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#### Abstract

This article presents a new way of dealing with the self-organizing map methods to visualize by an original way qualitative data or histogram vectors as we can find on the Internet e.g. after the pre-processing of plain text documents. The main difference with other known methods is the nature of the processed matrix: a contingency table. By adding constraints during the learning of a mixture of a discrete distribution which models the noise in classes of documents or rows, we obtain a self-organizing map algorithm named CASOM. We explain the properties of the model: metrics, criteria, links with Correspondence Analysis and mean biplot which help to better interpret results. A more general projection available for self-organizing maps in the dual Euclidian space or columns is also introduced. Then, we present some experiments on a corpus of textual short summaries to illustrate the behavior of the algorithm and to show its interest. The conclusion discusses alternative models and gives perspectives of the contribution.
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## 1 Introduction

Self-organizing maps methods were created by Kohonen in the early 1980's. Roughly speaking, Kohonen maps seek to approximate discretized surfaces to model correlation statistics and summarize data distribution. In practice, it is a K-mean[1] algorithm whose classes are constrained on an imaginary lattice. During the learning process, the centers of the classes are updated as in the K-mean method. But all the centers which are near a given center on the lattice also share the data they belong to. So, this smoothing process allows centers which are neighbors on the lattice, to be near each other in the data space. One of the greatest interests of the SOM method is to generalize the principal planes from the Principal Component Analysis method[2] (PCA) in a non-linear way. Correspondence Analysis[3] (CA), a PCA variant for dealing with contingency tables is a very efficient method to extract a structure from an histogram data cloud. Nevertheless, it needs to evolve and to be scaled to be suitable for the huge databases available nowadays. A few years ago, a method KPCA was presented[4] to deal with such data. As CA is like a PCA with a $\chi^{2}$ metrics, Self-Organizing Maps[5] was applied to this metrics. This method has not yet been used for textual data and give center vectors as continuous multivariables. Here, we propose an alternative approach by modeling classes with multinomial distributions. This last law is today one of the

[^0]best ways to classify $[6]$ texts and can deal successfully with the very sparse textual matrices. Therefore, it seems judicious to include it in the model. As alternative models, we can cite the works $[4,7]$ which study a stochastic version of SOM with a $\chi^{2}$ metrics for categorical data. This method should be adapted to construct our dual projections for SOM. Several parametric models have also been proposed these past years as a categorical version of the Generative Topographic Model[8]. These models are quite complex, hard to estimate for large corpuses and to interpret. Our work uses the original decreasing vicinity of SOM during the learning phase. Another work[9] projects the original Probabilistic Latent Semantic Model in the same way, needing more variables to be estimated. Other methods to project data on a plane exist like the classical Multidimensional Scaling (MDS), e.g. Sammon's maps[10], known for its difficulty to be estimated and for the sometimes confusing interpretation of the proximities on the resulting map.
In the following, first we describe the CASOM model that we propose and gives some justifications. Then a biplot method is presented and extented towards a dual projection for SOM methods. Then we report the experimental results performed and finally we draw our conclusions. We will mainly analyze textual data as abstracts from scientific articles available on-line. We call document (or text) a histogram data vector and term (or word) the component of a textual vector. In a formal way, let us suppose we have a corpus of I documents $\mathcal{D}=\left\{d_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{i=I}$ where $d_{i}$ represents the $i^{\text {th }}$ document " $m_{i_{1}} m_{i_{2}} \cdots m_{i_{\mid} d_{i} \mid}$ ", the $m_{i_{j}}$ are the words of the $i^{\text {th }}$ document. From that corpus, a vocabulary of J terms $\mathcal{V}=\left\{m_{j}\right\}_{j=1}^{j=J}$ is extracted. In practice, we select $\mathcal{V}$ by calculating the total frequency of each term and keeping the first J terms because of the Zip law[11]. The document matrix is built counting the occurrences of each word from $\mathcal{V}$. Let us have $N_{i j}=\#\left\{m_{i t}=m_{j}, t \in\left[1 ;\left|d_{i}\right|\right]\right\}, d_{i}=\left(N_{i 1}, N_{i 2}, \cdots, N_{i J}\right)^{T}$, and $N_{i \bullet}=\sum_{j} N_{i j}, N_{\bullet j}=\sum_{i} N_{i j}, N_{\bullet \bullet}=\sum_{i} \sum_{j} N_{i j}$. The contingency table is built with the $d_{i}$ as lines, and $m_{j}$ as columns.

