

# Getting Started With DataSimilarity: Quantifying Similarity of Datasets and Multivariate Two- and $k$ -Sample Testing

Marieke Stolte   
TU Dortmund University

Luca Sauer  
TU Dortmund University

Jörg Rahnenführer   
TU Dortmund University

Andrea Bommert   
TU Dortmund University

---

## Abstract

Quantifying the similarity of two or more datasets is a common task in various applications of statistics and machine learning, including two- or  $k$ -sample testing and meta- or transfer learning. The **DataSimilarity** package contains a variety of methods for quantifying the similarity of datasets. The package includes 36 methods of which 14 are implemented for the first time in R. The remaining are wrapper functions for methods with already existing implementations that unify and simplify the various input and output formats of different methods and bundle the methods of many existing R packages in a single package. In this vignette, we show the basic workflow for using the package.

*Keywords:* dataset similarity, two-sample testing, multi-sample testing.

---

## 1. Introduction

The challenge of quantifying how similar two or more datasets are arises in various contexts where two or more datasets should be compared. This could be in the context of transferring results of a prediction model from one dataset to another, as well as for assessing how close simulated data is to a real-world dataset. The most common usage is for two- or  $k$ -sample testing. Formally, the two-sample problem is defined as the testing problem

$$H_0 : F_1 = F_2 \text{ vs. } H_1 : F_1 \neq F_2. \quad (1)$$

A two-sample test, therefore, can be used to check whether the underlying distributions of two datasets coincide. Analogously, the  $k$ -sample problem is defined as

$$H_0 : F_1 = F_2 = \dots = F_k \text{ vs. } H_1 : \exists i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, k\} : F_i \neq F_j,$$

for  $k$  distributions  $F_1, \dots, F_k$ .

Many different methods are proposed in the literature for quantifying the similarity of two or more datasets, and most of these define a two- or  $k$ -sample test. In this package, a subset of these methods are implemented, which were selected as relevant from a literature review

(Stolte, Kappenberg, Rahnenführer, and Bommert 2024). For more details on the methods and their selection, see the ‘Details’ vignette. In the following, the basic steps for using the **DataSimilarity** package are explained using real-world example datasets with different characteristics with regard to the scale level, number of datasets, and presence of a target variable in each dataset.

## 2. Workflow

In the following, the typical workflow for working with the package is demonstrated.

There are two different use cases with different workflows.

- a) We already know which method to apply to our dataset comparison at hand.
- b) We have two datasets that we want to compare, but we do not have a specific method in mind.

In both cases, we first load the package:

```
R> library("DataSimilarity")
```

In case a), the workflow for using the package would be to find the corresponding function for the method and apply it to the data. The full list of methods can also be found in the ‘Details’ vignette as well as in the `method.table` dataset.

In case b), the package can also be used as a tool for finding an appropriate method. This depends on the dataset characteristics. Here, we distinguish between numeric and categorical data, the number of datasets (two or more than two), and whether or not the datasets include a target variable. We demonstrate how to find and apply a method for different types of datasets in the following. The general workflow for case b) can be summarized as follows:

1. Load the package.
2. Call `findSimilarityMethod()` to find an appropriate similarity method.
3. Call `DataSimilarity()` or use the function corresponding to the method found in 2. to apply the chosen method to the datasets at hand.

For the 2nd step, we present six important special cases in the following for datasets with different characteristics and demonstrate the package workflow in each of these special cases. For finding the appropriate methods in 2., there is a list of criteria (e.g. applicability to numeric or categorical data) which can guide our choice of an appropriate method. These were previously introduced by Stolte *et al.* (2024). The desired criteria can be passed to the `findSimilarityMethod()` by setting the corresponding arguments to `TRUE`. The function returns by default the function names for all implemented and suitable methods. By setting `only.names = FALSE`, the full information on which criteria the method fulfills can be retrieved.

