

#### CS 540 Introduction to Artificial Intelligence Unsupervised Learning I

Yudong Chen University of Wisconsin-Madison

Oct 5, 2021

#### Announcements

#### • Homeworks:

HW4 due next Tuesday

• Class roadmap:

Thursday, Sep 30	ML Intro	S
Tuesday, Oct 5	ML Unsupervised I	hi
Thursday, Oct 7	ML Unsupervised II	ne L
Tuesday, Oct 12	ML Linear Regression	earr
Thursday, Oct 14	ML: KNN, Naïve Bayes	ning

# Recap of Supervised/Unsupervised

#### Supervised learning:

- Make predictions, classify data, perform regression
- Dataset:  $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_2), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)$

Features / Covariates / Input

Labels / Outputs

• Goal: find function  $f: X \to Y$  to predict label on **new** data







indoor

outdoor

# Recap of Supervised/Unsupervised

#### **Unsupervised** learning:

- No labels; generally won't be making predictions
- Dataset:  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$
- Goal: find patterns & structures that help better understand data.



Mulvey and Gingold

# **Recap of Reinforcement Learning**

• Learn how to act in order to maximize rewards



DeepMind

- There are **other kinds** of ML:
  - Mixtures: semi-supervised learning, self-supervised

# Outline

- Intro to Clustering
  - Clustering Types, Centroid-based, k-means review
- Hierarchical Clustering
  - Divisive, agglomerative, linkage strategies
- Other Clustering Types
  - Graph-based, cuts, spectral clustering

# **Unsupervised Learning & Clustering**

- Note that clustering is just one type of unsupervised learning (UL)
- PCA is another unsupervised algorithm
- Estimating probability distributions also UL (GANs)



StyleGAN2 (Kerras et al '20)

• Several types of clustering

#### **Partitional**

- Centroid
- Graph-theoretic
- Spectral

#### **Hierarchical**

- Agglomerative
- Divisive

#### **Bayesian**

- Decision-based
- Nonparametric





- k-means is an example of partitional **centroid-based**
- Recall steps: **1.** Randomly pick k cluster centers



• 2. Find closest center for each point



• 3. Update cluster centers by computing centroids



• Repeat Steps 2 & 3 until convergence



**Q 1.1**: You have seven 2-dimensional points. You run 3-means on it, with initial clusters

 $C_1 = \{(2,2), (4,4), (6,6)\}, C_2 = \{(0,4), (4,0)\}, C_3 = \{(5,5), (9,9)\}$ 

Cluster centroids at the next iteration are?

- A. C<sub>1</sub>: (4,4), C<sub>2</sub>: (2,2), C<sub>3</sub>: (7,7)
- B. C<sub>1</sub>: (6,6), C<sub>2</sub>: (4,4), C<sub>3</sub>: (9,9)
- C. C<sub>1</sub>: (2,2), C<sub>2</sub>: (0,0), C<sub>3</sub>: (5,5)
- D. C<sub>1</sub>: (2,6), C<sub>2</sub>: (0,4), C<sub>3</sub>: (5,9)

**Q 1.2**: We are running 3-means again. We have 3 centers,  $c_1=(0,1)$ ,  $c_2=(2,1)$ ,  $c_3=(-1,2)$ . Which cluster assignment is possible for the points (1,1) and (-1,1), respectively? Ties are broken arbitrarily:

(i)  $c_1$ ,  $c_1$  (ii)  $c_2$ ,  $c_3$  (iii)  $c_1$ ,  $c_3$ 

- A. Only (i)
- B. Only (ii) and (iii)
- C. Only (i) and (iii)
- D. All of them

**Q 1.3:** If we run K-means clustering twice with random initial cluster centers, are we guaranteed to get same clustering results? Does K-means always converge?

- A. Yes, Yes
- B. No, Yes
- C. Yes, No
- D. No, No

# **Hierarchical Clustering**

Basic idea: build a "hierarchy"

- One advantage: no need for k, number of clusters.
- Input: points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$
- **Output**: a hierarchy
  - A binary tree



Credit: Wikipedia

### Agglomerative vs Divisive

Two ways to go:

- Agglomerative: bottom up.
  - Start: each point a cluster. Progressively merge clusters
- **Divisive**: top down
  - Start: all points in one cluster. Progressively split clusters



Credit: r2d3.us

Agglomerative. Start: every point is its own cluster



Get pair of clusters that are closest and merge



**Repeat:** Get pair of clusters that are closest and merge



**Repeat:** Get pair of clusters that are closest and merge



# Merging Criteria

Merge: use closest clusters. Define closest?

