

Exploiting clustering algorithms in a multiple-level fashion: A comparative study in the medical care scenario

*Original*

Exploiting clustering algorithms in a multiple-level fashion: A comparative study in the medical care scenario / Cerquitelli, Tania; Chiusano, SILVIA ANNA; Xiao, Xin. - In: EXPERT SYSTEMS WITH APPLICATIONS. - ISSN 0957-4174. - STAMPA. - 55:(2016), pp. 297-312. [10.1016/j.eswa.2016.02.005]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2630095 since: 2021-04-07T18:22:01Z

*Publisher:*

Elsevier

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.eswa.2016.02.005

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

(Article begins on next page)

# Exploiting clustering algorithms in a multiple-level fashion: A comparative study in the medical care scenario

Tania Cerquitelli\*, Silvia Chiusano, Xin Xiao

*Control and Computer Engineering Dept., Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24 - 10129 Torino, Italy.*

---

## Abstract

Clustering real-world data is a challenging task, since many real data collections are characterized by an inherent sparseness and variable distribution. The complexity of clustering such data increases with the data volume. In this study we are concerned with using clustering algorithms in a multiple level fashion to address these issues. The aim is to iteratively focus on different dataset portions and locally identify groups of objects sharing common properties. This paper proposes a clustering framework which exploits a variety of clustering algorithms according to this strategy. Five clustering algorithms, based on K-means, K-medoids and DBSCAN methods, have been integrated into the framework and a comparative study has been conducted on a real dataset of patients with overt diabetes. Experiments compared clustering results in terms of cluster quality, execution time, and cluster content from a medical perspective. Diverse quality indices have been used to effectively support cluster validation.

*Keywords:* Data analytics, cluster analysis, data with a variable distribution, diabetic patient treatments, multiple-level method, comparison.

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [tania.cerquitelli@polito.it](mailto:tania.cerquitelli@polito.it). Phone: +39-011-0907178, Fax: + 39-011-0907099

## 1. Introduction

Cluster analysis is an exploratory technique which aims at grouping a data object collection into subsets (clusters) based on object properties, without the support of additional a priori knowledge (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006). Nevertheless clustering is a widely studied data mining problem, clustering real-world data collections may impose new challenges. Real datasets are usually characterized by an *inherent sparseness* and *variable distribution*, since they are generated by a large variety of events, and *high data dimensionality* because features used to model real objects and human actions may have very large domains. The variability in data distribution grows with data volume, thus increasing the complexity of mining such data. For example, health care data collections can have large volume due to the large cardinality of patient records. Because of the variety of medical treatments usually adopted for the different degrees of severity of a given pathology, patient data collections are also usually characterized by high dimensionality, variable data distribution and inherent sparseness. However, at present, most clustering algorithms perform better with uniform data distribution, while their performance as well as the quality of the extracted knowledge tend to decrease in non-uniform collections.

Aimed at addressing the above issues, this paper presents a *Multiple-Level Clustering* (MLC) framework, which exploits clustering algorithms in a multiple-level fashion. MLC iteratively focuses on different dataset portions and *locally* identify groups of correlated objects, thus easing the computation of cohesive clusters on each of them. In this study, five different multiple-level clustering algorithms have been integrated into MLC, based on K-means (i.e., bisecting and refined K-means (Steinbach et al., 2000)), K-medoids (i.e., bisecting and refined K-medoids (Kashef & Kamel, 2008)), and DBSCAN methods (i.e., multiple-level DBSCAN (Antonelli et al., 2013)). These algorithms were selected because they cover different clustering strategies (i.e., density and representative based methods) and they showed better performance than standard (not multiple-level) clustering algorithms in various applications domains (Antonelli et al., 2013; Steinbach et al., 2000). In this paper a comparative study has been conducted on these selected algorithms based on the quality of discovered cluster sets, the computational time for the clustering process, and the cluster content.

For the experimental analysis, we considered as a reference case study a real dataset including the examination log data of (anonymized) patients

with overt diabetes. Diabetes describes a group of metabolic diseases in which the patient has high blood glucose and it may increase the risk for many serious health problems, such as cardiovascular disease, retinal damage, kidney disease, and foot complications. The considered data collection is characterized by an inherently sparse distribution due to the variety of possible examinations, covering both routine tests and more specific examinations for different degrees of severity in diabetes.

Before to apply the clustering analysis, in the MLC framework patient examination data are represented in the Vector Space Model (VSM) (Salton G., 1971) using the TF-IDF method (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006) with the aim of highlighting the relevance of specific examinations for a given clinical condition. Clustering results have been then analyzed and compared using some well-established quality indices, as SSE, Silhouette and overall similarity, and Rand Index (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006). The cluster content, i.e., the patient examination histories included in each cluster, is concisely represented in terms of the most frequent examinations appearing in each cluster and association rules (Han et al., 2000) modeling correlations among them.

The experimental evaluation showed that interesting clusters containing patients with a similar examination history (with standard or more specific examinations) can be discovered. It also pointed out that, nevertheless both the multiple-level DBSCAN and the refined k-means algorithms generate cluster sets with good quality and agreement, from a medical perspective the multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm appears as the more suitable approach for patient analysis in the considered case study.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes previous work using clustering techniques in the medical care scenario. Section 3 presents the MLC framework and how the selected clustering algorithms have been tailored to MLC. Section 4 reports the experimental study on a real diabetic patient dataset, while Section 5 compares algorithm performance and analyses the cluster sets from a medical perspective. Section 6 includes the conclusions.

## 2. Related work

Clustering algorithms find application in a wide range of different domains, including sensor network data (Abbasi & Younis, 2007), biological

data (Au et al., 2007), and network traffic data (Eriksson et al., 2008). Clustering algorithms have been also widely used to analyse medical data (Esfandiari et al.,  
75 2014). Many studies addressed the identification of correlated groups of patients affected by different diseases. For example, (Sengur & Turkoglu, 2008) reviewed the cluster methods used to diagnose heart valve diseases. In (Zheng et al., 2014), clustering techniques were used to diagnose breast cancer based on tumor features, by recognising hidden patterns of benign and  
80 malignant tumors. Authors in (Khaing, March 2011) exploited the K-means algorithm to cluster a collection of patient records aimed at identifying relevant features of patients subjected to heart attack.

Some research efforts have been devoted to exploiting clustering techniques on data related to diabetic patients (Esfandiari et al., 2014). Different issues have been addressed as food analysis (Phanich et al., 2010),  
85 gait patterns (Sawacha et al., 2010), discovering relationships among diabetes and risk factors (Chaturvedi, 2003), analyses of various imputation techniques (Purwar & Singh, 2015), and discovering similar medical treatments (Antonelli et al., 2013). (Purwar & Singh, 2015) focuses on diabetes  
90 datasets using the K-means algorithm aimed at analysing various imputation techniques. Different from (Purwar & Singh, 2015), in this work we aim at identifying groups of patients with similar examination histories.

The idea of exploiting a clustering algorithm in a multiple-level fashion was first introduced in (Antonelli et al., 2013) and used in (Baralis et al.,  
95 2013b) to analyze twitter messages. A first study towards a combined distance measure for clustering medical records has been presented in (Bruno et al., 2014). A parallel effort devoted to clustering documents proved that bisecting K-means was preferable to other clustering methods as standard K-means and hierarchical approaches (Steinbach et al., 2000).

100 The MLC data analysis framework presented in this study enhances the methodology proposed in (Antonelli et al., 2013) by providing a more general approach which (i) integrates different clustering algorithms, (ii) uses more indices to evaluate cluster quality, and (iii) concisely represents the cluster content through association rules. MLC does not exploit the distance measure proposed in (Bruno et al., 2014) because information on patient profiles  
105 (i.e., patient age and gender) are not available on the real data collection used in the discussed comparative study. Among the different categories of clustering algorithms, i.e., prototype (e.g., K-means (Juang & Rabiner, 1990), K-medoids (Kaufman, L. and Rousseeuw, P. J., 1990)), density (e.g., DB-SCAN (Ester et al., 1996)), model (e.g., EM (G. McLachlan and T. Krishnan,  
110




Figure 1: The MLC framework

1997)), and hierarchical based methods (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006), in this study we focused on the two popular categories of prototype and density based methods for the development of the MLC framework.

### 3. Proposed method

115 The MLC framework in Figure 1 adopts a multiple-level clustering strategy to analyse data collections characterized by a variable data distribution.

Information about patient examinations are collected and data are prepared for the subsequent cluster analysis (Section 3.1). Patient datasets are tailored to the Vector Space Model (VSM) representation (Salton G., 120 1971), where each vector corresponds to a patient and represents his/her examination history. The *patient examination history* lists the examinations undergone by the patient, and the weighted number of times the patient underwent each examination. Unweighted examination frequencies do not properly characterize the patient condition, since standard routine tests usually appear with high frequency, while more specific tests may appear with 125 lower frequency. To address this issue, in the MLC framework the patient examination frequencies have been weighted using the TF-IDF weighting score (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006).

