

Hierarchical Clustering: New Bounds and Objective

Mirmahdi Rahgoshay
 Department of Computing Science
 University of Alberta

Mohammad R. Salavatipour*
 Department of Computing Science
 University of Alberta

Abstract

Hierarchical Clustering has been studied and used extensively as a method for analysis of data. More recently, Dasgupta [STOC2016] initiated theoretical study and analysis of these clustering tools by defining precise objective functions. In a hierarchical clustering, one is given a set of n data points along with a notion of similarity/dis-similarity between them. More precisely for each two items i and j we are given a weight $w_{i,j}$ denoting their similarity/dis-similarity. The goal is to build a recursive (tree like) partitioning of the data points (items) into successively smaller clusters which is represented by a rooted tree where the leaves correspond to the items and each internal node corresponds to a cluster of all the items in the leaves of its subtree. Typically, the goal is to have the items that are relatively similar, to separate at deeper levels of the tree (and hence stay in the same cluster as deep as possible). Dasgupta [STOC2016] defined a cost function for a tree T to be $Cost(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times |T_{i,j}|)$ where $T_{i,j}$ is the subtree rooted at the least common ancestor of i and j and presented the first approximation algorithm for such clustering. Then Moseley and Wang [NIPS2017] considered the dual of Dasgupta’s objective function for similarity-based weights, where the objective is to maximize $Rev_{Dual}(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times (n - |T_{i,j}|))$. They showed that both random partitioning and average linkage have approximation ratio $1/3$ which has been improved to 0.336379 [Charikar et al. SODA2019], 0.4246 [Ahmadian et al. AISTATS2020], and more recently to 0.585 [Alon et al. COLT2020].

Later Cohen-Addad et al. [JACM2019] considered the same objective function as Dasgupta’s but for dissimilarity-based metrics: $Rev(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times |T_{i,j}|)$, where $w_{i,j}$ is the weight of dissimilarity between two nodes i and j . In this version a good clustering should have larger $T_{i,j}$ when $w_{i,j}$ is relatively large. It has been shown that both random partitioning and average linkage have ratio $2/3$ which has been only slightly improved to 0.667078 [Charikar et al. SODA2020].

Our first main result is to improve this ratio of 0.667078 for $Rev(T)$. We achieve this by building upon the earlier work and use a more delicate algorithm and careful analysis which can be refined to achieve approximation 0.71604 .

We also introduce a new objective function for dissimilarity-based Hierarchical Clustering. Consider any tree T , we define $H_{i,j}$ as the number of i and j ’s common ancestors in T . In other words, when we think of the process of building tree as a top-down procedure, $H_{i,j}$ is the step in which i and j are separated into two clusters (they were stayed within the same cluster for $H_{i,j} - 1$ many steps). Intuitively, items that are similar are expected to remain within the same cluster as deep as possible and items that are dissimilar are to be separated into two different clusters higher up in the tree. So, for dissimilarity-based metrics, it is better to separate two dissimilar items i and j at top levels and have low values of $H_{i,j}$, so we suggest the cost of each tree T , which we want to minimize, to be $Cost_H(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times H_{i,j})$. We present a 1.3977 -approximation for this objective.

1 Introduction

Hierarchical Clustering has been studied and used extensively as a method for analysis of data. Suppose we are given a set of n data points (items) along with a notion of similarity between them. The goal is to build a hierarchy of clusters, where each level of hierarchy is a clustering of the data points that is a refined clustering of the previous level, and data points that are more similar stay together in deeper levels of hierarchy. In other words, we want to output a recursive partitioning of the items into successively smaller

*Supported by NSERC.

clusters, which are represented by a rooted tree, where the root corresponds to the set of all items, the leaves correspond to the items, and each internal node corresponds to the cluster of all the items in the leaves of its subtree. Many well-established methods have been used for Hierarchical Clustering, including some bottom-up agglomerative methods like single linkage, average linkage, and complete linkage, and some top-down approaches like the minimum bisection algorithm. In the bottom-up approaches, one starts from singleton clusters and at each step two clusters that are more similar are merged. For instance, in the average linkage, the average of pair-wise similarity of points in two clusters is computed and clusters which have the highest average are merged into one and this continues until one cluster (of all points) is created. In the top-down approaches, one starts with a single cluster (of all points) and each step a cluster is broken into two (or more) smaller ones. One such example is bisecting k -means (see [20]). Although these methods have been around for a long time, it was only recently that researchers tried to formalize the goal and objective of hierarchical clustering.

Suppose the set of data points of input are represented as the vertices of a weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ where for any two nodes i and j , $w_{i,j}$ is the weight (similarity or dissimilarity) between the two data points. Then one can think of a hierarchical clustering as a tree T whose leaves are nodes of G and each internal node corresponds to the subset of nodes of the leaves in that subtree (hence root of T corresponds to V). For any two data points i and j we use $T_{i,j}$ to denote the subtree rooted at the least common ancestor (LCA) of i and j and $w_{i,j}$ represents the similarity between i, j . In the very first attempt to define a reasonable objective function, Dasgupta [14] suggested the cost of each tree T , which we want to minimize, to be:

$$Cost(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times |T_{i,j}|). \quad (1)$$

In other words, for each two items, i and j , the cost to separate them at a step is the product of their weight and the size of the cluster at the time we separate them. Intuitively, this means that the clusters deeper in the tree would contain items that are relatively more similar. Dasgupta [14] proved that the optimal tree must be a binary tree. He then analyzed this objective function on some canonical examples (such as complete graph) and proved that it is NP -hard to find the tree with the minimum cost. Finally, he showed that a simple top-down heuristic graph partitioning algorithm, namely using taking the (approximately) minimum sparsest cut, would have a provably good approximation ratio.

An alternative interpretation of this cost function is in terms of cuts. In a top-down approach at each step we must partition a set of items into two groups (recall that the optimal tree is binary). We can set a cost for each step such that the total cost would be the summation of the costs of all the steps. If in one step we partition set $A \cup B$ of items into two sets A and B , then the cost for this step would be $Cost(A, B) = |A \cup B| \times w(A, B)$ where $w(A, B)$ is the summation of all pairwise similarities between members of A and B . Considering this, taking the minimum cut as the partition at each step seems a reasonable choice, although we will see later that this would not give a good approximation ratio. A nice property of this objective function is its modularity. More precisely, suppose u is an internal node in tree T . If we replace T_u , the subtree rooted at u , by another subtree T'_u containing the same set of items as leaves, and denote the new tree by T' , then the change in the total cost of the tree is only the difference between the costs of T_u and T'_u : $Cost(T') = Cost(T) + Cost(T'_u) - Cost(T_u)$.

Dasgupta's showed that the top-down heuristic, which takes the minimum sparsest cut (approximately) at each step, has approximation factor of $O(\alpha \log n)$ [14], where α is the best approximation ratio for minimum sparsest cut problem which is $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ [4]. Later Roy and Pokutta [25] improved the previous result by giving an LP -based $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm for the same objective function. In more recent work Charikar and Chatziafratis [7] showed that the algorithm of [14] in fact has approximation ratio of $O(\alpha)$.

Cohen-Addad et al. [13] considered the same objective function but for dissimilarity-based graphs, where $w_{i,j}$ is the weight of dissimilarity between two nodes i and j . In this version a good clustering should have larger $T_{i,j}$ when $w_{i,j}$ is relatively large. Here the objective is to maximize the following formula:

$$Rev(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times |T_{i,j}|) \quad (2)$$

They showed that the random top-down partitioning algorithm is a $2/3$ -approximation and the classic average-linkage algorithm gives a factor $1/2$ approximation (later [8] mentioned that the same analysis will

show that it is actually $\frac{2}{3}$ -approximation), and provided a simple top-down local search algorithm that gives a factor $(\frac{2}{3} - \epsilon)$ -approximation. They take an axiomatic approach for defining ‘good’ objective functions for both similarity and dissimilarity-based hierarchical clustering by characterizing a set of admissible objective functions (that includes the one introduced by Dasgupta) that have the property that when the input admits a ‘natural’ ground-truth hierarchical clustering, the ground-truth clustering has an optimal value. They also provided a similar analysis showing that the algorithm of Dasgupta [14] (using sparsest cut algorithm) has ratio of $O(\alpha)$; their analysis of this is different (and slightly better) than [7]. More recently Chatziafratis et al. [10] showed that it is hard to approximate $Rev(T)$ within a constant of $9159/9189 = 0.996735$ assuming the Unique Games Conjecture.

1.1 More Related Work

Moseley and Wang [23] considered the dual of Dasgupta’s objective function for similarity-based graphs, where the objective is to maximize the following formula:

$$Rev_{Dual}(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times (n - |T_{i,j}|)) \quad (3)$$

For each tree T we have $Cost(T) + Rev_{Dual}(T) = nW$ where W is the summation of the weights of similarity over all pairs of the items which is not dependent to the structure of the tree. This means that the optimum solution for both objective functions is the same. They showed that the classic average-linkage algorithm as well as the random top-down partitioning algorithm have approximation ratio $1/3$ and provided a simple top-down local search algorithm that gives a $(\frac{1}{3} - \epsilon)$ -approximation.

Later Charikar, Chatziafratis and Niazadeh [8] proved that the average-linkage algorithm is tight for both objective functions (2) and (3). They also gave two top-down algorithms to beat the average-linkage ratios. More specifically for maximizing $Rev_{Dual}(T)$ (3), they provided an *SDP*-based algorithm which has approximation ratio 0.336379 (slightly better than $1/3$). For the maximizing dissimilarity-based graphs (2), they gave a top-down algorithm with a factor 0.667078 approximation (slightly better than $2/3$). We will go through this algorithm in more details shortly as one of our results is to improve their approach.

