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#### Abstract

As science progresses, the need for analyzing multivariate data sets is growing by the minute. Multiple disciplines, either scientific or not, require the examination of large amounts of data, in a short period of time, in order to obtain useful information. During the recent few decades, multivariate statistical analysis methods have been developed, aiming to satisfy such purposes.

This dissertation deals with the implementation of multivariate data analysis methods on a given data set, derived from oil family affiliations, which originate from Williston Basin of North America. In particular, Hierarchical Clustering, k-means and Principal Component analysis have been applied on four independent models, in an attempt to extract information regarding the oil-oil correlations among the samples under study. The models used on the exploration of the compositional information were the Saturated Fraction Compositional Model, the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model, the Gasoline Range Compositional Model and the Biomarkers Compositional Model.

These standard statistical methods were found to be quite insufficient in classifying the sample set into distinct familial affiliations. For this reason, the need to examine the nature of the data set arose. Compositional data represent a category on their own as they are characterized by specific numerical properties which present significant consequences when being analyzed by standard multivariate techniques. The analysis of such type of data represents a whole new chapter in the world of statistics and the need for further examination on this matter is constantly growing.
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## 1. Introduction

Over the last decades an overwhelming amount of data is poured into our lives and obtaining meaningful information out if them is an imperative task for people. Multiple disciplines such as chemistry, biology, medicine etc. demand the analysis of huge amounts of data and sometimes their multivariate nature makes it difficult to analyze. For this reason, special statistical techniques have been developed in order to process information in a meaningful fashion.

In this project, multivariate clustering methods have been implemented on geochemical data concerning oil family affiliations that exist in Williston Basin, North America, in order to explore the oil-oil correlations. The methods which have been utilized consider both Supervised and Unsupervised learning phases. These include Hierarchical Clustering, k-means clustering, as well as Principal Component Analysis. The ultimate goal of this project is to test how well such multivariate analysis methods perform, as far as classification of the compositional data is concerned

The thesis project is organized into seven chapters. In Chapter 2 a detailed description of the geological setting of Williston Basin is presented. The stratigraphy and the tectonic regime are thoroughly described and special focus is placed upon the geochemical classification of oil families which have been recognized in the area.

Chapter 3 raises the subject of Multivariate Data Analysis (MDA). It provides a brief presentation of the principles of Hierarchical Clustering, $k$-means clustering as well as Principal component analysis. All the main concepts that characterize each method are included.

In Chapter 4 we discuss the matter of the existing Family Affiliations of Williston Basin. In this chapter, there is an attempt to test the criteria under which the classification of the oil families was determined.

Chapter 5 deals with the application of multivariate data analysis methods on two different models; the Saturated Fraction Component Model and the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model. All MDA methods were implemented on both models and the results are discussed briefly.

In the final Chapter (6) the subject of Compositional Data, as a special type of data, is introduced. In this chapter, we analyze the properties of Compositional Data as well as the methodology with which, such kind of data should be treated.

## 2. Geological Setting of Williston Basin

The Williston Basin is an intracratonic, sub-circular sag basin that comprises main part of the North American craton. In particular, it forms a large depression in the western edge of the Canadian shield, occupying much of North Dakota, northwestern South Dakota, the eastern quarter of Montana, a significant part of southern Saskatchewan, and a portion of southwestern Manitoba. Among these regions major production of oil and gas occurs. Williston Basin is characterized by Phanerozoic, carbonate and clastic sedimentation of more than $16,000 \mathrm{ft}$ strata thickness in its central part, near Watford City, North Dakota [1, 2]. Having undergone episodic and prolonged subsidence rates, it comprises a preservational basin and it is composed by six major depositional sequences, each bounded by larger structural features [2, 3, 4] (Fig. 1). The basin is neither considered structurally complex nor tectonically active and its well -established petroleum provinces, clearly described rock succession, modest burial history and simple tectonics make this an uncomplicated area to study.


Fig. 1 Location map showing the main geological and geophysical elements of Williston Basin and environs. The region of anomalous subsidence that is Williston Basin proper (Ahern and Mrkvicka, 1984) is generally coincident with the 1 km depth contour on Carboniferous strata. The region of preserved Middle Devonian Prairie Formation salt deposited in Elk Point Basin is illustrated. The inset shows the location of Williston Basin and the extent of Elk Point Basin. Samples from petroleum pools entrapped at the subcrop of the upper Paleozoic succession in southeastern Saskatchewan and southwestern Manitoba, as well as American samples constitute the sample set for this study (following Burrus et al., 1996a).

Williston Basin is discretized into the American and the Canadian portions. The American portion of the basin is influenced by major deformational features, mainly anticlines (Fig. 2). The Canadian part of Williston Basin forms a petroleum province where oil production is quite active. Petroleum accumulations mainly occur in stratigraphic traps within the Phanerozoic succession [5]. There is, however, variety of trapping features which are structurally linked to Precambrian basement [6, 1, 7]. In southwestern Manitoba and southeastern Saskatchewan, oil exists around the Mississippian subcrop. In southwestern and west-central Saskatchewan, oil exists in stratigraphic traps within latest Devonian to Mississippian, Jurassic, and Lower Cretaceous formations.


Fig. 2 Petroleum region and crucial tectonic elements in the Williston Basin and adjacent area. Only generalized outlines of the Mississippian Madison Group Subcrop Petroleum Province and other Williston Basin petroleum provinces are indicated.

### 2.1 Stratigraphy of Williston Basin

The Williston Basin forms a large, roughly circular depression on the North American Craton. Its sedimentology is characterized by Paleozoic and Cenozoic - Mesozoic carbonate and clastic deposition, accordingly with a thickness of strata that exceeds $16,000 \mathrm{ft}$ in the basin's core (Fig. 3).


Fig. 3 Contour map pf Williston Basin presenting the thickness of sediments. Contour interval is 1,000 ft. [8]
There are six main depositional sequences, each bounded by major unconformities [3], which can be distinguished within the Phanerozoic succession of North American portion of the basin. The formulation of unconformities resulted in numerous processes affecting its final structure, such as primary and secondary dissolution, deposition of salt and anhydrite beds, and secondary dolomitization of limestone. Clastic deposition initiated in Mesozoic and Cenozoic Eras, including mudstone, sandstone, siltstone, coal and shale. All depositional sequences are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

## Sauk Sequence (Middle Cambrian - Lower Ordovician)

The Sauk sequence was deposited on the early Paleozoic miogeocline of western North America [7, 9], and is composed of Upper Precambrian sediments, interrupted by minor transgressions and regressions, which create several sub-members within the formation [10]. Saul deposition, mainly represented by Deadwood formation, includes shallow marine, coastal and alluvial plain sediments along with sandstone, mudstone and siltstone successions and finalizes due to the activity of an unconformity.

## Tippecanoe Sequence (Ordovician - Silurian)

The Tippecanoe sequence marks the beginning of Ordovician clastic, carbonate and evaporitic sedimentation. From bottom to top, it consists of Winnipeg, Red River, Stony Mountain and Stonewall Formations, each unconformably overlying the other (Fig. 4). Upper Ordovician
rocks of this sequence contain important petroleum sources. Depositional processes terminate at the end of the Silurian due to major regression activity.


Fig. 4 Diagram showing geologic time scale, major stratigraphic sequences of [3], first- and second order sea level curves from [11], and ages of petroleum source and reservoir rocks in the Williston Basin. Solid black interval in source rock column are for thick accumulations; thin lines indicate association with carbonate depositional cycles. In reservoir rock column, green is for oil and red is for gas; thin lines indicate generalized reservoir rock and do not necessarily represent the full spectrum of possible reservoirs. E, Early; M, Middle; L, Late; Pal, Paleocene; Eoc, Eocen; Olig, Oligocene; Mio, Miocene; Plio, Pliocene (following Lawrence , et al., 2013).

## Kaskaskia Sequence (Devonian - Mississippian)

The Kaskaskia sedimentation cycle initiated in Ordovician, continued to Jurassic and concluded due to transgressional activity. Three main transgressional events impacted on the depositional history of the sequence, during which several formations were deposited. The most significant is the Bakken Formation which represents the first major input of clastic material into the Williston Basin since the Cambrian Deadwood and Winnipeg Formations. Bakken marks a change in Kaskaskia sequence depositional patterns and sedimentation style $[12,13]$ and it is the most important interval for petroleum source rocks in the Williston Basin. In general, the Kaskaskia Sequence is stratigraphically characterized by subtidal, intertidal and rare supratidal depositional environments.

## Absaroka Sequence (Pennsylvanian - Triassic)

The Absaroka Sequence includes the Tyler and the Minnesula formations and mainly occurs in the American portion of the Williston Basin. It is vastly affected by major unconformities, occurring near the end of Pennsylvanian, Permian and Triassic [14] and contains effective oil source rocks $[15,16]$.

## Zuni Sequence (Jurassic - Early Tertiary [Eocene])

Two major transgressional events influenced the depositional history of the Zuni Sequence, which is characterized by shallow marine and clastic sediments. Sedimentation terminated during early Paleocene and the sands of the Dakota Group are likely the most significant targets for sequestration in the Zuni Sequence. This sequence can be locally subdivided into
two other sequences. The first includes the Jurassic, when Williston Basin changed from a large reentrant on the craton margin into an orogenic foreland [17, 18]. The lower sequence contains a time equivalent succession to the last cratonically derived miogeoclinal succession.

## Tejas Sequence (Tertiary - Quaternary)

Latest Jurassic and Cretaceous successions of the Columbian and Laramide orogenic forelands [19] form the final significant depositional episode [20,21]. Thick shales of this final sequence include significant probable source rocks, but they are all immature in the Canadian Williston Basin. The first produced hydrocarbons in North Dakota were from the youngest strata in the state, glacial drift of the Tejas Sequence. However, there is no production from glacial drift today.

### 2.2 Tectonic Regime of Williston Basin

In order to understand the Williston Basin's evolution, structural configuration, sedimentation, and thermal patterns, one must refer to the geological history of the Precambrian basement underlying the basin.

Two critical structures have influenced the evolution of the basin; the Trans-Hudson orogenic belt [22] and the northeast-southwest trending Proterozoic lineament and structural zones
[23]. The Trans-Hudson belt sutured the Archean Superior craton to the Archean Wyoming craton (Fig. 5A, B); the resulting collision created a north-south trending strike-slip fault and shear belt. A basin center was created, caused in part by later folding of the Trans-Hudson orogenic belt and rifting [24], although Nelson et al., [25] stated that there is a lack of direct evidence of a rift.

The northeast-southwest trending Proterozoic lineament and structural zones were renamed as the Transcontinental arch, Brockton-Froid fault zone, Great Falls tectonic zone, Poplar fault, and Hinsdale fault. These Precambrian structures were reactivated during the Neoproterozoic, which resulted in the creation of new north-south and northwest-southeast trending structures.


Fig. 5 Precambrian structural configuration of the Williston Basin and surrounding area. A: Tectonic map of the northern Great Plains region [23] showing northeast-southwest strike slip faults; Williston Basin province outline is shown for scale. Ga, billion years ago. B: Map showing the configuration of Trans-Hudson orogenic belt and associated north-south trending structures of the Williston Basin (modified Nelson et al., 1993).

Numerous studies have shown that surface lineament patterns in the Northern Great Plains region, including the Williston Basin, are a result of the aforementioned reactivation of Precambrian faults during the Phanerozoic [26, 27, 28, 29]. These studies show pervasive northeast-southwest and northwest-southeast trends that are parallel to major lineaments of Proterozoic terrane. North-south trending lineaments that are parallel to the Trans-Hudson structural system are less prominent, although north-south thermal patterns are evident from present-day subsurface temperature measurements.

Based on several observations, it is believed that Precambrian tectonic events and their recurrent movement along preexisting zones of weakness played a major role in the development of most of the major fault and shear systems in the Williston Basin. Although the basin is generally reported as a depression and tectonically inactive, its final structure is thought to be mostly formed as a result of structural deformation and down-to-the-basin block faulting from Precambrian rooted structures, as well as from deformation related to the Trans-Hudson orogenic belt.

### 2.3 Geochemical Classification of Oil Families in Williston Basin

Classification of oil families in the Canadian portion of the Williston Basin has been attempted by a number of investigators over the past decades. Dow and Williams, in their 1974 papers,
were the first researchers to apply the 'petroleum system' concept, identifying three oil systems in the Williston Basin, relying mainly on stable isotopic and gasoline range hydrocarbon composition: Tyler, Bakken, and Winnipeg [15, 16]. Each oil system is associated with a unique oil type. Type I refers to Ordovician and Silurian oils which originate from Middle Ordovician Winnipeg shale sources. Type II oils occur in Upper Devonian, Mississippian and Mesozoic reservoirs, and are probably linked to Fammenian - Tournaisian Bakken Formation Source rocks. Type III refers to Pennsylvanian oils which originate from Tyler Formation source rocks.

Most recent studies, however, have defined at least nine oil systems in the area. Zumberge [30] and Leenheer and Zumberge [31] defined five oil families based on the study of samples from the American part of the Williston Basin, while, Osadetz et al., [32] categorized oils from the Canadian part of the Basin (southeastern Saskatchewan and southwestern Manitoba) into four compositional families (Table 1). The criteria under which the classification of the latter was conducted, include pristane/phytane ( $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ) ratio, n-alkane predominance, $\mathrm{C}_{23}$ tricyclic/ $C_{30}$ pentacyclic terpane ratio and prominence amongst extended hopanes.

In particular, Family A oils occur in Ordovician to Middle Devonian and Upper Ordovician formations and match solvent extracts from kukersites (marine Type I rocks) of the Late Ordovician Binghorn Group [32, 33], rather than, as initially suggested, extracts from Winnipeg shales [15, 16]. Oils of this family present diagnostic saturate fraction gas chromatograms (SFGC), low $\mathrm{C}_{23}$ tricyclic/ $\mathrm{C}_{30}$ pentacyclic terpane ratios ( $<0.20$ ) and a strong $\mathrm{C}_{34}$ hopane prominence. They can be further subdivided into a group distinguished by low $\operatorname{Pr}$ and Ph , relative to faster eluting n -alkanes $\mathrm{nC}_{17}$ and $\mathrm{nC}_{18}$, a strong odd-even predominance among n -alkanes between $\mathrm{C}_{15}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{20}$, and a low relative abundance in higher carbon number n alkane homologues [34].

Family B oils primarily occur in Bakken reservoirs [32,35,33], they are however, also found in early Cretaceous reservoirs. They are sourced from Type II marine organic matter in the Upper Devonian-Mississippian Bakken Formation shale members. Main characteristic of this family is that it displays the highest $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}(>1.50)$ and $\mathrm{C}_{23} / \mathrm{C}_{30}(>0.80)$ ratios, accompanying n -alkane and hopane profiles, without any predominance and prominence respectively.

Table 1 Table showing all groups and oil families, in correlation with the according formations, present in Williston Basin (modified by Osadetz, 1994)

| Williams, 1974 Lum | Zumberge, 1983; <br> Leeheer and Zumberge, 1987 | Osadetz et al., 1992, 1994 | Source rocks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type III <br> (Pennsylvanian oils) not studied | Not studied | Not studied | Tyler Fm. (Pennsyl.) |
|  |  | Family E (Bakken oils) | Exshaw/Bakken Fm. (U. Dev.-Miss.) |
| Type II <br> (Devonian, Mississippian <br> \& Mesozoic oils) | Group 2 <br> (Mission Canyon oils) | Family B (Bakken oils) | Bakken Fm. (U.Dev.-Miss.) |
|  |  | Family C <br> (Miss. \& Jurassic oils) | Lodgepole Fm. (L. Miss.) |
| Not studied | Group 4 <br> (Nisku oils) <br> Group 3 <br> (Duperow oils) | Family D <br> (Winnipegosis oils) | Winnipegosis Fm. (M.Dev.) |
| Type 1 <br> (Ordovician-Silurian oils) | Group 1 <br> (Red River oils) <br> Group 5 <br> (Cambrian oil) | Family A <br> (Red River oils) <br> Not studied | Winnipeg Gr. (M. Ord.) and Bighorn Gr. (U.Ord.) unknown (?U.Cam.-Ord) |

Family C oils occur the Mississippian Madison Group and Mesozoic formations and are sourced from Type II marine rocks in the Mississipian Lodgepole formation. They present high $\mathrm{C}_{23} / \mathrm{C}_{30}$ (>0.20) ratio but, compared to Bakken sources, lower $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratio ( $<1.1$ ), a pronounced ( $>\mathrm{nC}_{20}$ ) even n -alkane predominance and a strong $\mathrm{C}_{35}$ prominence.

Finally, Family D oils occur in Silurian to Mississippian sediments. They originate from Middle Devonian Winnipegosis Formation marine rocks, which vary in terms of depositional background. In particular, there are two kinds of settings; the platform depositional and starved basinal. Family D oils display similar terpane compositional characteristics to kukersite derived oils (abundant Pr, Ph and generally complex SFGCs ), they differ however, in that they present greater relative acyclic isoprenoid and higher carbon n-alkane abundance. Oils of $D$ Family, are further discretized into $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ platformal and $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ starved basinal, based on $\mathrm{nC}_{17} / \mathrm{Pr}$ and $\mathrm{nC18} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratios. They display higher nC17/Pr ratios for a given nC18/Ph ratio compared to otherwise similar oils that occur in overlying Saskatchewan and Manitoba groups' strata, and they belong to the Elk Point Group of Winnipegosis reef formulations. Group $D_{1}$ predominantly occurs in younger Devonian reservoirs, lacking however, clear source definition. Suggested possible source rocks are thin organic-rich beds in Winnipegosis platform carbonates, the Birdbear Formation, and some Upper Devonian rocks. Group $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ occurs in pinnacle reefs of the Middle Devonian Winnipegosis Formation and the Brightholme Member comprises the source rock. Oils having similar molecular compositions to $D_{2}$ oils have been found in the Upper Cambrian Deadwood Formation, Silurian pools of the Nesson Anticline, and new discoveries in the Middle Ordovician Winnipeg Formation. They have, however, very different isotopic compositions of carbon and sulphur, suggesting that a stillundescribed petroleum system exists in Paleozoic strata [36]. Family D oils correlate to Groups 3,4 , and 5 of Leenheer and Zumberge [31].

As previously mentioned, the compositional classification of the Williston Basin petroleum, relied much on terpane, sterane, and select $n$ - and iso- alkane characteristics. The original classification by Williams [16], however, took into consideration the gasoline range fraction
(GRH) and later studies, based on that scheme, came to agree that families A - D and families B - C were inseparable and consistent with oil Types I and II [37]. Most recent work, depends on multivariate statistical methods, such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA), combined with geological information, in an attempt to enhance the independent interpretation of GRH and SFH fractions [32, 38]. Findings show that, while Family A oils can be uniquely classified, oils from Families B, C and D present insufficient characteristics for independent classification. Especially the composition of Family C seems to be quite heterogenous, often overlapping with families B and D [39].

This is attributed to the mixing of oils derived from different sources, without however, the extent to which this process occurs, having been defined [38]. A characteristic example of that mixing is the relative effectiveness of Bakken and Lodgepole petroleum systems [40, 41]. While part of the scientific community suggests that mixing is rare in the American portion of the basin [42, 43, 44], there is another part, proposing that major mixing is possible, without an impact on the biomarker traits $[45,46]$. What is to account for the inability to precisely define the extend of mixing sources, is either the neglection of current interpretive techniques or the semi-quantitative confirmation of the biomarker based classification in the GRH and SFH [34, 39].

## 3. Exploratory Data Analysis

Analysis of Data (DA) constitutes the science of collecting, organizing and examining raw data under the purpose of obtaining useful and usable information for decision-making by users. The analysis may describe and summarize the data, identify relationships among variables, compare and identify differences between them as well as forecast outcomes. Data analytics is distinguished from data mining, which is a particular data analysis technique, by the scope, purpose and focus of the analysis. The target of Data Mining is rather predictive than descriptive. Data miners sort through huge data sets using sophisticated software to identify undiscovered patterns and establish hidden relationships. Data analytics focuses on inference, the process of deriving a conclusion based solely on what is already known by the researcher. Statistician John Turkey defined the term "Data Analysis" in 1961 as: "Procedures for analyzing data, techniques for interpreting the results of such procedures, ways of planning the gathering of data to make its analysis easier, more precise or more accurate, and all the machinery and results of (mathematical) statistics which apply to analyzing data."

Turkey [47] distinguished in Data Analysis techniques and procedures, two major groups: Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA) and Confirmatory Data Analysis (CDA). In EDA analysts make a few assumptions under the purpose of suggesting hypotheses and according to Turkey it is a rather detective work. In contrast, CDA "quantifies the extent to which deviations from a model could be expected to occur by chance" [48]. Confirmatory Data Analysis utilizes the traditional statistical tools of inference, significance, and confidence.

As a scientific tool, DA can be further subdivided in alternate groups. Therefore, based on the quantity of variables examined, Data Analysis can be dichotomized into Univariate (UDA) and Multivariate (MDA). Univariate data analysis is conducted when one variable is used for one observation. Subsequently, it makes sense to state that Multivariate data analysis is used when more than one outcome variables are measured and it is concerned with the study of association among sets of measurements. It is referred to as any statistical technique used to analyze data that arises from more than one variable.

### 3.1 Multivariate Data Analysis (MDA)

This project will focus on MDA techniques that will be implemented on the given data set and the outcomes will be examined thoroughly. Multivariate Data Analysis can fall into two phases: Unsupervised learning and Supervised learning. The goal of unsupervised learning is the detection of hidden structure in unlabeled data and encompasses many techniques that seek to summarize and explain key features of the data (i.e. Clustering Analysis, PCA). Supervised learning is a task of inferring a function from labeled training data. Each example on training data is a pair consisting of an input object (typically a vector) and a desired output value (i.e. Classification Analysis). In general, supervised methods are used when the aim is the construction of a model to be used to classify future samples [49].

