

A comprehensive study of clustering a class of 2D shapes

Agnieszka Kaliszewska and Monika Syga

Abstract

The paper concerns clustering with respect to the shape and size of 2D contours that are boundaries of cross-sections of 3D objects of revolution. We propose a number of similarity measures based on combined disparate Procrustes analysis (PA) and Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) distances. Motivation and the main application for this study comes from archaeology. The performed computational experiments refer to the clustering of archaeological pottery.

Keywords: cross-sections, objects of revolution, shape representation, Procrustes distance, shape similarity, DTW, morphometrics, clustering, 2D contours, Kendall shape theory, typology of archaeological pottery

1 Introduction

We investigate clustering of 2D cross-sections of 3D objects of revolution with respect to shape and size. We do not tackle the problem of recognizing whether a given 3D object is rotationally symmetric or not.

Clustering is used extensively in unsupervised machine learning applications such as information retrieval and natural language understanding as well as in numerous fields such as economics, biology, medicine, physics, e.g. [25]. However, it evades an in-depth unified framework. This is mostly due to specific challenges arising depending on the nature of data, resulting in case-specific algorithms. Some of these challenges have been presented in e.g. [24] and [30]. There, the so called *impossibility theorem* is proved which states that no clustering algorithm exists satisfying the following three axioms: scale invariance, richness, and consistency. For further discussion see e.g., [6], [7], [9].

To obtain significant results for clustering of 2D cross-sections of objects of revolution with respect to shape, and size, aside from the choice of the algorithm, the following issues are of fundamental importance: the shape concept, the data representation, and the similarity measure [40] and [19]. In our investigation we address those three issues in the context of clustering of archaeological pottery.

1.1 State-of-the-art

The problem of automatic and semi-automatic classification of archaeological pottery has been investigated by several authors. In [31] similarity measure is proposed based on the extraction

of shape features from the silhouette through medialness. In [33] the authors make use of the 3D models of the investigated shapes in combination with syntactic pattern recognition approach. The classification of 3D shapes, and the issue of matching a fragment to its fully preserved counterpart, is investigated in [26], where the shape information is extracted based on a skeleton. In [18] a classification, based on contour representations and the representative functions, is presented. Most recently, a comprehensive overview of classification and shape matching methods in the study of archaeological ceramics has been published in [41]. Procrustes analysis and generalized Procrustes Analysis appear in the analysis of archaeological material as stand-alone methods, for example in [10], there they are used to study the variability of landmark points in the study of shapes of a class of objects.

On the other hand, clustering methods in archaeological applications are scarce. One such method for shape contours clustering that uses the representative functions for shape representation and the Euclidean distance to define the similarity measure is presented in [14]. Other contributions on the clustering of archaeological pottery include [5, 28, 36] and the references therein. In the paper, [20] we have proposed a similarity measure based on Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) to compare representative functions as defined in [14]. The performed experiments showed that DTW could provide a promising new similarity measure. This observation formed a basis for introducing the similarity measures as defined in the present paper.

In the present investigation, we use the concept of shape introduced by [22], [23], Procrustes Analysis (PA) and DTW to propose new weighted similarity measures. Up to our knowledge, this approach has not yet been used in the context of clustering of archaeological pottery. It is worth mentioning that our approach can be applied to clustering of any 3D objects of revolution for which the revolution axis and the 2D section are known.

1.2 The methods

The concept of shape we adopt, and a formal basis of shape analysis in the form of the so-called Kendall shape goes back to a series of publications by David Kendall [22], [23], [15]. Kendall shape analysis in turn is inspired by the shape theory introduced by Karol Borsuk in the sixties and seventieth [4] and is motivated by applications in archaeology. For the systematic exposition of the topic see the monograph [8].

Informally, the shape of an object X is defined as all the geometrical information that remains when location, scale and rotational effects are filtered out from the object X , or, in other words, the shape is the geometry of an object X modulo position, orientation, and size. In consequence, the shape space is the space of equivalence classes defined by a given class of objects X .

Such understanding of shape gives rise to the concept of the *Procrustes distance* or *Procrustes distance measure* (see e.g. [15]) between the objects X_1 and X_2 as the distance of X_1 to the equivalence class defined by X_2 . The Procrustes distance is not a distance in the formal meaning of the term. Based on Procrustes distance, Procrustes-type similarity measures between shapes are proposed.

In numerous applications, PA and Procrustes-type similarity measures are combined with other similarity measures, e.g. in [17], combining PA with the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is proposed to investigate 3D gait recognition problem, [12], PA is combined with the DTW to investigate surgery task classification in [1].

DTW is devised to compare time series. More about this topic can be found [2] and [11].

In general, similarity measures devised with the help of DTW can be applied to any objects composed with linearly parametrized (ordered) elements (components).

In our investigations, we define similarity measures by combining and Procrustes based similarity measures with DTW similarity measures. The computational experiments confirm the efficiency of the proposed approach.

2D cross-sections are represented through their contours, i.e 2D curves that are boundaries of these 2D cross-sections. In archaeological applications, those 2D curves are generated from technical drawings. This means that their position on the plane is not random and is determined by a set of strict rules. As a consequence, the problem of possible misalignment is not as crucial as in other applications, e.g. [34, 35]. By applying the boundary-based representation of cross-sections, the problem of clustering of 3D objects of revolution is reduced to the clustering of 2D curves with a given revolution axis with respect to shape and size. The problem of shape and size analysis of 2D curves and functions is gaining increasing interest due to many important applications, such as cardiovascular analysis [34], finance interest rates [21], nuclear industry [3].

A specific feature of clustering of archaeological pottery is that the contours should be classified with respect to subtle differences in shapes and size. Hence, the adopted similarity measures and the resulting clusters should reflect as precisely as possible, those subtle differences. The subtle differences are of great importance in the clustering of contours, as a relatively small change in the contour might have a great impact on the shape of the respective 3D object of revolution.

1.3 The aim and the contribution

The main aim of the present investigation is to propose weighted similarity measures, based on PA and DTW, for clustering of 2D curves defining boundaries of 2D cross-sections of 3D objects of revolution, with respect to shape and size.

Depending upon the particular case, the contribution of shape and size in the overall similarity measure is adjusted by proper choice of weights.

