

Conformal Coordinates for Molecular Geometry: from 3D to 5D

Jesus Camargo¹, Carlile Lavor², Michael Souza³

¹ CCET, The Western Paraná State University, 85819-110, Cascavel, Brazil
jesus.camargo@unioeste.br

² IMECC, University of Campinas, 13081-970, Campinas, Brazil
clavor@unicamp.br

³ Departamento de Estatística e Matemática Aplicada, Centro de Ciências,
Universidade Federal do Ceará, 60020-181, Fortaleza, Brazil,
michael@ufc.br

Abstract. This paper introduces the conformal model (an extension of the homogeneous coordinate system) for molecular geometry, where 3D space is represented within \mathbb{R}^5 with an inner product different from the usual one. This model enables efficient computation of interatomic distances using what we call the *Conformal Coordinate Matrix (C-matrix)*. The *C-matrix* not only simplifies the mathematical framework but also reduces the number of operations required for distance calculations compared to traditional methods.

Keywords: Molecular Geometry · *C-matrix* · *Z-matrix* · Conformal Coordinates · Homogeneous Coordinates · Conformal Model of 3D Space

1 Introduction

In computational chemistry, the geometric arrangement of atoms within a molecule is often represented using Cartesian or internal coordinates (given by the lengths of covalent bonds and the bond and torsion angles), which are particularly useful because they are closely related to the chemical bonds and angles that define the molecule's structure [9].

The traditional approach to converting internal coordinates into Cartesian coordinates involves the use of the homogeneous coordinate system. In this system, each point in 3D space is represented by a vector in \mathbb{R}^4 , allowing for translation and rotation of atoms to be described by matrix operations. This method, as proposed by Thompson in the 1960s [13], has been widely used in molecular geometry calculations (for example, see [10]).

While the homogeneous coordinate system simplifies the conversion of internal coordinates to Cartesian coordinates, it does not inherently simplify the calculation of interatomic distances, which is a crucial task in molecular geometry optimization and molecular dynamics simulations [11,12]. To address this limitation, this paper introduces the conformal model for molecular geometry, a generalization of the homogeneous coordinate system [5,6,8].

In the conformal model, we define the *Conformal Coordinate Matrix* (*C-matrix*), which allows for a more efficient computation of interatomic distances. The *C-matrix* not only retains the advantages of the homogeneous coordinate system but also introduces a new level of computational efficiency by reducing the number of operations required for distance calculations.

This paper explores the mathematical framework of the conformal model, demonstrates its application to molecular geometry, and compares its performance with traditional methods.

2 Homogeneous Coordinate System

Since internal coordinates are naturally associated with the geometry of a molecule, especially when bond lengths and bond angles are considered fixed and given a priori (which reduces the degrees of freedom needed to characterize the 3D structure of a molecule), internal coordinates are widely used in computational chemistry [11].

We will consider, then (as in [2]), a molecule as a linear chain of n atoms described by internal coordinates d_i, θ_i, ω_i , where d_i is the covalent bond length between atoms with Cartesian coordinates $x_{i-1}, x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ($i = 2, \dots, n$), θ_i is the angle formed by the bond vectors b_{i-1}, b_i , given by $b_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ ($i = 3, \dots, n$), and ω_i is the torsion angle formed by the planes generated by b_{i-2}, b_{i-1} and b_{i-1}, b_i ($i = 4, \dots, n$).

In [13] (see also [14]), Thompson proposes using the homogeneous model of 3D space (where each point is represented by $(x, y, z, 1)^t \in \mathbb{R}^4$) to convert internal coordinates into Cartesian coordinates. This approach allows for grouping the three “positioning movements” of an atom (one translation and two rotations), considering previous atoms in the chain, into a single linear operator. As a result, the calculation of Cartesian coordinates from internal coordinates is simply given by a matrix product, as we summarize below following the procedure given in [2].

The rotations associated with the bond and torsion angles are given in the homogeneous space by

$$B_{\theta_i} = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i & -\cos \theta_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\omega_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively, and the translation of a point $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is encoded by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & d_i \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Combining these matrices, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_i &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i & -\cos \theta_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & d_i \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 & -d_i \cos \theta_i \\ \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i \\ \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For $d_1 = \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = 0$ and $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$, we obtain

$$x_1 = B_1 e_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_2 = (B_1 B_2) e_4 = \begin{bmatrix} d_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_3 = (B_1 B_2 B_3) e_4 = \begin{bmatrix} (d_2 - d_3 \cos \theta_3) \\ d_3 \sin \theta_3 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and, for $i = 4, \dots, n$,

$$x_i = (B_4 \cdots B_i) e_4, \tag{1}$$

where $e_4 = (0, 0, 0, 1)^t$ is the vector in the homogeneous space that represents the ‘‘origin’’ of 3D space.

