

CLUSTERING OF FUNCTIONAL DATA PRONE TO COMPLEX HETEROSCEDASTIC MEASUREMENT ERROR

BY ANDI MAI¹ , CARMEN TEKWE¹ , ROGER ZOH¹ , LAN XUE² 

¹*Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University - Bloomington*

²*Department of Statistics, Oregon State University*

Several factors make clustering of functional data challenging, including the infinite dimensional space to which observations belong and the lack of a defined probability density function for the functional random variable. To overcome these barriers, researchers either assume that observations belong to a finite dimensional space spanned by basis functions or apply nonparametric smoothing methods to the functions prior to clustering. Current clustering methods for functional data include (1) two-stage methods that reduce the number of dimensions before clustering; (2) distance-based nonparametric methods, such as hierarchical clustering or k-means clustering; and (3) model-based algorithms. Although extensive literature describes clustering methods for functional data, few studies have explored the clustering of measurement error-prone function-valued data. In this work, we consider clustering methods for functional data prone to complex, heteroscedastic measurement errors. Two stage-based methods using mixed effects models are first applied to adjust for measurement error bias, followed by cluster analysis of the measurement error-adjusted curves. Through simulations, we investigate how varying sample size, the magnitude of measurement error and the presence of complex heteroscedastic measurement errors influence the cluster analysis of functional data. Our results indicate that failing to account for measurement errors and the correlation structures associated with frequently collected functional data reduces the accuracy of identifying the true latent groups or clusters. The method consistently produces better results regardless of the initial clustering values used. Moreover, it is flexible and can be applied to various clustering approaches, based on the specific distribution of the data. The developed methods are applied to two data sets, a school-based study of energy expenditure among elementary school-aged children in Texas and data from the National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey on participants' physical activity monitored by wearable devices at frequent intervals.

1. Introduction. Functional data analysis involves the examination of data that appear in forms such as functions, images, or other complex objects [Wang, Chiou and Müller (2016); Katina, Vittert and W. Bowman (2021); Srivastava et al. (2016)]. Distinct from traditional multivariate data analysis, functional data are characterized by their inherently infinite-dimensional nature [Ullah and Finch (2013); Wang et al. (2024); Lin, Müller and Yao (2018)]. The term functional data analysis was first coined by Ramsay [Ramsay (1982, 1988); Ramsay and Dalzell (1991)] where justifications were provided for introducing and proposing functional data analysis as an analytical tool for data that appear as functions. Functional data analysis provides a smooth, comprehensive representation of data, facilitating more realistic modeling and the identification of trends across the entire domain, rather than focusing on discrete points [Kokoszka and Reimherr (2017); Levitin et al. (2007); Rossi et al. (2005); Ferraty (2006)]. By considering temporal and spatial correlations, functional data analysis

Keywords and phrases: First keyword, second keyword.

enhances model accuracy and mitigates issues such as overfitting and underestimated variability [Li and Guan (2014); Ruggieri, Plaia and Di Salvo (2018)]. However, analyzing functional data is challenging due to its high dimensionality, irregularity, complex covariance structures, measurement errors, and the difficulty with model interpretations [James, Wang and Zhu (2009); Wang, Chiou and Müller (2016); Ullah and Finch (2013); Cuevas (2014); Fan, Han and Liu (2014); Tekwe et al. (2019)].

Several methods have been developed for the analysis of functional data including functional regression [Morris (2015); Greven and Scheipl (2017); Goldsmith et al. (2011); Cai and Hall (2006); Crainiceanu, Staicu and Di (2009)], clustering, and classification of functional data [Chamroukhi and Nguyen (2019); Rossi and Villa (2006); Leng and Müller (2006); Delaigle and Hall (2012); Bañlo, Cuevas and Fraiman (2010)]. Functional regression extends classical regression methods to situations where either the predictors, the responses, or both are functions [Morris (2015)]. Functional regression models can capture time or space varying dynamics [Kowal (2021); Cai, Fan and Yao (2000); Zhu et al. (2018)]. Analysis of functional data typically involves capturing important patterns in the data by smoothing the data that are assumed to be observed discrete realizations of an underlying latent curve [Ramsay et al. (2009)]. Clustering and classification methods for functional data group or classify the functions or curves into distinct categories based on their shapes, behaviors, or patterns [Jacques and Preda (2014a); Tarpey and Kinader (2003)]. Approaches for classifying and clustering of functional data has gathered considerable attention in recent literature, leading to the development of numerous methodologies that can be broadly classified into several key categories [Zhang and Parnell (2023); Chamroukhi and Nguyen (2019); Ferreira and Hitchcock (2009)] such as regression-based clustering, distance-based clustering, transformation-based clustering, non-parametric based clustering, Bayesian-based methods and other emerging techniques.

Regression-based clustering encompasses a range of methods designed to leverage regression techniques for clustering functional data. Examples of regression-based clustering methods include functional latent mixture models [Bouveyron and Jacques (2011)], functional Gaussian mixture models [Centofanti, Lepore and Palumbo (2023); Nguyen et al. (2016)], functional linear regression models [Goia, May and Fusai (2010)], parametric mixture models [Jacques and Preda (2014b, 2013)], and functional multiplicative models [Li and Chiou (2011)]. Moreover, mixed-effect models [Misumi, Matsui and Konishi (2019); Ma and Zhong (2008)] provide a robust framework for analyzing functional data by accounting for both fixed and random effects. When combined with wavelet decomposition techniques [Giacofci et al. (2013); Antoniadis et al. (2013)], this approach enhances the ability to interpret complex patterns within both fixed and random components, enabling more detailed insights into functional data.

Another approach to clustering of functional data are based on differentials where clusters are defined based on the means and modes of variation between clusters [Chiou and Li (2007)], or the covariances between two populations [Ieva, Paganoni and Tarabelloni (2016)]. Methods based on the Mahalanobis distance in Hilbert spaces [Martino et al. (2019); Galeano, Joseph and Lillo (2015)] have also been used for clustering and classification of functional data. Additionally, distance-based two-layer partition clustering methods [Qu, Dai and Genton (2023); Singh and Patil (2017)] have been developed for clustering of functional data. Other differential-based methods for clustering of functional are based on the variations in phase and amplitude of the data [Park and Ahn (2017); Fu (2019); Slaets, Claeskens and Hubert (2012)].

Transformed-based clustering includes techniques such as defining functions or curves by shifts and rotations as equivalent classes, employing rank-based transformations, and extracting splitting information from trajectories or their derivatives [Guo, Tierney and Gao (2020);

Lim, Oh and Cheung (2019); Justel and Svarc (2016); Pulido, Franco-Pereira and Lillo (2021)]. Additionally, semi-parametric mixed normal transformation models and time-shift clustering algorithms further enhance the efficacy of transformed-based clustering [Zhong, Lin and Li (2021); Wei and Wang (2023)].

Non-parametric based clustering offers flexible and adaptive techniques for clustering functional data without assuming specific parametric forms [Galvani et al. (2021); Hael et al. (2023); Song et al. (2023); Miller, Neill and Wang (2008); Boullé (2012)]. Some common methods for non-parametric-based methods for clustering include deterministic iterative procedures [Galvani et al. (2021)], non-parametric quantile-based models and multivariate functional principal component scores [Hael et al. (2023); Song et al. (2023)]. Further, similarity measures combined with agglomerative clustering algorithms [Miller, Neill and Wang (2008)], and piece-wise constant density estimation [Boullé (2012)] contribute to the robustness and adaptability of non-parametric clustering methods.

Bayesian methods are increasingly applied to clustering of functional data by incorporating prior knowledge in the clustering [Zoh et al. (2024); Ray and Mallick (2006); Rigon (2023); Zhang and Telesca (2014); Xian et al. (2022, 2024); Petrone, Guindani and Gelfand (2009)]. Some examples of Bayesian-based methods include non-parametric Bayes wavelet models [Ray and Mallick (2006)], Dirichlet mixture models [Rigon (2023); Zhang and Telesca (2014); Petrone, Guindani and Gelfand (2009)], and variational Bayes algorithms [Xian et al. (2022, 2024)]. Zoh et al. [Zoh et al. (2024)] introduced a non-parametric Bayesian scalar-on-function regression (SoFR) method that corrects measurement errors using an instrumental variable with a time-varying biasing factor, relaxing the assumption of white noise in measurement errors in SoFR models.

Other approaches such as sparse functional clustering, binary trees through recursive splitting of observations, and approximating self-organizing map algorithms have been developed for clustering of functional data [Vitelli (2023); Golovkine, Klutchnikoff and Patilea (2022); Rossi, Conan-Guez and El Golli (2004)]. While methods for clustering functional data are well established, less work has been considered in the literature to address the clustering of functional data in the presence of complex heteroscedastic measurement errors. Though some prior studies on clustering functional data have mentioned measurement errors, these methods assumed that the error terms were random independent noise [James and Sugar (2003); Rossi, Conan-Guez and El Golli (2004); Ma et al. (2006)].

It is essential to account for measurement error when clustering error-prone functional data to ensure accurate and reliable results [Fuller (2009)]. Measurement error is defined as the difference between the observed measurement of a particular quantity and its true, intrinsic value [Bound, Brown and Mathiowetz (2001); Fuller (2009)]. Repeated measurements of an identical quantity on a subject are generally expected to produce varying results [Matthews et al. (1990); Oldham (1962)]. This variability can be attributed to natural variation within the subject, variations in the methodology of measurement, or a combination of the two [Bland and Altman (1996)]. While many data applications contain measurement errors, one of the strengths of functional data analysis is its adeptness in handling measurement errors, facilitated by the use of repeated measurements for each subject [Wang, Chiou and Müller (2016)].

Several methods have been developed to cluster error-prone data, including approaches for scalar data [Zhang and Di (2020)] and for functional data [Lin and Carroll (2000)]. MCLUST is a model-based clustering approach that uses finite Gaussian mixture models to classify data into clusters using statistical model selection criteria, such as the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [Fraley et al. (2012)]. Zhang et al. extended this framework to handle measurement error in scalar data, developing the MCLUST-ME model, which incorporates Gaussian finite mixture modeling to correct for measurement error under both known and estimable error distributions [Zhang and Di (2020)]. However, the lack of closed-form solutions for parameter

estimation in MCLUST-ME leads to substantial computational challenges. These challenges become even more pronounced for multivariate or functional data, where the complexity of the model increases exponentially. Lin et al. proposed nonparametric local polynomial kernel regression methods to analyze clustered data settings where each cluster has multiple observations, extending applications to cases where predictors are measured accurately and where they are measured with error. To address measurement error in predictors, they applied the simulation-extrapolation method, enhancing nonparametric regression techniques to handle repeated, error-prone measurements within clusters [Lin and Carroll (2000)].