### 2.1. Exactly two numeric datasets without target variables

The dataset `dhfr` (Sutherland and Weaver 2004) from the `caret` package (Kuhn and Max 2008) is a binary classification dataset (regarding Dihydrofolate Reductase inhibition) consisting of

325 compounds of which 203 are labeled as ‘active’ and 122 as ‘inactive’. The variables are 228 molecular descriptors. As the active and inactive compounds should differ in their descriptors, we divide the dataset according to the first variable that indicates the activity status.

```
R> data(dhfr, package = "caret")
R> act <- dhfr[dhfr$Y == "active", -1]
R> inact <- dhfr[dhfr$Y == "inactive", -1]
```

For finding an appropriate method, we can use the function `findSimilarityMethod()`. We specify that we have two numeric datasets. As two datasets is already the default, we only need to specify `Numeric = TRUE`:

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Numeric = TRUE)

 [1] "Bahr"           "BallDivergence" "BF"
 [4] "BG"            "BG2"            "BMG"
 [7] "C2ST"          "CCS"            "CF"
[10] "Cramer"        "DiProPerm"      "DISCOB"
[13] "DISCOF"        "DS"             "Energy"
[16] "engineerMetric" "FR"             "FStest"
[19] "GGRL"          "GPK"            "HMN"
[22] "Jeffreys"      "KMD"            "LHZ"
[25] "MMCM"          "MMD"            "MW"
[28] "NKT"           "OTDD"           "Petrie"
[31] "RItest"        "Rosenbaum"      "SC"
[34] "SH"            "Wasserstein"    "YMRZL"
```

We can also get more information if we set `only.names = FALSE`:

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Numeric = TRUE, only.names = FALSE)
```

		Method Implementation
1	Baringhaus and Franz (2010)	Bahr
2	Pan et al. (2018)	BallDivergence
3	Baringhaus and Franz (2010)	BF
4	Biau and Gyorfi (2005)	BG
5	Biswas and Ghosh (2014)	BG2
6	Biswas, Mukhopadhyay and Ghosh (2014)	BMG
7	C2ST (Lopez-Paz and Oquab, 2017)	C2ST
8	Chen, Chen and Su (2018)	CCS
10	Chen and Friedman (2017)	CF
13	Cramer test (Baringhaus and Franz, 2004)	Cramer
14	DiProPerm test (Wei et al., 2016)	DiProPerm
15	DISCO (Rizzo and Székely, 2010)	DISCOB
16	DISCO (Rizzo and Székely, 2010)	DISCOF
17	Deb and Sen (2021)	DS
18	Energy statistic (Zech and Aslan, 2003)	Energy

19	Engineer metric (Rachev, 1991)	engineerMetric
20	Friedman and Rafsky (1979)	FR
22	Paul, De and Ghosh (2022)	FStest
23	Ganti et al. (1999)	GGRL
24	GPk (Song and Chen, 2023)	GPk
25	Hediger, Michel and Näf (2021)	HMN
26	Jeffrey's divergence	Jeffreys
27	KMD (Huang and Sen, 2023)	KMD
28	Li, Hu and Zhang (2022)	LHZ
29	Mukherjee et al. (2022)	MMCM
30	MMD (Gretton et al., 2009)	MMD
31	Mukhopadhyay and Wang (2020)	MW
32	Ntoutsis, Kalousis and Theodoridis (2008)	NKT
33	Alvarez-Melis and Fusi (2020)	OTDD
34	Petrie (2016)	Petrie
35	Paul, De and Ghosh (2022)	RIttest
36	Rosenbaum (2005)	Rosenbaum
37	Song and Chen (2022)	SC
38	Schilling (1986), Henze (1988)	SH
39	q-Wasserstein metrics	Wasserstein
40	Yu et al. (2007)	YMRZL

	Target.	Inclusion	Numeric	Categorical
1	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
2	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
3	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
4	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
5	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
6	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
7	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Conditionally	Fulfilled
8	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
10	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
13	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
14	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
15	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
16	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
17	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
18	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
19	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
20	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
22	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
23	Fulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled
24	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
25	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled
26	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
27	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
28	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
29	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled

30	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Conditionally	Fulfilled
31	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
32	Fulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
33	Fulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled
34	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled
35	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
36	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
37	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
38	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
39	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Unfulfilled
40	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled		Fulfilled
	Unequal.Sample.Sizes		p.Larger.N	Multiple.Samples
1	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
2	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
3	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
4	Unfulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
5	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
6	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
7	Fulfilled	Conditionally	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
8	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
10	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
13	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
14	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
15	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
16	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
17	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
18	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
19	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
20	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
22	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
23	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
24	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
25	Conditionally	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
26	Fulfilled		<NA>	Unfulfilled
27	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
28	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
29	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
30	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
31	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
32	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
33	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
34	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
35	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
36	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
37	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Fulfilled
38	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
39	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled

