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\section*{Abstract.} Clustering is a well-known technique that groups data points such that the data points in the same group are closer to each other than to those in other groups based on some similarity measure. We propose a new clustering approach, called optimality-based clustering, that clusters data points based on their latent decision making preferences. We assume that each data point is a decision made by a rational decision maker (i.e., by approximately solving an optimization problem) and cluster the data points by identifying a common objective function of the optimization problems for each cluster such that the worst-case optimality error for the data points within each cluster is minimized. We propose three clustering models and present mixed-integer programs that lead to lower and upper bound solutions. We demonstrate these models using various-sized randomly generated instances.
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\section{1 Introduction}

Clustering is a technique that groups objects (e.g., data points) into clusters such that the objects within each cluster are more similar to one another than to those in other clusters based on some similarity measure \cite{8}. Most clustering approaches fall into one of the following categories: centroid-based clustering, distribution-based clustering, and density-based clustering. In centroid-based clustering, each object is assigned to a cluster based on its similarity to a representative object called a centroid (e.g., K-means clustering) \cite{9,12,17}. In density-based clustering, a density measure, e.g., the number of objects within a certain distance, is used to detect areas with high density, in which the objects are grouped into the same cluster \cite{6,11}. Distribution-based clustering groups the objects based on whether or not they belong to the same distribution \cite{18}.

Often, data points correspond to decisions that are generated by decision makers (DMs) who are assumed to solve some kind of decision making problem (DMP). Although traditional clustering approaches for such decision data may indicate which decisions are similar to each other, this similarity does not necessarily imply that the DMs for which the decisions belong to the same cluster

\textsuperscript{*}Corresponding Author. tlee6@uh.edu
have similar preferences. For example, suppose the underlying DMPs can be formulated as optimization problems where the DM’s preferences are encoded in the objective function parameters. Two DMs’ might have solved their DMPs with completely different objective function parameters under different feasible regions, yet their decisions could happen to be geometrically close to each other. Therefore, one might be interested in grouping such decision data based on the similarity in the DMs’ decision making preferences, captured by parameters in their underlying DMPs.

Since this clustering problem requires inferring objective function parameters of the DMPs from the decision data, it inherently involves inverse optimization. Given an observed decision from a DM who solves an optimization problem, inverse optimization infers parameters of the optimization problem that make the decision as optimal as possible [1, 2, 4, 5, 10]. Solving the DM’s optimization problem with these inferred parameters then leads to a decision that is close to the observed one. Previous inverse optimization models assume that the decision data is collected from either a single DM or a group of DMs whose preferences are a priori known to be similar [2, 3, 5, 14]. In either case, the inverse optimization framework finds a single objective function for the given data and is not suitable for decision data collected from heterogenous DMs with different preferences.

In this paper, we develop a new clustering approach that clusters decision data (hence DMs) based on their latent decision making preferences. In particular, inspired by inverse optimization, we propose the clustering problem that simultaneously groups observed decisions into clusters and finds an objective function for each cluster such that the decisions in the same cluster are rendered as optimal as possible for the assumed DMPs. We model this problem as a centroid-based clustering problem that uses optimality errors associated with the decisions with respect to the inferred objective function as a measure of similarity; hence we call this problem “optimality-based clustering.” We further enhance the problem by incorporating the notion of cluster stability, measured for each cluster by the worst-case distance between the decision data in the cluster and optimal decisions achieved by the DMPs using the inferred objective function for the cluster. The stability-driven, optimality-based clustering problem is computationally challenging. We derive mixed-integer programs (MIPs) that provide upper and lower bound solutions for the true clustering problem as well as heuristics that approximately solve this problem.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present an initial formulation for the optimality-based clustering problem with a simple example to demonstrate the idea. We then define the notion of cluster stability in the context of optimality-based clustering, which we later use to propose an enhanced clustering problem.

2.1 Clustering

We focus on centroid-based clustering where similarity of a data point to a cluster is assessed by the distance between the data point and a centroid of the cluster. Given a dataset $\mathcal{X} = \{\hat{x}^1, \ldots, \hat{x}^K\}$ with the index set $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \ldots, K\}$, let $\{G^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}$ be a collection of $L$ clusters where $G^\ell \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ and
\( \mathcal{L} = \{1, \ldots, L\} \). For each cluster \( \mathcal{G}^\ell \), dissimilarity among the members of the cluster is measured by \( \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} d(\hat{x}^k, x^\ell) \), where \( x^\ell \) denotes the centroid of the cluster and \( d(\hat{x}^k, x^\ell) \) represents the distance between observation \( \hat{x}^k \) and its cluster centroid \( x^\ell \), e.g., \( d(\hat{x}^k, x^\ell) = \|\hat{x}^k - x^\ell\|_r \), for some \( r \geq 1 \). Based on the above definition, a centroid-based clustering approach seeks clusters \( \{\mathcal{G}^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) such that the sum of dissimilarities over all clusters is minimized, i.e.,

\[
\min_{\{\mathcal{G}^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{x^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} d(\hat{x}^k, x^\ell).
\]

### 2.2 Optimality-Based Clustering: The Initial Model

We assume that each data point \( \hat{x}^k \in \hat{\mathcal{X}} \) is an observed decision from DM \( k \) (denoted by DM\(_k\)) who approximately solves the following optimization problem as a decision making problem (DMP\(_k\)):

\[
\text{DMP}_k(c) : \min_{x} \{c'x | A^kx \geq b^k\},
\]

where \( c \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, A^k \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k \times n}, \) and \( b^k \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k} \), for each \( k \in \mathcal{K} \). For each DM \( k \in \mathcal{K} \), let \( \mathcal{I}^k = \{1, \ldots, m_k\} \) and \( \mathcal{J} = \{1, \ldots, n\} \) index the constraints and variables of DMP\(_k\), and \( a^{ki} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be a (column) vector corresponding to the \( i \)-th row of \( A^k \). We let \( \mathcal{X}^k \) be the set of feasible solutions for DMP\(_k\), assumed bounded, full-dimensional, and free of redundant constraints, and \( \mathcal{X}^{ki} = \{x \in \mathcal{X}^k | a^{ki}x = b^k\}, i \in \mathcal{I}^k \). Let \( \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c) = \arg\min \text{DMP}_k(c) \). Without loss of generality, we assume that each \( a^{ki} \) is normalized \( a \text{ priori} \) such that \( \|a^{ki}\|_1 = 1 \).

