

Expanding the class of global objective functions for dissimilarity-based hierarchical clustering

Sebastien Roch
Department of Mathematics
University of Wisconsin–Madison
roch@math.wisc.edu

August 1, 2022

Abstract

Recent work on dissimilarity-based hierarchical clustering has led to the introduction of global objective functions for this classical problem. Several standard approaches, such as average linkage, as well as some new heuristics have been shown to provide approximation guarantees. Here we introduce a broad new class of objective functions which satisfy desirable properties studied in prior work. Many common agglomerative and divisive clustering methods are shown to be greedy algorithms for these objectives, which are inspired by related concepts in phylogenetics.

1 Introduction

Background In hierarchical clustering, one seeks a recursive partitioning of the data that captures clustering information at different levels of granularity. Classical work on the subject mostly takes an algorithmic perspective. In particular, various iterative clustering methods have been developed, including the well-known bottom-up dissimilarity-based approaches single linkage, average linkage, etc. (see, e.g., [Mur12, Chapter 25]). Recent work on dissimilarity-based hierarchical clustering has emphasized a different, optimization-based, perspective. This has led to the introduction of global objective functions for this classical problem [Das16]. Some standard approaches as well as new heuristics have been shown to provide approximation guarantees [Das16, RP16, CC17, CKMM18, CNC18, CCN19, AAV20]. These new objective functions have also been justified through their behavior on random or structured input models [Das16, CAKMT17, CKMM18, MS21].

Here we introduce a broad new class of objective functions which satisfy natural, desirable properties considered in previous work. These new objectives are inspired by related work in the phylogenetic reconstruction literature (see Section 2). We argue that several common agglomerative and divisive clustering methods, including average linkage, single linkage and recursive sparsest cut, can be interpreted as greedy algorithms for these objectives.

Definitions and main results Our input data is a collection of n objects to be clustered, which we denote without loss of generality $L := \{1, \dots, n\}$, together with a dissimilarity map.¹

Definition 1 (Dissimilarity). A dissimilarity on L is a map $\delta : L \times L \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ which satisfies: $\delta(x, x) = 0$ for all x and $\delta(x, y) = \delta(y, x) > 0$ for all $x \neq y$.

For disjoint subsets $A, B \subseteq L$, we overload $\delta(A, B) := \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} \delta(x, y)$ and define

$$\bar{\delta}(A, B) = \frac{\delta(A, B)}{|A||B|}.$$

As in [Das16, CKMM18], we encode a hierarchical clustering as a rooted binary tree whose leaves are the objects to be clustered.

Definition 2 (Hierarchy). A hierarchy on L is a rooted binary tree $T = (V, E)$ with n leaves, which we identify with the set L .

We will need some notation. The leaves *below* $v \in V$, i.e., of the subtree $T[v]$ rooted at v , are denoted by $L_T[v] \subseteq L$. We let S_T be the internal vertices of T , that is, its non-leaf vertices. For $s \in S_T$, we denote by s_- and s_+ the immediate descendants of s in T . For a pair of leaves $x \neq y \in L$, the most recent common ancestor of x and y in T , denoted $x \wedge_T y$, is the internal vertex s furthest from the root (in graph distance) such that $x, y \in L_T[s]$.

In our setting, the goal of hierarchical clustering is to map dissimilarities to hierarchies. As a principled way to accomplish this, a global objective function over hierarchies was proposed in [Das16]. It was generalized in [CKMM18] to objectives of the form:

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \gamma(|L_T[s_-]|, |L_T[s_+]|) \delta(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+]), \quad (1)$$

where γ is a given real-valued function and $|A|$ is the number of elements in A . One then seeks a hierarchy T which minimizes $\Gamma(\cdot; \delta)$ under input δ .² For instance, the choice $\gamma(a, b) = \gamma_D(a, b) := -a - b$ was made in [Das16].

It was shown in [Das16, CKMM18] that, for γ_D , the objective Γ satisfies several natural conditions. In particular, it satisfies the following.

Definition 3 (Unit neutrality). An objective Γ is unit neutral if: all hierarchies have the same cost under the unit dissimilarity $\delta(x, y) = 1$ for all $x \neq y$.

Moreover, this Γ behaves well on ultrametric inputs. Formally, a dissimilarity δ on L is an *ultrametric* if for all $x, y, z \in L$, it holds that

$$\delta(x, y) \leq \max\{\delta(x, z), \delta(y, z)\}. \quad (2)$$

¹Our results can also be adapted to the case where the input are *similarities*. Throughout, we confine ourselves to dissimilarities for simplicity.

