

Fuzzy clustering of distribution-valued data using adaptive L_2 Wasserstein distances

Antonio Irpino and Rosanna Verde²

Second University of Naples, Dept. of Political Sciences, 81100 Caserta, Italy

Francisco de A.T. De Carvalho¹

*Centro de Informatica, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco,
Av. Jornalista Anibal Fernandes s/n - Cidade Universitaria,
CEP 50740-560, Recife-PE, Brazil*

Abstract

Distributional (or distribution-valued) data are a new type of data arising from several sources and are considered as realizations of distributional variables. A new set of fuzzy c-means algorithms for data described by distributional variables is proposed.

The algorithms use the L_2 Wasserstein distance between distributions as dissimilarity measures. Beside the extension of the fuzzy c-means algorithm for distributional data, and considering a decomposition of the squared L_2 Wasserstein distance, we propose a set of algorithms using different automatic way to compute the weights associated with the variables as well as with their components, globally or cluster-wise. The relevance weights are computed in the clustering process introducing product-to-one constraints. The relevance weights induce adaptive distances expressing the importance of each variable or of each component in the clustering process, acting also as a variable selection method in clustering. We have tested the proposed algorithms on artificial and real-world data. Results confirm that the proposed methods are able to better take into account the cluster structure of the data with respect to the standard fuzzy c-means, with non-adaptive distances.

Keywords: Distribution-valued data, Wasserstein distance, Fuzzy clustering, Relevance weights

2010 MSC: 62H30, 62H86, 62A86

¹antonio.irpino@unina2.it, rosanna.verde@unina2.it

²fatc@cin.ufpe.br

1. Introduction

One of the current big-data age requirement is the possibility of representing groups of data by summaries allowing the minimum loss of information as possible. This is usually done by replacing the distributional data with a set of characteristic values of the distributions (e.g.: the mean, the standard deviation). When a set of data is observed with respect to a numerical variable, it is usual to refer at the empirical distribution or at the estimate of the distribution that best fits the data. In this case, each object is described by a distribution-valued data and the variable is called *distributional variable* (or distributional feature). Such kinds of data can also be used in many practical situations, for instance, for preserving the respondents' privacy of customers of a bank or of patients of a hospital. Further, the rising of wireless sensor networks and of mobile devices, where the communication is constrained by the energy limitations of the devices, suggests that the use of suitable synthesis of sensed data is a necessary choice.

Distributional variables were firstly introduced in the context of *Symbolic Data Analysis* (SDA) [1] as particular set-valued variables, namely, modal variables having numeric support. For example, a *histogram variable* is a particular type of distributional variable whose values are histograms. Thus, we call *distributional variable* a more general type of attribute whose values are probability or frequency distributions on a numeric support.

Among the exploratory tools of analysis, clustering is considered a typical tool for unsupervised learning. Such a method aims to aggregate a set of objects into clusters such that objects within a given cluster are similar, while objects belonging to different clusters are not. Clustering algorithms are mainly distinguished in agglomerative and partitive methods. The agglomerative ones are also known as hierarchical methods. They yield a complete hierarchy, i.e., a nested sequence of partitions of the input data. On the other hand, partitive methods aim to obtain a single partition of the data into a fixed number of clusters, usually, iterating a set of steps by optimizing an objective function [2, 3] that is generally defined accordingly to a suitable dissimilarity or distance measure between objects.

Moreover, partitive methods can be divided in hard and fuzzy clustering. Hard clustering provides a crisp partition of a dataset, such that, each object belongs only to a cluster. A more flexible method is fuzzy clustering [4], where a fuzzy partition of data allows an object to belong to one or more clusters according to a membership degree [5].

The present paper introduces a new method of fuzzy clustering for objects described by distributional features. In fuzzy clustering the choice of a suitable distance between objects is relevant. More recently, in the field

of the analysis of distributional data, the use of Wasserstein distances [6] has been investigated and a new set of statistical indexes has been proposed [7]. In particular the L_2 Wasserstein distance has been used for the (hard) clustering of data described by histograms, a particular type of distribution-valued description [8, 9, 10, 11]. In [8, 10, 11], following the approach of SDA, a generalization of the Dynamic Clustering (DC) algorithm [12] has been proposed for distribution-valued data. The DC, whose k-means is a particular case, is a two steps algorithm: it alternates a representation and an allocation step, such that a within homogeneity criterion is minimized. Other approaches can be referred to [13], where it is proposed a k-means clustering method using empirical joint distributions, and to [14] where a Dynamic Clustering algorithm based on the copula analysis is proposed.

A common problem in classical clustering methods is that all the variables participate with the same importance to the clustering process.

Indeed, in most applications, some variables may be more discriminant in the clusters separation than others as well a cluster may be better characterized by a particular subset of variables with respect to another. For taking into consideration the different role of the variables, several strategies has been adopted. A first strategy consists in weighting in advance the features according to a background knowledge. After fixing the weights for each variable, a clustering is performed and a partition is obtained. A second strategy consists in including in the algorithm a step in order to compute automatically weights for the variable. In order to tackle this issue, in the clustering of classical real-valued data, Ref. [15] proposed to integrate adaptive distances. The use of adaptive distances in the clustering algorithm consists in introducing a weighting step in the optimization process. In this step a set of weights are obtained minimizing the total sum of squares criterion. Such weights are associated with each variable (for all the clusters or for each cluster) and represents a measure of the importance of a variable in the clustering process. Such a strategy can be a way for performing a feature selection in clustering process too, see [16].

In the framework of SDA, Refs.[17, 18, 19] proposed several adaptive distances, based on Hausdorff, City-Block and Euclidean distances in dynamic clustering algorithm of set-valued data. A more recent contribution [20] provides a partitioning hard clustering algorithm using an adaptive distance based on the L_2 Wasserstein metric. The authors propose two novel adaptive distances based on clustering schemes able to compute automatically the relevance of each distributional variable during the partitioning of the data set, under a product to one constraint of the relevance weights. In the framework of k-means with automatic relevance weights estimation a second approach was proposed for classical data in [21], where a sum to one constraint on the

weights is imposed. We do not extend this method because it depends on the setting of further parameters for the clustering that would imply a longer discussion about its choice.

The most clustering algorithms proposed for distribution-valued data (adaptive distance based or not) are partitioning *hard* clustering methods. However, particular structures of the observed distribution-valued data could give clusters not well separated and with a high internal variability due to the presence of some data that are forced to belong to only one cluster. In this case, a more suitable algorithm is the *fuzzy* clustering. According to that, an observation can be assigned to more than one cluster with a membership degree that expresses the similarity of this element to the representative element (prototype) of each cluster. Usually the membership degrees of an observation to the several clusters are valued in $[0, 1]$ and, on all clusters, sum to 1 [4].

Main contributions

This paper extends Refs. [8, 9, 10, 11] by proposing a fuzzy c-means clustering algorithm, in a more general scheme of Dynamical Clustering algorithm, for distributional data, based on the L_2 Wasserstein distance, denoted as: *Fuzzy c-means with non adaptive L_2 Wasserstein distance (FCM-D)*. Further, using a decomposition of the L_2 Wasserstein distance [22] and considering the variability measures introduced in [11], the distance between two distributions can be divided in two independent components: one related to the variability of averages of the histograms and the second related to the shapes of the histograms. In this paper, adaptive distances take into account the two components of the variability also, and the algorithm estimates two sets of weights for each variable and each component. In a local approach we consider also a different set of weights for each cluster.

Especially, the proposed fuzzy clustering algorithm, based on adaptive distances, is an alternating three steps procedure that estimates, step by step, the membership values of the observed distributions to the clusters, the weights for each variable and each component, as well as the cluster prototypes.

Beside extending the methods above discussed, we also propose two new variants of the algorithms taking into consideration two new set of constraints.

Application of simulated and real-world data will show that the new proposed settings are better able to identify the most important components of the variables for the fuzzy clustering also in presence of non discriminant variables in the cluster structure of data.

Organization of the paper

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Sec. 2 introduces to the distributional data and the L_2 Wasserstein distance between distributions. Sec. 3 details the proposed algorithms by defining the objective function minimized by each algorithm, the relevance weights for the variables or their components, and the derived adaptive distances for distributional data. In Sec. 4, the proposed algorithms are tested on synthetic datasets and a real world one. Sec. 5 concludes the paper.

2. Distribution-valued data and Wasserstein distance

A distributional variable takes values which are expressed by one-dimensional probability (empirical, or theoretical, parametric or non parametric) density functions. We assume that a set of N objects are described by P distributional variables. The vector $\mathbf{y}_k = [y_{k1}, \dots, y_{kP}]$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, is the description of the k -th object for the P distributional variable, where y_{kj} , $j = 1, \dots, P$, is a distribution-valued data. Whit y_{kj} is associated a (estimated) density function f_{kj} , which has its own F_{kj} cumulative distribution function and $Q_{kj} = F_{kj}^{-1}$ quantile function. Thus, the individuals \times variables table of input data contains a (one dimensional) distribution in each cell.

As told in the previous section, the choice of a suitable distance is crucial in the clustering process. Several distances between distribution functions [23] can be used for comparing density or frequency distributions. However, not all the distances are appropriate in prototype-based clustering methods for distributional data, like in k-means or fuzzy c-means. In this case, the family of distances based on Wasserstein metric [6] permits to obtain interesting interpretative results about the characteristics of the distributions with respect to other dissimilarity measures between distributions (see [11] for details).