More recently, Ahmadian et al. [1] provided a 0.4246-approximation algorithm for maximizing $Rev_{Dual}(T)$. What they do is to detect the cases where average linkage is not good and show that in those cases the maximum uncut bisection would gain a good fraction of the objective of the optimum solution in the very first step. So, by taking the better of the two of average-linkage and maximum uncut bisection (if we can solve it optimally in polynomial time) in the first step and average linkage for the remaining steps the approximation ratio would be $4/9$. But the best known algorithm for maximum uncut bisection has approximation ratio $\rho = 0.8776$ [5], so the ratio of their algorithm decreases from $4/9$ to 0.4246 which is still much better than the previous best 0.3363-approximation of [8]. They also complemented their positive results by providing the APX-hardness (even for 0-1 similarities), under the Small Set Expansion hypothesis [24].

More recently, Alon et al. [3] proved that the algorithm of [1] is actually giving a $2\rho/3 = 0.585$ -approximation by proving the existence of a better maximum uncut bisection. This is considered the third improvement over the Average-Linkage for revenue maximization of similarity-based Hierarchical Clustering (3), while the best algorithm for the revenue maximization of dissimilarity-based version (2) is still only slightly better than the average linkage (0.667 vs $2/3$).

Chatziafratis et al. [11] considered a version of the problem where we have some prior information about the data that imposes constraints on the clustering hierarchy and provided provable approximation guarantees for two simple top-down algorithms on similarity-based graphs. More recently, Bakkellund [6] considered order preserving hierarchical agglomerative clustering which is a method for hierarchical clustering of directed acyclic graphs and other strictly partially ordered data that preserves the data structure.

Emamjomeh-Zadeh and Kempe [16] considered adaptive Hierarchical Clustering using the notion of ordinal queries, where each ordinal query consists of a set of three elements, and the response to a query reveals the two elements (among the three elements in the query) which are ‘‘closer’’ to each other. They studied active learning of a hierarchical clustering using only ordinal queries and focused on minimizing the number of queries even in the presence of noise.

Wang and Wang [27] suggested that Dasgupta’s cost function is only effective in differentiating a good HC-tree from a bad one for a fixed graph, But the value of the cost function does not reflect how well an

input similarity graph is consistent with a hierarchical structure and present a new cost function, which is based on Dasgupta’s cost function but gives a cost between 0 and 1 to each tree.

Charikar et al. [9] were the first one to consider Hierarchical Clustering for Euclidean data and showed an improvement is possible for similarity-based graphs on objective (3). Later Wang and Moseley [28] considered objective (2) for Euclidean data and showed that every tree is a 1/2-approximation if the distances form a metric and developed a new global objective for hierarchical clustering in Euclidean space and proved that the optimal 2-means solution results in a constant approximation for their objective.

Hogemo et al. [19] considered the Hierarchical Clustering of unweighted graphs and introduced a proof technique, called the normalization procedure, that takes any such clustering of a graph G and iteratively improves it until a desired target clustering of G is reached. More recently Vainstein et al. [26] proved structural lemmas for both objectives (3) and (2) allowing to convert any HC tree to a tree with constant number of internal nodes while incurring an arbitrarily small loss. They managed to obtain approximations arbitrarily close to 1, if not all weights are small (i.e., there exist constants ϵ and δ such that the fraction of weights smaller than δ , is at most $1 - \epsilon$).

Chehreghani [12] proposed a hierarchical correlation clustering method that extends the well-known correlation clustering to produce hierarchical clusters. Later Vainstein et al. [26] provided a 0.4767-approximation and presented nearly optimal approximations for complementary similarity/dissimilarity weights. There are also some other works including the ones trying to reduce the time of the current algorithms [22] and [15], and those introducing Fair Hierarchical Clustering [2] and Online Hierarchical Clustering [21].

1.2 Our Results

Our first result is to consider the revenue maximization of dissimilarity (i.e. objective (2)) and improve upon the algorithm of [8] which has ratio 0.667078:

Theorem 1 *For hierarchical clustering on dissimilarity-based graphs, there is an approximation algorithm to maximize objective of (2) with ratio 0.71604.*

To prove this, we build upon the work of [8] and present an algorithm that takes advantage of some conditions in which their algorithm fails to perform better. Since the final algorithm (and its analysis) is more complex, and for ease of exposition, we start with a simpler algorithm which achieves ratio 0.6929. Then through a series of improvements we show how we can get to 0.71604 ratio.

Next we introduce a new objective function for hierarchical clustering and present approximation algorithms for this new objective. The intuition for this new objective function is that we expect the items that are more similar to remain in the same cluster for more steps, i.e. the step in which they are separated into different clusters is one which is further away from the root of the tree. Consider any tree T , we define $H_{i,j}$ as the number of common ancestors of i and j in T . In other words, when we think of the process of building the tree as a top-down procedure, $H_{i,j}$ is the step in which we decide to separate i and j from each other (they were decided to be together in $H_{i,j} - 1$ many steps). Intuitively, similar items are supposed to stay together until deeper nodes in the tree and hence are expected to have larger $H_{i,j}$ values whereas dissimilar items are supposed to be separated higher up in the tree. For instance, looking at a phylogenetic or genomic tree, the species that are most dissimilar are separated higher up in the tree (i.e. have small $H_{i,j}$) whereas similar species are separated at deep nodes of the tree and hence have high $H_{i,j}$ values. For dissimilarity-based graphs, we propose to minimize the following objective:

$$Cost_H(T) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (w_{i,j} \times H_{i,j}). \quad (4)$$

The problem we are looking to solve here is to find a full binary tree with the minimum $Cost_H(\cdot)$. It is easy to see that any algorithm that gives a balanced binary tree would have approximation ratio at most $O(\log n)$ since the height of such trees is $O(\log n)$. Furthermore, it is not hard to verify that the average-linkage algorithm would not perform well for this new objective function. The following example is an instance for which the cost of the solution of the average-linkage algorithm is at least $O(\frac{n}{\log n})$ times the cost of the optimum solution. Consider a graph with n vertices: v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n . Then for each $2 \leq j \leq n$ and for each $1 \leq i < j$ let $w_{i,j} = j - 1$. In this graph the summation of all the edges would be $O(n^3)$ but running

average linkage on this graph would result in a tree T with $Cost_H(T) = O(n^4)$ while the optimum tree (as well as any balanced binary tree) will have cost $O(n^3 \log n)$.

Our second main result is the following:

Theorem 2 *For hierarchical Clustering on dissimilarity-based graphs, a top-down algorithm that chooses the approximated weighted max-cut at each step, would be a $\frac{4\alpha_{GW}}{4\alpha_{GW}-1}$ -approximation algorithm to minimize $Cost_H(T)$, where α_{GW} is the ratio of the max-cut approximation algorithm.*

Considering that the best known approximation algorithm for weighted maximum cut problem has ratio $\alpha_{GW} = 0.8786$ [18], the ratio of this algorithm would be 1.3977. This also means that any top-down algorithm which cuts at least half of the weight of the remaining edges, including the random partitioning algorithm, would have approximation ratio 2.

2 Maximizing $Rev(T)$ in Dissimilarity-Based Graphs

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 1. For ease of exposition, we first present an algorithm and prove it has approximation 0.6929. Then we show how running the same algorithm with different parameters and taking the best solution of all we obtain a 0.71604-approximation. Our algorithm for maximizing $Rev(T)$ (objective function (2)) builds upon the algorithm of Charikar et al. [8] which has approximation ratio 0.667078, slightly better than random partition at each step, which has ratio $2/3$.

As explained in [8], one can see that the top-level cuts of the tree, i.e. those corresponding to clusters closer to the root are making the large portion of the optimum value. Therefore, it seems reasonable, in a top-down approach, to use larger cut sizes at each step. So, this suggests a simple algorithm: at each step try to find a max-cut (or approximate max-cut). However, this "recursive max-cut" fails. As shown in [8], for a graph of n vertices with a clique of size ϵn where the rest of the edges have weight zero, the optimum solution "peels off" vertices of the implanted clique one by one (i.e. in initial steps each vertex of the clique is separated from the rest), and this obtains an objective value of at least $n(1 - \epsilon)W$, where W is the sum of all edge weights. But the recursive max-cut (even if we find the optimum max-cut in each step) will have ratio at most $\frac{2+\epsilon}{3}nW$. Thus, this "recursive max-cut" is not going to perform better than the trivial random partitioning at each step.

Inspired by this, [8] suggested an algorithm that initially will peel off vertices with high (weighted) degree one by one (depending on a predetermined threshold) and after that will use a max-cut in one step to partition the remaining cluster into two. From there on, we can assume we use the random partitioning. This is the "peel-off first, max-cut next" algorithm of [8]. Note that the upper bound used so far in previous works for optimum is nW . Intuitively, if the optimum value is close to this lower bound then there must be a good max-cut, and if the optimum is bounded away from this then random partition performs better than $2/3$. They showed that the better of this "peel-off first, max-cut next" algorithm and the random partitioning algorithm has approximation ratio of 0.667078 for maximizing $Rev(T)$ in dissimilarity-based graphs, which slightly beats the $2/3$ -approximation of simply doing random partitioning.

Our algorithm is based on similar ideas [8] but has more steps added into it to improve the bound. Our basic algorithm takes the better of the two of "Random Partitioning" algorithm and our "Peel-Off first, Max-Cut or Random Next" algorithm. This is to make sure in the cases where the revenue of the optimum solution is too far from nW , the random partitioning algorithm would give us a good enough approximation and we can focus on the case where the revenue of the optimum, which we denote by OPT , is close to nW .

