
MEMETIC DIFFERENTIAL EVOLUTION METHODS FOR SEMI-SUPERVISED CLUSTERING

Pierluigi Mansueto

Global Optimization Laboratory (GOL)
Department of Information Engineering
University of Florence
Via di Santa Marta, 3, 50139, Florence, Italy
pierluigi.mansueto@unifi.it

Fabio Schoen

Global Optimization Laboratory (GOL)
Department of Information Engineering
University of Florence
Via di Santa Marta, 3, 50139, Florence, Italy
fabio.schoen@unifi.it

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we deal with semi-supervised Minimum Sum-of-Squares Clustering (MSSC) problems where background knowledge is given in the form of instance-level constraints. In particular, we take into account “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints, each of which indicates if two dataset points should be associated to the same or to a different cluster. The presence of such constraints makes the problem at least as hard as its unsupervised version: it is no more true that each point is associated to its nearest cluster center, thus requiring some modifications in crucial operations, such as the assignment step. In this scenario, we propose a novel memetic strategy based on the Differential Evolution paradigm, directly extending a state-of-the-art framework recently proposed in the unsupervised clustering literature. As far as we know, our contribution represents the first attempt to define a memetic methodology designed to generate a (hopefully) optimal feasible solution for the semi-supervised MSSC problem. The proposal is compared with some state-of-the-art algorithms from the literature on a set of well-known datasets, highlighting its effectiveness and efficiency in finding good quality clustering solutions.

Keywords Semi-Supervised Clustering · Minimum Sum-of-Squares Clustering · Memetic Differential Evolution · Global Optimization

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 90C11 · 90C30 · 90C59

1 Introduction

Clustering is one of the most relevant statistical techniques, as reported in various specialized books and surveys. In this paper, we do not wish to present in great detail the ideas of clustering, for which we refer the reader to specialized textbooks. Here, we would simply like to recall that clustering is a (usually) unsupervised methodology aimed at grouping together data records based on suitable similarity and dissimilarity criteria, so that similar observations are grouped together, while samples in different clusters are sufficiently dissimilar one another.

The easiest and by far the best known clustering model is the Euclidean Minimum Sum-of-Squares one (MSSC). In this scenario, observations are numerical arrays, each lying in the d -th dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , while similarity is based on Euclidean distance. Clustering is performed by choosing a set of centers, one for each cluster, so that the sum of squared distances from each sample point to its closest center is minimized [1]. Later, we will give a formal description of this basic model. Here, it suffices to recall that finding a suitable clustering according to this (but also to many other) similarity criterion requires the solution of a large scale Global Optimization (GO) problem. Apart from trivial cases, optimally placing cluster centers is a non-convex optimization problem, characterized by a large number of local optima which are not global.

The problem itself is, in general, NP-hard [2] and, thus, extremely difficult to solve, even in an approximate way. For this reason, a widespread use of fast heuristic techniques can be found in the clustering literature. For the Euclidean

MSSC problem, one of the best known and used technique is K-MEANS [3] (*Lloyd's algorithm* [4]), which, although being quite easy to implement and efficient, usually returns only a local optimum, which might be very far from the global one. Moreover, its performance highly depends on the execution initial settings. In order to overcome the limitations of the approach, multiple variants of K-MEANS have been explored over the years (e.g., [5, 6])

Much recent literature has been devoted to heuristics and meta-heuristics which try to improve on the quality of K-MEANS, without excessively sacrificing CPU time. As members of this class, we can cite the classical metaheuristic frameworks, such as simulated annealing [7], tabu search [8] and evolutionary algorithms [9, 10], as well as the more recent heuristic and convex optimization methodologies, such as the ones presented in [11, 12]. Among the mentioned methods, the memetic procedure HG-MEANS [13] certainly stands out. The latter is a population-based metaheuristic inspired by the process of natural selection typical of the larger class of evolutionary algorithms: at each iteration, the algorithm maintains and updates a population of candidate solutions; the evolution of the latter takes place through the repeated application of specific *genetic* operators such as crossover, mutation and selection; at the end of the approach, the best generated solution is returned. Unlike the (evolutionary) genetic algorithms, HG-MEANS also integrates K-MEANS as local refiner for the solutions at hand in order to avoid premature convergence. Inspired by the state-of-the-art performance of HG-MEANS, novel memetic strategies have been proposed in [14]. Here, the authors adapted the (genetic) *Differential Evolution* paradigm [15] to the MSSC case and, similar to HG-MEANS, they employed K-MEANS as local search procedure to refine the population; the outcome, called MDECLust, is a novel memetic framework for the MSSC clustering, which, according to an extensive set of computational tests, outperformed the state-of-the-art HG-MEANS algorithm.

In this paper, we plan to extend the idea of the memetic approach to a more challenging problem, the *Semi-Supervised Clustering Problem*. Successful application of such problem can be found in different domains, such as gene clustering [16, 17] and document clustering [18, 19]. Differently from the standard model, here some information on the clusters is available a priori and the algorithms need to take it into consideration. In particular, in this work, we consider instance-level constraints, i.e., constraints in the form of either “must-link” or “cannot-link” requirements. A “must-link” constraint imposes that two specific data points need to be assigned to the same cluster. On the other hand, a “cannot-link” constraint requires two points to be assigned to different clusters. Thus, the basic objective of the semi-supervised MSSC problem remains the same, i.e., that of choosing the location of K centers in \mathbb{R}^d so that the sum of squared distances from each point to its relevant center is minimized. However, now “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints have to be considered and, thus, the closest center is no more guaranteed to be the relevant one. It goes without saying that, if the *Unsupervised* MSSC problem is computationally NP-hard, this variant is, in general, at least as hard. Differently from the unsupervised case, the scientific literature related to the semi-supervised clustering problem is relatively new. Among the proposed approaches, we can find K-MEANS-like methods [20–22], soft-constrained algorithms, i.e., algorithms where penalties for the constraints violations are employed [23–27], exact algorithms [28–33] and soft-constrained memetic methodologies such as the extension of HG-MEANS for the considered problem class proposed in [34]. Moreover, the semi-supervised MSSC clustering problem has been studied in [35], where several MINLP formulations, both exact and approximate, are presented.

Our contribution in this context is the proposal of a novel methodology for the semi-supervised clustering problem which must strictly satisfy the given “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints. In particular, the proposal is a direct extension of the differential evolution based memetic framework proposed in [14] to the semi-supervised MSSC case. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt in the literature to define a memetic algorithm that aims to find an optimal solution satisfying all the link constraints. Additional difficulties arise in this scenario, mainly derived by the required modification to the assignment step, i.e., the mechanism by which we assign each point to its relevant center; in semi-supervised clustering, this operation is not trivial and it may require great computational resources depending on the problem at hand. In our new framework, we propose both an exact assignment operator, based on solving a mixed-integer linear optimization problem, and a greedy one, useful in specific phases to decrease the computational costs demanded by the entire procedure.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of the semi-supervised MSSC clustering problem and the main characteristics of the memetic framework MDECLust. In Section 3, we describe how to extend MDECLust in order to handle “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints, highlighting the main differences w.r.t. the original scheme. In Section 4, we show the goodness of our proposal, comparing it with some state-of-the-art approaches on well-known datasets from the literature. Finally, in Section 5, we provide some concluding remarks.

2 Preliminaries

In the following, we introduce the semi-supervised MSSC model with pairwise constraints, along with some of its properties. Moreover, we review the memetic differential evolution framework proposed in [14] for the unsupervised case.

2.1 Problem Statement

Given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ where p_i is a d -dimensional sample, i.e., $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, solving a clustering problem means the partitioning of such samples in K disjunctive sets C_1, C_2, \dots, C_K , where, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the cluster C_k is identified by a center $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote the set of the cluster centers as $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_K\}$. In general, the partition should lead to the grouping of points similar among each other (based on a specifically chosen distance metric) and to the separation of dissimilar samples. To this end, the semi-supervised MSSC model consists in associating each point p_i to a center y_k such that: the must-link and cannot-link constraints, whose sets are denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\}$ respectively, are satisfied; the sum of the squared Euclidean distances of each point to its associated center is minimized. Note that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is such that for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}$ we have that $(j, i) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}$. The same property also holds for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

A possible formulation for the semi-supervised MSSC problem is thus the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K x_{ik} \|p_i - y_k\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L} \\ & y_1, \dots, y_K \in \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where each binary variable x_{ik} indicates whether the point p_i is assigned to the cluster C_k ,

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times K} \text{ s.t.} \\ \sum_{k=1}^K x_{ik} = 1, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \\ \sum_{i=1}^N x_{ik} \geq 1, \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times K} \text{ s.t.} \\ x_{ik} = x_{jk}, \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}, \forall k = 1, \dots, K \\ x_{ik} + x_{jk} \leq 1, \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}}, \forall k = 1, \dots, K \end{array} \right\} \quad (3)$$

and $\|\cdot\|$ indicates the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^d . The constraints defining \mathcal{X} ensure that each point p_i is associated to one and only one center y_k (1° constraint) and that each cluster C_k has at least one sample (2° constraint). On the other hand, the set \mathcal{L} is defined by the “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints: for each $(i_m, j_m) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}$, we require that p_{i_m} and p_{j_m} belong to the same cluster, while, for each $(i_c, j_c) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}}$, the points p_{i_c} and p_{j_c} should be assigned to different clusters.

