

Online Functional Principal Component Analysis on a Multidimensional Domain

Muye Nanshan^{1,2}, Nan Zhang^{1,3}, and Jiguo Cao²

¹School of Data Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

²Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, Simon Fraser University,
Burnaby, Canada

³Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Fudan
University, Shanghai, China

Abstract

Multidimensional functional data streams arise in diverse scientific fields, yet their analysis poses significant challenges. We propose a novel online framework for functional principal component analysis that enables efficient and scalable modeling of such data. Our method represents functional principal components using tensor product splines, enforcing smoothness and orthonormality through a penalized framework on a Stiefel manifold. An efficient Riemannian stochastic gradient descent algorithm is developed, with extensions inspired by adaptive moment estimation and averaging techniques to accelerate convergence. Additionally, a dynamic tuning strategy for smoothing parameter selection is developed based on a rolling averaged block validation score that adapts to the streaming nature of the data. Extensive simulations and real-world applications demonstrate the flexibility and effectiveness of this framework for analyzing multidimensional functional data.

Keywords: Functional data analysis; Online learning; Riemannian Manifold; Stochastic Approximation

1 Introduction

Functional principal component analysis (FPCA) is an immensely popular technique in functional data analysis ([Ramsay and Silverman, 2005](#); [Ferraty and Vieu, 2006](#); [Hsing and Eubank, 2015](#)). As an extension of traditional PCA for multivariate data, FPCA aims to identify a lower-dimensional subspace capturing the major variability in a sample of realizations from a random process. Infinite-dimensional functional objects are represented by a few leading functional principal components, not only providing better visualization and interpretability but also facilitating subsequent statistical analyses such as clustering, classification, and regression. The recent development of FPCA and its applications can be found in review articles ([Morris, 2015](#); [Wang et al., 2016](#)).

In the big data era, modern advances in data acquisition and storage bring new challenges in analyzing functional data of new forms. The primary focus of this work is online learning of functional principal components for multidimensional functional data that arrive in a streaming way. While most methods in functional data analysis have been focusing on random curves defined over a bounded interval, there is recently a surge of interest in analyzing multidimensional functional data promoted by applications in various fields such as climate science, medical imaging, and chemical engineering. One of our motivating data examples is the daily Air Quality Index (AQI) collected by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. From over spatial and temporal dimensions, these data are recorded over 3,000 monitoring sites over 40 years. Due to the popularity of multidimensional functional data, there is a growing interest in developing statistical models for observations generated from random fields over multidimensional domains, including principal component analysis ([Zhou and Pan, 2014](#); [Shi et al., 2022](#)), covariance function estimation ([Wang et al., 2022](#); [Sarkar and Panaretos, 2022](#)), and functional regression ([Morris et al., 2011](#)).

Another major challenge in employing FPCA in practice is the limited development of

online algorithms. Most of the existing methods for analyzing functional data are categorized as *batch learning* whose learning procedure is completed by using the full training data at once. It is sometimes computationally infeasible to apply batch learning to large-scale data sets. In contrast, online learning is a popular machine learning technique to handle continuously arriving data in real time without storing the entire data set. Besides, online learning can effectively analyze large datasets without overwhelming computational resources or memory constraints. In practice, when the full data is too large to fit into memory, one can divide it into smaller and manageable batches, followed by processing the batches in a streaming way such that model estimates are incrementally refined through multiple epochs. Online algorithms have been extensively studied in machine learning and statistics, including PCA (Qiu et al., 2023), generalized linear models (Luo and Song, 2020), and nonparametric regression (Zhang and Simon, 2022). However, online learning for functional data has seen little progress until recently (Yang and Yao, 2023). The difficulty is that existing batch learning methods cannot be trivially translated to the online setting, because of the nonparametric nature of functional objects and complicated tuning issues. Furthermore, the aforementioned multidimensional domain introduces computational challenges, rendering the standard methods effectively inapplicable.

In the literature on batch learning of functional principal components (FPCs), there are two typical approaches. The first follows a two-step procedure in which FPCs are extracted via eigenanalysis after a smooth estimate of the covariance function is obtained. Although there have been many works on covariance function estimation for one-dimensional functional data (Yao et al., 2005; Xiao et al., 2018) and a few recent works for multidimensional functional data (Zhou and Pan, 2014; Wang et al., 2022; Sarkar and Panaretos, 2022), such two-stage procedures suffers from the estimation quality of covariance functions. In particular, when the input domain is of dimension d , it is difficult to estimate a $2d$ -dimensional covariance surface due to the curse of dimensionality. The second approach takes a more

direct strategy. It approximates the FPCs with basis functions and models the functional observations by linear combinations of the FPCs. Parameters such as basis coefficients are estimated under the likelihood framework with possible model complexity penalization. A partial list of such work includes [James et al. \(2000\)](#), [Yao et al. \(2005\)](#), [Zhou et al. \(2008\)](#), [Peng and Paul \(2009\)](#), [Lila et al. \(2016\)](#), [Nie and Cao \(2020\)](#) and [He et al. \(2024\)](#). Besides avoiding the daunting covariance function estimation, this approach enjoys explicit basis representations for the FPCs, and it is convenient to introduce regularities such as smoothness or orthogonality.

Our contribution in this article is three-fold. First, we propose a novel online learning method to estimate the leading Functional Principal Components (FPCs) for sequentially arriving multidimensional functional data. As eigenfunctions of the covariance function, FPCs are assumed to lie within a low-dimensional space of smooth functions. To address this, we utilize a direct approach by representing the FPCs with tensor product splines, thereby avoiding the challenges associated with estimating the high-dimensional covariance function. To maintain the orthonormal properties of the eigenfunctions, the basis coefficients representing the FPCs are constrained to a Stiefel manifold. Our online FPCA method is developed within a penalized framework that effectively integrates the smoothness property and the intrinsic geometric structure of the FPCs. Unlike existing batch FPCA methods that employ spline estimation without penalty ([James et al., 2000](#); [Peng and Paul, 2009](#)), our approach explicitly controls model complexity in a continuous manner. It has been observed that, in nonparametric function estimation, penalized splines offer superior performance compared to unpenalized polynomial regression ([Huang and Su, 2021](#)).

Second, we design an efficient Riemannian stochastic gradient descent (RSGD) algorithm to update model parameters with sequentially arriving data. Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is a very popular technique in machine learning. It naturally fits the online

setting by providing a stochastic approximation to the gradients using the newly received data block (Bottou et al., 2018). Under our online FPCA formulation, we perform model parameter optimization along a generalized Stiefel manifold (Absil et al., 2008; Sato and Aihara, 2019) to respect the geometric structure of the parameter space. The convergence of our RSGD algorithm is analyzed under proper hyperparameter tuning. To enhance the algorithm’s performance, we extend the RSGD algorithm by incorporating adaptive moment estimation (Adam; Kingma and Ba (2014)) and averaging techniques (Polyak and Juditsky, 1992). Specifically, Adam updates gradients by adaptively scaling them using estimates of first and second moments, ensuring efficient and adaptive step sizes. Meanwhile, the averaging technique outputs the average of parameter estimates over the optimization process, resulting in variance-reduced estimates and accelerated convergence.