The secondary aim is to apply these similarity measures to the automatic generation of typologies (clusters) for archaeological pottery fragments. Clustering archaeological pottery is considered a process that may depend, to some extent, upon subjective judgements. This subjective judgement can be reflected in the choice of weights in the similarity measure.

The contribution of the paper is as follows.

1. By using the PA (formula (3.3)) and DTW (formula (3.2)) we propose two novel curve-based pair-wise formulas to compare two curves:
 - Direct Composition similarity measure DC (see formula (3.6)),
 - scale (size) factor γ^* (formula (3.3)).
2. We use direct composition similarity measure DC (formula (3.6)), scale similarity measure γ^* (formula (3.5)) and the procrustes similarity measure PA (formula (3.3)) to generate various similarity matrices with the help of weights and normalization. By introducing weights and normalizations we get the following similarity matrices for which we perform our experiments:

- (a) PSM (formula (4.6))-Procrustes similarity matrix, emphasizes the variations in the shape of curves in data set,
 - (b) DCM (formula (4.7))-direct composition matrix, emphasizes the variations in shape and size of curves in data set,
 - (c) SCM (formula (4.8))-scale component matrix, emphasizes only the variations in the size of curves in data set,
 - (d) WPSM (formula (4.9))-weighted Procrustes and scale component matrix, emphasizes the variations in shapes and size of curves in data set, by changing the weights we can decide which feature we want to highlight in a given experiment,
 - (e) WNDCSM (formula (4.10))-weighted direct composition and scale component matrix where direct composition values are normalized. Since the direct composition values are usually much higher than the values of scale component we use normalization.
3. We apply the proposed similarity measures to the generation of typologies of archaeological pottery. The computational experiment is based on several data sets, some of them real-life data, larger data sets are generated automatically by augmentation procedures.

1.4 The organization of the paper

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we describe the class of investigated objects and we discuss the representations of 2D shapes (contours). In Section 3 we present basic elements of PA and DTW and we define direct composition similarity measure DC. In Section 4 we introduce similarity measures (a)-(e) and present a general algorithm. In Section 5 we describe the archaeological objects on which we test our method. In Section 6 we describe the numerical experiments conducted and the data used. In Section 7 we discuss the obtained results. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 The class of investigated objects

Geometrically, 3D objects of revolution is a solid obtained by rotating a plane curve around a straight line (axis of revolution) that lies on the same plane. We investigate 3D objects of revolution obtained by rotating their 2D cross-sections, (not necessarily curves) around an axis of revolution. Boundaries of 2D sections are called contours. We assume each contour is a 2D open curve $\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Each curve is a function $\alpha : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ represented as

$$\alpha(t) := (x(t), y(t)) \quad t \in [t_0, t_1], \quad (2.1)$$

where $x : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $y : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We assume that

- (A) the curves are contours of cross-sections of objects of revolution with the revolution axis OY and are all located in the first quadrant of the plane ($x \geq 0, y \geq 0$)
- (B) the lowermost point (points), i.e., points with the smallest value of the coordinate y of a given curve is forced to lay on OX axis (i.e. its y coordinate equals zero), and the point




Figure 1: The transformation of a section of rotationally symmetric object into a 2D input data curve.

$(x_r, 0)$, where x_r is the smallest value of x -coordinate corresponding to $y = 0$ defines the the radius r of the 3D object of revolution (see Figure 1),

$$r := x_r, \quad (2.2)$$

(C) the uppermost point (points), i.e. points with largest values of the coordinate y are assumed to lie on the revolution axis OY .

Remark 2.1 *Let us note that that assumption (A) is not limiting. In case we classify objects with various revolution axes, we can always rotate (and shift) the object so as to make the assumption (A) satisfied. Assumptions (B) and (C) refer to the situation which is natural in the archaeological application, i.e. the locations of contours on the plane are not random and defined as in (B) and (C). In the case where the locations of contours are random, some position normalization is needed, e.g. one can apply position normalization with which Procrustes Analysis typically starts.*

2.1 Shape representations

From the digitized cross-section the boundary discrete curve (contour) is extracted via standard techniques of contour extraction.

Contours are smoothed by the Savitzky-Golay filtering to preserve as much as possible the original shape of a profile.

In further analysis, we consider discrete curves, i.e. a curve α is a pair of vectors,

$$\alpha := (x(i), y(i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k_\alpha. \quad (2.3)$$

Consequently, in the sequel, all data are vectors of different dimensions. When the original data is acquired in the form of bitmaps (e.g. scanned hand-made drawings), the accuracy of discretization depends on the resolution of the scanned image.

3 Similarity measures

We start by recalling PA and DTW similarity measure. For more detailed readings, see e.g. [29, 11, 32].

Next, in subsection 3.3, we define new similarity measures based on PA and DTW, which is called direct composition DC.

3.1 Dynamic Time Warping (DTW)

In view of the adopted contour representations, the compared curves X and Y are represented by sequences $X := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ of length $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y := (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_M)$ of length $M \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively, i.e., $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^M$.

To make the comparison between these sentences the DTW algorithm align them by applying the following procedure. First, the definition of a warping path is introduced.

Definition 3.1 *Definition 4.1, [29] An (N, M) -warping path (or simply referred to as warping path if N and M are clear from the context) is a sequence $p = (p_1, \dots, p_L)$ with $p_\ell = (n_\ell, m_\ell) \in \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, M\}$ for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ satisfying the following three conditions.*

- (i) *Boundary condition:* $p_1 = (1, 1)$ and $p_L = (N, M)$.
- (ii) *Monotonicity condition:* $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_L$ and $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_L$.
- (iii) *Step size condition:* $p_{\ell+1} - p_\ell \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$ for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$.

Hence, an (N, M) -warping path $p = (p_1, \dots, p_L)$ is defined by an alignment between two sequences $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_M)$ by assigning the element x_{n_ℓ} of X to the element y_{m_ℓ} , $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ of Y . The Figure (2) shows how an alignment is transformed into a warping path.

Now we define a cost measure which allows finding the best warping path. In the following, by F we denote the feature space, i.e., $x_n, y_m \in F$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. To compare two different elements $x, y \in F$, a local cost measure is defined to be a function $c : F \times F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Evaluating the local cost measure for each pair of elements of the sequences X and Y , we obtain the cost matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ defined by $C(n, m) := c(x_n, y_m)$.