A key difference between our "Peel-Off first, Max-Cut or Random Next" algorithm and algorithm of [8], which is "Peel-Off first Max-Cut Next" algorithm, is that after the Peel Off in the first phase we then choose the better of the two of "Random Partitioning" and "Max Cut" algorithms. Actually, by looking at the fraction of W which is peeled off in the first phase, we can decide which one of the "Random Partitioning" or "Max Cut" would be good enough for the second phase and only go ahead with that one. We have also generalized their analysis by considering a few more parameters to finally improve the approximation ratio from 0.667078 to 0.6929.

In our algorithm, we first set a parameter $\gamma \geq 1$ and start the Peel-Off process. More precisely we define W_v for each remaining vertex as the current total of the weights of the edges incident to v and remove vertices with $W_v \geq \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$ and all their edges, where W is the total of the weight of all the edges (not only

the remaining edges) and n is the total number of vertices. So, W_v is a dynamic value (this is different from what [8] do as they compare the initial W_v with the threshold value). After removing one vertex (which is always the one with the largest W_v) we remove all the edges incident to it and update W_v for the remaining vertices accordingly. Note that, we do not update W and n and these two are fixed (to the initial values) throughout the entire peel-off process. So our Peel-Off process is a bit different than the one used in [8] as we need to update W_v for the remaining vertices after removing each vertex.

After we reach a state where all the remaining vertices have $W_v < \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$, we then look at the fraction of the W which is peeled off. Let us denote all the peeled off vertices by V_R and call them "Red" vertices (this is similar to the terminology used by [8]). We also denote all the edges incident to at least one red vertex, those that are removed from the graph after the peel off phase, by red edges, E_R , and denote the total weight of all the red edges by W_R and define $R = W_R/W$ as the weighted fraction of the red edges. We also call the vertices and edges that are not red, as blue vertices and edges, respectively: $V_B = V \setminus V_R$ and $E_B = E \setminus E_R$.

At this stage of our algorithm if R is greater than a pre-defined parameter $0 < R^* < 1/2$ (to be chosen later) this means that a good fraction of the vertices are peeled-off and we continue the algorithm by doing the random partitioning. Otherwise, this means that remaining graph is pretty dense, and we can prove there should be a big cut. So, if $R \leq R^*$ we continue the algorithm by doing an approximated max-cut. After max-cut we do the rest using random partitioning. Formally we propose "Peel-off First, Max Cut or Random Next" (Algorithm 1) and prove Theorem 3.

Algorithm 1 Peel-off First, Max Cut or Random Next

Input: $G = (V, E)$, dissimilarity weights $\{w_{i,j}\}_{(i,j) \in E}$, and parameters $\gamma \geq 1$ and $0 < R^* < 1/2$

define $W = \sum_{(v,u) \in E} w_{v,u}$ and $n = |V|$.

Initialize hierarchical clustering tree $T \leftarrow \emptyset$.

Initialize $V_B \leftarrow V$ and $E_B \leftarrow E$.

while there exists a vertex $v \in V_B$ with $W_v = \sum_{u \in V_B: (v,u) \in E_B} w_{v,u} \geq \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$ **do**

Choose $v^* \in V_B$ with the largest W_v .

Update T by adding the cut $(\{v^*\}, V_B \setminus \{v^*\})$.

Update V_B by removing v^* ; $V_B \leftarrow V_B \setminus \{v^*\}$.

Update E_B by removing all the edges incident to v^* ; $E_B \leftarrow E_B \setminus \{e \in E_B : e \text{ incident to } v^*\}$.

end while

define $W_R = W - \sum_{(v,u) \in E_B} w_{v,u}$ and $R = \frac{W_R}{W}$.

if $R > R^*$ **then**

Recursively run Random Partitioning Algorithm on V_B and update T .

else

Run approximate Max-Cut [18] on $G_B = (V_B, E_B)$

Let the resulting cut be (V_L, V_R) and update T by adding this cut.

Recursively run Random Partitioning Algorithm on V_L and V_R and update T .

end if

return T

Theorem 3 *For Hierarchical Clustering on dissimilarity-based graphs, there exists a choice of $\gamma \geq 1$ and $0 < R^* < 1/2$ such that the better of Algorithm 1 and "Random Partitioning" algorithm would be an α -approximation algorithm to maximize $Rev(T)$, where $\alpha = 0.6929$.*

2.1 Proof of Theorem 3

To prove Theorem 3, we first need to have some more definitions. First recall that in an instance with n vertices and the total weights of dissimilarities of W , the random partitioning algorithm always has revenue at least $2nW/3$ [11].

In the cases where OPT is too far from nW the random partitioning algorithm would be good enough. More precisely we consider $OPT = (1 - \epsilon)nW$, and this defines ϵ , which is not known to us. If $\epsilon \geq \frac{\alpha - 2/3}{\alpha}$, then $OPT \leq \frac{2}{3\alpha}nW$ and the random partitioning algorithm would be an α -approximation. So, we assume

$\epsilon < \frac{\alpha-2/3}{\alpha}$ and prove that there exist choices of γ and R^* which make Algorithm 1 an α -approximation for $\alpha = 0.6929$.

Lemma 1 *Let the number of vertices that are peeled off after the first phase of our algorithm be $|V_R| = n\ell$. Then $\ell \leq \frac{R}{2\gamma}$*

Proof. Recall that only those vertices that have $W_v \geq \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$ at the time of the peel-off are peeled off in the first phase. So, we can say that W_R , which is the summation of W_v of all the peeled off vertices, is at least $n\ell \cdot \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$. This means $W_R \geq 2\gamma\ell W$. ■

Now assume ALG_P is the contribution of all the red edges (of our algorithm) to the final objective revenue $Rev(T)$. This is the revenue which is obtained in the peel-off phase. The following lemma is a stronger version of Lemma 5.1 of [8].

Lemma 2 $ALG_P \geq (1 - \ell/2)nW_R$

Proof. Suppose $V_R = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n\ell}\}$ where v_i is the i 'th vertex which is peeled off. Recall that at each step of the peel-off phase of the algorithm we choose the vertex with the largest W_v . Thus $W_{v_1} \geq W_{v_2} \geq \dots \geq W_{v_{n\ell}} \geq \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$. Now consider the revenue which is obtained in the peel-off phase. While removing v_i the size of the tree is $n - i + 1$, so we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ALG_P &= nW_{v_1} + (n-1)W_{v_2} + \dots + (n-n\ell+1)W_{v_{n\ell}} \\ &\geq \frac{(\sum_{i=n-n\ell+1}^n i) \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^{n\ell} W_{v_j})}{n\ell} \\ &= \left(\frac{n\ell \cdot (n + (n - n\ell + 1))/2}{n\ell} \right) \cdot W_R \\ &= (1 - \ell/2 + 1/n) \cdot nW_R \\ &\geq (1 - \ell/2)nW_R. \end{aligned}$$

As we mentioned earlier, after the peel-off phase, the algorithm will look at the ratio $R = W_R/W$ and compares it with the given parameter R^* . If $R > R^*$, the second phase will be to do the random partitioning and no max-cut is needed. Otherwise, if $R \leq R^*$, then the algorithm will use Goemans and Williamson's algorithm for Max-Cut [18] on the remaining graph (blue vertices and edges) to do one partition (the rest can be done in any arbitrary manner, say random partition). So, we separate our analysis in those two cases and prove necessary lemmas and theorems in each case. ■

2.1.1 Case 1: $R > R^*$

Let us denote the total revenue obtained in the random partitioning phase of the algorithm by ALG_R . Then the total revenue of our algorithm would be at least $ALG_P + ALG_R$. For this case of $R > R^*$ we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4 *If $R > R^*$: $ALG_P + ALG_R \geq nW \cdot (\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\gamma-1}{3\gamma} \cdot R^* + \frac{1}{12\gamma} \cdot R^{*2})$.*

This means that the ratio of our algorithm in this case is at least $(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\gamma-1}{3\gamma} \cdot R^* + \frac{1}{12\gamma} \cdot R^{*2})$. Note that to have this ratio, we are actually comparing our revenue with nW (and not OPT which might in fact be smaller) and if we somehow find a better upper-bound for OPT , comparing our revenue with OPT might prove a better ratio for our algorithm. To prove this Theorem, we first recall that in an instance with n vertices and the total weights of dissimilarities of W , random partitioning algorithm has revenue at least $2nW/3$ [11].

Lemma 3 $ALG_R \geq \frac{2}{3}(1 - \ell)n(W - W_R)$.

Proof. This follows easily from the observation mentioned above since after the peel-off phase the number of remaining vertices is $|V_B| = n - n\ell = (1 - \ell)n$ and the total weights of the remaining edges is $W_B = W - W_R$. ■

The rest of the proof of Theorem 4 will be done by simply using Lemmas 1, 2, 3, and the fact that $R > R^*$. Combining Lemmas 2 and 3 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ALG_P + ALG_R &\geq (1 - \ell/2)nW_R + \frac{2}{3}(1 - \ell)n(W - W_R) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{ALG_P + ALG_R}{nW} &\geq (1 - \ell/2)R + \frac{2}{3}(1 - \ell)(1 - R). \end{aligned}$$

The RHS is decreasing with ℓ increasing, so using Lemma 1, we have:

$$\Rightarrow \frac{ALG_P + ALG_R}{nW} \geq \left(1 - \frac{R}{4\gamma}\right)R + \frac{2}{3}\left(1 - \frac{R}{2\gamma}\right)(1 - R) = \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\gamma - 1}{3\gamma} \cdot R + \frac{1}{12\gamma} \cdot R^2\right).$$

This bound is increasing with R , so considering the fact that $R > R^*$, it implies Theorem 4.

