

# A NOVEL ALGORITHM FOR COMPUTING THE FRÉCHET MEAN IN HADAMARD SPACES

MIROSLAV BAČÁK

**ABSTRACT.** It is more or less agreed on that the Fréchet mean is the right definition of an average in Hadamard spaces. On the other hand it is not so obvious how to compute this mean, and to the best of our knowledge, no algorithm for computing the Fréchet mean in Hadamard spaces is hitherto known. The main purpose of the present paper is to introduce such an algorithm.

In applications, computing Fréchet means is probably most needed in the tree space, which is an instance of Hadamard spaces, invented by Billera, Holmes, and Vogtmann (2001) as a tool for averaging phylogenetic trees. It turns out, however, that it can also be used to model numerous other tree-like structures. Since there now exists a polynomial-time algorithm for computing geodesics in the tree space due to Owen and Provan (2011), we obtain an efficient algorithm for computing Fréchet means, which can be directly used in practice.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many objects in nature have a structure of a (combinatorial) tree, for instance bronchial tubes in lungs, veins, transport systems in plants. Furthermore, trees have also been indispensable in phylogenetic evolutionary models.

For various reasons, biologists need to compare such trees, measure the difference between a given pair of trees, and also want to find an average tree of a given set of trees. In order to do so, one needs a space whose elements are trees. It should be equipped with a metric (in order to measure distances), and should also admit a robust definition of an average. Such a space was constructed by L. Billera, S. Holmes, and K. Vogtmann in [2] and named the *tree space*. In the same paper, the authors proved that the tree space is a metric spaces of nonpositive curvature, that is, an *Hadamard space*. This property turns out to be important from both the theoretical and computational point of view. Moreover, one can expect that exploring the rich geometrical structure of Hadamard spaces will yield further applications in this area.

---

*Date:* April 23, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary 51F99, secondary 60B99, 92B05.

*Key words and phrases.* Hadamard space, tree space, Fréchet mean, law of large numbers, approximation algorithm, nonpositive curvature.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no 267087.

In an Hadamard space  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$ , an average of a set of points  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$  can be defined as the Fréchet mean, that is, by

$$(1) \quad \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{n=1}^N d(y, x_n)^2.$$

The correctness of this definition is guaranteed by Theorem 2.4 below. Furthermore, the Fréchet mean behaves nicely when we perturb the points  $x_1, \dots, x_N$ , more precisely, it is Lipschitz continuous in its variables; see Theorem 2.4. Note that the property, which assures that the Fréchet mean is well defined, is the nonpositive curvature of an Hadamard space.

Since averages are of immense importance in many applications, we need an *algorithm* for computing the Fréchet mean. The main purpose of the present paper is to introduce such an algorithm. Research on this matter has already started, see for instance [5, 6]. Three different methods (centroid, Birkhoff's shortening, and weighted averages) for computing the Fréchet mean were introduced in [5, Section 4]. Unfortunately, none of these methods gives a correct result, as will be demonstrated in Remark 4.1 below.

Our approach to computing the Fréchet mean is based on the law of large numbers, which was in the context of Hadamard spaces proved by K.-T. Sturm [15]. It turns out that Sturm's result can be rather directly used as an algorithm, and its convergence to a correct value is assured; see Theorem 2.5. The resulting algorithm requires finding a geodesic segment at each of its iterations. While this can be a very difficult task in a general Hadamard space, geodesics in the tree space are now quite well-understood. Indeed, they were described already in [2], and in more detail in [11]. From the practical point of view, it is important that we can find a geodesic in the tree space in polynomial time. This is possible due to a recent ingenious algorithm by M. Owen and J.S. Provan [12].

Potential applications of our novel algorithm might be found in various areas of computational biology, as alluded at the beginning of this Introduction. We refer the interested reader to [4, 6, 14] and the references therein.

We have already implemented our algorithm and carried out first test computations. A large computational study based on real data is now in preparation, and will appear in a separate paper.

Let us now describe the rest of the present paper. In Section 2 we recall basic facts on Hadamard spaces including the definition of the Fréchet mean, and the law of large numbers. Section 3 is devoted to trees and the tree space. The algorithm for computing the Fréchet mean in Hadamard spaces is introduced in Section 4, where we also give a detailed description of the Owen-Provan algorithm for computing geodesics in the tree space.

