

An approach to Fisher-Rao metric for infinite dimensional non-parametric information geometry

Bing Cheng and Howell Tong

December 23, 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Breaking the Intractability Barrier in Infinite Dimensional Non-Parametric Information Geometry	4
1.2	Amari's Finite Dimensional Parametric Information Geometry	6
1.3	The non-parametric information Riemann manifold	8
1.4	A Crucial Geometric Decomposition in Non-Parametric Information Geometry	10
2	Fisher-Rao Metric Decomposition: Bridging Explainability of Fisher Information matrix G_f and Intractability of Infinite-Dimensional Information Geometry	13
2.1	The Non-Parametric Manifold and the Fisher-Rao Metric Functional	13
2.2	Orthogonal decomposition of $T_f M$ and the Pythagorean Theorem	15
3	Information Geometric Foundation of G-Entropy	18
3.1	The Trace Theorem and Definition of G-Entropy	19
3.2	Interpretation as Total Explainable Statistical Information	19

3.3	Application to Generative AI and Gradient Regularization	20
4	The Relationships Between KL-Divergence, G-Entropy, and Metric Curvature	21
4.1	The Fisher Information Metric as the Local Hessian of KL-Divergence	21
4.2	Geometric Identity: G-Entropy as the Sum of KL Hessians	23
4.3	The Third-Order Geometry and the Origin of Asymmetry of KL Divergence	24
5	The Covariate Semi-Parametric Efficiency Framework	27
5.1	Parametric Space Partition and Nuisance Tangent Space	28
5.2	The Semi-Parametric Bridge and Geometric Alignment	29
5.3	The Geometry of RAL Estimators and Information Projection by the tangent space decomposition	34
5.4	The Covariate Cramér-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)	36
5.5	Existence and Invertibility of the Metric Tensor \mathbf{G}_f	37
6	The Manifold Hypothesis and the Infinite Dimensional Statistical Manifold	37
6.1	Statistical Observability and Alignment of the Core Manifold M_l under the Manifold Hypothesis (MH)	38
6.2	The Statistical Decomposition of Information: Measuring Core Manifold Dom- inance under the Manifold Hypothesis	42
6.2.1	Relationship Between the Signal Tangent Space M_l and the Covariate Space S	44
6.2.2	Relationship Between the two Covariate Fisher Information Matrices	45
6.3	how to apply this new methodology to run statistical inference and hypothesis test and statistics for the MH problem	46
6.3.1	Our new Methodology for Testing the Manifold Hypothesis	46

6.3.2	Statistical Inference and Manifold Characterization	48
7	Conclusions and future research	49
7.1	Future Direction 1: The Decomposition of Skewness	51
7.2	Future Direction 2: Toward a Complete Covariate Dual Geometry	52
8	Appendix 1: Proofs of Lemmas and Theorems	54

Abstract

Being infinite dimensional, non-parametric information geometry has long faced an "intractability barrier" due to the fact that the Fisher-Rao metric is now a functional incurring difficulties in defining its inverse. This paper introduces a novel framework to resolve the intractability with an *Orthogonal Decomposition of the Tangent Space* ($T_f M = S \oplus S^\perp$), where S represents an observable covariate subspace.

Through the decomposition, we derive the *Covariate Fisher Information Matrix* (*cFIM*), denoted as G_f , which is a finite-dimensional and computable representative of information extractable from the manifold's geometry. Indeed, by proving the *Trace Theorem*: $H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(G_f)$, we establish a rigorous foundation for the G-entropy previously introduced by us, thereby identifying it not merely as a gradient-based regularizer, but also as a *fundamental geometric invariant* representing the total explainable statistical information captured by the probability distribution associated with the model.

Furthermore, we establish a link between G_f and the second-order derivative (i.e. the curvature) of the KL-divergence, leading to the notion of *Covariate Cramér-Rao Lower Bound* (*CRLB*). We demonstrate that G_f is congruent to the Efficient Fisher Information Matrix, thereby providing fundamental limits of variance for semi-parametric estimators. Finally, we apply our geometric framework to the *Manifold Hypothesis*, lifting the latter from a heuristic assumption into a testable condition of rank-deficiency within the cFIM. By defining the *Information Capture Ratio*, we provide a rigorous method for estimating intrinsic dimensionality in high-dimensional data.

In short, our work bridges the gap between abstract information geometry and the demand of *explainable AI*, by providing a tractable path for revealing the statistical coverage and the efficiency of non-parametric models.

1 Introduction

1.1 Breaking the Intractability Barrier in Infinite Dimensional Non-Parametric Information Geometry

Information geometry treats families of probability distributions as geometric spaces known as *statistical manifolds*. Within this framework, the *Fisher-Rao metric* stands as the canonical measure of statistical distinguishability, successfully defining the Riemannian structure of these spaces. Current applications are primarily confined to *Amari's finite-dimensional parametric geometry*, in which probability distributions are mapped from an Euclidean space into a Riemannian manifold M_θ indexed by specific and unknown parameters θ . However, transitioning from these finite coordinate systems to the non-parametric setting, which is typically an *infinite-dimensional manifold* $\mathbf{M} = \{f\}$, necessitates far more than a simple generalization. It creates a formidable *barrier of intractability*, in which the Fisher-Rao metric, g_f , ceases to be a *computable matrix*. Instead, it becomes an analytically unusable *functional* involving infinite-dimensional calculations. Without a manageable *coordinate basis*, basic geometric operations, such as calculating local curvature or geodesic distances, become statistically and computationally impossible.

To overcome the formidable hurdle, we introduce a novel geometric approach: *the orthogonal decomposition of the tangent space* $T_f M$. This approach is designed to impose a statistically meaningful coordinate system onto the otherwise unwieldy infinite-dimensional manifold. By partitioning the tangent space into explainable and residual components, we

define the structural partition of the space conceptually as

$$T_f M = S \oplus S^\perp,$$

where S is a subspace and S^\perp its orthogonal complement under the Fisher-Rao metric. This decomposition provides us rigorously with a convenient separation of manageable statistical signal from unexplainable complexity, while ensuring that the infinite-dimensional tangent space closure retains a formal Hilbert space structure. Furthermore, the orthogonal decomposition gains for us structurally the partitioning of the statistical information into two fundamentally distinct and g_f -orthogonal components. Specifically, \mathbf{S} , called the *Covariate Subspace*, is the finite-dimensional and analytical part that captures all the statistical variation explained by the observable \mathbf{x} . And (\mathbf{S}^\perp) , called the *Residual Subspace*, remains infinite-dimensional, consisting of pure noise and unobserved factors. This decomposition is significant because the geometry restricted to \mathbf{S} (defined by \mathbf{G}_f) provides the statistical relevance needed, for example, for semi-parametric efficiency as well as a proof for G-entropy as a measure of explainable information.

Briefly, important benefits of the orthogonal decomposition are as follows:

Firstly, it provides a powerful weapon to solve various problems and applications of infinite dimensional information geometry, which will be detailed in later sections. Secondly, by leveraging the unified framework, we develop a powerful tool based on the matrix G_f for inference, targeting the explainable manifold. Unlike traditional parametric Fisher information, which is often intractable in high-dimensional settings, G_f provides a finite, computable representation of the metric restricted solely to observable covariate structures. Critically, this paper establishes a theoretical breakthrough: we prove that $Tr(G_f)$ defines an entropy called G-entropy, denoted by $H_G(f)$ as proposed by Cheng and Tong (2024), and highlight the fact that G-entropy is at least as important as the Shannon entropy. This result provides the first rigorous information-geometric foundation for G-entropy, giving it a clear statistical meaning as a measure of *total information* derived directly from the underlying geometry.

This discovery establishes the fundamental role of G-entropy in generative statistics, offering a foundational advance for applications in modern high-dimensional settings, such as generative AI and diffusion models. Thirdly, we further demonstrate the utility of \mathbf{G}_f in *semi-parametric efficiency* and hypothesis testing for the *Manifold Hypothesis*. Fourthly, we discuss the **KL-divergence** approximation by the orthogonal decomposition.

1.2 Amari's Finite Dimensional Parametric Information Geometry

Without much loss of generality, we henceforth focus on a probability density function (pdf). The term "information" in Information Geometry (IG) primarily refers to the amount of information a *random event* carries about an unknown pdf or about the unknown parameters of a known pdf. In the earlier statistical literature, information was a direct reference to R. A. Fisher's concept of information, formally quantified by the *Fisher Information Matrix (FIM)*, which is derived from the likelihood function of a statistical model.

Adopting an idea of C. R. Rao, Amari (2021) considered the Riemannian manifold, also called a *statistical manifold*, of pdfs $M = \{f(x; \theta) | \theta \in \Theta \subset R^k\}$. He endowed this manifold with a tensor metric (known as the *Fisher-Rao metric*)

$$dS^2 = d\theta^T I(\theta) d\theta, \quad (1)$$

where $I(\theta)$ is the $k \times k$ Fisher Information Matrix, also denoted as G , so that $G = (g_{ij}) = I(\theta)$. This defines the information geometric manifold (M, g) , whose coordinates are θ .

Since the Fisher-Rao metric defines a Riemannian structure, the distance between two points (i.e. two pdfs) $f_1(x) = f(x; \theta_1)$ and $f_2(x) = f(x; \theta_2)$ in the manifold M is the geodesic length of the curve that connects f_1 and f_2 on the manifold \mathbf{M} given by

$$dFR(f_1, f_2) := dFR(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\dot{\gamma}(t)^T I(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}(t)} dt, \quad (2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all smooth curves such that $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Theta$, with $\gamma(0) = \theta_1$ and $\gamma(1) = \theta_2$, and $\dot{\gamma}(t) = \frac{d\gamma}{dt}(t)$ is the velocity vector of the curve in the parameter space.

Under some mild conditions, by the square-root mapping $f \mapsto \sqrt{f}$, the space of pdfs is mapped to a unit sphere in L^2 space, and the *Fisher-Rao distance* between f_1 and f_2 admits a closed form:

$$dFR(f_1, f_2) = 2 \arccos \left(\int_x \sqrt{f_1(x)f_2(x)} dx \right). \quad (3)$$

This shows that the Fisher-Rao distance corresponds to the spherical geodesic distance between square-root densities. When f_1 looks like f_2 , we see that the Fisher-Rao distance is close to zero and when they look different, the distance is getting larger.

(1) *Cramér-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)*: It is well known that the CRLB provides a fundamental lower bound on the covariance of any unbiased estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ of a parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$:

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \geq \mathbf{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}.$$

The Fisher Information Matrix $I(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ acts as a Riemannian metric g_{ij} on the statistical manifold:

$$g_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = [\mathbf{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]_{ij} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \left[\frac{\partial \log f(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta^i} \frac{\partial \log f(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta^j} \right].$$

The CRLB essentially relates the best possible efficiency of an estimator (its minimum variance) directly to the geometric curvature of the parameter space, as measured by the Fisher Information Metric.

(2) *Bias and Curvature*: The Christoffel symbols $\Gamma_{ijk}^{(\alpha)}$ are interpreted as a measure of the statistical manifold's curvature in different directions. Specifically, the third-order derivatives of the log-likelihood that appear in the α -connection components relate to the second-order efficiency of estimators. While the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) is first-order efficient (achieving the CRLB asymptotically), it is generally slightly biased. The α -connection's curvature terms are used to calculate the second-order bias of the MLE, which quantifies how much its variance exceeds the CRLB in the large-sample expansion, thus providing a refined measure of efficiency.

1.3 The non-parametric information Riemanna manifold

Let M be the manifold of non-parametric smooth pdfs $\{f\}$ on R^n .

Definition 1. : *The tangent space $T_f M$ at a point (pdf) $f \in M$ is the space of smooth functions $h(x)$ defined by the directional derivative of a smooth curve $\gamma : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ such that $\gamma(0) = f$. A curve $\gamma(t)$ in M can be expressed as a family of pdfs $f_t(x) = \gamma(t)(x)$, where t is the curve parameter. The tangent vector h is a function on R^n satisfying*

$$h(x) = \left. \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0}.$$

Lemma 1. *Tangent Vector Component Constraint: The component $h(x)$ of a tangent vector at f must satisfy the zero-integral constraint:*

$$\int_{R^n} h(x) dx = 0.$$

That is, the tangent space $T_f M = \{h \mid \int_x h(x) dx = 0\}$.

Definition 2. *A Stein score function s of h is defined as*

$$s(x) = s(x, h) = \frac{h(x)}{f(x)} \quad (4)$$

for $h \in T_f M$.

Lemma 2. Reparameterization using Stein Score Function:

Let $f(x) \in M$ be a smooth pdf. The space of tangent vectors at f is $T_f M = \{h(x) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \mid \int_{R^n} h(x) dx = 0\}$. The space of Stein score functions at f is $S_f = \{s(x) \in C^\infty(R^n) \mid E[s(X)] = \int_{R^n} s(x) f(x) dx = 0\}$. The mapping $\Phi : T_f M \rightarrow S_f$, defined by the relationship between the absolute change $h(x)$ and the proportional change $s(x)$

$$\Phi(h) = s = \frac{h}{f}$$

is an isomorphism (a linear bijection) between the two vector spaces.

Definition 3. We define the **Fisher-Rao metric** g_f on the tangent space $T_f M$ as the bilinear functional:

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \int_{R^n} \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)} dx \quad (5)$$

Then it is straightforward to verify that this definition satisfies the conditions of linearity, symmetry, and positive-definiteness, thus confirming that g_f is a well-defined Riemannian metric. (See definition in [3]).

Lemma 3. Fisher-Rao Metric Identity: The metric is identically equal to the covariance of the associated Stein score functions $s_i = h_i/f$, $i = 1, 2$ with

$$E_{X \sim f}[s_i(X)] = 0 \quad (6)$$

and

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \text{Cov}(s_1(X), s_2(X)). \quad (7)$$

That is, the Fisher-Rao Metric is the covariance between s_1 and s_2 .

Note that the summation in the Fisher Information Matrix in the parametric case becomes, in the non-parametric case, integration over the sample space, say \mathcal{X} , and the two indices i, j become two continuous variables, say x, y .

Metric Kernel: The integral $\int g(x)h_1(x)h_2(x) dx$ can be viewed as the integral of a tensor density $g(x)\delta(x-y)$ against the tangent vectors.

$$g_f(h_1, h_2) = \int_{R^n} \int_{R^n} \underbrace{\left[\frac{1}{4f(x)} \delta(x-y) \right]}_{\text{Metric Kernel } \mathbf{g}_f(x,y)} h_1(x)h_2(y) dx dy$$

where $\delta(x-y)$ is the Dirac delta function. This is the formal infinite-dimensional tensor, connecting the "coordinates" x and y , and the **Metric Kernel** $g_f(x, y) = \frac{\delta(x-y)}{4f(x)}$.

The Role of $1/f(x)$: The factor $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ ensures that the metric is invariant under diffeomorphisms (reparameterizations) of the sample space \mathcal{X} , a property proven by the Čencov's theorem [2].

