

# SACA: Selective Attention-Based Clustering Algorithm

Meysam Shirdel Bilehsavar<sup>1,2,3,4\*</sup>, Razieh Ghaedi<sup>5</sup>,  
Samira Seyed Taheri<sup>6</sup>, Xinqi Fan<sup>5</sup>, Christian O'Reilly<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of South Carolina, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of South Carolina, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Carolina Autism and Neurodevelopment Research Center, University of South Carolina, USA.

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Mind and Brain, University of South Carolina, USA.

<sup>5</sup>Department of Computing and Mathematics, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK.

<sup>6</sup>Tehran, Iran.

\*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [meysam@email.sc.edu](mailto:meysam@email.sc.edu);  
Contributing authors: [rozaghaedi90@gmail.com](mailto:rozaghaedi90@gmail.com); [x.fan@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:x.fan@mmu.ac.uk);  
[christian.oreilly@sc.edu](mailto:christian.oreilly@sc.edu);

## Abstract

Clustering algorithms are widely used in various applications, with density-based methods such as Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN) being particularly prominent. These algorithms identify clusters in high-density regions while treating sparser areas as noise. However, reliance on user-defined parameters often poses optimization challenges that require domain expertise. This paper presents a novel density-based clustering method inspired by the concept of selective attention, which minimizes the need for user-defined parameters under standard conditions. Initially, the algorithm operates without requiring user-defined parameters. If parameter adjustment is needed, the method simplifies the process by introducing a single integer parameter that is straightforward to tune. The approach computes a threshold to filter out the most sparsely distributed points and outliers, forms a preliminary cluster structure, and then reintegrates the excluded points to finalize the results. Experimental evaluations on diverse data sets highlight the accessibility and robust performance of the method, providing an effective alternative for density-based clustering tasks.

**Keywords:** Clustering, Density-Based, Selective Attention, Unsupervised Learning, Data Mining.

## 1 Introduction

Clustering is one of the central challenges in data mining. The objective of clustering is to identify groups of related items within a dataset while segregating dissimilar things into distinct groups or designating them as noise [1, 2]. In recent years, the advancement of clustering algorithms has attracted considerable interest from both academic and industry [3]. Exploring clustering is important for understanding data features, relationship between samples, and the overall structure of information in a dataset [4]. As an unsupervised technique and, as such, does not require training or labelled data [5–7]. Although clustering algorithms are widely used in tasks such as pattern analysis, grouping, decision-making, document retrieval, image segmentation, and data mining, significant challenges remain in accurately identifying clusters [8]. For instance, widely used algorithms such as  $k$ -Means rely on choosing initial cluster centroids and refining them through iterative optimization. To mitigate the effect of centroid initialization, these algorithms often involve multiple runs with different initializations and comparing outcomes. However, there is no guarantee that the best run corresponds to a globally optimal solution. Moreover, iterative computations are laborious, computationally expensive, and prone to uncertainty [9]. The presence of noise further complicates the problem, reducing the reliability of results while increasing processing and storage costs [10]. Consequently, selecting the most appropriate clustering approach is crucial.

Clustering techniques can be categorised into five types: partition-based, hierarchical, density-based, model-based, and grid-based [11]. Among these, density-based clustering algorithms are particularly advantageous because they eliminate the need to manually specify the number of clusters and are effective in handling noisy data [3]. Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN; [12]) is a prominent clustering technique that provided a foundation for density-based clustering. Its ability to discover clusters of arbitrary shapes, exclude noise points, and operate without a predefined number of clusters makes it especially attractive. However, DBSCAN also faces challenges, such as difficulty in detecting clusters with heterogeneous densities [13], distinguishing adjacent clusters [14], and incurring significant computational costs on large datasets due to its iterative nature [12]. Furthermore, its performance heavily depends on the careful selection of two parameters: the maximum radius (Eps) and the minimum number of neighbors (minPts) [15]. Automatically determining these parameters is challenging, particularly for extensive datasets.

This paper addresses a major limitation of density-based clustering algorithms: their dependence on the fine-tuning of input parameters (two in the case of DBSCAN, or three in Hierarchical DBSCAN). We present a novel clustering algorithm inspired by the concept of selective attention. Our method minimizes the need for user-defined

parameters by computing a threshold derived from intrinsic dataset characteristics to temporarily exclude sparse or low-density points. A preliminary cluster structure is formed, after which the excluded points are reintegrated to finalize the results. The algorithm requires no parameter tuning for most use cases. For specific, rare cases where clusters exhibit extreme overlap, our method simplifies parameter adjustment through a single, intuitive integer parameter called the Attention Selectivity Coefficient ( $C$ ). Increasing  $C$  makes the algorithm more sensitive to localized structures, allowing it to separate nearby clusters and control the level of granularity in complex, hierarchical datasets. This rule provides a simple, intuitive guideline for parameter selection without requiring extensive trial and error or specialized domain knowledge. Moreover, since  $C$  is an integer, the possible parameter values are limited, further simplifying the tuning process. Overall, the method operates with minimal configuration, making it effectively parameter-free in most practical scenarios.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: *Section 2* presents prominent density-based clustering techniques and examines their limitations. *Section 3* outlines the main ideas behind the proposed method, including selective visual attention, and presents pseudocode. *Section 4* demonstrates the performance of our method on a variety of datasets with different forms and densities, and discusses specific conditions that affect the algorithm’s outcome. *Section 5* summarises our algorithm and suggests directions for future research. Finally, *Section 6* concludes this paper.