Let us define function $F(R) = \left(1 - \frac{R}{4\gamma}\right)R + \frac{2}{3}\left(1 - \frac{R}{2\gamma}\right)(1 - R)$ and note that in Theorem 4 we just proved that if $R > R^*$ then $ALG_P + ALG_R \geq nW \cdot F(R^*)$. We will use this bound later.

2.1.2 Case 2: $R \leq R^*$

Like the other case, let us denote the total revenue obtained in the max-cut phase of the algorithm by ALG_C . Then the total revenue of our algorithm would be at least $ALG_P + ALG_C$. Note that we are not considering the revenue obtained after the max-cut phase, which uses random partitioning (as we do not have a good bound on the value/weight of the edges left after performing the max-cut). For this case of $R \leq R^*$ we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5 *Suppose $R \leq R^*$ and the following conditions for ϵ , R^* , and γ hold (where α_{GW} is the ratio of approximation for max-cut [18]):*

$$R^* < 1 - \frac{6\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \epsilon. \quad (5)$$

$$\gamma \leq (1 - R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{9\alpha_{GW}^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon}. \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{1}{3} \geq R^* \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\right) + \gamma \cdot (1 - \alpha_{GW}). \quad (7)$$


Then $ALG_P + ALG_C \geq nW \cdot F(R^*)$.

This means that the ratio of our algorithm in this case (like the other case) is at least $F(R^*)$ if conditions (5), (6), and (7) are met.

We continue by looking at the layered structure of the optimum tree similar to the one done in [8]. Fix parameter $\delta < 1/2$ (to be specified later) and imagine we start from the root of the optimum tree.

We are looking for the smallest (i.e. deepest) cluster of the tree with size more than $n(1 - \delta)$. This is a cluster where itself and all its ancestors have size more than $n(1 - \delta)$ but both its children are smaller. Consider each time the optimum tree performs a partition of a cluster into two. Since $\delta < 1/2$, either both of these clusters must be of size at most $n(1 - \delta)$ (at which point we stop), or exactly one of them is smaller than $n(1 - \delta)$ and the other is strictly larger than $n(1 - \delta)$. In the latter case, we go down the bigger branch and keep doing this until both children have size at most $n(1 - \delta)$. At this point we have found the smallest

cluster (internal node) of the tree with size more than $n(1 - \delta)$, which then has two (children) clusters of size at most $n(1 - \delta)$. We denote these two children clusters by L and R and we have: $|L| < n(1 - \delta)$, $|R| < n(1 - \delta)$, $|L \cup R| > n(1 - \delta)$, and finally $|V \setminus (L \cup R)| < n\delta$. We define $c = |V \setminus (L \cup R)|/n$ and we know $0 \leq c < \delta$.



Layered structure of optimum tree and red/blue vertices

Now we partition the blue vertices (vertices that survived the peel off phase) into two groups. $V_{B-Cut} = V_B \cap (L \cup R)$ and $V_{B-Chain} = V_B \setminus (L \cup R)$. Note that V_{B-Cut} are those inside the smallest cluster (internal node) of the optimum tree with size more than $n(1 - \delta)$ and $V_{B-Chain}$ are those outside it. We also define $W_{B-Chain}$ as the total weights of the blue edges incident to at least one vertex of $V_{B-Chain}$. Now W_B is partitioned into four part: $W_B = W_L + W_R + W_{L,R} + W_{B-Chain}$, where $W_{L,R}$ are those with one end in L and the other in R while W_L and W_R are those with both ends in L and R , respectively. Now we are ready for our first lemma.

Lemma 4 $W_{B-Chain} \leq 2c\gamma W$.

Proof. We know that $|V_{B-Chain}| \leq |V \setminus (L \cup R)| = cn$. We also know that each $v \in V_{B-Chain}$ has $W_v < \gamma \frac{2W}{n}$:

$$W_{B-Chain} \leq \sum_{v \in V_{B-Chain}} W_v < |V_{B-Chain}| \cdot \gamma \frac{2W}{n} = 2c\gamma W.$$

Now it is time to find a cut in V_B with provably good size. This layered structure of the optimum tree would suggest the cut (L, R) with size $W_{L,R}$ and the following lemma will give us a lower-bound on its size: ■

Lemma 5 $W_{L,R} \geq \frac{\delta W_B - (\epsilon + 2c\delta\gamma)W}{\delta - c}$.

Proof. Consider the revenue of the optimum solution. By looking at the layered structure we just introduced we have:

$$OPT \leq n(W_R + W_{B-Chain}) + n(1 - \delta)(W_L + W_R) + n(1 - c)W_{L,R}.$$

This is because the size of the cluster when the optimum solution produces cut (L, R) is exactly $n(1 - c)$ and after that the size of the following clusters could not be more than $n(1 - \delta)$. Now we use $OPT = (1 - \epsilon)nW$ and $W_L + W_R = W_B - W_{B-Chain} - W_{L,R}$ in the above inequality:

$$OPT = (1 - \epsilon)nW \leq n(W_R + W_{B-Chain}) + n(1 - \delta)(W_B - W_{B-Chain} - W_{L,R}) + n(1 - c)W_{L,R}.$$

By dividing both sides by n and considering the fact that $W = W_R + W_B$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow W - \epsilon W &\leq W - \delta(W_B - W_{B-Chain} - W_{L,R}) - cW_{L,R} \\ &\Rightarrow \delta(W_B - W_{B-Chain}) - \epsilon W \leq (\delta - c)W_{L,R}. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the fact that c is strictly less than δ and using Lemma 4 this completes the proof of the lemma. ■

The next lemma will provide a lower bound on ALG_C .

Lemma 6 $ALG_C \geq \alpha_{GW} \cdot (1 - \ell)nW_{L,R}$.

Proof. Note that after the peel-off phase, we are going to use Goemans and Williamson's max-cut algorithm to find a cut in V_B whose size is $n - n\ell$. As we know there is a cut with size at least $W_{L,R}$, we can find one with size $\alpha_{GW}W_{L,R}$ and because there are $(1 - \ell)n$ many blue vertices left after the first phase, the revenue we will have on the first step of the second phase will be at least $\alpha_{GW} \cdot (1 - \ell)nW_{L,R}$. ■

Note that if we can somehow find a lower-bound for the revenue which is obtained after this max-cut step, (perhaps using a bi-section instead of a max-cut) our ratio could be even better. We should point out that using a bi-section [1] obtained the improved ratio for the similarity-based version.

Considering the fact that $R = W_R/W$, $W = W_R + W_B$ and combining the previous two lemmas we have:

$$ALG_C \geq \alpha_{GW} \cdot (1 - \ell)nW \left(\frac{\delta(1 - R) - (\epsilon + 2c\delta\gamma)}{\delta - c} \right). \quad (8)$$

Now we want to set $\delta = \frac{3\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1 - R^*}$, and to be able to do that we need Condition (5). That is because we have to make sure $\delta < 1/2$ and Condition (5) will be enough to have that:

$$R^* < 1 - \frac{6\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \epsilon \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{6\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \epsilon < 1 - R^* \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{3\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1 - R^*} < 1/2$$

Now we apply $\delta = \frac{3\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW} - 2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1 - R^*}$ to Equation (8):

Corollary 1 $ALG_C \geq \alpha_{GW} \cdot (1 - \ell)nW \cdot G(c)$ where $G(c) = \left(\frac{(1-R) - (1-R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}} - 2c\gamma}{1 - c \frac{(1-R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}}}{\epsilon}} \right)$.

Note that $0 \leq c < \delta = \frac{3\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW}-2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-R^*}$, and the following lemma would make sure the worst case for us is when $c = 0$ (see Appendix A for proof).

Lemma 7 *If Condition (6) holds, then $G(0) \leq G(c)$ for all $0 \leq c < \delta = \frac{3\alpha_{GW}}{3\alpha_{GW}-2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-R^*}$.*

Using this lemma and applying $c = 0$ to Corollary 1 we have:

$$ALG_C \geq \alpha_{GW} \cdot (1 - \ell)nW \left((1 - R) - (1 - R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{3\alpha_{GW}} \right). \quad (9)$$

Using this and Lemmas 1 and 2 we can conclude:

$$\frac{ALG_P + ALG_C}{nW} \geq \left(1 - \frac{R}{4\gamma}\right) R + \alpha_{GW} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{R}{2\gamma}\right) \left((1 - R) - (1 - R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{3\alpha_{GW}} \right). \quad (10)$$

Let us define function $\tilde{F}(R) = \left(1 - \frac{R}{4\gamma}\right) R + \alpha_{GW} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{R}{2\gamma}\right) \left((1 - R) - (1 - R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{3\alpha_{GW}} \right)$. Note that the equation above says $\frac{ALG_P + ALG_C}{nW} \geq \tilde{F}(R)$ and:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(R^*) &= \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{4\gamma}\right) R^* + \alpha_{GW} \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{2\gamma}\right) \left((1 - R^*) - (1 - R^*) \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{3\alpha_{GW}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{4\gamma}\right) R^* + \alpha_{GW} \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{2\gamma}\right) (1 - R^*) \left(1 - \frac{3\alpha_{GW} - 2}{3\alpha_{GW}}\right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{4\gamma}\right) R^* + \alpha_{GW} \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{2\gamma}\right) (1 - R^*) \frac{2}{3\alpha_{GW}} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{4\gamma}\right) R^* + \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{2\gamma}\right) (1 - R^*) \\ &= F(R^*) \end{aligned}$$

So, the only thing we need to show to complete the proof of Theorem 5 is that $\tilde{F}(R)$ is decreasing with R increasing in interval $0 \leq R \leq R^*$ and the following lemma will prove this (see Appendix A):

Lemma 8 *If Condition (7) holds, then $\tilde{F}(R^*) \leq \tilde{F}(R)$ for all $0 \leq R \leq R^*$.*

It is easy to see that Equation (10) together with Lemma 8 imply Theorem 5.

