

Random Projections for k -Means: Maintaining Coresets Beyond Merge & Reduce

Marc Bury*, Chris Schwiegelshohn†

Efficient Algorithms and Complexity Theory, TU Dortmund, Germany.
{firstname.lastname}@tu-dortmund.de

We give a new construction for a small space summary satisfying the coreset guarantee of a data set with respect to the k -means objective function. The number of points required in an offline construction is in $\tilde{O}(k\epsilon^{-2} \min(d, k\epsilon^{-2}))$ which is minimal among all available constructions.

Aside from two constructions with exponential dependence on the dimension, all known coresets are maintained in data streams via the merge and reduce framework, which incurs a large space dependency on $\log n$. Instead, our construction crucially relies on Johnson-Lindenstrauss type embeddings which combined with results from online algorithms give us a new technique for efficiently maintaining coresets in data streams without relying on merge and reduce. The final number of points stored by our algorithm in a data stream is in $\tilde{O}(k^2\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n \min(d, k\epsilon^{-2}))$.

*Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, grant BO 2755/1-2

†Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the Collaborative Research Center SFB 876, project A2

1 Introduction

Analyzing big data sets from streams is a topic that has received considerable theoretical and practical attention. One of the most popular problems studied in this context is k -means clustering, where for a given set of points, we seek to determine exactly k clusters such that the total minimum Euclidean squared distance of all points to the nearest center is minimized.

Although there exist many good algorithms for k -means in theory and in practice, even heuristic algorithms are infeasible to run on large data sets. Assisting, not replacing data analysis through algorithms has therefore become an important topic. This can involve a preprocessing step to aggregate the data set while retaining its most important features. The characteristics of such an aggregation are necessarily problem and perhaps application dependent. Coresets have extremely strong aggregation properties in that they approximate the clustering cost for *any* candidate set of centers. As a general design paradigm for summarizing data features, coresets were originally proposed by Agarwal, Har-Peled and Varadarajan [2] and first applied to clustering by Bădoui, Har-Peled and Indyk [4].

Streaming algorithms for k -means

There exist two general (but by no means exclusive) approaches to solve k -means clustering in streams. The first is to produce a clustering on the fly, see [22, 10, 3, 34] for results on k -means and the related k -median objective. The state of art seems to be an algorithm by Braverman et al. [8] which produces a set of $O(k \log n)$ centers with constant approximation to the cost of an optimal k -means clustering.

The second approach is to aggregate the data for subsequent computation on the summary. Braverman et al. [8] augment their construction to provide good approximations for data sets satisfying a separation condition introduced by Ostrovsky et al. [32]. For general inputs, research has focused on constructions of coresets. For a complete overview of coreset constructions, we refer to Table 1. Coresets for k -means have the very useful property of being closed under union, that is, for two point sets, the union of coresets for both point sets is a coreset for the entire point set. This property allows us to transform an arbitrary offline coreset construction into a coreset for data streams via the merge and reduce framework introduced by Bentley and Saxe [5] by partitioning the input point set into a batch of points of small size (say $O(\log n)$), computing a coreset on each batch, and merging coresets bottom-up in a binary tree by recomputing a coreset of two coresets of equal depth. This framework does not come without a cost. The merging step incurs a loss in quality, that is, a coreset of two ϵ -coresets is a $2\epsilon + \epsilon^2$ coreset. Since the merge and reduce tree has depth $\log(n/\log n) \in O(\log n)$, this procedure introduces a dependency of a factor of $\log n$ on ϵ . In addition, we require the storage of at most one coreset at every level of the merge and reduce tree, incurring another $\log n$ in the space requirement. Finally, all known constructions for high dimensions fail with an adjustable probability δ . To limit the overall failure probability when processing a stream, δ is rescaled by the number of batches, incurring another factor of $O(\log n)$. The best dependency on $\log n$ is due to Langberg and Schulman [29] whose construction requires $\log^4 n$. There exist constructions not relying on the merge and reduce framework but processing each point online. While they typically have a better dependency on $\log n$, the best result by Fichtenberger et al. [20] is nevertheless exponential in the dimension.

