

# Self-organizing maps and symbolic data

Aïcha El Golli, Briec Conan-Guez, Fabrice Rossi<sup>1</sup>

AxIS project, National Research Institute in Computer Science and Control (INRIA)  
Rocquencourt Research Unit  
Domaine de Voluceau, Rocquencourt,  
B.P. 105, 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex, France  
`aïcha.elgolli`, `briec.conan-guez`, `fabrice.rossi@inria.fr`

**Abstract.** In data analysis new forms of complex data have to be considered like for example (symbolic data, functional data, web data, trees, SQL query and multimedia data,...). In this context classical data analysis for knowledge discovery based on calculating the center of gravity can not be used because input are not  $\mathbb{R}^1$  vectors. In this paper, we present an application on real world symbolic data using the self-organizing map. To this end, we propose an extension of the self-organizing map that can handle symbolic data.

**Keywords:** Classification, Self organizing map, symbolic data, dissimilarity.

## 1 Introduction

The self-organizing map(SOM) introduced by Kohonen [6] is an unsupervised neural network method which has both clustering and visualization properties. It can be considered as an algorithm that maps a high dimensional data space,  $\mathbb{R}^1$ , to a lower dimension, generally 2, and which is called a map. This projection enables the input data to be partitioned into "similar" clusters while preserving their topology. Its most similar predecessors are the k-means algorithm [7] and the dynamic clustering method [3], which operate as a SOM without topology preservation and therefore without easy visualization. In data analysis, new forms of complex data have to be considered, most notably symbolic data (data with an internal structure such as interval data, distributions, functional data, etc.) and semi-structured data (trees, XML documents, SQL queries, etc.). In this context, classical data analysis based on calculating the center of gravity can not be used because input are not  $\mathbb{R}^1$  vectors. In order to solve this problem, several methods can be considered depending on the type of data (for example projection operators for functional data [8]). However, those methods are not fully general and an adaptation of every data analysis algorithm to the resulting data is needed.

The Kohonen's SOM is based on the center of gravity notion and unfortunately, this concept is not applicable to many kinds of complex data. In this paper we propose an adaptation of the SOM to dissimilarity data as an alternative solution. Our goal is to modify the SOM algorithm to allow its implementation on dissimilarity measures rather than on raw data. To this end, we take one's inspiration from the work of Kohonen [5]. To apply the method, only the definition of a dissimilarity for each type of data is necessary and so complex data can be processed.

## 2 Batch self-organizing map for dissimilarity data

The SOM can be considered as carrying out vector quantization and/or clustering while preserving the spatial ordering of the prototype vectors (also called referent vectors) in one or two dimensional output space. The SOM consists of neurons organized on a regular low-dimensional map. More formally, the map is described by a graph  $(C, \Gamma)$ .  $C$  is a set of  $m$  interconnected neurons having a discrete topology defined by  $\Gamma$ .

For each pair of neurons  $(c, r)$  on the map, the distance  $\delta(c, r)$ , is defined as the shortest path between  $c$  and  $r$  on the graph. This distance imposes a neighborhood relation between neurons.

The batch training algorithm is an iterative algorithm in which the whole data set (noted  $\Omega$ ) is presented to the map before any adjustments are made. We note  $z_i$  an element of  $\Omega$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i$  the representation of this element in the space  $D$  called representation space of  $\Omega$ . In our case, the main difference with the classical batch algorithm is that the representation space is not  $\mathbb{R}^l$  but an arbitrary set on which dissimilarity (denoted  $d$ ) is defined.

Each neuron  $c$  is represented by a set  $A_c = z_1, \dots, z_q$  of elements of  $\Omega$  with a fixed cardinality  $q$ , where  $z_i$  belongs to  $\Omega$ .  $A_c$  is called an individual referent. We denote  $A$  the set of all individual referents, i.e. the list  $A = A_1, \dots, A_m$ . In our approach each neuron has a finite number of representations. We define a new adequacy function  $d^T$  from  $\Omega \times P(\Omega)$  to  $\mathbb{R}^+$  by:

$$d^T(z_i, A_c) = \sum_{r \in C} K^T(\delta_{rc}) \sum_{z_j \in A_r} d^2(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) \quad (1)$$

$d^T$  is based on the kernel positive function  $K$ .  $K^T(\delta(c, r))$  is the neighborhood kernel around the neuron  $r$ . This function is such that  $\lim_{|\delta| \rightarrow \infty} K(\delta) = 0$  and allows us to transform the sharp graph distance between two neurons on the map ( $\delta(c, r)$ ) into a smooth distance.  $K$  is used to define a family of functions  $K^T$  parameterized by  $T$ , with  $k^T(\delta) = K(\frac{\delta}{T})$ .  $T$  is used to control the size of the neighborhood [1]: when the parameter  $T$  is small, there are few neurons in the neighborhood. A simple example of  $K^T$  is defined by  $K^T(\delta) = e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{T^2}}$ .

