# Efficient Centroid-Linkage Clustering

MohammadHossein Bateni Google Research New York, USA

> Kishen N Gowda University of Maryland College Park, USA

Laxman Dhulipala University of Maryland College Park, USA

D Ellis Hershkowitz Brown University Providence, USA

Jakub Łącki Google Research New York, USA

Willem Fletcher Brown University Providence, USA

Rajesh Jayaram Google Research New York, USA

### Abstract

We give an efficient algorithm for Centroid-Linkage Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering (HAC), which computes a c-approximate clustering in roughly  $n^{1+O(1/\tilde{c}^2)}$  time. We obtain our result by combining a new Centroid-Linkage HAC algorithm with a novel fully dynamic data structure for nearest neighbor search which works under adaptive updates.

We also evaluate our algorithm empirically. By leveraging a state-of-the-art nearest-neighbor search library, we obtain a fast and accurate Centroid-Linkage HAC algorithm. Compared to an existing state-of-the-art exact baseline, our implementation maintains the clustering quality while delivering up to a  $36\times$  speedup due to performing fewer distance comparisons.

## <span id="page-0-0"></span>1 Introduction

Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering (HAC) is a widely-used clustering method, which is available in many standard data science libraries such as SciPy [\[35\]](#page-21-0), scikit-learn [\[30\]](#page-21-1), fastcluster [\[25\]](#page-20-0), Julia [\[17\]](#page-20-1), R [\[31\]](#page-21-2), MATLAB [\[24\]](#page-20-2), Mathematica [\[21\]](#page-20-3) and many more [\[27,](#page-20-4) [28,](#page-20-5) [32\]](#page-21-3). HAC takes as input a collection of n points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Initially, it puts each point in a separate cluster, and then proceeds in up to  $n-1$  steps. In each step, it merges the two "closest" clusters by replacing them with their union.

The formal notion of closeness is given by a *linkage function*; choosing different linkage functions gives different variants of HAC. In this paper, we study *Centroid-Linkage HAC* wherein the distance between two clusters is simply the distance between their centroids. This method is available in most of the aforementioned libraries. Other common choices include *single-linkage* (the distance between two clusters is the minimum distance between a point in one cluster and a point in the other cluster) or average-linkage (the distance between two clusters is the average pairwise distance between them).

HAC's applicability has been hindered by its limited scalability. Specifically, running HAC with any popular linkage function requires essentially quadratic time under standard complexity-theory assumptions. This is because (using most linkage functions) the first step of HAC is equivalent to finding the closest pair among the input points. In high-dimensional Euclidean spaces, this problem

was shown to (conditionally) require  $\Omega(n^{2-\alpha})$  time for any constant  $\alpha > 0$  [\[20\]](#page-20-6). In contrast, solving HAC in essentially  $\Theta(n^2)$  time is easy for many popular linkage functions (including centroid, single, average, complete, Ward), as it suffices to store all-pairs distances between the clusters in a priority queue and update them after merging each pair of clusters.

In this paper, we show how to bypass this hardness for Centroid-Linkage HAC by allowing for approximation. Namely, we give a subquadratic time algorithm which, instead of requiring that the two closest clusters be merged in each step, allows for any two clusters to be merged if their distance is within a factor of  $c \geq 1$  of that of the two closest clusters.

Contribution 1: Meta-Algorithm for Centroid-Linkage. Our first contribution is a simple meta-algorithm for approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC. The algorithm assumes access to a dynamic data structure for approximate nearest-neighbor search (ANNS). A dynamic ANNS data structure maintains a collection of points  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  subject to insertions and deletions and given any query point  $u \in S$  returns an approximate nearest neighbor  $v \in S$ . Formally, for a c-approximate NNS data structure, v satisfies  $D(u, v) \leq c \cdot \min_{x \in S \setminus \{u\}} D(u, x)$ .<sup>[1](#page-1-0)</sup> Here,  $D(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the Euclidean distance. By using different ANNS data structures we can obtain different Centroid-Linkage HAC algorithms (which is why we call our method a meta-algorithm). We make use of an ANNS data structure where the set of points  $S$  is the centroids of the current HAC clusters. Roughly, our algorithm runs in time  $O(n)$  times the time it takes an ANNS data structure to update or query.

While finding distances is the core part of running HAC, we note that access to an ANNS data structure for the centroids does not immediately solve HAC. Specifically, an ANNS data structure can efficiently find an (approximate) nearest neighbor of a single point, but running HAC requires us to find an (approximately) closest pair among all clusters. Furthermore, HAC must use the data structure in a dynamic setting, and so an update to the set of points  $S$  (caused by two clusters merging) may result in many points changing their nearest neighbors.

Our meta-algorithm requires that the dynamic ANNS data structure works under adaptive updates.<sup>[2](#page-1-1)</sup> Namely, it has to be capable of handling updates, which are dependent on the prior answers that it returned (as opposed to an ANNS data structure which only handles "oblivious" updates).

To illustrate this, consider a randomized ANNS data structure  $D$ . Clearly, a query to  $D$  often has multiple correct answers, as  $\mathcal D$  can return any near neighbor within the promised approximation bound. As a result, an answer to a query issued to  $\mathcal D$  is dependent on the internal randomness of D. Let us assume that D is used within a centroid-linkage HAC algorithm  $\mathcal A$  and upon some query returns a result u. Then, algorithm  $\mathcal A$  uses u to decide which two clusters to merge, and the centroid p of the newly constructed cluster is inserted into  $D$ . Since p depends on u, which in turn is a function of the internal randomness of  $\mathcal{D}$ , we have that the point that is inserted into  $\mathcal D$ is dependent on the internal randomness of the data structure. Hence, it is not sufficient for  $A$  to return a correct answer for each *fixed* query with high probability (meaning at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ ). Instead, A must be able to handle queries and updates dependent on its internal randomness. We note that a similar issue is prevalent in many cases when a randomized data structure is used as a building block of an algorithm. As a result, the subtle notion of adaptive updates is a major area of study [\[6,](#page-19-0) [18,](#page-20-7) [19,](#page-20-8) [29,](#page-21-4) [36\]](#page-21-5).

<span id="page-1-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We note that the notion of ANNS that we use is, in fact, slightly more general than this.

<span id="page-1-1"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Other papers sometimes refer to this property as working against an *adaptive adversary*.

Contribution 2: Dynamic ANNS Robust to Adaptive Updates. Our second contribution is a dynamic ANNS data structure for high-dimensional Euclidean spaces which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first one to work under adaptive updates.

To obtain our ANNS data structure, we show a black-box reduction from an arbitrary randomized dynamic ANNS data structure to one that works against adaptive updates (see Theorem [2\)](#page-5-0). The reduction increases the query and update times by only a  $O(\log n)$  factor. We apply this reduction to a (previously known) dynamic ANNS data structure which is based on locality-sensitive hashing [\[2,](#page-19-1)[16\]](#page-20-9) and requires non-adaptive updates.

By combining our dynamic ANNS data structure for adaptive updates with our meta-algorithm, we obtain an  $O(c)$ -approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC algorithm which runs in time roughly  $n^{1+1/c^2}$ .

Furthermore, our data structure for dynamic ANNS will likely have applications beyond our HAC algorithm. Specifically, ANNS is commonly used as a subroutine to speed up algorithms for geometric problems. Oftentimes, and similarly to HAC, formal correctness of these algorithms require an ANNS data structure that works for adaptive updates but prior work often overlooks this issue. Our new data structure can be used to fix the analysis of such works. For instance, an earlier work on subquadratic HAC algorithms for average- and Ward-linkage [\[1\]](#page-19-2) overlooked this issue and our new data structure fixes the analysis of this work.[3](#page-2-0) Similarly, a key bottleneck in the dynamic k-centers algorithm in [\[5\]](#page-19-3) was that it had to run nearest neighbor search over the entire dataset (instead of just the k-centers). By replacing the ANNS data structure used therein with our ANNS algorithm, we believe that that the  $n^{\epsilon}$  running times from that paper could be improved to  $k^{\epsilon}$ .

Contribution 3: Empirical Evaluation of Centroid-Linkage HAC. Finally, we use our Centroid-Linkage meta algorithm to obtain an efficient HAC implementation. We use a state-ofthe-art static library for ANNS that we extend to support efficient dynamic updates when merging centroids.

We empirically evaluate our algorithm and find that our approximate algorithm achieves strong fidelity with respect to the exact centroid algorithm, obtaining ARI and NMI scores that are within  $7\%$  of that of the exact algorithm, while achieving up to  $36\times$  speedup over the exact implementation, even when both implementations are run sequentially.

We note that the ANNS we use in the empirical evaluation of our meta-algorithm is different from our new dynamic ANNS (Contribution 2). This is because modern practical methods for ANNS (e.g., based on graph-based indices [\[15,](#page-20-10) [34\]](#page-21-6)) have far surpassed the efficiency of data structures for which rigorous theoretical bounds are known. Closing this gap is a major open problem.

#### 1.1 Related Work

Improving the efficiency of HAC has been an actively researched problem for over 40 years [\[7,](#page-19-4) [26,](#page-20-11) [27,](#page-20-4) [28\]](#page-20-5). A major challenge common to multiple linkage functions has been to improve the running time beyond  $\Theta(n^2)$ , which is the time it takes to compute all-pairs distances between the input points. For the case of low-dimensional Euclidean spaces, a running time of  $o(n^2)$  is possible for the case of squared Euclidean distance and Ward linkage, since the ANNS problem becomes much easier in this case [\[38\]](#page-21-7). However, breaking the  $\Theta(n^2)$  barrier is (conditionally) impossible in the case of high-dimensional Euclidean spaces (without an exponential dependence on the dimension) [\[20\]](#page-20-6).

To bypass this hardness result, a recent line of work focused on obtaining approximate HAC algorithms [\[22\]](#page-20-12). Most importantly, Abboud, Cohen-Addad and Houdrouge [\[1\]](#page-19-2) showed an approximate

<span id="page-2-0"></span> $3\text{We contacted the authors of } [1]$  $3\text{We contacted the authors of } [1]$  and they confirmed this gap in their analysis.

HAC algorithm which runs in subquadratic time for Ward and average linkage. These algorithms rely on the fact in the case of these linkage functions the minimum distance between two clusters can only increase as the algorithm progresses, which is not the case for centroid linkage; e.g. consider 3 equi-distant points as in Figure [1.](#page-3-0) We also note that, as mentioned earlier, our dynamic ANNS

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

(a) First merge. (b) Result of merge. (c) Second merge. (d) Result of merge. Figure 1: 3 points in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  initially all at distance 1 showing Centroid-Linkage HAC merge distances can **Figure 1:** 3 points in  $\mathbb{K}$ - initially all at distance 1 showing Centroid-Linkage HAC merge distances can decrease. [1a](#page-3-0) / [1b](#page-3-0) and [1c](#page-3-0) / [1d](#page-3-0) give the the first and second merges with distances 1 and  $\sqrt{3}/2 < 1$  respective

data structure fixes a gap in the analysis of both algorithms in the paper. In fact, not only can the minimum distances shrink when performing Centroid-Linkage HAC, but when doing  $O(1)$ approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC distances can get arbitrarily small; see Figure [2.](#page-3-1) This presents an additional issue for dynamic ANNS data structures which typically assume lower bounds on minimum distances.

Compared to the algorithm of Abboud, Cohen-Addad and Houdrouge, our centroid-linkage HAC algorithm introduces two new ideas. First, we show how to handle the case when the minimum distance between two clusters decreases as a result of two cluster merging. Second, we introduce an optimization that allows us not to consider each cluster at each of the (logarithmically many) distance scales. This optimization improves the running time bound by a logarithmic factor when each merge "makes stale" a small number of stored pairs and in practice the number of such stale merges occur only 60% of the time (on average) compared to the number of actual merges performed.

