

# Diffusion Maps and Coarse-Graining: A Unified Framework for Dimensionality Reduction, Graph Partitioning, and Data Set Parameterization

Stéphane Lafon and Ann B. Lee

**Abstract**—We provide evidence that nonlinear dimensionality reduction, clustering, and data set parameterization can be solved within one and the same framework. The main idea is to define a system of coordinates with an explicit metric that reflects the connectivity of a given data set and that is robust to noise. Our construction, which is based on a Markov random walk on the data, offers a general scheme of simultaneously reorganizing and subsampling graphs and arbitrarily shaped data sets in high dimensions using intrinsic geometry. We show that clustering in embedding spaces is equivalent to compressing operators. The objective of data partitioning and clustering is to coarse-grain the random walk on the data while at the same time preserving a diffusion operator for the intrinsic geometry or connectivity of the data set up to some accuracy. We show that the quantization distortion in diffusion space bounds the error of compression of the operator, thus giving a rigorous justification for  $k$ -means clustering in diffusion space and a precise measure of the performance of general clustering algorithms.

**Index Terms**—Machine learning, text analysis, knowledge retrieval, quantization, graph-theoretic methods, compression (coding), clustering, clustering similarity measures, information visualization, Markov processes, graph algorithms.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

WHEN dealing with data in high dimensions, one is often faced with the problem of how to reduce the complexity of a data set while preserving information that is important for, for example, understanding the data structure itself or for performing later tasks such as clustering, classification, and regression. Dimensionality or complexity reduction is an ill-posed problem until one clearly defines what one is ready to lose. In this work, we attempt to find both a parameterization and an explicit metric that reflects the *intrinsic* geometry of a given data set. With intrinsic geometry, we here mean a set of rules that describe the relationship between the objects in the data set without reference to structures outside of it; in our case, we define intrinsic geometry by the connectivity of the data points in a diffusion process. One application of this work is manifold learning where we have a manifold, say a 2D “Swiss roll,” embedded in a higher-dimensional space—but, more generally, the problems of data parameterization, dimensionality reduction, and clustering extend beyond manifold learning to general graphs of objects that are linked by edges with weights.

There is a large body of literature regarding the use of the spectral properties (eigenvectors and eigenvalues) of a pairwise similarity matrix for geometric data analysis. These methods can roughly be divided into two main categories: spectral graph cuts [1], [2], [3] and eigenmaps [4], [5], [6], [7]. The two methodologies were originally developed for different types of applications: segmentation and partitioning of graphs versus locality-preserving embeddings of data sets, respectively. Below, we briefly review previous work and how it relates to the diffusion framework.

Suppose that  $\Omega = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  is a data set of points, and assume that these points form the nodes of a weighted graph with weight function  $w(x, y)$ . In the graph-theoretic approach [8] to data partitioning, one seeks to divide the set of vertices into disjoint sets, where by some measure, the similarity among the vertices in a set is high and the similarity across different sets is low. Different algorithms use different matrices but, in general, these spectral grouping methods are based on an analysis of the dominant eigenvectors of a suitably normalized weight matrix (see, e.g., [1] for a review). If the weight function  $w(x, y)$  satisfies certain conditions (symmetry and pointwise positivity), then one can interpret the pairwise similarities as edge flows in a Markov random walk on the graph. In this probabilistic formulation, the transition probability of going from point  $x$  to  $y$  in one step is

$$p(x, y) = \frac{w(x, y)}{\sum_{z \in \Omega} w(x, z)}.$$

The Normalized Cut problem provides a justification and some intuition for the use of the first nontrivial eigenfunction of the random walk’s transition matrix [2]; the authors

• S. Lafon is with Google Inc., 1600 Amphitheater Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043. E-mail: stephane.lafon@gmail.com.

• A.B. Lee is with the Department of Statistics, Baker Hall 229J, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA 15213-3890. E-mail: annlee@stat.cmu.edu.

Manuscript received 10 May 2005; revised 14 Nov. 2005; accepted 25 Jan. 2006; published online 13 July 2006.

Recommended for acceptance by A. Srivastava.

For information on obtaining reprints of this article, please send e-mail to: tpami@computer.org, and reference IEEECS Log Number TPAMI-0241-0505.

TABLE 1  
A Simplified Table of Different Methods for Clustering and Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction

Methods for clustering and non-linear dim. reduction	data set parameterization?	explicit metric in embedding space?
Spectral graph methods [1], [2], [3]	not directly addressed	no
Eigenmaps [4], [5], [6], [7]	yes	no
Isomap [13]	yes	yes
Markov random walk learning [11]	no	yes
Diffusion maps	yes	yes

Shi and Malik also mention using higher-order eigenfunctions but do not provide a theoretical justification for such an analysis. More recently, Meila and Shi [3] have shown that the transition matrix  $P$  has piecewise constant eigenvectors relative to a partition  $S = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k)$  when the underlying Markov chain is lumpable with respect to  $S$ , i.e., when one is able to group vertices together due to similarities of their transition probabilities to the subsets  $S_j$ . The authors also define a “Modified Ncut” algorithm which, for the special case of lumpable Markov chains, finds all  $k$  segments by  $k$ -means of the eigenvectors of  $P$ .

Despite recent progress in the field of spectral graph theory, there are still many open questions. In particular: What is the intuition behind spectral clustering when eigenvectors are not piece-wise constant (and Markov chains are not lumpable)? Naturally occurring data sets only display, at best, approximate lumpability; the issue then is whether we can say something more precise about the performance of various clustering algorithms. Furthermore, for general data sets, which eigenvectors of the Markov matrix should be considered and what is the relative importance of these? Below, we answer these questions by unifying ideas in spectral clustering, operator compression, and data set parameterization.

