



HAL
open science

Boolean factors as a means of clustering of interestingness measures of association rules

Radim Belohlavek, Dhouha Grissa, Sylvie Guillaume, Engelbert Mephu Nguifo, Jan Outrata

► **To cite this version:**

Radim Belohlavek, Dhouha Grissa, Sylvie Guillaume, Engelbert Mephu Nguifo, Jan Outrata. Boolean factors as a means of clustering of interestingness measures of association rules. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 2014, 70 (1-2), pp.151-184. 10.1007/s10472-013-9370-x . hal-02079269

HAL Id: hal-02079269

<https://hal.science/hal-02079269v1>

Submitted on 10 Apr 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence

Boolean factors as a means of clustering of interestingness measures of association rules

--Manuscript Draft--

| | |
|--|---|
| Manuscript Number: | AMAI-D-12-00076R2 |
| Full Title: | Boolean factors as a means of clustering of interestingness measures of association rules |
| Article Type: | Special Issue S65: Concept Lattices |
| Corresponding Author: | Jan Outrata Palacky University Olomouc, CZECH REPUBLIC |
| Corresponding Author Secondary Information: | |
| Corresponding Author's Institution: | Palacky University |
| Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution: | |
| First Author: | Radim Belohlavek |
| First Author Secondary Information: | |
| Order of Authors: | Radim Belohlavek Dhouha Grissa Sylvie Guillaume Engelbert Mephu Nguifo Jan Outrata |
| Order of Authors Secondary Information: | |
| Abstract: | Measures of interestingness play a crucial role in association rule mining. An important methodological problem, on which several papers appeared in the literature, is to provide a reasonable classification of the measures. In this paper, we explore Boolean factor analysis, which uses formal concepts corresponding to classes of measures as factors, for the purpose of clustering of the measures. Unlike the existing studies, our method reveals overlapping clusters of interestingness measures. We argue that the overlap between clusters is a desired feature of natural groupings of measures and that because formal concepts are used as factors in Boolean factor analysis, the resulting clusters have a clear meaning and are easy to interpret. We conduct three case studies on clustering of measures, provide interpretations of the resulting clusters and compare the results to those of the previous approaches reported in the literature. |

| |
|--|
| Noname manuscript No. (will be inserted by the editor) |
|--|

Boolean factors as a means of clustering of interestingness measures of association rules

Radim Belohlavek · Dhouha Grissa · Sylvie
Guillaume · Engelbert Mephu Nguifo · Jan
Outrata

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Measures of interestingness play a crucial role in association rule mining. An important methodological problem, on which several papers appeared in the literature, is to provide a reasonable classification of the measures. In this paper, we explore Boolean factor analysis, which uses formal concepts corresponding to classes of measures as factors, for the purpose of clustering of the measures. Unlike the existing studies, our method reveals overlapping clusters of interestingness measures. We argue that the overlap between clusters is a desired feature of natural groupings of measures and that because formal concepts are used as factors in Boolean factor analysis, the resulting clusters have a clear meaning and are easy to interpret. We conduct three case studies on clustering of measures, provide interpretations of the resulting clusters and compare the results to those of the previous approaches reported in the literature.

1 Introduction

An important problem in extracting association rules, well known since the early stage of association rule mining [35], is the possibly huge number of rules extracted from data. A general way of dealing with this problem is to define the concept of rule

We acknowledge support by the ESF project No. CZ.1.07/2.3.00/20.0059, the project is co-financed by the European Social Fund and the state budget of the Czech Republic (R. Belohlavek); Grant No. 202/10/P360 of the Czech Science Foundation (J. Outrata); and by Grant No. 11G1417 of the French-Tunisian cooperation PHC Utique (D. Grissa). This paper is an extended version of a paper with the same title and the same authors that appeared in Proc. CLA 2011, pp. 207–222.

Radim Belohlavek, Jan Outrata

Data Analysis and Modeling Lab, Dept. Computer Science, Palacky University, Olomouc

17. listopadu 12, CZ-771 46 Olomouc, Czech Republic

E-mail: radim.belohlavek@acm.org, jan.outrata@upol.cz

Dhouha Grissa, Sylvie Guillaume, Engelbert Mephu Nguifo

Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, LIMOS, BP 10448, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand,

France, Clermont Université, Université d’Auvergne, LIMOS, BP 10448, F-63000 Clermont-

Ferrand, France, CNRS, UMR 6158, LIMOS, F-63173 Aubière, France, URPAH, Département

d’Informatique, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Campus Universitaire, 1060 Tunis, Tunisie

E-mail: dgrissa@isima.fr, guillaume@isima.fr, mephu@isima.fr

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 interestingness: only association rules that are considered interesting according to some
2 measure are presented to the user. The most widely used measures of interestingness are
3 based on the well-known concept of support and confidence. However, the suitability
4 of these measures to extract interesting rules was challenged by several studies, see [14]
5 for an overview. Consequently, several other interestingness measures of association
6 rules were proposed, see e.g. [13], [23], [40], [43].

7
8 To understand better the behavior of various measures, several studies of the prop-
9 erties of interestingness measures appeared, see e.g. [13], [15], [24], [30]. Those studies
10 explore various properties of the measures that are considered important and attempt
11 to provide reasonable classifications of the measures. For example, Vaillant et al. [42], as
12 a part of their work on facilitating the choice of user-adapted interestingness measures
13 [25–27], evaluated 20 interestingness measures according to 8 properties. The authors
14 applied hierarchical clustering on the 20×8 measure–property matrix and obtained
15 four clusters of measures. Tan et al. [40] studied 21 interestingness measures using
16 8 properties. They argued that each measure is useful for some applications but not
17 for others and study when two measures are consistent with each other. By applying a
18 new clustering approach, Huynh et al. [21] classified 34 interestingness measures with a
19 correlation analysis. Geng and Hamilton [13] made a survey of 38 interestingness mea-
20 sures for rules and summaries with 11 properties. They also gave strategies to select the
21 appropriate measures. Feno [11] evaluated 15 interestingness measures with 13 proper-
22 ties to describe their behaviour. Delgado et al. [10] provided a study of interestingness
23 measures by means of so-called logical model. Furthermore, the authors proposed and
24 justified the addition of two new principles for interestingness measures to the three
25 proposed by Piatetsky-Shapiro [35]. Heravi and Zaiane [22] studied 53 objective mea-
26 sures for associative classification rules according to 16 properties and concluded that
27 no single measure can be introduced as an obvious winner for associative classification.
28 Surana et al. [38] addressed the problem of selecting an interestingness measure for
29 mining rare association rules. For this purpose, they analyzed various properties of
30 measures and suggested a set of properties to be considered for selecting a measure.
31 Through experimental results, they showed that the measures satisfying the suggested
32 properties can efficiently discover rare association rules. Guillaume et al. [15] attempted
33 to significantly extend the number of measures and properties under scrutiny. The re-
34 sulting measure-property matrix was subject to two studies. Namely, [16] describes
35 how formal concept analysis may help highlighting interestingness measures with sim-
36 ilar behavior to help a user during his choice. More importantly, Guillaume et al. [15]
37 attempted to find natural clusters of measures by widely used clustering methods, the
38 agglomerative hierarchical method and the K-means method. The proposed approach
39 in [15] avoids the four pitfalls mentioned by Suzuki [39] concerning categorization of
40 interestingness measures. For example, the fourth one (search bias) was avoided by test-
41 ing various values of parameters, and aggregating the results of two different clustering
42 algorithms.

