

Stationarity of Manifold Time Series

Junhao Zhu^{*}, Dehan Kong[†], Zhaolei Zhang[†],
University of Toronto,
and
Zhenhua Lin[‡]
National University of Singapore

Abstract

In modern interdisciplinary research, manifold time series data have been garnering more attention. A critical question in analyzing such data is “stationarity”, which reflects the underlying dynamic behavior and is crucial across various fields like cell biology, neuroscience and empirical finance. Yet, there has been an absence of a formal definition of stationarity that is tailored to manifold time series. This work bridges this gap by proposing the first definitions of first-order and second-order stationarity for manifold time series. Additionally, we develop novel statistical procedures to test the stationarity of manifold time series and study their asymptotic properties. Our methods account for the curved nature of manifolds, leading to a more intricate analysis than that in Euclidean space. The effectiveness of our methods is evaluated through numerical simulations and their practical merits are demonstrated through analyzing a cell-type proportion time series dataset from a paper recently published in *Cell*. The first-order stationarity test result aligns with the biological findings of this paper, while the second-order stationarity test provides numerical support for a critical assumption made therein.

Keywords: bootstrap, CUSUM, curvature, spectral density, sphere.

^{*}JZ is partially supported by CANSSI (Canadian Statistical Sciences Institute), Data Science Institute and Medicine by Design, University of Toronto

[†]DK and ZZ acknowledge financial support from a *Catalyst Grant from Data Science Institute and Medicine by Design, University of Toronto*.

[‡]ZL research is partially supported by the NUS startup grant A-0004816-00-00

1 Introduction

Recent advances of scientific research introduce various complex data; a notable category among these is manifold time series, which refer to temporal data with values residing on manifolds. Central to the exploration of these datasets is a crucial question: is a manifold time series “stationary”? This inquiry is vital for a thorough understanding of the data’s dynamic nature and its implications in the broader context of the study.

For example, in cell biology, the pioneering study by [Schiebinger et al. \(2019\)](#) introduced Waddington Optimal Transport (WOT) for investigating cellular developmental paths and transitions between cell types by tracking changes in cell-type proportions over time. These proportions, represented on a unit sphere (e.g., [Scealy & Welsh 2011](#)), form a spherical time series. Stationarity in this context reflects dynamic equilibrium in cellular development, such as stable populations in stem cell differentiation. The relevance of “stationarity” in manifold time series (here, the unit sphere) to WOT emerges in two key ways. First, WOT seeks to capture the evolving trend in a spherical time series of non-stationary cell-type proportions, yet it lacks a formal method to distinguish genuine non-stationarity from random fluctuations. Secondly, WOT implicitly presumes the constancy of randomness from cellular proliferation and apoptosis or sequencing platform technical noises over time, without thorough statistical justification. These aspects relate to first- and second-order stationarity in manifold time series.

As another example, in neuroscience, there is a growing interest in modelling time series with values in the manifold of symmetric positive definite (SPD) matrices to study dynamic resting state functional connectivity and to reveal the fundamental mechanisms underlying brain networks ([Yang et al. 2020](#)). Typically, one interesting question is to determine the “stationarity” of the SPD-matrices-valued manifold time series. Scientists are interested in whether the observed temporal fluctuation in functional connectivity values reflects a reliable “non-stationarity”, or

merely attributes to noise and statistical uncertainty.

The above examples show that determining/testing “stationarity” of manifold time series is pivotal for advancing our knowledge in these complex biological fields. The concept of “stationarity” in manifold time series is not restricted to biological studies. In empirical finance, an important question is to determine whether the correlation matrices of returns, as a time series residing in a sub-manifold of SPD matrices, undergoes some systematic shift over time (Wied et al. 2012). Several promising results from spherical or general non-Euclidean time series analysis were proposed. Fisher & Lee (1994) and Zhu & Müller (2024) mainly focus on estimation of auto-regressive models in sphere-valued time series. Dubey & Müller (2020), Wang et al. (2023) and Jiang et al. (2024) investigated change-point detection in non-Euclidean data, assuming time series are segmented into blocks with constant mean and variance. However, their methods did not address more general forms of weak stationarity or account for continuous underlying dynamics in the time series. van Delft & Blumberg (2024) explored testing for strong stationarity in time-varying metric measure spaces, where each data point in the time series is a metric space instead of a point within a given manifold. A visible gap remains: none of the existing works have formally defined the concept of first and second-order stationarity for manifold time series. The existing weak stationarity definition and testing methods (Zhou 2013, Aue & van Delft 2020, van Delft et al. 2021) are only applicable to data in Euclidean or Hilbert spaces.

To bridge this gap, we propose the first definition of the first-order and second-order stationarity of manifold time series, and develop corresponding testing procedures to determine whether a manifold time series exhibits either first-order or second-order stationarity, based on our extension of locally stationary time series to manifolds. The notion of local stationarity, originally formulated for time series in Euclidean space, assumes a data-generating scheme varying smoothly within local time intervals (e.g., Priestley 1988, Dahlhaus 1997, Zhou & Wu 2009). In our work, local

stationarity allows a proper definition of the second-order stationarity of a manifold time series which may not be first-order stationary, and connects the manifold calculus with tools of asymptotic statistics to facilitate derivation of asymptotic properties of our test statistics. Local stationarity is a reasonable assumption in our real data application to cell biology, as demonstrated in Figure 4A and related works of cell biology (e.g., [Lähnemann et al. 2020](#)).

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We propose the first definition of the first-order stationarity and second-order stationarity for manifold time series. Our definition incorporates the stationarity of multivariate time series in Euclidean space as a special case. As demonstrated in the above examples, these concepts are crucial for addressing practical scientific inquiries.
2. We develop procedures to test the first-order stationarity of manifold time series based on the Cumulative Sum (CUSUM) ([Page 1954](#)) of residuals in the tangent space at the sample intrinsic mean. The tangent space at the sample intrinsic mean is not identical to the tangent space at the population intrinsic mean due to the curved nature of manifolds as shown in Figure 1(a). This property makes the CUSUM statistic in manifolds more complicated than the counterpart in Euclidean space. We show that the asymptotic null distribution of the L^2 -norm of the CUSUM of residuals induced by the Riemannian metric converges to the sup-norm of a process in the tangent space at the population intrinsic mean, with the form $U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{H}(1) \circ U(1)$, where $U(\cdot)$ is a centered Gaussian process with an unknown covariance operator and $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ is an unknown invertible linear operator induced by the curvatures. We propose a test that leverages techniques of Gaussian multiplier bootstrap to mimic $U(\cdot)$ and estimates the operator-valued function $\mathcal{H}(t)$. We establish the consistency of our method and provide the local alternative distribution to show that our method has local power with a rate of $O(T^{-1/2})$, where T is the length of the time series.

3. Third, we develop a second-order stationarity test for the manifold time series, and establish asymptotic properties for the test statistic. One of the major challenges lies in determining the asymptotic distribution of the test statistics since the curved nature of manifolds introduces an additional $O_p(T^{-1/2})$ term to the test statistic compared to Euclidean space. Surprisingly, under certain regularity conditions, the null distribution of the test statistic for manifold time series is invariant to manifold curvatures, asymptotically converges to a Gaussian distribution and aligns with its counterparts in Euclidean space. In contrast, under the alternative hypothesis, although the test statistic still asymptotically follows a Gaussian distribution, it exhibits a difference in variance from its Euclidean counterpart.

We structure the rest of the paper, as follows. In Section 2, we introduce background of Riemannian manifolds and Euclidean time series. Section 3 defines the first- and second-order stationarity for manifold time series. In Section 4, we develop statistical tests for the stationarity of manifold time series, and establish the corresponding asymptotic properties of the test statistics under null and alternative hypotheses. Simulations and real data application are presented in Section 5 and Section 6, respectively. In Section 7, we end with a brief discussion.

2 Background

Before introducing the definition of stationarity and the methods of stationarity test within the context of manifold time series, we briefly review the concepts of stationarity in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^D , some background of Riemannian manifolds, and the intrinsic mean.

2.1 Stationarity and locally stationary

The notion of stationarity is important as it guarantees the consistency and validity of most of modelling and testing in time series data analysis (Shumway et al. 2000). The definition of

stationarity is given as follows:

- A collection of \mathbb{R}^D -valued random vectors $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is first-order stationary if $\mathbb{E}(X_i) \equiv \mu$ for some constant $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^D$. It is second-order stationary if the auto-covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}\{(X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i)(X_j - \mathbb{E}X_j)^\top\}$ only depends on the lag $|i - j|$. If a time series is both first and second-order stationary, then it is stationary.

In real-world time series data, the stationarity may not always hold. Instead, the local stationarity was introduced (Dahlhaus 1997, Zhou & Wu 2009). It offers a way to relax the stationarity assumption, enabling flexible modeling of changes in mean and dependency structures.

Zhou & Wu (2009) defines the local stationarity of time series in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^D as follows:

- A collection of \mathbb{R}^D -valued random vectors $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is a locally stationary time series if there exists an unknown measurable filter function G such that $X_i = G(i/T, \mathcal{F}_i)$, where $\mathcal{F}_i = (\dots, \epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{i-1}, \epsilon_i)$, $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d. random variables, and G satisfies some smooth conditions.

The above definition includes many time series models, such as time-varying linear processes and time-varying GARCH models (Bollerslev 1986) satisfying some regularity conditions (Wu & Zhou 2011, Zhou 2013). If the filter G is further independent of t , then the time series is stationary.

2.2 Riemannian manifold

Below we briefly introduce some basic concepts of Riemannian manifolds that are essential to our development, with slight emphasis on geometric intuition rather than mathematical rigour. We refer readers to a self-contained note by Shao et al. (2022) for more details and to the textbook by Do Carmo (1992) for a more comprehensive treatment.

A topological space \mathcal{M} is called a differential manifold of dimension D if it admits a maximal differentiable atlas that consists of coordinate systems $(U_\alpha, \mathbf{x}_\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in J$, such that $\bigcup_{\alpha \in J} U_\alpha = \mathcal{M}$

and $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \circ \mathbf{x}_\beta^{-1}$ is differentiable whenever $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset$, where J is an index set and each $\mathbf{x}_\alpha : U_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a coordinate map. A curve $c : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is differentiable at p if $p = c(0)$ and there exists a coordinate system $(U_\alpha, \mathbf{x}_\alpha)$ such that $p \in U_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \circ c$ is differentiable at 0. The tangent vector to the curve c at $t = 0$ is a linear functional $c'(0)$ such that for any function f differentiable at p we have $c'(0)f = d(f \circ c)(0)/dt$. The tangent space at p is the linear space of all tangent vectors at p , denoted by $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$. The aggregation of all tangent spaces $\cup_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$ is called the tangent bundle of \mathcal{M} , denoted by $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}$.

A differentiable manifold \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold if it is additionally equipped with a Riemannian metric which defines a smoothly varying inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p : \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each point p in \mathcal{M} . The Riemannian metric also induces a norm $\| \cdot \|_p$ on each $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$, and induces a distance function on \mathcal{M} , denoted by $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, so that \mathcal{M} endowed with $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a metric space. In addition, the Riemannian metric uniquely determines an affine connection called Levi-Civita connection $\nabla : \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$, which allows us to connect nearby tangent spaces and to define the directional derivatives of tangent vectors. An important geometric characteristic of manifold is the curvature. Formally, the curvature on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} is defined as a tensor, given by $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(U, V) = \nabla_V \nabla_U - \nabla_U \nabla_V + \nabla_{[U, V]}$, where U, V are two vector fields on \mathcal{M} and $[U, V] = UV - VU$. Given a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and a two-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$ spanned by two linearly independent tangent vectors $u, v \in \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$, the sectional curvature is defined as $\kappa(u, v, p) = \langle \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}(u, v)u, v \rangle_p / (\|u\|_p^2 \|v\|_p^2 - \langle u, v \rangle_p^2)$. If $\kappa(u, v, p) \leq 0$ (≥ 0) for any $(u, v, p) \in \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$, then we say \mathcal{M} is a non-positively-curved (non-negatively-curved) manifold. For Euclidean space $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^D$, one can show that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}} \equiv 0$ and $\kappa(u, v, p) \equiv 0$. Intuitively, the deviation of the curvature tensor or the sectional curvature from 0 quantifies how a manifold bends or curves.

Let $c(t)$ be a differentiable curve with $c(0) = p$, and v be a tangent vector in $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$. The

parallel transport of v along $c(t)$ is a vector field $V(t)$ defined on $\mathcal{T}_{c(t)}\mathcal{M}$ such that $V(0) = v$ and $\nabla_{c'(t)}V(t) = 0$. Denote the parallel transport of $v \in \mathcal{T}_{c(s)}\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{T}_{c(t)}\mathcal{M}$ along c by $\mathcal{P}_{c(s)}^{c(t)}(v)$. The collection $\{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, denoted by \mathbf{E} , is called a parallel orthonormal frame on $\mathcal{T}_{\mu(t)}\mathcal{M}$, if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. $E_k(t) = \mathcal{P}_{c(0)}^{c(t)}E_k(0) \in \mathcal{T}_{c(t)}\mathcal{M}$, for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.
2. $\langle E_k(t), E_l(t) \rangle_{c(t)} = \delta_{kl}$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and $k, l \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, where δ_{kl} equals to 1 if $k = l$, and 0 if $k \neq l$.

We write $\mathbf{E}(t) = \{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t)\}$.

A differentiable curve γ is a geodesic if $\nabla_{\gamma'(t)}\gamma'(t) = 0$. The concept of geodesic generalizes the straight line in Euclidean space. For any $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a unique geodesic such that $\gamma_v(0) = p$ and $\gamma'_v(0) = v$, which gives rise to the Riemannian exponential map $\text{Exp}_p(v) = \gamma_v(1)$. There is a neighborhood $\mathcal{E}_p \subset \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$ such that Exp_p is bijective on \mathcal{E}_p . Therefore, restricting Exp_p to \mathcal{E}_p , we can define its inverse. This inverse is called the Riemannian logarithmic map at p , denoted by Log_p , satisfying $\text{Log}_p(\text{Exp}_p v) = v$ for $v \in \mathcal{E}_p$.

Let $f_X(\cdot) = d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\cdot, X)/2$, and denote $\partial_p f_X \in \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$ the Riemannian gradient of f_X at p , that is, for any tangent vector $u \in \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$, $u(f_X)(p) = \langle \partial_p f_X, u \rangle_p$. We also let $\mathcal{S}_p\mathcal{M}$ denote the space of self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$ and $H(p, X)$ denote the Riemannian Hessian operator of the function $f_X(\cdot)$ at p , i.e., the operator in $\mathcal{S}_p\mathcal{M}$ such that for any tangent vectors $u, v \in \mathcal{T}_p\mathcal{M}$, $\langle H(p, X)u, v \rangle_p = \langle \nabla_u \partial_p f_X, v \rangle_p = \langle \nabla_v \partial_p f_X, u \rangle_p = \langle H(p, X)v, u \rangle_p$.