To simplify the notation, let us write

$$B_{[i,j]} = \prod_{k=i}^j B_k$$

and calculate the Euclidean distance $r_{i,j}$ between x_i and x_j (for $i < j$):

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_{i,j} &= \|(x_j - x_i)\| \\
 &= \|(B_1 \cdots B_i \cdots B_j) e_4 - (B_1 \cdots B_i) e_4\| \\
 &= \|B_{[1,i]} (B_{[i+1,j]} - I) e_4\|,
 \end{aligned}$$

where I is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$.

Although the term $B_{[1,i]}$ is not an orthogonal matrix, the authors in [2] show that it can be removed, resulting in

$$r_{i,j} = \|(B_{[i+1,j]} - I) e_4\|. \tag{2}$$

3 Conformal Coordinate System

To obtain the position of the fourth atom in the molecule,

$$x_4 = (B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4) e_4,$$

we first calculate $B_4 e_4$, given by

$$B_4 e_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_4 & -\sin \theta_4 & 0 & -d_4 \cos \theta_4 \\ \sin \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 - \cos \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 & -\sin \omega_4 & d_4 \sin \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 & \\ \sin \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 - \cos \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 & \cos \omega_4 & d_4 \sin \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -d_4 \cos \theta_4 \\ d_4 \sin \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 \\ d_4 \sin \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the above calculation, we see that the rotations associated with the bond angle θ_4 and the torsion angle ω_4 are represented by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_4 & -\sin \theta_4 & 0 \\ \sin \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 - \cos \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 & -\sin \omega_4 & \\ \sin \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 - \cos \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 & \cos \omega_4 & \end{bmatrix}$$

and the translation associated with the bond length d_4 is encoded by

$$b = \begin{bmatrix} -d_4 \cos \theta_4 \\ d_4 \sin \theta_4 \cos \omega_4 \\ d_4 \sin \theta_4 \sin \omega_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In other words, using homogeneous coordinates, the translation is linearized and the three operations are represented by a single matrix. This linearization, in general, can be represented by

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Ax + b \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Note that the matrix A , related to the rotations, is orthogonal. However, when we linearize the translation, the new matrix, now in $\mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$, is no longer orthogonal.

In [7], the authors manage to recover this property (slightly modifying the concept of orthogonality) by using another model of 3D space, called the *conformal model* [5,6,8].

In \mathbb{R}^3 , the two rotations and the translation given in (3) can be represented by a function $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, defined by

$$f(x) = Ax + b,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, such that $A^{-1} = A^t$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$. That is, we have an isometry in \mathbb{R}^3 .

Also in [7], it is demonstrated that it is not possible to “orthogonalize” isometries in 3D space using the homogeneous model. However, by renouncing the positivity of the usual inner product and using the conformal model, one can encode translations in 3D space as orthogonal operations in \mathbb{R}^5 . In that paper, the motivation was the search for an orthogonal representation of isometries in 3D space. Perhaps, due to the chosen notation, the development of this reasoning was not very clear. We present an alternative below, which we believe is more convincing.

3.1 Orthogonalization of Isometries

The entire argument in [7] is based on constructing a bijection between \mathbb{R}^3 and a subset $H \subset \mathbb{R}^5$, in such a way that isometries in \mathbb{R}^3 can be represented orthogonally in \mathbb{R}^5 . For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, its representative in H will be denoted by $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^5$.

We want that when applying an isometry $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ to $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, their respective representatives $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in H \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ are altered orthogonally.

In other words, we would like to demonstrate that, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\|x - y\| = \|f(x) - f(y)\| \implies \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \widehat{f(x)} \cdot \widehat{f(y)}.$$

One way to obtain this result would be to assume that the usual inner product in \mathbb{R}^5 “encodes” the Euclidean distance in \mathbb{R}^3 . That is, if

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \|x - y\|^2,$$

we would have

$$\widehat{f(x)} \cdot \widehat{f(y)} = \|f(x) - f(y)\|^2,$$

which would imply

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \widehat{f(x)} \cdot \widehat{f(y)}.$$

The question, therefore, is to investigate how the hypothesis $\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \|x - y\|^2$, with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^5$, could lead to the discovery of the bijection in question between \mathbb{R}^3 and the subset $H \subset \mathbb{R}^5$.

