

THE PHYLOGENETIC KANTOROVICH-RUBINSTEIN METRIC FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SEQUENCE SAMPLES

STEVEN N. EVANS AND FREDERICK A. MATSEN

1. SUMMARY

Metagenomics attempts to sample and study all the genetic material present in a community of microorganisms in a given environment. A key problem in this new field is the development of comparative methods that indicate the extent to which two communities differ. *UniFrac*, a method constructed from a somewhat ad hoc phylogenetics-based distance between two communities, is one of the most commonly used tools for these analyses. We provide a foundation for such methods by establishing that the *weighted UniFrac* distance is a special case of the classical Kantorovich-Rubinstein (KR) metric applied to probability distributions representing the metagenomic samples on a reference phylogenetic tree. We demonstrate that in this case the KR distance can be written as an integral over the tree, develop L^p Zolotarev-type generalizations of the metric, and show how the p-value of the natural permutation test of the null hypothesis “no difference between the two communities” can be approximated using a functional of a Gaussian process indexed by the tree. We relate the L^2 case to an ANOVA-type decomposition and find that the distribution of its associated Gaussian functional is that of a computable linear combination of independent χ_1^2 random variables.

2. INTRODUCTION

In 2005, Lozupone and Knight introduced the *UniFrac* comparison measure to quantify the phylogenetic difference between microbial communities (Lozupone and Knight, 2005), and in 2007 they proposed a corresponding *weighted* version (Lozupone et al., 2007). These two papers already have hundreds of citations in total, attesting to their centrality in microbial community analysis. Researchers have used UniFrac to analyze microbial communities on the human hand (Fierer et al., 2008), establish the existence of a distinct gut microbial community associated with inflammatory bowel disease (Frank et al., 2007), and demonstrate that host genetics play a major part in determining intestinal microbiota (Rawls et al., 2006). The distance matrices derived from the UniFrac method are also commonly used in clustering methods, including heirarchical clustering and UPGMA

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 92B10, 62P10; secondary: 62G10, 60B05, 60G15.

Key words and phrases. phylogenetics, metagenomics, Wasserstein metric, Monte Carlo, permutation test, randomization test, optimal transport, Gaussian process, reproducing kernel Hilbert space, barycenter, negative curvature, Hadamard space, $CAT(\kappa)$ space .

The first author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0907630. The second author was supported by the Miller Institute for Basic Research in Science, University of California at Berkeley.

(Lozupone et al., 2007). Furthermore, the distances are widely used in conjunction with ordination methods such as PCA (Rintala et al., 2008) or to discover microbial community gradients with respect to another factor, such as ocean depth (Desnues et al., 2008). Two of the major metagenomic analysis “pipelines” developed in 2010 had a UniFrac analysis as one of their endpoints (Caporaso et al., 2010; Hartman et al., 2010). The software used to compute these measures have been recently re-optimized for speed (Hamady et al., 2009) and it has been re-implemented in the heavily used *mothur* (Schloss et al., 2009) microbial analysis software package.

The success of the UniFrac framework is due to its utility in analyzing population-level differences for organisms such as viruses or bacteria for which it is difficult or impossible to assign species membership to the sampled genetic material. Although it has been pointed out that alternative ways of using phylogenetic branch lengths are possible (Faith et al., 2009), there has been little work investigating the extent to which there is a mathematical rationale for these measures of similarity. The measures in the UniFrac papers are defined “as is” via a formula, and one of the principal aims of this paper is to establish general mathematical foundations for the weighted UniFrac and similar distances.

2.1. Phylogenetic placement and probability distributions on a phylogenetic tree. We now describe in more detail the biological motivation for the comparison of probability distributions on a phylogenetic tree.

Next-generation sequencing technology enables sequencing of hundreds of thousands to millions of short DNA sequences in a single experiment. This has led to a new methodology for characterizing the collection of microbes in a sample: rather than using observed morphology or the results of culturing experiments, it is possible to directly sequence genetic material extracted in bulk from the sample. This technology has revolutionized the possibilities for unbiased surveys of environmental microbial diversity, ranging from the human gut (Gill et al., 2006) to acid mine drainages (Baker and Banfield, 2003).

Recently, a number of groups have proposed *phylogenetic placement* algorithms that place each environmental sequences on a fixed *reference phylogenetic tree* according to the phylogenetic maximum-likelihood criterion (Von Mering et al., 2007; Monier et al., 2008; Berger and Stamatakis, 2010; Matsen et al., 2010). The reference phylogenetic tree is constructed from previously-characterized DNA sequences. The output of a placement algorithm is an assignment of the *query sequences* to their most likely location on the reference tree. By fixing a reference tree rather than attempting to build a phylogenetic tree for the sample from scratch, recent algorithms of this type are able to place tens of thousands of query sequences per hour per processor on a reference tree of one thousand taxa (e.g. species), with linear performance scaling in the number of reference taxa.

The emergence of these algorithms raises the question of how to make gene-level comparisons between the sets of placements that they output for two samples. One approach would be to use taxonomic annotation on the reference tree to assign taxonomic information to the query sequences. However, this is very difficult to automate: there is no canonical way to assign taxonomic information to the internal nodes, and the process can be further complicated by gene trees deviating from the species tree. Resolving such differences is an active research area, with algorithms and implementations such as Notung (Chen et al., 2000), Softparsmap (Berglund-Sonnhammer et al., 2006), and PrIME (Åkerborg et al., 2009).

Instead, we consider directly if there is a significant difference between two collections of placements on a reference gene tree. In doing so, we sidestep the errors introduced by the naming process and preserve the detailed information that phylogeny offers, including branch length information and information about paralogous genes. To do so, environmental sequence samples are considered as probability distributions on their corresponding reference tree as follows. Given n query sequences, each sequence fragment is assigned probability mass $1/n$. In the “point” version, the mass for a given query sequence is assigned to the location in the reference tree which best fits the location in the reference tree for that query sequence. In the “spread” version the $1/n$ mass is distributed in a continuous or discrete fashion across the tree according to the level of optimality of that location for the given query sequence.

These probability distributions can be found via likelihood-based phylogenetics. The likelihood of a phylogenetic tree under a given model of sequence evolution for a given aligned set of sequences is the probability of having those observed sequences evolve on the phylogenetic tree under the specified model (see, e.g., Felsenstein (2004)). In the likelihood setting, we define a phylogenetic placement to be a choice of attachment edge on the reference tree, position of attachment point along that edge, and “pendant” branch length (i.e. the length from the attachment point to the query node). The likelihood of a placement is the likelihood of the reference tree with the query sequence attached as specified. A maximum-likelihood point placement for a given query sequence is the maximum-likelihood attachment of the sequence to the tree.

By assuming prior probabilities on the edges, the attachment locations on those edges, and the pendant branch lengths, one can also calculate a posterior probability value for the placements. For example, one might take a uniform prior on edges and attachment locations, then an exponential or truncated uniform prior on pendant branch lengths. By integrating out pendant branch lengths, one obtains a posterior probability measure μ_i on the tree for each query sequence i ; the resulting probability distribution for the sample would in that case be $\sum_i \mu_i/n$. For large data sets, it is not practical to record detailed information about the posterior probability distribution. Thus, in our implementation, the posterior probability is computed on an edge-by-edge basis by integrating out the attachment location and the pendant branch length, and the corresponding mass is assigned to the maximum *a posteriori* location along the edge (Matsen et al., 2010). We note that the implementation of phylogenetic placement by Berger and Stamatakis (2010) allows for more flexibility in the tree, with the consequence that placements are only assigned to a given edge, rather than to a location along an edge.

