# MANIFOLD-VALUED FUNCTION APPROXIMATION FROM MULTIPLE TANGENT SPACES\*

HANG WANG<sup>†</sup>, RAF VANDEBRIL<sup>‡</sup>, JOERI VAN DER VEKEN<sup>§</sup>, and NICK VANNIEUWENHOVEN<sup>¶</sup>

**Abstract.** Approximating a manifold-valued function from samples of input-output pairs consists of modeling the relationship between an input from a vector space and an output on a Riemannian manifold. We propose a function approximation method that leverages and unifies two prior techniques: (i) approximating a pullback to the tangent space, and (ii) the Riemannian moving least squares method. The core idea of the new scheme is to combine pullbacks to multiple tangent spaces with a weighted Fréchet mean. The effectiveness of this approach is illustrated with numerical experiments on model problems from parametric model order reduction.

Key words. Function approximation; Riemannian manifold; manifold-valued function; Fréchet mean; multiple tangent space model

MSC codes. 65D15, 65D40, 65J99, 46T20, 53B20, 58C25

**1.** Introduction. Function approximation involves approximating a function by a simpler function. Traditional methods focus on approximating functions between Euclidean spaces. However, there is growing interest in approximating functions that map from a vector space into a manifold because such manifold-valued functions arise naturally in a variety of applications. They include among others subspace tracking in signal processing for dynamic direction of arrival estimation and beamforming [38, 54, 43, 20] where the function maps into the Grassmannian; parametric model order reduction based on (quasi-)interpolation of projections [8, 3, 56] where the functions also map into the Grassmannian; diffusion tensor imaging in medical imaging applications [48, 36] where functions map into the manifold of symmetric positivedefinite matrices; dynamic low-rank approximation of solutions of partial differential equations [33, 40, 55, 14, 17, 46] where the functions map into manifolds of low-rank matrices or tensors; and stiffness matrix prediction for additive manufacturing simulations [19] where the function maps into the manifold of low-rank positive semidefinite matrices. These applications show that common reasons for approximating a possibly implicit function from samples by an explicit surrogate function include reducing the cost of evaluation, reducing the cost of storing the function, and discovering an explicit description of an implicit function given through samples.

This paper seeks to approximate the—possibly unknown—function

(1.1) 
$$f: \mathbb{R}^n \supset \Omega \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^m,$$

\*Submitted to the editors DATE.

<sup>†</sup>KU Leuven, Department of Computer Science, Celestijnenlaan 200A, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium (hang.wang@kuleuven.be).

<sup>‡</sup>KU Leuven, Department of Computer Science, Celestijnenlaan 200A, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium (raf.vandebril@kuleuven.be).

<sup>§</sup>KU Leuven, Department of Mathematics, Celestijnenlaan 200B, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium (joeri.vanderveken@kuleuven.be).

<sup>¶</sup>KU Leuven, Department of Computer Science, Celestijnenlaan 200A, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium. Leuven.AI, KU Leuven Institute for AI, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium (nick.vannieuwenhoven@kuleuven.be).

**Funding:** This project was funded by BOF project C16/21/002 by the Internal Funds KU Leuven and FWO project G080822N. R. Vandebril is additionally supported by the Research Foundation–Flanders (Belgium), projects G0A9923N and G0B0123N. J. Van der Veken is additionally supported by the Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO) and the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS) under EOS Project G0I2222N.

where  $\Omega$  is open and  $\mathcal{M}$  is an embedded *Riemannian submanifold* of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , oftentimes equipped with the Euclidean metric from  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (see section 2 below for the background). Our aim is finding a function  $\widehat{f}: \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  that approximates f from  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  samples

(1.2) 
$$S := \{ (x_i, y_i) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{M} \mid i = 1, \dots, N \}.$$

We make no assumptions on which samples S are provided to us: they could be (i) a fixed set of known input-output pairs as is common in machine learning; (ii) queried by the user from a given, usually expensive-to-evaluate function f; or (iii) a combination thereof. The techniques we consider in this paper assume that a set of samples S is given; we do not investigate how to choose the samples if we have this liberty. Moreover, for simplicity, we assume that the samples  $y_i$  lie exactly on the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . If this is not the case, then the proposed techniques can still be employed either by (i) projecting the output samples to the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , or (ii) using the smooth extension of the logarithmic map from  $\mathcal{M}$  to the ambient  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .

The main challenge of this approximation problem is that the function spaces over  $\Omega$  are not linear due to the nonlinearity of  $\mathcal{M}$ . This causes difficulty in generalizing classic function approximation methods. Nonetheless, there are two main strategies for solving manifold-valued function approximation in the literature: one is to *linearize the problem* locally, as in [3, 30, 29, 56] and [57, Section 4], while the other is to compute a weighted *Riemannian center of mass, Karcher mean* [32], or *Fréchet mean* [23] of the function values at sample points, as in [26, 47, 44, 45] and [57, Section 3].

Linearization constitutes an effective methodology for reducing a manifold-valued function approximation problem to a classic vector-valued function approximation problem by pulling back the approximation problem to a single tangent space, as elucidated in [3, 30, 55]. We refer to this technique as a single tangent space model (STSM); it is described in more detail in subsection 3.1. For now it suffices to clarify that STSM encompasses two principal stages. The first stage involves pulling back the outputs  $\{y_1, \ldots, y_N\} \subset \mathcal{M}$  to a single tangent space  $T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$ , where  $p^*$  is a designated anchor point, which could be, for example, a randomly selected output from  $\{y_1, \ldots, y_N\}$ or their Fréchet mean. This pullback usually takes the form of the logarithmic map  $\log_{p^*} : \mathcal{M} \to T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$ ; see subsection 2.1.<sup>1</sup> The second stage entails approximating the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$  from the pullback samples  $\{(x_i, \log_{p^*} y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathcal{M} \times T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$ . This is an approximation problem between vector spaces so standard function approximation schemes can be used, such as multivariate Hermite interpolation as in [57, Section 4] and tensorized Chebyshev interpolation as in [30]. STSM is well defined only when all points  $\{y_1, \ldots, y_N\}$  lie within the injectivity radius of the point  $p^*$ .

The approximation models from [25, 26, 47, 44, 57, 45] utilize a weighted Fréchet mean as the basis of an approximation of f. They can be thought of as generalizing the linear moving least-squares method [53] that approximates a function f(x) between vector spaces by a linear combination of the outputs as  $\hat{f}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_i(x)y_i$ , where  $\phi_i$  are suitable weight functions, to the setting where the outputs  $y_i$  live on a Riemannian manifold. In these methods, proposed originally in [25, 26], the linear combination is substituted by a weighted Fréchet mean, resulting in the *Riemannian* moving least squares (RMLS) method. Recently, Sharon, Cohen, and Wendland [47]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Throughout this paper, we will work with the exponential map and its inverse, primarily so that we can rely on standard concepts from differential geometry. For many matrix manifolds in their natural geometries, the exponential map and its inverse can be efficiently computed [1, 11]. However, in the context of Riemannian optimization [1, 11] it is common to replace the exponential map by a computationally cheaper approximation thereof, which is called a *retraction*. We believe that most of the results of this paper can be generalized straightforwardly to retractions as well.

proposed a multi-scale extension of RMLS, called MRMLS, which approximates the error of the previous scale with higher resolution samples using RMLS. A different extension was proposed by Zimmermann and Bergmann [57]; they introduced the barycentric Hermite interpolation method that additionally interpolates the derivatives when computing the weighted Fréchet mean.

Comparing STSM and RMLS, we note that the main advantage of STSM is its computational advantage over RMLS for evaluating the approximated function (the online stage). The reason is that RMLS requires computing a weighted Fréchet mean involving all sample points with non-zero weights. As no closed expression is known in general for the Fréchet mean, this involves using specialized approximation [31] or general Riemannian optimization [1, 11] methods, which require evaluating the manifold's exponential map a number of times that is proportional to the number of nonzero weights. STSM requires but one evaluation of the exponential map during the online stage. The computational advantage of STSM during the online stage is paid for during the construction of the model (the offline stage): RMLS has no set up cost, while STSM needs to pull back all output samples to the designated tangent space  $T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$  and then solve a traditional multivariate approximation problem there.

Main contribution. To address the limitation of locality in STSM and the high computational cost of the online stage of (multilevel) RMLS, we propose a new approach that unifies STSM and RMLS. We call it the multiple tangent spaces model (MTSM). Our scheme utilizes multiple STSMs and combines their predictions with a weighted Fréchet mean. It can be thought of as replacing dense clusters of output samples by a single STSM. Hereby, MTSM can circumvent the locality restriction of STSM while significantly reducing the online computational cost of employing RMLS. MTSM trades off these advantages for a more costly offline stage.

The essential ingredients of MTSM are the following:

- 1. Choose appropriate anchor points  $p_1^*, \ldots, p_R^*$  on the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ ; 2. pull f back to the tangent spaces  $T_{p_j^*}\mathcal{M}, j \in \{1, \ldots, R\}$ , where possible, and approximate the vector-valued maps  $g_j = \text{Log}_{p_i^*} \circ f$  by  $\widehat{g}_j$  using classic function approximation methods;
- 3. push each  $\hat{g}_j$  forward with  $\text{Exp}_{p^*}$  and compute a weighted Fréchet mean of their predictions.

Proposition 4.6 presents an error bound of MTSM and section 5 provides the algorithms for its online and offline stages.

**Outline.** This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we recall the relevant terminology from differential geometry and basic properties of weighted Fréchet means. In section 3, we review the two main manifold-valued function approximation methods in the literature that MTSM generalizes. In section 4, we present the manifold-valued function approximation framework MTSM and describe its smoothness, error analysis, and required number of tangent spaces. Thereafter, in section 5, the algorithms to build and evaluate MTSM are proposed. In section 6, we present numerical experiments with two basic approximation problems from [47] and [57]. Moreover, we employ MTSM for parametric model order reduction on the two wellknown benchmark problems Anemometer and Microthruster, using psssMOR [41] and Manopt [12]. We conclude with a summary of the key findings and an outlook on potential future research in section 7.

2. Background and notation. We give an overview of the required background material and hereby also fix notation that will be used throughout the paper.



Fig. 1: A diagram of key geometric concepts, like the tangent space  $T_p\mathcal{M}$  at  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ , the exponential map  $\operatorname{Exp}_p$ , the logarithmic map  $\operatorname{Log}_p$ , and a geodesic curve  $\gamma_p(t)$ .

**2.1. Riemannian geometry.** In this subsection, we review standard concepts from Riemannian geometry that we use throughout this paper. We refer to Figure 1 for a visualization of some of them. Full technical details can be found in [34, 35].

