

L9 -- Hierarchical Clustering
[Jeff Phillips - Utah - Data Mining]

What is clustering?

one of the most ambiguous topics ever!

- I'll ambiguously define it.
- Then I'll formally define it.
- Then I'll tell you why you maybe should *not* formally define it!

Let P be a data set. (perhaps in R^d , but maybe not)
let $d : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a metric distance on P

A cluster S is a subset of P .
Typically we find a set $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$ subset P
s.t. S_i disjoint S_j and $\bigcup_i S_i = P$

goal:

- all for all points p_i, p_j in S
 $d(p_i, p_j)$ is small
"width"
- all (most) points p_i in S_i, p_j in S_j and $i \neq j$
 $d(p_i, p_j)$ is large
"split"

Want "split"/"width" large.

Draw points in plane.
Illustrate possible clusters.
Illustrate split/width.

Hierarchical/Agglomerative Clustering!

If two points are close --> put them in the same cluster.
Repeat.

Init: All points are 1 point clusters.
WHILE (2 clusters are "close enough")
 Find two "closest" clusters: S_i, S_j
 Merge clusters.

2 parts remain to be specified: "close" and "close enough"

What is "close"?

- distance between "centers" of clusters
 - "center" = mean, center-point (median), center of MEB,
some representative = min distance to other points "Non-Euclidean"
- distance between closest points
- distance between furthest points
- average distance between all pairs of points in different clusters
- lowest radius of MEB between joined cluster
- smallest average distance between point and center

** there are often ties **

What is "close enough"?

- diameter, radius of MEB, average from center beneath threshold?
fixes scale (good/bad?)
- density beneath threshold.
"density" = # points/volume, # points/radius^d
- joined density jumps too quickly since last time "elbow"
- when we have k clusters

Hierarchy --> Phylogenic Tree

Efficiency: (specific: closest to centroid, never stop)

$O(n^3)$

- $O(n)$ rounds
- $\times O(n^2)$ each round, check all pairs to find closest
- $+ O(n)$ to recompute centroid

can reduce to $O(n^2 \log n)$: maintain priority queue of $O(n^2)$ distance

- updates affect $O(n)$ distances, each takes $O(\log n)$ time
- $O(n)$ rounds | updates

k-center clustering

"Gonzalez Algorithm 85"

"HAC" one form of greedy. Different form of greedy.

--> be greedy, but be smart and greedy :)

k-center clustering:

Find k points $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$, s.t.

- each $p \in P$ assigned $\mu(p) = \arg \min_{\{c \in C\}} d(p, c)$
- minimize $\max_{\{p \in P\}} d(p, \mu(p))$

(like k-means minimize $\sum_{\{p \in P\}} d(p, \mu(p))^2$)

(k-median minimize $\sum_{\{p \in P\}} d(p, \mu(p))$)

k-center cluster optimally is NP-Hard.

better than 2-approx --> also NP-Hard !!!

Choose first c_1 arbitrarily

$C_1 = \{c_1\}$ (generally $C_i = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_i\}$ \ \ goal C_k)

Let $c_{i+1} = \arg \max_{\{p \in P \setminus C_i\}} d(p, \mu(p))$

"always pick point furthest from set of centers C_i "

2-approx to optimal algorithm (worst case). Often much better.

$O(k^2 n)$ $O(k)$ rounds $\times O(kn)$ per round

$O(kn)$: maintain $\mu(p)$

$O(k)$ rounds

- maintain $\mu(P)$
- on new c_i , spend $O(n)$ to check each point if closer,
update $t_j = \max_{\{p \in P \setminus C_i\}} d(p, \mu(p))$ s.t. $\mu(p) = c_j$
for each $c_j \in C_i$
- update $t = \max_j t_j$

*** Works for any metric.

*** Biases centers to "edge" of data set.

- heuristic to recenter: after run, find "clusteroid" of $\mu^{-1}(c_j)$ as new c_j