
Kernel Metric Learning for Clustering Mixed-type Data

Jesse S. Ghashti¹ and John R. J. Thompson¹

¹ *University of British Columbia, Department of Computer Science, Mathematics, Physics, and Statistics, Kelowna, BC, Canada*

ABSTRACT

Distance-based clustering and classification are widely used in various fields to group mixed numeric and categorical data. A predefined distance measurement is used to cluster data points based on their dissimilarity. While there exist numerous distance-based measures for data with pure numerical attributes and several ordered and unordered categorical metrics, an optimal distance for mixed-type data is an open problem. Many metrics convert numerical attributes to categorical ones or vice versa. They handle the data points as a single attribute type or calculate a distance between each attribute separately and add them up. We propose a metric that uses mixed kernels to measure dissimilarity, with cross-validated optimal kernel bandwidths. Our approach improves clustering accuracy when utilized for existing distance-based clustering algorithms on simulated and real-world datasets containing pure continuous, categorical, and mixed-type data.

Keywords: Mixed-type data, metric learning, clustering, smoothing, kernel distance, similarity measure

arXiv:2306.01890v1 [cs.LG] 2 Jun 2023

1 INTRODUCTION

Datasets comprising continuous, ordered, and unordered categorical data are known as mixed-type data and are prevalent across various disciplines, and the availability of such heterogeneous data types continues to increase. Although several approaches have been employed to calculate the distance for mixed-type data points, there is no broadly accepted definition. The challenge of quantifying distance is balancing the contributions of each variable—particularly between discrete and continuous—to the overall difference between data entries. In this paper, we develop a data-driven distance method that estimates the importance of discrete and continuous variables to the difference between entries.

Many existing distances homogenize mixed-type data to single-type by projecting all data to either discrete or continuous, through methods such as discretization or dummy coding before calculating distance (see, for example, Guha et al., 2000; Dougherty et al., 1995). While these distances are computationally efficient and well-known, they can inaccurately calculate the meaningful differences between data points and overweight variables in continuous or discrete domains. This overweighting can severely affect the accuracy of any methodology that requires distances through a significant loss of information on the homogenized data types.

Clustering is a fundamental technique in data analysis that involves grouping similar data points together based on distance or similarity. When clustering mixed-type data, choosing an appropriate distance metric that can handle the heterogeneity of the data types and scales is crucial. The metric should be able to capture the unique characteristics of each data type and accurately reflect the distances between data points meaningfully. The choice of metric can have a significant impact on the accuracy, reliability, and interpretability of clustering results; thus, it is essential to carefully consider the metric used in clustering mixed-type data and to evaluate its performance using the standard clustering metrics of clustering accuracy (CA) and Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) (Hubert & Arabie, 1985).

In this paper, we propose a novel kernel distance for mixed-type data, that is an effective way to handle mixed-type data in clustering applications. We estimate the distribution of the data using kernel density estimation with optimal bandwidth selection and then calculate the kernel distance between each data point. The advantage of this method is that the importance of each variable to the difference between

is determined through data-driven cross-validation when selecting the bandwidth. We apply kernel distance to agglomerative hierarchical clustering and demonstrate the utility of our Kernel distance metric (KDSUM) through agglomerative hierarchical clustering, using both simulated and real-world datasets. We find that using a kernel distance almost unilaterally improves clustering performance compared to other common mixed-type distances, such as Gower’s distance. A kernel distance provides researchers and practitioners with a unified, robust, effective, and efficient distance for mixed-type data, aiding in informed decision-making from the more accurately characterized clusters.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses existing homogenized and non-homogenized approaches for mixed-type distances. Section 3 outlines the methodology for the KDSUM metric, and Section 4 describes the simulated and real-life data. In Section 5, we present the results and discussion of the clustering process based on the KDSUM kernel distance applied to agglomerative hierarchical clustering. Finally, Section 6 offers a conclusion and insights for future work.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Consider a $n \times p$ mixed-type data matrix X consisting of n observations with p many variables that are a combination of continuous, unordered and ordered categorical variables. Assume that the p variables are arranged such that the first continuous variables p_c are first, followed by unordered categorical variables p_u , and then the ordered categorical variables p_o such that $p = p_c + p_u + p_o$.

2.1 *Mixed Distances*

Typical methodologies for calculating mixed-type distance require the user to homogenize data to purely numerical or categorical type, and then calculate differences. Discretization and dummy-coding are two common methods of data homogenization in statistical analysis. Discretization is a process of converting continuous variables into discrete categories or intervals such as binning—dividing the range of a continuous variable into intervals and assigning each observation to the corresponding interval (Dougherty et al., 1995). For example, a person’s age can be binned into discrete ordered categories such as "0-18", "19-30", "31-50", and so on.

Let \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j be two observations with mixed-type variables. To calculate their distance, we first homogenize the data using discretization or dummy-coding. For discretizing the k^{th} continuous variable, we divide \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j into c_k ordered categories $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{c_k}$, and replace each value $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{j,k}$ with their corresponding category label vectors $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{j,k}$ of length c_k . The elements of $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}$ are 1 if $x_{i,k}$ falls within the corresponding interval or 0 if it does not. The distance $d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ can then be calculated using any distance metric designed for categorical data. Discretization is often useful in cases where the data is highly skewed. However, it leads to a loss of information, and choosing an optimal interval width can be challenging and may affect the analysis results.

Dummy-coding involves representing categorical variables as binary (0 or 1) variables. Let \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j be two data points with categorical variables. For dummy-coding, we create a separate binary variable for each category of each categorical variable. Let $\mathcal{L}_h = \{z_{h,1}, z_{h,2}, \dots, z_{h,k}\}$ be the set of categories for categorical variable h , where k is the number of categories. For each category $z_{h,m} \in \mathcal{L}_h$, create a binary variable $x_{i,h,m}$ and $x_{j,h,m}$, where the binary variable assumes value 1 if \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j are both in category $c_{h,m}$, and 0 otherwise. The distance $d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ between the dummy-coded data points is then calculated using any binary distance metric (for more information, see, e.g., Choi et al., 2010). Dummy-coding has the advantage of preserving all the information in the categorical variable and ease of interpretation. However, such an approach can dramatically increase the dimensions of the feature space.