A d-dimensional topological manifold is a space where each point has a neighborhood that maps homeomorphically (a continuous bijection with a continuous inverse) to an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A smooth manifold is, informally, a topological manifold whose transition maps between these various neighborhoods are smooth. The tangent space  $T_p\mathcal{M}$  at a point  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  is the d-dimensional vector space of velocity vectors of smooth curves passing through p.

A Riemannian manifold  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$  is a smooth manifold that is equipped with a Riemannian metric  $\mathbf{g}$ . Throughout this paper, we assume a metric has been fixed, and for brevity we refer to  $\mathcal{M}$  as a Riemannian manifold. A Riemannian metric  $\mathbf{g}$ provides a smoothly varying inner product  $\mathbf{g}_p : T_p \mathcal{M} \times T_p \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$  on the tangent space at  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ . The norm induced by this inner product at p is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_p$ .<sup>2</sup> The geodesic distance between two points  $p, q \in \mathcal{M}$  is

 $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p,q) := \inf\{L(\gamma) \mid \gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M} \text{ piecewise smooth}, \gamma(0) = p, \gamma(1) = q\},\$ 

where  $L(\gamma) := \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\|_{\gamma(t)} dt$  is the *length* of the curve  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma'(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)}\mathcal{M}$  is the derivative of  $\gamma$  at  $t \in (0, 1)$ . If no curves exist between p and q, then  $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, q) = \infty$ .

A geodesic curve is a curve  $\gamma(t) : \mathbb{R} \supset [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$  that locally minimizes the length of the path between its endpoints, i.e., there exists a supremum  $a' \in (0,1]$  such that  $\gamma|_{[0,a']}$  is a *length-minimizing geodesic* in the sense that  $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma(0),\gamma(t)) = L(\gamma|_{[0,t]})$ for all  $0 \leq t \leq a'$ . Geodesic curves starting in  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  can be parameterized by a tangent vector in the tangent space at p via the *exponential map*  $\operatorname{Exp}_p : D \to \mathcal{M}$ , for some open  $D \subset T_p \mathcal{M}$ . It takes a tangent vector  $v \in D$  at  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  and maps it to  $\gamma(\|v\|_p)$ , where  $\gamma$  is the unit-speed geodesic with  $\gamma(0) = p$  and  $\gamma'(0) = t$ .

The *injectivity radius* inj(p) > 0 at  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  is the supremum over  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\operatorname{Exp}_{p}: B_{\sigma}(p) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p) \subset \mathcal{M}$$

is a diffeomorphism (a smooth bijective map with a smooth inverse), where

$$B_{\sigma}(p) := \{ v \in T_p \mathcal{M} \mid ||v||_p < \sigma \} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p) := \operatorname{Exp}_p(B_{\sigma}(p))$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>This notation is not to be confused with a common notation for the p-norm, which is nowhere used in this paper.

are the balls of radius  $\sigma$  around, respectively,  $0 \in T_p \mathcal{M}$  and  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ . If  $\sigma \leq \operatorname{inj}(p)$ , then  $\operatorname{Log}_p := \operatorname{Exp}_p|_{B_{\sigma}(p)}^{-1}$  is called the *logarithmic map* and both  $B_{\sigma}(p)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p)$  are called *geodesic* balls. The logarithmic map takes  $q \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p)$  to the tangent vector at pof the unique geodesic curve connecting p and q.

The curvature of a Riemannian manifold can be quantified as detailed in [24]. Let  $\Sigma_p$  be a 2-dimensional subspace of  $T_p\mathcal{M}$ , let  $C_{\Sigma_p}(r)$  denote the image under the exponential map at p of the unit circle in  $\Sigma_p$  for sufficiently small r > 0, and let  $\ell_{\Sigma_p}(r)$  be the length of  $C_{\Sigma_p}(r)$ . Then, the sectional curvature  $\sec(\Sigma_p) \in \mathbb{R}$  can be defined as  $\sec(\Sigma_p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}r^3}\Big|_{r=0} \ell_{\Sigma_p}(r)$ .

We will frequently require suitable sectional curvature bounds in this paper. For this reason, we introduce the next notations for the "clipped" infimum and supremum of the sectional curvatures on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ :

$$\kappa_{\ell}^{-}(\mathcal{M}) := \min\left\{0, \inf_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \Sigma_{p} \subset T_{p}\mathcal{M}}} \sec(\Sigma_{p})\right\} \text{ and } \kappa_{u}^{+}(\mathcal{M}) := \max\left\{0, \sup_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \Sigma_{p} \subset T_{p}\mathcal{M}}} \sec(\Sigma_{p})\right\},$$

where  $\Sigma_p$  is a 2-dimensional linear subspace of  $T_p\mathcal{M}$ . This definition ensures that  $\kappa_{\ell}^{-}(\mathcal{M}) \leq 0 \leq \kappa_{u}^{+}(\mathcal{M})$ .

**2.2. Fréchet mean.** In this subsection, we recall the definition and properties of a Fréchet mean, which forms the basis of the RMLS method.

The *d*-dimensional standard simplex is

$$\Delta^{d} = \left\{ (w_1, \dots, w_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid 0 \le w_1, \dots, w_{d+1} \le 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} w_i = 1 \right\},\$$

and, in a slight abuse of notation, we will use  $\Phi \in \Delta^d$  also for functions  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \to \Delta^d$ . For weights  $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_d) \in \Delta^{d-1}$  and data points  $Y = (y_1, \ldots, y_d) \in \mathcal{M}^{\times d} := \mathcal{M} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{M}$ , the *Fréchet mean* [32, 23] is

(2.1) 
$$\operatorname{avg}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M}^{\times d} \times \Delta^{d-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}, \qquad (Y, \Phi) \longmapsto \operatorname{argmin}_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \varphi_i \cdot \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}} (p, y_i)^2.$$

There could be multiple solutions of this minimization problem. However, under the following sufficient condition, a unique minimizer exists.

THEOREM 2.1 (Uniqueness [2, Theorem 2.1 with p = 2 and Remark 2.5]). If there exists a point  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  and a radius

$$\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \operatorname{inj}(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma}), \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\kappa_u^+(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma})}} \right\},\,$$

with  $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma}$  equal to  $\mathcal{M}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{2\sigma}(p)$ , such that  $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p)$ , then the minimization in the definition of  $\operatorname{avg}_{\mathcal{M}}$  in (2.1) has a globally unique solution for all  $\Phi \in \Delta^{d-1}$ .

**3.** Prior models for manifold-valued function approximation. Before introducing MTSM, we briefly review the two manifold-valued function approximation methods from the literature that our method will extend and unify.

### 6 H. WANG, R. VANDEBRIL, J. VAN DER VEKEN AND N. VANNIEUWENHOVEN

**3.1. STSM: Single tangent space model.** This approach from [30, 56] and [57, Section 4] constructs an approximating function for (1.1) from input-output samples as in (1.2) by seeking to solve

(3.1) 
$$\mathscr{S}f := \underset{\widehat{f}: \ \Omega \to \mathcal{M}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}} (\widehat{f}(x_i), y_i)^2,$$

where the approximating function  $\hat{f}$  is anchored at a single anchor point  $p^* \in \mathcal{M}$  and has the form

$$\widehat{f}(x) := \operatorname{Exp}_{p^*}(\widehat{g}(x)),$$

in which  $\widehat{g}: \mathbb{R}^n \to T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$  is a vector-valued function from a suitable function space.

The anchor point  $p^*$  is often chosen as a Fréchet mean, as in [30, 57], or as a random output sample from  $\{y_1, \ldots, y_N\}$ , as in [3, 56].

To determine the vector-valued function  $\hat{g}$ , the following auxiliary classic multivariate function approximation problem is solved:

(3.2) 
$$\min_{\widehat{g}: \mathbb{R}^n \to T_{p^*} \mathcal{M}} \sum_{i=1}^N \operatorname{dist}_{T_{p^*} \mathcal{M}} (\widehat{g}(x_i), \operatorname{Log}_{p^*}(y_i))^2,$$

where the minimization is over the function space determined by the chosen multivariate approximation method and  $\operatorname{dist}_{T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}}$  is the straight-line distance induced by the inner product  $\mathbf{g}_{p^*}$  defined by the Riemannian metric  $\mathbf{g}$  at  $p^*$ . Any vector-valued function approximation method can be used to solve (3.2), because the codomain of  $\hat{g}$  is a vector space of dimension equal to the dimension of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Optimization problem (3.2) is in general not equivalent to (3.1) because  $\operatorname{Exp}_{p^*}$  is only a *radial isometry* [35], which preserves the distances between points  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  in  $T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$  only if the straight line passing through  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  passes through the origin. The distance between any other pair of points will be distorted by the curvature of the Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . For this reason, to measure the accuracy of STSM, an error bound of this model was proposed in [30], which is recalled next.

THEOREM 3.1 (Error bound of STSM [30, Theorem 3.1]). Consider a Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  and a point  $p^* \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $f : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\Omega$  is a set whose image is contained in a geodesic ball  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p^*) \subset \mathcal{M}$ . Assume that  $\widehat{f} = \operatorname{Exp}_{p^*} \circ \widehat{g}$ , where  $\widehat{g} : \Omega \to \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p^*)$  is an approximation such that

$$\left\| \operatorname{Log}_{p^*}(f(x)) - \widehat{g}(x) \right\|_{p^*} \le \epsilon$$

for all  $x \in \Omega$ . Let  $L := \kappa_{\ell}^{-}(\mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p^{*}))$ . Then, for all  $x \in \Omega$ , the distance between f(x)and  $\widehat{f}(x)$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  obeys

$$\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x), \widehat{f}(x)) \leq \epsilon + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } L = 0, \\ \frac{2}{\sqrt{|L|}} \operatorname{arcsinh}\left(\frac{\epsilon \sinh(\sigma \sqrt{|L|})}{2\sigma}\right), & \text{if } L < 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.1 indicates that STSM can approximate a manifold-valued function with high accuracy if the image of f is contained in a small geodesic ball in  $\mathcal{M}$  and the vector-valued pullback function  $\log_{p^*} \circ f$  can be well approximated on  $\Omega$ . For a smaller negative sectional curvature, a smaller geodesic ball is required to maintain the same error bound.

For the sake of simplicity, we state a more concise corollary of Theorem 3.1.

COROLLARY 3.2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, if additionally  $\sigma \sqrt{|L|} < \pi$ , then dist<sub> $\mathcal{M}$ </sub> $(f(x), \hat{f}(x)) \leq 5\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* If L = 0, the bound holds trivially by Theorem 3.1. So consider the case L < 0. Exploiting that  $\arcsin(x) < x$  when x > 0, we obtain that

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{|L|}}\operatorname{arcsinh}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\cdot\frac{\sinh(\sigma\sqrt{|L|})}{\sigma}\right) < \epsilon\cdot\frac{\sinh(\sigma\sqrt{|L|})}{\sigma\sqrt{|L|}}.$$

If  $\sigma\sqrt{|L|} < \pi$ , we have  $\frac{\sinh(\sigma\sqrt{|L|})}{\sigma\sqrt{|L|}} < 4$ , so that  $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x), \widehat{f}(x)) < 5\epsilon$ .