Third, we introduce a dynamic tuning scheme for selecting an appropriate smoothing parameter throughout the online learning process. In nonparametric estimation of FPCs, tuning the smoothing parameter is crucial for balancing model bias and variance. While many online nonparametric methods keep regularization parameters fixed, the importance of dynamic tuning has been increasingly recognized. For instance, Zhang and Simon (2022) explored nonparametric regression using a sieve-SGD estimator, allowing the sieve size to grow with the accumulated sample size. Similarly, Yang and Yao (2023) proposed an online local polynomial estimation of mean and covariance functions, employing a dynamic sequence of candidate bandwidths. To address this, we integrate the classical cross-validation technique used in spline smoothing with the streaming nature of online learning. Specifically, the newly arrived data block serves as a validation set on a rolling basis. We define a novel averaged block validation score using an exponential weighting scheme to select the optimal hyperparameter at the current stage and form a compact set of future candidates. This dynamic tuning strategy effectively traces the path of selected hyperparameters throughout the learning process.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 formulates the online FPCA framework and our penalized estimation framework. Section 3 presents the RSGD algorithm with tuning parameter fixed. Section 4 describes our dynamic tuning procedure to adapt the smoothness of the FPCs to sequentially arriving data blocks. We establish the convergence of the RSGD algorithm in Section 5. To further improve the practical performance, we develop in Section 6 some variants of RSGD using the ideas of averaging and Adam. The numerical performance of the proposed method is evaluated by simulation studies in Section 7 and two real data applications in Section 8. Technical details are collected in the supplementary materials.

2 Online Learning for Multidimensional FPCA

In this section, we present a new online learning framework for multidimensional FPCA. For now, we focus on implementing online FPCA with a fixed smoothing parameter for the functional principal components, deferring a detailed discussion on dynamic parameter tuning to a later section. This approach formulates multidimensional FPCA as a manifold optimization problem, employing regularized spline approximations for FPC estimation and utilizing Riemannian stochastic gradient descent (RSGD) to ensure computational efficiency with minimal resource requirements per iteration.

2.1 FPC and Basis Representation

Suppose that we sequentially obtain observations $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N\}$, where $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ represents m_i measurements of a function $X_i(\mathbf{t})$ defined on a d -dimensional domain $\mathcal{T}$. The total sample size N is allowed to be infinite, and the numbers of measurements for each subject m_i 's are uniformly bounded. The j th component of $\mathbf{y}_i$, denoted by y_{ij} , is the measurement of a function $X_i(\mathbf{t})$ on a random location $\mathbf{t}_{ij}$ contaminated by a noise ε_{ij} , i.e., $y_{ij} = X_i(\mathbf{t}_{ij}) +$

ε_{ij} for $1 \leq i \leq m_i$, and the noises are assumed to be zero-mean and have a constant variance σ^2 .

We assume that the underlying functions $X_1(\mathbf{t}), \dots, X_N(\mathbf{t})$ are independent copies of a random field $X(\mathbf{t}) \in L^2(\mathcal{T})$. The Mercer's theorem implies that the covariance function $\gamma(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = \text{cov}(X(\mathbf{s}), X(\mathbf{t}))$ admits a spectral decomposition $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda_r \phi_r(\mathbf{s}) \phi_r(\mathbf{t})$, where $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots > 0$ are the eigenvalues, and $\{\phi_r : r \geq 1\}$ are the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions in $L^2(\mathcal{T})$. The eigenfunctions capturing the major variation of $X(\mathbf{t})$ are referred to as functional principal components (FPCs) in the context of FPCA. Given a pre-specified rank R , the truncated expansion using the leading FPCs provides a low rank approximation to the covariance function such that

$$\gamma(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) \approx \sum_{r=1}^R \lambda_r \phi_r(\mathbf{s}) \phi_r(\mathbf{t}). \quad (1)$$

Our goal is to learn the top R FPCs with the sequentially arrived observations.

We represent the FPCs by spline basis approximations. When $\mathcal{T}$ is a one-dimensional domain, B-spline basis is a popular choice due to its computational efficiency (de Boor, 1972). It can be easily generalized to multidimensional case as the tensor product B-spline basis (Wood, 2017). See Section S2 in the supplementary materials for the construction of the tensor product B-spline basis on a multidimensional domain. Let $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{t})$ be the spline basis on $\mathcal{T}$, consisting of p basis functions. The r th FPC, ϕ_r , is approximated by the basis expansion $\boldsymbol{\theta}_r^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{t})$ where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_r \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the vector of basis coefficients. Let $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_R) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times R}$ collect the basis coefficients of all the top R FPCs. The estimation of FPCs is thereby translated into the estimation of spline coefficients $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. Moreover, the orthonormal properties for the eigenfunctions, namely $\int \phi_r(\mathbf{t}) \phi_s(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = \delta_{rs}$, where δ_{rs} is the Kronecker delta function, can be written as the constraint $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{I}_R$ with $\mathbf{G} = \int \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{t})^\top d\mathbf{t}$ being the Gram matrix. This constraint corresponds to a geometric structure referred to as a generalized Stiefel manifold (Peng and Paul, 2009; Sato and Ai-

hara, 2019), $\text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p) = \{\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times R} : \boldsymbol{\Theta}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{I}_R\}$, see Section S1 in the supplementary materials for an introduction to the manifold.

2.2 Online FPCA

For simplicity, we assume $\mu(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbb{E}\{X(\mathbf{t})\} = 0$ and focus on the estimation of FPCs. For the case with a nonzero mean function, we can center each $\mathbf{y}_i$ by subtracting an estimated mean. See Yang and Yao (2023) for the online estimation of a general mean function.

We first introduce a valid objective function for a single observed subject and then discuss the general case where multiple subjects arrive as mini-batches. For the i th subject $X_i(\mathbf{t})$, its observed covariance $\mathbf{C}_i = \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top$ is an unbiased estimator for the true covariance $[\gamma(\mathbf{t}_{ij_1}, \mathbf{t}_{ij_2})]_{j_1, j_2} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{m_i}$, where the nugget term $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{m_i}$ accounts for the observational noise. Recall that the covariance function γ can be expanded with the eigenfunctions ϕ_r 's which are approximated by spline basis. Write $\mathbf{B}_i$ as the $m_i \times p$ spline basis matrix of $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{t})$ evaluated at the m_i observation locations. It follows from the rank R expression (1) that the above true covariance of $\mathbf{y}_i$ can be approximated by

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2) = \mathbf{B}_i \boldsymbol{\Theta} \text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \boldsymbol{\Theta}^\top \mathbf{B}_i^\top + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{m_i},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_R)$ and $\text{Diag}(\cdot)$ returns a diagonal matrix from given elements. Following Peng and Paul (2009), we use

$$\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2) = \text{tr} [\{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2)\}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_i] + \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2)| \quad (2)$$

to quantify the discrepancy between the observed covariance $\mathbf{C}_i$ and the spline approximation model $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2)$. The above covariance discrepancy corresponds to the negative log-likelihood of $\mathbf{y}_i$ up to some constant under the assumption that $\mathbf{y}_i$ follows a multivariate normal distribution. When the normal assumption is violated, He et al. (2024) showed that the discrepancy measure (2), as a special case of Bregman divergence, still works well for covariance fitting.

Now, suppose that we receive mini-batches of subjects from the data stream instead of a single observation. Let $\mathcal{I}_k$ denote the index set of the received observations, and the k th mini-batch contains subjects $\{\mathbf{y}_i : i \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$. It is natural to use the average of the covariance discrepancies plus a roughness penalty as the objective function for model parameter $(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2)$, that is

$$f_k(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2; \tau) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2) + \tau h(\boldsymbol{\Theta}), \quad (3)$$

where $|\mathcal{I}_k|$ is the size of the mini-batch, and $\tau > 0$ is the smoothing parameter balancing the data fidelity and the roughness penalty $h(\boldsymbol{\Theta})$. Popular choices of the roughness penalty include tensor-product smoothing penalty and thin-plate regression penalty (Wood, 2017). See more detail on the penalty in Section S2 in the supplementary materials.