40		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
	Without.training	No.assumptions	No.parameters	Implemented
1		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
2		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
3		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
4		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
5		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
6		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
7		Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
8		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
10		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
13		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
14		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
15		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
16		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
17		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
18		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
19		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
20		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
22		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
23		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
24		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
25	Conditionally	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
26		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
27		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
28		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
29		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
30		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
31		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
32		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
33		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
34		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
35		Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
36		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
37		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
38		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
39		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled
40		Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled
		Complexity	Interpretable.units	Lower.bound
1		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
2		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
3		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
4		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
5		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
6		$O(N^2 \log N)$	Fulfilled	1
7		<NA>	Fulfilled	0
8		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0

10		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
13		$O(N^2)$	Unfulfilled	0
14		<NA>	Unfulfilled	<NA>
15		$O(N^2)$	Unfulfilled	0
16		$O(N^2)$	Unfulfilled	0
17		$O(N^3)$	Unfulfilled	0
18		$O(N^2)$	Unfulfilled	0
19		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
20		<NA>	Fulfilled	2
22		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
23		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
24		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
25		<NA>	Fulfilled	0
26		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
27		$O(KN \log N)$	Unfulfilled	0
28		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
29		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
30		$O(N^{2p}), O(N^p)$	Unfulfilled	0
31		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
32		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
33		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
34		$O(N^2 \log N), O(N^3), O(N \log N)$	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
35		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
36		$O(N^3)$	Fulfilled	0
37		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
38		<NA>	Fulfilled	0
39		<NA>	Unfulfilled	0
40		<NA>	Fulfilled	0
	Upper.bound	Rotation.invariant	Location.change.invariant	
1	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
2	<NA>	<NA>	<NA>	
3	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
4	2	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled	
5	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
6	$\min(n_1, n_2)$	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
7	1	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled	
8	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
10	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
13	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
14	<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled	
15	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
16	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
17	<NA>	<NA>	Fulfilled	
18	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
19	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	
20	N	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	
22	1	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled	

23	<NA>	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
24	<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled
25	1	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
26	Unfulfilled	<NA>	<NA>
27	1	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
28	<NA>	<NA>	<NA>
29	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
30	<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled
31	<NA>	<NA>	<NA>
32	1	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
33	<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled
34	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
35	1	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled
36	min(n_1, n_2)	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
37	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
38	1	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
39	<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	Conditionally Fulfilled
40	1	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
	Homogeneous.scale.invariant	Positive.definite	Symmetric
1	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
2	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
3	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
4	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
5	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
6	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
7	Conditionally Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
8	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
10	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
13	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
14	Conditionally Fulfilled	<NA>	Unfulfilled
15	Unfulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
16	Unfulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
17	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
18	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
19	Unfulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
20	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
22	<NA>	<NA>	Fulfilled
23	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
24	Conditionally Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
25	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
26	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
27	Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
28	<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
29	Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
30	Conditionally Fulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
31	<NA>	<NA>	Fulfilled
32	Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled



33		<NA>	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
34		Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
35		<NA>	<NA>	Fulfilled
36		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
37		Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
38		Fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Fulfilled
39		Unfulfilled	Fulfilled	Fulfilled
40		Fulfilled	<NA>	Fulfilled
	Triangle.inequality		Consistency.N	
1		<NA>	Fulfilled	
2	Unfulfilled		Fulfilled	
3		<NA>	Fulfilled	
4		<NA>	Fulfilled	
5		<NA>	Fulfilled	
6		<NA>	<NA>	
7		<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	
8		<NA>	Fulfilled	
10		<NA>	Fulfilled	
13	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	
14		<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	
15		<NA>	Fulfilled	
16		<NA>	Fulfilled	
17		<NA>	Fulfilled	
18	Fulfilled		Fulfilled	
19	Fulfilled		Not Applicable	
20		<NA>	Fulfilled	
22		<NA>	<NA>	
23		<NA>	<NA>	
24		<NA>	<NA>	
25		<NA>	Conditionally Fulfilled	
26	Unfulfilled		Not Applicable	
27		<NA>	Fulfilled	
28		<NA>	Fulfilled	
29		<NA>	Fulfilled	
30	Fulfilled		Conditionally Fulfilled	
31		<NA>	<NA>	
32		<NA>	Not Applicable	
33	Fulfilled		Not Applicable	
34		<NA>	<NA>	
35		<NA>	<NA>	
36		<NA>	Fulfilled	
37		<NA>	Fulfilled	
38		<NA>	Fulfilled	
39	Fulfilled		Not Applicable	
40		<NA>	<NA>	
	Consistency.p	Number.Fulfilled	Number.Cond.Fulfilled	
1		<NA>	12	0

