Mathematical Data Science for crystals

Vitaliy Kurlin's group including Phil Smith, Matt Bright, Dan Widdowson, ... Materials Innovation Factory (MIF), Liverpool Royal Acad. Engineering Ind. Fellow, CCDC



Objects: all periodic crystals

Solid crystalline materials (periodic *crystals*) can have many types, all consist of elementary blocks (*motifs*) of atoms, ions or molecules in a *unit cell* periodically repeated in three directions.







Are the above lattices different or equivalent?



Even if we fix a cell, input ambiguity remains.

(日) (雪) (日) (日) (日)

500

Past equivalences of crystals

What crystals are *equivalent*? An equivalence has three axioms: $A \sim A$, if $A \sim B$ then $B \sim A$, transitivity: if $A \sim B \sim C$ then $A \sim C$ (needed for a non-trivial splitting into well-defined classes).

By symmetry group: 230 classes are known, insuffucient to classify 1M+ crystals in the CSD.

Many crystals are often called *similar*. When is such a similarity an *equivalence relation*?

What if crystals have similar density or energy?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Similarity by perturbation

Nomenclature of inorganic structure types (ACA 1990) uses many parameters, but any similarity threshold > 0 makes the classification trivial.



Assume $A \sim B$ if A can be perturbed to B by a small d > 0. Then any A, B are joined by a chain of small perturbations $A \sim A_1 \sim \cdots \sim A_n \sim B$, so A, B are equivalent by the transitivity axiom. We can compare any crystals, not only similar.

Crystals up to isometry

Crystal structures are determined in a **rigid** form and should be studied up to *rigid motion* (a composition of translations and rotations in 3D).

Isometries also include mirror reflections.



Hence a *crystal* is not a single set, but a class of *infinitely many periodic point sets* equivalent to each other up to isometry or rigid motion in 3D.

How can we distinguish crystals?

An invariant (number, vector, matrix,...) must

take the **same value** on all isometric crystals. crystal input = cell+motif, invariant: isometric crystals - one value



If a **non-invariant** takes two different values on two crystals, then **no conclusion** can be made.



Question: how about non-invariant *big data*? Answer: use invariants.

Non-invariants cannot help science

Even if some descriptors or features distinguish objects, it doesn't make them reliable invariants. The average colour (one of $256^3 = 16,777,216$) of clothes can easily distinguish many people but cannot be used for a reliable identification.

A scientifically justified invariant of humans is a DNA code. Data Science for any other objects looks for similar invariants that are complete for an important *equivalence relation* in question.



Taking boxes or balls with a *fixed cut-off radius* produces **non-isometric finite sets with no chance** to reconstruct a given periodic set.

Discontinuity of past invariants

Even if a cell is reduced (Niggli's cell), any such reduction is discontinuous under perturbations.

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	୍କ
•	୍କ	•	୍କ
•	é	ి	•
•	•	•	•

A reduced cell can double under almost any perturbation. All discrete invariants including symmetry groups are discontinuous. How can we continuously *quantify a crystal similarity*?

Why is *continuity important*? All atoms vibrate, real measurements are noisy, too many crystals.

Isometry classification problem

We need a complete and continuous isometry *invariant I* : {periodic point sets} \rightarrow {numbers}. 1) *Invariance* : if point sets $S \sim Q$ are isometric, then I(S) = I(Q), so I should be well-defined on isometry classes, independent of a unit cell. 2) Completeness : if I(S) = I(Q), then S, Q are isometric, so I distinguishes all sets $S \not\sim Q$. 3) Continuity : the invariant I slightly changes under perturbations to quantify a similarity.

More classification requirements

4) *Computability* : a polynomial time in a motif size (the number *m* of atoms in a unit cell).
Current brute-force : blind sampling of an infinite space produces 5679 predictions over 12 weeks on a supercomputer, five crystals synthesised.

5) *Inverse design* : a complete invariant should allow us to reconstruct a full 3D crystal so that we can choose a new invariant value and then discover a new crystal with desired properties.