Prepared data are analyzed through a multiple-level clustering approach 130 to identify, in a dataset with a variable distribution, groups of patients with a similar examination history (Section 3.2). In this study, five multiple-level clustering algorithms have been integrated into MLC. Clustering results

are validated through an internal, unsupervised, evaluation (Section 3.3). Each cluster is then compactly described through the most representative examinations occurring in their patient histories and the association rules modeling correlations among these examinations (Section 3.4).

### 3.1. Data representation

In the considered collection of patient records, each record corresponds to a medical examination done by a patient in a given date. For instance, Table 1 shows a toy example dataset listing the medical examinations undergone by two patients  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  in year 2014. A more formal definition of a collection of patient records is given in Definition 3.1.

Table 1: Example of a collection of patient records

| PatientID | Examination       | Date       | PatientID | Examination   | Date       |
|-----------|-------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| $p_1$     | Glucose level     | 2014-02-10 | $p_2$     | Urine test    | 2014-12-01 |
| $p_2$     | Fundus oculi      | 2014-01-06 | $p_2$     | Triglycerides | 2014-11-30 |
| $p_2$     | Urine test        | 2014-02-28 | $p_2$     | Urine test    | 2013-04-16 |
| $p_1$     | Fundus oculi      | 2014-03-10 | $p_1$     | Urine test    | 2014-09-06 |
| $p_2$     | Urine test        | 2014-04-11 | $p_2$     | Triglycerides | 2014-08-01 |
| $p_1$     | Glucose level     | 2014-04-15 | $p_2$     | Urine test    | 2014-07-25 |
| $p_2$     | Electrocardiogram | 2014-06-16 | $p_1$     | Fundus oculi  | 2014-07-10 |
| $p_1$     | Glucose level     | 2014-06-21 | $p_1$     | Urine test    | 2014-11-23 |

Table 2: VSM representation for dataset in Table 1

| PatientID | Glucose level | Fundus oculi | Electrocardiogram | Urine test | Triglycerides |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| $p_1$     | 3             | 2            | 0                 | 2          | 0             |
| $p_2$     | 0             | 1            | 1                 | 5          | 2             |

Table 3: VSM representation using the TF-IDF weighting score for dataset in Table 1

| PatientID | Glucose level | Fundus oculi | Electrocardiogram | Urine test | Triglycerides |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| $p_1$     | 0.347         | 0            | 0                 | 0          | 0             |
| $p_2$     | 0             | 0            | 0.077             | 0          | 0.154         |

**Definition 3.1. Collection of patient records.** A collection of patient records  $\mathcal{D}$  is a set of records, such that  $\Sigma = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$  is the set of examinations in  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\Theta = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  is the set of patients in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Each record

$r_k$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  models an examination  $e_j \in \Sigma$  done by a patient  $p_i \in \Theta$  in a given date.

To enable the mining process and discover valuable knowledge, in the MLC framework the collection of patient records is tailored to the Vector Space Model (VSM) representation (Salton G., 1971) and the Term Frequency (TF) - Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) scheme (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Ku  
2006) has been adopted to weight the examination frequency. In this study, we neglect the information on when an examination has been done because we focus on the frequency of performed examinations. The VSM representation has been applied in previous works (Salton G., 1971) to represent text documents, while the TF-IDF scheme has been used to weight the relevance of words appearing in the document.

In the VSM representation, each patient  $p_i$  is a vector in the examination space. This vector represents the *patient examination history*. The vector cell  $(p_i, e_j)$  corresponds to examination  $e_j$  done by patient  $p_i$ . Cell  $(p_i, e_j)$  is a weight describing the relevance of examination  $e_j$  for patient  $p_i$ . A more formal definition of the patient examination history follows.

**Definition 3.2. Patient examination history.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a collection of patient records,  $\Sigma = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$  the set of examinations in  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\Theta = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  the set of patients in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Each patient  $p_i$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  is represented by a weighted examination frequency vector  $v_{p_i}$  of  $|\Sigma|$  cells. Each cell  $v_{p_i}[j]$  of vector  $v_{p_i}$  reports the weighted frequency  $w_{p_i, e_j}$  of examination  $e_j$ ,  $e_j \in \Sigma$ , for patient  $p_i$ ,  $p_i \in \Theta$ . Thus,  $v_{p_i} = [w_{p_i, e_1}, \dots, w_{p_i, e_{|\Sigma|}}]$ .*

Table 2 reports a base VSM representation for the example dataset in Table 1. Table 2 has one row for each patient in Table 1, and a number of columns equal to the number of different examinations in Table 1. Each cell  $(p_i, e_j)$  in Table 2 reports the weight of examination  $e_j$  for patient  $p_i$ . In this base VSM representation the weight is simply given by the number of times examination  $e_j$  was repeated by patient  $p_i$ . However, a patient data representation as in Table 2 may not properly characterize the patient condition. In fact, it may give more relevance to standard routine tests, which usually appear with higher frequency, than to more specific tests, which often appear with lower frequency. The adoption of the TF-IDF scheme allows highlighting the relevance of specific examinations for a given patient condition. The TF-IDF value increases proportionally to the number of times

an examination has been done by the patient, but it is offset by the frequency of the examination in the examination dataset, which helps to control the fact that some examinations are generally more common than others. The definitions of TF and IDF are given below.

185 **Definition 3.3. Term Frequency (TF) and Inverse Document Frequency (IDF).** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a collection of patient records,  $\Sigma = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$  the set of examinations in  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\Theta = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  the set of patients in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

1. For each pair  $(p_i, e_j)$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the Term Frequency  $TF_{p_i, e_j}$  is the relative frequency of examination  $e_j$  for patient  $p_i$ . It is computed as  $f_{p_i, e_j} / \sum_{1 \leq k \leq |\Sigma|} f_{p_i, e_k}$ , where  $f_{p_i, e_j}$  is the number of times patient  $p_i$  underwent examination  $e_j$  and  $\sum_{1 \leq k \leq |\Sigma|} f_{p_i, e_k}$  is the total number of examinations done by  $p_i$ .
2. The Inverse Document Frequency  $IDF_{e_j}$  for examination  $e_j$  is the frequency of  $e_j$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ . It is computed as  $\text{Log}[|\Theta| / |\{p_k \in \Theta : f_{p_k, e_j} \neq 0\}|]$  where  $|\Theta|$  is the number of patients in  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $|\{p_k \in \Theta : f_{p_k, e_j} \neq 0\}|$  is the number of patients in  $\mathcal{D}$  who underwent (at least once) examination  $e_j$ .

Mathematically, the base of the log function for IDF computation in Definition 3.3 does not matter and constitutes a constant multiplicative factor towards the overall result.

200 The TF-IDF weight  $w_{p_i, e_j}$  for the pair  $(p_i, e_j)$  is high when examination  $e_j$  appears with high frequency in patient  $p_i$  and low frequency in patients in the collection  $\mathcal{D}$ . When examination  $e_j$  appears in more patients, the ratio inside the IDF's log function approaches 1, and the  $IDF_{e_j}$  value and TF-IDF weight  $w_{p_i, e_j}$  become close to 0. Hence, the approach tends to filter out common examinations. A more formal definition of TF-IDF weight follows.

**Definition 3.4. TF-IDF weight.** For each pair  $(p_i, e_j)$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the TF-IDF weight  $w_{p_i, e_j}$  is computed as  $w_{p_i, e_j} = TF_{p_i, e_j} * IDF_{e_j}$ , where  $TF_{p_i, e_j}$  is the Term Frequency and  $IDF_{e_j}$  is the Inverse Document Frequency.

210 Table 3 reports the VSM representation using the TF-IDF scheme for the example dataset in Table 1. The TF-IDF weights for examinations Fondus oculi and Urine Test are equal to 0 since they are performed by both patients. Instead, TF-IDF weights are different than zero for the other examinations, which are performed by only one of the two patients.

