

# Food Degradation Analysis Using Multimodal Fuzzy Clustering

## Supplementary Material

### 6. Texture features

The Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM)  $p(i, j)$  is defined as:

$$p(i, j) = \frac{\text{number of occurrences of gray levels}}{\text{total number of occurrences}}$$

$$\quad \quad \quad \begin{matrix} i \text{ and } j \text{ at distance } d \text{ and angle } \theta \\ \text{total number of occurrences} \end{matrix}$$

where  $i$  and  $j$  are gray levels,  $d$  is the distance between pixels, and  $\theta$  is the angle.

As defined in [11], let  $p(i, j)$  be the  $(i,j)$ -th entry in a normalized gray-tone spatial dependence matrix,  $p_x(i)$  be the  $i$ -th entry in the marginal-probability matrix obtained by summing the rows of  $p(i, j)$ ,  $N_g$  the number of distinct gray levels in the quantized image.  $\sum_i$  and  $\sum_j$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{N_g}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{N_g}$ , respectively, then define

$$p_y(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} p(i, j)$$

$$p_{x+y}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} p(i, j), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, 2N_g$$

$$p_{x-y}(k) = \sum_{\substack{i+j=k \\ |i-j|=k}}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} p(i, j), \quad k = 0, \dots, N_g - 1$$

$$(1)$$

Based on the GLCM the following texture features are introduced:

Angular Second Moment (Energy)

$$f_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} p(i, j)^2 \quad (2)$$

Contrast

$$f_2 = \sum_{n=0}^{N_g-1} n^2 \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} p(i, j), |i - j| = n \right\} \quad (3)$$

Correlation

$$f_3 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} (ij)p(i, j) - \mu_x \mu_y}{\sigma_x \sigma_y} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu_x$ ,  $\mu_y$ ,  $\sigma_x$ , and  $\sigma_y$  are the means and standard deviations of the marginal distributions associated with  $p(i, j)$ .

Sum of Squares (Variance)

$$f_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} (i - \mu)^2 p(i, j) \quad (5)$$

Inverse Difference Moment (Homogeneity)

$$f_5 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} \frac{1}{1 + (i - j)^2} p(i, j) \quad (6)$$

Sum Average

$$f_6 = \sum_{i=2}^{2N_g} i p_{x+y}(i) \quad (7)$$

where  $P_{x+y}(k)$  is the probability of co-occurrence matrix coordinates summing to  $k$ . Sum Variance

$$f_7 = \sum_{i=2}^{2N_g} (i - f_8)^2 p_{x+y}(i) \quad (8)$$

Sum Entropy

$$f_8 = - \sum_{k=2}^{2N_g} P_{x+y}(k) \log(P_{x+y}(k)) \quad (9)$$

Entropy

$$f_9 = - \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} \sum_{j=1}^{N_g} p(i, j) \log(p(i, j)) \quad (10)$$

Difference Variance

$$f_{10} = \text{variance of } p_{x-y} \quad (11)$$

Difference Entropy

$$f_{11} = - \sum_{i=0}^{N_g-1} P_{x-y}(i) \log(p_{x-y}(i)) \quad (12)$$

Information Measures of Correlation

$$f_{12} = \frac{HXY - HXY1}{\max\{HX, HY\}} \quad (13)$$

$$f_{13} = \sqrt{1 - \exp[-2(HXY2 - HXY)]} \quad (14)$$

Where  $HXY$  is the entropy of  $p(i, j)$ ,  $HX$  and  $HY$  are entropies of the marginal distributions, and  $HXY1$  and  $HXY2$  are

$$HXY = - \sum_i \sum_j p(i, j) \log(p(i, j))$$

$$HXY1 = - \sum_k p(i, j) \log(p_x(i)p_y(j))$$

$$HXY2 = - \sum_k p_x(i)p_y(j) \log(p_x(i)p_y(j))$$

Maximal Correlation Coefficient

$$f_{13} = \sqrt{\text{second largest eigenvalue of } Q} \quad (15)$$

Where  $Q$  is

$$Q(i, j) = \sum_k \frac{p(i, k) p(j, k)}{p_x(i) p_y(k)} \quad (16)$$

## 7. Fuzzy Clustering Exploration

This section presents the full results of the Fuzzy Cmeans exploration for the Orange, Apple and Banana cases considering 2 to 10 clustering solutions with the Partition Coefficient (PC), Partition Entropy (PE) and Xie-Beni index as cluster quality measures. There is a separate table for each case (Tables 3, 4, and 5 for Orange, Apple and Banana, respectively), with the best values of the cluster quality indices in bold. Note that even though according to these measures the best configurations are obtained with two clusters, it does not imply that the classes associated with the food states are binary. The time interval between the hinges of the membership function determines a transition zone and its length indicates the speed at which the state transition for each case takes place.

