

Approximate Bregman near neighbors in sublinear time: Beyond the triangle inequality

Amirali Abdullah
University of Utah

John Moeller
University of Utah

Suresh Venkatasubramanian
University of Utah

Abstract

Bregman divergences are important distance measures that are used extensively in data-driven applications such as computer vision, text mining, and speech processing, and are a key focus of interest in machine learning. Answering *nearest neighbor* (NN) queries under these measures very important in these applications and has been the subject of extensive study, but is problematic because these distance measures lack metric properties like symmetry and the triangle inequality.

In this paper, we present the first *approximate nearest-neighbor* (ANN) algorithms, which run in $\text{polylog}(n)$ time for Bregman divergences of fixed dimension. To do so, we explore two properties of Bregman divergences that are vital to the analysis: a *reverse triangle inequality* (RTI) and a relaxed triangle inequality called μ -*defectiveness*. We show that even though Bregman divergences do not satisfy the triangle inequality, the above properties can be utilized to design an efficient search data structure that follows the general two-stage paradigm of a ring-tree decomposition followed by a quad tree search used in previous near-neighbor algorithms for Euclidean space, as well as spaces of bounded doubling dimension.

The resulting algorithm resolves a query for a d -dimensional $(1 + \epsilon)$ -ANN in $O\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(d)}\right)$ time and $O(n \log^{d-1} n)$ space. We also show that a $O(\log n)$ nearest neighbor can be obtained in $O(\log n)$ time.

1 Introduction

The nearest neighbor problem is one of the most extensively studied problems in data analysis, and has myriad applications both as a stand alone operation for querying databases, as well as a tool for other analysis problems (for example in classification). The past 20 years has seen tremendous research into the problem of computing near neighbors efficiently, as well as approximately, in different kinds of metric spaces like Euclidean spaces, spaces of bounded doubling dimension, or even abstract metric spaces.

An important application of the nearest-neighbor problem is in querying content databases (images, text, and audio databases, for example). In these applications, the notion of similarity is not based on a distance metric, but instead on notions of distance that arise from information-theoretic or other considerations. The most celebrated example of such a distance is the Kullback-Leibler divergence [16], and other distance measures include the Itakura-Saito distance [19], the Mahalanobis distance [25], and even ℓ_2^2 . These distance measures are examples of a general class of divergences called the *Bregman divergences* [9], and this class has received much attention in the realm of machine learning, computer vision and other application domains.

Bregman divergences challenge traditional data analysis design techniques. While they possess a rich geometric structure, they are not metrics in general, and are not even symmetric in most cases ! The geometry of Bregman divergences has been formally studied both in the combinatorial setting, as well as in the realm of clustering, but thus far there have been no algorithms with provable guarantees for the fundamental problem of nearest-neighbor search. The only known near-neighbor search strategies thus far are heuristic, based on hierarchical data structures and branch-and-bound methods as seen in [10], [31], [32], [34] and [35].

In this paper we present the first approximate nearest-neighbor(ANN) algorithm for Bregman divergences with theoretical guarantees. Our algorithm processes queries in $O(\log^d n)$ time using $O(n \log^d n)$ space. The running time also depends on certain structural constants relating to the particular Bregman divergence being used. One interesting feature of our approach is that it only relies on the distance function satisfying certain general properties, and thus yields insight into the power of general algorithmic techniques for near-neighbor searching.

1.1 Overview of Techniques

There are many algorithms for performing nearest-neighbor search in low-dimensional spaces. They follow a general template [33] that works as follows. Build a quad-tree-like data structure to process queries. Since the quad tree cells reduce in size by a constant factor at each stage, the triangle inequality can be used to infer that we never need to expand cells that are smaller than a fraction of the true nearest neighbor distance in order to get a good approximation to the nearest neighbor. This fact is then combined with a packing bound that upper bounds the number of such cells we need to explore in order to obtain a query running time that is a function only of the desired error and the “spread” of the point set (the ratio of the maximum to minimum distance).

The next step is to remove terms involving the spread. This can be done by finding a crude approximation to the nearest neighbor which limits the size of the largest cell one needs to examine when searching the quad tree. Since the resulting depth to explore is bounded by the logarithm of the ratio of the cell sizes, any c -approximation of the nearest neighbor results in a depth of $O(\log(c/\epsilon))$, eliminating terms involving the spread. A standard data structure that yields such a crude bound is the *ring tree* [24].

Unfortunately, while these methods can be abstracted to metric spaces of bounded doubling dimension [15, 24, 7], they still require two key properties: the existence of the triangle inequality, as well as packing bounds for fitting small-radius balls into large-radius balls. Bregman divergences in general are not symmetric and do not even satisfy a directed triangle inequality, and this has prevented algorithms for metric

spaces from being adapted for Bregman divergences. We note in passing that such problems do not occur for the *exact* nearest neighbor problem in constant dimension: this problem reduces to point location in a Voronoi diagram, and Bregman Voronoi diagrams possess the same combinatorial structure as Euclidean Voronoi diagrams [8].

Reverse Triangle Inequality The first observation we make is that while Bregman divergences do not satisfy a triangle inequality, they satisfy a weak *reverse triangle inequality*: along a line, the sum of lengths of two contiguous intervals is always *less* than the length of the union. This immediately yields a packing bound: intuitively, we cannot pack too many disjoint intervals in a larger interval because their sum would then be too large, violating the reverse triangle inequality.

μ -defectiveness The second idea is to allow for a *relaxed* triangle inequality. A natural way to do this is to assume that there exists a fixed $\mu < 1$ such that for all triples (x, y, z) , the inequality $D(x, y) + D(y, z) \geq \mu D(x, z)$. In fact, this is the notion of μ -similarity used by Ackermann *et al* [3] to *cluster* data under a Bregman divergence. However, this version of a relaxed triangle inequality is too weak for the nearest-neighbor problem, as we see in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The ratio $\frac{D(q, \text{cand})}{D(q, \text{nn}_q)} = \mu$, no matter how small c is

Let q be a query point, cand be a point from P such that $D(q, \text{cand})$ is known and nn_q be the actual nearest neighbor to q . The principle of grid related machinery is that for $D(q, \text{nn}_q)$ and $D(q, \text{cand})$ sufficiently large, and $D(\text{cand}, \text{nn}_q)$ sufficiently small, we can verify that $D(q, \text{cand})$ is a $(1 + \epsilon)$ nearest neighbor, i.e we can short-circuit our grid.

The figure 1 illustrates a case where this short-circuit may not be valid for μ -similarity.

Note that μ -similarity is satisfied here for any $c < 1$. Yet the ANN quality of cand , i.e, $\frac{D(q, \text{cand})}{D(q, \text{nn}_q)}$, need not be better than μ even for arbitrarily close nn_q and cand . This illustrates the difficulty of naturally adapting the Ackermann notion of μ -similarity to finding a $1 + \epsilon$ nearest neighbor.

In fact, the relevant relaxation of the triangle inequality that we require is slightly different. Rearranging terms, we instead require that there exist a parameter $\mu \geq 1$ such that for all triples (x, y, z) , $|D(x, y) - D(x, z)| \leq \mu D(y, z)$. We call such a distance μ -defective. It is easy to see that a μ -defective distance measure is also $(1/\mu)$ -similar, but the converse does not hold, as the example above shows.

A Generic Approximate Near-Neighbor Algorithm We show that any distance measure satisfying the reverse triangle inequality, μ -defectiveness, and some mild technical conditions admits a ring-tree-based construction to obtain a weak approximation to a nearest neighbor. What remains is the quad tree construction. Here, we once again run into a roadblock. The μ -defectiveness of a distance measure means that if we take a unit length interval and divide it into two parts, all we can expect is that the two parts have length between $1/2$ and $1/(\mu + 1)$. This range of values plays havoc with the depth-packing tradeoff inherent in

quad trees: while we may have to go down to level $\lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ to guarantee that all cells have side length $O(\ell)$, some cells might actually have side length as little as $\ell^{\log_2(\mu+1)}$.

The difference between 2 and $\mu + 1$ implies that we might need to explore a number of cells that is exponential in ℓ , instead of a quantity independent of ℓ . Our current solution to this problem is in fact to construct a portion of the quad tree “on the fly” for each query. While this is expensive, it still yields $\text{polylog}(n)$ bounds for the overall query time in fixed dimensions, in contrast to building the quad tree in a preprocessing phase.

Putting it all together As mentioned above, the algorithm works for any distance measure that satisfies the properties described. What remains is to show that Bregman divergences indeed satisfy these properties. We show that all Bregman divergences satisfy the reverse triangle inequality. While in general Bregman divergences do *not* satisfy μ -defectiveness for any bounded region, we show that the *square root* of any Bregman divergence satisfies μ -defectiveness for any bounded domain. Since the square root is monotonic, the appropriate choice of ε yields the desired $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for the original Bregman divergences.

An important technical point is that we work with the *symmetrized* Bregman divergences (of the form $D_{s\phi}(x, y) = D_\phi(x | y) + D_\phi(y | x)$). This is a common practice in the application domains that use Bregman divergences, and the symmetrized Bregman divergences have also been studied geometrically, [31], [32], [30] and [28] being examples.

1.2 Paper Outline

The presentation of the main algorithm is in terms of an abstract distance measure satisfying certain properties. These properties are presented in Section 3, after which we demonstrate that Bregman divergences (or variations) satisfy these properties. We present important consequences of these properties in Section 5. Next, we outline a crude ring-tree based approximation in Section 6, and use this as part of the overall algorithm in Section 7.

