

An Autoregressive Model for Time Series of Random Objects

Matthieu Bulté^{a,b}, Helle Sørensen^a

^a*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen,*

^b*Faculty of Business Administration and Economics, Bielefeld University,*

Abstract

Random variables in metric spaces indexed by time and observed at equally spaced time points are receiving increased attention due to their broad applicability. However, the absence of inherent structure in metric spaces has resulted in a literature that is predominantly non-parametric and model-free. To address this gap in models for time series of random objects, we introduce an adaptation of the classical linear autoregressive model tailored for data lying in a Hadamard space. The parameters of interest in this model are the Fréchet mean and a concentration parameter, both of which we prove can be consistently estimated from data. Additionally, we propose a test statistic and establish its asymptotic normality, thereby enabling hypothesis testing for the absence of serial dependence. Finally, we introduce a bootstrap procedure to obtain critical values for the test statistic under the null hypothesis. Theoretical results of our method, including the convergence of the estimators as well as the size and power of the test, are illustrated through simulations, and the utility of the model is demonstrated by an analysis of a time series of consumer inflation expectations.

Keywords: Time Series, Random Objects, Autoregressive model, Metric space, Least squares

Email addresses: `mb@math.ku.dk` (Matthieu Bulté), `helle@math.ku.dk` (Helle Sørensen)

1. Introduction

Random variables in general metric spaces, also called random objects, have been receiving increasing attention in recent statistical research. The generality metric space setup does not require any algebraic structure to exist and is only based on the definition of a distance function. This allows the methods developed to be applied in domains ranging from classical setups to more complex use cases on non-standard data. This includes the study of functional data ([Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#)), data lying on Riemannian manifolds, correlation matrices and applications thereof to fMRI data ([Petersen and Muller \(2019\)](#)) or adjacency matrices and social networks ([Dubey and Müller \(2020\)](#)) among others.

One example of particular interest due to its wide range of applications is that of data comprising of probability density functions. Probability distributions are a challenging example of a space that is both functional, and thus infinite-dimensional, but also non-Euclidean in the constraints characterizing density functions. This leads to a number of different approaches to studying these objects: they have been studied as the image of Hilbert spaces under transformations ([Petersen and Müller \(2016\)](#)), as specific Hilbert spaces with specific addition and scalar multiplication operators ([van den Boogaart et al. \(2014\)](#)), as well as forming metric spaces equipped with different distances ([Panaretos and Zemel \(2020\)](#); [Srivastava and Klassen \(2016\)](#)). See [Petersen et al. \(2022\)](#) for a review of such methodologies. Distributions can be found in many applications; in considering the distribution of socioeconomic factors within a population such as income ([Yoshiyuki \(2017\)](#)), fertility ([Mazzucco and Scarpa \(2015\)](#)) or mortality data ([Chen et al. \(2021\)](#)). They are also useful when considering belief distributions of economic factors ([Meeks and Monti \(2023\)](#)), allowing economic analyses to consider entire distributions rather than empirical expectations.

The study of random objects has received recent attention with work in standard statistical questions ([Dubey and Müller \(2019, 2020\)](#); [McCormack and Hoff \(2023, 2022\)](#); [Köstenberger and Stark \(2023\)](#)) as well as various approaches to regression ([Petersen and Muller \(2019\)](#); [Bulté and Sørensen \(2023\)](#); [Hanneke et al. \(2021\)](#)). Since the setup of general metric spaces offers very little structure, part of the literature assumes additional structure on the space in order for standard statistical quantities to be well defined. This is usually done by assuming that the metric space is a Hadamard space, see for instance [Sturm \(2003\)](#) for a detailed review of results in Hadamard spaces

and Bačák (2014) for computation of Fréchet means in such spaces.

In many of the applications mentioned above, the data might be naturally observed repeatedly at a regular interval and for a time series. In this case, the observations might not be independent and the models and analyses require additional care to take this dependency into account. This work has mainly been carried out in a non-parametric setting, with classical weak dependence assumption. This has been done for instance for testing serial dependence (Jiang et al. (2023)) or for proving the consistency of the Fréchet mean estimator (Caner (2006)).

While this line of work can be broadly applied, they rely on non-parametric assumptions rather than proposing a specific model for the data generation. However, time series models have been developed for specific random objects by exploiting the structure of the space under study. One popular class of models is that of autoregressive models, which have been defined using the linear structure of functional spaces (Bosq (2000); Caponera and Marinucci (2021)) or exploiting a tangent space structure of the space (Zhu and Müller (2022); Xavier and Manton (2006); Ghodrati and Panaretos (2023); Zhu and Müller (2021)) to name only a few.

Inspired by existing autoregressive models, we propose an autoregressive model for random objects. Relying on an interpretation of iteration in the linear autoregressive model as a noisy weighted sum to the mean, we define a model parametrized by a mean and concentration parameters. For this to be possible, we assume additional structure and require the space to be a Hadamard space, and exploit the geometry of the space to define the time series iteration through geodesics. We develop the methodology and associated theory for estimation and hypothesis testing in this model. This includes estimators for the mean and concentration parameters, and we propose a test statistic for testing for no autocorrelation, corresponding to observing an i.i.d. sample.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives a presentation of useful concepts and results in Hadamard spaces for the rest of the article. In Section 3, we present our autoregressive model and present a theorem providing a sufficient condition for the existence of a stationary solution of the iterated system of equations associated with the model, and prove the identifiability of the model parameters. We propose in Section 4 estimators for these parameters and prove convergence results for those estimators. In Section 5, we propose a test for a null hypothesis of independence based on a test statistic of which we characterize the asymptotic behavior under the null hy-

pothesis and the alternative of a non-zero concentration parameter. Finally, we illustrate our theoretical results in Section 6 with a numerical study.

2. Preliminaries

Let (Ω, d) be a metric space and X a random variable, a Borel measurable function from some probability space to Ω . We say that $X \in L^p(\Omega)$ if $\mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^p] < \infty$ for some (and hence all) $\omega \in \Omega$. In the study of random objects, the concepts of mean and variance are generalized following the ideas of Fréchet (1948). Given a random variable $X \in L^2(\Omega)$, the Fréchet mean and variance of X are defined as

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \arg \min_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^2] \quad \text{Var}[X] = \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^2]. \quad (1)$$

While the existence of the variance in standard spaces implies the existence of a mean, this is not necessarily the case in general metric spaces. Furthermore, on its own, a metric space offers very little to define parametric models. We now present the additional structure that will be used in this work to construct models for time series of random objects following the presentation in Burago et al. (2001) and Sturm (2003).

We call *path* a map $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$, continuously mapping the unit interval to Ω . A path γ such that $d(\gamma(r), \gamma(t)) = d(\gamma(r), \gamma(s)) + d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t))$ for every $r < s < t \in [0, 1]$ is called a *geodesic*. Given two elements $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$, a path γ is said to *connect* ω and ω' if $\gamma(0) = \omega$ and $\gamma(1) = \omega'$. The set of all such paths is denoted by $\Gamma(\omega, \omega')$. The distance function d induces a *length* on the set of paths, defined for each γ by

$$L_p(\gamma) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k d(\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)) \mid 0 = t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_k = 1 \right\}.$$

In general, we have via the triangle inequality that $d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) \leq L_p(\gamma)$ and hence $d(\omega, \omega') \leq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\omega, \omega')} L_p(\gamma)$ for every $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$. A metric space in which the previous inequality always holds as an equality is called a *length space*. Furthermore, if there exists a geodesic γ connecting each pair $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$, then we see that the infimum is attained by γ , and Ω is called a *geodesic space*.

A class of metric spaces of special interest are *Hadamard spaces*. A metric space (Ω, d) is called Hadamard space if it's complete and satisfies the *NPC*




Figure 1: Illustration of the NPC inequality: triangles in Hadamard spaces are "thin".

inequality (standing for Non-Positive Curvature): for each pair $\omega_0, \omega_1 \in \Omega$, there exists an $\omega_{1/2} \in \Omega$ such that for every z ,

$$d(z, \omega_{1/2})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(z, \omega_0)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d(z, \omega_1)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d(\omega_0, \omega_1)^2. \quad (2)$$

Hadamard spaces can also be defined via *comparison triangles*. This approach is not described here, see Chapter 4 of [Burago et al. \(2001\)](#) for such a presentation of Hadamard spaces. The following proposition from [Sturm \(2003\)](#) shows that Hadamard spaces are geodesic spaces, and that (2) holds along geodesics.