The total cost $c_p(X, Y)$ of a warping path p between X and Y with respect to the local cost measure c is defined as

$$c_p(X, Y) := \sum_{\ell=1}^L c(x_{n_\ell}, y_{m_\ell}), \quad (3.1)$$

where, as in Definition 3.1, $p = (p_1, \dots, p_L)$ with $p_\ell = (x_{n_\ell}, y_{m_\ell})$, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. An optimal warping path between X and Y is a warping path p^* having minimal total cost from among all possible warping paths. The DTW similarity measure $DTW(X, Y)$ between X and Y is then defined as the total cost of p^* :

$$\begin{aligned} DTW(X, Y) &:= c_{p^*}(X, Y) \\ &= \min\{c_p(X, Y) \mid p \text{ is an } (N, M)\text{-warping path}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The DTW similarity measure is akin to Fréchet distance, see [2, 29]. In our experiments we use the DTW function from Matlab Signal Processing Toolbox.




Figure 2: An example of an alignment and a warping path p .

3.2 Procrustes analysis (PA)

Procrustes Analysis (PA) allows to perform the statistical shape analysis and to compute a similarity measure for any given pair of 2D curves represented in the discretised form (2.3) see e.g. [16, 32].

Let us consider the set of discrete curves $\alpha := (x(j), y(j))_{j=1}^k \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$ (regarded as row vectors). Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of similarity transformations defined on $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$. $\mathcal{T}$ is given in the form of triples $T := (\gamma, R, t)$, where:

- $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ represents a (uniform) scaling factor and defines the scaling transformation $\gamma: (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$, $\gamma(\alpha) = [\gamma(x(1), y(1)), \dots, \gamma(x(k), y(k))]$,
- R is a 2×2 rotation matrix of the angle θ , and defines rotation transformation $R: (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$,

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix},$$

$$R(\alpha) = R\alpha,$$

- $t \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$ is a translation vector, which defines the transformation $t: (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$, $t(\alpha) = t + \alpha$, with components $t(j) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$.

For the input discrete curves $\alpha_1 := (x_1(j), y_1(j)) = (z_1(j))$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, $\alpha_2 := (x_2(j), y_2(j)) = (z_2(j))$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, the Procrustes similarity measure $PA(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is defined as

$$PA(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) := \inf_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{j=1}^k \|z_1(j) - (\gamma(R\alpha_2)(j) + t(j))\|_2^2, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Euclidean distance in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The procrustes similarity measure is not a distance since in general $PA(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \neq PA(\alpha_2, \alpha_1)$.

Formula (3.3) can be interpreted in terms of equivalence classes $[\cdot]$ of some equivalence relation. Namely, a (discrete) curve $\alpha := (x(j), y(j))_{j=1}^k \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$ belongs to the equivalence class defined by $\alpha_1 = (x_1(j), y_1(j))_{j=1}^k \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$, $\alpha \in [\alpha_1]$ iff $(x(j), y(j)) = \gamma \cdot R(x_1(j), y_1(j)) + t(j)$, $t(j) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, where $\gamma > 0$ is a scaling factor, R is a 2×2 rotation matrix of the angle θ , as defined above, and $t \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In this way an equivalence relation $\equiv$ is defined as

$$\alpha_1 \equiv \alpha_2 \Leftrightarrow (x_1(j), y_1(j)) = \gamma \cdot R(x_1(j), y_1(j)) + t(j), \quad (3.4)$$

$j = 1, \dots, k$ for some scaling factor $\gamma > 0$, rotation matrix R and translation vector t with components $t(j) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$.

In our experiments we use the Procrustes function from Matlab Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox.

3.3 Direct Composition

In the present subsection we introduce a new similarity measure which is based on composition of PA and DTW.

Let two (discrete) curves $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^k$ be given. The objective function of the optimization problem (3.3) is strictly convex and bounded from below. By solving problem (3.3), we obtain the minimal value $PA(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = d$ and the curve $Z = T^* \alpha_2$, where $T^* \in \mathcal{T}$ is an optimal solution to problem (3.3) i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} PA(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = d &= \inf_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|\alpha_1 - T \alpha_2\|^2 \\ &= \|\alpha_1 - Z\|^2 = \|\alpha_1 - T^* \alpha_2\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

and $Z := T^* \alpha_2 = \gamma^* R^* \alpha_2 + t^*$, where $\gamma^* > 0$ is the (optimal) scaling factor and R^* is the (optimal) rotation matrix, and t^* is the (optimal) translation vector. In our experiments the curve Z is taken from the Procrustes function in Matlab Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox.

With the help of the curve Z we define the new similarity measure, called *direct composition DC* and given as

$$DC(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = DTW(\alpha_1, Z). \quad (3.6)$$

Direct composition DC combines global shape similarity measure PA with DTW which takes into account local shape variability as well.

The motivation for the combination of PA and DTW measures stems from previous works, e.g. [20] that have brought to light a necessity to introduce a similarity measure that would take into account the subtle nature of the differences between the investigated shapes. Not without importance is the possibility of introducing weights that account for the expert's knowledge, and bring his expertise into the process.

We consider PA and DTW methods complementary, as they address different characteristics of the shape. PA is, in our case, a robust tool for the alignment of shapes and the detection of overall shape similarity. It performs very well when used to detect scale and orientation invariant similarity between significantly different shapes. DTW on the other hand is well suited to detect subtle changes in objects that could be generally defined as similar. It fails, however, to quantify the similarity when the shapes differ in attributes such as rotation, or scale.

The idea of combining PA and DTW in similarity measures related to the analysis of temporal alignment of human motion already appeared e.g. in [42].

