

A Note On Spectral Clustering*

Pavel Kolev Kurt Mehlhorn

Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany

{pkolev,mehlhorn}@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph, λ_k the k th smallest eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian matrix of G , and $\rho(k)$ the smallest value of the maximal conductance over all k -way partitions S_1, \dots, S_k of V .

Peng et al. [4] gave the first rigorous analysis of k -clustering algorithms that use spectral embedding and k -means clustering algorithms to partition the vertices of a graph G into k disjoint subsets. Their analysis builds upon a gap parameter $\Upsilon = \rho(k)/\lambda_{k+1}$ that was introduced by Oveis Gharan and Trevisan [2]. In their analysis Peng et al. [4] assume a gap assumption $\Upsilon \geq \Omega(\text{APR} \cdot k^3)$, where $\text{APR} > 1$ is the approximation ratio of a k -means clustering algorithm.

We exhibit an error in one of their Lemmas and provide a correction. With the correction the proof by Peng et al. [4] requires a stronger gap assumption $\Upsilon \geq \Omega(\text{APR} \cdot k^4)$.

Our main contribution is to improve the analysis in [4] by an $O(k)$ factor. We demonstrate that a gap assumption $\Psi \geq \Omega(\text{APR} \cdot k^3)$ suffices, where $\Psi = \rho_{avr}(k)/\lambda_{k+1}$ and $\rho_{avr}(k)$ is the value of the *average* conductance of a partition S_1, \dots, S_k of V that yields $\rho(k)$.

arXiv:1509.09188v1 [cs.DM] 30 Sep 2015

*This work has been funded by the Cluster of Excellence “Multimodal Computing and Interaction” within the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal Government.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Some Notation	5
3	Structure of the Paper	6
4	The Vectors \hat{g}_i and f_i are Close	6
4.1	Analyzing the Columns of Matrix \mathbf{F}	7
4.2	Analyzing Eigenvectors f in terms of \hat{f}_j	8
5	Analyzing Matrix \mathbf{B}	9
5.1	Analyzing the Column Space of Matrix \mathbf{B}	10
5.2	Analyzing the Row Space of Matrix \mathbf{B}	11
6	The Points $p^{(i)}$ are Well-Spaced	13
7	Amended Version of [4, Lemma B.2]	14
8	The Proof of Lemma 1.3	15
9	The Proof of Lemma 1.4	17

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. For any subset of vertices $S \subseteq V$ we denote by $\mu(S) = \sum_{v \in S} \deg(v)$ the *volume* of S , and we define the *conductance* of S by

$$\phi(S) = \frac{|E(S, \bar{S})|}{\mu(S)}. \quad (1)$$

The *order k conductance constant* $\rho(k)$ of a graph G is defined by

$$\rho(k) = \min_{S_1, \dots, S_k} \max_{i \in [1:k]} \phi(S_i). \quad (2)$$

The k -way partitioning problem asks to cluster a graph G into k -disjoint subsets of vertices S_1, \dots, S_k such that the returned partition yields the value of the order k conductance constant $\rho(k)$. Lee et al. [1] established the following relation between the k th eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L}_G and the order k conductance constant $\rho(k)$ of a graph G

$$\lambda_k/2 \leq \rho(k) \leq O(k^2) \sqrt{\lambda_k}. \quad (3)$$

Oveis Gharan and Trevisan [2] proved the existence of good clusterings¹ into k disjoint subsets if the gap between the k th and $(k+1)$ th eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L}_G satisfies

$$\lambda_{k+1} \geq \Omega(k^2 \sqrt{\lambda_k}), \quad (6)$$

i.e., if λ_{k+1} is larger than the upper bound on the order k conductance constant $\rho(k)$ in Equation (3).

Peng et al [4] studied approximation schemes for the k -way partitioning problem. They analyzed spectral clustering algorithms that embed the vertices of G into vectors in \mathbb{R}^k using the first k eigenvectors of the normalized Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L}_G , and then partition the resulting vectors via k -means clustering algorithms. Their analysis crucially relies on the following gap assumption

$$\Upsilon = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\rho(k)} \geq \Omega(k^3). \quad (7)$$

Theorem 1.1. [4] *Let $k \geq 3$ and let G be a graph satisfying the gap assumption $\Upsilon = \lambda_{k+1}/\rho(k) = \Omega(k^3)$. Suppose a k -means clustering algorithm that achieves an approximation ratio APR takes as input a spectral embedding² $\{F(u)\}_{u \in V}$ where $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, and outputs a k -way partition $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then the following two statements hold:*

$$i) \mu(A_i \triangle S_i) = O(\text{APR} \cdot k^3 \cdot \Upsilon^{-1} \cdot \mu(S_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad ii) \phi_G(A_i) = O(\phi_G(S_i) + \text{APR} \cdot k^3 \cdot \Upsilon^{-1}).$$

¹Let S be a subset of vertices. We denote by $G[S]$ the induced subgraph whose edge set consists of all edges of G with both endpoints in S . The inner conductance of the subset S is defined by

$$\phi(G[S]) = \min_{X \subset S, \mu(X) \leq \mu(S)/2} \frac{|E_S(X, \bar{X})|}{\mu_S(X)}, \quad (4)$$

where the quantities $|E_S(X, \bar{X})|$ and $\mu_S(X)$ are defined w.r.t. the induced subgraph $G[S]$. Oveis Gharan and Trevisan [2] defined a partition S_1, \dots, S_k of V that is (ϕ_{in}, ϕ_{out}) -clustering if for all $i \in [1:k]$ it holds

$$\phi(G[S_i]) \geq \phi_{in} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(S_i) \leq \phi_{out}. \quad (5)$$

They showed that there exists a k -partitioning of graph G that is a $(\Omega(\lambda_{k+1}/k), O(k^3 \sqrt{\lambda_k}))$ -clustering if the gap between the k th and $(k+1)$ th eigenvalue of matrix \mathcal{L}_G satisfies $\lambda_{k+1} \geq \Omega(k^2 \sqrt{\lambda_k})$.

²The function F will be defined in Equation 8.

Our Contribution: We give a counter example to [4, Lemma 4.2] in the Appendix and prove a weaker statement (Lemma 7.1) that is tight up to a factor of 2. With the weaker version of the lemma, the proof of Theorem 1.1 needs the strengthened gap assumption

$$\Upsilon \geq \Omega(k^4).$$

We note that all occurrences of k^3 in the statement of the Theorem 1.1 have to be replaced by k^4 .

