## **Functional Tensor Regression**

Tongyu Li, Fang Yao and Anru R. Zhang

Peking University and Duke University

## Supplementary Material

This supplementary material contains the proofs of the main theorems and technical lemmas, and additional numerical results for observations on a non-uniform grid.

# S1 Proofs

#### Proof of Theorem 1

Notice that

•

To separate out the noise term, introduce the minimizer with  $\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  in place of  $\boldsymbol{y}$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} = \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}(\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*}\mathscr{Z}^{*}\mathscr{Z}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} + n\rho\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*}\mathscr{A}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}})^{-1}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*}\mathscr{Z}^{*}(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}).$$

Since  $\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}_i(t), \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}(t) \rangle \, \mathrm{d}t \right)_{i=1,\cdots,n} = \mathscr{Z} \boldsymbol{\Theta} + \boldsymbol{\delta}$ , it follows that

$$(2n)^{-1} \| \mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1}) + \boldsymbol{\delta} \|^{2} + \rho \langle \mathscr{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} \rangle$$

$$= (2n)^{-1} \| \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathscr{Z} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} \|^{2} + \rho \langle \mathscr{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} \rangle$$

$$\leq (2n)^{-1} \| \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathscr{Z} \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta} \|^{2} + \rho \langle \mathscr{A} \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta} \rangle \quad \text{recalling (2.11)}$$

$$= (2n)^{-1} \| \mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta}) + \boldsymbol{\delta} \|^{2} + \rho \langle \mathscr{A} \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \boldsymbol{\Theta} \rangle.$$

Using the inequalities that

$$\begin{split} \|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1}) + \boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 &\geq 2^{-1} \|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1})\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2, \\ \|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k}\boldsymbol{\Theta}) + \boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 &\leq 2 \|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k}\boldsymbol{\Theta})\|^2 + 2 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2, \end{split}$$

(3.17) and (3.21), we obtain that

$$\|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1})\|^2 \le 4nR_u p_0^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k} \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 + 6\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 + 8n\rho C_m.$$
(S2)

Besides, by writing

$$\mathscr{Z}(\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} - \check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1}) = \mathscr{Z}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \big( \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{Z}^{*} \mathscr{Z}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} + n\rho \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{A}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \big)^{-1} \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{Z}^{*} \varepsilon,$$

it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{Z}(\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} - \check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1})\|^{2} &\leq \varepsilon^{\top} \mathscr{Z}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \big(\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{Z}^{*} \mathscr{Z}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} + n\rho \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{A}\mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}\big)^{-1} \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}}^{*} \mathscr{Z}^{*} \varepsilon \\ &\leq p_{0}(c_{m}n\rho)^{-1} \|\mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k}} \mathscr{Z}^{*} \varepsilon\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \quad \text{by (2.8)} \\ &\leq c_{m}^{-1} p_{0} n^{-1} \rho^{-1} \|(\mathscr{Z}^{*} \varepsilon)_{\max(2r)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$(S3)$$

where the last step invokes the fact that  $T_{\Theta^k} \mathbb{M}_r \subset \bigcup_{s \leq 2r} \mathbb{M}_s$  (Luo and Zhang, 2023, Lemma 2). The combination of (S2) and (S3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{Z}(\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\Theta})\|^2 &\leq 2 \|\mathscr{Z}(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1})\|^2 + 2 \|\mathscr{Z}(\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} - \check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1})\|^2 \\ &\leq 8nR_u p_0^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k} \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 + 12 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 + 16n\rho C_m + 2c_m^{-1} p_0 n^{-1} \rho^{-1} \|(\mathscr{Z}^* \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\max(2r)}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

 $\mathbf{SO}$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{Z}(\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\Theta})\| &\leq 8^{1/2} n^{1/2} R_u^{1/2} p_0^{-1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k} \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\ &+ \left\{ 12 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 + 16n\rho C_m + 2c_m^{-1} p_0 n^{-1} \rho^{-1} \| (\mathscr{Z}^* \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\max(2\boldsymbol{r})} \|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (S1), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \le \{(D+1)^{1/2} + 1\} (8^{1/2} R_u^{1/2} R_l^{-1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k} \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}} + R_l^{-1/2} \eta).$$

Due to Luo and Zhang (2023, Lemma 9),

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \mathscr{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k}\boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leq (D+1)\lambda_{\min}^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2,$$

and thus the proof is complete.