Low Distortion Embeddings for Subspace Approximation

The k -means objective is closely related to the tractable low rank approximation problem of an n by d matrix A , where the task is to find a matrix B of rank k such that $\|A - B\|_F$ is minimized. The connection was first given theoretical consideration by Drineas et al. [16], who showed that

Algorithm	Offline Memory	Streaming Memory
Low Dimensions		
[24]	$O(k\epsilon^{-d} \log n)$	$O(k\epsilon^{-(d+1)} \log^{2d+2} n)$
[23]	$O(k^3 \epsilon^{-(d+1)})$	$O(k^3 \epsilon^{-(d+1)} \log^{d+2} n)$
[21]	$O(k\epsilon^{-d} \log n)$	$O(k\epsilon^{-(d+2)} \log^4 n)$
[20]	$O(k\epsilon^{-(d+2)} \log n)$	$O(k\epsilon^{-(d+2)} \log n)$
High Dimensions		
[11]	$O(d^2 k^2 \epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n)$	$O(d^2 k^2 \epsilon^{-2} \log^9 n)$
[18]	$O(k^2 \epsilon^{-5})$	$O(k^2 \epsilon^{-5} \log^7 n)$
[29]	$\tilde{O}(d^2 k^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{O}(d^2 k^3 \epsilon^{-2} \log^4 n)$
[17]	$O(dk\epsilon^{-4})$	$O(dk\epsilon^{-4} \log^6 n)$
here	$\tilde{O}(dk\epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{O}(dk^2 \epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$

Table 1: Comparison of memory demands, where polylogarithmic factors are suppressed and the memory to store a d -dimensional point is not specified. The constructions for high dimensions do not treat d as a constant and succeed with constant probability. [18] produces a weak coresets from which an $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation can be recovered. Any dependency on d may be replaced by $k\epsilon^{-2}$ via Theorem 12 of Cohen et al. [14].

projecting each point onto the best rank k subspace and solving k -means on the resulting point set gives a 2 approximation. Since then there have been a series of results studying dimensionality reduction techniques, see [6, 19, 7]. Recently, Cohen et al. [14] showed that projecting onto the best $j = \lceil k/\epsilon \rceil$ subspace and solving the resulting problem results in an $(1 + \epsilon)$ approximation. They also showed that an oblivious random projection with Johnson-Lindenstrauss moments onto $O(k\epsilon^{-2})$ dimensions is cost preserving for any k -means clustering. Random projections for faster computation of low rank approximations and for sketching matrices in streams were first proposed by Sarlós [33] and further studied by Clarkson and Woodruff [12, 13], who gave close to optimal space bounds of $O(k\epsilon^{-1}(n + d) \log nd)$ for point-wise insertion.

Our Contribution & Techniques

We utilize linear embeddings to summarize the points. Previous applications of linear embeddings only served to reduce the dimension by exploiting the connection of k -means to the low rank approximation problem which can be thought of as a clustering problem with a k -dimensional subspace as a center. Indeed, a low rank approximation of sufficient dimension is a coresets for the k -means problem but it is infeasible to store in small space. Since the k -means objective function clusters with points rather than a subspace, it tends to be far larger and thus easier to approximate. Our approach is closely related to that of Sarlós [33] and Clarkson and Woodruff [12] for approximate matrix multiplication. They showed that the distortion incurred by sketching two matrices and multiplying the sketches is proportionate to the respective Frobenius norm of the matrices. Although the error is only additive, it is sufficient for our purpose. Our offline construction consists of sketching the point set of each partition of a clustering with sufficiently low cost using a sign matrix of small target dimension.

