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Abstract
The fundamental model of a periodic structure is a periodic set of points considered up to rigid motion or isometry in Euclidean space. The recent work by Edelsbrunner et al defined the new isometry invariants (density functions), which are continuous under perturbations of points and complete for generic sets in dimension 3. This work introduces much faster invariants called higher order Pointwise Distance Distributions (PDD). The new PDD invariants are simpler represented by numerical matrices and are also continuous under perturbations important for applications. Completeness of PDD invariants is proved for distance-generic sets in any dimension, which was also confirmed by distinguishing all 229K known molecular organic structures from the world’s largest Cambridge Structural Database. This huge experiment took only seven hours on a modest desktop due to the proposed algorithm with a near linear or small polynomial complexity in terms of key input sizes. Most importantly, the above completeness allows one to build a common map of all periodic structures, which are continuously parameterized by PDD and explicitly reconstructible from PDD. Appendices include first tree-based maps for several thousands of real structures.
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1 Motivations, problem statement and overview of new results

This paper develops polynomial time algorithms for new invariants of discrete structures, which allow one to distinguish and visualize largest datasets of real periodic structures.

The recent work by Edelsbrunner et al [18] initiated a new direction in classifications of periodic point sets up to isometry. An isometry of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ is any map that preserves inter-point distances. Any orientation-preserving isometry can be realised as a continuous rigid motion, for example any composition of translations and rotations in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

This equivalence is most natural for periodic point sets that represent real rigid structures.

A lattice $\Lambda$ consists of all integer linear combinations of a basis whose vectors span a parallelepiped called a unit cell $U$. A periodic point set is the Minkowski sum $\Lambda + M = \{u + v : u \in \Lambda, v \in M\}$, where a motif $M$ is a finite set of points in the basis of $U$ [45].

A real periodic structure such as a solid crystalline material is best modeled as a periodic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of points at all atomic centers, whose positions have a physical meaning and are well-determined by X-ray diffraction. Chemical bonds between atoms only abstractly represent atomic interactions depending on many thresholds for distances and angles.
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Figure 1 Six lattices are defined by different cells and motifs but are isometric to each other. 1st: $U = \langle (1,0),(0,1) \rangle$ and $M = \{(0,0)\}$. 2nd: $U = \langle (1,0),(0,1) \rangle$ and $M = \{(1/2,1/2)\}$. 3rd: $U = \langle (1,0),(1,1) \rangle$ and $M = \{(0,0)\}$. 4th: $U = \langle (1,0),(0,1) \rangle$ and $M = \{(1,0)\}$. 5th: $U = \langle (\sqrt{2}/2,\sqrt{2}/2),(-\sqrt{2}/2,\sqrt{2}/2) \rangle$ and $M = \{(1,1/2)\}$. 6th: $U = \langle (\sqrt{2},0),(1,\sqrt{2}) \rangle$ and $M = \{(0,0)\}$.

Fig. 1 illustrates the first obstacle: the same lattice can be generated by infinitely many different bases or unit cells. So distinguishing lattices up to isometry is already non-trivial.

Fig. 2 shows that ambiguity of a conventional representation $S = \Lambda + M$ for periodic structures by a unit cell and a motif $M$ is actually deeper than the case of only lattices.
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Figure 2 Even for a fixed lattice $\Lambda$, different motifs $M$ can define isometric periodic sets $\Lambda + M$.

Periodic structures can be reliably distinguished up to isometry only by an isometry invariant that takes the same value for all isometric sets. We include mirror reflections into general isometries only for simplicity, because adding a sign of orientation to any isometry invariant can be straightforward. Non-invariants such as edge-lengths and angles of a unit cell, or coordinates of motif point in a cell basis cannot be used for an isometry classification.

Indeed, isometric sets can have different values of a non-invariant, see Fig. 1 and 2.
The traditional approach is to identify a crystal by using its conventional or reduced cell [23, section 9.3]. However, this reduced cell has been known to be discontinuous under perturbations [3] even for lattices when a motif $M$ is a single point. A continuous reduced cell of a lattice cannot exist, see [18, section 1].

For more general periodic sets, discontinuity of many past discrete invariants such as symmetry groups is clearer in Fig. 3 showing that even real-valued invariants struggle to continuously quantify a similarity between nearly identical periodic sets. For example, the minimal volume of any cell can easily double, while the density (the number or mass of points divided by the cell volume) remains constant under perturbations of points. Hence a continuous isometry classification of periodic point sets has been open at least since 1980 [3].
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Under almost any slight perturbation of points, the symmetry group and (the minimum volume of) any reduced cell discontinuously change, which justifies condition (1c) in Problem 1.

Continuity is practically important because atoms always vibrate above the absolute zero temperature. Any real measurement of atomic positions produces slightly different parameters of a unit cell and a motif. Any simulation of periodic structures similarly introduces floating point errors because of inevitable approximations in all iterative optimizations.

Thousands of near duplicates are routinely produced, though only a few structures are synthesized. Five real structures of 5679 predicted on a supercomputer over 12 weeks are a typical example [35]. This ‘embarrassment of over-prediction’ wastes resources and time to run simulations and then to analyze results, often by visual inspection, because there were no fast and reliable tools to quantify a similarity between periodic structures.

One natural similarity measure is the maximum displacement atoms under thermal vibrations. This bottleneck distance $d_B(S,Q)$ between periodic point sets is the maximum Euclidean distance needed to perturb every point $p \in S$ to its unique match in $Q$. Since $d_B$ is minimized over infinitely many bijections and points, $d_B$ is computationally intractable.

Continuity of isometry invariants can be measured with respect to the bottleneck distance $d_B$. The polynomial time (P) is relative to the number of motif points for a fixed dimension.

> Problem 1 (algorithmic classification). Find a function $I$ on periodic point sets such that

- (1a) invariance: if $S, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are isometric, then $I(S) = I(Q)$, which is checked in P time;
- (1b) computability: a distance $d$ between values of an invariant $I$ is computable in P time;
- (1c) Lipschitz continuity: $d(I(S), I(Q)) \leq C d_B(S, Q)$ for a constant $C$ and $S, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$;
- (1d) completeness: if $I(S) = I(Q)$ for periodic point sets $S, Q$, then $S, Q$ are isometric;
- (1e) reconstruction: any periodic point set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ can be reconstructed from $I(S)$.

The proposed invariant is the higher order Pointwise Distance Distribution PDD$^N$. The first order PDD was studied only for finite sets [29] and is now proved to satisfy all conditions of Problem 1 (except possibly (1d)). Completeness of PDD is proved in Theorem 9 for distance-generic sets approximating all periodic sets and is experimentally checked for all known 229K organic crystals from the world’s largest Cambridge Structural Database, which puts them all onto a common map continuously extending the periodic table of elements.
2 Definitions and a review of past work on comparing periodic sets

This section rigorously defines periodic point sets, which cannot be reconstructed from their finite subsets in Fig. 4 without a lattice basis whose discontinuity was a major obstacle.

Any point \( p \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) can be identified with the vector \( \vec{p} \) from the origin 0 to \( p \). The Euclidean distance between \( p,q \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is denoted by \( |p-q| \), which is the length of \( \vec{p}-\vec{q} \).
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**Figure 4** Left: hard to choose a finite subset that truly represents an infinite periodic set, discontinuity under perturbations of points or set sizes is similar to Fig. 3. Right: ambiguous input is transformed into the invariant PDD to visualize any real dataset as a Minimum Spanning Tree.

- **Definition 2** (a lattice \( \Lambda \), a motif \( M \), a periodic point set \( S = \Lambda + M \)). A lattice \( \Lambda \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) consists of all linear combinations \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \vec{v}_i \) with \( c_i \in \mathbb{Z} \). The vectors \( \vec{v}_1, \ldots, \vec{v}_n \) should form a basis so that if \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \vec{v}_i = \vec{0} \) for some \( c_i \), then all \( c_i = 0 \). A motif \( M \) is a finite set of points \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \) in the unit cell \( U(\vec{v}_1, \ldots, \vec{v}_n) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \vec{v}_i : c_i \in [0,1) \right\} \), which is the parallelepiped spanned by \( \vec{v}_1, \ldots, \vec{v}_n \). A periodic point set \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is the Minkowski sum of a lattice \( \Lambda \) and a motif \( M \), so \( S = \Lambda + M = \{ u + \vec{v} : u \in \Lambda, v \in M \} \). A unit cell \( U \) is primitive if \( S \) is invariant under shifts by only \( \vec{v} \in \Lambda \) that is generated by vectors along edges of \( U \).

Any lattice \( \Lambda \) is considered as a periodic set with a 1-point motif \( M = \{ p \} \). A single point \( p \) can be arbitrarily chosen in a unit cell \( U \) as in the first two pictures of Fig. 1. Notice that the \( U \) is half-open in the sense that coefficients \( \lambda_i \in [0,1) \) can take value 0, but not 1.

Now we discuss the closely related work on comparing finite and periodic sets up to isometry. The excellent book [25] reviews the wider area of Euclidean distance geometry.

For a finite set \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), the distribution of all pairwise is a complete invariant in general position [9] meaning that almost any finite set can be uniquely reconstructed up to isometry from the set of all pairwise distances. The non-isometric 4-point sets in Figure 5 are a classical counter-example to the completeness of this distribution of all pairwise distances.
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**Figure 5** Left: point sets \( K = \{ (\pm 2,0), (\pm 1,1) \} \) and \( T = \{ (\pm 2,0), (-1, \pm 1) \} \) can not be distinguished by their six pairwise distances \( \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{10}, \sqrt{10}, 4 \). Right: 1D periodic sets \( S(r) = \{ 0, r, 2+r, 4 \} + 8\mathbb{Z} \) and \( Q(r) = \{ 0, 2+r, 4, 4+r \} + 8\mathbb{Z} \) for \( 0 < r \leq 1 \) have the same Patterson function [31, p. 197, Fig. 2]. All these pairs are distinguished by the first order PDD in section 3.
The isometry classification of finite point sets was algorithmically resolved by Theorem 1 in [2] saying that the existence of an isometry between two m-point sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be checked in time $O(m^{n-2}\log m)$. The latest advance for finite sets is the $O(m\log m)$ algorithm in $\mathbb{R}^4$ [24]. Significant results on matching bounded rigid shapes and registration of finite point sets were obtained in [38, 41, 27, 17]. The research on graph isomorphisms [40, 1] can be potentially used for periodic graphs with fixed edges between points of a periodic set.

Mémoli’s seminal work on distributions of distances [29], also known as shape distributions [30, 6, 21, 26, 32], for bounded metric spaces is closest to the proposed Pointwise Distance Distributions (PDD) for periodic point sets. In addition to periodicity not reducible to a bounded case, see Fig. 4, another crucial novelty is the higher order extension PDD$^{(h)}$ in Definition 3, capturing the isometry information of $(h+1)$-point tuples beyond the case $h=1$ of pairs. Continuity of distance distributions was not yet addressed but is essential to filter out near duplicates among thousands or even millions of simulated structures [35].

The latest breakthrough in fast comparisons of probability measures [39] can help speed up computations of Earth Mover’s Distance (EMD), which will be proved to be continuous for Pointwise Distance Distributions PDD$^{(h)}$. The discontinuity under perturbations of points is the major weakness of all discrete invariants including symmetry groups and other group-theoretic invariants of periodic point sets [20]. The two nearly identical periodic sets in Figure 3 should be recognized as very similar. But they have different symmetries and can be related only by pseudo-symmetries depending on manual thresholds [46].

One of the oldest crystal structure descriptors is the X-ray diffraction pattern whose single crystal form is best for determining a 3D structure of an experimental crystal [14]. Since not all materials can be grown as single crystals, the powder X-ray diffraction pattern (PXRD) is more common. Periodic structures with identical PXRDs are called homometric, [36], for example the periodic versions $S(1) = \{0,1,3,4\} + 8\mathbb{Z}$ and $Q(1) = \{0,3,4,5\} + 8\mathbb{Z}$ of the 4-point non-isometric sets $T, K$ in Fig. 5. Even more general homometric sets $S(r), Q(r)$ depending on a $0 < r \leq 1$ will be distinguished by the first order PDD in section 3.

The Mercury software visually compares periodic structures [11] by minimizing the Root Mean Square Deviation (RMSD) of atomic positions from up to a given number $m$ (15 by default) of molecules in two structures. This RMSD measures a similarity between only finite subsets as in Fig. 4 and will be compared with the new PDD invariants in section 6.

More recently, for any periodic point set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with a motif $M$ in a unit cell $U$, Edelsbrunner et al. [18] introduced the density functions $\psi_k(t)$ for any integer $k \geq 1$. The $k$-th density function $\psi_k(t)$ is the total volume of the regions within the unit cell $U$ covered by exactly $k$ balls $B(p; t)$ with a radius $t \geq 0$ and centres at points $p \in M$, divided by the unit cell volume $\text{Vol}[U]$. The density function $\psi_k(t)$ was proved to be invariant under isometry, continuous under perturbations, complete for periodic sets satisfying certain conditions of general position in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and computable in time $O(mk^3)$, where $m$ is the motif size of $S$.