The problem of spectral clustering is very closely related to the problem of finding low-dimensional locality-preserving embeddings of data sets. For example, suppose that we wish to find an embedding of  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  according to

$$x \mapsto f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_p(x))$$

that preserves the local neighborhood information. Several algorithms, such as LLE [4], Laplacian eigenmaps [6], Hessian eigenmaps [7], LTSA [5], and diffusion maps [9], [10], all aim at minimizing distortions of the form  $Q(f) = \sum_i Q_i(f)$ , where  $Q_i(f)$  is a symmetric, positive semidefinite quadratic form that measures local variations of  $f$  around  $x_i$ . The  $p$ -dimensional embedding problem can, in these cases, be rewritten as an eigenvalue problem where the first  $p$  eigenvectors  $(f_1, \dots, f_p)$  provide the optimal embedding coordinates. The close relationship between spectral clustering and locality-preserving dimension reduction has, in particular, been pointed out by Belkin and Niyogi. In [6], the authors show that the Laplacian of a graph (whose eigenvectors are used in spectral cuts) is the discrete analogue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on manifolds, and the eigenfunctions of the latter operator have properties desired

for embeddings. However, as in the case of spectral clustering, the question of the number of eigenvectors in existing eigenmap methods is still open. Furthermore, as the distance metric in the embedding spaces is not explicitly defined, it is not clear *how* one should cluster and partition data. The usual approach is: First, pick a dimension  $k$ , then calculate the first  $k$  nontrivial eigenvectors and weight these equally in clustering and other subsequent data analysis.

The contribution of this paper is two-fold: First, we provide a unified framework for spectral data analysis based on the idea of diffusion and put previous work in a new perspective. Our starting point is an *explicit* metric that reflects the connectivity of the data set. This so-called “diffusion metric” can be explained in terms of transition probabilities of a Markov chain that evolves forward in time and is, unlike the geodesic distance, or the shortest path of a graph, very robust to noise. Similar distance measures have previously been suggested in clustering and data classification, see, for example, [11]. However, the use of such probabilistic distance measures in data parameterization is completely new. This paper unifies various ideas in eigenmaps, spectral cuts, and Markov random walk learning (see Table 1 for a list of different methods). We show that, in the diffusion framework, the defined distance measure is induced by a nonlinear embedding in Euclidean space where the embedding coordinates are weighted eigenvectors of the graph Laplacian. Furthermore, the time parameter in the Markov chain defines the scale of the analysis, which, in turn, determines the dimensionality reduction or the number of eigenvectors in the embedding.

The other contribution of this work is a novel approach to data partitioning and graph subsampling based on coarse-graining the dynamics of the Markov random walk on the data set. The goal is to subsample and reorganize the data set while retaining the spectral properties of the graph, and thus also the intrinsic geometry of the data set. We show that in order to maximize the quality of the eigenvector approximation, we need to minimize a distortion in the embedding space. Consequently, we are relating clustering in embedding spaces to lossy compression of operators—which is a key idea in this work. As a by-product, we are also obtaining a rigorous justification for  $k$ -means clustering in diffusion space. The latter method is, by construction, useful when dealing with data in high dimensions, and can (as in any kernel  $k$ -means algorithm [12]) be applied to arbitrarily shaped clusters and abstract graphs.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we define diffusion distances and discuss their connection to the spectral properties and time evolution of a Markov chain random walk. In Section 3, we construct a coarse-grained random walk for graph partitioning and subsampling. We relate the compression error to the distortion in the diffusion space. Moreover, we introduce diffusion  $k$ -means as a technique for distortion minimization. Finally, in Section 4, we give numerical examples that illustrate the ideas of a framework for simultaneous nonlinear dimensionality reduction, clustering, and subsampling of data using intrinsic geometry and propagation of local information through diffusion.

## 2 GEOMETRIC DIFFUSION AS A TOOL FOR HIGH-DIMENSIONAL DATA ANALYSIS

### 2.1 Diffusion Distances

Our goal is to define a distance metric on an arbitrary set that reflects the connectivity of the points within the set. Suppose that one is dealing with a data set in the form of a graph. When identifying clusters or groups of points in this graph, one needs to measure the amount of interaction, as described by the graph structure, between pairs of points. Following this idea, two points should be considered to be close if they are connected by many short paths in the graph. As a consequence, points within regions of high density (defined as groups of nodes with a high degree in the graph), will have a high connectivity. The connectivity is furthermore decided by the strengths of the weights in the graph. Below, we review the diffusion framework that first appeared in [10] and put it into the context of eigenmaps, dimensionality reduction, and Markov random walk learning on graphs.

Let  $G = (\Omega, W)$  be a finite graph with  $n$  nodes, where the weight matrix  $W = \{w(x, y)\}_{x, y \in \Omega}$  satisfies the following conditions:

- symmetry:  $W = W^T$  and
- pointwise positivity:  $w(x, y) \geq 0$  for all  $x, y \in \Omega$ .

The way we define the weights should be completely application-driven, the only requirement being that  $w(x, y)$  should represent the degree of similarity or affinity (as defined by the application) of  $x$  and  $y$ . In particular, we expect  $w(x, x)$  to be a positive number. For instance, if we are dealing with data points on a manifold, we can start with a Gaussian kernel  $w_\varepsilon = \exp(-\|x - y\|^2/\varepsilon)$  and then normalize it in order to adjust the influence of geometry versus the distribution of points on the manifold. Different normalization schemes and their connection to the Laplace-Beltrami operator on manifolds in the large sample limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  are discussed in [9].

The graph  $G$  with weights  $W$  represents our knowledge of the local geometry of the set. Next, we define a Markov random walk on this graph. To this end, we introduce the degree  $d(x)$  of node  $x$  as

$$d(x) = \sum_{z \in \Omega} w(x, z).$$

If one defines  $P$  to be the  $n \times n$  matrix whose entries are given by

$$p_1(x, y) = \frac{w(x, y)}{d(x)},$$

then  $p_1(x, y)$  can be interpreted as the probability of transition from  $x$  to  $y$  in one time step. By construction, this quantity reflects the first-order neighborhood structure of the graph. A new idea introduced in the diffusion maps framework is to capture information on larger neighborhoods by taking powers of the matrix  $P$  or, equivalently, to run the random walk forward in time. If  $P^t$  is the  $t$ th iterate of  $P$ , then the entry  $p_t(x, y)$  represents the probability of going from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $t$  time steps. Increasing  $t$ , corresponds to propagating the local influence of each node with its neighbors. In other words, the quantity  $P^t$  reflects the intrinsic geometry of the data set defined via the connectivity of the graph in a diffusion process and the time  $t$  of the diffusion plays the role of a scale parameter in the analysis.

