

A Fast and Convergent Algorithm for Unassigned Distance Geometry Problems

Jun Fan, Xiaoya Shan, and Xianchao Xiu, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a fast and convergent algorithm to solve unassigned distance geometry problems (uDGP). Technically, we construct a novel quadratic measurement model by leveraging ℓ_0 -norm instead of ℓ_1 -norm in the literature. To solve the nonconvex model, we establish its optimality conditions and develop a fast iterative hard thresholding (IHT) algorithm. Theoretically, we rigorously prove that the whole generated sequence converges to the L-stationary point with the help of the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property. Numerical studies on the turnpike and beltway problems validate its superiority over existing ℓ_1 -norm-based method.

Index Terms—unassigned distance geometry problems (uDGP), ℓ_0 -norm, quadratic measurement, iterative hard threshold.

I. INTRODUCTION

UNLIKE the classical distance geometry problems (DGP) [1], the unassigned DGP (uDGP) can determine the coordinates of a set of points using the distances between some pairs of points, without providing the relationship between the distances and the pairs of points [2], [3]. Nowadays, uDGP has been broadly applied in signal processing and engineering, including nanostructure determination [4], peptide sequencing [5], partial digestion [6], and spectral estimation [7].

Although uDGP can be defined in arbitrary dimensions [8], [9], most literature focuses on one-dimensional problems, including the turnpike and beltway problems caused by partial digestion. In fact, solving uDGP is generally NP-hard as stated in [10]. To this end, Skiena *et al.* [11] proposed an effective backtracking algorithm, but it may encounter high computational complexity or even the absence of any solution, and later some improved versions have been developed [12], [13]. More recently, Huang *et al.* [14] established a quadratic system with sparse vectors for one-dimensional uDGP. The core is to relax ℓ_0 -norm (not a true norm) into ℓ_1 -norm with box constraints, then developed a projected gradient descent algorithm called ℓ_1 PGD. In addition, the successful application of quadratic systems has also attracted great attention ranging from the theoretical aspects [15], [16] to the general Gaussian quadratic measurement system [17].

Note that the position vector to be recovered in [14] is a sparse vector with values of 0 or 1, which is similar to

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12271022 and 12371306, and the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province under Grant A2023202038. (*Corresponding author: Xianchao Xiu.*)

Jun Fan and Xiaoya Shan are with the Institute of Mathematics, Hebei University of Technology, Tianjin 300401, China (e-mail: junfan@hebut.edu.cn; shananice@163.com).

Xianchao Xiu is with the School of Mechatronic Engineering and Automation, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China (e-mail: xcxiu@shu.edu.cn).

sparse phase retrieval problems of binary signals [18], [19], [20]. Flinth *et al.* [21] verified that the sparse binary signal retrieval problem can be solved by the basis tracking method with a box constrained model. In addition, Bartmeyer *et al.* [22] applied the relaxation strategy to uDGP without quadratic measurements and proved that the relaxation scheme can reduce the computational complexity. Therefore, it is meaningful and effective to employ box relaxation to characterize binary signals in sparse models, which encourages us to continue this strategy in the quadratic measurement-based uDGP.

From the perspective of sparse optimization, Blumensath *et al.* [23] proposed an iterative hard threshold (IHT) algorithm to solve the ℓ_0 -norm related problems, and later extended it to the nonlinear case [24]. Beck *et al.* [25] applied IHT to solve optimization problems with sparse constraints and showed that it converges to the L-stationary point when the gradient is Lipschitz continuous. Pan *et al.* [26] extended IHT to nonlinear optimization problems with nonnegative and sparse constraints, and established that the algorithm can reach a local optimum under the restricted isometry property (RIP). Fan *et al.* [27] adopted IHT to recover signals from the sparse constrained quadratic measurement model. It has been verified in [28], [29] that ℓ_0 -norm with IHT has the advantages of simple calculation and good recovery effect, and is more suitable for large-scale problems when compared with ℓ_1 -norm. The interested readers can refer to [30].

Inspired by the above observations, a natural question comes to us: can we directly solve uDGP by constructing a quadratic measurement model that leverages ℓ_0 -norm instead of ℓ_1 -norm in [14]. This paper will give an affirmative answer. Compared with existing works, the main contributions are as follows.

