

Adaptive cut reveals multiscale complexity in networks

Louis Boucherie,^{1,2,*} Yong-Yeol Ahn,³ and Sune Lehmann^{1,2}

¹Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark

²Copenhagen Center for Social Data Science (SODAS), University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

³School of Data Science, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States

(Dated: December 10, 2025)

Hierarchical clustering and community detection are important problems in machine learning and complex network analysis. A common approach to identify clusters is to simply cut dendrograms at some threshold. However, single-level cuts are often suboptimal in terms of capturing underlying structure in the data, especially when the dendrogram is unbalanced. In this paper, we present the *adaptive cut*, a novel method that leverages the hierarchical structure of dendrograms by employing multi-level cuts to overcome the limitations of single-level approaches. The adaptive cut optimizes an objective function using a Markov chain Monte Carlo with simulated annealing, resulting in better partitions. We demonstrate the effectiveness of the adaptive cut through applications to link clustering and modularity optimization, but note that the method is applicable to any clustering task that relies on a dendrogram and an objective function. Beyond the adaptive cut, we introduce the *balancedness score*, an information-theoretic metric that quantifies how balanced a dendrogram is. Balancedness predicts the potential benefits of using multi-level cuts. For the community detection examples, we evaluate our method on more than 200 real-world networks and multiple synthetic datasets, demonstrating significant improvements in partition density and modularity over traditional single-cut approaches. In addition, we show the generality of the adaptive cut by applying it across various hierarchical clustering techniques and objective functions. Our results indicate that the adaptive cut provides a robust and versatile tool for improving clustering outcomes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Identifying groups of objects that are closely related, which is commonly referred to as ‘clustering’ or ‘community detection’ in the case of networks, is an important problem in many scientific fields. A plethora of clustering methods have been proposed in the literature [1–5]. Community detection and cluster analysis methods frequently produce hierarchies, reflecting the multi-scale nature found in many datasets [6–8]. The end product of hierarchical clustering is a merge tree (or dendrogram if binary) originating from leaves containing data elements and culminating at the root, which encompasses the entire dataset. Dendrograms are thus a common feature of both clustering and community detection methods. In this paper, we focus on hierarchical clustering and community detection in complex networks, specifically the Link Clustering algorithm [9] and the Louvain optimization of modularity [6]. However, our approach can be applied to any clustering process that produces a dendrogram and an independent function of clustering quality.

The most common method for obtaining clusters (or communities) is to cut the dendrogram at a single level or a constant height cutoff value [10–12]. There are several methods for selecting this value, including optimizing an objective function [9, 13], obtaining a specific number of clusters (through the elbow method or the silhouette method) [11], or optimizing for clusters with high intra-cluster similarity and high inter-cluster differences [14]. However, single-level cuts may not always identify the most useful clusters. In particular, many dendrograms are unbalanced (e.g. due to different levels of data density across a dataset), and a single-level cut cannot

effectively resolve the trade-off between over-aggregation in one part of the dendrogram and providing an excessively granular view in another part. Consequently, single-level cuts are incapable of optimally separating distinct clusters.

In this sense, single-level cuts are unable to use all of the information contained within the hierarchical structure of the dendrogram. In unbalanced dendrograms, choosing a single cut point can result in the formation of clusters with very different sizes. This can have a range of undesired downstream consequences. For example, statistical tests that assume equal cluster sizes may be unsuitable when employed in the analysis of unbalanced clusters [15, 16]. Similarly, machine learning algorithms that rely on balanced training sets may underperform [17, 18].

Here, we propose the *adaptive cut*, a novel method for cutting dendrograms using a multi-level cut. Our approach improves a range of tasks that involve hierarchical tree structures. To demonstrate the robustness of our results, we evaluate the method on over 200 real networks. The adaptive cut optimizes an objective function along the dendrogram using a Markov chain Monte Carlo with a simulated annealing scheme. We demonstrate the generality of the method across two distinct use cases of community detection for network nodes and edges. The previous key approach to examine this has been based on a visualization tool for exploring various clustering scenarios by offering different cut levels [19]. However, this approach depends on expert knowledge and does not provide a quantitative measure. Another approach [20] proposes a heuristic based on dendrogram shape, akin to the silhouette coefficient [21].

We also present a new measure of dendrogram balance. Numerous tree balance indices have been proposed in the literature [22, 23]. Our novel index of balance named *balancedness*, is based on information theory. It is defined at each level of the dendrogram, computationally efficient, and satisfies the

* louibo@dtu.dk

axioms required for membership in the class of robust, universal tree balance indices [24].

Existing work on community detection also connects to our method. Markov chain Monte Carlo with simulated annealing has been employed for community detection in networks to optimize modularity [25, 26], description length [7], or fit stochastic block models [27]. These approaches optimize community splits directly and as such do not utilize the tree structure to optimize the objective function. They operate on a large state space, making convergence to the optimal partition challenging and computationally expensive. By leveraging an underlying tree structure adaptive cut reduces the size of the state space and enables a more efficient optimization of the objective function and faster convergence to an optimal solution.