4 Clustering of curves - proposed algorithm

In the present section we propose an algorithm for clustering of 2D contours of cross-sections of 3D objects of revolution. We assume that the given set of contours consists of n 2 elements. Let $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$, by i and j we denote the i -th contour and j -th contour respectively. First we calculate the „distances“ between two contours i and j , $i \neq j$ by using the following three formulas

$$pa(i, j) = \max\{PA(i, j), PA(j, i)\}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$dc(i, j) = \max\{DC(i, j), DC(j, i)\}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\gamma(i, j) = 1 - \min\{\gamma^*(i, j), \gamma^*(j, i)\}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\gamma^*(i, j)$ is the optimal scaling factor obtained from the $PA(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$ (formula (3.5)) and $\gamma^*(j, i)$ is the optimal scaling factor obtained from the $PA(\alpha_j, \alpha_i)$ (formula (3.5)). Whenever $i = j$ we put

$$pa(i, i) = 0, \quad dc(i, i) = 0, \quad \gamma(i, i) = 0.$$

The numbers calculated by the formulas (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3) can have very different ranges, hence, to ensure the comparability, we use the following normalization formulas for dc and γ

$$ndc(j) = \frac{1}{\max_{i=1, \dots, n} dc(i, j)}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

$$n\gamma(j) = \frac{1}{\max_{i=1, \dots, n} \gamma(i, j)}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

When the normalization is not needed we put $ndc(j) = ndc = 1$, for all $j = 1, \dots, n$ or $n\gamma(j) = n\gamma = 1$, for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.

4.1 Similarity matrix

The similarity matrix is created by calculating the similarity measure between any two contours i and j . Let $\mu, \lambda, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$ be given numbers (weights), we calculate the similarity measure (SM) as follows:

$$SM_{ij}(\mu, \lambda, \omega, ndc, n\gamma) := \mu \cdot pa(i, j) + \lambda \cdot ndc(j) \cdot dc(i, j) + \omega \cdot n\gamma(j) \cdot \gamma(i, j). \quad (4.4)$$

By calculating the number SM_{ij} for every pair of contours i and j , $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ from the data set we get the similarity matrix

$$SM(\mu, \lambda, \omega, ndc, n\gamma), \quad (4.5)$$

which is symmetric and has zeros on the main diagonal.

This general similarity measure allows us to perform various experiments. By changing values of numbers $\mu, \lambda, \omega, ndc, n\gamma$ we get the following similarity matrices:

1. Procrustes similarity matrix

$$PSM = SM(1, 0, 0, 1, 1). \quad (4.6)$$

2. Direct composition matrix

$$DCM = SM(0, 1, 0, 1, 1). \quad (4.7)$$

3. Scale component matrix

$$SCM = SM(0, 0, 1, 1, 1). \quad (4.8)$$

4. Weighted Procrustes and scale component matrix

$$WPSM = SM(\mu, 0, \omega, 1, 1). \quad (4.9)$$

5. Weighted direct composition and scale component matrix where direct composition values are normalized

$$WNDCSM = SM(0, \lambda, \omega, ndc, 1). \quad (4.10)$$

6. Weighted direct composition and scale component matrix where both direct composition values and scale component values are normalized

$$WNDCNSM = SM(0, \lambda, \omega, ndc, n\gamma). \quad (4.11)$$

For clustering we apply the hierarchical clustering. We use three standard methods to measure the distance between clusters i.e single linkage, average linkage and weighted average linkage (see Table 3 and Table 4).

4.2 Proposed algorithm

The general algorithm is presented below in Algorithm 4.1. By changing the values of weights μ, λ, ω and $ndc, n\gamma$, we obtain different similarity measures, as described above, and consequently, different clustering results.

Algorithm 4.1 [1] *Choose the values of weights μ, λ, ω and $ndc, n\gamma$.*

[2] *Prepare the input data (vectors) as described in Section 2.*

[3] *Calculate the similarity between any two vectors i and j by the formula (4.4) and generate the similarity matrix by the formula (4.5).*

[4] *Perform clustering on the basis of the similarity matrix (4.5) generated in step [3] by the standard hierarchical algorithms (Matlab toolbox) and generate the dendrogram.*

5 Application-Archaeological objects.

In the present section, we describe the archaeological objects to which we apply our algorithm. These objects are archaeological pottery fragments. When produced on the pottery wheel, vessels are rotationally symmetric objects of revolution. We limit our attention to this kind of vessels. Consequently, a cross-section and the location of the revolution axis are enough to convey the shape of the whole vessel.

In archaeological practice, the vessels or vessel fragments are described by their cross-sections. These cross-sections are hand-made technical drawings- they are made according to a set of rules and use conventions and a visual language to maintain standards and convey as much information about the vessel as possible, without the need to supplement it with text.

Classification of pottery obtained through excavation is a form of organizing the material to conclude the investigated sets and deal with the spatio-temporal diversity of the pottery. Such classifications are traditionally performed manually and depend heavily on the expert's knowledge and experience and as a result, are prone to being biased.

In our application, the curves, as defined in Section 2, are contours of cross-sections of vessels uncovered in the course of archaeological work. From the technical drawings, the axis of revolution of each vessel can easily be deciphered. As mentioned in Section 2 to perform the clustering (generate clusters) we standardise the location of the contours to the first quadrant of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and standardise the position of contours by considering their upside-down versions. More

precisely, in the present study we consider contours (curves) for which we know the coordinate x_r , see Figure 1 and for which the uppermost point (points) lies on the revolution axis OY to satisfy assumptions (a)-(c) of Section 2. This means that we classify vessel fragments for which the full cross-section is known. This does not mean that the full vessel is known. There exist archaeological techniques which allow reconstructing the exact full cross-section of a vessel, even in the case where the vessel is considerably damaged.

During the process of clustering, the vessels can be divided into groups based on many features. With the help of our clustering algorithm, we divide given archaeological pottery sets with respect to shape and size. We limit our attention to the clustering of those pottery fragments for which the complete cross-section can be extracted.

6 Experiment

To test the algorithm (4.1) we have designed and conducted a series of experiments related to the clustering of archaeological pottery. For that purpose, we have chosen 6 sets of data, each with 36 to 51 elements. Set 2 is presented in Fig.3. The profiles used for the experiments come from the publication by P. Mountjoy [27] where the real-life archaeological pottery fragments are classified by experts.

In Table 1 we summarize the features of the sets 1-6. The estimated number of clusters is given as a range, as it depends on the method of counting the clusters (clusters vs. sub-clusters), and on the expert's decision. The table also provides a general description of the properties for each set, listing how the elements vary in size, and how much variation in shape there is within each cluster.

The results of clustering obtained by algorithm 4.1 are visualized in the form of dendrograms. The dendrogram's visual nature makes it inefficient when it comes to comparing results for large data sets.