So far, we have considered the usual inner product, both in \mathbb{R}^3 and in \mathbb{R}^5 , which induces Euclidean norms in both spaces.

The first consequence of the hypothesis $\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \|x - y\|^2$ is that, setting $x = y$, and assuming that there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\hat{x}_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^5$, we would have

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3 - \{x_0\}, \quad \hat{x} \cdot \hat{x} = 0 \implies \hat{x} = 0 \implies \hat{x} = \hat{x}_0,$$

which would be a contradiction because we are looking for a bijection.

To avoid this contradiction, we will abandon the positivity of the usual inner product in \mathbb{R}^5 , which implies that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \implies \|\hat{x}\| = 0.$$

That is, we will admit that all points in 3D space will be represented by vectors in \mathbb{R}^5 with zero norm. Of course, this norm, induced by the inner product, will no longer be Euclidean (we will continue to call “the new inner product”, even though we know that, formally, we no longer have such operation due to the lack of positivity).

The other properties that define an inner product will be preserved. This means that we will maintain the algebraic properties of the usual inner product in \mathbb{R}^5 (symmetry, homogeneity, and distributivity), but as the Euclidean character requires the positivity of the inner product, the geometry in \mathbb{R}^5 will be altered. Therefore, we are looking for a non-Euclidean representation, that lies in \mathbb{R}^5 , for

the 3D space. By abuse of notation, we will continue writing $\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y}$ to represent the new inner product.

From [7], knowing that it is not possible to orthogonalize isometries of 3D space in \mathbb{R}^4 , even by relinquishing the positivity of the inner product, we can follow what is done in the homogeneous model and represent a point $x = x_1e_1 + x_2e_2 + x_3e_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in $H \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ by

$$\hat{x} = x + x_4e_4 + x_5e_5,$$

where $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ and, together with $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, e_4, e_5 are vectors that complete the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^5 . Of course, for the above sum to make sense, we add zeros to the fourth and fifth coordinates, when embedding x, e_1, e_2, e_3 in \mathbb{R}^5 . The problem now is to determine the values of x_4 and x_5 .

In the homogeneous model, a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is represented in \mathbb{R}^4 by $x + e_4$, which already suggests considering $x_4 = 1$, imagining that the conformal model would be an extension of the homogeneous model.

From the algebraic properties of the inner product in \mathbb{R}^5 , we easily obtain that

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{x} = 0 \implies (x + x_4e_4 + x_5e_5) \cdot (x + x_4e_4 + x_5e_5) = 0 \implies x_4^2(e_4 \cdot e_4) + x_5^2(e_5 \cdot e_5) = -\|x\|^2.$$

In other words,

$$x \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|e_4\| = 1 \implies \|e_5\| < 0.$$

Because the norm in \mathbb{R}^5 is no longer Euclidean, negative norm, as well as zero norm of a non-zero vector, is no longer ‘‘forbidden’’.

We thus require that the set $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5\}$ ceases to be orthonormal, due to e_5 having a negative norm.

Since the vectors in H , which represent the points in 3D space, must have zero norm, we will replace e_4, e_5 with vectors e_0, e_∞ that also have zero norm (see [7] for more details), defined by

$$e_0 = \frac{e_5 - e_4}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad e_\infty = e_5 + e_4,$$

resulting in

$$\|e_0\| = \|e_\infty\| = 0$$

and

$$e_0 \cdot e_\infty = -1.$$

With the new basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_0, e_\infty\}$, and given that e_0, e_∞ are also orthogonal to $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, we obtain:

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = (x + x_0e_0 + x_\infty e_\infty) \cdot (y + y_0e_0 + y_\infty e_\infty) = x \cdot y - (x_0y_\infty + x_\infty y_0), \quad (4)$$

with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $x_0, x_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$, and $e_0, e_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^5$.