II. BALANCEDNESS

A. Definition

We begin by introducing the *balancedness* score, an information theory based metric that quantifies the balance of a dendrogram. The balancedness metric compares the actual branching structure of a dendrogram (real entropy) with both a perfectly balanced scenario (maximal entropy) and a highly skewed one (minimal entropy) to quantify how balanced a particular dendrogram is. At each level l of the dendrogram, the partition of the n leaves in each of the k branches is noted as follows:

$$\pi_l = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\}, \quad (1)$$

where B_i represents the set of leaves having branch B_i as an ancestor. To account for balancedness, we first define the maximal entropy of the leaf distribution,

$$H_{\max}(k) = - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{k} \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{k} \right) = \log_2 k. \quad (2)$$

Then we define the minimal entropy as

$$H_{\min}(k, n) = - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n} \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) - \frac{n - (k - 1)}{n} \log_2 \left(\frac{n - (k - 1)}{n} \right). \quad (3)$$

Additionally, we determine the actual realized entropy of the leaf partition π_l at level l as follows:

$$H(\pi_l) = - \sum_{i=1}^{|\pi_l|} p(B_i) \log_2 p(B_i), \quad (4)$$

where $p(B_i) = |B_i|/n$. The balancedness score is the average, over all levels, of the ratio between the realized entropy minus the minimal entropy and the maximum entropy minus the

minimal entropy across all levels,

$$B = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{H(\pi_l) - H_{\min}(\pi_l)}{H_{\max}(\pi_l) - H_{\min}(\pi_l)}. \quad (5)$$

The balancedness metric ranges from 0 (unbalanced dendrogram, Fig. 1a) to 1 (perfectly balanced dendrogram, Fig. 1c). Moreover, the balancedness score satisfies the axioms of a robust and universal measure of tree balance [24]. Balancedness can be computed in $O(n)$ with a single pass over levels.

B. Examples

To illustrate our metric, we now examine the balancedness score of two real networks. Figure 1d,g illustrate the dendrogram obtained by the link clustering of two real networks, the character network of Les Misérables (unbalanced) and the street network of Paris (balanced, 1g). To determine the balancedness of the dendrograms, we compute the maximum, minimal and real entropy values at each level as defined in (Eqs. 2-5). These values are displayed at each level of the dendrogram on Fig 1e,h. The balancedness score is equal to the proportion of the area between the two black curves that is under the pink curve. For further details, refer to Equation 5.

A majority of real-world networks yield unbalanced dendrograms, as illustrated in Figure 1f. Moreover, we show on Figure 1i that the balancedness measure is relatively independent of the size of the network and therefore the size of the dendrogram.

III. ADAPTIVE CUT

To identify the multi-levels of the adaptive cut, we optimize an objective function over the partitions (or cluster membership). We employ a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) approach to optimize the objective function f within a finite search space X , using the softmax distribution

$$\pi^*(x) = \frac{e^{f(x)/T}}{Z}, \quad (6)$$

where x represents a state within the search space X , T denotes the temperature parameter, and Z is the partition function.

A. Markov Chain

The Markov chain we define can walk up or down the dendrogram. As it goes up, it merges two neighboring partitions into a larger one; as it goes down, it splits a single partition into two smaller partitions. For each step, given a partition, a cluster is selected uniformly at random, followed by a direction (up or down). Subsequently, we obtain a new partition by merging the cluster with its neighbor (up) or splitting the cluster in two (down). Each move is accepted or rejected with a probability given as a function of the objective function difference Δf . To ensure that the adaptive cut MCMC




FIG. 1. **Explanation of the balancedness Measure.** (a, b, c) Illustrations of different tree structures: (a) an unbalanced caterpillar tree, (b) an intermediate tree, and (c) a balanced tree. (d) Dendrogram of the network of the urban street of Paris based on link similarities [9]. The dendrogram is unbalanced, as shown in (e). (e) The progression of the real, maximal and minimal entropies (x axis) across different similarity levels (y axis). The three entropies are used to compute the balancedness metric (Eq. 5). (f) Dendrogram representing the "Les Miserables" character network based on link similarities [9]. The dendrogram is unbalanced, as shown in (g). (g) The progression of the real, maximal and minimal entropies across different levels. (h) The distribution of balancedness scores for 200 real networks. (i) A plot of the balancedness metric against network size (number of nodes), demonstrating that the balancedness score is relatively independent of network size.

converges to the optimal partition we must verify the Markov chain is ergodic (or irreducible), implying that every network partition present in the dendrogram is accessible from every other partition in the dendrogram, and that detailed balance is maintained, meaning each step is reversible. After a sufficiently long equilibration time, each observed partition must occur with the desired probability π^* .

We define the following ergodic Markov chain. Given a partition that corresponds to the list of branches $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$, we select a branch with uniform probability $i \sim \mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, n\}$. The choice of the direction is not uniform. Indeed, if we go down one level, there are two paths that can bring back the chain to the initial state. Consequently, the probability of going down must be twice as large as the probability of going up. Although the number of branches also changes, it increases (down) or decreases (up) by one. Therefore, the probability of going up/down from a level l that contains n branches is:

$$P_{\text{up}}^n = \frac{1}{3} \times \frac{3n}{3n-2}, \quad (7)$$

$$P_{\text{down}}^{n-1} = \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{3(n-1)}{3n-2}. \quad (8)$$

The probability to move from a state x with n clusters to a

state y is,

$$Q_{x \rightarrow y} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{n} P_{\text{up}}^n, & \text{if } y \text{ is up from } x, \\ \frac{1}{n} P_{\text{down}}^n, & \text{if } y \text{ is down from } x, \\ 0, & \text{if we cannot attain } y \text{ from } x \text{ in one step.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The Markov chain defined by Q is symmetric, for state x and y , $Q_{x \rightarrow y} = Q_{y \rightarrow x}$. The process can transition from any state to any state, irrespective of the number of steps required, rendering the Markov chain defined by Q ergodic. However, it does not fulfill detailed balance, but this condition can be enforced using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [28, 29].