²Note that we deviate from [Das16, CKMM18] (in the *dissimilarity* setting) and *minimize* the objective function.

Ultrametrics are naturally associated to hierarchies in the following sense. If δ is an ultrametric, then there is a (not necessarily unique) hierarchy T together with a height function $h : S_T \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ such that, for all $x \neq y \in L$, it holds that

$$\delta(x, y) = h(x \wedge_T y). \quad (3)$$

See e.g. [SS03] for details. We say that such a hierarchy T is *associated* to ultrametric δ .

Definition 4 (Consistency on ultrametrics³). *The objective function Γ is consistent on ultrametrics if the following holds for all ultrametric δ and associated hierarchy T . For any hierarchy T' , we have the inequality*

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) \leq \Gamma(T'; \delta).$$

In other words, a hierarchy associated to an ultrametric δ is a global minimum under input δ .

Observe that unit neutrality in fact follows from consistency on ultrametrics as the unit dissimilarity on L is an ultrametric that can be realized on *any* hierarchy by assigning height 1 to all internal vertices.

Here we introduce a broad new class of global objective functions for dissimilarity-based hierarchical clustering. For a subset of pairs $M \subseteq L \times L$, let $\delta|_M : M \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ denote the dissimilarity δ restricted to M , i.e., $\delta|_M(x, y) = \delta(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in M$. Let also $\min \delta|_M$ and $\max \delta|_M$ be respectively the minimum and maximum value of δ over pairs in M . We consider objective functions of the general form

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}), \quad (4)$$

where we require moreover that the function \hat{h} satisfy the condition

$$\hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) \in [\min \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}, \max \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}, \quad (5)$$

for any hierarchy T , any $s \in S_T$ and any dissimilarity δ . We refer to such an objective function as a *length-based objective*, a name which will be explained in Section 2.

One possibility for \hat{h} is

$$\hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) = \bar{\delta}(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+]) = \frac{\delta(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+])}{|L_T[s_-]| |L_T[s_+]|}, \quad (6)$$

which is indeed a function of only $T[s]$ and $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$. This choice is a special case of (1) with

$$\gamma(|L_T[s_-]|, |L_T[s_+]|) = \frac{1}{|L_T[s_-]| |L_T[s_+]|}.$$

We show in Section 2 that there are many other natural possibilities that do not fit in the framework (1), including more “non-linear” choices.

Our main result is that, under condition (5), our new objectives are unit neutral and consistent on ultrametrics and therefore provide sound global objectives for hierarchical clustering.

Theorem 1 (Length-based objectives). *Any length-based objective satisfying (5) is unit neutral and consistent on ultrametrics.*

³Our definition is related to what is referred to as *admissibility* in [CKMM18]. We will not introduce the more general setting of [CKMM18] here.

Organization The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Theorem 1 is proved in Section 3. Motivation and further related work is provided in Section 2.

2 Motivation

To motivate our class of objectives for hierarchical clustering, we first give a heuristic derivation of the choice (6), which is inspired by the concept of minimum evolution (see e.g. [GS06] and references therein). In phylogenetics, one is given molecular sequences from extant species and the goal is to reconstruct a phylogenetic tree representing the evolution of these species (together with edge lengths which roughly measure the amount of evolution on the edges). One popular approach is to estimate a distance between each pair of species by comparing their molecular sequences. Various distance-based methods exist. One such class of methods relies on the concept of minimum evolution, which in a nutshell stipulates that the best tree is the shortest one (i.e., the one with the minimum sum of edge lengths). Put differently, in the spirit of Occam’s razor, the solution involving the least amount of evolution to explain the data should be preferred. Without going into details (see, e.g., [SS03, Ste16, War17] for comprehensive introductions to phylogenetic reconstruction methods), methods based on minimum evolution have been highly successful in practice. In particular, one of the most popular methods in this area is Neighbor-Joining [SN87], which has been shown to be a greedy method [GS06] for a variant of minimum evolution called balanced minimum evolution. Below we establish a formal connection to our class of objectives.