There are several clustering techniques established by the scientific community, all governed by some kind of taxonomy [50,51]. A major distinction among them involves the Hierarchical and the Partitional approaches, which are based on whether the set of produced clusters is nested or unnested. A Hierarchical clustering leads to a set of nested clusters that are
organized as a tree, whereas a Partitional clustering formulates a division of the set of data objects into non-overlapping subsets (clusters) such that each data object is in exactly one subset. Characteristic examples of algorithms derived from the aforementioned approaches are agglomerative or divisive, deterministic or stochastic, incremental or non-incremental, monothetic or polythetic and hard or fuzzy [51].

### 3.1.1 Hierarchical Clustering

Hierarchical Clustering Analysis is an unsupervised technique that examines the interpoint distances between all of the data objects and generates a tree diagram or dendrogram on which, that information is visualized. It can be considered both as a sequence of nested partitions and the similarity levels at which these change [51, 52]. Hierarchical clustering algorithms are either bottom-up (agglomerative) or top-down (divisive). At each step of the agglomerative hierarchical approach each subject is treated as a singleton cluster which is successively merged into the closest cluster [51, 49, 53]. This process is repeated until all clusters have been merged into a singleton cluster that contains all subjects. The alternate divisive approach, begins with a single cluster containing all subjects, and at each step, the cluster splits until N clusters form (each with a single subject).

The criterion under which clusters are merged or split, differentiates at each case. Since the bottom-up approach agglomerates pairs of clusters with the minimum distance, measures of similarity and dissimilarity have to be taken into account. Those measures are defined by linkage functions which have a direct impact on the whole clustering procedure. They affect the way clusters are merged together and subsequently the final cluster solution. Therefore, linkage measures will be discussed extensively in the process.

The following notation is given in order for the various linkages to be described:

- Cluster $r$ is formed from clusters $p$ and $q$.
- $n_{r}$ is the number of objects in cluster $r$
- $X_{r i}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$ object in cluster $r$

Single Linkage (Nearest Neighbor) functions utilize the shortest distance between any two objects in a pair of clusters [54,55]:

$$
d(r, s)=\min \left(\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{r i}, x_{s j}\right)\right), i \in\left(i, \ldots, n_{r}\right), j \in\left(1, \ldots, n_{s}\right)
$$

The similarity under which two clusters merge is the similarity of their most similar objects and the merge criterion is local. Single linkage is a bottom-up (agglomerative) process where the number of clusters is reduced by one at each step.

Complete Linkage (Furthest Neighbor/Maximum Method) functions utilize the furthest distance between any two objects in a pair of clusters [55]:

$$
d(r, s)=\max \left(\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{r i}, x_{s j}\right)\right), i \in\left(i, \ldots, n_{r}\right), j \in\left(1, \ldots, n_{s}\right)
$$

Accordingly, in complete linkage method, the similarity under which two clusters fuse, is the similarity of their most dissimilar objects and the merge criterion is non-local, that is, the entire structure of clustering can affect the way how clusters fuse.

Average linkage functions utilize the averaged distance between all pairs of the two clusters' members [55]:

$$
d(r, s)=\frac{1}{n_{r} n_{s}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{r}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{s}} \operatorname{dist}\left(x_{r i} x_{s j}\right)
$$

There is also, an average linkage method within groups, proposed by Sokal \& Michener [55], which takes into consideration the variability present within each cluster. This method will not be further discussed.

All the three methods mentioned above (single, complete and average) use a proximity matrix as input and the inter-cluster distances used are presented in Fig. 6.


Fig. 6 Single, Complete and Average linkage graphical representations, modified after [56].

Centroid linkage (Unweighted Pair-Group Method using the centroid approach- UPGMC) utilizes the Euclidean distance between the centroids of the two clusters:

$$
d(r, s)=\left\|\widetilde{x_{r}}+\widetilde{x_{s}}\right\|_{2}
$$

where $\widetilde{x_{r}}=\frac{1}{n_{r}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{r}} x_{r i}$
As single linkage method, centroid linkage also represents an agglomerative approach to hierarchical clustering. This approach uses a data matrix, in contrast to the previous ones, rather than a proximity matrix and involves merging clusters with the most similar mean vectors.

Median linkage (Weighted Pair-Group Method using the centroid approach) functions also utilize the Euclidean distance between the weighted centroids of the two clusters:

$$
d(r, s)=\left\|\widetilde{x_{r}}-\widetilde{x_{s}}\right\|_{2}
$$

where $\widetilde{x_{r}}$ and $\widetilde{x_{s}}$ are weighted centroids for the clusters $r$ and $s$. If cluster $r$ was created by combining clusters p and $\mathrm{q}, \widetilde{x_{r}}$ is defined recursively as:

$$
\widetilde{x_{r}}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\widetilde{x_{p}}+\widetilde{x_{q}}\right)
$$

Apart from the Euclidean distance, other proximity measures may be used for the Centroid and the Median linkage approaches, they would, however, lack interpretation in terms of the raw data [56]. The following table (Table 2 ) presents a brief description of various proximity measures used in linkages.

Table 2 Several Computational methods for distance

| Distance measures | Formula |
| :---: | :---: |
| Euclidean Distance | $\\|a-b\\|_{2}=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}}$ |
| Squared Euclidean Distance | $\\|a-b\\|_{2}^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}$ |
| Manhattan/City block | $\\|a-b\\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|a_{i}-b_{i}\right\|$ |
| DIstance | $\\|a-b\\|_{\infty}=$ max $\left\|a_{i}-b_{i}\right\|$ |
| Maximum Distance | $\sqrt{(a-b)^{T} S^{-1}(a-b)}$ where $S$ is the covariance matrix |
| Mahalanobis Distance |  |

Ward's Method aims to minimize the variance between clusters by utilizing an incremental sum of squares: that is, the increase in the total within-cluster sum of squares as a result of joining two clusters [57]. The within-cluster sum of squares is defined as the sum of the squared distances between all objects in the cluster and the centroid of the cluster. The sum of squares measure is equivalent to the following distance measure $d(r, s)$, which is the formula linkage:

$$
d(r, s)=\sqrt{\frac{2 n_{r} n_{s}}{\left(n_{r}+n_{s}\right)}}\left\|\widetilde{x_{r}}+\widetilde{x_{s}}\right\|_{2}
$$

Where:

- $\left\|\widetilde{x_{r}}+\widetilde{x_{s}}\right\|_{2}$ is the Euclidean distance
- $\quad \widetilde{x_{r}}$ and $\widetilde{x_{s}}$ are the centroids of the clusters $r$ and $s$
- $\widetilde{n_{r}}$ and $\widetilde{n_{s}}$ are the number of elements in clusters $r$ and $s$

In some references, factor of 2 multiplying $n_{r} n_{s}$ is not utilized by Ward's method. The linkage function uses this factor so that the distance between two singleton clusters is the same as the Euclidean distance. Ward's method differs from the centroid approach in clustering, in that centroids are weighted by $n_{r} n_{s} /\left(n_{r}+n_{s}\right)$ when computing distances between centroids, where $n_{r}$ and $n_{s}$ are the numbers of objects in the two clusters $r$ and $s$.

Finally, Weighted Average Linkage (WPGMA) utilizes a recursive definition for the distance between two clusters [58]. If cluster $r$ was created by combining clusters $p$ and $q$, the distance between $r$ and another cluster $s$ is defined as the average of the distance between $p$ and $s$ and the distance between q and s :

$$
d(r, s)=\frac{(d(p, s)+d(q, s))}{2}
$$

There are several other hierarchical approaches, related to the ones described above. There is the Sum-of-Squares Approach $[59,60]$ which differs from Ward's method in that it is based on the sum of squares within each cluster rather than the increase in sum of squares in the merged cluster. Another flexible method defined by values of the parameters of a general recurrence formula has also been introduced by Lance and Williams [61] but in this project, it will not be discussed any further.

### 3.1.2 k - means Clustering

The $k$-means algorithm is one of the most used clustering algorithms and it was first described by Macqueen [62]. It was designed to cluster numerical data in which each cluster has a center called the mean. k-means belongs to the partitional (non-hierarchical) clustering methods [50], which are fundamentally different from the hierarchical ones. Partitional clustering methods generate a single partition of the data in an attempt to recover natural groups in the data. While hierarchical clustering methods require only the proximity matrix among the data points, partitional techniques expect the data in the form of a pattern matrix.
$k$-means [62] is one of the simplest unsupervised learning algorithms, which is used to solve the well-known clustering problem. The goal of k -means method is to divide the data into k distinct groups (clusters) so that observations within a group are similar, whilst observations between groups are different. The value of k (number of clusters) may or may not be specified. In most cases, it is assumed to be fixed. As an algorithm, it is rather iterative than hierarchical, which means that at each stage of the algorithm data points are assigned to a fixed number of clusters (whereas in hierarchical clustering, the number of clusters ranges from the number of data points down to a single cluster). The method allows the reallocation of data objects from one cluster to another, which is not the case at hierarchical clustering.

There is an error function behind this reallocation of data objects. It proceeds, for a given initial k clusters, by allocating the remaining data to the nearest clusters and then repeatedly changing the membership of the clusters according to the error function until the error function does not change significantly or the membership of the clusters no longer changes. The conventional k -means algorithm $[63,64]$ is briefly described below.

Let $D$ be a data set with $n$ instances, and let $C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots, C_{k}$ be the $k$ disjoint clusters of $D$. Then the error function is defined as

$$
E=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{x \in C i} d(\boldsymbol{x}, \mu(C i)),
$$

where $\mu(\mathrm{Ci})$ is the centroid of cluster $\mathrm{Ci} . \mathrm{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mu(\mathrm{Ci}))$ denotes the distance between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mu(\mathrm{Ci})$, and it can be one of the many distance measures, a typical choice of which is the Euclidean distance.

Given a set of observations, k-means clustering aims to partition n observations into k clusters so that the total distance between the group's members and its corresponding centroid, representative of the group, is minimized. The component to be minimized is the withincluster sum of squares (WCSS):

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|x_{i}^{j}-c_{j}\right\|^{2}
$$

where the term $\left\|x_{i}^{j}-c_{j}\right\|^{2}$ provides the distance between any data point and the cluster's centroid.

Each cluster is associated with a centroid, which is the mean of the points in the cluster. Each point is assigned to the cluster with the closest centroid. The first step of k-means is to select as initial cluster centers K, randomly selected documents, the seeds (initialization phase). The algorithm then moves the cluster centers around in space in order to minimize WCSS (iteration phase). This is accomplished iteratively by repeating the following steps until a stopping criterion is met: reassigning documents to the cluster with the closest centroid; and recomputing each centroid based on the current members of its cluster. Firstly, WCSS decreases in the reassignment step, since each vector is assigned to the closest centroid, so the distance it contributes to WCSS decreases. Secondly, it decreases in the re-computation step because the new centroid is the vector $\vec{v}$ for which $\mathrm{WCSS}_{\mathrm{k}}$ reaches its minimum. Ultimately, k-means converges for the common similarity measures to a local minimum point after a finite number of iterations (normally the first few) [65]. Convergence and some probability properties regarding the k-means algorithm are also discussed in Pollard [66, 67], and Serinko \& Babu, [68]. García-Escudero and Gordaliza [69] discussed the robustness properties of the k-means algorithm.

The complexity of the whole procedure is summarized in the following expression:

$$
O\left(n * K^{*} I^{*} d\right)
$$

Where: $n=$ number of points
$\mathrm{K}=$ number of clusters
I= number of iterations
d= number of attributes
Choosing the right initial number of centroids is very important as it controls the performance of the algorithm. If there are $K$ 'real' clusters (especially when $K$ is large), then the probability of selecting one centroid from each cluster is relatively small. Particularly, if clusters are of the same size, $n$, then the aforementioned probability is as follows:

$$
P=\frac{\text { number of ways to select one centroid from each cluster }}{\text { number of ways to select } K \text { centroids }}=\frac{K!n^{K}}{(K n)^{K}}=\frac{K!}{K^{K}}
$$

There are several approaches to this problem such as multiple runs, sampling and usage of hierarchical clustering to determine the initial centroid number, selection of more than k initial centroids and re-selection among these (the most widely separated), postprocessing and/or bisecting k-means. Some methods for selecting good initial centers are proposed in Babu and Murty [70] and Bradley and Fayyad [71]. Pena et al. [72] provide a comparison of four initialization methods: a random method, Forgy's approach [56], Macqueen's approach [62], and Kaufman's approach [73]. Other initialization methods are presented in Khan and Ahmad [74].

Silhouette analysis is a method for selecting the number of clusters for k-means clustering. It can be used as a tool to study the separation distance between the resulting clusters. The silhouette plot displays a measure of how close each point in one cluster is to points in the neighboring clusters and thus provides a way to assess parameters like number of clusters visually. This measure has a range of [-1, 1].

Silhouette coefficients (as these values are referred to as) near +1 indicate that the sample is far away from the neighboring clusters. A value of 0 indicates that the sample is on or very close to the decision boundary between two neighboring clusters and negative values indicate that those samples might have been assigned to the wrong cluster. In other words, a value of +1 is ideal and -1 is the least preferred. Hence, the higher the value, the better is the cluster configuration.

The silhouette value for the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ point, Si , is defined as
$\mathrm{Si}=\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right) / \max \left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$
where $a_{i}$ is the average distance from the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ point to the other points in the same cluster as i , and $b i$ is the minimum average distance from the $i^{\text {th }}$ point to points in a different cluster, minimized over clusters.

A disadvantage of k-means algorithm is that it is sensitive to the presence of outliers and when clusters are of different size, different density or non-globular it might be disfunctional. For this reason, pretreatment and postprocessing of data is essential when implementing kmeans, especially on high-dimensional data. Also, working only on numerical data restricts some applications of the k-means algorithm.

All in all, k-means is a greedy, computationally efficient technique, being the most popular representative-based clustering algorithm.

### 3.1.3 Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) constitutes a multivariate statistical technique, probably one of the most popular in the chemometric literature, used by various scientific disciplines, in order to identify patterns and relationships within a data set [75, 76]. It is an unsupervised learning method which aims to reduce the dimensionality of a high-dimensional data set consisting of a large number of interrelated variables and at the same time to retain as much as possible of the variation present in the data set. In mathematical terms, this is accomplished by manipulating a data matrix in such a way that the variation or spread of data objects (i.e. the description of their interpoint distances) is described by as few dimensions as possible. In addition to data reduction, Principal Component Analysis forms a transformation technique
of data, also used for simplification, modelling, outlier detection (identification of their class membership), variable selection, classification, prediction and unmixing of constant sum mixtures (curve resolution) [77, 78, 79].

The information that PCA extracts from the mathematical manipulation of the data matrix, is expressed by a new orthogonal set of variables (PC axes), known as the Principal Components (PCs) [76]. These are new variables that are uncorrelated and ordered such that the first few retain most of the variation present in all of the original variables. Principal components are obtained as linear combinations of the original variables and each one of them is characterized by certain properties. For example, the first PC contains the maximum amount of possible variance in the data set, in one direction and successive PCs describe decreasing amounts of variation. Each data object has coordinates, defined by the original variables, which are relative to the new principal component axes (scores). What is more, PC axes are influenced by variables and this is because the formulation of each axis is based on combinations among the original measurement variables. Variables' contribution to PC axes depends mainly on the relative orientation between those two elements. Hence, parallel arrangement (in space) of the variable and PC axes, means that minimum variation is contained in the PC and accordingly, orthogonal arrangement of the two, means maximum variation. Finally, the maximum PC quantity to be calculated, is at the same time, the minimum quantity of data objects or variables (six habits).

The PCs are defined as follows. Let $\mathbf{v}=\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}, \mathrm{v}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)^{\prime}$ be a vector of d random variables, where ' is the transpose operation. The first step is to find a linear function $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{1 v}$ of the elements of $\mathbf{v}$ that maximizes the variance, where $\mathbf{a}_{1}$ is a d-dimensional vector $\left(a_{11}, a_{12}, \ldots, a_{1 d}\right)^{\prime}$, so

$$
\mathrm{a}_{1}^{\prime} v=\sum_{i=1}^{d} a_{1 i} u_{i}
$$

After finding $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{1} \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{v}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{j-1} \mathbf{v}$, we look for a linear function $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{j} \mathbf{v}$ that is uncorrelated with $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{1} \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{v}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{j-1} \mathbf{v}$ and has maximum variance. Then we will find d such linear functions after $d$ steps. The $j$ th derived variable $\mathbf{a}^{\prime} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{v}$ is the $j$ th PC. In general, most of the variation in $\mathbf{v}$ will be accounted for by the first few PCs. To find the form of the PCs, we need to know the covariance matrix $\sum$ of $\mathbf{v}$. In most realistic cases, the covariance matrix $\sum$ is unknown, and it will be replaced by a sample covariance matrix. For $j=1,2, \ldots, d$, it can be shown that the $j^{\text {th }}$ $P C$ is given by $z_{j}=\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{j} \mathbf{v}$, where $\mathbf{a}_{j}$ is an eigenvector of $\sum$ corresponding to the $j^{\text {th }}$ largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{j}$.

## 4. Family Affiliations of Williston Basin Oils

The sample set under study consists of four compositional families, $A, B, C$ and $D$, each containing 44, 11, 38 and 27 oil samples, respectively (a total of 120 oil samples - see Appendix). Family A oil samples belong to Red River and Yeoman formations. Family B oil samples belong to Bakken and Lodgepole formations while samples of family D belong to Winnipegosis formations. Oil samples of family C belong to various formations, such as Midale, Tilston, Bakken, Frobisher, Ratcliffe, Lodgepole, and Madison formations. The exploration of the compositional data was conducted on the main hydrocarbons of the gasoline range, the n-alkanes in the saturated fraction of the oils, as well as the biomarker's content of this sample set.

As far as the gasoline range is concerned, it represents the number of hydrocarbons containing less than twelve carbon atoms, and are often referred to as light hydrocarbons. In highly thermally mature oils, this range constitutes almost the $100 \%$ of the oil composition and therefore geochemical characterization of such oils is carried out based on these compounds.

The saturated fraction of hydrocarbons (SFH) is comprised of either the linear, branched or cyclic hydrocarbons. SFH contains the structural group of $n$-alkanes (usually between $\mathrm{C}_{12}-\mathrm{C}_{35}$ ) as well as the pristane $(\mathrm{Pr})$ and phytane $(\mathrm{Ph})$ isoprenoid compounds, measured in geochemical studies along with $n$-alkanes, due to their geochemical significance. In the analysis, the lighter n -alkanes were excluded and only the $\mathrm{C}_{13}-\mathrm{C}_{32}$ alkanes were considered.

Biomarkers are a group of compounds, found in oils and rock extracts. They have a variety of applications in petroleum exploration. Such applications are in source-rock correlation and/or in the inference of characteristics of the source rock that generated an oil, without examining the source rock itself. Specifically, biomarkers in an oil can reveal the relative amount of oilprone vs. gas-prone organic matter in the source kerogen, the age of the source rock, the environment of deposition, the lithology of the source rock (carbonate vs. shale), and the thermal maturity of the source rock during generation. Such data may be key inputs to effective basin modelling of a prospect or block. In this study, the sterane and hopane parts of the biomarkers' range have been examined thoroughly.

Before performing Multivariate Data Analysis (MDA) on the given oil sample set, an attempt was made in order to test the criteria under which the classification of the four family affiliations of Williston Basin, was determined in previous studies. The biomarker based classification of the four families relies on various compositional criteria, including Pr/Ph ratio, tricyclic to pentacyclic $C_{23} / C_{30}$ ratio, $n$-alkane predominance and prominence amongst extended hopanes and many other, extensively described in the following paragraphs. Empty spaces on the barcharts presented below, correspond either to zero component values for specific samples, or to infinite numbers, generated during the calculative ratio calculations.

The compositional character of each family is unique and this is evident from their $n$-alkane distributions, biomarker signature as well as their gasoline range characteristics, in general [39, 32]. Family A oils display diagnostic saturate fraction gas chromatograms (SFGC) and are fairly distinguishable from the other families by their overall $n$-alkane profile (centered at $\mathrm{C}_{13^{-}}$ $\mathrm{C}_{17}$ ) and CPI values (average CPI: 1.59) [39, 32]. According to Obermajer et al., (2000), they
also present a smooth extended hopane profile with a steady decrease in the concentration of $\mathrm{C}_{31}+$ homologues with increasing carbon numbers [39]. In addition, Family A oils, are characterized by a $\mathrm{C}_{34}$ hopane prominence, according to Osadetz et al., [32]. Homohopane distributions have been used to distinguish oils from different organic facies of the same source rock. Such distributions are sensitive and may be altered due to various factors such as thermal maturity and API gravity. Judging from the barchart (Fig. 7), Family A oils display a high $\mathrm{C}_{34}$ homohopane distribution, but, in addition, oils from Family D, present an even stronger prominence on this compound (Fig. 7). The behavior of $C_{34}$ for Families $B$ and $C$ is similar to that of Family A.


Fig. $7 C_{34}$ barchart for the whole sample set.

