

Estimating the Number of Clusters via Normalized Cluster Instability

BY JONAS M.B. HASLBECK

Psychological Methods, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands
jonashasbeck@gmail.com

AND DIRK U. WULFF

Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Germany
dirk.wulff@gmail.com

SUMMARY

We improve existing instability-based methods for the selection of the number of clusters k in cluster analysis by normalizing instability. In contrast to existing instability methods which show good performance only for bounded sequence of small k s, our improved method achieves high estimation performance for k across the whole sequence of possible k s. In addition, we compare for the first time model-based and model-free variants of k selection via cluster instability and find that their performance is similar. We make our method available in the R-package `cstab`.

Some key words: cluster analysis, k-means, spectral clustering, stability

1. INTRODUCTION

A central problem in cluster analysis is the selection of an appropriate number of clusters k . This is a difficult problem as opposed to supervising learning problems as there is no straightforward way to evaluate the quality of a clustering. Solutions can be divided in two classes:

The first class solves the above problem by defining clustering quality in terms of a distance metric and selecting the k with the best trade-off between this metric and the number of clusters k . The most commonly used metric within this class is the within-cluster dissimilarity $W(k)$, which measures the average dissimilarity between all object-pairs within the same cluster. One assumes that the function $W(k)$ has a 'kink' at $k = k^*$, after which the function becomes more flat, where k^* is the true number of clusters. This is a reasonable assumption as we split homogeneous clusters in the case of $k > k^*$. All methods of this class in one way or another try to identify this 'kink'. Two of the most recent methods of this class are the Gap statistic (Tibshirani et al., 2001) and the Jump statistic (Sugar & James, 2011). There are also other metrics like the Silhouette statistic (Rousseeuw, 1987), which is a measure of cluster separation, and a refinement thereof, the Slope statistic (Fujita et al., 2014).

The second class of methods defines a good clustering as a clustering that is *stable* when the data is perturbed. Accordingly, k is selected such that the clustering is most stable. Stability-based methods are attractive because of their generality as they do not require the definition of a distance metric and have been shown perform to similar to state-of-the-art methods that are based on distance metrics (Ben-Hur et al., 2001; Tibshirani & Walther, 2005; Hennig, 2007; Wang, 2010; Fang & Wang, 2012).

In the present paper, we show that the two variants of stability-based methods, the model-based method (Fang & Wang, 2012) and the model-free method (Ben-Hur et al., 2001), lead to incorrect estimates \hat{k} when one does not limit the set of considered k s to a small set, e.g., $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, 10\}$. To address this shortcoming, we propose a normalization of the instability path such that the correct k can be estimated without having to restrict k to small values. In addition, we report the first direct comparison of the model-based and model-free method and find that they perform similarly. Finally, we make our method available in the R-package `cstab`, which will be available on the The Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) at the time of publication.

2. CLUSTERING INSTABILITY

A stable clustering is a clustering $\psi(\cdot)$ that is robust against small perturbations of the data. That is, if two objects X_1, X_2 are assigned to the same cluster by the clustering $\psi(X)$ based on the original data X , then they should also be assigned to the same cluster by the clustering $\psi(\tilde{X})$ that is based on the perturbed data \tilde{X} . In this section we formalize this idea using the concepts of *clustering distance* and *clustering instability* as in Wang (2010).

Let $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be n samples from a p -dimensional random vector from an unknown distribution P . We define a clustering $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \mapsto \{1, \dots, K\}^n$ as a mapping from a configuration $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ to a cluster assignment $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. A clustering algorithm $\Psi(X, k)$ learns such a mapping from data.

DEFINITION 1 (CLUSTERING DISTANCE). *The distance between any pair of clusterings $\psi_a(X)$ and $\psi_b(X)$ is defined as*

$$d(\psi_a(X_1), \psi_b(X_2)) = \mathbb{E} [|\mathbb{I}\{\psi_a(X_1) = \psi_a(X_2)\} - \mathbb{I}\{\psi_b(X_1) = \psi_b(X_2)\}|]$$

where $X_1, X_2 \sim P$ are independent samples, \mathbb{I} is the indicator function and the expectation is taken with respect to P .