Given a set of observed decisions \( \hat{\mathcal{X}} \), the goal of optimality-based clustering is to group the observations into \( L < K \) clusters \( \{\mathcal{G}^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) and find a cost vector \( c^\ell \) for each cluster \( \ell \) such that each observation \( \hat{x}^k \) in cluster \( \ell \) (i.e., for \( k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell \)) is as close as possible to an optimal solution to DMP\(_k(c^\ell)\). This problem can be formulated as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{c^\ell, \mathcal{G}^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}} & \quad d(\hat{\mathcal{X}}, \{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell, \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (1b) \\
& \quad \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (1c)
\end{align*}
\]

The objective of the above problem is to minimize the distance between the observations \( \hat{\mathcal{X}} \) and solutions \( x^k \)'s that are optimal for their respective DMPs with respect to \( c^\ell \) for \( k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell \); e.g., \( d(\hat{\mathcal{X}}, \{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \|\hat{x}^k - x^k\| \). Constraint \((1c)\) prevents the trivial solution \( c^\ell = 0 \) from being feasible. Note that the above problem is analogous to centroid-based clustering problems in that \( c^\ell \) can be seen as the centroid of cluster \( \ell \), representing the shared decision preference of the observations assigned to cluster \( \ell \). To demonstrate the idea of optimality-based clustering, consider the following example.
Example 1 Suppose three DMs solve the following problem with their own objective functions:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{minimize} & \quad c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 \\
    \text{subject to} & \quad -x_1 \geq b_1, \\
                    & \quad -x_2 \geq b_2, \\
                    & \quad x_1, x_2 \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]

Let \((b_1, b_2) = (-1.5, -1)\) for DMs \(k = 1, 2\) and \((b_1, b_2) = (-2.5, -2.5)\) for DM \(k = 3\) (see Figure 1 for the feasible regions). We assume the following decisions are observed from the DMs: \(\hat{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{x}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \) and \(\hat{x}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.5 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix}\) (see Figure 1). If the desired number of clusters is two (i.e., \(L = 2\)), traditional k-means clustering based on the Euclidean distance finds \(\{\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2\}\) and \(\{\hat{x}_3\}\) to be optimal clusters. However, if the goal is to group the decisions based the preferences encoded in the corresponding DMPs, clustering should be done differently. In particular, given their respective feasible regions, \(\hat{x}_2\) and \(\hat{x}_3\) share the same decision preference as they are optimal for their respective DMPs based on the same cost vector \((c_1, c_2) = (-1, 0)\); on the other hand, \(\hat{x}_1\) is optimal to the DMP with respect to a completely different cost vector \((c_1, c_2) = (0, -1)\). As a result, an optimal clustering should be \(\{\hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3\}\) and \(\{\hat{x}_1\}\).

Figure 1: Observations from DMs \(k = 1, 2, \) and 3 and their respective feasible regions.

2.3 Cluster Instability

In this subsection, we show that the initial model (1) is often subject to an instability issue due to the structure of the DMP formulation and propose a measure of instability in optimality-based clustering. Given an optimal cost vector \(c^*\) for some cluster \(\ell\) achieved by model (1), we note that \(\text{DMP}_k(c^*)\) often leads to \(x^k \in X^k(c^\ell)\) that is far from the observations assigned to the cluster. For illustration, consider the same example in Figure 1, where model (1) finds \(\mathcal{G}_2 = \{\hat{x}_1\}\) (i.e., \(\hat{x}_1\) assigned to cluster \(\ell = 2\)) and \(c^{2*} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}\). While the desirable forward optimal solution with respect to this cost vector is supposed to be close to \(\hat{x}_1\), solving \(\text{DMP}_1(c^{2*})\) can lead to an optimal solution \(x^* = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}\), which is far from \(\hat{x}_1\). Note that this cluster instability issue is different from the cluster assignment instability issues considered in traditional clustering literature [13, 16]; it is
rather associated with the argmin set of the DMP for a certain cost vector. This type of instability is also discussed in Shahmoradi and Lee [14] in the context of inverse linear programming.

We now formally define a notion of cluster stability, which we then use to propose an enhanced clustering problem formulation that improves on the initial model [1] in the next section. Given that the instability issue is caused by \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}) \) being too far from \( \hat{x}^k \), we assess the instability of a cost vector \( \mathbf{c} \) associated with each \( \hat{x}^k \) via the worst-case distance between \( \hat{x}^k \) and \( \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}) \):

\[
\max \{ d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}) \}.
\]

Then, the instability of cluster \( \mathcal{G}^\ell \) with its cost vector \( \mathbf{c}^\ell \) is measured by the following measure:

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \{ d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}^\ell) \}.
\] (3)

In other words, cluster \( \ell \) is said to be more stable if its cost vector \( \mathbf{c}^\ell \) leads to a smaller worst-case distance between \( \hat{x}^k \) and the set of optimal solutions for DMP\(_k(\mathbf{c}^\ell) \) over all data points in cluster \( \ell \). For brevity, from here on out we combine the two max terms in (3) and simply write it as

\[
\max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \{ d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}^\ell) \}.
\]

### 3 Models

In this section, we first propose an enhanced optimality-based clustering problem that addresses the cluster instability issue by incorporating the stability measure (3). We propose two heuristics that approximately solve the problem by separating it into two stages: the clustering stage and the cost vector inference stage. We then analytically compare the performances of these approaches.