It is well known that, similar to the unconstrained MSSC model [2], the considered mixed-integer programming problem is NP-hard [36] and, thus, it results difficult to solve exactly both in terms of complexity and computational resources.

The solutions of the presented semi-supervised MSSC model present an easy-to-proof property, fundamental in the mechanisms of MSSC algorithms. This one, which also holds for the solutions of the unsupervised MSSC problem [4], is reported in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Let (x^*, y^*) be an optimal solution of Problem (1). Then, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the point y_k^* is the centroid (or geometric center) of the k -th cluster:*

$$y_k^* = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N x_{ik}^*} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{ik}^* p_i. \quad (4)$$

Note that in Problem (1) the number of clusters K is kept fixed. As discussed in [14], this characteristic is beneficial in applications where K is known in advance, while it is detrimental in cases where K is not. In this last scenario,

employing additional statistical techniques is necessary to find a suitable value for K before addressing the MSSC problem. Actually, in the semi-supervised case, the cannot-link constraints, if present, can give a hint about how large K should be at least. This a-priori knowledge, combined with the mentioned statistical techniques, may make this pre-processing step easier to perform. We will not discuss this topic further, assuming in the following that K is fixed.

2.2 The Memetic Differential Evolution Framework for Unconstrained MSSC Clustering Problems

In this section, we review the *Memetic Differential Evolution* (MDE) framework proposed in [14], which we call MDEClust. The latter represents a possible extension for the unsupervised MSSC model of the classic MDE for global optimization [37].

The MDEClust framework initializes and keeps updated throughout the iterations a population of P MSSC solutions $\mathcal{P} = \{S_1, \dots, S_P\}$. In particular, the initialization of the population is accomplished executing P independent runs of the K-MEANS algorithm [4], in each of which the initial centers are randomly selected among the points of the dataset \mathcal{D} at hand. Then, at each iteration of MDEClust, the population is updated performing the following operations for each solution $S_s \in \mathcal{P}$, with $s \in \{1, \dots, P\}$:

- an *offspring* solution O_s is generated by the *crossover* operator (Section 2.2.1);
- the (optional) *mutation* operator is performed, returning a modified offspring \tilde{O}_s (Section 2.2.2);
- K-MEANS is executed as local search procedure to refine \tilde{O}_s (Section 2.2.3);
- the resulting solution O'_s is then compared with S_s in terms of MSSC objective function (see Problem 1) and, if it is better, it replaces S_s in the population.

In order to perform the mentioned procedures, each solution $S \in \mathcal{P}$ is identified through the two following data structures.

- *Membership vector* $\phi^S \in \mathbb{N}^N$: for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\phi_i^S = k$, with $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, if and only if $x_{ik} = 1$, i.e., the point p_i is associated to the cluster C_k .
- *Coordinate matrix* $\psi^S = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_K]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$: given $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the k -th row contains the coordinates of the k -th cluster center.

As remarked in [13, 14], each of the two items is sufficient to completely characterize a solution. Indeed, having the membership vector ϕ^S , we can find each center as the centroid of its associated cluster (Lemma 1); on the other hand, we can derive ϕ^S by ψ^S performing an *assignment step*, i.e., assigning each point to its closest cluster center. Both operations can be performed in $O(NKd)$, albeit maintaining both may be preferred to reduce the CPU time at the expense of an increase of memory usage. In the remainder of the paper, we will use the following notation: a solution S will be denoted by $S = (\phi^S, \psi^S)$; the MSSC objective function value of a solution S will be indicated with

$$f(S) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| p_i - \psi_{\phi_i^S}^S \right\|^2.$$

The algorithm stops when one of the following stopping criteria is met, returning the best solution in the population in terms of MSSC objective function. Other stopping criteria can be also possible.

- $N_{MAX} > 0$ consecutive iterations have been performed without any best solution improvement.
- The difference in terms of MSSC objective function among the solutions in the population has fallen below a threshold, i.e.,

$$\sum_{s=1}^P \sum_{\bar{s} > s}^P |f(S_s) - f(S_{\bar{s}})| \leq tol,$$

where $tol > 0$. In this scenario, we have that the population has collapsed to a single solution.

In the next sections, we provide a brief description of the crossover, mutation and local search operations employed in the MDEClust framework.

2.2.1 Crossover Operator

Given a solution $S_s \in \mathcal{P}$, with $s \in \{1, \dots, P\}$, in MDECLust the *crossover* operator selects from the population three distinct random solutions S_1, S_2, S_3 , all different from S_s , and it creates an offspring solution $O_s = (\phi^{O_s}, \psi^{O_s})$ combining them in the following way:

$$\psi^{O_s} = \psi^{S_1} + F(\psi^{S_2} - \psi^{S_3}), \quad (5)$$

with $F \in (0, 2)$. The membership vector ϕ^{O_s} is then obtained performing an assignment step.

Taking inspiration from [13], the linear combination is carefully designed based on center matching strategies. Unlike the generic setting of [37], the clustering problem is indeed characterized by solutions that are invariant to permutations of cluster centers; moreover, no ordering of them is defined a priori. In order to deal with this redundancy, in [14] two different center matching methodologies have been proposed for MDECLust: an exact strategy based on the Hungarian algorithm [38], which is also employed in [13] and has a complexity of $O(K^3)$; a greedy and faster strategy, whose complexity is $O(K^2)$, more sensitive to the cluster centers permutation. For more information on these two methodologies, the reader is referred to [14].

2.2.2 Mutation Operator

In general, the *mutation* operator aims to diversify the population, preventing a premature stop of the framework caused by a rapid collapse of the population into a single solution. In the MDECLust framework, the operator mainly consists on a random relocation of one center of the offspring solution O_s generated during the crossover phase. The modified solution \tilde{O}_s will be then characterized by new features that are not inherited from either of the parents. The center relocation is performed through the following steps.

1. A center randomly selected with uniform probability is removed.
2. Each dataset point p_i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is re-assigned to its closest center among the $K - 1$ remaining ones, returning a new temporary membership vector $\tilde{\phi}^{O_s}$.
3. A point $p_{\bar{i}}$, with $\bar{i} \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is randomly chosen by *roulette wheel*, a randomized operation applied in order to select potentially useful points, based on the probability

$$P(\bar{i}) = \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{N} \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha \left\| p_{\bar{i}} - y_{\tilde{\phi}_{\bar{i}}^{O_s}} \right\|}{\sum_{j=1}^N \left\| p_j - y_{\tilde{\phi}_j^{O_s}} \right\|} \right). \quad (6)$$

The value of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ influences the selection of the new center: if $\alpha = 0$, every point has the same chances to be selected; as α gets larger, the selection is biased towards points that are more distant from their closest centers.

The whole procedure requires $O(NKd)$ time to be performed.

2.2.3 Local Search Procedure

In the MDECLust framework, the K-MEANS algorithm is employed as local search procedure to refine the solutions of the population. K-MEANS is a popular clustering algorithm for MSSC problems that was discovered independently over 50 years ago. For more details on its history, we refer the reader to [4, 39].

Given the initial positions of the cluster centers, K-MEANS iterates the two following steps until a stopping condition is satisfied.

1. Each data point p_i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is assigned to its closest cluster center.
2. Each center y_k , with $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, is moved to the geometric center of the k -th cluster (see Equation 4).

The loop is usually stopped until convergence, i.e., cluster centers positions are not updated for two successive iterations.

Over the years, K-MEANS variants capable of handling “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints have been proposed. The first most notable one is COP-K-MEANS [20], which aims to assign each point to the nearest cluster center such that no constraint is violated. The approach is not equipped with any backtracking procedure; thus, if none of the remaining observations can be associated to a center without violating the constraints, the algorithm stops failing to return a feasible solution for the problem. In order to address this issue, modified versions of COP-K-MEANS have been

proposed in the literature: some examples are the procedures presented in [40,41]. In [21], a integer programming based post-processing procedure is employed in solutions returned by unconstrained algorithms (K-MEANS included). Finally, K-MEANS-like procedures are proposed in [22,27], with assignment steps based on binary programming problems to enforce the solution to be feasible at each iteration. The one presented in [22] is the local search procedure we propose to use in our novel Differential Evolution based framework for semi-supervised MSSC clustering.