### Proof of Corollary 1

The argument is similar to the proof of Luo and Zhang (2023, Corollary 1), so we omit it here.  $\hfill \Box$ 

### Proof of Theorem 2

By writing the Riemann sum as the integral of a piece-wise constant function and recalling (2.5), it can be easily seen that the approximation errors satisfy that  $|\delta_i| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{pr}}(p_0^{-\kappa} C_m^{1/2})$ , and thus

$$\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2/n = \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{pr}}(p_0^{-2\kappa}C_m).$$

Following the proof of Luo and Zhang (2023, Lemma 12),

$$\begin{split} \left\| (\mathscr{Z}^* \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\max(2r)} \right\|_{\mathrm{F}} &= \max_{\boldsymbol{U}_d \in \mathbb{O}_{p_d, 2r_d}, d=0, 1, \cdots, D} \max_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0 \times p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D} : \|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leq 1} \langle \mathcal{T} \times_{d=0}^D (\boldsymbol{U}_d \boldsymbol{U}_d^\top), \mathscr{Z}^* \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle \\ &= \max_{\boldsymbol{U}_d \in \mathbb{O}_{p_d, 2r_d}, d=0, 1, \cdots, D} \max_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0 \times p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D} : \|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leq 1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathscr{Z} \{ \mathcal{T} \times_{d=0}^D (\boldsymbol{U}_d \boldsymbol{U}_d^\top) \} \end{split}$$

Since Lemma 1 provides the bounds for the operator norm of  $\mathscr{Z}$ , the proof of Han et al. (2022, Theorem 4.2) implies that

$$\left\| (\mathscr{Z}^* \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\max(2\boldsymbol{r})} \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{pr}} \bigg\{ n p_0^{-1} \Big( \sum_{d=0}^D p_d r_d + \prod_{d=0}^D r_d \Big) \bigg\}.$$

Plugging these into (3.23) leads to the desired result, and (3.24) follows directly. The proof is then complete.

### Proof of Theorem 3

After rescaling the regression model using (3.17) and (3.19), it follows from Luo and Zhang (2023, Lemma 12) and the proof of Luo and Zhang (2023, Theorem 2) that when  $n = \prod_{d=0}^{D} p_d$  we can choose  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}_{\max(2r)}$  for some  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0 \times p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D}$  with i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  entries. In what follows,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ denote universal positive constants. By Sudakov's minoration inequality (Vershynin, 2018, Theorem 7.4.1),

$$E(\left\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{\max(2\boldsymbol{r})}\right\|_{\mathrm{F}}) = E\left(\max_{\boldsymbol{U}_{d}\in\mathbb{O}_{p_{d},2r_{d}},\,d=0,1,\cdots,D} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}\times_{d=0}^{D}\boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top}\|_{\mathrm{F}}\right)$$
$$\geq c_{1}\epsilon\{\log N(\prod \mathbb{O}_{p_{d},2r_{d}},\epsilon)\}^{1/2}, \quad \epsilon > 0$$

where  $N(\prod \mathbb{O}_{p_d,2r_d}, \epsilon)$  is the  $\epsilon$ -covering number of  $\prod_{d=0}^{D} \mathbb{O}_{p_d,2r_d}$ . It can be seen that

$$N(\prod \mathbb{O}_{p_d, 2r_d}, \epsilon) \ge N(\prod \mathbb{O}_{p_d, r_d}, \epsilon) \ge (c_2/\epsilon)^{\sum_{d=0}^{D} (p_d - r_d)r_d},$$

and thus  $E(\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{\max(2\boldsymbol{r})}\|_{\mathrm{F}}) \geq 2c_0 \sum_{d=0}^{D} (p_d - r_d) r_d$ . Besides, with some fixed  $\boldsymbol{U}_d \in \mathbb{O}_{p_d, 2r_d}$ ,

$$E(\left\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{\max(2\boldsymbol{r})}\right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}) \geq E(\left\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}\times_{d=0}^{D}\boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top}\right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}) = \prod_{d=0}^{D} (2r_{d}).$$

Combining the two bounds completes the proof.