**3.2. RMLS: Riemannian moving least squares.** Aimed at solving a general manifold-valued function approximation problem, the Riemannian moving least squares method, which is based on the Fréchet mean and the moving least square method, was proposed by Grohs, Sprecher, and Yu [26].

Recall from [53] that the Euclidean moving least squares method approximates a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  from input-output samples  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  as

$$(\mathscr{E}f)(x) := \min_{p \in \pi_m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi(x, x_i) \cdot \left(p(x_i) - f(x_i)\right)^2,$$

where  $\pi_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  denotes the space of all *n*-variate polynomials of total degree less than or equal to  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and the weight function  $\Phi(x, x_i)$  calculates weights based on the distance between x and the data points  $x_i$ . Usually,  $\Phi$  is compactly supported so that the weight  $\Phi(x, x_i) = 0$  if the distance between x and  $x_i$  exceeds a threshold.

The foregoing scheme was extended to approximate manifold-valued functions as in (1.1) from samples as in (1.2) by [26]. If  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \Delta^{N-1}$  is a weight function, then the Riemannian moving least squares approximation is essentially a Fréchet mean (cf. (2.1)) with adaptively determined weights:

(3.3) 
$$(\mathscr{R}f)(x) := \underset{p \in \mathcal{M}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x) \cdot \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, y_i)^2,$$

where  $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is the *i*th component of the weight function  $\Phi$ . The component weight functions can be chosen in many ways, such as Lagrangians as in [45] or compactly supported basis functions as in [53].

RMLS is well defined only on the domain where the Fréchet mean is unique. If the points are contained in a sufficiently small ball, this is guaranteed by Theorem 2.1.

4. MTSM: Multiple tangent spaces model. This section introduces our approach to approximate manifold-valued functions via multiple tangent spaces.

On the one hand, STSM requires that all data points lie in a single cluster on the manifold, enabling efficient function approximation from a local linearization. On the other hand, RMLS can handle data points spread across the manifold so long as the points with nonzero weights are all in a geodesic ball, but it is computationally expensive to evaluate as it involves a weighted Fréchet mean.

The essence of the proposed MTSM is to plug in STSMs to replace dense clusters of points on the manifold to reduce the cost of computing a weighted Fréchet mean in RMLS. See Figure 2 for a visualization of an MTSM consisting of three STSMs.



Fig. 2: An illustration of a 3-MTSM. It shows three tangent spaces at the anchor points  $p_1^*$ ,  $p_2^*$ ,  $p_3^*$  and the relevant vector-valued functions  $\hat{g}_j : \Omega_j \to T_{p_j^*}\mathcal{M}$ . The approximation consists of computing the weighted Fréchet mean of  $\operatorname{Exp}_{p_j^*}\hat{g}_j(x)$ .

DEFINITION 4.1 (Multiple tangent space model). The R-MTSM approximates an f as in (1.1) from the samples (1.2) by utilizing R individual STSMs, as follows:

(4.1) 
$$(\mathscr{M}f)(x) := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{j=1}^{R} \varphi_j(\widehat{f}_j(x)) \cdot \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, \widehat{f}_j(x))^2, \quad \widehat{f}_j := \operatorname{Exp}_{p_j^*} \circ \widehat{g}_j$$

where, for  $j = 1, \ldots, R$ , we have that

- 1.  $p_i^* \in \mathcal{M}$  is the anchor point of the *j*th STSM,
- 2.  $\hat{g}_j : \Omega \supset \Omega_j \to T_{p_j^*} \mathcal{M}$  is the vector-valued function approximation of the *j*th STSM, and
- 3.  $\varphi_j : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$  is the weight function that determines to what extent the *j*th STSM is active in the total approximation of f at  $x \in \Omega$ .

We use as convention that  $\varphi_j(f_j(x)) := 0$  if  $x \notin \Omega_j$ .

Note that *R*-MTSM can be viewed as a unification of STSM and RMLS. On the one hand, if R = 1 and the single weight function  $\varphi_1(x)$  is taken to be 1, then this MTSM is an STSM. On the other hand, if R = N and for  $j = 1, \ldots, N$  we choose  $\hat{g}_j(x) = 0$  and  $p_j^* = y_j$ , then MTSM is an instance of RMLS in which all weights  $\phi_j(0)$  are constants—naturally, this is not a recommended choice of weights.

In the next subsections, we investigate some theoretical considerations about MTSM. In section 5, we propose concrete algorithms to set up and evaluate MTSMs.

**4.1. Well-posedness.** How the three components in Definition 4.1 should be chosen so that the minimization problem in the definition of MTSM is well posed is discussed in the next proposition. Practical choices are discussed in section 5.

PROPOSITION 4.2 (Well-posedness). Consider the map  $f : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  from (1.1) and the R-MTSM from Definition 4.1. Let  $L := \kappa_{\ell}^{-}(\mathcal{M}) \leq 0 \leq \kappa_{u}^{+}(\mathcal{M}) =: K$  be the clipped curvature bounds. If, for all  $j = 1, \ldots, R$ , there exist  $0 < \sigma_{j} \leq \tau_{j} \leq \operatorname{inj}(p_{j}^{*})$ with  $\tau_{j}\sqrt{|L|} \leq \pi$  such that

- A1. the  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$ 's cover  $f(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{M}$ ;
- A2. the maps  $\widehat{g}_j: \Omega_j \to \mathcal{B}_{\tau_j}(p_j^*)$ , where  $\Omega_j := f^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*))$  is the preimage;

A3. for all  $x \in \Omega_j$  the error bound

$$\|\widehat{g}_j(x) - (\operatorname{Log}_{p_j^*} \circ f)(x)\|_{p_j^*} \le \epsilon < \frac{1}{10} \min\left\{ \operatorname{inj}(\mathcal{M}), \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{K}} \right\}$$

holds; and

A4. the weights  $\varphi_j$  form a partition of unity subordinate to the cover of  $f(\Omega)$  by the larger geodesic balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\tau_i}(p_i^*)$ 's;

then (4.1) is well posed, has a unique global minimizer for each  $x \in \Omega$ , and MTSM in Definition 4.1 is well defined.

*Proof.* If the weight  $\varphi_i$  of a point  $y_i$  is zero in (2.1), then the Fréchet mean with or without the *i*th summand will be the same. Consequently, to determine if (4.1) is well posed, it suffices to show that

C1.  $\varphi_j(f_j(x)) > 0$  only if  $x \in \Omega_j$  and  $\widehat{g}_j(x)$  lies in the domain of  $\operatorname{Exp}_{p_i^*}$ ;

C2. for all  $x \in \Omega$ , the Fréchet mean is taken over at least 1 point; and

C3. the  $f_j(x)$ 's with  $\varphi_j(f_j(x)) > 0$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.1. We do this in the next paragraphs.

C1: Because of the definition of a partition of unity in A4 (see [34, p. 43]), we observe that  $\varphi_j(\hat{f}_j(x)) > 0$  only if  $x \in \Omega_j$  (by A1, A2, and the convention in the definition of  $\varphi_j$ ) and  $\hat{f}_j(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{\tau_j}(p_j^*)$  (which holds by A2). As each  $\mathcal{B}_{\tau_j}(p_j^*)$  is an open geodesic ball,  $\hat{g}_j(x)$  lies in the domain of  $\exp_{p_i^*}$ .

C2: Let  $x \in \Omega$  be arbitrary. Since the  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$ 's cover  $f(\Omega)$  by A1, we can assume, after relabeling, that  $x \in (\Omega_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Omega_\ell)$  for some  $\ell \geq 1$ . By A4, the  $\varphi_j$ 's form a partition of unity subordinate to the cover by the radius  $\tau_j$  balls, so that  $\varphi_j(\widehat{f}_j(x)) \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \varphi_j(\widehat{f}_j(x)) = 1$  [34, p. 43]. Hence, at least 1 of these weights must be nonzero. Note that by C1 no other weights can be nonzero.

C3: Assume again that the nonzero weights are those corresponding to  $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$ . By C1,  $\hat{f}_j(x)$  is well defined. Then, exploiting the bound in A3, we conclude from Corollary 3.2 that  $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x), \hat{f}_j(x)) \leq 5\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}\min\{\operatorname{inj}(\mathcal{M}), \frac{\pi}{2}K^{-1/2}\}$ . This implies that the sufficient condition of Theorem 2.1 holds for p = f(x), so the Fréchet mean is unique. This concludes the proof.

Remark 4.3. We can replace  $\mathcal{M}$  by the covering of the larger geodesic balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\tau_j}(p_j^*)$  in Proposition 4.2. This can potentially improve the curvature bounds L and K as well as the injectivity radius.

Proposition 4.2 is not a vacuous statement. Assumptions A1 and A4 can always be satisfied with a finite R for manifolds with a strictly positive injectivity radius. A simple choice of weight functions satisfying A4 is presented in (6.1) in section 6. Assumptions A2 and A3 are satisfied for  $\hat{g}_j = (\text{Log}_{p_i^*} \circ f)|_{\Omega_j}$ .

**4.2. Smoothness.** The key feature of MTSM is that it stitches together predictions from local STSMs through the Fréchet mean to obtain a potentially global approximation of a map into a manifold. Our main result is that the patches are stitched together smoothly if the vector-valued approximations are smooth.

THEOREM 4.4. Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2, the MTSM approximation ( $\mathscr{M}f$ ) :  $\Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  defined in (4.1) is a smooth map if all  $\hat{g}_j : \Omega_j \to T_{p_j^*}\mathcal{M}$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, R$ , are smooth maps.

The idea of the proof is relatively straightforward: Show that (4.1) is the map that takes its input to the point on  $\mathcal{M}$  where the gradient of the function inside of the minimization vanishes and then use the *implicit function theorem* to show that such an implicitly defined function is smooth. Working out the technical details, however, requires more advanced machinery from Riemannian geometry. Therefore, the detailed proof can be found in Appendix A.

Remark 4.5. Theorem 4.4 can be viewed as generalizing a result of Bergmann and Zimmermann [57, Section 3.2] to the setting of quasi-interpolation in the tangent space. By allowing a slight error between  $\hat{f}_j$  and f, establishing that the Riemannian Hessians are invertible becomes significantly more complicated. Fortunately, Karcher's analysis of the local convexity of the distance function in [32] applies.

**4.3. Error bound.** An error bound of MTSM is obtained by combining Proposition 4.2 with Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 as follows.

