

A genericity property of Fréchet sample means on Riemannian manifolds

David Groisser

*Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
e-mail: groisser@ufl.edu*

and

Sungkyu Jung

*Department of Statistics
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
e-mail: sungkyu@snu.ac.kr*

and

Armin Schwartzman

*Division of Biostatistics
and Hahcioğlu Data Science Institute
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093, USA
e-mail: armins@ucsd.edu*

Abstract: Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. If μ is a probability measure on M given by a continuous density function, one would expect the Fréchet means of data-samples $Q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$, with respect to μ , to behave “generically”; e.g. the probability that the Fréchet mean set $\text{FM}(Q)$ has any elements that lie in a given, positive-codimension submanifold, should be zero for any $N \geq 1$. Even this simplest instance of genericity does not seem to have been proven in the literature, except in special cases. The main result of this paper is a general, and stronger, genericity property: given i.i.d. absolutely continuous M -valued random variables X_1, \dots, X_N , and a subset $A \subset M$ of volume-measure zero, $\Pr \{\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset M \setminus A\} = 1$. We also establish a companion theorem for *equivariant Fréchet means*, defined when (M, g) arises as the quotient of a Riemannian manifold (\tilde{M}, \tilde{g}) by a free, isometric action of a finite group. The equivariant Fréchet means lie in \tilde{M} , but, as we show, project down to the ordinary Fréchet sample means, and enjoy a similar genericity property. Both these theorems are proven as consequences of a purely geometric (and quite general) result that constitutes the core mathematics in this paper: If $A \subset M$ has volume zero in M , then the set $\{Q \in M^N : \text{FM}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ has volume zero in M^N . We conclude the paper with an application to *partial scaling-rotation means*, a type of mean for symmetric positive-definite matrices.

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62R30, 60D05; secondary 60B05, 57R99.

Keywords and phrases: Fréchet means; equivariant Fréchet means; Riemannian centers of mass; barycenter; pre-barycenter; scaling-rotation means; stratified manifold

1. Introduction

Let (M, g) be a smooth (C^∞) Riemannian manifold, with induced distance-function d , and for $p \in M$ let $r_p = d(\cdot, p)$ denote the function “distance to p ”. The *Fréchet mean set* $\text{FM}(\mu)$ of a Borel probability measure μ on M is defined to be the set of minimizers of the function on M defined by $p \mapsto \int_M r_p^2 d\mu$, provided that the integral is finite for some (hence all) p , a condition met automatically by all measures μ_Q considered below. If (M, g) is complete, which we will henceforth assume, then $\text{FM}(\mu)$ is nonempty for any such μ [2, Theorem 2.1]. Elements of $\text{FM}(\mu)$ are called *Fréchet means*, or *Riemannian centers of mass*, of μ . (In this paper, the term *barycenter* will be used for something more general, defined later.)

For $q \in M$ let δ_q be the Dirac measure with support $\{q\}$, and for $N \geq 1$ let M^N denote the N -fold Cartesian product of M with itself. For an N -tuple (or *configuration*) of points $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$, by the *Fréchet mean set of Q* we will mean $\text{FM}(Q) := \text{FM}(\mu_Q)$, where $\mu_Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{q_i}$ (the notation μ_Q will be used with this meaning throughout the paper); similarly, a *Fréchet mean of Q* will mean an element of $\text{FM}(Q)$. For random N -tuples Q representing i.i.d. samples of an underlying probability measure μ , the Fréchet means μ_Q are called *Fréchet sample means* of μ .

If μ is given by a continuous probability density function, one would expect the Fréchet sample means of μ to behave “generically”; e.g. the probability that they lie in a positive-codimension submanifold should be zero for any $N \geq 1$. Surprisingly, even this much genericity does not seem to have been proven in the literature, except in special cases. The main result of this paper is a general, and stronger, genericity property:

Theorem 1.1. *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be i.i.d. absolutely continuous M -valued random variables. If $A \subset M$ has volume zero in M , then*

$$\Pr \{ \text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset M \setminus A \} = 1. \quad (1.1)$$

In particular, (1.1) holds if A is a countable union of submanifolds of positive codimension.

(Terminology in this theorem is discussed the end of this section.)

Fréchet means are not always unique (i.e. the Fréchet mean set may have more than one element). In [1, Theorem 2.1], Afsari established what is, to date, the least-stringent “concentration” condition known to guarantee uniqueness. Combining this with Theorem 1.1, we obtain a corresponding sufficient condition for N i.i.d. random variables under which, with probability 1, the Fréchet sample mean is unique and lies in the complement of a given volume-zero subset of M . Theorem 1.1 and this uniqueness result are restated together as Corollary 6.1.

Theorem 1.1 has an “equivariant” companion, in which (M, g) arises as the quotient of a Riemannian manifold $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ by a free, isometric action of a finite group G . (Thus $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ is a finite-degree principal Riemannian cover of (M, g) ; see Remark 7.1.) In this setting we consider a hybrid “equivariant distance function” $d_{\text{evt}} : M \times \widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, defined by $d_{\text{evt}}(q, \tilde{p}) = \tilde{d}(\text{quo}^{-1}(q), \tilde{p})$, the distance in $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ between the point $\tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}$ and the G -orbit $\text{quo}^{-1}(q) \subset \widetilde{M}$, where $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is the quotient map. (Equivalently, $d_{\text{evt}}(q, \tilde{p}) = d(q, \text{quo}(\tilde{p}))$.) For a given $Q \in M^N$, we can lift the Fréchet objective function $f_Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d(\cdot, q_i)^2 : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ to a function $\tilde{f}_Q : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by replacing $d(\cdot, p)$ by $d_{\text{evt}}(\cdot, \tilde{p})$. We call minimizers of such

a function *equivariant Fréchet means* of Q (a special case of “ ρ -means” as extended by Huckemann [12, 14]; if \tilde{p} is a minimizer, then so is $h \cdot \tilde{p}$ for every $h \in G$. For $Q \in M^N$, let $\text{EFM}(Q) \subset \widetilde{M}$ denote the set of equivariant Fréchet means of Q . We prove the following result about equivariant Fréchet means of i.i.d. random variables (essentially an equivariant version of Corollary 6.1, mentioned above):

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that the finite group G acts freely and isometrically on the Riemannian manifold $(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$, with quotient (M, g) and $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ the quotient map. Let X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N be i.i.d. M -valued random variables, with induced probability measure μ_X . Then:*

- (a) $\text{EFM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) = \text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}))$.
- (b) *Let $\tilde{A} \subset \widetilde{M}$ be a G -invariant set of volume zero in \widetilde{M} , let $A = \text{quo}(\tilde{A})$ and write $\widetilde{M}_* = \widetilde{M} \setminus \tilde{A}$ and $M_* = \text{quo}(\widetilde{M}_*) = M \setminus A$. If X is absolutely continuous then, almost surely, $\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset M_*$ and $\text{EFM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset \widetilde{M}_*$.*
- (c) *Under the hypotheses of part (b), if μ_X is supported in an open ball B of radius less than a certain number $r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)$ (specified in Definition 4.7), then almost surely the Fréchet mean set of $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ is a single point and lies in $M_* \cap B$. Correspondingly, under the same hypotheses, almost surely the equivariant Fréchet means of $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ are unique up to the action of G and lie in $\widetilde{M}_* \cap \text{quo}^{-1}(B)$.*

Our strategy for proving Theorem 1.1 is to deduce it from a purely geometric (and quite general) result that constitutes the core mathematics in this paper:

Theorem 1.3. *If $A \subset M$ has volume zero in M , then the set*

$$\{Q \in M^N : \text{FM}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\} \tag{1.2}$$

has volume zero in M^N . In particular, this holds if A is a countable union of submanifolds of positive codimension.

Since Theorem 1.1 is derived as a consequence of Theorem 1.3, much of this paper is, correspondingly, purely geometric. Our approach is to turn the question answered by Theorem 1.3 into a *transversality* problem by using “pre-barycenters”. These are pre-images of barycenters in the bundle $(TM)^{\times N}$, the N -fold fiberwise product of TM with itself. (We use the term *barycenter* in the “balancing point” sense in this paper.) The intuition behind Theorem 1.3 is that if we perturb a sample Q_0 to a sample Q that moves over an open neighborhood of Q_0 —or even if we hold all but one of the sample points fixed, and allow the remaining point to vary over an open neighborhood—the barycenters should *move*, varying over an open set themselves. In Sections 2–4 we define and discuss barycenters and pre-barycenters; show that the set \mathcal{PB}_N of *pre-barycentered configurations* is a submanifold of the bundle $(TM)^{\times N}$ (part of Proposition 3.1(a)); prove a forerunner of Theorem 1.3, a genericity property of barycenters rather than Fréchet means (Theorem 3.3); and establish some properties of the set of \mathcal{B}_N of *barycentered configurations* (the set $\mathcal{B}_N := \{(Q, p) : p \text{ is a barycenter of } Q\} \subset M^N \times M$).

Among the latter properties is that the set of *sufficiently concentrated* barycentered configurations is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$ (part of Corollary 4.10), a property that we do not

know or expect of the entire set \mathcal{PB}_N in general. In Section 5, building on work in [20], we show that all Fréchet means of finite configurations are barycenters (Corollary 5.5). This fact, combined with Theorem 3.3, yields Theorem 1.3.

In Section 6 we begin applying our geometric results to i.i.d. random variables. Theorem 1.1 follows quickly from Theorem 1.3. As mentioned earlier, we apply this together with [1]’s Theorem 2.1 to obtain, additionally, the almost-sure uniqueness of Fréchet sample means (under appropriate hypotheses). In Section 6 we also discuss an example that illustrates the generality of Theorem 1.1, and also give some examples of interest in which Theorem 1.1 does *not* apply.

Section 7 is pure geometry again: we examine finite-degree principal Riemannian covers $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g}) \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} (M, g)$ and equivariant means. For a finite configuration Q , we show that taking equivariant Fréchet means in \widetilde{M} is “equivalent” to taking Fréchet means in M , in the sense that $\text{EFM}(Q) = \widetilde{\text{quo}}^{-1}(\text{FM}(Q))$ (Proposition 7.4(a)). We also establish relations between the numbers $r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ and $r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)$. We are then set up to address Fréchet sample means in the equivariant setting in Section 8, where we prove Theorem 1.2 (as Corollary 8.6).

In Section 9 we discuss an application of our equivariant-Fréchet-means results to “partial scaling-rotation means”, a type of mean for symmetric positive-definite matrices that the authors introduced in [16].

Some remarks concerning the terminology “volume zero”, “generic”, “absolutely continuous”, and “ M -valued random variable” are worthwhile here. The notion of *measure-zero subset of a manifold* \mathcal{M} (see e.g. [21, Ch. 6] or [10, Ch. 3]) is independent of any measures that one is putting on \mathcal{M} , but coincides with “set of (n -dimensional) Lebesgue measure zero” when $\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{R}^n$. To avoid any confusion with probability measures under consideration, we will refer to a measure-zero subset of a manifold \mathcal{M} (in the sense above) as having *volume zero* in \mathcal{M} ; we call the complement of such a subset *generic* (in \mathcal{M}). Motivation for the “volume zero” terminology is that every Riemannian metric g on \mathcal{M} determines a *volume measure* whose null sets are precisely the measure-zero sets in the sense above. However, the above notions of “volume zero” and “genericity”—*residuality* in the terminology of [10, Ch. 3]—are at heart more topological than measure-theoretic, making sense even without specifying a measure on \mathcal{M} . Every generic subset of \mathcal{M} is dense, and every positive-codimension submanifold of \mathcal{M} has volume zero in \mathcal{M} .

We call a measure μ on a manifold \mathcal{M} *absolutely continuous* if $\mu(A) = 0$ whenever $A \subset \mathcal{M}$ has volume zero in \mathcal{M} . Every measure on \mathcal{M} given by a continuous density function is absolutely continuous.

Every manifold \mathcal{M} has two “natural” sigma-algebras of (potentially) measurable sets: the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of Borel sets, and its completion $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$, the “Lebesgue sigma-algebra”—an analog of the sigma-algebra of Lebesgue measurable subsets of \mathbf{R}^n —which can be obtained by adding to $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ the collection of all volume-zero subsets of \mathcal{M} . To have a clear meaning of “measurable map” (a map for which the inverse image of every measurable set is measurable), with domain or codomain \mathcal{M} , we must specify which of these sigma-algebras on \mathcal{M} we are using. It is desirable to make the same specification consistently, across all manifolds, to ensure that the composition of measurable maps is measurable. Since volume-zero sets occur throughout this paper, we choose the Lebesgue sigma-algebra on every manifold. (This choice differs from the customary definition of “measurable function $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ”, in which f is called measurable if the inverse image of every *Borel* set is *Lebesgue* measurable.)

In this paper we will take the domain of every random variable that appears to be a (fixed but arbitrary) complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$. An \mathcal{M} -valued random variable is then an $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}})$ -measurable map $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. We call X *absolutely continuous* if its induced measure μ_X on \mathcal{M} is absolutely continuous. For such X , it actually makes no difference whether we choose $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ as our sigma-algebra on \mathcal{M} : if $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is an $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ -measurable map whose induced measure μ_X on \mathcal{M} is absolutely continuous, then X is also $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}})$ -measurable.

Throughout this paper, $n = \dim(M)$, and N is an arbitrary positive integer. For $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$ we write $\text{supp}(Q)$ for the (unordered) multi-set $\{q_1, \dots, q_N\}$; when the points are distinct this coincides with the support of the measure μ_Q . For $p \in M$, the zero element of T_pM is sometimes denoted 0_p for clarity's sake, and sometimes simply denoted 0 . As is customary, “exp” denotes the exponential map $TM \rightarrow M$, while “ exp_p ” denotes the restriction of exp to T_pM . In any metric space that is understood from context, $B_r(q)$ and $\bar{B}_r(q)$ denote, respectively, the open and closed balls of radius r centered at q ; sometimes this notation may be augmented to include some reference to the metric space of interest.

To avoid technical distractions, throughout we take “smooth” to mean C^∞ , and “(sub)manifold” to mean “smooth (sub)manifold”. These restrictions of “smooth” and “(sub)manifold” can be relaxed; see Remark 4.11.

2. Barycenters and pre-barycenters

In this paper, we take *barycenter* of a configuration $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$ to mean a “balancing point” (suitably defined) for the configuration. The simplest example of such a barycenter is a point p for which no q_i lies in the cut-locus of p (thereby allowing a reasonable definition of “ $(\text{exp}_p)^{-1}(q_i)$ ”) and for which $\sum_{i=1}^N (\text{exp}_p)^{-1}(q_i) = 0$. This example is what we will soon be calling a *short barycenter*. To give a precise and more general definition of “barycenter” and related notions, we recall several facts pertaining to the exponential map and cut-loci, and fix some notation. All these facts can be found in standard books on Riemannian geometry, e.g. [5, 22], except for those facts for which we give specific references.

Let $S(TM)$ denote the unit tangent bundle of (M, g) , and for $p \in M$ let $S(T_pM) = S(TM) \cap T_pM$. For $v \in TM$ let γ_v be the geodesic $t \mapsto \text{exp}(tv)$. The *cut-time* function $\tau : S(TM) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is defined by $\tau(v) = \sup\{t \geq 0 : \gamma_v|_{[0,t]}$ is minimal $\}$. Recall that the *tangent cut locus* $\mathcal{C}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ and *cut locus* $\mathcal{C}(p)$ of $p \in M$ are defined by $\mathcal{C}^{\text{tan}}(p) = \{\tau(v)v : v \in S(T_pM), \tau(v) < \infty\}$ and $\mathcal{C}(p) = \text{exp}_p(\mathcal{C}^{\text{tan}}(p))$. Following [3], we call a cut-point $q \in \mathcal{C}(p)$ *ordinary* or *singular* accordingly as there are at least two minimal geodesics from p to q , or only one, and classify $v \in \mathcal{C}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ as an ordinary or singular accordingly as $\text{exp}_p(v)$ is an ordinary or singular cut-point of p . We will write $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p)$ for the set of ordinary and singular cut-points of p , respectively, and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ for the set of singular points in the tangent cut-locus of p . Note that any of these sets can be empty, and that the relations “ $q \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p)$ ” and “ $q \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p)$ ” are symmetric in p and q .

