

Wasserstein Regression*

Yaqing Chen¹, Zhenhua Lin², and Hans-Georg Müller¹

¹Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis

²Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, National University of Singapore

Abstract

The analysis of samples of random objects that do not lie in a vector space is gaining increasing attention in statistics. An important class of such object data is univariate probability measures defined on the real line. Adopting the Wasserstein metric, we develop a class of regression models for such data, where random distributions serve as predictors and the responses are either also distributions or scalars. To define this regression model, we utilize the geometry of tangent bundles of the space of random measures endowed with the Wasserstein metric for mapping distributions to tangent spaces. The proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model provides an extension of multivariate linear regression for Euclidean data and function-to-function regression for Hilbert space valued data in functional data analysis. In simulations, it performs better than an alternative transformation approach where one maps distributions to a Hilbert space through the log quantile density transformation and then applies traditional functional regression. We derive asymptotic rates of convergence for the estimator of the regression operator and for predicted distributions and also study an extension to autoregressive models for distribution-valued time series. The proposed methods are illustrated with data on human mortality and distributional time series of house prices.

Keywords: Distribution regression; distributional time series; functional data analysis; parallel transport; tangent bundles; Wasserstein geometry.

1 Introduction

Regression analysis is one of the foundational tools of statistics to quantify the relationship between a response variable and predictors and there have been many extensions of simple models such as the multiple linear regression model to more complex data scenarios. These include linear models for function-to-function regression, where predictors and responses are both considered random elements in Hilbert space, with a variant where responses are scalars (Grenander 1950; Ramsay and Dalzell 1991). Such linear functional regression models and their properties have been well studied (Cardot et al. 1999, 2003; Yao et al. 2005; Cai and Hall 2006; Hall and Horowitz 2007) and reviewed (Morris 2015; Wang et al. 2016).

*Research supported by NIH Echo and NSF DMS1712862.

Samples that include random objects, which are random elements in general metric spaces that by default do not have a vector space structure, are increasingly common. Such data cannot be analyzed with methods devised for Euclidean or functional data, which are usually viewed as random elements of a Hilbert space (Marron and Alonso 2014; Huckemann 2015). We focus here on the case where the random objects are random probability measures on the real line that satisfy certain regularity conditions. Specifically, at this time there are no in-depth studies with detailed statistical analysis of regression models that feature such random measures as predictors, in contrast to the situation where vector predictors are coupled with random distributions as responses (Petersen and Müller 2019a).

Related work also includes a variety of methods that specifically target the case where Euclidean predictors are paired with responses that reside on a finite-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Davis et al. 2007; Shi et al. 2009; Hinkle et al. 2012; Yuan et al. 2012; Cornea et al. 2017; Lin et al. 2017). Kernel and spline type methods have been proposed for the case where both predictors and responses are elements of finite-dimensional Riemannian manifolds (Steinke and Hein 2009; Steinke et al. 2010; Banerjee et al. 2016). However, these methods do not cover spaces of probability measures under the Wasserstein metric, where the tangent spaces are subspaces of infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Additionally, no comprehensive investigation of the statistical properties and asymptotic behavior of distribution-to-distribution regression models seems to exist. To develop the proposed model, we utilize tangent bundles in the space of probability distributions with the Wasserstein metric and parallel transport to obtain asymptotic results for regression operators and predicted measures.

A recent approach to including random distributions as predictors in complex regression models is to transform the densities of these distributions to unconstrained functions in the Hilbert space \mathcal{L}^2 , e.g., by the log quantile density (LQD) transformation (Petersen and Müller 2016) and then to employ functional regression models where the transformed functions serve as predictors and the responses are either also the transformed functions or scalars (Chen et al. 2019; Kokoszka et al. 2019; Petersen et al. 2019a), whence established methods for functional regression become applicable. However, the LQD transformation does not take into account the geometry of the space of probability distributions and therefore the corresponding transformation map is not isometric and leads to deformations that change distances between pairs of objects. In contrast, the transformation method we develop here is closely adapted to the underlying geometry, leads to an isometric map and fully utilizes the geometric properties of the metric space of random measures equipped with the Wasserstein distance. We also found in implementations and simulations that the proposed geometric method that we refer to as Wasserstein regression works very well, especially when comparing it to a regression approach that is based on the LQD transformation. Other alternatives have been considered for regressing scalar responses on distribution-valued predictors (Póczos et al. 2013; Oliva et al. 2014; Szabó et al. 2016; Bachoc et al. 2017; Thi Thien Trang et al. 2019), but

these are either Nadaraya–Watson type estimators that suffer from a severe curse of dimensionality, or kernel-based methods that rely on tuning parameters whose choice could be sensitive in real applications. [Bonneel et al. \(2016\)](#) approximate input histograms by the closest weighted barycenters of a database of reference histograms with respect to Wasserstein distance, which work when input histograms are not far from the references, aiming at applications in image processing.

Our goal is to develop a regression model where the predictors and responses are both distributions in \mathcal{W} . A good starting point is linear regression in Euclidean spaces, where for a pair of random elements $(X, Y) \in (\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbb{E}(Y \mid X) = \Gamma_E(X) = \mathbb{E}Y + \beta^\top (X - \mathbb{E}X)$. The regression function Γ_E can be characterized by the following two properties: First, it maps the expectation of X to the expectation of Y ; second, conditioning on X , it transports the line segment between $\mathbb{E}X$ and X to that between $\mathbb{E}Y$ and $\mathbb{E}(Y \mid X)$. Specifically,

$$\mathbb{E}Y = \Gamma_E(\mathbb{E}X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}Y + t(Y - \mathbb{E}Y) \mid X] = \Gamma_E[\mathbb{E}X + t(X - \mathbb{E}X)], \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1)$$

However, expectations and line segments are not well-defined for the space of distributions, since it is not a vector space. In this paper, we develop a distribution-to-distribution regression model that is analogous to traditional linear regression models for Euclidean and functional data, with the decisive difference that both predictors and responses are univariate probability measures. An example which we investigate later is to study the relationship of the age-at-death distributions of different countries in 2013 to the distributions 30 years before. We also discuss an extension of our approach to an autoregressive model for distribution-valued time series. In our estimation procedures and theoretical analysis we cover the commonly encountered but more complex situation where neither predictor nor response distributions are directly observed and instead the available data consist of i.i.d. samples that are generated by each of these distributions. After we submitted this paper, a preprint reporting independently conducted but related work on autoregressive modeling of distributional time series was posted by [Zhang et al. \(2020\)](#), where a simplified version of the distributional autoregressive model in (29) was studied.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We first propose a distribution-to-distribution regression model based on the tangent bundle of the Wasserstein space of probability distributions in Section 2, with estimation and asymptotic theory in Section 3, and then describe an extension of the model to an autoregressive model for time series of distributions in Section 4. Simulation studies are illustrated in Section 5 to assess the finite-sample performance of the proposed estimators and a competing approach. The wide applicability of the proposed methods is demonstrated with applications to human mortality data and US house price data in Section 6.

2 Methodology

2.1 Tangent Bundle of the Wasserstein Space

Let D be \mathbb{R} or a closed interval in \mathbb{R} , and $\mathcal{B}(D)$ be the Borel σ -algebra on D . We focus on the Wasserstein space $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}(D)$ of probability distributions on $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$ with finite second moments, endowed with the \mathcal{L}^2 -Wasserstein distance

$$d_W(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \left\{ \int_0^1 [F_1^{-1}(p) - F_2^{-1}(p)]^2 dp \right\}^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, where F_1^{-1} and F_2^{-1} denote the quantile functions of μ_1 and μ_2 , respectively; specifically, for any distribution $\mu = \mu(F) \in \mathcal{W}$ with cumulative distribution function (cdf) F , we consider the quantile function F^{-1} to be the left continuous inverse of F , i.e.,

$$F^{-1}(p) = \inf\{r \in D : F(r) \geq p\}, \quad \text{for } p \in (0, 1). \quad (3)$$

As demonstrated for example in [Ambrosio et al. \(2008\)](#); [Bigot et al. \(2017\)](#); [Zemel and Panaretos \(2019\)](#), basic concepts of Riemannian manifolds can be generalized to the Wasserstein space \mathcal{W} . We assume in the following that $\mu_* \in \mathcal{W}$ is an atomless reference probability measure, i.e., it possesses a continuous cdf F_* . For any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, the geodesic from μ_* to μ , $\gamma_{\mu_*, \mu} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, is given by

$$\gamma_{\mu_*, \mu}(t) = [t(F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id}) + \text{id}] \# \mu_*, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1], \quad (4)$$

where for a measurable function $h : D \rightarrow D$, $h \# \mu_*$ is a push-forward measure such that $h \# \mu_*(A) = \mu_*(\{r \in D : h(r) \in A\})$ for any set $A \in \mathcal{B}(D)$. The tangent space at μ_* is defined as

$$T_{\mu_*} = \overline{\{t(F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id}) : \mu = \mu(F) \in \mathcal{W}, t > 0\}}^{\mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*} = \mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*}(D)$ is the Hilbert space of μ_* -square-integrable functions on $D \subset \mathbb{R}$, with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mu_*}$ and norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mu_*}$. The tangent space T_{μ_*} is a subspace of $\mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*}$ equipped with the same inner product and induced norm (Theorem 8.5.1, [Ambrosio et al. 2008](#)).

The exponential map Exp_{μ_*} is then defined by the push-forward measures, which maps functions of the form $g = t(F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id})$ onto \mathcal{W} , with F^{-1} being the quantile function of an arbitrary distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\text{Exp}_{\mu_*} g = (g + \text{id}) \# \mu_*. \quad (5)$$

While this exponential map is not a local homeomorphism ([Ambrosio et al. 2004](#)), any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$ can be recovered by $\text{Exp}_{\mu_*}(F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id})$ in the sense that $d_W(\text{Exp}_{\mu_*}(F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id}), \mu) = 0$, and the

logarithmic map $\text{Log}_{\mu_*} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow T_{\mu_*}$, as the right inverse of the exponential map, is given by

$$\text{Log}_{\mu_*}\mu = F^{-1} \circ F_* - \text{id}, \quad \text{for } \mu \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, restricted to the log image, $\text{Exp}_{\mu_*}|_{\text{Log}_{\mu_*}(\mathcal{W})}$ is an isometric homeomorphism (e.g., Lemma 2.1, [Bigot et al. 2017](#)).

2.2 Distribution-to-Distribution Regression

Let (ν_1, ν_2) be a pair of random elements with a joint distribution \mathcal{F} on $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$, assumed to be square integrable in the sense that $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_1) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_2) < \infty$ for some (and thus for all) $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$. Any element in \mathcal{W} that minimizes $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\cdot, \nu_1)$ is called a Fréchet mean of ν_1 ([Fréchet 1948](#)). Since the Wasserstein space \mathcal{W} is a Hadamard space ([Kloeckner 2010](#)), such minimizers uniquely exist ([Sturm 2003](#)) and are given by

$$\nu_{1\oplus} = \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{W}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{2\oplus} = \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{W}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_2). \quad (7)$$

It is well-known that for univariate distributions as we consider here, the quantile functions of the Fréchet means are simply

$$F_{1\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}F_1^{-1}(\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{2\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}F_2^{-1}(\cdot),$$

where $F_{1\oplus}^{-1}, F_{2\oplus}^{-1}, F_1^{-1}$ and F_2^{-1} are the quantile functions of $\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_1$ and ν_2 , respectively.

As suggested by the multiple linear regression as per (1), we replace expectations and line segments, which are not well-defined for the Wasserstein space, by Fréchet means and geodesics, respectively. Hence, a regression operator $\Gamma_W : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ for the Wasserstein space would be expected to satisfy:

$$d_W(\nu_{2\oplus}, \Gamma_W(\nu_{1\oplus})) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d_W(\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}\{\gamma_{\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_2}(t) | \nu_1\}, \Gamma_W\{\gamma_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_1}(t)\}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1], \quad (8)$$

where the conditional Fréchet mean $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}\{\gamma_{\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_2}(t) | \nu_1\} := \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{W}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^2(\mu, \gamma_{\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_2}(t)) | \nu_1]$.

We assume that the Fréchet means $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ are atomless so that they can be used as the reference probability measures as in Section 2.1. Note that $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_{1\oplus} = 0$, $\nu_{1\oplus}$ -a.e., and $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\nu_{2\oplus} = 0$, $\nu_{2\oplus}$ -a.e., and that $\text{Exp}_{\mu}(0) = \mu$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$. Furthermore, it follows from (4)–(6) and the isometry property of $\text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}|_{\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\mathcal{W}}$ that $\gamma_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_1}(t) = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}(t\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_1)$ and that $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}\{\gamma_{\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_2}(t) | \nu_1\} = \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{W}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E}(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\mu - t\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\nu_2\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 | \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_1) = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}[\mathbb{E}(t\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\nu_2 | \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_1)]$. Hence, (8) can be rewritten as

$$\|\Gamma(0)\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbb{E}(t\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}\nu_2 | \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_1) - \Gamma(t\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}\nu_1)\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}} = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1], \quad (9)$$

where $\Gamma: T_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$, $\Gamma = \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \circ \Gamma_W \circ \text{Exp}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}$, is a regression operator between tangent spaces $T_{\nu_{1\oplus}}$ and $T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$.

As discussed in Section 2.1, $T_{\nu_{1\oplus}}$ and $T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$ are subspaces of $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, respectively. Distribution-to-distribution regression can then be viewed as function-to-function regression, which has been well-studied in functional data analysis (see, e.g., Ferraty and Vieu 2003; Yao et al. 2005; He et al. 2010; Wang et al. 2016). Specifically, we assume that the random pair of distributions (ν_1, ν_2) satisfy the model

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 \mid \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) = \Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1), \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma: T_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$ is a linear operator defined as

$$\Gamma g(t) = \langle \beta(\cdot, t), g \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } t \in D \text{ and } g \in T_{\nu_{1\oplus}}. \quad (11)$$

Here, $\beta: D^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a coefficient function (i.e., the kernel of Γ) lying in $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, and $\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}$ is a product probability measure on the product measurable space $(D^2, \mathcal{B}(D^2))$ generated by $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$. We note that our model satisfies (9). Furthermore, we assume

(A1) With probability 1, $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) + \text{id}$ is non-decreasing.

Assumption (A1) guarantees that $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) \in \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$ with probability 1. We demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed model in (10) by providing a framework in Section 5 to construct explicit examples that satisfy the model requirements and (A1).

2.3 Covariance Structure, Regression Coefficient Function and Scalar Responses

Noting that $\mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) = 0$, $\nu_{1\oplus}$ -a.e., and $\mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2) = 0$, $\nu_{2\oplus}$ -a.e., we denote the covariance operators of $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1$ and $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2$ by $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1} = \mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1 \otimes \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_2} = \mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 \otimes \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2)$, respectively, and the cross-covariance operator by $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} = \mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 \otimes \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1)$. Since the two covariance operators \mathcal{C}_{ν_1} and \mathcal{C}_{ν_2} are trace-class, they have eigendecompositions (Theorem 7.2.6, Hsing and Eubank 2015) as given below, which can be viewed as an analog to multivariate principal component analysis (Dauxois et al. 1982; Castro et al. 1986), yielding a corresponding decomposition for the cross-covariance operator $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \phi_j \otimes \phi_j, \quad \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varsigma_k \psi_k \otimes \psi_k, \quad \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j. \quad (12)$$

Here $\lambda_j = \mathbb{E}[\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2]$ and $\varsigma_k = \mathbb{E}[\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2]$ are eigenvalues such that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ and $\varsigma_1 \geq \varsigma_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$, $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\psi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are eigenfunctions that are orthonormal in $T_{\nu_{1\oplus}}$ and $T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$, respectively, and $\xi_{jk} = \mathbb{E}[\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}]$. With probability 1,

the log transformations $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1$ and $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2$ admit the Karhunen–Loève expansions

$$\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \psi_k.$$

Then as in the classical functional regression (e.g., [Bosq 1991](#); [Cardot et al. 1999](#); [Yao et al. 2005](#)), the regression coefficient function β can be expressed as

$$\beta = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j, \quad (13)$$

with $b_{jk} = \lambda_j^{-1} \xi_{jk}$. In order to guarantee that the right hand side of (13) converges in the sense that

$$\lim_{J,K \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \int_D \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \phi_j(s) \psi_k(t) - \beta(s, t) \right]^2 d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) d\nu_{2\oplus}(t) = 0,$$

we assume ([Lemma A.2](#), [Yao et al. 2005](#))

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2} \xi_{jk}^2 < \infty. \quad (14)$$

To keep notations simple, we use the same notation $g_1 \otimes g_2$ for the operator and its kernel throughout this paper. Namely, for $g_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2$ and $g_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$, $g_1 \otimes g_2$ can represent either an operator on $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$ such that $(g_1 \otimes g_2)(g) = \langle g_2, g \rangle_{\mu_2} g_1$ for $g \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$ or its kernel, i.e., a bivariate function such that $(g_1 \otimes g_2)(s, t) = g_1(t)g_2(s)$ for all $s, t \in D$.

A variant of the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression in (10) is the pairing of distributions as predictors with scalar responses. For a pair of random elements (ν_1, Y) with a joint distribution on $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{R}$, a distribution-to-scalar regression model is

$$\mathbb{E}(Y \mid \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) = \mathbb{E}(Y) + \langle \beta_1, \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1 \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}. \quad (15)$$

Here, $\nu_{1\oplus}$ is the Fréchet mean of ν_1 and $\beta_1: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a regression coefficient function in $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2$ which can be expressed as $\beta_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle \mathbb{E}(Y \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1), \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \phi_j$, where λ_j and ϕ_j are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the covariance operator \mathcal{C}_{ν_1} of $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1$ as in (12), and we assume that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2} \langle \mathbb{E}(Y \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1), \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 < \infty$. This model can also be viewed as function-to-scalar regression, which has been well studied in functional data analysis ([Cardot et al. 1999, 2003](#); [Cai and Hall 2006](#); [Hall and Horowitz 2007](#); [Yuan and Cai 2010](#)).

3 Estimation

3.1 Distribution Estimation

While [Bigot et al. \(2017\)](#) assume distributions are fully observed, in reality this is usually not the case, and this creates an additional challenge for the implementation of the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model. Options to address this include estimating cdfs (e.g., [Aggarwal 1955](#); [Read 1972](#); [Falk 1983](#); [Leblanc 2012](#)), or estimating quantile functions (e.g., [Parzen 1979](#); [Falk 1984](#); [Yang 1985](#); [Cheng and Parzen 1997](#)) of the underlying distributions. Given an estimated quantile function \hat{F}^{-1} (resp. cdf \hat{F}), we convert it to a cdf (resp. a quantile function) by right (resp. left) continuous inversion,

$$\hat{F}(r) = \sup\{p \in [0, 1] : \hat{F}^{-1}(p) \leq r\}, \quad \text{for } r \in \mathbb{R} \quad (16)$$

(resp. (3)). Alternatively, one can start with a density estimator to estimate densities ([Panaretos and Zemel 2016](#); [Petersen and Müller 2016](#)) and then compute the cdfs and quantile functions by integration and inversion.