43 The numerous previous works indicate the importance of categorization of inter-
44 estingness measures into clusters. For one, the clusters provide us with a structured
45 view on the many existing interestingness measures. Such a view helps to highlight
46 the similarity and possibly other relationships between the measures. For second, the
47 revealed clusters or groups of measures may be useful to help the user select interest-
48 ingness measures. In particular, a group of measures may be thought of a representing
49 a particular kind of interesting measures. In this view, a collection of clusters represents
50 a collection of particular kinds of measures, i.e. particular points of view regarding the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 importance of association rules. If a user intends to take into account several such views
2 represented by the clusters, he may opt to select one measure per cluster. This is the
3 case in a recent paper by Bouker et al. [6] who propose to generate association rules
4 using several different interestingness measures by means of aggregating the measure
5 values.

6
7 A common feature of the above mentioned approaches to cluster interestingness
8 measures is that the methods used only produce disjoint clusters of measures. However,
9 since the clusters are supposed to correspond to significant classes of measures, one
10 would naturally expect overlapping clusters rather than disjoint ones. Namely, a single
11 measure may belong to a particular cluster because it shares some properties with
12 other measures in that cluster (those characteristic for the cluster) and, at the same
13 time, may belong to a different cluster because it shares some other properties with
14 the measures in this different cluster. The aim of this paper is to explore the possibility
15 of obtaining reasonable overlapping clusters of measures using Boolean factor analysis
16 (BFA) and to compare the results with those of the other studies. In particular, we use
17 the method recently developed in [3], apply it to the various measure-property Boolean
18 matrices describing the measures reported in the literature, and take the discovered
19 factors for (overlapping) clusters. We argue that the clusters obtained this way provide
20 a reasonable classification of measures and that since the method uses formal concepts
21 as factors, the clusters are easy to interpret.

22 The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides preliminaries on Boolean
23 (binary) data, association rules, and Boolean factor analysis. Section 3 provides three
24 case studies on clustering using by means of Boolean factors and a discussion regarding
25 the interpretation of the clusters obtained and a comparison of the results to those
26 reported in the literature. Section 4 concludes the paper and outlines some directions
27 for future research.

32 2 Preliminaries

34 2.1 Boolean (binary) data

36 Let X be a set of objects (such as a set of customers, a set of functions or the like)
37 and Y be a set of attributes (such as a set of products that customers may buy, a set
38 of properties of functions). The information about which objects have which attributes
39 may formally be represented by a binary relation I between X and Y , i.e. $I \subseteq X \times Y$,
40 and may be visualized by a table (matrix) that contains 1s and 0s, according to whether
41 the object corresponding to a row has the attribute corresponding to a column. We
42 denote the entries of such matrix by I_{xy} . A data of this type is called *Boolean data* (or
43 binary data). The triplet $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ is called a *formal context* in formal concept analysis
44 (FCA) but other terms are used in other areas.

45
46 Such type of data appears in two roles in our paper. First, association rules, whose
47 interestingness measures we analyze, are certain dependencies over Boolean data. Sec-
48 ond, the information we have about the interestingness measures of association rules is
49 in the form of Boolean data: the objects are interestingness measures and the attributes
50 are their properties. An example is given by Table 2.

2.2 Association rules

An *association rule* [41] over a set Y of attributes is a formula

$$A \Rightarrow B \tag{1}$$

where A and B are sets of attributes from Y , i.e. $A, B \subseteq Y$. Let $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ be a formal context. A natural measure of interestingness of association rules is based on the notions of confidence and support. The *confidence* and *support* of an association rule $A \Rightarrow B$ in $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ are defined by

$$\text{conf}(A \Rightarrow B) = \frac{|A^\downarrow \cap B^\downarrow|}{|A^\downarrow|} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(A \Rightarrow B) = \frac{|A^\downarrow \cap B^\downarrow|}{|X|},$$

where C^\downarrow for $C \subseteq Y$ is defined by $C^\downarrow = \{x \in X \mid \text{for each } y \in C : \langle x, y \rangle \in I\}$, i.e. C^\downarrow is the set of all objects sharing all attributes from C , and $|D|$ denotes the size of a set D . Hence, the confidence of an association rule $A \Rightarrow B$ is the ratio of the number of objects sharing all attributes from both A and B to the number of objects sharing all attributes from A , while the support of the association rule is the ratio of the number of objects sharing all attributes from both A and B to the number of all objects from X .

An association rule is considered interesting if its confidence and support exceed some user-specified thresholds. However, the support-confidence approach suffers from certain weaknesses. Often, this approach as well as algorithms based on it leads to the extraction of an exponential number of rules. In addition, the limitation of the support measure is that sometimes many rules that are potentially interesting have a support lower than the specified threshold and get therefore lost. To address this problem, many other measures of interestingness have been proposed in the literature [14], mainly because they are effective for mining potentially interesting rules and capture various aspects of user interest. Because of lack of space, we do not describe all the measures to which we refer in this paper. Rather, we provide the reader with references (mainly in Table 1) where the definitions may be found. Note that association rules are attributed to [1]. However, the concept of association rule itself as well as various measures of interestingness are particular cases of what is investigated in depth in [18], a book that develops logico-statistical foundations of the GUHA method [19].

2.3 Boolean factor analysis (BFA)

Let I be an $n \times m$ Boolean (binary) matrix. The aim in Boolean factor analysis (BFA), also referred to as factor analysis of (Boolean) binary data, is to find a decomposition

$$I = A \circ B \tag{2}$$

of I into an $n \times k$ Boolean matrix A and a $k \times m$ Boolean matrix B with \circ denoting the Boolean product of matrices, i.e.

$$(A \circ B)_{ij} = \max_{l=1}^k \min(A_{il}, B_{lj}).$$

The inner dimension, k , in the decomposition may be interpreted as the number of factors that may be used to describe the original data. Namely, $A_{il} = 1$ if and only if the l th factor applies to the i th object and $B_{lj} = 1$ if and only if the j th attribute is one

of the manifestations of the l th factor. The factor model behind (2) has therefore the following meaning: the object i has the attribute j if and only if there exists a factor l that applies to i and for which j is one of the particular manifestations of factor l . Note that while the general aim is the same as in classical factor analysis, the nature of data and the algebra behind make BFA substantially different from classical factor analysis. We refer to [3] for further information and references to papers that deal with the problem of factor analysis and decompositions of Boolean matrices.

In [3], the following method for finding decompositions (2) with the number k of factors as small as possible has been presented. The method utilizes formal concepts of the formal context $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ as factors, where $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$, $Y = \{1, \dots, m\}$ (objects and attributes correspond to the rows and columns of I). Recall that a formal concept of $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ is any pair $\langle C, D \rangle$ of sets $C \subseteq X$ and $D \subseteq Y$ such that D is just the set of all attributes shared by all objects in C and, conversely, C is just the set of all objects that have all the attributes in D . Note also that the set of all formal concepts of $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ equipped with a natural subconcept-superconcept hierarchy is called the concept lattice of $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ and is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(X, Y, I)$ [12]. Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\langle C_1, D_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle C_k, D_k \rangle\} \quad (3)$$

be a set of formal concepts of $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$, i.e. $\langle C_l, D_l \rangle$ are elements of the concept lattice $\mathcal{B}(X, Y, I)$. Consider the $n \times k$ Boolean matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ and a $k \times m$ Boolean matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined by

$$(A_{\mathcal{F}})_{il} = 1 \text{ iff } i \in C_l \quad \text{and} \quad (B_{\mathcal{F}})_{lj} = 1 \text{ iff } j \in D_l. \quad (4)$$

Denote by $\rho(I)$ the smallest number k , so-called Schein rank of I , such that a decomposition of I exists with k factors. The following theorem [3] shows that using formal concepts as factors as in (4) is optimal in that it enables us to reach the Schein rank.

