CONVERGENCE OF HIERARCHICAL CLUSTERING AND PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY METHODS ON DIRECTED NETWORKS

SAMIR CHOWDHURY AND FACUNDO MÉMOLI

ABSTRACT. While there has been much interest in adapting conventional clustering procedures—and in higher dimensions, persistent homology methods—to directed networks, little is known about the convergence of such methods. In order to even formulate the problem of convergence for such methods, one needs to stipulate a reasonable model for a directed network together with a flexible sampling theory for such a model. In this paper we propose and study a particular model of directed networks, and use this model to study the convergence of certain hierarchical clustering and persistent homology methods that accept any matrix of (possibly asymmetric) pairwise relations as input and produce dendrograms and persistence barcodes as outputs. We show that as points are sampled from some probability distribution, the output of each method converges almost surely to a dendrogram/barcode depending on the structure of the distribution.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *directed network* is a list of nodes and pairwise relations given as real numbers, or alternatively, a (possibly asymmetric) square matrix of real numbers representing relations between points on a topological space. The points need not be embedded in Euclidean space, or even a metric space in general. Such objects arise naturally in data analysis, because real-world relations are often asymmetric (e.g. a traveler climbing a mountain assigns more difficulty to ascending than to descending).

The ubiquitousness of such data makes it necessary to understand how to adapt notions of *(flat) clustering*, i.e. of partitioning a dataset into groups while respecting intergroup dissimilarities, from the conventional setting of undirected networks to that of directed networks. The presence of weights suggests that instead of specifying the number of clusters in advance, the user should instead see the cluster structure of the directed network at all resolutions. This casts the problem into the domain of *hierarchical clustering*, where the objective is to produce a nested sequence of partitions that is represented via a dendrogram ([FHT01]). Unfortunately, as pointed out by [MV13], the most frequently used methods for hierarchical (or flat) clustering of directed data simply *ignore* the directionality, thus losing the essence of the data.

This state of affairs is changing, with researchers developing clustering methods that utilize edge directionality. However, it seems that little to nothing is known about the *convergence* of such methods, which is a vital statistical property guaranteeing that the clustering of randomly sampled points converges to the clustering of the entire underlying space as the sample size increases. Historically, it seems that there is a precedent for long delays between the emergence of a clustering method and a proof of its consistency/convergence: as noted in [VLBB08], "despite decades of work, little is known about consistency of most clustering algorithms." Indeed, the authors of [VLBB08] prove a fundamental result on convergence of spectral clustering, over 30 years after the emergence of this particular method.

Even in the setting of hierarchical clustering on undirected objects, only the method of *single linkage* has had any developments regarding convergence. The convergence properties, if any, of *complete linkage* and *average linkage* remain open ([Das16]). However, single linkage is prone to the *chaining effect* by which clusters appear to be long and "straggly." Whereas the chaining effect can be a nuisance in some situations,

(S. Chowdhury) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY. PHONE: (614) 292-6805.

(F. Mémoli) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY. PHONE: (614) 292-4975, FAX: (614) 292-1479.

E-mail address: chowdhury.57@osu.edu, memoli@math.osu.edu.

Date: November 12, 2017.

recent literature has described situations for which chaining is desirable and single linkage is better suited than complete or average linkage [AC11, §2.3]. In particular, chaining turns out to be meaningful for clustering one model of directed networks that we study.

An extension of the convergence question for hierarchical clustering of directed networks is to consider the analogous question in the setting of *persistent homology* [Car09, EM14]. In the conventional setting, persistent homology takes Euclidean or metric data as input, and produces a collection of topological summaries called *persistence diagrams* or *barcodes* as output, one in each dimension $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. This new field of applied algebraic topology has seen rapid progress in recent years, and in particular, the notion of persistent homology in directed/asymmetric settings has been studied in [Tur16, CM16, EW16, CM17b]. However, the convergence properties of any of these methods remains unknown.

In this paper, we first study hierarchical clustering methods on directed networks and prove related convergence results. For each of our methods, we prove that the output of applying the method to a sample of points chosen randomly from a distribution converges almost surely to a dendrogram arising from the structure of the support of the distribution. In the second part of the paper, we study the persistent homology methods on directed networks that appeared in [CM16]. We prove that each of these methods is consistent, in the sense that: (1) the persistence diagram of a distribution is well-defined, and (2) the diagram obtained by applying the method to a random sample converges almost surely to that of the underlying distribution.

We remark that the main obstruction in proving well-definedness of the persistence diagram is in first showing that an intermediate construction called a *persistent vector space* satisfies a property called *q-tameness* for each of these methods when the underlying space is compact (in particular, infinite). We establish this result by using a sampling theorem that appeared in [CM17a].

1.1. **Challenges and contributions.** The key difficulty in developing a statistical theory of hierarchical clustering on directed networks is that one needs to begin with a sample space that is directed, and such spaces are automatically difficult to study. Existing literature showing convergence results assume that the sample space is either a compact subspace of Euclidean space ([Har81], [CD10]), or a compact Riemannian manifold ([BNR$^+$13]), or at the most general, a compact metric space ([VLBB08], [CM10]). The directed generalization of a Riemannian manifold is a *Finsler* manifold ([BCS12]), and even in this well-understood setting, many standard mathematical tools such as open balls, tubular neighborhoods and Hausdorff distance are replaced by more complex analogues. A truly general treatment of directed networks should allow for sampling from spaces that are not even metric. This boosts the difficulty of the problem, because without metric space axioms like the triangle inequality, even simple notions like open balls are ill-defined. Finally, we remark that the difficulties described above are also extant in the setting of persistent homology.

Real-world networks are typically finite, but for modeling very large or very dense networks, it is necessary to think of a network as continuous rather than discrete, bolstered by a property such as compactness to guarantee that such "continuous" networks can be approximated up to arbitrary precision by discrete objects. Thus we adopt the following definition.

Definition 1 (Networks)**.** A *network* is a pair $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ where X is a (second countable, Hausdorff) compact topological space and $\mathfrak{e}_X : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous real valued function. The collection of all networks will be denoted $\mathcal{CN}$ (the $\mathcal{C}$ is a reminder that these networks are compact). When the context is clear, we will often refer to a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ by just X. Often we will equip a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ with a Borel probability measure μ_X. Given a closed subset $S \subseteq X$, we define $\mathfrak{e}_S := \mathfrak{e}_X|_{S\times S}$. Then $(S, \mathfrak{e}_S)$ is called the *subnetwork* of X generated by S.

In this paper, all networks are compact unless specified otherwise. However, sometimes we will still write "compact network" to distinguish infinite networks from finite networks, which are trivially compact.

In defining networks, all we ask for is a compact topological space with a continuous weight function between pairs of points. Our definition permits a network to be infinite, even uncountable. Most importantly, when equipped with a Borel probability measure, the notion of *sampling* from such a space makes sense, and the samples are themselves directed subnetworks. There are a large class of directed spaces which fit

within the scope of our definition, e.g. Finsler manifolds and directed metric spaces ([BCS12, p. 149], [SZ10]).

The necessary generality that comes with working in the setting of networks unfortunately robs us of the basic geometric tools (such as open metric balls) that are typically used for proofs of convergence. Despite this setback, we make use of a *network distance* (more specifically, a pseudometric) $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ to define notions of deterministic and probabilisitic approximation in the context of networks. This pseudometric is a dissimilarity measure such that given networks X, Y, Z, we have $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, X) = 0$, $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) = d_{\mathcal{N}}(Y, X)$, and $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Z) \leqslant d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) + d_{\mathcal{N}}(Y, Z)$. The core machinery that drives our results on convergence of clustering is the following *sampling theorem*, which states that (compact, infinite) networks can be *approximated* up to arbitrary precision by finite networks.

Theorem 1 (Sampling Theorem, [CM17a])**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be any network. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a finite network $(X', \mathfrak{e}_{X'})$ such that $d_{\mathcal{N}}\big((X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (X', \mathfrak{e}_{X'})\big) < \varepsilon$.*

The difficulty of the preceding statement can be seen after reinterpreting the situation in terms of matrices. A "non-compact" network is just an infinite matrix with no regularity assumptions, and such a matrix can be impossible to approximate via a finite network. An example is the $|\mathbb{R}| \times |\mathbb{R}|$ matrix with entries $\|x - y\|$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. To obtain a result such as Theorem 1, the first step is to realize that the correct framework for approximating an infinite matrix is to make the mild assumption that the infinite matrix arises from a *topological space*. This permits adding the compactness assumption. The proof of Theorem 1 is still subtle, because $\mathfrak{e}_X$ is partially decoupled from the topology on X. In particular, the topology of X may be quite complicated, in the sense that X may contain many more open sets than needed to make $\mathfrak{e}_X$ continuous.

The statement below summarizes the probabilistic network approximation results we obtain:

Main Result 1 (cf. Theorem 7)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a fully supported Borel probability measure μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ denote an i.i.d. sample from X with distribution μ_X. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, \mathbb{X}_n) \geqslant \varepsilon\big) \leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)},$$

where $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)$ is a quantity related to the minimal mass of a set in a particular type of cover of X. In particular, the finite network $\mathbb{X}_n$ converges almost surely to X in the network distance sense.

Since dendrograms can be represented without loss of information by ultrametrics [JS71], we regard hierarchical clustering methods as maps $\mathcal{H}$ that assign to any finite network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ a finite ultrametric space (X, u_X). Representing the output of clustering methods as metric trees was exploited in [CM10] in order to study the stability and convergence of hierarchical clustering methods.

The following statement summarizes our results regarding the convergence of the network hierarhical clustering methods that we study:

Main Result 2 (cf. Theorems 13, 15)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X such that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X)$ is a finite union of connected components $\{X_a : a \in A\}$, where A is a finite indexing set and each X_a satisfies compactness and a certain notion of path-connectivity (cf. Definition 6). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ denote an i.i.d. sample from X with distribution μ_X. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathcal{H}}), \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{X}_n)) \geqslant \varepsilon\Big) \leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))},$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is one of the hierarchical clustering methods we study and $(A, u_A^{\mathcal{H}})$ is a certain ultrametric space whose precise structure depends on the chosen HC method. In particular, the result of applying $\mathcal{H}$ to the sampled network $\mathbb{X}_n$ converges almost surely to $(A, u_A^{\mathcal{H}})$ in the sense of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the sample size increases.

The next statement summarizes the analogous results we obtain on the convergence of the network persistent homology methods presented in [CM16]. These methods are generalizations of the well-known *Rips*

and *Čech* persistent homology methods for metric spaces; for convenience, we simply refer to them (for now) as the Rips and Čech methods even in the network setting. We will clarify these terms in §6.

Main Result 3 (cf. Theorem 23)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a fully supported Borel probability measure μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ denote an i.i.d. sample from X with distribution μ_X. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(X), \mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathbb{X}_n)) \geqslant \varepsilon\big) \leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(X)\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(X)},$$

where $\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet$ is a persistence diagram (in dimension $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) obtained from one of the Rips or Čech methods and the bottleneck distance *d_{B} is a pseudometric on persistence diagrams. In particular, $\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathbb{X}_n)$ converges almost surely to that of $\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(X)$ in the sense of d_{B} as the sample size increases.*

1.2. **Related literature.** The authors of [MV13] provide a recent and comprehensive survey of clustering methods on directed networks. Of these methods, *spectral clustering* via the *directed Laplacian* ([Chu05]) has achieved some popularity. Hierarchical clustering methods based on directed spectral clustering have been proposed by [PM05] and [Gle06]. Similar approaches for flat clustering have been carried out by [ZHS05] and [ADN+08]. However, while these methods have been analyzed and tested on benchmark data, their consistency/convergence properties remain unknown. Perhaps this is due to the complications that arise when generalizing the ideas of spectral clustering to directed settings; we remark that even in the undirected setting, convergence results for flat spectral clustering were unknown until [VLBB08]. Several other methods for clustering directed networks are described in [MV13], but we note that even the most convincing of these methods lack supporting evidence for convergence.