### 3.2. Data clustering using a multiple-level strategy

215 The MLC framework applies clustering algorithms in a multiple-level fashion to progressively focus on different dataset portions and locally compute clusters. The pseudocode of the multiple-level clustering strategy is in Algorithm 1. It performs multiple runs over the considered data collection. Initially, the whole dataset is analysed. Then, at each subsequent iteration, 220 the clustering algorithm is applied on a selected portion of the dataset, and clusters are locally identified on it. Clustering algorithm parameters can be properly set at each iteration according to the local data distribution of the considered dataset portion. Clusters computed at each iteration contribute to the final cluster set. The approach is iterated until the target objective 225 is achieved, as the minimum threshold value of a given quality index or the maximum allowed number of clusters in the final cluster set.

```
Data: Initialize  $\mathcal{D}$  with the whole initial data object collection
repeat
  if first iteration then
    | select  $\mathcal{D}$  as target dataset;
  else
    | select a portion of  $\mathcal{D}$  as target dataset;
  end
  apply basic clustering algorithm on the target dataset;
  update the final cluster set;
  evaluate the quality of the final cluster set;
until target objective is verified;
```

**Algorithm 1:** Multiple-level clustering strategy

Clustering algorithms currently integrated in MLC are described in Section 3.2.1. Data objects in the analysed data collection corresponds to patients in our application scenario. For patient clustering, patient examination 230 histories are compared using the cosine distance measure (see Section 3.2.2).

#### 3.2.1. Multiple-level clustering algorithms

Clustering algorithms integrated in the MLC framework are described in the following. Their main characteristics are summarized in Table 4, by highlighting the improvement with respect to the corresponding (not multiple- 235 level) standard algorithms. Based on this evaluation, they appear as good

candidates for the analysis considered in this study. Objects in the analyzed data collection correspond to patients in our application scenario.

**Bisecting K-means** (Steinbach et al., 2000) applies the standard K-means algorithm in a multiple-level fashion. K-means (Juang & Rabiner, 1990) discovers K clusters modeled by their representatives, named *centroids*, given by the mean value of the objects in the clusters. Initially, K objects of the dataset are randomly chosen as centroids. Then, each object is assigned to the cluster whose centroid is the nearest to that object. Finally, centroids are relocated by computing the mean of the objects within each cluster. The process iterates until centroids do not change or some objective functions are achieved.

Nevertheless K-means is a widely used clustering method, it is biased to spherical clusters and it is sensitive to the initial choice of centroids. Aimed at overcoming this second limitation, the bisecting K-means algorithm adopts a multiple-level clustering approach based on a bisecting strategy. Instead of looking for all representative centroids (and corresponding clusters) at the same time, it iteratively focuses on a dataset portion and locally identifies centroids (and their clusters). More in detail, two clusters are initially generated using the standard K-means algorithm. Then, at each subsequent iteration level, a cluster is selected among those generated up to the current step. The selected cluster is split into two subclusters using K-means. K-1 level iterations are needed for discovering the desired K clusters. Different criteria can be exploited to choose the cluster to split: (i) The cluster size (i.e., the number of objects in the cluster), (ii) the cluster SSE (Sum of Squared Errors), which measures the squared total distances among cluster objects and cluster centroid, and (iii) a criterion based on both cluster size and SSE. In this study, the cluster with the largest SSE value is split.

**Bisecting K-medoids** (Kashef & Kamel, 2008) relies on the standard K-medoid algorithm (PAM) (Kaufman, L. and Rousseeuw, P. J., 1990) for implementing a multiple-level clustering technique similar to bisecting K-means. K-medoid works similarly to K-means, but clusters are in this case represented by an object (*medoid*) instead of a mean point (centroid). As for bisecting K-means, bisecting K-medoids is less susceptible to the initialization problems than standard K-medoids. K-medoids methods were also investigated in this study, since they can be less sensitive to outliers than K-means methods.

**Refined K-means and refined K-medoids**(Steinbach et al., 2000). Both bisecting strategies described above use the standard (K-means and K-medoids) clustering algorithms to bisect individual clusters. It follows that the final  
275 cluster set does not represent a local minimum with respect to the total SSE value over the whole cluster set. To deal with this problem, the cluster set generated by bisecting K-means and bisecting K-medoids can be refined as follows. The centroids (resp. medoids) in the computed cluster set are used as the initial centroids (resp. medoids) for the standard K-means (resp.  
280 K-medoids) algorithm.

**Multiple-Level DBSCAN** (Antonelli et al., 2013) progressively applies the standard DBSCAN (Ester et al., 1996) algorithm on different (disjoint) dataset portions. DBSCAN separates dense regions (with a similar density) from a sparse one in the dataset, driven by the user-specified parameters *Eps*  
285 and *MinPts*. A dense region in the data space is a n-dimensional sphere with radius *Eps* and containing at least *MinPts* objects. Objects are classified as being (i) in the interior of a dense region (a core point), (ii) on the edge of a dense region (a border point), or (iii) in a sparsely occupied region (an outlier point). A cluster contains any two core points close within a distance  
290 *Eps*, and any border point close within a distance *Eps* to at least one core point in the cluster. Outlier points are filtered out and they are unclustered.

Standard DBSCAN can discover clusters with different sizes and shapes, but it is weak in recognizing clusters with variant density. The multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm allows overcoming this limitation, by decomposing  
295 the clustering process into subsequent steps. The whole original dataset is clustered at the first level. Then, at each subsequent level, objects labeled as outliers in the previous level are re-clustered using the standard DBSCAN. With the multiple-level approach, parameters *Eps* and *MinPts* can be set at each level by adapting the definition of dense region to the local data density.  
300 Furthermore, the number of unclustered outlier points progressively reduces at each iteration level. Consequently, the multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm can finally provide a more homogenous but also richer cluster set, because it includes a larger portion of the original dataset. The number of iteration levels can be tuned based on the final number of unclustered objects and the  
305 number of computed clusters.

Table 4: Comparison of multiple-level clustering algorithms

|  | Bisecting and Refined<br>K-means | Bisecting and Refined<br>K-medoids | Multiple-level<br>DBSCAN          |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Initialization problem                     | Reduced                          | Reduced                            | No                                |
| Sensitivity to outliers                    | Reduced                          | Reduced                            | No                                |
| Unclustered data objects                   | No                               | No                                 | Reduced                           |
| Need of convex shape                       | Yes                              | Yes                                | No                                |
| Parameter specification                    | K                                | K                                  | Eps, MinPts<br>Num. of iterations |
| Num. of iterations                         | K-1                              | K-1                                | To be specified                   |
| Dealing with variable<br>data distribution | Improved                         | Improved                           | Improved                          |

### 3.2.2. Comparing patient examination histories

For all clustering algorithms described above, the weighted examination frequency vectors representing the patient examination histories are compared using the cosine distance measure (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006). In our reference case study, let  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  be two arbitrary patients in the collection  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $v_{p_i}$  and  $v_{p_j}$  be the corresponding weighted examination frequency vectors. The cosine distance between patients  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  is computed as

$$dist(p_i, p_j) = \arccos(\cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j})) \quad (1)$$

where the cosine similarity between patients  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  is computed as

$$\cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j}) = \frac{v_{p_i} \bullet v_{p_j}}{\|v_{p_i}\| \|v_{p_j}\|} = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq k \leq |\Sigma|} v_{p_i}[k] v_{p_j}[k]}{\sqrt{\sum_{1 \leq k \leq |\Sigma|} v_{p_i}[k]^2} \sqrt{\sum_{1 \leq k \leq |\Sigma|} v_{p_j}[k]^2}}. \quad (2)$$

The cosine distance in Equation 1 verifies the triangle inequality. The cosine similarity is in the range  $[0,1]$ .  $\cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j})$  equal to 1 describes the exact similarity of examination histories for patients  $p_i$  and  $p_j$ , while  $\cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j})$  equal to 0 points out that patients have complementary histories (i.e., the sets of their examinations are disjoint).

### 3.3. Cluster evaluation

For the (internal) validation of clustering results, MLC adopts the quality indices typically used for the considered algorithms. The Total SSE index (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006) is used for K-means

and K-medoids methods, while the Silhouette coefficient (Rousseeuw, 1987) for the multiple-level DBSCAN approach. Similar to (Steinbach et al., 2000), the overall similarity measure is used to compare cluster sets computed by different algorithms. Finally, the Rand Index (Rand, 1971) has been used to evaluate the agreement between different clustering results.

The **Sum of Squared Error (SSE)** is used to evaluate the cluster cohesion for center-based clusters, as clusters generated using K-means and K-medoids methods (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006). For an arbitrary patient, its error is computed as the squared distance between the patient and the centroid (resp. medoid) in the cluster including the patient. The SSE for a cluster  $C_i$  is computed as

$$SSE(C_i) = \sum_{p_j \in C_i} dist(c_i, p_j)^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $dist(c_i, p_j)$  is the distance between the centroid (resp. medoid)  $c_i$  of cluster  $C_i$  and a patient  $p_j$  in  $C_i$ . The cosine distance metric in Equation 1 has been used for distance evaluation. The smaller the SSE, the better the quality of the cluster. The *Total SSE* on a set of K clusters is computed by summing up the SSE values of the K clusters.