2.3 Intrinsic mean

In curved Riemannian manifolds, the concepts of algebraic addition and the usual mean/average do not apply. The notion of the intrinsic mean, proposed by [Fréchet \(1948\)](#), serves as a well established generalization of the traditional mean in the literature. For a random element X in a

metric space \mathcal{M} with a distance function d , we say μ is the intrinsic mean (or Fréchet mean) of X if

$$\mu = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(X, p). \quad (1)$$

Unlike the arithmetic mean, which is well-defined for data in Euclidean spaces, the intrinsic mean extends the idea of finding a central point to spaces where the notion of averaging as simple arithmetic might not make sense. In particular, the intrinsic mean mimics the Euclidean mean in the sense that it minimizes the average squared distance to X . The intrinsic mean is a popular tool to model metric-space (including Riemannian manifolds as a special case) valued data in different contexts, such as regression for non-Euclidean data (Petersen & Müller 2019, Shao et al. 2022), change-point detection (Jiang et al. 2024, Dubey & Müller 2020) in metric space, and generalized principal component analysis for manifold-valued data (Pennec 2018). To ensure the unique existence of μ in Eq.(1), we assume one of the following conditions:

- (M1) \mathcal{M} is a simply connected and complete manifold, with bounded non-positive sectional curvatures.
- (M2) \mathcal{M} is a simply connected and complete subset of a complete Riemannian manifold with positive sectional curvatures upper bounded by $\kappa > 0$, and satisfies a bounded diameter condition: $\sup_{p, q \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\mathcal{M}}(p, q) < \pi/\kappa^{1/2}$.

3 Stationarity on Riemannian Manifolds

In this section, we introduce the definition of stationarity and local stationarity of manifold time series. Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold of dimension D satisfying conditions (M1) or (M2), and $\mu(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a smooth curve on \mathcal{M} , associated with a parallel orthonormal frame $\mathbf{E} = \{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$. For any $e = (e^1, \dots, e^D) \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $e^\top \mathbf{E}(t)$ denotes the vector

in $\mathcal{T}_{\mu(t)}\mathcal{M}$ with coordinate-representations (e^1, \dots, e^D) under the basis $\{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t)\}$, i.e., $e^\top \mathbf{E}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^D e^j E_j(t)$.

Definition 1 (first-order stationarity) *A manifold time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ on \mathcal{M} is first-order stationary if there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mu = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(X_i, p)$ holds for all $i = 1, \dots, T$, i.e., when its intrinsic mean stays constant.*

Before defining the second-order stationarity for manifold time series, we need to introduce the notion of local stationarity. Traditionally, the second-order stationarity in Euclidean space is defined for first-order stationary time series. However, it is common in practice that a time series is trend-stationary, i.e., it is second-order stationary after subtracting a deterministic trend. In order to incorporate this wider sense of second-order stationary in manifold time series, we first introduce the local stationarity.

Definition 2 (local stationarity) *A manifold time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ on \mathcal{M} is locally stationary with the mean function $\mu(t)$ if there exists a parallel orthonormal frame $\mathbf{E} = \{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ and an \mathbb{R}^D -valued processes $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^T$ such that, with $t_i = i/T$,*

- $e_i = G_{\mathbf{E}}(t_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$ for some unknown measurable filter function, where $\mathcal{F}_i = (\dots, \varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_{i-1}, \varepsilon_i)$ and $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d random variables,
- $\text{Log}_{\mu(t_i)} X_i = e_i^\top \mathbf{E}(t_i)$ with $\mu(t_i) = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(X_i, p)$.

Local stationarity in manifold time series describes a data generating mechanism that varies continuously over time, where in a short time interval, the statistical characteristics for the time series, such as the intrinsic mean of the time series, do not significantly change. In addition, $\text{Log}_{\mu(t_i)} X_i = e_i^\top \mathbf{E}(t_i)$ implies $X_i = \text{Exp}_{\mu(t_i)} \{e_i^\top \mathbf{E}(t_i)\}$, ensuring that the observations X_1, X_2, \dots, X_T sampled from the data generating mechanism fall onto the manifold \mathcal{M} . In

contrast, analyses of the manifold time series while ignoring the manifold structure (e.g., via embedding the manifold into a Euclidean space and performing the analyses therein) may not preserve this important property.

Remark 1 *Throughout this manuscript, our definition of local stationarity follows the framework of Zhou & Wu (2009). We also recognize an alternative definition for Euclidean and functional time series discussed in Dahlhaus (1997), van Delft & Eichler (2018), which differs from that of Zhou & Wu (2009) by a factor of $O_p(1/T)$ under certain regularity conditions. Our theoretical results can be extended to accommodate this alternative with minimal adjustments.*

To introduce the concept of second-order stationarity, we note that for a locally stationary manifold time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ as in the above definition, we have $\mathbb{E}[e_i] = 0$. For a fixed orthonormal frame \mathbf{E} , let $\mathcal{C}_{ij} = \mathbb{E}(e_i e_j^\top)$ be the covariance matrix of coordinate-representation for $\text{Log}_\mu(i/T)$ and $\text{Log}_\mu(j/T)$ under \mathbf{E} .

Definition 3 (second-order stationarity) *A locally stationary manifold time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ on \mathcal{M} with mean function $\mu(t)$ is second-order stationary if \mathcal{C}_{ij} depends on i, j only through $|i - j|$.*

If a manifold time series is both first- and second-order stationary, then we say it is stationary. Our definition of stationarity extends the traditional notion from Euclidean space to general Riemannian manifolds. When \mathcal{M} is the Euclidean space endowed with the canonical inner product, then our definition of both first- and second-order stationarity is identical to the classical definition as given in Section 2.1. The definition is also invariant to the choice of the parallel orthonormal frames, i.e., if \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{E}' are two parallel orthonormal frames along $\mu(t)$ and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is first-order and/or second-order stationary under \mathbf{E} , then it is also first-order and/or second-order stationary under \mathbf{E}' . In fact, the concept of second-order stationarity in Euclidean space also (implicitly) depends on parallel orthonormal frames; see Remark 2 for elaboration.

The above three definitions provide tools to characterize dynamic states of different levels for manifold time series. For example, for the aforementioned cell developmental data, first-order stationarity of cell-type composition time series indicates that cell-type transitions reach an equilibrium state, while second-order stationarity suggests that the randomness in cell-type transitions, caused by noise in sampling procedures or cellular birth and death, remains constant over time. In addition, the proposed local stationarity can serve as a valuable tool for modeling multi-resolution and continuous cellular developmental processes, particularly observed in tissue generation (Lähnemann et al. 2020).

Remark 2 *One may notice that the definition of second-order stationarity in Riemannian manifold is defined through the parallel orthonormal frame, while in Euclidean space, the definition of stationarity appears to be free of orthonormal frames. However, we show that even for Euclidean space, the second-order stationarity is implicitly defined on the parallel orthonormal frame, and the second-order stationary may not hold if the basis along the mean is no longer a parallel orthonormal frame. For example, let $\{(Z_{i,1}, Z_{i,2})\}_{i=1}^T$ be an i.i.d sequence of standard Gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^2 , and $X_i = (i/T + 0.5 \cdot Z_{i,1} + 0.5 \cdot Z_{i,2}, i/T + 0.3 \cdot Z_{i,1} + 2 \cdot Z_{i,2})$. Then $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is a second-order stationary time series with a linear trend. Let $E_1 = (1, 0)$ and $E_2 = (0, 1)$ be the canonical orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^2 , and $E_1(t) = \cos(t)E_1 + \sin(t)E_2$ and $E_2(t) = -\sin(t)E_1 + \cos(t)E_2$ be a set of time-varying orthonormal basis for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, which is no longer parallel. The coordinate representation of the detrend time series $\{X_i - i/T\}_{i=1}^T$ under the frame $\{E_1(i/T), E_2(i/T)\}$, is not stationary because the autocovariance matrix of the coordinate representation $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^T$ depends on i .*

4 Tests of Stationarity

The real-world examples in the introduction highlight the considerable scientific importance of assessing the stationarity in manifold time series. In this section, we introduce detailed statistical testing procedures for both first- and second-order stationarity in manifold time series.

4.1 First-order stationarity test

Let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold of dimension D , and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ be a locally stationary time series with mean function $\mu(t)$ satisfying Definition 2. Let $\mathbf{E} = \{E_1(t), \dots, E_D(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ be a fixed parallel orthonormal frame on $\mu(t)$ and $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^T$ be the coordinate-representation of $\text{Log}_{\mu(i/T)} X_i \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu(i/T)} \mathcal{M}$ under the basis $\{E_1(i/T), \dots, E_D(i/T)\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, T$. We consider the following null and alternative:

$\mathbf{H}_0 : \mu(t) \equiv \mu$ for some constant $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, versus $\mathbf{H}_1 : \mu(t)$ is a non-constant smooth curve.

We employ a CUSUM statistic to construct a test for these hypotheses. First, we estimate μ by the empirical intrinsic mean $\hat{\mu} = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^T d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i)$. Then, with $v_i = \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$ and $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^j v_i$, we introduce the test statistic

$$Q_T = \max_{1 \leq j \leq T} \|T^{-1/2} S_j\|_{\hat{\mu}}.$$

Under \mathbf{H}_1 , one would expect the CUSUM statistic Q_T to be larger compared to its value when \mathbf{H}_0 is valid.

To develop a test based on the CUSUM statistic Q_T , we study the asymptotic property of Q_T , starting with introducing some technical definitions and regularity conditions. As the manifold time series may contain complex dependency structures, we first introduce an additional quantity

to quantify the temporal dependency; similar dependency measures can also be found in [Wu \(2005\)](#) and [Zhou \(2013\)](#).

Definition 4 Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ be a locally stationary time series as in [Definition 2](#), and $\{\varepsilon'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ an i.i.d copy of $\{\varepsilon\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Assume that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq T} \mathbb{E} \|e_i\|_p^p < \infty$ for some positive p , where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the L_p -norm in Euclidean space. Then for any integer $k > 0$, the k -th physical dependence measure is

$$\delta_p(k, G_{\mathbf{E}}) := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} (\mathbf{E} \|G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_k) - G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, (\mathcal{F}_{-1}, \varepsilon'_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k))\|_p^p)^{1/p}. \quad (2)$$

If $k \leq 0$, we take $\delta_p(k, G_{\mathbf{E}}) := 0$ conventionally.

We also assume the following regularity conditions for establishing the asymptotic distributions of the test statistic.

(A1) The Hessian tensor $H(p, X)$ is L_H -Lipschitz continuous in p given X , and L_H -Lipschitz continuous in X almost surely for any fixed p , where $L_H < \infty$ is uniformly bounded.

(A2) There exists some finite constant C such that $\mathbb{E} \|G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0) - G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 \leq C|s - t|$, and

$$\mathbb{E} d_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{Exp}_{\mu(t)}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top \mathbf{E}(t)\}, \text{Exp}_{\mu(s)}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top \mathbf{E}(s)\}) \leq C|t - s|, \quad \forall s, t \in [0, 1].$$

(A3) $\delta_4(k, G) = O(\alpha^k)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, where $\delta_4(k, G)$ is defined in [Definition 4](#).

(A4) Let $\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_k)^\top\}$ for $t \in [0, 1]$, where \mathbb{Z} is the set of all integers.

We assume the smallest eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(t)$ is bounded away from 0 uniformly over $t \in [0, 1]$.

(A5) $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{P}(\|G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 \geq M) \leq \exp(-C_1 M)$ for some constant $C_1 < \infty$ and any $M > 0$, i.e., $G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)$ is uniformly sub-exponential.

The above assumptions, whose Euclidean counterparts are common in the literature, are further discussed in Remark 3. A concrete example satisfying the above conditions is provided in Remark 4. The following lemma plays an important role in the investigation of the asymptotic properties of Q_T , and $\mathcal{S}_\mu \mathcal{M}$ is defined in Section 2.2.

Remark 3 *The assumption (A1) holds when the support of data is a bounded subset of \mathcal{M} , and can be replaced with sub-Gaussian conditions, for example, $\max_{1 \leq i \leq T} \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{M}}(X_i, \mu) > M) \leq \exp(-CM^2)$ for some positive constant $C < \infty$ and any $M > 0$. Euclidean counterparts of Assumptions (A2)-(A4) are common in the literature of stationarity test, such as Zhou (2013). The condition (A5) is required to control the variation induced by the curved nature of manifolds. Stronger conditions were used in previous works of non-Euclidean data analysis. For example, Petersen & Müller (2019), Dubey & Müller (2020) assumed bounded support of data.*

Remark 4 *We give an example satisfying Assumptions (A1)-(A5). Let \mathcal{M} be the space of 3×3 SPD matrices with the affine-invariant metric (Moakher 2005). Let $\mu(t)$ be a geodesic such that $\mu(0) = I_3$ and $\mu(1) = 1.5I_3$. Let $\{E_{j,k}(0)\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3} \subset \text{Sym}_3$ be a set of 3×3 symmetric matrices with 1 at the (j, k) and (k, j) entries and 0 at the remaining entries. One can show that $\{E_{j,k}(0)\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3}$ is an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu(0)} \text{Sym}_3^+$, with $\|E_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mu(0)} = 1$ for $j = k$, and $\|E_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mu(0)} = \sqrt{2}$ for $j \neq k$. Let $\{E_{j,k}(t) : 1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ be the parallel orthogonal frame along $\mu(t)$ with initial value $E_{j,k}(0)$. For simplicity in notations, we also let $t_i = i/T$. A time-varying auto-regressive processes satisfying our conditions are given as follows:*

$$\text{Log}_{\mu(t_i)} X_{i+1} = (0.05 + 0.25t_i) \mathcal{P}_{\mu(t_i)}^{\mu(t_{i+1})} \text{Log}_{\mu(t_{i+1})} X_i + \{(t_i - 0.5)^2 + 0.2\} \varepsilon_i,$$

where $\varepsilon_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3} Z_{i,j,k} E_{j,k}(t_i)$, and the collection of $Z_{i,j,k}$ are independent Gaussian random variables such that $Z_{i,j,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ if $j = k$ and $Z_{i,j,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/4)$. Here, $\mathcal{P}_{\mu(s)}^{\mu(t)}$ is the parallel

transport map from $\mu(s)$ to $\mu(t)$ along μ .