Note that the distance $d(\psi_a(X_1), \psi_b(X_2)) \in [0, 1]$ is equal to 0 if every pair of objects that is in the same cluster in the clustering ψ_a is also in the same cluster in the other clustering ψ_b . Conversely, the distance is equal to 1 if every pair of objects that is in the same cluster in clustering ψ_a is *not* in the same cluster in clustering ψ_b . We can alternatively express clustering distance as the probability that the two clusterings disagree in whether two objects X_1, X_2 are in the same cluster

$$\begin{aligned} d(\psi_a, \psi_b) = & p [\psi_a(X_1) = \psi_a(X_2), \psi_b(X_1) \neq \psi_b(X_2)] \\ & + p [\psi_a(X_1) \neq \psi_a(X_2), \psi_b(X_1) = \psi_b(X_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, X_1, X_2 are again independent samples from an unknown distribution P . We now use the notion of clustering distance to define clustering instability.

DEFINITION 2 (CLUSTERING INSTABILITY). *We define the clustering instability of the clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$ as*

$$s(\Psi, k, n) = \mathbb{E} \left[d_P(\Psi_{X_n, k}, \Psi_{\tilde{X}_n, k}) \right]$$

where $X, \tilde{X} \sim P$ are independent samples and the expectation is taken with respect to P .

Now, the optimal number of clusters k^* can now be estimated by minimizing the cluster instability as a function of k

$$\hat{k} = \arg \min_{2 \leq k \leq K} s(\Psi, k, n). \quad (2)$$

To calculate the instability of a clustering, however, we require a solution to the following problem: we need *different (perturbed) datasets* to compute different clusterings $\psi_a(\cdot), \psi_b(\cdot)$, but to compute the clustering instability, we need clustering assignments of the two clusterings for *the same set of objects*. There are two solutions to this problem, the model-based and the model-free approach, which we present in the following two sections.

3. MODEL-BASED CLUSTERING INSTABILITY

The first solution to the above mentioned problem uses a clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$ to compute two clusterings on the two perturbed datasets \tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2 and then uses the learned partitioning of the p -dimensional space into k clusters to assign new objects to these clusters. Thus, this procedure can only be used when the clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$ creates such a partition, which is necessarily based on a model. This is, for instance, the case for the k-means algorithm that partitions the p -dimensional feature space in k Voroni cells (Hartigan, 1975).

The model-based approach was first described as a cross validation scheme (Tibshirani & Walther, 2005; Wang, 2010), however, here we present the algorithm for a scheme based on the non-parametric bootstrap, which has been shown to perform slightly better (Fang & Wang, 2012).

Algorithm 1. Model-Based Clustering Instability

1. Take bootstrap samples $\tilde{X}_{\alpha,b}, \tilde{X}_{\beta,b}$ from the empirical distribution X
2. Compute clustering assignments $\psi_a(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,b}), \psi_b(\tilde{X}_{\beta,b})$ using the clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$
3. Use the clusterings ψ_a, ψ_b to compute assignments $\psi_a(X), \psi_b(X)$ on the original data X
4. Use $\psi_a(X), \psi_b(X)$ to compute the clustering instability as in (2)

Repeat 1-4 B times and return the average instability $\bar{s}(\Psi, k, n) = B^{-1} \sum_1^B s_b(\Psi, k, n)$.

The model-based approach can also be used for spectral clustering (Ng et al., 2002) using the method described in Bengio et al. (2003). However, it cannot be used for cluster algorithms that imply no specific model, such as hierarchical clustering (Friedman et al., 2001). In these cases, one must additionally implement a classifier (e.g. k nearest neighbors) trained on the initial clusterings in order to predict the unseen objects in the original dataset X . This problem is sidestepped by the solution described in the next section.

4. MODEL-FREE CLUSTERING INSTABILITY

The model-free approach (Ben-Hur et al., 2001) uses any clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$ to compute two clusterings on the two perturbed datasets \tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2 . It then solves the problem of computing instability for a common set of objects in the following way: instead of making predictions for the unseen objects, i.e., objects contained in one bootstrap sample but not the other, one assesses clustering instability only for items contained in both bootstrap samples. Specifically, this approach determines the intersection $\tilde{X}_{\alpha \cap \beta, b} = \tilde{X}_{\alpha, b} \cap \tilde{X}_{\beta, b}$ and computes the

clustering instability on the resulting set $\tilde{X}_{\alpha\cap\beta,b}$.