Proposition 2.1 (Proposition 2.3 in [Sturm \(2003\)](#)). If (Ω, d) is a Hadamard space then it is a geodesic space. Even more, for any pair of points $\omega_0, \omega_1 \in \Omega$ there exists a unique geodesic connecting them, denoted $\gamma_{\omega_0}^{\omega_1}$. For $t \in [0, 1]$ the intermediate points $\gamma(t)$ depends continuously on the endpoints ω_0, ω_1 . Finally, for any $z \in \Omega$ and $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$d(z, \gamma(t))^2 \leq (1-t)d(z, \gamma(0))^2 + td(z, \gamma(1))^2 - t(1-t)d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))^2. \quad (3)$$

Since (2) is a special case of (3), we will also refer to the latter as the NPC inequality. Hadamard spaces and the NPC inequality provide a rich context for the study of random objects. One important result is that for any $X \in L^1(\Omega)$, the function $\omega \mapsto \mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^2 - d(X, z)^2]$ is continuous and uniformly convex, and hence by completeness of the space, has a unique minimizer, see Proposition 4.3 in [Sturm \(2003\)](#). Since z only enters as an

additive term which does not depend on ω , the minimizer of this function is independent of z . This yields an alternative definition of the Fréchet mean for any Hadamard-value random variable in $L^1(\Omega)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \arg \min_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^2 - d(X, z)^2].$$

We mention some further useful results in [Appendix A](#) and refer the reader to [Sturm \(2003\)](#) for a thorough review of the subject.

We now present a few examples from [Sturm \(2003\)](#) of Hadamard spaces and ways of building Hadamard spaces out of existing ones. The most well-known case of Hadamard space are Hilbert spaces. This allows to approach Functional Data Analysis (see [Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#)) tasks from a random object perspective.

Example 2.2 (Hilbert spaces). Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, then (\mathcal{H}, d) with $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a Hadamard space. In Hilbert spaces, the Fréchet mean corresponds to the usual expectation, $\mathbb{E}[X] = \int xP(dx)$.

Hilbert spaces are examples of *flat spaces* in which the NPC inequality holds to equality. Manifolds of negative sectional curvature also are Hadamard spaces.

Example 2.3 (Constructed Spaces). Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space, then

1. Any subset $O \subset \Omega$ is a Hadamard space if and only if it is closed and convex.
2. Let Θ be an arbitrary set and $\omega : \Theta \rightarrow \Omega$ be a bijection. Then, Θ is a Hadamard space equipped with the distance $d_{\omega}(\theta, \theta') = d(\omega(\theta), \omega(\theta'))$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}[X] = \omega^{-1}(\mathbb{E}[\omega(X)])$ holds for any $X \in L^1(\Theta)$.

One specific example of Hadamard spaces of particular interest is the space of one-dimensional density functions over \mathbb{R} equipped with the 2-Wasserstein distance.

Example 2.4 (2-Wasserstein Space). Let $\mathcal{W}_2(I)$ be the space of probability measures on $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ with finite second moment. This space, endowed with the 2-Wasserstein distance, is a metric space, see [Panaretos and Zemel \(2020\)](#). Consider the subset $\mathcal{D}(I) \subset \mathcal{W}_2(I)$ of distributions having a density with respect to the Lebesgues measure. For two distributions $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{D}(I)$ with

quantile functions $F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}, F_{\mathbb{Q}}^{-1}$, the 2-Wasserstein distance between \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} is given by

$$d_{\mathcal{W}_2}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \|F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1} - F_{\mathbb{Q}}^{-1}\|_{L_2[0,1]}.$$

The space of quantile functions being a closed and convex subspace of $L_2[0, 1]$, it is also a Hadamard space. Hence, $(\mathcal{D}(I), d_{\mathcal{W}_2})$ falls under the second case described in Example 2.3 and is also a Hadamard space.

Another useful example of a constructed Hadamard space is that of symmetric positive definite (SPD) matrices together with the *Log-Cholesky* distance.

Example 2.5 (Log-Cholesky distance). Let \mathcal{S}_p^+ be the space of SPD matrices of dimension p . Given a matrix $M \in \mathcal{S}_p^+$, the Cholesky decomposition of M is well defined, meaning that there exists a lower-triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements $L \in \mathcal{L}_p^+$ such that $M = LL^\top$. Let $\lfloor M \rfloor$ be the $p \times p$ matrix such that $\lfloor M \rfloor_{ij} = M_{ij}$ if $i < j$ and 0 otherwise and $\mathbb{D}(M)$ be the $p \times p$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\mathbb{D}(M)_{ii} = M_{ii}$. While simply using the Froebenius distance between Cholesky factors of SPD matrices yields a valid distance, Lin (2019) argues that it leads to an unwanted *swelling* effect in geodesics and proposes another distance $d_{\mathcal{S}_p^+}$ treating the diagonal and strictly lower triangular parts of L differently. Let $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{S}_p^+$ with Cholesky factors L_1 and L_2 , then the distance $d_{\mathcal{S}_p^+}(M_1, M_2)$ is given by

$$d_{\mathcal{S}_p^+}(M_1, M_2)^2 = \|\lfloor L_1 \rfloor - \lfloor L_2 \rfloor\|_F^2 + \|\log \mathbb{D}(L_1) - \log \mathbb{D}(L_2)\|_F^2.$$

As a case of Example 2.3, this is a Hadamard space, which is also shown in Lin (2019), together with other properties of this space.

3. The GAR(1) Model

3.1. Model and Stationary Solution

Let us consider a time series $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{R} with constant mean $\mathbb{E}[X_t] = \mu$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ follows a first-order autoregressive model, denoted AR(1), with concentration parameter φ if it satisfies the following relation

$$X_{t+1} - \mu = \varphi(X_t - \mu) + \varepsilon_{t+1},$$




Figure 2: Representation of the iterated equation (5).

where the noise terms $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d random variables with mean 0. In general metric spaces lacking a vector space structure, such a model cannot be defined. A key insight is that this relation can be rewritten as

$$X_{t+1} = (1 - \varphi)\mu + \varphi X_t + \varepsilon_{t+1}.$$

This allows us to see that each random variable of the time series can be written as a weighted sum of the overall mean of the time series and the previous observation, perturbed by a centered random noise. For $\varphi \in [0, 1]$, this weighted sum corresponds to the point along the geodesic from μ to X_t at φ . This interpretation can be used to define an autoregressive process only using geodesics.

Let now (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space. In this context, we consider a broad class of noise models represented by random maps $\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$. We say that a random map ε is *unbiased* if for all $\omega \in \Omega$, the random variable $\varepsilon(\omega)$ is in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(\omega)] = \omega$. Note that the expectation is the Fréchet mean in Ω , hence the previous statement can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon(\omega), \omega)^2 - d(\varepsilon(\omega), \omega')^2] < 0 \quad \text{for all } \omega \neq \omega' \in \Omega. \quad (4)$$

We say that a sequence of random variables $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^1(\Omega)$ with common mean μ follows the *geodesic autoregressive* model of order 1, GAR(1), with concentration parameter $\varphi \in [0, 1]$ if it satisfies the following iterated system of equations

$$X_{t+1} = \varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \quad (5)$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d unbiased noise map and $\gamma_\mu^{X_t}$, we recall, is the (random) geodesic connecting μ to X_t .

This relation opens the question of whether the condition of a shared Fréchet mean $\mathbb{E}[X_t] = \mu$ and equation (5) can mutually be fulfilled. Using that $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are unbiased and assuming that $\mathbb{E}[X_t] = \mu$, the condition becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\gamma_{\mathbb{E}[X_t]}^{X_t}(\varphi)\right] = \mathbb{E}[X_t].$$

Unfortunately, this condition does not hold in every Hadamard space. Thus, we will assume the following.

