

A Novel Clustering Algorithm Based on Quantum Games

Qiang Li, Yan He, Jing-ping Jiang

College of Electrical Engineering, Zhejiang University,
Hang Zhou, Zhejiang, 310027, China

November 28, 2018

Abstract

The enormous successes have been made by quantum algorithms during the last decade. In this paper, we combine the quantum game with the problem of data clustering, and develop clustering algorithms based on it, in which data points in a dataset are considered as players who can make decisions and play quantum strategies in quantum games. After playing quantum games, each player's expected payoff is calculated and then he uses an link-removing-and-rewiring (LRR) function to change his neighbors and adjust the strength of links connecting to them for maximizing his payoff. Further, algorithms are discussed and analyzed in two cases of strategies, two payoff matrixes and two LRR functions. Consequently, the experimental results have demonstrated that data points in datasets are clustered reasonably and efficiently, and the clustering algorithms have fast rates of convergence. Moreover, the comparison with other algorithms also provides an indication of the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Keywords: Unsupervised learning; Data clustering; Quantum computation; Quantum game

1 Introduction

Quantum computation is an extremely exciting and rapidly growing field of investigation, and has attracted a lot of interests. More recently, an increasing number of researchers with different backgrounds, ranging from physics, computer sciences and information theory to mathematics and philosophy, are involved in researching properties of quantum-based computation [1]. During the last decade, a series of significant breakthroughs have been made. One was that in 1994 Peter Shor surprised the world by describing a polynomial time quantum algorithm for factoring integers [2], while in classical world this was a NP-complete problem that didn't find an efficient algorithm. Three years later, in 1997, Lov Grover proved that a quantum computer could search an unsorted database in only the square root of the time [3]. Meanwhile, Gilles Brassard et al. combined ideas from Grover's and Shor's quantum algorithms to propose a quantum counting algorithm [4].

In recent years, many interests focus on the quantum game theory and considerable work has been done. For instance, D. A. Meyer [5] studied the PQ game in quantum world firstly, and showed that when a player could implement quantum strategies, he would always defeat his opponent who played the classical strategies, and increase his expected payoff. J. Eisert et al. [6] quantized the Prisoners' Dilemma and demonstrated that the dilemma could be escaped in the quantum game and a new equilibrium would occur. L. Marinatto et al. [7] investigated the Battle of the Sexes game in quantum domain, and found a unique equilibrium of this game if the entangled strategies were allowed. A. P. Flitney et al. [8] showed that in a 2×2 symmetric and entangled quantum game, there existed a miracle move, i.e., the result of the game would move towards the quantum player's preferred result, if one played quantum strategies against the other's classical strategies. C. F. Lee et al. [9] reported that the quantum game looked more efficient than the classical game, and found an upper bound for this efficiency. Besides, J. F. Du et al. [10] realized the non-maximally entangled Prisoners' Dilemma on their nuclear magnetic resonance quantum computer.

Successes that have been made by quantum algorithms make us guess that powerful quantum computers can figure out solutions faster and better than the best known classical counterparts, or even solve certain problems that classical computer cannot solve. Furthermore, it is more important that they offer a new way to find potentially dramatic algorithmic speed-ups. Therefore, we may ask naturally: can we construct quantum versions of classical algorithms or present new quantum algorithms to solve the problems in pattern recognition faster and better on the quantum computer? Following this idea, some pioneers have proposed their novel methods and demonstrated exciting consequences [11, 12, 13].

In this paper, we attempt to combine the quantum game with the problem of data clustering in order to establish a novel clustering algorithm based on quantum games. In our algorithms, data points in a dataset are regarded as players who can make decisions in quantum games. On a time-varying network established by players, each player is permitted to use quantum strategies and plays a 2×2 entangled quantum game against every one of his neighbors respectively. Observing his neighbors' payoffs constantly, he applies a link-removing-and-rewiring (LRR) function to remove the links of neighbors with small payoffs and create new links to neighbors with high payoffs at the same time. Furthermore, the strength of links between a player and his neighbors is different from one another, which is updated by the Grover iteration. In the course of quantum games, the structure of network established by players and the strength of links between players and their neighbors tend toward stability gradually. Finally, if each player only connects to the neighbor with the highest strength (all other links are removed), the network will naturally divide into several separating parts, each of which corresponds to a cluster.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces some important concepts about the quantum computation and the quantum Prisoners' Dilemma briefly. In Section 3, the algorithms are constructed in two cases of strategies, payoff matrices and link-removing-and-rewiring (LRR) functions, and then are elaborated and analyzed. Section 4 discusses the relation between the number of nearest neighbors and the number of clusters first, the effect of the cost in the SD-like payoff matrix is analyzed, and the relationship

between the total payoff and the rates of convergence of algorithms is explained. Section 5 introduces those datasets used in the experiments briefly, and then demonstrates experimental results of algorithms. The conclusion is given in Section 6.

2 Quantum computation and quantum game

2.1 Quantum computation [1, 14]

The elementary unit of quantum computation is called the qubit, which is typically a microscopic system, such as an atom, a nuclear spin, or a polarized photon. In quantum computation, the Boolean states 0 and 1 are represented by a prescribed pair of normalized and mutually orthogonal quantum states labeled as $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ to form a 'computational basis'. Any pure state of the qubit can be written as a superposition state $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ for some α and β satisfying $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. A collection of n qubits is called a quantum register of size n , which spans a Hilbert space of 2^n dimensions, and so 2^n mutually orthogonal quantum states can be available.

