

BAYESIAN SPHERE-ON-SPHERE REGRESSION WITH OPTIMAL TRANSPORT MAPS

BY TIN LOK JAMES NG¹, KWOK-KUN KWONG²,
JIAKUN LIU³, AND ANDREW ZAMMIT-MANGION²

¹*School of Computer Science and Statistics, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland*

²*School of Mathematics and Applied Statistics, University of Wollongong, Australia*

³*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, Australia*

Spherical regression, where both covariate and response variables are defined on the sphere, is a required form of data analysis in several scientific disciplines, and has been the subject of substantial methodological development in recent years. Yet, it remains a challenging problem due to the complexities involved in constructing valid and expressive regression models between spherical domains, and the difficulties involved in quantifying uncertainty of estimated regression maps. To address these challenges, we propose casting spherical regression as a problem of optimal transport within a Bayesian framework. Through this approach, we obviate the need for directly parameterizing a spherical regression map, and are able to quantify uncertainty on the inferred map. We derive posterior contraction rates for the proposed model under two different prior specifications and, in doing so, obtain a result on the quantitative stability of optimal transport maps on the sphere, one that may be useful in other contexts. The utility of our approach is demonstrated empirically through a simulation study and through its application to real data.

1. Introduction Sphere-on-sphere regression aims to model the relationship between a covariate and a response variable on the p -sphere, defined as $\mathbb{S}^p := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \|x\|^2 = 1\}$. Early research in this area represented the mean direction of the response variable as a rotation of the covariate (Mackenzie, 1957; Stephens, 1979). With this approach to regression, the problem reduces to estimating an unknown rotation matrix $R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ where $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ is the space of all orthogonal matrices with unit determinant. Chang (1986) developed asymptotic tests and confidence regions for the rotation matrix R under the assumption of rotationally symmetric errors. Rivest (1989) focused on von Mises-Fisher errors, and developed asymptotic inferential procedures for R when the sample size is held fixed and the concentration parameter of the von Mises-Fisher distribution diverges to infinity. Chang (1989) extends the results of Rivest (1989) to the case where the covariates are also modeled as random. Moving beyond rotations, a more general family of transformation, the Möbius group, was introduced by Downs (2003) for the $p = 2$ case. A further generalization using the projected linear group was introduced by Rosenthal et al. (2014).

More recently, nonparametric methods for regression of spherical data have been proposed, which tend to be more flexible than parametric ones. Marzio, Panzera and Taylor (2014) propose using Taylor polynomials to obtain a component-wise local approximation of the regression map $f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$. On the other hand, motivated by the fact that any two points on the sphere are related by a rotation along the shortest arc between them, Marzio, Panzera

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62F15, 62F12.

Keywords and phrases: Laguerre tessellation; Semi-discrete optimal transport maps; Markov chain Monte Carlo; Posterior contraction.

and Taylor (2019) propose a nonparametric rotation model through a covariate-dependent rotation. That is, they model the conditional mean direction of the response $Y \in \mathbb{S}^p$ given covariate $x \in \mathbb{S}^p$ as $R_x x$, where the rotation matrix R_x varies with x . Since any rotation matrix R can be written as $R = \exp(A)$ where A is a skew-symmetric matrix (i.e., $A^T = -A$) and $\exp(\cdot)$ is the matrix exponential, one can write $R_x = \exp(A_x)$. Marzio, Panzera and Taylor (2019) propose using Taylor approximations to locally approximate A_x around the point x so that R_x can be estimated using a locally weighted least squares approach. Rosenthal et al. (2017) propose a more general approach where diffeomorphisms are used to model sphere-to-sphere maps.

Despite the methodological advancements, there remains a shortage of flexible regression models for sphere-on-sphere regression problems compared to their Euclidean counterparts. Directly parameterizing a regression map that maps from the sphere to itself is challenging due to the complex geometry involved. Therefore, we adopt an indirect approach that avoids directly parameterizing the regression map. Our modeling approach is inspired by the seminal work of McCann (2001) on polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds, which shows that a highly flexible class of maps from a Riemannian manifold to itself can be uniquely factorized into a composition of an optimal transport map and a volume-preserving map. We refer to our proposed model as the Factorization Model for Sphere-on-Sphere Regression (**FMSOS**). Compared to existing nonparametric methods, our approach has the advantage of being generative (i.e., observations can be simulated from the model). We adopt a Bayesian approach for inferring the regression map, which also facilitates uncertainty quantification.

The remainder of the manuscript is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide background on optimal transport theory, with a focus on semi-discrete optimal transport. We also discuss relevant literature on normalizing flows and posterior contraction rates. Section 3 introduces our novel modeling approach, FMSOS. We derive a general posterior contraction result for regression maps from the sphere to itself, which we then apply to FMSOS under two prior specifications. The general contraction result can be seen as an extension of the posterior contraction result established by Xie, Jin and Xu (2019) for regression in the Euclidean setting. A Markov chain Monte Carlo method for inferring the regression map from data is also proposed. In Section 4, we experimentally validate the contraction of posterior distributions through simulation studies. Finally, Section 5 presents two applications in which we apply our proposed method, and Section 6 concludes.

Notation

For $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, we let $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(\mathcal{X})}$ denote the L^r -norm of a measurable function (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) on a domain \mathcal{X} . We use the notation $a \lesssim b$ and $a \gtrsim b$ to denote inequalities up to a positive multiplicative constant, and $a \asymp b$ if $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. We denote \mathcal{F} as the space of regression maps from the sphere \mathbb{S}^p to itself, that is, $\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p\}$. For each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we let \mathbb{P}_f denote the joint distribution of a covariate-response pair (x, y) where the covariate x is uniformly distributed on \mathbb{S}^p . The precise definition of \mathbb{P}_f will be given later. We let $\Pi(\cdot)$ denote the prior distribution on \mathcal{F} and, given independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) observations $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ from \mathbb{P}_f for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we let $\Pi(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_n)$ denote the posterior distribution on \mathcal{F} . Given a function $h : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define $\mathbb{P}_n h := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(x_i)$ for i.i.d. uniformly distributed points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let \tilde{d} denote a semi-metric on \mathcal{F} , and let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ be an arbitrary regression map; we define the ϵ -ball around map f with respect to the semi-metric \tilde{d} as

$$B(f; \epsilon, \tilde{d}) = \{f' \in \mathcal{F} : \tilde{d}(f', f) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

When the underlying semi-metric is obvious from context, we use the simplified notation $B(f; \epsilon)$ instead. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any set $A \subset \mathcal{F}$, the ϵ -covering number of (A, \tilde{d}) , denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, A, \tilde{d})$, is defined to be the minimum number of ϵ -balls of the form $B(f; \epsilon, \tilde{d})$ that are needed to cover A .

2. Background and Related Work

2.1. Optimal Transport Given two probability measures μ, ν defined on a space \mathcal{X} equipped with a metric d , a transport map $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to push forward the measure μ to ν (written compactly as $T_{\#}\mu = \nu$) if

$$\nu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}(B)), \quad \text{for any Borel subset } B \subset \mathcal{X},$$

where T^{-1} is treated in a set value sense; that is, $x \in T^{-1}(z)$ if and only if $T(x) = z$. The optimal transport problem aims to find a transport map $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ that pushes forward μ to ν while minimizing a loss induced through a cost function $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. The cost function measures how costly it is to move a unit of mass from a location $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to a location $z \in \mathcal{X}$. Given the cost function c , the optimal transport map S_ν is given by the solution to Monge's optimization problem (Monge, 1781):

$$(1) \quad S_\nu = \arg \min_{T: T_{\#}\mu = \nu} \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, T(x)) d\mu(x).$$

Since a solution to Monge's problem may not always exist, Kantorovich (1958) proposed a relaxation of Monge's optimization problem:

$$(2) \quad \gamma^* = \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} c(x, z) d\gamma(x, z),$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of all couplings of μ and ν . That is, $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ if γ is a distribution on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ with marginals μ and ν . The coupling γ is also called a transport plan and $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of transport plans.

Since every transport map can be associated with a transport plan of the same cost, the solutions to Monge and Kantorovich problems are related through the inequality

$$(3) \quad \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} c(x, z) d\gamma(x, z) \leq \inf_{T: T_{\#}\mu = \nu} \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, T(x)) d\mu(x).$$

A common choice of the cost function is the half squared distance,

$$(4) \quad c(x, z) = \frac{d^2(x, z)}{2}, \quad x, z \in \mathcal{X}.$$

For the Euclidean case, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^p$ with metric $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$, Brenier (1991) showed that a unique solution to Monge's problem (1) exists as long as the source measure μ is absolutely continuous, in which case the inequality in (3) becomes an equality.

In this work, we focus on the spherical domain $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{S}^p$ with geodesic distance $d(x, z) = \cos^{-1}(x^T z)$ for $x, z \in \mathbb{S}^p$, with the squared distance cost function (4). McCann (2001) shows that unique optimal transport maps exist for Riemannian manifolds and a class of cost functions that includes the squared distance cost function (4). In particular, when the source measure μ is absolutely continuous, the solution to Monge's optimisation problem is guaranteed to be unique, and can be expressed as

$$(5) \quad S_\nu(x) = \exp_x(-\nabla\phi(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^p,$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Brenier potential function, ∇ is the gradient operator (i.e. $\nabla\phi(x) \in T_x\mathbb{S}^p$), $T_x\mathbb{S}^p$ is the tangent space at x , and $\exp_x : T_x\mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$ is the exponential map.

2.2. Semi-discrete Optimal Transport In the semi-discrete optimal transport setting, the source measure μ is absolutely continuous whereas the target measure ν is discrete and supported on a finite set $\mathcal{Z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\} \subset \mathcal{X}$. A transport map from μ to ν satisfies

$$(6) \quad T_{\#}\mu = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mu(T^{-1}(z))\delta_z = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \nu(\{z\})\delta_z,$$

where δ_z is the Dirac measure at z . Now, let $\tilde{\psi} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function supported on \mathcal{Z} , and consider the functional

$$(7) \quad \Phi(\tilde{\psi}) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (c(x, z) - \tilde{\psi}(z)) d\mu(x) + \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \tilde{\psi}(z) \nu(\{z\}).$$

It can be shown that minimizing Φ with respect to $\tilde{\psi}$ is equivalent to solving the Kantorovich problem (2) (Kitagawa, Mériqot and Thibert, 2019). In particular, when $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^p$ or $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{S}^p$ and the cost function is the half squared (geodesic) distance (4), minimizing (7) with respect to $\tilde{\psi}$ is also equivalent to solving the Monge problem (1), and the resulting optimal transport map (5) is given by

$$(8) \quad S_{\nu}(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \{c(x, z) - \psi(z)\}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where $\psi := \arg \min_{\tilde{\psi}} \Phi(\tilde{\psi})$. The function ψ is also called the dual potential function, and is related to the Brenier potential function through

$$\psi(z) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{c(x, z) - \phi(x)\}, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

From (8), the dual potential function ψ leads to the notion of a Laguerre tessellation, whose cells are given by

$$(9) \quad \operatorname{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : c(x, z_j) - \psi(z_j) \leq c(x, z) - \psi(z), \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}\}, \quad z_j \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

The optimal transport map (6) is defined almost everywhere on \mathcal{Z} apart from the boundaries of the Laguerre cells. The Laguerre cells are generalization of the Voronoi cells, given by

$$(10) \quad \operatorname{Vor}_{z_j} := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : c(x, z_j) \leq c(x, z), \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}\}, \quad z_j \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

An illustration of these two tessellations is shown in Figure 1. Note how, unlike in the Voronoi case, a Laguerre cell $\operatorname{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi)$ may not contain its nucleus z_j .

Solving the Monge problem is equivalent to computing the Laguerre tessellation (9). When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^p$ and when the cost is the squared Euclidean distance, there are efficient algorithms for computing the Laguerre tessellation (Fabri and Pion, 2009). For non-Euclidean spaces or other cost functions, modification of these algorithms is required (Kitagawa, Mériqot and Thibert, 2019; Cui et al., 2019).

2.3. Related Work on Normalizing Flows Normalizing flows (see Papamakarios et al., 2021, for a review) have gained popularity as a method for modeling complex probability distributions. Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two absolutely continuous measures on a space \mathcal{X} , with corresponding probability density functions p_{μ_1} and p_{μ_2} . The central idea of normalizing flows is to leverage the familiar change-of-variables formula:

$$p_{\mu_1}(x) = p_{\mu_2}(T(x)) |\det(\nabla T(x))|, \quad x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is some transport map from μ_1 to μ_2 which in general is not an optimal map. This formulation allows expressing a complex probability density μ_1 in terms of a simple reference density μ_2 (e.g. normal or bounded uniform density) and a transport map T .




FIG 1. Illustration depicting Voronoi (top-left) and Laguerre (bottom-left) tessellations for five atoms on the Euclidean domain $[0, 2] \times [0, 1]$, with $\psi(z) = 1$ for the Voronoi tessellation (top-right) and $\psi(z) = (z_1^3 + z_2^3)^{\frac{1}{5}}$ for the Laguerre tessellation (bottom-right).

Various strategies have been proposed to parameterize the map T on the Euclidean domain (Papamakarios, Pavlakou and Murray, 2017; Huang et al., 2018; Jaini, Selby and Yu, 2019). Recent approaches typically construct the map T as a composition of multiple transformations. A compelling aspect of the normalizing flows approach is its ability, under mild conditions, to approximate complex probability density functions arbitrarily well (Huang et al., 2018; Ng and Zammit-Mangion, 2023). Constructing flexible transport maps for non-Euclidean domains is a more challenging task. Efforts have been made to construct flexible transport maps on the sphere (Sei, 2013; Rezende et al., 2020; Ng and Zammit-Mangion, 2022) and more generally on Riemmanian manifolds (Cohen, Amos and Lipman, 2021). The normalizing flow model proposed by Cohen, Amos and Lipman (2021) also employs semi-discrete optimal transport.

2.4. Related Work on Contraction Rates of Posterior Distributions There has been extensive research conducted on the rates of contraction of posterior distributions for Bayesian nonparametric priors. Building on the initial framework for studying generic rates of contraction with i.i.d. data (Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000), much of the literature focuses on deriving rates of convergence in the setting of density estimation (Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007a; Kruijer, Rousseau and van der Vaart, 2010; Shen, Tokdar and Ghosal, 2013; Canale and Blasi, 2017). For nonparametric regression, convergence rates of posterior distributions with respect to empirical L_2 distance were studied by van der Vaart and van Zanten (2009) and de Jonge and van Zanten (2012). For integrated L_2 distance, general results on contraction rates are given by Huang (2004) and Xie, Jin and Xu (2019); contraction rates for Gaussian process priors were studied by van der Vaart and van Zanten (2011). Our posterior contraction rate result for a general sphere-to-sphere regression map, presented in Section 3.2, can be considered as an extension of the result by Xie, Jin and Xu (2019).

3. Methodology

3.1. *Model* We now present our model for sphere-on-sphere regression that builds on a semi-discrete optimal transport map. Let $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{S}^p \times \mathbb{S}^p$ be a random covariate-response pair. Conditional on the covariate $X = x$, we model the mean direction of the response Y using a regression map $f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$. As a frequently used modeling assumption in the literature, we also posit that the error distribution of Y given $X = x$ follows a von Mises-Fisher distribution,

$$(11) \quad Y|(X = x) \sim g_p(y; f(x), \kappa),$$

where $g_p(\cdot; f(x), \kappa)$ is the probability density function of the von Mises-Fisher distribution on \mathbb{S}^p with mean direction $f(x) \in \mathbb{S}^p$ and concentration parameter $\kappa > 0$.