**Acknowledgments.** I am grateful to Martin Kell for helpful discussions about the law of large numbers.

## 2. HADAMARD SPACES

Since the notion of the Fréchet mean as well as the law of large numbers heavily rely on the geometry of Hadamard spaces, we start by recalling rudiments of the theory of these spaces with a special regard to the aforementioned results. As a reference, we recommend [3] or [8].

**2.1. Definition of an Hadamard space.** A metric space  $(X, d)$  is called *geodesic* if for any pair of points  $x, y \in X$  there exists a geodesic which connects them. That is, there exists a mapping  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  such that  $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ , and

$$d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = d(x, y) |s - t|,$$

for  $s, t \in [0, 1]$ . A geodesic metric space  $(X, d)$  has *nonpositive curvature* if for any  $z \in X$  and any geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  we have

$$(2) \quad d(z, \gamma(t))^2 \leq (1-t)d(z, \gamma(0))^2 + td(z, \gamma(1))^2 - t(1-t)d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))^2,$$

whenever  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This inequality says that geodesic triangles are thinner than the corresponding triangles in the Euclidean plane of the same side lengths. One can also show that (2) implies that each pair of points is connected by a *unique* geodesic.

Given a pair of points  $x, y \in X$ , we denote  $(1-t)x + ty = \gamma(t)$ , where  $\gamma$  is the geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A complete geodesic metric space of nonpositive curvature is called an *Hadamard space*.

We will now recall an inequality which goes back to the work of Reshetnyak. Its modern proof can be found in [16, Proposition 2.4], or in [10, Lemma 2.1].

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$  be an Hadamard space. Then we have

$$d(x, y)^2 + d(u, v)^2 \leq d(x, v)^2 + d(y, u)^2 + 2d(x, u)d(y, v),$$

for any points  $x, y, u, v \in \mathcal{H}$ .

Here we collect several examples of Hadamard spaces.

**Example 2.3.** The class of Hadamard spaces encompasses many diverse spaces including

- (i) Hilbert spaces,
- (ii) hyperbolic spaces,
- (iii) complete simply connected Riemannian manifolds of nonpositive sectional curvature,
- (iv)  $\mathbb{R}$ -trees, and
- (v) Euclidean buildings.

Another important instance of an Hadamard space is the tree space, see Section 3.

It turns out that Hadamard spaces admit a natural generalization of the notion of convexity. Indeed, let  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$  be an Hadamard space. We say that a set  $C \subset \mathcal{H}$  is *convex* provided  $x, y \in C$  implies  $(1-t)x + ty \in C$  for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Furthermore, we say that a function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *convex* if the function  $f \circ \gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex for any geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ .

**2.2. The Fréchet mean in Hadamard spaces.** Recall that the Fréchet mean of a finite collection of points  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , was in (1) defined as

$$\Xi = \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{n=1}^N d(y, x_n)^2.$$

Some authors alternatively use the name Karcher mean. The existence and uniqueness of the minimizer in the definition is a consequence of nonpositive curvature. It

is guaranteed by the following theorem, which comes from [8, Theorem 3.2.1], [16, Proposition 4.4], and [10, Lemma 4.2].

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$  be an Hadamard space, and  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$  be a finite set of points. Then there exists a unique point  $\Xi$  defined in (1). Furthermore, this  $\Xi$  satisfies the variance inequality*

$$(3) \quad d(z, \Xi)^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N d(z, x_n)^2,$$

for any  $z \in \mathcal{H}$ . Finally, the function  $\Xi = \Xi(\cdot)$  satisfies

$$d(\Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N), \Xi(x'_1, \dots, x'_N)) \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d(x_i, x'_i),$$

for any  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , and  $x'_1, \dots, x'_N \in \mathcal{H}$ .