## 2 Related Work

Unlike centroid-based methods like k-Means, which assume spherical clusters [16], density-based clustering algorithms enable the discovery of clusters with arbitrary shapes and robust handling of noise. These algorithms group data points based on local density, making them suitable for datasets with complex structures. However, their reliance on user-defined parameters often requires domain expertise or extensive tuning, limiting their accessibility. This section reviews prominent density-based clustering methods, their parameter requirements, and their limitations, highlighting the need for a parameter-efficient approach like the one proposed in this paper.

The seminal DBSCAN algorithm [17] identifies clusters by expanding regions with high point density, defined by two parameters: the neighborhood radius ( $\varepsilon$ ) and the minimum number of points (*MinPts*). Points outside dense regions are labeled as noise. DBSCAN excels at detecting arbitrarily shaped clusters but struggles with datasets containing clusters of varying density, as a single global  $\varepsilon$  is often inadequate. Its performance is highly sensitive to parameter choices, necessitating trial-and-error tuning, and its computational cost increases with large datasets due to repeated distance calculations [17]. To address DBSCAN’s limitations, several variants have been proposed. OPTICS (Ordering Points To Identify the Clustering Structure) [18] mitigates sensitivity to a fixed  $\varepsilon$  by producing a hierarchical ordering of points based on core-distance and reachability-distance. As for DBSCAN, it requires  $\varepsilon$  (a maximum neighborhood radius) and *MinPts*, but is less sensitive to  $\varepsilon$  and captures clusters across varying densities levels. However, OPTICS demands additional memory for

nearest-neighbor queries. It also struggles to form clusters with similar local density, limiting its applicability in some scenarios. VDBSCAN (Varied Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise) [19] tackles varying cluster densities by selecting multiple  $\epsilon$  values based on k-dist plots, which orders points by how far they are from their k-th nearest neighbor, automating parameter selection to some extent. It partitions the dataset by density levels and applies DBSCAN-like clustering for each, improving adaptability. However, VDBSCAN still relies on precise  $\epsilon$  and  $MinPts$  settings and struggles with non-convex clusters. Similarly, DVDBSCAN (Density Variation Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise) introduces Cluster Density Variance and Cluster Similarity Index to allow density variation within clusters while separating distinct density profiles. It requires four parameters ( $\epsilon$ ,  $MinPts$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\lambda$ ), increasing complexity and making parameter tuning challenging [20]. DENCLUE (DENsity-based CLUstEring) [21] models point density as the sum of influence functions (e.g., Gaussian) and identifies clusters via density-attractors using a hill-climbing approach. It requires two parameters:  $\sigma$  (influence range) and  $\xi$  (density threshold). DENCLUE handles high-dimensional data and noise effectively but is sensitive to  $\sigma$  and  $\xi$  settings, and its hill-climbing may converge to local maxima [22]. DBCLASD (Distribution-Based Clustering of Large Spatial Databases) [23], a parameter-free method, incrementally grows clusters based on nearest-neighbor distance consistency with a uniform distribution, verified by a chi-square test. While attractive for large spatial databases, its uniform-density assumption can misclassify points in non-uniform regions [23]. Spatial-temporal DBSCAN (ST-DBSCAN) [24] extends DBSCAN for spatial-temporal data, using two distance parameters ( $\epsilon_1$  for spatial,  $\epsilon_2$  for non-spatial attributes),  $MinPts$ , and a threshold  $\Delta\epsilon$  to prevent merging adjacent clusters. It incorporates a density factor to handle varied density and temporal dependencies, making it suitable for applications like geographic information systems. However, tuning four parameters increases complexity [24]. GF-DBSCAN (Global Filtering DBSCAN) [25] reduces DBSCAN’s search space by partitioning data into grid cells based on  $\epsilon$ , but it sacrifices accuracy in some cases. AutoEpsDBSCAN [26] automates  $\epsilon$  selection using k-nearest neighbor distances and elbow detection in k-dist plots. Like DBSCAN, AutoEpsDBSCAN works best when there are clear differences between dense clusters and sparse noise. AutoEpsDBSCAN improves standard DBSCAN by removing the need to manually tune epsilon using a data-driven method. However, it still requires choosing  $k$ , and it does not perform well on datasets where clusters blend gradually into each other (i.e., no sharp density boundaries).

Recent approaches have increasingly aimed to reduce parameter sensitivity and improve clustering performance on datasets with complex structures. For example, the NNVC (The Nearest Neighbor Variable Density-based Clustering) algorithm [27] relies on a single user-defined parameter, the number of nearest neighbors  $k$ , to identify clusters via mutual  $k$ -nearest neighbor relationships. While simpler than multi-parameter methods, its performance remains sensitive to the choice of  $k$ , which can lead to over or under clustering depending on the dataset. Similarly, PDCSN (Partition Density Clustering with Self-Adaptive Neighborhoods) [28] introduces a self-adaptive neighborhood mechanism where the optimal neighborhood size  $\lambda$  is automatically determined based on natural nearest-neighbor density distributions. This

design removes the dependency on parameters like  $\varepsilon$  and enables the algorithm to distinguish between adjacent clusters with similar or varying densities. It achieves this by grouping points that are mutual  $\lambda$ -nearest neighbors (i.e., both points fall within each other’s  $\lambda$  nearest neighbors) and then designating dense, well-connected points as core samples to form cluster centers. Another significant advancement is DPC-MDNN (Density Peak Clustering with Manifold Distance and Natural Nearest Neighbors) [29], which enhances traditional DPC by replacing fixed-radius neighborhoods with natural neighbor-based adaptive neighborhoods. In this approach, the number of neighbors for each point is determined automatically by the data distribution, rather than using a predefined radius. Furthermore, the algorithm integrates manifold distances, which capture the true underlying geometric structure of the data (e.g., curved or non-linear shapes) instead of relying solely on straight-line Euclidean distance.