We wish to construct a regression map f that is sufficiently flexible to capture complex relationships between covariates and responses, that is adaptable to varying data complexities, and that leads to an interpretable model. As we will show, the optimal transport regression framework we construct satisfies these properties. The regression map we use is given by

$$(12) \quad f(x) = U \circ S_\nu(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^p,$$

where U is some volume-preserving map and S_ν is the optimal transport map from the uniform probability measure μ to some target measure ν with the (half) squared geodesic distance cost function

$$(13) \quad c(x, z) = \frac{1}{2}d^2(x, z), \quad x, z \in \mathbb{S}^p,$$

where $d(x, z) = \cos^{-1}(x^T z)$ is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^p . This model is partly motivated by the polar factorization result of [McCann \(2001\)](#), which states that any Borel map that does not map positive volume to zero volume can be uniquely decomposed into an optimal transport map and a volume-preserving map. As explained in [Section 2.1](#), with the squared geodesic distance cost function c and the uniform probability measure μ , uniqueness of the optimal transport map S_ν is guaranteed.

Model (12) is a general construction to which we now apply some modeling choices that still retain the framework's flexibility. We first replace U in (12) with a rigid rotation $R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$; that is, we let

$$(14) \quad f(x) = R \circ S_\nu(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

Second, we define ν to be a discrete measure. Constraining the space of target measures to consist of discrete measures might be seen as counter-productive, but as we will show, this choice leads to a model that has attractive theoretical properties, as well as computational benefits, since it enables efficient algorithms for computing semi-discrete optimal maps. Additionally, as we will show, this model can be used to adapt automatically to the complexity of the data.

Informally, the regression map f in (14) is decomposed into two parts: S_ν and R . The squared distance cost function c that is used to construct S_ν discourages shifts of mass over large distances; hence S_ν models the finer, localized behavior of f . On the other hand, the rotation matrix R captures the global behavior. We refer to the regression model (11) where f is constructed as in (14) as the Factorization Model for Sphere-on-Sphere Regression (**FMSOS**).

REMARK 1. *One natural extension of the model (14) is to replace the space of rotations $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ with a more general family of parametric transformations, such as the Möbius group (Downs, 2003) and the projected linear group (Rosenthal et al., 2014). We defer the consideration of these transformations to future research.*

REMARK 2. *The proposed model can be viewed as a semi-parametric approach, comprising a parametric component represented by the rotation matrix and a non-parametric component represented by the optimal transport map induced by the space of discrete probability measures.*

The regression map associated with FMSOS can be expressed as

$$(15) \quad f = R \circ S_\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{V}, R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1),$$

where \mathcal{V} is the set of discrete probability measures on \mathbb{S}^p , that is,

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{V} := \left\{ \nu = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j \delta_{z_j} : z_j \in \mathbb{S}^p, p_j > 0, \sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1, k \in \mathbb{N}_+ \right\}.$$

Our inferential objects thus become the target measure ν and the rotation matrix R . In a Bayesian setting, we assign a prior distribution Π_ν on the space of discrete measures \mathcal{V} and a prior Π_R on $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$. The priors Π_ν and Π_R then induce a prior Π on \mathcal{F} , the space of regression maps from \mathbb{S}^p to \mathbb{S}^p . Then, given observed data $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we can sample from the posterior distribution of f by sampling from the posterior distributions of ν and R . This, in turn, requires constructing several optimal transport maps S_ν for different discrete measures $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$. Recall from Section 2.2 that each map construction is equivalent to computing the Laguerre tessellation (9) or, equivalently, finding the dual potential function ψ that minimizes the functional (7).

REMARK 3. *FMSOS induces spatial clustering of the domain \mathbb{S}^p where covariates in the same Laguerre cell, $\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi)$ say, have a vMF distribution with the same mean direction, $R \circ z_j$. Hence, FMSOS allows for the estimation of homogeneous regions in covariate space from data. One way to extend the model is to allow a different rotation matrix R_{z_j} for each Laguerre cell $\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi)$. We leave this extension for future research.*

FMSOS possesses several desirable properties. First, it avoids the need to directly parameterize the regression map, which can be a challenging task. Second, because of its clustering behavior (Remark 3), the parameters in FMSOS are intuitive and interpretable. Third, by varying the number of atoms k in ν , one induces variation in the complexity of the optimal transport map and, consequently, the regression map. In Section 3.3 we place a prior on k so that FMSOS can adapt to the complexity of the data.

We note that the normalizing flows approach described in Section 2.3, which was initially devised for density estimation could, in principle, also be adapted for sphere-on-sphere regression. However, this would present several challenges. First, normalizing flow models are highly parameterized, and are not well-suited to small datasets often encountered in applications of sphere-on-sphere regression. Second, the normalizing flows approach does not automatically adapt to the complexity of the data.

3.2. *Posterior Contraction Rates: General Regression Map* In this section we derive a general result on the contraction rate of Bayesian non-parametric regression models on the sphere.

Consider the availability of an i.i.d. sample $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where, without loss of generality, we assume that the covariates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are uniformly distributed on \mathbb{S}^p . Our “working” model for these data is derived from the non-parametric regression model (11):

$$(17) \quad Y_i | (X_i = x_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} g_p(y_i; f(x_i), \kappa), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

while we assume that the “true” model for these data is

$$(18) \quad Y_i | (X_i = x_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} g_p(y_i; f_0(x_i), \kappa), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $f_0 : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$ is some unknown regression map.

Let \mathbb{P}_f denote the joint distribution of (X, Y) corresponding to regression map f with joint density $p_f(x, y)$, and let \mathbb{P}_0 denote the joint distribution of (X, Y) corresponding to the regression map f_0 with joint density $p_0(x, y)$. Given the i.i.d. sample \mathcal{D}_n , and a prior distribution Π on f , the posterior distribution of f is given by

$$(19) \quad \Pi(f \in A | \mathcal{D}_n) = \frac{\int_A \prod_{i=1}^n (p_f(x_i, y_i)/p_0(x_i, y_i)) \Pi(df)}{\int_{\mathcal{F}} \prod_{i=1}^n (p_f(x_i, y_i)/p_0(x_i, y_i)) \Pi(df)},$$

where $\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p\}$ is the space of regression maps and $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. As in [Xie, Jin and Xu \(2019\)](#), we derive the contraction rate of the posterior distribution $\Pi(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_n)$ with respect to the integrated L_2 distance on \mathcal{F} , defined as

$$\tilde{d}^2(f_1, f_2) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} d^2(f_1(x), f_2(x)) d\mu(x), \quad f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F},$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^p and μ is the uniform measure on \mathbb{S}^p . The distribution $\Pi(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_n)$ is said to contract around the true regression map f_0 with respect to the semi-metric $\tilde{d}(\cdot, \cdot)$ at rate ϵ_n if

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\tilde{d}(f, f_0) > M_n \epsilon_n | \mathcal{D}_n)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathbb{E}_0 is the expectation corresponding to probability measure \mathbb{P}_0 , and where M_n either grows to ∞ arbitrarily slowly or equals a large enough constant M .

THEOREM 1. *Assume there exists sequences $(\epsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty, (\underline{\epsilon}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $0 \leq \underline{\epsilon}_n \leq \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\min(n\epsilon_n^2, n\underline{\epsilon}_n^2) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be “sieves” for \mathcal{F} , that is, a sequence of sets $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{F}$. Assume for some constants $D_1 > 0$ and for sufficiently large M , the following three conditions hold.*

CONDITION 1.

$$(20) \quad \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-D_1 n j^2 \epsilon_n^2) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $N_{nj} = \mathcal{N}(\xi j \epsilon_n, \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n), \tilde{d})$ for $\xi \in (0, 1)$ is the covering number of the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n) = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : j\epsilon_n < \tilde{d}(f, f_0) \leq (j+1)\epsilon_n\}.$$

CONDITION 2. *For sufficiently large n ,*

$$(21) \quad \Pi(\mathcal{F}_n^c) \lesssim \exp(-3D_1 n \underline{\epsilon}_n^2).$$

CONDITION 3. For sufficiently large n ,

$$(22) \quad \Pi(B_n(f_0; \epsilon_n)) \geq \exp(-D_1 n \epsilon_n^2).$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\tilde{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The three conditions are analogous to those needed for existing results on posterior contraction rates (Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000; Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007b). Condition 1. corresponds to the entropy condition, stipulating that the sieve space \mathcal{F}_n should not be excessively large. Condition 2., combined with Condition 1., asserts that \mathcal{F}_n^c , the complement of the sieve space, should attract minimal prior probability mass. Condition 3. requires that the prior distribution puts a sufficient amount of probability mass around the true map f_0 .

Theorem 1 could likely be used for studying contraction rates of posterior distributions for other Bayesian sphere-on-sphere regression models. Similar to Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000); Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007b); Xie, Jin and Xu (2019), the proof of Theorem 1, which we give in Appendix A.1 in the Supplementary Material, involves constructing a suitable test statistic and obtaining exponentially small Type I and Type II error probability bounds. The proof and the construction of the test statistic are inspired by the work of Xie, Jin and Xu (2019).

REMARK 4. Extending Theorem 1 to the case where the concentration parameter κ is unknown and assigned a prior distribution with density bounded away from 0 and ∞ is desirable. However, this extension presents complications with the test statistic used in the proof; we therefore treat this extension as future research.

3.3. *Posterior Contraction: FMSOS* In this section we derive the contraction rates for two different prior specifications in FMSOS. For the first specification, we construct a prior on the target discrete measure, Π_ν , by assigning a prior distribution to the locations of the atoms $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ of the measure and to the associated probability vector (p_1, \dots, p_k) corresponding to these atoms. We treat the locations and the probability parameters as independent, when conditioned on the number of atoms k . The contraction rate for this prior specification is derived in Section 3.3.1. For the second prior specification, we consider the dual formulation of the semi-discrete optimal transport described in Section 2.1, and assign a prior distribution to the dual potential conditional on the locations of the atoms. The contraction rate for this prior specification is derived in Section 3.3.2. For both cases, we derive the posterior contraction rates by verifying the three conditions in Theorem 1.

We assume that the true regression map $f_0 = R_0 \circ S_0$ is the composition of a rigid rotation $R_0 \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ with an optimal transport map S_0 from the uniform probability measure μ to some probability measure ν_0 on \mathbb{S}^p .

3.3.1. *Direct Prior Specification on Discrete Measures* We construct the prior distribution Π_ν of \mathcal{V} as follows. We assign a prior on the number of atoms $K = k$ of the discrete measure ν from some prior Π_k on \mathbb{N}_+ which satisfies the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 1. *The prior distribution Π_k has probability mass function π_k satisfying*

$$(23) \quad \pi_k(\tilde{k}) \geq \exp(-b_0 \tilde{k} \log \tilde{k}),$$

$$(24) \quad \sum_{k=\tilde{k}+1}^{\infty} \pi_k(k) \leq \exp(-b_1 \tilde{k} \log \tilde{k}),$$

for some constants $b_0, b_1 > 0$ and for all $\tilde{k} \geq 1$.

A convenient choice of Π_k that satisfies these conditions is the zero-truncated Poisson distribution (Xie, Jin and Xu, 2019). The remainder of the prior specification is given by the following assumptions.

ASSUMPTION 2. *Conditional on $K = k$, the atoms $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k\}$ of the measure ν are uniformly distributed on \mathbb{S}^p . The probability vector (p_1, \dots, p_k) corresponding to the atoms have a Dirichlet distribution $\text{Dir}(\alpha_p, \dots, \alpha_p)$ for some $\alpha_p < 1$.*

Assumption 1 and 2 thus complete the specification of the prior Π_ν on \mathcal{V} . Recall from Section 2.2 that, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$, obtaining the optimal transport map S_ν is equivalent to finding the dual potential function ψ , or equivalently, the Laguerre cells (9).

ASSUMPTION 3. *The rigid rotation matrix R is uniformly distributed with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1)$.*

THEOREM 2. *Suppose the true regression map f_0 is given by*

$$f_0 = R_0 \circ S_{\nu_0},$$

where $R_0 \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1)$ and S_{ν_0} is the optimal transport map from μ to ν_0 , and where ν_0 is an arbitrary probability measure on \mathbb{S}^p . Let

$$\epsilon_n = n^{-\frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}} (\log n)^t,$$

where $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$ and s, t are any values satisfying $s > p$, and $t > \frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}$. Supposing the prior distribution satisfies Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 we have

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\tilde{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all sufficiently large $M > 0$.

The proof for Theorem 2, which we give in Appendix A.2 in the Supplementary Material, applies Theorem 1, and hence requires the construction of suitable sieves $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. Let $(k_n)_n$ be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ with rate of divergence to ∞ as specified in Appendix A.2 in the Supplementary Material. Let \mathcal{V}_n denote the set of discrete measures with at most k_n atoms:

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : \nu = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j \delta_{z_j}, z_j \in \mathbb{S}^p, p_j > 0, \sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1, k \leq k_n \right\},$$

and let $\mathcal{G}_n := \{S_\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{V}_n\}$ be the set of optimal transport maps from μ to some measure $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_n$. The sieve \mathcal{F}_n is then constructed as

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{F}_n := \{f = R \circ S : S \in \mathcal{G}_n, R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)\}.$$

Another key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 2 is a result on the quantitative stability of the optimal transport map with squared distance cost function, as presented in Lemma 7 in Appendix A.2 in the Supplementary Material. Let $W_1(\mu, \nu)$ be the 1-Wasserstein distance between two probability measures μ and ν ,

$$(26) \quad W_1(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p \times \mathbb{S}^p} d(x, z) d\gamma(x, z),$$

where the infimum is taken over the set of transport plans $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$. Given two arbitrary measures ν_1, ν_2 on \mathbb{S}^p , let S_{ν_1} and S_{ν_2} be the corresponding optimal transport maps from μ to ν_1 and from μ to ν_2 , respectively. Lemma 7, proved in Appendix B in the Supplementary Material, states that the distance between S_{ν_1} and S_{ν_2} with respect to semi-metric \tilde{d} can be upper bounded by a power of the W_1 -distance between ν_1 and ν_2 . That is,

$$(27) \quad \tilde{d}(S_{\nu_1}, S_{\nu_2}) \lesssim W_1^\tau(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

where $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$.

REMARK 5. *Recent research has focused on quantitative stability results for optimal transport maps with squared distance cost functions in Euclidean space (Delalande and Mérigot, 2023; Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal, 2020). There is a lack of similar results on the spherical domain. Therefore, Lemma 7 is also relevant to the broader literature on optimal transport. Its proof in Appendix B in the Supplementary Material is similar to that of Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal (2020), and the Hölder exponent $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$ is consistent with that in Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal (2020) following the correction of a minor error therein.*

REMARK 6. *Similar to Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal (2020), the Hölder exponent $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$ in (27) is likely sub-optimal. As discussed in Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal (2020), the optimal exponent is in the range $[\frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{2}]$ following the correction of a minor error therein.*

3.3.2. Prior Specification under Dual Formulation In this section we consider an alternative approach for the construction of the prior distribution on \mathcal{V} , one that is based on the dual formulation of the Kantorovich problem discussed in Section 2.1. Bayesian inference requires computation of optimal transport maps S_ν for $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$. Thus, for a given ν , one needs to solve an optimization problem to obtain the dual potential function ψ , or equivalently, the Laguerre cells (9). To circumvent the need to solve this optimization problem, conditional on the locations of the atoms of the target measure, we assign a prior distribution to the dual potential function.