**PROPOSITION 4.6** (Error bound). Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2,

$$\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x), (\mathcal{M}f)(x)) \le 5\epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \Omega$  be arbitrary. As in the proof of Proposition 4.2, we can assume without loss of generality that  $x \in \Omega_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Omega_\ell$  for some  $1 \leq \ell \leq R$ . Then, the proof of Proposition 4.2 revealed that

$$\operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x), \widehat{f}_j(x)) \leq 5\epsilon < \frac{1}{2} \min\left\{ \operatorname{inj}(\mathcal{M}), \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{K}} \right\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

This implies that the geodesic ball  $\mathcal{B}_{5\epsilon}(f(x))$  is *convex* by [42, Theorem 6.4.8]. The main result of Karcher [32, Theorem 1.2] implies that the minimum of (4.1) is attained in the interior of this convex ball. As  $(\mathcal{M}f)(x)$  is the solution of (4.1) and the only nonzero  $\varphi_j(\widehat{f}_j(x))$ 's are those with  $x \in \Omega_j$ , this concludes the proof.

Proposition 4.6 implies that the global approximation error of MTSM depends on the local approximation errors of the individual STSMs. This result is not surprising, as we are essentially employing a partition of unity in Definition 4.1 to smoothly determine which individual STSMs are active while the Fréchet mean is used to combine their individual predictions.

4.4. Number of tangent spaces. The number of tangent spaces can affect the approximation accuracy, as we except that by using more tangent spaces we can reduce their radii  $\sigma_j$  which may improve the local approximation error  $\epsilon$  in Proposition 4.6. We first consider a theoretical upper bound on the number of anchor points so that their geodesic balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$  can cover the image of f. This bound can be obtained from a consequence of the *Bishop–Gromov's relative volume comparison theorem* [10], called *Gromov's Packing Lemma*. The latter provides a bound on the number of small balls to cover a larger ball.

LEMMA 4.7 (Gromov's Packing Lemma [27]). Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold whose sectional curvatures are lower bounded by  $L \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $M_L$ be the complete n-dimensional simply connected space of constant sectional curvature L and let  $q \in M_L$  be any point. Given  $\Sigma \geq \sigma > 0$ , for all  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ , there exists a set  $\{\mathcal{B}_{\sigma}(p_i) \mid i = 1, \ldots, \ell\} \subset \mathcal{M}$  with  $p_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\Sigma}(p)$  of at most

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(2\Sigma, \frac{1}{4}\sigma\right) := \frac{\operatorname{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_{2\Sigma}(q))}{\operatorname{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_{\sigma/4}(q))}$$

balls covering  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma}(p)$ , where Vol denotes the volume of a geodesic ball on  $M_L$ .

## This manuscript is for review purposes only.

Incorporating Gromov's Packing Lemma and the error bound of MTSM, the next relationship between the upper bound on the number of tangent spaces and the error bound in MTSM can be observed.

COROLLARY 4.8. If we restrict the radii of the smaller geodesic balls to  $\sigma_1 = \cdots = \sigma_R = \min\{ \inf(\mathcal{M}), \pi/\sqrt{|L|} \}$  in Proposition 4.2, then a smooth map f can be approximated with R-MTSM under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2 for some value of R satisfying

$$\frac{\operatorname{diam}(f(\Omega))}{2\sigma_1} \le R \le \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\operatorname{diam}(f(\Omega)), \frac{1}{4}\sigma_1\right)$$

where diam $(S) := \sup_{p,q \in S} \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p,q)$  for any subset  $S \subset \mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* The upper bound is immediate from Lemma 4.7.

As f is smooth and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is open and connected, the image of a piecewise smooth path in  $\Omega$  will be a piecewise smooth path in  $f(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{M}$ . By requirement A1 of Proposition 4.2, we necessarily need to cover all paths in  $f(\Omega)$  using the geodesic balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$ . Given balls of diameter  $2\sigma_1$ , this can be accomplished by using a number of balls that is at least the length of the path in  $f(\Omega)$  divided by  $2\sigma_1$ . The maximum distance between points in  $f(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{M}$  is diam $(f(\Omega))$  which lower bounds the length of any piecewise smooth path [35]. This concludes the proof.

5. Algorithms. In this section, we introduce algorithms to set up and evaluate MTSM. The algorithms for setting up MTSM comprise the *offline stage*, which is executed only once for a given approximation problem. The evaluation of MTSM comprises the *online stage*, which is assumed to be executed a large number of times. These two stages are detailed respectively in subsection 5.1 and subsection 5.2.

**5.1. Offline stage.** The offline stage consists of two main steps: (i) compute suitable anchor points  $p_i^*$ , and (ii) compute the vector-valued functions  $\hat{g}_i$ .

Step 1. For well-posedness, Proposition 4.2 prescribes that the R anchor points  $p_i^* \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfy assumption A1: the geodesic balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_i}(p_i^*)$  with radii

(5.1) 
$$\sigma_j < \min\{ \inf(p_j^*), \pi/\sqrt{|L|} \}$$

should cover the image of f. In our setting, f is given through samples S as in (1.2). Verifying whether the balls  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$  cover  $f(\Omega)$  will thus not be possible. At best we can cover the set  $\{y_1, \ldots, y_N\}$ . Hence, it seems natural to choose the anchor points that minimize the maximum distance of the  $y_i$ 's to the nearest anchor point  $p_i^*$ ; i.e.,

(5.2) 
$$d_R^* = \min_{p_1^*, \dots, p_R^* \in \mathcal{M}} \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \min_{j=1,\dots,R} \| \operatorname{Log}_{p_j^*} y_i \|_{p_j^*},$$

where  $\|\text{Log}_{p_j^*} y_i\|_{p_j^*} := \infty$  if  $y_i$  does not lie in the injectivity radius of  $p_j^*$ . This is a standard clustering problem on a Riemannian manifold. Hence, we propose to choose the anchor points as the cluster centers of the given points  $y_i$ 's that (approximately) solve (5.2). For this we can use any existing clustering method, which assigns each point of Y to one (i.e., partitioning) or more (i.e., soft clustering) clusters  $C(p_i^*)$ .

The foregoing discussion shows that after fixing the number of anchor points R, it is sensible to choose them as cluster centers. But how do we determine R? We say that a clustering is *covering* if  $d_R^* < \infty$  is a finite value in (5.2), which entails that each data point  $y_i$  lies in the injectivity radius of at least one anchor point. To satisfy assumption A1 of Proposition 4.2, R should be such that the clustering is covering. Moreover, R should also be sufficiently large so that (5.1) holds; that is, R should be Algorithm 5.1 Adaptive anchor points selection

- 1: Input: Data points  $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_N\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , the maximal number of anchor points  $R_{\max} < N$ , an estimate of the injectivity radius  $0 \leq M \approx \operatorname{inj}(\mathcal{M})$ , a negative lower bound  $L \leq 0$  on the sectional curvatures of  $\mathcal{M}$ .
- 2: **Output**: The clusters  $C(p_i^*) \subset Y$  centered at the anchor points  $p_i^* \in \mathcal{M}$ .

3:  $R_{\min} \leftarrow \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{ddiam}(Y) \max\{M^{-1}, \sqrt{|L|}/\pi\} \right\rfloor$ 4: if  $R_{\min} > R_{\max}$  then  $R_{\min} \leftarrow 1$ 5: 6: end if 7: for  $R = R_{\min}, R_{\min} + 1, ..., R_{\max}$  do Compute R clusters  $C(p_1^*) \cup \cdots \cup C(p_R^*) = Y$  using any (soft or hard) clustering 8: method. if  $d_R^* < \pi/\sqrt{|L|}$  then 9: return  $(C(p_1^*), \ldots, C(p_B^*))$ 10: end if 11: 12: end for 13: return failure

any value such that  $d_R^* < \pi/\sqrt{|L|}$ . If all the other assumptions of Proposition 4.2 also hold, then Proposition 4.6 guarantees that the error is bounded by the same quantity  $5\epsilon$  regardless of R. Thus, to attain any fixed error bound, we propose to choose the smallest R so that  $d_R^* < \pi/\sqrt{|L|}$ . Corollary 4.8 then gives some guidance on the range in which such an R would lie under simplifying assumptions.

The above observations are summarized as Algorithm 5.1. To determine a reasonable initial number of clusters, we approximate the lower bound in Corollary 4.8. Neither under- or overshooting the left-hand side of Corollary 4.8 impacts the correctness; if we undershoot it a few extra cluster sizes will be tested, while if we overshoot it a smaller number of anchor points might have sufficed. We use the quantity

$$\operatorname{ddiam}(Y) := \max_{\substack{x,y \in Y, \\ 0 < \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(x,y) < \infty}} \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(x,y)$$

as a discrete approximation of the diameter of  $f(\Omega)$ , and a supplied M as an approximation of the injectivity radius of  $\mathcal{M}$ . If M = 0, then  $R_{\min} = 1$  will be the initial number of clusters.

**Step 2.** Based on the first stage, we approximate the vector-valued function  $g_j(x)$  in Algorithm 5.2. To compute the radius of the ball  $B_{\sigma_j}(p_j^*)$ , we suggest to estimate it as in line 4 of Algorithm 5.2.

**5.2.** Online stage. The online stage consists of evaluating (4.1) for a give  $x \in \Omega$ . This is given by Algorithm 5.3. The core step of the online stage is computing the weighted Fréchet mean, which can be computed, e.g., via Riemannian gradient descent [11] or approximated using successive geodesic interpolation [16, 15]. In section 6, we use a Riemannian gradient descent method.

6. Numerical experiments. In this section, we present numerical experiments to illustrate the performance of the proposed MTSM from section 4 and the algorithms from section 5 as compared to other methods from the literature. We compare MTSM with three manifold-valued approximation schemes: STSM (see subsection 3.1), RMLS (see subsection 3.2), and MRMLS from [47, Section 5.4]. We

Algorithm 5.2 Compute vector-valued function

- 1: Input: Anchor points  $p_i^* \in \mathcal{M}$  and their clusters  $C(p_i^*)$  for  $j = 1, \ldots, R$ ; and a sample set  $S = \{(x_i, y_i) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{M} \mid i = 1, ..., N\}.$ 2: **Output**: Vector-valued functions  $\widehat{g}_j : \Omega_j \to T_{p_j^*}\mathcal{M}$ , for j = 1, ..., R.
- 3: for j = 1 : R do
- Set the radius  $\sigma_j := \max_{y \in C(p_i^*)} \|\operatorname{Log}_{p_i^*} y\|_{p_i^*}$ 4:
- Compute  $\hat{g}_j$  from  $\{(x_i, \operatorname{Log}_{p_i^*} y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  using vector-valued function approxima-5:tion methods
- 6: end for
- 7: return  $(\widehat{g}_1,\ldots,\widehat{g}_R)$

## Algorithm 5.3 Computing Riemannian multiple centroids (Online)

- 1: Input: Anchor points  $p_i^* \in \mathcal{M}$  for  $j = 1, \ldots, R$ ; the vector-valued functions  $\widehat{g}_j$ ; and the point  $x \in \Omega$ .
- 2: **Output**: The approximate function value  $(\mathcal{M}f)(x)$ .
- 3: Compute weight  $\varphi_i(x)$  as (6.1).
- 4: Define the active site  $I(x) = \{j \mid \varphi_j(x) > 0\}.$ 5: if  $I(x) = \emptyset$  then
- 6: return failure

7: end if

- 8: Compute  $q_j = \operatorname{Exp}_{p_i^*} \widehat{g}_j(x)$  for all  $j \in I(x)$
- if  $I(x) = \{j\}$  then 9:
- return  $q_i$ 10:
- 11: else **return**  $q^* = \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{j \in \mathbf{I}} \varphi_j(x) \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(q_j, p)^2$ 12:13: end if

implemented RMLS based on the description in [26, Section 4.3] and MRMLS as described in [47, Algorithm 5.1]. STSM uses the same code as MTSM.

