Supplementary Material: Learning Self-Growth Maps for Fast and Accurate Imbalanced Streaming Data Clustering

Yiqun Zhang, Senior Member, IEEE, Sen Feng, Pengkai Wang, Zexi Tan, Xiaopeng Luo, Yuzhu Ji, Member, IEEE, Rong Zou, and Yiu-Ming Cheung, Fellow, IEEE

A Parameter Sensitivity Evaluation

In the proposed SOHI framework, there are two parameters, namely the initial number of neurons Q and the neighborhood count κ . The varying values of these parameters may affect the clustering performance in various ways. Here is an explanation of these parameters.

Regarding the parameter Q used in the initialization of the sub-networks in SO, it directly determines the initial number of neurons, that is, the number of initial sub-networks. The value of Q is not set too large, as our goal is to allow the network to grow automatically to an appropriate size. On the other hand, a too small value of Q can lead to a scarcity of sub-networks, thereby causing issues with bridge nodes, especially when Q is only 3, SO will degenerate to a situation with only one network, directly affecting the quality of the SOHI framework.

Regarding the parameter κ used in the approximate κ -neighbors algorithm in HI, it calculates the global separability value for a specific cluster. When κ is too large, it may lead to increased computational overhead. Conversely, when κ is too small, it may render the global separability value meaningless.

We conduct experiments on eleven datasets by varying the values of Q and κ , recording the obtained ARI, NMI and DBI scores, as shown in Fig. 1 to Fig. 22. Q values are traversed from 3 to 30, while κ values range from 1 to 20. Specifically, κ performs well and stabilizes between 7 to 15. Different values of Q produce greater changes in accuracy than κ . Larger values of Q generally imply better results; the effects tend to converge once Q exceeds 15. Generally speaking, the SOHI framework is less sensitive to parameter variations.




Figure 1: Clustering performance on AB dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 2: Clustering performance on CAE dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 3: Clustering performance on GAS dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 4: Clustering performance on HM dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 5: Clustering performance on HFCR dataset w.r.t. different values of κ





Figure 6: Clustering performance on IDS2 dataset w.r.t. different values of κ



1.2 ARI NMI DBI

1.0 0.8 DBI

0.4 DBI

0.2 DBI

2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 17.5 20.0 Number of Neighbors κ

Figure 7: Clustering performance on MD dataset w.r.t. different values of κ

Figure 8: Clustering performance on PB dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 9: Clustering performance on RA dataset w.r.t. different values of κ




Figure 10: Clustering performance on SD dataset w.r.t. different values of κ






Figure 11: Clustering performance on WC dataset w.r.t. different values of κ

Figure 12: Clustering performance on AB dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$










Figure 14: Clustering performance on GAS dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$




25 - ARI NMI NMI DBI

Figure 15: Clustering performance on HM dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$

Figure 16: Clustering performance on HFCR dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$









Figure 18: Clustering performance on MD dataset w.r.t. different values of Q



0.65 - O.60 - O.55 - O.55 - O.30 - O.25 - O.30 - O.30 - O.25 - O.30 - O.


Figure 19: Clustering performance on PB dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$

Figure 20: Clustering performance on RA dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$

NMI

30

← DBI






Figure 21: Clustering performance on SD dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$

Figure 22: Clustering performance on WC dataset w.r.t. different values of ${\cal Q}$

4.0

3.5