Lemma 1 *Let $H_i = H(\mu, X_i)$. If Assumptions (A1)-(A5) hold and $\mu(t) \equiv \mu$ for some constant $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, then $d(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = O_p(T^{-1/2})$. In addition, there uniquely exists $\mathcal{H}(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\mu \mathcal{M}$, an $\mathcal{S}_\mu \mathcal{M}$ -valued function, such that $\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathcal{H}(k/T) - T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k H_i\|_\mu = O_p(T^{-1/2})$.*

We are ready to present the asymptotic null distribution of Q_T in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *If Assumptions (A1)-(A5) hold and that $\mu(t) \equiv \mu$ for some constant $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, then*

$$Q_T \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1)\|_\mu, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{H} is introduced in Lemma 1 and $U(t) = u(t)^\top \mathbf{E}(0)$ with $u(t)$ being a centered Gaussian process with covariance function $\Sigma_u(t, s) = \int_0^{\min(t, s)} \Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi) d\xi$.

Theorem 1 states that the null distribution of the test statistic Q_T converges to the distribution of the sup-norm of a centered Gaussian process defined on $\mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$. In Euclidean space and Hilbert space, the operator valued function $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is given by $\mathcal{H}(t) = t \circ \text{Id}$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) = t \circ \text{Id}$ and Q_T weakly converges to $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|U(t) - tU(1)\|_2$, which is identical to the convergence of the asymptotic distribution of $T^{-1/2} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} X_j - T^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq l \leq T} X_l\|$ as given in Zhou (2013). However, for a first-order stationary time series in a general Riemannian manifold with non-vanishing curvatures, $\mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \neq t \circ \text{Id}$, and the test proposed by Zhou (2013) is no longer valid since it does not include the additional term $\mathcal{H}(t)$ induced by the curvature. Intuitively, the difference between $\mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1)$ and $t \circ \text{Id}$ is induced by the deviation shown in Figure 1, i.e., the deviations of $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^\mu \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$ from $\text{Log}_\mu X_i - \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}$.

The limiting process established by Theorem 1 includes two components, specifically, a Gaussian random process $U(t)$ with a complicated covariance function and a deterministic operator-valued function $\mathcal{H}(t)$. To perform a valid test under null hypothesis, we propose to




Figure 1: Left Panel: Illustration on how a curved manifold differs from Euclidean space and affects the CUSUM statistics. Assume μ is the population intrinsic mean, $\hat{\mu}$ is the sample intrinsic mean, and X_i is a data point in \mathcal{M} . Let $v_i = \text{Log}_\mu X_i$ and $\hat{v}_i = \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$. The red star \star represents $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^\mu v_i$, and the square \blacksquare represents $v_i - \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}$. In Euclidean space, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^\mu \hat{v}_i = X_i - \hat{\mu}$, $v_i = X_i - \mu$, $\text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu} - \mu$, and thus $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^\mu v_i = v_i - \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}$, or equivalently $X_i - \hat{\mu} = (X_i - \mu) - (\hat{\mu} - \mu)$. However, in a curved manifold, as shown in the figure, $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^\mu v_i$ (\star) deviates from $v_i - \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}$ (\blacksquare); this deviation contributes to the CUSUM statistics, which is unknown and need to be estimated from data. Right Panel: Illustration of the local alternative. We consider a perturbation $\tau(T) \cdot b(t)$ on the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$. Let $\gamma(s, t) = \text{Exp}_\mu(s \cdot b(t))$. As $T \rightarrow \infty$, $\tau(T)$ converges to 0, and the mean function $\mu_T(t) = \gamma(\tau(T), t)$ converges to μ .

approximate the deterministic function $\mathcal{H}(t)$ by a CUSUM statistic and bootstrap the random process $U(t)$ by adapting the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap in Zhou (2013). Specifically, for $t = k/T$ with some positive integer k , we take $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(t) = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\hat{\mu}, X_i)$ as an estimate of $\mathcal{H}(t)$. Roughly speaking, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ can be viewed as a plug-in estimate of $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ by substituting μ with $\hat{\mu}$.

We bootstrap the Gaussian process $U(t)$ by a moving-block multiplier bootstrap procedure, as follows. Let n be a fixed block size. For each bootstrap sample, generate i.i.d standard Gaussian random variables $\{R_k\}_{k=n}^{T-n+1}$. For $t = k/T$ with $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, define $U_\star(t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \{n(T - n + 1)\}^{-1/2} R_j \sum_{i=j}^{j+n-1} \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$. Via resampling from U_\star , we can obtain an estimate of the null distribution of Q_T ; see Algorithm 1, where a test procedure is provided in Step 5. The following theorem establishes the consistency of the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap method with curvature term adjustment under the null, showing that the proposed test procedure is asymptotically valid.

Theorem 2 Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold and the block-size $n := n(T)$ satisfies $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} n(T) = \infty$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1}n(T) = 0$. Under \mathbf{H}_0 , conditioning on $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$, we then have

$$Q_T^{(b)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1)\|_{\mu}. \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1 Curvature Adjusted Multiplier Bootstrap (CAMB)

- Input:** Manifold time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$, bootstrap sample size B , and the significant level α .
1. Estimate empirical intrinsic mean $\hat{\mu} = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} T^{-1} \sum_i d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i)$. Estimate the Riemannian Hessian tensor \hat{H}_i by the plug-in estimator $\hat{H}_i = H(\hat{\mu}, X_i)$, and the tensor-valued process $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_j = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^j \hat{H}_i$, $j = 1, \dots, T$.
 2. Compute the residuals $v_i = \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$, and determine the moving-block size n by the minimum-volatility method (Politis et al. 2012).
 3. Compute the CUSUM $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^j v_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq T$, the test statistic Q_T , and the moving-block local sum $S_{j,n} = \sum_{i=j}^{j+n-1} v_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq T - n + 1$.
 4. Generate bootstrap samples of Q_T :
 - for** $b = 1, \dots, B$ **do**
 - i. Generate $T - n + 1$ i.i.d standard normal random variables $\{R_j^{(b)}\}_{j=1}^{T-n+1}$.
 - ii. $V_{k,n}^{(b)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \{n(T - n + 1)\}^{-1/2} S_{j,n} R_j^{(b)}$, for $k = n, \dots, T - n + 1$.
 - iii. $Q_T^{(b)} = \max_{n \leq k \leq T-n+1} \|V_{k,n}^{(b)} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k^{-1} \circ V_{T-n+1,n}^{(b)}\|_{\hat{\mu}}$.
 - end for**
 5. Obtain the bootstrap p -value = $(B^{-1}) \sum_{b=1}^B I\{Q_T^{(b)} \geq Q_T\}$, and reject H_0 if p -value $\leq \alpha$.
-

Next we study the asymptotic local power of the proposed test, where we utilize tools of parametrized surfaces in manifolds (Do Carmo 1992). Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ be a constant, and $b(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mu}\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth curve, $\gamma(s, t) = \text{Exp}_{\mu}\{s \cdot b(t)\}$, $0 \leq s, t \leq 1$ be a parametrized surface near μ , and $\{E_j(s, t), j = 1, \dots, d, 0 \leq s, t \leq 1\}$ a collection of vector fields such that

- For fixed s , $\{E_j(s, t), 0 \leq t \leq 1, j = 1, \dots, d\}$ is a parallel orthonormal frame along γ ;
- $E_j(s, t) : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}$ is smooth on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$.

We consider the following local alternative hypothesis under the locally stationary scheme:

$$\mu_T(t) = \gamma(\tau(T), t), \text{ with } \tau(T) \text{ being a non-negative sequence s.t. } \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tau(T) = 0, \quad (5)$$

for a locally stationary time series $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ as in Definition 2 with

$$\text{Log}_{\mu_T(i/T)} = e_i^\top \mathbf{E}(\tau(T), i/T). \quad (6)$$

A visual illustration of this local alternative is provided Figure 1(b). This local alternative scheme possesses two properties. First, for each T , the data is locally stationary associated with the mean curve $\mu_T(\cdot)$ and parallel orthonormal frame $\mathbf{E}(\tau, \cdot)$. Second, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the time series smoothly changes and uniformly converges to a first-order stationary time series at a rate $\tau(T)$. In Euclidean space, this local alternative scheme is identical to the case where $X_i = \mu_T(i/T) + e_i$ with $\mu_T(t) = \mu + \tau(T)b(t)$ for a smooth function $b(t)$ and $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is a zero-mean locally stationary time series. The following theorems present the asymptotic results for the local alternative.

Theorem 3 Assume (A1)-(A5) and the local alternative hypothesis given by Eq.(5) and Eq.(6).

1. If $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{1/2}\tau(T) \rightarrow \infty$, then $Q_T \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely.
2. If $\tau(T) = T^{-1/2}$, then, with $\mathcal{H}(t)$ defined in Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_T \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1) \\ + \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \mathcal{H}(\xi) \circ b(\xi) d\xi - \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \mathcal{H}(\xi) \circ b(\xi) d\xi\|_{\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Theorem 4 Under the conditions of Theorem 3, if we further assume that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} n(T) = \infty$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} n(T)^{1/2}\tau(T) = 0$, then the bootstrap procedure in Algorithm 1 is consistent in the sense that, conditioning on $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$, $Q_T^{(b)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1)\|_{\mu}$.

Theorem 4 suggests that, even under the local alternative, the bootstrap samples $Q_T^{(b)}$ are asymptotically drawn from the limiting null distribution, with some suitable block size n that meets a stronger condition $n(T)^{1/2}\tau(T) \rightarrow 0$ compared with those in Theorem 2. Theorems 3 and 4

together show that our method can detect the first-order non-stationarity with rate $T^{-1/2}$ and has asymptotic power 1 whenever $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} n(T)^{1/2} \tau(T) = 0$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} n(T) = \infty$. Note that, in Theorem 3, if $b(\cdot) \equiv 0$, i.e., under the null hypothesis, the asymptotic distribution of Q_T given by Eq.(7) is identical to the one in Theorem 2.

Remark 5 *Our test for first-order stationarity differs from previous change point detection methods (Dubey & Müller 2020, Wang et al. 2023, Jiang et al. 2024) by examining whether the mean is constant or varies (continuously or discontinuously) over time, allowing gradual changes. In contrast, their methods detect abrupt changes and assume the time series can be segmented into blocks of constant mean and variance, a condition not required in our test.*

4.2 Second-order stationarity test

If a manifold time series is first-order stationary, it is natural to further test the second-order stationarity. Below we propose a second-order stationarity test for first-order stationary manifold time series using local spectral density (Dahlhaus 1997, Dette et al. 2011, van Delft et al. 2021).

Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ be a first-order stationary manifold time series with constant intrinsic mean μ . The local spectral density of the coordinate representation of $\{\text{Log}_\mu X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ under a given orthonormal frame \mathbf{E} , i.e., the time series $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^T$, is $F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0) G_{\mathbf{E}}^\top(t, \mathcal{F}_h)\} e^{-i\omega h}$, $\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]$, where we define $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ throughout this paper. Under some technical assumptions introduced later, the local spectral density is well-defined. The second-order stationarity of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is equivalent to $F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) \equiv F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)$ a.e. on $[-\pi, \pi] \times [0, 1]$, for some function $F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)$.

Thus, testing the second-order stationarity is equivalent to testing the following hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_0 &: F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) \equiv F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega), \text{ a.e. on } [-\pi, \pi] \times [0, 1]; \\ \mathbf{H}_1 &: F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) \neq F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega) \text{ for all } F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega) \text{ on a subset of } [-\pi, \pi] \times [0, 1] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with positive Lebesgue measure.

We then define squared variation of $F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t)$ by

$$V_F^2 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^1 \|F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, u)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 du d\omega - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\omega,$$

where $\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega) = \int_0^1 F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) dt$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of complex matrices. Since Hilbert-Schmidt norm is invariant under unitary transformation, V_F^2 is independent of choices of \mathbf{E} . Note that $V_F^2 = 0$ if and only if $F_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega, t) \equiv \bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)$, a.e. on $[-\pi, \pi] \times [0, 1]$. Thus, the testing the hypothesis in (8) is equivalent to testing

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : V_F^2 = 0, \text{ versus } \mathbf{H}_1 : V_F^2 > 0. \quad (9)$$

We adapt the technique from [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#), initially created for assessing second-order stationarity in functional time series, into our context of manifold time series. Let m and n be two positive integers such that $mn = T$ and n is even. The intuition is to split the time series into m blocks of size n , and then estimate the local spectral density and the squared variation V_F^2 . Let $\hat{\mu}$ be the empirical intrinsic mean and $I_n(\omega, t) = J_n(\omega, t) \otimes J_n(\omega, t)$, where \otimes is the complex tensor product (i.e., conjugation included) and

$$J_n(\omega, t) = (2\pi n)^{-1/2} \sum_{h=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_{[tT] - n/2 + 1 + h} \cdot e^{-ih\omega}.$$

Then the coordinate representation of $I_n(\lambda, t)$ under any orthonormal frame at $\hat{\mu}$ can serve as an estimator of $F(\lambda, t)$, and the test statistic is given by

$$V_{\hat{F}}^2 = 4\pi T^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_k, t_j), I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} + \widehat{W} - 4\pi n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j), m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}},$$

where $\omega_k = 2k\pi/n$, $t_j = n(j - 0.5)/T$, and $\widehat{W} = T^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \|J_n(\omega_k, t_j)\|_{\hat{\mu}}^2 \|J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j)\|_{\hat{\mu}}^2$.

To develop a test based on the statistic $V_{\hat{F}}^2$, we proceed with studying its asymptotic distribution. Let $Y_i(t) = (Y_{i,1}(t), \dots, Y_{i,d+d(d+1)/2}(t))$ be a vector such that $(Y_{i,1}(t), \dots, Y_{i,d}(t)) = G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_i)$ and

$$Y_{i,d+(d-j/2)(j-1)+k}(t) = \langle E_j(t), H(\mu, \text{Exp}_{\mu}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_i)^{\top} \mathbf{E}(t)\}) \circ E_{j+k}(t) \rangle_{\mu}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad j \leq k \leq d.$$

Given k random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_k , we denote the k^{th} order joint cumulant of k random variables $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_k\}$ by $\mathbf{cum}_k(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)$. We assume that $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ satisfies the following conditions. For every even number $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a positive sequence $\alpha_{k;i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}}$ such that, for all $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ and for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} (1 + |i_j|^{\ell}) \alpha_{k;i_1, \dots, i_k} < \infty$, and

$$\text{(C1)} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\mathbf{cum}_k\{Y_{i_1, l_1}(t), \dots, Y_{i_k, l_k}(t)\}| \leq \alpha_{k;i_1-i_k, \dots, i_{k-1}-i_k}, \quad \text{for all } (l_1, \dots, l_k) \in \{1, \dots, d+d(d+1)/2\}^k,$$

$$\text{(C2)} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t^{\ell}} \mathbf{cum}_k\{Y_{i_1, l_1}(t), \dots, Y_{i_k, l_k}(t)\} \right| \leq \alpha_{k;i_1-i_k, \dots, i_{k-1}-i_k}, \quad \text{for all } (l_1, \dots, l_k) \in \{1, \dots, d+d(d+1)/2\}^k.$$

The conditions **(C1)** and **(C2)** are proposed to guarantee the existence of the local spectral density and the weak convergence of test statistics. Similar conditions are used in previous works ([van Delft et al. 2021](#)).

