

Benchmarking distance-based partitioning methods for mixed-type data

Efthymios Costa^{1†}, Ioanna Papatsouma^{1†} and Angelos
Markos^{2†}

¹Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London.

²Department of Primary Education, Democritus University of
Thrace.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

efthymios.costa17@imperial.ac.uk;

Contributing authors: i.papatsouma@imperial.ac.uk;

amarkos@eled.duth.gr;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Clustering mixed-type data, that is, observation by variable data that consist of both continuous and categorical variables poses novel challenges. Foremost among these challenges is the choice of the most appropriate clustering method for the data. This paper presents a benchmarking study comparing six distance-based partitioning methods for mixed-type data in terms of cluster recovery performance. A series of simulations carried out by a full factorial design are presented that examined the effect of a variety of factors on cluster recovery. The amount of cluster overlap had the largest effect on cluster recovery and in most of the tested scenarios. Modha-Spangler K-Means, K-Prototypes and a sequential Factor Analysis and K-Means clustering typically performed better than other methods. The study can be a useful reference for practitioners in the choice of the most appropriate method.

Keywords: cluster benchmarking, partitioning, mixed-type data, heterogeneous data, K-Means

MSC Classification: 62H30

1 Introduction

Benchmarking studies of clustering are increasingly important for guiding users and practitioners in choosing appropriate clustering approaches among an increasing number of alternatives (Van Mechelen et al, 2018). The objective of the present study is to contribute to the benchmarking literature by evaluating the performance of clustering methods for mixed-type data, that is, observation by variable data that consist of both continuous and categorical variables. Indeed, research in a variety of domains usually relies on heterogeneous or mixed-type data. In social science research, for example, data sets typically include demographic background characteristics (usually categorical variables) together with socioeconomic or psychological measures (usually continuous variables). Such heterogeneity urges for ways to guide users and practitioners in choosing appropriate clustering approaches for mixed-type data sets in order to identify distinct profiles of individuals and/or generate hypotheses, thereby contributing to a quantitative empirical methodology for the discipline.

Cluster analysis of mixed-type data sets can be a particularly challenging task because it requires to weight and aggregate different variables against each other (Hennig and Liao, 2013). One of the main issues is the choice of the most appropriate distance or model to simultaneously process both data types. Among the most simple and intuitive strategies for clustering mixed-type data is to convert all variables to a single type, continuous or categorical, via discretization, dummy-coding or fuzzy-coding. Such a strategy may lead to a significant loss of information from the original data and may consequently lead to increased bias (Foss and Markatou, 2018). Another approach is to cluster observations separately for continuous and categorical variables, and then match the clusters in the two clusterings. This approach, however, ignores any dependencies that might exist between variables of different types (Hunt and

Jorgensen, 2011). Fortunately, a wide range of clustering algorithms has been specifically developed to deal with mixed-type data. A taxonomy of available methods can be found in Ahmad and Khan (2019) and overviews of distance or dissimilarity-based methods are given by Foss et al (2019) and van de Velden et al (2019).

To the best of the authors' knowledge, there have been several benchmarking studies of clustering for continuous data only or categorical data only (e.g., Milligan, 1980; Meilă and Heckerman, 2001; Ferreira and Hitchcock, 2009; Saraçlı et al, 2013; Boulesteix and Hatz, 2017; Javed et al, 2020; Hennig, 2022), whereas benchmarking studies of clustering for mixed-type data are scarce (Preud'Homme et al, 2021). In this paper, we concern ourselves with distance or dissimilarity-based partitioning methods for mixed-type data, that is, methods that rely exclusively on explicit distances or dissimilarities between observations. In the authors' understanding, these methods span three general categories: (a) computing an appropriate dissimilarity measure for mixed-type data, followed by a partitioning algorithm on the resulting dissimilarity matrix. Typically, such a dissimilarity measure can be constructed by defining and combining dissimilarity measures for each type of variable. A popular choice in this category involves the computation of Gower's (dis)similarity measure among observations and then applying K-Medoids or hierarchical clustering on the dissimilarity matrix (see, e.g., Hennig and Liao, 2013). Another popular choice of dissimilarity measure, frequently used in the computer science literature, is the co-occurrence distance of Ahmad and Dey (2007), (b) conducting a partitional clustering of the observation by variable data with the distances between observations and cluster centroids calculated separately for categorical and continuous variables, and combine them into a single objective function. Representative methods in this category are K-Prototypes (Huang, 1997) and

Modha-Spangler K-Means (Modha and Spangler, 2003), and (c) conducting factor analysis of the variables and partitional clustering of the observations in the low-dimensional space. Factor analysis and clustering can be performed sequentially, i.e., in a two-step approach where clustering is applied to the resulting factor scores (see e.g., Dolnicar and Grün, 2008) or simultaneously, where the two objectives are combined by optimizing a single convex objective function (Vichi et al, 2019). In the sequential approach, the first step usually involves Factor Analysis for Mixed Data or PCAMIX (Pagès, 2014; Kiers, 1991) to obtain the observation scores in a low-dimensional space and then K-Means clustering to partition the observation scores. Simultaneous approaches include extensions of Reduced K-Means (De Soete and Carroll, 1994) and Factorial K-Means (Vichi and Kiers, 2001) to deal with the general relevant case of mixed variables (Vichi et al, 2019).

