

Qualitative Euclidean embedding of Disjoint Sets of Points

N. Alexia Raharinirina^{1,*}, Konstantin Fackeldey^{1,2}, and Marcus Weber¹

¹Zuse Institute Berlin, Takustraße 7, 14195 Berlin, Germany

³Technical University Berlin, Institute for Mathematics, Straße des 17. Juni 136, 10623 Berlin, Germany

*corresponding author: raharinirina@zib.de, missralexia1@gmail.com

December 2, 2022

Abstract

We consider two disjoint sets of points with a distance metric, or a proximity function, associated with each set. If each set can be separately embedded into separate Euclidean spaces, then we provide sufficient conditions for the two sets to be jointly embedded in one Euclidean space. In this joint Euclidean embedding, the distances between the points are generated by a specific relation-preserving function. Consequently, the mutual distances between two points of the same set are specific qualitative transformations of their mutual distances in their original space; the pairwise distances between the points of different sets can be constructed from an arbitrary proximity function (might require scaling).

keywords: Euclidean embedding, Geršgorin circle theorem, Gerschgorin circle theorem, Schoenberg criterion, disjoint sets, Euclidean distance matrix

Declarations

Funding: Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – The Berlin Mathematics Research Center MATH+ (EXC-2046/1, project ID: 390685689), project EF5-4 “The Evolution of Ancient Egyptian – Quantitative and Non-Quantitative Mathematical Linguistics” and the Einstein Center Chronoi, project “Diglossie im ptolemäischen Ägypten” (FU Berlin).

Code availability: To demonstrate our results, python codes and jupyter notebooks are provided at: https://github.com/AlexiaNomena/PSD_cosine_law_matrix

1 Prerequisites

In this section, we provide the most important concepts and theorems that are necessary for understanding our proofs. The general notation scheme is shown in Table 1.

Definition 1.1. (Distance set)

Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary a set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ points

$$\mathcal{V} := \{v_s : s \in \{1, \dots, S\}\}, \quad (1.1)$$

Table 1: **General notation scheme.**

Objects	Notations	Examples
Scalar / integer	italic upper case letter or lower case letters	i, m, n, I, M, N, \dots
Set	curly upper case letters	$\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}, \dots$
Distance measure in sets	d with the set in subscript	$d_{\mathcal{X}}, d_{\mathcal{Y}}, d_{\mathcal{V}}, \dots$
Point of a set v_s	straight lower case	x_m, y_n, v_s, \dots
Euclidean embedding of a point v_s	same notation as the point	x_m, y_n, v_s, \dots
Matrix	bold upper case letter	$\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \dots$
Dot product	a point-sign between vectors/matrices	$x \cdot y, x \cdot \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}$
Row vector pointing from an origin to a point	same notation as the point	x_m, y_n, v_s, \dots
A place holder for variable items	a sign in the position of the variable	\bullet
Dependency to variables (case 1)	anything with parenthesis	$f(\bullet, \bullet), \mathbf{A}(\bullet), \dots$
Dependency to variables (case 2)	subscripts and superscripts	$i_{\bullet}, \mathbf{A}_{\bullet}, \mathcal{P}_{\bullet}^{\bullet}, \dots$
An element of a matrix	in square brackets with subscripts	$[\mathbf{A}]_{m,n}$
Euclidean norm	norm notation with the space as subscript	$\ \bullet\ _{\mathbb{R}^d}$

and let $d_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a distance metric associated with \mathcal{V} .

We consider the set of numbers

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}} := \left\{ d_{\mathcal{V}}(v_l, v_s) = d_{\mathcal{V}}(v_s, v_l) : v_l, v_s \in \mathcal{V} \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

containing the pairwise distance metric between the points of \mathcal{V} . We call $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ the “distance set” associated with \mathcal{V} .

Definition 1.2. (Proximity function, proximity set, and symmetric proximity level)

A “proximity function” between two sets of points \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} is a non-negative function that maps any pairs of points to some measure of closeness between them. f is characterized as follows

$$\begin{aligned} f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \\ (v, w) &\mapsto f(v, w) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

We then define the associated the “proximity set” as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}}^f := \left\{ p_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}}^f(v, w) = p_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}}^f(w, v) = f(v, w) : v \in \mathcal{V}, w \in \mathcal{W} \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

we refer to $p_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}}^f$ as the “symmetric proximity level” corresponding to f . If $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V}$ we simply denote the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$ and the symmetric proximity level $p_{\mathcal{V}}^f$ in Eq. 1.4 (and vice-versa if $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W}$).

Definition 1.3. (Euclidean embedding of a set of points)

Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ points with associated distance set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ as defined in Def. 1.1 (resp. proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$).

We say that \mathcal{V} can be embedded into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^Q with respect to the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^{d_{\mathcal{V}}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$) it satisfies the following

- (i) there exists a bijection ϕ between \mathcal{V} and a subspace of \mathbb{R}^Q .
- (ii) for any pair of points $(v_l, v_s) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$,

$$\|\phi(v_l) - \phi(v_s)\|_{\mathbb{R}^Q} = d_{\mathcal{V}}(v_l, v_s) \quad (\text{resp.} \quad \|\phi(v_l) - \phi(v_s)\|_{\mathbb{R}^Q} = p_{\mathcal{V}}^f(v_l, v_s))$$

Definition 1.4. (Set of mutual Euclidean distances)

Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ points with associated distance set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$).