Consider any arbitrary fixed atoms $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. For any probability vector (p_1, \dots, p_k) corresponding to these k atoms, there exists a dual potential function $\psi : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that minimizes the functional (7). Moreover, since the dual potential function ψ is supported on the finite set $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$, one can identify ψ with the dual potential vector $\boldsymbol{\psi} := (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$ where $\psi_j = \psi(z_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$.

In this prior formulation, conditional on the locations of the atoms, we put a prior distribution on $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ rather than on the vector of probabilities. For any fixed arbitrary set of atoms $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$, not every choice of dual potential vector results in a measure ν with positive

probability mass on all atoms; in other words, for some choices of ψ , the resulting measure ν may be supported on a strict subset of $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$, which is undesirable. Recalling (9), the Laguerre cells associated with ψ are

$$\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi) := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^p : c(x, z_j) - \psi_j \leq c(x, z_l) - \psi_l, \quad \forall l = 1, 2, \dots, k, j = 1, \dots, k.\}$$

For each $j = 1, \dots, k$, we let $G_j(\psi) := \mu(\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi))$ be the measure of the cell $\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi)$. We first have the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. *Let $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)$ be a dual potential vector corresponding to atoms $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. If $G_j(\psi) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, then we must have*

$$\max_j \psi_j - \min_j \psi_j \leq \frac{\pi^2}{2}.$$

PROOF. This follows from the cost function $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ being upper bounded by $\frac{\pi^2}{2}$. \square

ASSUMPTION 4. *Conditional on $K = k$, the atoms $\mathbf{z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ of the target measure ν are uniformly distributed on \mathbb{S}^p . Conditional on \mathbf{z} , the dual potential vector ψ follows the uniform distribution on the set*

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}} := \left\{ \psi \in \mathbb{R}^k : G_j(\psi) > 0, \psi_j \in \left[-\frac{\pi^2}{2}, \frac{\pi^2}{2} \right], \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k \right\}.$$

The bound $\left[-\frac{\pi^2}{2}, \frac{\pi^2}{2} \right]$ on the dual potential vector can be substituted with other sufficiently large constants. Requiring the dual potential vector to be bounded is sufficient to satisfy the prior mass condition (Condition 3) in Theorem 1. We refer to $\mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ as the *feasible set of dual potentials* corresponding to the atoms $\mathbf{z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. In other words, $\mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ consists of dual potentials which result in the target measure with positive probabilities on all its atoms. Elements in $\mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ are unique up to additive constants.

In practice, we can sample from the proposed distribution using a rejection sampling approach. Specifically, verifying $\psi \in \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ requires checking all Laguerre cells $\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\psi)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, are non-empty. This check can be done numerically by uniformly sampling a large number of points on \mathbb{S}^p and ensuring that all Laguerre cells contain at least one point.

For each fixed set of atoms $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$, each $\psi \in \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ corresponds to some probability vector (p_1, \dots, p_k) . Our prior construction thus induces a prior on the set of discrete measures \mathcal{V} . Finally, we assign the uniform distribution with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ to the rotation matrix R .

Generating observations from FMSOS is straightforward under this prior specification. We first generate the covariates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from the uniform distribution on \mathbb{S}^p . We then generate the number of atoms of the target measure k using a prior satisfying Assumption 1. We then simulate the locations of the atoms $\mathbf{z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ and the dual potential vector $\psi \in \mathcal{S}_+$ using Assumption 4. The atom locations \mathbf{z} along with dual potential vector ψ result in a target probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$ and facilitate straightforward computation of the optimal transport map S_ν . Consequently, with a random rotation matrix R , the regression map $f := R \circ S_\nu$ is obtained, and response variables can be simulated according to (11).

The following theorem shows that for this prior specification we obtain the same posterior contract rate as with the direct prior specification. In contrast to Theorem 2, however, we require the true target measure to be continuous.

THEOREM 3. *Suppose the true regression map f_0 is given by*

$$f_0 = R_0 \circ S_{\nu_0},$$

where $R_0 \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ and S_{ν_0} is the optimal transport map from μ to ν_0 , and where ν_0 is an absolutely continuous probability measure (with respect to the surface measure) on \mathbb{S}^p with density bounded below by some positive constant. Let

$$\epsilon_n = n^{-\frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}} (\log n)^t,$$

where $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$ and s, t are any values satisfying $s > p$, and $t > \frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}$. Supposing the prior distribution satisfies Assumptions 1, 4 and 3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\tilde{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all sufficiently large $M > 0$.

A proof for Theorem 3 is given in Appendix A.2 in the Supplementary Material.

3.4. Bayesian Inference We adopt a Bayesian approach to make inference on the unknown regression map $f_0 = R_0 \circ S_0$ and to quantify uncertainty. For computational reasons, we focus solely on the case of prior construction based on the dual formulation of semi-discrete optimal transport as described in Section 3.3.2. In particular, we assume that the prior distribution Π_k on the number of atoms of ν is a zero-truncated Poisson distribution with rate parameter λ . While the theoretical results presented in Section 3 assume that the concentration parameter κ of the response variable is known, in practice κ is unknown and needs to be estimated. For simplicity, we assign an improper flat prior to κ , $\kappa \sim \text{Unif}(0, \infty)$.

We sample from the posterior distribution of the target measure ν , rotation matrix R , and concentration parameter κ using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC). The posterior distribution of the regression map f can then be inferred from the posterior distribution of ν and R . Given an i.i.d. sample $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, the likelihood function is proportional to

$$(29) \quad L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu, \kappa) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n g_p(y_i; R \circ S_\nu(x_i), \kappa).$$

MCMC involves sampling from the posterior distribution of R , κ and ν . We now outline how we generate proposals for each of these parameters within our MCMC scheme.

Proposal for the rotation matrix R

Let I_{p+1} denotes the identity matrix of order $p+1$, and let $\exp(\cdot)$ denote the matrix exponential: $\exp(A) = I_{p+1} + A + A^2/2 + \dots$. Recall that any rotation matrix R can be represented as $R = \exp(A)$ where A is a skew-symmetric matrix, that is, $A^T = -A$.

Denote the current rotation matrix $R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$; we propose a new rotation matrix $R' \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)$ as follows: Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{p+1})^T$ be a normal random vector with zero mean and variance $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_{p+1}$ for some small σ_ϵ . Let $\Omega: \mathbb{R}^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ map a vector $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ into a skew-symmetric matrix $\Omega(\epsilon)$. For example, for $p=2$ we have

$$\Omega(\epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\epsilon_3 & \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_3 & 0 & -\epsilon_1 \\ -\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The proposed matrix is then given by $R' = \exp(\Omega(\epsilon))R = \exp(\Omega(\epsilon) + A)$ where $\Omega(\epsilon) + A$ is skew-symmetric. We note that the proposal distribution is symmetric by normality assumption of ϵ , and the reverse move is given by $R = \exp(\Omega(-\epsilon))R'$.

Proposal for the concentration parameter κ

Given the current concentration parameter κ , we propose a new value κ' using a proposal distribution that is symmetric around κ .

Proposal for the target measure ν

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$ be a measure with atoms $\mathbf{z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ and corresponding dual potentials $\boldsymbol{\psi} := (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)$. Let $S_+^{\mathbf{z}}$ be the feasible set of dual potentials for atoms \mathbf{z} as defined in (28). For any $j = 1, \dots, k$, let $\mathbf{z}_{-j} := \{z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_k\}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j} := (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_k)$, and define

$$(30) \quad S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}} := \{\boldsymbol{\psi} : (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, \psi, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_k) \in S_+^{\mathbf{z}}\},$$

to be the conditional feasible set of dual potential functions. That is, $S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}$ consists of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ such that $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, \psi, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_k)$ is feasible for the atoms \mathbf{z} . Details for computing $S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}$ is provided in Appendix D in the Supplementary Material, where we show that $S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}$ is an interval.

At each iteration of the MCMC, we propose a new measure $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{F}$ by randomly choosing one of three types of moves. Assuming that the sampled measure at previous iteration has k atoms, we let $q_{k \rightarrow k}^v$ denote the probability of choosing the move of randomly perturbing an atom location, $q_{k \rightarrow k}^\psi$ the probability of choosing the move of randomly perturbing an individual component of the dual potential vector, $q_{k \rightarrow k+1}$ the probability of choosing the move of adding an atom to the measure, and $q_{k \rightarrow k-1}$ the probability of choosing the move of removing a randomly chosen atom from the existing measure (assuming $k \geq 2$). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo (RJMC) (Green, 1995) is required for adding or removing an atom from the current target measure. The RJMC sampler offers a flexible framework for MCMC simulation, allowing the parameter space dimension to change across iterations of the Markov chain.

We note that the following equalities must be satisfied:

$$q_{k \rightarrow k}^v + q_{k \rightarrow k}^\psi + q_{k \rightarrow k+1} + q_{k \rightarrow k-1} = 1, \quad \forall k = 2, 3, \dots$$

and for the case $k = 1$:

$$q_{1 \rightarrow 1}^v + q_{1 \rightarrow 1}^\psi + q_{1 \rightarrow 2} = 1.$$

Type I Move: Perturbing an atom: The first type of move involves perturbing the location of a randomly selected atom. Suppose the measure ν has atoms $\mathbf{z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ with corresponding dual potentials $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)$. We randomly selected one atom, say z_j , and sample a new atom location z'_j from the vMF distribution with mean direction z_j and concentration parameter $\kappa_v > 0$. Thus, the proposed atom location z'_j centers at the current atom location z_j . Let $\mathbf{z}' = \{z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z'_j, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_k\}$. We then sample a corresponding dual potential ψ'_j from the uniform distribution on the interval $S_+^{\mathbf{z}', \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}$. Let ν' denote the proposed measure, the acceptance ratio is given by $\min\{1, A\}$ where

$$(31) \quad A = \frac{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu', \kappa) |S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}|_{\mathbb{R}}}{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu, \kappa) |S_+^{\mathbf{z}', \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}}|_{\mathbb{R}}},$$

and where $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .

Type II Move: Perturb a component of the dual potential vector: The second type of move involves updating a randomly chosen component of the dual potential vector. We randomly select one atom, say z_j and update its dual potential by sampling from the uniform distribution on $S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \psi - j}$. The acceptance probability is $\min\{1, A\}$ where

$$(32) \quad A = \frac{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu', \kappa)}{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu, \kappa)}.$$

Type III Move: Add or remove an atom from target measure: The next move involves adding or removing an atom with corresponding dual potential from the measure ν . We first consider the case of adding an atom to ν . The location of the new atom z'_{k+1} is sampled uniformly on \mathbb{S}^p , that is, z'_{k+1} is sampled from the prior distribution. Sampling z'_{k+1} from the prior simplifies the calculation of acceptance probability. Let $\mathbf{z}' = \{z_1, \dots, z_k, z'_{k+1}\}$. We sample the corresponding dual potential ψ'_{k+1} uniformly on the interval $S_+^{\mathbf{z}', \psi}$. Let ν' denote the proposed measure. The acceptance ratio is $\min\{1, A\}$ where

$$(33) \quad A = \frac{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu', \kappa) \pi_k(k+1) q_{k+1 \rightarrow k} \frac{1}{k+1}}{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu, \kappa) \pi_k(k) q_{k \rightarrow k+1} |S_+^{\mathbf{z}', \psi}|_{\mathbb{R}}},$$

where $\frac{1}{k+1}$ is the probability of the atom z'_{k+1} is selected to be removed.

The reverse move of randomly removing an atom and its corresponding dual potential from the target measure is largely determined. Let ν be the current target measure with $k \geq 2$ atoms, we randomly select an atom, say z_j and its corresponding dual potential ψ_j and remove them from ν . Let ν' denote the proposed measure. The acceptance ratio is given by $\min\{1, A\}$ where

$$(34) \quad A = \frac{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu', \kappa) \pi_k(k-1) q_{k-1 \rightarrow k} |S_+^{\mathbf{z}, \psi - j}|_{\mathbb{R}}}{L(\mathcal{D}_n; R, \nu, \kappa) \pi_k(k) q_{k \rightarrow k-1} \frac{1}{k}}.$$

REMARK 7. *The move to add or remove an atom from the target measure is similar to the birth/death move in RJMCMC as used in applications such as mixture modeling (Richardson and Green, 1997; Dellaportas and Papageorgiou, 2006). However, unlike RJMCMC for mixture models, our approach does not include a split/combine move, where two atoms are randomly combined into one or a single atom is split into two. We find this type of move more complex in the current context and have therefore opted to exclude it from our RJMCMC implementation.*

4. Simulation Study In this section we conduct simulation experiments to assess the viability of using MCMC to infer FMSOS model parameters. We simulate data using a variable number of atoms k , concentration parameter κ , and sample size n . For a given k , the locations of the atoms $\mathbf{z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ and corresponding dual potentials $\psi \in S_{+,0}^{\mathbf{z}}$ are generated according to the prior distribution described in Assumption 4. This approach utilizes rejection sampling, which is feasible for small-to-moderate k . The optimal transport map S_0 is subsequently obtained. The rotation matrix R_0 is then simulated from the uniform distribution with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$; details on generating random rotation matrices are provided in Ozols (2009). Finally, the covariates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are simulated from the uniform distribution on \mathbb{S}^p and each response variable y_i is generated according to the von Mises-Fisher distribution with mean direction $f_0(x_i) = R_0 \circ S_0(x_i)$ and concentration parameter κ .

TABLE 1
Posterior mean and posterior standard deviation (in parentheses) of the L_2 distance between the true and inferred regression map

Sample Size n	$k = 5$ $\kappa = 10$	$k = 5$ $\kappa = 100$	$k = 10$ $\kappa = 10$	$k = 10$ $\kappa = 100$	$k = 20$ $\kappa = 10$	$k = 20$ $\kappa = 100$
100	0.270 (0.025)	0.114 (0.013)	0.294 (0.024)	0.120 (0.012)	0.426 (0.018)	0.191 (0.013)
500	0.053 (0.010)	0.038 (0.003)	0.072 (0.009)	0.057 (0.010)	0.158 (0.014)	0.089 (0.007)
1000	0.020 (0.009)	0.032 (0.003)	0.044 (0.007)	0.044 (0.005)	0.143 (0.008)	0.046 (0.005)

We consider $k \in \{5, 10, 20\}$, $\kappa \in \{10, 100\}$, and $n \in \{100, 500, 1000\}$, and for each experiment we apply the MCMC algorithm of Section 3.4 to infer the parameters of FMSOS with the prior model specified using the dual formulation, as described in Section 3.3.2. For each experiment, we compute the posterior mean and posterior standard deviation of the L_2 distance between the true regression map f_0 and the inferred regression map, using samples from the MCMC algorithm.

The results are summarized in Table 1. In all scenarios, we observe a decrease in the average L_2 distance as the sample size increases, suggesting a concentration of the posterior around the true regression map. Faster convergence is observed with smaller values of k . Additionally, a larger concentration parameter κ corresponds to faster convergence, this is expected since variance of the response variable decreases with increasing κ .

5. Data Applications In this section we demonstrate the use of FMSOS in real data applications.

5.1. Vector-Cardiogram Data The first application we consider is in vector-cardiography, using data detailed by Downs (2003) and further examined by Rosenthal et al. (2017). Vector-cardiogram data is directional data, and is valuable for diagnosing heart conditions. In this study, two sets of vector-cardiograms are available, obtained from a cohort of 53 children ranging in age from 11 to 19 years. One set was acquired using the Frank system, while the other was acquired using the McFee system; these two approaches differ in the spatial configuration of vectorcardiographic lead placement for recording the heart’s electrical activity.