Theorem 1. *For any set of n points in \mathbb{R}^d , let K be a set of centers such that the clustering cost to K is within a constant factor of the optimal k -means clustering cost OPT . Then there exists a set of at most $O(|K| \log(|K|/\delta) \epsilon^{-2} \min(d, k\epsilon^{-2}))$ points from which with probability at least $1 - \delta$ a (k, ϵ) coresets for the k -means objective function can be extracted.*

By simply combining the offline construction with the merge and reduce framework, we can maintain a coreset using $O(k \log(k/\delta) \epsilon^{-2} \log^4 n \min(d, k \epsilon^{-2}))$ points. We improve on this by maintaining sketches of partitions akin to online algorithms. Specifically, we adapt an algorithm by Braverman et al. [8] which computes a constant approximation to the optimal k -means clustering using $O(k \log n)$ centers. One might first attempt to simply pipeline the partitions induced by the centers into our sketches. However, while points assigned to a cluster remain in the same partition, different partitions may be merged over time. Maintaining all possible partitions is not feasible as it would require $2^{O(k \log n)}$ space. While we are not able to precompute a reduced number of partitions that might appear over the course of the algorithm, we will utilize the linearity of the sketches to carry out all merges within the sketches, at the cost of squaring the number of required sketches.

Theorem 2. *For any set of n points in \mathbb{R}^d arriving over an insertion-only stream, there exists an algorithm maintaining a set of at most $O(k^2 \log^2 n \log(k \log n / \delta) \epsilon^{-2} \min(d, k \epsilon^{-2}))$ points from which with probability at least $1 - \delta$ a (k, ϵ) coreset for the k -means objective function can be extracted.*

1.1 Preliminaries

The Euclidean norm of a vector v is defined as $\|v\| := \sqrt{\sum_i v_i^2}$ and the Frobenius norm of a matrix A is defined as $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2}$, respectively. The centroid μ of a point set A is defined as $\frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{x \in A} x$. We say the distance of a point p to a set of (not necessarily k) points $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is $\text{dist}(x, K) := \min_{q \in K} \|x - q\|$, analogously, the cost of clustering a point set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ via centers K is $\text{cost}(A, K) := \sum_{x \in A} \text{dist}^2(x, K)$. The partition of A induced by K is the set of subsets $\Pi := \{\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_{|K|}\}$ where Π_i is the set of all points assigned to $c_i \in K$. The cost of an optimal k -means clustering is denoted by OPT .

Definition 1 ([19]). An (ϵ, k) -coreset of a set of points $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to the k -means optimization problem is a set of points $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a linear weight function $w : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that for any set of candidate centers C and a given $\epsilon > 0$

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot \text{cost}(A, C) \leq \text{cost}_w(K, C) + \Delta \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{cost}(A, C).$$

The weight function w typically counts the number of points assigned to the respective element of K . In our case the weights are unitary and $\Delta = 0$.

2 Offline Coreset Construction

Proof of Theorem 1. We start by giving the following well known statements from k -means clustering literature.

Lemma 1 (Movement Lemma [21, 20]). *Let $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and A, A' be two sets of points in \mathbb{R}^d and let $\pi : A \rightarrow A'$ be a bijection such that $\sum_{p \in A} \|p - \pi(p)\|^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{16} \cdot OPT$. Then for any set of k centers K we have*

$$|\text{cost}(A', K) - \text{cost}(A, K)| \leq \epsilon \cdot \text{cost}(A, K).$$

Lemma 2 (Objective Value Decomposition). *Let A be a set of points in \mathbb{R}^d with mean μ . Then for any point c*

$$\sum_{x \in A} \|x - c\|^2 = |A| \cdot \|\mu - c\|^2 + \sum_{x \in A} \|x - \mu\|^2.$$

There are several noteworthy consequences of the last lemma. First, the optimal centers are the centroids of a partition of the point set P . Second, if the origin is the center to which a set of points P is assigned, the 1-means clustering cost is equal to $\|P\|_F^2$.

Our final ingredient comes from the theory of linear embeddings for Euclidean subspaces. An n by m sign matrix S consists of entries uniformly chosen from $\{-1, 1\}$, scaled to have Euclidean column norm of 1. Denote by $\mathbb{E}_p[X] = (\mathbb{E}[X^p])^{1/p}$ for a random variable X . Then

Lemma 3 (Lemma 2.3 of [12]). *Given matrices A and B , suppose S is a scaled sign matrix with $m > 15$ columns, and A , B , and S have the same number of rows. Then there is an absolute constant C so that for integer $p > 1$ with $m > Cp$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_p[\|A^T S S^T B - A^T B\|_F^2] \leq 2^{1/2p} (8p/e) \|A\|_F^2 \|B\|_F^2 / m.$$

This bound also holds when S is $4p$ -wise independent.