#### 3.1 Stability-Driven Clustering Model

To address the cluster instability issue in model [1], we replace its objective function with the stability-incorporated dissimilarity measure in [3]. This leads to the following, which we call the stability-driven clustering (SC) model:

\[
\text{SC}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) : \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{minimize} & \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \{ d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \} \\
\text{subject to} & x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}^\ell), \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell, \\
& \|\mathbf{c}^\ell\|_1 = 1, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}.
\end{array}
\] (4a)

(4b)

(4c)

where now the objective is to maximize stability for all clusters by minimizing the worst-case distance between \( \hat{x}^k \) and the argmin set \( \mathcal{X}^{k*}(\mathbf{c}^\ell) \) over all observations and clusters. Since each
DMP_k is an LP, we utilize the LP optimality conditions to reformulate model (4) as follows:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\text{minimize} & & \left\{ (c^\ell, G^\ell) \right\} \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \{ (x^k, y^k) \} k \in \mathcal{K} \\
&\text{subject to} & & A^k y^k = c^\ell, \ \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell, \\
& & & y^k \geq 0, \ \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \\
& & & A^k x^k \geq b^k, \ \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \\
& & & c^\ell x^k = b^k y^k, \ \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell, \\
& & & \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1, \ \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}.
\end{aligned}
\]  

Constraints (5b)–(5e) represent the LP optimality conditions for solutions \{x^k\}_{k \in G^\ell} with respect to \(c^\ell\) for each cluster \(\ell \in \mathcal{L}\): constraints (5b)–(5c) enforce dual feasibility where \(y^k \in \mathbb{R}^{m^k}\) represents the vector of dual variables corresponding to DMP_k, constraint (5d) corresponds to primal feasibility, and constraint (5e) ensures strong duality. Note that problem (5) is non-convex due to its objective function and constraints (5e) and (5f). In Section 4, we analyze its solution structure and propose MIP formulations that provide lower and upper bounds on the optimal objective value of problem (5). Our subsequent analysis for the rest of this paper focuses on \(d(\hat{x}, x) = \|\hat{x} - x\|_r\) for \(r \geq 1\), though similar analysis can be derived for other distance functions.

### 3.2 Heuristics: Two-Stage Approaches

While (5) provides an exact reformulation of the SC problem, it is computationally challenging. Instead, one naive view on this problem would be to treat the clustering and cost vector inference parts separately. In this subsection, we propose two heuristics based on this separation idea.

The first algorithm applies traditional k-means clustering to cluster \(\hat{X}\) \textit{a priori} based on some distance function, e.g., Euclidean distance, followed by applying inverse optimization \textit{post-hoc} to derive a cost vector for each of the predetermined clusters. This approach, which we call the cluster-then-inverse (CI) approach, can be written as follows.

\[
\text{CI(}K,L) : \left\{
\begin{aligned}
\text{Stage 1.} & \quad \text{Find } \{G^\ell_{\text{CI}}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \in \text{argmin} \left\{ \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{k \in G^\ell_{\text{CI}}} d(\hat{x}^k, x^k_{\text{cen}}) \right\} x^k_{\text{cen}} \text{ is the centroid of } G^\ell_{\text{CI}} \\
\text{Stage 2.} & \quad \text{Find } c^\ell_{\text{CI}} \in \text{argmin}_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in G^\ell_{\text{CI}}} d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \right\} x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell), \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1, \ \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}.
\end{aligned}
\right.
\]

In Stage 1, clusters \(\{G^\ell_{\text{CI}}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}\) are obtained by solving a traditional clustering problem on \(\hat{X}\). Then, Stage 2 finds a cost vector for each of the clusters that minimizes cluster instability. Note that Stage 2 of the CI approach solves a “reduced” version of the SC problem that finds a stability-maximizing cost vector for each \(\ell \in \mathcal{L}\) with respect to the observations assigned to cluster \(\ell\); i.e., \(\text{SC}(G^\ell_{\text{CI}}, L = 1)\) where \(L = 1\) implies that no further clustering happens.

Alternatively, the second approach finds a cost vector \(c^{k*}\) for each data point \(k \in \mathcal{K}\) \textit{a priori} such
that \( \max \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^{k*})\} \) is minimized. Then, the cost vectors are clustered \textit{post-hoc} into \( L \) groups via traditional clustering. We call this approach inverse-then-cluster (IC):

\[
\text{IC}(\mathcal{K}, L) : \begin{cases} 
\text{Stage 1.} & \text{Find } c^{k*} \in \arg\min_{c^k} \left\{ \max d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^k), \|c^k\|_1 = 1 \right\}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \\
\text{Stage 2.} & \text{Find } \{G^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \in \arg\min \left\{ \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{k \in G^\ell} d(c^\ell_k, c^\ell_{cen}) \mid c^\ell_{cen} \text{ is the centroid of } G^\ell \right\}.
\end{cases}
\]

Note that, similarly, Stage 1 of the above IC approach can be seen as solving a reduced version of SC, i.e., \( \text{SC} \{k\}, L = 1 \), which finds a cost vector \( c^{k*} \) that maximizes stability associated with each observation \( \hat{x}^k \). However, once the cost vectors are clustered in Stage 2, it is the centroid cost vector, i.e., \( c^\ell_{cen} \), that represents the preferences for the observations assigned to cluster \( \ell \), which does not necessarily carry over the same level of stability achieved by the per-observation cost vectors (i.e., \( c^{k*}(s) \)) in Stage 1. To address this, once the clustering is done, one may solve the SC problem for each cluster again to find a “corrected” cost vector; i.e., \( \text{SC}(G^\ell, L = 1) \) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \). We denote such a post-processed cost vector by \( c^\ell_{IC}, \ell \in \mathcal{L} \).

### 3.3 Model Comparison

Next, we compare the performance of the SC model (i.e., (4)) and the CI and IC approaches.

**Proposition 1** Given \( \hat{\mathcal{X}} \), let \( \{G^\ell_{SC}, c^\ell_{SC}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) denote an optimal solution to model (4), and \( \{G^\ell_{CI}, c^\ell_{CI}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) and \( \{G^\ell_{IC}, c^\ell_{IC}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) be the clusters and corresponding cost vectors achieved the CI and IC approaches, respectively. Then we have

\[
(i) \quad \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{SC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{SC})\} \leq \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{CI}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{CI})\}, \text{ and}
\]

\[
(ii) \quad \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{SC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{SC})\} \leq \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{IC})\}.
\]

**Proof:** Since \( \{G^\ell_{SC}, c^\ell_{SC}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) is an optimal solution to (4), we have

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{SC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{SC})\} = \min_{\{(c^\ell, G^\ell)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}} \left\{ \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell)\} \mid \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1 \right\},
\]

where the right hand side corresponds to model (4).