According to [6], the L_2 squared Wasserstein distance between two distribution-valued data is:

$$d_W^2(y_{kj}, y_{k'j}) = \int_0^1 [Q_{kj}(t) - Q_{k'j}(t)]^2 dt. \quad (1)$$

Let \bar{y}_{kj} and $\bar{y}_{k'j}$ be the means (or the expected values) of, respectively, y_{kj} and $y_{k'j}$, we denote with $Q_{kj}^c(t) = Q_{kj}(t) - \bar{y}_{kj}$ and $Q_{k'j}^c(t) = Q_{k'j}(t) - \bar{y}_{k'j}$ the corresponding centered (w.r.t. their respective means) quantile functions, and with y_{kj}^c and $y_{k'j}^c$ the corresponding *centered* distribution-valued data.

In [24] is shown a decomposition of the L_2 Wasserstein distance into two components, that is:

$$d_W^2(y_{kj}, y_{k'j}) = (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{y}_{k'j})^2 + d_W^2(y_{kj}^c, y_{k'j}^c). \quad (2)$$

In other words, the (squared) L_2 Wasserstein distance between two quantile functions $Q_{kj}(t)$ and $Q_{k'j}(t)$ is decomposed in the squared Euclidean distance between their means and the squared L_2 Wasserstein distance between the *centered* quantile functions. The latter can be considered as a distance measure of the different characteristics of the distributions (variability and shape) except for their location. Given the input vector \mathbf{y}_k , since no information is available about the multivariate distribution associated to the marginal distributions y_{kj} , in this paper we consider the multivariate squared L_2 Wasserstein distance expressed as follows:

$$d_W^2(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{y}_{k'}) = \sum_{j=1}^P d_W^2(y_{kj}, y_{k'j}). \quad (3)$$

Adaptive distances

Adaptive distances [15] can be considered as distances that are weighted by a suitable set of scalars for each variable, accordingly to particular constraints. In this paper, we generalize the concept of adaptive distances [15] to the L_2 Wasserstein distance. Let us consider a vector of weights $\Lambda = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p]$ such that $\lambda_j > 0$. According to [17] and [15], a general formulation for an *Adaptive Single Variable (squared) Wasserstein distance* is:

$$d_W^2(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{y}_{k'} | \Lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^P \lambda_j d_W^2(y_{kj}, y_{k'j}). \quad (4)$$

Several approaches have been proposed in clustering (see for examples [18],[19]), where the weights are associated to whole set of data (namely, one for each variable) or they are cluster-wisely associated (namely, a weight for each variable and each cluster). In the mentioned approaches, the weights satisfy by a product to one constraint. This is related to the minimization of the determinant of within-cluster inertia matrix, with zero components outside the main diagonal. This would lead to the maximization of the determinant of the between-inertia matrix, that is, from a geometric point of view, the size of the highest hypervolume containing the representatives of the clusters.

Considering that the L_2 Wasserstein distance can be decomposed in two components, in hard clustering, [20] proposed to introduce a suitable system of weights on such components. This paper extends this approach to fuzzy

c-means of distributional data. Moreover, existing methods assign weights independently to the two components, making not comparable the components each other. The present paper introduces two new configurations of weights, accordingly to two new constraints, that solve such drawbacks.

3. Fuzzy c-means with adaptive Wasserstein distances

This section is concerned with fuzzy c-means algorithms that aim to cluster histogram-valued data based on adaptive L_2 Wasserstein distance. In the remainder of the paper we will use the following notation: objects are indexed by $k = 1, \dots, N$, variables are denoted by Y_j where $j = 1, \dots, P$, the distributional data observed on the Y_j variable for the k -th object is denoted with y_{kj} , clusters are indexed by $i = 1, \dots, c$, and the memberships degree of the k -th object to the i -th cluster is denoted with u_{ik} .

Fuzzy c-means is a prototype-based clustering method, namely, clusters are represented by prototypes and the membership degree of an object to a cluster depends on its distance from the cluster prototype with respect to the distances from the other ones. The definition of the prototypes and of the memberships depends on the minimization of a suitable within-cluster dispersion criterion that is based on the distance chosen for comparing objects and prototypes. We remark that prototypes are artifacts or fictitious objects described by a set of distributional data.

In the following, we present the criterion used in the algorithms for the standard (namely, without using adaptive distances) fuzzy c-means algorithm of distributional data using the L_2 Wasserstein distance. Then, we present the criteria used for different configurations of the relevance weights for the adaptive-distance-based fuzzy c-means. Each fuzzy cluster i ($i = 1, \dots, c$) has a representative or prototype $\mathbf{g}_i = (g_{i1}, \dots, g_{iP})$, where each g_{ij} is a distributional data, having a distribution function G_{ij} and a quantile function Q_{ij} .

3.1. Criterion function of standard fuzzy c-means (FCM)

Fixing a $m > 1$ scalar (the fuzzyfier parameter) the standard fuzzy c-means algorithm aims to provide a fuzzy partition of a set of N objects into K fuzzy clusters, represented by a positive matrix of membership degrees $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N)$ with $\mathbf{u}_k = (u_{k1}, \dots, u_{kc})$ ($k = 1, \dots, N$), such that $\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ki} = 1$, and a matrix of prototypes $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_c)$ of the fuzzy clusters.

They are obtained iteratively by (locally) minimizing a suitable objective function, here-below denoted with J , that gives the total homogeneity of

the fuzzy partition computed as the sum of the homogeneity in each fuzzy cluster:

$$J(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d_W^2(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i). \quad (5)$$

The d_W^2 function is the non-adaptive (squared) L_2 Wasserstein distance computed between the k -th object and the prototype \mathbf{g}_i of the fuzzy cluster i , which is defined as

$$d_W^2(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^P (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{y}_{g_{ij}})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^P d_W^2(y_{kj}^c, g_{ij}^c). \quad (6)$$

For the rest of the paper, we denote with $dM_{ik,j} = \sum_{j=1}^P (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{y}_{g_{ij}})^2$ the squared distance between the means of distributional data y_{kj} and $y_{g_{ij}}$, and with $dV_{ik,j} = \sum_{j=1}^P d_W^2(y_{kj}^c, g_{ij}^c)$ the squared L_2 Wasserstein distance between the centered (w.r.t. the respective means) distributional data. Equation 6 can be written in a compact formulation as follows:

$$d_W(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i) = dM_{ik,j} + dV_{ik,j}. \quad (7)$$

3.2. Criterion function of adaptive distance-based fuzzy c-means (AFCM)

Usually, clustering methods do not take into account the relevance of the variables, i.e., considering all the variables having the same importance in the clustering process. However, in most applications some variables may be irrelevant and, among the relevant ones, some may be more or less relevant than others. Furthermore, the relevance of each variable to each cluster may be different, i.e., each cluster may have a different set of relevant variables [21, 25, 26, 27].

The identification of a relevance weight for each variable in the clustering process is useful also as a feature selection method [28], for ranking variables, or, from a geometric point of view, for a better interpretation of how each variable contributes to the clusters definition. If relevance weights are clusterwisely computed, they provide an evidence of the role of each variable in determining the shape of each cluster (assuming that a different variability structure is observed for each cluster).

Recalling that L_2 Wasserstein distance consists in two components, the first related to the position and the second related to the internal variability structure of the distributions (namely, scale and shape), we propose to consider the relevance of each component of the distributional variable too.

In this case, the method we propose is a fuzzy clustering algorithm, which aims to provide a fuzzy partition of N objects around c prototypes, represented by a matrix of memberships $\mathbf{u}_k = (u_{k1}, \dots, u_{kc})$ ($k = 1, \dots, N$) and a matrix of positive relevance weights denoted by $\mathbf{\Lambda}$. The dimensions of the $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ matrix depends on the possibility of computing a set of P relevance weights, if a weight is associated with each variable for the whole dataset, $2P$ weights, if a weight is associated with each component of the variable for the whole dataset, $P \times c$ weights, if a weight is computed for each variable and each cluster, and, finally, $2P \times c$, if a weight is computed for each component and each cluster.

As the prototypes and the membership degrees, the relevance weights are not defined in advance, but are obtained by (locally) minimizing a suitable objective function, here-after denoted as J_A , the criterion function that gives the total homogeneity of the fuzzy partition computed as the sum of the homogeneity in each fuzzy cluster.

The minimum of the objective function J_A is obtained when $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a null matrix. For avoiding such a trivial result, a constraint on the elements of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is needed. In the literature, two main types of constraints are proposed: a product-to-one constraint[15] and a sum-to-one constraint[21]. Because the latter method require also the tuning of a further parameter, needing a deeper discussion, for the sake of brevity we do not treat it here.