The general experimental setup is as follows. First, we construct a *training set*  $S = \{(x_i, f(x_i)) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{M}\}_{i=1}^N$  for approximating a given  $f : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  as in (1.1). This set is used by STSM and MTSM to build their model offline, while RMLS and MRMLS use it as the set of points whose weighted Fréchet mean is taken. Second, an independent test set is generated to assess the performance of the constructed models online. In each experiment, all algorithms use the same training and test sets.

6.1. Implementation details. All algorithms were implemented as Matlab code. Our implementation including the numerical experiments is available at https: //gitlab.kuleuven.be/numa/public/mtsm. All the experiments were performed on an HP EliteBook x360 830 G7 Notebook with 32 GiB memory and an Intel Core i7-10610U CPU using Matlab 2022a on Ubuntu 22.04.3 LTS. Matlab was allowed to use all four physical CPU cores.

The setup of MTSM (and STSM as a special case) used throughout the experiments is as follows. We perform the offline stage of MTSM with Algorithm 5.2 using a straightforward Riemannian k-means clustering algorithm as hard clustering method: we transformed the implementation from Geomstat [37] into Matlab code. The online stage of MTSM is applied to the test set with Algorithm 5.3. Let  $d_i^2(x) = \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_i^*, \widehat{f_j}(x))^2$  be the squared distance to the *j*th anchor point. This is



Fig. 3: The Wendland function  $\varphi(d)$  and the smooth cutoff function  $\varphi_j(d)$  with  $\sigma_j^2 = 1$ and  $c = \frac{1}{2}$ .

a smooth function from  $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$  if  $\hat{f}_j : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  is smooth. Then, the smooth weight function we choose for MTSM is

(6.1) 
$$\varphi_j(x) = \frac{h_j(d_j^2(x))}{\sum_{j=1}^R h_j(d_j^2(x))}, \quad \text{where} \quad h_j(d) = \frac{e^{-(\sigma_j^2 - d)_+^{-1}}}{e^{-(\sigma_j^2 - d)_+^{-1}} + e^{-(d - c\sigma_j^2)_+^{-1}}}$$

is a smooth cutoff function [34, Chapter 2],  $\sigma_j < \operatorname{inj}(p_j^*)$ ,  $(x)_+ := \max\{0, x\}$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , 0 < c < 1, and  $e^{-1/0} = 0$ . A cutoff function  $h_j$  is visualized in Figure 3. The value  $c = \frac{1}{4}$  is used in the experiments.

For MRMLS and RMLS, the Wendland function [52]  $\varphi(d) := (1-d)_+^4 (4d+1)$  is used as weight function. It is visualized in Figure 3.

The weighted Fréchet mean in RMLS, MRMLS and MTSM is computed by a trust region based optimization method [11] with the centroid function from the Manopt toolbox [12] in Matlab.

**6.2. Basic examples.** We first compare MTSM to several manifold-valued function approximation methods from the literature on two simple benchmark problems involving matrix manifolds  $\mathcal{M}$ . In both cases, we measure the accuracy of the approximant  $\hat{f}: \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  to  $f: \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$  via the maximum relative error

on the test set  $T \subset \Omega \times \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix.

**6.2.1. Symmetric positive-definite matrices.** We consider the function that maps  $[-1, 1]^2$  into the manifold of  $3 \times 3$  symmetric positive-definite matrices  $\mathcal{P}_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  from [47, Section 6.5.2]:

$$f: [-1,1]^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_3,$$
(6.3)  $\mathbf{x} \longmapsto 2I + (|\cos(2x_2) + 0.6|)e^{-x_1^2 - x_2^2} \begin{pmatrix} 10 + 2\sin(5x_2) & x_2 & x_1x_2 \\ x_2 & 10 & x_2^2 \\ x_1x_2 & x_2^2 & 10 \end{pmatrix}.$ 



Fig. 4: The maximum relative error (6.2) of the function (6.3) approximated by RMLS, MRMLS, STSM and 3-MTSM. The vertical axis is displayed in a logarithmic scale. The setup is described in subsection 6.2.1.

We equip  $\mathcal{P}_3$  with the affine invariant metric that is discussed in [11, Chapter 11, section 7, equation (11.35)]. Then, the exponential and logarithmic maps are

$$\operatorname{Exp}_{P}(\dot{P}) = P^{1/2} \operatorname{exp}_{m} \left( P^{-1/2} \dot{P} P^{-1/2} \right) P^{1/2},$$
$$\operatorname{Log}_{P}(Q) = P^{1/2} \log_{m} \left( P^{-1/2} Q P^{-1/2} \right) P^{1/2},$$

where  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_3$ ;  $\dot{P} \in T_P \mathcal{P}_3$ ;  $P^{1/2}$  is the Cholesky factor of P;  $\exp_m(\cdot)$  is the classic matrix exponential; and  $\log_m(\cdot)$  is the classic matrix logarithm; see [11, equations (11.37) and (11.38)].

We investigate the impact on the accuracy of STSM, MTSM, RMLS, and MRMLS with a varying number of training samples. For this, we generate training sets

$$S_k = \{ (\mathbf{x}_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \in [-1, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{P}_3 \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor 50 \cdot 1.5^k \rfloor \}$$

for k = 0, 1, ..., 5, where the  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's are chosen as the first points from the Halton sequence as generated by Matlab's haltonset(2) function. As test set we choose a  $50 \times 50$  uniform grid on  $[-1, 1]^2$ .

For MTSM (including STSM), we choose radial basis functions interpolation from [7, 9] based on the multiquadric radial basis function in [9, Chapter 2.2] to approximate the vector-valued function in the offline stage. For this, we used the implementation from https://github.com/joslorgom/RBFinterp. For all training sets, we use L = -4 as lower bound of the sectional curvature of  $\mathcal{P}_3$  [18, Proposition I.1]; with this choice the stopping criterion in line 9 of Algorithm 5.1 terminated at R = 3 anchor points.

Figure 4 shows the relative error of the function (6.3) by the different methods for increasingly larger training sets. We observe the relative approximation error of MTSM is approximately one order of magnitude lower than that of RMLS, and similar to those of MRMLS and STSM.

The computation time of the offline stage in MTSM is approximately 0.20 seconds, while STSM requires about 0.022 seconds. For the online stage based on the largest training set  $S_5$ , predicting the 2500 test points takes less than 0.5 seconds for both RMLS and STSM. By constrast, MTSM takes around 4 times as long (2 seconds) and MRMLS approximately 9 times as long ( $\approx 4.5$  seconds).

 Section 5.2]:

(6.4) 
$$f: \mathbb{R}^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{SO}(3), \quad (x_1, x_2) \longmapsto \exp_m H(x_1, x_2),$$

where  $\mathcal{SO}(3) = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid Q^T Q = Q Q^T = I, \det(Q) = 1\}$  is the *special orthogonal group*, which we view as an embedded Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ ;  $\cdot^T$  denotes the matrix transpose;  $\exp_m$  is the classic matrix exponential; and

$$H(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}x_2 & \sin\left(4\pi\left(x_1^2 + x_2^2\right)\right) \\ -x_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 & 0 & x_1 + x_2^2 \\ -\sin\left(4\pi\left(x_1^2 + x_2^2\right)\right) & -x_1 - x_2^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this geometry of  $\mathcal{SO}(3)$ , the exponential and logarithmic maps are, respectively,

$$\operatorname{Exp}_P(\dot{P}) = P \operatorname{exp}_m(P^T \dot{P}) \text{ and } \operatorname{Log}_P(Q) = P \operatorname{log}_m(P^T Q),$$

where  $P, Q \in \mathcal{SO}(3)$ ;  $\dot{P} \in T_P \mathcal{SO}(3)$ ; and  $\log_m(\cdot)$  is the classic matrix logarithm.

We will investigate the performance of the methods on two training sets. We use a  $7 \times 7$  Chebychev grid on the domain  $[-0.5, 0.5]^2$  and its corresponding function values (represented as  $3 \times 3$  matrices) as first training set  $S_1$ , and a  $14 \times 14$  Chebychev grid on  $[-1, 1]^2$  and its corresponding function values as a second training set  $S_2$ . As test sets, we respectively use a  $20 \times 20$  uniform grid on  $[-0.5, 0.5]^2$ , and a  $20 \times 20$  uniform grid on  $[-1, 1]^2$ .

The implementation details for BHI and THI are outlined in [57, Section 5.2]. We used their Matlab implementation from https://github.com/RalfZimmermannSDU/MultivarHermiteManifoldInterp\_SISC. As for THI, we randomly sampled one of the training points on the manifold as the location of the tangent space. For MTSM, we approximate the vector-valued function  $\hat{g}_j(x)$  using multivariate Hermite interpolation, as detailed in [57, Section 4]. In this configuration, MTSM can be viewed as an extension of THI, but now using multiple tangent spaces. Running Algorithm 5.1, it decides to use R = 2 tangent spaces for both training sets when L = -1 is supplied as lower curvature bound.

Figure 5 shows the relative error (6.2) for approximating f in (6.4) of 3-MTSM, BHI and THI for approximating the SO(3)-valued function (6.4). When the function (6.4) is defined on  $[-0.5, 0.5]^2$ , the approximation errors of 2-MTSM, THI, and BHI are very similar. However, on  $[-1, 1]^2$ , BHI has a significantly higher approximation error compared to both THI and 2-MTSM, whose results are rather similar.

The computation time for the offline stage using the 2-MTSM is approximately 487 seconds, whereas THI requires only about 197 seconds to build the model. In the online stage, predicting the 400 test points on the  $[-1, 1]^2$  domain takes about 38 seconds for THI, 90 seconds for 2-MTSM, and 2 hours for BHI.

**6.3.** Parametric model order reduction. The goal of parametric model order reduction (pMOR) is to replace a complicated system by a simpler one that can be computed efficiently. This is often achieved by first sampling a set of parameters, then computing reduced order models at these points, and finally using some form of (quasi-)interpolation to extend the approximation to the entire parameter domain.