Another diagnostic feature of this group is its very low concentration of acyclic isoprenoids relative to n -alkanes, presenting the lowest $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{C}_{17}$ and $\mathrm{Ph} / \mathrm{nC}_{18}$ ratios among all families [39]. The corresponding barcharts (Fig. 14, Fig. 15), in which these ratios have been plotted, is in agreement with this fact. According to Osadetz et al., [32], the $\mathrm{C}_{23}$ tricyclic/ $\mathrm{C}_{30}$ pentacyclic terpanes ratio, especially for Families $A$ and $B$, is very distinct, differentiating them from the rest family groups. From the corresponding barchart, it is indeed observed that Family A oils display very low values of $\mathrm{C}_{23} / \mathrm{C}_{30}$, whereas Family B displays the highest peaks for the same ratio (Fig. 8). What is also noticeable from the $\mathrm{C}_{23} / \mathrm{C}_{30}$ barchart, is that Family D oils, similarly to Family A, present very low values for this ratio.


Fig. 8 Barchart presenting $C_{23} / C_{30}$ ratios for the whole sample set.

Family B oils, according to Obermajer et al., [39], differ from the rest in that they present a smooth $n$-alkane distribution with a maximum in the $\mathrm{C}_{13}-\mathrm{C}_{17}$ range, lacking any homohopane prominence, which is in agreement with Osadetz et al., [32]. According to Obermajer et al., [39], there are variations in 17a(H)-trisnorhopane (Tm) over 18a(H)-trisnorhopane (Ts), compared to the rest oils. From the respective barchart (Fig. 10) we observe that there are indeed, intense variations within this Family affiliation, the density of the specimens, however, is not adequate enough in order to confirm the clear distinction of this family from the rest. The calculative process of the code has produced the NaN notation, resulting in non-plotted samples. The $T s / T m$ ratio profiles of the rest Families ( $A, C$ and $D$ ) show almost equivalent variations.

Another characteristic of Family B oils, is that they obtain values above unity for the $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratio [32]. This ratio is one of the most common correlation parameters, utilized as an indicator of depositional environment [80]. Variations may reflect multiple degrees of oxidation during the early stages of chlorophyll degradation. It is one of the most commonly utilized correlation parameters, indicative of the source rock's depositional environment [80]. Being sensitive to diagenetic conditions, values of $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratios substantially below unity are considered to indicative of petroleum origin and/or highly reducing depositional environments. Very high $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratios (>3) reflect source material of terrestrial origin. $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratios ranging between 1-3 reflect oxidizing depositional environments [81]. According to Lijmbach [82] low Pr/Ph values (<2) reflect aquatic depositional environments including marine, fresh and brackish water (reducing conditions), intermediate values (2-4) reflect fluviomarine and coastal swamp environments, whereas very high values (up to 10) are related to peat swamp depositional environments (oxidizing conditions). From the corresponding barchart (Fig. 9), we observe that, contrary to Family C, Families A, B and D present similar, above unity values for this ratio, which is in agreement with Osadetz et al., [32]. At the same time, however, Family B oils display the highest peaks (Fig. 9).


Fig. 9 Pr/Ph ratios barchart for the whole sample set.


Fig. 10 Ts/Tm ratios barchart for the whole sample set.


Fig. 11 CPI profile for the whole sample set.


Fig. 12 Odd/Even predominance for the whole sample set.


Fig. $13 C_{35}$ barchart for the whole sample set.

Main characteristic of Family $C$ is the strong $C_{35}$ prominence [32], which is confirmed by the respective barchart (Fig. 13). The lowest $\mathrm{C}_{35}$ homohopane distribution is indicative of Family A oils, as shown. According to Osadetz et al., [32] and Obermajer et al., [39], these oils obtain lower $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}$ values in comparison to the rest, and in particular, less than unity. This fact holds true, as we observe from the corresponding barchart (Fig. 9), confirming at the same time that Family C oils display a strong and consistent predominance of $\mathrm{Ph} / \mathrm{Pr}$ ratio.

Additionally, oils of this familial group also display an even/odd $n$-alkane predominance [32]. The composition and distribution of $n$-alkanes carbon numbers reflect the source of kerogenic organic matter, sedimentary environment, and maturity of the rocks. Traditional geochemists feel that the odd/even carbon number predominance of $n$-alkane decreases as rocks mature. The OEP (odd/even predominance) of mature source rocks is close to 1 . However, the odd carbon number predominance appears in Upper Ordovician source rocks, and an even carbon number predominance is found in Cambrian - Lower Ordovician source rocks. Family C oils are characterized by an even/odd $n$-alkanes predominance and this is confirmed by both the CPI and OEP, respective barcharts (Fig. 11, Fig. 12).


Fig. $14 n^{n} C_{17} / \operatorname{Pr}$ barchart for the whole sample set.


Fig. $15 n C_{18} /$ Ph barchart for the whole sample set.
Oils from Family D display a distinctive stratigraphic occurrence and have been subdivided into two separate groups $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2}$, based on $\mathrm{nC}_{17} / \operatorname{Pr}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{18} / \mathrm{Ph}$ ratios [32]. The corresponding barcharts (Fig. 14, Fig. 15) present the distributions of these ratios amongst the whole sample set. What is more, $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ oils, depending on the pools they occur, either in Madison or Birdbear, they display $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph} \leq 1.0$ and $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}>1.1$, respectively. This is indeed, evident, from the corresponding barchart (Fig. 9).

Reviewing the barcharts presented before, it would be important to state that based on individual geochemical characteristics, the four families can be indeed uniquely identified at a great extent. However, it would be a challenge to investigate if a clear classification can be obtained, by applying this time, multivariate data analysis (MDA) on raw data.

In the next chapters, we implement several multivariate methods on the given data set and examine the results, that each method produces. Hierarchical clustering, k-means and Principal Component Analysis are applied on four independent models that were developed for this purpose; the Saturated Fraction Compositional Model, the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model, the Gasoline Range Compositional Model and the Biomarkers Compositional Model. All of the steps that were followed are extensively described.

## 5. Application of MDA methods; inputs and results

The core of this project is the investigation of the oil-oil correlations among compositional data of a sample set from Williston Basin, by using multivariate statistical analysis methods. Oil-oil correlations are based on compositional criteria and examine whether a genetic relationship exists among a group of oil samples. In particular, Hierarchical Clustering, kmeans and PCA have been employed in order to explore compositional data from the gasoline range (GRH), saturated hydrocarbons (SFH) and biomarker traits of 120 oil samples from the Williston Basin Petroleum province. The samples examined in this study are from four, previously defined, compositional families (A-D) [34].

For the application of MDA methods on the sample set, a MATLAB code created in the "Hydrocarbons Chemistry and Technology Research Unit", of the School of Mineral Resources of the TUC, was utilized. All necessary adjustments and modifications were applied in order for the code to work.

From the sample set under study, four independent models were developed in order to explore different compositional information. The models used for the identification of petroleum systems were: a) Saturated Fraction Compositional Model (SFCM) b) Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM), c) Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM) and d) Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM). SFCM embodies original variables derived from the gas chromatographic analysis of the Saturated Fraction of Hydrocarbons (SFH). It takes into account peak areas of $n$-alkanes, $\mathrm{nC}_{13}-\mathrm{nC}_{24}$, pristane ( Pr ) and phytane ( Ph ). The SFRM contains the most commonly utilized compositional ratios and factors derived from the gas chromatographic analysis of the SFH (Pr/Ph, n- $\mathrm{C}_{17} / \mathrm{Pr}, \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{C}_{18} / \mathrm{Ph}, \mathrm{CPI} n-\mathrm{C}_{14-20}, \mathrm{CPI} n-\mathrm{C}_{22-32}$ ). GRCM includes variables derived solely from GRH compositional data. The parameters reflect internal variations for compounds with the same number of carbon atoms to minimize possible variations due to sample handling and experimental conditions. Finally, BCM contains all variables derived from biomarkers' traits of the oil sample set.

The approach under which all statistical methods were applied, was that of trial and error in order to achieve a "clear clustering" (if possible) of the oil samples. A pretreatment scheme of the sample set was considered necessary in order to reformat the original data file and prepare data for clustering. This is because the data set consists of peak areas that are analysis-dependent. As a consequence, only by preprocessing the data, we get meaningful statistical results, since all components are put under the same scale. The idea is that if different components of data (features) have different scales, then derivatives tend to align along directions with higher variance, which leads to poorer/slower convergence. The chemometric software package that was utilized, offered various pretreatment options, all of which were originally applied on the sample set, in order to examine which one produces the best classifying solution. While only the results from one preprocessing option will be presented, all pretreatment schemes which were utilized, are briefly described below.

Command "pre_scaling_0_1": It refers to the subtraction of the minimum value and the division of each column by the range. The results of this pretreatment scheme are going to be presented in the upcoming chapters.

Command "norm_variables_0_1": It refers to the subtraction of the minimum value and the division of each variable by the range.

Command "pre_minusMean": It concerns the subtraction of the mean value from each variable.

Command "pre_PQN" (Probabilistic quotient normalization): It refers to the division of each sample with the sum of the sample's variables. The calculative process takes into consideration the median value of each column.

Command "pre_CLR" (Centered log-ratio normalization): It concerns the division of each sample with the sum of the sample's variables. It differs, however, from "pre_PQN" in that it takes into consideration the geometric mean of each column.

Command "Subtract_sample_min": It refers to the subtraction from each sample of its minimum value.

Command "pre_TSN" (total sum normalization): It concerns the division of each sample with the sum of the samples' variables.

Command "pre_max": This matlab command refers to the division of each sample with the maximum value of the samples' variables.

### 5.1 Saturated Fraction Compositional Model (SFCM)

### 5.1.1 Hierarchical Clustering on SFCM

The subtraction of the minimum value from the subset and division of each variable by the range ("pre_scaling_0_1" command) resulted in the following dendrogram (Fig. 16). Average linkage with a correlation coefficient were combined

It is evident that the oil samples from all four family affiliations overlap, presenting no clear distinction. In particular, there is a slight overlap of samples from Families B (B1014, B1993, B2121, B2179, B1879, B1874) and D (D1275, D1276, D1289, D1313, D1288, D1290, D1291) with Family A. The original clustering solution detected outlier values (samples C599, D2595 and C566), removing which from the sample set and reprocessing it under the same pretreatment, made no difference on the clustering solution.


Fig. 16 Resulting Dendrogram under the command "pre_scaling_0_1" for the Saturated fraction compositional model (SFCM).

As observed, the algorithm failed to discriminate distinct familial affiliations among the given oil sample set, under this pretreatment scheme. In order to test how Hierarchical Clustering would offer the best clustering solution, many other pretreatment schemes were also applied on the data set and as a procedure, this was also followed in the upcoming MDA methods. The following dendrogram resulted from the division of each sample with the sum of the samples' variable - Total Sum Normalization ("pre_TSN" command of the chemometric software package). City block distance and Centroid linkage were combined and the produced dendrogram displays a relatively good distinction of Family A. It fails, however, to distinguish amongst Families B, C and D, which, once again, overlap one another (Fig. 17).


Fig. 17 Dendrogram under the "pre_TSN" command for the Saturated fraction compositional model (SFCM).
An interesting feature of the dendrogram in Fig. 17, is that it displays a non-monotonic tree. This occurs when the distance from the union of two clusters, $r$ and $s$, to a third cluster is less than the distance between $r$ and $s$. In this case, in a dendrogram drawn with the default orientation, the path from a leaf to the root node takes some downward steps. Usually, the centroid and median methods (as in this case) can produce a cluster tree that is not monotonic and if this happens, it is better to utilize another linkage method. In our case, however (Fig. 17), the centroid linkage, which was automatically chosen by the chemometric software package, produced a dendrogram which classified sufficiently samples of Family A. All other pretreatment options failed in this task significantly.

### 5.1.2 k - means algorithm on SFCM

k-means clustering was then performed under the same pretreatment option ("pre_scaling_0_1") resulting in the following features (Fig. 18, Fig. 19, Table 3).

Table 3 Summary of $k$-means clustering under the " pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Saturated fraction compositional model (SFCM).

| K-values | Best distances sums | Average silhuette values |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{K}=2$ | 594.077 | 0,566689 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=3$ | 41.787 | 0,539449 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=4$ | 345.548 | 0,503212 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=5$ | 290.114 | 0,467112 |

The silhouette plots for $\mathrm{K}=2, \mathrm{~K}=3, \mathrm{~K}=4$ and $\mathrm{K}=5$ clusters are shown in the following figure (Fig. 18). An insufficient choice of an initial $K$ value would result in clusters below average silhouette scores or even wide fluctuations in the size of the silhouette plots. This is the criteria under which, each clustering solution is evaluated as sufficient or insufficient.


Fig. 18 Silhouette plots for $k=2, k=3, k=4$ and $k=5$ clusters under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Saturated fraction compositional model (SFCM).

From the silhouette plots (Fig. 18), we observe that, in general, the obtained silhouette values fall in the range of 0.1-0.9. The size of the silhouette plots does not present wide fluctuations for each case, and negative values are present in all clustering solutions. The two - cluster solution has an average silhouette value of 0.566689 , being the highest amongst the others (Table 3). This is an indication that grouping into two clusters using k-means is more efficient compared to grouping into three, four or five clusters. It is not, however, sufficient enough, as we would expect, grouping into four clusters to be the best solution. In Fig. 20 we can observe, which cluster each sample is assigned to.


Fig. 19 The plot of $k$-means clustering for $k=2$ under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Saturated fraction compositional model (SFCM). The $\otimes$ symbol represents the centroid of each cluster.

Fig. 19 represents the plot of k -means clustering, for the case of $\mathrm{k}=2$. Taking into consideration the average silhouette value, $\mathrm{k}=2$ is the most efficient clustering solution. However, by observing the plot, we could say that there is no clear boundary between the two clusters and samples overlap with each other.


Fig. 20 Table displaying to which cluster each sample belongs, for each $K$ value of the SFCM (idx2 = k:2, idx3 = k:3, etc.)

Taking into consideration that the most sufficient clustering solution is that of $\mathrm{k}=2$ (idx=2) and according to Fig. 20, all samples from Family A oils are assigned to one cluster. The vast majority of Family $C$ oil samples are assigned to a different cluster with a few exemptions (C540, C543). The discretization of these two families is relatively sufficient, but as far as Family D and B oil samples are concerned, they overlap with A and C considerably, as samples from both families are assigned to both clusters.

### 5.1.3 Principal Component Analysis on SFCM

Sample scores describe a position in principal component space, and each original variable has loadings that describe their contribution to each principal component. The sample score of the first two principal components and the respective loading diagrams are presented in figure (Fig. 21a, b). The percentages of variation attributed to each of the Principal Components are shown in Fig. 21c.


Fig. 21 a) Sample scores for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Saturated Fraction Compositional Model (SFCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. Colors on sample symbols indicate compositional families determined by independent analysis. Blue color represents oils of Family A, green applies for Family B oils, red for Family C oils and yellow for Family D oils. "Pre_scaling_0_1" command was used on the data set. b) Original Variable loadings for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Saturated Fraction Compositional Model (SFCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. c) Percentage of variance explained by each Principal Component.

SFCM sample scores of the first two PCs explain almost 85 per cent of the variance (Fig. 21c). There are linear gradients observed in the data by comparing the sample scores of the first two principal components of the SFCM. These gradients indicate that both distinctive family characteristics and linear compositional variations of the original variables exist within each family. Sample scores of Family A oils exhibit the most coherent grouping and are characterized by a positive gradient defined by positive PC1 scores and positive PC2 scores. Family $C$ oils are also characterized by a positive gradient whereas Family $B$ and $D$ are defined by a negative gradient. The mild gradients of Families B, C and D exhibit positive PC1 scores, as Family A, but negative PC2 scores. There is a considerable overlap of Family B with Family D and a slight overlap of Family C with Family D. What is more, for a given value of PC1 Families $C$ and $D$ have more negative PC2 scores but this is not enough to be uniquely distinguishable.

As far as variable loadings are concerned, they are a tool used for the understanding of the role and importance of the original variables. The original variable loadings for the SFCM distinguish between a preponderance of lighter versus heavier $n$-alkanes (Fig. 21b). $\mathrm{C}_{13}-\mathrm{C}_{17}$
alkanes are characterized by strongly positive PC1 and PC2 loadings but $\mathrm{C}_{16}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{17}$ exhibit negative PC3 values. Probably all these variable loadings control the gradients that separates independently defined oil families. The variable with the higher weight (0.1034) among the 22 variables of the SFCM, is alkane $\mathrm{C}_{13}$ with strongly positive PC1, PC2 and PC3 loadings.

### 5.1.4 Discussion on the performance of MDA on the SFCM

To summarize, Hierarchical Clustering, k-means and Principal Component analysis were applied on the Saturated Fraction Component Model. Both in Hierarchical Clustering and PCA, Family A oils presented the most coherent group, being sufficiently separated from the rest familial affiliations. Families B and D overlapped significantly while also in both cases there appeared a slight overlap between families $C$ and $D$. The method which completely failed to distinguish among the four oil families ( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ and D ) was k - means clustering. The clustering solution produced only two clusters and according to which cluster each sample was assigned, $k$-means presents only $25 \%$ of success. Out of the three statistical methods, k-means was the one to produce the most insufficient results.

### 5.2 Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM)

### 5.2.1 Hierarchical Clustering on SFRM

The following dendrogram is the outcome of the "pre_scaling_0_1" command (Fig. 22). Average linkage along with Euclidean distance as a measure of proximity, were combined.

Family A is clearly distinguished from the rest. Family C considerably overlaps with Families B and D. All pretreatment schemes that were applied on the data set, behaved similarly producing almost the same results when Hierarchical Clustering was performed; all distinguished Family A quite sufficiently, but exhibited a slight overlap amongst Families B, C and D.


Fig. 22 Resulting Dendrogram under the command "pre_scaling_0_1" for the Saturated fraction ratios model (SFRM).

### 5.2.2 k - means algorithm on SFRM

Under the same pretreatment scheme ("pre_scaling_0_1" command), $k$-means algorithm was applied and below we present the results.

Table 4 Summary of $k$-means clustering under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option on the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM).

| K-values | Best distances sums | Average silhuette values |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| K=2 | 184.117 | 0,727318 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=3$ | 115.198 | 0,691804 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=4$ | $832.004 \mid 831.205$ | 0,715499 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=5$ | 649.877 | 0,702406 |

The silhouette plots for $\mathrm{K}=2, \mathrm{~K}=3, \mathrm{~K}=4$ and $\mathrm{K}=5$ clusters are presented in the following figure (Fig. 23).


Fig. 23 silhouette plots for $k=2, k=3, k=4$ and $k=5$ clusters under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM).

From the silhouette plots (Fig. 23), we observe that in all cases we obtain silhouette values above 0.6 and negative silhouette coefficients are always present. Average silhouette values are similar for all clustering solutions, with a maximum of 0,727318 for $\mathrm{K}=2$ (Table 4). This is an indication that under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment scheme, grouping into two clusters using $k$-means is more efficient compared to grouping into three, four or five clusters. In Fig. 25 we can observe, which cluster each sample is assigned to.

In Fig. 24 the plot of k-means clustering, for the case of $\mathrm{k}=2$ is presented with different colors for sample members that belong to different clusters.


Fig. 24 The plot of $k$-means clustering for $k=2$, of the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM). The $\otimes$ symbol represents the centroid of each cluster.


Fig. 25 Table displaying to which cluster each sample belongs, for each $K$ value of the SFRM (idx2 = k:2, idx3 = k:3,
etc.)
Based on the average silhouette values, the most efficient clustering solution is that of $\mathrm{k}=2$ (idx=2). According to Fig. 25, all samples from Family A oils are assigned to cluster one. Almost all of Family C oil samples are assigned to cluster two (only sample C1705 is assigned to cluster 1). Oil samples from family $B$ are all assigned to cluster 2 , whereas family $D$ oil samples are assigned in both clusters.

### 5.2.3 Principal Component Analysis on SFRM

The original variables used in the Saturate Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM) include the compositional factors $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{Ph}, \mathrm{nC}_{17} / \mathrm{Pr}, \mathrm{nC}_{18} / \mathrm{Ph}$ and the carbon preference indices for both lighter $\left(\mathrm{nC}_{14}-\mathrm{nC}_{20}\right)$ and heavier $\left(\mathrm{nC}_{22}-\mathrm{nC}_{30}\right)$ alkanes of the saturated fraction hydrocarbons. The
sample scores of the first two principal components and the respective loading diagrams are presented in Fig. 26. The percentages of variation attributed to each of the Principal Components are shown in Fig. 26c.


Fig. 26 a) Sample scores for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. Colors on sample symbols indicate compositional families determined by independent analysis. Blue color represents oils of Family A, green applies for Family B oils, red for Family C oils and yellow for Family D oils. "Pre_scaling_0_1" command was used on the data set. b) Original Variable loadings for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model (SFRM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. c) Percentage of variance explained by each Principal Component.

SFRM sample scores of the first two PCs explain 83 per cent of the variance (Fig. 26c). There are two linear gradients observed in the data by comparing the sample scores of the first two principal components of the SFRM; a dispersed positive gradient displayed by samples with positive PC1 scores and PC2 scores less than 0, and a relatively tight negative gradient consisting of both positive PC1 and PC2 scores. As in the SFCM, these gradients also indicate that distinctive family characteristics and linear compositional variations of the original variables exist within each family. When the samples are compared to the biomarker-based oil families, Family A is once again clearly distinguished by consistently positive PC1 and PC2 scores and a linear variation between them. Only sample D2626 overlaps with this group, however. Family D oils are also characterized by a general positive gradient, while Families B and $D$ are defined by mainly a positive gradient. All gradients exhibit high positive PC1 scores but, Families B, C and D exhibit negative PC2 scores. As in the SFCM, the fields of PC1 and PC2 in Family C overlap those of Families B and D, effectively obscuring their separation. However, Family C samples appear to fall along a positively correlated gradient in PC1 vs PC2 space.