Theorem 1 *For every Boolean matrix I , there exists $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X, Y, I)$ such that $I = A_{\mathcal{F}} \circ B_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $|\mathcal{F}| = \rho(I)$.*

Example 1 As an illustration, consider the 4×5 Boolean matrix I depicted bellow. Using the described method one can find a decomposition of the matrix into 4×3 and 3×5 Boolean matrices $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $B_{\mathcal{F}}$ with the number of factors k (and also the Schein rank $\rho(I)$) equal to 3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & = & A_{\mathcal{F}} \quad \circ \quad B_{\mathcal{F}} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & = & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \circ \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

Considering the input Boolean matrix as a formal context $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$, where $X = \{1, \dots, 4\}$ and $Y = \{1, \dots, 5\}$, the following three formal concepts of $\langle X, Y, I \rangle$ are utilized as factors:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\langle \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2\} \rangle, \langle \{2, 4\}, \{1, 5\} \rangle, \langle \{3\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \rangle\}.$$

As has been demonstrated in [3], a useful feature of using formal concepts as factors is the fact that formal concepts may easily be interpreted. Namely, every factor, i.e. a formal concept $\langle C_l, D_l \rangle$, consists of a set C_l of objects (objects are measures of interestingness in our case) and a set D_l of attributes (properties of measures in our

case). C_l contains just the objects to which all the attributes from D_l apply and D_l contains all attributes shared by all objects from C_l . From a clustering point of view, the factors $\langle C_l, D_l \rangle$ may thus be seen as clusters C_l with their descriptions by attributes from D_l . The factors thus have a natural, easy to understand meaning. Since the problem of computing the smallest set of factors is NP-hard, an approximation algorithm was proposed in [3, Algorithm 2]. This algorithm is utilized below in our paper (and also in the above example). The algorithm is based on a greedy strategy to select in every step a large formal concept that covers most of the yet uncovered data. The algorithm uses a heuristic way of selecting formal concepts that makes it possible to avoid the computation of the whole concept lattice, making it much faster yet with comparable quality when compared to a direct greedy strategy performing an exhaustive search, which is represented by [3, Algorithm 1].

3 Results of clustering of interestingness measures by means of BFA

In this section, we present three case studies of clustering interestingness measures using BFA. The input in each case study is a Boolean matrix I in which the rows correspond to interestingness measures and the columns to their properties. Using Algorithm 2 from [3] we compute a set \mathcal{F} of factors, i.e. formal concepts, which decompose I , i.e. for which $I = A_{\mathcal{F}} \circ B_{\mathcal{F}}$. The formal concepts $\langle C_i, D_i \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, cf. (3), provide us with clusters the following way. Each formal concept $\langle C_i, D_i \rangle$ consists of a set C_i of measures and a set D_i of their properties. C_i may be thought of as a cluster of measures and D_i as its description. In the next section, we denote the factors $\langle C_i, D_i \rangle$ by F_i . For convenience, we sometimes identify the set C_i , i.e. the measures covered by F_i , with F_i . That is, we say e.g. $F_i \subseteq C$ instead of the proper $C_i \subseteq C$, to indicate that the measures covered by factor F_i are included in some set C . Note also that according to the nature of BFA, the first factors account for most data and are thus the most important, while the last ones may usually be disregarded. Therefore, we considered the first factors as candidates for important clusters of measures.

3.1 Case Study 1

3.1.1 Input: Measures and their properties

In case study 1, we analyzed the interestingness measures and their properties basically as described in [15]. Table 1 lists the properties with references to the literature where one can find details about these properties. The properties are also described in detail in [15]. We adopt the terminology regarding association rules (even though the usage is somewhat inconsistent and the terminology objectionable from a mathematical viewpoint). In particular, when speaking of a rule $A \Rightarrow B$, an example of $A \Rightarrow B$ is an object (row) in which both A and B are valid (i.e. the object has all attributes from $A \cup B$); one speaks of independence when the probability of having B is independent of the fact that A is true or not, i.e. $P(B|A) = P(B)$; logical implication when the confidence of $A \Rightarrow B$ is 1; equilibrium or indetermination when having maximum uncertainty of B given that A is true, i.e. $P(B|A) = 0.5$ (or, equivalently, $P(A \cap B) = P(A)/2$); attraction when having A increases the chances of having B ,

| No. | Property (basic description) | Ref. |
|----------|--|------------|
| P_1 | Intelligibility of measure. | [27] |
| P_2 | Easiness to fix a threshold to the rule. | [24] |
| P_3 | Asymmetric role of A and B . | [40], [24] |
| P_4 | Asymmetric measure in the sense of the negation of the consequent. | [24], [40] |
| P_5 | Evaluates $A \Rightarrow B$ and $\bar{B} \Rightarrow \bar{A}$ similarly in the logical implication case. | [24] |
| P_6 | Increasing in the number of examples or decreasing in the number of counter-examples. | [35], [24] |
| P_7 | Increasing in data size. | [13], [40] |
| P_8 | Decreasing in the size of antecedent and consequent. | [24], [35] |
| P_9 | Fixed value in the independence case. | [24], [35] |
| P_{10} | Fixed value in the logical implication case. | [24] |
| P_{11} | Fixed value in the equilibrium case. | [5] |
| P_{12} | Particular values in the attraction case between A and B . | [35] |
| P_{13} | Particular values in the repulsion case between A and B . | [35] |
| P_{14} | Tolerance to a few counter-examples. | [17], [28] |
| P_{15} | Invariance in case of expansion of certain quantities. | [40] |
| P_{16} | Desired relationship between $A \Rightarrow B$ and $\bar{A} \Rightarrow B$ rules, namely $m(A \Rightarrow B) = -m(\bar{A} \Rightarrow B)$ for measure m . | [40] |
| P_{17} | Desired relationship between $A \Rightarrow B$ and $A \Rightarrow \bar{B}$ rules, namely $m(A \Rightarrow B) = -m(A \Rightarrow \bar{B})$ for measure m . | [40] |
| P_{18} | Desired relationship between $A \Rightarrow B$ and $\bar{A} \Rightarrow \bar{B}$ rules, namely $m(A \Rightarrow B) = m(\bar{A} \Rightarrow \bar{B})$ for measure m . | [40] |
| P_{19} | Antecedent size is fixed (if measure m is not based on a certain probabilistic model) or random (if m is based on a certain probabilistic model). | [24] |
| P_{20} | Descriptive (invariant with n) or statistical (increases with n) measure. | [24] |
| P_{21} | Discriminant measure (as n grows, measure is less able to distinguish the interesting rules). | [24] |

Table 1 Interestingness measures properties.

i.e., when $P(B|A) > P(B)$; repulsion when having A decreases the chances of having B i.e., when $P(B|A) < P(B)$.

The authors in [15] proposed an evaluation of 61 interestingness measures according to 19 properties, namely P_3 to P_{21} . Properties P_1 and P_2 were not taken into account in this study because of their subjective character and for this reason we disregard them as well. The measures and their properties result in a Boolean 61×19 measure-property matrix that is used for clustering the measures according to their properties. The clustering performed in [15] using the agglomerative hierarchical method and the K-means method revealed 7 clusters of measures which are used in the next section for comparison with the results obtained by BFA from the same measure-property matrix.

The measure-property matrix that we used for clustering by BFA is depicted in Table 2. It consists of 61 measures (taken from [15]) described by 21 properties (18 binary properties and one three-valued property, namely P_{14} , which is represented by three yes-no properties $P_{14.1}$, $P_{14.2}$, and $P_{14.3}$).