During the learning, we minimize a cost function  $E$  by alternating an assignment step and a representation step. During the assignment step, the assignment function  $f$  assigns each individual  $z_i$  to the nearest neuron, here in terms of the function  $d^T$ :

$$f(z_i) = \arg \min_{c \in C} d^T(z_i, A_c) \quad (2)$$

If there is equality, we assign the individual  $z_i$  to the neuron with the smallest label.

During the representation step, we have to find the new individual referents  $A^*$  that represent the set of observations in the best way in terms of the following cost function  $E$ :

$$E(f, A) = \sum_{z_i \in \Omega} d^T(z_i, A_{f(z_i)}) = \sum_{z_i \in \Omega} \sum_{r \in C} K^T(\delta(f(z_i), r)) \sum_{z_j \in A_r} d^2(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) \quad (3)$$

This function calculates the adequacy between the induced partition by the assignment function and the map referents  $A$ .

The criterion  $E$  is additive so this optimization step can be carried out independently for each neuron. Indeed, we minimize the  $m$  following functions:

$$E_r = \sum_{z_i \in \Omega} K^T(\delta(f(z_i), r)) \sum_{z_j \in A_r} d^2(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) \quad (4)$$

In the classical batch version, this minimization of  $E$  function is immediate because the positions of the referent vectors are the averages of the data samples weighted by the kernel function.

### 3 Experiments

To evaluate our method, we consider real world interval data. Our adaptation of the SOM to dissimilarity data is directly applied to this kind of interval structured data, once we can associate dissimilarity to these data. This application concerns monthly minimal and maximal temperatures observed in 265 meteorological stations in China. A natural representation of the monthly temperature recorded by a station is the interval constituted by the mean of the daily minimal and the mean of the daily maximal temperatures observed at this station over a month. Table 1 depicts the temperature recorded by the 265 stations over a 10-year period (between 1979 and 1988). Each interval is the mean of the minimal and the mean of the maximal monthly temperatures for these 10 years.

Station	January	February	...	November	December
Abag Qi	[-24.9; -17]	[-22.3; -12.8]	...	[-16.4; -6.2]	[-24.7; -14.8]
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
Hailaer	[-28.6; -22.5]	[-25.5; -19.7]	...	[-17.4; -9.3]	[-25.5; -20.0]
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

**Table 1.** Temperatures of the 265 Chinese stations between 1979 and 1988

We will now describe the parameters used for this application (dissimilarity, map dimensions, number of iterations, ...). The choice of these parameters is important for the algorithm. We will then describe the obtained results. We use the factorial dissimilarity analysis (for more details [9], [4]) to visualize the maps.


### 3.1 Hausdorff distance

First, we choose to work with the Hausdorff-type L2-distance on interval data defined as follows:

$$d(Q, Q') = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^p (\max\{|a_j - a'_j|, |b_j - b'_j|\})^2} \quad (5)$$

with  $Q = (I_1, \dots, I_p)$  and  $Q' = (I'_1, \dots, I'_p)$  a pair of items described by  $p$  intervals and  $I_j = [a_j, b_j]$ . It combines the  $p$  one-dimensional, coordinate-wise Hausdorff distances in a way which is similar to the definition of the Euclidean distance in  $\mathbb{R}^1$ . The map dimension is  $m = 30$  neurons ( $10 \times 3$ ). We use the elements of  $\Omega$  in a random order to initialize the map and to choose the initial individual referents  $A^0$ . The cardinality of the individual referent  $q$  is fixed to 1.


Figure 1 shows the initial map on factorial dissimilarity analysis plans.




**Fig. 1.** Initial map and the data on factorial dissimilarity analysis plan

Figure 2 shows the projection of the map that was finally obtained on the training data in factorial plans.

The details of the result, shown in Figure 3, provide a nice representation of all the stations displayed over 30 clusters. These resulting clusters on the geographical map of China provide the representation of the stations attached to their referent station. The clusters on the right of Figure 2 are cold stations and correspond to the north and west of China. The warm stations are on the left of Figure 2 and correspond to the south and south-east of China and are characterized by very large variations in temperature. There is a continuity from cold stations to warm



**Fig. 2.** Final map and the data on factorial dissimilarity analysis plans. Each color represents a cluster



**Fig. 3.** Distribution of the clusters on the geographical map of China using the same colors of Figure 2

and hot ones. The analysis of the distribution of the clusters on the geographical map of China made it possible to deduce that the variations in temperature depend on latitude than on longitude.

### 3.2 Euclidean distance

Secondly, we use the Euclidean distance on interval data defined as follows:


$$d(Q, Q') = 1/4\|(a - a') + (b - b')\|^2 \quad (6)$$

with  $Q = (I_1, \dots, I_p)$  and  $Q' = (I'_1, \dots, I'_p)$  a pair of items described by  $p$  intervals and  $I_j = [a_j, b_j]$ .