We construct our summary now as follows. First, compute any set of (possibly more than k) centers K such that their clustering cost is within a constant factor α of the optimal objective value. Such a set K forms the basis for most coresets constructions and can for instance be a constant factor approximation, see Kanugo et al. [28] and Jain and Vazirani [26], or a bicriteria approximation using $\beta \cdot k$ many centers with a clustering cost that is within $\alpha \cdot OPT$, see Indyk [25] and Chen [11]. Let Π_i be the subset of A assigned to center $c_i \in K$. We subtract c_i from each point of Π_i and draw a random $|\Pi_i|$ by m scaled sign matrix. Finally add the c_i onto each row of $S S^T (\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T)$ and denote the final matrix P_i . The union of all these matrices denoted by A' will be proven to be a coreset. We note that $\Pi_i = \Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T + \mathbf{1} c_i^T$ and $P_i = S S^T (\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T) + \mathbf{1} c_i^T$.

Set $p = \log(\sqrt{2} \cdot |K|/\delta)$ and $m = \frac{128 d p \alpha}{\epsilon^2}$. We first observe, that for any orthonormal n by d matrix X with submatrix X_i associated with the entries of the partition Π_i

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[\|X_i^T \Pi_i - X_i^T P_i\|_F^2 > \frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[\|X_i^T \Pi_i - X_i^T P_i\|_F^{2p} > \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^2 \right)^p \right] \\ \text{(Markov)} \quad & \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^2 \right)^{-p} \mathbb{E}[\|X_i^T \Pi_i - X_i^T P_i\|_F^{2p}] \\ &= \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^2 \right)^{-p} \mathbb{E}[\|X_i^T (\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T) - X_i^T S S^T (\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T)\|_F^{2p}] \\ \text{(Lemma 3)} \quad & \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \right)^{-p} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^{-2p} \sqrt{2} (8p/em)^p \|X_i\|_F^{2p} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^{2p} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \right)^{-p} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^{-2p} \sqrt{2} (8p/em)^p d^p \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1} c_i^T\|_F^{2p} \\ &= \left(\frac{\epsilon^2 \cdot m \cdot e}{128 \cdot d \cdot \alpha \cdot p} \right)^{-p} \sqrt{2} = e^{-p} \sqrt{2} = \frac{\delta}{|K|}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Let $U_i \Sigma_i V_i$ be the singular decomposition of $(\Pi_i - P_i)$. By invariance of the Frobenius norm under

rotations, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\|A - A'\|_F^2 > \frac{\epsilon^2}{16} OPT] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{|K|} \|\Pi_i - TP_i\|_F^2 > \frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{|K|} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1}c_i^T\|_F^2\right] \\
(\text{Union Bound}) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|K|} \mathbb{P}\left[\|\Pi_i - P_i\|_F^2 > \frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1}c_i^T\|_F^2\right] \\
(\text{Rotation Invariance}) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|K|} \mathbb{P}\left[\|U_i^T \Pi_i - U_i^T P_i\|_F^2 > \frac{\epsilon^2}{16\alpha} \|\Pi_i - \mathbf{1}c_i^T\|_F^2\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|K|} \frac{\delta}{|K|} = \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1, A' is an ϵ coreset of A . To store A , we require a sketch of each of the k partitions of size $O(d\epsilon^{-2}\log(k/\delta))$, as well as the sketching matrices. The dependency on d may be replaced by a dependency on k/ϵ^2 via Theorem 12 of Cohen et al. [14]. \square

3 Streaming Implementation

Ideally, we would want to compute a partition of the point set online, using as few centers as possible while obtaining a sufficiently good approximation guarantee. However, there exist few pure online algorithms with provable guarantees for k -means. We are only aware of an algorithm by Liberty et al. [30] which obtains a constant competitive factor using $O(k \log n)$ centers, assuming knowledge of at least an approximation to n and OPT , and otherwise an $O(\log n)$ competitive ratio using $O(k \log n \log \gamma n)$ centers, where $\gamma = \frac{\max_{v,v'} \|v-v'\|}{\min_{v,v'} \|v-v'\|}$ is the aspect ratio of the data. Without further assumptions, $\log \gamma$ is infeasible to store.

