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# ON INVERSE MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING 

## JAN DE LEEUW


#### Abstract

We discuss Inverse Multidimensional Scaling, clarifying and extending some results of De Leeuw and Groenen [1997]. $\underline{R}$ code for all computations is also provided.


## 1. Introduction

We use standard notation for Euclidean Multidimensional Scaling (MDS), as explained, for example, in Borg and Groenen [2005] or De Leeuw and Mair [2009]. The stress loss function, first introduced by Kruskal 1964ab], is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(X) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j}\left(\delta_{i j}-d_{i j}(X)\right)^{2} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the $w_{i j}$ are known non-negative weights, and the $\delta_{i j}$ are known non-negative dissimilarities. We minimize stress over the $n \times p$ configurations $X$, the coordinates of $n$ points in $\mathbb{R}^{p}$.

Following De Leeuw and Heiser [1980 we introduce some matrix notation for this problem. If the $e_{i}$ are unit vectors, i.e. vectors with all elements zero except element $i$ which is equal to one, then we let

$$
A_{i j} \stackrel{\Delta}{=}\left(e_{i}-e_{j}\right)\left(e_{i}-e_{j}\right)^{\prime}
$$
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For an $n \times p$ configuration $X$, i.e. the coordinates of $n$ points in $\mathbb{R}^{p}$, we define squared distance

$$
d_{i j}^{2}(x)=\operatorname{tr} X^{\prime} A_{i j} X
$$

Let

$$
V \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j} A_{i j}
$$

and, at points where $d_{i j}>0$ for all $i \neq j$,

$$
B(X) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j} \frac{\delta_{i j}}{d_{i j}(X)} A_{i j} .
$$

Then, assuming without loss of generality that

$$
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j} \delta_{i j}^{2}=1
$$

we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(X)=1-\operatorname{tr} X^{\prime} B(X) X+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} X^{\prime} V X, \tag{2a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we find for the partial derivatives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{D} \sigma(X)=(V-B(X)) X \tag{2b}
\end{equation*}
$$

In MDS we have data $W$ and $\Delta$ and we want to find $X$ such that $\mathcal{D} \sigma(X)=0$. In Inverse MDS De Leeuw and Groenen, 1997 we want to find $W$ and $\Delta$ for a given $X$ such that $\mathcal{D} \sigma(X)=0$. Thus we want to find all weights and dissimilarities such that configuration $X$ is a stationary point.

In this note we study the a slightly simpler variant of the Inverse MDS problem, also studied in De Leeuw and Groenen [1997], in which we have both $X$ and $W$ and we want to find all $\Delta$ such that $\mathcal{D} \sigma(X)=0$. Our main contribution is some new code in $\mathrm{R} \mathrm{R} \mathrm{De}-$ velopment Core Team, 2012], which we then use to explore some aspects of Inverse MDS.

## 2. AnAlysis

Assume $X$ is column-centered and of rank $p$. As shown in lemma A. 1 the equation $\mathcal{D} \sigma(X)=0$ can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
V-B(X)=K_{\perp} C K_{\perp}^{\prime}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K_{\perp}$ is an orthonormal basis for the null-space of $X$, and $C$ is a symmetric matrix. In fact, we choose $K_{\perp}$ orthogonal to $(1 \mid X)$, so that all columns of $K_{\perp}$ are centered. Thus $K_{\perp}$ is an $n \times q$ matrix with $q=n-p-1$. Both sides of (3) are symmetric and doubly-centered.

From (3) the off-diagonal elements of the dissimilarity matrix $\Delta(C)$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{i j}(C)=d_{i j}(X)\left(1-\frac{1}{w_{i j}} k_{i}^{\prime} C k_{j}\right), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $k_{i}$ and $k_{j}$ are the rows of $K_{\perp}$. Because both sides of (3) are doubly-centered, equality of the off-diagonal elements implies equality of the diagonal elements as well. This shows that the set of solutions for $\Delta$ is an affine set. If $\Delta_{1}, \cdots, \Delta_{m}$, corresponding with symmetric matrices $C_{1}, \cdots, C_{m}$ are solutions, and $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{j}=$ 1 , then $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{j} \Delta_{j}$ is a solution as well. Note that the $\alpha_{j}$ are not required to be non-negative.