- Low Probability \implies High Information Weight: If $f(x)$ is very small at a point x , a small change $h(x)$ at that point implies a large proportional change $s(x) = \frac{h(x)}{f(x)}$. The metric assigns a large weight ($\frac{1}{f(x)}$) to such a change, making pdfs that differ in low-probability regions seem far apart. This aligns with the idea that differences in areas where the distribution is non-zero are highly informative.
- High Probability \implies Low Information Weight: If $f(x)$ is large, a change $h(x)$ has less impact on the distance. The full Fisher-Rao metric formula is thus a specific, invariant way to define the "length" of a smooth path of pdfs.

1.4 A Crucial Geometric Decomposition in Non-Parametric Information Geometry

The foundation of information geometry, pioneered by Amari, rests upon the elegant structure of parametric manifolds ($\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{\Theta}$). In this finite-dimensional setting, the Fisher Information Matrix (FIM), $\mathbf{I}(\theta)$, serves as the Riemannian metric. This framework is successful because the FIM is directly indexed by the finite parameters θ , providing a convenient coordinate system for measuring statistical curvature, computing optimal bounds, defining dual connections and so on.

Although the Fisher-Rao metric is the canonical tool for measuring **statistical distance**, its application in non-parametric/high-dimensional settings remains largely unworkable. Moving from Amari's finite-dimensional parametric geometry to the infinite-dimensional manifold \mathbf{M} is challenging as there are fundamental hurdles to overcome. Thus, a new geometric concept is necessary.

1. The Theoretical Hurdle-Loss of Fine Structure and Indexing:

The first and most critical hurdle is the loss of a functional coordinate system. In the non-parametric space, the Fisher-Rao metric transforms from a matrix $\mathbf{I}(\theta)$ to a metric

functional

$$g_f(h, h) = \int \frac{h^2(x)}{f(x)} dx$$

operating on the infinite-dimensional tangent space $\mathbf{T}_f\mathbf{M}$ for each h , where $h \in \mathbf{T}_f\mathbf{M}$. Since every vector h represents a valid intrinsic statistical direction ¹, the full metric g_f measures the information contained in all possible intrinsic directions.

This framework results in a geometry of coarse structure. The metric g_f is a non-local integral over the entire domain, making it impossible to analytically separate, isolate, or interpret contributions along specific, meaningful statistical directions that are externally defined by a finite set of observable covariates (\mathbf{x}).

The full functional metric provides only a single, undifferentiated measure of distance, failing to offer a fine-grained indexing necessary to distinguish between an intrinsic change that is explainable by the observed features and intrinsic change that is purely residual. This failure to re-establish an interpretable basis means the resulting geometry is analytically incomplete for applied work. The following is a simple illustration.

Example 1. *Imagine a city where every possible path you can take represents a "direction."*

The Full Metric (g_f): *If you are standing at the city center, g_f measures the total statistical distance (or effort) required to move from your current spot to any new spot, regardless of whether you walk, drive, or fly. It's a measure of the total change, but it doesn't tell you how that change occurred. Following is the result.*

Coarse Structure: *It only tells you the "straight-line" distance, not the path.*

Specific, Meaningful Statistical Directions (S): *These are the clearly marked and indexed roads in the city (e.g., "Main Street," "Highway 101," "The Covariate*

¹A "direction" in the tangent space ($\mathbf{T}_f\mathbf{M}$) is formally a tangent vector h . Intuitively, h represents a way the pdf f can be perturbed or changed.

Avenue”). When you move along a specific road, you can precisely track your progress and identify the cause of the movement (e.g., you moved 5 miles along the Main Street).

2. The Computational Hurdle-The Inverse Problem and Unworkable Optimization:

The problem of mere ”intractability” is eclipsed by the computational hurdle related to the inverse of the metric. In the parametric setting (Amari’s framework), the inverse of FIM, $\mathbf{I}(\theta)^{-1}$, is the cornerstone for calculating the so-called Natural Gradient—the statistically optimal direction for gradient-based optimization. ²

In the non-parametric setting or generative processes from a latent space such as the diffusion models or various decoders, the inverse of the metric functional g_f is a highly complex integral operator. This operator is almost always impossible to analytically invert or even approximate tractably in high dimensions. Consequently, the theoretically perfect full natural gradient is computationally unusable. Consequently, while the full natural gradient is the theoretically ideal direction of steepest statistical descent (the full Natural Gradient), it remains computationally inaccessible.

The non-parametric geometry is thus paralysed in practice and only beautiful in theory; it cannot provide a usable optimization tool for modern machine learning algorithms, which desperately need an efficient gradient pre-conditioning framework.

3. The Applied Hurdle-Conflation of Information and Loss of Relevance

Perhaps the most compelling argument for the orthogonal decomposition lies in the need for statistical relevance and explainability.

²Unlike the Standard Gradient Descent (SGD), Natural Gradient Descent (NGD) is to use the parametric Fisher information matrix $I(\theta)$ as a Riemannian metric to precondition the gradient. This metric measures the ”distance” or dissimilarity between two pdfs in a way that is invariant to how the model is parametrized. See Jiang Hu et al., (2024 [5]).

In most applied contexts, we are not interested in the total statistical variation captured by g_f , which conflates signal, noise, model misspecification, and unobserved factors. Instead, we seek the variation that is attributable to the finite set of observable covariates \mathbf{x} . The full metric g_f fails to act as a geometric filter: it conflates explainable information (the signal of interest) and residual information (the statistical noise or irrelevance).

2 Fisher-Rao Metric Decomposition: Bridging Explainability of Fisher Information matrix G_f and Intractability of Infinite-Dimensional Information Geometry

2.1 The Non-Parametric Manifold and the Fisher-Rao Metric Functional

The foundation of modern Information Geometry rests upon endowing a family of probability distributions, \mathbf{M} , with a Riemannian structure. In the Amari’s influential framework, \mathbf{M} is defined parametrically, reducing the geometric analysis to the properties of the finite-dimensional parameter space Θ . However, to rigorously address problems in non-parametric statistics and high-dimensional machine learning, we must transition to the **non-parametric manifold**.

We define the **non-parametric statistical manifold**, \mathbf{M} , as the set of all probability density functions (PDFs), $f(x)$, that are sufficiently smooth and positive on \mathbb{R}^n . This formulation, derived from geometric measure theory, makes \mathbf{M} an **infinite-dimensional space**, meaning that the distribution f **cannot be indexed** by a finite vector of parameters θ .

The manifold \mathbf{M} is equipped with a **tangent space**, $T_f M$, at each point f in \mathbf{M} . A

tangent vector $h \in T_f M$ represents an infinitesimal perturbation or direction of change away from the reference distribution f . To preserve the probabilistic nature of the manifold, every tangent vector must satisfy the fundamental constraint that the perturbation preserves total probability mass:

$$\int_{R^n} h(x) dx = 0$$

The Fisher-Rao metric is a functional form. The local geometry of \mathbf{M} is defined by the **Fisher-Rao metric**. This metric is the unique Riemannian metric (up to scalar multiplication) that is invariant under smooth transformations of the underlying sample space R^n . In the non-parametric setting, the metric takes the form of an inner product functional on the tangent space.

Definition 4. (The Fisher-Rao Metric Functional g_f):

The metric g_f assigns a scalar value to a pair of tangent vectors $h_1, h_2 \in T_f M$:

$$g_f(h_1, h_2) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)} dx \quad (8)$$

The **statistical length** (or **information content**) of a single deviation h from f is given by $g_f(h, h)$. The space $(T_f M, g_f)$ forms an infinite-dimensional **Hilbert space**.

While mathematically fundamental, the metric functional g_f is the primary source of the “**intractability barrier**” discussed in the Section 1. In the parametric case, the **Fisher Information matrix** (FIM) is a local, finite matrix $I(\theta)$ whose entries are explicitly indexed by the coordinates. In contrast, the non-parametric metric g_f relies on a **global integral** over the entire domain R^n . That is, the **intractability** comes from global coupling.

This integral form fundamentally couples the variation across all dimensions of the distribution f . The measurement of **length** or **distance** is always a collective, non-local quantity. This structure prevents the metric from being analytically separable, making it impossible to **isolate** or **index** contributions along specific, meaningful statistical directions, such as those defined by a finite set of observable covariates. This lack of an intrinsic, finite coordinate

system is precisely why the standard machinery of parametric information geometry fails, necessitating the orthogonal decomposition introduced in the subsequent subsection.

In the rest of this paper, we assume that pdf function f is zero-valued at the boundaries of R^n , which implies $f(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0$ as $\|\mathbf{x}\| \rightarrow \infty$. This ensures that the product term in integration by parts vanishes.

2.2 Orthogonal decomposition of $T_f M$ and the Pythagorean Theorem

The fundamental barrier in non-parametric information geometry is that the Fisher-Rao metric exists only as an unindexed integral functional. To resolve this, we introduce a geometric structure derived from observable covariates to partition the tangent space

Definition 5. Covariate Subspace S :

*We assume a finite set of d observable features or covariates $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. The **Covariate Subspace S** is defined as the d -dimensional subspace of the tangent space $T_f M$ spanned by the score functions corresponding to these features:*

$$S = \text{span} \left\{ s_i(x) \mid s_i(x) = \frac{\partial \ln f(x)}{\partial x_i}, i = 1, \dots, n \right\} = \{w^T \nabla f \mid w \in R^n\} \subset T_f M$$

*Any tangent vector $h_S \in S$ represents a **statistical variation** that is entirely explainable by the observed covariate structure.*

Definition 6. Residual Subspace S^\perp :

*The **Residual Subspace S^\perp** is the orthogonal complement of S with respect to the **Fisher-Rao metric g_f** . It comprises all tangent vectors $\epsilon \in T_f M$ that are **g_f -orthogonal** to every vector in S :*

$$S^\perp = \{\epsilon \in T_f M \mid g_f(\epsilon, h_S) = 0 \quad \forall h_S \in S\}$$

*The residual subspace is generally infinite-dimensional and contains all the **statistical variation** related to unobserved factors, pure noise, and intrinsic structure not spanned by \mathbf{x} .*

Lemma 4. *S is a Subspace of $T_f M$*

Lemma 5. *S is a closed subspace of dimension $\leq n$ of $T_f M$ with the norm induced by g_f .*

Theorem 1. Existence and Uniqueness of the Orthogonal Decomposition of $T_f M$:

For every $h \in T_f M$, there exists a unique $\mathbf{w} \in R^n$ and a unique $\varepsilon \in S^\perp$ such that $h = \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla f + \varepsilon$, and S^\perp is the orthogonal complement of S with respect to g_f .

$$T_f M = S \oplus S^\perp \quad (9)$$

That is, to any tangent vector $h \in T_f M$, we have the existence and uniqueness of the orthogonal decomposition of h

$$h(x) = h_S(\mathbf{x}) + h_\perp(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} + \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}), \quad (10)$$

where $h_S(\mathbf{x}) \in S$ and $\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = h_\perp(\mathbf{x}) \in S^\perp$, The decomposition holds if the subspace S is a closed subspace of the Hilbert space $T_f M$ (under the norm induced by g_f) and S is finite-dimensional.

Next we consider analytic representation problem. To any two h_1 and h_2 in $T_f M$, we have tangent vectors decomposed:

$$h_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w}_1^T \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon_1(\mathbf{x}) = h_{1,S}(\mathbf{x}) + h_{1,\perp}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$h_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w}_2^T \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon_2(\mathbf{x}) = h_{2,S}(\mathbf{x}) + h_{2,\perp}(\mathbf{x})$$

where $h_{a,S} = \mathbf{w}_a^T \nabla f \in S$ (the covariate subspace) and $h_{a,\perp} = \varepsilon_a \in S^\perp$ (the orthogonal complement) for $a = 1, 2$.

Lemma 6. *Orthogonality of Mixed Terms: $g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,\perp}) = 0$ and $g_f(h_{1,\perp}, h_{2,S}) = 0$.*

Lemma 7. *$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,S}) = \mathbf{w}_1^T G_f \mathbf{w}_2$, where G_f is the matrix with entries*

$$(G_f)_{ij} = g_f \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \right)$$

Corollary 1.

$$(G_f)_{ij} = E_{X \sim f}[s_i(X)s_j(X)] \quad (11)$$

where $[s_i(X)]$ and $[s_j(X)]$ are i -th and j -th score function of log-likelihood function, $\log f(x)$.

Definition 7. In order to avoid name's conflict with the Fisher Information Matrix $I(\theta)$ for parametric pdf family, here we call the matrix $G_f = ((G_f)_{ij})_{n \times n}$ as a **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix (cFIM)** for the information geometry manifold M .

If we restrict our view of tangent vectors to S , the infinite-dimensional geometry takes on the tractable, explainable form of classical parametric geometry in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Analytical Explainability of the Covariate Metric: Let $h \in T_f M$ and h_S be its unique orthogonal projection in S . Let \mathbf{w}_h be the coefficient vector such that $h_S = \mathbf{w}_h^T \nabla f$. Then:

1. The vector \mathbf{w}_h is the unique solution to the linear equation: $\mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{w}_h = \mathbf{v}_h$, that is, if f satisfies some mild and reasonable conditions, then G_f will have inverse of matrix, then we have the coefficient solution by

$$w_h = G_f^{-1} v_h \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{v}_h is the cross-information vector with entries $(\mathbf{v}_h)_j = g_f(h, \partial_j f)$.

2. The **metric** g_f evaluated on the projected subspace becomes a finite quadratic form:

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = \mathbf{v}_h^T \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h. \quad (13)$$

This Theorem demonstrates that the covariate decomposition is **explainable**. While the original **functional metric** g_f is a "black box" integral, the metric on the subspace S behaves exactly like Amari's parametric **Fisher Information Matrix**. In this paper, we call the metric as **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix (cFIM)**. It allows us to **index**

statistical changes using concrete weights (\mathbf{w}_h), transforming abstract geometric deviations into interpretable feature-based framework.

Having established that the metric on S is analytically solvable above, we now present the geometric and statistical consequences of this structure.

Theorem 3. Pythagorean Theorem of Information *Due to the g_f -orthogonality between S and S^\perp , the total statistical information of any deviation h decomposes additively:*

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(h_S, h_S) + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon). \quad (14)$$

Therefore the total statistical information (squared distance) of the perturbation h is precisely the sum of the **Explainable Information** ($g_f(h_S, h_S)$) and the **Residual Information** ($g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$). This is the geometric justification for the **Information Capture Ratio** (R) later. It proves that we can precisely quantify what fraction of the total statistical information is "explainable" by our features ($g_f(h_S, h_S)$) and what remains as unexplainable part or noise ($g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$).

To the conventional **parametric information geometry**, it only owns the first explainable part so that theory and applications to the parametric information geometry are much easy relatively, by comparing with that of the **nonparametric information geometry**.

3 Information Geometric Foundation of G-Entropy

While the matrix \mathbf{G}_f established in Section 2 provides the analytical coordinate system for non-parametric manifolds, we require a scalar invariant to measure the magnitude of the information captured. This section proves that **G-entropy** in Cheng and Tong (2023) in [4], serves this role by acting as the trace of the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix.

3.1 The Trace Theorem and Definition of G-Entropy

By restricting the infinite-dimensional geometry to the finite covariate subspace S , we can characterize the "total information" of the explainable system through the matrix trace.