The original variable loadings for the SFRM indicate a lack of discriminating power of the $\mathrm{nC}_{17} / \mathrm{Pr}$ and $\mathrm{nC}_{18} / \mathrm{Ph}$ with respect to Families B and C , which opposes to Osadezt et al. [32], who claim that this biomarker parameter is highly effective as far as the discrimination among these affiliations is concerned.

### 5.2.4 Discussion on the performance of MDA on the SFRM

MDA methods on the Saturated Fraction Ratios Model seemed to perform in a similar manner as in the Saturated Fraction Compositional Model. In all three methods Family A was significantly distinguished in contrast to the rest familial affiliations. Only sample D2626, in PCA overlapped with family A samples. As far as k-means is concerned, even though it discretizes family $A$, as a whole, it failed in considerably in separating families B, C and D. It produced a two-cluster solution.

### 5.3 Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM)

### 5.3.1 Hierarchical Clustering on GRCM

Applying the Hierarchical Clustering algorithm on GRCM, produced the following dendrogram (Fig. 27). Single linkage with Euclidean distance were combined this time.

From the figure, we notice that oil samples from all four family affiliations overlap, presenting no clear distinction. In this case, we also observe that a few samples from $C$ and $D$ are excluded from the clustering solution (samples B1873, B1874, B1014, C1390, and D842).


Fig. 27 Resulting Dendrogram under the command "pre_scaling_0_1" for the Gasoline range compositional model (GRCM).

These components presented zero values for all variables. To examine how the model would perform without these values, they were removed from the data set and then hierarchical clustering was implemented again. The following dendrogram is the result.


Fig. 28 Resulting Dendrogram under the command "pre_scaling_0_1" for the Gasoline range compositional model (GRCM) after removing zero values.

Implementing the algorithm produced another two outlier samples from family D (samples D1312 and D2885). Family A oil samples, however, seem to distinguish from the rest, but not sufficiently enough, as there is a slight overlap with samples from family D. As far as families $B, C$ and $D$ are concerned, there is a considerable overlap among them.

### 5.3.2 k-means algorithm on GRCM

Implementing the k -means algorithm on the Gasoline range compositional model produced the following results. Components with zero values (as mentioned before) were kept out of the analysis.

Table 5 Summary of $k$-means clustering under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option on the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM).

| K-values | Best distances sums | Average silhuette values |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| K=2 | 60,1718 | 0.4438 |
| K=3 | 49,6733 | 0.4572 |
| K=4 | 43,5093 | 0.4510 |
| K=5 | 38,3703 | 0.4271 |

The silhouette plots for $\mathrm{K}=2, \mathrm{~K}=3, \mathrm{~K}=4$ and $\mathrm{K}=5$ clusters are presented in the following figure (Fig. 23).


Fig. 29 Silhouette plots for $k=2, k=3, k=4$ and $k=5$ clusters under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM).

From the silhouette plots (Fig. 29), we observe that generally we obtain silhouette values in the range of 0.01-0.8. Negative silhouette coefficients are present in all cases. Average silhouette values are close for all clustering solutions, with a maximum of 0.4572 for $\mathrm{K}=3$ (Table 5). The outcome of this analysis, infers that grouping into three clusters using k-means is more efficient compared to grouping into two, four or five clusters. In Fig. 31 we can observe, which cluster each sample is assigned to.

In Fig. 30 we observe the clustering solution of $k$-means for $k=3$. The figure shows the three clusters along with their centroids.


Fig. 30 Plot of $k$-means clustering for $k=3$, of the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM). The $\otimes$ symbol represents the centroid of each cluster.


Fig. 31 Table displaying to which cluster each sample belongs, for each $K$ value of the GRCM (idx2 = k:2, idx3 $=k: 3$, etc.)

Even though the three-cluster solution seems to be the most efficient out of the analysis, from the plot we observe that the clusters present no clear boundaries from one another. The overlapping among samples is evident. Fig. 31 confirms this fact as it presents in which of the three clusters, each sample is assigned to.

### 5.3.3 Principal Component Analysis on GRCM

The sample scores of the first two principal components and the respective loading diagrams are presented in Fig. 32. The percentages of variation attributed to each of the Principal Components are shown in Fig. 32c.


Fig. 32 a) Sample scores for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. Colors on sample symbols indicate compositional families determined by independent analysis. Blue color represents oils of Family A, green applies for Family B oils, red for Family C oils and yellow for Family D oils. "Pre_scaling_0_1" command was used on the data set. b) Original Variable loadings for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. c) Percentage of variance explained by each Principal Component.

GRCM sample scores of the first two PCs explain 82 per cent of the variance (Fig. 32c). There is generally one linear gradient observed in the data by comparing the sample scores of the first two principal components of the GRCM; a dispersed negative gradient displayed by samples with positive PC1 scores and PC2 scores both positive and negative. Family A is once again clearly distinguished by consistently positive PC1 and PC2 scores and a linear variation between them. The gradient exhibits high positive PC1 scores but for Families B, C and D exhibits also negative PC2 scores. The gradients of Families B, C and D overlap each other's scores resulting in the obscureness of their separation.

The variable loadings for the GRCM indicate that PC1 is controlled strongly by loadings attributed to the relative concentration of n-alkanes and branched and cyclic alkanes. High negative PC1 loadings are characteristic of the GRH n-alkanes, while the cyclic and branched alkanes with 6 to 8 carbon atoms are characterized by strong positive values. In our case the GRCM fails in the task of classifying the four family affiliations.

### 5.3.4 Discussion on the performance of MDA on the GRCM

Although in several studies (e.g. [38]) the Gasoline Range Compositional Model appears to be successful in classifying efficiently oil samples of the four family affiliations recognized in Williston Basin, in our case it substantially fails. All statistical methods that were implemented on this model, classified relatively sufficiently only family A. Families B, C and D presented a significant overlap, both one to another, but also with Family A. This is evident from the dendrogram of Fig. 28 as well as from Fig. 32a. The overlapping of oil families is incredibly apparent in the k-means plot (Fig. 30), where there is no distinct cluster.

### 5.4 Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM)

The biomarkers of the given sample set were examined in multiple ways; firstly as a whole and secondly in their separate parts of steranes and hopanes. The results that each model produced were similar, as far as the classification of oil families, is concerned. For this reason, only the results from BCM will be presented in the upcoming paragraphs, as the most characteristic.

### 5.4.1 Hierarchical Clustering on BCM

Applying the Hierarchical Clustering algorithm on BCM, produced the following dendrogram (Fig. 27). Average linkage with Euclidean distance were combined this time.

Clustering X, Measuring Method : Euclidean - Metric Method: Average - Verification: 0.90828


Fig. 33 Resulting Dendrogram under the command "pre_scaling_0_1" for the Biomarkers compositional model (BCM).

Hierarchical clustering on BCM seems to separate relatively well Family C oils. Only sample B1443 (of Family B) overlaps with family C. The dendrogram illustrates an overlapping of Family D with Family A and the rest of Family B samples form a small group which is interrupted by sample D2885.

### 5.4.2 k-means algorithm on BCM

Implementing the k-means algorithm on the Biomarkers compositional model produced the following results.

Table 6 Summary of $k$-means clustering under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option on the Gasoline Range Compositional Model (GRCM).

| K-values | Best distances sums | Average silhuette values |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{K}=2$ | 250.993 | 0.5503 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=3$ | 15.438 | 0.6665 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=4$ | 131.334 | 0.5865 |
| $\mathrm{~K}=5$ | 113.741 | 0.5425 |

The silhouette plots for $\mathrm{K}=2, \mathrm{~K}=3, \mathrm{~K}=4$ and $\mathrm{K}=5$ clusters are presented in the following figure (Fig. 23).

From the silhouette plots (Fig. 34), we observe that generally the highest silhouette values we obtain almost reach the value of 0.9 . Fluctuations in the width of clusters is present in all cases and so are negative silhouette coefficients. Average silhouette values fall in the range of $0.5425-0.665$, with 0.665 being the maximum for $\mathrm{K}=3$ (Table 6 ). The outcome of this analysis, infers that grouping into three clusters using k-means is more efficient compared to grouping into two, four or five clusters. In Fig. 36 we can observe, which cluster each sample is assigned to.


Fig. 34 Silhouette plots for $k=2, k=3, k=4$ and $k=5$ clusters under the "pre_scaling_0_1" pretreatment option for the Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM).

Fig. 35 illustrates the clustering solution of $k$-means for $k=3$. The figure shows the three clusters along with their centroids.


Fig. 35 Plot of $k$-means clustering for $k=3$, of the Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM). The $\otimes$ symbol represents the centroid of each cluster


Fig. 36 Table displaying to which cluster each sample belongs, for each $K$ value of the BCM (idx2 = k:2,idx3 = k:3, etc.)

Fig. 35 illustrates the three-cluster solution that silhouette analysis produced as the most efficient. The clusters do not exhibit clear boundaries and overlapping is evident. Fig. 36 supports the overlapping fact as it illustrates in detail in which cluster each sample is assigned to.

### 5.4.3 Principal Component Analysis on BCM

The sample scores of the first two principal components and the respective loading diagrams are presented in Fig. 32. The percentages of variation attributed to each of the Principal Components are shown in Fig. 32c.

BCM sample scores of the first two PCs explain almost 90 per cent of the variance (Fig. 37c). By comparing the sample scores of the first two principal components of the BCM, we observe no clear distinction among families. All families exhibit high positive PC1 scores and all of them present both negative and positive PC2 scores. Family B (green symbols on the PC plot) exhibit solely negative PC2 scores. Family A overlaps here mainly with family D and a few samples of family $D$ overlap with family $C$. Scores of family $B$ are quite dispersed in the plot.


Fig. 37 a) Sample scores for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. Colors on sample symbols indicate compositional families determined by independent analysis. Blue color represents oils of Family A, green applies for Family B oils, red for Family C oils and yellow for Family D oils. "Pre_scaling_0_1" command was used on the data set. b) Original Variable loadings for the first to Principal Components resulting from the Biomarkers Compositional Model (BCM) of selected Williston Basin petroleum oils. c) Percentage of variance explained by each Principal Component.

### 5.4.4 Discussion on the performance of MDA on the BCM

The Biomarkers Compositional Model appears to be successful in classifying relatively well oil family C. All methods produced similar results as far as this classification pattern is concerned. Families A and D overlap significantly, while family B overlaps slightly with family D.

All in all, the performance of MDA methods was insufficient, failing in all models to classify the samples into four familial affiliations. Based on common compositional information, it seems that unsupervised methods fail to cluster these oils. They cannot be implemented blindly without additional information. For this reason, in the next chapter we examine the compositional character of the given data set in an alternative approach.

## 6. Compositional Data

As discussed in the previous chapters, MDA methods failed in the task of classifying the data set into distinct oil family affiliations. This applies to all the compositional models and is probably attributed to the nature of the data, which fall into a special category of data; the Compositional Data. The Saturates Fraction Ratios Model is excluded from this category and none of the following information concerns this model.

Compositional Data (CoDa) are a type of multivariate data, the components of which represent proportions or fractions of a whole. Such data come in a closed form, meaning that they sum to a constant value (e.g. one if measured in parts per unit or 100 if measured in percentages). However, the term Compositional Data, covers all those vectors representing parts of a whole which only carry information on the relative (and not the absolute) frequencies, with which different and positive components occur.

Typical examples of Coda are geochemical elements in geology, data corresponding to categories of sedimentary particle-size distributions, proportions of fossil species in two or more assemblages, body composition (fat, sugar, etc.) in medicine, nutrient-balance ionomics (measurement of the total elemental composition of an organism to address biological problems) in agriculture, genotype frequency in genetics, chemical compositions in chemistry, and many more other. This type of data is generally widespread in disciplines supporting modeling, classification or discrimination and is characterized by specific numerical properties that have significant consequences for any statistical analysis [85] [86] [87] [88] [89] [90] [91]. Their fundamental properties are briefly reviewed in the upcoming paragraphs.

### 6.1 The Constant Sum Constraint (CSC) - Impacts on the Analysis

As mentioned before, Compositional Data only convey relative information as they represent part of a whole, and their unique properties are a corollary of this fact. They concern data consisting of vectors of always positive components, often subject to a constant (unit-) sum constraint; they must sum to one because they are proportions. Their main difference to unconstrained variables is that they are never free to vary independently, which in turn imposes constraints upon their variance-covariance structure (Aitchison 1986, chapter 3). The constant sum constraint forces at least one of their covariance to obtain a negative value. The result is at least one correlation or coefficient between elements, is also negative. This is explained as a consequence of the Euclidean Foundation of classical statistics, where the scale is absolute and not relative.

In particular, for a D-part composition $\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{D}\right]$ with the component sum $x_{1}+\ldots+x_{D}=1$, since

$$
\operatorname{cov}\left(x_{1}, x_{1}+\ldots+x_{D}\right)=0
$$

we have

$$
\operatorname{cov}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)+\ldots+\operatorname{cov}\left(x_{1}, x_{D}\right)=-\operatorname{var}\left(x_{1}\right) .
$$

The right-hand side here is negative except for the trivial case where the first component is constant.

The fact that data are closed, induces invalid correlations and as a result, all methods based on the covariance or correlation matrix of vectors of observations, are inappropriate to examine and analyze Compositional Data in crude or raw form (e.g. as simple percentages) [92]. Conventional statistical methods present uncertainty in the analysis of compositional data, as far as the results are concerned. The main reason is because it is not possible to distinguish between the spurious effects caused by the constant sum constraint and the effects that would be attributed to natural processes. Rock [90] in his paper describes some of the problems: trends and clusters on petrological ternary and principal components diagrams can have little or no geological significance; dendrograms produced by cluster analysis can be severely biased; results from discriminant analysis are likely to be illusory; any correlation coefficient will be affected to an unknown degree by spurious effects induced by the constant sum constraint, etc. In general, problems appear with all methods based on regression and multivariate analysis which rely on an assumption of multivariate normality. Such methods refer to Factor Analysis, Discriminant Analysis or Principal Component Analysis and they seem to perform better on unconstrained random variables.

### 6.2 Approaches in the Statistical Analysis of CoDa

In the early 1980's the analysis of Compositional Data began to obtain a more efficient form. The key to such analysis is the relative magnitudes and variations of the parts in a D-part composition, rather than their absolute values. Thus, the information provided is essentially about ratios and any meaningful function (scale-invariant) of a composition should be expressed under such terms. The principal justification for using ratios of components is the Sub-Compositional coherence, which is a fundamental property of Aitchison's approach to compositional data analysis. Ratios are unaltered in the process of forming sub-compositions $\left(s_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)$ which should mean that there exists some form of covariance structure based upon them.

However, mathematically and statistically speaking, ratios are somewhat difficult to handle. For example, between $\operatorname{var}\left(u_{i} / u_{j}\right)$ and $\operatorname{var}\left(u_{j} / u_{i}\right)$ there does not exist any simple relationship. Therefore, in order to overcome this difficulty, Aitchison was the first to introduce the logratio method, because of the simplicity of relationships such as

$$
\operatorname{var}\left\{\log \left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right\}=\operatorname{var}\left\{\log \left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}} / \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right\}
$$

Since there is also a one-to-one correspondence between compositions and a full set of logratios, for example,

$$
\left[y_{1} \ldots y_{D-1}\right]=\left[\log \left(x_{1} / x_{D}\right) \ldots \log \left(x_{D-1} / x_{D}\right)\right]
$$

with inverse

$$
\left[x_{1} x_{2} \ldots x_{D}\right]=\left[\exp \left(y_{1}\right) \ldots \exp \left(y_{D-1}\right)+1\right] /\left\{\exp \left(y_{1}\right)+\ldots+\exp \left(y_{D-1}\right)+1\right\}
$$

any problem or hypothesis concerning compositions can be fully expressed in terms of log ratios and vice versa.

The proposed methodology is simple; first transform each of the compositions (ui,..., ud) to their log-ratio vectors and then apply standard multivariate procedures upon them. The conclusions of the unconstrained multivariate analysis can then be translated back into conclusions about the compositions, and the analysis is complete.

The aforementioned methodology represents a transformation technique, widely utilized in statistics. Starting with McAlister [93] and his logarithmic transformation, the lognormal distribution and the significance of the geometric mean, the log-ratio transformation comes in line with a long tradition of statistical methodology.

### 6.3 The Simplex $S^{D}$ - Fundamental Properties of CoDa Analysis

There has been much debate against transformation techniques over the scientific community [ $94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103]$. However, while most of them are still valid, new approaches have been developed towards the statistical analysis of compositional data. Staying-in-the-simplex approach, represents part of them, offering the advantage of keeping the analysis free of dependence upon transformations and results in unconstrained multivariate analysis. Therein, compositional data analysis is conducted within a simple algebraic-geometric structure on the simplex. At this point, the term simplex has to be defined.

One of the main differences between compositional and unconstrained data, is the sample space within which, each type lies. The natural sample space of CoDa is the (restricted) unit simplex $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{d}}$ (while unconstrained data belong to the real space R ). The simplex is a basic geometric element in a Euclidean space, and is defined as

$$
S^{D}=\left\{x=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{D}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{D} \mid x_{i}>0, \iota=1,2 \ldots, D ; \sum_{l=1}^{D} x_{i}=\varkappa\right\}
$$

The constant $\mathcal{\psi}$ simplex is positive and arbitrary. Frequent values for $\mathcal{\psi}$ are 1 (per unit), 100 (percent, $\%$ ), 1000, etc. The simplex $\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{D}}$ is a line segment in one dimension ( $\mathrm{D}=1$ ), a triangle in two dimensions ( $D=2$ ), a tetrahedron in three dimensions ( $D=3$ ), and so on. As far the superscript in the $S^{D}$ is concerned, it accounts for the effective dimension of D-part compositions and is often reduced to D-1, due to the unit-sum constraint. A unit-simplex is defined as

$$
S^{D}=\left\{\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{D}\right]: x_{i}>0(\imath=1,2 \ldots, D) \mid x_{1}+\cdots+x_{D}=1\right\}
$$

With this representation, scale invariance is an element to be ensured by formulating all statements concerning compositions in terms of ratios of components.

Scale invariance is one the fundamental principles governing the compositional data analysis according to Aitchison. What scale variance addresses, is that statistical inferences about compositional data should not depend upon the scale of the data.

More specifically, two vectors of $D$ positive real components $x, y \in R D+\left(x_{i}, y \geq 0\right.$ for all $i=1$, $2, \ldots, D)$, are compositionally equivalent if there exists a positive scalar $\lambda \in R+$ such that $x=$ $\lambda \cdot y$ and, equivalently, $C(x)=C(y)$. It is highly reasonable to ask our analyses to yield the same result, independently of the value of $\lambda$. This is what Aitchison (1986) called scale invariance.

A function $f(\cdot)$ is scale-invariant if for any positive real value $\lambda \in R+$ and for any composition $x$ $\in S D$, the function satisfies $f(\lambda x)=f(x)$, i.e. it yields the same result for all vectors compositionally equivalent. This can only be achieved if $f(\cdot)$ is a function only of log-ratios of the parts in $x$ (equivalently, of ratios of parts) [102, 104]. According to Aitchison, apart from scale invariance, there are also two other conditions that should be satisfied in order for any statistical method to be performed on compositional data; permutation invariance and subcompositional coherence.

A function is permutation-invariant if it yields equivalent results when the order of parts of the composition is changed. Two examples might illustrate what "equivalent" means here. If we are computing the distance between our initial sandstone and our final sand compositions, this distance should be the same if we work with [Q, F, R] or if we work with [F, R, Q] (or any other permutation of the parts). On the other side, if we are interested in the change occurred from sandstone to sand, results should be equal after reordering. A classical way to get rid of the singularity of the classical covariance matrix of compositional data is to erase one component: this procedure is not permutation-invariant, as results will largely depend on which component is erased.

Before examining the topic of sub-compositional incoherence, the definition of subcomposition must be given. A composition only representing some of the possible components is called a sub-composition and most of real compositional data is actually representing a sub-composition, as we never analyze each and every possible component of our samples. Sub-compositions represent the marginals of compositional data analysis. Two compositions (a greater and a smaller one) sharing common parts (therefore, the smaller is the sub-composition) should produce common correlations for these parts, regardless of whether we analyzed only that sub-composition or a larger composition containing other parts. This is what coherence means. If this is not the case, then there is what is expressed as sub-compositional incoherence.

### 6.4 Perturbation and Powering

In any sample space there is, only certain operations can be performed. For example, in real space $R^{D}$ translation and scalar multiplication are the most commonly used operations. However, the typical algebraic/geometric operations (addition/translation, product/scaling, scalar product/orthogonal projection, Euclidean distance) used to deal with conventional real vectors are neither sub-compositionally coherent nor scaling invariant. The simplex is a sample space characterized by a different, compositional geometry and such operations would not be adequate for any analysis within it. Two fundamental groups of operations for the simplex are the perturbation operations, analogous to translation in the real space, and power transformation, analogous to multiplication by a scalar in the real space. These operational sets were introduced by Aitchison [89], they underpin the complete algebraic geometric structure of the simplex and both require in their definition the closure operation [104, 105]. Closure is nothing but the operation responsible for the constant sum constraint as it divides each component of a vector by the sum of the components and represents the projection of a vector with positive components onto the simplex.