2.2. The phylogenetic Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric and UniFrac. The standard statistical approach to determining whether two metagenomic samples came from communities with the “same” or “different” constituents would involve proposing a family of probability distributions that described the outcomes of sampling from a range of communities and then using the machinery of classical statistical inference to construct a test of the hypothesis that the two samples were realizations from the same distribution in the family.

However, there does not appear to be such a family that is appropriate in this setting, and so we use the idea of a permutation test (also known as a randomization test) that goes back to Fisher (1935) and Pitman (1937a,b, 1938) (see Good, 2005,

and Edgington and Onghena, 2007, for a guide to the more recent literature). We expand on the details of this procedure in Section 6, but the following is quick description.

Recall that we can treat a sample as being a probability distribution on the reference phylogenetic tree and assume that we have settled on some metric on the space of probability distributions on the tree. Now suppose that our data are two samples with m and n placements, respectively, and that we have computed the distance between the resulting probability distributions using our metric. Imagine creating a new pair of samples by taking some other subset of size m and its complement from the set of all $m+n$ placements and then computing the distance between the resulting two probability distributions. The proportion of the $\binom{m+n}{m}$ choices of such pairs of samples that result in a distance larger than the one observed in the data is an indication of the significance of the observed distance. Of course, we can rephrase this procedure as taking a uniform random subset of placements of size m and its complement and asking for the probability that the distance between the resulting probability distributions is greater than the observed one. Consequently, it is possible to approximate the proportion/probability by taking repeated independent choices of the random subset and recording the proportion of times there is a distance greater than the observed one. We describe the distribution of the distance between the two random probability distributions produced from a uniform random subset of placements of size m and its complement of size n as the *distribution of the distance under the null hypothesis of no clustering*.

The key element in implementing this approach is the choice of a suitable metric. There are, of course, a multitude of choices: Chapter 6 of (Villani, 2009) notes that there are “dozens and dozens” of them and provides a discussion of their similarities, differences and various virtues.

Perhaps the most familiar metric is the total variation distance, which is just the supremum over all (Borel) sets of the difference between the masses assigned to the set by the two distributions. The total variation distance is clearly inappropriate for our purposes, however, because it pays no attention to the evolutionary distance structure on the tree: if one took k point placements and constructed another set of placements by perturbing each of the original placements by a tiny amount so that the two sets of placements were disjoint, then the total variation distance between the corresponding probability distributions would be 2, the largest it can be for any pair of probability distributions, even though we would regard the two sets of placements as being very close. Note that even genetic material from organisms of the same species can result in slightly different placements due to genetic variation within species and experimental error.

We therefore need a metric that is compatible with the evolutionary distance on the reference tree and measures two distributions as being close if one is obtained from the other by short range redistributions of mass. The Kantorovich-Rubinstein (KR) metric, which can be defined for probability distributions on an arbitrary metric space, is a classical and widely used distance that meets this requirement and, as we shall see, has other desirable properties such as being easily computable on a tree. It is defined rigorously below, but it can be described intuitively in physical terms as follows. Picture each of the two probability distributions on the metric space as a collection of piles of sand with unit mass; the amount of sand at a given point is equal to the probability mass at that point. Suppose that the amount

of “work” required to transport an amount of sand from one place to another is proportional to the mass of the sand moved times the distance it has to travel. Then the KR distance between two probability distributions P and Q is simply the minimum amount of work required to move sand in a configuration corresponding to P into a configuration corresponding to Q . It will require little effort to move sand between the configurations corresponding to two similar probability distributions, while more will be needed for two distributions that place most of their respective masses on disjoint regions of the metric space. As noted in (Villani, 2009), the KR metric is also called the *Wasserstein(1) metric* or, in the engineering literature, the *earthmover distance*.

In the phylogenetic case, the optimization implicit in the definition of the KR metric can be done analytically, resulting in a closed form expression that can be evaluated in linear time, thereby enabling analysis of the volume of data produced by large-scale sequencing studies. Indeed, as shown in Section 3, the metric can be represented as a single integral over the tree, and the integral reduces to a summation with a number of terms on the order of the number of placements. In contrast, computing the KR metric in Euclidean spaces of dimension greater than one requires a linear programming optimization step. The existence of this simple integral expression means that not only is the total variation metric inappropriate because of its lack of connection with the underlying evolutionary distance on the reference tree, but it is not even any easier to compute than the KR metric.

We note in passing that the metric on probability distributions that is most familiar to statisticians other than the total variation distance is probably the Prohorov metric and so they may feel more comfortable using it rather than the KR metric. However, the Prohorov metric is defined in terms of an optimization that does not appear to have a closed form solution on a tree and, in any case, for a compact metric space there are results that bound the Prohorov metric above and below by functions of the KR metric, see Problem 3.11.2 of Ethier and Kurtz (1986), so the two metrics incorporate very similar information about the differences between the two distribution. We also note that mass-transport ideas have already been used in evolutionary bioinformatics for the comparison and clustering of “evolutionary fingerprints” – such a fingerprint being defined by Kosakovsky Pond et al. (2010) as a discrete bivariate distribution on synonymous and nonsynonymous mutation rates for a given gene.

It is remarkable that the point version of this closed-form expression for the phylogenetic KR distance (although apparently not the optimal mass transport justification for the distance) was intuited by microbial ecologists and called *weighted UniFrac*. The original UniFrac distance (Lozupone and Knight, 2005) measured the fraction of branch length shared between two samples when a tree is constructed on both samples together. When the branches are weighted by the number of samples below them (Lozupone et al., 2007), one obtains a formula identical to the point version of the KR distance – see (2) below.

We introduce L^p generalizations of the KR metric that are analogous to ones on the real line due to Zolotarev (Rachev, 1991; Rachev and Rüschendorf, 1998) – the KR metric corresponds to the case $p = 1$. The generalizations do not arise from optimal mass transport considerations, but we remark in Section 4 that the square of the $p = 2$ version does have an appealing interpretation as the amount

of variability in a pooling of the two samples that is not accounted for by the variability in each of them.

We show in Section 7 that the distribution of the distance under the null hypothesis of no clustering is approximately that of a readily-computable functional of a Gaussian process indexed by the tree and that this Gaussian process is relatively simple to simulate. Moreover, we observe that when $p = 2$ this approximate distribution is that of the square root of a weighted sum of χ_1^2 random variables.

2.3. Barycenters. We recall in Section 5 the well-known fact that any tree is a *Hadamard space*: a Hadamard space is a simply connected complete metric space in which there is a suitable notion of the length of a path in the space, the distance between two points is the infimum of the lengths of the paths joining the points, and the space has nonpositive curvature in an appropriate sense – see (Burago et al., 2001). Equivalently, a Hadamard space is a complete CAT(0) space in the sense of (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999). CAT(0) spaces have already made an appearance in phylogenetics in the construction of spaces of phylogenetic trees (Billera et al., 2001). Any compactly supported probability distribution on a Hadamard space has an appropriately defined *barycenter* that shares some of the properties of the expectation of a probability distribution on a Euclidean space and acts as a sensible “single point summary” of the distribution. We describe a simple procedure for calculating the barycenter of a probability distribution on a tree.

