

# Risk Bounds For Mode Clustering

**Martin Azizyan**

MAZIZYAN@CS.CMU.EDU

*Machine Learning Department  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Yen-Chi Chen**

YENCHIC@ANDREW.CMU.EDU

*Department of Statistics  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Aarti Singh**

AARTI@CS.CMU.EDU

*Machine Learning Department  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Larry Wasserman**

LARRY@STAT.CMU.EDU

*Machine Learning Department and Department of Statistics  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

## Abstract

Density mode clustering is a nonparametric clustering method. The clusters are the basins of attraction of the modes of a density estimator. We study the risk of mode-based clustering. We show that the clustering risk over the cluster cores — the regions where the density is high — is very small even in high dimensions. And under a low noise condition, the overall cluster risk is small even beyond the cores, in high dimensions.

**Keywords:** Clustering, Density Estimation, Morse Theory

## 1. Introduction

Density mode clustering is a nonparametric method for using density estimation to find clusters (Cheng, 1995; Comaniciu and Meer, 2002; Arias-Castro et al., 2013; Chacón and Duong, 2013). The basic idea is to estimate the modes of the density, and then assign points to the modes by finding the basins of attraction of the modes. See Figures 1 and 5.

In this paper we study the risk of density mode clustering. We define the risk in terms of how pairs of points are clustered under the true density versus the estimated density. We show that the cluster risk over the cluster cores — the high density portion of the basins — is exponentially small, independently of dimension. Moreover, if a certain low noise assumption holds then the cluster risk outside the cluster cores is small. The low noise assumption is similar in spirit to the Tsybakov low noise condition that often appears in the high dimensional classification literature (Audibert and Tsybakov, 2007).

It is worth expanding on this last point. Because mode clustering requires density estimation — and because density estimation is difficult in high dimensions — one might

get the impression that mode clustering will not work well in high-dimensions. But we show that this is not the case. Even in high dimensions the clustering risk can be very small. Again, the situation is analogous to classification: poor estimates of the regression function can still lead to accurate classifiers.

There are many different types of clustering —  $k$ -means, spectral, convex, hierarchical — and we are not claiming that mode clustering is necessarily superior to other clustering methods. Indeed, which method is best is very problem specific. Rather, our goal is simply to find bounds on the performance of mode base clustering. Our analysis covers both the low and high-dimensional cases.

*Outline.* In Section 2 we review mode clustering. In Section 3 we discuss the estimation of the clusters using kernel density estimators. Section 4 contains the main results. After some preliminaries, we bound the risk over the cluster cores in Section 4.3. In Section 4.4 we bound the risk outside the cores under a low noise assumption. In Section 4.5 we consider the case of Gaussian clusters. In Section 4.6 we show a different method to bound the risk in the low dimensional case. Section 5 contains some numerical experiments. We conclude with a discussion in Section 6.

*Related Work.* Mode clustering is usually implemented using the mean-shift algorithm which is discussed in Fukunaga and Hostetler (1975); Cheng (1995); Comaniciu and Meer (2002). The algorithm is analyzed in Arias-Castro et al. (2013). Li et al. (2007); Azzalini and Torelli (2007) introduced mode clustering to the statistics literature. The related idea of clustering based on high density regions was proposed in Hartigan (1975). Chacón et al. (2011) and Chacón and Duong (2013) propose several methods for selecting the bandwidth for estimating the derivatives of the density estimator which can in turn be used as a bandwidth selection rule for mode clustering. A method that is related to mode clustering is clustering based on trees constructed from density level sets. See, for example, Chaudhuri and Dasgupta (2010), Kpotufe and von Luxburg (2011) and Kent et al. (2013).

*Notation:* We let  $p$  denote a density function,  $g$  its gradient and  $H$  its Hessian. A point  $x$  is a *local mode* (i.e. a local maximum) of  $p$  if  $\|g(x)\| = 0$  and all the eigenvalues of  $H(x)$  are negative. Here,  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the usual  $L_2$  norm. In general, the eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix  $A$  are denoted by  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots$ . We write  $a_n \preceq b_n$  to mean that there is some  $C > 0$  such that  $a_n \leq Cb_n$  for all large  $n$ . We use  $B(x, \epsilon)$  to denote a closed ball of radius  $\epsilon$  centered at  $x$ . The boundary of a set  $A$  is denoted by  $\partial A$ .

## 2. Mode Clustering and Morse Theory

Here we give a brief review of mode clustering, also called mean-shift clustering; more details can be found in Cheng (1995), Comaniciu and Meer (2002), Arias-Castro, Mason, Pelletier (2014) and Chacon (2012).




Figure 1: *Left: a simple dataset. Middle: the kernel density estimator. Right: The four estimated modes and their basins of attractions.*

## 2.1 Morse Theory

We will need some terminology from Morse theory. Good references on Morse theory include Edelsbrunner and Harer (2010); Milnor (1963); Matsumoto (2002); Banyaga and Hurtubise (2004).

Let  $p$  be a bounded continuous density on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with gradient  $g$  and Hessian  $H$ . A point  $x$  is a *critical point* if  $\|g(x)\| = 0$ . We then call  $p(x)$  a *critical value*. A point that is not a critical point is a *regular point*.

The function  $p$  is a *Morse function* if all its critical values are non-degenerate (i.e. the Hessian at each critical point is non-singular). A critical point  $x$  is a *mode*, or local maximum, if the Hessian  $H(x)$  is negative definite at  $x$ . The *index* of a critical point  $x$  is the number of negative eigenvalues of  $H(x)$ . Critical points are maxima, minima or saddlepoints.

