Theoretically Efficient Parallel Density-Peaks Clustering

Michael Huang Under the direction of Shangdi Yu and Prof. Julian Shun

October 16, 2022

Density-based Clustering



Why Density-Peaks Clustering (DPC) Algorithm



DBSCAN fails on datasets where clusters are close together³

³Amagata and Hara 2021.

Why Density-Peaks Clustering (DPC) Algorithm



DBSCAN fails on datasets where clusters are close together³



DPC is able to separate close clusters⁴

³Amagata and Hara 2021. ⁴Amagata and Hara 2021.



⁵Rodriguez and Laio 2014.



⁵Rodriguez and Laio 2014. ⁶Rodriguez and Laio 2014.



Compute density⁵



Find dependent point (the nearest neighbor with higher density)⁶



Separate into clusters⁷

⁵Rodriguez and Laio 2014.
 ⁶Rodriguez and Laio 2014.
 ⁷Rodriguez and Laio 2014.



Why Focus on Parallelism



⁸Shun 2021.

Parallel Algorithm Background

 $T_p =$ runtime with p processors $T_1 =$ work $T_{\infty} =$ span

Brent's Law:

$$T_p \leq T_\infty + \frac{T_1 - T_\infty}{p}$$

Computational graph of a parallel algorithm⁹

⁹Shun 2021.



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree => higher density)



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree ⇒ higher density)



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree ⇒ higher density)



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree => higher density)

Reduce dependent point finding from O(n) to Avg. $O(\log(n))$



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree => higher density)

Reduce dependent point finding from O(n) to Avg. $O(\log(n))$



Binary Space Partitioning Tree:

- Divide points up equally
- Satisfy heap property (higher in the tree => higher density)

Reduce dependent point finding from O(n) to Avg. $O(\log(n))$

	Compute density		Find dependent point	
Algorithms	Avg. Work	Avg. Span	Avg. Work	Avg. Span
Previous SOTA ¹⁰	$O(n^{2-\frac{1}{d}}+n ho)$	$O(n^{1-rac{1}{d}}+ ho)$	$O(n^2)$	<i>O</i> (<i>n</i>)
Our algorithm	$O(n^{2-\frac{1}{d}})$	$O(n^{1-rac{1}{d}})$	$O(n\log(n))$	$O(\log(n))$

Complexity comparison

- In: the number of points to be clustered
- 2 ρ : average density of points
- I the number of dimensions each point has

¹⁰Rodriguez and Laio 2014; Amagata and Hara 2021.

Experiment Setup

- 30-core, 2-way hyperthreading, CPU
 @3.1 GHz
- Implemented with ParlayLib¹¹ and ParGeo¹²



Dataset	n	d	synthetic
uniform	10M	2	yes
simden	10M	2	yes
varden	10M	2	yes
GeoLife	24.88M	3	no
PAMAP2	0.26M	4	no
Sensor	3.84M	5	no
HT	0.93M	8	no

Datasets

¹¹Blelloch, Anderson, and Dhulipala 2020.
 ¹²Wang et al. 2022.

Runtime Comparison



Parallel Scalability



13.2x self-relative speedup

- Proposed the Priority Search kd-tree data structure and proved its avg. query complexity
- Oeveloped a theoretically efficient and practically fast DPC algorithm, with up to 4666x speedup compared to SOTA

- Shangdi Yu
- Prof. Julian Shun
- MIT PRIMES Program