One can also imagine using the distance between the respective barycenters as an alternative way of detecting differences between two probability distributions on a tree. *A priori*, one does not expect an approach based on this quantity to be as sensitive as one based on a metric comparing the two distributions because of phenomena analogous to two probability distributions on the real line that have the same mean but vastly differing dispersion around that mean. Moreover, the barycenter is more difficult to compute than the KR distance and its generalizations.

2.4. Example application. To illustrate the usefulness of probability metrics for distinguishing between collections of placements, we perform an example analysis using a dataset on a photosystem gene that was collected to investigate the difference in populations when organic sulfur is added to seawater. A significant difference is seen when comparing the two conditions using the KR metric and its generalizations, and the sampling distribution of the various distances under the null hypothesis is quite consistent as the exponent p varies. It is noteworthy that for this data set the barycenters of the two samples are quite close together, and so the significant value of the observed distance between the two sets of placements is not simply due to them occupying essentially non-overlapping regions of the reference tree (however, even this small distance between the barycenters is still quite significant in our example). Also, it is not immediately clear from plots of the distributions of distances between pairs of placements for the two samples and a pooling of them that there is clustering present.

2.5. Remarks on other techniques. There are a number of ways to compare microbial samples in a phylogenetic context besides the method presented here. One popular means of comparing samples is the “parsimony test,” by which the most parsimonious assignment of internal nodes of the phylogenetic tree to communities is found; the resulting parsimony score is interpreted as a measure of difference between communities (Slatkin and Maddison, 1989; Schloss and Handelsman, 2006).

Another interesting approach is to consider a “generalized principal components analysis” whereby the tree structure is incorporated into the process of finding principal components of the species abundances (Bik et al., 2006; Purdom, 2008). The Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric complements these methods by providing a means of comparing samples that leverages established statistical methodology, that takes into account uncertainty in read location, and can be visualized directly on the tree.

3. PROBABILITY METRICS ON TREES

In this section we describe more formally the phylogenetic Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric, which is a particular case of the family of Wasserstein metrics. We then use a dual formulation of the KR metric to show that it can be calculated in linear time via a simple integral over the tree.

Let T be a phylogenetic tree with assigned branch lengths. Write d for the path distance on T . We assume that probability distributions have been given on the tree via collections of either “point” or “spread” placements as described in the introduction.

For a metric space (S, r) , the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance $Z(P, Q)$ between two Borel probability distributions P and Q on S is defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{R}(P, Q)$ denote the set of probability distributions R on the product space $S \times S$ with the property $R(A \times S) = P(A)$ and $R(S \times B) = Q(B)$ for all Borel sets A and B (that is, the two marginal distributions of R are P and Q). Then,

$$Z(P, Q) := \inf \left\{ \int_{S \times S} r(x, y) R(dx, dy) : R \in \mathcal{R}(P, Q) \right\};$$

see, for example, (Rachev, 1991; Rachev and Rüschendorf, 1998; Villani, 2003; Ambrosio et al., 2008; Villani, 2009).

There is an alternative formula for $Z(P, Q)$ that comes from convex duality. Write \mathcal{L} for the set of functions $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the Lipschitz property $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq r(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in S$. Then,

$$Z(P, Q) = \sup \left\{ \int_S f(x) P(dx) - \int_S f(y) Q(dy) : f \in \mathcal{L} \right\}.$$

We can use this expression to get a simple explicit formula for $Z(P, Q)$ when $(S, r) = (T, d)$.

Given any two points $x, y \in T$, let $[x, y]$ be the arc between them. There is a unique Borel measure λ on T such that $\lambda([x, y]) = d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in T$. We call λ the *length measure*. It is analogous to Lebesgue measure on the real line. Fix a distinguished point $\rho \in T$, which we think of as the “root” of the tree. For any $f \in \mathcal{L}$ with $f(\rho) = 0$, there is a λ -a.e. unique Borel function $g : T \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ such that $f(x) = \int_{[\rho, x]} g(y) \lambda(dy)$ (this follows easily from the analogous fact for the real line).

Given $x \in T$, put $\tau(x) := \{y \in T : x \in [\rho, y]\}$; that is, if we draw the tree with the root ρ at the top of the page, then $\tau(x)$ is the sub-tree below x . Observe that if $h : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded Borel function and μ is a Borel probability distribution

on T , then we have the integration-by-parts formula

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T \left(\int_{[\rho, x]} h(y) \lambda(dy) \right) \mu(dx) &= \int_{T \times T} 1_{[\rho, x]}(y) h(y) (\mu \otimes \lambda)(dx, dy) \\ &= \int_{T \times T} 1_{\tau(y)}(x) h(y) (\mu \otimes \lambda)(dx, dy) \\ &= \int_T h(y) \left(\int_{\tau(y)} \mu(dx) \right) \lambda(dy) \\ &= \int_T h(y) \mu(\tau(y)) \lambda(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if P and Q are two Borel probability distributions on T we have

$$Z(P, Q) = \sup \left\{ \int_T g(y) [P(\tau(y)) - Q(\tau(y))] \lambda(dy) : -1 \leq g \leq +1 \right\}.$$

It is clear that the integral is maximized by taking $g(y) = +1$ (resp. $g(y) = -1$) when $P(\tau(y)) > Q(\tau(y))$ (resp. $P(\tau(y)) < Q(\tau(y))$), so that

$$(1) \quad Z(P, Q) = \int_T |P(\tau(y)) - Q(\tau(y))| \lambda(dy).$$

Interestingly, the quantity on the LHS does not depend on the choice of root, whereas *a priori* the quantity on the RHS appears to.

3.1. Zolotarev-type L^p generalization. The metric defined in (1) generalizes to an L^p Zolotarev-type version: for $0 < p < \infty$ we have the distances

$$Z_p(P, Q) = \left[\int_T |P(\tau(y)) - Q(\tau(y))|^p \lambda(dy) \right]^{\frac{1}{p} \wedge 1}$$

– see (Rachev, 1991; Rachev and Rüschendorf, 1998) for a discussion of analogous metrics for probability distributions on the real line. Intuitively, large p gives more weight in the distance to parts of the tree which are maximally different in terms of P and Q , while small p gives more weight to differences which require lots of transport.

The position of the root ρ also does not matter for this generalized version. Indeed, if ρ' and ρ'' are two choices of the root and $[\rho', \rho'']$ is the segment in the tree T joining them, then (in the obvious notation)

$$P(\tau'(y)) - Q(\tau'(y)) = P(\tau''(y)) - Q(\tau''(y)), \quad y \notin [\rho', \rho''],$$

and

$$P(\tau'(y)) - Q(\tau'(y)) = -[P(\tau''(y)) - Q(\tau''(y))], \quad \lambda - \text{a.e. } y \in [\rho', \rho''];$$

(there is equality provided y is not an atom of P or Q), so

$$\int_T |P(\tau'(y)) - Q(\tau'(y))|^p \lambda(dy) = \int_T |P(\tau''(y)) - Q(\tau''(y))|^p \lambda(dy)$$

and the choice of the “root” is irrelevant.