## 8. Multidimensional Scaling

Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) is a statistical technique for visualizing pairwise dissimilarities between objects in a low-dimensional Euclidean space [34]. Given  $n$  objects with pairwise dissimilarities  $\delta_{ij}$ , MDS seeks coordinates  $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^k$  that minimize the *stress* function:

$$S(\mathbf{Y}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i < j} w_{ij} (d_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) - \delta_{ij})^2} \quad (17)$$

where  $d_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|$  represents the Euclidean distance between points  $i$  and  $j$ , and  $w_{ij}$  are optional weights [16].

### 8.1. Classical Metric MDS

For Euclidean distances, the solution derives from the Gram matrix  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^\top$ . Let  $\mathbf{D}^{(2)} = (d_{ij}^2)$  be the squared distance matrix. The centered inner product matrix is computed as:

ORANGE			
cluster	Color (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.9425</b>	<b>0.1021</b>	<b>0.0246</b>
3	0.9414	0.1287	0.0287
4	0.9253	0.1729	0.0277
5	0.9080	0.2185	0.0520
6	0.8886	0.2674	0.0839
7	0.8003	0.4044	0.1816
8	0.7781	0.4532	0.3028
9	0.7892	0.4443	0.2046
10	0.7538	0.5144	0.2664
cluster	Texture (Haralick descriptors)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.8927</b>	<b>0.1898</b>	<b>0.0610</b>
3	0.8245	0.3237	0.0959
4	0.8203	0.3612	0.2794
5	0.8417	0.3449	0.1364
6	0.8315	0.3807	0.1024
7	0.8175	0.4218	0.0794
8	0.7622	0.5289	0.5266
9	0.7911	0.4858	0.1951
10	0.7500	0.5660	0.3080
cluster	Shape (simple descriptors)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.9151</b>	<b>0.1554</b>	<b>0.0326</b>
3	0.8407	0.3000	0.0841
4	0.7974	0.3921	0.0683
5	0.8006	0.4094	0.1092
6	0.7784	0.4667	0.0844
7	0.7216	0.5718	0.2873
8	0.6927	0.6393	0.3270
9	0.6603	0.7091	0.2980
10	0.6414	0.7562	0.3290
cluster	Shape (Zernike)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.9199</b>	<b>0.1369</b>	<b>0.0266</b>
3	0.9029	0.1868	0.0374
4	0.8730	0.2546	0.0471
5	0.8437	0.3139	0.1036
6	0.8404	0.3319	0.0693
7	0.8269	0.3668	0.0544
8	0.8123	0.3966	0.0635
9	0.7842	0.4477	0.0937
10	0.7846	0.4555	0.1794

Table 3. Orange case. Fuzzy cMeans cluster quality measures using different visual properties for 2 to 10 cluster solutions (Best values in bold). PC: Partition coefficient, PE: Partition Entropy

$$\mathbf{G} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J} \mathbf{D}^{(2)} \mathbf{J} \quad (18)$$

