

Eigenvalue-based Incremental Spectral Clustering

Mieczysław A. Kłopotek Bartłomiej Starosta
Sławomir T. Wierzchoń
Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences,
ul. Jana Kazimierza 5, 01-248 Warsaw, Poland

August 23, 2023

Abstract Our previous experiments demonstrated that subsets collections of (short) documents (with several hundred entries) share a common normalized in some way eigenvalue spectrum of combinatorial Laplacian. Based on this insight, we propose a method of incremental spectral clustering. The method consists of the following steps: (1) split the data into manageable subsets, (2) cluster each of the subsets, (3) merge clusters from different subsets based on the eigenvalue spectrum similarity to form clusters of the entire set. This method can be especially useful for clustering methods of complexity strongly increasing with the size of the data sample, like in case of typical spectral clustering. Experiments were performed showing that in fact the clustering and merging the subsets yields clusters close to clustering the entire dataset.

1 Introduction

One of intensively developing clustering techniques is the Graph Spectral Analysis (GSA). It works best for objects whose mutual relationships are described by a graph that connects them based on a similarity measure [23, 19, 15].

One important application is text documents clustering, where the similarity of documents can be expressed in a number of ways, e.g. by the count of common words or in terms of more sophisticated descriptions (e.g. cosine similarity), see e.g. [7]. In our experiments, we use the cosine between document vectors in the term vector space as the measure of document similarity. GSA applies eigen-decomposition of the so-called graph Laplacians, derived from the similarity matrix.

The original GSA suffers from the lack of a method for assignment of new data items to the existing clusters. Hence a clustering from scratch or training of some external classification model is required. Clustering from scratch may be hard for large data collections. Classification by the external model may cause cluster definition drift. Due to these issues, several approaches were proposed to solve them, including [14, 2, 1, 20]. This paper can be seen as a contribution to

this type of research. The mentioned approaches concentrate on transforming eigenvectors, while our method relies on eigenvalues only.

The algorithm proposed in this paper allows to perform the clustering in batches. The algorithm has the following structure (details are given in section 3):

- For each batch of documents, perform the traditional spectral clustering into the predefined number of clusters.
- Compute the vector of combinatorial or normalized Laplacian eigenvalues of each cluster of each batch.
- Then, based on some dissimilarity criteria between the cluster spectra of different batches, make a decision to combine the corresponding clusters of different batches.
- The matching of clusters is based on minimizing the difference between these vectors.

We investigated the following (dis)similarity criteria:

- normalize the spectra by dividing by the largest eigenvalue, then the dissimilarity is equal to an (approximate) integral between the class spectrum and the new data set spectrum (Combinatorial Laplacian Relative Lambda Method, CLRL); see Fig 1,
- normalize the spectra by dividing by the dataset size (class or new data set), then the dissimilarity is equal to an (approximate) integral between the class spectrum and the new data set spectrum (Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Lambda Method, CLSSAL); see Fig 2,
- normalize the spectra by dividing by the dataset size (class or new data set), then the dissimilarity is equal to the absolute difference between largest eigenvalues (Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Maximum Lambda Method, CLMXL); see Fig 2,
- compute not the combinatorial Laplacian but rather the Normalized Laplacian (which has always by definition the largest eigenvalue not greater than 2^1 , then the dissimilarity is equal to an (approximate) integral between the class spectrum and the new data set spectrum (Normalized Laplacian Method, NLL); see Fig 3.

The dissimilarity measures mentioned above differ due to specific properties of GSA. NLL is based on normalized Laplacian while the other three measures refer to combinatorial Laplacian. This has an effect on the shape of the respective spectrograms. Eigenvalues of normalized Laplacian are upper-bounded by the value of 2, whatever the sample size is. So if one has samples of different sizes