B. Metropolis-Hastings

To sample the Markov chain we use the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [28]. This means that at each step of the Markov chain, we accept a move with a probability α given by

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(x_\star) Q_{x_\star \rightarrow x_i}}{\pi(x_i) Q_{x_i \rightarrow x_\star}} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

With probability α , we move to state $x_{i+1} = x_\star$, otherwise, $x_{i+1} = x$. As Q is symmetric and $\pi \propto \exp(f(x)/T)$ then if




FIG. 2. **Comparison between Link Clustering and adaptive cut** (a) The adjacency matrix of a stochastic block model network, with nodes colored according to edge communities identified by the link clustering method [9]. (b) The corresponding dendrogram for the same network, with partitions or communities defined by the single-level link clustering cut [9]. The similarity level at which the cut is made is indicated by the dashed line. (c, d) Similar network to (a) and (b), but using an adaptive cut method instead of link clustering.

the objective function increases between the two states, i.e. $f(x_*) > f(x)$ we always move to x_* , else we move with probability $\exp(-|\Delta f|/T)$. In Eq. (10), the parameter T represents the temperature, which can assist in escaping local maxima. Therefore, the Markov chain converges to the desired distribution, as defined in Eq. (6).

C. Simulated Annealing

In practice, however, the mixing time may be long. To prevent the Markov chain from getting trapped in a local maximum, we employ a simulated annealing scheme [30]. The principle behind simulated annealing is to initiate with a high temperature and gradually reduce it over time. We opt for Fast Annealing [31], where the temperature cooling scheme is,

$$T_k = \frac{T_0}{k}, \quad (11)$$

with T_k is the temperature at iteration k and T_0 is the initial temperature.

D. Initialization

We initiate the Markov chain at the optimal single-level cut obtained from the clustering algorithms. This is important since a critical practical aspect of Markov chain Monte Carlo

(MCMC) methods is the selection of the initial state, as it has a significant impact on the mixing time [32]. The mixing time is strongly influenced by the proximity of the initial state of the Markov chain to the equilibrium partitions. While it is common practice to start with a random partition, in the present case, a local maximum is already provided by the single-level cut. Using Markov chain Monte Carlo to optimize community detection methods is not novel [25–27]. However, the main issue is the long convergence time as the state space of these methods is very large. By restricting our method to the structure of the dendrogram, we optimize the moves and achieve significant improvement over random alternatives when networks become larger. The adaptive cut has a much smaller state space, allowing it to converge to the global optimum in a shorter time.

IV. RESULTS

A. Link Clustering with toy network models

The Link Clustering method [9] uses hierarchical clustering based on link similarity (Jaccard index of neighbors) to create a dendrogram, where each link is a leaf, and branches represent link communities. Communities are extracted by cutting the dendrogram at a specific similarity threshold, allowing nodes to belong to multiple overlapping communities (see VID). To identify the most relevant communities, the method

introduces partition density D , which measures link density within communities and does not suffer from resolution limits [9, 33, 34]. The optimal cut is determined by maximizing D along the levels of the dendrogram.

However, determining the best cut level can be challenging. The adaptive cut method optimizes D further, potentially revealing more accurate community structures, especially in networks with communities of varying sizes and densities. This approach addresses the limitations of a single-level cut by better capturing complex network structures (Fig. 2c).

1. Varying Density Stochastic Block Model

To illustrate the limitations of the single-level cut, we focus on two toy networks with a given community structure, a stochastic block model [35, 36] and a varying density stochastic block model that we introduce. We simplify the stochastic block model (SBM) by assuming that the probability of an edge between two nodes depends only on whether the nodes belong to the same community or different communities (see the adjacency matrix Fig. 2a). The model is described by the following equation:

$$P(A_{ij} = 1 \mid z_i = z_j) = \theta_{\text{intra}}, \quad P(A_{ij} = 1 \mid z_i \neq z_j) = \theta_{\text{inter}}, \quad (12)$$

where A_{ij} is the adjacency matrix entry for nodes i and j , where $A_{ij} = 1$ indicates the presence of an edge between these nodes, and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The variables z_i and z_j denote the community assignments of nodes i and j respectively. The term θ_{intra} represents the probability of an edge between any two nodes in the same community, while θ_{inter} represents the probability of an edge between nodes in different communities. In this model, θ_{intra} is the same for all communities, and θ_{inter} is the same for all pairs of different communities. Our varying density stochastic block model is the same, except that the θ_{intra} decreases and the θ_{inter} also decreases. In the Varying Density Stochastic Block Model, we generalize the traditional stochastic block model by varying the intra-community and inter-community densities. This approach allows the creation of communities with different internal structures and varying degrees of connectivity between them. In particular, the intra- and inter-community densities decrease across communities (see VIC and adjacency matrix Fig. 2e).