The **Silhouette** index measures both intra-cluster cohesion and inter-cluster separation to evaluate the appropriateness of the assignment of a data object to a cluster rather than to another one (Rousseeuw, 1987). The silhouette value for a given patient  $p_i$  in a cluster  $C$  is computed as

$$s(p_i) = \frac{b(p_i) - a(p_i)}{\max\{a(p_i), b(p_i)\}}, s(p_i) \in [-1, 1], \quad (4)$$

where  $a(p_i)$  is the average distance of patient  $p_i$  from all other patients in cluster  $C$ , and  $b(p_i)$  is the smallest of average distances from its neighbour clusters. The silhouette value for cluster  $C$  is the average silhouette value on all patients in  $C$ . Silhouette values in the range  $[0.51, 0.70]$  and  $[0.71, 1]$  show that a reasonable and a strong cluster structure has been found (Kaufman, L. and Rousseeuw, P. J., 1990). Lower silhouette values progressively indicate clusters with a weak structure until a no substantial structure. The cosine distance metric in Equation 1 has been used for silhouette evaluation.

The **Overall Similarity** index evaluates the cluster quality. In this study, it has been adopted for comparing the cluster sets from the algorithms integrated into the MLC framework. Specifically, it is used to measure the cluster cohesiveness based on the pairwise cosine similarity of patients in a cluster. For each cluster  $C$ , the overall similarity is computed as

$$Overall\_Similarity(C) = \frac{1}{|C|^2} \sum_{\substack{v_{p_i} \in C \\ v_{p_j} \in C}} \cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j}) \quad (5)$$

where  $|C|$  is the cluster size,  $\cos(v_{p_i}, v_{p_j})$  is the cosine similarity between two patients  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  in  $C$  represented by their weighted examination frequency vectors  $v_{p_i}$  and  $v_{p_j}$ . The overall similarity on a set of  $K$  clusters is computed as the weighted similarity of the clusters

$$Overall\ Similarity = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{|C_i|}{N} Overall\_Similarity(C_i) \quad (6)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of patients in the cluster set.

The **Rand Index** computes the number of pairwise agreements between two partitions of a set (Rand, 1971). It is exploited to measure the similarity between the cluster sets obtained by two different clustering techniques. In our case study, let  $O$  be a set of  $N$  patients, and  $X$  and  $Y$  two different partitions of set  $O$  to be compared. The Rand Index  $R$  is computed as

$$R = \frac{a + b}{\binom{N}{2}} \quad (7)$$

where  $a$  denotes the number of pairs of patients in  $O$  which are in the same cluster both in  $X$  and  $Y$ , and  $b$  denotes the number of pairs of patients in  $O$  which do not belong to the same cluster neither in  $X$  nor in  $Y$ . Therefore, the term  $a + b$  is the number of pair wise agreements of  $X$  and  $Y$ , while  $\binom{N}{2}$  is the number of different pairs of elements which can be extracted from  $O$ . The Rand Index ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates that the two partitions do not agree for any patient pair, and 1 that the two partitions are equivalent.

### 3.4. Cluster content characterization

In the MLC framework, each computed cluster is concisely described through the most representative examinations occurring in their patient his-

380 tories and the association rules modeling correlations among these exami-  
nations (Han et al., 2000). In our analysis, association rules identify sets  
of examinations that are statistically related in the underlying collection  
of patient histories. Association rules are usually represented in the form  
 $X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $X$  and  $Y$  are disjoint conjunctions of examinations. The  
quality of an association rule  $X \rightarrow Y$  is usually measured by rule sup-  
port and confidence. Rule support is the percentage of patient histories  
385 containing both  $X$  and  $Y$ . Rule confidence is the percentage of patient  
histories with  $X$  that also contain  $Y$ , and describes the strength of the  
implication. To rank the most interesting rules, we also used the lift in-  
dex (Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V., 2006), which measures  
the (symmetric) correlation between sets  $X$  and  $Y$ . Lift values below 1 show  
390 a negative correlation between sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , while values above 1 indicate  
a positive correlation.

#### 4. Experimental results

This section presents the results of the experiments with the MLC frame-  
work regarding (i) *quality evaluation* for the computed cluster sets, (ii) *execu-  
395 tion time* for cluster set computation, and (iii) impact of *data dimensionality*,  
given by the number of different examinations used to describe patient his-  
tories, on the quality of the cluster sets. The MLC methodology has been  
validated on a real collection of examination log data for diabetic patients.

##### 4.1. Dataset

400 As a reference case study we considered a real dataset of (anonymized)  
diabetic patients collected by an Italian Hospital. It contains the examina-  
tion log data of a set of 6,380 patients with overt diabetes, covering the time  
period of one year. Both male and female patients in a wide age range are  
included. The domain of the examinations includes 159 different examina-  
405 tion types. Table 5 lists the most frequent examinations including routine  
examinations as well as more specific diagnostic tests for diabetes compli-  
cations with varying degrees of severity. Complications due to diabetes can  
affect for example the cardiovascular system, eyes, and liver. The diagnostic  
and therapeutic procedures are defined using the ICD 9-CM (International  
410 Classification of Diseases, 9th revision, Clinical Modification) (ICD-9-CM,  
2011).

Table 5: Most frequent examinations for each category in the diabetes dataset

| <i>Category</i> | <i>Examination</i>       | <i>Freq. (%)</i> | <i>Category</i>             | <i>Examination</i>                      | <i>Freq. (%)</i> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|
| Routine         | Glucose level            | 85               | Liver                       | Alanine aminotransferase enzyme (ALT)   | 30               |
|                 | Venous blood             | 79               |                             | Aspartate aminotransferase enzyme (AST) | 30               |
|                 | Capillary blood          | 75               |                             | Gamma GT                                | 15               |
|                 | Urine test               | 75               |                             | Bilirubin                               | 2                |
|                 | Glycated hemoglobin      | 46               |                             | Upper abdominal ultrasound              | 2                |
|                 | Complete blood count     | 18               |                             | Kidney                                  | Culture urine    |
| Cardiovascular  | Cholesterol              | 36               | Uric acid                   |   | 23               |
|                 | Triglycerides            | 36               | Microscopic urine analysis  |   | 23               |
|                 | HDL Cholesterol          | 35               | Microalbuminuria            |   | 21               |
|                 | Electrocardiogram        | 23               | Creatinine                  |   | 20               |
| Eye             | Fundus oculi             | 27               | Creatinine clearance        |   | 16               |
|                 | Retinal photocoagulation | 2                | Carotid ECO doppler carotid | 3                                       |                  |
|                 | Eye examination          | 2                | Limb                        | ECO doppler limb                        | 3                |
|                 | Angioscopy               | 2                |                             | Vibration sense thresholds              | 1                |

#### 4.2. Evaluation setup and parameter configuration

The MLC framework has been implemented as follows. To perform the multiple-level cluster analysis, the DBSCAN, K-means and K-medoids algorithms available in the RapidMiner toolkit have been used, and they have been applied in a multiple-level fashion. RapidMiner is an open-source platform including a number of data mining algorithms (Rapid Miner Project, 2013). For a more accurate evaluation of the multiple-level strategy, also the standard (not multiple-level) K-means, K-medoids, and DBSCAN algorithms have been considered for performance comparison.

We developed in Java programming language the procedures for transforming the patient examination log data into the corresponding VSM representation using the TF-IDF weighting score, and for cluster evaluation through the SSE, silhouette, and overall similarity measures. Procedures for cluster evaluation have been implemented as a RapidMiner plugin. The procedure for Rand Index computation has been developed in Python programming language.

For K-means and K-medoids methods, experiments have been run by varying the K parameter, corresponding to the number of clusters in the final cluster set. For bisecting algorithms, this set is computed with K-1 iteration levels of the bisecting approach. For refined algorithms, the refinement process has been run for each final cluster set provided by bisecting algorithms. The usual approach has been adopted to address the problem of centroids

and medoids initialization for bisecting algorithms, and for standard K-means  
435 and K-medoids when considered for performance comparison. Multiple runs,  
each with set of randomly chosen initial centroids (resp. medoids) have been  
performed, and then the cluster set with the minimum SSE has been selected.  
Specifically, RapidMiner parameters maximum number of random initialisa-  
440 tions and maximum number of iterations for each initialisation have been  
set to 50 and 300, respectively, for K-means methods. The same parameters  
have been set to 10 and 100 (default values in RapidMiner) for K-medoids  
methods because of their relevant execution time on the considered use case  
(see Section 4.4).

For the multiple-level DBSCAN, in setting the number of iterations, and  
445 the *Eps* and *MinPts* values at each iteration level, we aimed at avoiding  
clusters with few patients, to discover representative examination sets, and  
at limiting the number of outlier patients, to take into account the contri-  
bution of various examination histories. Clusters should show good cohesion  
and separation (i.e., silhouette values greater than 0.5). Different *Eps* and  
450 *MinPts* values have been selected at each iteration level due to the differ-  
ent data distribution of the dataset portion locally analyzed. This portion  
tends to be progressively sparser because it includes subsets of patients with  
more and more specific examinations (see Section 5). Consequently, at each  
subsequent iteration level, smaller *MinPts* values are progressively selected  
455 to define a dense area region. The *Eps* value has been then locally tuned by  
trading-off the quality of the cluster set and the number of outlier patients.