Another line of work considered a different variant of HAC, where the input is a weighted similarity graph [\[4,](#page-19-5) [11,](#page-19-6) [12,](#page-19-7) [14\]](#page-20-13). The edge weights specify similarities between input points, and a lack of edge corresponds to a similarity value of 0. By assuming that the graph is sparse, this representation allows bypassing the hardness of finding distances, which leads to near-linear-time approximate algorithms for average-linkage HAC [\[11\]](#page-19-6), as well as to efficient parallel algorithms  $(4,12)$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review our conventions and preliminaries. Throughout this paper, we will work in d-dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We will use  $D(\cdot, \cdot)$  for the Euclidean metric in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; that is, for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the distance between x and y is  $D(x, y) := \sqrt{\sum_i (x[i] - y[i])^2}$  where  $x[i]$  and  $y[i]$ are the *i*th coordinates of x and y respectively. Likewise, we let  $D(x, Y) := \min_{y \in Y} D(x, y)$  for  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . section, we review our conv conventions and preliminaries ari

<span id="page-3-1"></span>

(a) First merge. (b) Result of merge. (c) Second merge. (d) Result of merge. Figure 2: 3 points in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (two of which are initially at distance 1) showing that  $O(1)$ -approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC can arbitrarily reduce merge distances.  $2a / 2b$  $2a / 2b$  $2a / 2b$  and  $2c / 2d$  $2c / 2d$  $2c / 2d$  give the the first and second merges with distances 1 and  $\epsilon \ll 1$  respectively; centroids are dashed circles.

### 2.1 Formal Description of Centroid-Linkage HAC

We begin by formally defining Centroid-Linkage HAC in a cluster-centric way. For a set of points  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define  $cent(X)$  to be the centroid of X as below.

**Definition 1** (Centroid). Given a set of points  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the centroid of X is the point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  whose ith coordinate is

$$
x[i] = \sum_{y \in X} \frac{y[i]}{|X|}.
$$

Centroid HAC uses distance between centroids as a linkage function. That is, for clusters X and Y we have the linkage function  $\mathcal L$  defined as

$$
\mathcal{L}(X, Y) = D(\text{cent}(X), \text{cent}(Y)).
$$

c-approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC is defined as follows. We are given input points  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . First, initialize a set of active clusters  $\mathcal{C} = \{\{p\}\}_{p\in P}$ . Then, until  $|\mathcal{C}| = 1$  we do the following: let  $\hat{X}, \hat{Y} \in \mathcal{C}$  $\mathcal C$  be a pair of active clusters satisfying

$$
\mathcal{L}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) \le c \cdot \min_{X, Y \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}(X, Y)
$$

where the min is taken over distinct pairs; merge  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{Y}$  by removing them from C and adding  $\ddot{X} \cup \ddot{Y}$  to C. (Non-approximate) Centroid-Linkage HAC is just the above with  $c = 1$ .

While the above is a cluster-centric way of describing centroid-linkage HAC, it will be more useful to use an equivalent centroid-centric definition. Specifically, we can equivalently define c-approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC as repeatedly "merging centroids". Initialize the set of all centroids  $C = P$ and a weight  $w_u = 1$  for each  $u \in C$ ; these weights will encode the cluster sizes of each centroid. Then, until  $|C| = 1$  we do the following: let  $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in C$  be a pair of centroids satisfying

$$
D(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \le c \cdot \min_{x, y \in C} D(x, y)
$$

where the min is taken over distinct pairs; merge  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{y}$  into their weighted midpoints by removing them from C, adding  $z = w_x \hat{x} + w_y \hat{y}$  to C and setting  $w_z = w_{\hat{x}} + w_{\hat{y}}$ .

### 2.2 Dynamic Nearest-Neighbor Search

We define a dynamic ANNS data structure. Typically, dynamic ANNS requires a lower bound on distances; we cannot guarantee this for centroid HAC. Thus, we make use of  $\beta$  additive error below.

**Definition 2** (Dynamic Approximate Nearest-Neighbor Search (ANNS)). An  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate dynamic nearest-neighbor search data structure N maintains a dynamically updated set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ (initially  $S = \emptyset$ ) and supports the following operations.

- 1. **Insert**, N.INSERT(u). given  $u \notin S$  update  $S \leftarrow S \cup \{u\}$ .
- 2. Delete, N.DELETE $(u)$ : given  $u \in S$  update  $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{u\}$ ;
- <span id="page-4-0"></span>3. Query, N.QUERY $(u, \bar{u})$ : given  $u, \bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  return  $v \in S \setminus {\bar{u}}$  s.t.

$$
D(u, v) \leq \alpha \cdot D(u, S \setminus {\overline{u}}) + \beta.
$$

If N is a dynamic  $(\alpha, 0)$ -approximate NNS data structure then we will simply call it  $\alpha$ -approximate. For a set of points S, we will use the notation NONADAPTIVEANN(S) to denote the result of starting with an empty dynamic ANNS data structure and inserting each point in S (in an arbitrary order).

We say N succeeds for a set of points  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and a query point u if after starting with an empty set and any sequence of insertions and deletions of points in S we have that the query  $\mathcal{N}.\text{QUERY}(u,\bar{u})$ is correct for any  $\bar{u}$  (i.e., the returned point satisfies the stated condition in [3\)](#page-4-0). If the data structure is randomized then we say that it succeeds for adaptive updates if with high probability (over the randomness of the data structure) it succeeds for all possible subsets of points and queries. Queries have true distances at most  $\Delta$  if the (true) distance from S to any query is always at most  $\Delta$ .

The starting point for our dynamic ANNS data structure is the following data structure requiring non-adaptive updates which alone does not suffice for centroid HAC as earlier described. See Appendix [A](#page-22-0) for a proof.

<span id="page-5-1"></span>**Theorem 1** (Dynamic ANNS for Oblivious Updates, [\[2,](#page-19-1)[16\]](#page-20-9)). Suppose we are given  $\gamma > 1$  and  $c, \beta, \Delta$ and n where  $\log(\Delta/\beta), \gamma \leq \text{poly}(n)$  and a dynamically updated set S with at most n insertions. Then, if all queries have true distance at most  $\Delta$ , we can compute a randomized  $(O(c), \beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure with update, deletion and query times of  $n^{1/c^2+o(1)} \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot d \cdot \gamma$ , which for a fixed set of points and query point succeeds except with probability at most  $\exp(-\gamma)$ .

# <span id="page-5-3"></span>3 Dynamic ANNS with Adaptive Updates

The main theorem we show in this section is how to construct a dynamic ANNS data structure that succeeds for adaptive updates using one which succeeds for oblivious updates.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>Theorem 2 (Reduction of Dynamic ANNS from Oblivious to Adaptive). Suppose we are given c,  $\beta$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $n$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and dynamically updated set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with at most n insertions, such that all inserted points and query points lie in  $B_s(\Delta)$ . Moreover, assume that we can compute a dynamic  $(c, \beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure with query, deletion and insertion times  $T_Q$ ,  $T_D$  and  $T_I$  which succeeds for S and a fixed query except with probability at most  $n^{-O(d \log d \log(\Delta/\beta))}$ .

Then, we can compute a randomized dynamic  $(c, c\beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure that succeeds for adaptive updates with query, deletion and amortized insertion times  $O(\log n) \cdot T_Q$ ,  $O(T_D)$ and  $O(\log n) \cdot T_I$ .

We note that our result is slightly stronger than the above: the insertions we make into the oblivious ANNS that we use only occur upon their instantiation, not dynamically.

As a corollary of the above reduction and known constructions for dynamic ANNS that work for oblivious updates—namely, Theorem [1](#page-5-1) with  $\gamma = \Theta(d \log d \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot \log n)$  and using parameter  $\beta' = \beta/c$  where  $\beta'$  is the additive distortion parameter for Theorem [1—](#page-5-1)we obtain the following.

<span id="page-5-2"></span>**Theorem 3** (Dynamic ANNS for Adaptive Updates). Suppose we are given c,  $\beta$ ,  $\Delta$ , n, s  $\in \mathbb{R}^d$ where  $\log(\Delta/\beta)$ ,  $d, c \leq \text{poly}(n)$  and dynamically updated set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with at most n insertions, such that all inserted and query points lie in  $B_s(\Delta)$ .

Then, we can compute a randomized dynamic  $(O(c), \beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure that succeeds for adaptive updates with query, deletion and amortized insertion time  $n^{1/c^2+o(1)} \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot d^2$ .

A previous work [\[16\]](#page-20-9) also provided algorithms that work against an "adaptive updates" but only a set of adaptive updates made against a fixed set of query points. Also, note that if we have a lower bound of  $\delta$  on the true distance of any query then lowering c by a constant and setting  $\beta = \Theta(\delta)$  for a suitably small hidden constant gives an  $O(c)$ -approximate NNS with similar guarantees.

### 3.1 Algorithm Description

Our algorithm for dynamic ANNS for adaptive updates uses two ingredients. First, we make use of the following "covering nets" to fix our queries to a small set against which we can union bound.

<span id="page-6-0"></span>**Lemma 1.** Given  $s \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\beta, \Delta > 0$ , there exists a covering net  $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

- 1. Small Size:  $|Q| \leq (\Delta/\beta)^{O(d \log d)}$
- 2. Queries: given  $u \in B_s(\Delta)$ , one can compute  $u' \in Q$  in time  $O(d)$  such that  $D(u, u') \leq \beta$ .

*Proof.* The basic idea is simply to take an evenly spaced hypergrid centered at s of radius  $\Delta$ . More formally, we let

$$
Q:=\left\{s+\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\cdot y: y\in\mathbb{Z}^d\cap\left(\left[-\Delta\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta},\Delta\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta}\right]\right)^d\right\}
$$

where above  $\left( \left[ -\Delta \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon} \right] \right)$  $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon}, \Delta$ √ d  $\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta}\right)^d$  is the *d*-way Cartesian product. That is, *y* is a *d*-dimensional vector whose coordinates are integers between  $-\Delta$ √ d  $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta}$  and  $\Delta$ √ d  $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta}$ . Thus, Q consists of all points which offset each coordinate of s by a multiple of  $\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}}$  up to total offset distance  $\Delta$  in each coordinate.

The number of points in  $Q$  is trivially the number of offsets  $y$  which is, in turn,

$$
\left(2\frac{\Delta\cdot\sqrt{d}}{\beta}\right)^d = \left(\frac{\Delta}{\beta}\right)^{O(d\log d)}
$$

as desired.

Next we analyze how to query. Given a point  $u$ , we let

$$
u_i' := s_i + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\beta} (u_i - s_i) \right\rfloor
$$

be  $u_i$  rounded down to the nearest multiple of  $\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}}$  after offsetting by  $s_i$ . Observe that  $u' =$  $(u'_1, u'_2, \dots u'_d) \in Q$  by our assumption that  $u \in B_s(\Delta)$  and that, furthermore, u' can be computed from  $u$  in time  $O(d)$ . Lastly, observe that

$$
|u_i - u'_i| \le \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}}
$$

and so we have that the distance between  $u$  and  $u'$  is

$$
D(u, u') = \sqrt{\sum_{i} (u_i - u'_i)^2} \le \sqrt{\sum_{i} \left(\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^2} = \beta. \quad \Box
$$

Second, we make use of a "merge-and-reduce" approach. A similar approach was taken by [\[9\]](#page-19-8) for exact k-nearest-neighbor queries in the plane. Namely, for each  $i \in [O(\log n)]$  we maintain a set  $S_i$ of size at most  $2^i$  (where all  $S_i$  partition all inserted points) and a dynamic ANNS data structure  $\mathcal{N}_i$  for  $S_i$  which only works for oblivious updates. Other than the size constraint, the partition is arbitrary. Informally, we perform deletions, insertions and queries as follows.