For $\hat{x} = \hat{y}$,

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{x} = 0 \implies \|x\|^2 - 2x_0x_\infty = 0,$$

and, considering $x_0 = 1$, as suggested above, we finally obtain that

$$\hat{x} = x + e_0 + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 e_\infty, \quad (5)$$

implying that

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \left(x + e_0 + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 e_\infty \right) \cdot \left(y + e_0 + \frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2 e_\infty \right) = -\frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|^2.$$

The expression (5) defines the conformal model [6,8]. Since e_0 represents the ‘‘origin’’ of 3D space ($\hat{x} = x + e_0 + 0.5\|x\|^2 \implies \hat{0} = e_0$), the conformal model is also known as the generalized homogeneous model.

With the bijection between \mathbb{R}^3 and the subset $H \subset \mathbb{R}^5$, defined by (5), our hypothesis becomes true with a slight adjustment. That is, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\hat{x} = x + e_0 + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 e_\infty \implies \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = -\frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|^2,$$

which, in turn, implies that

$$\|x - y\| = \|f(x) - f(y)\| \implies \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = \widehat{f(x)} \cdot \widehat{f(y)}.$$

Thus, we reach our goal: when applying an isometry $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ to $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, their respective representatives $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^5$ are altered orthogonally (of course, considering the new inner product in \mathbb{R}^5 , which no longer respects positivity).

3.2 Conformal Coordinate Matrix (*C-matrix*)

Using the conformal model, an isometry $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$f(x) = Ax + b,$$

is then represented by

$$\widehat{f(x)} = (Ax + b) + e_0 + \frac{1}{2}\|Ax + b\|^2 e_\infty.$$

Because of the orthogonality of the matrix A , we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\|Ax + b\|^2 = b^t Ax + \frac{\|b\|^2}{2} + \frac{\|x\|^2}{2},$$

which implies that the isometry f can be encoded in matrix form as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ b^t A & \frac{\|b\|^2}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ 1 \\ \frac{\|x\|^2}{2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Ax + b \\ 1 \\ \frac{\|Ax + b\|^2}{2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (see details in [7]).

Taking

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i \\ \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} -d_i \cos \theta_i \\ d_i \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i \\ d_i \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$b^t A = [d_i \ 0 \ 0]$$

and

$$\|b\|^2 = d_i^2,$$

implying that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ b^t A & \frac{\|b\|^2}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 & -d_i \cos \theta_i & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ d_i & 0 & 0 & \frac{d_i^2}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote this matrix as the *Conformal Coordinate Matrix* of atom i or simply the *C-matrix* of atom i .

The *C-matrix* is not orthogonal with respect to the usual inner product, but it is if we consider the new one. That is, it satisfies

$$(U\hat{x}) \cdot (U\hat{y}) = \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y}.$$

From (4),

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3 - x_0 y_0 - x_\infty y_\infty,$$

which implies that

$$\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = [x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 \ x_0 \ x_\infty] \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \\ y_0 \\ y_\infty \end{bmatrix} = \hat{x}^t I_c \hat{y}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$I_c = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $I \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. Considering

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} A & b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ b^t A & \frac{\|b\|^2}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

we obtain

$$U^t I_c U = I_c, \quad (7)$$

and, in turn,

$$(U\hat{x}) \cdot (U\hat{y}) = (U\hat{x})^t I_c (U\hat{y}) = \hat{x}^t (U^t I_c U) \hat{y} = \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y},$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Thus, U (and, in particular, the *C-matrix*) is an orthogonal matrix with respect to the inner product defined by (6).

Finally, we are ready to compute distances using the conformal model.

4 Computing Distances in the Conformal Coordinate System

Since the construction of Cartesian coordinates from internal coordinates follows the same procedure performed in the homogeneous space (see Section 2), we have that

$$\hat{x}_i = B_{[i]} e_0,$$

where $B_{[i]} = \prod_{k=1}^i B_k$,

$$\hat{x}_i = \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ 1 \\ \frac{\|x_i\|^2}{2} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$B_i = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i & 0 & -d_i \cos \theta_i & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \cos \omega_i & -\sin \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \cos \omega_i & 0 \\ \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & -\cos \theta_i \sin \omega_i & \cos \omega_i & d_i \sin \theta_i \sin \omega_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ d_i & 0 & 0 & \frac{d_i^2}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

As mentioned earlier, e_0 is the representative of the origin of 3D space in the conformal model, playing the role of e_4 in the homogeneous model.