In the setting of persistent homology methods for asymmetric data, an interesting line of work was carried out in [EW16]. Here the data consisted of asymmetric dissimilarity matrices arising from Bregman divergences. Other approaches for working with asymmetric data were studied in [Tur16, CM16] and [CM17b]. As in the case of hierarchical clustering, there appears to be no prior work towards convergence of persistent homology methods for directed networks.

In our work we analyze the convergence of certain extensions of the *nonreciprocal* and *reciprocal* hierarchical clustering methods that appeared in [CMRS13, CMRS17]. Both these methods are relatives of single linkage hierarchical clustering, for which efficient algorithms exist ([Sib73]). Single linkage is also the only hierarchical clustering method for which meaningful convergence results exist [Das16], dating back to [Har81] and continuing in recent times with [CM10], [CDKvL14] and [EBW15] (for modified versions of single linkage). Along the persistent homology front, we study the constructions that were presented in [CM16] for finite networks, and extend these constructions to the compact setting. After showing that these persistent homology methods are well-defined, we state and prove their convergence properties.

Our definition (Definition 1) of a directed network is very general, so our methods accept a wide variety of input. Interesting examples of such inputs include points sampled from a *Finsler* manifold, which is the directed generalization of a Riemannian manifold. While there has been recent interest in clustering points sampled from Riemannian manifolds ([BNR+13], [CGOS13], [EBW15]), nothing seems to be known in the case of Finsler manifolds.

1.3. **Notation and preliminaries.** We write $\mathbb{R}$ to denote the real numbers, and $\mathbb{R}_+$ to denote the nonnegative reals. Similarly we write $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+$ to denote the integers and nonnegative integers, respectively. By $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the natural numbers, which we understand to be $\{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$. Given a set S, we write $|S|$ to denote its cardinality, and $\mathrm{pow}(S)$ to denote the nonempty elements of the power set of S. For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$, an open ball of radius ε is denoted $B(r, \varepsilon)$. Given a function $f : X \to Y$ and a subset $A \subseteq X$, we write $f(A)$ to denote the set $\{f(x) : x \in A\}$. All topological spaces are assumed to be second countable and Hausdorff. An *open cover* of a topological space X is a collection of open sets $\{U_i \subseteq X : i \in I\}$ indexed by some set I such that each U_i is nonempty, and $\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i = X$. The *connected components* of a topological space X are the maximal connected subsets of X—they are disjoint, nonempty, and closed.

Given a topological space X, we will write $\mathrm{Borel}(X)$ to denote the Borel σ-field on X. We often write $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to denote a probability space. The support of a measure μ_X on a topological space X is defined as:

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X) := \{x \in X : \text{ for each open neighborhood } N_x \ni x, \text{ we have } \mu_X(N_x) > 0\}.$$

The complement of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ is the union of open sets of measure zero. It follows that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ is closed, hence compact.

Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and a measurable space $(X, \mathcal{G})$, a *random variable* (defined on Ω with values in X) is a measurable function $x : \Omega \to X$. The *pushforward* or *image measure* of x is defined to be the measure $(x)_*\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ given by writing $(x)_*\mathbb{P}(A) := \mathbb{P}(x^{-1}[A])$ for all $A \in \mathcal{G}$. The pushforward is often called the *distribution* of x.

We recall an important corollary of the existence of infinite products of probability measures. For any probability space $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mu_X)$, there exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{E}, \mathbb{P})$ on which there are independent random variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots$ taking values in X with distribution μ_X [Dud02, §8.2]. This is done by letting $\Omega := \prod_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X$ and taking each x_i to be the canonical projection map $(\omega_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \mapsto \omega_i$.

A *metric space* is a set X together with a function $d_X : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $x, x', x'' \in X$, we have $d_X(x, x') = 0$ iff $x = x'$, $d_X(x, x') = d_X(x', x)$, and $d_X(x, x'') \leqslant d_X(x, x') + d_X(x', x'')$. An *ultrametric space* is a metric space (X, u_X) satisfying the strong triangle inequality: for all $x, x', x'' \in X$, $u_X(x, x'') \leqslant \max(u_X(x, x'), u_X(x', x''))$.

Proofs not contained in the main text have been relegated to Appendix A.

2. The Network Distance

As we mentioned in the introduction, in order to state convergence results, we define a dissimilarity measure $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ on $\mathcal{CN}$. A related method, using the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between compact metric spaces, was used in [CM10] to prove convergence of metric space clustering methods.

Intuitively, given two networks $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ and $(Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y)$, one measures their dissimilarity by matching nodes of X with nodes of Y and then calculating the "deviation" in edge weights. This can be done using the *distortion* of *correspondences*.

Definition 2 (Correspondence)**.** Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{CN}$. A *correspondence between X and Y* is a relation $R \subseteq X \times Y$ such that $\pi_X(R) = X$ and $\pi_Y(R) = Y$, where π_X and π_Y are the canonical projections of $X \times Y$ onto X and Y, respectively. The collection of all correspondences between X and Y will be denoted $\mathscr{R}(X, Y)$, abbreviated to $\mathscr{R}$ when the context is clear.

Definition 3 (Distortion and the network distance)**.** Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{CN}$ and let $R \in \mathscr{R}(X, Y)$. The *distortion* of R is given by $\mathrm{dis}(R) := \sup_{(x,y),(x',y')\in R} |\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') - \mathfrak{e}_Y(y, y')|$. The *network distance* between X and Y is defined as:

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}((X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y)) := \tfrac{1}{2} \inf_{R\in\mathscr{R}} \mathrm{dis}(R).$$

The distance $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between compact metric spaces [BBI01]. In order to provide a self-contained presentation, additional material related to $d_{\mathcal{N}}$, including examples, is provided in Appendix C. The next theorem justifies calling $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ a network *distance*:

Theorem 2 ([CM17a])**.** *The function $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a pseudometric on $\mathcal{CN}$.*

For our purposes in this paper, it turns out that a reformulation of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ is more useful. First we define the distortion of a map between two networks. Given any $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{CN}$ and a map $\varphi : (X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \to (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y)$, the *distortion* of φ is defined as:

$$\mathrm{dis}(\varphi) := \sup_{x,x'\in X} |\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') - \mathfrak{e}_Y(\varphi(x), \varphi(x'))|.$$

Next, given maps $\varphi : (X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \to (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y)$ and $\psi : (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \to (X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$, we define two *co-distortion* terms:

$$C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi) := \sup_{(x,y)\in X\times Y} |\mathfrak{e}_X(x, \psi(y)) - \mathfrak{e}_Y(\varphi(x), y)|,$$
$$C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi) := \sup_{(y,x)\in Y\times X} |\mathfrak{e}_Y(y, \varphi(x)) - \mathfrak{e}_X(\psi(y), x)|.$$

Theorem 3 (Reformulation via maps)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{CN}$. Then,*

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) = \tfrac{1}{2} \inf\{\max(\mathrm{dis}(\varphi), \mathrm{dis}(\psi), C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi), C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi)) : \varphi : X \to Y, \psi : Y \to X \text{ any maps}\}.$$

Remark 4. Theorem 3 is analogous to a result of Kalton and Ostrovskii [KO97] and has already appeared with proof in the setting of finite networks in [CM16]. We provide full details in Appendix A along with the modifications needed for the result to hold in the setting of compact networks.

3. Results on finite approximation of networks

We now develop a framework that will enable us to approximate any network by a *finite subnetwork*. Notably, the ε-systems that we develop below are vital in proving the sampling results in this paper.

Definition 4 (ε-systems)**.** Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For any network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$, an *ε-system on X* is a finite open cover $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \ldots, U_n\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, of X such that for any $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n$, we have $\mathfrak{e}_X(U_i, U_j) \subseteq B(r_{ij}, \varepsilon)$ for some $r_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$.

In some cases, we will be interested in the situation where X is a finite union of connected components $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. By a *refined ε-system*, we will mean an ε-system such that each element of the ε-system is contained in precisely one connected component of X.

The next theorem is a restatement of Theorem 1 [CM17a]; we state it here in a slightly augmented form and remark that this form follows from the proof provided in [CM17a] with little extra work.

Theorem 5 ($\exists$ of refined ε-systems)**.** *Any network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ has a refined ε-system for any $\varepsilon > 0$.*



FIGURE 1. Elements of an ε-system on X, as described in Definition 4.

The preceding result shows that refined ε-systems always exist; this result relies crucially on the assumption that the network is compact. The proof of the theorem is delicate and requires careful arguments using the continuity of $\mathfrak{e}_X : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ and the compactness of $X \times X$. In the setting of compact subsets of Euclidean space or compact metric spaces, ε-systems are easy to construct: we can just take a cover by ε-balls, and then extract a finite subcover by invoking compactness. The strength of Theorem 5 lies in proving the existence of ε-systems even when symmetry and triangle inequality (key requirements needed to guarantee the standard properties of ε-balls) *are not assumed*. The next result shows that by sampling points from all the elements of an ε-system, one obtains a finite, quantitatively good approximation to the underlying network.

Theorem 6 (ε-systems and $d_{\mathcal{N}}$)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network, let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be an ε-system on X. Suppose X' is any finite subset of X that has nonempty intersection with each element in $\mathcal{U}$. Then there exists a correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(X, X')$ such that $\mathrm{dis}(R') < 4\varepsilon$, and for each $(x, x') \in R'$ we have $\{x, x'\} \in U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. In particular, it follows that*

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}\big((X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (X', \mathfrak{e}_X|_{X'\times X'})\big) < 2\varepsilon.$$

The first statement in the preceding theorem asserts that we can choose a "well-behaved" correspondence that associates to each point in X a point in X' that belongs to the same element in the ε-system. We will make use of this assertion in Lemma 12.

Given a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X and some $\varepsilon > 0$, a natural question to ask is the following: what should it mean to take an *optimal* ε-system on X? The next definition sheds some light on this question.

Definition 5. Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network with a Borel probability measure μ_X. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be any ε-system on X. We define the *minimal mass function* $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}) := \min\{\mu_X(U) : U \in \mathcal{U},\ \mu_X(U) > 0\}$. Note that $\mathfrak{m}$ returns the minimal non-zero mass of an element in $\mathcal{U}$.

Next let $\varepsilon > 0$. Define a function $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon : \mathcal{CN} \to (0, 1]$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon(X) := \sup\{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}) : \mathcal{U} \text{ a refined } \varepsilon\text{-system on } X\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{U}$ covers X, we know that the total mass of $\mathcal{U}$ is 1. Thus the set of elements $\mathcal{U}$ with positive mass is nonempty, and so $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U})$ is strictly positive. It follows that $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon(X)$ is strictly positive. More is true when μ_X is fully supported on X: given any ε-system $\mathcal{U}$ on X and any $U \in \mathcal{U}$, we automatically have $\mu_X(U) > 0$. To see this, suppose $\mu_X(U) = 0$. Then $U \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_X) = \varnothing$, which is a contradiction because $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X) = X$ and $U \cap X \neq \varnothing$ by our convention for an open cover (i.e. that empty elements are excluded, see §1.3).