3 Riemannian Stochastic Gradient Descent

We constrain the model parameter updates on the manifold $\text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p)$ to respect the geometric nature of FPCA formulation. In this section, we fix the smoothing parameter τ to simplify the discussion. A dynamic tuning strategy will be introduced in the next section.

Riemannian stochastic gradient descent (RSGD) is an extension of the standard stochastic gradient descent tailored for manifold-constrained problems. The main idea of RSGD is to evaluate the fit of the current estimate to the newly received mini-batch, compute the Riemannian gradient as the update direction, and project the parameters onto a new position on the manifold. Further details on RSGD can be found in Absil et al. (2008). In the following, we explain the updating rules for each component of the model parameter. Denote the updated model parameter at iteration k as $(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_k, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k, \sigma_k^2)$.

For the spline coefficients $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$, the Riemannian gradient at iteration k , denoted by $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} f_k$,

is obtained via

$$\nabla_{\Theta} f_k(\Theta_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2) = \mathcal{P}_{\Theta_{k-1}} \left(\partial_{\Theta} f_k(\Theta_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2) \right),$$

where the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{\Theta}$ projects the Euclidean gradients $\partial_{\Theta} f_k$ onto the tangent space $T_{\Theta} \text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p)$. See Section S1 in the supplementary materials for an introduction to projection and tangent space. Intuitively, the projection removes the component of the gradient that is perpendicular to the manifold, resulting in a refined search direction for the manifold-constrained problem. The previous estimate, Θ_{k-1} , is then updated along the Riemannian gradient. In RSGD, this update can be performed using either an exponential map or a retraction, both of which serve as manifold-specific analogs of standard gradient descent. Here, we focus on retraction due to its relative simplicity and computational efficiency. The retraction step at iteration k with a step size α_k is written as

$$\Theta_k = \mathcal{R}_{\Theta_{k-1}}(-\alpha_k \nabla_{\Theta} f_k(\Theta_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2)),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\Theta}$ is a retraction operator that smoothly maps the tangent space $T_{\Theta} \text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p)$ to the manifold $\text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p)$ and satisfies $\mathcal{R}_{\Theta}(\mathbf{0}_{p \times R}) = \Theta$ and $\frac{d}{d\alpha} \big|_{\alpha=0} \mathcal{R}_{\Theta}(-\alpha \Delta) = \Delta$ for any Θ, Δ in $\text{St}_{\mathbf{G}}(R, p)$.

For λ and σ^2 , we reparameterize them as $\lambda = \exp(\eta) + \delta$ with $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^R$, and $\sigma^2 = \exp(\zeta) + \delta$ with $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, where δ is a small positive constant. This approach ensures that λ and σ^2 remain bounded away from zero, thereby guaranteeing the non-singularity of $\Sigma_i(\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2)$, while simultaneously avoiding to impose explicit positivity constraints. Since η and ζ lie in the entire Euclidean space, their RSGD updates reduce to the standard SGD. The complete procedure for updating all model parameters is provided in Algorithm 1.

To conclude this section, we comment on the relationship between the online method and its batch counterpart. By the stochastic approximation theory ([Bonnabel, 2013](#); [Bottou et al., 2018](#)), as the number of mini-batches increases, the online updates of the model

Algorithm 1: RSGD optimizing $f(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2; \tau)$ with a fixed τ

Input: $(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)_{i=1}^N$, $(\alpha_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, $(\mathcal{I}_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, τ , δ
Initialize: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = \log(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 - \delta)$, $\zeta_0 = \log(\sigma_0^2 - \delta)$
for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 /* Calculate Riemannian stochastic gradients */
 $\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta = \mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2; \tau) + \tau \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} h(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}) \right)$
 $\mathbf{s}_k^\eta = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2; \tau)$
 $\mathbf{s}_k^\zeta = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \nabla_{\zeta} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2; \tau)$

 /* RSGD updates */
 $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_k = \mathcal{R}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k-1}}(-\alpha_k \mathbf{S}_k^\Theta)$
 $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k-1} \exp(-\alpha_k \mathbf{s}_k^\eta) + \delta$
 $\sigma_k^2 = \sigma_{k-1}^2 \exp(-\alpha_k \mathbf{s}_k^\zeta) + \delta$
end

parameter will converge to a stationary point of the population loss function

$$F(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2; \tau) = \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2)] + \tau h(\boldsymbol{\Theta}), \quad (4)$$

where the expectation is with respect to $(\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$. On the other hand, the *batch FPCA* method that solves the problem with all the observed data is minimizing the empirical loss function

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sigma^2) + \tau h(\boldsymbol{\Theta}).$$

It corresponds to the works of [Peng and Paul \(2009\)](#) and [He et al. \(2024\)](#) for FPCA over one-dimensional domain.

4 Dynamic Tuning

In this section, we design a novel dynamic tuning scheme for the smoothing parameter τ which is previously kept fixed in the objective function (3). In the literature on functional data analysis, smoothing parameter selection is crucial to estimating accuracy and model interpretability. Existing batch methods commonly use cross-validation and its variants to achieve model tuning. However, the multi-fold data split required by cross-validation

is not applicable to the online setting where data arrive sequentially. Even when we have access to the full dataset such that cross-validation is possible, the computational cost of searching the best among a fine grid of smoothing parameters is prohibitively high. It thus contradicts the fundamental goal of designing online methods for computational efficiency.

To address this issue, we dynamically update the smoothing parameter along with the model parameter updating process. Specifically, when the k th mini-batch arrives, the RSGD update of model parameter Θ_k with dynamic tuning τ_k is

$$\Theta_k = \mathcal{R}_{\Theta_{k-1}} \left(-\alpha_k \nabla_{\Theta} f_k(\Theta_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2; \tau_k) \right),$$

where the smoothing parameter τ_k is allowed to change with k . The rest model parameters, λ and σ^2 , that are not subject to smoothness regularization are still updated by the same approach as in the previous section. For simplicity, we write $\Psi = (\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2)$, denote its estimate at the k th iteration by Ψ_k , and abbreviate the k th parameter updating iteration as $\Psi_k = \text{RSGD}(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)$. Figure 1 displays the pipeline of model parameter update and dynamic tuning. Our dynamic tuning strategy is characterized by two primary compo-




Figure 1: A schematic diagram of the online estimation with dynamic tuning. At the k th iteration, a new smoothing parameter τ_k is chosen using the k th mini-batch and the current model parameter estimate Ψ_{k-1} . Then, the model parameter is updated to Ψ_k via RSGD. Consecutively, at the $(k+1)$ th iteration, τ_{k+1} is chosen based on the $(k+1)$ th mini-batch and Ψ_k , and the procedure proceeds. The pair (Ψ_{k-1}, τ_k) is presented in a rectangle as a node, and the RSGD step is a path connecting subsequent nodes. The node-path view motivates us to develop the beam search in Section 4.2 to dynamically select τ_k .

nents: a goodness-of-fit measure of the current model parameter estimate to the data, and

an efficient approach to acquire new smoothing parameter candidates. To these ends, we first propose a novel *averaged block validation* (ABV) score, which iteratively combines validation scores from each newly received data block using an exponential weighting scheme. Second, we develop a beam search algorithm to explore the space of smoothing parameters. While only a few rather than a dense grid of candidate smoothing parameters are maintained during the process, the one with the smallest ABV score is selected.