Following the considerations about the relevance weights, we have four choices for the J_A criterion, depending on the choice between global and cluster-wise relevance weights and whether we assign a single weight for each variable or two weights for the components of the variable. The four criterion functions are summarized as follows:

Global for each variable: GV

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad (8)$$

with $\mathbf{\Lambda} = [\lambda_j]_{1 \times P}$, $dM_{ik,j} | \mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_j dM_{ik,j}$, $dV_{ik,j} | \mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_j dV_{ik,j}$ and

$$d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=1}^P [dM_{ik,j} | \mathbf{\Lambda} + dV_{ik,j} | \mathbf{\Lambda}] \quad (9)$$

Cluster-wise for each variable: CwV

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad (10)$$

with $\mathbf{\Lambda} = [\lambda_{ij}]_{c \times P}$, $dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{ij}dM_{ik,j}$, $dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{ij}dV_{ik,j}$ and

$$d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i|\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=1}^P [dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} + dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda}] \quad (11)$$

Global for each component: GC

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i|\mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad (12)$$

with $\mathbf{\Lambda} = [\lambda_{j,M}, \lambda_{j,V}]_{2 \times P}$, $dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{j,M}dM_{ik,j}$, $dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{j,V}dV_{ik,j}$ and

$$d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i|\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=1}^P [dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} + dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda}] \quad (13)$$

Cluster-wise for each component: CwC

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i|\mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad (14)$$

with

$\mathbf{\Lambda} = [\lambda_{ij,M}, \lambda_{ij,V}]_{2c \times P}$, $dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{ij,M}dM_{ik,j}$, $dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} = \lambda_{ij,V}dV_{ik,j}$ and

$$d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i|\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=1}^P [dM_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda} + dV_{ik,j}|\mathbf{\Lambda}] \quad (15)$$

where u_{ik} and m are defined as usual in fuzzy c-means.

These functions measures the within variability of clusters depending on the relevance weights, i.e., the homogeneity of clusters. As usual for the fuzzy c-means, the algorithm looks for a (local) minimum of J_A , bearing in mind that the local minimum depends on the initialization of the algorithm.

In the following, the criteria proposed in the literature, for crisp or fuzzy clustering, and two new criteria are presented for the product-to-one constraint on the four functions ins Eqs. (8, 10, 12, and 14).

Constraint for Eq. (8) See [25]:

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_j = 1, \lambda_j > 0 \quad (16)$$

A set of c constraints for Eq. (10) See [25]:

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij} = 1, \lambda_{ij} > 0 \quad (17)$$

A set of 2 constraints for Eq. (12) See [20]:

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{j,M} = 1, \lambda_{j,M} > 0 \text{ and } \prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{j,V} = 1, \lambda_{j,V} > 0 \quad (18)$$

A set of $2 \times c$ constraints for Eq. (14) See [20]:

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij,M} = 1, \lambda_{ij,M} > 0 \text{ and } \prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij,V} = 1, \lambda_{ij,V} > 0 \quad (19)$$

A new set of 2 constraints for Eq. (12) :

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{j,M} \lambda_{j,V} = 1, \lambda_{j,M} > 0, \lambda_{j,V} > 0 \quad (20)$$

A new set of $2 \times c$ constraints for Eq. (14) :

$$\prod_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij,M} \lambda_{ij,V} = 1, \lambda_{ij,M} > 0, \lambda_{ij,V} > 0 \quad (21)$$

Remark. The new proposed constraints are useful for comparing all the λ values both for the mean component and dispersion one, while those proposed in [20], allow comparisons separately for the two components. In other words, because of the decomposition of the distance, the sets of relevance weights are independently identified w.r.t. only the mean and the dispersion components of the distributional variables.

3.3. The optimization algorithm

This section provides the optimization algorithm aiming to compute the prototypes, the relevance weights (for the AFCM algorithm) and the fuzzy partition.

From an initial solution, for the FCM algorithm, the minimization of J is performed in two steps (computation of the prototypes and computation of the membership degrees), whereas for the AFCM algorithm, the minimization of J_A is performed in three steps (computation of the prototypes, computation of the relevance weights, and computation of the membership degrees).

3.3.1. Initialization

The results of the algorithms of c-means type, is sensitive to the initialization of membership degrees, or of initial centers. In this case, also an initialization strategy for choosing the initial values of the relevance weights for the variables (or the components) is needed. Among several approaches suggested in the literature [29], we adopt the following initialization strategy. The initialization step requires the definition of an initial of $\mathbf{U}^{(0)}$ matrix of membership degrees, of the $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(0)}$ matrix of relevance weights, and then the definition of an initial set $\mathbf{G}^{(0)}$ of prototypes. Being an iterative algorithm, in the superscript brackets we denoted the iteration of the algorithm, being (0) the initialization step. The $\mathbf{U}^{(0)}$ matrix is initialized by assigning, for each column a random vector of c positive scalars summing up to one. The $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(0)}$ matrix is initialized consistently with the constraints, giving an initial equal relevance to all the variables (or the components). Namely, we use a unitary matrix if the constraint is the product to one.

3.3.2. Computation of the prototypes

This section provides an algebraic solution for the optimal computation of the representative (prototype vector) of a fuzzy cluster.

For both algorithms FCM and AFCM, the first step consists in the computation of the \mathbf{G} matrix of the initial prototypes. With \mathbf{U} fixed for the FCM algorithm and with $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, \mathbf{U} fixed for the AFCM algorithm, by taking, respectively, the derivative of J and J_A with respect to the prototypes, the distributional description of the generic g_{ij} ($i = 1, \dots, c$, $j = 1, \dots, P$) element of the matrix of prototypes \mathbf{G} is computed from the following optimization problem:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m dM_{ik,j} + \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m dV_{ik,j}, \longrightarrow \text{Min} . \quad (22)$$

Recalling that $dM_{ik,j} = \sum_{j=1}^P (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{g}_{ij})^2$ and $dV_{ik,j} = \sum_{j=1}^P d_W^2(y_{kj}^C, g_{ij}^C)$, and that

$$d_W^2(y_{kj}^C, g_{ij}^C) = \int_0^1 [Q_{kj}^C(t) - Q_{ij}^C(t)]^2 dt,$$

where $Q_{kj}^C = Q_{kj} - \bar{y}_{kj}$ and $Q_{ij}^C = Q_{ij} - \bar{g}_{ij}$ are centered quantile functions, i.e. quantile function minus the respective means, the problem in Eq. (22) is solved by setting the partial derivatives, w.r.t. \bar{g}_{ij} and Q_{ij}^C to zero. According to [7], the quantile function associated with the g_{kj} pdf is obtained as follows:

$$Q_{ij} = Q_{ij}^C + \bar{g}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m Q_{kj}^C}{\sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m} + \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m \bar{g}_{kj}}{\sum_{k=N}^n (u_{ik})^m}, \quad (23)$$

3.3.3. Computation of the relevance weights

This section provides an optimal solution for the computation of the relevance weights, globally for all fuzzy clusters or cluster-wise for each fuzzy cluster, during the weighting step of AFCM algorithm.

For the AFCM algorithm, with \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{U} fixed, this step aims at computing the elements of the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ of relevance weights.

Proposition 1. *The vectors of relevance weights are computed according to the adaptive L_2 Wasserstein distance:*

II-a) *If*

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m \lambda_j d_W(y_{kj}, g_{ij})$$

is constrained by $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_j = 1$, $\lambda_j > 0$ the relevance weights are P and are computed as follows:

$$\lambda_j^{(t)} = \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m d_W \left(y_{kh}, g_{ih}^{(t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m d_W \left(y_{kj}, g_{ij}^{(t)} \right)} \quad (24)$$

II-b) *If*

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{j,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{j,V} dV_{ik,j}]$$

is subject to 2 constraints equal to $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{j,M} = 1$, $\lambda_{j,M} > 0$ and $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{j,V} = 1$, $\lambda_{j,V} > 0$ the relevance weights are $2 \times P$ and are computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{j,M}^{(t)} &= \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,j}^{(t)}}, \text{ and} \\
\lambda_{j,V}^{(t)} &= \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,j}^{(t)}}. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

II-c) If

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m \lambda_{ij} d_W(y_{kj}, g_{ij})$$

is subject to c constraints equal to $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij} = 1$, $\lambda_{ij} > 0$ the relevance weights are $c \times P$ and are computed as follows:

$$\lambda_{ij}^{(t)} = \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m d_W(y_{kh}, g_{ih}^{(t)}) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m d_W(y_{kj}, g_{ij}^{(t)})} \tag{26}$$

II-d) If

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{ij,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{ij,V} dV_{ik,j}]$$

is subject to $2 \times c \times P$ constraints equal to $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,M} = 1$, $\lambda_{ij,M} > 0$ and $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,V} = 1$, $\lambda_{ij,V} > 0$, the $2 \times c \times P$ relevance weights are computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ij,M}^{(t)} &= \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,j}^{(t)}} \text{ and} \\
\lambda_{ij,V}^{(t)} &= \frac{\left[\prod_{h=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,j}^{(t)}}. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

II-e) If

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{j,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{j,V} dV_{ik,j}]$$

is subject to the constraint equal to $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{j,M} \lambda_{j,V} = 1$, $\lambda_{j,M} > 0$, $\lambda_{j,V} > 0$, the relevance weights are $2 \times P$ and are computed as follows:

$$\lambda_{j,M}^{(t)} = \frac{\left\{ \prod_{h=1}^P \left[\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \left[\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2P}}}{\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,j}^{(t)}}, \text{ and}$$

$$\lambda_{j,V}^{(t)} = \frac{\left\{ \prod_{h=1}^P \left[\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \left[\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2P}}}{\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,j}^{(t)}}. \quad (28)$$