In order to evaluate the quality of clustering, we use the cophenetic correlation coefficient to calculate a score for each clustering method and set, see Table 3 and Table 4. The cophenetic correlation coefficient is a measure of how closely the dendrogram represents the pairwise dissimilarities between the objects. It was originally introduced by [38] as a method for comparing dendrograms resulting from numerical taxonomic research. The cophenetic correlation coefficient c is defined as follows:

$$c := \frac{\sum_{i < j} (Y_{ij} - y)(Z_{ij} - z)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i < j} (Y_{ij} - y)^2 \sum_{i < j} (Z_{ij} - z)^2}}, \quad (6.1)$$

where Y_{ij} is the distance between objects i and j in the similarity matrix Y , and Z_{ij} is the cophenetic distance, that is the distance between two observations i and j represented in a dendrogram by the height of the link at which those two observations are first joined. y and z are the average of Y and Z , respectively. The closer the value is to 1 the higher the quality of the solution. For a detailed discussion of the cophenetic correlation coefficient, please consult [13].

6.1 Augmentation

The sets of archaeological pottery excavated by archaeologists are usually large and very diverse in terms of shape. Traditionally, the clustering (generating of typologies) is done manually by

Table 1: Description of data-sets used in the experiment

Set Nr	Nr of elements	Estimated nr of clusters	Characteristics
Set 1	41	7-9	2 size groups, little variation in shape in clusters
Set 2	41	6-10	2 size groups, at least 2 clusters with significant variation in shape in clusters
Set 3	45	6-8	3 size groups, some variation in shape in clusters
Set 4	36	5-7	all similar size, 4 basic shape groups, significant variation in shape in the clusters
Set 5	51	8-10	5 size groups, significant differences in size between groups, some variation in shape in the clusters
Set 6	40	5-8	similar size, 2 size groups, little variation in shape in clusters.

experts. Due to this, in practice, only a small part of the archaeological material is clustered and published, as it is in [27].

Hence, the real-life data sets which are available consist of 30-50 elements. This size does not provide a large enough sample to evaluate the performance of the algorithm. This was remedied by an automated augmentation of the data set. To ensure the comparability of the results we used the same data-sets (see Table 1). Each element of the set has been subjected to 6 different transformations, resulting in sets with 252 to 357 elements (including the original objects). For these transformations, we have chosen warp type transformation, as they can produce slight changes, that are characteristic of our investigated elements. The warp transformations were grid-based and used a Bézier curve based grid to perform the transformations. Each of the 6 transformations targeted one part of the image (very generally described as top, middle, and bottom), and either bevelled the image towards the left or right edge of the image in the specific section. The transformations were chosen to be radical enough to modify the original image, to generate new groups, without ‘damaging’ the image to the degree that it does not fulfil the original requirements (Fig.4) (see Section 2). Same as for the original data sets, the proposed methods have been tested on all 6 augmented sets, including different methods of the linkage algorithm. The results are included in Table 4.




Figure 3: Set 2.




Figure 4: Illustration of the transformations applied in the augmentation process.

7 Results and Discussion

In this section, we discuss the results of the experiments.

The evaluation of the results is based on the dendrograms obtained for each set. The cophenetic correlation coefficient (Tables 3 and 4) is used as an additional measure, evaluating the quality of the dendrogram.

The crucial point in this kind of clustering problem is the definition of similarity measure which should reflect the similarity as it is perceived by the expert. The following properties of the proposed similarity measures can be observed based on the experiment:

1. First type of mismatch occurs when two contours are very similar or even identical on a long portion of the curve and differ significantly on a relatively short portion of the curve. In such a case, the high similarity, i.e. the small distance between curves on a given portion *overpowers* the similarity measure calculated for the two objects, and fails to take into account the difference between the objects. This can lead to a false-positive result, with two contours perceived as "different", and belonging to different clusters, being grouped.
2. The second type of mismatch in the dendrogram can occur when the weights are improperly selected. This means that one of the aspects of the clustering, the shape or scale, takes precedence over the other and leads to two contours being paired or separated as e.g. their scale is very similar, despite not exhibiting similarity in shape.
3. The third type of mismatch stems from the difference between the perceived similarity (experts evaluation) and the calculated similarity measure. The in-depth discussion of this is outside of the scope of this paper, however, it will be demonstrated below in the discussion of the results obtained for the original data-sets (Section 7.1).

Those types of mismatches do not point to a fault in the method. They are an inherent property of automated shape detection, especially Type 1. Type 2 can be remedied by the appropriate selection of weights by the expert. These types of mismatches highlight the discrepancies between manual *handmade* classification, where consistency of decision making is hard to maintain all through the process and personal biases come into play. Whereas with an automated process the same criteria are applied throughout. The same applies to Type 3.

7.1 Results obtained for the original data-sets

The analysis of the dendrograms has yielded the best results for the combination of the Mix method and the scale component. The exact choice of weights depends on the nature of the set. The WNDCSM similarity measure turned out to be the best choice for sets 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. This is due to the differences in shape coinciding with the differences in scale. That is, there are few or no contour fragments that overlap in similar shape and similar size, although belonging to different clusters. For set 2 the best combination is weight 3/4 for Procrustes and 1/4 for the Scale Component. For this set, the weight of the Scale Component had to be reduced in favour of the shape component PA of the measure. This is due to several contours being *close*, both in terms of shape and size, and the need to put more stress on the shape component, as this is our primary goal.




Figure 5: A single-level cut through the dendrogram obtained for the Set 2 according to formula 4.11. CCF=0,98, correctly classified objects= 80%.

The results of an expert-based evaluation of the obtained dendrograms are summarized in Table 2. The table presents the total number and percentage of the elements that are, in the expert's opinion, correctly classified. As the tool is meant to be of assistance to experts, we choose an expert-based evaluation for our results. An automated or semi-automated assessment of results based on the dendrograms, and the choice of a correct similarity threshold is itself a matter of ongoing research (e.g. see [39], [37]).