The *flow* starting at  $x$  is the path  $\pi_x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\pi_x(0) = x$  and

$$\pi'_x(t) = \nabla p(\pi_x(t)). \quad (1)$$

The flow  $\pi_x(t)$  defines the direction of steepest ascent at  $x$ . The *destination* and *origin* of the flow  $\pi_x$  are defined by

$$\text{dest}(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \pi_x(t), \quad \text{org}(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \pi_t(x). \quad (2)$$

If  $x$  is a critical point, then  $\text{dest}(x) = x$ .

The *stable manifold* corresponding to a critical point  $y$ — also called the *descending manifold* or the *basin of attraction*— is

$$\mathcal{C}(y) = \{x : \text{dest}(x) = y\}. \quad (3)$$

In particular, the basin of attraction of a mode  $m$  is called a *cluster*. See Figures 2 and 3.

Let us mention a few properties of Morse functions that are useful:




Figure 2: A Morse function with four modes. Each solid blue dot is a mode. Each red dot is a minimum. Pink dots denote saddle points. The green area is the descending manifold (cluster) for one of the modes.




Figure 3: The three large black dots are the three local modes that induce three clusters based on the corresponding basins of attraction. The cluster boundaries,  $D$ , consists of the local minima (the square box,  $D_0$ ) and the three thick smooth curves are  $D_1$ . The circles on the boundaries are saddle points. The dotted lines show the flow lines.

1. Excluding critical points, two flow lines are either disjoint or they are the same.
2. The origin and destination of a flow line are critical points (except at boundaries of clusters). The set of points  $x$  whose destinations are not modes are on the boundaries of clusters and form a set of measure 0.
3. Flow lines are monotonic:  $p(x_t)$  is a non-decreasing function of  $t$ , where  $x_t = \pi_x(t)$ . Further,  $p(\text{dest}(x)) \geq p(\text{org}(x))$  and  $\text{dest}(x) \neq \text{org}(x)$  if  $x$  is a regular point.
4. The index of  $\text{dest}(x)$  is greater than the index of  $\text{org}(x)$ .
5. The flow has the semi-group property:  $\phi(x, t+s) = \phi(\phi(x, t), s)$  where  $\phi(x, t) = \pi_x(t)$ .
6. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the basin of attraction of a mode  $m$ . If  $y$  is a critical point in the closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $y \neq m$ , then  $y \in \partial\mathcal{C}$ .

## 2.2 Clusters

Consider a distribution  $P$  on  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with density  $p$ . We assume that  $p$  is a Morse function with finitely many critical points. The modes of  $p$  are denoted by

$$\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, \dots, m_k\} \quad (4)$$

The corresponding clusters are  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$  where  $\mathcal{C}_j = \{x : \text{dest}(x) = m_j\}$ . Define the clustering function  $c : \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by

$$c(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{dest}(x) = \text{dest}(y) \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{dest}(x) \neq \text{dest}(y). \end{cases}$$

Thus,  $c(x, y) = 1$  if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  are in the same cluster.

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be random vectors drawn iid from  $P$ . Let  $\hat{p}$  be an estimate of the density  $p$  with corresponding estimated modes  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = \{\hat{m}_1, \dots, \hat{m}_\ell\}$ , and basins  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} = \{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_\ell\}$ . This defines a cluster function  $\widehat{c}$ .

In this paper, the *pairwise clustering loss* is defined to be

$$L = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{j < k} I(\widehat{c}(X_j, X_k) \neq c(X_j, X_k)) \quad (5)$$

which is one minus the Rand index. The corresponding clustering risk is  $R = \mathbb{E}[L]$ .

## 3. Estimated Clusters

Estimating the clusters involves two steps. First we estimate the density then we estimate the modes and their basins of attractions. To estimate the density we use the standard kernel density estimator

$$\hat{p}_h(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{h^d} K\left(\frac{\|x - X_i\|}{h}\right). \quad (6)$$

We will need the following result on the accuracy of derivative estimation. We state the result without proof as it is a simple generalization of the result in Gine and Guillou (2002) which is based on Talagrand's inequality. In fact, it is essentially a different way of stating the results of Lemmas 2 and 3 in Arias-Castro et al. (2013).




Figure 4: The Mean Shift Algorithm

**Lemma 1** *Let  $p_h(x) = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{p}_h(x)]$ . Assume that the kernel is Gaussian. Also assume that  $p$  has bounded continuous derivatives up to and including third order. Then:*

(1: Bias) *There exist  $c_0, c_1, c_2$  such that*

$$\sup_x |p_h(x) - p(x)| \leq c_0 h^2, \quad \sup_x \|\nabla p_h(x) - \nabla p(x)\| \leq c_1 h^2, \quad \sup_x \|\nabla^2 p_h(x) - \nabla^2 p(x)\| \leq c_2 h.$$

(2: Variance) *There exist  $b, b_0, b_1, b_2$  such that, if  $(\log n/n)^{1/d} \leq h \leq b$  where  $b < 1$ , then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sup_x |\widehat{p}_h(x) - p_h(x)| > \epsilon) &\leq e^{-b_0 n h^d \epsilon^2} \\ \mathbb{P}(\sup_x \|\widehat{\nabla} p_h(x) - \nabla p_h(x)\| > \epsilon) &\leq e^{-b_1 n h^{d+2} \epsilon^2} \\ \mathbb{P}(\sup_x \|\widehat{\nabla}^2 p_h(x) - \nabla^2 p_h(x)\| > \epsilon) &\leq e^{-b_2 n h^{d+4} \epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** It is not necessary to use a Gaussian kernel. Any kernel that satisfies the conditions in Arias-Castro et al. (2013) will do.