### 4.3. Cluster quality evaluation

The quality for the computed cluster sets has been evaluated based on  
the SSE (for K-means and K-medoids methods), Silhouette (for DBSCAN  
460 methods), and overall similarity (for all methods) measures.

#### 4.3.1. Evaluation of K-means methods

For all K-means methods, the total SSE measure progressively decreases,  
and the overall similarity measure progressively increases, when growing the  
value of K and thus the number of clusters (see Figure 2). The bisecting K-  
465 means algorithm always provides the worst results for both measures, i.e., the  
cluster sets with the highest total SSE and the lowest overall similarity values.  
Nevertheless, the refined K-means algorithm always provides better results  
than bisecting K-means, showing that the use in a subsequent clustering




Figure 2: K-means methods: quality of the cluster set when varying the number of clusters

phase of the “centroids” computed with the bisecting K-means algorithm  
 470 can improve the quality of the final cluster set.

Compared to standard K-means, the refined K-means algorithm provides  
 better results when increasing K (about  $K > 30$ , i.e., more than 30 clusters).  
 It is worse than standard K-means when a lower value of K is considered  
 ( $5 \leq K \leq 15$ , i.e., between 5 and 15 clusters). It follows that the final cluster  
 475 set can benefit from a multiple-level clustering strategy when the number  
 of iteration levels, and thus the final number of clusters, increases. The K  
 parameter can be selected based on the desired number of clusters and the  
 expected quality of the cluster set.

#### 4.3.2. Evaluation of K-medoids methods

480 The experimental results reported in Figure 3 show that K-medoids meth-  
 ods exhibit a similar behavior to K-means ones. The bisecting K-medoids  
 algorithm always provides the worst results in terms of overall similarity and  
 total SSE values. The refined K-medoids algorithm always improves bisecting  
 K-medoids and provides comparable results to standard K-medoids.

485 K-medoids methods showed a very high computational cost which limited  
 their applicability in the MLC framework (see Section 4.4). Due to this cost,  
 solution sets with a larger number of clusters have not been generated.

#### 4.3.3. Evaluation of DBSCAN methods

490 As reported in Table 6, when iterating the multiple-level DBSCAN ap-  
 proach for four levels, 32 clusters are computed in total showing good overall




Figure 3: K-medoids methods: quality of the cluster set when varying the number of clusters

similarity and silhouette values (greater than 0.5). These clusters globally includes 3,510 patients (about 55% of the diabetes dataset). Most patients belong to clusters computed at the first level, while a comparable number of patients is included in clusters computed at the next levels. After four iterations, 2,870 patients are labeled as outliers and remain unclustered. Note that these patients can be additionally clustered by iterating the approach for more levels.

Clustering about 55% of the patients using the standard DBSCAN algorithm generates a lower quality cluster set than when using the multiple-level DBSCAN approach. To deepen into the analysis of this point, Figure 4 plots the silhouette and overall similarity values, and number of outlier patients, when the whole patient collection is analyzed using the standard DBSCAN. With parameters  $Eps=0.36$  and  $MinPts=30$ , a cluster set is generated including almost the same number of patients than the cluster set from the multiple-level DBSCAN approach, but with a significantly lower quality. The overall similarity value is 0.73 and the silhouette is 0.4 (i.e., lower than 0.5), while these values are 0.85 and 0.55, respectively, for the multiple-level DBSCAN when iterated for four levels (see Table 6). It follows that, also for the DBSCAN method, the final cluster set can benefit of the multiple-level strategy.

#### 4.4. Execution time

Experiments were performed on a 2.66-GHz Intel(R) Core(TM)2 Quad PC with 8 GBytes of main memory, running linux (kernel 3.2.0).

Table 6: Clustering results for multiple-level DBSCAN

|                              | 1st level | 2nd level | 3rd level | 4th level  |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| (MinPts, Eps)                | (30, 0.3) | (30, 0.5) | (20, 0.5) | (10, 0.35) |
| Number of clusters           | 11        | 5         | 4         | 12         |
| Number of patients           | 2,872     | 260       | 104       | 274        |
| Silhouette                   | 0.54      | 0.61      | 0.66      | 0.6        |
| Overall similarity           | 0.85      | 0.86      | 0.89      | 0.94       |
| <b>Whole cluster set</b>     |           |           |           |            |
| Number of clusters           | 32        |           |           |            |
| Number of clustered patients | 3,510     |           |           |            |
| Number of outliers           | 2,870     |           |           |            |
| Silhouette                   | 0.55      |           |           |            |
| Overall similarity           | 0.86      |           |           |            |




Figure 4: DBSCAN algorithm: quality of the cluster set and number of outlier patients when varying the  $Eps$  value ( $MinPts=30$ )

For the multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm, the total run time for computing a solution with 32 clusters is 13min 40s. The first, second, third and fourth iteration level require 3min 34s, 3min 8s, 3min, and 2min 58s, respectively. The time tends to progressively reduce at each level because a smaller dataset portion is progressively analysed.

The run time for bisecting and refined K-means algorithms for computing a solution with 32 clusters is (slightly) lower than for the multiple-level DBSCAN approach. Bisecting k-means requires 10 min, while refined K-means requires 7s in addition for the refinement of centroids (i.e., to run K-means after having initialized centroids). The time for K-means is about 2 minutes.

The run time is significantly higher for bisecting K-medoids, making the

525 approach not suitable for datasets with many examinations as the one con-  
sidered in this study. The time is approximately 38 hours for generating a  
set of 20 clusters, while refined K-medoids requires 34min in addition for the  
refinement of medoids. The time for K-medoids is about 5 hours and a half.

#### 4.5. *Impact of data dimensionality on cluster sets*

530 In the patient data representation considered in this study, the data di-  
mensionality is given by the set of examinations describing the patient ex-  
amination history. When the cardinality of this set increases, a larger set  
of facets characterizes patient care plans. Besides routine tests, also more  
specific examinations are considered, which are progressively undergone by  
535 a reduced number of patients. Consequently, the patient distribution tends  
to become increasingly sparser, and the computation of cohesive clusters  
becomes more complex.

To evaluate how data dimensionality impacts on the quality of the cluster  
set, in addition to the whole diabetes dataset (with 159 examinations), two  
540 other configurations of this dataset have been considered, including about  
60% and 40% of the most frequent examinations (i.e., 60 and 30 exami-  
nations, respectively). The three datasets contain the same number of pa-  
tients, showing that patient histories include various examinations, possibly  
repeated a different number of times by each patient. The multiple-level DB-  
545 SCAN and the refined K-means algorithms have been considered as reference  
example methods for this analysis.

For refined K-means, given a number of clusters, the overall similarity  
value decreases, and the total SSE increases, as the number of examinations  
(and thus the dataset sparsity) increases (see Figure 5). Consequently, when  
550 the number of examinations increases, a larger number of clusters should be  
generated to discover cohesive groups of patients. For example, the over-  
all similarity value gradually tends to 0.8 when considering 20 clusters for  
dataset with 30 examinations and 40 clusters for datasets with 60 and 159  
examinations.

555 The multiple-level DBSCAN has been iterated for four levels for all three  
datasets, aimed at generating cluster sets with comparable good quality in  
terms of overall similarity and silhouette values. As the number of examina-  
tions increases (and thus the dataset sparsity), the final number of patients  
labeled as outliers, and thus unclustered, decreases. After four iterations,  
560 the final number of outliers is 2,573, 2,678 and 2,870 for datasets with 30,  
60, and 159 examinations, respectively (see Tables 6 and 7). It follows that




Figure 5: Refined K-means on the three datasets: quality of the cluster set when varying the number of clusters

when the dataset sparsity increases, more iterations are needed to cluster a larger subset of patients but preserving the quality of the cluster set.