Still for arbitrary $p \in M$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p) &= \{tv : v \in S(T_p M), t \in [0, \tau(v))\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p) &= \mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}^{\text{tan}}(p), \\ \mathcal{D}(p) &= \exp_p(\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)), \\ \text{and } \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(p) &= \exp_p(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p)) = \mathcal{D}(p) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p). \end{aligned}$$

(Thus $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(p)$ is precisely the set of points $q \in M$ for which there is a unique minimal geodesic from p to q .) The set $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ is open, and the map \exp_p is injective on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ and nonsingular on $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)$. The set $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ is the largest subset $U \subset T_p M$, star-shaped with respect to 0_p , such that $\exp_p|_U$ is injective; $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)$ is the largest *open* subset $U \subset T_p M$, star-shaped with respect to 0_p , such that $\exp_p|_U$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image. In particular, $\mathcal{D}(p)$ is open, $\exp_p|_{\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)} : \mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(p)$ is a diffeomorphism, and $M = \mathcal{D}(p) \amalg \mathcal{C}(p)$. We define the notation $(\exp_p)^{-1}$ to mean the inverse of the bijective map $\exp_p|_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p)} : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(p)$. Note that $(\exp_p)^{-1}$ may not be continuous at points of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p)$, but the restriction of $(\exp_p)^{-1}$ to the open set $\mathcal{D}(p)$ is a diffeomorphism. The open set $\mathcal{D}(p)$ is dense in M , and its complement $\mathcal{C}(p)$ has measure zero. The distance function r_p is never C^1 at an ordinary cut-point of p , and never C^2 at any cut-point of p [3], but r_p^2 is smooth on $\mathcal{D}(p)$.

Our definition of *barycenter* is now as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$ and let $p \in M$. We call p a *barycenter* of Q if there exist $v_1, \dots, v_N \in T_p M$ such that $q_i = \exp_p(v_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, and $\sum_i v_i = 0$. We call p a *short barycenter* of Q if there exist such $v_1, \dots, v_N \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p)$, and an *almost-short barycenter* of Q if there exist such $v_1, \dots, v_N \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tan}}(p)$. We will write $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ for the set of barycenters of Q , and $\mathcal{B}^0(Q)$ (respectively, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^0(Q)$) for the set of short (resp., almost-short) barycenters of Q . We define

$$\mathcal{B}_N = \mathcal{B}_N(M) = \{(Q, p) \in M^N \times M : p \in \mathcal{B}(Q)\},$$

the set of *barycentered configurations of N points in M* . Similarly, we define $\mathcal{B}_N^0 = \{(Q, p) \in M^N \times M : p \in \mathcal{B}^0(Q)\}$. Note that $\mathcal{B}(Q)$, $\mathcal{B}^0(Q)$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^0(Q)$ are subsets of M , while \mathcal{B}_N and \mathcal{B}_N^0 are subsets of $M^N \times M$.

Also important will be the notion of *pre-barycenter*. To define this, let $(TM)^{\times N}$ denote the fiber bundle over M whose fiber over $p \in M$ is the N -fold Cartesian product $(T_p M)^N$. (The bundle-structure is the same as that of the N -fold Whitney sum of TM with itself, but we are regarding the fiber simply as a Cartesian product rather than a direct sum.) We will write $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ and $\pi' : (TM)^{\times N} \rightarrow M$ for the projection-maps of these bundles. Thus, elements of $(TM)^{\times N}$ may be written as $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in TM \times \dots \times TM$ with $\pi(v_1) = \pi(v_2) = \dots = \pi(v_N)$, and we have $\pi'(V) = \pi(v_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Note that $\dim((TM)^{\times N}) = (N+1)n = \dim(M^N \times M)$.

Definition 2.2. Define

$$\mathcal{PB}_N = \mathcal{PB}_N(M) = \{ (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in (TM)^{\times N} : \sum_i v_i = 0 \}.$$

We call elements of \mathcal{PB}_N *pre-barycenters* (of configurations of N points in M). We define the map $\exp^N : (TM)^{\times N} \rightarrow M^N$ by $\exp^N(v_1, \dots, v_N) = (\exp(v_1), \dots, \exp(v_N))$. If $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathcal{PB}_N$ and $Q = \exp^N(V)$, we say that V is a pre-barycenter of Q . For $Q \in M^N$ we write $\mathcal{PB}(Q)$ for the set of pre-barycenters of Q .

From Definitions 2.1 and 2.2 it is clear that for all $Q \in M^N$,

$$\mathcal{B}(Q) = \pi'(\mathcal{PB}(Q)). \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.3. We are using *ordered* N -tuples $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N)$ to take advantage of the manifold structures of M^N and $(TM)^{\times N}$. Clearly the set $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ depends only on the measure μ_Q , not on how the points q_i are ordered.

Remark 2.4. Our definitions of *barycenter* and *pre-barycenter* of a configuration are closely related to the definition of *barycentre of a (Borel) probability measure* in [6], which for purposes of distinction with our definition we will call a CK-barycenter. Given a measure μ on M and a point $p \in M$, we call a measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on T_pM a *lift* of μ if μ is the push-forward, under \exp_p , of $\tilde{\mu}$. A point $p \in M$ is a CK-barycenter of a probability measure μ if μ lifts to some probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on T_pM having zero “vector mean”, i.e. satisfying $\int_{T_pM} v d\tilde{\mu}(v) = 0$. For $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in (TM)^{\times N}$, $p = \pi'(V)$, and $Q = \exp^N(V)$, the probability measure $\mu_V := \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \delta_{v_i}$ on T_pM is a lift of μ_Q . Thus if V is a pre-barycenter of Q , or p is a barycenter of Q , then p is a CK-barycenter of Q . Our pre-barycenters of Q are a proxy for the probability measures of the form μ_V on T_pM to which μ_Q may lift. However, our definition of “barycenter of Q ” may be more restrictive than “CK-barycenter of μ_Q ”, since for p to be a barycenter of Q we require that μ_Q lift not just to an arbitrary vector-mean-zero probability measure on T_pM , but to one of the form μ_V above. (A general lift of μ_Q need not even be discrete; if discrete, it may have more than N points, and the weights of certain points need not be equal.)

Taking the liberty of writing elements of $M^N \times M$ as elements of M^{N+1} , we define subsets $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1, \mathcal{M}_1$ of $M^N \times M$ by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1 = \{(q_1, \dots, q_N, p) \in M^N \times M : q_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(p), 1 \leq i \leq N\}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \{(q_1, \dots, q_N, p) \in M^N \times M : q_i \in \mathcal{D}(p), 1 \leq i \leq N\}, \quad (2.3)$$

and define a map $F : \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1 \rightarrow TM$ by

$$F(q_1, \dots, q_N, p) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\exp_p)^{-1}(q_i) \in T_pM.$$

The set \mathcal{M}_1 is open and dense in $M^N \times M$, and the restricted map $F|_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ is smooth.

Notation 2.5.

- (a) Let $\pi_N : M^N \times M \rightarrow M^N$, $\pi_{\text{last}} : M^N \times M \rightarrow M$ denote projection onto the first and second factors of $M^N \times M$. We use the same notation for the restrictions of π_N, π_{last} to \mathcal{M}_1 and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1$. Observe that $\pi_{\text{last}}(\mathcal{M}_1) = M$.
- (b) For $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$, define the following:

- (i) $f_Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_{q_i}^2 : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

- (ii) $M_Q = \{p \in M : (Q, p) \in \mathcal{M}_1\} = \{p \in M : \text{supp}(Q) \subset \mathcal{D}(p)\} = \pi_{\text{last}}(\pi_N^{-1}(Q) \cap \mathcal{M}_1)$. Since the condition $\text{supp}(Q) \subset \mathcal{D}(p)$ is equivalent to $p \in \bigcap_{i=1}^N \mathcal{D}(q_i)$, and since $\mathcal{D}(q_i)$ is open and dense in M for each i , the set M_Q is open and dense as well.
- (iii) $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_Q = \{p \in M : (Q, p) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1\} = \{p \in M : \text{supp}(Q) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(p)\} = \pi_{\text{last}}(\pi_N^{-1}(Q) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_1)$.
- (iv) Define a vector field Y_Q on M_Q by $Y_Q(p) = F(Q, p)$.

It is well known that f_Q is smooth on M_Q and that the vector field Y_Q is the negative gradient of $f_Q|_{M_Q}$ (see e.g. [18]). Thus the following are equivalent: (i) p is a short barycenter of Q ; (ii) p is a critical point of f_Q in M_Q ; and (iii) $Y_Q(p) = 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{B}^0(Q)$ contains all Fréchet means of Q lying in M_Q .

We will see later that $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ contains the entire set $\text{FM}(Q)$; in fact $\text{FM}(Q) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^0(Q)$. This nontrivial fact, which follows from results in [20], will essentially allow us to deduce Theorem 1.1 from a stronger conclusion in which $\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\})$ in (1.1) is replaced by $\mathcal{B}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\})$. For efficiency of presentation we structure the argument slightly differently, restating and proving Theorem 1.1 as Corollary 6.1 (a).

3. Genericity of barycenters

At the heart of Theorem 1.1 is the question of how the set $\text{FM}(Q)$ varies as we vary Q . Rather than approaching this directly, our strategy will be to analyze perturbations of (pre-)barycenters and to show that from this analysis, the desired facts about Fréchet means can be deduced. Perturbation analysis is easier for barycenters, short barycenters, and pre-barycenters than (directly) for Fréchet means since barycenters (and short and pre-barycenters) are defined as solutions of *equations* on open subsets of manifolds, putting us in the realm in which we can hope to apply the Implicit Function Theorem in some guise (e.g. the Regular Value Theorem or transversality). This is why we have defined the sets $\mathcal{B}_N, \mathcal{B}_N^0$, and \mathcal{PB}_N —parametrized families of (pre-)barycenters, parametrized by the N -tuple Q . As we shall see shortly, \mathcal{PB}_N is a manifold, and the family of barycenter-sets $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ enjoys a genericity property.

To this end, writing elements of $(TM)^{\times N}$ as $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$, we define maps $\widetilde{F} : (TM)^{\times N} \rightarrow TM$ and $H : (TM)^{\times N} \rightarrow M^N \times M$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{F}(V) &= \sum_i v_i, \\ H(V) &= (\exp^N(V), \pi'(V)). \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth let Z denote the zero-section of TM (as a submanifold of TM). Observe that

$$\mathcal{B}_N^0 = (F|_{\mathcal{M}_1})^{-1}(Z) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{PB}_N = \widetilde{F}^{-1}(Z) =: \widetilde{Z}. \quad (3.1)$$

(We use the notation \widetilde{Z} for \mathcal{PB}_N to simplify other notation below.) The commutative diagram in Figure 1 depicts relations among various spaces and maps we have defined. Note that if we define

$$\mathcal{M}'_1 = \{V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in (TM)^{\times N} : v_i \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(\pi'(V)), 1 \leq i \leq N\}, \quad (3.2)$$

over M^N), the tangent space $T_V((TM)^{\times N})$ may be canonically identified with a subspace of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^N T_{v_i}(TM)$, namely $\{(w_1, \dots, w_N) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^N T_{v_i}(TM) : \pi_{*v_1}w_1 = \pi_{*v_2}w_2 = \dots = \pi_{*v_N}w_N\}$. The vertical subspace of $T_V((TM)^{\times N})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vert}_V((TM)^{\times N}) := \ker(\pi'_{*V}) &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^N \text{Vert}_{v_i}(T_pM) \\ &= \{(\iota_{v_1}(w_1), \dots, \iota_{v_N}(w_N)) : w_i \in T_pM\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{canon.}}{\cong} \bigoplus_{i=1}^N T_pM. \end{aligned}$$

For $X \in T_pM$, we define the horizontal lift of X to $(TM)^{\times N}$ at V to be the vector

$$\tilde{X}_V = (\tilde{X}_{v_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{v_N}) \in T_V((TM)^{\times N}) \subset \bigoplus_{i=1}^N T_{v_i}(TM), \quad (3.4)$$

where \tilde{X}_{v_i} is the horizontal lift of X to TM at v_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$. Defining $\text{Hor}_V((TM)^{\times N})$ to be the set of all horizontal lifts of elements of T_pM to $(TM)^{\times N}$, it is easily seen that $\text{Hor}_V((TM)^{\times N})$ is a vector subspace of $T_V((TM)^{\times N})$ and is a complement to $\text{Vert}_V((TM)^{\times N})$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in (TM)^{\times N}$ and let $p = \pi'(V)$. Decomposing $T_V((TM)^{\times N})$ as $\text{Hor}_V((TM)^{\times N}) \oplus \text{Vert}_V((TM)^{\times N})$, let us write elements of $T_V((TM)^{\times N})$ in the form $(\tilde{X}_V, (\iota_{v_1}(w_1), \dots, \iota_{v_N}(w_N)))$, where \tilde{X}_V is the horizontal lift at V of $X \in T_pM$ and $w_1, \dots, w_N \in T_pM$. Then one easily computes

$$\tilde{F}_{*V}(\tilde{X}_V, (\iota_{v_1}(w_1), \dots, \iota_{v_N}(w_N))) = (\tilde{X}_{\tilde{F}(V)}, \iota_{\tilde{F}(V)}(\sum_i w_i)) \quad (3.5)$$

where $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{F}(V)} \in \text{Hor}_{\tilde{F}(V)}(TM)$ is the horizontal lift of X to TM at $\tilde{F}(V)$. Clearly the image of \tilde{F}_{*V} is all of $\text{Hor}_{\tilde{F}(V)}(TM) \oplus \text{Vert}_{\tilde{F}(V)}(TM) = T_{\tilde{F}(V)}(TM)$. Hence \tilde{F} is a submersion, and $\tilde{Z} = \tilde{F}^{-1}(Z)$ is a submanifold of $(TM)^{\times N}$ of codimension equal to the codimension of Z in TM , namely n . Hence $\dim(\tilde{Z}) = \dim((TM)^{\times N}) - n = Nn$.

Let $V = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \tilde{F}^{-1}(Z)$ and $p = \pi'(V)$; thus $\tilde{F}(V) = 0_p \in T_pM$. Recall that $\text{Hor}_{0_p}(TM) = T_{0_p}Z$. Hence using (3.5) we find

$$\begin{aligned} T_V(\tilde{Z}) &= (\tilde{F}_{*V})^{-1}(T_{\tilde{F}(V)}Z) = (\tilde{F}_{*V})^{-1}(\text{Hor}_{0_p}(TM)) \\ &= \{(\tilde{X}_{\tilde{F}(V)}, (\iota_{v_1}(w_1), \dots, \iota_{v_N}(w_N))) \in T_V((TM)^{\times N}) : \sum_i w_i = 0_p\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that $\text{Hor}_{\tilde{F}(V)}(T_V((TM)^{\times N})) \subset T_V\tilde{Z}$ and that $\pi'_{*V}(\text{Hor}_V((TM)^{\times N})) = T_pM$; thus $\pi'_{*V}|_{T_V(\tilde{Z})}$ is surjective. Hence $\pi'|_{\tilde{Z}}$ is a submersion. ■

Knowing that $\pi'_{\tilde{Z}}$ is a submersion (Proposition 3.1(b)) will be valuable to us because of the following lemma. This lemma is almost certainly known, but the authors have found no reference for it. For a proof, see Appendix A.

Lemma 3.2. *Under a submersion, the inverse image of a set of volume zero has volume zero.*

Theorem 3.3. *If $A \subset M$ has volume zero in M , then the set*

$$\{Q \in M^N : \mathcal{B}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\} \quad (3.7)$$

has volume zero in M^N .