To find the modes of  $\widehat{p}_h$  we use the well-known mean shift algorithm. See Figures 4 and 5. The algorithm approximates the flow defined by (1). The algorithm finds the modes, the basins of attractions and the destination  $\widehat{\text{dest}}(x)$  of any point  $x$ . A rigorous analysis of the algorithm can be found in Arias-Castro et al. (2013).

## 4. Bounding the Risk

We are now ready to bound the clustering risk. We begin by introducing some preliminary concepts.




Figure 5: An illustration of the mean shift algorithm. The data are moved to the two modes along their gradient ascent paths.

#### 4.1 Stability

To bound the clustering risk, we need to control how much the critical points can change when the density is perturbed. In particular, we need the following result which is Lemma 16 from Chazal et al (2015).

**Lemma 2** *Let  $p$  be a density with compact support. Assume that  $p$  is a Morse function with finitely many critical values  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_L\}$  and that  $p$  has two continuous derivatives on the interior of its support and non-vanishing gradient on the boundary of its support. Let  $q$  be another density and let  $\eta = \max\{\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2\}$  where*

$$\eta_0 = \sup_x |p(x) - q(x)|, \quad \eta_1 = \sup_x \|\nabla p(x) - \nabla q(x)\|, \quad \eta_2 = \sup_x \|\nabla^2 p(x) - \nabla^2 q(x)\|$$

*where  $\nabla^2$  is the vec of the Hessian. There are constants  $\kappa \equiv \kappa(p)$  and  $A \equiv A(p)$  such that, if  $\eta \leq \kappa$  then the following is true. The function  $q$  is Morse and has  $L$  critical points  $C' = \{c'_1, \dots, c'_L\}$ . After a suitable relabeling of the indices,  $c_j$  and  $c'_j$  have the same Morse index for all  $j$  and  $\max_j \|c_j - c'_j\| \leq A(p)\eta$ .*

#### 4.2 The Cluster Cores

An important part of our analysis involves, what we refer to as, the cluster cores. These are the high density regions inside each cluster. Consider the clusters  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k\}$ . Define

$$\xi_j = \sup_{x \in \partial \mathcal{C}_j} p(x) \quad (7)$$

where  $\partial \mathcal{C}_j$  is the boundary of  $\mathcal{C}_j$ . For any  $a \geq 0$  we define the  $j^{\text{th}}$  cluster core by

$$\mathcal{C}_j^\dagger(a) = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{C}_j : p(x) \geq \xi_j + a \right\}. \quad (8)$$

See Figure 6.

**Theorem 3** *Let  $p$  be a density function with compact support. Assume that  $p$  is a Morse function with finitely many critical values and that  $C_g \equiv \sup_x \|g(x)\| < \infty$  where  $g$  is the gradient of  $p$ . Let  $\tilde{p}$  be another density and define  $\eta, \eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2, A(p)$  and  $\kappa(p)$  as in Lemma 2. Let  $\tilde{\pi}$  denote the paths defined by  $\tilde{p}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cluster of  $p$  with mode  $m$  and let  $\xi = \sup_{x \in \partial\mathcal{C}} p(x)$ . Let  $a = C_g A\eta + 2\eta_0$ . Assume that  $\eta < \kappa(p)$  and that*

$$p(m) > a + A\eta C_g + \xi = 2A\eta C_g + 2\eta_0 + \xi. \quad (9)$$

*Then the following hold:*

1. *If  $x \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$  then  $d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) \geq \frac{a}{C_g}$  where  $d(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\|$ .*
2.  *$B(m, A\eta) \subset \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ .*
3.  *$\tilde{p}$  has a mode  $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ .*
4.  *$\tilde{p}$  has no other critical points in  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ .*
5. *Let  $x \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$ . Then  $\tilde{\pi}_x(t) \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .*
6. *Let  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$ . Then  $\text{dest}(x) = \text{dest}(y) = m$  and  $\widetilde{\text{dest}}(x) = \widetilde{\text{dest}}(y) = \tilde{m}$ . Hence,  $c(x, y) = \tilde{c}(x, y)$ .*

### Proof

1. Let  $z$  be the projection of  $x$  onto  $\partial\mathcal{C}$ . (Choose any projection if it is not unique.) Using an exact Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi + a &\leq p(x) = p(z) + (x - z)^T \int_0^1 g(z + u(x - z)) du \\ &\leq p(z) + C_g \|x - z\| = p(z) + C_g d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) \\ &\leq \xi + C_g d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}). \end{aligned}$$

2. Let  $x \in B(m, A\eta)$ . Then

$$p(x) = p(m) + (x - m)^T \int_0^1 g(m + u(x - m)) du \geq p(m) - \|x - m\| C_g \geq p(m) - A\eta C_g > a + \xi$$

and hence  $x \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a) \subset \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ .

3. By Lemma 2,  $\tilde{p}$  has a mode  $\tilde{m}$  such that  $\|m - \tilde{m}\| \leq A\eta$ . The result then follows from part 2.