Assumption 3.1. For every $X \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\varphi \in [0, 1]$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\gamma_{\mathbb{E}[X]}^X(\varphi)\right] = \mathbb{E}[X]$.

It is however possible to prove that this condition holds for some of the examples mentioned in the previous section. For any Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , this condition holds by linearity of the expectation since for any $X \in L^1(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\gamma_{\mathbb{E}[X]}^X(\varphi)\right] = \mathbb{E}[(1 - \varphi)\mathbb{E}[X] + \varphi X] = (1 - \varphi)\mathbb{E}[X] + \varphi\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X].$$

Furthermore, if the condition holds for a Hadamard space (Ω, d) , then it also holds for a Hadamard space constructed by taking the image of a bijection ω as described in the second part of Example 2.3.

Lemma 3.2. Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space and (Θ, d_ω) be a constructed Hadamard space based on the bijection ω . If (Ω, d) satisfies Assumption 3.1, then so does (Θ, d_ω) .

This lemma shows that Assumption 3.1 holds for a large class of Hadamard spaces, in particular for the subspace $\mathcal{D}(I)$ of $\mathcal{W}_2(I)$ of distributions having a density function, as described in Example 2.4.

To show the existence of a stationary solution, we use the framework of *iterated random function systems* presented in Wu and Shao (2004). Let us first introduce some notation. Given the i.i.d noise maps $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, define for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ the random functions $F_t : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$,

$$F_t(x) = \varepsilon_t(\gamma_\mu^x(\varphi)).$$

Then, Equation (5) can be rewritten as an iterated random function system,

$$X_{t+1} = F_{t+1}(X_t).$$

Further, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, the following random variable will be useful in expressing the condition of existence of a stationary solution,

$$X_t(x) = F_t \circ F_{t-1} \circ \dots \circ F_1(x), \tag{6}$$

clearly then, we have that $X_t = X_t(X_0)$, but this construct also allows to study a coupled version $X_t(X'_0)$ of X_t for $X'_0 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} X_0$. The following theorem provides a sufficient condition for the existence of a stationary solution to (6) based on a *geometric-moment contracting* condition on the iteration maps $\{F_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Theorem 3.3 (Theorem 2 of [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#)). Suppose there exists $x_0 \in \Omega, \alpha > 0, r \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[d(X_t(x), X_t(x_0))^\alpha] \leq Cr^t d(x, x_0)^\alpha, \quad (7)$$

holds for all $x \in \Omega, t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $x \in \Omega$

$$X_t^* = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} F_t \circ F_{t-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{t-m+1}(x)$$

exists and does not depend on x . Moreover, $\{X_t^*\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a stationary solution of Equation (5).

Note that if we assume that the noise maps $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are Lipschitz with Lipschitz constants $L_t \in L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+)$, which, by assumption, are i.i.d copies of some random variable L , we have by the Geodesic Comparison Inequality (see [Appendix A.2](#))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d(X_1(x), X_1(x_0))^\alpha] &= \mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon_1(\gamma_\mu^x(\varphi)), \varepsilon_1(\gamma_\mu^{x_0}(\varphi)))^\alpha] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[L^\alpha] d(\gamma_\mu^x(\varphi), \gamma_\mu^{x_0}(\varphi))^\alpha \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[L^\alpha] \varphi^\alpha d(x, x_0)^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, this implies $\mathbb{E}[d(X_t(x), X_t(x_0))^\alpha] \leq [\mathbb{E}[L^\alpha] \varphi^\alpha]^t d(x, x_0)^\alpha$, which shows that condition (7) holds with $r = \varphi^\alpha \mathbb{E}[L^\alpha] < 1$.

3.2. Identifiability

Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, Equation (5) has a stationary solution and the model features two quantities of interest: the time-invariant Fréchet mean of the time series $\mu \in \Omega$, and the concentration parameter $\varphi \in [0, 1]$. Before considering the estimation of these quantities, we show that both are identifiable. The identifiability of the Fréchet mean follows directly from the stationarity of the time series and the definition and existence of the Fréchet mean in a Hadamard space.

Theorem 3.4. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Omega$, assume that $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.3. Then, the Fréchet mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X_t]$ is identifiable.

As for the concentration parameter, we can consider the mean squared error

$$L(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(u))^2 \right]. \quad (8)$$

Then, assuming that the noise maps are unbiased, we can show that this loss is uniquely minimized by the true concentration parameter φ .

Theorem 3.5. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Omega$, assume that $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are $L^2(\Omega)$ and satisfies Equation (5) with true concentration parameter $\varphi \in [0, 1]$. Assume further that the noise maps $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are unbiased and hence satisfy Equation (4). Then, φ is the unique minimizer of L .

Proof. We prove that φ is the unique minimizer of L . This is the case since $\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)$ is the Fréchet mean of X_{t+1} given X_t and ε_{t+1} is unbiased. Thus, for all $\varphi' \in [0, 1]$, with $\varphi' \neq \varphi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\varphi') &= \mathbb{E} \left[d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi'))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi'))^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi'))^2 \mid X_t \right] \right] \\ &> \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi))^2 \mid X_t \right] \right] = L(\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the unbiasedness of ε_{t+1} . The uniqueness of φ follows from the strong convexity of L inherited from the geodesic convexity of the squared distance in Hadamard spaces. Indeed, let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in [0, 1]$, wlog $\varphi_1 < \varphi_2$. Let $t \in [0, 1]$ and define $\varphi_t = (1-t)\varphi_1 + t\varphi_2$. Then, $\gamma_\mu^{X_t}$ restricted to $[\varphi_1, \varphi_2]$ and reparametrized on $[0, 1]$ gives the geodesic connecting $\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_1)$ to $\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_2)$ and hence

$$L(\varphi_t) = \mathbb{E} \left[d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}((1-t)\varphi_1 + t\varphi_2))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[d \left(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_1)}^{\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_2)}(t) \right)^2 \right].$$

Then, using Proposition 2.1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} L(\varphi_t) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(1-t)d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_1))^2 + td(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_2))^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[t(1-t)d(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_1), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_2))^2 \right] \\ &= (1-t)L(\varphi_1) + tL(\varphi_2) - t(1-t)|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2|^2 \mathbb{E} [d(X_{t+1}, \mu)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Since X_{t+1} is $L^2(\Omega)$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[d(X_{t+1}, \mu)^2] < \infty$, showing that L is strongly convex. Hence, any minimizer of L is unique, concluding the proof. \square

4. Estimation of model parameters

Now that the identifiability of the Fréchet mean and the concentration parameter have been established, we show that empirical estimation of the associated risks produces consistent estimators. Furthermore, we show that the Fréchet mean can be estimated at a \sqrt{T} -rate.

4.1. Fréchet mean

For simplicity, we assume that the $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are $L^2(\Omega)$. Then, define the Fréchet function $M(\omega) = \mathbb{E}[d(X, \omega)^2]$ has a natural empirical version based on the observations X_1, \dots, X_T .

$$M_T(\omega) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T d(X_t, \omega)^2. \quad (9)$$

We define the estimator $\hat{\mu}_T$ as the minimizer of M_T . The asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\mu}_T$ is described by the theory of M-estimation, see for instance [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), where consistency and rates of convergence are readily available for i.i.d data. Here, we adapt results on iterated random function system from [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#) to verify the general assumptions for M-estimation presented in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#). One assumption which is standard in the study of random objects, concerns the covering number of (Ω, d) .

Assumption 4.1. Let $B(\mu, \delta)$ be the ball in Ω of size δ centered in μ and $N(\varepsilon, B_\delta(\mu))$ be the covering number of $B_\delta(\mu)$ using balls of size ε . Assume

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{1 + \log N(\varepsilon \delta, B_\delta(\mu))} d\varepsilon = O(1) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

In the following theorem, we show that this assumption, together with the assumptions required for stationarity of the sequence $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, are enough to obtain the \sqrt{T} consistency of the mean estimator. Note that this result is of more more general interest since it does not assume that the data follows our GAR model but only requires control on the dependency of the sequence $\{X_t\}$.