We can use unit vectors a basis for the space of symmetric matrices is given by $E_{s t}=e_{s} e_{t}^{\prime}+e_{t} e_{s}^{\prime}$, for all $s<t$, and $E_{s s}=e_{s} e_{s}^{\prime}$ for all $s$. By lemma A.2 the solutions to equation (4) are affine combinations of $D(X)$ and the matrices $\Delta_{s t}$, with $s \leq t$, and with elements

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{i j}(X)\left[1-\frac{1}{w_{i j}}\left(k_{s} k_{t}^{\prime}+k_{t} k_{s}^{\prime}\right)\right] . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In equation (5) the $k_{s}$ and $k_{t}$ are now columns of $K_{\perp}$.
$\underline{R}$ code for computation of the spanning set of the affine subspace is in code segment 1 .

Insert Code Segment 1 About here

The representaton we have chosen makes it easy to answer the slightly more general question of computing the dissimilarity matrices $\Delta(X)$ such that for some real $\lambda$ the matrix $\lambda X$ is stationary. This is simply the subspace spanned by $D(X)$ and the $\Delta_{s t}$. Thus we can use the same spanning set but include the non-affine linear combinations.

## 3. Non-NEGATIVITY Constraints

The affine combinations of the basis matrices given in (5) can have negative elements. If we require that $\delta_{i j} \geq 0$ for all $i$ and $j$, then the solution set becomes a closed and bounded convex polyhedron.

The convex polyhedron is analyzed with the double description method, as described in Fukuda [1999], and implemented in R in the rcdd package [Geyer and Meeden, 2012].

Insert Code Segment 2 about here

## 4. SECOND Partials

To get a convenient formula for the second partials of stress we define the direct sums

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\bar{A}}_{i j} & =\underbrace{A_{i j} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{i j}}_{p \text { times }}, \\
\overline{\bar{V}} & =\underbrace{V \oplus \cdots \oplus V}_{p \text { times }} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, with $x \triangleq \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \mathbf{v e c}(X)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma(x)=\overline{\bar{V}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{i j} \frac{\delta_{i j}}{d_{i j}(x)}\left[\overline{\bar{A}}_{i j}-\frac{\overline{\bar{A}}_{i j} x x^{\prime} \overline{\bar{A}}_{i j}}{x^{\prime} \overline{\bar{A}}_{i j} x}\right] . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

There is code to compute the second partials in code segment 3. We also use hessian() from the numDeriv package [Gilbert, 2012] for comparison purposes.

## Insert Code Segment 3 About here

By the way, equation (6) and our previous expression for derivatives make it easy to implement Newton's method for MDS. Note, however, that $\mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma(x)$ is always singular with at least $p+1$ zero eigenvalues.

## 5. EXAMPLES

If $p=n-1$ then there is no null space and $\Delta=D(X)$ is the only solution for which $X$ is stationary. In other words if $\Delta$ is not a Euclidean distance matrix then any stationary point $X$ satisfies $\operatorname{rank}(X)<n-1$.

If $p=n-2$ then $K_{\perp}$ only has a single column. Thus all solutions for $\Delta$ are on the line in matrix space

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{i j}(\alpha) \triangleq d_{i j}(X)\left\{1-\alpha \frac{1}{w_{i j}} k_{i} k_{j}\right\} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us show in detail what happens in the example of four points in the corners of a square, with unit weights. Thus

$$
X=\left[\begin{array}{rr}
1 & 1 \\
1 & -1 \\
-1 & 1 \\
-1 & -1
\end{array}\right] \quad k=\left[\begin{array}{r}
\frac{1}{2} \\
-\frac{1}{2} \\
-\frac{1}{2} \\
\frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right] \quad d=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & & & \\
2 & 0 & & \\
2 & 2 \sqrt{2} & 0 & \\
2 \sqrt{2} & 2 & 2 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

We find

$$
\Delta(\alpha)=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & & & \\
2\left(1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 0 & & \\
2\left(1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 2 \sqrt{2}\left(1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 0 & \\
2 \sqrt{2}\left(1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 2\left(1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 2\left(1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha\right) & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

and

$$
B(\alpha)=\left[\begin{array}{rrrr}
3-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha \\
-1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & 3-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha \\
-1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & 3-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha \\
-1-\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & -1+\frac{1}{4} \alpha & 3-\frac{1}{4} \alpha
\end{array}\right] .
$$