4. Let  $\tilde{c}$  be a critical point of  $\tilde{p}$  different from  $\tilde{m}$ . By Lemma 2, there is a critical point  $c$  of  $p$  such that  $\|c - \tilde{c}\| \leq A\eta$ . Now  $c$  must be on the boundary of some cluster or must be a minimum. Either way, it is not in the interior of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $r$  be the point on  $\partial\mathcal{C}$  closest to  $c$ . Then  $d(c, \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)) \geq d(r, \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0))$ . By part 1,  $d(r, \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)) > (a - 2\eta_0)/C_g$ . Thus,  $d(\tilde{c}, \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)) > (a - 2\eta_0)/C_g - A\eta$ . By the definition of  $a$ , it follows then that  $d(\tilde{c}, \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)) > 0$  and hence  $\tilde{c} \notin \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ .

5. Let  $x \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$ . Then, for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\tilde{\pi}_x(t)) &\geq \tilde{p}(\tilde{\pi}_x(t)) - \eta_0 \geq \tilde{p}(\tilde{\pi}_x(0)) - \eta_0 \\ &= \tilde{p}(x) - \eta_0 \geq p(x) - 2\eta_0 \geq \xi + a - 2\eta_0. \end{aligned}$$



6. Let  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$ . Trivially, we have that  $\text{dest}(x) = \text{dest}(y) = m$ . From the previous result,  $\widetilde{\text{dest}}(x) \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$ . From parts 3 and 4, the only critical point of  $\tilde{p}$  in  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a - 2\eta_0)$  is  $\tilde{m}$ . Similarly for  $y$ . Hence,  $\widetilde{\text{dest}}(x) = \widetilde{\text{dest}}(y) = \tilde{m}$ .  $\blacksquare$

### 4.3 Bounding the Risk Over the Cores

Now we bound the risk for the data points that are in the cluster cores.

**Theorem 4** *Assume that  $p$  is a Morse function with finitely many critical values. Denote the modes and clusters by  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$ . Let  $\hat{p}_h$  be the kernel density estimator. Let  $\eta = \max\{\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2\}$  where*

$$\eta_0 = \sup_x |\hat{p}_h(x) - p(x)|, \quad \eta_1 = \sup_x \|\nabla \hat{p}_h(x) - \nabla p(x)\|, \quad \eta_2 = \sup_x \|\nabla^2 \hat{p}_h(x) - \nabla^2 p(x)\|.$$

*Let  $a = C_g A \eta + 2\eta_0$  and let  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger = \bigcup_j \mathcal{C}_j^\dagger(a)$  and let  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_i : X_i \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)\}$  be the points in the cores. Let  $\xi_j = \sup\{p(x) : x \in \partial \mathcal{C}_j\}$ .*

1. *If*

$$p(m_j) > 2A\eta C_g + 2\eta_0 + \xi_j$$

*for each  $j$ , then  $\hat{c}(X_i, X_j) = c(X_i, X_j)$  for every  $X_i, X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ .*

2. *If  $h_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $nh_n^{d+4} \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{c}(X_i, X_j) \neq c(X_i, X_j) \text{ for any } X_i, X_j \in \mathcal{X}\right) \leq e^{-nb} \quad (10)$$

*for some  $b > 0$  (independent of  $d$ ).*

**Remark:** Note that  $\eta, \eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2$  are functions of  $n$  but we suppress the dependence for simplicity.

**Proof** 1. From Lemma 1, we have that  $\mathbb{P}(\eta > \kappa(p))$  is exponentially small. Hence, Lemma 2 applies. If  $p(m_j) > 2A\eta C_g + 2\eta_0 + \xi$  for all  $j$ , then Theorem 3 implies that  $\hat{c}(X_i, X_j) = c(X_i, X_j)$  for every  $X_i, X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ .

2. We need to show that  $p(m_j) > 2A\eta C_g + 2\eta_0 + \xi_j$  for all  $j$  so we can apply part 1. The probability that  $p(m_j) > 2A\eta C_g + 2\eta_0 + \xi_j$  fails for some  $j$ , is  $\mathbb{P}(\eta > q)$  where  $q > 0$  is a constant. If  $h_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $nh_n^{d+4} \rightarrow \infty$ , then from Lemma 1,  $\mathbb{P}(\eta > q)$  is exponentially small:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta > q) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^2 \mathbb{P}(\eta_j > q) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-b_0 n h_n^d (q - c_0 h_n^2)^2\right) + \exp\left(-b_1 n h_n^{d+2} (q - c_1 h_n^2)^2\right) + \exp\left(-b_2 n h_n^{d+4} (q - c_2 h_n)^2\right) \\ &\leq e^{-nb} \end{aligned}$$

for some  $b > 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### 4.4 Beyond the Cores

Now we bound the risk beyond the cores. Furthermore, we explicitly let  $d = d_n$  increase with  $n$ . This means that the distribution also changes with  $n$  so we sometimes write  $p$  as  $p_n$ .

Theorem 4 shows that the risk over the cores where  $p(x) > \xi + a$  is exponentially small as long as we take  $a = C\eta$  for some  $C > 0$ . The total risk is therefore the exponential bound plus the probability that a point fails to satisfy  $p(x) > \xi + a$ . Formally:

**Corollary 5** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 4. The cluster risk is bounded by*

$$P(p(X) < \xi + C\eta) + e^{-nb}. \quad (11)$$

Note that, in the corollary, it is not necessary to let  $h \rightarrow 0$ . To further control the risk beyond the cores, we need to make sure that  $P(p(X) < \xi + C\eta)$  is small. To do this, especially in the high-dimensional case, we need to assume that the clusters are well-defined and are well-separated. We call these assumptions “low noise” assumptions since they are similar in spirit to the Tsybakov low noise assumption that is often used in high-dimensional classification (Audibert and Tsybakov, 2007). Specifically, we assume that following:

(Low Noise Assumptions:)

1. Let  $\sigma_n$  be the minimal distance between critical points of  $p_n$ . We assume that  $\sigma = \liminf_n \sigma_n > 0$ .
2. Let  $m_n$  be the number of modes of  $p_n$ . Then  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n < \infty$ .
3.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_j p_n(m_j) > 0$ .
4.  $\xi_n \leq n^{-\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$  where  $\xi_n = \sup_{x \in D} p_n(x)$  and  $D = \bigcup_j \partial C_j$ .
5. For all small  $\epsilon$ ,  $P(p_n(X) < \epsilon) \leq \epsilon^\beta$  where  $\beta = \beta_d$  is increasing with  $d$ .