A simulation study was conducted to compare six distance-based partitioning methods in terms of cluster recovery performance, following recommendations provided in Boulesteix et al (2013) and Van Mechelen et al (2018). The study attempts to provide a neutral comparison of the methods since none of the authors have been involved in the development of any of the compared methods, and have no specific interest to portray any of them as particularly good or bad. The current study goes beyond previous work by considering different aspects that might affect performance (number of clusters, number of observations, number of variables, cluster overlap, cluster density and cluster shape), according to a full factorial design. The result is a concrete description of the method performance, with the goal of providing researchers with a guide to selecting the most suitable method for their study.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews benchmarking studies of clustering for mixed-type data, Section 3 presents the

methods under comparison, Section 4 describes the simulation study design, Section 5 presents the results and Section 6 discusses the results and concludes the paper.

2 Related work

Most comparison studies of clustering algorithms for mixed-type data have been performed within original articles presenting new methods, usually in order to establish their superiority over classical approaches. [Foss et al \(2016\)](#) conducted a small scale simulation study and analyses of real-world data sets to illustrate the effectiveness of KAMILA, a newly proposed semi-parametric method, versus Modha–Spangler K-Means, K-Means with a weighting scheme described in [Hennig and Liao \(2013\)](#) and two finite mixture models. The variable parameters included varying levels of cluster separation with regard to the continuous and categorical variables (i.e., how much useful information each type of variables contain with regard to the cluster structure), cluster shape and sample size. The proposed method performed well across all conditions.

In line with [Foss et al \(2016\)](#), [Markos et al \(2020\)](#) investigated the performance of three sequential dimensionality reduction and clustering approaches versus KAMILA, Modha–Spangler K-Means and Gower’s (dis)similarity measure followed by Partitioning Around Medoids on simulated data with varying degree of cluster separation. Results showed that dimensionality reduction followed by clustering in the reduced space is an effective strategy for clustering mixed-type data when categorical variables are more informative than continuous ones with regard to the cluster structure.

More recently, [Jimeno et al \(2021\)](#) compared KAMILA, K-Prototypes and Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) followed by K-Means, fuzzy

C-Means, Probabilistic Distance (PD) clustering or a mixture of Student- t distribution, under different simulated scenarios. The variable parameters included the number of clusters, amount of overlap in each cluster, proportion of continuous variables and cluster skewness. K-Prototypes and KAMILA performed consistently well for spherical clusters. As the number of clusters increased, the performance of MCA followed by C-means or PD clustering worsened. MCA followed by a mixture of Student- t distributions performed well in all cases.

A recent benchmarking study by [Preud'Homme et al \(2021\)](#) compared the performance of four model-based and five distance/dissimilarity-based methods on mixed-type data, simulated under various parameters (sample size, number of clusters, number of continuous and categorical variables, proportion of relevant or non-noisy variables and degree of relevance). For each scenario 1,000 data sets were generated. Results revealed the dominance of model-based over most distance or dissimilarity-based methods; this was somewhat expected since the simulated data matched the assumptions of model-based methods. K-Prototypes was the only efficient distance-based method, outperforming all other techniques for larger numbers of clusters. It is important to outline that none of the aforementioned studies made use of a full factorial design to enhance inferential capacity in terms of disentangling the effects of each of the manipulated parameters and their interactions.

3 Benchmark methods

The present study constrains its scope to distance or dissimilarity-based methods for partitioning mixed-type-data, i.e., methods that rely exclusively on explicit distances or dissimilarities between observations or between observations and cluster centroids. The methods under comparison produce crisp

partitions, allow to fix the number of clusters in advance and have an R-implementation.

The first method considered in our study involves a conversion of observation by variable data into observation by observation proximities, by calculating the pairwise Gower’s dissimilarities among observations (Gower, 1971):

$$d_{Gower}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{l=1}^p w_l(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j) s_l(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}{\sum_{l=1}^p w_l(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n, \quad i \neq j, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j$ are distinct observations, therefore rows of an $(n \times p)$ -dimensional data matrix. We denote the weight of variable l for the two observations by w_l ; this is typically set to 1, assuming equal weight for all variables, but can also take different values for different variables based on their subject matter importance (Hennig and Liao, 2013). Finally, s_l is a coefficient of similarity between the l th components of \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{X}_j , defined as the range-normalised Manhattan distance for continuous variables and the Kronecker delta for categorical ones. Gower’s dissimilarity is very general and covers most applications of dissimilarity-based clustering to mixed-type variables.

Once the pairwise dissimilarities are obtained, Partitioning Around Medoids or PAM (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 1990) is applied to the proximity matrix obtained from the previous step. The objective of PAM is to find k observations that will be representative, in the sense that they will minimise the average dissimilarity with all other points in each cluster. These are called ‘medoids’ and are analogous to the ‘centroids’ in the widely-used K-Means algorithm. In this study, the R package `cluster` (Maechler et al, 2021) was used to calculate Gower’s dissimilarity (function `daisy`) and subsequently carry

out PAM clustering (function `pam`). Clustering mixed-type data with Gower’s dissimilarity and PAM is herein referred to as ‘Gower/PAM’.