Metric axioms and metric problem

- A metric $d \ge 0$ on isometry classes of crystals:
- (1) d(S, Q) = 0 if and only if S, Q are isometric;
- (2) symmetry: d(S, Q) = d(Q, S);
- (3) riangle inequality: $d(S, T) \le d(S, Q) + d(Q, T)$.
- The first metric axiom fails for any non-complete invariant *I*: if I(S) = I(Q) for non-isometric *S*, *Q*, then any distance *d* between I(S), I(Q) is 0.

The metric problem solves the classification: S, Q are isometric if and only if d(S, Q) = 0.

Mercury's RMSD implementation

Given two crystals, Mercury tries to match a number of molecules (15 by default) in both crystals by finding a best rigid motion, outputs the Root Mean Square Deviation RMSD

 $=\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}||p_i-q_i||^2}$ between *n* matched atoms.

RMSD fails the triangle inequality and is a bounded version of the bottleneck distance $d_B(S, Q) = \inf_{f:S \to Q} \sup_{p \in S} ||f(p) - p||$, which can be $+\infty$, e.g. $S = \mathbb{Z}$, $Q = (1 + \varepsilon)\mathbb{Z}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

New isometry invariants of crystals

Density functions, Proceedings SoCG 2021 + continuous, + complete for generic crystals,

- slower (cubic time, hours on 5679 crystals) *Isosets*, DGMM 2021, arxiv:2103.02749
- + continuous, + complete for all crystals,
- slower (cubic time), + allow inverse design.

Distance-based invariants, MATCH, to appear + simple, + continuous, + fast (near linear time, seconds on 5679 crystals), arxiv:2108.04798, + generically complete, + allow inverse design.



For a finite or periodic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let d_{ij} be the distance from a point p_i in a motif, i = 1, ..., m, to its *j*-th nearest neighbour in *S*. For any $k \ge 1$, *Average Minimum Distance* AMD_k = $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{ik}$.

Finite sets up to isometry

Pozdnyakov et al. *Incompleteness of atomic structure representations*, Phys. Rev. Let. 2020 reviewed many isometry invariants, also for finite sets and suggested several pairs of sets that are not distinguished by inter-point distances.

For a set *S* of *m* points and $k \ge 1$, $d_k(p)$ is the distance from *p* to its *k*-th nearest neighbor in *S*. The rows of the $m \times k$ matrix D(S; k) are lists $d_1(p) \le \cdots \le d_k(p)$, ordered lexicographically.



To get PDD(S; k), collapse identical rows and assign weights. The trapezium and kite differ:

$$PDD(T;3) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \\ 1/2 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{10} & 4 \end{pmatrix} \neq \\PDD(K;3) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} & 4 \\ 1/2 & \sqrt{2} & 2 & \sqrt{10} \\ 1/4 & \sqrt{10} & \sqrt{10} & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$



Higher-order $PDD^{(h)}$ **invariants** Matrices $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ for $h \ge 2$ include ordered distances from *h*-point subsets of *S* to *k* nearest neighbours, distinguish all known non-isometric sets, continuous in the Earth Mover's Distance.

Generic periodic sets can be **reconstructed** from PDD(S; k) and lattice invariants for big k.

Based on *k*-nearest neighbours, $PDD^{(h)}(S; k)$ is found in time $O(h^2 k m^h \log(hm) \log^2 k)$ with some constants depending on *S*, arxiv:2108.04798.

A tree of 12576 crystalline drugs



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへで

Crystal Isometry Principle Map: {all crystals} \rightarrow {periodic point sets} taking only atomic centres should be injective.



Nearest neighbor distance d = a/2

400M+ pairwise comparisons of all 660K+ periodic crystals in the CSD detected 5 pairs with identical geometry, different chemistry, physically impossible: 5 journals are investigating.



Summary: maths for crystals Equivalence of crystals: isometry, rigid motion. Past descriptors: not invariants, discontinuous.

Isometry invariants PDD (Pointwise Distance Distributions) are complete in general position, simpler and faster than persistence that is a weaker isometry invariant of finite sets in TDA.

Crystal Isometry Principle (CRISP) justifies that all crystals live in one *continuous space* parameterised by complete invariants.