Section 5 in [18] gives the counter-example to completeness: the 1-dimensional periodic sets $S_{15} = X + Y + 15\mathbb{Z}$ and $Q_{15} = X - Y + 15\mathbb{Z}$ for $X = \{0, 4, 9\}$ and $Y = \{0, 1, 3\}$, which appeared earlier in [22, section 4]. These non-isometric sets have the same density functions for all $k \geq 1$, see [41 Example 11], and were recently distinguished in [43, Example 5b].

The latest advance [5] reduces the isometry classification of all periodic point sets to an isoset of isometry classes of $\alpha$-clusters around points in a motif at a certain radius $\alpha$, which was motivated by the seminal work of Dolbilin with co-authors about Delone sets [16, 8, 15]. Checking if two isosets coincide needs a cubic algorithm, which is not yet implemented.
3 The higher order Pointwise Distance Distributions \( PDD^{(h)}(S; k) \)

This section introduces the Pointwise Distance Distributions \( PDD \) in Definition 3 and the higher order \( PDD^{(h)} \) in Definition 4, whose isometry invariance is proved by Theorem 5.

For periodic point sets, distances to neighbors were considered in [3] Definition 5], though only their average was proved to be invariant under permutations of points. Moreover, doubling a unit cell and perturbing points as in Fig. 3 produces a twice larger list of distances. New Definition 3 below introduces weights that make \( PDD \) continuous under perturbations in Theorem 7. We consider only periodic point sets, though the lexicographic ordering of rows in \( PDD \) makes it invariant for any finite set of weighted points in a metric space.

Definition 3 (Pointwise Distance Distribution \( PDD \)). Let a periodic set \( S = \Lambda + M \) have points \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \) in a unit cell. For \( k \geq 1 \), consider the \( m \times k \) matrix \( D(S; k) \), whose \( i \)-th row consists of the ordered Euclidean distances \( d_{i1} \leq \cdots \leq d_{ik} \) measured from \( p_i \) to its first \( k \) nearest neighbors in the full set \( S \). The rows of \( D(S; k) \) are lexicographically ordered as follows. A row \( (d_{i1}, \ldots, d_{ik}) \) is smaller than \( (d_{j1}, \ldots, d_{jk}) \) if the first (possibly none) distances coincide: \( d_{i1} = d_{j1}, \ldots, d_{id} = d_{jd} \) for \( l \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \) and the next \( (l+1)\)-st distances satisfy \( d_{i,l+1} < d_{j,l+1} \). If \( w \) rows are identical to each other, any such group is collapsed to a single row with the weight \( w/m \). For each row, put this weight in the first column. The final \( m \times (k+1) \)-matrix is the Pointwise Distance Distribution \( PDD(S; k) \).

Table 1 shows the \( 4 \times 3 \) matrices \( D(S; 3) \) from Definition 3 for the 4-point sets in Fig. 5. The matrix \( D(T; 3) \) in Table 4 has two pairs of identical rows, so the matrix \( PDD(T; 3) \) consists of two rows of weight \( 1/2 \) below. The matrix \( D(K; 3) \) in Table 1 has only one pair of identical rows, so \( PDD(K; 3) \) has three rows of weights \( 1/2, 1/4, 1/4 \). Then \( PDD(T; 3) \neq PDD(K; 3) \).

\[
\text{T points} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{neigh.1} & \text{neigh.2} & \text{neigh.3} \\ (-2,0) & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{10} & 4 \\ (+2,0) & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{10} & 4 \\ (-1,1) & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \\ (+1,1) & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{K points} & \text{neigh.1} & \text{neigh.2} & \text{neigh.3} \\ (-2,0) & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} & 4 \\ (+2,0) & \sqrt{10} & \sqrt{10} & 4 \\ (-1,1) & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \\ (+1,1) & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \end{array}
\]

\[\text{Table 1} \quad \text{Each point in } T, K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ from Figure 5 has ordered distances to three other points.}\]

\[\text{PDD}(T; 3) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1/2 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{10} \\ 1/2 & \sqrt{2} & 4 \end{array} \right) \neq \text{PDD}(K; 3) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1/4 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ 1/4 & \sqrt{10} & 4 \end{array} \right).\]

\[
\text{S(r) points} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 1} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 2} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 3} \\
p_1 = 0 \quad |0 - r| = r \quad |0 - (2 + r)| = 2 + r \quad |0 - 4| = 4 \\
p_2 = r \quad |r - 0| = r \quad |r - (2 + r)| = 2 \quad |r - 4| = 4 - r \\
p_3 = 2 + r \quad |(2 + r) - 4| = 2 - r \quad |(2 + r) - r| = 2 \quad |(2 + r) - 0| = 2 + r \\
p_4 = 4 \quad |4 - (2 + r)| = 2 - r \quad |4 - r| = 4 - r \quad |4 - 0| = 4
\]

\[\text{Q(r) points} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 1} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 2} \quad \text{distance to neighbor 3} \\
p_1 = 0 \quad |0 - (2 + r)| = 2 + r \quad |0 - (r + 4 - 8)| = 4 - r \quad |0 - 4| = 4 \\
p_2 = 2 + r \quad |(2 + r) - 4| = 2 - r \quad |(2 + r) - (4 - r)| = 2 \quad |(2 + r) - 0| = 2 + r \\
p_3 = 4 \quad |4 - (4 + r)| = r \quad |4 - (2 + r)| = 2 - r \quad |4 - 0| = 4 \\
p_4 = 4 + r \quad |(4 + r) - 4| = r \quad |(4 + r) - (2 + r)| = 2 \quad |(4 + r) - 8| = 4 - r
\]

\[\text{Table 2} \quad \text{Distances from each motif point of } S(r) \text{ and } Q(r) \text{ to their closest neighbors in Fig. 5}\]
For the 1D periodic sets \( S(r) = \{0, r, 2 + r, 4\} + 8\mathbb{Z} \) and \( Q(r) = \{0, 2 + r, 4, 4 + r\} + 8\mathbb{Z} \) in Fig. 5, Table 2 shows that \( S(r), Q(r) \) are not isometric to each other for any parameter \( 0 < r < 1 \) due to Invariance Theorem 5 stated later for higher order PDD\((h)\).

\[
PDD(S(r); 2) = 1/4 \begin{bmatrix} r & 2 + r \\ r & 2 \\ 2 - r & 2 \\ 2 - r & 4 - r \end{bmatrix} \neq PDD(Q(r); 2) = 1/4 \begin{bmatrix} r & 2 - r \\ r & 2 \\ 2 - r & 2 \\ 2 + r & 4 - r \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The Average Minimum Distance AMD\(_k\)(S) from [33, Definition 5] is the average of the \((k + 1)\)-st column of PDD(S; k). The vectors AMD(S(r); 6) = (1, 2.5, 3.5) don’t distinguish the sets S(r) in Fig. 5. Hence PDD(S; k) is strictly stronger than AMD(S; k).

For a periodic set S, the number \( k \) in PDD(S; k) can be considered as a degree of approximation (or a count of decimal places), not as not a parameter that affects invariant values. If we increase \( k \), we extract more distant geometric information from S by add more columns to PDD(S; k) and keep all previous distances. If some rows of PDD(S; k) were identical but become different in PDD(S; k), we recompute weights but not distances.

Fig. 6 shows the 5-point sets \( S_\pm \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) from [33, Figure S4(A)], which were considered as a hard pair to distinguish. The sets \( S_\pm \) are not isometric, because \( S_+ \) has the triple of points \( B_+ G_+ R_+ \) with pairwise distances \( \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{6}, \sqrt{6} \), but \( S_- \) has no such a triple. This example motivated our stronger invariant. Instead of collecting triples of distances, we extend Definition 3 to represent relations between \( h \)-tuples for \( h > 1 \) in a matrix form.

**Figure 6** Left: \((x, y)\)-projection of the 5-point set \( S_- \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) consisting of the green points \( G_- = (-1, -1, 0) \) and \( G_+ = (1, 1, 0) \), the red points \( R_- = (-2, 0, -2) \) and \( R_+ = (2, 0, 2) \), and the blue point \( B_- = (0, 1, -1) \). Right: to get the set \( S_+ \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) from \( S_- \), replace \( B_- \) by \( B_+ = (0, 1, 1) \).

**Definition 4** (higher order Pointwise Distance Distribution PDD\((h)(S; k))\). Let a periodic set \( S = \Lambda + M \) have points \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \) in its motif \( M \). We start from the case \( h = 2 \).

For any \( k \geq 1 \), we build the \( \frac{m(m - 1)}{2} \times (k + 2) \) matrix PDD\((2)(S)\). For each unordered pair \( \{p_i, p_j\} \) of distinct points with \( i \neq j \), construct the row whose first element is the distance \( |p_i - p_j| \) and every element is the ordered pair of distances \( |p_i - p_k|, |p_j - p_k| \) to another point \( p_k \) for \( l \neq i, j \), i.e. in each pair the first distance is not smaller than the second. In every row these pairs are lexicographically ordered, i.e. \((a, b) < (c, d)\) if \( a < c \) or \( a = c, b < d \).

Table 3 includes the first column with pairs \( \{p_i, p_j\} \) for convenience. To avoid a dependence on any ordering of \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \), we remove this first column and order the resulting rows lexicographically, we compare distances \( |p_i - p_j| \) and then (in the case of equal distances) we compare the ordered pairs of distances. We collapse all rows that are identical to each other and put weights into the first column as in Definition 3, see Table 3 for \( S_\pm \) in Fig. 6.
8 Pointwise distance distributions of periodic sets
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<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>($\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{6}$)</td>
<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>($\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{6}$)</td>
<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
<td>($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{14}$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 The 2nd order Pointwise Distance Distribution $PDD^{(2)}(S_+)$ is obtained by lexicographically ordering the rows of Table 6 and replacing pairs of points in column 1 by weights of rows.

For $h > 2$, each row of $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ has data related to an unordered subset $A \subset S$ of $h$ points. In each row, the first element is the weight coming from collapsing identical rows in the final matrix $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ as for $h = 1$. The second element is the $h \times (h - 1)$ matrix $D(A; h - 1)$, whose every row has ordered distances from $p \in A$ to all other $h - 1$ points in $A$, all rows are lexicographically ordered. Other elements of $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ are lexicographically ordered lists of distances $d_{i1} \leq \cdots \leq d_{ih}$ from a point $p_i \in S - A$ to the $h$ points of $A$.

Definition 4 makes sense for a finite set $S$ of $m$ points, then $k \leq m - 1$. Similarly to Definition 3 increasing an index $k \geq 1$ only adds more information about $S$ without changing values obtained for smaller $k$. Similarly the order $h$ is not a parameter that affects values of $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$, because all $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ are different matrices for distinct orders $h$.

- The second order $PDD^{(2)}$ distinguishes non-isometric sets that have identical invariants from [23], section 6 in supplementary materials. The 5-point sets $S_k$ in Fig. 6 have $PDD^{(2)}(S_-) \neq PDD^{(2)}(S_+)$. The pairs in Table 3 represent $G_+ B_+$, which have the same shortest distance $\sqrt{2}$ in both $S_+$ but the distinct pairs of distances to the first neighbor: ($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{8}$) from $(G_+, B_-)$ to $G_-$, ($\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{6}$) from $(G_+, B_+)$ to $R_+$, see details in appendix C.

We have chosen only distances to form the stronger higher order invariant $PDD^{(h)}$, not angles or other isometry invariants such as volumes, because distances are simple enough to prove the continuity of $PDD^{(h)}$ under perturbations of points in Theorem 7 later.

Theorem 5 (isometry invariance of $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$). For any finite or periodic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ from Definition 3 is an isometry invariant of the set $S$ for any $k \geq 1$.
Short proof. Any isometry preserves inter-point distances, see details in Appendix B.

4 Continuity of Pointwise Distance Distributions under perturbations

Definition 6 below works for any vector \( I(S) = ([w_1(S), R_1(S)], \ldots, [w_n(S), R_n(S)(S)]) \) of pointwise invariants of a set \( S \) with weights \( w_i(S) \in (0, 1] \) satisfying \( \sum_{i=1}^{n(S)} w_i(S) = 1 \).