K-Prototypes is a clustering method introduced by [Huang \(1997\)](#) for dealing with data of mixed type. The K-Means algorithm can be seen as a ‘special case’ of this method, since the rationale behind it is that it seeks for a minimisation of the trace of the within cluster dispersion matrix cost function, defined as:

$$E = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n y_{il} d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_l). \quad (2)$$

The terms y_{il} and \mathbf{Q}_l in Equation (2) denote the (i, l) th element of an $(n \times k)$ partition matrix, taking values 0 and 1 (1 indicating cluster membership) and the prototype for the l th cluster respectively. A prototype is the equivalent to a medoid for PAM or a centroid for K-Means. The distance between \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{Q}_l is denoted by $d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ and it is calculated as a combination of the squared Euclidean distance for continuous and the weighted binary indicator for categorical variables. Assuming, without loss of generality, that the first $p_r < p$ variables in our data set are continuous and the rest are categorical, this may be expressed as:

$$d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_l) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_r} (x_{ij} - q_{lj})^2 + \gamma_l \sum_{j=p_r+1}^p \delta(x_{ij}, q_{lj}). \quad (3)$$

In the expression above, γ_l is a weight coefficient for categorical variables in cluster l ; setting it to zero (thus indicating the absence of categorical variables), one can recover the K-Means algorithm. For computational reasons, the value of γ_l is chosen to be the same for all clusters and it is calculated as the ratio of the variance of continuous variables to the variance of the categorical variables in the data set. For a categorical variable j , the variance is defined as $1 - \sum_i p_{ji}^2$, where p_{ji} is the frequency of categorical level i of variable j divided by n . It

can be shown that the components q_{lj} ($j = 1, \dots, p$) of \mathbf{Q}_l upon minimisation of (2) are given by the mean or the mode of values that variable j takes in the l th cluster, for j being a continuous or a categorical variable respectively. K-Prototypes was conducted in this study using the `kproto()` function in the R package `clustMixType` (Szepannek, 2018).

Some of the shortcomings of K-Prototypes, as argued by Ahmad and Dey (2007), include the use of the mode of categorical variables while ignoring other frequent categories, the fact that the distance for categorical variables is not weighted and the need for a more ‘refined’ notion of categorical distance. Therefore, they have proposed a K-Means algorithm for Mixed Data (Ahmad and Dey, 2007), which we will be referring to as ‘Mixed K-Means’, that scales the Euclidean distance and calculates categorical distances based on the co-occurrence of categorical values.

More precisely, the distance between two distinct categories is first calculated with respect to the rest of the variables. Say A and B are two categories of the same categorical variable j , then the categorical distance between the two with respect to some other categorical variable j' is defined as the sum of the conditional probability that the j th component of an observation \mathbf{X}_i takes the value A , given that $x_{ij'}$ is in some subset σ of possible values of j' and the conditional probability that $x_{ij} = B$ given $x_{ij'} \notin \sigma$. In order for this to be a distance metric satisfying that the distance between two identical categorical values is zero, we subtract one from the sum we obtain. Notice that σ is chosen carefully among all possible subsets of values of j' so that it maximises the sum. Then, the distance between A and B is calculated as the average of all the categorical distances with respect to all other variables j' . Since this notion is defined for j' being a categorical variable, Ahmad and Dey (2007) suggested a simple algorithm for the discretisation of continuous variables in

intervals of equal width. This discretisation is also used for determining the weight of continuous variables, which is defined to be the average categorical distance between all possible combinations of the categorical levels introduced.

To conduct Mixed K-Means in this study, a distance matrix was first computed using the function `distmix()` from the R package `kmed` and was then supplied as the input to a K-Medoids algorithm, implemented in the function `fastkmed()` of the same package.

Another clustering method, that is based on K-Prototypes, is Modha-Spangler K-Means (Modha and Spangler, 2003). Once again, the Euclidean distance is used for continuous variables (not scaled, unlike for Mixed K-Means), while the cosine dissimilarity is used for categorical variables. The objective function is thus given by:

$$d_{MS}(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_l) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_r} (x_{ij} - q_{lj})^2 + \gamma_l \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j=p_r+1}^P x_{ij} q_{lj}}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=p_r+1}^P x_{ij}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=p_r+1}^P q_{lj}^2}} \right) \quad (4)$$

which is really similar to the cost function (2) but uses a different categorical distance. For the cosine dissimilarity to be used as in Equation (4), we need to make sure that our categorical variables are first dummy-coded, so that inner products and norms of vectors can be calculated. We also denote the total number of columns for continuous and dummy-coded categorical variables by P .

Modha-Spangler K-Means is a convex algorithm as both distance functions used are convex. One of its main strengths is that the coefficient γ_l is automatically determined by the algorithm, by trying to minimise the ratio of the product of the average within-cluster dispersion for continuous and categorical

variables to the product of the average between-cluster dispersion for continuous and categorical variables. A much more detailed description can be found in [Modha and Spangler \(2003\)](#). However, a weakness of this algorithm is that it requires a brute-force approach for determining the optimal value of γ_l ; usually a greedy search over a grid of values specified by the user is employed. In our case, due to computational constraints, we consider only five candidate values of γ_l , which are the values of the set $\Gamma_l = \{\frac{i}{6} : i \in [1, 5]\}$. The element of Γ_l that yields the smallest value for the objective function (4) is the one that is eventually used for γ_l . Modha-Spangler K-Means was applied in this study using the function `gmsClust()` of the R package `kamila` ([Foss and Markatou, 2018](#)). The number of distinct cluster weightings evaluated in the brute-force search was set to 10 (the default option).