*Proof.* We are to show that there exists a unique minimizer of the function

$$\varphi : y \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^N d(y, x_n)^2, \quad y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The function  $\varphi$  is bounded from below by 0. Take a minimizing sequence  $(y_k) \subset \mathcal{H}$ , that is, a sequence such that  $\varphi(y_k) \rightarrow \inf \varphi$ . The inequality (2) yields that  $(y_k)$  is Cauchy. Indeed, if  $y_{kl}$  denotes the midpoint of  $y_k$  and  $y_l$ , then (2) gives

$$d(y_{kl}, x_n)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(y_k, x_n)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d(y_l, x_n)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d(y_k, y_l)^2.$$

Summing from  $n = 1$  to  $N$  easily gives that  $(y_k)$  is Cauchy. Since  $\varphi$  is continuous, the sequence  $(y_k)$  converges to a minimizer of  $\varphi$ . The uniqueness of this minimizer follows again from (2). It remains to show (3). Employing (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N d(\gamma(t), x_n)^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 &\leq (1-t) \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N d(\gamma(0), x_n)^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + t \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N d(\gamma(1), x_n)^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 \right] \\ &\quad - Nt(1-t)d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . Setting  $\gamma(0) = \Xi$  and  $\gamma(1) = z$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N d(\gamma(t), x_n)^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 \\ &\leq t \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N d(z, x_n)^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N d(\Xi, x_n)^2 \right] - Nt(1-t)d(\Xi, z)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Dividing by  $t$  and letting  $t \rightarrow 0$  yields (3).

If we denote  $\Xi = \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ , and  $\Xi' = \Xi(x'_1, \dots, x'_N)$ , then Lemma 2.2 yields

$$d(x_n, \Xi')^2 + d(x'_n, \Xi)^2 \leq d(x_i, \Xi)^2 + d(x'_i, \Xi')^2 + 2d(\Xi, \Xi')d(x_n, x'_n),$$

multiplying by  $1/N$  and summing over  $n$  from 1 to  $N$  further gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ d(x_n, \Xi')^2 + d(x'_n, \Xi)^2 \right] &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ d(x_n, \Xi)^2 + d(x'_n, \Xi')^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2d(\Xi, \Xi') \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N d(x_n, x'_n). \end{aligned}$$

By the variance inequality (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ d(x_n, \Xi')^2 + d(x'_n, \Xi)^2 \right] &\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ d(x_n, \Xi)^2 + d(x'_n, \Xi')^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2d(\Xi, \Xi')^2. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether we obtain

$$d(\Xi, \Xi') \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d(x_i, x'_i),$$

which finishes the proof.  $\square$

**2.3. The law of large numbers.** The Fréchet mean is related to the law of large numbers, both in a classical linear setting and in Hadamard spaces [15]. For a historical remark we refer the interested reader to [15, Remark 2.7a]. As we shall see in the sequel (more precisely in Section 4), the probabilistic point of view enables one to find an algorithm for computing the Fréchet mean. Let again  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , and denote the probability measure

$$(4) \quad \pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n},$$

where  $\delta_{x_n}$  stands for the Dirac measure at  $x_n$ . Assume that  $Y$  is a random variable with values in  $\mathcal{H}$  distributed according to  $\pi$ . Then the variational inequality (3) can be written as

$$(5) \quad d(z, \Xi)^2 + \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, Y)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}d(z, Y)^2, \quad z \in \mathcal{H},$$

where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}$  is of course taken with respect to the distribution  $\pi$ .

Given a sequence of random variables  $Y_i$  with values in  $\mathcal{H}$ , we define a sequence  $(S_i)$  of random variables putting  $S_1 = Y_1$ , and

$$(6) \quad S_{i+1} = \frac{i}{i+1} S_i + \frac{1}{i+1} Y_{i+1},$$

for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . The random variables  $Y_i$ , and hence also  $S_i$ , are defined on some probability space  $\Omega$ , but this space  $\Omega$  of course plays no role here. The following theorem states a nonlinear version of the law of large numbers. It appeared in a much more general form in [15, Theorem 2.6].

**Theorem 2.5** (The law of large numbers). *Let  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$  be an Hadamard space, and  $(Y_i)$  be a sequence of independent random variables  $Y_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , identically distributed according to the distribution  $\pi$ , defined in (4). Then*

$$S_i \rightarrow \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N), \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the convergence is pointwise.