Later we consider only the case when \( [w_i, R_i] \) is the \( i \)-th row of \( \text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k) \). Then \( n(S) \) is the number of rows in \( \text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k) \). Each component \( R_i(S) \) should have a size independent of \( S \), for example a number \( k \) of neighbors in \( \text{PDD}(S; k) \). For \( h > 1 \), the index \( i \) represents an unordered subset \( A \subset S \) of \( h \) points. The first component of \( R_i \) is the \( h \times (h-1) \) matrix \( D(A) \) of ordered distance lists from Definition 4. For any vectors \( R_i = (r_{i1}, \ldots, r_{ik}) \) and \( R_j = (r_{j1}, \ldots, r_{jk}) \) of a length \( k \), we use the \( L_\infty \)-distance \( |R_i - R_j|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq l \leq k} |r_{il} - r_{jl}|_\infty \), where \( |r_{il} - r_{jl}|_\infty \) is again the \( L_\infty \)-distance between the components \( r_{il}, r_{jl} \) (Euclidean distance if \( r_{il}, r_{jl} \) are single numbers). For \( h > 1 \), the first component \( r_{ij} \) of \( R_i \) is the matrix \( D(A; h-1) \) for a subset \( A_i \subset S \) of \( h \) points. To get \( |r_{i1} - r_{j1}|_\infty \), we turn the matrices \( D(A_1; h-1), D(B_1; h-1) \) into vectors by concatenating all rows.

Definition 6 (EMD). Let finite or periodic sets \( S, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) have weighted vectors \( I(S), I(Q) \) as discussed above. A full flow from \( I(S) \) to \( I(Q) \) is an \( m(S) \times m(Q) \) matrix whose element \( f_{ij} \in [0, 1] \) represents a partial flow from \( R_i(S) \) to \( R_j(Q) \). The Earth Mover’s Distance is the minimum value of \( \text{EMD}(I(S), I(Q)) = \sum_{i=1}^{m(S)} \sum_{j=1}^{m(Q)} f_{ij}|R_i(S) - R_j(Q)| \) over \( f_{ij} \in [0, 1] \) subject to \( \sum_{j=1}^{m(Q)} f_{ij} \leq w_i(S) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m(S) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{m(S)} f_{ij} \leq u_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m(Q) \), and \( \sum_{i=1}^{m(S)} \sum_{j=1}^{m(Q)} f_{ij} = 1 \).

The first condition \( \sum_{j=1}^{m(Q)} f_{ij} \leq w_i(S) \) means that not more than the weight \( w_i(S) \) of the component \( R_i(S) \) ‘flows’ into all components \( R_j(Q) \) via ‘flows’ \( f_{ij} \), \( j = 1, \ldots, m(Q) \).

Similarly, the second condition \( \sum_{i=1}^{m(S)} f_{ij} \leq u_j \) means that all ‘flows’ \( f_{ij} \) from \( R_i(S) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m(S) \) ‘flow’ into \( R_j(Q) \) up to the maximum weight \( u_j \) of \( R_j(Q) \). The last condition \( \sum_{i=1}^{m(S)} \sum_{j=1}^{m(Q)} f_{ij} = 1 \) forces to ‘flow’ all rows \( R_i(S) \) into all rows \( R_j(Q) \). The Earth Mover’s Distance satisfies all metric axioms [37] appendix]. The EMD needs \( O(m^3 \log m) \) time for distributions of a maximum size \( m \) or can be approximated in a time \( O(m) \) [11].

Theorem 7 uses the bottleneck distance \( d_B(S, Q) = \inf_{g: S \to Q, p \in S} \sup_{p \in S} |p - g(p)| \) and the packing radius \( r(S) \), which is the minimum half-distance between any points of \( S \). Equivalently, \( r(S) \) is the maximum radius \( r \) to have disjoint open balls of radius \( r \) centered at all points of \( S \).

Theorem 7 (continuity of \( \text{PDD}^{(h)} \)). For any \( k \geq 1 \), if finite or periodic sets \( S, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfy \( d_B(S, Q) < r(S) \), then \( \text{EMD}(\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k), \text{PDD}^{(h)}(Q; k)) \leq 2d_B(S, Q) \).
Following the earlier work \cite{18} section 5.1, this section defines distance-generic periodic point sets that can be uniquely reconstructed up to isometry from first order Pointwise Distance Distributions in dimension $n = 2$. For $n = 3$, we will also use conorms $p_{ij}$ of a lattice \cite{12}, which are continuous isometry invariants expressed via scalar products of basis vectors.

Any lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ in dimensions $n \leq 3$ has an obtuse superbase $\vec{v}_1, \ldots, \vec{v}_n$ with the extra $\vec{v}_0 = - \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{v}_i$ such that $p_{ij} = - \vec{v}_i \cdot \vec{v}_j \geq 0$ for distinct $i, j = 0, \ldots, n$. These negative Selling parameters were called conorms of $\Lambda$ in \cite{12}, where formula (1) for $p_{ij}$ missed the minus, but the rest of the paper needs $p_{ij} \geq 0$, for example in Selling’s formula (5).

For any lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $V(\Lambda; p)$ be the open Voronoi domain of a point $p \in \Lambda$. The neighbor set $N(\Lambda; p)$ consists of all points that appear among the first $n+1$ nearest neighbors within $\Lambda - p$ for some interior point $q \in V(\Lambda; p)$ whose first neighbor is $p$. Let $p = (0,0)$. If $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^2$, then $N(\Lambda; p) = \{(\pm 1,0),(0,\pm 1)\}$. For $\Lambda$ generated by $(2,0),(0,1)$, the neighbor set $N(\Lambda; p)$ also includes the 3rd neighbors $(0, \pm 2)$ of the points $q = (0, \pm 0.4) \in V(\Lambda; p)$.

For any point $q \in V(\Lambda; p)$, consider all $n$-tuples $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ of points $p_i \in N(\Lambda; p)$ such that the vectors $p_i - p, i = 1, \ldots, n$, form a linear basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Order the points of $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ by their distances to $q$ (uniquely if all distances are distinct). Choose the lexicographically smallest list of basis distances $d_1 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$ from $q$ over all $n$-tuples $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ above.

\begin{definition}[a distance-generic periodic point set] A periodic point set $S = \Lambda + M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with a primitive unit cell $U$ is called distance-generic if the following conditions hold.
\end{definition}

\begin{enumerate}[\textbf{(S1)}]
\item For any $p \in M$ and points $q, r \in S \cap V(\Lambda; p)$, the vectors $q - p, r - p$ are not orthogonal.
\item For any vectors $\vec{u}, \vec{v}$ between two pairs of points in $S$, if $|\vec{u}| = l |\vec{v}| \leq 2diam[U]$ for $l = 1, 2$, then $\vec{u} = \pm l \vec{v}$ and $\vec{v} \in \Lambda$, hence the cell $U$ has different edge-lengths and no right angles.
\item For any points $p_0 \in M$ and $q \in V(\Lambda; p_0)$, let $d_0$ be the distance from $q$ to its closest neighbor $p_0$ within $\Lambda + p_0$. Take any $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ in the neighbor set $N(\Lambda; p_0)$ with distances $d_1 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$ to $q$. Then the $n+1$ spheres $C(p_i; d_i)$ with the centers $p_i$ and radii $d_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$, can meet at a single point in $V(\Lambda; p_0)$ only if $d_1 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$ are the basis distances of $q$, the vectors $p_i - p_0, i = 1, \ldots, n$ form a linear basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and only for at most two tuples $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; p_0)$ that are symmetric to each other with respect to $p_0$.
\end{enumerate}

Condition (S1) means that all inter-point distances are distinct apart from necessary exceptions due to periodicity. Since any periodic set $S = \Lambda + M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is invariant under translations along vectors of its lattices $\Lambda$, condition (S2) can be checked only for vectors from points in a unit cell $U$ to points in the extended motif $S \cap (3U)$ for $3U = \{3\vec{v} \mid \vec{v} \in U\}$.

Almost all $n+1$ spheres in $\mathbb{R}^n$ have no common points, hence condition (S3) forbids very singular situations, which can be practically checked since the neighbor set $N(\Lambda; p_0)$ is finite for any lattice $\Lambda$ and its point $p_0$. All conditions of Definition \text{S} can be written as algebraic equations via coordinates of motif points and basis vectors of a unit cell. Hence any periodic point set can be made distance-generic by almost any small perturbation of points.

\begin{theorem}[generic completeness of PDD] Let $S = \Lambda + M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a distance-generic periodic set with $m$ points in a unit cell $U$. Choose $k$ so that the smallest distance value in the last $k$-th column of $PDD(S; k)$ is at least $2diam[U]$. The set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ can be uniquely reconstructed up to isometry from $PDD(S; k)$ and $m$. For $n = 3$, the set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ can be uniquely reconstructed up to isometry from $PDD(S; k)$, $m$ and the six conorms $p_{ij}$ of $\Lambda$.
\end{theorem}
Short proof. Using rational weights of rows in PDD$(S; k)$, we expand this matrix so that all $m$ rows have equal weights, hence correspond to $m$ points in a motif of $S$, which is built below. For any lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with an obtuse superbase $\tilde{v}_0, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2$, condition (8) helps recognize $|\tilde{v}_0|, |\tilde{v}_1|, |\tilde{v}_2|$ as three shortest distances (appearing with their doubles) in every row of PDD$(S; k)$, see [12. Theorem 7] and reconstruct $\Lambda$. Any $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is reconstructed from its six conorms $p_{ij}$, see [12. section 8]. After we built $\Lambda$ containing (say) $p_0 = 0$, we remove from each row of PDD$(S; k)$ all distances from any point $p$ to its lattice translates $p + \Lambda$.

Any other point $q \in S$ in the open Voronoi domain $V(\Lambda; 0)$ has its lexicographically smallest list of basis distances $d_1 < \cdots < d_n$ from $q$ to $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; 0)$. The basis distances appear once in both rows of $p_0 = 0$ and $q$ in PDD$(S; k)$ after the shortest distance $d_0 = |q - p_0| = |q|$. Trying all $n$-distance subsequences $d'_1 < \cdots < d'_n$ appearing in both rows of $p_0 = 0$ and $q$, and also trying all $n$-tuples of points $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; 0)$ that form a linear basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we check if the $n + 1$ spheres $(p_i; d'_i)$ meet at a single point in $V(\Lambda; 0)$.

By condition (8) a single-point intersection, which will be our point $q$, is possible only for the basis distances $d_1 < \cdots < d_n$ of $q$ and only for two $n$-tuples $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; 0)$ related by the symmetry with respect to $0$. We can choose one of two possible positions of $q$ since this symmetry is an isometry preserving $\Lambda$. For any further point $p \neq 0, q$, there is no choice due to the available distance $|p - q|$ and condition (8), see more details in Appendix A □

6 Polynomial time algorithms and a discussion of PDD$(h)$ significance

This section presents the main algorithmic result for PDD$(h)$, which has allowed us to thoroughly check the world’s largest database of hundreds of thousands of real structures.

Theorem 10 (PDD$(h)$ complexity). Let a periodic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ have $m$ points in a unit cell $U$. Then PDD$(h)(S; k)$ is computed in time $O(h^2 km^h (5\nu)^n V_n \log(\log_2 k))$, where $V_n$ is the unit ball volume in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $d$ and $\nu = \frac{d}{\sqrt{\text{Vol}(U)}}$ are the diameter and skewness of $U$. □

Short proof. For any point $p \in S$, let $d_k(S; p)$ be the distance to its $k$-th nearest neighbor in $S$. Then $d_k(S; p) \leq c(S) \sqrt{k} + d$, where $d$ is the diameter of $U$ of $S$ and $c(S) = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Vol}(U)}{mV_n}}$, $V_n$ is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We find all $k$ nearest neighbors of motif points $p \in M = S \cap U$ by adding ‘spherical’ layers around the initial cell $U$. The total number of points from $S$ in this extension is at most $\mu = \left( \sqrt{k} + \frac{2.5d}{c(S)} \right)^n = O(2^n (k + m(2.5\nu)^n V_n))$.

After computing a cover tree [14] on $\mu$ points in time $O(\mu \log \mu)$, the time for PDD$(S; k)$ for $h = 1$ is $O(\mu \log \mu + mk \log_2 k) = O(km(5\nu)^n V_n \log m \log^2 k)$, see details in appendix B □

A detailed pseudo-code is in appendix A. Most real structures have a small skewness $\nu$. If $\nu$ is fixed, then $(5\nu)^n V_n \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$ by Stirling’s approximation. For practical dimensions $n = 2, 3$, the key input sizes are the number $k$ of neighbors and the number $m$ of motif points. Hence the near linear and quadratic dependencies on $k, m$ are most crucial.

We conjecture that any finite or periodic sets $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is uniquely determined up to an isometry by PDD$(h)(S; k)$ for $h = n - 1$ and a sufficiently large $k$ depending on $S$. Theorem 9 has proved this for $h = 1$ and any $n = 2, 3$ in general position. Actual data of all real and simulated structures contains measurement noise and floating point errors, which makes many structures generic in practice. Moreover, PDD$(h)$ can distinguish non-generic sets, see Examples [16, 17, 18] in appendix C for all known counter-examples to past invariants.
We computed AMD(S; 100) obtained from PDD(S; 100) by column averaging for all 229K known molecular organic crystals in the Cambridge Structural Database. The $L_\infty$-distance between the vectors AMD(S; 100) was less than 0.01 for 2483 pairs, which turned out to be identical or near duplicates by the traditional and much slower RMSD comparison [11].