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

Figure 3: Our merge-and-reduce strategy when a point (in green) is inserted.

**Deletion:** To delete a point we simply delete it from its corresponding  $\mathcal{N}_i$ .

**Insertion:** To insert a point, we insert it into  $S_0$  and for each i we move all points from  $S_i$  to  $S_{i+1}$ if  $S_i$  contains more than  $2^i$  points; we update  $\mathcal{N}_i$  accordingly each time we move points; namely, we recompute  $\mathcal{N}_i$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{i+1}$  from scratch on  $S_i$  and  $S_{i+1}$  respectively. See Figure [3.](#page-7-0)

Query: Lastly, to query a point u we first map this point to a point in our covering net  $u'$  (as specified by Lemma [1\)](#page-6-0), query u' in each of our  $\mathcal{N}_i$  and then return the best output (i.e., the point output by an  $\mathcal{N}_i$  that is closest to  $u'$ ).

Our algorithm is more formally described in pseudo-code in Algorithm [1.](#page-7-1)

<span id="page-7-1"></span>Algorithm 1 Dynamic ANNS for Adaptive Updates

<span id="page-7-4"></span>**Input:**  $\beta$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $n$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $Q \leftarrow \text{CovERINGNET}(s, \Delta, \beta)$  (computed using Lemma [1\)](#page-6-0) **Maintains:**  $S_0, S_1, \ldots$  – partition of the inserted points, s.t.  $|S_i| \leq 2^i$ **Maintains:**  $\mathcal{N}_0, \mathcal{N}_1, \ldots$  – a non-adaptive ANNS for each  $S_i$ function  $INSERT(u)$  $S_0 \leftarrow S_0 \cup \{u\}$ while  $\exists i$  such that  $|S_i| > 2^i$  do  $S_{i+1} \leftarrow S_{i+1} \cup S_i$  and  $S_i \leftarrow \emptyset$  $\mathcal{N}_{i+1} \leftarrow \text{NonADAPTIVEANN}(S_{i+1})$  and  $\mathcal{N}_i \leftarrow \text{NonADAPTIVEANN}(\emptyset)$ function DELETE $(u)$ Let i be such that  $u \in S_i$  $\mathcal{N}_i$ .DELETE $(u)$  and remove u from  $S_i$ function  $\text{QUERY}(u, \bar{u})$ Let  $u' \in Q$  be such that  $D(u, u')$  $\triangleright$  computed using Lemma [1](#page-6-0) Let  $v_i = \mathcal{N}_i$ . QUERY $(u', \bar{u})$ return  $v = \arg \min_{v_i} D(u', v_i)$ 

### <span id="page-7-3"></span>3.2 Algorithm Analysis

We now analyze our dynamic ANNS data structure (as described in Algorithm [1\)](#page-7-1). The two nontrivial aspects of analyzing our algorithm are its correctness (i.e., the fact that it is  $(c, \beta)$ -approximate) and its amortized insertion time. We begin with its correctness.

<span id="page-7-2"></span>**Lemma 2.** Algorithm [1](#page-7-1) is a  $(c, c\beta)$ -approximate nearest-neighbor search data structure with high probability for adaptive updates.

*Proof.* Consider a query on  $(u, \bar{u})$  with corresponding  $u' \in Q$  in our covering net (i.e., the u' returned by Lemma [1](#page-6-0) when input u). We refer to the state of our data structure at the beginning of its for loop (i.e., upon receiving a new update or query) as at the beginning of an iteration.

First, observe that a simple argument by induction on our insertions and deletions shows that the point set for which  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is a data structure at the beginning of an iteration is  $S_i$  and that, furthermore, if S is the set of points which have been inserted but not deleted at a given point in time then  $\{S_i\}_i$ partitions S. Thus, we have

$$
\min_i D(u', S_i \setminus \bar{u}) = D(u', S \setminus \bar{u}).
$$

Furthermore, by the guarantees of Lemma [1](#page-6-0) and the fact that all points of  $S$  and all query points are always contained in  $B_s(\Delta)$ , we know that

<span id="page-8-1"></span><span id="page-8-0"></span>
$$
D(u, u') \le O(\beta). \tag{1}
$$

It follows that

$$
D(u', S \setminus \bar{u}) \le D(u, S \setminus \bar{u}) + O(\beta)
$$

and so

$$
\min_{i} D(u', S_i \setminus \bar{u}) \le D(u, S \setminus \bar{u}) + O(\beta). \tag{2}
$$

Furthermore, notice that since the randomness of  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is chosen after we fix  $S_i$ , we have by assumption that for a fixed  $u' \in Q$  that  $\mathcal{N}_i$  succeeds for a query on  $(u', \bar{u})$  with points  $S_i$  except with probability at most

<span id="page-8-2"></span>
$$
n^{-\Omega(d\log d\cdot \log(\Delta/\beta))}.
$$

On the other hand, by Lemma [1](#page-6-0) we know that  $|Q| \leq \left(\frac{\Delta}{\beta}\right)$  $\frac{\Delta}{\beta}$ )<sup>O(d log d)</sup> so taking a union bound over all points in Q we have that with high probability  $\mathcal{N}_i$  succeeds for  $S_i$  and every query point in Q except with probability at most  $1/\text{poly}(n)$ . Union bounding over our  $O(n)$ -many  $\mathcal{N}_i$  that we ever instantiate, we get that every  $\mathcal{N}_i$  succeeds for its corresponding  $S_i$  and every query point of Q except with probability at most  $1/poly(n)$ . In other words, with high probability we always have

$$
D(u', v_i) \le c \cdot D(u', S_i \setminus \bar{u}) + O(\beta). \tag{3}
$$

Thus, combining the triangle inequality, Equations [1,](#page-8-0) [2](#page-8-1) and [3,](#page-8-2) we have that with high probability whenever we query point  $u$ , the returned point  $v$  satisfies

$$
D(u, v) = \min_{i} D(u, v_i)
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq D(u, u') + \min_{i} D(u', v_i)
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq O(\beta) + \min_{i} D(u', v_i)
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq O(\beta) + c \cdot \min_{i} \cdot D(u', S_i \setminus \bar{u})
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq c \cdot D(u, S \setminus \bar{u}) + O(c \cdot \beta)
$$

Choosing our hidden constant appropriately, we get that with high probability our data structure is indeed  $(c, c\beta)$ -approximate.  $\Box$  We next prove its amortized insertion time.

<span id="page-9-0"></span>**Lemma 3.** Algorithm [1](#page-7-1) has amortized insertion time  $O(\log n) \cdot T_I$  where  $T_I$  is the insertion time of the input oblivious dynamic ANNS data structure.

*Proof.* Let  $n_{\text{INSERT}} \leq n$  be the total number of insertions up to some point in time. Each time we instantiate an  $\mathcal{N}_{i+1}$  on an  $S_{i+1}$ , it consists of at most  $2^{i+2}$ -many points and so by assumption takes us time

$$
T_I\cdot 2^{(i+2)}
$$

time to instantiate. On the other hand, the total number of times we can instantiate  $\mathcal{N}_{i+1}$  is at most  $n_{\text{INSERT}}/2^i$  (since each time we instantiate it we add a new set of at least  $2^i$  points to  $S_{i+1}$  and points only move from  $S_j$ s to  $S_{j+1}$ s). It follows that the total time to instantiate  $\mathcal{N}_{i+1}$  is at most

$$
T_I \cdot 2^{(i+2)} \cdot \frac{n_{\text{INSERT}}}{2^i} = O(T_I \cdot n_{\text{INSERT}}).
$$

Applying, the fact that  $i \leq \log n$ , we get that the total time for all insertions is

$$
O(\log n) \cdot T_I \cdot n_{\text{INSERT}}.
$$

Dividing by our  $n_{\text{INSERT}}$ -many insertions, we get an amortized insertion time of  $O(\log n) \cdot T_I$ , as desired.  $\Box$ 

We conclude this section with our proof of Theorem [2.](#page-5-0)

**Theorem 2** (Reduction of Dynamic ANNS from Oblivious to Adaptive). Suppose we are given c,  $\beta$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $n$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and dynamically updated set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with at most n insertions, such that all inserted points and query points lie in  $B_s(\Delta)$ . Moreover, assume that we can compute a dynamic  $(c, \beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure with query, deletion and insertion times  $T_Q$ ,  $T_D$  and  $T_I$  which succeeds for S and a fixed query except with probability at most  $n^{-O(d \log d \log(\Delta/\beta))}$ .

Then, we can compute a randomized dynamic  $(c, c\beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure that succeeds for adaptive updates with query, deletion and amortized insertion times  $O(\log n) \cdot T_Q$ ,  $O(T_D)$ and  $O(\log n) \cdot T_I$ .

Proof. We use Algorithm [1.](#page-7-1) Correctness follows from Lemma [2](#page-7-2) and the amortized insertion time follows from Lemma [3.](#page-9-0) The deletion time is immediate from the fact that we can compute the  $i$ such that  $u \in S_i$  in constant time. Lastly, we analyze our query time. By Lemma [1,](#page-6-0) computing each u' takes time  $O(d) \leq T_Q$  (since reading the query takes time  $\Omega(d)$ ). Likewise, by assumption, computing  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{QUERY}}$ <sup>QUERY</sup> $(u', \bar{u})$  takes time  $T_Q$  for each *i*, giving our desired bounds.  $\Box$ 

# 4 Centroid-Linkage HAC Algorithm

In this section, we give our algorithm for Centroid-Linkage HAC. Specifically, we show how to (with Algorithm [3\)](#page-11-0) reduce approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC to roughly linearly-many dynamic ANNS function calls, provided the ANNS works for adaptive updates.

<span id="page-9-1"></span>Theorem 4 (Reduction of Centroid HAC to Dynamic ANN for Adaptive Updates). Suppose we are given a set of n points  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $c > 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and lower and upper bounds on the minimum and maximum pairwise distance in P of  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$  respectively. Suppose we are also given a data structure that is a dynamic c-approximate NNS data structure for all queries in Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) that works for adaptive updates with insertion, deletion and query times of  $T_I$ ,  $T_D$ , and  $T_Q$ .

Then there exists an algorithm for  $c(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC on n points that runs in time  $\tilde{O}(n \cdot (T_I + T_D + T_Q))$  assuming  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \le \text{poly}(n)$  and  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \le \text{polylog}(n)$ .

Our final algorithm for centroid HAC is not quite immediate from the above reduction and our dynamic ANNS algorithm for adaptive updates. Specifically, the above reduction requires a c-approximate NNS data structure but in the preceding section we have only provided a  $(c, \beta)$ approximate NNS data structure for  $\beta > 0$ . However, by leveraging the structure of centroid HAC—in particular, the fact that there is only ever at most one "very close" pair—we are able to show that this suffices. In particular, for a given c, there exists a  $c_0$  and  $\beta_0$  such that a  $(c_0, \beta_0)$ approximate NNS data structure functions as a c-approximate NNS data structure for all queries in Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0) This is formalized by Lemma [6.](#page-13-0) Combining Lemma [6,](#page-13-0) Theorem [4](#page-9-1) and Theorem [3,](#page-5-2) we get the following.