In the preceding definition, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon(X)$ considers the collection of all *refined* ε-systems on X, and then maximizes the minimal mass of any element in such an ε-system. For an example, consider the setting of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$: ε-systems can be constructed using ε-balls, and the mass of an ε-ball scales as ε^d. The functions in Definition 5 are crucial to the next result, which shows that as we sample points from a distribution on a network, the sampled subnetwork converges almost surely to the support of the distribution.

Theorem 7 (Probabilistic network approximation)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_i : \Omega \to X$ be an independent random variable defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with distribution μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X), \mathbb{X}_n(\omega)) \geqslant \varepsilon\}\big) \leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))},$$

where $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ is the subnetwork induced by $\{x_1(\omega), \ldots, x_n(\omega)\}$. In particular, the subnetwork $\mathbb{X}_n$ converges almost surely to X in the $d_{\mathcal{N}}$-sense.

As noted before, the mass of an ε-ball in d-dimensional Euclidean space scales as ε^d. Thus in the setting of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, the quantity on the right would scale as $\varepsilon^{-d}(1 - \varepsilon^d)^n$. Before proving the theorem, we prove the following useful lemma:

Lemma 8. *Assume the setup of $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$, μ_X, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and $\mathbb{X}_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Theorem 7. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$ be a refined ε-system on $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X)$. For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the following event:*

$$A_i := \bigcap_{k=1}^{n} \{\omega \in \Omega : x_k(\omega) \notin U_i\} \subseteq \Omega.$$

Then we have $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U})}(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}))^n$.

Proof of Lemma 8. Here we are considering the probability that at least one of the U_i has empty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n$. By independence, $\mathbb{P}(A_i) = (1 - \mu_X(U_i))^n$. Then we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(A_k) = \sum_{k=1}^m (1 - \mu_X(U_k))^n \leqslant m \cdot \max_{1 \leqslant k \leqslant m} (1 - \mu(U_k))^n \leqslant \frac{(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}))^n}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U})}.$$

Here the first inequality follows by subadditivity of measure, and the last inequality follows because the total mass $\mu_X(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X)) = 1$ is an upper bound for $m \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U})$. Note also that each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ has nonzero mass, by the observation in Definition 5. □

Proof of Theorem 7. By endowing $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ with the restriction of $\mathfrak{e}_X$ to $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X) \times \mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ it may itself be viewed as a network with full support, so for notational convenience, we assume $X = \mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$.

First observe that $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X) \in (0, 1]$. Let $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))$, and let $\mathcal{U}_r$ be an $\varepsilon/2$-system on X such that $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r) \in (r, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)]$. For convenience, write $m := |\mathcal{U}_r|$, and also write $\mathcal{U}_r = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$. For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, define A_i as in the statement of Lemma 8. Then by Lemma 8, the probability that at least one U_i has empty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n$ is bounded as $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r))^n$. On the other hand, if U_i has nonempty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, then by Theorem 6, we obtain $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, \mathbb{X}_n) < \varepsilon$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define: $B_n := \{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, \mathbb{X}_n(\omega)) \geqslant \varepsilon\}$. Then we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(B_n) \leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r))^n}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}.$$

Since $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))$ was arbitrary, letting r approach $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)$ shows that $\mathbb{P}(B_n) \leqslant \frac{(1-\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)}$. We have by Definition 5 that $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)$ is strictly positive. Thus the term on the right side of the inequality is an element of a convergent geometric series, so

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(B_n) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))^n < \infty.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n\to\infty} B_n) = 0$. The result follows. □

Throughout this section, we described the idea behind sampling from a directed network. In the preceding theorem, we proved the important result that the sampled subnetwork converges to the actual underlying network as the sample size increases. We will introduce a few more definitions in the next section, where we discuss connectivity and induce networks from preexisting partitions of a network. Then we will be ready to define hierarchical clustering methods on directed networks and to prove related convergence results.

3.1. **Chain cost and path-connectedness.**

Definition 6 (The modified weight $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}$ and path-connectedness)**.** Given a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$, one defines a new weight function $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ by writing the following for $x, x' \in X$:

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x, x') := \max\left(\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x), \mathfrak{e}_X(x, x'), \mathfrak{e}_X(x', x')\right).$$

To say that $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is *path-connected* means that given any $x, x' \in X$, there exists $r_{x,x'} \in X$ and a continuous function $\gamma : [0, 1] \to X$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma(1) = x'$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $0 = t_0 \leqslant t_1 \leqslant t_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant t_n = 1$ such that:

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X\left(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})\right) \in (r_{x,x'} - \varepsilon, r_{x,x'} + \varepsilon) \text{ for each } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant n - 1. \tag{1}$$

Notice that when $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is a metric space, all the self weights $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x)$ are zero, so that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X = \mathfrak{e}_X$. Observe that when viewing a compact subspace of Euclidean space as a network, where the weight function is given by Euclidean distance, the preceding definition agrees with the standard notion of path connectedness. Note that if $\gamma(t)$ connecting x to x' satisfies (1), because of the asymmetry of $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X$, it does not follow that the reverse curve $\gamma(1 - t)$ connecting x' to x will satisify (1).

Lemma 9. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a path-connected network. Then there exists a unique $r_X \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x) = r_X$ for all $x \in X$. In the case of metric spaces, one has $r_X = 0$.*

Definition 7 (Path-connectivity constant)**.** Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a path-connected network. Then we define its *path-connectivity constant* $\mathfrak{pc}_X$ to be the real number r_X obtained via Lemma 9.

Definition 8 (Networks arising from disconnected networks)**.** Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network such that X is a finite union of path-connected components $\{U_a : a \in A\}$, where A is a (finite) indexing set and each U_a is compact. Let $\nu_A : A \times A \to \mathbb{R}$ be the map given by writing, for each $a, a' \in A$,

$$\nu_A(a, a') := \min\left\{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x, x') : x \in U_a, x' \in U_a'\right\}.$$

Then (A, ν_A) is a network. The construction of ν_A is illustrated in Figure 2. In the three-component network X at the top, the solid lines mark the minimizers of $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X$ between components. The three-node network on the bottom is the induced network with weights given by ν.

Analogously, one induces a *symmetric* network by defining λ_A as follows:

$$\lambda_A(a, a') := \min\left\{\max(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x, x'), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x', x)) : x \in U_a,\ x' \in U_{a'}\right\}.$$

The following definition will be useful in the next section.

Definition 9 (Chains and directed cost)**.** A *chain* c from x to x' is defined to be a finite ordered set of points starting at x and reaching x':

$$c = \left\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n : x_0 = x, x_1 = x', x_i \in X \text{ for all } i\right\}.$$

The collection of all chains from x to x' will be denoted $C_X(x, x')$. The *(directed) cost* of a chain $c \in C_X(x, x')$ is defined as follows: $\mathrm{cost}_X(c) := \max_{x_i, x_{i+1} \in c} \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

Remark 10 (Equivalence of ultrametrics and dendrograms)**.** Before proceeding to the next section, we remind the reader that any ultrametric has a lossless representation as a dendrogram, and conversely, any dendrogram has a lossless representation as an ultrametric [JS71]. By virtue of this result, we write the outputs of hierarchical clustering methods as ultrametrics. As shown in [SCM16], a similar duality holds even in the setting of (asymmetric) networks, up to a small modification of definitions. In particular, the output of an HC method on a network is a network in itself, along with some special structure that allows it to be visualized as a (generalized) dendrogram.



FIGURE 2. Networks arising from disconnected networks

4. THE NONRECIPROCAL CLUSTERING METHOD: DEFINITION AND CONVERGENCE

We now present the nonreciprocal hierarchical clustering method for directed networks.

Definition 10 (Nonreciprocal clustering)**.** The *nonrecriprocal clustering method* is a map $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}} : \mathcal{CN} \to \mathcal{CN}$ given by $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \mapsto (X, u_X^{\mathrm{NR}})$, where $u_X^{\mathrm{NR}} : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by writing, for each $x, x' \in X$,

$$u_X^{\mathrm{NR}}(x, x') := \max\left(\inf_{c \in C_X(x,x')} \mathrm{cost}_X(c), \inf_{c \in C_X(x',x)} \mathrm{cost}_X(c)\right).$$

The output u_X^{NR} is symmetric and satisfies the *ultrametric inequality*, so it can be represented as a tree [SS03, §7.2]. Compare this to the *cluster trees* discussed by [Har75]. The idea behind this definition is easily summarized: two points x and x' belong to the same cluster at resolution δ if there are directed paths $x \to x'$ and $x' \to x$, each with cost $\leqslant \delta$.

Lemma 11 (Nonreciprocal clustering on a path connected network)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a path-connected network with path-connectivity constant $\mathfrak{pc}_X$ (cf. Definition 6). Then $(X, u_X^{\mathrm{NR}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is given by writing $u_X^{\mathrm{NR}}(x, x') = \mathfrak{pc}_X$ for all $x, x' \in X$.*

Lemma 12 (Nonreciprocal clustering collapses path-connected subsets)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network such that X can be written as a finite union of compact, path-connected components $\{X_a : a \in A\}$. Let (A, ν_A) be as in Definition 8, and let $(A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(A, \nu_A)$. Also let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$ be a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system on X.*

Suppose that $S \subseteq X$ is a finite subset equipped with the restriction $\mathfrak{e}_S := \mathfrak{e}_X|_{S \times S}$ such that S has nonempty intersection with X_a for each $a \in A$, and with U_i for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Then,

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}\left((S, u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}), (A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}})\right) < \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 13 (Convergence of nonreciprocal clustering)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X. Suppose $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X)$ is a finite union of compact, path-connected components $\{X_a : a \in A\}$. Let (A, ν_A) be as in Definition 8, and let $(A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(A, \nu_A)$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_i : \Omega \to X$ be an independent random variable defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with distribution μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, and for each $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ denote the subnetwork induced by $\{x_1(\omega), \ldots, x_n(\omega)\}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))\right)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X))}.$$

In particular, the output of the nonreciprocal clustering method applied to the sampled network X_n converges almost surely to (A, u_A^{NR}) in the sense of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the sample size increases.

We end this section with an application of nonreciprocal clustering to Finsler manifolds.

Proposition 14 (Nonreciprocal clustering on Finsler manifolds)**.** *Let $(M, F_M, \mathfrak{e}_M)$ be a compact, connected Finsler manifold without boundary, where $\mathfrak{e}_M$ is the asymmetric weight function induced by the Finsler function F_M. Then $u_M^{\mathrm{NR}}(x, x') = 0$ for all $x, x' \in M$.*

Proof of Proposition 14. Let $x, x' \in M$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\gamma, \gamma' : [0, 1] \to M$ be curves from x to x' and from x' to x, respectively. By choosing n uniformly separated points on $\gamma([0, 1])$ and $\gamma'([0, 1])$ for sufficiently large n, we obtain finite chains c and c' on $\gamma([0, 1])$ and $\gamma'([0, 1])$ such that $\max(\operatorname{cost}_M(c), \operatorname{cost}_M(c')) < \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we obtain $u_M^{\mathrm{NR}}(x, x') = 0$. □

5. The reciprocal clustering method: definition and convergence

Definition 11 (Reciprocal clustering)**.** The *recriprocal clustering method* is a map $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}} : \mathcal{CN} \to \mathcal{CN}$ given by $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \mapsto (X, u_X^{\mathrm{R}})$, where $u_X^{\mathrm{R}} : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by writing, for each $x, x' \in X$,

$$u_X^{\mathrm{R}}(x, x') := \inf_{c \in C_X(x, x')} \max_{x_i, x_{i+1} \in c} \left(\max\left(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x_i, x_{i+1}), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x_{i+1}, x_i)\right)\right). \tag{2}$$

The function u_X^{R} satisfies the ultrametric inequality, so it can be represented as a tree [SS03, §7.2].