4.1 Averaged Block Validation Score

Recall that we define in (2) the covariance discrepancy measure of model parameter $\Psi = (\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2)$. When a new mini-batch arrives, let $V_k = 1/|\mathcal{I}_k| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \ell_i(\Psi_{k-1})$ be the validation score of Ψ_{k-1} using the k th mini-batch. We then obtain the *averaged validation* (AV) score by accumulating V_k 's with a constant $\omega \in (0, 1)$

$$V_0 = 0, \quad AV_k = (1 - \omega)V_k + \omega AV_{k-1}. \quad (5)$$

In fact, the AV score can be expressed as the exponentially weighted moving average of V_k 's, that is, $AV_k = (1 - \omega) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^j V_{k-j}$. It is clear that the weight ω^j decays fast as j increases. Therefore, the AV score places more importance on the more recent validation performance, which justifies its use in the online setting.

In our experiments, we found that the AV score often exhibits significant fluctuations across iterations, especially when the mini-batch size is small. A partial explanation is that the score is likely dominated by a few recent mini-batches, due to the rapid decay of the weight ω^j . To stabilize the variation of the AV score, we propose to form several adjacent min-batches as a data block and introduce the *averaged block validation* (ABV) score as follows. First, let q be the number of min-batches in each data block, and $\mathcal{K}_n = \{(n-1)q+1, \dots, nq\}$ be set of the mini-batch indexes in the n th data block. The *block validation* (BV) score of the n th data block is defined as the average of the validation scores across all

involved mini-batches, i.e., $BV_n = q^{-1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} V_k$. Then, we compute the ABV score using the exponential moving average such that $ABV_0 = 0, ABV_n = (1 - \omega)BV_n + \omega ABV_{n-1}$. Clearly, the ABV score reduces to the AV score in (5) when $q = 1$, and to the average of all V_k 's when q is infinite. Therefore, the ABV score serves as an intermediate between the AV score and the arithmetic mean of the validation scores. It effectively tracks validation performance throughout the sequential process, providing a more stable metric by incorporating more mini-batches.

4.2 Beam Search




Figure 2: A beam search diagram for the first three rounds of the dynamic tuning. The beam width $W = 2$, and the branching factor $B = 3$, such that $C = W \times B = 6$ candidate smoothing parameters are maintained throughout. Each node represents a pair of smoothing parameter and model parameter estimate (τ_k, Ψ_k) at iteration k . Dashed lines indicate RSGD steps from new to old nodes. During the update stage, model parameters are updated through q RSGD iterations (dashed lines) with smoothing parameters remaining fixed. Then the two nodes (highlighted in yellow) with the lowest ABV scores are selected, and each is further expanded into three new nodes (solid lines). Active paths are displayed in blue, whereas discarded paths are shown in gray.

Beam search is a heuristic tree search algorithm widely used to find approximate solutions to optimization problems, particularly in sequence generation tasks. It is an extension of the breadth-first search strategy that balances between breadth and depth exploration. In the dynamic tuning, we formulate the online search of best smoothing parameter as a

graph search problem. Figure 2 displays a conceptual diagram of the algorithm, where a node denotes a pair of smoothing parameter and corresponding model parameter estimate.

As the online procedure proceeds, instead of expanding all possible nodes, a fixed number of the most promising nodes, called the beam width, are retained for further exploration. After updating the model parameter by RSGD, we evaluate potential candidates based on the recorded ABV scores and keep only the top W candidates at each iteration, where W is the beam width. Next, for each of the selected nodes, we expand it into B children nodes with valid neighboring smoothing parameter values, where B is called the branching factor. Both the beam width W and branching factor B are critical to the performance of the beam search algorithm. A larger beam width or branching factor enables more comprehensive exploration, but at the cost of higher computational demands. To adjust the balance, we set $C = W \times B$ to be constant such that there are always C nodes under consideration at each iteration. It turns out to be efficient in practice.

In the following, we outline the three main stages of the dynamic tuning for smoothing parameter selection: update, selection, and exploration. To initialize, we set C smoothing parameters $\{\tau_0^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$, and let $\{\Psi_0^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$ be the corresponding model parameter estimates. Recall that the j th data block consists of q mini-batches whose indexes are $\mathcal{K}_n = \{(n-1)q+1, \dots, nq\}$.

Stage 1: Update When the n th data block arrives, we fix the smoothing parameters as their most recent values $\{\tau_{n-1}^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$. Using the mini-batches in this data block, we update the C model parameters in parallel such that $\Psi_k^{(l)} = \text{RSGD}(\Psi_{k-1}^{(l)}; \tau_{n-1}^{(l)}), k \in \mathcal{K}_n$.

Stage 2: Selection Among the recorded ABV scores $\{\text{ABV}_n^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$, we choose the smallest W scores and denote their indexes as $l_1, \dots, l_W$, where W is the beam width. The model parameter estimates in the selected nodes are $\Psi_{nq}^{(l_1)}, \dots, \Psi_{nq}^{(l_W)}$. The rest nodes are discarded.

Stage 3: Exploration To explore the smoothing parameter space efficiently, we expand each selected smoothing parameter to B new candidates, where B is the branching factor. In principle, the new candidates should be located within a narrow neighborhood of the current ones to avoid large variations. With the new smoothing parameters $\{\tau_n^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$ and corresponding model parameter estimates $\{\Psi_{nq+1}^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^C$, we return to Stage 1 and are ready for the next data block.

To sum up, the advantage of using beam search in dynamic tuning is that it reduces computational cost compared to exhaustive search methods, while still thoroughly exploring the smoothing parameter space. The trade-off is that beam search does not guarantee an optimal selection but offers a good balance between efficiency and accuracy.

5 Convergence Analysis

We develop the convergence theory based on that for the standard RSGD under mild conditions. The integration of the dynamic tuning brings challenges in analyzing the convergence of our RSGD algorithm, as the objective function varies throughout the online procedure.

Recall the shorthand notation $\Psi = (\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2)$, where Θ is the basis coefficient matrix, λ is the vector of top R eigenvalues, and σ^2 is the observation variance. Let ∇ be the Riemannian gradient operator with respect to (Θ, η, ζ) , where η and ζ are the logarithm transformation of λ and σ^2 , respectively. Regularity assumptions are provided in Section S5 in the supplementary materials.

The objective function $F(\Psi; \tau)$, defined in (4), is the expected covariance discrepancy plus a roughness penalty. The following proposition shows that F is retraction L -smooth, see Definition S1 in the supplementary materials for the definition. It characterizes the upper bound of the one-step descent in $F(\cdot; \tau_k)$ during each iteration k , establishing a useful result for the final convergence analysis.

Proposition 1. *Under Assumptions S1 and S3 in the supplementary materials, there exists some $L > 0$ such that for $k \geq 1$ the one-step descent in the objective function $F(\cdot; \tau_k)$ satisfies*

$$F(\Psi_k; \tau_k) - F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k) \leq -\alpha_k \langle \nabla f_k(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k), \nabla F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 L \|\nabla f_k(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2.$$

Theorem 1 describes the convergence of the RSGD algorithm with a dynamic smoothing parameter. By Assumption S1, we denote by τ^* a limiting value of the dynamic smoothing parameter sequence $\{\tau_k\}$.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions S1–S3 in the supplementary materials, the RSGD iterate Ψ_k will converge almost surely to a stationary point of $F(\Psi; \tau^*)$, i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla F(\Psi_k; \tau^*)\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s. \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

The main idea of the proof is to inspect the one-step descent $F(\Psi_k; \tau_{k+1}) - F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)$, derive its upper bound using Proposition 1, and sum over iterations to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \|\nabla F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2 \right] &\leq F(\Psi_0; \tau_1) - F(\Psi_K; \tau_{K+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f_k(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2] + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} [(\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k) h(\Psi_k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Assumptions S1–S3 ensure that all terms on the right side of (6) remain bounded, which implies that the left-hand side converges as K goes to infinity. If we can further show that $\|\nabla F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2$ converges, its limit must be zero given $\mathbb{E} [\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k \|\nabla F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2] < \infty$. The convergence of $\|\nabla F(\Psi_{k-1}; \tau_k)\|^2$ can be proved by following the argument in [Bonnabel \(2013\)](#) and applying Fisk’s theorem ([Fisk, 1965](#)). Due to the continuity of F , $\|\nabla F(\Psi_k; \tau^*)\|^2$ converges to the same limit as $\|\nabla F(\Psi_k; \tau_{k+1})\|^2$, which concludes the proof. The complete proof is presented in Section S6 in the supplementary materials.