2 Related Work

Nearest-neighbor problems have been extensively studied both within the algorithms community (for methods with formal guarantees) and in application domains (including many effective heuristics). For good reviews of the overall area of nearest neighbor search, the reader is referred to the book by Har-Peled[33] for the theory of approximate near-neighbor methods, the book by Samet [22] for a review of the different near-neighbor heuristics, and the edited collection by Shakhnarovich *et al* [27] for a review of near-neighbor methods in learning and vision (which includes a discussion of high-dimensional nearest-neighbor methods).

Approximate nearest-neighbor algorithms come in two flavors: the high dimensional variety, where all bounds must be polynomial in the dimension d , and the constant-dimensional variety, where terms exponential in the dimension are permitted, but the dependence on the input size n is sublinear for query time and close to linear for space complexity. In this paper, we focus on the constant-dimensional setting. As mentioned in the introduction, the main techniques include building ring-tree separators to generate crude approximations, and then using quad-tree-like constructions to find the desired neighbors. The idea of using ring-trees appears in many works [23, 24, 21], and good expositions of the general method can be found in Clarkson’s survey of near-neighbor methods [14] as well as Har-Peled’s textbook [33, Chapter 11].

The Bregman distances were first introduced by Bregman in 1967[9]. They are the unique divergences that satisfy certain axiom systems for distance measures [17], and are key players in the theory of information geometry [5]. Bregman distances are used extensively in machine learning, where they have been used to unify boosting with different loss functions and unify different mixture-model density estimation problems

[6]. A first study of the algorithmic geometry of Bregman divergences was performed by Nielsen, Nock and Boissonnat [8]. This was followed by a series of papers analyzing the behavior of clustering algorithms under Bregman divergences [3, 2, 1, 26, 13].

Many heuristics have also been proposed for spaces endowed with Bregman divergences. Nielsen and Nock [29] developed a Frank-Wolfe-like iterative scheme for finding minimum enclosing balls under Bregman divergences. Cayton [10] proposed the first nearest-neighbor search strategy for Bregman divergences, based on a clever primal-dual branch and bound strategy. Zhang *et al* [35] developed another prune-and-search strategy that they argue is more scalable and uses operations better suited to use within a standard database system.

3 Definitions

In this paper we study the approximate nearest neighbor problem for symmetric distance functions D :

Problem 3.1. *Given a point set P , a query point q , and an error parameter ε , find a point $nn_q \in P$ such that $D(q, nn_q) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{p \in P} D(q, p)$.*

We start by defining general properties that we will require of our distance measures. In what follows, we will assume that the distance measure D is *reflexive*: $D(x, y) = 0$ iff $x = y$. All references to distance measures in this paper will be to *symmetric* distance measures, except to the unsymmetrized Bregman divergence D_ϕ or unless specifically noted.

Definition 3.1 (Monotonicity). *Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}$, $D : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a distance function, and let $a, b, c \in M$ where $a < b < c$. If the following are true for any such choice of a, b , and c :*

- $0 \leq D(a, b) < D(a, c)$ and
- $0 \leq D(b, c) < D(a, c)$ and
- $D(x, y) = 0$ iff $x = y$,

then we say that D is monotonic.

For a general distance function $D : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we say that D is monotonic if it is monotonic when restricted to any subset of M parallel to a coordinate axis.

Definition 3.2 (Reverse Triangle Inequality). *Let M be a subset of \mathbb{R} . We say that a monotone distance measure $D : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies a reverse triangle inequality or RTI if for any three elements $a \leq b \leq c \in M$,*

$$D(a, b) + D(b, c) \leq D(a, c)$$

Definition 3.3 (μ -defectiveness). *Let D be a symmetric monotone distance measure satisfying the reverse triangle inequality. We say that D is μ -defective with respect to domain M if for all $a, b, q \in M$*

$$|D(a, q) - D(b, q)| < \mu D(a, b) \tag{3.1}$$

μ -defectiveness and μ -similarity Another natural way to relax the triangle inequality is to specify a parameter $\mu > 1$, and require that any triple a, b, c of points satisfy the inequality $D(a, b) + D(b, c) \geq \frac{1}{\mu} D(a, c)$. This notion has been called μ -similarity by Ackermann *et al* [2]. It is easy to show that μ -defectiveness implies μ -similarity, and that the converse is not true.

Two technical notes. The distance functions under consideration are typically defined over \mathbb{R}^d . We will assume in this paper that the distance D is *decomposable*: roughly, that $D((x_1, \dots, x_d), (y_1, \dots, y_d))$ can be written as $g(\sum_i f(x_i, y_i))$, where g and f are monotone. This captures all the Bregman divergences that are typically used (with the exception of the Mahalanobis distance: see Table 1). We will also need to compute the diameter of an axis parallel box of side length ℓ . Our results hold as long as the diameter of such a box is $O(\ell d^{O(1)})$: note that this captures standard distances like those induced by norms, as well as decomposable Bregman divergences. In what follows, we will mostly make use of the *square root* of a Bregman divergence, for which the diameter of a box is precisely $\ell d^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and so without loss of generality we will use this form of the diameter in our bounds.

Bregman Divergences. Let $\phi : M \subset \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a *strictly convex* function that is differentiable in the relative interior of M . The *Bregman divergence* D_ϕ is defined as

$$D_\phi(x, y) = \phi(x) - \phi(y) - \langle \nabla \phi(y), x - y \rangle$$

In general, D_ϕ is not symmetric. A *symmetrized* Bregman divergence can be defined by averaging:

$$D_{s\phi}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(D_\phi(x, y) + D_\phi(y, x)) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x - y, \nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(y) \rangle$$

An important subclass of Bregman divergences are the *decomposable* Bregman divergences. Suppose ϕ has domain $M = \prod_{i=1}^d M_i$ and can be written as $\phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(x_i)$, where $\phi_i : M_i \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also strictly convex and differentiable in $\text{relint}(S_i)$. Then

$$D_\phi(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^d D_{\phi_i}(x_i, y_i)$$

is a *decomposable* Bregman divergence.

Most commonly used Bregman divergences are decomposable: Table 1 [11, Chapter 3] illustrates some of the commonly used ones. In what follows we will limit ourselves to decomposable Bregman divergences.

Table 1: Commonly used Bregman divergences

Name	Domain	ϕ	$D_\phi(x, y)$
ℓ_2^2	\mathbb{R}^d	$\frac{1}{2}\ x\ ^2$	$\frac{1}{2}\ x - y\ _2^2$
Mahalanobis ^a	\mathbb{R}^d	$\frac{1}{2}x^\top Qx$	$\frac{1}{2}(x - y)^\top Q(x - y)$
Kullback-Leibler	\mathbb{R}_+^d	$\sum_i x_i \log x_i$	$\sum x_i \log \frac{x_i}{y_i} - x_i + y_i$
Itakura-Saito	\mathbb{R}_+^d	$-\sum_i \log x_i$	$\sum \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} - \log \frac{x_i}{y_i} - 1 \right)$
Exponential	\mathbb{R}^d	$\sum_i e^{x_i}$	$\sum e^{x_i} - (x_i - y_i + 1)e^{y_i}$
Bit entropy	$[0, 1]^d$	$\sum_i x_i \log x_i + (1 - x_i) \log(1 - x_i)$	$\sum x_i \log \frac{x_i}{y_i} + (1 - x_i) \log \frac{1 - x_i}{1 - y_i}$
Log-det	S_{++}^d ^b	$\log \det X$	$\langle X, Y^{-1} \rangle - \log \det XY^{-1} - N$
von Neumann entropy	S_{++}^d	$\text{tr}(X \log X - X)$	$\text{tr}(X(\log X - \log Y) - X + Y)$

^a The Mahalanobis distance is technically not decomposable, but is a linear transformation of a decomposable distance

^b (S_{++}^d denotes the cone of positive definite matrices)

4 Properties of Bregman Divergences

The previous section defined key properties that we desire of a distance function D . We now show that Bregman divergences (or modifications) satisfy these properties.