APPLE			
cluster	Color (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.8537</b>	<b>0.2551</b>	<b>0.0977</b>
3	0.7409	0.4726	0.1475
4	0.7112	0.5620	0.2143
5	0.6935	0.6270	0.2241
6	0.6812	0.6767	0.1762
7	0.6633	0.7523	0.2093
8	0.6640	0.7556	0.1530
9	0.6700	0.7639	0.1240
10	0.6471	0.8247	0.4139
Texture (Haralick descriptors)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.8767</b>	<b>0.2209</b>	<b>0.0796</b>
3	0.7816	0.3998	0.2220
4	0.7767	0.4554	0.1343
5	0.7446	0.5483	0.1226
6	0.6151	0.7677	1.3436
7	0.5955	0.8420	1.0561
8	0.5630	0.9299	0.7618
9	0.5430	0.9723	0.7359
10	0.5595	0.9824	0.5735
Shape (simple descriptors)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.9408</b>	<b>0.1088</b>	<b>0.0212</b>
3	0.8934	0.2163	0.0420
4	0.7733	0.4182	0.2977
5	0.7585	0.4652	0.2246
6	0.7014	0.5946	0.2202
7	0.6463	0.7058	0.6539
8	0.6197	0.7803	0.5616
9	0.6081	0.8054	0.4501
10	0.5812	0.8918	0.3596
Shape (Zernike)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.9069</b>	<b>0.1698</b>	<b>0.0367</b>
3	0.8467	0.2863	0.0990
4	0.8390	0.3126	0.0641
5	0.7780	0.4328	0.1734
6	0.7861	0.4315	0.1061
7	0.7785	0.4636	0.1321
8	0.7741	0.4774	0.1006
9	0.7726	0.4873	0.0832
10	0.7602	0.5167	0.1650

Table 4. Apple case. Fuzzy cMeans cluster quality measures using different visual properties for 2 to 10 cluster solutions (Best values in bold). PC: Partition coefficient, PE: Partition Entropy

BANANA			
cluster	Color (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D)		
	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
2	<b>0.8992</b>	<b>0.1734</b>	<b>0.0537</b>
3	0.8131	0.3336	0.1438
4	0.8141	0.3649	0.0623
5	0.8310	0.3555	0.0748
6	0.8221	0.3864	0.0554
7	0.8107	0.4243	0.0597
8	0.7908	0.4731	0.1431
9	0.7656	0.5334	0.2190
10	0.7656	0.5363	0.2426
Texture (Haralick descriptors)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.8794</b>	<b>0.2183</b>	<b>0.0566</b>
3	0.8139	0.3534	0.1891
4	0.8060	0.3967	0.0901
5	0.7906	0.4466	0.0796
6	0.7791	0.4912	0.0755
7	0.7104	0.6210	0.6171
8	0.7128	0.6317	0.5407
9	0.6936	0.6772	0.4736
10	0.7308	0.6401	0.1821
Shape (simple descriptors)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.8671</b>	<b>0.2300</b>	<b>0.0622</b>
3	0.7907	0.3839	0.1000
4	0.7678	0.4478	0.0889
5	0.7508	0.5009	0.0682
6	0.7298	0.5550	0.1003
7	0.7313	0.5683	0.0746
8	0.7156	0.6103	0.1154
9	0.7178	0.6125	0.0854
10	0.6972	0.6613	0.1086
Shape (Zernike)			
cluster	PC	PE	Xie-Beni index
	<b>0.8656</b>	<b>0.2290</b>	<b>0.0648</b>
3	0.7955	0.3694	0.0700
4	0.7795	0.4261	0.0948
5	0.7168	0.5497	0.1234
6	0.7734	0.4701	0.0749
7	0.7446	0.5303	0.1676
8	0.7401	0.5458	0.1284
9	0.7409	0.5564	0.1061
10	0.7254	0.5936	0.1520

Table 5. Banana case. Fuzzy cMeans cluster quality measures using different visual properties for 2 to 10 cluster solutions (Best values in bold). PC: Partition coefficient, PE: Partition Entropy

where  $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$  is the centering matrix [6]. The

spectral decomposition  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^\top$  yields the embedding

coordinates:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{U}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{1/2} \quad (19)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k$  contains the  $k$  largest eigenvalues and  $\mathbf{U}_k$  their corresponding eigenvectors.

## 8.2. Optimality Conditions

The MDS embedding preserves original distances through the relation:

$$d_{ij}^2 = \|\mathbf{y}_i\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_j\|^2 - 2\mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{y}_j \quad (20)$$

with the centroid constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{0}$  to ensure identifiability [7].

## 8.3. Non-Metric MDS

When only ordinal dissimilarities are available, non-metric MDS minimizes the stress ( $S_{nm}$ ) through a monotonic transformation  $f$ :

$$S_{nm} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i < j} (d_{ij} - f(\delta_{ij}))^2}{\sum_{i < j} d_{ij}^2}} \quad (21)$$

and uses isotonic regression to estimate  $f$  [28].

## 8.4. Algorithmic Complexity

The classical MDS solution requires  $O(n^3)$  operations for eigendecomposition, making it computationally intensive for large datasets [8].