Proof: Let A be a volume-zero subset of M . By Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, $(\pi'|_{\tilde{Z}})^{-1}(A)$ has volume zero in the Nn -dimensional manifold \tilde{Z} . Every smooth map between manifolds of the same dimension carries sets of volume zero to sets of volume zero [21]. In particular, this is true of the map $\pi_N \circ H|_{\tilde{Z}} : \tilde{Z} \rightarrow M^N$. Thus $\pi_N(H((\pi'|_{\tilde{Z}})^{-1}(A)))$ has volume zero in M^N . Using Corollary 5.5, observation (2.1), and the fact that $\pi_{\text{last}} \circ H = \pi'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q \in M^N : \mathcal{B}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\} &= \{Q \in M^N : \exists p \in A \text{ such that } p \in \mathcal{B}(Q)\} \\ &\subset \{Q \in M^N : \exists p \in A \text{ such that } p \in \pi_{\text{last}}(\mathcal{PB}(Q))\} \\ &= \{Q \in M^N : \exists p \in A \text{ such that } (Q, p) \in H(\tilde{Z})\} \\ &= \pi_N \left(H(\tilde{Z}) \cap \pi_{\text{last}}^{-1}(A) \right) \\ &= \pi_N \left(H \left((\pi'|_{\tilde{Z}})^{-1}(A) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Hence the set (3.7) has volume zero in M^N . ■

4. Some properties of the set of barycentered configurations

Proposition 3.1(a) shows that \mathcal{PB}_N , the set of *pre*-barycentered configurations, is a submanifold of $(TM)^{\times N}$. It appears unlikely that \mathcal{B}_N , the set of barycentered configurations, is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$. However, we shall see that the subset \mathcal{B}_N^0 is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$, and captures the barycenters of almost all configurations in the sense that $\pi_N(\mathcal{B}_N \setminus \mathcal{B}_N^0) = M^N \setminus \pi_N(\mathcal{B}_N^0)$ has volume zero in M^N . (We have $\pi_N(\mathcal{B}_N) = M^N$ since $\text{FM}(Q) \neq \emptyset$ for every $Q \in M^N$.)

In proving these facts, two types of derivative of the vector fields Y_Q will arise. One is the covariant derivative ∇Y_Q , whose value at $p \in M$ is an endomorphism of $T_p M$, namely the map $v \mapsto \nabla_v Y_Q$. The other is the derivative of the map-of-manifolds $Y_Q : M \rightarrow TM$, whose value at p is the linear map $Y_{Q*p} : T_p M \rightarrow T_{Y_Q(p)}(TM)$. These derivatives are related as follows: for $v \in T_p M$,

$$Y_{Q*p}(v) = \tilde{v}_{Y_Q(p)} + \iota_{Y_Q(p)}(\nabla_v Y_Q); \quad (4.1)$$

i.e. $\nabla_v Y_Q$ is essentially the vertical part of $Y_{Q*p}(v)$ [7, 18].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(Q, p) = (q_1, \dots, q_N, p) \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Writing elements of $T_{(Q,p)}(M^N \times M)$ in the form (w_1, \dots, w_N, v) , where $w_i \in T_{q_i} M$ and $v \in T_p M$, the derivative of F at (Q, p) is given by*

$$F_{*(Q,p)}(w_1, \dots, w_N, v) = \tilde{v}_{Y_Q(p)} + \iota_{Y_Q(p)} \left\{ \nabla_v Y_Q + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{z_i}^{-1} [((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)] \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $z_i = (\exp_p)^{-1}(q_i)$.

Proof: Let $(w_1, \dots, w_N, v) \in T_{(Q,p)}\mathcal{M}_1 = T_{(Q,p)}(M^N \times M)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{*(Q,p)}(w_1, \dots, w_N, v) &= \sum_{i=1}^N F_{*(Q,p)}(0_{q_1}, \dots, 0_{q_{i-1}}, w_i, 0_{q_{i+1}}, \dots, 0_{q_N}, 0_p) \\ &\quad + F_{*(Q,p)}(0_{q_1}, \dots, 0_{q_N}, v). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, the vector $((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)$ is vertical: it is the initial velocity of a curve of the form $t \mapsto (\exp_p)^{-1}(\gamma_i(t))$ lying entirely in $T_p M \subset TM$ (where γ_i is a curve in M defined on some interval $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ and having $\gamma_i'(0) = w_i$). The i^{th} summand on the first line of (4.3) is simply the image of $((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)$ under the isomorphism $\iota_{Y_Q(p)} \circ \iota_{z_i}^{-1}$; the isomorphisms $\iota_{z_i}^{-1}$ allow us to identify the vertical vectors $((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i) \in T_{z_i} M$ with elements of $T_p M$ and thereby add them.

Thus the sum on the first line of (4.3) is

$$\iota_{Y_Q(p)} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{z_i}^{-1} [((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)] \right). \quad (4.4)$$

The term on the second line of (4.3) is simply $Y_{Q*}p(v)$. The result now follows from (4.3), (4.4), and (4.1). ■

Corollary 4.2. $F|_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ is a submersion.

Proof: Let $(Q, p) \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and let $u = F(Q, p)$. Let $X \in T_u(TM)$ and let $X_1 = \text{hor}_u(X)$, $X_2 = \iota_u^{-1}(\text{vert}_u(X))$, where $\text{hor}_v : T_v(TM) \rightarrow \text{Hor}_v(TM)$ and $\text{vert}_v : T_v(TM) \rightarrow \text{Vert}_v(TM)$ are the horizontal and vertical projection-maps determined by the splitting of $T_v(TM)$ as $\text{Hor}_v(TM) \oplus \text{Vert}_v(TM)$. Let $v = \pi_{*u}(X_1)$, $z_1 = (\exp_p)^{-1}(q_1)$, $w_1 = N(\exp_p)_{*z_1}(\iota_{z_1}(X_2 - \nabla_v Y_Q))$, and $w_i = 0$ for $i > 1$. Then from (4.2) we have $F_{*(Q,p)}(w_1, 0, \dots, 0, v) = X_1 + X_2 = X$. Hence $F_{*(Q,p)}$ is surjective. ■

Since Z is a codimension- n submanifold of TM , Corollary 4.2 immediately implies that $(F|_{\mathcal{M}_1})^{-1}(Z)$ is a codimension- n submanifold of the $(N+1)n$ -dimensional manifold \mathcal{M}_1 . Hence, remembering (3.1):

Corollary 4.3. \mathcal{B}_N^0 is an (Nn) -dimensional submanifold of $M^N \times M$. ■

It is natural to ask how nicely the projection-maps π_N and π_{last} restrict to \mathcal{B}_N^0 . We will see below that π_{last} restricts to a submersion. Since \mathcal{B}_N^0 and M^N have the same dimension, one may wonder whether π_N restricts to a local diffeomorphism. We are able to provide only a partial answer to this question, exhibiting a large open subset of \mathcal{B}_N^0 on which π_N restricts this nicely.

Letting $\text{Hess}(f_Q)|_p$ denote the covariant Hessian of f_Q at p , define

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \{(Q, p) \in \mathcal{B}_N^0 : \text{Hess}(f_Q)|_p \text{ is nondegenerate}\},$$

an open subset of \mathcal{B}_N^0 . Note that since $Y_Q = -\text{grad } f_Q$, at any $p \in M_Q$ the endomorphism $-(\nabla Y_Q)|_p$ is the image of $\text{Hess}(f_Q)|_p$ under the “index-lowering” isomorphism $T_p^*M \otimes T_p^*M \rightarrow T_pM \otimes T_pM \xrightarrow{\text{canon.}} \text{End}(T_pM)$ induced by the metric g . Thus the nondegeneracy condition in the definition of \mathcal{M}_2 is equivalent to $(\nabla Y_Q)|_p : T_pM \rightarrow T_pM$ being an isomorphism.

Proposition 4.4. *The map $\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{B}_N^0} : \mathcal{B}_N^0 \rightarrow M$ is a submersion, and $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2} : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow M^N$ is a local diffeomorphism.*

Proof: Let $(Q, p) = (q_1, \dots, q_N, p) \in \mathcal{B}_N^0$; note that $F(Q, p) = 0_p$. Since $T_{0_p}Z$ is exactly the horizontal subspace of $T_{0_p}(TM)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{(Q,p)}(\mathcal{B}_N^0) &= (F_{*(Q,p)})^{-1}(T_{0_p}Z) \\ &= \{W \in T_{(Q,p)}M : \text{vert}_{0_p}(F_{*(Q,p)}(W)) = 0\} \\ &= \{(w_1, \dots, w_N, v) \in T_{q_1}M \times \dots \times T_{q_N}M \times T_pM : \\ &\quad \nabla_v Y_Q + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{z_i}^{-1} [((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)] = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $z_i = (\exp_p)^{-1}(q_i)$; the final equality follows from (4.2). Analogously to the proof of Corollary 4.2, let $v \in T_pM$ and set $w_1 = N(\exp_p)_{*z_1}(\iota_{z_1}(-\nabla_v Y_Q))$, $w_i = 0$ for $i > 1$. Then

$$\nabla_v Y_Q + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{z_i}^{-1} [((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)] = 0, \quad (4.5)$$

so $W := (w_1, \dots, w_N, v) \in T_{(Q,p)}(\mathcal{B}_N^0)$, and $\pi_{\text{last}*}(Q,p)(W) = v$. Thus $\pi_{\text{last}*}(Q,p)$ is surjective, and $\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{B}_N^0}$ is a submersion. Now assume that $(Q, p) \in \mathcal{M}_2$ and let $w_i \in T_{q_i}M$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then the map $(\nabla Y_Q)|_p : T_pM \rightarrow T_pM$ is invertible, and we may define

$$v = -((\nabla Y_Q)|_p)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{z_i}^{-1} [((\exp_p)^{-1})_{*q_i}(w_i)] \right) \in T_pM.$$

Then $W := (w_1, \dots, w_N, v) \in T_{(Q,p)}(\mathcal{B}_N^0) = T_{(Q,p)}\mathcal{M}_2$, and $\pi_{N*(Q,p)}(W) = (w_1, \dots, w_N)$. Thus $(\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2})_{*(Q,p)}$ is surjective. Since $\dim(\mathcal{M}_2) = \dim(\mathcal{B}_N^0) = Nn = \dim(M^N)$, $(\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2})_{*(Q,p)}$ is an isomorphism, and $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ is a local diffeomorphism. \blacksquare

Remark 4.5. The result concerning \mathcal{M}_2 in Proposition 4.4 is not wholly satisfying, since the set \mathcal{M}_2 itself is not easy to get one’s hands on explicitly. However, at least the set $\pi_N(\mathcal{M}_2)$ —the set of configurations Q for which $\text{Hess}(f_Q)|_p$ is nondegenerate for every short barycenter p of Q —is generic in M^N . In Appendix B, we prove this using a “Parametric Transversality Theorem” (Theorem B.1). Since $\mathcal{B}_N^0 \supset \mathcal{M}_2$, it follows that $\pi_N(\mathcal{B}_N^0)$ is generic in M^N as well, as asserted earlier.

Corollary 4.6. *Let $A \subset M$ be a submanifold of codimension k . Then the subset $\pi_N((\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{M}_2})^{-1}(A))$ of*

$$\pi_N((\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{B}_N^0})^{-1}(A)) = \{Q \in M^N : \mathcal{B}^0(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$$

is a codimension- k submanifold of M^N .

Proof: Since \mathcal{M}_2 is an open subset of \mathcal{B}_N^0 , and $\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{B}_N^0}$ is a submersion, $\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ is also a submersion. Hence $(\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{M}_2})^{-1}(A)$ is a codimension- k submanifold of \mathcal{M}_2 , and its image under the local diffeomorphism $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ is a codimension- k submanifold of M^N . ■

By imposing certain hypotheses under which Fréchet means are unique, we will provide in Corollary 4.10 a reasonably large and *explicit* open subset of \mathcal{M}_2 (hence an explicit subset of \mathcal{B}_N that is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$). First, some notation:

Definition 4.7. Let $r_{\text{inj}} = r_{\text{inj}}(M, g) \geq 0$ denote the injectivity radius of (M, g) , let $\Delta = \Delta(M, g) \leq \infty$ be the supremum of the sectional curvatures of (M, g) , and let $r_{\text{cx}} = r_{\text{cx}}(M, g) = \frac{1}{2} \min\{r_{\text{inj}}, \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\Delta}}\}$, where if $\Delta \leq 0$ we interpret $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}}$ as ∞ . Define

$$M_{\text{con}}^N := \{Q \in M^N : \text{supp}(Q) \subset B_{r_{\text{cx}}}(p) \text{ for some } p \in M\},$$

the set of (somewhat) “concentrated” configurations.

Note that $r_{\text{cx}} > 0$ if (and only if) $r_{\text{inj}} > 0$ and $\Delta < \infty$, and that $M_{\text{con}}^N = \emptyset$ if $r_{\text{cx}} = 0$. (Hence any hypothesis of the form “ $Q \in M_{\text{con}}^N$ ” implicitly assumes $r_{\text{cx}} > 0$.)

A fundamental theorem of Afsari [1], applied to the probability measures μ_Q , yields the following:

Theorem 4.8 (Special case of [1, Theorem 2.1]). *If $Q \in M_{\text{con}}^N$, then Q has a unique Fréchet mean. Furthermore, for any open ball B of radius less than r_{cx} containing $\text{supp}(Q)$, this unique element of $\text{FM}(Q)$ lies in B and is the unique short barycenter of Q in the concentric open ball of radius r_{cx} .*

Remark 4.9. Theorem 2.1 in [1] is far more extensive than Theorem 4.8, and for digestibility’s sake, its author makes certain simplifications. By removing these simplifications, the original theorem and the special case above can be strengthened. For example, instead of the global geometric invariant r_{cx} , which is a convenient (and often sharp) lower bound on what is termed the “regular convexity radius” of (M, g) in [7], local invariants can be used; see [1, Remark 2.5]. However, because of its simplicity and wide applicability, r_{cx} is very commonly used in hypotheses on the radius of a ball supporting a probability distribution for which one wants to guarantee the uniqueness of a Fréchet mean.

Let $Q \in M_{\text{con}}^N$. The proof of Theorem 2.1 in [1] shows that $\text{Hess}(f_Q)$ is positive-definite, and hence nondegenerate, at the (unique) Fréchet mean of Q . As a corollary, we have:

Corollary 4.10. *The set*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{con}} := \{(Q, p) \in \mathcal{B}_N : Q \in M_{\text{con}}^N\} = (\pi_N|_{\mathcal{B}_N})^{-1}(M_{\text{con}}^N) \quad (4.6)$$

is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$, and the restriction of π_N to this submanifold is a diffeomorphism onto its image.

Proof: Theorem 4.8 implies that if $Q \in M_{\text{con}}^N$ and p is the Fréchet mean of Q , then $(Q, p) \in \mathcal{M}_2$. Thus \mathcal{M}_{con} is a subset of the manifold \mathcal{M}_2 , and is open in \mathcal{M}_2 (hence is a submanifold of $M^N \times M$) since M_{con}^N is open in M^N . The map $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{con}}}$ is the restriction of the local diffeomorphism $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ to the open subset $\mathcal{M}_{\text{con}} \subset \mathcal{M}_2$, and is one-to-one by Theorem 4.8. ■

Remark 4.11. As noted in the introduction, we have taken “smooth” to mean C^∞ , and have taken “(sub)manifold” to mean “smooth (sub)manifold”. However, all statements in Sections 3 and 4 up through Corollary 4.6 remain true (and the same proofs work) if the manifold M and Riemannian metric g are assumed only to be of class C^k , where $k \geq 2$, and other explicit or implicit references to smoothness are modified as follows:

- The functions f_Q are C^k .
- The tangent bundle TM is a C^{k-1} manifold. The maps $\exp, \exp_p, \pi, \pi_N, \pi_{\text{last}}$, and F_Q are C^{k-1} , as are the vector fields Y_Q and the submanifolds $Z \subset TM$, $\mathcal{B}_N = F^{-1}(Z) \subset M^N \times M$, and $\mathcal{M}_2 \subset M^N \times M$.
- The maps $\pi_{\text{last}}|_{F^{-1}(Z)}$ and $\pi_N|_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ are C^{k-1} .
- The submanifold $\pi_N((\pi_{\text{last}}|_{\mathcal{M}_2})^{-1}(A))$ in Corollary 4.6 is C^1 .