- 1) We establish a novel quadratic measurement model with ℓ_0 -norm and box constraints.
- 2) We analyze the optimality conditions and develop a fast IHT algorithm with Armijo line search.
- 3) We prove that the proposed algorithm converges to the L-stationary point for the whole sequence.

II. THE PROPOSED METHOD

A. New Model

Given a multiset \mathcal{D} containing the $\binom{2}{s}$ distance of points and the number of points s , uDGP aims to recover the relative locations of s points $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$. Here

$$\mathcal{D} = \{b_k = a_k + w_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, \binom{2}{s}\}, \quad (1)$$

where $a_k = \|v_i - v_j\|_1$ is the noise-free distance between the k -th pair of points $\{i, j\}$, but the assignment map between k and $\{i, j\}$ is unknown, and a_k is the distance with noise w_k .

According to [14], by partitioning the domain into discrete segments, point locations are encoded as an indicator vector $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, where $x_i = 1$ denotes the presence of a point in the i -th segment. The resulting distance distribution \mathbf{y} can then be formulated quadratically as $y_i = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}$, where $\mathbf{A}_i \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ is the measurement matrix whose (u, v) -th entry is 1 if $v - u = i$, otherwise 0, and the matrix here does not satisfy Gaussian sampling. The mathematical model of uDGP can be characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find } & \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s.t. } & \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x} = y_i, \\ & \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n, \\ & \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = s. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Then, Huang *et al.* [14] relaxed (2) into the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x} - y_i)^2 \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = s, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the set $[0, 1]^n$ is defined as $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

In this paper, we propose a new model to characterize uDGP in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x} - y_i)^2 \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n, \\ & \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Obviously, compared with (3), our proposed model in (4) adopts ℓ_0 -norm, i.e., $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s$, rather than ℓ_1 -norm, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = s$, which holds the following two advantages:

- **Reduce the computational cost for projection to the constrained set to some extent.** The projection operation of ℓ_0 -norm only requires sorting the vector elements and applying the hard threshold operator, thus avoiding the higher computational cost of iterative optimization associated with ℓ_1 -norm.
- **Reflect the sparse structure of the position vector in a better way.** It is known that ℓ_0 -norm can intuitively characterize sparsity, and the sparsity can be easily determined by adjusting s , so it is more flexible than ℓ_1 -norm.

B. Optimization Algorithm

Denote $\mathcal{C}_s = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]^n$. Below, we establish the optimality conditions for Problem (4).

Theorem 1. *There exists a global minimize $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ of Problem (4) which satisfies the following fixed point inclusion*

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tau \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) \quad (5)$$

for any $\tau \in (0, \min\{l^{-1}, 1\})$, where l is a positive constant associated with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

Proof. Note that the set $\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$ is a bounded closed subset of \mathbb{R}^n , hence compact. Moreover, f is a continuous function, which shows that Problem (4) has an optimal solution, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

On one side, given any $\tau > 0$, define

$$F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \langle \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2. \quad (6)$$

Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n, \\ & \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let $\mathcal{C}_{2s} \cap \mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n, \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq 2s\}$. It is evident that there exists a constant l such that

$$l = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_{2s} \cap \mathcal{B}} \|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})\|_2. \quad (8)$$

By taking $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$, it satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{y}\|_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 + \alpha \|\mathbf{y}\|_0 \leq 2s \text{ and } \mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^n, \quad (9)$$

which shows $\mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}_{2s} \cap \mathcal{B}$. Hence, for any $\tau \in (0, l^{-1})$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$, where \mathbf{x} is not on the boundary of $\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$, the following statements hold

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &= f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \langle \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})^\top \nabla^2 f(\xi) (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &= F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})^\top \nabla^2 f(\xi) (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla^2 f(\xi)\|_2 \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{l}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq F_\tau(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\xi = \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \alpha(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The second inequality holds because $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_{2s} \cap \mathcal{B}$, thus $\|\nabla^2 f(\xi)\|_2 \leq l$. Next, let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ be an optimal solution of (7), where $\tau \in (0, l^{-1})$. Since $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = F_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$, for any $\tau \in (0, l^{-1})$, it derives

$$F_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \leq F_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \leq F_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (11)$$

which implies

$$F_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = F_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (12)$$

Thus, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is also an optimal solution of Problem (7).