Total length Inspired by the concept of minimum evolution, we reformulate the length-based objective with choice (6), i.e.,

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \bar{\delta}(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+]), \quad (7)$$

as an estimate of the “total length of the hierarchy T under δ .” We start with the ultrametric case. If δ is ultrametric and T is associated to δ with height function h then, for any $s \in S_T$, $x \in L_T[s_-]$ and $y \in L_T[s_+]$, we have

$$\bar{\delta}(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+]) = \delta(x, y) = h(s). \quad (8)$$

Moreover, letting $M = \max \delta + 1$, consider a modified rooted tree $\tilde{T} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ with an extra edge connected to the root of T and associate height M to the new root so created. Then assign to each edge $e = (s_0, s_1)$ of \tilde{T} a length equal to $h(s_0) - h(s_1)$, where s_0 is closer to the root than s_1 . Then the *total length* of \tilde{T} is

$$\sum_{e=(s_0, s_1) \in \tilde{E}} [h(s_0) - h(s_1)] = M + \sum_{s \in S_T} h(s) = M + \sum_{s \in S_T} \bar{\delta}(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+]) = M + \Gamma(T; \delta),$$

where we used the fact that each non-root internal vertex of \tilde{T} is counted twice positively and once negatively (since it has two immediate children and one immediate parent), while the root of \tilde{T} is counted once. In other words, up to translation by M , $\Gamma(T; \delta)$ measures the total length of hierarchy T associated to ultrametric δ .

More generally, on a heuristic level, if δ is not ultrametric (but perhaps close to one) and T is any hierarchy we interpret $\bar{\delta}(L_T[s_-], L_T[s_+])$ as an estimate of the height of s on T based on the values $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$. Then we see $\Gamma(T; \delta)$ as an estimate of the total length⁴ of T under δ . Minimizing Γ hence corresponds roughly speaking to finding a hierarchy whose estimated total length is minimum under a fit to the input δ . In addition to its connection to the fruitful concept of minimum evolution in phylogenetics, as pointed out in Section 1 this objective has the desirable property of being consistent on ultrametrics.

Other choices for \hat{h} Interpreting \hat{h} as a height estimator suggests many more natural choices. For instance, one can take a model-based approach such as the one advocated in the related work of [Deg83, CCN04]. There, a simple error model is assumed (adapted to our setting): the dissimilarity δ is in fact an ultrametric δ^* plus an entrywise additive noise that is i.i.d. If T is associated to δ^* and $s \in S_T$, then a likelihood-based estimate of $h(s)$ can be obtained from the values $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$, which all share the same mean $h(s)$ and are independent. Under the assumption that the additive noise is Gaussian for instance, one recovers the least-squares estimate (6). Taking the noise to be Laplace leads to the median. As pointed out by [Deg83], other choices also lead to estimates that arise naturally in the hierarchical clustering context. If the density of the noise is assumed to be 0 below 0 and non-increasing above 0, then the maximum likelihood estimate is the minimum of the observed values $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$. Note that all these examples satisfy condition (5) and therefore Theorem 1 implies that they produce length-based objectives

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]})$$

that are consistent on ultrametrics.

We note further that we allow in general the function \hat{h} to depend on the structure of the subtree rooted at the corresponding internal vertex. For instance, one could consider a weighted average of the quantities $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$ where the weights depend on the graph distance between the leaves. In the phylogenetic context, precisely such an estimator, namely

$$\hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) = \sum_{x \in L_T[s_-], y \in L_T[s_+]} 2^{-|x|_{L_T[s_-]}} 2^{-|y|_{L_T[s_+]}} \delta(x, y), \quad (9)$$

where $|x|_{L_T[s_-]}$ denotes the graph distance between s_- and x in $T[s]$, has been shown rigorously to lead to significantly better height estimates in certain regimes of parameters for standard models of sequence evolution [Roc10]. The analysis of this estimator accounts for the fact that the dissimilarities in $\delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}$ are not independent—but in fact highly correlated—under these models. It can be shown (by induction on the size of the hierarchy) that $\sum_{x \in L_T[s_-], y \in L_T[s_+]} 2^{-|x|_{L_T[s_-]}} 2^{-|y|_{L_T[s_+]}} = 1$, and therefore Theorem 1 applies in this case as well.

Greedy algorithms Finally, we connect our class of objectives to standard approaches to hierarchical clustering. The first clustering approach we consider, average linkage, is an agglomerative method.

⁴Note that we are not imposing that estimated edge lengths be positive.

0. *Average linkage*

1. Input: dissimilarity δ on $L = \{1, \dots, n\}$.
2. Create n singleton trees with leaves respectively $1, \dots, n$.
3. While there are at least two trees left:
 - a- Pick two trees T_1, T_2 with leaves A_1, A_2 **minimizing** $\bar{\delta}(A_1, A_2)$.
 - b- Merge T_1 and T_2 through a new common root adjacent to their roots.
4. Return the resulting tree.