The aim of this analysis is to characterize the relationship between the readings from the two systems. We employ FMSOS, treating the directional vectors obtained from the Frank system as covariates, and the directional vectors obtained from the McFee system as responses. To visualize the fitted model alongside the observations, we randomly select 20 covariate-response pairs, shown in the left plot of Figure 2. The middle and right plots show the predicted mean responses for these 20 covariates from two randomly selected MCMC iterations. It is evident that the fitted model generates a clustering structure among the covariates, where covariates within the same cluster share the same mean predicted response. The predicted mean responses are observed to align closely with the true responses.




FIG 2. The plots show a sample of randomly selected 20 covariate-response pairs. Left: Blue points show covariates, and green points represent responses, with dotted lines connecting each covariate to its corresponding response. Middle and Right: Blue points show covariates, while red points display the predicted mean responses, with arrows linking covariates to their predicted mean responses. The two panels correspond to two MCMC iterations.

5.2. *Cyclone Data* The second application we consider is in the study of cyclones, using data sourced from the United States National Hurricane Center¹. The data contains details of cyclones in the North Pacific Ocean and comprises six-hourly data points with information on the location, maximum wind speeds, and central pressure of all identified tropical and subtropical cyclones, totaling 1207 instances between the year 1949 and 2022. Previously, this dataset was examined by Ng and Zammit-Mangion (2022) within the framework of Poisson point process intensity estimation. Here, we treat the starting location of each cyclone as the covariate and the corresponding end location as the response.

We apply FMSOS, and to visualize the fitted model with the observations, we randomly select 20 covariate-response pairs, displayed in the left plot of Figure 3. The middle and right plots illustrate the predicted mean responses for these 20 covariates from two randomly selected MCMC iterations. Again, we observe clustering behavior: in the middle plot, covariates are grouped into three clusters, while in the right plot, they form four clusters. The cyclone data are more challenging to fit compared to the vector-cardiogram data. This is due to the covariates (cyclone starting locations) being concentrated in a small region, and the corresponding response variables (cyclone end locations) being widely dispersed. As a result, nearby covariates may be mapped to responses that are far apart.

5.3. *Comparison with Rotation Model* We compare FMSOS with a simple rotation model, $f(x) = Rx$, where $R \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1)$. Note that the rotation model is FMSOS without the optimal transport map component. The comparison aims to assess the benefits of including this additional component. For both data applications, we train both models using 80% of the data points and evaluate their performance on the remaining 20% by estimating the average held-out log-likelihood. The results are shown in Table 2, where we see that FMSOS yields a substantially better fit to held-out data than the simple rotation model.

¹<https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/data/hurdat/hurdat2-nepac-1949-2020-043021a.txt>




FIG 3. The plots show a sample of randomly selected 20 covariate-response pairs. Left: Blue points indicate covariates, and green points represent responses, with arrows connecting each covariate to its corresponding response. Middle and Right: Blue points show covariates, while red points display the mean predicted responses, with arrows linking covariates to their predicted mean responses. The two panels correspond to two MCMC iterations.

TABLE 2

Estimated average held-out log-likelihood along with the standard error of the estimates in parentheses.

Application / Model	Rotation Model	FMSOS
Vector-Cardiogram	-0.320 (0.039)	-0.197 (0.031)
Cyclone	1.758 (< 0.001)	1.801 (< 0.001)

6. Conclusion In this work, we have introduced a novel sphere-on-sphere regression model founded on semi-discrete optimal transport theory, accompanied by a Bayesian approach for model inference. We examined the posterior contraction rates under two distinct prior specifications. Considering the model formulation in (14), a natural extension would be to replace the fixed rotation R with more flexible mappings. Since the optimal transport map S_ν for discrete ν creates partitioning of \mathbb{S}^p , another extension involves assigning a unique rotation to each subset within this partition. Furthermore, while our approach specifically addresses sphere-on-sphere regression, the optimal transport map approach may be used for developing regression models on more general domains.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplement to “Bayesian Inference for Sphere-on-Sphere Regression with Optimal Transport Map”. Supplementary information.

REFERENCES

- BANSIL, M. and KITAGAWA, J. (2020). Quantitative stability in the geometry of semi-discrete optimal transport. *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2022** 7354-7389.
- BONDARENKO, A., RADCHENKO, D. and VIAZOVSKA, M. (2013). Well-separated spherical designs. *Constructive Approximation* **41**.
- BRENIER, Y. (1991). Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **44** 375-417.
- CANALE, A. and BLASI, P. D. (2017). Posterior asymptotics of nonparametric location-scale mixtures for multivariate density estimation. *Bernoulli* **23** 379 – 404.
- CHANG, T. (1986). Spherical regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **14** 907 – 924.
- CHANG, T. (1989). Spherical regression with errors in variables. *The Annals of Statistics* **17** 293–306.
- CHANG, S.-Y. A., LIU, J. and YANG, P. (2014). Optimal transportation on the hemisphere. *Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica (New Series)* **9** 25–44.
- COHEN, S., AMOS, B. and LIPMAN, Y. (2021). Riemannian convex potential maps. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* 2028–2038.

- CUI, L., QI, X., WEN, C., LEI, N., LI, X., ZHANG, M. and GU, X. (2019). Spherical optimal transportation. *Computer-Aided Design* **115** 181-193.
- DE JONGE, R. and VAN ZANTEN, J. H. (2012). Adaptive estimation of multivariate functions using conditionally Gaussian tensor-product spline priors. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **6** 1984 – 2001.
- DELALANDE, A. and MÉRIGOT, Q. (2023). Quantitative stability of optimal transport maps under variations of the target measure. *Duke Mathematical Journal* **172** 3321 – 3357.
- DELLAPORTAS, P. and PAPAGEORGIOU, I. (2006). Multivariate mixtures of normals with unknown number of components. *Statistics and Computing* **16** 57–68.
- DOWNS, T. D. (2003). Spherical regression. *Biometrika* **90** 655-668.
- FABRI, A. and PION, S. (2009). CGAL: the computational geometry algorithms library. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems. GIS '09* 538–539. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- GHOSAL, S., GHOSH, J. K. and VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2000). Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* **28** 500 – 531.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2007a). Posterior convergence rates of Dirichlet mixtures at smooth densities. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 697 – 723.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2007b). Convergence rates of posterior distributions for noniid observations. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 192 – 223.
- GREEN, P. J. (1995). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination. *Biometrika* **82** 711–732.
- HUANG, T.-M. (2004). Convergence rates for posterior distributions and adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 1556 – 1593.
- HUANG, C.-W., KRUEGER, D., LACOSTE, A. and COURVILLE, A. (2018). Neural autoregressive flows. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* **80** 2078–2087. PMLR.
- JAINI, P., SELBY, K. A. and YU, Y. (2019). Sum-of-squares polynomial flow. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* **97** 3009–3018. PMLR.
- KANTOROVICH, L. (1958). On the translocation of masses. *Management Science* **5** 1–4.
- KITAGAWA, J., MÉRIGOT, Q. and THIBERT, B. (2019). Convergence of a Newton algorithm for semi-discrete optimal transport. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* **21** 2603–2651.
- KRUIJER, W., ROUSSEAU, J. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2010). Adaptive Bayesian density estimation with location-scale mixtures. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **4** 1225 – 1257.
- LEE, J. M. (2006). *Riemannian Manifolds: An Introduction to Curvature* **176**. Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Germany.
- LIU, L., LI, D. and WONG, W. H. (2023). Convergence rates of a class of multivariate density estimation methods based on adaptive partitioning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **24** 1–64.
- LOEPER, G. (2011). Regularity of optimal maps on the sphere: The quadratic cost and the reflector antenna. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **199** 269–289.
- MACKENZIE, J. K. (1957). The estimation of an orientation relationship. *Acta Crystallographica* **10** 61–62.
- MARZIO, M. D., PANZERA, A. and TAYLOR, C. C. (2014). Nonparametric regression for spherical data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109** 748-763.
- MARZIO, M. D., PANZERA, A. and TAYLOR, C. C. (2019). Nonparametric Rotations for Sphere-Sphere Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114** 466-476.
- MCCANN, R. (2001). Polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds. *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **11** 589-608.
- MÉRIGOT, Q., DELALANDE, A. and CHAZAL, F. (2020). Quantitative stability of optimal transport maps and linearization of the 2-Wasserstein space. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* **108** 3186–3196. PMLR.
- MONGE, G. (1781). *Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais*. De l’Imprimerie Royale, Paris, France.
- NG, T. L. J. and ZAMMIT-MANGION, A. (2022). Spherical Poisson point process intensity function modeling and estimation with measure transport. *Spatial Statistics* **50** 100629.
- NG, T. L. J. and ZAMMIT-MANGION, A. (2023). Non-homogeneous Poisson process intensity modeling and estimation using measure transport. *Bernoulli* **29** 815 – 838.
- OZOLS, M. (2009). How to generate a random unitary matrix.
- PAPAMAKARIOS, G., PAVLAKOU, T. and MURRAY, I. (2017). Masked autoregressive flow for density estimation. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. NIPS'17* 2335–2344.
- PAPAMAKARIOS, G., NALISNICK, E., REZENDE, D. J., MOHAMED, S. and LAKSHMINARAYANAN, B. (2021). Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22** 1–64.

- REZENDE, D. J., PAPAMAKARIOS, G., RACANIÈRE, S., ALBERGO, M. S., KANWAR, G., SHANAHAN, P. E. and CRANMER, K. (2020). Normalizing flows on tori and spheres. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning. ICML'20*.
- RICHARDSON, S. and GREEN, P. J. (1997). On Bayesian analysis of mixtures with an unknown number of components (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **59** 731-792.
- RIVEST, L.-P. (1989). Spherical regression for concentrated Fisher-Von Mises distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* **17** 307 – 317.
- ROSENTHAL, M., WU, W., KLASSEN, E. and SRIVASTAVA, A. (2014). Spherical regression models using projective linear transformations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109** 1615-1624.
- ROSENTHAL, M., WU, W., KLASSEN, E. and SRIVASTAVA, A. (2017). Nonparametric spherical regression using diffeomorphic mappings.
- SEI, T. (2013). A Jacobian inequality for gradient maps on the sphere and its application to directional statistics. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* **42** 2525-2542.
- SHEN, W., TOKDAR, S. T. and GHOSAL, S. (2013). Adaptive Bayesian multivariate density estimation with Dirichlet mixtures. *Biometrika* **100** 623-640.
- STEPHENS, M. A. (1979). Vector correlation. *Biometrika* **66** 41-48.
- SZAREK, S. (1998). Metric entropy of homogeneous spaces. *Banach Center Publications* **43** 395-410.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and VAN ZANTEN, J. H. (2009). Adaptive Bayesian estimation using a Gaussian random field with inverse Gamma bandwidth. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 2655 – 2675.
- VAN DER VAART, A. and VAN ZANTEN, H. (2011). Information rates of nonparametric Gaussian process methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12** 2095–2119.
- WEED, J. and BACH, F. (2019). Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance. *Bernoulli* **25** 2620–2648.
- XIE, F., JIN, W. and XU, Y. (2019). Rates of contraction with respect to L_2 -distance for Bayesian nonparametric regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **13** 3485 – 3512.

Supplementary Material for “Bayesian Inference for Sphere-on-Sphere Regression with Optimal Transport Map”

In Appendix A we prove Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Theorem 3. The proof of the quantitative stability of optimal transport maps is given in Appendix B. The proof of auxiliary results are presented in Appendix C. The details regarding the computation of the conditional feasible set of dual potentials are provided in Appendix D.

A. Proof of Main Results

A.1. *Proof of Theorem 1* We present several preliminary lemmas that will be utilized in the proof of Theorem 1, and the proof of these lemmas are presented in Appendix C.

We first define the semi-metric \hat{d} on the space of regression maps $\{f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p\}$ as

$$\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - f_0(x)^T f_1(x)) d\mu(x).$$

We first show that the \hat{d} and \tilde{d} are equivalent.

LEMMA 2. *For all $f_0, f_1 : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$, we have*

$$\tilde{d}(f_0, f_1) \lesssim \hat{d}(f_0, f_1) \lesssim \tilde{d}(f_0, f_1).$$

Lemma 2 allows us to work with the semi-metric \hat{d} in instead of \tilde{d} . We have the following lemma concerning the conditional expectation of response Y given covariate x . Recall that the conditional distribution of Y given covariate x follows the vMF distribution with mean direction $f_0(x)$ and concentration parameter κ .

LEMMA 3. *Let $f_0 : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$ be the true regression function. Conditional on $X = x$, We have*

$$\mathbb{E}_0(Y | X = x) = A_d(\kappa) f_0(x),$$

where

$$A_d(\kappa) = \frac{I_{p/2}(\kappa)}{I_{p/2-1}(\kappa)},$$

and where $I_v(\cdot)$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind of order v .

Let $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sieves for \mathcal{F} . We first establish the following local test lemma.

LEMMA 4. *Let $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_n$ be a regression map that satisfies $\hat{d}(f_0, f_1) > 0$. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, there exists a test functions $\phi_n : (\mathbb{S}^p \times \mathbb{S}^p)^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n \leq \exp(-Cn\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)),$$

$$\sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_1) \leq \xi \hat{d}(f_0, f_1)\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) \leq 2 \exp\left(-C \frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) + \exp(-Cn\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and $\xi \in (0, 1)$.

We next extend the local test lemma to the following global test lemma.

LEMMA 5. Let $(\epsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence with $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$. For any $M > 0$, there exists a sequence of tests $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ where $\phi_n : (\mathbb{S}^p \times \mathbb{S}^p)^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-Cnj^2\epsilon_n^2),$$

$$\sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) \leq \exp(-CM^2n\epsilon_n) + 2 \exp\left(-C \frac{nM^2\epsilon_n^2}{M^2\epsilon_n^2 + \eta}\right),$$

where we recall that $N_{nj} = \mathcal{N}(\xi j\epsilon_n, \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n), \tilde{d})$ is the covering number of the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n) = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : j\epsilon_n < \tilde{d}(f, f_0) \leq (j+1)\epsilon_n\},$$

and $C > 0$ is some constant.

We also need the following lemma concerning the exponential lower bound of $\int_{\mathcal{F}} \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_f(x_i, y_i)}{p_0(x_i, y_i)} \Pi(df)$.

LEMMA 6. Let $(\epsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence with $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, $n\epsilon_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \left(\int_{\mathcal{F}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_f(x_i, y_i)}{p_0(x_i, y_i)} \Pi(df) \leq \Pi(B(f_0; \epsilon_n^2)) \exp(-Cn\epsilon_n^2) \right) \rightarrow 0$$

for all sufficiently large constant $C > 0$.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Define the log likelihood ratio function

$$\Lambda_n(f | \mathcal{D}_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n (\log p_f(x_i, y_i) - \log p_0(x_i, y_i)),$$

and the event

$$\mathcal{H}_n := \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f | \mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \geq \exp(-2D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \right\}.$$

We have

$$\mathcal{H}_n^c \subset \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f | \mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) > \Pi(B_n(f_0, \epsilon_n^2)) \exp(-D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \right\}.$$

We have by Lemma 6 that

$$\mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c) \rightarrow 0.$$

We now apply Lemma 5 to obtain the global test function ϕ_n . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n | \mathcal{D}_n)) &\leq \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) 1(\mathcal{H}_n) \Pi(\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n | \mathcal{D}_n) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n + \mathbb{E}_0((1 - \phi_n) 1(\mathcal{H}_n^c)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) 1(\mathcal{H}_n) \frac{\int_{\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n} \exp(\Lambda_n(f | \mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)}{\int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f | \mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n + \mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-D_1 n j^2 \epsilon_n^2) \rightarrow 0,$$

where the convergence above follows from Condition (1).