In addition to discretization, data needs to be scaled, and the choice of scaling also affects clustering performance. Hennig et al. (2015) noted that distance-based clustering methods are not invariant to affine transformations, and Foss et al. (2016) showed that the choice of scaling can affect clustering performance. Foss et al. (2019) illustrated the inadequacy of dummy coding, noting that the expectation of the interval scale variable is always greater than 1, while the expectation from the categorical is always less than 1. This means that the choice of coding can lead to different interpretations of the data and may affect the analysis results.

Various mixed distance metrics do not require the homogenization or scaling of the data. The quadratic distance proposed by Lindsay et al. (2008) extends the chi-squared measures of distance between two distributions and requires the choice of a nonnegative definite kernel. De Leon & Carriere (2005) use

a general mixed-data model to define the distance between two populations of mixed unordered categorical, ordered categorical, and interval scale data. Krzanowski (1983) proposes a distance based on Matusita’s distance, as mixtures of these location models and generalizations are not identifiable without further conditions on some of the parameters. Recently, van de Welden et al., (2023) introduced a framework that allows for an implementation of distances between observations that can be extended to many existing distances for categorical variables.

For mixed distances, consider that the rows of X are observation vectors \mathbf{x}_j , and the dissimilarity or distance between any two observations \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j is denoted $d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$, whereas the similarity between the observations is denoted $s(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$. For any arbitrary variable l , denote $w_{i,j,l} = 0$ if variable l has missing data, otherwise $w_{i,j,l} = 1$. Denote $\delta_{i,j,l} \equiv \delta_c(x_{i,l} - x_{j,l})$ for categorical variables, where $\delta_{i,j,l} = 1$ if the two observations for the l th variables are the same, and 0 otherwise.

Modha and Spangler (2003) propose a method similar to k -prototypes that includes estimating a suitable weight that scales the relative contribution of the interval and categorical variables. However, the brute-force search to cluster repeatedly for a range of values for the weight that minimizes its objective function is computationally exhaustive.

The metrics in Table 1 will be used as benchmarks for the analysis of metrics herein. Gower’s distance (Gower, 1971) is a common hybrid distance function that calculates the distance between two vectors of the same length. It uses a weighted combination of interval and categorical distances, where the categorical distance is based on whether the categories match or not, and the interval distance is scaled based on the range of the variable. The user-specified weights for each variable may lead to intractable solutions and varying results based on the data. k -prototypes (Huang, 1998) is another hybrid distance technique that uses a similar approach to Gower’s distance, except the squared Euclidean distance is used for the interval scale variables. Unlike Gower’s distance, it does not require variable-specific weights, but rather a single weight used for the entire categorical contribution of the distance function. The Podani distance metric (1999) extends Gower’s general coefficient of similarity to ordinal variables, while the Wishart (2003) metric is similar to the Podani metric, except it makes use of the sample standard deviation for continuous variables, rather than the range of the continuous variables. The latter three distances can be

calculated in R using the *kmed* package (Budiaji, 2022), while Gower’s distance is calculated using the *daisy* function in the package *cluster* (Maechler et al., 2022)

Metric	Definition
Gower (1971):	$d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = 1 - s_{i,j};$ $s_{i,j} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^p w_{i,j,l} \delta_{i,j,l}}{\sum_{l=1}^p w_{i,j,l}}$ <p>For continuous variables, $\delta_{i,j,l} = 1 - \frac{ x_{i,l} - x_{j,l} }{\max_l - \min_l} = 1 - \frac{ x_{i,l} - x_{j,l} }{R_l}$</p>
Wishart (2003):	$d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^p w_{i,j,l} \left(\frac{x_{i,l} - x_{j,l}}{\delta_{i,j,l}} \right)^2};$ <p>$\delta_{i,j,l} = s_l :=$ sample standard deviation of lth variable (if l is continuous)</p>
Podani (1999):	$d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^p w_{i,j,l} \left(\frac{x_{i,l} - x_{j,l}}{\delta_{i,j,l}} \right)^2};$ <p>$\delta_{i,j,l} = R_l$ (if l is continuous)</p>
Huang (2003):	$d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \sum_{l=1}^{p_c} (x_{i,l} - x_{j,l})^2 +$ $+ \gamma \sum_{l=p_c+1}^{p_u+p_o} \delta_c(x_{i,l} - x_{j,l});$ $\gamma = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^{p_c} s_r^2}{p_c}$

Table 1: Selection of mixed data distance metrics found in literature.

2.2 Kernel Density Estimation and Bandwidth Selection Procedures

Kernel functions are weighting functions that can be used to map data points from a high-dimensional sample space to a low-dimensional space. This paper uses kernel functions to calculate the similarities between observations within a mixed-type dataset. The kernel function can be used to define a similarity function between data points, and can be used to define a distance metric for various data types.

We denote $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as an arbitrary similarity function with the following two properties: for any observation \mathbf{x}_i , $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = 1$, and as the difference between two observations \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j increases, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ decreases. The similarity \mathcal{L} can be cast as any symmetric kernel function satisfying these properties. We denote the kernel functions specific to datatypes as K , L , and ℓ for continuous, unordered and ordered categorical variables, respectively. For each kernel, we denote bandwidths associated with the kernel functions as $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \equiv \{\lambda^c, \lambda^u, \lambda^o\}$ where $\lambda^c \equiv \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{p_c}$, $\lambda^u \equiv \{\lambda_i\}_{i=p_c+1}^{p_c+p_u}$, and $\lambda^o \equiv \{\lambda_i\}_{i=p_c+p_u+1}^p$. Common kernel functions used in the smoothing literature are in Table 2. However, as shown, fewer unordered and categorical kernel functions are typically used. The Aitchison & Aitken kernel is com-

monly used for unordered categorical data, while the Wang & Van Ryzin kernel is often used for ordered data. In this paper, we select a Gaussian kernel for continuous variables, an Aitken kernel for unordered categorical variables, and a Wang & Van Ryzin kernel for ordered categorical.