Parts 1-3 capture the idea that the clusters are well-defined. It is really parts 4 and 5 that capture the low noise idea. In particular, part 4 says that the density at the cluster boundaries is small. (See Figure 6.) Part 5 rules out thick tails. Note that for a multivariate Normal  $N(0, \sigma^2 I)$ , we have that, for any fixed small  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $P(p(X) < \epsilon) \leq e^{-d}$  when  $\sigma$  is not too large. So part 5 automatically holds for distributions with Gaussian-like tails.

**Theorem 6** *Assume that  $p_n$  is Morse and that the low noise conditions hold. Assume that  $p_n$  has three bounded continuous derivatives. Let  $h_n \asymp n^{-1/(5+d)}$ . Then the clustering risk  $R$  satisfies*

$$R \preceq \left[ \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{5+d}} \vee \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\beta\gamma} \right] + e^{-nb}.$$

In particular,  $R = O(\sqrt{\log n/n})$  when  $\beta_d \geq \max\{(d+5)/2, 1/(2\gamma)\}$ .

**Proof** For points in the core, the risk is controlled by Theorem 4. We need now bound the number of pairs outside the cores. For this, it suffices to bound

$$\mathbb{P}(p_n(X) < \xi_n + C_g A\eta + 2\eta_0).$$




Figure 6: *Left: When clusters are not well separated,  $\xi$  is large. In this case, the mass inside the cluster but outside the core can be large. Right: When clusters are well separated,  $\xi$  is small. The blue lines correspond to  $p(x) = \xi + a$  for  $a > 0$ . The pink regions are the cluster cores.*

For this choice of bandwidth, Lemma 1 implies that  $\eta = O_P(\log n/n^{5+d})$ . From the low noise assumption, the above probability is bounded by  $\xi_n^\beta \vee (\log n/n)^{\beta/(d+5)}$ . ■

**Remark:** Parts 4 and 5 of the low noise assumption can be replaced by a single, slightly weaker assumption, namely,  $P(|p_n(X) - \xi_{n,j}| \leq \epsilon) \leq \epsilon^\beta$  where  $\xi_{n,j} = \sup_{x \in \partial \mathcal{C}_j} p(x)$ . The condition only need hold near the boundaries of the clusters.

#### 4.5 Gaussian Clusters

Recently, Tan and Witten (2015) showed that a type of clustering known as convex clustering yields the correct clustering with high probability, even with increasing dimension, when the data are from a mixture of Gaussians. They assume that each Gaussian has covariance  $\sigma^2 I$  and that the means are separated by a factor of order  $\sqrt{d}$ . Here we show a similar result for mode clustering. The clustering is based on a kernel estimator with a small but fixed bandwidth  $h > 0$ .

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j N(\mu_j, \sigma^2 I)$  so that  $X_i$  has density

$$p(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\pi_j}{\sigma^d (2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{-\|x - \mu_j\|^2 / (2\sigma^2)}.$$

**Lemma 7** *Let  $X \sim p$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Suppose that*

$$\epsilon \leq \min_j \left( \frac{\pi_j^{1/d}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma e^{16}} \right)^d \quad (12)$$

*and that*

$$\min_{j \neq k} \|\mu_j - \mu_k\| > 2\sigma \max_j \sqrt{2d \log \left( \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) + 2 \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) - 2 \log \left( \frac{1}{\pi_j} \right)}. \quad (13)$$

*Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(p(X) < \epsilon) \leq e^{-8d}.$$

**Remark:** Given the condition on  $\epsilon$ , we can re-write (13) as

$$\min_{j \neq k} \|\mu_j - \mu_k\| > C' \sqrt{d}$$

for a constant  $C' > 0$ .

**Proof** Let

$$c = \min_j \sqrt{2 \log \left( \frac{\pi_j}{\epsilon \sigma^d (2\pi)^{d/2}} \right)}$$

and let  $B_j = \{x : \|x - \mu_j\|/\sigma \leq c\}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . The sets  $B_1, \dots, B_k$  are disjoint due to (13).

First we claim that

$$p(x) < \epsilon \quad \text{implies that} \quad x \in \left( \bigcup_s B_s \right)^c = \bigcap_s B_s^c.$$

To see this, let  $x \in B_j$  for some  $j$ . Then, from the definition of  $B_j$  and  $c$ ,

$$p(x) = \sum_{s=1}^k \frac{\pi_s}{\sigma^d (2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{-\|x - \mu_s\|^2 / (2\sigma^2)} \geq \frac{\pi_j}{\sigma^d (2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{-\|x - \mu_j\|^2 / (2\sigma^2)} \geq \frac{\pi_j}{\sigma^d (2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{-c^2/2} \geq \epsilon.$$

That is,  $x \in B_j$  for some  $j$  implies  $p(x) \geq \epsilon$  and so the claim follows.