Suppose $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$ are n independent realizations of (ν_1, ν_2) . What we observe are collections of independent measurements $\{X_{il}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\nu_{1i}}}$ and $\{Y_{il}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\nu_{2i}}}$, sampled from ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} , respectively, where $m_{\nu_{1i}}$ and $m_{\nu_{2i}}$ are the sample sizes which may vary across distributions. Note that there are two independent layers of randomness in the data: The first generates independent pairs of distributions (ν_{1i}, ν_{2i}) ; the second generates independent observations according to each distribution, $X_{il} \sim \nu_{1i}$ and $Y_{il} \sim \nu_{2i}$.

For a distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, denote by $\hat{\mu} = \mu(\hat{F})$ the distribution associated with some cdf estimate \hat{F} , based on a sample of measurements drawn according to μ . Using $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$ as surrogates of ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} , the theoretical analysis of the estimation of the distribution-to-distribution regression operator requires the following assumptions that quantify the discrepancy of the estimated and true probability measures.

(A2) For any distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, with some nonnegative decreasing sequences $\tau_m = o(1)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, the corresponding estimate $\hat{\mu}$ based on a sample of size m drawn according to μ satisfies

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] = O(\tau_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^4(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] = O(\tau_m^2).$$

For example, for compactly supported distributions, the distribution estimator proposed by [Panaretos and Zemel \(2016\)](#) satisfies (A2) with $\tau_m = m^{-1/2}$, while [Petersen and Müller \(2016\)](#) consider a subset $\mathcal{W}_R^{\text{ac}}$ of \mathcal{W} containing distributions that are absolutely continuous with respect

to Lebesgue measure on a compact domain D such that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_R^{\text{ac}}} \sup_{r \in D_\mu} \max\{f_\mu(r), 1/f_\mu(r), |f'_\mu(r)|\} \leq R, \quad (17)$$

where f_μ is the density function of a distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_R^{\text{ac}}$, D_μ is the support of distribution μ and $R > 0$ is constant, and then obtain the rates $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_R^{\text{ac}}} \mathbb{E} d_W^2(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = O(m^{-2/3})$ and $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_R^{\text{ac}}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^4(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] = O(m^{-4/3})$ in (A2) (Proposition 1, Petersen and Müller 2019b).

The following assumption on the numbers of measurements per distribution $m_{\nu_{1i}}$ and $m_{\nu_{2i}}$ facilitates our analysis:

(A3) There exists a sequence $m = m(n)$ such that $\min\{m_{\nu_{1i}}, m_{\nu_{2i}} : i = 1, \dots, n\} \geq m$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3.2 Regression Operator Estimation

We note that notations with “ \sim ” refer to estimators based on fully observed distributions, while those with “ \wedge ” refer to estimators for which the distributions, ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} , are not fully observed and only samples of measurements drawn from the distributions are available.

Given independent realizations $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$ of (ν_1, ν_2) , we first consider an oracle estimator for the regression operator Γ , where we initially assume that $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$ are fully observed. First of all, the empirical Fréchet means are well-defined and unique due to the fact that we work in Hadamard spaces. Specifically, replacing the expectation in (7) by that with respect to the empirical measure based on $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$ gives

$$\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus} = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\nu_{1i}, \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus} = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\nu_{2i}, \mu), \quad (18)$$

where the corresponding quantile functions are the empirical means of quantile functions across the sample,

$$\tilde{F}_{1\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_{1i}^{-1}(\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{F}_{2\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_{2i}^{-1}(\cdot), \quad (19)$$

and the corresponding distribution functions are given by right continuous inverses of the quantile functions as in (16). Then the log transforms $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}$ and $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}$ admit estimates $\text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}$ and $\text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}$. The covariance operators \mathcal{C}_{ν_1} and \mathcal{C}_{ν_2} can be estimated by $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}$. We denote the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ by $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ and $\tilde{\phi}_j$, respectively by $\tilde{\zeta}_k$ and $\tilde{\psi}_k$, where the eigenvalues are in non-ascending order. The cross-covariance operator $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$ can be estimated by $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}$.

Due to the compactness of \mathcal{C}_{ν_1} , its inverse is not bounded, leading to an ill-posed problem (e.g., He et al. 2003; Wang et al. 2016). Regularization is thus needed and can be achieved through

truncation. Oracle estimators for the regression coefficient function β and regression operator Γ are

$$\tilde{\beta} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{b}_{jk} \tilde{\psi}_k \otimes \tilde{\phi}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Gamma}g(t) = \langle g, \tilde{\beta}(\cdot, t) \rangle_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } g \in \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mathcal{W}, \quad t \in D, \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{b}_{jk} = \tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_{jk}$, with $\tilde{\xi}_{jk} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \tilde{\phi}_j \rangle_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$, and J and K are the truncation bounds, i.e., the numbers of included eigenfunctions.

Furthermore, we can construct an estimator based on the distribution estimation in Section 3.1 which will be applicable in practical situations, where typically ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are observed in the form of samples generated from ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} . Denote the estimated quantile functions by \hat{F}_{1i}^{-1} and \hat{F}_{2i}^{-1} , respectively. Then the quantile functions of the empirical Fréchet means $\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}$ of $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are given by

$$\hat{F}_{1\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{F}_{1i}^{-1}(\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{F}_{2\oplus}^{-1}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{F}_{2i}^{-1}(\cdot), \quad (21)$$

and the corresponding distribution functions $\hat{F}_{1\oplus}$ and $\hat{F}_{2\oplus}$ can be obtained by right continuous inversion as per (16). Replacing ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} by the corresponding estimates $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$, we can analogously obtain the estimates for the covariance operators, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i}$, as well as the estimate for the cross-covariance operator, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i} \otimes \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}$. We denote the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ by $\hat{\lambda}_j$ and $\hat{\phi}_j$, respectively by $\hat{\xi}_k$ and $\hat{\psi}_k$, where the eigenvalues are in non-ascending order. Data-based estimators of the regression coefficient function β and regression operator Γ in (11) are then

$$\hat{\beta} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{b}_{jk} \hat{\psi}_k \otimes \hat{\phi}_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}g(t) = \langle g, \hat{\beta}(\cdot, t) \rangle_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } g \in \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mathcal{W}, \quad t \in D, \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{b}_{jk} = \hat{\lambda}_j^{-1} \hat{\xi}_{jk}$, and $\hat{\xi}_{jk} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}, \hat{\phi}_j \rangle_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i}, \hat{\psi}_k \rangle_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$.

Regarding the numbers of eigenfunctions included, J and K , we note that larger values of J and K lead to smaller bias but larger variance and potential overfitting. We discuss the selection of J and K further in Section S.4.1 in the Supplementary Material.

While this paper focuses on univariate distributions, we note that the proposed method in principle can be extended to the multivariate setting, where however the optimal maps and hence the log maps in general do not have closed-form expressions and the estimation is completely different from the univariate setting. In addition, the required determination of the optimal transport maps is fraught with numerical difficulties (Cuturi 2013). This is in contrast to the univariate case, where optimal transports just require the computation of quantile functions. Furthermore, the corresponding asymptotic analysis is also different from the univariate setting; in particular, the

expression of the parallel transport does not hold in the multivariate case. See Section S.7 in the Supplementary Material for further discussion.

3.3 Parallel Transport

Note that the true regression operator, $\Gamma: T_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\nu_{2\oplus}}$, and its estimators, $\tilde{\Gamma}: T_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}: T_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$, are defined on different tangent spaces, which makes their comparison not so straightforward. For this, we employ parallel transport, which is a commonly used tool for data on manifolds (Yuan et al. 2012; Lin and Yao 2019; Petersen and Müller 2019b). For two probability distributions $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, a parallel transport operator $P_{\mu_1, \mu_2}: \mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$ can be defined between the entire Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$ by

$$P_{\mu_1, \mu_2} g := g \circ F_1^{-1} \circ F_2, \quad \text{for } g \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2, \quad (23)$$

where F_1^{-1} and F_2 are the quantile function of μ_1 and cdf of μ_2 , respectively. Assuming that μ_1 is atomless, restricted to the tangent space T_{μ_1} , the parallel transport operator $P_{\mu_1, \mu_2}|_{T_{\mu_1}}$ defines the parallel transport from tangent space T_{μ_1} to T_{μ_2} .

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ the space of all Hilbert–Schmidt operators from T_{μ_1} to T_{μ_2} , for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}$. With $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ where μ'_1 and μ_2 are atomless, we can define a parallel transport operator $\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)}$ from $\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ to $\mathcal{H}_{\mu'_1, \mu'_2}$ by

$$(\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)} \mathcal{A})g = P_{\mu_2, \mu'_2}(\mathcal{A}(P_{\mu'_1, \mu_1} g)), \quad \text{for } g \in T_{\mu'_1} \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}. \quad (24)$$

Denoting the Hilbert–Schmidt norm on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}}$, for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, properties of parallel transport operators P_{μ_1, μ_2} and $\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)}$ that are relevant for the theory are listed in Proposition S1 in Section S.1.1 in the Supplementary Material. Given atomless distributions $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, applying Proposition S1, the discrepancy between operators $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ and $\mathcal{A}' \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu'_1, \mu'_2}$ can be quantified in the space $\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ by $\|\mathcal{P}_{(\mu'_1, \mu'_2), (\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}}$.

3.4 Asymptotic Theory

Our goal for the theory is to evaluate the performance of the estimated regression operators, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ as per (20) and (22), respectively. According to the discussion in Section 3.3, if the true Fréchet means $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ and their estimators are atomless, the discrepancy between the estimated and true regression operators can be gauged by $\|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}$, for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$, respectively. To guarantee the atomlessness of $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ and their estimators $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}$, we assume

(A4) With probability equal to 1, the random distributions ν_1 and ν_2 are atomless.

Let $C > 1$ denote a constant. To derive the convergence rate of the estimators for the regression

operator, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$, we require the following conditions regarding the variability of ν_1 and ν_2 , the spacing of the eigenvalues λ_j and ς_k , and the decay rates of the coefficients b_{jk} . Conditions of this type are standard in traditional functional linear regression (e.g., [Hall and Horowitz 2007](#)).

$$(A5) \quad \mathbb{E}(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^4) < \infty, \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^4) \leq C\lambda_j^2, \text{ for all } j \geq 1; \mathbb{E}(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^4) < \infty, \text{ and } \mathbb{E}(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^4) \leq C\varsigma_k^2, \text{ for all } k \geq 1.$$

$$(A6) \quad \text{For } j \geq 1, \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} \geq C^{-1}j^{-\theta-1}, \text{ where } \theta \geq 1 \text{ is a constant.}$$

$$(A7) \quad \text{For } k \geq 1, \varsigma_k - \varsigma_{k+1} \geq C^{-1}k^{-\vartheta-1}, \text{ where } \vartheta > 0 \text{ is a constant.}$$

$$(A8) \quad \text{For } j, k \geq 1, |b_{jk}| \leq Cj^{-\rho}k^{-\varrho}, \text{ where } \rho > \theta + 1 \text{ and } \varrho > 1 \text{ are constants.}$$

Note that (A8) implies (14). Furthermore, for J and K in (20) and (22), we assume

$$(A9) \quad n^{-1}J^{2\theta+2} \rightarrow 0, n^{-1}K^{2\vartheta+2} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(C, \theta, \vartheta, \rho, \varrho)$ denote the set of distributions \mathcal{F} of (ν_1, ν_2) that satisfy (A1) and (A4)–(A8). Defining the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(n) &= \kappa(n; \theta, \vartheta, \rho, \varrho) \\ &= \begin{cases} \min \left\{ n^{\max\{2\rho/(2\vartheta+3), (4\rho-1)/(2\vartheta+2\varrho+2)\}/(\theta+2\rho)}, n^{1/(2\vartheta+3)} \right\}, & \text{if } \varrho - \vartheta \leq 1, \\ \min \left\{ n^{\max\{2\rho/(2\vartheta+3), (4\rho-1)/(2\vartheta+2\varrho+2)\}/(\theta+2\rho)}, (n/\log n)^{1/(2\vartheta+3)} \right\}, & \text{if } \varrho - \vartheta \in (1, 3/2], \\ \min \left\{ n^{\max\{2\rho/(2\vartheta+3), (4\rho-1)/(2\vartheta+2\varrho+2)\}/(\theta+2\rho)}, n^{1/(2\varrho)} \right\}, & \text{if } \varrho - \vartheta > 3/2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

then when distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are fully observed, we obtain

Theorem 1. Assume (A1) and (A4)–(A9). If $J \sim n^{1/(\theta+2\rho)}$ and $K \sim \kappa(n)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left(\|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 > M\alpha(n) \right) = 0, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\alpha(n) = \max \left\{ n^{-(2\rho-1)/(\theta+2\rho)}, \kappa(n)^{-(2\varrho-1)} \right\}. \quad (26)$$

We note that $\alpha(n) = n^{-(2\rho-1)/(\theta+2\rho)}$ in (26) if either of the following holds: $\varrho - \vartheta \leq 1$ and $4\rho(\vartheta - \varrho + 2) \leq 2\vartheta + 3 \leq (2\varrho - 1)(\theta + 2\rho)/(2\rho - 1)$; or $1 < \varrho - \vartheta \leq 3/2$ and $4\rho(\vartheta - \varrho + 2) \leq 2\vartheta + 3 < (2\varrho - 1)(\theta + 2\rho)/(2\rho - 1)$; or $\varrho - \vartheta > 3/2$ and $\varrho \geq \max\{\vartheta + 2 - (2\vartheta + 3)/(4\rho), (\theta + 2\rho)/(2\theta + 2)\}$. In this case, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ achieves the same rate as the minimax rate for function-to-scalar linear regression ([Hall and Horowitz 2007](#)) and function-to-function linear regression (following similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3 of [Imaizumi and Kato 2018](#)).

Next, we consider the case where the distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are not fully observed. In addition, we require an assumption regarding the number of measurements per distribution and a uniform

Lipschitz condition on the estimated cdfs to guarantee the atomlessness of the estimated Fréchet means $\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}$ and hence to justify the use of $\|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}$ as a measure of the estimation error.

(A10) For τ_m in (A2), $\tau_m \leq C \min\{n^{-1}J^{-\theta}, n^{-1}K^{-1}\}$, for all n .

(A11) For any atomless distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, the corresponding estimate $\hat{\mu}$ based on a sample of measurements drawn according to μ is also atomless.

For example, with $J \sim n^{1/(\theta+2\rho)}$ and $K \sim \kappa(n)$ as in Theorem 1, (A10) holds with $m \sim \max\{n^{3(\theta+\rho)/(\theta+2\rho)}, n^{3/2}\kappa(n)^{3/2}\}$ and $m \sim \max\{n^{4(\theta+\rho)/(\theta+2\rho)}, n^2\kappa(n)^2\}$ for the estimators proposed by Petersen and Müller (2016) and Panaretos and Zemel (2016), respectively. We note that these two estimators also satisfy (A11). Then we find that the data-based estimator $\hat{\Gamma}$ achieves the same rate as the estimator $\tilde{\Gamma}$ based on fully observed distributions as shown in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *If (A1)–(A11) hold and choosing J and K as in Theorem 1, then*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left(\|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 > M\alpha(n) \right) = 0. \quad (27)$$

We note that while the proposed method is based on function-to-function linear regression, the asymptotic analysis is more involved. The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 are based on the geometry of the Wasserstein space, since we are not dealing with general functions in \mathcal{L}^2 space (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) as in functional data analysis but rather the log maps. In particular, we do not assume additive noise in the proposed model in (10). Furthermore, parallel transport maps are employed to quantify the estimation discrepancy of the estimators of the regression operator, Γ , the covariance and cross-covariance operators, \mathcal{C}_{ν_1} , \mathcal{C}_{ν_2} and $\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}$, and the eigenfunctions, ϕ_j and ψ_k . All of these create additional complexities for the theoretical derivations. For Theorem 2, the distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are not be fully observed and instead only data samples drawn from these distributions are available. Hence, we need to deal with two layers of stochastic mechanisms: The first layer generates random elements (ν_{1i}, ν_{2i}) taking values in $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$; the second layer generates random samples according to ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} . Specifically, we need to tackle the discrepancy between the estimated distributions based on the observed data $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$ and the actual underlying distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} .

Theorems 1 and 2 entail the following corollaries on the prediction of ν_2 based on ν_1 , where the target is the conditional Fréchet mean of ν_2 given ν_1 , i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_2|\nu_1) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mu' \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^2(\nu_2, \mu') | \nu_1] = \operatorname{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}[\mathbb{E}(\operatorname{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 | \operatorname{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1)]$. In the following, for any given $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, the corresponding estimate $\hat{\mu}$ is assumed to be based on a sample of $m_{\mu} \geq m$ observations drawn from μ , where m is the lower bound of the number of observations per distribution as per (A3). We denote the prediction of ν_2 based on fully observed distributions by $\tilde{\nu}_2(\mu) := \operatorname{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}[\tilde{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \mu)]$, and the prediction based on samples generated from the distributions by $\hat{\nu}_2(\hat{\mu}) := \operatorname{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}[\hat{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\mu})]$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ are as per (20) and (22), respectively.

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left(d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_2(\mu), \mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_2 \mid \nu_1 = \mu)) > M\alpha(n) \right) = 0. \quad (28)$$

Corollary 2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2,*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left(d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_2(\hat{\mu}), \mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_2 \mid \nu_1 = \mu)) > M\alpha(n) \right) = 0.$$

For the proofs, see Section S.1.2 in the Supplementary Material. We further discuss the estimation and theoretical analysis for the distribution-to-scalar regression model as per (15) in Section S.2 in the Supplementary Material, where we show that the estimates of the regression coefficient function β_1 achieve the same rate as the minimax rate for the function-to-scalar linear regression based on fully observed predictor functions; see Hall and Horowitz (2007).