*Proof.* First denote

$$\xi = \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N d(y, x_n)^2.$$

We show by induction on  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  that

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, S_i)^2 \leq \frac{1}{i} \xi.$$

It obviously holds for  $i = 1$  and we assume it holds for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . We have

$$\mathbb{E}d(\Xi, S_{i+1})^2 = \mathbb{E}d\left(\Xi, \frac{i}{i+1}S_i + \frac{1}{i+1}Y_{i+1}\right)^2,$$

by (2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{i}{i+1} \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, S_i)^2 + \frac{1}{i+1} \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, Y_{i+1})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{(i+1)^2} \mathbb{E}d(Y_{i+1}, S_i)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and applying independence and (5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{i}{i+1} \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, S_i)^2 + \frac{1}{i+1} \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, Y_{i+1})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{(i+1)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ d(\Xi, S_i)^2 + d(\Xi, Y_{i+1})^2 \right] \\ &= \left( \frac{i}{i+1} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}d(\Xi, S_i)^2 + \frac{1}{(i+1)^2} \xi \\ &\leq \frac{1}{i+1} \xi. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (7) holds, and hence the proof is complete.  $\square$

### 3. TREES AND THE TREE SPACE

We will now describe the construction of the tree space due to L. Billera, S. Holmes, and K. Vogtmann. For the details, the interested reader is referred to the original paper [2]. We first need to make precise what we mean by a tree. Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , a *metric  $n$ -tree* is a combinatorial tree (connected graph with no circuit) with  $n + 1$  terminal vertices called *leaves* that are labeled  $0, 1, \dots, n$ . The leaf with the label 0 is called a *root*, but it will have no distinguished role in our considerations. Vertices other than leaves have no labels since we consider them just as ‘branching points’. The edges which are adjacent to a leaf are called *leaf edges*, and the remaining edges are called *inner*. We see an example of a 6-tree with three inner edges  $e_1, e_2$ , and  $e_3$  in Figure 1. All edges, both leaf and inner, have positive lengths. Instead of a metric  $n$ -tree, we will write simply a tree. The number  $n$  will be fixed and clear from the context. Later, when we consider multiple trees, it will be important that they all have the same number of leaves.

Each inner edge of a tree determines a unique partition of the set of leaves  $L$  into two disjoint and nonempty subsets  $L_1 \cup L_2 = L$  called a *split*, which we denote  $L_1|L_2$ . A split is defined as the disjoint union of the two sets of leaves which arise when we removed the inner edge under consideration. For instance the inner edges




FIGURE 1. An example of a 6-tree with three inner edges.

$e_1, e_2,$  and  $e_3$  of the tree in Figure 1 have splits  $(0, 4, 5, 6|1, 2, 3)$ ,  $(0, 1, 2, 3|4, 5, 6)$ , and  $(0, 1, 2, 3, 4|5, 6)$ , respectively. On the other hand, having a set of leaves and splits subject to certain conditions, we can uniquely construct a tree [4, 14]. Namely, we require any two splits  $L_1|L_2$  and  $L'_1|L'_2$  be *compatible*, that is, one of the sets

$$L_1 \cap L'_2, \quad L'_1 \cap L_2, \quad L_1 \cap L'_1, \quad L_2 \cap L'_2$$

be empty. We say that a set of inner edges  $I$  is *compatible* if for any two edges  $e, e' \in I$ , the corresponding splits are compatible. These terms will be essential for computing geodesics in the tree space in Section 4.

We will now proceed to construct a space of trees, that is, a space whose elements will be all metric  $n$ -trees, where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is a fixed number determined by the number of leaf vertices. The resulting space will be the tree space  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . First, it is useful to realize that one can treat separately leaf edges and inner edges. Since the former can be represented in the Euclidean space of dimension  $n + 1$ , the whole space  $\mathcal{T}_n$  is a product of a Euclidean factor and a factor representing the inner edges. We may for simplicity ignore the Euclidean factor in the following construction.