2	<NA>	11	0
3	<NA>	12	0
4	<NA>	9	0
5	Fulfilled	13	0
6	Fulfilled	13	0
7	<NA>	7	6
8	<NA>	13	0
10	<NA>	12	0
13	Conditionally Fulfilled	14	1
14	<NA>	5	5
15	<NA>	11	0
16	<NA>	11	0
17	<NA>	13	0
18	Conditionally Fulfilled	14	1
19	Not Applicable	8	0
20	Unfulfilled	14	0
22	Fulfilled	11	3
23	<NA>	11	0
24	<NA>	8	3
25	<NA>	11	3
26	Not Applicable	11	0
27	<NA>	16	0
28	<NA>	10	0
29	<NA>	14	0
30	<NA>	9	5
31	<NA>	9	0
32	Not Applicable	11	0
33	Not Applicable	11	2
34	<NA>	13	0
35	Fulfilled	11	3
36	<NA>	14	0
37	<NA>	12	0
38	Unfulfilled	12	1
39	Not Applicable	9	2
40	<NA>	11	0

	Number.Unfulfilled	Number.NA
1	6	3
2	5	5
3	6	3
4	9	3
5	5	3
6	5	3
7	5	3
8	5	3
10	5	4
13	6	0
14	6	5

15	7	3
16	7	3
17	4	4
18	6	0
19	10	1
20	6	1
22	3	4
23	4	6
24	5	5
25	4	3
26	5	3
27	3	2
28	4	7
29	3	4
30	5	2
31	4	8
32	6	2
33	4	2
34	4	4
35	3	4
36	5	2
37	5	4
38	6	2
39	7	1
40	5	5

		Class
1	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
2		Testing approach
3	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
4	Comparison of CDFs, density or characteristic functions	
5	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
6		Graph-based
7	Method based on binary classification	
8		Graph-based
10		Graph-based
13	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
14	Method based on binary classification	
15	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
16	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
17	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
18	Comparison based on inter-point distances	
19	Discrepancy measure for distributions	
20		Graph-based
22		Testing approach
23	Comparison of CDFs, density or characteristic functions	
24		Kernel-based
25	Method based on binary classification	

26	Discrepancy measure for distributions
27	Kernel-based
28	Comparison of CDFs, density or characteristic functions
29	Graph-based
30	Kernel-based
31	Graph-based
32	Comparison of CDFs, density or characteristic functions
33	Distance/ similarity measure for datasets
34	Graph-based
35	Testing approach
36	Graph-based
37	Graph-based
38	Graph-based
39	Discrepancy measure for distributions
40	Method based on binary classification
	Subclass
1	Comparison based on inter-point distances
2	Testing approach
3	Comparison based on inter-point distances
4	Comparison of CDFs
5	Comparison based on inter-point distances
6	Graph-based
7	Method based on binary classification
8	Graph-based
10	Graph-based
13	Comparison based on inter-point distances
14	Method based on binary classification
15	Comparison based on inter-point distances
16	Comparison based on inter-point distances
17	Comparison based on inter-point distances
18	Comparison based on inter-point distances
19	Probability metric
20	Graph-based
22	Testing approach
23	Comparison of density functions
24	Kernel-based (MMD)
25	Method based on binary classification
26	Divergence
27	Kernel-based
28	Comparison of characteristic functions
29	Graph-based
30	Kernel-based (MMD)
31	Graph-based
32	Comparison of density functions
33	Distance/ similarity measure for datasets
34	Graph-based
35	Testing approach

```

36             Graph-based
37             Graph-based
38             Graph-based (NN)
39             Probability metric
40 Method based on binary classification

```

We could use this additional information and choose the method that fulfills most criteria among all methods that fulfill the required criteria, i.e., here, the KMD. For demonstration purposes, we apply the Rosenbaum cross-match test here to check whether the active and inactive compounds differ. For a description of the test, see the ‘Details’ vignette. As the combined sample size is smaller than 340, we can apply the exact test. We can either use the `DataSimilarity()` function and specify the `method` argument accordingly:

```
R> DataSimilarity(act, inact, method = "Rosenbaum", exact = TRUE)
```

```
Exact cross-match test
```

```

data: act and inact
z = -9.4098, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of act and inact are unequal.
sample estimates:
edge.count
      20

```

Alternatively, we can use the `Rosenbaum()` function directly:

```
R> Rosenbaum(act, inact, exact = TRUE)
```

```
Exact cross-match test
```

```

data: act and inact
z = -9.4098, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of act and inact are unequal.
sample estimates:
edge.count
      20

