

Response to the Reviewer Comments on Manuscript “Local Graph Clustering with Network Lasso”

corresponding author: Alexander Jung (first.last (at) aalto.fi)

January 13, 2024

We express our sincere gratitude for the insightful and constructive comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have tried to address all these comments to the extent possible. In the revised manuscript, modifications and amendments are highlighted in red (the parts that have been removed are not visible in the revised manuscript, though).

Major modifications we implemented in the revised manuscript include the following:

- We have significantly revised the introduction in Section ?? to more transparently position our work relative to existing local graph clustering methods.
- We now dedicate ...
- We now define ...
- We have added a numerical experiment ...

In the following, we respond to the reviewer comments in a point-by-point manner. Section, page, equation, and reference numbers in the copied action editor and reviewer comments (typeset in italic print) refer to the original manuscript whereas those in our response (typeset in upright print) refer to the revised manuscript unless indicated otherwise.

Comments of Reviewer #1

- 1.1 *The author should emphasize the contributions of this work in the end of the section 1, more clearly. What the advantages and differences between this method and the existed ones? More fast or more efficient using the proposed methods? It is still unclear for readers.*

We have revised the introduction in Section I to better clarify the contributions made relative to prior work (including our own work).

- 1.2 *Authors should provide more clear and detailed explanations of Fig.1 i.e., such as the meaning of the rain drop, and the color of nodes, on the caption of this figure.*

We have expanded the caption of Figure 1 to clarify the meaning of the water drops and the node shading.

- 1.3 *Please improve language presentation carefully.*

We have carefully revised the manuscript and tried to improve the use of language and clarity of

presentation.

Comments of Reviewer #2

- 2.1 *The paper does well to contrast with spectral methods. Please elaborate on the drawbacks of the Laplacian quadratic minimization and elaborate on why total variation is a better conceptualization for local clusters.*

We now compare spectral methods with our flow-based approach in Section ?? to demonstrate how our method is able to recover the ground-truth cluster while spectral methods fail.

- 2.2 *Fig 1 is highly informative, yet its caption does little to help understand what's happening. Expand caption to highlight the meaning convey by the figure.*

We have expanded the caption of Figure 1 to improve its clarity.

Comments of Reviewer #3

- 3.1 *Why give Eq. (3) suddenly? Where is it original from? who did define it? It needs a reference?*

We have reformulated the end of Section ?? and the beginning of Section ?? to better motivate using nLasso (??) as a model for local graph clustering. In particular, we point out the relation to our recent paper at p. ??:

- 3.2 *Eq. (4) is somehow similar to the objective of spectral clustering, only the metric is changed to street distance. So your means the seeds are designed for semi-supervised learning?*

We try to make the relation between our approach and spectral method more explicit in the introduction Section ?? of the revised manuscript. Moreover, we have added the following after we define the nLasso problem on page ??,

- 3.3 *Since Eq. (5,6, and 7) are the dual problem of Eq. (3)., you give a solution. Then, what is different the paper from your [7] and [8]?*

We now point out the difference between this approach and our previous work more explicitly in the revised manuscript after Eq (??).