Fix now a metric  $n$ -tree  $T$  with  $r$  inner edges of lengths  $l_1, \dots, l_r$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq n - 2$ . Clearly  $(l_1, \dots, l_r)$  lies in the open orthant  $(0, \infty)^r$ , and conversely, any point of  $(0, \infty)^r$  corresponds to an  $n$ -tree of the same combinatorial structure as  $T$ . Note that a tree  $S$  is said to have the same combinatorial structure as  $T$  if it has the same number of inner edges as  $T$  and all its inner edges have the same splits as the inner edges of  $T$ . In other words, the trees  $S$  and  $T$  differ only by inner edge lengths.

To any point from the boundary  $\partial(0, \infty)^r$  we associate a metric  $n$ -tree obtained from  $T$  by shrinking some inner edges to zero length. Hence, each point from the closed orthant  $[0, \infty)^r$  corresponds to a metric  $n$ -tree of the same combinatorial structure as  $T$ .

Binary  $n$ -trees have the maximal possible number of inner edges, namely  $n - 2$ , which is of course equal to the dimension of the corresponding orthant. An orthant of an  $n$ -tree that is not binary appears as a face of the orthants corresponding to (at least three) binary trees. In Figure 2, we see a copy of  $[0, \infty)^2$  representing all 4-trees of a given combinatorial structure, namely, all 4-trees with two inner edges  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , such that the split of  $e_1$  is  $(1, 2|0, 3, 4)$ , and the split of  $e_2$  is  $(1, 2, 3|0, 4)$ . If the length of  $e_1$  is zero, then the tree lies on the vertical boundary ray. If the length of  $e_2$  is zero, then the tree lies on the horizontal boundary ray. In summary,




FIGURE 2. 4-trees of a given combinatorial structure.

any orthant  $\mathcal{O} = [0, \infty)^r$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq n - 2$ , corresponds to a compatible set of inner edges, and conversely, any compatible set of inner edges  $I = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$  corresponds to a unique orthant  $\mathcal{O}(A)$ , which is a copy of  $[0, \infty)^r$ .

The *tree space*  $\mathcal{T}_n$  consists of  $(2n-3)(2n-5)\cdots\cdots 5\cdot 3$  copies of orthants  $[0, \infty)^{n-2}$  glued together along lower-dimensional faces, which correspond to non-binary trees, that is, compatible sets of inner edges of cardinality  $< n - 2$ .

We equip the tree space  $\mathcal{T}_n$  with the induced length metric. Then it becomes a geodesic space. One can easily observe that each geodesic consists of finitely many Euclidean line segments. The following important theorem states that the tree space has nonpositive curvature.

**Theorem 3.1.** *The space  $\mathcal{T}_n$  is an Hadamard space.*

*Proof.* The proof is an application of Gromov's characterization of CAT(0) complexes, which requires the link of each vertex to be a flag complex. See [2, Lemma 4.1].  $\square$

#### 4. THE ALGORITHM FOR COMPUTING THE FRÉCHET MEAN

This section contains the main result of the present paper: we shall introduce a novel algorithm for computing Fréchet means in an Hadamard space  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$ .

**4.1. Computing the Fréchet mean in Hadamard spaces.** Recall, that given a finite family of points  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have the existence and uniqueness of its Fréchet mean  $\Xi = \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  due to Theorem 2.4. We now get to the question how to *compute* this average. The methods used in [5], namely Birkhoff's shortening, the centroid, and weighted averages, do not give a correct value as one can see in the following remark.

**Remark 4.1.** Let  $(\mathcal{H}, d)$  be an Hadamard space consisting of three geodesic rays issuing from the origin 0. This is an  $\mathbb{R}$ -tree, and as a matter of fact the tree space  $\mathcal{T}_3$ . Consider three points  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{H}$  lying in distinct rays issuing from the origin 0 such that  $d(0, z) = 5$ , and  $d(0, x) = d(0, y) = 1$ , as depicted in Figure 3. Then it is easy to see that the Fréchet mean  $\Xi = \Xi(x, y, z)$  lies on the geodesic  $[0, z]$  and

$d(0, \Xi) = 1$ . On the other hand if we apply Birkhoff's shortening or the centroid method, we will get a point  $c \in [0, z]$  such that  $d(0, c) > \frac{5}{4}$ . Finally, the weighted average of the points  $x, y, z$  is a point  $w \in [0, z]$  with  $d(0, w) = \frac{5}{3}$ .




