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## Multidimensional scaling

Multidimensional scaling is a group of techniques used to fit a set of points in a q-dimensional space such as the distance between the points ( $\delta_{\mathrm{ij}}$ ) matches as closely as possible the dissimilarity ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ ) between the original objects in the p-dimensional space in order to obtain a simple spatial model (map).
The model does not need statistical distribution assumptions, but the data should satisfy metric conditions:

- distance from an object with itself is 0
- distance from object $A$ to object $B$ is the same as the distance of $B$ from $A$ (the dissimilarity matrix should be simmetrical)
- distance from $A$ to $C$ is less or equal than the sum of distances between A to B and B to C (triangle inequality)


## MDS vs. PCA

- Advantages
- MDS will usually find a solution with less dimensions compared to PCA
- If the purpose is just finding or visualizing natural groups of objects, a map is easier to explain than a score plot
- Cluster of objects are easier to visualize / highlight in a MDS map
- Disadvantages
- It is usually more difficult to find relationships between dimensions and original variables
- MDS is usually effective only when observation are fairly well spread out in the space


## Multidimensional scaling

The model can be written as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_{i j} & =f\left(d_{i j}\right) \\
d_{i j} & =h\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{x}_{j}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where:
$\mathbf{x}_{i}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{j}$ are the vectors of the coordinates of objects $i$ and $j$ in the $q$-dimensional space ( $q<p$ )
$\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)$ is the assumed functional relationship between the dissimilarities and the distances
$h$ is the distance function (usually Euclidean, but Minkowski metrics can be used)

## Metric multidimensional scaling

A direct numerical comparison between fitted distances and dissimilarities (usually based on a least squares criterion) is used. The coordinates are iteratively calculated to minimize a goodness of fit statistics (stress). In linear metric scaling a linear model is used to relate distances to dissimilarities:

$$
d_{i j}=\alpha+\beta \delta_{\mathrm{ij}}+\varepsilon_{\mathrm{ij}}
$$

## Metric multidimensional scaling

A fit criterion which is invariant both under rigid transformations (rotations, reflections, translations) and under non-rigid transformations (stretching and shrinking obtained by multiplications of the coordinate by a factor $k$ ) is:

$$
S_{3}=\frac{\sum_{i<j}\left(d_{i j}-f\left(\delta_{i j}\right)\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i<j} d_{i j}^{2}}
$$

whose square root is known as stress

## Non-metric (monotonic) MDS

When observed proximities contain information on rank order rather than on real distances, assuming a linear relationship between observed and fitted distances may be inappropriate and monotonic regression should be used

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d_{i j}=\hat{d}_{i j}+\varepsilon_{i j} \\
& \delta_{i_{1}, j_{1}}<\delta_{\mathrm{i}_{2}, \mathrm{j}_{2}}<\ldots \delta_{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{N}}} \\
& \hat{d}_{i_{1} \mathrm{j}_{1}} \leq \hat{d}_{i_{i} j_{2}} \leq \ldots \leq \hat{d}_{i_{N} j_{N}}
\end{aligned}
$$

the fitted distances are chosen to represent a weak monotonicity condition

## MDS input data

- Dissimilarity matrices obtained in a direct way (ask assessors to state how different two objects are, take measurement from a map, etc.)
- Dissimilarity matrices calculated from rectangular ( $n \times p$ ) data matrices
- Euclidean distance (on standardized or unstandardized data)
- Negative correlation (beware, high positive correlation = most similar, high negative correlation = most dissimilar)
- Other distance or correlation measures (Spearman, Guttman)


## Adjustable parameters in the analysis

- Type of scaling (monotonic, metric: linear, log, power)
- Number of dimensions
- Stress function
- Iteration and convergence parameters


## MDS output

In the MDS output look for:

- final configuration in the q dimensions
( $q<p$ ), coordinates and plots
- final stress and proportion of the variance; according to Kruskal (1964)
- stress 0.20 -> poor fit
- stress 0.10 -> fair fit
- stress 0.05 -> good fit
- stress 0.025 -> excellent fit
- Shepard diagram (plot of observed vs fitted distances)


## Individual differences MDS

- Uses multiple dissimilarity matrices (for example different judges evaluating a common set of ptoducts)
- The input is a rectangular matrix containing stacked triangular dissimilarity matrices
- Scales both objects in a common space in order to
- Find a common configuration for all objects
- Calculate weights for judges in the common space
- Assess goodness of fit for both objects and judges