The four aforementioned clustering methods all work with the full data, in perhaps very high dimensions. Another approach to cluster analysis is the so-called ‘tandem analysis’, a term coined by [Arabie \(1994\)](#), which consists of a dimensionality reduction step via factor analysis, followed by a clustering of the observations in the resulting low-dimensional space (see also [Dolnicar and Grün, 2008](#)). One such dimensionality reduction method, suitable for mixed-type data, is Factor Analysis for Mixed Data or FAMD (also known as Principal Component Analysis for Mixed Data) ([Pagès, 2014](#)).

Dimensionality reduction in FAMD is seen as a compromise between Principal Component Analysis and Multiple Correspondence Analysis ([Markos et al, 2020](#)). The idea is that the data matrix is partitioned in such a way that all columns consisting of continuous variables are ‘stacked’ right next to an ‘indicator matrix’ or ‘complete disjunctive table’ that is constructed from the categorical variables. This partition matrix is constructed by recoding the categorical variables using dummy variables. The usual standardisation process

of subtracting from each column its mean and dividing by its standard deviation is used for continuous variables. Standardisation of the indicator matrix is achieved by dividing the elements of each of its columns by the square root of the proportion of observations possessing the respective category that the column represents. Then, the two standardised matrices are concatenated and standard PCA is performed on the resulting matrix. As in PCA, when applying FAMD it is important to decide on the number of factors to retain.

[Audigier et al \(2016\)](#) state that if the i th principal component obtained is denoted by \mathbf{F}_i , then the first principal component \mathbf{F}_1 maximises the expression:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p_r} R^2(\mathbf{F}_i, \mathbf{X}_{con_j}) + \sum_{j=p_r+1}^p \eta^2(\mathbf{F}_i, \mathbf{X}_{cat_j}). \quad (5)$$

Here, R^2 represents the coefficient of determination and η^2 is the squared correlation ratio, also known as the ‘Intraclass Correlation Coefficient’. Moreover, \mathbf{X}_{con_j} and \mathbf{X}_{cat_j} denote the j^{th} continuous and categorical variables respectively, with j being the column index. Maximising Equation (5) is therefore equivalent to maximising the link between continuous and categorical variables, so one may view \mathbf{F}_1 as the synthetic variable that is most correlated with both continuous and categorical variables. Similarly, \mathbf{F}_2 will be the synthetic variable orthogonal to \mathbf{F}_1 maximising Equation (5). Once the dimensionality reduction step has been implemented, the final step consists of applying K-Means clustering on the lower-dimensional representation that has been obtained. This two-step procedure is herein referred to as ‘FAMD/K-Means’. FAMD is conducted using the function `FAMD()` of the R package `FactoMineR` and K-Means using the base R function `kmeans()`.

While FAMD followed by K-Means and generally tandem analysis seems like a reasonable approach to the clustering problem, [De Soete and Carroll](#)

(1994) raise the point that variables with little contribution to the cluster structure can potentially ‘mask’ this structure, thus leading to unreliable results. This problem of ‘cluster masking’ is described in more detail by Vichi et al (2019), who provide an illustration via a toy example. The idea of performing dimensionality reduction via PCA and K-Means clustering simultaneously, known as Reduced K-Means, was introduced in De Soete and Carroll (1994) as a potential solution to the cluster masking problem, with van de Velden et al (2017) giving a concise description of a similar algorithm suitable for categorical data. Vichi et al (2019) generalized Reduced K-Means algorithm in the case of mixed-type data.

This joint dimensionality reduction and clustering technique is referred to as Mixed Reduced K-Means, where ‘Mixed’ indicates the presence of mixed-type data (van de Velden et al, 2019). Its objective function is given by:

$$\phi_{RKM}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{G}) = \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{G} \mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2, \quad (6)$$

with \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{Z}_k , \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{B} indicating the data matrix is centered and standardised in the exact same way as described for FAMD, the $(n \times k)$ -dimensional cluster membership matrix, the $(k \times s)$ -dimensional matrix of cluster centroids in the reduced s -dimensional space and a $(P \times s)$ -dimensional columnwise orthonormal loadings matrix respectively. We use $\|\cdot\|_F$ to refer to the Frobenius norm and Equation (6) is minimised via an Alternating Least Squares algorithm. In fact, it can be shown that there exists a certain expression for \mathbf{G} that minimises (6), from which one can derive an expression for ϕ_{RKM} that only depends on \mathbf{Z}_k and \mathbf{B} . The ALS algorithm used will first update the loadings matrix \mathbf{B} while keeping \mathbf{Z}_k fixed and this corresponds to a dimensionality reduction step. Once \mathbf{B} has been updated, it is kept fixed and \mathbf{Z}_k is updated