If the graph is connected, we have that [8]:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} p_t(x, y) = \phi_0(y), \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi_0$  is the unique stationary distribution

$$\phi_0(x) = \frac{d(x)}{\sum_{z \in \Omega} d(z)}.$$

This quantity is proportional to the degree of  $x$  in the graph, which is one measure of the density of points. The Markov chain is furthermore reversible, i.e., it verifies the following detailed balance condition

$$\phi_0(x)p_1(x, y) = \phi_0(y)p_1(y, x). \quad (2)$$

We are mainly concerned with the following idea: For a fixed but finite value  $t > 0$ , we want to define a metric between points of  $\Omega$  which is such that two points  $x$  and  $z$  will be close if the corresponding conditional distributions  $p_t(x, \cdot)$  and  $p_t(z, \cdot)$  are close. A similar idea appears in [11], where the authors consider the  $L^1$  norm  $\|p_t(x, \cdot) - p_t(z, \cdot)\|$ . Alternatively, one can use the Kullback-Leibler divergence or any other distance between  $p_t(x, \cdot)$  and  $p_t(z, \cdot)$ . However, as shown below, the  $L^2$  metric between the conditional distributions has the advantage that it allows one to relate distances to the spectral properties of the random walk—and thereby, as we will see in the next section, *connect Markov random walk learning on graphs with data parameterization via eigenmaps*. As in [14], we will define the “diffusion distance”  $D_t$  between  $x$  and  $y$  as the weighted  $L^2$  distance

$$D_t^2(x, z) = \|p_t(x, \cdot) - p_t(z, \cdot)\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 = \sum_{y \in \Omega} \frac{(p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y))^2}{\phi_0(y)}, \quad (3)$$

where the “weights”  $\frac{1}{\phi_0(x)}$  penalize discrepancies on domains of low density more than those of high density.

This notion of proximity of points in the graph reflects the intrinsic geometry of the set in terms of connectivity of the data points in a diffusion process. The diffusion distance between two points will be small if they are connected by many paths in the graph. This metric is thus a key quantity in the design of inference algorithms that are based on the preponderance of evidences for a given hypothesis. For example, suppose one wants to infer class labels for data points based on a small number of labeled examples. Then, one can easily propagate the label information from a labeled

example  $x$  to the new point  $y$  following 1) the shortest path or 2) all paths connecting  $x$  to  $y$ . The second solution (which is employed in the diffusion framework and in [11]) is usually more appropriate, as it takes into account all “evidences” relating  $x$  to  $y$ . Furthermore, since diffusion-based distances add up the contribution from several paths, they are also (unlike the shortest path) robust to noise; the latter point is illustrated via an example in Section 4.2.

## 2.2 Dimensionality Reduction and Parameterization of Data by Diffusion Maps

As mentioned, an advantage of the above definition of the diffusion distance is the connection to the spectral theory of the random walk. As is well-known, the transition matrix  $P$  that we have constructed has a set of left and right eigenvectors and a set of eigenvalues  $|\lambda_0| \geq |\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_{n-1}|$ :

$$\phi_j^T P = \lambda_j \phi_j^T \text{ and } P \psi_j = \lambda_j \psi_j,$$

where it can be verified that  $\lambda_0 = 1$ ,  $\psi_0 \equiv 1$ , and that  $\phi_k^T \psi_l = \delta_{kl}$ . In fact, left and right eigenvectors are dual and can be regarded as signed measures and test functions, respectively. These two sets of vectors are related according to

$$\psi_l(x) = \frac{\phi_l(x)}{\phi_0(x)} \text{ for all } x \in \Omega. \quad (4)$$

For ease of notation, we normalize the left eigenvectors of  $P$  with respect to  $1/\phi_0$ :

$$\|\phi_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 = \sum_x \frac{\phi_l^2(x)}{\phi_0(x)} = 1, \quad (5)$$

and the right eigenvectors with respect to the weight  $\phi_0$ :

$$\|\psi_l\|_{\phi_0}^2 = \sum_x \psi_l^2(x) \phi_0(x) = 1. \quad (6)$$

If  $p_t(x, y)$  is the kernel of the  $t$ th iterate  $P^t$ , we will then have the following biorthogonal spectral decomposition:

$$p_t(x, y) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda_j^t \psi_j(x) \phi_j(y). \quad (7)$$

The above identity corresponds to a weighted principal component analysis of  $P^t$ . The first  $k$  terms provide the best rank- $k$  approximation of  $P^t$ , where “best” is defined according to the following weighted metric for matrices:

$$\|A\|^2 = \sum_x \sum_y \phi_0(x) a(x, y)^2 \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)}.$$

Here is our main point: If we insert (7) into (3), we will have that

$$D_t^2(x, z) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j^{2t} (\psi_j(x) - \psi_j(z))^2.$$

Since  $\psi_0 \equiv 1$  is a constant vector, it does not enter in the sum above. Furthermore, because of the decay of the eigenvalues,<sup>1</sup> we only need a few terms in the sum for a certain

accuracy. To be precise, let  $q(t)$  be the largest index  $j$  such that  $|\lambda_j|^t > \delta |\lambda_1|^t$ . The diffusion distance can then be approximated to relative precision  $\delta$  using the first  $q(t)$  nontrivial eigenvectors and eigenvalues according to

$$D_t^2(x, z) \simeq \sum_{j=1}^{q(t)} \lambda_j^{2t} (\psi_j(x) - \psi_j(z))^2.$$

Now, observe that the identity above can be interpreted as the Euclidean distance in  $\mathbb{R}^{q(t)}$  if we use the right eigenvectors weighted with  $\lambda_j^t$  as coordinates on the data. In other words, this means that, if we introduce the diffusion map

$$\Psi_t : x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^t \psi_1(x) \\ \lambda_2^t \psi_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_{q(t)}^t \psi_{q(t)}(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

then clearly,

$$D_t^2(x, z) \simeq \sum_{j=1}^{q(t)} \lambda_j^{2t} (\psi_j(x) - \psi_j(z))^2 = \|\Psi_t(x) - \Psi_t(z)\|^2. \quad (9)$$

Note that the factors  $\lambda_j^t$  in the definition of  $\Psi_t$  are crucial for this statement to hold.