II-f) If

$$J_A(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{ij,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{ij,V} dV_{ik,j}]$$

is subject to $2 \times c \times P$ constraints equal to $\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,M} \lambda_{ij,V} = 1$, $\lambda_{ij,M} > 0$ and $\lambda_{ij,V} > 0$, the $2 \times c \times P$ relevance weights are computed as follows:

$$\lambda_{ij,M}^{(t)} = \frac{\left\{ \prod_{h=1}^P \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2P}}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,j}^{(t)}}, \text{ and}$$

$$\lambda_{ij,V}^{(t)} = \frac{\left\{ \prod_{h=1}^P \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dM_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,h}^{(t)} \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2P}}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left(u_{ik}^{(t-1)} \right)^m dV_{ik,j}^{(t)}}. \quad (29)$$

Proof. With \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{U} fixed, this step aims the computation of the matrix of relevance weights $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ assuming the constraints listed before. The minimization of the criterion J_A is obtained from the method of Lagrange Multipliers. The relevance weights are obtained by minimizing the following Lagrangian equations for the product-to-one constraints, as follows:

$$\mathbf{\Pi-a): } \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m \lambda_j d_W(y_{kj}, g_{ij}) - \theta \prod_{j=1}^P (\lambda_j - 1); \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi-b): } \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{j,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{j,V} dV_{ik,j}] + \\ & - \theta_M \prod_{j=1}^P (\lambda_{j,M} - 1) - \theta_V \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{j,V} - 1 \right); \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbf{\Pi-c): } \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m \lambda_{ij} d_W(y_{kj}, g_{ij}) - \sum_{i=1}^c \theta_i \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij} - 1 \right); \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi-d): } \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{ij,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{ij,V} dV_{ik,j}] + \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^c \theta_{i,M} \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,M} - 1 \right) - \sum_{i=1}^c \theta_{i,V} \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,V} - 1 \right); \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi-e): } \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{j,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{j,V} dV_{ik,j}] + \\ & - \theta \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{j,M} \lambda_{j,V} - 1 \right); \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi-f): } \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^P (u_{ik})^m [\lambda_{ij,M} dM_{ik,j} + \lambda_{ij,V} dV_{ik,j}] + \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^c \theta_i \left(\prod_{j=1}^P \lambda_{ij,M} \lambda_{ij,V} - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By setting the partial derivatives of \mathcal{L} with respect to the λ 's and the θ parameters, we obtain the system of equations of the first order condition.

The elements of the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ are determined by solving the respective system of equations. \square

3.3.4. Computation of the membership degrees

This section gives the optimal solution for the fuzzy cluster partition during the affectation step of the FCM and AFCM algorithms.

For FCM algorithm, with \mathbf{G} fixed, the second step computes the matrix of membership degrees \mathbf{U} assuming the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} = 1, u_{ik} \in [0, 1]$$

Let $A = \{i \in \{1, \dots, c\} : d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i) = 0\}$, where $d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i)$ is defined according to equation (6), i.e.,

$$d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^P (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{g}_{kj})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^P d_W^2(y_{ij}^C, g_{kj}^C)$$

- if $A = \emptyset$ (i.e., no object coincides with any of the representatives), the minimization of the criterion J is obtained from the method of Lagrange Multipliers:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i) - \sum_{k=1}^N \theta_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} - 1 \right)$$

By setting the derivatives of \mathcal{L} with respect to u_{ik} and θ_k to zero, we obtain the components of the matrix \mathbf{U} of membership degrees:

$$u_{ik} = \left[\sum_{h=1}^c \left(\frac{d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i)}{d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \right]^{-1} \quad (36)$$

- if $A \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\begin{cases} u_{ik} = 1/|A| & , \forall k \in A \\ u_{is} = 0 & , \forall s \notin A \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

For the AFCM algorithm with objective function defined according to equations from (8) to (14), and with \mathbf{G} and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ fixed, the third step computes the matrix of membership degrees \mathbf{U} assuming again the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} = 1, u_{ik} \in [0, 1].$$

Let $A = \{i \in \{1, \dots, c\} : d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \mathbf{\Lambda}) = 0\}$, where $d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \mathbf{\Lambda})$ is defined according to equations from (9) to (15),

- if $A = \emptyset$ (i.e., no object coincides with any of the representatives), the minimization of the criterion J_A is obtained from the method of Lagrange Multipliers:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^N (u_{ik})^m d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \Lambda) - \sum_{k=1}^N \theta_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} - 1 \right)$$

By setting the derivatives of \mathcal{L} with respect to u_{ik} and θ_k to zero, we obtain the components of the matrix \mathbf{U} of membership degrees:

$$u_{ik} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^c \left(\frac{d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_i | \Lambda)}{d(\mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{g}_h | \Lambda)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \right]^{-1} \quad (38)$$

- if $A \neq \emptyset$ then the membership degree u_{ik} is computed according to equation (37)

3.3.5. Algorithm

For the FCM algorithm, the two steps of computation of the prototypes and computation of the membership degrees are alternated until the convergence is obtained, i.e., the J value change is small. Moreover, for the AFCM algorithm, the three steps of computation of the prototypes, computation of the weights as well as computation of the membership degrees are alternated until the convergence is obtained, i.e., the J_A value change is small. The Algorithm 1 summarizes these steps.

4. Application

In this section, two applications are performed on synthetic datasets and on a real-world one. Three distribution-valued synthetic datasets are generated according to three scenarios of clustering structure. In this case, since the apriori membership of each object is known, the proposed methods are validated by using external validity indexes. External validity indexes are generally used in a confirmatory analysis, or when simulations are performed according to fixed generating processes of the data, or when two clusterings need to be compared. In general, external validity indexes compares the results of a clustering with respect to a predefined partition of the objects. As reported in [30], a number of indexes have been proposed for hard clustering. In the literature of fuzzy clustering validity assessment, two groups of indexes are discussed: a first group compare fuzzy clusterings to a crisp apriori assignment, while a second group assumes a fuzzy apriori assignment of data (for example, for comparing two fuzzy clusterings)(see, for example,

Algorithm 1 General algorithm for FCM and AFCM

input: \mathbf{Y} the $k \times P$ distributional data table,
 i (the number of clusters) and m (the fuzzifier parameter)
 T (maximum number of iterations),
 $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ (a tolerance parameter)
initialization: $t \leftarrow 0$; $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(0)} = \mathbf{1}$,
random initialization of $\mathbf{U}^{(0)}$
repeat
 $t \leftarrow t + 1$;
 (Representation step) Compute $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}$ using equation (23);
 (Weighting step) For AFCM method, compute $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(t)}$ using the suitable
 equation from Eq. (24) to Eq.(29)
 (Allocation step)
 For FCM method, compute $\mathbf{U}^{(t)}$ using the Eq. (36) or Eq. (37);
 For AFCM method, compute $\mathbf{U}^{(t)}$ using Eq. (38) or Eq. (37);
 (Objective function computation)
 For AFC method, $J(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)})$
 For AFCM method, $J_A(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}, \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)})$
until
For FCM method, $|J(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)}) - J(\mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t-1)})| < \varepsilon$ or $t > T$;
For AFCM method, $|J_A(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}, \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(t)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t)}) - J_A(\mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{U}^{(t-1)})| < \varepsilon$ or
 $t > T$;
output: $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{U}$

[31]). We remark that the second group can be considered a generalization of the first one when one of the two assignments is crisp. In this paper, when simulation on artificial data are proposed, we use the modified version of the *Rand*, *Jaccard*, *Folkes-Mallows* and *Hubert* indexes for fuzzy clustering algorithms proposed in [32].

The application on real-world dataset is performed on age-sex pyramids data collected by the Census Bureau of USA in 2014 on 228 countries. In this case, we use internal validity indexes for defining the number of fuzzy clusters. Validity indexes are either validity indexes defined for fuzzy c-means or fuzzy version of indexes used for crisp clustering algorithms.

A first group of validity indexes for FCM are the partition coefficient I_{PC} and the partition entropy I_{PE} , both proposed by [33], and the modified partition coefficient I_{MPC} [34]. They are based only on the memberships resulting from the algorithm and do not take into consideration the distances between objects and prototypes. A second set of internal validity indexes exploits the distances between objects for obtaining a measure of compactness and/or separation of the obtained solution. In particular, we used three indexes suitably modified for taking into account the adaptive distances. With respect to the original formulations, the Euclidean distance is substituted by the adaptive distances. In this case, three indexes are used for validating the algorithms: the Xie-Beni index (I_{XB}) [35], the fuzzy silhouette index (I_{FS}) [36], and quality of partition index (I_{QPI}) [37]. While I_{XB} and I_{FS} are useful also for discovering a suitable number of clusters, I_{QPI} does not since it is monotonic with respect the number of clusters. However, being I_{QPI} a generalization of the r-squared statistics, it is a relative measure of clustering separation ranging in $[0, 1]$, we use it for providing a comparison and an interpretation the obtained solutions of the different algorithms after than the number of clusters is fixed.

All the elaborations have been performed under the R³ environment and the scripts are provided as supplementary material.