3.2. Connection with the “weighted UniFrac” metric. Assume there are m sequences from sample A and n sequences in sample B . The “weighted UniFrac” formula is

$$(2) \quad u = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i \left| \frac{A_i}{m} - \frac{B_i}{n} \right|$$

where ℓ_i is the length of branch i , A_i and B_i are the number of descendants of branch i from communities A and B respectively, and m and n are the total number of sequences from communities A and B , respectively (Lozupone et al., 2007). This is the same as (1) when P assigns point mass $1/m$ to each of the leaves in community A , and Q assigns point mass $1/n$ to each of the leaves in community B .

4. $Z_2^2(P, Q)$ AND ANOVA

In this section we demonstrate how $Z_2^2(P, Q)$ can be interpreted as a difference between the pooled average of pairwise distances and the average for each sample individually.

Let π_1, \dots, π_m (resp. $\pi_{m+1}, \dots, \pi_{m+n}$) be the placements in the first (resp. second) sample, so that each π_k is a probability distribution on the tree T , $P = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \pi_k$, and $Q = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=m+1}^{m+n} \pi_k$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_2^2(P, Q) &= \int_T |P(\tau(u)) - Q(\tau(u))|^2 \lambda(du) \\ &= \int_T P(\tau(u))^2 \lambda(du) - 2 \int_T P(\tau(u))Q(\tau(u)) \lambda(du) \\ &\quad + \int_T Q(\tau(u))^2 \lambda(du) \\ &= \int_T \left[\int_T \int_T 1_{[\rho, v]}(u) 1_{[\rho, w]}(u) P(dv) P(dw) \right] \lambda(du) \\ &\quad - 2 \int_T \left[\int_T \int_T 1_{[\rho, v]}(u) 1_{[\rho, w]}(u) P(dv) Q(dw) \right] \lambda(du) \\ &\quad + \int_T \left[\int_T \int_T 1_{[\rho, v]}(u) 1_{[\rho, w]}(u) Q(dv) Q(dw) \right] \lambda(du) \end{aligned}$$

Now, $[\rho, v] \cap [\rho, w]$ is an arc of the form $[\rho, v \wedge w]$, where $v \wedge w$ is the “most recent common ancestor” of v and w relative to the root ρ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T 1_{[\rho, v]}(u) 1_{[\rho, w]}(u) \lambda(du) &= \lambda([\rho, v \wedge w]) \\ &= d(\rho, v \wedge w) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [d(\rho, v) + d(\rho, w) - d(v, w)], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_2^2(P, Q) &= \int_T \int_T \frac{1}{2} [d(\rho, v) + d(\rho, w) - d(v, w)] P(dv) P(dw) \\
&\quad - 2 \int_T \int_T \frac{1}{2} [d(\rho, v) + d(\rho, w) - d(v, w)] P(dv) Q(dw) \\
&\quad + \int_T \int_T \frac{1}{2} [d(\rho, v) + d(\rho, w) - d(v, w)] Q(dv) Q(dw) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[2 \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) Q(dw) \right. \\
&\quad - \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) P(dw) \\
&\quad \left. - \int_T \int_T d(v, w) Q(dv) Q(dw) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we set

$$R := \frac{m}{m+n} P + \frac{n}{m+n} Q = \frac{1}{m+n} \sum_k \pi_k,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
2mn \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) Q(dw) &= (m+n)^2 \int_T \int_T d(v, w) R(dv) R(dw) \\
&\quad - m^2 \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) P(dw) \\
&\quad - n^2 \int_T \int_T d(v, w) Q(dv) Q(dw)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_2^2(P, Q) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{(m+n)^2}{mn} \int_T \int_T d(v, w) R(dv) R(dw) \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{(mn+m^2)}{mn} \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) P(dw) \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{(mn+n^2)}{mn} \int_T \int_T d(v, w) Q(dv) Q(dw) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \frac{(m+n)^2}{mn} \left[\int_T \int_T d(v, w) R(dv) R(dw) \right. \\
&\quad - \left\{ \frac{m}{m+n} \int_T \int_T d(v, w) P(dv) P(dw) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{n}{m+n} \int_T \int_T d(v, w) Q(dv) Q(dw) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $Z_2^2(P, Q)$ gives an indication of the “variability” present in the pooled collection π_i , $1 \leq i \leq m+n$, that is over and above the “variability” in the two collections π_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, and π_i , $m+1 \leq i \leq m+n$.

5. CALCULATING THE BARYCENTER

It can be useful to compare probability distributions on a metric space by calculating a suitably defined “center of mass” that provides a single point summary for

each distribution. Recall the standard fact that if P is a probability distribution on a Euclidean space such that $\int |y - x|^2 P(dy)$ is finite for some (and hence all) x , then the function $x \mapsto \int |y - x|^2 P(dy)$ has a unique minimum at $x_0 = \int y P(dy)$. It therefore makes sense to say that a probability distribution P on an arbitrary metric space (S, r) has a *barycenter* at x_0 if $\int r(x, y)^2 P(dy)$ is finite for some (and hence all x) and the function $x \mapsto \int r(x, y)^2 P(dy)$ has a unique minimum at x_0 . In general, a barycenter need not exist. However, it is well-known that barycenters do exist for probability distributions on Hadamard spaces – see Chapter 9 of (Burago et al., 2001) for the formal definition of a Hadamard space and a proof of this fact. It is a straightforward exercise to check that a tree is a Hadamard space – see Example II.1.15(4) of (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999) and note the remark after Definition II.1.1 of (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999) that a Hadamard space is the same thing as a complete CAT(0) space. Thus, a probability distribution on a tree possesses a barycenter in the above sense.

This fact may also be established directly as follows. As a continuous function on a compact metric space, the function $f : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by $f(x) := \int_T d(x, y)^2 P(dy)$ achieves its infimum. Suppose that the infimum is achieved at two points x' and x'' . Define a function $\gamma : [0, d(x', x'')] \rightarrow [x', x'']$, where $[x', x''] \subseteq T$ is the arc between x' and x'' , by the requirement that $\gamma(t)$ is the unique point in $[x', x'']$ that is distance t from x' . It is straightforward to check that the composition $f \circ \gamma$ is *strongly convex*; that is,

$$(f \circ \gamma)(\alpha r + (1 - \alpha)s) < \alpha(f \circ \gamma)(r) + (1 - \alpha)(f \circ \gamma)(s)$$

for $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $r, s \in [0, d(x', x'')]$. In particular, $f(\gamma(d(x', x'')/2)) = (f \circ \gamma)(d(x', x'')/2) < (f(x') + f(x''))/2$, contradicting the definitions of x' and x'' .