• Single-linkage

$$d(A,B) = \min_{x_1 \in A, x_2 \in B} d(x_1, x_2)$$

• Complete-linkage

$$d(A, B) = \max_{x_1 \in A, x_2 \in B} d(x_1, x_2)$$

• Average-linkage

$$d(A,B) = \frac{1}{|A||B|} \sum_{x_1 \in A, x_2 \in B} d(x_1, x_2)$$

We'll merge using single-linkage

- 1-dimensional vectors.
- Initial: all points are clusters



We'll merge using single-linkage





Continue...

$$d(C_1, C_2) = d(2, 4) = 2$$
  
 $d(C_2, \{7.25\}) = d(5, 7.25) = 2.25$ 



#### Continue...





We'll merge using complete-linkage

- 1-dimensional vectors.
- Initial: all points are clusters



Beginning is the same...



Now we diverge:





### When to Stop?

#### No simple answer:

Use the binary tree (a dendogram)

Cut at different levels (get different heights/depths)



**Q 2.1**: Let's do hierarchical clustering for **two** clusters with average linkage on the dataset below. What are the clusters?

- A. {1}, {2,4,5,7.25}
- B. {1,2}, {4, 5, 7.25}
- C. {1,2,4}, {5, 7.25}
- D. {1,2,4,5}, {7.25}



**Q 2.2**: If we do hierarchical clustering on *n* points, the maximum depth of the resulting tree is

- A. 2
- B. log *n*
- C. n/2
- D. *n*-1

# Other Types of Clustering

Graph-based/proximity-based

- Recall: Graph G = (V,E) has vertex set V, edge set E.
  - Edges can be weighted or unweighted
  - Encode similarity

Don't need vectors here
Just edges (and maybe weights)



## **Graph-Based Clustering**

Want: partition V into V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub>

- Implies a graph "cut"
- One idea: minimize the weight of the cut
  - Downside: might just cut of one node
  - Need: "balanced" cut





### **Partition-Based Clustering**

**Want:** partition V into  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ 

- Just minimizing weight isn't good... want **balance!**
- Approaches:

$$CCut(V_1, V_2) = \frac{Cut(V_1, V_2)}{|V_1|} + \frac{Cut(V_1, V_2)}{|V_2|}$$

$$\operatorname{NCut}(V_1, V_2) = \frac{\operatorname{Cut}(V_1, V_2)}{\sum_{i \in V_1} d_i} + \frac{\operatorname{Cut}(V_1, V_2)}{\sum_{i \in V_2} d_i}$$

# **Partition-Based Clustering**

#### How do we compute these?

- Hard problem  $\rightarrow$  heuristics
  - Greedy algorithm
  - "Spectral" approaches
- Spectral clustering approach:
   Adjacency matrix



 $= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ 

### **Partition-Based Clustering**

- Spectral clustering approach:
   Adjacency matrix
  - **Degree** matrix



$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Spectral clustering approach:

 1. Compute Laplacian L = D – A
 (Important tool in graph theory)



$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 3 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$
Degree Matrix
Adjacency Matrix
Laplacian

3

- Spectral clustering approach:
  - 1. Compute Laplacian L = D A
  - 2. Compute *k* smallest eigenvectors
  - 3. Set *U* to be the *n* x *k* matrix with  $u_1, ..., u_k$  as columns. Treat *n* rows as *n* points in  $\mathbb{R}^k$
  - 4. Run k-means on the representations

• Compare/contrast to **PCA**:

Use an eigendecomposition / dimensionality reduction

- But, run on Laplacian (not covariance); use smallest eigenvectors, not largest
- Intuition: Laplacian encodes structure information
  - "Lower" eigenvectors give partitioning information

- **Q**: Why do this?
  - 1. No need for points or distances as input
  - 2. Can handle intuitive separation (k-means can't!)





Credit: William Fleshman