

On the strengths of the self-updating process clustering algorithm

Shang-Ying Shiu^{a*} and Ting-Li Chen^b

^a*Department of Statistics, National Taipei University, New Taipei, Taiwan;* ^b*Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan*

(September 2014)

The Self-Updating Process (SUP) is a clustering algorithm that stands from the viewpoint of data points and simulates the process how data points move and perform self-clustering. It is an iterative process on the sample space and allows for both time-varying and time-invariant operators. By simulations and comparisons, this paper shows that SUP is particularly competitive in clustering (i) data with noise, (ii) data with a large number of clusters, and (iii) unbalanced data. When noise is present in the data, SUP is able to isolate the noise data points while performing clustering simultaneously. The property of the local updating enables SUP to handle data with a large number of clusters and data of various structures. In this paper, we showed that the blurring mean-shift is a static SUP. Therefore our discussions on the strengths of SUP also apply to the blurring mean-shift.

Keywords: Clustering; Generalized Association Plots; Hierarchical clustering; K-means; Mean-shift

AMS Subject Classification: 91C20;62H30;68T10

1. Introduction

Clustering analysis is a useful technique to discover patterns in data. This technique has been widely applied to many disciplines for partitioning data into groups. In the literature, a vast number of clustering algorithms have been developed. The model-based methods [1] make an assumption on the probabilistic distribution of data, and the distance-based methods employ the notion of “distance” that represents the similarity between two data points. Among the distance-based methods, two major types are most commonly used. The first type is hierarchical clustering [2], which clusters data into groups through a series of agglomerative or divisive steps that operate on the similarity measure between data points. The second type uses a clustering criterion. Clustering results are obtained by optimizing the criterion. The most popular clustering method of the second type is probably the k-means algorithm [3, 4]. A large number of follow-up articles have addressed to improve some weaknesses of the k-means [5–8]. In addition, the fuzzy c-means algorithm [9] was developed as a soft type of the k-means algorithm. With the flexibility that each element in the data can belong to each of the clusters with probabilities, the fuzzy c-means is more robust than the k-means in the presence of noise.

The Self-Updating Process (SUP) [10] is a distance-based method for clustering. The original idea was initiated as an extension of the iteratively generated correlation matrices [11–13], according to which data points are gathered towards the left and right sides of an ellipse at each iteration and eventually merge into two clusters. The sequence of correlation matrices consequently produces an iterative process for clustering, which

Supported by NSC 96-2118-M-001-007-

*Corresponding author. Email: tlchen@stat.sinica.edu.tw

has been implemented in the Generalized Association Plots [13, 14]. Compared with the iteratively generated correlation matrices, the self-updating process operates on the sample space, not on the correlation space. It shows the actual movements of data points around the sample space. Data points continue updating their positions until the whole system reaches a balanced therefore static condition, in which the clusters are formed. It is as if the process describes how data points perform self-clustering. We therefore named it Self-Updating Process (SUP).

A similar iterative process that also operates on the sample space is the mean-shift algorithm [15]. It has non-blurring and blurring approaches. Compared with the self-updating process in which operators can be time-varying, both non-blurring and blurring approaches use time-invariant operators. Specific differences between the mean-shift and the self-updating process are outlined in Section 2.6. The mean-shift algorithm made its first appearance for kernel density estimation by taking the sample mean within a local region to estimate the gradient of a density function. It was further extended and analyzed by Cheng [16]. Comaniciu successfully applied the non-blurring mean-shift algorithm to the problem of image segmentation [17]. Since then the mean-shift algorithm has become well-known in the Computer Science community but not as familiar to the Statistics community. As the implementation of the mean-shift algorithm requires a choice of the kernel function, the Gaussian kernel is very often used in practice [17–19]. There are other clustering algorithms that can be viewed as some version of the mean-shift algorithm. For example, Cheng [16] showed that the k-means algorithm is some limit of the non-blurring mean-shift algorithm. Yang and Wu used a total similarity objective function to derive a similarity-based clustering method (SCM) [20], which is a non-blurring mean-shift type clustering algorithm. Although the non-blurring mean-shift is more popular in image processing, Chen et al. [21] reported that the blurring process is more robust and is often more efficient than the non-blurring process in location estimation.

Through simulations and real data examples, this paper discusses the strengths of the self-updating process in clustering the following three types of data: (i) data with noise, (ii) data with a large number of clusters, and (iii) unbalanced data. Such data is often met in practice, but it is difficult to be analyzed. One example is the Cryo-EM image data, which has a high level of noise and a large number of clusters. Chen et al. [22] applied the γ -SUP, a variant of SUP that minimizes the γ -divergence, to the analysis of Cryo-EM images. The clustering results by γ -SUP correctly identified all of the 128 clusters of Cryo-EM images. On the basis of the similarity between the blurring mean-shift and the self-updating process, our discussions in this paper also apply to the blurring mean-shift type algorithms. To our knowledge, such discussions on the strengths of the mean-shift type algorithms have not been reported in the literature.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the self-updating process in details. Section 3 presents simulation results for the aforementioned three types of data. Real data applications are given in Section 4. A discussion is provided in the final section.

2. The Self-Updating Process

2.1. *The idea*

Suppose there are N elements to be clustered, and there are p random variables representing elements' information. The data is a $N \times p$ matrix. We can view this data as N data points in a p -dimensional space. When the updating process begins, data points start to move. The movement of a point is determined by its relationship with other data points. We can quantify the relationships according to data points' information,

using measures such as the correlation, Euclidean distance, or other measures that are relevant.

2.2. Main algorithm

The self-updating process is formulated as follows.