accordingly, which can be seen as a K-Means problem. This also explains the intuition behind this algorithm performing joint dimensionality reduction and clustering. The choice of the number of dimensions retained, namely s , is set to be equal to $k - 1$, where k is the number of clusters. This follows from the recommendation of [Vichi and Kiers \(2001\)](#), who argue that keeping more than $k - 1$ dimensions is wasteful in joint dimensionality reduction and clustering algorithms, as this corresponds to describing a low-dimensional configuration of centroids in more dimensions than necessary. We have used the same number of dimensions in FAMD as in Mixed RKM for consistency. Notice that while Mixed RKM, as well as Mixed Factorial K-Means, which we have not implemented in our study, seem like reasonable methods for one to implement, [Yamamoto and Hwang \(2014\)](#) warn that these joint dimensionality reduction and clustering techniques are prone to giving inaccurate results if there exist variables irrelevant to the cluster structure in the data, which also happen to have high correlations between each other. Reduced K-Means was conducted in the current study using the function `cluspca()` of the R package `clustrd` ([Markos et al, 2019](#)).

4 Simulation Study

A simulation study was conducted to evaluate the performance of the six distance-based partitioning methods in terms of cluster recovery. The data were generated using the R package `MixSim` ([Melnykov et al, 2012](#)), which allows for the determination of pairwise overlap between any pair of clusters. The notion of pairwise overlap is defined as the sum of two misclassification probabilities for a pair of weighted Gaussian distributions ([Melnykov and Maitra, 2010](#)). However, this notion is only determined for continuous variables. In order to generate a categorical variable, a continuous variable was

discretized by dividing it into c classes with the $100/c\%$ quantile as the cut point. For simplicity, we will be assuming an equal number of categorical levels for all categorical variables (set equal to 4).

Six factors, commonly encountered in benchmarking studies of clustering, were systematically manipulated for data generation. The first factor, the number of clusters in the data set, was examined at three levels, $K = 3, 4$, and 5. The second factor, the number of observations, was evaluated at three levels, $N = 300, 600$ and 1200, corresponding to a small, moderately large and large sample size in the social and behavioral sciences. The third factor, number of variables, was tested at three levels, $p = 6, 10$ and 14. The fourth factor, overlap of clusters, assumed values of 0.1%, 0.5%, 1.0%, 1.5% and 2.0%, corresponding to very small, small, moderate, high and very high overlap. These values correspond to smaller overlap, similar overlap, and much more overlap than in real data sets typically used to demonstrate clustering algorithms (see [Shireman et al \(2016\)](#), for a justification and discussion of cluster overlap in real data sets compared to simulated data sets). The fifth factor, density of the clusters, was tested at two levels: (a) an equal number of observations in each cluster and (b) 10% of the observations in one cluster and the remaining observations equally divided across the remaining clusters. The sixth factor considered is cluster shape, defined by the covariance matrix structure with two levels: (a) mixtures of heteroscedastic spherical components and (b) mixtures of heteroscedastic non spherical components. This resulted in $3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 5 \times 2 \times 2 = 540$ distinct data scenarios. In addition, 50 replications were made for each scenario, resulting in a total of 27,000 data sets. Each clustering procedure was fit 100 times using random starting values. For each data set, the number of clusters was always correctly specified. For FAMD and Mixed Reduced K-Means the number of dimensions (factors) was set to the number of clusters minus

one. The ability of each procedure to return the true cluster structure was measured by the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI; Hubert and Arabie, 1985). The simulated data sets, the resulting ARI values and the R code used for analyses are publicly available in an OSF repository at <https://osf.io/q7nc4/>.

5 Results

Table 1 reports average cluster recovery of the six methods across all factors. The best performing methods, on average, are FAMD/K-Means, Modha-Spangler K-Means and K-Prototypes, followed by Mixed Reduced K-Means and Mixed K-Means, whereas Gower/PAM is by far the most underperforming method. Table 1 also presents the degree of agreement in cluster recovery between methods, based on Pearson’s correlation. The correlations are large enough (the largest being $\text{Cor}(\text{Modha-Spangler K-Means, K-Prototypes}) = .95$ to allow the assertion that one method may serve as a predictor for the other method (for instance, both Modha-Spangler K-Means and K-Prototypes account for 90% of the variance in the other).

Table 1: Agreement between methods based on Pearson’s correlation and mean cluster recovery (ARI values) in the analysis of simulated data sets.

| Method | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | Mean ARI |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| (1) FAMD/K-Means | - | | | | | | .401 |
| (2) Modha-Spangler K-Means | .93 | - | | | | | .392 |
| (3) K-Prototypes | .93 | .95 | - | | | | .386 |
| (4) Mixed Reduced K-Means | .90 | .89 | .86 | - | | | .315 |
| (5) Mixed K-Means | .71 | .77 | .81 | .67 | - | | .231 |
| (6) Gower/PAM | .73 | .74 | .74 | .71 | .67 | - | .135 |

Note: All correlations are significant at $p < .0001$.

The violin/box plots in Figure 1 show the corresponding distributions of ARI values for the six methods computed on the true clusterings, confirming

that FAMD/K-Means, Modha-Spangler K-Means and K-Prototypes perform better than others. For Mixed K-Means and Mixed Reduced K-Means, more than 50% of the ARI values are less than .20. Also notice that more than 75% of the ARI values for Gower/PAM are less than .20.