The set of numbers $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$) is a “set of mutual Euclidean distances”, between the points of \mathcal{V} , if \mathcal{V} with respect to the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^{d_{\mathcal{V}}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$) can be embedded into an Euclidean space.

Definition 1.5. (Cosine law matrix)

Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and let

$$h : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

a symmetric proximity function or symmetric proximity level associated to a proximity function.

Then, for an arbitrary index $a \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ let $\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, h, a)$ be the real symmetric $S \times S$ matrix of components

$$[\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, h)]_{l,s} := [\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, h)]_{s,l} := \frac{h_{\mathcal{V}}(v_l, v_a)^2 + h_{\mathcal{V}}(v_a, v_s)^2 - h_{\mathcal{V}}(v_l, v_s)^2}{2}, \quad (1.5)$$

We call $\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, h)$ “cosine law matrix” associated with (\mathcal{V}, h) and reference v_a because it is based on the cosine law in Euclidean space where v_a is assumed to be used as a reference point.

Definition 1.6. (Positive semi-definite matrix)

Let \mathbf{A} be an arbitrary $I \times I$ symmetric real matrix ($I \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$). \mathbf{A} is positive semi-definite if it satisfies one of the following equivalent statements

- (i) $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}^T$ where \mathbf{x} is a real row vector of \mathbb{R}^I ,
- (ii) all the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} are real and non-negative.

Lemma 1.1. Let \mathbf{A}_p ($p \in \{1, \dots, P\}, P \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$) be positive semi-definite matrices. The matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbf{A}_p,$$

is positive semi-definite.

Theorem 1.1. (Young-Householder or Schoenberg criterion)

Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ points with an associated distance set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ associated with the distance metric $d_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$ associated with symmetric proximity level $p_{\mathcal{V}}^f$).

The set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$) is a set of mutual Euclidean distances, between the points of \mathcal{V} , if and only if the cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, d_{\mathcal{V}})$ (resp. $\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, p_{\mathcal{V}}^f)$) is positive semi-definite. This result does not depend on the choice of v_a .

Proof. See (Young and Householder, 1938) or (Schoenberg, 1935) □

Corollary 1.1. Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary set of $S \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ points with an associated distance set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$).

The set \mathcal{V} can be embedded into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^Q with respect to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$), if and only if the associated cosine law matrix can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{M}^{v_a}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) = \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{E}^T,$$

where \mathbf{E} is a $S \times S$ matrix. The s^{th} row of \mathbf{E} is the Euclidean embedding of the point v_s for all $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$.

Proof. By definition 1.3 \mathcal{V} can be embedded into the Euclidean space if the distance set $D_{\mathcal{V}}$ (resp. proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}}^f$) is a set of mutual Euclidean distance. This is true if and only if cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ is positive semi-definite (Theorem 1.1). We have two steps for proving this.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Let us assume that $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ is positive semi-definite. Since $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ is real and symmetric, there exists an eigendecomposition such that

$$\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{D}_{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{U}^{\top},$$

where \mathbf{U} is a unitary $S \times S$ matrix and \mathbf{D}_{λ} is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ compatible with \mathbf{U} . Since $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ is positive semi-definite all the eigenvalues are non-negative and thus we can choose

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{D}_{\lambda}^{1/2},$$

where $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda}^{1/2}$ is the diagonal matrix of square roots of eigenvalues $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$, to obtain

$$\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) = \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{\top}.$$

“ \Leftarrow ”: Let \mathbf{E} be a real $S \times S$ matrix such that

$$\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) = \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{\top}.$$

And let \mathbf{x} be a real row vector of \mathbb{R}^S

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\top} &= \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{\top} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\top} \\ &= (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{E}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{E})^{\top} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by definition of the dot product. Thus, $\mathbf{M}^{\text{va}}(\mathcal{V}, \bullet)$ is positive semi-definite. \square

Theorem 1.2. (*Geršgorin circle theorem*) Let \mathbf{A} be an arbitrary $I \times I$ symmetric complex matrix ($I \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$) and let R_i be the sum of the modulus of the non-diagonal entries in the i -th row of \mathbf{A} , that is

$$R_i = \sum_{j \neq i} |[A]_{i,j}|.$$

The closed disc centered at $[A]_{i,i}$ with radius R_i , denoted $D([A]_{i,i}, R_i) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, is called a Geršgorin disc.

For every eigenvalues λ of \mathbf{A} , there exists an index $i_{\lambda} \in \{1, \dots, I\}$ such that $\lambda \in D([A]_{i_{\lambda}, i_{\lambda}}, R_{i_{\lambda}})$. In other words

$$\forall \text{ eigenvalue } \lambda \text{ of } \mathbf{A}, \exists i_{\lambda} \in \{1, \dots, I\}, \text{ such that } |\lambda - [A]_{i_{\lambda}, i_{\lambda}}| \leq R_{i_{\lambda}}.$$

Proof. See (Geršgorin, 1931) or (Horn and Johnson, 1985). \square

Notation 1.1. (Two arbitrary sets of points)

Let us consider two arbitrary sets of M and N points ($M, N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$) denoted

$$\mathcal{X} := \{x_m : m \in \{1, \dots, M\}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{y_n : n \in \{1, \dots, N\}\}.$$

We denote distance sets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, associated to \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively. We also consider some proximity function

$$u_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \times \{o_{\mathcal{X}}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \times \{o_{\mathcal{Y}}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

where $o_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $o_{\mathcal{Y}}$ are points of origin such that the proximity function u_{\bullet} define the distance to origin for each corresponding sets. We denote the associated proximity sets to origin as $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{o_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{u_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{o_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{u_2}$.