On \mathcal{H}_n , by Lemma 6 we can lower bound

$$\int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) 1(\mathcal{H}_n) \frac{\int_{\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)}{\int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)} \right) \\ & \leq \exp(2D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) \int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n: \hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \right) \\ & \quad + \exp(2D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \mathbb{E}_0 \left(\int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n^c} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini's theorem and Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) \int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n: \hat{d}^2(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \right) \\ & = \int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n: \hat{d}^2(f, f_0) > M^2 \epsilon_n^2} \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n: \hat{d}^2(f, f_0) > M^2 \epsilon_n^2} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) \\ & \leq \exp(-CM^2 n \epsilon_n^2) + 2 \exp \left(-C \frac{nM^2 \epsilon_n^2}{M^2 \epsilon_n^2 + \eta} \right) \\ & \leq \exp(-\tilde{C} M^2 n \epsilon_n^2), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ and for all sufficiently large n .

We apply Fubini's theorem once more to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 \left(\int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n^c} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \right) & = \int_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n^c} \mathbb{E}_0 \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df) \\ & = \Pi(\mathcal{F}_n^c) \lesssim \exp(-3D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \end{aligned}$$

by Condition (2). Putting it together we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_0 \left((1 - \phi_n) 1(\mathcal{H}_n) \frac{\int_{\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)}{\int_{\mathcal{F}} \exp(\Lambda_n(f|\mathcal{D}_n)) \Pi(df)} \right) \\ & \leq \exp(2D_1 n \epsilon_n^2 - \tilde{C} M^2 n \epsilon_n^2) + \exp(2D_1 n \epsilon_n^2 - 3D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for large enough $M > 0$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\Pi(\hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n | \mathcal{D}_n)) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

□

A.2. *Proof of Theorem 2* We prove Theorem 2 by verifying the three conditions in Theorem 1. Recall that the sieves are defined as:

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{F}_n := \{f = R \circ S : S \in \mathcal{G}_n, R \in \mathbb{SO}(p+1)\}.$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \{S_\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{V}_n\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : \nu = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j \delta_{z_j}, z_j \in \mathbb{S}^p, p_j > 0, \sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1, k \leq k_n \right\}.$$

We set $\epsilon_n = \underline{\epsilon}_n \asymp n^{-\frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}} (\log n)^t$, for any $s > p$ and any $t > \frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}$. We also set $k_n \asymp \underline{\epsilon}_n^{-s/\tau}$.

A key ingredient of the proof of the contraction rates is the following lemma concerning the stability of optimal transport map with respect to variation in the target measures.

LEMMA 7. *Given two probability measures ν_1, ν_2 on \mathbb{S}^p , and let S_{ν_1} and S_{ν_2} be the corresponding optimal transport maps with squared distance cost function from μ to ν_1 and from μ to ν_2 , respectively. We have*

$$\tilde{d}(S_{\nu_1}, S_{\nu_2}) \lesssim W_1^\tau(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

for $\tau = \frac{1}{9}$.

In particular, by Lemma 7, we can work with the W_1 distance between probability measures instead of distance between optimal transport maps. The proof of Lemma 7 is deferred to Appendix B.

We also need a lemma concerning the approximation of an arbitrary measure by discrete measures in \mathcal{V}_n .

LEMMA 8. *For any probability measure ν_0 on \mathbb{S}^p , there exists a discrete probability measure $\nu_{n,0} \in \mathcal{V}_n$ such that*

$$W_1(\nu_{n,0}, \nu_0) \lesssim k_n^{-1/s}, \quad \forall s > p.$$

Moreover, if ν_0 is a continuous measure, there exists a discrete measure $\nu_{n,0}$ taking the form

$$\nu_{n,0} = \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \delta_{z_{j,0}},$$

where $z_{j,0} \in \mathbb{S}^p$ for $j = 1, \dots, k_n$.

Lemma 8 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1 and Proposition 7 of Weed and Bach (2019). In particular, if ν_0 is a continuous measure, the discrete measure $\nu_{n,0} \in \mathcal{V}_n$ which achieves the approximation order $k_n^{-1/s}$ for any $s > p$ has equal probability $\frac{1}{k_n}$ on all its atoms.

We also need the following lemma concerning the property of the Dirichlet distribution.

LEMMA 9. *Suppose $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_p)$ where $\alpha_p < 1$. Let $(p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ be any point on the k -simplex such that $p_{0,j} > 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|p_j - p_{0,j}| < \frac{\epsilon}{k}, \forall j = 1, \dots, k\right) \geq \frac{\Gamma(\alpha k)}{\Gamma(\alpha)^k} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2k}\right)^{2k}.$$

PROOF. By Lemma 24 of Liu, Li and Wong (2023), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k |p_j - p_{0,j}| < \frac{\epsilon}{k}\right) \geq \frac{\Gamma(\alpha k)}{(\Gamma(\alpha))^k} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2k}\right)^{2k}.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|p_j - p_{0,j}| < \frac{\epsilon}{k}, \forall j = 1, \dots, k\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k |p_j - p_{0,j}| < \frac{\epsilon}{k}\right),$$

the result follows. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We are now in a position to prove Theorem 2. We first verify that the entropy condition is satisfied.

LEMMA 10. *For some constant $D_1 > 0$ and for sufficiently large $M > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-D_1 n j^2 \epsilon_n^2) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $N_{nj} = \mathcal{N}(\xi j \epsilon_n, \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n), \tilde{d})$ is the covering number of the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n) = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : j \epsilon_n < \tilde{d}(f, f_0) \leq (j+1) \epsilon_n\}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 10. By (40), we first upper bound the covering number N_{nj} as

$$\begin{aligned} N_{nj} &= \mathcal{N}(\xi j \epsilon_n, \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n), \tilde{d}) \leq \mathcal{N}(\xi \epsilon_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \tilde{d}) \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{G}_n, \tilde{d}) \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1), \|\cdot\|_{op}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7, we have

$$\tilde{d}(S_\nu, S_{\nu_0}) \lesssim W_1^\tau(\nu, \nu_0),$$

it follows that

$$\mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{G}_n, \tilde{d}) \lesssim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{V}_n, W_1^\tau).$$

Hence, it is sufficient to upper bound $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{V}_n, W_1^\tau)$.

For each $k = 1, \dots, k_n$, we consider the subset of \mathcal{V}_n consists of discrete measures with exactly k atoms, that is,

$$\mathcal{V}_{n,k} := \left\{ \nu = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j \delta_{z_j} : p_1, \dots, p_k > 0, \sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1, z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{S}^p \right\}.$$

We note that $\mathcal{V}_n = \cup_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathcal{V}_{n,k}$. We consider two arbitrary measures $\nu_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{1,j} \delta_{z_{1,j}}, \nu_2 = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{2,j} \delta_{z_{2,j}} \in \mathcal{V}_{n,k}$.

We have that

$$d(z_{1,j}, z_{2,j}) \leq \epsilon_n^\tau / k_n$$

and

$$|p_{1,j} - p_{2,j}| \leq \epsilon_n^\tau / k_n$$

for $j = 1, \dots, k_n$ implies

$$W_1^\tau(\nu_1, \nu_2) \lesssim \epsilon_n.$$

It follows that

$$(36) \quad \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{V}_{n,k}, W_1^\tau) \lesssim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right)^k \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right)^k,$$

where $\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right)$ is the covering number of the unit sphere with respect to the geodesic d , and $\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right)$ is the covering number of the unit interval with respect to $|\cdot|$.

Since for $k < k'$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right) \leq \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k'}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right),$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right) \leq \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k'}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right),$$

it follows that

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_n, \mathcal{V}_n, W_1^\tau) \lesssim k_n \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k_n}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right)^{k_n} \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k_n}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right)^{k_n}.$$

Since both \mathbb{S}^p and the unit interval are compact, we have

$$(38) \quad k_n \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k_n}, \mathbb{S}^p, d\right)^{k_n} \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\epsilon_n^\tau}{k_n}, [0, 1], |\cdot|\right)^{k_n} \leq k_n \left(\frac{C_1 k_n}{\epsilon_n^\tau}\right)^{2k_n} \leq \exp(C_2 n \epsilon_n^2)$$

for some constant $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

By Theorem 7 of [Szarek \(1998\)](#), we also have that

$$(39) \quad \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1), \epsilon_n, \|\cdot\|_{op}) \leq \left(\frac{C_3}{\epsilon_n}\right)^{\dim(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1))} \leq \exp(C_4 n \epsilon_n^2),$$

for some constants $C_3, C_4 > 0$, where $\dim(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1))$ is the dimension of $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1)$ which is finite.

Therefore, combining (37), (38), (39), we have

$$N_{nj} \leq \exp(D_1 n \epsilon_n^2)$$

for some constant $D_1 > 0$.

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-D_1 n j^2 \epsilon_n^2) &\lesssim \exp(D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \int_{j-1}^j \exp(-D_1 n \epsilon_n^2 x^2) dx \\ &\leq \exp(D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \int_{M-1}^{\infty} \exp(-D_1 n \epsilon_n^2 x^2) dx \\ &\leq \exp(D_1 n \epsilon_n^2) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} D_1 (M-1)^2 n \epsilon_n^2\right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for sufficiently large M . \square

We now tackle the prior mass condition (3) in Theorem 1.

LEMMA 11.

$$\Pi(B(f_0; \underline{\epsilon}_n)) \geq \exp(-C n \underline{\epsilon}_n^2),$$

for some $C > 0$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 11. We recall and introduce the following notation that will be used in the proof:

- Π_S : The prior on the space of optimal transport maps \mathcal{S} .
- Π_R : The prior on the space of rotation matrices $\mathbb{SO}(p+1)$.
- Π_ν : The prior on the space of discrete measures on \mathbb{S}^p .
- Π_k : The prior of the number of atoms of the discrete measure.
- $\Pi_{\nu|k}$: The conditional prior of the discrete measure, given that the number of atoms equals k .
- $\Pi_{\mathbf{z}|k}$: The conditional prior for atom locations \mathbf{z} of the discrete measure, given that the number of atoms equals k .
- $\Pi_{\mathbf{p}|k}$: The conditional prior for the probability vector \mathbf{p} of the discrete measure, given that the number of atoms equals k .

We first recall that the metrics \tilde{d} and \hat{d} are equivalent by Lemma 2.

Let $f_0 = R_0 \circ S_0$ be the true regression map. For any regression map $f_1 = R_1 \circ S_1 \in \mathcal{F}$, by triangle inequality

$$\hat{d}(R_1 \circ S_1, R_0 \circ S_0) \leq \hat{d}(R_1 \circ S_1, R_1 \circ S_0) + \hat{d}(R_1 \circ S_0, R_0 \circ S_0).$$

Consider the first term on the RHS of the inequality above,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}^2(R_1 \circ S_1, R_1 \circ S_0) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - (R_1(S_1(x)))^T (R_1(S_0(x)))) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - S_1(x)^T R_1^T R_1 S_0(x)) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - S_1(x)^T S_0(x)) d\mu(x) \\ &= \hat{d}^2(S_1, S_0). \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{d}^2(R_1 \circ S_0, R_0 \circ S_0) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - (R_1(S_0(x)))^T (R_0(S_0(x)))) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} S_0(x)^T (I - R_1^T R_0) S_0(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} S_0(x)^T (R_1 - R_0)^T (R_1 - R_0) S_0(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} ((R_1 - R_0) S_0(x))^T (R_1 - R_0) S_0(x) d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} \|R_1 - R_0\|_{op}^2 d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \|R_1 - R_0\|_{op}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the operator norm. It follows that

$$(40) \quad \hat{d}^2(R_1 \circ S_1, R_0 \circ S_0) \lesssim \hat{d}^2(S_1, S_0) + \|R_1 - R_0\|_{op}^2.$$

It follows that the following inequality holds:

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi(B(f_0; \underline{\epsilon}_n)) &\geq \Pi_S(\{S \in \mathcal{S} : \hat{d}(S_\nu, S_0) \leq c_1 \underline{\epsilon}_n\}) \\ &\Pi_R(\{R_1 \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1) : \|R_1 - R_0\|_{op} \leq c_1 \underline{\epsilon}_n\}), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

Therefore, it suffices to lower bound each of the two probabilities on the RHS of the inequality (41).

We first lower bound the first probability on the RHS of inequality (41). By Lemma 7, we have

$$(42) \quad \Pi_S(\{S_\nu \in \mathcal{S} : \hat{d}(S_\nu, S_0) \leq c_1 \underline{\epsilon}_n\}) \geq \Pi_\nu(\nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_0) \leq c_2 \underline{\epsilon}_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}),$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$.

We can lower bound the RHS of the inequality (42) by

$$\Pi_\nu\left(\left\{\nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_0) \leq c_2 \underline{\epsilon}_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right\}\right) \geq \Pi_{\nu|k_n}\left(\left\{\nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_0) \leq c_2 \underline{\epsilon}_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right\}\right) \pi_k(k_n).$$

Now, by the assumption on the prior π_k , and that $k_n \asymp \underline{\epsilon}_n^{-s/\tau}$, $\underline{\epsilon}_n \asymp n^{-\frac{\tau}{2\tau+s}} (\log n)^t$, we have

$$(43) \quad \pi_k(k_n) \geq \exp(-b_0 k_n \log k_n) \geq \exp(-c_0 n \underline{\epsilon}_n^2),$$

for some $c_0 > 0$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 8 there exists $\nu_{n,0} \in \mathcal{V}_n$ such that

$$W_1(\nu_{n,0}, \nu_0) \leq c_3 k_n^{-1/s}$$

for some $c_3 > 0$ and for any $s > p$. Recall that $k_n \asymp \underline{\epsilon}_n^{-s/\tau}$, we choose the constant c_3 so that

$$c_3 k_n^{-1/s} \leq \frac{1}{2} c_2 \underline{\epsilon}_n^{1/\tau}.$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_0) \leq c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} - W_1(\nu_0, \nu_{n,0}) \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \frac{1}{2} c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consider an arbitrary ordering of the atoms of $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{n,j} \delta_{z_{n,j}}$ as $(z_{n,1}, z_{n,2}, \dots, z_{n,k_n})$ and $\nu_{n,0} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{n,0,j} \delta_{z_{n,0,j}}$ as $(z_{n,0,1}, z_{n,0,2}, \dots, z_{n,0,k_n})$, we have for some $c_4 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \frac{1}{2} c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \Pi_{\mathbf{z}|k_n} \left(\left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |z_{n,j} - z_{n,0,j}| \leq c_4 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n} \right\} \right) \Pi_{\mathbf{p}|k_n} \left(\left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |p_{n,j} - p_{n,0,j}| \leq c_4 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

With uniform prior on $z_{n,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{z}|k_n} \left(\left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |z_{n,j} - z_{n,0,j}| \leq c_4 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n} \right\} \right) \geq \left(c_5 \frac{\epsilon_n^{1/\tau}}{k_n} \right)^{k_n},$$

for some constant $c_5 > 0$. By Lemma 9, we have

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{p}|k_n} \left(\left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |p_{n,j} - p_{n,0,j}| \leq c_4 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n} \right\} \right) \geq \frac{\Gamma(\alpha k_n)}{\Gamma(\alpha)^{k_n}} \left(c_6 \frac{\epsilon_n^{1/\tau}}{k_n} \right)^{2k_n}$$

for constant $c_6 > 0$. It thus follows that for n large enough

$$(44) \quad \Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \frac{1}{2} c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right) \geq \exp(-c_7 n \epsilon_n^2)$$

for constant $c_7 > 0$.