The stochastic block model (adjacency matrix in Fig. 2a) exhibits clear communities of identical size and density, thus exhibiting identical similarities with respect to link clustering. The single-level cut is capable of distinguishing between the communities (see Fig. 2a), while the adaptive cut does not offer a superior partitioning (see Fig. 2b). Indeed, the partition densities of both cuts is close $D = 0.620$ for link clustering and $D = 0.622$ for the adaptive cut. Conversely, although the Varying Density Stochastic Block Model still exhibits a clear community structure, as evidenced by the adjacency matrix in Fig. 2e, the single-level cut is unable to provide a partition that reflects these communities. This is due to the inability of a single-cut to capture communities with varying densities. The adaptive cut improves performance, with a value

of $D = 0.45$, in comparison to the single-level cut, which has a value of $D = 0.325$, Fig. 2c,d). The communities are clearly aligned with the blocks of the adjacency matrix, as illustrated in Figure 2d. Finally, it can be observed that the stochastic block model dendrogram is more balanced than the dendrogram of the varying density stochastic block model. This is evidenced by the respective balancedness values of $B = 0.55$ and $B = 0.22$.

2. Community Structure Evaluation




FIG. 3. Varying Density Stochastic Block Model Network: Comparison of average cluster size and recovery accuracy for a. (a) Comparison of the average cluster size (log-scale) for Link Clustering, the adaptive cut, and the ground truth. Link Clustering has many singleton communities that yield a smaller average size, whereas the adaptive cut merges the singletons into clusters and therefore the average cluster size matches the ground truth better. (b) Adjusted Mutual information between the detected partitions and the ground truth assignments. The adaptive cut has higher mutual information with ground truth than Link Clustering, indicating a better community detection.

In Figure 3a, we compare the log-scale average cluster size produced by each method with the true cluster size. The Link Clustering method has a smaller average community size because it leaves many links isolated in singleton communities (21,254). This observation is due to the tendency for the single-level cuts of unbalanced networks to ‘over-partition’. In contrast, the adaptive cut method successfully merges these small communities into larger communities – shifting its mean cluster size much closer to the ground truth, reflecting a more accurate representation of the structure of the network, as can be seen in the adjacency matrix (see Fig. 2d).

Figure 3b shows the mutual information between each detected partition and the true cluster assignments. The adaptive cut has a higher mutual information with the ground truth than Link Clustering, demonstrating that its multi-level cutting scheme recovers the underlying community structure more accurately than a single-level cut.

B. Link Clustering with real networks examples

We compare the Link Clustering and adaptive cut across 200 real-world networks to evaluate a) the typical improve-




FIG. 4. Improvement (in %) of the partition density between the single-level cut (Link Clustering [9]) and the multi-level adaptive cut as a function of the dendrogram balancedness. The color of the symbols indicates the domain of the network, and the size indicates the number of nodes in the network.

ment and b) the influence of balancedness on the outcome of the community detection. Figure 4 presents the extent to which adaptive cut enhances partition density (expressed as a percentage) relative to the balancedness of each dendrogram. Our findings indicate that as the balancedness of a network decreases, the likelihood of achieving significant improvements with adaptive cut increases. Importantly, this relationship is consistent across various types of networks, including economic, transportation, informational, biological, and social networks.

C. Louvain with real network examples

The Louvain method [6] is a popular algorithm for community detection that optimizes modularity to identify community structures in networks. It operates iteratively, initially assigning each node to its own community and then repeatedly merging communities to maximize modularity gains. However, this greedy optimization can lead to the algorithm getting trapped in local maxima, potentially missing the globally optimal community structure. Moreover, the standard Louvain method does not produce a complete dendrogram that represents the full hierarchy of community merges, as it stops merging when no further modularity gain is possible.

To integrate the adaptive cut into the Louvain method, we modify the algorithm to construct a full dendrogram, extending beyond the point where modularity gain ceases. This is achieved by allowing merges that result in a modularity decrease, thereby capturing the entire hierarchical structure of the network from individual nodes up to the entire network as a single community.

Our experiments on real-world networks demonstrate sig-




FIG. 5. Improvement (in %) of the modularity between the single-level cut (Louvain) and the multi-level cut (Louvain + adaptive cut) as a function of balancedness. The symbol colors indicate the domain of the network, and the size the number of nodes in the network.

nificant improvements in modularity when applying the adaptive cut to the Louvain method. For instance, in networks with unbalanced dendrograms—where community sizes and densities vary widely—the adaptive cut effectively adjusts for imbalance by selecting cuts at different levels of the dendrogram, leading to partitions with higher modularity. Figure 5 shows the percentage improvement in modularity achieved by the adaptive cut compared to the original Louvain partition, plotted against the balancedness score of each network’s dendrogram. The results indicate that networks with lower balancedness scores benefit more from the adaptive cut, validating our approach.

D. Generalizing to any hierarchical clustering

The adaptive cut framework extends beyond network community detection and is applicable to any clustering task that produces a dendrogram. This generalization requires two main components: a method for constructing the dendrogram and an objective function to optimize.

For dendrogram construction, any hierarchical clustering algorithm can be utilized, such as single linkage [1], average linkage [37], or Ward’s method [38]. These methods build a hierarchical tree by iteratively merging clusters based on a chosen linkage criterion.

An appropriate objective function is necessary to evaluate the quality of partitions at different levels of the dendrogram. Common choices include the Davis-Bouldin index [14], silhouette score [21], within-cluster sum of squares as in K-means clustering [39], or the ratio of intra-cluster to inter-cluster distances.