Much more importantly, since all real structures were distinguished above, the map from real crystals to isometry classes of periodic point sets is injective. Hence the space of all crystals is continuously parameterized by PDD$^{(h)}$, a sought-after DNA-type code for a guided discovery of new materials. Such a continuous map will substantially extend a simpler discrete parameterization of all chemical elements known as Mendeleev’s periodic table.

### Appendix A: pseudocode of the polynomial time PDD$^{(h)}$ algorithm

This appendix describes the algorithm from Theorem 10 for the higher order Pointwise Distance Distribution PDD$^{(h)}$ in greater detail.

The algorithm takes any periodic point set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ in the form of a unit cell $U$ and a motif $M \subset S$ in the basis of $U$. A unit cell can be given by a linear basis of $n$ vectors. Then every point $p \in M$ is given by coordinates in this basis. The implemented code in Python takes any Crystallographic Information File of a 3D crystal containing the above parameters. The code also works for periodic sets in 1D and 2D, extensions to $n > 3$ are straightforward.

In addition to a periodic point set $S$, the only other part of the input are a number $k$ of neighbors and an order $h$ of Pointwise Distance Distributions. These $k$ and $h$ are not usual parameters that affect an output, but can be considered as orders of approximation, i.e. increasing $k$ includes extra information between more distant neighbors. All results for lower values of $k$ remain unchanged in the output for any larger $k$. Here are the key stages

**Neighboring stage 1.** Find the first $k + h - 1$ nearest neighbors to each motif point within the given periodic set $S$ by using fast k-d trees.

**Distancing stage 2.** Compute ordered lists of distances from points in every subset $A \subset M$ of $h$ points within the motif of $m$ points.

**Ordering stage 3.** Lexicographically order rows, collapse identical rows, assign weights to rows for the final PDD$^{(h)}(S; k)$.

In the output the first order PDD(S; $k$) is a matrix with at most $m$ rows (if all different) and exactly $k + 1$ columns, where $m$ is the number of points in a motif $M$ (or in a unit cell $U$). The first column of PDD(S; $k$) includes weights of rows (default values $1/m$ if all rows are different).

The second order PDD$^{(2)}(S; k)$ is also a matrix with $k + 2$ columns, which are more diverse. The extra 2nd column contains distances between unordered pairs of points. The $k$ columns from 3 to $k + 2$ contain pairs of distances. The lexicographic ordering of rows in PDD$^{(2)}$ compares distances in the 2nd column, then pairs of ordered distances one by one.

The higher order distributions PDD$^{(h)}(S; k)$ are even more diverse. The 2nd column contains the matrices $D(A; h - 1)$ from Definition 3 for finite unordered subsets $A \subset M$ of $h$ points in a motif of $S$. In the case $h = 2$, the matrix $D(A; h - 1)$ consists of a single distance between two points. For $h > 2$ and each point $p \in A$, we order its distances to all other $h - 1$ points in $A$. Then we lexicographically order the resulting $h$ lists of distances to form the $h \times (h - 1)$ matrix $D(A; h - 1)$. Then all elements of the 2nd column in PDD$^{(h)}(S; k)$ have the same size $h \times (h - 1)$, hence can be lexicographically compared when ordering rows in PDD$^{(h)}(S; k)$. Here is the Python interface of the PDD$^{(h)}$ code.
PDD(motif, cell, k, h=1)

Returns PDD\((h)(S;k)\) for a periodic set \(S \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) represented by motif and cell.

Input:
- **motif**: np.ndarray shape \((m,n)\). Cartesian coordinates of motif points in the unit cell.
- **cell**: np.ndarray shape \((n,n)\). Square matrix representing the unit cell in Cartesian form. (ase.geometry.cellpar_to_cell converts \([a,b,c,\alpha,\beta,\gamma]\) to Cartesian form.)
- **k**: int \(> 0\). Number of columns to return in PDD\((h)(S;k)\).
- **h**: int \(> 0\), default 1. Order of the PDD\((h)\) invariant.

Output:
- np.ndarray (structured array) representing PDD\((h)(S;k)\). The array is a vector length \(t\), where \(t \leq C_m^h\) depends on the number of identical rows of distances that are collapsed.
  - The dtype (layout) of each row depends on \(h\):
    - \(h = 1\): (float, array)
    - \(h = 2\): (float, float, array)
    - \(h > 2\): (float, array, array)
  - If the result is assigned to the name arr, elements can be accessed as follows:
    - arr[‘weight’] (first column) the vector of weights, shape \((t,)\)
    - arr[‘dist’] (second column) a vector of floats when \(h = 2\), a vector of arrays if \(h > 2\)
      and is not present when \(h = 1\)
    - arr[‘pdd’] (all other columns) the main distance distribution matrix, of shape \((t,k,h)\)
      (last dimension removed if \(h = 1\)).

A.1 Stage 1: Nearest neighbors to motif points

The outline of this step is straightforward, after describing the core objects in use:
- A generator object \(g\), which creates points from the periodic set \(S\) for use in distance calculations,
- KD Trees (canonically \(k\) is the dimension here, in our case it’s denoted \(n\)), data structures designed for fast nearest-neighbour lookup in \(n\)-dimensional space.

Once \(g\) is constructed, next(g) is called to get new points from \(S\). The first call returns all points in the ‘main’ unit cell described by cell (i.e. the motif), and successive calls returns points from unit cells further from the origin in a spherical fashion.

A KDTree is constructed with a point set \(T\), then queried with another \(Q\), returning a matrix with distances from all points in \(Q\) to their nearest neighbors (up to some given number, \(q\) below) in \(T\), as well as the indices of these neighbors in \(T\).

The following pseudocode gets the first \(q\) neighbours:
```python
cloud = [] # contains points from S
g = point_generator(motif, cell)

# at least q points will be needed
while len(cloud) < q:
    points = next(g)
    cloud.extend(points)

# first distance query
tree = KDTree(cloud)
```
D_, inds = tree.query(motif, q)
D = zeros_like(D_)  # copy of D_, but all zeros

## repeat until distances don’t change,
## then all nearest neighbors are found
while not D == D_:
    D = D_
    cloud.extend(next(g))
    tree = KDTree(cloud)
    D_, inds = tree.query(motif, q)

In implementation, cloud, D_ and inds are all returned to be used in the next step.

A.2 Stage 2: main distance constructions

This stage is skipped for \( h = 1 \), because all necessary distances were already found in stage 1.
From step 1, we have (1) a set \( \text{cloud} \) of points from \( S \), (2) a matrix \( D_\) of nearest neighbor
distances for each \( \text{motif} \) point (up to \( k + h - 1 \) neighbors), and (3) a matrix \( \text{inds} \) of the
indexes of these neighbors in \( \text{cloud} \).

We construct the PDD (and dists column) row-by-row, element-by-element. For a given
row, \( \text{points} \) contains (the indexes of) points in the corresponding unordered set. We initialise
a list \( \text{pointers} \) of \( h \) zeros, which are indices into \( D_\) and \( \text{inds} \). They start pointing at the
first elements, i.e. the nearest neighbors to \( \text{points} \). We also create a set \( \text{done} \) containing
points to be ignored as neighbors, at first just containing \( \text{points} \).

Before adding an element to a row, we increment all \( \text{pointers} \) until they don’t point to
an element of \( \text{done} \). Now, \( \text{pointers} \) point to the next \( h \) candidates for nearest neighbor to
the unordered set. We find which is closest, compute distances from that point to \( \text{points} \)
and sort, appending the new element to the row. We then also find the next element in the
dist column, which is different for \( h = 2 \) and \( h > 2 \).

pdd = []
dist = []

for points in combinations(range(m), 2):
    done = set(points)
    pointers = [0] * h

    ## construct row
    row = []
    for _ in range(k):
        ## pointer update
        for i in range(h):
            while inds[points[i]][pointers[i]] in done:
                pointers[i] += 1

            # ...
# index of point with the closest neighbor
p = argmin([D_\[points[i]\][pointers[i]]
    for i in range(h)])

# index of said neighbour in cloud
point = inds[points[p]][pointers[p]]

# add to element to row
row.append(
    sorted(
        euclidean(motif[points[i]],
                cloud[point])
        for i in range(h)
    )
)

# update done and pointer
done.add(point)
pointers[p] += 1

pdd.append(row)

## add to dist
if h == 2:
    d = euclidean(motif[points[0]],
                  motif[points[1]])
else:
    d = finite_PDD(motif[points])
dist.append(d)

Final stage 3 requires only standard operations of lexicographic ordering.

## example: PDD for the lowest energy T2-$\ep$ crystal from \cite{pulido2017functional}

```python
>>> cell = [12.607 0. 0. [-6.303 10.91 0. ]
[ 0. 0. 7.493]]

>>> motif = [[11.221 1.564 1.873]
[ 9.750 0.120 2.972]
[... [-3.446 10.798 4.520]
[-3.625 10.586 3.685]]

>>> PDD(motif, cell, k=20, h=1)

# output: weights in first column
[[0.011 0.880 1.369 ... 3.367 3.372 3.568]
[0.011 0.880 1.369 ... 3.367 3.372 3.568]
...
```
Pointwise distance distributions of periodic sets

>>> PDD(motif, cell, k=20, h=2)

# output: columns separated by keys in a dict.
{
    'weights':
        [2.3e-4, 2.3e-4, ..., 2.3e-4, 2.3e-4],
    'dists':
        [0.88, 0.88, ..., 18.3, 18.5],
    'matrix':
        
        
        
        
        (perturbed distances)

Full proof of Theorem\textsuperscript{5}. For periodic sets, first we show that $D(S; k)$ from Definition\textsuperscript{3} hence $PDD^{(h)}(S)$, is independent of a primitive unit cell. Let $U, U'$ be primitive cells of a periodic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with a lattice $\Lambda$. Any point $q \in S \cap U'$ can be translated by some $\vec{v} \in \Lambda$ to a point $p \in S \cap U$ and vice versa. These translations establish a bijection between the motifs $S \cap U \leftrightarrow S \cap U'$ and preserve distances. So $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ is the same for both $U, U'$.

Now we prove that $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ is preserved by any isometry $f : S \rightarrow Q$. Any primitive cell $U$ of $S$ is bijectively mapped by $f$ to the unit cell $f(U)$ of $Q$, which should be also primitive. Indeed, if $Q$ is preserved by a translation along a vector $\vec{v}$ that doesn’t have all integer coefficients in the basis of $f(U)$, then $S = f^{-1}(Q)$ is preserved by the translation along $f^{-1}(\vec{v})$, which also doesn’t have all integer coefficients in the basis of $U$, i.e. $U$ was non-primitive. Since both primitive cells $U$ and $f(U)$ contain the same number of points from $S$ and $Q = f(S)$, the isometry $f$ gives a bijection between the motifs of $S, Q$.

For any finite or periodic sets $S, Q$, since $f$ preserves distances, every list of ordered distances from $p_i \in S \cap U$ to its first $k$ nearest neighbors in $S$, coincides with the list of the ordered distances from $f(p_i)$ to its first $k$ neighbors in $Q$. These coincidences of distance lists give $PDD^{(h)}(S; k) = PDD^{(h)}(Q; k)$ after collapsing identical rows. \hfill $\square$

Lemmas\textsuperscript{11-13} are needed to prove Theorem\textsuperscript{7}.

Lemma\textsuperscript{11} (perturbed distances). For some $\varepsilon > 0$, let $g : S \rightarrow Q$ be a bijection between finite or periodic sets such that $|a - g(a)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $a \in S$. Then, for any $i \geq 1$, let $a_i \in S$ and $b_i \in Q$ be the $i$-th nearest neighbors of points $a \in S$ and $b = g(a) \in Q$, respectively. Then the Euclidean distances from the points $a, b$ to their $i$-th neighbors $a_i, b_i$ are $2\varepsilon$-close to each other, i.e. $||a - a_i| - |b - b_i|| \leq 2\varepsilon$.

Proof. Shifting the point $g(a)$ back to $a$, assume that $a = g(a)$ is fixed and all other points change their positions by at most $2\varepsilon$. Assume by contradiction that the distance from $a$ to its new $i$-th neighbor $b_i$ is less than $|a - a_i| - 2\varepsilon$. \hfill $\blacksquare$
Then all first new \( i \) neighbors \( b_1, \ldots, b_i \) of \( a \) within \( Q \) belong to the open ball with the center \( a \) and the radius \( |a-a_1| - 2\varepsilon \). Since the bijection \( g \) shifted every \( b_1, \ldots, b_i \) by at most \( 2\varepsilon \), their preimages \( g^{-1}(b_1), \ldots, g^{-1}(b_i) \) belong to the open ball with the center \( a \) and the radius \( |a-a_i| \).