3.1.2 Output: Clustering using Boolean factors

We computed the decomposition of the matrix using Algorithm 2 from [3] and obtained 28 factors. Several of them may be disregarded as not very important, cf. Section 2.3. In addition, we extended the original 61×21 Boolean matrix by adding for every property its negation, and obtained a 61×42 Boolean matrix. The reason for adding negated properties is due to our goal to compare the results with the two clustering methods mentioned above and the particular role of the properties and their negations in these clustering methods. From the 61×42 matrix, we obtained 38 factors, denoted F_1, \dots, F_{38} . The factors are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 depicts the object-

| | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 | P13 | P14.1 | P15 | P16 | P17 | P18 | P19 | P20 | P21 | P14.2 | P14.3 |
|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Correlation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Cohen | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Confidence | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Causal confidence | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Pavillon | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Ganascia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Causal confirmation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Descriptive confirmation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Conviction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Cosine | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Coverage | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Dependency | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Causal dependency | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Gray Orłowska | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Bayes factor | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Loevinger | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Collective strength | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Fukuda | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Information gain | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Goodman | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Implication index | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| IPEE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| IP3E | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| PDI | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| II | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| EH | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| REH | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Likelihood index | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Interest | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Jaccard | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Jmeasure | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Klosgen | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Laplace | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Mgk | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Least contradiction | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Pearl | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Piatetsky-Shapiro | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Precision | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Prevalence | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| YuleQ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Recall | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Gini | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Relative risk | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Sebag | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Support | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| One way support | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Two way support | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Examples rate | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| VT100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Variation support | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| YuleY | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Zhang | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Causal confirm-confidence | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Czekanowski-dice | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Negative reliability | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Mutual information | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Kulczynski | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Leverage | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Novelty | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Odds ratio | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Specificity | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |

Table 2 Input Boolean matrix describing interestingness measures by their properties.




Fig. 1 Cumulative cover of input matrix from Table 2 extended by negated properties by factors obtained by decomposition of the matrix.

factor matrix describing the interestingness measures by factors, i.e. the matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$, see Section 2.3. Table 4 depicts the factor-property matrix explaining factors by properties of measures, i.e. the matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$, see Section 2.3. The factors are sorted from the most important to the least important, where the importance is determined by the number of 1s in the input measure-property matrix covered by the factor [3]. The first factors cover a large part of the matrix, while the last ones cover only a small part and may thus be omitted [3], see also the graph of cumulative cover of the matrix by the factors in Figure 1.

3.1.3 Interpretation and comparison

The aim of this section is to provide an interpretation of the results described in the previous section and compare them to the results already reported in the literature, focusing mainly on [15]. As was described in the previous section, 38 factors were obtained. The first 21 of them cover 94% of the input measure-property matrix (1s in the matrix), the first nine cover 72%, and the first five cover 52%. Another remark is that the first ten factors cover the whole set of measures.

Note first that the Boolean factors represent overlapping clusters, contrary to the clustering using the agglomerative hierarchical method and the K-means method performed in [15]. Namely, the clusters are depicted in Figure 2 describing the Venn diagram of the first five Boolean factors (plus the eighth and part of the sixth and tenth to cover the whole set of measures). Figure 3, which is borrowed from [15], demonstrates the consensus of the clusterings obtained by both hierarchical and K-means clustering methods. Classes C_1 to C_7 are collections of measures that were identified to belong to the same cluster by both methods. Some other measures were also found to belong to one of these classes by each method, i.e. by one but not the other. This is indicated by the arrows labeled c (hierarchical clustering) and p (K-means clustering). For example, Fukuda was found to be in C_3 by the hierarchical clustering and in C_4 by the K-means clustering. Given these 7 classes, we can then make a comparison with the factors revealed by the BFA method. A comparison with the classes revealed by the hierarchical and K-means methods follows.

| | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 | P13 | P14.1 | P14.2 | P14.3 | P15 | P16 | P17 | P18 | P19 | P20 | P21 | P14.2 | P14.3 | |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|--|
| F1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F10 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F13 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F16 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F17 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F18 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F19 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F21 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F22 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F24 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F26 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F28 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F29 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F30 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F32 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F33 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F34 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F35 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F36 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4 Factors obtained by decomposition of the input matrix from Table 2 extended by negated properties. The factors are described in terms of the original and negated properties.

Factor 1. The first factor F_1 applies to (i.e. its extent covers) 20 measures, see Table 3: Correlation, Cohen, Pavillon, Conviction, Bayes factor, Loevinger, Collective strength, Information gain, Goodman, Interest, Klosgen, Mggk, YuleQ, Relative risk, One way support, Two way support, YuleY, Zhang, Novelty, and Odds ratio. These measures share the following 9 properties: P4, P7, P9, not P11, P12, P13, not P19, not P20, P21, see Table 4.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and have a fixed point in the case of independence (this allows one to identify the attractive and repulsive area of a rule). The factor also applies only to descriptive and discriminant measures that are not based on a certain probabilistic model.

Comparison. When looking at the classification results reported in [15], F_1 covers two classes from [15] : C_6 and C_7 , which together contain 15 measures. Those classes are closely related according to the dendrogram obtained with the agglomerative hierarchical clustering, which is shown in Figure 4 taken from [15]. The 5 missing measures




Fig. 2 Venn diagram of selected factors of the input matrix from Table 2 extended by negated properties.

form a class obtained with K-means method in [15] with Euclidian distance.

Factor 2. F_2 applies to 16 measures, namely: Confidence, Causal confidence, Ganascia, Causal confirmation, Descriptive confirmation, Cosine, Causal dependency, Laplace, Least contradiction, Recall, Support, Causal confirmed confidence, Czekanowski, Negative reliability, Leverage and Specificity. These measures share the following 12 properties: P4, P6, not P9, not P12, not P13, P14.2, not P15, not P16, not P18, not P19, not P20, P21.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and has a variable point in the case of independence, which implies that the attractive and repulsive areas of a rule are not identifiable. The factor also applies only to measures that are discriminant, are indifferent to a few counter-examples, and are not based on a certain probabilistic model.

Comparison. F_2 corresponds to two classes, C_4 and C_5 reported in [15]. The dendrogram exposed in Figure 4 confirm their closeness. $C_4 \cup C_5$ contains 21 measures. The measures present in $C_4 \cup C_5$ and missing in F_2 are: Jaccard, Kulczynski, Accuracy, Examples and counter-examples rate, and Sebag. Those measures are not covered by F_2 since they are not indifferent to a few counter-examples.

Factor 3. F_3 applies to 10 measures, namely: Coverage, Dependency, Weighted dependency, Implication index, Jmeasure, Pearl, Prevalence, Gini, Variation support, and Mutual information. These measures share the following 10 properties: not P6, not P8, not P10, not P11, not P13, not P14.1, not P15, not P16, not P17, not P19.




Fig. 3 Classes of measures obtained by the hierarchical and K-means clusterings.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures that share only negated properties and whose value does not increase w.r.t. the number of examples. Their common behavior makes them unique compared to the other studied measures and explains the absence of factor that overlaps with F_3 . Factor F_3 represents the only factor among those presented in the Venn diagram which only gather measures that do not share any original (non-negated) property.

Comparison. F_3 corresponds to class C_3 reported in [15], which contains 8 measures. The two missing measures, Variation support and Pearl, belong to C_3 within K-means method and are closely related to it according to the dendrogram (Figure 4). We see a strong correspondence between the results obtained by using Boolean factors and the ones reported in [15].

Factor 4. F_4 applies to 9 measures, namely: Confidence, Ganascia, Descriptive confirmation, IPEE, IP3E, Laplace, Least contradiction, Sebag, and Examples and counter-examples rate. These measures share the following 12 properties: P3, P4, P6, P11, not P7, not P8, not P9, not P12, not P13, not P15, not P16, not P18.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and has a fixed value in the equilibrium case.

Comparison. F_4 mainly applies to measures of class C_5 obtained in [15]. In fact, 7 measures from C_5 are in F_4 . The only two missing measures, IPEE and IP3E, which belong to a different class C_2 , are represented in F_8 which overlaps with C_5 . This can




Fig. 4 Dendrogram of the agglomerative hierarchical clustering using Ward criterion.

be explained by the fact that IPEE and IP3E share property P11 with other measures of the same factor F_4 .