3 A Memetic Differential Evolution Framework for Semi-Supervised MSSC Clustering

In this section, we propose a possible extension of the MDECLust framework (Section 2.2) for semi-supervised MSSC clustering problems, which we call S-MDECLust. We want to remark that, to the best of our knowledge, it is the first attempt in the semi-supervised clustering literature to define a memetic approach designed to generate a (hopefully optimal) feasible solution.

Algorithm 1: S-MDECLust Framework

```

1 Input:  $\mathcal{D} = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  number of clusters,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\}$  sets of
   “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints respectively,  $P \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  population size,  $N_{MAX} \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ ,  $tol \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .
2 Initialize population  $\mathcal{P} = \{S_1, \dots, S_P\}$ 
3 Let  $S^* \in \mathcal{P}$  be such that  $f(S^*) \leq f(S), \forall S \in \mathcal{P}$ 
4 Let  $n_{it}^* = 0$ 
5 while  $(n_{it}^* < N_{MAX}) \wedge (\sum_{s=1}^P \sum_{\bar{s}>s}^P |f(S_s) - f(S_{\bar{s}})| > tol)$  do
6   forall  $S_s \in \mathcal{P}$  do
7     Randomly select  $S_1, S_2, S_3 \in \mathcal{P}$ , all different from each other and from  $S_s$ 
8     Execute crossover with  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  to generate an offspring  $O_s$ 
9     (Optional) Execute semi-supervised mutation on  $O_s$  to get  $\tilde{O}_s$ 
10    Apply constrained local search to  $\tilde{O}_s$  to obtain a solution  $O'_s$ ;
11    if  $f(O'_s) < f(S_s)$  then
12      Set  $S_s = O'_s$ ;
13      if  $f(O'_s) < f(S^*)$  then
14        Set  $S^* = O'_s$ 
15        Set  $n_{it}^* = 0$ 
16      else
17        Set  $n_{it}^* = n_{it}^* + 1$ 
18 return  $S^*$ 

```

We begin showing the algorithmic scheme in Algorithm 1. Basically, the structure of the proposed framework is similar to that of MDECLust, from which we also inherit the stopping criteria (Line 5, Section 2.2) and the crossover operator (Line 8, Section 2.2.1). The main differences w.r.t. the original framework concern the operations whose execution highly depends on the assignment step. In particular, the involved operations are the mutation operator (Line 9, Section 2.2.2) and the local search phase (Line 10, Section 2.2.3). In the unsupervised MSSC model, the assignment step is trivial to perform: for each point, we assign it to its closest cluster center. However, in the semi-supervised scenario, “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints must be taken into account and, then, it is no more true that points are associated to their closest centroid. We analyze this aspect, along with the consequences on the design of the mutation and local search procedures, in the next sections.

3.1 Assignment Step

As mentioned in Section 2.2, each solution S in the population can be represented by any of the following items: the *membership vector* ϕ^S or the *coordinate matrix* ψ^S . However, while in the unsupervised MSSC scenario each one can be simply derived from the other in $O(NKd)$, in the semi-supervised context the assignment step to obtain ϕ^S from the coordinates of the clusters centers stored in ψ^S , may not be trivial, since “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints must be taken into account. A graphical example of how the outcome of the assignment step can change depending on the considered scenario is shown in Figure 1.

In order to deal with the “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints, we propose an exact assignment step and a greedy one.




Figure 1: Two-dimensional examples of assignment step outcome with $N = 20$ points and $K = 3$ cluster centers. The dotted black lines indicate the separations between clusters, while shaded areas just emphasize cluster centers.

Exact Assignment Step Inspired by [22,33], the exact assignment step is based on solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K x_{ik} \|p_i - \psi_k^S\|^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{L} are defined as in Equations (2) and (3), respectively.

Solving an additional optimization problem each time an assignment step is required surely leads to a consumption of greater computational resources. Moreover, although one between ϕ^S and ψ^S is enough to characterize a solution S , now, with respect to the unconstrained MSSC scenario, deriving one item from the other does not imply an equal effort. The greater computational complexity is justified as we deal with semi-supervised MSSC problems. We indeed remind that these latter ones present a higher complexity w.r.t. the unconstrained MSSC model, which is NP-hard itself as already mentioned in Section 2.1. In order to reduce the resources demand, we propose a faster greedy assignment methodology, to be used in specific phases of the S-MDEC1ust framework.

Greedy Assignment Step We report the scheme of the proposed greedy methodology in Algorithm 2.

First, all the points are collected in groups based on the “must-link” constraints (Line 2). Then, for each group G , we try to find a cluster center to assign to each point of the group (Line 5): the cluster center should not be already associated to a group \hat{G} that has a point involved in a “cannot-link” constraint with a point of G ; moreover, among the available centers, the center should be the nearest one for the points in G . Similarly to COP-K-MEANS (Section 2.2.3), the methodology highly depends on the assignment order of the groups; thus, it could happen that, in presence of “cannot-link” constraints, finding a cluster center to associate to a group is not possible (Line 6). In such cases, we find the nearest cluster center for the points of the group (Line 7), without taking into account any possible constraint violation. Given the cluster center, we finally assign each group point to it (Lines 9-10).

Algorithm 2 has no guarantee to return a final assignment that does not violate the constraints. However, being less demanding in terms of computational costs than the exact assignment step (no binary programming problem is involved), the greedy methodology can be useful in phases of S-MDEC1ust (i.e., crossover and mutation) where having a solution satisfying all the constraints is not mandatory. In this way, we can indeed reduce the computational costs of the entire framework, still returning a final feasible solution. More information on the topic can be found in Section 3.2.

The new assignment steps lead to some design-related consequences on specific operators of S-MDEC1ust, i.e., the mutation operator and the local search procedure. We will provide a description of each of them in the following sections.

Algorithm 2: Greedy Assignment Step

```

1 Input:  $\mathcal{D} = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  number of clusters,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\}$  sets of
   “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints respectively,  $S = (\phi^S, \psi^S)$ .
2 Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}} = \{G \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \mid \forall i, j \in G \text{ s.t. } i \neq j, (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}\}$ 
3 Let  $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ 
4 forall  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}}$  do
5   Let
6     
$$k_G \in \arg \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \sum_{i \in G} \|p_i - \psi_k^S\|^2$$

7     s.t.  $k \in \left\{ \hat{k} \in \{1, \dots, K\} \mid \begin{array}{l} \nexists (\hat{G}, \hat{k}) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t.} \\ \exists (i_c, j_c) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}} \text{ with } i_c \in G \wedge j_c \in \hat{G} \end{array} \right\}$ 
8   if  $k_G$  is not well-defined then
9     Set
10    
$$k_G \in \arg \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \sum_{i \in G} \|p_i - \psi_k^S\|^2$$

11   Set  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{(G, k_G)\}$ 
12   forall  $i \in G$  do
13     Set  $\phi_i^S = k_G$ 
14 return  $S$ 
    
```

3.2 Mutation Operator

While the crossover operator (Line 8 of Algorithm 1) is the same one employed in the MDEC1ust framework (Section 2.2.1), the mutation operator described in Section 2.2.2 must be structurally changed so as to take into account “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints. As already explained in the referenced section, the operator consists in a random-based relocation of a center of the offspring solution O_s generated though the crossover operator. However, in the semi-supervised MSSC model, the two following issues may arise.

- After removing a cluster center, if the exact assignment step (Section 3.1) is employed in Step 2. of the mutation operator (Section 2.2.2), it may not be possible to assign each dataset sample to one of the remaining centers without violating any “cannot-link” constraint, if present.
- Regardless the outcome of the assignment phase, it is still required to choose a new center to get a *mutated* solution with exactly K clusters.

In Algorithm 3, we provide the algorithmic scheme of the new mutation operator. With respect to the one presented in Section 2.2.2, there are two major changes.