```

The output of the Rosenbaum test is an object of class ‘`htest`’. The output of the other methods is also in this format. The statistic value can be accessed by saving the result and accessing the `statistic` element of the saved result:

```
R> res.Rosenbaum <- Rosenbaum(act, inact, exact = TRUE)
R> res.Rosenbaum$statistic
```

```

z
-9.409805

```

The  $p$  value can be accessed analogously as follows:

```
R> res.Rosenbaum$p.value
```

```
[1] 3.56166e-22
```

This holds for almost all other functions in this package. Additionally, the output might include more information specific to the method, which is then described on the respective help page. For the Rosenbaum test, for example, the unstandardized cross-match count is also returned and can be accessed via

```
R> res.Rosenbaum$estimate
```

```
edge.count
      20
```

The cross-match count is equal to 20. At most, there could be 122 cross-matches if each observation from the ‘inactive’ dataset was connected to an observation in the ‘active’ dataset. Therefore, the cross-match count of 20 can be considered a rather small value. This is also reflected by the  $z$  score of -9.41. Consequently, we see that the hypothesis of equal distributions can be rejected with a  $p$  value smaller than  $2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$ .

We obtain a warning that informs us that a ghost value was introduced when calculating the optimal non-bipartite matching, due to the odd pooled sample size. This means that an artificial point was added to the sample that has the highest distance to all other points in the sample, such that the optimal non-bipartite matching, which needs an even sample size, could be calculated. The ghost value and the point with which it was matched are then discarded from the subsequent calculations.

## 2.2. More than two numeric datasets without target variables

The well-known `iris` dataset (Fisher 1936) included in the `datasets` package that comes with base R (R Core Team 2024) includes measurements of sepal and petals of 50 flowers each of three iris species. We compare the datasets for the three species *Iris setosa*, *versicolor*, and *virginica*, which are known to differ in their sepal and petal measurements.

```
R> data("iris")
R> setosa <- iris[iris$Species == "setosa", -5]
R> versicolor <- iris[iris$Species == "versicolor", -5]
R> virginica <- iris[iris$Species == "virginica", -5]
```

For finding an appropriate method, we can use the function `findSimilarityMethod()` again and specify that we have more than two numeric datasets using the `Numeric` and the `Multiple.samples` options:

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Numeric = TRUE, Multiple.Samples = TRUE)

[1] "BallDivergence" "C2ST"          "DISCOB"
[4] "DISCOF"         "Energy"       "FStest"
[7] "KMD"           "MMCM"        "MW"
[10] "Petrie"        "RItest"      "SC"
```

For comparing the three datasets, we could, for example, use the [Mukherjee, Agarwal, Zhang, and Bhattacharya \(2022\)](#) Mahalanobis multisample cross-match (MMCM) test, which is a generalization of the cross-match test for multiple samples. For a description of the test, see the ‘Details’ vignette. Again, we can either use the `DataSimilarity()` function or the `MMCM()` function directly

```
R> DataSimilarity(setosa, versicolor, virginica, method = "MMCM")
```

Approximative MMCM test

```
data: setosa, versicolor, virginica
chisq = 129.78, df = 3, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

```
R> MMCM(setosa, versicolor, virginica)
```

Approximative MMCM test

```
data: setosa, versicolor, virginica
chisq = 129.78, df = 3, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

The MMCM statistic value on its own is hard to interpret. However, the test rejects the null hypothesis of equal distributions with  $p < 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$ . Therefore, we can conclude that the observed MMCM value presents an extreme value when assuming the null. Thus, the datasets are dissimilar.

### 2.3. Exactly two numeric datasets with target variables

The `segmentationData` dataset ([Hill, LaPan, Li, and Haney 2007](#)) in the `caret` package ([Kuhn and Max 2008](#)) includes cell body segmentation data. The dataset contains 119 imaging measurements of 2019 cells to predict the segmentation that is divided into the two classes PS for ‘poorly segmented’ and WS for ‘well segmented’. Moreover, there is a division into 1009 observations used for training and 1010 observations used as a test set. We compare this training and test set. Ideally, the distributions of the training and test set should be equal in this predictive modelling setting.