The second method we consider, recursive sparsest cut, is a divisive method.

0. *Recursive sparsest cut*

1. Input: dissimilarity δ on $L = \{1, \dots, n\}$.
2. Find a partition $\{A_1, A_2\}$ of L **maximizing** $\bar{\delta}(A_1, A_2)$.
3. Recurse on $\delta|_{A_1 \times A_1}$ and $\delta|_{A_2 \times A_2}$ to obtain trees T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} .
4. Merge T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} through a new common root adjacent to their roots.
5. Return the resulting tree.

Note that Step (2) is NP-hard and one typically resorts to approximation algorithms [Das16].

We argue here that both these methods are greedy algorithms for the *same* global objective function. From an algorithmic point of view, these methods proceed in an intuitive manner: average linkage starts from the bottom and iteratively merges clusters that are as similar as possible according to $\bar{\delta}$; recursive sparsest cut starts from the top and iteratively splits clusters that are as different as possible according to $\bar{\delta}$. From an optimization point of view, both methods seemingly use the same local criterion: $\bar{\delta}$. But, given that at each iteration one *minimizes* while the other *maximizes* this criterion, what is their *common global objective*?

We claim it is (7). At each iteration, average linkage forms a new cluster whose contribution to (7) is minimized among all possible merging choices. As for recursive sparsest cut: when splitting A_1 and A_2 , the value $\bar{\delta}(A_1, A_2)$ is (in the interpretation above) the estimated height of the parent s_{A_1, A_2} of the two corresponding subtrees; by maximizing $\bar{\delta}(A_1, A_2)$, one then greedily *minimizes* the length of the newly added edge *above* s_{A_1, A_2} and, hence, the contribution of that edge to the total length.

Other choices of \hat{h} lead to single linkage, complete linkage and median linkage as well as the more general agglomerative approach of [CCN04]. For instance, single linkage greedily minimizes the estimated total length of a hierarchy whose heights are fitted using maximum likelihood assuming the noise has any density that is 0 below 0 and is non-increasing above 0. The choice (9) on the other hand leads to WPGMA.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1. As we noted above, it suffices to prove consistency on ultrametrics, as it implies unit neutrality.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first reduce the proof to a special \hat{h} .

Claim 1 (Reduction to minimum). *It suffices to prove Theorem 1 for the choice $\hat{h} = \hat{h}_m$ where*

$$\hat{h}_m(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) = \min \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Let \hat{h} be an arbitrary choice of function satisfying (5) and let δ be an ultrametric with associated hierarchy T . Recall that we seek to show that $\Gamma(T; \delta) \leq \Gamma(T'; \delta)$ for any hierarchy T' .

By (3), for any $s \in S_T$ and for any $x, x' \in L_T[s_-]$ and $y, y' \in L_T[s_+]$, we have

$$\delta(x, y) = \delta(x', y') = \min \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]} = \max \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]},$$

since $x \wedge_T y = x' \wedge_T y' = s$, where the first equality over all choices of x, x', y, y' implies the other two. Therefore, under the ultrametric associated to T , this arbitrary \hat{h} in fact satisfies

$$\hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) = \min \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]},$$

by condition (5). This holds for all $s \in S_T$, so that

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \hat{h}(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) = \sum_{s \in S_T} \hat{h}_m(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) \quad (11)$$

takes the same value for any \hat{h} .

On the other hand, for any other hierarchy T' and for any internal vertex $s' \in S_{T'}$ it holds that

$$\hat{h}(T'[s'], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s'_-] \times L_{T'}[s'_+]}) \geq \min \delta|_{L_{T'}[s'_-] \times L_{T'}[s'_+]},$$

by condition (5). Hence,

$$\Gamma(T'; \delta) = \sum_{s' \in S_{T'}} \hat{h}(T'[s'], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s'_-] \times L_{T'}[s'_+]}) \geq \sum_{s' \in S_{T'}} \hat{h}_m(T'[s'], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s'_-] \times L_{T'}[s'_+]}) \quad (12)$$

Combining (11) and (12), we see that establishing the desired inequality under the choice (10)

$$\sum_{s \in S_T} \hat{h}_m(T[s], \delta|_{L_T[s_-] \times L_T[s_+]}) \leq \sum_{s' \in S_{T'}} \hat{h}_m(T'[s'], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s'_-] \times L_{T'}[s'_+]})$$

implies that the desired inequality $\Gamma(T; \delta) \leq \Gamma(T'; \delta)$ holds under \hat{h} . That proves the claim. \square

For the rest of the proof, we assume that $\hat{h} = \hat{h}_m$. We prove the result by induction on the number of leaves. The proof proceeds by considering the two subtrees hanging from the root in the hierarchy associated to the ultrametric δ and comparing their respective costs to that of the subtrees of any other hierarchy on the same sets of leaves.