Instead, we adapt an algorithm by Braverman et al. [8] (see also the later modification by Schindler et al. [34]). To outline the general idea, we first review their algorithm (see also Algorithm 1). The algorithm maintains a set of centers K and either opens a new point x as a center with probability $\text{dist}^2(x, K)/f$, where f is dependent on k , $\log n$, and a current estimate of OPT , or assigns x to the nearest center. If too many centers (more than $ck \log n$ for an absolute constant c) are chosen, the algorithm increases its estimate of OPT and restarts by including the previous centers weighted with the number of points that have been assigned to them.

Theorem 3 (Theorem 3.2 of [8]). *With high probability, Algorithm 1 achieves a constant approximation to k -service clustering if α -approximate triangle inequality holds for fixed constant α . This uses exactly k facilities and stores $O(k \log n)$ points in memory.*

For k -means, $\alpha = 2$ is a direct consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality applied to the sum of two squared Euclidean norms.

The merging of centers in the last step is the major obstacle for our algorithm, as we would naively have to precompute all possible resulting partitions, which may sum up to $2^{|K|} \in n^{O(k)}$. While we are not able to precompute fewer partitions in general, we will show that we require at most $|K|^2 \in O(k^2 \log^2 n)$ linear sketches to carry out all merge operations within our summaries.

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. We describe the merge operation on sketches and prove correctness in Lemma 4. While the sketches contain a coreset, extracting one is non-trivial. Here, we use a technical Lemma 5 showing that a bijection satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1 can still be determined. We conclude by formally proving Theorem 2.

Algorithm 1: One pass, constant approximation k -means clustering algorithm. [8]

input: Point set A

```

1  $L_1 \leftarrow 1$ ;
2  $i \leftarrow 1$ ;
3 while solution not found do
4    $K \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
5    $cost \leftarrow 0$ ;
6    $f \leftarrow L_i / (k(1 + \log n))$ ;
7   while there are points still in the stream do
8      $x \leftarrow$  next point from stream;
9      $y \leftarrow$  facility in  $K$  that minimizes  $\text{dist}^2(x, y)$ ;
10    if with probability  $\min\left(\frac{\text{weight}(x) \cdot \text{dist}^2(x, y)}{f}, 1\right)$  then
11       $K \leftarrow K \cup \{x\}$ ;
12    else
13       $cost \leftarrow cost + \text{weight}(x) \cdot \text{dist}^2(x, y)$ ;
14       $\text{weight}(y) \leftarrow \text{weight}(y) + \text{weight}(x)$ ;
15      if  $cost > L_i$  or  $|K| > (\gamma - 1)(1 + \log n)k$  then
16        break and raise flag;
17  if flag raised then
18    push facilities in  $K$  onto stream;
19     $L_{i+1} \leftarrow \beta L_i$ ;
20     $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
21  else
22    Cluster  $K$  to yield exactly  $k$  facilities;
23    Declare solution found;

```

Lemma 4. Let Π be the final set of partitions computed at the end of Algorithm 1 with $|\Pi| = |K| \in O(k \log n)$. Then for each $\Pi_i \in \Pi$, $S^T(\Pi_i - \mathbf{1}K_i^T)$ can be computed using at most $O(|K|^2) = O(k^2 \log^2 n)$ sketches.