## The data file

|  | DIETPEPS | RC | YUKON | PEPPER | SHASTA | COKE | DIETPEPR | TAB | PEPSI | DIETRITE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.000 |  |  | . | . | . | . |  | . |  |
| 2 | 16.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . | . |  | . |  |
| 3 | 81.000 | 47.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . |  | . | . |
| 4 | 56.000 | 32.000 | 71.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| 5 | 87.000 | 68.000 | 44.000 | 71.000 | 0.000 | . | . |  | . | . |
| 6 | 60.000 | 35.000 | 21.000 | 98.000 | 34.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . |
| 7 | 84.000 | 94.000 | 98.000 | 57.000 | 99.000 | 99.000 | 0.000 |  | . | . |
| 8 | 50.000 | 87.000 | 79.000 | 73.000 | 19.000 | 92.000 | 45.000 | 0.000 | . | . |
| 9 | 99.000 | 25.000 | 53.000 | 98.000 | 52.000 | 17.000 | 99.000 | 84.000 | 0.000 | . |
| 10 | 16.000 | 92.000 | 90.000 | 83.000 | 79.000 | 44.000 | 24.000 | 18.000 | 98.000 | 0.000 |
| 11 | 0.000 |  |  | . | . | . | . |  | . | . |
| 12 | 9.000 | 0.000 |  | . | . | . | . |  |  | . |
| 13 | 90.000 | 70.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . |  | . | . |
| 14 | 87.000 | 65.000 | 6.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| 15 | 87.000 | 77.000 | 83.000 | 83.000 | 0.000 | . | - |  | . | . |
| 16 | 33.000 | 79.000 | 25.000 | 89.000 | 39.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | . |
| 17 | 86.000 | 86.000 | 99.000 | 22.000 | 90.000 | 40.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . |
| 18 | 81.000 | 30.000 | 57.000 | 88.000 | 69.000 | 39.000 | 97.000 | 0.000 | . | . |
| 19 | 74.000 | 20.000 | 94.000 | 78.000 | 5.000 | 81.000 | 92.000 | 88.000 | 0.000 |  |
| - | - ${ }^{\text {ann }}$ | - . . . | -~~n | . . .n. | - ${ }^{\text {an }}$ | -~~m | -..... | m. ${ }^{\text {an }}$ | - ${ }^{\text {an }}$ |  |

## The configuration



## The output

Monotonic Multidimensional Scaling
Kruskal Method
The data are analyzed as dissimilarities
There are 10 replicated data matrices
Dimensions are weighted separately for each matrix
Fitting is split between data matrices
Minimizing Kruskal STRESS (form 1) in 3 dimensions

Iteration History

| Iteration | STRESS |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | 0.22090 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.18442 |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | 0.22131 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.18451 |



Stress of Final Configuration : 0.18451
Proportion of Variance (RSQ) : 0.53501

Coordinates in 3 Dimensions

| Variable | Dimension |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | 3 |
| DIETPEPS | -0.60820 | 0.19557 | 0.77706 |
| RC | 0.52175 | 0.05235 | 0.75639 |
| YUKON | 0.41586 | -0.08904 | -0.86786 |
| PEPPER | 0.27187 | -1.26587 | 0.05912 |
| SHASTA | 0.79785 | 0.02490 | -0.14379 |
| COKE | 0.39073 | 0.83659 | -0.34734 |
| DIETPEPR | -0.74711 | -0.84291 | -0.17340 |
| TAB | -0.79097 | 0.43843 | -0.60917 |
| PEPSI | 0.57067 | 0.22100 | 0.38103 |
| DIETRITE | -0.82245 | 0.42898 | 0.16795 |

Matrix Weights

| Matrix | Stress | RSQ | Dimension |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.18837 | 0.54776 | 0.69776 | 0.43369 | 0.52679 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 0.19981 | 0.41627 | 0.45210 | 0.46536 | 0.72123 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 0.19643 | 0.46782 | 0.34785 | 0.52299 | 0.73932 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.17068 | 0.56431 | 0.59123 | 0.49248 | 0.60823 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 0.17816 | 0.59439 | 0.70448 | 0.37011 | 0.56384 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 0.17191 | 0.62137 | 0.70417 | 0.36761 | 0.57019 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 0.18107 | 0.55169 | 0.41948 | 0.58226 | 0.65912 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 0.18046 | 0.55973 | 0.48352 | 0.59725 | 0.60864 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 0.16326 | 0.62452 | 0.56269 | 0.49556 | 0.62580 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 0.21166 | 0.40227 | 0.43525 | 0.60937 | 0.61744 |

## MDS examples

Open file MDSRAPD.syo for examples of MDS on RAPD-PCR data (including bootstrapping/MDS procedure, which can be found in file sardiniabread.syo);
look at the original data and final configuration for the MDS on RAPD data in file breadlab.xls; look at file MDSboot.xls for the final bootstrapping/ MDS configuration;
look at the command files for details on the procedures of pretreatment (boot.syc, Breadlfornextloop.syc)

## MDS examples

Open file mds.syo for MDS examples on the RP-HPLC dataset for smear cheese.

## MDS of RAPD patterns of LAB <br> $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\mathrm{Mk} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & \mathrm{Mk}\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Mk } & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 & 20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 & M k\end{array}$


$$
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text { Mk } & 25 & 26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & M k
\end{array}
$$
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## MDS of RP-HPLC data from smear cheese

Chemometric Analysis of Peptide Profiles from Cheese Extracts


J. Agric. Food Chem., Vol. 52, No. 23, 20046909



Figure 5. MDS configuration of the matrix of Pearson product-moment correlation between peptide profiles processed by visual matching (VM, a) or by fuzzy approach (HI, b; MED, c; and LOW, d). Symbols refer to reference smear R ( $\mathbf{\square}$ ) and to defined-strain smear mix D ( $\mathbf{\Delta})$ or mix $\mathrm{C}(\boldsymbol{\bullet})$; open and solid symbols are for core and surface samples, respectively. Convex hulls around samples show the five groups obtained by K -means clustering.

RP-HPLC data from smear cheese: PCA vs. MDS of Eulidean distance matrix
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