Measurement error can substantially bias clustering results, leading to misleading interpretations and conclusions about the underlying structures within the data [Pankowska and Oberski (2020); Kumar and Patel (2007); Cooper and Milligan (1988)]. Since most existing methods for clustering of functional data do not explicitly account for measurement error, addressing this gap is crucial for improving the reliability and validity of clustering outcomes, especially in applications where precision is paramount. Wearable monitors are widely used for global surveillance of physical activity, aiding in understanding the distribution and extent of these behaviors [Matthews et al. (2012); Bassett (2012)]. They also contribute to clarifying the relationship between physical activity and health outcomes [Kraus et al. (2019); Jakicic et al. (2019); Strain et al. (2020)]. Research indicates that quantifying the effects of measurement errors on physical activity estimates is essential, as factors such as device-related errors such as sensor accuracy and calibration issues; user-related errors including non-compliance and improper device usage; and variations in activity type or environmental conditions can all contribute to inaccuracies in measurements [Ferrari, Friedenreich and Matthews (2007); Fuller et al. (2020); Ward and Clarkson (2004); Bassett Jr (2000); Seneviratne et al. (2017); Schukat et al. (2016)].

Researchers are keen to understand how clusters of individuals with varying levels of physical activity compare. This article aims to bridge this gap by introducing a two stage-based method using point-wise mixed effect models with clustering. The method first corrects for biases in the error prone curves in the first stage and the second stage involves clustering procedures. Our developed approach can handle functional data with heteroscedastic measurement error, offering a straightforward interpretation of the results and demonstrating superior performance, particularly in small sample sizes. The remainder of this article is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the point-wise clustered mixed effect model with measurement error (CMEM-ME). We provide descriptions of the simulation studies in Section 3, and Section 4 provides applications of the methods to two real life datasets. Finally, we provide some concluding remarks and discuss some future research directions in Section 5.

2. Method.

2.1. *Point-wise clustered mixed effect model with measurement error (PCME-ME).* To address the computational challenges in handling large, complex longitudinal data, Cui et al. (2022) proposed Fast Univariate Inference (FUI) that fits univariate pointwise mixed-effects models. We propose a clustered mixed effect model with measurement error (CMEM-ME) for correcting error-prone functional data. The pointwise clustered mixed effect model is considered by fitting a separate model for each time point across all replicates at each time t . The function $t \in [0, 1]$ is considered a random process and is assumed to be integrable over the unit interval $[0, 1]$.

Suppose we know the true number of clusters, then we extend the traditional measurement error model [Fuller (2009)] to the clustered case. The functional data are assumed to come from C different clusters. In particular, for i th ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n_c$) subject and j th ($j = 1, \dots, J$) repeated measure in the c th ($c = 1, \dots, C$) cluster, we assume

$$(1) \quad W_{cij}(t) = X_{ci}(t) + U_{cij}(t).$$

Here, the true functional measurement $X_{ci}(t)$ are unobserved, and $W_{cij}(t)$ represents the j th replicate of observed measurements for subject i in the c th cluster, and is contaminated by an unknown functional measurement error $U_{cij}(t)$. The observed values $W_{cij}(t)$ is an unbiased surrogate for the true value $X_{ci}(t)$. The true values $X_{ci}(t)$ and measurement errors $U_{cij}(t)$ are uncorrelated.

We assume that subjects within the same cluster share a common mean trajectory, denoted by $\mu_c(t)$. For each subject $i = 1, \dots, n_c$ in cluster c , the observed trajectory can be expressed as

$$X_{ci}(t) = \mu_c(t) + b_{ci}(t),$$

where $b_{ci}(t)$ is a random term representing the individual's deviation from the mean trajectory.

Consequently, for any fixed $t \in [0, 1]$, the pointwise clustered mixed effect model with measurement error has the form

$$(2) \quad W_{cij}(t) = \alpha_c(t) + b_{ci}(t) + U_{cij}(t),$$

where $\alpha_c(t)$ is fixed intercept for the cluster c , $b_{ci}(t)$ is random intercept for subject i within cluster c . In addition, we assume $b_{ci}(t) \sim N(0, \sigma_c^2)$ and $U_{cij}(t) \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. For any fixed t , $\{b_{ci}(t)\}$ and $\{U_{cij}(t)\}$ are all independent of each other.

When the clustering index is completely known, a point-wise linear mixed effect model can be used to obtain the predicted values for the latent $X_{ci}(t)$ based on the repeated measurements $W_{cij}(t)$. This approach yields the predicted trajectory for $\hat{X}(t)$ at each point t . If the true number of clusters is unknown, clustered results using single measures or averaged data from J replicated measures, or prior clustered information could be used for initial cluster groups.

The high or infinite dimensionality of the estimated functional matrices poses challenges for estimation. To address this, polynomial spline basis expansion is applied to reduce dimensionality, also with smoothing techniques incorporated to account for the temporal correlation structure in $\hat{X}(t)$ [Reinsch (1967)]. Temporal correlation is modeled through smoothing penalties, which discourage large differences between adjacent spline coefficients, thereby enforcing continuity and gradual transitions in the estimated curve $\hat{X}(t)$. The placement and number of basis functions (K_n) to balance the model's flexibility and smoothness, ensuring that the estimate captures meaningful temporal patterns without overfitting noise [Wang (1998); Krivobokova and Kauermann (2007)].

$$\hat{X}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \gamma_k b_k(t),$$

where $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$ are unknown spline coefficients and $\{b_k(t)\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$ are a series of spline basis functions defined on the unit interval. The number of bases, K_n , is selected based on the sample size n . $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$ are used for next clustering step.

2.2. Clustering. The spline coefficients $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$ are used for final clustering. In this paper, a Gaussian Mixture Modeling for Model-Based Clustering (MCLUST) method is used for clustering the optimal number of clusters, and each observation is assigned to one of the C clusters [Fraley and Raftery (1998a)]. The method relies on the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm to iteratively estimate the parameters of each cluster, aiming for maximum likelihood. MCLUST uses statistical criteria, like the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), to determine the number of clusters. Other clustering methods, based on different data distributions, can also be employed.

****Model Assumption****: Each observation \mathbf{x}_i is generated from one of C components in a Gaussian mixture model for i th ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n_c$) subject,

$$f(\gamma_i | \theta_c) = \sum_{c=1}^C \pi_c \cdot \mathcal{N}(\gamma_i | \mu_c, \Sigma_c)$$

where π_c is the mixture proportion, μ_c is the mean, and Σ_c is the covariance matrix for each component c .

****Covariance Structure****: Covariance matrices Σ_c are parametrized as:

$$(3) \quad \Sigma_c = \lambda_c D_c A_c D_c^T$$

where D_c represents orientation, A_c represents shape, and λ_c the volume of clusters. This enables flexibility in modeling various cluster shapes.

****Expectation-Maximization (EM) Algorithm****: To maximize the likelihood:

- E-step: Calculate the posterior probability τ_{ic} that observation i belongs to component c :

$$(4) \quad \tau_{ic} = \frac{\pi_c f(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_c, \Sigma_c)}{\sum_{j=1}^C \pi_j f(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_j, \Sigma_j)}$$

- M-step: Update μ_c , Σ_c , and π_c to maximize the expected complete-data log-likelihood $Q(\Theta | \Theta^{(t)})$, given the observed data and the current parameter estimates $\Theta^{(t)}$.

$$(5) \quad Q(\Theta | \Theta^{(t)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{c=1}^C \tau_{ic} (\log \pi_c + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_c, \Sigma_c))$$

where the term $\tau_{ic} (\log \pi_c + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_c, \Sigma_c))$ represents the contribution of each observation to the log-likelihood, weighted by its probability of belonging to component c . $\Theta^{(t)}$ is the parameter estimate after the t -th iteration.

****Model Selection****: Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) is used to select the best model and number of clusters:

$$(6) \quad BIC = 2 \log L - m \log(n)$$

where L is the maximized likelihood, m is the number of parameters, and n the sample size.

2.3. *Algorithm.* The whole clustering procedure proceeds as follows.

1. Obtain an initial clustering result based on either a single measure $W_{ij}(t)$ or averaged values of J replicates measures.

2. Apply the CMEM-ME method to estimate predicted values $\hat{X}(t)$.

3. Incorporate the temporal correlation structure in $\hat{X}(t)$ with smoothing techniques, here we use basis expansion and get coefficient $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$.

4. Perform cluster analysis on $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{K_n}$.

5. Repeat step 2-4 until

the subject memberships remain unchanged between the r th iteration and the $(r - 1)$ th iteration.

3. Simulation.

3.1. *Simulation procedure.* Simulation studies were used to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods. The true functional values were generated from three groups with

$$X_i(t) = \begin{cases} \sin(2\pi t) + \epsilon_i(t), & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n/3 \\ \frac{\sin(\pi(16(t-0.5))/2)}{1+(2(16(t-0.5))^2)(\sin(8(t-0.5))+1)} + \epsilon_i(t), & \text{for } i = n/3 + 1, \dots, 2n/3 \\ 1 - 2 \exp(-6t) + \epsilon_i(t), & \text{for } i = 2n/3 + 1, \dots, n \end{cases}$$

The error term $\epsilon_i(t)$ was simulated independently from a Gaussian process with a mean of zero, constant variance σ_X^2 , and covariance function $\Sigma_X(s, t) = \sigma_X^2 \exp\left(-\frac{(s-t)^2}{2\rho_X^2}\right)$, where the correlation depends on the distance between two points and ρ_X controls the strength of correlation. The observed functional values $W_{cij}(t)$ were simulated using the traditional additive measurement error model: $W_{ij}(t) = X_i(t) + U_{ij}(t)$, where $U_{ij}(t)$ was simulated independently from a Gaussian process with a mean of zero, constant variance σ_U^2 , and covariance function $\Sigma_U(s, t) = \sigma_U^2 \exp\left(-\frac{(s-t)^2}{2\rho_U^2}\right)$, where the correlation depends on the distance between two points and ρ_U controls the strength of correlation. In this simulation, five replicated measurements were generated for each individual.

The simulation studies were conducted to evaluate the performance of the proposed estimators under the following conditions (1) increasing sample sizes with $n = 300, 600, 1500$ or 3000 ; (2) different magnitudes of measurement error with $\sigma_X = 0.5$ and $\sigma_U = 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2$ or $\sigma_X = 1$ and $\sigma_U = 1, 1.5, 2, 3$ or $\sigma_X = 1.5$ and $\sigma_U = 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3$; (3) different strengths of correlation with $\rho_X = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$ and $\rho_U = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$; (4) different structures for the variance-covariance matrix of the true functional values and measurement error: including compound symmetric, autoregressive one and Independent. In our simulation, the number of replications is 500.