#### Proof of Lemma 1

By the law of large numbers,

$$n^{-1} \| \mathscr{Z} \Upsilon \|^2 = n^{-1} (\langle \mathcal{Z}_1, \Upsilon \rangle^2 + \dots + \langle \mathcal{Z}_n, \Upsilon \rangle^2) \to E(\langle \mathcal{Z}_1, \Upsilon \rangle^2)$$

in probability as  $n \to \infty$ . Hence we only need to bound  $E(\langle \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \rangle^2)$ . For convenience, let  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\ell}$  and  $\mathbf{\mathcal{E}}$  be the  $p_0 \times p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D$  tensors such that  $[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\ell}]_{kj_1,\dots,j_D} = [\mathbf{\Xi}_{k+(\ell-1)p_0}]_{j_1,\dots,j_D}$  and  $[\mathbf{\mathcal{E}}]_{jj_1,\dots,j_D} = [\mathbf{\mathcal{E}}_{1j}]_{j_1,\dots,j_D}$ , and let  $\mathbf{\Delta}^{1/2}$ be the diagonal matrix constructed from  $(\Delta t_j)^{1/2}$ ,  $j = 1, \cdots, p_0$ . We have  $E(\langle \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \rangle^2) = E\left\{\left\langle \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\ell} \times_0 (\mathbf{\Delta}^{1/2} \mathbf{\Phi}_{\ell}) + \mathbf{\mathcal{E}} \times_0 \mathbf{\Delta}, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \right\rangle^2 \right\}$  by (2.1) and (2.2)  $= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} E\{\langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\ell} \times_0 (\mathbf{\Delta}^{1/2} \mathbf{\Phi}_{\ell}), \mathbf{\Upsilon} \rangle^2\} + E(\langle \mathbf{\mathcal{E}} \times_0 \mathbf{\Delta}, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \rangle^2)$  by uncorrelatedness  $= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} E\{\langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\ell}, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \times_0 (\mathbf{\Phi}_{\ell}^{\top} \mathbf{\Delta}^{1/2}) \rangle^2\} + E(\langle \mathbf{\mathcal{E}}, \mathbf{\Upsilon} \times_0 \mathbf{\Delta} \rangle^2)$  by algebra  $\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{A}{\{1+(\ell-1)p_0\}^a} \|\mathbf{\Upsilon} \times_0 \mathbf{\Phi}_{\ell}^{\top} \times_0 \mathbf{\Delta}^{1/2}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 + \sigma_X^2 \|\mathbf{\Upsilon} \times_0 \mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2$  by Assumptions 1 and 3  $\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{A}{\{1+(\ell-1)p_0\}^a} \frac{C_0}{p_0} C_{\varphi} \|\mathbf{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 + \sigma_X^2 \frac{C_0^2}{p_0^2} \|\mathbf{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2$  by Assumption 2  $\leq \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{a}{a-1} \frac{1}{p_0^6} \right) A C_0 C_{\varphi} + \frac{C_0^2 \sigma_X^2}{p_0} \right\} \frac{\|\mathbf{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2}{p_0}$ 

where the last step uses the fact that  $\sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} \{1/p_0 + (\ell-1)\}^{-a} < 1 + \int_1^{\infty} u^{-a} du = a/(a-1)$ . This completes the proof of (3.17). In a similar manner, writing  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_0$  for the  $r_0 \times p_1 \times \cdots \times p_D$  tensor such that  $[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_0]_{k,j_1,\ldots,j_D} =$ 

 $[\boldsymbol{\Xi}_k]_{j_1,\ldots,j_D}$ , it can be seen that

$$E(\langle \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Z}}_{1}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \rangle^{2}) \geq E(\langle \boldsymbol{\varGamma}_{0}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{\varPhi}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Delta}^{1/2}) \rangle^{2})$$
  
$$\geq \frac{1}{Ar_{0}^{a}} \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{\varPhi}_{0}^{\top} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{\Delta}^{1/2} \|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \quad \text{by Assumption 1}$$
  
$$\geq \frac{1}{Ar_{0}^{a}} \frac{1}{C_{0}p_{0}} \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{\varPhi}_{0}^{\top} \|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \quad \text{by (2.5)}$$
  
$$\geq \frac{c^{2}}{AC_{0}r_{0}^{a}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}}{p_{0}} \quad \text{by (3.18)} \quad .$$

This completes the proof of (3.19).