Our convergence result for reciprocal clustering requires two additional assumption on the underlying network: (1) the weight function is a dissimilarity measure (i.e. self-weights are 0), and (2) the asymmetry is bounded. This is clarified in the following definition.

Definition 12 (Dissimilarity weights and finite reversibility)**.** The weight function $\mathfrak{e}_X$ of a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is called a *dissimilarity* if $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') = 0$ if and only if $x = x'$, for all $x \in X$, and $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') \geqslant 0$ for all $x, x' \in X$. The *reversibility* ρ_X of a network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ with dissimilarity weights is defined to be $\rho_X := \sup_{x \neq x' \in X} \frac{\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x')}{\mathfrak{e}_X(x', x)}$. We always have $\rho_X \geqslant 1$. Finally, $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is said to have *finite reversibility* if $\rho_X < \infty$.

Dissimilarity networks with finite reversibility are very natural: all metric spaces have reversibility 1, and the main objects of interest when studying Finsler manifolds or directed metric spaces are those with finite reversibility ([BCS12, SZ10]). When viewed as networks, the weight functions of these spaces are always dissimilarities.

The following result is a statement of the convergence of reciprocal hierarchical clustering. A detailed proof is provided in the appendix.

Theorem 15 (Convergence of reciprocal clustering)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network with dissimilarity weights and finite reversibility equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X. Suppose $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_X)$ is a finite union of compact, path-connected components $\{X_a : a \in A\}$. Let (A, λ_A) be as in Definition 8, and let $(A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(A, \lambda_A)$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_i : \Omega \to X$ be an independent random variable defined on some probability*

space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with distribution μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, and for each $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ denote the subnetwork induced by $\{x_1(\omega), \ldots, x_n(\omega)\}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X), A)\right)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X), A)}.$$

In particular, the output of the reciprocal clustering method applied to the sampled network $\mathbb{X}_n$ converges almost surely to (A, u_A^{R}) in the sense of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the sample size increases.

In the case of Finsler manifolds with finite reversibility, we can also recover the result of Proposition 14.

Proposition 16 (Reciprocal clustering on Finsler manifolds with finite reversibility)**.** *Let $(M, F_M, \mathfrak{e}_m)$ be a compact, connected finitely-reversible Finsler manifold without boundary. Here $\mathfrak{e}_M$ is the asymmetric weight function induced by the Finsler function F_M. Then $u_M^{\mathrm{R}}(x, x') = 0$ for all $x, x' \in M$.*

Proof of Proposition 16. Let $x, x' \in M$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\gamma : [0, 1] \to M$ be a curve from x to x'. By invoking the finite reversibility of M, choose n uniformly separated points $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ on $\gamma([0, 1])$ for sufficiently large n such that $\max(\overline{\mathfrak{e}}_M(x_i, x_{i+1}), \overline{\mathfrak{e}}_M(x_{i+1}, x_i)) < \varepsilon$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$. Here $x_1 = x$ and $x_n = x'$. Then $u_M^{\mathrm{R}}(x, x') < \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the result follows. □

6. Persistent homology methods and convergence

In this section, we describe two persistent homology methods that have appeared in the literature and prove their convergence. We begin with the definition of a *persistent vector space*. Throughout this section, all our vector spaces are assumed to be over a fixed ground field $\mathbb{F}$.

Definition 13. A *persistent vector space* $\mathcal{V}$ is a family $\{V^\delta \xrightarrow{\nu_{\delta,\delta'}} V^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$ of vector spaces and linear maps such that: (1) $\nu_{\delta,\delta}$ is the identity map for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and (2) $\nu_{\delta,\delta''} = \nu_{\delta',\delta''} \circ \nu_{\delta,\delta'}$ whenever $\delta \leqslant \delta' \leqslant \delta''$.

Recall that conventional hierarchical clustering methods take in metric data as input and produce ultrametrics as output that are in turn faithfully visualized as dendrograms. A conventional persistent homology method (e.g. Rips or Čech) yields a higher dimensional analogue of this process: it takes a metric dataset as input, and outputs a persistent vector space $\mathcal{V}$ that is faithfully represented as a *persistence diagram* $\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{V})$. A classification result in [CZCG05, §5.2] shows that the persistence diagram is a full invariant of a persistent vector space. This completes the analogy with the setting of hierarchical clustering.

Persistence diagrams can be compared using the *bottleneck distance*, which we denote by d_{B}. We point the reader to [CDSGO16] and references therein for details.

While the persistence diagram and bottleneck distance are the primary tools in practical applications, theoretical proofs are often made simpler through the language of *interleavings* and *interleaving distance*. We present this next.

Definition 14 (ε-interleaving, [CCSG+09])**.** Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U^\delta \xrightarrow{s_{\delta,\delta'}} U^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{V^\delta \xrightarrow{t_{\delta,\delta'}} V^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$ be two persistent vector spaces. Given $\varepsilon \geqslant 0$, $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are said to be *ε-interleaved* if there exist two families of linear maps $\{\varphi_\delta : U^\delta \to V^{\delta+\varepsilon}\}_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\psi_\delta : V^\delta \to U^{\delta+\varepsilon}\}_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}}$ such that: (1) $\varphi_{\delta'} \circ s_{\delta,\delta'} = t_{\delta+\varepsilon,\delta'+\varepsilon} \circ \varphi_\delta$, (2) $\psi_{\delta'} \circ t_{\delta,\delta'} = s_{\delta+\varepsilon,\delta'+\varepsilon} \circ \psi_\delta$, (3) $s_{\delta,\delta+2\varepsilon} = \psi_{\delta+\varepsilon} \circ \varphi_\delta$, and (4) $t_{\delta,\delta+2\varepsilon} = \varphi_{\delta+\varepsilon} \circ \psi_\delta$ for each $\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}$.

The *interleaving distance* between $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is then defined as:

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) := \inf\{\varepsilon \geqslant 0 : \mathcal{U} \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \text{ are } \varepsilon\text{-interleaved}\}.$$

The interleaving and bottleneck distances are connected by the *Isometry Theorem*, which states that the two distances are in fact equivalent. Various forms of this theorem have appeared in the literature; we will end this section with a statement of this result that appears in [CDSGO16].

Our aim in this work is to describe the convergence of persistent homology methods applied to network data. When dealing with finite networks, the vector spaces resulting from applying a persistent homology method will necessarily be finite dimensional. However, our setting is that of infinite (more specifically,

compact) networks, and so we need additional machinery to ensure that our methods output well-defined persistent vector spaces. The following definition and theorem are provided in full detail in [CDSGO16].

Definition 15 (§2.1, [CDSGO16])**.** A persistent vector space $\mathcal{V} = \{V^\delta \xrightarrow{\nu_{\delta,\delta'}} V^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$ is *q-tame* if $\nu_{\delta,\delta'}$ has finite rank whenever $\delta < \delta'$.

Theorem 17 ([CDSGO16], also [CDSO14] Theorem 2.3)**.** *Any q-tame persistent vector space $\mathcal{V}$ has a well-defined persistence diagram* $\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{V})$*. If $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ are ε-interleaved q-tame persistent vector spaces, then* $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{U}), \mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{V})) \leqslant \varepsilon$.

We conclude this section with a statement of the isometry theorem.

Theorem 18 (Theorem 5.14, [CDSGO16])**.** *Let $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ be q-tame persistent vector spaces. Then,*

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}).$$

6.1. **Rips and Dowker persistent homology methods on networks.** We now present methods of producing persistent vector spaces from network data. For finite networks, these methods have already appeared in [CM16]. In this paper, our goal is to define these methods for compact networks and to establish their convergence properties.

Definition 16 (Rips complexes)**.** Given a compact network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the *Rips complex at resolution δ* is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{R}_\delta(X) := \{\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X) : \sigma \text{ finite}, \max_{x,x' \in \sigma} \mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') \leqslant \delta\}.$$

The Rips complex construction is the simplest to understand, because it is a direct generalization of the Rips complex of a metric space (at a given resolution). This definition yields a simplicial filtration $\{\mathfrak{R}_\delta(X) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{\delta'}(X)\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$. Applying the simplicial homology functor in dimension k (for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) to this filtration yields the *Rips persistent vector space* $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(X)$.

Next we describe two constructions—the Dowker source and sink complexes—that are asymmetric generalizations of the Čech complex of a metric space.

Definition 17 (Dowker complexes)**.** Given a compact network $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the *Dowker sink-complex at resolution δ* is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{D}_\delta^{\mathrm{si}}(X) := \{\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X) : \sigma \text{ finite}, \min_{p \in X} \max_{x \in \sigma} \mathfrak{e}_X(x, p) \leqslant \delta\}.$$

Similarly, the *Dowker source-complex at resolution δ* is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{D}_\delta^{\mathrm{so}}(X) := \{\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X) : \sigma \text{ finite}, \min_{p \in X} \max_{x \in \sigma} \mathfrak{e}_X(p, x) \leqslant \delta\}.$$

The Dowker sink and source complexes are different in general when X is asymmetric. Surprisingly, the persistent vector spaces obtained from the sink and source filtrations *are equivalent*. This result was established in [CM16] in the setting of finite networks. For compact networks, the statement is as follows.

Theorem 19 (Dowker duality)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a compact network, and let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathrm{si}}(X) = \mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathrm{so}}(X).$$

The proof is via a functorial generalization of Dowker's Theorem [Dow52], which holds in the case of infinite sets. Alternatively, a functorial generalization of the Nerve Lemma can also be used to prove this result, as suggested in [CDSO14]. Hence we denote the resulting persistent vector space (in dimension $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) as $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X)$, without distinguishing between sink and source constructions.

The following lemma essentially follows from arguments presented in [CM16], along with minor modifications to fit the setting of compact networks.

Lemma 20 (Relations between $d_{\mathcal{N}}$ and d_{I})**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ and $(Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y)$ be two networks. Let $\varepsilon > 2d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y)$. Then $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(X)$ and $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(Y)$ are ε-interleaved, and so are $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X)$ and $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)$.*

Theorem 21. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \in \mathcal{CN}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then both $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(X)$ and $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X)$ are q-tame.*

The metric space analogue of Theorem 21 appeared in [CDSO14, Proposition 5.1]; the same proof structure works in the setting of networks after applying our results on approximation via ε-systems.