## 2 CASOM: Generalized Correspondence Analysis

Our algorithm is based on the Topology Preserving Expectation-Maximization or TPEM from [12] which modifies the Classifying EM[13] (CEM) algorithm. This one is a clustering version of the Expectation-Maximization[14] (EM) algorithm where EM is an algorithm to calculate the local maximum of likelihood with latent random variables. Therefore, it is a SOM-like map built with explicit Gaussian distribution for the classes. The counting vectors $d_{i}$ are now supposed to be i.i.d. realizations of discrete multidimensional random variables following a multinomial law. The algorithm is a clustering process using a mixture of discrete laws with a fuzzification $\mu_{i k}$ of the original binary variables $c_{i k}$ which is one if $d_{i}$ is in class $k$ and zero else, like in a SOM algorithm. During the learning process, the vicinity is reduced to zero when there is no more neighborhood. TPEM is justified by its authors because the CEM of identical isotropic Gaussian laws is equivalent to a K-mean procedure. The Gaussian class distribution can also be argued by the asymptotic properties[15] of the SOM. Since our current model is different, we seek the underlying metrics and discuss some statistical properties of the algorithm. Here $\theta$ is the parameter vector merging all unknown variables $P_{j \mid k}$ (multinomial parameter component), $P_{k}$ (mixing component), and $\mu_{i k}$. So, the algorithm is a likelihood maximization of a mixture of multinomial distributions by an EM process with a forced fuzzification of the a posteriori probabilities before the maximization step. It enables
lateral links between close centers in the lattice. In practice, the batch algorithm encounters what is called a dead unit (class center) when no document is assigned to the corresponding class. Besides, as smoothing decreases, $\mu_{i k}$ is binary or almost binary, so that $P_{\bullet} \mid k$ cannot be estimated because the class is empty. In that case, we do not update its value any longer. Thus, we obtain our CASOM algorithm of self-organizing map. Distribution values are initialized with random values or in a more suitable way, with already organized centers as a grid from some linear factorial method. Generally, to display the final map, one uses the U-matrix $[16,17]$ which shows the local correlation between the closest neighbor classes. A clustering of the class centers, e.g. hierarchical clustering[18], facilitates browsing on the map by permitting the user to focus on the main themes revealed. For the model presented, we propose the natural criterion by analogy with SOM, replacing Euclidian distance by KL distance, where the binary variable $h_{k l}$ is $1 \mathrm{iff} e_{k}$ and $e_{l}$ are neighbor or identical:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{C}(\mathcal{D} \mid \theta)=\sum_{i} f_{i} \sum_{k} \mu_{i k} \sum_{l} h_{k l} K L\left(f_{\bullet}|i|\left|P_{\bullet}\right| k\right)
$$

This last criterion is approximately[19] minimized by CASOM, ignoring the Bayesian smoothing and near convergence when the centers are well organized. And, we have an approximate local $\chi^{2}$ metrics, remembering that of Malahanobis : the distance locally adapts[19] itself to each class center:

$$
K L\left(f_{\bullet}| | \mid \hat{P}_{\bullet \mid k}\right) \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j} \frac{1}{\hat{P}_{j \mid k}}\left(f_{j \mid i}-\hat{P}_{j \mid k}\right)^{2}
$$

Because of the stochastic fluctuation around the mean value, it can also be shown that this last criterion is distributed as a normal law when $\min _{i} N_{i}$ grows towards infinite values. Morever, as SOM is a non-linear PCA method, the distance justifies that our model is an approximate generalization of the CA method, as the underlying metrics is near the $\chi^{2}$ one. We call the method CASOM for CA by SOM. Our method also permits a very specific visualization of a corpus by showing rows and columns of a two-way contingency table. We use mean projections of words and documents by showing a document $d_{i}$ at the Euclidian coordinates $<s \mid d_{i} ; \hat{\theta}>$ and a word $m_{j}$ at the Euclidian coordinates $\left\langle s \mid m_{j} ; \hat{\theta}\right\rangle$ where we have:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\langle s| d_{i} ; \hat{\theta}> & =\sum_{k} s_{k} \hat{P}\left(k \mid d_{i}\right) \text { with } \hat{P}\left(k \mid d_{i}\right) \propto \prod_{j} \hat{P}_{j \mid k}^{N_{i j}} \\
<s \mid m_{j} ; \hat{\theta}> & =\sum_{k} s_{k} \hat{P}\left(k \mid m_{j}\right) \\
\hat{\mathcal{H}}\left(m_{j}\right) & =-\sum_{k} \hat{P}\left(k \mid m_{j}\right) \log _{2} \hat{P}\left(k \mid m_{j}\right)
\end{array}
$$

It is clear that we must be careful with multimodal distributions showing documents and words at spurious places. So, we choose to select from the finite vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ only low entropy $\hat{\mathcal{H}}\left(m_{j}\right)$ terms to limit mistakes, with $\hat{P}\left(k \mid m_{j}\right) \propto \hat{P}_{j \mid k}$ (or possibly $\left(\hat{P}_{j \mid k}\right)^{\alpha}$ with $\alpha>1$ to underline modes of the distribution). Some edges can be added between very near class distributions, i.e. with small distances D as $D\left(\hat{P}\left(k \mid \square_{1}\right), \hat{P}\left(k \mid \square_{2}\right)\right)$ where $\square_{l} \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{V}$. This biplot is a main difference between the original SOM and CASOM: we are able to interpret term statistics and to make comparisons between documents, classes and terms on the same bidimensional map. For classical SOM methods, where centers are continuous, we propose an alternative. Knowing the fact that the K-means is equivalent to a CEM of a mixture of gaussian law with spherical and identical variance matrices, we can write $P\left(k \mid m_{j}\right) \propto$ $\exp \left(-\rho \sum_{i}\left(x_{i j}-c_{j k}\right)^{2}\right)$ which, for a $\operatorname{good} \rho$, and $c_{k}$ a center in $\mathbb{R}^{J}$, reveals most of the explained intra-variance.