Factor 5. F_5 applies to 13 measures, namely: Interest, Relative risk, One way support, Two way support, Bayes factor, Czekanowski-dice, Recall, Causal dependency, Cosine, Leverage, Specificity, Jaccard and Kulczynski. These measures share the following 13 properties: P4, not P5, P8, not P10, not P11, not P14.1, not P15, not P16, not P17, not P18, not P19, not P20, P21.

Interpretation. The factor applies to descriptive and discriminant measures whose value decreases w.r.t. the increasing number of items satisfying the consequent. It applies also to measures having a variable point in the equilibrium case and logical implication case and which are not based on a certain probabilistic model.

Comparison. Factor F_5 covers principally two classes C_4 and C_7 from the classification results reported in [15]. $C_4 \cup C_7$ contain 24 measures. We then have the following 11

measures missing from F_5 : Precision, Support, Causal confirmation, Causal confidence, Causal confirmed confidence, negative reliability which belong to C_4 , and Information gain, Conviction, Loevinger, Pavillon, Klogsen which represent C_7 missing measures.

Factor 6. F_6 applies to VT100, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Accuracy or Precision, and, moreover, to Correlation, Cohen, Pavillon, Loevinger, Novelty, Interest, Causal dependency, Leverage, Specificity, Causal confirmation, Causal confidence, Causal confirmed confidence, and Negative reliability, which belong to classes C_4 , C_7 and G_{p8} revealed by [15]. These measures share the following 8 properties: P4, P6, P7, P8, not P11, P14.2, not P15, P21.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and the data size but decreases with increasing number of items satisfying the consequent. The factor also applies only to discriminant measures that are indifferent to a few counter-examples and have a variable point in the equilibrium case.

Comparison. The clustering resulted from K-means method in [15] revealed the presence of the class G_{p8} which gather Piatetsky-Shapiro and VT100 measures from F_6 . On the other hand, according to the agglomerative hierarchical clustering method, we find that VT100 is also close to Precision and to other additional measures from both C_4 and F_6 , e.g., Negative reliability, Cosine, or Recall. Furthermore, we mention that G_{p8} measures are divided between F_1 (Correlation, Cohen, Collective strength, Odds ratio and Novelty) and F_6 (Piatetsky-Shapiro and VT100).

Factor 8. F_8 applies to 10 measures, namely: IPEE, IP3E, II, PDI, EII, Likelihood index, REII. These measures share the following 10 properties: P4, P5, P6, not P10, P14.1, not P16, not P17, not P18, P19, P20.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and does not assign a fixed value to a rule with confidence equal to 1. It also applies to statistical measures which are based on a certain probabilistic model.

Comparison. F_8 corresponds to two classes, C_1 and C_2 reported in [15], which contain 6 measures and represent the statistical measures. Only one measure is missing, REII, which according to the partitioning method belongs to C_1 , and to C_2 with the agglomerative hierarchical method.

Factor 10. The only remaining measure not covered by previous factors is Fukuda. F_{10} revealed its presence in addition to the following 15 measures: Causal confidence, Causal confirmed confidence, Pavillon, Causal confirmation, Coverage, Dependency, Causal dependency, Loevinger, Implication index, Mgc, Prevalence, Recall, Negative reliability, Leverage and Specificity. These measures share the following 7 properties: P3, not P11, P14.2, not P15, not P16, not P18, not P19.

Interpretation. The factor applies to asymmetric measures having a variable point in the equilibrium case. It also applies to measures which are not based on a certain probabilistic model and are indifferent to a few counter-examples.

Comparison. F_{10} covers classes C_3 , C_4 , C_6 and C_7 described in Figure 3 in addition to Fukuda measure for which no consensus was found. It belongs to C_3 according to the agglomerative hierarchical method and to C_4 according to K-means. The union of C_3 , C_4 , C_6 and C_7 unveils 36 measures among which about twenty are missing from F_{10} .

| | P_3 | $\overline{P_3}$ | $\overline{P_8}$ | P_8 | P_{10} | $\overline{P_{10}}$ | P_9 | $\overline{P_{11}}$ | P_{11} | $P_{14.3}$ | $P_{14.2}$ | $P_{14.1}$ | $\overline{P_7}$ | P_7 |
|---------------------|-------|------------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-------|
| Support | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Confidence | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Correlation | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Pavillon | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Piatetsky-Shapiro | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Loevinger | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Zhang | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Implication index | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Interest | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Least contradiction | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Sebag | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Bayes factor | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Conviction | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Examples rate | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cohen | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Information gain | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| II | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| REII | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| PDI | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Laplace | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |

Table 5 Input Boolean measure-property matrix from [43].

With seven shared properties, F_{10} represents the factor having the minimal number of properties common to all its measures. This explains the mutual dissimilarity of the measures belonging to this factor.

3.2 Case Study 2

3.2.1 Input: Measures and their properties

In this study we analyzed the measures studied in [43] which provides a study of 20 measures described by 9 properties. From these 9 properties, we considered 7 in case study 1, namely, P_3 , P_7 , P_8 , P_9 , P_{10} , P_{11} , P_{14} . The two other properties, namely, “comprehensibility of the measure” and “easiness to set a threshold of acceptance” were considered too subjective and thus not taken into account in the analysis. The authors in [43] then obtained the 20×15 measure-property matrix shown in Table 5 to cluster the measures by the agglomerative hierarchical method using Ward criterion and Manhattan distance. The authors point out that when using other criteria, they obtained similar results. They identified the five following classes:

$$CUBV_1 = \{\text{Support, Least contradiction, Laplace}\},$$

$$CUBV_2 = \{\text{Confidence, Sebag, Examples rate}\},$$

$$CUBV_3 = \{\text{Correlation, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Pavillon, Interest, Implication index, Cohen, Information gain}\},$$

$$CUBV_4 = \{\text{Loevinger, Bayes factor, Conviction}\},$$

$$CUBV_5 = \{\text{Zhang, REII, II, PDI}\}.$$

| | F_v1 | F_v2 | F_v3 | F_v4 | F_v5 | F_v6 | F_v7 | F_v8 | F_v9 | F_v10 | F_v11 | F_v12 | F_v13 | F_v14 | F_v15 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Support | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Confidence | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Correlation | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Pavillon | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Piatetsky-Shapiro | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Loevinger | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Zhang | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Implication index | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Interest | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Least contradiction | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Sebag | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| Bayes factor | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| Conviction | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| Examples rate | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Cohen | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Information gain | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| II | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| REII | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| PDI | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| Laplace | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |

Table 6 Object-factor matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the matrix in Table 5.

| | P3 | P3 | P8 | P8 | P10 | P10 | P9 | P9 | P11 | P11 | P14,3 | P14,2 | P14,1 | P7 | P7 |
|---------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| F_v1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| F_v2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| F_v3 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| F_v4 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| F_v5 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| F_v6 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| F_v7 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| F_v8 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| F_v9 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| F_v10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| F_v11 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| F_v12 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| F_v13 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| F_v14 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| F_v15 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | |

Table 7 Factor-attribute matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the matrix in Table 5.

3.2.2 Output: Clustering using Boolean factors

We applied BFA to the matrix I from Table 5 and obtained a set \mathcal{F} of 15 factors which decompose I , i.e. $I = A_{\mathcal{F}} \circ B_{\mathcal{F}}$. The factors are denoted F_v1, \dots, F_v15 and are shown in Table 6 (object-factor matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$) and Table 7 (factor-attribute matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$). The graph of the cumulative cover of the matrix by the factors depicted in Figure 5. The first eight factors cover 91% of the input-measure property matrix, the first four cover 69% and the first three cover 57%, more than a half of the matrix. However, the first five cover the whole set of measures, in that every measure is covered by (the extent of) some of the first five factors. Figure 6 provides the Venn diagram of the first five factors.




Fig. 5 Cumulative cover by factors of the input matrix from Table 5.