We consider four estimation methods, namely, the oracle, the naive, the average, and the functional mixed-effects model with clustering(FMEC). The oracle estimator was obtained based on the true functional values $X_i(t)$. The naive estimator was obtained by using one of the observed measurements among five repeated measures. In the simulation, we use the first replicate $W_{i1}(t)$ for the Naive estimator. The average estimator was obtained by averaging all five replicates of observed measurements as $\bar{W}_{ij}(t)$.

3.2. *Index.* We use the following three indexes to compare the numerical performances of the different clustering methods.

Average Group Size. In simulation and practical studies, we use MCLUST package in R to perform the clustering. Here, MCLUST utilizes functions that integrate Expectation-Maximization (EM) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) to automatically determine the optimal number of clusters [Fraley and Raftery (1998b)]. In our simulation, this average number of clusters S over 500 replications is calculated as

$$A_{size} = \frac{1}{500} \sum_{r=1}^{500} S_r$$

Rand index, adjusted Rand Index and Jaccard index. As the true membership of samples were known, we could assess the performance of estimation methods externally by computing the Rand index [Rand (1971)], adjusted Rand index [Hubert and Arabie (1985)] and Jaccard index [Jaccard (1912)]. These three indexes are used to evaluate clustering performance because they either adjust for chance agreement or focus on true positive pairs, suitable for imbalanced datasets [Pinto et al. (2007); Romano et al. (2016); Gupta and Sardana

(2015)]. For a given clustering membership of subjects, the concepts of true positive (TP), true negative (TN), false positive (FP), and false negative (FN) are defined as follows. TP refers to the number of subject pairs that are correctly identified as belonging to the same cluster. TN denotes the number of subject pairs that are correctly identified as belonging to different clusters, meaning they originate from separate clusters and are assigned to distinct clusters. FP represents the number of subject pairs that originate from different clusters but are incorrectly assigned to the same cluster. FN indicates the number of subject pairs that belong to the same cluster but are incorrectly assigned to different clusters. Therefore, the Rand index $Rand = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+FN+FP+TN}$ and the adjusted Rand Index $aRand = \frac{Rand - E(Rand)}{\max(Rand) - E(Rand)}$. The Jaccard index $Jaccard = \frac{TP}{TP+FN+FP}$. For all three indexes, higher values signify better agreement between the estimated and true group memberships.

3.3. Simulation result.

3.3.1. *Effects of varying sample sizes.* We provide the simulation results for evaluating the impacts of varying sample sizes on the clustering performance with the Oracle, PCME-ME-avg, Average, PCME-ME-naive, and Naive methods in the Figure 1. Under $\rho = 0.25$, where the correlation in the AR(1) covariance structure is weaker, the clustering performance of all methods improves as the sample size increases. For larger sample sizes ($n \geq 150$), the benchmark Oracle technique consistently yields the top values for all metrics (Rand Index, ARI, and Jaccard Index). It's interesting to see that PCME-ME-avg outperforms Oracle in small sample sizes ($n \leq 150$). PCME-ME-avg gets closer to Oracle as the sample size grows, especially for bigger datasets ($n \geq 600$). Although PCME-ME-naive performs well as well, it lags behind PCME-ME-avg by a small margin, suggesting that the capacity to recover real clusters is influenced by the initial clustering values chosen. For small to moderate sample sizes ($n \leq 300$), the Average technique performs rather well, surpassing the Naive approach but falling short of the PCME-ME approaches' accuracy no matter for what initial values, indicating the essential need to use our method. Even with increasing sample size, the Naive method, performs the worst and exhibits significant clustering error, demonstrating its inability to handle measurement error effectively.

Under $\rho = 0.5$, where the correlation between measurements is stronger, all methods based on higher temporal structure, leading to weaker clustering performance across metrics. PCME-ME-avg remains the most robust among the error-prone methods, achieving performance comparable to Oracle for larger sample sizes ($n \geq 600$) and outperforming Oracle for smaller and moderate sample sizes. PCME-ME-naive also shows substantial improvement with increasing sample size, though it slightly underperforms PCME-ME-avg, it still outperms than Oracle and Average method when ($n \leq 300$). Overall, the Average technique is less successful than the PCME-ME methods, especially for small and moderate sample sizes ($n = 60$ to 150). Even though the larger correlation helps the Naive technique a little, it still performs badly for all sample sizes, highlighting its shortcomings in dealing with measurement error.

Both $\rho = 0.25$ and $\rho = 0.5$ show how crucial sample size is in reducing the performance difference among approaches. The PCME-ME techniques (avg and naive initial values) show a discernible improvement with small sample sizes, especially in situations with stronger correlation. When sample size is large enough, it doesn't matter which method to use for correcting measurement error.




FIG 1. The effect of varying sample sizes on the clustering performance with the Oracle, PCME-ME-avg, Average, PCME-ME-naive and Naive estimators is shown by Rand Index, Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) and average Jaccard Index for $n \in \{30, 60, 90, 150, 300, 600, 1500, 3000\}$. Oracle is benchmark, PCME-ME-avg is point clustered mixed effect model with averaged clusters as initial value, Average is averaging all replicates of data, PCME-ME-naive is point clustered mixed effect model with naive clusters as initial value and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $\sigma_X = 1.5$, $\sigma_U = 1.5$, and $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

3.3.2. *The effect of measurement error.* In order to analyze the outcomes for assessing how different measurement errors affect the clustering performance using the Oracle, PCME-ME-avg, Average, PCME-ME-naive, and Naive estimators, we run simulations among $n = 1500$, $\sigma_X = 1.5$, $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5\}$, and $\sigma_U \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5, 3\}$ in Figure 2. The performance of all approaches declines as σ_U rises for lower sample sizes ($n = 90$), underscoring the detrimental effects of increased measurement error. As evidenced by no additive measurement error, the Oracle approach continuously produces the best results across all metrics (Rand Index, ARI, and Jaccard Index), and the values remain the same. Among the error-prone methods, PCME-ME-avg exhibits the best performance, closely approximating the Oracle for lower values of σ_U and maintaining relatively higher values for all metrics as σ_U increases. Although it lags slightly behind PCME-ME-avg, PCME-ME-naive likewise performs well, especially with larger measurement error, suggesting better way than averaging values. With notable drops in clustering accuracy across all measures as σ_U rises, the Naive method performs the worst, highlighting its shortcomings in mitigating measurement error in smaller datasets.

For larger sample sizes ($n = 600$), all methods exhibit improved performance compared to $n = 90$, with smaller declines in clustering accuracy as σ_U increases. The Oracle approach achieves nearly flawless values across all criteria. Even at higher σ_U levels, PCME-ME-avg maintains its superior performance over other error-prone techniques, demonstrating resistance to measurement error. Its scalability and dependability in larger datasets are demonstrated by the near alignment of its performance with Oracle, especially for metrics like ARI and Jaccard Index. The Average method performs significantly better, even outperforming the PCME-ME-naive method in larger datasets. The Naive approach continues to perform

the worst, demonstrating its incapacity to control measurement error even in larger datasets. According to scenarios with varying sample sizes, PCME-ME-avg may largely correct measurement error and get results that are close to Oracle.




FIG 2. The effect of varying measurement error on the clustering performance with the Oracle, PCME-ME-avg, Average, PCME-ME-naive and Naive estimators is shown by Rand Index, Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) and average Jaccard Index for $\sigma_U \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 3\}$. Oracle is benchmark, PCME-ME-avg is point clustered mixed effect model with averaged clusters as initial value, Average is averaging all replicates of data, PCME-ME-naive is point clustered mixed effect model with naive clusters as initial value and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as σ_X , $n \in \{90, 600\}$, and $\rho = 0.5$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

The impact of different measurement errors (σ_U) on clustering performance across $\sigma_U \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 3\}$, with small sample size $n = 90$, $\sigma_X = 1$, and $\rho = 0.5$ in 500 iterations is summarized in Figure 3. ASize (Size = 3) indicates how accurately the clustering techniques predict the actual number of clusters. For all σ_U values, the Oracle consistently obtains an ASize near 3. With median ASize values close to 3 and comparatively small interquartile ranges, the FMEC approach performs well, showing a strong ability to cluster the right number of groups in spite of rising measurement error. In comparison to FMEC, the Average approach exhibits somewhat greater fluctuation.

All methods perform worse as measurement error rises, with increased variability across all variables and decreasing clustering accuracy. When compared to the Average and Naive methods, the FMEC approach consistently performs better when measurement error increases and exhibits good performance throughout the ARand and AJaccard Index, closely replicating Oracle findings. Although the Average method provides a good intermediate solution, as σ_U rises, it becomes less accurate and more variable. The Naive approach performs noticeably worse, especially at larger σ_U values. Its failure to take measurement error into

account leads to low performance, irregular group sizes, and poor clustering accuracy. The performance difference between FMEC and the other approaches grows as σ_U rises, demonstrating FMEC's consistency in situations with substantial measurement error.




FIG 3. The effect of varying measurement error on the clustering performance with the Oracle, FMEC, Average, and Naive estimators. The performance metrics are shown by the average group size (ASize), average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard) for $\sigma_U \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 3\}$. Oracle is the benchmark, FMEC is the clustered mixed effect model, Average is the averaging of all replicates of data, and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $n = 90$, $\sigma_X = 1$, and $\rho \in \{0.5\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

3.3.3. *The effect of functional error term.* To provide the results for evaluating the impacts of varying the functional error term (σ_X) on the clustering performance with the Oracle, FMEC, Average and Naive estimators, we made simulation in $n = 1500$, $\sigma_U = 2$, and $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error. The table shows in Table 1. Out of all the correlations, the performance metrics of the Oracle, FMEC, and Average estimators consistently exhibited outcomes when the functional error term (σ_X) rose. FMEC estimators are substantially closer to the original groups (group=3) since the ASize for the Oracle estimator stayed optimal across all values of σ_X . As σ_X increased, the Naive estimator's performance dramatically deteriorated, highlighting its incapacity to handle bigger functional error components. Functional error terms can be managed partially by averaging all functional data replicates, but the FMEC approach consistently performs better by yielding more accurate clustering results.