4 Autoregressive Models for Distribution-Valued Time Series

Here we consider a distribution-valued time series $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, each element taking values in \mathcal{W} . We assume that the random process $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary in the sense that

- (1) μ_i are square integrable, i.e., $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \mu_i) < \infty$ for some (and thus for all) $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$;
- (2) μ_i have a common Fréchet mean μ_{\oplus} that is atomless, i.e., $\mu_{\oplus} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \mu_i)$, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (3) The autocovariance operators $\mathbb{E}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_{i+r} \otimes \operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i)$ do not depend on $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, which are hence denoted by \mathcal{C}_r , for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we assume a first order autoregressive model which is an extension of the distribution-to-distribution regression model in (10)

$$\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_{i+1} = \Gamma(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i) + \varepsilon_{i+1}, \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (29)$$

Here, $\Gamma: T_{\mu_{\oplus}} \rightarrow T_{\mu_{\oplus}}$ is a linear operator defined as

$$\Gamma g(t) = \langle \beta(\cdot, t), g \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } t \in D, \text{ and } g \in T_{\mu_{\oplus}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\beta: D^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the auto-regression coefficient kernel lying in $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\oplus} \times \mu_{\oplus}}^2$, and $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d. random elements taking values in the tangent space $T_{\mu_{\oplus}}$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_i) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 < \infty$. Similar models have been previously studied in the seminal work of Bosq (2000). To ensure the existence and uniqueness of such a stationary process, we assume

(B1) There exists an integer $q \geq 1$ such that $\|\Gamma^q\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2} < 1$.

Here, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2}$ denotes the sup norm for linear operators on $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2$ and we define Γ^q by induction, $\Gamma^k(\cdot) = \Gamma[\Gamma^{k-1}(\cdot)]$, for any integer $k > 1$. We note that under (B1), (29) has a unique stationary solution given by

$$\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}), \quad (31)$$

where $\Gamma^0(\varepsilon_i) := \varepsilon_i$ and the right hand side converges in mean square, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|\sum_{r=n}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r})\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 = 0$, and also almost surely, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\sum_{r=n}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r})\|_{\mu_{\oplus}} = 0$ with probability 1 (Theorem 3.1, Bosq 2000). Furthermore, we assume

(B2) With probability 1, $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{-r}) + \text{id}$ is non-decreasing.

Assumption (B2) guarantees that the right hand side of (31) lies in $\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$ a.s. We further provide a fully detailed example of a stationary process $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ that satisfies the autoregressive model as per (29) in Section S.3 in the Supplementary Material.

As in Section 3, we have $\mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_1) = 0$, μ_{\oplus} -almost surely. The operator \mathcal{C}_0 admits the eigendecomposition

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \phi_j \otimes \phi_j,$$

with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ and orthonormal eigenfunctions $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ in $T_{\mu_{\oplus}}$. With probability 1, the logarithmic transforms $\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i$ admit the expansion

$$\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \phi_j, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and hence $\mathcal{C}_1 = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_{jl} \phi_l \otimes \phi_j$, where $\xi_{jl} = \mathbb{E}(\langle \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_2, \phi_l \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}})$. With $b_{jl} = \lambda_j^{-1} \xi_{jl}$, the auto-regression coefficient function can then be expressed as

$$\beta = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jl} \phi_l \otimes \phi_j.$$

For the estimation of the operator Γ in (30), first considering a fully observed sequence of length n , $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n$, with the oracle estimator of the Fréchet mean $\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}$ defined analogously to (18), the autocovariance operators \mathcal{C}_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 can be estimated by their empirical counterparts $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_i \otimes \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_i$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_{i+1} \otimes \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_i$. We denote the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$ by $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ and $\tilde{\phi}_j$, respectively, where the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ are in non-ascending order. Then oracle estimators for the auto-regression coefficient function β and operator Γ in (30) are

$$\tilde{\beta} = \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{b}_{jl} \tilde{\phi}_l \otimes \tilde{\phi}_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Gamma}g(t) = \langle g, \tilde{\beta}(\cdot, t) \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } g \in \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mathcal{W}, \quad t \in D, \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{b}_{jl} = \tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_{jl}$, $\tilde{\xi}_{jl} = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_i, \tilde{\phi}_j \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mu_{i+1}, \tilde{\phi}_l \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}}$, and J is the truncation bound.

As discussed for the independent case in Section 3.2, a realistic estimator $\hat{\beta}$ for β based on the distribution estimation discussed in Section 3.1 can be obtained by replacing μ_i and μ_{\oplus} with the corresponding estimates $\hat{\mu}_i$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}$, the latter analogous to (21). Specifically, estimates for the autocovariance operators with corresponding decompositions are given by $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_i \otimes \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_i$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_{i+1} \otimes \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_i$. We denote the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$ by $\hat{\lambda}_j$ and $\hat{\phi}_j$, respectively, where the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_j$ are in non-ascending order. With $\hat{b}_{jl} = \hat{\lambda}_j^{-1} \hat{\xi}_{jl}$ and $\hat{\xi}_{jl} = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\phi}_j \rangle_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \hat{\mu}_{i+1}, \hat{\phi}_l \rangle_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}}$, data-based estimators for the auto-regression coefficient function β and operator Γ in (30) are then given by

$$\hat{\beta} = \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{b}_{jl} \hat{\phi}_l \otimes \hat{\phi}_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}g(t) = \langle g, \hat{\beta}(\cdot, t) \rangle_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}}, \quad \text{for } g \in \text{Log}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}} \mathcal{W}, \quad t \in D. \quad (33)$$

We first focus on the case where the distributions are fully observed. To derive the convergence rate of the estimator $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in (32), we require the following assumptions analogous to the independent case in Section 3. Let $C > 1$ be a constant.

(B3) With probability 1, the distributions μ_i are all atomless.

(B4) $\mathbb{E}(\|\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^4) < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}(\langle \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}}^4) \leq C\lambda_j^2$, for all $j \geq 1$.

(B5) For $j \geq 1$, $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} \geq C^{-1}j^{-\theta-1}$, where $\theta \geq 1/2$ is a constant.

(B6) For $j, l \geq 1$, $|b_{jl}| \leq Cj^{-\rho}l^{-\varrho}$, where $\rho > \theta + 1$ and $\varrho > 1$ are constants.

(B7) $n^{-1}J^{2\theta+2} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(C, \theta, \rho, \varrho)$ denote the set of distributions \mathcal{G} of the process $\{\mu_i\}$ that satisfy (B1)–(B6). Then we obtain

Theorem 3. Assume (B1)–(B7). If $J \sim \min\{n^{1/(2\theta+2\rho+2\max\{2-\varrho, 0\})}, n^{1/(2\theta+2\max\{\varrho, 2\})}\}$, then

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}} \left(\|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus}}}^2 > M\zeta(n) \right) = 0,$$

where

$$\zeta(n) = \max \left\{ n^{-(2\rho-1)/(2\theta+2\rho+2\max\{2-\varrho, 0\})}, n^{-(2\varrho-1)/(2\theta+2\max\{\varrho, 2\})} \right\}. \quad (34)$$

The convergence rate obtained for the estimator $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in Theorem 3 is slower than the rate obtained for the independent case as per Theorem 1. This is due to the serial dependence among μ_i and with the special choice of J as above is manifested by the fact that $\alpha(n)$ as per (26) with $\theta = \vartheta$ is always

smaller than $\zeta(n)$ as per (34). Furthermore, regarding the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}$ in (33) where only samples drawn from the distributions μ_i are available, we in addition make the following assumption of the numbers of measurements observed per distribution.

(B8) There exists a sequence $m = m(n)$ such that for the number of measurements per distribution m_{μ_i} , $\min\{m_{\mu_i} : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \geq m$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(B9) $\tau_m \leq Cn^{-1}$, for all n , where τ_m is as per (A2).

For example, if distributions μ_i are estimated via the methods used by Panaretos and Zemel (2016) and Petersen and Müller (2016), in order to ensure (B9), it suffices to take $m \sim n^2$ and $m \sim n^{3/2}$, respectively. Then we show that the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}$ in (33) converges with the same rate as $\tilde{\Gamma}$, as shown in Theorem 3.

Theorem 4. *If (A2), (A11) and (B1)–(B9) hold and choosing J as in Theorem 3, then*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}} \left(\|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \hat{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus}}}^2 > M\zeta(n) \right) = 0.$$

As for the independent case, Theorems 3 and 4 entail the following asymptotic results for the one-on-one prediction of μ_{n+1} given μ_n , where the target is the conditional Fréchet mean of μ_{n+1} given μ_n by $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\mu_{n+1} \mid \mu_n) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mu'} \mathbb{E}[d_W^2(\mu_{n+1}, \mu') \mid \mu_n] = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu_{\oplus}}[\mathbb{E}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_{n+1} \mid \operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_n)]$. For any given $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, the corresponding estimate $\hat{\mu}$ is assumed to be based on a sample of $m_{\mu} \geq m$ observations drawn from μ , where m is the lower bound of the number of observations per distribution as per (B8). The prediction of μ_{n+1} based on fully observed distributions is given by $\operatorname{Exp}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\sim}[\tilde{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\sim} \mu)]$ and the prediction based on samples generated from the distributions by $\operatorname{Exp}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\hat{\sim}}[\hat{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\hat{\sim}} \hat{\mu})]$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ are as per (32) and (33), respectively. Then these predictions achieve the same rate as the estimates of the regression operators in Theorems 3 and 4.

Corollary 3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3,*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}} \left(d_W^2(\operatorname{Exp}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\sim}[\tilde{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\sim} \mu)], \mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_2 \mid \nu_1 = \mu)) > M\zeta(n) \right) = 0.$$

Corollary 4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4,*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}} \left(d_W^2(\operatorname{Exp}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\hat{\sim}}[\hat{\Gamma}(\operatorname{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^{\hat{\sim}} \hat{\mu})], \mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\mu_{n+1} \mid \mu_n = \mu)) > M\zeta(n) \right) = 0.$$

Proofs and auxiliary lemmas for this section are in Section S.1.3 in the Supplementary Material.

5 Simulations

In practice, the fit of the logarithmic response may not fall in the logarithmic space with base point $\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}) \notin \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}, \quad (35)$$

with $\hat{\Gamma}$ given in (22). This problem was already recognized by Bigot et al. (2017). If (35) happens, we employ a boundary projection method described in Section S.4.2 in the Supplementary Material. We compared the performance of the proposed method implemented with boundary projection (referred to as projection method) with two other approaches. The first of these is to employ an alternative to the proposed boundary projection for those situations where the event (35) takes place, which was proposed by Cazelles et al. (2018) in the context of principal component analysis (PCA). This alternative to handle the problem extends the domains of the distributions. We use this method by fitting the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model with distributions on an extended domain when the event (35) happens, and then normalize the fitted distributions by restricting them back to the original domain. We refer to this as the domain-extension method in the following. The second alternative approach is the log quantile density (LQD) method (Petersen and Müller 2016), where we apply function-to-function linear regression to the LQD transformations of distributions and map the fitted responses back to the Wasserstein space \mathcal{W} through the inverse LQD transformation (Chen et al. 2019). Specifically, we use the R package `fdadensity` (Petersen et al. 2019b) for implementations of the LQD transformations. To generate data for simulations, we provide the following framework to construct explicit examples, which also demonstrates the feasibility of the proposed model in (10).

Framework for Explicit Construction. For $D = [0, 1]$, we consider Fréchet mean distributions $\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus} \in \mathcal{W}$ with bounded density functions, i.e., $\sup_{s \in D} f_{1\oplus}(s) < \infty$ and $\sup_{t \in D} f_{2\oplus}(t) < \infty$. We consider a set of orthonormal functions $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in the Lebesgue-square-integrable function space on $[0, 1]$, $\mathcal{L}^2([0, 1])$, such that the φ_j are continuously differentiable with bounded derivatives, and $\varphi_j(0) = \varphi_j(1)$, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$. In particular, φ_j can be taken as

$$\varphi_j(r) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi jr), \quad \text{for } r \in [0, 1], \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N}_+. \quad (36)$$

Suppose $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1$ admits the expansion $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1 = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \chi_j \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus}$, where χ_j are uncorrelated random variables with zero mean such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \chi_j^2 < \infty$ almost surely. We define the regression operator Γ as $\Gamma g = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty b_{jk}^* \langle g, \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus}$, for $g \in T_{\nu_{1\oplus}}$, with $b_{jk}^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \sum_{k=1}^\infty b_{jk}^{*2} < \infty$. Hence, $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty b_{jk}^* \chi_j \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus}$. To guarantee $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \chi_j \varphi_j \circ$

$F_{1\oplus} \in \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jk}^* \chi_j \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus} \in \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$, it suffices to require

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \chi_j \varphi'_j(F_{1\oplus}(s)) f_{1\oplus}(s) + 1 \geq 0, \text{ for all } s \in D, \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jk}^* \chi_j \varphi'_k(F_{2\oplus}(t)) f_{2\oplus}(t) + 1 \geq 0, \text{ for all } t \in D, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \chi_j (\varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus})' \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jk}^* \chi_j (\varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus})' \text{ uniformly converge,} \end{array} \right. \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (37)$$

Requirement (37) is satisfied, e.g., when $|\chi_j| \leq v_{1j}/(\sup_{r \in [0,1]} |\varphi'_j(r)| \sup_{s \in D} f_{1\oplus}(s) \sum_{j'=1}^{\infty} v_{1j'})$ and $|b_{jk}^* \chi_j| \leq v_{1j} v_{2k}/(\sup_{r \in [0,1]} |\varphi'_k(r)| \sup_{t \in D} f_{2\oplus}(t) \sum_{j'=1}^{\infty} v_{1j'} \sum_{k'=1}^{\infty} v_{2k'})$, a.s., where $\{v_{1j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{v_{2k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are two non-negative sequences such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} v_{1j} < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} v_{2k} < \infty$, examples including $\{a^{-j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{j^{-a}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, for any given $a > 1$.

With $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1)$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$, the distributional response ν_2 can be generated by adding distortions to $\text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}(\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1))$ through push-forward maps, i.e., $\nu_2 = g \# \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}(\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1))$, where $g: D \rightarrow D$ is a random distortion function independent of ν_1 , such that g is non-decreasing almost surely, and that $\mathbb{E}[g(t)] = t$ almost everywhere on D . This is a valid method to provide random distortions for distributions (Panaretos and Zemel 2016) in the sense that the conditional Fréchet mean of ν_2 is on target, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_2 | \nu_1) := \text{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}[d_W^2(\nu_2, \mu) | \nu_1] = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}(\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1))$. Furthermore, the pair (ν_1, ν_2) generated in this way satisfies our model in (10). An example (Petersen and Müller 2019a) of the random distortion function is $g = g_A$, where A is a random variable such that $\mathbb{P}(A \leq r) = \mathbb{P}(A \geq -r)$ for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{P}(A = 0) = 0$, and g_a is defined as

$$g_a(r) = \begin{cases} r - |a|^{-1} \sin(ar), & \text{if } a \neq 0, \\ r, & \text{if } a = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } r \in D. \quad (38)$$

Specifically, for our simulation studies, with $D = [0, 1]$, we consider two cases with different choices of the Fréchet means $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$:

Case 1.1. $\nu_{1\oplus} = TN_D(0.5, 0.2^2)$, and $\nu_{2\oplus} = TN_D(0.75, 0.3^2)$, where $TN_D(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes the Gaussian distribution $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ truncated on D .

Case 1.2. $\nu_{1\oplus} = \text{Beta}(6, 2)$, and $\nu_{2\oplus} = \text{Beta}(2, 4)$.

Taking $J^* = K^* = 20$, for $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we set $b_{jk}^* = 2^{-k} \kappa_k^{-1} R_{2\oplus}^{-1} \kappa_j R_{1\oplus}$ if $j \leq J^*$ and $k \leq K^*$, and set $b_{jk}^* = 0$ otherwise, where $\kappa_l = \sup_{r \in [0,1]} |\varphi'_l(r)| = 2\sqrt{2}\pi l$, for $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $R_{1\oplus} = \sup_{s \in D} f_{1\oplus}(s)$ and $R_{2\oplus} = \sup_{t \in D} f_{2\oplus}(t)$. Taking $v_{1j} = 2^{-j}$, data were generated as follows:

Step 1: Generate $\chi_{ij} \sim \text{Unif}(-v_{1j}(\kappa_j R_{1\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} v_{1l})^{-1}, v_{1j}(\kappa_j R_{1\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} v_{1l})^{-1})$ independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, J^*$, whence $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} = \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \chi_{ij} \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus}$, with the basis functions φ_j as per (36), $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K^*} \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} b_{jk}^* \chi_{ij} \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus}$, and $\nu_{1i} = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}(\sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \chi_{ij} \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus})$.

Step 2: Generate ν_{2i} by adding distortion to $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i})$: Sample $A_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}\{\pm\pi, \pm 2\pi, \pm 3\pi\}$; let $\nu_{2i} = g_{A_i} \# \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}[\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i})]$, with function g_a defined as per (38).

Step 3: Draw an i.i.d. sample of size m from each of the distributions $\{\nu_{1i}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\nu_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$.

Four scenarios were considered with $n \in \{20, 200\}$ and $m \in \{50, 500\}$ for each case. We simulated 500 runs for each (n, m) pair. For the domain-extension method, the distribution domain is expanded from $[0, 1]$ to $[-0.5, 1.5]$ and $[-1, 2]$. To compare the three methods, we computed the out-of-sample average Wasserstein discrepancy (AWD) based on observations for 200 new predictors $\{\nu_{1i}\}_{i=n+1}^{n+200}$, for each Monte Carlo run. Denoting the fitted response distributions by ν_{2i}^{\natural} , the out-of-sample AWD is given by

$$\text{AWD}(n, m) = \frac{1}{200} \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+200} d_W(\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_{2i} | \nu_{1i}), \nu_{2i}^{\natural}), \quad (39)$$

with $\mathbb{E}_{\oplus}(\nu_{2i} | \nu_{1i})$ being the conditional Fréchet mean of ν_{2i} given ν_{1i} as defined above (38).

We found that the domain-extension method often failed to force the fit $\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i})$ to fall in the log space $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$. In particular, this failure occurred in around 15–25% of the Monte Carlo runs where (35) happened when $n = 20$; therefore we do not report the results for this method. The results of the LQD method and the proposed Wasserstein regression method with boundary projection (WR) are summarized in the boxplots of Figure 1.

The proposed method outperforms the LQD method in all the scenarios considered. In fact, the log maps are isometries between the Wasserstein space and the log image spaces. This provides support for the proposed approach. In contrast, the LQD transformation is not an isometry and the ensuing distortions likely contribute to its inferior behavior. In particular, in Case 1.2 where the Fréchet mean distributions are beta distributions and the density functions are not bounded away from zero on D , the LQD method suffers from bias issues. When the number of distributions n increases, (35) is seen to happen less frequently and boundary projection is seldom needed when the sample size is large ($n = 200$).

Additional simulations illustrating the asymptotic result in Theorem 1, regarding the robustness of the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression method and comparing the proposed distribution-to-scalar regression method with a Gaussian process regression approach (Bachoc et al. 2017) can be found in Section S.5 in the Supplementary Material.