For part (i), consider \( \{G^\ell_{CI}, c^\ell_{CI}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) generated by CI. Recall from (6) that \( c^\ell_{CI} \in \arg\min_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in G^\ell_{CI}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell)\} \mid \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1 \right\} \) for the given cluster \( G^\ell_{CI} \) for each \( \ell \). Thus,

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in G^\ell_{CI}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell_{CI})\} = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \min_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in G^\ell_{CI}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k*}(c^\ell)\} \mid \|c^\ell\|_1 = 1 \right\}.
\]
Then it follows that

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell_{SC})\}
\]

\[
= \min_{\{(c^\ell, \gamma^\ell)\} \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \min_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}
\]

\[
= \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell_{IC})\},
\]

as desired.

Proof for part (ii) is similar. Consider \(\{G^\ell_{IC}, c^\ell_{IC}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}\) generated by IC. Recall from (7) and the subsequent post-processing that \(c^\ell_{IC} \in \text{argmin}_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}.\) That is,

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell_{IC})\} = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \min_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}.
\]

Thus, we have

\[
\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell_{SC})\}
\]

\[
= \min_{\{(c^\ell, \gamma^\ell)\} \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \min_{c^\ell} \left\{ \max_{k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell)\} \left\| c^\ell \right\|_1 = 1 \right\}
\]

\[
= \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell_{IC}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c^\ell_{IC})\},
\]

as desired. □

While Proposition 1 indicates that the SC model produces better cluster stability than the CI and IC approaches, solving the SC model is typically computationally less efficient than CI and IC. Later in Section 3, we show that the CI and IC approaches can be used to generate an initial feasible solution for the SC model and thus reduce its computational burden. In the next section, we analyze the solution structure of the SC model, which we use to derive MIP formulations that provide lower and upper bounds on the optimal objective value of the SC model.

### 4 Solution Structure and Bounds

The reformulation of the SC model (i.e., (5)) is non-convex due to the normalization constraint (5f) as well as the objective function: for a given \(k \in \mathcal{K}\) and arbitrary \(c\),

\[
\max \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \mid x^k \in \mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c)\}
\]

is a maximization of the convex function \(d \in \mathcal{K}\) over the convex region \(\mathcal{X}^{k\ast}(c)\). Both the CI and IC approaches also face the same computational challenges because they also involve solving the SC formulations albeit of smaller size; i.e., Stage 2 of the CI approach solves \(\text{SC}(G^\ell_{CI}, L = 1)\) for each
ℓ ∈ ℒ and Stage 1 of the IC approach solves \( \text{SC}(\{k\}, L = 1) \) for each \( k \in K \). In this section, we analyze the solution structure of the SC model, which leads to MIP formulations that provide lower and upper bound solutions for the SC problem.

**Theorem 2** There exists an optimal solution \( \{\{(c^\ell x, G^\ell x)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in K}\} \) to (5) such that for each cluster \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \):

(i) \( a^{ki}x^k = b^k_i \) for \( i \in I^k \subseteq \mathcal{I}^k \) where \( |I^k| = n \) for all \( k \in G^\ell x \), and

(ii) \( c^\ell x \in \text{cone}(\{a^{ki}\}_{i \in I^k}) \) for all \( k \in G^\ell x \) where \( \text{cone}(\cdot) \) denotes the conic hull of the given vectors, i.e., \( \text{cone}(\{a^{ki}\}_{i \in I^k}) = \{\sum_{i \in I^k} \gamma_i a^{ki} \mid \gamma_i \geq 0\} \).

**Proof:** Consider an optimal solution \( \{\{(c^\ell x, G^\ell x)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in K}\} \) to (5). Due to constraints (5b)–(5e), we have \( x^{k*} \in X^{k*}(c^\ell x) \) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \) and \( k \in G^\ell x \). Note that any point in \( X^{k*}(c^\ell x) \) can be represented by a convex combination of extreme points of \( X^{k*}(c^\ell x) \). Let \( \text{ext}(X^{k*}(c^\ell x)) \) be the set of extreme points of \( X^{k*}(c^\ell x) \), \( Q_k = \left| \text{ext}(X^{k*}(c^\ell x)) \right| \), and \( Q^k = \{1, \ldots, Q_k\} \), i.e., \( \text{ext}(X^{k*}(c^\ell x)) = \{\bar{x}^1, \ldots, \bar{x}^Q_k\} \), for each \( k \in K \). Then, there exists \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^Q_k \) such that \( x^{k*} = \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \bar{x}^{q_k} \) and \( \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} = 1 \).

Now we prove part (i). Let \( q^*_k \in \text{argmax}_{q_k \in Q^k} \{\|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \} \). That is, we have \( \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \geq \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \) for all \( q_k \in Q^k \). Multiplying both sides of the inequality by \( \lambda_{q_k} \) yields \( \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \geq \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \) for all \( q_k \in Q^k \), and thus \( \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \geq \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \). Note that, from \( \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} = 1 \) we have \( \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r = \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \). This leads to

\[
\|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \geq \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \\
= \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \\
\geq \|\sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \\
= \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \sum_{q_k \in Q^k} \lambda_{q_k} \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \\
= \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r,
\]

where the second inequality holds due to Minkowski inequalities. Also, from the optimality of \( x^{k*} \), we have \( \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r \leq \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - x^{k*}\|_r \). Thus, it must be that \( \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - \bar{x}^{q_k}\|_r = \|\bar{x}^{q^*_k} - x^{k*}\|_r \). This means that the solution \( \{\{(c^\ell x, G^\ell x)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in K}\} \) is also optimal to (5). Since \( \bar{x}^{q^*_k} \) is an extreme point, there must exist \( I^{k*} \subseteq I^k \) where \( a^{ki} \bar{x}^{q^{*}_k} = b^k_i \) for all \( i \in I^{k*} \) and \( |I^{k*}| = n \).

