Balasubramaniam Jayaram

Department of Mathematics

Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad

FSTA 2014 - 30, January



भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान हैदराबाद

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis:

Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Dimension,

Dimension, Distance and

Dimension, Distance and Distribution.

Dimension, Distance and Distribution.

Who is your nearest neighbour?

Who is your closest friend?

Who is your closest friend?

Does it even make sense?

Who is your closest friend?

Does it even make sense?

3-D's in Data Analysis

3-D's in Data Analysis

1. Dimensions

Occurence

Occurence

Images -

Occurence

• Images - 256×256 resolution -

Occurence

• Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

No. of dimensions m = 65536

Occurence

• Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

No. of dimensions m = 65536

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Occurence

• Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

No. of dimensions m = 65536

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

No. of dimensions m = 65536

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

More dimensions

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

No. of dimensions m = 65536

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

More dimensions —> More information

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

```
No. of dimensions m = 65536
```

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

More dimensions ⇒ More information
 ⇒ Better Inference

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

```
No. of dimensions m = 65536
```

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

- More dimensions → More information
 ⇒ Better Inference
- Ex: Diagnosis of a disease.

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

```
No. of dimensions m = 65536
```

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

- More dimensions → More information
 ⇒ Better Inference
- Ex: Diagnosis of a disease.

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

```
No. of dimensions m = 65536
```

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

- More dimensions → More information
 ⇒ Better Inference
- Ex: Diagnosis of a disease.

Why is large m a problem?

Occurence

Images - 256 × 256 resolution -

```
No. of dimensions m = 65536
```

• Gene Expression data - m = 10's of thousands

Need

- More dimensions → More information
 ⇒ Better Inference
- Ex: Diagnosis of a disease.

Why is large m a problem?




























Algorithms in Data Analysis

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Algorithms in Data Analysis

Query Searching & Clustering

Consider the data points in the figure.



Consider a query point in red.



Its nearest neighbour is the point in green



$$NN_1(\bar{x}) = \arg\min_{\bar{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}} \{ \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}_i\| \}.$$



Consider another query point in red.



Who is his nearest neighbour?



Who is his nearest neighbour?



Who is his nearest neighbour?



k-NN Search - A Pictorial Example

Find *k*-nearest neighbours of the query point in **red**.



k-NN Search - A Pictorial Example

$NN_k(\bar{x})$ - k-nearest neighbours of \bar{x} .



k-NN Search - A Pictorial Example

Find 5-nearest neighbours of the query point in red.



$$NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x}) = \{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| < \varepsilon \}.$$



$$NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x}) = \{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| < \varepsilon \}.$$



$$NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x}) = \{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| < \varepsilon \}.$$



$$NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\| < \varepsilon \}.$$



Clustering - General Idea

Clustering - General Idea

• Minimise intra-cluster distances.

Clustering - General Idea

- Minimise intra-cluster distances.
- Maximise inter-cluster distances.

Clustering - General Idea

- Minimise intra-cluster distances.
- Maximise inter-cluster distances.



Data to be clustered



Fuzzy C-Means



Fuzzy C-Means



Fuzzy C-Means - In Low Dimensions



Issues with Fuzzy C-Means

FCM Collapses in High Dimensions

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

FCM Collapses in High Dimensions

• Winkler et al. (2010) investigated FCM in High-Dimension
- Winkler et al. (2010) investigated FCM in High-Dimension
- It collapses !!!

- Winkler et al. (2010) investigated FCM in High-Dimension
- It collapses !!!
- All the prototypes move towards the center of the data

- Winkler et al. (2010) investigated FCM in High-Dimension
- It collapses !!!
- All the prototypes move towards the center of the data
- Converges only if properly initialised !!

- Winkler et al. (2010) investigated FCM in High-Dimension
- It collapses !!!
- All the prototypes move towards the center of the data
- Converges only if properly initialised !!