We consider a linear time-varying dynamical system parameterized with parameter  $\mathbf{p} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  (usually,  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain):

(6.5) 
$$E(\mathbf{p})\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t;\mathbf{p}) = A(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{x}(t;\mathbf{p}) + B(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{x}(0;\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{0},$$
$$\mathbf{y}(t;\mathbf{p}) = C(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{x}(t;\mathbf{p}),$$

MTSM: MULTIPLE TANGENT SPACE MODEL



Fig. 5: The relative error (6.2) for the SO(3)-valued function (6.4), approximated in different domains by different models. The scale used is the same for all panels in subfigure (a), and likewise for subfigure (b). The setup is described in subsection 6.2.2.

where  $t \in [0, \infty)$  and we used the dot-notation  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t; \mathbf{p})$  to denote the time-derivative  $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathbf{x}(t; \mathbf{p})$ . The state variables  $\mathbf{x}(t; \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , are determined by the given inputs  $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , the matrices  $A(\mathbf{p}), E(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , and  $C(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$ . The output of the system is  $\mathbf{y}(t; \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ .

The idea of pMOR is to approximate the original state variables inside of a lowdimensional vector subspace, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}(t; \mathbf{p}) \approx V(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{x}_r(t; \mathbf{p})$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_r(t; \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^r$  and  $V(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$  has orthogonal columns. Then, multiplying (6.5) from the left by a matrix with orthonormal rows  $W(\mathbf{p})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ , we obtain the reduced system:

$$E_r(\mathbf{p})\dot{\mathbf{x}}_r(t;\mathbf{p}) = A_r(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{x}_r(t;\mathbf{p}) + B_r(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{x}_r(0;\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{0},$$
$$\mathbf{y}_r(t;\mathbf{p}) = C_r(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{x}_r(t;\mathbf{p}),$$

where the reduced matrices are

$$E_r(\mathbf{p}) := W(\mathbf{p})^T E(\mathbf{p}) V(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, \qquad B_r(\mathbf{p}) := W(\mathbf{p})^T B(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$$
$$A_r(\mathbf{p}) := W(\mathbf{p})^T A(\mathbf{p}) V(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, \qquad C_r(\mathbf{p}) := C(\mathbf{p}) V(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times r}.$$

Without going into further detail, substituting  $V(\mathbf{p}) \mapsto V(\mathbf{p})Q(\mathbf{p})$ , where  $Q(\mathbf{p})$  is a square orthogonal matrix, alters only the representation of the reduced system but not its approximation properties. The pMOR approximation problem is hence intrinsically one on the *Grassmannian*, which is the manifold of all linear subspaces of a fixed dimension, namely

$$\mathcal{G}(n,r) := \{ \operatorname{span}(Q) \mid Q \in \operatorname{St}(n,r) \}, \text{ where } \operatorname{St}(n,r) := \{ Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \mid Q^T Q = I_r \},$$

rather than on the *Stiefel manifold* St(n,r) of matrices with orthonormal columns. Elements of the Grassmannian have a natural representation on St(n,r): the subspace  $[Q] := \operatorname{span}(Q) \in \mathcal{G}(n,r)$  can be represented by any orthonormal basis  $Q \in St(n,r)$  of it. Detailed information on the exponential map on the Grassmannian can be found in [21], while the logarithmic map can be approximated by the algorithm in [56, Algorithm 7.10]. The tangent space at a point  $P \in \mathcal{G}(n,k)$  is

$$T_P \mathcal{G}(n,k) = \left\{ X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k} \mid X^T P + P^T X = 0 \right\}$$

We can view pMOR as a problem of approximating the manifold-valued function

$$f: \mathbb{R}^d \supset \Omega \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(n,r) \times \mathcal{G}(m,r), \quad \mathbf{p} \longmapsto ([V(\mathbf{p})], [W(\mathbf{p})])$$

such that the solution of the reduced system is a good approximation of the solution of the original system. With an approximation  $\hat{f}$  of f, we can efficiently construct and solve the projected small-scale linear dynamical system, yielding the coordinates of the solution  $\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{p})$  relative to the chosen matrix with orthonormal columns  $V(\mathbf{p})$ representing the approximating subspace  $[V(\mathbf{p})]$ .

To measure the quality of reduced order models for linear dynamical systems, the *transfer function* 

$$G(s) := G(s, \mathbf{p}) := C(\mathbf{p}) (sE(\mathbf{p}) - A(\mathbf{p}))^{-1} B(\mathbf{p})$$

is used in the frequency domain [8]. The transfer function of the of reduced system is denoted by  $G_r(s)$ . The relative  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$ -norm [13] is used to measure the accuracy of the reduced-order systems:

(6.6) 
$$\operatorname{relErr}(G, G_r) := \frac{\|G - G_r\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}}{\|G\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}}, \quad \text{where} \quad \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}} = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \|F(\iota\omega)\|_{\infty}$$

and  $i^2 = -1$  is the imaginary unit.<sup>3</sup>

To evaluate the performance of MTSM for solving pMOR problems, we investigate two model problems and compare MTSM's accuracy and computational time with RMLS, STSM, and the interpolatory projection method (INP) from [5]. The latter is implemented in the Matlab psssMOR toolbox [41]. Note that INP was specifically developed to address pMOR problems.

The anchor point of STSM was sampled randomly with uniform probability from our training set, as in [56, Chapter 7]. The vector-valued function  $g_j$  in MTSM is approximated by two different schemes: component-wise multivariate linear interpolation, and component-wise multivariate tensorized interpolation, which extends a univariate approximation scheme to the multivariate case through a tensor decomposition, as explained in [30, 49].

**6.3.1.** Anemometer model. We consider the anemometer model, a flow sensing device [39] modeled by the convection-diffusion partial differential equation

$$\rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla T) - \rho c v \nabla T + \dot{q},$$

where  $\rho$  is the mass density, c is the specific heat capacity,  $\kappa$  is the thermal conductivity, v is the fluid velocity, T is the temperature, and  $\dot{q}$  is the heat flow into the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>We compute it using the norm(system, 'Inf') function in Matlab's Control System Toolbox.



Fig. 6: The relative error (6.6) between the original anemometer system and its reduced system computed by INP, STSM, 3-MTSM, and RMLS. The vertical axis uses a logarithmic scale to show the range of relative error values more clearly. The setup is described in subsection 6.3.1.

system caused by the heater,  $\nabla$  denotes the gradient of the T and  $\nabla$ · denotes the divergence  $\kappa \nabla T$ . In 1D space, this equation models how the temperature T changes over time t and space x due to the combined effects of convection (movement with the fluid flow) and diffusion (spreading due to temperature gradients). This equation has been discretized with finite differences, yielding a parameterized linear dynamical system in state-space form with a single output [50]:

$$E\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = (A_1 + p(A_2 - A_1))\mathbf{x}(t) + B\mathbf{u}(t)$$
$$y(t) = C\mathbf{x}(t)$$

where  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the parameter, and the matrices  $A_1, A_2, E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ , where n = 29008.

As training set, we used 200 points  $x_i$  uniformly spaced in [0.5, 1.5] and used the rational Krylov projection method from [6] to obtain approximating 20-dimensional vector spaces  $[V(\mathbf{p}_i)]$  and  $[W(\mathbf{p}_i)]$ , both in the Grassmannian  $\mathcal{G}(29008, 20)$ . As test set, we generate 100 points uniformly spaced between 0.5 and 1.5.

The vector-valued function in MTSM (and STSM) is approximated by multivariate linear interpolation. Supplying L = -4 as lower sectional curvature bound, Algorithm 5.1 applied to the training set decides to choose R = 10.

Figure 6 displays the relative error (6.6) for the different methods. It clearly shows that all manifold-valued approximation methods outperform the matrix interpolation method [5]. Comparing 10-MTSM with STSM, we see a substantial advantage in approximation accuracy of MTSM.

While the accuracy of MTSM is comparable to that of RMLS, as we see in Figure 6, 10-MTSM requires the computation of the weighted Fréchet mean of ten points in the online stage, whereas RMLS computes it for all points with nonzero weights, resulting in significantly higher computational costs. Specifically, 10-MTSM's offline stage takes approximately 602 seconds, with around 572 seconds spent on selecting the 10 anchor points, and 30 seconds to approximate the vector-valued functions. By contrast, STSM requires only about 3 seconds in the offline stage. For the online stage, predicting the bases  $[V(\mathbf{p}_i)]$  and  $[W(\mathbf{p}_i)]$  at 100 test points takes about 220 seconds with 10-MTSM, about 2.7 seconds with STSM, 1.1 seconds with INP, and about 1300 seconds with RMLS.

**6.3.2.** Microthruster unit model. We consider the 3D microthruster unit model from [22]. It describes thermal conduction in a semiconductor chip, offering



Fig. 7: The computational time for approximating  $\mathbf{p} \mapsto ([V(\mathbf{p})], [W(\mathbf{p})])$  for solving the Microthruster 3D model based on different number of test points by the methods described in subsection 6.3.2. The vertical axis is displayed in a logarithmic scale.

flexibility in the boundary conditions to simulate environmental temperature changes. Discretization leads to a system of linear ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} E\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= (A - \mathbf{p}(1)A_{\text{top}} - \mathbf{p}(2)A_{\text{bottom}} - \mathbf{p}(3)A_{\text{side}})\,\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{b},\\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= C\mathbf{x}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the heat capacity matrix  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and the heat conductivity matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are symmetric sparse matrices of order n = 4257,  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the load vector,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  is the output matrix,  $A_{\text{top}}$ ,  $A_{\text{bottom}}$ , and  $A_{\text{side}}$  are real  $n \times n$  diagonal matrices originating from the discretization of the convection boundary conditions.

As training set, we generate 343 points  $\mathbf{p}_i$  on a  $7 \times 7 \times 7$  Chebyshev grid on  $[10, 1000]^3$  and compute the corresponding projection spaces  $[V(\mathbf{p}_i)]$  and  $[W(\mathbf{p}_i)] \in \mathcal{G}(4257, 40)$  as the rational Krylov subspaces computed by the method of [6]. The test sets are the uniform grids with dimensions  $k \times k \times k$  for  $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$  on  $[10, 1000]^3$ . Evaluating RMLS took almost 2 hours on the  $8 \times 8 \times 8$  uniform test grid, so we did not try k = 9.

The vector-valued function in MTSM and STSM is approximated by two schemes. In STSM(ho) and MTSM(ho), we use the multivariate tensorized method with ST-HOSVD approximation [51]. The ST-HOSVD is implemented with hosvd function in the Tensor Toolbox v3.6 [4] using the truncation ranks (90, 30, 7, 7, 7) and mode processing order (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). In STSM(lin) and MTSM(lin) we use multivariate linear interpolation. Algorithm 5.1 applied to the training set selected R = 2 anchor points when L = -1 is supplied as lower curvature bound. INP is constructed through the pssMOR toolbox using the same training set.