We next consider how to compute the barycenter of a probability distribution P on a tree (T, d) . For each point $u \in T$ there is the associated set of directions in which it is possible to proceed when leaving u . There is one direction for every connected component of $T \setminus \{u\}$. Thus, there is just one direction associated with a leaf, two directions associated with a point in the interior of an edge, and k associated with a vertex of degree k . Given a point u and a direction δ , write $T(u, \delta)$ for the subset of T consisting of points $v \neq u$ such that the unique path connecting u and v departs u in the direction δ , set

$$D(u, \delta) := - \int_{T(u, \delta)} d(u, y) P(dy) + \int_{T \setminus T(u, \delta)} d(u, y) P(dy),$$

and note that

$$\lim_v \frac{1}{d(u, v)} \left[\int_T d(v, y)^2 P(dy) - \int_T d(u, y)^2 P(dy) \right] = 2D(u, \delta),$$

where the limit is taken over $v \rightarrow u$, $v \in T(u, \delta)$. Note that if u is in the interior of an edge $[a, b]$ and b is in the direction δ from u , u is in the direction α from a , and

u is in the direction β from b , then

$$\begin{aligned}
D(u, \delta) &= - \int_{T \setminus T(b, \beta)} d(u, y) P(dy) - \int_{(u, b)} d(u, y) P(dy) \\
&\quad + \int_{T \setminus T(a, \alpha)} d(u, y) P(dy) + \int_{(a, u)} d(u, y) P(dy) \\
&= - \int_{T \setminus T(b, \beta)} d(a, y) P(dy) + d(a, u) P(T \setminus T(b, \beta)) \\
&\quad - \int_{(u, b)} d(a, y) P(dy) + d(a, u) P((u, b)) \\
&\quad + \int_{T \setminus T(a, \alpha)} d(a, y) P(dy) + d(a, u) P(T \setminus T(a, \alpha)) \\
&\quad + d(a, u) P((a, u)) - \int_{(a, u)} d(a, y) P(dy) \\
&= D(a, \alpha) + d(a, u).
\end{aligned}$$

If for some vertex u of the reference tree $D(u, \delta) \geq 0$ for all directions δ associated with u , then u is the barycenter (this case includes the trivial one in which u is a leaf and all the mass of P is concentrated on u). If there is no such vertex, then there must be a unique pair of neighboring vertices a and b such that $D(a, \alpha) < 0$ and $D(b, \beta) < 0$, where α is the direction from a pointing towards b and β is the direction from b pointing towards a . In that case, the barycenter must lie on the edge between a and b , and it follows from the calculations above that the barycenter is the point $u \in (a, b)$ such that $d(a, u) = -D(a, \alpha)$.

6. ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE

To assess the significance of the observed distance between the probability distributions associated with two samples of placed reads of size m and n , we use an idea familiar from classical nonparametric statistics: we imagine creating all $\binom{m+n}{m}$ pairs of ‘‘samples’’ that arise from placing m of the reads into one sample and the remaining n into the other, computing the distances between the two probability distributions on the reference tree that result from the placed reads, and determining what proportion of these distances exceed the distance observed in the data. This proportion may be thought of as a p-value for a test of the null hypothesis of no clustering against an alternative of some degree of clustering.

Of course, for most values of m and n it is infeasible to actually perform this exhaustive listing of distances. We observe that if, as above, the pooled collection of placed reads from both samples is π_1, \dots, π_{m+n} , $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m+n\}$ is a uniformly distributed random subset with cardinality m (that is, all $\binom{m+n}{m}$ values are equally likely), $J := I^c$ is the complement of I , \tilde{P} is the random probability distribution $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in I} \pi_i$, and \tilde{Q} is the random probability distribution $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in J} \pi_j$, then the proportion of interest is simply the probability that the distance between \tilde{P} and \tilde{Q} exceeds the distance between P and Q . We can approximate this probability in the obvious way by taking independent replicates of (I, J) and hence of (\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}) and looking at the proportion of them that result in distances greater than the observed one. We illustrate this Monte Carlo approximation procedure in Section 8.

7. GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION

Although the Monte Carlo approach to approximating a p-value in Section 6 is conceptually straightforward, it is tempting to explore whether there are further approximations to the outcome of this procedure that give satisfactory results but require less computation.

Recall that π_1, \dots, π_{m+n} is the pooled collection of placed reads and that $\tilde{P} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in I} \pi_i$ and $\tilde{Q} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in J} \pi_j$, where I is a uniformly distributed random subset of $\{1, \dots, m+n\}$ and J is its complement. Write

$$G_k(u) := \pi_k(\tau(u)) \text{ for any } u \in T, 1 \leq k \leq m+n,$$

where we recall that $\tau(u)$ is the tree below u relative to the root ρ . Define a T -indexed stochastic process $X = (X(u))_{u \in T}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} X(u) &:= \tilde{P}(\tau(u)) - \tilde{Q}(\tau(u)) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in I} G_i(u) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in J} G_j(u). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$Z_p(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}) = \left[\int_T |X(u)|^p \lambda(du) \right]^{\frac{1}{p} \wedge 1}.$$

If H_k , $1 \leq k \leq m+n$, is the indicator random variable for the event $\{k \in I\}$, then

$$X(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{m+n} \left[\left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \right) H_k - \frac{1}{n} \right] G_k(u).$$

Writing \mathbb{E} , \mathbb{V} , and \mathbb{C} for expectation, variance, and covariance, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[H_i] = \frac{m}{m+n},$$

$$\mathbb{V}[H_i] = \frac{m}{m+n} \frac{n}{m+n},$$

and

$$\mathbb{C}[H_i, H_j] = -\frac{1}{m+n-1} \frac{m}{m+n} \frac{n}{m+n}, \quad i \neq j.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[X(u)] = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{C}[X(u), X(v)] \\
&= \frac{1}{mn} \left(\sum_i G_i(u)G_i(v) - \frac{1}{m+n-1} \sum_{i \neq j} G_i(u)G_j(v) \right) \\
&\approx \frac{1}{mn} \left[\sum_i G_i(u)G_i(v) - \frac{1}{m+n} \sum_{i,j} G_i(u)G_j(v) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{mn} \left[\sum_i G_i(u)G_i(v) - (m+n) \left(\frac{1}{m+n} \sum_i G_i(u) \right) \left(\frac{1}{m+n} \sum_j G_j(v) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{mn} \left[\sum_i (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) (G_i(v) - \bar{G}(v)) \right] \\
&=: \Gamma(u, v)
\end{aligned}$$

when $m+n$ is large, where $\bar{G}(u) := \frac{1}{m+n} \sum_k G_k(u)$.

Remark 7.1. *In the case of point placements, with the probability distribution π_k being the point mass at $w_k \in T$ for $1 \leq k \leq m+n$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(u, v) = \frac{1}{mn} \left[\sum_k \#\{k : u \in [\rho, w_k], v \in [\rho, w_k]\} \right. \\
\left. - \frac{1}{m+n} \#\{k : u \in [\rho, w_k]\} \#\{k : v \in [\rho, w_k]\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By a standard central limit theorem for exchangeable random variables, the process X is approximately Gaussian with covariance kernel Γ when $m+n$ is large. A straightforward calculation shows that we may construct a Gaussian process ξ with covariance kernel Γ by taking independent standard Gaussian random variables $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{m+n}$ and setting

$$\xi(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}} \left[\sum_i G_i(u)\eta_i - \frac{1}{m+n} \left(\sum_i G_i(u) \right) \left(\sum_i \eta_i \right) \right].$$

It follows that the distribution of $Z_p(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is approximately that of the random variable

$$(3) \quad \left[\int_T |\xi(u)|^p \lambda(du) \right]^{\frac{1}{p} \wedge 1},$$

One can repeatedly sample the normal random variates η_i and numerically integrate (3) to approximate the distribution of this integral.