Fuzzy C-Means - In High Dimensions



Fuzzy C-Means - In High Dimensions



Fuzzy C-Means - In High Dimensions



Issues in High Dimensional Data

Issues in High Dimensional Data

Data Analysis - A Math Challenge!!

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Issues in High Dimensional Data

Data Analysis - A Math Challenge!!

• Hilbert's Lecture at ICM 1900.

- Hilbert's Lecture at ICM 1900.
- Prof. David Donoho August 8, 2000 by AMS.

- Hilbert's Lecture at ICM 1900.
- Prof. David Donoho August 8, 2000 by AMS.
- Math Challenges of the 21st Century.

- Hilbert's Lecture at ICM 1900.
- Prof. David Donoho August 8, 2000 by AMS.
- Math Challenges of the 21st Century.
- Curse of Dimensionality.

- Hilbert's Lecture at ICM 1900.
- Prof. David Donoho August 8, 2000 by AMS.
- Math Challenges of the 21st Century.
- Curse of Dimensionality.

Curse of Dimensionality

1.

Curse of Dimensionality

1. Combinatorial Explosion in Search Space

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Combinatorial Explosion in Search Space

• Richard Bellman (1961).

- Richard Bellman (1961).
- If we have *m* variables each of which can take *n_i* values ...

- Richard Bellman (1961).
- If we have *m* variables each of which can take *n_i* values ...
- ... then there is a total of $n_1 \times \ldots \times n_m$ possibilities.

- Richard Bellman (1961).
- If we have m variables each of which can take n_i values ...
- ... then there is a total of $n_1 \times \ldots \times n_m$ possibilities.
- Think of finding the joint probabilities $P(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m) \parallel$

- Richard Bellman (1961).
- If we have *m* variables each of which can take *n_i* values ...
- ... then there is a total of $n_1 \times \ldots \times n_m$ possibilities.
- Think of finding the joint probabilities $P(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m) \parallel$
- Think of a complete fuzzy If-Then rule base !!

Combinatorial Explosion in Search Space

- Richard Bellman (1961).
- If we have *m* variables each of which can take *n_i* values ...
- ... then there is a total of $n_1 \times \ldots \times n_m$ possibilities.
- Think of finding the joint probabilities $P(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m) \parallel$
- Think of a complete fuzzy If-Then rule base !!

What does it affect?

Increases Computational Complexity.

Curse of Dimensionality

2.

Curse of Dimensionality

2. Need for Greed

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Classify the point marked x.



Classify the point marked x.



Partition the space into grids.



Partition the space into grids.



Partition the space into grids.



Count the no. of points in each class in the grid containing x.



Assign x to the class having most points in the same grid.



2. Need for Greed - $(N \gg m)$

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

2. Need for Greed - $(N \gg m)$


D = 1







As m increases, the no. of points N also should increase!

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective



Increases Storage Complexity.

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Curse of Dimensionality

3.

Curse of Dimensionality

3. The Empty Space Phenomenon

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

• Consider uniformly distributed data on [0, 1].

- Consider uniformly distributed data on [0, 1].
- Consider data at the edges,

- Consider uniformly distributed data on [0, 1].
- Consider data at the edges, (distance < 0.05 from the edges).

- Consider uniformly distributed data on [0, 1].
- Consider data at the edges, (distance < 0.05 from the edges).



- Consider uniformly distributed data on [0, 1].
- Consider data at the edges, (distance < 0.05 from the edges).



Roughly 10% of the data are in the edges.

• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^2$.

• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^2$.



• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^2$.



Roughly 19% of the data are in the edges.

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^3$.

• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^3$.



• Consider uniformly distributed data on $[0,1]^3$.



Roughly 27% of the data are in the edges.

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

• How many data points are close to the edges?

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D:

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D:

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%

• In 2-D:
$$1 - (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%

• In 2-D:
$$1 - (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$$



- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D:

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D:

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} =$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 =$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

 B_{ϵ}^{m} be the volume of the *edge set* in $[0, 1]^{m}$ for a fixed ϵ .