The computation time for predicting the Krylov subspaces with varying numbers of test points is plotted in Figure 7. The intercept with the vertical axis represents the time taken to perform the offline stage, i.e., to build the models. RMLS has no offline setup cost, while MTSM and STSM need to approximate the vector-valued pullback functions and INP needs to compute the global basis. The time of MTSM is higher than for STSM as we need to compute the anchor points by Algorithm 5.2. These account for the differences in execution time of the offline stage.

As for the online stage, we see from Figure 7 that there is a significant difference between RMLS and all the other methods. RMLS needs to compute the weighted Fréchet mean of all points on the Grassmannian with non-zero weights, which results in the highest computational cost. This is mainly attributable to the high cost of com-

Method	Relative error	
	Maximum	Geometric mean
INP RMLS STSM(lin) STSM(ho) 2-MTSM(lin) 2-MTSM(ho)	$2.6 \cdot 10^{-1}  1.6 \cdot 10^{-2}  5.4 \cdot 10^{-2}  1.0 \cdot 10^{-1}  1.2 \cdot 10^{-2}  4.5 \cdot 10^{-2} $	$7.5 \cdot 10^{-3}  3.2 \cdot 10^{-3}  3.7 \cdot 10^{-3}  5.3 \cdot 10^{-3}  3.1 \cdot 10^{-3}  3.4 \cdot 10^{-3} $

Table 1: The geometric mean and maximum of the relative error (6.6) for computing 512 test points as described in subsection 6.3.2.

puting the gradient of weighted Fréchet mean. For 2-MTSM this cost is significantly reduced because the Fréchet mean of at most 2 points on the Grassmannian will be required. STSM relies on only one evaluation of the exponential map, avoiding the expensive computation of the Fréchet mean. This mostly explains the performance difference of about 60% between STSM and 2-MTSM.

Table 1 presents the maximum and geometric mean value of the relative error (6.6) on the largest test set. All methods show comparable performance in terms of accuracy on average. However, we see that the maximum error is significantly larger for INP compared to the manifold-based function approximation methods. All of the MTSM-type methods have a better accuracy than all of the TSMs.

Taking both accuracy and computational efficiency into account, we conclude that MTSM is competitive with the speed of INP and STSM while providing the approximation accuracy of RMLS. This makes it an effective approach for generating qualitative projection spaces for pMOR.

7. Conclusions. In this paper, we proposed MTSM in Definition 4.1, a novel function approximation scheme that approximates a manifold-valued function f as in (1.1) from samples (1.2) by smoothly mixing predictions of multiple STSMs through the weighted Fréchet mean. It combines the computational efficiency of STSM [30] and the global approximation ability of the Riemannian moving least squares method [26]. The numerical experiments show that MTSM can solve different types of problems. The *offline* stage in which the model is built has a relatively acceptable cost, provided sufficiently many model queries are made during the online stage. The *online* stage is very cheap compared to RMLS and MRMLS, especially for a large number of points.

Two avenues of further research can be pursued. First, the choice of the location of the anchor points deserves a deeper study. On the one hand, cheaper schemes than Riemannian k-means clustering are of interest to accelerate the sometimes costly offline stage. On the other hand, optimizing the location of the anchors through Riemannian optimization could increase the accuracy of MTSM. Second, if the samples (1.2) can be chosen as part of the approximation scheme, the (adaptive) choice of these points will affect the approximation accuracy. How the samples should be chosen to satisfy a desired error bound or error decay with MTSM is an open question.

**Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 4.4.** Our main source for the material to prove Theorem 4.4 in the remainder of this section is the book by Petersen [42].

Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$  be a Riemannian manifold. A (smooth) vector field  $X : \mathcal{M} \to T\mathcal{M}$  on a smooth manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is a smooth section of the tangent bundle  $T\mathcal{M} = \{(p, v_p) \mid p \in \mathcal{M}, v_p \in T_p\mathcal{M}\}$ , i.e., it is a smooth assignment to p of a tangent vector  $X(p) \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ . An example of a vector field is the gradient (field) of a smooth function  $f: \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that the gradient  $\nabla f$  at  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  is the tangent vector of  $T_p\mathcal{M}$  that is dual to the derivative  $d_pf: T_p\mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$  under the identification of linear forms and vectors via the inner product  $\mathbf{g}_p$  on  $T_p\mathcal{M}$ . The first-order necessary condition for a function  $f: \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$  to have a minimum at p is that the gradient  $(\nabla f)(p) = 0$ ; see, e.g., [1, 11].

The covariant derivative allows vector fields to be differentiated. Intuitively, this can be understood as follows. Let  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  be a point and X, Y smooth vector fields. There is a unique smooth curve  $\gamma(t)$  with  $\gamma(0) = p$  and  $\gamma'(0) = X(p)$ , obtained by integrating the flow defined by X from p. The covariant derivative  $\nabla_Y X$  is then measuring at p how the initial tangent vector X(p) is moving if p is moved infinitesimally in the direction of Y(p). There is a preferred covariant derivative for Riemannian manifolds. This Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla : T\mathcal{M} \times T\mathcal{M} \to T\mathcal{M}$  is the unique covariant derivative that is torsion-free and compatible with the metric in the sense of [42, Theorem 2.2.2].

The connection  $\nabla$  applied to the gradient  $\nabla f$  results in the *Riemannian Hessian*  $\nabla^2 f$  of f by [42, Proposition 2.2.6]. Evaluated at p, this object can be viewed as a self-adjoint linear endomorphism on  $T_p\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $(\nabla^2 f)(p) : T_p\mathcal{M} \to T_p\mathcal{M}$ . Given two self-adjoint linear endomorphisms A, B, we write  $A \succeq B$  (resp.,  $A \succ B$ ) to mean that the eigenvalues of A - B are all positive (resp., strictly positive). In particular,  $A \succeq 0$  (resp.,  $A \succ 0$ ) means that A is positive semidefinite (resp., positive definite). The second-order necessary condition for a function f to have a minimum at p is that  $(\nabla^2 f)(p) \succeq 0$ ; see, e.g., [1, 11].

The Nash–Moser implicit function theorem is an advanced but standard result in differential geometry; see, e.g., Hamilton [28] for an overview—Theorem 3.3.4 specifically is a suitable version for our purpose. An accessible version for Riemannian manifolds was presented in full detail by Bergmann and Zimmermann [57]. In our notation, the latter can be phrased as follows.

THEOREM A.1 (Essentially [57, Theorem 6]). Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$  be a Riemannian manifold of dimension d, and let  $G : \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to T\mathcal{M}$  be a smooth vector field on an open subset  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . If there is a  $(p^*, x^*) \in \mathcal{U}$  such that

- 1.  $G(p^*, x^*) = 0 \in T_{p^*}\mathcal{M}$ , and
- 2. the covariant derivative  $\nabla G^*$  at p of the smooth vector field  $G_{x^*} := G|_{\mathcal{M}, \{x^*\}}$  has rank d,

then there exists an open neighborhood  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  of  $x^*$  and a smooth map  $\widehat{q} : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$ that solves the implicit equation  $G(\widehat{q}(x), x) = 0$ .

We now have the necessary background to prove Theorem 4.4.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Consider the map

$$G: \mathcal{M} \times \Omega \longrightarrow T\mathcal{M}, \quad (p, x) \longmapsto \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{R} \varphi_j(\widehat{f}_j(x)) \cdot \nabla \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, \widehat{f}_j(x))^2$$

which for a fixed x takes (p, x) to the gradient (in the first variable) of the objective function inside the arg min in (4.1), scaled by  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Herein,  $\nabla \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, \hat{y}_j)^2$  is the gradient of the squared distance function from p to the fixed point  $\hat{y}_j := \hat{f}_j(x)$ . As G is a linear combination of gradient fields with smooth functions as coefficients, it follows that G is a smooth vector field.

If follows from Proposition 4.2 that for every  $x \in \Omega$  there exists a global minimizer q(x) of the minimization problem in (4.1). The first-order necessary condition for optimality implies that G(q(x), x) = 0. Let  $r_j(p) = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(p, \hat{y}_j)$ . Fixing x, we see

that the covariant derivative of  $G_x = G|_{\mathcal{M},x}$  satisfies

$$\nabla G_x = \sum_{j=1}^R \varphi_j(\widehat{y}_j) \cdot \nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2.$$

If we could prove that rank( $\nabla G_x$ ) = m at q(x), then the proof would be concluded by applying Theorem A.1. Since the  $\varphi_j$ 's are a convex combination, it suffices to show that the Riemannian Hessians  $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2 \succ 0$  if  $\varphi_j(y_j) > 0$ .

A close inspection of Karcher's result [32, Theorem 1.2] reveals that this is the case under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2. Indeed, Karcher shows in equation (1.2.2) in [32] that in manifolds with all sectional curvatures negative, we have  $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2 \succeq \mathbf{g} \succ 0$ , where  $\mathbf{g}$  is the Riemannian metric; this is [42, Lemma 6.2.5]. Hence, the claim holds when K = 0 in Proposition 4.2. For manifolds with positive sectional curvatures bounded by K > 0, a much more advanced argument is required to obtain (1.2.3) in [32]. Essentially, Karcher exploits  $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2 = dr_j^2 + r_j \nabla^2 r_j$  (by [42, Exercise 2.5.6]) and Rauch's comparison theorem [42, Theorem 6.4.3] applied to  $\nabla^2 r_j$  to yield  $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2 \succeq \sqrt{K} \cotan(\sqrt{K}r_j)\mathbf{g}$ . Since the cotangent is strictly positive for  $0 \leq r_j(p) < \frac{\pi}{2}$ , it follows that  $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{2} r_j^2 \succeq 0$  if  $r_j < \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{K}}$ . As in the proof of C3 in Proposition 4.2, assumption A3 implies that the distance from f(x) to each  $\hat{y}_j$  is bounded by  $5\epsilon$ . By [32, Theorem 1.2], the minimum q(x) of (4.1) will be attained in the interior of the geodesic ball of radius  $5\epsilon$  centered at f(x). The maximum distance  $r_j(q(x))$  from q(x) to the  $\hat{y}_j$ 's is then  $10\epsilon < \min\{inj(p_j^*), \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{k}}\} \le \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{K}}$  by the triangle inequality. This shows that  $\nabla \frac{1}{2}r_i^2(q(x)) \succ 0$  for all j such that  $\varphi_j(\hat{y}_j) > 0$  and concludes the proof.