Theorem 5 *If $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$ is a first-order stationary time series, the conditions (A1)-(A5) and (C1)-(C2) hold, and $T^{1/2} \ll n \ll T^{2/3}$, then under both null and fixed alternative hypotheses, we have*

$$T^{1/2}(V_{\hat{F}}^2 - V_F^2) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \sigma_V^2), \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty, \text{ where } 0 < \sigma_V^2 < \infty.$$

Theorem 6 *Suppose conditions (A1)-(A5) and (C1)-(C2) hold. Then under H_0 of (9), we have $\sigma_V^2 = 4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{HS}^4 d\omega$. In addition, the estimator*

$$\hat{\sigma}_V^2 = 16\pi^2 n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{HS} \right)^2 \quad (10)$$

converges to $4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{HS}^4 d\omega$ in probability under both H_0 and H_1 .

The above theorem implies that $\hat{\sigma}_V^2$ consistently estimates σ_V^2 under H_0 . It also suggests that, for a significant level α , we can conduct the test by rejecting the null hypothesis H_0 if $T^{1/2}V_{\hat{F}}^2/\hat{\sigma}_V \geq z_{1-\alpha}$, where $z_{1-\alpha}$ is the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of standard normal distribution. Under H_1 , the quantity $\hat{\sigma}_V^2$ given by (10) also converges to $4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{HS}^4 d\omega$ in probability. Thus, when $0 < 4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{HS}^4 d\omega < \infty$, the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis H_0 is approximately $\Phi\{(4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{HS}^4 d\omega)^{1/2} z_{1-\alpha}/\sigma_V + T^{1/2}V_F^2/\sigma_V\}$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the CDF of the standard normal distribution. This result implies that the test has asymptotic power 1 as $T \rightarrow \infty$ under any fixed alternative H_1 .

Interestingly, Theorem 5 implies that under certain regularity conditions, the null distribution of our test statistic for the second-order stationarity is not affected by the curvature. This is in contrast to the first-order stationarity test, where curvature does have an impact on the null distribution. The reason is that the curvature effect in $4\pi T^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_k, t_j), I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle_{HS}$ is asymptotically neutralized by the curvature effect in $(4\pi n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j), m^{-1} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{HS}$ under the null hypothesis. Under the alternative hypothesis, the curvature effect exists and

asymptotically has a form of $\langle U, \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} \hat{\mu} \rangle_{\mu}$, where U is an unknown deterministic vector in $\mathcal{T}_{\mu} \mathcal{M}$ and vanishes when \mathcal{M} is Euclidean space. Thus, the asymptotic alternative distribution of $T^{1/2}(V_{\hat{F}}^2 - V_F^2)$ is a Gaussian distribution, with a variance different from the one in Euclidean or Hilbert space. The asymptotic variance under the alternative is complex, and therefore not included here; details on the asymptotic behavior related to the curvature impact on the second-order stationarity test can be found in Section S1.6 of the supplementary materials.

Remark 6 *Our second-order stationarity test addresses a different setting from the variance change detection in non-Euclidean data proposed by [Dubey & Müller \(2020\)](#) and [Jiang et al. \(2024\)](#). Their focus is on detecting changes in $\mathbb{E}d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\mu, X_i)$, which, in our context, corresponds to testing whether the trace of the time-varying matrix $F_{\mathbb{E}}(0, t)$ remains independent of t . In contrast, our test examines the entire variance structure, not just its trace, and also accommodates continuously varying variance over time.*

Remark 7 *Although the null distribution of the test statistic for the second-order stationarity on the manifold is the same as Hilbert space or Euclidean space, the block size n is more restricted. For the test in Hilbert space, the upper bound of n is of order $T^{3/4}$ ([van Delft et al. 2021](#)), while for the general manifold it is of order $T^{2/3}$, since the curvature effect introduces a bias of order $T^{-1}n^{3/2}$ in non-trivial manifolds, as discussed in the supplementary materials.*

Remark 8 *The constant mean assumption is common in the literature on second-order stationarity tests ([Dette et al. 2011](#), [Preuß et al. 2013](#), [van Delft et al. 2021](#)), and when μ is non-constant but smooth, it can be estimated ([van Delft et al. 2021](#)). For instance, we can estimate μ using methods from [Petersen & Müller \(2019\)](#), [Lin & Müller \(2021\)](#), and then estimate $J_n(\lambda, t)$ by parallel transporting $\text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}(i/T)} X_i$ to $\hat{\mu}(1/T)$ along the estimated curve $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ as a detrending procedure.*

5 Simulations

In this section, we conduct Monte Carlo simulation experiments to study the finite sample performance of our proposed testing procedures in two cases: (i) hypersphere, a positively-curved manifold example; (ii) SPD-matrices endowed with negatively curved manifold structure.

5.1 Simulations for first-order stationarity test on spherical time series

In the numerical study of first-order stationarity test, we consider the following two settings, and report results for Type-I error rates under null and power under alternative hypothesis.

Setting (i): We simulate locally stationary time series on $\mathbb{S}^6 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^7 : \|x\|_2^2 = 1\}$, as follows. Let $t_i = i/T$ for $1 \leq i \leq T$. Take $\mu(t)$ be the geodesic such that $\mu(0) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$ and $\mu(1) = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, and $\mu_\tau(t) = \mu(\tau t)$ be a re-scaled version of $\mu(t)$ for $\tau \in [0, 1]$. We also denote $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\tau(s)}^{\mu_\tau(t)}(\cdot)$ the parallel transport map from $\mu_\tau(s)$ to $\mu_\tau(t)$ along the geodesic $\mu_\tau(\cdot)$, which is equivalent to the parallel transport map from $\mu(\tau s)$ to $\mu(\tau t)$ along the geodesic $\mu(\cdot)$ in this simulation setting. For $j = 1, \dots, 6$, let $E_j(0)$ be the vector with 1 at the j^{th} and with 0 at the other entries; we view $\{E_j(0)\}_{j=1}^6$ as an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu(0)}\mathbb{S}^6$. Then we consider the following time-varying auto-regressive models

$$M_1(\tau) : \text{Log}_{\mu_\tau(t_{i+1})} X_{i+1} = \{0.05 + 0.5t_i \cdot (1 - t_i)\} \mathcal{P}_{\mu_\tau(t_i)}^{\mu_\tau(t_{i+1})} \text{Log}_{\mu_\tau(t_i)} X_i + (1 + \tau)^{-1} \varepsilon_i, \quad (11)$$

where $\varepsilon_i = \sum_{j=1}^6 \sigma_j(\tau, t_i) Z_{i,j} E_j(\tau t)$, $\sigma_j(\tau, t_i) = (1.1 + 1.1t_i)/(1 + \tau)$ if $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\sigma_j(\tau, t_i) = 1/(1 + \tau)$ if $j = 4, 5, 6$, $Z_{i,j} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-0.5, 0.5)$, and $\{E_j(t), 1 \leq j \leq 6, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ is a parallel orthonormal frame along $\mu(t)$, i.e., $E_j(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\mu(0)}^{\mu(t)} E_j(0)$. The parameter τ in Eq.(11) determines the deviation of the time series from first-order stationarity. When $\tau = 0$, the time series is first-order stationary. As τ increases, the model will deviate from the null and we use it to

evaluate the performance of the test statistic under the alternative. In this setting, we consider $\tau = 0.125, 0.25, 0.375, 0.75, 1.0$.

Setting (ii): We next consider Sym_3^+ , the space of 3×3 SPD matrices endowed with the affine-invariant metric (Moakher 2005), which is a six-dimensional negatively-curved Riemannian manifold. Let $\mu(t)$ be a geodesic joining I_3 and $2I_3$ such that $\mu(0) = I_3$ and $\mu(1) = 2I_3$, and define $\mu_\tau(t) = \mu(\tau t)$. Let $\{E_{j,k}(0)\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3} \subset \text{Sym}_3$ be the set of 3×3 symmetric matrices with 1 at the (j, k) and (k, j) entries and 0 at the remaining entries. Note that $\{E_{j,k}(0)\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3}$ form an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu(0)}\text{Sym}_3^+$, with $\|E_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mu(0)} = 1$ for $j = k$, and $\|E_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mu(0)} = \sqrt{2}$ for $j \neq k$. Let $\{E_{j,k}(t) : 1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ be the parallel orthogonal frame along $\mu(t)$ with initial value $E_{j,k}(0)$. We simulate the following time-varying auto-regressive process:

$$M_2(\tau) : \text{Log}_{\mu_\tau(t_{i+1})} X_{i+1} = (0.05 + 0.25t_i) \mathcal{P}_{\mu_\tau(t_i)}^{\mu_\tau(t_{i+1})} \text{Log}_{\mu_\tau(t_i)} X_i + (1 + 2\tau)^{-1} \{6.25(t_i - 0.25)^2 + 0.2\} \varepsilon_i,$$

where $\varepsilon_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq 3} Z_{i,j,k} E_{j,k}(\tau t_i)$, and the collection of $Z_{i,j,k}$ are independent Gaussian random variables such that $Z_{i,j,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ if $j = k$ and $Z_{i,j,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/4)$. Similarly, $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\tau(s)}^{\mu_\tau(t)}(\cdot)$ is the parallel transport map from $\mu_\tau(s)$ to $\mu_\tau(t)$ along the geodesic $\mu_\tau(\cdot)$. When $\tau = 0$, the manifold time series is first-order stationary. For power study under alternative, we consider $\tau = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.25, 1.5, 1.75$.

For the first-order stationary test in both scenarios, we consider $T = 50, 100, 500$. The number of Monte Carlo runs is 5000. The null distribution of the test statistic Q_T is estimated by the curvature adjusted multiplier bootstrap (CAMB) method in Algorithm 1. We compare the proposed test against two approaches: (B1) a method that bootstrap $\sup_t \|U(t) - tU(1)\|_\mu$, neglecting the curvature effect $\mathcal{H}(t)$, and (B2) an approach that considers manifold time series as Euclidean multivariate time series, utilizing the multiplier bootstrap technique suggested by (Zhou 2013), thereby overlooking the manifold structure. The bootstrap sample size is set as $B = 2000$ for all




Figure 2: Simulated power curves for the first-order stationarity test. Left Panel: power curve for first-order stationarity test of spherical time series. Right Panel: power curve for first-order stationarity test of SPD-matrix-valued time series. The significant level is 0.05.

methods in this benchmark study.

The Type-I error rates of our method and the two comparison methods are reported in Table 1. In the sphere scenario, we find that the Type-I error rates of the two comparison methods are inflated, while our method controls the Type-I error well. In the context of SPD matrices, the first comparison method, B1, which overlooks the curvature, tends to be overly conservative in this instance, exhibiting an empirical rejection probability of approximately 0.009. This conservative approach may result in diminished power under the alternative hypothesis. Results of the comparison method B1 in both scenarios numerically support that the curvature term $\mathcal{H}(t)$ plays an important role in manifold time series. On the other hand, the second method, B2, which treats the data as Euclidean multivariate time series, leads to an escalation in the eigenvalues of the sample mean and variance. Consequently, the variance associated with the multiplier bootstrap also surges, rendering the Type-I error rates for this approach unreliable in this scenario.

We also evaluate the power of the first-order stationary test by varying τ . For each fixed τ , the power is calculated based on 5000 repetitions of Monte Carlo runs. We plot the power curve in Figure 2, and as expected, one can observe that the test becomes more powerful as T increases, and the power will ultimately reach 1 as τ continues to increase.

5.2 Simulations for second-order stationarity test

To study the second-order stationarity test, for both \mathbb{S}^6 and Sym_+^3 settings, we simulate locally stationary manifold time series which are first-order stationary from the model

$$M_3(\tau) : \text{Log}_\mu X_{i+1} = [0.1 + \tau\{0.2 \cos(2\pi t_i) + t_i * (1 - t_i)\}] \cdot \text{Log}_\mu X_i + \epsilon_i.$$

In the 6-dimensional hypersphere \mathbb{S}^6 case, we set $\mu = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$ and take $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^6$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$, as the $E_j(0)$ in Setting (i) of Section 5.1. We set $\epsilon_i = \sum_{j=1}^6 Z_{i,j} E_j$, and $Z_{i,j} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-0.75, 0.75)$. For the Sym_+^3 -valued time series, μ is set to be I_3 , and ϵ_i is generated in the same way as Section 5.1. When $\tau = 0$, the manifold time series under both settings is second-order stationary, and when $\tau > 0$, the simulated time series is non-stationary in terms of the second order. We consider $\tau = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.5$ in the power study. We implement 5000 Monte Carlo replications with $T = 256, 512, 1024$, respectively. The block size is set to be $n = 8$ as suggested in [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#).

Type-I error rates are reported in Table 2. We observe that, under both \mathbb{S}^6 and Sym_+^3 settings, at the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$, the Type-I error rates decrease as T increases, but are slightly inflated for relatively small T . This slight inflation is due to an intrinsic limitation of the method we adapted ([van Delft et al. 2021](#)), which also applies to Euclidean time series. Specifically, we show in Table 2 that for an AR(0.1) process in \mathbb{R}^6 , the Type-I error rates of this testing procedure are also slightly larger than 0.05. In our power study, we observe that the testing power for both \mathbb{S}^6 and Sym_+^3 settings increases to 1 as τ grows; see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Simulated power curves for the second-order stationarity test. Left Panel: power curve for the second-order stationarity test of spherical time series. Right Panel: power curve for the second-order stationarity test of SPD-matrices-valued time series. The significant level is 0.05.