2.1.3 Using Theorems 4 and 5 to prove Theorem 3

To complete the proof of Theorem 3, we use Theorems 4 and 5 to conclude that if we can set γ and R^* such that Conditions (5), (6), and (7) are met, then the ratio of our algorithm would be at least $F(R^*)$:

$$F(R^*) = \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{4\gamma}\right) R^* + \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{R^*}{2\gamma}\right) (1 - R^*). \quad (11)$$

Recall that we can assume $\epsilon < \frac{\alpha-2/3}{\alpha}$ as otherwise the random partitioning gives a better than α -approximation. If we fix a value for α , this condition implies a bound for ϵ , which then using Condition (6) gives a bound for γ : $\gamma = (1 - R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{9\alpha_{GW}^2} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-2/3}$ and this in turn implies the best value for R^* using the equation above for $F(R^*)$. Note that the ratio of our algorithm would be the minimum of α and $F(R^*)$. It is easy to verify that by having $\alpha = 0.6929$, we will get $R^* = 0.227617$ which maximizes $F(\cdot)$ exactly at $F(R^*) = \alpha$; for this value γ will be set to 1.442042. Note that these values of α , R^* and γ will satisfy all the conditions of Theorem 5 and the ratio of algorithm will be 0.6929. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

2.2 Improving the ratio to 0.71604: Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we will show how to improve the ratio of our algorithm to 0.71604. A key observation from the past section is that while we use ϵ in our conditions, at the end we are comparing the revenue obtained by the algorithm with nW and not with $OPT = (1 - \epsilon)nW$. In other words, the function $F(\cdot)$ is obtained based on comparing the solution of the algorithm with nW (in both Theorems 4 and 5). This is because we do not have any lower-bound on ϵ and it really could be arbitrarily close to 0. However, when ϵ is close to 0, then our conditions, especially Condition (6), will let us choose better γ and R^* . We will take advantage of this to find a series of values for γ and R^* , such that if we run our algorithm with these parameters and take the better of all solutions then the ratio will be 0.71604.

Recall that to maximize the ratio of our algorithm we first set α and use our conditions to find the best R^* and γ to maximize $F(R^*)$ (using Equation (11)) and finally the ratio would be the minimum of α and $F(R^*)$. If $F(R^*) < \alpha$, it means that our initial choice of α was too high and vice versa. Suppose we set α to some value such that based on that value we obtain R_1^* and γ_1 that are maximizing $F(R_1^*)$ but $F(R_1^*) < \alpha$. As we mentioned earlier, since the actual ratio of our algorithm is $\frac{F(R_1^*)}{1-\epsilon}$ (since we assume $OPT = (1 - \epsilon)nW$), there is an $\epsilon_2 < \epsilon$ where $\frac{F(R_1^*)}{1-\epsilon_2} = \alpha$ and for all values of ϵ where $\epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$ (we define $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha-2/3}{\alpha}$) the algorithm with parameters R_1^* and γ_1 is actually an α -approximation and all three conditions of Theorem 5 are met. But what happens if $\epsilon < \epsilon_2$? In this case the bounds of those three conditions are in fact better and we can set the parameters R^* and γ differently to obtain better ratios.

As an example, suppose that we want to improve the ratio to $\alpha = 0.7$. Using the bound $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha-2/3}{\alpha} = 1/21$, we use Condition (6) and set $\gamma = (1 - R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{9\alpha_{GW}^2} \cdot 21 = 1.9218297 \cdot (1 - R^*)^2$ and find the best R^* to maximize $F(R^*)$ in Equation (11). It turns out the maximum of $F(\cdot)$ is obtained at $R_1^* = 0.173114$ and $\gamma_1 = 1.314032$, with $F(R_1^*) = 0.682358$. This means that by running our algorithm with parameters R_1^* and γ_1 we will have the revenue at least $0.682358nW$. To make this an α -approximation (for $\alpha = 0.7$), we must have a lower-bound on ϵ . More precisely $0.682358nW \geq \alpha OPT = 0.7 \cdot (1 - \epsilon)nW$ only if $\epsilon \geq \epsilon_2 = 0.02520285$. This means that if $\epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then the revenue gained by our algorithm using parameters R_1^* and γ_1 is at least αOPT . Recall that if $\epsilon > \epsilon_1$, then random partitioning is an α -approximation. The only remaining case is if $\epsilon < \epsilon_2$, and in this case we can set $\gamma = (1 - R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{9\alpha_{GW}^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} = 3.6311637(1 - R^*)^2$ and again find the best R^* to maximize $F(R^*)$. We must set $R_2^* = 0.316719$ and $\gamma_2 = 1.695292$ to maximize $F(R_2^*) = 0.714896$ which is even greater than α . This means that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_2$, then the revenue gained by our algorithm using parameters R_2^* and γ_2 is at least αOPT . Note that for γ_1, R_1^* and $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha-2/3}{\alpha}$ and for $\gamma_2, R_2^*, \epsilon_2$ all three conditions of Theorem 5 are met. Because we do not know the exact value of ϵ , the only thing we need to do is to take the better of the following three:

1. Run Random Partitioning Algorithm all the way.
2. Run Algorithm 1 with parameters R_1^* and γ_1 .
3. Run Algorithm 1 with parameters R_2^* and γ_2 .

So, with only two sets of parameters for R^* and γ and running Algorithm 1 for each (and taking the better of the results as well as random partitioning) we can get a 0.7-approximation. It turns out using this approach and running the algorithm with several more parameters we can get slight improvement. More specifically, starting with $\alpha = 0.716$ we will find 83 triples of values $\gamma_i, R_i^*, \epsilon_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq 83$) such that for each triple, the three conditions of Theorem 5 are met and for each pair of γ_i, R_i^* if we run Algorithm 1 with these parameters if the actual value of ϵ is between ϵ_{i+1} and ϵ_i (with the assumption of $\epsilon_{84} = 0$) then the revenue of the solution is at least αOPT . These 83 triples of $\gamma_i, R_i^*, \epsilon_i$ are obtained using a simple computer program and are listed in Table 1 in Appendix B. By choosing $\alpha = 0.71604$ we will have 211 triples of $\gamma_i, R_i^*, \epsilon_i$ and ratio will be at least 0.71604.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

We discuss a method for bounding the cost of any top-down algorithm regarding this new objective function (4). When a top-down algorithm splits cluster $A \cup B$ into clusters A and B , the least common ancestor for

any two pair of nodes $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ is determined. But for each two nodes $a, a' \in A$ (also for $b, b' \in B$), the distance between their least common ancestor and the root in the final tree is increased by 1. Given this, we define the cost of partitioning a cluster into two clusters A and B as the following formula:

$$\text{split-cost}_H(A, B) = \sum_{a, a' \in A} w_{a, a'} + \sum_{b, b' \in B} w_{b, b'}.$$

Notice that the total cost $\text{Cost}_H(T)$ is exactly the sum of the *split-cost* over all internal nodes of tree T plus and additional $\sum_{i, j \in [n]} w_{i, j}$. We model the problem as a multi-step game. At each step we have to choose a cut (S_1, S_2) in G and remove its cutting edges $\delta(S_1) = \delta(S_2)$. The cost of step 0 is W and the cost of each step is the total weight of all the remaining edges. Then the total cost of the algorithm would be summation over all iterations. Considering this view, it would make sense to choose the maximum weighted cut at each step. One of our main results is to analyze this algorithm by showing that it has a constant approximation ratio. Note that this algorithm has a large approximation ratio when we want to minimize Dasgupta's objective function $\text{Cost}(T)$ or maximize its dual $\text{Rev}_{\text{Dual}}(T)$.

The method we use to prove Theorem 2 is inspired by the work done by Feige et al. [17]. We assume all the weights are integers and for each edge $(i, j) \in E$ we replace it with $w_{i, j}$ many unit weight edges to make the graph unweighted. Let OPT be the cost of the optimal tree and AMC be the cost of the approximated Max-Cut algorithm. For $i = 1, 2, \dots$ let X_i^* and X_i be the sets of edges removed at step i by the optimal tree and approximated Max-Cut algorithm, respectively. Also, let R_i^* and R_i be the sets of edges remained after step i of the algorithms. We also set $R_0^* = R_0 = E$. Notice that for each $i \geq 0$ we have $R_i = E \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} X_j$, $R_i = X_{i+1} \cup R_{i+1}$ and $R_i = \cup_{j=i+1}^n X_j$ (same for R_i^*).