Definition 8. G-Entropy $H_G(f)$ We formally define the G-entropy $H_G(f)$ of a smoothing probability density f as the expectation of the squared norm of the score function relative to the observable covariates:

$$H_G(f) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f}[\|\nabla \log f(X)\|^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (15)$$

Theorem 4. Identity of G-Entropy

The G-entropy $H_G(f)$ is identically equal to the **trace** of the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f :

$$H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f). \quad (16)$$

The identity proves that G-entropy is a **geometric scalar invariant** of the statistical manifold M restricted to the observable subspace S . Because the trace is the sum of the eigenvalues, $H_G(f)$ rigorously quantifies the total cumulative curvature or **Total Explainable Statistical Information** captured by the system's observable features.

3.2 Interpretation as Total Explainable Statistical Information

The proof of the Identity Theorem allows us to move beyond heuristic definitions of the G-entropy and provides a clear physical and geometric meaning for $H_G(f)$.

- **Analytical Explainability of Information:** Just as the Analytical Explainability of the Covariate Metric Theorem showed that the metric $g_f(h_S, h_S)$ is solvable via matrix algebra, the G-entropy shows that the **Total Statistical Information** of the subspace S is solvable as a simple scalar invariant. It represents the sum of the statistical information **lengths** along all observable feature directions.

- **Spectral Decomposition:** In terms of the **eigenvalues** (λ_k) of \mathbf{G}_f , the G-entropy represents the **total variance** captured across all principal statistical directions:

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k(\mathbf{G}_f). \quad (17)$$

If the **Manifold Hypothesis(MH)** holds, these eigenvalues decay rapidly, and $H_G(f)$ represents the information concentrated on the **core low-dimensional manifold** D which we will come back in more details later the MH section.

By using G_f and $H_G(f)$ tools, it will provide a new powerful information geometric method to study the Manifold Hypothesis problems.

3.3 Application to Generative AI and Gradient Regularization

The analytical link between $H_G(f)$ and \mathbf{G}_f provides a rigorous foundation for its use in modern generative statistics, such as diffusion models and score matching.

- **Metric for Informational Budget:** $H_G(f)$ measures the "cost" (in terms of information distance) of moving a unit distance in the **covariate space**. In generative modeling, a high G-entropy indicates a steep, high-information density region where **generative algorithms** must take precise, small steps to remain on the manifold.
- **Geometric Regularization:** By proving $H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f)$, we justify its use as a regularizer. Minimizing **G-entropy** during the training of score-based models is **equivalent** to constrain the total information of the score functions, which promotes the learning of "**statistically smooth**" distributions that are easier to sample from via such as the Langevin dynamics.
- **Relationship to Preconditioning:** While the matrix \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} is used to "correct" or precondition the update direction in the Analytical Explainability of the Covariate Metric Theorem, the trace $H_G(f)$ provides a robust scalar diagnostic of the **local sampling difficulty** before the full matrix inverse is calculated.

In the next section, we will show linking this "Explainable Information" (G_f and G-entropy) to the global KL-divergence and showing how their second derivatives are geometrically identical.

4 The Relationships Between KL-Divergence, G-Entropy, and Metric Curvature

Here by applying the "Analytical Explainability" logic, we demonstrate that the **G-entropy** and the **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix** (G_f) are not isolated definitions, but are the computable realizations of the local curvature of the KL divergence.

4.1 The Fisher Information Metric as the Local Hessian of KL-Divergence

Recall that, in Information Geometry, a smooth curve f_t on the statistical manifold M and its associated tangent vector h are defined as follows:

Definition 9. Smooth Curve (f_t): *A smooth curve f_t (or $f(x, t)$) is a one-parameter family of probability density functions on the manifold M . This curve must satisfy two conditions for t in a neighborhood of 0:*

1. **Normalization:** $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) dx = 1$ for all t .
2. **Smoothness:** $f_t(x)$ is a C^∞ function of the parameter t . The curve starts at the reference distribution f , meaning $f_{t=0} = f$.

Definition 10. Associate Tangent Vector (\mathbf{h}): ³ *The tangent vector $\mathbf{h} \in T_f M$ is defined as the instantaneous rate of change of the density function along the curve at $t = 0$:*

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = \left. \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0}$$

Lemma 8. The Zero First Derivative of KL Divergence: *The first derivative of the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the reference density f and a perturbed density f_t with respect to the parameter t , evaluated at $t = 0$, is identically zero:*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f || f_t) \right|_{t=0} = 0$$

To formally prove that the Fisher Information is the second derivative of the KL divergence, we need to introduce and prove a lemma that relates the second derivative of $\log f_t$ to the score function and the tangent vector.

Lemma 9. Second Derivative of Log-Likelihood

The second derivative of $\log f_t$ with respect to t , evaluated at $t = 0$, is equal to the derivative of the tangent score function minus the square of the tangent score function.

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{\partial s_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} - s(x)^2 \quad (18)$$

Where $s_t(x) = \frac{\partial \log f_t(x)}{\partial t}$ and $s(x) = \frac{\partial \log f(x)}{\partial t}$ (the score function of h).

Lemma 10. Zero Mean of the Second Derivative of the Tangent Density

he expectation of the second derivative of the density function f_t with respect to t , scaled by $1/f$, must integrate to zero at $t = 0$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[\left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} \right] dx = 0$$

³Since the curve f_t must preserve normalization for all t , the tangent vector \mathbf{h} must satisfy the zero-integral constraint:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{h}(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left. \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} dx = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) dx \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (1) \Big|_{t=0} = 0$$

Theorem 5. Fisher Information as the Second Derivative of KL-Divergence

The Fisher-Rao metric g_f , evaluated for a tangent vector $\mathbf{h} \in T_f M$, is exactly equal to the second-order Taylor expansion coefficient of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, or equivalently, the second derivative of the KL divergence evaluated at $t = 0$:

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f || f_t) \right|_{t=0} \quad (19)$$

4.2 Geometric Identity: G-Entropy as the Sum of KL Hessians

By restricting the tangent space to the covariate subspace S , we can link the **G-entropy** directly to the directional curvatures of the KL divergence along observable paths. We define a family of curves $f_{i,t}$ in M corresponding to perturbations along each covariate direction x_i .

To evaluate the curvature in the direction of the i -th covariate x_i , we define a smooth curve $f_{i,t}$ that describes an infinitesimal statistical perturbation driven only by the score function $\partial \log f / \partial x_i$.

Definition 11. Covariate Perturbation Curve $f_{i,t}$:

For each covariate x_i , we define a smooth curve $f_{i,t}$ starting at f ($f_{i,0} = f$), where the tangent vector \mathbf{h}_i at $t = 0$ is proportional to the score function $s_i(x)$:

$$\mathbf{h}_i(x) = \left. \frac{\partial f_{i,t}(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \quad \text{such that the score function is} \quad s_i(x) = \frac{\mathbf{h}_i(x)}{f(x)} = \frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x_i}$$

Since the score function $s_i(x)$ is one of the basis vectors of the covariate subspace S , this curve defines a geodesic path whose length is governed by the i -th diagonal element of \mathbf{G}_f .

Theorem 6. G-Entropy and the KL Second Derivative:

The G-entropy $H_G(f)$ is equal to the sum of the second derivatives of the KL divergence $D_{KL}(f || f_{i,t})$ evaluated along each covariate perturbation curve $f_{i,t}$.

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f || f_{i,t}) \right|_{t=0} \quad (20)$$

This result provides a deep theoretical grounding for **G-entropy**: it is the **total cumulative curvature of the KL divergence across all observable covariate dimensions**. It quantifies the "**Total Explainable Statistical Information**" as the sum of the local **sensitivities** of the log-likelihood.

4.3 The Third-Order Geometry and the Origin of Asymmetry of KL Divergence

While the second derivative (the metric) provides a symmetric measure of distance, the global KL divergence is **inherently asymmetric** ($D_{KL}(p||q) \neq D_{KL}(q||p)$). This asymmetry is captured by the third derivative of the divergence, known as the Amari-Chentsov Cubic Tensor $T(h, h, h)$.

The Cubic Tensor measures the statistical **skewness** of the score function and acts as the sole geometric obstruction to a manifold being "**dually flat**". It quantifies the **non-Riemannian structure** that causes the exponential connection ($\nabla^{(1)}$) and the mixture connection ($\nabla^{(-1)}$) to diverge. Specifically, the **difference** between forward and reverse KL divergences is determined entirely by this third-order tensor.

In classical differential geometry, the **connection** (∇) defines how to differentiate vector fields along a curve, dictating the manifold's **geodesic paths**. In Information Geometry, the **non-symmetric** nature of the KL divergence **necessitates** a family of dual connections, known as the α -connections.

Definition 12. α -Connection ($\nabla^{(\alpha)}$)⁴

The $\nabla^{(1)}$ connection is defined by the following covariant derivative acting on tangent vectors \mathbf{h}_1 in the direction of \mathbf{h}_2 :

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{h}_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{h}_2 \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}_2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{h}_1}{f} \right) \cdot f \quad (21)$$

⁴Please notice. Here we are considering non-parametric statistical manifold M , not conventional finite-dimensional parametric manifold M_θ

More practically, using the tangent score function $s_1 = \mathbf{h}_1/f$:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{h}_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{h}_2 \cdot \left(\frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \mathbf{h}_2} \right) \cdot f + \mathbf{h}_1 \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{h}_2}{f} \right) \quad (22)$$

The $\nabla^{(1)}$ connection is **torsion-free** and its geodesics are curves where the score function \mathbf{h}/f changes linearly.

Definition 13. Mixture Connection ($\nabla^{(-1)}$)

The $\nabla^{(-1)}$ connection is defined by the following covariant derivative:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{h}_2}^{(-1)} \mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{h}_2 \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}_2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{h}_1}{f} \right) \cdot f + \mathbf{h}_1 \cdot \left(\frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \mathbf{h}_2} \right) \cdot f - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}_1 \cdot \mathbf{h}_2 \cdot \frac{1}{f} \quad (23)$$

*The $\nabla^{(-1)}$ connection is **torsion-free** and its geodesics are curves where the density function f changes linearly (a "mixture" of densities).*

Definition 14. Amari-Chentsov Cubic Tensor (T)

The Cubic Tensor $T(h, h, h)$ is the third-order derivative of the KL divergence along the curve f_t :

$$T(h, h, h) = \left. \frac{d^3}{dt^3} D_{KL}(f || f_t) \right|_{t=0} \quad (24)$$

Lemma 11. Zero Third-Order Constraint Term

The integral term involving the third derivative of the curve density f_t and the log-density f , which arises in the calculation of the third derivative of the reverse KL divergence, is identically zero at $t = 0$:

$$\mathcal{C}_3 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left. \frac{\partial^3 f_t(x)}{\partial t^3} \right|_{t=0} \log f(x) dx = 0$$

Lemma 12. Third Derivative of Reverse KL Divergence

The third derivative of the reverse KL divergence, $D_{KL}(f_t || f)$, evaluated at $t = 0$, is equal to the negative of the Cubic Tensor:

$$\left. \frac{d^3}{dt^3} D_{KL}(f_t || f) \right|_{t=0} = -T(h, h, h)$$

Theorem 7. Asymmetry Identity of KL Divergence

The third-order difference between the forward and reverse Kullback-Leibler divergences is entirely determined by the **Amari-Chentsov Cubic Tensor** $T(h, h, h)$:

$$\left. \frac{d^3}{dt^3} D_{KL}(f || f_t) \right|_{t=0} - \left. \frac{d^3}{dt^3} D_{KL}(f_t || f) \right|_{t=0} = 2T(h, h, h). \quad (25)$$

Example 2. Manifold where $T(h, h, h) = 0$ (The Exponential Family)

Exponential families are defined by the property that the **Exponential Connection** $(\nabla^{(1)})$ is flat.

A statistical manifold M is $\nabla^{(\alpha)}$ -flat if and only if the α -connection is zero, which is equivalent to saying that the **Amari-Chentsov Cubic Tensor** T is zero when viewed in the coordinate system of the exponential family (the θ -coordinates).

Since the Normal family $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ is an exponential family, it is dually flat.

$$T(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = 0$$

Example 3. Manifold where $T(h, h, h) \neq 0$ (The Mixture Family)

We consider the family of Bernoulli distributions, where the probability of success is p . This family can be viewed as both an exponential family (parameterized by $\log(\frac{p}{1-p})$) and a mixture family (parameterized by p itself).

If we define the curve f_t in the mixture parameter p (which is the η -coordinate), the geometric properties change.

Geometric Property: Mixture Flatness and Exponential Curvature

When parameterized by the mixture parameter p , the manifold exhibits **non-zero Exponential Curvature**. Its geometric property is of mixture flatness and exponential curvature

For the Bernoulli family parameterized by p , the component of the Cubic Tensor T_{111} is known to be non-zero:

$$T_{111} = \frac{(1 - 2p)^2}{p^2(1 - p)^2}$$

Since $p \in (0, 1)$, T_{111} is strictly positive (unless $p = 1/2$). Therefore, along a perturbation \mathbf{h} in the p direction:

$$T(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \neq 0$$

5 The Covariate Semi-Parametric Efficiency Framework

This section establishes the equivalence between the geometric information structure of the covariates (\mathbf{G}_f) and the statistical bound provided by the Efficient Fisher Information Matrix (\mathbf{I}_{eff}), demonstrating its role as the canonical semi-parametric efficiency metric.

The ultimate validation of any information-theoretic metric lies in its ability to dictate the **fundamental limits** of statistical estimation. For the parametric Fisher Information Matrix (FIM), this role is fulfilled by the **Cramer-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)**. However, in a purely non-parametric framework, the CRLB faces a "**crisis of dimensionality**." Because the non-parametric manifold M is infinite-dimensional, the variance of an arbitrary estimator can be influenced by infinite nuisance directions, typically rendering the Fisher Information operator **non-invertible** and the resulting bound zero.

This section demonstrates that the **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix** (\mathbf{G}_f) provides the complete resolution to this intractability by serving as the bridge to **Semi-Parametric Efficiency**.

In a pure non-parametric setting, where we seek to estimate a functional of a density f **without** any structural assumptions, the "**Information**" is spread across an infinite-dimensional tangent space $T_f M$. If one attempts to define a CRLB for the entire space, the resulting metric functional g_f acts as an operator that cannot be inverted in a way that yields a finite variance bound. Mathematically, the "**noise**" from the unobserved, infinite-dimensional residual space S^\perp overwhelms the signal. This is why pure non-parametric estimation is often regarded as an "**ill-posed**" problem in classical inference.

5.1 Parametric Space Partition and Nuisance Tangent Space

We begin by applying the principle of orthogonal decomposition to the parameter space Θ to define the statistical target of interest.

Definition 15. Parameter Space and Partition

The parameter space Θ for the statistical model \mathcal{M} is defined by the set of all density functions f parametrized by the pair $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$:

$$\Theta = \{(\boldsymbol{\theta}(f), \boldsymbol{\eta}(f)) \mid f \in M\} \quad (26)$$

- **Parameter of Interest ($\boldsymbol{\theta}$):** The finite-dimensional vector of coefficients, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{T}(f) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathbf{T} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous functional mapping the non-parametric distribution f to the parameter value.
- **Infinite-Dimensional Nuisance ($\boldsymbol{\eta}$):** The function or collection of functions that defines the residual distribution structure, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{H}(f) \in \mathbf{H}$. (e.g., L^2).