6 Application to Real Data

In this section, we apply our stationarity test to a single-cell RNA sequencing data generated by [Schiebinger et al. \(2019\)](#). The raw data is available at NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE122662>). The goal is to understand the developmental process of mouse embryonic cells and model the change of cell-type proportion at each stage. To achieve this goal, scientists first obtained mouse embryonic cells from a single female embryo, plated cells for 18 days, measured the gene expression profiles of cells collected across 18 days, and finally profiled 251, 203 high-quality cells with 1, 479 variable genes after pre-processing. A nonlinear dimensionality reduction method called force-directed layout embedding ([Jacomy et al. 2014](#)) was used to visualize the temporal change of cellular populations in 2D in the original work, as shown in Figure 4A. These cells were then assigned to seven major cell types by clustering and annotation with gene signature scores provided by prior biological knowledge. The annotated seven cell types are Mouse Embryonic Fibroblasts (MEFs), Mesenchymal-Epithelial Transition (MET) Cells, Induced Pluripotent Stem (IPS) Cells, Stromal Cells, Epithelial Cells, Neural Cells and Trophoblasts; each cell type has their own morphological features and functions. In this study, the proportions of these cell types are observed at each time

point, with data collected at 37 time points over the course of 18 days (at 12-hour intervals).

A common approach to model the compositional data is the square-root transformation, which maps the data to a hypersphere. This transformation has an advantage that the composition constraint and zero components are naturally incorporated (Stephens 1982, Scealy & Welsh 2011). Applying square-root transformation to our data, we finally obtain a time series in hypersphere \mathbb{S}^6 with length $T = 37$, with visualization provided in Figure 4B. We aim to answer a biological question: does the cell-type proportion have systematic change over time, or equivalently, does the cell-type transition achieve dynamic equilibrium? This question is closely related to the discussion regarding validity of adopting a dynamic equilibrium assumption for modeling cellular dynamics without prior knowledge in cell biology (Schiebinger et al. 2019, Zhou et al. 2021, Sha et al. 2024). Statistically, the question is equivalent to testing the constancy of the mean of this hyperspherical time series, i.e., the first-order stationarity, and our proposed test serves as a tool to assess the feasibility of such an assumption when applied to real data.

Specifically, we apply the proposed first-order stationarity test to the data, with bootstrap sample size $B = 2000$ and block size selected by the minimum volatility method (Politis et al. 2012). The corresponding p-value is 0.0005, providing a strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, the cell-type proportions in this cell population undergo systematic temporal change, and cell-type transitions are still out of dynamic equilibrium. This result is consistent with the findings in Schiebinger et al. (2019), as they discovered that the extracted mouse embryonic cells have a strong ability of differentiation, and gradually moves to a terminal stromal state or a MET state, where the latter further generates pluripotent, extra-embryonic, and neural cells.

We then use the same dataset as an illustrative example to evaluate the proposed second-order stationarity test. In particular, we first estimate the mean curve $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ using the total-variation regression with regularization parameters selected by leave-one-out cross validation

(Lin & Müller 2021). Then we parallelly transport $\text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}(i/T)} X_i$ from $\hat{\mu}(i/T)$ to $\hat{\mu}(1/T)$ along the $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ as a detrend procedure, and apply the second-order test to the detrend version time-series $\{\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}(1/T)}^{\hat{\mu}(i/T)}(\text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}(i/T)} X_i)\}_{i=1}^T$. Since the sample size is small, we divide the data into 5 overlapped blocks of size $n = 8$, which are $[1, 8], [8, 15], [15, 22], [22, 29]$ and $[30, 37]$. The p-value associated to the second-order stationarity test is 0.223. The result shows that there is no significant evidence suggesting the uncertainty caused by the rate of random proliferation and apoptosis or noises due to technical issues in the sequencing platform varies over time. The constant uncertainty was implicitly made as an assumption of the biological model in Schiebinger et al. (2019) since the uncertainty parameter was shared by all time points in their models and numerical analysis, and our testing result provides a numerical support for the assumption in this dataset.




Figure 4: **(A)**: Visualization of gene expression profiles of cells using force directed layout embedding (a type of nonlinear dimension reduction). This figure is adopted from Schiebinger et al. (2019), which was originally used to visualize the temporal change of cell populations. In this visualization, each cell is depicted as a dot. The coloring of these dots corresponds to the time point at which each cell was sequenced, with darker shades indicating later time points. This visualization illustrates that the temporal dynamics of the cell population varies continuously over time, hence is locally stationary. **(B)**: A heatmap to visualize the square-root transformed cell-type proportion time series data of seven cell types at 37 time points across 18 days. The square-root transform outputs a spherical time series of length $T = 37$ in the manifold \mathbb{S}^6 . Each row corresponds to the square-root of the time-varying proportion of a particular cell type within the cellular population, while each column denotes the observed value in the manifold time series at a particular time point. A darker hue signifies a larger proportion.

7 Discussion

In this paper, we introduce the definition of first-order and second-order stationarity of manifold-valued time series. We propose testing methods to test both first-order and second-order stationarity. Our methods can account for the curved nature of general manifolds. We derive the asymptotic consistency and asymptotic local powers of the tests. Numerical simulation studies and real data analysis are provided to illustrate the efficiency of our methods.

One limitation of our work is the dependency of our method for spectral density-based testing second-order stationarity on the choice of block size, a process that lacks a universally accepted benchmark and requires further improvement. This issue is not exclusive to our approach but is a widespread concern in the context of second-order stationarity assessments for time series within linear spaces ([Dette et al. 2011](#), [van Delft et al. 2021](#)).

There are a few interesting future directions of our work. For example, in neuroscience study, an interesting question is how to detect structural break of dynamic functional connectivity [Hutchison et al. \(2013\)](#) when the state change. This issue can be approached as a problem of identifying breakpoints in manifold time series, which can be potentially solved by an extension of our framework to detect abrupt change in a block-wise locally stationary manifold time series. Another interesting extension is to generalize our framework and methods to the Wasserstein space $\mathcal{W}_1([0, 1])$, since $\mathcal{W}_1([0, 1])$ can be viewed as an infinite-dimensional Hilbert manifold ([Chen et al. 2023](#)) by proper definition. However, an extension to general metric spaces is challenging and is still an open question, and we leave it for future research.

Acknowledgment

We thank Robert J. McCann and Zhou Zhou for their insightful conversations and suggestions.

T	\mathbb{S}^6			Sym_3^+		
	CAMB	B1	B2	CAMB	B1	B2
50	0.0364	0.0584	0.3936	0.0384	0.0082	0.0098
100	0.0544	0.1070	0.9806	0.0404	0.0086	0.0254
500	0.0392	0.1008	1.0000	0.0478	0.0098	0.1116

Table 1: Type-I error rates of the first-order stationarity test of three benchmarked methods under \mathbb{S}^6 and Sym_3^+ scenarios. CAMB represents our method, B1 represents the first comparison method and B2 represents the second comparison method. The bootstrap size is $B = 2000$ for all methods in this study. The results are based on 5000 repetitions of Monte Carlo runs. The significant level is set to be 0.05.

T	\mathbb{S}^6	Sym_+^3	\mathbb{R}^6
256	0.090	0.085	0.106
512	0.071	0.073	0.090
1024	0.064	0.070	0.074

Table 2: Type-I errors of second-order stationarity test for $T = 256, 512, 1024$ and $n = T/8$ with values in sphere, SPD matrices, and Euclidean space, respectively. The results are based on 5000 Monte Carlo runs. The significant level is set to be 0.05.

Supplementary Materials

The supplementary file contains technical proofs for the theorems in this article.

References

- Aue, A. & van Delft, A. (2020), ‘Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain’, *The Annals of Statistics* **48**(5), 2505 – 2547.
- Bollerslev, T. (1986), ‘Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity’, *Journal of Econometrics* **31**(3), 307–327.
- Chen, Y., Lin, Z. & Müller, H.-G. (2023), ‘Wasserstein regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **118**(542), 869–882.

- Dahlhaus, R. (1997), 'Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes', *The Annals of Statistics* **25**(1), 1–37.
- Dette, H., Preuß, P. & Vetter, M. (2011), 'A measure of stationarity in locally stationary processes with applications to testing', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**(495), 1113–1124.
- Do Carmo, M. P. (1992), *Riemannian geometry*, Vol. 6, Springer.
- Dubey, P. & Müller, H.-G. (2020), 'Fréchet change-point detection', *The Annals of Statistics* **48**(6), 3312–3335.
- Fisher, N. I. & Lee, A. J. (1994), 'Time series analysis of circular data', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **56**(2), 327–339.
- Fréchet, M. (1948), 'Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié', *Annales de l'institut Henri Poincaré* **10**(4), 215–310.
- Hutchison, R. M., Womelsdorf, T., Allen, E. A., Bandettini, P. A., Calhoun, V. D., Corbetta, M., Della Penna, S., Duyn, J. H., Glover, G. H., Gonzalez-Castillo, J. et al. (2013), 'Dynamic functional connectivity: promise, issues, and interpretations', *NeuroImage* **80**, 360–378.
- Jacomy, M., Venturini, T., Heymann, S. & Bastian, M. (2014), 'Forceatlas2, a continuous graph layout algorithm for handy network visualization designed for the gephi software', *PLOS ONE* **9**(6), 1–12.
- Jiang, F., Zhu, C. & Shao, X. (2024), 'Two-sample and change-point inference for non-euclidean valued time series', *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **18**(1), 848–894.
- Lähnemann, D., Köster, J., Szczurek, E., McCarthy, D. J., Hicks, S. C., Robinson, M. D., Vallejos,

- C. A., Campbell, K. R., Beerenwinkel, N., Mahfouz, A. et al. (2020), ‘Eleven grand challenges in single-cell data science’, *Genome Biology* **21**(1), 1–35.
- Lin, Z. & Müller, H.-G. (2021), ‘Total variation regularized Fréchet regression for metric-space valued data’, *The Annals of Statistics* **49**(6), 3510 – 3533.
- Mardia, K. V., Jupp, P. E. & Mardia, K. (2000), *Directional statistics*, Vol. 2, Wiley Online Library.
- 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.
- Page, E. S. (1954), ‘Continuous inspection schemes’, *Biometrika* **41**(1/2), 100–115.
- Pennec, X. (2018), ‘Barycentric subspace analysis on manifolds’, *The Annals of Statistics* **46**(6A), 2711–2746.
- Petersen, A. & Müller, H.-G. (2019), ‘Fréchet regression for random objects with Euclidean predictors’, *The Annals of Statistics* **47**(2), 691 – 719.
- Politis, D. N., Romano, J. P. & Wolf, M. (2012), *Subsampling*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Preuß, P., Vetter, M. & Dette, H. (2013), ‘A test for stationarity based on empirical processes’, *Bernoulli* **19**(5B), 2715 – 2749.
- Priestley, M. B. (1988), ‘Non-linear and non-stationary time series analysis’, *London: Academic Press*.
- Scealy, J. L. & Welsh, A. H. (2011), ‘Regression for compositional data by using distributions defined on the hypersphere’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology* **73**(3), 351–375.

- Schiebinger, G., Shu, J., Tabaka, M., Cleary, B., Subramanian, V., Solomon, A., Gould, J., Liu, S., Lin, S., Berube, P. et al. (2019), ‘Optimal-transport analysis of single-cell gene expression identifies developmental trajectories in reprogramming’, *Cell* **176**(4), 928–943.
- Sha, Y., Qiu, Y., Zhou, P. & Nie, Q. (2024), ‘Reconstructing growth and dynamic trajectories from single-cell transcriptomics data’, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **6**(1), 25–39.
- Shao, L., Lin, Z. & Yao, F. (2022), ‘Intrinsic Riemannian functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal observations’, *The Annals of Statistics* **50**(3), 1696 – 1721.
- Shumway, R. H., Stoffer, D. S. & Stoffer, D. S. (2000), *Time series analysis and its applications*, Vol. 3, Springer.
- Stephens, M. A. (1982), ‘Use of the von mises distribution to analyse continuous proportions’, *Biometrika* **69**(1), 197–203.
- van Delft, A. & Blumberg, A. J. (2024), ‘A statistical framework for analyzing shape in a time series of random geometric objects’.
- van Delft, A., Characiejus, V. & Dette, H. (2021), ‘A nonparametric test for stationarity in functional time series’, *Statistica Sinica* **31**(3), pp. 1375–1395.
- van Delft, A. & Eichler, M. (2018), ‘Locally stationary functional time series’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **12**(1), 107 – 170.
- Wang, X., Borsoi, R. A. & Richard, C. (2023), Online change point detection on riemannian manifolds with karcher mean estimates, in ‘2023 31st European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)’, IEEE, pp. 2033–2037.
- Wied, D., Krämer, W. & Dehling, H. (2012), ‘Testing for a change in correlation at an unknown point of time using an extended functional delta method’, *Econometric Theory* **28**(3), 570–589.

- Wu, W. B. (2005), ‘Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102**(40), 14150–14154.
- Wu, W. B. & Zhou, Z. (2011), ‘Gaussian approximation for non-stationary multiple time series’, *Statistica Sinica* **21**(3), 1397–1413.
- Yang, J., Gohel, S. & Vachha, B. (2020), ‘Current methods and new directions in resting state fMRI’, *Clinical Imaging* **65**, 47–53.
- Zhou, P., Wang, S., Li, T. & Nie, Q. (2021), ‘Dissecting transition cells from single-cell transcriptome data through multiscale stochastic dynamics’, *Nature Communications* **12**(1), 5609.
- Zhou, Z. (2013), ‘Heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation robust structural change detection’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**(502), 726–740.
- Zhou, Z. & Wu, W. B. (2009), ‘Local linear quantile estimation for nonstationary time series’, *The Annals of Statistics* pp. 2696–2729.
- Zhu, C. & Müller, H.-G. (2024), ‘Spherical autoregressive models, with application to distributional and compositional time series’, *Journal of Econometrics* **239**(2), 105389.

Supplementary Material for “Stationarity of Manifold Time Series”

Junhao Zhu, Dehan Kong, Zhaolei Zhang and Zhenhua Lin

S1 Technical Proofs

S1.1 Lemma 1

Proof. We begin by showing that $\hat{\mu}$ is a \sqrt{T} -consistent estimator of $\hat{\mu}$. Let $F_T(p) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i)$. As \mathcal{M} satisfies the condition **(M1)** or **(M2)**, F_T is strongly convex in the sense

$$F_T(p) \geq F_T(q) + \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \text{Log}_q X_j, \text{Log}_q p \right\rangle_q + \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, q) \quad (\text{S1})$$

for some constant $\lambda > 0$ depending on \mathcal{M} only. Let \mathbf{E} be an orthonormal frame at $\mathcal{T}_{\mu}\mathcal{M}$, and e_i be the coordinate representation of $\text{Log}_{\mu} X_i$. When conditions **(A1)**-**(A4)** hold, by Proposition 5 in [Zhou \(2013\)](#), then on a richer probability space, there exists i.i.d standard normal random vectors $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq T} \left| \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} e_i - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}^{1/2} \left(\frac{j}{T} \right) V_j \right| = o_p(T^{-1/2} \log^2 T),$$

which implies that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T \text{Log}_q X_i = O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$. With $p = \hat{\mu}$ and $q = \mu$ in Eq.(S1), we have

$$0 \geq F_T(\hat{\mu}) - F_T(\mu) \geq \{O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}) + d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu})\} \cdot d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu}),$$

which implies $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$.