Algorithm 2: Riemannian Adam optimizing $f(\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2; \tau)$ with a fixed τ

Input: $(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)_{i=1}^N$, $(\alpha_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, $(\mathcal{I}_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, τ , δ , $0 < \beta_1, \beta_2 < 1$
Initialize: Θ_0 , $\eta_0 = \log(\lambda_0 - \delta)$, $\zeta_0 = \log(\sigma_0^2 - \delta)$, $\mathbf{M}_0^\Theta = \mathbf{0}_{p \times R}$, $\mathbf{m}_0^\eta = \mathbf{0}_R$, $m_0^\zeta = 0$,
 $\mathbf{V}_0^\Theta = \mathbf{0}_{p \times R}$, $\mathbf{v}_0^\eta = \mathbf{0}_R$, $v_0^\zeta = 0$
for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 Compute $\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta, \mathbf{s}_k^\eta, s_k^\zeta$ as in Algorithm 1;
 $\mathbf{M}_k^\Theta = (1 - \beta_1)\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta + \beta_1\mathcal{P}_{\Theta_{k-1}}(\mathbf{M}_{k-1}^\Theta)$;
 $\mathbf{V}_k^\Theta = (1 - \beta_2)\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta \odot \mathbf{S}_k^\Theta + \beta_2\mathbf{V}_{k-1}^\Theta$;
 $\Theta_k = \mathcal{R}_{\Theta_{k-1}}(-\frac{\alpha_k\sqrt{1-\beta_2^k}}{1-\beta_1^k}\mathbf{M}_k^\Theta \oslash \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_k^\Theta})$;
 Update $\eta_k = \log(\lambda_k - \delta)$ and $\zeta_k = \log(\sigma_k^2 - \delta)$ with the standard Adam;
end

* Notations $\odot$, $\oslash$, and $\sqrt{\cdot}$ are entry-wise multiplication, division, and square root, respectively.

6 RSGD Variants

In this section, we incorporate two widely recognized SGD variants, adaptive moment estimation (Adam) and averaged SGD (ASGD), as drop-in replacements for the RSGD step within the online FPCA framework. In the Euclidean case, both variants are designed for improved convergence and robust performance. On the one hand, Adam is widely used optimization algorithm in machine learning that takes the advantages of momentum and adaptive learning rate. It rescales the updating direction with an estimated second-order moment of the gradients, enabling efficient computation with little memory requirements. On the other hand, ASGD performs the same update as the standard SGD, but it enhances the performance by maintaining a running average of the model parameter estimates over iterations. The general framework of Adam and ASGD are presented in the Section S4 in the supplementary materials.

Both Adam and ASGD have been successfully adapted to Riemannian matrix manifolds (Béçigneul and Ganea, 2019; Kasai et al., 2019; Tripuraneni et al., 2018). Necessary operations, such as averaging in tangent spaces and retraction back to the manifold, are needed to ensure updates stay on the manifold and respect the geometric structure.

Algorithm 2 presents the Riemannian Adam (RAdam) algorithm under our online

FPCA framework. At the k th iteration, the algorithm uses two matrices to store the exponential average of historical gradient information for Θ : one matrix averaging the gradients to the momentum

$$\mathbf{M}_k^\Theta = (1 - \beta_1)\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta + \beta_1\mathcal{P}_{\Theta_{k-1}}(\mathbf{M}_{k-1}^\Theta),$$

and another matrix averaging the entry-wise squares of the gradients

$$\mathbf{V}_k^\Theta = (1 - \beta_2)\mathbf{S}_k^\Theta \odot \mathbf{S}_k^\Theta + \beta_2\mathbf{V}_{k-1}^\Theta,$$

where $\odot$, $\oslash$, and $\sqrt{\cdot}$ are entry-wise multiplication, division, and square root, respectively. The exponential averaging process is controlled by constants $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, 1)$, representing how much of the stored information will be carried on to the next iteration. In addition to using a retraction $\mathcal{R}_{\Theta_{k-1}}$ in updating Θ_k as in RSGD, RAdam differs from the standard Adam in that it first projects the past momentum $\mathbf{M}_{k-1}^\Theta$ onto the current tangent space by the operator $\mathcal{P}_{\Theta_{k-1}}$ before combining it to the current $\mathbf{M}_k^\Theta$. Otherwise, the sum of the momentum and the current gradient, which are two elements on the manifold, may not be well-defined. For the other model parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \log \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\zeta = \log \sigma^2$, RAdam reduces to the regular Adam.

Algorithm 3 outlines the steps of Riemannian ASGD. A new retraction operation is used to iteratively average RSGD estimates over the Riemannian manifold. Specifically, the Riemannian average estimate of Θ at the k th iteration, denoted by $\bar{\Theta}_k$, is updated by

$$\bar{\Theta}_k = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\Theta}_{k-1}}\left(\frac{1}{k}\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\Theta}_k}^{-1}(\Theta_k)\right).$$

The averaged estimates for the other model parameters are updated by the regular iterative averaging

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k = \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{k-1} + \frac{1}{k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{k-1}), \quad \bar{\zeta}_k = \bar{\zeta}_{k-1} + \frac{1}{k}(\zeta_k - \bar{\zeta}_{k-1}).$$

We start the averaging stage after a pre-specified number of k_A iterations. It can avoid

Algorithm 3: Riemannian ASGD optimizing $f(\Theta, \lambda, \sigma^2; \tau)$ with a fixed τ

Input: Manifold $\mathcal{M}$, step size (α_k) , averaging starting time k_A
Initialize: Parameters $\Theta_0, \lambda_0, \sigma_0^2$, averages $\bar{\Theta}_0 = \Theta_0, \bar{\eta}_0 = \log \lambda_0, \bar{\zeta}_0 = \log \sigma_0^2$
for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 $\Theta_k = \mathcal{R}_{\Theta_{k-1}}(-\alpha_k \nabla_{\Theta} f_k(\Theta_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}^2; \tau))$;
 Update $\eta_k = \log \lambda_k$ and $\zeta = \log \sigma_k^2$ by the standard SGD ;
 if $k \geq k_A$ **then**
 $\bar{\Theta}_k = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\Theta}_{k-1}}(\frac{1}{k-k_A} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\Theta}_k}^{-1}(\Theta_k))$;
 $\bar{\eta}_k = \frac{1}{k-k_A} \bar{\eta}_{k-1} + \frac{k-k_A-1}{k-k_A} \eta_{k-1}$;
 $\bar{\zeta}_k = \frac{1}{k-k_A} \bar{\zeta}_{k-1} + \frac{k-k_A-1}{k-k_A} \zeta_{k-1}$;
 else
 $\bar{\Theta}_k = \Theta_k, \bar{\eta}_k = \eta_k, \bar{\zeta}_k = \zeta_k$;
 end
end

including less accurate early updates in the average and is proved to yield optimal convergence rate (Rakhlin et al., 2012).