Lemma 4.1. *Any one-dimensional Bregman divergence is monotonic.*

Proof. Fix three points $a \leq b \leq c$. Consider the points a, c . Working from the definition of D_ϕ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c} D_\phi(a, c) = \phi''(c)(c - a) > 0 \quad (4.1)$$

Similarly, we have:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a} D_\phi(a, c) = \phi'(a) - \phi'(c) < 0 \quad (4.2)$$

□

Lemma 4.2. *Any one-dimensional Bregman divergence satisfies the reverse triangle inequality. Let $a \leq b \leq c$ be three points in the domain of D_ϕ . Then*

$$D_\phi(a, b) + D_\phi(b, c) \leq D_\phi(a, c) \text{ and } D_\phi(c, b) + D_\phi(b, a) \leq D_\phi(c, a)$$

Proof. By direct calculation

$$\begin{aligned} D_\phi(a, b) + D_\phi(b, c) &= \phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi'(b)(b - a) + \phi'(c)(c - b) \\ &\leq \phi(a) - \phi(c) + \phi'(c)(b - a) + \phi'(c)(c - b) \\ &= \phi(a) - \phi(c) + \phi'(c)(c - a) \\ &= D_\phi(a, c) \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that this lemma can be extended similarly by induction to any series of n points between a and c . Further, using the relationship between $D_\phi(a, b)$ and the “dual” distance $D_{\phi^*}(b^*, a^*)$, we can show that the reverse triangle inequality holds going “left” as well: $D_\phi(c, b) + D_\phi(b, a) \leq D_\phi(c, a)$

These two separate reverse triangle inequalities together yield one for $D_{s\phi}$:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$ be three points on the line.*

$$D_{s\phi}(a, b) + D_{s\phi}(b, c) \leq D_{s\phi}(a, c)$$

Proof. We have the following two inequalities from Lemma 4.2.

$$\begin{aligned} D_\phi(a, b) + D_\phi(b, c) &\leq D_\phi(a, c) \\ D_\phi(c, b) + D_\phi(b, a) &\leq D_\phi(c, a) \end{aligned}$$

Combining them, we get:

$$\frac{D_\phi(a, b) + D_\phi(b, a)}{2} + \frac{D_\phi(b, c) + D_\phi(c, b)}{2} \leq \frac{D_\phi(a, c) + D_\phi(c, a)}{2}$$

$$D_{s\phi}(a, b) + D_{s\phi}(b, c) \leq D_{s\phi}(a, c)$$

□

While the Bregman divergences satisfy both monotonicity and the reverse triangle inequality, they are not μ -defective with respect to *any* domain ! This is not surprising if we consider that the ℓ_2^2 distance, which is also a Bregman divergence, does not satisfy μ -defectiveness as well on any continuous domain for any value of μ .

A surprising fact however is that $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ does however satisfy μ -defectiveness (with μ depending on the bounded size of our domain) and also satisfies the reverse triangle inequality.

Lemma 4.4. $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ satisfies the reverse triangle inequality.

Proof. Fix $a \leq x \leq b$, and assume that the reverse triangle inequality does not hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,x)} + \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(x,b)} &> \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,b)} \\ \sqrt{(x-a)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a))} + \sqrt{(b-x)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x))} &> \sqrt{(b-a)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(a))} \end{aligned}$$

Squaring both sides, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (x-a)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a)) + (b-x)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x)) \\ + 2\sqrt{(x-a)(b-x)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a))(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x))} &> (b-a)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(a)) \\ (b-x)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a)) + (x-a)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x)) \\ - 2\sqrt{(x-a)(b-x)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a))(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x))} &< 0 \\ \left(\sqrt{(b-x)(\phi'(x) - \phi'(a))} - \sqrt{(x-a)(\phi'(b) - \phi'(x))} \right)^2 &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction, since the LHS is a perfect square. \square

Lemma 4.5. Given any interval $I = [x_1, x_2]$ on the real line, there exists a finite μ such that $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ is μ -defective with respect to I .

Proof. Consider three points $a, b, q \in I$.

Due to symmetry of the cases and conditions, there are three cases to consider: $a < q < b$, $a < b < q$ and $q < b < a$.

Case 1: Here $a < q < b$. The following is trivially true by the monotonicity of the $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$.

$$\left| \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,q)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b,q)} \right| < \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,b)} \quad (4.3)$$

Cases 2 and 3: For the remaining symmetric cases, $a < b < q$ and $q < b < a$, note that since $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q,a)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q,b)}$ and $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,b)}$ are both bounded, continuous functions on a compact domain (the interval $[x_1, x_2]$), we need only show that the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q,a)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q,b)}|}{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,b)}} \quad (4.4)$$

First consider $a < b < q$, and we assume $\lim_{b \rightarrow a}$ We will use the following substitutions repeatedly in our derivation: $b = a + h$, $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \phi(a+h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (\phi(a) + h\phi'(a))$, and $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{1+h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (1+h/2)$. For ease of computation, we replace ϕ' by ψ , to be restored at the last step.

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,q)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b,q)}}{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,b)}} = \frac{\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \left(\sqrt{(q-a)(\psi(q) - \psi(a))} - \sqrt{(q-b)(\psi(q) - \psi(b))} \right)}{\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \sqrt{(b-a)(\psi(b) - \psi(a))}} \quad (4.5)$$

Computing the denominator:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{b \rightarrow a} \sqrt{(b-a)(\psi(b) - \psi(a))} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(a+h-a)(\psi(a+h) - \psi(a))} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{h(\psi(a) + h\psi'(a) - \psi(a))} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{h(h\psi'(a))} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h\sqrt{\psi'(a)} \end{aligned}$$

We now address the numerator:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{b \rightarrow a} \sqrt{(q-a)(\psi(q) - \psi(a))} - \sqrt{(q-b)(\psi(q) - \psi(b))} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(q-a)(\psi(q) - \psi(a))} - \sqrt{(q-a-h)(\psi(q) - \psi(a) - h\psi'(a))} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(q-a)(\psi(q) - \psi(a))} - \sqrt{(q-a) \left(1 - \frac{h}{q-a}\right) (\psi(q) - \psi(a)) \left(1 - h \frac{\psi'(a)}{\psi(q) - \psi(a)}\right)} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{h}{q-a}} \sqrt{1 - h \frac{\psi'(a)}{\psi(q) - \psi(a)}}\right) \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{h}{2(q-a)}\right) \left(1 - h \frac{\psi'(a)}{2(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}\right)\right) \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)} \left(\frac{h}{2(q-a)} + h \frac{\psi'(a)}{2(\psi(q) - \psi(a))} - \frac{h^2}{4(q-a)(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Dropping higher order terms of h , the above reduces to:

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sqrt{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)} \left(\frac{1}{2(q-a)} + \frac{\psi'(a)}{2(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}\right)$$

Now combine numerator and denominator back in equation 4.5.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{b \rightarrow a} \frac{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b, q)}}{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, b)}} &= \frac{\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sqrt{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)} \left(\frac{1}{2(q-a)} + \frac{\psi'(a)}{2(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}\right)}{\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sqrt{\psi'(a)}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))(q-a)}{\psi'(a)}} \left(\frac{1}{2(q-a)} + \frac{\psi'(a)}{2(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\psi(q) - \psi(a)}{\psi'(a)(q-a)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\psi'(a)(q-a)}{\psi(q) - \psi(a)}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting back $\phi'(x)$ for $\psi(x)$, we see that limit 4.4 exists, provided ϕ is strictly convex:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\phi'(q) - \phi'(a)}{\phi''(a)(q-a)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\phi''(a)(q-a)}{\phi'(q) - \phi'(a)}}\right) \quad (4.6)$$

The analysis follows symmetrically for case 3, where $q < b < a$. □

We note here that limit 4.4 is clearly bounded by $\sqrt{\max_x \phi''(x)} / \sqrt{\min_y \phi''(y)}$, which leads us to conjecture a relationship between μ and this quantity over our entire interval.

Although the scope of our paper does not address asymmetric distance measures such as $\sqrt{D_\phi}$, it is of interest to note that μ -defectiveness applies even here.

Lemma 4.6. *Given any interval $I = [x_1 x_2]$ on the real line, there exists a finite μ such that $\sqrt{D_\phi}$ is μ -defective with respect to I with some restrictions on directionality.*

Proof. Consider three points $a, b, q \in I$. As before, due to symmetry of the cases, there are three cases to consider: $a < q < b$, $a < b < q$ and $q < b < a$.

Case 1: Here $a < q < b$. The following is trivially true by the monotonicity of the Bregman divergence.

$$\left| \sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(b, q)} \right| < \sqrt{D_\phi(a, b)} \quad (4.7)$$

Cases 2 and 3: For the remaining symmetric cases, $a < b < q$ and $q < b < a$, note that since $\sqrt{D_\phi(q, a)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(q, b)}$ and $\sqrt{D_\phi(a, b)}$ are both bounded, continuous functions on a compact domain (the interval $[x_1, x_2]$), we need only show that the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{|\sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(b, q)}|}{\sqrt{D_\phi(a, b)}} \quad (4.8)$$

First consider $a < b < q$, and we assume $\lim_{b \rightarrow a}$. We will use the following substitutions repeatedly in our derivation: $b = a + h$, $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \phi(a + h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (\phi(a) + h\phi'(a))$, $\phi(a + h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (\phi(a) + h\phi'(a) + \frac{h^2\phi''(a)}{2})$ and $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{1+h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (1 + h/2)$. For ease of computation, we replace ϕ' by ψ , to be restored at the last step.