4.1. Synthetic data

Wasserstein distance, even it was used for density functions, can be see as a norm between two quantile functions. With this in mind, we build several datasets where each object is described by distribution-valued data derived by a parametric family of quantile functions, such that each pair of quantile functions belongs to two different distributional variables. The generation of the quantile functions was done by using a model of quantile function

³<https://cran.r-project.org>




Figure 1: Quantile functions of three skew logistic distributions




Figure 2: Density functions associated with quantile functions in fig. 1

proposed by Gilchrist [38]. Denoting with $Q(p)$ the quantile observed for a level of $p \in [0, 1]$, Gilchrist [38] introduced a way for modeling the quantile function of a *skew logistic distribution*, depending on three parameters: γ a position parameter, $\eta > 0$ a scale parameter, and δ a skewness parameter taking value in $[-1; 1]$ (negative, resp. positive, values are associated to left-skewed, resp. right-skewed, distributions). The explicit formula of such quantile function is:

$$Q(t) = \gamma + \eta \left[\frac{1 - \delta}{2} (\ln t) - \ln(1 - t) \frac{1 + \delta}{2} \right] \quad t \in (0, 1). \quad (39)$$

In Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 are shown the quantile functions and the associated density functions of three examples of skew logistic distributions. This family of quantile functions are related to random variables having the following

expectation (denoted by μ) and standard deviation (denoted by σ):

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x \cdot f(x) dx = \int_0^1 Q(p) dp = \gamma + \eta \cdot \delta \\ \sigma &= \sqrt{\int_0^1 [Q(p)]^2 dp - \mu^2} = \eta \sqrt{\delta^2 - \frac{1}{12} \pi^2 (\delta^2 - 1)}.\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

The choice of this kind of family of quantile functions is also motivated by the possibility of expressing the $L2$ Wasserstein distance in closed form. Given two quantile functions, namely, Q_1 and Q_2 , parameterized, respectively by γ_1, η_1 and δ_1 , and by γ_2, η_2 and δ_2 , associate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}d_W^2(f_1, f_2) &= \int_0^1 [Q_1(t) - Q_2(t)]^2 dt = \\ &= (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^2 + (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2 + 2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2) + \\ &+ (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2 + \frac{1}{12} \pi [(\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 - (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2] = \\ &= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 + (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2 + \frac{1}{12} \pi [(\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 - (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2];\end{aligned}$$

where the dM_{12} and dV_{12} are, respectively

$$\begin{aligned}dM_{12} &= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 = [(\gamma_1 + \eta_1 \delta_1) - (\gamma_2 + \eta_2 \delta_2)]^2 \\ dV_{12} &= (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2 + \frac{1}{12} \pi [(\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 - (\eta_1 \delta_1 - \eta_2 \delta_2)^2].\end{aligned}$$

Finally, given a set N quantile functions Q_i of such a family and a set of N positive weights $[w_i]$, the weighted mean is a quantile function \bar{Q} having the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Q}(t) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k Q_k(t)}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k \left\{ \gamma_k + \eta_k \left[\frac{1-\delta_k}{2} (\ln p) - \ln(1-p) \frac{1+\delta_k}{2} \right] \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k} = \\ &= \bar{\gamma} + \bar{\eta} \left\{ \frac{(\ln p)}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\eta} \bar{\delta}}{\bar{\eta}} \right) - \frac{\ln(1-p)}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\eta} \bar{\delta}}{\bar{\eta}} \right) \right\} = \\ &= \bar{\gamma} + \bar{\eta} \left\{ \frac{(\ln p)}{2} (1 - \bar{\delta}) - \frac{\ln(1-p)}{2} (1 - \bar{\delta}) \right\} \quad ; \quad t \in [0, 1];\end{aligned}$$

where, being:

$$\bar{\eta} \bar{\delta} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k \eta_k \delta_k}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k};$$

if follows that \bar{Q} is a quantile function of the same family, having as parameters:

$$\bar{\gamma} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k \gamma_k}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k}; \bar{\eta} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k \eta_k}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_k}; \bar{\delta} = \frac{\overline{\eta \delta}}{\bar{\eta}}.$$

We considered $c = 3$ clusters each one of $N = 100$ objects described by $P = 2$ distributional variables. Each distributional data is defined by three parameters γ_{kj} , η_{kj} and δ_{kj} sampled from a Gaussian having different parameters for each cluster and each variable. We considered four scenarios as follows: We performed all the 6 algorithms variants of fuzzy c-means plus the base fuzzy c-means algorithm and we evaluated the obtained partitions using the proposed external validity indexes, both in their fuzzy version and in their crisp version. In the last case, each object is assigned to the cluster with the highest membership. Because the proposed algorithms are sensitive to the initialization of centers, we repeated 20 times the initialization step and we reported the results for the solution having the minimum criterion value for each algorithm. Before, fixing the m parameter, we did a preliminary study using a grid of values for $m \in \{1.5, 1.7, 2.0, 2.1, 2.5\}$. According to the observed results, we fixed $m = 1.5$.

The three scenario have been chosen accordingly to the following criteria:

Scenario 1 Three clusters have a similar within dispersion for each variable, for each cluster, and both for the position component and the dispersion one.

Scenario 2 Three clusters have different within dispersion for each variable, for each component and for each cluster.

Scenario 3 Three clusters have different within dispersion for each single variable, for each component and for each cluster, but the cluster structure related to the position parameters is very weak.

4.1.1. Scenario 1

In the first scenario, we set up three clusters having similar within dispersion for the position and the variability. In this case, the distributional data are generated according to Gaussian distributions of the parameter as listed in Tab. 1. The bivariate plots for each parameter are shown in Fig. 3.

In Table 2 are reported the within cluster dispersion for each variable and each component, and the total dispersion of the dataset. We remark that

Clusters	Var. 1			Var. 2		
	γ	η	δ	γ	η	δ
1	$\mathcal{N}(0, 0.8)$	$\mathcal{N}(7, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.002)$	$\mathcal{N}(-3, 4)$	$\mathcal{N}(10, 0.5)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.002)$
2	$\mathcal{N}(-3, 0.80)$	$\mathcal{N}(8, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.002)$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 4)$	$\mathcal{N}(8, 0.5)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.02)$
3	$\mathcal{N}(3, 0.80)$	$\mathcal{N}(9, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.002)$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 4)$	$\mathcal{N}(10, 0.5)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.002)$

Table 1: Scenario 1: Sample distributions of parameters




Figure 3: Scenario 1: parameters

in Table 2 are reported the Sum of Squares within each predefined class of objects according to each variable (SSE_j) and each component ($SSE_{j,m}$ and $SSE_{j,d}$), where $SSE_j = SSE_{j,m} + SSE_{j,d}$, $SSE_{j,m} = \sum_{k \in C_i} (\bar{y}_{kj} - \bar{g}_{ij})^2$ and $SSE_{j,m} = \sum_{k \in C_i} d_W^2(y_{kj}^c, g_{ij}^c)$, where C_i denote the i -th class, g_{ij} denotes the Wasserstein-barycenter of the i -th class for the j -th variable having \bar{g}_{ij} as mean g_{ij}^c as centered distribution. Further, $WSSE$ is the sum within Sum of Squares for each variable and each component, while $TSSE$ is the Total Sum of Squares of the dataset for each variable and each component. The Quality of Partition Indexes (QPI) are equal to 1 minus the ratio between the SSE_j (respectively, $SSE_{j,m}$ and $SSE_{j,d}$) and the corresponding $TSSE$. They measure the discriminant power of each variable or component for the three predefined classes of objects, namely, suggests if a class structure exists. Being a generalization of the R -squared statistics, the more the QPI is close to one the more the variable or the component is relevant for discriminate the classes.

The parameters choice induces three clusters having a similar internal dispersion and a cluster structure that, observing the QPI values, is more evident for variable 1 w.r.t. variable 2.

Clusters	Var.1			Var.2		
	SSE_1	$SSE_{1,m}$	$SSE_{1,d}$	SSE_2	$SSE_{2,m}$	$SSE_{2,d}$
Cl. 1	106.84	89.77	17.06	548.39	522.86	25.53
Cl. 2	111.70	94.53	17.17	465.44	444.62	20.82
Cl. 3	108.58	87.57	21.01	464.05	433.09	30.96
WSSE	$WSSE_1$	$WSSE_{1,m}$	$WSSE_{1,d}$	$WSSE_2$	$WSSE_{2,m}$	$WSSE_{2,d}$
	327.13	271.88	55.24	1477.88	1400.57	77.31
TSSE	$TSSE_1$	$TSSE_{1,m}$	$TSSE_{1,d}$	$TSSE_2$	$TSSE_{2,m}$	$TSSE_{2,d}$
	2534.04	2425.26	108.78	1918.83	1749.24	169.59
QPI	QPI_1	$QPI_{1,m}$	$QPI_{1,d}$	QPI_2	$QPI_{2,m}$	$QPI_{2,d}$
	0.8709	0.8879	0.4921	0.2298	0.1993	0.5441

Table 2: Scenario 1: Dispersion (SSE) of clusters and of the datasets. $WSSE$ is the within cluster sum of squares, $TSSE$ is the total sum of squares, $QPI = 1 - WSSE/TSSE$.

We executed the FCM and the six AFCM algorithms and we reported the external validity indexes in Tab. 3, both for their fuzzy and crisp version. As expected, the algorithms based on adaptive distances performs better than the standard FCM algorithm and the differences are not very large among them. The best performance is observed for algorithm $\Pi - f$ (the values in

bold), namely, the algorithm where relevance weights are computed for each cluster and for each component.