Let \mathcal{O} be the set of partitions $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$ with $\max_i \phi(S_i) = \rho(k)$, i.e., the set of all partitions that achieve the order k conductance constant. Let

$$\rho_{avg}(k) = \min_{\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{1}{k} \sum_i \phi(S_i)$$

be the minimal *average* conductance of any partition in \mathcal{O} and let

$$\Psi = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\rho_{avg}(k)}.$$

For the remainder of the paper we use $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$ to denote a partition that defines ρ_{avg} . We refine the analysis in [4] and show the following statement.

Theorem 1.2 (Main Theorem). *Let G be a graph that satisfies for some fixed $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $k \geq 3$ the gap assumption*

$$\Psi = 20^4 \cdot \delta^{-1} \cdot \text{APR} \cdot k^3.$$

Suppose a k -means clustering algorithm that achieves an approximation ratio APR takes as input a spectral embedding $\{F(u)\}_{u \in V}$ where $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, and outputs a k -way partition $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then for every $i \in [1 : k]$ the following two statements hold (after suitable renumbering of one of the partitions):

$$1) \mu(A_i \triangle S_i) \leq \frac{\delta}{600} \cdot \mu(S_i) \quad \text{and} \quad 2) \phi(A_i) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{300}\right) \cdot \phi(S_i) + \frac{\delta}{300}.$$

The Spectral Embedding Let $\mathcal{L}_G = I - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$ be a normalized Laplacian matrix, where D is diagonal degree matrix and A is adjacency matrix. We refer to the k th eigenvalue of matrix \mathcal{L}_G by $\lambda_k \triangleq \lambda_k(\mathcal{L}_G)$. Let f_k be the eigenvector corresponding to λ_k . The vectors f_1 to f_n form an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Following Peng et al., we define the *spectral embedding map* $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ by

$$F(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_u}} (f_1(u), \dots, f_k(u))^T \tag{8}$$

for all vertices $u \in V$.

The Clustering Algorithm For a set of k centers c_1, \dots, c_k and a partition $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_k$ of V , define the cost as

$$\text{Cost}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in \mathcal{X}_i} d_u \|F(u) - c_i\|^2.$$

Note that the norm $\|F(u) - c_i\|$ is weighted by d_u . Alternatively, we may ask to cluster a set containing d_u copies of $F(u)$. Let OPT be the minimal cost that can be obtained in this way. The

approximate k -partitioning algorithm returns a partition A_1, \dots, A_k of V and corresponding center vectors c_1, \dots, c_k such that

$$\text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i} d_u \|F_u - c_i\|^2 \leq \text{APR} \cdot \text{OPT}. \quad (9)$$

Throughout the paper, we use $\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ to denote the clustering returned by the approximation algorithm. The goal is to show that this clustering satisfies Theorem 1.2.

The Proof of the Main Theorem: Part ii) follows from Part i). Indeed,

$$\mu(A_i) \geq \mu(S_i \cap A_i) = \mu(S_i) - \mu(S_i \setminus A_i) \geq \mu(S_i) - \mu(A_i \Delta S_i) \geq (1 - \delta/5^4) \cdot \mu(S_i)$$

and $|E(A_i, \overline{A_i})| \leq |E(S_i, \overline{S_i})| + \mu(A_i \Delta S_i)$ since every edge that is counted in $|E(A_i, \overline{A_i})|$ but not in $|E(S_i, \overline{S_i})|$ must have an endpoint in $A_i \Delta S_i$. Thus

$$\Phi(A_i) = \frac{|E(A_i, \overline{A_i})|}{\mu(A_i)} \leq \frac{|E(S_i, \overline{S_i})| + \delta\mu(S_i)/5^4}{(1 - \delta/5^4)\mu(S_i)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{300}\right) \cdot \phi(S_i) + \frac{\delta}{300}.$$

The proof of Part I builds upon the following Lemmas that we will prove in Section 8 and Section 9 respectively.

Lemma 1.3. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2, the following holds. If for every permutation $\sigma : [1 : k] \rightarrow [1 : k]$ there exists an index $i \in [1 : k]$ such that $\mu(A_i \Delta S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq (\delta/5^4) \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$. Then it holds that*

$$\text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) > \frac{2k^2}{\Psi} \cdot \text{APR}.$$

Lemma 1.4. *If $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$ then there are points $\{p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k$ such that*

$$\text{OPT} \leq \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_i} d_u \|F(u) - p^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k^2}{\Psi}.$$

Substituting these bounds into Equation 9 yields a contradiction, since

$$\frac{2k^2}{\Psi} \text{APR} < \text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) \leq \text{APR} \cdot \text{OPT} \leq \text{APR} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k) \leq \text{APR} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k^2}{\Psi}.$$

Thus there must be a permutation π (the identity after suitable renumbering of one of the partitions) such that $\mu(A_i \Delta S_{\sigma(i)}) < (\delta/5^4) \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$ for all $i \in [1 : k]$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Remark 1.5. *Based on the counter example to [4, Lemma 4.2] and the weaker statement of Lemma 7.1, we can show that the analogue [4, Lemma 4.4] of Lemma 1.3 requires an extra $\Theta(k)$ -factor. More precisely, the gap assumption in [4, Lemma 4.4] has to be replaced with*

$$\text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) > \Omega\left(\frac{k^3}{\Upsilon} \cdot \text{APR}\right),$$

which leads to $\Theta(k^4)$ instead of the stated $\Theta(k^3)$ dependence in Theorem 1.1.

2 Some Notation

We use the notation adopted by Peng et al. [4] and restate it below for completeness. Let $\mathcal{L}_G = I - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$ be a normalized Laplacian matrix, where D is diagonal degree matrix and A is adjacency matrix. We refer to the k th eigenvalue of matrix \mathcal{L}_G by $\lambda_k \triangleq \lambda_k(\mathcal{L}_G)$. The (unit) eigenvector corresponding to λ_k is denoted by f_k .