TABLE 1

The effect of varying functional error term (σ_X) on the clustering performance with the Oracle, FMEC, Average, and Naive estimators. The performance metrics are shown by the average group size (ASize), average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard) for different values of σ_X . Oracle is the benchmark, FMEC is the clustered mixed effect model, Average is the averaging of all replicates of data, and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $n = 1500$, $\sigma_U = 2$, and $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

σ_X	ASize				ARand				AJaccard			
	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive
$\rho = 0.25$												
0.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.876	0.333	1.000	1.000	0.686	0.333
1	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.995	0.995	0.986	0.977	0.832	0.984	0.958	0.933	0.599
1.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.795	0.946	0.929	0.920	0.774	0.851	0.809	0.785	0.522
$\rho = 0.5$												
0.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.948	1.000	0.999	0.997	0.855
1	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.609	0.968	0.943	0.921	0.515	0.909	0.844	0.788	0.390
1.5	3.000	2.997	2.984	1.061	0.869	0.844	0.831	0.351	0.672	0.622	0.598	0.338
$\rho = 0.75$												
0.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.991	0.995	0.988	0.978	0.836	0.985	0.964	0.935	0.607
1	3.000	2.967	2.864	1.000	0.872	0.824	0.784	0.333	0.677	0.588	0.530	0.333
1.5	1.694	2.290	1.063	1.000	0.538	0.643	0.352	0.333	0.397	0.408	0.338	0.333

3.3.4. *The effect of correlation.* Simulation findings on the effects of changing the correlation parameter (ρ) on the clustering performance of the Oracle, FMEC, Average, and Naive estimators are shown in Table 2. For varying values of ρ , the performance metrics taken into consideration are average group size (ASize), average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard). The correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error is represented by ρ . The simulations are performed with $n = 1500$, $\sigma_X = 1$, and $\sigma_U \in \{1, 2\}$. A significant drop in clustering performance was linked to an increase in the correlation parameter (ρ) in the AR(1) configuration. ARand and AJaccard indices showed lower values as ρ increased, indicating a decline in the accuracy and reliability of the clustering results. Higher ARand and AJaccard indices showed that the FMEC estimator consistently performed better in clustering data with measurement errors for both smaller measurement error $\sigma_U = 1$ and larger measurement error $\sigma_U = 2$. In contrast to the Naive and Average approaches, which shown appreciable performance drops as measurement error and correlation increased, the robustness of FMEC was especially noteworthy.

TABLE 2

The effect of varying correlation (ρ) on the clustering performance with the Oracle, FMEC, Average, and Naive estimators. The performance metrics are shown by the average group size (ASize), average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard) for different values of ρ . Oracle is the benchmark, FMEC is the clustered mixed effect model, Average is the averaging of all replicates of data, and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $n = 1500$, $\sigma_X = 1$, $\sigma_U \in \{1, 2\}$, and $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

ρ	ASize				ARand				AJaccard			
	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive
$\sigma_U = 1$												
0.25	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.995	0.993	0.991	0.958	0.984	0.978	0.974	0.882
0.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.968	0.960	0.957	0.887	0.909	0.888	0.878	0.710
0.75	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.223	0.872	0.856	0.851	0.670	0.677	0.645	0.634	0.449
$\sigma_U = 2$												
0.25	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.995	0.995	0.986	0.977	0.832	0.984	0.958	0.933	0.599
0.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.609	0.968	0.943	0.921	0.515	0.909	0.844	0.788	0.390
0.75	3.000	2.967	2.864	1.000	0.872	0.824	0.784	0.333	0.677	0.588	0.530	0.333

As for small sample size, Figure 4 shows the clustering performance metrics under varying correlation levels ($\rho = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$) for four methods in the performance metrics include the ARand Index and AJaccard Index. Each boxplot represents the distribution of values from 500 iterations conducted under the simulation scenario with $\sigma_X = 1$, $\sigma_U = 1.5$ and $n = 150$. The FMEC approach continuously performs best across all correlation levels when compared to the Average and Naive methods. In many situations, particularly at lower correlation levels, FMEC performs similarly to the Oracle approach. Excellent clustering accuracy and low variability are indicated by the FMEC's ARand and AJaccard values, which even have identical median values and lower interquartile ranges at higher correlation levels. The Average Method, which falls between FMEC and Naive estimators, performs moderately. Higher variability in clustering results is indicated by the Average method's interquartile ranges, which are wider than FMEC's. As the correlation parameter rises, this steady performance illustrates how well FMEC corrects measurement errors.




FIG 4. The effect of varying correlation on the clustering performance with the Oracle, FMEC, Average, and Naive estimators is shown by average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard) for $n \in \{150\}$. Oracle is benchmark, FMEC is clustered mixed effect model, Average is averaging all replicates of data and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $\sigma_X = 1$, $\sigma_U = 1.5$, and $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the AR(1) covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

3.3.5. *The effect of variance covariance matrix.* Simulation findings of clustering performance across various variance-covariance structures, including AR(1), Independent, and Compound Symmetry, are shown in Table 3. $n = 1500$, $\sigma_X = 1.5$, $\sigma_U \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5\}$, and $\rho = 0.5$ are the parameters that are set. FMEC estimators demonstrated strong performance for AR(1) Covariance Structure, preserving high ARand and AJaccard indices at different measurement error levels. Despite a minor decrease when measurement error rose, the FMEC estimator's performance was still quite good. The FMEC approach consistently outperformed the Naive and Average methods, achieving the highest ARand and AJaccard indices under the Independent covariance structure. The efficacy of the FMEC estimator in this context was demonstrated by its consistent and near-Oracle estimator performance. The Oracle estimator consistently performed better than the other approaches in the Compound Symmetry covariance structure. However, the FMEC estimator's ARand and AJaccard indices were marginally lower than those of the Average approach. The average group size was larger the initial three groups as measurement error rose, suggesting difficulties in sustaining high clustering accuracy under this compound symmetry structure. The Naive estimator's performance continues to deteriorate significantly. The findings showed that the FMEC method may not be a good fit for all covariance structures. It performed well under the Independent and AR(1) covariance structures, but as measurement errors increased, its efficacy decreased under the Compound Symmetry structure.

TABLE 3

Clustering performance with different variance covariance structures: $AR(1)$, Independent, and Compound Symmetry. The performance metrics are shown by the average group size (ASize), average Rand Index (ARand), and average Jaccard Index (AJaccard). Oracle is the benchmark, FMEC is the clustered mixed effect model, Average is the averaging of all replicates of data, and Naive is one replicate of data. The parameters are set as $n = 1500$, $\sigma_X = 1.5$, $\sigma_U \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5\}$, and $\rho = 0.5$, where ρ is the correlation parameter in the $AR(1)$ and compound symmetry covariance function of the functional true values and measurement error.

σ_U	ASize				ARand				AJaccard			
	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive	Oracle	FMEC	Average	Naive
AR(1)												
1.5	3.000	2.998	2.995	2.073	0.869	0.854	0.847	0.637	0.672	0.641	0.629	0.436
2	3.000	2.997	2.984	1.061	0.869	0.844	0.831	0.351	0.672	0.622	0.598	0.338
2.5	3.000	2.976	2.946	1.000	0.869	0.832	0.809	0.333	0.672	0.602	0.563	0.333
Independent												
1.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.985	0.980	0.978	0.925	0.955	0.941	0.935	0.798
2	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.985	0.977	0.971	0.879	0.955	0.932	0.918	0.692
2.5	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.986	0.985	0.972	0.963	0.828	0.955	0.920	0.894	0.593
Compound Symmetry												
1.5	3.077	3.179	3.089	3.430	0.989	0.981	0.985	0.937	0.967	0.945	0.955	0.823
2	3.077	3.268	3.132	3.744	0.989	0.973	0.979	0.891	0.967	0.922	0.937	0.711
2.5	3.077	3.363	3.209	3.943	0.989	0.963	0.971	0.835	0.967	0.892	0.916	0.595

4. Data application.

4.1. *Physical activity intensity of NHANES data.* We applied data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), a survey that provides a wealth of health and nutrition data, to apply the suggested FMEC model. Two survey cycles (2003–2004 and 2005–2006) are used in this research, and data on physical activity was gathered using the Physical Activity Monitor (PAM) [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention \(2023\)](#). Activity intensity was captured by the PAM device at 1-minute intervals, and the intensity data was then aggregated by hour. The dataset also contained other demographic factors.

The inclusion criteria for this analysis were as follows:

- 1 Participants aged 20 years or older,
- 2 Participants with complete 7-day, 24-hour physical activity data, and
- 3 Participants with no missing values for relevant demographic variables.

A total sample of 2,196 people was kept after these criteria. Because physical activity levels are usually lower between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am than at other times, data from this time frame were excluded for analysis.

The physical activity intensity trajectories for three randomly chosen subjects (470, 503, and 2035) throughout a seven-day period, measured over a 16-hour period from 6 AM to 10 PM, are shown in Figure 5. Every participant displays unique patterns of activity, with significant variation in intensity within and between subjects. Subject 2035, for example, has consistently greater activity levels with noticeable spikes on Days 2 and 7, whereas Subject 470 exhibits generally very moderate intensity with sporadic peaks on particular days. Subject 503 has a more similar pattern, with daily variations in intensity. The daily variations are highlighted by the intensity trajectories within each individual. The intensity value also vary greatly; some readings are above 40,000 units, while others stay close to zero all day. Further investigation into clustering, variability, and behavioral tendencies in physical activity data,




FIG 5. Grouped intensity trajectories among different methods

as well as possible measurement inaccuracy in wearable devices, is made possible by this plot, showing the variability in physical activity patterns between people and days.

Three methods—the FMEC method, the Average method, and the Naive method—were then employed to correct for measurement error in physical activity intensity data. For clustering, the `Mclust` package in R was utilized, categorizing participants into intensity groups ordered from lowest to highest. These intensity group memberships were subsequently used as predictor variables to examine their relationship with diabetes status, controlling for gender, ethnicity, and age group. For the naive approach, days 2 and 7 were chosen as representative random days. The clustering results are shown in Table 4. Different days would produce different number of clusters. While FMEC method get 6 groups, Average method clusters for 9 groups, while Naive method only obtains 3 or 4 groups.