Theorem 4.2. Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space and $\{X_t\}$ be an $L^2(\Omega)$ sequence of random variables satisfying Equation (7) for some $\alpha \geq 1$. Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds around the Fréchet mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X_t]$. Then, the minimizer $\hat{\mu}_T$ of M_T is a consistent estimator of μ and satisfies

$$\sqrt{T}d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T) = O_P(1). \quad (10)$$

The proof of Theorem 4.2 can be found in the Appendix.

4.2. Concentration parameter

Similarly to the Fréchet mean, we construct an estimator of the concentration parameter by minimizing an empirical version of L in Equation (8). We estimate the expectation with the available sample and replace the Fréchet mean μ by the estimator $\hat{\mu}_T$, giving the following risk function

$$L_T(u) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(u))^2. \quad (11)$$

We prove the consistency of the resulting estimator based on results from Newey (1991) relying on the compactness of the domain $[0, 1]$ and continuity results about L and L_T . The consistency result is then the following.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that (Ω, d) and $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.2. Then, the minimizer $\hat{\varphi}_T$ of L_T is a consistent estimator of φ .

Proof. By Proposition Appendix B.3, we have that $\|L_T - L\|_\infty = o_p(1)$. Together with the identifiability result in Theorem 3.5, we have that L has a unique minimizer. By Corollary 3.2.3 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we have that any sequence of minimizers $\hat{\varphi}_T$ of L_T satisfies $|\hat{\varphi}_T - \varphi| = o_P(1)$. \square

5. Testing for the absence of serial dependence

One hypothesis test of interest in this model is whether the random variables $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent, which corresponds to testing $H_0 : \varphi = 0$ vs. $H_1 : \varphi > 0$. Since no strong results are available about the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\varphi}_T$, another test statistic must be considered. To that end, let us consider the statistic

$$D_T = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_t, X_{t+1})^2. \quad (12)$$

We proceed to show that D_T is asymptotically normal with mean and variance depending on the hypothesis, allowing to build a test that has correct level, and asymptotic power.

Under H_0 , the sequence $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is formed of i.i.d random variables. We consider the centered summands, $Y_t = d(X_t, X_{t+1})^2 - \mathbb{E}[d(X_1, X_2)^2]$. The sequence $\{Y_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is then m -dependent with $m = 1$. By the Central Limit Theorem for m -dependent sequences, see Theorem 2 in [Hoeffding and Robbins \(1948\)](#), we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.1. Let X_1, X_2, X_3 be i.i.d copies of $\varepsilon(\mu)$, then, under H_0 and as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{T}(D_T - \mathbb{E}[d(X_1, X_2)^2]) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma_0^2),$$

where $\sigma_0^2 = \text{Var}[d(X_1, X_2)^2] + 2\text{Cov}[d(X_1, X_2)^2, d(X_1, X_3)^2]$.

To study the behavior of this test statistic under $H_1 : \varphi \neq 0$, we base our analysis on Theorem 3 of [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#) which provides conditions for the asymptotic normality of sums of the form of D_T . Under the assumptions required for the existence of a stationary solution, we obtain the result.

Theorem 5.2. Assume that $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.3 with $\varphi > 0$, then there exists a $\sigma_\varphi \geq 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{T}(D_T - \mathbb{E}[d(X_t, X_{t+1})^2]) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma_\varphi^2).$$

In general, it is not clear whether $\mathbb{E}_{\varphi=0}[D_T] \neq \mathbb{E}_{\varphi=\varphi^*}[D_T]$ for an arbitrary $\varphi^* \neq 0$, and hence whether the test described above has asymptotic power. One possible way to avoid this issue is to require the following monotonicity condition on the noise maps.

Assumption 5.3. For all $x, y, z \in \Omega$, then the noise maps ε satisfy the following monotonicity condition

$$d(x, z) < d(y, z) \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon(x), z)^2] < \mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon(y), z)^2]. \quad (13)$$

Then, for any $\varphi > 0$, we have that $d(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi), X_t) = (1 - \varphi)d(\mu, X_t) < d(\mu, X_t)$. Using Assumption 5.3, this gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varphi=\varphi^*}[D_T] = \mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), X_t)^2] < \mathbb{E}[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\mu), X_t)^2] = \mathbb{E}_{\varphi=0}[D_T],$$

which implies that the asymptotic power of the test is 1.

To construct a level α hypothesis test for $H_0 : \varphi = 0$ vs. $H_1 : \varphi > 0$, one could reject H_0 if the absolute deviation of D_T from its asymptotic mean exceeds a certain threshold q_α based on the result in Theorem 5.1. However, the asymptotic mean and variance of D_T required for this test depend on the underlying data distribution and are unknown. Instead, we use a permutation procedure to compute approximate p -values under H_0 . Specifically, let $B \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of permutations used for constructing the approximate p -value \hat{p}_B and let π_1, \dots, π_B be random permutations of $\{1, \dots, T\}$. For each permutation π , we denote by D_T^π the test statistic computed based on the permuted sample $\{X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(T)}\}$ and define the approximated p -value, $\hat{p}_B = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{1}\{D_T \leq D_T^{\pi_b}\}$. The resulting level α test is then constructed by rejecting H_0 if $\hat{p}_B \leq \alpha$, see Hemerik and Goeman (2018).

6. Numerical experiments

In the following, we illustrate our theoretical results with several numerical experiments taking place in different Hadamard spaces. We empirically verify the convergence rate of $\hat{\mu}_T$ proved in Theorem 4.2, and show that the test constructed via the bootstrapping procedure described in Section 5 has the desired size, and power as T grows.

We study three scenarios of time series following the GAR(1) model (5). The first example is that of the real line \mathbb{R} equipped with the standard Euclidean distance, with a multiplicative noise model. For the second example, we consider the space of density distributions over the real line equipped with the 2-Wasserstein distance, described in Example 2.4, with a geodesic noise model that we describe later. For the last example, we consider SPD matrices with the Log-Cholesky metric from Example 2.5 with a noise model based on the Lie group structure defined in Lin (2019).

In each of these scenarios, we generate time series of different lengths $T \in \{40, 80, 160, 320, 640\}$ and for different values of the concentration parameter $\varphi \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 1\}$. Naturally, $\varphi = 0$ and $\varphi = 1$ are special cases that we will consider with care in the evaluation of our results. For each combination of a metric space, a time series length and a concentration parameter, we generate 1000 datasets. For each dataset, we compute the estimators $\hat{\mu}_T$ and $\hat{\varphi}_T$, and run the permutation-based hypothesis test at level $\alpha = 0.05$. In our results, we report for each combination of a metric




Figure 3: (a) Depicts a trajectory of 200 time steps from the GAR(1) process described in Section 6.1. Panel (b) illustrates the \sqrt{T} convergence of the mean estimator $\hat{\mu}_T$ for $\varphi < 1$. Panels (c) and (d) show the rejection rate of the independence test described in Section 5 for different values of φ . In (c), we display it for the test with target level 0.05 against the sample size. For panel (d), we fix $T = 80$ and show the rejection rate as a function of the test's target levels.

space, T and φ , the average estimator errors $d(\hat{\mu}_T, \mu)$ as well as properties of the hypothesis test, all calculated over the 1000 runs.

All simulations and analyses are done in Python. The code to reproduce the experiments and figures is available online¹.

6.1. \mathbb{R} with multiplicative noise

In the first experimental setup, we investigate the simple case of (Ω, d) being the real line \mathbb{R} equipped with the Euclidean distance $d(x, y) = |x - y|$. In this space, Assumption 4.1 is verified since $N(\varepsilon\delta, B_\delta(\mu)) = \varepsilon^{-1}$, thus the entropy integral is bounded and does not depend on δ . Here, the geodesics are given by straight lines, $\gamma_x^y(t) = (1 - t)x + ty$.

¹<https://github.com/matthieubulte/GAR>




Figure 4: (a) Displays 6 consecutive densities sampled from the GAR(1) process described in Section 6.2. Panels (b), (c) and (d) are generated in the same way as in Figure 3.