Type	Name	Kernel
Continuous	Gaussian	$k(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}z^2\right)$
	Epanechnikov	$k(z) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - z^2) \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Uniform	$k(z) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Triangular	$k(z) = (1 - z) \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Triweight	$k(z) = \frac{35}{32}(1 - z^2)^3 \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Tricube	$k(z) = \frac{70}{81}(1 - z ^3)^3 \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Biweight	$k(z) = \frac{15}{16}(1 - z^2)^2 \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Cosine	$k(z) = \frac{\pi}{4} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}z\right) \cdot \mathbf{1}(z \leq 1)$
	Logistic	$k(z) = \frac{1}{2 + e^z + e^{-z}}$
	Sigmoid	$k(z) = \frac{2}{\pi(e^z + e^{-z})}$
	Silverman (1986)	$k(z) = \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{ z }{\sqrt{2}}\right) \sin\left(\frac{4 z + \sqrt{2}\pi}{4\sqrt{2}}\right)$
Categorical	Aitchison & Aitken (1976)	$L(X_i, x, \lambda^u) = \begin{cases} 1 - \lambda^u & X_i = x \\ \frac{\lambda^u}{c-1} & X_i \neq x \end{cases}$
(unordered)	Aitken (Li et al., 2008)	$L(X_i, x, \lambda^u) = \begin{cases} 1 & X_i = x \\ \lambda^u & X_i \neq x \end{cases}$
Categorical	Li & Racine (2007)*	$\ell(X_i, x, \lambda^o) = \frac{\lambda^{ X_i-x }}{\sum_{x \in D} \lambda^{ X_i-x }}$
	Wang & Van Ryzin (1981)	$\ell(X_i, x, \lambda^o) = \begin{cases} 1 - \lambda^o & X_i = x \\ \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda^o)(\lambda^o)^{ X_i-x } & X_i \neq x \end{cases}$
(ordered)	Aitken (Li et al., 2008)	$\ell(X_i, x, \lambda^o) = \begin{cases} \lambda^o & X_i = x \\ \frac{1-\lambda^o}{2^{ X_i-x }} & X_i \neq x \end{cases}$
	Aitchison & Aitken (Li & Racine, 2007)	$\ell(X_i, x, \lambda^o) = \binom{c}{ X_i-x } (\lambda^o)^{ X_i-x } (1 - \lambda^o)^{c- X_i-x }$

Table 2: Common kernel functions. For continuous kernels, $z = \frac{X_i-x}{\lambda^c}$.
* is not a symmetric kernel function

A mixed-type joint kernel function between a random vector $\mathbf{x}_j \equiv \{\mathbf{x}_j^c, \mathbf{x}_j^u, \mathbf{x}_j^o\}$ and an arbitrary point $x_{i,j}$ is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\mathbf{x}_i, x_{i,j}) = \prod_{k=1}^{p_c} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} K\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_k^c - x_{i,k}^c}{\lambda_k}\right) \prod_{k=1}^{p_u} L(x_{i,k}^u, \mathbf{x}_k^u, \lambda_k^u) \prod_{k=1}^{p_o} \ell(x_{i,k}^o, \mathbf{x}_k^o, \lambda_k^o). \quad (1)$$

Optimal bandwidth selection methods are designed to preserve estimator convergence while having several other desirable properties, including smoothing out irrelevant variables (Loader, 1999). There is a wide range of methods for optimal bandwidth selection, including Akaike Information Criterion (Hurvich et al., 1998), Least Squares Cross-Validation (e.g., Sain et al., 1994), Rule of Thumb (Silverman, 1986), and Maximum-Likelihood Cross-Validation (MLCV) (e.g., Hall 1981). In this paper, we use MLCV through the *R* package *np* for our bandwidth selection criterion (Hayfield & Racine, 2008), where the MLCV objective function to be minimized is

$$CV(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \left(\frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{-i}(x_i) \right),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{-i}(x_i)$ is the leave-one-out estimator of $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\cdot)$ in Equation (1).

3 MIXED KERNEL DISTANCES

This concept of distance is fundamental in many fields, including machine learning, data mining, and computer vision. Consider the set of observations X . A real-valued function $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ on the Cartesian product $X \times X$ is a similarity function if, for any points $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3 \in X$, it satisfies four conditions (Chen et al., 2009):

(S1) Symmetry: $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1)$,

(S2) Indiscernible: $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \iff \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$,

(S3) Nonnegative self-similarity: $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \geq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \geq 0$,

(S4) Similarity triangle inequality: $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)$.

A metric for mixed-type data can be constructed using kernel functions based on the underlying density of the individual variables. To transform kernel similarities into distances, we extend the metric described in Phillips and Venkatasubramanian (2011) to the multivariate setting, which uses a well-defined kernel function to measure similarity between points \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 . The distance between \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 is then defined as

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1). \quad (2)$$

If a symmetric kernel function is elected, the formula reduces to $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - 2\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$. Equation (2) represents the difference between the self-similarities of the two points and their cross-similarity. The multiplicative factor of two ensures that the distance between an object and itself equals zero and satisfies the identity of indiscernibles.

Theorem # 1: (2) is a well-defined distance metric, i.e, it satisfies the following properties (Chen et al., 2009):

Proof: Nonnegativity ($d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \geq 0$): note by (S3) that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) \geq 0$. Adding yields $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) \geq 0$ and thus, $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \geq 0$.