We next show that

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{H}(\frac{k}{T}) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H_i \right\|_{\mu} = O_p(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}}).$$

Since $H_i = H(\mu, X_i) = H(\mu, \text{Exp}_{\mu}(G_{\mathbf{E}}(t_i, \mathcal{F})_i^{\top} \mathbf{E}))$, where $\mathbf{E} = \{E_j\}_{j=1}^d$ is an orthonormal frame on $\mathcal{T}_{\mu} \mathcal{M}$. By the assumption (A1), there exists a constant L_H such that :

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| H(\mu, \text{Exp}_{\mu}(G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)^{\top} E)) - H(\mu, \text{Exp}_{\mu}(G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^{\top} E)) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \leq L_H C |t - s| \quad (\text{S2})$$

By conditions (A3) and the (A5), there exists a constant $\tilde{\alpha} < 1$ which only depends on C_1 and α such that $\langle H(\mu, \text{Exp}_{\mu}(G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)^{\top} E)) E_j, E_k \rangle$ also satisfies (A3) for all $1 \leq j \leq k \leq d$. Let $\{H_{i,jk}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq d}$ be the coordinate representation of $H(\mu, X)$ under the basis $\{E_1, \dots, E_d\}$, i.e. $A_{i,jk} = \langle H_i E_j, E_k \rangle_{\mu}$. It suffices to show that

$$A_{T,jk} := \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^l H_{i,jk} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbb{E} H_{i,jk} \right| = O_P(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}}).$$

Let $\Xi_{l,jk} = \sum_{i=1}^l (H_{i,jk} - \mathbb{E}[H_{i,jk} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}])$ and $\Lambda_{l,jk} = \sum_{i=1}^l (\mathbb{E}[H_{i,jk} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbb{E}[H_{i,jk}])$. Then $A_{T,jk}$ can be bounded by

$$A_{T,jk} = \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Xi_{l,jk} + \Lambda_{l,jk}| \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Xi_{l,jk}| + \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}|.$$

Noting that $\Xi_{l,jk}$ is a bounded martingale, hence by Doob's L^p inequality (Durrett 2019) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{T} \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} |\Xi_{l,jk}|^2\right] \leq \frac{C}{T^2} \mathbb{E}|\Xi_{T,jk}|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right). \quad (\text{S3})$$

Now We start to bound the quantity $\max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}|$. Define $\Pi_i Y = \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}| &= \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \left| \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right| = \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \left| \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality implies that

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\max_{1 \leq l \leq T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}|)^2} \leq \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right) \right|^2}.$$

Note that $\left(\sum_{i=1}^l \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk}\right)$ is a martingale. By Doob's L^p inequality again, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\max_{1 \leq l \leq T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}|)^2} \leq C \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right) \right|^2}.$$

By Theorem 1 in Wu (2005), $\mathbb{E} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \Pi_{i-a} H_{i,jk} \right) \right|^2 = O(T\tilde{\alpha}^a)$ with $\tilde{\alpha} < 1$, which implies that

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\max_{1 \leq l \leq T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}|)^2} \leq C\sqrt{T} \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\alpha}^a = O(\sqrt{T}). \quad (\text{S4})$$

By the upper bounds provided by Eq.(S3) and Eq.(S4) we can deduce that

$$A_{T,jk} \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Xi_{l,jk}| + \max_{1 \leq l \leq T} \frac{1}{T} |\Lambda_{l,jk}| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) ds$. $\mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(s, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E))$ is uniformly bounded and Lipschitz continuous in s , so the integral is well-defined. By the property of Riemann sum, we have:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\| \mathcal{H}(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i/T \leq t} \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(i/T, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) \right\|_{HS} = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Hence, we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H_i \right\|_{HS} \\ & \leq \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}H_i \right\|_{\mu} + \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H_i - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}H_i \right\|_{HS} \\ & = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

S1.2 Theorem 1

Proof. For simplicity, throughout this proof we use \tilde{e}_i to represent $\text{Log}_\mu X_i$. The proof is based on the Taylor expansion of Riemannian log map on manifold (Kendall & Le 2011). Let $\gamma : [0, 1]$ be the geodesic from $\hat{\mu} = \gamma(0)$ to $\mu = \gamma(1)$. By Taylor expansion, we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k\right) - \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \right\} \right\|_{\mu} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

Since parallel transport is a linear map and $S_T = 0$, the above equation implies that $\sqrt{T} \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} = \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T H(\mu, X_j)\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^T \tilde{e}_j + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)$. By Proposition 5 in Zhou (2013),

on a richer probability space, there exists a Gaussian process $U(t)$ such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{\epsilon}_j - U\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) \right\|_{\mu} = o_p(T^{-1/4} \log^2 T).$$

The above equation combined with Lemma 1 yields that

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^{\mu} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) - \left(U\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) - \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1} \circ (1)U(1) \right) \right\|_{\mu} = o_p(T^{-1/4} \log^2 T),$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mu}}^{\mu} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) \right\|_{\mu} = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq T} \left\| U\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) - \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1) \right\|_{\mu} + o_p(T^{-1/4} \log^2 T).$$

Since parallel transport $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}$ is an isometry from $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma(0)}\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma(1)}\mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right\|_{\hat{\mu}} = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq T} \left\| U\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) - \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1) \right\|_{\mu} + o_p(T^{-1/4} \log^2 T),$$

which completes the proof. \square

S1.3 Theorem 2

Proof. To establish the consistency of the debiased bootstrap procedure, we first show that $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_k$ is a consistent estimate of $\mathcal{H}(k/T)$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be the geodesic from $\hat{\mu} = \gamma(0)$ to $\mu = \gamma(1)$. Note that $H(\mu, X)$ is Lipschitz continuous w.r.t μ by (A1), i.e.,

$$|\langle \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(H(\mu, X) \circ E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\mu} - \langle H(\hat{\mu}, X) \circ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}}| \leq L_H d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu}).$$

The above inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\mu} - \langle \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}} | \\ & \leq \frac{k}{T} L_H d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} |\langle \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\mu} - \langle \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}} | \\ & \leq L_H d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu}) = O_p(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}}). \end{aligned}$$

By the bound in Lemma 1 that $\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathcal{H}(\frac{k}{T}) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H_i\|_{HS} = O_P(\frac{\log^2 T}{T^{1/2}})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} |\langle \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(\mathcal{H}(k/T) \circ E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\mu} - \langle \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}} | \\ & = O_P(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S6})$$

We next show that $\{V_{k,n}\}$ consistently mimics the Gaussian process $U(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1$ up to an isometry, where $V_{k,n}$ is a generic version of $V_{k,n}^{(b)}$ defined in Algorithm 1. Recall $v_i = \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i$ be the residuals at the tangent space of $\hat{\mu}$, $S_{j,n} = \sum_{i=j}^{j+n-1} v_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq T - n + 1$, and $V_{k,n}^{(b)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \{n(T - n + 1)\}^{-1/2} S_{j,n} R_j$ for $k = n, \dots, T - n + 1$, where $\{R_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d standard normal random variables. Define

$$B_{i,j} = \frac{1}{n(T - n + 1)} \sum_{i \leq l \leq j} S_{l,n} \otimes S_{l,n}$$

and

$$B_{i,j,a,b} = \frac{1}{n(T - n + 1)} \sum_{i \leq l \leq j} \langle S_{l,n}, \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)} E_a \rangle_{\hat{\mu}} \langle S_{l,n}, \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)} E_b \rangle_{\hat{\mu}}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

We first show that

$$\max_{n+1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| B_{i,j,a,b} - \int_{i/T}^{j/T} \{\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)\}_{a,b} d\xi \right| = o_p(1),$$

where $\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)\}_{a,b}$ is the (a,b) -entry of the matrix $\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)$. To this end, applying Taylor expansion of Riemannian log map on $\mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} S_{l,n} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \sum_{k=l}^{i+n-1} v_k = \sum_{k=l}^{i+n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} v_k \\ &= \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \tilde{e}_k - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} H(\mu, X_k) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} + o_p(1/T) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} \tilde{e}_k - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} H(\mu, X_k) \right) \circ (\sqrt{n} \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}) + o_p(1/T). \end{aligned}$$

By the bounded curvature condition of the manifold, $H(\mu, X)$ is uniformly bounded, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} S_{l,n}, E_a \right\rangle_\mu &= \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \sum_{k=l}^{i+n-1} v_k, E_a \right\rangle_\mu = \left\langle \sum_{k=l}^{i+n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} v_k, E_a \right\rangle_\mu \\ &= \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_a \right\rangle_\mu + O_p(n^{1/2}/T^{3/2}) \\ &\quad - \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} H(\mu, X_k) \right) \circ (\sqrt{n} \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}), E_a \right\rangle_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

We apply the above expansion of $S_{l,n}$ to $B_{i,j,ab}$ and deduce

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| B_{i,j,a,b} - \frac{1}{n(T-n+1)} \sum_{i \leq l \leq j} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_a \right\rangle_\mu \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_b \right\rangle_\mu \right| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{T}}\right)$$

for any $1 \leq a \leq b \leq d$. When the conditions **(A2)**-**(A4)** hold, by Theorem 4 in [Zhou \(2013\)](#),

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{n+1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| B_{i,j,a,b} - \int_{i/T}^{j/T} \{\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)\}_{a,b} d\xi \right| \\
& \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| B_{i,j,a,b} - \frac{1}{n(T-n+1)} \sum_{i \leq l \leq j} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_a \right\rangle_{\mu} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_b \right\rangle_{\mu} \right| \\
& + \max_{n+1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| \frac{1}{n(T-n+1)} \sum_{i \leq l \leq j} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_a \right\rangle_{\mu} \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=l}^{l+n-1} e_k, E_b \right\rangle_{\mu} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \int_{i/T}^{j/T} \{\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)\}_{a,b} d\xi \right| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{T}} + \frac{1}{n}\right). \tag{S8}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to prove the statement of Theorem 2. Let $U_n(t) : [\frac{n}{T}, 1 - \frac{n}{T}] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}\mathcal{M}$ be the linear interpolation of $V_{k,n}$, i.e., $U_n(t) = V_{\lfloor tT \rfloor, n} + (tT - \lfloor tT \rfloor)(V_{\lfloor tT \rfloor + 1, n} - V_{\lfloor tT \rfloor, n})$. By (S8) and Theorem 3 in Zhou (2013), whenever $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} U_n(t)$ converges to $U(t)$ under the uniform topology of $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], (\mathcal{T}_{\mu}\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\mu}))$. By (S6) and the uniform convergence of $U_n(t)$, we conclude

$$\max_{n \leq k \leq T-n+1} \left\| V_{k,n} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T^{-1} \circ V_{T-n+1,n} \right\|_{\hat{\mu}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\| U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1) \right\|_{\mu}. \tag{S9}$$

□

S1.4 Theorem 3

Proof. For simplicity, we write $\tau(T)$ as τ . Let e_i be the coordinate-representation of $\text{Log}_{\mu_T(i/T)}$ under the frame $\mathbf{E}(\tau, i/T)$, i.e., $\text{Log}_{\mu_T(i/T)} = e_i^{\top} \mathbf{E}(\tau, i/T)$; see also (6) in the main text. To begin with, for a fixed $p \in \mathcal{M}$, when conditions (M1) or (M2) hold, there exists a constant

$\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T (d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i) - d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\mu, X_i)) \geq \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \text{Log}_{\mu} X_i, \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu} + \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, \mu).$$

Taylor expansion of vector fields on manifold yields

$$\text{Log}_{\mu} X_i = \mathcal{P}_{\mu_T(i/T)}^{\mu} \left(e_i^{\top} E\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right) \right) - \tau H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right) + O_p(\tau^2),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T (d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i) - d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\mu, X_i)) &\geq \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \text{Log}_{\mu} X_i, \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu} + \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, \mu) \\ &= \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T \left\langle e_i^{\top} E\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right), \mathcal{P}_{\mu_T(i/T)}^{\mu} \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu} - \tau \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right), \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu} \\ &\quad + \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, \mu) + O_p(\tau^2). \end{aligned}$$

By the bounded conditions on the curvature and the curve $b(\cdot)$, there exists a constant C_b such that $\left\| \tau \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right), \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu} \right\| \leq \tau C_b$. Let $\overline{\mu p}$ be the coordinate representation of $\text{Log}_{\mu} p$ under the orthonormal basis $\{E_j, 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ and $\{R_{\tau, T, i} : 1 \leq i \leq T\}$ be a collection of $d \times d$ matrices such that

$$(R_{\tau, T, i})_{j, k} = \left\langle E_j\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right), \mathcal{P}_{\mu_T(i/T)}^{\mu} E_k \right\rangle_{\mu_T(i/T)}.$$

Then $\left\langle e_i^{\top} E\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right), \mathcal{P}_{\mu_T(i/T)}^{\mu} \text{Log}_{\mu} p \right\rangle_{\mu_T(i/T)}$ can be rewritten as $e_i^{\top} R_{\tau, T, i} \overline{\mu p}$. Moreover, the local isometry property of parallel transport on smooth manifold implies $R_{\tau, T, i} = I_d + O\left(\frac{\tau}{T}\right)$, and hence

$$\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T (d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, X_i) - d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\mu, X_i)) \geq \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T e_i^{\top} \overline{\mu p} + \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(p, \mu) + O_p(\tau). \quad (\text{S10})$$

Since $|\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T e_i^\top \overline{\mu p}| \leq \|\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^T e_i\| \cdot d(\mu, p)$, by taking $p = \hat{\mu}$, we deduce from (S10) that $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = O_p(\max\{\tau, \sqrt{1/T}\})$.