**Theorem 5** (Centroid HAC Algorithm). For n points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a randomized algorithm that given any  $c > 1.01$  and lower and upper bounds on the minimum and maximum pairwise distance in P of  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$  respectively, computes a c-approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC with high probability. It has runtime  $O(n^{1+O(1/c^2)}d^2)$  assuming  $c, d, \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \le \text{poly}(n)$ .

#### 4.1 Algorithm Description

In what remains of this section, we describe the algorithm for Theorem [4.](#page-9-1) Consider a set of points  $P \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Suppose we have a dynamic c-approximate NNS data structure N that works with adaptive updates with query time  $T_Q$ , insertion time  $T_I$ , and deletion time  $T_D$ . Let Q be a priority queue storing elements of the form  $(l, x, y)$  where x and y are "nearby" centroids and  $l = D(x, y)$ . The priority queue supports queuing elements and dequeueing the element with shortest distance, l. At any given time while running the algorithm, say a centroid  $x$  is queued if there is an element of the form  $(l, x, y)$  in Q. We will maintain a set, C, of active centroids allowing us to check if a centroid is active in constant time. For each active centroid, C will also store the weight of the centroid so we can preform merges and an identifier to distinguish between distinct clusters with the same centroid. Note that any time we store a centroid, including in Q, we will implicitly store this identifier.

First, we describe how the algorithm handles merges. To merge two active centroids,  $x$  and y, we remove them from C and delete them in N. Let  $z = w_x x + w_y y$  be the centroid formed by merging x and y. We use N to find an approximate nearest neighbor,  $y^*$ , of z and add to Q the tuple  $(D(z, y^*), z, y^*)$ . Lastly, we add z to N and C. Pseudo-code for this algorithm is given by Algorithm [2.](#page-7-3) Crucially, we do not try to update any nearest neighbors of any other centroid at this stage. We will do this work later and only if necessary. Since we are using an approximate NNS, it is possible that the centroid z will be the same point in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as the centroid of another cluster. We can detect this in constant time using  $C$  and we will immediately merge the identical centroids.

We now describe the full algorithm using the above merge algorithm; we also give pseudo-code in Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0) Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be a parameter that tells the algorithm how aggressively to merge centroids. To begin, we construct N by inserting all points of P in any order. Then for each  $p \in P$ , we use N to find an approximate nearest neighbor  $y \in P \setminus \{p\}$  and queue  $(D(p, y), p, y)$  to Q. We also initialize  $C = \{p : p \in P\}$ . The rest of the algorithm is a while loop that runs until Q is empty. Each iteration of the while loop begins by dequeuing from Q the tuple  $(l, x, y)$  with minimum l.

Algorithm 2 Handle-Merge

1: **Input:** set of active centroids C, ANNS data structure N, priority queue Q, centroids x and y 2:  $z \leftarrow w_x x + w_y y$   $\triangleright$  Merge x and y 3: Remove x and y from C and  $\mathcal N$ 4: if there is a centroid  $z^*$  that is the same as z is in C then 5:  $z \leftarrow w_z z + w z^* z$ ∗  $\triangleright$  Merge z and  $z^*$ 6: Remove  $z^*$  from C and add  $z$ 7: else 8: Add z to  $\mathcal N$  and  $C$ 9:  $y^* \leftarrow$  An approximate nearest neighbor of z returned by  $\mathcal{N}.\text{QUERY}(z, z)$ 10: Queue  $(D(z, y^*), z, y^*)$  to Q

- (1) If x and y are both active centroids then we merge them.
- (2) Else if x is not active then we do nothing and move on to the next iteration of the while loop.
- (3) Else if x is active but y is not, we use N to compute a new approximate nearest neighbor,  $y^*$ of x. Let  $l^* = D(x, y^*)$ . If  $l^* \leq (1 + \epsilon)l$ , then we merge x and y<sup>\*</sup>. Otherwise we add  $(l^*, x, y^*)$ to Q.

Algorithm 3 Approximate-HAC

1: **Input:** set of points P, metric D, fully dynamic ANNS N data structure,  $\epsilon > 0$ 

- 2: **Output:**  $(1 + \epsilon)c$ -approximate centroid HAC
- 3: Initialize Q and  $C = \{ \{p\} : p \in P \}$  and insert all points of P into N
- 4: for  $p \in P$  do
- 5:  $y \leftarrow$  An approximate nearest neighbor of p returned by  $\mathcal{N}.\text{QUERY}(p, p)$
- 6: Queue  $(D(p, y), p, y)$  to Q

```
7: while Q is not empty do
```

```
8: (l, x, y) \leftarrow dequeue shortest distance from Q
```
9: if  $x, y \in C$  then

```
10: Handle-Merge(C, \mathcal{N}, Q, x, y)
```

```
11: else if x \in C then
```

```
12:y^* \leftarrow An approximate nearest neighbor of x returned by \mathcal{N}.\text{QUERY}(x, x)
```

```
13:* \leftarrow D(x, y^*)
```

```
14: if l^* \leq (1+\epsilon)l then
```
<span id="page-11-0"></span>17: Queue  $(l^*, x, y^*)$  to  $Q$ 

```
15: Handle-Merge(C, \mathcal{N}, Q, x, y^*)16: else
```
# 4.2 Algorithm Analysis

We now prove that Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) gives a  $(c(1+\epsilon))$ -approximate HAC where c is the approximation value inherited from the approximate nearest neighbor data structure. Note that a smaller  $\epsilon$  will give a more accurate HAC but will increase the runtime of the algorithm.

<span id="page-11-1"></span>**Lemma 4.** Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) gives a  $c(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC.

Proof. The idea of the proof is to observe that one of the two endpoints of the closest pair will always store an approximate of the minimum distance in Q. In that spirit, suppose that right before a centroid is dequeued, the shortest distance between active centroids is  $l_{\text{OPT}}$ . Then there must exist active centroids  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  such that  $D(x_1, x_2) = l_{\text{OPT}}$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $x_1$ was queued before  $x_2$  and  $x_2$  was queued with distance  $l_2$ . Then, when  $x_2$  was queued,  $x_1$  was active so  $l_2 \leq c \cdot l_{\text{OPT}}$ .

Thus, when a centroid, x, is dequeued, its distance  $l_x$  obeys the inequality

$$
l_x \leq l_2 \leq c \cdot l_{\mathsf{OPT}}.
$$

Then, if x is merged during the while loop, it is merged with a centroid of distance at most

$$
(1+\epsilon)l_x \le c(1+\epsilon)l_{\text{OPT}}
$$

as desired. If a centriod gets merged without being dequeued, that means it merged with another identical centroid which is consistent with 1-approximate HAC.  $\Box$ 

We now prove the runtime of the algorithm. Say that the maximum pairwise distance between points in P is  $\Delta$  and the minimum is  $\delta$ . We make the following observations about the geometry of the centriods throughout the runtime of Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0)

<span id="page-12-1"></span>**Observation 1.** Consider any point  $p \in P$ . Throughout the runtime of Algorithm [3,](#page-11-0) the distance from any centroid to p is at most  $\Delta$ .

*Proof.* Consider a cluster  $Q \subseteq P$ . Since for each  $q \in Q$  we have  $D(p,q) \leq \Delta$ , it follows that  $D(p, \text{cent}(Q)) \leq \Delta$ .  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-12-0"></span>**Observation 2.** When running Algorithm [3,](#page-11-0) at any point in time there can only ever be a single centroid queued with distance less than  $\delta$ .

*Proof.* Initially, every centroid is queued with distance at least  $\delta$ . Thus, if a centroid is ever queued with a smaller distance it will immediately be dequeued and merged.  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-12-2"></span>**Lemma 5.** Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) runs in time  $O(n \cdot T_I + n \cdot T_D + n \cdot T_Q \cdot \log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta}))$  $\frac{d\Delta}{d}$ ) + n log(n) log<sub>1+ $\epsilon$ </sub> ( $\frac{2\Delta}{d}$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta})$ ).

Proof. The idea of the proof is that each time we dequeue a centroid we either merge it or we increase the distance associated with it by a multiplicative factor of  $1 + \epsilon$  which can only happen  $\log_{1+\epsilon}(2\Delta/\delta)$  times for each of our  $O(n)$ -many centroids.

Each centroid is inserted into  $\mathcal N$  at most once, either during the initial construction or in Algorithm [2,](#page-7-3) and deleted at most once. Since there are  $2n-1$  centroids throughout the runtime, the total time spent on updates to N is  $O(n \cdot T_I + n \cdot T_D)$ .

At any given point during the algorithm, a centroid can be in  $Q$  at most once. Since only  $2n-1$ centroids are ever created, there are at most  $2n - 1$  elements in Q at any time. Thus, a single queue or dequeue operation takes  $O(\log(n))$  time. In the initial for loop we queue n elements to Q and make n queries to N taking time  $O(n \log(n) + n \cdot T_Q)$ . Each time algorithm [2](#page-7-3) gets called it queues one element to Q and makes up to 4 updates to C. Since Algorithm [2](#page-7-3) is called at most  $n-1$  times, the total time spent on merges, not including updates to  $\mathcal{N}$ , is  $O(n \cdot T_Q + n \log(n))$ .

Lastly, we consider how many times a centroid  $x$  can be dequeued on Line [8.](#page-7-4) Suppose  $x$  is queued with distance  $l_i$  the *i*th time it is queued. If  $l_1 < \delta$  then by Observation [2,](#page-12-0) x will be immediately dequeued and merged so x is only queued once. Thus, we assume  $l_1 \geq \delta$ . If x is dequeued with distance  $l_i$  then either x is merged and will not be queued again or it is queued again with distance

$$
l_{i+1} > (1+\epsilon)l_i > (1+\epsilon)^i l_1.
$$

Since  $l_1 \geq \delta$  by assumption and  $l_i \leq 2\Delta$  for all  $i \geq 1$  by Observation [1,](#page-12-1) it follows that x can only be queued, and therefore dequeued,  $\log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ ) times. Each time, not including merges, there can be one dequeue from Q, one queue to Q, and one query to  $\mathcal N$ . Since there are  $2n-1$  centroids created by the algorithm, the while loop (not including merges) runs in time  $O(n \log(n) \log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta}))$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ ) + n ·  $T_Q \cdot \log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta})$ ).  $\Box$ 

Combining the previous two lemmas together we get the following.

Theorem 4 (Reduction of Centroid HAC to Dynamic ANN for Adaptive Updates). Suppose we are given a set of n points  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $c > 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and lower and upper bounds on the minimum and maximum pairwise distance in P of  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$  respectively. Suppose we are also given a data structure that is a dynamic c-approximate NNS data structure for all queries in Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) that works for adaptive updates with insertion, deletion and query times of  $T_I$ ,  $T_D$ , and  $T_Q$ .

Then there exists an algorithm for  $c(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC on n points that runs in time  $\tilde{O}(n \cdot (T_I + T_D + T_Q))$  assuming  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \le \text{poly}(n)$  and  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \le \text{polylog}(n)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma [4](#page-11-1) and Lemma [5](#page-12-2) we get that Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) gives  $c(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate HAC in time  $O(n \cdot T_I + n \cdot T_D + n \cdot T_Q \cdot \log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{d\Delta}{d}$ ) + n log(n) log<sub>1+ $\epsilon$ </sub> ( $\frac{2\Delta}{d}$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ )). It is only left to show that  $\log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}) \leq$  $polylog(n)$ . Changing the base of the logarithm we get

$$
\log_{1+\epsilon}\left(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta}\right) = \frac{\log(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})}{\log(1+\epsilon)}.
$$

We have that  $\log(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial \delta}$   $\leq$  polylog(*n*) by the assumption that  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \leq$  poly(*n*). By the inequality  $\log(1+x) \geq \frac{x}{1+x}$  $\frac{x}{1+x}$  for all  $x > -1$  we get that if  $\epsilon \leq 1$ 

$$
\frac{1}{\log(1+\epsilon)} \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} = O\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big) \leq \mathsf{polylog}(n)
$$

where the final inequality comes from the assumption that  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \leq \text{polylog}(n)$ . If  $\epsilon > 1$  then

$$
\frac{1}{\log(1+\epsilon)} \leq \frac{1}{\log(2)} \leq \mathsf{polylog}(n).
$$

Combining the above inequalities and the above-stated runtime gives our final runtime.