7 Simulation Studies

We conduct simulations to implement the proposed online methods, named by OnlineFPCA, and compare them with other online and batch methods under both one- and two-dimensional settings. In short, the performance of our methods can be significantly improved by allowing for multiple epochs. Even if the data are revisited multiple times, OnlineFPCA achieves the best estimation accuracy with observably less computational time among existing online and some batch methods. More importantly, OnlineFPCA offers an efficient means for multi-dimensional FPCA while most online and batch methods fail due to the curse of dimensionality. In the following simulation studies, we aim to extract the leading three FPCs from $N = 5000$ sequentially arrive functional data which are measured at irregular locations with contaminated Gaussian noises. The mini-batch size is 5 for all online procedures. All experiments are repeated 100 times on a Ubuntu server equipped with 8 CPU cores, 16 GB of memory, and 859 GB of storage.

We first describe the data generation. For the one-dimensional (1D) case, we consider curves defined on $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$ of the form $X_i(t) = \sum_{r=1}^{10} \xi_{nr} \phi_{r0}(t)$, where the true eigenfunctions $\phi_{10}(t) = 1$ and $\phi_{r0}(t) = \sqrt{2} \cos\{(r-1)\pi t\}$, and ξ_{nr} are independently sampled from $N(0, \lambda_r)$ with $\lambda_r = 0.4r^{-2}$. The observation number m_i for the i th subject is sampled from $N(6, 4)$ and rounded to an integer, and the locations $t_{n1}, \dots, t_{nm_i}$ are sampled from the Uniform $[0, 1]$. Let iid noises $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$, and we generate the observations by $y_{ij} = X(\mathbf{t}_{ij}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$. For the two-dimensional (2D) case, we consider surfaces defined on $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]^2$ of the form $X_i(s, t) = \sum_{r=1}^6 \xi_{nr} \phi_{r0}(s, t)$, where the true eigenfunctions by $\phi_r(s, t) = e_{k_1}(s)e_{k_2}(t)$, with $e_k(t) = \sqrt{2} \cos(k\pi t)$, $r = 3(k_1 - 1) + k_2$ for $k_1 = 1, 2$ and $k_2 = 1, 2, 3$, and ξ_r are independently sampled from $N(0, \lambda_r)$ with $\lambda_r = 2^{-r+1}$. The observation number m_i is an integer rounded from a sample of $N(25, 6)$, and the locations $(s_{n1}, t_{n1}), \dots, (s_{nm_i}, t_{nm_i})$ are uniformly sampled from $[0, 1]^2$. Let iid noises $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, 0.2^2)$, and we generate the observations by $y_{ij} = X(s_{ij}, \mathbf{t}_{ij}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$.

The competing methods under investigation are as follows. For the 1D case, we compare with the online method by [Yang and Yao \(2023\)](#) whose major focus is on covariance function estimation. This method is denoted by OnlineCov in our paper to underline that the estimation of FPCs is carried out via a subsequent decomposition of the estimated covariance function. In contrast, OnlineFPCA takes a direct approach to estimating FPCs. Among the relatively plentiful batch methods, we compare with FACE ([Xiao et al., 2018](#)), REML ([Peng and Paul, 2009](#)), and SOAP ([Nie et al., 2022](#)). For the 2D case, to the best of our knowledge, no off-the-shelf online FPCA method exists, while batch methods are also scarce except for some extensions from the one-dimensional counterparts. For comparison, we consider SOAP-2D proposed by [Shi et al. \(2022\)](#) which extends the SOAP method in 1D to 2D. Recently, [Wang et al. \(2022\)](#) proposed mOpCov as a low-rank covariance function estimator for multidimensional functional data. It works well for datasets of moderate size but fails to scale up because of daunting memory requirements.

When implementing our OnlineFPCA, we start with applying a batch method to the first N_{init} subjects for initialization. Specifically, FACE is used for the 1D case while mOpCov is for the 2D case. Then, we run the RSGD (Section 3) and the RAdam (Section 6) combined with the iterative averaging (Section 6) and dynamic tuning (Section 4) to stabilize the estimation. The above two methods are named OnlineFPCA-RSGD and OnlineFPCA-RAdam, respectively. We configure the step size α_k for RAdam as $0.2k^{-0.6}$, complying with Assumption S2 in the supplementary materials. The coefficient 0.2 is empirically determined to be effective and is consistently used throughout the experiments without additional fine-tuning. Notably, RAdam normalizes the descent direction, unlike RSGD. To align the scales of descent in both stochastic methods, we adjust the step sizes in RSGD. Specifically, we scale $0.2k^{-0.6}$ by dividing it by the mean L^2 -norm of the gradient, where this mean norm is estimated from the first N_{init} subjects. We also configure the β_1 and β_2 , two extra parameters required by RAdam, as 0.9 and 0.999, respectively. For spline specification, we choose B-spline bases of degree 3 with 5 equally spaced inner knots within $[0, 1]$ for the 1D setting, and the tensor product bases on $[0, 1]^2$ can be further constructed.

In dynamic tuning, we set the branching factor $B = 3$ and the beam width $W = 2$, hence in total $C = 6$ candidate parameters are maintained simultaneously. For both 1D and 2D scenarios, we select the largest initial smoothing parameters as 0.1 and 0.001, respectively. These chosen values are roughly the largest number such that the magnitude of the regularization term in the objective function is comparable to that of the data likelihood term. The remaining five smoothing parameters are set sequentially at $10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, \dots, 10^{-5}$ of the largest parameter. We execute the two OnlineFPCA methods over multiple epochs, monitoring their performance throughout the online procedure. The dynamic tuning was stopped after the first epoch since all data had been used for validation by that point. Since multiple revisits can generally improve the performance of OnlineFPCA, we run our procedures for up to five epochs to ensure good convergence. In contrast, there is no need

Setting	Category	Method	Time (s)	
1D	Online	OnlineFPCA	1 epoch	60.4
			2 epochs	70.7
			3 epochs	81.0
	OnlineCov		513.3	
	Batch	REML	403.3	
FACE		152.1		
SOAP		288.6		
2D	Online	OnlineFPCA	1 epoch	151.1
			3 epochs	168.6
			5 epochs	185.9
	Batch	SOAP-2D	625.4	

Table 1: Running times of online and batch FPCA methods in the simulation studies. OnlineFPCA is run for multiple epochs for better performance. REML, FACE, and SOAP are the batch methods compared in the 1D case, while SOAP-2D is the only competing method in the 2D case.

for OnlineCov to run for multiple epochs, because the sufficient statistics maintained by OnlineCov have already stored the information from previously processed data.

Setting	Category	Method	RMSE			
			ϕ_1	ϕ_2	ϕ_3	
1D	Online	OnlineFPCA-RSGD	1 epoch	0.058	0.118	0.243
			2 epochs	0.030	0.089	0.209
			3 epochs	0.028	0.083	0.197
		OnlineFPCA-RAdam	1 epoch	0.056	0.083	0.211
			2 epochs	0.028	0.060	0.155
			3 epochs	0.026	0.059	0.147
	OnlineCov		0.029	0.082	0.181	
	Batch	REML	0.021 [*]	0.058 [*]	0.124	
FACE		0.029	0.070	0.147		
SOAP		0.043	0.069	0.092 [*]		
2D	Online	OnlineFPCA-RSGD	1 epoch	0.060	0.167	0.172
			3 epochs	0.044	0.110	0.111
			5 epochs	0.042[*]	0.088	0.091
		OnlineFPCA-RAdam	1 epoch	0.086	0.178	0.167
			3 epochs	0.058	0.117	0.109
	5 epochs		0.046	0.089	0.088[*]	
	Batch	SOAP-2D	0.054	0.063 [*]	0.103	

Table 2: Estimation accuracy of the top three FPCs by online and batch methods in the simulation studies. Our two OnlineFPCA algorithms, RSGD and RAdam, are run for multiple epochs for better performance. The lowest RMSE values among online methods are highlighted in bold, with the overall lowest RMSE across all methods marked by an asterisk (“*”). REML, FACE, and SOAP are the batch methods compared in the 1D case, while SOAP-2D is the only competing method in the 2D case.