¹the value 2 is attained for bipartite graphs

from the same population, the value range is bounded and one needs only to adjust the indexes of eigenvalues to match the spectrograms of data from the same population. But the eigenvalues of combinatorial Laplacian can grow without any limit if the sample size increases. The approaches CLRL, CLSSAL and CLMXL handle the issue of matching spectrograms of data from the same population in different ways. It is necessary in all these cases to normalize the indexes of eigenvalues (into the range 0-1). The approach CLRL normalizes the eigenvalues by dividing by the largest eigenvalue, while CLSSAL divides them by the sample size. The effects of both on the spectrogram would be the same for samples from the population, but the shapes of different population spectrograms will differ in different ways (e.g. in CLRL the spectrograms will meet at both ends, while in CLSSAL they will not). CLSSAL divides them by the sample size. The effects of both on the spectrogram would be the same for samples from the population, but the shapes of different population spectrograms will differ in different ways (e.g. in CLRL the spectrograms will meet at both ends, while in CLSSAL they will not). CLRL is more susceptible to noise at the largest eigenvalue than CLSSAL. CLMXL transforms the spectrogram in the same way as CLSSAL, but instead of using an integral to assess the differences between populations it takes the largest eigenvalue after normalization. For justifications of the used properties see [16].

Our algorithm is proposed in section 3.

The experimental study of the effectiveness of our method is presented in section 5 and the conclusions are described in section 6. Let us first provide with an overview of concepts behind spectral clustering methods in section 2.

2 Previous Work

One observes growing interest in graph spectral clustering and classification methods. While they have interesting properties with respect to spatial form of clusters and classes [13], they face the problem of inability to operate incrementally [14, 2, 1, 20]. Let us briefly explain the reasons for this problem.

The traditional way to perform graph spectral clustering is based on relaxation of ratio cut (RCut) and normalized cut (NCut) graph clustering methods. k -means algorithm is applied to the rows of the matrix, the columns of which are eigenvectors associated with the k lowest eigenvalues of the corresponding graph Laplacian [13].

Formally, consider a similarity matrix S between pairs of items (e.g. documents). One can imagine a weighted graph G linking the items with weights represented by S . A(n unnormalized) or combinatorial Laplacian L of the matrix S is defined as

$$L = T - S, \tag{1}$$

where T is the diagonal matrix with $t_{jj} = \sum_{k=1}^n s_{jk}$ for each $j \in [n]$. A normalized Laplacian \mathcal{L} of the graph represented by S is defined as

$$\mathcal{L} = T^{-1/2} L T^{-1/2} = I - T^{-1/2} S T^{-1/2}. \tag{2}$$

Recall that the RCut criterion means finding the partition matrix $P_{RCut} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ that minimizes the formula $H^T L H$ over the set of all partition matrices $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$. This minimization problem turns out to be NP-hard. This is the reason for relaxing it by assuming that H is a column orthogonal matrix. Then the solution is simple: the columns of P_{RCut} are eigenvectors of L corresponding to k smallest eigenvalues of L . Similarly, the columns of matrix P_{NCut} , representing NCut criterion, are eigenvectors of \mathcal{L} corresponding to k smallest eigenvalues of \mathcal{L} . For an explanation and further details see e.g. [13] or [15].

Various modifications are applicable, including (1) usage of the top eigenvalue eigenvectors of the matrix $D^{-1/2} S D^{-1/2}$ instead of the lowest ones [8, 22], (2) normalization of the rows of the aforementioned eigenvector sub-matrix to unit length prior to k -means clustering, (3) making use of more than k eigenvectors to cluster into k clusters, [18], (4) application of a supervised learning method, instead of clustering, preferentially on a subset of the rows of the aforementioned sub-matrix, followed by employing the learned classifier to the remaining rows.

There exists research also on semi-supervised spectral clustering, like the semi-supervised sentiment classification of Li and Hao [11] or semi-supervised spectral detection of population stratification by Liu, Shen, and Pan in [12].