6 Applications

6.1 Mortality Data

There has been continuing interest in the nature of human longevity and the analysis of mortality data across countries and calendar years has provided some of the key data to study it (e.g., Chiou




Figure 1: Boxplots of the out-of-sample AWDs as per (39) for the four simulation setups with $(n, m) \in \{20, 200\} \times \{50, 500\}$, where “LQD” denotes the LQD method and “WR” denotes the proposed Wasserstein regression method. The numbers in brackets “[]” below the boxplots for WR indicate for how many runs event (35) happened and boundary projection became necessary.

and Müller 2009; Ouellette and Bourbeau 2011; Hyndman et al. 2013; Shang and Hyndman 2017). Of particular interest is how patterns of mortality of specific populations evolve over calendar time. Going beyond summary statistics such as life expectancy, viewing the entire age-at-death distributions as data objects is expected to lead to deeper insights into the secular evolution of human longevity and its dynamics. The Human Mortality Database (<http://www.mortality.org>) provides yearly life tables for 38 countries, which yield histograms for the distributions of age-at-death. Smooth densities can then be obtained by applying local linear regression (Fan and Gijbels 1996). We obtained these densities on the domain $[0, 100]$ (years of age).

In a first analysis, we focused on the $n = 32$ countries for which data are available for the years 1983 and 2013. We applied the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model with mortality distributions for an earlier year (1983) as the predictor and a later year (2013) as the response

to compare the temporal evolution of age-at-death distributions among different countries. We show the leave-one-out prediction results together with the observed distributional predictors and responses for females in Figure 2 for Japan, Ukraine, Italy and the USA, which showcase different patterns of mortality change between 1983 and 2013. In addition to the graphical comparisons, Wasserstein discrepancies (WD) between the observed and leave-one-out predicted distributions are also listed. For all four countries, the observed and predicted distributions for 2013 are seen to be shifted to the right from the corresponding distributions in 1983, indicating increased longevity.




Figure 2: Age-at-death distributions of females in Italy, Japan, Ukraine, and the USA for 1983 and 2013, and the leave-one-out cross validation prediction based on the proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model, where the predictors are the distributions for 1983 and the responses are the distributions 30 years later. Top row: Observed densities for 1983 and 2013 and the leave-one-out predicted densities $\text{Exp}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}(\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}))$ for 2013; Bottom row: Log-mapped predictors and responses, $\text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i}$, and leave-one-out prediction for log responses $\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i})$, where the estimated regression operator $\hat{\Gamma}$ is defined in (22) and no boundary projection is needed for these four countries. The Wasserstein discrepancies (WDs) between the observed distributions and the corresponding leave-one-out prediction are indicated for each country.

The top row of Figure 2 shows a comparison between the model anticipation and the actual observed distributions in 2013 in terms of density functions. Specifically, for Japan and the USA, the rightward mortality shift is seen to be more expressed than suggested by the leave-one-out prediction, indicating that longevity extension is more than anticipated, while the mortality distribution for Ukraine seems to shift to the right at a slower pace than the model prediction would

suggest, leading to a relatively large WD with a value of 3.59 between the observed and predicted response. In contrast, the regression fit for Italy almost perfectly matches the observed distribution in 2013.

The log maps shown in the bottom row of Figure 2 indicate the shifts of the distributions relative to the Fréchet mean across countries for the corresponding year. For Japan, the log maps for the observed predictors and responses and also the model prediction are all positive across the age domain, indicating that the distributions for Japan shift to the right from the Fréchet mean across countries, and Japanese females live longer compared to the average across countries at all the ages, while the magnitude of these log maps vary between 1983 and 2013 and also between observed and predicted distributions for 2013. The observed mortality distribution for 2013 has a bigger rightward shift relative to the Fréchet mean distribution for older females and minors and a smaller one for younger adults than the model prediction. In contrast, Ukraine has a leftward shift from the Fréchet mean for females of all ages, and for 2013 the shift exceeds the model anticipation. For Italy, the log transformed predictor is negative before 15 and positive after, whence the predicted log response becomes positive throughout and also expands in size, meaning the relative standing of Italy in terms of longevity is anticipated to be improved in 2013 by the model prediction. The predicted distribution of Italy in 2013 is shifted to the right from the Fréchet mean for all ages, and such rightward shift is more expressed in the actual distribution in 2013. For the USA, the predicted log-mapped response for 2013 is entirely negative and consequently the mortality distribution moved to the left of the Fréchet mean, i.e., its relative standing in terms of longevity is anticipated to become worse, while the actual observation is a mixture of a rightward shift for more than 88 years of age and a leftward shift for the other ages.

We also illustrated the proposed autoregressive model for distribution-valued time series with the mortality data for Sweden, and the results are summarized in Section S.6 in the Supplementary Material.

6.2 House Price Data

A question of continuing interest to economists is how house prices change over time (e.g., Oikarinen et al. 2018; Bogin et al. 2019). We fitted the temporal evolution of house price distributions via the autoregressive distribution time series model described in Section 4, where we downloaded house price data from <http://www.zillow.com>. These data included bimonthly median house prices after inflation adjustment for $m = 306$ cities in the US from June 1996 to August 2015, for which the distribution of median house prices across the cities was constructed for every second month. The autoregressive model was trained on data up to April 2007 and predictions were computed for the remaining period, where we successively predicted the distribution of each month based on the prediction two months prior, i.e., by running the distribution time series model as estimated from the training period.




Figure 3: Observed and fitted (top row) / predicted (bottom row) densities of the house price distributions. Training period: August 1996 to April 2007. Prediction period: June 2007 to August 2015. Five representative months are depicted for each of the training and prediction periods in time order, where the Wasserstein discrepancies (WDs) are also listed.

Table 1: Five-number summary of the Wasserstein discrepancies in training and prediction periods.

	Min	$Q_{0.25}$	Median	$Q_{0.75}$	Max
Training	0.0020	0.0035	0.0047	0.0066	0.017
Prediction	0.0040	0.016	0.042	0.054	0.068

Figure 3 shows the fitting and prediction results for training and prediction periods, where selected months are ordered in time, while a five-number summary of the fitting and prediction WDs is given in Table 1. The house price densities are found to be mostly uni-modal, and the peak shifts gradually to the right over time. Within the training period, the fitted densities are initially very close to the observed densities and then gradually are situated to the left of the observed densities, which means that the house price evolution overall accelerates during this period. For the prediction period, the predicted densities almost coincide with the observed distributions in 2007, fall behind the actual distribution in 2008, and then continue shifting to the right of the observed distributions. We find that the discrepancy between the predicted and observed house price distributions increases from 2007 to 2012 and then decreases afterwards. These findings are in line with the overheating of the housing market before 2006, the crash in 2007–2008, and the lingering effects of the financial crisis, followed by a recovery after 2012.

Supplement to “Wasserstein Regression”

S.1 Proofs and Ancillary Results

Throughout the proof, given any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}$, we denote the space of all Hilbert–Schmidt operators from T_μ to T_μ by $\mathcal{H}_\mu := \mathcal{H}_{\mu,\mu}$.

S.1.1 Properties of Parallel Transport Operators

Proposition S1. *With probability measures $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, the parallel transport operators P_{μ_1, μ_2} and $\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)}$, as defined in (23) and (24), have the following properties:*

1. *If μ_1 is atomless, P_{μ_1, μ_2} is unitary, i.e.,*

$$\langle P_{\mu_1, \mu_2} g, P_{\mu_1, \mu_2} h \rangle_{\mu_2} = \langle g, h \rangle_{\mu_1}, \quad \text{for } g, h \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2.$$

2. *If μ_1 and μ_2 are both atomless, then the parallel transport P_{μ_2, μ_1} from $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2$ to $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2$ is the adjoint operator of P_{μ_1, μ_2} , i.e.,*

$$\langle P_{\mu_1, \mu_2} g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mu_2} = \langle g_1, P_{\mu_2, \mu_1} g_2 \rangle_{\mu_1}, \quad \text{for } g_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_1}^2 \text{ and } g_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mu_2}^2.$$

3. *If μ_1, μ_2 , and μ'_1 are atomless, given any positive integers N_1 and N_2 , for $g_{1j} \in T_{\mu_1}$, $j = 1, \dots, N_1$ and $g_{2k} \in T_{\mu_2}$, $k = 1, \dots, N_2$,*

$$\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} c_{jk} g_{2k} \otimes g_{1j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} c_{jk} (P_{\mu_2, \mu'_2} g_{2k}) \otimes (P_{\mu_1, \mu'_1} g_{1j}).$$

4. *If μ_1, μ_2 , μ'_1 , and μ'_2 are all atomless, for $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$ and $\mathcal{A}' \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu'_1, \mu'_2}$,*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu'_1, \mu'_2)} \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}'\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu'_1, \mu'_2}} = \|\mathcal{P}_{(\mu'_1, \mu'_2), (\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}}.$$

Related results for finite-dimensional Riemannian manifolds are in Proposition 2 of Lin (2019). These four statements can be easily checked by the definition of parallel transport operators in (23) and (24); we omit the proof.

S.1.2 Proofs for Section 3.4

We start with the definitions of notations to be used in the proofs. For random variables X_n and a sequence of positive constants c_n , we will write $X_n = O_p(c_n)$ if

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(|X_n| > Mc_n) = 0,$$

and $X_n = o_p(c_n)$ if there exists $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(|X_n| > M_0 c_n) = 0.$$

For a sequence of deterministic quantities $a_n = a_n(\mathcal{F})$, we will write $a_n = O(c_n)$ if

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} c_n^{-1} \sup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}} |a_n(\mathcal{F})| < \infty.$$

In addition, for simplicity, we denote $P_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} g$, $P_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}} g$, $P_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} g$, and $P_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}} g$ by Pg for g in $T_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}}$, $T_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$, $T_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}}$, and $T_{\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$, respectively; we define $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} := \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus})} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} := \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} := \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} := \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} := \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} := \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$,

$$\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} := \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{b}_{jk} P\tilde{\psi}_k \otimes P\tilde{\phi}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta} := \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{b}_{jk} P\hat{\psi}_k \otimes P\hat{\phi}_j.$$

By the third statement in Proposition S1, under (A4), $\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}$ is the kernel of $\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma}$; under (A4) and (A11), $\mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta}$ is the kernel of $\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 &= \int_D \int_D \left(\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}(s, t) - \beta(s, t) \right)^2 d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) d\nu_{2\oplus}(t), \\ \|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 &= \int_D \int_D \left(\mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta}(s, t) - \beta(s, t) \right)^2 d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) d\nu_{2\oplus}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{S.1}$$

Thus, for the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, we will derive the asymptotic order of the right hand sides in (S.1). To this end, we need to study the asymptotic properties of the estimators of the covariance and cross-covariance operators, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$ when the distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are fully observed, and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}$ when only samples of observations drawn from the ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are available. We use the convention that $\langle P\tilde{\phi}_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \geq 0$, $\langle P\tilde{\psi}_k, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \geq 0$, $\langle P\hat{\phi}_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \geq 0$ and $\langle P\hat{\psi}_k, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \geq 0$ to determine the signs of the estimated eigenfunctions, $\tilde{\phi}_j$, $\tilde{\psi}_k$, $\hat{\phi}_j$ and $\hat{\psi}_k$ where choice of the signs may impact the validity of the results.

We first focus on the case where ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are fully observed.

Lemma S1. Assume (A4) and (A5). Furthermore, assume that the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and

$\{\varsigma_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ are distinct, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus}}^2 &= O_p(n^{-1}), \quad \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_2\oplus}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1}), \\ \text{and } \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 &= O_p(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j \geq 1} |\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus}}, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} |\tilde{\varsigma}_k - \varsigma_k| \leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_2\oplus}}, \\ \|\mathbb{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1\oplus} &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus}} / \min_{1 \leq j' \leq j} \{\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_{j'+1}\}, \text{ for all } j \geq 1, \\ \|\mathbb{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus} &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_2\oplus}} / \min_{1 \leq k' \leq k} \{\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_{k'+1}\}, \text{ for all } k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We only prove the results for $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$; those for $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2}$ can be shown analogously. We first note that under (A4), $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ are atomless, the latter with probability 1. By the third statement in Proposition S1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \otimes (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1} \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \otimes (\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1} \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \otimes (\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \otimes (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \otimes (\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) \\ &=: \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3 + \mathcal{A}_4. \end{aligned}$$

For \mathcal{A}_2 , it can be observed that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 \leq \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right).$$

For the first term, since ν_1 is square integrable,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1i}) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(d_W^2(\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_1) \right) < \infty, \quad (\text{S.2})$$

whence $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 = O_p(1)$. For the second term, by (6), (23) and the atomlessness

of $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$, $\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} = \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$. In conjunction with (21), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} d_W^2(\nu_1, \nu_{1\oplus}), \quad (\text{S.3})$$

where the last equality is due to the fact that $\{\nu_{1i}\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent realizations of ν_1 . Thus, $\|\mathcal{A}_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\|\mathcal{A}_3\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$, and $\|\mathcal{A}_4\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-2})$. For \mathcal{A}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathcal{A}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_D \int_D \left[\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1(s) \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1(t) - \mathbb{E} \left(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1(s) \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1(t) \right) \right]^2 d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) d\nu_{1\oplus}(t) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{n} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^4 \right) + \|\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In conjunction with (A5) and the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j = \mathbb{E} d_W^2(\nu_1, \nu_{1\oplus}) < \infty$, this implies

$$\|\mathcal{A}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1}).$$

Therefore, $\|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$. By the atomlessness of $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and Proposition S1, $\{\tilde{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\text{P}\tilde{\phi}_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, for which the results follow from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 of Bosq (2000). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Defining

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_1 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{b}_{jk} - b_{jk}) \text{P}\tilde{\psi}_k \otimes \text{P}\tilde{\phi}_j, \\ \tilde{A}_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \left(\text{P}\tilde{\psi}_k \otimes \text{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \psi_k \otimes \phi_j \right), \\ A_3 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.4})$$

we observe that by (S.1),

$$\left\| \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 \leq 3 \|\tilde{A}_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3 \|\tilde{A}_2\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3 \|A_3\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2,$$

where and hereafter, $\|A\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 := \int_D \int_D A(s, t)^2 d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) d\nu_{2\oplus}(t)$ for $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$.

For \tilde{A}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{b}_{jk} - b_{jk})^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \lambda_j^{-1} \xi_{jk})^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_j^{-2} (\tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} - \lambda_j^{-1})^2 \xi_{jk}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.5})$$

Using the same technique as in the proof of [Hall and Horowitz \(2007\)](#), we define events

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{1J} = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}(n) = \left\{ \lambda_J \geq 2 \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}} \right\}.$$

On $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}$, Lemma [S1](#) entails $\tilde{\lambda}_j \geq \lambda_j/2$, for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Note that $n^{-1/2} \lambda_J^{-1} = O(n^{-1/2} J^\theta) = o(1)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, under the assumptions of Theorem [1](#). Thus, Lemma [S1](#) entails that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}$, it holds for the last two terms in [\(S.5\)](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_j^{-2} (\tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 &\leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2, \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} - \lambda_j^{-1})^2 \xi_{jk}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} \lambda_j - 1)^2 b_{jk}^2 \leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2 b_{jk}^2 \\ &\leq \text{const.} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho} = O_p(n^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.6})$$

We will show later that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 \\ &= O_p(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1}) + O_p(n^{-2} J^{2\theta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) + O_p(n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} (1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3})) \\ &\quad + O_p\left((1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2}\right) \\ &\quad + \begin{cases} O_p\left((1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) n^{-2} K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2\right), & \text{if } \varrho \leq \vartheta + 1, \\ O_p\left((1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3}\right), & \text{if } \varrho > \vartheta + 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.7})$$

For \tilde{A}_2 , we observe that $\|\tilde{A}_2\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \leq 3\|\tilde{A}_{21}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3\|\tilde{A}_{22}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3\|\tilde{A}_{23}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A}_{21} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes (\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \\ \tilde{A}_{22} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} (\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k) \otimes \phi_j, \\ \tilde{A}_{23} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} (\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k) \otimes (\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j).\end{aligned}$$

We note that (A6) and Lemma S1 entail

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 &\leq \text{const.} j^{2\theta+2} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2, \\ \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 &\leq \text{const.} k^{2\vartheta+2} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{S.8}$$

uniformly in j, k , which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{A}_{21}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 &\leq J \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} J \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} \right) \\ \|\tilde{A}_{22}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 &\leq K \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right), \\ \|\tilde{A}_{23}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 &\leq JK \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \\ &= O_p \left(n^{-2} JK \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|\tilde{A}_2\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} J \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} + n^{-1} K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right).\tag{S.9}$$

For A_3 , we observe that by (A8),

$$\|A_3\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} b_{jk}^2 + \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 + \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} b_{jk}^2 = O \left(J^{-2\rho+1} + K^{-2\varrho+1} \right).\tag{S.10}$$

Under (A9), combining (S.6), (S.7), (S.9) and (S.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 \\
 &= O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1} K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right) + O \left(J^{-2\rho+1} + K^{-2\varrho+1} \right) \\
 &+ O_p \left(n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} (1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) \right) + O_p \left(n^{-2} J^{2\theta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right) \\
 &+ \begin{cases} O_p \left((1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) n^{-2} K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \varrho \leq \vartheta + 1, \\ O_p \left((1 + n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \varrho > \vartheta + 1. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $n^{-1} J \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} = O(n^{-1} J^2 (J/\log J)^{2(\theta-\rho+1)}) = o(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1})$, since $\theta + 1 < \rho$ and $\theta \geq 1$, and that $n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3} / (n^{-2} J^{2\theta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3}) = n^{-1} J^{2\theta+2} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Also observe that $\sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \sim K^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+3} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta \leq 1\}} + K(K/\log K)^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 < \varrho-\vartheta < 3/2\}} + (\log K) \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta=3/2\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta > 3/2\}}$, whence $n^{-2} K^{4\theta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 / (n^{-1} K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2}) \sim n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+1} \cdot (\log K)^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, if $\varrho \leq \vartheta + 1$, and $n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3} / (n^{-1} K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2}) \leq \text{const.} n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+2} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, if $\varrho > \vartheta + 1$. Therefore, $\|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 = \alpha(n)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha(n) &= n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} + n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} + n^{-2} J^{2\theta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3} + J^{-2\rho+1} + K^{-2\varrho+1} + n^{-1} K \left(K^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+3} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta \leq 1\}} \right. \\
 &+ K(K/\log K)^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 < \varrho-\vartheta < 3/2\}} + (\log K) \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta=3/2\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta > 3/2\}} \Big) \\
 &+ n^{-1} K^{2\vartheta+3} \left(n^{-2} K^{4\theta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta \leq 1\}} + n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varrho-\vartheta > 1\}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

whence (25) follows. Furthermore, choosing $J \sim n^{1/(\theta+2\rho)}$, $K \sim \varkappa(n)$ with $\varkappa(n)$ as defined in Theorem 1, we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 = O_p \left(\max \left\{ n^{-(2\rho-1)/(\theta+2\rho)}, \varkappa(n)^{-(2\varrho-1)} \right\} \right).$$