Thus, combining inequalities (43) and (44), we obtain the lower bound:

$$\Pi_{\nu} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \frac{1}{2} c_2 \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right) \geq \exp(-C_0 n \epsilon_n^2),$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$.

It follows from inequality (42) that

$$(45) \quad \Pi_S(\{S \in \mathcal{S} : \hat{d}(S_\nu, S_0) \leq \epsilon_n\}) \geq \exp(-C_1 n \epsilon_n^2),$$

for some $C_1 > 0$.

On the other hand, since we have the uniform prior distribution on a compact space $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1)$, we clearly have

$$(46) \quad \Pi_R(\{R_1 \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(p+1) : \|R_1 - R_0\|_{op} \leq \epsilon_n\}) \geq \exp(-C_2 n \epsilon_n^2),$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$.

Thus, combining the two lower bounds (45) and (46), we have verified (3) of Theorem 1. \square

We now verify the remaining mass condition (2).

LEMMA 12.

$$\Pi(\mathcal{F}_n^c) \lesssim \exp(-C_2 n \underline{\epsilon}_n^2),$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 12. We note that by the assumption on Π_k in (1),

$$\Pi(\mathcal{F}_n^c) = \Pi_k(\{k > k_n\}) \leq \exp(-b_1 k_n \log k_n) \lesssim \exp(-C_2 n \underline{\epsilon}_n^2),$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. □

The proof of Theorem 2 is thus complete. □

A.3. *Proof of Theorem 3* We first have the following lemma concerning approximation of continuous measures on \mathbb{S}^p .

LEMMA 13. *Let ν_0 be a continuous probability measure on \mathbb{S}^p with density function lower bounded by some positive constant. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, there exists a discrete probability measure $\nu_{n,0} = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{n,0,j} \delta_{z_{n,0,j}} \in \mathcal{V}_n$ such that*

$$W_1(\nu_{n,0}, \nu_0) \lesssim k_n^{-1/p}.$$

Furthermore, the atoms of $\nu_{n,0}$ satisfies

$$\min_{j_1 \neq j_2} d(z_{n,0,j_1}, z_{n,0,j_2}) \gtrsim k_n^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

PROOF. We apply the results of [Bondarenko, Radchenko and Viazovska \(2013\)](#) which states that there exist some constants c_1, c_2 such that for every k_n , we can find a set $\{z_1, \dots, z_{k_n}\} \subset \mathbb{S}^p$ satisfying

$$\min_{i \neq j} d(z_i, z_j) \geq c_1 k_n^{-\frac{1}{p}},$$

and

$$\max_{x \in \mathbb{S}^p} \min_j d(x, z_j) \leq c_2 k_n^{-1/p}.$$

Consider a Voronoi partition of $\mathbb{S}^p = \cup_{i=1}^{k_n} A_i$ with nucleus z_1, \dots, z_{k_n} , and let $\nu_{n,0}$ be the discrete measure with atoms z_1, \dots, z_{k_n} and corresponding probabilities p_1, \dots, p_{k_n} given by

$$p_i = \int_{A_i} d\nu_0.$$

Since $\max_{i=1, \dots, k_n} \text{diam}(A_i) \lesssim k_n^{-1/p}$, it thus follows that

$$(47) \quad W_1(\nu_0, \nu_{n,0}) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} p_i k_n^{-1/p} = k_n^{-1/p}.$$

□

For two discrete measures supported on the same set of atoms, we also have the following lemma, which provides an upper bound on the distance between two probability vectors in terms of the distance between two dual potential vectors. This result is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.5 of [Bansil and Kitagawa \(2020\)](#).

LEMMA 14. *Let ν_1, ν_2 be two discrete measures supported on the same set of atoms z_1, \dots, z_k , given by $\nu_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{1,j} \delta_{z_j}$, $\nu_2 = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{2,j} \delta_{z_j}$. Let $(\psi_{1,j})_{j=1}^k$ and $(\psi_{2,j})_{j=1}^k$ be the dual potential vectors for ν_1 and ν_2 , respectively. We have for some constant $C > 0$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, k} |p_{1,j} - p_{2,j}| \leq C \frac{k}{\min_{j_1, j_2=1, \dots, k, j_1 \neq j_2} \{d(z_{j_1}, z_{j_2})\}} \max_{j=1, \dots, k} |\psi_{1,j} - \psi_{2,j}|.$$

PROOF. We note that by Lemma 5.5 of [Bansil and Kitagawa \(2020\)](#), which can be extended to the case of Riemannian manifold, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{j=1, \dots, k} |p_{1,j} - p_{2,j}| \\ & \leq C \frac{k}{\min_{x \in \mathbb{S}^p} \min_{j_1 \neq j_2} \|\nabla_x c(x, z_{j_1}) - \nabla_x c(x, z_{j_2})\|_2} \max_{j=1, \dots, k} |\psi_{1,j} - \psi_{2,j}|. \end{aligned}$$

By simple calculation, for all $x \in \mathbb{S}^p$, we have

$$\|\nabla_x c(x, z_{j_1}) - \nabla_x c(x, z_{j_2})\|_2 \geq \min_{j_1 \neq j_2} d(z_{j_1}, z_{j_2}).$$

Hence, the result follows. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. We now prove Theorem 3. We note that the entropy condition and remaining mass condition follow from Theorem 2. It remains to verify the prior mass condition (3). The proof follows the same strategy as the proof of Lemma 11.

For each n , by Lemma 13 there exists a discrete measure $\nu_{n,0} \in \mathcal{V}_n$ with k_n atoms taking the form

$$\nu_{n,0} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{n,0,j} \delta_{z_{n,0,j}},$$

such that $W_1(\nu_0, \nu_{n,0}) \lesssim k_n^{-\frac{1}{s}}$ for any $s > p$. By analysing the proof of Lemma 11, it suffices to show that

$$\Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^\tau} \right\} \right) \geq \exp(-c n \epsilon_n^2)$$

for some constant $c > 0$.

With uniform prior on $z_{n,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$(48) \quad \Pi_{\mathbf{z}|k_n} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{z} : \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} d(z_{n,j}, z_{n,0,j}) \leq c_1 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n} \right\} \right) \geq \left(c_2 \frac{\epsilon_n^{1/\tau}}{k_n} \right)^{k_n},$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Now, let ν_n be any measure supported on the atoms $(z_{n,1}, \dots, z_{n,k_n})$ satisfying

$$(49) \quad \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} d(z_{n,j}, z_{n,0,j}) \leq c_3 \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n},$$

with corresponding probabilities $(p_{n,1}, \dots, p_{n,k_n})$ given by $p_{n,j} = p_{n,0,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k_n$. Denote the corresponding dual potential vector of ν_n by $(\psi_{n,1}, \dots, \psi_{n,k_n})$. We note that by (49) and Lemma 13, we have

$$(50) \quad \min_{j_1 \neq j_2} d(z_{n,j_1}, z_{n,j_2}) \geq c_4 k_n^{-\frac{1}{p}},$$

for some constant $c_4 > 0$. For any measure ν'_n supported on the same set of atoms as ν_n with corresponding probabilities $(p'_{n,1}, \dots, p'_{n,k_n})$ and corresponding dual potentials $(\psi'_{n,1}, \dots, \psi'_{n,k_n})$, we have by Lemma 13 and (50),

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |p'_{n,j} - p_{n,j}| \lesssim k_n^{\frac{1}{p}+1} \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |\psi'_{n,j} - \psi_{n,j}|.$$

Thus,

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |\psi'_{n,j} - \psi_{n,j}| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n^{\frac{1}{p}+2}}$$

implies

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |p'_{n,j} - p_{n,j}| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n},$$

and consequently,

$$W_1(\nu'_n, \nu_{n,0}) \lesssim \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}.$$

Since

$$(51) \quad \Pi_{\psi|z} \left(\left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, k_n} |\psi'_{n,j} - \psi_{n,j}| \leq \frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n^{\frac{1}{p}+2}} \right\} \right) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}}}{k_n^{\frac{1}{p}+2}} \right)^{k_n},$$

where $\Pi_{\psi|z}$ denote the prior of dual potential vector ψ conditional on the locations of the atoms z . Therefore, combining the two inequalities (48) and (51), we obtain that

$$\Pi_{\nu|k_n} \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{V} : W_1(\nu, \nu_{n,0}) \leq \epsilon_n^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \right) \geq \exp(-c n \epsilon_n^2),$$

for some $c > 0$. Therefore, the proof is completed. \square

B. Proof of Quantitative Stability By Lemma 3.2 of [Mérigot, Delalande and Chazal \(2020\)](#), it is sufficient to consider two discrete measures ν^0, ν^1 supported on the same fixed set $\mathcal{Z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \mathbb{S}^p$. Let $c(x, z) = d(x, z)^2/2$ be the cost function where d is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^p . Recall that μ is the uniform measure on \mathbb{S}^p , and S_{ν^k} be the optimal transport map from μ to ν^k , $k = 0, 1$.

For each $k = 0, 1$, let ϕ^k be the Brenier potential such that

$$(52) \quad S_{\nu^k}(x) = \exp_x[-\nabla \phi^k(x)].$$

Let ψ^k be the dual potential function on \mathcal{Z} :

$$\psi^k(z) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^p} c(x, z) - \phi^k(x), \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

Note that ψ^k can be identified with the vector $\boldsymbol{\psi}^k$ defined by $\psi_i^k = \psi^k(z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Meanwhile,

$$(53) \quad \phi^k(x) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} c(x, z) - \psi^k(z) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

Recall that the vector ψ^k induces a partition of \mathbb{S}^p into Laguerre cells:

$$(54) \quad \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k) = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^p : \psi_j^k \leq \psi_i^k + c(z_j, x) - c(z_i, x) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

For a given ψ^k , let

$$G_i(\psi^k) = \mu(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)) =: \nu_i^k$$

be the measure of the set $\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)$, and let

$$\nu^k = (\nu_i^k)_{1 \leq i \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We let $\mathcal{S}_+ \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be the set of potentials such that all Laguerre cells $\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)$ have positive measures

$$\mathcal{S}_+ = \{\psi \in \mathbb{R}^N : G_i(\psi) > 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{P}^+(\mathcal{Z})$ to be the set of positive measures on \mathcal{Z}

$$\mathcal{P}^+(\mathcal{Z}) = \{\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N : \nu_i = \nu(\{z_i\}) > 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

By the uniqueness of optimal transportation, for each $\nu \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mathcal{Z})$, there exists a unique optimal mapping $S_\nu : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. Our aim is to show the **stability of the optimal mappings**, namely for any $\nu^0, \nu^1 \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mathcal{Z})$,

$$(55) \quad \tilde{d}(S_{\nu^0}, S_{\nu^1}) \leq CW_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{1}{9}}.$$

where we recall that

$$\tilde{d}^2(S_{\nu^0}, S_{\nu^1}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} d^2(S_{\nu^0}(x), S_{\nu^1}(x)) d\mu(x).$$

From (52) and (53), the key part of proving (55) is to obtain the **stability of dual potentials**, namely

$$(56) \quad \|\psi^0 - \psi^1\|_{L^2(\nu^0)}^2 \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

provided their difference is normalised (by adding a proper constant)

$$(57) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi_i^0 - \psi_i^1) \nu_i^0 = 0.$$

Assuming (56) for the moment, we first prove (55) as follows.

PROOF OF (55). Heuristically, (56) says ψ^0 and ψ^1 are close in L^2 . By Chebyshev's inequality, they are close in L^∞ in a large portion. Hence, their Legendre transforms ϕ^0 and ϕ^1 are close in L^∞ in a large portion. By a Gagliardo-Nirenberg type inequality, this implies that $\nabla\phi^0$ and $\nabla\phi^1$, and thus T_{ν^0} and T_{ν^1} are close in L^2 , namely (55).

Below, we divide the proof into several steps:

(i): Although (56) assumed ϕ^0 and ϕ^1 are close in L^2 measured by μ^0 , we show that this also holds when measuring by μ^1 .

Note that the difference $(\psi^0 - \psi^1)$ is normalised w.r.t. ν^0 , i.e. (57), but not w.r.t. ν^1 . Let's define

$$\tilde{\psi}_i^0 = \psi_i^0 - \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi_i^0 - \psi_i^1) \nu_i^1, \quad \tilde{\psi}_i^1 = \psi_i^1.$$

It's easy to see the difference $(\tilde{\psi}^0 - \tilde{\psi}^1)$ is now normalised w.r.t. ν^1 in the sense that $\sum_{i=1}^N (\tilde{\psi}_i^0 - \tilde{\psi}_i^1) \nu_i^1 = 0$. Hence, by (56) we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\psi}^0 - \tilde{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(\nu^1)} \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi^0 - \psi^1\|_{L^2(\nu^1)} &= \|(\psi^0 - \tilde{\psi}^0) - (\psi^1 - \tilde{\psi}^1) + (\tilde{\psi}^0 - \tilde{\psi}^1)\|_{L^2(\nu^1)} \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi_i^0 - \psi_i^1) \nu_i^1 \right| + \|\tilde{\psi}^0 - \tilde{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(\nu^1)} \\ (58) \quad &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (\psi^0 - \psi^1) d(\nu^1 - \nu^0) \right| + \|\tilde{\psi}^0 - \tilde{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(\nu^1)} \\ &\lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1) + W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{1}{3}} \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Kantorovich-Rubinstein's theorem and assumed $W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)$ is sufficiently small.