- (i) $x_1^{(0)}, \dots, x_N^{(0)} \in R^p$ are the original positions of data points to be clustered.
- (ii) At time $t + 1$, every point is updated to the following new position:

$$x_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{f_t(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)})}{\sum_{k=1}^N f_t(x_i^{(t)}, x_k^{(t)})} x_j^{(t)}, \quad (1)$$

where f_t is some function that measures the influence between two data points at time t .

- (iii) Repeat (ii) until every data point no longer moves.



When two data points are closer, the influence between them should be stronger. Therefore, we assign a larger value to f_t when $x_i^{(t)}$ and $x_j^{(t)}$ are closer. We interpret $f_t(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)})$ as the mutual influence between point i and point j at the t -th update. In plain words, equation (1) states that the next position where point i moves to is determined by the influences it currently receives from all data points, including from point i itself. In statistical terminology, $x_i^{(t+1)}$ is the weighted average of all $x_i^{(t)}$'s, for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Throughout this paper we take f_t as a truncated exponential decay function of some distance d ,

$$f_t(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)}) = \begin{cases} \exp[-d(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)})/T(t)], & d(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)}) \leq r \\ 0, & d(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)}) > r, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where r and $T(t)$ are parameters, and $d(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)})$ is the Euclidean distance between positions of point i and point j at the t -th update. We propose the use of exponential decay function because it is very often observed in nature. Other formulations of f_t 's can be considered and are discussed in the final section. Note that f_t can change over iterations t 's. In such a case, we call the process *dynamic* SUP. When f_t does not change with t , it is called *static*.

2.3. A simple illustration

We present a simple example to illustrate the self-updating process and the effects of parameters r and T . Three data points from bivariate normal distributions $BVN(\mu_k, I_2/25)$ were sampled for each $k \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$, where $\mu_k \in \{(0,0), (2,0), (1,1), (6,0), (8,0), (7,1), (3,3), (5,3) \text{ and } (4,4)\}$. Figure 1(a) plots a total of 27 sampled data points. With $r = 0.9$ and $T = 0.7$, Figure 1(b)-(d) show the updated position of each data point at the first, second and third iteration. The 27 data points moved to nine positions at the third iteration and made no further movements. The nine positions are the representative positions of the resulting nine clusters.

Figure 1. SUP with $r=0.9$ and $T=0.7$ Figure 2. SUP with $r=3.5$ and $T=0.7$

2.3.1. The parameter r

Figures 2(a)-(f) present the updating process and the final clustering result when r was increased to 3.5. In the end of the process, data points moved to three positions instead of nine. The difference between Figure 1(d) and Figure 2(f) explains the effect of r . In Figure 1(d), a choice of $r = 0.7$ forced each data point to be influenced only by those within 0.7 units. Squares, circles and triangles of the same colors had no influence on one

another, therefore eventually moved to different positions. We interpret r as the *range of influence*. The use of a small r value generally produces clusters of compact sizes. Without the use of r , or equivalently, when r is infinite, Corollary 2.2 in the next section proves that all data points eventually move to one position when f is a strictly positive function.




Figure 3. A graphical presentation of SUP with $r=3.5$ and $T=0.5$

2.3.2. The parameter T

Figures 3(a)-(h) present the updating process and the final clustering result when T was decreased to 0.5 and when r was 3.5. A comparison between Figure 2 and Figure 3 shows that data points moved at a slower rate when T was smaller. This observation can be explained mathematically from (2): When T is small, $f(u, u) = 1$ is much larger than $f(u, v)$ for every $v \neq u$. Data point u therefore hardly moves as the influence from itself totally dominates. Similarly, it can be explained that data points move faster when T is larger. If we consider data points as particles in a statistical mechanical system, then parameter T can be interpreted as *temperature*. This temperature parameter determines the speed of the updating process.

2.4. The effect of parameters and the proposed parameter values

2.4.1. The influential range r

When there is a training set, cross-validation is a standard way to estimate the value of r . However, in practice we rarely have additional data sets to learn the parameter values. In the following we present a simple data-driven approach. The distribution of the pairwise distance provides useful information on the structure of data.

We begin with a simple situation when there are only two clusters in the data. Confined to the two-cluster structure, the pairwise distances of pairs that contain one point from each cluster should not differ much, meaning that the estimated probability density function of the pairwise distance has a large probability mass in the range of the between-cluster distances. Similarly, the pairwise distances of pairs that contain both points from the same cluster should not differ much. There should also be a large probability mass in the range of the within-cluster distances. To select an influential range r that produces clusters retaining the original structure of two clusters, we should avoid the distances at peak regions that are likely to be the between- or within-cluster distances. We propose to select the distance at sharp valley regions, because this valley selection can reduce the chance that the updating process distorts the data structure, as the number of pairs that are influenced by this selection is small. The same reasoning applies to data of more than two clusters.

Take the data presented in Figure 1(a) for example. We use frequency polygon to approximate the probability density function of the pairwise distance. Figure 4 presents the frequency polygon, in which sharp valleys occur at around 0.9, 2.5, 3.5, 5.1, 6.8 and 7.7. We showed in Section 2.3 that the use of $r = 0.9$ produced three clusters and that of $r = 3.5$ produced nine clusters. For the rest of the valleys, $r = 2.5$ produced an identical clustering result as $r = 3.5$, while $r = 5.1$, 6.8 and 7.7 moved all data points into one single cluster.




Figure 4. The frequency polygon of the pairwise distances.

When data does not show clear patterns of clusters or when the noise level in data is substantial, the frequency polygon may not have peaks or valleys. In such situations, we can try different values of r by taking percentiles of the pairwise distances.