5.1. Nonnegativity. The dissimilarities are non-negative for $-4 \leq$ $\alpha \leq+4$.
5.2. Triangle Inequality. By checking all $4 \times 3=12$ triangle inequalities we find that $\Delta(\alpha)$ is a metric for $-(12-8 \sqrt{2}) \leq \alpha \leq 4$. Note that $12-8 \sqrt{2} \approx 0.6862915$.
5.3. Euclidean Distance. If we square the dissimilarities in (7) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{i j}^{2}(\alpha)=\left(1+\frac{1}{16} \alpha^{2}\right) d_{i j}^{2}(X)-2 \alpha d_{i j}^{2}(X) k_{i} k_{j} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

because $k_{i}^{2} k_{j}^{2}=\frac{1}{16}$ for all $i, j$. Define $u_{i j} \triangleq{ }_{=}^{2} d_{i j}^{2}(X) k_{i} k_{j}$. The Torgerson transformation of a matrix $C$ is defined as $\tau(C)=-\frac{1}{2} J C J$, with $J=I-\frac{1}{n} e e^{\prime}$ the centering operator. Apply this transformation to both sides of (8). This gives

$$
\tau(\Delta(\alpha))=\left(1+\frac{1}{16} \alpha^{2}\right) X X^{\prime}-2 \alpha \tau(U)
$$

In this example

$$
U=\left[\begin{array}{rrrr}
0 & -1 & -1 & 2 \\
-1 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\
-1 & 2 & -1 & -1 \\
2 & -1 & -1 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

which is already doubly-centered, so $\tau(U)=-\frac{1}{2} U$. Now define

$$
K \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{rrrr}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\
-1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\
-1 & -1 & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right] .
$$

In this example $K$ diagonalizes both $X X^{\prime}$ and $\tau(U)$, and thus

$$
K^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\tau}(\Delta(\alpha)) K=4\left(1+\frac{1}{16} \alpha^{2}\right)\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right]-2 \alpha\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Because $4\left(1+\frac{1}{16} \alpha^{2}\right)-2 \alpha \geq 0$ for all $\alpha$ we see that the eigenvalues of $\tau(\Delta(\alpha))$ are non-negative for all $\alpha \geq 0$. Thus the $\Delta(\alpha)$ are nonnegative Euclidean distances for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 4$.
5.4. Second Derivatives. Formula (6) shows that the Hessian is linear in the sense that

$$
\mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma(X, \Delta(\alpha))=\mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma(X, D(X))-\alpha \mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma\left(X, D(X) * k k^{\prime}\right)
$$

This makes it easy to compute the interval where $\mathcal{D}^{2} \sigma(X, \Delta(\alpha))$ is positive semi-definite. It turns out that in our example $X$ is a local minimum for $\Delta(\alpha)$ only if $\alpha \leq 0$.

## 6. MUltiple Minima

As Trosset and Mathar [1997] show, it is not easy to rigorously find non-global minima of stress. An exception is $p=1$, i.e. unidimensional scaling. Exact computations, for example by De Leeuw [2005], show hundreds of local minima, even in small examples.

Inverse MDS can be used to study some aspects of the local minimum problem. Suppose both $X$ and $Y$ are stationary values of the same MDS problem defined by $W$ and $\Delta$. Then $\Delta$ must be an affine combination of the basis $U$ generated by $X$ and an affine combination of the basis $T$ generated by $Y$. Thus we must find vectors $\alpha$ and $\beta$ that add up to one and that satisfy $U \alpha=T \beta$.

As indicated before, if we only care about the solutions up to a proportionality factor, then constraining $\alpha$ and $\beta$ to add up to one is no longer necessary.

