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## Euclidean distance matrix completion

Given a weighted graph, $(V, E, \delta)$, find an EDM $D$ such that

$$
D_{i j} \approx \delta_{i j}, \quad \forall(i, j) \in E
$$

For example, we could (try to) solve

$$
\min _{D \in \mathbb{E} \mathbb{D} \mathbb{M}} \sum_{(i, j) \in E}\left(D_{i j}-\delta_{i j}\right)^{2}
$$
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## Graph Embedding

Given a weighted graph, $(V, E, \delta)$, and embedding dimension $d$, find $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ such that

$$
\left\|y_{i}-y_{j}\right\| \approx \delta_{i j}, \quad \forall(i, j) \in E
$$

For example, we could (try to) solve

$$
\min _{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}} \sum_{(i, j) \in E}\left(\left\|y_{i}-y_{j}\right\|-\delta_{i j}\right)^{2}
$$

(Known as non-metric scaling in the statistics literature.)

The problem is also known as multidimensional scaling, graph drawing, graph realization, sensor localization, etc

The problem is also known as multidimensional scaling, graph drawing, graph realization, sensor localization, etc

Important connections to:

- nearest neighbor search
- embedding a finite metric space into a given Banach space

When the graph is complete and there is an exact solution, Classical Scaling finds that solution (by solving an eigenvalue problem).

When the graph is complete and there is an exact solution, Classical Scaling finds that solution (by solving an eigenvalue problem).

It is known to be robust to noise.
(Arias-Castro, Javanmard, and Pelletier 2018)

In the general case, some dissimilarities are missing...
${ }^{1}$ Thorpe and Duxbury 1999; Asimow and Roth 1978; Laman 1970.

In the general case, some dissimilarities are missing...
Whether a graph can be uniquely embedded is a central question in rigidity theory. ${ }^{1}$
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[^5]A number of methods have been proposed:

- Use the graph distances to fill in the missing dissimilarities and apply classical scaling. ${ }^{2}$
- Embed a clique by classical scaling and then sequentially position the nodes for which this is possible. ${ }^{3}$

■ Embed all cliques using classical scaling and synchronize the resulting embedded point sets. ${ }^{4}$

- Solve by direct optimization via majorization. ${ }^{5}$
- Solve a semidefinite program after an appropriate relaxation. ${ }^{6}$

[^6]



Based on $\delta$, define the graph distances

$$
\Delta(i, j)=\inf _{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{m}} \sum_{s=0}^{m} \delta\left(k_{s}, k_{s+1}\right)
$$

where the infimum is over paths $\left(k_{0}, \ldots, k_{m+1}\right)$ with $k_{0}=i$ and $k_{m+1}=j$.

Suppose that the graph is in fact the $r$-ball neighborhood graph of a set of points $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, meaning

$$
(i, j) \in E \Leftrightarrow \delta_{i j}=\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\| \leq r
$$

## Bound for neighborhood graphs

Suppose that the graph is in fact the $r$-ball neighborhood graph of a set of points $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, meaning

$$
(i, j) \in E \Leftrightarrow \delta_{i j}=\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\| \leq r
$$

## Proposition ${ }^{7}$

Take $\mathcal{X}=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and define

$$
\varepsilon=\max _{x \in \operatorname{Conv}(\mathcal{X})} \min _{i \in[n]}\left\|x-x_{i}\right\|
$$

When $\varepsilon / r \leq 1 / c_{1}$,

$$
\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\| \leq \Delta(i, j) \leq\left(1+c_{2}(\varepsilon / r)^{2}\right)\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|
$$

where $c_{1}, c_{2}$ are universal constants.
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Bernstein et al. 2000 prove a weaker bound... but in the context of manifold learning, when analyzing Isomap in the setting of a convex domain isometrically embedded in higher dimensions.

Oh, Montanari, and Karbasi 2010 prove a similar bound in the context of graph drawing for essentially the same method (MDS-MAP of Shang et al. 2003).
(The same bound above holds in that context too.)

## Estimating the shortest paths distances on a surface

## In manifold learning, the distances of interest are the intrinsic distances on the underlying surface. ${ }^{8}$

[^7]> In manifold learning, the distances of interest are the intrinsic distances on the underlying surface. ${ }^{8}$

The same is true in motion planning. ${ }^{9}$

[^8]Consider a subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^{D}$.
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The intrinsic distance on $\mathcal{S}$ is defined, for $x, x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{S}$, as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)=\inf \{a: \exists \gamma:[0, a] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}, \\
& \\
& \left.\qquad \text { with } \gamma(0)=x \text { and } \gamma(a)=x^{\prime}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$
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Define

$$
\varepsilon=\sup _{x \in \mathcal{S}} \min _{i \in[n]}\left\|x-x_{i}\right\| .
$$

Proposition (Bernstein et al. 2000)
When $\varepsilon \leq r / 4$, we have

$$
\Delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right) \leq(1+4 \varepsilon / r) g\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad \forall x, x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{X} .
$$
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Assume that

- The intrinsic and ambient topologies coincide on $\mathcal{S}$.
- The shortest paths on $\mathcal{S}$ have curvature bounded by $\kappa$.