There is an even simpler approach for the case $p = 2$. Let μ_k^2 , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and ψ_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, be the positive eigenvalues and corresponding normalized eigenfunctions of the non-negative definite, self-adjoint, compact operator on $L^2(\lambda)$ that maps the function f to the function $\int_T \Gamma(\cdot, v)f(v) \lambda(dv)$. The functions $\mu_k \psi_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, form an orthonormal basis for the reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with Γ and the Gaussian process ξ has the Karhunen-Loève expansion

$$\xi(u) = \sum_k \mu_k \psi_k(u) \eta_k,$$

where η_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, are independent standard Gaussian random variables – see (Jain and Marcus, 1978) for a review of the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and the Karhunen-Loève expansion.

Therefore,

$$\int_T |\xi(u)|^2 \lambda(du) = \sum_k \mu_k^2 \eta_k^2,$$

and the distribution of $Z_2^2(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is approximately that of a certain positive linear combination of independent χ_1^2 random variables.

The eigenvalues of the operator associated with Γ can be found by calculating the eigenvalues of a related matrix as follows. Define an $(m+n) \times (m+n)$ non-negative definite, self-adjoint matrix M given by

$$M_{ij} := \frac{1}{mn} \int_T (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) (G_j(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \lambda(du).$$

Note that if we have point placements at locations $w_k \in T$ for $1 \leq k \leq m+n$ as in Remark 7.1, then

$$M = \frac{1}{mn} \left(I - \frac{1}{m+n} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top \right) N \left(I - \frac{1}{m+n} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top \right),$$

where I is the identity matrix, $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector which has 1 for every entry, and the matrix N has (i, j) entry given by the distance from the root to the “most recent common ancestor” of w_i and w_j .

Suppose that x is an eigenvector of M for the positive eigenvalue ν^2 . Set

$$(4) \quad \psi(u) := \sum_j (G_j(u) - \bar{G}(u)) x_j.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_T \Gamma(u, v) \psi(v) \lambda(dv) \\ &= \frac{1}{mn} \int_T \left[\sum_i (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) (G_i(v) - \bar{G}(v)) \right] \sum_j (G_j(v) - \bar{G}(v)) x_j \lambda(dv) \\ &= \sum_i (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \sum_j M_{ij} x_j \\ &= \sum_i (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \nu^2 x_i \\ &= \nu^2 \psi(u), \end{aligned}$$

and so ψ is an (unnormalized) eigenfunction of the operator on $L^2(\lambda)$ defined by the covariance kernel Γ with eigenvalue ν^2 .

Conversely, suppose that μ^2 is an eigenvalue of the operator with eigenfunction ϕ . Set

$$x_j := \int_T (G_j(v) - \bar{G}(v)) \phi(v) \lambda(dv).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_j M_{ij} x_j \\
&= \sum_j \frac{1}{mn} \int_T (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) (G_j(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \lambda(du) \\
&\quad \times \int_T (G_j(v) - \bar{G}(v)) \phi(v) \lambda(dv) \\
&= \int_T (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \\
&\quad \times \left[\int_T \frac{1}{mn} \sum_j (G_j(u) - \bar{G}(u)) (G_j(v) - \bar{G}(v)) \phi(v) \lambda(dv) \right] \lambda(du) \\
&= \int_T (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \left[\int_T \Gamma(u, v) \phi(v) \lambda(dv) \right] \lambda(du) \\
&= \int_T (G_i(u) - \bar{G}(u)) \mu^2 \phi(u) \lambda(du) \\
&= \mu^2 x_i,
\end{aligned}$$

so that μ^2 is an eigenvalue of M with (unnormalized) eigenvector of x .

It follows that the positive eigenvalues of the operator associated with Γ coincide with those of the matrix M and have the same multiplicities.

However, we don't actually need to compute the eigenvalues of M to implement this approximation. Because M is orthogonally equivalent to a diagonal matrix with the eigenvalues of M on the diagonal, we have from the invariance under orthogonal transformations of the distribution of the random vector $\eta := (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{m+n})^\top$ that $\sum_k \mu_k^2 \eta_k^2$ has the same distribution as $\eta^\top M \eta$. Thus, the distribution of the random variable $Z_2^2(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is approximately that of $\sum_{ij} M_{ij} \eta_i \eta_j$. In the example application of Section 8, this provides a reasonable though not perfect approximation (Figure 3).

One might hope to go even further in the $p = 2$ case and obtain an analytic approximation for the distribution $\sum_k \mu_k^2 \eta_k^2$ or a useful upper bound for its right tail.

It is shown in (Hwang, 1980) that if we order the positive eigenvalues so that $\mu_1^2 \geq \mu_2^2 \geq \dots$ and assume that $\mu_1^2 > \mu_2^2$, then

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_k \mu_k^2 \eta_k^2 \geq r \right\} \sim \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \mu_1 \prod_{k>1} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_k^2}{\mu_1^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{r}{2\mu_1^2} \right),$$

in the sense that the ratio of the two sides converges to one as $r \rightarrow \infty$. It is not clear what the rate of convergence is in this result and it appears to require a detailed knowledge of the spectrum of the matrix M to apply it.

Gaussian concentration inequalities such as Borell's inequality (see, for example, Section 4.3 of (Bogachev, 1998)) give bounds on the right tail that only require a knowledge of $\mathbb{E}[(\sum_k \mu_k^2 \eta_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$ and μ_1^2 , but these bounds are far too conservative for the example in Section 8.

There is a substantial literature on various series expansions of densities of positive linear combinations of independent χ_1^2 random variables. Some representative papers are (Robbins and Pitman, 1949; Gurland, 1955; Pachares, 1955; Ruben,

1962; Kotz et al., 1967; Gideon and Gurland, 1976). However, it seems that applying such results would also require a detailed knowledge of the spectrum of the matrix M as well as a certain amount of additional computation to obtain the coefficients in the expansion and then to integrate the resulting densities, and this may not be warranted given the relative ease with which it is possible to repeatedly simulate the random variable $\eta^\top M \eta$.

8. EXAMPLE APPLICATION

To demonstrate the use of the Z_p metric in an example application, we investigated variation in expression levels for the *psbA* gene for an experiment in the Sargasso Sea (Vila-Costa et al., 2010). Metatranscriptomic data was downloaded from the CAMERA website (<http://camera.calit2.net/>), and a *psbA* alignment was supplied by Robin Kodner. Searching and alignment was performed using HMMER (Eddy, 1998), a reference tree was inferred using RAxML (Stamatakis, 2006), and phylogenetic placement was performed using pplacer (Matsen et al., 2010). Although not yet formally released software, the code used to calculate the KR metrics is available at <http://github.com/matsen/mokaphy>.

Visual inspection of the trees fattened by number of placements showed the same overall pattern with some minor differences (Figure 1 and 2). Application of the KR metric revealed a significant difference between the two samples. The value of the Z_1 for this example (using spread placements) was 0.006601; this is far out on the tail of the distribution (Figure 3), and is in fact larger than any of the 1000 replicates generated via shuffling or the Gaussian-based approximation.