A visualization of the expert's assessment is presented in Figures 5, 6, 7, and 8. For dendrograms that have a smaller similarity measure values between objects and groups, the difference between the single cut and the multi-level cut is not significant. For Set 2 (Figures 5, 6), for the single-level cut we obtain the accuracy of 80% (compared to 92,68 % with the multi-level cut-2). The dendrogram has the CFF value of 0,98, which means the dendrogram's structure is very good. For Set 4 (Figures 7, 8), CFF value is significantly lower, with 0,89. This dendrogram has higher values of similarity measures between objects. Using the multi-level cut method we obtain the result of 91,67 %. The single-level cut method results in only 83,34 % of accuracy. The amount of correctly classified elements and the resulting percentages, as presented below, have been calculated based on the expert's judgement. In calculations of the results of Table 2, the cuts of the dendrograms have been made on different levels (multi-level cuts), i.e. different thresholds (cut levels) selected for splitting the dendrogram (i.e. obtaining clusters) have been chosen by the expert and are based on the direct data inspection.

The expert-based evaluation is supplemented by the cophenetic correlation coefficient (CCF) (Table 3) calculated for each set and each method in the experiments performed. A discussion of the obtained results, summarized in Table 2 and Table 3 is presented below, in Section 7.2.

7.2 Discussion of the results

One of the results, for the WNDCSM similarity measure, obtained through the experiments is presented in Figures 5 and 6.

Based on Table 2 we notice that the best results were obtained for the method WNDCNSM ($SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, n\gamma)$) for sets 1, 2, 5, and 6. This can be attributed to the character of the sets, as summarized in Table 1. Sets 3 and 4 show significant variation in shape within the clusters, which might result in some under-performance of the method. However, the results are still fairly high. Combining together the results in Table 2 and Table 3 we see that all proposed




Figure 6: A Multi-level cut through the dendrogram obtained for the Set 2 according to formula 4.11. CCF=0,98, correctly classified objects= 92,68%.




Figure 7: A single-level cut through the dendrogram obtained for the Set 2 according to formula 4.10. CCF=0,98, correctly classified objects= 83,34%.




Figure 8: A Multi-level cut through the dendrogram obtained for the Set 4 according to formula 4.10. CCF=0,89, correctly classified objects= 91,67%.

methods perform fairly well, as the performance is on average 85% (Table 2) for the 3 proposed methods, and all values for CCF are at 0,75 and above (Table 3), with most of them being above 0,9. As stated before, the values of CCF do not evaluate the clustering results, but rather the structure of the dendrogram, and in this sense, the performance of the algorithm.

The results as described above prove the efficiency of the WNDCSM algorithm, and the introduction of the additional DWT distance component to the similarity measure. The results point to a double function of the WPSM similarity measure and all the subsequent combinations, in the sense of Procrustes analysis being responsible for a robust detection of the "global shape" while DTW detects subtle differences between shapes, and allows taking into account of the scaling factor. Furthermore, the Scaling component accounts for the difference in size, between the investigated objects. Such a composition allows for a fuller analysis of the given sets.

7.3 Results obtained for the augmented data-sets

The augmented data sets were clustered by the algorithm in Section (4.1), the same as the original data. Due to the method of augmentation (Section 6.1), each set increased in the number of shapes, however, no new shape groups were created, as the augmentation did not target size, solely the shape. Due to the size of the resulting dendrograms, we omit here the detailed discussion. However, the satisfactory performance of the algorithm (4.1) for the original sets, and the high values of the cophenetic correlation coefficient, gives an insight into the performance of the algorithm for the augmented sets. The augmentation process will be applied in future research to increase the size of data sets to employ machine learning algorithms.

8 Conclusions

We have presented the conception and performance of the algorithm (see Section (4.1)) for clustering of a class of 2D objects, with application in archaeology. The performed experiment shows that the proposed algorithm provides satisfactory results. Even if, the results obtained are promising, many problems related to the clustering of archaeological pottery remain open.

Conceivable extensions of the research presented here encompass investigating the possible advantages of using alternative shape representations and similarity measures. As a part of our further research, we plan to investigate the case where only a fragment of the section is preserved. Another problem arises when the investigated pottery vessel has a handle. As far as we know this problem has not yet been addressed in the literature.

References

- [1] Safaa Albasri, Mihail Popescu, and James M. Keller. Surgery task classification using procrustes analysis. *48th IEEE Applied Imagery Pattern Recognition Workshop, AIPR 2019, Washington, DC, USA, October 15-17, 2019*, pages 1–6, 2019.
- [2] Boris Aronov, Sarel Har-Peled, Christian Knauer, Yusu Wang, and Carola Wenk. Fréchet distance for curves, revisited. In Yossi Azar and Thomas Erlebach, editors, *Algorithms – ESA 2006*, pages 52–63, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Table 2: Percentage of correctly classified elements as evaluated by the expert for Sets 1-6. The number of elements in each set, and the number of correctly classified elements, is given in brackets. All scores have been calculated using the average distance between clusters.

Method	set 1 [41]	set 2 [41]	set 3 [45]	set 4 [36]	set 5 [51]	set 6 [40]
$SM(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 1)$	82.93 % [34]	78.05% [32]	75.56% [34]	75% [27]	69.23% [36]	87.5% [35]
$SM(\frac{3}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{4}, 1, 1)$	85.36% [35]	90.24% [37]	82.22% [37]	86.11% [31]	78.43% [40]	85% [34]
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, 1)$	90.24% [37]	80.49% [33]	77.78% [35]	86.11% [31]	78.43% [40]	82.5% [33]
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, 1)$	87.8% [36]	90.24% [37]	77.78% [35]	91.67% [33]	78.43% [40]	87.5% [35]
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, n\gamma)$	87.8% [36]	75.61% [31]	75.56% [34]	88.89% [32]	78.43% [40]	92.5% [37]
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, n\gamma)$	90.24% [37]	92.68% [38]	80% [36]	86.11% [31]	82.35% [42]	92.5% [37]