Once the dendrogram and objective function are defined, the adaptive cut is applied by optimizing the objective func-




FIG. 6. Comparison of clustering results on the two-circle dataset using a single-level cut and the adaptive cut. The adaptive cut effectively identifies the two concentric clusters, which the single-level cut fails to separate.

tion using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method described earlier. The Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm explores different partitions by moving up and down the dendrogram to find the partition that optimizes the objective function.

To illustrate the generality of our method, we apply the adaptive cut to the classic two-circle toy dataset [40], which presents a challenging clustering problem due to its non-convex cluster shapes. We construct a dendrogram using hierarchical clustering and use the within-cluster sum of squares as the objective function. Figure 6 compares the clustering results of the traditional single-level cut and the adaptive cut. While the single-level cut fails to separate the concentric circles effectively, the adaptive cut successfully identifies the inherent cluster structure by leveraging multi-level cuts.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we introduced the adaptive cut, a new method designed to overcome the limitations of traditional single-level cuts in hierarchical clustering and community detection. Using multi-level cuts and optimizing an objective function using a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm with simulated annealing, the adaptive cut leverages the full hierarchical structure of dendrograms. This approach is particularly effective for datasets with unbalanced dendrograms, where single-level cuts often fail to capture the true underlying structure. We also introduce the balancedness score, an information-theoretic metric that quantifies the balance of a dendrogram

and predicts the potential benefits of the adaptive cut.

First, we demonstrated that traditional single-level cuts can be inadequate for accurately identifying clusters in complex networks, especially when dealing with unbalanced dendrograms—something which can arise when the density of data is uneven across a dataset. Single-level cuts may lead to over-aggregation in some parts of the dendrogram and overly granular partitions in others, resulting in suboptimal clustering. This issue was particularly evident in our experiments with stochastic block models exhibiting varying densities, where the adaptive cut significantly outperformed the single-level approach.

Second, we introduced the balancedness score, an information-theoretic metric that quantifies the balance of a dendrogram. Our analysis of over 200 real-world networks revealed that most dendrograms are indeed unbalanced. The balancedness score not only measures dendrogram balance but also serves as a predictor of the potential improvement achievable with the adaptive cut method. Networks with lower balancedness scores tended to benefit more from the adaptive cut, as it effectively adjusts for the imbalance by employing multi-level cuts.

The applications of the adaptive cut to both synthetic and real-world networks consistently outperforms single-level cuts. In synthetic networks, the adaptive cut produced partitions that more accurately reflected the ground truth community structures, particularly in models with varying densities. In real-world networks across diverse domains—including social, economic, biological, and transportation networks—the adaptive cut consistently improved performance metrics such as partition density and modularity. These improvements were most pronounced in networks with unbalanced dendrograms.

We showcased the generality and versatility of the adaptive cut method. It can be applied across different hierarchical clustering techniques (e.g., single linkage, average linkage, Ward’s method) and optimized for various objective functions (e.g., modularity, silhouette score, partition density). This flexibility makes the adaptive cut a valuable tool for a wide range of clustering applications beyond network analysis, including machine learning tasks where hierarchical clustering is essential.

While the adaptive cut offers substantial advantages, it is not without limitations. One key limitation is its reliance on the dendrogram structure, which confines the set of possible partitions to those represented within the dendrogram. Although this restriction reduces the state space and enhances computational efficiency, it may exclude some potentially optimal partitions not present in the dendrogram.

Moreover, the optimization process within the adaptive cut uses a Markov chain Monte Carlo method with a simulated annealing schedule. While effective, the choice of cooling schedule can impact convergence rates and computational efficiency. Future work could investigate adaptive cooling schemes, where the cooling rate is adjusted dynamically based on the acceptance rate of new solutions. This approach could provide a more flexible optimization strategy, enhancing convergence and allowing the algorithm to balance exploration and exploitation more effectively.

Another promising direction is to explore alternative optimization methods, such as dynamic programming, which can optimize objective functions on tree structures with lower computational complexity [41, 42].

In conclusion, the adaptive cut method, coupled with the balancedness score, represents a significant advancement in hierarchical clustering and community detection. By effectively utilizing the hierarchical information in dendrograms and addressing the shortcomings of single-level cuts, it provides a more nuanced and accurate clustering method suitable for complex and unbalanced datasets.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Morten Mørup, Nikolaos Nakis and Abdulkadir Çelikkanat for stimulating discussions. The work was supported in part by the Villum Foundation Grant Nation-Scale Social Networks [grant number: 00034288] (SL) and the Danish Council for Independent Research [grant number: 0136-00315B](SL). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

VI. SUPPLEMENTARY

A. Code availability

Code is available on GitHub https://github.com/LCB0B/adaptive_cut.

B. The definition of the Markov chain

For the Markov chain to be symmetric, i.e. for all states x , y with x having n clusters and y having $n-1$ clusters,

$$Q_{x \rightarrow y} = Q_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{2}{n} P_{\text{up}}^n = \frac{1}{n-1} P_{\text{down}}^{n-1} \quad (13)$$

However we also know that $P_{\text{up}}^n + P_{\text{down}}^n = 1$. These two constraints lead to the equation 8.