Without loss of generality, let us consider $i < j$. Also defining

$$B_{[i+1,j]} = \prod_{k=i+1}^j B_k$$

and writing

$$B_{[j]} = B_{[i]} B_{[i+1,j]},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_j \cdot \hat{x}_i &= \hat{x}_j^t I_c \hat{x}_i \\ &= e_0^t B_{[j]}^t I_c B_{[i]} e_0 \\ &= e_0^t B_{[i+1,j]}^t (B_{[i]}^t I_c B_{[i]}) e_0,\end{aligned}$$

and, from (7),

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_j \cdot \hat{x}_i &= e_0^t B_{[i+1,j]}^t I_c e_0 \\ &= -e_0^t B_{[i+1,j]}^t e_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{x}_j \cdot \hat{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(-e_0^t B_{[i+1,j]}^t e_\infty)^t = -e_\infty^t B_{[i+1,j]} e_0,$$

which implies

$$\hat{x}_j \cdot \hat{x}_i = -e_\infty^t B_{[i+1,j]} e_0.$$

As we know that

$$\hat{x}_j \cdot \hat{x}_i = -\frac{1}{2} \|x_j - x_i\|^2,$$

we have that the Euclidean distance $r_{i,j}$ between atoms i and j is given by

$$r_{i,j}^2 = 2e_\infty^t B_{[i+1,j]} e_0. \quad (8)$$

Comparing this with the expression obtained using the homogeneous model [2], given by

$$r_{i,j}^2 = e_4^t (B_{[i+1,j]}^t B_{[i+1,j]}) e_4 - 1,$$

we can see that the simplification obtained is due to the orthogonality of $B_{[i]}$, a consequence of the orthogonality of the *C-matrix* (of course, orthogonality in terms of the new inner product in \mathbb{R}^5). We conclude this because

$$(B_i B_j)^t I_c (B_i B_j) = B_j^t (B_i^t I_c B_i) B_j = B_j^t I_c B_j = I_c.$$

4.1 Number of Operations for Computing $r_{i,j}$

In [2], a comparison was made between the Euclidean and homogeneous models regarding the number of operations (additions and multiplications) required to calculate the interatomic distance $r_{i,j}$ between atoms i and j . As in [2], we will disregard the cost associated with calculating sine and cosine functions, as well as the square root, since they appear in equal numbers in all three models.

To compute $r_{i,j}$ in the conformal model, we need to calculate

$$r_{i,j} = \sqrt{2e_\infty^t B_{[i+1,j]} e_0}.$$

First, let us determine separately the cost associated with the vectors $e_\infty^t B_{i+1}$ and $B_{[i+2,j]}e_0$.

Note that the first of these two vectors is exactly given by the fifth row of B_{i+1} , which requires only 2 multiplications.

For the second vector, $B_{[i+2,j]}e_0$, we need to calculate the fourth column of the matrix resulting from the product of $B_{i+2}, B_{i+3}, \dots, B_j$. We will do this through a sequence of matrix-vector multiplications, operating from right to left.

The first vector calculated is $B_j e_0$, which is given by the fourth column of B_j and requires 5 multiplications, as $(d_i^2/2)$ has already been calculated in the first vector, $e_\infty^t B_{i+1}$. The sequence of matrix-vector multiplications is performed such that, for $p = i + 2, \dots, j - 1$, we need to calculate

$$B_p (B_{[p+1,j]}e_0).$$

The cost of determining B_p is 9 multiplications and the cost of multiplying the matrix B_p by the vector $B_{[p+1,j]}e_0$ is 25 multiplications and 20 additions, totaling 54 operations for each index p .

Disregarding the count of multiplications by 0 and 1, and additions with 0, the product of a matrix B_p and a vector, whose fourth component is always equal to 1, requires 9 multiplications and 10 additions. Along with the 9 operations needed to determine each matrix B_p , constructing the vector $B_{[p+1,j]}e_0$ requires 28 operations, for $p = i + 2, \dots, j - 1$. Considering the 5 multiplications to determine $B_j e_0$ and the 2 multiplications to determine $e_\infty^t B_{[i+1]}$, we have, so far, $28(j - i - 2) + 7$ operations.

The product between $e_\infty^t B_{i+1}$ and $B_{[i+2,j]}e_0$ requires 1 multiplication and 2 additions (considering that $e_\infty^t B_{i+1}$ has two zero entries and one entry equal to one, and that $B_{[i+2,j]}e_0$ has one entry equal to one) and we also have to consider the product of the resulting value by two. Thus, the total number of operations to calculate $r_{i,j}$, using the conformal model, is

$$28(j - i - 2) + 7 + 4 = 28(j - i) - 45.$$

In Table 1, we compare the cost determined here with the cost obtained using the homogeneous and Euclidean models, as given in [2] (note that, to make sense, we assume that $j > i + 2$).