The growing interest in spectral clustering results from the ability to deal with nonlinearly separable datasets. But regrettably it suffers from a critical limitation induced by its huge time and space complexity. This handicap severely restricts applicability to large-scale problems. The fact that all these methods rely on computation of eigenvectors and that eigenvectors do not exhibit the property of eigenvectors of bigger matrices being derivable from smaller matrices, there exists a problem with new coming data that they enforce computations of the eigen-vectors from scratch. This limitation prompted researchers to develop methods that can help to overcome this limitation. One strategy relies on sparsifying the affinity S matrix and solve the eigen-decomposition problem by sparse eigen-solvers [13]. Another strategy is to construct sub-matrices. E.g., the method of Nyström, as applied by [4], randomly selects p representatives from the original dataset and builds an $N \times p$ affinity sub-matrix. [3] improved this method by proposing so-called landmark based spectral clustering (LSC) method, which performs k -means on the dataset to get p cluster centers as the p representatives. Both approaches seem to suffer from the bottleneck of the number sub-matrices to be sampled. [6] proposed two algorithms, ultra-scalable spectral clustering (U-SPEC) and ultra-scalable ensemble clustering (U-SENC). U-SPEC relies on fast approximation method for K -nearest representatives used in construction of a sparse affinity sub-matrix. U-SENC integrates multiple U-SPEC into an ensemble clustering framework. These algorithms were further refined in [21] by exploring the approximate explicit feature map (aEFM) transform of low-dimensional data into a low-dimensional subspace in Hilbert space. Still another approach relies on divide-and-conquer paradigm applied to the landmark-based methodology [10]. The path is followed in [5] where probability density estimation drives the landmark approach. The idea of dealing with processing complexity via ensemble clustering is followed up in [9].

The paper [16] proposes a completely different approach to the problem of this eigenvector discontinuity. Instead of relying on eigenvectors, it turns to sole usage of eigenvalues. The paper investigates batch type classification problem. Given a collection of documents, labelled with classes, consider a new batch of documents which is known to belong to a single class, but it is unknown to which. It turns out that comparison of the spectrum of the combinatorial Laplacian of the unlabeled batch with those of labelled batches can identify the appropriate batch with reasonable probability.

3 Our Method

The theoretical background to our assumptions is outlined in the mentioned paper [16]. We do not follow the Nyström paradigm of operating in the embedding space of L matrices. Instead we look at the eigenvalue spectra.

The essence of the approach to clustering is to split the document set D , that may be too large to handle, into smaller batches (data portions) D_i . Each of them should be clustered with a spectral clustering method. Subsequently, we identify corresponding clusters of each document batch via comparing eigenvalue spectra. In this way we produce the clusters of the big dataset D .

The Algorithm 1 presents in a compact way the described method bundle. The functions called in the sub-algorithm 2, that is $L()$, $spectrum()$, $specfun()$, $spectdist()$ are described below.

Data: D - a (large) set of documents, to be processed in batches
 k - the number of clusters to be obtained
Result: Γ - the clustering of D into k clusters
Split randomly D into (small) subsets $\{D_0, \dots, D_m\}$;
For each D_i compute its spectral clustering Γ_i into k clusters;
For each cluster $C_{i,j} \in \Gamma_i$ compute the similarity matrix $S_{i,j}$ $\Gamma := \Gamma_0$ -
initial clusters (Γ_0 is the D_0 spectral clustering) ;
for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** m **do**
 for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** k **do**
 call Algorithm 2 setting: $S := S_{i,j}$; $\mathfrak{S} := \{S_{0,1}, \dots, S_{0k}\}$;
 c be the identifier returned by it;
 Update $C_c \in \Gamma$ with $C_c \cup C_{j,c}$;
 end
end

Algorithm 1: The eigenvalue based clustering algorithm

A drawback of this approach is that each cluster to be discovered must be a homogeneous group and must be distributed proportionally over various batches. By a homogeneous group we understand a population i which each sample has the same (exactly speaking very similar) spectrogram (after normalization by a given method). In fact, our experiments reported in [16] demon-

```

Data:  $S$  - similarity matrix of the new cluster of documents
 $\mathfrak{S}$  - set of similarity matrices of the clusters of documents to match with
Result:  $c$  - the assigned cluster of documents
 $L := L(S)$  - Compute Laplacian;
 $\mathfrak{L} := L(\mathfrak{S})$  - Compute Laplacians;
 $E := spectrum(L)$  - Compute Laplacian eigenvalues;
 $\mathfrak{E} := spectrum(\mathfrak{L})$  - Compute Laplacian eigenvalue for each Laplacian
  from  $\mathfrak{L}$ ;
 $F := specfun(E)$  - transform a spectrum into a function;
 $\mathfrak{F} := specfun(\mathfrak{E})$  - transform spectra into functions;
 $K \leftarrow$  number of clusters in  $\mathfrak{S}$ ;
 $c \leftarrow -1$ ;
 $mndist \leftarrow \infty$ ;
for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $K$  do
  |  $distance \leftarrow spectdist(F, \mathfrak{F}_j)$  ;
  | if  $distance < mndist$  then
  | |  $c \leftarrow j$  ;
  | |  $mndist \leftarrow distance$  ;
  | else
  | | do nothing;
  | end
end