We consider multiplicative noise maps $\varepsilon_i(x) = (1 + \eta_i)x$ where $\eta_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Then, ε_i are unbiased and the condition of Theorem 3.3 is satisfied for $\varphi < (1 + \sigma^2)^{-1/2}$ since

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_t(x_0) - X_t(x))^2] = [\varphi^2(1 + \sigma^2)]^t (x_0 - x)^2.$$

In our simulation setup, we work with $\sigma^2 = 0.25^2$ which gives an upper bound $\varphi < (1 + \sigma^2)^{-1/2} \approx 0.97$.

As shown in Figure 3, the theoretical results presented in the previous sections appear to hold in practice. The \sqrt{T} convergence of the Fréchet mean estimator holds for $\varphi < 1$ and the rejection rates for the hypothesis test for the independence test presented in Section 5 show that the test is well calibrated and achieves high power for moderate sample sizes.

6.2. Univariate distributions with a density

In this second experiment, we consider a time series in the space $\mathcal{D}([0, 1])$ of density functions over $[0, 1]$ equipped with the 2-Wasserstein distance, as

described in Example 2.4. Since the support of the distributions is bounded, the space $\mathcal{D}([0, 1])$ is bounded as well. There, geodesics are given by linear interpolation of the corresponding quantile function. Given two distributions $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{D}$ with quantile functions $F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}, F_{\mathbb{Q}}^{-1}$, the density $\gamma_{\mathbb{P}}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ on the geodesic connecting \mathbb{P} to \mathbb{Q} is given via its quantile function $F_{\gamma_{\mathbb{P}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(t)}^{-1}(u) = (1-t)F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}(u) + tF_{\mathbb{Q}}^{-1}(u)$.

We generate the time series with the standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$ truncated to $[0, 1]$ as the Fréchet mean. Then, the data is generated according to Equation (5). The noise sampling is based on sampling a random optimal transport η and applying it by quantile composition, which corresponds to computing the pushforward under η . Given a distribution $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{D}$ with quantile function $F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}$, the noise map ε is then given by $F_{\varepsilon(\mathbb{P})}^{-1} = \eta \circ F_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}$. To generate the transport maps η , we follow the procedure described in Panaretos and Zemel (2016). First, a random integer frequency is uniformly sampled from $\{-4, \dots, 4\} \setminus \{0\}$, then, the maps are given by $\eta(x) = x - \sin(\pi k x) / |\pi k|$. The random maps η are smooth, strictly increasing and satisfy $\eta(0) = 0$ and $\eta(1) = 1$. By symmetry of the random parameter k , one can see that for any $x \in [0, 1]$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\eta(x)] = x$, property inherited by the noise maps ε . While the noise maps have a Lipschitz constant of 2, meaning that the condition of Theorem 3.3 is satisfied for $\varphi < 0.5$, we observe empirically that the estimators seem to still be consistent even for values of $\varphi \in [0.5, 1)$.

The results in Figure 4 match those observed in the previous experiment. The scaled error curves displayed in panel (b) confirm the convergence rate proved in Theorem 4.2. Similarly, the conditions of Theorem 3.3 are not satisfied for $\varphi = 1$, and the estimator $\hat{\mu}_T$ fails to converge which is omitted here. We also observe in panels (c) and (d) that the test behaves as expected. The blue curve in both panels, corresponding to the null hypothesis, demonstrates that the empirical size of the test appears to be correct for all sample sizes considered.

6.3. SPD Matrices

In this last experiment, we investigate the properties of the GAR(1) model in the space \mathcal{S}_p^+ of p -dimensional SPD matrices with the Log-Cholesky distance $d_{\mathcal{S}_p^+}$ described in Example 2.5. In this space, matrices $M_0, M_1 \in \mathcal{S}_d^+$ are uniquely identified by their Cholesky factors L_0, L_1 . Points on the geodesic line between these matrices are given by linearly interpolating off-diagonal entries of the Cholesky factors and geometrically interpolating the diagonal




Figure 5: (a) Displays 10 consecutive covariance ellipses from the upper 2×2 submatrix of the covariances sampled from the GAR(1) process described in Section 6.2. Panels (b), (c) and (d) are generated in the same way as in Figure 3.

elements. That is, for $t \in [0, 1]$, the Cholesky factor L_t of $\gamma_{M_0}^{M_1}(t)$ is given via $[L_t] = (1 - t)[L_0] + t[L_1]$ and $\mathbb{D}(L_t) = \mathbb{D}(L_0)^{1-t}\mathbb{D}(L_1)^t$.

We generate a time series with the identity matrix 1_d as the Fréchet mean. Each noise map in this experiment applies a random congruent transformation of the input with a random lower-triangular matrix $L_\varepsilon \in R^{d \times d}$ with $\varepsilon(X) = L_\varepsilon X L_\varepsilon^\top$. The lower-triangular entries of L_ε are i.i.d. following a Normal distribution $[L_\varepsilon]_{ij} \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$ and the diagonal entries are i.i.d. following a log-Normal distribution $\log \mathbb{D}(L_\varepsilon)_{ii} \sim N(0, 0.2^2)$. For a matrix $X \in \mathcal{S}_p^+$ with Cholesky decomposition $X = LL^\top$, the matrix $\varepsilon(X)$ is also \mathcal{S}_p^+ and has Cholesky decomposition $\varepsilon(X) = L_\varepsilon L$, implying $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(X)] = X$.

Here, Figure 5 shows similar results as in the other two experimental settings. The convergence rate proved in Theorem 4.2 is confirmed in panel (a). We observe that in this setting, the stability of the error curves seems to

indicate an early attainment of the asymptotic regime. Similarly, we observe in panels (c) and (d) that the test exposes the right level and high power, already at small sample sizes for all tested values of φ .

7. Application




Figure 6: Left: Smoothed densities of the monthly 12-months-ahead inflation expectation with empirical Fréchet mean displayed in red. Right, top: Empirical cumulative distribution function of the residuals for the GAR(1) and mean-only models. Right, bottom: Residuals of both models over time.

Analyzing consumer inflation expectations brings insights into how everyday perceptions shape broader economic trends (Dietrich et al., 2022; Meeks and Monti, 2023). The *Survey of Consumer Expectations* (SCE) is a monthly survey maintained by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York collecting information on households’ expectations on a broad variety of economic topics between June 2013 and November 2022, see Armantier et al. (2017). We focus our attention on the inflation expectation question, in which each consumer is asked to provide a distribution representing their belief for the 12-months ahead inflation. The survey respondents are presented with pre-defined bins over which they can distribute percentage points, defining a histogram of their beliefs. Each month, an average of approximately 1300 response histograms are available, which we aggregate by first taking the individual’s median belief and approximating the median belief density via kernel density estimator with a Gaussian kernel and using Scott’s rule (Scott, 1992) for

the choice of the bandwidth, resulting in a time-series of $T = 114$ elements in $\mathcal{D}([-12, 12])$ displayed in the left panel of Figure 6.

We fit the parameters of the GAR(1) model as described in Section 4 and obtain an empirical Fréchet mean $\hat{\mu}_T$ displayed in red in the left panel of Figure 6 and a concentration parameter $\hat{\varphi}_T = 0.92$ indicating a strong sequential dependence of the curves. The hypothesis test presented in Section 5 rejects the hypothesis of independence at level at a 5% level with a test statistic $D_T = 0.26$ and estimated p-value $\hat{p}_B \approx 0.001$ with $B = 1000$.

Using the fitted parameters, we generate predictions under the model, $\hat{X}_{t+1} = \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\hat{\varphi}_T)$, and compare the squared residuals $d(X_{t+1}, \hat{X}_{t+1})^2$ to the squared residuals under the null model $d(X_{t+1}, \hat{\mu}_T)^2$. We use the metric space version of the coefficient of determination proposed in Petersen and Muller (2019) to evaluate the fit of the GAR(1) model, with its empirical version given by

$$\hat{R}_{\oplus}^2 = 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\hat{\varphi}_T))^2}{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_t, \hat{\mu}_T)^2}.$$

In this analysis, we find an empirical coefficient of determination of $\hat{R}_{\oplus}^2 = 0.82$ indicating that the GAR(1) model is able to explain a significant portion of the variability in the data. The right panel of Figure 6 shows that the residuals of the GAR(1) fit are smaller than for the mean-only fit, as shown in the upper graph. Furthermore, as shown in the lower-right panel, the residuals under the mean-only residuals increase and are high during the years 2021 and 2022 while the GAR(1) residuals stay stable over time.