Let $\bar{g}_i = \frac{D^{1/2}\chi_{S_i}}{\|D^{1/2}\chi_{S_i}\|}$, where χ_{S_i} is the characteristic vector of a subset $S_i \subseteq V$. Note \bar{g}_i is the normalized characteristic vector of S_i and that $\|D^{1/2}\chi_{S_i}\|^2 = \sum_{v \in S_i} \deg_v = \mu(S_i)$. We will write μ_i instead of $\mu(S_i)$. The Rayleigh quotient is defined by and satisfies that

$$\mathcal{R}(\bar{g}_i) \triangleq \frac{\bar{g}_i^T \mathcal{L}_G \bar{g}_i}{\bar{g}_i^T \bar{g}_i} = \frac{1}{\mu_{S_i}} \chi_{S_i}^T L \chi_{S_i} = \frac{|E(S, \bar{S})|}{\mu_{S_i}} = \phi_{S_i},$$

where $L = D - A$ is the graph Laplacian matrix.

The eigenvectors $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ form an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Thus each characteristic vector \bar{g}_i can be expressed as $\bar{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^{(i)} f_j$ for all $i \in [1 : k]$. We define its *projection* onto the first k eigenvectors by $\hat{f}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^{(i)} f_j$.

Peng et al. [4] showed that $\text{span}(\{\hat{f}_i\}_{i=1}^k) = \text{span}(\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ if Υ is sufficiently small. In Lemma 4.2 we will show that equality holds if Ψ sufficiently small. Hence, each of the first k eigenvectors can be expressed by $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \hat{f}_j$. Moreover, they demonstrated that each vector

$$\hat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \bar{g}_j$$

approximates the eigenvector f_i for all $i \in [1 : k]$, if Υ is sufficiently small. Theorem 4.1 states that Ψ being small suffices.

In the proof of Lemma 1.4, we will use the points

$$p^{(i)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu(S_i)}} \left(\beta_i^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_i^{(k)} \right)^T. \quad (10)$$

For any vertex $u \in S_i$, we have

$$p^{(i)} = \left(\left[D^{-1/2} \hat{g}_1 \right] (u), \dots, \left[D^{-1/2} \hat{g}_k \right] (u) \right). \quad (11)$$

Indeed, for any $h \in [1 : k]$,

$$D^{-1/2} \hat{g}_h(u) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \beta_j^{(h)} D^{-1/2} \frac{D^{1/2} \chi_{S_i}}{\sqrt{\mu(S_i)}}(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu(S_i)}} \beta_i^{(h)}.$$

Our analysis builds upon the following two matrices. Let $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ be square matrices such that for all indices $i, j \in [1 : k]$ we have

$$\mathbf{F}_{j,i} = \alpha_j^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{j,i} = \beta_j^{(i)}. \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\widehat{f}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^{(i)} f_j & \xrightarrow[\| \widehat{f}_i - \overline{g}_i \|^2 \leq \phi_{S_i} / \lambda_{k+1}]{\text{Lemma 4.3}} & \overline{g}_i = \frac{D^{1/2} \chi_{S_i}}{\sqrt{\mu(S_i)}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^{(i)} f_j \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \widehat{f}_j & \xrightarrow[\| f_i - \widehat{g}_i \|^2 \leq (1 + 3k/\Psi) \cdot k/\Psi]{\text{Theorem 4.1}} & \widehat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \overline{g}_j
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: The relation between the vectors f_i , \widehat{f}_i , \widehat{g}_i and \overline{g}_i . The vectors $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are eigenvectors of the normalized Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L}_G of a graph G satisfying $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$. The vectors $\{\overline{g}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are the normalized characteristic vectors of an optimal partition $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$. For each $i \in [1 : k]$ the vector \widehat{f}_i is the projection of vector \overline{g}_i onto $\text{span}(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. By Lemma 4.3 the vectors \widehat{f}_i and \overline{g}_i are close for $i \in [1 : k]$. By Lemma 4.2 it holds $\text{span}(f_1, \dots, f_k) = \text{span}(\widehat{f}_1, \dots, \widehat{f}_k)$ when $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$, and thus we can write $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \widehat{f}_j$. Moreover, by Theorem 4.1 the vectors f_i and $\widehat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \overline{g}_j$ are close for $i \in [1 : k]$.

3 Structure of the Paper

In Section 4, we will show that if $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$ then the vectors \widehat{g}_i and f_i are close for all $i \in [1 : k]$, i.e.,

$$\|f_i - \widehat{g}_i\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi}.$$

The proof follows [4] but our analysis depends on the less restrictive gap parameter Ψ .

In contrast to [4] we exhibit in Section 5 key spectral properties of the matrices $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^T$. More precisely, we show that they are close to the identity matrix in the following sense. If $\Psi \geq 10^4 \cdot k^3 / \varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle \leq 1 + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (13)$$

Peng et al. (c.f. [4, Lemma 4.2]) proved that the L_2 square norm between any distinct estimation center points satisfies

$$\|p^{(i)} - p^{(j)}\|^2 \geq [10^3 \cdot k \cdot \min\{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}.$$

In Section 6 we improve their result by $\Theta(k)$ -factor. Our analysis depends on a less restrictive gap assumption $\Psi \geq 20^4 \cdot k^3$ and builds upon Equation 13. We show in Lemma 6.2 that for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds

$$\|p^{(i)} - p^{(j)}\|^2 \geq [3 \cdot \min\{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}.$$

In Section 7, we formulate and prove a weaker version of [4, Lemma B.2] that is optimal up to a factor of 2. We demonstrate its tightness in the Appendix.

We prove Lemma 1.3 in Section 8 and Lemma 1.4 in Section 9. The analysis of these two Lemmas builds upon our improved results from Section 4 to Section 7, and in contrast depends on the gap parameter Ψ instead of Υ .

4 The Vectors \widehat{g}_i and f_i are Close

In this section we prove Theorem 4.1. We argue in a similar manner as in [4], however, in terms of Ψ instead of Υ . For completeness, we show in Subsection 4.1 that the span of the first k

eigenvectors is equal to the span of the projections of the characteristic vectors of the S_i onto the first k eigenvectors. Then in Subsection 4.2 by expressing the eigenvectors f_i in terms of the vectors \widehat{f}_i we conclude the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$ then the vectors $\widehat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \overline{g}_j$, $i \in [1 : k]$, satisfy*

$$\|f_i - \widehat{g}_i\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi}.$$

4.1 Analyzing the Columns of Matrix F

We prove in this subsection the following result that depends on gap parameter Ψ .