2.4.2. The temperature T

In Section 2.3.2, we showed that the temperature T influences the updating speed of SUP. Therefore, one may want to choose a large T value to reduce the computation time. This is, however, not necessarily a good choice. For data with certain structures, the updating speed is also likely to influence the clustering results.

In the following we describe two examples of extreme T values. When T is set to be very large, f_t is close to one for every pair of $x_i^{(t)}$ and $x_j^{(t)}$. Namely, each data point receives nearly the same amount of influences from the other data points, suggesting that the updating process utilizes the information on the overall structure of the data.

When T is set to be close to zero, each data point receives comparatively negligible influences from the other data points, except from those that are the closest. That is, the updating process with such a small T value utilizes the information on the most local structure of the data. To summarize, the temperature T that represents the speed of the updating process also determines the relative emphasis on the global versus the local structures. Different levels of emphasis mostly influence the data points located near the boundaries of the clusters. From the descriptions above, the effect of temperature T is summarized as follows. When the structures of the clusters in data are simple, such as well separated clusters and clusters of similar sizes and shapes, the boundary points of one cluster are often located far enough from those of another cluster. In this case, it is easier to select a r value so that there is no mutual influences between boundary points of different clusters. The temperature T therefore only determines the updating speed. The illustration presented in Section 2.3 is such an example. When the structures of the clusters in data are complex, the selection of a proper r value is difficult. The temperature T therefore influences the boundary data points and consequently the final clustering results.

To select a temperature T , we consider the following. Suppose that data point i is $r - \delta$ and $r + \delta$ units away from data points j and k , respectively, where r is the influential range. When δ is small, i is about r units away from both j and k . It is reasonable to assume that i receives approximately the same amount of influence from j and k . According to (2), however, the actual influences that i receives from j and k are $\exp[-(r + \delta)/T]$ and zero, respectively. We therefore propose to use a small enough T value so that $\exp(-r/T)$ is close to zero. For static temperature, throughout this paper we use $T = r/5$, which makes $\exp(-r/T) = 0.0063$. Our experiments showed that the use of $T = r/5$ very often produced good clustering results within a reasonable computing time.

When data contains different sizes and shapes of clusters, the use of local structures of data is usually more capable of correctly identifying clusters of various structures. The idea is to capture more of the local structures by allowing data points to move at a low temperature in early iterations. Afterwards, the temperature is gradually increased with time to accelerate the updating speed. For dynamic temperature, we need to select the *initial temperature* T_0 and the *heating rate* s , where T_0 is certainly smaller than $r/5$. Throughout this paper we present results from using $T(t) = T_0 + st$, where $T_0 = r/20$ and $s = r/50$. In this heating scheme, the temperature increases linearly with time and exceeds $r/5$ after the seventh iteration. Different values of T_0 and s can be considered according to the running time and the emphasis on the local versus global properties. However, our experiments showed that the dynamic SUP is relatively more stable than the static SUP: the use of different temperatures T_0 and s has less influence on the structures of the final clustering results. The simulation results in Section 3 also support this statement.

2.5. Convergence

The self-updating process stops when all the data points no longer move. This is called the convergence. The convergence of the self-updating process depends on the function f . Chen [23] showed that *PDD* (positive and decreasing with respect to distance) is a sufficient condition to ensure the convergence.

Definition 2.1 A function f is *PDD* (positive and decreasing with respect to distance), if

- (i) $0 \leq f(u, v) \leq 1$, and $f(u, v) = 1$ only when $u = v$.
- (ii) $f(u, v)$ depends only on $\|u - v\|$, the distance between u and v .

(iii) $f(u, v)$ is decreasing with respect to $\|u - v\|$,

The PDD condition specifies f to have the following properties. Condition (i) states the non-negativity of f . This condition excludes the situation that data points u and v may repel each other. Although in practice $f(u, v)$ may be negative, data points move further apart and eventually may result in the divergence of the updating process. This is the reason we require $f(u, v)$ to be non-negative. Generally $f(u, u)$ can be defined as any positive number. For simplicity it is normalized to be one. Condition (ii) states that the influence between u and v is solely determined by the distance between them, meaning that $f(u_1, v_1) = f(u_2, v_2)$ whenever $\|u_1 - v_1\| = \|u_2 - v_2\|$. Condition (iii) states that the influence between u and v is larger whenever u and v are closer.

The following Theorem 1 guarantees the convergence of SUP when f_t satisfies the PDD condition for each t . The proof of the case that f_t 's are time-invariant can be found in [23]. The proof for the case of time-varying functions f_t 's is essentially the same.

Theorem 1 If the function f_t in (1) is PDD for each t , there exists $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i^{(t)} = x_i \quad \forall i.$$

The following corollary further identifies f_t 's that produce trivial clustering results: If f_t are PDD and strictly positive, all data points converge to one single position.

COROLLARY 2.2 Let r_M be the maximum pairwise distance between any two data points. If f_t 's are PDD with $f_t(a, b) > 0$ whenever $\|a - b\| \leq r_M$, there exists c , such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i^{(t)} = c \quad \forall i.$$

Recall that we introduced the parameter r in (1). Corollary 2.2 shows the necessity of the use of r in the specification of any f_t function.