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

 B_{ϵ}^{m} be the volume of the *edge set* in $[0,1]^{m}$ for a fixed ϵ .

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} B_{\epsilon}^m =$$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

 B_{ϵ}^{m} be the volume of the *edge set* in $[0,1]^{m}$ for a fixed ϵ .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} B_{\epsilon}^m = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left[1 - (1 - 2\epsilon)^m \right] =$$

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

 B_{ϵ}^{m} be the volume of the *edge set* in $[0, 1]^{m}$ for a fixed ϵ .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} B_{\epsilon}^m = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left[1 - (1 - 2\epsilon)^m \right] = 1.$$
3. The Empty Space Phenomenon

- How many data points are close to the edges?
- In 1-D: 1 0.9 = 0.1 = 10%
- In 2-D: $1 (0.9)^2 = 0.19 = 19\%$
- In 3-D: $1 (0.9)^3 = 0.271 = 27.1\%$
- In 50-D: $1 (0.9)^{50} = 0.995 = 99.5\%$

 B_{ϵ}^{m} be the volume of the *edge set* in $[0, 1]^{m}$ for a fixed ϵ .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} B_{\epsilon}^m = \lim_{m \to \infty} \left[1 - (1 - 2\epsilon)^m \right] = 1.$$

The Empty Space Phenomenon !!

Curse of Dimensionality



Curse of Dimensionality

4. Relations among the Dimensions

Correlation among the Dimensions

• Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.

- Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.
- Dimensionality of \mathcal{X} , m = 6.

- Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.
- Dimensionality of \mathcal{X} , m = 6.
- However, if $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, 3x_1, x_1 + x_2, 2x_2, x_1^2) \in \mathcal{X}$, then ...

- Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.
- Dimensionality of \mathcal{X} , m = 6.
- However, if $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, 3x_1, x_1 + x_2, 2x_2, x_1^2) \in \mathcal{X}$, then ...
- ... \bar{x} essentially depends only on x_1, x_2 .

- Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.
- Dimensionality of \mathcal{X} , m = 6.
- However, if $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, 3x_1, x_1 + x_2, 2x_2, x_1^2) \in \mathcal{X}$, then ...
- ... \bar{x} essentially depends only on x_1, x_2 .
- **Embedding** Dimn m vs. **Intrinsic** Dimn ℓ .

Correlation among the Dimensions

- Let the data set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$.
- Dimensionality of \mathcal{X} , m = 6.
- However, if $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, 3x_1, x_1 + x_2, 2x_2, x_1^2) \in \mathcal{X}$, then ...
- ... \bar{x} essentially depends only on x_1, x_2 .
- **Embedding** Dimn m vs. **Intrinsic** Dimn ℓ .

Data may lie in a low-dimensional manifold, i.e., $\ell \ll m$.































The story ahead ...













The story ahead ...


The story ahead ...



• How **D** & **D** are affected by the above issues.

The story ahead ...



• How **D** & **D** are affected by the above issues.

• In turn, can **D** & **D** mitigate the above effects?

The story ahead ...



• How **D** & **D** are affected by the above issues.

• In turn, can **D** & **D** mitigate the above effects?

3-D's in Data Analysis

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

3-D's in Data Analysis

2. Distance

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

In Similarity Searches

In Similarity Searches

• Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.

In Similarity Searches

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.
- ε -neighbourhood of a point, $NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x})$.

In Similarity Searches

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.
- ε -neighbourhood of a point, $NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x})$.

In Clustering

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.
- ε -neighbourhood of a point, $NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x})$.

In Clustering

Most of the clustering algorithms are distance based.

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.
- ε -neighbourhood of a point, $NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x})$.

In Clustering

- Most of the clustering algorithms are distance based.
- If not directly, *indirectly* !!