However, for the genericity statement in Remark 4.5, a much higher degree of smoothness of (M, g) is needed: we need to assume that M and g are C^k , where $k \geq n(N-1)+2$. The reason is that, just as in the finite-differentiability version of Sard’s Theorem [10, Theorem III.1.3] of which the finite-differentiability version of the Parametric Transversality Theorem [10, Theorem III.2.7] is a corollary, the required degree of smoothness depends on the dimensions of the manifolds involved, via an explicit inequality that reduces to the stated restriction on k in our setting.

5. All Fréchet means of finite configurations are barycenters

Theorem 4.8 shows that the Fréchet mean set of a sufficiently concentrated configuration $Q \in M^N$ lies in $\mathcal{B}(Q)$. Using results from [20], we will remove the “sufficiently concentrated” restriction.

For any $f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, p \in M$, and $v \in T_p M$, define the *forward geodesic directional derivative* $v_+(f)$ by

$$v_+(f) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\exp_p(tv)) - f(p)}{t} \quad (5.1)$$

whenever the limit exists. Note that if f has a relative minimum at p , and $v_+(f)$ exists, then $v_+(f) \geq 0$.

Remark 5.1. In [4, Section 11], in the more general setting of Alexandrov spaces with curvature bounded below, the notion corresponding to (5.1) is developed (only) for functions f that are locally Lipschitz at p —i.e., that satisfy a Lipschitz condition on some neighborhood of p . With this restriction on f , the limit (5.1) is simply called a “directional derivative” in [4]. This terminology, and the notation $v(f)$ for our $v_+(f)$, are used in [20] for powers (with exponent ≥ 1) of the distance function $r_p = d(p, \cdot)$. However, the omission from [20] of any mention of Lipschitzness may leave a misperception that the notation is unambiguous, and consequently that certain facts discussed below are true, for any continuous function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. We use the longer “forward geodesic directional derivative” because of several sources of potential misunderstanding, all related to the fact that in the setting of smooth manifolds, there is a conventional—and not metric-related—use of the term “directional derivative” that, unlike in vector spaces, is usually applied only to *differentiable* functions. If $f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is differentiable at p (below we leave the “at p ” implicit), and

$v \in T_p M$, then what is commonly called the “directional derivative $v(f)$ ” is the two-sided limit $\frac{d}{dt} f(\gamma(t))|_{t=0}$, where $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is *any* smooth curve based at p with $\gamma'(0) = v$. Crucially, differentiability of f ensures that (i) $\frac{d}{dt} f(\gamma(t))|_{t=0}$ is independent of the choice of curve γ representing v , so that the notation “ $v(f)$ ” makes sense, and (ii) $v_+(f) = v(f)$, so that the word “forward” would be superfluous. But if f is not differentiable at p , then even if $(-v)_+(f) = -(v_+(f))$ (so that $\frac{d}{dt} f(\exp_p(tv))|_{t=0}$ exists), it is not always true that for *every* curve γ representing v , the derivative $\frac{d}{dt} f(\gamma(t))|_{t=0}$ exists or has the same value. Even the existence of the map $(d_+ f)_p : T_p M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $v \mapsto v_+(f)$ (i.e. existence of $v_+(f)$ for all $v \in T_p M$) plus linearity in v , are not sufficient to ensure the curve-independence property. However, for functions that are locally Lipschitz at p , existence *and continuity* of the map $(d_+ f)_p$ together ensure the curve-independence property. (This can be deduced from the arguments in [4].) Therefore for positive powers of the distance function r_p , the terminology “directional derivative” and notation $v(f)$ in [20] are consistent with the usual terminology and notation for functions on manifolds, modulo the one-sidedness of the limit (5.1).

For $q \in M$, the function $r_q^2 : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is never differentiable at ordinary cut-points of q [3]. However, Le and Barden show in [20] that at *every* cut-point of q , all forward geodesic directional derivatives of r_q^2 exist. An explicit formula, which is valid also at non-cut points of q , is derived there:

Lemma 5.2 ([20, Lemma 2]). *Let $p, q \in M$, $v \in T_p M$. Then*

$$v_+(r_q^2) = -2 \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q,p}} g(v, v'), \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{q,p} = \{v' \in T_p M : \|v'\| = d(q, p) \text{ and } \exp_p(v') = q\}$.

As noted in [20], if $p \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(q)$, then since r_q^2 is not differentiable at p , we do not necessarily have $(-v)_+(r_q^2)$ equal to $-(v_+(r_q^2))$. Also note that if $p \notin \mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(q)$, then $\mathcal{V}_{q,p}$ consists of the single element $(\exp_p)^{-1}(q)$.

The proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollaries 2 and 3 in [20] show the following: Let μ be probability measure on M that is the sum of an absolutely continuous measure and a discrete measure, let $\alpha > 1$, and assume that the α -energy function $f_{\mu, \alpha} : x \mapsto \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_M d(x, y)^\alpha d\mu(y)$ achieves a relative minimum at p . Then (i) if $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p) = \emptyset$, then $\mu(\mathcal{C}(p)) = 0$; (ii) $\exp_p^{-1}(q)$ is defined μ -a.e. in q ; and (iii) $\int_M \exp_p^{-1}(q) d\mu(q) = 0$. Proving fact (i) was the main goal of [20]; for us, more directly important is fact (iii) (but note that the integral in (iii) is well-defined only because of (ii)). Specializing these facts to the case $\mu_Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \delta_{q_i}$ and $\alpha = 2$ yields Proposition 5.3 below. We will prove this proposition more directly, however. Our proof borrows heavily from the proof of [20, Theorem 1], but our argument is rather simpler.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$, let $p \in M$ and assume that f_Q achieves a relative minimum at p . Then:*

- (i) *For $1 \leq i \leq N$ we have $q_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(p)$, and hence $\exp_p^{-1}(q_i)$ is defined.*
- (ii) *The point p is a barycenter of Q (in fact, an almost-short barycenter).*

Proof: For (i), it suffices to show that $\text{supp}(Q) \cap \mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p) = \emptyset$. Let I_{reg} , I_{ord} , and I_{sing} denote the subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ for which q_i lies, respectively, in $\mathcal{D}(p)$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p)$, and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{sing}}(p)$. Then

for every $v \in T_p M$, by Lemma 5.2 we have

$$v_+(f_Q) = -\frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{i \in I_{\text{reg}} \cup I_{\text{sing}}} g(v, \exp_p^{-1}(q_i)) + \sum_{i \in I_{\text{ord}}} \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}} g(v, v') \right\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Since f_Q has a relative minimum at p , we have $v_+(f_Q) \geq 0$ for every $v \in T_p M$. Hence, for each $v \in T_p M$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq N[v_+(f_Q) + (-v)_+(f_Q)] \\ &= - \sum_{i \in I_{\text{ord}}} \left(\sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}} g(v, v') + \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}} g(-v, v') \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I_{\text{ord}}} \left(\inf_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}} g(v, v') - \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}} g(v, v') \right) \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

implying that each summand in (5.4) is zero. Hence for each $i \in I_{\text{ord}}$ and $v \in T_p M$, the set $\{g(v, v') : v' \in \mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}\}$ consists of a single element, implying that the difference of any two elements of $\mathcal{V}_{q_i, p}$ is perpendicular to every element of $T_p M$, hence is zero. But by definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p)$, if $q \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{ord}}(p)$ then $\mathcal{V}_{q, p}$ contains at least two vectors. Hence $I_{\text{ord}} = \emptyset$, establishing (i).

Substituting $I_{\text{ord}} = \emptyset$ into (5.3), we now have $v_+(f_Q) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(v, \exp_p^{-1}(q_i)) \geq 0$ for all $v \in T_p M$. Replacing v with $-v$, we obtain the opposite inequality, and hence the equality $\sum_{i=1}^N g(v, \exp_p^{-1}(q_i)) = 0$. Thus $p \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^0(Q)$. ■

Remark 5.4. The proof above also shows that $v_+(f_Q) = 0$ for all $v \in T_p M$. For a general function f , having $v_+(f) = 0$ for all $v \in T_p M$ does *not* imply that f is differentiable at p ; see Remark 5.1. However, it is not hard to show that f_Q is locally Lipschitz (or that the same is true more generally for the function $f_{\mu, \alpha} : p \mapsto \int_M r_p^\alpha d\mu$, where $\alpha \geq 1$ and μ is any probability measure on M for which $f_{\mu, \alpha}$ is finite). Therefore for f_Q , the fact that $v_+(f_Q) = 0$ for all $v \in T_p M$ *does* imply that f_Q is differentiable at p ; again see Remark 5.1.

An immediate corollary of Proposition 5.3 is the following:

Corollary 5.5. *For every $Q \in M^N$, we have $\text{FM}(Q) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^0(Q) \subset \mathcal{B}(Q)$.* ■

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The theorem follows immediately from Corollary 5.5 and Theorem 3.3. ■

6. Fréchet sample means of i.i.d. random variables

Convention. For the remainder of this paper, given a probability measure μ on a topological space Y , and a subset $A \subset Y$, we will say that μ is *supported in A* if $\mu(A) = 1$. This

is less restrictive than saying that A contains the set $\text{supp}(\mu)$ (the support of μ), which by definition is a closed set.

Corollary 6.1. *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be absolutely continuous, i.i.d. M -valued variables with underlying measure μ_X , and let A be a volume-zero subset of M . Then:*

- (a) $\Pr\{\text{FM}(X_1, \dots, X_N) \subset M \setminus A\} = 1$.
- (b) *If μ_X is supported in an open ball B of radius $r \leq r_{\text{cx}}$, then almost surely the Fréchet mean set of (X_1, \dots, X_N) is a single point and lies in $B \setminus A$.*

Proof: Let \mathcal{X} denote the M^N -valued random variable (X_1, \dots, X_N) and let μ_X^N be the product probability measure on M^N induced by μ_X . Since μ_X is absolutely continuous, so is μ_X^N . Hence

$$\Pr\{\text{FM}(\mathcal{X}) \cap A \neq \emptyset\} = \mu_X^N(\{Q \in M^N : \text{FM}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}) = 0$$

by Theorem 1.3. Statement (a) follows.

Now suppose that μ_X is supported in an open ball B of radius $r \leq r_{\text{cx}}$, and let B^N denote the N -fold Cartesian product of B with itself. Then $\Pr\{\mathcal{X} \in B^N\} = 1$. If the support of a configuration $Q \in M^N$ lies in the open ball B , then $\text{supp}(Q)$ also lies in a concentric open ball of radius strictly less than r , hence less than r_{cx} . Therefore Theorem 4.8 ensures that if a value of \mathcal{X} lies in B^N , then the Fréchet mean of that value of \mathcal{X} is unique and lies in B . Statement (b) follows. ■

Remark 6.2. Corollary 6.1(a) is precisely Theorem 1.1. This theorem has an application to manifolds that are stratified in even a very weak sense. Let us call M *weakly stratified* if we are given a collection \mathcal{T} of pairwise disjoint submanifolds of M , the *strata*, whose union is M , and for which exactly one stratum, M_{top} , is an open set. (More precisely, the “weakly stratified manifold” is the pair (M, \mathcal{T}) , but in many situations, it is often not important to have a symbol for the set \mathcal{T} .) Then each of the other strata has positive codimension, so the union of all the other strata has volume zero in M . Hence Theorem 1.1 implies that if X_1, \dots, X_N are absolutely continuous, i.i.d., M -valued random variables, then $\Pr\{\text{FM}(X_1, \dots, X_N) \subset M_{\text{top}}\} = 1$.

But note that Theorem 1.1 is much more general than the above application; the theorem does not require *any* sort of stratification.

An example of a well known manifold to which Theorem 1.1 applies is the projective space $\mathbf{C}P^{k-2}$. This manifold arises in the statistics of shape as Kendall’s *shape space* Σ_2^k of $k > 2$ labeled points in \mathbf{R}^2 (“planar shapes”) [19]. With the usual shape-space stratification, Σ_2^k has only one stratum (the entire space), so the results of [15] reduce to tautologies. However, Σ_2^k has other stratifications. For example, we can stratify according to the greatest number of collinear points in the configuration. In this case the top stratum consists of the shapes whose pre-shapes lie in *general position* (no three points are collinear), and the remaining strata have positive codimension. Theorem 1.1 shows that for i.i.d. random planar shapes X_1, \dots, X_N with absolutely continuous distribution, the sample Fréchet mean shape almost surely has no more than two collinear points. More generally, a similar result holds for many other ways in which a planar shape can be non-generic. For example, for $k \geq 4$, if we call a point in Σ_2^k a *k-trapezoid* if it has k distinct points and at least

two parallel non-adjacent sides, then the set $\Sigma_2^{k,\text{trap}}$ of k -trapezoids is a finite union of codimension-1 submanifolds of Σ_2^k . Thus if X_1, \dots, X_N are as above, then by Theorem 1.1, $\Pr \left\{ \text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \cap \Sigma_2^{k,\text{trap}} \neq \emptyset \right\} = 0$.

Theorem 1.1 applies only to *manifolds*, but allows *arbitrary* (volume-)measure-zero subsets A . There are certain, more general, *non-manifold* spaces for which similar results have been obtained, but only for *very specific* measure-zero subsets A : unions of lower strata of an orbit-type stratification of a quotient space M/G , where M is a complete, connected Riemannian manifold and G is a Lie group acting properly and isometrically on M . These spaces are (generalized) shape spaces, as broadly defined in [15]. The orbit-type stratification of M induces a stratification of M/G , which we will call the “usual shape-space stratification”, and M/G inherits a quotient distance-function. For these spaces the behavior of sample means is similar to what Theorem 1.1 shows what it is for a manifold: in [15, Corollary 2], Huckemann establishes that Fréchet sample means of an absolutely continuously distributed random variable lies in the top stratum—the complement of the union A of all lower strata (a particular measure-zero set)—with probability 1.

There are other situations in which Theorem 1.1 does not apply. In recent years there has been considerable interest in the behavior of various means on certain stratified spaces that usually are not manifolds, for example “open books” and “spiders” [11]. For open-books and spiders, Fréchet sample means are often “sticky”, tending to lie in lower strata [11]. See also [13]. The “sticky means” behavior on these non-manifold spaces is in sharp contrast to what Theorem 1.1 implies for (even weakly) stratified manifolds.

7. Riemannian covers and equivariant means

In some applications, the easiest way to compute or analyze Fréchet sample means of configurations (or random variables) is to relate them to what we will call *equivariant Fréchet means* on a Riemannian covering space. We will see an example of this in Section 9.

Let G be a finite group of order at least 2, with identity element e , acting isometrically on a Riemannian manifold $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$; without loss of generality we assume that the action is a left-action, and denote it by $(\tilde{p}, h) \mapsto h \cdot \tilde{p}$. Assume that $\beta := \inf\{\widetilde{d}(\tilde{p}, h \cdot \tilde{p}) : \tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}, e \neq h \in G\} > 0$; in particular this implies that the G -action is free. For simplicity’s sake, we assume throughout this section that $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ is complete, but this assumption is not actually needed until Lemma 7.6; in particular, Propositions 7.2 and 7.4 do not require completeness.

Remark 7.1. Because the G -action is free, \widetilde{M} is a (left) principal bundle over M (more strongly, a “principal Riemannian cover”). The principality assumption is primarily a convenience, allowing simplification of certain statements whose full generality is not needed for our application to $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ mentioned in the Introduction. Many of the ideas and results in this section generalize to non-principal Riemannian covers.

Since the finite G -action is free and isometric, $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ is a *Riemannian covering space*: the quotient $M = \widetilde{M}/G$ is (canonically) a manifold, the quotient map $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is a covering map, and there is a (unique) induced Riemannian metric g on M such that quo is a local isometry. The assumed completeness of $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ implies that (M, g) is complete as well. We will write \widetilde{d} and d for the Riemannian distance functions on $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ and (M, g) , respectively; in this section, balls are always taken with respect to these distance functions.