Quantum state preparations, and any other manipulations on qubits, have to be performed by unitary operations. A quantum logic gate is a device which performs a fixed unitary operation on selected qubits in a fixed period of time, and a quantum circuit is a device consisting of quantum logic gates whose computational steps are synchronized in time. The most common quantum gate is the Hadamard gate, which acts on a qubit in state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ to produce

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{cases} |0\rangle \xrightarrow{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \xrightarrow{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

2.2 Quantum Prisoners' Dilemma [6, 8]

The Prisoners' Dilemma (PD) is one of well-known examples in the classical game theory, which is an abstract of many phenomena in the real world and widely used in plenty of scientific fields. In the Prisoners' Dilemma, each of two players has two optional strategies, cooperation (C) and defection (D), and then he chooses one against the other's in order to maximize his own payoff, so does the other simultaneously, but both do not know his opponent's strategy. As a result, each player receives a payoff which depends on his selected strategy, where the payoff matrix under different strategy profiles is described in Table 1.

Table 1: Payoff matrix for the Prisoners' Dilemma.

	$C = 0$	$D = 1$
$C = 0$	$\hat{R} = 3$	$\hat{S} = 0$
$D = 1$	$\hat{T} = 5$	$\hat{P} = 1$

According to the classical game theory, the strategy profile (defection, defection) is the unique Nash Equilibrium, but unfortunately it is not Pareto optimal.

In the quantum game, however, thanks to the quantum strategies, the dilemma in the classical game can be escaped. The physical model of quantum Prisoners' Dilemma presented by Eisert is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The block diagram of the system.

If the possible outcomes of the classical strategies, $C = 0$ and $D = 1$, are assigned to two basis vectors $\{|C = 0\rangle, |D = 1\rangle\}$ in Hilbert space respectively, then at any time the state of the game may be represented by a vector in the space spanned by the basis $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$. Assume the initial state of the game is $|\psi_0\rangle = \hat{J} |00\rangle$, where \hat{J} is an entangling operator which is known to both players. For a two-player game with two pure strategies, the general form of \hat{J} may be written as

$$\hat{J}(\gamma) = \exp(i\frac{\gamma}{2}\sigma_x^{\otimes 2}) = I^{\otimes 2} \cos\frac{\gamma}{2} + i\sigma_x^{\otimes 2} \sin\frac{\gamma}{2} \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma \in [0, \pi/2]$ is a measure of entanglement of a game. When $\gamma = \pi/2$, there is a maximally entangled game, at this time which takes form

$$\hat{J}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (I^{\otimes 2} + i\sigma_x^{\otimes 2}). \quad (3)$$

Next, each player chooses a unitary operator $\hat{Y}_1(\hat{Y}_2)$ from the strategy space $S_1(S_2)$ and operates it on the qubit that belongs to him, which makes the game in a state $(\hat{Y}_1 \otimes \hat{Y}_2)\hat{J}|00\rangle$. Specifically, the strategies, cooperation and defection, correspond to unitary operators \hat{C} and \hat{D} , which are given below

$$\hat{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

In the end, a projective measurement in the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is carried out, so the final state is

$$|\psi_f\rangle = \hat{J}^\dagger(\hat{Y}_1 \otimes \hat{Y}_2)\hat{J} |00\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Thus, the player's expected payoff is written as

$$u = \hat{R}|\langle\psi_f|00\rangle|^2 + \hat{S}|\langle\psi_f|01\rangle|^2 + \hat{T}|\langle\psi_f|10\rangle|^2 + \hat{P}|\langle\psi_f|11\rangle|^2. \quad (6)$$

3 Algorithm

Assume an unlabeled dataset $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$, which are distributed in a m -dimensional metric space. Each data point in the dataset is considered as a player in quantum games who can make decision and always hope to maximize his own payoff by observing other players' payoffs in his neighborhood. In this metric space, there is a distance function $d : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, satisfying the

closer the two players are, the smaller the output is. Based on the distance function, a k nearest neighbors (knn) network as a weighted and directed network, $G_0(\mathbf{X}, E_0, d)$, may be created among data points by adding k edges directed toward its k nearest neighbors for each player.

Definition 1 *If there is a set \mathbf{X} with N players, $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$, initially the weighted and directed knn network, $G_0(\mathbf{X}, E_0, d)$, is created as below.*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N\} \\ E_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^N E_0(i) \\ E_0(i) = \{e_0(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \mid j \in \Gamma_0(i)\} \\ \Gamma_0(i) = \left\{ j \mid j = \underset{\mathbf{X}_h \in \mathbf{X}}{\operatorname{argmink}} \left(\left\{ d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_h), \mathbf{X}_h \in \mathbf{X} \right\} \right) \right\} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here, each player in the set \mathbf{X} corresponds to a node in the network $G_0(\mathbf{X}, E_0, d)$; a link in the network represents a certain relation between a pair of players and the distances denote the weights over links; the function, $\operatorname{argmink}(\cdot)$, is to find k nearest neighbors of a player which construct a neighbor set, $\Gamma_0(i)$.