Algorithm 2. Model-Free Clustering Instability

1. Take bootstrap samples $\tilde{X}_{\alpha,b}, \tilde{X}_{\beta,b}$ from the empirical distribution X
2. Compute clustering assignments $\psi_a(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,b}), \psi_b(\tilde{X}_{\beta,b})$ using the clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$
3. Take the intersection $\tilde{X}_{\alpha\cap\beta,b} = \tilde{X}_{\alpha,b} \cap \tilde{X}_{\beta,b}$
4. Use $\psi_a(\tilde{X}_{1\cap 2}), \psi_b(\tilde{X}_{1\cap 2})$ to compute the clustering instability as in (2)

Repeat 1-4 B times and return the average instability $\bar{s}(\Psi, k, n) = B^{-1} \sum_1^B s_b(\Psi, k, n)$.

Note that this approach requires no (explicit) model because unseen objects need to be assigned, which renders Algorithm 2 applicable to *any* clustering algorithm $\Psi(\cdot, k)$. A possible downside of the Algorithm 2 compared to Algorithm 1, however, is that in each of the B iterations it computes clustering instability only on approximately 40.2 %¹ of the original data and which is why more bootstrap comparisons may be needed to achieve a comparable level of performance to that of the model-based approach.

5. NORMALIZED CLUSTERING INSTABILITY

In this section we describe how to normalize the clustering instability (2) for both the model-based and the model-free approaches to improve its performance in recovering the true number of clusters k^* . Clustering instability as defined in (2) has the undesirable property that it trivially decreases with increasing k . To see this, consider the clustering distance in (1): the distance can only be nonzero if a pair of objects X_1, X_2 can be in the same cluster, that is, if $k < n$. Now, considering the whole range of k , we will show that the probability that two objects X_1, X_2 are in the same cluster $p[\psi(X_1) = \psi(X_2)]$ decreases with the number of clusters k , and therefore also $s(\Psi, k, n)$, until $k = n$, at which point $p[\psi(X_1) = \psi(X_2)]$ and $s(\Psi, k, n)$ become 0. This means that a freely estimated \hat{k} will overestimate k^* unless the clustering instability $s(\Psi, k^*, n)$ at $k = k^*$ is unequal to zero (as in almost all real datasets). We illustrate this problem by considering the clustering problem presented in Figure 1 (Fang & Wang, 2012).

For the unnormalized methods, Fig.1 shows a clear local minimum at $k^* = 3$ in the instability path. However, for $k > 6$ instability decreases with increasing k . The dashed horizontal line indicates the value s_{loc} of the local minimum at $k = 3$. We see that the unnormalized instability path intersects this local minimum at around $k = 32$, which means that we make a incorrect estimate \hat{k} if we consider $ks > 32$. Note that this intersection may occur much earlier if the clustering problem is not as simple as in Fig.1. This shows that if we consider the whole range of ks , the unnormalized instability approach leads to an incorrect estimate of k^* .

Note that Fang & Wang (2012) and Ben-Hur et al. (2001) both considered only $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, 10\}$, where the undesirable tail behavior of the unnormalized instability path does not yet lead to incorrect k estimates (given the relatively simple situations used in their papers). However, if the clustering problem is more difficult, k can be grossly overestimated, which is shown by Table 2 of Fang & Wang (2012).

¹ Determined by a straightforward simulation.




Fig. 1. Left: mixture of three (each $n=50$) standard normal distributions. Right: instability path for the model-based and model-free instability approach, both normalized and unnormalized.

To overcome this undesirable behavior of the instability path, we introduce a normalization constant that accounts for the trivial decrease in instability due to increasing k . In the rest of this section we show how to compute this normalization constant for a given k and clustering assignment $\psi(X)$.

Let $M = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K\}$ be the number of objects in each of the clusters in a given clustering $\psi(X)$. We calculate the probability that two objects X_1, X_2 are assigned to the same cluster, assuming that the objects are assigned to clusters randomly given the frequencies defined by the set M . Note that the sum $\sum_{i=1}^K n_i$ is equal to the number of objects in the original data set X in the model-based approach. In the model-free approach it is equal to the number of objects in the intersection $\tilde{X}_{\alpha \cap \beta, b}$ of the two bootstrap samples.

This probability is the ratio of all possible combinations N_{pair} in which we fix X_1, X_2 to be in the same cluster and the number of all possible combinations N_{tot}

$$p[\psi(X_1) = \psi(X_2)] = \frac{N_{pair}}{N_{tot}}. \quad (3)$$

We first compute

$$N_{tot} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq K} \binom{m_i}{n_i}, \quad (4)$$

where n_i is the number of objects in cluster i and m_i is the number of objects that are not yet contained in already considered clusters

$$m_i = \sum_{i \leq j \leq k} n_j.$$

Intuitively, we compute all possible ways to select n_1 objects from all objects. Then we multiply this quantity by the number of possible ways to select n_2 objects from all objects minus n_1 etc.