Table 7: Clustering results for multiple-level DBSCAN on datasets with 30 and 60 examinations

|                              | 30 examinations |            |           |            | 60 examinations |            |            |           |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|
|                              | 1st level       | 2nd level  | 3rd level | 4th level  | 1st level       | 2nd level  | 3rd level  | 4th level |
| (MinPts, Eps)                | (50, 0.3)       | (20, 0.45) | (10, 0.4) | (15, 0.25) | (30, 0.3)       | (30, 0.55) | (15, 0.25) | (10, 0.6) |
| Number of clusters           | 6               | 12         | 7         | 10         | 11              | 6          | 10         | 14        |
| Number of patients           | 2,837           | 617        | 147       | 206        | 2,891           | 358        | 186        | 267       |
| Silhouette                   | 0.56            | 0.60       | 0.72      | 0.64       | 0.54            | 0.54       | 0.70       | 0.6       |
| Overall similarity           | 0.84            | 0.89       | 0.90      | 0.98       | 0.85            | 0.83       | 0.99       | 0.65      |
| <b>Whole cluster set</b>     |                 |            |           |            |                 |            |            |           |
| Number of clusters           | 35              |            |           |            | 41              |            |            |           |
| Number of clustered patients | 3,807           |            |           |            | 3,702           |            |            |           |
| Number of outliers           | 2,573           |            |           |            | 2,678           |            |            |           |
| Silhouette                   | 0.57            |            |           |            | 0.55            |            |            |           |
| Overall similarity           | 0.86            |            |           |            | 0.84            |            |            |           |

## 5. Discussion

565 Here we discuss the clustering results discovered through the MLC framework. The discussion addresses the performance comparison for clustering

methods, the comparison from a medical perspective for discovered cluster sets, and the cluster characterization in terms of association rules.

### 5.1. Performance comparison

570 Concerning *K-means methods*, *refined K-means* in particular benefits of the multiple-level strategy. The quality of the final cluster set is at least comparable to the cluster quality of standard and bisecting K-means algorithms, but it outperforms them when the approach is iterated for more levels. Also the *multiple-level DBSCAN* algorithm pointed out the improvement in  
575 adopting a multiple-level strategy with respect to the standard DBSCAN in the considered case study. On the contrary, *K-medoids methods* do not seem suitable to be used in a multiple-level fashion in our case study, because they provide cluster sets with lower quality. For example, for the solution with 21 clusters, the overall similarity is 0.67 and total SSE is 3,200 for K-medoids methods (see Figure 3), while these measures are 0.71 and 2,275 for  
580 K-means methods (see Figure 2). In addition, the high computational time of K-medoids methods limits the possibility of iterating them for more levels, thus progressively improving cluster quality.

Based on the discussion above, we focused our attention on comparing  
585 the refined K-means and the multiple-level DBSCAN algorithms. Let us consider, as a reference example, the solutions with 32 clusters generated by the two algorithms on the whole dataset with 159 examinations. The following considerations hold. (i) Both *cluster sets exhibit good quality* in terms of overall similarity, even if this value is higher for multiple-level DBSCAN (0.86, see Table 6) than for refined K-means (0.75, see Figure 2). (ii) In both  
590 cases, the clustering process requires a *comparable and acceptable execution time*, slightly lower for refined K-means (about 10min) than for multiple-level DBSCAN (about 13min). Thus, (iii) in both cases the multiple-level strategy can be potentially *iterated for more levels* by further increasing the quality  
595 of the final cluster set. Specifically, the unclustered outlier patients can be progressively reduced for multiple-level DBSCAN, while clusters can be split into more cohesive subclusters for refined K-means.

To deepen into the comparison of the two algorithms, the agreement between the two cluster sets is evaluated using the Rand Index. While refined  
600 K-means clusters the whole dataset, the multiple-level DBSCAN clusters a subset, since outlier patients are grouped into a separate cluster. The following two options are considered to guarantee the same number of patients in

the compared cluster sets. The separate cluster of outlier patients is (a) ex-  
cluded from, or (b) it is included in, the final cluster set generated by the  
605 multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm. In case (a), the outlier patients are also  
removed from clusters computed by the refined K-means algorithm. The  
Rand Index value shows a good agreement between the two clustering re-  
sults, higher in option (a) (Rand Index = 0.83) than in option (b) (Rand  
Index = 0.73). It follows that the two cluster sets mainly differ on the pa-  
610 tients labeled as outliers. While they are isolated by multiple-level DBSCAN,  
they are clustered together with other patients by refined K-means.

### 5.2. Comparison from a medical perspective

Discovered cluster sets are also analysed from a medical perspective. Fol-  
lowing the discussion on performance comparison in Section 5.1, we focused  
615 on the multiple-level DBSCAN and the refined k-means algorithms, and we  
analysed and compared the solutions with 32 clusters computed on the whole  
dataset with 159 examinations.

Nevertheless the two algorithms generate cluster sets with good qual-  
ity and agreement, from a medical perspective the *multiple-level DBSCAN*  
620 appears as the *more suitable approach* for patient analysis. The refined K-  
means algorithm is less effective in partitioning the initial data collection into  
subsets with different data distributions, i.e., including patients with (signif-  
icantly) different examination histories. Instead, the multiple-level BSCAN  
algorithm isolates these outlier patients, and separately analyzes them in a  
625 subsequent clustering phase. Since refined K-means computes a cluster set  
including *all* the patients in the original dataset, these outlier patients are  
always assigned to some clusters, thus increasing the variety of examinations  
in each cluster.

More in detail, unlike refined K-means, the multiple-level DBSCAN ap-  
630 proach computed clusters including, on average, a limited number of different  
examinations. These clusters contain from 2 to 35 different examinations and  
about 12 on average (see Table 8), while clusters from refined K-means in-  
clude from 18 to 67 different examinations and about 38 on average (see  
Table 9). In addition, clusters from refined K-means mostly contain patients  
635 with diversified examination histories, including both routine and more spe-  
cialized examinations to test different diabetes complications. Instead, in  
clusters from multiple-level DBSCAN, the number of examinations tend to  
increase with the iteration levels, thus progressively including more special-  
ized examinations.

Table 8: Detailed clustering results for multiple-level DBSCAN

|                        | First-level                |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                        | C <sub>1<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>2<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>3<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>4<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>5<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>6<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>7<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>8<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>9<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>10<sub>1</sub></sub> | C <sub>11<sub>1</sub></sub> |                             |
| Number of patients     | 1,764                      | 223                        | 140                        | 294                        | 144                        | 110                        | 42                         | 43                         | 35                         | 36                          | 41                          |                             |
| Number of examinations | 10                         | 6                          | 8                          | 7                          | 6                          | 2                          | 7                          | 8                          | 9                          | 19                          | 2                           |                             |
| Silhouette             | 0.48                       | 0.53                       | 0.62                       | 0.50                       | 0.56                       | 0.99                       | 0.83                       | 0.66                       | 0.85                       | 0.71                        | 1.00                        |                             |
| Overall similarity     | 0.82                       | 0.87                       | 0.94                       | 0.88                       | 0.92                       | 1.00                       | 0.96                       | 0.94                       | 0.97                       | 0.94                        | 1.00                        |                             |
|                        | Second-level               |                            |                            |                            |                            | Third-level                |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |
|                        | C <sub>1<sub>2</sub></sub> | C <sub>2<sub>2</sub></sub> | C <sub>3<sub>2</sub></sub> | C <sub>4<sub>2</sub></sub> | C <sub>5<sub>2</sub></sub> | C <sub>1<sub>3</sub></sub> | C <sub>2<sub>3</sub></sub> | C <sub>3<sub>3</sub></sub> | C <sub>4<sub>3</sub></sub> |                             |                             |                             |
| Number of patients     | 75                         | 73                         | 49                         | 30                         | 33                         | 32                         | 29                         | 21                         | 22                         |                             |                             |                             |
| Number of examinations | 35                         | 27                         | 15                         | 16                         | 8                          | 22                         | 19                         | 14                         | 15                         |                             |                             |                             |
| Silhouette             | 0.61                       | 0.52                       | 0.70                       | 0.62                       | 0.63                       | 0.71                       | 0.54                       | 0.73                       | 0.69                       |                             |                             |                             |
| Overall similarity     | 0.84                       | 0.85                       | 0.91                       | 0.89                       | 0.86                       | 0.9                        | 0.83                       | 0.92                       | 0.91                       |                             |                             |                             |
|                        | Fourth-level               |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |
|                        | C <sub>1<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>2<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>3<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>4<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>5<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>6<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>7<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>8<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>9<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>10<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>11<sub>4</sub></sub> | C <sub>12<sub>4</sub></sub> |
| Number of patients     | 19                         | 19                         | 100                        | 12                         | 14                         | 14                         | 24                         | 30                         | 10                         | 10                          | 12                          | 10                          |
| Number of examinations | 7                          | 3                          | 20                         | 9                          | 8                          | 19                         | 12                         | 12                         | 9                          | 16                          | 4                           | 19                          |
| Silhouette             | 0.69                       | 1                          | 0.42                       | 0.88                       | 0.79                       | 0.53                       | 0.48                       | 0.50                       | 0.73                       | 0.51                        | 0.93                        | 0.72                        |
| Overall similarity     | 0.93                       | 1                          | 0.91                       | 0.98                       | 0.95                       | 0.94                       | 0.94                       | 0.92                       | 0.94                       | 0.94                        | 0.99                        | 0.95                        |
| Whole cluster set      |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |
| Silhouette             | 0.55                       |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |
| Overall similarity     | 0.86                       |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                             |                             |                             |