TABLE 4
Group tables among different methods

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
FMEC	73	220	412	269	522	700			
Average	66	69	238	274	276	345	408	263	257
Naive (D2)	153	253	806	984					
Naive (D7)	188	980	1028						

Figure 6 illustrates the average physical activity intensity throughout the days (from 6 am to 10 pm) across clusters determined by three methods: the FMEC method, the Average method and the Naive method. Each plot reveals distinct patterns of activity peaking around midday and gradually decreasing in the evening. In the first subplot, the FMEC approach divides the data into six clusters. Without unduly complicating the analysis, this strategy better captures the diversity in activity levels while maintaining the general circadian regularity observed in the later methods. For example, clusters 1 and 2 keep the lowest intensities, while cluster 6 represents the greatest intensity group, similar with cluster 9 in the Average approach. FMEC offers a more subtle clustering than the Naive approach and is easier to

understand than the average method, which has fewer clusters. The second subplot provides a more detailed perspective of activity patterns by grouping the data into nine groups using the Average method. Particularly for intermediate activity groups like clusters 3 to 6, the extra clusters capture minute variations in intensity levels. Compared to the Naive method, the trajectories are more precise, but the greater number of clusters can make interpretation more difficult. The third subplot displays a general rhythm in physical activity by using the Naive approach to group the data into four clusters. In clusters 3 and 4, intensity levels rise in the morning (after 6:00), peak at noon (12:00), and then level out in the evening (after 18:00). Cluster 1 continuously maintains lowest throughout the day, whereas cluster 4 constantly displays the highest levels. The simplicity of the basic approach, however, leads to fewer clusters and may obscure subtler differences in activity patterns. All things considered, the FMEC approach seems to provide the best trade-off between interpretability and complexity.




FIG 6. Grouped intensity trajectories among different methods

Table 5 compares the distribution of demographic variables across clusters derived using three different clustering methods: FMEC method, Average Method and Naive Method. The FMEC method, compared to Average and Naive method, offers more distinct and meaningful clusters. For example, cluster 1 from the FMEC method is characterized by a significantly higher percentage of individuals aged ≤ 44 (68.5%) compared to other clusters. Moreover, the FMEC method shows clearer differences in ethnicity composition between clusters, when cluster 3 having a higher proportion of White individuals (80.8%) and cluster 4 showing a more diverse ethnic composition. Gender patterns in FMEC method are also more distinct, as shown by cluster 6, which has the largest percentage of males (35.3%). With nine clusters, the Average method offers more detail in the distributions of age and ethnicity. Nonetheless, certain clusters, including clusters 3, 4, and 5, which share mean ages and age distributions. Since the clusters for the Naive method are loosely categorized, subtle differences are not captured. The ethnic distribution under the Naive method, for example, is comparatively homogeneous, with "White" being the predominant group in every cluster. And there are no notable variations in the age distribution amongst clusters, and the mean age values fall between 42.3 and 56.8.

TABLE 5
Proportion tables for different clustering methods

Intensity group	Count	Proportion table for FMEC method				
		Diabetes No Yes	Gender Male Female	Ethnicity White Hispanic Black Others	Age Group ≤ 44 45-64 ≥ 65	Age
1	73	94.5 5.5	45.2 54.8	74 13.7 8.2 4.1	68.5 21.9 19.6	39.6
2	220	77.7 22.3	42.7 57.3	77.3 7.3 12.7 2.7	31.4 16.8 51.8	60.2
3	412	80.6 19.4	46.4 53.6	80.8 6.1 10.2 2.9	19.2 17.7 63.1	64.7
4	269	84 16	32.3 67.7	68.8 11.5 15.2 4.5	37.5 27.5 34.9	52.1
5	522	87 13	32.8 67.2	71.3 12.5 12.3 1.4	36 24.5 39.5	53.9
6	700	89 11	35.3 64.7	71.3 10 13.6 5.1	33.3 39 27.7	53.1

Intensity group	Count	Proportion table for Average method				
		Diabetes No Yes	Gender Male Female	Ethnicity White Hispanic Black Others	Age Group ≤ 44 45-64 ≥ 65	Age
1	66	92.4 7.6	45.5 54.5	71.2 13.6 10.6 4.5	69.7 21.2 19.1	39.4
2	69	84.1 15.9	47.8 52.2	72.5 10.1 15.9 1.4	59.4 15.9 24.6	46.7
3	238	79 21	46.6 53.4	83.6 4.6 9.7 2.1	13.4 16.8 69.7	67.8
4	274	80.3 19.7	39.8 60.2	79.2 8 10.2 2.6	23.4 18.6 58	62.6
5	276	83.3 16.7	32.2 67.8	70.3 10.9 14.9 1.4	37.3 27.9 34.8	52.5
6	345	89.9 10.1	37.4 62.6	76.8 8.1 10.4 4.6	29.9 26.4 43.8	57.8
7	408	85.5 14.5	32.4 67.6	69.6 12.7 12.7 4.9	36.5 25 38.5	53.5
8	263	85.2 14.8	44.1 55.9	69.6 10.3 15.6 4.6	27.4 38.4 34.2	55.7
9	257	91.4 8.6	28.8 71.2	67.7 12.1 14.4 5.8	42.8 44.4 12.8	47.2

Intensity group	Count	Proportion table for Naive method				
		Diabetes No Yes	Gender Male Female	Ethnicity White Hispanic Black Others	Age Group ≤ 44 45-64 ≥ 65	Age
1	153	88.9 11.1	39.2 60.8	69.3 13.7 13.1 3.9	62.7 23.5 13.7	42.3
2	253	87.4 12.6	43.9 56.1	75.9 8.7 13 2.4	33.6 19.4 47	57.8
3	806	82.4 17.6	33.3 66.7	72.5 8.9 13.5 5.1	30.6 27.2 42.2	56.0
4	984	86.8 13.2	39 61	74.3 10.4 11.6 3.8	29.7 30.2 40.1	56.8

The distribution of diabetes prevalence across several clusters is shown in Figure 7. The FMEC method offers the clearest clustering. Cluster 2 had the highest prevalence of diabetes (22.3%), while cluster 1 has the lowest (5.5%), possibly due to the small cluster size. It illustrates how well the FMEC method distinguish across groups according to the prevalence of diabetes. Using the FMEC method, the prevalence of diabetes continuously declines as physical activity increases. With diabetes prevalence ranging from 7.6% in cluster 1 to 21% in cluster 3, the Average method's clustering offers a little more variety. Nonetheless, similar diabetes rates are seen in several clusters, including clusters 2 and 5, clusters 7 and 8, and others. According to the Naive method, the percentage of people with diabetes varies comparatively little between clusters, ranging from 11.1% in cluster 1 to 17.6% in cluster 3.




FIG 7. Diabetes prevalence across clusters for different methods

Clusters derived from the different methods were utilized to perform a logistic regression analysis, with diabetes serving as the outcome variable. Gender, ethnicity, age group, and blood pressure were included as confounding variables. Male participants were treated as the reference group for gender. Ethnicity was categorized into four groups: Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Others, with Non-Hispanic White serving as the reference category. Age was grouped into three categories: ≤ 44 , 45–64, and ≥ 65 , with individuals aged ≤ 44 designated as the reference group. The largest physical activity intensity group was set as the reference group.

The logistic regression results for the three clustering methods (FMEC, Average and Naive) are presented in Table 6. Gender was not significant in any of the models ($p > 0.3$), suggesting no substantial difference in diabetes prevalence based on gender. Ethnic groups, however, showed consistent and significant associations across all methods. Non-Hispanic Black had the strongest positive association with the diabetes prevalence, with coefficients around 1.1 and $p < 0.001$ for all methods. Hispanic group also exhibited a significant positive association ($p < 0.05$), with smaller coefficients ranging from 0.567 to 0.579. Both age groups, 45–64 and ≥ 65 years significantly indicated a higher risk of getting diabetes in older age groups. FMEC and Average methods produced slightly larger coefficients for the 45–64 group (around 2.0) compared to the Naive method (1.962). The coefficients for intensity groups in the FMEC model were generally positive except group 1, reflecting higher risk of diabetes for lower intensity groups compared to the reference (largest physical intensity). Intensity group 2 showed the strongest association (0.858, $p < 0.001$) with diabetes, representing when physical activity decrease, chance of getting diabetes increases. Average method consistently had positive coefficients for all intensity groups. The Naive method included only four intensity groups, with the largest group as the reference. Group 3 showed a significant positive association (0.361, $p = 0.009$) between lack of physical activity and risk of diabetes. The Adjusted Akaike Information Criterion (aAIC) values indicate that the FMEC method achieved the best model fit ($aAIC = 1658.7$).

TABLE 6

Comparison of logistic regression results for FMEC, Average, and Naive Methods with the Largest Group as Reference

Covariate	FMEC		Average		Naive	
	Estimate	P-value	Estimate	P-value	Estimate	P-value
Intercept	-3.236	< 0.001***	-3.405	< 0.001***	-3.063	< 0.001***
Female	-0.098	0.455	-0.096	0.461	-0.130	0.317
Hispanic	0.579	0.015*	0.567	0.017*	0.567	0.016*
Non-Hispanic Black	1.102	< 0.001***	1.107	< 0.001***	1.081	< 0.001***
Other Race	0.166	0.660	0.199	0.599	0.122	0.747
Age 45-64 (ref: ≤ 44)	1.997	< 0.001***	2.006	< 0.001***	1.962	< 0.001***
Age ≥ 65 (ref: ≤ 44)	2.213	< 0.001***	2.258	< 0.001***	2.324	< 0.001***
Blood Pressure	-0.007	0.078	-0.007	0.073	-0.007	0.072
Intensity group 1	-0.116	0.833	0.380	0.486	0.404	0.167
Intensity group 2	0.858	< 0.001***	1.057	0.013*	-0.018	0.935
Intensity group 3	0.539	0.003**	0.722	0.014*	0.361	0.009**
Intensity group 4	0.496	0.021*	0.754	0.009**	(ref)	–
Intensity group 5	0.245	0.188	0.710	0.015*	–	–
Intensity group 6	(ref)	–	0.044	0.882	–	–
Intensity group 7	–	–	0.518	0.062	–	–
Intensity group 8	–	–	0.395	0.180	–	–
Intensity Group 9	–	–	(ref)	–	–	–
aAIC	1658.9	–	1664.8	–	1666.1	–

Note: AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) is a measure of model fit that accounts for both the goodness of fit and model complexity. Lower AIC values indicate a better balance between model fit and complexity. aAIC (Adjusted AIC) is a modified version of the AIC that accounts for the finite sample size in a model.

Significant level: <0.001 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1

4.2. *Physical activity energy expenditure of kids data.* We also applied the proposed FMEC model to the stand-biased desks study (a cluster randomized trial) conducted in Texas is the basis for this practical data application [Benden et al. (2014)]. During the 2012-2013 academic year, 24 teachers from eight elementary schools were recruited and randomly assigned to utilize different types of desks. At baseline, the study included 374 students from second through fourth grades. The student participants were required to wear calibrated BodyMedia SenseWear armband devices during school hours for a week, separately for each semester. These devices recorded individualized step counts and caloric energy expenditure (EE) per minute while being worn. In this paper, we analyzed data at baseline.