We use Theorem [4](#page-9-1) with our results from Section [3](#page-5-3) to get our main result. First we prove the following lemma which says that our ANNS that includes an additive term functions as a purely multiplicative ANNS for our algorithm.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>**Lemma 6.** For any  $\lambda \in (1, c)$ , if N is a  $\left(\frac{c}{\lambda}\right)$  $\frac{c}{\lambda}, \frac{\delta(\lambda-1)}{(1+c)\lambda}$  $\frac{\delta(\lambda-1)}{(1+c)\lambda}$  -approximate NNS data structure that works for adaptive updates then  $N$  is a c-approximate NNS data structure for all queries in Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0)

 $\Box$ 

*Proof.* Let C be the set of active centroids at the time any given query takes place. We will say a point x is close to the set C if  $D(x, C) < \frac{\delta}{c}$  $\frac{\delta}{c}$ . We show that if x is not close to C, then  $\mathcal{N}^{\text{query}}(x, x) =$ y will give us the multiplicative result we desire:

$$
D(x, y) \leq \frac{c}{\lambda} D(x, C) + \frac{\delta(\lambda - 1)}{(1 + c)\lambda}
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq \frac{c}{\lambda} D(x, C) + \frac{\delta}{c} (\lambda - 1)
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq \frac{c}{\lambda} D(x, C) + D(x, C)(\lambda - 1)
$$
  
\n
$$
< \frac{c}{\lambda} D(x, C) + D(x, C) \frac{c(\lambda - 1)}{\lambda}
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq c \cdot D(x, C) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda - 1}{\lambda}\right)
$$
  
\n
$$
\leq c \cdot D(x, C).
$$
 (4)

We now prove the lemma by induction. The base case is the set of neighbors calculated for the initial set of points P. Each  $p \in P$  is not close to  $C \setminus p$  so by Eq. [\(4\)](#page-14-0),

<span id="page-14-0"></span>
$$
D(p, \mathcal{N}^{\text{query}}(p, p)) < c \cdot D(p, C \setminus p)
$$

as desired. Now for the induction step, consider some query for a centroid  $x$  that has just been dequeued. For  $x, y \in C$ , say y is a c-approximate nearest neighbor of x if  $D(x, y) \leq c \cdot D(x, C \setminus x)$ . Assume by induction that all queries up to this point have returned c-approximate nearest neighbors. We know by Observation [2](#page-12-0) and the inductive hypothesis that either no points are close to C or x is the lone point that is close to C. In the former case,  $\mathcal N$  returns a c-approximate nearest neighbor by Eq. [\(4\)](#page-14-0). Now consider the latter case. Let y be a centroid such that  $D(x, y) > c \cdot D(x, C \setminus x)$ . We will show that  $\mathcal{N}^{\text{query}}(x, x) \neq y$ .

Define  $L = D(x, y) + D(x, C \setminus x)$ . By the triangle inequality and because x is the only point that is close to C, we have  $L \geq \frac{\delta}{c}$  $\frac{\delta}{c}$ . Define  $p_y = D(x, y)/L$  and  $p_S = D(x, C \setminus x)/L$  to be the percentage of the distance L from  $D(x, y)$  and  $D(x, C \setminus x)$  respectively. It is enough for us to show that

$$
\frac{c}{\lambda}(p_S \cdot L) + \frac{\delta(\lambda - 1)}{(1 + c)\lambda} < p_y \cdot L
$$

for all  $L \geq \frac{\delta}{c}$  $\frac{\delta}{c}$ . Since this equation is linear in L, if it is true for any such L then it is true for  $L =$ δ  $\frac{\delta}{c}$ . Since  $p_y > c \cdot p_S$ , we have  $p_S < \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon}$  $\frac{1}{1+c}$  and  $p_y > \frac{c}{1+c}$  $\frac{c}{1+c}$ . Plugging in  $L = \frac{\delta}{c}$  we get

$$
\frac{c}{\lambda} \left( p_S \cdot L \right) + \frac{\delta(\lambda - 1)}{(1 + c)\lambda} < \frac{c}{\lambda} \left( \frac{1}{1 + c} \cdot \frac{\delta}{c} \right) + \frac{\delta(\lambda - 1)}{(1 + c)\lambda} \\
= \frac{\delta + \delta(\lambda - 1)}{(1 + c)\lambda} \\
= \frac{\delta}{(1 + c)} \\
\leq p_y \cdot \frac{\delta}{c} \\
= p_y \cdot L
$$

as desired.

**Theorem 5** (Centroid HAC Algorithm). For n points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a randomized algorithm that given any  $c > 1.01$  and lower and upper bounds on the minimum and maximum pairwise distance in P of  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$  respectively, computes a c-approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC with high probability. It has runtime  $O(n^{1+O(1/c^2)}d^2)$  assuming  $c, d, \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \le \text{poly}(n)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon = 0.001$  and define  $\hat{c} = \frac{c}{1+\epsilon} > 1.005$ . For any  $\lambda \in (1,\hat{c})$ , Theorem [3](#page-5-2) says we can construct a  $\left(\frac{\hat{c}}{\lambda}\right)$  $\frac{\delta(\lambda-1)}{(1+\hat{c})\lambda}$ -approximate nearest neighbor data structure,  $\mathcal{N}$ , with query, deletion, and  $\frac{\hat{c}}{\lambda}, \frac{\delta(\lambda-1)}{(1+\hat{c})\lambda}$ amortized insertion time  $n^{O(\lambda^2/\hat{c}^2)}\log\left(\frac{\Delta(1+\hat{c})\lambda}{\delta(\lambda-1)}\right)d^2$ . Note that we moved the big O in Theorem [3](#page-5-2) from the approximation guarantee to the runtime by scaling by some constant. By Lemma  $6, N$  $6, N$ is a  $\hat{c}$ -approximate ANNS data structure for all queries in Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0) By Theorem [4](#page-9-1) and our definition of  $\hat{c}$ , we get c-approximate centroid HAC by running Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) with N. The runtime is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1+O(\lambda^2/\hat{c}^2)}\log\left(\frac{\Delta(1+\hat{c})\lambda}{\delta(\lambda-1)}\right)d^2$ ). Letting  $\lambda=1.005$  and by the assumptions that  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}, c \leq \text{poly}(n)$ , all log terms are dominated by the big O in the exponent and we get the runtime  $O(n^{1+O(1/\hat{c}^2)})^2$  $O(n^{1+O(1/c^2)}d^2)$ .  $\Box$ 

In Algorithm [3,](#page-11-0) in the worst case we may have to queue a centroid  $\log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ ) times. However, in practice a centroid may only be queued a small number of times. Say a tuple  $(l, x, y)$  in our priority queue becomes stale if the centroid y is merged. Let  $\Gamma$  be the average number of tuples in our priority queue that become stale with each merge. Our experiments summarized in Table [4](#page-28-0) suggest that  $\Gamma$  is a small constant in practice with  $\Gamma < 1$  for all experiments. The following lemma shows that in this case we lose the  $\log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ ) in the runtime.

**Lemma 7.** If the average number of queued element made stale for each merge in Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) is Γ, then Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) runs in time  $O(n \cdot T_I + n \cdot T_D + n \cdot T_Q \cdot \Gamma + n \log(n) \cdot \Gamma)$ .

*Proof.* There are a total of  $n-1$  merges during the runtime of Algorithm [3](#page-11-0) so the total number of tuples that are made stale is  $(n-1)\Gamma$ . There are an additional  $n-1$  tuples that get merged. Thus, the total number of tuples that get dequeued throughout the runtime of the algorithm is  $O(\Gamma)$ . The rest of the proof is the same as that of Lemma [5](#page-12-2) except we pay the cost of de-queuing on Line [8](#page-7-4)  $O(n \cdot \Gamma)$  times instead of  $n \cdot \log_{1+\epsilon}(\frac{2\Delta}{\delta})$  $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$ ).  $\Box$ 

# 5 Empirical Evaluation

We empirically evaluate the performance and effectiveness of our approximate Centroid HAC algorithm through a comprehensive set of experiments. Our analysis on various publicly-available benchmark clustering datasets demonstrates that our approximate Centroid HAC algorithm:

- (1) Consistently produces clusters with quality comparable to that of exact Centroid HAC;
- (2) Achieves an average speed-up of  $22 \times$  with a max speed-up of  $175 \times$  compared to exact Centroid HAC when using 96 cores in our scaling study. On a single core, it achieves an average speed-up of  $5\times$  with a max speed-up of  $36\times$ .

Experimental Setup: We run our experiments on a 96-core Dell PowerEdge R940 (with two-way hyperthreading) machine with  $4\times2.4$ GHz Intel 24-core 8160 Xeon processors (with 33MB L3 cache) and 1.5TB of main memory. Our programs are implemented in  $C_{++}$  and compiled with the  $g_{++}$ compiler (version 11.4) with -O3 flag.

Dynamic ANNS Implementation using DiskANN As demonstrated in previous works, although LSH-based algorithms have strong theoretical guarantees, they tend to perform poorly in practice when compared to graph-based ANNS data structures [\[15\]](#page-20-10). For instance, in ParlayANN [\[15\]](#page-20-10), the authors find that the recall achievable by LSH-based methods on a standard ANNS benchmark dataset are strictly dominated by state-of-the-art graph-based ANNS data structures.

Therefore, for our experiments, we use DiskANN, a widely-used state-of-the-art graph-based ANNS data structure [\[34\]](#page-21-6). In particular, we consider the in-memory version of this algorithm from ParlayANN, called Vamana. In a nutshell, the algorithm builds a bounded degree *routing* graph that can be searched using beam search. Note that this graph is not the  $k$ -NN graph of the pointset. The graph is constructed using an incremental construction that adds bidirectional edges between a newly inserted point, and points traversed during a beam search for this point; if a point's degree exceeds the degree bound, the point is pruned to ensure a diverse set of neighbors. See [\[34\]](#page-21-6) for details.

For Centroid HAC, we require the ANNS implementation to support dynamic updates. The implementation provided by ParlayANN currently only supports fast static index building and queries. Recently, FreshDiskANN [\[33\]](#page-21-8) described a way to handle insertions and deletions via a lazy update approach. However, their approach requires a periodic *consolidation* step that scans through the graph and deletes inactive nodes and rebuilds the neighborhood of affected nodes, which is expensive.

Instead, in our implementation of Centroid HAC, we adopt the following new approach that is simple and practical, and adheres to the updates required by our theoretical algorithm: when clusters u and v merge, choose one of them to represent the centroid, and update its neighborhood  $N(u)$  (without loss of generality) to the set obtained by pruning the set  $N(u) \cup N(v)$ . The intuition here is that  $N(u) \cup N(v)$  is a good representative for the neighborhood of the centroid of u and  $v$  in the routing graph. Further, during search, points will redirect to their current representative centroid (via union-find [\[13\]](#page-19-9)), thus allowing us to avoid updating the in-neighbors of a point in the index. We believe application-driven update algorithms, such as the one described here, can help speed-up algorithms that uses dynamic ANNS as a subroutine.