Definition 16. (Nuisance Tangent Space $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$)

The **Nuisance Tangent Space** ($T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$) is the closed linear span (**CLSP**) in the Hilbert space $L^2(f)$ of all scores corresponding to local perturbations in the nuisance parameter $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, holding $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ fixed:

$$T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}} = \text{CLSP} \left\{ \frac{\partial \log f(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\eta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}} \right\}$$

Example 4. Partially Linear Model (PLM) Coefficients:

Consider the data $X = (Y, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, where Y is the response, \mathbf{x} are the covariates of interest, and \mathbf{z} are nuisance covariates.

$$\text{Model: } Y = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{x} + g(\mathbf{z}) + \epsilon$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the vector of linear coefficients. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be defined by the functional that minimizes the expected squared residual after projecting Y onto the space spanned by \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{z} .

A common definition of $\boldsymbol{\theta}(f)$ relies on the property that the error must be orthogonal to \mathbf{x} (after projecting out \mathbf{z} 's influence):

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(f) \text{ solves: } \mathbb{E}_f[(Y - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[Y | \mathbf{z}]) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}] = \mathbf{0}$$

Where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is the part of \mathbf{x} orthogonal to the space spanned by $g(\mathbf{z})$. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is clearly a functional of the joint density f .

Example 5. Average Treatment Effect (ATE) in Causal Inference: The parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ might be a single value, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, representing the Average Treatment Effect of a binary treatment A on a **potential outcome** Y , adjusting for covariates \mathbf{x} .

$$\theta(f) = \mathbb{E}_f[Y | A = 1, \mathbf{x}] - \mathbb{E}_f[Y | A = 0, \mathbf{x}]$$

This is clearly a functional that depends on the entire conditional density $f(Y | A, \mathbf{x})$. The efficiency of estimating θ requires accounting for the nuisance functionals $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ (which include the propensity score and the outcome regression function).

Example 6. Generalized Linear Models (GLM) with Non-Parametric Link:

Suppose we are estimating coefficients $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in a generalized linear model, but the link function h is unknown ($\boldsymbol{\eta}$):

$$\text{Model: } \mathbb{E}[Y | \mathbf{x}] = h(\boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{x})$$

The parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is often defined by the Nuisance-Free Moment Condition (the Efficient Estimating Equation). This condition is derived by ensuring the estimating function is orthogonal to the nuisance tangent space $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$. The resulting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is implicitly defined as a functional of the true density f .

5.2 The Semi-Parametric Bridge and Geometric Alignment

In this sub-section, we transition from the purely geometric properties of the density manifold M to the statistical problem of estimating a finite-dimensional parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in the

presence of an infinite-dimensional nuisance $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. This bridge is constructed by aligning the statistical optimum (the efficient score) with the geometric observable (the covariate score).

In this section, we only focus to the context of semi-parametric theory and this geometric framework, and are primarily concerned with the estimation Efficiency problem.

From geometric point of view, efficiency is about the **curvature** of the manifold. A "sharper" curvature (higher \mathbf{G}_f) means the density changes rapidly with respect to the covariates, making $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ easier to estimate with high precision.

Statistical consistence is about **direction** (are we hitting the target?), while Efficiency is about **spread** (how tight is our cluster around the target?). This subsection is dedicated to proving that the "tightest possible cluster" is determined by the metric tensor \mathbf{G}_f .

Definition 17. The Efficient Score and Efficient Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{I}_{eff} :

Let $\mathbf{T} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous functional such that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{T}(f)$. In the semi-parametric model \mathcal{M} , the tangent space $T_f M$ is decomposed into the Nuisance Tangent Space $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and its orthogonal complement - Efficient Tangent Space.

1. **Efficient Tangent Space:** *The orthogonal complement of the Nuisance Tangent Space $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$ with respect to the Fisher-Rao metric g_f is the **Efficient Tangent Space:** $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}^\perp$.*
2. **Efficient Score Function (s_{eff}):** *The Efficient Score Function for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the **unique element** of the Efficient Tangent Space that corresponds to the score for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. It is defined as the **projection** of the full score $s_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \partial \log f / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$ onto $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}^\perp$:*

$$s_{eff} = s_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{s}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \tag{27}$$

where $\tilde{s}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is the projection of $s_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ onto $T_{\perp, \boldsymbol{\eta}}$ since $s_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = s_{eff} + \tilde{s}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$.

3. **Efficient Fisher Information Matrix⁵ ($\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$):** *This is the covariance matrix of*

⁵In semi-parametric statistics theory, \mathbf{I}_{eff}^{-1} represents the "**Information Bound**"—the smallest possible asymptotic variance achievable by any regular estimator (Bickel et al., 1993 in [6])

the *Efficient Score*:

$$\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_f[s_{eff}s_{eff}^T] \quad (28)$$

Assumption 1. The Geometric Alignment Postulate

We assume the statistical estimation problem is **geometrically aligned** with the covariate structure of the data. Specifically, we assume the projection of the signal onto the subspace orthogonal to the nuisance is exactly captured by the covariate score:

$$s_{eff,i} = s_{x_i} = \frac{\partial \log f(X)}{\partial x_i} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \quad (29)$$

This Assumption 1 is essentially stating that the way θ affects the distribution is ”**mirrored**” by the way the covariates x span the distribution. Here we briefly discuss why the assumption of the geometric alignment is reasonable from both statistical and geometric points of view.

The semi-parametric efficiency is a hard-won result of functional analysis, that is, to project scores onto nuisance tangent spaces. The assumption claims that this complex projection is simply equal to the gradient of the log-density with respect to the data ($s_{\mathbf{x}}$) may let some statisticians have a bit surprise. Indeed, it is not and is natural.

Statistical and information justifications to the assumption 1:

1. The Statistical Inference Justification: ”The Clean Signal”

From a purely statistical perspective, this assumption is a statement about the ancillarity of the data coordinates.

In semi-parametric theory, the Efficient Score (s_{eff}) is the ”**clean**” part of the signal—the part of the likelihood change that cannot be explained away by any variation in the nuisance $\boldsymbol{\eta}$.

- **Core logic:** In most regression-like problems, we assume that the ”noise” (nuisance) is **independent** of the ”features” (covariates). If the distribution of the

noise does not change when we move the covariates, then the sensitivity of the **likelihood** to the covariates is the **signal**.

- **Why it's reasonable?** If $s_{eff} = s_{\mathbf{x}}$, it means that the way the data \mathbf{x} "**spreads/diffuses**" the density is exactly the way the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ "**identifies**" the density. If this weren't true, it would imply that the covariates are "contaminated" by the nuisance, making it impossible to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ without first perfectly modeling the infinite-dimensional $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. In practice, we only build models where we believe the covariates provide a clear, interpretable path to the parameter.

2. The Information Geometry Justification: "The Metric of Nature"

From the perspective of Information Geometry (Fisher-Rao metric), the Covariate Fisher Information \mathbf{G}_f is the **intrinsic curvature** of the data manifold.

- **Core logic:** Information Geometry treats the density f as a point on a manifold. The "**distance**" between two densities is measured by how much the log-density changes.
- **The Geometric Bridge:** The assumption asserts that the **Statistical Manifold** (the space of parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$) and the **Data Manifold** (the space of observations \mathbf{x}) are **locally isometric**.
- **Why it's reasonable** In physics and geometry, we expect the laws governing a system to be invariant under coordinate transformations. If our statistical model is "**natural**," the **information** we gain by changing the parameter should be the same as the **information** we see by looking at the variance of the data coordinates. $s_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the "Geometric Score." **Aligning** it with s_{eff} is simply saying that the **geometry** of the data and the **geometry** of the information are the same thing.

3. Why is it true "in most cases"?

- **Exponential Families:** In any natural exponential family (Gaussian, Poisson, Binomial), the **sufficient statistics** are tied directly to the **covariates**. In these cases, the derivatives with respect to the parameter and the data are mathematically linked by the form of the density (often just a sign change or a constant scale)
- **The Information-Dominant Regime:** In modern high-dimensional statistics and Machine Learning, we assume that the covariates \mathbf{x} are "rich" enough to capture the entire structure of the signal. In this regime, the nuisance $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ becomes "white noise" relative to the "structured signal" of \mathbf{x} . When signal and noise are separated this way, the projection of the score onto the nuisance-orthogonal space naturally collapses onto the covariate directions.

Theorem 8. The Geometric Efficiency Identity

Under the assumption of Geometric Alignment, the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f is identical to the Efficient Fisher Information Matrix $\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$:

$$\mathbf{G}_f = \mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (30)$$

Example 7. The Gaussian Case for geometric efficiency identity

To demonstrate that Assumption 1 is a natural structural property rather than a restrictive one, consider the Gaussian family $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \eta)$ where θ (mean) is the parameter of interest and $\eta = \sigma^2$ (variance) is the nuisance.

1. **The Geometry of the Nuisance:** *The nuisance score $s_\eta = \frac{(x-\theta)^2}{2\eta^2} - \frac{1}{2\eta}$ spans the space of "scale-like" perturbations. In the $L^2(f)$ Hilbert space, this score is a quadratic function of $(x - \theta)$.*
2. **The Statistical Signal:** *The efficient score s_{eff} must be orthogonal to s_η . In the Gaussian case, the parametric score $s_\theta = \frac{x-\theta}{\eta}$ (a linear function) is already orthogonal*

to the quadratic nuisance score s_η because the third central moment of a Gaussian is zero. Thus, no projection (subtraction) is needed: $s_{eff} = s_\theta$.

3. **The Geometric Observable:** *The covariate score*

$$s_x = \frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x} = -\frac{x - \theta}{\eta}$$

4. **The Alignment Result:** *We observe that s_{eff} and s_x span the exact same one-dimensional subspace in $T_f M$. Their magnitudes are identical, and their information content is equivalent:*

$$\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[s_{eff}^2] = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}, \quad \mathbf{G}_f = \mathbb{E}[s_x^2] = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$$

*This example shows that for the most fundamental distribution in statistics, the alignment between the optimal estimation direction (s_{eff}) and the data-sensitivity direction (s_x) is a **built-in geometric property**. The assumption simply **generalizes** this symmetry to the semi-parametric manifold.*

5.3 The Geometry of RAL Estimators and Information Projection by the tangent space decomposition

In semi-parametric theory (See Bickel et al in [6] for example), the **RAL (Regular Asymptotically Linear) condition** is the bridge that connects an estimator's performance to the Hilbert space geometry of the tangent space.

Without this condition, an estimator could behave "erratically" (like the Hodges' estimator), making the Cramér-Rao bound meaningless. Next we will show how RAL interacts specifically with our geometric manifold.

An estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is **asymptotically linear** if there exists a function $\boldsymbol{\psi}(X)$, called the **influence function**, such that:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\psi}(X_i) + o_p(1)$$

.

In the $L^2(f)$ Hilbert space, the influence function $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ must be an element of the Tangent Space $T_f M$.

An estimator is **regular** if its limiting distribution is locally stable under small perturbations of the true distribution P .

Specifically, consider a "local" sequence of distributions $P_{n,h}$ that approaches P at a rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$ along a direction g in the tangent space (formally, a Hellinger-differentiable path). An estimator is regular if:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta(P_{n,h})) \xrightarrow{d} L \quad \text{under } P_{n,h}$$

where the limiting distribution L is the **same** for every local path h .

Regularity rules out "superefficient" estimators like **Hodges' estimator**, which performs exceptionally well at one specific parameter value but breaks down completely under the slightest perturbation. In the context of your manifold, regularity ensures the estimator respects the **Fisher-Rao metric** and doesn't exploit "twists" in the geometry.

Definition 18. A **RAL** estimator is an estimator which satisfies the two distinct mathematical properties: **Asymptotic Linearity** and **Regularity**.

Lemma 13. Influence Function Projection

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ be a RAL estimator with influence function $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in T_f M$. Under Assumption 1, the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is **minimized** if and only if $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}} = S$, where the covariate space S is given in Section 2.

5.4 The Covariate Cramér-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)

Having established that the optimal influence function must reside in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we now derive the explicit form of the lower bound.

Lemma 14. The Canonical Influence Function

Under Assumption 1, the unique influence function ψ^ that minimizes variance in $T_f M$ is:*

$$\psi^* = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} s_{\mathbf{x}}$$

Theorem 9. The Covariate CRLB

*Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ be any **RAL** estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Under Assumption 1, the asymptotic covariance matrix satisfies:*

$$\text{AsyCov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \geq \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \quad (31)$$

where \mathbf{G}_f is the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix.

where the symbol \geq denotes the Loewner partial order on the space of symmetric matrices.

Here we propose a procedure to estimate this geometric bound directly from data, serving as an "efficiency standard" benchmark for any applied estimator.

Geometric Efficiency Estimation Procedure: Given an i.i.d. sample $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ from an unknown density f ,

1. **Non-Parametric Learning:** Estimate the joint density $\hat{f}_n(\mathbf{x})$ using a consistent non-parametric method (e.g., Kernel Density Estimation).
2. **Geometric Metric Extraction:** Compute the empirical covariate scores $\hat{s}_{\mathbf{x}} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log \hat{f}_n$ and the empirical Covariate Information Matrix:

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{s}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{X}_i) \hat{s}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{X}_i)^T]$$

3. **Bound Calculation:** Compute the Estimated Covariate CRLB: $\widehat{\text{CRLB}} = [\hat{\mathbf{G}}_n]^{-1}$.
4. **Efficiency Testing:** For a candidate estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ with estimated variance $\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$, calculate the efficiency ratio:

$$\text{Eff} = \frac{\text{Trace}(\widehat{\text{CRLB}})}{\text{Trace}(\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))}$$

If $\text{Eff} \approx 1$, the estimator extracts all geometrically available **information**.

5.5 Existence and Invertibility of the Metric Tensor \mathbf{G}_f

The Covariate Fisher Information Matrix is defined as the Gram matrix of the covariate scores:

$$\mathbf{G}_f = \mathbb{E}_f[s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T]$$

where $s_{\mathbf{x}} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log f(X)$ are the scores in the tangent space $T_f M$.

Theorem 10. The Linear Independence Condition

*The matrix \mathbf{G}_f is **invertible** (positive definite) if and only if the set of covariate score functions $\{s_{x_1}, \dots, s_{x_d}\}$ is linearly independent in the Hilbert space $L^2(f)$.*

Hence, \mathbf{G}_f is invertible if and only if $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is linearly independent.

6 The Manifold Hypothesis and the Infinite Dimensional Statistical Manifold

The goal of the **statistical manifold** M is to capture the geometry of all possible statistical variation (entropy, randomness). However, the **price for this universality** is opacity. In applications like **manifold learning or shape analysis**, one needs to define efficient operations (like means, principal components, or clustering) on the manifold. The

intractability of the full metric g_f means these operations cannot be performed directly on M , rendering the manifold a theoretical "black-box" for practical data analysis.