For any two equivalent compositions $x$ and $X$, in the same compositional class, there is a scale relationship $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{D}\right)=\left(a x_{1}, \ldots, a x_{D}\right)$ for some $a>0$, where each component of $x$ is scaled by the same factor a to obtain the corresponding component of $X$. For any two compositions $X$ and $X$ in different compositional classes $c$ and Ca similar, but differential, scaling relationship $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, X_{D}\right)=\left(p_{1} x_{1}, \ldots, p_{D} x_{D}\right)$ can always be found, simply by taking $p_{i}=X_{i} / x_{i}(i=1, \ldots, D)$.Denoting the operation between the positive perturbing vector $p=\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{D}\right)$ and the composition $x$ by $\oplus$ we have $p \oplus x=\left(p_{1} x_{1}, \ldots, p_{D} x_{D}\right)$ and $X=p \oplus x$. Such a perturbation operator is then easily adapted to the simplex simply by defining $p \oplus u=\left(p_{1} u_{1}, \ldots, p_{D} u_{D}\right) /\left(p_{1} u_{1}+\ldots+p_{D} u_{D}\right)$. Note that the roles of $p$ and $u$ are interchangeable in this definition and we can conveniently restrict $p$ to lie in the simplex $S^{d}$. Perturbations thus defined form a group, with $\mathrm{p}^{-1}$, the inverse of $p$, defined as $\left(p_{1}^{-1}, \ldots, p_{D}{ }^{-1}\right) /\left(p_{1}^{-1}+\ldots+p_{D}{ }^{-1}\right)$ and the identity perturbation as (1/D, ... $, 1 / D)$.Moreover, for any two compositions $u, U$ there is a unique perturbation $p \in S^{d}$ such that $\mathrm{U}=\mathrm{p} \oplus \mathrm{u}$ and $\mathrm{u}=\mathrm{p}^{-1} \oplus \mathrm{U}$, where $\mathrm{p}=\mathrm{U} \oplus \mathrm{u}^{-1}$. Thus, the perturbation $\mathrm{U} \oplus \mathrm{u}^{-1}$, or equivalently X $\oplus \mathrm{x}^{-1}$ characterizes the change from c to C ; the change from X to x is simply the inverse perturbation $\mathrm{U} \oplus \mathrm{u}^{-1}$.

Powering or power transformation, as mentioned before, is the second fundamental operational group in the simplex. First, we define the power operation and then consider its relevance in compositional data analysis. For any real number $a \in R^{1}$ and any composition $x \in S^{D}$, we define:

$$
X=\alpha \otimes X=C\left[x_{1}^{\alpha} \ldots X_{D}{ }^{\alpha}\right]
$$

as the $a$-power transform of $x$. Such an operation arises in compositional data analysis in two distinct ways. First it may be of relevance directly because of the nature of the sampling process. More indirectly the power transformation can be useful in describing regression relations for compositions.

It is clear that powering $\otimes$ and perturbation $\bigoplus$ play a significant role as far as the geometry of $S^{\mathrm{D}}$ is concerned. Powering is an external operation whereas perturbation is an internal one, and it would be meaningless to establish that they define a vector or linear space structure on $S^{D}$. In particular, the $\bigoplus$ operation defines an abelian group with identity $e=[1, \ldots, 1] / D$. Both operational groups are marked by certain properties, which will now be addressed.

$$
x \oplus y=y \oplus x,(x \oplus y) \oplus z=x \oplus(y \oplus z), a \otimes(x \oplus y)=(a \otimes x) \oplus(a \otimes y)
$$

The operator $\Theta$ is the inverse of $\oplus$ and is defined by:

$$
x \Theta y=C\left[x_{1} / y_{1} \ldots x_{D} / y_{D}\right]
$$

and plays an important role in the construction of compositional residuals.

The structure can be extended by the introduction of the simplicial metric

$$
\Delta: S^{D} x S^{D} \rightarrow R \geq 0
$$

Defined as follows:

$$
\Delta(x, y)=\left[\sum_{i=1}^{D}\left\{\log \frac{x_{i}}{g(x)}-\log \frac{y_{i}}{g(y)}\right\}^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=\left[\sum_{i<j}^{D}\left\{\log \frac{x_{i}}{x_{j}}-\log \frac{y_{i}}{y_{j}}\right\}^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}\left(x, y \in S^{D}\right)
$$

where $g()$ is the geometric mean of the components of the composition. The metric $\Delta$ satisfies the usual metric axioms:

- Positivity: $\Delta(x, y)>0(x \neq y), \Delta(x, y)=0(x=y)$
- Symmetry: $\Delta(x, y)=\Delta(y, x)$
- Power relationship: $\Delta(a \otimes x, a \otimes y)=|a| \Delta(x, y)$
- Triangular inequality: $\Delta(x, z)+\Delta(z, y) \geq \Delta(x, y)$

The fact that this metric has also desirable properties relevant and logically necessary, such as scale, permutation and perturbation invariance and sub-compositional dominance, for meaningful statistical analysis of compositional data is now well established and the relevant properties are recorded briefly here:

- Permutation invariance: $\Delta(x P, y P)=\Delta(x, y)$, for any permutation matrix $P$.
- Perturbation invariance: $\Delta(x \oplus p, y \oplus p)=\Delta(x, y)$, where $p$ is any perturbation.
- Sub-compositional dominance: if $s x$ and $s y$ are similar, say (1, . . , C)-Subcompositions of $x$ and $y$, then $\Delta S^{C}\left(s_{x}, s_{y}\right) \leq \Delta_{S}{ }^{\mathrm{D}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$.


### 6.5 The Log Ratio Methodology

The constant-sum constraint is a mathematical property embedded in any compositional data set, causing problems on the analysis of such a type of data. Aitchison [106, 107, 89] showed that the effects of this constraint on the covariance and correlation matrices disappear, if the raw percentage data are expressed as logarithms of ratios, where the denominator is the geometric mean of the percentages in each sample.

For applying statistical methods designed for the Euclidean geometry on compositional data, as wells as for representing them in the Aitchison geometry on the simplex, some kind of transformations are first necessary. The main idea that leads to such transformations is to find a basis (or a generating system) and to express compositions in coefficients of such a basis (coordinate system). This class of mappings is widely known under the term log ratio transformations. There are three types to be presented in the upcoming paragraphs: a) the additive log ratio transformation (alr) and inverse b) the centered log ratio transformation (clr), and finally, c) the isometric log-ratio transformation (ilr). All of them move the operations of perturbation and power transformation to the usual vector addition and scalar multiplication. However, only the latter two transformations move the whole Aitchison geometry to the Euclidean one, i.e. including the Aitchison inner product. As the proposed transformations are one-to-one transformations, the obtained results are usually backtransformed to the simplex in order to simplify the interpretation.

### 6.5.1 Additive Log Ratio Transformation (alr)

The additive log ratio (alr) transformation transforms raw compositional data from simplex to real (Euclidean) space. Alr transformation is also capable of performing its inverse
transformation (from real space to simplex) with its inverse ALR-1 (Aitchison, 2003). ALR differs from other transformations in that it maps a composition in the D-part simplex none isometrically to a D-1, dimensional Euclidean vector. As it maps, the last part is treated as a common denominator to the others, which means that in case the denominator changes, then the $A L R$ transformations obtained, would be different. The additive log ratio transformation follows the idea to construct a (non-orthonormal) basis which is very easy to interpret, since the relation to the original $\mathrm{D}-1$ first parts is preserved. Thus, for a composition x , a special case of the additive log ratio (alr) transformation [89] to $\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{D}-1}$, is defined as:

$$
\operatorname{alr}(x)=\left(\ln \frac{x_{1}}{x_{D}}, \ldots, \ln \frac{x_{D-1}}{x_{D}}\right)^{\prime}
$$

In this equation, there is a division of each of the first D-1 components by the final component. It is easy to see that also another part can be used as ratio part in the denominator. It is usually chosen in such a way that the interpretation of the result is facilitated. Note that different alr transformations are related by linear transformations (see, e.g., Filzmoser and Hron, 2008).

The inverse transformation $A L R^{-1}: R^{D-1} \rightarrow S^{D}$ is

$$
x=\operatorname{alr}^{-1}(x)=C\left[\exp \left(y_{1}\right), \exp \left(y_{2}\right) \ldots \exp \left(y_{D-1}\right) 1\right]
$$

, where $C$ is the closure operation. When data are in their transformed state, they can be analyzed by all those statistical methods not relying on a distance. The drawback of alr transformation is that it is not an isometric transformation from the simplex. It lacks symmetry and orthogonality dew to the use of a common numerator or denominator. This weakness could be solved by use of an appropriate metric with oblique coordinates in real ALRspace, but that is not a standard practice [91].

### 6.5.2 Centered Log Ratio Transformation (clr)

Taking a generating system on the simplex leads to the centered log ratio (clr) transformation (Aitchison, 1986) to $R^{\mathrm{D}}$,

$$
\operatorname{clr}(x)=\left[\ln \frac{x}{g(x)}-\cdots-\ln \frac{x_{D}}{g(x)}\right]
$$

, where $g(x)$ is the geometric mean of the parts involved:

$$
g(x)=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{D} x_{i}\right)^{1 / D}=\exp \left(\frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^{D} \ln x_{i}\right)
$$

,or with the inverse transformation ( $c l^{-1}$ ), from real space (clr coefficients) to the simplex (raw data) (Aitchison, 1986). The clr coordinates represent a generating system, not a basis, and therefore clr coordinates sum up to zero [108], i.e. we get a constrained transformed vector. As a result, correlations and covariances between clr parts are not sub-compositionally coherent.

### 6.5.3 Isometric Log Ratio Transformation (ilr)

The calculation of ilr coordinates is more complex and the generation of specific expressions is dominated by different rules. With ilr the data are transformed from the simplex to real space, as ilr coordinates, or conversely applying the inverse ilr ${ }^{-1}$. Both features are defined by a sequential binary partition [108, 109]. The ilr transformation is defined as:

$$
i \operatorname{lir}(x)=(y 1, y 2, \ldots, y D-1) \in R^{D-1}
$$

where $y_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{D} y_{i j} \ln x_{j}, i=1,2, \ldots D-1$ and

$$
\psi_{i, j}=\sqrt{\frac{s_{i}}{r_{i}\left(s_{i}+r_{i}\right)}} \text { if at step } i \text { the part } j \text { is }+1
$$

or

$$
\psi_{i, j}=-\sqrt{\frac{s_{i}}{r_{i}\left(s_{i}+r_{i}\right)}} \text { if at step } i \text { the part } j \text { is }-1
$$

or

$$
\psi_{i, j}=0 \text { if at step } i \text { the part } j \text { is } 0
$$

with $r_{i}$ the number of parts at step $i$ as +1 , and $s_{i}$ the number of parts at step $i$ as -1 .
The ilr ${ }^{-1}$ transformation is defined as:
$\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{ilr}{ }^{-1}(\mathrm{y})=\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{D}}\right) \in \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{D}}$, where $\left[\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{D}}\right]=\operatorname{Cexp}\left[\mathrm{z}_{1}, \mathrm{z}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{D}}\right], z_{j}=\sum_{j=1}^{D-1} \psi_{i j} y_{;}, \mathrm{C}$ stands for the closure operation [89].

### 6.6 The CoDaPack v2 Software Package

Over the last years, a new methodological approach has been developed for the statistical analysis of compositional data, based on the approach introduced in the early eighties by John Aitchison. This methodology is not straightforward to use with standard statistical packages. For this reason, in this project, we examine a new freeware software, The Compositional Data Package, which implements at this moment the most elementary of mentioned statistical methods. The features of this new software are very wide:

- Transformations between the real space to the simplex or vice versa such as the alr, clr and ilr transformations.
- Operations inside the simplex like centering, perturbation, power transformation, amalgamation, subcomposition (closure) or rounded zero replacement.
- 2-D and 3D graphical outputs like ternary diagrams, alr plots, clr plots, biplots, plots of principal components.
- Compositional Descriptive Statistics.

The software has been developed by members of the Research Group on Compositional Data Analysis at the Dept. Informàtica, Matemàtica Aplicada i Estadística (IMAE-UdG) under the projects Compositional Data Analysis and Related methods (CODA-RETOS) and Compositional and Spatial Data Analysis (COSDA). The core of the group belongs to the University of Girona (UdG), and includes members from the Technical University of Catalonia (UPC), and Biomathematics \& Statistics Scotland (BioSS).

### 6.6.1 Interface of the CoDaPack software

This time the analysis will be conducted only on a small part of the data set, in order to examine briefly, how a different treatment approach would impact on the data. There will be a comparison of the results between the classical statistical analysis and the compositional statistical approach. For this attempt, the Saturate Fraction Compositional Model (SFCM) was selected, and in the next paragraphs there will be a presentation of the interface of the software package.

Data could be imported from Excel files or recovered from previous sessions. The observations are organized in rows and the variables in columns. CoDaPack v2 main window (Fig. 38) has four parts. On the very top there are the menus, on the left the active data frame and the name of its variables. The bigger part is the right side. On top of this part there is the place where alphanumerical results are placed, and on bottom there is the data.


Fig. 38 CoDaPack v2 main window.
In order to run a CoDaPack routine we first import the data. The software stores a set of data on Data Frames or Tables. It is possible to have opened more than one Data frame. A set of

Data frames could be saved as a Workspace and also it could be recovered by means of the item button Open Workspace (Fig. 39).

Each Data frame contains the name of variables and its numerical values. As far as the missing values are concerned, there are two kinds; non-detected or non-available data and there is a specific symbol to distinguish them. Non-detected data should begin with a character prefix, for example <, followed by the value of low detection limit while Non-Available data should use a symbol, for example "NA".
A. CoDaPack v2.02.04

File Data Statistics Graphs Help


Fig. 39 Menu File
Data frames may be imported and exported from Excel files. After data are imported, (Fig. 40) we must indicate in which row starts the data, if there are labels, non-available symbol and non-detected prefix. At any time, we may can delete a Data Frame from the active workspace. The exportation saves the names of the variables into the first row of an Excel file and the data in rows below variable names.


Another part of the menu which is utilized in this project, is the Data menu (Fig. 41). In general, this menu manages three kinds of routines: 1) transformations of the data from the simplex
to the real space and vice versa, 2) operations inside the simplex and 3) management of variables.

| ( CoDaPack v2.02.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| File | Data | Statistics Graphs Help |  |  |  |  |  |
| Datc |  | Transformations |  | ALR |  |  |  |
| C13 |  | Centering |  | CLR Versi | Version 2.02.04 |  |  |
| C14 |  | Subcomposition/Closure |  | ILR re is being develop |  |  |  |
| C15 |  | Amalgamation |  |  |  |  |  |
| C17 |  | Perturbation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pr |  | Power transformation |  |  |  |  |  |
| C 18 |  | Set detection limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| C19 |  | Rounded zero replacement |  |  |  |  |  |
| C20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C21 |  | Numeric to categorical |  |  |  |  |  |
| C22 |  | Categorical to Numeric |  | C13 | C14 | C15 | C16 |
| 4 |  |  |  | \%15.uU | $\angle 400.00$ | 0 21 Y.U0 | s00y.u0 |
| C25 |  | Add Numeric Variables |  | 5854.00 | 6289.00 | 8055.00 | 6005.00 |
| C26 |  | Delete variables |  | 3672.00 | 3861.00 | 4965.00 | 3634.00 |
| C27 |  |  | 100 | 1865.00 | 2858.00 | 3872.00 | 3127.00 |
| C28 |  |  | 101 | 2858.00 | 4003.00 | 5313.00 | 3970.00 |
| C29 |  |  | 102 | 1879.00 | 2440.00 | 3128.00 | 2325.00 |
| $\xrightarrow{-20}$ |  |  | 103 | 5069.00 | 6455.00 | 8124.00 | 5821.00 |

Fig. 41 Menu: Data
The software package offers various options as far as the data analysis is concerned (Fig. 41). Beginning with the Data Menu, Centering is a feature with which the data are centered, that is, they are perturbed by the center or closed geometric mean of the data (Fig. 42).


Fig. 42 Data: Centering
This routine centers the data set, that is, it returns the data set $Y$ formed by the D-part compositions $y=g N(X)^{-1} \otimes X$, where

$$
g N(X)=C\left[\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N} x_{k 1}\right)^{1 / N}, \ldots,\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N} x_{k D}\right)^{1 / N}\right]
$$

is the closed geometric mean of the data set $X$. The center of the set $Y$ is e, the barycenter of the simplex; e.g. for $D=3$ the geometric center of a ternary diagram is [0:333; 0:333; 0:333]. If Show Center is activated this routine writes the center of the parts selected on the output window.

The feature Subcompostion/Closure the data is closed, i.e. data are converted into parts of some whole summing to a given constant, $Y=C(X)$ : This constant is, by default 1:0 but could be entered by the user by means of the Closure form. If $S$ parts, $S<D$; are selected, a subcomposition with S-parts is obtained (Fig. 43).


Fig. 43 Data : Subcomposition/Closure
The Amalgamation feature amalgamates some columns of the data (Fig. 44). The result of amalgamation of some of the parts of a D-composition selected by the user is the sum of those parts. Amalgamation should be used only as a first step in preparing the data for further analysis, as this operation is non-linear in the Aitchison geometry and might lead to inconsistent results if compared to analysis made without amalgamation.


Fig. 44 Data: Amalgamation
With the Perturbation feature a vector perturbs the data. The output is a matrix of D-part compositions
?

$$
y=\boldsymbol{p} \quad \boldsymbol{x}=C\left[p_{1} x_{1} p_{2} x_{2}, \ldots, p_{D} x_{D}\right],
$$

where $C$ stands for the closure operation, and $p$ is a given $D$-part composition. The user has to indicate on Perturbation box the vector $p$, which has to be the same length as the compositions x .


Fig. 45 Data : Perturbation
The Power Transformation feature applies a power transformation to the data. For $a \in R$; the power transformation returns

$$
\mathrm{a} \otimes \mathrm{x}=C\left[x_{1}^{a}, x_{2}^{a}, \ldots, x_{D}^{a}\right]
$$

In this option, we have to indicate the constant of the operation on the Power box.

The Rounded Zero Replacement applies a transformation to the data to avoid zeros (Fig. 46). This transformation involves substituting an observation $x$, with zeros in some parts, by an observation $y$ using the expression:

$$
y_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\delta_{i}, & \text { if } x_{i}=0 \\
x_{i}\left(1-\frac{\Sigma x_{j}=0^{\delta_{j}}}{C_{x}}\right), & \text { if } x_{i}>0
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where $\delta i$ is the replacement value for the $i$-th part defined by the user and $C x$ the components sum of observation x . This routine applies to non-detected data (the software distinguishes between non-available and non-detected data). There is an individual constant $\delta i$ for each non-detected value, that is stored on the data frame.


Fig. 46 Data : Rounded Zero Replacement
The Numeric to Categorical feature transforms the selected variables into strings and overwrites the results on the same variables.

| Transformations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Centering |  |
| Subcomposition/Closure |  |
|  | Amalgamation |
|  | Perturbation |
|  | Power transformation |
|  | Set detection limit |
|  | Rounded zero replacement |
|  | Numeric to categorical |
|  | Categorical to Numeric |
|  | Add Numeric Variables |
|  | Delete variables |

Fig. 47 Data : Numeric to Categorical
The Numeric to Categorical feature, on the other hand, transforms the selected variables coded with a string into numerical ones, and overwrites the result on the same variables.

The Add Numeric Variables feature, imports date to the data set by a simple copy-paste action (Fig. 48).


Fig. 48 Data : Add numeric variables
Finally, the Delete Variables routine deletes the variables the user selects from the workspace (Fig. 49).


Fig. 49 Data : Delete Variables
The CoDaPack software includes a Statistics Menu. The first option is the Compositional Statistics Summary (Fig. 50). This menu produces two types of descriptive statistics: the first related to logratios (Variation Array, CLR variance and Total Variance) and the second related
to compositional descriptive statistics (Centre, Min, Max and quartiles). This routine is utilized and the results are presented in the next chapter.


Fig. 50 Statistics : Compositional Statistics Summary

1. Variation Array: Returns a matrix where the upper diagonal contains the logratio variances and the lower diagonal contains the logratio means. That is, the ij -th component of the upper diagonal is var $\left[\ln \left(X_{i}=X_{j}\right)\right]$; and the $i j$-th component of the lower diagonal is $E\left[\ln \left(X_{i}=X_{j}\right)\right]$, where $i, j=1,2, \ldots, D$.
2. CLR Variances: Returns, for each part, the sum of logratio variances that involve it. Thus, for the i-th clr component $\xi \mathrm{i}$ we have

$$
\operatorname{var}\left(\xi_{i}\right)=\frac{1}{2 D} \sum_{i=1, j \neq 1}^{D} \operatorname{var}\left[\ln \left(X_{i} / X_{j}\right)\right]
$$

3. Total Variance: The sum of all clr Variances is the Total Variance totvar.
4. Centre: Returns the center of the data set, that is, $\widehat{\xi}=C\left[g_{1} g_{2}, \ldots, g_{D}\right]$, where $g_{i}=$ $\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N} x_{k i}\right)^{1 / N}$ stands for the geometric mean of part $X i$ in data set $X$. The data set $X$ has been previously closed.
5. Minimum and Maximum: For each part of the data set $X$ it returns the maximum and the minimum of the closed data set.
6. Quartiles: For each part of the data set X it returns the first quartile Q1, the median Q2 and the third quartile Q3 of the closed data set. The user has to select the columns to close and where to put the results. There are two buttons in this routine:

The output of the routine is placed on the output part. It includes a color classification of the logratio variances (elements of the upper diagonal of Variation Array). It is assumed that the logarithm of the logratio variances follow a t-student distribution, then dark blue colores those elements below percentile 5 , light blue from percentile 5 to 25 , light red form percentiles 75 to 95 and dark red up to percentile 95 .

The menu Classical Statistics Summary produces standard descriptive statistics, including mean (arithmetic), standard deviation, covariance matrix, Min, Max and quartiles). The output of the routine is placed on the output part.