Collectively, these methods illustrate a growing trend toward adaptive, parameter-efficient density-based clustering. However, despite these advances, most approaches still retain some degree of parameter sensitivity. Building on this trend, the proposed method not only further reduces dependency on user-defined settings through a biologically inspired mechanism, but also enables the extraction of multilevel patterns using a single, easy-to-tune parameter.


Drawing inspiration from the brain’s ability to focus on relevant information while ignoring noise [30], our method computes a dataset-derived threshold to filter sparse points. Only in rare cases of extreme cluster overlap does it require the adjustment of one intuitive integer parameter the Attention Selectivity Coefficient ( $C$ ). Unlike DBSCAN and its variants, which depend on precise  $\varepsilon$  and  $MinPts$  settings, or DEN-CLUE, which relies on  $\sigma$  and  $\xi$ , our approach operates nearly parameter-free under standard conditions. This enhances both accessibility and robustness across diverse datasets.

### 3 Methods

To address the limitations of existing algorithms, this paper proposes the Selective Attention-Based Clustering Algorithm (SACA) using a neighborhood threshold automatically calculated from the dataset.

#### 3.1 Visual Selective Attention

The proposed algorithm is inspired by the concept of visual selective attention, a cognitive function that filters out irrelevant information while focusing on important data. Visual selective attention regulates the processing of retinal input based on relevance and selects particular representations to enter perceptual awareness [30]. This mechanism enables the selective focus on information pertinent to the current context while disregarding competing, less relevant stimuli [31].



**Fig. 1** Simplified depiction of visual selective attention. The brain attempts to find relevant patterns of information, emphasizing the importance of structured information (blue and yellow clusters) over unstructured noise (red dots).

As illustrated in Figure 1, humans naturally ignore irrelevant data points to selectively attend to data assumed to be important in areas with structurally identifiable patterns. The brain is inherently biased toward creating significant patterns from noisy input by emphasizing relevant signals and suppressing irrelevant ones. We observe this bias in our natural tendency of seeing meaningful forms in clouds or inkblots, as exploited, for example, by the Rorschach test [32]. This tendency of attributing meaningful interpretation to nebulous, or noisy sensory input is known as pareidolia and has a long history [33]. It is also captured by the concept of predictive-coding [34], and the idea that our perceptions are not a raw representation of the information reaching the retina, but a fusion of the incoming data and our internal expectation about likely incoming data. At the root of this mechanism is the ability of our brain to emphasize the importance of some data and ignore others.

SACA mirrors this functionality by retaining data points that contribute to the core structure of clusters while filtering out noisy or irrelevant points. This selective process enhances clustering accuracy and improves computational efficiency, making the method particularly suitable for large-scale datasets with heterogeneous density distributions.

### 3.2 Pruning

To operationalize the concept of selective attention, we require a mechanism that prunes irrelevant data points during cluster formation. This is achieved by identifying isolated points in an  $n$ -dimensional Cartesian space, where each data point is defined as  $p^i = \{p_1^i, p_2^i, \dots, p_n^i\}$  and isolation is determined based on the Euclidean distance.

$$d(p^i, p^j) = \sqrt{\sum_{x=1}^n (p_x^i - p_x^j)^2} \quad (1)$$

separating them from all the other points. Using this measure of distance, we produce a  $N \times N$  matrix  $D = [d_{ij}] = [d(p^i, p^j)]$  of pairwise distances, where  $N$  is the number of samples in our dataset.

After calculating the distance matrix, the minimum distances for each data sample are derived as

$$\min(D_i) = \min_{j:j \neq i} d_{i,j} \quad (2)$$

resulting in a vector

$$\text{mins} = [\min(D_1), \min(D_2), \dots, \min(D_N)] \quad (3)$$

Then, we extract the minimum and maximum values from this vector.

$$\sigma_{\text{opt}} = \min(D) \quad (4)$$

$$L = \max(\text{mins}) \quad (5)$$

In (4),  $\sigma_{\text{opt}}$  is the global minimum in the distance matrix  $D$  and corresponds to the smallest distance between any two points in the entire dataset, and  $L$  is the largest value among the minimum distances. These two values are the key parameters and form the foundation of the proposed method. Using these dataset-derived values, a global threshold is determined as follows

$$T = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{L}{\sigma_{\text{opt}}} \right) \right\rceil \quad (6)$$

where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  represent the ceiling function.

In this context, the integer threshold  $T$  serves as a characteristic of the entire dataset. Our goal is to prune samples located in sparse regions to keep only high-density points forming the core structure of a cluster. Since data points are typically closer together in dense regions, minimum distances provide an effective criterion for this purpose. Building on this observation, we extract a measure derived from the minimum distances within the dataset and use it as a radius for evaluating the number of neighboring samples around each data point. Points with fewer neighbors are then pruned. We incorporate a factor of  $1/2$  in the definition of  $T$  (see (6)) as a smoothing term to reduce the strictness of the algorithm in ignoring sparse areas. This value is used to compute the weight of each data sample. Initially, the set of neighbors whose distance from the  $i$ -th sample is less than  $T$  units is obtained as follows:

$$n_i = \arg \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{D_i}{\sigma_{\text{opt}}} \right) < T \right) \quad (7)$$

where the function  $\arg(X < T)$  returns the set of elements  $x_i$  in  $X = [x_i]$  for which the condition  $x_i < T$  is true. Then, the weight  $w_i$  of the data point  $p^i$  is defined as the number of neighbors of the point  $p^i$  whose distances are less than  $T$ . This value can be obtained as the cardinality of the set  $n_i$ :

$$w_i = |n_i| \quad (8)$$

The algorithm disregards irrelevant samples when forming the initial cluster cores (i.e., the dense part of a cluster, typically located at its centre, as common in bell-shaped distributions) according to the following rule:

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } w_i < C & \text{use point for cluster base} \\ \text{else} & \text{prune point} \end{cases}$$

where  $C$  is an integer passed as input parameter and referred to as the Attention Selectivity Coefficient.

