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Abstract

Distributional data such as detrital age populations or grain size distributions are common in the geological sciences. As analytical techniques become more sophisticated, increasingly large amounts of distributional data are being gathered. These advances require quantitative and objective methods, such as multidimensional scaling (MDS), to analyse large numbers of samples. Crucial to such methods is choosing a sensible measure of dissimilarity between samples. At present, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistic is the most widely used of these dissimilarity measures. However, the KS statistic has some limitations. It is very sensitive to differences between the modes of two distributions, and relatively insensitive to differences between their tails. Here we introduce the Wasserstein-2 distance (W2) as an alternative to address this issue. Whereas the KS-distance is defined as the maximum vertical distance between two empirical cumulative distribution functions, the W2-distance is a function of the horizontal distances (i.e., age differences) between individual observations. Using a combination of synthetic examples and a published zircon U-Pb dataset, we show that the W2 distance produces similar MDS results to the KS-distance in most cases, but significantly different results in some cases. Where the results differ, the W2 results are geologically more sensible. For the case study, we find that the MDS map that is produced using W2 can be readily interpreted in terms of the shape and average age of the age spectra. The W2-distance has been added to the R package IsoplotR, for immediate use in detrital geochronology and other applications. The W2 distance can be generalised to multiple dimensions, which opens opportunities beyond distributional data.

Keywords Distributional data · Wasserstein distance · Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance · Detrital mineral ages · Zircon U-Pb dating · Multi-dimensional scaling

1 Introduction

A distributional dataset is one where the information does not lie in individual observations, but in the distribution of many observations associated with one sample. Such data are common in the geological sciences, for example, detrital mineral ages or grain size distributions. Zircon U-Pb ages, in igneous and detrital samples, are one particularly widely used class of distributional data, which are used inter alia to constrain sediment provenance, global magmatic processes, and the evolution of plate tectonics (e.g., Condie et al. 2009; Cawood et al. 2012; Reimink et al. 2021). Analytical advances mean that we require objective and quantitative ways to analyse increasingly large amounts of distributional data. Qualitative comparison becomes infeasible when even modest numbers of samples are being analysed. For example, the dimension reducing technique of multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) has become popular for analysing large numbers of detrital age spectra simultaneously (Vermeesch 2013; Sharman et al. 2018). This method, and others, require a dissimilarity metric between samples to be specified (Vermeesch 2018a). Such a metric corresponds to how ‘different’ two distributional samples are. The choice of metric is vital as different metrics can result in different MDS ‘maps’ and potentially different geological interpretations.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) distance, calculated as the maximum vertical distance between two empirical cumulative distribution functions (ECDFs) has emerged as a ‘canonical’ distance metric between mineral age distributions (Berry et al. 2001; Vermeesch 2018a). However, the KS-distance has a number of drawbacks, chiefly that as only the maximum vertical difference between ECDFs is important, it is insensitive to variability in the tails of distributions. A number of alternative dissimilarity measures have previously been proposed to address this issue, including established methods such as the Kuiper statistic, and ad-hoc dissimilarity measures such as the ‘likeness’ and ‘cross-correlation’ coefficients (Saylor et al. 2012; Satkoski et al. 2013; Sharman et al. 2018). Unfortunately, all these alternatives have drawbacks, including a propensity for the ad-hoc dissimilarity measures to produce unintuitive results when applied to extremely large and/or precise datasets (Vermeesch 2018a).

In this paper we present an alternative to the KS-distance that does not suffer from these drawbacks: the Wasserstein distance (also known as the Earth-mover’s or Kantorovich–Rubinstein distance). To introduce the chief principle behind this measure, let us consider a simple toy example. Table 1 contains four samples (A through D), each of which contains exactly one single grain analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the KS distance is the vertical difference between ECDFs, it is insensitive to the absolute, ‘horizontal’ age differences between
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individual observations. Thus, the KS-distances between \( A \) and the other three samples are \( KS(A, B) = 0, KS(A, C) = 1 \) and \( KS(A, D) = 1 \). Counter to our expectation, the KS-distance cannot ‘see’ the relative age difference between sample \( A \) and samples \( C \) and \( D \). For the toy example, the Wasserstein distance simply corresponds to the horizontal distance between the four samples. Thus, \( W(A, B) = 0, W(A, C) = 1, \) and \( W(A, D) = 10 \), which is a more sensible result than that achieved with the KS-distance.