```

Algorithm 2: The eigenvalue based class assignment algorithm

strate that this is the case for various datasets. Homogeneity does not mean that each batch must be of the same size. Rather the share of the group in each batch should be the same. If the shares of groups in different batches differ, then the spectral clustering algorithms would have in general a problem because their underlying algorithm, k -means, does not "like" clusters that differ too much in size and shape. This is not a flaw of our approach, but rather a general problem of GSA. Nonetheless there exist practical applications where homogenous groups occur proportionally in batches. One example is the task of clustering products handled by big sales companies. The number of consumer products in large chains of hypermarkets may amount to hundreds of thousands and new ones occur in bundles every week. The suppliers do not care about the groups of products the chain has created so it is the job of chain employees to cluster the products based on their descriptions. While large computers may handle spectral clustering in hundreds of thousands of dimensions, accessibility of such machines may be not common enough, so that approaches to lower the scale need to be sought.

In the Algorithm 2, being a subroutine of our main Algorithm 1, the following functions are used:

- $spectdist(F_1, F_2)$ function is the area between the two functions F_1, F_2 being its arguments for the function domains $[0,1]$, $\int_0^1 |F_1(x) - F_2(x)| dx$, except for CLMXL, where $|F_1(0) - F_2(0)|$ is returned.
- The function $L(S)$ applied to the similarity matrix S is computed as $D(S) - S$ except for Normalized Laplacian Method (NLL), where $D(S)^{-1/2} Z (D(S) - S) D(S)^{-1/2} Z$ is the result.
- The function $spectrum(L)$ applied to Laplacian L returns a vector of eigenvalues of L in non-decreasing order.
- The function $specfun(E)$ applied to the spectrum E of a Laplacian returns a function $F(x)$ defined in the domain $x \in [0, 1]$ with properties depending on the type of cluster-matching method.

– for CLRL:

$$F\left(\frac{n-i}{n-1}\right) = \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_n}$$

– for CLSSAL and CLMXL:

$$F\left(\frac{n-i}{n-1}\right) = \frac{\lambda_i}{n}$$

– for NLL:

$$F\left(\frac{n-i}{n-1}\right) = \lambda_i$$

and otherwise for any $x \in \left[\frac{n-(i+1)}{n-1}, \frac{n-i}{n-1} \right]$

$$F(x) = F\left(\frac{n-(i+1)}{n-1}\right) \cdot \left(x - \frac{n-(i+1)}{n-1}\right) + F\left(\frac{n-i}{n-1}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{n-i}{n-1} - x\right).$$

n is the number of elements in the spectrogram E ; the spectrogram is the sequence of eigenvalues ordered decreasingly, with their index i running from 1 to n .

Note that our approach to distance computation between spectra (function *spectdist*) bears some resemblance to Dynamic Time Warping (DTW, [17]) distance, but the difference is that we apply a linear transformation to the index axis of the spectrogram, while DTW promotes non-linear transformations.

4 Dataset

For our experiments, we used tweets provided by Twitter (a random sample of about 1% of English tweets) collected for the time period from mid September 2019 till end of May 2022.

We restricted our investigation to tweets having only one hashtag at the end of text with at least 10 words, whereby we restrict ourselves to the hashtags: #bbnaija, #blacklivesmatter and #puredoctrinesofchrist. This dataset will be referred to as *TWT.EN*. A copy can be found in **Supplementary File**.

5 Experiments

We want to demonstrate via the experiments that our algorithm correctly matches the clusters stemming from different data portions.

The ideal case for such a demonstration would be that the base clustering algorithm splits the dataset along known labels (coming from an external labeling) and then our method matches clusters from different data portions combining the clusters with the same external label. This external label is of course not known to the algorithm.

The only external labels available for our tweets are the hashtag. So the ideal situation would be if an algorithm may split the *TWT.EN* data in agreement with hashtags.

We assume in our first stage of experiments (subsections 5.1 and 5.2) that in fact such an ideal algorithm exists and has split each portion exactly in agreement with the hashtag labeling. Then we check if our algorithm can correctly match "clusters" stemming from different batches (data portions).