It is worth noting that the strength of links between each player \mathbf{X}_i and his k nearest neighbors represented by $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) (t \geq 1)$ is time-varying, whose initial values are calculated by

$$\rho_0(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} 1/|\Gamma_0(i)| = 1/k, & j \in \Gamma_0(i) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where the symbol $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of a set. Moreover, the distance between a player \mathbf{X}_i and itself, $d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$, is zero according to the defined distance function, which means that initially he is one of its k nearest neighbors. So there is an edge between the player \mathbf{X}_i and itself, namely a self-loop. In practice, the distance is set as $d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_i) = 1$.

After the initial connections are constructed among players (data points), on this weighted and directed knn network, a quantum game can be defined as following.

Definition 2 *A quantum game $\Omega = \{\mathbf{X}, G_t, S, U_t\}$ on a network G_t is a 4-tuple: \mathbf{X} is a set of players; G_t represents the network established by players; $S = \{s(i), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ represents a set of players' strategies including the full range of quantum strategies; $U_t = \{u_t(i), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ represents a set of players' expected payoffs. In each round, players choose their strategies simultaneously, and each player can only observe its neighbors' payoffs, but does not know the strategy profile of anyone of all other players in \mathbf{X} .*

3.1 Cases of quantum strategies and payoff matrices

Next, each player selects a strategy from his strategy set and plays a 2×2 entangled quantum game against one of his k neighbors respectively. In the classical 2×2 game, such as the Prisoners' Dilemma, usually there are only two pure strategies, cooperation and defection, but in the quantum game, one can design different unitary operators as strategies, i.e., the strategy set S may be

identified with some subset of the group of 2×2 unitary matrices [6]. Here, the strategy set of a player \mathbf{X}_i is restricted in a set $S = \{H, \hat{H}_{t-1}(i, j), \hat{D}\}$, and the player's and his opponent's strategies are treated in two cases.

Case 1:

When a player \mathbf{X}_i use the Hadamard matrix H as a strategy, his opponent (neighbor) \mathbf{X}_j has two optional strategies $\{H, \hat{D}\}$, but which strategy is chosen is dependent on the strength of the link between them. If the strength $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$ equals to zero, i.e., there is no link directed from the player \mathbf{X}_j to the player \mathbf{X}_i , then the player \mathbf{X}_j will apply the strategy 'Defection' (\hat{D}). Alternatively, if $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) > 0$, namely mutual connection between them, the player \mathbf{X}_j implements the strategy H . If the initial state of the game is $|\psi_0\rangle = \hat{J}|00\rangle$, by applying the model of the quantum game the final state of the game is

$$|\psi_{f,j}\rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle - i|01\rangle - i|10\rangle + |11\rangle), & H \otimes H \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(i|00\rangle - |01\rangle), & H \otimes \hat{D}. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Case 2:

A player \mathbf{X}_i use the strategy $\hat{H}_{t-1}(i, j)$,

$$\hat{H}_{t-1}(i, j) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}{1 - \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}} & \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}{\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}{1 - \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}} & \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}{\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which is a general form of Hadamard matrix H and whose elements are associated with the strength of links $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$. When $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = 0.5$, the strategy $\hat{H}_{t-1}(i, j)$ becomes the strategy H . Similarly, the neighbor \mathbf{X}_j , when $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = 0$, applies the strategy 'Defection' (\hat{D}), while use the strategy $\hat{H}_{t-1}(i, j)$ when $\rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) > 0$. If the initial state of the game is $|\psi_0\rangle = \hat{J}|00\rangle$, after their moves and a measure are executed orderly, the final state of the game is

$$|\psi_{f,j}\rangle = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\rho_1\rho_2}|00\rangle - i\sqrt{\rho_2(1-\rho_1)}|01\rangle \\ -i\sqrt{\rho_1(1-\rho_2)}|10\rangle + \sqrt{(1-\rho_1)(1-\rho_2)}|11\rangle, & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{H} \\ i\sqrt{1-\rho_1}|00\rangle - \sqrt{\rho_1}|01\rangle, & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{D}. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

According to the payoff matrix, the player's expected payoff can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} u_{t-1}(i) &= \sum_{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)} u_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)} \hat{R}|\langle\psi_{f,j}|00\rangle|^2 + \hat{S}|\langle\psi_{f,j}|01\rangle|^2 + \hat{T}|\langle\psi_{f,j}|10\rangle|^2 + \hat{P}|\langle\psi_{f,j}|11\rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In practice, the payoff matrix takes PD-like or Snowdrift (SD)-like form, described in Table 2 and 3.

In the PD-like payoff matrix, the relationship of the elements satisfies the inequality: $\hat{T} > \hat{R} > \hat{P} > \hat{S}$ and $2\hat{R} > \hat{T} + \hat{S}$, and likewise in the SD-like payoff matrix, the relationship satisfies the inequality: $\hat{T} > \hat{R} > \hat{S} > \hat{P}$ [15], where $c = \beta \cdot \omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$ is a cost and β is a proportional factor. Besides, the variable $\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$ in two payoff matrices is calculated by the formulation below.

$$\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \times Deg_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_j)/d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \quad (12)$$

Table 2: PD-like payoff matrix.