The mapping  $\Psi_t : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{q(t)}$  provides a parameterization of the data set  $\Omega$ , or equivalently, a realization of the graph  $G$  as a cloud of points in a lower-dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^{q(t)}$ , where the rescaled eigenvectors are the coordinates. The dimensionality reduction and the weighting of the relevant eigenvectors are dictated by both the time  $t$  of the random walk and the spectral fall-off of the eigenvalues.

Equation (9) means that  $\Psi_t$  embeds the entire data set in  $\mathbb{R}^{q(t)}$  in such a way that the Euclidean distance is an approximation of the diffusion distance. Our approach is thus different from other eigenmap methods: Our starting points is an *explicitly* defined distance metric on the data set or graph. This distance is also the quantity we wish to preserve during a nonlinear dimensionality reduction.

## 3 GRAPH PARTITIONING AND SUBSAMPLING

In what follows, we describe a novel scheme for subsampling data sets that—as above—preserves the intrinsic geometry defined by the connectivity of the data points in a graph. The idea is to construct a coarse-grained version of the original random walk on a new graph  $\tilde{G}$  with similar spectral properties. This new Markov chain is obtained by grouping points into clusters and appropriately averaging the transition probabilities between these clusters. We show that in order to retain most of the spectral properties of the original random walk, the choice of clusters is critical. More precisely, the quantization distortion in diffusion space bounds the error of the approximation of the diffusion operator.

One application is dimensionality reduction and clustering of arbitrarily shaped data sets using geometry; see Section 4 for some simple examples. However, more generally, the construction also offers a systematic way of subsampling operators [15] and arbitrary graphs using geometry.

1. The speed of the decay depends on the graph structure. For example, for the special case of a fully connected graph, the first eigenvalue will be 1 and the remaining eigenvalues will be equal to 0. The other extreme case is a graph that is totally disconnected with all eigenvalues equal to 1.






Fig. 1. Example of a coarse-graining of a graph: For a given partition  $\Omega = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$  of the set of nodes in a graph  $G$ , we define a coarse-grained graph  $\tilde{G}$  by aggregating all nodes belonging to a subset  $S_i$  into a metanode. By appropriately averaging the transition probabilities between points  $x \in S_i$  and  $y \in S_j$ , for  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ , we then compute new weights  $\tilde{w}(S_i, S_j)$  and a new Markov chain with transition probabilities  $\tilde{p}(S_i, S_j)$ .

### 3.1 Construction of a Coarse-Grained Random Walk

Start by considering an arbitrary partition  $\{S_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$  of the set of nodes  $\Omega$ . Our aim is to aggregate the points in each set in order to coarse-grain both the state set  $\Omega$  and the time evolution of the random walk. To do so, we regard each set  $S_i$  as corresponding to the nodes of a  $k$ -node graph  $\tilde{G}$ , whose weight function is defined as

$$\tilde{w}(S_i, S_j) = \sum_{x \in S_i} \sum_{y \in S_j} \phi_0(x) p_t(x, y),$$

where the sum involves all the transition probabilities between points  $x \in S_i$  and  $y \in S_j$  (see Fig. 1).

From the reversibility condition of (2), it can be verified that this graph is symmetric, i.e., that  $\tilde{w}(S_i, S_j) = \tilde{w}(S_j, S_i)$ . By setting

$$\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) = \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_0(x),$$

one can define a reversible Markov chain on this graph with stationary distribution  $\tilde{\phi}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and transition probabilities

$$\tilde{p}(S_i, S_j) = \frac{\tilde{w}(S_i, S_j)}{\sum_k \tilde{w}(S_i, S_k)} = \frac{\sum_{x \in S_i} \sum_{y \in S_j} \phi_0(x) p_t(x, y)}{\sum_{x \in S_i} \sum_{y \in S_j} \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) p_t(x, y)}.$$

Let  $\tilde{P}$  be the  $k \times k$  transition matrix on the coarse-grained graph. More generally, for  $0 \leq l \leq n-1$ , we define in a similar way coarse-grained versions of  $\phi_l$  by summing over the nodes in a partition:

$$\tilde{\phi}_l(S_i) = \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_l(x). \quad (10)$$

As in (4), we define coarse-grained versions of  $\psi_l$  according to the duality condition

$$\tilde{\psi}_l(S_i) = \frac{\tilde{\phi}_l(S_i)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)}, \quad (11)$$

which is equivalent to taking a weighted average of  $\psi_l$  over  $S_i$ :

$$\tilde{\psi}_l(S_i) = \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \psi_l(x). \quad (12)$$

The coarse-grained kernel  $\tilde{p}(S_i, S_j)$  contains all the information in the data regarding the connectivity of the

new nodes in the graph  $\tilde{G}$ . The extent to which the above vectors constitute approximations of the left and right eigenvectors of  $\tilde{P}$  depends on the particular choice of the partition  $\{S_i\}$ . We investigate this issue more precisely in the next section.