In the second stage (subsections 5.3 and 5.4), we exploit a real spectral clustering algorithm, approximating the split by hashtag.

Data portion	#bbnaija	#blacklivesmatter	#puredoctrines ofchrist	total
all	1857	2051	1295	5203
Portion 1	649	677	409	1735
Portion 2	610	686	439	1735
Portion 3	598	688	447	1733

Table 1: Hashtag distribution over data portions

5.1 Differentiation of hashtags by Laplacian spectrum

In order to check the differentiation of hashtags by Laplacian eigenvalue spectrum, the dataset TWT.EN was divided randomly into three subsets (data portions) of approximately same size. The distribution of the number of documents in data portions for each hashtag is shown in Table 1.

For each subset (data portion) and each hashtag, the combinatorial and normalized Laplacian and its spectrum of eigenvalues were calculated. The results, in normalized form, suitable for respective methods, are shown in Figs 1, 2 and 3. The figures represent the aforementioned functions *specfun()* for CLRL (Fig. 1), CLSSAL (Fig.2) and NLL (Fig.3) for each of the eigenvalue spectrum of a given hashtag of a given data portion. Lines related to the same hashtag have the same color. To improve visibility, the hashtag names were replaced in the figures by the coding `gr1 ← #bbnaija`, `gr2 ← #blacklivesmatter`, and `gr3 ← #puredoctrinesofchris`. As you can see, the method CLSSAL is characterized by the best separation of the spectrograms of different hashtags. The hashtag `#puredoctrinesofchris` seems to be best separated from the other ones.

5.2 Stability of hashtag spectra over various samples

In order to verify the usability of various cluster matching methods (CLRL, CLSSAL, NLL), the stability of hashtag eigenvalue spectra over various samples was investigated.

First, based on the data portion 1, our cluster-matching algorithm was "trained" (the spectra of hashtags were acquired, that is for each hashtag in the data portion 1 the spectrogram of Laplacian was computed for each data subset marked with this hashtag). The Algorithm 1 was applied then to an artificial series of 100 data portions created as random subsamples of data portions 2 and 3.

The correctness of data portion assignment to hashtags is shown in Tables 2-5 for the respective methods.

As visible from Table 4, the method CLSSAL provides with best results. CLMXL is second best (Table 5). See the error and F1 Table 6.

This allows us to conclude that if a clustering method would approximate well the hashtag allocations for these hashtags, then incremental clustering would be possible.




Figure 1: Spectral normalization in the Combinatorial Laplacian Relative Lambda Method method. The TWT.EN dataset

TRUE/PRED	gr1	gr2	gr3
gr1	56	44	0
gr2	26	74	0
gr3	0	91	9

Table 2: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for classes using Combinatorial Laplacian Relative Lambda Method

TRUE/PRED	gr1	gr2	gr3
gr1	0	0	100
gr2	0	0	100
gr3	0	0	100

Table 3: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for classes using Normalized Laplacian Method

TRUE/PRED	gr1	gr2	gr3
gr1	100	0	0
gr2	0	100	0
gr3	0	0	100

Table 4: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for classes using Combinatorial Laplacian Set Size Adjusted Lambda Method




Figure 2: Spectral normalization in the Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Lambda Method method and Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Maximum Lambda Method method. The TWT.EN dataset.

TRUE/PRED	gr1	gr2	gr3
gr1	73	27	0
gr2	14	86	0
gr3	0	0	100

Table 5: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for classes using Combinatorial Laplacian SSA Maximal Lambda Method




Figure 3: Spectral normalization in the Normalized Laplacian Method. The TWT.EN dataset.

Method	Error %	F1 value
CLRL	53.67	41.98
CLSSAL	0	100
CLMXL	13.67	86.27
NLL	66.67	16.67

Table 6: Errors and F1 values for TWT.EN dataset

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
#bbnaija	429	219	1
#blacklivesmatter	247	430	0
#puredoctrinesofchrist	38	86	285

Table 7: Result of clustering data portion no 1

5.3 Differentiation of clusters by Laplacian spectrum

As a next step, each data portion was clustered by Normalized spectral clustering method with unit length rows and one additional dimension (that is by a real-world spectral clustering algorithm).