8. Acknowledgement

This work has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 956107, ”Economic Policy in Complex Environments (EPOC)”.

Appendix A. General results in Hadamard spaces

We start by stating results available in Hadamard spaces that will be used in the rest of the Appendix.

Proposition Appendix A.1 (Reshetnyak's Quadruple Comparison; Proposition 2.4 in [Sturm \(2003\)](#)). Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space. For all $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \Omega$,

$$d(x_1, x_3)^2 + d(x_2, x_4)^2 \leq d(x_2, x_3)^2 + d(x_4, x_1)^2 + 2d(x_1, x_2)d(x_3, x_4).$$

Specializing this inequality to geodesics yields the following

Proposition Appendix A.2 (Geodesic comparison inequality; Corollary 2.5 in [Sturm \(2003\)](#)). Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space, $\gamma, \eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$ be geodesics and $t \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(\gamma(t), \eta(t))^2 &\leq (1-t)d(\gamma(0), \eta(0))^2 + td(\gamma(1), \eta(1))^2 \\ &\quad - t(1-t)[d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))d(\eta(0), \eta(1))]. \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B. Proofs

Consistency of the mean estimator

We start by defining the following function which will be useful in the proofs presented in this section. Let $\omega, \omega_0 \in \Omega$, we define for all $x \in \Omega$ the function

$$g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x) = d(x, \omega)^2 - d(x, \omega_0)^2.$$

In a Hadamard space, $g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}$ has the following Lipschitz property holding both in x and in the pair (ω, ω_0) .

Lemma Appendix B.1. Let (Ω, d) be a Hadamard space and $\omega, \omega_0, x, x' \in \Omega$, then

$$|g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x) - g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x')| \leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0)d(x, x').$$

Proof. By Reshetnyak's Quadruple Comparison (see Proposition [Appendix A.1](#)),

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', \omega_0)^2 + d(x, \omega)^2 &\leq d(x, \omega_0)^2 + d(x', \omega)^2 + 2d(x, x')d(\omega, \omega_0) \\ \Rightarrow d(x, \omega)^2 - d(x', \omega)^2 - (d(x, \omega_0)^2 - d(x', \omega_0)^2) &\leq 2d(x, x')d(\omega, \omega_0) \\ \Rightarrow g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x) - g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x') &\leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0)d(x, x') \end{aligned}$$

By inverting the role of x and x' we obtain the same upper bound on $g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x') - g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(x)$ which completes the proof. \square

We can now show that the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_T = \sqrt{T}(\mathbb{P}_T - \mathbb{P})$ applied to $g_{\omega_0}^\omega$ indexed by ω is sub-Gaussian, which is a crucial step for proving rates of convergence of $\hat{\mu}_T$.

Proposition Appendix B.2. Let $\omega_0 \in \Omega$, define the process $\{H_{\omega_0}^\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$ with $H_{\omega_0}^\omega = \mathbb{G}_n(g_{\omega_0}^\omega)$. Then, there exists a constant K such that for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[|H_{\omega_0}^\omega| \geq \lambda] \lesssim 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Kd(\omega, \omega_0)^2}\right\}.$$

Proof. Following [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#), we show that the scaled process $\sqrt{T}H_{\omega_0}^\omega$ can be decomposed as

$$\sqrt{T}H_{\omega_0}^\omega = \sum_{t=1}^T D_t + R_T. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Putting the noise maps in random variables $\Theta_t = (\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-1}, \dots)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Theta_0) &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X_t) \mid \Theta_0] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X)]), \\ D_t &= h(\Theta_t) - \mathbb{E}[h(\Theta_t) \mid \Theta_{t-1}], \\ R_T &= \mathbb{E}[h(\Theta_1) \mid \Theta_0] - \mathbb{E}[h(\Theta_{T+1}) \mid \Theta_T] = O_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that D_t is a martingale-difference and that $R_T = O_p(1)$. To show that this decomposition is valid, we start by showing that h is absolutely summable. That is, we now show

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X_t) \mid X_0 = x] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X)]| < \infty.$$

Using Lemma [Appendix B.1](#), then, by independence of $\{\varepsilon_i\}$ and finally assuming (7) holds with $\alpha = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X_t) \mid X_0 = x] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^\omega(X)]| \\ &\leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0) \mathbb{E}_{X_t}[\mathbb{E}_X[d(X_t, X)] \mid X_0 = x] \\ &= 2d(\omega, \omega_0) \mathbb{E}[d(X_t(x), X_t(\tilde{X}_0))] \\ &\leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0) Cr^t. \end{aligned}$$

Plugin this bound in the infinite sum, this gives

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_t) \mid X_0 = x] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X)]| \leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0)C \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r^t = \tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0).$$

We can thus now use the decomposition (B.1). From the bound above, $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{T}H_{\omega_0}^{\omega}$ exists and is bounded and so are D_t and R_t with $|D_t| < C_d$ and $|R_T| < C_r$. In particular, we have that $C_d \leq \tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0)$ for some $\tilde{C} > 0$, since

$$\begin{aligned} D_t &= h(\Theta_t) - \mathbb{E}[h(\Theta_t) \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}]) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \quad (\text{Tower rule}) \\ &= \sum_{k=t-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}]. \quad (k \leq t-1 \Rightarrow \sigma(X_k) \subset \sigma(\Theta_{t-1})) \end{aligned}$$

We can use the function notation in Equation (6) to get $X_k = X_{k:t+1}(X_t)$ and rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_{k:t+1}(X_t)) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_{k:t+1}(X_t)) \mid \Theta_{t-1}] \end{aligned}$$

where $X_{k:t+1}$ is random in both conditional expectations, but X_t is only random in the second conditional expectation. Taking absolute values and using Lemma Appendix B.1 together with (2) in Wu and Shao (2004) gives

$$|\mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_t] - \mathbb{E}[g_{\omega_0}^{\omega}(X_k) \mid \Theta_{t-1}]| \leq 2d(\omega, \omega_0)Cr^{k-(t+1)}.$$

Using this bound in the sum gives

$$|D_t| \leq \sum_{k=t-1}^{\infty} 2d(\omega, \omega_0)Cr^{k-(t+1)} = 2Cd(\omega, \omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^k = \tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0).$$

Hence, $C_d \leq \tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0)$ and we use this bound instead. Using Chernoff's bounding technique, we have for all $\lambda, u > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[H_{\omega_0}^\omega \geq \lambda] &\leq \exp(-u\lambda) \mathbb{E}[\exp(uH_{\omega_0}^\omega)] \\
&= \exp(-u\lambda) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(u \frac{\sqrt{T}H_{\omega_0}^\omega}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right] \\
&= \exp(-u\lambda) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T D_t + R_T\right)\right\}\right] \\
&\leq \exp(-u\lambda) \exp\left\{u \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{T}}\right\} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{u \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{D_t}{\sqrt{T}}\right\}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Following the standard proof of Azuma-Hoeffding's inequality (see Theorem 2.2.1 in [Raginsky and Sason \(2013\)](#)) we can bound the moment generating function of the martingale-difference sum. Together with the bound $|D_t| \leq \tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[H_{\omega_0}^\omega \geq \lambda] &\leq \exp\left\{-u\left(\lambda - \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \frac{u^2}{2}T\left(\frac{\tilde{C}d(\omega, \omega_0)}{\sqrt{T}}\right)^2\right\} \\
&= \exp\left\{-u\left(\lambda - \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \frac{u^2}{2}\tilde{C}^2d(\omega, \omega_0)^2\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, choosing $u = \left(\lambda - \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{T}}\right)/(\tilde{C}^2d(\omega, \omega_0)^2)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}[H_{\omega_0}^\omega \geq \lambda] \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(\lambda - \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{T}}\right)^2}{2\tilde{C}^2d(\omega, \omega_0)^2}\right\} \sim \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2\tilde{C}^2d(\omega, \omega_0)^2}\right\},$$

where $a_t \sim b_t$ means $a_t/b_t \rightarrow 1$. By symmetry of the bounds used and repeating the above argument, we get in non-vanishing form

$$\mathbb{P}[|H_{\omega_0}^\omega| \geq \lambda] \lesssim 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2\tilde{C}^2d(\omega, \omega_0)^2}\right\}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Using the fact that the empirical process applied to $g_{\omega_0}^\omega$ is sub-gaussian, we can use standard M-estimation theory to provide a proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Noting that $(M_T - M)(\omega) - (M_T - M)(\mu) = T^{-1/2}H_\mu^\omega$ we have by Proposition Appendix B.2 that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sqrt{T}|(M_T - M)(\omega) - (M_T - M)(\mu)| \geq \lambda\right] \lesssim 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Kd(\omega, \omega_0)^2}\right\}.$$