Regarding (S.7), by the atomlessness of $\nu_{1\oplus}$, $\nu_{2\oplus}$, $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}$ and Proposition S1,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk} &= \langle \mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \mathbf{P} \tilde{\phi}_j, \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} - \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
 &= \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) \phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} (\mathbf{P} \tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
 &+ \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
 &+ \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} (\mathbf{P} \tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
 &+ \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
 &=: \tilde{I}_{jk1} + \tilde{I}_{jk2} + \tilde{I}_{jk3} + \tilde{I}_{jk4} + \tilde{I}_{jk5} + \tilde{I}_{jk6} + \tilde{I}_{jk7},
 \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 \leq 7 \sum_{l=1}^7 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jkl}^2.$$

For $\tilde{I}_{jk4}, \dots, \tilde{I}_{jk7}$, applying Lemma S1 and (S.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk4}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \\ &= O_p\left(n^{-2}J^{2\theta+1}K^{2\theta+3}\right), \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk5}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1\oplus}^2 \\ &= O_p\left(n^{-2}J^{4\theta+3}\right), \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk6}^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}(\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j)\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk3}^2\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2\right), \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk7}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1\oplus}^2 \\ &= O_p\left(n^{-3}J^{4\theta+3}K^{2\theta+3}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{S.11}$$

For \tilde{I}_{jk1} , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{jk1} &= \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2})\phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{S.12}$$

In conjunction with (A5) and the fact that $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent realizations of (ν_1, ν_2) , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{I}_{jk1}^2) &\leq \frac{2}{n} \text{var} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right) \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \text{const.} n^{-1} \lambda_j \varsigma_k, \end{aligned} \tag{S.13}$$

uniformly in j, k , whence we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk1}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right). \quad (\text{S.14})$$

For \tilde{I}_{jk2} , note that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ has at most $(n-1)$ non-zero eigenvalues, i.e., $\tilde{\lambda}_j = 0$ for all $j \geq n$. In conjunction with the atomlessness of $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and Proposition S1, we have

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\lambda}_j \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j \otimes \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\lambda}_j \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j \otimes \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j,$$

and $\{\tilde{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$. Hence, applying Lemma 5.1 of Hall and Horowitz (2007) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{jk2} &= \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}(\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\ &= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} + \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \\ &= \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(1)} + \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)} + \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(3)} + \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(4)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(1)} &:= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) \phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(3)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} \left((\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} - (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \right) \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) \phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(4)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) (\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}. \end{aligned}$$

We define events

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2J} = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2J}(n) = \left\{ (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2} \leq 2(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2}, \text{ for all } j, j' = 1, \dots, J \text{ s.t. } j \neq j' \right\}.$$

Note that by (A6),

$$|\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'}| \geq \begin{cases} |\lambda_j - \lambda_{2j}| \geq C_1 \sum_{l=j}^{2j-1} l^{-\theta-1} \geq C_2 j^{-\theta}, & \text{if } j' \geq 2j, \\ |\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_{2j'}| \geq C_2 j'^{-\theta}, & \text{if } j' \leq j/2, \\ C_1 \sum_{j \wedge j' \leq l < j \vee j'} l^{-\theta-1} \geq C_2 |j - j'| j^{-\theta-1}, & \text{if } j/2 < j' < j \text{ or } j < j' < 2j, \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.15})$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are constants that do not depend on j, j' . Hence, $|\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'}|^{-1} = O(J^{\theta+1})$, uniformly in distinct $j, j' = 1, \dots, J$, and in conjunction with Lemma S1, this implies that with

some $t_{j,j'} \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{(\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2} - (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2}}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2}} \right| &= \frac{2|\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'} + t_{j,j'}(\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)|^{-3} |\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j|}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'})^{-2}} \\ &= 2 \left| 1 + t_{j,j'} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'}} \right|^{-3} |\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| |\lambda_j - \lambda_{j'}|^{-1} \\ &= O_p \left(n^{-1/2} J^{\theta+1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in j, j' . Hence, under the assumptions of Theorem 1, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2J}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By (A8) and (S.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(1)})^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \leq \text{const.} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{-2\rho} \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \\ &= O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} \right) = o_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{S.16}$$

For $\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)}$, using similar arguments to (S.12), it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} n\mathbb{E}(\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)})^2 &\leq \text{const.} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \right)^2 \\ &= \text{const.} \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \sum_{j': j' \neq j} b_{j'k}^2 \lambda_{j'}^2 (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \\ &= \text{const.} \lambda_j \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^3 b_{j'k}^2 (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \\ &\leq \text{const.} \lambda_j k^{-2\varrho} \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^3 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (S.15), under (A6) and (A8), $\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^3 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(j^{2\theta} \sum_{j': j' \geq 2j} \lambda_{j'}^3 j'^{-2\rho} \right) + \left(j^{2\theta+2} \sum_{j': j' \neq j, j/2 < j' < 2j} \lambda_{j'}^3 j'^{-2\rho} |j - j'|^{-2} \right) + \left(\sum_{j': j' \leq j/2} \lambda_{j'}^3 j'^{2\theta-2\rho} \right) \\ &\leq \text{const.} \left(j^{2\theta-2\rho+1} + j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} + \max_{j': j' \leq j/2} j'^{2\theta-2\rho} \right) \leq \text{const.}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in j . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)})^2 \leq \text{const.} n^{-1} \lambda_j k^{-2\varrho},$$

and hence

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(2)})^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-1} k^{-2\varrho} \right) = O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right). \quad (\text{S.17})$$

For $\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(3)}$, on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2J}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(3)})^2 &\leq \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} |\xi_{j'k}| \left| (\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} - (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \right| \left| \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \right| \right]^2 \\ &\leq \text{const.} \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'} |b_{j'k}| \frac{|\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_{j'}|}{(\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^2} \left| \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \right| \right]^2 \\ &\leq \text{const.} k^{-2\varrho} \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} \frac{|\tilde{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_{j'}|^2}{(\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^4} \\ &\leq \text{const.} k^{-2\varrho} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^4 \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-4}. \end{aligned}$$

Under (A6), (S.15) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j': j' \geq 2j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-4} &\leq \text{const.} j^{4\theta} \sum_{j': j' \geq 2j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} \leq \text{const.} j^{4\theta-2\rho}, \\ \sum_{j': j' \leq j/2} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-4} &\leq \text{const.} \sum_{j': j' \leq j/2} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{4\theta-2\rho} \leq \text{const.} \max_{j': j' \leq j/2} j'^{4\theta-2\rho}, \\ \sum_{\substack{j': j' \neq j, \\ j/2 < j' < 2j}} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-4} &\leq \text{const.} j^{4\theta+4} \sum_{\substack{j': j' \neq j, \\ j/2 < j' < 2j}} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} |j - j'|^{-4} \leq \text{const.} j^{4\theta-2\rho+4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-4} \leq \text{const.} \left(1 + j^{4\theta-2\rho+4} \right),$$

whence

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(3)})^2 = O_p \left(n^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta} \left(1 + j^{4\theta-2\rho+4} \right) \right) = O_p \left(n^{-2} \left(J^{2\theta+1} + J^{6\theta-2\rho+5} \right) \right). \quad (\text{S.18})$$

For $\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(4)}$, on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2J}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(4)}| &\leq \text{const.} k^{-\varrho} \sum_{j': j' \neq j} j'^{-\rho} \lambda_{j'} |\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j|^{-1} \left| \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})(\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \right| \\ &\leq \text{const.} k^{-\varrho} \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}} \|\mathbf{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \sum_{j': j' \neq j} j'^{-\rho} \lambda_{j'} |\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j|^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where by (S.15), $\sum_{j': j' \neq j} j'^{-\rho} \lambda_{j'} |\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j|^{-1}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(j^\theta \sum_{j': j' \geq 2j} \lambda_{j'} j'^{-\rho} \right) + \left(j^{\theta+1} \sum_{j': j' \neq j, j/2 < j' < 2j} \lambda_{j'} j'^{-\rho} |j - j'|^{-1} \right) + \left(\sum_{j': j' \leq j/2} \lambda_{j'} j'^{\theta-\rho} \right) \\ & \leq \text{const.} \left(j^{\theta-\rho} + j^{\theta-\rho+1} + \max_{j': j' \leq j/2} j'^{\theta-\rho} \right) \leq \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk2}^{(4)})^2 = O_p \left(n^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{4\theta+2} \right) = O_p \left(n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} \right). \quad (\text{S.19})$$

Combining (S.16)–(S.19) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk2}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3} \right). \quad (\text{S.20})$$

For $\tilde{I}_{jk3} = \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} = \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(1)} + \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(2)} + \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(3)} + \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(4)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(1)} &:= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(2)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) \psi_k, \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(3)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} \left((\tilde{\varsigma}_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} - (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \right) \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) \psi_k, \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\ \tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(4)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} (\tilde{\varsigma}_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k), \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}. \end{aligned}$$

Define events

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{3K} = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{3K}(n) = \left\{ (\tilde{\varsigma}_k - \varsigma_{k'})^{-2} \leq 2(\varsigma_k - \varsigma_{k'})^{-2}, \text{ for all } k, k' = 1, \dots, K \text{ s.t. } k \neq k' \right\}.$$

Using similar arguments to the proof of (S.20), it can be shown that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{3K}) \rightarrow 1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

that on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{3K}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(1)})^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbb{P}\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(2)})^2 &= O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \varsigma_k \sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-2} \varsigma_{k'} \right) \\
 &= O_p \left(n^{-1} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(3)})^2 &= O_p \left(n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-4} \right) \\
 &= O_p \left(n^{-2} K + n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+4} \right) = O_p \left(n^{-2} K + n^{-2} K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\tilde{I}_{jk3}^{(4)})^2 &= O_p \left(n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta+2} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-\varrho} |\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k|^{-1} \right)^2 \right) \\
 &= \begin{cases} O_p \left(n^{-2} K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \geq -1, \\ O_p \left(n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{S.21}$$

Here, under (A7), similar arguments to (S.15) imply that $\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-2} \varsigma_{k'}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned}
 &k^{2\vartheta} \left(\sum_{k': k' \geq 2k} k'^{-2\varrho} \varsigma_{k'} \right) + k^{2\vartheta+2} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k, k/2 < k' < 2k} |k' - k|^{-2} k'^{-2\varrho} \varsigma_{k'} \right) + \left(\sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \varsigma_{k'} \right) \\
 &\leq \text{const.} \left(k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + \max_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \\
 &\leq \text{const.} \begin{cases} k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2}, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \geq 0, \\ k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + 1, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < 0, \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{S.22}$$

that $\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-4}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned}
 &k^{4\vartheta} \left(\sum_{k': k' \geq 2k} k'^{-2\varrho} \right) + k^{4\vartheta+4} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k, k/2 < k' < 2k} |k' - k|^{-4} k'^{-2\varrho} \right) + \left(\sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{4\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \\
 &\leq \text{const.} \begin{cases} k^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+4}, & \text{if } 2\vartheta - \varrho \geq -1/2, \\ k^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+4} + 1, & \text{if } 2\vartheta - \varrho < -1/2, \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

and that $\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-\varrho} |\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k|^{-1}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & k^\vartheta \left(\sum_{k': k' \geq 2k} k'^{-\varrho} \right) + k^{\vartheta+1} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k, k/2 < k' < 2k} |k' - k|^{-1} k'^{-\varrho} \right) + \left(\sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{\vartheta-\varrho} \right) \\ & \leq \text{const.} \begin{cases} k^{\vartheta-\varrho+1} + k^{\vartheta-\varrho+1} \log k, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \in [0, \infty) \cup \{-1\}, \\ k^{\vartheta-\varrho+1} \log k, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \in (-1, 0), \\ 1 + k^{\vartheta-\varrho+1} \log k, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \tilde{I}_{jk3}^2 &= O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right) \\ &+ \begin{cases} O_p \left(n^{-2} K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \geq -1, \\ O_p \left(n^{-2} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.23})$$

Combining (S.11), (S.14), (S.20) and (S.23) yields (S.7), which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. First note that for two distributions $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}$, if μ_2 is atomless, then $d_W^2(\text{Exp}_{\mu_1} g, \text{Exp}_{\mu_2} \text{P}_{\mu_1, \mu_2} g) = d_W^2(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_2(\mu), \mathbb{E}_\oplus(\nu_2 | \nu_1 = \mu)) \\ &= d_W^2 \left(\text{Exp}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \int_D \tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}(s), \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} [\mathbb{E}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_2 | \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1 = \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \mu)] \right) \\ &\leq 2d_W^2 \left(\text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \text{P}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}} \int_D \tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}(s), \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \int_D \beta(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) \right) \\ &\quad + 2d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}) \\ &= 2 \left\| \text{P}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}} \int_D \tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}(s) - \int_D \beta(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\nu_{1\oplus}(s) \right\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 2d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by (A4) and Proposition S1,

$$\text{P}_{\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}} \int_D \tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}(s) = \int_D \mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \mu(s) d\nu_{1\oplus}(s).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_2(\mu), \mathbb{E}_\oplus(\nu_2|\nu_1 = \mu)) \\
 & \leq 2 \left\| \int_D \mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) \text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu(s) d\nu_{1 \oplus}(s) - \int_D \beta(s, \cdot) \text{Log}_{\nu_1 \oplus} \mu(s) d\nu_{1 \oplus}(s) \right\|_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 + 2d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_{2 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus}) \\
 & \leq 4 \left\| \int_D [\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}(s, \cdot) - \beta(s, \cdot)] \text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu(s) d\nu_{1 \oplus}(s) \right\|_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 \\
 & \quad + 4 \left\| \int_D \beta(s, \cdot) [\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu(s) - \text{Log}_{\nu_1 \oplus} \mu(s)] d\nu_{1 \oplus}(s) \right\|_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 + 2d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_{2 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus}) \\
 & \leq 4 \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}^2 \|\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} - \beta\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus} \times \nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 + 4 \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu - \text{Log}_{\nu_1 \oplus} \mu\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}^2 \|\beta\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus} \times \nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 + 2d_W^2(\tilde{\nu}_{2 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}^2 \leq 2 \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu - \text{Log}_{\nu_1 \oplus} \mu\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}^2 + 2d_W^2(\nu_{1 \oplus}, \mu), \\
 & \|\text{PLog}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \oplus} \mu - \text{Log}_{\nu_1 \oplus} \mu\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}^2 = d_W^2(\nu_{1 \oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{1 \oplus}) = O_p(n^{-1}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the latter follows from (S.3). Analogously, $d_W^2(\nu_{2 \oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2 \oplus}) = O_p(n^{-1})$. By (A8), $\|\beta\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus} \times \nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 < \infty$. In conjunction with the fact that $\|\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} - \beta\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus} \times \nu_{2 \oplus}}^2 = \|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\nu}_{1 \oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2 \oplus}), (\nu_{1 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus}}}^2$, (28) follows from Theorem 1. \square

Next, we move on to the case where the distributions ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are not fully observed and hence need to be estimated from the corresponding samples $\{X_{il}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\nu_{1i}}}$ and $\{Y_{il}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\nu_{2i}}}$ generated from ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} , respectively. For the proof of Theorem 2, we need to study the asymptotic properties of the covariance operators, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$.

Lemma S2. Assume (A2)–(A5) and (A11). Furthermore, assume that the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\{\varsigma_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ are distinct, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1}), \quad \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1}), \\
 & \text{and } \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1 \oplus}, \nu_{2 \oplus}}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{j \geq 1} |\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| \leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}}, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} |\hat{\varsigma}_k - \varsigma_k| \leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}}, \\
 & \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1 \oplus}} \leq 2\sqrt{2} \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1 \oplus}}} / \min_{1 \leq j' \leq j} \{\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_{j'+1}\}, \text{ for all } j \geq 1, \\
 & \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2 \oplus}} \leq 2\sqrt{2} \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{2 \oplus}}} / \min_{1 \leq k' \leq k} \{\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_{k'+1}\}, \text{ for all } k \geq 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We note that by (6), (23) and (A11),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{PLog}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
&\leq 3\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) + 3\mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + 3\mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (6), (19) and (21),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}), \\
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{F}_{1i}^{-1}(p) - F_{1i}^{-1}(p) \right) \right]^2 dp \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, in conjunction with (A2)–(A3) and (S.3), this entails

$$\mathbb{E} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{PLog}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) = O(\tau_m + n^{-1}), \quad (\text{S.24})$$

whence $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{PLog}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1})$. Using similar arguments to the proof of Lemma S1, it can be shown that $\|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1})$. Results for $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2}$ can be shown analogously. By (A4) and the atomlessness of $\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ following from (A11), Proposition S1 implies that $\{\hat{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\{\text{P}\hat{\phi}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$, for which the results follow from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 of Bosq (2000). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Defining

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}_1 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J (\hat{b}_{jk} - b_{jk}) \text{P}\hat{\psi}_k \otimes \text{P}\hat{\phi}_j, \\
\hat{A}_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \left(\text{P}\hat{\psi}_k \otimes \text{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \psi_k \otimes \phi_j \right),
\end{aligned}$$

we observe that by (S.1),

$$\left\| \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 \leq 3\|\hat{A}_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3\|\hat{A}_2\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2 + 3\|A_3\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2,$$

with A_3 as per (S.4).

In analogy to the proof of Theorem 1, we define events

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{1J} = \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}(n) = \left\{ \lambda_J \geq 2 \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1 \oplus}} \right\}.$$

On $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}$, Lemma S2 entails $\widehat{\lambda}_j \geq \lambda_j/2$, for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Note that under the assumptions of Theorem 2, $(\tau_m + n^{-1})\lambda_J^{-2} = o(1)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, Lemma S2 entails that $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Following similar arguments to (S.5) and (S.6), it holds on $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{1J}$ that

$$\|\widehat{A}_1\|_{\nu_1 \oplus \times \nu_2 \oplus}^2 \leq 8 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 + 8 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2 b_{jk}^2, \quad (\text{S.25})$$

where

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2 b_{jk}^2 \leq \text{const.} \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1 \oplus}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho} = o_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) J^{\theta+1} \right). \quad (\text{S.26})$$

We will show later that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 \\ &= O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left(\tau_m J^{2\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left(\tau_m J^{\theta+1} K \right) \\ &+ O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^K \left(k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + \sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \right) \\ &+ O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{4\theta+3} [1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] \right) + O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{2\theta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right) \\ &+ \begin{cases} O_p \left([1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] (\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \varrho \leq \vartheta + 1, \\ O_p \left([1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] (\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \varrho > \vartheta + 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.27})$$

For \widehat{A}_2 , we note that (A6) and Lemma S2 entail

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1 \oplus}^2 &\leq \text{const.} j^{2\theta+2} \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1 \oplus}}^2, \\ \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2 \oplus}^2 &\leq \text{const.} k^{2\theta+2} \|\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_2 \oplus}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.28})$$

uniformly in j, k , which implies

$$\|\widehat{A}_2\|_{\nu_1 \oplus \times \nu_2 \oplus}^2 = O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) J \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2} + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\theta-2\varrho+2} \right). \quad (\text{S.29})$$

Combining (S.26), (S.27), (S.29) and (S.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{P}_{(\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}), (\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus})} \widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \nu_{2\oplus}}}^2 \\
&= O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{\vartheta+1} \right) + O_p \left(\tau_m J^{2\vartheta+1} \right) + O_p \left(\tau_m J^{\vartheta+1} K \right) + O \left(J^{-2\rho+1} + K^{-2\varrho+1} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{4\vartheta+3} [1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] \right) + O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{2\vartheta+1} K^{2\vartheta+3} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) K \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right) \\
&\quad + \begin{cases} O_p \left([1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] (\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \varrho \leq \vartheta + 1, \\ O_p \left([1 + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) K^{2\vartheta+3}] (\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \varrho > \vartheta + 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

whence (27) follows with τ_m satisfying (A10).