Symmetry ($d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1)$): note $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1)$

Identity of indiscernibles ($d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = 0 \iff \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$): suppose that $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = 0$, thus $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) = 0$, implying $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1)$ which is true if and only if $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$ or $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_1$ by (S5). Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_1$, then $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) = 2\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) - 2\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) = 0$

Triangle inequality ($d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) \leq d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$): note by (S4) that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)$, and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)$. Then,

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_3) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_1) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_3) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2) = d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$$

□

3.1 KDSUM: Dissimilarity metric for Mixed-Type Data

The pairwise similarity between two observations \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j is

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^{p_c} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} K \left(\frac{x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}}{\lambda_k} \right) + \sum_{k=p_c+1}^{p_u} L(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}, \lambda_k) + \sum_{k=p_c+p_u+1}^p \ell(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}, \lambda_k).$$

By the definition of the kernel functions in Section 2.2, $\psi(\cdot)$ satisfies the similarity properties (S1)-(S4) and is a similarity function, thus we can use $\mathcal{L}(\cdot) := \psi(\cdot)$. Combining the similarity properties (S1)-(S4), and adapting the kernel distance described by Phillips and Venkatasubramanian (2011) to the

multivariate setting, we define the distance between any two data points $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j$ of the dataset X as

$$d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \psi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_j | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) - 2\psi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j | \boldsymbol{\lambda}). \quad (3)$$

Consider the following simulated mixed-type data matrix:

$$X = \begin{matrix} & & p_{c_1} & p_{u_1} & p_{o_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_1 & \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1.5 & 1 & 3 \\ 1.5 & 1 & 3 \\ 1.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 \end{array} \right) \\ \mathbf{x}_2 & \\ \mathbf{x}_3 & \\ \mathbf{x}_4 & \\ \mathbf{x}_5 & \end{matrix}$$

where $p_{c_1} = p_{u_1} = p_{o_1} = 1$. The distance between vectors \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 should be assigned 0, while $\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4,$ and \mathbf{x}_5 each contain one variable value in common with both \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 but the rest of the observations are 0, and the variables in common between $\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4,$ and \mathbf{x}_5 and \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 are different for each vector.

We begin by testing $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 = [0.01, 0, 0]$ in anticipation that the distances approach their upper bounds. We also test $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2 = [10, 1, 1]$ in anticipation that the distances will be minimal as the bandwidths reach their upper bounds. Case 1 and 2 below confirm this. Finally, we test $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ chosen using maximum likelihood-cross validation with the given kernel functions, which yields $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3 = [1.29, 1.000, 1.83 \times 10^{-8}]$. We observe that the variable p_{u_1} has nearly reached its upper bounds and will contribute little to the overall distance based on the data, while p_{c_1} and p_{o_1} will contribute more heavily. The results are shown in case 3.

case 1: $d(X | \boldsymbol{\lambda}_1)$

$$\begin{matrix} & \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{x}_4 & \mathbf{x}_5 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 & \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & 0 & 4.000 & 81.788 & 81.788 \\ & 0 & 4.000 & 81.788 & 81.788 \\ & & 0 & 81.788 & 81.788 \\ & & & 0 & 4.000 \\ & & & & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ \mathbf{x}_2 & \\ \mathbf{x}_3 & \\ \mathbf{x}_4 & \\ \mathbf{x}_5 & \end{matrix}$$

case 2: $d(X | \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2)$

$$\begin{matrix} & \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{x}_4 & \mathbf{x}_5 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 & \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.001 & 0.001 \\ & 0 & 0 & 0.001 & 0.001 \\ & & 0 & 0.001 & 0.001 \\ & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ \mathbf{x}_2 & \\ \mathbf{x}_3 & \\ \mathbf{x}_4 & \\ \mathbf{x}_5 & \end{matrix}$$

case 3: $d(X | \lambda_3)$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \mathbf{x}_1 \\
 \mathbf{x}_2 \\
 \mathbf{x}_3 \\
 \mathbf{x}_4 \\
 \mathbf{x}_5
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{x}_4 & \mathbf{x}_5 \\
 0 & 0 & 2.000 & 2.306 & 0.306 \\
 & 0 & 2.000 & 2.306 & 0.306 \\
 & & 0 & 0.306 & 2.306 \\
 & & & 0 & 2.000 \\
 & & & & 0
 \end{pmatrix}$$

3.2 KDSUM Algorithm

Algorithm 1 KDSUM

- 1: Given a dataset X , order as $[p_c, p_u, p_o]$
 - 2: Select symmetric kernel functions K, L, ℓ from Table 2
 - 3: Calculate optimal bandwidths for each p_i using cross-validation procedure using Equation (1) for selected kernels in Step 2
 - 4: Calculate the pairwise distance between all observations \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j using Equation (3) and the selected kernels in Step 2 to obtain the dissimilarity matrix with bandwidths from Step 3
 - 5: Cluster dissimilarity matrix with any clustering algorithm that accepts this matrix as input
-

The metric KDSUM in Equation (2) requires a user-defined kernel distance metric for each variable type within a given dataset.

4 STUDY DESCRIPTION

To evaluate the performance of the KDSUM metric in comparison to established metrics for mixed-type data distance-based clustering, we analyzed simulated and real datasets of continuous, categorical, and mixed-type attributes using agglomerative hierarchical clustering techniques. We establish the performance of the KDSUM metric relative to existing metrics for handling mixed-type data and to demonstrate the potential of the KDSUM metric to enhance clustering accuracy. By comparing the KDSUM metric to these advanced clustering techniques, we demonstrate the flexibility of the KDSUM metric for usage in distance-based clustering of various mixed datasets.

4.1 Clustering algorithms

Mixed-type approaches offer a solution to the challenge of clustering datasets that contain both continuous and categorical variables. One approach involves selecting a distance metric that can handle both types of variables, and then clustering the data using methods that depend on the distance function.

4.1.1 Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering

A kernel distance metric can be utilized in any clustering algorithm that accepts a dissimilarity metric. Additionally, this metric can be adapted to centroid, medoid, or prototype-based methods. To test the KDSUM metric for clustering, we follow previous literature that uses agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithms designed to cluster based on dissimilarity metrics (see, for example, Day & Edelsbrunner, 1984; Murtagh & Contreras, 2012; Bouguettaya et al., 2015; Sasirekha & Baby, 2013; Nielson, 2016). Single-linkage calculates the distance between two clusters as the shortest distance between any two points in the two clusters. Similarly, Complete-linkage (e.g., Macnaughton-Smith, 1965) calculates the distance between two clusters as the maximum distance between any two points in the two clusters. Average-linkage (e.g., Lance & Williams, 1967), on the other hand, considers the average distance between all pairs of points in the two clusters. Ward's method (Ward, 1963) seeks to minimize the total variance within each cluster as the criterion for merging clusters. Median linkage employs the median distance between all pairs of points in the two clusters, while centroid linkage (e.g., Sokal & Michener, 1958) relies on the distance between the centroids of the two clusters.