The Additive-Logistic normality test feature allows the user to perform a test for logistic normality of a D-part composition (Fig. 51). It includes all marginal, univariate distributions (with a total of ( $D-1$ ) tests); all bivariate angle distributions (with a total of $D(D-1) / 2$ tests); and the (D-1)-dimensional radius distribution. For each kind of test the Anderson-Darling, Cramer-von Misses and Watson statistics are computed and their significance is given.


Fig. 51 Statistics: Logistic Normality tests
The Atypicality Indices feature obtains the atypical observations and their indices under the assumption of Additive Logistic Normal distribution of the selected parts (Fig. 52). The user has to select the columns to calculate its atypical observations and the threshold of atypicality (usually $0: 95$ ) has to be given.


Fig. 52 Statistics : Atypicality indices
The last part in the Menu section is the Graphs Section (Fig. 53). The options this software offers, enable the user to create graphs in independent windows. The can customize the appearance of each graph and, in some cases, plot the observations in the graph according to a previous classification. These graphs can be zoomed and, in 3D, rotated.


Fig. 53 Graphs Menu
To perform a zoom in a graph it is possible to use the slider scroll at the bottom of the graph or just using the scroll wheel of the mouse. It is also possible to rotate a figure by means of the left button of the mouse. Holding the left mouse button and moving it the graph rotates following the direction of the mouse. If the graph is 2D then the figure just moves inside the windows without rotation. To move the graph inside the window holding the left mouse button and simultaneously holding the ALT key. Furthermore, the graphs can be saved by means of snapshots of what windows have each moment. This can be done with the menu File-Snapshot and the files produced could be in jpeg, eps, png and bitmap formats. The same menu File includes a submenu Configuration that allows to customize the elements of the graph like lines and labels by means of changing size and colors.

The Graphs menu will not be further presented here, as many of the options will be used straight on the data set, and the outcome will be discussed.

### 6.6.2 Application of the CoDaPack's routine on the Saturates' fraction

To examine how compositional data behave when treated according to Aitchison, only a part of the whole data was used; the Saturates' fraction (see Appendix). Components with zero values were removed from this data set, as they would cause problems to the transformation operations. In particular, samples A549, A1711,A1724, A2268, A2283, A2284, A2468, A2469, B515, B554, B014, B1279, B2121, B2122, C540, C1465 and finally, C1473 were removed.

The first step is to use the Amalgamation option. As mentioned before, amalgamation should be applied on the data to prepare them before further analysis. Amalgamation is equal to addition in $R$. The results are presented in the following table (Table 7).

|  | A549 | A550 | A920 | A1140 | A1710 | A1711 | A1712 | A1723 | A1724 | A1725 | A2268 | A2269 | A2270 | A2283 | A2284 | A2313 | A2362 | A2363 | A2364 | A2424 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| amalg | 24574.0 | 164351.0 | 95894.0 | 118237.0 | 84688.0 | 96204.0 | 130134.0 | 58253.0 | 65913.0 | 66642.0 | 39317.0 | 24519.0 | 41602.0 | 53986.0 | 62386.0 | 65691.0 | 79984.0 | 76814.0 | 78769.0 | 239513.0 |
|  | A2425 | A2426 | A2427 | A2428 | A2429 | A2430 | A2431 | A2432 | A2433 | A2434 | A2435 | A2436 | A2468 | A2469 | A2470 | A2611 | A2627 | A2706 | A2884 | A2892 |
| amalg | 229793.0 | 252557.0 | 255369.0 | 288556.0 | 147814.0 | 212470.0 | 152544.0 | 103844.0 | 142061.0 | 202393.0 | 284439.0 | 171464.0 | 94280.0 | 255283.0 | 348520.0 | 51185.0 | 115613.0 | 64207.0 | 137398.0 | 121527.0 |
|  | A2895 | A2896 | A2897 | A2898 | B515 | B554 | B1014 | B1279 | B1393 | B1443 | B2121 | B2122 | B2887 | B1873 | B1874 | C495 | C499 | C503 | C511 | C513 |
| amalg | 239946.0 | 141455.0 | 191406.0 | 104755.0 | 63637.0 | 85889.0 | 37508.0 | 24213.0 | 83605.0 | 63678.0 | 18410.0 | 22286.0 | 37639.0 | 39058.0 | 40661.0 | 73354.0 | 80288.0 | 124331.0 | 300295.0 | 200714.0 |
|  | C529 | C540 | C548 | C553 | C557 | C566 | C574 | C575 | C579 | C582 | C589 | C596 | C711 | C714 | C721 | C722 | C725 | C1386 | C1387 | C1388 |
| amalg | 286154.0 | 74231.0 | 152070.0 | 253089.0 | 268887.0 | 181418.0 | 133703.0 | 233839.0 | 124065.0 | 124764.0 | 49701.0 | 70429.0 | 69213.0 | 95710.0 | 201581.0 | 69094.0 | 53147.0 | 124722.0 | 162462.0 | 224475.0 |
|  | C1389 | C1390 | C1465 | C1466 | C1467 | C1468 | C1469 | C1470 | C1471 | C1472 | C1473 | C1705 | C1715 | D756 | D800 | D801 | D802 | D841 | D842 | D924 |
| amalg | 93596.0 | 135161.0 | 33821.0 | 26273.0 | 16547.0 | 20901.0 | 77669.0 | 18958.0 | 22813.0 | 19675.0 | 15327.0 | 101468.0 | 80685.0 | 101365.0 | 164064.0 | 206299.0 | 87376.0 | 89224.0 | 56791.0 | 45470.0 |
|  | D1173 | D1273 | D1274 | D1275 | D1276 | D1288 | D1289 | D1290 | D1291 | D1312 | D1313 | D1335 | D1364 | D1365 | D1385 | D2471 | D2472 | D2595 | D2626 | D2885 |
| amalg | 54842.0 | 33217.0 | 85176.0 | 47918.0 | 49561.0 | 52781.0 | 52667.0 | 41060.0 | 31760.0 | 82846.0 | 66946.0 | 45664.0 | 79499.0 | 117301.0 | 244337.0 | 403272.0 | 93609.0 | 83301.0 | 79110.0 | 139966.0 |

The next options utilized are the Compositional Statistics Summary and the Classical Statistics Summary (Table 8, Table 9).

Table 8 Compositional Statistics Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Compositional NA's: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Sample size: }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Center |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C13 | C14 | C15 | C16 | C17 | Pr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0653 | 0.0869 | 0.1131 | 0.1035 | 0.1227 | 0.0265 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C18 | Ph | C19 | C20 | C21 | C22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0676 | 0.0305 | 0.0771 | 0.0463 | 0.0375 | 0.0355 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C23 | C24 | C25 | C26 | C27 | C28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0300 | 0.0290 | 0.0266 | 0.0233 | 0.0200 | 0.0168 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C29 | C30 | C31 | C32 | C31 | C32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variation array: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0145 | 0.0116 | 0.0086 | 0.0072 | 0.0086 | 0.0072 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variance $\ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{X} \mathrm{j}\right)$ |  |  | C15 | C16 | C17 | Pr | C18 | Ph | C19 | C20 | C21 | C22 | C23 | C24 | C25 | C26 | C27 | C28 | C29 | C30 | C31 |  |  |  |
| xilXj | C13 | C14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C32 | clr variances |  |
| c13 |  | 0.2668 | 0.2975 | 0.4900 | 0.5675 | 15.260 | 0.9115 | 20.073 | 0.9388 | 12.839 | 15.900 | 14.883 | 16.916 | 16.127 | 16.077 | 16.570 | 16.381 | 17.318 | 15.840 | 16.146 | 15.135 | 18.519 | 10.099 |  |
| C14 | 0.2860 |  | 0.1872 | 0.2844 | 0.3442 | 11.968 | 0.5762 | 15.872 | 0.5804 | 0.8622 | 11.456 | 10.586 | 12.674 | 12.097 | 12.433 | 12.637 | 12.676 | 13.312 | 12.123 | 12.002 | 11.353 | 14.289 | 0.6816 |  |
| C15 | 0.5492 | 0.2632 |  | 0.0518 | 0.0812 | 0.8739 | 0.2740 | 12.048 | 0.2701 | 0.5247 | 0.7707 | 0.6867 | 0.8709 | 0.8133 | 0.8331 | 0.8605 | 0.8596 | 0.9301 | 0.8117 | 0.8116 | 0.7528 | 10.275 | 0.3700 |  |
| C16 | 0.4608 | 0.1748 | -0.0884 |  | 0.0372 | 0.9882 | 0.2583 | 12.921 | 0.1937 | 0.4852 | 0.7392 | 0.6621 | 0.8605 | 0.8143 | 0.8593 | 0.8682 | 0.8736 | 0.9294 | 0.8137 | 0.7888 | 0.7329 | 10.108 | 0.3809 |  |
| C17 | 0.6304 | 0.3444 | 0.0812 | 0.1696 |  | 11.495 | 0.3356 | 14.719 | 0.2185 | 0.5932 | 0.8582 | 0.7788 | 0.9760 | 0.9261 | 0.9645 | 0.9806 | 0.9811 | 10.527 | 0.9213 | 0.8987 | 0.8330 | 11.264 | 0.4747 |  |
| Pr | -0.9007 | -11.866 | -14.498 | -13.615 | -15.310 |  | 0.4274 | 0.0982 | 0.8334 | 0.4168 | 0.4618 | 0.3732 | 0.4566 | 0.3901 | 0.3871 | 0.4090 | 0.4426 | 0.4735 | 0.4574 | 0.4543 | 0.4949 | 0.5272 | 0.3265 |  |
| C18 | 0.0353 | -0.2507 | -0.5139 | -0.4255 | -0.5951 | 0.9360 |  | 0.5457 | 0.1672 | 0.0679 | 0.2097 | 0.1376 | 0.2684 | 0.2278 | 0.2878 | 0.2702 | 0.2959 | 0.3095 | 0.2770 | 0.2563 | 0.2596 | 0.4260 | 0.0516 |  |
| Ph | -0.7596 | -10.456 | -13.088 | -12.205 | -13.900 | 0.1410 | -0.7950 |  | 10.365 | 0.4776 | 0.4970 | 0.3924 | 0.4639 | 0.3790 | 0.3856 | 0.3866 | 0.4261 | 0.4401 | 0.4556 | 0.4437 | 0.5201 | 0.5050 | 0.4256 |  |
| C19 | 0.1660 | -0.1200 | -0.3831 | -0.2948 | -0.4644 | 10.667 | 0.1307 | 0.9257 |  | 0.2502 | 0.4559 | 0.3874 | 0.5627 | 0.5349 | 0.6184 | 0.5950 | 0.6189 | 0.6455 | 0.5700 | 0.5345 | 0.5160 | 0.7796 | 0.2570 |  |
| C20 | -0.3448 | -0.6308 | -0.8940 | -0.8056 | -0.9752 | 0.5558 | -0.3801 | 0.4148 | -0.5109 |  | 0.1028 | 0.0385 | 0.1521 | 0.1318 | 0.2198 | 0.1831 | 0.2251 | 0.2148 | 0.2254 | 0.1878 | 0.2187 | 0.3730 | 0.0719 |  |
| C21 | -0.5536 | -0.8396 | -11.028 | -10.144 | -11.840 | 0.3471 | -0.5889 | 0.2060 | -0.7196 | -0.2088 |  | 0.0698 | 0.0337 | 0.1423 | 0.2067 | 0.1793 | 0.2167 | 0.2159 | 0.2446 | 0.2074 | 0.2532 | 0.3730 | 0.1509 |  |
| C22 | -0.6104 | -0.8964 | -11.596 | -10.712 | -12.408 | 0.2902 | -0.6457 | 0.1492 | -0.7765 | -0.2656 | -0.0568 |  | 0.0699 | 0.0444 | 0.1110 | 0.0794 | 0.1145 | 0.1138 | 0.1347 | 0.1079 | 0.1522 | 0.2674 | 0.0734 |  |
| C23 | -0.7775 | -10.635 | -13.267 | -12.383 | -14.079 | 0.1231 | -0.8128 | -0.0179 | -0.9436 | $-0.4327$ | $-0.2239$ | -0.1671 |  | 0.0706 | 0.1153 | 0.0865 | 0.1093 | 0.1201 | 0.1534 | 0.1427 | 0.1841 | 0.2731 | 0.1489 |  |
| C24 | -0.8121 | -10.981 | -13.613 | -12.729 | -14.425 | 0.0886 | -0.8474 | -0.0524 | -0.9781 | -0.4673 | -0.2585 | -0.2017 | -0.0346 |  | 0.0437 | 0.0122 | 0.0282 | 0.0406 | 0.0665 | 0.0742 | 0.1147 | 0.1903 | 0.1006 |  |
| c25 | -0.8986 | -11.846 | -14.478 | -13.594 | -15.290 | 0.0021 | -0.9339 | -0.1390 | -10.646 | -0.5538 | $-0.3450$ | -0.2882 | -0.1211 | -0.0865 |  | 0.0409 | 0.0469 | 0.0761 | 0.0853 | 0.1047 | 0.1423 | 0.2210 | 0.1339 |  |
| C26 | -10.294 | -13.154 | -15.786 | -14.902 | -16.598 | -0.1288 | -10.647 | -0.2698 | -11.955 | -0.6846 | -0.4758 | -0.4190 | $-0.2519$ | $-0.2173$ | -0.1308 |  | 0.0079 | 0.0186 | 0.0351 | 0.0513 | 0.0843 | 0.1559 | 0.1169 |  |
| C27 | -11.851 | -14.711 | -17.343 | -16.459 | -18.155 | -0.2844 | -12.204 | -0.4254 | -13.511 | -0.8403 | -0.6315 | -0.5747 | -0.4076 | $-0.3730$ | -0.2865 | -0.1557 |  | 0.0157 | 0.0238 | 0.0492 | 0.0712 | 0.1421 | 0.1273 |  |
| C28 | -13.571 | -16.431 | -19.063 | -18.179 | -19.875 | -0.4564 | -13.924 | -0.5974 | -15.231 | -10.123 | -0.8035 | -0.7467 | $-0.5796$ | -0.5450 | -0.4585 | -0.3276 | -0.1720 |  | 0.0221 | 0.0424 | 0.0631 | 0.1343 | 0.1485 |  |
| C29 | -15.070 | -17.930 | -20.562 | -19.678 | -21.374 | -0.6063 | -15.423 | -0.7473 | -16.730 | -11.622 | -0.9534 | $-0.8966$ | -0.7295 | -0.6949 | -0.6084 | -0.4776 | -0.3219 | -0.1499 |  | 0.0297 | 0.0334 | 0.1249 | 0.1195 |  |
| C30 | -17.317 | -20.176 | -22.808 | -21.925 | -23.620 | $-0.8310$ | -17.670 | -0.9720 | -18.977 | -13.868 | -11.781 | -11.212 | -0.9541 | -0.9196 | -0.8331 | -0.7022 | -0.5466 | -0.3746 | -0.2247 |  | 0.0322 | 0.1415 | 0.1145 |  |
| c31 | -20.328 | -23.188 | -25.820 | -24.936 | -26.632 | -11.321 | -20.681 | -12.731 | -21.988 | -16.880 | -14.792 | -14.224 | -12.553 | -12.207 | -11.342 | -10.034 | -0.8477 | $-0.6757$ | -0.5258 | $-0.3011$ |  | 0.1263 | 0.1173 |  |
| C32 | -22.047 | -24.906 | -27.538 | -26.655 | -28.350 | -13.040 | -22.400 | -14.450 | -23.707 | -18.598 | -16.511 | -15.942 | -14.271 | -13.926 | -13.061 | -11.752 | -10.196 | -0.8476 | -0.6977 | $-0.4730$ | $-0.1719$ |  | 0.2524 |  |
|  | Mean $\operatorname{In}$ ( | xi/Xj) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.537 | Total Variance |

The Menu Compositional Statistics Summary, as mentioned before, includes two types of descriptive statistics. On Table 8 we observe the Variation Array, CLR variance and Total Variance as well as the Center, Min, Max and quartiles. The sample size is 95 in this case, due to the fact that in the data set, there exist zero values. The inadvertency introduced by a logratio variance (here clr variance) is that the logarithm of zeros does not exist, so if there are such observations in the data

On the other hand, the Menu Classical Statistics Summary includes the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, covariance matrix, Min, Max and quartiles (Table 9). The first step in analyzing multivariate data is computing the mean vector and the variance-covariance matrix. The mean vector consists of the means of each variable and the variance-covariance matrix consists of the variances of the variables along the main diagonal and the covariances between each pair of variables in the other matrix positions. The variance and the standard deviation are important in data analysis because of their relationships to correlation and the
normal curve. Correlation between a pair of variables measures to what extent their values co-vary. The term covariance is undoubtedly associatively prompted immediately. There are numerous models for describing the behavioral nature of a simultaneous change in values, such as linear, exponential and more. Observing Table 9, it is evident that all variables are correlated positively. The strongest positive correlation forms between C14 and C13 (0.9434). What is interesting here, is that in the classical statistics summary, the sample size remains at each original form of 120 samples. This is contrast to the Compositional Statistics summary, where sample size reduces, due to the exclusion of zero values.

Table 9 Classical Statistics Summary


The CoDaPack softaware offers the option of a Ternary Principal Component Graph. This feature calculates the two (or three) compositional principal components for a 3-part (or 4part) composition and displays the result in a ternary diagram. What is more, it returns, as a numerical result, the Principal Components and the cumulative proportion explained with each component.

It would be meaningful if the Principal Components of this 3-part composition, is based on variables that present a bigger weight, related to the rest variables of the data set. For this reason, the command $\operatorname{var}(X)$ was utilized on Matlab to examine which are the three variables with the most impact. It was found that C13, C14 and phytane obtain the biggest weights ( $0.1034,0.0796$ and 0.924 respectively). Below we present both the ternary principal
component graph for all components produced by CoDaPack, as well as the PC plot that is produced by matlab (using raw compositional data).


Fig. 54 Ternary Principal Component Graph for C13, C14 and phytane.


Fig. 55 Plot of the first two Principal Components for C13, C14 and phytane.
By examining the ternary principal component graph (Fig. 54), we observe that Family A oils are distinctively separated from the rest, presenting a sub-parallel alignment to the first principal component axis (PC1). Samples from families B, C and D follow a linear trend along the PC2 axis overlapping each other. In Table 10 we observe the numerical representation of the principal components for each variable, as well as, the cumulative proportion explained with each PC. Both PC1 and PC2 are positively correlated to the three variables. C13 is the most important in explaining PC1, whereas C 14 is the most important in explaining PC2

Table 10 Principal Components as Numerical results and the Cumulative proportions explained with each principal component.

|  | C13 | C14 | Ph | Cum. Prop. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PC1 | 0.4715 | 0.3999 | 0.1287 | 0.9074 |
| PC2 | 0.1465 | 0.5970 | 0.2565 | 1.0000 |

On the other hand, Fig. 55 displays a completely different principal component analysis result. As far as the discrimination of the four family affiliations is concerned, it is evident that there is no clear distinction among them. All samples follow strictly linear gradients, overlapping
significantly, at the same time. PC1 scores for all samples are positively high, whereas for PC2, the majority obtains negative scores. The first Principal Component in this case explains $81 \%$ of the total variance, and PC2 follows with $15 \%$ of the total variance.

A simple ternary plot of $\mathrm{C} 13, \mathrm{C} 14$ and phytane is displayed on Fig. 56. As in the ternary principal component graph, in this plot there is a significant overlapping among oils $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ and D . Family A oils form a quite distinct group along the C13-C14 axis. Along the C13-phytane axis there is a sample (number) which displays a different behavior from the rest and it is D1338. Fig. 57 displays the centered version of the same plot. It offers a better understanding of how oil samples exist in the ternary plot's space.


Fig. 56 Ternary Plot of C13, C14 and phytane


Fig. 57 Centered ternary plot with grid on

The ALR plot represents a plot of three (four in 3D) alr-transformed parts (Fig. 58). The new variables obtained with the ALR transformation are displayed in an orthogonal coordinate system to visualize how the plot changes when permuting the components or initial columns. Nevertheless, care is required when interpreting the plot, as the axis are not really orthogonal, but at $60^{\circ}$.


Fig. 58 ALR plot of C13, C14 and phytane
What is observed in the ALR plot, is that oil samples form a positive gradient of $30^{\circ}$ along the intersection of alr.C14_Ph and alr.C13_Ph axes. The additive logratio transformation seems to reveal a linearity embodied in oil families. Once more, the most distinct group is that of family A oils. The overlapping still holds among the other oil families.

The CLR plot feature represents a plot in an orthogonal coordinate system of the data, after the centred logratio transformation (clr) of two (three in 3D) selected parts. It has the same capabilities as the ALR Plot.

The ILR plot feature displays a plot in an orthogonal coordinate system of the data after the isometric logratio transformation (ilr) of three (four in 3D) selected parts according to a sequential binary partition. The way to select the partition is the same as in TransformationILR routine. The partition selected in our case is the default (Table 11).
$\begin{array}{ll}- & A \\ 0 & B \\ - & C \\ 0 & D\end{array}$
${ }^{88}$


Fig． 59 CLR plot of C13，C14 and phytane

Table 11 Binary partition for ILR transformation

| C13 | C14 | Ph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | -1 |
| 1 | -1 | 0 |

○○○
ロのロロ


Fig． 60 ILR plot of C13，C14 and phytane

In the ILR plot there are two distinct positive gradients sub-parallel to and below the ilr. 1 axis (Fig. 60). One of the two gradients, consists of oil samples solely from Family A and the other consists of oil samples from families $B, C$ and $D$. The projections of sample points of family $A$ oils do not overlap with any of the other, in contrast to the rest that overlap significantly.