The result of these clustering processes are visible in Tables 7, 8 and 9 for data portions 1,2, and 3 respectively.

We assigned cluster labels in such a way that in each clustering the cluster with the same highest share of a given hashtag gets the same cluster label. These cluster labels were of course invisible to the cluster-matching algorithm.

For each subset (data portion) and each cluster label, the combinatorial and normalized Laplacians and their eigenvalue spectra were computed. As previously, the results, in normalized form, suitable for respective methods, are shown in Figs 4, 6 and 5.

Lines related to the same cluster label have the same color.

One can see that again the method CLSSAL of data normalization is a clear winner, though first two clusters are not separated well.

5.4 Stability of cluster spectra over various samples

To investigate the ability of our method to match clusters from various data portions appropriately, we again trained our cluster-matching algorithm based on the data portion 1, The Algorithm 1 was applied then to an artificial series

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
#bbnaija	410	200	0
#blacklivesmatter	208	477	1
#puredoctrinesofchrist	94	54	291

Table 8: Result of clustering data portion no 2

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
#bbnaija	448	150	0
#blacklivesmatter	277	411	0
#puredoctrinesofchrist	21	132	294

Table 9: Result of clustering data portion no 3




Figure 4: Spectral normalization in the Combinatorial Laplacian Relative Lambda Method method. The TWT.EN dataset

of 100 data portions created as random subsamples of data portions 2 and 3.

The correctness of data portion assignment to clusters is shown in Tables 10-13 for the respective methods.

As one can see, the method CLSSAL is the best one, but due to overlapping nature of spectrograms of clusters pseudo-1 and pseudo-2, they are not as well matched as the cluster pseudo-3. See also the error and F1 Table 14.

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
pseudo-1	40	57	3
pseudo-2	51	41	8
pseudo-3	0	0	100

Table 10: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for clusters using Combinatorial Laplacian Relative Lambda Method

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
pseudo-1	0	0	100
pseudo-2	0	0	100
pseudo-3	0	0	100

Table 11: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for clusters using Normalized Laplacian Method




Figure 5: Spectral normalization in the Normalized Laplacian Method. The TWT.EN dataset.

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
pseudo-1	36	64	0
pseudo-2	84	16	0
pseudo-3	0	0	100

Table 12: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for clusters using Combinatorial Laplacian Set Size Adjusted Lambda Method

TRUE/PRED	pseudo-1	pseudo-2	pseudo-3
pseudo-1	37	63	0
pseudo-2	15	85	0
pseudo-3	0	0	100

Table 13: Classification experiment for the dataset TWT.EN for clusters using Combinatorial Laplacian SSA Maximal Lambda Method




Figure 6: Spectral normalization in the Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Lambda Method method and Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Maximum Lambda Method method. The TWT.EN dataset.

Method	Error %	F1 value
CLRL	39.67	59.36
CLSSAL	49.33	50.17
CLMXL	26	72.41
NLL	66.67	16.67

Table 14: Errors and F1 values for TWT.EN dataset

6 Conclusions

Our research shows that Twitter tweets related to the same hashtag are "similar" in "style" in any subsample (that is their combinatorial Laplacian spectrum). This carries over to clusters obtained by clustering algorithms discovering the hashtags. So instead of clustering of the entire set, we could propose in this paper to cluster subsets and then recover the total cluster and then match the clusters from subsets via the Laplacian spectrum.

It seems to be an interesting feature of collections of (short) documents that their subsets share a common normalized in some way eigenvalue spectrum. If clusters obtained from a given method yield spectra of significantly different characteristics, then the spectral analysis may be exploited for the purpose of splitting the clustering process to smaller portions of data and then matching the obtained subclusters via the outlined Combinatorial Laplacian Sample Size Adjusted Lambda Method method. This can be especially useful for clustering methods of complexity strongly increasing with the size of the data sample.

Further research would be directed towards understanding the mechanism relating the literary style of short documents collections on a particular topic to the eigenvalue spectrogram and the reasons why some spectrograms are more or less similar for various topical collections.