We also use $\tilde{d}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ to denote the corresponding distances between subsets of \widetilde{M} and M , respectively.

Proposition 7.2. *For all $p, q \in M$ and $\tilde{p} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$, we have*

$$d(p, q) = \tilde{d}(\text{quo}^{-1}(p), \text{quo}^{-1}(q)) = \tilde{d}(\tilde{p}, \text{quo}^{-1}(q)). \quad (7.1)$$

Proof: This is straightforward and is left to the reader. ■

The equivariant means defined below are a special case of “ ρ -means” as extended by Huckemann [12, 14].

Definition 7.3. Define an “equivariant distance function” $d_{\text{evt}} : M \times \widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$d_{\text{evt}}(q, \tilde{p}) = \tilde{d}(\text{quo}^{-1}(q), \tilde{p}) = \min\{\tilde{d}(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}) : \tilde{q} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(q)\}. \quad (7.2)$$

For $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$ define the “equivariant Fréchet function” $\tilde{f}_Q : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$\tilde{f}_Q(\tilde{p}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d_{\text{evt}}(q_i, \tilde{p})^2. \quad (7.3)$$

Call $\tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}$ an *equivariant Fréchet mean* of Q if \tilde{p} is a minimizer of \tilde{f}_Q , and write $\text{EFM}(Q)$ for the set of equivariant Fréchet means of Q .

Note that by Proposition 7.2, for all $q \in M$ and $\tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}$ we have

$$d_{\text{evt}}(q, \tilde{p}) = d(q, \text{quo}(\tilde{p})), \quad (7.4)$$

and hence

$$\tilde{f}_Q(\tilde{p}) = f_Q(\text{quo}(\tilde{p})) = \tilde{f}_Q(h \cdot \tilde{p}) \quad \text{for all } h \in G. \quad (7.5)$$

Hence if \tilde{p} is an equivariant Fréchet mean of Q , then so is $h \cdot \tilde{p}$ for every $h \in G$. Analogously to [12] and [16], we say that *the equivariant Fréchet mean of Q is unique up to the action of G* if any two equivariant Fréchet means of Q are related by the action of an element of G .

As one might expect, taking equivariant Fréchet means in \widetilde{M} is “equivalent” to taking Fréchet means in M :

Proposition 7.4. *Let $Q \in M^N$.*

(a) *Let $\tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}$ and let $p = \text{quo}(\tilde{p})$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $p \in \text{FM}(Q)$.
- (ii) $\tilde{p} \in \text{EFM}(Q)$.
- (iii) $\text{quo}^{-1}(p) \subset \text{EFM}(Q)$.

Thus $\text{EFM}(Q) = \text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(Q))$ and $\text{quo}(\text{EFM}(Q)) = \text{FM}(Q)$.

(b) *Q has a unique Fréchet mean if and only if the equivariant Fréchet mean of Q is unique up to the action of G .*

Proof: This follows from equation (7.5). ■

Corollary 7.5. *Equivariant Fréchet means always exist. More precisely, for any $Q \in M^N$, the set $\text{EFM}(Q)$ is nonempty.*

Proof: Let $Q \in M^N$. As noted in the introduction, since (M, g) is complete, $\text{FM}(Q)$ is nonempty. Since $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is surjective, $\text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(Q)) (= \text{EFM}(Q))$ by Proposition 7.4) is nonempty as well. ■

To obtain a useful equivariant-means analog of Corollary 6.1, we need to know how the numbers $r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}), r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)$, and β are related. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 7.6. $r_{\text{inj}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}) \geq r_{\text{inj}}(M, g) = \min \left\{ r_{\text{inj}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}), \frac{\beta}{2} \right\}$.

This lemma is almost certainly known, but the authors have found no reference for it. For a proof, see Appendix A.

Corollary 7.7. $r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}) \geq r_{\text{cx}}(M, g) = \min \{ r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}), \frac{\beta}{4} \}$.

Proof: Since $(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$ is a Riemannian covering space of (M, g) , the sectional-curvature function of (M, g) has the same range as the sectional-curvature function of $(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$. Hence $\Delta(M, g) = \Delta(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$. The result now follows from Lemma 7.6. ■

Since $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is a covering map and a local diffeomorphism, every sufficiently small open set $A \subset M$ is *smoothly evenly covered*: $\text{quo}^{-1}(A)$ is a disjoint union of open sets \tilde{A}_j (unique up to labeling), each of which is carried diffeomorphically to A by quo . For any such $A, \{\tilde{A}_j\}$, and arbitrary subset $A' \subset A$, the set $\text{quo}^{-1}(A')$ is the disjoint union of the sets $\tilde{A}'_j := \tilde{A}_j \cap \text{quo}^{-1}(A')$, each of which is carried homeomorphically to A' by quo . We will say that A' is evenly covered by the sets \tilde{A}'_j (whether or not A' is open), and that the collection $\{\tilde{A}'_j\}$ is an *even covering* of A' (a *smooth even covering* if A' is open).

Corollary 7.8. *Let $p \in M$, let $r < r_{\text{inj}}(M, g)$, and let $B = B_r(p)$. Then B is open (as a subset of the manifold M) and is smoothly evenly covered by a collection of \tilde{d} -open balls $\tilde{B}_j = B_r(\tilde{p}_j) \subset (\widetilde{M}, \tilde{d}), 1 \leq j \leq |G|$. For each j , the map $\text{quo}|_{\tilde{B}_j} : \tilde{B}_j \rightarrow B$ is an isometry.*

Proof: Since d is the geodesic-distance function of a Riemannian metric on M , the metric-space topology of (M, d) coincides with the manifold topology. Hence the metrically open ball B is also open in the manifold topology. (This would *not* be true for an *arbitrary* distance-function on M .)

Since $r < r_{\text{inj}}(M, g) \leq r_{\text{inj}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$, the exponential maps $\exp_p, \exp_{\tilde{p}}$, restricted to the open balls of radius r centered at 0 in $T_p M, T_{\tilde{p}} \widetilde{M}$ respectively, are diffeomorphisms onto $B_r(p), B_r(\tilde{p})$, respectively. Equation (A.1) in the proof of Lemma 7.6 then implies that $\text{quo}|_{B_r(\tilde{p})}$ is a diffeomorphism onto $B_r(p)$. Since quo is a local isometry, it follows that $\text{quo}|_{B_r(\tilde{p})}$ is an isometry.

It remains only to show that for distinct $\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2 \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$, the sets $\tilde{B}_j := B_r(\tilde{p}_j)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are disjoint. Suppose there exists $q \in \tilde{B}_1 \cap \tilde{B}_2$. Then there are minimal geodesics $\gamma_j : [0, 1] \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ from \tilde{p}_j to \tilde{q} ($i = 1, 2$), each of length less than r , and $\gamma'_1(1) \neq \gamma'_2(1)$ (else both \tilde{p}_1 and

\tilde{p}_2 would be images of the same vector in $T_{\tilde{q}}\widetilde{M}$ under $\exp_{\tilde{q}}$. Hence $\tilde{\gamma}_j := \text{quo} \circ \gamma_j$ ($j = 1, 2$) is a geodesic from p to $q \in B_r(p)$ of length less than r , and $\tilde{\gamma}'_1(1) \neq \tilde{\gamma}'_2(1)$ (since $\text{quo}_{*\tilde{q}}$ is an isomorphism); thus $\tilde{\gamma}_1 \neq \tilde{\gamma}_2$. But then the restriction of \exp_p to the ball $B_r(0_p) \subset T_p\widetilde{M}$ is not one-to-one, a contradiction. Hence $\tilde{B}_1 \cap \tilde{B}_2 = \emptyset$. ■

Remark 7.9. In the setting of Corollary 7.8, the G -action permutes the sets \tilde{B}_j . While there is, in general, no *canonical* labeling of the \tilde{B}_j by elements of G , if we arbitrarily label any one of these balls as \tilde{B}_e , then we can (re-)label all of the others by setting $\tilde{B}_h = h \cdot \tilde{B}_e$ for all $h \in G$. We then have $h_1 \cdot \tilde{B}_{h_2} = \tilde{B}_{h_1 h_2}$ for all $h_1, h_2 \in G$, so we call such a labeling *equivariant*. This facilitates the statement of the next proposition, a corollary of earlier results.

Proposition 7.10. *Let $r \in (0, r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)]$ and let $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_N) \in M^N$. Assume that $\text{supp}(Q)$ lies in a ball B of radius less than r . Let $\{\tilde{B}_h\}_{h \in G}$ be the even covering of B given by Corollary 7.8, with the covering balls labeled equivariantly, and for each $h \in G$ and $p \in B$, let $\tilde{p}^{(h)}$ be the unique element of $\text{quo}^{-1}(p) \cap \tilde{B}_h$. Let $\tilde{Q}^{(h)} = (\tilde{q}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{q}_N^{(h)})$. Then*

- (a) *For each $h \in G$, $\text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h)})$ consists of a single point and lies in \tilde{B}_h .*
- (b) *For all $h_1, h_2 \in G$ we have $h_1 \cdot \text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h_2)}) = \text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h_1 h_2)})$.*
- (c) *$\text{EFM}(Q) = \{\text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h)})\}_{h \in G} \subset \text{quo}^{-1}(B')$. In particular, the equivariant Fréchet mean of Q is unique up to the action of G .*
- (d) *$\text{FM}(Q) = \text{quo}(\text{EFM}(Q)) = \text{quo}(\text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h)}))$ for all $h \in G$, and consists of a single point lying in B . Since $\text{EFM}(Q)$ is a G -invariant set, the first equality is equivalent to $\text{EFM}(Q) = \text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(Q))$.*

Proof: (a) Let $h \in G$. By Corollary 7.8, \tilde{B}_h is a ball of radius $r < r_{\text{cx}}(M, g) \leq r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$. Hence Theorem 4.8 implies that the Fréchet mean of $\tilde{Q}^{(h)}$ is unique and lies in \tilde{B}_h .

(b) Since $h_1 \cdot B'_{h_2} = B'_{h_1 h_2}$ we have $h_1 \cdot \tilde{Q}^{(h_2)} = \tilde{Q}^{(h_1 h_2)}$. Since the metric on M is G -invariant, it follows that $h_1 \cdot \text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h_2)}) = \text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h_1 h_2)})$.

(c) Follows from Proposition 7.4(a).

(d) Follows from (c), (a), and Proposition 7.4(b). ■

8. Fréchet sample means in the equivariant setting

In this section, $(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$, G , (M, g) , and quo are as in Section 7.

Given any set S , any function $f : S \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$, and any $h \in G$, let $h \cdot f$ denote the function $x \mapsto h \cdot f(x)$. This defines a (left) action of G on the set of functions from S to \widetilde{M} . We will use the term *minimal invariant family of functions (from S to \widetilde{M})* for an orbit of G under this action, and *equivariant family of functions (from S to \widetilde{M})* for an indexed collection $\{f^{(h)} : S \rightarrow \widetilde{M}\}_{h \in G}$ satisfying $f^{(h_1 h_2)} = h_1 \cdot f^{(h_2)}$ for all $h_1, h_2 \in G$. (In the latter case, we are opting for terminology that is simpler than the more precise “*equivariantly indexed minimal family of functions (from S to \widetilde{M})*”.) For these families of functions, there will be

only two types of domains of concern to us: the domain Ω of a random variable, and subsets of M . In each case the domain S will be clear from context, so we will usually omit the “from S to \widetilde{M} .”

Clearly the underlying set of functions in an equivariant family of functions is a minimal invariant family. Conversely, given a minimal invariant family \mathcal{F} , any chosen element $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ determines an equivariant indexing of \mathcal{F} by setting $f(h) = h \cdot f_1$ for each $h \in G$.

Corollary 7.8 and Remark 7.9 illustrate one way that such families of functions arise naturally. Consider a d -open ball $B \subset M$ that is smoothly evenly covered by a collection of \tilde{d} -open balls \tilde{B}_j , $1 \leq j \leq |G|$. For each such j let $s_j = (\text{quo}|_{\tilde{B}_j})^{-1} : B \rightarrow \tilde{B}_j$, but viewed as a map from B to \widetilde{M} (a *local section* of the bundle $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$). Then $\{s_j : 1 \leq j \leq |G|\}$ is a minimal invariant family of smooth maps. A re-indexing of the collection $\{\tilde{B}_j\}$ by the elements of G , as in Remark 7.9, yields a corresponding re-indexing of this collection of local sections. The re-indexed family $\{s_h\}_{h \in G}$ is an equivariant family of smooth maps.

Definition 8.1. We will call a map $s : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ a *measurable section* (of the G -bundle $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$) if s is measurable and $\text{quo} \circ s = \text{id}_M$. Given a random variable $X : \Omega \rightarrow M$, we call a map $\tilde{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ a *measurable lift* of X if $\tilde{X} = s \circ X$ for some measurable section s .

Observe that a measurable lift \tilde{X} of a measurable map $X : \Omega \rightarrow M$ is automatically measurable (see the discussion near the end of Section 1), hence is an \widetilde{M} -valued random variable for which $\text{quo} \circ \tilde{X} = X$.

The (left) principal G -bundle $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$ need not be trivial, hence may have no *continuous* sections (continuous maps $s : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ such that $\text{quo} \circ s = \text{id}_M$). However, there always exist *measurable* sections:

Lemma 8.2. *There exists a measurable section $s : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$. In fact, for any $p \in M$, there exists a measurable section that is smooth on the complement of the cut-locus of p .*

Proof: Fix any $p \in M$ and any $\tilde{p} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$. As mentioned in Section 2, (i) the cut-locus $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}(p)$ is a closed set of volume zero, (ii) the set $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tan}}(p) \subset T_p M$ is star-shaped with respect to 0_p (so its diffeomorphic image $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}(p) = M \setminus \mathcal{C}$ is contractible), and (iii) $M = \mathcal{D} \amalg \mathcal{C}$. Since $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is a submersion, Lemma 3.2 implies that the set $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} := \text{quo}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) \subset \widetilde{M}$ has volume zero. Since \mathcal{D} is contractible, the restricted bundle $\widetilde{M}|_{\mathcal{D}}$ is trivial, so there exists a continuous map $s_1 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ such that $\text{quo} \circ s_1 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Since $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is a local diffeomorphism, the continuity of s_1 implies that s_1 is smooth. For each $q \in \mathcal{C}$, arbitrarily select a point $\tilde{q} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(q)$, thereby constructing a map $s_2 : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ satisfying $\text{quo} \circ s_2 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Then the map $s : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ defined by setting $s|_{\mathcal{D}} = s_1$ and $s|_{\mathcal{C}} = s_2$ satisfies $\text{quo} \circ s = \text{id}_M$, is continuous on \mathcal{D} , and is easily seen to be measurable. ■

Lemma 8.2 can be generalized to any principal bundle over M ; thus any such bundle is *measurably trivial*. For the principal G -bundle $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$, this is essentially the content of Corollary 8.3(a) below.

Corollary 8.3. (a) *Let $p \in M$. There exists an equivariant family $\{s_h\}_{h \in G}$ of measurable sections of $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$, each of which is smooth on the open, generic set $\mathcal{D}(p)$. (b) Let X be an M -valued random variable. Then an equivariant family $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in G}$ of measurable lifts of X exists. If X is absolutely continuous, then an equivariant family of absolutely*

continuous measurable lifts exists.

Proof: (a) Let $s : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ be a measurable section that is continuous on $\mathcal{D}(p)$. For each $h \in G$ let $s_h = h \cdot s$. Then $\{s_h\}_{h \in G}$ is an equivariant family of measurable sections of $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$, each of which is continuous on $\mathcal{D}(p)$.

(b) Select any $p \in M$ and let $\{s_h\}_{h \in G}$ be as above. For each $h \in G$ let $\tilde{X}^{(h)} = s_h \circ X$. Then $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in G}$ is an equivariant family of measurable lifts of X .