4.1.2 Evaluation Metrics

When evaluating and comparing the effectiveness and accuracy of clustering and classification techniques, we use the two commonly used metrics of classification accuracy (CA) and the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI).

The ARI is a statistic that quantifies the similarity between the true classification of the data and the classification obtained by a given method (Rand, 1971). The ARI is defined as

$$ARI = \frac{\sum_{ij} \binom{n_{ij}}{2} - [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] / \binom{n}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} + \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] - [\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2}] / \binom{n}{2}},$$

where n_{ij} is the diagonal sum of the clustering contingency table, and a_i, b_j correspond to the row sums and column sums of the contingency table, respectively. The contingency table is a visual depiction that summarizes agreement and disagreement between the true class labels and the classification class labels. The index considers the number of pairs of data points that are labelled identically in both sets and labelled differently in both sets. The ARI then adjusts for a chance agreement based on the expected

agreement between the two sets under a null model. The resulting ARI value ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates complete randomness and 1 indicates perfect agreement in classification. The ARI is calculated using in *R* using the package *mclust* (Scrucca et al., 2022)

Clustering accuracy is also used to measure the percentage of data points correctly assigned to their corresponding clusters. It is calculated by comparing the true classification labels with those generated by the clustering algorithm, defined as

$$CA(y, \hat{y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\hat{y}_i = y_i)}{n},$$

where the indicator function $\mathbb{1}(\cdot) = 1$ if the class label y for the i th observation matches the predicted class label \hat{y}_i , and 0 otherwise. The CA ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates that none of the data points are assigned to the correct clusters, and 1 indicates that all data points are assigned to the correct clusters.

4.2 Simulated Data

The first four continuous datasets were simulated to evaluate the ability of KDSUM to effectively handle data that exhibits a diverse range of distributions, adapted from Morbieu (2018). In all instances, the simulated data comprised two variables and two known classes. Specifically, the first set of data consisted of 1000 observations that were simulated using a highly-correlated bimodal Gaussian distribution with low variance. Each cluster consisted of 500 observations, and the cluster separation was distinct. The second set contained 2050 observations that were simulated using a well-defined large cluster of 2000 observations with low variance, and a small cluster of 50 observations with high variance. Compared to the first simulation, the boundary between the clusters was blurred. The third set of data consisted of 200 observations that were simulated with one dense spherical cluster that was contained inside a sparse spherical cluster, with both clusters having equal observations. Lastly, the fourth set of data consisted of two equally-sized clusters that were spiralled within each other. A visualization of the four simulated continuous datasets is presented in Figure 1.

Two additional simulated datasets were constructed with categorical and mixed variables, primarily for bandwidth selection analysis. Sim 6 was constructed with 100 observations and 6 variables, where 4 of




Figure 1: Variable distribution with respect to class assignment for four continuous simulated datasets. From left to right: Sim 1, Sim 2, Sim 3, Sim 4.




Figure 2: Variable distribution with respect to class assignment for Sim 5. X_1 and X_2 represent the binary noise variables, and X_3 , X_4 and X_5 are the meaningful categorical variables, grouped in a 10 unit interval for ease of interpretation.

them were continuous variables drawn from a uniform distribution to serve as noise terms with no interpretable meaning. The two categorical variables were unordered and consisted of two distinct groupings, with values ranging from 0 to 10 for class 1 and 12 to 20 for class 2. In contrast, Sim 5 consisted of 200 observations, where 5 unordered categorical variables were employed. Two of these variables were random binary noise variables with no interpretable meaning. The three categorical variables had three distinct clusters of equal sizes. The three unordered categorical variables were randomly selected integers in the range of 0 – 30, and the first class consisted only of values between 0 – 10 for each of the three variables, while classes two and three consisted of values of 10 – 20 and 20 – 30, respectively. From Figure 2, it is evident that there are some overlap in class assignment in these intervals since the value of 10 and 20 belongs to more than one class.

4.3 Real Data

This study utilized a diverse range of data, including continuous, categorical, and mixed-type datasets, to evaluate the KDSUM metric for clustering algorithms. All data sets used in the study are publicly avail-

Data type	Name	# Obs.	# Continuous	# Unordered	# Ordered	# Classes	Class Sizes
Continuous only	Sim 1	100	2	-	-	2	500, 500
	Sim 2	2050	2	-	-	2	2000, 50
	Sim 3	200	2	-	-	2	100, 100
	Sim 4	1000	2	-	-	2	500, 500
	Iris	150	4	-	-	3	50, 50, 50
	Wine	178	13	-	-	3	71, 59, 48
Categorical only	Sim 5	200	-	5	-	3	67, 67, 66
	Zoo	101	-	15	1	7	41, 20, 13, 10, 8, 5, 4
	Breast Cancer	683	-	-	9	2	444, 239
	Soybean (sm.)	47	-	35	-	4	17, 10, 10, 10
	Soybean (lg.)	266	-	35	-	15	$40 \times 3, 20 \times 2, 16, 10 \times 9$
Mixed	Sim 6	200	4	2	-	2	100, 100
	Credit (Aus)	690	6	8	-	2	383, 307
	Cars	392	4	3	-	2	214, 178

Table 3: Structures of datasets used to compare distance metrics for agglomerative hierarchical clustering

able through the UCI Machine Learning Repository (Dua & Graff, 2017). The study included the Iris dataset, which has 150 observations with four continuous variables and a classification column containing three distinct classes, the Wine dataset with 178 observations of 13 continuous variables and three classes, the Zoo dataset with 101 observations consisting of 12 binary variables and one ordered categorical variable, and the Breast Cancer dataset with nine ordered categorical variables and two classes. The Soybean dataset was also included, which contains 307 observations and a mix of 35 ordered and unordered categorical variables and 18 classes. The Australian Credit and Auto MPG dataset were also utilized, which have a mix of continuous and categorical variables and two classes each. For the Auto MPG dataset, the predicted class was a continuous variable (miles per gallon), and was partitioned into 2 distinct classes with an approximately even dispersion of observations into the two classes, namely, miles per gallon < 22 and ≥ 22 . A summary of all the datasets can be found in Table 3.