	$C = 0$	$D = 1$
$C = 0$	$\hat{R} = 0.6\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$	$\hat{S} = 0.01\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$
$D = 1$	$\hat{T} = \omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$	$\hat{P} = 0.2\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$

Table 3: SD-like payoff matrix.

	$C = 0$	$D = 1$
$C = 0$	$\hat{R} = \omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) - \frac{c}{2}$	$\hat{S} = \omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) - c$
$D = 1$	$\hat{T} = \omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$	$\hat{P} = 0.01\omega_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$

3.2 Design of LRR functions

When all players' payoffs have been computed, each player will observe his neighbors' payoffs, and apply an LRR function $L_i(\cdot)$ to change his own links. The LRR function $L_i(\cdot)$ is a function of payoffs, whose output is a set with k elements, namely an updated neighbor set $\Gamma_t(i)$ of a player \mathbf{X}_i .

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_t(i) &= L_i(\hat{u}_{t-1}(i)) = \underset{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)}{\operatorname{argmax}k} \left(\{u_{t-1}(j), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)\} \right) \\
\hat{u}_{t-1}(i) &= \left\{ u_{t-1}(j), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i) \right\}, \Upsilon_{t-1}(i) = \bigcup_{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}^+(i)} \Gamma_{t-1}(j) \\
\Gamma_{t-1}^+(i) &= \left\{ j | u_{t-1}(j) \geq \theta_{t-1}(i), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \right\}, \Gamma_{t-1}^-(i) = \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \setminus \Gamma_{t-1}^+(i)
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\theta_{t-1}(i)$ is a payoff threshold, $\Upsilon_{t-1}(i)$ is called an extended neighbor set, and the function $\operatorname{argmax}k(\cdot)$ is to find k neighbors with the first to the k -th largest payoffs in the set $\Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)$.

Here, two LRR functions $L_i^1(\cdot)$ and $L_i^2(\cdot)$ are designed. The function $L_i^1(\cdot)$ always observes an extended neighbor set formed by half neighbors of a data point \mathbf{X}_i , $\alpha = \lceil 0.5 \times |\Gamma_{t-1}(i)| \rceil$, where the symbol $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is to take an integer part of a number satisfying the integer part is no larger than the number. Next, the payoff threshold $\theta_{t-1}^1(i)$ is set by $\theta_{t-1}^1(i) = \operatorname{find}^\alpha(\{u_{t-1}(i), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)\})$, where the function $\operatorname{find}^\alpha(\cdot)$ is to find the α -th largest payoff in a set that is composed of all neighbors' payoffs of the data point. When the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$ is applied, the links connecting to the neighbors with small payoffs are removed and meanwhile new links are created between the data point and found players with higher payoffs. Hence, according to Eq.(13), its new neighbor set is

$$\Gamma_t(i) = L_i^1(\hat{u}_{t-1}(i)) = \underset{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)}{\operatorname{argmax}k} \left(\{u_{t-1}(j), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cup \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)\} \right). \tag{14}$$

Unlike the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$, the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$ adjusts the number of neighbors dynamically to form an extended neighbor set instead of the constant number of neighbors in the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$. Therefore, the payoff threshold $\theta_{t-1}^2(i)$ takes the average of neighbors' payoffs, $\theta_{t-1}^2(i) = \sum_{j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)} u_{t-1}(j) / |\Gamma_{t-1}(i)|$. Next, the set $\Gamma_{t-1}^+(i)$ is formed, $\Gamma_{t-1}^+(i) = \{j | u_{t-1}(j) \geq \theta_{t-1}^2(i), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)\}$, and then the new neighbor set is achieved by means of the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$, $\Gamma_t(i) = L_i^2(\hat{u}_{t-1}(i))$. In the case, when the payoffs of all neighbors are equal to

the payoff threshold $\theta_{t-1}^2(i)$, the output of the LRR function is $\Gamma_t(i) = \Gamma_{t-1}(i)$. This may be viewed as self-protective behavior for avoiding a payoff loss due to no enough information acquired.

The LRR function $L_i(\cdot)$ expands the view of a player \mathbf{X}_i , i.e., it makes him observe payoffs of players in the extended neighbor set, which provides a chance to find players with higher payoffs around him. If no players with higher payoffs are found in the extended neighbor set, namely $\min(\{u_{t-1}(j), j \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i)\}) \geq \max(\{u_{t-1}(h), h \in \Upsilon_{t-1}(i)\})$, then the output of the LRR function is $\Gamma_t(i) = \Gamma_{t-1}(i)$. Otherwise, neighbors with small payoffs will be removed together with the corresponding links from the neighbor set, and replaced by some found players with higher payoff. This process is repeated till the payoffs of unlinked players in the extended neighbor set are no larger than those of linked neighbors. Since the links among players are changed by the LRR function, the network $G_t(\mathbf{X}, E_t, d)$ has begun to evolve over time, when $t \geq 1$.

$$G_t(\mathbf{X}, E_t, d) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t) = \{\mathbf{X}_i(t), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\} \\ \Gamma_t(i) = L_i(\hat{u}_{t-1}(i)) \\ E_t = \bigcup_{i=1}^N E_t(i) \\ E_t(i) = \{e_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \mid j \in \Gamma_t(i)\} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