On the other side, Problem (7) can also be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - (\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tau \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n, \\ & \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq s, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which has the solution given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tau \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})). \quad (14)$$

Therefore, the conclusion is obtained. \square

According to [31], the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}$ in (5) can be done in two stages: first find the super support \mathcal{S} onto \mathcal{C}_s , and then find the projection onto \mathcal{B} , i.e.,

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s}), \quad (17)$$

Algorithm 1 Iterative Hard Thresholding Algorithm

Input: Given data \mathbf{x}^0 , sparsity level s , and parameters $\lambda > 0$, $\epsilon \geq 0$, $\tau_0, \alpha, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, δ
While $\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ **do**

1: Compute $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$

2: Update

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}^k - \tau_k \nabla f(\mathbf{x})) \quad (15)$$

3: Set t_k is the least nonnegative integer for which

$$f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|_2^2 \quad (16)$$

4: Update $\tau_k = \gamma \alpha^{t_k}$, $k = k + 1$

End while

Output: \mathbf{x}^k

where the set \mathcal{S} is a super support of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$ if $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $|\mathcal{S}| = s$ with \mathcal{I} denoting the support of \mathbf{x} and $|\mathcal{S}|$ representing the number of elements in the set \mathcal{S} .

Therefore, the iterative scheme for solving Problem (4) can be summarized in Algorithm 1. To achieve sufficient step-size reduction, it is necessary to identify the least nonnegative integer that satisfies (16), which can be accomplished through the following Remark 1.

Remark 1. For any $\delta > 0$ and $\gamma, \alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists t_k such that (16) holds for every k . Furthermore, there exists a nonnegative integer \bar{t} such that $\tau_k \in [\gamma \alpha^{\bar{t}}, \gamma]$.

Please go to the supplementary material for detailed proof.

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

Although the coordinate descent algorithm has been proven to converge [25], [31], the feasibility of the L-stationary point of our proposed IHT algorithm with Armijo line search is more stringent, which brings great challenges to the proof. Next, we present our main result of whole sequence convergence.

Theorem 2. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following properties hold

- (i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2 = 0$.
- (ii) Any cluster point of a sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 is an L-stationary point of Problem (4).

Proof. (i) Since (16) holds from Remark 1, it has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\delta} [f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\delta} f(\mathbf{x}^0). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ with } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (19)$$

(ii) Since $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ is bounded and $\tau_k \in [\gamma \alpha^{\bar{t}}, \gamma]$, the cluster points exist. There exist \tilde{x} and $\tilde{\tau} \in [\gamma \alpha^{\bar{t}}, \gamma]$, as well as k_j , such that the subsequences $\{x^{k_j}\}$ and $\{\tau_{k_j}\}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{x}^{k_j} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } \tau_{k_j} \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}. \quad (20)$$

Now, it will be proved that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is an L-stationary point of Problem (4), which means

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})). \quad (21)$$

In the following, we will consider two cases.

Case 1. Suppose that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{S}$. In view of Theorem 5.4 in [31], a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}$ is an L-stationary point of Problem (4) if and only if \mathbf{x} is a feasible point and

$$l\mathbf{x}_i - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i) \geq -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_j) \quad (22)$$

for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ is the complementary set of \mathcal{I} . So we only need to show that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies (22).

First, according to the algorithm update formula, it has

$$\mathbf{x}^{k_j+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k_j})). \quad (23)$$

Since $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]^n$ is a type-1 symmetric set, the following inequality holds by Lemma 3.1 in [31] (describing properties related to projections onto type-1 symmetric sets). For any $p, q \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, may as well $p \in \mathcal{I}, q \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x_p^{k_j+1} - x_q^{k_j+1})[(x_p^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p^{k_j})) - (x_q^{k_j} - \\ \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_q^{k_j}))] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Invoking the statement (i), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_p^{k_j+1} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_p^{k_j} = \tilde{x}_p, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_q^{k_j+1} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_q^{k_j} = \tilde{x}_q. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Taking the limit of (24) and combining $\tilde{x}_p > \tilde{x}_q$ and $\tilde{x}_q = 0$, it is seen that

$$\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p) \geq -\tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})_q. \quad (26)$$