Assume now that X is absolutely continuous, and let μ_X be the probability measure on M induced by X . Let $E \subset \widetilde{M}$ be a set of volume zero, and let $h \in G$. Then $(\tilde{X}^{(h)})^{-1}(E) = X^{-1}(s_h^{-1}(E)) = X^{-1}(\text{quo}(E))$, so $\mu_{\tilde{X}^{(h)}}(E) = \mu_X(\text{quo}(E))$. Since the map quo is a local diffeomorphism, $\text{quo}(E)$ has volume zero in M , implying that $\mu_X(\text{quo}(E)) = 0$ (since μ_X is absolutely continuous). Hence $\mu_{\tilde{X}^{(h)}}$ is absolutely continuous. ■

Remark 8.4. Suppose that X is an absolutely continuous M -valued random variable whose induced measure μ_X is supported in an open ball $B = B_r(p)$, where $r < r_{\text{inj}}(M, g)$. Let $\{\tilde{B}_h\}_{h \in G}$ be the even covering of B given by Corollary 7.8, relabeled as in Remark 7.9. Let $\{s_h\}_{h \in G}$ be an equivariant family of measurable sections of $\widetilde{M} \xrightarrow{\text{quo}} M$ for which $s_h|_{\mathcal{D}(p)}$ is smooth (for each $h \in G$). Note that $B \subset \mathcal{D}(p)$ since $r < r_{\text{inj}}(M, g)$. Then by equivariance, each local section s_h must be precisely the map $(\text{quo}|_{\tilde{B}_h})^{-1}$ (viewed as a map from B to \widetilde{M}). Furthermore, the measure $\mu_{\tilde{X}^{(h)}}$ is supported in \tilde{B}_h and is canonically determined by X , in the sense that $\mu_{\tilde{X}^{(h)}}$ depends only on the canonically defined local section $s_h|_B$ (and on X). In view of this observation, we make the following simplifying definition:

Definition 8.5. In the setting of Remark 8.4, we refer to any equivariant family $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in G}$ determined by an equivariant family of measurable sections that are continuous on B , as “the” associated lifts of X to \widetilde{M} -valued random variables (implicitly identifying any two random variables that coincide a.e.).

Corollary 8.6. Let $\tilde{A} \subset \widetilde{M}$ be a G -invariant set of volume zero in \widetilde{M} , let $A = \text{quo}(\tilde{A})$, and write $\widetilde{M}_* = \widetilde{M} \setminus \tilde{A}$ and $M_* = \text{quo}(\widetilde{M}_*) = M \setminus A$. Let X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N be i.i.d. M -valued random variables with induced probability measure μ_X and for $1 \leq i \leq N$ let $\{\tilde{X}_i^{(h)}\}_{h \in G}$ be an equivariant family of measurable lifts of X . (Note that for each h , the random variables $\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}$ are i.i.d.)

(a) For all $h, h_1, h_2 \in G$ we have

$$h_1 \cdot \text{FM}(\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h_2)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h_2)}\}) = \text{FM}(\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h_1 h_2)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h_1 h_2)}\}) \quad (8.1)$$

and

$$\text{quo}(\text{FM}(\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\})) = \text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}). \quad (8.2)$$

Furthermore, $\text{EFM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) = \text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}))$.

(b) Assume now that X is absolutely continuous. Then

(i) Almost surely, $\text{FM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset M_*$ and, correspondingly, $\text{EFM}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset \widetilde{M}_*$.

(ii) For every $h \in G$, almost surely $\text{FM}(\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\}) \subset \widetilde{M}_*$.

(c) Let $r \in (0, r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)]$, and assume that X is absolutely continuous and supported in an open ball B of radius less than r . Then

(i) Almost surely, the Fréchet mean set of $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ is a single point and lies in $M_* \cap B$. Correspondingly, the equivariant Fréchet means of $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ are unique up to the action of G , and lie in $\widetilde{M}_* \cap \text{quo}^{-1}(B)$.

(ii) Let $\{\tilde{B}_h\}_{h \in G}$ be the even covering of B given by Corollary 7.8, with the sets relabeled as in Remark 7.9, and assume that the equivariant family $\{\tilde{X}_i^{(h)}\}_{h \in G}$ consists of the associated lifts of X_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$. For every $h \in G$, almost surely the Fréchet mean set of $\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\}$ is a single point and lies in $\widetilde{M}_* \cap \tilde{B}_h$.

Proof: (a) This follows from Proposition 7.4(a).

(b) Since quo is a local diffeomorphism, the set A has volume zero in M . Statements (i) and (ii) therefore follow from Corollary 6.1(a).

(c) This follows from part (b) and Proposition 7.10. ■

Theorem 1.2, which is simply Corollary 8.6 minus the statements that explicitly involve the lifts $\{X^{(h)}\}$, is now proven.

Remark 8.7. If $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}})$ is a weakly stratified manifold in sense of Remark 6.2, and for any $h \in G$ and any stratum $\tilde{T} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$, the set $h \cdot \tilde{T}$ is also a stratum, then M inherits a (weak) stratification by declaring the strata of M to be the images of the strata of \widetilde{M} under quo . In Corollary 8.6 we can then take \tilde{A} to be the union of all strata of \widetilde{M} other than the top stratum. Then Corollary 8.6 applies with \widetilde{M}_* and M_* replaced by $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}$ and M^{top} , respectively.

9. An application to “partial scaling-rotation means”

In this section we apply results from earlier sections to a problem concerning symmetric positive-definite (SPD) matrices that was the initial motivation behind Theorem 1.2: establishing a strong relation between *scaling-rotation* (SR) *means* of samples of SPD matrices, and the more easily computed *partial scaling-rotation* (PSR) *means* of such samples, notions introduced in [16]. To describe these means and the application of Theorem 1.2, we first review the “scaling-rotation framework” introduced in earlier work of the authors.

Let $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ denote the space of (real) $m \times m$ SPD matrices. In [17] the authors defined a “distance-function” d_{SR} (not a true metric) on $\text{Sym}^+(m)$, studied further in [8, 9], that measures rotation of eigenvectors and scaling of eigenvalues. For these purposes, an element $S \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ is represented as an eigendecomposition, a pair $(U, D) \in \widetilde{M}(m) := \text{SO}(m) \times \text{Diag}^+(m)$ for which $\mathcal{F}(U, D) := UDU^T = S$. (Thus $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ is the set of eigendecompositions of S .)

The finite group $\mathcal{G}(m)$ of *even, signed permutations*, corresponding to orientation-preserving combinations of permutations and sign-changes of eigenvectors, acts freely on $\widetilde{M}(m)$ (see [8, Section 2.3]), thereby determining a quotient manifold $M(m) := \widetilde{M}(m)/\text{Sym}^+(m)$ and a projection map $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow M(m)$. As depicted in the left-hand commutative diagram




FIG 2. Commutative diagrams showing the relations among various spaces and maps.

in Figure 2, the manifold $M(m)$ sits “between” $\widetilde{M}(m)$ and $\text{Sym}^+(m)$: each $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -orbit is contained in a fiber of the “eigencomposition” map $\mathcal{F} : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(m)$, so \mathcal{F} descends to a well-defined map $\bar{\mathcal{F}} : M(m) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(m)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{F} = \bar{\mathcal{F}} \circ \text{quo}. \quad (9.1)$$

Note that if (and only if) $S \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ has distinct eigenvalues, then $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S)$ is precisely an orbit of the $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -action. Thus the manifolds $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ and $M(m)$ are not identical. However, they have full-volume-measure subsets that are “essentially the same”. Specifically and more precisely, the subset $S_m^{\text{top}} \subset \text{Sym}^+(m)$ consisting of matrices with distinct eigenvalues, and the subset $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widetilde{M}(m)) \subset \widetilde{M}(m)$, are open, generic subsets of their ambient spaces. The set $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ is $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -invariant, and S_m^{top} can be identified with the quotient of $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ by the $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -action. (We regard $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m), M^{\text{top}}(m)$ as the “top strata” of their ambient spaces; see [8].) Since $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ is open in $\widetilde{M}(m)$, its image $M^{\text{top}}(m)$ under the covering-map quo is open in $M(m)$. The restriction of \mathcal{F} to $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ is a covering map $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m) \rightarrow S_m^{\text{top}}$, and the restriction of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ to $M^{\text{top}}(m)$ is thus a diffeomorphism

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}} := \bar{\mathcal{F}}|_{M^{\text{top}}(m)} : M^{\text{top}}(m) \rightarrow S_m^{\text{top}} ;$$

see the right-hand commutative diagram in Figure 2. Thus $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}$ naturally identifies $M^{\text{top}}(m)$ and S_m^{top} as manifolds, not just as point-sets. It is in this sense that these subsets of the different spaces $M(m)$ and $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ are “essentially the same”.

The Lie groups $SO(m)$ and $\text{Diag}^+(m)$ carry natural bi-invariant Riemannian metrics g_{SO} and $g_{\mathcal{D}^+}$, respectively. (These are complete and are canonical up to scale; for our choice of scale see [8, Section 3.1].) We define a product Riemannian metric \tilde{g} on $\widetilde{M}(m)$ by setting $\tilde{g} = kg_{SO} \oplus g_{\mathcal{D}^+}$, where $k > 0$ is an arbitrary relative-weight parameter. The action of $\mathcal{G}(m)$ on $\widetilde{M}(m)$ is then isometric. We are thus in the situation of Section 7: the manifold $M(m)$ then inherits a (unique) Riemannian metric g for which the map $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow M(m)$ is a principal Riemannian covering map carrying \tilde{g} to g . Thus all the results of Section 7 apply, with $\widetilde{M}(m)$ as the covering space and $M(m)$ as the base space. As in Section 7, we will denote the distance-functions (between points or subsets) arising from \tilde{g} and g as \tilde{d} and d , respectively.

Define functions $d_{\text{SR}} : \text{Sym}^+(m) \times \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ (the *scaling-rotation distance*) and $d_{\text{PSR}} : \text{Sym}^+(m) \times \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ (the *partial scaling-rotation distance*) by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{SR}}(S_1, S_2) &= \tilde{d}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_1), \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_2)), \\ d_{\text{PSR}}(S, \tilde{S}_0) &= \tilde{d}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S), \tilde{S}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (9.2)$$

Note that despite the formal similarity between equations (9.2) and (7.2), d_{PSR} does not meet our definition of “equivariant distance function” on its full domain, since $\widetilde{M}(m)$ is a covering space only of $M(m)$, not of $\text{Sym}^+(m)$.

Remark 9.1. For $S_1, S_2 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{SR}}(S_1, S_2) &= \tilde{d}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_1), \mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_2)) \\ &= d(\text{quo}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_1)), \text{quo}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_2))) \quad \text{by Proposition 7.2} \\ &= d(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(S_1), \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(S_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

This shows that $d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}$, the restriction of d_{SR} to $S_m^{\text{top}} \times S_m^{\text{top}}$, is a metric (precisely the result of [17, Theorem 3.12], but proven by a somewhat different argument), and that, writing d^{top} for the restriction of d to $M^{\text{top}}(m)$,

$$\text{The diffeomorphism } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}} \text{ is an isometry } (M^{\text{top}}(m), d^{\text{top}}) \rightarrow (S_m^{\text{top}}, d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}). \quad (9.4)$$

For any configuration $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_N) \in (\text{Sym}^+(m))^N$, we define functions $f_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{SR}} : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{PSR}} : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$f_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{SR}}(S) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d_{\text{SR}}(S_i, S)^2, \quad (9.5)$$

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{PSR}}(\tilde{S}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d_{\text{PSR}}(S_i, \tilde{S})^2. \quad (9.6)$$

As in [16], we define the *scaling-rotation (SR) mean set* and *partial scaling-rotation (PSR) mean set* of \mathcal{S} , denoted $E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S})$ respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S}) &:= \arg \min(f_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{SR}}) \subset \text{Sym}^+(m), \\ \tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S}) &:= \arg \min(\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{PSR}}) \subset \widetilde{M}(m). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.10 of [16] establishes that SR and PSR means always exist (i.e. that for any N -point configuration \mathcal{S} , the sets $E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S})$ are nonempty).

Our main focus in this section will be on PSR means rather than SR means, for several reasons. One reason is that the SR mean set of a general configuration \mathcal{S} can be very hard to compute, even when \mathcal{S} has a unique SR mean, since already the definition of $d_{\text{SR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ involves a double-optimization. As a practical alternative to using SR-means, [16] proposed using PSR means to give more-easily computable approximations of SR means (upon projecting the PSR means to $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ via \mathcal{F}). It is not clear, in general, how good this approximation is. However, Theorem 3.5 of [16] established that in one important situation, this approximation is perfect:

Theorem 9.2 ([16, Theorem 3.5]). *Let S_1, \dots, S_N be elements of S_m^{top} and let $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_N)$. If $E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S}) \subset S_m^{\text{top}}$, then $\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S}))$ and $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S})) = E_N^{\text{SR}}(\mathcal{S})$.*

Since S_m^{top} is an open, dense, full-measure subset of $\text{Sym}(m)$, one might think that, given i.i.d. absolutely continuous $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables X_1, \dots, X_N , the genericity property $\Pr(E_N^{\text{SR}}(X_1, \dots, X_N) \subset S_m^{\text{top}}) = 1$ would hold. This intuition is not correct, essentially because the discontinuity of d_{SR} leads to discontinuity of the SR objective functions (9.5). This is another reason we focus here on PSR means, which have nicer genericity properties.

Our final reason for focusing here on PSR means is that for a finite configuration that lies entirely in the top stratum $S_m^{\text{top}} \subset \text{Sym}^+(m)$, the PSR mean set in $\widetilde{M}(m)$ is exactly the equivariant Fréchet mean set:

Proposition 9.3. *Let $S_1, \dots, S_n \in S_m^{\text{top}}$, and for $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $S_i^M = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(S_i)$. Let $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_N)$ and $\mathcal{S}^M = (S_1^M, \dots, S_N^M)$.*

Then

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{PSR}} = \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}^M} \quad (9.7)$$

where the “equivariant Fréchet function” $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}^M}$ is defined as in (7.3). Hence \tilde{S} is a PSR mean of \mathcal{S} if and only if \tilde{S} is an equivariant Fréchet mean of \mathcal{S}^M , and $\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{EFM}(\mathcal{S}^M)$.

Proof: Using the definition of d_{PSR} , equation (9.1), Proposition 7.2, the injectivity of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}$, and equation (7.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{PSR}}(S_i, \tilde{S}) = \tilde{d}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(S_i), \tilde{S}) &= \tilde{d}(\text{quo}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(S_i)), \tilde{S}) \\ &= d(\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(S_i), \text{quo}(\tilde{S})) \\ &= d(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(S_i), \text{quo}(\tilde{S})) \\ &= d(S_i^M, \text{quo}(\tilde{S})) \\ &= d_{\text{evt}}(S_i^M, \tilde{S}). \end{aligned}$$

Equation (9.7) now follows from the definition of $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}^M}$ (equation (7.3)). ■

Although the surjective maps $\bar{\mathcal{F}} : M(m) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(m)$ and $F : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(m)$ are not covering maps, we can still define *measurable sections* for these maps, *measurable lifts* of $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables to $M(m)$ -valued and $\widetilde{M}(m)$ -valued random variables, and $(\mathcal{G}(m)$ -)equivariant families of lifts, to $\widetilde{M}(m)$, of a $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variable:

1. Call a map $s : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow M(m)$ a *set-theoretic section* of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ if $\bar{\mathcal{F}} \circ s$ is the identity map of $\text{Sym}^+(m)$; equivalently, if $s(Y) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(Y)$ for all $Y \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$. If, in addition, the map s is measurable, call s a *measurable section*. Similarly, call a map $\tilde{s} : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow \widetilde{M}(m)$ a set-theoretic section or measurable section of \mathcal{F} if the appropriate condition(s) above hold with $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}, s)$ replaced by (\mathcal{F}, \tilde{s}) .
2. Call a map $X^M : \Omega \rightarrow M(m)$ (respectively, $\tilde{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \widetilde{M}(m)$) a *lift* of a map $X : \Omega \rightarrow \text{Sym}^+(m)$ if $X = \bar{\mathcal{F}} \circ X^M$ (resp., $X = \mathcal{F} \circ \tilde{X}$); equivalently, if $X^M = s \circ X$ for some set-theoretic section s of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ (resp., if $\tilde{X} = \tilde{s} \circ X$ for some set-theoretic section \tilde{s} of \mathcal{F}). If X is measurable, call X^M (resp. \tilde{X}^M) a *measurable lift* of X if $X^M = s \circ X$ (resp.