The **Manifold Hypothesis (MH)** is the central axiom/assumption of modern representation learning and high-dimensional data analysis. It posits that high-dimensional data, such as images or linguistic vectors, do not fill the ambient space uniformly but instead lie on or near a **low-dimensional manifold** M_l . While this hypothesis justifies the use of dimensionality reduction and deep neural networks, it is often treated as an empirical assumption rather than a measurable geometric property.

6.1 Statistical Observability and Alignment of the Core Manifold M_l under the Manifold Hypothesis (MH)

Definition 19. Manifold Hypothesis (MH)

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ be the observed data living in the ambient space, distributed according to the smooth probability density function f . The Manifold Hypothesis (MH) asserts that there exists a low-dimensional differentiable manifold $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ with intrinsic dimension $d \ll n$ such that the probability mass of the data distribution f is highly concentrated on or very near D .

$$MH \iff \int_{\mathbf{R}^n \setminus N_\delta(D)} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx 0 \quad \text{for a small neighborhood } N_\delta(D),$$

where $N_\delta(D)$ is the δ -neighborhood of D .

To use the information-geometric tools on the density f , we must define the statistical representation of the geometric manifold D and establish the link between its intrinsic information and the observable coordinates.

Definition 20. Statistical Signal Manifold Tangent Subspace (M_l)

Let the geometric manifold D be locally parameterized by the smooth embedding $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{y})$, where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ are the intrinsic coordinates ($d < n$). The Statistical Signal Manifold Tangent

Subspace (M_l) is the subspace of the full tangent space $T_f\mathcal{M}$ spanned by the scores with respect to the intrinsic manifold coordinates \mathbf{y} :

$$M_l = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_d\} \subset T_f\mathcal{M},$$

where the basis vectors u_j are the intrinsic scores:

$$u_j = \frac{\partial \ln f(\mathbf{X})}{\partial y_j}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Definition 21. Observable Covariate Subspace (S)

The Observable Covariate Subspace (S) is the n -dimensional subspace of $T_f\mathcal{M}$ spanned by the scores with respect to the ambient data coordinates \mathbf{x} :

$$S = \text{span}\{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \subset T_f\mathcal{M},$$

where $s_i = \frac{\partial \ln f(\mathbf{X})}{\partial x_i}$, and n is the ambient dimension.

For the Fisher-Rao metric decomposition to effectively study the MH, we must make the following **feasible assumptions** that mathematically link the unknown low-dimensional signal (M_l) to the observable ambient information (S) and confirm the statistical validity of the MH.

- **Assumption 1: Statistical Sufficiency (Subspace Inclusion)**

$$M_l \subset S.$$

- **Rationale:** The **statistical variation** along the low-dimensional manifold D (represented by M_l) must be contained within the information captured by the ambient data coordinates $\{x_i\}$.
- **Justification:** This is guaranteed by the **Chain Rule** applied to the scores, which confirms the signal is measurable in the \mathbf{x} -coordinates. The basis vectors u_j are linear combinations of the s_i :

$$u_j = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \left(\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j} \right).$$

- **Assumption 2: Statistical Separability (The Core MH Premise)** For any statistically relevant $h \in T_f\mathcal{M}$, the residual component is **negligible**:

$$g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \approx 0,$$

where $\varepsilon = h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)$, and $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is the **orthogonal projection** onto M_l .

- **Rationale:** The hypothesis is that the full, infinite-dimensional statistical variation of the density ($T_f\mathcal{M}$) is **effectively captured** by the low-dimensional manifold's tangent space (M_l). The noise or unexplained variation must be **negligible**.
- **Justification:** This assumption **transforms** the geometric MH ("data lives near D ") into an information-geometric statement ("all information is contained in M_l "). This is the key link that allows the geometric decomposition to measure the **validity of the MH**.

- **Assumption 3: Low-Rank Efficiency of I_D**

The **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix (cFIM)**, I_D , of the manifold D is full rank d where

$$(I_D)_{jk} = g_f(u_j, u_k) = E_f[u_j u_k].$$

This ensures that M_l has dimension d and that the statistical information along the manifold is **non-degenerate**.

- **Rationale:** The d intrinsic coordinates \mathbf{y} must be non-redundant. The metric on M_l must be full rank d , confirming the low dimensionality is **efficient** and not merely an arbitrary choice.

The three core assumptions regarding the **Statistical Observability and Alignment of the Core Manifold M_l** under the Manifold Hypothesis (MH) have profound implications for translating the geometric MH into a rigorous, testable statistical framework.

- **Implication of Assumption 1: Statistical Sufficiency** ($M_l \subset S$)

Assumption 1 ensures that the low-dimensional signal space M_l (defined by intrinsic parameters \mathbf{y}) is entirely contained within the observable covariate space S (defined by ambient data \mathbf{x}). The implication is **Statistical Observability**. The true signal of the manifold is, in principle, perfectly detectable through the high-dimensional data gradients. If this were not true, the intrinsic manifold variations would be statistically invisible in the \mathbf{x} -coordinate system, making machine learning impossible without explicitly knowing the manifold embedding $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{y})$. Since the Chain Rule dictates this inclusion, the signal is guaranteed to be measurable within the ambient system.

- **Implication of Assumption 2: Statistical Separability** ($g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \approx 0$)

Assumption 2 is the engine that converts the geometric MH into a quantitative statistical statement. The implication is **Information Concentration**. By asserting that the information of the residual component ϵ (orthogonal to M_l) is negligible, the hypothesis formally states that all relevant statistical information of the density f is captured by the low-dimensional signal space M_l . This provides the **formal, testable meaning of the MH**: the complexity of the full distribution can be almost entirely explained by the complexity of the d -dimensional manifold model. Furthermore, a large residual signals either model misspecification or a high degree of **statistical curvature** in the distribution \mathcal{M} that cannot be captured by the linear tangent space M_l , contradicting the simple structure implied by the MH (Theorem 2). Furthermore, under this separability assumption, the **Information Capture Coefficient R** will satisfy

$$R \approx 1 = 100\%.$$

- **Implication of Assumption 3: Low-Rank Efficiency** ($\text{rank}(I_D) = d$)

Assumption 3—the full rank of the intrinsic Fisher Information Matrix I_D (the metric

on M_l)—implies that the core dimension d is **Non-Redundant**. Each of the d intrinsic dimensions is statistically necessary and independent, maximizing the information captured per dimension. This leads to the operational implication that the intrinsic dimension d of the manifold is precisely given by the **effective rank** of the relevant Fisher Information Matrix (Lemma 1). By combining this with Assumption 1 and 2, the problem of finding the unknown dimension d of the geometric manifold D is rigorously simplified to calculating the number of significant eigenvalues of the observable metric \mathbf{G}_f , providing a concrete procedure for **intrinsic dimension estimation**.

6.2 The Statistical Decomposition of Information: Measuring Core Manifold Dominance under the Manifold Hypothesis

We use the established framework:

- **Space:** Tangent space $T_f\mathcal{M}$, a Hilbert space with inner product $g_f(u, v) = E_f[uv]$.
- **Subspaces:**
 - **Signal Manifold** M_l (dimension d): $M_l = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_d\}$, where $u_j = \partial \ln f / \partial y_j$.
 - **Covariate Space** S (dimension n): $S = \text{span}\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, where $s_i = \partial \ln f / \partial x_i$.
- **Assumptions:**
 - **A1 (Sufficiency):** $M_l \subset S$.
 - **A2 (Separability/Dominance):** $g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \approx 0$ for $\varepsilon = h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)$, for $h \in T_f\mathcal{M}$.
 - **A3 (Low-Rank Efficiency):** $\text{rank}(I_D) = d$.

Theorem 11. (MH Dominance)⁶ *For any tangent vector $h \in T_f\mathcal{M}$, the statistical information (squared Fisher-Rao length) decomposes orthogonally with respect to the statistical*

⁶This theorem formalizes Assumption 2 into a rigorous geometric decomposition, which is the starting point for quantifying the MH.

signal subspace M_l :

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h), \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad (32)$$

where $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is the orthogonal projection of h onto M_l , and $\varepsilon = h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is the residual.

Hence, the MH is strongly supported if $g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \approx 0$, meaning the total information is almost entirely captured by the component in the low-dimensional signal space M_l (that is, $R \approx 1$).

Lemma 15. (Effective Manifold Dimension)

Under Assumption 3 ($\text{rank}(I_D) = d$), the dimension of the statistical signal manifold tangent space is exactly d , and the information along any direction $h_{M_l} \in M_l$ is given by a quadratic form defined by I_D .

The following theorem justifies why the failure of the MH (large $g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$) is attributed to the complexity or **curvature** of the underlying true distribution \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 12. (Minimal Residual Information) *The squared length of the residual vector $g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ is the **minimum statistical distance squared** between the full variation h and the statistical signal manifold tangent space M_l :*

$$g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \min_{v \in M_l} g_f(h - v, h - v).$$

A large $g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ indicates that h cannot be well-approximated by any linear combination of the intrinsic scores $\{u_j\}$, signifying that the density change is highly non-linear relative to the M_l structure.

We now discuss the relationship between the true signal manifold M_l and the observable covariate space S .

Lemma 16. Relationship Between M_l and S Projections

Under Assumption 1 ($M_l \subset S$), the orthogonal projection of any signal vector $v \in M_l$ onto the covariate space S is the vector itself.

$$\Pi_S(v) = v \quad \text{for all } v \in M_l.$$

Theorem 13. Equivalence of Projections under MH Dominance

Under the combined assumptions of MH Dominance and Subspace Inclusion, the signal captured by the intrinsic manifold (M_l) is equivalent to the signal captured by the observable covariate space (S).

If Assumption 2 holds, then $\Pi_{M_l}(h) \approx \Pi_S(h)$ for all $h \in T_f\mathcal{M}$.

This Theorem indicates that if the MH is true (Assumption 2), then the low-dimensional signal (M_l) is the dominant component, making the $n - d$ extra dimensions of the observable space S **statistically redundant**. This simplifies the study of the MH to finding the rank d of the metric on M_l .

6.2.1 Relationship Between the Signal Tangent Space M_l and the Covariate Space S

The relationship between M_l and S is one of subspace inclusion and statistical equivalence under the Manifold Hypothesis (MH).

- **Conclusion 1: Subspace Inclusion and Trivial Projection**

The relationship is primarily defined by Assumption 1 ($M_l \subset S$), which is a consequence of the Chain Rule applied to the scores: the statistical signal space M_l is a subspace of the observable covariate space S .

As proven by the Lemma ($\Pi_S(v) = v$ for $v \in M_l$): The projection of the signal space M_l onto the covariate space S is trivial (i.e., the signal space itself), confirming that the entire signal is fully contained within the observable coordinates.

- **Conclusion 2: Statistical Equivalence and Redundancy**

The relationship is further refined by Assumption 2 ($g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \approx 0$) and the Theorem ($\Pi_{M_l}(h) \approx \Pi_S(h)$).

The space S can be orthogonally decomposed with respect to M_l :

$$S = M_l \oplus M_{\text{Redundant}}$$

where $M_{\text{Redundant}} = S \cap M_l^\perp$ is the $(n - d)$ -dimensional subspace of S orthogonal to M_l .

Statistical Implication: Under the MH (Assumption 2), the statistical information content of the redundant space $M_{\text{Redundant}}$ is negligible. The tangent vector $\Pi_S(h)$ captures all the measurable information, but Theorem 3 shows that the difference between this full observable information $\Pi_S(h)$ and the intrinsic manifold information $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is statistically negligible. In essence, M_l is the statistically efficient core of S .

6.2.2 Relationship Between the two Covariate Fisher Information Matrices

We have defined two Fisher Information Matrices (FIMs):

1. **Intrinsic cFIM** on M_l (The Metric on D):

$$I_D = (g_f(u_j, u_k))_{d \times d},$$

where $u_j = \frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial y_j} \in M_l$.

Covariate FIM on S (The Metric on \mathbf{R}^n):

$$\mathbf{G}_f = (g_f(s_i, s_k))_{n \times n}, \quad \text{where } s_i = \frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial x_i} \in S.$$

The relationship between I_D and \mathbf{G}_f is established via the Chain Rule, which forms the basis of Assumption 1.

Theorem 14. (The Relationship Between I_D and \mathbf{G}_f)

The $d \times d$ Intrinsic Fisher Information Matrix I_D is related to the $n \times n$ Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f by the local embedding Jacobian $\mathbf{J} = \partial \mathbf{x} / \partial \mathbf{y}$:

$$I_D = \mathbf{J}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{J}. \tag{33}$$

This theorem provides the central result for studying the MH:

Under the **MH assumptions**, the problem of characterizing the **Intrinsic FIM** (I_D) (which defines the d -dimensional signal manifold) is mathematically equivalent to analyzing the Covariate FIM (\mathbf{G}_f) (which is calculated using only observable \mathbf{x} -gradients).

Specifically, by Assumption 2 (Dominance), \mathbf{G}_f must be **rank-deficient** with an effective rank d . \mathbf{G}_f is the metric on the ambient space S , but its eigenvalues and eigenvectors provide the optimal statistical basis that is spanned by the low-dimensional manifold D . The d non-zero eigenvalues of I_D are exactly related to the d large, non-zero eigenvalues of \mathbf{G}_f through the transformation defined by \mathbf{J} .

6.3 how to apply this new methodology to run statistical inference and hypothesis test and statistics for the MH problem

The methodology developed, rooted in Information Geometry (IG), provides a powerful and precise way to run hypothesis tests and perform statistics for the Manifold Hypothesis (MH) by reframing it as a low-rank problem for an observable metric.

6.3.1 Our new Methodology for Testing the Manifold Hypothesis

The core of our test is to check if the statistical information carried by the ambient data gradients (S) is effectively restricted to a low-dimensional space (M_l), as implied by the dominance assumption (Assumption 2).

1. The Null Hypothesis and Test Statistic

The MH is tested as a **rank-deficiency hypothesis** on the observable Covariate Fisher Information Matrix (\mathbf{G}_f).

- **Null Hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_0):** The data distribution f is supported by a manifold D of intrinsic dimension d . Mathematically, this corresponds to the effective rank of

the Covariate FIM being d :

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \text{rank}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{G}_f) = d \ll n.$$

- **Alternative Hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_1):** The data distribution f is high-dimensional (fully fills \mathbf{R}^n) or the underlying manifold D is pathologically curved, meaning the effective rank is high:

$$\mathbf{H}_1 : \text{rank}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{G}_f) \approx n.$$

2. The **Statistical Procedure (Intrinsic Dimension Estimation)** The test procedure mimics Principal Component Analysis (PCA) but uses the Fisher-Rao metric **instead of** the Euclidean covariance matrix:

- **Estimate the Covariate FIM (\mathbf{G}_f):** Since the true density f is unknown, $\mathbf{G}_f = E_f[\mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^T]$ must be estimated from data samples $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k=1}^N$. This requires estimating the score function $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \ln f(\mathbf{x})$, often done using the Cheng-Tong G-entropy models. The resulting empirical matrix is $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_f$
- Perform **Eigen-Decomposition:** Decompose the empirical FIM:

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_f = \sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\lambda}_k \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^T,$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \hat{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\lambda}_n$.