Lemma 4.2. *If $\Psi > k^{3/2}$ then the span($\{\widehat{f}_i\}_{i=1}^k$) = span($\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$) and thus each eigenvector can be expressed as $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \cdot \widehat{f}_j$ for every $i \in [1 : k]$.*

To prove Lemma 4.2 we build upon the following result shown by Peng et al. [4].

Lemma 4.3. [4, Theorem 3.1 Part 1] *For any $i \in [1 : k]$ it holds that*

$$\|\overline{g}_i - \widehat{f}_i\|^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^n (\alpha_j^{(i)})^2 \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}(\overline{g}_i)}{\lambda_{k+1}} = \frac{\phi_{S_i}}{\lambda_{k+1}}.$$

Based on the following two results we prove Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.4. *For every $i \in [1 : k]$ and $p \neq q \in [1 : k]$ it holds that*

$$1 - \phi_{S_i}/\lambda_{k+1} \leq \|\widehat{f}_i\|^2 = \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \langle \widehat{f}_p, \widehat{f}_q \rangle \right| = |\langle \alpha^p, \alpha^q \rangle| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\phi_{S_p} \cdot \phi_{S_q}}}{\lambda_{k+1}}.$$

Proof. The first part follows by Lemma 4.3 and the following chain of inequalities

$$1 - \frac{\phi_{S_i}}{\lambda_{k+1}} \leq 1 - \sum_{j=k+1}^n (\alpha_j^{(i)})^2 = \|\widehat{f}_i\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_j^{(i)})^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j^{(i)})^2 = 1.$$

We show now the second part. Since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are orthonormal eigenvectors we have for all $p \neq q$ that

$$\langle f_p, f_q \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^n \alpha_l^{(p)} \cdot \alpha_l^{(q)} = 0. \tag{14}$$

We combine Equation 14 and Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \widehat{f}_p, \widehat{f}_q \rangle \right| &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^k \alpha_l^{(p)} \cdot \alpha_l^{(q)} \right| = \left| \sum_{l=k+1}^n \alpha_l^{(p)} \cdot \alpha_l^{(q)} \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{l=k+1}^n (\alpha_l^{(p)})^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{l=k+1}^n (\alpha_l^{(q)})^2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\phi_{S_p} \cdot \phi_{S_q}}}{\lambda_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 4.5. *If $\Psi > k^{3/2}$ then the columns $\{\mathbf{F}_{:,i}\}_{i=1}^k$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. We show that the columns of matrix \mathbf{F} are almost orthonormal. Consider the symmetric matrix $\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}$. It is known that $\ker(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}) = \ker(\mathbf{F})$ and that all eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}$ are real numbers. We proceed by showing that the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}) > 0$. This would imply that $\ker(\mathbf{F}) = \emptyset$ and hence yields the statement.

By combining Gersgorin Circle Theorem, Lemma 4.4 and Cauchy-Schwarz it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}) &\geq \min_{i \in [k]} \left\{ (\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F})_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} |(\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F})_{ij}| \right\} = \min_{i \in [k]} \left\{ \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 - \sum_{j \neq i} |\langle \alpha^{(j)}, \alpha^{(i)} \rangle| \right\} \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{\frac{\phi_{S_j}}{\lambda_{k+1}}} \sqrt{\frac{\phi_{S_{i^*}}}{\lambda_{k+1}}} \geq 1 - \sqrt{k} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\phi_{S_j}}{\lambda_{k+1}}} \sqrt{\frac{\phi_{S_{i^*}}}{\lambda_{k+1}}} \geq 1 - \frac{k^{3/2}}{\Psi} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

We present now the proof of Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let λ be an arbitrary non-zero vector. Notice that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \cdot \widehat{f}_i = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^{(i)} f_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \alpha_j^{(i)} \right) f_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j f_j, \quad \text{where } \gamma_j = \langle \mathbf{F}_{j,:}, \lambda \rangle. \quad (15)$$

By Lemma 4.5 the columns $\{\mathbf{F}_{:,i}\}_{i=1}^k$ are linearly independent and since $\gamma = \mathbf{F}\lambda$, it follows at least one component $\gamma_j \neq 0$. Therefore the vectors $\{\widehat{f}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are linearly independent and span \mathbb{R}^k . ■

4.2 Analyzing Eigenvectors f in terms of \widehat{f}_j

To prove Theorem 4.1 we establish next the following result.

Lemma 4.6. *If $\Psi > k^{3/2}$ then for $i \in [k]$ it holds*

$$\left(1 + \frac{2k}{\Psi}\right)^{-1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\beta_j^{(i)}\right)^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{2k}{\Psi}\right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. We show now the upper bound. By Lemma 4.2 $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \widehat{f}_j$ for all $i \in [1 : k]$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|f_i\|^2 = \left\langle \sum_{a=1}^k \beta_a^{(i)} \widehat{f}_a, \sum_{b=1}^k \beta_b^{(i)} \widehat{f}_b \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\beta_j^{(i)}\right)^2 \|\widehat{f}_j\|^2 + \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b \neq a}^k \beta_a^{(i)} \beta_b^{(i)} \langle \widehat{f}_a, \widehat{f}_b \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\geq} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\beta_j^{(i)}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the inequality $(*)$ we consider the two terms separately.

By Lemma 4.4, $\|\widehat{f}_j\|^2 \geq 1 - \phi_{S_j}/\lambda_{k+1}$. We then apply $\sum_i a_i b_i \leq (\sum_i a_i)(\sum_i b_i)$ for all non-negative vectors a, b and obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2 \left(1 - \frac{\phi_{S_j}}{\lambda_{k+1}}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2 - \sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2 \frac{\phi_{S_j}}{\lambda_{k+1}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{k}{\Psi}\right) \sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2.$$

Again by Lemma 4.4, we have $|\langle \widehat{f}_a, \widehat{f}_b \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\phi_{S_a} \phi_{S_b}}/\lambda_{k+1}$, and by Cauchy-Schwarz it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b \neq a}^k \beta_a^{(i)} \beta_b^{(i)} \langle \widehat{f}_a, \widehat{f}_b \rangle &\geq - \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b \neq a}^k |\beta_a^{(i)}| \cdot |\beta_b^{(i)}| \cdot |\langle \widehat{f}_a, \widehat{f}_b \rangle| \\ &\geq - \frac{1}{\lambda_{k+1}} \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b \neq a}^k |\beta_a^{(i)}| \sqrt{\phi_{S_a}} \cdot |\beta_b^{(i)}| \sqrt{\phi_{S_b}} \\ &\geq - \frac{1}{\lambda_{k+1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k |\beta_j^{(i)}| \sqrt{\phi_{S_j}} \right)^2 \geq - \frac{k}{\Psi} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound follows by analogous arguments. ■