Proof. Let K be the current set of centers of Algorithm 1, where K_i was opened before K_j if $i < j$. Let $\text{ind}(j)$ be indexes of points assigned to cluster K_j . Denote by A_ℓ the ℓ -th row of A and by A^j and $C^{i,j}$ with $i \leq j$ the n times d matrices with rows

$$A_\ell^j = \begin{cases} A_\ell & \text{if } \ell \in \text{ind}(j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad C_\ell^{i,j} = \begin{cases} K_i & \text{if } \ell \in \text{ind}(j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

It is straightforward to maintain the $|K|$ different $S^T A^j$ and $\binom{|K|}{2}$ different $S^T C^{i,j}$ during the execution of Algorithm 1 for a sign matrix of appropriate target dimension. When pushing the centers back onto the stream, we apply an inverse chronological order, that is, K_1 is the first center read from the stream while $K_{|K|}$ is the last one. Therefore, points of center K_j can only be assigned to K_i if $i < j$. The crux here is that for partition A^j we maintain matrices containing the centers of the older partitions $i < j$ at the rows associated with partition j . This allows us to merge the partitions A^i and A^j by just calculating the new sketch of the union of A^i and A^j by $S^T A^i + S^T A^j$ and, more importantly, the new sketches of the center matrices by $S^T C^{i,j'} + S^T C^{j',j}$ for every $j' \leq i$. In the end, we have $S^T A^i - S^T C^{i,i}$ as the desired sketches. \square

In our online approach, A^i is an n times d matrix while the corresponding matrix of the offline problem is a $|\Pi_i|$ times d matrix. If we know the assignment of the points to the centers, then we could just pick the corresponding rows from $SS^T(A^i - \mathbf{1}K_i^T)$ and add the center K_i . But explicitly storing the assignment of points to centers is not an option due to space limitations. However, we can use the sketch $S^T(A^i - \mathbf{1}K_i^T)$ to extract a set of $|\Pi_i|$ points whose movement cost w.r.t. the points in $A^i - \mathbf{1}K_i^T$ is bounded and add the center K_i onto these points.

Lemma 5. Let A be an n by d matrix and let I be the set of non-zero rows of A with $|I| = \ell$. Let S be a scaled sign matrix with $d \cdot \epsilon^{-2}$ columns. Let J be the ℓ largest rows of $SS^T A$ with respect to the Euclidean norm. Then there exists a bijection $\pi : I \rightarrow J$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_p \left[\sum_{p \in I} \|p - \pi(p)\|^2 \right] \leq 2^{1/2p} (48p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m.$$

Proof. Let $U\Sigma V$ be the singular value decomposition of $(SS^T A - A)$. We first note that by Lemma 3

$$\mathbb{E}_p [\|SS^T A - A\|_F^2] = \mathbb{E}_p [\|USS^T A - UA\|_F^2] \leq 2^{1/2p} (8p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m. \quad (2)$$

Let $\text{ind}(I)$ and $\text{ind}(J)$ be the set of indices of I and J with respect to A and $SS^T A$. For all indices i in $\text{ind}(I) \cap \text{ind}(J)$, we set $\pi(A_i) = (SS^T A)_i$. For the remaining $\ell - |\text{ind}(I) \cap \text{ind}(J)|$ indices we choose any legal assignment resulting in a bijection. Note that $|\text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)| = |\text{ind}(J) \setminus \text{ind}(I)|$. Since we choose J to be the largest rows with respect to the Euclidean norm, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|(SS^T A)_i\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|\pi(A_i)\|^2 = \sum_{j \in \text{ind}(J) \setminus \text{ind}(I)} \|(SS^T A)_j\|^2$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - \pi(A_i)\|^2 &= \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i + (SS^T A)_i - \pi(A_i)\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i\|^2 + \|(SS^T A)_i - \pi(A_i)\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i\|^2 + 2 \cdot \|(SS^T A)_i\|^2 + 2 \cdot \|\pi(A_i)\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i\|^2 + 4 \cdot \sum_{j \in \text{ind}(J) \setminus \text{ind}(I)} \|(SS^T A)_j\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Note that $A_j = \mathbf{0}$ if $j \in \text{ind}(J) \setminus \text{ind}(I)$. Together with Equation 2, this implies that for every set of indices H it holds $\mathbb{E}_p \left[\sum_{i \in H} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i\|^2 \right] \leq 2^{1/2p} (8p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m$ and, particularly, $\mathbb{E}_p \left[\sum_{j \in \text{ind}(J) \setminus \text{ind}(I)} \|(SS^T A)_j\|^2 \right] \leq 2^{1/2p} (8p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m$.