Algorithms Implemented We implement the approximate Centroid HAC algorithm described in Algorithm [3,](#page-11-0) using the dynamic ANNS implementation based on DiskANN [\[15,](#page-20-10) [34\]](#page-21-6). We denote this algorithm as  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -Centroid HAC or Centroid<sub> $\epsilon$ </sub>. We emphasize that although we refer to this as  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -Centroid HAC, it is not necessarily a *true*  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate algorithm since we are using a heuristic ANNS data structure with no theoretical guarantees on the approximation factor. The use of  $(1 + \epsilon)$  here captures only the loss from merging a "near-optimal" pair of clusters, as detailed in Algorithm [3.](#page-11-0)

As our main baseline, we consider the optimized implementation of exact Centroid HAC from the fastcluster<sup>[4](#page-16-0)</sup> package. This implementation requires quadratic space since it maintains the distance matrix, and is a completely sequential algorithm. We also implement an efficient version of exact Centroid HAC based on our framework (i.e. setting  $\epsilon = 0$  and using exact NNS queries) which has the benefit of using only linear space and supports parallelism in NNS queries.

We also implement a *bucket-based* version of approximate Centroid HAC as a baseline, based on the approach of [\[1\]](#page-19-2). The algorithm of [\[1\]](#page-19-2) runs in rounds processing pairs of clusters whose distance is within the threshold defined by that round; the threshold value scales by a constant factor, resulting in logarithmic (in aspect ratio) number of rounds. In each round, they consider a pair of clusters

<span id="page-16-0"></span><sup>4</sup> <https://pypi.org/project/fastcluster/>

<span id="page-17-0"></span>**Table 1:** The ARI and NMI scores of our approximate Centroid HAC implementations for  $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.2, 0.4$ . and 0.8, versus Exact Centroid HAC. The best quality score for each dataset is in bold and underlined.

	Dataset	Centroid <sub>01</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.2</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.4</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.8</sub>	Exact Centroid
ARI	iris	0.759	0.746	0.638	0.594	0.759
	wine	0.352	0.352	0.402	0.366	0.352
	cancer	0.509	0.526	0.490	0.641	0.509
	digits	0.589	0.571	0.576	0.627	0.559
	faces	0.370	0.388	0.395	0.392	0.359
	mnist	0.270	0.222	0.218	0.191	0.192
	birds	0.449	0.449	0.442	0.456	0.441
	Avg	0.471	0.465	0.452	0.467	0.453
IMMI	iris	0.803	0.795	0.732	0.732	0.803
	wine	0.424	0.424	0.413	0.389	0.424
	cancer	0.425	0.471	0.459	0.528	0.425
	digits	0.718	0.726	0.707	0.754	0.727
	faces	0.539	0.534	0.549	0.549	0.556
	mnist	0.291	0.282	0.306	0.307	0.250
	birds	0.748	0.747	0.756	0.764	0.743
	Avg	0.564	0.569	0.560	0.575	0.561

that are within the threshold distance away, and merge them. For the linkage criteria considered in [\[1\]](#page-19-2), the distances between two clusters can only go up as a result of two clusters merging. However, this is not true for Centroid HAC, as discussed in Section [1.](#page-0-0)

Here, we observe that when two clusters merge in a round, the only distances affected are distances of other clusters to the new merged cluster. Thus, we can repeatedly check if the nearest neighbor of this cluster is still within the threshold and merge with it in that case. Thus, in a nutshell, the algorithm filters clusters whose nearest neighbors are within the current threshold in each round and merges clusters by the approach mentioned above. This algorithm requires many redundant NNS queries, as we will see during the experimental evaluation.

### 5.1 Quality Evaluation

We evaluate the clustering quality of our approximate centroid HAC algorithm against ground truth clusterings using standard metrics such as the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI), Normalized Mutual Information (NMI), Dendrogram Purity, and the unsupervised Dasgupta cost [\[8\]](#page-19-10). Our primary objective is to assess the performance of our algorithm across various values of  $\epsilon$  on a diverse set of benchmarks. We primarily compare our results with those obtained using exact Centroid HAC.

For these experiments, we consider the standard benchmark clustering datasets iris, digits, cancer, wine, and faces from the UCI repository (obtained from the sklearn.datasets package). We also consider the MNIST dataset which contains images of grayscale digits between 0 and 9, and birds, a dataset containing images of 525 species of birds; see Appendix [B](#page-24-0) for more details.

Results. The experimental results are presented in Table [1,](#page-17-0) with a more detailed quality evaluation in Appendix [B.1.](#page-24-1) We summarize our results here.

We observe that the quality of the clustering produced by approximate Centroid HAC is generally comparable to that of the exact Centroid HAC algorithm. On average, the quality is slightly better in some cases, but we attribute this to noise. In particular, we observe that for the value of  $\epsilon =$ 0.1, we consistently get comparable quality to that of exact centroid: the ARI and NMI scores are on average within a factor of 7% and 2% to that of exact Centroid HAC, respectively. We also obtained good dendrogram purity score and Dasgupta cost as well, with values within 0.3% and 0.03%, respectively.

<span id="page-18-0"></span>

Figure 4: Running times of fastcluster's centroid HAC, our implementation of exact centroid HAC, and the heap-based and bucket-based approximate centroid HAC with  $\epsilon = 0.1$ . In Figure [4a,](#page-18-0) our approximate and exact implementations are run on 1 core, whereas in Figure [4b](#page-18-0) they have access to 192 cores. Figure [4c](#page-18-0) compares the running times of heap and bucket based algorithms as a function of  $\epsilon$ .

### 5.2 Running Time Evaluation

Next, we evaluate the scalability of approximate Centroid HAC against exact Centroid HAC on large real-world pointsets. We consider the optimized exact Centroid HAC implementation from the fastcluster package [\[25\]](#page-20-0). We also implement an efficient version of exact Centroid HAC based on our framework (i.e. setting  $\epsilon = 0$  and using exact NNS queries) which has the benefit of using only linear space and supports parallelism in NNS queries. We also implement a bucket-based version of approximate Centroid HAC as a baseline, based on the approach of [\[1\]](#page-19-2) along with an observation to handle the non-monotonicity of Centroid HAC; details in Appendix [B.](#page-24-0)

Results. We now summarize the results of our scalability study; see Appendix [B.2](#page-26-0) for a more details and plots. Figures [4a](#page-18-0) and [4b](#page-18-0) shows the running times on varying slices of the SIFT-1M dataset using one thread and 192 parallel threads, respectively. For the approximate methods, we considered  $\epsilon = 0.1$ . Figure [4c](#page-18-0) further compares the heap and bucket based approaches as a function of  $\epsilon$ .

We observe that the bucket based approach is very slow for small values of  $\epsilon$  due to many redundant nearest-neighbor computations. Yet, at  $\epsilon = 0.1$ , both algorithms, with 192 threads, obtain speed-ups of up to  $175\times$  with an average speed-up of  $22\times$  compared to the exact counterparts. However, on a single thread, the bucket based approach fails to scale, while the heap based approach still achieves significant speed-ups of upto  $36\times$  with an average speed-up of  $5\times$ . Overall, our heapbased approximate Centroid HAC implementation with  $\epsilon = 0.1$  demonstrates good quality and scalability, making it a good choice in practice.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work we gave an approximate algorithm for Centroid-Linkage HAC which runs in subquadratic time. Our algorithm is obtained by way of a new ANNS data structure which works correctly under adaptive updates which may be of independent interest. On the empirical side we have demonstrated up to  $36\times$  speedup compared to the existing baselines. An interesting open question is whether approximate Centroid-Linkage HAC admits a theoretically and practically efficient parallel algorithm.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by NSF grant CNS-2317194. We thank Vincent Cohen-Addad for helpful discussions.