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{\sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(b, q)}}{\sqrt{D_\phi(a, b)}} = \lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{\sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(a - q)} - \sqrt{\phi(b) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(b - q)}}{\sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(b) - \psi(b)(a - b)}} \quad (4.9)$$

Computing the denominator:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{a \rightarrow b} \sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(b) - \psi(b)(a - b)} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(a) - h\psi(a) - \frac{h^2\psi'(a)}{2} - \psi(b)(-h)} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{-h\psi(a) - \frac{h^2\psi'(a)}{2} + (\psi(a) + h\psi'(a))(h)} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{h^2\psi'(a)}{2}} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sqrt{\frac{\psi'(a)}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

We now address the numerator:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{b \rightarrow a} \lim_{a \rightarrow b} \left(\sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(a - q)} - \sqrt{\phi(b) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(b - q)} \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(a - q)} - \sqrt{\phi(a) - \phi(q) - \psi(q)(a - q) + h(\psi(a) - \psi(q))} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(a, q) \left(1 + \frac{h(\psi(a) - \psi(q))}{D_\phi(a, q)} \right)} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{h(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}{D_\phi(a, q)}} \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{h(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}{2D_\phi(a, q)} \right) \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{h(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}{2\sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)}} \end{aligned}$$

Now combine numerator and denominator back in equation 4.9, and note that $D_\phi(q, a) = \frac{1}{2}(\psi'(x))(q - a)^2$, for some $x \in [ab]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{a \rightarrow b} \frac{\sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_\phi(b, q)}}{\sqrt{D_\phi(a, b)}} &= \frac{\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{h(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}{2\sqrt{D_\phi(a, q)}}}{\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h\sqrt{\frac{\psi'(a)}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{(\psi(q) - \psi(a))}{q - a} \frac{\sqrt{\psi'(a)}}{\sqrt{\psi'(x)}} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back $\phi'(x)$ for $\psi(x)$, we see that limit 4.8 exists, provided ϕ is strictly convex:

$$\frac{(\phi'(q) - \phi'(a))}{q - a} \frac{\sqrt{\phi''(a)}}{\sqrt{\phi''(x)}} \quad (4.10)$$

The analysis follows symmetrically for case 3, where $q < b < a$. □

We extend our results to d dimensions naturally now by showing that if M is a domain such that $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ is μ -defective with respect to the projection of M onto each coordinate axis, then $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ is μ -defective with respect to all of M .

Lemma 4.7. *Consider three points, $a = (a_1, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_d)$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_i, \dots, b_d)$, $q = (q_1, \dots, q_i, \dots, q_d)$ such that $|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)}| < \mu\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, b_i)}$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq d$. Then*

$$\left| \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b, q)} \right| < \mu\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, b)} \quad (4.11)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b, q)} \right| &< \mu\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, b)} \\ D_{s\phi}(a, q) + D_{s\phi}(b, q) - 2\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)D_{s\phi}(b, q)} &< \mu^2 D_{s\phi}(a, b) \\ \sum_{i=1}^d (D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i) + D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)) - 2\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)D_{s\phi}(b, q)} &< \mu^2 \sum_{i=1}^d D_{s\phi}(a_i, b_i) \\ \sum_{i=1}^d (D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i) + D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i) - \mu^2 D_{s\phi}(a_i, b_i)) &< 2\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)D_{s\phi}(b, q)} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is what we need to prove for μ -defectiveness with respect to a, b, q . By assumption we already have μ -defectiveness w.r.t each a_i, b_i, q_i , for every $1 \leq i \leq d$:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i) + D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i) - \mu^2 D_{s\phi}(a_i, b_i) &< 2\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i)D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)} \\ \sum_{i=1}^d (D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i) + D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i) - \mu^2 D_{s\phi}(a_i, b_i)) &< 2\sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i)D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)} \end{aligned}$$

So to complete our proof we need only show:

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i)} \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)} \leq \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, q)} \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b, q)} \quad (4.12)$$

But notice the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a,q)} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^d D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a_i, q_i)} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b,q)} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^d D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(b_i, q_i)} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

So inequality 4.12 is simply a form of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, which states that for two vectors u and v in \mathbb{R}^d , that $|\langle u, v \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|v\|$, or that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^d u_i v_i \right| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d v_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

□

5 Packing and Covering Bounds

The aforementioned key properties (monotonicity, the reverse triangle inequality, decomposability, and μ -defectiveness) can be used to prove packing and covering bounds for a distance measure D . We now present some of these bounds.

Lemma 5.1 (Interval packing). *Consider a monotone distance measure D satisfying the reverse triangle inequality, an interval $[ab]$ such that $D(a,b) = s$ and a collection of disjoint intervals intersecting $[ab]$, where $I = \{[xx'] \mid [xx'], D(x,x') \geq \ell\}$. Then $|I| \leq \frac{s}{\ell} + 2$.*

Proof. Let I' be the intervals of I that are totally contained in $[ab]$. The combined length of all intervals in I' is at most $|I'|\ell$, but by the reverse triangle inequality, their total length cannot exceed s , so $|I'| \leq \frac{s}{\ell}$. There can be only two members of I not in I' , so $|I| \leq \frac{s}{\ell} + 2$. □

A simple greedy approach yields a constructive version of this lemma.

Corollary 5.1. *Given any two points, $a \leq b$ on the line s.t $D(a,b) = s$, we can construct a packing of $[ab]$ by $r \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ intervals $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$, $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $D(a, x_0) = D(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \varepsilon s$, $\forall i$ and $D(x_r, b) \leq \varepsilon s$. Here D is a monotone distance measure satisfying the reverse triangle inequality.*

Proof. We proceed greedily, from left to right, placing point $x_1 \in [a, b]$ s.t $D(a, x_1) = \varepsilon s$ and then placing point x_{i+1} , s.t $D(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \varepsilon s$, $x_{i+1} > x_i$. We terminate this process when $x_{r+1} \notin [a, b]$. By Lemma 5.1, $r \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. □

The above bounds can be generalized to higher dimensions, to prove general packing and covering bounds for balls with respect to a monotone, decomposable distance measure.

Definition 5.1. *Given a collection of d intervals a_i, b_i , s.t $D_\phi(a_i, b_i) = s$ where $1 \leq i \leq d$, the cube in d dimensions is defined as $\prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, b_i]$ and is said to have side length s .*

We can now extend our construction for interval packing, corollary 5.1, to the case of cubes.

Lemma 5.2. *Given a d dimensional cube B_1 of side length s , we can cover it with at most ε^d cubes of side length exactly εs .*

Proof. By corollary 5.1, we take any disjoint covering of an interval to get a gridding of at most $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ points in each dimension. We then take a product over all d dimensions, and the lemma follows trivially. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Each ball of radius s with respect to D can be covered by $(\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^d$ cubes of size εs .*

Proof. We divide the ball into 2^d orthants around the center c . After this step, we look at each orthant. Each orthant can be covered by a cube of size s , and each such cube can be broken down into $(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^d$ cubes of side length εs by Lemma 5.2 \square

6 Computing a rough approximation

Armed with our packing and covering bounds, we now describe how to compute a rough approximate nearest-neighbor, which we will use in the next section to find the $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate nearest neighbor. The technique we use is based on ring separators. Ring separators are a fairly old concept in geometry, notable appearances of which include the landmark paper by Indyk and Motwani [23]. Our approach is heavily influenced by that of Har Peled and Mendel, [21] and Krauthgamer and Lee [24] in the ring structure utilized, and our presentation is along the template of the textbook by Har-Peled [33, Chapter 11]

Let $B(m, r)$ denote the ball of radius r centered at m , and let $B'(m, r)$ denote the complement (or exterior) of $B(m, r)$. A *ring* R is the difference of two concentric balls: $R = B(m, r_2) \setminus B(m, r_1), r_2 \geq r_1$. We will often refer to the larger ball $B(m, r_2)$ as B_{out} and the smaller ball as B_{in} . We use $P_{\text{out}}(R)$ to denote the set $P \cap B'_{\text{out}}$, and similarly use $P_{\text{in}}(R)$ as $P \cap B_{\text{in}}$. When the context is obvious, we may drop the reference to R . A *t-ring separator* $R_{P,c}$ on a point set P is a ring such that $\frac{n}{c} < |P_{\text{in}}| < (1 - \frac{1}{c})n$, $\frac{n}{c} < |P_{\text{out}}| < (1 - \frac{1}{c})n$, $r_2 \geq (1+t)r_1$ and $B_{\text{out}} \setminus B_{\text{in}}$ is empty. Where the context is obvious, we may drop the subscript on $R_{P,c}$. Finally, we denote the minimum sized ball containing at least $\frac{n}{c}$ points of P by $B_{\text{opt},c}$; its radius is denoted by $r_{\text{opt},c}$.




Figure 2: A ring-separator. Note that the ring is empty

We demonstrate that for any point set P , a ring separator exists and secondly, it can always be computed efficiently. Applying this “separator” recursively on our point structure yields a ring-tree structure for searching our point set. Before we proceed further, we need to establish some properties of disks under a μ -defective distance.

Lemma 6.1. *Let D be a μ -defective distance, and let $B(m, r)$ be a ball with respect to D . Then for any two points $x, y \in B(m, r)$, $D(x, y) < (\mu + 1)r$.*

Proof. Follows from the definition of μ -defectiveness.

$$\begin{aligned} D(x, y) - D(m, x) &< \mu D(m, y) \\ D(x, y) &< \mu D(m, y) + D(m, x) \\ D(x, y) &< (\mu + 1)r \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *Given any constant $1 \leq c \leq n$, we can compute in $O(n^2)$ time a ball $B(m, r')$ such that $r' \leq (\mu + 1)r_{\text{opt},c}$ and $B(m, r') \cap P \geq \frac{n}{c}$.*

Proof. First, compute all pair-wise point distances of P . Then for each $p \in P$ compute the smallest ball containing $\frac{n}{c}$ points, with p as center. Return the smallest of these balls. For any point p this corresponds to selection of the $\frac{n}{c}$ -th smallest distances of p to all other points in P which can be done in $O(n)$ time. Since there are n points in total, this gives us a overall time complexity of $O(n^2)$. Note that $B_{\text{opt},c}$ must contain some point $p' \in P$. Also, by Lemma 6.1, $B_{\text{opt},c} \subset B(p', (\mu + 1)r_{\text{opt},c})$, so $B(p', (\mu + 1)r_{\text{opt},c})$ must contain at least $\frac{n}{c}$ points of P , and the ball we return will not have a larger radius. □

Lemma 6.3. *There exists a constant c (which depends only on d and μ), such that for any d -dimensional point set P and any μ -defective distance D , we can find a $O(\frac{1}{n})$ ring separator $R_{P,c}$.*

Proof. First, using Lemma 6.2, we compute a ball $S = B(m, r_1)$ (where $m \in P$) containing $\frac{n}{c}$ points such that $r_1 \leq (\mu + 1)r_{\text{opt},c}$, where c is a constant to be set. Consider the ball $\bar{S} = B(m, 2r_1)$. We shall argue that there must be $\frac{n}{c}$ points of P in \bar{S}' , for careful choices of c . Note that by Lemma 5.3, \bar{S} can be covered by 2^d hypercubes of side length $2r_1$, the union of which we shall refer to as H . Set $L = (\mu + 1)\sqrt{d}$. Imagine a partition of H into a grid, where each cell is of side-length $\frac{r_1}{L}$. Each cell in this grid is of diameter at most $\Delta(\frac{r_1}{L}, d) = \frac{r_1}{\mu+1} \leq r_{\text{opt},c}$. Hence, a ball of radius $r_{\text{opt},c}$ on any corner of a cell will contain the entire cell. This implies any cell will contain at most $\frac{n}{c}$ points, by the definition of $r_{\text{opt},c}$.