$\tilde{X}^M = \tilde{s} \circ X$) for some measurable section s of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ (resp. \tilde{s} of \mathcal{F}). Note that measurable lifts are always measurable maps.

3. Call an indexed collection of $\tilde{M}(m)$ -valued random variables $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ an *equivariant family of lifts* of a $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variable X if (i) $\tilde{X}^{(h)}$ is a lift of X for each $h \in \mathcal{G}(m)$, and (ii) $\tilde{X}^{(h_1 h_2)} = h_1 \cdot \tilde{X}^{(h_2)}$ for all $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{G}(m)$.

Let $S_m^{\text{low}} = \text{Sym}^+(m) \setminus S_m^{\text{top}}$ and $\tilde{M}^{\text{low}}(m) = \tilde{M}(m) \setminus \tilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$. As detailed in [8, Sections 2.4–2.7], the closed subsets S_m^{low} and $\tilde{M}^{\text{low}}(m)$ are finite unions of certain positive-codimension submanifolds (“lower strata”) of $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ and $\tilde{M}(m)$ respectively, and hence have volume zero in their ambient spaces. Since quo is a local diffeomorphism, it follows that $M^{\text{low}}(m) := \text{quo}(\tilde{M}^{\text{low}}(m)) \subset M(m)$ is also a finite union of positive-codimension submanifolds and is a closed set. Thus each of the sets S_m^{low} , $\tilde{M}^{\text{low}}(m)$, and $M^{\text{low}}(m)$ is a closed volume-zero subset of its ambient space.

Lemma 9.4. (a) *Set-theoretic sections of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ exist, and all such sections are measurable. For any such section s , if $U \subset M(m)$ has volume zero, then so does $s^{-1}(U)$.*

(b) *Let X be an absolutely continuous $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variable X . Then:*

- (i) *Lifts of X to $M(m)$ exist. All such lifts are absolutely continuous $M(m)$ -valued random variables.*
- (ii) *An equivariant family $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ of measurable, absolutely continuous lifts of X to $\tilde{M}(m)$ exists.*

For a proof of Lemma 9.4, see Appendix A.

Proposition 9.5. *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be i.i.d., absolutely continuous, $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables, and let X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M be lifts of X_1, \dots, X_N to $M(m)$. The following are true almost surely:*

- (a) *All PSR means of $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ lie in the top stratum:*

$$\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) = \text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}) \subset \tilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m). \quad (9.8)$$

- (b) $\text{FM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}) = \text{quo}(\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\})) = \text{quo}(\text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}))$ and $\text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\})) = \tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) = \text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\})$.

Proof: (a) By Lemma 9.4(b), the lifts X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M are absolutely continuous $M(m)$ -valued random variables. For each X_i^M , since $\tilde{M}^{\text{low}}(m) = \text{quo}^{-1}(M^{\text{low}}(m))$ is a $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -invariant volume-zero subset of $\tilde{M}(m)$, Corollary 8.6(b) shows that the event (i) “ $\text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}) \subset \tilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ ” occurs almost surely. Since S_m^{low} has volume zero and X_1, \dots, X_N are absolutely continuous, the event (ii) “ X_1, \dots, X_N all lie in S_m^{top} ” occurs almost surely as well. Hence the event “(i) and (ii)” also occurs almost surely. But whenever (ii) occurs, Proposition 9.3 implies that the equality in (9.8) holds. It follows that $\tilde{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \subset \tilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$ almost surely.

(b) Proposition 8.6(a) implies that we *always* (not just almost surely) have that $\text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}) = \text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M))$, which, since quo is surjective, implies

that $\text{quo}(\text{EFM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\})) = \text{FM}(X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M)$ as well. Combining this with the almost-sure statement (9.8) yields the result. \blacksquare

To apply results of Corollary 6.1 and Proposition 7.10 in the context of PSR means, we review some previously established geometric facts about the manifolds $(M(m), g)$ and $(\widetilde{M}(m), \tilde{g})$. As is well known, the manifold $(\text{Diag}^+(m), g_{\mathcal{D}^+})$ has non-positive sectional curvature and infinite injectivity radius, while $(SO(m), g_{SO})$ has non-negative sectional curvature, so $r_{\text{inj}}(\widetilde{M}(m), \tilde{g}) = r_{\text{inj}}(SO(m), kg_{SO})$ and $\Delta(\widetilde{M}(m), \tilde{g}) = \Delta(SO(m), kg_{SO})$. With the normalization chosen for g_{SO} in [16], $r_{\text{inj}}(SO(m), kg_{SO}) = \sqrt{k}\pi$ and $\Delta(SO(m), kg_{SO}) = k^{-1}/4$. It is shown in [16, Lemma 4.4] that $\inf\{\tilde{d}(p, h \cdot p) : h \in \mathcal{G}(m), p \in \widetilde{M}(m)\} = \min\{d_{SO}(h, \text{id.}) : h \in \mathcal{G}(m) \setminus \{\text{id.}\}\} =: \beta_m \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, so

$$r_{\text{cx}}(\widetilde{M}(m), \tilde{g}) = \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{k} \geq \sqrt{k}\beta_m. \quad (9.9)$$

Via Lemma 7.6 and Corollary 7.7, the inequality in (9.9) then additionally yields

$$r_{\text{inj}}(M(m), g) = \sqrt{k}\beta_m/2 \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\text{cx}}(M(m), g) = \sqrt{k}\beta_m/4. \quad (9.10)$$

Notation 9.6. (a) For $Y_0 \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ and $r > 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) &= \{Y \in \text{Sym}^+(m) : d_{\text{SR}}(Y, Y_0) \leq r\}, \\ \mathbf{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) &= \{Y \in \text{Sym}^+(m) : d_{\text{SR}}(Y, Y_0) < r\}, \\ \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) &= \{Y \in \text{Sym}^+(m) : d_{\text{SR}}(Y, Y_0) = r\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\tilde{Y}_0 \in \widetilde{M}(m)$ and $r > 0$ let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_r(\tilde{Y}_0; \tilde{d}) = \{\tilde{Y} \in \widetilde{M}(m) : \tilde{d}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}_0) = r\},$$

the *sphere* with radius r and center \tilde{Y}_0 in the Riemannian manifold $(\widetilde{M}(m), \tilde{g})$.

(b) For $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$ and $r > 0$, we write $B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ and $\bar{B}_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ for the open and closed balls, respectively, of radius r and center Y_0 in the metric space $(S_m^{\text{top}}, d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$.

Informally, we call $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$, $\mathbf{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$, and $\mathbf{S}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ the “closed d_{SR} -ball”, “open d_{SR} -ball” and “ d_{SR} -sphere” with center Y_0 and radius r , but we caution the reader not to let this terminology lead to implicit assumptions. Since d_{SR} is not a metric, these informally named balls and spheres are not balls and sphere in the metric-space sense, and cannot be expected to have all the properties of metric balls and spheres. Indeed, for $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$, the function $d_{\text{SR}}(\cdot, Y_0) : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is not even continuous (see [16, Appendix A]). It can be shown that $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ is a closed *set*, at least, but $\mathbf{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ is not always an open set. However, we will not need those facts to prove anything in the present paper. Here, all that we need to know about “ d_{SR} -balls” is in the following lemma.

Lemma 9.7. *Let $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$ and let $r > 0$. Then:*

$$(a) \quad \bar{B}_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}) = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) \cap S_m^{\text{top}} \quad \text{and} \quad B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}) = \mathbf{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) \cap S_m^{\text{top}}.$$

$$(b) \quad \text{The set } \bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) \setminus B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}) \text{ has volume zero in } \text{Sym}^+(m).$$

(c) *Any absolutely continuous measure on $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ supported in $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ is also supported in $B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$.*

Proof: (a) Immediate from definitions.

(b) Let $S_m^{\text{low}} = \text{Sym}^+(m) \setminus S_m^{\text{top}}$. It is easily seen that

$$\bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) \setminus B_r(Y_0, d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}) \subset S_m^{\text{low}} \cup S_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0).$$

Since $S_m^{\text{low}} \subset \text{Sym}^+(m)$ is a finite union of positive-codimension submanifolds, S_m^{low} has volume zero in $\text{Sym}^+(m)$. Thus it suffices to show that $S_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ also has volume zero.

Let $\tilde{Y}_i, 1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{G}(m)|$, be the elements of $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(Y_0)$. Then by definition of d_{SR} ,

$$S_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0) \subset \mathcal{F} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{G}(m)|} S_r(\tilde{Y}_i; \tilde{d}) \right). \quad (9.11)$$

In any complete Riemannian manifold, the sphere with any given center and radius has volume zero in that manifold. Hence each of the spheres $S_r(\tilde{Y}_i; \tilde{d})$ has volume zero in $\widetilde{M}(m)$, and therefore so does their union. Since $\dim(\widetilde{M}(m)) = \dim(\text{Sym}^+(m))$ and \mathcal{F} is smooth, \mathcal{F} carries volume-zero sets to volume-zero sets. Hence $S_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ is contained in a volume-zero subset of $\text{Sym}^+(m)$, and therefore itself has volume zero in $\text{Sym}^+(m)$.

(c) Immediate from part (a). \blacksquare

In the next proposition, we consider i.i.d., absolutely continuous, $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables X_1, \dots, X_N whose induced measure μ_X is supported in $\bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$ for some given $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$ and radius r less than $r_{\text{cx}}(M(m), g) = \frac{\beta_m \sqrt{k}}{4}$. Lemma 9.7(b) assures us that μ_X is also supported in the open metric ball $B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$. By Lemma 9.4, for each i , lifts X_i^M of X_i to $M(m)$ exist and are absolutely continuous, and since $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}} : (M^{\text{top}}(m), d^{\text{top}}) \rightarrow (S_m^{\text{top}}, d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ is an isometry, the common measure μ_{X^M} is supported in $B_r(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(Y_0)) \subset (M(m), d)$. Since $r < r_{\text{cx}}(M(m), g) < r_{\text{inj}}(M(m), g)$, and $\text{quo} : \widetilde{M}(m) \rightarrow M(m)$ is a Riemannian covering map, each random variable X_i^M has an equivariant family of associated lifts to $\widetilde{M}(m)$ (see Definition 8.5). We call such families $\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}, \dots, \{\tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$, *consistently indexed* if, in the setting of Remark 8.4 and Definition 8.5, there is an equivariant family of measurable sections $\{s_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}}$ that simultaneously determines each of the families $\{\tilde{X}_i^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$.

Proposition 9.8. *Let $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$, let $Y'_0 = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(Y_0)$, let $r \in (0, \frac{\beta_m \sqrt{k}}{4})$, and let X_1, \dots, X_N be i.i.d., absolutely continuous, $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables whose distribution μ_X is supported in $\bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$. Let X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M be lifts of X_1, \dots, X_N to $M(m)$, and let $\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}, \dots, \{\tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ be consistently indexed, equivariant families of associated lifts of X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M to $\widetilde{M}(m)$; note that, thanks to the consistent indexing, for each $h \in \mathcal{G}(m)$ the random variables $\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}$ are i.i.d.*

The following are true almost surely:

- (a) *For each $h \in \mathcal{G}(m)$, the set $\text{FM}(\{\tilde{X}_1^{(h)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_N^{(h)}\})$ consists of a single point and lies in $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})) = \text{quo}^{-1}(B_r(Y'_0) \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) \subset \widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$.*

- (b) $\text{FM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\})$ consists of a single point lying in $B_r(Y_0) \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)$. In addition, $\bar{E}_N^{\text{PSR}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\})$ is identical to $\text{quo}^{-1}(\text{FM}(\{X_1^M, \dots, X_N^M\}))$ and consists of a single $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -orbit lying in $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})) \subset \widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$.

Proof: Let us write $\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{M}(m)$, $M = M(m)$, $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}} = \widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}(m)$, and $M^{\text{top}} = M^{\text{top}}(m)$. Letting $B^M := B_r(Y_0) \subset (M, d)$ play the role of the ball B in Corollary 7.8, let $\{\tilde{B}_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ be as in Corollary 7.8, labeled equivariantly (see Remark 7.9). For each $\omega \in \Omega$ (recall from Section 1 that Ω is the domain of all random variables in this paper), let us write $Q(\omega) := (X_1(\omega), \dots, X_N(\omega))$ and $Q^M(\omega) := (X_1^M(\omega), \dots, X_N^M(\omega))$.

Since $r < r_{\text{cx}}(M, g)$ and $\widetilde{M} \setminus \widetilde{M}^{\text{top}}$ is a $\mathcal{G}(m)$ -invariant subset of \widetilde{M} of volume zero, Lemma 9.7 and Corollary 8.6(c) together imply that there is a full-measure subset $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega_1$:

- (i) For each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $X_i(\omega) \in B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ (implying that $X_i^M(\omega) = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}(X_i(\omega))$, since $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}$ is one-to-one). Equivalently, $Q(\omega) \in (B_r(Y_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}))^N$, which implies that $Q^M(\omega) \in (B_r(Y_0'))^N$, since $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}} : (M^{\text{top}}, d^{\text{top}}) \rightarrow (S_m^{\text{top}}, d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ is an isometry.
- (ii) $\text{FM}(Q^M(\omega))$ is a single point and lies in $M^{\text{top}} \cap B^M$.
- (iii) For each $h \in G$, the set $\text{FM}(\tilde{Q}^{(h)}(\omega))$ is a single point and lies in $\widetilde{M}^{\text{top}} \cap \tilde{B}_h$.

Conclusion (a) of the Proposition is immediate from (iii). Conclusion (b) then follows from Corollary 8.6(a) and Proposition 9.5. \blacksquare

Remark 9.9. By simply foregoing the first conclusion of Proposition 9.8 we obtain the following weaker, but more easily stated, result:

Let $Y_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$, let $r \in (0, \frac{\beta_m \sqrt{k}}{4})$, and let X_1, \dots, X_N be absolutely continuous, i.i.d., $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ -valued random variables whose distribution μ_X is supported in $\bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$. Then, almost surely, the partial scaling-rotation means of X_1, \dots, X_N are unique up to the action of $\mathcal{G}(m)$ and lie in the top stratum of $\widetilde{M}(m)$.

Remark 9.10. It can be shown that d_{SR} is continuous on $S_m^{\text{top}} \times S_m^{\text{top}}$. Hence, given $S_0 \in S_m^{\text{top}}$, $r > 0$, and $S \in B_r(S_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ (the closure of $B_r(S_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$ in $\text{Sym}^+(m)$),

$$d_{\text{SR}}(S, S_0) \leq \sup \left\{ d_{\text{SR}}(S', S_0) : S' \in B_r(S_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}}) \right\} = r;$$

i.e. $S \in \bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$. Thus $\overline{B_r(S_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})} \subset \bar{B}_r^{\text{SR}}(Y_0)$. Hence the support-condition on μ_X in Proposition 9.8 and Remark 9.9 is met if μ_X is supported in $B_r(S_0; d_{\text{SR}}^{\text{top}})$.

Appendix A: Proofs of some technical results

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $n > 0$. Suppose $A' \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ has volume zero in \mathbf{R}^n . By [21, Lemma 6.2], $\mathbf{R} \times A'$ has volume zero in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} . By induction, $\mathbf{R}^k \times A'$ has volume zero in \mathbf{R}^{n+k} for all $k > 0$. Trivially this is true for $k = 0$ as well.