### 3.2 Approximation Error: Definition of Geometric Centroids

In a similar manner to (5) and (6), we define the norm on coarse-grained signed measures  $\tilde{\phi}_l$  to be

$$\|\tilde{\phi}_l\|_{1/\tilde{\phi}_0}^2 = \sum_i \frac{\tilde{\phi}_l^2(S_i)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)},$$

and on the coarse-grained test functions  $\tilde{\psi}_l$  to be

$$\|\tilde{\psi}_l\|_{\tilde{\phi}_0}^2 = \sum_i \tilde{\psi}_l^2(S_i) \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i).$$

We now introduce the definition of a geometric centroid, or a representative point, of each partition  $S_i$ :

**Definition 1 (Geometric Centroid).** Let  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . The geometric centroid  $c(S_i)$  of subset  $S_i$  of  $\Omega$  is defined as the weighted sum

$$c(S_i) = \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \Psi_t(x).$$

The following result shows that for small values of  $l$ ,  $\tilde{\phi}_l$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_l$  are approximate left and right eigenvectors of  $\tilde{P}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_l^t$ .

**Theorem 1.** We have for  $0 \leq l \leq n-1$ ,

$$\tilde{\phi}_l^T \tilde{P} = \lambda_l^t \tilde{\phi}_l^T + e_l \text{ and } \tilde{P} \tilde{\psi}_l = \lambda_l^t \tilde{\psi}_l + f_l,$$

where

$$\|e_l\|_{1/\tilde{\phi}_0}^2 \leq 2\mathcal{D} \text{ and } \|f_l\|_{\tilde{\phi}_0}^2 \leq 2\mathcal{D},$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} = \sum_i \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_0(x) \|\Psi_t(x) - c(S_i)\|^2.$$

This means that, if  $|\lambda_l^t| \gg \sqrt{\mathcal{D}}$ , then  $\tilde{\phi}_l$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_l$  are approximate left and right eigenvectors of  $\tilde{P}$  with approximate eigenvalue  $\lambda_l^t$ . The proof of this theorem can be found in the Appendix.

The previous result also shows that, in order to maximize the quality of approximation, we need to minimize the following distortion in diffusion space:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \sum_i \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_0(x) \|\Psi_t(x) - c(S_i)\|^2 \\ &\approx E \left\{ E_{X|i} \left\{ \|\Psi_t(X) - c(S_i)\|^2 | X \in S_i \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $E$  represents an expectation. This can also be written in terms of a weighted sum of pairwise distances according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) \sum_{z \in S_i} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \frac{\phi_0(z)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \|\Psi_t(x) - \Psi_t(z)\|^2 \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} E \left\{ E_{X,Z|i} \left\{ \|\Psi_t(X) - \Psi_t(Z)\|^2 | X, Z \in S_i \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$




Fig. 2. The Swiss roll, and its quantization by  $k$ -means ( $k = 4$ ) in the (a) original coordinate system and in the (b) diffusion space.

### 3.3 An Algorithm for Distortion Minimization

Finally, we make a connection to kernel  $k$ -means and the algorithmic aspects of the minimization. The form of  $\mathcal{D}$  given in (13) is classical in information theory and its minimization is equivalent to solving the problem of quantizing the diffusion space with  $k$  codewords based on the mass distribution of the sample set  $\Psi_t(\Omega)$ . This optimization issue is often addressed via the  $k$ -means algorithm [16] which guarantees convergence toward a local minimum:

1. Step 0: initialize the partition  $\{S_i^{(0)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$  at random in the diffusion space.
2. For  $p > 0$ , update the partition according to

$$S_i^{(p)} = \left\{ x \text{ such that } i = \arg \min_j \|\Psi_t(x) - c(S_j^{(p-1)})\|^2 \right\},$$

where  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $c(S_j^{(p-1)})$  is the geometric centroid of  $S_j^{(p-1)}$ .

3. Repeat point 2 until convergence.

A drawback of this approach is that each center of mass  $\{c(S_i)\}$  may not belong to the set  $\Psi_t(E)$  itself. This can be a problem in some applications where such combinations have no meaning, such as in the case of gene data. In order to obtain representatives  $\{c_i\}$  of the clusters that belong to the original set  $E$ , we introduce the following definition of diffusion centers:

**Definition 2 (Diffusion Center).** The diffusion center  $u(S)$  of a subset  $S$  of  $\Omega$  is any solution of

$$\arg \min_{x \in \Omega} \|\Psi_t(x) - c(S)\|^2.$$

This notion does not define a unique diffusion center, but it is sufficient for our purpose of minimizing the distortion. Note that  $u(S)$  is a generalization of the idea of center of mass to graphs.

Now, if  $\{S_i\}$  is the output of the  $k$ -means algorithm, then we can assign to each point in  $S_i$  the representative center  $u(S_i)$ . In that sense, the graph  $\tilde{G}$  is a subsampled version of  $G$  that, for a given value of  $k$ , retains the spectral properties of the graph. The analysis above provides a rigorous justification for  $k$ -means clustering in diffusion spaces, and furthermore links our work to both spectral graph partitioning

(where often only the first nontrivial eigenvector of the graph Laplacian is taken into account) and eigenmaps (where one uses spectral coordinates for data parameterization).

## 4 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

### 4.1 Importance of Learning the Nonlinear Geometry of Data in Clustering

In many applications, real data sets exhibit highly nonlinear structures. In such cases, linear methods such as Principal Components will not be very efficient for representing the data. With the diffusion coordinates, however, it is possible to learn the intrinsic geometry of data set and then project the data points into a nonlinear coordinate space with a diffusion metric. In this diffusion space, one can use classical geometric algorithms (such as separating hyperplane-based methods,  $k$ -means algorithms, etc.) for unsupervised as well as supervised learning.

To illustrate this idea, we study the famous Swiss roll. This data set is intrinsically a surface embedded in three dimensions. In this original coordinate system, global extrinsic distances, such as the Euclidean distance, are often meaningless as they do not incorporate any information on the structure or shape of the data set. For instance, if we run the  $k$ -means algorithm for clustering with  $k = 4$ , the obtained clusters do not reflect the natural geometry of the set. As shown in Fig. 2, there is some “leakage” between different parts of the spiral due to the convexity of the  $k$ -means clusters in the ambient space.