- Similarity and Distance are in some sense dual concepts.
- *k*-nearest neighbours of a point, $NN_k(\bar{x})$.
- ε -neighbourhood of a point, $NN^{\varepsilon}(\bar{x})$.

In Clustering

- Most of the clustering algorithms are distance based.
- If not directly, *indirectly* !!





Consider the Swiss Roll data set.



Are these two points close or far?



Are these two points close or far?



Intrinsic dimension $\ell = 2$, while Embedding dimension m = 3.



Distance in which dimension - Intrinsic or Embedding ?



Relation between Dimensions - Revisited

Distance in which dimension - Intrinsic or Embedding ?



Relation between Dimensions - Revisited

Distance along which manifold ?





Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Euclidean distance in pixel intensity space



retrieved using Euclidean distance in pixel intensity space



retrieved using Euclidean distance in pixel intensity space

dist: 0.0



dist: 3161.9





dist: 3064.2

dist: 3094.1

dist: 3184.1



dist: 3132.4

dist: 3187.5





dist: 3188.1





dist: 3194.5

dist: 3150.9





dist: 3197.4





dist: 3154.8

retrieved using 256 bit codes





retrieved using Euclidean distance in pixel intensity space





dist: 3161.9





dist: 3167.8



dist: 3094.1

dist: 3187.5



dist: 3132.4



dist: 3139.2

dist: 3188.1



dist: 3147.0

dist: 3194.5



dist: 3150.9

dist: 3154.8



dist: 3197.4











Meaningfulness of Distances

Distribution of Euclidean Distances

Distribution of Euclidean Distances

•
$$\mathcal{X} = \{ \bar{x}_i \in U ([0,1]^m) \}$$

Distribution of Euclidean Distances

•
$$\mathcal{X} = \{ \bar{x}_i \in U([0,1]^m) \mid 1 \le i \le 20,000 \}.$$
- $\mathcal{X} = \{ \bar{x}_i \in U ([0,1]^m) \mid 1 \le i \le 20,000 \}.$
- Distribution of $\|\bar{x}_i\|$

- $\mathcal{X} = \{ \bar{x}_i \in U([0,1]^m) \mid 1 \le i \le 20,000 \}.$
- Distribution of $\|\bar{x}_i\|$ for m = 1, 2, 5, 10, 20.

- $\mathcal{X} = \{ \bar{x}_i \in U ([0,1]^m) \mid 1 \le i \le 20,000 \}.$
- Distribution of $\|\bar{x}_i\|$ for m = 1, 2, 5, 10, 20.



- $\|\bar{x}_i\|$ is small iff all *m*-components are small.
- When m = 10, $P\{\bar{x} \mid \|\bar{x}\| \le 1\}$ is extremely small.



• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$,

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, $0 \le \|\bar{x}\|_2^2 \le m$.

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, $0 \le \|\bar{x}\|_2^2 \le m$.

• Let us consider the normalised lengths, i.e., $\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_2^2$.

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, $0 \le \|\bar{x}\|_2^2 \le m$.

• Let us consider the normalised lengths, i.e., $\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_2^2$.

• Let us consider a general *L_p* norm, i.e.,

$$\|\bar{x}\|_p = (|x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \ldots + |x_m|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, $0 \le \|\bar{x}\|_2^2 \le m$.

• Let us consider the normalised lengths, i.e.,
$$\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_2^2$$
.

• Let us consider a general L_p norm, i.e., $\|\bar{x}\|_p = (|x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \ldots + |x_m|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

• Let us consider a modified general
$$L_p$$
 norm, i.e.,
 $\|\bar{x}\|_p^p = |x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \ldots + |x_m|^p$.

• Let
$$\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
.
 $\|\bar{x}\|_2 = (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
• If $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, $0 \le \|\bar{x}\|_2^2 \le m$.

• Let us consider the normalised lengths, i.e.,
$$\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_2^2$$
.