Fig. 1: Violin/box plots of Adjusted Rand Index values by method

After examining the overall performance of the methods, it is informative to determine if method performance is dependent upon specific situations (i.e., performance varies with the factor levels). The individual performances are examined by the levels of each factor. A repeated-measures ANOVA (see Table 2) was conducted on the true cluster structure recovery. The between data sets effects can be thought of as the influence of the design factors across all clustering methods. To simplify the discussion, only main effects are modeled and discussed. Furthermore, given the large sample size, it was expected that most factors would be statistically significant; therefore, all effects were evaluated with respect to their estimated effect sizes, partial eta-squared (η^2).

Table 2: Repeated measures ANOVA for six clustering methods on ARI (factors are ordered by decreasing effect size, partial η^2).

| Effect | Source | df | SS | F | partial η^2 |
|---|------------|--------|---------|----------|------------------|
| Between data sets effects | overlap | 4 | 4852.01 | 27606.19 | .804 |
| | shape | 1 | 410.35 | 9889.20 | .268 |
| | # clusters | 2 | 182.87 | 2203.58 | .140 |
| | density | 1 | 112.40 | 2708.79 | .091 |
| | # vars | 2 | 13.84 | 166.74 | .012 |
| | # obs | 2 | 6.30 | 75.97 | .006 |
| | Error | | 1119.81 | | |
| Within data sets effects (univariate tests) | Method (M) | 1 | 488.90 | 53916.15 | .666 |
| | M*overlap | 4 | 245.46 | 6767.40 | .501 |
| | M*vars | 2 | 63.45 | 3498.51 | .206 |
| | M*clusters | 2 | 44.04 | 2428.34 | .153 |
| | M*density | 1 | 24.96 | 2752.51 | .093 |
| | M*shape | 1 | 6.04 | 666.36 | .024 |
| | M*obs | 2 | .052 | 28.72 | .002 |
| Error | | 244.71 | | | |

Cluster overlap had the largest effect on cluster recovery. Overall, and as expected, as the overlap of clusters increased from .1% to 2%, the average recovery in terms of ARI decreased, going from .69 to .10. Cluster shape had also a large effect on cluster recovery with a mean ARI of .37 for spherical clusters and .26, for non-spherical clusters. Moreover, the number of clusters had a negative effect on cluster recovery, with .35, .30 and .27, for 3, 4 and 5 clusters, respectively. Cluster density had a moderate effect on cluster recovery, with mean ARI values equal to .34 and .28 for equally-sized clusters and a 10% of the observations in a single cluster, respectively. A much smaller and negative effect was observed in the case of the number of variables, with mean ARI values equal to .32, .31 and .30 for 6, 10 and 14 variables, respectively. Last, the number of observations (300, 600 or 1200) had a negligible effect on cluster recovery (.30, .31 and .32, respectively).

Based on the lower half of Table 2 (within data sets effects) we determine which methods are effective under which conditions. Table 3 shows the ARI values of the six methods by all factors. We observe that for increasing cluster

Table 3: Cluster recovery (ARI) of six clustering methods by cluster overlap, cluster shape, number of clusters, percentage of categorical variables, cluster density and sample size

| Factor | Level | Gower /PAM | Mixed K-Means | Mixed Reduced K-Means | K-proto | FAMD /K-Means | M-S K-Means |
|------------|-------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| overlap | .01 | .28 | .45 | .70 | .69 | .72 | .75 |
| | .05 | .16 | .28 | .41 | .48 | .51 | .50 |
| | 1 | .11 | .19 | .23 | .34 | .36 | .32 |
| | 1.5 | .08 | .14 | .15 | .24 | .26 | .22 |
| | 2 | .06 | .10 | .10 | .18 | .19 | .16 |
| # vars | 6 | .17 | .29 | .28 | .40 | .39 | .40 |
| | 10 | .13 | .23 | .32 | .39 | .42 | .39 |
| | 14 | .10 | .18 | .35 | .37 | .41 | .39 |
| # clusters | 3 | .15 | .25 | .40 | .42 | .47 | .44 |
| | 4 | .13 | .23 | .28 | .38 | .41 | .39 |
| | 5 | .12 | .21 | .27 | .36 | .34 | .34 |
| density | 10% | .13 | .22 | .29 | .34 | .37 | .35 |
| | equal | .14 | .24 | .35 | .43 | .44 | .43 |
| shape | no | .12 | .20 | .26 | .32 | .33 | .33 |
| | yes | .15 | .26 | .37 | .45 | .48 | .45 |
| # obs | 300 | .14 | .22 | .32 | .38 | .39 | .39 |
| | 600 | .11 | .23 | .32 | .39 | .41 | .39 |
| | 1200 | .11 | .22 | .32 | .40 | .43 | .40 |

overlap, all methods perform worse; however, the performance of Reduced K-Means deteriorates at a faster rate compared to other methods. This is also apparent in Figure 2a. Going from 6 to 14 variables, deteriorates the performance of Gower/PAM and Mixed K-Means, whereas cluster recovery of Mixed Reduced K-Means and FAMD/K-Means is slightly improved (Fig. 2b). The number of clusters negatively affects the performance of all methods; the effect is more profound for Reduced K-Means, especially when going from 3 to 4 clusters (Fig. 2c). Cluster density and cluster shape seem to affect cluster recovery in a relatively uniform manner across methods (Fig. 2d and 2e).