```
R> data(segmentationData, package = "caret")
R> test <- segmentationData[segmentationData$Case == "Test", -(1:2)]
R> train <- segmentationData[segmentationData$Case == "Train", -(1:2)]
```

The following methods would be appropriate to use:

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Numeric = TRUE, Target.Inclusion = TRUE)
```

```
[1] "GGRL" "NKT" "OTDD"
```

Setting `Target.Inclusion = TRUE` selects only the methods that can handle datasets that include a target variable. For demonstration, we choose the method of [Ntoutsis, Kalousis, and Theodoridis \(2008\)](#) and use all three proposed similarity measures NTO1, NTO2, and NTO3. For a description of the method, see the 'Details' vignette. The `target1` and `target2` arguments have to be specified as the column names of the target variable in the first and second supplied datasets, respectively. Here, the target variable is named "Class" in both cases. Again, we can use either the `DataSimilarity()` function or `NKT()`.

```
R> DataSimilarity(train, test, method = "NKT", target1 = "Class",
+               target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE)
```

Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 1

```
data: train and test
s = 0.96931
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.
```

```
R> NKT(train, test, target1 = "Class", target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE)
```

Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 1

```
data: train and test
s = 0.96931
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.
```

```
R> DataSimilarity(train, test, method = "NKT", target1 = "Class",
+               target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE, version = 2)
```

Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 2

```
data: train and test
s = 0.92444
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.
```

```
R> NKT(train, test, target1 = "Class", target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE,
+       version = 2)
```

Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 2

```
data: train and test
s = 0.92444
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.
```

```
R> DataSimilarity(train, test, method = "NKT", target1 = "Class",
+               target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE, version = 3)
```



Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 3

```
data: train and test
s = 0.96648
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.

R> NKT(train, test, target1 = "Class", target2 = "Class", tune = FALSE,
+       version = 3)
```

Data similarity according to Ntoutsis et al. (2008), version 3

```
data: train and test
s = 0.96648
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of train and test are unequal.
```

We observe high similarity between the training and test datasets with all three methods, reflected by the similarity values `s` that are all close to the maximal value 1. For the method of Ntoutsis *et al.* (2008), no test is proposed and therefore, no  $p$  value is calculated.

## 2.4. Exactly two categorical datasets without target variables

The `banque` dataset from the `ade4` package (Dray and Dufour 2007) consists of bank survey data of 810 customers. All variables are categorical and contain socio-economic information of the customers. We divide the data into bank card owners and non-bank card owners and compare these two groups. In total, 243 out of the 810 customers own a bank card. Bank card owners and non-bank card owners might differ in their socio-economic characteristics.

```
R> data(banque , package = "ade4")
R> card <- banque[banque$cableue == "oui", -7]
R> no.card <- banque[banque$cableue == "non", -7]
```

We again apply the `findSimilarityMethod()` function to find appropriate methods for comparing two categorical datasets. Again, two samples are the default. Therefore, we only have to specify `Categorical = TRUE`.

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Categorical = TRUE)

[1] "C2ST"      "CCS_cat"   "CF_cat"    "CMDistance" "FR_cat"
[6] "GGRL"      "HMN"       "MMCM"      "MMD"         "OTDD"
[11] "Petrie"    "YMRZL"     "ZC_cat"
```

For demonstration, we use the random forest test of Hediger, Michel, and Näf (2022) to compare these two groups. For a description of the test, see the ‘Details’ vignette. For easier interpretation, we look at the overall out-of-bag (OOB) prediction error instead of the per-class OOB prediction error and perform a permutation test with 1000 permutations. For reproducibility, we set a seed before applying the method. Alternatively, we could supply the seed via the `seed` argument for setting the seed within the function.

```
R> set.seed(1234)
R> DataSimilarity(card, no.card, method = "HMN", n.perm = 1000,
+               statistic = "Overall100B")
```

Permutation Overall100B random forest based two-sample test

```
data: card and no.card
p.hat = 0.1605, p-value = 0.000999
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of card and no.card are unequal.
```

```
R> set.seed(1234)
R> HMN(card, no.card, n.perm = 1000, statistic = "Overall100B")
```

Permutation Overall100B random forest based two-sample test

```
data: card and no.card
p.hat = 0.1605, p-value = 0.000999
alternative hypothesis: The distributions of card and no.card are unequal.
```

The overall OOB prediction error is 0.161, which is considerably smaller than the naive prediction error of  $243/810 = 0.3$ . Therefore, the random forest can distinguish between the datasets, so we can conclude that the datasets differ. This is also reflected by the  $p$  value of  $9.990e-04$ .

## 2.5. More than two categorical datasets without target variables

We consider the `banque` dataset from the `ade4` package (Dray and Dufour 2007) again. This time, we split it by the nine socio-professional categories given by ‘`csp`’, which are again expected to differ with regard to the other socio-economic characteristics.