2.6. The blurring mean-shift is a static SUP

Although the mean-shift and the self-updating process were developed independently, their mathematical forms display great similarity. The original mean-shift [15] uses the operator:

$$x_i^{(t+1)} = x_i^{(t)} + a \nabla_x \ln(p(x_i^{(t)})), \quad (3)$$

where a is a positive constant to ensure the convergence, ∇ is the gradient, \ln denotes the natural logarithm, and p is the density function. Cheng [16] generalized (3) to the following form:

$$x_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K(x_i^{(t)} - x_j)}{\sum_{k=1}^N K(x_i^{(t)} - x_k)} x_j, \quad (4)$$

where x_j 's represent the positions of data points. When the positions at the current iteration $x_j^{(t)}$'s are used, the algorithm is called the *blurring* mean-shift. In contrast, we use *non-blurring* to refer to the mean-shift that uses the initial positions $x_j^{(0)}$'s.

The self-updating process (1) that uses the current positions is closer to the *blurring* mean-shift algorithm. In the following we outline the specific differences between the two.

- (i) K is originally a flat kernel. It is an indicator function representing whether $x_i^{(t)} - x_j$ is less than some threshold value. Cheng generalized K to be any kernel function. In most of the mean-shift applications, truncated Gaussian kernels are often considered. SUP is less restricted in the sense that the integrability of f_t is not required.
- (ii) The mean-shift uses the same kernel K over iterations. SUP uses f_t that can change over iterations.

From the above, we see that the blurring mean-shift is a static SUP that uses a fixed f_t function through iterations. In Section 2.4.2 we described the advantage of using the dynamic temperature in plain words. The following Section 3.2 and 3.3 in particular address the different impacts on clustering performance between the static (the blurring mean-shift) and the dynamic SUP.

3. Simulation and Comparison

This section shows the strengths of the self-updating process in clustering the following three types of data: (i) data with noise, (ii) data with a large number of clusters, and (iii) unbalanced data. In each simulation example, we compare clustering results of the k-means, the fuzzy c-means, the non-blurring mean-shift, the static SUP, and the dynamic SUP. We replace the current positions $x_j^{(t)}$'s in (1) with the initial positions $x_j^{(0)}$'s and take r in (2) as infinity and $T(t)$ as fixed to represent the non-blurring mean-shift type algorithms.

Throughout the three simulation examples in this section, we use the the following temperatures. For the non-blurring mean-shift, we experimented with several T values and selected the best performance. For the static and the dynamic SUP, $T = r/5$ and $T(t) = r/20 + (r/50)t$, respectively.

3.1. Data with noise

Data that contains noise is very often present in practice, such as the gene expressions data and the image data. Clustering algorithms sometimes fail to produce reasonable results for data with noise, because scattered points of noise can very often obscure the structure of data, therefore make it difficult for algorithms to discover patterns.

We used Tseng and Wong's example [8] to compare the performance of the following algorithms on data with noise: the k-means, the fuzzy c-means and the mean-shift type algorithms, including SUP. The example includes three clusters and a number of scattered points. Data points in the three clusters were sampled from standard normal distributions centered at $(-6,0)$, $(6,0)$ and $(0,6)$, respectively. Each point was restricted within two standard deviations to its center. The scattered points representing noise were sampled uniformly from $[-12, 12] \times [-6, 12]$, but not within three standard deviations to any of the three centers. Each simulated data contained 50 points from each of the three clusters and n scattered points, where n can be 10, 50, 100 or 200, representing varying degrees of noise. Figure 5 shows one simulated data: 50 points from each of the three clusters were denoted by circles, x-marks and pluses, and 50 scattered points of noise were denoted by dots.

The selection of parameter values are as follows. For the k-means algorithm, we present results from using random initials of one set, random initials of 100 sets, and the initials proposed by Tseng and Wong using Hierarchical clustering with single and complete




Figure 5. Three groups (circles, x-marks and pluses) and noises (dots)

linkages by taking $p=1, 3,$ and $6,$ respectively. The latter two approaches were used to solve the problem of local minimum for the k-means. When the random initials of 100 sets were used, only the clustering result from the set of initials that achieved the minimum sum of the within-cluster variations is presented for comparison. For the static and dynamic SUP, the value of r was selected automatically at a time for each simulated data according to the frequency polygon of the pairwise distances.

Since the purpose of this example is to correctly distinguish between the three clusters in the presence of noise, we only compare the clustering results of the 150 non-noise data points. Table 1 presents the number of incorrect runs out of the 100,000 runs of simulations for each level of noise, in which "incorrect" means that at least one of the 150 non-noise data points was clustered incorrectly. Table 1 shows that both the blurring and non-blurring mean-shift type algorithms are robust against noise. The fuzzy c-means also demonstrates to be robust.

We further compared the running time in seconds for one run of simulation. Results are presented in Table 2. The fuzzy c-means shows great promise in both accuracy and computation efficiency when noise is present in the data. The non-blurring mean-shift and the self-updating process are competitive in accuracy with a reasonable computation efficiency.

3.2. Large number of clusters

For data with a large number of clusters, it is often difficult for most clustering methods to correctly identify every cluster. This is especially true for methods that require a set of initial values, such as the k-means algorithm that relies on a good initial assignment of cluster centers. When the number of cluster is large, the chance that each assigned initial center is close to a true center is small. As a result, clusters without any assigned initial center are likely to be absorbed into other clusters, and clusters within which multiple initial centers are assigned are likely to be broken down to multiple clusters. In comparison with the k-means, the blurring and the non-blurring mean-shift type algorithms do not

Table 1. The numbers of incorrect runs in 100,000 runs of simulations

Number of noise		10	50	100	200	
K-means	One random initial set	9746	1248	1179	1481	
	100 random initial sets	0	0	0	731	
	Single Linkage	$p=1$	6934	1453	1229	1165
		$p=3$	41	3161	2155	1183
		$p=6$	0	534	956	944
	Complete Linkage	$p=1$	1860	1294	1054	1253
		$p=3$	9	0	0	483
$p=6$		4517	4	0	363	
Fuzzy c -means with one random initial set		0	0	0	0	
Non-blurring mean-shift		0	0	0	0	
Static SUP (Blurring mean-shift)		0	0	0	0	
Dynamic SUP		0	0	0	1	