The inclusion criteria are:

- 1 Subjects are those who contained five days' data
- 2 Subjects are those who had at least 235 minute level's data during 10:00AM to 13:59PM(240 minutes' interval) each worn day. Missing rate is controlled in order to run the clustering model successfully.

After criteria, the final valid subjects are 195. Since values of energy expenditure data are too small, we multiply with 10 to make the range larger. After getting final sample size, FMEC method, Average method, and Naive method were used to correct EE data with measurement error. Then we use Mclust() package in R to choose the optimal groups. Finally a mixed effect model was implemented, with log(BMI) as outcome, the clustered membership as exposure, clustered random effect for teachers nested within schools, and controlling for desk choices, age, gender, ethnicity, to check the effect of functional mixed effect model for clustering when dealing with practical data prone to measurement error.

Figure 8 illustrates the original EE trajectories for three randomly selected subjects (IDs 56, 119, and 191) over five consecutive days. Each line represents the EE values recorded throughout the day, measured in 1-minute intervals. The trajectories reveal substantial variability in EE patterns across days for each subject. While some peaks and dips are observed consistently, the magnitude and timing of these fluctuations differ by day and subject. For instance, subject 56 exhibits relatively stable EE patterns with sporadic spikes in activity, whereas subject 119 demonstrates more frequent and pronounced variations, particularly toward the end of the day. Subject 191 shows relatively low and steady EE values, with intermittent peaks that suggest bursts of high activity. Across all three subjects, EE values generally range between 0 and 50 units (multiplying by 10 with original EE value), with heterogeneity in individual physical activity patterns across days.




FIG 8. Grouped EE trajectories among different methods

The ideal number of clusters was found using the `Mclust()` program, as seen in Table 7. The average energy expenditure (EE) measurements during a four-hour period were then used to assign group memberships in descending order. The average EE line for all of the individuals in a group serves as its defining characteristic. Group 5 has the lowest mean EE value while group 1 has the highest mean EE value over the four-hour period for the FMEC method. If not considering measurement error, depending on the day, the number of clusters based on `Mclust()` package can range from three to seven groups (day 4 and day 2). This variability demonstrates how Naive measurement influences clustering results and highlights the importance of methods that correct such errors. After applying methods like FMEC or Average method, the optimal number of clusters stabilizes at five. Compared with the Naive method on Day 2 data, these methods merge some subjects into smaller groups while splitting others into more granular clusters. Although the Average and FMEC methods result in the same number of clusters, the distribution of subjects within each cluster differs significantly.

The Figure 9 indicates trajectories for each cluster by different clustering method. Gray lines are subject-specific trajectories and colorful trajectories are mean-value for each time point. In the FMEC subplot, the mean trajectories closely resemble those observed in the average plot in general, but have some differences. The first group exhibits relatively milder peaks. Group 2 shows an ascending trend over the time period. Group 3 demonstrates more

TABLE 7
Group tables among different methods

FMEC method							
Group number	1	2	3	4	5		
Sample size	54	19	42	25	55		
Average method							
Group number	1	2	3	4	5		
Sample size	37	29	64	25	40		
Naive method (Day 2)							
Group number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sample size	2	35	22	9	52	23	52
Naive method (Day 4)							
Group number	1	2	3				
Sample size	64	31	100				

significant fluctuations during the middle two hours. Group 5 displays a consistently smooth and moderate EE intensity. In the Average method subplot, group 1 demonstrates a more intensive energy expenditure (EE) range at the initial, middle, and final time points. Group 2 exhibits stable relative EE values after the first two-hour period. Group 3 displays fluctuations in EE during the middle two hours. Group 4 shows a pronounced peak in EE at the beginning, followed by more moderate values. Group 5 experiences varying fluctuations in EE throughout the entire duration. The third subplot is the Naive method. Here we only plot 7 clusters for day 2 data. Since we randomly choose one day for energy expenditure without measurement error correction, the mean-trajectory data is messy even after clustering. The optimal number of clusters of both FMEC and Average method is 5. While gray lines of naive method are not identified, subject trajectories of average and FMEC method have more distinguished trajectories.




FIG 9. Grouped EE trajectories among different methods

The findings of mixed-effects models comparing three clustering models—FMEC, Average, and Naive method, with BMI as the outcome are shown in Table 8. Covariates for treatment group, age, gender, ethnicity, and energy expenditure (EE) levels are included in the models. Women are regarded as the reference group for gender. Non-Hispanic White is the reference category for ethnicity, which also includes Hispanic, Non-Hispanic Black, and Others. The reference group of EE is the one with the highest energy expenditure. Out of the three methods, FMEC exhibits the best model fit with the lowest aAIC score (-118.95), followed by the Average technique (-99.06) and the Naive method (-114.92). With respect to the fixed factors, Non-Hispanic Black ethnicity shows consistently significant higher BMI than the reference group (Non-Hispanic White). Three clusters statistically showing when energy expenditure decreases, BMI decreases for the FMEC method. Less power in identifying significant association is demonstrated by the bigger SEs for Naive method compared with FMEC method.

The variance of the random intercepts for the nested teacher and school levels is zero for the Naive method's random effects. On the other hand, the variance components for random intercepts are not zero for the FMEC and Average approaches. At the school level, the FMEC method's standard deviation (0.035) is marginally higher than the Average method's (0.03). When compared to the Naive technique, the FMEC and Average methods both perform better at capturing the hierarchical variability in the data. In keeping with the original multilevel study design, the FMEC technique provides more difference in variability between schools and instructors within schools.

TABLE 8
Comparison of Mixed-Effects Model Results for FMEC, Average, and Naive Methods

Covariate	FMEC		Average		Naive	
	Estimate (SE)	P-value	Estimate (SE)	P-value	Estimate (SE)	P-value
Fixed Effects						
Intercept	3.044 (0.191)	< 0.001 ***	2.747 (0.150)	< 0.001 ***	3.025 (0.173)	< 0.001 ***
Treatment	0.007 (0.025)	0.759	-0.006 (0.025)	0.803	0.035 (0.022)	0.117
Age	-0.007 (0.017)	0.693	0.014 (0.013)	0.308	0.018 (0.013)	0.176
Male	-0.025 (0.022)	0.259	-0.009 (0.022)	0.665	-0.028 (0.022)	0.188
Hispanic	-0.048 (0.038)	0.207	-0.038 (0.040)	0.345	-0.040 (0.037)	0.285
Black	0.087 (0.037)	0.020 *	0.091 (0.038)	0.021 *	0.085 (0.036)	0.021 *
Others	0.032 (0.038)	0.385	0.038 (0.039)	0.332	0.029 (0.037)	0.433
EE.Group1	(ref)		(ref)		(ref)	
EE.Group2	-0.101 (0.052)	0.081	0.018 (0.041)	0.662	-0.289 (0.104)	0.006 **
EE.Group3	-0.143 (0.047)	0.008 **	-0.039 (0.034)	0.278	-0.317 (0.106)	0.003 **
EE.Group4	-0.144 (0.046)	0.008 **	-0.061 (0.042)	0.185	-0.307 (0.112)	0.007 **
EE.Group5	-0.151 (0.031)	< 0.001 ***	0.081 (0.037)	0.041 *	-0.366 (0.103)	0.001 ***
EE.Group6	–	–	–	–	-0.378 (0.107)	< 0.001 ***
EE.Group7	–	–	–	–	-0.440 (0.104)	< 0.001 ***
Random Effects (Variance / Std. Dev.)						
Teacher:School (Intercept)	0.00061 (0.025)	–	0.00023 (0.015)	–	0 (0)	–
School (Intercept)	0.00120 (0.035)	–	0.00091 (0.030)	–	0 (0)	–
Residual	0.020 (0.143)	–	0.023 (0.152)	–	0.020 (0.143)	–
aAIC	-118.95	–	-99.06	–	-114.92	–

Note: Adjusted Akaike Information Criterion (aAIC) is used to compare model fit while accounting for sample size and complexity. Lower values indicate better fit.

Significant level: <0.001 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1

The distribution of BMI across various energy expenditure (EE) groups is shown in Figure 10. The trend shows that the median BMI tends to decline as energy expenditure declines across a variety of groups and techniques. This finding is in line with the regression results. Although this result is statistically consistent, it seems contradictory because a lower BMI is typically assumed to be associated with higher energy expenditure since increased physical activity results in a greater expenditure of calories. This association could be explained by a number of reasons. First, it is important to note that the maximum BMI among subjects was only 26.99. According to established guidelines, a BMI of 25 indicates overweight and 30 indicates obesity in children [Dietz and Bellizzi (1999)]. Thus, the subject with the highest BMI was only categorized as overweight, with 95% of subjects having a BMI below 25. Second, the subjects in this study are children aged 9–13, usually in a developmental stage. During this period, energy expenditure patterns can differ widely depending on growth spurts, metabolic changes, and puberty status [Cheng, Amatoury and Steinbeck (2016); Pfeiffer et al. (2006)]. Children with higher BMI may naturally expend more energy due to the increased metabolic cost, even if their physical activity levels are lower [Treuth et al. (1998)]. Third, the observed energy expenditure might not accurately reflect levels of physical activity. It could be influenced by factors including genetics, sleep patterns, and diet [Ravussin and Bogardus (1989); Markwald et al. (2013); Vujović et al. (2022)]. Despite participating in less physical activity, children who have lower energy expenditure may also have lower calorie intake, which results in a lower BMI [Thivel et al. (2013)].




FIG 10. *BIM range among different groups and methods*

5. Discussion. In order to overcome the difficulties caused by measurement errors in data analysis, we proposed a pairwise mixed effect model (FMEC) in this manuscript. The clustering results can be severely impacted by measurement errors, especially in situations when sample sizes are small or error is high. Our approach is to increase robustness and reliability in these kinds of situations. To assess the FMEC method's performance in various settings, simulations show that FMEC operates consistently effectively, showing particular benefits in situations with high measurement errors and small sample size. However, FMEC

is less effective in compound symmetry correlation. The FMEC model fits the data better than the Average and Naive methods, particularly in datasets with small sample sizes, according to the application of the FMEC method to actual datasets. The FMEC method produced better clustering results and fit the data better than the Average and Naive approaches. The use of FMEC in a variety of circumstances and with more correlation structures may be investigated in future research. The method's applicability could be further expanded by expanding it to include multivariate functional responses or dynamic measurement error structures.