Let δ be an ultrametric dissimilarity on $L = [n]$. Let T be an associated hierarchy on L with height function h . We start with the base of the induction argument.

Claim 2 (Base case). *If $n = 2$, then $\Gamma(T; \delta) \leq \Gamma(T' : \delta)$ for any hierarchy T' on L .*

Proof. When $n = 2$, there is only one hierarchy, so the statement is vacuous. \square

Now suppose $n > 2$ and assume that the result holds by induction for all hierarchies less than n leaves. Before we begin, it will be convenient to define a notion of hierarchy allowing degree 2 vertices.

Definition 5 (Extended hierarchy). *An extended hierarchy on L is a rooted tree $T'' = (V'', E'')$ with n leaves, which we identify with the set L , such that all internal vertices have degree at most 3 and the root has degree 2.*

We generalize the objective function to extended hierarchies T'' by letting

$$\Gamma(T''; \delta) = \sum_{s \in S_{T''}^2} \hat{h}(T''[s], \delta|_{L[s_-] \times L[s_+]}),$$

where $S_{T''}^2$ is the set of internal vertices of T'' with exactly two immediate descendants. That is, we ignore the degree 2 vertices in the objective, except for the root. We refer to these ignored vertices as *muted*. We also trivially generalize to extended hierarchies the notion of an associated ultrametric. The presence of degree 2 vertices will arise as a by-product of the following definition.

Definition 6 (Restriction). *Let T'' be a hierarchy on L'' and let $A'' \subseteq L''$. The restriction of T'' to A'' , denoted $T''_{A''}$, is the extended hierarchy obtained from T'' by keeping only those edges and vertices lying on a path between two leaves in A'' .*

Note that applying the restriction procedure to a hierarchy can indeed produce degree 2 vertices and that the root of a restriction has degree 2 by definition.

We are now ready to proceed with the induction. Let ρ be the root of T and let $T_- = T[\rho_-]$, $T_+ = T[\rho_+]$, $L_- = L_T[\rho_-]$ and $L_+ = L_T[\rho_+]$. Let T' be a distinct hierarchy on L . Note that, for any subset $A \subseteq L$, the dissimilarity $\delta|_{A \times A}$ is an ultrametric on A as it continues to satisfy condition (2). Note, moreover, that T_A is an extended hierarchy associated with $\delta|_{A \times A}$, as the same heights can be used on the restriction. Hence, we can apply the induction hypothesis to L_- and L_+ . That is, we have by induction that:

Claim 3 (Induction on the subtrees hanging from the root).

$$\Gamma(T_-; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) \leq \Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(T_+; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}) \leq \Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}).$$

Proof. In addition to the observations above, we used 1) on the LHS of each inequality the fact that $T_- = T'_{L_-}$ and $T_+ = T'_{L_+}$; and 2) on the RHS the fact that internal vertices of degree 2 (except the root) are ignored in the objective (which is equivalent to suppressing those vertices in the extended hierarchy and computing the objective over the resulting hierarchy). \square

We now relate the quantities in the previous claim to the objective values on T and T' . Let $\Delta := \max \delta$.

Claim 4 (Relating T and T' : Applying induction). *It holds that*

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) \leq \Delta + \Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) + \Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}).$$

Proof. Because T is associated to ultrametric δ , the corresponding height of the root of T is also the largest height on T and, hence,

$$\hat{h}(T[\rho], \delta|_{L[\rho_-] \times L[\rho_+]}) = \min \delta|_{L[\rho_-] \times L[\rho_+]} = \max \delta = \Delta.$$

Therefore, adding up the contributions to $\Gamma(T; \delta)$ of the root and of the two subtrees hanging from the root, we get

$$\Gamma(T; \delta) = \Delta + \Gamma(T_-; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) + \Gamma(T_+; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}).$$

We use Claim 3 to conclude. □

So it remains to relate the RHS in the previous claim to the objective value of T' . This involves a case analysis. We start with a simple case.