5 RESULTS

5.1 Comparison to Mixed-type Distance Metrics

Prior to the comparative study of clustering methods, an experiment was performed to assess the effectiveness of the suggested metric compared to other established mixed-type metrics when employed in agglomerative hierarchical clustering. Furthermore, an analysis of the bandwidths obtained via MLCV was conducted. Four common mixed-type metrics were evaluated and compared to the KDSUM metric. The dissimilarity matrices resulting from each of the tested metrics were subsequently clustered using Average-Linkage agglomerative hierarchical clustering.

The data used for this study was Zoo, Auto, Sim 5, and Sim 6. Our objective with the simulated data was to examine the influence of perfect clustering results by analyzing the bandwidths. For Sim 6, the bandwidths of the continuous noise terms were determined to be $(\lambda_1^c, \lambda_2^c, \lambda_3^c, \lambda_4^c) = (0.475, 0.310, 0.448, 0.469)$, whereas the meaningful categorical variables had bandwidths of $(\lambda_5^u, \lambda_6^u) = (0.108, 0.070)$. As continuous variable bandwidths range from $0 < \lambda^c < \infty$, and unordered categorical variables have bandwidths in the range $0 \leq \lambda^u \leq 1$, it is evident that all MLCV bandwidths for Sim 6 were small. This implies that all the variables in the data were given higher weighting, resulting in sharp, narrow kernels for both variable types.

The observed bandwidths for Sim 5 were $(\lambda_1^u, \lambda_2^u, \lambda_3^u, \lambda_4^u, \lambda_5^u) = (0.775, 0.741, 0.017, 0.029, 0.037)$, with $(\lambda_3^u, \lambda_4^u, \lambda_5^u)$ being the bandwidths associated with variables of importance. By analyzing the bandwidth outcomes, we observe that the noise terms acquired bandwidths $(\lambda_1^u, \lambda_2^u)$ that essentially attained their maximum bandwidth values. As a result, they were effectively smoothed out from the data, leading to a reduced influence on the overall kernel distance calculation. Employing cross-validation techniques for kernel smoothing in the distance metric offers two-fold benefits. First, it effectively smooths out variables considered irrelevant from the distance calculation, thereby leaving only significant variables in the overall calculation of the distance function. Second, this approach results in a more accurate representation of distance between observations.

Table 4 presents the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) scores for four mixed datasets. The results demonstrate that the KDSUM metric outperforms the other tested mixed-type metrics in terms of clustering accuracy and ability to cluster data against known class labels for each dataset. It is notable that the KDSUM method achieves exceptionally high clustering results, while other metrics exhibit poor performance with respect to hierarchical clustering methods.

Data	Gower	Wishart	Podani	Huang	KDSUM
Sim 5	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.000	0.857
Sim 6	0.247	0.247	0.300	0.247	1.00 <i>similarity</i> 0
Zoo	0.468	0.473	0.332	0.002	0.880
Auto	0.649	0.269	0.624	0.219	0.682

Table 4: Comparison of distance metrics for mixed-type data using average-linkage agglomerative hierarchical clustering. Reported is the Adjusted Rand Index.

5.2 Comparison to Common Clustering Algorithms

To cluster the 6 simulated and 8 real datasets, the KDSUM metric was utilized in conjunction with standard agglomerative hierarchical clustering techniques provided in the *R* package *stats* (R Core Team, 2022). The clustering method with the highest clustering accuracy (CA) was employed for the resulting analysis. The performance of the KDSUM metric was compared to Gower’s distance using a partitioning around medoids (PAM) model (Kaufman, 1990). For purely continuous or categorical data, Gower’s distance employs the Euclidean distance or Simple Matching Coefficient, respectively (Gower, 1971). Results for continuous datasets are provided for *k*-Means (Hartigan & Wong, 1979), for categorical data, results are provided for *k*-Modes (Huang, 1998), and for mixed-type data, results are provided for *k*-Prototypes (Huang, 1998). The clustering accuracy and ARI are summarized in Table 5.

The results of the experiments demonstrate the significant advantages of the KDSUM metric in terms of clustering accuracy. For each of the six simulated datasets, the KDSUM metric in combination with hierarchical clustering achieved clustering accuracy that was 11% to 40.6% higher than that of the next best clustering accuracy for the respective models, along with significantly higher ARI scores. For the Wine dataset, the clustering accuracy achieved by the KDSUM metric was more than 20% higher than that of Gower’s distance with PAM, and *k*-Means. Similarly, for the Zoo, Breast Cancer, Soybean (lg), Credit, and Auto datasets, the KDSUM metric obtained an increase in clustering accuracy of 12%, 1.1%, 9.9%, 2.3%, 8.4%, respectively, over the second highest performing method. All methods performed well for the Soybean (sm) dataset.

It should be noted that the only dataset in which the KDSUM method did not perform as well as the competing methods was Iris, where both competing methods achieved clustering accuracy that was 1.3% higher. It is worth mentioning that if we only consider one column (petal width), all three methods achieved the same clustering accuracy and ARI of 0.960 and 0.886, respectively, which is the highest value obtained from any combination of variables in this dataset. While the obvious cluster of the setosa species class label was correctly identified, the overlapping nature of the remaining two species, setosa and versicolor, led the KDSUM method to incorrectly classify two observations more than the other two methods. Improving the effectiveness of the KDSUM metric for handling overlapping clusters is an active area of consideration.

Table 5: Classification results on all datasets. The KDSUM metric was compared to Gower’s distance with PAM for all datasets, and to k -Means, k -Modes , and k -Prototypes for the continuous, categorical and mixed datasets, respectively.