- Determine the **Intrinsic Dimension (d):** The dimension d is determined by finding the **spectral gap** in the eigenvalues. This is the largest gap where $\hat{\lambda}_d$ is significantly larger than $\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}$.

$$d = \underset{k}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left(\frac{\hat{\lambda}_k}{\hat{\lambda}_{k+1}} \right).$$

The value d is the estimated dimension of the signal space M_l .

- **Hypothesis Test:** The hypothesis is confirmed if $d \ll n$. If the eigenvalues drop off sharply, it supports the MH. The actual statistical test (e.g., a Likelihood Ratio Test variant or a specialized test for rank-deficiency of the FIM) measures the probability of observing the remaining information ($\sum_{k=d+1}^n \hat{\lambda}_k$) under the null hypothesis.

6.3.2 Statistical Inference and Manifold Characterization

The eigenvectors and eigenvalues provide statistical results that characterize the manifold D .

1. Statistical Core Coordinates

The d **dominant eigenvectors** $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d\}$ of \mathbf{G}_f define the basis for the estimated signal space \hat{M}_l .

- These vectors represent the **statistically efficient linear combinations** of the ambient \mathbf{x} -scores. They are the directions in S along which the density f is most sensitive to perturbation.
- These are the closest observable representation of the unknown intrinsic scores u_j in M_l (as implied by Theorem 3, $\Pi_{M_l}(h) \approx \Pi_S(h)$).
- The magnitudes of the d large eigenvalues, $\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_d$, quantify the **relative importance** of each intrinsic dimension, with $\hat{\lambda}_k$ measuring the statistical length (information content) along the \mathbf{v}_k direction.

2. **Statistical Quantification of Dominance (Sloppiness)** The theorems quantify how well the MH holds:

- **Signal Information:** The statistical information contained in the manifold is

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{Signal}} = \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{\lambda}_k.$$

- **Residual Information (Sloppiness):** The statistical information residing in the irrelevant/redundant directions (the violation of the MH/Assumption 2) is

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{Residual}} = \sum_{k=d+1}^n \hat{\lambda}_k.$$

- **Dominance Measure:** The degree of MH dominance is measured by the ratio:

$$\text{Dominance Ratio} = \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\text{Signal}}}{\mathcal{E}_{\text{Total}}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \hat{\lambda}_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\lambda}_k}.$$

A ratio close to 1 strongly supports the MH, indicating that the manifold D is **statistically sufficient** (Assumption 2).

3. Geometric Interpretation (Curvature and Error)

- The residual $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Residual}}$ directly relates to the minimum error $g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ that results from approximating a full variation h with the d -dimensional space M_I .
- If $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Residual}}$ is small, it implies the underlying distribution is statistically **”simple”** (low curvature) around the manifold D , validating the local linear approximation inherent in the tangent space method. If it is large, the manifold D cannot locally describe f , suggesting the MH fails in that region.

7 Conclusions and future research

This paper aimed to dismantle the ”intractability barrier” inherent in infinite-dimensional non-parametric information geometry. By treating the statistical manifold M not as an opaque black box, but as a structure decomposable by observable features, this work has established a rigorous framework for **Analytical Explainability** in high-dimensional statistics.

The core contribution of this study is the introduction of the **Orthogonal Decomposition of the Tangent Space** ($T_f M = S \oplus S^\perp$). This geometric principle allowed us to isolate

the **Covariate Subspace** (S), transforming the unworkable infinite-dimensional Fisher-Rao metric functional into a finite, computable **Covariate Fisher Information Matrix** G_f .⁷

Building on this foundational decomposition, this research established five major theoretical advancements:

1. Resolution of Geometric Intractability (Metric Decomposition)

We proved that the infinite-dimensional Fisher-Rao metric g_f can be orthogonally decomposed, where the metric restricted to the covariate subspace S becomes the finite matrix G_f .

This resolves the "**Inverse Problem**" that paralyzes non-parametric geometry. By providing a computable inverse (G_f^{-1}) , we enable the calculation of **Natural Gradients** and **geometric preconditioning** in high-dimensional spaces without requiring the full, intractable inverse of the metric functional.

2. The Information Geometric Foundation of G-Entropy

We proved that G-entropy is identically the **trace** of the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix $H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(G_f)$. Therefore we have grounded **G-entropy in the laws of statistical information**.

This result provides the first rigorous information geometric definition of G-entropy, interpreting it as the **Total Explainable Statistical Information**. It validates the use of G-entropy in **generative AI** (e.g., diffusion models) not just as a smoothing term, but as a **precise regulator** of the manifold's total statistical curvature.

3. Linkage of G_f to KL-Divergence and Curvature

We demonstrated that **G-entropy** is equal to the sum of the second derivatives (Hessians) of the **KL-divergence** along the covariate perturbation curves.

⁷In this paper, due to space of restriction, we didn't include our work of extending the decomposition from the second-order (Fisher-Rao) to the third-order (Cubic Tensor).

This connects the **local** metric structure G_f to the **global** information measure (KL-divergence). It implies that minimizing G-entropy is **geometrically equivalent** to minimizing the sensitivity of the likelihood function to perturbations in the data features, offering a stable objective for robust model training/selection.

4. Semi-Parametric Efficiency and the Covariate Cramer-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)

We established the Covariate Cramér-Rao Lower Bound, proving that under geometric alignment, G_f is **congruent** to the Efficient Fisher Information Matrix (I_{eff}).

This provides a concrete "**Efficiency Standard**" for non-parametric estimation¹. It implies that the matrix G_f dictates the fundamental limit of variance for any Regular Asymptotically Linear (RAL) estimator, allowing researchers to benchmark "**black-box**" estimators against a theoretically derived geometric limit.

5. A Rigorous Test for the Manifold Hypothesis (MH)

We formalized the Manifold Hypothesis as a **statistical test** of rank deficiency, defined by the Information Capture Ratio R .

This transforms the Manifold Hypothesis from a **vague intuition** into a quantifiable property. It implies that the intrinsic dimension of high-dimensional data can be rigorously estimated by the effective rank of G_f , providing a diagnostic tool to validate the "**low-dimensional structure**" assumption critical to modern **representation learning**.

7.1 Future Direction 1: The Decomposition of Skewness

While the second-order geometry (the metric g_f) is fully resolved by the orthogonal decomposition, the statistical manifold M is generally curved, meaning its higher-order geometry is non-trivial. Our work on the **Amari-Chentsov Cubic Tensor** T (Theorem 10)

confirms that this third-order tensor governs the asymmetry (statistical skewness) of the KL divergence.

The natural and essential next step is to extend the decomposition to this third-order object:

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_S + \mathbf{T}_{S^\perp} + \mathbf{T}_{\text{mixed}}$$

This requires defining a **Covariate Cubic Tensor** (\mathbf{T}_G) that captures the statistical skewness **only** within the explainable subspace S .

- **The Covariate Skewness** (\mathbf{T}_G): This third-order tensor would quantify how non-Gaussian (asymmetric) the statistical variations are along the explainable covariate directions.
- **Residual Skewness**: This would measure the asymmetry residing entirely in the residual, unexplainable space S^\perp .
- **Mixed Tensors**: These would describe the cross-dependencies between the explainable and residual skewness components.

7.2 Future Direction 2: Toward a Complete Covariate Dual Geometry

The ultimate goal is to define the full dual geometric structure $(\{\nabla^{(1)}, \nabla^{(-1)}, g_f, T\})$ restricted to the covariate subspace S . If \mathbf{T}_G can be calculated, it would allow us to define the **Covariate Dual Connections** ($\nabla_G^{(1)}$ and $\nabla_G^{(-1)}$) on S .

This new **Covariate Dual Geometry** would have several profound implications:

- **Dual Explainability**: It would provide two distinct, geometrically meaningful ways to measure distance on the manifold (e-geodesics and m-geodesics), both restricted purely to the observable covariate space S .

- **Optimal Asymmetric Paths:** It would allow for the optimization of learning algorithms based not just on minimal statistical variance (CRLB) but also on minimal statistical skewness. For instance, it could identify the optimal path f_t in parameter space that best maintains the initial distribution’s symmetry properties.
- **Higher-Order Decomposition:** Success in defining \mathbf{T}_G opens the door to decomposing all higher-order tensors, potentially leading to a complete, infinite-order geometric description of explainability.

In conclusion, this orthogonal decomposition research provides the necessary geometric foundation for **analytical explainability** so that we can use calculus and algebric methods to study the infinite dimensional information geometry. By successfully defining the second-order structure, we have created the **roadmap** for future work in building a complete, high-order, Covariate Dual Geometry, capable of fully characterizing the complexity, efficiency, and asymmetry of statistical inference in high-dimensional non-parametric systems.

8 Appendix 1: Proofs of Lemmas and Theorems

Proof of Lemma ??.

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 1**

Start with the normalization condition for the curve f_t :

$$\int_x f_t(x) dx = 1, \quad \text{for all } t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$$

Differentiate both sides with respect to t :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} f_t(x) dx \right) &= \frac{d}{dt}(1) \\ \int_x \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} dx &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

(Assuming that f_t is sufficiently smooth to allow interchange of differentiation and integration, as is typical for a smooth manifold structure.) Evaluate at $t = 0$, by the definition of the tangent vector $h(x)$, we have

$$\int_x \left. \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} dx = \int_x h(x) dx = 0$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 2**

1. Linearity:

Let $h_1, h_2 \in T_f M$ and $\alpha, \beta \in R$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\alpha h_1 + \beta h_2) &= \frac{\alpha h_1 + \beta h_2}{f} \\ &= \alpha \frac{h_1}{f} + \beta \frac{h_2}{f} \\ &= \alpha \Phi(h_1) + \beta \Phi(h_2) \end{aligned}$$

The map Φ is linear.

2. Injectivity (One-to-One):

We must show that if $\Phi(h) = 0$, then $h = 0$.

$$\Phi(h) = s = \frac{h}{f} = 0$$

Since $f(x)$ is a probability density function, $f(x) > 0$ almost everywhere. Therefore, the only way for $h(x)/f(x) = 0$ is if $h(x) = 0$ almost everywhere. The map Φ is injective.

3. Surjectivity (Onto):

We must show that for any $s \in S_f$, there exists an $h \in T_f M$ such that $\Phi(h) = s$.

- Candidate h : Given $s \in S_f$, we define the candidate tangent vector as the inverse map:

$$h = f \times s$$

- Membership Check: We must verify that this candidate h satisfies the constraint for $T_f M$, i.e., $\int_{R^n} h(x) dx = 0$. Since s is in the score space S_f ,

$$\int_{R^n} h(x) dx = \int_{R^n} s(x) f(x) dx = 0$$

Therefore The map Φ is surjective.

Since Φ is linear, injective, and surjective, it is an isomorphism. This proves that the spaces $T_f M$ and S_f are algebraically equivalent. \square

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 3**

- **Part 1: Equivalence of the Integral and Expectation Forms** We start with the integral definition of the metric and show its equivalence to the expected product of score functions. Given the definition of the score functions:

$$s_1(x) = \frac{h_1(x)}{f(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad s_2(x) = \frac{h_2(x)}{f(x)}$$

The integral form of the Fisher-Rao metric is:

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)} dx$$

We can rewrite the numerator $\frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)}$ by substituting $h_1(x) = s_1(x)f(x)$ and $h_2(x) = s_2(x)f(x)$:

$$\frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)} = \frac{(s_1(x)f(x))(s_2(x)f(x))}{f(x)} = s_1(x)s_2(x)f(x)$$

Substituting this back into the integral:

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} s_1(x)s_2(x)f(x)dx$$

By the definition of expectation for a random variable $Z = s_1(X)s_2(X)$ under the density f :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} s_1(x)s_2(x)f(x)dx = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f}[s_1(X)s_2(X)]$$

Thus, the first equivalence is proven:

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x)}{f(x)} dx = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f}[s_1(X)s_2(X)]$$

- **Part 2: Equivalence to the Covariance** We now show that $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim f}[s_1(X)s_2(X)]$ is equal to $\text{Cov}(s_1(X), s_2(X))$. The general definition of the covariance between two random variables Z_1 and Z_2 is:

$$\text{Cov}(Z_1, Z_2) = \mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_1]\mathbb{E}[Z_2]$$

In our case, $Z_1 = s_1(X)$ and $Z_2 = s_2(X)$. Therefore:

$$\text{Cov}(s_1(X), s_2(X)) = \mathbb{E}[s_1(X)s_2(X)] - \mathbb{E}[s_1(X)]\mathbb{E}[s_2(X)]$$

We need to demonstrate that the second term, $\mathbb{E}[s_1(X)]\mathbb{E}[s_2(X)]$, is zero. A tangent vector $\mathbf{h} \in T_f M$ represents a perturbation that must preserve the total probability mass, meaning $\int h(x)dx = 0$. Using the relationship $h(x) = s(x)f(x)$, this constraint translates to the zero-mean property of the score function:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h(x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} s(x)f(x)dx = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f}[s(X)] = 0$$

Applying this to both score functions s_1 and s_2 :

$$\mathbb{E}[s_1(X)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[s_2(X)] = 0$$

Substituting these zero-mean properties back into the covariance formula:

$$\text{Cov}(s_1(X), s_2(X)) = \mathbb{E}[s_1(X)s_2(X)] - (0)(0) = \mathbb{E}[s_1(X)s_2(X)]$$

• **Conclusion** Conclusion

□

Proof. Proof of Lemma 4 This requires us to show that $\int_{R^n} h_S(x)dx = 0$ for all $h_S \in S$. Since h_S is a linear combination of the basis vectors, it suffices to show that each basis vector is in $T_f M$.

$$\int_{R^n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} dx = \int_{R^{n-1}} \left(\int_R \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} dx_i \right) dx_{\neq i}$$

By the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and the assumption that f is zero-valued at the boundaries (i.e., $f(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\|\mathbf{x}\| \rightarrow \infty$):

$$\int_R \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} dx_i = f(x) \Big|_{x_i=-\infty}^{x_i=+\infty} = 0 - 0 = 0$$

Thus, $\int_{R^n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} dx = 0$. Since S is a linear span of such vectors, $S \subset T_f M$.

□

Proof. Proof of Lemma 5 The dimension of S is at most n (if the gradients are linearly independent, $\dim(S) = n$). Any finite-dimensional subspace of a topological vector space (including a Hilbert space) is closed. Since $\dim(S) \leq n < \infty$, S is a closed subspace of $T_f M$.

□

Proof. Proof of Theorem 1

- **Existence:** By the Projection Theorem (or Orthogonal Decomposition Theorem) in Hilbert space theory: If H is a Hilbert space and V is a closed subspace of H , then every element $h \in H$ can be uniquely written as the sum of an element in V and an

element in V^\perp : $h = v + v^\perp$. Here, $H = T_f M$ (the Hilbert space structure is induced by g_f) and $V = S$. Since S is a closed subspace (Lemma 2), the decomposition exists. Let h_S be the projection of h onto S , and ϵ be the orthogonal complement h_\perp . Since $h_S \in S = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right\}$, it must be a linear combination:

$$h_S(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} = \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla f(x)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in R^n$. The remaining term is $\epsilon = h - h_S$. Since $h \in T_f M$ and $h_S \in S \subset T_f M$, their difference $\epsilon \in T_f M$. By definition, h_S is the projection, so ϵ must be orthogonal to S : $\epsilon \in S^\perp$. Thus, $h(x) = \mathbf{w} \cdot \nabla f(x) + \epsilon(x)$ exists.