Claim 5 (Relating T and T' : Equality case). *If there is $s \in S_{T'}$ such that $L_{T'}[s] = L_-$ or L_+ , then it holds that*

$$\Gamma(T'; \delta) = \Delta + \Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) + \Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}). \quad (13)$$

Proof. Observe that s cannot be the root of T' as otherwise we would have $L_- = \emptyset$. So s has a parent. Let \tilde{s} be the parent of s with descendants \tilde{s}_- and \tilde{s}_+ , and assume without loss of generality that $L_{T'}[\tilde{s}_-] \subseteq L_-$ and $L_{T'}[\tilde{s}_+] = L_+$ (i.e., $\tilde{s}_+ = s$). Then the contribution to $\Gamma(T'; \delta)$ of \tilde{s} is Δ . Furthermore, the contribution to $\Gamma(T'; \delta)$ of those vertices in T'_{L_+} is $\Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+})$. Finally, in T'_{L_-} vertex s has degree 2 and so is muted. The remaining vertices of T'_{L_-} contribute $\Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-})$ to both sides of (13). □

The general case analysis follows. We assume for the rest of the proof that:

$$\nexists s \in S_{T'}, L_{T'}[s] = L_- \text{ or } L_+. \quad (14)$$

Claim 6 (Relating T and T' : Case analysis). *Under condition (14), it holds that*

$$\Gamma(T'; \delta) \geq \Delta + \Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}) + \Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}). \quad (15)$$

Proof. Recall that $\Gamma(T'; \delta)$ is a sum over internal vertices of T' . We divide up those vertices into several classes. Below, we identify the vertices in the restrictions to the original vertices and we write $s \in T''$ to indicate that s is a vertex of T'' . Observe that, by definition, $T_- = T_{L_-}$ and $T_+ = T_{L_+}$ do not share vertices—but that T'_{L_-} and T'_{L_+} might. Recall that, for $s \in S_{T'}$, we denote by s_- and s_+ the immediate descendants of s in T' .

1. **Appears in one subtree:** Let R_1 be the elements s of $S_{T'}$ such that either (i) $s \in T'_{L_-}$ but $s \notin T'_{L_+}$, or (ii) $s \in T'_{L_+}$ but $s \notin T'_{L_-}$. It will be important below whether or not s is muted. Case (i) means that there is a path on T' between two leaves in L_- that goes through s —but not between two leaves in L_+ . Note that a path going through s necessarily has an endpoint

in $L_{T'}[s_-]$ or $L_{T'}[s_+]$, or both. We claim that, for such an s , we have that both $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ have a non-empty intersection with L_- . Indeed assume that, say, $L_{T'}[s_+]$ contains only leaves from L_+ . Because there is no path between two leaves in L_+ going through s in T' , it must be that actually $L_{T'}[s_+] = L_+$. But that contradicts condition (14), and proves the claim. Moreover one of $L_{T'}[s_-]$ or $L_{T'}[s_+]$ (or both) is a subset of L_- , as otherwise there would be a path between two leaves in L_+ going through s and we would have that $s \in T'_{L_+}$, a contradiction. In case (ii), the same holds with the roles of L_- and L_+ interchanged. That implies further that s is not muted in the restriction it belongs to. However it is muted in the restriction it does not belong to. Let $r_1 = |R_1|$.

2. **Appears in both, twice muted:** Let $R_{2,tm}$ be the elements s of $S_{T'}$ such that $s \in T'_{L_-}$ and $s \in T'_{L_+}$ and s is muted in both restrictions. That arises precisely when $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ each belong to a *different* subset among L_- and L_+ . Let $r_{2,tm} = |R_{2,tm}|$.
3. **Appears in both, once muted:** Let $R_{2,om}$ be the elements s of $S_{T'}$ such that $s \in T'_{L_-}$ and $s \in T'_{L_+}$ and s is muted in exactly one restriction. That arises precisely when one of $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ has a non-empty intersection with exactly *one* of L_- and L_+ , and the other has a non-empty intersection with *both* L_- and L_+ . Let $r_{2,om} = |R_{2,om}|$.
4. **Appears in both, neither muted:** Let $R_{2,nm}$ be the elements s of $S_{T'}$ such that $s \in T'_{L_-}$ and $s \in T'_{L_+}$ and s is muted in neither restriction. That arises precisely when *both* $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ have a non-empty intersection with *both* L_- and L_+ . Let $r_{2,nm} = |R_{2,nm}|$.