As a comparison, we also show in Fig. 2 the result of running the  $k$ -means algorithm in diffusion space. In the latter case, we obtain meaningful clusters that respect the intrinsic geometry of the data set.

### 4.2 Robustness of the Diffusion Distance

One of the most attractive features of the diffusion distance is its robustness to noise and small perturbations of the data. In short, its stability follows from the fact that it reflects the connectivity of the points in the graph. We illustrate this idea by studying the case of data points approximately lying on a spiral in the two-dimensional plane. The goal of this experiment is to show that the diffusion distance is a robust metric on the data, and in order to do so, we compare it to the




Fig. 3. Two realizations of a noisy spiral with points of references  $A$  and  $B$ . Ideally, the shortest path between  $A$  and  $B$  should follow the (a) branch of the spiral. However, some realizations of the noise may give rise to shortcuts, thereby dramatically reducing the length of the (b) shortest path.

shortest path (or geodesic) distance that is employed in schemes such as ISOMAP [13].

We generate 1,000 instances of a noisy spiral in the plane, each corresponding to a different realization of the random noise perturbation (see Fig. 3). From each instance, we construct a graph by connecting all pairs of points at a distance less than a given threshold  $\tau$ , which is kept constant over the different realizations of the spiral. The corresponding adjacency matrix  $W$  contains only zeros or ones, depending on the absence or presence of an edge, respectively. In order to measure the robustness of the diffusion distance, we repeatedly compute the diffusion distance between two points of reference  $A$  and  $B$  in all 1,000 noisy spirals. We also compute the geodesic distance between these two points using Dijkstra's algorithm.

As shown in Fig. 3, depending on the presence of shortcuts arising from points appearing between the branches of the spiral, the geodesic distance (or shortest path length) between  $A$  and  $B$  may vary by large amounts from one realization of the noise to another. The histogram of all geodesic distances measurements between  $A$  and  $B$  over the 1,000 trials is shown on Fig. 4. The distribution of the geodesic distance appears poorly localized, as its standard deviation equals 42 percent of its mean. This indicates that the geodesic distance is extremely sensitive to noise and thus unreliable as a measure of distance.

The diffusion distance, however, is not sensitive to small random perturbations of the data set because, unlike the geodesic distance, it represents an average quantity. More specifically, it takes into account all paths of length less than or equal to  $t$  that connect  $A$  and  $B$ . As a consequence, shortcuts due to noise will have little weight in the computation, as the number of such paths is much smaller than the number of paths following the shape of the spiral. This is also what our experiment confirms: Fig. 4 shows the distribution of the diffusion distances between  $A$  and  $B$  over the random trials. In this experiment,  $t$  was taken to be equal to 600. The corresponding histogram shows a very localized distribution, with a standard deviation equal to only 7 percent of its mean, which translates into robustness and consistency of the diffusion distance.

### 4.3 Organizing and Clustering Words via Diffusion Maps

Many of the ideas in this paper can be illustrated with an application to word-document clustering. We here show how we can measure the semantic association of words using diffusion distances and how we can organize and form representative metawords using diffusion maps and the k-means algorithm.

Our starting point is a collection of  $p = 1,161$  Science News articles. These articles belong to eight different categories (see [17]). Our goal is to cluster words based on their distribution over the documents. From the database, we extract the 20 most common words in each document, which corresponds to 3,218 unique words total. Out of these words, we then select words with an intermediate document conditional entropy. The conditional entropy of a document




Fig. 4. Distribution of the (a) geodesic and (b) diffusion distances. Each distribution was rescaled in order to have a mean equal to 1.





TABLE 2  
Examples of Diffusion Centers and Words in a Cluster

Diffusion center	All other words in cluster
psychiatric	depression, psychiatrist, psychologist
talent	award, competition, finalist, intel, prize, scholarship, student, winner
laser	beam, nanometer, photon, pulse, quantum
velocity	detector, emit, infrared, ultraviolet
gravitational	bang, cosmo, gravity, hubble
orbiting	jupiter, orbit, solar
geologic	beneath, crust, depth, earthquake, ice, km, plate, seismic, trapped, volcanic
warming	climate, el, nino, pacific, weather
underwater	atlantic, coast, continent, floor, island, marine, seafloor, sediment
ecosystem	algae, drought, dry, ecologist, extinction, forest, gulf, lake, pollution, river
farmer	carolina, crop, fish, florida, insect, nutrient, pesticide, pollutant, soil, tree, tropical, wash, wood
virus	aids, allergy, hiv, resistant, vaccine, viral
cholesterol	aging, artery, fda, insulin, obesity, sugar, vitamin

## 5 DISCUSSION

In this work, we provide evidence that clustering, graph partitioning, and data set parameterization can be solved within one and the same framework. Our starting point is to find a meaningful representation of the data and to *explicitly* define a distance metric on the data. Here, we propose using a system of coordinates and a metric that reflects the connectivity of the data set. By doing so, we lay down a solid foundation for subsequent data analysis.

All the geometry of the data set is captured in a diffusion kernel. However, unlike SVM and so-called “kernel methods” [18], [19], [20], we are working with the embedding coordinates explicitly. Our method is completely data driven: Both the data representation and the kernel are computed directly on the data. The notion of a distance allows us to more precisely define our goals in clustering and dimensionality reduction. In addition, the diffusion framework makes it possible to directly connect grouping in embedding spaces to spectral graph clustering and data analysis by Markov chains [21], [11].

In a sense, we are extending Meila and Shi’s work [3] from lumpable Markov chains and piece-wise constant eigenvectors to the general case of arbitrary Markov chains and arbitrary eigenvectors. The key idea is to work with embedding spaces directly and also to take powers of the transition matrix. The time parameter  $t$  sets the scale of the analysis. Note also that by using different values of  $t$ , we are able to perform a multiscale analysis of the data [22], [23].