- [3] Benjamin Auder and Aurélie Fischer. Projection-based curve clustering. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 82(8):1145–1168, 2012.
- [4] Karol Borsuk and Jerzy Dydak. What is the theory of shape? *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 22(2):161–198, 1980.
- [5] Yan Cao and David Mumford. Geometric structure estimation of axially symmetric pots from small fragments. In *In Proc. Signal Processing, Pattern Recognition, and Applications*, 2002.
- [6] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Varun Kanade, and Frederik Mallmann-Trenn. Clustering redemption—beyond the impossibility of kleinberg’s axioms. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’18, page 8526–8535, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2018. Curran Associates Inc.
- [7] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Varun Kanade, Frederik Mallmann-Trenn, and Claire Mathieu. Hierarchical clustering: Objective functions and algorithms, 2017.
- [8] Luciano da Fontoura Costa and Roberto Marcond Cesar. *Shape Analysis and Classification: Theory and Practice*. Image Processing Series. CRC Press, 2010.
- [9] Ian Davidson and S. S. Ravi. Intractability and clustering with constraints. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML ’07, page 201–208, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] Ian L. Dryden. Statistical shape analysis in archaeology. *workshop ‘Spatial Statistics in Archaeology’*, University of Chieti, Italy, 2000.
- [11] A. Efrat, Q. Fan, and S. Venkatasubramanian. Curve matching, time warping, and light fields: New algorithms for computing similarity between curves. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 27(3):203–216, Apr 2007.
- [12] Alma Eguizabal, Peter J. Schreier, and Jürgen Schmidt. Procrustes registration of two-dimensional statistical shape models without correspondences. *CoRR*, abs/1911.11431, 2019.

Table 3: Cophenetic correlation coefficient calculated for 6 investigated data-sets.

Method		set 1	set 2	set 3	set 4	set 5	set 6	Arithmetic average
$SM(1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.8564	0.9952	0.9396	0.6340	0.5906	0.7495	0.7942
	average	0.9958	0.9221	0.9194	0.7930	0.8141	0.8546	0.8832
	weighted	0.9189	0.9956	0.9047	0.7838	0.7692	0.8456	0.8696
$SM(0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.8549	0.9872	0.9492	0.8325	0.8165	0.7894	0.8716
	average	0.9082	0.9892	0.9735	0.8446	0.8966	0.8328	0.9075
	weighted	0.9038	0.9886	0.9725	0.8426	0.8598	0.8172	0.8974
$SM(0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.9760	0.8939	0.9964	0.8973	0.9155	0.9056	0.9308
	average	0.9792	0.9379	0.9974	0.9423	0.9293	0.9170	0.9505
	weighted	0.9774	0.8730	0.9961	0.9404	0.9284	0.8993	0.9358
$SM(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.9645	0.9747	0.9874	0.8816	0.9100	0.9467	0.9441
	average	0.9705	0.9815	0.9881	0.9450	0.9256	0.9542	0.9608
	weighted	0.9681	0.9803	0.9880	0.9414	0.9248	0.9532	0.9593
$SM(\frac{3}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{4}, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.8963	0.9917	0.9446	0.8986	0.8915	0.9150	0.9229
	average	0.9287	0.9933	0.9450	0.9298	0.9068	0.9292	0.9388
	weighted	0.9268	0.9933	0.9428	0.9386	0.9061	0.9262	0.9390
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, 1)$								
	single	0.9441	0.9670	0.9704	0.8023	0.8034	0.9110	0.8997
	average	0.9611	0.9583	0.9717	0.8862	0.8991	0.9199	0.9327
	weighted	0.9588	0.9724	0.9708	0.8763	0.8954	0.9188	0.9321
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, 1)$								
	single	0.9042	0.9806	0.9353	0.8189	0.7574	0.8456	0.8737
	average	0.9309	0.9845	0.9368	0.8279	0.8739	0.8641	0.9030
	weighted	0.9285	0.9828	0.9360	0.8463	0.8707	0.8561	0.9034
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, n\gamma)$								
	single	0.9513	0.9589	0.9726	0.8147	0.8543	0.9248	0.9128
	average	0.9650	0.9583	0.9738	0.9030	0.9125	0.9372	0.9416
	weighted	0.9626	0.9535	0.9734	0.9029	0.9047	0.9355	0.9388
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, n\gamma)$								
	single	0.9116	0.9784	0.9372	0.8177	0.7518	0.8610	0.8763
	average	0.9343	0.9836	0.9387	0.8509	0.8855	0.8762	0.9115
	weighted	0.9361	0.9817	0.9378	0.8365	0.8828	0.8746	0.9083

[13] James Farris. On the cophenetic correlation coefficient. *Systematic Zoology*, 18(3):279–285, 1969.

[14] Ayelet Gilboa, Avshalom Karasik, Ilan Sharon, and Uzy Smilansky. Towards com-

Table 4: Cophenetic correlation coefficient results for the augmented data-sets.

Method		set 1a	set 2a	set 3a	set 4a	set 5a	set 6a	Arithmetic average
$SM(1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.6780	0.9788	0.7984	0.5813	0.6211	0.1760	0.6389
	average	0.8777	0.9836	0.8968	0.7844	0.8088	0.7933	0.8574
	weighted	0.8530	0.9808	0.8583	0.8042	0.7633	0.7536	0.8355
$SM(0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.8520	0.9736	0.9454	0.7676	0.8182	0.6921	0.8415
	average	0.8972	0.9771	0.9584	0.7852	0.8599	0.7548	0.8721
	weighted	0.9104	0.9617	0.9750	0.6916	0.8505	0.7464	0.8559
$SM(0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.9592	0.8019	0.7192	0.6006	0.8912	0.8213	0.7989
	average	0.9731	0.8770	0.9613	0.8664	0.9131	0.8602	0.9085
	weighted	0.9687	0.8517	0.9566	0.8742	0.7725	0.7979	0.8703
$SM(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.9439	0.9619	0.9874	0.7321	0.8515	0.6190	0.8493
	average	0.9573	0.9713	0.9091	0.8688	0.9009	0.7758	0.8972
	weighted	0.9485	0.9513	0.8162	0.6914	0.8706	0.7385	0.8361
$SM(\frac{3}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{4}, 1, 1)$								
	single	0.8457	0.9803	0.7350	0.7211	0.8139	0.3865	0.7471
	average	0.8850	0.9825	0.8749	0.8276	0.8581	0.7608	0.8648
	weighted	0.7902	0.9804	0.8155	0.8077	0.8472	0.7680	0.8348
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, 1)$								
	single	0.9428	0.9539	0.9046	0.7411	0.7916	0.7523	0.8477
	average	0.9537	0.9550	0.9737	0.7923	0.8566	0.8314	0.8938
	weighted	0.9571	0.9351	0.9685	0.7862	0.8402	0.7957	0.8805
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, 1)$								
	single	0.9082	0.9701	0.9562	0.7725	0.7410	0.7258	0.8456
	average	0.9396	0.9720	0.9735	0.8261	0.8388	0.7858	0.8893
	weighted	0.9386	0.9660	0.9720	0.7718	0.8590	0.7646	0.8787
$SM(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ndc, n\gamma)$								
	single	0.9474	0.9459	0.9008	0.7191	0.8154	0.7832	0.8520
	average	0.9574	0.9556	0.9739	0.8208	0.8867	0.8519	0.9077
	weighted	0.9536	0.9338	0.9651	0.7628	0.8519	0.7893	0.8761
$SM(0, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, ndc, n\gamma)$								
	single	0.9104	0.9686	0.9552	0.7625	0.7558	0.7232	0.8460
	average	0.9431	0.9711	0.9737	0.7773	0.8550	0.8012	0.8869
	weighted	0.9279	0.9631	0.9721	0.7560	0.8670	0.7957	0.8803