• Let us consider a general L_p norm, i.e., $\|\bar{x}\|_p = (|x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \ldots + |x_m|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

• Let us consider a modified general
$$L_p$$
 norm, i.e.,
 $\|\bar{x}\|_p^p = |x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \ldots + |x_m|^p$.

• The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \overline{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) =$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \ .$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \ .$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \ .$$

$$Var\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) =$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \,.$$

$$Var\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_{p}^{p}\right) = \frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{p^{2}}{\left(2p+1\right)\left(p+1\right)^{2}}$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \,.$$

$$Var\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_{p}^{p}\right) = \frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{p^{2}}{\left(2p+1\right)\left(p+1\right)^{2}}$$

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) =$$

- The expected value of the modified *p*-norm of a ...
- ... random vector \bar{x} ...
- ... from the *m*-dimensional unit hypercube is

$$E\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \frac{1}{p+1} \,.$$

$$Var\left(\frac{1}{m}\|\bar{x}\|_{p}^{p}\right) = \frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{p^{2}}{\left(2p+1\right)\left(p+1\right)^{2}}$$

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{1}{m} \|\bar{x}\|_p^p\right) = \mathbf{0} \; .$$



















Distribution of lengths w.r.to any $\|\cdot\|$

Distribution of lengths w.r.to any $\|\cdot\|$

• X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.

Distribution of lengths w.r.to any || · ||

- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- \bar{q}_m be the query point.

- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.

- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.

- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

- X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.
- $\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.
- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

• X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.

•
$$\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
 be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.

- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right)$$

• X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.

•
$$\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
 be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.

- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0$$

• X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.

•
$$\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
 be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.

- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies$$

• X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_m be i.i.d. random variables.

•
$$\bar{x}_m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$$
 be a r. \bar{v} , where $x_i \sim X_i$.

- \bar{q}_m be the query point. W.I.o.g. $\bar{q}_m = \bar{0}_m$.
- $D_m^{(\max)}$ largest distance between any $ar{x}_m$ to $ar{q}_m$ w.r.to $\|\cdot\|$.
- $D_m^{(\min)}$ smallest distance between any \bar{x}_m to \bar{q}_m .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$



Theorem [Beyer et al, 1999]

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_{\mathbf{p}} 0.$$

• When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

- When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...
- ... of the distances to the origin converges to 0, then ...

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

- When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...
- ... of the distances to the origin converges to 0, then ...
- ... the relative difference between the ...

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

- When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...
- ... of the distances to the origin converges to 0, then ...
- ... the relative difference between the ...
- ... closest and the farthest points to the origin ...

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

- When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...
- ... of the distances to the origin converges to 0, then ...
- ... the relative difference between the ...
- ... closest and the farthest points to the origin ...
- ... goes to 0 with increasing dimensions.

Theorem [Beyer et al, 1999]

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

- When the relative variance (w.r.to the mean distance) ...
- ... of the distances to the origin converges to 0, then ...
- ... the relative difference between the ...
- ... closest and the farthest points to the origin ...
- ... goes to 0 with increasing dimensions.

Concentration of Norms phenomenon!!

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

Result is valid ...

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

Result is valid ...

• ... for any \bar{q}_m

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

• ... for any
$$\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$$
.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.
- ... for most distance functions.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.
- ... for most distance functions.
 - L_p norms, $p \in [1, \infty)$ Beyer *et al.*, ICDT 1999 .

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.
- ... for most distance functions.
 - L_p norms, $p \in [1, \infty)$ Beyer *et al.*, ICDT 1999 .
 - L_p norms, $p \in (0, 1)$ Francois *et al.* 2007, IEEE TKDE.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.
- ... for most distance functions.
 - L_p norms, $p \in [1, \infty)$ Beyer *et al.*, ICDT 1999 .
 - L_p norms, $p \in (0, 1)$ Francois *et al.* 2007, IEEE TKDE.
 - Aggarwal 2001, Hsu & Chen 2009, Jayaram & Klawonn 2012.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

- ... for any $\bar{q}_m \neq \bar{0}_m$.
- ... under some mild assumptions on X_i , e.g., $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 < \infty$.
- ... for most distance functions.
 - L_p norms, $p \in [1, \infty)$ Beyer *et al.*, ICDT 1999 .
 - L_p norms, $p \in (0, 1)$ Francois *et al.* 2007, IEEE TKDE.
 - Aggarwal 2001, Hsu & Chen 2009, Jayaram & Klawonn 2012.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

Distance between any two points in HD seems the same!!