Our other contribution is a novel scheme for simultaneous dimensionality reduction, parameterization, and subsampling of data sets. We show that clustering in embedding spaces is equivalent to compressing operators. As mentioned, the diffusion operator defines the geometry of our data set.

There are several ways of compressing a linear operator, depending on what properties one wishes to retain. For instance, in [22], the goal is to maintain sparseness of the representation while achieving the best compression rate. On the other hand, the objective in our work is to cluster or partition a given data set while at the same time preserving the operator (that captures the geometry of the data set) up to some accuracy. We show that, for a given partitioning scheme, the corresponding quantization distortion in diffusion space bounds the error of compression of the operator. This gives us a precise measure of the performance of clustering algorithms. To find the best clustering, one needs to minimize this distortion, and the  $k$ -means algorithm is one way to achieve this goal. Another aspect of our approach is that we are coarse-graining a Markov chain defined on the data, thus offering a general scheme to subsample and parameterize graphs based on intrinsic geometry.

## APPENDIX

In this section, we provide a proof for Theorem 1, which we recall as

**Theorem 2.** We have for  $0 \leq l \leq n - 1$ ,

$$\tilde{\phi}_l^T \tilde{P} = \lambda_l^t \tilde{\phi}_l^T + e_l \text{ and } \tilde{P} \tilde{\psi}_l = \lambda_l^t \tilde{\psi}_l + f_l,$$

where

$$\|e_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 \lesssim 2\mathcal{D} \text{ and } \|f_l\|_{\phi_0}^2 \lesssim 2\mathcal{D},$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} = \sum_i \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_0(x) \|\Psi_t(x) - c(S_i)\|^2.$$

This means that, if  $|\lambda_l|^t \gg \sqrt{\mathcal{D}}$ , then  $\tilde{\phi}_l$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_l$  are approximate left and right eigenvectors of  $\tilde{P}$  with approximate eigenvalue  $\lambda_l^t$ .

**Proof.** We start by treating left eigenvectors: For all  $z \in S_i$ , we define

$$r_{ij}(z) = \tilde{p}(S_i, S_j) - p_t(z, S_j).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |r_{ij}(z)| &= \left| \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} (p_t(x, S_j) - p_t(z, S_j)) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \sum_{y \in S_j} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)| \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \left( \sum_{y \in S_j} \phi_0(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \left( \sum_{y \in S_j} \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ (Cauchy-Schwarz)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\phi_0(S_j)} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \left( \sum_{y \in S_j} \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Another application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$|r_{ij}(z)|^2 \leq \tilde{\phi}_0(S_j) \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \sum_{y \in S_j} \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)|^2. \quad (15)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \tilde{\phi}_l(S_i) \tilde{p}(S_i, S_j) &= \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_l(z) \tilde{p}(S_i, S_j) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_l(z) (p_t(z, S_j) + r_{ij}(z)) \\ &= \lambda_l^t \tilde{\phi}_l(S_j) + \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_l(z) r_{ij}(z). \end{aligned}$$

We therefore define  $e_l \in \mathbb{R}^k$  by

$$e_l(S_j) = \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_l(z) r_{ij}(z).$$

To prove the theorem, we need to bound

$$\|e_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 = \sum_j \frac{e_l(S_j)^2}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_j)}.$$

First, observe that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$e_l(S_j)^2 \leq \left( \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \frac{\phi_l(z)^2}{\phi_0(z)} \right) \left( \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} r_{ij}(z)^2 \phi_0(z) \right).$$

Now, since  $\phi_l$  was normalized, this means that

$$e_l(S_j)^2 \leq \left( \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} r_{ij}(z)^2 \phi_0(z) \right).$$

Invoking (15), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 &\leq \sum_j \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_0(z) \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \sum_{y \in S_j} \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_i \sum_{z \in S_i} \phi_0(z) \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \sum_y \frac{1}{\phi_0(y)} |p_t(x, y) - p_t(z, y)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_i \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) \sum_{z \in S_i} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \frac{\phi_0(z)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} D_t^2(x, z) \\ &\leq \sum_i \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) \sum_{z \in S_i} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \frac{\phi_0(z)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \|\Psi_t(x) - \Psi_t(z)\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_i \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) \sum_{z \in S_i} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \frac{\phi_0(z)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \\ &\quad \times (\|\Psi_t(x) - c(S_i)\|^2 + \|\Psi_t(z) - c(S_i)\|^2 - 2\langle \Psi_t(x) - c(S_i), \Psi_t(z) - c(S_i) \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

By definition of  $c(S_i)$ ,

$$\sum_{z \in S_i} \sum_{x \in S_i} \frac{\phi_0(x)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \frac{\phi_0(z)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \langle \Psi_t(x) - c(S_i), \Psi_t(z) - c(S_i) \rangle = 0,$$

and, therefore,

$$\|e_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 \leq 2 \sum_i \sum_{x \in S_i} \phi_0(x) \|\Psi_t(z) - c(S_i)\|^2.$$

As for right eigenvectors, the result follows from (11) and the fact that the coarse-grained Markov chain is reversible with respect to  $\tilde{\phi}_0$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P} \tilde{\psi}_l(S_i) &= \sum_j \tilde{p}(S_i, S_j) \tilde{\psi}_l(S_j) \\ &= \sum_j \frac{\tilde{p}(S_i, S_j)}{\phi_0(S_j)} \tilde{\phi}_l(S_j) \text{ by (11)} \\ &= \sum_j \frac{\tilde{p}(S_j, S_i)}{\phi_0(S_i)} \tilde{\phi}_l(S_j) \text{ by reversibility} \\ &= \lambda_l^t \frac{\tilde{\phi}_l(S_i)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} + \frac{e_l(S_i)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \\ &= \lambda_l^t \tilde{\psi}_l(S_i) + \frac{e_l(S_i)}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)} \text{ by (11)}. \end{aligned}$$