Table 1 presents the computational times for both online and batch methods in the simulation examples. Our OnlineFPCA method demonstrates remarkable computational efficiency. Despite running for multiple epochs, it completes in significantly less time than competing methods require for a single epoch. Note that the initialization time for OnlineFPCA is included in the first epoch. This efficiency arises from several factors: the direct representation of FPCs rather than relying on the full covariance matrix, the low computational complexity of the RSGD and RAdam algorithms, and an efficient tuning strategy that minimizes redundant computations. Furthermore, the time required for subsequent epochs is significantly shorter than the first, as initialization and dynamic tuning are not repeated.

Table 2 displays the estimation accuracy for the leading three FPCs. As shown by the results, OnlineFPCA methods provide accurate FPC estimations. In the 1D scenario, OnlineFPCA-RSGD performs comparably to the online method OnlineCov, while OnlineFPCA-RAdam achieves accuracy comparable to the best batch method for the first two FPCs. In the 2D scenario, both OnlineFPCA approaches yield accuracy on par with the batch method SOAP-2D. In conclusion, our methods are not only competitive in online FPCA for functional data but also serve as strong alternatives to batch FPCA methods, effectively handling large functional data streams.

Figures 3 illustrates the dynamic tuning process of one experiment for the 1D simulation study, and a similar plot for the 2D case is included in Section S7 of the supplementary materials. In both cases, the dynamic tuning algorithm effectively explores the smoothing parameter space. The selected τ_k begins at a relatively large value and gradually converges to 0 as k increases and more data become available. This decreasing trend in τ_k aligns with standard spline smoothing theory, which suggests that the optimal smoothing parameter decreases as the sample size grows.




Figure 3: The dynamic tuning paths for OnlineFPCA-RAdam or OnlineFPCA-RSGD in the 1D FPCA simulation study. The linked blue circles denote the selected smoothing parameters, while the grey circles denote the discarded candidate parameters. Overall, the selected parameters tend to decrease as more data become available.

8 Real Data Analysis

8.1 PM10 Air Quality

In this section, we study the spatial patterns of the air quality data from the Air Quality System (AQS) (<https://www.epa.gov/aqs>), an important repository maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that takes into account multiple types of pollution, including particulate matter, ground-level ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and carbon monoxide. Specifically, we focus on PM10, which describes inhalable particles with diameters of 10 micrometers or less. The levels of PM10 pollution in the database are recorded as integer indexes called the Air Quality Index (AQI), which are converted from the PM10 concentration. We retrieve the daily AQI from 1982 to 2022 collected at 3,443 monitoring sites across the contiguous United States (the US territory excluding the only two non-contiguous states, Alaska and Hawaii, and all other offshore




Figure 4: The sampling irregularities among the AQI monitoring sites. Blue circles stand for daily records, while darker color indicates that higher measurements are densely collected around. As the air quality data at different sites are measured intermittently at different frequencies, the daily records can be as abundant as that on January 1, 2022, or as scarce as Oct 31, 2022.

insular areas). On each day, the data may be only available at a portion of the sites, as different sites record the air quality data intermittently at different frequencies. Figure 4 displays the spatial maps of monitoring sites that collected PM₁₀ AQI data on two sampled dates, January 1 and October 31, 2022, showing the irregularities of the data.

In this study, we carry out the data analysis by modeling the daily AQI spatial maps as two-dimensional functional data. To preprocess the data, we first transform AQI to its logarithmic value to correct the observable right-skewness. Next, we subtract the mean function which is estimated by the tensor product smoothing implemented in the `bam` function from the R package `mgcv`. Then, we keep only the data records of every Saturday to reduce the temporal dependency among the data and view the measurements as independent functional data. Finally, we bin the monitoring station sites into $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ boxes and average measurements within each box, creating an aggregated measurement placed at the box center. It avoids repeated computations over the area with extremely dense measurements. After all pre-processing steps, we end up with 2,045 days and a total of 179,619 observations.




Figure 5: Top four FPCs estimated by OnlineFPCA-RAdam in the air pollution data analysis.

We apply the OnlineFPCA-RAdam to extract the top 6 FPCs of the large and irregularly spaced AQI data. We define tensor product B-spline bases on the $[125^\circ\text{W}, 67^\circ\text{W}] \times [25^\circ\text{N}, 49^\circ\text{N}]$ box that contains the contiguous United States, where 8 marginal basis functions are placed along longitudes and another 6 basis functions along latitudes. The model parameters are initialized by mOpCov with 10% of the data sampled from each day in the first 100 days. The subsampling used in the initialization is necessary for mOpCov to work well. OnlineFPCA-RAdam runs with mini-batches of size 10. In dynamic tuning configured by $C = 6$, $B = 3$, and $W = 2$, the smoothing parameter is dynamically selected from three candidates, with initialization $\{10^{-4}, \dots, 10^{-9}\}$, and is updated for each data block containing 100 days. Finally, only 1.6 minutes are used to finish the RAdam procedure. In comparison, the batch method SOAP-2D uses 35.4 minutes, and mOpCov is not able to complete calculations within a reasonable time range.

Figure 5 presents the estimated first four functional principal components (FPCs). The proportion of variation explained by each FPC is determined by the ratio of its estimated eigenvalue, λ_k to the sum of all eigenvalues. The first FPC is positive across the entire

domain, accounting for 32% of the total variation. Its corresponding score represents a weighted average of the air quality index across the U.S., with the first FPC serving as the weight. The second FPC is positive in the northwestern region and negative elsewhere, explaining 29.4% of the total variation. Its corresponding score reflects the contrast in air quality between the northwestern region and the rest of the country. The third FPC is negative in the western region and positive elsewhere, contributing 22.6% of the total variation. Its corresponding score captures the contrast in air quality between the western region and the rest of the U.S. The fourth FPC is negative in the central-northern region and positive elsewhere. Its corresponding score represents the contrast in air quality between the central-northern region and the rest of the country.

8.2 GFR Longitudinal Trajectories after Kidney Transplant

Glomerular Filtration Rate (GFR) is a fundamental metric in nephrology, quantifying the volume of blood filtered by the glomeruli, the kidney’s microscopic filtering units, per minute. This indicator is particularly important in the context of kidney transplantation. After a transplant, recipients may experience various changes in kidney function due to factors like transplant rejection, medication effects, or the onset of chronic kidney disease. Monitoring GFR in transplant recipients thus becomes a vital component of post-operative care. Our study utilizes a dataset compiled by [Liu et al. \(2023\)](#), who estimated GFR based on the creatinine levels and associated factors. This dataset encompasses GFR records for 143,604 recipients, tracked annually for up to seven years post-transplant. Notably, only 36.9% of recipients have complete records for all seven years, 52.3% are missing one year of data, and 10.7% have five or fewer records.

The focus of our study is to perform FPCA for the GFR dataset with the post-transplant GFRs treated as irregularly observed one-dimensional functional data over time. Due to the large data size, traditional batch FPCA methods will be time-consuming. Instead, we resort

to the online alternatives for FPCA including our OnlineFPCA methods and the OnlineCov method by [Yang and Yao \(2023\)](#). Before analysis, we center the data by subtracting the




Figure 6: The estimated top three FPCs for the GFR Longitudinal Trajectories by OnlineFPCA-RAdam (solid red lines) and OnlineCov (dashed blue lines).

annual mean GFR and employ a cubic B-spline basis on the interval $[1, 7]$ with five evenly spaced knots to represent each individual subject. The model parameters are initialized based on the first 100 recipients. OnlineFPCA-RAdam runs with a mini-batch of size 20 for one epoch. In dynamic tuning configured with $C = 3$, $B = 3$, and $W = 1$, the smoothing parameter is dynamically selected from three candidates, with initialization $\{10^{-1}, 10^{-2.5}, 10^{-4}\}$, and is updated for each data block containing 200 recipients. For

OnlineCov, we also maintain three candidate bandwidths in parallel for a fair comparison.