Let  $Y \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  where  $P(Y = j) = \pi_j$ . We can write  $X = \sum_j I(Y = j) X_j$  where  $X_j \sim N(\mu_j, \sigma^2 I)$ . Of course,  $X \stackrel{d}{=} X_j$  when  $Y = j$ . Note that  $\|X_j - \mu_j\|^2 / \sigma^2 \sim \chi_d^2$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P(p(X) < \epsilon) &\leq P\left(X \in \bigcap_s B_s^c\right) = \sum_j \pi_j P\left(X \in \bigcap_s B_s^c \mid Y = j\right) \\ &= \sum_j \pi_j P(X_j \in \bigcap_s B_s^c) \leq \sum_j \pi_j P(X_j \in B_j^c) \\ &= \sum_j \pi_j P\left(\frac{\|X_j - \mu_j\|}{\sigma} > c\right) \\ &= \sum_j \pi_j P(\chi_d^2 > c^2) = P(\chi_d^2 > c^2). \end{aligned}$$

From Lauren and Massart (2000), (see also Lemma 11 of Obizinski et al) when  $t \geq 2d$ ,

$$P(\chi_d^2 > t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2}\left(1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{2d}{t}}\right)\right)$$

The last quantity is bounded above by  $e^{-t/4}$  when  $t \geq 32d$ . By the condition on  $\epsilon$ ,  $c^2 \geq 32d$ . Hence

$$P(p(X) < \epsilon) \leq P(\chi^2 > c^2) \leq e^{-c^2/4} \leq e^{-8d}.$$

■

**Theorem 8** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j N(\mu_j, \sigma^2 I)$ . Let  $\hat{p}_h$  be the kernel density estimator with fixed bandwidth  $h > 0$  satisfying

$$0 < h < \frac{1}{2} \min_j \left( \frac{\pi_j^d}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma e^{16}} \right)^d.$$

Let  $D = \bigcup_j \partial \mathcal{C}_j$  and define  $\Gamma = \min_j d(\mu_j, D)$ . Suppose that  $p$  is Morse,

$$\Gamma > \sigma \sqrt{32d + 2 \log \left( \frac{1}{\min_j \pi_j} \right)}$$

and that

$$\min_{j \neq k} \|\mu_j - \mu_k\| > 2\sigma \max_j \sqrt{2d \log \left( \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \right) + \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) - 2 \log \left( \frac{1}{\pi_j} \right)}. \quad (14)$$

Then, for all large  $n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \hat{c}(X_j, X_k) \neq c(X_j, X_k) \text{ for some } j, k \right) \leq e^{-8d} + e^{-nb}.$$

**Proof** By Corollary 5, the cluster risk is bounded by  $P(p(X) < \xi + C\eta) + e^{-nb}$ . With a fixed bandwidth not tending to 0, the bias dominates for all large  $n$ , and so  $\eta < ch$  for some  $c > 0$ , except on a set of exponentially small probability. The condition on  $\Gamma$  implies that

$$\xi = \sup_{x \in D} p(x) \leq \min_j \left( \frac{\pi_j^{1/d}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma e^{16}} \right)^d.$$

So  $\epsilon \equiv \xi + C\eta = \xi + ch$  satisfies (12). By the previous lemma,  $P(p(X) < \xi + Ch) \leq e^{-8d}$ . ■

**Remark:** The theorem implies the following. As long as the means are separated from each other and from the cluster boundaries by at least  $\sqrt{d}$ , then a kernel estimator has cluster risk  $e^{-8d} + e^{-nb}$ . It is not necessary to make the bandwidth tend to 0.

#### 4.6 Low Dimensional Analysis

In this section we assume that the dimension  $d$  is fixed. In this case, it is possible to use a different approach to bound the risk. We do not make the low noise assumption. The idea is to use results on the stability of dynamical systems (Chapter 17 of Hirsch, Smale and Devaney 2004). As before  $p$  is a Morse function and  $\tilde{p}$  is another function. Define  $\eta, \xi, C_g$  and  $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$  as in the previous sections.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cluster with mode  $m$ . Choose a number  $a$  such that

$$0 < a < p(m) - A\eta C_g - \xi. \quad (15)$$

For any  $x$  in the interior of  $\mathcal{C}$ , let

$$t(x) = \inf \left\{ t : \pi_x(t) \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a) \right\}. \quad (16)$$

If  $x \in \partial\mathcal{C}$  then  $t(x) = \infty$  since  $\pi_x(t)$  converges to a saddlepoint on the boundary. But for any interior point,  $t(x) < \infty$ . For  $x \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a)$  we define  $t(x) = 0$ .

Our first goal is to control the difference  $\|\tilde{\pi}_x(t(x)) - \pi_x(t(x))\|$ . And to do this, we first need to bound  $t(x)$ . Let

$$\Delta(x) = \inf_{0 \leq t \leq t(x)} \|g(\pi_x(t))\|. \quad (17)$$

Now,  $\Delta(x) > 0$  for each  $x \notin \partial\mathcal{C}$ . However, as  $x$  gets closer to the boundary,  $\Delta(x)$  approaches 0. We need an assumption about how fast  $\Delta(x)$  approaches 0 as  $x$  approaches  $\partial\mathcal{C}$  which is captured in the following assumption:

(B) Let  $\mathcal{B}_\delta = \{x \in \mathcal{C} : d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) = \delta\}$ . There exists  $\gamma > 0$  such that, for all small  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$x \in \mathcal{B}_\delta \quad \text{implies that} \quad \Delta(x) \geq c\delta^\gamma. \quad (18)$$