If we set  $f_l(S_i) = e_l(S_i)/\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)$ , we conclude that

$$\|f_l\|_{\phi_0}^2 = \sum_i \frac{e_l(S_i)^2}{\tilde{\phi}_0(S_i)^2} \tilde{\phi}_0(S_i) = \|e_l\|_{1/\phi_0}^2 \leq 2\mathcal{D}.$$

□

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS


The authors would like to thank R.R. Coifman for his insight and guidance, M. Maggioni and B. Nadler for contributing in the development of the diffusion framework, and Y. Keller for providing comments on the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Weiss, "Segmentation Using Eigenvectors: A Unifying View," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Computer Vision*, vol. 14, pp. 975-982, 1999.
- [2] J. Shi and J. Malik, "Normalized Cuts and Image Segmentation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 888-905, Aug. 2000.
- [3] M. Meila and J. Shi, "A Random Walk's View of Spectral Segmentation," *AI and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2001.
- [4] S.T. Roweis and L.K. Saul, "Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction by Locally Linear Embedding," *Science*, vol. 290, pp. 2323-2326, 2000.
- [5] Z. Zhang and H. Zha, "Principal Manifolds and Nonlinear Dimension Reduction via Local Tangent Space Alignment," Technical Report CSE-02-019, Dept. of Computer Science and Eng., Pennsylvania State Univ., 2002.
- [6] M. Belkin and P. Niyogi, "Laplacian Eigenmaps for Dimensionality Reduction and Data Representation," *Neural Computation*, vol. 6, no. 15, pp. 1373-1396, June 2003.
- [7] D.L. Donoho and C. Grimes, "Hessian Eigenmaps: New Locally Linear Embedding Techniques for High-Dimensional Data," *Proc. Nat'l Academy of Sciences*, vol. 100, no. 10, pp. 5591-5596, May 2003.
- [8] F. Chung, *Spectral Graph Theory*, no. 92, CBMS-AMS, May 1997.
- [9] R.R. Coifman and S. Lafon, "Diffusion Maps," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, to appear.
- [10] R.R. Coifman, S. Lafon, A.B. Lee, M. Maggioni, B. Nadler, F. Warner, and S. Zucker, "Geometric Diffusions as a Tool for Harmonics Analysis and Structure Definition of Data: Diffusion Maps," *Proc. Nat'l Academy of Sciences*, vol. 102, no. 21, pp. 7426-7431, 2005.
- [11] M. Szummer and T. Jaakkola, "Partially Labeled Classification with Markov Random Walks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 14, 2001.
- [12] I.S. Dhillon, Y. Guan, and B. Kulis, "Kernel K-Means, Spectral Clustering and Normalized Cuts," *Proc. 10th ACM SIGKDD Int'l Conf. Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2004.
- [13] V. de Silva, J.B. Tenenbaum, and J.C. Langford, "A Global Geometric Framework for Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction," *Science*, vol. 290, pp. 2319-2323, 2000.
- [14] B. Nadler, S. Lafon, R.R. Coifman, and I. Kevrekidis, "Diffusion Maps, Spectral Clustering and the Reaction Coordinates of Dynamical Systems," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, to appear.
- [15] Private communication with R.R. Coifman.
- [16] S. Lloyd, "Least Squares Quantization in PCM," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 129-138, 1982.
- [17] C.E. Priebe, D.J. Marchette, Y. Park, E.J. Wegman, J.L. Solka, D.A. Socolinsky, D. Karakos, K.W. Church, R. Guglielmi, R.R. Coifman, D. Lin, D.M. Healy, M.Q. Jacobs, and A. Tsao, "Iterative Denoising for Cross-Corpus Discovery," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Computer Vision*, pp. 975-982, 2004.
- [18] B. Schölkopf, A.J. Smola, and K.-R. Müller, "Nonlinear Component Analysis as a Kernel Eigenvalue Problem," *Neural Computation*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1299-1319, 1998.
- [19] V.N. Vapnik, *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*, second ed. 1995.
- [20] C.J.C. Burges, "A Tutorial on Support Vector Machines for Pattern Recognition," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 2, pp. 121-167, 1998.
- [21] F. Fous, A. Pirotte, J.-M. Renders, and M. Saerens, "A Novel Way of Computing Similarities between Nodes of a Graph, with Application to Collaborative Recommendation," *Web Intelligence*, 2005.
- [22] R.R. Coifman and M. Maggioni, "Diffusion Wavelets," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, to appear.
- [23] R.R. Coifman, S. Lafon, A.B. Lee, M. Maggioni, B. Nadler, F. Warner, and S. Zucker, "Geometric Diffusions as a Tool for Harmonics Analysis and Structure Definition of Data: Multiscale Methods," *Proc. Nat'l Academy of Sciences*, vol. 102, no. 21, pp. 7432-7437, 2005.



**Stéphane Lafon** received the BSc degree in computer science from Ecole Polytechnique and the MSc degree in mathematics and artificial intelligence from Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan in France. He received the PhD degree in applied mathematics at Yale University in 2004 and was a research associate in the Applied Mathematics Group during the year 2004-2005. He is currently with Google where he works as a software engineer and his work focuses on the design, analysis, and implementation of machine learning algorithms. His research interests are in data mining, machine learning, and information retrieval.



**Ann B. Lee** received the MSc degree in engineering physics from Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden, and the PhD degree in physics from Brown University in 2002. She is an assistant professor of statistics at Carnegie Mellon University. She was a research associate in the Division of Applied Mathematics (Pattern Theory Group) at Brown University during the year 2001-2002, and a J.W. Gibbs Instructor and assistant professor of applied mathematics at Yale University from 2002-2005. In August 2005, she joined the Department of Statistics at Carnegie Mellon as an assistant professor of statistics. Her research interests are in machine learning, statistical models in pattern analysis and vision, high-dimensional data analysis, and multiscale geometric methods.

► For more information on this or any other computing topic, please visit our Digital Library at [www.computer.org/publications/dlib](http://www.computer.org/publications/dlib).