Let us use the example of five points equally spaced on a line and five points equally spaced on a circle.

$$
X=\left[\begin{array}{r}
-2 \\
-1 \\
0 \\
1 \\
2
\end{array}\right] \quad Y=\left[\begin{array}{rr}
0 & 1 \\
\sin \left(\frac{2}{5} \pi\right) & \cos \left(\frac{2}{5} \pi\right) \\
\sin \left(\frac{4}{5} \pi\right) & \cos \left(\frac{4}{5} \pi\right) \\
\sin \left(\frac{6}{5} \pi\right) & \cos \left(\frac{6}{5} \pi\right) \\
\sin \left(\frac{8}{5} \pi\right) & \cos \left(\frac{8}{5} \pi\right)
\end{array}\right]
$$

We look for the $\Delta$ for which $\mu X$ is a stationary value for some $\mu$ and for which $\lambda Y$ is stationary for some $\lambda . U$, generated by $X$, has seven dimensions, while $V$, generated by $Y$, has four dimensions. They are both computed by the function inverseMDS().
The $10 \times 11$ matrix $[U \mid-V]$ turns out to have rank nine, which means there are two linearly independent solutions f $U \alpha=T \beta$. And there is a two-dimensional subspace of the space of hollow symmetric matrices with the property that for each matrix in the subspace there exist $\mu$ and $\lambda$ such that $\mu X$ and $\lambda Y$ are stationary.

## Insert Code Segment 4 ABOUT HERE

Within the subspace we can easily find the two extreme rays of the cone of non-negative dissimilarity matrices. They turn out to be

| 1 |  | $[, 1]$ | $[, 2]$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $[1]$, | 0.0467 | 0.0989 |
| 3 | $[2]$, | 0.0989 | 0.0467 |
| 4 | $[3]$, | 0.0233 | 0.1223 |
| 5 | $[4]$, | 0.0756 | 0.0700 |
| 6 | $[5]$, | 0.0000 | 0.1456 |
| 7 | $[6]$, | 0.1456 | 0.0000 |
| 8 | $[7]$, | 0.0233 | 0.1223 |
| 9 | $[8]$, | 0.0000 | 0.1456 |
| 10 | $[9]$, | 0.0989 | 0.0467 |
| 11 | $[10]$, | 0.0467 | 0.0989 |

Note that the two rows, say $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$, add up to $0.1456 \cdots$. If we look at the convex combinations $\lambda f_{1}+(1-\lambda) f_{2}$, it turns out that these are Euclidean for $0.2282 \cdots \leq \lambda \leq 0.6016 \cdots$. For $\lambda=.5$ we find the matrix with all dissimilarities equal.

For the same convex combinations we find that $X$, suitably normalized, is a local minimum of $\lambda f_{1}+(1-\lambda) f_{2}$ for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. This corresponds with the fact that in one-dimensional MDS we only have local minima, no saddle-points, and no local maxima (except for $X=0$ ). Normalized $Y$ is a local minimum for all $0.1712 \cdots \leq \lambda \leq 1$.

Clearly the techniques in this section can be generalized to deal with solving for subspaces or cones of dissimilarity matrices that have more than two given solutions to the stationary equations, although it is clear that if we choose $X_{1}, \cdots, X_{m}$ completely generally we will rapidly run out of dimensions for the intersection of the dissimilarity spaces.

## Appendix A. Lemmas

Lemma A.1. Suppose $K$ is $n \times p$ with $K^{\prime} K=I$ and $K_{\perp}$ is $n \times(n-p)$ such that $K^{\prime} K_{\perp}=0$ and $K_{\perp}^{\prime} K_{\perp}=I$. Then a real symmetric $T$ satisfies $T K=0$ if and only if $T=K_{\perp} C K_{\perp}^{\prime}$, with $C$ real symmetric.

Proof. If $T=K_{\perp} C K_{\perp}^{\prime}$ then $T K=0$. For necessity write $T$ in the form

$$
T=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
K & K_{\perp}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
A & B \\
B^{\prime} & C
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
K^{\prime} \\
K_{\perp}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then we must have

$$
T K=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
K & K_{\perp}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
B^{\prime}
\end{array}\right]=0
$$

which implies $A=0$ and $B=0$.
Lemma A.2. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace with basis $x_{1}, \cdots, x_{m}$ and $\mathcal{M} \triangleq x_{0}+L$ is the affine subspace obtained by translating $\mathcal{L}$ by $x_{0}$. Then each $z \in \mathcal{M}$ can be written as an affine linear combination of $x_{0} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x_{0}+x_{1} \in \mathcal{M}, \cdots, x_{0}+x_{m} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Suppose $y=\sum_{j=i}^{m} \alpha_{j} x_{j}$. Then

$$
z=x_{0}+y=\left(1-\sum_{j=i}^{m} \alpha_{j}\right) x_{0}+\sum_{j=i}^{m} \alpha_{j}\left(x_{j}+x_{0}\right)
$$