Data	Distance Metric & Clustering Method	Accuracy (CA)	ARI
Sim 1	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	1.000	1.000
	Gower’s / PAM	0.646	0.080
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.505	5.1e-5
Sim 2	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	1.000	1.000
	Gower’s / PAM	0.664	0.005
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.554	0.005
Sim 3	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	1.000	1.000
	Gower’s / PAM	0.890	0.607
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.835	0.446
Sim 4	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	0.999	0.996
	Gower’s / PAM	0.593	0.034
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.596	0.036
Iris	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	0.880	0.706
	Gower’s / PAM	0.893	0.730
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.893	0.730
Wine	KDSUM / Ward’s Method	0.978	0.929
	Gower’s / PAM	0.708	0.371
	Euclidean / k -Means	0.702	0.377
Sim 5	KDSUM / Average Linkage	0.967	0.857
	Gower’s distance / Pam	0.775	0.461
	Matching coefficient / k -Modes	0.490	0.046
Zoo	KDSUM / Single-Linkage	0.933	0.935
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.813	0.662
	Matching coefficient / k -Modes	0.800	0.647
Breast Cancer	KDSUM / Ward’s Method	0.966	0.869
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.955	0.825
	Matching coefficient / k -Modes	0.933	0.745
Soybean (small)	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	1.000	1.000
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.936	0.820
	Matching coefficient / k -Modes	1.000	1.000
Soybean (large)	KDSUM / Ward’s Method	0.792	0.557
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.693	0.376
	Matching coefficient / k -Modes	0.673	0.320
Sim 6	Propose / Average-Linkage	1.000	1.000
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.755	0.257
	Huang / k -Prototypes	0.750	0.247
Credit (Australian)	KDSUM / Ward’s Method	0.817	0.401
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.794	0.345
	Huang / k -Prototypes	0.793	0.342
Auto (mpg)	KDSUM / Average-Linkage	0.913	0.682
	Gower’s Distance / PAM	0.829	0.431
	Huang / k -Prototypes	0.888	0.600

6 CONCLUSION

In this study, we proposed a novel kernel distance metric for effectively handling mixed-type data. Specifically, we developed a metric based on the kernel function, which is a widely used tool in machine learning and data analysis for transforming data into a higher dimensional feature space. To ensure the viability of our KDSUM metric, we rigorously proved that it satisfies all necessary properties of a distance metric, including non-negativity, symmetry, the triangle inequality, and the identity of indiscernibles. In doing so, we established the theoretical foundation for our KDSUM metric and demonstrated its potential for accurately capturing the distances between mixed-type data points.

We conducted extensive experiments on both simulated and empirical data to evaluate the effectiveness of our KDSUM metric compared to existing mixed-type data metrics and state-of-the-art clustering algorithms designed to handle mixed-type data. Using the same agglomerative hierarchical clustering techniques, we assessed the performance of our KDSUM metric in terms of clustering accuracy and the Adjusted Rand Index. The experimental results showed that our KDSUM metric outperformed existing mixed-type data metrics and achieved competitive results compared to state-of-the-art clustering algorithms. Although most existing metrics employ an additive structure for each variable type, which is similar to the KDSUM method, none of the methods analyzed utilize kernels or kernel smoothing techniques to eliminate irrelevant variables for clustering. Instead, they rely on parametric approaches that require either data transformations through importance weighting of categorical variables that can be controlled by the user directly or estimated using optimization techniques.

This paper demonstrates the first steps towards a generalized distance for mixed-type data. Some improvements to the methodology are possible. We have calculated distances orthogonally to the clustering algorithm, and we note that calculating optimal bandwidths for density estimation may not necessarily lead to sub-optimal bandwidths for distance and clustering. An investigation of optimal bandwidth selection procedures for various distance-based clustering algorithms is also future work. While agglomerative hierarchical clustering was preferred for this study for ease of demonstration, a new or existing algorithm may further enhance the classification and clustering of mixed data with a kernel distance metric. A detailed analysis of clustering algorithms that require dissimilarity matrices as input and de-

termine the optimal clustering algorithm that pairs with kernel distance metrics is also future work.

Moreover, we identified several promising directions for future research, including applying kernel metrics to fuzzy clustering algorithms. By exploring these research directions, we can further explore the applicability and effectiveness of our KDSUM method for clustering mixed-type data.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The datasets analyzed during the current study are publicly available in the UCI Learning Repository.

CODE AVAILABILITY

All code is available upon request from the contact author.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, J. & Aitken, C.G. (1976). "Multivariate binary discrimination by the kernel method". In: *Biometrika* , vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 413–420.
- Bouguettaya, A., Yu, Q., Liu, X., Zhou, X. & Song, A. (2015). "Efficient agglomerative hierarchical clustering". In: *Expert Systems with Applications* , vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 2785–2797.
- Chen, S., Ma, B. & Zhang, K. (2009). "On the similarity metric and the distance metric". In: *Theoretical Computer Science* , vol. 410, no. 24-25, pp. 2365–2376.
- Chen, Y., Garcia, E.K., Gupta, M.R., Rahimi, A. & Cazzanti, L. (2009). "Similarity-based classification: concepts and algorithms". In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* , vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 747–776.
- Choi, S.S., Cha, S.H. & Tappert, C.C. (2010). "A survey of binary similarity and distance measures". In: *Journal of systemics, cybernetics and informatics* , vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 43–48.
- Day, W.H. & Edelsbrunner, H. (1984). "Efficient algorithms for agglomerative hierarchical clustering methods". In: *Journal of Classification* , vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 7–24.
- de Leon, A.R. & Carriere, K.C. (2005). "A generalized Mahalanobis distance for mixed data". In: *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* , vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 174–185.
- Dougherty, J., Kohavi, R. & Sahami, M. (1995). "Supervised and unsupervised discretization of continuous features". In: *In Machine Learning Proceedings 1995*, pp. 194–202.