Table 3: Scenario 1: external validity indexes, $m = 1.5$

Method	Fuzzy partition				Crisp partition			
	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub
FCM								
FCM	0.7841	0.5100	0.6755	0.5137	0.8171	0.5697	0.7259	0.5887
AFCM								
$\Pi - a$	0.8994	0.7363	0.8481	0.7729	0.9573	0.8788	0.9355	0.9036
$\Pi - b$	0.9052	0.7496	0.8569	0.7860	0.9572	0.8785	0.9353	0.9033
$\Pi - c$	0.9016	0.7416	0.8516	0.7781	0.9613	0.8896	0.9416	0.9126
$\Pi - d$	0.9071	0.7542	0.8599	0.7904	0.9613	0.8896	0.9416	0.9126
$\Pi - e$	0.9137	0.7695	0.8697	0.8052	0.9911	0.9736	0.9866	0.9800
$\Pi - f$	0.9156	0.7740	0.8726	0.8095	0.9911	0.9736	0.9866	0.9800

In Tab. 4 are reported the relevance weights for algorithm $\Pi - f$. First of all we can observe that the weights for each component are similar for each cluster, suggesting that the within dispersion of clusters is similar for the two components of the two variables. As expected, We can observe that the component related to the position is more important for variable 1 than for variable 2, because the internal dispersion of the γ parameters is very high for variable two w.r.t. variable 1, while, considering the product-to-one constraint, not a great difference is observed for the variability component. This confirm the usefulness of adaptive distances, because a component has a higher weight when a lower dispersion is observed.

Table 4: Scenario 1: Relevance weights for algorithm $\Pi - f$

Cluster	Var.1		Var. 2	
	$\lambda_{1,M}$	$\lambda_{1,V}$	$\lambda_{2,M}$	$\lambda_{2,V}$
1	0.7401	3.9772	0.1310	2.5932
2	0.7700	3.3488	0.1661	2.3345
3	0.6428	3.6056	0.1500	2.8767

4.1.2. Scenario 2

For scenario 2, we set up the three clusters having different within dispersion for the position and the variability components for each cluster. In this case, the distributional data are generated according to Gaussian distributions of the parameter as listed in Tab. 5. The bivariate plots for each parameter are shown in Fig. 4.

Clusters	Var. 1			Var. 2		
	γ	η	δ	γ	η	δ
1	$\mathcal{N}(0, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(9, 0.2)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.01)$	$\mathcal{N}(1, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(5, 0.2)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.02)$
2	$\mathcal{N}(-1, 0.01)$	$\mathcal{N}(8, 0.05)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.05, 0.02)$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$	$\mathcal{N}(8, 0.8)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.05, 0.01)$
3	$\mathcal{N}(1, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(7, 0.6)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.2, 0.005)$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 0.3)$	$\mathcal{N}(6, 0.05)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.1, 0.002)$

Table 5: Scenario 2: Sample distributions of parameters




Figure 4: Scenario 2: parameters

In Table 6 are reported the within cluster dispersion for each variable and each component, and the total dispersion of the dataset. The last row reports the ratios between the between-cluster and the total dispersion (namely, the QPI of the apriori clustered data), where the more the values are close to 1, the more there is a cluster structure. The parameters choice induces three clusters having a different within internal dispersion and a cluster structure.

Clusters	Var.1			Var.2		
	SSE_1	$SSE_{1,m}$	$SSE_{1,d}$	SSE_2	$SSE_{2,m}$	$SSE_{2,d}$
Cl. 1	181.54	111.88	69.66	125.88	87.49	38.39
Cl. 2	223.58	131.15	92.43	148.00	84.41	63.59
Cl. 3	99.45	62.45	37.00	47.17	40.03	7.14
WSSE	$WSSE_1$	$WSSE_{1,m}$	$WSSE_{1,d}$	$WSSE_2$	$WSSE_{2,m}$	$WSSE_{2,d}$
	504.57	305.48	199.09	321.05	211.93	109.12
TSSE	$TSSE_1$	$TSSE_{1,m}$	$TSSE_{1,d}$	$TSSE_2$	$TSSE_{2,m}$	$TSSE_{2,d}$
	1049.34	584.93	464.41	910.16	601.22	308.94
QPI	QPI_1	$QPI_{1,m}$	$QPI_{1,d}$	QPI_2	$QPI_{2,m}$	$QPI_{2,d}$
	0.5191	0.4777	0.5713	0.6473	0.6475	0.6468

Table 6: Scenario 2: Dispersion (SSE) of clusters and of the datasets. $WSSE$ is the within cluster sum of squares, $TSSE$ is the total sum of squares, $QPI = 1 - WSSE/TSSE$.

Tab. 7 shows the external validity indexes for each algorithm. The best performance is observed for algorithm $\Pi - f$ (the values in bold), namely, the algorithm where the relevance weights are computed for each cluster and for each component, confirming the ability of the algorithm in obtaining a good classification when the clusters have a different structure w.r.t. the internal variability.

In Tab. 8 are reported the relevance weights obtained from the AFCM $\Pi - f$ type algorithm. We can observe that, as expected the components have different weights, and the weights related to the dispersion component are generally greater than the weights of the position one for the first variable. We remark that the dispersion component is related to the interaction between the η and the δ parameters as described in Eq. 40, thus it does not follow exactly the dispersion of the η component only.

4.1.3. Scenario 3

For scenario 3, we set up three clusters having different within dispersion only for the variability component for each cluster, while, for the position component, a weak cluster structure holds. In this scenario, we aim at studying what happens if a distributional variable dispersion is heavily determined

Table 7: Scenario 2: external validity indexes, $m = 1.5$

Method	Fuzzy partition				Crisp partition			
	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub
FCM								
FCM	0.7864	0.5167	0.6814	0.5208	0.8361	0.6079	0.7562	0.6330
AFCM								
$\Pi - a$	0.7987	0.5387	0.7003	0.5489	0.8587	0.6539	0.7909	0.6844
$\Pi - b$	0.7978	0.5371	0.6989	0.5468	0.8587	0.6539	0.7909	0.6844
$\Pi - c$	0.7979	0.5371	0.6989	0.5470	0.8519	0.6412	0.7816	0.6699
$\Pi - d$	0.7982	0.5374	0.6991	0.5474	0.8622	0.6605	0.7956	0.6919
$\Pi - e$	0.8109	0.5604	0.7183	0.5761	0.8622	0.6605	0.7956	0.6919
$\Pi - f$	0.8149	0.5668	0.7235	0.5845	0.8695	0.6752	0.8062	0.7080

Table 8: Scenario 2: Relevance weights for algorithm $\Pi - f$

Cluster	Var.1		Var. 2	
	$\lambda_{i1,M}$	$\lambda_{i1,V}$	$\lambda_{i2,M}$	$\lambda_{i2,V}$
1	0.6737	1.0776	0.9145	1.5062
2	0.5749	0.6905	1.1397	2.2104
3	0.6739	1.0083	1.2043	1.2219

by just one component (the position one, in this case). In this case, because of the different constraints, Π_a , Π_b , Π_c and Π_d AFCM algorithms should fail in identifying a cluster structure. In this case, the distributional data are generated according to Gaussian distributions of the parameter as listed in Tab. 9. The bivariate plots for each parameter are shown in Fig. 5.

Clusters	Var. 1			Var. 2		
	γ	η	δ	γ	η	δ
1	$\mathcal{N}(-2, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(1.5, 0.03)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.01)$	$\mathcal{N}(-2, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(1.5, 0.015)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.02)$
2	$\mathcal{N}(0, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(2, 0.01)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.05, 0.02)$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(2, 0.05)$	$\mathcal{N}(0.05, 0.01)$
3	$\mathcal{N}(2, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(2, 0.02)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.2, 0.005)$	$\mathcal{N}(2, 30)$	$\mathcal{N}(1, 0.01)$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.1, 0.01)$

Table 9: Scenario 3: Sample distributions of parameters

In Table 10 are reported the within cluster dispersion for each variable and each component, and the total dispersion of the dataset. The last row reports the ratios between the between-cluster and the total dispersion (namely, the QPI of the apriori clustered data), where the more the values are close to 1, the more there is a cluster structure. The parameters choice induces three clusters having a different within internal dispersion and a cluster structure.




Figure 5: Scenario 3: parameters

Tab. 11 shows the external validity indexes for each algorithm. It is worth noting that while FCM and $AFCM$ Π_a , Π_b , Π_c and Π_d algorithms have similar performances, Π_e and Π_f types recognize better the classification structure. This is due to the constraints on relevance weights used in the algorithms. For example, in the Π_d type algorithms, where the relevance weights are computed for the components of each variable for each cluster, the product-to-one constraint is considered separately for the position and the dispersion component. Thus, even if a cluster structure does not exist for a component, the algorithm is forced to assign a relevance weight greater than zero. On the other hand, in Π_e and Π_f $AFCM$ algorithms this situation does not occur, and the relevance weights of those components for which a cluster structure cannot be observed go towards zero.

Among the Π_e and Π_f types algorithms, the best performances is observed for algorithm Π_f (the values in bold), namely, the algorithm where the relevance weights are computed for each cluster and for each component.