- **Uniqueness:** Assume there are two such decompositions for h :

$$h = h_{S,1} + \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad h = h_{S,2} + \varepsilon_2$$

where $h_{S,1}, h_{S,2} \in S$ and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in S^\perp$. Subtracting the two equations gives:

$$0 = (h_{S,1} - h_{S,2}) + (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2)$$

This implies $h_{S,1} - h_{S,2} = -(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2)$. Let $k = h_{S,1} - h_{S,2}$. Since S is a vector space, $k \in S$. Also, $k = -(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2)$. Since S^\perp is a vector space, $k \in S^\perp$. Thus, $k \in S \cap S^\perp$. The intersection of any subspace and its orthogonal complement is the zero vector.

$$g_f(k, k) = g_f(k, -(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2)) = 0 \quad (\text{since } k \in S \text{ and } -(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2) \in S^\perp)$$

Since g_f is a positive-definite metric (i.e., $g_f(k, k) = \int \frac{k^2}{f} dx > 0$ for $k \neq 0$), we must have $k = 0$. Therefore, $h_{S,1} - h_{S,2} = 0 \implies h_{S,1} = h_{S,2}$, and $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 = 0 \implies \varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$.

The decomposition is unique.

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 6**

By definition of the orthogonal complement S^\perp , $h_{2,\perp} = \varepsilon_2$ is orthogonal to every vector in S , including the basis vectors $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$. Since $h_{1,S}$ is a linear combination of these basis vectors, $h_{1,S}$ must be orthogonal to $h_{2,\perp}$.

$$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,\perp}) = g_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \varepsilon_2\right)$$

By the bi-linearity of the metric g_f :

$$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,\perp}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i} \cdot g_f\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \varepsilon_2\right)$$

Since $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \in S$ and $\varepsilon_2 \in S^\perp$, the term $g_f\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \varepsilon_2\right) = 0$ for all i .

$$\implies g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,\perp}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i} \cdot 0 = 0$$

The same logic applies to $g_f(h_{1,\perp}, h_{2,S})$, since $h_{1,\perp} = \varepsilon_1 \in S^\perp$ and $h_{2,S} \in S$. □

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 7**

Substitute the linear combination form for $h_{1,S}$ and $h_{2,S}$:

$$h_{1,S}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{2,S}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{2,j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$$

Apply the bilinearity of g_f :

$$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,S}) = g_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \sum_{j=1}^n w_{2,j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\right)$$

$$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,S}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n w_{1,i} w_{2,j} \cdot g_f\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\right)$$

The term $g_f\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\right)$ is, by definition, the (i, j) -th entry of the matrix G_f . This sum is exactly the definition of a quadratic form in matrix-vector notation:

$$g_f(h_{1,S}, h_{2,S}) = \mathbf{w}_1^T G_f \mathbf{w}_2$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Corollary 1**

$$\begin{aligned}(G_f)_{ij} &= g_f \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \right) = \int_{R^n} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}}{f(x)} dx \\ &= \int_{R^n} \frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x_j} f(x) dx = E_{X \sim f}[s_i(X)s_j(X)]\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 2** Start with the definition of $g_f(h_S, h_S)$ and substitute $h_S = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\partial_i f)$:

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = g_f \left(h_S, \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(\partial_j f) \right)$$

Using linearity and the definition of \mathbf{v}_h (from Lemma 2):

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j g_f(h_S, \partial_j f)$$

By the orthogonality condition $g_f(h - h_S, \partial_j f) = 0$, we have $g_f(h_S, \partial_j f) = g_f(h, \partial_j f) = (\mathbf{v}_h)_j$.

Substituting this back:

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (\mathbf{v}_h)_j = \mathbf{w}_h^T \mathbf{v}_h$$

Finally, substitute the solution for \mathbf{w}_h from Lemma 2 ($\mathbf{w}_h = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h$):

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = (\mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h)^T \mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{v}_h^T (\mathbf{G}_f^{-1})^T \mathbf{v}_h$$

Since \mathbf{G}_f is symmetric, \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} is also symmetric, so $(\mathbf{G}_f^{-1})^T = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1}$:

$$g_f(h_S, h_S) = \mathbf{v}_h^T \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h$$

The Information Capture Ratio R is simply the ratio of the projected information to the total information, as stated. □

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 3**

1. By the **Existence and Uniqueness of Decomposition Theorem**, any tangent vector h can be uniquely written as the sum of its projection onto the covariate subspace S and the residual vector:

$$h = h_S + \epsilon$$

2. **Expand the Metric:** We calculate the Fisher-Rao metric of h with itself, $g_f(h, h)$, using the bilinearity of the metric $g_f(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(h_S + \epsilon, h_S + \epsilon)$$

Expanding this bilinear form:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(h_S, h_S) + g_f(h_S, \epsilon) + g_f(\epsilon, h_S) + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$$

3. **Apply the Orthogonality Condition:** The fundamental definition of the **Covariate Orthogonal Decomposition** is that the two subspaces, S and S^\perp , are g_f -orthogonal. This means the inner product between any vector in S and any vector in S^\perp is zero. Since $h_S \in S$ and $\epsilon \in S^\perp$, we have the orthogonality conditions:

$$g_f(h_S, \epsilon) = 0$$

$$g_f(\epsilon, h_S) = 0$$

4. **Simplify the Expanded Metric:** Substituting the orthogonality conditions back into the expanded metric expression from Step 2:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(h_S, h_S) + 0 + 0 + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$$

This simplifies directly to the final additive relationship:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(h_S, h_S) + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon)$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 4**

1. **Start with the Definition of G-Entropy**

The G-Entropy $H_G(f)$ is defined as the sum of the expected squared score functions for each of the n observable covariates x_1, \dots, x_n :

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f \left[\left(\frac{\partial \log f}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right]$$

Let $s_i(x) = \frac{\partial \log f(x)}{\partial x_i}$ denote the score function corresponding to the i -th covariate. We can rewrite the definition using the score functions:

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2]$$

2. Define the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f

The matrix \mathbf{G}_f is defined by restricting the Fisher-Rao metric g_f to the basis vectors of the covariate subspace S . The basis vectors are the score functions $\{s_i(x)\}$. The entry $(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ij}$ is the inner product (metric) between the score functions s_i and s_j :

$$(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ij} = g_f(s_i, s_j)$$

Using the Fisher-Rao Metric Identity Lemma, which states $g_f(h_1, h_2) = \mathbb{E}_f[s_1(X)s_2(X)]$:

$$(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ij} = \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)s_j(X)]$$

3. Calculate the Trace of \mathbf{G}_f

The trace of an $n \times n$ matrix is the sum of its diagonal elements:

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$$

Now, substitute the definition of the matrix element $(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ij}$ from Step 2 into the trace formula, focusing on the diagonal elements where $i = j$:

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)s_i(X)]$$

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2]$$

4. Establish the Identity

Compare the final expression for $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f)$ from Step 3 with the definition of $H_G(f)$ from Step 1:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2] \\ H_G(f) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2]\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the G-Entropy is identically equal to the trace of the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix:

$$H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f)$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma: 8**

1. Define KL Divergence:

$$D_{KL}(f||f_t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \log \left(\frac{f(x)}{f_t(x)} \right) dx$$

2. Differentiate with respect to t :

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) [\log f(x) - \log f_t(x)] dx$$

Since $f(x)$ and $\log f(x)$ are independent of t :

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log f_t(x) \right] dx$$

3. Apply the Chain Rule:

Recall the derivative of $\log g$: $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log f_t(x) = \frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t}$.

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[\frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right] dx$$

4. Evaluate at $t = 0$:

At $t = 0$, we have $f_{t=0}(x) = f(x)$ and $\left. \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} = \mathbf{h}(x)$.

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[\frac{1}{f(x)} \mathbf{h}(x) \right] dx$$

5. Simplify and Use Constraint:

The $f(x)$ terms cancel:

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{h}(x) dx$$

By the tangent space constraint derived in Part 1, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{h}(x) dx = 0$.

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = -(0) = 0$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 9**

1. First Derivative: Start with the chain rule for the first derivative (the instantaneous score s_t):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log f_t(x) = \frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} = s_t(x)$$

2. Second Derivative: Differentiate the expression above again with respect to t :

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right]$$

.

3. Apply the Product Rule: Treat this as $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}[A(t)B(t)]$, where $A(t) = 1/f_t$ and $B(t) = \partial f_t / \partial t$.

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{1}{f_t} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{f_t} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial t^2} \right)$$

4. Evaluate at $t = 0$: At $t = 0$, we use:

- $f_t = f$
- $\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} = h$
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{1}{f_t} = -\frac{1}{f_t^2} \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} \implies \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{1}{f_t} \Big|_{t=0} = -\frac{1}{f^2} h$

Substitute these into the second derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \Big|_{t=0} &= \left(-\frac{1}{f(x)^2} h(x) \right) (h(x)) + \left(\frac{1}{f(x)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0} \right) \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \Big|_{t=0} &= -\left(\frac{h(x)}{f(x)} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{f(x)} \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0} \end{aligned}$$

5. Simplify and Relate to Score ($s = h/f$):

Recognizing that $s(x) = h(x)/f(x)$:

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \Big|_{t=0} = -s(x)^2 + \frac{1}{f(x)} \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0}$$

The term $\frac{1}{f(x)} \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0}$ must be equal to $\frac{\partial s_t(x)}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0}$ by comparing the initial equation to the final target, proving the identity.

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 10**

1. Start with Normalization: We know the normalization integral must be constant for all t :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) dx = 1$$

.

2. Differentiate Twice: Differentiate the entire equation with respect to t :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) dx \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (1) = 0.$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) dx \right] = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} (1) = 0.$$

3. Interchange Differentiation and Integration: Assuming sufficient regularity (smoothness):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} dx = 0$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 5**

1. Differentiate the KL Divergence Twice

We start with the expression for the first derivative of the KL divergence derived in Lemma 8:

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[\frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right] dx$$

Differentiate this expression again with respect to t :

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = - \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[\frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right] dx$$

Assuming we can interchange differentiation and integration (due to the smoothness of f_t):

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f||f_t) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{1}{f_t(x)} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right) \right] dx$$

2. Simplify the Inner Derivative at $t = 0$

Recall that the term inside the parenthesis is the instantaneous score function: $\frac{1}{f_t} \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log f_t$. The term we need to evaluate inside the integral is the second derivative of the log-likelihood:

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \right|_{t=0}$$

From Lemma 9 (Second Derivative of Log-Likelihood), we have:

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \log f_t(x) \right|_{t=0} = -s(x)^2 + \frac{1}{f(x)} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0}$$

3. Substitute into the Second Derivative of D_{KL}

Substitute the result from Step 2 back into the integral expression for $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}D_{KL}(f||f_t)$, evaluated at $t = 0$:

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2}D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left[-s(x)^2 + \frac{1}{f(x)} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} \right] dx$$

Break the integral into two parts:

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2}D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)(-s(x)^2)dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left(\frac{1}{f(x)} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} \right) dx$$

4. Apply Zero Mean Properties

Term 1 (Information Term):

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)(-s(x)^2)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} s(x)^2 f(x)dx = \mathbb{E}_f[s(X)^2]$$

By the Fisher-Rao Metric Identity (Lemma 3), $\mathbb{E}_f[s(X)^2] = g_f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})$.

Term 2 (Normalization Term):

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \left(\frac{1}{f(x)} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} \right) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} dx$$

By Lemma 10 (Zero Mean of the Second Derivative), this integral is zero:

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left. \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \right|_{t=0} dx = 0$$

5. Final result

Substituting the simplified terms back:

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2}D_{KL}(f||f_t) \right|_{t=0} = g_f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) + 0$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 6**

1. Relate Second Derivative of KL to Metric

We begin by applying Theorem 5 (**Fisher Information as the Second Derivative of KL-Divergence**) to the curve $f_{i,t}$ with the tangent vector \mathbf{h}_i :

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f || f_{i,t}) \right|_{t=0} = g_f(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i)$$

Note: In this context, we use the definition where the second derivative directly equals the metric $g_f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})$.

2. Relate Metric to Covariate Fisher Information Matrix (\mathbf{G}_f):

The term $g_f(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i)$ is the Fisher-Rao metric evaluated on the tangent vector \mathbf{h}_i . By the definition of the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f , the diagonal element $(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$ is exactly this self-inner product, where the tangent vector \mathbf{h}_i corresponds to the score function s_i :

$$g_f(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i) = (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$$

3. Apply the Definition of G-Entropy:

The G-Entropy $H_G(f)$ is defined as the sum of the expected squared score functions:

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2]$$

By the Fisher-Rao Metric Identity (Lemma 1.1), the expected squared score function $\mathbb{E}_f[s_i(X)^2]$ is equal to the metric self-inner product $g_f(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i)$ and thus the diagonal matrix entry $(\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$:

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$$

4. By Theorem 4 (Identity of G-Entropy), the sum of the diagonal elements is the trace of \mathbf{G}_f :

$$H_G(f) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_f) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$$

Now, substitute the result from Step 2 into the sum of the second derivatives:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f||f_{i,t}) \Big|_{t=0} = \sum_{i=1}^n g_f(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii}$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{G}_f)_{ii} = H_G(f)$, we have established the identity:

$$H_G(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{KL}(f||f_{i,t}) \Big|_{t=0}$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 11**

1. **Evaluate the High-Order Term at $t = 0$:** The term that defines \mathcal{C}_3 is isolated when we evaluate the full expansion at $t = 0$. The integrand term involving $\frac{\partial^3 f_t}{\partial t^3}$ is:

$$I_3(x) = \frac{\partial^3 f_t(x)}{\partial t^3} \cdot \log \left(\frac{f_t(x)}{f(x)} \right) \Big|_{t=0}$$

2. **Apply the Reference Point Condition:** At the reference point, $t = 0$, the curve density f_t equals the reference density f :

$$f_{t=0}(x) = f(x)$$

Therefore, the logarithmic term evaluates to zero:

$$\log \left(\frac{f_{t=0}(x)}{f(x)} \right) = \log \left(\frac{f(x)}{f(x)} \right) = \log(1) = 0$$

3. Since the coefficient of the third derivative term is zero at $t = 0$, the entire integral term vanishes:

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial^3 f_t(x)}{\partial t^3} \Big|_{t=0} \cdot 0 \, dx = 0$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 12**

1. Differentiate the Reverse KL Divergence

The reverse KL divergence is:

$$D_{KL}(f_t||f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_t(x) \log \left(\frac{f_t(x)}{f(x)} \right) dx = \int f_t \log f_t dx - \int f_t \log f dx$$

We know from Lemma 8 that $\frac{d}{dt} \int f_t \log f dx = 0$ at $t = 0$. Therefore, we focus on differentiating the first term, the negative entropy part, $E(t) = \int f_t \log f_t dx$.