```
R> data(banque, package = "ade4")
R> agric <- banque[banque$csp == "agric", -1]
R> artis <- banque[banque$csp == "artis", -1]
R> cadsu <- banque[banque$csp == "cadsu", -1]
R> inter <- banque[banque$csp == "inter", -1]
R> emplo <- banque[banque$csp == "emplo", -1]
R> ouvri <- banque[banque$csp == "ouvri", -1]
R> retra <- banque[banque$csp == "retra", -1]
R> inact <- banque[banque$csp == "inact", -1]
R> etudi <- banque[banque$csp == "etudi", -1]
```

To compare these datasets, we now need a method that can handle multiple datasets at once:

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Categorical = TRUE, Multiple.Samples = TRUE)
```

```
[1] "C2ST" "MMCM" "Petrie"
```

We apply the classifier two-sample test (C2ST). For a description of the test, see the ‘Details’ vignette. First, we use the default  $K$ -NN classifier. Categorical variables are dummy-coded. Again, we can use either `DataSimilarity()` or `C2ST()`:

```
R> DataSimilarity(agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact,
+                 etudi, method = "C2ST")
```

Approximative Classifier Two-Sample Test using knn

```
data:  agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi
p.hat = 0.31944, size = 567.00000, prob = 0.22593, p-value =
4.571e-07
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

```
R> C2ST(agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi)
```

Approximative Classifier Two-Sample Test using knn

```
data:  agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi
p.hat = 0.31944, size = 567.00000, prob = 0.22593, p-value =
4.571e-07
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

The accuracy of the  $K$ -NN classifier is 0.319. It is larger than the naive accuracy for always predicting the largest class, which is given by `prob = 0.226` in the output. The classifier seems to be able to distinguish between the datasets, and we can therefore regard them as dissimilar. Moreover, the null hypothesis of equal distributions can be rejected with a  $p$  value of `4.571e-07`.

For demonstration, we additionally perform the C2ST with a neural net classifier.

```
R> DataSimilarity(agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact,
+                 etudi, method = "C2ST", classifier = "nnet",
+                 train.args = list(trace = FALSE))
```

Approximative Classifier Two-Sample Test using nnet

```
data:  agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi
p.hat = 0.22222, size = 567.00000, prob = 0.22593, p-value =
0.001977
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

```
R> C2ST(agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi,
+       classifier = "nnet", train.args = list(trace = FALSE))
```

Approximative Classifier Two-Sample Test using nnet

```
data:  agric, artis, cadsu, inter, emplo, ouvri, retra, inact, etudi
p.hat = 0.30556, size = 567.00000, prob = 0.22593, p-value =
1.826e-06
alternative hypothesis: At least one pair of distributions are unequal.
```

The results are very similar to using  $K$ -NN.

## 2.6. Exactly two categorical datasets with target variables

We consider the `banque` dataset from the `ade4` package (Dray and Dufour 2007) again. In this case, we interpret the savings bank amount (`eparliv`) variable as the target variable, which is again supplied via the `target1` and `target2` arguments. It is divided into the three categories ‘> 20000’, ‘> 0 and < 20000’, and ‘nulle’. We divide the data into the socio-professional categories as before, and now need a method for two categorical datasets that include a target variable.

```
R> findSimilarityMethod(Categorical = TRUE, Target.Inclusion = TRUE)
```

```
[1] "GGRL" "OTDD"
```

We use the optimal transport dataset distance (OTDD) to compare the resulting datasets for craftsmen, shopkeepers, company directors (‘`artis`’), to that of higher intellectual professions (‘`cadsu`’), and to that of manual workers (‘`ouvri`’). For a description of the method, see the ‘Details’ vignette. As all variables are categorical, we use the Hamming distance instead of the default Euclidean distance. We can either use `DataSimilarity()` or `OTDD()`.

```
R> DataSimilarity(artis, cadsu, method = "OTDD", target1 = "eparliv",
+               target2 = "eparliv", feature.cost = hammingDist)
```

```
Optimal Transport Dataset Distance
```

```
data:  artis and cadsu
OTDD = 44.166
alternative hypothesis: Distributions of artis and cadsu are unequal
```

```
R> OTDD(artis, cadsu, target1 = "eparliv", target2 = "eparliv",
+       feature.cost = hammingDist)
```

```
Optimal Transport Dataset Distance
```

```
data:  artis and cadsu
OTDD = 44.166
alternative hypothesis: Distributions of artis and cadsu are unequal
```

We obtain a dataset distance of 44.166 between craftsmen/shopkeepers/company directors and executives/higher intellectual professions. For the OTDD, low values correspond to high similarity, and the minimum value is 0. The observed value is clearly larger than zero, so the

datasets are not exactly similar. How dissimilar they are is however hard to interpret from the observed OTDD value on its own. For the OTDD, no test is proposed and therefore, no  $p$  value is calculated.