We prove part (ii) using the same optimal solution \( \{\{(c^\ell x, G^\ell x)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in K}\} \) to (5). First, note that for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), \( c^\ell x \) satisfies (5b), which means for all \( k \in G^\ell x \) there exists at least one \( i \in I^{k*} \) for which \( y^i_k > 0 \). Moreover, \( y^i_k = 0 \) for all \( i \in I^k \setminus I^{k*} \) because for such \( i \)'s
we have $a^{ki} x_{ki}^* > b_i$. Thus, from (5b) we have $c^f = \sum_{i \in I^k} y_i^k a^{ki} = \sum_{i \in I^k} y_i^k a^{ki}$, or equivalently $c^f \in \text{cone}(\{a^{ki}\}_{i \in I^k})$, for all $k \in G^f$. □

The following result characterizes the solution structure of the SC model under the special case where all DMs solve the same DMP.

**Corollary 3** Assume $A^k = A$ and $b^k = b$ for all $k \in K$ and let $I$ be the index set for rows of $A$. Then there exists an optimal solution $\{(c^f, G^f)\}_{i \in L} \cdot \{(x^{ks}, y^{ks})\}_{k \in K}$ to (5) such that $c^f \in \text{cone}(\{a^i\}_{i \in I^f})$ for each cluster $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, where $I^f \subseteq I$, $|I^f| = n$, and $\text{cone}(\cdot)$ denotes the interior of the conic hull of given vectors, i.e., $\text{cone}(\cdot) = \{\sum_{i \in I^f} \lambda_i a^i | \lambda_i > 0\}$.

**Proof:** Consider an optimal solution $\{(c^f, G^f)\}_{i \in L} \cdot \{(x^{ks}, y^{ks})\}_{k \in K}$ to (5). Let $X$ denote the set of solutions for $x$ that satisfy $Ax \geq b$. Since $A^k = A$ and $b^k = b$ for all $k \in K$, we have $\lambda^a = \lambda^c$, $k \in K$, for any $c$. Let $Q = [\lambda^a(\{c^f\})]$, $Q^f = \{1, \ldots, Q\}$ (i.e., $\lambda^a(\{c^f\}) = \{\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_Q\}$), and $q^f \in \arg\max_{q \in Q} \{\sum_{i \in I^f} \|\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{x}_q\|_r\}$. Let $I^f = \{i \in I | a^i \tilde{x}_i = b_i\}$ for each $\tilde{x} \in L$. From the proof of Theorem 2, we know that $\{(c^f, G^f)\}_{i \in L} \cdot \{(x^{ks}, y^{ks})\}_{k \in K}$ is also optimal for (5) for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $k \in G^f$. Note that since $\tilde{x}_q^f$ is an extreme point of $X$, the interior of the cone $\text{cone}(\{a^i\}_{i \in I^f})$, i.e., $\text{cone}(\{a^i\}_{i \in I^f})$, is nonempty (see Proposition 15 in [15]). Hence, there exist $y^f_i > 0$ and $\tilde{c}^f$ such that $y^f_i > 0$ for all $i \in I^f$, $\|\tilde{c}^f\|_1 = 1$, and $\tilde{c}^f = \sum_{i \in I^f} y^f_i a^i$, i.e., $\tilde{c}^f \in \text{cone}(\{a^i\}_{i \in I^f})$ for all $\ell \in L$. To complete the proof, given such $y^f_i$ and $\tilde{c}^f$ we show that $\{(\tilde{c}^f, G^f)\}_{i \in L} \cdot \{(\tilde{x}_q^f, \tilde{y}^f)\}_{k \in K}$ where $\tilde{y}^f = \tilde{y}^f$ for all $k \in G^f$ is also feasible for (5), because $\|\tilde{c}^f\|_1 = 1$ for all $\ell \in L$, $A^f \tilde{x}_q^f \geq b$, $\tilde{y}^f \geq 0$, $A^f \tilde{c}^f = \tilde{c}^f$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $k \in G^f$, and finally, $\tilde{c}^f \tilde{x}^f = \sum_{i \in I^f} y^f_i a^i \tilde{x}^f = \sum_{i \in I^f} y^f_i b_i = b^y \tilde{y}^f$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $k \in G^f$. □

### 4.1 Lower Bound Formulation

Theorem 2 states that there exists an optimal solution to the SC model where $x^{ks}$ is an extreme point of $X^k$ for all $k \in K$. Additionally, if $k \in G^f$ then $c^f$ must be a conic combination of $a^{ki}$’s for $i$ such that $a^{ki} x^{ks} = b_i^f$. Based on this observation, we propose an MIP formulation that explicitly finds an extreme point $x^{ks}$ for each $X^k$, clusters the data points, and constructs $c^f$ for cluster $\ell$ as a conic combination of $a^{ki}$’s for $k$ assigned to cluster $\ell$ and for $i$ such that $a^{ki} x^{ks} = b_i^f$. We then show that the optimal value of this MIP provides a lower bound on the optimal value of the SC
problem:

$$
\text{SC-LB}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) : \quad \text{minimize}_{\{(x^k, v^k, \lambda^k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \ (c^k, e^k, e^k - x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{L}, \ u}} \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{d(\hat{x}^k, x^k)\} \\
\text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{A}^k \lambda^k - M_1(1 - u_{k\ell}) \leq c^\ell \\
\quad \quad \leq \mathbf{A}^k \lambda^k + M_1(1 - u_{k\ell}), \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (8b) \\
\lambda^k_i \leq M_2 w^k_i, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, i \in \mathcal{I}^k, \quad (8c) \\
b^k_i \leq a^{ki} x^k \leq b^k_i + M_3(1 - v^k_i), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, i \in \mathcal{I}^k, \quad (8d) \\
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^k} v^k_i = n, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (8e) \\
\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} u_{k\ell} = 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (8f) \\
c^\ell = c^\ell+ - c^\ell-, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8g) \\
c^\ell+ \leq z^\ell, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8h) \\
c^\ell- \leq e - z^\ell, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8i) \\
\mathbf{e}'(c^\ell+ + c^\ell-) = 1, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8j) \\
v^k \in \{0, 1\}^n, u \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times L}, z^\ell \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8k) \\
\lambda^k, c^\ell+, c^\ell- \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (8l)
$$