By Lemma 5.2 the grid on H has at most $2^d (2r_1 / \frac{r_1}{L})^d = (4(\mu + 1)\sqrt{d})^d$ cells. Each cell may contain at most $\frac{n}{c}$ points. In particular, set $c = 2(4(\mu + 1)\sqrt{d})^d$. Then we have that H may contain at most $\frac{n}{2}(4(\mu + 1)\sqrt{d})^d = \frac{n}{2}$ points, or since $\bar{S} \subset H$, \bar{S} contains at most $\frac{n}{2}$ points and \bar{S}' contains at least $\frac{n}{2}$ points.

Note that we do not actually construct H or the grid on H , but have given an existential argument that S and \bar{S} are good candidates for an inner and outer ball, respectively, in a ring separator. We need to choose the inner and outer radii, $r_{\text{in}} \geq r_1$ and $r_{\text{out}} \leq 2r_1$, such that $B(m, r_{\text{out}}) \setminus B(m, r_{\text{in}})$ is empty of points of P , and $r_{\text{out}} \geq (1 + \frac{1}{n})r_{\text{in}}$.

Consider the set $A = P \cap (\bar{S} \setminus S)$. Note that the points of A are in a range of distances from m between r_1 and $r_2 = 2r_1$. Since there are at most $\frac{n}{2}$ points in A , by the pigeonhole principle there must be an empty interval I of length at least $r_1 / \frac{n}{2} = \frac{2r_1}{n}$. Write $I = [r_{\text{in}}, r_{\text{out}}]$, where by construction $r_1 \leq r_{\text{in}} \leq r_{\text{out}} \leq 2r_1$. Now, $S \subset B(m, r_{\text{out}})$, so $B(m, r_{\text{out}})$ contains at least $\frac{n}{c}$ points. Also, $B(m, r_{\text{out}}) \subset B(m, 2r_1) = \bar{S}$, so $B(m, r_{\text{out}})$ contains at least $\frac{n}{2}$ points. This implies each child may contain at most $1 - \frac{n}{c}$ points. And finally, by the construction, $r_{\text{out}} \geq r_{\text{in}} + \frac{2r_1}{n}$ and $r_{\text{in}} \leq 2r_1$ so, $r_{\text{out}} \geq (1 + \frac{1}{n})r_{\text{in}}$. This shows that $B(m, r_{\text{in}})$ and $B(m, r_{\text{out}})$ define our required separating ring. □

Lemma 6.4. *Given any point set P , we can construct a $O(\frac{1}{n})$ ring-separator tree T of depth $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n)$.*

Proof. Repeatedly partition P by Lemma 6.3 into $P_{\text{in}}^{\mathbf{v}}$ and $P_{\text{out}}^{\mathbf{v}}$ where \mathbf{v} is the parent node. Store only the single point $\text{rep}_{\mathbf{v}} = m \in P$ in node \mathbf{v} , the center of the ball $B(m, r_1)$. We continue this partitioning until we have nodes with only a single point contained in them.

Since each child contains at least $\frac{n}{c}$ points, each subset reduces by a factor of at least $1 - \frac{1}{c}$ at each step, and hence the depth of the tree is logarithmic. We calculate the depth more exactly, noting that in Lemma

6.3, $c = O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d)$. Hence the depth x can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} n\left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)^x &= 1 \\ \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)^x &= \frac{1}{n} \\ x &= \frac{\ln \frac{1}{n}}{\ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)} = \frac{-1}{\ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)} \ln n \\ x &\leq c \ln n = O\left(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

Algorithm and Quality Analysis We start with some terminology.

best_q : The best candidate for nearest neighbor to q found so far.

nn_q : The exact nearest neighbor to q from point set P .

curr: The tree node currently being examined by our algorithm.

D_{exact} : The exact nearest neighbor distance $D(\text{nn}_q, q)$

D_{near} : The distance $D(\text{best}_q, q)$

rep_{curr} : A representative point $p \in P$ of the current node being examined.

Lemma 6.5. *Given a t -ring tree T for a point set with respect to a μ -defective distance D , we can find a $O\left(\mu + \frac{2\mu^2}{t}\right)$ nearest neighbor $O((\mu + 1)^d d^{\frac{d}{2}} \log n)$ time.*

Proof. By convention r_v represents the radius of the *inner* ball associated with a node \mathbf{v} , and that within each node \mathbf{v} we store $\text{rep}_v = m_v$, which is the center of $B_{\text{in}}(m_v, r_v)$. As usual, the node associated with the inner ball B_{in} is denoted by \mathbf{v}_{in} and the node associated with B_{out} is denoted by \mathbf{v}_{out} .

Our search algorithm is a binary tree search. Whenever we reach node \mathbf{v} , if $D(\text{rep}_v, q) < D_{\text{near}}$ set $\text{best}_q = \text{rep}_v$ and $D_{\text{near}} = D(\text{rep}_v, q)$ as our current nearest neighbor and nearest neighbor distance respectively.

Our branching criterion is that if $D(\text{rep}_v, q) < (1 + \frac{t}{2})r_v$, we continue search in \mathbf{v}_{in} , else we continue the search in \mathbf{v}_{out} . Since the depth of the tree is $O(\log n)$ by lemma 6.4, this process will take $O(\log n)$ time.

We consider the quality of the approximate nearest neighbor returned by our search. Let \mathbf{w} be the first node such that $\text{nn}_q \in \mathbf{w}_{\text{in}}$ but we searched in \mathbf{w}_{out} , or vice-versa. Note that after examining rep_w , by construction we have that $D_{\text{near}} \leq D(\text{rep}_w, q)$ and that D_{near} can only decrease at each step. If we can provide an upper bound on $D(q, \text{rep}_w)/D(q, \text{nn}_q)$, then we will have a bound on the final approximation quality of the nearest neighbor produced.




Figure 3: q is outside $(1 + \frac{t}{2})r_{in}$ so we search \mathbf{w}_{out} , but $nn_q \in \mathbf{w}_{in}$

The analysis goes by cases. In the first case as seen in figure 3, suppose $nn_q \in \mathbf{w}_{in}$, but we searched in \mathbf{w}_{out} . Then

$$D(\text{rep}_w, q) > \left(1 + \frac{t}{2}\right) r_w$$

$$D(\text{rep}_w, nn_q) < r_w.$$

Now μ -defectiveness implies a lower bound on the value of $D(q, nn_q)$:

$$\mu D(q, nn_q) > D(\text{rep}_w, q) - D(\text{rep}_w, nn_q)$$

$$\mu D(q, nn_q) > \left(1 + \frac{t}{2}\right) r_w - r_w$$

$$D(q, nn_q) > \frac{t}{2\mu} r_w,$$

and for the upper bound on $D(\text{rep}_w, q)/D(q, nn_q)$:

$$D(\text{rep}_w, q) - D(q, nn_q) < \mu D(nn_q, \text{rep}_w)$$

$$D(\text{rep}_w, q) < D(q, nn_q) + \mu r_w$$

$$\frac{D(\text{rep}_w, q)}{D(q, nn_q)} < 1 + \mu \frac{r_w}{D(q, nn_q)}$$

$$\frac{D(\text{rep}_w, q)}{D(q, nn_q)} < 1 + \mu \frac{r_w}{\frac{t}{2\mu} r_w}$$

$$\frac{D(\text{rep}_w, q)}{D(q, nn_q)} < 1 + \mu \frac{2\mu}{t}$$

$$\frac{D(\text{rep}_w, q)}{D(q, nn_q)} < 1 + 2\frac{\mu^2}{t}$$

We now consider the other case. Suppose $nn_q \in \mathbf{w}_{out}$ and we search in \mathbf{w}_{in} instead. The analysis is almost identical. By construction we must have:

$$D(\text{rep}_w, q) < \left(1 + \frac{t}{2}\right) r_w$$

$$D(\text{rep}_w, nn_q) > (1 + t)r_w$$

Again, μ -defectiveness yields:

$$D(q, nn_q) > \frac{t}{2\mu} r_w$$

We can simply take the ratios of the two:

$$\frac{D(\text{rep}_w, q)}{D(q, \text{nn}_q)} < \frac{(1 + \frac{t}{2})r_w}{\frac{t}{2\mu}r_w} = \mu + \frac{2\mu}{t}$$