Acknowledgments. This research was supported by an award from the National Institutes of Diabetes, Digestive, and Kidney Disease Award number R01DK132385. This research was also supported in part by Lilly Endowment, Inc., through its support for the Indiana University Pervasive Technology Institute.

The author(s) used ChatGPT during the preparation of this work to refine the writing and enhance readability. The content were subsequently reviewed and edited as necessary and the author(s) take full responsibility for the final publication.

REFERENCES

- ANTONIADIS, A., BROSSAT, X., CUGLIARI, J. and POGGI, J.-M. (2013). Clustering functional data using wavelets. *International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing* **11** 1350003.
- BAÍLLO, A., CUEVAS, A. and FRAIMAN, R. (2010). *Classification methods for functional data*. Oxford University Press.
- BASSETT, D. R. (2012). Device-based monitoring in physical activity and public health research. *Physiological measurement* **33** 1769.
- BASSETT JR, D. R. (2000). Validity and reliability issues in objective monitoring of physical activity. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport* **71** 30–36.
- BENDEN, M. E., ZHAO, H., JEFFREY, C. E., WENDEL, M. L. and BLAKE, J. J. (2014). The evaluation of the impact of a stand-biased desk on energy expenditure and physical activity for elementary school students. *International journal of environmental research and public health* **11** 9361–9375.
- BLAND, J. M. and ALTMAN, D. G. (1996). Measurement error. *BMJ: British medical journal* **312** 1654.
- BOULLÉ, M. (2012). Functional data clustering via piecewise constant nonparametric density estimation. *Pattern Recognition* **45** 4389–4401.
- BOUND, J., BROWN, C. and MATHIOWETZ, N. (2001). Measurement error in survey data. In *Handbook of econometrics*, **5** 3705–3843. Elsevier.
- BOUYEYRON, C. and JACQUES, J. (2011). Model-based clustering of time series in group-specific functional subspaces. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* **5** 281–300.
- CAI, Z., FAN, J. and YAO, Q. (2000). Functional-coefficient regression models for nonlinear time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **95** 941–956.
- CAI, T. T. and HALL, P. (2006). Prediction in functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **34** 2159–2179.
- CENTOFANTI, F., LEPORE, A. and PALUMBO, B. (2023). Sparse and smooth functional data clustering. *Statistical Papers* 1–31.
- CHAMROUKHI, F. and NGUYEN, H. D. (2019). Model-based clustering and classification of functional data. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **9** e1298.
- CHENG, H. L., AMATOURY, M. and STEINBECK, K. (2016). Energy expenditure and intake during puberty in healthy nonobese adolescents: a systematic review. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **104** 1061–1074.
- CHIOU, J.-M. and LI, P.-L. (2007). Functional clustering and identifying substructures of longitudinal data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **69** 679–699.
- COOPER, M. C. and MILLIGAN, G. W. (1988). The effect of measurement error on determining the number of clusters in cluster analysis. In *Data, expert knowledge and decisions: An interdisciplinary approach with emphasis on marketing applications* 319–328. Springer.
- CRAINICEANU, C. M., STAIUCU, A.-M. and DI, C.-Z. (2009). Generalized multilevel functional regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104** 1550–1561.
- CUEVAS, A. (2014). A partial overview of the theory of statistics with functional data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **147** 1–23.
- CUI, E., LEROUX, A., SMIRNOVA, E. and CRAINICEANU, C. M. (2022). Fast univariate inference for longitudinal functional models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **31** 219–230.

- DELAIGLE, A. and HALL, P. (2012). Achieving near perfect classification for functional data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **74** 267–286.
- DIETZ, W. H. and BELLIZZI, M. C. (1999). Introduction: the use of body mass index to assess obesity in children. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **70** 123S–125S.
- FAN, J., HAN, F. and LIU, H. (2014). Challenges of big data analysis. *National science review* **1** 293–314.
- FERRARI, P., FRIEDENREICH, C. and MATTHEWS, C. E. (2007). The role of measurement error in estimating levels of physical activity. *American journal of epidemiology* **166** 832–840.
- FERRATY, F. (2006). *Nonparametric functional data analysis*. Springer.
- FERREIRA, L. and HITCHCOCK, D. B. (2009). A comparison of hierarchical methods for clustering functional data. *Communications in statistics-simulation and computation* **38** 1925–1949.
- CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION (2023). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Accessed: 2023-11-03.
- FRALEY, C. and RAFTERY, A. E. (1998a). How many clusters? Which clustering method? Answers via model-based cluster analysis. *The computer journal* **41** 578–588.
- FRALEY, C. and RAFTERY, A. (1998b). MCLUST: Software for model-based cluster and discriminant analysis. *Department of Statistics, University of Washington: Technical Report* **342** 1312.
- FRALEY, C., RAFTERY, A. E., MURPHY, T. B. and SCRUCICA, L. (2012). mclust version 4 for R: normal mixture modeling for model-based clustering, classification, and density estimation Technical Report, Citeseer.
- FU, S. (2019). Clustering and modelling of phase variation for functional data, PhD thesis, University of British Columbia.
- FULLER, W. A. (2009). *Measurement error models*. John Wiley & Sons.
- FULLER, D., COLWELL, E., LOW, J., ORYCHOCK, K., TOBIN, M. A., SIMANGO, B., BUOTE, R., VAN HEERDEN, D., LUAN, H., CULLEN, K. et al. (2020). Reliability and validity of commercially available wearable devices for measuring steps, energy expenditure, and heart rate: systematic review. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* **8** e18694.
- GALEANO, P., JOSEPH, E. and LILLO, R. E. (2015). The Mahalanobis distance for functional data with applications to classification. *Technometrics* **57** 281–291.
- GALVANI, M., TORTI, A., MENAFOGLIO, A. and VANTINI, S. (2021). FunCC: A new bi-clustering algorithm for functional data with misalignment. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **160** 107219.
- GIACOFI, M., LAMBERT-LACROIX, S., MAROT, G. and PICARD, F. (2013). Wavelet-based clustering for mixed-effects functional models in high dimension. *Biometrics* **69** 31–40.
- GOIA, A., MAY, C. and FUSAI, G. (2010). Functional clustering and linear regression for peak load forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting* **26** 700–711.
- GOLDSMITH, J., BOBB, J., CRAINICEANU, C. M., CAFFO, B. and REICH, D. (2011). Penalized functional regression. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics* **20** 830–851.
- GOLOVKINE, S., KLUTCHNIKOFF, N. and PATILEA, V. (2022). Clustering multivariate functional data using unsupervised binary trees. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **168** 107376.
- GREVEN, S. and SCHEIPL, F. (2017). A general framework for functional regression modelling. *Statistical Modelling* **17** 1–35.
- GUO, Y., TIERNEY, S. and GAO, J. (2020). Robust functional manifold clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* **32** 777–787.
- GUPTA, A. K. and SARDANA, N. (2015). Significance of clustering coefficient over jaccard index. In *2015 Eighth International Conference on Contemporary Computing (IC3)* 463–466. IEEE.
- HAEL, M. A., MA, H. Q., AL-KUHALI, H. A. and RIZK, Z. (2023). Quantile-based Clustering for Functional Data via Modelling Functional Principal Components Scores. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **2449** 012016. IOP Publishing.
- HUBERT, L. and ARABIE, P. (1985). Comparing partitions. *Journal of classification* **2** 193–218.
- IEVA, F., PAGANONI, A. M. and TARABELLONI, N. (2016). Covariance-based clustering in multivariate and functional data analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17** 1–21.
- JACCARD, P. (1912). The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. 1. *New phytologist* **11** 37–50.
- JACQUES, J. and PREDA, C. (2013). Funclust: A curves clustering method using functional random variables density approximation. *Neurocomputing* **112** 164–171.
- JACQUES, J. and PREDA, C. (2014a). Functional data clustering: a survey. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* **8** 231–255.
- JACQUES, J. and PREDA, C. (2014b). Model-based clustering for multivariate functional data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **71** 92–106.
- JAKICIC, J. M., POWELL, K. E., CAMPBELL, W. W., DIPIETRO, L., PATE, R. R., PESCATELLO, L. S., COLLINS, K. A., BLOODGOOD, B., PIERCY, K. L., COMMITTEE, . P. A. G. A. et al. (2019). Physical activity and the prevention of weight gain in adults: a systematic review. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **51** 1262.