Regarding (S.27), by the atomlessness of $\nu_{1\oplus}$, $\nu_{2\oplus}$, $\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ and $\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}$ and Proposition S1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk} &= \langle \mathcal{P} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \mathbf{P} \widehat{\phi}_j, \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} - \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
&= \langle (\mathcal{P} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) \phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
&\quad + \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle (\mathcal{P} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
&\quad + \langle (\mathcal{P} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} + \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
&\quad + \langle (\mathcal{P} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\
&=: \widehat{I}_{jk1} + \widehat{I}_{jk2} + \widehat{I}_{jk3} + \widehat{I}_{jk4} + \widehat{I}_{jk5} + \widehat{I}_{jk6} + \widehat{I}_{jk7},
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{\xi}_{jk} - \xi_{jk})^2 \leq 7 \sum_{l=1}^7 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \widehat{I}_{jkl}^2.$$

For $\hat{I}_{jk4}, \dots, \hat{I}_{jk7}$, applying Lemma S2 and (S.28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk4}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \\
 &= O_p\left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2})J^{2\theta+1}K^{2\vartheta+3}\right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk5}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1\oplus}^2 \\
 &= O_p\left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2})J^{4\theta+3}\right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk6}^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}(\mathbf{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j)\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \\
 &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk3}^2\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2\right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk7}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1\oplus, \nu_2\oplus}}^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_2\oplus}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|\mathbf{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_1\oplus}^2 \\
 &= O_p\left((\tau_m^3 + n^{-3})J^{4\theta+3}K^{2\vartheta+3}\right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{S.30}$$

For \hat{I}_{jk1} , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{I}_{jk1} &= \langle (\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1\nu_2})\phi_j, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \hat{\nu}_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \hat{\nu}_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right) \\
 &\quad - \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right) \\
 &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_1\oplus} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_1\oplus} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_2\oplus} \nu_2, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_2\oplus} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

By (A2) and (A5),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \right) \right]^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \right)^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{3}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right\} \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right\} \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2i} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \text{const.} \left(\varsigma_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbb{E} d_W^4(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}) \right\}^{1/2} + \lambda_j \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbb{E} d_W^4(\hat{\nu}_{2i}, \nu_{2i}) \right\}^{1/2} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbb{E} d_W^4(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} d_W^4(\hat{\nu}_{2i}, \nu_{2i}) \right\}^{1/2} \\
& = O \left((\varsigma_k + \lambda_j) \tau_m + \tau_m^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} - \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \right)^2 \\
& \leq 3 \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 3 \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 3 \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{2\oplus} - \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right) \\
& \leq 3 \mathbb{E} \left(d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right) + 3 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}) \right) \\
& \quad + 3 \mathbb{E} \left(d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}) d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{2\oplus}, \tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus}) \right) \\
& \leq \frac{3}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{2i}, \nu_{2i}) \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{3}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{1i}, \nu_{1i}) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\hat{\nu}_{2i}, \nu_{2i}) \right) \right] \\
& = O \left((\varsigma_k + \lambda_j) \tau_m + \tau_m^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in j, k . In conjunction with (S.12) and (S.13), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(\widehat{I}_{jk1}^2) = O\left((s_k + \lambda_j)\tau_m + \tau_m^2 + n^{-1}\lambda_j s_k\right), \quad (\text{S.31})$$

uniformly in j, k , which entails

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \widehat{I}_{jk1}^2 = O_p\left(\tau_m J^{2\theta+1} + \tau_m J^{\theta+1} K + \tau_m^2 J^{2\theta+1} K + n^{-1} J^{\theta+1}\right). \quad (\text{S.32})$$

For \widehat{I}_{jk2} , analogous to the discussion of I_{jk2} in the proof of Theorem 1, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{I}_{jk2} &= \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2}(\mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \\ &= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} + \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\widehat{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \\ &= \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(1)} + \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(2)} + \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(3)} + \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(4)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(1)} &:= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(2)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(3)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} \left((\widehat{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} - (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \right) \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}, \\ \widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(4)} &:= \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{j'k} (\widehat{\lambda}_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})(\mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j), \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A8) and (S.28),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(1)})^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \leq \text{const.} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{-2\rho} \|\mathbf{P}\widehat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \\ &= O_p\left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\rho+2}\right) = o_p\left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) J^{\theta+1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.33})$$

For $\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(2)}$, using similar arguments to the proof of (S.31), it can be shown that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1})\phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 = O\left((\lambda_j + \lambda_{j'})\tau_m + \tau_m^2 + n^{-1}\lambda_j \lambda_{j'}\right),$$

uniformly in j, j' , and hence that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(2)})^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'} b_{j'k}^2 (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) \phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \right]^2 \\
&\leq \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'} b_{j'k}^2 (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \right] \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'} \mathbb{E} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1}) \phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 \right] \\
&\leq \text{const.} k^{-2\varrho} \left(\tau_m + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) \lambda_j \right) \left[\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'} j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \right] \\
&\leq \text{const.} k^{-2\varrho} \left(\tau_m + (\tau_m + n^{-1}) \lambda_j \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (S.15) and similar arguments to (S.22). This implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(2)})^2 = O_p \left(\tau_m J^{2\theta+1} + n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right). \quad (\text{S.34})$$

For $\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(3)}$ and $\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(4)}$, following similar arguments as in the proof of (S.18) and (S.19), it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(3)})^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) (J^{2\theta+1} + J^{6\theta-2\rho+5}) \right), \\
\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\widehat{I}_{jk2}^{(4)})^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{4\theta+3} \right).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.35})$$

Combining (S.33)–(S.35) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \widehat{I}_{jk2}^2 = O_p \left(\tau_m J^{2\theta+1} + n^{-1} J^{\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) J^{4\theta+3} \right). \quad (\text{S.36})$$

For $\widehat{I}_{jk3} = \langle \mathcal{C}_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \phi_j, \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}} = \widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(1)} + \widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(2)} + \widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(3)} + \widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(4)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(1)} &:= \xi_{jk} \langle \mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\
\widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(2)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) \psi_k, \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\
\widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(3)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} \left((\widehat{\varsigma}_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} - (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \right) \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) \psi_k, \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}, \\
\widehat{I}_{jk3}^{(4)} &:= \sum_{k': k' \neq k} \xi_{jk'} (\widehat{\varsigma}_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_2} - \mathcal{C}_{\nu_2}) (\mathbf{P} \widehat{\psi}_k - \psi_k), \psi_{k'} \rangle_{\nu_{2\oplus}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using similar arguments as in the proof of (S.23), it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\hat{I}_{jk3}^{(1)})^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}^2 \|\mathbb{P}\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k\|_{\nu_{2\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\hat{I}_{jk3}^{(2)})^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-2} \right) \\
 &= O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^K \left(k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + \sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\hat{I}_{jk3}^{(3)})^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-4} \right) \\
 &= O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K + (\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} \right), \\
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} (\hat{I}_{jk3}^{(4)})^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) \sum_{k=1}^K k^{2\vartheta+2} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-\varrho} |\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k|^{-1} \right)^2 \right) \\
 &= \begin{cases} O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \geq -1, \\ O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, similar arguments to (S.15) imply that $\sum_{k': k' \neq k} k'^{-2\varrho} (\varsigma_{k'} - \varsigma_k)^{-2}$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned}
 &k^{2\vartheta} \left(\sum_{k': k' \geq 2k} k'^{-2\varrho} \right) + k^{2\vartheta+2} \left(\sum_{k': k' \neq k, k/2 < k' < 2k} |k' - k|^{-2} k'^{-2\varrho} \right) + \left(\sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \\
 &\leq \text{const.} \left(k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + \sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \\
 &\leq \text{const.} \begin{cases} k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2}, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho > -1/2, \\ k, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \in (-1, -1/2], \\ 1 + \log k, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho = -1, \\ 1, & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \hat{I}_{jk3}^2 &= O_p \left((\tau_m + n^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^K \left(k^{2\vartheta-2\varrho+2} + \sum_{k': k' \leq k/2} k'^{2\vartheta-2\varrho} \right) \right) \\
 &\quad + \begin{cases} O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{4\vartheta-2\varrho+5} (\log K)^2 \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho \geq -1, \\ O_p \left((\tau_m^2 + n^{-2}) K^{2\vartheta+3} \right), & \text{if } \vartheta - \varrho < -1. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{S.37}$$

Combining (S.30), (S.32), (S.36) and (S.37) yields (S.27), which completes the proof. \square

We omit the proof of Corollary 2, since it is analogous to that of Corollary 1.

S.1.3 Proofs for Section 4

In this section, analogous to the definitions in Section S.1.2, for random variables X_n and a sequence of positive constants c_n , we will write $X_n = O_p(c_n)$ if

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(|X_n| > Mc_n) = 0,$$

and $X_n = o_p(c_n)$ if there exists $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(|X_n| > M_0 c_n) = 0.$$

For a sequence of deterministic quantities $a_n = a_n(\mathcal{G})$, we will write $a_n = O(c_n)$ if

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} c_n^{-1} \sup_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{G}} |a_n(\mathcal{G})| < \infty.$$

We denote $P_{\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus}} g$ and $P_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus}} g$ by Pg , for g in $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}}^2$, respectively; we define $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 := \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0 := \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \hat{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$, $\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 := \mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$, $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1 := \mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \hat{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1$,

$$\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} := \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{b}_{jl} P\tilde{\phi}_l \otimes P\tilde{\phi}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta} := \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{b}_{jl} P\hat{\phi}_l \otimes P\hat{\phi}_j.$$

By the third statement in Proposition S1, under (B3), $\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}$ is the kernel of $\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma}$; under (B3) and (A11), $\mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta}$ is the kernel of $\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \hat{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 &= \int_D \int_D [\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}(s, t) - \beta(s, t)]^2 d\mu_{\oplus}(s) d\mu_{\oplus}(t) \\ \|\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{\mu}_{\oplus}, \hat{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 &= \int_D \int_D [\mathcal{Q}\hat{\beta}(s, t) - \beta(s, t)]^2 d\mu_{\oplus}(s) d\mu_{\oplus}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{S.38}$$

Thus, for the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4, we will focus on the right hand sides in (S.38). To this end, we need to study the asymptotic properties of the estimators of the covariance operators, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$ when the distributions μ_i are fully observed, and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1$ when only samples of observations drawn from the μ_i are available. We use the convention that $\langle P\tilde{\phi}_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \geq 0$ and $\langle P\hat{\phi}_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \geq 0$ to determine the signs of the estimated eigenfunctions, $\tilde{\phi}_j$ and $\hat{\phi}_j$ where choice of the signs may impact the validity of the results.

We first focus on the case where μ_i are fully observed.

Lemma S3. Assume (B1)–(B4). Furthermore, assume that the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are distinct.

Then

$$\|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 - \mathcal{C}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 = O_p(n^{-1}).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j \geq 1} |\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}, \\ \|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\mu_{\oplus}} &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}} / \min_{1 \leq j' \leq j} \{\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_{j'+1}\}, \text{ for all } j \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We note that due to stationarity, (B1) and (B4),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \right) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_1\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(d_W^2(\mu_1, \mu_{\oplus}) \right) < \infty, \\ \mathbb{E} \left(\|\text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i \right\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \right) = O(n^{-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{S.39}$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i \otimes \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i - \mathcal{C}_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 \right) = O(n^{-1}), \tag{S.40}$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_{i+1} \otimes \text{Log}_{\mu_{\oplus}} \mu_i - \mathcal{C}_1 \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}}}^2 \right) = O(n^{-1}), \tag{S.41}$$

where (S.39), (S.40) and (S.41) follow from Theorems 3.7, 4.1 and 4.7 of Bosq (2000), respectively. Then the proof follows arguments similar to those in Lemma S1. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof follows similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1. Here we just discuss some of the differences due to the serial dependence.

Regarding the counterpart of (S.14),

$$\sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 - \mathcal{C}_1) \phi_j, \phi_l \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 - \mathcal{C}_1) \phi_j\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 = O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{2\theta+1} \right);$$

regarding the counterpart of (S.17), it can be shown similarly to (S.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \left(\sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{jl} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_j, \phi_{j'} \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \right)^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_j\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \xi_{jl}^2 (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \\
& \leq \text{const.} \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_j\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \sum_{j': j' \neq j} \lambda_{j'}^2 j'^{-2\rho} (\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_j)^{-2} \\
& = O_p \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J j^{4\theta-2\rho+2} \right) = o_p \left(n^{-1} J^{2\theta+1} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

regarding the counterpart of the second term in (S.21),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j^{-2} \left(\sum_{l': l' \neq l} \xi_{jl'} (\lambda_{l'} - \lambda_l)^{-1} \langle (\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_l, \phi_{l'} \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \right)^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{l=1}^J \sum_{j=1}^J \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_l\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \sum_{l': l' \neq l} b_{jl'}^2 (\lambda_{l'} - \lambda_l)^{-2} \\
& \leq \text{const.} \sum_{l=1}^J \|(\mathcal{P}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0) \phi_l\|_{\mu_{\oplus}}^2 \sum_{l': l' \neq l} l'^{-2\varrho} (\lambda_{l'} - \lambda_l)^{-2} \\
& \leq \text{const.} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^J l^{2\theta-2\varrho+2} \right) = o_p \left(n^{-1} J^{2\theta+1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, under the assumptions of Theorem 3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{P}_{(\tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}, \tilde{\mu}_{\oplus}), (\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus})} \tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_{\oplus}, \mu_{\oplus}}}^2 &= O_p \left(n^{-1} J^{2\theta+1} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1} J \sum_{j=1}^J j^{2\theta-2\varrho+2} \right) + O \left(J^{1-2\rho} + J^{1-2\varrho} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(n^{-2} J^{4\theta+4} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-3} J^{6\theta+6} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we move on to the case where the distributions μ_i are not fully observed and hence need to be estimated from the corresponding samples of measurements drawn from μ_i . Again, we first obtain the asymptotic properties of the estimates of the autocovariance operators, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1$.

Lemma S4. Assume (A2), (A11), (B1), (B3), (B4) and (B8). Furthermore, assume that the

eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are distinct. Then

$$\|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_\oplus}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1 - \mathcal{C}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_\oplus}}^2 = O_p(\tau_m + n^{-1}).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j \geq 1} |\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| &\leq \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_\oplus}}, \\ \|\mathcal{P}\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|_{\mu_\oplus} &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0 - \mathcal{C}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu_\oplus}} / \min_{1 \leq j' \leq j} \{\lambda_{j'} - \lambda_{j'+1}\}, \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma S4 is analogous to the proof of Lemma S2 and the proof of Theorem 4 is similar to the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 and therefore there is no need for further details. The same applies to the proofs of Corollaries 3 and 4, which are analogous to the proof of Corollary 1.

S.2 Estimation for Distribution-to-Scalar Regression

For the distribution-to-scalar regression as per (15) in Section 2.3, suppose $\{(\nu_{1i}, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are n independent realizations of (ν_1, Y) . When ν_{1i} are fully observed, the regression coefficient function β_1 can be estimated by

$$\tilde{\beta}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{\lambda}_j^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle Y_i \text{Log}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \tilde{\phi}_j \rangle_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\phi}_j,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ and $\tilde{\phi}_j$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ as defined in Section 3.2. Similar to the distribution-to-distribution regression case, given a constant $C > 1$, we assume

(A1') With probability equal to 1, the random distributions ν_1 are atomless.

(A2') $\mathbb{E}(\|\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^4) < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}(\langle \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1, \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^4) \leq C\lambda_j^2$, for all $j \geq 1$.

(A3') For $j \geq 1$, $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} \geq C^{-1}j^{-\theta-1}$, where $\theta \geq 1$ is a constant.

(A4') For $j \geq 1$, $|\lambda_j^{-1} \langle \mathbb{E}(Y \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_1), \phi_j \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}}| \leq Cj^{-\rho}$, where $\rho > \theta + 1$ is a constant.

(A5') $n^{-1}J^{2\theta+2} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}'(C, \theta, \rho)$ denote the set of distributions \mathcal{F} of (ν_1, Y) that satisfy (A1')–(A4').

Theorem S1. *If (A1')–(A5') hold, then*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{F}'} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'} \left(\left\| \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_1 \right\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 > M \max \left\{ n^{-1}J^{\theta+1}, n^{-2}J^{4\theta+3}, J^{-2\rho+1} \right\} \right) = 0.$$

Choosing $J \sim n^{1/(\theta+2\rho)}$, we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{F}'} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'} \left(\left\| \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} \tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_1 \right\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 > Mn^{-(2\rho-1)/(\theta+2\rho)} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{S.42})$$

As per (S.42), the rate of convergence of $\tilde{\beta}_1$ matches the minimax rate of the function-to-scalar linear regression based on fully observed functions developed by Hall and Horowitz (2007).

When ν_{1i} are not fully observed but rather only samples of measurements $\{X_{il}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\nu_{1i}}}$ drawn from ν_{1i} are available, an estimate of the regression coefficient function β_1 is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\lambda}_j^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle Y_i \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}, \hat{\phi}_j \rangle_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\phi}_j, \quad (\text{S.43})$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_j$ and $\hat{\phi}_j$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\nu_1}$ as defined in Section 3.2. Furthermore, we assume

(A6') There exists a sequence $m = m(n)$ such that $\min\{m_{\nu_{1i}} : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \geq m$ and that $m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(A7') For τ_m in (A2), $\tau_m \leq Cn^{-1}J^{-\theta}$, for all n .

Then the data-based estimator $\hat{\beta}$ is found to achieve the same rate as the estimator $\tilde{\beta}$ based on fully observed distributions as shown in Theorem S1.