Proof of Theorem 21. Both cases are similar, so we just prove the case of $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X)$. For convenience, write $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X) = \{V^\delta \xrightarrow{\nu_{\delta,\delta'}} V^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$. Let $\delta < \delta'$. We need to show $\nu_{\delta,\delta'}$ has finite rank. Write $\varepsilon := (\delta' - \delta)/2$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an $\varepsilon/4$-system on X (this requires Theorem 5). Then by Theorem 6 we pick a finite subset $X' \subseteq X$ such that $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, X') < \varepsilon/2$. Then $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X')$ and $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X)$ are ε-interleaved. For convenience, write $\mathbf{PVec}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X') = \{U^\delta \xrightarrow{\mu_{\delta,\delta'}} U^{\delta'}\}_{\delta \leqslant \delta' \in \mathbb{R}}$. Then the map $\nu_{\delta,\delta'} : V^\delta \to V^{\delta'}$ factorizes through $U^{\delta+\varepsilon}$ via interleaving maps $V^\delta \to U^{\delta+\varepsilon} \to V^{\delta+2\varepsilon} = V^{\delta'}$. Since $U^{\delta+\varepsilon}$ is finite dimensional, it follows that $\nu_{\delta,\delta'}$ has finite rank. This concludes the proof. □

Corollary 22 (Stability)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{CN}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then,*

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(X), \mathrm{Dgm}_k^{\mathfrak{R}}(Y)) \leqslant 2 d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y), \quad \textit{and} \quad d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(X), \mathrm{Dgm}_k^{\mathfrak{D}}(Y)) \leqslant 2 d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y).$$

Proof. By Theorem 21, both the Rips and Dowker persistent vector spaces of X and Y are q-tame. Thus they have well-defined persistence diagrams (Theorem 17). The result follows by Lemma 20 and Theorem 17. □

Theorem 23 (Convergence)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network equipped with a Borel probability measure μ_X. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_i : \Omega \to X$ be an independent random variable defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with distribution μ_X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{X}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)), \mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\} \big) \leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))},$$

where $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ is the subnetwork induced by $\{x_1(\omega), \ldots, x_n(\omega)\}$ and $\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet$ is either of $\mathrm{Dgm}^{\mathfrak{R}}$ and $\mathrm{Dgm}^{\mathfrak{D}}$. In particular, either of the Rips and Dowker persistent vector spaces of the subnetwork $\mathbb{X}_n$ converges almost surely to that of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ in bottleneck distance.

Proof of Theorem 23. We can consider $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ as a network with full support by endowing it with the restriction of $\mathfrak{e}_X$ to $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X) \times \mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$, so for convenience, we assume $X = \mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$. Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be such that $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, \mathbb{X}_n(\omega)) < \varepsilon/2$. Then by Corollary 22, we have that $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(X), \mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathbb{X}_n)) < \varepsilon$. By applying Theorem 7, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(X), \mathrm{Dgm}^\bullet(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\} \big) &\leqslant \mathbb{P}\big(\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, \mathbb{X}_n(\omega)) \geqslant \varepsilon/2\} \big) \\ &\leqslant \frac{\big(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))\big)^n}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/4}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof with an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma, as in the proof of Theorem 7. □

In the next section, we will apply these results to the particular example of a *directed circle* [CM17a].

7. Clustering and persistence on the directed circle

Consider the *directed unit circle* $(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1, \mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1})$, which is defined as follows:

$$\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1 := \left\{ e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{C} : \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \right\}.$$

For each $e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2} \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$,

$$\mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}) := \begin{cases} \theta_2 - \theta_1 & : \theta_1 \leqslant \theta_2, \\ 2\pi - (\theta_1 - \theta_2) & : \theta_1 > \theta_2. \end{cases}$$

Here $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ is endowed with the standard topology generated by open balls in $\mathbb{C}$, and is thus a compact topological space. Observe that $\mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}$ yields the *counterclockwise* distance, i.e. the length of a counterclockwise arc, between pairs of points on $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$. As such, it satisfies the triangle inequality and vanishes on a pair $(e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2})$ if and only if $\theta_1 = \theta_2$.

Thus $(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1, \mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1})$ becomes an example of a compact network with dissimilarity weights. Furthermore, this compact, asymmetric network admits ε-approximations for any $\varepsilon > 0$. To see this, fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider the *directed circle network on n nodes* $(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n, \mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n})$ obtained by writing

$$\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n := \left\{ e^{\frac{2\pi i k}{n}} \in \mathbb{C} : k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\} \right\},$$

and defining $\mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n}$ to be the restriction of $\mathfrak{e}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}$ on this set. An illustration of $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ and $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n$ for $n = 6$ is provided in Figure 3. In [CM17a], it was shown that $d_{\mathcal{N}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1, \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_6) \leqslant \pi/3$, and that more generally, we have the following:

Theorem 24 ([CM17a]). *As $n \to \infty$, the sequence of finite networks $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n$ limits to the compact network $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ in the sense of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$.*

The directed circles on n nodes are closely related to the *cycle networks on n nodes* that were introduced in [CM16]. The only difference is that a cycle network on n nodes has largest edge weight n, whereas $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n$ is normalized to have largest edge weight $2\pi - 2\pi/n$. The 1-dimensional Dowker persistence diagrams of cycle networks with finitely many nodes were fully characterized in [CM16]. By transporting those results to our setting, we obtain:

Theorem 25 ([CM16]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then* $\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n) = \{\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}, \frac{2\pi}{n}\lceil n/2 \rceil\right) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$.



FIGURE 3. The directed circle $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ and a directed circle on 6 nodes $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_6$. By the results in [CM17a], we have $d_{\mathcal{N}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1, \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_6) \leqslant \frac{\pi}{3}$. By Theorem 25, we have $\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_6) = \{\left(\frac{\pi}{3}, \pi\right) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$.

7.1. **Characterization results.** As an explicit application of the tools developed in this paper, we provide the following characterization results regarding clustering and persistence on the directed circle. The results are illustrated in Figure 4.

Theorem 26 (Nonreciprocal clustering on $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$)**.**

$$u^{\mathrm{NR}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x, x') = 0 \text{ for all } x, x' \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1.$$

Proof of Theorem 26. We claim that $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ is path-connected, with path-connectivity constant $\mathfrak{pc}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1} = 0$ (invoking Lemma 9). The result then follows by Lemma 11.

Let $e^{i\theta} \neq e^{i\phi} \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$. Without loss of generality, suppose $\theta < \phi$. Then $\mathfrak{e}(e^{i\theta}, e^{i\phi}) = \phi - \theta$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and pick $\theta_0 < \theta_1 < \ldots < \theta_n \in [\theta, \phi]$ such that $\theta_0 := \theta$, $\theta_n := \phi$, and $\theta_k - \theta_{k-1} < \varepsilon$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Then $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\theta_{k-1}}, e^{i\theta_k}) \in B(0, \varepsilon)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$.

We also have $\mathfrak{e}(e^{i\phi}, e^{i\theta}) = 2\pi - (\phi - \theta) > 0$. But again we can pick $\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_m$ such that $\phi_0 := \phi$, $\phi_m := \theta$, and $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\phi_{k-1}}, e^{i\phi_k}) \in B(0, \varepsilon)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$.

Since $e^{i\theta} \neq e^{i\phi} \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, it follows by Definition 6 that $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ is path-connected. The preceding work shows that $\mathfrak{pc}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1} = 0$. The result follows. □

The case of nonreciprocal clustering essentially followed from an application of Theorem 13 (i.e. the special case of Lemma 11. Next we consider the application of reciprocal clustering to $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$. Notice that $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ is not finitely reversible, so we cannot apply Theorem 15 directly.

Theorem 27 (Reciprocal clustering on $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$)**.**

$$u^{\mathrm{R}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x, x') = \pi \text{ for all } x \neq x' \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1.$$

Proof of Theorem 27. Let $e^{i\theta} \neq e^{i\phi} \in \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$. Without loss of generality, suppose $\theta < \phi$. Then $\mathfrak{e}(e^{i\theta}, e^{i\phi}) = \phi - \theta$, and $\mathfrak{e}(e^{i\phi}, e^{i\theta}) = 2\pi - (\phi - \theta)$. Thus

$$\max\left(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\theta}, e^{i\phi}), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\phi}, e^{i\theta})\right) \geqslant \pi,$$

and equality is achieved when $e^{i\theta}$ and $e^{i\phi}$ are antipodal.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Write $x_0 := e^{i\theta}$, and consider the function $f : \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1 \to \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ defined by writing $f(e^{i\alpha}) = e^{i(\alpha+\pi+\varepsilon/3)}$. Here f maps a point in $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$ to an "$\varepsilon/3$-offset" of its antipode, where the offset is in the counterclockwise direction. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $x_k := f(x_{k-1})$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x_n, e^{i\phi}) \in B(\pi, \varepsilon)$. Then $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\phi}, x_n) \in B(\pi, \varepsilon)$ as well. Thus we have

$$\max\left(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\phi}, x_n), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x_n, e^{i\phi})\right) \in B(\pi, \varepsilon).$$

By construction, we also have

$$\max\left(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x_{k-1}, x_k), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(x_k, x_{k-1})\right) \in B(\pi, \varepsilon), \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Thus $u^{\mathrm{R}}_{\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1}(e^{i\theta}, e^{i\phi}) \in B(\pi, \varepsilon)$. But $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary. The result now follows. □

Finally, we consider the application of 1-dimensional Dowker persistent homology to $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$.

Theorem 28 (1-dimensional Dowker persistence of $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$)**.**

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1), \{(0, \pi)\}\right) = 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 28. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Theorem 24, $d_{\mathcal{N}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1, \vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Then by Corollary 22, $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1), \mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n)) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. By Theorem 25, $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n), \{(0, \pi)\}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough so that for all $n \geqslant N$, we have $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1), \mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n)) < \varepsilon/2$ and $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1_n), \{(0, \pi)\}) < \varepsilon/2$. Thus by triangle inequality, $d_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{Dgm}_1^{\mathfrak{D}}(\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1), \{(0, \pi)\}) < \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the result follows. □



FIGURE 4. (Left to Right): The output dendrograms of the nonreciprocal and reciprocal clustering methods on $\vec{\mathbb{S}}^1$, and a persistence barcode representing the diagram $\{(0,\pi)\}$. See Theorems 26, 27, and 28.

8. DISCUSSION

We proposed a framework for consistent sampling from general directed networks. Our framework encompasses metric spaces, directed metric spaces, and possibly infinite structures that do not satisfy any of the usual metric properties. We also proved convergence results for two hierarchical clustering methods and two persistent homology methods that apply to our model of directed networks. As an exemplification of our results, we considered a natural model of a directed circle, and characterized the behavior of these methods on this directed circle.

We are currently interested in developing other models of directed shapes and characterizing the results of applying these methods on such shapes.

Acknowledgments. This work is partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grants CCF-1526513, IIS-1422400, and DMS-1547357.

REFERENCES

[AC11] Ery Arias-Castro. Clustering based on pairwise distances when the data is of mixed dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(3):1692–1706, 2011.

[ADN+08] Konstantin Avrachenkov, Vladimir Dobrynin, Danil Nemirovsky, Son Kim Pham, and Elena Smirnova. Pagerank based clustering of hypertext document collections. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 873–874. ACM, 2008.

[BBI01] Dmitri Burago, Yuri Burago, and Sergei Ivanov. *A Course in Metric Geometry*, volume 33 of *AMS Graduate Studies in Math.* American Mathematical Society, 2001.

[BCS12] David Bao, S-S Chern, and Zhongmin Shen. *An introduction to Riemann-Finsler geometry*, volume 200. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[BNR+13] Sivaraman Balakrishnan, Srivatsan Narayanan, Alessandro Rinaldo, Aarti Singh, and Larry Wasserman. Cluster trees on manifolds. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2679–2687, 2013.

[Car09] Gunnar Carlsson. Topology and data. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2):255–308, 2009.

[CCSG+09] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, Marc Glisse, Leonidas J Guibas, and Steve Y Oudot. Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 237–246. ACM, 2009.

[CD10] Kamalika Chaudhuri and Sanjoy Dasgupta. Rates of convergence for the cluster tree. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 343–351, 2010.