In Tab. 12 are reported the relevance weights for algorithm Π_f . We observe that, as expected, the components have different weights, and the weights related to the position component ($\lambda_{ij,M}$), are close to zero. In this

Clusters	Var.1			Var.2		
	SSE_1	$SSE_{1,m}$	$SSE_{1,d}$	SSE_2	$SSE_{2,m}$	$SSE_{2,d}$
Cl. 1	3031.52	3028.87	2.65	3712.05	3708.67	3.38
Cl. 2	2721.72	2715.82	5.90	3467.91	3463.94	3.97
Cl. 3	3052.63	3050.55	2.09	3026.37	3025.94	0.44
WSSE	$WSSE_1$	$WSSE_{1,m}$	$WSSE_{1,d}$	$WSSE_2$	$WSSE_{2,m}$	$WSSE_{2,d}$
	8805.87	8795.24	10.63	10206.33	10198.54	7.79
TSSE	$TSSE_1$	$TSSE_{1,m}$	$TSSE_{1,d}$	$TSSE_2$	$TSSE_{2,m}$	$TSSE_{2,d}$
	9929.54	9903.03	26.51	10401.25	10375.66	25.59
QPI	QPI_1	$QPI_{1,m}$	$QPI_{1,d}$	QPI_2	$QPI_{2,m}$	$QPI_{2,d}$
	0.1132	0.1119	0.5989	0.0187	0.0171	0.6955

Table 10: Scenario 3: Dispersion (SSE) of clusters and of the datasets. $WSSE$ is the within cluster sum of squares, $TSSE$ is the total sum of squares, $QPI = 1 - WSSE/TSSE$.

Table 11: Scenario 3: external validity indexes, $m = 1.5$

Method	Fuzzy partition				Crisp partition			
	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub	ARI	Jacc	FM	Hub
FCM	0.5660	0.2089	0.3456	0.0210	0.5696	0.2126	0.3506	0.0287
$\Pi - a$	0.5531	0.2042	0.3392	0.0018	0.5511	0.2054	0.3409	0.0009
$\Pi - b$	0.5531	0.2042	0.3392	0.0018	0.5511	0.2054	0.3409	0.0009
$\Pi - c$	0.5561	0.2010	0.3348	0.0017	0.5559	0.2021	0.3363	0.0027
$\Pi - d$	0.5561	0.2010	0.3347	0.0017	0.5559	0.2021	0.3363	0.0027
$\Pi - e$	0.7871	0.5150	0.6799	0.5204	0.9162	0.7761	0.8740	0.8112
$\Pi - f$	0.8132	0.5606	0.7184	0.5786	0.9197	0.7844	0.8792	0.8191

case, it is more evident that the proposed algorithms are able to perform an automatic feature selection within the clustering process.

Table 12: Scenario 3: Relevance weights for algorithm $\Pi - f$

Cluster	Var. 1		Var. 2	
	$\lambda_{i1,M}$	$\lambda_{i1,V}$	$\lambda_{i2,M}$	$\lambda_{i2,V}$
1	0.0473	21.0950	0.0388	25.8161
2	0.0193	27.2639	0.0198	96.1187
3	0.0397	28.8574	0.0298	29.2874

4.2. Real world data: age-sex pyramids of World Countries in 2014

For testing the proposed algorithm on a real-world dataset, we considered population age-sex pyramids data collected by the Census Bureau of USA in 2014 on 228 countries in the World. The dataset `Age_Pyramids_2014` is freely available in the `HistDAWass` package developed in R⁴. A population pyramid is a common way to represent the distribution of sex and age of people living in a given administrative unit (for instance, in a town, region or country) jointly. Each country is represented by two histograms describing the age distributions for the male and the female population respectively. Both distributions are vertically opposed, and the representation is similar to a pyramid. The shape of a pyramid varies according to the distribution of the age in the population that is considered as a consequence of the development of a country. In Fig. 6 is shown the age pyramid of the World in 2014. In the




Figure 6: World population pyramid in 2014

demographic literature, there is a good consensus in considering three main

⁴<https://cran.r-project.org/package=HistDAWass>

stages in the demographic evolution of a population of a country that can be represented by three main kinds of pyramids: constrictive, expansive and stationary. In Fig. 7, we reported the three prototypical pyramid structures [39, Ch. 5]. This would suggest that a suitable choice for a correct number of




Figure 7: Types of pyramids

cluster is $c = 3$. For confirming this choice, we computed the internal validity indexes discussed above, for the standard fuzzy c -means of distributional data obtaining the results in Table 13. After fixing $m = 1.5$ as fuzzifier parameter, $\varepsilon = 10^{-5}$, we used the I_{PC} , I_{PE} , I_{MPC} , I_{XB} and I_{Sil} as validity indexes using a range of number of clusters from $C = 2$ to $C = 8$.

Table 13: Fuzzy c -means of distributional data. Internal validity indexes.

c	I_{PC}	I_{PE}	I_{MPC}	I_{XB}	I_{Sil}
2	0.9346	0.1107	0.8692	0.0796	0.8284
3	0.9196	0.1435	0.8793	0.1023	0.7906
4	0.8868	0.2030	0.8490	0.1348	0.7359
5	0.8754	0.2312	0.8442	0.1931	0.6957
6	0.8644	0.2591	0.8373	0.1977	0.6557
7	0.8360	0.3143	0.8086	0.2604	0.6054
8	0.8345	0.3198	0.8109	0.2608	0.6406

Considering that, I_{PC} , and I_{PE} suffer of some monotonic effects w.r.t. the number of clusters, we observe that I_{XB} and I_{Sil} both agree on a suitable choice for $c = 2$. In fact, observing the three models in Fig. 7, the *Constrictive* and the *Stationary* looks very similar. Once fixed $c = 2$, and $m = 1.5$ for the base algorithm, we adopt the same values for those based on adaptive distances. In Tables 14 we reported the validity indexes computed for the FCM and the AFCM algorithms. We introduce, here the QPI index, a separation index, for comparing the obtained fuzzy partitions. In Tab. 14,

Table 14: Pyramid dataset: the FCM and AFCM algorithms compared according to internal validity indexes. $c = 2$, $m = 1.5$.

Method	I_{PC}	I_{PE}	I_{MPC}	I_{XB}	I_{Sil}	QPI
FCM	0.9346	0.1107	0.8692	0.0796	0.8284	0.7550
$\Pi - a$	0.9344	0.1108	0.8689	0.0794	0.8280	0.7544
$\Pi - b$	0.9345	0.1108	0.8689	0.0794	0.8280	0.7545
$\Pi - c$	0.9345	0.1108	0.8690	0.0793	0.8284	0.7544
$\Pi - d$	0.9345	0.1108	0.8690	0.0793	0.8284	0.7544
$\Pi - e$	0.9308	0.1185	0.8616	0.0650	0.8099	0.7404
$\Pi - f$	0.9311	0.1182	0.8622	0.0648	0.8101	0.7401

we observe that all the validity indexes show similar values except for the I_{XB} . From the results we remark that in general the Π_f AFCM shows better performances accordingly to this index. We recall that I_{XB} , is a validity index taking into consideration both the compactness and the separateness of a fuzzy partition, while the other measures are mainly related or to the compactness or to the separateness aspect of the obtained partition.

In the following, we show the detailed results for the algorithm $\Pi - f$ since it results to obtain the best scores for I_{XB} index.

Prototypes Looking at the two centers of the fuzzy clusters in Fig. 8, we can observe that the first center represent more the *expanding* model of population, while the second center has a shape similar to the *stationary* population. So the method is able to catch the two extreme situations theorized by the demographic literature.




Figure 8: Class prototypes.

Weights Considering the results of $\Pi - f$ algorithm in Tab. 15, we remark that the relevance weights of the components of the two variables is higher for the variability component of the distributional variables, while it is lower for the position component. This suggests that the cluster structure is more related to the similarity in the variability (namely, the size and the shape) of the distributions than the variability of the positions, with a little more importance related to the variability for the *Male.Population* distributions. Please, note that in this case the pyramid related to each center is represented by two histograms for the male and the female population.

Table 15: Age-pyramid dataset, relevance weights of $\Pi - f$ algorithm

Cluster	Male population		Female population	
	$\lambda_{1,M}$	$\lambda_{1,V}$	$\lambda_{2,M}$	$\lambda_{2,V}$
1	0.5335	1.7761	0.5250	2.0102
2	0.5709	2.1635	0.4251	1.9047

Clusters members In Tab. 16 are reported the first 15 countries with the highest membership degree to each cluster, and the 15 most confused countries, namely, those countries with a low membership squared average to the two clusters. We expect that these countries belong to the *constrictive* phase of the evolution of a population, especially for those countries with a squared average membership close to 0.5, like *Azerbaijan* and *Brazil*.

5. Conclusions

The paper presented an extension of fuzzy c-means algorithms to data described by distributional variables. The fuzzy c-means algorithm has been integrated in order to compute the relevance of each distributional variable, or of its components, in order to take into consideration also non-spherical clusters. We presented an automatic weighting systems which is related to the determinant of the within covariance matrix, leading to a set of six product-to-one constraints for the relevance weights. Generally, the proposed algorithms are able to identify clusters with different within variability structure. In particular, the algorithms of type $\Pi - e$ and $\Pi - f$ are able also to discover cluster structures also when this occur for not all the components of the distributional variables. The applications on synthetic and real world data confirm the hypothesis that algorithms based on adaptive distances are useful to discover non-spherical clusters and to perform a variable and/or a component selection.