We are ready now to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. By Lemma 4.2, we have $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \widehat{f}_j$ and recall that $\widehat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \overline{g}_j$ for all $i \in [1 : k]$. We combine triangle inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_i - \widehat{g}_i\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} (\widehat{f}_j - \overline{g}_j) \right\|^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^k |\beta_j^{(i)}| \cdot \|\widehat{f}_j - \overline{g}_j\| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j^{(i)})^2 \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \|\widehat{f}_j - \overline{g}_j\|^2 \right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2k}{\Psi}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{k+1}} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{S_j} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{2k}{\Psi}\right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi} \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $\Psi > 4 \cdot k$. ■

5 Analyzing Matrix \mathbf{B}

In this section we bound the inner product of any two rows of matrix \mathbf{B} (c.f. Equation 12).

Theorem 5.1. *If $\Psi \geq 10^4 \cdot k^3/\varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle \leq 1 + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

The proof is divided into two parts. We show in Lemma 5.4 that $1 - \varepsilon \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle \leq 1 + \varepsilon$, and we establish the second statement $|\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ in Lemma 5.5.

5.1 Analyzing the Column Space of Matrix \mathbf{B}

We show below that the matrix $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}$ is close to the identity matrix.

Lemma 5.2. (Columns) *If $\Psi > 4 \cdot k^{3/2}$ then for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds*

$$1 - \frac{3k}{\Psi} \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{:,i}, \mathbf{B}_{:,i} \rangle \leq 1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi} \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle \mathbf{B}_{:,i}, \mathbf{B}_{:,j} \rangle| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.6 it holds that

$$1 - \frac{3k}{\Psi} \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{:,i}, \mathbf{B}_{:,i} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\beta_j^{(i)} \right)^2 \leq 1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}.$$

Recall that $\hat{g}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j^{(i)} \cdot \bar{g}_j$. Moreover, since the eigenvectors $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and the characteristic vectors $\{\bar{g}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are orthonormal by combing Cauchy-Schwarz and by Theorem 4.1 it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{B}_{:,i}, \mathbf{B}_{:,j} \rangle| &= \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l^{(i)} \beta_l^{(j)} = \left\langle \sum_{a=1}^k \beta_a^{(i)} \cdot \bar{g}_a, \sum_{b=1}^k \beta_b^{(j)} \cdot \bar{g}_b \right\rangle = \langle \hat{g}_i, \hat{g}_j \rangle \\ &= \langle (\hat{g}_i - f_i) + f_i, (\hat{g}_j - f_j) + f_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \hat{g}_i - f_i, \hat{g}_j - f_j \rangle + \langle \hat{g}_i - f_i, f_j \rangle + \langle f_i, \hat{g}_j - f_j \rangle \\ &\leq \|\hat{g}_i - f_i\| \cdot \|\hat{g}_j - f_j\| + \|\hat{g}_i - f_i\| + \|\hat{g}_j - f_j\| \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi} + 2\sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi}} \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Using a stronger gap assumption we show that the columns of matrix \mathbf{B} are linearly independent.

Lemma 5.3. *If $\Psi > 25 \cdot k^3$ then the columns $\{\mathbf{B}_{:,i}\}_{i=1}^k$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. Since $\ker(\mathbf{B}) = \ker(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B})$ and $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}$ is SPSD³ matrix, it suffices to show that the smallest eigenvalue

$$\lambda(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}) = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B} x}{x^T x} > 0.$$

By Lemma 5.2,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k |x_i| |x_j| \left| \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle \right| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |x_i| \right)^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \cdot 4k\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B} x &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \beta^{(i)}, \sum_{j=1}^k x_j \beta^{(j)} \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 \|\beta^{(i)}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k x_i x_j \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \|x\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k |x_i| |x_j| \left| \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle \right| \geq \left(1 - 5k\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}\right) \cdot \|x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lambda(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}) > 0$ and the statement follows. ■

³We denote by SPSD the class of symmetric positive semi-definite matrices.

5.2 Analyzing the Row Space of Matrix \mathbf{B}

In this subsection we show that the matrix $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T$ is close to the identity matrix. We bound now the squared L_2 norm of the rows in matrix \mathbf{B} , i.e. the diagonal entries in matrix $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T$.

Lemma 5.4. (Rows) *If $\Psi \geq 400 \cdot k^3/\varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We show that the eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T$ are concentrated around 1. This would imply that $\mathbf{1}_i^T \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{1}_i = \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle \approx 1$. By Lemma 5.2 we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right)^2 \leq \left(\beta^{(i)}\right)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \cdot \beta^{(i)} = \|\beta^{(i)}\|^4 + \sum_{j \neq i}^k \langle \beta^{(j)}, \beta^{(i)} \rangle^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right)^2 + \frac{16k^2}{\Psi} \leq 1 + \frac{23k^2}{\Psi}$$

and

$$\left| \left(\beta^{(i)}\right)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \cdot \beta^{(j)} \right| \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \left| \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(l)} \rangle \right| \left| \langle \beta^{(l)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle \right| \leq 8 \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}} + 16 \frac{k^2}{\Psi} \leq 11 \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}.$$

By Lemma 5.3 every vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ can be expressed as $x = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \beta^{(i)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} x^T \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T x &= \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \left(\beta^{(i)}\right)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j \beta^{(j)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^2 \left(\beta^{(i)}\right)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \cdot \beta^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k \gamma_i \gamma_j \left(\beta^{(i)}\right)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T \cdot \beta^{(j)} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{23k^2}{\Psi} - 11k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}\right) \|\gamma\|^2 \geq \left(1 - 14k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}\right) \|\gamma\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$x^T x = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_i \gamma_j \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^2 \|\beta^{(i)}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k \gamma_i \gamma_j \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle$$

By Lemma 5.2 we have $\left| \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \neq i}^k \gamma_i \gamma_j \langle \beta^{(i)}, \beta^{(j)} \rangle \right| \leq \|\gamma\|^2 \cdot 4k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}$ and $\|\beta^{(i)}\|^2 \leq 1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}$. Thus it holds

$$\left(1 - 5k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}\right) \|\gamma\|^2 \leq x^T x \leq \left(1 + 5k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}\right) \|\gamma\|^2.$$

Therefore

$$1 - 20k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}} \leq \lambda(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T) \leq 1 + 20k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}. \quad \blacksquare$$

We have now established the first part of Theorem 5.1. We turn to the second part and restate it in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.5. (Rows) *If $\Psi \geq 10^4 \cdot k^3/\varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then for all distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds*

$$|\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

To prove Lemma 5.5 we establish the following three Lemmas. Before stating them we need some notation that is inspired by Lemma 5.2.