Figure 6 presents the first three estimated FPCs after processing datasets of 400, 20,000, and 100,000 recipients. As the number of data increases, the estimated FPCs given by the two methods gradually converge. Meanwhile, processing all 143,604 recipients took only around 7 minutes with OnlineFPCA-RAdam, compared to more than 89 minutes with OnlineCov, approximately 13 times longer. The first FPC estimated using the OnlineFPCA-RAdam method remains positive throughout the seven-year period, accounting for 90.2% of the total variation. Its corresponding score represents a weighted average of each subject’s longitudinal GFR trajectory, with the first FPC serving as the weight. The second FPC is positive during the first four years and negative thereafter, explaining 8.1% of the total variation. Its corresponding score reflects the decline in GFR after four years. The third FPC is negative between years 2 and 5 and positive at other times, contributing 1.7% of the total variation. Its corresponding score captures the contrast in GFR between years 2–5 and the rest of the timeline.

9 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a novel online framework for functional principal component analysis applied to data streams over multidimensional domains. By using a manifold optimization approach and regularized spline approximations, we successfully incorporated the smoothness and orthonormality of functional principal components within a penalized framework. A key contribution of this work is the integration of dynamic tuning for smoothing parameter selection, which adapts to the streaming nature of the data. Our dynamic tuning strategy, based on a rolling averaged block validation score, effectively tracks the estimation performance and balances the model regularization. The Riemannian stochastic gradient descent algorithm, with extensions inspired by adaptive moment estimation and

averaging techniques, not only provides an efficient and scalable approach for estimating FPCs for large-scale multidimensional functional data, but is also competitive in terms of both computational efficiency and accuracy.

Several directions for future work can be identified. We mainly focus in this work on functional data on multidimensional Euclidean spaces. It is of practical interest to adapt the proposed approach to non-Euclidean manifolds where higher-order temporal or spatial interactions exist, for example, neuroimaging signals located over the cortical surface. Moreover, extending other batch FPCA formulations, such as those based on covariance estimation, tensor decomposition, or regression, to the online setting could enhance computational efficiency and scalability while retaining the advantages of batch methods for large-scale data. In summary, extending the online FPCA framework to more diverse models and applications holds great promise for improving real-time analysis in various domains.

References

- Absil, P.-A., R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre (2008). *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press.
- Bécigneul, G. and O. Ganea (2019). Riemannian adaptive optimization methods. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bonnabel, S. (2013). Stochastic gradient descent on Riemannian manifolds. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 58(9), 2217–2229.
- Bottou, L., F. E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal (2018). Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *SIAM Review* 60(2), 223–311.

- de Boor, C. (1972). On calculating with B-splines. *Journal of Approximation Theory* 6(1), 50–62.
- Ferraty, F. and P. Vieu (2006). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis: Theory and Practice*. New York: Springer.
- Fisk, D. L. (1965). Quasi-martingales. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 120(3), 369–389.
- He, S., J. Z. Huang, and K. He (2024). Penalized spline estimation of principal components for sparse functional data: Rates of convergence. *Bernoulli* 30(4), 2795 – 2820.
- Hsing, T. and R. Eubank (2015). *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators*. New York: Wiley.
- Huang, J. Z. and Y. Su (2021). Asymptotic properties of penalized spline estimators in concave extended linear models: Rates of convergence. *The Annals of Statistics* 49(6), 3383–3407.
- James, G. M., T. J. Hastie, and C. A. Sugar (2000). Principal component models for sparse functional data. *Biometrika* 87(3), 587–602.
- Kasai, H., P. Jawanpuria, and B. Mishra (2019). Riemannian adaptive stochastic gradient algorithms on matrix manifolds. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3262–3271. PMLR.
- Kingma, D. P. and J. Ba (2014). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Lila, E., J. A. Aston, and L. M. Sangalli (2016). Smooth principal component analysis over two-dimensional manifolds with an application to neuroimaging. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 10(4), 1854–1879.

- Liu, H., J. You, and J. Cao (2023). Functional L-optimality subsampling for functional generalized linear models with massive data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24(219), 1–41.
- Luo, L. and P. X.-K. Song (2020). Renewable estimation and incremental inference in generalized linear models with streaming data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 82(1), 69–97.
- Morris, J. S. (2015). Functional regression. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 2(1), 321–359.
- Morris, J. S., V. Baladandayuthapani, R. C. Herrick, P. Sanna, and H. Gutstein (2011). Automated analysis of quantitative image data using isomorphic functional mixed models, with application to proteomics data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 5(2A), 894.
- Nie, Y. and J. Cao (2020). Sparse functional principal component analysis in a new regression framework. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 152, 107016.
- Nie, Y., Y. Yang, L. Wang, and J. Cao (2022). Recovering the underlying trajectory from sparse and irregular longitudinal data. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 50(1), 122–141.
- Peng, J. and D. Paul (2009). A geometric approach to maximum likelihood estimation of the functional principal components from sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 18(4), 995–1015.
- Polyak, B. T. and A. B. Juditsky (1992). Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 30(4), 838–855.
- Qiu, Y., J. Lei, and K. Roeder (2023). Gradient-based sparse principal component analysis with extensions to online learning. *Biometrika* 110(2), 339–360.

- Rakhlín, A., O. Shamir, and K. Sridharan (2012). Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1571–1578. PMLR.
- Ramsay, J. and B. Silverman (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. New York: Springer.
- Sarkar, S. and V. M. Panaretos (2022). Covnet: Covariance networks for functional data on multidimensional domains. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 84(5), 1785–1820.
- Sato, H. and K. Aihara (2019). Cholesky QR-based retraction on the generalized Stiefel manifold. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 72, 293–308.
- Shi, H., Y. Yang, L. Wang, D. Ma, M. F. Beg, J. Pei, and J. Cao (2022). Two-dimensional functional principal component analysis for image feature extraction. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 31(4), 1127–1140.
- Tripuraneni, N., N. Flammarion, F. Bach, and M. I. Jordan (2018). Averaging stochastic gradient descent on Riemannian manifolds. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, pp. 650–687. PMLR.
- Wang, J., R. K. Wong, and X. Zhang (2022). Low-rank covariance function estimation for multidimensional functional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117(538), 809–822.
- Wang, J.-L., J.-M. Chiou, and H.-G. Müller (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 3, 257–295.
- Wood, S. N. (2017). *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R* (2nd ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Xiao, L., C. Li, W. Checkley, and C. Crainiceanu (2018). Fast covariance estimation for sparse functional data. *Statistics and Computing* 28(3), 511–522.
- Yang, Y. and F. Yao (2023). Online estimation for functional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118(543), 1630–1644.
- Yao, F., H.-G. Müller, and J.-L. Wang (2005). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100(470), 577–590.
- Zhang, T. and N. Simon (2022). A sieve stochastic gradient descent estimator for online nonparametric regression in Sobolev ellipsoids. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(5), 2848–2871.
- Zhou, L., J. Z. Huang, and R. J. Carroll (2008). Joint modelling of paired sparse functional data using principal components. *Biometrika* 95(3), 601–619.
- Zhou, L. and H. Pan (2014). Principal component analysis of two-dimensional functional data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 23(3), 779–801.