### 3.3 Outlier removal

Ensuring resilience to outlier is a key challenge in clusterings. The existence of outliers within the minimum distances computed with (3) can greatly influence the outcome of SACA and needs to be excluded before  $T$  is calculated. To tackle this problem, we utilize the Modified Z-score criterion [35]. Classical Z-scores fall short because the mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$  statistics used in their calculation are not robust estimators and, therefore, can be heavily distorted by extreme values or even by a single outlier. As an alternative, the Modified Z-score is a robust statistic for detecting outliers.

Given the population median ( $\tilde{\mu}$ ) and median absolute deviation (MAD;  $\tilde{\sigma} = \text{median}(|x_i - \tilde{\mu}|)$ ), a raw value  $x_i$  is converted into a Modified Z-score as follows:

$$m_i = \frac{0.6745 \cdot (x_i - \tilde{\mu})}{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (9)$$

After computing the Modified Z-score for each data point based on their *mins* values, we mitigate the impact of outliers by excluding minimum distances from the calculation of  $T$ . In SACA, we require a less aggressive outlier detection. Empirically, we found that using 10 as a more lenient threshold for outlier rejection yielded the best trade-off between sensitivity and specificity, particularly in preserving edge points while still isolating distant anomalies. The constant 0.6745 in (9) is traditionally used to scale the MAD [35]. This approach effectively identifies and removes outliers, thereby limiting density variation among clusters to genuine differences in cluster densities.


### 3.4 Cluster formation

Following the acquisition of the core structures of the clusters, two methodologies are employed to gradually recreate the final clusters using the trimmed data samples. The first method assigns each data point to the cluster of its nearest clustered neighbor. In the algorithm, this approach corresponds to setting the boolean parameter *use\_center* to **False** which is also the default configuration. The second method assigns data points based on the centroids of the base clusters identified in the previous step. This centroid-based approach is particularly effective for convex datasets. It can be enabled by setting *use\_center* to **True**.

### 3.5 Algorithm

In summary, SACA addresses limitations found in traditional density-based clustering methods which often rely heavily on user-defined parameters and may struggle with datasets containing clusters of differing densities. By minimizing dependency on such

input parameters, SACA achieves a more autonomous and user-friendly clustering process. By default, the proposed method is fully automated and does not require any user-defined parameters. If the initial results are unsatisfactory, a single parameter, the Attention Selectivity Coefficient ( $C$ ), can be adjusted. This parameter limits the inclusion of samples from sparse areas during the formation of the initial clusters and allows focusing on the fundamental structure of the clusters. Such structures exist not only as the central areas of convex clusters but also as the high-density areas for variously shaped clusters.



**Fig. 2** Graphical illustration of the method’s key steps (columns) using three examples of cluster distributions (rows).

The algorithm proceeds in two main steps (Fig. 2). During the first step, it calculates the minimum distances for each data point using a distance matrix, discards outliers among these minimum distances, computes a global threshold to differentiate core points from potential noise, and uses the Attention Selectivity Coefficient ( $C$ ) and the threshold  $T$  to identify high-density regions and form robust core clusters. In the second step, the algorithm expands clusters by assigning remaining data points based on their proximity to either the cluster centers or to nearby assigned points, resulting in the final clustering structure.

Through these steps, the algorithm dynamically adapts to the dataset’s intrinsic properties, automatically adjusting thresholds, and minimizing human intervention. The pseudo-code in Algorithm 1 provides an overview of the algorithm’s logic and key operations. In this pseudo-code,  $0^N$  refers to an array of zeros of shape  $N$ . The computational complexity of SACA is dominated by the pairwise distance matrix construction, which requires  $O(N^2)$  time and space.