References

- [1] C. Alzate and J.A.K. Suykens. Multiway spectral clustering with out-of-sample extensions through weighted kernel pca. *IEEE Tran. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 32(2):335 – 347, 2010.
- [2] Y. Bengio, J. Paiement, P. Vincent, O. Delalleau, N. L. Roux, and M. Ouimet. Out-of-sample extensions for LLE, ISOMAP, MDS, eigenmaps, and spectral clustering. In *NIPS 16*, pages 177–184, 2003.
- [3] Deng Cai and Xinlei Chen. Large scale spectral clustering via landmark-based sparse representation. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 45(8):1669–1680, 2015.
- [4] Wen-Yen Chen, Yangqiu Song, Hongjie Bai, Chih-Jen Lin, and Edward Y. Chang. Parallel spectral clustering in distributed systems. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 33(3):568–586, 2011.
- [5] Xia Hong, Junbin Gao, Hong Wei, James Xiao, and Richard Mitchell. Two-step scalable spectral clustering algorithm using landmarks and probability density estimation. *Neurocomputing*, 519:173–186, 2023.
- [6] Dong Huang, Chang-Dong Wang, Jian-Sheng Wu, Jian-Huang Lai, and Chee-Keong Kwoh. Ultra-scalable spectral clustering and ensemble clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 32(6):1212–1226, 2020.

- [7] R. Janani and S. Vijayarani. Text document clustering using spectral clustering algorithm with particle swarm optimization. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 134:192–200, 2019.
- [8] S.D. Kamvar, D. Klein, and Ch.D. Manning. Spectral learning. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Joint Conf. on Artificial intelligence. IJCAI'03*, page 561–566, 2003.
- [9] Hongmin Li, Xiucui Ye, Akira Imakura, and Tetsuya Sakurai. Lsec: Large-scale spectral ensemble clustering, 2021.
- [10] Hongmin Li, Xiucui Ye, Akira Imakura, and Tetsuya Sakurai. Divide-and-conquer based large-scale spectral clustering. *Neurocomputing*, 501:664–678, aug 2022.
- [11] S. Li and J. Hao. Spectral clustering-based semi-supervised sentiment classification. In S. Zhou, S. Zhang, and G. Karypis, editors, *Advanced Data Mining and Applications. ADMA 2012*, volume LNAI 7713, pages 271–283. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35527-1_23.
- [12] Binghui Liu, Xiaotong Shen, and Wei Pan. Semi-supervised spectral clustering with application to detect population stratification. *Frontiers in Genetics*, page Article 215, Oct 2013. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2013.00215>.
- [13] U. von Luxburg. A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and Computing*, 17(4):395–416, 2007. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11222-007-9033-z>.
- [14] F. Nie, Z. Zeng, I.W. Tsang, D. Xu, and Ch. Changshui. Spectral embedded clustering: A framework for in-sample and out-of-sample spectral clustering. *IEEE Trans. Neur. Netw.*, 2011.
- [15] A. Nonymous. *Anonymous for the sake of reviewing*. Anonymous, 2018.
- [16] A. Nonymous. Anonymous for the sake of reviewing. *Anonymous*, pages 1–2, 2023.
- [17] L. R. Rabiner and B.-H. Juang. *Fundamentals of Speech Recognition, Chapter 4*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- [18] N. Rebagliati and A. Verri. Spectral clustering with more than K eigenvectors. *Neurocomputing*, 74(9):1391–1401, Apr 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurocom.2010.12.08>.
- [19] H. Sevi, M. Jonckheere, and A. Kalogeratos. Generalized spectral clustering for directed and undirected graphs, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.03221>.

- [20] D. Shen, Xiuyi Li, and Guannan Yan. Improve the spectral clustering by integrating a new modularity similarity index and out-of-sample extension. *Modern Physics Letters B*, 34(11):2050105, 2020.
- [21] Dario Sitnik and Ivica Kopriva. Clustering and classification of low-dimensional data in explicit feature map domain: intraoperative pixel-wise diagnosis of adenocarcinoma of a colon in a liver, 2022.
- [22] R. Suganthi and S. Manimekalai. Spectral clustering based classification algorithm for text classification. *International Journal of Engineering Science Invention (IJESI)*, pages 36–41, 2018. <http://www.ijesi.org/papers/NCIOT-2018/Volume-3/7.%2036-41.pdf>.
- [23] Jingzhi Tu, Gang Mei, and Francesco Picciallib. An improved Nyström spectral graph clustering using k-core decomposition as a sampling strategy for large networks. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 2022.