Fig. 6 Venn diagram of the first five factors of the matrix from Table 5.

3.2.3 Interpretation and comparison

In this section, we interpret and describe the characteristics of the five obtained factors F_{v1}, \dots, F_{v5} . Then we compare each factor firstly with the factors depicted in Figure 2 and secondly with the clusters obtained in [43].

Factor 1. The first factor F_{v1} applies to 11 measures, namely: Correlation, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Interest, Cohen, Pavillon, Implication index, Information gain, Loevinger, Zhang, Bayes factor and Conviction. These measures share the following 4 properties: P8, P9, not P7 and not P11.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value decreases w.r.t. the data and with the number of items matching the consequent and has a fixed point in the case of independence and a variable point in the case of equilibrium.

Factor 2. F_v2 applies to 5 measures, namely: Confidence, Least contradiction, Sebag, Examples rate and Laplace. These measures share the following 3 properties: not P3, not P7 and not P8.

Interpretation. The factor applies to symmetric measures whose evolutionary curve decreases w.r.t. the data size and increases w.r.t. the consequent size.

Factor 3. F_v3 applies to 6 measures, namely: Loevinger, Zhang, Bayes factor, Conviction, II and REII. These measures share the following 4 properties: not P3, P8, P9 and P10.

Interpretation. The factor applies to symmetric measures whose evolutionary curve decreases w.r.t. the consequent size and has a fixed point in the independence and logical implication case.

Factor 4. F_v4 applies to 5 measures, namely: Support, Correlation, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Interest and Cohen. These measures share the following 5 properties: P3, not P7, not P10, not P11 and P14.2.

Interpretation. The factor applies to asymmetric measures whose value decreases w.r.t. the data size and does not assign a fixed value to a rule with confidence equal to 1 and in the equilibrium case. The factor also applies only to measures that are indifferent to a few counter-examples.

Factor 5. F_v5 applies to 3 measures, namely: II, REII and PDI. These measures share the following 5 properties: not P3, P7, P8, P9 and P14.1.

Interpretation. The factor applies to symmetric measures whose value increases w.r.t. the data size and decreases w.r.t. the number of examples matching the consequent. The factor also applies only to measures that have a fixed value in the independence case and tolerate a few counter-examples.

Comparison: Comparing the Venn diagram from Figure 2 with the one presented in Figure 6 we see that (cf. the remark at the beginning of Section 3: we identify factors with the sets of measures covered by the factors)

$$F_v2 \subset F4 \quad \text{and} \quad F_v5 \subset F8,$$

and, moreover, one may observe the following interesting relationship revealing similarity of the factors:

$$F_v1 - \{\text{Piatetsky-Shapiro, Implication index}\} \subset F1,$$

$$F_v4 - \{\text{Piatetsky-Shapiro}\} \subset F1,$$

$$F_v3 - \{\text{II, REII}\} \subset F1.$$

Note also that $F1$ contains half of the measures studied in [43], cf. Figure 2. Further similarities between the factors may be seen from the Venn diagrams in Figures 2 and 6.

Regarding a comparison of factors F_v1, \dots, F_v5 with clusters $CIBV_1, \dots, CIBV_5$ obtained in [43], we get the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_v1 &= CLUBV_3 \cup CLUBV_4 \cup CLUBV_5 - \{\text{PDI}\}, \\
F_v2 &= CLUBV_1 - \{\text{Support}\} \cup CLUBV_2, \\
F_v3 &= CLUBV_4 - \{\text{Zhang, II, REII}\}, \\
F_v4 - \{\text{Support}\} &= CLUBV_3 - \{\text{Pavillon, Implication index, Information gain}\}, \\
F_v5 &= CLUBV_5 - \{\text{Zhang}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We also observed that BFA was able to reveal similarities among measures found in [43]. In addition the first five factors allow to cover the whole 20 measures, and show some relationships among clusters found in [43].

3.3 Case Study 3

3.3.1 Input: Measures and their properties

In this study, we analyzed the measures and their properties studied in [13]. As in the previous case studies, we apply BFA to obtain factors and then interpret and compare these factors with clusters obtained in the two previous case studies, as the authors of [13] did not provide any clustering. [13] analyzed 38 interestingness measures using 11 properties. From these, we only retain the measures and properties that also appear in our two previous studies, which means that we retain 37 measures and 7 properties. The 7 properties retained are P_3 , P_6 , P_7 , P_8 , P_9 , P_{10} , and P_{14} . Nevertheless, the authors of [13] considered slight variations of P_8 and P_9 that we denote $P_{8,1}$ and $P_{9,1}$, respectively. For the case of $P_{8,1}$, they consider that an interestingness measure must decrease with increasing numbers of items matching the antecedent as well as the consequent, but in our study (P_8) we only consider the consequent as in [15]. Concerning $P_{9,1}$, Geng and Hamilton focus on the value of an interestingness measure in the independence case considering that the value must be 0, while we (P_9) only ask that the measure has a fixed value as in [15]. According to these definitions, $P_{8,1}$ is stronger than P_8 ; however, $P_{9,1}$ is a generalization of P_9 . The strong relationships existing between these properties encourage us to apply them in order to obtain the clusters of measures. From these measures and properties, we obtained a Boolean matrix I shown in Table 8.

3.3.2 Output: Clustering using Boolean factors

We applied BFA to the matrix I from Table 8 and obtained a set \mathcal{F} of 13 factors which decompose I , i.e. $I = A_{\mathcal{F}} \circ B_{\mathcal{F}}$. The factors are denoted F_{h1}, \dots, F_{h11} and are shown in Table 9 (object-factor matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$) and Table 10 (factor-attribute matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$). The graph of the cumulative cover of the matrix by the factors is depicted in Figure 7. The graph reveals that the first nine factors cover 91% of the input-measure property matrix, the first five cover 70% and the first four cover 61%. However, the first four cover the whole set of measures. The first four factors are visualized using their Venn diagram in Figure 8, which reveals the overlap between the factors.

Note that the authors in [13] focus only on the assessment of interestingness measures according to their properties and their purpose is in no case the clustering of

| | P3 | P3 | P6 | P6 | P7 | P7 | P8 | P8 | P9 | P9 | P10 | P10 | P14.1 | P14.2 | P14.3 |
|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| Support | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Confidence | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Prevalence | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Recall | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Lift | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Leverage | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Pavillon | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Relative Risk | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Loevinger | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Odds ratio | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Yule's Q | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Yule's Y | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Klogsen | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Conviction | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Weighted dependency | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Collective strength | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Laplace | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Gini | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Goodman | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Mutual information | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| J-measure | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| One way support | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Two way support | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Correlation | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Piatetsky-Shapiro | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Cosine | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Information gain | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Sebag | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Least contradiction | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Bayes factor | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Examples rate | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Zhang | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Jaccard | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Variation support | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Coverage | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Specificity | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |

Table 8 Input Boolean measure-property matrix obtained from [13].

these measures. However, even if no classification of measures is performed, we think that it is quite important to apply BFA on the measure-property matrix obtained by [13] to see the factors resulting from it and to compare them with previous works.

3.3.3 Interpretation and comparison

An interpretation of the four obtained factors F_h1, \dots, F_v4 and their comparison with the factors depicted in Figure 2 follow.