# References

- <span id="page-19-2"></span>[1] Amir Abboud, Vincent Cohen-Addad, and Hussein Houdrouge. Subquadratic high-dimensional hierarchical clustering. In Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019.
- <span id="page-19-1"></span>[2] Alexandr Andoni. Nearest neighbor search: the old, the new, and the impossible. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2009.
- <span id="page-19-11"></span>[3] Alexandr Andoni and Piotr Indyk. Near-optimal hashing algorithms for approximate nearest neighbor in high dimensions. Communications of the ACM, 51(1):117–122, 2008.
- <span id="page-19-5"></span>[4] MohammadHossein Bateni, Laxman Dhulipala, Kishen N Gowda, D Ellis Hershkowitz, Rajesh Jayaram, and Jakub Łącki. It's hard to hac with average linkage! In *International Colloquium* on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP), 2024.
- <span id="page-19-3"></span>[5] MohammadHossein Bateni, Hossein Esfandiari, Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, Rajesh Jayaram, Vahab Mirrokni, and Andreas Wiese. Optimal fully dynamic k-center clustering for adaptive and oblivious adversaries. In Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), pages 2677–2727. SIAM, 2023.
- <span id="page-19-0"></span>[6] Amos Beimel, Haim Kaplan, Yishay Mansour, Kobbi Nissim, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Uri Stemmer. Dynamic algorithms against an adaptive adversary: generic constructions and lower bounds. In Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, pages 1671–1684, 2022.
- <span id="page-19-4"></span>[7] J-P Benzécri. Construction d'une classification ascendante hiérarchique par la recherche en chaîne des voisins réciproques. Cahiers de l'analyse des données, 7(2):209–218, 1982.
- <span id="page-19-10"></span>[8] Sanjoy Dasgupta. A cost function for similarity-based hierarchical clustering. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), page 118–127, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. [doi:10.1145/2897518.2897527](https://doi.org/10.1145/2897518.2897527).
- <span id="page-19-8"></span>[9] Sarita de Berg and Frank Staals. Dynamic data structures for k-nearest neighbor queries. Computational Geometry, 111:101976, 2023.
- <span id="page-19-12"></span>[10] Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]. IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 29(6):141–142, 2012. [doi:10.1109/MSP.2012.](https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2012.2211477) [2211477](https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2012.2211477).
- <span id="page-19-6"></span>[11] Laxman Dhulipala, David Eisenstat, Jakub Łącki, Vahab Mirrokni, and Jessica Shi. Hierarchical agglomerative graph clustering in nearly-linear time. In International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), pages 2676–2686, 2021.
- <span id="page-19-7"></span>[12] Laxman Dhulipala, David Eisenstat, Jakub Łącki, Vahab Mirrokni, and Jessica Shi. Hierarchical agglomerative graph clustering in poly-logarithmic depth. Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 35:22925–22940, 2022.
- <span id="page-19-9"></span>[13] Laxman Dhulipala, Changwan Hong, and Julian Shun. Connectit: a framework for static and incremental parallel graph connectivity algorithms. Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, 14(4):653–667, 2020.
- <span id="page-20-13"></span>[14] Laxman Dhulipala, Jakub Łącki, Jason Lee, and Vahab Mirrokni. Terahac: Hierarchical agglomerative clustering of trillion-edge graphs. Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data, 1(3):1–27, 2023.
- <span id="page-20-10"></span>[15] Magdalen Dobson, Zheqi Shen, Guy E. Blelloch, Laxman Dhulipala, Yan Gu, Harsha Vardhan Simhadri, and Yihan Sun. Scaling graph-based ANNS algorithms to billion-size datasets: A comparative analysis.  $CoRR$ , abs/2305.04359, 2023. [arXiv:2305.04359](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04359), [doi:10.48550/arXiv.](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.04359) [2305.04359](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.04359).
- <span id="page-20-9"></span>[16] Sariel Har-Peled, Piotr Indyk, and Rajeev Motwani. Approximate nearest neighbor: Towards removing the curse of dimensionality. 2012.
- <span id="page-20-1"></span>[17] JuliaStats. Clustering.jl. URL: [https://juliastats.org/Clustering.jl/stable/hclust.](https://juliastats.org/Clustering.jl/stable/hclust.html) [html](https://juliastats.org/Clustering.jl/stable/hclust.html).
- <span id="page-20-7"></span>[18] Bruce M Kapron, Valerie King, and Ben Mountjoy. Dynamic graph connectivity in polylogarithmic worst case time. In Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms, pages 1131–1142. SIAM, 2013.
- <span id="page-20-8"></span>[19] Adam Karczmarz and Jakub Łącki. Reliable hubs for partially-dynamic all-pairs shortest paths in directed graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02266, 2019.
- <span id="page-20-6"></span>[20] CS Karthik and Pasin Manurangsi. On closest pair in euclidean metric: Monochromatic is as hard as bichromatic. *Combinatorica*,  $40(4):539-573$ , 2020.
- <span id="page-20-3"></span>[21] Wolfram: Computation Meets Knowledge. Hierarchical clustering. URL: [https://reference.](https://reference.wolfram.com/language/HierarchicalClustering/tutorial/HierarchicalClustering) [wolfram.com/language/HierarchicalClustering/tutorial/HierarchicalClustering](https://reference.wolfram.com/language/HierarchicalClustering/tutorial/HierarchicalClustering).
- <span id="page-20-12"></span>[22] Silvio Lattanzi, Thomas Lavastida, Kefu Lu, and Benjamin Moseley. A framework for parallelizing hierarchical clustering methods. In Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2019, Würzburg, Germany, September 16–20, 2019, Proceedings, Part I, pages 73–89. Springer, 2020.
- <span id="page-20-14"></span>[23] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. A convnet for the 2020s. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 11976–11986, June 2022.
- <span id="page-20-2"></span>[24] MathWorks. Agglomerative hierarchical cluster tree - matlab linkage. [https://www.mathworks.](https://www.mathworks.com/help/stats/linkage.html) [com/help/stats/linkage.html](https://www.mathworks.com/help/stats/linkage.html), 2024.
- <span id="page-20-0"></span>[25] Daniel Müllner. fastcluster: Fast hierarchical, agglomerative clustering routines for r and python. Journal of Statistical Software, 53:1–18, 2013.
- <span id="page-20-11"></span>[26] Fionn Murtagh. A survey of recent advances in hierarchical clustering algorithms. The computer journal, 26(4):354–359, 1983.
- <span id="page-20-4"></span>[27] Fionn Murtagh and Pedro Contreras. Algorithms for hierarchical clustering: an overview. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 2(1):86–97, 2012.
- <span id="page-20-5"></span>[28] Fionn Murtagh and Pedro Contreras. Algorithms for hierarchical clustering: an overview, ii. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 7(6):e1219, 2017.
- <span id="page-21-4"></span>[29] Danupon Nanongkai and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic spanning forest with worst-case update time: adaptive, las vegas, and o  $(n1/2-\varepsilon)$ -time. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM* SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, pages 1122–1129, 2017.
- <span id="page-21-1"></span>[30] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, et al. Scikitlearn: Machine learning in python. the Journal of machine Learning research, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- <span id="page-21-2"></span>[31] RDocumentation. hclust function - rdocumentation. URL: [https://www.rdocumentation.](https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/hclust) [org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/hclust](https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/hclust).
- <span id="page-21-3"></span>[32] JM Shearer and Michael A Wolfe. Alglib, a simple symbol-manipulation package. Communications of the ACM, 28(8):820–825, 1985.
- <span id="page-21-8"></span>[33] Aditi Singh, Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Harsha Vardhan Simhadri. Freshdiskann: A fast and accurate graph-based ann index for streaming similarity search, 2021. [arXiv:2105.09613](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.09613).
- <span id="page-21-6"></span>[34] Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Devvrit, Rohan Kadekodi, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Harsha Simhadri. Diskann: Fast accurate billion-point nearest neighbor search on a single node. In NeurIPS 2019, November 2019.
- <span id="page-21-0"></span>[35] Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, et al. Scipy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in python. Nature methods, 17(3):261–272, 2020.
- <span id="page-21-5"></span>[36] David Wajc. Rounding dynamic matchings against an adaptive adversary. In Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, pages 194–207, 2020.
- <span id="page-21-9"></span>[37] Shangdi Yu, Joshua Engels, Yihao Huang, and Julian Shun. Pecann: Parallel efficient clustering with graph-based approximate nearest neighbor search, 2023. [arXiv:2312.03940](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.03940).
- <span id="page-21-7"></span>[38] Shangdi Yu, Yiqiu Wang, Yan Gu, Laxman Dhulipala, and Julian Shun. Parchain: A framework for parallel hierarchical agglomerative clustering using nearest-neighbor chain.  $arXiv$  preprint arXiv:2106.04727, 2021.

## <span id="page-22-0"></span>A Proof of Theorem [1](#page-5-1)

In the interest of completion, we give a proof of Theorem [1](#page-5-1) (dynamic ANNS for oblivious updates).

#### A.1 Locality Sensitive Hashing

We will make use of the well-known algorithmic primitive of locality sensitive hashing.

**Definition 3** (Locality Sensitive Hashing). A family of hash functions H is called  $(r, cr, p_1, p_2)$ sensitive if for any  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we have

- 1. Close Points Probably Collide: If  $D(u, v) \leq r$  then  $Pr_{h \sim H}(h(u) = h(v)) \geq p_1$ .
- 2. Far Points Probably Don't Collide: If  $D(u, v) \geq cr$  then  $Pr_{h \sim H}(h(u) = h(v)) \leq p_2$ .

We will make use of known locality sensitive hashing schemes for Euclidean distance in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For this result, see also [\[3\]](#page-19-11).

<span id="page-22-1"></span>**Theorem 6** (Lemma 3.2.3 of [\[2\]](#page-19-1)). Given r and c, there is a  $(r, cr, p_1, p_2)$ -sensitive LSH family with

$$
\frac{\log(1/p_1)}{\log(1/p_2)} = 1/c^2 + o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \log(1/p_2) \le o(\log n).
$$

Furthermore, one can sample  $h \sim \mathcal{H}$  and given  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  compute  $h(u)$  in time  $dn^{o(1)}$ .

**Theorem 1** (Dynamic ANNS for Oblivious Updates, [\[2,](#page-19-1)[16\]](#page-20-9)). Suppose we are given  $\gamma > 1$  and  $c, \beta, \Delta$ and n where  $\log(\Delta/\beta), \gamma \leq \text{poly}(n)$  and a dynamically updated set S with at most n insertions. Then, if all queries have true distance at most  $\Delta$ , we can compute a randomized  $(O(c), \beta)$ -approximate NNS data structure with update, deletion and query times of  $n^{1/c^2+o(1)} \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot d \cdot \gamma$ , which for a fixed set of points and query point succeeds except with probability at most  $\exp(-\gamma)$ .

Proof. We first construct a data structure which succeeds with constant probability for a given query. To do so we begin by turning our LSH hashes from Theorem [6](#page-22-1) into a hash function which is an "L" ors of  $K$  ands". In particular, we let

$$
L := n^{1/c^2 + o(1)} \cdot \Theta(\log n).
$$

and let

$$
K := \frac{1}{\log(1/p_2)} \cdot \left( \Theta(\log n) + \log L + \log \log(\Delta/\beta) \right).
$$

Notice that by Theorem [6](#page-22-1) we have that  $\log(1/p_2) \leq o(\log n)$  and by assumption we have  $\log(\Delta/\beta)$ ,  $\gamma \leq$  $\mathsf{poly}(n)$  and so we have

<span id="page-22-2"></span>
$$
K \cdot L \le n^{1/c^2 + o(1)}\tag{5}
$$

For each *i* such that  $\beta \leq 2^i \leq \Delta$ , we define L-many new hash functions, each of which consists of K-many h from Theorem [6.](#page-22-1) In particular, for  $i \in [\log(\Delta/\beta)], l \in [L]$  and  $k \in [K]$ , we let  $h_{ikl}$  be a uniformly random h sampled according to Theorem [6](#page-22-1) using radius  $r = 2<sup>i</sup>$  and our input c. Likewise, we let  $g_{il} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$  be a new hash function defined on  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as

<span id="page-23-0"></span>
$$
g_{il}(u) = (h_{il1}(u), h_{il2}(u), \ldots, h_{ilk}(u)).
$$

We let  $G_i := \{g_{il} : l \leq L\}$  be all such hash functions for i and let  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_i G_i$  be all such hash functions across scales.

By Theorem [6,](#page-22-1) sampling each constituent hash functions for each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  can be done in time  $dn^{o(1)}$  and so by this and Equation [\(5\)](#page-22-2) initializing all hash functions in G takes time

$$
dn^{o(1)} \cdot L \cdot K \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) = n^{1/c^2 + o(1)} \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot d \tag{6}
$$

This initialization time will be dominated by the time it takes to insert a single point. For each such hash function we will maintain a collection of buckets which partitions points in S.

To insert a point into S, we simply compute its hash for each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and store this hash in each corresponding bucket. To delete a point from  $S$  we simply delete it from all buckets to which it hashes. Lastly, to answer a query on  $(u, \bar{u})$ , we hash u according to each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and then return the  $v \in S \setminus \bar{u}$  such that for minimum i we have a  $g \in G_i$  such that  $g(u) = g(v)$ . Since by Theorem [6](#page-22-1) evaluating each hash function takes time  $dn^{o(1)}$ , we get that all of these operations also take time at most that given by Equation [\(6\)](#page-23-0).

Lastly, we argue the (constant probability) correctness of a query for a fixed set of points. Fix query points  $(u, \bar{u})$  and a set of points S. Let  $w \in S \setminus \{u\}$  be a fixed point of  $S \setminus \{u\}$  where we let  $i_w$  be such that  $2^{i_w} \le D(u, w) \le 2^{i_w+1}$ . Say that w succeeds if

- 1. One Correct Collision: there is a  $g \in G_{i_w}$  such that  $g(w) = g(u)$  and
- 2. No Incorrect Collisions: for all  $i < i_w$  and  $g \in G_i$  we have that  $g(u) \neq g(w)$ .

Observe that if both of the cases happen for every  $w \in S \setminus \{u\}$  then we have that our query is correct. The only non-trivial part of this observation is the fact that if u is within distance  $\beta$  of  $S \setminus {\bar{u}}$  then  $i_w = 1$  and the returned point is within an additive  $\beta$  of u so long as one correct collision holds.