puterized typology and classification of ceramics. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 31(6):681–694, 2004.

[15] Colin Goodall. Procrustes methods in the statistical analysis of shape. *Journal of the*

- Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 53(2):285–339, 1991.
- [16] John C. Gower and Garmt B. Dijkstra. *Procrustes problems*, volume 30 of *Oxford Statistical Science Series*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, January 2004.
 - [17] Nadia Hosni, Hassen Drira, Faten Chaieb, and Boulbaba Ben Amor. 3D Gait recognition based on functional PCA on Kendall’s shape space. In *2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 2130–2135, 2018.
 - [18] Valentin Hristov and Gennady Agre. A software system for classification of archaeological artefacts represented by 2d plans. *Cybernetics and Information Technologies*, 13(2):82–96, 2013.
 - [19] Anil K. Jain. Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 31(8):651–666, 2010. Award winning papers from the 19th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR).
 - [20] Agnieszka Kaliszewska and Monika Syga. On representative functions method for clustering of 2d contours with application to pottery fragments typology. *Control and Cybernetics*, 47(1):85–108, 2018.
 - [21] M. Kanevski and V. Timonin. Machine learning analysis and modeling of interest rate curves. In *ESANN 2010 proceedings, European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks - Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning. Bruges (Belgium), 28-30 April 2010*, 2010.
 - [22] D. G. Kendall. The diffusion of shape. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 9(3):428–430, 1977.
 - [23] David G. Kendall. A survey of the statistical theory of shape. *Statistical Science*, 4(2):87–99, 1989.
 - [24] Jon Kleinberg. An impossibility theorem for clustering. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’02*, page 463–470, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2002. MIT Press.
 - [25] Jacek M. Leski and Marian P. Kotas. Linguistically defined clustering of data. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computer Sciences*, 28(3):545–557, 2018.
 - [26] C. Maiza and V. Gaildart. Automatic classification of archaeological potsherds. In *The Eight International Conference on Computer Graphics and Artificial Intelligence, 3IA’2005*, pages 11–12, 2005.
 - [27] P. A. Mountjoy. *Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*. 1999.
 - [28] D. Mumford. Mathematical theories of shape: do they model perception? In *Proc. Conference 1570, Soc. Photo-optical & Ind. Engineers (SPIE)*, pages 2–10, 1991.
 - [29] M. Müller. *Information Retrieval for Music and Motion*. Springer Science, 2007.
 - [30] Julio-Omar Palacio-Niño and Fernando Berzal. Evaluation metrics for unsupervised learning algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1905.05667, 2019.

- [31] C. Piccoli, P. Aparajeya, G. Th. Papadopoulos, J. Bintliff, F. Leymarie, P. Bes, Poblome J. Van der Enden, M., and P. Daras. Towards the automatic classification of pottery sherds: two complementary approaches. In *Across Space and Time. Papers from the 41st Conference on Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, pages 463–474, 2015.
- [32] D. Pizarro and A. Bartoli. Global optimization for optimal generalized procrustes analysis. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 2409–2415, June 2011.
- [33] R. Sablatnig, Ch. Menard, and W. Kropatsch. Classification of archaeological fragments using a description language. In *Proceedings of European Association for Signal Processing (Eusipco) 1998, Island of Rhodas, Greece*, volume 2, pages 1097–1100, 1998.
- [34] L. M. Sangalli, Piercesare Secchi, Simone Vantini, and Valeria (2010) Vitelli. Classification of functional data: Unsupervised curve clustering when curves are misaligned. *2010 JSM Proceedings: Papers Presented at the Joint Statistical Meetings, Vancouver, British Columbia, July 31-August 5, 2010 and Other ASA-sponsored Conferences*, pages pp. 4034–4047, 2010.
- [35] M. Sangalli, L., P. Secchi, S. Vantini, and V. Vitelli. *Advanced Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Large Data-Sets*, chapter Joint Clustering and Alignment of Functional Data: An Application to Vascular Geometries, pages 34–43. Studies in Theoretical and Applied Statistics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [36] E. Sharon and D. Mumford. 2d-shape analysis using conformal mapping. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 70(1):55–75, 2006.
- [37] Krzysztof Siminski. An outlier-robust neuro-fuzzy system for classification and regression. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computer Sciences*, 31(2):307, 2021.
- [38] Robert R. Sokal and James F. Rohlf. The comparison of dendrograms by objective methods. *Taxon*, 11(2):33–40, 1962.
- [39] Athanasios Vogogias, Jessie Kennedy, Daniel Archambault, V. Anne Smith, and Hannah Currant. MLCut: Exploring Multi-Level Cuts in Dendrograms for Biological Data. In Cagatay Turkay and Tao Ruan Wan, editors, *Computer Graphics and Visual Computing (CGVC)*. The Eurographics Association, 2016.
- [40] S. T. Wierzchoń and M. A. Kłopotek. *Algorithms of Cluster Analysis*. Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences, 2015.
- [41] Josef Wilczek, Fabrice Monna, Nicolas Navarro, and Carmela Chateau-Smith. A computer tool to identify best matches for pottery fragments. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 37:102891, 2021.
- [42] Feng Zhou and Fernando De la Torre. Generalized time warping for multi-modal alignment of human motion. In *2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1282–1289, 2012.