Proposition (Bernstein et al. 2000; Arias-Castro and Le Gouic 2017)

There is $\tau$ depending on (the reach of) $\mathcal{S}$ and $c_{0}$ universal such that, when $r \leq \tau$ and $\kappa r \leq 1 / 3$,

$$
g\left(x, x^{\prime}\right) \leq\left(1+c_{0} r^{2}\right) \Delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad \forall x, x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{X} .
$$

We also show that every shortest path on $\mathcal{S}$ between two sample points can be approximated by a shortest path in the neighborhood graph...

We also show that every shortest path on $\mathcal{S}$ between two sample points can be approximated by a shortest path in the neighborhood graph... and vice versa.

We also study curvature-constrained shortest paths...

We also study curvature-constrained shortest paths...
For $\kappa>0$, the $\kappa$-curvature-constrained intrinsic semi-distance on $\mathcal{S}$ is defined, for $x, x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{S}$, as

$$
g_{\kappa}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)=\inf \{a: \text { there is } \gamma \text { as before }
$$ with curvature bounded by $\kappa\}$

We need a notion of curvature for polygonal lines (which is how paths in a neighborhood graph are embedded).

We need a notion of curvature for polygonal lines (which is how paths in a neighborhood graph are embedded).

For an ordered triplet of points $(x, y, z)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{D}$, define its angle as $\angle(x, y, z)=\angle(\overrightarrow{y x}, \overrightarrow{y z}) \in[0, \pi]$ and its curvature as

$$
\operatorname{curv}(x, y, z)= \begin{cases}1 / R(x, y, z), & \text { if } \angle(x, y, z) \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \\ \infty, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $R(x, y, z)$ is the radius of the circle passing through $x, y, z$.



There are other notions of discrete curvature ${ }^{10}$. This one is consistent in the following sense.

There are other notions of discrete curvature ${ }^{10}$. This one is consistent in the following sense.

## Lemma

Consider a curve $\gamma:(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{D}$ which is twice continuously differentiable. Holding $s \in(a, b)$ fixed while $r \nearrow s$ and $t \searrow s$,

$$
\operatorname{curv}(\gamma(r), \gamma(s), \gamma(t)) \rightarrow \text { curvature of } \gamma \text { at } s .
$$

[^9]We also have the following key lemma.

We also have the following key lemma.
Lemma
Let $\gamma$ be a simple curve with curvature at most $\kappa$. If $x, y, z \in \gamma$ are such that $y$ is between $x$ and $z$ on $\gamma$ and $\|x-z\| \leq 2 / \kappa$, then

$$
\operatorname{curv}(x, y, z) \leq \kappa
$$

For technical reasons, we work with an annulus graph, where edges with distance $\leq r / 4$ are removed from the $r$-ball graph.

For technical reasons, we work with an annulus graph, where edges with distance $\leq r / 4$ are removed from the $r$-ball graph.

Let $\Delta_{\kappa}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)$ now denote the length of the shortest path in the graph with curvature bounded by $\kappa$.

## Proposition

There is a numerical constant $c \geq 1$ such that, when $\varepsilon / r \leq 1 / c$, $\kappa r \leq 1 / c$, and $\kappa^{\prime} \geq \kappa+c\left(\kappa^{2} r+\varepsilon / r^{2}\right)$,

$$
\Delta_{\kappa}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right) \leq(1+6 \varepsilon / r) g_{\kappa}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad x, x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{X}
$$

(The right-hand side may be infinite.)

We now assume in addition that all the shortest paths on $\mathcal{S}$ have curvature bounded by $\kappa$.

[^10]We now assume in addition that all the shortest paths on $\mathcal{S}$ have curvature bounded by $\kappa$.

## Lemma

Assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is a compact and connected $C^{2}$ submanifold with boundary that is either empty or $C^{2}$. Then there is $\kappa<$ $\infty$ such that all the shortest paths on $\mathcal{S}$ have max-curvature bounded by $\kappa$.
(Strange things near the boundary. ${ }^{11}$ )

[^11]
## Theorem

There is a universal constant $c>0$ such that, if $\kappa r \leq 1 / c$ and $\varepsilon / \kappa r^{2} \leq 1 / c$, the unconstrained shortest paths in the graph have curvature at most $\kappa^{\prime} \leq \kappa+c \varepsilon / \kappa r^{3}$.