All set of numbers $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{o_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{u_1}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{o_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{u_2}$, must contain at least one non-zero value.

And lastly, we consider

- (i) an arbitrary proximity function f measuring some notion of closeness between the points of different sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , such that f is not 0 everywhere.
- (ii) theoretical origin point o for defining the distance to the origin of the points of $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$.

Notation 1.2. Given \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} as characterized in Notation 1.1, we denote

$$\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y} \cup \{o\}.$$

With the following convention for the points w_s of \mathcal{W} , where $s \in \{1, \dots, S = M + N + 1\}$

$$w_s = \begin{cases} x_s & \text{if } s = 1, \dots, M, \\ o & \text{if } s = M + 1, \\ y_{s-(M+1)} & \text{if } s = M + 2, \dots, M + N + 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

We also denote

$$\mathcal{V}^z := \mathcal{W} \cup \{z\},$$

where $z \notin \mathcal{X}$ and $z \notin \mathcal{Y}$ is an arbitrary theoretical point.

We use the following convention for the points v_q of \mathcal{V}^z where $q \in \{1, \dots, Q = M + N + 2\}$

$$v_q = \begin{cases} z & \text{if } q = 1, \\ x_{q-1} & \text{if } q = 2, \dots, M + 1, \\ o & \text{if } q = M + 2, \\ y_{q-(M+2)} & \text{if } q = M + 3, \dots, M + N + 2, \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

2 Main result

In this section, we provide the main result of our paper.

Theorem 2.1. (Sufficient conditions for a Qualitative Euclidean embedding)

Let us consider the set of M and N points, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , with corresponding distance sets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, with a defined proximity sets to origin $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{X}}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{Y}}}$, an arbitrary proximity function f , and a theoretical origin point \mathbf{o} , as characterized in Notation 1.1, and 1.2.

If the following conditions are satisfied

(i) the distance sets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ (can be proximity sets) are sets of mutual Euclidean distances between the corresponding sets of points.

(ii) f is chosen or scaled such that

$$\begin{cases} f(x_m, y_n) < u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}) \text{ and } f(x_m, y_n) \leq d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, x_{m'}) \quad \forall x_m \neq x_{m'}, \text{ and } y_n, \\ f(x_m, y_n) < u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \text{ and } f(x_m, y_n) \leq d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, y_{n'}) \quad \forall x_m, \text{ and } y_n \neq y_{n'}, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Then, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ parametrizing a proximity function f^ε given by,

$$f^\varepsilon : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \quad (2.2)$$

satisfying that for every $w_{s_1}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{W}$ where $s_1, s_2 \in \{1, \dots, S = M + N + 1\}$,

$$f^\varepsilon(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w_{s_1} = w_{s_2}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{A} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{A}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{A}}}(w_{s_1}, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{A}})^2 + \varepsilon \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} \in \mathcal{A}, w_{s_2} = \mathbf{o}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{A} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{A}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{A}}}(w_{s_2}, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{A}})^2 + \varepsilon \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} = \mathbf{o}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(d_{\mathcal{A}}(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2})^2 + \varepsilon \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^f(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2})^2 + \varepsilon \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} \in \mathcal{X}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ or vice-versa.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

And furthermore, the set of points \mathcal{W} , with respect to the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{W}}^{f^\varepsilon}$, can be embedded into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^Q ($Q = M + N + 2$).

Remark 2.1. Here, we note that Theorem 2.1 is also valid without including the theoretical point of origin \mathbf{o} , in which case conditions between f and u_{\bullet} . Equation 2.1 are not required, and f^ε does not include the evaluation for $w_{\bullet} = \mathbf{o}$.

proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\alpha \geq 0$ and let us consider the symmetric proximity function f^α given by

$$f^\alpha : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

satisfying that, for every $w_{s_1}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{W}$ where $s_1, s_2 \in \{1, \dots, S = M + N + 1\}$

$$f^\alpha(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w_{s_1} = w_{s_2}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{A} \times \{o_{\mathcal{A}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{A}}}(w_{s_1}, o_{\mathcal{A}})^2 + \alpha\right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} \in \mathcal{A}, w_{s_2} = o, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{A} \times \{o_{\mathcal{A}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{A}}}(w_{s_2}, o_{\mathcal{A}})^2 + \alpha\right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} = o, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(d_{\mathcal{A}}(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2})^2 + \alpha\right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^f(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2})^2 + \alpha\right)^{1/2} & \text{if } w_{s_1} \in \mathcal{X}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ or vice-versa,} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where $p_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^f$ is the symmetric proximity level $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^f$ associated with f , and similarly $p_{\mathcal{A} \times \{o_{\mathcal{A}}\}}^{u_{\mathcal{A}}}(\bullet, \bullet)$ is the proximity level associated with $u_{\mathcal{A}}$ ($\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X}$ or \mathcal{Y}).