In the following sections, we first introduce the Wasserstein distance in a more realistic setting, and formally define it. Next we discuss how it can be decomposed into intuitive terms that accord with how qualitatively, as geologists, we might compare distributions. We then proceed to compare the Wasserstein distance to the KS distance using a simple yet realistic synthetic example. Finally, we perform a case study, analysing eight real zircon U-Pb age spectra from Scandinavian river sediments using MDS with the Wasserstein distance. Whilst we focus primarily on detrital age distributions, we emphasise that much of the following discussion applies equally to any form of distributional data.

2 The Wasserstein distance

The Wasserstein distance is a distance metric between two probability measures from a branch of mathematics called ‘optimal transport’. Optimal transport is often intuited in terms of moving piles of sand from one location to another with no loss or gain of material (e.g., Villani 2003). The problem that optimal transport solves is finding the way to transport the sand such that least sand is moved the least distance. The Wasserstein distance is the cost associated with this most efficient transportation. The association with moving piles of sand is why the Wasserstein distance is often termed the Earth-mover’s distance. Figure 1a shows an example of how one univariate probability distribution, \( \mu \), based on a detrital age spectrum, is transformed into another, \( \nu \) according to the optimal transport plan. Like the KS-distance the Wasserstein defines a metric space, satysfing the triangle inequality. Elsewhere in the Earth sciences, the Wasserstein distance is increasingly being used for solving non-linear geophysical inverse problems (e.g., Engquist and Froese 2014; Métivier et al. 2016; Sambridge et al. 2022). Full mathematical treatments of the Wasserstein distance and optimal transport are beyond the scope of this paper, but interested readers are referred to Villani (2003) or Peyré and Cuturi (2019). A geophysical perspective is given in Sambridge et al. (2022).

2.1 Formal definition

We consider two univariate probability distributions \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) which have cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) \( M \) and \( N \) respectively. The \( \rho \)-th Wasserstein distance between \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) is given by:

\[
W^\rho(\mu, \nu) = \left( \int_0^1 |M^{-1}(r) - N^{-1}(r)|^\rho \, dr \right)^{1/\rho}.
\]  

Figure 1: Intuition of the Wasserstein distance. a) Green and blue filled polygons show two example probability distributions of mineral ages from two samples. The distributions are labelled \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) for consistency with Equation 1. Semi-transparent coloured lines are probability distributions spaced equally in Wasserstein space between \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) (termed ‘barycentres’; Benamou et al. 2015). b) Empirical Cumulative Distribution Functions (ECDFs) of the detrital ages used to calculate the distributions shown in panel a, same colours. The first Wasserstein (\( W_1 \)) distance corresponds to the total area between the two ECDFs (shaded pink). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) distance is the maximum distance between the two ECDFs (black double-headed arrow). The data used to generate these distributions is taken from the ‘Byeskealven’ and ‘Vefsna’ samples of Morton et al. (2008), but modified to aid illustration.

in geology. In the further special case of \( p = 1 \) (i.e., the first Wasserstein distance, \( W_1 \)), Equation 1 can be re-written simply as:

\[
W_1(\mu, \nu) = \int x |M - N| \, dx,
\]  

where \( M^{-1} \) indicates the inverse of the CDF \( M \) and \( 0 \leq x \leq 1 \) (Villani 2003). Note that this definition of \( W_1 \) assumes that the cost-function is given by \( |x - y|^p \) (e.g., the Euclidean distance where \( p = 2 \)), which is the case for most distributional data

which is the area between two CDFs (e.g., Figure 1b). Recall that the KS-distance between two distributions is the maximum distance between the two corresponding CDFs. Whilst the \( W_1 \) is easily visualised, we actually use the \( W_2 \) going forwards as the squared distance (i.e., \( p = 2 \)) between observations is the standard distance metric in most statistical analyses (e.g., least squares regression). Additionally, \( W_2 \) decomposes into readily interpretable terms, as discussed below.