Fig. 2: Two-way interactions of method by (a) cluster overlap, (b) number of variables, (c) number of clusters, (d) cluster density, (e) cluster shape and (f) number of observations

6 Discussion

This paper reports benchmark test results from applying distance-based partitioning methods on simulated data sets with different characteristics. Six methods were selected to cover three general strategies of distance or dissimilarity-based partitioning of mixed-type data (i.e., constructing a dissimilarity matrix between observations given as input to K-Medoids, extending K-Means to mixed-type data and reducing the number of variables and clustering of the observations in the reduced space).

One essential goal of the benchmark is to make the results available and reusable to other researchers. Benchmark results revealed both similarities and differences in the overall performance of the six algorithms, as well as across different criteria. A group of top-performing methods with similar performance was distinguished, consisting of K-Prototypes, Modha-Sprangler K-Means and FAMD/K-Means. These methods also exhibited more or less uniform performance across all criteria, indicating that no method is superior to the others, at least within the restricted scope of the current study. This is in line with the benchmarking study of [Preud'Homme et al \(2021\)](#), where K-Prototypes has been shown to outperform all other distance-based methods. Modha-Sprangler K-Means, although it appears to be a strong competitor, remains among the least applied techniques in the literature, probably because of its computational complexity, as it involves a brute-force approach for determining the optimal value of the weights for categorical variables. In contrast to the other two methods, FAMD/K-means additionally involves a dimensionality reduction step, which can be convenient for visualizing and interpreting the clusters in the reduced space. FAMD/K-means performed better or equally well against competitors in all settings and its performance was not affected when the number of variables increased. Although Mixed Reduced K-Means was

expected to improve upon FAMD/K-Means, in the sense that it can address the cluster masking problem by optimizing a single objective function, this hypothesis was not confirmed by the study results. Mixed Reduced K-Means performed relatively well only for very low levels of cluster overlap and its performance deteriorated sharply when the cluster overlap or the number of clusters increased. However, it is important to note that both FAMD/K-means and Mixed Reduced K-means depend heavily on the amenability of the data set to dimensionality reduction where a few principal components account for a high percentage of variability in the data set. Where this is not the case, these methods cannot be reasonably applied. Gower/PAM was the worst performing method across all criteria, even for well-separated clusters. This is an important finding, considering that Gower/PAM is among the most popular choices in the literature for clustering mixed-type data. Mixed K-Means also demonstrated relatively poor performance in our experiments, especially when cluster overlap or the number of variables increased. This method has also performed poorly on real data sets with known cluster structure, in a previous study ([Markos et al, 2020](#)).

There are some limitations with the current study. First, to generate mixed-type data for the simulations, continuous variables were generated by drawing from finite mixtures of multivariate normal distributions; categorical variables were generated via discretization of such continuous variables. Ideally, for our experiments we would need to generate purely mixed-type data, that is, purely categorical variables and purely continuous variables with a cluster structure. However, controlling the overlap between clusters in mixed-type data sets with more than two clusters is not straightforward (e.g., see [Maitra and Melnykov, 2010](#)). In addition, the covariance structure between the variables was not user-defined. Controlling the correlation structure between the variables could have

been useful, so as to draw conclusions on how correlated variables affect the performance of clustering algorithms. Second, clustering performance depends on the software implementation used; different implementations of a method often lead to different results. The included clustering methods were required to have an R-implementation that can be used in a default way without additional tuning in order to allow for a comparison that is not influenced by different tuning flexibilities. Third, cluster recovery was assessed based on the Adjusted Rand Index. In some work, the ARI has been criticised and alternative indexes have been proposed, such as the Variation of Information, a proper metric between partitions which is based on the entropy of the intersections between two clusters from the two different clusterings (for a further discussion and some more alternatives to compare partitions, see [Meilă, 2015](#)). Last, the results of the current study were based on simulated data sets only. An empirical comparison of cluster analysis methods on real mixed-type data (see, e.g., [Hennig, 2022](#)) is expected to further highlight how different clustering methods produce solutions with different data analytic characteristics, which can help a user choosing an appropriate method for the research question of interest.

References

- Ahmad A, Dey L (2007) A k-mean clustering algorithm for mixed numeric and categorical data. *Data & Knowledge Engineering* 63(2):503–527
- Ahmad A, Khan SS (2019) Survey of state-of-the-art mixed data clustering algorithms. *IEEE Access* 7:31,883–31,902
- Arabie P (1994) *Cluster analysis in marketing research*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp 160–189

Audigier V, Husson F, Josse J (2016) A principal component method to impute missing values for mixed data. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* 10(1):5–26

Boulesteix AL, Hatz M (2017) Benchmarking for clustering methods based on real data: A statistical view. In: Palumbo F, Montanari A, Vichi M (eds) *Data Science*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 73–82

Boulesteix AL, Lauer S, Eugster MJ (2013) A plea for neutral comparison studies in computational sciences. *PLoS ONE* 8:e61,562