[CDKvL14] Kamalika Chaudhuri, Sanjoy Dasgupta, Samory Kpotufe, and Ulrike von Luxburg. Consistent procedures for cluster tree estimation and pruning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(12):7900–7912, 2014.

[CDSGO16] Frédéric Chazal, Vin De Silva, Marc Glisse, and Steve Oudot. *The structure and stability of persistence modules*. Springer, 2016.

[CDSO14] Frédéric Chazal, Vin De Silva, and Steve Oudot. Persistence stability for geometric complexes. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 173(1):193–214, 2014.

[CGOS13] Frédéric Chazal, Leonidas J Guibas, Steve Y Oudot, and Primoz Skraba. Persistence-based clustering in riemannian manifolds. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 60(6):41, 2013.

[Chu05] Fan Chung. Laplacians and the cheeger inequality for directed graphs. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 9(1):1–19, 2005.

[CM10] Gunnar Carlsson and Facundo Mémoli. Characterization, stability and convergence of hierarchical clustering methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1425–1470, 2010.

[CM16] Samir Chowdhury and Facundo Mémoli. Persistent homology of asymmetric networks: An approach based on dowker filtrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05432*, 2016.

[CM17a] Samir Chowdhury and Facundo Mémoli. Distances and isomorphism between networks and the stability of network invariants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04727*, 2017.

[CM17b] Samir Chowdhury and Facundo Mémoli. Persistent path homology of directed networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.00565*, 2017.

[CMRS13] Gunnar Carlsson, Facundo Mémoli, Alejandro Ribeiro, and Santiago Segarra. Axiomatic construction of hierarchical clustering in asymmetric networks. In *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 5219–5223. IEEE, 2013.

[CMRS17] Gunnar Carlsson, Facundo Mémoli, Alejandro Ribeiro, and Santiago Segarra. Hierarchical clustering of asymmetric networks. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, page to appear, 2017.

[CZCG05] Gunnar Carlsson, Afra Zomorodian, Anne Collins, and Leonidas J Guibas. Persistence barcodes for shapes. *International Journal of Shape Modeling*, 11(02):149–187, 2005.

[Das16] Sanjoy Dasgupta. A cost function for similarity-based hierarchical clustering. In *Proceedings of the Forty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '16, pages 118–127. ACM, 2016.

[Dow52] Clifford H Dowker. Homology groups of relations. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 84–95, 1952.

[Dud02] Richard M Dudley. *Real analysis and probability*, volume 74. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[EBW15] Justin Eldridge, Mikhail Belkin, and Yusu Wang. Beyond hartigan consistency: Merge distortion metric for hierarchical clustering. In *COLT*, pages 588–606, 2015.

[EM14] Herbert Edelsbrunner and Dmitriy Morozov. Persistent homology: theory and practice. 2014.

[EW16] Herbert Edelsbrunner and Hubert Wagner. Topological data analysis with bregman divergences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06274*, 2016.

[FHT01] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. *The elements of statistical learning*, volume 1. Springer series in statistics Springer, Berlin, 2001.

[Gle06] David Gleich. Hierarchical directed spectral graph partitioning, 2006.

[Har75] John A Hartigan. *Clustering algorithms*, volume 209. Wiley New York, 1975.

[Har81] John A Hartigan. Consistency of single linkage for high-density clusters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76(374):388–394, 1981.

[JS71] N. Jardine and R. Sibson. *Mathematical Taxonomy*. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. Wiley, 1971.

[KO97] Nigel J Kalton and Mikhail I Ostrovskii. Distances between banach spaces. *arXiv preprint math/9709211*, 1997.

[MV13] Fragkiskos D Malliaros and Michalis Vazirgiannis. Clustering and community detection in directed networks: A survey. *Physics Reports*, 533(4):95–142, 2013.

[PM05] William Pentney and Marina Meila. Spectral clustering of biological sequence data. In *AAAI*, volume 5, pages 845–850, 2005.

[SCM16] Zane Smith, Samir Chowdhury, and Facundo Mémoli. Hierarchical representations of network data with optimal distortion bounds. *50th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, page to appear, IEEE, 2016.

[Sib73] Robin Sibson. Slink: an optimally efficient algorithm for the single-link cluster method. *The computer journal*, 16(1):30–34, 1973.

[SS03] Charles Semple and Mike A Steel. *Phylogenetics*, volume 24. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2003.

[SZ10] Yi-Bing Shen and Wei Zhao. Gromov pre-compactness theorems for nonreversible finsler manifolds. *Differential Geometry and its Applications*, 28(5):565–581, 2010.

[Tur16] Katharine Turner. Generalizations of the rips filtration for quasi-metric spaces with persistent homology stability results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00365*, 2016.

[VLBB08] Ulrike Von Luxburg, Mikhail Belkin, and Olivier Bousquet. Consistency of spectral clustering. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 555–586, 2008.

[ZHS05] Dengyong Zhou, Jiayuan Huang, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Learning from labeled and unlabeled data on a directed graph. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 1036–1043. ACM, 2005.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS

Proof of Theorem 3. First we show that:

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,Y) \geqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\inf\{\max(\mathrm{dis}(\varphi),\mathrm{dis}(\psi),C_{X,Y}(\varphi,\psi),C_{Y,X}(\psi,\varphi)) : \varphi : X \to Y, \psi : Y \to X \text{ any maps}\}.$$

Let $\varepsilon > d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,Y)$, and let R be a correspondence such that $\mathrm{dis}(R) < 2\varepsilon$. We can define maps $\varphi : X \to Y$ and $\psi : Y \to X$ as follows: for each $x \in X$, set $\varphi(x) = y$ for some y such that $(x,y) \in R$. Similarly, for each $y \in Y$, set $\psi(y) = x$ for some x such that $(x,y) \in R$.

Let $x \in X, y \in Y$. Then we have

$$|\mathfrak{e}_X(x, \psi(y)) - \mathfrak{e}_Y(\varphi(x), y)| < 2\varepsilon \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\mathfrak{e}_X(\psi(y), x) - \mathfrak{e}_Y(y, \varphi(x))| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Since $x \in X, y \in Y$ were arbitrary, it follows that $C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi) \leqslant 2\varepsilon$ and $C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi) \leqslant 2\varepsilon$.

Also for any $x, x' \in X$, we have $(x, \varphi(x)), (x', \varphi(x')) \in R$, and so

$$|\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') - \mathfrak{e}_Y(\varphi(x), \varphi(x'))| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Thus $\mathrm{dis}(\varphi) \leqslant 2\varepsilon$, and similarly $\mathrm{dis}(\psi) \leqslant 2\varepsilon$. This proves the "$\geqslant$" case.

Next we wish to show:

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2} \inf\{\max(\mathrm{dis}(\varphi), \mathrm{dis}(\psi), C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi), C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi)) : \varphi : X \to Y, \psi : Y \to X \text{ any maps}\}.$$

Suppose φ, ψ are given, and $\frac{1}{2}\max(\mathrm{dis}(\varphi), \mathrm{dis}(\psi), C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi), C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi)) < \varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let $R_X = \{(x, \varphi(x)) : x \in X\}$ and let $R_Y = \{(\psi(y), y) : y \in Y\}$. Then $R = R_X \cup R_Y$ is a correspondence. We wish to show that for any $z = (a, b), z' = (a', b') \in R$,

$$|\mathfrak{e}_X(a, a') - \mathfrak{e}_Y(b, b')| < 2\varepsilon.$$

This will show that $\mathrm{dis}(R) \leqslant 2\varepsilon$, and so $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) \leqslant \varepsilon$.

To see this, let $z, z' \in R$. Note that there are four cases: (1) $z, z' \in R_X$, (2) $z, z' \in R_Y$, (3) $z \in R_X$, $z' \in R_Y$, and (4) $z \in R_Y$, $z' \in R_X$. In the first two cases, the desired inequality follows because $\mathrm{dis}(\varphi), \mathrm{dis}(\psi) < 2\varepsilon$. The inequality follows in cases (3) and (4) because $C_{X,Y}(\varphi, \psi) < 2\varepsilon$ and $C_{Y,X}(\psi, \varphi) < 2\varepsilon$, respectively. Thus $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X, Y) \leqslant \varepsilon$. □

Proof of Theorem 6. Write $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X' = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m\}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, let $s_i \in X' \cap U_i$. Then define $S := \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\}$, and equip S with the restriction of $\mathfrak{e}_X$ to obtain a finite network.

Claim 1. Let A be a subset of X equipped with the weight function $\mathfrak{e}_X|_{A\times A}$ that has nonempty intersection with each element in $\mathcal{U}$. Then $d_{\mathcal{N}}(S, A) < \varepsilon$.

Proof of Claim 1. Observe that $\mathcal{U}$ is a cover of A, and that U_i contains s_i for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$. To avoid ambiguity in our construction, we will need to ensure that U_i does not contain s_j for $i \neq j$. So our first step is to obtain a cover of A by disjoint sets while ensuring that each $s_i \in S$ belongs to exactly one element of the new cover. We define:

$$U_1^* := U_1 \backslash S,\ U_2^* := U_2 \backslash S,\ U_3^* := U_3 \backslash S,\ \ldots,\ U_n^* := U_q \backslash S, \text{ and}$$
$$\widetilde{U}_1 := U_1^* \cup \{s_1\},\ \widetilde{U}_2 := (U_2^* \backslash \widetilde{U}_1) \cup \{s_2\},\ \widetilde{U}_3 := \left(U_3^* \backslash (\widetilde{U}_1 \cup \widetilde{U}_2)\right) \cup \{s_3\},\ \ldots,$$
$$\widetilde{U}_n := \left(U_n^* \backslash \left(\cup_{k=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{U}_k\right)\right) \cup \{s_n\}.$$

Notice that $\left\{\widetilde{U}_i : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\right\}$ is a cover for A, and for each $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n$, $\widetilde{U}_i$ contains s_j if and only if $i = j$. Now we define a correspondence between A and S as follows:

$$R := \left\{(x, s_i) : x \in A \cap \widetilde{U}_i,\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\right\}.$$

Next let $(x, s_i), (x', s_j) \in R$. Then we have $(x, x'), (s_i, s_j) \in \widetilde{U}_i \times \widetilde{U}_j \subseteq U_i \times U_j$. Therefore $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x')$ and $\mathfrak{e}_X(s_{p(i)}, s_{p(j)})$ both belong to $B(r, \varepsilon)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus we have:

$$|\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x') - \mathfrak{e}_X(s_{p(i)}, s_{p(j)})| < 2\varepsilon.$$

It follows that $\mathrm{dis}(R) < 2\varepsilon$, and so $d_{\mathcal{N}}(A, S) < \varepsilon$. ■

By Claim 1 and the triangle inequality of $d_{\mathcal{N}}$, we have $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,X') \leqslant d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,S) + d_{\mathcal{N}}(S,X') < \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$. This proves the first part of the claim.