Now we show that when $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau}{T^{-1/2}} = \infty$, the CUSUM statistic $Q_T \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be the geodesic from $\hat{\mu} = \gamma(0)$ to $\mu = \gamma(1)$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, we can show that

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k\right) - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu}\right) \right\|_{\mu} = O_p(\tau^2),$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k\right) \right\|_{\mu} \\ &= \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{\mu} + O_p(\tau^2) \\ &\geq - \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j \right\|_{\mu} + \sqrt{T} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T H(\mu, X_j)\right) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{\mu} + O_p(\tau^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j \right\|_{\mu} = O_p(1)$ and that $\left\| \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^T H(\mu, X_j)\right) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{\mu} \geq \lambda d_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu) \asymp O_p(\tau)$ when conditions (M1) and (M2) hold. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_T &= \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k\right) \right\|_{\mu} \\ &\geq - \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j \right\|_{\mu} + \lambda \sqrt{T} d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mu, \hat{\mu}) + O_p(\tau^2) \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ a.e.}, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{T}} \rightarrow \infty$.

We next show that, if $\tau(T) = T^{-1/2}$, then

$$Q_T \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\| U(t) - \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ U(1) \right. \\ \left. + \mathcal{H}(t) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1) \circ \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \mathcal{H}(\xi) \circ v(\xi) d\xi - \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \mathcal{H}(\xi) \circ v(\xi) d\xi \right\|_{\mu}, \quad (\text{S11})$$

where $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is defined in Lemma 1. For convenience, we define $\Pi(s, t)$ be the parallel transport map from $\gamma(s, t)$ to μ along the geodesic $s \rightarrow \gamma(s, t)$. Notice that $\sum_i \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_i = 0$, and that $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = O_p(T^{-1/2})$, we can apply Taylor expansion at $\hat{\mu}$ similarly to (S10) for $\tau = T^{-1/2}$ and have

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^T \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right) \left(e_i^{\top} E\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right) \right) - \frac{\tau}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

The above identity implies that

$$\text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} = \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \right)^{-1} \circ \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right) \left(e_i^{\top} E\left(\tau, \frac{i}{T}\right) \right) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\tau}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right) \right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right). \quad (\text{S12})$$

Substituting $\text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu}$ by (S12) in the following equation

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right) \right\|_{\mu} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) \right\|_{\mu} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{\mu} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \right)^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \circ \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \Pi \left(\tau, \frac{i}{T} \right) \left(e_i^{\top} E \left(\tau, \frac{i}{T} \right) \right) - \frac{\tau}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b \left(\frac{i}{T} \right) \right) \right\|_{\mu} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Taylor expansion of \tilde{e}_j , i.e.,

$$\tilde{e}_j = \Pi \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \left(e_j^{\top} E \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \right) - \tau H(\mu, X_j) \circ b \left(\frac{j}{T} \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right),$$

the test statistic $Q_T = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) \right\|_{\mu}$ could be further represented by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} S_k \right) \right\|_{\mu} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{e}_j - \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_{\mu} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{\mu} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\Pi \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \left(e_j^{\top} E \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \right) - \tau H(\mu, X_j) \circ b \left(\frac{j}{T} \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^k H(\mu, X_j) \circ \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \right)^{-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \circ \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \Pi \left(\tau, \frac{i}{T} \right) \left(e_i^{\top} E \left(\tau, \frac{i}{T} \right) \right) - \frac{\tau}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T H(\mu, X_i) \circ b \left(\frac{i}{T} \right) \right) \right\|_{\mu} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{S13}$$

To show our desired asymptotic results, it suffices to prove the following claims:

$$\text{(C1)} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \Pi \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \left(e_j^{\top} E \left(\tau, \frac{j}{T} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{D} U \left(\frac{k}{T} \right) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty;$$

$$\text{(C2)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\mu, X_i) - \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{k}{T}\right) \right\| = O_p(1/\sqrt{T});$$

$$\text{(C3)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\mu, X_i) \circ b\left(\frac{i}{T}\right) - \int_0^{k/T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \mathcal{H}(\xi) \circ b(\xi) d\xi \right\| = O_p(1/\sqrt{T}).$$

Now we prove the claim **(C1)**. Given $\tau = 1/\sqrt{T}$, Taylor expansion of parallel transport yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(e_j^\top E\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) &= \sum_{l=1}^d e_{j,l} \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(E_l\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \\ &= e_j^\top E + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=1}^d e_{j,l} \left(\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l\left(s, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(e_j^\top E\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) - \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. e_j^\top E - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=1}^d e_{j,l} \left(\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l\left(s, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0} \right] \right\|_\mu = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For fixed l and T , define

$$\Xi_{k,l} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^k e_{j,l} \left(\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l\left(s, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq T.$$

Then $\{\Xi_{k,l}\}_{k=1}^T$ is a L^2 -martingale since $\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l\left(s, \frac{j}{T}\right)$ is uniformly bounded whenever $b(\cdot)$ is bounded continuous. By the Doob's inequality, we have $\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\Xi_{k,l}\|_\mu^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \|\Xi_{k,l}\|_\mu^2$ for some constant C . Similar to proof of Lemma 1, $\mathbb{E} \|\Xi_{k,l}\|_\mu^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)$ and thus ensuring

that $\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\Xi_{k,l}\|_\mu = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$ and that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\Pi(\tau, \frac{j}{T}) \left(e_j^\top E(\tau, \frac{j}{T}) \right) - e_j^\top E \right] \right\|_\mu = O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}).$$

Applying the weak convergence of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k e_j^\top E$ to $U(\cdot)$ provided by Lemma 1, we conclude that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \Pi(\tau, \frac{j}{T}) \left(e_j^\top E(\tau, \frac{j}{T}) \right)$ converges to $U(\cdot)$, as claimed.

To prove the Claim (C2), it suffices to show that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H\left(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)\right) \right\|_{HS} \leq C/\sqrt{T},$$

for some constant C , since the physical dependency measure is the same as Theorem 1. Let $\mathcal{J}(t, e_i)$ be the Jacobi field along the geodesic $t \rightarrow \text{Exp}_\mu(t\tau b(\frac{i}{T}))$ such that $\mathcal{J}(0, e_i) = \tau b(\frac{i}{T})$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{J}(t, e_i) \Big|_{t=0} = \tau \sum_{l=1}^d e_{i,l} \nabla_{b(\frac{i}{T})} E_l(s, \frac{i}{T}) \Big|_{s=0}.$$

By the Lipschitz condition of the Hessian tensor and the sub-exponential condition of $G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H\left(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)\right) \right\|_{HS} \\ & \leq L_H \mathbb{E} d_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\text{Exp}_\mu\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E\}, \text{Exp}_{\mu_T(i/T)}\{G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E(\tau, \frac{i}{T})\}\right) \\ & \leq L_H \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathcal{J}(1, e_i) \right\|_{\text{Exp}_\mu(\tau b(\frac{i}{T}))} \\ & \leq \tau C L_H, \text{ (by Gronwall's inequality) (Taylor 2010)} \end{aligned} \tag{S14}$$

for some constant $C < \infty$ and $\tau = 1/\sqrt{T}$.

Claim (C3) holds by applying similar argument to $H(\mu, X_i) \circ b(\frac{i}{T})$ instead of $H(\mu, X_i)$. By

applying results of Claims **(C1)**-**(C3)** to **(S13)**, we obtain our desired asymptotic convergence in **(S11)**.

□

S1.5 Theorem 4

Proof. To prove the consistency of the bootstrap procedure, it suffices to show that the estimated covariance function is consistent. The argument is similar to the proof of Theorem 2. Applying Taylor expansion twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} S_{l,n} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(e_j^\top E\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) + \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} H(\mu, X_j) \circ b\left(\frac{j}{T}\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} + o_p(\tau\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Taylor expansion of parallel transport yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(e_j^\top E\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) &= \sum_{l=1}^d e_{j,k} \Pi\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \left(E_k\left(\tau, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \\ &= e_j^\top E + \tau \sum_{l=1}^d e_{j,k} \left(\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l\left(s, \frac{j}{T}\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0} + O_p(\tau^2), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} S_{l,n} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} \left(e_j^\top E + \tau \sum_{k=1}^d e_{j,k} \left(\nabla_{b(j/T)} E_l(s, \frac{j}{T}) \right) \Big|_{s=0} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} H(\mu, X_j) \circ b\left(\frac{j}{T}\right) \\ &- \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} H(\mu, X_j) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} + o_p(\tau\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}\tau \rightarrow 0$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} S_{l,n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+n} (e_j^\top E) + O_p(\tau\sqrt{n}),$$

which implies that

$$\max_{n+1 \leq i \leq j \leq T-n+1} \left| B_{i,j,a,b} - \int_{i/T}^{j/T} \{\Sigma_{\mathbf{E}}(\xi)\}_{a,b} d\xi \right| = o_p(1), \quad (\text{S15})$$

where $B_{i,j,a,b}$ is defined in (S7).

We then show that $\{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\hat{\mu}, X_i)\}_{k=1}^T$ consistently estimates $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$. Since convergence of $\{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\hat{\mu}, X_i)\}_{k=1}^T$ to $\{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\mu, X_i)\}_{k=1}^T$ with rate $O_p(\max\{\tau, 1/\sqrt{T}\})$ is guaranteed by (S5), it suffices to show that $\{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\mu, X_i)\}_{k=1}^T$ converges to $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$. $H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E))$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H\left(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)\right) &= H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H\left(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (S14), the bias term $\mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) + \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H\left(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{i}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)\right)$ is bounded by $O(\tau)$. Similarly to the argument in the proof for Lemma 1, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^k H(\mu, X_i) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_i) \right\|_{HS}^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Hence, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq T} |\langle \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(\mathcal{H}(k/T) \circ E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_\mu - \langle \hat{\mathcal{H}}_k \circ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_i), \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(1)}^{\gamma(0)}(E_j) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}} | \\ = O_P(\max\{\tau, \frac{1}{T^{1/2}}\}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S16})$$

Let $U_n(t) : [\frac{n}{T}, 1 - \frac{n}{T}] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}\mathcal{M}$ be the piece-wise linear interpolation of $V_{k,n}$, i.e., $U_n(t) = V_{[tT],n} + (tT - [tT])(V_{[tT]+1,n} - V_{[tT],n})$. Combining the results given by (S15) and (S16), conditioned on $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^T$, $U_n(t)$ converges to $U(t)$ on $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], (\mathcal{T}_\mu\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_\mu))$ with the uniform topology. \square

S1.6 Theorem 5

To establish the asymptotic result, we follow the arguments in [Aue & van Delft \(2020\)](#) and [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#). Different from the Hilbert space, we need to investigate the curvature effect in the general Riemannian manifold. When \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold, we have to account for the curvature effect in J_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} J_n(\omega, t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}} X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s, T} \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s, T} \cdot e^{-is\omega} \end{aligned}$$

$$- \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} + O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{T}\right).$$

Define $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}(U \otimes V) = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}(U) \otimes \mathcal{P}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)}(V)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\gamma(0)}^{\gamma(1)} I_n(\omega, u) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \\ &\quad \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right) \\ &+ O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(\omega, t) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right), \\ B_n(\omega, t) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right), \\ C_n(\omega, t) &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}s\omega} \right) \\ &\quad \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T}) \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-\mathbf{i}r\omega} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic behaviour of $A_n(\omega, t)$ is well-studied in the work by [Aue & van Delft \(2020\)](#) and [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#). We then investigate the property of $B_n(\omega, t)$. Notice that $B_n(\omega, t)$ is multi-linear in $\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}$, $\text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu}$ and $(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + r, T} \cdot e^{-ir\omega})$, where the asymptotic distribution of the latter two terms are known. Thus, we only need to identify the asymptotic behaviour of $\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}$. We rewrite $\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \left\{ H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \right\} \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ & \quad + \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim:

$$\text{(C4)} \quad \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega} = O(n^2/T), \text{ for } \omega = 2\pi k/n, k = 1, \dots, n;$$

$$\text{(C5)} \quad \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} (H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T})) \cdot e^{-is\omega} = O_p(\sqrt{n}).$$

To prove the claim [\(C4\)](#), without loss of generality, we consider $t = \frac{n}{2T}$, and rewrite $\sum_{s=1}^n \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}H(\mu, X_{\lfloor tT \rfloor - n/2 + 1 + s, T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega} = \sum_{s=1}^n \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{s+1}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \left(\mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{1+s}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{n}{2T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) \right) \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{n}{2T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) \cdot \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} e^{-is\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that when $\omega = 2\pi k/n$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, $\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} e^{-is\omega} = 0$ by the property of discrete Fourier transform. By the Lipschitz continuity provided by Eq.(S2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \left(\mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{1+s}{T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(\frac{n}{2T}, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) \right) \cdot e^{-is\omega} \\ & \leq \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} CL_H \left| \frac{s+1-n/2}{T} \right| = O\left(\frac{n^2}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We then apply the martingale techniques to prove the Claim (C5). Let $\{H_{i,jk}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k \leq d}$ be the coordinate representation of $H(\mu, X)$ under the basis $\{E_1, \dots, E_d\}$, i.e. $H_{i,jk} = \langle H_i E_j, E_k \rangle_\mu$. It suffices to show that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} (H_{s+1,jk} - \mathbb{E}H_{s+1,jk}) \cdot e^{-is\omega} = O_p(\sqrt{n}).$$

We consider the real part of $\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} (H_{s+1,jk} - \mathbb{E}H_{s+1,jk}) \cdot e^{-is\omega}$. Let $\Xi_{l,jk} = \sum_{s=0}^{l-1} (H_{s+1,jk} - \mathbb{E}[H_{s+1,jk} | \mathcal{F}_s]) \cos(s\omega)$ and $V_{l,jk} = \sum_{s=0}^{l-1} (\mathbb{E}[H_{s+1,jk} | \mathcal{F}_s] - \mathbb{E}[H_{s+1,jk}]) \cos(s\omega)$. $\{\Xi_{l,jk}\}_{l=1}^n$ is a bounded martingale, and by elementary calculation we have $\mathbb{E}|\Xi_{n,jk}|^2 = O(n)$. Similar to argument in proof of Lemma 1, we apply Theorem 1 in Wu (2005) and have $\mathbb{E}|V_{n,jk}|^2 = O(n)$. The imaginary part is also bounded by $O(n)$ by similar argument, and thus (S1.6) is proved. Claims (C4) and (C5) indicate that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} H(\mu, X_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T}) \cdot e^{-is\omega} = O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{n}{T})$, and that $B_n(\omega, u) = O_p(\frac{n^{3/2}}{T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{T^{1/2}})$, which may not converge to 0 in the test statistic scaled by \sqrt{T} . Similarly, we have $C_n(\omega, t) = O_p(\frac{1}{T} + \frac{n^3}{T^3} + \frac{n^{3/2}}{T^2}) = o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$, which is negligible in the test statistic as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Denote $\bar{H}_i = H_i - \mathbb{E}H_i$ the centered version of H_i . Then

$$\begin{aligned} B_n(\omega, t) &= O_p\left(\frac{n^{3/2}}{T^{3/2}}\right) + \\ & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \bar{H}_{[tT]-n/2+1+s,T} \circ \text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu} \cdot e^{-is\omega}\right) \otimes \left(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \text{Log}_\mu X_{[tT]-n/2+1+r,T} \cdot e^{-ir\omega}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Define $F_{H,G}(\lambda, t)$ the cross-spectral density function of $G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E$ and $H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E)) - \mathbb{E}H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E))$, i.e., $\forall v \in \mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$, we have $F_{H,G}(\omega, t)(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}(t, \mathcal{F}_h) \circ v \otimes \{G_{\mathbf{E}}(t, \mathcal{F}_0)^\top E\}] e^{i\omega h}$. Then $B_n(\omega, t)$ intuitively serves as an estimate of $F_{H,G}(\omega, t)(\text{Log}_\mu \hat{\mu})$.