Let us also consider a theoretical point z and the set of point $\mathcal{V}^z = \mathcal{W} \cup \{z\}$ (Notation 1.2). We then provide \mathcal{V}^z with the following proximity set

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha} := \left\{ p_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha}(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2}) = p_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha}(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2}) = h^\alpha(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2}) : v_{q_1}, v_{q_2} \in \mathcal{V}^z \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $q_1, q_2 \in \{1, \dots, Q = M + N + 2\}$ and $h^\alpha : \mathcal{V}(z) \times \mathcal{V}(z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is the symmetric proximity function

$$h^\alpha(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v_{q_1} = v_{q_2}, \\ f^\alpha(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2}) & v_{q_1} \neq v_{q_2} \text{ and } v_{q_1}, v_{q_2} \neq z, \\ p_{\mathcal{V} \times \{z\}}^g(v_{q_1}, z) & \text{if } v_{q_2} = z, \text{ and } v_{q_1} \neq v_{q_2}, \\ p_{\mathcal{V} \times \{z\}}^g(v_{q_2}, z) & \text{if } v_{q_2} = z \text{ and } v_{q_1} \neq v_{q_2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

where $g : \mathcal{W} \times \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an arbitrary proximity function that does not necessarily depend on α and $p_{\mathcal{V} \times \{z\}}^g$ is the symmetric proximity level corresponding to g (Def. 1.2).

It is evident that, for any arbitrary point z , if \mathcal{V}^z can be embedded in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^Q , then \mathcal{W} can also be embedded in \mathbb{R}^Q . Therefore, we search for a sufficient condition to obtain an Euclidean embedding of \mathcal{V}^z . This Euclidean embedding can be found when the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha}$ is a set of mutual Euclidean distances between the points of \mathcal{V}^z .

Firstly, according to Theorem 1.1, the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha}$ is a set of mutual Euclidean distance, between the points of \mathcal{V}^z , if and only if the cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, h^\alpha)$ is positive semi-definite.

Next, we need to find a sufficient condition for $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, h^\alpha)$ to be positive semi-definite and the dimensions Euclidean embedding space is equal to the number of rows/columns of $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, h^\alpha)$ which is equal to Q (see corollary 1.1). This is tackled in section 3 (notably in Theorem 3.1) and relies on a specific construction of the point $z = z^*$ and on a specific choice of $\alpha = \varepsilon > 0$, as well as on the conditions (i), (ii) in Theorem 2.1. From this procedure, we conclude that there exists a point z^* and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbf{M}^{z^*}(\mathcal{V}^{z^*}, h^\varepsilon)$ is positive semi-definite and thus \mathcal{V}^{z^*} can be embedded in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^Q , and thus, \mathcal{W} can also be embedded in \mathbb{R}^Q . Finally, the set of mutual distances between the Euclidean embedding of \mathcal{W} is equal to

$$\{\|w_{s_1} - w_{s_2}\|_{\mathbb{R}^Q} = f^\varepsilon(w_{s_1}, w_{s_2}) : w_{s_1}, w_{s_2} \in \mathcal{W}\},$$

where f^ε is the symmetric proximity function obtained by replacing α with ε in Eq. 2.4. \square

3 Intermediate results

In this section, we provide the intermediate results needed to find the value of ε mentioned in Theorem 2.1.

Definition 3.1. (Connecting point)

Let us consider the set \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} and a theoretical origin point \mathfrak{o} as characterized Notation 1.1. Let us also consider the set of points $\mathcal{V}^z = \mathcal{W} \cup \{z\}$ as characterized in Notation 1.2 and with associated proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}^z}^{h^\alpha}$ (for $\alpha \geq 0$) given in Eq. 2.5, where h^α is given in Eq. 2.6.

As shown in Eq. 2.6, h^α depends on the choice of α through the proximity function f^α given by

$$f^\alpha : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

satisfying Eq. 2.4 and on the choice of proximity function g that does not necessarily depends on α , given by

$$g : \mathcal{W} \times \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+.$$

We say that $z = z^*$ is a ‘‘connecting point’’ associated with h^α if \mathcal{V}^{z^*} , with respect to the proximity set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}^{z^*}}^{h^\alpha}$, can be embedded into an Euclidean space.

Definition 3.2. (Special proximity function for \mathcal{V}^z)

Let us consider the sets \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} with an associated proximity function f and a theoretical origin point \mathfrak{o} (Notation 1.1), and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y} \cup \{\mathfrak{o}\}$ (Notation 1.2). We denote

$$\zeta_f = \max_l \left\{ \sum_{\substack{s \neq l \\ w_s \in \mathcal{A}}} |[\mathbf{M}^{w_a}(\mathcal{W}, f^0)]_{l,s}| \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X}$ or \mathcal{Y} , $f^0 : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, is the proximity function given in 2.4 (when $\alpha = 0$) and $\mathbf{M}^{w_a}(\mathcal{W}, f^0)$ is the cosine law matrix associated to (\mathcal{V}, f^0) with reference point w_a . f^0 must be constructed such that $\zeta_f > 0$.