Then the \( i \)-th neighbor of \( a \) within \( S \) is among these \( i \) preimages, i.e. the distance from \( a \) to its \( i \)-th nearest neighbor should be strictly less than the assumed value \( |a-a_i| \).

Similarly get a contradiction assuming that the distance from \( a \) to its new \( i \)-th neighbor \( b_i \) is more than \( |a-a_i| + 2\varepsilon \).

**Lemma 12** (perturbed distance vectors). For \( \varepsilon > 0 \), let \( g : S \to Q \) be a bijection between finite or periodic sets so that \( |a-g(a)| \leq \varepsilon \) for all \( a \in S \). Then, for \( k \geq 1 \), the bijection \( g \) changes the vector \( \tilde{R}_a(S) = (|a-a_1|, \ldots, |a-a_k|) \) of the first \( k \) minimum distances from any point \( a \in S \) to its \( k \) nearest neighbors \( a_1, \ldots, a_k \in S \) by at most \( 2\varepsilon \) in the \( L_\infty \)-distance. So if \( b_1, \ldots, b_k \in Q \) are the \( k \) nearest neighbors of \( b = g(a) \) within \( Q \) and \( \tilde{R}_b(S) = (|b-b_1|, \ldots, |b-b_k|) \) is the vector of the first \( k \) minimum distances from \( b = g(a) \), then the \( L_\infty \)-distance \( |\tilde{R}_a(S) - \tilde{R}_b(Q)|_\infty \leq 2\varepsilon \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 11 every coordinate of the vector \( \tilde{R}_a(S) \) changes by at most \( 2\varepsilon \). Hence the \( L_\infty \)-distance from \( \tilde{R}_a(S) \) to the perturbed vector \( \tilde{R}_b(Q) \) is at most \( 2\varepsilon \).

**Lemma 13** (common lattice). Let periodic point sets \( S, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) have a bottleneck distance \( d_B(S, Q) < r(Q) \), where \( r(Q) \) is the packing radius. Then \( S, Q \) have a common lattice \( \Lambda \) with a unit cell \( U \) such that \( S = \Lambda + (U \cap S) \), \( Q = \Lambda + (U \cap Q) \).

**Proof.** Let \( S = \Lambda(S) + (U(S) \cap S) \) and \( Q = \Lambda(Q) + (U(Q) \cap Q) \), where \( U(S), U(Q) \) are initial unit cells of \( S, Q \) and the lattices \( \Lambda(S), \Lambda(Q) \) of \( S, Q \) contain the origin.

By shifting all points of \( S, Q \) (but not their lattices), we guarantee that \( S \) contains the origin 0 of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume by contradiction that the given periodic point sets \( S, Q \) have no common lattice. Then there is a vector \( \bar{p} \in \Lambda(S) \) whose all integer multiples \( kp \notin \Lambda(Q) \) for \( k \in \mathbb{Z} - 0 \). Any such multiple \( kp \) can be translated by a vector \( \bar{v}(k) \in \Lambda(Q) \) to the initial unit cell \( U(Q) \) so that \( \tilde{q}(k) = kp - \bar{v}(k) \in U(Q) \).

Since \( U(Q) \) contains infinitely many points \( \tilde{q}(k) \), one can find a pair \( \tilde{q}(i), \tilde{q}(j) \) at a distance less than \( \delta = r(Q) - d_B(S, Q) > 0 \). The formula \( \tilde{q}(k) \equiv kp \mod \Lambda(Q) \) implies that \( \tilde{q}(i+k(j-i)) \equiv (i+k(j-i))p \mod \Lambda(Q) \equiv \tilde{q}(i+k(\bar{q}(j)-\tilde{q}(i))) \mod \Lambda(Q) \). If the point \( \tilde{q}(i+k(\bar{q}(j)-\tilde{q}(i))) \) belongs to \( U(Q) \), we get the equality \( \tilde{q}(i+k(j-i)) = \tilde{q}(i)+k(\bar{q}(j)-\tilde{q}(i)) \).

All these points over \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) lie on a straight line within \( U(Q) \) and have the distance \( |\bar{q}(j)-\tilde{q}(i)| < \delta \) between successive points.

The closed balls with radius \( d_B(S, Q) \) and centers at points in \( Q \) are at least \( 2\delta \) away from each other. Then one of the points \( \tilde{q}(i+k(j-i)) \) is more than \( d_B(S, Q) \) away from \( Q \). Hence the point \( (i+k(j-i))p \in S \) also has a distance more than \( d_B(S, Q) \) from any point of \( Q \), which contradicts the definition of the bottleneck distance.

**Full proof of Theorem 7** for \( h = 1 \). Recall that the bottleneck distance is defined as

\[
\inf_{g : S \to Q} \sup_{a \in S} \left| a - g(a) \right|
\]

between point sets \( S, Q \). Then for any \( \delta > 0 \) there is a bijection \( g : S \to Q \) such that \( \sup_{a \in S} |a - g(a)| \leq d_B(S, Q) + \delta \).
If the given sets $S, Q$ are finite, one can set $\delta = 0$. Indeed, there are only finitely many bijections $S \to Q$, hence the infimum in the definition above is achieved for one of them.

By Lemma 13, if the sets $S, Q$ are periodic, they have a common lattice $\Lambda$. Any primitive cell $U$ of $\Lambda$ is a unit cell of $S, Q$, i.e. $S = \Lambda + (S \cap U)$ and $Q = \Lambda + (Q \cap U)$. Since the bottleneck distance $\varepsilon = d_B(S, Q) < \frac{r(S)}{4}$, we can define a bijection $g$ from every point $a \in S$ to a closest point $g(a) \in Q$. If $U$ is a non-primitive unit cell of $S$, the distance matrix $D(S; k)$ can be constructed as in Definition 3, but each row will be repeated $n(S)$ times, where $n(S)$ is $\text{Vol}[U]$ divided by the volume of a primitive unit cell of $S$. So we can assume that $S, Q$ share a unit cell $U$ and have in $U$ the same number $m(S) = m(Q)$, say both are equal to $m$.

For any $k \geq 1$, we first define the simple 1-1 flow from the rows of $D(S; k)$ to the rows of $D(Q; k)$ by setting $f_{ii} = \frac{1}{m}$ and $f_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$, where $i, j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Recall that Definition 3 collapses all rows of $D(S; k)$ that are identical to each other to a single row, similar for $D(Q; k)$. By summing up weights of collapsed rows, the above flow induces a flow from all distance vectors in $\text{PDD}(S; k)$, e.g. $R_i(S)$ in the $i$-th row of $\text{PDD}(S; k)$, to all distance vectors in $\text{PDD}(Q; k)$.

Then $\text{EMD}(\text{PDD}(S; k), \text{PDD}(Q; k)) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |\vec{R}_i(S) - \vec{R}_i(Q)|_\infty$, because $\text{EMD}$ minimizes the cost over all flows in Definition 6. Since each $|\vec{R}_i(S) - \vec{R}_i(Q)| \leq 2(d_B(S, Q) + \delta)$ by Lemma 12, we conclude that $\text{EMD}(\text{PDD}(S; k), \text{PDD}(Q; k)) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} 2(d_B(S, Q) + \delta) = 2(d_B(S, Q) + \delta)$. Since the last inequality holds for any small $\delta > 0$, we get the required continuity $\text{EMD}(\text{PDD}(S; k), \text{PDD}(Q; k)) \leq 2d_B(S, Q)$.

**Full proof of Theorem 7** for $h > 1$. The proof follows the easier case $h = 1$. The rows of $\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k)$ are indexed by $m_h(S) = \frac{m(S)!}{h!(m(S) - h)!}$ unordered subsets $A \subset S$ of $h$ points.

Here $m(S)$ is the number of points in a motif of $S$.

The first component of a row $R_A$ in $\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k)$ is $D(A)$ from Definition 4. The distance between these matrices for subsets $A \subset S$ and $g(A) \subset Q$ is computed as $d(A, g(A)) = |D(A) - D(g(A))|_\infty \leq 2d_B(S, Q)$. Indeed, we turn $D(A)$ into a vector by concatenating all rows. The corresponding rows in $D(A), D(g(A))$ are close by Lemma 12.

The $L_\infty$-distance between the remaining lists of $h$ ordered distances to $h$ points in the subsets $A$ and $g(A)$ has the same upper bound $2d_B(S, Q)$ by Lemma 12. Hence the upper bound $2d_B(S, Q)$ emerges unchanged through the estimate

$$\text{EMD}(\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k), \text{PDD}^{(h)}(Q; k)) \leq \frac{1}{m_h(S)} \sum_{|A|=h} \max \{ d(A, g(A)), |\vec{R}_A(S) - \vec{R}_{g(A)}(Q)|_\infty \} \leq 2d_B(S, Q),$$

where $m_h(S)$ is the number of unordered subsets of $h$ points chosen from $m(S) = m(Q)$ points.

**Full proof of Theorem 9.** Assuming that the first order $\text{PDD}(S; k)$ is realizable by a periodic point set $S = \Lambda + M$, we explain below how to reconstruct a lattice $\Lambda$ containing (say) the origin (uniquely up to isometry), then a motif of $S$ in the Voronoi domain $V(\Lambda; 0)$, uniquely up a central symmetry preserving $\Lambda$.

Let $l$ be the lowest common multiple of all denominators in rational weights of the rows in the given matrix $\text{PDD}(S; k)$. Then every row of weight $j/l$ can be replaced by $j$ identical
rows of weight $1/l$. The number $m$ of points in a given unit cell $U$ can be considered as an
isometry invariant, because any isometry maps a unit cell to another unit cell with the same
number of points. If $l < m$, for example, if all $m$ points $p \in M$ have isometrically equivalent
neighborhoods $(S, p) = \{q - p \mid q \in S\}$, so $l = 1$, then we know that every row should
be multiplied $m/l$ times. Now we forget about these equal weights and will reconstruct a
periodic point set $S$ with a motif $M$ of $m$ points.

Condition (3b) for any point $p \in M$, allows us to recognize lattice distances from $p$ to
its lattice translates $p + \Lambda$ within the row of $\text{PDD}(S; k)$ representing $p$. Indeed, only such a
lattice distance $d$ appears in the row together with $2d$ (and possibly with higher multiples)
by condition (3b). Moreover, any lattice distance $d$ and its multiple is repeated twice in
every row, because any lattice is centrally symmetric.

Every row contains several such distinct distances $d$ between $p$ and $p + \vec{v}$ for non-parallel
vectors $\vec{v} \in \Lambda$. In dimension $n = 2$, we consider only the first three such shortest distances
$d_0 < d_1 < d_2$ repeated exactly twice in every row. If we start building a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$
from the origin 0, then $d_0 < d_1 < d_2$ are the distances from 0 to three symmetric pairs of
Voronoi neighbors of 0 within $\Lambda$. By [12, Theorem 7], these distances equal the lengths of
vectors $\vec{v}_0, \vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in \Lambda$ that form an obtuse superbase of $\Lambda$ meaning that $\vec{v}_0 + \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 = 0$ and
$p_{ij} = -\vec{v}_i \cdot \vec{v}_j \geq 0$ for distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Using $d_0, d_1, d_2$ as edge-lengths, we can build a
triangle (unique up to isometry) on the vectors $-\vec{v}_0 = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2, \vec{v}_1, -\vec{v}_2$ and get a unit cell $U$
of $\Lambda$. Since $d_0 < d_1 < d_2 \leq \text{diam}[U]$, the above distances and their doubles are included into
every row of $\text{PDD}(S; k)$, hence can be recognized above.

The above argument is insufficient for $n \geq 3$. However, any lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ has an obtuse
superbase $\vec{v}_0, \vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \vec{v}_3$ such that $\vec{v}_0 + \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 + \vec{v}_3 = 0$ and $p_{ij} = -\vec{v}_i \cdot \vec{v}_j \geq 0$ for distinct
$i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. These six conorms $p_{ij}$ are continuous isometry invariants that suffice to
reconstruct $\Lambda$ up to isometry [12, section 8]. For $n = 2$, a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ can be similarly
reconstructed from its three conorms, which are extractable from $\text{PDD}(S; k)$ as above.

Without loss of generality one can assume that a reconstructed lattice $\Lambda$ contains the
origin $p_0 = 0$ represented by the first row of $\text{PDD}(S; k)$. If this matrix has $m \geq 2$ rows, we
will reconstruct all other $m - 1$ points of $S$ within the open Voronoi domain $V(\Lambda; 0)$. No
points of $S$ can be on the boundary of $V(\Lambda; 0)$ due to condition (3b) on distinct distances.