Such a low p-value prompts the question of whether the center of mass of the two distributions is radically different in the two samples. In this case, the answer is no, as the two barycenters are quite close together (Figure 4). However, this small difference is highly significant (Figure 5).

These observations of significance beg the question of if a method not using mass-transport ideas would be able to detect such differences. We observe that the density plot of the distributions of pairwise distances (Figure 6) does not reveal an obvious difference in the pairwise distances.

It was not intuitively obvious to us how varying p would affect the distribution of the Z_p distance under the null hypothesis of no clustering. To investigate this question, we plotted the observed distance along with boxplots of the null distribution for a collection of different p (Figure 7). It is apparent that there is a consistent conclusion over a wide range of values of p .

One can also visualize the difference between the two samples by drawing the tree such that the branch thicknesses represent the minimal amount of “mass” which flows through that edge in the optimal transport of mass implicit in the computation of $Z_1(P, Q)$ (Figure 8). The color of the edge represents the sign of the movement.

9. CONCLUSION

As sequencing becomes faster and less expensive, it will become increasingly common to have a collection of large data sets for a given gene. Phylogenetic placement can furnish an evolutionary context for query sequences, resulting in each data set being represented as a probability distribution on a phylogenetic tree. The Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric is a natural means to compare those

probability distributions. In this paper we showed that the UniFrac metric is the phylogenetic Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric for point placements. We explored Zolotarev-type generalizations of the KR metric, showed how to approximate the limiting distribution and made connections with the analysis of variance in the $p = 2$ case.

The phylogenetic KR metric and its generalizations can be used any time one wants to compare two probability distributions on a tree. However, our software implementation is designed with metagenomic and metatranscriptomic investigations in mind; for this reason it is tightly integrated with the phylogenetic placement software pplacer (Matsen et al., 2010). With more than two samples, techniques such as principal components analysis could be applied to the pairwise distances to cluster environments based on the KR distances as has been done with UniFrac (Lozupone and Knight, 2005; Lozupone et al., 2008; Hamady et al., 2009). In a large scale metagenomic analysis with several genes, the KR and related metrics could be used to scan for “discriminating” genes, i.e. genes whose frequency differs between environments. Further work will also combine information from a large collection of genes to deliver a comparative method on the level of metagenomes.

One potential future extension not explored here is to partition the tree into subsets in a principal components fashion for a single data set. Recall that (4) gives a formula for the eigenfunctions of the covariance kernel Γ given the eigenvectors of M . For any k , one could partition the tree into subsets based on the sign of the product of the first k eigenfunctions, which would be analogous to partitioning Euclidean space by the hyperplanes associated with the first k eigenvectors in traditional principal components analysis.

Future methods will also need to take details of the DNA extraction procedure into account. Recent work shows that current lab methodology is unable to recover absolute mixture proportions due to differential ease of DNA extraction between organisms (Morgan et al., 2010). However, relative abundance between samples for a given organism with a fixed laboratory protocol potentially can be measured, assuming consistent DNA extraction protocols are used. An important next step is to incorporate such organism-specific biases into the sort of analysis described here.

10. TABLES AND FIGURES




FIGURE 1. Tree with branches thickened as a linear function of the number of placements in the control sample placed on that edge.




FIGURE 2. Tree as in Figure 1 but for the DMSP-treated sample.




FIGURE 3. Comparison of the distribution of Z_1 and Z_2 distances obtained by shuffling, Gaussian approximation, and the observed value (marked with x) for the example data set.




FIGURE 4. Dendrogram with barycenters marked. Circle is the control sample, and star is the sample treated with DMSP.




FIGURE 5. Comparison of the distance between the barycenters obtained by shuffling and the observed value (marked with x) for the example data set.




FIGURE 6. Density plot of the distribution of pairwise distances for the sample data sets.




FIGURE 7. Plot showing sample (point) and randomized ranges (box-and-whisker). Outliers eliminated for clarity. For each p , the distribution was rescaled by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation.




FIGURE 8. A tree displaying the optimal movement of mass for the KR metric. When moving from the first probability distribution to the second, edges marked in gray have mass moving towards the root, while those marked in black have mass moving towards the leaves. Thickness shows the quantity of mass moving through that edge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Robin Kodner for her *psbA* alignment, to the Armbrust lab for advice and for the use of their computing cluster, to Mary Ann Moran and her lab for allowing us to use her metagenomic sample from the DMSP experiment, and to David Donoho for a helpful suggestion.

REFERENCES

- Åkerberg, Ö., B. Sennblad, L. Arvestad, and J. Lagergren (2009). Simultaneous Bayesian gene tree reconstruction and reconciliation analysis. *PNAS* 106(14), 5714.
- Ambrosio, L., N. Gigli, and G. Savaré (2008). *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures* (Second ed.). Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag.
- Baker, B. and J. Banfield (2003). Microbial communities in acid mine drainage. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 44(2), 139–152.
- Berger, S. and A. Stamatakis (2010). Evolutionary Placement of Short Sequence Reads. Submitted to *Sys. Biol.*; <http://arxiv.org/abs/0911.2852>.
- Berglund-Sonnhammer, A., P. Steffansson, M. Betts, and D. Liberles (2006). Optimal gene trees from sequences and species trees using a soft interpretation of parsimony. *J. Mol. Evol.* 63(2), 240–250.
- Bik, E., P. Eckburg, S. Gill, K. Nelson, E. Purdom, F. Francois, G. Perez-Perez, M. Blaser, and D. Relman (2006). Molecular analysis of the bacterial microbiota in the human stomach. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103(3), 732.
- Billera, L., S. Holmes, and K. Vogtmann (2001). Geometry of the space of phylogenetic trees. *Adv. Appl. Math.* 27(4), 733–767.
- Bogachev, V. I. (1998). *Gaussian measures*, Volume 62 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
- Bridson, M. R. and A. Haefliger (1999). *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Volume 319 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Burago, D., Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov (2001). *A course in metric geometry*, Volume 33 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
- Caporaso, J., J. Kuczynski, J. Stombaugh, K. Bittinger, F. Bushman, E. Costello, N. Fierer, A. Peña, J. Goodrich, J. Gordon, et al. (2010). QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nature methods* 7(5), 335–336.
- Chen, K., D. Durand, and M. Farach-Colton (2000). NOTUNG: a program for dating gene duplications and optimizing gene family trees. *J. Comp. Biol.* 7(3–4), 429–447.
- Desnues, C., B. Rodriguez-Brito, S. Rayhawk, S. Kelley, T. Tran, M. Haynes, H. Liu, M. Furlan, L. Wegley, B. Chau, et al. (2008). Biodiversity and biogeography of phages in modern stromatolites and thrombolites. *Nature* 452(7185), 340–343.
- Eddy, S. (1998). Profile hidden Markov models. *Bioinformatics* 14(9), 755–763.
- Edgington, E. S. and P. Onghena (2007). *Randomization tests* (Fourth ed.). Statistics: Textbooks and Monographs. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL. With 1 CD-ROM (Windows).