The probability to move from a state x with n clusters to a state y is,

$$Q_{x \rightarrow y} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{n} P_{\text{up}}^n, & \text{if } y \text{ is up from } x, \\ \frac{1}{n} P_{\text{down}}^n, & \text{if } y \text{ is down from } x, \\ 0, & \text{if we cannot attain } y \text{ from } x \text{ in one step.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

C. Varying Density Stochastic Block Model

The model begins by defining a set of communities, each with a specific size and intra-community density. The intra-community density, $\theta_{\text{intra}}^{(c)}$, for community c is given by:

$$\theta_{\text{intra}}^{(c)} = \frac{1}{k_c} \sum_{i \in \text{Community } c} p_i$$

where k_c is the size of the community, and p_i represents the probability of an edge between any two nodes within community c . As the community index c increases, $\theta_{\text{intra}}^{(c)}$ decreases linearly or non-linearly, depending on the specific configuration used.

For the inter-community density, $\theta_{\text{inter}}^{(c,c+1)}$, which represents the probability of an edge between nodes in adjacent communities c and $c+1$, the density is also designed to decrease as a function of the intra-community densities:

$$\theta_{\text{inter}}^{(c,c+1)} = \left(\theta_{\text{intra}}^{(c+1)} \right)^2$$

D. Dendrogram Construction and Link Similarity

To construct a dendrogram representing link communities [9], we start by defining the similarity between pairs of links. For an undirected, unweighted network, let $n_1(i)$ denote the set of neighbors of node i . The similarity $S(e_{ik}, e_{jk})$ between two links e_{ik} and e_{jk} , sharing a common node k , is calculated using the Jaccard index:

$$S(e_{ik}, e_{jk}) = \frac{|n_1(i) \cap n_1(j)|}{|n_1(i) \cup n_1(j)|}, \quad (15)$$

Here, $n_1(i)$ and $n_1(j)$ represent the sets of neighbors of nodes i and j , respectively, with the shared node k excluded. This measure, known as the Jaccard index, provides a normalized similarity score based on the overlap between the sets of neighbors.

The similarity between links can be easily extended to networks with weighted, directed, or signed links (without self-loops), as the Jaccard index generalizes to the Tanimoto coefficient [43]. Consider a vector $\mathbf{a}_i = (\tilde{A}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{A}_{iN})$, where

$$\tilde{A}_{ij} = \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{i' \in n(i)} w_{ii'} \delta_{ij} + w_{ij}, \quad (16)$$

with w_{ij} representing the weight on edge e_{ij} , $n(i) = \{j | w_{ij} > 0\}$ being the set of all neighbors of node i , $k_i = |n(i)|$ denoting the degree of node i , and $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and zero otherwise. The similarity between edges e_{ik} and e_{jk} , analogous to Eq. 15, is now defined by the Tanimoto coefficient:

$$S(e_{ik}, e_{jk}) = \frac{\mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j}{|\mathbf{a}_i|^2 + |\mathbf{a}_j|^2 - \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j}, \quad (17)$$

This formula generalizes the similarity measure to handle various types of networks, including those with weighted, directed, or signed edges, offering greater flexibility in the analysis.

E. Single-Linkage Clustering for Dendrogram Creation

Using the similarity matrices $S(e_{ik}, e_{jk})$ for the unweighted case, or $S(e_{ik}, e_{jk})$ for the weighted, directed case as defined in Eq. 17, we perform single-linkage hierarchical clustering. This method initializes each link as its own cluster and iteratively merges clusters based on the highest similarity until a single cluster remains. The resulting hierarchical structure is represented as a dendrogram, where each leaf corresponds to an original network link, and the branches depict the formation of link communities.

F. Partition Density for Evaluating Clusters

To identify the most meaningful level of clustering within the dendrogram, we employ partition density D , a metric that assesses the density of links within communities. Given a network with M links and N nodes, partitioned into C subsets $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_C\}$, where m_c is the number of links in subset P_c , and n_c is the number of nodes connected by these links, the link density D_c for a community c is defined as:

$$D_c = \frac{m_c - (n_c - 1)}{n_c(n_c - 1)/2 - (n_c - 1)}, \quad (18)$$

This expression normalizes the number of links in P_c by the minimum and maximum possible number of links that could exist among n_c nodes. The overall partition density D is then computed as the weighted average of D_c over all communities:

$$D = \frac{2}{M} \sum_c m_c \frac{m_c - (n_c - 1)}{(n_c - 2)(n_c - 1)}. \quad (19)$$

This approach avoids the resolution limits that often challenge other community detection methods, making it an effective measure for evaluating the hierarchical structure in a network.

G. Adaptive cut for Optimal Clustering

To optimize the clustering process, we introduce an adaptive cutting technique that selects the optimal dendrogram cut by maximizing the partition density D as defined in equation 19. This method ensures that the communities identified are both meaningful and reflective of the network's underlying structure.

1. State Space

The state space of MCMC restricted to a dendrogram is smaller than the space of all set partitions. The number of

ways to partition n vertices into k nonempty groups is the Stirling number of the second kind $S(n, k)$. Summing over all k gives the total number of partitions (the Bell number $B(n)$):

$$B(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n S(n, k).$$

Although there is no simple elementary closed form, $B(n)$ admits Dobinski's formula

$$B(n) = \frac{1}{e} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{m^n}{m!},$$

and its exponential generating function is $\sum_{n \geq 0} B(n) x^n / n! = e^{e^x - 1}$. Moreover, since $S(n, 1) + S(n, 2) = 1 + (2^{n-1} - 1) = 2^{n-1}$, we have $B(n) \geq 2^{n-1}$, so the number of partitions grows at least exponentially in n .