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

- Distance between any two points in HD seems the same!!
- Affects Query searches !

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

- Distance between any two points in HD seems the same!!
- Affects Query searches !
- Who is your nearest neighbour?

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

- Distance between any two points in HD seems the same!!
- Affects Query searches !
- Who is your nearest neighbour?

Cause?

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} Var\left(\frac{\|\bar{x}_m\|}{E\left(\|\bar{x}_m\|\right)}\right) = 0 \implies \frac{D_m^{(\max)} - D_m^{(\min)}}{D_m^{(\min)}} \to_p 0.$$

Inability of a distance function to separate points well in HD.

What is its effect?

- Distance between any two points in HD seems the same!!
- Affects Query searches !
- Who is your nearest neighbour?

Cause?

The Empty Space phenomenon?

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

Interplay between the 3D's - 1
























3-D's in Data Analysis

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

3-D's in Data Analysis

3. Distribution

Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective





Meaningfulness of Results ?

• So far, \mathcal{X} contained r. \bar{v} from a single distribution.

- So far, \mathcal{X} contained r. \bar{v} from a single distribution.
- Now, let, \mathcal{X} contain r. \bar{v} from a mixture of distributions.

- So far, \mathcal{X} contained r. \bar{v} from a single distribution.
- Now, let, \mathcal{X} contain r. \bar{v} from a mixture of distributions.



- Let there be *c* Gaussian clusters in *m*-dimensions.
- ۲



- Let there be *c* Gaussian clusters in *m*-dimensions.
- Is not nearest neighbour query meaningful now?



• When data come from mixture of distributions ...

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...
- ... nearest neighbour searches can be meaningful !

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...
- ... nearest neighbour searches can be meaningful !
- Theoretical results do exist Bennett et al. (2001).

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...
- ... nearest neighbour searches can be meaningful !
- Theoretical results do exist Bennett et al. (2001).
- The Empty Space or CoN phenomena do not mean much for NN now!!.

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...
- ... nearest neighbour searches can be meaningful !
- Theoretical results do exist Bennett et al. (2001).
- The Empty Space or CoN phenomena do not mean much for NN now!!.

Really?!

- When data come from mixture of distributions ...
- ... (as is usually the case with real data sets) ...
- ... nearest neighbour searches can be meaningful !
- Theoretical results do exist Bennett et al. (2001).
- The Empty Space or CoN phenomena do not mean much for NN now!!.

Really?!




























Intrinsic dimn vs. Embedding dimn

Do we see clusters here ?

Do we see clusters here ?



Balasubramaniam Jayaram

Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

• Do we see clusters here ?



• Clusterable data \sim Data from a mixture of distributions.



Balasubramaniam Jayaram Data Analysis: A 3-D Perspective

What is its effect on algorithms, say clustering?

What is its effect on algorithms, say clustering?



Data are distributed as two well-separated clusters.



Data are distributed on a 3D-sphere $\implies \ell = 2 < 3 = m$



FCM proceeds by finding the centroid of the clusters.



FCM proceeds by finding the centroid of the clusters.



FCM proceeds by finding the centroid of the clusters.



The centroids of both the clusters converge!!!



























M.E. Houle et al.(**2010**)

 "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...
- ... induced by a distance measure

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...
- ... induced by a distance measure

Their recommendation
Clustering on the basis of correlation

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...
- ... induced by a distance measure

Their recommendation

Rank-based similarity measures.