## Appendix B. Code

```
Code Segment 1 Basis Computation
```

```
inverseMDS <- function (x) {
```

inverseMDS <- function (x) {
n s- nrow (x)
n s- nrow (x)
m s- ncol (x)
m s- ncol (x)
x <- apply (x, 2, function (y) y - mean (y))
x <- apply (x, 2, function (y) y - mean (y))
nm <- n - (m + 1)
nm <- n - (m + 1)
kk <- cbind (1, x, matrix (rnorm (n \# nm), n, nm))
kk <- cbind (1, x, matrix (rnorm (n \# nm), n, nm))
kperp <- as.matrix (qr.Q ( qr (kk))[, -(1 : (m + 1))])
kperp <- as.matrix (qr.Q ( qr (kk))[, -(1 : (m + 1))])
dd <- Euclid (x)
dd <- Euclid (x)
k s- 1
k s- 1
base <- matrix (0, n* (n - 1) L 2, nm * (nm + 1) L 2)
base <- matrix (0, n* (n - 1) L 2, nm * (nm + 1) L 2)
for (i in 1 : nm) {
for (i in 1 : nm) {
for (j in 1 : i) {
for (j in 1 : i) {
oo <- outer (kperp[, i], kperp[, j])
oo <- outer (kperp[, i], kperp[, j])
if (j != i) {
if (j != i) {
oo <- oo + t(oo)
oo <- oo + t(oo)
}
}
base[, k] <- lower_triangle (dd \#丷 (1 - oo))
base[, k] <- lower_triangle (dd \#丷 (1 - oo))
k <- k + 1
k <- k + 1
print (c(i,j,k))
print (c(i,j,k))
}
}
}
}
return (base = cbind (lower_triangle (dd), base))
return (base = cbind (lower_triangle (dd), base))
}

```
}
```


## Code Segment 3 Second Partials

```
require ("numDeriv")
second_partials_stress <- function (x, delta, w = nonDiag (
    nrow (x))) {
        n s- nrow (x)
        p s- ncol (x)
        d s- Euclid (x)
        fac <- (w * delta) L (d + diag (n))
        dd <- d # d
        v <- vmat (w)
        deri <- direct_sum (repList (v, p))
        xx <- as.vector (x)
        for (i in 1 : (n - 1)) {
            for (j in (i + 1) : n) {
                aa <- direct_sum (repList (aijn (i, j, n), p))
            ax <- drop (aa %※% xx)
            deri <- deri - fac[i, j] :丷 (aa - outer (ax, ax)
                    L dd [i, j])
        }
        }
        return (deri)
}
second_partials_numerical <- function (x, delta, w =
    nonDiag (nrow (x))) {
    stress <- function (x, delta, w) {
        n <- nrow (delta)
        p <- length (x) / n
        d <- Euclid (matrix (x, n, p))
        res <- delta - d
        return (sum (w # res * res) / 2)
        }
        return (hessian (stress, x, delta = delta, w = w))
}
```

```
Code Segment 4 Two Stationary Points
    twoPoints <- function ( \(x, y\) ) \{
    dx s- inverseMDS (x)
    dy <- inverseMDS ( \(y\) )
    \(m x\) s- ncol (dx)
    \(m y \leq-n c o l\) (dy)
    ez s- eigen (crossprod (cbind (dx, -dy)))
    \(i z\) s- which (abs (ez \$ values) < 1e-10)
    ax s- ez \$ vectors[1 : mx, iz]
    ay \(\leq-\) ez \(\$\) vectors[mx + (1 : my), iz]
    fx s- dx \%*\% ax
    fy <- dy \% \%\% ay
    return (list (fx = fx, fy = fy))
\}
```

```
Code Segment 5 Check Functions
checkMinima <- function ( \(x\), base, \(w=\) nonDiag (nrow ( \(x\) )) ) \{
    m <- ncol (base)
    n <- nrow (x)
    p <- ncol (x)
    \(\mathrm{np} \leq-\mathrm{n}\) 兰 p
    eval s- matrix ( \(0, m, n p\) )
    for (i in 1 : m) \{
        delta s- fill_symmetric (base[, i])
        eval[i, ] <- eigen (second_partials_stress (x,
            delta, w) ) \$ values
    \}
    return (eval)
\}
checkStationary s- function (x, base, w = nonDiag (nrow (x)
    ), scale \(=\) FALSE) \{
    n s- nrow (x)
    m <- ncol (base)
    d s- Euclid (x)
    eps \(\leq-\) rep \((0, m)\)
    1 bd <- rep ( \(0, \mathrm{~m}\) )
    for (i in 1 : m) \{
        delta s- fill_symmetric (base [, i])
        b s- bmat (x, delta, w)
        v s- vmat (w)
        vx <- v \%*\% x
        bx <- bmat \%\% x
```



```
        if (sca7e) \{
            eps[i] <- max (abs (1bd[i] * vx - bx))
        \} else \{
            eps[i] s- max (abs (vx - bx))
        \}
    \}
    return (1ist(eps = eps, 1bd = 1bd))
\}
```