First we remove from each row of $\text{PDD}(S; k)$ all lattice distances so that every remaining
distance is from a point $p$ to a point $q \notin p + \Lambda$. Any other point $q \in S$ in the open Voronoi
domain $V(\Lambda; 0)$ has its lexicographically smallest list of basis distances $d_1 < \cdots < d_n$ from $q$
to its closest lattice points $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; 0) \subset \Lambda$ subject to the condition that the vectors
$p_i - p_0 = p_i$ form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The basis distances are distinct by (3) and appear once in
both rows of $p_0 = 0$ and $q$ in $\text{PDD}(S; k)$ after the shortest distance $d_0 = |q - p_0| = |q| - d_0$
from $q$ to $\Lambda$. Indeed, the maximum $(n + 1)$-st distance (for $n = 2$ or $n = 3$) from $q$ to $\Lambda$ cannot be
longer than a maximum distance to a corner of a unit cell $U$ so $\text{diam}[U]$ is an upper bound.
Hence all basis distances of any point $q \in S \cap V(\Lambda; 0)$ are contained in $\text{PDD}(S; k)$.

Though the basis distances of $q$ may not be the $n$ smallest values appearing after $d_0 = |q|
in the first and second rows of 0 and $q$, we will try all $n$-distance subsequences $d_1' < \cdots < d_n'$
shared by both rows. Similarly, we cannot be sure that $n$ closest neighbors of $q$ in $\Lambda$ form
a basis of $R^n$, hence we will try all $n$-tuples of points $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in N(\Lambda; 0)$ that form a
linear basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The condition of a linear basis is needed to guarantee that $n + 1$ affinely
independent points $p_0 = 0, p_1, \ldots, p_n$ uniquely identify a point $q$ by their distances to $q$. For
all finitely many choices above, we check if the \( n + 1 \) spheres \( S(p_i; d'_i) \), which are 1D circles (for \( n = 2 \)) or 2D spheres (for \( n = 3 \)), meet at a single point in \( V(\Lambda; 0) \), which will be \( q \).

Condition (5) guarantees that these \( n + 1 \) spheres can intersect at a single point in the open Voronoi domain \( V(\Lambda; 0) \) only if the three conditions below hold. Firstly, the vectors of the points \( p_1, \ldots, p_n \) should form a linear basis of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Secondly, the distances \( d'_1 < \cdots < d'_n \) equal the basis distances \( d_1 < \cdots < d_n \) of \( q \) meaning that this list is the lexicographically smallest over all tuples \( \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \subset N(\Lambda; 0) \) that form a linear basis. Thirdly, the single-point intersection happens only for two subsets \( \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \subset N(\Lambda; 0) \) related by the central symmetry with respect to \( p_0 = 0 \). This symmetry is an isometry preserving the lattice \( \Lambda \) and the distances \( d_0 < d_1 < \cdots < d_n \). Making a choice by this inevitable ambiguity, we uniquely identify a point \( q \in (S - 0) \cap V(\Lambda; 0) \) relative to the already fixed lattice \( \Lambda \).

If the matrix \( \text{PDD}(S; k) \) has \( m \geq 3 \) rows, any further point \( p \in (S - \{0, q\}) \cap V(\Lambda; 0) \) will be uniquely determined as follows. Similarly to the point \( q \) above, we extract \( n + 1 \) shortest distances from the third row. In addition to \( p_0 = 0 \), we look for other \( n \) nearest neighbors that have specified distances to a next point \( p \). Since the second point \( q \) is already fixed, the third point \( p \) is also restricted by the distance \( |p - q| \) appearing once only in the second and third rows of \( \text{PDD}(S; k) \). This distance doesn’t help to resolve the ambiguity between \( \pm p \) only \( q \) belongs to the bisector of points equidistant to \( \pm p \). In this case the points \( p, 0, q \) form a right-angle triangle, which is forbidden by condition (5). Hence \( p \) and any further point of \( S \cap V(\Lambda; 0) \) is uniquely determined by the fixed lattice \( \Lambda \) and second point \( q \).

Lemmas 14 and a few auxiliary concepts below are needed to prove Theorem 10.

The volume of the unit ball in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is \( V_n = \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + 1)} \), where \( \Gamma \) denotes Euler’s Gamma function \( \Gamma(m) = (m - 1)! \) and \( \Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2} + 1\right) = \sqrt{\pi} \frac{(m - \frac{3}{2}) \cdots \frac{1}{2}}{2} \) for any integer \( m \geq 1 \).

The Point Packing Coefficient is \( c(S) = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Vol}[U]}{mV_n}} \), where a cell \( U \) may not be primitive since \( \frac{m}{m} \) is independent of \( U \). Then \( (c(S))^n \) is inversely proportional to the density of \( S \), where every point has the mass \( V_n \). The diameter of a unit cell \( U \) is \( d = \sup_{a, b \in U} |a - b| \).

Lemma 14 (bounds on points within a ball). Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be any periodic point set with a unit cell \( U \), which generates a lattice \( \Lambda \) and has a diameter \( d \). For any point \( p \in S \cap U \) and a radius \( r \), consider the lower union \( U'(p; r) = \bigcup \{(U + \vec{v}) \mid \vec{v} \in \Lambda, (U + \vec{v}) \subset \bar{B}(p; r)\} \) and the upper union \( U''(p; r) = \bigcup \{(U + \vec{v}) \mid \vec{v} \in \Lambda, (U + \vec{v}) \cap \bar{B}(p; r) \neq \emptyset\} \). Then the number of points from \( S \) in the closed ball \( \bar{B}(p; r) \) with center \( p \) and radius \( r \) has the bounds

\[
\left(\frac{r - d}{c(S)}\right)^n \leq m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U'(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \leq |S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \leq m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U''(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \leq \left(\frac{r + d}{c(S)}\right)^n \, .
\]

Proof. Intersect the three regions \( U'(p; r) \subset \bar{B}(p; r) \subset U''(p; r) \) with \( S \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and count the numbers of resulting points: \(|S \cap U'(p; r)| \leq |S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \leq |S \cap U''(p; r)|\). The union \( U'(p; r) \) consists of \( \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U'(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \) cells, which all have the same volume \( \text{Vol}[U] \). Since \(|S \cap U| = m\), we now get \(|S \cap U'(p; r)| = m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U'(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \). Similarly we count the points in the upper union: \(|S \cap U''(p; r)| = m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U''(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \). The bounds of \(|S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \) become

\[
m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U'(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \leq |S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \leq m \frac{\text{Vol}\left[U''(p; r)\right]}{\text{Vol}[U]} \, .
\]
For the diameter $d$ of the unit cell $U$, the smaller ball $B(p; r - d)$ is completely contained within the lower union $U'(p; r)$. Indeed, if $|q - p| \leq r - d$, then $q \in U + \vec{v}$ for some $\vec{v} \in \Lambda$. Then $(U + \vec{v})$ is covered by the ball $B(q; d)$, hence by $B(p; r)$ due to the triangle inequality.

The inclusion $B(p; r - d) \subset U'(p; r)$ implies the lower bound for the volumes:

$$V_n(r-d)^n = \text{Vol}[B(p; r - d)] \leq \text{Vol}[U'(p; r)]$$

$V_n$ is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The similar inclusion $U''(p; r) \subset B(p; r + d)$ gives

$$\frac{mV_n}{\text{Vol}[U]}(r-d)^n \leq |S \cap B(p; r)| \leq mV_n(r+d)^n, \text{ which implies the required inequality.}$$

**Lemma 15** (distance bounds). Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be any periodic point set with a unit cell $U$ of diameter $d$. For any motif point $p \in M = S \cap U$, let $d_k(S; p)$ be the distance from $p$ to its $k$-th nearest neighbour in $S$. Then $c(S) \sqrt{k} - d < d_k(S; p) \leq c(S) \sqrt{k} + d$ for any $k \geq 1$. ■

**Proof.** The closed ball $B(p; r)$ of radius $r = d_k(S; p)$ has more than $k$ points (including $p$) from $S$. The upper bound of Lemma 14 for $r = d_k(S; p)$ implies that $k < |S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \leq \frac{(r+d)^n}{c(S)^n}$. Taking the $n$-th root of both sides, we get $\sqrt[k]{k} < \frac{r+d}{c(S)}$, so $r = d_k(S; p) > c(S) \sqrt{k} - d$.

For any smaller radius $r < d_k(S; p)$, the closed ball $\bar{B}(p; r)$ contains at most $k$ points (including $p$) from $S$. The lower bound of Lemma 14 for any $r < d_k(S; p)$ implies that $\frac{(r-d)^n}{c(S)^n} \leq |S \cap \bar{B}(p; r)| \leq k$. Since $\frac{(r-d)^n}{c(S)^n} \leq k$ holds for the constant upper bound $k$ and any radius $r < d_k(S; p)$, the same inequality holds for the radius $r = d_k(S; p)$.

Similarly to the upper bound above, we get $r - d = d_k(S; p) \leq c(S) \sqrt{k} + d$. Combine the two bounds above as follows: $c(S) \sqrt{k} - d < d_k(S; p) \leq c(S) \sqrt{k} + d$. ■

Define the skewness of a unit cell $U$ with a diameter $d$ as $\nu = \frac{d}{\sqrt{\text{Vol}[U]}}$. Most reduced cell $U$ have a small $\nu$, though in $\mathbb{R}^2$ the rectangular cell with edge-lengths 1, $l$ has $\nu = \sqrt{1 + \frac{l^2}{l}} \to +\infty$ as $l \to +\infty$, though such cells are rare for real periodic structures.

**Full proof of Theorem 10** for $h = 1$. Let the origin 0 be in the center of the unit cell $U$. If $d$ is the diameter of $U$, any point $p \in M = S \cap U$ is covered by the closed ball $B(0, 0.5d)$.

By Lemma 15 all $k$ neighbours of $p$ are covered by the ball $B(0; r)$ of radius $r = c(S) \sqrt{k} + 1.5d$. To generate all $\Lambda$-translates of $M$ within $B(0; r)$, we gradually extend $U$ in spherical layers by adding more shifted cells until we get the upper union $U''(0; r) \supset B(0; r)$. By Lemma 14 the union $U''(0; r)$ includes $k$ neighbors of motif points and has at most $\mu = m \frac{\text{Vol}[U''](0; r)}{\text{Vol}[U]} \leq \left( \frac{c(S) \sqrt{k} + 2.5d}{c(S)} \right)^n = \left( \frac{\sqrt{k} + 2.5d}{c(S)} \right)^n = O(2^n(k + m(2.5\nu)^nV_n))$ points.
To get the last expression, we use the rough estimate \((a + b)^n \leq 2^n(a^n + b^n)\) with \(a^n = k\) and
\[
b^n = \left(\frac{2.5d}{c(S)}\right)^n = \frac{(2.5d)^n}{\text{Vol}[U]} mV_n = m(2.5\nu^n) V_n,
\]
where \(\nu = \frac{d}{\sqrt{\text{Vol}[U]}}\) is the skewness of \(U\).

A cover tree on \(\mu\) points can be built in time \(O(\mu \log \mu)\) by [7] Theorems 4, 6. Then all \(k\) neighbours of \(m \leq \mu\) motif points \(p \in M\) can be found in time \(O(mk\log^2 k)\) by [19] chapter 3, which extends [13] Theorem 2 for \(k = 1\). By Definition 3 we lexicographically sort \(m\) lists of ordered distances in time \(O(km \log m)\), because a comparison of two ordered lists of the length \(k\) takes \(O(k)\) time. These ordered lists are the rows of the matrix \(D(S; k)\). Then identical rows are collapsed to a single row with in time \(O(km)\). Using
\[
O(\mu \log \mu + mk \log^2 k) = O(2^n(k + m(2.5\nu^n) V_n) n \log (km) + mk \log^2 k) =
\]
\[
= O((5\nu^n) V_n km \log m \log^2 k),
\]
which is near linear in both key inputs \(k, m\).

Our implementations of \(\text{PDD}^{(h)}\) invariants in Python uses the \(n\)-d tree [10] on \(\mu\) points in \(\mathbb{R}^n\), which performs faster in small dimensions than a cover tree but has no proved complexity for a nearest neighbour search.

Full proof of Theorem [10] for \(h > 1\). We might need up to \(k + h - 1\) neighbors for each \(p \in M\), because up to \(h - 1\) neighbors of \(p\) can belong to a subset \(A\) of \(h\) points including \(p_i\).

For any subset \(A \subset S\) of \(h > 1\) points, all distances in the corresponding row of \(\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k)\) were already computed for \(\text{PDD}(S; k)\). Indeed, for any point \(p_i \in A\), we add its \(k\) nearest neighbors (together with distances to \(p_i\)) to the pool of neighbors for all points of \(A\). For every point of this pool, we build a list of ordered distances to all points of \(A\) in a time \(O(h \log h)\). Since the pool has at most \(hk\) points, we lexicographically order the lists of the length \(h\) in time \(O(h^2 k \log (hk))\). Hence a single row of \(\text{PDD}^{(h)}(S; k)\) is completed in the extra time \(O(h^2 k \log (hk))\). Since there are \(O(m^h)\) rows corresponding to unordered subsets \(A \subset S\) of \(h\) points, all rows will be completed in time \(O(h^2 km^h \log (hk))\).