So $\left\{\sqrt{T}(M_T - M)(\omega)\right\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ is sub-Gaussian. By Corollary 2.2.8 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{d(\omega, \mu) < \delta} \sqrt{T}|(M_T - M)(\omega) - (M_T - M)(\mu)|\right] &\lesssim \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log(1 + D(\varepsilon, d))} d\varepsilon \\ &= \delta \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log(1 + D(\delta\varepsilon, d))} d\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since by assumption the entropy integral is bounded and $O(1)$ for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we bound (up to a multiplicative constant) the modulus of continuity by $T^{-1/2}\delta$. Additionally, by the variance inequality in Hadamard spaces (see Proposition 4.4 in Sturm (2003)), we have that the condition $M(\omega) - M(\mu^*) \geq d(\omega, \mu^*)^2$ holds. Thus by Theorem 3.2.5 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), $d(\hat{\mu}_T, \mu^*) = O_P(T^{-1/2})$. \square

Appendix B.1. Uniform convergence of L_T

Proposition Appendix B.3. Under the conditions of Theorem 4.3, we have that $\|L_T - L\|_\infty = o_P(1)$.

Proof. We show this result by verifying the conditions of Corollary 2.2 of Newey (1991). Namely, we need to show that:

1. L is continuous;
2. L_T converges pointwise to L ;
3. There exists a sequence $C_t = O_p(1)$ such that for all $\varphi, \varphi' \in (0, 1)$, $|L_T(\varphi) - L_T(\varphi')| \leq C_t|\varphi - \varphi'|$.

We proceed to verify these conditions.

1. Continuity of L . By definition $\omega \mapsto d(\omega_0, \omega)^2$ is continuous. Since Ω is a Hadamard space, we also have that geodesics are continuous in $t \in [0, 1]$,

hence for all $x_t, x_{t+1} \in \Omega$ and $\varphi_0 \in [0, 1]$, $d(x_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{x_t} \varphi_n) \rightarrow d(x_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{x_t} \varphi_0)$ for any sequence $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi_0$. Furthermore, by geodesic convexity of the squared distance, we have that $d(x_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{x_t} \varphi)^2 \leq (1 - \varphi)d(x_{t+1}, \mu)^2 + \varphi d(x_{t+1}, x_t)^2$ which is integrable with respect to (X_t, X_{t+1}) since X_t and X_{t+1} have second moments. By dominated convergence, this shows that $L(\varphi) \rightarrow L(\varphi_0)$ as $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi_0$ for any sequence $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi_0$, and hence L is continuous.

2. Pointwise convergence. Let $\varphi_0 \in (0, 1)$. Using the fact that $X_{t+1} = \varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi))$, we can decompose the pointwise deviation of L_T from L as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_T(\varphi_0) - L(\varphi_0)| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lipschitz continuity of the squared distance in a bounded metric space, together with its geodesic convexity in Hadamard spaces and the fact that $d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T) = O_P(T^{-1/2})$, we have that the first sum in the upper bound is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \leq C_1 d(\gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0)) |d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0)) + d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))|. \end{aligned}$$

By the geodesic comparison inequality, $d(\gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0)) \leq \varphi_0 d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T)$, and using that $x \mapsto d(x_0, x)$ is geodesically convex, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0)) &\leq \varphi_0 d(X_{t+1}, \hat{\mu}_T) + (1 - \varphi_0) d(X_{t+1}, X_t) \\ &\leq d(X_{t+1}, \hat{\mu}_T) + d(X_{t+1}, X_t) \\ &\leq 2d(X_{t+1}, \mu) + d(X_t, \mu) + d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0)) \leq 2d(X_{t+1}, \mu) + d(X_t, \mu)$, giving

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \leq C_2 d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T) [d(X_{t+1}, \mu) + d(X_t, \mu) + d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T)] \end{aligned}$$

Taking the average over $t = 1, \dots, T-1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \leq d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T)^2 + d(\mu, \hat{\mu}_T) \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(X_{t+1}, \mu) + d(X_t, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that the second term is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$ as well. We do this using Theorem 3 in [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#) with $Y_t = (X_t, X_{t+1})$ and $g(X_t, X_{t+1}) = d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[d(\varepsilon_{t+1}(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0)), \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right]$. Let ρ be the product metric on $\Omega \times \Omega$, $\rho((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = \sqrt{d(x_1, y_1)^2 + d(x_2, y_2)^2}$. Let $Y_t = (X_t, X_{t+1})$ and $\tilde{Y}_t = (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{X}_{t+1})$ be pairs in $\Omega \times \Omega$ such that $\rho(Y_t, \tilde{Y}_t) \leq \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| g(Y_t) - g(\tilde{Y}_t) \right| = \left| d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(\tilde{X}_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{\tilde{X}_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \leq \left| d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(\tilde{X}_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \quad + \left| d(\tilde{X}_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0))^2 - d(\tilde{X}_{t+1}, \gamma_\mu^{\tilde{X}_t}(\varphi_0))^2 \right| \\ & \leq Cd(X_{t+1}, \tilde{X}_{t+1}) + Cd(\gamma_\mu^{X_t}(\varphi_0), \gamma_\mu^{\tilde{X}_t}(\varphi_0)) \\ & = Cd(X_{t+1}, \tilde{X}_{t+1}) + C\varphi_0 d(X_t, \tilde{X}_t) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho(Y_t, \tilde{Y}_t) \leq \delta$, we have that $\max \{d(X_{t+1}, \tilde{X}_{t+1}), d(X_t, \tilde{X}_t)\} \leq \delta$ and hence $\left| g(Y_t) - g(\tilde{Y}_t) \right| \leq C\delta$, showing that g is Dini continuous and also stochastically Dini continuous. Theorem 3 in [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#) gives that the second term in the above equation converges to a Brownian motion when scaled by \sqrt{T} and hence is $O_p(T^{-1/2})$ which completes the proof of pointwise convergence.

3. Stochastic Lipschitz Continuity of L_T . Let $\varphi, \varphi' \in (0, 1)$, then using that Ω is bounded and thus the squared distance is Lipschitz, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |L_T(\varphi) - L_T(\varphi')| &\leq \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left| d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi))^2 - d(X_{t+1}, \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi'))^2 \right| \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(\gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi), \gamma_{\hat{\mu}_T}^{X_t}(\varphi')) \\ &= |\varphi - \varphi'| C \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} d(\hat{\mu}_T, X_t). \end{aligned}$$

Again using that Ω is bounded, the average is also bounded and we obtain the desired result. \square

References

- Armantier, O., Topa, G., Van der Klaauw, W., Zafar, B., 2017. An overview of the survey of consumer expectations. *Economic Policy Review* , 51–72.
- Bačák, M., 2014. Computing Medians and Means in Hadamard Spaces. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 24, 1542–1566. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/140953393>, doi:10.1137/140953393. publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- van den Boogaart, K.G., Egozcue, J.J., Pawlowsky-Glahn, V., 2014. Bayes Hilbert Spaces. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics* 56, 171–194. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anzs.12074>, doi:10.1111/anzs.12074.
- Bosq, D., 2000. Linear Processes in Function Spaces. volume 149 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer New York, New York, NY. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4612-1154-9>, doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-1154-9.
- Bulté, M., Sørensen, H., 2023. Medoid splits for efficient random forests in metric spaces. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17031>, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2306.17031. arXiv:2306.17031 [stat].