Taking an upper bound of the approximation quality provided by each case, we get that the ring separator provides us a $\mu + 2\frac{\mu^2}{t}$ rough approximation. \square

Corollary 6.1. *We can find a $O(\mu + 2\mu^2n)$ approximate nearest neighbor to a query point q in $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log(n))$ time, using a $O(\frac{1}{n})$ ring separator tree.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.5. \square

Lemma 6.6. *We can construct a ring-tree with an arbitrary $\frac{1}{t}$ separator for $1 \leq t$ by repeating points, while maintaining the query time and approximation bounds from Lemma 6.5.*

Proof. As in the argument of Lemma 6.3, we can compute a $(\mu + 1)$ -approximation to the optimum ball $S = B(m, r_1)$ containing $\frac{n}{c}$ points (along with the constant c) and a ball $\bar{S} = B(m, 2r_1)$ that contains at most $\frac{n}{2}$ points. To improve the bounds of Lemma 6.3, divide $\bar{S} \setminus S$ into t rings of equal width, and observe that by the pigeonhole principle, at least one of these rings must contain at most $O(\frac{n}{t})$ points of P . Since this ring is not empty, the separator does not induce a perfect partition, unlike the ring separator of Lemma 6.3. Hence we include the points in *both* children of the ring-tree, and repeat the process recursively.

Note that the inner ball B_{in} contains at least $\frac{n}{c}$ points, and the outer ball $B_{\text{out}} \subset B(m, 2r_1)$ contains at most $\frac{n}{2}$ points, Hence the ring $B_{\text{out}} \setminus B_{\text{in}}$ contains at most $\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{c}$ points. Even for $t = 1$, each child contains at most $\frac{n}{2} + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{c}) = (1 - \frac{1}{c})n$ points, so the tree is still of logarithmic depth.

Also, the thickness of the ring is bounded by $\frac{2r_1 - r_1}{t} / 2r_1 = \frac{1}{2t}$, i.e it is a $O(\frac{1}{t})$ ring separator, where we abuse the notation in that the ring is not actually empty. However for the approximation quality of this version of our ring tree, remember that if nn_q is in the separating ring, then nn_q repeats in both children and cannot fall off the search path. Hence the only cases where our algorithm fails to locate nn_q is if $\text{nn}_q \in B_{\text{in}}$ and we search in P_{out} , or the converse case. The argument for the approximation bounds in these cases follows identically to that in Lemma 6.5. \square

Corollary 6.2. *We can find a $O(\mu + 2\mu^2t)$ approximate nearest neighbor to a query point q in $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n)$ time, by constructing a $O(\frac{1}{t})$ ring separator tree.*

In particular, for $t = 1$, this yields an $O(\mu^2)$ -nearest neighbor, for $t = \log n$, a $O(\mu^2 \log n)$ -nearest neighbor, and for $t = n$, a $O(\mu^2 n)$ -nearest neighbor.

Storage and preprocessing. We now come to the questions of storage requirement and construction time. We note that the following lemma is almost identical to results from [21].

Lemma 6.7. *To compute a $O(\frac{1}{t})$ ring-separator tree requires:*

- For $t = n$: $O(n)$ storage and $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d n^2 \log n)$ time,
- For $t = \log n$: $O(n)$ storage and $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d n^2 \log n)$ time,
- For $t = 1$: $O(n^{O((\mu+1)^d d^{\frac{d}{2}})})$ storage and $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d n^{O((\mu+1)^d d^{\frac{d}{2}})} \log n)$ time.

Proof. In the first case, note that only a single point is stored in each node of the ring tree. Since at each node there is a further partition of a subset of P , there can only be $O(n)$ nodes in our ring-tree. Lemma 6.2 also implies a $O(n^2)$ time cost at each level for computing a $\mu + 1$ -approximation to the smallest ball containing a $\frac{1}{c}$ fraction of the points. Since the number of levels is $O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n)$ by Lemma 6.4, this gives us the time complexity bound of $O(n^2 d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n)$. In general, given that our point set contains T_i points at the i -th level, the time cost incurred at that level during construction is $(T_i)^2$.

In the second case, by Lemma 6.6 the approximation quality and depth bounds still hold. For storage, we have to bound the total number of points in our data structure after repetition, let us say P_R . Since each node corresponds to a splitting of P_R , there may be only $O(P_R)$ nodes and total storage. Note in the proof of Lemma 6.6, for a node containing x points, at most an additional $\frac{x}{\log n}$ may be duplicated in the two children.

To bound this over each level of our tree, we sum across each node to obtain that the number of points T_i at the i -th level, as:

$$T_i = T_{i-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log T_{i-1}} \right) \quad (6.1)$$

Note also by Lemma 6.5, the tree depth is $O(\log n)$ or bounded by $k \log n$ where k is a constant. Hence we only need to bound the storage at the level $i = O(\log n)$. We solve the recurrence, noting that $T_0 = n$ and $T_i > n$ for all i and hence $T_i < T_{i-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log n} \right)$. Thus the recurrence works out to:

$$T_i < n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log n} \right)^{O(\log n)} < n \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\log n} \right)^{\log n} \right)^k < n(e^k).$$

Where the main algebraic step is that $(1 + \frac{1}{x})^x < e$. This proves that the number of points, and hence our storage complexity is $O(n)$. Multiplying the depth by $O(\log n)$ for computing the smallest ball across nodes on each level, gives us the time complexity of $O(n^2 \log n)$.

Finally, we consider the case of the $O(1)$ separator. Note that due to replication of points, there may be at most $n + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{c})$ points, or asymptotically $\frac{3n}{2}$ total points after a split. This gives us the recurrence:

$$T_i = \frac{3T_{i-1}}{2} \quad (6.2)$$

This solves to $T_i = (\frac{3}{2})^i T_0 = (\frac{3}{2})^i n$. Considering that the depth of the tree is $d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu + 1)^d \log n$, this gives us a bound on the worst case storage complexity as $(\frac{3}{2})^{d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu+1)^d \log n} n = n^{O(d^{\frac{d}{2}}(\mu+1)^d)}$ which is super-exponential in d . Again, multiplying the square of this term, by the depth gives us the time complexity. \square

7 Overall algorithm

We give now our overall algorithm for obtaining a $1 + \varepsilon$ nearest neighbor in $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \log^{2d} n)$ query time.

7.1 Preprocessing

We first construct a improved ring-tree R on our point set P in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time as described in Lemma 6.7, with ring thickness $O(\frac{1}{\log n})$. We then compute an efficient orthogonal range reporting data structure on P , such as that described in [4] by Afshani *et al.* We note the main range reporting result we need:

Lemma 7.1. *We can compute a data structure from P with $O(n \log^{d-1} n)$ storage (and same construction time), such that given an arbitrary axis parallel box B we can determine in $O(\log^d n)$ query time a point $p \in P \cap B$ if $|P \cap B| > 0$*

7.2 Query handling

Given a query point q , we use R to obtain a point q_{rough} in $O(\log n)$ time such that $D(q, q_{\text{rough}}) \leq (1 + \mu^2)D(q, \text{nn}_q)$. Given q_{rough} , we can use Lemma 5.3 to find a family F of 2^d cubes of side length exactly D_{rough} such that they cover $B(q, q_{\text{rough}})$. We use our range reporting structure to find a point $p \in P$ for all non-empty cubes in F in a total of $2^d \log^d n$ time. These points act as representatives of the cubes for what follows. Note that nn_q must necessarily be in one of these cubes, and hence there must be a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -nearest neighbor $q_{\text{approx}} \in P$ in some $G \in F$. To locate this q_{approx} , we construct a quadtree [33, Chapter 11] [18] for repeated bisection and search on each $G \in F$.

Algorithm 1 describes the overall procedure. We borrow the presentation in Har-Peled's book [33] with the important qualifier that we construct our quadtree at runtime. The terminology here is as introduced earlier in section 6.

Algorithm 1 QueryApproxNN(P, root, q)

Instantiate a queue Q containing all cells from F along with their representatives and enqueue **root**

Let $D_{\text{near}} = D(\text{rep}_{\text{root}}, q)$, $\text{best}_q = \text{rep}_{\text{root}}$

repeat

 Pull off the head of the queue and place it in **curr**.

if $D(\text{rep}_{\text{curr}}, q) < D(\text{best}_q, q)$ **then**

 Let $\text{best}_q = \text{rep}_{\text{curr}}$, $D_{\text{near}} = D(\text{best}_q, q)$

 Bisect **curr** according to procedure of Lemma 7.3; place the result in $\{G_i\}$.

for all G_i **do**

 As described in 7.3, check if G_i is non-empty by passing it to our range reporting structure, which will also return us some $p \in P$ if G_i is not empty.

 Also check if G_i may contain a point closer than $(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})D_{\text{near}}$ to q . (This may be done in $O(d)$ time for each cell, given the coordinates of the corners.)

if G_i is non-empty AND has a close enough point to q **then**

 Let $\text{rep}_{G_i} = p$

 Enqueue G_i

end if

end for

end if

until Q is empty

Return best_q

We call our *quadtree* the collection of all cells produced during the procedure.

First we demonstrate that our algorithm always returns a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -nearest neighbor to q correctly.