Now observe that we have:

$$\text{OPT} = \sum_{i=0}^n |R_i^*| = \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot |X_i^*| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{AMC} = \sum_{i=0}^n |R_i| = \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot |X_i|.$$

Now we define $p_1 = 0$ and for each $i \geq 2$ we define $p_i = \frac{|R_{i-1}|}{|X_i|}$ and for each $e \in E$ we set $p_e = p_i$ if $e \in X_i$, we then have:

$$\sum_{e \in E} p_e = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{e \in X_i} p_i = \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i| \cdot p_i = \sum_{i=2}^n |X_i| \cdot \frac{|R_{i-1}|}{|X_i|} = \sum_{i=1}^n |R_i| = \text{AMC} - |R_0|.$$

Observe that if you use an algorithm that chooses a cut that contains at least half of the edges at each step, including approximated maximum cut, then for each $e \in E \setminus X_1$ we have $p_e \leq 2$. Note that $p_e = p_1 = 0$ for each $e \in X_1$, so we have the following upper-bound for AMC :

$$\text{AMC} - |R_0| = \sum_{e \in E \setminus X_1} p_e \leq \sum_{e \in E \setminus X_1} 2 = 2|R_1| \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{AMC} \leq |R_0| + 2|R_1|.$$

Now we consider two cases. For the first case we assume $|R_1^*| > \frac{2\alpha_{GW}-1}{2\alpha_{GW}} \cdot |R_0|$, and the second case is when $|R_1^*| \leq \frac{2\alpha_{GW}-1}{2\alpha_{GW}} \cdot |R_0|$, where α_{GW} is the ratio of approximate max-cut algorithm.

For the first case, note that X_1 is the cut the approximated maximum cut chooses in the first step and it has at least half of the edges, so $|R_1| \leq \frac{|E|}{2} = \frac{|R_0|}{2}$. If use the lower bound of $|R_0| + |R_1^*|$ for OPT , then we have:

$$\frac{\text{AMC}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{|R_0| + 2|R_1|}{|R_0| + |R_1^*|} < \frac{|R_0| + |R_0|}{|R_0| + \frac{2\alpha_{GW}-1}{2\alpha_{GW}}|R_0|} = \frac{2}{1 + \frac{2\alpha_{GW}-1}{2\alpha_{GW}}} = \frac{4\alpha_{GW}}{4\alpha_{GW} - 1}.$$

For the second case, note that X_1^* is a cut in G and X_1 has at least α_{GW} fraction of the maximum cut or any other cut including X_1^* , so:

$$|X_1| \geq \alpha_{GW} \cdot |X_1^*|.$$

So, for R_1 we have:

$$|R_1| = |R_0| - |X_1| \leq |R_0| - \alpha_{GW} \cdot |X_1^*| = |R_0| - \alpha_{GW} \cdot (|R_0| - |R_1^*|) = (1 - \alpha_{GW})|R_0| + \alpha_{GW} \cdot |R_1^*|.$$

Then again, we use the lower bound of $|R_0| + |R_1^*|$ for OPT to bound the ratio of the Approximated Max-Cut algorithm:

$$\frac{AMC}{OPT} \leq \frac{|R_0| + 2|R_1|}{|R_0| + |R_1^*|} \leq \frac{|R_0| + 2(1 - \alpha_{GW})|R_0| + 2\alpha_{GW} \cdot |R_1^*|}{|R_0| + |R_1^*|} = \frac{(3 - 2\alpha_{GW})|R_0| + 2\alpha_{GW} \cdot |R_1^*|}{|R_0| + |R_1^*|}.$$

Remember that in this case $|R_0| \geq \frac{2\alpha_{GW}}{2\alpha_{GW}-1} \cdot |R_1^*|$, so:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{AMC}{OPT} &\leq (3 - 2\alpha_{GW}) + \frac{(4\alpha_{GW} - 3) \cdot |R_1^*|}{|R_0| + |R_1^*|} \leq (3 - 2\alpha_{GW}) + \frac{(4\alpha_{GW} - 3) \cdot |R_1^*|}{\frac{2\alpha_{GW}}{2\alpha_{GW}-1} \cdot |R_1^*| + |R_1^*|}. \\ \Rightarrow \frac{AMC}{OPT} &\leq (3 - 2\alpha_{GW}) + \frac{(4\alpha_{GW} - 3)(2\alpha_{GW} - 1)}{(4\alpha_{GW} - 1)} = \frac{4\alpha_{GW}}{4\alpha_{GW} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in either case, the cost of the solution returned by the recursively finding an α_{GW} -approximate max-cut is at most $\frac{4\alpha_{GW}}{4\alpha_{GW}-1}$ times the optimum. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

References

- [1] S. Ahmadian, V. Chatziafratis, A. Epasto, E. Lee, M. Mahdian, K. Makarychev, and G. Yaroslavtsev. Bisect and conquer: Hierarchical clustering via max-uncut bisection. In *The 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2020, 3-5 June 2020, Palermo, Sicily, Italy, 2020*.
- [2] S. Ahmadian, A. Epasto, M. Knittel, R. Kumar, M. Mahdian, B. Moseley, P. Pham, S. Vassilvitskii, and Y. Wang. Fair hierarchical clustering. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual, 2020*.
- [3] N. Alon, Y. Azar, and D. Vainstein. Hierarchical clustering: A 0.585 revenue approximation. In J. D. Abernethy and S. Agarwal, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2020, 9-12 July 2020, Virtual Event [Graz, Austria]*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 153–162. PMLR, 2020.
- [4] S. Arora, S. Rao, and U. V. Vazirani. Expander flows, geometric embeddings and graph partitioning. *J. ACM*, 56(2):5:1–5:37, 2009.
- [5] P. Austrin, S. Benabbas, and K. Georgiou. Better balance by being biased: A 0.8776-approximation for max bisection. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(1):2:1–2:27, 2016.
- [6] D. Bakkelund. Order preserving hierarchical agglomerative clustering of strict posets. *CoRR*, abs/2004.12488, 2020.
- [7] M. Charikar and V. Chatziafratis. Approximate hierarchical clustering via sparsest cut and spreading metrics. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19 [7]*, pages 841–854.
- [8] M. Charikar, V. Chatziafratis, and R. Niazadeh. Hierarchical clustering better than average-linkage. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 2291–2304. SIAM, 2019.
- [9] M. Charikar, V. Chatziafratis, R. Niazadeh, and G. Yaroslavtsev. Hierarchical clustering for euclidean data. In K. Chaudhuri and M. Sugiyama, editors, *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2019, 16-18 April 2019, Naha, Okinawa, Japan*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2721–2730. PMLR, 2019.
- [10] V. Chatziafratis, N. Gupta, and E. Lee. Inapproximability for local correlation clustering and dissimilarity hierarchical clustering. *CoRR*, abs/2010.01459, 2020.

- [11] V. Chatziafratis, R. Niazadeh, and M. Charikar. Hierarchical clustering with structural constraints. In J. G. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 773–782. PMLR, 2018.
- [12] M. H. Chehreghani. Hierarchical correlation clustering and tree preserving embedding. *CoRR*, abs/2002.07756, 2020.
- [13] V. Cohen-Addad, V. Kanade, F. Mallmann-Trenn, and C. Mathieu. Hierarchical clustering: Objective functions and algorithms. *J. ACM*, 66(4):26:1–26:42, 2019.
- [14] S. Dasgupta. A cost function for similarity-based hierarchical clustering. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016* [14], pages 118–127.
- [15] L. Dhulipala, D. Eisenstat, J. Lacki, V. S. Mirrokni, and J. Shi. Hierarchical agglomerative graph clustering in nearly-linear time. *CoRR*, abs/2106.05610, 2021.
- [16] E. Emamjomeh-Zadeh and D. Kempe. Adaptive hierarchical clustering using ordinal queries. In A. Czumaj, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 415–429. SIAM, 2018.
- [17] U. Feige, L. Lovász, and P. Tetali. Approximating min sum set cover. *Algorithmica*, 40(4):219–234, 2004.
- [18] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *J. ACM*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- [19] S. Høgemo, C. Paul, and J. A. Telle. Hierarchical clusterings of unweighted graphs. In J. Esparza and D. Král’, editors, *45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2020, August 24-28, 2020, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 170 of *LIPICs*, pages 47:1–47:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [20] A. K. Jain. Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 31(8):651 — 666, 2010.
- [21] A. K. Menon, A. Rajagopalan, B. Sumengen, G. Citovsky, Q. Cao, and S. Kumar. Online hierarchical clustering approximations. *CoRR*, abs/1909.09667, 2019.
- [22] B. Moseley, S. Vassilvitskii, and Y. Wang. Hierarchical clustering in general metric spaces using approximate nearest neighbors. In A. Banerjee and K. Fukumizu, editors, *The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2021, April 13-15, 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2440–2448. PMLR, 2021.
- [23] B. Moseley and J. Wang. Approximation bounds for hierarchical clustering: Average linkage, bisecting k-means, and local search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, 4-9 December 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 3094–3103, 2017.
- [24] P. Raghavendra and D. Steurer. Graph expansion and the unique games conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010* [24], pages 755–764.
- [25] A. Roy and S. Pokutta. Hierarchical clustering via spreading metrics. volume 6325 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2016.
- [26] D. Vainstein, V. Chatziafratis, G. Citovsky, A. Rajagopalan, M. Mahdian, and Y. Azar. Hierarchical clustering via sketches and hierarchical correlation clustering. In A. Banerjee and K. Fukumizu, editors, *The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2021, April 13-15, 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 559–567. PMLR, 2021.

[27] D. Wang and Y. Wang. An improved cost function for hierarchical cluster trees. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(1):283–331, 2020.

[28] Y. Wang and B. Moseley. An objective for hierarchical clustering in euclidean space and its connection to bisecting k-means. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 6307–6314. AAAI Press, 2020.