- Burago, D., Burago, Y., Ivanov, S., 2001. A Course in Metric Geometry. volume 33 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island. URL: <http://www.ams.org/gsm/033>, doi:10.1090/gsm/033.
- Caner, M., 2006. M-estimators with non-standard rates of convergence and weakly dependent data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 136, 1207–1219. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0378375804003647>, doi:10.1016/j.jspi.2004.09.004.
- Caponera, A., Marinucci, D., 2021. Asymptotics for spherical functional autoregressions. *The Annals of Statistics* 49. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-statistics/volume-49/issue-1/Asymptotics-for-spherical-functional-autoregressions/10.1214/20-AOS1959.full>, doi:10.1214/20-AOS1959.
- Chen, Y., Lin, Z., Müller, H.G., 2021. Wasserstein Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–14 URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01621459.2021.1956937>, doi:10.1080/01621459.2021.1956937.
- Dietrich, A.M., Kuester, K., Müller, G.J., Schoenle, R., 2022. News and uncertainty about COVID-19: Survey evidence and short-run economic impact. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 129, S35–S51. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0304393222000216>, doi:10.1016/j.jmoneco.2022.02.004.
- Dubey, P., Müller, H.G., 2019. Fréchet analysis of variance for random objects. *Biometrika* 106, 803–821. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article/106/4/803/5609104>, doi:10.1093/biomet/asz052.
- Dubey, P., Müller, H.G., 2020. Fréchet change-point detection. *The Annals of Statistics* 48, 3312–3335. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-statistics/volume-48/issue-6/Fr%C3%A9chet-change-point-detection/10.1214/19-AOS1930.full>, doi:10.1214/19-AOS1930. publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Fréchet, M., 1948. Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié, in: *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré*, pp. 215–310. Issue: 4.

- Ghodrati, L., Panaretos, V.M., 2023. On Distributional Autoregression and Iterated Transportation. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.09469>, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.09469. arXiv:2303.09469 [stat].
- Hanneke, S., Kontorovich, A., Sabato, S., Weiss, R., 2021. Universal Bayes consistency in metric spaces. The Annals of Statistics 49, 2129–2150. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-statistics/volume-49/issue-4/Universal-Bayes-consistency-in-metric-spaces/10.1214/20-AOS2029.full>, doi:10.1214/20-AOS2029. publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Hemerik, J., Goeman, J., 2018. Exact testing with random permutations. TEST 27, 811–825. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11749-017-0571-1>, doi:10.1007/s11749-017-0571-1.
- Hoeffding, W., Robbins, H., 1948. The central limit theorem for dependent random variables. Duke Mathematical Journal 15, 773–780. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/duke-mathematical-journal/volume-15/issue-3/The-central-limit-theorem-for-dependent-random-variables/10.1215/S0012-7094-48-01568-3.full>, doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-48-01568-3. publisher: Duke University Press.
- Jiang, F., Gao, H., Shao, X., 2023. Testing serial independence of object-valued time series. Biometrika , asad069URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asad069>, doi:10.1093/biomet/asad069.
- Köstenberger, G., Stark, T., 2023. Robust Signal Recovery in Hadamard Spaces. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.06057>, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2307.06057. arXiv:2307.06057 [math, stat].
- Lin, Z., 2019. Riemannian Geometry of Symmetric Positive Definite Matrices via Cholesky Decomposition. SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications 40, 1353–1370. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/18M1221084>, doi:10.1137/18M1221084. publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Mazzuco, S., Scarpa, B., 2015. Fitting Age-Specific Fertility Rates by a Flexible Generalized Skew Normal Probability Density Function. Journal

- of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society 178, 187–203. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12053>, doi:10.1111/rssa.12053.
- McCormack, A., Hoff, P., 2022. The Stein effect for Fréchet means. The Annals of Statistics 50, 3647–3676. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-statistics/volume-50/issue-6/The-Stein-effect-for-Fr%c3%a9chet-means/10.1214/22-AOS2245.full>, doi:10.1214/22-AOS2245. publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- McCormack, A., Hoff, P.D., 2023. Equivariant estimation of Fréchet means. Biometrika , asad014 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asad014>, doi:10.1093/biomet/asad014.
- Meeks, R., Monti, F., 2023. Heterogeneous beliefs and the Phillips curve. Journal of Monetary Economics URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304393223000703>, doi:10.1016/j.jmoneco.2023.06.003.
- Newey, W.K., 1991. Uniform Convergence in Probability and Stochastic Equicontinuity. Econometrica 59, 1161. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2938179?origin=crossref>, doi:10.2307/2938179.
- Panaretos, V.M., Zemel, Y., 2016. Amplitude and phase variation of point processes. The Annals of Statistics 44. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-statistics/volume-44/issue-2/Amplitude-and-phase-variation-of-point-processes/10.1214/15-AOS1387.full>, doi:10.1214/15-AOS1387.
- Panaretos, V.M., Zemel, Y., 2020. An Invitation to Statistics in Wasserstein Space. SpringerBriefs in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Springer International Publishing, Cham. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-38438-8>, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-38438-8.
- Petersen, A., Muller, H.G., 2019. Frechet regression for random objects with Euclidean predictors , 29.
- Petersen, A., Müller, H.G., 2016. Functional data analysis for density functions by transformation to a Hilbert space. The Annals of

- Statistics 44. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.02869>, doi:10.1214/15-AOS1363. arXiv: 1601.02869.
- Petersen, A., Zhang, C., Kokoszka, P., 2022. Modeling Probability Density Functions as Data Objects. *Econometrics and Statistics* 21, 159–178. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S245230622100054X>, doi:10.1016/j.ecosta.2021.04.004.
- Raginsky, M., Sason, I., 2013. Concentration of Measure Inequalities in Information Theory, Communications, and Coding. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory* 10, 1–246. URL: <https://www.nowpublishers.com/article/Details/CIT-064>, doi:10.1561/01000000064. publisher: Now Publishers, Inc.
- Ramsay, J.O., Silverman, B.W., 2005. Functional data analysis. Springer series in statistics. 2nd ed ed., Springer, New York.
- Scott, D.W., 1992. Multivariate Density Estimation: Theory, Practice, and Visualization. Wiley. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470316849>, doi:10.1002/9780470316849. iSSN: 1940-6347 Publication Title: Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics.
- Srivastava, A., Klassen, E.P., 2016. Functional and Shape Data Analysis. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer New York, New York, NY. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4939-4020-2>, doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-4020-2.
- Sturm, K.T., 2003. Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature, in: Auscher, P., Coulhon, T., Grigor’yan, A. (Eds.), *Contemporary Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island. volume 338, pp. 357–390. URL: <http://www.ams.org/conm/338/>, doi:10.1090/conm/338/06080.
- van der Vaart, A.W., Wellner, J.A., 1996. Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer New York, New York, NY. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2>, doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2.
- Wu, W.B., Shao, X., 2004. Limit theorems for iterated random functions. *Journal of Applied Probability* 41, 425–436. URL: <https://www>.

[cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-applied-probability/article/abs/limit-theorems-for-iterated-random-functions/9CA522B1DE090C02B7374ED8212739AB#](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-applied-probability/article/abs/limit-theorems-for-iterated-random-functions/9CA522B1DE090C02B7374ED8212739AB#), doi:10.1239/jap/1082999076.
publisher: Cambridge University Press.

Xavier, J., Manton, J., 2006. On the Generalization of AR Processes To Riemannian Manifolds, in: 2006 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics Speed and Signal Processing Proceedings, IEEE, Toulouse, France. pp. V-1005-V-1008. URL: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1661448/>, doi:10.1109/ICASSP.2006.1661448.

Yoshiyuki, A., 2017. A Functional Linear Regression Model in the Space of Probability Density Functions. Discussion papers URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/eti/dpaper/17015.html>. number: 17015 Publisher: Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI).

Zhu, C., Müller, H.G., 2021. Autoregressive Optimal Transport Models. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05439>. arXiv:2105.05439 [stat].

Zhu, C., Müller, H.G., 2022. Spherical Autoregressive Models, With Application to Distributional and Compositional Time Series. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.12783>. arXiv:2203.12783 [stat].