Lemma 7.2. *Algorithm 1 will always return a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate nearest neighbor.*

Proof. Let best_q be the point returned by the algorithm at the end of execution. By the method of the algorithm, for all points p for which the distance is directly evaluated, we have that

$$D(\text{best}_q, q) < D(p, q) \tag{7.1}$$

So, we instead look at points p which are *not* evaluated during the running of the algorithm, i.e. we did not expand their containing cells. But by the criterion of the algorithm for not expanding a cell, it must be that $D(\text{best}_q, q)(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) < D(p, q)$. For $\varepsilon < 1$, this means that $(1 + \varepsilon)D(p, q) > D(\text{best}_q, q)$ for any $p \in P$, including nn_q . So best_q is indeed a $1 + \varepsilon$ approximate nearest neighbor. \square

We first analyze the time complexity of a single iteration of our algorithm, namely the complexity of a subdivision of a cube G and determining which of the 2^d subcells of G are non-empty.

Lemma 7.3. *Let G be a cube with maximum side length s and G_i its subcells produced by bisecting along each side of G . For all non-empty subcubes G_i of G , we can find $p_i \in P \cap G_i$ in $O(2^d \log^d n)$ total time complexity, and the maximum side length of any G_i is at most $\frac{s}{2}$.*

Proof. Note that G is defined as a product of d intervals. For each interval, we can find an approximate bisecting point in $O(1)$ time and by the RTI each subinterval is of length at most $\frac{s}{2}$. This leads to an $O(d)$ cost to find a bisection point for all intervals, which define $O(2^d)$ subcubes or children.

We pass each subcube of G to our range reporting structure. By lemma 7.1, this takes $O(\log^d n)$ time to check emptiness or return a point $p_i \in P$ contained in the child, if non-empty. Since there are $O(2^d)$ non-empty children of G , this implies a cost of $2^d (\log^d n)$ time incurred.

Checking each of the non-empty subcubes G_i to see if it may contain a point closer than $(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2})D_{\text{near}}$ to q takes a further $O(d)$ time per cell or $O(d2^d)$ time. \square

We now wish to determine the bound on the number of cells that will be added to our search queue. We do so indirectly, by placing a lower bound on the maximum side length of all such cells.

Lemma 7.4. *Algorithm 1 will not add the children of node \mathbf{C} to our search queue if the maximum side length of \mathbf{C} is less than $\frac{\epsilon D(q, \text{nn}_q)}{2\mu\sqrt{d}}$.*

Proof. Let $\Delta(\mathbf{C})$ represent the diameter of cell \mathbf{C} . By construction, we can expand \mathbf{C} only if some subcell of \mathbf{C} contains a point p such that $D(p, q) \leq (1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2})D_{\text{near}}$. Note that since \mathbf{C} is examined, we have $D_{\text{near}} \leq D(\text{rep}_{\mathbf{C}}, q)$. Now assuming we expand \mathbf{C} , then we must have:

$$\begin{aligned} D(\text{rep}_{\mathbf{C}}, q) - D(p, q) &< \mu\Delta(\mathbf{C}) \\ D_{\text{near}} - (1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2})D_{\text{near}} &< \mu\Delta(\mathbf{C}) \\ \frac{\epsilon}{2}D_{\text{near}} &< \mu\Delta(\mathbf{C}) \\ \frac{\epsilon}{2\mu}D_{\text{near}} &< \Delta(\mathbf{C}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that we substitute $D(\text{rep}_{\mathbf{C}}, q) < D_{\text{near}}$. By the definition of D_{near} as our candidate nearest neighbor distance, $D(q, \text{nn}_q) < D_{\text{near}}$. Also, $\Delta(\mathbf{C}) < \sqrt{d}s$ where s is the maximum side length of \mathbf{C} . These substitutions in the inequality give us our required bound. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Given a quadtree of depth x , the number of nodes expanded at the x -th level is at most 2^{xd}*

Proof. Follows trivially from the fact that each cell \mathbf{C} can have at most 2^d children. \square

Lemma 7.6. *Given a cube G of side length D_{rough} , we can compute a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -nearest neighbor to q in $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^d} 2^d \mu^d d^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(\frac{D_{\text{rough}}}{D(q, \text{nn}_q)}\right)^d\right) \log^d n$ time.*

Proof. Consider a quadtree search from q on a cube G of side length D_{rough} . By lemma 7.4, our algorithm will not expand cells with all side lengths smaller than $\frac{\epsilon D(q, \text{nn}_q)}{2\mu\sqrt{d}}$. But since the side length reduces by at least half in each dimension upon each split, all side lengths are less than this value after $x = \log\left(\frac{D_{\text{rough}}}{\frac{\epsilon D(q, \text{nn}_q)}{2\mu\sqrt{d}}}\right)$ repeated bisections of our root cube.

Noting that $O(\log^d n)$ time is spent at each node by lemma 7.3, and that at the x -th level the number of nodes expanded is 2^{xd} , we get a final time complexity bound of $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^d} 2^d \mu^d d^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(\frac{D_{\text{rough}}}{D(q, \text{nn}_q)}\right)^d \log^d n\right)$. \square

Substituting $D_{\text{rough}} = \mu^2 D(q, \text{nn}_q) \log n$ in Lemma 7.6 gives us a bound of $O\left(2^d \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \mu^{3d} d^{\frac{d}{2}} \log^{2d} n\right)$. This time is per cube of F that covers $B(q, q_{\text{rough}})$. Noting that there are 2^d such cubes gives us a final time complexity of $O\left(2^{2d} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \mu^{3d} d^{\frac{d}{2}} \log^{2d} n\right)$.

For the space complexity of our run-time queue, note that the number of nodes in our queue increases only if a node has more than one non-empty child, i.e., there is a split of our n points. Since our point set may only split n times, this gives us a bound of $O(n)$ on the space complexity of our queue.

8 Numerical arguments

In our algorithms, we are required to *bisect* a given interval with respect to the distance measure D , as well as construct points that lie a fixed distance away from a given point. We note that in both these operations, we do not need exact answers: a constant factor approximation suffices to preserve all asymptotic bounds. In particular, our algorithms assume two procedures:

1. Given interval $[ab] \subset \mathbb{R}$, find $\bar{x} \in [ab]$ such that $(1 - \alpha) \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, \bar{x})} < \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(\bar{x}, b)} < (1 + \alpha) \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, \bar{x})}$
2. Given $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and distance r , find \bar{x} s.t $|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, \bar{x})} - r| < \alpha r$

For a given $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and precision parameter $0 < \alpha < 1$, we describe a procedure that yields an $0 < \alpha < 1$ approximation in $O(\log c_0 + \log \mu + \log \frac{1}{\alpha})$ steps for both problems, where c_0 implicitly depends on the domain of convex function ϕ :

$$c_0 = \sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \left(\max_x \phi_i''(x) / \min_y \phi_i''(y) \right)} \quad (8.1)$$

A careful adjustment of our analysis gives a $O\left((\log \mu + \log c_0 + \log \frac{1}{\alpha}) 2^{2d} (1 + \alpha)^d \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \mu^{3d} d^{\frac{d}{2}} \log^{2d} n\right)$ time complexity to compute a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -ANN to query point q .

Lemma 8.1. Consider $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_0 = \sqrt{\max_x \phi''(x) / \min_y \phi''(y)}$. Then for any two intervals $[x_1 x_2], [x_3 x_4] \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{1}{c_0} \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{|x_3 - x_4|} < \frac{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(x_1, x_2)}}{\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(x_3, x_4)}} < c_0 \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{|x_3 - x_4|} \quad (8.2)$$

Proof. The lemma follows by the definition of c_0 and by direct computation from the Lagrange form of $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, b)}$, i.e., $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(a, b)} = \sqrt{\phi''(\bar{x}_{ab})|b - a|}$, for some $\bar{x}_{ab} \in [ab]$. \square

Lemma 8.2. Given a point $q \in \mathbb{R}$, distance $r \in \mathbb{R}$, precision parameter $0 < \alpha < 1$ and a μ -defective $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can locate a point x_i such that $|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_i)} - r| < \alpha r$ in $O(\log \frac{1}{\alpha} + \log \mu + \log c_0)$ time.

Proof. Let x be the point such that $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x)} = r$. We outline an iterative process, 2, with i -th iterate x_i that converges to x . First note that $\frac{\sqrt{\phi''(q)}}{c_0} \leq \sqrt{\min_y \phi''(y)}$ and $\frac{\sqrt{\phi''(q)}}{c_0} \geq \frac{\max_z \sqrt{\phi''(z)}}{c_0^2}$. It immediately follows that $r \leq \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_0)} \leq c_0^2 r$.

By construction, $|x_i - x| \leq |x_0 - q|/2^i$. Hence by Lemma 8.1, $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(x_i, x)} < \frac{c_0^3 r}{2^i}$. We now use μ -defectiveness to upper bound our error $|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_i)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x)}|$ at the i -th iteration:

$$\left| \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_i)} - \sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x)} \right| < \frac{\mu c_0^3 r}{2^i} \quad (8.3)$$

Choosing i such that $(\mu c_0^3)/2^i \leq \alpha$ implies that $i \leq \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + \log \mu + 3 \log c_0$. \square

Algorithm 2 QueryApproxDist(q, r, c_0, α)

Let $x_0 > q$ be such that $\frac{\sqrt{\phi''(q)}}{c_0}(x_0 - q) = r$
Let $\text{step} = (x_0 - q)/2$
repeat
 if $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_i)} < r$ **then**
 $x_{i+1} = x_i + \text{step}$
 else
 $x_{i+1} = x_i - \text{step}$
 end if
 $\text{step} = \text{step}/2$
until $|\sqrt{D_{s\phi}(q, x_i)} - r| \leq \alpha r$
Return $\bar{x} = x_i$

An almost identical procedure can locate an approximate bisection point of interval $[ab]$ in $O(\log \mu + \log c_0 + \log \frac{1}{\alpha})$ time. We omit the details here.