Definition 5.6. Let $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{E}$, where $|\mathbf{E}_{ij}| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}$ and \mathbf{E} is symmetric matrix. Then we have

$$(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T)^2 = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{E})\mathbf{B}^T = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T.$$

Lemma 5.7. If $\Psi \geq 40^2 \cdot k^3 / \varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then all eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T$ satisfy

$$|\lambda(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)| \leq \varepsilon/5.$$

Proof. Let $z = \mathbf{B}^T x$. We upper bound the quadratic form

$$|x^T \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T x| = |z^T \mathbf{E} z| \leq \sum_{ij} |\mathbf{E}_{ij}| |z_i| |z_j| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |z_i| \right)^2 \leq \|z\|^2 \cdot 4k\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}}.$$

By Lemma 5.4 we have $1 - \varepsilon \leq \lambda(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T) \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ and since $\|z\|^2 = \frac{x^T \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T x}{x^T x} \cdot \|x\|^2$ it follows that

$$\frac{\|z\|^2}{1 + \varepsilon} \leq \|x\|^2 \leq \frac{\|z\|^2}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

and hence

$$|\lambda(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)| \leq \max_x \frac{|x^T \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T x|}{x^T x} \leq 4(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot k\sqrt{\frac{k}{\Psi}} \leq \varepsilon/5. \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 5.8. Suppose $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is orthonormal basis and the square matrix \mathbf{U} has u_i as its i th column. Then $\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T$.

Proof. Notice that by the definition of \mathbf{U} it holds $\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$. Moreover, the matrix \mathbf{U}^{-1} exists. Hence, we have $\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{U}^{-1}$, and thus $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{I}$ as claimed. \blacksquare

Lemma 5.9. If $\Psi \geq 40^2 \cdot k^3 / \varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ then it holds $|(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)_{ij}| \leq \varepsilon/5$ for every $i, j \in [1 : k]$.

Proof. Notice that $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T$ is symmetric matrix, since \mathbf{E} is symmetric. By SVD Theorem there is an orthonormal basis $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^k$ such that $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T) \cdot u_i u_i^T$. Thus, it suffices to bound the expression

$$|(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)_{ij}| \leq \sum_{l=1}^k |\lambda_l(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)| \cdot |(u_l u_l^T)_{ij}|.$$

By Lemma 5.8 we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^k |(u_l)_i| \cdot |(u_l)_j| \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{U}_{i,:}\|^2} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{U}_{j,:}\|^2} = 1.$$

We apply now Lemma 5.7 to obtain

$$\sum_{l=1}^k |\lambda_l(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T)| \cdot |(u_l u_l^T)_{ij}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \cdot \sum_{l=1}^k |(u_l)_i| \cdot |(u_l)_j| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{5}. \quad \blacksquare$$

We are ready now to prove Lemma 5.5, i.e. $|\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for all $i \neq j$.

Proof of Lemma 5.5. By Definition 5.6 we have $(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)^2 = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^\top$. Observe that the (i, j) th entry of matrix $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top$ is equal to the inner product between the i th and j th row of matrix \mathbf{B} , i.e. $(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)_{ij} = \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle$. Moreover, we have

$$\left[(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)^2 \right]_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^k (\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)_{i,l} (\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)_{l,j} = \sum_{l=1}^k \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{l,:} \rangle \langle \mathbf{B}_{l,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle.$$

For the entries on the main diagonal, it holds

$$\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle^2 + \sum_{l \neq i} \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{l,:} \rangle^2 = [(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)^2]_{ii} = [\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^\top]_{ii} = \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{i,:} \rangle + (\mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^\top)_{ii},$$

and hence by applying Lemma 5.4 with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/5$ and Lemma 5.9 with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon$ we obtain

$$\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle^2 \leq \sum_{l \neq i} \langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{l,:} \rangle^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{5} - \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{5}\right)^2 \leq \varepsilon.$$

■

6 The Points $p^{(i)}$ are Well-Spaced

Peng et al. (c.f. [4, Lemma 4.2]) showed that the L_2 square norm between any distinct estimation center points (defined in Equation (10)) is lower bounded by

$$\|p^{(i)} - p^{(j)}\|^2 \geq [10^3 \cdot k \cdot \min\{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}.$$

We now improve their result by $\Theta(k)$ -factor. We achieve this by building upon Theorem 5.1, rather than invoking [4, Lemma 4.2]. We use the following fact.

Lemma 6.1. [4, Lemma B.1] *We have $\|p^{(i)}\|^2 \in [(1 \pm \frac{1}{10}) \mu(S_i)]$ for every $i \in [1 : k]$.*

Lemma 6.2. *If $\Psi \geq 20^4 \cdot k^3$ then for distinct $i, j \in [1 : k]$ it holds that*

$$\|p^{(i)} - p^{(j)}\|^2 \geq [3 \cdot \min\{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}.$$

Suppose c_i is the center of a cluster A_i . If $\|c_i - p^{(i_1)}\| \geq \|c_i - p^{(i_2)}\|$ then it holds

$$\|c_i - p^{(i_1)}\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \|p^{(i_1)} - p^{(i_2)}\|^2 \geq [12 \cdot \min\{\mu(S_{i_1}), \mu(S_{i_2})\}]^{-1}.$$

Proof. We argue in a similar manner as in [4] but in contrast apply Theorem 5.1 with $\varepsilon = 1/4$ to obtain

$$\left\langle \frac{p^{(i)}}{\|p^{(i)}\|}, \frac{p^{(j)}}{\|p^{(j)}\|} \right\rangle = \frac{\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,:}, \mathbf{B}_{j,:} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{B}_{i,:}\| \|\mathbf{B}_{j,:}\|} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