### REFERENCES

- P.-A. ABSIL, R. MAHONY, AND R. SEPULCHRE, Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds, Princeton University Press, Dec. 2008, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400830244.
- B. AFSARI, Riemannian L<sup>p</sup> center of mass: Existence, uniqueness, and convexity, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 139 (2011), pp. 655–655, https://doi.org/10.1090/ s0002-9939-2010-10541-5.
- D. AMSALLEM AND C. FARHAT, An online method for interpolating linear parametric reducedorder models, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 33 (2011), pp. 2169–2198, https: //doi.org/10.1137/100813051.
- [4] B. W. BADER, T. G. KOLDA, D. M. DUNLAVY, ET AL., Tensor toolbox for matlab, version 3.6, 2023, https://www.tensortoolbox.org/.
- U. BAUR, C. BEATTIE, P. BENNER, AND S. GUGERCIN, Interpolatory projection methods for parameterized model reduction, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 33 (2011), pp. 2489– 2518, https://doi.org/10.1137/090776925.
- C. BEATTIE AND S. GUGERCIN, Chapter 7: Model Reduction by Rational Interpolation, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, July 2017, pp. 297–334, https://doi.org/10.1137/ 1.9781611974829.ch7.
- [7] A. BECKERT AND H. WENDLAND, Multivariate interpolation for fluid-structure-interaction problems using radial basis functions, Aerospace Science and Technology, 5 (2001), pp. 125– 134, https://doi.org/10.1016/s1270-9638(00)01087-7.
- [8] P. BENNER, S. GUGERCIN, AND K. WILLCOX, A survey of projection-based model reduction methods for parametric dynamical systems, SIAM Review, 57 (2015), pp. 483–531, https: //doi.org/10.1137/130932715.
- M. E. BIANCOLINI, Fast Radial Basis Functions for Engineering Applications, Springer International Publishing, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75011-8.
- [10] R. BISHOP AND R. CRITTENDEN, Geometry of Manifolds, American Mathematical Society, Aug. 2001, https://doi.org/10.1090/chel/344.
- [11] N. BOUMAL, An Introduction to Optimization on Smooth Manifolds, Cambridge University Press, Mar. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009166164.
- [12] N. BOUMAL, B. MISHRA, P.-A. ABSIL, AND R. SEPULCHRE, Manopt, a Matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 15 (2014), pp. 1455–

1459, https://www.manopt.org.

- [13] N. BRUINSMA AND M. STEINBUCH, A fast algorithm to compute the H-inf norm of a transfer function matrix, Systems & Control Letters, 14 (1990), pp. 287–293, https://doi.org/10. 1016/0167-6911(90)90049-z.
- [14] G. CERUTI AND C. LUBICH, An unconventional robust integrator for dynamical low-rank approximation, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 62 (2021), pp. 23–44, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10543-021-00873-0.
- [15] R. CHAKRABORTY AND B. C. VEMURI, Recursive fréchet mean computation on the grassmannian and its applications to computer vision, in 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), 2015, pp. 4229–4237, https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.481.
- [16] R. CHAKRABORTY AND B. C. VEMURI, Statistics on the stiefel manifold: Theory and applications, (2019).
- [17] A. CHAROUS AND P. F. J. LERMUSIAUX, Dynamically orthogonal Runge-Kutta schemes with perturbative retractions for the dynamical low-rank approximation, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 45 (2023), p. A872–A897, https://doi.org/10.1137/21m1431229.
- [18] C. CRISCITIELLO AND N. BOUMAL, An accelerated first-order method for non-convex optimization on manifolds, arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.02252, (2020).
- [19] T. DE WEER, N. VANNIEUWENHOVEN, N. LAMMENS, AND K. MEERBERGEN, The parametrized superelement approach for lattice joint modelling and simulation, Computational Mechanics, 70 (2022), pp. 451–475, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00466-022-02176-9.
- [20] J. P. DELMAS, Adaptive Signal Processing: Next Generation Solutions, Wiley, Mar. 2010, ch. 4. Subspace Tracking for Signal Processing, pp. 211–270, https://doi.org/10.1002/ 9780470575758.ch4.
- [21] A. EDELMAN, T. A. ARIAS, AND S. T. SMITH, The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 20 (1998), pp. 303–353, https://doi.org/10.1137/s0895479895290954.
- [22] L. FENG, E. B. RUDNYI, AND J. G. KORVINK, Parametric model reduction to generate boundary condition independent compact thermal model, in Proceedings of 10th International Workshops on THERMAI INvestigations of ICs and Systems, THERMINIC2004, vol. 29, 2004, pp. 281–285.
- [23] M. FRÉCHET, Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié, Annales de l'institut Henri Poincaré, 10 (1948), pp. 215–310.
- [24] S. GALLOT, D. HULIN, AND J. LAFONTAINE, Riemannian Geometry, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-97242-3.
- [25] P. GROHS, Quasi-interpolation in Riemannian manifolds, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 33 (2012), pp. 849–874, https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drs026.
- [26] P. GROHS, M. SPRECHER, AND T. YU, Scattered manifold-valued data approximation, Numerische Mathematik, 135 (2016), pp. 987–1010, https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00211-016-0823-0.
- [27] M. GROMOV, Metric Structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian Spaces, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, 2007, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4583-0.
- [28] R. S. HAMILTON, The inverse function theorem of nash and moser, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 7 (1982), pp. 65–222, https://doi.org/10.1090/ s0273-0979-1982-15004-2.
- [29] R. HIELSCHER AND L. LIPPERT, Approximating the derivative of manifold-valued functions, Journal of Approximation Theory, 285 (2023), p. 105832, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat. 2022.105832.
- [30] S. JACOBSSON, R. VANDEBRIL, J. VAN DER VEKEN, AND N. VANNIEUWENHOVEN, Approximating maps into manifolds with lower curvature bounds, arXiv:2403.16785, (2024), https://arxiv. org/abs/2403.16785.
- [31] B. JEURIS, R. VANDEBRIL, AND B. VANDEREYCKEN, A survey and comparison of contemporary algorithms for computing the matrix geometric mean, Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis, 39 (2012), pp. 379–402.
- [32] H. KARCHER, Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 30 (1977), pp. 509–541, https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa. 3160300502.
- [33] O. KOCH AND C. LUBICH, Dynamical low-rank approximation, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 29 (2007), pp. 434–454, https://doi.org/10.1137/050639703.
- [34] J. M. LEE, Introduction to Smooth Manifolds, Springer New York, 2012, https://doi.org/10. 1007/978-1-4419-9982-5.
- [35] J. M. LEE, Introduction to Riemannian Manifolds, Springer International Publishing, 2 ed., 2018, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91755-9.
- [36] L. LIN, B. ST. THOMAS, H. ZHU, AND D. B. DUNSON, Extrinsic local regression on manifold-

valued data, Journal of the American Statistical Association, 112 (2017), pp. 1261–1273, https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2016.1208615.

- [37] N. MIOLANE, N. GUIGUI, A. LE BRIGANT, J. MATHE, B. HOU, Y. THANWERDAS, S. HEYDER, O. PELTRE, N. KOEP, H. ZAATITI, H. HAJRI, Y. CABANES, T. GERALD, P. CHAUCHAT, C. SHEWMAKE, D. BROOKS, B. KAINZ, C. DONNAT, S. HOLMES, AND X. PENNEC, Geomstats: a Python package for Riemannian geometry in machine learning, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 21 (2020).
- [38] M. MOONEN, P. VAN DOOREN, AND J. VANDEWALLE, A singular value decomposition updating algorithm for subspace tracking, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 13 (1992), pp. 1015–1038, https://doi.org/10.1137/0613061.
- [39] C. MOOSMANN, ParaMOR-Model Order Reduction for Parameterized MEMS Applications, PhD thesis, Freiburg (Breisgau), 2007.
- [40] A. NONNENMACHER AND C. LUBICH, Dynamical low-rank approximation: applications and numerical experiments, Mathematics and Computers in Simulation, 79 (2008), pp. 1346–1357, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matcom.2008.03.007.
- [41] M. . C. OF AUTOMATIC CONTROL, MATLAB: psssMOR Toolbox, 2024, https://nl.mathworks. com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/64392-psssmor-toolbox.
- [42] P. PETERSEN, Riemannian Geometry, Springer International Publishing, 3 ed., 2016, https: //doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26654-1.
- [43] D. J. RABIDEAU, Fast, rank adaptive subspace tracking and applications, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 44 (1996), pp. 2229–2244, https://doi.org/10.1109/78.536680.
- [44] O. SANDER, Geodesic finite elements on simplicial grids, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 92 (2012), pp. 999–1025, https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.4366.
- [45] O. SANDER, Geodesic finite elements of higher order, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 36 (2016), pp. 238–266.
- [46] A. SÉGUIN AND D. KRESSNER, Hermite interpolation with retractions on manifolds, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 64 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1007/s10543-024-01023-y.
- [47] N. SHARON, R. S. COHEN, AND H. WENDLAND, On multiscale quasi-interpolation of scattered scalar- and manifold-valued functions, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 45 (2023), pp. A2458–A2482, https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1528306.
- [48] X. SHI, M. STYNER, J. LIEBERMAN, J. G. IBRAHIM, W. LIN, AND H. ZHU, Intrinsic Regression Models for Manifold-Valued Data, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 192–199, https: //doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04271-3\_24.
- [49] C. STRÖSSNER, B. SUN, AND D. KRESSNER, Approximation in the extended functional tensor train format, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 50 (2024), pp. 1–28.
- [50] THE MORWIKI COMMUNITY, Anemometer. MORwiki Model Order Reduction Wiki, 2018, http://modelreduction.org/index.php/Anemometer.
- [51] N. VANNIEUWENHOVEN, R. VANDEBRIL, AND K. MEERBERGEN, A new truncation strategy for the higher-order singular value decomposition, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 34 (2012), pp. A1027–A1052, https://doi.org/10.1137/110836067.
- [52] H. WENDLAND, Piecewise polynomial, positive definite and compactly supported radial functions of minimal degree, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 4 (1995), pp. 389–396, https: //doi.org/10.1007/bf02123482.
- [53] H. WENDLAND, Scattered Data Approximation, Cambridge University Press, Dec. 2004, https: //doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511617539.
- [54] B. YANG, Projection approximation subspace tracking, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 43 (1995), pp. 95–107, https://doi.org/10.1109/78.365290.
- [55] R. ZIMMERMANN, Hermite interpolation and data processing errors on Riemannian matrix manifolds, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 42 (2020), pp. A2593–A2619, https: //doi.org/10.1137/19m1282878.
- [56] R. ZIMMERMANN, Manifold interpolation, in System- and Data-Driven Methods and Algorithms, Publisher Name, 2023, ch. 7 Manifold interpolation, pp. 123–145.
- [57] R. ZIMMERMANN AND R. BERGMANN, Multivariate Hermite interpolation on Riemannian manifolds, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 46 (2024), pp. A1276–A1297, https: //doi.org/10.1137/22m1541071.