For \mathcal{V}^z as characterized in Notation 1.2, we associate the special the proximity function

$$h^\alpha = \tilde{h}^\alpha : \mathcal{V}^z \times \mathcal{V}^z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

given in Eq. 2.6, and in which g is chosen as

$$g = \tilde{g}_{w_a} : \mathcal{V} \times \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

and to be defined for $w_a \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{\mathfrak{o}\}$, such that for $s \in \{1, \dots, S = M + N + 1\}$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$

$$\tilde{g}_{w_a}(v_s, z) = \begin{cases} (c_1 \zeta_f)^{1/2} & \text{if } v_s = w_a, \\ (c_2 \zeta_f)^{1/2} & \text{if } v_s \neq w_a \text{ and } v_s = \mathfrak{o}, \\ (d_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, v_a)^2 + c_2 \zeta_f)^{1/2} & \text{if } v_s \neq w_a \text{ and } v_s, w_a \in \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X} \text{ or } \mathcal{Y}, \\ \left(p_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^f(v_s, v_a)^2 + c_2 \zeta_f \right)^{1/2} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Notation 3.1. (Split the cosine law matrix into a specific sum of matrices)

Given $\alpha \geq 0$, $\zeta_f > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and \tilde{g}_{w_a} as definite in Eq. 3.2 to construct the special proximity function \tilde{h}^α as in Def. 3.2. The cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha)$ has the following components for $q_1, q_2 \in \{1, \dots, Q = M + N + 2\}$

$$[\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha)]_{q_1, q_2} = \frac{\tilde{h}^\alpha(v_{q_1}, z)^2 + \tilde{h}^\alpha(v_{q_2}, z)^2 - \tilde{h}^\alpha(v_{q_1}, v_{q_2})^2}{2}.$$

Then, by definition, \tilde{h}^α depends on \tilde{g}_{w_a} and we need that $w_a \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$. To make the computation clearer, we set $w_a = w_1$ (this does not change the result because it is always possible to shuffle the elements of $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ such that w_a is at the first position). Then, we can split $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha)$ in the following way

$$\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha) = \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) + \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) + \mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\circ_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{w_1}(\alpha) + \mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\circ_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{w_1}(\alpha), \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{w_1}(\alpha) & \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times N} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times M} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbf{0}_{\bullet \times \bullet}$ are null matrices of dimensions $\bullet \times \bullet$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{w_1}(\alpha)$ is an $M \times M$ matrix with components $[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{w_1}(\alpha)]_{m_1, m_2}$ such that

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{w_1}(\alpha)]_{m_1, m_2} = \begin{cases} 2c_1\zeta_f & \text{if } x_{m_1} = x_{m_2} = w_1 \\ c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } x_{m_1} = w_1, x_{m_1} \neq x_{m_2} \text{ or vice-versa,} \\ d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{m_1}, w_1)^2 + d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{m_2}, w_1)^2 - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{m_1}, x_{m_2})^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } x_{m_1}, x_{m_2} \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{w_1\}, w_1 \in \mathcal{X}, \\ f(x_{m_1}, w_1)^2 + f(x_{m_2}, w_1)^2 - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{m_1}, x_{m_2})^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } w_1 \in \mathcal{Y}, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha)$ is the $N \times N$ is the matrix with components $[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha)]_{n_1, n_2}$ such that

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha)]_{n_1, n_2} = \begin{cases} 2c_1\zeta_f & \text{if } y_{n_1} = y_{n_2} = w_1, \\ c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } y_{n_1} = w_1, y_{n_1} \neq y_{n_2} \text{ or vice-versa,} \\ d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{n_1}, w_1)^2 + d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{n_2}, w_1)^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{n_1}, y_{n_2})^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } y_{n_1}, y_{n_2} \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{w_1\}, w_1 \in \mathcal{Y}, \\ f(w_1, y_{n_1})^2 + f(w_1, y_{n_2})^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{n_1}, y_{n_2})^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } w_1 \in \mathcal{X}. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Next,

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha) \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\alpha))^T & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)$ is a $M \times N$ matrix with components $[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{m,n}$ such that

$$2[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{m,n} = \begin{cases} f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } x_m = \mathbf{w}_1 \\ d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 + f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } x_m \neq \mathbf{w}_1 \\ f(\mathbf{w}_1, x_m)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ and } y_n = \mathbf{w}_1 \\ f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 + d_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ and } y_n \neq \mathbf{w}_1 \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

and furthermore, since we consider the condition that $\mathbf{w}_1 \neq \mathbf{o}$,

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & (\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha))^{\top} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times N} \\ 0 & \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha) & c_2\zeta_f/2 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times M} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)$ is an $1 \times M$ matrices with components $[\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{1,m}$ such that

$$2[\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{1,m} = \begin{cases} c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}})^2, & \text{if } x_m = \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha + d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}})^2, & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}, x_m \neq \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha + f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}})^2, & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}, \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times N} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & c_2\zeta_f/2 & \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha) \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times M} & (\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha))^{\top} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.11)$$

and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}$ is an $1 \times N$ matrix with components $[\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{1,n}$ such that

$$2[\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\alpha)]_{1,n} = \begin{cases} c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \alpha - u_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 & \text{if } y_n = \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha + d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}, y_n \neq \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - \alpha + f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}. \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let us consider the sets \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} with an associated proximity function f and a theoretical origin point \mathbf{o} (Notation 1.1), $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y} \cup \{\mathbf{o}\}$ with S elements and \mathcal{V}^z with Q elements as characterized in Notation 1.2.*

For $\alpha \geq 0$, $\zeta_f > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}_a}, \mathbf{w}_a \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}\}$, as defined in Eq. 3.2 we construct the special proximity function \tilde{h}^α associated with a theoretical point \mathbf{z} in Def. 3.2. We use $\mathbf{w}_a = \mathbf{w}_1$ for clarity.