**Lemma 9** *Assume condition B. If  $d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) \geq \delta$  then  $t(x) \leq p(m)/\delta^{2\gamma}$ .*

**Proof** Let  $z = \pi_x(t(x))$  and  $x(s) = \pi_x(s)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} p(m) &\geq p(z) - p(x) = \int_0^{t(x)} \frac{\partial p(x(s))}{\partial s} ds = \int_0^{t(x)} g(x(s))^T \pi'_x(s) ds \\ &= \int_0^{t(x)} \|g(x(s))\|^2 ds \geq t(x) \Delta^2(x) = t(x) \delta^{2\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Now we need the following result which is Lemma 6 of Arias-Castro et al (2013) adapted from Section 17.5 of Hirsch, Smale and Devaney (2004)

**Lemma 10** *Let  $\eta_1 = \sup_x \|\nabla p(x) - \nabla \tilde{p}(x)\|$ . For all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|\tilde{\pi}_x(t) - \pi_x(t)\| \leq \frac{\eta_1}{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d}} e^{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} t} \quad (19)$$

where  $\kappa_2 = \sup_x \|\nabla^2 p(x)\|$ .

We now have the following result.

**Theorem 11** *Let*

$$\delta = \left( \frac{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} p(m)}{\log(\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} / \sqrt{\eta_1})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}}. \quad (20)$$

*Let  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ . Suppose that  $d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) \geq \delta$  and  $d(y, \partial\mathcal{C}) \geq \delta$ . Also, suppose that  $\eta_1 < a^2/C_g$ . Then, for all small  $\eta$ ,  $\widetilde{\text{dest}}(x) = \widetilde{\text{dest}}(y)$ .*

**Proof** We prove the theorem in the following steps:

1. If  $x \in C^\dagger(a)$  and  $\epsilon < a/C_g$  then  $B(x, \epsilon) \subset C^\dagger(a')$  where  $a' = a - \epsilon C_g > 0$ .

Proof: Let  $y \in B(x, \epsilon)$ . Expanding  $p(y)$  around  $x$ ,  $p(y) \geq p(x) - \|y-x\| C_g \geq \xi + a - \epsilon C_g = \xi + a'$ .

2. Let  $t = t(x)$ . If  $d(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) \geq \delta$  then  $\tilde{\pi}_x(t) \in C^\dagger(a')$  where  $a' = a - \sqrt{\eta_1} C_g > 0$ .

Proof: By definition,  $\pi_x(t) \in C^\dagger(a)$ . From the previous Lemmas,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\pi}_x(t) - \pi_x(t)\| &\leq \frac{\eta_1}{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d}} e^{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} t} \\ &\leq \frac{\eta_1}{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d}} e^{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} p(m) \delta^{-2\gamma}} \leq \sqrt{\eta_1}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the definition of  $\delta$ . Hence,  $\tilde{\pi}_x(t) \in B(\pi_x(t), \sqrt{\eta_1})$ . It follows from part 1 that  $\tilde{\pi}_x(t) \in C^\dagger(a')$ . The fact that  $a' > 0$  follows from the fact that  $\eta_1 < a^2/C_g$ .

3. From Theorem 3,  $\tilde{p}$  has a mode  $\tilde{m}$  in  $C^\dagger(a')$  and has no other critical points in  $C^\dagger(a')$ . So, letting  $z = \tilde{\pi}_x(t)$ , and noting that  $z$  is on the path  $\tilde{\pi}_x(t)$ ,

$$\widetilde{\text{dest}}(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\pi}_x(s) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\pi}_z(s) = \tilde{m}.$$

Applying steps 1, 2 and 3 to  $y$  we have that  $\widetilde{\text{dest}}(y)$  also equals  $\tilde{m}$ . ■

Now let  $\hat{p}_h$  be the kernel density estimator with  $h = h_n \asymp n^{-1/(5+d)}$ . In this case  $\eta_1 = O_P(n^{-2/(6+d)})$  so, with  $\delta$  defined as in (20), we have

$$\delta \equiv \delta_n \asymp (\log n)^{-1/(2\gamma)}.$$

By the previous theorem, there are no clustering errors for data points  $X_i$  such that  $d(X_i, D) \succeq \delta_n$  where  $D = \bigcup_j \partial\mathcal{C}_j$  as long as  $\eta_1 = \sup_x \|\nabla p(x) - \hat{\nabla} p(x)\| < a^2/C_g$  which holds except on a set of exponentially small probability (Lemma 1). Hence, we have:

**Corollary 12** *Assume that  $p$  is a Morse function with finitely many critical values. Denote the modes and clusters by  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$ . Suppose that condition (B) holds in each cluster. Let  $\hat{p}_h$  be the kernel density estimator. Let  $\eta = \max\{\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2\}$  where*

$$\eta_0 = \sup_x |\hat{p}_h(x) - p(x)|, \quad \eta_1 = \sup_x \|\nabla \hat{p}_h(x) - \nabla p(x)\|, \quad \eta_2 = \sup_x \|\nabla^2 \hat{p}_h(x) - \nabla^2 p(x)\|.$$

*Let  $D = \bigcup_j \partial\mathcal{C}_j$  and let*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X_i : d(X_i, D) \geq \delta_n\}$$

where

$$\delta_n = \left( \frac{\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} p(m)}{\log(\kappa_2 \sqrt{d} / \sqrt{\eta_1})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \asymp (\log n)^{-1/(2\gamma)}.$$

If  $h_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $nh_n^{d+4} \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \hat{c}(X_i, X_j) \neq c(X_i, X_j) \text{ for any } X_i, X_j \in \mathcal{X} \right) \leq e^{-nb} \quad (21)$$

for some  $b > 0$ .