Factor 1. The first factor F_h1 applies to 23 measures, namely: Pavillon, Loevinger, Klogsen, Mutual information, One way support, Leverage, Relative risk, Least contradiction, Precision, Interest, Odds ratio, Collective strength, Cosine, Sebag, Bayes factor, Examples rate, Jaccard, Yule's Q, Yule's Y, Two way support, Correlation, Piatetsky-Shapiro and Information gain. These measures share the following 3 properties: P6, not P7 and P8.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and decreases w.r.t. the data and the consequent size.

| | $F_{h,1}$ | $F_{h,2}$ | $F_{h,3}$ | $F_{h,4}$ | $F_{h,5}$ | $F_{h,6}$ | $F_{h,7}$ | $F_{h,8}$ | $F_{h,9}$ | $F_{h,10}$ | $F_{h,11}$ | $F_{h,12}$ | $F_{h,13}$ |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Support | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Confidence | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Prevalence | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Recall | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Lift | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | |
| Leverage | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Pavillon | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Relative Risk | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Loevinger | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Odds ratio | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Yule's Q | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Yule's Y | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Klosgen | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Conviction | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Weighted dependency | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Collective strength | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Laplace | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Gini | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Goodman | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Mutual information | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| J-measure | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| One way support | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Two way support | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Correlation | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Piatetsky-Shapiro | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Cosine | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Information gain | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Sebag | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Least contradiction | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Bayes factor | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Examples rate | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Zhang | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Jaccard | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Variation support | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Coverage | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Specificity | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |

Table 9 Object-factor matrix $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the matrix in Table 8.

| | P3 | $\overline{P3}$ | P6 | $\overline{P6}$ | P7 | $\overline{P7}$ | P8 | $\overline{P8}$ | P9 | $\overline{P9}$ | P10 | $\overline{P10}$ | P14.1 | P14.2 | P14.3 |
|------------|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|-----|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| $F_{h,1}$ | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| $F_{h,2}$ | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| $F_{h,3}$ | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| $F_{h,4}$ | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| $F_{h,5}$ | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| $F_{h,6}$ | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| $F_{h,7}$ | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| $F_{h,8}$ | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| $F_{h,9}$ | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| $F_{h,10}$ | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| $F_{h,11}$ | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| $F_{h,12}$ | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| $F_{h,13}$ | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Table 10 Factor-attribute matrix $B_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the matrix in Table 8.

Factor 2. F_h2 applies to 16 measures, namely: Pavillon, Loevinger, Klosgen, Mutual information, One way support, Leverage, Relative risk, Least contradiction, Prevalence, Gini, Zhang, Coverage, Specificity, Recall, Gray Orłowska and Laplace. These measures share the following 3 properties: not P3, not P7 and not P10.

Interpretation. The factor applies to symmetric measures whose value decreases w.r.t. the data size and does not assign a fixed value to a rule with confidence equal to 1.

Factor 3. F_h3 applies to 18 measures, namely: Leverage, Relative risk, Least contradiction, Precision, Interest, Odds ratio, Collective strength, Cosine, Sebag, Bayes factor, Examples rate, Jaccard, Recall, Gray Orłowska, Laplace, Support, Confidence and Conviction. These measures share the following 3 properties: P6, not P7 and not P9.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value increases w.r.t. the number of examples and decreases w.r.t. the data size and has a variable point in the independence case.

Factor 4. F_h4 applies to 13 measures, namely: Pavillon, Loevinger, Klosgen, Mutual information, One way support, Prevalence, Gini, Zhang, Coverage, Specificity, Goodman, Jmeasure and Variation support. These measures share the following 3 properties: not P6, not P7 and not P8.

Interpretation. The factor applies to measures whose value decreases w.r.t. the number of examples and the data size and increases w.r.t. the number of examples matching the consequent.

Comparison: The comparison of these clusters with those from Figure 2 reveals the following similarities between the factors from case study 1 and the factors of the present case study:

$$\begin{aligned} F1 - \{\text{Conviction, Goodman, Zhang}\} &\subset F_h1, \\ F_h2 &\subset F1 \cup F2 \cup F3, \\ F_h3 &\subset F1 \cup F2 \cup F3 \cup F4 \cup F5 \cup F6, \\ F_h4 - \{\text{Zhang, Specificity, Goodman}\} &\subset F3. \end{aligned}$$

We can see that in fact, F_h4 is very similar to $F3$, the $F1$ measures are included in F_h1 and that the F_h2 and F_h3 measures are scattered among $F1$, $F2$, $F3$ and $F1$, $F2$, $F3$, $F4$, $F5$, $F6$, respectively. We can also see that F_h4 is very similar to $F3$. Note also that looking at Table 8 and Table 2 tells us that we disagree with the authors of [13] on the properties of some measures, namely of P_8 and P_9 , because the authors in [13] use slightly modified version of these properties compared to us. Some differences between the clusterings obtained therefore result from this fact.

3.4 Discussion

In this section we discuss the outcome of our experiments mainly by comparing the results of the three cases with the measures and their properties taken from [43], [13], and [15]. We applied BFA on the corresponding Boolean measure-property matrices and




Fig. 7 Cumulative cover by factors of the input matrix from Table 8.




Fig. 8 Venn diagram of the first five factors of the matrix from Table 8.

1 visualized the most important clusters thus obtained by means of Venn diagrams. Such
2 clusters overlap and correspond to subgroups of measures with a common behavior.

3 An examination of the Venn diagrams depicted in Figures 2, 6, and 8 reveals three
4 stable groups of interestingness measures:
5

6 {Sebag, Examples rate, Laplace, Confidence, Least contradiction},
7 {Interest, Information gain, Relative risk},
8 {Factor of bayes, Conviction, Loevinger, Pavillon}.

9
10 These new groups of measures were not found in the previous studies. These groups
11 represent particular kinds of measures with similar behavior and may be added to those
12 mentioned in [15]. From this viewpoint, BFA as a clustering method is complementary
13 to other clustering techniques.

14 A work of Suzuki [39] mentions four pitfalls to avoid when studying categorization
15 of interestingness measures: rule bias, data bias, expert bias, and search bias. In our
16 work none of this bias is present, as we focus on formal characteristics of measures
17 and the Boolean factors are generated using formal concept analysis. No additional
18 parameters are used to compute Boolean factors. From this viewpoint, we provide a
19 study that fits most of the requirements of categorization described in [39].

20 Recall from Section 1 that the clusters of measures obtained may be seen as rep-
21 resenting certain kinds of measures and may be used by a user to select measures,
22 in particular when the user intends to select various measures of different kinds as in
23 Bouker et al. [6]. For the particular form of clusters used in the present study, such
24 scenario is particularly suitable because the clusters are represented by formal concepts
25 and have thus a natural meaning. Namely, the meaning of each cluster derives from
26 the intent of the corresponding formal concept, i.e. from the collection of attributes
27 which uniquely determines the cluster.

30 4 Conclusions and further issues

31
32 We analyzed by means of clustering three datasets of interestingness measures for as-
33 sociation rules that were described in the literature in terms of their binary properties.
34 For this purpose, we used a recently developed method of Boolean factor analysis.
35 We interpreted the Boolean factors obtained by this method as clusters, i.e. classes
36 of measures described by their properties. We demonstrated that Boolean factors pro-
37 vide us with clearly interpretable, meaningful clusters of measures. Contrary to other
38 clustering methods, Boolean factors represent overlapping clusters. We argued that
39 this an advantage because overlapping clusters are a natural phenomenon in human
40 classification in general and in the case when objects are represented by overlapping
41 attributes in particular. We performed a detailed comparison of the clusterings ob-
42 tained by Boolean factor analysis and the ones reported in the literature. It turns out
43 that among the clusters obtained from Boolean factors, the ones corresponding to the
44 first couple of factors seem natural and are highly similar to other clusters of measures
45 reported in the literature. The clustering results obtained in this paper may therefore
46 be regarded as cluster validation results as well and may be taken as reference points
47 for future studies on classification of interestingness measures.

48 An interesting topic for future research is a further exploration of Boolean factor
49 analysis as a clustering technique and the empirical and theoretical study of such
50 method including its relationships to other methods of clustering. Another topic of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

future research is to exploit the possibility to utilize the clusters in helping a user select measures with desired properties. As mentioned in Sections 1 and 3.4, an approach based on selecting and aggregating the scores of several measures was suggested in [6]. A suitable clustering of measures, with clusters representing various kinds of measures, may help the user select measures representative of the intended kinds.