Because the sets above form a partition of $S_{T'}$ and that any hierarchy on n leaves has exactly $n - 1$ internal vertices, it follows that

$$r_1 + r_{2,tm} + r_{2,om} + r_{2,nm} = n - 1.$$

Moreover, on an extended hierarchy with $n' < n$ leaves, the number of internal non-muted vertices is $n' - 1$ (which can be seen by collapsing the muted vertices). Hence, counting non-muted vertices on each restriction with multiplicity, we get the relation

$$1 \cdot r_1 + 0 \cdot r_{2,tm} + 1 \cdot r_{2,om} + 2 \cdot r_{2,nm} = (|L_-| - 1) + (|L_+| - 1) = n - 2.$$

Combining the last two displays gives

$$r_{2,tm} = 1 + r_{2,nm}. \tag{16}$$

This last equality is the key to comparing the two sides of (15): the twice muted vertices which contribute $\max \delta$ to the LHS are in one-to-one correspondence with terms on the RHS whose contributions are smaller or equal.

We expand on this last point. To simplify the notation, we let $\delta_- = \delta|_{L_- \times L_-}$ and $\delta_+ = \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+}$. By the observations above, we have the following. Recall that $\hat{h} = \hat{h}_m$.

1. R_1 : Each $s \in R_1$ is muted in the restriction it does not belong to but it is not in the restriction it belongs to, so that it contributed to exactly one term on the RHS, say $\Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-})$. In that case, we have shown that both $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ have a non-empty intersection with L_- . The RHS term $\hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_{-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}})$ differs from the corresponding LHS term $\hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]})$ only in that pairs $(x, y) \in L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]$ with $(x, y) \in L_- \times L_+$ or $L_+ \times L_-$ are removed (which we refer to below as being suppressed by restriction) from the minimum defining $\hat{h} = \hat{h}_m$ —but such pairs contribute $\Delta = \max \delta$ and therefore do not affect the minimum on the LHS. We have also shown that none of these pairs can be in $L_+ \times L_+$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in R_1} \hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) \\ &= \sum_{s \in R_1 \cap S_{T'_{L_-}}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_{-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}) + \sum_{s \in R_1 \cap S_{T'_{L_+}}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_+}, \delta_{+|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}). \end{aligned}$$

2. $R_{2,tm}$: Each $s \in R_{2,tm}$ contributes to neither term on the RHS, as it is muted in both restriction. On the other hand, we have argued that $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ each belong to a *different* subset among L_- and L_+ . Hence we have

$$\sum_{s \in R_{2,tm}} \hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) = \Delta \cdot r_{2,tm},$$

while

$$\sum_{s \in R_{2,tm}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_{-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}) + \sum_{s \in R_{2,tm}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_+}, \delta_{+|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}) = 0 \cdot 2r_{2,tm}.$$

3. $R_{2,om}$: In this case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in R_{2,om}} \hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) \\ &= \sum_{s \in R_{2,om}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_{-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}) + \sum_{s \in R_{2,om}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_+}, \delta_{+|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that (1) each s in $R_{2,om}$ is muted in exactly one of the sums on the second line and that (2) the pairs of leaves suppressed by restriction in the non-muted terms on the second line correspond to pairs on opposite sides of the root in T , which contribute $\Delta = \max \delta$ and therefore do not affect the minimum defining \hat{h} .

4. $R_{2,nm}$: Each $s \in R_{2,nm}$ contributes to both terms $\Gamma(T'_{L_-}; \delta|_{L_- \times L_-})$ and $\Gamma(T'_{L_+}; \delta|_{L_+ \times L_+})$ on the RHS of (15), once with the same value as the corresponding term on the LHS and once with a larger value. Indeed, because both $L_{T'}[s_-]$ and $L_{T'}[s_+]$ have a non-empty intersection

with both L_- and L_+ and pairs $(x, y) \in L_- \times L_+$ or $L_+ \times L_-$ have dissimilarity Δ , it follows that the minimum

$$\hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) = \min \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}, \quad (17)$$