Table 2. CPU time per run in seconds

Number of noise		10	50	100	200
K-means	One random initial set	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.004
	100 random initial sets	0.149	0.171	0.223	0.246
Fuzzy c -means with one random initial set		0.003	0.004	0.005	0.012
Non-blurring mean-shift		0.088	0.434	0.798	1.738
Static SUP (Blurring mean-shift)		0.020	0.056	0.092	0.248
Dynamic SUP		0.026	0.053	0.081	0.199

require initial values to begin the updating process. The process moves each data point locally towards where most neighboring data points are, making it possible to capture every high-density region of data points.

This simulation example considers data with one hundred clusters. For each cluster, 50 points were sampled from standard normal distributions centered at $(5 \times i, 5 \times j)$, where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$. Each point in a cluster was restricted to within three standard deviations from its center. Figure 6 shows one simulated data. Note that the diameter of each cluster is six and the distance between centers of any two clusters is five, meaning that clusters are likely to overlap. For data points located in overlapping regions, the number of mis-clustering errors is not able to properly assess the clustering performance. Therefore, we consider the sum of within-cluster variations as a more appropriate metric for the evaluation of clustering results in this simulation example .

We simulated 1000 sets of data to compare the performance of clustering algorithms. For the k-means and the fuzzy c -means, we used 100 sets of random initials and selected the one that produced the smallest sum of within-cluster variations. For both static and dynamic SUP, we used $r = 3.6$ so that the number of clusters did not exceed 100. This choice of r was in order not to make an unfair comparison to the k-means and the fuzzy c -means, because the sum of within-cluster variations decreases with the increasing number of clusters. Table 3 presents the clustering results from 1000 simulated data, summarizing the means and the standard deviations of the sum of within-cluster variations. These results show that the self-updating process produced smaller sums of variations in reasonable running time.

We increased the number of random initial sets to improve the performance of the k-means and the fuzzy c -means. Our simulations showed that both algorithms still failed to find the minimum sum of within-cluster variations even when the number of random initial sets increased to 100,000. Illustrating using one simulated data, Figure 7 shows the best solution from 100,000 sets of random initials by the k-means. The black color




Figure 6. Example of simulated data set of 100 clusters

Table 3. The means and the standard deviations in parentheses of the sum of within cluster variations and the cpu time per run in seconds

	Sum of within-cluster variations	CPU time per run
K-means with 100 initial sets	11681 (363)	27.84 (1.80)
Fuzzy c-means with 100 initial sets	18442 (467)	584.58 (21.50)
Non-blurring mean shift	9382 (241)	62.53 (17.84)
Static SUP (Blurring mean shift)	9185 (118)	18.24 (1.94)
Dynamic SUP	9219 (128)	25.07 (3.69)

is used to represent clusters that were correctly identified by the k-means, and the other colors are to represent mis-clustered data points: points that were clustered in the same group were displayed by the same color. This color presentation makes it easier to see how the k-means falsely split and merged some of the true clusters.

In contrast to its great performance in the previous example when noise is present in data, the fuzzy c-means in this example performs poorly in both the clustering results and the computation time. First, the computation complexity of the fuzzy c-means increases linearly with the number of clusters. The running time of the fuzzy c-means is therefore much longer than that of the k-means when data has a large number of clusters. Second, the robustness against noise presented in the previous example is achieved by assigning the noise data points with almost uniform probabilities of belonging to each of the three clusters. Such an assignment minimizes the influences of the noise data points on the clustering results. When the number of clusters is large so that good initial centers are




Figure 7. Clustering results by the k-means using 100,000 sets of random initials

difficult to be selected, data points located far from the initial centers are likely to be mistaken as the noise data points. Consequently, the fuzzy c-means cannot correctly identify the true clusters without an initial center nearby.




Figure 8. Part of the clustering results by the static and the dynamic SUP

The simulation results showed that the non-blurring mean-shift, the static SUP and the dynamic SUP always correctly identified the global structure of the 10×10 clusters. Differences only existed on the boundary data points. The non-blurring mean-shift reported a total within-cluster variations approximately 2% higher than that of the static

and dynamic SUP. It produced a relatively more mixed structure of boundary data points which were identified as from different clusters. In contrast, the static and the dynamic SUP produced a cleaner structure of the clustering results on the boundary points. Labeling the clustering results by letters A to E, Figure 8(a) and Figure 8(b) compare the two temperature schemes. The two figures show that the boundary data points are more influenced by their nearest neighbors in a dynamic SUP than in a static SUP. This observation corresponds to our previous descriptions on the effect of the temperature: The dynamic SUP utilizes more of the local structures of the data than the static SUP.

3.3. Unbalanced data

When clusters are well separated and the sizes of the clusters are similar, most of the clustering algorithms are able to provide good results. When clusters are closely located and their sizes vary, clustering becomes a challenging task.

We sampled 30 points for each of the three clusters from bivariate normal distributions centered at $(-4, 5)$, $(-5, -1)$ and $(0, 1)$ with $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \rho)$ as $(5, 2, 0)$, $(2, 2, 0)$ and $(3, 3, 0)$, respectively. Each point was restricted to within one standard deviation from its center. The data points in the first cluster were further rotated counter-clockwise with respect to its center $(-4, 5)$. This created the structure of an inclined ellipse. Figure 11(a) shows one simulated data. Data points from the three clusters were colored in navy, red and green, respectively. In the following we use this simulated data to compare the performances of the clustering algorithms.

