

Agglomerative (Single-link / Min-distance) Hierarchical

Problem statement (dataset chosen)

We have 6 one-dimensional data points:

Data: 12, 17, 18, 24, 50, 52

Use **agglomerative hierarchical clustering** with **single-link (min distance)**. At each iteration:

1. Find the two clusters with the smallest inter-cluster distance (single-link = minimum pairwise distance between points of the clusters).
2. Merge them.
3. Update the proximity matrix using single-link (min of pairwise distances).
Show the proximity matrix for each iteration and the final dendrogram.

Key reminder (single-link update)

If cluster A and cluster B are merged into cluster $A \cup B$, the distance between cluster $A \cup B$ and any other cluster C under **single-link** is:

r

$$d_{\text{single}}(A \cup B, C) = \min(d(a, c) \text{ for } a \in A, c \in C) = \min(d(A, C), d(B, C))$$

(So you update a cluster-to-cluster distance by taking the **minimum** of the prior distances.)

1) Initial proximity (pairwise absolute differences)

We list the points in ascending order and compute $|x_i - x_j|$.

makefile

Points: 12 17 18 24 50 52

Index: P1 P2 P3 P4 P5 P6

Initial symmetric proximity matrix (rows = clusters, columns = clusters). Diagonal = 0.

java

Initial proximity **matrix** (absolute differences)

	12	17	18	24	50	52
12	0	5	6	12	38	40
17	5	0	1	7	33	35
18	6	1	0	6	32	34
24	12	7	6	0	26	28

```
50 38 33 32 26 0 2
52 40 35 34 28 2 0
```

Check a few entries (digit-by-digit):

- $|17 - 18| = 1$ (smallest).
- $|50 - 52| = 2$.
- $|12 - 24| = 12$.
- $|24 - 50| = 26$.

2) Merge history and matrices — step by step

I will number iterations. At each step I show which clusters are merged and the updated matrix (labels show current clusters).

Step 0 — start

Clusters: $\{12\}$, $\{17\}$, $\{18\}$, $\{24\}$, $\{50\}$, $\{52\}$

Matrix shown above.

Smallest distance = 1 between **17** and **18**. So we merge $\{17\}$ & $\{18\}$.

Step 1 — merge $\{17\}$ and $\{18\}$

Merged clusters: $(17, 18)$ at distance 1.

New cluster set (sorted for display):

$\{12\}$, $\{(17, 18)\}$, $\{24\}$, $\{50\}$, $\{52\}$

Proximity matrix after the merge (single-link):

markdown

Step 1: clusters = [12, (17,18), 24, 50, 52]

	12	(17,18)	24	50	52
12	0	5	12	38	40
(17,18)	5	0	6	32	34
24	12	6	0	26	28

```
50  38  32  26  0  2
52  40  34  28  2  0
```

How entries were computed (examples):

- $d((17,18), 12) = \min(|17-12|, |18-12|) = \min(5,6) = 5$.
- $d((17,18), 24) = \min(|17-24|, |18-24|) = \min(7,6) = 6$.
- distances to 50 and 52 use the minimum of pairwise differences (32 and 34 respectively).

Next smallest distance = 2 between 50 and 52 . Merge {50} & {52} .

Step 2 — merge {50} and {52}

Merged clusters: (50,52) at distance 2.

New clusters: {12}, {(17,18)}, {24}, {(50,52)}

Proximity matrix:

markdown

Step 2: clusters = [12, (17,18), 24, (50,52)]

	12	(17,18)	24	(50,52)
12	0	5	12	38
(17,18)	5	0	6	32
24	12	6	0	26
(50,52)	38	32	26	0

Notes:

- $d((50,52), 24) = \min(|50-24|, |52-24|) = \min(26,28) = 26$.
- $d((50,52), (17,18)) = \min(33,32,35,34) = 32$ (min among 50-17, 50-18, 52-17, 52-18).

Next smallest distance = 5 between 12 and (17,18) . Merge {12} with {17,18} .

Step 3 — merge {12} and (17,18)

Merged clusters: (12,17,18) at distance 5.

New clusters: $\{ (12, 17, 18) \}, \{ 24 \}, \{ (50, 52) \}$

Proximity matrix:

markdown

Step 3: clusters = [(12,17,18), 24, (50,52)]

	(12,17,18)	24	(50,52)
(12,17,18)	0	6	32
24	6	0	26
(50,52)	32	26	0

Check computation:

- $d((12, 17, 18), 24) = \min(|12-24|, |17-24|, |18-24|) = \min(12, 7, 6) = 6$.
- $d((12, 17, 18), (50, 52)) = \min(38, 40, 33, 35, 32, 34) = 32 \rightarrow$ the minimum is $|18 - 50| = 32$.