is achieved for a pair $(x, y) \in L_- \times L_-$ or $L_+ \times L_+$. The claim then follows by noticing that restriction increases the minimum. Let $R_{2, nm}^{-, =}$ be the set of all $s \in R_{2, nm}$ such that the minimum in (17) is achieved for a pair in $L_- \times L_-$ and $R_{2, nm}^{+, =} = R_{2, nm} \setminus R_{2, nm}^{-, =}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in R_{2, nm}} \hat{h}(T'[s], \delta|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) \\ &= \sum_{s \in R_{2, nm}^{-, =}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) + \sum_{s \in R_{2, nm}^{+, =}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_+}, \delta_+|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in R_{2, nm}^{+, =}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_-}, \delta_-|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) + \sum_{s \in R_{2, nm}^{-, =}} \hat{h}(T'_{L_+}, \delta_+|_{L_{T'}[s_-] \times L_{T'}[s_+]}) \\ & \leq \Delta \cdot r_{2, nm}. \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, the contributions of R_1 and $R_{2, om}$ are the same on both sides of (15). The contributions of $R_{2, nm}$ on the LHS are canceled out by the contributions of $R_{2, nm}^{-, =}$ and $R_{2, nm}^{+, =}$ on the RHS. The remaining terms are: on the LHS, $\Delta \cdot r_{2, tm}$; and on the RHS, $\leq \Delta \cdot (1 + r_{2, nm})$. Using (16) concludes the proof. \square

That concludes the induction and the proof of the theorem. \square

Acknowledgments

The author's work was supported by NSF grants DMS-1149312 (CAREER), DMS-1614242, CCF-1740707 (TRIPODS Phase I), DMS-1902892, DMS-1916378, and DMS-2023239 (TRIPODS Phase II), as well as a Simons Fellowship and a Vilas Associates Award. Part of this work was done at MSRI and the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing. I thank Sanjoy Dasgupta, Varun Kanade, Harrison Rosenberg, Garvesh Raskutti and Cécile Ané for helpful comments.

References

- [AAV20] Noga Alon, Yossi Azar, and Danny Vainstein. Hierarchical Clustering: A 0.585 Revenue Approximation. In *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 153–162. PMLR, July 2020. ISSN: 2640-3498.

- [CAKMT17] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Varun Kanade, and Frederik Mallmann-Trenn. Hierarchical clustering beyond the worst-case. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 6201–6209. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [CC17] Moses Charikar and Vaggos Chatziafratis. Approximate hierarchical clustering via sparsest cut and spreading metrics. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '17, pages 841–854, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2017. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [CCN04] R. M. Castro, M. J. Coates, and R. D. Nowak. Likelihood based hierarchical clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 52(8):2308–2321, Aug 2004.
- [CCN19] Moses Charikar, Vaggos Chatziafratis, and Rad Niazadeh. Hierarchical Clustering better than Average-Linkage. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, Proceedings, pages 2291–2304. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, January 2019.
- [CKMM18] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Varun Kanade, Frederik Mallmann-Trenn, and Claire Mathieu. Hierarchical clustering: Objective functions and algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 378–397, 2018.
- [CNC18] Vaggos Chatziafratis, Rad Niazadeh, and Moses Charikar. Hierarchical Clustering with Structural Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 774–783. PMLR, July 2018. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [Das16] Sanjoy Dasgupta. A cost function for similarity-based hierarchical clustering. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016*, pages 118–127, 2016.
- [Deg83] Paul O. Degens. *Hierarchical Cluster Methods as Maximum Likelihood Estimators*, pages 249–253. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1983.
- [GS06] Olivier Gascuel and Mike Steel. Neighbor-joining revealed. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 23(11):1997–2000, 2006.
- [MS21] Bogdan-Adrian Manghiuc and He Sun. Hierarchical Clustering: $O(1)$ -Approximation for Well-Clustered Graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 9278–9289. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [Mur12] Kevin P. Murphy. *Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective*. MIT Press, September 2012. Google-Books-ID: RC43AgAAQBAJ.
- [Roc10] Sebastien Roch. Toward Extracting All Phylogenetic Information from Matrices of Evolutionary Distances. *Science*, 327(5971):1376–1379, 2010.

- [RP16] Aurko Roy and Sebastian Pokutta. Hierarchical clustering via spreading metrics. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 2316–2324. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- [SN87] N. Saitou and M. Nei. The neighbor-joining method: A new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 4(4):406–425, 1987.
- [SS03] C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics*, volume 22 of *Mathematics and its Applications series*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [Ste16] Mike Steel. *Phylogeny—discrete and random processes in evolution*, volume 89 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2016.
- [War17] Tandy Warnow. *Computational Phylogenetics: An Introduction to Designing Methods for Phylogeny Estimation*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1st edition, 2017.