---

**Algorithm 1** SACA Clustering

---

```
1: procedure SACA( $C \leftarrow 1$ ,  $use\_center \leftarrow \mathbf{false}$ )

2:   1. Initialize
3:    $N \leftarrow$  number of data points
4:    $cluster\_number \leftarrow 0^N$ ,  $added\_to\_neighbor \leftarrow 0^N$ 
5:    $noise\_list, non\_noise\_list \leftarrow []$ 
6:    $neighbor\_cands[i] \leftarrow [] \forall i$ 

7:   2. Calculate Distance Matrix, Remove Outliers, and Compute
   Threshold T
8:    $dist\_matrix \leftarrow$  pairwise Euclidean distances
9:    $mins \leftarrow$  each point's nearest-neighbor distance
10:   $outlier\_idx \leftarrow modified\_z\_score\_filter(mins)$ 
11:  remove entries at  $outlier\_idx$  from  $mins$ 
12:   $\sigma_{opt} \leftarrow \min(mins)$ 
13:   $L \leftarrow \max(mins)$ 
14:   $T \leftarrow \lceil (L/\sigma_{opt})/2 \rceil$ 

15:  3. Separate Points in Dense and Sparse Areas
16:  for  $i = 0, \dots, N - 1$  do
17:    compute  $nbrs_i = \{j \mid D_{ij}/\sigma_{opt}/2 < T\}$ 
18:    if  $|nbrs_i| \leq C$  then
19:      mark  $i$  as noise
20:       $cluster\_number[i] = -1$ 
21:    else
22:      mark  $i$  as non-noise
23:    end if
24:  end for
25:  if no non-noise points then
26:    print "Decrease C";
27:    return
28:  end if
29:   $noise\_data \leftarrow data[noise]$ ,  $non\_noise\_data \leftarrow data[non-noise]$ 

30:  4. Labelling Core-Shapes:
31:  while there exists  $i$  with  $cluster\_number[i] = 0$  do
32:     $c \leftarrow c + 1$ , pick random seed  $s$  with  $cluster\_number[s] = 0$ 
33:    Initialize queue  $Q \leftarrow [s]$ 
34:    while  $Q \neq \emptyset$  do
35:       $i \leftarrow Q.pop\_front()$ ,  $cluster\_number[i] \leftarrow c$ 
36:      for all  $j \in neighbor\_cands[i]$  where  $cluster\_number[j] = 0$  do
37:         $cluster\_number[j] \leftarrow c$ , push  $j$  onto  $Q$ 
38:      end for
39:    end while
40:  end while
```

---

---

```

41: 5. Re-assign Noise Samples to Appropriate Clusters
42: if use_center then
43:   for all  $c$  in clusters do
44:      $\mu_c \leftarrow$  mean of points in cluster  $c$ 
45:   end for
46:   for all  $i \in$  noise_list do
47:     assign  $i$  to cluster with nearest  $\mu_c$ 
48:   end for
49: else
50:   for all  $i$  where cluster_number[ $i$ ] = -1 do
51:      $j \leftarrow$  nearest non-noise neighbor of  $i$ 
52:     cluster_number[ $i$ ]  $\leftarrow$  cluster_number[ $j$ ]
53:   end for
54: end if
55: end procedure

```

---

### 3.6 Datasets

To test our algorithm, we reused different artificially created benchmark datasets with varying shapes and densities [36, 37]. We also created additional datasets to assess specific situations (Table 1).

**Table 1** Datasets used for benchmarking

Dataset	Source	Samples	Features	Clusters
Spiral	[36]	312	2	3
Birch1 (12 clusters)	[36]	11872	2	12
A3	[36]	7500	2	50
S2	[36]	5000	2	15
Flame	[36]	240	2	2
Skewed	[36]	1000	2	6
Cluto-t4-8k	[37]	8010	2	6
Complex-9	[37]	3040	2	9
Smile 2	[37]	1010	2	4
DS-850	[37]	850	2	5
Noisy Circles	Author made	2400	2	7
Rings	Author made	7200	2	36
Noisy Spiral	Author made	800	2	2
Moons-Stars	Author made	1200	3	4
3Compound	Author made	1500	2	3
Unbalanced	Author made	1500	2	6

---

### 3.7 Evaluation Metrics for Clustering

To benchmark the performance of our approach, we used several established metrics. The Silhouette index assesses clustering performance by measuring the difference between distances within clusters and between clusters. The optimal number of clusters is identified by maximising this index. Values range from -1 to +1, with higher values indicating that an object is well-suited to its assigned cluster and poorly aligned with neighbouring clusters [38]. The Calinski-Harabasz index measures cluster validity by comparing the average sum of squares between and within clusters. It often favours solutions with more clusters but excels at identifying compact, well-separated groups. Higher values for this index indicate better clustering performance [39]. The Davies-Bouldin index averages across all clusters the ratio of within-cluster scatter to between-cluster separation. Lower values indicate better clustering [40].

Additional evaluation metrics comparing the true and predicted labels can be used when the ground truth is known. Among these metrics, the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) measures the similarity between two clusterings by considering all pairs of data points and checking whether each pair is assigned to the same cluster or to different clusters in both the predicted clustering and the true labels. This value is equal to 0 when points are assigned into clusters randomly, and it equals 1 when the two cluster results are identical [41]. The Adjusted Mutual Information (AMI) metric provides a normalized measure of the agreement between two clusterings. It addresses a key limitation of Mutual Information by adjusting the score to account for the level of agreement expected by chance. As a result, an AMI score of 1 indicates that the partitions are identical, while a score of 0 suggests the agreement is no better than random. [42]. The Completeness metric calculates the completeness for a cluster labelling based on ground truth data. A clustering outcome achieves completeness if all data points belonging to the same class are grouped within a single cluster. Scores range between 0.0 and 1.0, with 1.0 representing perfectly complete labelling [43].

## 4 Results

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the algorithm when applied to different dataset configurations.

### 4.1 Effect of cluster density heterogeneity and inter-cluster margin


The inter-cluster margin  $\delta$  (also known as single linkage) between two clusters  $C_i$  and  $C_j$  is defined as [44]:

$$\delta(C_i, C_j) = \min_{p \in C_i, q \in C_j} \|p - q\| \quad (10)$$

where  $\|p - q\|$  denotes the Euclidean distance between points  $p$  and  $q$ . This concept plays a vital role in the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. If the following condition:


$$\delta(C_i, C_j) > T \quad (11)$$

is satisfied, the algorithm can perform clustering with high precision, eliminating the need for parameter selection and adjustment. In other words, when the distance between clusters exceeds the neighbourhood radius  $T$ , then points near the edges of one cluster will not detect or connect to points from the other cluster (see Fig. 3). This ensures that clusters remain well-separated, allowing the algorithm to achieve high precision without requiring parameter tuning or adjustment. However, in datasets with overlapping or closely spaced clusters, the algorithm relies on the parameter  $C$  to enforce a margin, which can result in the formation of disconnected core regions, as previously illustrated in Fig. 2.