W.l.o.g. assume that $\|p^{(i)}\|^2 \geq \|p^{(j)}\|^2$. Then by Lemma 6.1 we have

$$\|p^{(i)}\|^2 \geq \frac{9}{10} [\min\{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}.$$

Let $\|p^{(j)}\| = \alpha \cdot \|p^{(i)}\|$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|p^{(i)} - p^{(j)}\|^2 &= \|p^{(i)}\|^2 + \|p^{(j)}\|^2 - 2 \left\langle \frac{p^{(i)}}{\|p^{(i)}\|}, \frac{p^{(j)}}{\|p^{(j)}\|} \right\rangle \|p^{(i)}\| \|p^{(j)}\| \\ &\geq \left(\alpha^2 - \frac{4}{3} \cdot \alpha + 1 \right) \|p^{(i)}\|^2 \geq [3 \cdot \min \{\mu(S_i), \mu(S_j)\}]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

since for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds $\alpha^2 - 4\alpha/3 + 1 > 1/2$.

The second claim follows immediately from the first. ■

7 Amended Version of [4, Lemma B.2]

In Appendix 9 we give a counter example of [4, Lemma B.2]. Here, we formulate and prove a correction. The counter example in the appendix shows that the revised statement is tight up to a factor of 2.

Lemma 7.1. *Let S_1 to S_k and A_1 to A_k be partitions of the vertex set. Suppose for every permutation $\pi : [1 : k] \rightarrow [1 : k]$ there is an index $i \in [1 : k]$ such that*

$$\mu(A_i \triangle S_{\pi(i)}) \geq 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\pi(i)}), \quad (16)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - 1/k)$ is a parameter. Then there is an index $j \in [1 : k]$ and distinct indices $j_1, j_2 \in [1 : k]$ such that

$$\mu(A_j \cap S_{j_1}) \geq \mu(A_j \cap S_{j_2}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \min \{\mu(S_{j_1}), \mu(S_{j_2})\}.$$

Proof. We argue in a similar manner as in [4], but correct an oversight in Part 1, Case 2. We begin by defining a function

$$\sigma(l) = \arg \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{\mu(A_l \cap S_j)}{\mu(S_j)}.$$

Part 1. Suppose σ is a permutation. By Equation 16 there is an index i such that

$$\mu(A_i \triangle S_{\sigma(i)}) = \mu(S_{\sigma(i)} \setminus A_i) + \mu(A_i \setminus S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)}).$$

Case 1: Suppose $\mu(S_{\sigma(i)} \setminus A_i) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$. Since $S_{\sigma(i)} \setminus A_i = \dot{\cup}_{j \neq i} \mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(i)})$, there is an index $j \neq i$ such that

$$\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \mu(S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \min \{\mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})\}.$$

Moreover, by the definition of σ it holds that

$$\frac{\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(j)})}{\mu(S_{\sigma(j)})} \geq \frac{\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(i)})}{\mu(S_{\sigma(i)})} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1}.$$

Thus

$$\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(j)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \min \{\mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})\}$$

Case 2: Suppose $\mu(A_i \setminus S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$. Since $A_i \setminus S_{\sigma(i)} = \dot{\cup}_{\sigma(j) \neq \sigma(i)} A_i \cap S_{\sigma(j)}$, there is an index $\sigma(j) \neq \sigma(i)$ such that

$$\mu(A_i \cap S_{\sigma(j)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(j)}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \min \{ \mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_{\sigma(i)}) \}.$$

If $\mu(A_i \cap S_{\sigma(i)}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$, $\sum_{j \neq i} \mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)})$ and we are in the first case. Otherwise, for every $\sigma(j) \neq \sigma(i)$ it holds

$$\mu(A_i \cap S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \mu(S_{\sigma(i)}) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \min \{ \mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_{\sigma(i)}) \}.$$

Part 2. Suppose σ is NOT a permutation. There is an index $l \in [k]$ such that $l \notin \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\}$. Since $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are partitions, there is an index $j \in [k]$ such that

$$\mu(A_j \cap S_l) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot \min \{ \mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_l) \}.$$

Notice that $\sigma(j) \neq l$ and thus by the definition of σ it holds

$$\frac{\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(j)})}{\mu(S_{\sigma(j)})} \geq \frac{\mu(A_j \cap S_l)}{\mu(S_l)} \geq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Thus

$$\mu(A_j \cap S_{\sigma(j)}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot \min \{ \mu(S_{\sigma(j)}), \mu(S_l) \}.$$

■

8 The Proof of Lemma 1.3

We first establish

$$\text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \right] - \frac{7k^2}{\Psi} \cdot \text{APR}^{1/2}. \quad (17)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F(u) - c_i\|^2 \\ \geq & \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \\ & - 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\| \cdot \|p^{(j)} - c_i\| \\ \geq & \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \right] - 2\sqrt{2(\text{APR} + 1)} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\|F(u) - c_i\|^2 &= \left\| (F_u - p^{(j)}) + (p^{(j)} - c_i) \right\|^2 \geq \left(\|F_u - p^{(j)}\| - \|p^{(j)} - c_i\| \right)^2 \\ &= \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 + \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 - 2\|F_u - p^{(j)}\| \cdot \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|.\end{aligned}$$

We prove now that

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\| \cdot \|p^{(j)} - c_i\| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2(\text{APR} + 1)} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k)\end{aligned}$$

To upper bound the first summation we use the fact that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 = \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k).$$

For the second summation we introduce a vector F_u for every $u \in A_i \cap S_j$. Then it follows that

$$\|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \leq \left(\|F_u - p^{(j)}\| + \|F_u - c_i\| \right)^2 \leq 2 \left[\|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 + \|F_u - c_i\|^2 \right]$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|F_u - c_i\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_j} d_u \|F_u - p^{(j)}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i} d_u \|F_u - c_i\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2(\text{APR} + 1) \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k),\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i} d_u \|F_u - c_i\|^2 &= \text{Cost}(\{A_i, c_i\}_{i=1}^k) \leq \text{APR} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, c_i^*\}_{i=1}^k) \\ &\leq \text{APR} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 1.4 we have

$$2\sqrt{2(\text{APR} + 1)} \cdot \text{Cost}(\{S_i, p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k) \leq \frac{7k^2}{\Psi} \cdot \sqrt{\text{APR}}.$$