It remains to order \(O(m^h)\) rows of the length \(k\) (with each component of size \(h\)) in time \(O(hkm^h \log m)\). Hence the total time for \(\text{PDD}^{(h)}\) is \(O(h^2 km^h (5\nu^n) V_n \log (km) \log^2 k)\).

### Appendix C: computations of Pointwise Distance Distributions

This appendix shows that \(\text{PDD}^{(2)}\) distinguishes pairs of finite sets in [33] Figure S4(A,B,C)], which were impossible to distinguish up to isometry by past distance-based invariants.

▶ Example 16 (5-point sets). The 5-point sets in Fig. 6 have pairwise distances in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distances of (S_-)</th>
<th>(R_-)</th>
<th>(R_+)</th>
<th>(G_-)</th>
<th>(G_+)</th>
<th>(B_-)</th>
<th>distances of (S_+)</th>
<th>(R_-)</th>
<th>(R_+)</th>
<th>(G_-)</th>
<th>(G_+)</th>
<th>(B_+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R_- (-2, 0, -2))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{32})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(R_- (-2, 0, -2))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{32})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_+ (+2, 0, +2))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{32})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(R_+ (+2, 0, +2))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{32})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G_- (-1, -1, 0))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{8})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(G_- (-1, -1, 0))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{8})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G_+ (+1, +1, 0))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{8})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>(G_+ (+1, +1, 0))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{8})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\sqrt{2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B_- (0, +1, -1))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(B_- (0, +1, +1))</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{14})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{6})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4 | The matrix of pairwise distances between all points of the 5-point set \(S_\pm\) in Fig. 6.
Table 5 For each point from $S_+ \in \text{Fig. 6}$ the distances from Table 4 are ordered in each row.

Table 5 illustrates Definition 3 of PDD for the sets $S_{\pm}$ in Fig. 6 and confirm that

$$\text{PDD}(S_+; 4) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc} 1/5 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{14} \\ 1/5 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{14} \\ 1/5 & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{8} & \sqrt{14} \\ 1/5 & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{8} & \sqrt{14} \end{array} \right) = \text{PDD}(S_-; 4).$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$S_-$ distances to</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_- = (-2, 0, -2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_+ = (+2, 0, +2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_- = (-1, -1, 0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_+ = (+1, +1, 0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_- = (0, +1, -1)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$S_+$ distances to</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_- = (-2, 0, -2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_+ = (+2, 0, +2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_- = (-1, -1, 0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_+ = (+1, +1, 0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_+ = (0, +1, -1)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 For any unordered pair $\{p_i, p_j\} \subset S_\pm$ in Figure 6 each row includes the distance $|p_i - p_j|$ and lexicographically ordered pairs $|p_i - p_j| \leq |p_j - p_i|$ of distances from $p_i, p_j$ to other $p_l \in S_\pm$

Both sets have one pair at distance $\sqrt{2}$ whose rows in PDD(4) differ by distances to neighbors 1,2,3.

The equality of the first order $\text{PDD}(S_+; 4) = \text{PDD}(S_-; 4)$ motivated us to introduce the stronger higher order $\text{PDD}(h)$, which distinguish $S_{\pm}$ already for $h = 2$ in Table 3 which might be easier to understand from intermediate Table 6 with highlighted differences.
Example 17 (7-point sets). The sets $Q_{\pm}$ in Figure S4(B) have distances in Table 7. Table 8 shows two pairs of the only rows in $\text{PDD}^{(2)}(Q_{\pm};3)$ starting from distance $\sqrt{6}$. The highlighted pairs of distances imply that $\text{PDD}^{(2)}(Q_{-};k) \neq \text{PDD}^{(2)}(Q_{+};k)$ for $k \geq 1$.

![Figure 7](image)

**Figure 7** Left: $(x,y)$-projection of the 7-point set $Q_{-} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ consisting of the red point $R = (-2,0,-2)$, green point $G = (2,0,2)$, four blue points $B_{\pm} = (\pm 1, \pm 1, 0)$, $B_{\pm 2} = (\pm 1, 2, 0)$ and orange point $O_{-} = (0,0,-1)$. Right: to get the set $Q_{+} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ from $Q_{-}$, replace $O_{-}$ by $O_{+} = (0,0,1)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distances of $Q_{-}$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>$B_{-1}$</th>
<th>$B_{+1}$</th>
<th>$B_{-2}$</th>
<th>$B_{+2}$</th>
<th>$O_{-}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R = (-2,0,-2)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G = (+2,0,+2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-1} = (-1,-1,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{+1} = (+1,+1,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-2} = (-1,2,0)$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{+2} = (+1,2,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_{-} = (0,0,-1)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distances of $Q_{+}$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>$B_{-1}$</th>
<th>$B_{+1}$</th>
<th>$B_{-2}$</th>
<th>$B_{+2}$</th>
<th>$O_{+}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R = (-2,0,-2)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G = (+2,0,+2)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{32}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-1} = (-1,-1,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{+1} = (+1,+1,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{14}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{8}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-2} = (-1,2,0)$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{+2} = (+1,2,0)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_{+} = (0,0,1)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 The matrix of distances between all points of the 7-point set $Q_{\pm}$ in Figure S4(B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Q_{-}$ pair</th>
<th>dist.</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.1</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.2</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${G, B_{+1}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>(1,3) to $B_{+2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$O_{-}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${R, B_{-1}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5})$</td>
<td>to $O_{-}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{8}, \sqrt{14})$ to $B_{+1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Q_{+}$ pair</th>
<th>dist.</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.1</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.2</th>
<th>dist. pair to neighb.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${G, B_{+1}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>(1,3) to $B_{+2}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>$O_{+}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${R, B_{-1}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{13})$</td>
<td>to $O_{+}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{8}, \sqrt{14})$ to $B_{+1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Both 7-point sets $Q_{\pm}$ have only two pairs $\{G, B_{+1}\}$ and $\{R, B_{-1}\}$ at distance $\sqrt{6}$, whose rows in $\text{PDD}^{(2)}$ differ by distances from $O_{\pm}$ to these pairs, hence $\text{PDD}^{(2)}(Q_{-};1) \neq \text{PDD}^{(2)}(Q_{+};1)$.
which should be ordered and written lexicographically. Hence it makes sense to compare $PDD$ in the lexicographic order. So $PDD$ include the same four pairs such that $\{R, G\} \in \{O_\pm, C_i, C_j\}$ for distinct $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. For example, in both PDD$^{(2)}$ (Figure 4) the row of $\{R, G\}$ starts with their distance $\sqrt{32}$ and then include the same four pairs $\{\sqrt{5}, \sqrt{13}\}, \{2\sqrt{17} + 1, 2\sqrt{17} - 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ modulo 3, which should be ordered and written lexicographically. Hence it makes sense to compare PDD$^{(2)}$ (Figure 4) only by the remaining rows $\{R, O_\pm, C_i, G, O_\pm, R, C_i, G, C_j\}$ in Table 10.

Without loss of generality assume that $l_1 \geq l_2 \geq l_3$. If all the parameters are distinct, then $l_1 > l_2 > l_3$. Then the rows for $\{R, O_\pm\}$ and $\{G, O_\pm\}$ differ in Table 11 even after ordering each pair so that a smaller distance precedes a larger one, and after writing all pairs in the lexicographic order. So PDD$^{(2)}$ (Figure 4) $\neq$ PDD$^{(2)}$ (Figure 4) unless two of $l_i$ are equal.
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Pointwise distance distributions of periodic sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distances of ( T_{-2} )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( G )</th>
<th>( C_1 )</th>
<th>( C_2 )</th>
<th>( C_3 )</th>
<th>( O_+ )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R = (−2, 0, −2) )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \sqrt{52} )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{5} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G = (+2, 0, +2) )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{32} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{13} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 = (x_1, y_1, 0) )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 = (x_2, y_2, 0) )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_3 = (x_3, y_3, 0) )</td>
<td>( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{12} + 1 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O_+ = (0, 0, +1) )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{5} )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{13} )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 )</td>
<td>( 0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 The matrix of distances between all points of the 7-point set \( T_2 \) in [33] Figure S4(C).

If (say) \( l_1 = l_2 \), the lexicographically ordered rows of \( \{ R, O_- \} \) and \( \{ G, O_+ \} \) coincide in PDD(2) \( (T_2; 4) \), similarly the rows of \( \{ G, O_- \} \) and \( \{ R, O_+ \} \). Hence it suffices to compare only the six rows for the remaining pairs \( \{ R, C_i \}, \{ G, C_i \} \) in PDD(2) \( (T_2; 4) \).

For \( l_1 = l_2 \), we get \( x_3 = \frac{l_2^2 - l_1^2}{2} = 0 \) and \( x_1 = -x_2 = \frac{l_2^2 - l_1^2}{2} \). In equation (18) the equality \((x_1 + 2)^2 + y_1^2 = (x_2 - 2)^2 + y_2^2 \) with \( x_1 = -x_2 \) implies that \( y_1 = y_2 \). The even more degenerate case \( l_1 = l_2 = l_3 \) means that \( x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 0 \) and \( y_1 = y_2 = y_3 \), hence at least two of \( C_1, C_2, C_3 \) should coincide. The above contradiction means that it remains to consider only the case \( l_1 = l_2 > l_3 \) when \( x_1 = -x_2 \neq 0 = x_3 \) and \( y_1 = \pm y_2 \), see Fig. 8.

If \( y_1 = y_2 \), the sets \( T_3 \) are isometric by \((x, y, z) \mapsto (−x, y, −z)\). If \( y_1 = −y_2 \) and \( y_3 = y_1 \), the sets \( T_4 \) are isometric by \((x, y, z) \mapsto (−x, −y, −z)\). If \( y_1 = −y_2 \) and \( y_3 = 0 \), then \( C_1 = (y_1, 0, 0) \), \( C_2 = (−x_1, −y_1, 0) \), \( C_3 = (0, 0, 0) \). In this case among the six remaining rows, only the rows of \( \{ R, C_i \}, \{ G, C_2 \} \) have points at the distance \( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 \), see Table 10 for \( i = 3 \) considered modulo 3. Then \( i + 1 \equiv 1 \) (mod 3), \( i − 2 \equiv 1 \) (mod 3), so \( l_1 + l_2 = l_2 = l_4 \).

Looking at the rows of \( \{ R, C_1 \}, \{ G, C_2 \} \), the three common pairs in each of PDD(2) \( (T_2; 4) \) include the same distance \( 2\sqrt{12} + 1 = 2\sqrt{12} + 1 \) but differ by \( |C_1 − C_2| \neq |C_2 C_3| \neq |C_1, C_2 | \). This couple of different rows implies that PDD(2) \( (T_2; 4) \neq PDD(2) \( (T_2; 4) \) due to the swapped distances \( \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} = 2 \) in their remaining pairs, see Table 10 for the sets \( T_3 \) in Fig. 8 with \( l_1 = l_2 = \frac{\sqrt{12}}{2}, l_3 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} \).

D Appendix D: breakthrough visualizations of large crystal datasets

This section explains visualisations of large crystal datasets for experts in applications.