A Missing Proofs

Proof of Lemma 7. To prove this lemma, we need to show that $G(c)$ is increasing with c . And note that a function like $\frac{X-Yc}{1-Zc}$, where X, Y and Z are all independent of c , is ascending if and only if $XY \geq Z$. In $G(c)$ we have $X = (1-R) - (1-R^*)\frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}}$, $Y = 2\gamma$ and $Z = \frac{(1-R^*)}{\epsilon} \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}}$. Now recall that we are in a case where $R \leq R^*$, so:

$$X \geq (1-R^*) - (1-R^*)\frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}} = (1-R^*) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}}\right) = (1-R^*)\frac{2}{3\alpha_{GW}}.$$

Now using the definition of X, Y, Z and the bound above for X , Condition (6) implies $XZ \geq Y$, which completes the proof of the lemma. ■

Proof of Lemma 8. First we do some simplifications to $\tilde{F}(R)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(R) &= \left(1 - \frac{R}{4\gamma}\right)R + \alpha_{GW} \left(1 - \frac{R}{2\gamma}\right) \left((1-R) - (1-R^*)\frac{3\alpha_{GW}-2}{3\alpha_{GW}}\right) \\ &= \alpha_{GW} - (1-R^*)(\alpha_{GW}-2/3) - R \cdot \left(\alpha_{GW} + \frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - 1 - \frac{(1-R^*)(\alpha_{GW}-2/3)}{2\gamma}\right) + R^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - \frac{1}{4\gamma}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $X = \alpha_{GW} - (1-R^*)(\alpha_{GW}-2/3)$, $Y = \left(\alpha_{GW} + \frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - 1 - \frac{(1-R^*)(\alpha_{GW}-2/3)}{2\gamma}\right)$, and $Z = \left(\frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - \frac{1}{4\gamma}\right)$; then $\tilde{F}(R) = X - YR + ZR^2$. Observe that since $\gamma > 0$, Z is positive. Also, we will soon show that Y is positive too. Thus, the minimum of $\tilde{F}(R)$ is at $R = \frac{Y}{2Z}$. If we show that $R^* \leq \frac{Y}{2Z}$ then we have shown that $\tilde{F}(R)$ is totally descending in the interval $0 \leq R \leq R^*$. So, it is enough to show:

$$R^* \leq \frac{\alpha_{GW} + \frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - 1 - \frac{(1-R^*)(\alpha_{GW}-2/3)}{2\gamma}}{2\left(\frac{\alpha_{GW}}{2\gamma} - \frac{1}{4\gamma}\right)}.$$

Or equivalently we need to have:

$$R^*(\alpha_{GW} - 1/2) \leq R^*(\alpha_{GW}/2 - 1/3) + 1/3 - \gamma(1 - \alpha_{GW}).$$

This inequality is exactly what we have in Condition (7). Also, since this condition implies that $R^* < \frac{Y}{2Z}$ and we know that $R^* > 0$, this also means $Y > 0$. Thus, the minimum of $\tilde{F}(R)$ is at $R = R^*$ and this completes the proof of the lemma. ■

B R^* and γ Values to have a 0.716-approximation

Table 1: Values of parameters R^* , γ and ϵ to run Algorithm 1 and take the best and improve the approximation ratio to 0.716

| R^* | γ | $F(R^*)$ | ϵ |
|-------|----------|----------|------------|
|-------|----------|----------|------------|

| | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| $R_1^* = 0.07852$ | $\gamma_1 = 1.1278206$ | $F(R_1^*) = 0.670089$ | $\epsilon_1 = 0.0689014$ |
| $R_2^* = 0.09761$ | $\gamma_2 = 1.1621875$ | $F(R_2^*) = 0.67189$ | $\epsilon_2 = 0.0641222$ |
| $R_3^* = 0.10809$ | $\gamma_3 = 1.1817295$ | $F(R_3^*) = 0.673031$ | $\epsilon_3 = 0.0616056$ |
| $R_4^* = 0.11489$ | $\gamma_4 = 1.1946796$ | $F(R_4^*) = 0.673828$ | $\epsilon_4 = 0.0600121$ |
| $R_5^* = 0.11973$ | $\gamma_5 = 1.2039729$ | $F(R_5^*) = 0.67442$ | $\epsilon_5 = 0.0588994$ |
| $R_6^* = 0.12337$ | $\gamma_6 = 1.2110441$ | $F(R_6^*) = 0.67488$ | $\epsilon_6 = 0.0580723$ |
| $R_7^* = 0.12622$ | $\gamma_7 = 1.216645$ | $F(R_7^*) = 0.67525$ | $\epsilon_7 = 0.0574297$ |
| $R_8^* = 0.12853$ | $\gamma_8 = 1.2211909$ | $F(R_8^*) = 0.675554$ | $\epsilon_8 = 0.0569138$ |
| $R_9^* = 0.13045$ | $\gamma_9 = 1.2249629$ | $F(R_9^*) = 0.67581$ | $\epsilon_9 = 0.0564888$ |
| $R_{10}^* = 0.13206$ | $\gamma_{10} = 1.2282025$ | $F(R_{10}^*) = 0.676029$ | $\epsilon_{10} = 0.0561313$ |
| $R_{11}^* = 0.13346$ | $\gamma_{11} = 1.2309501$ | $F(R_{11}^*) = 0.676219$ | $\epsilon_{11} = 0.0558255$ |
| $R_{12}^* = 0.13467$ | $\gamma_{12} = 1.2333801$ | $F(R_{12}^*) = 0.676386$ | $\epsilon_{12} = 0.05556$ |
| $R_{13}^* = 0.13574$ | $\gamma_{13} = 1.2355205$ | $F(R_{13}^*) = 0.676535$ | $\epsilon_{13} = 0.0553267$ |
| $R_{14}^* = 0.13669$ | $\gamma_{14} = 1.2374426$ | $F(R_{14}^*) = 0.676668$ | $\epsilon_{14} = 0.0551194$ |
| $R_{15}^* = 0.13755$ | $\gamma_{15} = 1.2391589$ | $F(R_{15}^*) = 0.676788$ | $\epsilon_{15} = 0.0549334$ |
| $R_{16}^* = 0.13832$ | $\gamma_{16} = 1.2407467$ | $F(R_{16}^*) = 0.676898$ | $\epsilon_{16} = 0.0547652$ |
| $R_{17}^* = 0.13903$ | $\gamma_{17} = 1.2421809$ | $F(R_{17}^*) = 0.676999$ | $\epsilon_{17} = 0.0546119$ |
| $R_{18}^* = 0.13968$ | $\gamma_{18} = 1.2435107$ | $F(R_{18}^*) = 0.677092$ | $\epsilon_{18} = 0.0544711$ |
| $R_{19}^* = 0.14029$ | $\gamma_{19} = 1.2447186$ | $F(R_{19}^*) = 0.677178$ | $\epsilon_{19} = 0.0543411$ |
| $R_{20}^* = 0.14085$ | $\gamma_{20} = 1.2458665$ | $F(R_{20}^*) = 0.677259$ | $\epsilon_{20} = 0.0542204$ |
| $R_{21}^* = 0.14138$ | $\gamma_{21} = 1.2469242$ | $F(R_{21}^*) = 0.677335$ | $\epsilon_{21} = 0.0541076$ |
| $R_{22}^* = 0.14187$ | $\gamma_{22} = 1.2479438$ | $F(R_{22}^*) = 0.677406$ | $\epsilon_{22} = 0.0540017$ |
| $R_{23}^* = 0.14234$ | $\gamma_{23} = 1.2488869$ | $F(R_{23}^*) = 0.677474$ | $\epsilon_{23} = 0.0539018$ |
| $R_{24}^* = 0.14278$ | $\gamma_{24} = 1.2497992$ | $F(R_{24}^*) = 0.677539$ | $\epsilon_{24} = 0.0538072$ |
| $R_{25}^* = 0.1432$ | $\gamma_{25} = 1.2506663$ | $F(R_{25}^*) = 0.6776$ | $\epsilon_{25} = 0.0537172$ |
| $R_{26}^* = 0.14361$ | $\gamma_{26} = 1.2514715$ | $F(R_{26}^*) = 0.677659$ | $\epsilon_{26} = 0.0536313$ |
| $R_{27}^* = 0.14399$ | $\gamma_{27} = 1.2522842$ | $F(R_{27}^*) = 0.677716$ | $\epsilon_{27} = 0.0535489$ |
| $R_{28}^* = 0.14437$ | $\gamma_{28} = 1.2530263$ | $F(R_{28}^*) = 0.67777$ | $\epsilon_{28} = 0.0534697$ |
| $R_{29}^* = 0.14473$ | $\gamma_{29} = 1.2537652$ | $F(R_{29}^*) = 0.677823$ | $\epsilon_{29} = 0.0533932$ |
| $R_{30}^* = 0.14508$ | $\gamma_{30} = 1.2544791$ | $F(R_{30}^*) = 0.677875$ | $\epsilon_{30} = 0.0533192$ |
| $R_{31}^* = 0.14542$ | $\gamma_{31} = 1.255175$ | $F(R_{31}^*) = 0.677925$ | $\epsilon_{31} = 0.0532473$ |
| $R_{32}^* = 0.14575$ | $\gamma_{32} = 1.2558593$ | $F(R_{32}^*) = 0.677974$ | $\epsilon_{32} = 0.0531771$ |
| $R_{33}^* = 0.14607$ | $\gamma_{33} = 1.2565379$ | $F(R_{33}^*) = 0.678022$ | $\epsilon_{33} = 0.0531086$ |
| $R_{34}^* = 0.14639$ | $\gamma_{34} = 1.2571865$ | $F(R_{34}^*) = 0.67807$ | $\epsilon_{34} = 0.0530414$ |
| $R_{35}^* = 0.1467$ | $\gamma_{35} = 1.2578398$ | $F(R_{35}^*) = 0.678116$ | $\epsilon_{35} = 0.0529754$ |
| $R_{36}^* = 0.14701$ | $\gamma_{36} = 1.2584728$ | $F(R_{36}^*) = 0.678162$ | $\epsilon_{36} = 0.0529103$ |
| $R_{37}^* = 0.14732$ | $\gamma_{37} = 1.2590901$ | $F(R_{37}^*) = 0.678208$ | $\epsilon_{37} = 0.0528459$ |
| $R_{38}^* = 0.14762$ | $\gamma_{38} = 1.2597255$ | $F(R_{38}^*) = 0.678253$ | $\epsilon_{38} = 0.0527821$ |
| $R_{39}^* = 0.14792$ | $\gamma_{39} = 1.2603536$ | $F(R_{39}^*) = 0.678299$ | $\epsilon_{39} = 0.0527187$ |
| $R_{40}^* = 0.14822$ | $\gamma_{40} = 1.2609785$ | $F(R_{40}^*) = 0.678344$ | $\epsilon_{40} = 0.0526554$ |
| $R_{41}^* = 0.14852$ | $\gamma_{41} = 1.2616042$ | $F(R_{41}^*) = 0.678389$ | $\epsilon_{41} = 0.0525923$ |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| $R_{42}^* = 0.14883$ | $\gamma_{42} = 1.2622052$ | $F(R_{42}^*) = 0.678435$ | $\epsilon_{42} = 0.0525289$ |
| $R_{43}^* = 0.14913$ | $\gamma_{43} = 1.2628447$ | $F(R_{43}^*) = 0.678481$ | $\epsilon_{43} = 0.0524653$ |
| $R_{44}^* = 0.14943$ | $\gamma_{44} = 1.2634973$ | $F(R_{44}^*) = 0.678527$ | $\epsilon_{44} = 0.0524013$ |
| $R_{45}^* = 0.14974$ | $\gamma_{45} = 1.2641378$ | $F(R_{45}^*) = 0.678574$ | $\epsilon_{45} = 0.0523366$ |
| $R_{46}^* = 0.15006$ | $\gamma_{46} = 1.2647704$ | $F(R_{46}^*) = 0.678622$ | $\epsilon_{46} = 0.052271$ |
| $R_{47}^* = 0.15038$ | $\gamma_{47} = 1.2654297$ | $F(R_{47}^*) = 0.67867$ | $\epsilon_{47} = 0.0522044$ |
| $R_{48}^* = 0.1507$ | $\gamma_{48} = 1.2661208$ | $F(R_{48}^*) = 0.67872$ | $\epsilon_{48} = 0.0521367$ |
| $R_{49}^* = 0.15103$ | $\gamma_{49} = 1.2668193$ | $F(R_{49}^*) = 0.678771$ | $\epsilon_{49} = 0.0520674$ |
| $R_{50}^* = 0.15138$ | $\gamma_{50} = 1.2675011$ | $F(R_{50}^*) = 0.678823$ | $\epsilon_{50} = 0.0519965$ |
| $R_{51}^* = 0.15173$ | $\gamma_{51} = 1.2682323$ | $F(R_{51}^*) = 0.678876$ | $\epsilon_{51} = 0.0519237$ |
| $R_{52}^* = 0.15209$ | $\gamma_{52} = 1.26899$ | $F(R_{52}^*) = 0.678932$ | $\epsilon_{52} = 0.0518486$ |
| $R_{53}^* = 0.15246$ | $\gamma_{53} = 1.2697821$ | $F(R_{53}^*) = 0.67899$ | $\epsilon_{53} = 0.0517711$ |
| $R_{54}^* = 0.15285$ | $\gamma_{54} = 1.2705873$ | $F(R_{54}^*) = 0.679049$ | $\epsilon_{54} = 0.0516907$ |
| $R_{55}^* = 0.15325$ | $\gamma_{55} = 1.2714451$ | $F(R_{55}^*) = 0.679112$ | $\epsilon_{55} = 0.051607$ |
| $R_{56}^* = 0.15368$ | $\gamma_{56} = 1.2723064$ | $F(R_{56}^*) = 0.679177$ | $\epsilon_{56} = 0.0515197$ |
| $R_{57}^* = 0.15412$ | $\gamma_{57} = 1.273244$ | $F(R_{57}^*) = 0.679246$ | $\epsilon_{57} = 0.0514283$ |
| $R_{58}^* = 0.15459$ | $\gamma_{58} = 1.2742119$ | $F(R_{58}^*) = 0.679319$ | $\epsilon_{58} = 0.0513321$ |
| $R_{59}^* = 0.15508$ | $\gamma_{59} = 1.2752568$ | $F(R_{59}^*) = 0.679396$ | $\epsilon_{59} = 0.0512306$ |
| $R_{60}^* = 0.1556$ | $\gamma_{60} = 1.2763678$ | $F(R_{60}^*) = 0.679478$ | $\epsilon_{60} = 0.051123$ |
| $R_{61}^* = 0.15616$ | $\gamma_{61} = 1.2775371$ | $F(R_{61}^*) = 0.679566$ | $\epsilon_{61} = 0.0510085$ |
| $R_{62}^* = 0.15676$ | $\gamma_{62} = 1.2787913$ | $F(R_{62}^*) = 0.67966$ | $\epsilon_{62} = 0.0508861$ |
| $R_{63}^* = 0.1574$ | $\gamma_{63} = 1.280162$ | $F(R_{63}^*) = 0.679762$ | $\epsilon_{63} = 0.0507544$ |
| $R_{64}^* = 0.1581$ | $\gamma_{64} = 1.2816267$ | $F(R_{64}^*) = 0.679872$ | $\epsilon_{64} = 0.0506122$ |
| $R_{65}^* = 0.15886$ | $\gamma_{65} = 1.2832312$ | $F(R_{65}^*) = 0.679993$ | $\epsilon_{65} = 0.0504577$ |
| $R_{66}^* = 0.15969$ | $\gamma_{66} = 1.2850016$ | $F(R_{66}^*) = 0.680126$ | $\epsilon_{66} = 0.0502888$ |
| $R_{67}^* = 0.16061$ | $\gamma_{67} = 1.2869469$ | $F(R_{67}^*) = 0.680274$ | $\epsilon_{67} = 0.0501029$ |
| $R_{68}^* = 0.16163$ | $\gamma_{68} = 1.2891241$ | $F(R_{68}^*) = 0.680439$ | $\epsilon_{68} = 0.0498968$ |
| $R_{69}^* = 0.16277$ | $\gamma_{69} = 1.2915835$ | $F(R_{69}^*) = 0.680625$ | $\epsilon_{69} = 0.0496664$ |
| $R_{70}^* = 0.16407$ | $\gamma_{70} = 1.2943462$ | $F(R_{70}^*) = 0.680837$ | $\epsilon_{70} = 0.0494067$ |
| $R_{71}^* = 0.16555$ | $\gamma_{71} = 1.2975399$ | $F(R_{71}^*) = 0.681081$ | $\epsilon_{71} = 0.0491107$ |
| $R_{72}^* = 0.16727$ | $\gamma_{72} = 1.3012328$ | $F(R_{72}^*) = 0.681366$ | $\epsilon_{72} = 0.0487696$ |
| $R_{73}^* = 0.16928$ | $\gamma_{73} = 1.305618$ | $F(R_{73}^*) = 0.681704$ | $\epsilon_{73} = 0.0483715$ |
| $R_{74}^* = 0.17169$ | $\gamma_{74} = 1.310843$ | $F(R_{74}^*) = 0.682112$ | $\epsilon_{74} = 0.0478995$ |
| $R_{75}^* = 0.17461$ | $\gamma_{75} = 1.3172771$ | $F(R_{75}^*) = 0.682614$ | $\epsilon_{75} = 0.0473301$ |
| $R_{76}^* = 0.17825$ | $\gamma_{76} = 1.3253364$ | $F(R_{76}^*) = 0.68325$ | $\epsilon_{76} = 0.0466283$ |
| $R_{77}^* = 0.18292$ | $\gamma_{77} = 1.3357437$ | $F(R_{77}^*) = 0.68408$ | $\epsilon_{77} = 0.0457406$ |
| $R_{78}^* = 0.18912$ | $\gamma_{78} = 1.3497665$ | $F(R_{78}^*) = 0.68521$ | $\epsilon_{78} = 0.0445811$ |
| $R_{79}^* = 0.19775$ | $\gamma_{79} = 1.3696989$ | $F(R_{79}^*) = 0.686838$ | $\epsilon_{79} = 0.0430022$ |
| $R_{80}^* = 0.21061$ | $\gamma_{80} = 1.4001298$ | $F(R_{80}^*) = 0.689369$ | $\epsilon_{80} = 0.0407297$ |
| $R_{81}^* = 0.23172$ | $\gamma_{81} = 1.4523369$ | $F(R_{81}^*) = 0.693804$ | $\epsilon_{81} = 0.0371936$ |
| $R_{82}^* = 0.27259$ | $\gamma_{82} = 1.5620635$ | $F(R_{82}^*) = 0.703325$ | $\epsilon_{82} = 0.0309996$ |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| $R_{83}^* = 0.32069$ | $\gamma_{83} = 1.7081291$ | $F(R_{83}^*) = 0.716$ | $\epsilon_{83} = 0.0177022$ |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|