Proof of Lemma 2

Recall that  $\boldsymbol{U}_0 \boldsymbol{U}_0^\top + \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}^\top = \boldsymbol{I}_{r_0}$ . Using the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{split} \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\|_{\mathrm{F}} &= \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top}) + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}^{\top})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\ &\geq \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top})\|_{\mathrm{F}} - \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}^{\top})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\ &\geq \sigma_{r_{0}} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0})\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top}\|_{\mathrm{F}} - \sigma_{1} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp})\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}^{\top}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\ &= \sigma_{r_{0}} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0})\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{U}_{0} \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top})\|_{\mathrm{F}} - \sigma_{1} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp})\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \times_{0} (\boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}^{\top})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \\ &= \sigma_{r_{0}} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0}) \alpha \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}} - \sigma_{1} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp}) (1 - \alpha^{2})^{1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}\|_{\mathrm{F}}. \end{split}$$

This completes the proof.

# **Proof of Proposition 1**

Recalling (2.12), we have

$$\begin{split} \mathscr{AR}_{oldsymbol{\Theta}}igl( \mathcal{C}, (oldsymbol{D}_d)_{d=0}^D igr) &= \mathscr{A}igg\{ \mathcal{C} imes_{d=0}^D oldsymbol{U}_d + \sum_{d=0}^D \mathscr{T}_d(oldsymbol{U}_{d\perp} oldsymbol{D}_d oldsymbol{W}_d^{ op}) igr\} \ &= oldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} imes_0 igl( oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{U}_0 igr) imes_{d=1}^D oldsymbol{U}_d + \sum_{d=0}^D \mathscr{T}_d(oldsymbol{U}_{d\perp} oldsymbol{D}_d oldsymbol{W}_d^{ op}) imes_0 oldsymbol{A}. \end{split}$$

The core part of  $\mathscr{R}^*_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\mathscr{AR}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}, (\boldsymbol{D}_d)_{d=0}^D\right)$  is

$$\begin{split} \left\{ \mathscr{AR}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \big( \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}, (\boldsymbol{D}_{d})_{d=0}^{D} \big) \right\} \times_{d=0}^{D} \boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) \times_{d=1}^{D} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d} \right) + \mathscr{T}_{0} (\boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \boldsymbol{D}_{0} \boldsymbol{W}_{0}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \right) \times_{d=1}^{D} \boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top} \\ &+ \sum_{d=1}^{D} \mathscr{T}_{d} (\boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp} \boldsymbol{D}_{d} \boldsymbol{W}_{d}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \right) \times_{e \neq 0, d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) + \mathscr{T}_{0} (\boldsymbol{D}_{0} \boldsymbol{V}_{0}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \right) \times_{d=1}^{D} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{d}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d} \right) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) + \mathscr{T}_{0} (\boldsymbol{D}_{0} \boldsymbol{V}_{0}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0\perp} \right). \end{split}$$

The 0-mode part of  $\mathscr{R}_{\Theta}^* \mathscr{AR}_{\Theta} (\mathcal{C}, (D_d)_{d=0}^D)$  is

$$egin{aligned} &oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}\mathscr{M}_0ig\{\mathscr{AR}_{oldsymbol{\Theta}}ig(\mathcal{C},(oldsymbol{D}_d)_{d=0}ig)ig\}oldsymbol{W}_0 \ &=oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}ig[oldsymbol{AU}_0^{ op}ig(\mathcal{C})(\otimes_{d=D}^1oldsymbol{U}_d^{ op})+oldsymbol{AU}_{0ot}oldsymbol{D}_0oldsymbol{W}_0^{ op}+\sum_{d=1}^Doldsymbol{A}\mathscr{M}_0ig\{\mathscr{T}_d(oldsymbol{U}_dot D_doldsymbol{W}_d^{ op})ig\}ig]oldsymbol{W}_0 \ &=oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}oldsymbol{AU}_0(oldsymbol{\mathcal{C}})oldsymbol{V}_0+oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}oldsymbol{AU}_{0ot}oldsymbol{D}_0+oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}\sum_{d=1}^Doldsymbol{A}\mathscr{M}_0ig\{\mathscr{T}_d(oldsymbol{U}_d^{ op}oldsymbol{U}_doldsymbol{W}_d^{ op})\times_{e
eq 0,d}oldsymbol{U}_e^{ op}ig\}oldsymbol{V}_0 \ &=oldsymbol{U}_{0ot}^{ op}oldsymbol{AU}_{0ot}oldsymbol{O}_0. \end{aligned}$$