Now let M and N be manifolds of dimensions $k + n$ and n respectively, and let $H : M \rightarrow N$ be a submersion. Identify \mathbf{R}^{k+n} with $\mathbf{R}^k \times \mathbf{R}^n$ the usual way. Since H is a

submersion, M and N have atlases \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} with the following property: for every chart $(U, \varphi) \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $(V, \psi) \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $U = H^{-1}(V)$ and such that the map $\psi \circ H \circ \varphi^{-1} : (\varphi(U) \subset \mathbf{R}^k \times \mathbf{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is simply the natural projection $\pi : \mathbf{R}^k \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ (restricted to $\varphi(U) \subset \mathbf{R}^k \times \psi(V) \subset \mathbf{R}^k \times \mathbf{R}^n$).

With all data as in the previous paragraph, suppose $A \subset N$ has volume zero in N . Then $A' := \psi(A \cap V)$ has volume zero in \mathbf{R}^n . Observing that $\pi \circ \varphi(H^{-1}(A) \cap U) = \pi \circ \varphi(H^{-1}(A \cap V)) = \psi \circ H(H^{-1}(A \cap V)) = A'$, we have $\varphi(H^{-1}(A) \cap U) \subset \mathbf{R}^k \times A'$. The first paragraph of this proof therefore shows that $\varphi(H^{-1}(A) \cap U)$ has volume zero in \mathbf{R}^{k+n} . Since \mathcal{A} is an atlas of M , this proves that $H^{-1}(A)$ has volume zero in M . ■

Proof of Lemma 7.6. Let $\tilde{\rho} = r_{\text{inj}}(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g})$ and $\rho = r_{\text{inj}}(M, g)$. Since quo is a local isometry, it intertwines the exponential maps of \widetilde{M} and M :

$$\text{quo} \circ \exp_{\tilde{p}} = \exp_{\text{quo}(\tilde{p})} \circ \text{quo}_{*\tilde{p}} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It follows that for any $p \in M$, $\tilde{p} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$, and $r > 0$ for which $\exp_p : B_r(0) \subset T_p M \rightarrow M$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, so is $\exp_{\tilde{p}} : B_r(0) \subset T_{\tilde{p}} \widetilde{M} \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$. Hence $\tilde{\rho} \geq \rho$.

Next, suppose that $\rho < \min\{\tilde{\rho}, \frac{\beta}{2}\}$. For $v \in T\widetilde{M}$, let $\tilde{\gamma}_v$ denote the geodesic $t \mapsto \exp(t\tilde{v})$; for $v \in TM$ we similarly define the geodesic γ_v . We write $L[\cdot]$ for the length of a curve in \widetilde{M} or M . Since quo is a local isometry, curve-lifting from M to \widetilde{M} preserves length and carries geodesics to geodesics.

Let $\tilde{p} \in \widetilde{M}$, $p = \text{quo}(\tilde{p})$, and let $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{p}}, \rho_p$ denote the local injectivity radii of \widetilde{M}, M at \tilde{p}, p respectively. Since $\rho < \tilde{\rho}$, we may select $\epsilon > 0$ and $p \in M$ such that $\rho_p < \rho + \epsilon < \tilde{\rho}$. Then ρ_p is finite, so there exists $q \in M$ such that $q \in \mathcal{C}(p)$ and $d(p, q) = \rho_p$. Let $v \in T_p M$ be such that $\gamma_v|_{[0,1]}$ is a minimal geodesic from p to q , and let $\delta = \epsilon/\|v\|$; thus $L[\gamma_v|_{[0,1+\delta]}] = \rho_p + \epsilon < \tilde{\rho}$. Since $q \in \mathcal{C}(p)$, the geodesic γ_v does not minimize beyond $t = 1$. Hence there exists $w \in T_p M$ such that $\exp_p(w) = \gamma_v(1 + \delta)$ and $\|w\| < (1 + \delta)\|v\|$.

Let $\alpha : [0, 2 + \delta] \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ be the loop defined by $\alpha(t) = \gamma_v(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1 + \delta$ and $\alpha(t) = \gamma_w(2 + \delta - t)$ for $1 + \delta \leq t \leq 2 + \delta$. Let $\tilde{p} \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$. Then the lift $\tilde{\alpha}$ of α to \widetilde{M} starting at \tilde{p} satisfies $\tilde{\alpha}(2 + \delta) = h \cdot \tilde{p}$ for some (unique) $h \in G$. Let $\tilde{q} = \tilde{\alpha}(1 + \delta)$. Since $L[\tilde{\alpha}|_{[0,1+\delta]}] = L[\alpha|_{[0,1+\delta]}] < \tilde{\rho}$, the curve $\tilde{\alpha}|_{[0,1+\delta]}$ is a minimal geodesic from \tilde{p} to \tilde{q} , while $\tilde{\alpha}|_{[1+\delta,2+\delta]}$ is a shorter-length path from \tilde{q} to $h \cdot \tilde{p}$. It follows that $h \neq e$, and that

$$\beta \leq \tilde{d}(\tilde{p}, h \cdot \tilde{p}) \leq L[\tilde{\alpha}] = L[\alpha] < 2(1 + \delta)\|v\| < 2\rho + 4\epsilon. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since (A.2) holds for arbitrarily small ϵ , this contradicts the hypothesis that $\rho < \beta/2$. Hence $\rho \geq \min\{\tilde{\rho}, \frac{\beta}{2}\}$.

Finally, suppose the strict equality $\rho > \min\{\tilde{\rho}, \frac{\beta}{2}\}$ holds. Since $\rho \leq \tilde{\rho}$, we must have $\min\{\tilde{\rho}, \frac{\beta}{2}\} = \frac{\beta}{2}$, so $\tilde{\rho} > \frac{\beta}{2}$ and $\rho > \frac{\beta}{2}$. For each $p \in M$, let β_p be the minimal distance between distinct elements of $\text{quo}^{-1}(p)$, and let $\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2 \in \text{quo}^{-1}(p)$ be a pair of points achieving this distance β_p . Let $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ be a minimal geodesic from \tilde{p}_1 to \tilde{p}_2 and let $\gamma = \text{quo} \circ \tilde{\gamma}$. Then γ is a closed geodesic loop starting and ending at p , and $L[\gamma] = L[\tilde{\gamma}] = \beta_p$. Hence $\rho_p \leq \frac{1}{2}L[\gamma] = \frac{\beta_p}{2}$. Taking the infimum over all $p \in M$ yields $\rho \leq \frac{\beta}{2}$, a contradiction. Hence

$$\rho = \min\{\tilde{\rho}, \frac{\beta}{2}\}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Lemma 9.4. (a) Using the Axiom of Choice, for each $Y \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ select an element $s(Y) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{Y\})$, thereby defining a set-theoretic section $s : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow M(m)$. Note that since $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}$ is a bijection, $s|_{S_m^{\text{top}}} = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}^{-1}$.

Let $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ denote the sigma-algebras of Lebesgue-measurable subsets of $\text{Sym}^+(m), M(m)$ respectively (see Section 1).

For any $U \subset M(m)$, trivially $U = (U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) \cup U \cap M^{\text{low}}(m)$, and therefore $s^{-1}(U) = s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) \cup s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{low}}(m))$. Since $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{low}}(m)) \subset S'_m$, which has volume zero, it follows that $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{low}}(m))$ has volume zero, and therefore lies in \mathcal{L}_1 . Hence, given $U \in \mathcal{L}_2$, to show that $s^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ it suffices to show that $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) \in \mathcal{L}_1$.

First suppose that $U \subset M(m)$ is a Borel set. Since $M^{\text{top}}(m)$ is open, $U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)$ is a Borel set, and therefore so is $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) = s|_{S_m^{\text{top}}}^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m))$. Thus $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) \in \mathcal{L}_1$.

Next, suppose that $U \subset M(m)$ has volume zero. Then every subset of U has volume zero and therefore lies in \mathcal{L}_2 . In particular this applies to $U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)$. Again we have $s^{-1}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m)) = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m))$, and since $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}$ is a diffeomorphism, it follows that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{top}}(U \cap M^{\text{top}}(m))$ has volume zero, hence lies in \mathcal{L}_1 . Furthermore, $s^{-1}(U)$ is the union of two volume-zero sets, hence has volume zero.

Thus, for every $U \subset M(m)$ that is either a Borel set or a volume-zero set, $s^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Since every $U \in \mathcal{L}_2$ is the union of a Borel set and a volume-zero set, it follows that $s^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ whenever $U \in \mathcal{L}_2$. Thus s is measurable.

(b) Trivially, a map $X^M : \Omega \rightarrow M(m)$ is a lift of X if and only if $X^M = s \circ X$ for some set-theoretic (hence measurable, by part (a)) section s of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$. Since such sections exist, so do lifts X^M of X .

Let X^M be a lift of X to $M(m)$, and let s be the (necessarily unique) set-theoretic section of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ for which $X^M = s \circ X$. Since s and X are measurable, so is X^M .

(i) Let $U \subset M(m)$ be a volume-zero subset. Then $s^{-1}(U)$ has volume zero, by part (a). Since X is absolutely continuous, it follows that

$$0 = \mu_X(s^{-1}(U)) = \Pr(X^{-1}(s^{-1}(U))) = \Pr((s \circ X)^{-1}(U)) = \mu_{X^M}(U).$$

Hence the $M(m)$ -valued random variable X^M is absolutely continuous.

(ii) By Corollary 8.3(b) and its proof, there exists an equivariant family $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ of absolutely continuous, measurable lifts of X^M from $M(m)$ to $\widetilde{M}(m)$. Hence the family $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in \mathcal{G}(m)}$ has all the desired properties. \blacksquare

Appendix B: Parametric transversality and a proof for Remark 4.5

Given manifolds \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , and a submanifold $A \subset \mathcal{M}$, we say that a smooth map $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is *transverse to A* if, for every $p \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(A)$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{*p}(T_p\mathcal{N}) + T_{\mathcal{F}(p)}A = T_{\mathcal{F}(p)}\mathcal{M}$$

(i.e. at $\mathcal{F}(p)$, the tangent space of \mathcal{M} is spanned by the tangent space of A together with the image of $T_p\mathcal{N}$ under the derivative of \mathcal{F}). If this condition is met, then $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(A)$ is a submanifold of \mathcal{N} , of codimension equal to the codimension of A in \mathcal{M} . Note that trivially, a *submersion* $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is transverse to every submanifold of \mathcal{M} .

Theorem B.1 (C^∞ Parametric Transversality Theorem [21, Theorem 6.35]). *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, S$ be smooth manifolds and let $A \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a smooth submanifold. Suppose that $\{\mathcal{F}_s : s \in S\}$ is a smooth family of smooth maps $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$; i.e. assume that the map $\mathcal{F} : S \times \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ defined by $\mathcal{F}(s, p) = \mathcal{F}_s(p)$ is smooth. If \mathcal{F} is transverse to A , then $\{s \in S : \mathcal{F}_s \text{ is transverse to } A\}$ is a generic subset of S ; i.e. generically the maps \mathcal{F}_s are transverse to A .*

We will use Theorem B.1 to prove the following:

Proposition B.2. *For each $N \geq 1$, the set $\pi_N(\mathcal{M}_2)$ is generic in M^N .*

Proof: Since \mathcal{M}_1 is open in $M^N \times M$, we can express \mathcal{M}_1 as a countable union of products $U_i \times V_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$), where U_i and V_i are open subsets of M^N and M , respectively. Since F is a submersion, so is $F_i := F|_{U_i \times V_i}$ for each i . Hence F_i is transverse to Z for each i . For $Q \in U_i$, the evaluation-map $Y_{Q,i} : p \mapsto F_i(Q, p)$ is simply $Y_Q|_{V_i}$. The proof of the Parametric Transversality Theorem as presented in [10, Ch. 3, Theorem 2.7] shows that the set $A_i = \{Q \in U_i : Y_{Q,i} \text{ is not transverse to } Z\}$ has volume zero in U_i , hence in M^N . Since there are only countably many A_i , their union has volume zero in M^N . But this union contains $\{Q \in M^N : Y_Q \text{ is not transverse to } Z\}$, and (using e.g. (4.1)) the condition “ Y_Q is transverse to Z ” is equivalent to “ $(\nabla Y_Q)|_p : T_pM \rightarrow T_pM$ is an isomorphism for all $p \in Z \cap \text{domain}(Y_Q)$ ”. Hence the volume-zero set $\{Q \in M^N : Y_Q \text{ is not transverse to } Z\}$ is exactly $M^N \setminus \pi_N(\mathcal{M}_2)$, and thus $\pi_N(\mathcal{M}_2)$ is generic in M^N . ■

Acknowledgements

The second author was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2019R1A2C2002256).

References

- [1] AFSARI, B. (2011). Riemannian L^p Center of Mass: Existence, Uniqueness, and Convexity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139**, 133–136.
- [2] BHATTACHARYA, R. and PATRANGENARU, V. (2003). Large Sample Theory of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Sample Means on Manifolds, I, *Ann. Stat.* **31** (2003), 1–29.
- [3] BISHOP, R. L. (1977). Decomposition of cut loci. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **65**, 655–673.

- [4] BURAGO, Y., GROMOV, M., and PERELMAN, G. (1992). A. D. Alexandrov spaces with curvature bounded below, *Russian Math. Surveys* **47**, 1–58.
- [5] CHAVEL, I. (2006). *Riemannian Geometry: A Modern Introduction*, 2nd ed. *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics* **108**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [6] CORCUERA, J. M. and KENDALL, W. S. (1999). Riemannian barycentres and geodesic convexity. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **127**, 253–269.
- [7] GROISSER D. (2004). Newton’s method, zeroes of vector fields, and the Riemannian center of mass. *Adv. Appl. Math.* **33**, 95–135.
- [8] GROISSER, D., JUNG, S., and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2017). Geometric foundations for scaling-rotation statistics on symmetric positive definite matrices: minimal smooth scaling-rotation curves in low dimensions. *Electronic J. Stat.* **11**, 1092–1159.
- [9] GROISSER, D., JUNG, S., and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2021). Uniqueness questions in a scaling-rotation geometry on the space of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *Diff. Geom. and its Appl.* **79**, 1–40.
- [10] HIRSCH, M. W. (1994). *Differential Topology*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **33**. Springer-Verlag, New York. Corrected reprint of the 1976 original.
- [11] HOTZ, T., SKWERER, S., HUCKEMANN, S., LE, H., MARRON, J. S., MATTINGLY, J. C., MILLER, E., NOLEN, J., OWEN, M., and PATRANGENARU, V. (2013). Sticky central limit theorems on open books. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **23**, 2238–2258.
- [12] HUCKEMANN, S. (2011). Inference on 3D Procrustes Means: Tree Bole Growth, Rank Deficient Diffusion Tensors and Perturbation Models. *Scand. J. Stat.* **38**, 424–446.
- [13] HUCKEMANN, S., MATTINGLY J. C., MILLER, E. and NOLEN, J. (2015). Sticky central limit theorems at isolated hyperbolic planar singularities. *Electron. J. Probab.* **20**, no. 78, 34.
- [14] HUCKEMANN, S. F. (2011). Intrinsic inference on the mean geodesic of planar shapes and tree discrimination by leaf growth. *The Annals of Statistics* **39**, 1098–1124.
- [15] S. HUCKEMANN (2012). On the meaning of mean shape: manifold stability, locus and the two sample test. *Ann. Inst. Stat. Math.* **64**, 1227–1259.
- [16] JUNG, S., ROOKS, B., GROISSER, D., and SCHWARTZMAN, A. (2023). Averaging Symmetric Positive-Definite Matrices on the Space of Eigen-Decompositions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12025*
- [17] S. JUNG, A. SCHWARTZMAN, AND D. GROISSER (2015). Scaling-Rotation Distance and Interpolation of Symmetric Positive-Definite Matrices. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **36**, 1180–1201.
- [18] KARCHER, H. (1977). Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing. *Commun. Pure and Appl. Math.* **30**, 509–541.
- [19] KENDALL, D. G. (1984). Shape manifolds, Procrustean metrics, and complex projective spaces. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **16**, 81–121.
- [20] LE, H. and BARDEN, D. (2014). On the measure of the cut locus of a Fréchet mean. *Bull London Math. Soc.* **46**, 698–708.
- [21] LEE, J. M. (2013). *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [22] SAKAI, T. (1996). *Riemannian Geometry*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs v. 149, Amer. Math. Soc.