3.3 Strength of links updating

As such, after the LRR function is applied, the strength of links of a player \mathbf{X}_i needs to also be formed and adjusted. The new strength of links of a player $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbf{X}$ is formed by means of the below formulation.

$$\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{h \in \Gamma_{t-1}(i) \setminus \{\Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cap \Gamma_t(i)\}} \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_h)}{|\Gamma_t(i) \setminus \{\Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cap \Gamma_t(i)\}|} & j \in \Gamma_t(i) \setminus \{\Gamma_{t-1}(i) \cap \Gamma_t(i)\} \\ \rho_{t-1}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Then, the player adjusts the strength of neighbors' links as follows. First, he finds a neighbor \mathbf{X}_m with maximal payoff in his neighbor set,

$$m = \underset{j \in \Gamma_t(i)}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left(\{u_{t-1}(j), j \in \Gamma_t(i)\} \right). \quad (17)$$

Next, the strength of links $\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j), j \in \Gamma_t(i)$ are taken square roots and the maximal strength of the link becomes negative,

$$\begin{cases} \{\sqrt{\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}, j \in \Gamma_t(i)\} \\ \sqrt{\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_m)} = -\sqrt{\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_m)}, m \in \Gamma_t(i). \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Further, let $Ave_t(i) = (\sum_{j \in \Gamma_t(i)} \sqrt{\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_m)}) / |\Gamma_t(i)|$, thus, the updated strength of link is

$$\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \left(2 \times Ave_t(i) - \sqrt{\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)} \right)^2, j \in \Gamma_t(i). \quad (19)$$

The above-mentioned method is a variant of the Grover iteration G in the quantum search algorithm [3], a well-known algorithm in quantum computation[1],

which is a way to adjust the probability amplitude of each term in a superposition state. By adjustment, the probability amplitude of the wanted is increased, while the others are reduced. This whole process may be regarded as the *inversion about average* operation [3]. For our case, each strength of link is taken its square root first, and then the average $Ave_t(i)$ of square roots is computed. Finally, all values are inverted about the average. There are three main reasons that we select the modified Grover iteration as the updating method of strength of links: (a) the sum of updated strength of links retains one, $\sum_{j \in \Gamma_t(i)} \rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = 1$, (b) a certain strength updated in strength of neighbors' links is much larger than the others, $\rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \gg \rho_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_h), h \in \Gamma_t(i) \setminus j$, and (c) it helps players' payoffs to follow a power law distribution, in which only a few players' payoffs are far larger than others' in the end of iterations.

When the strength of neighbors' links of each player has been updated, the process of an iteration is completed. In conclusion, when $t \geq 1$, the structure of network representing connections among players begins to evolve over time. During the process repeated, the structure of the network formed by players tends toward stability gradually, i.e., each player always connects to one of his neighbors with the largest strength or jumps among some neighbors with the largest strength in a constant period. At this time, the algorithms stop. If only the links with the largest strength are left but all other links are removed among players, the network naturally divides into several separating parts, each of which corresponds to a cluster.

4 Discussion

In the section, firstly, the relationship between the number of nearest neighbors and the number of clusters is discussed, and then how the cost in the SD-like payoff matrix influences the results is analyzed, which provides a way to choose the proportional factor. Finally, the total payoffs based on two different payoff matrices are compared and the relationship between the total payoffs and the rates of convergence of algorithms is explained.

4.1 Number of nearest neighbors vs. number of clusters

The number k of nearest neighbors represents the number of neighbors to which a data point (player) $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbf{X}$ connects. For a dataset, the number k of nearest neighbors determines the number of clusters in part. Generally speaking, the number of clusters decreases with the increase of the number k of nearest neighbors. If the number k of nearest neighbors is small, which indicates the player \mathbf{X}_i connects to only a few neighbors. At this time only those not-too-distance neighbors can be observed by the LRR function, i.e., the elements in the union of the extended neighbor set $\Upsilon_{t-1}(i)$ and the neighbor set $\Gamma_{t-1}(i)$ are only a few. Therefore, when the evolution of the network formed by players is end, many small clusters are established among data points. On the other hand, a big number k of nearest neighbors provides more neighbors, as specifies that the cardinality of the union is larger than that when a small k . This means that more neighbors can be observed and explored by the LRR function, so that big clusters containing more data points are formed.

For a dataset, the clustering results in different number k of nearest neighbors have been illustrated in Fig. 2, in which each data point only connects to one of its neighbors who is with the largest strength, and clusters are represented by different signs. As is shown in Fig. 2, we can find that only a few data points receive considerable links, whereas most of data points have only one link. This implies that when the structure of network tends to stability, the network in which only the links with the largest strength are remained is characterized by the scale-free network [16], i.e., winner takes all. Besides, in Fig. 2(a), six clusters are obtained by the clustering algorithm, when $k = 9$. As the number of nearest neighbors rises, four clusters are obtained when $k = 12$ in Fig. 2(b), three clusters when $k = 16$ in Fig. 2(c). So, if the exact number of clusters is not known in advance, different number k of clusters may be achieved by adjusting the number of nearest neighbors in practice.




Figure 2: The number of nearest neighbors vs. number of clusters.