For  $d \neq 0$ , the *d*-mode part of  $\mathscr{R}^*_{\Theta} \mathscr{A} \mathscr{R}_{\Theta} (\mathcal{C}, (D_d)_{d=0}^D)$  is

$$\begin{split} & \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \mathscr{A} \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \Big( \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}, (\boldsymbol{D}_{d})_{d=0}^{D} \Big) \Big\} \boldsymbol{W}_{d} \\ &= \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big[ \Big\{ \mathscr{A} \mathscr{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \Big( \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}, (\boldsymbol{D}_{d})_{d=0}^{D} \Big) \Big\} \times_{d} \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \times_{e \neq d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \Big] \boldsymbol{V}_{d} \\ &= \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) \times_{d} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d} \right) \times_{e \neq 0, d} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{e} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{c=0}^{D} \mathscr{T}_{c} (\boldsymbol{U}_{c\perp} \boldsymbol{D}_{c} \boldsymbol{W}_{c}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \right) \times_{d} \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \times_{e \neq 0, d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \Big\} \boldsymbol{V}_{d} \\ &= \sum_{c=0}^{D} \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \left( \mathscr{T}_{c} (\boldsymbol{U}_{c\perp} \boldsymbol{D}_{c} \boldsymbol{V}_{c}^{\top}) \times_{e \neq c} \boldsymbol{U}_{e} \right) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \right) \times_{d} \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \times_{e \neq 0, d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \Big\} \boldsymbol{V}_{d} \\ &= \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \mathscr{T}_{d} \Big( \boldsymbol{D}_{d} \boldsymbol{V}_{d}^{\top} \right) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) \times_{d} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp} \right) \times_{e \neq 0, d} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{e} \right) \Big\} \boldsymbol{V}_{d} \\ &+ \sum_{c \neq d} \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \left( \mathscr{T}_{c} (\boldsymbol{U}_{c\perp} \boldsymbol{D}_{c} \boldsymbol{V}_{c}^{\top} \right) \times_{e \neq c, d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e} \right) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \right) \times_{d} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{d\perp}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U}_{d} \right) \times_{e \neq 0, d} \boldsymbol{U}_{e}^{\top} \Big\} \boldsymbol{V}_{d} \\ &= \mathscr{M}_{d} \Big\{ \mathscr{T}_{d} (\boldsymbol{D}_{d} \boldsymbol{V}_{d}^{\top}) \times_{0} \left( \boldsymbol{U}_{0}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{U}_{0} \right) \Big\} \boldsymbol{V}_{d}. \end{split}$$

The proof is then complete.

#### 

# S2 Additional Numerical Results

Here we present an example of non-uniform grid points. The setup follows the first simulation in Section 4, except we now choose an unbalanced set of  $t_j$ 's. Specifically,  $5p_0/12$  measurements are equally spaced within (0, 1/3), another  $5p_0/12$  measurements are equally spaced within (2/3, 1), and  $p_0/6$ measurements are equally spaced within (1/3, 2/3). Despite this imbalance, the estimation performs similarly to the uniform case, as shown below, analogous to the results in Figure 1.



Figure S1: Left: Convergence performance of the functional Riemannian Gauss–Newton algorithm. Middle and Right: GCV and RISE versus the tuning parameter  $\rho$ . Displayed are averages based on 100 Monte Carlo replications of  $(\mathcal{X}_i, y_i)_{i=1,...,500}$  with measurements on a non-uniform grid.

#### References

- Han, R., R. Willett, and A. R. Zhang (2022). An optimal statistical and computational framework for generalized tensor estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(1), 1–29.
- Luo, Y. and A. R. Zhang (2023). Low-rank tensor estimation via riemannian gauss-newton: Statistical optimality and second-order convergence. Journal of Machine Learning Research 24 (381), 1–48.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science, Volume 47. Cambridge university press.