Code Segment 6 Utility Functions I

```
lower_triangle <- function (x) {
    n <- nrow (x)
    return (x[outer (1:n, 1:n, ">")])
}
fil1_symmetric <- function (x) {
    m s- length (x)
    n <- 0.5 + sqrt (0.25 + 2* m)
    d <- matrix (0, n, n)
    d[outer (1:n, 1:n, ">")] <- x
    return (d + t(d))
}
Euclid <- function (x) {
    c <- tcrossprod (x)
    d s- diag (c)
    return (sqrt (outer (d, d, "+'") - 2 % c))
}
circular <- function (n) {
    x <- seq (0, 2 * pi, length = n + 1)
    z <- matrix (0, n + 1, 2)
    z[, 1] <- sin (x)
    z[, 2] <- cos (x)
    return (z[-1, ])
}
direct_sum <- function (x) {
    n <- length (x)
    nr <- sapply (x, nrow)
    nc <- sapply (x, ncol)
    s <- matrix (0, sum (nr), sum (nc))
    k <- 0
    1<- 0
    for (j in 1 : n) {
        s[k + (1 : nr[j]), 1 + (1 : nc[j])] <- x[[j]]
        k <- k + nr[j]
        l <- 1 + nc[j]
        }
    return (s)
}
```

```
Code Segment 7 Utility Functions II
aijn s- function (i, j, n) \{
    a <- matrix ( \(0, \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n}\) )
    \(a[i, i] \leq-1\)
    \(a[j, j] \leq-1\)
    \(a[i, j] \leq--1\)
    \(a[j, i] \leq--1\)
    return (a)
\}
repList <- function(x, n) \{
    z s- list()
    for (i in 1 : \(n\) )
        \(z \leq-c\) (z, list (x))
    return (z)
\}
nonDiag s- function ( \(n\) ) \{
    return (matrix (1, n, n) - diag (n))
\}
bmat <- function (x, delta, w = nonDiag (nrow (x))) \{
    d s- Euclid (x)
    bmat \(\leq-(w \underset{\underline{*}}{ }\) delta) \(/(d+d i a g(n))\)
    diag (bmat) \(\leq-\)-rowSums (bmat)
    return (bmat)
\}
vmat <- function (w = nonDiag (nrow (x))) \{
    vmat <- -w
    diag (vmat) <- -rowSums (vmat)
    return (vmat)
\}
torgerson <- function (delta) \{
    n <- nrow (delta)
    dd \(\leq-\) delta \(\underset{\text { t }}{ }\) delta
    sd <- rowSums (dd) \(\angle \mathrm{n}\)
    ed \(\leq-\) sum (dd) \(/(\mathrm{n} \underset{\underline{*}}{\mathrm{n}})\)
    cc s- -(dd - outer (sd, sd, "+") + ed) \(/ 2\)
    return (eigen (cc))
\}
```
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