where parameters $M_1$, $M_2$, and $M_3$ are sufficiently large positive constants. Using the result of Theorem 2, constraints (8b)–(8c) enforce each $c^\ell$ to be a conic combination of some $a^{ki}$'s; which $a^{ki}$ is selected is dictated by binary variables $v^k_i$ and $u_{k\ell}$. If $u_{k\ell} = 1$, data point $\hat{x}^k$ is assigned to cluster $\ell$ and (8b) holds with equality. The variables $\lambda^k_i$ in (8b) are then controlled by (8c) using binary variable $v^k_i$, i.e., if $v^k_i = 0$ then $\lambda^k_i = 0$ and thus preventing $a^{ki}$ from being a basis vector for the conic hull constructing $c^\ell$. Constraints (8d)–(8e) enforce each $x^k$ to be an extreme point of $X^k$, i.e., satisfying $a^{ki} x^k \geq b^k_i$ with equality for $n$ number of $i$'s ensured by (8e). Constraint (8f) ensures that each observation is assigned to only one cluster. Finally, constraints (8g)–(8l) replace the non-convex normalization constraint (5f). The following result shows that the optimal value of the above problem is a lower bound on the optimal value of the SC problem, i.e., (5).

**Proposition 4** Let $\rho^*$ and $\beta^*$ denote the optimal objective values of problems (5) and (8), respectively. Then, we have (i) $\beta^* \leq \rho^*$, and (ii) $\beta^* = \rho^*$ if there exists $\{\hat{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{\hat{u}^\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}$ optimal for (8) such that $\hat{c}^\ell \in \text{cone}_+(\{a^{ki}\}_{i, k: \hat{v}^k_i = 1, \hat{u}_{k\ell} = 1})$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$.

**Proof:** To prove part (i), we show that given an optimal solution for (5) we can construct a feasible solution for (8) that achieves the objective value no greater than $\rho^*$. Let $\{(c^\ell, G^\ell)\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^k, y^k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ be an optimal solution to (5). From the proof of Theorem 2 for a fixed $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $k \in G^\ell$, the set of $x^k$'s that satisfy (5d)–(5e), together with $(c^\ell, G^\ell, y^k)$,
can be characterized by \( \text{conv}(\text{ext}(\mathcal{X}^k(c^{\ell*}))) \) where \( \text{conv}(\cdot) \) denotes the convex hull of a given set of points. Let \( Q^k = \{1, \ldots, Q_k\} \) be the index set for the extreme points in \( \text{ext}(\mathcal{X}^k(c^{\ell*})) \).

We now construct a feasible solution for (8). For all \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), let \( \tilde{c}^{\ell*}_j = c^{\ell*}_j, \tilde{c}^{-\ell*}_j = 0 \), and \( \tilde{z}^\ell_j = 1 \) if \( c^{\ell*}_j \geq 0 \), and let \( \tilde{c}^{\ell*}_j = 0, \tilde{c}^{-\ell*}_j = -c^{\ell*}_j \), and \( \tilde{z}^\ell_j = 0 \) otherwise. Since \( \|c^{\ell*}\|_1 = 1, (c^*, c^{\ell*}, c^{-\ell*}, z^\ell) = (c^{\ell*}, \tilde{c}^{\ell*}, \tilde{c}^{-\ell*}, \tilde{z}^\ell) \) satisfies (8) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \). Construct \( \tilde{u} \) by letting \( \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 1 \) if \( k \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \) and \( \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 0 \) otherwise, and let \( \tilde{\lambda}^k = y^{k*} \). For \( k \not\in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \), i.e., \( (k, \ell) \) such that \( \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 0 \), constraint (8b) holds trivially with \( (\tilde{\lambda}^k, \tilde{u}) = (\tilde{\lambda}^k, \tilde{u}) \) as \( M^k \) is a sufficiently large positive constant. For \( k \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \), because \( A^{k'}y^{k*} = c^{\ell*} \) from constraint (5b) we have \( A^{k'}\tilde{\lambda}^k = c^{\ell*} \), which satisfies (8b) with \( \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 1 \). Also, \( \tilde{\lambda}^k \) and \( \tilde{v}^\ell_k \) satisfy (8c) because \( \tilde{\lambda}^k = y^{k*} = 0 \) whenever \( \tilde{v}^\ell_k = 1 \). Next, for each \( k \in \mathcal{K} \) and some arbitrary extreme point \( \tilde{q}_k \in Q^k \), let \( \tilde{I}_{\tilde{q}_k} = \{i \in \mathcal{I}^k \mid a^{ki}\tilde{x}^\ell_k = b^k_k\} \); then let \( \tilde{v}^\ell_k = 1 \) if \( i \in \tilde{I}_{\tilde{q}_k} \) and \( \tilde{v}^\ell_k = 0 \) otherwise. Clearly, by definition of \( \tilde{I}_{\tilde{q}_k} \), we have \( \tilde{x}^\ell_k \) and \( \tilde{v}^\ell_k \) satisfy (8d). Furthermore, since \( \tilde{x}^\ell_k \) is an extreme point, we have \( |\tilde{I}_{\tilde{q}_k}| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^k} \tilde{v}^\ell_k = n \), satisfying (8e). Since each data point \( k \) is assigned to one of the clusters \( \{\mathcal{G}^{\ell*}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \), we have \( \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 1 \), which satisfies constraint (8f). Thus, the solution \( \{(c^{\ell*}, \mathcal{G}^{\ell*})\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(\tilde{\lambda}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k, \tilde{v}^\ell_k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}} \) is feasible for problem (8). Let \( \beta = \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k)\} \leq \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k)\} \leq \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k)\} \leq \rho^* \). Finally, because \( \beta^* \leq \beta \), we have \( \beta^* \leq \rho^* \), as desired.