For the second part, assume that we are in the setup of Claim 1. Then we can obtain correspondences $R \in \mathscr{R}(X',S)$ and $P \in \mathscr{R}(X,S)$ of the following form:

$$R := \left\{(x',s_i) : x' \in X' \cap \widetilde{U}_i,\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\right\}$$
$$P := \left\{(x,s_i) : x \in X \cap \widetilde{U}_i,\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\right\}.$$

Then we can define a correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(X,X')$:

$$R' := \left\{(x,x') : (x,s_i) \in P,\ (x',s_i) \in R \text{ for some } s_i \in S\right\}.$$

Finally, let $(x,x'),(z,z') \in R'$. Then there exist $s_i, s_j \in S$ such that $(x,s_i) \in P$, $(x',s_i) \in R$, and $(z,s_j) \in P$, $(z',s_j) \in R$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathfrak{e}_X(x,z) - \mathfrak{e}_X(x',z')| &= |\mathfrak{e}_X(x,z) - \mathfrak{e}_X(s_i,s_j) + \mathfrak{e}_X(s_i,s_j) - \mathfrak{e}_X(x',z')| \\ &\leqslant \operatorname{dis}(P) + \operatorname{dis}(R) < 4\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. Observe that this also gives a direct proof that $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,X') < 2\varepsilon$. □

Proof of Lemma 9. Let $x,x' \in X$ and let $r_{x,x'} \in \mathbb{R}$ be as in Definition 6. Let $(\varepsilon_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence decreasing to 0. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\gamma : [0,1] \to X$ be a continuous function such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma(1) = x'$, and there exist $t_0^n = 0 \leqslant t_1^n \leqslant t_2^n \leqslant \ldots, t_k^n = 1$ such that:

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(\gamma(t_i^n), \gamma(t_{i+1}^n)) \in B(r_{x,x'}, \varepsilon_n) \text{ for each } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1.$$

In particular, we have:

$$\left\{\mathfrak{e}_X(x,x), \mathfrak{e}_X(x',x')\right\} \subseteq B(r_{x,x'}, \varepsilon_n) \text{ for each } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1.$$

Thus $|\mathfrak{e}_X(x,x) - \mathfrak{e}_X(x',x')| \leqslant 2\varepsilon_n$. Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain $\mathfrak{e}_X(x,x) = \mathfrak{e}_X(x',x')$. Since $x' \in X$ was arbitrary, we get that $\mathfrak{e}_X(x',x') = \mathfrak{e}_X(x,x)$ for all $x' \in X$. The result now follows. □

Proof of Lemma 11. Let $x,x' \in X$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Definition 6, there exist chains $c \in C_X(x,x')$ and $c' \in C_X(x',x)$ such that $\max(\operatorname{cost}_X(c), \operatorname{cost}_X(c')) < r_X + \varepsilon$. Thus $u_X^{\mathrm{NR}}(x,x') < r_X + \varepsilon$. This holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$, and for any $x,x' \in X$. This concludes the proof. □

Remark 29 (Distortion and $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X$)**.** Let $(X,\mathfrak{e}_X),(Y,\mathfrak{e}_Y) \in \mathcal{N}$ and let $R \in \mathscr{R}(X,Y)$. Then,

$$\sup_{(x,y),(x',y')\in R} |\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x,x') - \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_Y(y,y')| \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R).$$

To see this, fix $(x,y),(x',y') \in R$. Suppose $u,u' \in \{x,x'\}$ are such that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x,x') = \mathfrak{e}_X(u,u')$. Let $v,v' \in \{y,y'\}$ be such that $(u,v),(u',v') \in R$. Then we have

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x,x') = \mathfrak{e}_X(u,u') \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R) + \mathfrak{e}_Y(v,v') \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R) + \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_Y(y,y').$$

Now let $v,v' \in \{y,y'\}$ be such that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_Y(y,y') = \mathfrak{e}_Y(v,v')$. Let $u,u' \in \{x,x'\}$ be such that $(u,v),(u',v') \in R$. Then,

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_Y(y,y') = \mathfrak{e}_Y(v,v') \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R) + \mathfrak{e}_X(u,u') \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R) + \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x,x').$$

It follows that $|\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x,x') - \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_Y(y,y')| \leqslant \operatorname{dis}(R)$.

Proof of Lemma 12. For each $x \in X$, let $a(x) \in A$ denote the index such that $x \in X_{a(x)}$. Then define:

$$R := \{(s,a(s)) : s \in S\}.$$

Then $R \in \mathscr{R}(S,A)$. We wish to show $\operatorname{dis}(R) < 2\varepsilon$, where the distortion is calculated with respect to u_S^{NR} and u_A^{NR}. Let $(s,a(s)),(s',a(s')) \in R$.

Claim 2. We have $u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s),a(s')) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s,s')$.

Proof. Pick chains

$$c_1 := \left\{r_0 = s, r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k = s'\right\} \in C_S(s, s') \text{ and}$$
$$c_2 := \left\{t_0 = s', t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_j = s\right\} \in C_S(s', s)$$

such that $u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') = \max(\mathrm{cost}(c_1), \mathrm{cost}(c_2))$. Then for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(r_i, r_{i+1}) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s')$. Similarly for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1$ we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s')$. Now observe that for each $x, x' \in X$, we have:

$$\nu_A(a(x), a(x')) \leqslant \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x, x'). \tag{3}$$

Then for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, we have:

$$\nu_A(a(r_i), a(r_{i+1})) \leqslant \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(r_i, r_{i+1}) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s').$$

Similarly for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1$, we have:

$$\nu_A(a(t_i), a(t_{i+1})) \leqslant \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s').$$

It follows that $u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s')$. □

By Theorem 6, we obtain a correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(S, X)$ with $\mathrm{dis}(R') < 2\varepsilon$ such that for each $(s, x) \in R'$, we have $\{s, x\} \subseteq U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Here the distortion is measured with respect to $\mathfrak{e}_X$ and $\mathfrak{e}_S$. We will use this correspondence R' as follows: for each $x \in X$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $(s, x) \in R'$. In other words, there exists $s \in S$ such that $\{s, x\} \subseteq U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ is a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system, we know also that s, x belong to the same connected component X_a, for some $a \in A$.

For each $x \in X$, we will write $s(x)$ to denote the element of S obtained by the preceding construction.

Claim 3. Let $s, s' \in S$ be such that $a(s) = a(s')$, i.e. s, s' belong to the same path-connected component of X. Then $u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') < \nu_A(a(s), a(s)) + 2\varepsilon \leqslant u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon$.

Proof of Claim 3. Since $X_{a(s)}$ is path-connected, there exists a unique $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x) = r$ for all $x \in X_{a(s)}$ by Lemma 9. By Definition 8, we have $r \leqslant \nu_A(a(s), a(s))$. Let $\eta > 0$, and let $x, x' \in X$ be such that $(s, x), (s', x') \in R'$. Then by the definition of path connectivity, we can take a chain $c = \{x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n = x'\}$ joining x to x' such that $\mathrm{cost}_X(c) \leqslant r + \eta$. We can now convert this to a chain in S by using the correspondence R'. Define:

$$c_S := \left\{s, s(x_1), s(x_2), \ldots, s(x_{n-1}), s'\right\}.$$

By construction, $(s(x_i), x_i) \in R'$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$. Furthermore we have $(s, x), (s', x') \in R'$ by our choice of x, x'. Now by using Remark 29 and the fact that $\mathrm{dis}(R') < 2\varepsilon$, we have $\mathrm{cost}_S(c_S) < r + \eta + 2\varepsilon \leqslant \nu_A(a(s), a(s)) + \eta + 2\varepsilon$.

By a similar process, we can obtain a chain $c_S' \in C_S(s', s)$ such that $\mathrm{cost}_S(c_S') < \nu_A(a(s), a(s)) + \eta + 2\varepsilon$. Thus $u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') < \nu_A(a(s), a(s)) + \eta + 2\varepsilon$. Since $\eta > 0$ was arbitrary, the result follows. □

Claim 4. We have $u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') < u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon$.

Proof. Let $\overrightarrow{c} := \{r_0, \ldots, r_k\}$ be a chain in A such that $r_0 = a(s)$, $r_k = a(s')$, and for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_A(r_i, r_{i+1}) \leqslant u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s'))$. Similarly let $\overleftarrow{c} := \{t_0, \ldots, t_j\}$ be a chain in A such that $t_0 = a(s')$, $t_j = a(s)$, and for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_A(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leqslant u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s'))$.

By construction, we have $\nu_A(r_i, r_{i+1}) \leqslant u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s'))$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$. Similarly we have $\nu_A(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leqslant u^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s'))$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1$.

Next observe that by compactness of X, for each $a, a' \in A$ we can obtain $x(a) \in X_a$, $x(a') \in X_{a'}$ such that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(a), x(a')) = \nu_A(a, a')$. Applying this construction to consecutive elements in the chains $\overrightarrow{c}$ and $\overleftarrow{c}$, we obtain the following chains in X:

$$\overrightarrow{c_X} = \{x(r_0), \ldots, x(r_k)\}, \text{ joining } x(a(s)) = x(r_0) \text{ to } x(a(s')) = x(r_k),$$
$$\overleftarrow{c_X} = \{x(t_0), \ldots, x(t_j)\}, \text{ joining } x(a(s')) = x(t_0) \text{ to } x(a(s)) = x(t_j).$$

In particular, for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_i), x(r_{i+1})) = \nu_A(r_i, r_{i+1})$. Similarly for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(t_i), x(t_{i+1})) = \nu_A(t_i, t_{i+1})$. Furthermore, we have $x(r_i) \in X_{r_i}$ for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k$, and $x(t_i) \in X_{t_i}$ for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j$.

Now we can use the correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(S, X)$ that we had fixed earlier. Recall the use of the notation $s(x) \in S$ for $x \in X$ from the discussion preceding Claim 3. Now we obtain the following chains in S:

$$\overrightarrow{c_S} = \{s(x(r_0)), \ldots, s(x(r_k))\}\,, \text{ joining } s(x(a(s))) \in X_{a(s)} \text{ to } s(x(a(s'))) \in X_{a(s')}, \text{ and}$$
$$\overleftarrow{c_S} = \{s(x(t_0)), \ldots, s(x(t_j))\}\,, \text{ joining } s(x(a(s'))) \in X_{a(s')} \text{ to } s(x(a(s))) \in X_{a(s)}, \text{ such that}$$

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(s(x(r_i)), s(x(r_{i+1}))) < \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_i), x(r_{i+1})) + 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1, \text{ and}$$
$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(s(x(t_i)), s(x(t_{i+1}))) < \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(t_i), x(t_{i+1})) + 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j-1.$$

Here we have applied Remark 29 on consecutive points in the chains to obtain the inequalities.

We know that s and $s(x(r_0)) = s(x(t_j))$ belong to the same path-connected component $X_{a(s)}$, and similarly s' and $s(x(r_k)) = s(x(t_0))$ belong to the same path-connected component $X_{a(s')}$. By Claim 3, we have:

$$u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s(x(\rho_0))) = u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s(x(\tau_v))) < u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon,$$
$$u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s', s(x(\rho_u))) = u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s', s(x(\tau_0))) < u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Finally it follows that:

$$u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') < u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon.$$

□

Thus we have $|u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}(s, s') - u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}(a(s), a(s'))| < 2\varepsilon$. Since $(s, a(s)), (s', a(s')) \in R$ were arbitrary, it now follows that $d_{\mathcal{N}}\left((S, u_S^{\mathrm{NR}}), (A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}})\right) < \varepsilon$. □

Proof of Theorem 13. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 7, but we repeat the argument here to facilitate the assessment of details. First observe that $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)) \in (0, 1]$. Let $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)))$, and let $\mathcal{U}_r$ be a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system on $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ such that $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r) \in (r, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))]$. For convenience, write $m := |\mathcal{U}_r|$, and also write $\mathcal{U}_r = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$.

For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, define A_i as in the statement of Lemma 8. Then by Lemma 8, the probability that at least one U_i has empty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n$ is bounded as $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r))^n$.