Figure 9 presents the clustering results by the k-means and the fuzzy c-means. Both algorithms failed to identify the structure of the data, even though the "true" centers were taken as the initials. Figure 10 presents the clustering results by the non-blurring mean-shift. The temperature T was selected to show the change of the structures of the clustering results as the number of clusters decreases. These results show that the non-blurring mean-shift was able to correctly distinguish between the red and the navy clusters. However, Figure 10(c) shows that some of the data points located near the boundary of the green cluster were mis-identified.




Figure 9. Using the true centers as the initials, the k-means and the fuzzy c-means provided the same clustering results.

For the static and the dynamic SUP, the selection of the r value is as follows. Figure 11(b) is the frequency polygon calculated from the simulated data in Figure 11(a). There does not exist a sharp valley in this frequency polygon, because clusters in this example are closely located. We only see a flat valley at around 3.051. This r value produced four clusters. Figures 11(c) and 11(g) show the clustering results by the static and the dynamic SUP, respectively.




Figure 10. The clustering results by non-blurring mean shift with weight function $f = \exp(-d/T)$.

We increase the value of r to reduce the number of clusters. Figures 11(d)-(f) and 11(h)-(j) show the clustering results by the static and the dynamic SUP, respectively, taking r value as the 35th, 40th, and 45th percentiles of the pairwise distances. The results show that the static SUP made few mistakes on the data points located near the boundaries of the clusters. In addition, Figure 11(e) and Figure 11(f) show the consequence of using an inappropriate r value: the structures of the data are falsely identified. In contrast, Figure 11(h) and Figure 11(i) show that the dynamic SUP correctly identified the structures of the data regardless of the r values.

We described in Section 2.4.2 that the dynamic SUP utilizes more of the local structures of the data by imposing a slow updating speed at early iterations. By showing that the dynamic SUP provided better clustering results than other algorithms, this simulation example demonstrates the following: When data contains closely located clusters which also have varying sizes, the ability of a clustering algorithm to utilize the local structures for clustering becomes more important.

4. Application

Section 3 showed the strengths of the self-updating process in clustering the three types of challenging data. In particular, results showed that the dynamic SUP was more capable to handle data with various structures. Therefore, in this section we select the dynamic SUP to perform clustering analysis on the following real data applications.

4.1. Seeds Data

The seeds data set is from the UCI machine learning repository [24]. This data has information on the geometrical properties of kernels belonging to three different varieties of wheat. There are 70 kernels from each of the three varieties, and the geometrical properties of each kernel were measured by seven real-valued continuous variables. After principal component analysis, the first two components explained 99.3% of the total variation. It is therefore possible to visualize the clustering results by a two-dimensional presentation. Figure 12(a) shows the two-dimensional projection of the seeds data along the first two principal directions. Note that this data shows no clear boundary between varieties.

Figures 12(c)-(e) present the clustering results by the dynamic SUP. The pairwise distances between kernels were used to select the r values. The frequency polygon showed a valley at around the 30th percentile of the pairwise distance, which produced five clusters. When the r value was increased to the 35th and the 40th percentiles, the dynamic SUP produced three and two clusters, respectively, without counting the tiny green cluster of size two that can be considered outliers.

We use the clustering results by the k-means algorithm as a comparison to present




Figure 11. (a) The example data. (b) The selection of r value. (c)-(f) Clustering results by the static SUP using various r values. (g)-(j) Clustering result by the dynamic SUP using various r values. Data points that were clustered into the same group are displayed by the same color.

the effect of the dynamic SUP on the kernels located at the boundaries of the varieties. Figure 12(b) shows the clustering results by the k-means algorithm. The major difference between Figure 12(b) and 12(d) is the eight points near coordinates $(1, 1)$ and the four points near coordinates $(-4, -2)$. Although we see that the gap between the black and red clusters in Figure 12(d) is slightly more obvious than that in Figure 12(b), we leave it to readers' judgement.

Merging the tiny green cluster into the navy blue, we used the results presented in Figure 12(d) that shows a structure of three clusters to calculate the validation criteria. Two criteria were considered: the sum of the within-cluster variations and the mis-clustering errors compared to the variety information. The sum of the within-cluster variation is 632.60. This value is larger than 587.32 by the k-means algorithm as expected, because the k-means was developed to achieve the minimum value of this sum. The number of the mis-clustering errors is 22 (9.52%). The k-means produced two more errors than the dynamic SUP.

4.2. Golub Data

We use the gene expression data presented in Golub *et al.* [25] to show the strength of the self-updating process that can isolate noises. The data we obtained was from the package “multtest” (version 2.8.0) in Bioconductor. This data contains pre-processed and normalized expression values of 3105 genes from 38 patients, among whom 27 were with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) and 11 were with acute myeloid leukemia




Figure 12. (a) Two-dimensional projection of the seeds data. Symbols and colors are used to distinguish between kernels from different varieties. (b) Clustering result by the k-means. (c)-(e) Clustering results by the dynamic SUP.

(AML). The following clustering analyses include (i) discover gene patterns that are mostly associated with ALL-AML distinction, and (ii) classify the 38 patients using the 50 genes selected by Golub *et al.* [25].

4.2.1. Discover gene patterns

Before we performed the self-updating process on genes, the expression values were first normalized by genes to ensure an equal weight of each gene.