Table 16: The first 15 countries with highest memberships for each cluster, and the 15 countries with an average lower memberships.

Countries	Cl.1	Countries	Cl.2	Countries	Cl.1	Cl.2
Haiti	0.9999	Slovakia	0.9999	Azerbaijan	0.5081	0.4919
Syria	0.9999	United States	0.9998	Brazil	0.5223	0.4777
Honduras	0.9999	Luxembourg	0.9997	Antigua and Bar.	0.4246	0.5754
Laos	0.9999	Poland	0.9997	French Polynesia	0.5796	0.4204
Pakistan	0.9999	Australia	0.9996	Montserrat	0.6027	0.3973
Belize	0.9999	Cuba	0.9996	Bahamas, The	0.6242	0.3758
West Bank	0.9999	Romania	0.9996	Costa Rica	0.6307	0.3693
Philippines	0.9999	Saint Helena	0.9996	Kazakhstan	0.6340	0.3660
Nepal	0.9999	New Zealand	0.9996	Panama	0.6427	0.3573
Solomon Islands	0.9999	Puerto Rico	0.9995	New Caledonia	0.3358	0.6642
Papua New Guinea	0.9999	Norway	0.9995	Saint Martin	0.6728	0.3272
Western Sahara	0.9999	Liechtenstein	0.9995	Guam	0.2987	0.7013
Kiribati	0.9999	Iceland	0.9994	Sint Maarten	0.2971	0.7029
Ghana	0.9999	Macedonia	0.9994	Tunisia	0.2724	0.7276
Namibia	0.9998	Taiwan	0.9994	Palau	0.2696	0.7304

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the anonymous referees for their careful revision, valuable suggestions, and comments which improved this paper. The Brazilian author would like to thank FACEPE (Research Agency from the State of Pernambuco, Brazil) and CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development, Brazil) for their financial support.

References

References

- [1] H. H. Bock, E. Diday, Analysis of Symbolic Data. Exploratory Methods for Extracting Statistical Information from Complex Data, Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [2] A. K. Jain, Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means, Pattern Recognition Letters 31 (2010) 651–666.
- [3] R. Xu, D. I. I. Wunusch, Survey of clustering algorithms, IEEE Trans. Neural Networks 16 (3) (2005) 645–678.

- [4] J. C. Bezdek, Pattern recognition with fuzzy objective function algorithms, Advanced applications in pattern recognition, Plenum Press, New York, 1981.
- [5] L. Kaufman, P. Rousseeuw, Finding Groups in Data: An Introduction to Cluster Analysis, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2005.
- [6] L. Rüshendorff, Wasserstein metric, in: Encyclopedia of Mathematics, Springer, 2001.
- [7] A. Irpino, R. Verde, Basic statistics for distributional symbolic variables: a new metric-based approach, *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification* 9 (2) (2015) 143–175.
- [8] A. Irpino, R. Verde, A new Wasserstein based distance for the hierarchical clustering of histogram symbolic data, in: V. Batanjeli, H. Bock, A. Ferligoj, A. Ziberna (Eds.), *Data Science and Classification*, Springer, Berlin, 2006, pp. 185–192.
- [9] R. Verde, A. Irpino, Dynamic clustering of histograms using Wasserstein metric, in: A. Rizzi, M. Vichi (Eds.), *Proceedings in Computational Statistics, COMPSTAT 2006, Compstat 2006*, Physica Verlag, Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 869–876.
- [10] R. Verde, A. Irpino, Comparing histogram data using a Mahalanobis-Wasserstein distance, in: P. Brito (Ed.), *Proceedings in Computational Statistics, COMPSTAT 2008, Compstat 2008*, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 77–89.
- [11] R. Verde, A. Irpino, Dynamic clustering of histogram data: using the right metric, in: P. Brito, P. Bertrand, G. Cucumel, F. De Carvalho (Eds.), *Selected contributions in data analysis and classification*, Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 123–134.
- [12] E. Diday, J. C. Simon, Clustering analysis, in: K. Fu (Ed.), *Digital Pattern Classification*, Springer, Berlin, 1976, pp. 47–94.
- [13] Y. Terada, H. Yadohisa, Non-hierarchical clustering for distribution-valued data, in: Y. Lechevallier, G. Saporta (Eds.), *Proceedings of COMPSTAT 2010*, Springer, Berlin, 2010, pp. 1653–1660.
- [14] M. Vrac, L. Billard, E. Diday, A. Chedin, Copula analysis of mixture models, *Computational Statistics* 27 (2012) 427–457.

- [15] E. Diday, G. Govaert, Classification automatique avec distances adaptatives, R.A.I.R.O. Informatique Computer Science 11 (4) (1997) 329–349.
- [16] D. S. Modha, W. S. Spangler, Feature weighting in k-means clustering, Machine Learning 52 (3) (2003) 217–237.
- [17] F. A. T. De Carvalho, Y. Lechevallier, Partitional clustering algorithms for symbolic interval data based on single adaptive distances, Pattern Recognition 42 (7) (2009) 1223–1236.
- [18] F. A. T. De Carvalho, Y. Lechevallier, Dynamic clustering of interval-valued data based on adaptive quadratic distances, Trans. Sys. Man Cyber. Part A 39 (6) (2009) 1295–1306.
- [19] F. A. T. De Carvalho, R. M. C. R. De Souza, Unsupervised pattern recognition models for mixed feature-type symbolic data, Pattern Recognition Letters 31 (2010) 430–443.
- [20] A. Irpino, R. Verde, F. de A.T. De Carvalho, Dynamic clustering of histogram data based on adaptive squared wasserstein distances, Expert Systems with Applications 41 (7) (2014) 3351 – 3366.
- [21] J. Huang, M. Ng, H. Rong, Z. Li, Automated variable weighting in k-means type clustering, Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on 27 (5) (2005) 657–668.
- [22] A. Irpino, E. Romano, Optimal histogram representation of large data sets: Fisher vs piecewise linear approximation, Revue des Nouvelles Technologies de l’Information RNTI-E-9 (2007) 99–110.
- [23] A. L. Gibbs, F. E. Su, On choosing and bounding probability metrics, International Statistical Review 70 (3) (2002) 419–435.
- [24] C. R. Givens, R. M. Shortt, A class of wasserstein metrics for probability distributions., Michigan Math. J. 31 (2) (1984) 231–240.
- [25] E. Diday, G. Govaert, Classification automatique avec distances adaptatives, RAIRO Informatique/Computer Science 11 (4) (1977) 329–349.
- [26] J. H. Friedman, J. J. Meulman, Clustering objects on subsets of attributes, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Serie B 66 (2004) 815–849.
- [27] H. Frigui, O. Nasraoui, Unsupervised learning of prototypes and attribute weights, Pattern Recognition 37 (3) (2004) 567–581.

- [28] C. Laclau, F. De A.T. De Carvalho, M. Nadif, Fuzzy co-clustering with automated variable weighting, in: Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE), 2015 IEEE International Conference on, 2015, pp. 1–8.
- [29] D.-W. Kim, K. H. Lee, D. Lee, A novel initialization scheme for the fuzzy c-means algorithm for color clustering, *Pattern Recognition Letters* 25 (2) (2004) 227 – 237.
- [30] M. Meila, Comparing clusterings an information based distance, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 98 (5) (2007) 873 – 895.
- [31] E. Hllermeier, M. Rifqi, S. Henzgen, R. Senge, Comparing fuzzy partitions: A generalization of the rand index and related measures., *IEEE T. Fuzzy Systems* 20 (3) (2012) 546–556.
- [32] H. Frigui, C. Hwang, F. C.-H. Rhee, Clustering and aggregation of relational data with applications to image database categorization, *Pattern Recognition* 40 (11) (2007) 3053 – 3068.
- [33] J. Bezdek, J. Keller, R. Krisnapuram, N. Pal, Fuzzy Models and Algorithms for Pattern Recognition and Image Processing, Vol. 4 of The Handbooks of Fuzzy Sets Series, Springer US, 1999.
- [34] R. N. Dave, Validating fuzzy partitions obtained through c-shells clustering, *Pattern Recogn. Lett.* 17 (6) (1996) 613–623.
- [35] X. L. Xie, G. Beni, A validity measure for fuzzy clustering, *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* 13 (8) (1991) 841–847.
- [36] R. J. G. B. Campello, E. R. Hruschka, A fuzzy extension of the silhouette width criterion for cluster analysis, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 157 (21) (2006) 2858–2875.
- [37] F. de A.T. de Carvalho, C. P. Tenrio, N. L. C. Junior, Partitional fuzzy clustering methods based on adaptive quadratic distances, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 157 (21) (2006) 2833 – 2857.
- [38] W. Gilchrist, *Statistical Modelling with Quantile Functions*, CRC Press, Abingdon, 2000.
- [39] D. Hulse, S. Gregory, J. Baker, *Willamette River Basin: trajectories of environmental and ecological change*, Oregon State University Press, 2002.

URL http://www.fsl.orst.edu/pnwerc/wrb/Atlas_web_compressed/PDFtoc.html