To prove part (ii), let \( \{\tilde{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{\tilde{v}^\ell_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{\lambda^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{c^{\ell*}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, \tilde{u}} \) be optimal for (8) and assume \( \tilde{c}^\ell \in \text{cone}_+ \{\{a^{ki}\}_{i,k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1,\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1}\} \). Consider \( c^{\ell*} = \tilde{c}^\ell, x^{k*} = \tilde{x}^k, y^{k*} = \tilde{\lambda}^k \), and \( \lambda^k = \tilde{\lambda}^k \), and \( \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} = \{k \in \mathcal{K} \mid \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 1\} \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{K} \) and \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \). We show that the solution \( \{(c^{\ell*}, \mathcal{G}^{\ell*})\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \) is feasible for (8) as follows. First, we have \( A^{k'}y^{k*} = A^{k'}\tilde{\lambda}^k \tilde{c}^\ell = c^{\ell*} \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \) if \( \tilde{u}_{k\ell} = 1 \), which satisfies (5b); \( y^{k*} = \tilde{\lambda}^k \geq 0 \), which satisfies (5e); \( A^kx^{k*} = \tilde{\lambda}^k \tilde{x}^\ell_k \geq b^k_k \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{K} \) and \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), which satisfies (5d); and \( \|c^{\ell*}\|_1 = \|c^{\ell*}\|_1 = 1 \) for all \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), which satisfies constraint (8f). To show this solution also satisfies (5e), let \( \tilde{I}_k = \{i \in \mathcal{I}^k \mid \tilde{u}^\ell_k = 1\} \) for each \( k \in \mathcal{K} \). From (8d) and \( x^{k*} = \tilde{x}^k \), we have \( \tilde{y}^\ell_k \geq 0 \) for \( i \in \tilde{I}_k \) and \( \tilde{y}^\ell_k = 0 \) otherwise. Thus, we have \( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^k} \tilde{y}^\ell_k a^{ki}x^{k*} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^k} \tilde{y}^\ell_k b^k_k \), and because \( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^k} \tilde{y}^\ell_k a^{ki} = c^{k*} \) from (8b), this equation becomes \( c^{k*}x^{k*} = b^k_k y^{k*} \), which satisfies (5e). As a result, \( \{(c^{k*}, \mathcal{G}^{\ell*})\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}, \{(x^{k*}, y^{k*})\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \) is feasible for (8). Next, note that \( c^{\ell*} \in \text{cone}_+ \{\{a^{ki}\}_{i \in \tilde{I}_k}\} \) and \( |\tilde{I}_k| = n \) for each \( k \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \); therefore, \( x^{k*} \) is an extreme point and in fact is the only solution for \( x^{k*} \) that satisfies constraints (5) for each \( k \in \mathcal{K} \), i.e., \( \text{ext}(\mathcal{X}^k(c^{\ell*})) = \{x^{k*}\} \) and \( |Q^k| = 1 \) for all \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \) and \( k \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell*} \). Thus, we have \( \beta = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1} d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1} d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1} d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1} \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, k:\tilde{u}^\ell_k=1} d(\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{x}^\ell_k) = \rho^* \), where the fourth equality holds because \( x^{k*} \) is the only member in \( Q^k \).

Proposition 4 suggests that the optimal value of model (8) is a lower bound on the optimal value of the SC model. Proposition 4 also implies that once model (8) is solved, we can check the condition in Proposition (ii) to determine whether (8) achieves the exact optimal value of the SC model.
4.2 Upper Bound Formulation

Proposition 4 states that if formulation (8) finds a solution such that each \( c^\ell \), \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), is a strict conic combination of the selected \( a^{ki} \) vectors, then its optimal value is equal to that of the SC model. Based on this observation, we add a constraint to (8) that enforces this condition and show that the following modified problem provides an upper bound on the optimal value of the SC model:

\[
\text{SC-UB}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) : \begin{array}{ll}
\text{minimize} & \max_k \{ d(\hat{x}^k, x^k) \} \\
\text{subject to} & (8b) - (8l), (9c)
\end{array}
\]

where \( \hat{\alpha} \) is a small positive constant. For each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \in \mathcal{G}^\ell \), and \( i \in \mathcal{I}^k \), if \( v^k_i = 1 \) then \( \lambda^k_i \geq \hat{\alpha} > 0 \), which enforces \( c^\ell \) to be a strict conic combination of \( n \) selected \( a^{ki} \) vectors (i.e., for which \( v^k_i = 1 \); see (8d)–(8e)). If there exists an optimal solution for the SC problem whose \( c^\ell \) vectors satisfy the strict conic combination condition then (9) with an appropriate \( \hat{\alpha} \) generates the optimal solution for the SC model; otherwise, the optimal solution of (9) is an upper bound on the optimal objective value of the SC model. We formalize this in the following result.

Proposition 5 Given \( \hat{\alpha} \), let \( \rho^* \) and \( \beta^* \) denote the optimal objective values of problems (5) and (9), respectively. Then, we have \( \rho^* \leq \beta^* \).

Proof: Let \( \{ (x^k, v^k, \lambda^k) \}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, \{ (c^\ell, \nu^\ell, \mu^\ell) \}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}, u} \) be optimal for problem (9) and \( \beta^* \) be the optimal value of (9). Due to constraint (9c), we have \( c^\ell \in \text{cone}(\{a^{ki}\}_{i,k: v^k_i = 1, u^k = 1}) \) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \). Note that this solution is feasible for (8) with the same objective value \( \beta^* \) because the feasible region of (9) is a subset of that of (8) due to the extra constraint (9c). From the proof of Proposition 4 (ii), if this solution is optimal for (8), then \( \beta^* \) is equal to the optimal value of (5), i.e., \( \rho^* \); on the other hand, if this solution is feasible for (8), \( \beta^* \geq \rho^* \). Thus, \( \beta^* \) is an upper bound on \( \rho^* \).

In our numerical experiment in Section 6, we demonstrate the performance of formulations (8) and (9) in achieving near-optimal solutions to the SC problem. In the next section, we discuss solution approaches for the IC, CI, and SC approaches.