The frequency polygon was not useful for the selection of the influential range r , because the empirical distribution of the pairwise distances calculated from the normalized expression values did not have any sharp valley. An alternative was to use different percentiles of the pairwise distances. Figure 13 presents five heatmaps, which show the clustering results by the dynamic SUP using different r values. In each heatmap, gene clusters are presented from left to right according to the sizes of the clusters. Note a large number of tiny clusters in the heatmaps. They represent genes that showed no resemblance to other genes therefore were isolated as single-gene clusters. These genes are often called scattered noise genes. Figure 13 also shows that a larger r value produced fewer gene clusters, which generally had larger sizes and larger within-cluster heterogeneity.

When $r = 4.8$, SUP produced only one very large cluster; the rest were tiny clusters of scattered noise genes.

We summarize the clustering results by taking $r = 4.6$ as an example. The use of $r = 4.6$ produced a total of 1478 clusters. Among these clusters, only 9 clusters contained more than ten genes, and there were as many as 1420 single-gene clusters. In Figure 13(c), the four largest clusters are presented from left to right, containing 580, 349, 276, and 176 genes, respectively. These clusters showed clear gene patterns, because SUP separated the scatter noise genes from them. The largest cluster showed a pattern that corresponded to genes having expression values above the mean (colored in red) for most of the ALL patients and below the mean (colored in blue) for most of the AML patients. The third largest cluster, in contrast, showed a pattern that corresponded to genes having high expression values (colored in red) for most of the AML patients and low values (colored in blue) for most of the ALL patients. To validate these clustering results, we examined the 50 genes that were identified to be most highly correlated with ALL-AML distinction [25]. Among the 50 genes, 25 of them were in the largest cluster, 24 in the third largest cluster and 1 in the second largest cluster. When $r = 4.7$ was used, we located all of the 50 genes in the two largest clusters, with 25 genes in each of the two.

In contrast to the isolations of the scattered noise genes, Figure 14 presents clustering results by the k-means using $k = 20$ and $k = 50$, showing that the clusters produced by




Figure 13. The clustering results by dynamic SUP with different values of r . The side-bar next to each of the heat-map indicates patients' cancer types, where light and dark gray colors represent ALL and AML patients, respectively. The heatmaps display normalized gene expression values of 3051 genes from 38 patients, with each row representing a patient's gene expression profile.




Figure 14. Clustering results by the k-means with different values of k 's.

the k-means were of similar sizes. The aforementioned 50 significant genes were scattered to nine and twelve clusters when $k = 20$ and $k = 50$, respectively. These results show that meaningful gene expression patterns were difficult to be discovered by the k-means algorithm when the scattered noise genes are present. The inability to handle noise is a well-known weakness of most of the clustering methods.

4.2.2. Classify patients

We used the expression values of the aforementioned 50 genes to perform the self-updating process on the 38 patients. The purpose of this analysis is only to illustrate the clustering performance.

Figure 15 shows the frequency polygon of the pairwise distances between patients, in which a sharp valley is at around 9.9. Using this r value, the dynamic SUP produced two clusters of sizes 27 and 11. These two clusters identically corresponded to the leukemia patients of two types, meaning that SUP made a perfect distinction between the ALL and AML patients.




Figure 15. The frequency polygon of pairwise distances between patients

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The self-updating process (SUP) is a simple, intuitive and powerful clustering algorithm. In the updating process, each data point moves to a new position at each iteration. The new position depends on the influences the data point receives from other points. At the end of the process, every point reaches an equilibrium position without further

movements. Data points that arrive at the same position are considered to belong to the same cluster. In this paper, we outlined the similarities and the differences between the self-updating process and the blurring mean-shift algorithm, showing that blurring mean-shift is a static SUP. We studied the benefits of using the self-updating process in three types of data sets. Some of the benefits therefore also apply to the use of the blurring mean-shift for clustering. Unless otherwise noted, in the following we use the self-updating process to refer to both the static and the dynamic SUP, therefore including the blurring mean-shift.

Although the self-updating process was not originally developed to handle noise in data, this ability comes naturally as a byproduct. Recall that data points move around the sample space according to the mutual influences, which are defined to be larger when two points are closer. Noise data points that are not close to most of the data points therefore are to be isolated at the end of the process. This is one strength of the self-updating process that can separate out the noise data points. The strength offers a great advantage especially when the noise level in the data is high.

The phenomenon that a movement of a data point is more affected by its neighboring points suggests that the self-updating process utilizes more of the local information. Clustering result of a data point can hardly be affected by clusters relatively distant apart, regardless of how many clusters are in the data. This property of local updating makes the self-updating process an efficient method when the number of clusters in data is large. On the other hand, clustering algorithms such as the k-means and the fuzzy c-means algorithms that require good initial values usually can not produce satisfactory results when clustering data sets with a large number of clusters.

In this paper, the self-updating process is not introduced as a clustering method that optimizes a certain criterion function. Although it is often appealing to have clustering results that represent a specific optimal solution, there are times when the optimal solutions are not what we truly seek for. For example, the k-means algorithm uses the criterion of the sum of within-cluster variations, which is ideal when clusters are from a mixture of normals of the same shape. However, when clusters have different sizes and shapes, such as the example presented in Section 3.3, the k-means algorithm was not unable to correctly identify clusters. This example illustrated that sometimes the use of criterion functions for clustering is inappropriate. The self-updating process which performs clustering by learning the relationships between data points is able to cope with different kinds of data structures. Moreover, the dynamic SUP that utilizes even more of the local information for clustering was shown to provide the best clustering performance among the five algorithms we studied.