4.2 Effect of the cost c in the SD-like payoff matrix

In the Snowdrift game, assume that two drivers are blocked by a snowdrift, each of whom is in either side of the snowdrift. If they want to go back home, one of them or both must shovel a path through the snowdrift. So, there exists a cost c in the SD-like payoff matrix, which is determined by the proportional factor β . As is known, if the cost is too high, the SD-like payoff matrix recovers the PD-like payoff matrix [15]. Therefore, the proportional factor β is restricted in an interval $(0, 0.5]$.

However, different costs will bring about the changes of the payoff matrix, which means that different clustering results will be produced even in the same algorithm. Figure 3 illustrates how the clustering results change at the different number k of nearest neighbors when the proportional factor β takes different values, in which the clustering results are represented by clustering accuracies (for definition, see the section 5.2). As is shown in Figure 3, we can see that similar results are obtained by the algorithm at different costs, and the best results are produced when $k = 7$ and $k = 8$, but from the Figure 3(b), the clustering result with the largest mean and the least variance is yielded when $\beta = 0.3$. Also, as mentioned above, the high cost leads to the recovery of the payoff matrix, so the proportional factor $\beta = 0.2$ or $\beta = 0.3$ is recommended.




Figure 3: The effect of the cost for the clustering results.

4.3 Total payoff and the rate of convergence

In this subsection, at first, the total payoffs of players in the PD- or SD-like payoff matrix are compared, and then the differences are explained. Later, the rates of convergence of algorithms are discussed when two LRR functions are applied respectively, and further their impacts for the rates of convergence is analyzed in two payoff matrices.

4.3.1 Comparison of total payoffs

If all other conditions are fixed, an algorithm will form two versions due to using different payoff matrix, and naturally bring different results. As compared with the PD-like payoff matrix, the payoff P and S in the SD-like payoff matrix have a reverse order in the payoff inequality. In all algorithms, the relationship between the total payoffs and the number of iterations is drawn in Figure 4. From Figure 4, we can find that the total payoffs in the algorithms with SD-like payoff matrix are larger than that of the algorithms with PD-like payoff matrix regardless of which LRR function is selected.




Figure 4: The total payoffs vs. the rates of convergence.

Remark 1 The algorithms are named as follows. For example, the name of an algorithm, QGC1PDL1, denotes that the Case 1, PD-like payoff matrix and the

LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$ are employed in this algorithm.

According to two payoff matrices, using Eq.(11), each player's expected payoff can be calculated in two cases of strategies respectively as below.

Case 1:

$$\text{PD} : u_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}(0.6\omega + 0.01\omega + \omega + 0.2\omega) = 0.4525\omega, & H \otimes H \\ \frac{1}{2}(0.6\omega + 0.01\omega) = 0.305\omega, & H \otimes \hat{D} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

$$\text{SD} : u_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}(\omega - \frac{c}{2} + \omega - c + \omega + 0.01\omega) = \frac{1}{4}(3.01 - \frac{3\alpha}{2})\omega, & H \otimes H \\ \frac{1}{2}(\omega - \frac{c}{2} + \omega - c) = \frac{1}{2}(2 - \frac{3\alpha}{2})\omega, & H \otimes \hat{D} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Case 2:

$$\text{PD} : u_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} \rho_1\rho_2 0.6\omega + \rho_2(1 - \rho_1)0.01\omega \\ + \rho_1(1 - \rho_2)\omega + (1 - \rho_1)(1 - \rho_2)0.2\omega, & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{H} \\ (1 - \rho_1)0.6\omega + \rho_1 0.01\omega, & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{D} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{SD} : u_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \begin{cases} \rho_1\rho_2(\omega - \frac{c}{2}) + \rho_2(1 - \rho_1)(\omega - c) \\ + \rho_1(1 - \rho_2)\omega + (1 - \rho_1)(1 - \rho_2)0.01\omega, & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{H} \\ (1 - \rho_1)(\omega - \frac{c}{2}) + \rho_1(\omega - c), & \hat{H} \otimes \hat{D} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Comparing the expected payoffs in these cases, we can observe that when the SD-like payoff matrix is used, the expected payoff is larger than that of using PD-like payoff matrix regardless of cases of strategies. Therefore, this explains why differences between total payoffs are produced.

4.3.2 Comparison of rates of convergence

Figure 4 not only describes the changes of total payoffs of algorithms, but also reflects the rates of convergence of algorithms. When the total payoffs remain constant or fluctuate slightly, this means that the algorithms have converged. At this time, players do not frequently apply the LRR function to change his neighbors but reach a stable status. As mentioned in the section 3.2, the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$ only can observe an extended neighbor set formed by those larger-than-average neighbors in contrast to an extended neighbor set built by half neighbors in the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$. Generally speaking, for the same k , the median of payoffs is smaller than or equal to the mean, i.e., $\theta_{t-1}^1 \leq \theta_{t-1}^2$, which means that the exploring area of the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$ is larger than that of the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$. So, as a whole, the algorithms with the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$ are faster slightly than that with the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$, i.e., the number of iterations that the former type of algorithms is less.