- The assignment steps (Lines 4-12) can be performed through the exact or the greedy methodology proposed in Section 3.1. However, in Line 4, we have $K - 1$ centers to which the points can be assigned; thus, we require a few modifications in the proposed methodologies.
 - In the exact assignment step, Problem (7) changes into

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K x_{ik} \left\| p_i - \psi_k^{\bar{O}_s} \right\|^2 \\
 & \text{s.t. } x \in \mathcal{X}_{\bar{c}} \cap \mathcal{L}
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Algorithm 3: Mutation Operator

-
- 1 **Input:** $\mathcal{D} = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $K \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ number of clusters, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\}$ sets of “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints respectively, $O_s = (\phi^{O_s}, \psi^{O_s})$ offspring solution, $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ uniform random number generator, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.
 - 2 Let $\psi^{\tilde{O}_s} = \psi^{O_s}$
 - 3 Let $\bar{c} = \mathcal{U}(1, \dots, K)$
 - 4 Perform assignment step with $\mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_{\bar{c}}\}$
 - 5 **if** *assignment step has not failed* **then**
 - 6 Let $\tilde{\phi}^{O_s}$ be the temporary membership vector
 - 7 **else**
 - 8 Let $\alpha = 0$
 - 9 Let $P_r = [P(1), \dots, P(N)]$ ($\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $P(i)$ defined as in 6)
 - 10 Choose $\bar{i} \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ by *roulette wheel* based on P_r
 - 11 Set $\psi_{\bar{c}}^{\tilde{O}_s} = p_{\bar{i}}$
 - 12 Perform assignment step to get $\phi^{\tilde{O}_s}$
 - 13 **return** $\tilde{O}_s = (\phi^{\tilde{O}_s}, \psi^{\tilde{O}_s})$
-

where

$$\mathcal{X}_{\bar{c}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times K} \text{ s.t.} \\ \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq \bar{c}}}^K x_{ik} = 1, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \\ \sum_{i=1}^N x_{ik} \geq 1, \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\} \setminus \{\bar{c}\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

As anticipated at the beginning of the section, if the semi-supervised MSSC problem present some “cannot-link” constraints, Problem (8) may not have a feasible solution and, thus, the exact assignment step may fail.

- In the greedy methodology, we only consider the groups whose points are assigned to the removed center $y_{\bar{c}}$. In detail, in Line 4 of Algorithm 2, we only take into account the sets $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ such that $\forall i \in G$, $\phi_i^{O_s} = \bar{c}$. Moreover, we add a constraint in Lines 5-7: the center chosen for a group cannot be the removed one, that is, $k_G \neq \bar{c}$. Unlike the exact assignment step, the greedy methodology always returns a solution, although it could not be feasible.
- If the exact assignment step has failed, in Line 8 we set $\alpha = 0$ for Equation (6) and, thus, we employ the *roulette wheel* operation with each dataset point having the same chances to be selected. In this scenario, a probability based on the point-center distances cannot indeed be defined, as we cannot *exactly* associate each dataset point to a cluster center without getting a violation on the “cannot-link” constraints. If the exact methodology has not failed or the greedy one is employed, then the choice of the new center is performed as in the mutation operator of the MDECLust framework.

Note that the greedy assignment step can be helpful in the mutation operator, as well as in the crossover one, to reduce the computational costs demanded by the entire S-MDECLust framework. Indeed, in these phases a feasible solution is not required, since it will be then used as a starting point for the local search procedure (Section 3.3), designed to generate a solution satisfying all the constraints regardless the starting conditions. Moreover, performing local search steps from non-feasible solutions can be seen as a further mechanism to explore new regions of the feasible set.

In Figure 2, we show a possible application of the mutation operator on a solution for the same two-dimensional problem of Figure 1.

3.3 Semi-supervised Local Search Procedure

In the S-MDECLust framework, we employ the semi-supervised K-MEANS variant proposed in [22] as a local search procedure. Similar to the original approach (Section 2.2.3), this methodology iterates two steps until convergence is reached:




Figure 2: Steps of the mutation operator (Algorithm 3) on a solution in the same setting as Figure 1. Note that for the assignment steps we employ the exact methodology.

1. an *exact* assignment step (Section 3.1) is performed;
2. each center y_k , with $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, is moved to the geometric center of the k -th cluster (see Equation 4).

The main difference with respect to the original approach is again on the assignment step, where “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints must be taken into account.

By definition of the feasible set \mathcal{X} (Equation 2), a solution for Problem (7) is feasible only if all the clusters have at least one assigned point. Thus, unlike K -MEANS, the algorithm proposed in [22] cannot produce *degenerated* solutions, i.e., instances where some clusters are left empty. This property makes useless the employment of *solution repair* operations, such as the one proposed in [14] for the MDEC1ust framework. Indeed, even if a degenerated solution is generated by either the crossover or mutation operator, that one is implicitly repaired after the local search procedure execution.

Finally, note that the local search procedure proposed in [22] is further extended in [27]. In particular, the extension presents a model size reduction technique based on kd-trees for Problem (7) to improve scalability. Moreover, the possible management of “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints as *soft* ones, for each of which the user can express a

confidence value, is an additional feature which increases the number of clustering applications where the new approach can be used. We decided not to compare the performance of the two local search procedures within the S-MDEClust framework, since the main focus of the paper is the proposal of a novel *global* memetic approach for the semi-supervised MSSC clustering problem. In addition, we are confident that the experimental comparisons proposed in Section 4 would be similar regardless the employed local search methodology.

4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we report the results of thorough computational experiments, where we compared our framework S-MDEClust with some state-of-the-art methodologies from the semi-supervised clustering literature. The implementation code of S-MDEClust was written in C++. All the tests were run on a computer with the following characteristics: Intel Xeon Processor E5-2430 v2, 6 cores, 12 threads, 2.50 GHz, 32 GB RAM. Finally, in order to solve instances of Problems (7)-(8), the Gurobi Optimizer [42] (Version 10) was employed.

4.1 Experimental Settings

In the following sections, we report the tested algorithms, the datasets and the metrics used for the comparisons.

4.1.1 Algorithms

The proposed framework S-MDEClust was tested in four different variants, with each of them differing from the others on the use of the mutation operator and/or the employment of the greedy assignment step in the crossover and mutation operations.

- SM-MDE: mutation operator and exact assignment step.
- S-MDE: no mutation operator and exact assignment step.
- SMG-MDE: mutation operator and greedy assignment step.
- SG-MDE: no mutation operator and greedy assignment step.

We remind that in the local search procedure (Section 3.3) the exact assignment step is always employed, in order to have at the end of each iteration a feasible solution for the semi-supervised MSSC problem. All the tested variants employed the exact matching for the crossover operator (Section 2.2.1).

For what concerns the parameters setting, we used the values recommended in the MDEClust original paper [14]: $P = 150$ for the variants without mutation operator (S-MDE, SG-MDE) and $P = 20$ for the other ones (SM-MDE, SMG-MDE); $tol = 10^{-4}$; $F \in [0.5, 0.8]$, randomly chosen at each crossover execution; $\alpha = 0.5$ for the mutation operator. The algorithms were mainly tested with the maximum number of iterations without improvements on the best solution $N_{MAX} = 5000$.

As anticipated in Section 1, to the best of our knowledge, S-MDEClust represents the first attempt in the semi-supervised clustering literature to define a memetic approach designed to return a (hopefully optimal) feasible solution. Then, in the absence of competitors of the same class, we decided to test our framework with some recently proposed, albeit of different types, state-of-the-art global optimization approaches.

- PC-SOS-SDP: a branch-and-cut algorithm for semi-supervised MSSC problems proposed in [33]; for the lower bound procedure, a semi-definite programming (SDP) relaxation of the MSSC discrete optimization model and a cutting-plane procedure for strengthening the bound are employed; for the upper bound, the authors use the same local search employed in our framework (Section 3.3) and proposed in [22], with an initialization technique based on the primal solution of the SDP relaxation; the algorithm was proved to be effective with problems whose dimensionalities are about four times larger than the ones tested with other exact algorithms from the literature.
- S-HG-MEANS: a probabilistic-based adaptation for the semi-supervised scenario of the HG-MEANS algorithm [34], which was proven to be highly effective in unconstrained MSSC problems [13]; in [34], the authors propose a generative model that assumes Gaussian-distributed data samples along with “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints generated by stochastic block models; adopting a maximum-likelihood approach, they employ the HG-MEANS algorithm equipped with modified and new operators to take into account the new generative model; the resulting procedure also has a parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ indicating the accuracy of the provided pairwise constraints, so as to handle possible inaccuracies in their definitions.

Although neither PC-SOS-SDP nor S-HG-MEANS are direct competitors of S-MDECLust, both of them allowed to figure out the potentialities of the proposed framework: the comparison w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP let us test the effectiveness of S-MDECLust in finding a global optimum of the problem, while the one w.r.t. S-HG-MEANS mainly allowed to evaluate the efficiency of S-MDECLust. Moreover, the comparisons let us assess the capacity of our framework of obtaining good quality solution w.r.t. the real dataset class partitioning.