Thus, the clustering risk is exponentially small if we exclude points that are close to the boundary.

## 5. Experiments

An example of highly non-spherical mode clusters in two dimensions is given in Figure 7, left panel. The true density (contours shown in blue) has two modes, with the corresponding basins of attraction shown in blue and green. Mean shift (using a Gaussian kernel with bandwidth 1) is applied to the 1000 points sampled from the density as plotted, and all but the points shown in red are correctly clustered. All but 1% of points are correctly clustered, despite a total variation distance of about 0.29 between the true and estimated densities.

Our theoretical results show that mean shift clustering should perform well even in high dimensions, assuming the bulk of the basins of attraction are well-separated by low density regions. We simulate such a setting in 10 dimensions, where we measure the performance of mean shift clustering on samples drawn from a mixture of two equal weight Gaussian components. The norm of the difference between the means is 5, and each component has randomly generated non-spherical covariance matrix with eigenvalues between 0.5 and 2. The center panel of Figure 7 shows the average clustering error as a function of the sample size  $n$  and bandwidth  $h$ , after 75 replications of the procedure. With only 50 samples, an average error of 0.05 is achieved with the appropriate bandwidth.

The effect of component separation is demonstrated further in the right panel of Figure 7. Here, we draw  $n = 300$  samples from an equal weight mixture of two unit covariance Gaussians in two dimensions, and measure the clustering error of mean shift (averaged over 35 replications).

## 6. Conclusion

Density mode clustering — also called mean-shift clustering — is very popular in certain fields such as computer vision. In statistics and machine learning it is much less well known. This is too bad because it is a simple, nonparametric and very general clustering method. And as we have seen, it is not necessary to estimate the density well to get a small clustering risk. Because of this, mode clustering can be effective even in high dimensions.

We have developed a bound on the pairwise risk of density mode clustering. The risk within the cluster cores — the high density regions — is very small with virtually no






Figure 7: *Left: example of highly non-convex basins of attraction. Center: small sample complexity in high dimensions due to well-separated clusters. Right: effect of cluster separation, ranging from nearly unimodal to having two well-separated modes.*

assumptions. If the clusters are well-separated (low noise condition) then the overall risk is small, even in high dimensions.

Several open questions remain such as: how to estimate the risk, how to choose a good bandwidth and what to do when the low noise condition fails. Regarding the last point, we believe it should be possible to identify regions where the low noise conditions fail. These are essentially parts of the cluster boundaries with non-trivial mass. In that case, there are two ways to reduce the risk. One is to merge poorly separated clusters. Another is to allow ambiguous points to be assigned to more than one cluster. For research in this direction, see Li et al. (2007); Chen et al. (2014).

## Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge support for this project from the National Science Foundation (NSF grant XXXX) and XXXX.

## References

- Ery Arias-Castro, David Mason, and Bruno Pelletier. On the estimation of the gradient lines of a density and the consistency of the mean-shift algorithm. Technical report, IRMAR, 2013.
- Jean-Yves Audibert and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Fast learning rates for plug-in classification. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2007.
- Adelchi Azzalini and Nicola Torelli. Clustering via nonparametric density estimation. *Statistics and Computing*, 17(1):71–80, 2007. ISSN 0960-3174. doi: 10.1007/s11222-006-9010-y.
- A Banyaga and D Hurtubise. *Morse homology*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2004.

- J.E. Chacón and Tarn Duong. Data-driven density derivative estimation, with applications to nonparametric clustering and bump hunting. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2013.
- J.E. Chacón, T. Duong, and M.P Wand. Asymptotics for general multivariate kernel density derivative estimators. *Statistica Sinica*, 2011.
- Kamalika Chaudhuri and Sanjoy Dasgupta. Rates of convergence for the cluster tree. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 343–351, 2010.
- Yen-Chi Chen, Christopher R. Genovese, and Larry Wasserman. Generalized mode and ridge estimation. *arXiv: 1406.1803*, 2014.
- Yizong Cheng. Mean shift, mode seeking, and clustering. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 17(8):790–799, 1995.
- D. Comaniciu and P. Meer. Mean shift: a robust approach toward feature space analysis. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 24(5):603 –619, may 2002.
- Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational topology: an introduction*. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- Keinosuke Fukunaga and Larry D. Hostetler. The estimation of the gradient of a density function, with applications in pattern recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 21:32–40, 1975.
- E. Gine and A Guillou. Rates of strong uniform consistency for multivariate kernel density estimators. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, 2002.
- J.A. Hartigan. *Clustering Algorithms*. Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 1975.
- Brian P Kent, Alessandro Rinaldo, and Timothy Verstynen. Debacl: A python package for interactive density-based clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.8136*, 2013.
- Samory Kpotufe and Ulrike von Luxburg. Pruning nearest neighbor cluster trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.0540*, 2011.
- J. Li, S. Ray, and B.G. Lindsay. A nonparametric statistical approach to clustering via mode identification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(8):1687–1723, 2007.
- Yukio Matsumoto. *An introduction to Morse theory*, volume 208. American Mathematical Soc., 2002.
- John Willard Milnor. *Morse theory*. Number 51. Princeton university press, 1963.
- Kean Ming Tan and Daniela Witten. Statistical properties of convex clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.08340*, 2015.