Furthermore, in an algorithm, a phenomenon that the strategies H and \hat{H} are more likely used by players in a high density area while the strategy \hat{D} by those in a low density area is always observed. This is because usually they are mutually neighbors in the high density area on the weighted and directed knn network, but in the low density area this case is reverse. As a result, the differences of payoffs between the high density and low density areas are enlarged rapidly for the expected payoff in the strategy profile (H, H) or (\hat{H}, \hat{H}) is higher than that in other strategy profile, and this also cause the distribution

of players’ payoffs follows a power-law distribution, which is why algorithms converge fast.

5 Experiment

To evaluate these clustering algorithms, we choose six datasets from UCI repository [17], which are Soybean, Iris, Wine, Sonar, Ionosphere and Breast cancer Wisconsin datasets, and complete our experiments on them. In this section, firstly we introduce these datasets briefly, and then demonstrate the experimental results.

5.1 Experimental setup

The original data points in above datasets all are scattered in high dimensional spaces spanned by their features, where the description of all datasets is summarized in Table 4. As for Breast dataset, those lost features are replaced by random numbers. Finally, this algorithm is coded in Matlab 6.5.

Table 4: Description of datasets.

Dataset	Instances	Features	classes
Soybean	47	21	4
Iris	150	4	3
Wine	178	13	3
Sonar	208	60	2
Ionosphere	351	32	2
Breast	699	9	2

Throughout all experiments, data points in a dataset are viewed as players in quantum games whose initial positions are taken from the dataset. Next, the initial network representing relations among data points are created according to Def.1, after a distance function is selected, which only needs to satisfy that the more similar data points are, the smaller the output of the function is. In the experiments, the distance function is employed as following

$$d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = \exp\left(\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{X}_j\|/2\sigma^2\right), i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (24)$$

where the symbol $\|\cdot\|$ represents $L2$ -norm. The advantage of this function is that it not only satisfies our requirements, but also overcomes the drawbacks of Euclidean distance. For instance, when two points are very close, the output of Euclidean distance function approaches zero, which may make the computation of payoff fail due to the payoff approaching infinite. Nevertheless, when Eq. 24 is selected as the distance function, it is more convenient to compute the players’ payoffs, since its minimum is one and the reciprocals of its output are between zero and one, $1/d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) \in [0, 1]$. In addition, the parameter σ in Eq. 24 takes one and the distance between a data point and itself is set as $d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_i) = 1$. As is analyzed in the section 4.2, the cost c in SD-like payoff matrix is set at $c = 0.2\omega_t(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$ in the related clustering algorithms.

Table 5: Comparison of clustering accuracies of algorithms.

Algorithm	Soybean	Iris	Wine	Sonar	Ionosphere	Breast
QGC1PDL1	97.872%	92%	94.94%	54.81%	75.499%	95.42%
QGC1SDL1	95.75%	90.67%	96.63%	56.25%	74.07%	95.42%
QGC2PDL1	95.75%	91.33%	96.63%	55.77%	73.79%	95.42%
QGC2SDL1	89.36%	91.33%	96.63%	55.77%	75.499%	95.28%
QGC1PDL2	95.75%	96.67%	95.51%	54.33%	74.07%	94.99%
QGC1SDL2	89.36%	90.67%	95.51%	54.33%	74.64%	95.14%
QGC2PDL2	89.36%	90%	95.51%	55.29%	74.64%	95.28%
QGC2SDL2	89.36%	91.33%	94.94%	55.77%	74.93%	95.14%
Kmeans	68.1%	89.3%	70.2%	47.2%	71%	–
PCA-Kmeans	72.3%	88.7%	70.2%	45.3%	71%	–
LDA-Km	76.6%	98%	82.6%	51%	71.2%	–

5.2 Experimental results

The clustering algorithms are applied on the six datasets respectively. Because two cases of strategies are designed and the different payoff matrices and LRR functions are employed, the algorithms are run on every dataset at the different number k of nearest neighbors. Those clustering results obtained by these algorithms are compared in Fig. 5, in which each point represents a clustering accuracy.

Definition 3 *cluster _{i} is the label which is assigned to a data point \mathbf{X}_i in a dataset by the algorithm, and c_i is the actual label of the data point \mathbf{X}_i in the dataset. So the clustering accuracy is [18]:*

$$accuracy = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda(\text{map}(\text{cluster}_i), c_i)}{N} \quad (25)$$

$$\lambda(\text{map}(\text{cluster}_i), c_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{map}(\text{cluster}_i) = c_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where the mapping function $\text{map}(\cdot)$ maps the label got by the algorithm to the actual label.

As is analyzed in section 4.1, for a dataset the number k of clusters decreases with the increase of the number of nearest neighbors. When a small k is selected, it is possible that the number of clusters is larger than the preset number of the dataset, after the algorithm is end. So a merging-subroutine is called to merge unwanted clusters, which works in this way. At first, the cluster with the fewest data points is identified, and then is merged to the cluster whose distance between their centroids is smallest. This subroutine is repeated till the number of clusters is equal to the preset number.

As is shown in Fig. 5, the similar results are obtained by algorithms at different nearest neighbors, but almost all the best results are obtained by the algorithms using the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$.

Further, we compare our results to those results obtained by other clustering algorithms, Kmeans[19], PCA-Kmeans[19], LDA-Km[19], on the same dataset. The comparison is summarized in Table 5.