De Soete G, Carroll JD (1994) K-means clustering in a low-dimensional Euclidean space, Springer, pp 212–219

Dolnicar S, Grün B (2008) Challenging “factor–cluster segmentation”. *Journal of Travel Research* 47(1):63–71

Ferreira L, Hitchcock DB (2009) A comparison of hierarchical methods for clustering functional data. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 38(9):1925–1949

Foss A, Markatou M, Ray B, et al (2016) A semiparametric method for clustering mixed data. *Machine Learning* 105(3):419–458

Foss AH, Markatou M (2018) kamila: Clustering mixed-type data in R and Hadoop. *Journal of Statistical Software* 83:1–44

Foss AH, Markatou M, Ray B (2019) Distance metrics and clustering methods for mixed-type data. *International Statistical Review* 87(1):80–109

Gower JC (1971) A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties. *Biometrics* 27:857–871

- Hennig C (2022) An empirical comparison and characterisation of nine popular clustering methods. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* 16:201–229
- Hennig C, Liao TF (2013) How to find an appropriate clustering for mixed-type variables with application to socio-economic stratification. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 62(3):309–369
- Huang Z (1997) Clustering large data sets with mixed numeric and categorical values. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (PAKDD)*, Citeseer, pp 21–34
- Hubert L, Arabie P (1985) Comparing partitions. *Journal of Classification* 2(2):193–218
- Hunt L, Jorgensen M (2011) Clustering mixed data. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 1(4):352–361
- Javed A, Lee BS, Rizzo DM (2020) A benchmark study on time series clustering. *Machine Learning with Applications* 1:100,001
- Jimeno J, Roy M, Tortora C (2021) Clustering mixed-type data: A benchmark study on KAMILA and K-Prototypes. In: Chadjipadelis T, Lausen B, Markos A, et al (eds) *Data Analysis and Rationality in a Complex World*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 83–91
- Kaufman L, Rousseeuw PJ (1990) Finding Groups in Data: An Introduction to Cluster Analysis, John Wiley & Sons, chap 2, pp 68–125
- Kiers HA (1991) Simple structure in component analysis techniques for mixtures of qualitative and quantitative variables. *Psychometrika* 56(2):197–212

Maechler M, Rousseeuw P, Struyf A, et al (2021) cluster: Cluster Analysis Basics and Extensions. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cluster>, R package version 2.1.2)

Maitra R, Melnykov V (2010) Simulating data to study performance of finite mixture modeling and clustering algorithms. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 19(2):354–376

Markos A, D’Enza AI, van de Velden M (2019) Beyond tandem analysis: Joint dimension reduction and clustering in R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 91:1–24

Markos A, Moschidis O, Chadjipantelis T (2020) Sequential dimension reduction and clustering of mixed-type data. *International Journal of Data Analysis Techniques and Strategies* 12(3):228–246

Meilă M (2015) Criteria for comparing clusterings. In: *Handbook of cluster analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, p 640–657

Meilă M, Heckerman D (2001) An experimental comparison of model-based clustering methods. *Machine Learning* 42:9–29

Melnykov V, Maitra R (2010) Finite mixture models and model-based clustering. *Statistics Surveys* 4:80–116

Melnykov V, Chen WC, Maitra R (2012) MixSim: An R package for simulating data to study performance of clustering algorithms. *Journal of Statistical Software* 51(12):1–25

Milligan GW (1980) An examination of the effect of six types of error perturbation on fifteen clustering algorithms. *Psychometrika* 45:325–342

- Modha DS, Spangler WS (2003) Feature weighting in k-means clustering. *Machine Learning* 52(3):217–237
- Pagès J (2014) Multiple Factor Analysis By Example Using R, Chapman and Hall/CRC, chap 3, pp 67–78
- Preud’Homme G, Duarte K, Dalleau K, et al (2021) Head-to-head comparison of clustering methods for heterogeneous data: a simulation-driven benchmark. *Scientific Reports* 11(1):1–14
- Saraçlı S, Doğan N, İsmet Doğan (2013) Comparison of hierarchical cluster analysis methods by cophenetic correlation. *Journal of Inequalities And Applications* 2013:1–8
- Shireman EM, Steinley D, Brusco MJ (2016) Local optima in mixture modeling. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 51(4):466–481
- Szepannek G (2018) clustmixtype: User-friendly clustering of mixed-type data in R. *The R Journal* pp 200–208
- Van Mechelen I, Boulesteix AL, Dang R, et al (2018) Benchmarking in cluster analysis: A white paper URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.10496v2>
- van de Velden M, Iodice D’Enza A, Palumbo F (2017) Cluster correspondence analysis. *Psychometrika* 82(1):158–185
- van de Velden M, Iodice D’Enza A, Markos A (2019) Distance-based clustering of mixed data. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* 11(3):e1456
- Vichi M, Kiers HA (2001) Factorial k-means analysis for two-way data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 37(1):49–64

Vichi M, Vicari D, Kiers HA (2019) Clustering and dimension reduction for mixed variables. *Behaviormetrika* 46(2):243–269

Yamamoto M, Hwang H (2014) A general formulation of cluster analysis with dimension reduction and subspace separation. *Behaviormetrika* 41(1):115–129