Theorem S2. If (A2), (A11) and (A1')–(A7') hold, then

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{F}'} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'} \left(\left\| \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1 \right\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 > M \max \left\{ n^{-1} J^{\theta+1}, n^{-2} J^{4\theta+3}, J^{-2\rho+1} \right\} \right) = 0.$$

Choosing $J \sim n^{1/(\theta+2\rho)}$, we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{F}'} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'} \left(\left\| \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}, \nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1 \right\|_{\nu_{1\oplus}}^2 > M n^{-(2\rho-1)/(\theta+2\rho)} \right) = 0.$$

Proofs of Theorems S1 and S2 are analogous to those of Theorem 1 and S2 and are therefore omitted.

S.3 An Example for Explicit Construction of the Autoregressive Model

We consider $D = [0, 1]$ and μ_{\oplus} with bounded density $R_{\mu_{\oplus}} := \sup_{x \in D} f_{\mu_{\oplus}}(x) < \infty$, where we denote the density and cdf of μ_{\oplus} by $f_{\mu_{\oplus}}$ and $F_{\mu_{\oplus}}$, respectively. We set

$$\beta = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{jl} (\varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}) \otimes (\varphi_j \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}), \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_i = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} E_{il} \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}.$$

Here, φ_j are basis functions as per (36),

$$b_{kl} = p \frac{j^{-a_1+1} l^{-a_2-1}}{\varpi(a_2)},$$

$$E_{il} \sim \text{Unif}(-e_l, e_l), \quad \text{with } e_l = (1-p) \frac{l^{-a_2-1} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{2\sqrt{2}\pi R_{\mu_\oplus} \varpi(a_2)^2},$$

where $a_1 > 3/2$ and $a_2 > 1$ are constants, and $\varpi(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-s}$. Define

$$\text{Log}_{\mu_\oplus} \mu_i = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We will show in the following that $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary process taking values in \mathcal{W} which satisfies the proposed model in (29).

For this, it suffices to show that $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}) \in \text{Log}_{\mu_\oplus} \mathcal{W}$ with probability 1 and that (B1) holds. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\varepsilon_{i-1}) &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 l} E_{i-1, j_1} \right) \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_\oplus}, \\ \Gamma^2(\varepsilon_{i-2}) &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} b_{j_2 l} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} E_{i-2, j_1} \right) \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_\oplus}, \\ &\vdots \\ \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}) &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} E_{i-r, j_1} \right) \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_\oplus}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[E_{il} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} E_{i-r, j_1} \right) \right] \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_\oplus}.$$

To show $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}) \in \text{Log}_{\mu_\oplus} \mathcal{W}$ with probability 1, we will show that

$$\sup_{t \in D} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r})(t) \right| \leq 1. \quad (\text{S.44})$$

Since $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\varphi'_l(t)| = 2\sqrt{2}\pi l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{t \in D} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} |(\Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}))'(t)| \\
& \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[e_l + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} e_{j_1} \right) \right] 2\sqrt{2}\pi l R_{\mu_{\oplus}} \\
& = (1-p) \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{l^{-a_2} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} \frac{j_1^{-a_2-1} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} l \right) \right] \\
& = (1-p) \left[\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} + \frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} j_1^{-a_2-1} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} j_1^{-a_2-1} = \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} p \frac{j_1^{-a_1-a_2} j_2^{-a_2-1}}{\varpi(a_2)} = j_2^{-a_2-1} \frac{p \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)}, \\
& \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} b_{j_2 j_3} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} j_1^{-a_2-1} = \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} b_{j_2 j_3} j_2^{-a_2-1} \frac{p \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} = j_3^{-a_2-1} \frac{p^2 \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^2}{\varpi(a_2)^2}, \\
& \vdots \\
& \sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} j_1^{-a_2-1} = l^{-a_2-1} \frac{p^r \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-p) \left[\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} + \frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} j_1^{-a_2-1} \right) \right] \\
& = (1-p) \left[\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} + \frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l^{-a_2} \frac{p^r \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r} \right] \\
& = (1-p) \left[\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} + \frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)^2} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \varpi(a_2) \frac{p^r \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r} \right] \\
& = (1-p) \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{p^{r-1} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r} = (1-p) \frac{\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)}}{1 - \frac{p \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)}} = \frac{(1-p) \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2) - p \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (\Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}))'$ uniformly converges and hence

$$\sup_{t \in D} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r})(t) \right| = \sup_{t \in D} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} |(\Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}))'(t)| \leq \frac{(1-p) \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2) - p \varpi(a_1 + a_2)}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1-p)\varpi(a_1+a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)-p\varpi(a_1+a_2)} \leq 1 &\Leftrightarrow (1-p)\varpi(a_1+a_2) \leq \varpi(a_2) - p\varpi(a_1+a_2) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \varpi(a_1+a_2) \leq \varpi(a_2), \end{aligned}$$

whence (S.44) follows. Similarly, it can be shown that $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} |\Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r})|$ uniformly converges. Applying the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i+1-r}) = \Gamma \left(\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \Gamma^{r-1}(\varepsilon_{i+1-r}) \right) + \varepsilon_{i+1} = \Gamma \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^r(\varepsilon_{i-r}) \right) + \varepsilon_{i+1},$$

whence model (29) holds.

We also note that the stationarity condition (B1) holds. In fact, for any $g \in T_{\mu_{\oplus}}$ such that $\|g\|_{\mu_{\oplus}} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma g &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 l} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}} \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}, \\ \Gamma^2 g &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} b_{j_2 l} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}} \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}, \\ &\vdots \\ \Gamma^r g &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}} \rangle_{\mu_{\oplus}} \varphi_l \circ F_{\mu_{\oplus}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Gamma^r g\|_{\mu_\oplus}^2 \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} b_{j_r l} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} b_{j_{r-1} j_r} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} b_{j_1 j_2} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r} \sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} j_r^{-a_1+1} l^{-a_2-1} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} j_{r-1}^{-a_1+1} j_r^{-a_2-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} j_1^{-a_1+1} j_2^{-a_2-1} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p^r}{\varpi(a_2)^r} l^{-a_2-1} \sum_{j_r=1}^{\infty} j_r^{-a_1-a_2} \sum_{j_{r-1}=1}^{\infty} j_{r-1}^{-a_1-a_2} \cdots \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} j_2^{-a_1-a_2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} j_1^{-a_1+1} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p^r \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^{r-1}}{\varpi(a_2)^r} l^{-a_2-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} j_1^{-a_1+1} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{p^{2r} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^{2r-2}}{\varpi(a_2)^{2r}} \varpi(2a_2 + 2) \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} j_1^{-a_1+1} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{p^{2r} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^{2r-2}}{\varpi(a_2)^{2r}} \varpi(2a_2 + 2) \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} j_1^{-2a_1+2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \langle g, \varphi_{j_1} \circ F_{\mu_\oplus} \rangle_{\mu_\oplus}^2 \\
&= \frac{p^{2r} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^{2r-2}}{\varpi(a_2)^{2r}} \varpi(2a_2 + 2) \varpi(2a_1 - 2) \|g\|_{\mu_\oplus}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\Gamma^r\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\oplus}^2} < 1$ if

$$\frac{p^{2r} \varpi(a_1 + a_2)^{2r-2}}{\varpi(a_2)^{2r}} \varpi(2a_2 + 2) \varpi(2a_1 - 2) < 1,$$

i.e.,

$$p \frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)}{\varpi(a_2)} < \left[\frac{\varpi(a_1 + a_2)^2}{\varpi(2a_2 + 2) \varpi(2a_1 - 2)} \right]^{1/(2r)}. \quad (\text{S.45})$$

Note that $p\varpi(a_1 + a_2)/\varpi(a_2) < 1$ and that by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, $\varpi(a_1 + a_2)^2 \leq \varpi(2a_2 + 2)\varpi(2a_1 - 2)$, whence the right hand side of (S.45) $\uparrow 1$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, there always exists $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that (S.45) holds.

S.4 Implementation

S.4.1 Tuning Parameter Selection

Choosing J and K for the Independent Case

The following data-based method for choosing the numbers of predictor and response FPCs J and K , respectively, as defined in (22), when one has an i.i.d. sample of distributions $\{\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$, was found to be adequate in practical applications. We first choose the number of FPCs K for the logarithms of the response distributions $\text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \nu_{2i}$, by applying either leave-one-curve-out cross-validation or thresholding according to cumulative fraction of variance explained (FVE). For cross-validation, the objective function to be minimized is the discrepancy between predicted and observed trajectories, i.e.,

$$K = \underset{K'}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{2i} - \sum_{k=1}^{K'} \langle \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{2i}, \widehat{\psi}_{k,-i} \rangle_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\psi}_{k,-i} \right\|_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}^2,$$

where $\{\widehat{\psi}_{k,-i}\}_{k \geq 1}$ are the estimated eigenfunctions from the functional principal component analysis (FPCA) of the i th-curve-left-out sample $\{\text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{2i'}\}_{i' \neq i}$. For the choice by FVE, K is chosen such that at least $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ of the variance is explained by the first K FPCs, where users need to specify α , with the common choice $\alpha = 0.05$.

Now turning to the choice of J , we use leave-one-curve-out cross-validation by minimizing the difference between the curves constructed with FPCs predicted by linear regression and the observed trajectories:

$$J = \underset{J'}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{2i} - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{J'} \widehat{b}_{jk,-i} \langle \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{1i}, \widehat{\phi}_{j,-i} \rangle_{\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \widehat{\psi}_{k,-i} \right\|_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}^2,$$

where $\widehat{b}_{jk,-i} = \widehat{\lambda}_{j,-i}^{-1} \widehat{\xi}_{jk,-i}$ with $\widehat{\xi}_{jk,-i} = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i' \neq i} \langle \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{1i'}, \widehat{\phi}_{j,-i} \rangle_{\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \cdot \langle \text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{2i'}, \widehat{\psi}_{k,-i} \rangle_{\widehat{\nu}_{2\oplus}}$, and $\{\widehat{\lambda}_{j,-i}\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\widehat{\phi}_{j,-i}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are the estimated eigenvalues and eigenfunctions from the FPCA of the i th-curve-left-out sample $\{\text{Log}_{\widehat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \widehat{\nu}_{1i'}\}_{i' \neq i}$, respectively.

We mention that in practical implementations we replace leave-one-curve-out cross validation by 5-fold cross-validation when $n > 30$.

Choosing J for Distribution-Valued Time Series

Here, we use a cross-validation approach proposed by Bergmeir et al. (2018) to select the number of FPCs J as defined in (33) for the time series case. Note that there is no second truncation parameter K . Following Bergmeir et al. (2018), we first divide the observed time series into a training set and a testing set, and then apply k -fold cross validation on the training set to choose

the number of FPCs J ; secondly, the regression coefficient function β will be estimated on the whole training set with the optimal J ; lastly, the estimate of β will be applied on the testing set to evaluate the performance of out-of-sample prediction.

S.4.2 Boundary Projection

We discuss the independent scenario only; the time series case is analogous. If (35) happens, we update the fit by a projection onto the boundary of $\text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$ along the line segment connecting the origin 0 and the original fit $\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i})$. Specifically, we multiply the original estimate $\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i})$ by a constant η_i such that

$$\eta_i = \max\{\eta \in [0, 1]: \eta \hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}) + \text{id is non-decreasing}\}. \quad (\text{S.46})$$

Note that $\eta_i = 1$ when $\hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i}) \in \text{Log}_{\nu_{2\oplus}} \mathcal{W}$. In our implementation, the fitted logarithmic response is then given by $\eta_i \hat{\Gamma}(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

S.5 Additional Simulations

S.5.1 Illustration of Asymptotic Results in Theorem 1

Regardless of the distribution estimation method, we consider the case where distributions are fully observed. To illustrate the asymptotic results in Theorem 1, we generate data as follows such that we can derive the decay rates in (A6)–(A8) and hence obtain the value of $\alpha(n)$ in Theorem 1. With κ_j , $R_{1\oplus}$ and $R_{2\oplus}$ defined as below (38) and $J^* = K^* = 20$, for $j = 1, \dots, J^*$ and $k = 1, \dots, K^*$, we set $b_{jk} = pj^{-a_1}k^{-a_2}\kappa_j R_{1\oplus}(\kappa_k R_{2\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l^{-a_2})^{-1} = pj^{-a_1+1}k^{-a_2-1}R_{1\oplus}(R_{2\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l^{-a_2})^{-1}$, where $p \in (0, 1)$, $a_1 > 3/2$, and $a_2 > 1$ are constants. Taking $v_{1j} = j^{-a_0}$ with $a_0 > 1$, data were generated as follows:

Step 1: Generate $\chi_{ij} \sim \text{Unif}(-v_{1j}(\kappa_j R_{1\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} v_{1l})^{-1}, v_{1j}(\kappa_j R_{1\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} v_{1l})^{-1})$ independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, J^*$, whence $\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} = \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \chi_{ij} \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus}$, with φ_j as per (36), $\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K^*} \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} b_{jk} \chi_{ij} \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus}$, and $\nu_{1i} = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{1\oplus}}(\sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \chi_{ij} \varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus})$.

Step 2: Sample $E_{ik} \sim \text{Unif}(-e_k, e_k)$, independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, K^*$, where $e_k = (1-p)k^{-a_2}(\kappa_k R_{2\oplus} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l^{-a_2})^{-1}$. Let $\nu_{2i} = \text{Exp}_{\nu_{2\oplus}}(\Gamma(\text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) + \sum_{k=1}^{K^*} E_{ik} \varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus})$.

We considered the two cases with different choices of the Fréchet mean distributions $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ as in Section 5. Taking $p = 0.9$, $a_0 = 1.5$, $a_1 = 8.5$ and $a_2 = 5$, we simulated 500 runs for each $n \in \{20, 100, 500\}$.

From (S.1) one finds that among the terms that determine the convergence rate of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in Theorem 1, the terms $J^{1-2\rho}$ and $K^{1-2\varrho}$ correspond to the bias, i.e., $\|\beta - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, and the other terms correspond to the variance, i.e., $\|\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk} \psi_k \otimes \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, where $\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}$

is defined above (S.1). Since in simulations only a finite number of basis functions can be included in the generation of the regression coefficient function $\beta = \sum_{k=1}^{K^*} \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} b_{jk}(\varphi_k \circ F_{2\oplus}) \otimes (\varphi_j \circ F_{1\oplus})$, the number of included eigenfunctions in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is necessarily bounded ($J \leq J^*$, $K \leq K^*$) and does not increase as n increases. Therefore, we focus here exclusively on the variance part, which converges with a rate of $O_p(n^{-1})$ according to Theorem 1.

For each run $l = 1, \dots, 500$, we computed the variance part, $SE_{n,l} = \|\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta}_l - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}\psi_k \otimes \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$, where $\tilde{\beta}_l$ is the estimate obtained in the l th run. We show in Figure S.1 the mean of $SE_{n,l}$ across MC runs, $MSE_n = 500^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^{500} SE_{n,l}$, on a log scale for each $n \in \{20, 100, 500\}$ as well as the theoretical rate represented by the dashed line passing through the point at which $n = 100$, i.e., $\log(MSE_n) = -1 \cdot [\log(n) - \log(100)] + \log(MSE_{100})$. This suggests that indeed $\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{Q}\tilde{\beta} - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J b_{jk}\psi_k \otimes \phi_j\|_{\nu_{1\oplus} \times \nu_{2\oplus}}^2$ converges with a rate close to n^{-1} , which aligns with the results in Theorem 1.




Figure S.1: Illustration of Theorem 1 using simulations. The MSE_n across 500 runs on a log scale, represented by the crosses “x”, are shown for $n \in \{20, 100, 500\}$ in the two cases. The dashed lines represent the theoretical O_p rate passing through the point at which $n = 100$, i.e., $\log(MSE_n) = -1 \cdot [\log(n) - \log(100)] + \log(MSE_{100})$.

S.5.2 Robustness of the Proposed Method in the Regression between Gaussian Distributions

Suppose that the predictor and response distributions are both Gaussian, $\nu_1 = N(u_1, \sigma_1^2)$ and $\nu_2 = N(u_2, \sigma_2^2)$, where $(u_1, \sigma_1, u_2, \sigma_2)$ is a random vector with a joint distribution on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{E}\sigma_1, \mathbb{E}\sigma_2 > 0$. For simulations, we independently sample $u_{i1} \sim N(0, 1^2)$, $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$, $\sigma_{i1} \sim \text{Gamma}(0.5, 0.5)$, and $\sigma_{2i} \sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.5)$, independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We consider different cases of generating u_{2i} : (1) Linear case: $u_{2i} = 1 + u_{i1} + \epsilon_i$; (2) Quadratic case: $u_{2i} = 1 + u_{i1} - 0.5u_{i1}^2 + \epsilon_i$. Then i.i.d. samples of size m are drawn from each of $\{\nu_{1i}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\nu_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$.

We note that (ν_{1i}, ν_{2i}) generated as per the linear case satisfy the proposed model in (10), which does not hold for the quadratic case. Four scenarios were considered with $n \in \{20, 200\}$ and $m \in \{50, 500\}$, and 500 runs were executed for each (n, m) pair and each case. The out-of-sample AWDs for 200 new predictors as per (39) were computed for each run. The results for both linear and quadratic cases are summarized in Figure S.2, where it can be seen that the performance of the proposed method does not worsen too much when the model becomes invalid in the quadratic case as compared to the linear case.




Figure S.2: Boxplots of the out-of-sample AWDs as per (39) for the linear and quadratic cases, each with $(n, m) \in \{20, 200\} \times \{50, 500\}$.

S.5.3 Distribution-to-Scalar Regression: Comparison with the Gaussian Process Regression Method

In this section, we compare the proposed distribution-to-scalar Wasserstein regression as per (15) in Section 2.3 with a Gaussian process regression (GPR) method proposed by Bachoc et al. (2017). The data is generated by $Y_i = \mathbb{E}(Y) + \langle \beta_1, \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i} \rangle_{\nu_{1\oplus}} + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta_1(s) = 3 - 2F_{1\oplus}(s) + F_{1\oplus}(s)^2$, for $s \in D$, and the distributional predictors ν_{1i} and random noise ϵ_i are generated in two cases as follows.