As for PC-SOS-SDP, we considered all the parameter settings recommended in [33] and in the code, written in C++ and available online¹; the algorithm was tested with a pool of 12 threads for the branch-and-cut procedure, 12 threads for the computation at the root node and 1 thread for each lower bound computation. The parameters values for S-HG-MEANS were set according to the referenced paper [34], the HG-MEANS original paper [13] and the published code², written in Julia. Moreover, since in our setting the constraints were considered accurate, we set $p = 1$. For a fairer comparison of S-HG-MEANS with our framework, in addition to the stopping criterion based on a maximum number of iterations [34], we also set a limit to the consecutive no-best-solution-improvement iterations $N_{MAX} = 5000$; following the experimental settings of the original version of HG-MEANS [13], we set the maximum number of iterations 10 times larger than N_{MAX} .

Finally, unlike PC-SOS-SDP, S-MDECLust and S-HG-MEANS involve random-based operations. Thus, in order to reduce the sensitivity w.r.t. these latter ones, for each clustering problem instance the two approaches were run 5 times, each of them with a different seed for the pseudo-random number generator. Then, unless otherwise stated, the results were obtained by calculating the averages of the metrics values achieved in the five tests.

4.1.2 Datasets

The tested datasets are listed in Table 1. All of them can be downloaded from the UCI³ Machine Learning Repository [43] and from the UCR⁴ Time Series Classification Archive [44]. The proposed set is quite varied, being composed by datasets of different sizes and/or number of features. Moreover, some of them had been part of both the benchmarks used to evaluate the goodness of PC-SOS-SDP and S-HG-MEANS [33, 34].

Table 1: Datasets used for the experiments

| <i>Dataset</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>K</i> | $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{L}} , \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}})$ |
|----------------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| Iris | 150 | 4 | 3 | (50, 0), (100, 0), (25, 25), (50, 50), (0, 50), (0, 100) |
| Wine | 178 | 13 | 3 | |
| Connectionist | 208 | 60 | 2 | |
| Seeds | 210 | 7 | 3 | |
| Glass | 214 | 9 | 6 | |
| Accent | 329 | 12 | 6 | (100, 0), (150, 0), (50, 50), (75, 75), (0, 100), (0, 150) |
| Ecoli | 336 | 7 | 8 | |
| ECG5000 | 500 | 140 | 5 | (150, 0), (250, 0), (75, 75), (125, 125), (0, 150), (0, 250) |
| Computers | 500 | 720 | 2 | |
| Gene | 801 | 20531 | 5 | (200, 0), (400, 0), (100, 100), (200, 200), (0, 200), (0, 400) |

As for the constraints definition, we considered the instances generated to test PC-SOS-SDP in [33], which can be downloaded from the GitHub folder of the exact approach. The instances were composed by approximately $N/2$ and $N/4$ constraints and they were generated taking into account the real dataset class partitioning. In Table 1, we list the various constraint set configurations used for each dataset: a set can contain either only “must-link” constraints, only “cannot-link” ones or constraints of both types. Since for each configuration the constraint generation was made 5 times with different seeds, the total number of problems used for the comparisons was equal to 300.

¹<https://github.com/antoniosudoso/pc-sos-sdp>

²<http://github.com/danielgribel/SSC-IPA>

³<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/>

⁴https://www.cs.ucr.edu/%7Eeamonn/time_series_data_2018/

4.1.3 Metrics

The first metrics we employed to test the effectiveness and efficiency of the methodologies are the following: *MSSC O.F.*, the elapsed time (*Time*) and the number of calls to the local search procedure ($N^\circ L.S.$). In order to compare a variant of the S-MDEClust framework and a competitor, for each of the metrics we also considered the gap defined as

$$Gap(\%) = \frac{100(m - m_R)}{m_R}, \quad (9)$$

where m is the metric value achieved by the variant and m_R is the one obtained by the competitor. A negative gap means that the variant outperformed the competitor in terms of the considered metric.

In addition to *MSSC O.F.*, we also considered two other metrics for evaluating the quality of the solutions generated by the approaches. Both of them measure the agreement between the solution partition and the real dataset class one: the *Adjusted Rand Index (ARI)* [45] and the *Normalized Mutual Information (NMI)* [46]. While the first one takes continuous values between -0.5 (discordant partitions) and 1 (identical partitions), the second one does between 0 (no mutual information) and 1 (perfect correlation). For more details on the two metrics, the reader is referred to the cited papers.

Lastly, we employed the variant proposed in [47] of the performance profiles [48]. Given a solver and a specific metric, the tool allows to plot the (cumulative) distribution function of the relative gap between the score achieved by that solver and the best score among those obtained by all the tested solvers. In other words, it shows the probability that the relative gap for a solver in a problem is within a factor $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Similar to the performance profiles, the tool proposed in [47] allows to appreciate the relative performance and robustness of the considered algorithms. Moreover, distribution of relative gap is particularly useful when evaluating metrics involving objective function values. For a more technical explanation of the tool, we refer the reader to [47]. Note that, since *ARI* and *NMI* have greater values for better performance, their relative gap cumulatives were generated based on the inverse of the obtained values. Moreover, in order to deal with negative *ARI* values, all the values of the metric were first shifted so as to be non-negative.

4.2 Preliminary Assessment of the S-MDEClust Variants

Before proceeding with the comparisons w.r.t. the state-of-the-art approaches, we first compared the proposed variants of the S-MDEClust framework in terms of *MSSC O.F.*, *Time* and $N^\circ L.S.$ on a subset of datasets (Iris, Wine, Connectionist). The idea was to test the effectiveness and efficiency of the variants, observing the influence in each of them of the mutation operator presence and/or the use of the greedy assignment step. In Figure 3, the relative gap cumulative distributions obtained by SM-MDE, S-MDE, SMG-MDE and SG-MDE on the considered datasets subset are reported.

First, we can observe that all the variants present the same effectiveness in terms of *MSSC O.F.*: no conspicuous difference can be indeed highlighted in the related distributions (Figure 3a).

The situation is different taking into account the metrics *Time* and $N^\circ L.S.$. As for the second one (Figure 3c), the variants equipped with the mutation operator (SM-MDE and SMG-MDE) outperformed the others (S-MDE and SG-MDE). The result can be partly justified by the smaller population considered in SM-MDE and SMG-MDE. However, we have to consider two facts.

- In S-MDE and SG-MDE, more solutions have to be taken into account since they are not equipped with any operator, like the mutation one, that allows to diversify the population.
- In the tested datasets, the mutation operator prevented a premature collapse of the population into a single solution and, at the same time, it enhanced the exploration of the feasible set. This fact allowed SM-MDE and SMG-MDE to have performance similar to that of S-MDE and SG-MDE in terms of *MSSC O.F.*, considering however a smaller population.

Finally, the cumulative distributions related to *Time* (Figure 3b) highlight the influence in the variants of the presence/absence of the greedy assignment step. We can indeed observe that this methodology allowed to save much computing time without degrading the solution quality in terms of *MSSC O.F.*: the differences between SM-MDE and SMG-MDE, which are not obvious in terms of $N^\circ L.S.$, are sharp in terms of *Time*; the same result holds for S-MDE and SG-MDE. Even on the *Time* cumulative distributions, we still observe a superiority of the methodologies equipped with the mutation operator. Thus, taking into account the results on the other metrics too, we decided to consider only these two variants for the next comparisons.




Figure 3: Plots of the relative gap cumulative distributions for SM-MDE, S-MDE, SMG-MDE and SG-MDE on a subset of the datasets listed in Table 1 (Iris, Wine, Connectionist). Note that the intervals of the axes are set for a better visualization of the methodologies results.

4.3 Comparison with the Exact Branch-and-Cut Algorithm

After evaluating the proposed S-MDEClust framework variants in a preliminary stage, we now compare SM-MDE and SMG-MDE with the branch-and-cut approach PC-SOS-SDP. As anticipated in Section 4.1.1, a comparison of our proposals w.r.t. an exact algorithm mainly allowed us to test their effectiveness in finding optimal solutions.

We start comparing SM-MDE and PC-SOS-SDP in terms of *MSSC O.F.* and *Time*. In Table 2, for each dataset we report four different values.