- Ethier, S. N. and T. G. Kurtz (1986). *Markov processes: Characterization and convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Faith, D., C. Lozupone, D. Nipperess, and R. Knight (2009). The Cladistic Basis for the Phylogenetic Diversity (PD) Measure Links Evolutionary Features to Environmental Gradients and Supports Broad Applications of Microbial Ecology's" Phylogenetic Beta Diversity" Framework. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 10(11), 4723.
- Felsenstein, J. (2004). *Inferring Phylogenies*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Press.
- Fierer, N., M. Hamady, C. Lauber, and R. Knight (2008). The influence of sex, handedness, and washing on the diversity of hand surface bacteria. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105(46), 17994.
- Fisher, R. A. (1935). *The Design of Experiment*. Hafner, New York.
- Frank, D., A. St Amand, R. Feldman, E. Boedeker, N. Harpaz, and N. Pace (2007). Molecular-phylogenetic characterization of microbial community imbalances in human inflammatory bowel diseases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104(34), 13780.
- Gideon, R. A. and J. Gurland (1976). Series expansions for quadratic forms in normal variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 71(353), 227–232.
- Gill, S., M. Pop, R. DeBoy, P. Eckburg, P. Turnbaugh, B. Samuel, J. Gordon, D. Relman, C. Fraser-Liggett, and K. Nelson (2006). Metagenomic analysis of the human distal gut microbiome. *Science* 312(5778), 1355–1359.
- Good, P. (2005). *Permutation, parametric and bootstrap tests of hypotheses* (Third ed.). Springer Series in Statistics. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Gurland, J. (1955). Distribution of definite and of indefinite quadratic forms. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 26, 122–127.
- Hamady, M., C. Lozupone, and R. Knight (2009). Fast UniFrac: facilitating high-throughput phylogenetic analyses of microbial communities including analysis of pyrosequencing and PhyloChip data. *ISME-J* 4(1), 17–27.
- Hartman, A., S. Riddle, T. McPhillips, B. Ludaescher, and J. Eisen (2010). WATERS: a Workflow for the Alignment, Taxonomy, and Ecology of Ribosomal Sequences. *BMC Bioinformatics* 11(1), 317.
- Hwang, C.-R. (1980). Gaussian measure of large balls in a Hilbert space. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 78(1), 107–110.
- Jain, N. C. and M. B. Marcus (1978). Continuity of sub-Gaussian processes. In *Probability on Banach spaces*, Volume 4 of *Adv. Probab. Related Topics*, pp. 81–196. New York: Dekker.
- Kosakovsky Pond, S., K. Scheffler, M. Gravenor, A. Poon, and S. Frost (2010). Evolutionary Fingerprinting of Genes. *Molecular biology and evolution* 27(3), 520.
- Kotz, S., N. L. Johnson, and D. W. Boyd (1967). Series representations of distributions of quadratic forms in normal variables. I. Central case. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 38, 823–837.
- Lozupone, C., M. Hamady, B. Cantarel, P. Coutinho, B. Henrissat, J. Gordon, and R. Knight (2008). The convergence of carbohydrate active gene repertoires in human gut microbes. *PNAS* 105(39), 15076.
- Lozupone, C., M. Hamady, S. Kelley, and R. Knight (2007). Quantitative and qualitative {beta} diversity measures lead to different insights into factors that

- structure microbial communities. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 73(5), 1576.
- Lozupone, C. and R. Knight (2005). UniFrac: a new phylogenetic method for comparing microbial communities. *Appl. environ. microbiol.* 71(12), 8228.
- Matsen, F. A., R. B. Kodner, and E. V. Armbrust (2010). pplacer: linear time maximum-likelihood and bayesian phylogenetic placement of sequences onto a fixed reference tree. Accepted to *BMC Bioinfo.*
- Monier, A., J. Claverie, and H. Ogata (2008). Taxonomic distribution of large DNA viruses in the sea. *Genome Biol.* 9(7), R106.
- Morgan, J., A. Darling, and J. Eisen (2010). Metagenomic sequencing of an in vitro-simulated microbial community. *PLoS ONE* 5(4), e10209. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010209.
- Pachares, J. (1955). Note on the distribution of a definite quadratic form. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 26, 128–131.
- Pitman, E. (1937a). Significance tests which may be applied to samples from any population. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 4, 119–130.
- Pitman, E. (1937b). Significance tests which may be applied to samples from any population. II. The correlation coefficient test. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 4, 225–232.
- Pitman, E. (1938). Significance tests which may be applied to samples from any population. III. The analysis of variance test. *Biometrika* 29, 322–335.
- Purdom, E. (2008). Analyzing data with graphs: Metagenomic data and the phylogenetic tree.
- Rachev, S. T. (1991). *Probability metrics and the stability of stochastic models.* Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Applied Probability and Statistics. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Rachev, S. T. and L. Rüschendorf (1998). *Mass transportation problems. Vol. I. Probability and its Applications* (New York). New York: Springer-Verlag. Theory.
- Rawls, J., M. Mahowald, R. Ley, and J. Gordon (2006). Reciprocal gut microbiota transplants from zebrafish and mice to germ-free recipients reveal host habitat selection. *Cell* 127(2), 423–433.
- Rintala, H., M. Pitkäranta, M. Toivola, L. Paulin, and A. Nevalainen (2008). Diversity and seasonal dynamics of bacterial community in indoor environment. *BMC microbiology* 8(1), 56.
- Robbins, H. and E. J. G. Pitman (1949). Application of the method of mixtures to quadratic forms in normal variates. *Ann. Math. Statistics* 20, 552–560.
- Ruben, H. (1962). Probability content of regions under spherical normal distributions. IV. The distribution of homogeneous and non-homogeneous quadratic functions of normal variables. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 33, 542–570.
- Schloss, P. and J. Handelsman (2006). Introducing TreeClimber, a test to compare microbial community structures. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 72(4), 2379.
- Schloss, P., S. Westcott, T. Ryabin, J. Hall, M. Hartmann, E. Hollister, R. Lesniewski, B. Oakley, D. Parks, C. Robinson, et al. (2009). Introducing mothur: open-source, platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 75(23), 7537.

- Slatkin, M. and W. P. Maddison (1989). A cladistic measure of gene flow inferred from the phylogenies of alleles. *Genetics* 123(3), 603–613.
- Stamatakis, A. (2006). RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 22(21), 2688.
- Vila-Costa, M., J. M. Rinta-Kanto, S. Sun, S. Sharma, R. Poretsky, and M. A. Moran (2010). Transcriptomic analysis of a marine bacterial community enriched with dimethylsulfoniopropionate (dmSP). *ISME-J*. In press.
- Villani, C. (2003). *Topics in optimal transportation*, Volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
- Villani, C. (2009). *Optimal transport*, Volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. Old and new.
- Von Mering, C., P. Hugenholtz, J. Raes, S. Tringe, T. Doerks, L. Jensen, N. Ward, and P. Bork (2007). Quantitative phylogenetic assessment of microbial communities in diverse environments. *Science* 315(5815), 1126.
E-mail address: evans@stat.berkeley.edu

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 367 EVANS HALL #3860 BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860

E-mail address: matsen@fhcrc.org

PROGRAM IN COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY, FRED HUTCHINSON CANCER RESEARCH CENTER, 1100 FAIRVIEW AVE. N. M1-B514, P.O. BOX 19024, SEATTLE, WA 98109-1024