Continuing, we next lower bound the probability of one correct collision. For a fixed  $g_{iwl} \in G_{i_w}$ , we have that  $g(w) = g(u)$  iff  $h_{i_wlk}(w) = h_{i_wlk}(u)$  for all  $k \leq K$ . The probability of this for one  $k \leq$ K is, by definition,  $p_1$ . By Theorem [6](#page-22-1) we know that  $\frac{\log(1/p_1)}{\log(1/p_2)} = 1/c^2 + o(1)$  and so for a fixed l, we have that this occurs with probability at least

$$
p_1^K = \exp(-K \cdot \log(1/p_1))
$$
  
=  $\exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/p_1)}{\log(1/p_2)} \cdot (O(\log n) + \log L + \log \log(\Delta/\beta))\right)$   
=  $\exp(-(1/c^2 + o(1)) \cdot (O(\log n) + \log L + \log \log(\Delta/\beta)))$   
 $\ge \exp(-(1/c^2 + o(1)) \cdot O(\log n))$ 

It follows that the probability that this does not hold for some l is at most

$$
(1 - p_1^K)^L \le \exp(-L \cdot p_1^K)
$$
  
\n
$$
\le \exp(-L \cdot \exp[-(1/c^2 + o(1)) \cdot O(\log n)])
$$
  
\n
$$
= \exp(-\Omega(\log n) - \exp[((1/c^2) + o(1)) \cdot \Omega(\log n)] \cdot \exp[-(1/c^2 + o(1)) \cdot O(\log n)])
$$
  
\n
$$
= n^{-\Omega(1)}.
$$

<span id="page-24-2"></span>

Dataset	n	d	Clusters #
iris	150	4	3
wine	178	13	3
cancer	569	30	2
digits	1797	64	10
faces	400	4096	40
mnist	70000	784	10
birds	84635	1024	525
covertype	581012	54	
$sift-1M$	1000000	128	
	Table 2: Datasets		

Next, we lower bound the probability of no incorrect collisions. Fix an  $i < i_w$ . Observe that for a given  $h_{ilk}$  we have, by definition, that  $h_{ilk}(u) = h_{ilk}(w)$  with probability at most  $p_2$ . Thus, we have  $g_{il}(u) = g_{il}(w)$  with probability at most

$$
p_2^K = \exp(-\log(1/p_2)K) = \exp(-\Omega(\log n) - \log L - \log \log(\Delta/\beta)).
$$

Union bounding over our at most  $\log(\Delta/\beta)$ -many such i and L-many such l, we get that that we have no incorrect collisions except with probability at most

$$
p_2^K \cdot \log(\Delta/\beta) \cdot L = \exp(-\Omega(\log n)) = n^{-\Omega(1)}.
$$

Finally, union bounding over our n-many possible points in S and using the fact that  $\gamma \geq 1$  we have that we succeed except with probability at least a fixed constant bounded away from 0 for S and this query. Furthermore, by taking  $\gamma$ -many independent repetitions of this data structure and taking the returned point closest to our query, we increase our runtime by a multiplicative  $\gamma$  and reduce our failure probability to  $\exp(-\gamma)$ .  $\Box$ 

# <span id="page-24-0"></span>B Empirical Evaluation

Datasets The details of the various datasets used in our experiments are stated in Table [2.](#page-24-2) mnist  $[10]$  is a standard machine learning dataset that consists of  $28 \times 28$  dimensional grayscale images of digits between 0 and 9. Here, each digit corresponds to a cluster. The birds dataset contains  $224 \times 224 \times 3$  dimensional images of 525 species of birds. As done in previous works [\[37\]](#page-21-9), we pass each image through ConvNet [\[23\]](#page-20-14) to obtain an embedding. The ground truth clusters correspond to each of the 525 species of birds. The licenses of these datasets are as follows: iris (CC BY 4.0), wine  $(CC BY 4.0)$ , cancer  $(CC BY 4.0)$ , digits  $(CC BY 4.0)$ , faces  $(CC BY 4.0)$ , Covertype  $(CC$ BY 4.0), mnist (CC BY-SA 3.0 DEED), birds (CC0: Public Domain), and sift-1M (CC0: Public Domain).

### <span id="page-24-1"></span>B.1 Quality Evaluation

The output of a hierarchical clustering algorithm is typically a tree of clusters, called a *dendrogram*, that summarizes all the merges performed by the algorithm. The leaves correspond to the points in the dataset, and each internal node represents the cluster formed by taking all the leaves in its subtree. There is a cost associated to each internal node denoting the cost incurred when merging two clusters to form the cluster associated to that node. Given a threshold value, a clustering is obtained by cutting the dendrogram at certain internal nodes whose associated cost is greater than the threshold.

	Dataset	Centroid <sub>0.1</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.2</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.4</sub>	Centroid <sub>0.8</sub>	Exact Centroid	
ARI	iris	0.759	0.746	0.638	$\,0.594\,$	0.759	
	wine	0.352	0.352	0.402	0.366	0.352	
	cancer	0.509	0.526	0.490	0.641	0.509	
	digits	0.589	0.571	$0.576\,$	0.627	0.559	
	faces	0.370	0.388	0.395	$\,0.392\,$	0.359	
	mnist	0.270	0.222	0.218	$\rm 0.191$	0.192	
	birds	0.449	0.449	0.442	0.456	0.441	
	Avg	0.471	0.465	0.452	0.467	0.453	
	iris	0.803	0.795	0.732	0.732	0.803	
	wine	0.424	0.424	0.413	0.389	0.424	
	cancer	0.425	0.471	0.459	0.528	0.425	
INNI	digits	0.718	0.726	0.707	0.754	0.727	
	faces	$\,0.539\,$	0.534	0.549	0.549	0.556	
	mnist	0.291	0.282	0.306	0.307	0.250	
	birds	0.748	0.747	0.756	0.764	0.743	
	Avg	0.564	0.569	0.560	0.575	0.561	
	iris	0.869	0.862	0.808	0.809	0.871	
	wine	0.616	0.616	0.640	$0.601\,$	0.616	
	cancer	0.816	0.818	$0.805\,$	0.836	$0.816\,$	
Purity	digits	0.677	0.667	0.654	0.715	0.679	
	faces	0.460	0.477	0.478	0.488	0.467	
	mnist	0.310	0.286	0.283	0.278	0.308	
	birds	0.555	0.550	0.543	0.516	0.559	
	Avg	0.615	0.611	0.602	0.606	0.616	
	iris	506011.1	506101.2	510680.6	507149.4	505809.8	
	wine	7655.9	7655.9	7545.7	7564.2	7655.9	
Dasgupta	cancer	153644.7	153519.2	156220.4	156893.8	153843.2	
	digits	39292919.2	39315744.3	39299184.6	39215081.5	39289534.3	
	faces	1703728.2	1703696.7	1706886.4	1703361.3	1704833.1	
	mnist	$11193\times10^{9}$	$11195\times10^{9}$	$11194\times10^{9}$	$11185{\times}10^9$	$11195 \times 10^{9}$	
	birds	$5198\times10^{9}$	$5199\times10^{9}$	$5196\times10^{9}$	$5183{\times}10^9$	$5201\times10^{9}$	
	Avg	$2341\times10^{9}$	$2342\times10^{9}$	$2341\times10^{9}$	$2338{\times}10^9$	$2342\times10^{9}$	

<span id="page-25-0"></span>Table 3: The ARI, NMI, Dendrogram Purity and Dasgupta Cost of our approximate Centroid HAC implementations for  $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.2, 0.4$ , and 0.8, versus Exact Centroid HAC. The best quality score for each dataset is in bold and underlined.

In our experiments, the ARI and NMI scores are calculated by taking the best score obtained over the clusterings formed by considering all possible *thresholded*-cuts to the output dendrogram. For larger datasets, we consider cuts only at threshold values scaled at a constant factor (i.e. logarithmic-many cuts).

Table [3](#page-25-0) contains the results obtained for our quality evaluations. We also plot the scores obtained by approximate Centroid HAC as a function of  $\epsilon$ ; see Figure [6,](#page-28-1) Figure [7,](#page-29-0) Figure [8,](#page-29-1) Figure [9,](#page-30-0) and Figure [10.](#page-30-1)

We observe that the quality of the clustering produced by approximate Centroid HAC is generally comparable to that of the exact Centroid HAC algorithm. On average, the quality is slightly better in some cases, but we attribute this to noise. In particular, we observe that for the value of  $\epsilon =$ 0.1, we consistently get comparable quality to that of exact centroid: the ARI and NMI scores are on average within a factor of 7% and 2% to that of exact Centroid HAC, respectively. We also obtained good dendrogram purity score and Dasgupta cost as well, with values within 0.3% and 0.03%, respectively.

Non-Monotonicity of CentroidHAC Unlike other HAC algorithms, the costs of merging clusters for centroid HAC is not monotone (i.e., non-decreasing). The monotonicity property of HAC algorithms is useful when producing the clusterings for applications from the output dendrgoram: typically the dendrogram is cut at certain thresholds, and the disconnected subtrees obtained are flattened to compute the clusters. Here, cutting the dendrogram for a given threshold returns a well-defined and unique clustering. However, this is not the case with Centroid HAC. Indeed, for a given threshold value, we can obtain different clusterings depending on how we define to cut the dendrogram. For e.g., if two nodes  $U$  and  $V$  exists in the output dendrogram with associated merge costs (i.e., cost incurred at the time of merging the two clusters to form that node) of  $U$  being greater than  $V$ , and  $V$  is an ancestor of  $U$  (which is a possibility for Centroid HAC). Then, given a threshold value  $cost(V) < \tau < cost(V)$ , we could either cut at V (or above), or stop somewhere below U.

We would like to characterize and study this non-monotonicity of Centroid HAC in real-world datasets. For this, we define the following notion: for nodes  $U, V$  in the output dendrogram, the pair  $(U, V)$  is called a  $\delta$ -inversion if V is an ancestor of U and  $cost(U) \ge (1 + \delta)cost(V)$ , where  $cost(U)$ is the merge cost associated to node U.

We calculate the number of such inversions incurred by exact Centroid HAC, and compare with the inversions incurred by our approximate algorithm. Figure [5](#page-27-0) shows the number of  $\delta$ -inversions incurred on the benchmark datasets. We observe that for small values of  $\epsilon$ , approximate Centroid HAC has similar number of  $\delta$  inversions as that of exact Centroid HAC.

### <span id="page-26-0"></span>B.2 Running Time Evaluation

Figures [4a](#page-18-0) and [4b](#page-18-0) shows the running times on varying slices of the SIFT-1M dataset using one thread and 192 parallel threads, respectively. For the approximate methods, we considered  $\epsilon = 0.1$ . Figure [4c](#page-18-0) further compares the heap and bucket based approaches as a function of  $\epsilon$ .

We observe that the bucket based approach is very slow for small values of  $\epsilon$  due to many redundant nearest-neighbor computations. Yet, at  $\epsilon = 0.1$ , both algorithms, with 192 threads, obtain speed-ups of up to  $175\times$  with an average speed-up of  $22\times$  compared to the exact counterparts. However, on a single thread, the bucket based approach fails to scale, while the heap based approach still achieves significant speed-ups of upto  $36\times$  with an average speed-up of  $5\times$ . Overall, our heapbased approximate Centroid HAC implementation with  $\epsilon = 0.1$  demonstrates good quality and

<span id="page-27-0"></span>

(e) faces Figure 5: Non-Monotonicity of Centroid HAC: No. of  $\delta$ -inversions vs  $\delta$ 

scalability, making it a good choice in practice.

Stale Merges and Number of Queries We compute the number of *stale merges* (see Section [1\)](#page-0-0) incurred by our algorithm on various benchmark datasets. See Table [4.](#page-28-0) We observe that, on average, the number of such stale queries are incurred about 60% of the time compared to the number of actual merges (i.e. number of points).

<span id="page-28-0"></span>

We also compare the number of nearest-neighbor queries made by the heap and bucket based algorithms. As expected, the number of NNS queries made by the bucket-based algorithms is an order of magnitude higher than that of the heap based approach. This is due to many redundant queries performed at each round by the bucket-based algorithm. However, these queries can be performed in parallel, thus resulting in good speed-ups for this algorithm when run on many cores.

<span id="page-28-1"></span>

Figure 6: Quality Evaluations of the iris dataset

<span id="page-29-0"></span>



<span id="page-29-1"></span>

Figure 8: Quality Evaluations of the cancer dataset

<span id="page-30-0"></span>

Figure 9: Quality Evaluations of the digits dataset

<span id="page-30-1"></span>

Figure 10: Quality Evaluations of the faces dataset