Next, we show that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a feasible point. The feasible point conditions under $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{S}$ is

$$\frac{\partial f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\partial x_p} \begin{cases} = 0, & \text{if } 0 < x_p < 1, \\ \geq 0, & \text{if } x_p = 0, \\ \leq 0, & \text{if } x_p = 1, \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

where $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then the issue is to prove that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies (27). Based on $\mathbf{x}^{k_j+1} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}^{k_j})$, for any super support set \mathcal{S} of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}}^{k_j+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}}^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}}^{k_j})). \quad (28)$$

On the one hand, if $\tilde{x}_p \in (0, 1)$, $p \in \mathcal{I}$, there exists an integer j large enough such that j such that $x_p^{k_j+1} \in (0, 1)$. From the definition of $\Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}$, it holds

$$x_p^{k_j+1} = x_p^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p^{k_j}). \quad (29)$$

Taking the limit of (29), together with $x_p^{k_j+1} \rightarrow \tilde{x}_p$, $x_p^{k_j} \rightarrow \tilde{x}_p$, and $\tau_k \in [\gamma \alpha^{\bar{t}}, \gamma]$, it obtains

$$\nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p) = 0, p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \tilde{x}_p \in (0, 1). \quad (30)$$

On the other hand, if $\tilde{x}_p = 1$, $p \in \mathcal{I}$, consider the following two situations.

- If there exists a sufficiently large index k_j such that $x_p^{k_j+1} = x_p^{k_j+2} = \dots = 1$, it can be inferred that

$$x_p^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p^{k_j}) \geq 1, \quad (31)$$

which is based on the update formula of $x_p^{k_j+1}$, i.e.,

$$x_p^{k_j+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(x_p^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p^{k_j})). \quad (32)$$

Taking the limit of (31) and invoking $x_p^{k_j} \rightarrow \tilde{x}_p = 1$, $\tau_k \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}$, and $\tau_k \in [\gamma\alpha^{\tilde{\tau}}, \gamma]$, the following result is obtained

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p) \leq 0, \quad p \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (33)$$

- If there exist infinitely indices k_{j_l} such that $x_p^{k_{j_l}+1} \in (0, 1)$, then (30) holds. If there exist infinitely indices $k_{j_{l'}}$ such that $x_p^{k_{j_{l'}}+1} = 1$, then (33) holds. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a feasible point in this case.

Case 2. Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{S}$. We only need to show that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a feasible point.

On the one hand, if $\tilde{x}_p \in (0, 1)$, then (33) holds. Thus, for any $\tilde{\tau} > 0$,

$$\tilde{x}_p = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p) = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p)). \quad (34)$$

If $\tilde{x}_p = 1$, then (33) holds, it is easy to see that

$$P_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau}_p \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p)) = 1 \quad (35)$$

by the definition of $P_{\mathcal{B}_s}$. Moreover, it has

$$\tilde{x}_p = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p)). \quad (36)$$

On the other hand, if $\tilde{x}_p = 0$, consider the following two situations.

- If there exists a sufficiently large index k_j such that $x_p^{k_j+1} = x_p^{k_j+2} = \dots = 0$, it concludes that

$$x_p^{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p^{k_j}) \leq 0 \quad (37)$$

according to the update formula of $x_p^{k_j+1}$. Taking the limit of (37) with $x_p^{k_j} \rightarrow \tilde{x}_p = 0$, $\tau_k \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}$, and $\tau_k \in [\gamma\alpha^{\tilde{\tau}}, \gamma]$, it has

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_p) \geq 0, p \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (38)$$

which derives that

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p)) = 0, \quad (39)$$

and thus

$$\tilde{x}_p = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{x}_p - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p)). \quad (40)$$

- Similar to the above Case 1, it is not hard to obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{S}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_s}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \tilde{\tau} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{S}})) \quad (41)$$

with the implication that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a feasible point in the case of $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Thanks to Theorem 4.1 of [32], we know if $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ is a bounded gradient descent sequence for $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $f(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the KL property, then the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ converges to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Moreover, the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ is semi-algebraic and the ℓ_0 -norm is a semi-algebraic set as described in [33], thus the function satisfies the KL property. Therefore, it is concluded that the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ converges to the L-stationary point and the proof is completed. \square

TABLE I
THE COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS, WHERE (I) AND (II) DENOTE THE
TURNPIKE AND BELTWAY PROBLEMS, RESPECTIVELY.