The CLR biplot includes the selected variables C13, C14 and phytane. Once the graph is performed, we may choose 1) which 2D view we prefer (axes XY, YZ or XZ), 2) to display observations or not, and 3) which biplot display depending on the Form value; $\alpha=0$ corresponds to a Covariance Biplot, $\alpha=1$ Form Biplot, and $\alpha=0: 5$ Symmetric Scaling Biplot, which is the default value. In Fig. 61 the biplot is a Form Biplot

What is more this routine returns, as a numerical result, the Principal Components and the cumulative proportion explained with each component (Table 12). Biplot consists on the decomposition of clr matrix, $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{UDV}$ '. If numerical output is desired the routine writes three matrices: UD, D and V . UD are the ilr coordinates of the original data.


Fig. 61 CLR biplot of C13, C14 and phytane
As far as the distinction of the families is concerned, more or less, the CLR Biplot presents the same results, as in the previous graphs.

Table 12 Principal Components explained by clr.13, clr. 14 and phytane

|  | clr.C13 | clr.C14 | clr.Ph | Cum.Prop.Exp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PC1 | 0.4878 | 0.3231 | -0.8109 | 0.9074 |
| PC2 | -0.6548 | 0.7498 | -0.0951 | 1.0000 |

Table 12 displays with which variable each principal component is explained along with the cumulative proportion explained. PC1 is positively correlated with clr.C13 and clr.C14, but negatively with clr.ph. PC2 is negatively correlated with clr.C13 and clr.ph, but positively with clr.C14.

Lastly, the Balance Dendrogram represents a dendrogram by means of a sequential binary partition of selected parts (Fig. 62). The way to select the partition is the same as in Transformation-ILR routine. Here the default partition is chosen (Table 14). As a numerical output, this routine returns on the output window the sequential binary partition used, the mean and the variance of each balance (Table 13). Also on the Data window are the ilr coordinates produced with this partition.


Fig. 62 Balance dendrogram of C13, C14 and phytane
Table 13 Numerical output of Balance Dendrogram routine, including the mean and variance

| Mean |  | Variance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balance 1 | Balance 2 | Balance 1 | Balance 2 |
| 0.7370 | -0.2022 | 1.1537 | 0.1334 |

Table 14 Default partition for the Balance Dendrogram routine

| C13 | C14 | Ph |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | -1 |
| 1 | -1 | 0 |

## 7. Conclusions

The aim of this project has been the examination of the way multivariate clustering methods perform on the classification of oil family affiliations. The methods implemented hereby include Hierarchical clustering, k-means clustering and Principal Component Analysis. The data set under study contained raw compositional information of four distinct oil families present at Williston Basin of Canada. For the needs of the study, four different models were developed out of the given geochemical information; the Saturates' Fraction Compositional Model, the Saturates' Fraction Ratios Model, the Gasoline Range Compositional Model. Focus was not placed on how the models would perform under the aforementioned statistical analysis, but the exact opposite. The effort was on the examination of the data set through a manifold manner.

Taking into consideration the performance of each method separately we conclude as follows:

- Hierarchical Clustering performed relatively well on all models. Family A oils were classified sufficiently and in some cases Family C oils appeared to form fair clusters. However, there was always considerable overlapping among families B, C and D.
- k-means failed in the task of classifying the given data set into distinct groups. In the SFCM and SFRM, it produced a two-cluster solution, with one cluster including mainly samples from Family A, and another cluster containing the rest. Judging, however, from the k-means plots, the clusters produced, did not present clear boundaries between them. In the GRCM and BCM, k-means produced a three-cluster solution, but significant overlapping among all families was observed. This was also evident from the respective k-means plots.
- Principal Component Analysis performed similarly to hierarchical clustering. It mainly distinguished Family A samples and presented significant overlapping among the rest oil samples. In BCB especially, there was an overlapping between families $A$ and $D$, as well as with families $C$ and $D$. Family $B$ oil samples were dispersed in the plot.

All in all, the geochemical information under study, contains complex compositions of different oils. A blind application of multivariate data analysis methods on such data seems to be unable to classify them into distinct groups. Compositional data require probably different approaches concerning their analysis. Their special properties cause problems when analyzed with standard multivariate methods and a whole new chapter has been introduced by the scientific community on the way to examine them. The final chapter of this project deals with an alternative approach towards the analysis of compositional data, and results are compared to previous approaches. Principal Component Analysis in particular, presents a completely different picture when approached in a different manner. Further investigation, however, should be conducted on this type of data in order to understand their behavior and obtain meaningful information through their analysis.
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## APPENDIX

Below we present the data set under study. The next tables include all raw data concerning the Biomarkers, the Gasoline range and the Saturated fraction. All models that were examined by multivariate statistical were derived from these three parts of the data set.


|  | A2425 | A2426 | A2427 | 2428 | A2429 | A2430 | A2431 | A2432 | A2433 | A2434 | A2435 | A2436 | A2468 | A2469 | A2470 | A2611 | A2627 | A2706 | A2884 | A2892 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1tr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 650000 | 10000 | 930000 | 990000 | 0 |
| C23tri | 2380000 | 1000 | 0000 | 0 | 7200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4400 | 8900 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 650000 | 60000 | 30000 | 130000 | 990000 |
| Ts | 9930000 | 8780000 | 6560000 | 4610000 | 3360000 | 750000 | 459000 | 335000 | 3010000 | 784000 | 306000 | 890000 | 3724000 | 484000 | 95400 | 17700000 | 6410000 | 9650000 | 12500000 | 7760000 |
| Tm | 14900000 | 13000000 | 8590000 | 10200000 | 4280000 | 11700000 | 7860000 | 5270000 | 6190000 | 11500000 | 6500000 | 12800000 | 51820000 | 53980000 | 12650000 | 36500000 | 9500000 | 14400000 | 17300000 | 3930000 |
| C 29 H | 30700000 | 28500000 | 19500000 | 22400000 | 11000000 | 26700000 | 15700000 | 12200000 | 13500000 | 25700000 | 12900000 | 22600000 | 135900000 | 116800000 | 25630000 | 74700000 | 21200000 | 31800000 | 38400000 | 8790000 |
| $\mathrm{C3OH}$ | 48500000 | 48000000 | 34700000 | 36900000 | 21900000 | 46600000 | 26900000 | 22600000 | 20800000 | 46400000 | 21000000 | 33300000 | 259700000 | 222300000 | 49010000 | 129000000 | 41400000 | 53400000 | 66900000 | 5000000 |
| C31S | 17700000 | 1920000 | 11600000 | 16100000 | 8210000 | 19200000 | 10700000 | 8920000 | 8610000 | 18100000 | 8750000 | 10700000 | 99660000 | 92850000 | 16760000 | 54700000 | 17800000 | 22800000 | 25200000 | 5270000 |
| C31R | 11300000 | 12400000 | 7550000 | 11100000 | 5770000 | 12400000 | 7120000 | 5470000 | 5740000 | 12000000 | 5680000 | 6530000 | 68410000 | 59630000 | 11480000 | 37800000 | 12200000 | 15000000 | 16600000 | 3850000 |
| GAM | 1630000 | 1800000 | 1570000 | 1670000 | 1220000 | 2350000 | 1200000 | 1010000 | 965000 | 2300000 | 904000 | 849000 | 14840000 | 10560000 | 2731000 | 5890000 | 2050000 | 1870000 | 0 | 0 |
| C32S | 9630000 | 11200000 | 7020000 | 10500000 | 5760000 | 12300000 | 6510000 | 5480000 | 5290000 | 11800000 | 5300000 | 4960000 | 70540000 | 58890000 | 11570000 | 36600000 | 12800000 | 15700000 | 65000 | 710000 |
| C32R | 6000000 | 7330000 | 4700000 | 7080000 | 40900 | 8270000 | 4420000 | 3520000 | 3430000 | 7850000 | 3500000 | 3150000 | 48970000 | 42700000 | 8838000 | 24000000 | 8950000 | 10500000 | 10700000 | 3560000 |
| C33S | 3950000 | 5230000 | 3280000 | 5200000 | 3340000 | 6350000 | 3150000 | 2620000 | 2300000 | 5920000 | 2360000 | 1860000 | 38360000 | 32930000 | 6148000 | 19100000 | 7880000 | 9230000 | 7130000 | 2250000 |
| C33R | 2100000 | 2760000 | 1870000 | 3150000 | 2060000 | 4010000 | 1770000 | 1520000 | 1350000 | 3690000 | 1450000 | 1020000 | 23290000 | 20630000 | 3837000 | 12000000 | 4980000 | 5500000 | 4770000 | 1260000 |
| C34S | 2760000 | 4030000 | 2640000 | 3810000 | 3560000 | 6170000 | 2450000 | 2280000 | 1700000 | 5320000 | 1760000 | 1210000 | 65720000 | 28830000 | 5905000 | 16000000 | 9380000 | 8670000 | 6480000 | 1690000 |
| C34R | 1490000 | 2280000 | 1430000 | 2400000 | 2210000 | 3880000 | 1400000 | 1280000 | 877000 | 3060000 | 1000000 | 597000 | 41110000 | 18250000 | 3576000 | 10100000 | 5830000 | 5520000 | 3560000 | 923000 |
| C35s | 471000 | 828000 | 501000 | 1550000 | 849000 | 1670000 | 618000 | 79000 | 448000 | 1410000 | 568000 | 20100 | 25600000 | 13250000 | 2297000 | 9570000 | 3820000 | 3630000 | 1630000 | 35000 |
| C35R | 230000 | 291000 | 0000 | 78 | 40800 | 757000 | 228000 | 0000 | 186000 | 59900 | 227000 | 10000 | 1475000 | 6785000 | 1134000 | 5100000 | 2340000 | 2020000 | 61000 | 220000 |
| C21S | 653000 | 560000 | 519000 | 381000 | 368000 | 486000 | 311000 | 207000 | 298000 | 530000 | 401000 | 1030000 | 3841000 | 2877000 | 2492000 | 1600000 | 1050000 | 880000 | 1080000 | 1290000 |
| C27diaS | 1040000 | 968000 | 710000 | 753000 | 423000 | 692000 | 551000 | 372000 | 424000 | 908000 | 614000 | 1300000 | 6462000 | 5582000 | 3957000 | 3840000 | 1490000 | 1780000 | 2170000 | 1950000 |
| C29dias | 2170000 | 1720000 | 1520000 | 1610000 | 799000 | 1430000 | 1110000 | 787000 | 810000 | 1840000 | 1140000 | 2370000 | 10820000 | 9838000 | 6672000 | 6200000 | 2740000 | 3250000 | 3810000 | 3330000 |
| C27aaaR | 536000 | 235000 | 283000 | 3900 | 12400 | 348000 | 241000 | 155000 | 149000 | 413000 | 307000 | 475000 | 4360000 | 2580000 | 1530000 | 1570000 | 708000 | 727000 | 89000 | 333000 |
| C28aar | 319000 | 184000 | 187000 | 240000 | 118000 | 213000 | 133000 | 109000 | 118000 | 243000 | 199000 | 245000 | 1760000 | 1040000 | 718000 | 642000 | 258000 | 408000 | 287000 | 236000 |
| C29aaas | 1200000 | 1000000 | 908000 | 961000 | 517000 | 878000 | 650000 | 451000 | 514000 | 966000 | 738000 | 1210000 | 8594000 | 6405000 | 2794000 | 3220000 | 1550000 | 1820000 | 2010000 | 1180000 |
| C29abbR | 1540000 | 1290000 | 1230000 | 1240000 | 683000 | 1280000 | 879000 | 630000 | 672000 | 1220000 | 944000 | 1530000 | 11220000 | 6871000 | 3647000 | 4170000 | 1840000 | 2170000 | 2350000 | 1650000 |
| C29abbs | 1210000 | 1060000 | 926000 | 950000 | 538000 | 1030000 | 712000 | 485000 | 518000 | 898000 | 725000 | 1160000 | 8935000 | 5362000 | 2897000 | 3390000 | 1360000 | 1730000 | 1940000 | 1310000 |
| C29aaaR | 1100000 | 931000 | 894000 | 924000 | 489000 | 873000 | 628000 | 421000 | 492000 | 854000 | 672000 | 1010000 | 8251000 | 5234000 | 2464000 | 3290000 | 1460000 | 1540000 | 1730000 | 1150000 |


|  | A2895 | A2896 | A2897 | A2898 | B515 | B554 | B1014 | B1279 | B1393 | B1443 | B2121 | B2122 | B2887 | B1873 | B1874 | C495 | C499 | C503 | C511 | C513 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C21tr | 4730000 | 0 | 2050000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1680000 | 1010000 | 7250000 | 0 | 1720000 | 1320000 | 1927000 | 1959000 | 1063000 | 2119000 | 1800000 |
| c23tri | 3060000 | 2210000 | 1570000 | 2470000 | 0 | 713400 | 1024000 | 2312000 | 213800 | 5482000 | 1670000 | 14100000 | 164000 | 4260000 | 3140000 | 7834000 | 6310000 | 4719000 | 9069000 | 6670000 |
| Ts | 16100000 | 10300000 | 10700000 | 13900000 | 231100 | 257400 | 351500 | 643900 | 156000 | 1086000 | 500000 | 3560000 | 713000 | 1520000 | 1130000 | 5106000 | 5777000 | 1943000 | 4091000 | 5090000 |
| Tm | 25500000 | 8430000 | 13900000 | 10400000 | 250900 | 164900 | 145000 | 511800 | 62860 | 4973000 | 888000 | 3970000 | 310000 | 978000 | 598000 | 4939000 | 2506000 | 4280000 | 7294000 | 5310000 |
| C 29 H | 52700000 | 16900000 | 31000000 | 21500000 | 0 | 405300 | 0 | 1192000 | 153700 | 15010000 | 1870000 | 10800000 | 911000 | 3990000 | 2760000 | 16580000 | 7859000 | 13290000 | 20800000 | 16370000 |
| С30Н | 85200000 | 26400000 | 58400000 | 32600000 | 1226000 | 890200 | 769000 | 2820000 | 423600 | 15340000 | 3300000 | 24700000 | 2240000 | 8820000 | 6020000 | 18390000 | 9606000 | 13400000 | 21140000 | 16390000 |
| C315 | 28900000 | 8990000 | 23400000 | 10400000 | 0 | 350800 | 372100 | 903800 | 133800 | 8302000 | 1140000 | 8040000 | 594000 | 2590000 | 1640000 | 10040000 | 5414000 | 8007000 | 12410000 | 9473000 |
| C31R | 19800000 | 5630000 | 15800000 | 7100000 | 0 | 245500 | 189300 | 678400 | 108000 | 5655000 | 838000 | 8280000 | 607000 | 2090000 | 1310000 | 6935000 | 3574000 | 5854000 | 9553000 | 6814000 |
| GAM | 0 | 0 | 2910000 | 0 | 0 | 178600 | 189900 | 504300 | 0 | 1482000 | 205000 | 2360000 | 0 | 772000 | 406000 | 2251000 | 1345000 | 2140000 | 4093000 | 2368000 |
| C32S | 17900000 | 5260000 | 15900000 | 6620000 | 0 | 219500 | 182900 | 748500 | 130500 | 5674000 | 658000 | 5100000 | 509000 | 1530000 | 938000 | 8455000 | 4632000 | 6697000 | 11400000 | 7430000 |
| C32R | 11000000 | 3480000 | 11000000 | 4540000 | 0 | 145900 | 116100 | 443320 | 85620 | 3731000 | 434000 | 3760000 | 341000 | 1210000 | 715000 | 5593000 | 2922000 | 4299000 | 7440000 | 4865000 |
| C33S | 7150000 | 2100000 | 9440000 | 2600000 | 0 | 135800 | 133000 | 528200 | 103000 | 3371000 | 357000 | 3770000 | 283000 | 1250000 | 773000 | 5977000 | 3224000 | 4785000 | 8079000 | 5043000 |
| C33R | 3920000 | 1120000 | 5500000 | 1520000 | 0 | 84820 | 74310 | 324900 | 55780 | 2150000 | 175000 | 2960000 | 128000 | 635000 | 423000 | 3704000 | 2042000 | 3076000 | 5182000 | 3062000 |
| C34S | 5510000 | 1330000 | 8950000 | 1830000 | 0 | 99420 | 63970 | 369900 | 51350 | 2141000 | 198000 | 2390000 | 118000 | 700000 | 370000 | 5606000 | 3190000 | 4065000 | 7127000 | 4298000 |
| C34R | 2750000 | 712000 | 5370000 | 929000 | 0 | 56750 | 45770 | 189000 | 40400 | 1362000 | 124000 | 1080000 | 75500 | 419000 | 230000 | 3394000 | 1923000 | 2602000 | 4603000 | 2471000 |
| C35s | 886000 | 206000 | 3200000 | 370000 | 0 | 47700 | 32800 | 138000 | 30600 | 1880000 | 25400 | 1240000 | 0 | 395000 | 238000 | 8054000 | 4406000 | 6263000 | 10990000 | 6528000 |
| C35R | 400000 | 100000 | 1540000 | 150000 | 0 | 30700 | 23860 | 82060 | 24200 | 1015000 | 13000 | 1010000 | 0 | 214000 | 193000 | 4965000 | 2271000 | 3880000 | 6974000 | 3842000 |
| C21S | 1590000 | 1270000 | 823000 | 1480000 | 454100 | 408900 | 1114000 | 1624000 | 67580 | 1557000 | 1020000 | 8970000 | 1370000 | 1090000 | 792000 | 1039000 | 951500 | 512200 | 952000 | 731000 |
| C27dias | 2570000 | 1720000 | 1730000 | 2100000 | 627700 | 592900 | 809100 | 1961000 | 121100 | 1193000 | 768000 | 7910000 | 846000 | 1510000 | 1050000 | 575800 | 906900 | 350100 | 610700 | 302000 |
| C29dias | 4370000 | 3330000 | 3210000 | 4010000 | 915100 | 764000 | 1127000 | 2388000 | 153300 | 2575000 | 928000 | 9090000 | 1070000 | 2130000 | 1540000 | 2305000 | 1867000 | 1962000 | 3130000 | 1500000 |
| C27aaaR | 960000 | 667000 | 682000 | 645000 | 512300 | 319700 | 408200 | 1032000 | 33720 | 3036000 | 574000 | 7030000 | 387000 | 514000 | 305000 | 1425000 | 788800 | 1219000 | 2148000 | 789000 |
| C28aaaR | 366000 | 302000 | 346000 | 508000 | 230000 | 124200 | 124600 | 365100 | 18980 | 1141000 | 228000 | 2540000 | 144000 | 156000 | 124000 | 500600 | 273600 | 453800 | 827800 | 287000 |
| C29aaas | 2210000 | 1320000 | 1830000 | 1930000 | 421000 | 290200 | 330800 | 806100 | 48980 | 2337000 | 401000 | 5350000 | 318000 | 651000 | 461000 | 1625000 | 1085000 | 1411000 | 2362000 | 975000 |
| C29abbr | 2460000 | 1830000 | 2230000 | 2450000 | 456900 | 348400 | 665300 | 1247000 | 74660 | 2936000 | 511000 | 6500000 | 678000 | 1020000 | 702000 | 2252000 | 1327000 | 1645000 | 2325000 | 1650000 |
| C29abbS | 1870000 | 1480000 | 1750000 | 1970000 | 386000 | 291400 | 574300 | 955800 | 64740 | 2392000 | 366000 | 5210000 | 555000 | 841000 | 590000 | 2321000 | 1398000 | 1936000 | 2866000 | 1580000 |
| C29aaaR | 1820000 | 1200000 | 1470000 | 1640000 | 539800 | 314600 | 303100 | 1055000 | 46680 | 3249000 | 491000 | 8860000 | 359000 | 658000 | 463000 | 1843000 | 1099000 | 1478000 | 2593000 | 1050000 |