Combining this result with the indexes in $\text{ind}(I) \cap \text{ind}(J)$ we obtain from Equation 3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_p \left[\sum_{p \in I} \|p - \pi(p)\|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_p \left[\sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \cap \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - (SS^T A)_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \in \text{ind}(I) \setminus \text{ind}(J)} \|A_i - \pi(A_i)\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq 6 \cdot 2^{1/2p} (8p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m = 2^{1/2p} (48p/e) d \|A\|_F^2 / m.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 3, we have a constant approximation using at most $O(k \log n)$ centers, and by Lemma 4 we can compute all partition matrices using at most $O(k^2 \log^2 n)$ sketches. For each partition we count the number of points assigned to respective center. Lemma 5 guarantees the existence of a bijection from the points Π_i in each partition to a row of the respective sketch matrix by taking the $|\Pi_i|$ rows of largest magnitude. We then repeat the analysis of Theorem 1, where we use the squared Euclidean distance given by the modified bijection instead of the squared Frobenius norm of the matrix resulting from row-wise subtraction and use Lemma 5 instead of Lemma 3 in Equation 1. □

4 Concluding Remarks

The primary focus of this paper is the space requirement of maintaining a coresset in data streams. Additionally, we want to do this with small running times. Using dense sign matrices, see for example Achlioptas [1], the update time per point is linear in n . Recently, research has begun to focus on the construction of sparser sign matrices with similar guarantees [15, 9, 13]. The best result for our setting is due to Kane and Nelson [27], who give a construction with update time $O(\epsilon \ell d + \ell)$ per point, where ℓ is the target dimension of the sketch.

Having processed the stream, we still have to extract the points one by one when running an algorithm. Although this can be done in small space, the procedure is time consuming. Moreover, to apply more expensive algorithms with running times only feasible for small input sizes, we would have to compute one of the previously proposed coresets consisting of fewer points from our summary.

In our analysis we use the online algorithm by Braverman et al. [8] which is especially appealing due to its simplicity. However, the algorithm is randomized and requires additional space for a high probability guarantee as well as random bits of sufficiently high independence. The random

bits can be drawn from a pseudo-random generator for bounded space computation, see Nisan [31], which requires $O(S \log n)$ space with S being the space requirement of the algorithm. These problems can be avoided by using the streaming algorithm by Fichtenberger et al. [20] which deterministically computes an $O(1)$ approximation using $O(k \log n)$ centers and therefore does not require any additional random bits. The merging procedure of the sketches can be carried out similarly, again maintaining at most $O(k^2 \log^2 n)$ sketches at any given time. Since this algorithm is more complicated than that of Braverman et al. [8], we chose the simpler construction for the sake of brevity.