	Our (I)		ℓ_1 PGD (I)		Our (II)		ℓ_1 PGD (II)	
ξ	Co.P	T(s)	Co.P	T(s)	Co.P	T(s)	Co.P	T(s)
$s = 10 \quad n = 1e3$								
0	10	0.832	10	1.659	10	0.786	10	1.742
1e-5	10	0.860	10	1.703	10	0.747	10	1.031
3e-5	10	0.892	10	2.246	10	0.772	10	1.050
5e-5	10	0.703	10	1.546	10	1.257	10	0.891
7e-5	10	0.918	10	1.856	10	0.906	10	1.049
$s = 20 \quad n = 2e3$								
0	20	1.326	20	7.338	20	4.820	20	12.888
1e-5	20	1.320	20	7.171	20	4.196	20	12.641
3e-5	20	1.818	20	6.923	20	4.856	20	12.697
5e-5	20	1.806	20	7.535	20	4.149	20	11.987
7e-5	20	1.795	20	7.123	20	5.309	20	14.848
$s = 30 \quad n = 4e3$								
0	30	14.201	30	27.166	30	19.908	30	46.656
1e-5	30	14.751	30	24.810	30	24.722	30	45.473
3e-5	30	15.443	30	25.679	30	29.961	30	45.703
5e-5	30	15.568	30	25.205	30	18.047	30	47.123
7e-5	30	15.804	30	25.838	30	20.085	30	45.691

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

This section compares with the benchmark ℓ_1 PGD [14] in the recovery experiments of the turnpike and beltway problems. We first uniformly sample $s = 10, 20, 30$ points from the interval $[0, 1]$, and add Gaussian noise $\omega \sim N(0, \xi^2)$ to their distances. Then adjust the variation of its standard deviation in $\xi \in \{0, 1e-5, 3e-5, 5e-5, 7e-5\}$. The probability of each distance is calculated based on its relative frequency within the set of ℓ_0 -norm instead of the normal distribution distance. Finally, the point positions are obtained by clustering. If the distance between the estimated position and the actual position is less than half of the known minimum distance, the recovery is considered successful.