|  | C529 | C540 | C548 | 553 | C557 | C566 | 574 | C575 | 579 | C582 | C589 | C596 | 711 | C714 | C721 | C722 | C725 | C1386 | C1387 | C1388 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C21tri | 1180000 | 0 | 327600 | 0 | 1945000 | 0 | 633600 | 2336000 | 0 | 1028000 | 0 | 1142000 | 1891000 | 1700000 | 3679000 | 3057000 | 2850000 | 0 | 7534000 | 1883000 |
| C23tri | 5266000 | 4076000 | 1705000 | 4127000 | 9556000 | 040000 | 2818000 | 12240000 | 310000 | 5828000 | 178000 | 5860000 | 5902000 | 5536000 | 13490000 | 10930000 | 9689000 | 53400 | 24780000 | 6858000 |
| Ts | 2469000 | 2476000 | 1124000 | 873400 | 172000 | 2850000 | 1099000 | 4068000 | 1540000 | 2148000 | 1050000 | 2223000 | 3653000 | 3736000 | 5880000 | 5885000 | 3600000 | 5214000 | 14080000 | 1533000 |
| Tm | 3815000 | 5104000 | 1472000 | 3050000 | 10940000 | 9180000 | 3190000 | 9866000 | 3860000 | 4913000 | 1170000 | 6095000 | 2350000 | 2843000 | 6867000 | 558800 | 3728000 | 12140000 | 2147000 | 4392000 |
| $\mathrm{C29H}$ | 12860000 | 15620000 | 5080000 | 8709000 | 27690000 | 21970000 | 10980000 | 25150000 | 11660000 | 16400000 | 3867000 | 20550000 | 7601000 | 8856000 | 18110000 | 16330000 | 14110000 | 38440000 | 42650000 | 15040000 |
| $\mathrm{C3OH}$ | 12410000 | 18570000 | 4882000 | 377000 | 28270000 | 22300000 | 10120000 | 27150000 | 12900000 | 16190000 | 4825000 | 2152000 | 8373000 | 10310000 | 18210000 | 16890000 | 13000000 | 36060000 | 47640000 | 14260000 |
| C31S | 7263000 | 10810000 | 2793000 | 187000 | 18190000 | 13280000 | 6104000 | 16650000 | 7624000 | 9512000 | 248900 | 12970000 | 4971000 | 6227000 | 12720000 | 11230000 | 8357000 | 25660000 | 33750000 | 7472000 |
| C31R | 5252000 | 8168000 | 1941000 | 3651000 | 13960000 | 9910000 | 4585000 | 13130000 | 5353000 | 7169000 | 2 | 9068000 | 3150000 | 3901000 | 8577000 | 7351000 | 5876000 | 18140000 | 2831000 | 4966000 |
| GAM | 1955000 | 2675000 | 683800 | 1053000 | 5409000 | 4012000 | 1670000 | 5190000 | 1592000 | 2869000 | 69190 | 3352000 | 1087000 | 1408000 | 3550000 | 2613000 | 2132000 | 5808000 | 11180000 | 1922000 |
| C32S | 5690000 | 9532000 | 2526000 | 3163000 | 17020000 | 10370000 | 4782000 | 14880000 | 6348000 | 8144000 | 199100 | 10540000 | 3769000 | 4805000 | 9945000 | 9009000 | 6780000 | 20900000 | 28210000 | 5796000 |
| C32R | 3698000 | 6466000 | 1536000 | 2063000 | 10620000 | 6581000 | 3189000 | 9487000 | 4412000 | 5189000 | 1309000 | 7042000 | 2582000 | 3249000 | 7154000 | 6301000 | 4991000 | 13810000 | 2385000 | 3651000 |
| C33S | 3901000 | 6267000 | 191 | 1607000 | 12260000 | 7082000 | 3166000 | 10180000 | 4225000 | 5627000 | 1457000 | 7473000 | 2717000 | 3664000 | 8055000 | 6884000 | 5654000 | 14460000 | 22860000 | 3234000 |
| C33R | 2383000 | 3856000 | 1130000 | 1061000 | 8114000 | 4369000 | 2062000 | 6395000 | 2607000 | 3465000 | 865400 | 4689000 | 1773000 | 2326000 | 5086000 | 4453000 | 3631000 | 9174000 | 15830000 | 1953000 |
| C34S | 3078000 | 5325000 | 1675000 | 1061000 | 12100000 | 5618000 | 2497000 | 9181000 | 4800000 | 4765000 | 1164000 | 6216000 | 2401000 | 3301000 | 6451000 | 6166000 | 4748000 | 12430000 | 2114000 | 2063000 |
| C34R | 1914000 | 3357000 | 976000 | 624200 | 8086000 | 3612000 | 1602000 | 5826000 | 2912000 | 3089000 | 736500 | 3858000 | 1471000 | 2046000 | 4179000 | 3822000 | 3047000 | 7852000 | 1432000 | 1196000 |
| C35S | 4651000 | 6550000 | 2672000 | 905900 | 15810000 | 8189000 | 3681000 | 12590000 | 5145000 | 7428000 | 1889000 | 9774000 | 3460000 | 4756000 | 10160000 | 8955000 | 6848000 | 17340000 | 25970000 | 2289000 |
| C35R | 2990000 | 3841000 | 1772000 | 442400 | 10640000 | 5117000 | 2237000 | 8637800 | 3138000 | 4727000 | 1169000 | 5988000 | 2144000 | 3053000 | 6783000 | 6039000 | 4523000 | 10400000 | 18750000 | 1214000 |
| C21S | 567600 | 70210 | 235000 | 125700 | 993500 | 968000 | 429030 | 917800 | 407000 | 492800 | 324000 | 718400 | 1008000 | 952700 | 1745000 | 1773000 | 1308000 | 1024000 | 2654000 | 1137000 |
| C27diaS | 301200 | 888600 | 68550 | 1681000 | 579600 | 604000 | 377600 | 442500 | 432000 | 218300 | 321000 | 495900 | 640600 | 706200 | 728000 | 792100 | 655100 | 639100 | 1837000 | 306700 |
| C29diaS | 1628000 | 2838000 | 458000 | 3782000 | 4848000 | 3020000 | 1611000 | 3869000 | 1770000 | 2065000 | 751000 | 2853000 | 1792000 | 1950000 | 3672000 | 3199000 | 2306000 | 4579000 | 9029000 | 1520000 |
| C27aaaR | 1000000 | 1787000 | 325700 | 2930000 | 3777000 | 2080000 | 983000 | 2896000 | 1140000 | 1486000 | 450000 | 2082000 | 856000 | 985400 | 2560000 | 2067000 | 1421000 | 3455000 | 6385000 | 1090000 |
| C28aaaR | 35060 | 665 | 81900 | 105700 | 1278000 | 786000 | 367800 | 985100 | 447000 | 508100 | 164000 | 725800 | 275500 | 310000 | 748800 | 606800 | 488700 | 1078000 | 2295000 | 755400 |
| C29aaaS | 1044000 | 2050000 | 313400 | 2321000 | 3831000 | 2160000 | 1043000 | 3009000 | 1300000 | 1518000 | 489000 | 2208000 | 939100 | 1136000 | 2451000 | 2184000 | 1637000 | 4104000 | 7327000 | 1113000 |
| C29abbR | 1411000 | 2916000 | 629400 | 2952000 | 3846000 | 2280000 | 1436000 | 3002000 | 1640000 | 1787000 | 711000 | 3190000 | 1527000 | 1801000 | 4193000 | 3364000 | 2304000 | 6109000 | 11000000 | 1966000 |
| C29abbs | 1510000 | 2560000 | 545800 | 2501000 | 4755000 | 2640000 | 1558000 | 3749000 | 1900000 | 2126000 | 640000 | 3033000 | 1401000 | 1696000 | 3721000 | 3313000 | 2157000 | 5598000 | 9603000 | 1647000 |
| C29aaR | 1135000 | 2430000 | 459800 | 2883000 | 4389000 | 2290000 | 1164000 | 3499000 | 1410000 | 1754000 | 525000 | 2497000 | 1160000 | 1406000 | 3259000 | 2917000 | 2569000 | 4344000 | 7833000 | 1343000 |


|  | C1389 | C1390 | C1465 | C1466 | C1467 | C1468 | C1469 | C1470 | C1471 | C1472 | C1473 | C1705 | C1715 | D756 | D800 | D801 | D802 | D841 | D842 | D924 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1tri | 0 | 996100 | 4200 | 7300 | 1020000 | 894600 | 199500 | 1552000 | 1007000 | 459900 | 441300 | 5290000 | 2470000 | 1236000 | 0 | 0 | 199900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C23tri | 93200 | 2573000 | 3650000 | 1999000 | 5607000 | 4926000 | 1014000 | 7321000 | 4607000 | 2369000 | 2190000 | 13400000 | 5220000 | 2123000 | 111700 | 7660 | 509600 | 141000 | 5800 | 8400 |
| Ts | 28760 | 508600 | 1380000 | 768900 | 1882000 | 2138000 | 324600 | 2747000 | 1317000 | 858700 | 713600 | 16300000 | 19900000 | 6729000 | 3547000 | 899000 | 1294000 | 4495000 | 3340000 | 4210000 |
| Tm | 94580 | 1578000 | 2896000 | 1519000 | 4999000 | 4262000 | 1017000 | 4814000 | 3928000 | 1746000 | 2198000 | 8890000 | 8620000 | 5809000 | 3171000 | 850800 | 1897000 | 10580000 | 7490000 | 4431000 |
| $\mathrm{C29H}$ | 297400 | 5484000 | 9874000 | 5447000 | 17220000 | 14010000 | 3765000 | 16910000 | 13870000 | 6530000 | 7594000 | 34600000 | 28300000 | 10070000 | 9151000 | 3033000 | 3272000 | 26180000 | 20500000 | 12370000 |
| С30Н | 287700 | 5134000 | 10720000 | 5759000 | 17630000 | 14880000 | 3445000 | 18110000 | 13170000 | 6888000 | 7570000 | 44900000 | 51600000 | 14000000 | 19660000 | 6808000 | 4543000 | 36490000 | 29100000 | 23270000 |
| C31S | 172000 | 2787000 | 5617000 | 3207000 | 10060000 | 8297000 | 2167000 | 10020000 | 7452000 | 3693000 | 4248000 | 20900000 | 18400000 | 7918000 | 7455000 | 2446000 | 2809000 | 22620000 | 16600000 | 9931000 |
| C31R | 122800 | 1886000 | 3862000 | 2139000 | 6932000 | 5746000 | 1420000 | 6785000 | 5101000 | 2478000 | 2946000 | 18300000 | 13600000 | 6367000 | 5651000 | 1684000 | 2452000 | 17950000 | 12500000 | 8031000 |
| GAM | 40200 | 678200 | 1334000 | 750200 | 2670000 | 2017000 | 563300 | 2236000 | 1909000 | 878600 | 561900 | 3520000 | 3440000 | 3051000 | 1209000 | 430400 | 1115000 | 5758000 | 2490000 | 1791000 |
| C32S | 127100 | 2188000 | 4994000 | 2797000 | 8656000 | 6968000 | 1756000 | 8478000 | 5736000 | 3125000 | 3462000 | 18300000 | 17000000 | 6284000 | 5760000 | 1713000 | 2384000 | 18260000 | 13300000 | 7937000 |
| C32R | 87500 | 1329000 | 3119000 | 1732000 | 5396000 | 4487000 | 1116000 | 5468000 | 3691000 | 1981000 | 2139000 | 11800000 | 12000000 | 4696000 | 3734000 | 1149000 | 1864000 | 12870000 | 9180000 | 5505000 |
| C33S | 80080 | 1542000 | 3574000 | 2029000 | 5950000 | 5235000 | 1253000 | 6365000 | 4050000 | 2323000 | 2352000 | 11000000 | 9860000 | 3885000 | 2878000 | 993900 | 1882000 | 13430000 | 9240000 | 4619000 |
| C33R | 51080 | 899400 | 2092000 | 1201000 | 3556000 | 3124000 | 728500 | 3801000 | 2455000 | 1306000 | 1414000 | 6510000 | 6430000 | 2630000 | 1832000 | 639300 | 1393000 | 9333000 | 6340000 | 2961000 |
| C34S | 65830 | 1470000 | 2997000 | 1796000 | 5101000 | 4505000 | 999000 | 5156000 | 3099000 | 1865000 | 1807000 | 8040000 | 11200000 | 5602000 | 4624000 | 728500 | 2537000 | 22420000 | 16300000 | 8541000 |
| C34R | 42410 | 678800 | 1721000 | 1018000 | 2979000 | 2617000 | 616600 | 3152000 | 2013000 | 1112000 | 1080000 | 4570000 | 6310000 | 4006000 | 2663000 | 417500 | 2066000 | 17030000 | 12000000 | 5334000 |
| C35s | 94340 | 1564000 | 4329000 | 2494000 | 7028000 | 6284000 | 1485000 | 8158000 | 4463000 | 2737000 | 2516000 | 9930000 | 7340000 | 2472000 | 1787000 | 353900 | 1393000 | 11600000 | 7830000 | 3955000 |
| C35R | 59770 | 1032000 | 2661000 | 1608000 | 4567000 | 3948000 | 930200 | 5150000 | 2818000 | 1699000 | 161000 | 5260000 | 3800000 | 1683000 | 1040000 | 205400 | 1036000 | 8020000 | 4950000 | 2306000 |
| C21S | 9194 | 339300 | 259500 | 146900 | 408300 | 366000 | 79450 | 550800 | 490100 | 165100 | 216700 | 2590000 | 2200000 | 859500 | 403900 | 243600 | 150600 | 359300 | 204000 | 357800 |
| C27diaS | 9683 | 249800 | 129800 | 76990 | 213600 | 186400 | 49580 | 281400 | 410600 | 114500 | 194100 | 1970000 | 1860000 | 1477000 | 1381000 | 1028000 | 244900 | 927200 | 674000 | 860700 |
| C29diaS | 60480 | 945300 | 867500 | 476900 | 1409000 | 1143000 | 300900 | 1452000 | 1497000 | 589600 | 806600 | 3930000 | 4190000 | 2831000 | 3244000 | 1944000 | 602300 | 2546000 | 1740000 | 2450000 |
| C27aaR | 39250 | 446400 | 492300 | 271800 | 908300 | 708500 | 182900 | 904700 | 839700 | 329900 | 442500 | 2730000 | 1330000 | 1052000 | 744100 | 407500 | 291900 | 1721000 | 1180000 | 649900 |
| C28aaR | 9622 | 130400 | 153200 | 82050 | 257700 | 194200 | 58080 | 256200 | 0 | 97880 | 134800 | 759000 | 402000 | 568900 | 495900 | 199000 | 125800 | 616000 | 419000 | 527100 |
| C29aaaS | 36570 | 421900 | 538300 | 282100 | 914800 | 690600 | 195200 | 904500 | 829100 | 338800 | 437800 | 3640000 | 3360000 | 2591000 | 1584000 | 732900 | 656000 | 3212000 | 2230000 | 1788000 |
| C29abbR | 64220 | 717100 | 985000 | 533200 | 1629000 | 1228000 | 364100 | 1573000 | 1426000 | 610200 | 789500 | 6340000 | 5740000 | 3021000 | 2335000 | 1224000 | 834900 | 3594000 | 2510000 | 2365000 |
| C29abbs | 57320 | 705700 | 866600 | 483500 | 1464000 | 1137000 | 310100 | 1412000 | 1239000 | 543200 | 713700 | 5080000 | 4580000 | 2654000 | 1930000 | 1002000 | 809400 | 3027000 | 2150000 | 1849000 |
| C29aaaR | 40610 | 616400 | 591200 | 341400 | 1140000 | 836900 | 221600 | 1071000 | 954600 | 399800 | 508800 | 4110000 | 3790000 | 2307000 | 1275000 | 682500 | 837200 | 4359000 | 2930000 | 1603000 |


|  | D1173 | D1273 | D1274 | D1275 | D1276 | D1288 | D1289 | D1290 | D1291 | D1312 | D1313 | D1335 | D1364 | D1365 | D1385 | D2471 | D2472 | D2595 | D2626 | D2885 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C21tri | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1495000 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 40240000 | 38060000 | 3400000 | 21500000 |
| C23tri | 2190000 | 1940000 | 1640000 | 1307000 | 459800 | 2240000 | 904000 | 11900 | 269400 | 106000 | 19600 | 202500 | 485700 | 38900 | 446253 |  | 73510000 | 65530000 | 4560000 | 63800000 |
| Ts | 9977000 | 6860000 | 4978000 | 4885000 | 1898000 | 9307000 | 4411000 | 5231000 | 11540000 | 4271000 | 1320000 | 7922000 | 7404000 | 3293000 | 11889165 | 50850000 | 89300000 | 139300000 | 27000000 | 102000000 |
| Tm | 14520000 | 106 | 9615000 | 5100000 | 1745000 | 6141000 | 3061000 | 3757000 | 9172000 | 9517000 | 1181000 | 11050000 | 7504000 | 4405000 | 12547264 | 3000 | 139100000 | 182500000 | 46400000 | 279000000 |
| C29H | 4570000 | 3284000 | 265400 | 9900 | 810 | 9500 | 9189000 | 67000 | 242900 | 319900 | 3712000 | 26620000 | 23280000 | 489000 | 644 | 484000 | 240600000 | 442100000 | 10400000 | 417000000 |
| C 3 H | 6372000 | 5495000 | 4407000 | 261100 | 1003000 | 33350 | 1794000 | 2179000 | 477500 | 549100 | 6955000 | 41960 | 4479000 | 97900 | 87406 | 552500000 | 332000000 | 673300000 | 164000000 | 154000000 |
| C315 | 36610000 | 2297000 | 2029000 | 9667000 | 2300 | 340 | 5947000 | 7574000 | 1729000 | 236300 | 2828000 | 219 | 1566000 | 05900 | 25316 | 28400000 | 202800000 | 289700000 | 76800000 | 103000000 |
| C31R | 28010000 | 1642000 | 1527 | 7236000 | 2673000 | 8950000 | 463300 | 5936000 | 13170000 | 17620000 | 2020000 | 1717000 | 1257000 | 7637000 | 83456 | 21280000 | 180500000 | 215400000 | 52500000 | 0 |
| GAM | 7810000 | 338400 | 3396000 | 1776000 | 662400 | 2399000 | 1325000 | 1194000 | 3544000 | 3882000 | 681700 | 4549000 | 359400 | 2066000 | 0 | 72150000 | 657700 | 65370000 | 9690000 | 90100000 |
| C32S | 28900000 | 1497000 | 13630000 | 7168000 | 2663000 | 8066000 | 4279000 | 5559000 | 13170000 | 16350000 | 2291000 | 16750000 | 1242000 | 7901000 | 18272410 | 206100000 | 174500000 | 20030000 | 49900000 | 54600000 |
| C32R | 212 | 983200 | 9388000 | 4816000 | 1702000 | 5853000 | 3025000 | 3959000 | 9060000 | 11460000 | 1613000 | 1176000 | 8750000 | 5247000 | 12608585 | 1480 | 130100000 | 142400000 | 33900000 | 39200000 |
| C33S | 18 | 8439000 | 8503000 | 3872000 | 1391000 | 4576000 | 2642000 | 3274000 | 7628000 | 10660000 | 1462000 | 1062000 | 7382000 | 4446000 | 11472005 | 125100000 | 107600000 | 110000000 | 27200000 | 21500000 |
| C33R | 12180000 | 5193000 | 5504000 | 2241000 | 919800 | 2832000 | 1630000 | 1935000 | 4779000 | 6740000 | 1052000 | 6802000 | 4743000 | 2133000 | 6666641 | 84690000 | 66680000 | 72580000 | 17200000 | 48500000 |
| C34S | 34940000 | 16050000 | 16040000 | 7450000 | 2648000 | 7631000 | 4477000 | 5898000 | 14080000 | 21470000 | 2319000 | 18760000 | 1379000 | 8989000 | 17794250 | 252200000 | 139400000 | 194600000 | 40400000 | 26000000 |
| C34R | 25150000 | 9978000 | 10610000 | 4583000 | 1574000 | 4769000 | 2685000 | 3724000 | 8596000 | 14020000 | 1643000 | 1225000 | 8843000 | 5707000 | 11573888 | 165400000 | 92250000 | 118400000 | 26900000 | 8580000 |
| C35S | 14280000 | 4726000 | 4820000 | 2345000 | 798300 | 2485000 | 1434000 | 2182000 | 4902000 | 7427000 | 938000 | 7112000 | 550800 | 3217000 | 6087510 | 079 | 457 | 900 | 11700000 | 3430000 |
| C35R | 87000 | 9000 | 2920000 | 1371000 | 513600 | 8000 | 884800 | 0000 | 350 | 200 | 601900 | 4412000 | 9300 | 222200 | 371120 | 2600 | 250500 | 46100 | 6900000 | 7110000 |
| C21S | 904700 | 70 | 700 | 2700 | 221200 | 100 | 438600 | 370 | 0900 | 250 | 3090 | 240 | 5600 | 500 | 459 | 722000 | 490000 | 1950000 | 30000 | 0500 |
| C27diaS | 1935000 | 1094000 | 3700 | 5200 | 2640 | 97000 | 440 | 50000 | 30400 | 5000 | 1500 | 010 | 11300 | 250 | 5991 | 2700 | 14590000 | 4000 | 780000 | 1080000 |
| C29dias | 5681000 | 3036000 | 3427000 | 2672000 | 105800 | 379400 | 8800 | 24200 | 82000 | 8600 | 0600 | 7300 | 313900 | 860 | 9627 | 12800000 | 2996000 | 0 | 9690000 | 52000 |
| C27aaaR | 2282000 | 7900 | 138300 | 763900 | 357500 | 123800 | 100 | 400 | 90100 |  | 500 | 5600 | 11790 | 586400 | 1060 | 980 | 64900 | 193000 | 548000 | 270000 |
| С28aaa | 121100 | 626100 | 795700 | 594100 | 219400 | 669400 | 328200 | 402400 | 976700 | 680900 | 95550 | 780 | 681600 | 344800 | 938203 | 0 | 0 | 321000 | 220000 | 158000 |
| C29 | 672900 | 2368000 | 500 | 1955000 | 727900 | 290 | 1460000 | 1686000 | 4500 | 256400 | 600 | 750 | 27230 | 151900 | 582199 | 187300 | 3619000 | 3980000 | 101000 | 194000 |
| C29 | 84 | 3671000 | 3897000 | 5400 | 1117000 | 3526000 | 1861000 | 2112000 | 600 | 3790000 | 401100 | 3013000 | 3748000 | 600 | 6429155 | 300 | 74900 | 2000 | 103000 | 49000 |
| 29a | 74 | 3087000 | 3228000 | 2155000 | 841000 | 380 | 1638000 | 1888000 | 4315000 | 2846000 | 372800 | 27020 | 27670 | 1659 | 5344605 | 180 | 37380000 | 91000 | 7440000 | 15100000 |
| 9aa | 6180000 | 1952000 | 2956000 | 1636000 | 617500 | 2068000 | 1091000 | 1245000 | 2959000 | 2443000 | 304400 | 2239000 | 2338000 | 1339000 | 5281395 | 18500000 | 30330000 | 40100000 | 10100000 | 0 |
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