If the conditions (i), (ii) in Theorem 2.1 are satisfied and we choose $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that

(i) Eq. 3.27.

(ii) Eq. 3.29 if $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and Eq. 3.30 if $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$.

(iii) We have Eq. 3.34 and Eq. 3.35 if $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and Eq. 3.36 and Eq. 3.37 if $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Then, if we choose $\alpha = \varepsilon = c_3\zeta_f$, the theoretical point $z = z^*$ associated with \tilde{h}^ε is a connecting point.

Proof. It is sufficient to find the conditions for positive semi-definiteness of the cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha)$. If the matrices on the right-hand side of Eq. 3.3 are positive semi-definite, then the cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^z(\mathcal{V}^z, \tilde{h}^\alpha)$ is positive semi-definite (Lemma 1.1). It remains to show that if the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1, and conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, then for a specific construction of $z = z^*$ obtained by a specific choice of $\alpha = \varepsilon = c_3\zeta_f$, $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.5), $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.5), $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X}\times\{\circ_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{\mathbf{v}_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.10) $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y}\times\{\circ_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{\mathbf{v}_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.12) are positive semi-definite.

First, let's look at $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$. Suppose that $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{m_1, m_2} = \begin{cases} 2c_1\zeta_f & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1} = \mathbf{x}_{m_2} = \mathbf{w}_1 \\ c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1} = \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \neq \mathbf{x}_{m_1} \text{ or vice-versa,} \\ [\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})]_{m_1, m_2} + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1}, \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{\mathbf{w}_1\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

where $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is the cosine law matrix associated with $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and with reference \mathbf{w}_1 . This implies that

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathbf{w}_1} + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon), \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathbf{w}_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M\times 1} & \mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}}) & \mathbf{0}_{M\times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M\times N} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N\times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N\times M} & \mathbf{0}_{N\times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N\times N} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M\times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon) & \mathbf{0}_{M\times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{M\times N} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1\times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N\times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N\times M} & \mathbf{0}_{N\times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon)]_{m_1, m_2} = \begin{cases} 2c_1\zeta_f & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1} = \mathbf{x}_{m_2} = \mathbf{w}_1 \\ c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1} = \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \neq \mathbf{x}_{m_1} \text{ or vice-versa,} \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{m_1}, \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{\mathbf{w}_1\}. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{n_1, n_2} = f(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}_{n_1})^2 + f(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}_{n_2})^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{y}_{n_1}, \mathbf{y}_{n_2})^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon, \quad (3.16)$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, associated with $d_{\mathcal{X}}$, is a set of mutual Euclidean distances between the elements of \mathcal{X} (condition (i) of Theorem 2.1), the cosine law matrix $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is positive semi-definite and so is $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}$. Therefore, it is sufficient to use $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ instead of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$.

Eq. 3.7 shows that the only non-zero block of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ is $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$. Again, assuming that $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$2[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{m,n} = \begin{cases} f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } x_m = \mathbf{w}_1, \\ d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 + f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 - f(x_m, y_n)^2 + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } x_m \neq \mathbf{w}_1. \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

Then, using the definition of ζ_f (Eq. 3.1), for all couple of indexes (q, j) corresponding to the matrices, we get

$$\begin{cases} 2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon)]_{q,j} \leq 2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } v_j = \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon)]_{q,j} \leq 2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } v_j \neq \mathbf{w}_1, \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$2[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q,j} \leq 2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon, \quad \text{if } f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_{q-(M+2)}) \leq d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1) \forall x_m \neq \mathbf{w}_1, \quad (3.19)$$

as well as

$$\begin{cases} 2[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q,j} \leq 2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } v_j = \mathbf{w}_1, \\ 2[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q,j} \leq 2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon & \text{if } v_j \neq \mathbf{w}_1. \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

We shall derive the conditions for the positive semi-definiteness of

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\text{Diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon)) & \mathbf{0}_{M \times 1} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times M} & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon))^{\top} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) - \frac{2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon}{4}\mathbf{I}_{N \times N} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.21)$$

where $\text{Diag}(\bullet)$ refers to the diagonal matrix obtained from using the diagonal elements of the indicated matrix and $\mathbf{I}_{\bullet \times \bullet}$ is the identity matrix. We later use $\frac{1}{2}\text{Diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon))$ and value $\frac{2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon}{4}\mathbf{I}_{N \times N}$ in other parts of this proof, for finding the conditions for positive semi-definiteness of the other matrices.