We use the same parameters than for the Hausdorff distance.

Figure 4 shows the projection of the final map on factorial dissimilarity analysis plan. Figure 5 provides the details of the result.

The classification is meaningful but different from the one with the Hausdorff distance. We will now compare the different results.



**Fig. 4.** Final map on factorial dissimilarity analysis plan. Each color represent a cluster



**Fig. 5.** Distribution of the clusters on the geographical map of China using the same colors of Figure 4

### 3.3 Discussion

We use some other metrics for this application but we can't detail the results for lack of space. We use the vertex-type distance defined as the sum of the squared Euclidean distances between the  $2^p$  vertices. We use also the mean temperatures of the stations (it's a non symbolic representation of the temperatures). In order to compare the different results obtained by these different metrics, we calculate longitude and latitude distortions of the different obtained clustering. The distortion is defined as the quadratic mean error between the referent and their assigned individuals.

The longitudinal distortion is defined as follows:

$$(D_{long})^2 = \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{z_i \in c} \frac{1}{|c|} |Lo_{z_i} - Lo_{f(z_i)}|^2 \quad (7)$$

with  $|c|$  the cardinal of the cluster  $c$ ,  $|Lo_{z_i} - Lo_{f(z_i)}|$  the longitude distance between the station  $z_i$  and his referent  $f(z_i)$

The latitude distortion is defined as follows:

$$(D_{lati})^2 = \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{z_i \in c} \frac{1}{|c|} |La_{z_i} - La_{f(z_i)}|^2 \quad (8)$$

with  $|La_{z_i} - La_{f(z_i)}|^2$  the latitude distance between the station  $z_i$  and his referent  $f(z_i)$ .

In the table 2, we represent the longitude and the latitude distortions of the different obtained clustering with the different metrics.

Data type	Used metric	Longitude distortion	Latitude distortion
Intervals	Euclidean distance	9.250688	1.993213
Intervals	Vertex-type distance	8.625175	2.165838
Means(numerics)	Euclidean distance	7.656033	1.936692
Intervals	Hausdorff distance	7.38314	1.911461

**Table 2.** The different longitude and latitude distortions for the different metrics

We can deduce that the clustering obtained with the Hausdorff distance induced the smallest latitude and longitude distortions.

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an adaptation of the self-organizing map to dissimilarity data. This adaptation is based on the batch algorithm and can handle both numerical data and complex data. The experiments showed the usefulness of the method and that it can be applied to symbolic data or other complex data once we can define dissimilarity for these data.

## References

1. Anouar, F. and Badran, F. and Thiria, S.: Self Organized Map, a Probabilistic Approach. Proceedings of the Workshop on Self-Organized Maps (1997). Helsinki University of Technology, Espoo, Finland, June 4-6.
2. De Reynis, A.: Classification et discrimination en analyse de donnes symboliques. Thse de Doctorat. Universit Paris Dauphine, 2003.
3. Diday, E. and Schroeder, A. and Ok, Y.: The Dynamic Clusters Method in Pattern Recognition. IFIP Congress 1974, 691-697.
4. El Golli, A.: Extraction de donnes symboliques et cartes topologiques: application aux donnes ayant une structure complexe. Thse de Doctorat. Universit Paris Dauphine, 2004.
5. Kohonen, T.: Self-Organizing maps of symbol strings, Technical Report A42, Laboratory of Computer and Information Science, Helsinki University of Technology, Finland 1996.
6. Kohonen, T.: self-organizing maps, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
7. MacQueen, J.: Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. The fifth Proc. Berkeley symposium on Math., stat. and Prob., Vol. 1, pp.281-297, 1965.
8. Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B.: Functional Data Analysis. Springer series in statistics. Springer-Verlag, June 1997.
9. Saporta, G.: Probabilités, analyse des données et statistique. Technip Edition, 1990.
10. Clarke, F., Ekeland, I.: Nonlinear oscillations and boundary-value problems for Hamiltonian systems. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **78** (1982) 315–333
11. Clarke, F., Ekeland, I.: Solutions périodiques, du période donnée, des équations hamiltoniennes. Note CRAS Paris **287** (1978) 1013–1015

12. Michalek, R., Tarantello, G.: Subharmonic solutions with prescribed minimal period for nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems. *J. Diff. Eq.* **72** (1988) 28–55
13. Tarantello, G.: Subharmonic solutions for Hamiltonian systems via a  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  pseudoindex theory. *Annali di Matematica Pura* (to appear)
14. Rabinowitz, P.: On subharmonic solutions of a Hamiltonian system. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **33** (1980) 609–633

*Received for submission on February 2004*

*Accepted for publication on September 2004*