- *Succ(%)*: it indicates the percentage of the tested constraint configurations (30 for each dataset; see Section 4.1.2 for more information) where we had a *success*, i.e., SM-MDE obtained a better or equal performance w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP; in the *Time* context, in order to have a success, we also required that in the considered instance our method had obtained a success in terms of *MSSC O.F.*; we indeed considered a computational time saving useless if it was at the expense of the solution quality.
- *MinGap*, *MedianGap*, *MaxGap*: the minimum, median and maximum of all the gaps (see Equation 9) obtained by our method on the tested constraint configurations; in the *Time* context, we considered only the gaps achieved in instances where our methodology obtained a success in terms of *MSSC O.F.*

Table 2: Numerical results obtained by the SM-MDE algorithm w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP.

| Dataset | MSSC O.F. | | | | Time | | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap |
| Iris | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -98.516 | -90.655 | -64.139 |
| Wine | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 96.67 | -99.523 | -96.016 | 14.262 |
| Connectionist | 96.67 | -0.001 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 96.67 | -99.638 | -95.703 | -5.292 |
| Seeds | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -99.626 | -97.496 | -61.839 |
| Glass | 93.33 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.048 | 93.33 | -95.478 | -81.985 | -2.919 |
| Accent | 100.0 | -0.004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -97.099 | -73.57 | -5.421 |
| Ecoli | 100.0 | -0.001 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -97.044 | -85.37 | -29.153 |
| ECG5000 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 96.67 | -98.612 | -89.258 | 41.857 |
| Computers | 76.67 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.002 | 73.33 | -99.223 | -87.91 | 43.381 |
| Gene | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 86.67 | -93.903 | -53.379 | 114.428 |

As for *MSSC O.F.*, SM-MDE proved to be competitive with PC-SOS-SDP on the tested problems, reaching most of the times a similar effectiveness in obtaining an optimal solution. In some cases, our methodology also managed to outperform the exact algorithm: in these instances, PC-SOS-SDP struggled to reach a gap between lower and upper bound below the considered threshold (10^{-4} ; for more details, see [33]).

Regarding the *Time* metric, in some instances our memetic algorithm achieved far better performance than its competitor, reaching values in the *MinGap* column near to -100%. These values were mostly obtained in the small-dimensional datasets (Iris, Wine, Connectionist and Seeds). As the dataset size and dimension grow, we can observe that the gaps become larger, especially in the *MedianGap* and *MaxGap* columns. However, the efficiency of SM-MDE w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP is quite clear observing the *MedianGap* column values.

We want to remark that the great results obtained by SM-MDE in terms of *Time* could be seen as a consequence of the different nature of the algorithms: being an exact approach, PC-SOS-SDP strength is the effectiveness in finding an optimal solution; on the other hand, our method is composed by less time-consuming operations but, unlike the exact approach, it may end up in bad quality solutions. While the results in terms of *Time* are thus not particularly surprising, the performance achieved in terms of *MSSC O.F.* is worth mentioning. Indeed, without any guarantee to reach an optimal solution, SM-MDE managed to have the same effectiveness as PC-SOS-SDP in most of the tested instances. These results are also attested in Table 3, where we considered for SM-MDE the best, average and worst values obtained in the 5 runs executed for each problem. Note that in this table the results achieved on all the datasets were collected together. Even considering the *Worst* scenario, the performance of our methodology remained stable w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP.

Table 3: Numerical results obtained on all the datasets by the SM-MDE algorithm w.r.t. PC-SOS-SDP. *Mod* indicate which metric value is considered for SM-MDE among the ones obtained in the 5 runs executed for each problem; for more details on this experimental setting, we refer the reader to Section 4.1.1.

| Mod | MSSC O.F. | | | | Time | | | |
|-------|--------------|---------------|------------|--------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap |
| Best | 98.67 | -0.004 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 96.33 | -99.718 | -91.141 | 41.229 |
| Mean | 96.67 | -0.004 | 0.0 | 0.048 | 94.33 | -99.638 | -88.369 | 114.428 |
| Worst | 96.67 | -0.004 | 0.0 | 0.242 | 92.0 | -99.621 | -85.624 | 257.103 |

We conclude the section showing in Figure 4 the box plots generated with the *Time* values obtained by SM-MDE, SMG-MDE and PC-SOS-SDP on the dataset instances. Each sub-figure is related to a specific type of constraints configuration: in the first one both “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints were taken into account; in the second and third ones we considered only “must-link” and only “cannot-link” constraints, respectively.

We can observe that PC-SOS-SDP obtained its best results on the only “must-link” scenario, being competitive with the S-MDEClust variants: the management of the “cannot-link” constraints proved to be more time-consuming in the PC-SOS-SDP mechanisms, a result that can be also observed in [33]. Regarding the S-MDEClust variants, as already noted in Section 4.2, the greedy assignment step allowed SMG-MDE to be more efficient than SM-MDE. Finally, it seems




Figure 4: Box Plots of the *Time* values achieved by SM-MDE, SMG-MDE and PC-SOS-SDP. Each of them is related to a different type of constraints configuration: “must-link” and “cannot-link”, only “must-link”, only “cannot-link”. Note that the intervals of the y-axis are set for a better visualization of the methodologies results.

that the presence of “must-link” constraints allowed to speed up the two methodologies, regardless the employed assignment step.

4.4 Performance Evaluation of the Memetic Methods

In this section, we evaluate the performance of SM-MDE w.r.t. the other tested memetic method S-HG-MEANS. Since the execution code of the latter was written in Julia, we decided not to use the *Time* metric and, inspired by the experimental part in [14], we carried out the comparisons in terms of *MSSC O.F.* and *N° L.S.*, which represents a good proxy for the overall CPU time in this scenario. In Table 4, we report the gaps obtained by SM-MDE w.r.t. S-HG-MEANS. The legend of the table is similar to the ones of Section 4.3, with the only addition of the column *N°NoViol* that indicate the number of problems related to a dataset where S-HG-MEANS reached a solution where no constraint is violated. Indeed, we remind that, being a methodology derived from a probabilistic interpretation, S-HG-MEANS may not return a feasible solution for the semi-supervised MSSC problem, even if the constraints accuracy parameter $p = 1$ (see Section 4.1.1 for more details). In each dataset where $N^{\circ}NoViol \in (0, 30)$ (30 is the number of instances considered per dataset; for more information, see Section 4.1.2), the results obtained taking into account only the instances where S-HG-MEANS did not violate any constraint are reported in parenthesis.

As for *MSSC O.F.*, considering all the instances regardless the S-HG-MEANS violations, SM-MDE outperformed the memetic method in more than 95% of the tested constraint configurations for 4 datasets, obtaining excellent results in almost all the *Gap* columns. In the other datasets, S-HG-MEANS produced better quality solutions overall, although most of them were infeasible as can be deduced by the *N°NoViol* column values. Violating the constraints, S-HG-MEANS was able to obtain a value for *MSSC O.F.* smaller than or at least equal to the global optimum. Thus, the great performance achieved by SM-MDE w.r.t. the memetic competitor on some datasets becomes even more interesting, being our method constrained to satisfy all the constraints at each iteration. Taking into account only the instances where S-HG-MEANS obtained feasible solutions, SM-MDE is the clear winner, achieving excellent values in all the columns. Regarding *N° L.S.*, SM-MDE obtained all gaps below -75%: we thus conclude that the stopping criterion based on the population convergence (Section 3) was crucial to save computational resources. Not being equipped with a similar stopping criterion, S-HG-MEANS is forced to execute all the remaining iterations, even when the population has already converged; a similar observation is also made for the original HG-MEANS algorithm in [14].

Finally, since in the released S-HG-MEANS execution code a total number of iteration equal to 500 is recommended, we further tested the memetic methods with the maximum number of consecutive no-best-solution-improvement iterations $N_{MAX} = 50$ (for more details on the relation between the two parameters, we refer the reader to Section 4.1.1). The results with the new experimental setting are reported in Table 5. Note that, using this parameter calibration allowed to test the performance of S-HG-MEANS in the Gene dataset too; this evaluation was not possible with the previous parameter setting as it requires excessive computational resources for each constraint configuration.