```
R> DataSimilarity(artis, ouvri, method = "OTDD", target1 = "eparliv",
+                 target2 = "eparliv", feature.cost = hammingDist)
```

Optimal Transport Dataset Distance

```
data: artis and ouvri
OTDD = 49.427
alternative hypothesis: Distributions of artis and ouvri are unequal
```

```
R> OTDD(artis, ouvri, target1 = "eparliv", target2 = "eparliv",
+        feature.cost = hammingDist)
```

Optimal Transport Dataset Distance

```
data: artis and ouvri
OTDD = 49.427
alternative hypothesis: Distributions of artis and ouvri are unequal
```

We obtain a dataset distance of 49.427 between craftsmen/shopkeepers/company directors and manual workers. Again, this value on its own is hard to interpret. However, we can compare the values and conclude that the data of craftsmen/shopkeepers/company directors is more similar to that of executives/higher intellectual professions than to that of manual workers.

## Acknowledgments

This work has been supported (in part) by the Research Training Group “Biostatistical Methods for High-Dimensional Data in Toxicology” (RTG 2624, Project P1) funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation - Project Number 427806116).

We would like to thank Nabarun Deb and Bodhisattva Sen for allowing us to use their R implementation of their test for the package. Moreover, we would like to thank David Alvarez-Melis, whose Python implementation of the OTDD was the basis for our R implementation.

## References

- Dray S, Dufour AB (2007). “The ade4 Package: Implementing the Duality Diagram for Ecologists.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **22**(4), 1–20. doi:10.18637/jss.v022.i04.
- Fisher RA (1936). “The Use of Multiple Measurements in Taxonomic Problems.” *Annals of Eugenics*, **7**(2), 179–188. ISSN 2050-1439. doi:10.1111/j.1469-1809.1936.tb02137.x. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1469-1809.1936.tb02137.x>.

- Hediger S, Michel L, Näf J (2022). “On the Use of Random Forest for Two-Sample Testing.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **170**, 107435. ISSN 0167-9473. doi:10.1016/j.csda.2022.107435. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167947322000159>.
- Hill AA, LaPan P, Li Y, Haney S (2007). “Impact of Image Segmentation on High-Content Screening Data Quality for SK-BR-3 Cells.” *BMC Bioinformatics*, **8**(1), 340. ISSN 1471-2105. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-8-340. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-8-340>.
- Kuhn, Max (2008). “Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **28**(5), 1–26. doi:10.18637/jss.v028.i05. URL <https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v028i05>.
- Mukherjee S, Agarwal D, Zhang NR, Bhattacharya BB (2022). “Distribution-Free Multi-sample Tests Based on Optimal Matchings With Applications to Single Cell Genomics.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **117**(538), 627–638. ISSN 0162-1459. doi:10.1080/01621459.2020.1791131.
- Ntoutsis I, Kalousis A, Theodoridis Y (2008). “A General Framework for Estimating Similarity of Datasets and Decision Trees: Exploring Semantic Similarity of Decision Trees.” In *Proceedings of the 2008 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, pp. 810–821. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. ISBN 978-0-89871-654-2. doi:10.1137/1.9781611972788.73.
- R Core Team (2024). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Stolte M, Kappenberg F, Rahnenführer J, Bommert A (2024). “Methods for Quantifying Dataset Similarity: A Review, Taxonomy and Comparison.” *Statistics Surveys*, **18**, 163–298. ISSN 1935-7516. doi:10.1214/24-SS149.
- Sutherland JJ, Weaver DF (2004). “Three-Dimensional Quantitative Structure-Activity and Structure-Selectivity Relationships of Dihydrofolate Reductase Inhibitors.” *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, **18**(5), 309–331. ISSN 0920-654X. doi:10.1023/b:jcam.0000047814.85293.da.

**Affiliation:**

Marieke Stolte  
Department of Statistics  
TU Dortmund University  
Vogelpothsweg 87  
44227 Dortmund, Germany  
E-mail: [stolte@statistik.tu-dortmund.de](mailto:stolte@statistik.tu-dortmund.de)