Having established Equation 17, it is now easy to complete the proof of Lemma 1.3. By Lemma 7.1 there is an index i and distinct indices $i_1 \neq i_2$ such that

$$\{\mu(A_i \cap S_{i_1}), \mu(A_i \cap S_{i_2})\} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \cdot \min\{\mu(S_{i_1}), \mu(S_{i_2})\}.$$

Let c_i be the center of the cluster A_i . Assume w.l.o.g. that $\|c_i - p^{(i_1)}\| \geq \|c_i - p^{(i_2)}\|$. We lower bound C_A by the loss accumulated from points only in the subset $A_i \cap S_{i_1}$. By Equation 17, the choice of $A_i \cap S_{i_1}$ and Lemma 6.2 it holds that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_j} d_u \|p^{(j)} - c_i\|^2 \geq \sum_{u \in A_i \cap S_{i_1}} d_u \|p^{(i_1)} - c_i\|^2 \geq \mu(A_i \cap S_{i_1}) \cdot \|p^{(i_1)} - c_i\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{12} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 1.3.

9 The Proof of Lemma 1.4

By Theorem 4.1 we have $\|f_i - \hat{g}_i\|^2 \leq (1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}) \cdot \frac{k}{\Psi}$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_i} d_u \|F(u) - c_i^*\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_i} d_u \|F(u) - p^{(i)}\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_i} d_u (F(u)_j - p_j^{(i)})^2 \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in S_i} (f_j(u) - \hat{g}_j(u))^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \|f_j - \hat{g}_j\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{3k}{\Psi}\right) \cdot \frac{k^2}{\Psi}. \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] J. R. Lee, S. Oveis Gharan, and L. Trevisan. Multi-way spectral partitioning and higher-order cheeger inequalities. In *Proceedings of the Forty-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '12*, pages 1117–1130, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-1245-5. doi: 10.1145/2213977.2214078. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2213977.2214078>.
- [2] S. Oveis Gharan and L. Trevisan. Partitioning into expanders. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1256–1266, 2014. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611973402.93. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973402.93>.
- [3] R. Peng, H. Sun, and L. Zanetti. Partitioning well-clustered graphs with k-means and heat kernel. *CoRR*, abs/1411.2021, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.2021>.
- [4] R. Peng, H. Sun, and L. Zanetti. Partitioning well-clustered graphs: Spectral clustering works! In *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2015, Paris, France, July 3-6, 2015*, pages 1423–1455, 2015. URL <http://jmlr.org/proceedings/papers/v40/Peng15.html>.

Appendix

We give a counterexample to the following Lemma in [4].

Lemma 9.1. [4, Lemma B.2] Let (A_1, \dots, A_k) and (S_1, \dots, S_k) be partitions of the vertex set of a graph G . Suppose for every permutation $\pi : \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exists index i such that $\mu(A_i \Delta S_{\pi(i)}) \geq 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\pi(i)})$. Then, for any index i , there are ε_i and distinct indices i_1 and i_2 such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i \geq \varepsilon$ and

$$\mu(A_i \cap S_{i_1}) \geq \mu(A_i \cap S_{i_2}) \geq \varepsilon_i \cdot \min(\mu(S_{i_1}), \mu(S_{i_2})).$$

In the arXiv-version of the paper [3], the Lemma is formulated weaker.

Lemma 9.2. [4, Lemma 4.8] Let (A_1, \dots, A_k) and (S_1, \dots, S_k) be partitions of the vertex set of a graph G . Suppose for every permutation $\pi : \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exists index i such that $\mu(A_i \Delta S_{\pi(i)}) \geq 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\pi(i)})$. Then one of the following statements holds:

- For any index i , there are ε_i and distinct indices i_1 and i_2 such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i \geq \varepsilon$ and

$$\mu(A_i \cap S_{i_1}) \geq \mu(A_i \cap S_{i_2}) \geq \varepsilon_i \cdot \min\{\mu(S_{i_1}), \mu(S_{i_2})\}.$$

- There are indices i', j, ℓ (they mean $j \neq \ell$) such that

$$\mu(A_{i'} \cap S_j) \geq \mu(A_{i'} \cap S_\ell) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot \mu(S_\ell).$$

The Counter Example: Let G be any regular graph. Then the volume of a set of vertices is proportional to the cardinality of the set. The partition S_1 to S_k is into equal sized sets, and the number of disjoint sets satisfies $k \geq 4$. The partition A_1 to A_k is such that for a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ it holds

$$1) S_1 \subseteq A_1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2) A_i \subseteq S_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(A_1 \cap S_i) = \frac{2\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \mu(S_i), \quad \text{for } i \geq 2.$$

Notice that $\mu(A_1) = (1 + 2\varepsilon) \cdot \mu(S_1)$.

We verify next that the above instance satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 9.2. Observe that

$$\mu(A_1 \Delta S_j) = \begin{cases} \mu(A_1 \setminus S_1) = 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_1) & \text{if } j = 1, \\ \mu(S_1) + \mu(A_i) \geq \mu(S_1) & \text{if } j > 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus for every permutation π of the integers 1 to k , there is an i , namely $i = 1$, such that

$$\mu(A_i \Delta S_{\pi(i)}) \geq 2\varepsilon \cdot \mu(S_{\pi(i)}).$$

How about the conclusion of Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 9.2? Since $A_j \subset S_j$ for $j \geq 2$, for any two distinct indices j_1 and j_2 , we have

$$\min\{\mu(A_j \cap S_{j_1}), \mu(A_j \cap S_{j_2})\} = 0.$$

Thus the conclusion of Lemma 9.1 and the first alternative of Lemma 9.2 do not hold, due to

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_1 = \frac{2\varepsilon}{k-1} < \varepsilon.$$

The second alternative of Lemma 9.2 certainly does not hold for $i' \geq 2$. On the other hand, for $i' = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ we have

$$\mu(A_1 \cap S_\ell) = \frac{2\varepsilon}{k-1} \cdot \mu(S_\ell) < \frac{1}{k} \cdot \mu(S_\ell),$$

and hence the second alternative of Lemma 9.2 does not hold.