On the other hand, the number of partitions allowed by the dendrogram, i.e. that respect the structure of the binary tree, is much smaller. When considering multi-cuts on a dendrogram, the state space is defined by the possible partitions of the tree, which can be obtained by making cuts at different levels of the tree. For a perfectly balanced binary tree with n leaf nodes, the number of possible partitions (or states) is $2^{n-1} - 1$. Indeed, each cut separates the subtree below that node from the rest of the tree, creating a new cluster. The number of ways to cut the tree is equivalent to the power set of the set of internal nodes, minus the empty set (since we don't consider the situation with no cuts as a valid partition). The power set of a set is the set of all possible subsets of that set. If n is the number of leaf nodes in the tree, then there are $n - 1$ internal nodes in a complete binary tree. Therefore, the number of possible partitions is $2^{(n-1)} - 1$ which is also $S(n, 2)$.

This state space size is significantly smaller than the Bell number, which represents the number of ways to partition a set of n objects into any number of subsets. The Bell number grows much faster than $2^{n-1} - 1$, and for large n , the difference between the two becomes increasingly pronounced.

The smaller state space when considering multi-cuts on a dendrogram has important implications for the performance of MCMC methods. In particular, it suggests that MCMC algorithms should converge faster when applied to dendrograms compared to more general partition problems. This is because the algorithm has fewer states to explore, allowing it to more quickly and efficiently sample the state space and converge to the equilibrium distribution.

Moreover, the tree structure of the dendrogram allows for more informed decisions about where to make cuts, potentially leading to more efficient exploration of the state space. Therefore, in practice, MCMC methods applied to dendrograms with multi-cuts can offer significant advantages in terms of both computational efficiency and convergence speed.

H. Proof that the balancedness score fulfills the three universal tree-balance axioms

In this paragraph we prove that our balancedness measure satisfies the three universal tree-balance axioms. We keep the notation already introduced in Eqs. (2)–(5) of the manuscript. Below we prove that B satisfies the three universal axioms of [24].

Axiom 1 (Maximum-value). Bound. For every level l we have $H_{\min}(\pi_l) \leq H(\pi_l) \leq H_{\max}(\pi_l)$, hence each summand is in the closed interval $[0, 1]$ and therefore $0 \leq B \leq 1$.

Saturation. Equality $B = 1$ requires every summand to equal 1; thus $H(\pi_l) = H_{\max}(\pi_l)$ for all l . Because Shannon entropy attains its maximum iff $p_1 = \dots = p_k = \frac{1}{k}$, each internal node splits its n leaves into k subbranches of identical size n/k . Conversely, if every internal split is perfectly even, then $H(\pi_l) = H_{\max}(\pi_l)$ at every level and $B = 1$.

Axiom 2 (Minimum-value). Linear dendrogram gives $B = 0$. In a caterpillar (fully unbalanced) dendrogram every internal node separates a single leaf from the rest. For any level l the partition is therefore $\pi_l = \{1 \text{ leaf}, n-1 \text{ leaves}\}$, which realizes the minimal entropy: $H(\pi_l) = H_{\min}(\pi_l)$. Each summand vanishes and $B = 0$.

Conversely, $B = 0$ implies linearity. Suppose $B = 0$. Then $H(\pi_l) = H_{\min}(\pi_l)$ for every l . Minimal entropy is achieved only when exactly one block of π_l contains $n - (k-1)$ leaves while the remaining $k-1$ blocks are singletons. Inductively

climbing up the dendrogram this forces *every* internal node to eject a single leaf while passing the remainder upwards, i.e. the dendrogram is linear.

Axiom 3 (Insensitivity to vanishing subtrees). Let a leaf be replaced by a finite subtree whose total number of leaves is εn with $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, producing a modified dendrogram T_ε . Probabilities of all original leaves scale by the factor $(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}$, while the new leaves jointly carry probability mass $\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)$.

Entropy change at any fixed level. Standard Taylor expansion yields

$$|H_\varepsilon(\pi_l) - H(\pi_l)| = O(\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

Effect on balancedness. The denominators $H_{\max}(\pi_l) - H_{\min}(\pi_l)$ are independent of ε , hence each summand in the definition of B perturbs by at most $C\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)$ for a constant $C > 0$. Averaging over the L levels therefore gives

$$|B(T_\varepsilon) - B(T)| \leq C\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Thus adding a *vanishingly small* subtree leaves B unchanged in the limit.

The balancedness index defined in Eq. (5) achieves its maximum exclusively for perfectly balanced trees, its minimum exclusively for linear trees, and is insensitive to subtrees of vanishing size. Hence it fulfills the three universal axioms and constitutes a *robust, universal tree-balance index*.