We focus on these univariate instances as they apply to the most common geological distributional data including detrital age distributions and grain size distributions. However, we note that the Wasserstein distance is, in general, multivariate. As a
result, some form of the Wasserstein distance could prove useful for analysing a number of other geological datasets such as the geochemical compositions of detrital minerals, or joint U-Pb and Lu-Hf isotope analysis. Statistics for comparing distributional data in multiple dimensions are increasingly needed (Sundell and Saylor 2021).

A property of the KS-distance is that it is insensitive to whether the data are presented as ‘raw’ or log-transformed ages. This property arises as the KS-distance is only sensitive to the relative ordering of observations in a distribution, which is insensitive to a log transformation. The $W_2$ however will give different results depending on whether the data are transformed or not. For the remainder of this study we consider only raw ages, focussing as a result on absolute age differences. However, we can conceive of situations in which it is relative age differences which are of interest, in which case a logarithmic transformation would be applied prior to calculating $W_2$.

### 2.2 Decomposition

A particularly useful property of $W_2$ between two univariate distributions is that it can be decomposed in terms of the differences between the two distributions’ location, spread and shape. Irpino and Romano 2007 show that:

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) = (\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu})^2 + (\sigma_\mu - \sigma_\nu)^2 + 2\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu (1 - \rho_{\mu\nu}),$$

where $\bar{\mu}$ is the mean of $\mu$, $\sigma_\mu$ is the standard deviation of $\mu$ and $\rho_{\mu\nu}$ is the Pearson correlation coefficient between the quantiles of the distributions $\mu$ and $\nu$. These three terms also accord with, qualitatively, how as geologists we might compare two distributions.

### 2.3 Discrete data

Most distributional data in the Earth sciences do not, in raw form, follow continuous probability distributions. Instead, samples may be discrete sets of observations, e.g., lists of individual mineral ages. The above formulations can be easily applied to such cases by describing the probability functions $\mu$ and $\nu$ as weighted sums of $\delta$ functions. For example, let us consider two samples $x_m$ and $x_n$ with $p$ and $q$ numbers of observations respectively:

$$\mu = \sum_i^p m_i \delta_{x_m}, \quad \nu = \sum_i^q n_i \delta_{x_n},$$

where $m$ and $n$ are weight vectors, such that $\sum m = \sum n = 1$. In most geological cases these weights would be uniform, $m_i = 1/p$; $n_i = 1/q$, giving each observation within a sample equal weight. In this scenario, $M$ and $N$ are the familiar empirical cumulative distribution functions (ECDF), given as a series of step functions (e.g., Figure 1b).

### 3 Synthetic data

We consider two probability density functions of mineral ages: a bimodal distribution and a unimodal distribution, both constructed from Gaussians with the same scale (Figure 2a). We fix the bimodal distribution at 1000 Ma, but translate the unimodal distribution along the time axis. For each translated distribution we calculate the KS-distance (red line) and $W_2$ (blue line). The green dashed line and circles indicate values associated with the location of the green distribution shown in panel a.