A Crystallographic Information File (CIF) is typically used to represent 3D structures of periodic crystals. The geometric part of CIF represents a unit cell (a parallelepiped)

\( U \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) canonically by three edge-lengths \( a, b, c \) and between angles \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) so that \( \alpha \) is between \( b, c \) opposite to \( a \) and so on. A CIF also contains a list of atoms, each with their chemical element and three coordinates \( x, y, z \) (called fractional) of their atomic center. An atom then Cartesian coordinates given by \( x\hat{v}_1 + y\hat{v}_2 + z\hat{v}_3 \) for the basis vectors \( \hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2, \hat{v}_3 \).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{\pm}$</th>
<th>pair</th>
<th>distance</th>
<th>common pairs in PDD$^{[2]}(T_{\pm}; 4)$</th>
<th>pairs that differ in PDD$^{[2]}(T_{\pm}; 4)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${R, O_{-}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{13}, \sqrt{32})$ to $G$</td>
<td>$(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_1$, $(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_2$, $(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${G, O_{-}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{5}, \sqrt{32})$ to $R$</td>
<td>$(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_1$, $(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_2$, $(2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}, 2\sqrt{l_2^2 + 2l_3^2 - 3})$ to $C_3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${R, C_{i+1}}$</td>
<td>$2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}$</td>
<td>$(2\sqrt{l_{i-1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $G$, $(2\sqrt{l_{i-1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $C_{i-1}$, $(2\sqrt{l_{i+1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $C_i$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{5}, 2\sqrt{l_{i-1}^2 + 2l_i^2 - 3})$ to $O_{-}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${G, C_{i-1}}$</td>
<td>$2\sqrt{l_1^2 + 1}$</td>
<td>$(2\sqrt{l_{i+1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $R$, $(2\sqrt{l_{i-1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $C_{i-1}$, $(2\sqrt{l_{i+1}^2 + 1}, \sqrt{32})$ to $C_i$</td>
<td>$(\sqrt{5}, \sqrt{2l_{i-1}^2 + 2l_i^2 - 3})$ to $O_{+}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 For the sets $T_{\pm}$, the distributions PDD$^{[2]}(T_{\pm}; 4)$ can differ only in rows of the pairs $\{R, O_{-}\}, \{G, O_{+}\}, \{R, C_{i}\}, \{G, C_{i}\}$ above, where $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is considered modulo 3 so that $1 - 1 \equiv 3 \pmod{3}$. In rows of corresponding pairs of points, some pairs of distances are the same in both PDD$^{[2]}(T_{\pm}; 4)$, but other pairs can differ. If parameters $l_1, l_2, l_3$ are pairwise distinct, the rows $\{R, O_{-}\}, \{G, O_{+}\}$ include three different pairs of distances, so PDD$^{[2]}(T_{-}; 4) \neq$ PDD$^{[2]}(T_{+}; 4)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{\pm}$</th>
<th>pair</th>
<th>dist.</th>
<th>dist. to neighb.1</th>
<th>dist. to neighb.2</th>
<th>dist. to neighb.3</th>
<th>dist to neighb.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${R, C_{1}}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{17}$</td>
<td>to $C_3$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{5}, \sqrt{32}$</td>
<td>to $O_{-}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}, \sqrt{20}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${G, C_{2}}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{13}$</td>
<td>to $O_{+}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}, \sqrt{20}$</td>
<td>to $C_1$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{17}, \sqrt{20}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 The above rows show that PDD$^{[2]}(T_{-}; 4) \neq$ PDD$^{[2]}(T_{+}; 4)$ for the sets $T_{\pm}$ with $C_1 = (-1, 2, 0)$, $C_2 = (1, -2, 0)$, $C_3 = (0, 3, 0)$ so that $l_1 = l_2 = \sqrt{2}$, $l_3 = \sqrt{17}$ in Table 10.

along edges of the unit cell $U$. In the paper we consider points without chemical labels, however they can be easily added and taken into account when sorting rows of distances.

For the experimental crystal T2-ε, Fig. 9 shows 10 PDD curves corresponding to 10 types of non-isometric atomic positions within the T2 molecule. The rotation through 120° around an axis keeps the T2 molecule and the whole infinite crystal T2-ε invariant, while the three oxygen atoms shown in red simply rotate their positions. Hence all oxygen atom have
the same ordered distances to their neighbors and their PDD curves coincide. The same conclusion holds for six nitrogens whose positions are isometrically equivalent in T2.

Carbon atoms have five non-isometric positions, which generate five type of PDD curves in Fig. 9. All 10 PDD curves provide a finer classification of atomic types not only by chemical elements, but by their geometric positions within a molecule. For every atom, the first distance for \( k = 1 \) is the bond distance to its closest neighbor, see the zoomed beginnings of PDD curves. Though chemical elements can be included into the PDD matrix as an extra column, the above facts show that the PDD invariants can infer this chemistry.

Our second dataset has all 12576 structures of crystalline drugs from the Cambridge Structural Database (CSD). Though CSD is the world’s largest collection of more than 1.1M known crystals, it is basically a huge folder of Crystallographic Information Files (CIF) with limited search functions, for example by a chemical composition.

Though all crystalline drugs are based on many different molecules, these molecules tend to be smaller than the T2 molecule. Since larger than necessary values of \( k \) don’t affect distances to closer neighbors, we tried \( k = 100 \) and \( k = 200 \) for the whole CSD drug subset.

After computing \( \text{PDD}(S; k) \), we use a standard EMD algorithm for distances between these distributions. A Minimum Spanning Tree can be computed from a smaller graph on PDD invariants not requiring all pairwise distances. Since distances asymptotically approach \( \text{PPC}(S) \sqrt[3]{k} \), we used the instantly computable Point Packing Coefficient \( \text{PPC}(S) \) to find 3000 neighbors for each of 12576 crystals. For \( k = 200 \), the computations of \( 12576 \times 3000 \) EMD distances (excluding all repetitions) took 7 hours 39 min (1.238 ms per comparison, 2.19 sec per crystal). The time for PDD computations was in minutes. The time for drawing a Minimum Spanning Tree was in seconds.
A key challenge in visualization is to justifiably represent invariant data in a simple form. Past algorithms such as t-SNE [12], UMAP [28] are stochastic and can produce different outputs from repeated runs on the same input. Hence we used the more recent deterministic TreeMap [34] drawing a Minimum Spanning Tree (MST).

Informally, any MST can be considered as an optimal road network between cities. Such a network can be drawn in many different ways. Hence the most valuable and reliable new crystal data is in the new invariants $PDD^{(h)}$ and EMD distances between them, while MST is drawn only for visualization. Similarly, positions of cities and distances between them are more important than a sketch of a road network.

**Figure 10** State-of-the-art visualization of a CSP dataset, modified from Fig. 2d in [35]. Every predicted crystal has two coordinates (density, energy). The arrows show the predicted crystals that were manually matched to the five experimental crystals T2-$\alpha$, T2-$\beta$, T2-$\gamma$, T2-$\delta$, T2-$\epsilon$.

Fig. [12] illustrates key advantages of the invariant-based visualization in the right picture compared with the energy landscape in the left picture extracted from the state-of-the-art [35] in Fig. 10. Briefly, the MST based on stronger isometry invariants $PDD(S; 100)$ provides more information about crystal similarity than the cloud of points (density, energy). In the past, simulated versions were manually searched to match experimental crystals only by density. Measuring the energy of an experimental crystal needs an explosion disintegrating this crystal. For the experimental crystal T2-$\delta$, dozens of simulated crystals were searched in the vertical strip in the left picture of Fig. [12] as the best match for T2-$\delta$. The new $PDD^{(h)}$ invariants can now automate the search for closest crystals, because $PDD^{(h)}$ can be computed for all types of simulated and experimental crystals. The MST in the right picture of Fig. [12] includes T2-$\delta$ as a red dot close to the near duplicate crystals 14 and 15, which were not filtered out by past tools because of very different unit cells and motifs in Fig. [11]. There were many other pairs of crystals with almost identical values of (density, energy), for example crystals 5920 and 0049, whose structures were found away from each other in the MST. When comparing this pair by the COMPACK algorithm, only one molecule is matched in Table [13]. The resulting zero value of RMSD only means that crystals
Figure 11 These crystals 14 and 15 based on the same T2 molecule have very different Crystallographic Information Files (with different motifs in unit cells of distinct shapes) but are nearly identical up to isometry.

5920 and 0049 are different (no similarity found), while EMD provides a proper distance.

The right picture of Fig. 12 shows crystals 5920, 0049 in different branches of the MST.

Figure 12 Left: the vertical ‘strip’ of the energy landscape from Fig. 10 in the density range [1.2, 1.25] around the density of the experimental crystal T2-δ. The lowest energy crystals are highlighted by their IDs in the T2 dataset reported in [35]. Right: MST of the simulated crystals on the left plus the experimental crystal T2-δ in red, based on PDD(S; 100). All simulated crystals are colored according to the energy bar in the bottom right corner.

The 4950 comparisons of 100 crystals by COMPACK took 3 hours 53 min (2.825 sec per comparison), which is 3 orders of magnitude slower than for EMD on PDD invariants. Table 12 says that over half the time (56%) only one molecule is matched, which means that no similarity was found between crystals based on identical molecules. Actually, 95% of the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># molecules</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># comparisons</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12** Outputs of the COMPACK algorithm [11] pairwisely comparing 100 lowest energy crystals in the T2-δ 'strip' from Fig. 12. Most comparisons match only a small number of molecules.

**Table 13** The traditional COMPACK algorithm [11] measures packing similarity by attempting to match up to 15 (by default) molecules from two crystals. The low values 1, 2, 3 (of 15) mean that very few matches were found without a reliable Root Mean Square Deviation (RMSD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0014</th>
<th>0015</th>
<th>0049</th>
<th>0098</th>
<th>4274</th>
<th>5916</th>
<th>5919</th>
<th>5920</th>
<th>5924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5919</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5924</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

time, three or fewer molecules are matched, which is a failure to find also too small for the default number of 15 molecules. Rarely do matches exceed 10 (0.5%). Only 6 comparisons were 15/15 producing a more reliable packing similarity.

The key contribution is the new invariant data for edge-lengths of the MST, which can be visualized by TreeMap [34] or any other graph drawing algorithm. The continuity and invariance of higher order Pointwise Distance Distributions PDD\((h)\) in Theorems 5 and 7 guarantee than any crystal data analysis based on these invariants is justified.

Since a Minimum Spanning Tree has no cycles, some close crystals might appear at terminal vertices of distant branches, which could be connected to form a cycle. Drawing a graph with cycles will require more sophisticated algorithms. However, the new invariants can be used for a justifiable search of similar crystals without visualization.

We also have interactive versions of full Minimum Spanning Trees of the T2 dataset and CSD drug subset. In any Javascript-enabled browser one can zoom these TreeMaps, color the vertices by properties, hover over any vertex to get more information. Though aspirin and paracetamol are chemically different, their crystal structures are found in close branches confirming their similar properties.

Our first dataset, T2, consists of 5679 simulated and 9 experimental crystals, all consisting of the same T2 molecules, those in Fig. 9. This dataset was reported in [35] in the new state-of-the-art approach to materials discovery through energy-structure maps.

This map or Crystal Structure Prediction (CSP) energy landscape is shown in Fig. 10 where every simulated crystal is represented by two coordinates (density, energy). The colors in Fig. 10 indicate a potential of a resulting crystalline material for methane adsorption.

The above ‘structure’ of a crystal was previously measured by only one continuous isometry invariant: the physical density equal to the weight of atoms within a unit cell, divided by the cell volume. All other descriptors are either non-invariants, e.g. powder diffraction
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patterns depend on various thresholds and are not always reliable, or are discontinuous under perturbations, e.g. symmetry groups.

Fig. 13 is a substantial advancement in visualizing crystal datasets, because the underlying invariants PDD(S; k) are much more informative than a single-value density. The nine experimental crystals (red dots) clearly split into five groups marked by T2-α, T2-β, T2-γ, T2-δ, T2-ε. These nine experimental crystals have no known energies and cannot appear in the past energy landscapes. The four red dots at the very top represent slightly different forms of a T2-γ crystal synthesized at different temperatures.

Figure 13 A Minimum Spanning Tree of 9+5679 T2 crystals drawn by TreeMap [34]. The distance between any crystals S, Q is the EMD(PDD(S; 125), PDD(Q; 125)). The color bar in the top left corner shows energy values. The minimum of -223.69 kJ/mol corresponds to 0 in Figure 10. Nine experimental crystals, which form the families T2-α, T2-β, T2-γ, T2-δ, T2-ε, are shown in red, because their energies are unknown.

The main contribution is replacing the single-value density by much stronger more isometry invariants PDD^h. Comparing crystals by only their densities was the latest
‘state-of-the-art’ in [35], where 5 forms of 9 experimental crystals were initially matched to
dozens of simulated crystals with close densities. Then hundreds of crystals were visually
inspected to select the five matches in Fig. 10.

Now a ‘structure’ of a crystal can be much better represented by many more numerical
invariants in $\text{PDD}^{(h)}$. Fig. 13 is the first justified map of (a discretely sampled) space of
T2 crystals, because the underlying distance between $\text{PDD}^{(h)}$ invariants satisfies all metric
axioms and continuity under perturbations by [37] and Theorem 7.

The map in Fig. 13 shows a Minimum Spanning Tree built on 5679+9 crystals. Each
crystal is a vertex. The distance between any crystals is the Earth Mover’s distance between
the first order PDD invariants.

The most interesting vertices in the T2 map are experimental crystals shown in red,
because their energies are impractical to measure. The map shows experimental crystals
with simulated predictions for the first time, because past plots such as in Fig. 10 need all
energy values.

The maps can be interactively explored by opening the file T2L_PDD125_TMap.html
from the supplementary materials in any browser in the same folder with the corresponding
JavaScript files. In the interactive version one can color vertices by a property, which can be
changed in the drop-down menu in the bottom right corner. For example, all crystals with
low energies appear in yellow colors.

Fig. 14 show the much more diverse dataset of all 12576 crystalline drugs from the
Cambridge Structural Database (CSD). These crystals are manually split into 9234 families,
which are decided at the time of deposition. Usually, if several chemically identical crystals
are reported in the same paper, they get the 6-letter code in the CSD.

In Fig. 13 six of nine experimental T2 crystals have the codes DEBXIT01…06, though
they split into two subgroups: four nearly identical crystals T2-γ and two nearly identical
crystals T2-β. Our final experiment on all 229K molecular organic crystals found thousands
of such near duplicates in the Cambridge Structural Database.
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