(ii): **From L^2 -close to L^∞ -close in a large portion.**

From (56) and (58), for $k \in \{0, 1\}$

$$(59) \quad \|\psi^0 - \psi^1\|_{L^2(\nu^k)}^2 \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{2}{3}} =: \varepsilon.$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, define

$$(60) \quad \mathcal{Z}_\alpha := \{z \in \mathcal{Z} : |\psi^0(z) - \psi^1(z)| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha\}.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality and (59) we have that for $k \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\varepsilon^{2\alpha} \nu^k(\mathcal{Z} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_\alpha) \leq \|\psi^0 - \psi^1\|_{L^2(\nu^k)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

This implies that

$$(61) \quad 1 - \nu^k(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-2\alpha}.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ and from (53),

$$\phi^k(x) = \min_i c(x, z_i) - \psi^k(z_i), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

Define

$$(62) \quad \phi^{k,\alpha}(x) = \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} c(x, z) - \psi^k(z), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

One can see that $\phi^{k,\alpha} \geq \phi^k$, and if $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha$,

$$(63) \quad \phi^{k,\alpha}(x) = \phi^k(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k),$$

since the minimums are both attained at the point z_i . This implies that $\phi^{k,\alpha} \equiv \phi^k$ on the subset

$$(64) \quad \mathcal{X}_\alpha^k = \bigcup_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k) \subset \mathbb{S}^p.$$

By measure-preserving one has $\mu(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)) = \nu^k(z_i)$, and thus

$$\mu(\mathcal{X}_\alpha^k) = \sum_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} \mu(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)) = \sum_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} \nu^k(z_i) = \nu^k(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha).$$

Then by (61) we obtain

$$(65) \quad \mu(\mathbb{S}^p \setminus \mathcal{X}_\alpha^k) = 1 - \mu(\mathcal{X}_\alpha^k) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1-2\alpha}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{S}^p$, by definitions (62) and (60) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{0,\alpha}(x) &= \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} c(x, z) - \psi^0(z) \\ &\geq \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} c(x, z) - \psi^1(z) - \varepsilon^\alpha \\ &= \phi^{1,\alpha}(x) - \varepsilon^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

thus by symmetry

$$(66) \quad \|\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^p)} \leq \varepsilon^\alpha.$$

(iii): **From L^∞ -close to H^2 -close.**

We are now ready to prove (55). First, note that by the Jacobi field comparison theorem (Lee, 2006, Theorem 11.2), \exp_x is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1. In particular, \exp_x does not increase distances. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(T_{\nu^0}, T_{\nu^1}) &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^p} d^2(\exp_x[-\nabla\phi^0(x)], \exp_x[-\nabla\phi^1(x)]) d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (67) \quad &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^p} |\nabla\phi^0(x) - \nabla\phi^1(x)|^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|\nabla\phi^0 - \nabla\phi^{0,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} + \|\nabla\phi^{0,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} + \|\nabla\phi^{1,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} \\ &=: I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate on I, III : By (63) and (64), $\nabla\phi^{k,\alpha} = \nabla\phi^k$ on \mathcal{X}_α^k . Since both the gradients $\nabla\phi^{k,\alpha}$ and $\nabla\phi^k$ are bounded by π , from (65) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (68) \quad I, III &= \|\nabla\phi^{k,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} \\ &= \|\nabla\phi^{k,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p \setminus \mathcal{X}_\alpha^k)} \\ &\leq 2\pi\mu^{1/2}(\mathbb{S}^p \setminus \mathcal{X}_\alpha^k) \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate on II : We need to utilise (66), and use the *claim* that

$$(69) \quad \|\nabla\phi^{0,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} \leq C\|\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^p)}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and thus obtain that

$$(70) \quad \|\nabla\phi^{0,\alpha} - \nabla\phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} \lesssim \varepsilon^\alpha.$$

Combining (68) and (70) into (67), we have

$$\tilde{d}(S_{\nu^0}, S_{\nu^1}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + \varepsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Setting $\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$ so that $\frac{1}{2} - \alpha = \frac{\alpha}{2}$, and recalling $\varepsilon = W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{2}{3}}$, we then obtain the desired estimate

$$\tilde{d}(S_{\nu^0}, S_{\nu^1}) \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove the claim (69). By calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} |\nabla \phi^{0,\alpha}(x) - \nabla \phi^{1,\alpha}(x)|^2 d\mu(x) &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}) \Delta(\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}) d\mu \\ &\leq \|\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^p)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^p} |\Delta \phi^{0,\alpha}| + |\Delta \phi^{1,\alpha}| d\mu \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for each $k = \{0, 1\}$, $\phi^{k,\alpha}$ defined in (62) is a Brenier potential of the optimal mapping $S^{k,\alpha} : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\alpha$. Correspondingly, the Laguerre cells will be

$$\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^p : \text{the minimum in (62) is attained at } z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha\}$$

and the target measure will be

$$\nu^{k,\alpha}(\{z_i\}) = \mu(\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}), \quad \text{if } z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha; \quad \nu^{k,\alpha}(\{z_i\}) = 0, \quad \text{if } z_i \notin \mathcal{Z}_\alpha.$$

One can see that $\mu^{k,\alpha}$ is supported on \mathcal{Z}_α and $\mu^{k,\alpha} \geq \mu^k > 0$ on \mathcal{Z}_α . Therefore, Lemma 15 applies, and thus for each $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha$,

$$(71) \quad d(-z_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}) \geq \delta$$

for some constant $\delta > 0$.

Again, from the definition (62),

$$\phi^{k,\alpha}(x) = \frac{1}{2}d^2(x, z_i) - \psi^k(z_i) \quad \text{for } x \in \text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}, \quad z_i \in \mathcal{Y}_\alpha.$$

Let (r, θ) be the polar coordinates around z_i . It can be shown that if $d(x, z_i) = r$ and $\phi^{k,\alpha}(x) = \frac{1}{2}d^2(x, z_i) - \psi^k(z_i)$, then $\Delta \phi^{k,\alpha}(x) = 1 + (p-1)r \cot r$. By (71), $\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha} \subset \{0 \leq r \leq \pi - \delta\}$. In particular, $|\Delta \phi^{k,\alpha}(x)| \leq 1 + (p-1)r |\cot r|$ is uniformly bounded by $C = C(p, \delta) = \max\{p, 1 + (p-1)(\pi - \delta) |\cot(\pi - \delta)|\}$ on $\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} |\Delta \phi^{k,\alpha}| d\mu &= \sum_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} \int_{\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}} |\Delta \phi^{k,\alpha}| d\mu \\ &\leq \sum_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha} C \mu(\text{Lag}_{z_i}^{k,\alpha}) \\ &= C \mu(\mathbb{S}^p) = C. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain $\|\nabla \phi^{0,\alpha} - \nabla \phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^p)} \lesssim \|\phi^{0,\alpha} - \phi^{1,\alpha}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^p)}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. \square

LEMMA 15. *Assume $N \geq 2$, $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$. Let ν be a probability measure supported on \mathcal{Z} satisfying $\nu(\{z_i\}) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let $S : (\mathbb{S}^p, \mu) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Z}, \nu)$ be the optimal mapping and ψ be the dual potential function on \mathcal{Z} , accordingly the Laguerre cells $\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)$ is defined in (54). Then, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$d(\hat{z}_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)) \geq \delta \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $\hat{z}_i = -z_i$ is the antipodal point of z_i .

PROOF. This follows from an inequality

$$(72) \quad d(Sx, \hat{x}_0) \leq 2\pi \frac{d(Sx_0, \hat{x}_0)}{d(x, x_0)}$$

where $x_0, x \in \mathbb{S}^p$ and $x \neq x_0$. The above inequality relies on the optimality of S and was proved in [Chang, Liu and Yang \(2014\)](#) on hemisphere. For completeness, we include it here.

Define the function

$$F(p) = \frac{1}{2}d^2(p, x) - \frac{1}{2}d^2(p, x_0) \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

By calculation, $\nabla F(p) = v_x - v_{x_0}$, where $v_x, v_{x_0} \in T_p\mathbb{S}^p$ satisfy $\exp_p(-v_x) = x$ and $\exp_p(-v_{x_0}) = x_0$. So

$$|\nabla F(p)| = |v_x - v_{x_0}| \geq d(x_0, x)$$

by the distance-nondecreasing property of \exp_p .

Let us consider on $\mathbb{S}^p \setminus \{\hat{x}_0\}$ the normalized steepest descent equation (with arc-length parameter s):

$$\dot{p}(s) = -\frac{\nabla_p F[p(s)]}{|\nabla_p F(p(s))|}.$$

Then a solution $p(s)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{ds}F[p(s)] = -|\nabla_p F(p(s))| \leq -d(x_0, x).$$

Since the function $F(p)$ attains its minimum at $p = \hat{x}_0$, starting from $p(0) = p_0$, the minimum of $p \mapsto F(p)$ is reached by flowing along an integral curve of length $L \geq d(p_0, \hat{x}_0)$. Writing

$$F(p_0) - F(\hat{x}_0) = -\int_0^L \frac{d}{ds}F[p(s)] ds,$$

we then have

$$F(p_0) - F(\hat{x}_0) \geq \int_0^L d(x_0, x) ds \geq d(x_0, x)d(p_0, \hat{x}_0).$$

It implies that for $x \neq x_0$,

$$(73) \quad d(p_0, \hat{x}_0) \leq \frac{F(p_0) - F(\hat{x}_0)}{d(x_0, x)} \quad \forall p_0 \in \mathbb{S}^p.$$

Since T is the optimal mapping, it must be c -monotone [McCann \(2001\)](#), namely

$$d^2(x_0, Sx_0) + d^2(x, Sx) \leq d^2(x_0, Sx) + d^2(x, Sx_0).$$

From the definition of function F , we get

$$F(Sx) \leq F(Sx_0).$$

Now, setting $p_0 = Sx$ in (73), we have

$$d(Sx, \hat{x}_0) \leq \frac{F(Sx) - F(\hat{x}_0)}{d(x_0, x)} \leq \frac{F(Sx_0) - F(\hat{x}_0)}{d(x_0, x)}.$$

Hence, since $p \mapsto F(p)$ is 2π -Lipschitz, we obtain (72), namely

$$d(Sx, \hat{x}_0) \leq 2\pi \frac{d(Sx_0, \hat{x}_0)}{d(x_0, x)}.$$

We can now prove the lemma by contradiction. Suppose there does not exist a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(\hat{z}_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)) \geq \delta \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This implies that

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, N} d(\hat{z}_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)) < \frac{1}{k}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, N} d(\hat{z}_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)) = 0.$$

Therefore, there is some $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$d(\hat{z}_i, \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)) = 0,$$

namely there is $x_0 \in \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi)$ such that $d(Tx_0, \hat{x}_0) = 0$. By (72), we have

$$d(Sx, \hat{x}_0) = 0 \quad \forall x \neq x_0, x \in \mathbb{S}^p,$$

namely S maps the whole sphere \mathbb{S}^p into a single point \hat{x}_0 , which contradicts the fact $\mu > 0$ and $N \geq 2$. □

In the following we shall prove the key estimate (56).

LEMMA 16. *Suppose $v := \psi^1 - \psi^0$ satisfies $\langle v | G(\psi^0) \rangle = 0$, where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product on \mathbb{R}^N . This is equivalent to (57). Then, we have*

$$\langle v^2 | G(\psi^0) \rangle \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

PROOF. By Kantorovich-Rubinstein's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v | G(\psi^1) - G(\psi^0) \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (\psi^1 - \psi^0) \, \mathbf{d}(\nu^1 - \nu^0) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{\text{Lip}(f) \leq 2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f \, \mathbf{d}(\nu^1 - \nu^0) \\ &= 2\pi \max_{\text{Lip}(f) \leq 1} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f \, \mathbf{d}(\nu^1 - \nu^0) \\ (74) \quad &\lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1). \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor's formula

$$\langle v | G(\psi^1) - G(\psi^0) \rangle = \int_0^1 \langle DG(\psi^t)v | v \rangle \, dt,$$

where $\psi^t = (1-t)\psi^0 + t\psi^1$. From the Discrete Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality [Proposition 3.4 of Mériçot et al. (2020)], we have

$$\langle v^2 | G(\psi^t) \rangle - \langle v | G(\psi^t) \rangle^2 \lesssim -\langle DG(\psi^t)v | v \rangle$$

and $\langle DG(\psi^t)v|v \rangle \leq 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Hence, for any $\theta \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\langle v|G(\psi^1) - G(\psi^0) \rangle| &= \int_0^1 -\langle DG(\psi^t)v|v \rangle dt \\
 &\geq \int_0^\theta -\langle DG(\psi^t)v|v \rangle dt \\
 (75) \quad &\gtrsim \int_0^\theta \langle v^2|G(\psi^t) \rangle - \langle v|G(\psi^t) \rangle^2 dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

At the moment, we *claim* that for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$

$$(76) \quad G_i(\psi^t) \gtrsim G_i(\psi^0) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then the first term of (75) is bounded by

$$(77) \quad \int_0^\theta \langle v^2|G(\psi^t) \rangle dt \gtrsim \int_0^\theta \langle v^2|G(\psi^0) \rangle dt = \theta \langle v^2|G(\psi^0) \rangle.$$

For the second term of (75), using the assumption $\langle v|G(\psi^0) \rangle = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\langle v|G(\psi^t) \rangle| &= |\langle v|G(\psi^t) - G(\psi^0) \rangle| \\
 &\leq \|v\|_\infty \|G(\psi^t) - G(\psi^0)\|_1 \\
 (78) \quad &\lesssim \|G(\psi^t) - G(\psi^0)\|_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.5 of [Bansil and Kitagawa \(2020\)](#) which can be extended to Riemannian manifold, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|G(\psi^t) - G(\psi^0)\|_1 &\leq C_1 N^2 \|\psi^t - \psi^0\|_\infty \\
 &= C_1 N^2 t \|\psi^1 - \psi^0\|_\infty \\
 &\leq C_2 N^2 t
 \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Together with (78) we then obtain

$$|\langle v|G(\psi^t) \rangle| \lesssim N^2 t,$$

and thus

$$(79) \quad \int_0^\theta \langle v|G(\psi^t) \rangle^2 dt \lesssim \int_0^\theta N^4 t^2 dt \lesssim N^4 \theta^3.$$

Now, combining (74), (75), (77) and (79), we obtain

$$\theta \langle v^2|G(\psi^0) \rangle - N^4 \theta^3 \lesssim W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1),$$

namely

$$\langle v^2|G(\psi^0) \rangle \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta} W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1) + N^4 \theta^2.$$

If $W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)$ is small enough, by choosing $\theta^3 = \frac{W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)}{N^4}$ we obtain the desired estimate. If $W_1(\nu^0, \nu^1)$, the estimate trivially holds by choosing, for example $\theta = 1/4$. \square

Last, we prove the claim (76) that was used in the above proof.