On the other hand, if U_i has nonempty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, then by Lemma 12, we obtain $d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) < \varepsilon$. Now define:

$$B_n := \{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{NR}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\}\,.$$

Then we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B_n\right) \leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}\left(1 - \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)\right)^n.$$

Since $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))$ was arbitrary, it follows that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B_n\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))}\left(1 - \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))\right)^n.$$

By an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma as in Theorem 7, we have $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n\to\infty} B_n) = 0$. The result now follows. □

APPENDIX B. DETAILS ON CONVERGENCE OF RECIPROCAL CLUSTERING

Lemma 30 (Reciprocal clustering on a path connected network)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a path connected network with dissimilarity weights and finite reversibility ρ_X. Then $(X, u_X^{\mathrm{R}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ is given by writing $u_X^{\mathrm{R}}(x, x') = 0$ for all $x, x' \in X$.*

Proof. Let $x, x' \in X$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Definition 6 and the assumption that $\mathfrak{e}_X(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$, there exists a continuous function $\gamma : [0, 1] \to X$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma(1) = x'$, and there exist $t_0 = 0 \leqslant t_1 \leqslant t_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant t_n = 1$ such that:

$$\mathfrak{e}_X(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})) \in \left[0, \tfrac{\varepsilon}{\rho_X}\right) \text{ for each } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1.$$

Since $\mathfrak{e}_X$ is a dissimilarity, we have $\mathfrak{e}_X(\gamma(t_{i+1}), \gamma(t_i)) \geqslant 0$. By finite reversibility (Definition 12), we also have

$$\mathfrak{e}_X(\gamma(t_{i+1}), \gamma(t_i)) \leqslant \rho_X \cdot \mathfrak{e}_X(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})) < \varepsilon.$$

Thus by using the chain $\{\gamma(t_0), \gamma(t_1), \ldots, \gamma(t_n)\}$, we have $u_X^{\mathrm{R}}(x, x') < \varepsilon$. Since $x, x' \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, the result now follows. □

Lemma 31 (Reciprocal clustering collapses path-connected subsets)**.** *Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ be a network with dissimilarity weights and finite reversibility such that X is a disjoint collection $\{X_a : a \in A\}$, where A is a finite indexing set and each X_a is compact and path-connected. Let (A, λ_A) be as in Definition 8, and let $(A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}}) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(A, \lambda_A)$. Also let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$ be a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system on X.*

Suppose that $S \subseteq X$ is a finite subset equipped with the restriction $\mathfrak{e}_S := \mathfrak{e}_X|_{S \times S}$ such that S has nonempty intersection with U_i for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Then we have:

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}\left((S, u_S^{\mathrm{R}}), (A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}})\right) < \varepsilon.$$

Proof of Lemma 31. For each $x \in X$, let $a(x) \in A$ denote the index such that $x \in X_{a(x)}$. Then define:

$$R := \{(s, a(s)) : s \in S\}.$$

Then $R \in \mathscr{R}(S, A)$. We wish to show $\mathrm{dis}(R) < 2\varepsilon$, where the distortion is calculated with respect to u_S^{R} and u_A^{R}. Let $(s, a(s)), (s', a(s')) \in R$.

Claim 5. We have $u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s')) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s')$.

Proof. Pick a chain $c := \{r_0 = s, r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k = s'\} \in C_S(s, s')$ such that

$$u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') = \max_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} (\max(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(r_i, r_{i+1}), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(r_{i+1}, r_i))).$$

Next consider the chain $c_A := \{a(r_0), \ldots, a(r_k)\}$. By Definition 8, we have:

$$\max_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} \lambda_A(a(r_i), a(r_{i+1})) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s').$$

It follows that $u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s')) \leqslant u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s')$. □

By Theorem 6, we obtain a correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(S, X)$ with $\mathrm{dis}(R') < 2\varepsilon$ such that for each $(s, x) \in R'$, we have $\{s, x\} \subseteq U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Here the distortion is measured with respect to $\mathfrak{e}_X$ and $\mathfrak{e}_S$. We will use this correspondence R' as follows: for each $x \in X$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $(s, x) \in R'$. In other words, there exists $s \in S$ such that $\{s, x\} \subseteq U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ is a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system, we know also that s, x belong to the same connected component X_a, for some $a \in A$.

For each $x \in X$, we will write $s(x)$ to denote the element of S obtained by the preceding construction.

Claim 6. Let $s, s' \in S$ be such that $a(s) = a(s')$, i.e. s, s' belong to the same path-connected component of X. Then $u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') < 2\varepsilon$.

Proof of Claim 6. Let $\eta > 0$, and let $x, x' \in X$ be such that $(s, x), (s', x') \in R'$. By Lemma 30, we can take a chain $c = \{x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n = x'\}$ from x to x' such that

$$\max_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1} \max(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x_i, x_{i+1}), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x_{i+1}, x_i)) < \eta.$$

We can now convert this to a chain in S by using the correspondence R'. Define:

$$c_S := \left\{s, s(x_1), s(x_2), \ldots, s(x_{n-1}), s'\right\}.$$

By construction, $(s(x_i), x_i) \in R'$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$. Furthermore we have $(s, x), (s', x') \in R'$ by our choice of x, x'. Now by using Remark 29 and the fact that $\mathrm{dis}(R') < 2\varepsilon$, we have $u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') < \eta + 2\varepsilon$. Since $\eta > 0$ was arbitrary, the result follows. □

Claim 7. We have $u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') < u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon$.

Proof. Let $c := \{r_0, \ldots, r_k\}$ be a chain in A such that $r_0 = a(s)$, $r_k = a(s')$, and

$$\max_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} \lambda_A(r_i, r_{i+1}) \leqslant u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s')).$$

Next observe that by compactness of X, for each $a, a' \in A$ we can obtain $x(a) \in X_a$, $x(a') \in X_{a'}$ such that:

$$\max(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(a), x(a')), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(a'), x(a))) = \lambda_A(a, a').$$

Applying this construction to consecutive elements in the chain c, we obtain a chain in X:

$$c_X = \{x(r_0), \ldots, x(r_k)\}, \text{ joining } x(a(s)) \text{ to } x(a(s')).$$

In particular, for each $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, we have

$$\max(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_i), x(r_{i+1})), \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_{i+1}), x(r_i))) = \lambda_A(r_i, r_{i+1}).$$

Now we can use the correspondence $R' \in \mathscr{R}(S, X)$ that we had fixed earlier. Recall the use of the notation $s(x) \in S$ for $x \in X$ from the discussion preceding Claim 6. Now we obtain the following chain in S:

$$c_S = \{s(x(r_0)), \ldots, s(x(r_k))\}, \text{ joining } s(x(a(s))) \in X_{a(s)} \text{ to } s(x(a(s'))) \in X_{a(s')}, \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(s(x(r_i)), s(x(r_{i+1}))) < \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_i), x(r_{i+1})) + 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1, \text{ and} \\
&\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_S(s(x(r_{i+1})), s(x(r_i))) < \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_X(x(r_{i+1}), x(r_i)) + 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have applied Remark 29 on consecutive points in the chains to obtain the inequalities.

We know that s and $s(x(r_0))$ belong to the same path-connected component $X_{a(s)}$, and similarly s' and $s(x(r_k))$ belong to the same path-connected component $X_{a(s')}$. By Claim 6, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s(x(r_0))) &< 2\varepsilon, \\
u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s', s(x(r_k))) &< 2\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally it follows that:

$$u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') < u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s')) + 2\varepsilon.$$

□

Thus we have $|u_S^{\mathrm{R}}(s, s') - u_A^{\mathrm{R}}(a(s), a(s'))| < 2\varepsilon$. Since $(s, a(s)), (s', a(s')) \in R$ were arbitrary, it now follows that $d_{\mathcal{N}}((S, u_S^{\mathrm{R}}), (A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}})) < \varepsilon$. □

Proof of Theorem 15. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 13, but we repeat the argument here to facilitate the assessment of details. First observe that $\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)) \in (0,1]$. Let $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)))$, and let $\mathcal{U}_r$ be a refined $\varepsilon/2$-system on $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X)$ such that $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r) \in (r, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))]$. For convenience, write $m := |\mathcal{U}_r|$, and also write $\mathcal{U}_r = \{U_1, \ldots, U_m\}$.

For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, define A_i as in the statement of Lemma 8. Then by Lemma 8, the probability that at least one U_i has empty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n$ is bounded as $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}(1-\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r))^n$.

On the other hand, if U_i has nonempty intersection with $\mathbb{X}_n(\omega)$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, then by Lemma 31, we obtain $d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) < \varepsilon$. Now define:

$$B_n := \left\{\omega \in \Omega : d_{\mathcal{N}}((A, u_A^{\mathrm{R}}), \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathbb{X}_n(\omega))) \geqslant \varepsilon\right\}.$$

Then we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B_n\right) \leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m A_k\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)}\left(1-\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{U}_r)\right)^n.$$

Since $r \in (0, \mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(X))$ was arbitrary, it follows that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B_n\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))}\left(1-\mathfrak{M}_{\varepsilon/2}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_X))\right)^n.$$

By an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma as in Theorem 7, we have $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n\to\infty} B_n) = 0$. The result now follows. □

Appendix C. Examples related to the network distance

Example 32. The following are some useful correspondences.

***1-point correspondences*:** Let X be a set, and let $\{p\}$ be the set with one point. Then there is a unique correspondence $R = \{(x,p) : x \in X\}$ between X and $\{p\}$.

***Diagonal correspondence*:** Let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ be two enumerated sets with the same cardinality. A natural correspondence is the *diagonal correspondence*, defined as $\Delta := \{(x_i, y_i) : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$. When X and Y are infinite sets with the same cardinality, and $\varphi : X \to Y$ is a given bijection, then we can write the diagonal correspondence as $\Delta := \{(x, \varphi(x)) : x \in X\}$.

Example 33. Now we give some examples of computing the network distance.

- For $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{R}$ consider two networks with one node each: $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X) = (\{p\}, \alpha)$ and $(Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) = (\{p'\}, \alpha')$. By Example 32 there is a unique correspondence $R = \{(p, p')\}$ between these two networks, so that $\mathrm{dis}(R) = |\alpha - \alpha'|$ and as a result $d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,Y) = \frac{1}{2}|\alpha - \alpha'|$.
- Let $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X) \in \mathcal{N}$ be any network and for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ let $(Y, \mathfrak{e}_Y) = (\{p\}, \alpha)$. Then $R = \{(x,p),\, x \in X\}$ is the unique correspondence between X and $\{p\}$, so that

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}(X,Y) = \frac{1}{2}\max_{x,x' \in X}\left|\mathfrak{e}_X(x,x') - \alpha\right|.$$

- Given a finite set X and two edge weight functions $\mathfrak{e}_X, \mathfrak{e}'_X$ defined on it, we can use the ℓ^∞ distance as a measure of network similarity between $(X, \mathfrak{e}_X)$ and $(X, \mathfrak{e}'_X)$:

$$\|\mathfrak{e}_X - \mathfrak{e}'_X\|_{\ell^\infty(X\times X)} := \max_{x,x' \in X}\left|\mathfrak{e}_X(x,x') - \mathfrak{e}'_X(x,x')\right|.$$

  The diagonal correspondence in Example 32 has this value as its distortion. So we have the following bound:

$$d_{\mathcal{N}}((X, \mathfrak{e}_X), (X, \mathfrak{e}'_X)) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\|\mathfrak{e}_X - \mathfrak{e}'_X\|_{\ell^\infty(X\times X)}.$$