FIGURE 3. The Fréchet mean of three points.

It turns out, however, that one can use Theorem 2.5 to find an approximation algorithm for computing the correct value of the Fréchet mean. Let us now describe such an algorithm. It receives the points  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  as the input, and at each iteration  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  produces a new point  $S_i \in \mathcal{H}$ , which is an approximate version of the desired mean  $\Xi = \Xi(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  in the sense that  $d(S_i, \Xi)$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . This is guaranteed by Theorem 2.5. We now give a formal and precise description of the algorithm.

<b>Algorithm for computing the Fréchet mean</b>	
Input: $x_1, \dots, x_N$	
Step 1	$S_1 := x_1$ and $i := 1$
Step 2	choose $r \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ at random
Step 3	$S_{i+1} := \frac{1}{i+1}x_r + \frac{i}{i+1}S_i$
Step 4	$i := i + 1$
Step 5	go to Step 2

The main difficulty lies at Step 3. It requires computing the geodesic connecting  $x_r$  and  $S_i$ , and hence strongly depends on the nature of the Hadamard space in question. We will in the sequel focus on the tree space, where we have an algorithm for computing geodesics, and it works in polynomial time [12]. We should also like to mention some earlier attempts to find an algorithm for computing geodesics in the tree space, namely [1, 9, 11].

**4.2. The Owen-Provan algorithm.** In the remainder of this section we will describe the algorithm for finding geodesics in a tree space  $\mathcal{T}_n$  as presented in [12]. Let  $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_n$  be trees. As in the construction of the tree space in Section 3, we observe that the leaves of any tree on the geodesic between  $T$  and  $T'$  lie in the Euclidean factor of  $\mathcal{T}_n$ , and hence we can restrict our attention only to the inner edges. Denote  $\mathcal{E}$  the set of inner edges of  $T$ , and  $\mathcal{E}'$  the set of inner edges of  $T'$ . If the trees  $T$  and  $T'$  have a common inner edge, that is, if there exist  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $e' \in \mathcal{E}'$  which have the same splits, then this common edge will be present in any

tree on the geodesic. This means that we can remove this edge and solve the original problem for the two subtrees which arise by removing this common edge. Hence we may assume without loss of generality that  $T$  and  $T'$  have no edge in common.

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ , and  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$  be partitions of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$ , respectively. If

$$B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_l \cup A_{l+1} \cup \dots \cup A_k$$

is a compatible set for each  $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , then there exist corresponding orthants  $\mathcal{O}_l = \mathcal{O}_l(B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_l \cup A_{l+1} \cup \dots \cup A_k)$  in the tree space  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . The finite sequence of such orthants  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_k)$  is called a *path space* for the pair  $(T, T')$ . The pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is called its *support*. The shortest curve through a path space which connects  $T$  and  $T'$  is called a *path space geodesic*.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_n$  be trees with no edge in common. Then the geodesic connecting  $T$  and  $T'$  is a path space geodesic for some path space between  $T$  and  $T'$ .*

We shall now proceed to identify path space geodesics. For a set of inner edges  $A$ , denote

$$\|A\| = \sqrt{\sum_{e \in A} |e|^2},$$

where  $|e|$  stands for the length of  $e$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_n$  be trees with no edge in common. Then a curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n$  such that  $\gamma(0) = T$  and  $\gamma(1) = T'$  is a geodesic if and only if there exist partitions  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ , and  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$ , respectively, satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) *For any  $n > m$ , the sets  $A_n$  and  $B_m$  are compatible,*
- (ii) *The sets satisfy*

$$\frac{\|A_1\|}{\|B_1\|} \leq \frac{\|A_2\|}{\|B_2\|} \leq \dots \leq \frac{\|A_k\|}{\|B_k\|},$$

- (iii) *For each  $n \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , there is no nontrivial partition  $C_1 \cup C_2$  of  $A_n$ , and partition  $D_1 \cup D_2$  of  $B_n$ , such that  $C_2$  is compatible with  $D_1$  and,*

$$\frac{\|C_1\|}{\|D_1\|} < \frac{\|C_2\|}{\|D_2\|},$$

and  $\gamma$  is a path space geodesic with support  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .

The algorithm for computing a geodesic is based on Theorem 4.3. We start with the support  $(\mathcal{A}^0, \mathcal{B}^0)$ , where  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{E}'$ , and with the path space geodesic  $\gamma^0$  which consists of the line segment connecting  $T$  and 0, and the line segment connecting 0 and  $T'$ . Having a path space geodesic  $\gamma^i$  with support  $(\mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{B}^i)$  satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.3, we check whether the condition (iii) of Theorem 4.3 is also satisfied. If so, we have a geodesic, otherwise we construct a shorter path space geodesic  $\gamma^{i+1}$  with support  $(\mathcal{A}^{i+1}, \mathcal{B}^{i+1})$  satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.3. By [12, Theorem 3.5] we know that this algorithm gives a geodesic in finitely many steps.

Let us now take a closer look at the iterative step  $i \rightarrow i+1$ , and reformulate it as the extension problem for bipartite graphs. Given sets  $A \subset \mathcal{E}$  and  $B \subset \mathcal{E}'$ , we define their *incompatibility graph*  $G(A \cup B, E)$  as a bipartite graph with the vertex set  $A \cup B$ , whose edges correspond to pairs  $e \in A$  and  $f \in B$  with incompatible

splits. Clearly, two sets  $A \subset \mathcal{E}$  and  $B \subset \mathcal{E}'$  are compatible if and only if they form an independent set in  $G(A \cup B, E)$ . We define the weight of a vertex to be the squared length of the corresponding tree edge. The extension problem for  $G(A \cup B, E)$  asks whether there exist a partition  $C_1 \cup C_2$  of  $A$  and partition  $D_1 \cup D_2$  of  $B$  such that  $C_2 \cup D_1$  is an independent set in  $G(A \cup B, E)$ , and

$$(8) \quad \frac{\|C_1\|}{\|D_1\|} < \frac{\|C_2\|}{\|D_2\|}.$$

Hence a path space geodesic  $\gamma^i$  with support  $(\mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{B}^i)$  is a geodesic if and only if the extension problem has no solution for any pair  $(A_k, B_k)$  of  $(\mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{B}^i)$ .

To reformulate the extension problem, we first note that scaling the edge lengths does not affect (8), hence we multiply each edge length so that  $\|A\| = \|B\| = 1$ . Then (8) is equivalent to

$$\|C_2\|^2 + \|D_1\|^2 > 1.$$

Since the *maximal matching problem* is according to König's theorem equivalent to the *minimal vertex cover problem*, we need to find a vertex cover  $C_1 \cup D_2$  of the graph  $G(A \cup B, E)$  such that

$$\|C_1\|^2 + \|D_2\|^2 < 1.$$

For a general graph, this is a typical NP-hard problem (its decision version is NP-complete), but in case of bipartite graphs, it is classically solved via a flow network in polynomial time. As a reference on this subject, we recommend [13].

Indeed, we transform the bipartite graph  $G(A \cup B, E)$ , depicted in Figure 4, into a flow network as follows. First we impose an orientation to all edges from  $E$




FIGURE 4. A bipartite graph with vertex weights.

so that they go from  $A$  to  $B$ , and assign infinite capacity to each of these edges. Then we add a new vertex called a *source*, and connect it with each vertex of  $A$  so that all these edges are oriented from the source to  $A$ . Set the capacity of an edge going from the source to a vertex  $a \in A$  to be the weight of  $a$ . In a similar way, we add a new vertex called a *sink*, and connect all vertices of  $B$  with it. These edges are oriented from  $B$  to the sink and have capacities equal to the weights of the vertices of  $B$ . We obtained a flow network as in Figure 5. The aim now is to push as much of a flow from the source to the sink as possible. A maximal flow then gives a minimal cut by the *max flow - min cut theorem*, and a minimal cut is exactly the desired vertex cover, as one can easily observe. There exist many



MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES, INSELSTR. 22, 04103 LEIPZIG,  
GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `bacak@mis.mpg.de`