9 Further work

For general μ -defective distances, the unevenness of cell lengths during a recursive bisection presents major technical difficulties in locating a $O(\log n)$ ANN. When repeatedly bisecting a unit interval, at the i -th level of the quadtree our subintervals may be anywhere between length 2^{-i} or $(\mu + 1)^{-i}$. This means, for instance, that our quadtree cells may be relatively "skinny" in some dimensions, or that near our query point q , cells at the i -th level may locally be of very small diameter as compared to the cell containing the nearest neighbor nn_q . This prevents us from getting the most effective packing bounds for the number of cells we need examine at each level of our quadtree. We speculate that other methods in the literature for metric spaces may be more successful in determining optimal bounds, such as cover tree [7] or epsilon-net [21] based approaches.

Our initial analysis suggests that for the more specific problem of μ -defective $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$ along with the additional assumption of a bound on c_0 as defined in Lemma 8.1, our grid based approach can be modified to yield a $O(\log n)$ ANN. This can be done by constructing a quadtree through Euclidean bisection of intervals, and observing that the Bregman length of any two intervals at the i -th level differ only by a factor of c_0 . With some other minor technical insights, we can then favorably employ the "tree search depth vs packing" tradeoffs described in [33]. We note that the quantities c_0 and μ appear intrinsically related for $\sqrt{D_{s\phi}}$, as both rely on the boundedness of the domain, and we conjecture that $\mu = c_0^{O(1)}$, although we are currently unable to prove this analytically.

Finally, a major open question is whether bounds independent of μ -defectiveness can be obtained for the complexity of ANN-search under Bregman divergences. As we have observed in this paper, traditional grid based methods rely heavily on some form of triangle inequality, and there are many technical difficulties in modifying other techniques designed for Euclidean geometry, such as decomposing the ambient space into cones [12] or constructing approximate Voronoi diagrams [20]. We conclude by stating that for optimal bounds, we expect that we will need to use the geometry of Bregman divergences in a nontrivial way, instead of adapting prior work on ANN-search for metric spaces.

References

- [1] ACKERMANN, M., AND BLÖMER, J. Bregman clustering for separable instances. In *Algorithm*

- Theory - SWAT 2010*, H. Kaplan, Ed., vol. 6139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 212–223.
- [2] ACKERMANN, M., BLÖMER, J., AND SCHOLZ, C. Hardness and non-approximability of bregman clustering problems. Tech. rep., Electronic colloquium on computational complexity, 2011. <http://eccc.hpi-web.de/report/2011/015/>.
- [3] ACKERMANN, M. R., AND BLÖMER, J. Coresets and approximate clustering for bregman divergences. In *Proceedings of the twentieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms* (Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2009), SODA '09, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp. 1088–1097.
- [4] AFSHANI, P., ARGE, L., AND LARSEN, K. D. Orthogonal range reporting in three and higher dimensions. *Foundations of Computer Science, Annual IEEE Symposium on 0* (2009), 149–158.
- [5] AMARI, S., AND NAGAOKA, H. *Methods of Information Geometry*, vol. 191 of *Translations of Mathematical monographs*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [6] BANERJEE, A., MERUGU, S., DHILLON, I. S., AND GHOSH, J. Clustering with bregman divergences. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 6 (December 2005), 1705–1749.
- [7] BEYGELZIMER, A., KAKADE, S., AND LANGFORD, J. Cover trees for nearest neighbor. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning* (New York, NY, USA, 2006), ICML '06, ACM, pp. 97–104.
- [8] BOISSONNAT, J.-D., NIELSEN, F., AND NOCK, R. Bregman voronoi diagrams. *Discrete and Computational Geometry* 44 (2010), 281–307. 10.1007/s00454-010-9256-1.
- [9] BREGMAN, L. M. The Relaxation Method of Finding the Common Point of Convex Sets and Its Application to the Solution of Problems in Convex Programming. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* 7 (1967), 200–217.
- [10] CAYTON, L. Fast nearest neighbor retrieval for bregman divergences. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning* (New York, NY, USA, 2008), ICML '08, ACM, pp. 112–119.
- [11] CAYTON, L. *Bregman proximity search*. PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego, 2009.
- [12] CHAN, T. M. Approximate nearest neighbor queries revisited. *Discrete and Computational Geometry* 20 (1998), 359–373. 10.1007/PL00009390.
- [13] CHAUDHURI, K., AND MCGREGOR, A. Finding metric structure in information theoretic clustering. In *COLT '08* (2008).
- [14] CLARKSON, K. L. Nearest-neighbor searching and metric space dimensions. In *Nearest-Neighbor Methods for Learning and Vision: Theory and Practice*, G. Shakhnarovich, T. Darrell, and P. Indyk, Eds. MIT Press, 2006, pp. 15–59.
- [15] COLE, R., AND GOTTLIEB, L.-A. Searching dynamic point sets in spaces with bounded doubling dimension. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (New York, NY, USA, 2006), STOC '06, ACM, pp. 574–583.
- [16] COVER, T. M., AND THOMAS, J. A. *Elements of information theory*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY, USA, 1991.

- [17] CSISZÁR, I. I-Divergence Geometry of Probability Distributions and Minimization Problems. *The Annals of Probability* 3 (1975), 146–158.
- [18] EPPSTEIN, D., GOODRICH, M. T., AND SUN, J. Z. The skip quadtree: a simple dynamic data structure for multidimensional data. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual symposium on Computational geometry* (New York, NY, USA, 2005), SCG '05, ACM, pp. 296–305.
- [19] GRAY, R., BUZO, A., GRAY JR, A., AND MATSUYAMA, Y. Distortion measures for speech processing. *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on* 28, 4 (Aug 1980), 367–376.
- [20] HAR-PELED, S. A replacement for voronoi diagrams of near linear size. In *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (Washington, DC, USA, 2001), FOCS '01, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 94–.
- [21] HAR-PELED, S., AND MENDEL, M. Fast construction of nets in low dimensional metrics, and their applications. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual symposium on Computational geometry* (New York, NY, USA, 2005), SCG '05, ACM, pp. 150–158.
- [22] HJALTASON, G. R., AND SAMET, H. Index-driven similarity search in metric spaces (survey article). *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 28 (December 2003), 517–580.
- [23] INDYK, P., AND MOTWANI, R. Approximate nearest neighbors: towards removing the curse of dimensionality. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (New York, NY, USA, 1998), STOC '98, ACM, pp. 604–613.
- [24] KRAUTHGAMER, R., AND LEE, J. The black-box complexity of nearest neighbor search. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, J. Daz, J. Karhumki, A. Lepist, and D. Sannella, Eds., vol. 3142 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 153–178.
- [25] MAHALANOBIS, P. C. On the generalised distance in statistics. *Proc. National Institute of Sciences in India* 2, 1 (1936), 49–55.
- [26] MANTHEY, B., AND RÖGLIN, H. Worst-case and smoothed analysis of k-means clustering with bregman divergences. In *Algorithms and Computation*, Y. Dong, D.-Z. Du, and O. Ibarra, Eds., vol. 5878 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 1024–1033.
- [27] MORALEDA, J., SHAKHNAROVICH, DARRELL, T., AND INDYK, P. Nearest-neighbors methods in learning and vision. theory and practice. *Pattern Analysis and Applications* 11 (2008), 221–222. 10.1007/s10044-007-0076-8.
- [28] NIELSEN, F., AND BOLTZ, S. The burbea-rao and bhattacharyya centroids. *CoRR abs/1004.5049* (2010).
- [29] NIELSEN, F., AND NOCK, R. On the smallest enclosing information disk. *Information Processing Letters* 105, 3 (2008), 93 – 97.
- [30] NIELSEN, F., AND NOCK, R. Sided and symmetrized bregman centroids. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.* 55 (June 2009), 2882–2904.
- [31] NIELSEN, F., PIRO, P., AND BARLAUD, M. Bregman vantage point trees for efficient nearest neighbor queries. In *Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE international conference on Multimedia and Expo* (Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2009), ICME'09, IEEE Press, pp. 878–881.

- [32] NIELSEN, F., PIRO, P., AND BARLAUD, M. Tailored bregman ball trees for effective nearest neighbors. In *In European Workshop on Computational Geometry (2009)*.
- [33] SARIEL-HAR-PELED. *Geometric Approximation Algorithms*. AMS, 2011. <http://goo.gl/pLiEO>.
- [34] SPELLMAN, E., AND VEMURI, B. Efficient shape indexing using an information theoretic representation. In *Image and Video Retrieval*, W.-K. Leow, M. Lew, T.-S. Chua, W.-Y. Ma, L. Chaisorn, and E. Bakker, Eds., vol. 3568 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 590–590.
- [35] ZHANG, Z., OOI, B. C., PARTHASARATHY, S., AND TUNG, A. K. H. Similarity search on bregman divergence: towards non-metric indexing. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 2 (August 2009), 13–24.