Next, we compute N_{pair}

$$N_{pair} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ n_i \geq 2}} \binom{m-2}{n_i-2} \prod_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq i}} \binom{m_j}{n_j}. \quad (5)$$

Here, we fix two objects to be in the same cluster, and analogous to above, compute the number of possible ways to distribute the remaining objects across clusters while respecting the cluster sizes M .

We can now use (3) to compute the probability of two objects X_1, X_2 being in the same cluster for both clusterings ψ_a, ψ_b when the cluster allocation is random but respects the sizes of clusters defined by the clusterings. We can then plug these probabilities in the definition of clustering distance in terms of probabilities in (1) to obtain $d^r(\psi_a, \psi_b)$, the expected clustering distance for a given k and M .

Note that this d^r characterizes the trivial decrease of clustering instability due to an increase in k . We thus normalize the original cluster distance with d^r

$$d^n(\psi_a, \psi_b) = \frac{d(\psi_a, \psi_b)}{d^r(\psi_a, \psi_b)} \quad (6)$$

to remove the effect of decreasing clustering instability due to an increase in k alone. Fig. 1 illustrates the impact of the normalization: the (dashed) normalized stability paths also have the local minimum at $k = 3$ but then do not decrease with k . Thus the local minimum is a global minimum and we are now able to consistently estimate k^* via (2).

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We generate data from Gaussian mixtures as illustrated in Fig. 2. For the first scenario with $k^* = 3$, we distributed the means of three Gaussians with $\sigma = .15$ equidistant on a unit circle. Similarly, we created the second scenario with $k^* = 7$, now with $\sigma = .04$. We chose prime numbers and the circular layout to avoid local minima for $k < k^*$ which renders the interpretation of results easier. In addition, we embedded both 2-dimensional scenarios in a 10-dimensional space, where the remaining 8 dimensions are Gaussian noise. This results in the four scenarios shown in Tab. 6.

For the instability based methods we use 100 bootstrap comparisons (see Algorithm 1 and 2). For all k -selection methods, we used the k -means clustering algorithm (Hartigan, 1975). The k -means algorithm was restarted 10 times with random starting centroids in order to avoid local minima. For all methods, we considered the sequence $k = \{2, 3, \dots, 50\}$.

In addition to the four instability-based methods, we considered three alternative state-of-the-art k -selection methods. First, the Gap Statistic (Tibshirani et al., 2001), which simulates uniform data of the same dimensionality as the original data and then compares the gap between the logarithm of the within-cluster dissimilarity $W(k)$ for the simulated and original data in order to select k as the one that produces the largest gap. Second, the jump statistic (Sugar & James, 2011), which computes the differences of the within-cluster distortion at k and $k - 1$ after transforming it with a negative power in order to select k as the one producing the largest




Fig. 2. Left: three Gaussians with $\sigma = .1$ and $n = 50$ distributed on a unit circle. Right: seven Gaussians with $\sigma = .1$ and $n = 50$ distributed on a unit circle.

differences of the transformed distortions. Finally, we consider the Slope statistic (Fujita et al., 2014), which based on the Silhouette statistic $Si(\cdot)$ (Rousseeuw, 1987), which selects the k that maximizes $[Si(k) - Si(k - 1)]Si(k)^v$, where v is a positive integer and a tuning parameter.

Tab.1 shows the estimated \hat{k} over 100 iterations for the four data scenarios and the seven methods. Estimated $\hat{k} \geq 20$ are collapsed in the category '20+'. In the scenario with $k^* = 3$ and two dimensions, all methods except the Jump statistic perform very well. In the scenario with $k^* = 3$ and ten dimensions, however, also the unnormalized instability method perform poorly. This poor performance is due to the unfavorable behavior illustrated in Fig. 1. The normalized instability methods, however, do not suffer from this problem and accordingly show high performance in both situations. We observe similar results for the scenario of $k^* = 7$, although here differences are more pronounced as the clustering problem is more difficult.

Note that the poor performance of the Jump statistic is explained by the large number k s we consider in combination with raising differences to a negative power, which leads to an increasing variance in the jumps as k increases. We illustrate the problematic behavior of the jump statistic in Fig. 3. The figure shows that the Jump statistic can only yield correct estimates \hat{k} when the range of possible k s is restricted to a small range around the small true k^* . The favorable performance of the Jump statistic in the simulation results of Fang & Wang (2012) and Sugar & James (2011) thus depended on the use of small ranges of k .