Table I lists the computational results, where Co.P represents the average number of points recovered correctly and T(s) represents the average running time in seconds. It can be seen that both methods can correctly recover the positions, but there is a significant difference in terms of the running time. Compared with ℓ_1 PGD, our proposed method saves half the time on average for $s = 10, 30$, and two-thirds of the time on average for $s = 20$, which convinces that ℓ_0 -norm is very effective in solving uDGP with the same accuracy.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a novel ℓ_0 -norm based model to solve the problem of low efficiency of uDGP. Although the model is nonconvex, we developed a fast IHT algorithm and provided a step-size selection strategy. With the help of the KL property, we rigorously proved the convergence. Thus, a fast and convergent algorithm was obtained. Numerical studies demonstrated its advantages, and in some cases even improved the efficiency by more than 2 times. In the future, we are interested in developing second-order optimization algorithms.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Liberti, C. Lavor, N. Maculan, and A. Mucherino, "Euclidean distance geometry and applications," *SIAM Review*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 3–69, 2014.
- [2] S. J. Billinge, P. M. Duxbury, D. S. Gonçalves, C. Lavor, and A. Mucherino, "Assigned and unassigned distance geometry: Applications to biological molecules and nanostructures," *4OR*, vol. 14, pp. 337–376, 2016.
- [3] G. Abud, J. Alencar, C. Lavor, L. Liberti, and A. Mucherino, "An impossible combinatorial counting method in distance geometry," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 354, pp. 83–93, 2024.
- [4] P. Juhás, D. Cherba, P. Duxbury, W. Punch, and S. Billinge, "Ab initio determination of solid-state nanostructure," *Nature*, vol. 440, no. 7084, pp. 655–658, 2006.
- [5] H. Mohimani, W.-T. Liu, Y.-L. Yang, S. P. Gaudêncio, W. Fenical, P. C. Dorrestein, and P. A. Pevzner, "Multiplex de novo sequencing of peptide antibiotics," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 18, no. 11, p. 1371, 2011.
- [6] L. Fontoura, R. Martinelli, M. Poggi, and T. Vidal, "The minimum distance superset problem: Formulations and algorithms," *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 72, pp. 27–53, 2018.
- [7] J. Cao, Z. Yang, and X. Chen, "Compressed line spectral estimation using covariance: A sparse reconstruction perspective," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 31, pp. 2540–2544, 2024.
- [8] P. M. Duxbury, L. Granlund, S. Gujarathi, P. Juhas, and S. J. Billinge, "The unassigned distance geometry problem," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 204, pp. 117–132, 2016.
- [9] P. Duxbury, C. Lavor, L. Liberti, and L. L. de Salles-Neto, "Unassigned distance geometry and molecular conformation problems," *Journal of Global Optimization*, pp. 1–10, 2022.
- [10] M. Cieliebak and S. Eidenbenz, "Measurement errors make the partial digest problem NP-hard," in *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*. Springer, 2004, pp. 379–390.
- [11] S. S. Skiena and G. Sundaram, "A partial digest approach to restriction site mapping," *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, vol. 56, pp. 275–294, 1994.
- [12] T. Dakic, *On the turnpike problem*. Simon Fraser University BC, Canada, 2000.
- [13] P. Lemke, S. S. Skiena, and W. D. Smith, "Reconstructing sets from interpoint distances," in *Discrete and Computational Geometry: The Goodman-Pollack Festschrift*. Springer, 2003, pp. 597–631.
- [14] S. Huang and I. Dokmanić, "Reconstructing point sets from distance distributions," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 1811–1827, 2021.
- [15] C. Elder, M. Hoang, M. Ferdosi, and C. Kingsford, "Approximate and exact optimization algorithms for the beltway and turnpike problems with duplicated, missing, partially labeled, and uncertain measurements," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 908–926, 2024.
- [16] T. Bendory, D. Edidin, and O. Mickelin, "The beltway problem over orthogonal groups," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 74, p. 101723, 2025.
- [17] J. Chen, M. K. Ng, and Z. Liu, "Solving quadratic systems with full-rank matrices using sparse or generative priors," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 73, pp. 477–492, 2025.
- [18] Y. Mao, "Reconstruction of binary functions and shapes from incomplete frequency information," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3642–3653, 2012.
- [19] J.-H. Ahn, "Compressive sensing and recovery for binary images," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 4796–4802, 2016.
- [20] S. M. Fosson and M. Abuabiah, "Recovery of binary sparse signals from compressed linear measurements via polynomial optimization," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1070–1074, 2019.
- [21] A. Flinth and S. Keiper, "Recovery of binary sparse signals with biased measurement matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 8084–8094, 2019.
- [22] P. M. Bartmeyer and C. Lyra, "A new quadratic relaxation for binary variables applied to the distance geometry problem," *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 2197–2201, 2020.
- [23] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies, "Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 265–274, 2009.
- [24] T. Blumensath, "Compressed sensing with nonlinear observations and related nonlinear optimization problems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 3466–3474, 2013.
- [25] A. Beck and Y. C. Eldar, "Sparsity constrained nonlinear optimization: Optimality conditions and algorithms," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1480–1509, 2013.
- [26] L. Pan, S. Zhou, N. Xiu, and H.-D. Qi, "A convergent iterative hard thresholding for nonnegative sparsity optimization," *Pacific Journal of Optimization*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 325–353, 2017.
- [27] J. Fan, L. Wang, and A. Yan, "An inexact projected gradient method for sparsity-constrained quadratic measurements regression," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 36, no. 02, pp. 1–21, 2019.
- [28] Y. Wang, Z. He, G. Zhang, and J. Wen, "Improved sufficient conditions based on RIC of order 2s for IHT and HTP algorithms," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 30, pp. 668–672, 2023.
- [29] C. Li, Z. Ma, D. Sun, G. Zhang, and J. Wen, "Stochastic IHT with stochastic Polyak step-size for sparse signal recovery," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 31, pp. 2035–2039, 2024.
- [30] A. M. Tillmann, D. Bienstock, A. Lodi, and A. Schwartz, "Cardinality minimization, constraints, and regularization: A survey," *SIAM Review*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 403–477, 2024.
- [31] A. Beck and N. Hallak, "On the minimization over sparse symmetric sets: Projections, optimality conditions, and algorithms," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 196–223, 2016.
- [32] J. Bolte, S. Sabach, M. Teboulle, and Y. Vaisbourd, "First order methods beyond convexity and Lipschitz gradient continuity with applications to quadratic inverse problems," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 2131–2151, 2018.
- [33] J. Bolte, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle, "Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 146, no. 1, pp. 459–494, 2014.