- JAMES, G. M. and SUGAR, C. A. (2003). Clustering for sparsely sampled functional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **98** 397–408.
- JAMES, G. M., WANG, J. and ZHU, J. (2009). Functional linear regression that's interpretable. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 2083–2108.
- JUSTEL, A. and SVARC, M. (2016). Sequential Clustering for Functional Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.03640*.
- KATINA, S., VITTEERT, L. and W. BOWMAN, A. (2021). Functional data analysis and visualisation of three-dimensional surface shape. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* **70** 691–713.
- KOKOSZKA, P. and REIMHERR, M. (2017). *Introduction to functional data analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- KOWAL, D. R. (2021). Dynamic regression models for time-ordered functional data. *Bayesian Analysis* **16** 459–487.
- KRAUS, W. E., JANZ, K. F., POWELL, K. E., CAMPBELL, W. W., JAKICIC, J. M., TROIANO, R. P., SPROW, K., TORRES, A., PIERCY, K. L., COMMITTEE, . P. A. G. A. et al. (2019). Daily step counts for measuring physical activity exposure and its relation to health. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **51** 1206.
- KRIVOBOKOVA, T. and KAUERMANN, G. (2007). A note on penalized spline smoothing with correlated errors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102** 1328–1337.
- KUMAR, M. and PATEL, N. R. (2007). Clustering data with measurement errors. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **51** 6084–6101.
- LENG, X. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2006). Classification using functional data analysis for temporal gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* **22** 68–76.
- LEVITIN, D. J., NUZZO, R. L., VINES, B. W. and RAMSAY, J. (2007). Introduction to functional data analysis. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne* **48** 135.
- LI, P.-L. and CHIOU, J.-M. (2011). Identifying cluster number for subspace projected functional data clustering. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **55** 2090–2103.
- LI, Y. and GUAN, Y. (2014). Functional principal component analysis of spatiotemporal point processes with applications in disease surveillance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109** 1205–1215.
- LIM, Y., OH, H.-S. and CHEUNG, Y. K. (2019). Functional clustering of accelerometer data via transformed input variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* **68** 495–520.
- LIN, X. and CARROLL, R. J. (2000). Nonparametric function estimation for clustered data when the predictor is measured without/with error. *Journal of the American statistical Association* **95** 520–534.
- LIN, Z., MÜLLER, H.-G. and YAO, F. (2018). Mixture inner product spaces and their application to functional data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* **46** 370–400.
- MA, P. and ZHONG, W. (2008). Penalized clustering of large-scale functional data with multiple covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **103** 625–636.
- MA, P., CASTILLO-DAVIS, C. I., ZHONG, W. and LIU, J. S. (2006). A data-driven clustering method for time course gene expression data. *Nucleic acids research* **34** 1261–1269.
- MARKWALD, R. R., MELANSON, E. L., SMITH, M. R., HIGGINS, J., PERREAULT, L., ECKEL, R. H. and WRIGHT JR, K. P. (2013). Impact of insufficient sleep on total daily energy expenditure, food intake, and weight gain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110** 5695–5700.
- MARTINO, A., GHIGLIETTI, A., IEVA, F. and PAGANONI, A. M. (2019). A k-means procedure based on a Mahalanobis type distance for clustering multivariate functional data. *Statistical Methods & Applications* **28** 301–322.
- MATTHEWS, J., ALTMAN, D. G., CAMPBELL, M. and ROYSTON, P. (1990). Analysis of serial measurements in medical research. *British Medical Journal* **300** 230–235.
- MATTHEWS, C. E., HAGSTRÖMER, M., POBER, D. M. and BOWLES, H. R. (2012). Best practices for using physical activity monitors in population-based research. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **44** S68.
- MILLER, F., NEILL, J. and WANG, H. (2008). Nonparametric clustering of functional data. *Statistics and its interface* **1** 47–62.
- MISUMI, T., MATSUI, H. and KONISHI, S. (2019). Multivariate functional clustering and its application to typhoon data. *Behaviormetrika* **46** 163–175.
- MORRIS, J. S. (2015). Functional regression. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **2** 321–359.
- NGUYEN, H. D., MCLACHLAN, G. J., ULLMANN, J. F. and JANKE, A. L. (2016). Faster Functional Clustering via Gaussian Mixture Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05481*.
- OLDHAM, P. (1962). A note on the analysis of repeated measurements of the same subjects. *Journal of chronic diseases* **15** 969–977.
- PANKOWSKA, P. and OBERSKI, D. L. (2020). The effect of measurement error on clustering algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11743*.
- PARK, J. and AHN, J. (2017). Clustering multivariate functional data with phase variation. *Biometrics* **73** 324–333.
- PETRONE, S., GUINDANI, M. and GELFAND, A. E. (2009). Hybrid Dirichlet mixture models for functional data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **71** 755–782.

- PFEIFFER, K. A., SCHMITZ, K. H., MCMURRAY, R. G., TREUTH, M. S., MURRAY, D. M. and PATE, R. R. (2006). Physical activities in adolescent girls: variability in energy expenditure. *American journal of preventive medicine* **31** 328–331.
- PINTO, F. R., CARRIÇO, J. A., RAMIREZ, M. and ALMEIDA, J. S. (2007). Ranked Adjusted Rand: integrating distance and partition information in a measure of clustering agreement. *BMC bioinformatics* **8** 1–13.
- PULIDO, B., FRANCO-PEREIRA, A. M. and LILLO, R. E. (2021). Functional clustering via multivariate clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00217*.
- QU, Z., DAI, W. and GENTON, M. G. (2023). Robust two-layer partition clustering of sparse multivariate functional data. *Econometrics and Statistics*.
- RAMSAY, J. O. (1982). When the data are functions. *Psychometrika* **47** 379–396.
- RAMSAY, J. O. (1988). Monotone regression splines in action. *Statistical science* 425–441.
- RAMSAY, J. O. and DALZELL, C. (1991). Some tools for functional data analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **53** 539–561.
- RAMSAY, J., HOOKER, G., GRAVES, S., RAMSAY, J., HOOKER, G. and GRAVES, S. (2009). Introduction to functional data analysis. *Functional data analysis with R and MATLAB* 1–19.
- RAND, W. M. (1971). Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods. *Journal of the American Statistical association* **66** 846–850.
- RAVUSSIN, E. and BOGARDUS, C. (1989). Relationship of genetics, age, and physical fitness to daily energy expenditure and fuel utilization. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **49** 968–975.
- RAY, S. and MALLICK, B. (2006). Functional clustering by Bayesian wavelet methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **68** 305–332.
- REINSCH, C. H. (1967). Smoothing by spline functions. *Numerische mathematik* **10** 177–183.
- RIGON, T. (2023). An enriched mixture model for functional clustering. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry* **39** 232–250.
- ROMANO, S., VINH, N. X., BAILEY, J. and VERSPOOR, K. (2016). Adjusting for chance clustering comparison measures. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17** 1–32.
- ROSSI, F., CONAN-GUEZ, B. and EL GOLLI, A. (2004). Clustering functional data with the SOM algorithm. In *ESANN* 305–312. Citeseer.
- ROSSI, F. and VILLA, N. (2006). Support vector machine for functional data classification. *Neurocomputing* **69** 730–742.
- ROSSI, F., DELANNAY, N., CONAN-GUEZ, B. and VERLEYSSEN, M. (2005). Representation of functional data in neural networks. *Neurocomputing* **64** 183–210.
- RUGGIERI, M., PLAIA, A. and DI SALVO, F. (2018). Comparing spatial and spatio-temporal fpc to impute large continuous gaps in space. In *Classification, (Big) Data Analysis and Statistical Learning* 201–208. Springer.
- SCHUKAT, M., MCCALDIN, D., WANG, K., SCHREIER, G., LOVELL, N. H., MARSCHOLLEK, M. and REDMOND, S. J. (2016). Unintended consequences of wearable sensor use in healthcare. *Yearbook of medical informatics* **25** 73–86.
- SENEVIRATNE, S., HU, Y., NGUYEN, T., LAN, G., KHALIFA, S., THILAKARATHNA, K., HASSAN, M. and SENEVIRATNE, A. (2017). A survey of wearable devices and challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* **19** 2573–2620.
- SINGH, M. A. and PATIL, V. (2017). Two Layer k-means based Consensus Clustering for Rural Health Information System. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*.
- SLAETS, L., CLAESKENS, G. and HUBERT, M. (2012). Phase and amplitude-based clustering for functional data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **56** 2360–2374.
- SONG, W., OH, H.-S., CHEUNG, Y. K. and LIM, Y. (2023). Multi-feature clustering of step data using multivariate functional principal component analysis. *Statistical Papers* 1–26.
- SRIVASTAVA, A., KLASSEN, E. P., SRIVASTAVA, A. and KLASSEN, E. P. (2016). Motivation for Function and Shape Analysis. *Functional and Shape Data Analysis* 1–19.
- STRAIN, T., WIJNDAELE, K., DEMPSEY, P. C., SHARP, S. J., PEARCE, M., JEON, J., LINDSAY, T., WAREHAM, N. and BRAGE, S. (2020). Wearable-device-measured physical activity and future health risk. *Nature medicine* **26** 1385–1391.
- TARPEY, T. and KINATEDER, K. K. (2003). Clustering functional data. *Journal of classification* **20**.
- TEKWE, C. D., ZOH, R. S., YANG, M., CARROLL, R. J., HONVOH, G., ALLISON, D. B., BENDEN, M. and XUE, L. (2019). Instrumental variable approach to estimating the scalar-on-function regression model with measurement error with application to energy expenditure assessment in childhood obesity. *Statistics in medicine* **38** 3764–3781.
- THIVEL, D., AUCCOUTURIER, J., DOUCET, É., SAUNDERS, T. J. and CHAPUT, J.-P. (2013). Daily energy balance in children and adolescents. Does energy expenditure predict subsequent energy intake? *Appetite* **60** 58–64.

- TREUTH, M., FIGUEROA-COLON, R., HUNTER, G., WEINSIER, R., BUTTE, N. and GORAN, M. (1998). Energy expenditure and physical fitness in overweight vs non-overweight prepubertal girls. *International Journal of Obesity* **22** 440–447.
- ULLAH, S. and FINCH, C. F. (2013). Applications of functional data analysis: A systematic review. *BMC medical research methodology* **13** 1–12.
- VITELLI, V. (2023). A novel framework for joint sparse clustering and alignment of functional data. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 1–30.
- VUJOVIĆ, N., PIRON, M. J., QIAN, J., CHELLAPPA, S. L., NEDELTCHEVA, A., BARR, D., HENG, S. W., KERLIN, K., SRIVASTAV, S., WANG, W. et al. (2022). Late isocaloric eating increases hunger, decreases energy expenditure, and modifies metabolic pathways in adults with overweight and obesity. *Cell metabolism* **34** 1486–1498.
- WANG, Y. (1998). Smoothing spline models with correlated random errors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **93** 341–348.
- WANG, J.-L., CHIOU, J.-M. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and its application* **3** 257–295.
- WANG, S., ZHANG, W., CAO, G. and HUANG, Y. (2024). Functional data analysis using deep neural networks. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* **16** e70001.
- WARD, J. R. and CLARKSON, P. J. (2004). An analysis of medical device-related errors: prevalence and possible solutions. *Journal of medical engineering & technology* **28** 2–21.
- WEI, T. and WANG, B. (2023). A Novel Curve Clustering Method for Functional Data: Applications to COVID-19 and Financial Data. *Analytics* **2** 781–808.
- XIAN, C., DE SOUZA, C., JEWELL, J. and DIAS, R. (2022). Clustering functional data via variational inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13716*.
- XIAN, C., DE SOUZA, C. P., JEWELL, J. and DIAS, R. (2024). Clustering functional data via variational inference. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* 1–50.
- ZHANG, W. and DI, Y. (2020). Model-based clustering with measurement or estimation errors. *Genes* **11** 185.
- ZHANG, M. and PARNELL, A. (2023). Review of clustering methods for functional data. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* **17** 1–34.
- ZHANG, Y. and TELESKA, D. (2014). Joint clustering and registration of functional data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.7134*.
- ZHONG, Q., LIN, H. and LI, Y. (2021). Cluster non-Gaussian functional data. *Biometrics* **77** 852–865.
- ZHU, H., VERSACE, F., CINCIRIPINI, P. M., RAUSCH, P. and MORRIS, J. S. (2018). Robust and Gaussian spatial functional regression models for analysis of event-related potentials. *NeuroImage* **181** 501–512.
- ZOH, R. S., LUAN, Y., XUE, L., ALLISON, D. B. and TEKWE, C. D. (2024). A Bayesian semi-parametric scalar-on-function regression with measurement error using instrumental variables. *Statistics in Medicine* **43** 4043–4054.