**Fig. 3** Illustration of some of the concepts involved by SACA, including  $T$  and the inter-cluster margin.

The outcomes of performing the method on the datasets listed in Table 1 are shown in Fig. 4 to 10.




**Fig. 4** Clustering results in the context of uniform cluster densities (using default parametrization): (a) Spiral, (b) Noisy Circles, (c) Complex-9.

The algorithm performs optimally on datasets with uniform cluster densities, as shown in Fig. 4, without requiring any input parameters. Additionally, it yields reliable results for datasets with clusters of varying densities or noise, provided that condition (10) is met. Fig. 5 illustrates two datasets with different cluster densities. In panel (b), for instance, six clusters are present, with clusters 5 and 6 having densities twice as high as clusters 1 to 4. The algorithm’s accuracy in this case is due to the satisfaction of condition (10) despite the density differences.




**Fig. 5** Clustering results in presence of non uniform cluster densities (using default parametrization): (a) Smile 2 and (b) Unbalanced.


Another scenario occurs when condition (10) is not met, and there is an overlap between clusters. In this case, the user needs to adjust the value of  $C$  to increase its selectivity to smaller details and increase the number of cluster, or decrease its value to cluster fewer, broader motifs. This parameter functions as the "level of attention" for the algorithm and enables precise control over the clustering to meet specific analysis requirements. See Fig. 6 to 8 for examples of effect of varying  $C$  on different cluster configurations.



**Fig. 6** Clustering results on clusters with conflicts: (a) Birch1, (b) A3, (c) S2, and (d) 3-Compound.



**Fig. 7** Clustering results on challenging, noisy clusters without conflicts : (a) Noisy Spiral, (b) Skewed, (c) Cluto-t4-8k.




**Fig. 8** Clustering result in 3D using the Moons-Stars dataset.

## 4.2 Multilevel Pattern Recognition

Datasets often exhibit diverse structures, where each pattern or cluster may be composed of smaller sub-clusters or sub-clusters with varying geometries. The ability to accurately identify these sub-clusters without the necessity of precise parameter tuning is a crucial advantage for any clustering algorithm. The proposed method offers this

flexibility, enabling the identification of diverse patterns within the dataset through the simple adjustment of  $C$ .




**Fig. 9** Rings made of small clusters: (a) result without user-defined  $C$ , (b) result with  $C=20$ .

In left panel of Fig. 9, the algorithm, using its default Attention Selectivity Coefficient ( $C$ ) of 1 and without any additional input parameter, successfully identifies the two main clusters, represented by two large circles. However, these two main clusters are composed of smaller sub-clusters. By increasing the  $C$  to 20, the algorithm also detects all these smaller sub-clusters. This demonstrates that the proposed algorithm can easily uncover structures at multiple scales by adjusting  $C$ . In other words, the algorithm functions similarly to humans, discovering various patterns by increasing the focus of attention on the image from global shapes to more local details.

### 4.3 Performance Benchmarking

There are several established metrics commonly used to evaluate the performance of clustering algorithms. We applied these metrics to a selection of well-known density-based algorithms, as well as to SACA. The results, summarized in Table 2, clearly demonstrate that SACA outperforms the other prominent algorithms in the comparison.



**Fig. 10** (a) DS-850 used for performance evaluation (b) result from SACA

**Table 2** Performance evaluation metrics on the DS-850 dataset. Bold indicate best performances.

Metric	DBSCAN	HDBSCAN	OPTICS	SACA
Silhouette Score	0.45	0.53	−0.08	<b>0.57</b>
Calinski–Harabasz Index	697	878	83	<b>1514</b>
Davies–Bouldin Index	1.35	1.64	1.51	<b>0.53</b>
Adjusted Rand Index	0.7912	0.8754	0.2094	<b>0.9933</b>
Adjusted Mutual Information	0.8495	0.8876	0.5082	<b>0.9916</b>
Completeness Score	0.7956	0.8482	0.6421	<b>0.9917</b>

As seen in Table 2, SACA clearly outperforms the other three clustering algorithms in the evaluation metrics mentioned above. Notably, the results of the other three algorithms were obtained through numerous runs during trial and error, whereas our algorithm achieved the best result after only two adjustments by increasing the selectivity of the algorithm from 1 to 10. This simplicity is a key feature of the proposed method.

## 5 Discussion

Considering two major drawbacks of density-based clustering algorithms namely, the need for multiple input parameters and the requirement for precise parameter tuning to achieve optimal results, we proposed a novel algorithm inspired by visual selective attention. This algorithm is designed to perform in most case without requiring any input parameters. Under specific conditions, if any parameter is necessary, the number of required parameters is minimised, and their values are easy to determine and understand. DBSCAN, for instance, requires two critical parameters, *Eps* and *MinPts*, to function. In contrast, our proposed method can initially execute without any user-defined parameters. As observed in the results section, this parameter-free mode is effective when condition (10) is satisfied, and the dataset contains minimal noise. If the desired outcome is not achieved, the integer parameter  $C$  modulating the level of selective attention, and the boolean parameter *use\_center* can be specified. The parameter  $C$  is particularly useful when clusters are closely positioned or overlapping. The advantage of the  $C$  parameter lies in its simplicity and intuitive behaviour. Increasing its value enhances the algorithm’s attention to details, enabling more localized clustering and potentially leading to the discovery of additional distinct clusters nested within larger clusters. Thus, as  $C$  increases, the number of identified clusters also rises, a phenomenon clearly demonstrated in the *Two Circles* dataset in Fig. 9. The *use\_center* parameter needs to be set *True* in situations where the clusters are convex shaped with significant overlap (i.e., in the absence of inter-cluster margins). Results indicate that the proposed method delivers significantly better outcomes across various datasets with diverse shapes. This forms the foundational functionality of our algorithm. Another common challenge in clustering datasets is the presence of outliers, which can negatively affect the results. To address this, we incorporated a Boolean parameter that allows the algorithm to ignore outliers. Our evaluations showed that,