Another noteworthy finding of our analysis is the near-equivalent performance of the model-based and the model-free instability approaches (see Tab. 6). We therefore decided to analyze the long run behavior of both approaches to evaluate whether they consistently produce equivalent results. In Fig. 4 we show the average instability for both methods evaluated for $k = 3$ and the example in Fig. 1) over a increasing number of $B \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5000\}$ bootstrap comparisons.

Both instabilities seem to stabilize in a small region around .038, however, they do not converge. The right panel in Fig. 4 shows the differences between the two instabilities. With increasing B , the differences become smaller, but they do not reach zero. In the simulation reported in

Table 1. *Estimated number of clusters in different scenarios*

3 true clusters, 2 dimensions																			
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+
Model-based	0	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Model-based(N)	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-free	1	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Model-free(N)	1	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gap Statistic	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jump Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Slope Statistic	0	98	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 true clusters, 10 dimensions																			
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+
Model-based	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Model-based(N)	1	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-free	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Model-free(N)	1	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gap Statistic	0	94	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Jump Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Slope Statistic	2	91	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 true clusters, 2 dimensions																			
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+
Model-based	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-based(N)	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-free	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-free(N)	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gap Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jump Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Slope Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	32	4	6	7	7	11	8	7	3	3	3	3	0	6
7 true clusters, 10 dimensions																			
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+
Model-based	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Model-based(N)	0	3	19	1	4	64	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Model-free	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Model-free(N)	0	4	18	1	3	67	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gap Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	93	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jump Statistic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Slope Statistic	0	13	83	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Tab.1 the correlations of the instabilities collapsed across iterations and k s are between .86 and .96, again suggesting that the two methods show similar but not identical behavior.




Fig. 3. The jump-path along the sequence of considered k s for each of the 100 simulation iterations. Left: for the scenario with 3 true clusters in 2 dimensions. Right: for the scenario with 7 true clusters in 2 dimensions.




Fig. 4. Left: The average instability for $k = 3$ up to bootstrap sample b for both the model-based (red) and model-free (black) instability approach. The data is the one from in Fig. 1. Right: The difference between the two functions.

7. DISCUSSION

We proposed a normalization for both model-based and model-free instability based methods for the estimation of k^* , which leads to high estimation performance for arbitrarily large sequences of k s. This improves upon existing methods which only show good performance when limiting the sequence to subsets of small k s, e.g., $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, 10\}$.

In addition we showed that the performance of the model-based and model-free variants of the instability-based approach to selecting the number of clusters k are similar, but not identical. It seem worthy to pursue formalization of the relationship between the two variants in future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Junhui Wang for helpful answers to several questions about his papers on clustering instability.

REFERENCES

- BEN-HUR, A., ELISSEEFF, A. & GUYON, I. (2001). A stability based method for discovering structure in clustered data. In *Pacific symposium on biocomputing*, vol. 7.
- BENGIO, Y., VINCENT, P., PAIEMENT, J.-F., DELALLEAU, O., OUIMET, M. & LE ROUX, N. (2003). *Spectral clustering and kernel PCA are learning eigenfunctions*, vol. 1239. Citeseer.
- FANG, Y. & WANG, J. (2012). Selection of the number of clusters via the bootstrap method. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **56**, 468–477.
- FRIEDMAN, J., HASTIE, T. & TIBSHIRANI, R. (2001). *The elements of statistical learning*, vol. 1. Springer series in statistics Springer, Berlin.
- FUJITA, A., TAKAHASHI, D. Y. & PATRIOTA, A. G. (2014). A non-parametric method to estimate the number of clusters. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **73**, 27–39.
- HARTIGAN, J. A. (1975). *Clustering algorithms*.
- HENNIG, C. (2007). Cluster-wise assessment of cluster stability. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **52**, 258–271.
- NG, A. Y., JORDAN, M. I., WEISS, Y. et al. (2002). On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **2**, 849–856.
- ROUSSEEUW, P. J. (1987). Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics* **20**, 53–65.
- SUGAR, C. A. & JAMES, G. M. (2011). Finding the number of clusters in a dataset. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. & WALTHER, G. (2005). Cluster validation by prediction strength. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **14**, 511–528.
- TIBSHIRANI, R., WALTHER, G. & HASTIE, T. (2001). Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **63**, 411–423.
- WANG, J. (2010). Consistent selection of the number of clusters via crossvalidation. *Biometrika* **97**, 893–904.