In terms of *MSSC O.F.*, SM-MDE obtained results similar to the ones in Table 4; moreover, in Gene, it outperformed on all the tested instances S-HG-MEANS, which did not manage to obtain a single feasible solution. As for *N° L.S.*,

Table 4: Numerical results obtained by the SM-MDE algorithm w.r.t. S-HG-MEANS. When $0 < N^{\circ}NoViol < 30$, the results considering only the problem instances where no constraint is violated by S-HG-MEANS are reported in parenthesis.

| Dataset | $N^{\circ}NoViol$ | MSSC O.F. | | | | $N^{\circ} L.S.$ | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap |
| Iris | 30 | 100.0 | -1.28 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -99.92 | -99.714 | -94.012 |
| Wine | 0 | 40.0 | -17.731 | 5.317 | 57.978 | 40.0 | -99.92 | -99.92 | -95.769 |
| Connectionist | 0 | 0.0 | 3.927 | 10.034 | 17.645 | 0.0 | N/A | | |
| Seeds | 30 | 100.0 | -0.937 | -0.047 | 0.0 | 100.0 | -99.92 | -99.714 | -90.898 |
| Glass | 1 | 96.67 (100.0) | -29.239 | -17.143 (-28.188) | 7.721 | 96.67 (100.0) | -99.176 | -97.305 (-99.04) | -88.946 |
| Accent | 10 | 33.33 (100.0) | -3.655 (-3.655) | 48.242 (-1.716) | 96.625 (-0.648) | 33.33 (100.0) | -98.392 (-98.392) | -97.217 (-97.217) | -95.337 (-95.337) |
| Ecoli | 16 | 100.0 (100.0) | -22.42 (-22.42) | -13.379 (-17.142) | -2.432 (-5.284) | 100.0 (100.0) | -99.008 (-98.064) | -97.161 (-97.209) | -93.457 (-93.457) |
| ECG5000 | 0 | 80.0 | -13.303 | -4.437 | 7.613 | 80.0 | -98.576 | -96.117 | -79.751 |
| Computers | 0 | 0.0 | 2.82 | 4.504 | 6.291 | 0.0 | N/A | | |


Table 5: Numerical results obtained by the SM-MDE algorithm w.r.t. S-HG-MEANS with $N_{MAX} = 50$. When $0 < N^{\circ}NoViol < 30$, the results considering only the problem instances where no constraint is violated by S-HG-MEANS are reported in parenthesis.

| Dataset | $N^{\circ}NoViol$ | MSSC O.F. | | | | $N^{\circ} L.S.$ | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap | Succ(%) | MinGap | MedianGap | MaxGap |
| Iris | 30 | 100.0 | -1.28 | -0.001 | 0.0 | 80.0 | -90.766 | -74.545 | 33.333 |
| Wine | 0 | 40.0 | -17.731 | 5.317 | 57.978 | 40.0 | -92.157 | -92.157 | -71.651 |
| Connectionist | 0 | 0.0 | 4.16 | 10.126 | 17.645 | 0.0 | N/A | | |
| Seeds | 30 | 100.0 | -1.134 | -0.044 | 0.0 | 90.0 | -92.157 | -62.561 | 33.333 |
| Glass | 3 | 93.33 (100.0) | -28.744 (-29.516) | -14.579 (-28.597) | 10.129 (-26.051) | 93.33 (100.0) | -81.176 (-80.392) | -73.333 (-79.085) | -48.8 (-70.196) |
| Accent | 10 | 33.33 (100.0) | -2.71 (-2.71) | 48.935 (-1.713) | 103.094 (-0.964) | 33.33 (100.0) | -78.039 (-79.412) | -70.987 (-70.987) | -65.336 (-62.126) |
| Ecoli | 16 | 96.67 (100.0) | -22.059 (-22.059) | -12.153 (-16.91) | 2.918 (-3.758) | 96.67 (100.0) | -78.824 (-84.314) | -70.476 (-67.563) | -43.333 (-52.727) |
| ECG5000 | 0 | 80.0 | -13.377 | -4.428 | 7.664 | 76.67 | -81.961 | -76.266 | 100.0 |
| Computers | 0 | 0.0 | 2.82 | 4.503 | 6.338 | 0.0 | N/A | | |
| Gene | 0 | 100.0 | -1.302 | -1.224 | -1.12 | 100.0 | -84.314 | -81.481 | -73.214 |


the gaps between the two methods are less sharp than the ones in Table 4; moreover, we can observe that in some instances S-HG-MEANS was more efficient than our proposal. However, SM-MDE obtained the best values overall, with gaps in the *MedianGap* column smaller than -60%. This last result can be seen as a further proof that, even when the parameter N_{MAX} is decreased, the population convergence based stopping criterion remains crucial to save computational resources.

4.5 General Assessment of Clustering Quality


In the last section regarding the computational experiments, we compared our methodology SM-MDE with PC-SOS-SDP and S-HG-MEANS in terms of the external measures of cluster validity *ARI* [45] and *NMI* [46]. In Figure 5, we report the relative gap cumulative distributions obtained by the three methodologies. Since two out of three methods




(a) ARI – *Best Mod*




(b) NMI – *Best Mod*




(c) ARI – *Mean Mod*



(d) NMI – *Mean Mod*



(e) ARI – *Worst Mod*



(f) NMI – *Worst Mod*

Figure 5: Plots of the relative gap cumulative distributions for SM-MDE, PC-SOS-SDP and S-HG-MEANS on the datasets listed in Table 1. For SM-MDE and S-HG-MEANS, we considered the parameter setting $N_{MAX} = 50$.

are non-deterministic (SM-MDE and S-HG-MEANS), we decided to show the distributions computed in three different modalities: in the first scenario we considered, for each metric and problem, the best value found in 5 runs by the two methodologies; in the second one we took into account the average of the results; finally, in the third modality we considered the worst values. In order to consider the results obtained on all the datasets of Table 1, we considered the executions of SM-MDE and S-HG-MEANS with $N_{MAX} = 50$.

In the *Mean* modality (Figures 5c-5d), SM-MDE and PC-SOS-SDP turned out to be the best algorithms overall, with our approach obtaining a slightly better results in terms of *ARI*. S-HG-MEANS was the third algorithm in these comparisons, having a better robustness in terms of *NMI*; a similar behavior of the memetic approach can be also noted in the other two scenarios (*Best* and *Worst*). Regarding the *Best* modality (Figures 5a-5b), SM-MDE managed to outperform all the competitors; the situation is the opposite in the *Worst* modality (Figures 5e-5f), where PC-SOS-SDP was the best approach. However, also in this adverse scenario, unlike S-HG-MEANS, our approach managed to have a robustness similar to the one of PC-SOS-SDP in terms of both *ARI* and *NMI*.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we considered the semi-supervised MSSC clustering problem, where instance-level constraints, each of them indicating the membership of two points to the same or to a different cluster, are given a priori. The presence of such “must-link” and “cannot-link” constraints make the semi-supervised MSSC clustering problem at least as hard as the unsupervised one (NP-hard).

After reviewing the (relatively new) related literature, we proposed a novel methodology for the considered problem where the given constraints must be strictly satisfied at each iteration. In particular, the proposal is an extension for the semi-supervised scenario of the Differential Evolution based memetic framework MDECLust [14], proposed for unsupervised clustering and proved to be highly competitive w.r.t. other state-of-the-art approaches. Being a memetic approach, the new framework, called S-MDECLust, combines random-based genetic operations with an effective local search procedure, placed at the end of each iteration to refine every new solution. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first attempt in the semi-supervised clustering literature to propose a memetic algorithm designed to return a (hopefully) optimal solution satisfying all the constraints. The main modifications reported in the original framework are direct consequences of the required assignment step changes. For this operation, we proposed an exact and a greedy strategy; the last one can be useful in specific phases of the framework to reduce the required computational costs.

Finally, we compared our framework with some state-of-the-art methodologies proposed in the literature, showing the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposal in finding feasible and good quality clusters for well-known datasets. In particular, the framework, equipped with the mutation operator and the exact assignment step, was proved to have on the considered datasets an effectiveness in finding good solutions similar to the one typical of exact approaches. Moreover, it presented an high efficiency, which could be also improved employing the proposed greedy methodology for the assignment step.

As for future works, two possible research directions are the following: an extension of the presented framework to handle other clustering models; the management of cluster constraints other than the instance-level ones.

Competing Interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

- [1] P. Hansen, B. Jaumard, Cluster analysis and mathematical programming, *Mathematical Programming* 79 (1) (1997) 191–215. doi:10.1007/BF02614317.
- [2] D. Aloise, A. Deshpande, P. Hansen, P. Papat, NP-hardness of Euclidean sum-of-squares clustering, *Machine Learning* 75 (2) (2009) 245–248. doi:10.1007/s10994-009-5103-0.
- [3] J. Hartigan, M. Wong, Algorithm as 136: A k -means clustering algorithm., *Applied Statistics* 28 (1979) 100–108. doi:10.2307/2346830.
- [4] S. Lloyd, Least squares quantization in pcm, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 28 (2) (1982) 129–137. doi:10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489.