Next smallest distance = 6 between $(12, 17, 18)$ and 24 . Merge them next.

Step 4 — merge $(12, 17, 18)$ and 24

Merged clusters: $(12, 17, 18, 24)$ at distance **6**.

Now clusters: $\{ (12, 17, 18, 24) \}, \{ (50, 52) \}$

Proximity matrix:

markdown

Step 4: clusters = [(12,17,18,24), (50,52)]

	(12,17,18,24)	(50,52)
(12,17,18,24)	0	26
(50,52)	26	0

Check:

- $d((12, 17, 18, 24), (50, 52)) = \min(\text{distances of any element in left cluster to 50 or 52})$.

The minimum is $|24 - 50| = 26$ (smaller than all the other pairwise differences).

Final merge merges these two clusters at distance **26**.

Step 5 — final merge

Merge $(12, 17, 18, 24)$ with $(50, 52)$ at distance **26** → final cluster $\{12, 17, 18, 24, 50, 52\}$.

3) Merge summary (compact)

Merge #	Clusters merged	Distance at merge	New resulting cluster
1	$\{17\}$ & $\{18\}$	1	$(17, 18)$
2	$\{50\}$ & $\{52\}$	2	$(50, 52)$
3	$\{12\}$ & $(17, 18)$	5	$(12, 17, 18)$
4	$(12, 17, 18)$ & $\{24\}$	6	$(12, 17, 18, 24)$
5	$(12, 17, 18, 24)$ & $(50, 52)$	26	$(12, 17, 18, 24, 50, 52)$

4) Dendrogram (parentheses and interpretation)

Parenthetical (Newick-like) representation:

```
SCSS
(((12,(17,18)),24),(50,52))
```

If we annotate the *heights* (merge distances):

```
graphql
(((12, (17,18) @1) @5, 24) @6, (50,52) @2) @26
```

Interpreting the dendrogram left → right:

- 17 and 18 join very close (height = 1).
- 50 and 52 join very close (height = 2) in their own cluster.
- 12 joins the 17–18 pair at distance 5.
- That group joins with 24 at distance 6.
- Finally the big left cluster meets the (50,52) cluster at distance 26.

(If you draw this exactly like your screenshots, the y-axis (height) would show jumps at 1, 2, 5, 6, and 26.)

ights & best-practice notes

- **Single-link (min)** tends to produce **chains**: points can be pulled into a cluster if they are close to *any* member. That is visible here: 12 merges into the small cluster {17, 18} even though 12 is not that close to 18 (it's closer to 17). This chaining is a property to keep in mind.
 - **Choosing number of clusters**: cut the dendrogram at a horizontal line. For example:
 - cut at height < 6 → clusters would be {12, 17, 18} and {24} and {50, 52} (3 clusters)
 - cut at height between 6 and 26 → clusters {12, 17, 18, 24} and {50, 52} (2 clusters)
 - cut below 2 → clusters {17, 18}, {50, 52}, 12, 24 (4 clusters)
 - **Other linkages**: complete-link uses max distances (compact clusters), average uses mean pairwise distance (smoother), Ward minimizes increase in total within-cluster variance (balanced clusters). If you want compact spherical clusters, complete or Ward may be more appropriate.
 - **Complexity**: the naive agglomerative implementation recomputes matrices each merge → $O(n^3)$. With appropriate data structures (priority queues, nearest-neighbor tracking) you can achieve roughly $O(n^2)$ time and $O(n^2)$ memory for many linkage methods.
 - **Numeric correctness**: all distances above are absolute differences computed exactly (checked step-by-step).
-

6) Appendix — quick checks & example calculations

- $d(17, 18) = |17-18| = 1 \rightarrow$ first merge.
- After merging $\{17, 18\}$, $d((17, 18), 24) = \min(|17-24|, |18-24|) = \min(7, 6) = 6$.
- $d(50, 52) = |50-52| = 2 \rightarrow$ second merge.
- $d((12, 17, 18), 24) = \min(|12-24|, |17-24|, |18-24|) = \min(12, 7, 6) = 6$.
- $d((12, 17, 18, 24), (50, 52)) = \min(\text{all pairwise differences}) = \min(\dots, |24-50|=26, \dots) = 26$.

@S S Roy, 9th Sept, 2025