Clustering on the basis of correlation

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...
- ... induced by a distance measure

Their recommendation

- Rank-based similarity measures.
- Can result in *better* performance.

Clustering on the basis of correlation

M.E. Houle et al.(2010)

- "Can Shared-Neighbor Distances Defeat the Curse of Dimensionality?"
- Used secondary similarity measures on the basis of the rankings ...
- ... induced by a distance measure

Their recommendation

- Rank-based similarity measures.
- Can result in *better* performance.

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

 Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's ρ and Kendall's τ .

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's ρ and Kendall's τ .

Known to be not ideally suited in the presence of noise.

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's ρ and Kendall's τ.
 Known to be not ideally suited in the presence of noise.
- Fuzzy/robust γ (Bodenhofer & Klawonn, 2008).

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's *ρ* and Kendall's *τ*.
 Known to be not ideally suited in the presence of noise.
- Fuzzy/robust γ (Bodenhofer & Klawonn, **2008**).

Generalization of Goodman and Kruskal's γ .

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's *ρ* and Kendall's *τ*.
 Known to be not ideally suited in the presence of noise.
- Fuzzy/robust γ (Bodenhofer & Klawonn, **2008**).

Generalization of Goodman and Kruskal's γ .

Shown to be more robust to noise in the data.

Brief overview [Krone et al, 2013]

- Based on the rank correlation of every pair of points w.r.t. all other points in the dataset.
- Any rank correlation measure can be used.
- Classical measures: Spearman's *ρ* and Kendall's *τ*.
 Known to be not ideally suited in the presence of noise.
- Fuzzy/robust γ (Bodenhofer & Klawonn, **2008**).

Generalization of Goodman and Kruskal's γ .

Shown to be more robust to noise in the data.

Our Findings

• Appears to work well, *especially* with HD data.

Our Findings

• Appears to work well, *especially* with HD data.

FCM was shown to break down in those cases.

Our Findings

• Appears to work well, *especially* with HD data.

FCM was shown to break down in those cases.

• Seems well suited for sparsely populated data.

Our Findings

• Appears to work well, *especially* with HD data.

FCM was shown to break down in those cases.

Seems well suited for sparsely populated data.

Take Home Message!!

Our Findings

• Appears to work well, *especially* with HD data.

FCM was shown to break down in those cases.

• Seems well suited for sparsely populated data.

Take Home Message!!

Fuzzy Set Theory (still) has its role to play!!

























Dimension






















C. C. Aggarwal, A. Hinneburg, D. A. Keim (2001) On the Surprising Behavior of Distance Metrics in High Dimensional Space. Database Theory ICDT 2001.

Nellmann, R. (1961)

Adaptive Control Processes: A Guided Tour, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.

K. Bennett, U. Fayyad, and D. Geiger (1999) Density-Based Indexing for Approximate Nearest Neighbor Queries KDD-99.

Bishop, C.M. (2006)

Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning, Springer.

Beyer, K.S., Goldstein, J., Ramakrishnan, R. and Shaft, U. (1999)

When is nearest neighbor meaningful?, ICDT 1999.

- B. Jayaram and F. Klawonn (2012)
 Can unbounded distance metrics mitigate the curse of dimensionality?
 Int. Jl. of Data Mining, Modelling and Mgmt., 4-361 383.
- Radovanovic, M., Nanopoulos, A., Ivanovic, M. (2010) Hubs in space: Popular nearest neighbors in high-dimensional data.

Journal of Machine Learning Research 11, 2487–2531

R. Winkler, F. Klawonn and R. Kruse. (2011) Fuzzy C-Means in high dimensional spaces Fuzzy System Applications, 1:1-17.

Prof. Frank Klawonn

Prof. Frank Klawonn

Ing. Roland Winkler

Ing. Martin Krone











Thanks for your patient listening !!!

Thanks for your patient listening !!!

Any Questions ???