Figure 2: Comparing the Wasserstein distance to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance. a) Two synthetic probability density functions, modelled on U-Pb age spectra. The black bimodal distribution is fixed at 1000 Ma, and the green unimodal distribution is translated along the time axis. b) For each translated distribution, we calculate the KS-distance (red line) and $W_2$ (blue line). The green dashed line and circles indicate values associated with the location of the green distribution shown in panel a.
Table 2: The geological provinces drained by each of the rivers sampled in Morton et al. (2008), reproduced from Table 1 of the original study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Geological Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byskealven</td>
<td>Fennoscandian Shield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranealven</td>
<td>Fennoscandian Shield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lainioalven</td>
<td>Archaean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljusnan</td>
<td>Trans Scandinavian Igneous Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sälteva</td>
<td>Norwegian Caledonides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vefsna</td>
<td>Norwegian Caledonides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindelalven</td>
<td>Swedish Caledonides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljungan</td>
<td>Swedish Caledonides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is, by contrast, sensitive to the absolute offset between non-overlapping distributions. Additionally, the stepped response of the KS-distance under translation is undesirable. Under the simple operation of translating a unimodal distribution, we would expect our dissimilarity to increase at a constant, or at least predictable (e.g., quadratic) rate. The change of the KS-distance with translation is, unintuitively, non-linear. By contrast, the $W_2$ value of 1. As a result, when MDS is applied to the dataset with translation is, unintuitively, non-linear. By contrast, the $W_2$ distance has been added to the IsoplotR package (Vermeesch 2018b). This software can either be accessed using an (online) graphical user interface, at https://pieter-vermeesch.es.ucl.ac.uk/isoplotr/. Alternatively, the function can also be accessed from the command line:

```r
# Load the package:
library(IsoplotR)

# Load data
vefsna = as.data.frame(read.csv("vefsna.csv"))
# Load data
byskealven = as.data.frame(read.csv("byskealven.csv"))

# Calculate W2 using square root
W2 = sqrt(2 * wasserstein_1d(vefsna, byskealven, p=2))
```

In python, we make use of the POT package to calculate $W_2$ (Flamary et al. 2021). The following snippet calculates $W_2$ between the Byskealven and Vefsna age distribution from the example above. The data required, and a python script, is provided at https://github.com/AlexLipp/detrital-wasserstein/.

```python
import numpy as np
import ot

# Load in the packages
import nump as np
import ot

# Load data
vefsna = np.loadtxt("vefsna.csv", delimiter="", skiprows=1)
byskealven = np.loadtxt("byskealven.csv", delimiter="", skiprows=1)

# Calculate W2 between vefsna and byskealven samples
W2 = ot.wasserstein_1d(vefsna, byskealven, p=2)

# Calculate W2 using square root
W2 = np.sqrt(W2)
```

The above code returns a $W_2$ of 490.01.

---

2This is a temporary URL pointing to the beta version of the software. This will be replaced with a link to the public IsoplotR mirror once the review process has been completed.

3To install the beta version of the IsoplotR package, enter

```bash
# Install the package
install.packages("IsoplotR\beta")
```
Figure 3: Analysing detrital zircon U-Pb ages using the Wasserstein distance. a–h) Kernel Density Estimates (KDEs) of zircon U-Pb ages from modern sand gathered in Scandinavian rivers by Morton et al. (2008). Sampled river names are indicated in the upper left corners of the plots. ‘Ranealven’ and ‘Ljusnan’ samples are filled in and highlighted in panels i–k. KDEs generated using a Gaussian kernel with adaptive bandwidth (Shimazaki and Shinomoto 2010). i) Empirical Cumulative Distribution Functions (ECDFs) for each zircon age population. j) Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) map for zircon populations calculated using $W_2$ as a dissimilarity metric. Note the closeness of ‘Ranealven’ and ‘Ljusnan’. k) MDS map of same samples but using KS-distance. Note the distance separating ‘Ranealven’ and ‘Ljusnan’.
6 Conclusions

The second Wasserstein distance, $W_2$, is an effective metric for comparing distributional data in the geological sciences such as detrital age spectra or grain size. The metric is particularly useful for univariate data, but can be extended to further dimensions. $W_2$ is a function of the horizontal distances between observations, in contrast to the KS distance, which corresponds to vertical differences between ECDFs. Consequently, unlike the KS-distance, $W_2$ is sensitive to variability in the tails of distributions, not just the modes. Under synthetic tests we find that the $W_2$ metric behaves more intuitively in comparing distributions relative to the KS-distance. We performed a case study in which eight zircon U-Pb age distributions from Scandinavian river sediments were analysed by MDS using $W_2$. We showed that the resulting MDS map accurately clusters samples with the same provenance together. Additionally, the relative positions of samples on the map coincide with trends in interpretable qualities such as distribution shape and average age. The univariate $W_2$ distance has an analytical solution, which we provide implementations of in R and python for detrital geochronology and other Earth science applications.
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