with this parameter, the algorithm achieves high-accuracy clustering even in the presence of outliers. However, the current algorithm faces challenges when dealing with datasets containing uniformly distributed noise across the dataset’s range. Addressing this limitation presents an opportunity for future work.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced the SACA, a novel density-based clustering method inspired by the concept of visual selective attention. By automatically determining a global neighborhood threshold from pairwise distances, SACA removes the burden of extensive parameter tuning that is common in traditional clustering algorithms. For more complex datasets, a single optional parameter,  $C$ , offers an intuitive way to adjust the level of clustering detail. SACA also introduces the *use\_center* parameter, which enables two flexible point-assignment strategies for reintegration step: nearest-neighbor (default) and centroid-based, the latter being particularly effective for convex datasets.

Our experiments demonstrate that SACA consistently outperforms well-known algorithms such as DBSCAN, HDBSCAN, and OPTICS in both accuracy and robustness. Beyond its strong performance, SACA provides practical benefits including effective outlier handling, multilevel pattern discovery, and flexible assignment strategies through *use\_center*. Although our algorithm initially operates without any user-defined parameters, typically yielding high-quality results, it also provides the ability to extract local patterns nested within more global patterns simply by increasing the value of  $C$ . While its performance on data dominated by uniformly distributed noise remains a challenge, we plan to address this through adaptive strategies and optimized implementations to reduce time and space complexity of SACA by incorporating more efficient data structures and approximate neighbor search methods. Such improvements would allow the algorithm to scale to substantially larger datasets while preserving its clustering accuracy. Overall, SACA represents an accessible and powerful solution for a wide range of modern clustering tasks.

## Acknowledgements

This work was partly supported by the NIH (Grant no R01MH122545).

## Declarations

- Funding This work was partly supported by the NIH (Grant no R01MH122545).
- Conflict of interest/Competing interests All authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.
- Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable
- Consent for publication Not applicable
- Data availability Benchmark datasets used in this study are publicly available from the original sources cited in Table 1 of the manuscript. The synthetic datasets

generated during this study are available from the authors upon request and will be deposited in a public repository after acceptance.

- Materials availability Not applicable
- Code availability The code supporting this study is not shared during peer review to protect intellectual property. It will be released in a public repository after acceptance.
- Author contribution Meysam Shirdel Bilehsavar: conceptualization, methodology, implementation, data analysis, writing. Christian O'Reilly: conceptualization, data analysis, writing. Razieh Ghaedi: data collection, writing. Samira Seyed Taheri: data collection and manuscript drafting. Xinqi Fan: data analysis.

## References

- [1] Weng, S., Gou, J., Fan, Z.: *h*-dbscan: A simple fast dbscan algorithm for big data. In: Asian Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 81–96 (2021). PMLR
- [2] Campello, R.J., Kröger, P., Sander, J., Zimek, A.: Density-based clustering. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery **10**(2), 1343 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1343>
- [3] Cai, Z., Wang, J., He, K.: Adaptive density-based spatial clustering for massive data analysis. IEEE Access **8**, 23346–23358 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2969635>
- [4] Zhuang, H., Cui, J., Liu, T., Wang, H.: A physical model inspired density peak clustering. PLOS One **15**(9), 0239406 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239406>
- [5] Jain, A.K., Murty, M.N., Flynn, P.J.: Data clustering: a review. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR) **31**(3), 264–323 (1999) <https://doi.org/10.1145/331499.331504>
- [6] Martos, L.A.P., García-Vico, Á.M., González, P., Carmona, C.J.: Clustering: an r library to facilitate the analysis and comparison of cluster algorithms. Progress in Artificial Intelligence **12**(1), 33–44 (2023)
- [7] Oyewole, G.J., Thopil, G.A.: Data clustering: application and trends. Artificial intelligence review **56**(7), 6439–6475 (2023)

- [8] Bhattacharjee, P., Mitra, P.: A survey of density based clustering algorithms. *Frontiers of Computer Science* **15**, 1–27 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-020-00176-5>
- [9] Zou, H.: Clustering algorithm and its application in data mining. *Wireless Personal Communications* **110**(1), 21–30 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11277-019-06679-5>
- [10] Cai, J., Yang, Y., Yang, H., Zhao, X., Hao, J.: Aris: A noise insensitive data pre-processing scheme for data reduction using influence space. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* **16**(6), 1–39 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1145/3524185>
- [11] Soni, N., Ganatra, A.: Categorization of several clustering algorithms from different perspective: a review. In: *International Journal Of* (2012)
- [12] Ester, M., Kriegel, H.P., Sander, J., Xu, X.: A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In: *KDD*, pp. 226–231 (1996)
- [13] Wang, Y., Gu, Y., Shun, J.: Theoretically-efficient and practical parallel dbscan. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pp. 2555–2571 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3318464.3389727>
- [14] Tran, T.N., Drab, K., Daszykowski, M.: Revised dbscan algorithm to cluster data with dense adjacent clusters. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **120**, 92–96 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemolab.2013.09.002>
- [15] Li, S.S.: An improved dbscan algorithm based on the neighbor similarity and fast nearest neighbor query. *IEEE Access* **8**, 47468–47476 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2979316>
- [16] Jain, A.K.: Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means. *Pattern recognition letters* **31**(8), 651–666 (2010)
- [17] Ester, M., Kriegel, H.-P., Sander, J., Xu, X., *et al.*: A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In: *Kdd*, vol. 96, pp. 226–231 (1996)
- [18] Ankerst, M., Breunig, M.M., Kriegel, H.-P., Sander, J.: Optics: Ordering points to identify the clustering structure. *ACM Sigmod record* **28**(2), 49–60 (1999)
- [19] Liu, P., Zhou, D., Wu, N.: Vdbscan: varied density based spatial clustering of applications with noise. In: *2007 International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management*, pp. 1–4 (2007). IEEE