References

1. Agrawal R., Imielinski T., Swami A.: Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases. *Proc. ACM SIGMOD* 1993, 207–216.
2. Agrawal R., Srikant R.: Fast algorithms for mining association rules. *Proc. VLDB Conf.* 1994, 478–499.
3. Belohlavek R., Vychodil V.: Discovery of optimal factors in binary data via a novel method of matrix decomposition. *J. of Computer and System Sciences* **76**(1)(2010), 3–20.
4. Blanchard J., Guillet F., Briand H., Gras R.: Assessing rule with a probabilistic measure of deviation from equilibrium. In *Proc. Of 11th International Symposium on Applied Stochastic Models and Data Analysis ASMDA* 2005, Brest, France, 191–200.
5. Blanchard J., Guillet F., Briand H., Gras R.: IPEE: Indice Probabiliste d'Écart à l'Équilibre pour l'évaluation de la qualité des règles. *Dans l'Atelier Qualité des Données et des Connaissances* 2005, 26–34.
6. Bouker S., Saidi R., Ben Yahia S., Mephu Nguifo E.: Ranking and selecting association rules based on dominance relationship. *IEEE ICTAI* (2012), 658–665.
7. Brin S., Motwani R., Silverstein C.: Beyond Market Baskets: Generalizing Association Rules to Correlations. In *Proc. of the ACM SIGMOD Conference*, Tucson, Arizona, 1997, 265–276.
8. Carpineto C., Romano G.: *Concept Data Analysis. Theory and Applications*. J. Wiley, 2004.
9. Davey B. A., Priestley H.: *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press, Oxford, 1990.
10. Delgado M., Ruiz D.-L., Sanchez D.: Studying interest measures for association rules through a logical model. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems* **18**(1)(2010), World Scientific, 87–106.
11. Feno D.R.: Mesures de qualité des règles d'association: normalisation et caractérisation des bases. PhD thesis, Université de La Réunion, 2007.
12. Ganter B., Wille R.: *Formal Concept Analysis. Mathematical Foundations*. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
13. Geng L., Hamilton H.J.: Choosing the Right Lens: Finding What is Interesting in Data Mining. *Quality Measures in Data Mining* 2007, ISBN 978-3-540-44911-9, 3–24.
14. Geng L., Hamilton H. J.: Interestingness measures for data mining: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surveys* **38**(3)(2006), 1–31.
15. Guillaume S., Grissa D., Mephu Nguifo E.: Categorization of interestingness measures for knowledge extraction. ArXiv e-prints 1206.6741. cs.IT. June (2012).
16. Grissa D., Guillaume S., Mephu Nguifo E.: Combining clustering techniques and formal concept analysis to characterize interestingness measures. ArXiv e-prints 1008.3629. cs.IT. August (2010).
17. Gras, R. Kuntz, P. Couturier, R. Guillet, F.: Une version entropique de l'intensité d'implication pour les corpus volumineux. *EGC* (2001), 69–80.
18. Hájek P., Havránek T.: *Mechanizing Hypotheses Formation*. Springer, 1978.
19. Hájek P., Holeňa, Rauch J.: The GUHA method and its meaning for data mining. *J. Computer and System Sciences* **76**(2010), 34–48.
20. Hilderman R. J., Hamilton H. J.: Knowledge Discovery and Measures of Interest, *Volume 638 of The International Series in Engineering and Computer Science* **81**(2)(2001), Kluwer.
21. Huynh X.-H., Guillet F., Briand H.: Clustering interestingness measures with positive correlation. *ICEIS* (2) (2005), 248–253.
22. Heravi M. J., Zaïane O. R.: A study on interestingness measures for associative classifiers. *ACM SAC* (2010), 1039–1046.

23. Lallich S., Teytaud, O.: Évaluation et validation de mesures d'intérêt des règles d'association. *RNTI-E-1, numéro spécial* 2004, 193–217.
24. Lallich S., Teytaud, O., Prudhomme, E.: Association Rule Interestingness: Measure and Statistical Validation. *Quality Measures in Data Mining* **43**(2007), 251–275.
25. Lenca P., Meyer P., Vaillant B., Picouet P.: Aide multicritère à la décision pour évaluer les indices de qualité des connaissances—modélisation des préférences de l'utilisateur. *EGC* **1**(2003), 271–282.
26. Lenca P., Meyer P., Picouet P., Vaillant B., Lallich S.: Critères d'évaluation des mesures de qualité en ecd. *Revue des Nouvelles Technologies de l'Information (Entreposage et Fouille de données)* (1)(2003), 123–134.
27. Lenca P., Meyer P., Vaillant B., Lallich, S.: A multicriteria decision aid for interestingness measure selection. Technical Report LUSSE-TR-2004-01-EN, Dpt. LUSSE, ENST Bretagne 2004 (chapter 1).
28. Lenca P., Vaillant B., Meyer P., Lallich S.: Association Rule Interestingness Measures: Experimental and Theoretical Studies. *Quality Measures in Data Mining* **43**(2007), 51–76.
29. Liu J., Mi J.-S.: A novel approach to attribute reduction in formal concept lattices. *RSKT 2006, Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence* **4062** (2006), 522–529.
30. Maddouri M., Gammoudi J.: On Semantic Properties of Interestingness Measures for Extracting Rules from Data. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **4431** (2007), 148–158.
31. Maier D.: *The Theory of Relational Databases*. Computer Science Press, Rockville, 1983.
32. Pawlak Z.: Rough sets. *Int. J. Information and Computer Sciences* **11**(5)(1982), 341–356.
33. Pawlak Z.: *Rough Sets: Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning About Data*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991.
34. Pearson K.: Mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution, regression, heredity and panmixia. *Philosophical Trans. of the Royal Society A* (1896).
35. Piatetsky-Shapiro G.: Discovery, Analysis and Presentation of Strong Rules. In G. Piatetsky-Shapiro & W.J. Frawley, editors: *Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. AAAI Press, 1991, 229–248.
36. Polkowski L.: *Rough Sets: Mathematical Foundations*. Springer, 2002.
37. Sese J., Morishita S.: Answering the most correlated n association rules efficiently. In *Proceedings of the 6th European Conf on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 2002, Springer-Verlag, 410–422.
38. Surana, A., Kiran R. U., Reddy P. K.: Selecting a right interestingness measure for rare association rules. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Management of Data (COMAD 2010)*, Nagpur, India, 2010, pp. 115–124.
39. Suzuki E.: Pitfalls for Categorizations of Objective Interestingness Measures for Rule Discovery, In *Statistical Implicative Analysis*, 2008, Springer-Verlag, 383-395.
40. Tan P.-N., Kumar V., Srivastava J.: Selecting the right objective measure for association analysis. *Information Systems* **29**(4)(2004), 293–313.
41. Tan P.-N., Steinbach M., Kumar V.: *Introduction to Data Mining*. Addison-Wesley, 2005.
42. Vaillant B., Lenca P., Lallich S.: A Clustering of Interestingness Measures. *DS'04, the 7th International Conference on Discovery Science* **LNAI 3245** (2004), 290–297.
43. Vaillant B.: Mesurer la qualité des règles d'association: études formelles et expérimentales. PhD thesis, ENST Bretagne, 2006.
44. Wang X., Ma J.: A novel approach to attribute reduction in concept lattices. *RSKT 2006, Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence* **4062** (2006), 522–529.
45. Wille R.: Restructuring lattice theory: an approach based on hierarchies of concepts. In: Rival I.: *Ordered Sets*. Reidel, Dordrecht, Boston, 1982, 445–470.
46. Zhang W.-X., Wie L., Qi J.-J.: Attribute reduction in concept lattices based on discernibility matrix. *RSFDGrC 2005, Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence* **3642** (2005), 157–165.