- [5] D. Arthur, S. Vassilvitskii, K-means++: The advantages of careful seeding, in: Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '07, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, USA, 2007, p. 1027–1035.
- [6] A. Likas, N. Vlassis, J. J. Verbeek, The global k-means clustering algorithm, *Pattern Recognition* 36 (2) (2003) 451–461, biometrics. doi:10.1016/S0031-3203(02)00060-2.
- [7] S. Selim, K. Alsultan, A simulated annealing algorithm for the clustering problem., *Pattern Recognition* 24 (1991) 1003–1008. doi:10.1016/0031-3203(91)90097-0.
- [8] K. Al-Sultan, A tabu search approach to the clustering problem., *Pattern Recognition* 28 (1995) 1443–1451. doi:10.1016/0031-3203(95)00022-R.
- [9] U. Maulik, S. Bandyopadhyay, Genetic algorithm-based clustering technique., *Pattern Recognition* 33 (2000) 1455–1465. doi:10.1016/S0031-3203(99)00137-5.
- [10] M. Sarkar, B. Yegnanarayana, D. Khemani, A clustering algorithm using an evolutionary programming-based approach., *Pattern Recognition Letters* 18 (1997) 975–986. doi:10.1016/S0167-8655(97)00122-0.
- [11] B. Ordin, A. M. Bagirov, A heuristic algorithm for solving the minimum sum-of-squares clustering problems, *Journal of Global Optimization* 61 (2) (2015) 341–361. doi:10.1007/s10898-014-0171-5.
- [12] A. Bagirov, S. Taheri, J. Ugon, Nonsmooth DC programming approach to the minimum sum-of-squares clustering problems., *Pattern Recognition* 53 (2016) 12–24. doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2015.11.011.
- [13] D. Gribel, T. Vidal, Hg-means: A scalable hybrid genetic algorithm for minimum sum-of-squares clustering, *Pattern Recognition* 88 (2019) 569–583. doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2018.12.022.
- [14] P. Mansueto, F. Schoen, Memetic differential evolution methods for clustering problems, *Pattern Recognition* 114 (2021) 107849. doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2021.107849.
- [15] R. Storn, K. Price, Differential evolution—a simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces, *Journal of global optimization* 11 (4) (1997) 341. doi:10.1023/A:1008202821328.
- [16] R. G. Pensa, J.-F. Boulicaut, Constrained co-clustering of gene expression data, in: Proceedings of the 2008 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM), 2008, pp. 25–36. doi:10.1137/1.9781611972788.3.
- [17] D. H. Tran, B. Babaki, D. Van Daele, P. Leyman, P. De Causmaecker, Local search for constrained graph clustering in biological networks, *Computers & Operations Research* 132 (2021) 105299. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2021.105299.
- [18] Y. Huang, T. M. Mitchell, Text clustering with extended user feedback, in: Proceedings of the 29th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '06, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2006, p. 413–420. doi:10.1145/1148170.1148242.
- [19] G. Hu, S. Zhou, J. Guan, X. Hu, Towards effective document clustering: A constrained k-means based approach, *Information Processing & Management* 44 (4) (2008) 1397–1409. doi:10.1016/j.ipm.2008.03.001.
- [20] K. Wagstaff, C. Cardie, S. Rogers, S. Schrödl, et al., Constrained k-means clustering with background knowledge, in: *Icml*, Vol. 1, 2001, pp. 577–584.
- [21] N.-V.-D. Nghiem, C. Vrain, T.-B.-H. Dao, I. Davidson, Constrained clustering via post-processing, in: A. Appice, G. Tsoumakas, Y. Manolopoulos, S. Matwin (Eds.), *Discovery Science*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 53–67. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-61527-7_4.
- [22] P. Baumann, A binary linear programming-based k-means algorithm for clustering with must-link and cannot-link constraints, in: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), 2020, pp. 324–328. doi:10.1109/IEEM45057.2020.9309775.
- [23] S. Basu, A. Banerjee, R. J. Mooney, Active semi-supervision for pairwise constrained clustering, in: Proceedings of the 2004 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM), 2004, pp. 333–344. doi:10.1137/1.9781611972740.31.
- [24] I. Davidson, S. S. Ravi, Clustering with constraints: Feasibility issues and the k -means algorithm, in: Proceedings of the 2005 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM), 2005, pp. 138–149. doi:10.1137/1.9781611972757.13.
- [25] M. Ganji, J. Bailey, P. J. Stuckey, Lagrangian constrained clustering, in: Proceedings of the 2016 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM), 2016, pp. 288–296. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974348.33.
- [26] G. González-Almagro, J. Luengo, J.-R. Cano, S. García, Dils: Constrained clustering through dual iterative local search, *Computers & Operations Research* 121 (2020) 104979. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2020.104979.

- [27] P. Baumann, D. S. Hochbaum, Pccc: The pairwise-confidence-constraints-clustering algorithm (2023). doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.14437.
- [28] Y. Xia, A global optimization method for semi-supervised clustering, *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 18 (2) (2009) 214–256. doi:10.1007/s10618-008-0104-3.
- [29] D. Aloise, P. Hansen, L. Liberti, An improved column generation algorithm for minimum sum-of-squares clustering, *Mathematical Programming* 131 (1) (2012) 195–220. doi:10.1007/s10107-010-0349-7.
- [30] D. Aloise, P. Hansen, C. Rocha, A column generation algorithm for semi-supervised minimum sum-of-squares clustering, in: *Global Optimization Workshop 2012*, 2012, pp. 19–22.
- [31] T.-B.-H. Dao, K.-C. Duong, C. Vrain, Constrained clustering by constraint programming, *Artificial Intelligence* 244 (2017) 70–94, combining Constraint Solving with Mining and Learning. doi:10.1016/j.artint.2015.05.006.
- [32] T. Guns, T.-B.-H. Dao, C. Vrain, K.-C. Duong, Repetitive branch-and-bound using constraint programming for constrained minimum sum-of-squares clustering, in: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI'16*, IOS Press, NLD, 2016, p. 462–470. doi:10.3233/978-1-61499-672-9-462.
- [33] V. Piccialli, A. Russo Russo, A. M. Sudoso, An exact algorithm for semi-supervised minimum sum-of-squares clustering, *Computers & Operations Research* 147 (2022) 105958. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2022.105958.
- [34] D. Gribel, M. Gendreau, T. Vidal, Semi-supervised clustering with inaccurate pairwise annotations, *Information Sciences* 607 (2022) 441–457. doi:10.1016/j.ins.2022.05.035.
- [35] L. Liberti, B. Manca, Side-constrained minimum sum-of-squares clustering: mathematical programming and random projections, *Journal of Global Optimization* 83 (1) (2022) 83–118. doi:10.1007/s10898-021-01047-6.
- [36] I. Davidson, S. S. Ravi, Intractability and clustering with constraints, in: *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '07*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2007, p. 201–208. doi:10.1145/1273496.1273522.
- [37] M. Locatelli, M. Maischberger, F. Schoen, Differential evolution methods based on local searches, *Computers and Operations Research* 43 (2014) 169–180. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2013.09.010.
- [38] H. W. Kuhn, The hungarian method for the assignment problem, *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 2 (1-2) (1955) 83–97. doi:10.1002/nav.3800020109.
- [39] J. MacQueen, Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations, in: *Proc. 5th Berkeley Symposium on Math., Stat., and Prob*, 1965, p. 281.
- [40] W. Tan, Y. Yang, T. Li, An improved cop-kmeans algorithm for solving constraint violation, in: *Computational Intelligence*, Vol. Volume 4 of World Scientific Proceedings Series on Computer Engineering and Information Science, World Scientific, 2010, pp. 690–696. doi:10.1142/9789814324700_0104.
- [41] T. Rutayisire, Y. Yang, C. Lin, J. Zhang, A modified cop-kmeans algorithm based on sequenced cannot-link set, in: J. Yao, S. Ramanna, G. Wang, Z. Suraj (Eds.), *Rough Sets and Knowledge Technology*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 217–225. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-24425-4_30.
- [42] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual (2023). URL <https://www.gurobi.com>
- [43] M. Kelly, R. Longjohn, K. Nottingham, The UCI machine learning repository (2024). URL <https://archive.ics.uci.edu>
- [44] H. A. Dau, E. Keogh, K. Kamgar, C.-C. M. Yeh, Y. Zhu, S. Gharghabi, C. A. Ratanamahatana, Yanping, B. Hu, N. Begum, A. Bagnall, A. Mueen, G. Batista, Hexagon-ML, The ucr time series classification archive (October 2018). URL https://www.cs.ucr.edu/~eamonn/time_series_data_2018/
- [45] L. Hubert, P. Arabie, Comparing partitions, *Journal of Classification* 2 (1) (1985) 193–218. doi:10.1007/BF01908075.
- [46] T. O. Kvalseth, Entropy and correlation: Some comments, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* 17 (3) (1987) 517–519. doi:10.1109/TSMC.1987.4309069.
- [47] P. Capanera, L. Di Gangi, M. Lapucci, G. Pellegrini, M. Roma, F. Schoen, A. Sortino, Integrated task scheduling and personnel rostering of airports ground staff: A case study, *Expert Systems with Applications* 238 (2024) 121953. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2023.121953.
- [48] E. D. Dolan, J. J. Moré, Benchmarking optimization software with performance profiles, *Mathematical Programming* 91 (2) (2002) 201–213. doi:10.1007/s101070100263.