## 3 Experimental and empirical results

The projected corpus comes from the summaries of the technical home publications of INRIA (http://www.irisa.fr/bibli/publi/), of the past 10 years. These scientific abstracts cover all the research themes of the INRIA institute: 1) Networks and systems, 2) Software engineering and Symbolic calculus, 3) Human-Machine Interface and 4) Simulation and optimization of complex systems.These abstracts are in two languages, French and English. The factorial planes of the multinomial parameters come from the French version with a vocabulary of 480 words. We project this corpus of 1,961 documents on a $12^{*} 10$ knot mesh and extract a quick view of its content. For these French summaries, we decide to stop the algorithm before near convergence. We noticed a clear empirical link of the properties between CA and CASOM in the Figure 1. We also project the English version of the abstracts, learning the map until the end of the convergence. We thus obtain a well-trained map with natural clusters. Here, for a vocabulary of 476 words, we retain only 1,955 texts. The size of the textual vectors is near the French one. SOM-like methods index data in semantic clusters where they can be retrieved by a user providing a query $d_{q}=\left(N_{q 1} N_{q 2} \cdots N_{q J}\right)$. A Boolean treatment is for instance the intuitive value $\sum_{j: N_{q j}>0} \hat{P}_{j \mid k}$. We are able to provide different maps to a user, in the Figure 2 underlying various features of the data map by drawing the values as level lines. We illustrate the browsing property of the model. This corresponds to activation maps with level lines for the sum of probabilities of the multinomial for the queries "knowledge" and "interface" with the part of the subgraph around each projected word. Any other indicator could be used instead of the probabilities. The figures show how the self-organizing map behaves: it is activated on different zones according to the diverse themes of the corpus. For example, the word knowledge is statistically near the word interface as is demonstrated by the superposable curves obtained after the query ; and interface defines too an other well separated theme as is demonstrated by its bimodal distribution. Finally, the graph of words gives us an easy way to find the most interesting and reliable statistical correlations. This output permits a quick study of the main hidden relations between words in $\mathcal{V}$, less apparent on the whole table in the Figure 3 unless we use a color scale for the frequencies or clustering.



Figure 1: Factorial planes for eigenvectors $(1,2)$ and $(2,3)$. As we stopped before convergence, we get a shape empirically showing the link between CA and CASOM. The values 0.39 and 0.29 are the projected inertia of the corresponding factorial planes. Each knot of the mesh is the class number $k$.


Figure 2: Mean Biplot with graph of words for the two terms interface, and knowledge. As a remark, every word is written here followed by its total frequency in the corpus. It is shown on the drawings only the restricted graphs of words around the chosen term.
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Figure 3: Table of the multinomial centers for the English summaries : the terms corresponding to the components with the highest probabilities are shown to caracterize associated classes. It appears that close centers often represent similar themes. We can retrieve here the less apparent two areas where the terms interface, and knowledge were shown to be the most frequent previously.

## 4 Conclusion

Our work gives new ideas to deal with self-organizing maps. First, we have presented a new self-organizing map method which has strong links with Correspondence Analysis; as CA is intensively used in textual data analysis, our model is an ideal method to scale CA for large textual datasets where matrices are very sparse with the KL distance known to be competitive, and numerically more efficient than the $\chi^{2}$ one because zero values are cancelled. We have presented some remarkable properties and the first biplot with a SOM algorithm. Second, new ways to evaluate the quality of the final map have also been briefly given, by visual display or by more quantitative methods. To our knowledge, the parallel between multinomial probability vectors and a discrete bivariate law is an original idea in this domain. Finally, the model is illustrated for KD and IR, providing intuitive indicators. Our paper gives new perspectives for self-organizing map methods in the categorical data analysis field. Biplot is a powerful feature which is lacking in most of the currently developed methods. For instance Multidimensional Scaling could be used to make such a biplot, though inevitably losing the understanding of the projections obtained. Our approach gives tools to have an indepth look at a dataset and also to help as a complementary tool to retrieve data by answering a query. Finally, scaling CASOM to bigger datasets is hopefully possible thanks to the SOM experience[20]. Roughly speaking, our maps can be constructed by any classical SOM process on the reducted data matrix with a joint clustering of the frequencies vector or using[21] fuzzy batch quantities to construct multinomial vectors.
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