

Appendix F

Proof of EDM composition

F.1 EDM-entry exponential

(§4.10)

$$D \in \text{EDM}^n \Leftrightarrow [1 - e^{-\lambda d_{ij}}] \in \text{EDM}^n \quad \forall \lambda > 0 \quad (656)$$

Lemma 2.1. from *A Tour d'Horizon ... on Completion Problems*. [154]
The following assertions are equivalent: for $D = [d_{ij}, i, j = 1 \dots n] \in \mathbb{S}_h^n$ and \mathcal{E}^n the ellipsope in \mathbb{S}^n (§4.9.1.0.1),

(i) $D \in \text{EDM}^n$

(ii) $e^{-\lambda D} \triangleq [e^{-\lambda d_{ij}}] \in \mathcal{E}^n$ for all $\lambda > 0$

(iii) $\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T - e^{-\lambda D} \triangleq [1 - e^{-\lambda d_{ij}}] \in \text{EDM}^n$ for all $\lambda > 0$ ◇

Proof. [211] (*confer* [149])

Date: Fri, 06 Jun 2003 10:42:47 +0200
 From: Monique Laurent <M.Laurent@cwi.nl>
 To: Jon Dattorro <dattorro@Stanford.EDU>
 Subject: Re: Tour

Hallo Jon,

I looked again at the paper of Schoenberg and what I can see is the following:

1) the equivalence of Lemma 2.1 (i) (ii) (my paper) is stated in Schoenberg's Theorem 1 (page 527).

2) (ii) implies (iii) can be seen from the statement in the beginning of section 3, saying that a distance space embeds in L_2 iff some associated matrix is PSD. Let me reformulate it:

Let $d=(d_{ij})_{i,j=0,1,\dots,n}$ be a distance space on $n+1$ points (i.e., symmetric matrix of order $n+1$ with zero diagonal) and let $p=(p_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ be the symmetric matrix of order n related by relations:

$$(A) \quad p_{ij} = \{d_{0i}+d_{0j}-d_{ij}\}^2 \text{ for } i,j=1,\dots,n$$

or equivalently

$$(B) \quad d_{0i} = p_{ii}, \quad d_{ij} = p_{ii}+p_{jj}-2p_{ij} \\ \text{for } i,j=1,\dots,n$$

Then, d embeds in L_2 iff p is positive semidefinite matrix iff d is of negative type
 (see second half of page 525 and top of page 526)

For the implication from (ii) to (iii), set:

$\rho = \exp(-\lambda d)$ and define d' from ρ using (B) above. Then, d' is a distance space on $n+1$ points that embeds in L_2 . Thus its subspace of n points also embeds in L_2 and is precisely $1 - \exp(-\lambda d)$.

Note that (iii) implies (ii) cannot be read immediately from this argument since (iii) involves the subdistance of d' on n points (and not the full d' on $n+1$ points).

3) Show (iii) implies (i) by using the series expansion of the function $1 - \exp(-\lambda d)$; the constant term cancels; λ factors out; remains a summation of d plus a multiple of λ ; letting λ go to 0 gives the result.

As far as I can see this is not explicitly written in Schoenberg. But Schoenberg also uses such an argument of expansion of the exponential function plus letting λ go to 0 (see first proof in page 526).

I hope this helps. If not just ask again.
Best regards, Monique

> Hi Monique
>
> I'm reading your "A Tour d'Horizon..." from the AMS book "Topics in
> Semidefinite and Interior-Point Methods".
>
> On page 56, Lemma 2.1(iii), $1 - \exp(-\lambda D)$ is EDM \iff D is EDM.
> You cite Schoenberg 1938; a paper I have acquired. I am missing the
> connection of your Lemma(iii) to that paper; most likely because of my
> lack of understanding of Schoenberg's results. I am wondering if you
> might provide a hint how you arrived at that result in terms of
> Schoenberg's results.
>
> Jon Dattorro