LEMMA 17. Given $\psi^0, \psi^1 \in S_+$, let $\psi^t = (1-t)\psi^0 + t\psi^1$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Then,

$$G_i(\psi^t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq c \left((1-t)G_i(\psi^0)^{\frac{1}{p}} + tG_i(\psi^1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $0 < c < 1$ is some constant. In particular, we have

$$G_i(\psi^t) \gtrsim G_i(\psi^0) \quad \forall t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{4}\right].$$

PROOF. We write with slight abuse of notation $\psi^0 = (\psi^0)^{cc}$ and $\psi^1 = (\psi^1)^{cc}$, so that ψ^0 and ψ^1 are now functions on \mathbb{S}^p . From definition (54), for a fixed $1 \leq i \leq N$, if $x_0 \in \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^0)$ one has

$$\psi^0(z_j) \leq \psi^0(z_i) + c(z_j, x_0) - c(z_i, x_0) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N,$$

and if $x_1 \in \text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^1)$ one has

$$\psi^1(z_j) \leq \psi^1(z_i) + c(z_j, x_1) - c(z_i, x_1) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N.$$

These imply that

$$D_z c(z_i, x_0) \in \partial \psi^0(z_i)$$

and

$$D_z c(z_i, x_1) \in \partial \psi^1(z_i),$$

where $\partial \psi^k(z_i)$ is the subgradient of ψ^k at z_i . Since

$$\partial \psi^t(z_i) = (1-t)\partial \psi^0(z_i) + t\partial \psi^1(z_i).$$

we have that

$$(1-t)D_z c(z_i, x_0) + tD_z c(z_i, x_1) \in \partial \psi^t(z_i).$$

Recall that the cost function $c(x, z) = d^2(x, z)/2$, we have

$$D_z c(z, \cdot) = \exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\cdot).$$

It follows that

$$(1-t)\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^0)) + t\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^1)) \subset \exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^t)).$$

The Laguerre cell $\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)$ is the contact set of the c -convex function ψ^k with its c -support function. From Loeper (2011), we know that $\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k)$ is c -convex with respect to z_i , namely $\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k))$ is a convex set in \mathbb{R}^p . Let $|\cdot|$ denote the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^p . It follows from Brunn-Minkowski inequality that

$$(80) \quad |\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^t))|^{1/p} \geq (1-t)|\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^0))|^{1/p} + t|\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^1))|^{1/p}.$$

Under the polar coordinates (r, θ) around y_i , the spherical measure is given by $d\mu = \sin^{p-1} r dr d\theta$ and the Euclidean measure is given by $dx = r^{p-1} dr d\theta$. Clearly $d\mu \leq dx$. By Lemma 15, $\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k))$ lies in $\{0 \leq r \leq \pi - \delta\}$, and so $d\mu \geq C dx$ when restricted to $\exp_{z_i}^{-1}(\text{Lag}_{z_i}(\psi^k))$, where $0 < C < 1$ depends only on d and δ . From this and (80), we obtain

$$G_i(\psi^t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq c \left((1-t)G_i(\psi^0)^{\frac{1}{p}} + tG_i(\psi^1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right),$$

for some positive constant $c < 1$. □

C. Proof of Auxiliary Results

C.1. Proof of Lemma 2

PROOF. Using the following inequalities

$$1 - \frac{x^2}{2} \leq \cos x \leq 1 - \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^4}{24},$$

we obtain

$$f_1(x)^T f_0(x) \leq 1 - \frac{(\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^2}{2} + \frac{(\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^4}{24},$$

and

$$f_1(x)^T f_0(x) \geq 1 - \frac{(\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^2}{2}.$$

Since

$$(\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^4 \leq \pi^2 (\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^2,$$

it follows that

$$1 - f_1(x)^T f_0(x) \geq \frac{1}{6} (\cos^{-1}(f_1(x)^T f_0(x)))^2.$$

Thus, we have

$$\tilde{d}^2(f_0, f_1) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (\cos^{-1}(f_0(x)^T f_1(x)))^2 d\mu(x) \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} 2(1 - f_0(x)^T f_1(x)) d\mu(x),$$

and

$$\tilde{d}^2(f_0, f_1) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (\cos^{-1}(f_0(x)^T f_1(x)))^2 d\mu(x) \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} 6(1 - f_0(x)^T f_1(x)) d\mu(x).$$

□

C.2. Proof of Lemma 3

PROOF. For a vMF random variable with mean direction $\mu \in \mathbb{S}^p$ and concentration κ , the expectation is $A_d(\kappa)\mu$. Therefore, the result follows. □

C.3. Proof of Lemma 4

PROOF. For an arbitrary regression function $f_1 : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$, we define

$$Z_i := (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T Y_i - A_p(\kappa)(f_1(X_i)^T f_0(X_i) - 1), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We first consider the case of fixed covariates x_1, \dots, x_n . We note that the random variables $Z_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ are bounded and by Lemma 3 have zero mean

$$\mathbb{E}_0(Z_i | X_i = x_i) = 0.$$

Define the test statistic T_n as

$$T_n := \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - \frac{1}{16} A_p(\kappa)t,$$

where

$$t = n \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0)} \hat{d}(f_0, f_1) + \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) \right),$$

and the test function as

$$\phi_n = 1\{T_n > 0\}.$$

We note that t satisfies

$$t^2 \geq n^2 \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1).$$

We first derive the Type I and Type II errors of the test.

Type I Error

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|(f_1(x) - f_0(x))^T Y|^2 \leq (f_1(x) - f_0(x))^T (f_1(x) - f_0(x)) = 1 - f_1(x)^T f_0(x).$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0(\phi_n | x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \mathbb{P}_0(T_n > 0 | x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_0 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i > \frac{1}{16} A_p(\kappa) t \mid x_1, \dots, x_n \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-C_1 \frac{n^2 \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0)}{2n \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0)} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-C_1 \frac{n \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the unconditional expectation can also be bounded as:

$$\mathbb{E}_0(\phi_n) \leq \exp \left(-C_1 \frac{n \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{2} \right).$$

Type II Error

We consider an arbitrary $f : \mathbb{S}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^p$ satisfying

$$\hat{d}^2(f, f_1) \leq \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)/32.$$

Let \mathbb{P}_n be the empirical measure of the covariates X_i , we re-write the test statistic as

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &:= \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T Y_i - A_p(\kappa) \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T f(X_i) \\ &\quad + A_p(\kappa) \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T f(X_i) - A_p(\kappa) \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T f_0(X_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{16} A_p(\kappa) t \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T Y_i - A_p(\kappa) \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^T f(X_i) \\ &\quad + A_p(\kappa) n (\mathbb{P}_n(f_1 - f_0)^T f) - A_p(\kappa) n (\mathbb{P}_n(f_1 - f_0)^T f_0) - \frac{1}{16} A_p(\kappa) t. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the following event

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 &:= \left\{ (\mathbb{P}_n(f_1 - f_0)^T f) - (\mathbb{P}_n(f_1 - f_0)^T f_0) - \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \leq \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f) - \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) + \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) \leq \frac{1}{8} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the event \mathcal{E}_1 is contained in the event \mathcal{E}_2 defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_2 := \left\{ -\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) + \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) \leq \frac{1}{8} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \right\}.$$

We also define the event

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := \left\{ \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) - \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f_1) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

and upper bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_1^c)$ where \mathcal{G}_1^c is the complement of \mathcal{G}_1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) - \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f_1) > 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) - \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f_1) - \hat{d}^2(f, f_1) + \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. > -\hat{d}^2(f, f_1) + \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) - \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f_1) - \hat{d}^2(f, f_1) + \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) > \frac{1}{32} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption that $\hat{d}^2(f, f_1) \leq \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)/32$. Now, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, define

$$U_i := (1 - f_1(X_i)^T f(X_i)) - \frac{1}{16} (1 - f_1(X_i)^T f_0(X_i)) - \hat{d}^2(f, f_1) + \frac{1}{16} \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1),$$

and using the inequality $\hat{d}^2(f, f_1) \leq \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)/32$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U_i^2) &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - f_1(x)^T f(x))^2 \mathbf{d}\mu(x) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} (1 - f_1(x)^T f_0(x))^2 \mathbf{d}\mu(x) + \hat{d}^4(f_0, f_1) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} 1 - f_1(x)^T f(x) \mathbf{d}\mu(x) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} 1 - f_1(x)^T f_0(x) \mathbf{d}\mu(x) + \hat{d}^4(f_0, f_1) \\ &\leq \hat{d}^2(f, f_1) + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) + \hat{d}^4(f_0, f_1) \\ &\lesssim \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) + \hat{d}^4(f_0, f_1) \end{aligned}$$

Applying Bernstein's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_1^c) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f) - \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_0^T f_1) > 0\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-K_1 \frac{n \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta_1 + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $K_1, \eta_1 > 0$.

On the other hand, we have by Bernstein's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2|\mathcal{G}_1) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{15}{16}\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) \leq \frac{1}{8}\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{15}{16}\mathbb{P}_n(1 - f_1^T f_0) - \frac{15}{16}\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1) \leq -\frac{13}{16}\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-K_2\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta_2 + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right),\end{aligned}$$

for $K_2, \eta_2 > 0$.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2|\mathcal{G}_1) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_1^c) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-K_1\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta_1 + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) + \exp\left(-K_2\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta_2 + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) \\ &\leq 2\exp\left(-C_2\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_2, \eta > 0$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_f(T_n < 0|\mathcal{E}_1^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(x_i) - f_0(x_i))^T Y_i - A_p(\kappa) \sum_{i=1}^n (f_1(x_i) - f_0(x_i))^T f(x_i) + \frac{1}{16}A_p(\kappa)t < 0\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-C_3n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1))\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$, by Hoeffding's inequality. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_f(T_n < 0) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) + \mathbb{P}_f(T_n < 0|\mathcal{E}_1^c) \\ &\leq 2\exp\left(-C_2\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) + \exp(-C_3n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_0\phi_n &\leq \exp(-Cn\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)) \\ \sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n: \hat{d}(f, f_1) \leq \xi \hat{d}(f_0, f_1)\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) &\leq 2\exp\left(-C\frac{n\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}{\eta + \hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)}\right) + \exp(-Cn\hat{d}^2(f_0, f_1)).\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and $\xi \in (0, 1)$. \square

C.4. Proof of Lemma 5

PROOF. For each n , we partition the alternative into disjoint sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n\} &\subset \bigcup_{j=M}^{\infty} \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : j\epsilon_n < \hat{d}(f, f_0) \leq (j+1)\epsilon_n\} \\ &=: \bigcup_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n). \end{aligned}$$

For each $\mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n)$, we can find $N_{nj} = \mathcal{N}(\xi j \epsilon_n, \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n), \hat{d})$ many functions $f_{njl} \in \mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n)$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{nj}(\epsilon_n) \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{N_{nj}} \{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_{njl}) \leq \xi j \epsilon_n\}.$$

By Lemma 4, we can construct individual test function ϕ_{njl} for each function f_{njl} with type I and type II errors bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 \phi_{njl} &\leq \exp(-Cnj^2\epsilon_n^2) \\ \sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_{njl}) \leq \xi \hat{d}(f_0, f_{njl})\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_{njl}) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-C \frac{nj^2\epsilon_n^2}{\eta + j^2\epsilon_n^2}\right) + \exp(-Cnj^2\epsilon_n^2). \end{aligned}$$

We then define the global test as

$$\phi_n = \sup_{j \geq M} \max_{1 \leq l \leq N_{nj}} \phi_{njl}.$$

We can upper bound the type I error of ϕ_n as

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \phi_n \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{nj}} \mathbb{E}_0 \phi_{njl} \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} N_{nj} \exp(-Cnj^2\epsilon_n^2).$$

Type II error can also be upper bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_0) > M\epsilon_n\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) \\ &\leq \sup_{j \geq M} \sup_{l=1, \dots, N_{nj}} \sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}_n : \hat{d}(f, f_{njl}) \leq \xi \hat{d}(f_0, f_{njl})\}} \mathbb{E}_f(1 - \phi_n) \\ &\leq \exp(-CM^2n\epsilon_n) + 2 \exp\left(-C \frac{nM^2\epsilon_n^2}{M^2\epsilon_n^2 + \eta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

C.5. Proof of Lemma 6

PROOF. Let $\Pi(df|B_n)$ be the restriction of the prior to the set $B_n = B(f_0; \epsilon_n)$. We have the following equality

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_0 \left(\int_{\mathcal{F}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_f(x_i, y_i)}{p_0(x_i, y_i)} \Pi(df) \leq \Pi(B_n) \exp(-Cn\epsilon_n^2) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_0 \left(\int_{\mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))^T Y_i \Pi(df|B_n) \geq Cn\epsilon_n^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Fubini's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\int_{\mathcal{F}} (f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \right] &= \int_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_0((f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_0((f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y | X = x)) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{F}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^p} A_p(\kappa) (1 - f_0(x)^T f(x)) \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{F}} A_p(\kappa) \hat{d}^2(f, f_0) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&\leq A_p(\kappa) \epsilon_n^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows since $\hat{d}^2(f, f_0) \leq \epsilon_n^2$ for $f \in B_n$.

We also have that by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\left(\int_{\mathcal{F}} (f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \right)^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\int_{\mathcal{F}} ((f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y)^2 \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \right] \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_0 \left(((f_0(X) - f(X))^T Y)^2 \right) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{F}} A_p(\kappa) \hat{d}^2(f, f_0) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \\
&\leq A_p(\kappa) \epsilon_n^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We apply Bernstein's inequality and the two bounds above:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_0 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{F}} (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))^T Y_i \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) - n \int_{\mathcal{F}} A_p(\kappa) \hat{d}^2(f_0, f) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \geq Cn\epsilon_n^2 - n \int_{\mathcal{F}} A_p(\kappa) \hat{d}^2(f_0, f) \Pi(\mathrm{d}f|B_n) \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left(\frac{-\frac{1}{2}(Cn\epsilon_n^2 - nA_p(\kappa)\epsilon_n^2)^2}{nA_p(\kappa)\epsilon_n^2 + \frac{1}{3}Cn\epsilon_n^2} \right) \\
&\leq \exp(-C_1n\epsilon_n^2) \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $C > A_p(\kappa)$ and $C_1 > 0$ is some constant. \square

D. Computation of Conditional Feasible Set of Dual Potentials The MCMC algorithm in Section 3.4 requires computing the conditional feasible set of dual potentials. Given atoms $\mathbf{z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ and corresponding dual potentials $\boldsymbol{\psi} := (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k) \in \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}}$, we let $\mathbf{z}_{-j} := \{z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_k\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j} := (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_k)$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$. We recall that the conditional feasible set of dual potential is defined as

$$(81) \quad \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}} := \{ \boldsymbol{\psi} : (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, \psi, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_k) \in \mathcal{S}_+^{\mathbf{z}} \}.$$

For $l \neq j$, we let $\text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})$ denote the Laguerre cell for z_l corresponding to the measure with atoms \mathbf{z}_{-j} and corresponding dual potentials $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}$.

We first derive a lower bound for ψ_j . In order to ensure that the cell $\text{Lag}_{z_j}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is non-empty, we must have that

$$c(x, z_j) - \psi_j < c(x, z_l) - \psi_l, \quad \forall l \neq j,$$

for some $x \in \mathbb{S}^p$. That is,

$$\psi_j > \max_{l \neq j} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\},$$

for some $x \in \mathbb{S}^p$. Thus, it follows that

$$(82) \quad \psi_j > \min_{x \in \mathbb{S}^p} \left\{ \max_{l \neq j} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\} \right\}.$$

We note that the lower bound in (82) is tight.

For the upper bound, we need to ensure that each cell $\text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ for $l \neq j$ remains non-empty with the addition of the atom z_j with dual potential ψ_j . That is, for all $l \neq j$, there exists $x \in \text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})$ such that

$$c(x, z_j) - \psi_j > c(x, z_l) - \psi_l.$$

That is, for all $l \neq j$, the following inequality holds:

$$\psi_j < \max_{x \in \text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\}.$$

It follows that an upper bound is given by

$$(83) \quad \psi_j < \min_{l \neq j} \left\{ \max_{x \in \text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\} \right\}.$$

The upper bound in (83) is also tight.

Computation of the lower bound in (82) requires optimization over \mathbb{S}^p whereas computation of the upper bound in (83) requires computing the and optimizing over the Laguerre cells $\text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})$ for each $l \neq j$. For computational reason, we solve (82) and (83) approximately by first sampling a large number of points $\mathbf{u} := \{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ on \mathbb{S}^p uniformly. The lower bound in (82) is now approximated by

$$\min_{x \in \mathbf{u}} \left\{ \max_{l \neq j} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\} \right\}.$$

For the approximation of the upper bound, for each $l \neq j$, we first define $U_l(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j}) := \{u \in \mathbf{u} : u \in \text{Lag}_{z_l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})\}$. The upper bound in (83) can be approximated by

$$\min_{l \neq j} \left\{ \max_{x \in U_l(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{-j})} \{c(x, z_j) - c(x, z_l) + \psi_l\} \right\}.$$

E. Visualizations of Results from Simulation Studies Figure E1 illustrates the results from a simulation study for the case where $k = 10$ and $\kappa = 1000$. We randomly selected 20 covariate-response pairs and obtained predicted mean responses for these 20 covariates from two randomly chosen MCMC iterations. The top row displays results for a sample size of $n = 100$, the middle row for $n = 500$, and the bottom row for $n = 1000$.




FIG E1. *Left: Blue points indicate covariates, and red points represent responses, with arrows connecting each covariate to its corresponding response. Middle and Right: Blue points show covariates, while red points display the predicted mean responses, with arrows linking covariates to their predicted mean responses. Top row: sample size = 100. Middle row: sample size = 500. Bottom row: sample size = 1000.*