

# Comparision Results

*Parismita Das*

*5 March 2017*

## Comparison between rioja and adjClustBand\_heap

To check the validity of the cWard's Heap algorithm that is applied for the function adjClustBand\_heap, we compare the clustering results of adjClustBand\_heap with the results of rioja chclust function.

We compare whether the merging of clusters happen at same height and for same index for both the functions. Hence analysing below plots and table data we verify the correctness of adjClustBand\_heap.

### Comparing the Merge Data Table of rioja and adjClustBand\_heap.

In rioja, the function chclust takes input as dissimilarity matrix and gives 'hclust' object as output. The 'hclust' object has attributes such as the indices of the clusters that are merged and the height at which clusters are merged.

Considering the dissimilarity matrix as the same given in the file dissimilarity2.txt. We get the merge data as:

	V1	V2	height
1	-30	-31	0.01
2	-81	-82	0.02
3	-28	-29	0.03
4	-96	-97	0.04
5	-3	-4	0.07
6	-127	-128	0.10

From the table we can say that the (30,31) merges at height 0.01, (81,82) at 0.02 and so on.

Considering function adjClustBand\_heap, it takes similarity matrix as input such that the diagonal elements are 1 and gives 'hclust' object as output. Hence it also has same attributes as rioja chclust function. Thus we can compare the values of Merge Data.

adjClustBand\_heap Data Table with maximum band similarity as shown below:

	V1	V2	gain	height
1	-28	-29	0.001064484	0.001064484
2	-30	-31	0.001307686	0.002372169
3	-40	-41	0.002497098	0.004869267
4	-3	-4	0.002729742	0.007599009
5	-35	-36	0.003671523	0.011270532
6	-23	-24	0.004680510	0.015951043

We realise that the merge data are not same, the reason is that we converted the dissimilarity to similarity using a different approach than rioja does. Hence the output we get are different.


But if we consider the dissimilarity matrix such that it is  $2-2*s'$ , where  $s'$  is scaled similarity matrix (with diagonal as 1). We get:

	V1	V2	height
1	-28	-29	0.001064484
2	-30	-31	0.002372169
3	-40	-41	0.004869267
4	-3	-4	0.007599009
5	-35	-36	0.011270532
6	-23	-24	0.015951043


From the table we can say that the merge data of both `chclust` and `adjClustBand_heap` function are same when we take dissimilarity matrix as  $2-2*s'$  and maximum band of similarity matrix for `adjBandClust_heap`.

### Comparing the dendrograms formed by `chclust` and `adjClustBand_heap`


Considering `adjClustBand_heap` dendrograms for various values of the band constrain  $h$ , so that we can compare the difference on what happens when we take only values which are in located in the neighbourhood of the diagonal.



adjClustBand\_heap Dendrogram for  $h = 5$




adjClustBand\_heap Dendrogram for  $h = 20$



adjClustBand\_heap Dendrogram for  $h = \text{maximum height of the matrix}$

We get to know from the dendrograms that larger the value of  $h$ , more similar it is to clusters formed by rioja. Considering dendrograms formed by chclust with dissimilarity as  $2 \cdot 2^s$  :



We can see that we get exact same result from rioja and adjClustBand\_heap when full band is considered. After normalising the matrix such that the diagonal elements are 1, the Cluster Merging details that are coming are almost similar as of rioja cluster merge data. Hence we can conclude that the adjClustBand\_heap gives same result as that of rioja thus proving its correctness and uses a more optimised algorithm.