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{T}}{T} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} (\langle I_n(\omega_k, t_j), I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle - \langle A_n(\omega_k, t_j), A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{T}}{T} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle A_n(\omega_k, t_j), B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{T}}{T} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle B_n(\omega_k, t_j), A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{T}}{T} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle B_n(\omega_k, t_j), B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle + o_p(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $B_n(\omega_k, t_j) = O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$, we have $\frac{\sqrt{T}}{T} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle B_n(\omega_k, t_j), B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle = O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$.

For the quantity $\sqrt{T} \langle A_n(\omega_k, t_j), B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle$, Taylor expansion yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \langle A_n(\omega_k, t_j), B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle &= \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle_\mu \\ &\times \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ U_T \rangle_\mu + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega, t_j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} e^{-is\omega} \bar{H}_{[tT] - n/2 + 1 + s, T} \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1),$$

and

$$U_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j'=1}^T e_{j'}^\top E$$

is the local DFT of the tensor $\bar{H}_s \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(1)$. Under the orthonormal basis $\mathbf{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_d\}$ on $\mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{M}$, we can rewrite $\langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle_\mu \times \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ U_T \rangle_\mu$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle_\mu \times \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ U_T \rangle_\mu \\ &= \sum_{l_3=1}^d \langle U_T, E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \sum_{l_1=1}^d \sum_{l_2=1}^d \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \\ & \quad \times \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \langle E_{l_2}, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

We apply the similar expansion to $\frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle - \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle, \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m B_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m B_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle + O_p(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned} \tag{S17}$$

Note that $\frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m B_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle$ is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{T}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m B_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_j) \circ U_T \otimes J_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle + O_p(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Extracting the common linear factor U_T above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_j) \circ U_T \otimes J_n(-\omega_k, t_j) \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{l_3=1}^d \langle U_T, E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{l_1=1}^d \sum_{l_2=1}^d \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \\
&\quad \times \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \langle E_{l_2}, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_{j_2}) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \\
&= \sum_{l_3=1}^d \sum_{l_1=1}^d \sum_{l_2=1}^d \langle U_T, E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_2=1}^m \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_{j_2}) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the additional term induced by the curvatures of manifold compared to Euclidean space is asymptotically equivalent to $\Delta + \bar{\Delta}$, where Δ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &= \sum_{l_3=1}^d \sum_{l_1=1}^d \sum_{l_2=1}^d \langle U_T, E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right. \\
&\quad \times \langle J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle E_{l_2}, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_2=1}^m \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_{j_2}) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{\Delta}$ is the complex conjugate of Δ . Denote $F_{l_1, l_2}^{GG}(u, w)$ the cross spectral density of $\langle G_{\mathbf{E}}(u, \mathcal{F}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu$ and $\langle G_{\mathbf{E}}(u, \mathcal{F}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu$, and $F_{l_1, l_2, l_3}^{GH}(u, w)$ the cross spectral density of $\langle G_{\mathbf{E}}(u, \mathcal{F}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu$

and $\langle E_{l_2}, H(\mu, \text{Exp}_\mu(G_{\mathbf{E}}(u, \mathcal{F})) \circ E_{l_3}) \rangle_\mu$. We claim that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3} &= \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right. \\
&\quad \times \langle J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle E_{l_2}, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right) \\
&\quad \times \left. \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_2=1}^m \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_{j_2}) \circ E_{l_3} \right)_\mu \right\} \tag{S18} \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2}^{GG}(u, w) F_{l_1, l_2, l_3}^{GH}(u, w) dudw \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2}^{GG}(u, w) du \right) \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2, l_3}^{GH}(u, w) du \right) d\omega + O_p\left(\frac{1}{m}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which indicates that whenever $G_{\mathbf{E}}(u, \mathcal{F})$ is independent of u , $\Delta + \bar{\Delta} = O_p(\frac{1}{m})$, and the asymptotic distribution of the test statistics $V_{\hat{F}}^2$ only depends on $A_n(u, \omega)$, as per the distribution in Euclidean space or Hilbert space; and under \mathbf{H}_1 the asymptotic distribution will differ from the counterpart in Euclidean or Hilbert space in the asymptotic variance. In the remainder of this section we apply the cumulant techniques to show the claim given by (S18) holds.

For a complex random variable X , we define \bar{X} as the complex conjugate of X . Denote $\mathbf{cum}_k(\cdot)$ the k^{th} -order joint cumulant of random variables X_1, \dots, X_k , which is given by the coefficient of $\mathbf{i}^k(t_1 \cdots t_k)$ in the complex Taylor expansions of $\log \mathbb{E}[e^{\mathbf{i} \sum_j^k t_j X_j}]$ at the origin (Brillinger 2001). Particularly, $\mathbf{cum}_1(X) = \mathbb{E}X$ and $\mathbf{cum}_2(\{X, \bar{Y}\}) = \mathbb{E}(XY) - \mathbb{E}X\mathbb{E}Y$. For comprehensive details of cumulants, we refer to the book by Brillinger (2001).

We mainly follow the discussions by van Delft et al. (2021). For simplicity, we use $D_{n, l}(\omega_k, t_j)$ to represent $\langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), E_l \rangle_\mu$ and $D_{n, l, l'}^H(\omega_k, t_j)$ to represent $\langle E_l, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ E_{l'} \rangle_\mu$.

$E_{l_1}\rangle_\mu$. Then by the expansion of cumulant (Brillinger 2001), Lemma S4.1 and Corollary S4.1 in van Delft et al. (2021), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_j), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \\
& \quad \times \langle J_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle E_{l_2}, J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \\
& = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_1(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j) D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j) D_{n,l_1}(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_4(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_1}(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j)) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_j), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_j)) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_{k-1}, t_j)) \\
& \quad + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
& = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^1 F_{l_1,l_2}^{GG}(u, w) F_{l_1,l_2,l_3}^{GH}(u, w) du dw + O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \langle J_n(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), E_{l_2} \rangle_\mu \right) \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j_2=1}^m \langle J_n(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), E_{l_1} \rangle_\mu J_n^{\bar{H}}(-\omega_k, t_{j_2}) \circ E_{l_3} \rangle_\mu \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_1(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}) D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1}) D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2}) D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&= \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_4(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1})) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1})) \\
&= \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1})) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{mT} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j_1=1}^m \sum_{j_2=1}^m \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_1}(-\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_1}(\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n,l_2}(\omega_k, t_{j_1}), D_{n,l_2,l_3}^H(-\omega_k, t_{j_2})) \\
&+ O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1,l_2}^{GG}(u, w) du \right) \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1,l_2,l_3}^{GH}(u, w) du \right) + \\
&+ \frac{1}{4\pi m} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^1 F_{l_1,l_1}^{GG}(u, w) F_{l_2,l_2,l_3}^{GH}(u, w) dudw + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We then compute $\mathbf{cum}_2(\Delta_{l_1,l_2,l_3}, \Delta_{l_1,l_2,l_3})$, the second order cumulant of Δ_{l_1,l_2,l_3} . We begin

by considering the quantity:

$$V_1(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3}) = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2} \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1}) D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1}) D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_1-1}, t_{j_1}) D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_1-1}, t_{j_1}), \\ D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_2}) D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_2}) D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_2-1}, t_{j_2}) D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_2-1}, t_{j_2}))$$

It suffices to compute the multiplication of cumulant induced by all indecomposable partitions with size larger than 3 of the following array

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1})}^1, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1})}^2, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_1-1}, t_{j_1})}^3, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_1-1}, t_{j_1})}^4, \\ \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_2})}^5, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_2})}^6, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_2-1}, t_{j_2})}^7, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_2-1}, t_{j_2})}^8. \end{array}$$

Particularly, the significant terms of cumulant have structures $\mathbf{cum}_4(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$. By Lemma S4.1 and Lemma S4.2 in [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#), the significant terms with the structure $\mathbf{cum}_4(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ can only be included in arrays with $j_1 = j_2$ and induced by one of the following partitions:

$$\{(1256)(34)(78)\}, \{(1278)(34)(56)\}, \{(3456)(12)(78)\}, \{(3478)(12)(56)\}.$$

There are nm^2 terms satisfying these two conditions, and each of them is at of order $\frac{1}{n}$, which means that their contribution to the quantity $V_1(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$ is of order $O(\frac{1}{T^2} \times n^2 m \times \frac{1}{n}) = O(\frac{1}{T})$.

The terms with structures $\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ that is significant asymptotically can only be included in arrays with $j_1 = j_2$ and $|k_1 - k_2| \leq 1$ and induced by one of the following partitions:

$$\{12\}(37)(56)(48)\}, \{12\}(36)(78)(45)\}, \{(15)(26)(34)(78)\}, \{(18)(27)(34)(56)\} \\ \{(15)(26)(37)(48)\}.$$

There are at most $\frac{3}{2}(mn)$ terms satisfying these two restrictions, with each is of order $O(1)$ and uniformly bounded, hence will contribute to the quantity $V_1(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$ with asymptotic order $O(mn \times \frac{1}{T^2}) = O(\frac{1}{T})$. It remains to show that $V_2(\delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$ also vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\begin{aligned} & V_2(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3}) \\ &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k_1, k_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} \mathbf{cum}_2(D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1}) D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1}) D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_2}) D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_2}), \\ & D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_3}) D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_3}) D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_4}) D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_4})). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the discussion of $V_1(\delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$, we calculate the order of cumulants of indecomposable partitions of arrays:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1})}^1, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_1})}^2, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_2})}^3, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_1}, t_{j_2})}^4, \\ \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_3})}^5, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_3})}^6, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_2, l_3}^H(-\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_4})}^7, & \overbrace{D_{n, l_1}(\omega_{k_2}, t_{j_4})}^8. \end{array}$$

Similar to $V_1(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$, we only need to consider cumulants with structures $\mathbf{cum}_4(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$. The only significant terms with structure $\mathbf{cum}_4(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ are the same as $V_1(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$:

$$\{(1256)(34)(78)\}, \{(1278)(34)(56)\}, \{(3456)(12)(78)\}, \{(3478)(12)(56)\}.$$

which is of order $O(\frac{1}{T})$. Similarly, there are $O(nm^3)$ significant terms with structure $\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)\mathbf{cum}_2(\cdot)$ and of order $O(1)$, which will contribute to $V_2(\Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3})$ with

asymptotic order $\frac{1}{T}$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{l_1, l_2, l_3} &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2}^{GG}(u, w) F_{l_1, l_2, l_3}^{GH}(u, w) du dw \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2}^{GG}(u, w) du \right) \left(\int_0^1 F_{l_1, l_2, l_3}^{GH}(u, w) du \right) d\omega + O_p\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S19})$$

as claimed.

When \mathbf{H}_0 holds, (S19) suggests that $\Delta + \bar{\Delta} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)$, and the null distribution is the same as the null distribution given by Theorem 1 in [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#). When \mathbf{H}_1 holds, $\Delta + \bar{\Delta}$ weakly converges to a normal distribution, since U_T is asymptotically normally distributed as shown in the proof to Lemma 1 and $\Delta + \bar{\Delta}$ is asymptotically equivalent to a linear transform of U_T . By the asymptotic normality of $\frac{4\pi}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_k, t_j), A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j) \rangle + \hat{W} - \frac{4\pi}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \langle \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle$ provided by Theorem 1 in [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#), and the asymptotic normality of $\Delta + \bar{\Delta}$, we deduce that $\sqrt{T}(V_{\hat{F}}^2 - V_F^2)$ also converges to a normal distribution under \mathbf{H}_1 .

S1.7 Theorem 6

Here we show that the estimate given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_V^2 = 16\pi^2 n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 \quad (\text{S20})$$

converges to the asymptotic variance under \mathbf{H}_0 .

Applying the similar technique to establish (S17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 = \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right. \\ & + m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), B_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} + m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ & \left. + m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle B_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), B_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} + O_p(T^{-1}) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $B_n(\omega_k, t_j) = O_p(T^{-1/2})$, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 = \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} + O_p(T^{-1/2}) \right)^2 \\ & = \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 + O_p(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_V^2 &= 16\pi^2 n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle I_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), I_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 \\ &= 16\pi^2 n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2 + O_p(T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1 in [van Delft et al. \(2021\)](#), the quantity

$$16\pi^2 n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \left(m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \langle A_n(\omega_{k-1}, t_j), A_n(\omega_k, t_j) \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right)^2$$

is a consistent estimate $4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{\text{HS}}^4 d\omega$. Thus $\hat{\sigma}_V^2$ also converges to $4\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\bar{F}_{\mathbf{E}}(\omega)\|_{\text{HS}}^4 d\omega$,

as desired.

References

- Aue, A. & van Delft, A. (2020), ‘Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain’, *The Annals of Statistics* **48**(5), 2505 – 2547.
- Brillinger, D. R. (2001), *Time series: data analysis and theory*, SIAM.
- Durrett, R. (2019), *Probability: Theory and Examples*, Cambridge University Press.
- Kendall, W. S. & Le, H. (2011), ‘Limit theorems for empirical Fréchet means of independent and non-identically distributed manifold-valued random variables’, *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics* **25**(3), 323 – 352.
- 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.
- Taylor, M. (2010), *Partial Differential Equations I: Basic Theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer New York.
- van Delft, A., Characiejus, V. & Dette, H. (2021), ‘A nonparametric test for stationarity in functional time series’, *Statistica Sinica* **31**(3), pp. 1375–1395.
- Wu, W. B. (2005), ‘Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102**(40), 14150–14154.
- Zhou, Z. (2013), ‘Heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation robust structural change detection’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**(502), 726–740.