We can ignore the row of $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ that have all zero components because they correspond to zero eigenvalues. Let λ be an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ corresponding to a non-zero row. The Geršgorin circle theorem (Theorem 1.2) states that

$$\exists q_{\lambda} \in \{1, \dots, Q\}, \text{ such that } |\lambda - [\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_{\lambda}, q_{\lambda}}| \leq R_{q_{\lambda}}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) \quad (3.22)$$

where

$$R_{q_{\lambda}}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{j \neq q_{\lambda}} |[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_{\lambda}, j}|,$$

which implies

$$R_{q_{\lambda}}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq q_{\lambda}}}^{M+1} |[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon)]_{q_{\lambda}, j}| + \sum_{\substack{j=M+3 \\ j \neq q_{\lambda}}}^Q |[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_{\lambda}, j-M+2}| & \text{if } q_{\lambda} = 2, \dots, M+2, \\ \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq q_{\lambda}}}^{M+1} |[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{j, q_{\lambda}-(M+2)}| + \sum_{\substack{j=M+3 \\ j \neq q_{\lambda}}}^Q |[\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_{\lambda}-(M+2), j-(M+2)}| & \text{if } q_{\lambda} = M+3, \dots, Q. \end{cases}$$

Using Eq. 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, and supposing that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon &\geq 0 \\ 2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$f(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{y}_n) \leq d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1), \forall \mathbf{y}_n \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_m \neq \mathbf{w}_1, \quad (3.24)$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} R_{q_\lambda}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) \leq \frac{M}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] + \frac{N}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} = \mathbf{w}_1, q_\lambda = 2, \dots, M+2, \\ R_{q_\lambda}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) \leq \frac{M}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] + \frac{N}{2} [2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} = \mathbf{w}_1, q_\lambda = M+3, \dots, Q, \\ R_{q_\lambda}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) \leq \frac{M}{2} [2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] + \frac{N}{2} [2\zeta_f + 2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} \neq \mathbf{w}_1, q_\lambda = 2, \dots, M+2, M+3, \dots, Q, \end{cases} \quad (3.25)$$

The diagonal elements of $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ corresponding to the non-zero rows are the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2}\text{Diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon))$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon) - \frac{2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon}{4}\mathbf{I}_{N \times N}$, which leads to the following

$$\begin{cases} [\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q,q} = c_1\zeta_f/2 & \text{if } v_q = \mathbf{w}_1 \iff q = 2, \\ [\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q,q} \geq (2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon)/4, & \text{if } q = 3, \dots, M+2, M+3, \dots, Q, \end{cases} \quad (3.26)$$

Given that Eq. 3.22 implies that

$$\lambda - [\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\lambda, q_\lambda} \geq -R_{q_\lambda}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)),$$

which implies that

$$\lambda \geq [\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\lambda, q_\lambda} - R_{q_\lambda}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)),$$

by using Eq. 3.25 and 3.26 and setting $\varepsilon = c_3\zeta_f$, and provided that

$$\begin{cases} 2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3 \geq 0, \\ 2 + 2c_2 - c_3 \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.27)$$

and condition (ii) of Theorem 2.1 (leading to Eq. 3.24), we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \lambda \geq \frac{c_1 \zeta_f}{2} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1 \zeta_f + c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} = w_1, q_\lambda = 2 \\ \lambda \geq \frac{2c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1 \zeta_f + c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} \neq w_1, q_\lambda = 3, \dots, M+2, \\ \lambda \geq \frac{c_1 \zeta_f}{2} - \frac{M}{2} [2\zeta_f + c_1 \zeta_f + c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f] - \frac{N}{2} [2\zeta_f + 2c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} = w_1, q_\lambda = M+3, \dots, Q, \\ \lambda \geq \frac{2c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2\zeta_f + 2c_2 \zeta_f - c_3 \zeta_f] & \text{if } v_{q_\lambda} \neq w_1, q_\lambda = 3, \dots, M+2, M+3, \dots, Q. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.28)$$

Since $\zeta_f > 0$ by its construction (Def 3.2), if we suppose that $w_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, and $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ are chosen to satisfy Eq. 3.27 and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{2c_2 - c_3}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{M}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] - \frac{N}{2} [2 + 2c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{2c_2 - c_3}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + 2c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.29)$$

then all the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ are non-negative, that is, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ is positive semi-definite.

Similarly, assuming that $w_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, we swap the columns corresponding to the points of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in the matrix $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ (which does not change the eigenvalues and their associated eigenvectors). Then, by using conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1, and if we choose $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ satisfying Eq. 3.27 and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{2c_2 - c_3}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{N}{2} [2 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3] - \frac{M}{2} [2 + 2c_2 - c_3] \geq 0, \\ \frac{2c_2 - c_3}{4} - \frac{M+N}{2} [2 + 2c_2 - c_3] \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.30)$$

then $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ is positive semi-definite. The numbers in red are the only difference between the conditions in Eq. 3.29 and Eq. 3.30.

It remains to find the conditions for the positive semi-definiteness of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{o_x\}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.9) and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{o_y\}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ (Eq. 3.11) and this use the conditions (ii) of theorem 2.1. Given that the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{o_x\}}^{w_1}(\varepsilon)$ and

$\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ are zeros expect at entry $(M+2, M+2)$ where it is equal to $c_2\zeta_f/2$. We deal with this by using the matrices $\frac{1}{2}\text{Diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\varepsilon))$ and value $\frac{2c_2\zeta_f - \varepsilon}{4}\mathbf{I}_{N \times N}$ which we extracted from previous matrices (Eq. 3.21). These components are added to the corresponding components of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$, respectively. The resulting matrices are denoted $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$.