Table 9: Detailed clustering results for refined K-means

|                        | C <sub>1</sub>  | C <sub>2</sub>  | C <sub>3</sub>  | C <sub>4</sub>  | C <sub>5</sub>  | C <sub>6</sub>  | C <sub>7</sub>  | C <sub>8</sub>  | C <sub>9</sub>  | C <sub>10</sub> | C <sub>11</sub> | C <sub>12</sub> |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Number of patients     | 96              | 172             | 169             | 97              | 124             | 239             | 233             | 206             | 13              | 88              | 38              | 376             |
| Number of examinations | 42              | 39              | 25              | 18              | 52              | 51              | 44              | 40              | 31              | 34              | 38              | 60              |
| SSE                    | 67.6            | 112             | 39.9            | 8.72            | 43.3            | 105             | 88.7            | 65.5            | 5.17            | 22.4            | 14.7            | 134             |
| Overall similarity     | 0.51            | 0.50            | 0.80            | 0.92            | 0.70            | 0.63            | 0.67            | 0.72            | 0.70            | 0.79            | 0.67            | 0.69            |
|                        | C <sub>13</sub> | C <sub>14</sub> | C <sub>15</sub> | C <sub>16</sub> | C <sub>17</sub> | C <sub>18</sub> | C <sub>19</sub> | C <sub>20</sub> | C <sub>21</sub> | C <sub>22</sub> | C <sub>23</sub> | C <sub>24</sub> |
| Number of patients     | 18              | 78              | 402             | 231             | 351             | 50              | 47              | 26              | 201             | 182             | 226             | 146             |
| Number of examinations | 33              | 30              | 56              | 44              | 67              | 28              | 34              | 51              | 37              | 41              | 46              | 54              |
| SSE                    | 7.43            | 38.3            | 137             | 100             | 149             | 24.2            | 17.6            | 15.7            | 98.7            | 48.9            | 76.3            | 113             |
| Overall similarity     | 0.66            | 0.61            | 0.70            | 0.63            | 0.64            | 0.60            | 0.69            | 0.54            | 0.59            | 0.77            | 0.71            | 0.45            |
|                        | C <sub>25</sub> | C <sub>26</sub> | C <sub>27</sub> | C <sub>28</sub> | C <sub>29</sub> | C <sub>30</sub> | C <sub>31</sub> | C <sub>32</sub> |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number of patients     | 74              | 1,126           | 509             | 61              | 169             | 170             | 257             | 205             |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number of examinations | 39              | 35              | 35              | 40              | 20              | 24              | 28              | 30              |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| SSE                    | 58.7            | 55.3            | 57              | 34.2            | 22.5            | 65.5            | 43.9            | 55.8            |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Overall similarity     | 0.43            | 0.96            | 0.90            | 0.57            | 0.88            | 0.76            | 0.85            | 0.76            |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Whole cluster set      |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Total SSE              | 1,926.01        |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Overall similarity     | 0.75            |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |

640 For both methods, the content of some example clusters, in terms of the most frequent examinations in the cluster, is reported in Table 10. For the multiple-level DBSCAN, first-level clusters contain patients who mostly performed standard routine tests to monitor diabetes conditions (cluster  $C_{2_1}$ ). Second-level clusters contain patients tested with an increasing number of  
645 specific examinations, showing that patients can be affected by a particular disease complication or by more disease complications (e.g., on cardiovascular and eye system in cluster  $C_{5_2}$ ). Examinations become progressively more numerous and specific in third- and fourth-level clusters, indicating patients that can have diabetes complications of increasing severity (clusters  
650  $C_{1_3}$  and  $C_{12_4}$ ). Instead, in clusters from refined K-means, examinations cover most categories. Thus, patients with different disease complications can be included in the same cluster (clusters  $C_2$ ,  $C_5$ ,  $C_{11}$  and  $C_{21}$ ).

Being clusters computed using the multiple-level DBSCAN algorithm rather homogeneous in their patient examination histories, clinical domain  
655 experts can inspect the cluster content from a medical perspective to support various analysis as for example those reported below. (a) Discover, for each cluster, the examinations actually prescribed to diabetic patients included in the cluster. (b) Check the coherence between the underwent examinations in each cluster and the existing medical guidelines for diabetes  
660 disease (ICD-9-CM, 2011). (c) Provide feedbacks to health care organizations to improve the application of the existing medical guidelines, but also to enrich these guidelines or assess new ones.

### 5.3. Cluster characterization using association rule analysis

The cluster content has been concisely described using association rules,  
665 which represent correlated examinations within each cluster. As an example of the type of information which can be mined using these patterns, some association rules are reported in Table 11 for the multiple-level DBSCAN clusters in Table 10.

Rules in the first-level cluster  $C_{2_1}$  show strong correlations among routinely checked examinations, being rules mostly characterized by high support and confidence values and lift greater than 1. For example, rule  $R_1$   
670 reports that *Urine test* and *Capillary blood* examinations appear together in 72% of patients in the cluster. Moreover, being rule confidence 100%, all patients with *Urine test* underwent *Capillary blood*. In the second-level cluster  $C_{5_2}$ , rule  $R_4$ , with lift value lower than 1, highlights an inverse impli-

Table 10: Multiple-level DBSCAN and refined K-means: most frequent examinations in some example clusters (examination frequencies are in %)

| Category       | Examination                | Multiple-level DBSCAN |           |           |            | Refined K-means |       |          |          |
|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------|-------|----------|----------|
|                |                            | 1st level             | 2nd level | 3rd level | 4th level  | $C_2$           | $C_5$ | $C_{11}$ | $C_{21}$ |
|                |                            | $C_{2_1}$             | $C_{5_2}$ | $C_{1_3}$ | $C_{12_4}$ |                 |       |          |          |
| Routine        | Glucose level              | 78                    | 100       | 75        | 100        | 68              | 94    | 63       | 90       |
|                | Capillary blood            | 72                    | 97        | 72        | 100        | 58              | 69    | 61       | 57       |
|                | Urine test                 | 72                    | 100       | 72        | 100        | 60              | 68    | 61       | 55       |
|                | Venous blood               | 96                    | 91        | 69        | 70         | 56              | 98    | 68       | 96       |
|                | Glycated Hemoglobin        | 100                   | 76        | 16        | 10         | 24              | 90    | 40       | 79       |
|                | Complete Blood Count       | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 5               | 73    | 16       | 100      |
| Cardiovascular | Cholesterol                | -                     | -         | 13        | 10         | 10              | 85    | 37       | 70       |
|                | Triglycerides              | -                     | -         | 13        | 1          | 11              | 84    | 37       | 69       |
|                | HDL Cholesterol            | -                     | -         | 13        | 10         | 10              | 84    | 37       | 67       |
|                | Electrocardiogram          | -                     | 79        | 25        | -          | 20              | 25    | 26       | 15       |
| Eye            | Fundus oculi               | -                     | 100       | -         | 20         | 26              | 34    | 45       | 20       |
|                | Retinal photocoagulation   | -                     | -         | -         | -          | -               | 1     | 3        | -        |
|                | Eye examination            | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 1               | 7     | 8        | 1        |
|                | Angioscopy                 | -                     | -         | 100       | -          | -               | 2     | 8        | -        |
| Liver          | ALT                        | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 9               | 95    | 26       | 50       |
|                | AST                        | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 10              | 97    | 29       | 49       |
|                | Gamma GT                   | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 5               | 83    | 18       | 10       |
|                | Bilirubin                  | -                     | -         | -         | -          | -               | 95    | -        | -        |
|                | Upper abdominal ultrasound | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 1               | 6     | 3        | 2        |
| Kidney         | Culture urine              | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 7               | 52    | 37       | 20       |
|                | Uric acid                  | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 6               | 65    | 21       | 33       |
|                | Microscopic urine analysis | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 4               | 69    | 13       | 50       |
|                | Microalbuminuria           | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 6               | 44    | 26       | 11       |
|                | Creatinine                 | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 4               | 61    | 13       | 29       |
|                | Creatinine clearance       | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 6               | 29    | 18       | 11       |
| Carotid        | ECO doppler carotid        | -                     | -         | -         | -          | 67              | 4     | 11       | 2        |
| Limb           | ECO doppler limb           | -                     | -         | -         | 10         | 53              | 2     | 16       | 2        |
|                | Vibration sense thresholds | -                     | -         | -         | 100        | -               | 2     | -        | 2        |

680 cation between *Electrocardiogram* and examinations *Venous blood* and *Glycated Hemoglobin*. These two examinations occur with probability 65% (corresponding to the rule confidence value) in the subset of patients having *Electrocardiogram*. Instead, the probability of the two examinations grows to 72.7% when all patients in the cluster are considered, regardless of whether they performed *Electrocardiogram* (72.7% is the frequency in the cluster of the pair of examinations). Thus, patients tested with *Electrocardiogram* tend

to follow less than expected *Venous blood* and *Glycated Hemoglobin*.