- [20] Ram, A., Jalal, S., Jalal, A.S., Kumar, M.: A density based algorithm for discovering density varied clusters in large spatial databases. *International Journal of Computer Applications* **3**(6), 1–4 (2010)
- [21] Hinneburg, A., Keim, D.A.: An efficient approach to clustering in large multimedia databases with noise. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. KDD'98*, pp. 58–65. AAAI Press, ??? (1998)
- [22] Hinneburg, A., Keim, D.A., *et al.*: *An Efficient Approach to Clustering in Large Multimedia Databases with Noise* vol. 98. Bibliothek der Universität Konstanz Konstanz, Germany, ??? (1998)
- [23] Xu, X., Ester, M., Kriegel, H.-P., Sander, J.: A distribution-based clustering algorithm for mining in large spatial databases. In: *Proceedings 14th International Conference on Data Engineering*, pp. 324–331 (1998). IEEE
- [24] Birant, D., Kut, A.: St-dbscan: An algorithm for clustering spatial-temporal data. *Data & knowledge engineering* **60**(1), 208–221 (2007)
- [25] Tsai, C.-F., Wu, C.-T., Chen, S.: Gf-dbscan; a new efficient and effective data clustering technique for large databases. In: *WSEAS International Conference. Proceedings. Mathematics and Computers in Science and Engineering* (2009). World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society
- [26] Gaonkar, M.N., Sawant, K.: Autoepsdbscan: Dbscan with eps automatic for large dataset. *International Journal on Advanced Computer Theory and Engineering* **2**(2), 11–16 (2013)
- [27] Hou, P., Zhou, L., Yang, Y.: Density clustering method based on k-nearest neighbor propagation. In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 2858, p. 012041 (2024). IOP Publishing
- [28] Xing, S., Su, Q.-M., Xiong, Y.-J., Xia, C.-M.: Pcdsn: A partition density clustering with self-adaptive neighborhoods. *Expert Systems with Applications* **227**, 120195 (2023)
- [29] Wang, H., Zhang, J., Shen, Y., Wang, S., Deng, B., Zhao, W.: Improved density peak clustering with a flexible manifold distance and natural nearest neighbors for network intrusion detection. *Scientific Reports* **15**(1), 8510 (2025)
- [30] Chelazzi, L., Perlato, A., Santandrea, E., Della Libera, C.: Rewards teach visual selective attention. *Vision Research* **85**, 58–72 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2012.12.005>
- [31] Kotary, L., Hoyer, W.J.: Age and the ability to inhibit distractor information in visual selective attention. *Experimental Aging Research* **21**(2), 159–171 (1995)

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03610739508253975>

- [32] Weiner, I.B.: The rorschach inkblot method. In: *Forensic Uses of Clinical Assessment Instruments*, pp. 202–229. Routledge, ??? (2013)
- [33] Kahlbaum, K.L.: Die sinnesdelirien. *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medizin* **23**, 56–78 (1866)
- [34] Rao, R.P., Ballard, D.H.: Predictive coding in the visual cortex: a functional interpretation of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nature neuroscience* **2**(1), 79–87 (1999)
- [35] Iglewicz, B., Hoaglin, D.C.: *How to Detect and Handle Outliers*. ASQC Basic References in Quality Control. American Society for Quality, Milwaukee, WI (1993)
- [36] Fränti, P., Sieranoja, S.: K-means properties on six clustering benchmark datasets. *Applied Intelligence* **48**, 4743–4759 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-018-1238-7>
- [37] Barton, T., Bruna, T.: *Clustering Benchmarks* (2023). <https://github.com/deric/clustering-benchmark>
- [38] Rousseeuw, P.J.: Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics* **20**, 53–65 (1987)
- [39] Calinski, R.B., Harabasz, J.: A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communication in statistics* (1974)
- [40] Davies, D.L., Bouldin, D.W.: A cluster separation measure. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* (2), 224–227 (1979)
- [41] Sinnott, R.O., Sun, Y., Duan, H.: A case study in big data analytics: Exploring twitter sentiment analysis and the weather. In: *Big Data Analytics*, pp. 357–388 (2016)
- [42] Vinh, N.X., Epps, J., Bailey, J.: Information theoretic measures for clusterings comparison: Variants, properties, normalization and correction for chance. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**, 2837–2854 (2010)
- [43] Rosenberg, A., Hirschberg, J.: V-measure: A conditional entropy-based external cluster evaluation measure. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pp. 410–420 (2007)
- [44] Jain, A.K., Dubes, R.C.: *Algorithms for Clustering Data*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., ??? (1988)