- Dua, D. & Graff, C. (2017). *UCI Machine Learning Repository*. URL: <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
- Foss, A., Markatou, M. & Ray, B. (2019). “Distance metrics and clustering method for mixed-type data”. In: *International Statistics Review* , vol. 87, no. 1, pp. 80–109.
- Foss, A., Markatou, M., Ray, B. & Heching, A. (2016). “A semiparametric method for clustering mixed data”. In: *Machine Learning* , vol. 105, pp. 419–458.
- Gower, J. C. (1971). “A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties”. In: *Biometrics* , vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 857–871.
- Guha, S., Rastogi, R. & Shim, K. (2000). “ROCK: a robust clustering algorithm for categorical attributes”. In: *Information Systems* , vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 345–366.
- Hall, P. (1981). “On nonparametric multivariate binary discrimination”. In: *Biometrika* , vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 287–294.
- Hartigan, J. A. & Wong, M. A. (1979). “Algorithm AS 136: A k-means clustering algorithm”. In: *Journal of the royal statistical society. series c (applied statistics)* , vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 100–108.
- Hayfield, T. & Racine, J.S. (2008). “Nonparametric Econometrics: The np Package”. In: *Journal of Statistical Software* , vol. 27, no. 5. URL: <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v27/i05/>.
- Hennig, C., Meila, M., Murtagh, F. & Rocci, R. (2015). *Handbook of cluster analysis*. CRC Press.
- Huang, Z. (1998). “Extensions to the k-means algorithm for clustering large data sets with categorical values”. In: *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* , vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 283–304.
- Hubert, L. & Arabie, P. (1985). “Comparing partitions”. In: *Journal of Classification* , vol. 2, pp. 193–218.
- Hurvich, C.M., Simonoff, J.S. & Tsai, C. (1998). “Smoothing parameter selection in nonparametric regression using an improved Akaike information criterion”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* , vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 271–293.
- Kaufman, L. (1990). “Partitioning around medoids (program pam)”. In: *Finding Groups in Data : An Introduction to Cluster Analysis*. Wiley, pp. 68–125.
- Krzanowski, W. J. (1983). “Distance between populations using mixed continuous and categorical variables”. In: *Biometrika* , vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 235–243.
- Lance, G.N. & Williams, W.T. (1967). “A general theory of classificatory sorting strategies: 1. hierarchical systems”. In: *The Computer Journal* , vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 373–380.

- Li, Q. & Racine, J.S (2007). *Nonparametric econometrics: Theory and practice*. Princeton University Press.
- Li, Q., Racine, J.S. & Woolridge, J. (2008). “Estimating average treatment effects with continuous and discrete covariates: the case of swan-ganz catheterization”. In: *The American Economic Review* , vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 357–362.
- Lindsay, B.G., Markatou, M., Ray, S., Yang, K. & Chen, S.C. (2008). “Quadratic distances on probabilities: a unified foundation”. In: *Annals of Statistics* , vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 983–1006.
- Loader, C.R. (1999). “Bandwidth selection: classical or plug-in?” In: *The Annals of Statistics* , vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 415–438.
- Macnaughton-Smith, P. (1965). *Some statistical and other numerical techniques for classifying individuals*. London: H.M.S.O.
- Maechler, M., Rousseeuw, P., Struyf, A., Hubert, M. & Hornik, K. (2022). “cluster: Cluster Analysis Basics and Extensions”. In: URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cluster>.
- Modha, D.S. & Spangler, W.S. (2003). “Feature weighting in k-means clustering”. In: *Machine learning* , vol. 3, no. 52, pp. 217–237.
- Morbieu, S. (2018). *Generate datasets to understand some clustering algorithms behavior: R-bloggers*. URL: <https://www.r-bloggers.com/2018/11/generate-datasets-to-understand-some-clustering-algorithms-behavior/>.
- Murtagh, F. & Contreras, P. (2012). “Algorithms for hierarchical clustering: an overview”. In: *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* , vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 86–97.
- Nielson, F. (2016). “Hierarchical clustering”. In: *Introduction to HPC with MPI for Data Science*. Springer, pp. 195–211.
- Phillips, J.M. & Venkatasubramanian, S. (2011). “A gentle introduction to the kernel distance”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.1625*.
- Podani, J. (1999). “Extending Gower’s general coefficient of similarity to ordinal characters”. In: *Taxon* , vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 331–340.
- R Core Team (2013). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. ISBN 3-900051-07-0. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Racine, J.S., Li, Q. & Yan, K.X. (2020). “Kernel smoothed probability mass functions for ordered datatypes”. In: *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* , vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 563–586.

- Rand, W.M. (1971). “Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical association* , vol. 66, no. 336, pp. 846–850.
- Sain, S.R., Baggerly, K.A. & Scott, D.W. (1994). “Cross-validation of multivariate densities”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* , vol. 89, no. 427, pp. 807–817.
- Sasirekha, K. & Baby, P. (2013). “Agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithm-a”. In: *International Journal of Scientific Research and Publications* , vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 83–85.
- Scrucca, L., Fop, M., Murphy, T.B., & Raftery, A.E. (2016). “mclust 5: clustering, classification and density estimation using Gaussian finite mixture models”. In: *The R Journal* , vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 289–317. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2016-021>.
- Silverman, B. W. (1986). *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*. CRC Press.
- Sokal, R.R. & Michener, C.D. (1958). “A statistical method for evaluation system relationships”. In: *University of Kansas Science Bulletin* , vol. 38, pp. 1409–1439.
- van de Velden, M., D’Enza, A.I., Markos, A. & Cavicchia, C. (2023). “A general framework for implementing distance for categorical variables”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02190*.
- W. Budiaji (2022). *kmed: Distance-Based k-Medoids*. R package version 0.4.2. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kmed>.
- Wang, M. C. & van Ryzin, J. (1981). “A class of smooth estimators for discrete distributions”. In: *Biometrika* , vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 301–309.
- Ward Jr, J.H (1963). “Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function”. In: *Journal of the American statistical association* , vol. 58, no. 301, pp. 236–244.
- Wishart, D. (2003). “K-means clustering with outlier detection, mixed variables and missing values”. In: *In Exploratory Data Analysis in Empirical Research: Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference of the Gesellschaft für Klassifikation eV, University of Munich*, pp. 216–226.