Figure 5: Comparison of clustering accuracies in all proposed algorithms.

6 Conclusions

The enormous successes gained by the quantum algorithms make us realize it is possible that the quantum algorithms can obtain solutions faster and better than those classical counterparts. Therefore, we combine the quantum game with the problem of data clustering, and establish clustering algorithms based on quantum games. In the algorithms, data points for clustering are regarded as players who can make decisions in quantum games. On a weighted and directed knn network constructed among players, each player uses quantum strategies against every one of his neighbors in a 2×2 entangled quantum game respectively. We design two cases of strategies: (i) one plays the strategy H , and the other plays the strategy H or \hat{D} , (ii) one plays the strategy \hat{H} , and the other plays the strategy \hat{H} or \hat{D} according to the strength of links, in each of which players' expected payoffs are calculated based on the PD- and SD-like payoff matrices respectively. According to neighbors' payoffs in his neighbor set, each player applies a LRR function ($L_i^1(\cdot)$ or $L_i^2(\cdot)$) to change his neighbors, i.e., the links connecting to neighbors with small payoffs are removed and then new links are created to those with higher payoffs. Later, the Grover iteration G is employed to update the strength of links between him and his neighbors. In the process of playing quantum game, the structure of the network formed by players tends to stability gradually, i.e., each player always connects to one of his neighbors with the largest strength or jumps among some neighbors with the largest strength in a constant period. At this time, if only the links with the largest strength are left but all other links are removed among players, the network naturally divides into several separating parts, each of which corresponds to a cluster.

Additionally, in experiments, we find that the total expected payoffs of algorithms using SD-like payoff matrix are higher than that of algorithms using PD-like payoff matrix, and the reason is explained. Further, we observe that the

rates of convergence of the algorithms employing the LRR function $L_i^2(\cdot)$ are faster slightly than that of the algorithms employing the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$, because more areas are explored by the LRR function $L_i^1(\cdot)$, but it brings better clustering results.

In the case when the exact number of clusters is unknown in advance, one can adjust the number k of nearest neighbors to control the number of clusters, where the number of clusters reduces with the increase of the number k of nearest neighbors. We evaluate the clustering algorithms on six real datasets, experimental results have demonstrated that data points in a dataset are clustered reasonably and efficiently, and the rates of convergence of three algorithms are fast enough. Besides, these clustering algorithms can detect clusters of arbitrary shape, size and density.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 60405012, No. 60675055).

References

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [2] P. W. Shor, "Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring," in *Foundations of Computer Science, 1994 Proceedings., 35th Annual Symposium on*, pp. 124–134, 1994.
- [3] L. K. Grover, "Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 79, no. 2, p. 325, 1997.
- [4] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, "Quantum counting," in *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pp. 820–831, 1998.
- [5] D. A. Meyer, "Quantum strategies," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 82, no. 5, p. 1052, 1999.
- [6] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, and M. Lewenstein, "Quantum games and quantum strategies," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 83, no. 15, p. 3077, 1999.
- [7] L. Marinatto and T. Weber, "A quantum approach to static games of complete information," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 272, no. 5-6, pp. 291–303, 2000.
- [8] A. P. Flitney and D. Abbott, "Advantage of a quantum player over a classical one in 2×2 quantum games," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 459, no. 2038, p. 2463, 2003.
- [9] C. F. Lee and N. F. Johnson, "Efficiency and formalism of quantum games," *Physical Review A*, vol. 67, no. 2, p. 022311, 2003.
- [10] J. Du, H. Li, X. Xu, M. Shi, J. Wu, X. Zhou, and R. Han, "Experimental realization of quantum games on a quantum computer," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 88, no. 13, p. 137902, 2002.

- [11] E. Aïmeur, G. Brassard, and S. Gambs, “Quantum clustering algorithms,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, (Corvallis, OR), 2007.
- [12] D. Horn and A. Gottlieb, “Algorithm for data clustering in pattern recognition problems based on quantum mechanics,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 88, no. 1, p. 018702, 2001.
- [13] R. Schützhold, “Pattern recognition on a quantum computer,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 67, no. 6, p. 062311, 2003.
- [14] A. Ekert, P. M. Hayden, and H. Inamori, “Course 10: Basic concepts in quantum computation,” in *Coherent atomic matter waves*, vol. 72, p. 661, Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2001.
- [15] C. Hauert and M. Doebeli, “Spatial structure often inhibits the evolution of cooperation in the snowdrift game,” *Nature*, vol. 428, no. 6983, pp. 643–646, 2004.
- [16] A.-L. Barabási and E. Bonabeau, “Scale-free networks,” *Scientific American*, vol. 288, no. 5, pp. 60–69, 2003.
- [17] C. Blake and C. Merz, *UCI Repository of machine learning databases*. <http://www.ics.uci.edu/mllearn/MLRepository.html>: Department of ICS, University of California, Irvine., 1998.
- [18] G. Erkan, “Language model-based document clustering using random walks,” in *Proceedings of the main conference on Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association of Computational Linguistics*, (New York, New York), Association for Computational Linguistics, 2006.
- [19] C. Ding and T. Li, “Adaptive dimension reduction using discriminant analysis and k-means clustering,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, (Corvallis, OR), pp. 521–528, 2007.