5 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Uwe Schwiegelshohn, Christian Sohler and David Woodruff for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] D. Achlioptas. Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 66(4):671–687, 2003.
- [2] P. Agarwal, S. Har-Peled, and K. Varadarajan. Approximating extent measures of points. *J. ACM*, 51(4):606–635, 2004.
- [3] N. Ailon, R. Jaiswal, and C. Monteleoni. Streaming k-means approximation. In *NIPS*, pages 10–18, 2009.
- [4] M. Bădoiu, S. Har-Peled, and P. Indyk. Approximate clustering via core-sets. In *STOC*, pages 250–257, 2002.
- [5] J. L. Bentley and J. B. Saxe. Decomposable searching problems i: Static-to-dynamic transformation. *J. Algorithms*, 1(4):301–358, 1980.
- [6] C. Boutsidis and M. Magdon-Ismail. Deterministic feature selection for k -means clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(9):6099–6110, 2013.
- [7] C. Boutsidis, A. Zouzias, M. W. Mahoney, and P. Drineas. Randomized dimensionality reduction for k-means clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(2):1045–1062, 2015.
- [8] V. Braverman, A. Meyerson, R. Ostrovsky, A. Roytman, M. Shindler, and B. Tagiku. Streaming k-means on well-clusterable data. In *SODA*, pages 26–40, 2011.
- [9] V. Braverman, R. Ostrovsky, and Y. Rabani. Rademacher chaos, random Eulerian graphs and the sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform. *CoRR*, abs/1011.2590, 2010.
- [10] M. Charikar, L. O’Callaghan, and R. Panigrahy. Better streaming algorithms for clustering problems. In *STOC*, pages 30–39, 2003.
- [11] K. Chen. On coresets for k-median and k-means clustering in metric and euclidean spaces and their applications. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(3):923–947, 2009.
- [12] K. Clarkson and D. Woodruff. Numerical linear algebra in the streaming model. In *STOC*, pages 205–214, 2009.
- [13] K. Clarkson and D. Woodruff. Low rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. In *STOC*, pages 81–90, 2013.
- [14] M. Cohen, S. Elder, C. Musco, C. Musco, and M. Persu. Dimensionality reduction for k-means clustering and low rank approximation. *CoRR*, abs/1410.6801, 2014.
- [15] A. Dasgupta, R. Kumar, and T. Sarlós. A sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform. In *STOC*, pages 341–350, 2010.
- [16] P. Drineas, A. Frieze, R. Kannan, S. Vempala, and V. Vinay. Clustering large graphs via the singular value decomposition. *Machine Learning*, 56(1-3):9–33, 2004.
- [17] D. Feldman and M. Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In *STOC*, pages 569–578, 2011.
- [18] D. Feldman, M. Monemizadeh, and C. Sohler. A PTAS for k-means clustering based on weak coresets. In *SoCG*, pages 11–18, 2007.

- [19] D. Feldman, M. Schmidt, and C. Sohler. Turning big data into tiny data: Constant-size coresets for k -means, PCA and projective clustering. In *SODA*, pages 1434–1453, 2013.
- [20] H. Fichtenberger, M. Gillé, M. Schmidt, C. Schwiegelshohn, and C. Sohler. BICO: BIRCH meets coresets for k -means clustering. In *ESA*, pages 481–492, 2013.
- [21] G. Frahling and C. Sohler. Coresets in dynamic geometric data streams. In *STOC*, pages 209–217, 2005.
- [22] S. Guha, N. Mishra, R. Motwani, and L. O’Callaghan. Clustering data streams. In *FOCS*, pages 359–366, 2000.
- [23] S. Har-Peled and A. Kushal. Smaller coresets for k -median and k -means clustering. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):3–19, 2007.
- [24] S. Har-Peled and S. Mazumdar. On coresets for k -means and k -median clustering. In *STOC*, pages 291–300, 2004.
- [25] P. Indyk. Sublinear time algorithms for metric space problems. In *STOC*, pages 428–434, 1999.
- [26] K. Jain and V. Vazirani. Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k -median problems using the primal-dual schema and Lagrangian relaxation. *J. ACM*, 48(2):274–296, 2001.
- [27] D. Kane and J. Nelson. Sparser Johnson-Lindenstrauss transforms. *J. ACM*, 61(1):4, 2014.
- [28] T. Kanungo, D. Mount, N. Netanyahu, C. Piatko, R. Silverman, and A. Wu. A local search approximation algorithm for k -means clustering. *Comput. Geom.*, 28(2-3):89–112, 2004.
- [29] M. Langberg and L. J. Schulman. Universal epsilon-approximators for integrals. In *SODA*, pages 598–607, 2010.
- [30] E. Liberty, R. Sriharsha, and M. Sviridenko. An algorithm for online k -means clustering. *CoRR*, abs/1412.5721, 2014.
- [31] N. Nisan. Pseudorandom generators for space-bounded computations. In *STOC*, pages 204–212, 1990.
- [32] R. Ostrovsky, Y. Rabani, L. J. Schulman, and C. Swamy. The effectiveness of Lloyd-type methods for the k -means problem. *J. ACM*, 59(6):28, 2012.
- [33] T. Sarlós. Improved approximation algorithms for large matrices via random projections. In *FOCS*, pages 143–152, 2006.
- [34] M. Shindler, A. Wong, and A. Meyerson. Fast and accurate k -means for large datasets. In *NIPS*, pages 2375–2383, 2011.