Table 1. Number of operations required to determine $r_{i,j}$, for $j > i + 2$, with the Euclidean, homogeneous, and conformal models.

| Model | Number of Operations |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Euclidean | $55(j - i) - 97$ |
| Homogeneous | $35(j - i) - 25$ |
| Conformal | $28(j - i) - 45$ |

5 Conclusion

The conformal model is a generalization of the homogeneous coordinate system, where 3D space is represented by a subset of \mathbb{R}^5 with an inner product that no longer respects positivity. Widely used in problems of robotics, physics, and computer graphics [1,3,4], this paper applies the conformal model, for the first time (as far as we know), to represent atomic positions and calculate interatomic distances in the context of molecular geometry.

As a result, we defined the *C-matrix*, which can perform the same function as the *Z-matrix*⁴, used in the calculation of the Cartesian coordinates of an atom in a molecule, in terms of its internal coordinates. The difference, as we have seen, is that the *C-matrix* can be used to calculate interatomic distances more efficiently than the *Z-matrix*.

Acknowledgements

This research was partially funded by Brazilian research agencies FAPESP (grant number 2023/08706-1) and CNPq (grant number 305227/2022-0). We would also like to thank Prof. Alberto Saa and Prof. Marcelo Terra Cunha, both from the University of Campinas, for the fruitful discussions on all the ideas in the paper.

References

1. Bayro-Corrochano, E.: Geometric Algebra Applications. Computer Vision, Graphics and Neurocomputing I. Springer (2019)
2. Camargo, J., Lavor, C.: A new perspective on the homogeneous coordinate system for calculating interatomic distances and their derivatives in terms of internal coordinates. *Advanced Theory and Simulations* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1002/adts.202400271>
3. Doran, C., Lasenby, A.: Geometric Algebra for Physicists. Cambridge University Press (2003)
4. Dorst, L., Fontijne, D., Mann, S.: Geometric Algebra for Computer Science: An Object-Oriented Approach to Geometry. Morgan Kaufman (2007)
5. Dress, A., Havel, T.: Distance geometry and geometric algebra. *Foundations of Physics* **23**, 1357–1374 (1993)
6. Hestenes, D.: Old wine in new bottles: a new algebraic framework for computational geometry. In: Bayro-Corrochano, E., Sobczyk, G. (eds.) *Advances in Geometric Algebra with Applications in Science and Engineering*, pp. 1–14. Birkhäuser (2001)
7. Lavor, C., Souza, M., Aragón, J.L.: Orthogonality of isometries in the conformal model of the 3d space. *Graphical Models* **114**, 101100 (2021)
8. Li, H., Hestenes, D., Rockwood, A.: Generalized homogeneous coordinates for computational geometry. In: Sommer, G. (ed.) *Geometric Computing with Clifford Algebra*, pp. 25–58. Springer (2001)
9. Li, J., Zhang, O., Lee, S., Namini, A., Liu, Z., Teixeira, J., Forman-Kay, J., Head-Gordon, T.: Learning correlations between internal coordinates to improve 3d cartesian coordinates for proteins. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **19**, 4689–4700 (2023)

⁴ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Z-matrix_\(chemistry\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Z-matrix_(chemistry))

10. Liberti, L., Lavor, C., Maculan, N., Mucherino, A.: Euclidean distance geometry and applications. *SIAM Review* **56**, 3–69 (2014)
11. Parsons, J., Holmes, J., Rojas, J., Tsai, J., Strauss, C.: Practical conversion from torsion space to cartesian space for in silico protein synthesis. *Journal of Computational Chemistry* **26**, 1063–1068 (2005)
12. Rybkin, V., Ekström, U., Helgaker, T.: Internal-to-cartesian back transformation of molecular geometry steps using high-order geometric derivatives. *Journal of Computational Chemistry* **34**, 1842–1849 (2013)
13. Thompson, H.B.: Calculation of cartesian coordinates and their derivatives from internal molecular coordinates. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **47**, 3407–3410 (1967)
14. Thompson, H.B.: Calculation of cartesian coordinates and their derivatives from internal molecular coordinates. ii. second and higher derivatives of vectors. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **53**, 3034–3036 (1970)