-
- [1] S. C. Johnson, Hierarchical clustering schemes, *Psychometrika* **32**, 241 (1967).
 - [2] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, and F. Radicchi, Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms, *Physical Review E* **78**, 046110 (2008).
 - [3] K. A. Heller and Z. Ghahramani, Bayesian hierarchical clustering, in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Machine Learning* (ACM, 2005) pp. 297–304.
 - [4] R. Xu and D. Wunsch, Survey of clustering algorithms, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **16**, 645 (2005).
 - [5] F. Radicchi, C. Castellano, F. Cecconi, V. Loreto, and D. Parisi, Defining and identifying communities in networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101**, 2658 (2004).
 - [6] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, Fast unfolding of communities in large networks, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2008**, P10008 (2008).
 - [7] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**, 1118 (2008).
 - [8] F. Murtagh and P. Contreras, Algorithms for hierarchical clustering: an overview, *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **2**, 86 (2012).
 - [9] Y.-Y. Ahn, J. P. Bagrow, and S. Lehmann, Link communities reveal multiscale complexity in networks, *Nature* **466**, 761 (2010).
 - [10] R. J. Campello, D. Moulavi, A. Zimek, and J. Sander, A framework for semi-supervised and unsupervised optimal extraction of clusters from hierarchies, *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **27**, 344 (2013).
 - [11] G. W. Milligan and M. C. Cooper, An examination of procedures for determining the number of clusters in a data set, *Psychometrika* **50**, 159 (1985).
 - [12] A. K. Jain and R. C. Dubes, *Algorithms for Clustering Data* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1988).
 - [13] J. C. Dunn, Well separated clusters and optimal fuzzy partitions, *Journal of Cybernetics* **4**, 95 (1974).
 - [14] D. L. Davies and D. W. Bouldin, A cluster separation measure, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **PAMI-1**, 224 (1979).
 - [15] S.-J. Yen and Y.-S. Lee, Cluster-based under-sampling approaches for imbalanced data distributions, *Expert Systems with Applications* **36**, 5718 (2009).
 - [16] W.-C. Lin, C.-F. Tsai, Y.-H. Hu, and J.-S. Jhang, Clustering-based undersampling in class-imbalanced data, *Information Sciences* **409**, 17 (2017).
 - [17] H. He and E. A. Garcia, Learning from imbalanced data, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **21**, 1263 (2009).
 - [18] P. Branco, L. Torgo, and R. P. Ribeiro, A survey of predictive modeling on imbalanced domains, *ACM Computing Surveys* **49**, 1 (2016).
 - [19] A. Vogogias, J. Kennedy, D. Archambault, V. A. Smith, and H. Currant, MLCut: Exploring Multi-Level Cuts in Dendrograms for Biological Data, in *Computer Graphics and Visual Computing (CGVC)*, edited by C. Turkay and T. R. Wan (The Eurographics Association, 2016).
 - [20] P. Langfelder, B. Zhang, and S. Horvath, Defining clusters from a hierarchical cluster tree: the Dynamic Tree Cut package for R, *Bioinformatics* **24**, 719 (2007).

- [21] P. J. Rousseeuw, Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **20**, 53 (1987).
- [22] K.-T. Shao and R. R. Sokal, Tree Balance, *Systematic Zoology* **39**, 266 (1990).
- [23] M. Fischer, L. Herbst, S. Kersting, L. Kühn, and K. Wicke, Tree balance indices: a comprehensive survey (2021).
- [24] J. Lemant, C. Le Sueur, V. Manojlović, and R. Noble, Robust, Universal Tree Balance Indices, *Systematic Biology* **71**, 1210 (2022).
- [25] S. Lehmann and L. K. Hansen, Deterministic modularity optimization, *The European Physical Journal B* **60**, 83 (2007).
- [26] R. Guimerà and L. A. N. Amaral, Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks, *Nature* **433**, 895 (2005).
- [27] T. P. Peixoto, Efficient monte carlo and greedy heuristic for the inference of stochastic block models, *Physical Review E* **89**, 012804 (2014).
- [28] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller, Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **21**, 1087 (1953).
- [29] W. K. Hastings, Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications, *Biometrika* **57**, 97 (1970).
- [30] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt Jr, and M. P. Vecchi, Optimization by simulated annealing, *Science* **220**, 671 (1983).
- [31] H. H. Szu and R. Hartley, Fast simulated annealing, *Physics Letters A* **122**, 157 (1987).
- [32] R. M. Neal, *Probabilistic inference using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods*, Tech. Rep. CRG-TR-93-1 (Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada, 1993).
- [33] S. Fortunato and M. Barthélemy, Resolution limit in community detection, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**, 36 (2007).
- [34] A. Lancichinetti and S. Fortunato, Limits of modularity maximization in community detection, *Physical Review E* **84**, 066122 (2011).
- [35] P. W. Holland, K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt, Stochastic blockmodels: First steps, *Social Networks* **5**, 109 (1983).
- [36] B. Karrer and M. E. Newman, Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks, *Physical Review E* **83**, 016107 (2011).
- [37] R. R. Sokal and C. D. Michener, A statistical method for evaluating systematic relationships, *University of Kansas Science Bulletin* **38**, 1409 (1958).
- [38] J. H. Ward Jr, Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **58**, 236 (1963).
- [39] J. MacQueen, Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations, in *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics* (University of California Press, 1967) pp. 281–297.
- [40] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay, Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12**, 2825 (2011).
- [41] R. Bellman, Dynamic programming, *Science* **153**, 34 (1966).
- [42] G. Marti, How and where should you cut a dendrogram?, gautier.marti.ai tech blog (2017), accessed: 2024-09-12.
- [43] T. T. Tanimoto, *Elementary mathematical theory of classification and prediction*, Internal Report (IBM Corporation, 1958).