From one point of view, the self-updating process is a “slow” version of the agglomerative hierarchical clustering: two data points are merged “gradually” by the self-updating process instead of “at once” by the hierarchical clustering. One weakness of the hierarchical clustering is that early mistakes cannot be corrected. Slowing down the merging process especially at the beginning stage can very often reduce the chances of making mistakes. We later realized that the connection between the agglomerative hierarchical clustering and the self-updating process is even closer: Consider the following influence function:

$$f_t(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)}) = \begin{cases} 1, & d(x_i^{(t)}, x_j^{(t)}) \leq r^{(t)}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where the influential range $r^{(t)}$ changes at each iteration,

$$r^{(t)} = \min_{x_k^{(t)} \neq x_l^{(t)}} \|x_k^{(t)} - x_l^{(t)}\|.$$

This function f_t (5) takes a positive value only when (i) $x_i^{(t)} = x_j^{(t)}$ or when (ii) the distance between $x_i^{(t)}$ and $x_j^{(t)}$ is the smallest among all non-zero pairwise distances. Using this f_t , the self-updating process at the first iteration only updates the pair that has the smallest pairwise distance, and both data points of the pair are updated to the averaged position of the pair according to (1). At later iterations, the self-updating process only updates the two groups that have the smallest between-group distance, and each data point in the two groups is updated to the averaged position of all points in the two groups. These descriptions explain that when the f_t function (5) is considered, the self-updating process is identical to the agglomerative hierarchical clustering with centroid linkage.

With a proper choice of the influence function f_t , the self-updating process can be taken as a clustering method that minimizes a criterion function. For example, the γ -SUP that uses the q -Gaussian as the weight function is a clustering method that minimizes the γ -divergence to the empirical data [22]. When there is information on data structure, we can incorporate the information in the function f_t ; then the self-updating process can be taken as a model-based clustering method. This is to say that with different formations of f_t 's, the self-updating process can have diverse looks. Thus, learning to design f_t accordingly to uncover clusters with certain structures will be our next task.

References

- [1] Banfield JD, Raftery AE. Model-based gaussian and non-gaussian clustering. *Biometrics*. 1993;49(3):803–821.
- [2] Hartigan JA. Clustering algorithms. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics; New York,: Wiley; 1975.
- [3] MacQueen J. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability; Statistics; Vol. 1; 1967*. p. 281–297.
- [4] Lloyd SP. Least-squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*. 1982;28(2):129–137.
- [5] Milligan GW, Cooper MC. An examination of procedures for determining the number of clusters in a data set. *Psychometrika*. 1985;50(2):159–179.
- [6] Tibshirani R, Walther G, Hastie T. Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Statistical Methodology*. 2001; 63:411–423.
- [7] Selim SZ, Alsultan K. A simulated annealing algorithm for the clustering problem. *Pattern Recognition*. 1991;24(10):1003–1008.
- [8] Tseng GC, Wong WH. Tight clustering: A resampling-based approach for identifying stable and tight patterns in data. *Biometrics*. 2005;61(1):10–16.
- [9] Bezdek JC. *Pattern recognition with fuzzy objective function algorithms*. Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1981.
- [10] Chen TL, Shiu SY. A clustering algorithm by self-updating process. In: *JSM Proceedings, Statistical Computing Section, Salt Lake City, Utah; 2007*. p. 2034–2038.
- [11] Mcquitty LL. Multiple clusters, types, and dimensions from iterative intercolumnar correlational analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*. 1968;3(4):465–477.
- [12] Breiger RL, Boorman SA, Arabie P. An algorithm for clustering relational data with appli-

- cations to social network analysis and comparison with multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*. 1975;12(3):328–383.
- [13] Chen CH. Generalized association plots: Information visualization via iteratively generated correlation matrices. *Statistica Sinica*. 2002;12(1):7–29.
 - [14] Wu HM, Tien YJ, Chen CH. Gap: A graphical environment for matrix visualization and cluster analysis. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*. 2010;54(3):767–778.
 - [15] Fukunaga K, Hostetler LD. The estimation of the gradient of a density function, with applications in pattern recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*. 1975;21(1):32–40.
 - [16] Cheng YZ. Mean shift, mode seeking, and clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 1995;17(8):790–799.
 - [17] Comaniciu D, Meer P. Mean shift: A robust approach toward feature space analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2002;24(5):603–619.
 - [18] Carreira-Perpinan MA. Fast nonparametric clustering with Gaussian blurring mean-shift. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd Int. Conf. Machine Learning (ICML 2006)*; 2006. p. 153–160.
 - [19] Carreira-Perpinan MA. Gaussian mean-shift is an EM algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2007;29(5):767–776.
 - [20] Yang MS, Wu KL. A similarity-based robust clustering method. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2004;26(4):434–448.
 - [21] Chen TL, Fujisawa H, Huang SY, Hwang CR. On the weak convergence and central limit theorem of blurring and nonblurring processes with application to robust location estimation. eprint, arXiv:1412.1411. 2015.
 - [22] Chen TL, Hsieh DN, Hung H, Tu IP, Wu PS, Wu YM, Chang WH, Huang SY. γ -SUP: a clustering algorithm for cryo-electron microscopy images of asymmetric particles. *Annals of Applied Statistics*. 2014;8(1):259–285.
 - [23] Chen TL. On the convergence and consistency of the blurring mean-shift process. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*. 2015;67(1):157–176.
 - [24] Bache K, Lichman M. UCI machine learning repository. 2013; Available from: <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
 - [25] Golub TR, Slonim DK, Tamayo P, Huard C, Gaasenbeek M, Mesirov JP, Coller H, Loh ML, Downing JR, Caligiuri MA, Bloomfield CD, Lander ES. Molecular classification of cancer: Class discovery and class prediction by gene expression monitoring. *Science*. 1999; 286(5439):531–537.