Case 2.1. $\nu_{1i} = g_{A_i} \# N(u_{i1}, \sigma_{i1}^2)$, where $u_{i1} \sim N(0, 1^2)$, $\sigma_{i1} \sim \text{Gamma}(0.5, 0.5)$, $A_i \sim \text{Unif}\{\pm\pi, \pm 2\pi, \pm 3\pi\}$, and $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 1^2)$, independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Case 2.2. $\nu_{1i} = g_{A_i} \# \text{Beta}(S_{1i}, S_{2i})$, where $S_{1i} \sim \text{Unif}(1, 5)$, $S_{2i} \sim \text{Unif}(1, 5)$, $A_i \sim \text{Unif}\{\pm\pi, \pm2\pi, \pm3\pi\}$, and $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 0.2^2)$, independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Here, g_a is defined as per (38). Then, i.i.d. samples of size m are drawn from each of $\{\nu_{1i}\}_{i=1}^n$. Five hundred runs were executed for each (n, m) pair with $n \in \{20, 200\}$ and $m \in \{50, 500\}$ and each case considered. The out-of-sample average prediction errors (APEs) for 200 new predictors were computed for each run. Specifically,

$$\text{APE}(n, m) = \frac{1}{200} \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+200} \left| \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid \text{Log}_{\nu_{1\oplus}} \nu_{1i}) - \hat{Y}_i \right|, \quad (\text{S.47})$$

where \hat{Y}_i denotes the predicted value for Y_i ; for the proposed method, $\hat{Y}_i = \bar{Y} + \langle \hat{\beta}_1, \text{Log}_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}} \hat{\nu}_{1i} \rangle_{\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}}$, $\bar{Y} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$, $\hat{\beta}_1$ is as per (S.43), and $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{1\oplus}$ are the estimates for ν_{1i} and $\nu_{1\oplus}$ as described in Section 3.2. The results of the GPR method and the proposed Wasserstein regression (WR) method are summarized in the boxplots of Figure S.3. The proposed method is found to outperform the GPR method when model (15) is true.




Figure S.3: Boxplots of the out-of-sample APEs as per (S.47) for the GPR and proposed WR methods for distribution-to-scalar regression. One outlier is omitted for Case 2.1 for better visual comparison.

S.6 Autoregressive Modeling of the Mortality Data for Sweden

We chose Sweden as an example because demographic data are available for a longer time span and are of very high quality. Here, the model was trained on the time series between 1961 and 2001, and the out-of-sample prediction was evaluated for the following 15 years up to 2016, where the yearly distribution was predicted from the fitted distribution time series, using the predicted distributions from previous years.




Figure S.4: Implementation of the autoregressive distribution time series model for age-at-death distributions of females in Sweden. Training period: 1961–2001 (with fitting results for three years shown in the top row). Prediction period: 2002–2016 (with prediction results for three years shown in the bottom row). The fitting/prediction Wasserstein discrepancies (WDs) are as shown for each panel.

As can be seen from the fitted distributions for the training period as shown in the first row of Figure S.4, they are all close to the observed distributions. For the prediction period, the predicted densities displayed in the second row of the figure increasingly deviate from the observed distributions going from 2002 to 2016, where the observed densities have a mode increasingly shifting to the right compared to the prediction. This means that the rightward mortality distribution shift outpaces the model expectation and longevity extension is accelerating for Sweden.

S.7 Multivariate Extension

Consider the Wasserstein space of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^p with finite second moments, $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$, for $p > 1$. For two given measures $\mu_*, \mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$, any map $\mathbf{t}: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ that minimizes Monge’s transport problem $\mathbf{t}_{\mu_*, \mu} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{t} \# \mu_* = \mu} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \|\mathbf{t}(x) - x\|^2 d\mu_*(x)$ is called an optimal transport map. Such optimal transport maps uniquely exist if μ_* is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue

measure on \mathbb{R}^p (referred to as “a.c.” hereafter) (Theorem 6.2.4, [Ambrosio et al. 2008](#)). Their construction is however computationally demanding and difficult to implement in practice. We note that for $p = 1$, $\mathbf{t}_{\mu_*, \mu} = F^{-1} \circ F_*$, where F_* and F^{-1} are the cdf of μ_* and the quantile function of μ , respectively. The notions of tangent spaces, exponential maps and log maps at μ_* can be analogously defined as for $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R})$: $T_{\mu_*} = \overline{\{t(\mathbf{t}_{\mu_*, \mu} - \text{id}) : \mu \in \mathcal{W}, t > 0\}}^{\mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*}}$; $\text{Exp}_{\mu_*} g = (g + \text{id}) \# \mu_*$ for functions of the form $g = t(\mathbf{t}_{\mu_*, \mu} - \text{id})$; $\text{Log}_{\mu_*} \mu = \mathbf{t}_{\mu_*, \mu} - \text{id}$, for $\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$. Also, the tangent space T_{μ_*} is a subspace of $\mathcal{L}^2_{\mu_*}$.

Let (ν_1, ν_2) be a pair of random elements with a joint distribution on $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p) \times \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$, assumed to be square integrable in the sense that $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_1) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_2) < \infty$ for some (and thus for all) $\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$. While $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ is not a Hadamard space for $p > 1$, there exists an element $\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ that minimizes $\mu \mapsto \mathbb{E}d_W^2(\mu, \nu_1)$; such minimizers are unique and referred to as the Fréchet mean of ν_1 , $\nu_{1\oplus}$, if ν_1 is a.c. (with positive probability) ([Bigot and Klein 2018](#)). We assume

- (C1) With probability 1, both ν_1 and ν_2 are a.c. and the corresponding densities, f_1 and f_2 , are bounded, i.e., there exists a constant $R > 0$ such that $\sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^p} f_1(r) < R$ and $\sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^p} f_2(r) < R$.

Under (C1), $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ are also a.c. with bounded densities (Theorem 5.5.2, [Panaretos and Zemel 2020](#)), whence it follows that the optimal transport maps from $\nu_{1\oplus}$ and $\nu_{2\oplus}$ to any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ uniquely exist, denoted by $\mathbf{t}_{\nu_{1\oplus}, \mu}$ and $\mathbf{t}_{\nu_{2\oplus}, \mu}$, respectively. The proposed distribution-to-distribution regression model in (10) for $\mathcal{W}(D)$ with $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ can hence be generalized to $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ with $p > 1$.

Considering n independent realizations of (ν_1, ν_2) , $\{(\nu_{1i}, \nu_{2i})\}_{i=1}^n$, the empirical Fréchet means, $\tilde{\nu}_{1\oplus} = \text{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\mu, \nu_{1i})$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{2\oplus} = \text{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{i=1}^n d_W^2(\mu, \nu_{2i})$, uniquely exist ([Agueh and Carlier 2011](#); [Álvarez-Esteban et al. 2011](#)) and are a.c. with bounded densities under (C1) ([Agueh and Carlier 2011](#)). Similar statements hold for the empirical Fréchet means based on estimates of ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} , $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$, when ν_{1i} and ν_{2i} are not fully observed and only samples of measurements drawn from them are available if employing a distribution estimation method that guarantees the absolute continuity of $\hat{\nu}_{1i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{2i}$. Hence, the proposed estimation method in Section 3 can be extended to this case. Regarding the implementations, the empirical Fréchet means can be computed by the steepest descent algorithm ([Zemel and Panaretos 2019](#)), and the optimal transport maps can be obtained by the computation of a power diagram ([Aurenhammer 1987](#); [Aurenhammer et al. 1998](#); [Mérigot 2011](#); [Lévy and Schwindt 2018](#)) or approximate algorithms that are computationally efficient ([Cuturi 2013](#); [Genevay et al. 2016](#)).

References

AGGARWAL, O. P. (1955). Some minimax invariant procedures for estimating a cumulative distribution function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **26** 450–463.

- AGUEH, M. and CARLIER, G. (2011). Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **43** 904–924.
- ÁLVAREZ-ESTEBAN, P., DEL BARRIO, E., CUESTA-ALBERTOS, J. and MATRÁN, C. (2011). Uniqueness and approximate computation of optimal incomplete transportation plans. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré - Probabilités et Statistiques* **47** 358–375.
- AMBROSIO, L., GIGLI, N. and SAVARÉ, G. (2004). Gradient flows with metric and differentiable structures, and applications to the Wasserstein space. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Rend. Lincei (9) Mat. Appl* **15** 327–343.
- AMBROSIO, L., GIGLI, N. and SAVARÉ, G. (2008). *Gradient Flows: in Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Springer.
- AURENHAMMER, F. (1987). Power diagrams: Properties, algorithms and applications. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **16** 78–96.
- AURENHAMMER, F., HOFFMANN, F. and ARONOV, B. (1998). Minkowski-type theorems and least-squares clustering. *Algorithmica* **20** 61–76.
- BACHOC, F., GAMBOA, F., LOUBES, J.-M. and VENET, N. (2017). A Gaussian process regression model for distribution inputs. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **64** 6620–6637.
- BANERJEE, M., CHAKRABORTY, R., OFORI, E., OKUN, M. S., VIALLANCOURT, D. E. and VEMURI, B. C. (2016). A nonlinear regression technique for manifold valued data with applications to medical image analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 4424–4432.
- BERGMEIR, C., HYNDMAN, R. J. and KOO, B. (2018). A note on the validity of cross-validation for evaluating autoregressive time series prediction. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **120** 70–83.
- BIGOT, J., GOUET, R., KLEIN, T. and LÓPEZ, A. (2017). Geodesic PCA in the Wasserstein space by convex PCA. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* **53** 1–26.
- BIGOT, J. and KLEIN, T. (2018). Characterization of barycenters in the Wasserstein space by averaging optimal transport maps. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* **22** 35–57.
- BOGIN, A., DOERNER, W. and LARSON, W. (2019). Local house price dynamics: New indices and stylized facts. *Real Estate Economics* **47** 365–398.
- BONNEEL, N., PEYRÉ, G. and CUTURI, M. (2016). Wasserstein barycentric coordinates: histogram regression using optimal transport. *ACM Transactions on Graphics* **35** 71–1.
- BOSQ, D. (1991). Modelization, nonparametric estimation and prediction for continuous time processes. In *Nonparametric Functional Estimation and Related Topics* (G. Roussas, ed.). Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, 509–529.
- BOSQ, D. (2000). *Linear Processes in Function Spaces: Theory and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- CAI, T. and HALL, P. (2006). Prediction in functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*

- 34** 2159–2179.
- CARDOT, H., FERRATY, F., MAS, A. and SARDA, P. (2003). Testing hypotheses in the functional linear model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **30** 241–255.
- CARDOT, H., FERRATY, F. and SARDA, P. (1999). Functional linear model. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **45** 11–22.
- CASTRO, P. E., LAWTON, W. H. and SYLVESTRE, E. A. (1986). Principal modes of variation for processes with continuous sample curves. *Technometrics* **28** 329–337.
- CAZELLES, E., SEGUY, V., BIGOT, J., CUTURI, M. and PAPADAKIS, N. (2018). Geodesic PCA versus log-PCA of histograms in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **40** B429–B456.
- CHEN, Z., BAO, Y., LI, H. and SPENCER JR, B. F. (2019). LQD-RKHS-based distribution-to-distribution regression methodology for restoring the probability distributions of missing SHM data. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **121** 655–674.
- CHENG, C. and PARZEN, E. (1997). Unified estimators of smooth quantile and quantile density functions. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **59** 291–307.
- CHIOU, J.-M. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2009). Modeling hazard rates as functional data for the analysis of cohort lifetables and mortality forecasting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104** 572–585.
- CORNEA, E., ZHU, H., KIM, P. and IBRAHIM, J. G. (2017). Regression models on Riemannian symmetric spaces. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **79** 463–482.
- CUTURI, M. (2013). Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- DAUXOIS, J., POUSSE, A. and ROMAIN, Y. (1982). Asymptotic theory for the principal component analysis of a vector random function: Some applications to statistical inference. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **12** 136–154.
- DAVIS, B. C., FLETCHER, P. T., BULLITT, E. and JOSHI, S. (2007). Population shape regression from random design data. In *2007 IEEE 11th International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- FALK, M. (1983). Relative efficiency and deficiency of kernel type estimators of smooth distribution functions. *Statistica Neerlandica* **37** 73–83.
- FALK, M. (1984). Relative deficiency of kernel type estimators of quantiles. *The Annals of Statistics* **12** 261–268.
- FAN, J. and GIJBELS, I. (1996). *Local Polynomial Modelling and its Applications*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- FERRATY, F. and VIEU, P. (2003). Functional nonparametric statistics: A double infinite dimensional framework. In *Recent Advances and Trends in Nonparametric Statistics*. Elsevier, 61–76.
- FRÉCHET, M. (1948). Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié. In

- Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré*, vol. 10. 215–310.
- GENEVAY, A., CUTURI, M., PEYRÉ, G. and BACH, F. (2016). Stochastic optimization for large-scale optimal transport. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 3440–3448.
- GRENANDER, U. (1950). Stochastic processes and statistical inference. *Arkiv för Matematik* **1** 195–277.
- HALL, P. and HOROWITZ, J. L. (2007). Methodology and convergence rates for functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 70–91.
- HE, G., MÜLLER, H.-G. and WANG, J.-L. (2003). Functional canonical analysis for square integrable stochastic processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **85** 54–77.
- HE, G., MÜLLER, H.-G., WANG, J.-L. and YANG, W. (2010). Functional linear regression via canonical analysis. *Bernoulli* **16** 705–729.
- HINKLE, J., MURALIDHARAN, P., FLETCHER, P. T. and JOSHI, S. (2012). Polynomial regression on Riemannian manifolds. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2012*. Springer, 1–14.
- HSING, T. and EUBANK, R. (2015). *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators*. John Wiley & Sons.
- HUCKEMANN, S. F. (2015). (Semi-)intrinsic statistical analysis on non-Euclidean spaces. In *Advances in Complex Data Modeling and Computational Methods in Statistics*. Springer, 103–118.
- HYNDMAN, R. J., BOOTH, H. and YASMEEN, F. (2013). Coherent mortality forecasting: the product-ratio method with functional time series models. *Demography* **50** 261–283.
- IMAIZUMI, M. and KATO, K. (2018). Pca-based estimation for functional linear regression with functional responses. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **163** 15–36.
- KLOECKNER, B. R. (2010). A geometric study of Wasserstein spaces: Euclidean spaces. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze* **9** 297–323.
- KOKOSZKA, P., MIAO, H., PETERSEN, A. and SHANG, H. L. (2019). Forecasting of density functions with an application to cross-sectional and intraday returns. *International Journal of Forecasting* **35** 1304–1317.
- LEBLANC, A. (2012). On estimating distribution functions using Bernstein polynomials. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **64** 919–943.
- LÉVY, B. and SCHWINDT, E. L. (2018). Notions of optimal transport theory and how to implement them on a computer. *Computers & Graphics* **72** 135–148.
- LIN, L., ST. THOMAS, B., ZHU, H. and DUNSON, D. B. (2017). Extrinsic local regression on manifold-valued data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** 1261–1273.
- LIN, Z. (2019). Riemannian geometry of symmetric positive definite matrices via Cholesky decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **40** 1353–1370.
- LIN, Z. and YAO, F. (2019). Intrinsic Riemannian functional data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 3533–3577.
- MARRON, J. S. and ALONSO, A. M. (2014). Overview of object oriented data analysis. *Biometrical*

- Journal* **56** 732–753.
- MÉRIGOT, Q. (2011). A multiscale approach to optimal transport. *Computer Graphics Forum* **30** 1583–1592.
- MORRIS, J. S. (2015). Functional regression. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **2** 321–359.
- OIKARINEN, E., BOURASSA, S. C., HOESLI, M. and ENGBLOM, J. (2018). US metropolitan house price dynamics. *Journal of Urban Economics* **105** 54–69.
- OLIVA, J., NEISWANGER, W., PÓCZOS, B., SCHNEIDER, J. and XING, E. (2014). Fast distribution to real regression. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 706–714.
- OUELLETTE, N. and BOURBEAU, R. (2011). Changes in the age-at-death distribution in four low mortality countries: A nonparametric approach. *Demographic Research* **25** 595–628.
- PANARETOS, V. M. and ZEMEL, Y. (2016). Amplitude and phase variation of point processes. *The Annals of Statistics* **44** 771–812.
- PANARETOS, V. M. and ZEMEL, Y. (2020). *An Invitation to Statistics in Wasserstein Space*. Springer Nature.
- PARZEN, E. (1979). Nonparametric statistical data modeling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **74** 105–121.
- PETERSEN, A., CHEN, C.-J. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2019a). Quantifying and visualizing intraregional connectivity in resting-state functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging with correlation densities. *Brain Connectivity* **9** 37–47.
- PETERSEN, A., HADJIPANTELOS, P. Z. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2019b). *fdadensity: Functional Data Analysis for Density Functions by Transformation to a Hilbert Space*. R package version 0.1.2, available at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fdadensity>.
- PETERSEN, A. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis for density functions by transformation to a Hilbert space. *The Annals of Statistics* **44** 183–218.
- PETERSEN, A. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2019a). Fréchet regression for random objects with Euclidean predictors. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 691–719.
- PETERSEN, A. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2019b). Wasserstein covariance for multiple random densities. *Biometrika* **106** 339–351.
- PÓCZOS, B., SINGH, A., RINALDO, A. and WASSERMAN, L. A. (2013). Distribution-free distribution regression. In *AISTATS*. 507–515.
- RAMSAY, J. O. and DALZELL, C. J. (1991). Some tools for functional data analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **53** 539–572.
- READ, R. (1972). The asymptotic inadmissibility of the sample distribution function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **43** 89–95.
- SHANG, H. L. and HYNDMAN, R. J. (2017). Grouped functional time series forecasting: An application to age-specific mortality rates. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **26**

- 330–343.
- SHI, X., STYNER, M., LIEBERMAN, J., IBRAHIM, J. G., LIN, W. and ZHU, H. (2009). Intrinsic regression models for manifold-valued data. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention–MICCAI 2009*. Springer, 192–199.
- STEINKE, F. and HEIN, M. (2009). Non-parametric regression between manifolds. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 1561–1568.
- STEINKE, F., HEIN, M. and SCHÖLKOPF, B. (2010). Nonparametric regression between general Riemannian manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* **3** 527–563.
- STURM, K.-T. (2003). Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature. *Heat Kernels and Analysis on Manifolds, Graphs, and Metric Spaces (Paris, 2002)* **338** 357–390.
- SZABÓ, Z., SRIPERUMBUDUR, B. K., PÓCZOS, B. and GRETTON, A. (2016). Learning theory for distribution regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17** 5272–5311.
- THI THIEN TRANG, B., LOUBES, J.-M., RISSER, L. and BALARESQUE, P. (2019). Distribution regression model with a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space approach. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* in Press.
- WANG, J.-L., CHIOU, J.-M. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **3** 257–295.
- YANG, S.-S. (1985). A smooth nonparametric estimator of a quantile function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **80** 1004–1011.
- YAO, F., MÜLLER, H.-G. and WANG, J.-L. (2005). Functional linear regression analysis for longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics* **33** 2873–2903.
- YUAN, M. and CAI, T. T. (2010). A reproducing kernel Hilbert space approach to functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 3412–3444.
- YUAN, Y., ZHU, H., LIN, W. and MARRON, J. (2012). Local polynomial regression for symmetric positive definite matrices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **74** 697–719.
- ZEMEL, Y. and PANARETOS, V. M. (2019). Fréchet means and Procrustes analysis in Wasserstein space. *Bernoulli* **25** 932–976.
- ZHANG, C., KOKOSZKA, P. and PETERSEN, A. (2020). Wasserstein autoregressive models for density time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12640* .