The first two derivatives of $E(t)$ at $t = 0$ are known to be:

$\frac{d}{dt} E(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \int \mathbf{h}(\log f + 1) dx = 0$ (due to $\int \mathbf{h} dx = 0$ and $\int \mathbf{h} \log f dx = \int \frac{\mathbf{h}}{f} f \log f dx = 0$ by the orthogonality of the tangent space), and

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} E(t) \Big|_{t=0} = g_f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})$$

2. Calculate the Third Derivative of $E(t)$

We differentiate $E(t)$ three times:

$$\frac{d^3}{dt^3} E(t) = \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \int f_t \log f_t dx$$

Using the identity $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(f_t \log f_t) = \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(\log f_t + 1)$, and differentiating twice more (this requires complex algebraic expansion), it is a standard result in Information Geometry that the third derivative evaluated at $t = 0$ is:

$$\frac{d^3}{dt^3} E(t) \Big|_{t=0} = 3\mathbb{E}_f \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0} \cdot s \right] + \mathbb{E}_f[s^3]$$

where $s = \mathbf{h}/f$.

3. Calculate the Third Derivative of Reverse KL

Since $D_{KL}(f_t||f) = E(t) - \int f_t \log f dx$, and the derivatives of the second term are simple:

$$\frac{d^3}{dt^3} D_{KL}(f_t||f) = \frac{d^3}{dt^3} E(t) - \frac{d^3}{dt^3} \int f_t \log f dx$$

We evaluate the second term:

$$\frac{d^3}{dt^3} \int f_t \log f dx \Big|_{t=0} = \int \frac{\partial^3 f_t}{\partial t^3} \Big|_{t=0} \log f dx$$

The final formula for the third derivative of the reverse KL is:

$$D_{KL}'''(f_t||f) = 3\mathbb{E}_f \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0} \cdot s \right] + \mathbb{E}_f[s^3] - \int \frac{\partial^3 f_t}{\partial t^3} \Big|_{t=0} \log f dx$$

4. Relate to Forward KL and the Cubic Tensor T

From the finition of T and by using an integration-by-parts on the forward third derivative, we can obtain

$$D_{KL}'''(f||f_t) = T(h, h, h) = -3\mathbb{E}_f \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log f_t}{\partial t^2} \Big|_{t=0} \cdot s \right] - \mathbb{E}_f[s^3]$$

By thusing Lemma 11, we have prove that

$$D_{KL}'''(f_t||f) = -T(h, h, h)$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 7**

By using the definition of Cubic Tensor $T(h, h, h)$ and Lemma 12, we have the equation.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 8**

1. By the definition 17 of the Efficient Fisher Information Matrix

$$\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_f[s_{eff} s_{eff}^T]$$

2. Applying Assumption 1, we substitute the Covariate Score vector $s_{\mathbf{x}}$ for the Efficient Score vector s_{eff} :

$$\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_f[s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] = \mathbb{E}_f \left[\left(\frac{\partial \log f}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \log f}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)^T \right]$$

3. Recall definition of $(G_f)_{i,j}$, the final expression is exactly the Covariate Fisher Information Matrix \mathbf{G}_f .

$$\mathbf{I}_{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{G}_f$$

The identity is proven. □

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 13**

1. Asymptotic Variance: The asymptotic covariance is $\text{AsyCov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}\boldsymbol{\psi}^T]$.
2. Orthogonal Decomposition: By Theorem 1, write $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_S + \boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp$, where $\boldsymbol{\psi}_S \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbf{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbf{x}^\perp$.
3. The Information Identity: For any RAL estimator, the influence function must satisfy $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}s_{eff}^T] = \mathbf{I}$. Under Assumption 1 ($s_{eff} = s_\mathbf{x}$), we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_f[(\boldsymbol{\psi}_S + \boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp)s_\mathbf{x}^T] = \mathbf{I} \implies \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}_S s_\mathbf{x}^T] + 0 = \mathbf{I}$$

Thus, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp$ contributes nothing to the required unit-correlation with the signal.

4. Variance Comparison:

$$\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}\boldsymbol{\psi}^T] = \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}_S \boldsymbol{\psi}_S^T] + \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp \boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp^T]$$

Since $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp \boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp^T]$ is positive semi-definite, the variance is **minimized** when $\boldsymbol{\psi}_\perp = \mathbf{0}$ □

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 14**

1. Since $\boldsymbol{\psi}^* \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbf{x}$, there exists a matrix \mathbf{A} such that $\boldsymbol{\psi}^* = \mathbf{A}s_\mathbf{x}$.
2. From the identity $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}^* s_\mathbf{x}^T] = \mathbf{I}$, we substitute:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbb{E}_f[s_\mathbf{x}s_\mathbf{x}^T] = \mathbf{I} \implies \mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}_f = \mathbf{I}$$

3. Solving for \mathbf{A} gives $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1}$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{\psi}^* = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} s_{\mathbf{x}}$.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 9**

1. For any RAL estimator, $\text{AsyCov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}\boldsymbol{\psi}^T]$.
2. Using the decomposition $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^* + \boldsymbol{\delta}$, where $\boldsymbol{\psi}^*$ is the canonical influence function and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*$.
3. Note that $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}^* \boldsymbol{\delta}^T] = \mathbf{0}$ because $\boldsymbol{\psi}^*$ is a linear combination of $s_{\mathbf{x}}$, and for any RAL estimator, $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] = \mathbf{I}$, while $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}^* s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] = \mathbf{I}$, implying $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\delta} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] = \mathbf{0}$.
4. Therefore:

$$\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}\boldsymbol{\psi}^T] = \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}^*(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*)^T] + \mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\delta}\boldsymbol{\delta}^T]$$

5. Calculating the optimal variance:

$$\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\psi}^*(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*)^T] = \mathbb{E}_f[(\mathbf{G}_f^{-1} s_{\mathbf{x}})(s_{\mathbf{x}}^T \mathbf{G}_f^{-1})] = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbb{E}_f[s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{G}_f^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_f^{-1}$$

6. Since $\mathbb{E}_f[\boldsymbol{\delta}\boldsymbol{\delta}^T] \geq 0$, it follows that $\text{AsyCov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \geq \mathbf{G}_f^{-1}$.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 10**

- **Necessity:** Suppose the scores are linearly dependent. Then there exists a non-zero vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^d c_j s_{x_j} = 0$ almost everywhere with respect to f . Multiplying by the vector \mathbf{c}^T on the left and \mathbf{c} on the right of \mathbf{G}_f :

$$\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}^T \mathbb{E}_f[s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{x}}^T] \mathbf{c} = \mathbb{E}_f[(\mathbf{c}^T s_{\mathbf{x}})^2]$$

If the scores are linearly dependent, $\mathbf{c}^T s_{\mathbf{x}} = 0$, thus $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{c} = 0$. This implies \mathbf{G}_f is singular (not positive definite).

- **Sufficiency:** If the scores are linearly independent, then for any non-zero vector \mathbf{c} , the random variable $Y = \mathbf{c}^T s_{\mathbf{x}}$ is not zero almost everywhere. Since $Y^2 \geq 0$ and $P(Y^2 > 0) > 0$, we have:

$$\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{c} = \mathbb{E}_f[Y^2] > 0$$

A symmetric matrix that satisfies $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{c} > 0$ for all $\mathbf{c} \neq 0$ is positive definite and thus invertible.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 11**

1. Express the tangent vector h as the sum of its projection onto M_l and the residual vector ϵ :

$$h = \Pi_{M_l}(h) + \epsilon.$$

2. By the **Orthogonal Projection Theorem** in the Hilbert space $T_f \mathcal{M}$, the residual ϵ is orthogonal to the subspace M_l . Since $\Pi_{M_l}(h) \in M_l$, we have:

$$g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h), \epsilon) = g_f(\epsilon, \Pi_{M_l}(h)) = 0.$$

3. Calculate the squared length of h :

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h) + \epsilon, \Pi_{M_l}(h) + \epsilon).$$

4. Expand the inner product using bilinearity:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h), \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h), \epsilon) + g_f(\epsilon, \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon).$$

5. Substitute the zero cross-terms:

$$g_f(h, h) = g_f(\Pi_{M_l}(h), \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + g_f(\epsilon, \epsilon).$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 15**

1. Let $h_{M_l} \in M_l$. Since $M_l = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_d\}$, h_{M_l} can be uniquely written as:

$$h_{M_l} = \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j u_j,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)^T$ is the coordinate vector of h_{M_l} in the $\{u_j\}$ basis

2. The squared Fisher-Rao length of h_{M_l} is:

$$g_f(h_{M_l}, h_{M_l}) = g_f\left(\sum_j \alpha_j u_j, \sum_k \alpha_k u_k\right) = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d \alpha_j \alpha_k g_f(u_j, u_k).$$

3. By Definition, the term $g_f(u_j, u_k)$ is the (j, k) -th element of the manifold's Fisher Information Matrix, I_D :

$$g_f(h_{M_l}, h_{M_l}) = \sum_{j,k} \alpha_j (I_D)_{jk} \alpha_k = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T I_D \boldsymbol{\alpha}.$$

4. Assumption 3 states that $\text{rank}(I_D) = d$. By definition, the rank of a Gram matrix (like I_D) equals the dimension of the space spanned by its generating vectors. Since I_D is full rank d , the basis vectors $\{u_j\}$ are linearly independent in $T_f \mathcal{M}$.
5. Therefore, M_l is a non-degenerate d -dimensional subspace, and all information in M_l is captured by the quadratic form $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T I_D \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 12**

1. Let $v \in M_l$ be an arbitrary vector in the signal subspace, $v \neq \Pi_{M_l}(h)$.
2. Define the difference $\delta = \Pi_{M_l}(h) - v$. Since $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ and v are both in M_l , their difference δ must also be in M_l .
3. We want to show that $g_f(h - v, h - v)$ is minimized when $v = \Pi_{M_l}(h)$.

4. Rewrite the distance term:

$$g_f(h - v, h - v) = g_f((h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + (\Pi_{M_l}(h) - v), (h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)) + (\Pi_{M_l}(h) - v))$$

$$g_f(h - v, h - v) = g_f(\varepsilon + \delta, \varepsilon + \delta).$$

5. Expand the inner product:

$$g_f(\varepsilon + \delta, \varepsilon + \delta) = g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) + g_f(\varepsilon, \delta) + g_f(\delta, \varepsilon) + g_f(\delta, \delta).$$

6. Since $\varepsilon \in M_l^\perp$ and $\delta \in M_l$, the cross-terms vanish: $g_f(\varepsilon, \delta) = g_f(\delta, \varepsilon) = 0$.

$$g_f(h - v, h - v) = g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) + g_f(\delta, \delta).$$

7. Since $g_f(\delta, \delta) \geq 0$, the minimum value is achieved when $g_f(\delta, \delta) = 0$, which implies

$$\delta = 0, \text{ or } v = \Pi_{M_l}(h).$$

$$\min_{v \in M_l} g_f(h - v, h - v) = g_f(\varepsilon, \varepsilon).$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Lemma 16**

- Let $v \in M_l$.
- Assumption 1 states that M_l is a subspace of S ($M_l \subset S$). Therefore, v is also an element of S .
- By the definition of an orthogonal projection, the projection of any vector v onto a subspace that already contains v is the vector itself.

$$\Pi_S(v) = v.$$

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 13**

1. By Theorem 1, $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is the optimal d -dimensional representation of h .
2. The vector $\Pi_S(h)$ is the optimal n -dimensional representation of h within the observable space S .
3. Since $M_l \subset S$ (Assumption 1), S can be decomposed into the direct sum $S = M_l \oplus M_{l,\text{redundant}}$, where $M_{l,\text{redundant}} = S \cap M_l^\perp$.
4. The projection onto S is $\Pi_S(h) = \Pi_{M_l}(h) + \Pi_{M_{l,\text{redundant}}}(\varepsilon_{M_l})$, where $\varepsilon_{M_l} = h - \Pi_{M_l}(h)$.
5. If Assumption 2 (MH Dominance) holds, then the residual ε_{M_l} is statistically negligible: $g_f(\varepsilon_{M_l}, \varepsilon_{M_l}) \approx 0$.
6. The difference between $\Pi_S(h)$ and $\Pi_{M_l}(h)$ is the projection of the negligible residual onto the redundant part of S . The statistical length of this difference is:

$$g_f(\Pi_S(h) - \Pi_{M_l}(h), \Pi_S(h) - \Pi_{M_l}(h)) \leq g_f(\varepsilon_{M_l}, \varepsilon_{M_l}) \approx 0.$$

7. Therefore, the projections are statistically equivalent: $\Pi_{M_l}(h) \approx \Pi_S(h)$.

□

Proof. **Proof of Theorem 14**

1. Start with the (j, k) -th element of I_D :

$$(I_D)_{jk} = g_f(u_j, u_k) = E_f \left[\frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial y_j} \frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial y_k} \right].$$

2. Apply the Chain Rule to the partial derivative with respect to the intrinsic coordinates y_j :

$$\frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial y_j} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \ln f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j} = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \mathbf{J}_{ij}.$$

where \mathbf{J}_{ij} is the element of the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{J} at row i and column j .

3. Substitute the Chain Rule expression back into the definition of I_D :

$$(I_D)_{jk} = E_f \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n s_i \mathbf{J}_{ij} \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^n s_l \mathbf{J}_{lk} \right) \right].$$

4. Expand the expectation and move the non-random Jacobian elements outside:

$$(I_D)_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{J}_{ij} E_f[s_i s_l] \mathbf{J}_{lk}.$$

5. Recognize the term $E_f[s_i s_l]$ as the (i, l) -th element of the Covariate FIM \mathbf{G}_f :

$$(I_D)_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{J}_{ij} (\mathbf{G}_f)_{il} \mathbf{J}_{lk}.$$

6. This summation corresponds exactly to the definition of the matrix product $\mathbf{J}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{J}$.

$$(I_D) = \mathbf{J}^T \mathbf{G}_f \mathbf{J}.$$

□

References

- [1] Shun-ichi Amari (2021). Differential-Geometrical Methods in Statistics. Lecture Notes in Statistics. 28, Springer-Verlag.
- [2] Chentsov's theorem. Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chentsov%27stheorem>
- [3] Riemannian manifold. Wikipedia, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Riemannian_manifold#:text=Formally%2C%20a%20Riemannian%20metric%20\(or,without%20referencing%20an%20an](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Riemannian_manifold#:text=Formally%2C%20a%20Riemannian%20metric%20(or,without%20referencing%20an%20an)
- [4] Bing Cheng and Howell Tong (2025) On foundation of generative statistics with G-entropy: a gradient-based approach. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.05389>
- [5] Jiang Hu, Ruicheng Ao, Anthony Man-Cho So, Minghan Yang, and Zaiwen Wen (2024). Riemannian Natural Gradient Methods. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing Vol. 46, Iss. 1 (2024)10.1137/22M1509643
- [6] Peter J. Bickel , Chris A.J. Klaassen , Ya'acov Ritov , Jon A. Wellner (2019). Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models. Springer New York, NY.