## Estimating distances based on adjacency information
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We observe the adjacency matrix $W=\left(W_{i j}\right)$ of an undirected graph. We assume the existence of points, $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{v}$, such that

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(W_{i j}=1 \mid x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\phi\left(\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|\right)
$$

for some non-increasing link function $\phi:[0, \infty) \mapsto[0,1]$.

- The $\left(W_{i j}, i<j\right)$ are assumed to be independent.
- The link function $\phi$ may be known or unknown.

Our goal is to estimate the pairwise distances

$$
d_{i j}:=\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|
$$

## Hoff, Raftery, and Handcock 2002 assume a parametric model.
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[^14]Hoff, Raftery, and Handcock 2002 assume a parametric model.
Interestingly, there is a close connection with the literature on link prediction ${ }^{12}$, where one wants to determine which nodes are closest at a given point in time as they are the most likely to become connected in the near future.

There is related work by Carey Priebe et al, some of it in the context of a dot product graph - where $\phi\left(\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|\right)$ is replaced by $\phi\left(\left\langle x_{i}, x_{j}\right\rangle\right) .{ }^{13}$

Ulrike von Luxburg et al have considered the case where, instead, a $K$-nearest neighbor graph is available. ${ }^{14}$

[^15]We focus on using graph distances to estimate the underlying Euclidean distances.
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Let $\Delta_{i j}$ denote the distance between $i$ and $j$ in the graph defined by the adjacency matrix $W$.

First assume that $\phi(d)=\mathbb{I}\{d \leq r\}$ for some $r>0$. ( $r$ may be assumed known without loss of generality.)

We estimate $d_{i j}=\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|$ by $\hat{d}_{i j}=r \Delta_{i j}$.

Define

$$
\varepsilon=\max _{x \in \operatorname{Conv}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)} \min _{i \in[n]}\left\|x-x_{i}\right\|
$$

Theorem
For all $i, j \in[n]$,

$$
0 \leq \hat{d}_{i j}-d_{i j} \leq 4(\varepsilon / r) d_{i j}+r
$$

Assume without loss of generality that $r \leq 1 / 2$.

Assume without loss of generality that $r \leq 1 / 2$.
Theorem
There is a numeric constant $c>0$ with the property that, for any $\varepsilon>0$ and any estimator $\hat{d}$, there is $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in[0,1]$ such that

$$
\max _{x \in[0,1]} \min _{i \in[n]}\left\|x-x_{i}\right\| \leq \varepsilon
$$

and, for at least half of the pairs $i \neq j$,

$$
\left|\hat{d}_{i j}-d_{i j}\right| \geq \frac{c \varepsilon}{r \vee \varepsilon} d_{i j} .
$$


latent positions (in $[0,2] \times[0,1]$ )

recovered positions with $r=0.05$

recovered positions with $r=0.1$

recovered positions with $r=0.2$

The method requires convexity...

(latent positions)


More generally, assume that $\phi$ has support [ $0, r$ ], for some $r>0$, and for some $c_{0}>0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$
\phi(d) \geq c_{0}(1-d / r)_{+}^{\alpha}
$$

(When $\alpha=0, \phi$ as a discontinuity at $d=r$.)

More generally, assume that $\phi$ has support [ $0, r$ ], for some $r>0$, and for some $c_{0}>0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$
\phi(d) \geq c_{0}(1-d / r)_{+}^{\alpha}
$$

(When $\alpha=0, \phi$ as a discontinuity at $d=r$.)
Assume without loss of generality that $\operatorname{diam}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \leq 1$.

## Theorem

There are $C_{1}, C_{2}>0$ depending only on ( $\alpha, c_{0}$ ) such that, whenever $r / \varepsilon \geq C_{1}(\log n)^{1+\alpha}$, with probability at least $1-1 / n$, for all $i, j \in[n]$,

$$
0 \leq \hat{d}_{i j}-d_{i j} \leq C_{2}\left[(\varepsilon / r)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} d_{i j}+r\right]
$$

We also obtain results for the setting where the graph is the $K$-nearest neighbor graph of a point set $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, a setting first considered by Alamgir and Luxburg 2012.

We also obtain results for the setting where the graph is the $K$-nearest neighbor graph of a point set $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, a setting first considered by Alamgir and Luxburg 2012.

The graph distances perform similarly when $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ are generated iid from the uniform distribution on a compact and convex subset $\Omega \ldots$ but only for pairs of points away from the boundary $\partial \Omega$.

(latent positions)

(estimated positions)

The boundary acts as a high-speed freeway...
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