Let γ and δ be eigenvalues corresponding to the non-zero rows $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$, respectively. Then, by the Geršgorin circle theorem (Theorem 1.2), we have the following

$$\begin{cases} \exists q_\gamma, \in \{1, \dots, Q\}, \text{ such that } \left| \gamma - [\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\gamma, q_\gamma} \right| \leq R_{q_\gamma}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)), \\ \exists q_\delta, \in \{1, \dots, Q\}, \text{ such that } \left| \delta - [\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\delta, q_\delta} \right| \leq R_{q_\delta}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)), \end{cases} \quad (3.31)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} R_{q_\gamma}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{j \neq q_\gamma} \left| [\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\gamma, j} \right|, \\ R_{q_\delta}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{j \neq q_\delta} \left| [\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)]_{q_\delta, j} \right|. \end{cases} \quad (3.32)$$

Assuming that $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and assuming that

$$\begin{cases} c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathcal{O}_X)^2 \geq 0, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f + d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathcal{O}_X)^2 \geq 0, \forall \mathbf{x}_m, \end{cases} \quad (3.33)$$

then, replacing $R_{q_\delta}(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon))$ with the corresponding values, and as well as the diagonal elements we get

$$\begin{cases} \gamma \geq \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} [c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathcal{O}_X)^2] & \text{if } q_\gamma = 2, \\ \gamma \geq \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} [2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f + d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_{q_\lambda-1}, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_{q_\lambda-1}, \mathcal{O}_X)^2] & \text{if } q_\gamma = 3, \dots, M+1, \\ \gamma \geq \frac{c_2\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^M [2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f + d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathcal{O}_X)^2] & \text{if } q_\gamma = M+2 \end{cases}$$

and thus, we get the conditions

$$\begin{cases} c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathcal{O}_X)^2, \\ \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} [c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathcal{O}_X)^2] \geq 0, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathcal{O}_X)^2 - d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \\ \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} [2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathcal{O}_X)^2 - d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\}] \geq 0, \\ \frac{c_2\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{M}{2} [2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathcal{O}_X)^2 - d_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\}] \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.34)$$

for which $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathcal{O}_X\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ is positive semi-definite. And by similar calculations, if $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathcal{O}_Y\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$

is positive semi-definite if the following conditions are satisfied

$$\begin{cases} 2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2\} \\ \frac{c_2\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{N}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2\} \right] \geq 0 \\ \frac{2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2\} \right] \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.35)$$

In the case where $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, we swap the columns corresponding to the points of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in the matrices, and we reason similarly as above by using conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1 to obtain the following conditions for the positive semi-definiteness of $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{X} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}}\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$

$$\begin{cases} 2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\}, \\ \frac{c_2\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{M}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \right] \geq 0 \\ \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_m \{u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \right] \geq 0, \forall x_m \end{cases} \quad (3.36)$$

and the following conditions for positives semi-definiteness of $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \{\mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}}\}}^{\mathbf{w}_1}(\varepsilon)$ as

$$\begin{cases} c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq u_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2, \\ \frac{c_1\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left[c_1\zeta_f + c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - u_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 \right] \geq 0, \\ 2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f \geq \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \\ \frac{2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \right] \geq 0, \\ \frac{c_2\zeta_f}{2} - \frac{N}{2} \left[2c_2\zeta_f - c_3\zeta_f - \max_n \{u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{w}_1)^2\} \right] \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.37)$$

The conditions Eq. 3.34, 3.35, 3.36, and 3.37 requires that f and u are chosen or scaled such that

$$\begin{cases} f(x_m, \mathbf{w}_1)^2 < u_{\mathcal{X}}(x_m, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{X}})^2, \quad \forall x_m \quad \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}, \\ f(\mathbf{w}_1, y_n)^2 < u_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_n, \mathbf{o}_{\mathcal{Y}})^2, \quad \forall y_n, \quad \text{if } \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{X}, \end{cases} \quad (3.38)$$

which is satisfied when the Eq. 2.1 in Theorem 2.1 is satisfied. \square

Remark 3.1. Besides the listed conditions, there might still be other choices of $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ defining the

choice of ε Theorem 3.1 because the conditions are sufficient but not necessary to the positive-definiteness of $\mathbf{M}^{z^*}(\mathcal{V}^{z^*}, \tilde{h}^\varepsilon)$ is positive semi-definite. Python codes and jupyter notebooks are provided to demonstrate our results (see Code availability section).

References

- Geršgorin, S. (1931). Über die Abgrenzung der Eigenwerte einer Matrix. Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS. Classe des sciences mathématiques et naturelles , 749–754.
- Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. (1985). Matrix Analysis. Cambridge University Press.
- Schoenberg, I. J. (1935). Remarks to Maurice Frechet's Article "Sur La Definition Axiomatique D'Une Classe D'Espace Distances Vectoriellement Applicable Sur L'Espace De Hilbert". Annals of Mathematics 36, 724–732.
- Young, G. and Householder, A. S. (1938). Discussion of a set of points in terms of their mutual distances. Psychometrika 3, 19–22.