5 Solution Approaches

While \( \text{SC-LB}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) \) and \( \text{SC-UB}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) \) provide bounds for the true SC problem, i.e., \( \text{SC}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}) \), these problems are typically large-scale MIPs and thus can be computationally challenging. To address this, we propose to use the CI and IC approaches to create initial solutions for these MIPs. However, as discussed in Section 4, Stage 2 of the CI approach itself involves \( \text{SC}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{IC}}, L = 1) \) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), and Stage 1 and the post-processing of the IC approach also involves solving \( \text{SC}(\{k\}, L = 1) \) for each \( k \in \mathcal{K} \) and \( \text{SC}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{IC}}, L = 1) \) for each \( \ell \in \mathcal{L} \), respectively. These “smaller” SC problems can also be approximately solved using the corresponding smaller upper and lower bound MIP
formulations, just like how the full-size SC problem is approximated. For example, \( \text{SC}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{CI}}, L = 1) \) for the CI approach can be approximated by \( \text{SC-UB}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{CI}}, L = 1) \) and \( \text{SC-LB}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{CI}}, L = 1) \).

Once approximate solutions (clusters and cost vectors) for the IC and CI approaches are obtained, we use them as initial feasible solutions for \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \) and \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \). In particular, solving the smaller SC problems in the CI and IC approaches using the corresponding SC-UB formulations leads to initial feasible solutions for \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \); similarly, solving the smaller SC problems using the SC-LB formulations leads to initial feasible solutions for \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \). Figure 2 details how initial solutions are generated for \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \); similar steps can be performed to find initial feasible solutions for \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \). Finally, once \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \) and \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \) are solved, if their objective values are equal, their solutions will be optimal for the true SC problem. Otherwise, it is safer to use the result obtained by the upper bound formulation \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \) because the true worst-case distance will never exceed the objective value of \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \).

Figure 2: Steps for generating initial solutions for \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \). Similar steps can be used for generating initial solutions for \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \).

6 Numerical Results

We use various-sized randomly generated instances to demonstrate the CI, IC, and SC approaches. For small instances we choose \( K \in \{30, 40, 50\} \) and generate LP instances with \( n = 10 \) and \( m_k = m \in \{30, 40\}, \forall k = 1, \ldots, K \). For large instances we use \( K \in \{100, 115, 130\}, n = 20 \), and \( m_k = m \in \{60, 80\}, \forall k = 1, \ldots, K \). To generate \( \hat{X} \) for each instance, we generate \( K \) random cost vectors, solve \( K \) DMPs to generate optimal solutions, and add random noise to the solutions to generate input data \( \hat{X} \). All optimization problems were solved by Gurobi 9.1 [7] with a 16-core 2.9 GHz processor and 512 GB memory.

Table I shows the achieved worst-case distances and solutions times for the IC and CI approaches as well as the upper and lower bound formulations for the SC problem (i.e., \( \text{SC-UB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \) and \( \text{SC-LB}(K, \mathcal{L}) \), respectively). Although the IC and CI problems involved both (their respective
smaller versions of) SC-UB and SC-LB formulations, for brevity Table 1 only presents the IC and CI results involving SC-UB. Columns labeled as UB show the results for SC-UB \((K, L)\), which were obtained using the initial solution achieved by the IC and CI results presented in this table. Thus, the solution time for UB is the time for finding an initial solution using either IC or CI approach (whichever leads to a smaller worst-case distance) plus the time for the solver to improve the initial solution and find an optimal solution. Columns labeled LB show the results for SC-LB \((K, L)\). For each instance \((n, m, K)\), the reported worst-case distance values and times in the table were averaged over two sub-instances with \(L = 3\) and \(L = 5\). For all instances, the UB and LB values were the same or close to each other, indicating that the solutions generated by both models are close to the optimal solutions for the SC model. Since the SC model considers a minimization of the worst-case distance, our suggestion for the user is to use the clusters and cost vectors achieved by the upper bound formulation so as not to underestimate the true cluster instability.

Table 2: Performance of the CI, IC, and SC for instances with similar \((A, b)\) across all DMs.
Although the UB model performs better than both CI and IC in terms of cluster stability, it is slower in most instances. The performance of the CI and IC approaches depend highly on the geometric variation of the DMP feasible regions. For example, when all DMs solve DMPs with similar constraints, i.e., similar $A^k$ and $b^k$, the performance of CI and IC becomes comparable to that of the SC approach. To demonstrate this, we generated instances where $(A, b)$ is fixed across all DMs. Table 2 shows the result of CI, IC, and SC for these instances. Recall from Corollary 3 that solving the upper bound formulation $SC-UB(K, L)$, i.e., (9), for these instances generates an optimal solution for the SC model. We solved both (9) (with $\hat{\alpha} = 0.05$) and (8) and indeed observed that their optimal values matched, indicating that the solution is optimal for SC. In most cases, both IC and CI approaches find worst-case distance values close to those from the SC model, though the CI approach appears to perform better than IC for these specific instances.

Figure 3 further compares the performance of the CI, IC, and SC approaches using a small instance $(n, m, K, L) = (3, 15, 5, 2)$. For all three approaches we used the same solution process discussed for instances in Table 2. The values for the SC approach were optimal as the UB and LB matched. The x-axis represents five DMs and the y-axis shows the optimal solutions for $x^k$ achieved for DM $k$ with respect to the cost vector representing its cluster, along with the observations $\hat{x}^k$. While the solutions from IC and CI are closer to the observations than those from SC are for some DMs (e.g., $k=5$), the SC approach achieved a lowest worst-case distance over all DMs, as expected.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we introduced a new clustering approach, called optimality-based clustering, that clusters DMs based on similarity of their decision preferences. We formulated the clustering problem as a non-convex optimization problem and proposed MIP formulations that provide lower and upper bounds on its optimal objective value. We also proposed two heuristics that can be efficient in large
instances and perform comparably to solving the problem exactly in certain instances. The future research includes extending the idea of optimality-based clustering to the cases where the DMPs are non-linear, mixed-integer, or multi-objective optimization problems.
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