Rules tends to be characterized by lower support values in the next-level  
685 clusters, being patient histories more diversified. Correlations among exami-  
nations *Electrocardiogram*, *Angioscopy*, and *Venus blood* are reported for the  
third-level cluster  $C_{13}$  in rules  $R_7$  and  $R_8$ . 25% of patients in the cluster  
performed all three examinations but, based on the rule confidence value,  
there is a stronger correlation between *Electrocardiogram* and examinations  
690 *Angioscopy* and *Venus blood* than vice-versa. While all (100%) patients with  
*Electrocardiogram* also had *Angioscopy* and *Venus blood* (rule  $R_7$ ), fewer  
(36%) patients with *Angioscopy* and *Venus blood* also had *Electrocardiogram*  
(rule  $R_8$ ). In the fourth-level cluster  $C_{124}$ , containing more diversified exami-  
nations, more diversified association rules are discovered. These rules may  
695 model strong correlations, but usually occur with (quite) low frequency in  
the cluster.

Table 11: Example association rules for some clusters from multiple-level DBSCAN

| Cluster   | Association rules  | Sup.(%) | Conf.(%) | Lift |
|-----------|--|---------|----------|------|
| $C_{21}$  | $R_1$ : Urine test $\Rightarrow$ Capillary blood                               | 72      | 100      | 1.39 |
|           | $R_2$ : Venous blood $\Rightarrow$ Glycated Hemoglobin, Capillary blood        | 72      | 75       | 1.04 |
| $C_{52}$  | $R_3$ : Capillary blood $\Rightarrow$ Venous blood, Electrocardiogram          | 69      | 72       | 1.03 |
|           | $R_4$ : Electrocardiogram $\Rightarrow$ Venous blood , Glycated Hemoglobin     | 52      | 65       | 0.90 |
| $C_{13}$  | $R_5$ : Triglycerides $\Rightarrow$ HDL Cholesterol                            | 13      | 100      | 8    |
|           | $R_6$ : Glucose level $\Rightarrow$ Angioscopy, Urine test                     | 72      | 96       | 1.33 |
|           | $R_7$ : Electrocardiogram $\Rightarrow$ Angioscopy, Venous blood               | 25      | 100      | 1.46 |
|           | $R_8$ : Angioscopy, Venous blood $\Rightarrow$ Electrocardiogram               | 25      | 36       | 1.46 |
| $C_{124}$ | $R_9$ : Uric acid $\Rightarrow$ Triglycerides                                  | 10      | 100      | 10   |
|           | $R_{10}$ : Microscopic urine analysis $\Rightarrow$ HDL Cholesterol            | 10      | 100      | 10   |
|           | $R_{11}$ : Vibration sense thresholds, Venous blood $\Rightarrow$ Fundus oculi | 20      | 29       | 1.43 |

## 6. Conclusion

This paper presented the multiple-level strategy to effectively cluster real  
data with variable data distribution. We presented and discussed the cluster  
analysis performed on a real collection of diabetic patients records through  
700 five different clustering algorithms integrated into the MLC framework. This  
work can be extended in different research directions. For example, MLC can  
be used on more complex and heterogeneous real data as patient data also  
including additional aspects of the medical treatments (e.g., pharmaceutical

705 drug therapies) or sports data including athlete profile and data on exercise execution (Baralis et al., 2013a). This research direction should touch various aspects of the framework as distance measure, data exploration strategy, and quality indices.

## References

710 Abbasi, A. A., & Younis, M. (2007). A survey on clustering algorithms for wireless sensor networks. *Comput. Commun.*, *30*, 2826–2841.

Antonelli, D., Baralis, E., Bruno, G., Cerquitelli, T., Chiusano, S., & Mahoto, N. A. (2013). Analysis of diabetic patients through their examination history. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, *40*, 4672–4678.

715 Au, W., Chan, K. C. C., Wong, A. K. C., & Wang, Y. (2007). Correction to "attribute clustering for grouping, selection, and classification of gene expression data". *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biology Bioinform.*, *4*, 157.

Baralis, E., Cerquitelli, T., Chiusano, S., D'Elia, V., Molinari, R., & Susta, D. (2013a). Early prediction of the highest workload in incremental cardiopulmonary tests. *ACM TIST*, *4*, 70.

720 Baralis, E., Cerquitelli, T., Chiusano, S., Grimaudo, L., & Xiao, X. (2013b). Analysis of twitter data using a multiple-level clustering strategy. In *MEDI* (pp. 13–24).

Bruno, G., Cerquitelli, T., Chiusano, S., & Xiao, X. (2014). A clustering-based approach to analyse examinations for diabetic patients. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics, ICHI 2014, Verona, Italy, September 15-17, 2014* (pp. 45–50).

Chaturvedi, K. (2003). Geographic concentrations of diabetes prevalence clusters in texas and their relationship to age and obesity. <http://www.ucgis.org/summer03/studentpapers/kshitijchaturvedi.pdf>. Retrieved, 9, 2010.

735 Eriksson, B., Barford, P., & Nowak, R. D. (2008). Network discovery from passive measurements. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2008 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communications, Seattle, WA, USA, August 17-22, 2008* (pp. 291–302).

- Esfandiari, N., Babavalian, M. R., Moghadam, A.-M. E., & Tabar, V. K. (2014). Knowledge discovery in medicine: Current issue and future trend. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *35*, 4434–4463.
- 740 Ester, M., Kriegel, H.-P., Sander, J., & Xu, X. (1996). A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)* (pp. 226–231).
- G. McLachlan and T. Krishnan (1997). *The EM algorithm and extensions*. Wiley series in probability and statistics. John Wiley and Sons.
- 745 Han, J., Pei, J., & Yin, Y. (2000). Mining frequent patterns without candidate generation. In *SIGMOD'00, Dallas, TX*, .
- ICD-9-CM, I. (2011). International Classification of Diseases, 9th revision, Clinical Modification. Available: <http://icd9cm.chrisendres.com>. Last access on March 2011, .
- 750 Juang, B.-H., & Rabiner, L. (1990). The segmental k-means algorithm for estimating parameters of hidden markov models. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, *38*, 1639–1641.
- Kashef, R., & Kamel, M. S. (2008). Efficient bisecting k-medoids and its application in gene expression analysis. In *Image Analysis and Recognition* (pp. 423–434). Springer.
- 755 Kaufman, L. and Rousseeuw, P. J. (1990). *Finding groups in data: An introduction to cluster analysis*. Wiley.
- Khaing, H. W. (March 2011). Data mining based fragmentation and prediction of medical data. In *Int. Conf. Computer Research and Development (ICCRD)* (pp. 480–485).
- 760 Pang-Ning T. and Steinbach M. and Kumar V. (2006). *Introduction to Data Mining*. Addison-Wesley.
- Phanich, M., Pholkul, P., & Phimoltares, S. (2010). Food recommendation system using clustering analysis for diabetic patients. In *IEEE International Conference on Information Science and Applications (ICISA)* (pp. 1–8).
- 765

- Purwar, A., & Singh, S. K. (2015). Hybrid prediction model with missing value imputation for medical data. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 42, 5621–5631.
- 770 Rand, W. M. (1971). Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods. *Journal of the American Statistical association*, 66, 846–850.
- Rapid Miner Project, R. M. (2013). The Rapid Miner Project for Machine Learning. Available: <http://rapid-i.com/> Last access on Febraury 2014, .
- Rousseeuw, P. J. (1987). Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Computational and Applied Mathematics*, (pp. 53–65).
- 775
- Salton G. (1971). *The SMART retrieval system: experiments in automatic document processing*. Prentice-Hall.
- Sawacha, Z., Guarneri, G., Avogaro, A., & Cobelli, C. (2010). A new classification of diabetic gait pattern based on cluster analysis of biomechanical data. *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology*, 4, 1127–38.
- 780
- Sengur, A., & Turkoglu, I. (2008). A hybrid method based on artificial immune system and fuzzy k-nn algorithm for diagnosis of heart valve diseases. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 35, 1011–1020.
- 785 Steinbach, M., Karypis, G., & Kumar, V. (2000). A comparison of document clustering techniques. In *KDD Workshop on Text Mining*.
- Zheng, B., Yoon, S. W., & Lam, S. S. (2014). Breast cancer diagnosis based on feature extraction using a hybrid of k-means and support vector machine algorithms. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 41, 1476–1482.