Estimation of significance levels and confidence intervals for first-order reversal curve distributions
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[1] First-order reversal curve (FORC) distributions provide a means with which to describe a magnetic mineral assemblage in terms of coercivities and interaction fields. In recent years the use of experimentally derived FORC distributions has increased dramatically and they are being placed in an increasingly quantitative interpretational framework. An outstanding issue for calculation and interpretation of FORC data sets is the statistical significance that can be assigned to structures in experimentally determined distributions. Without this knowledge, the selection and characterization of structures that can be deemed interpretable within a FORC distribution is a subjective process. We demonstrate how FORC processing algorithms can be adapted to provide a measure of statistical significance and a confidence interval for each point in a FORC distribution. This information can guide measurement protocols and provides a more quantitative framework for interpretation of FORC distributions.
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1. Introduction

[2] Since development of an efficient measurement protocol [Pike et al., 1999], first-order reversal curve (FORC) diagrams have become a popular hysteresis-based method with which to characterize magnetic mineral assemblages. FORC distributions provide a means with which to estimate the distributions of coercivities and interaction fields within a magnetic particle system and, therefore, provide information on both mineralogical composition and domain state [Roberts et al., 2000; Winklhofer and Zimanyi, 2006; Muxworthy and Roberts, 2007].

[3] Recent studies have addressed several issues concerned with both calculation and interpretation of FORC distributions. Statistical analysis of measured magnetization data now allows estimation of a FORC distribution with an optimized signal-to-noise ratio [Heslop and Muxworthy, 2005; Harrison and Feinberg, 2008]. An extended FORC
formalism has been developed so that undefined regions of FORC distributions can be estimated via imputation [Pike, 2003; Winklhofer et al., 2008]. Theoretical and experimental studies have produced type FORC distributions for systems such as superparamagnetic, single domain and multidomain ferromagnets as well as for interacting single domain systems [e.g., Pike et al., 1999; Roberts et al., 2000; Pike et al., 2001a, 2001b; Muxworthy et al., 2004; Newell, 2005; Egli, 2006; Egli et al., 2010]. Artificial samples have been examined to understand the expression of mixed magnetic mineral assemblages and magnetostatic interactions in FORC distributions [Muxworthy et al., 2005; Carvallo et al., 2006a; Krása et al., 2009, 2011]. Fitting parametric functions to profiles taken through FORC distributions has helped to elucidate the behavior of complex systems and quantify the relative abundance of different magnetic components within natural mixing systems [Egli, 2006; Chen et al., 2007; Yamazaki, 2009; Egli et al., 2010]. Finally, the magnetic mineral assemblages contained within a wide variety of geological, biological and extraterrestrial materials have been characterized using the FORC method [Roberts et al., 2000; Pan et al., 2005; Carvallo et al., 2006b; Roberts et al., 2006; Acton et al., 2007a; Chen et al., 2007; Carvallo et al., 2009; Yamazaki, 2009].

In recent years, there has been an effort to place FORC data into a more quantitative framework to enable interpretation of subtle features of calculated distributions [Newell, 2005; Egli, 2006; Winklhofer and Zimanyi, 2006; Egli et al., 2010]. It is therefore necessary to provide an objective assessment of the fidelity of structures observed in experimental FORC distributions. Without such information, the decision as to which features of a FORC distribution are a real expression of the magnetic particle system becomes a subjective decision.

We demonstrate how FORC algorithms can be adapted to provide measures of statistical significance and confidence intervals for each point in a calculated distribution. Significance levels can be mapped across a FORC distribution to quantify the structure of large-scale characteristic features, for example, the field to which a central ridge produced by non-interacting single domain grains propagates [Egli et al., 2010]. When fitting parametric functions to FORC data it is essential to consider the uncertainty associated with the points in the selected profile and thus the level of correspondence that is required between the model and data [Egli, 2006; Chen et al., 2007; Yamazaki, 2009; Egli et al., 2010]. Confidence intervals can be assigned to each point in a profile enabling a realistic model to be formulated that takes into account the uncertainty in the data. Finally, averaging multiple FORC runs is considered to be an effective means with which to increase the signal-to-noise ratio of a FORC distribution [Egli et al., 2010]. Significance levels and confidence intervals can guide the decision of how many runs must be made to produce an averaged FORC distribution with sufficient fidelity for the task at hand. For example, if the aim of the analysis is to produce profiles that elucidate the nature of a mixed magnetic mineral assemblage, runs can be repeated until the confidence intervals associated with the profile are sufficiently narrow to allow construction of a meaningful mixing model. We demonstrate our approach with a number of examples.

2. Estimation of a FORC Distribution

Estimation of a FORC distribution is based on measurement of a collection of FORCs. An individual FORC is measured by first saturating a sample in a positive magnetic field and then decreasing the field to a pre-defined reversal field, \( B_a \). From this reversal point, the field is once again increased and the magnetization, \( M \), is measured at each applied field, \( B_b \) (Figure 1). The magnetization at any given point along a FORC is therefore a function of both the reversal field and the applied fields. A FORC diagram is constructed by measuring a suite of FORCs across a range of \( B_a \) values, which yields a grid of magnetization data: \( M(B_a', B_b) \).

Figure 1. An example of a FORC originating from the reversal field, \( B_a \), and measured at various values of \( B_b \) as the field returns to positive saturation.
A FORC distribution is given by the mixed second derivative of the magnetization data with respect to $B_a$ and $B_b$ [Mayergoyz, 1986]:

$$\rho(B_a, B_b) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 M(B_a, B_b)}{\partial B_a \partial B_b},$$

(1)

where $\rho$ is only well defined for $B_b > B_a$ and is displayed in a rotated $\{B_c, B_d\}$ coordinate system given by $B_c = (B_a - B_b)/2$ and $B_d = (B_a + B_b)/2$ [Pike et al., 1999]. When estimated directly from a measured data set, $\rho$ will usually have a low signal-to-noise ratio, thereby hindering interpretation of the FORC distribution. To overcome this issue, Pike et al. [1999] employed a local second-order polynomial surface to represent $\rho(B_a, B_b)$ points using the OLS approach of Pike et al. [1999] and Harrison and Feinberg [2008]. The initial step in both techniques is to select $n$ points around a location of interest using ordinary least squares (OLS). The polynomial surface takes the form $a_1 + a_2B_a + a_3B_a^2 + a_4B_b + a_5B_b^2 + a_6B_a B_b$, multiplication of the $a_6$ coefficient (associated with the mixed $B_a B_b$ term) by $-0.5$ provides an estimate of $\rho$. The size of the local grid is controlled by a smoothing factor (SF), with larger values yielding a smoother FORC distribution [Roberts et al., 2000]. The optimal value of SF provides a balance between removing noise from the FORC distribution while ensuring that the structure of the distribution is not distorted by excessive smoothing [Heslop and Muxworthy, 2005; Harrison and Feinberg, 2008]. The FORCIT software package of Acton et al. [2007b] provides a full implementation of the Pike et al. [1999] approach.

An alternative locally weighted polynomial regression (LOESS) approach to estimate $\rho$ was presented by Harrison and Feinberg [2008]. While Pike et al. [1999] used a regular grid of points, Harrison and Feinberg [2008] selected points around a location of interest on a nearest-neighbor basis. A second-order polynomial surface is then fitted to the selected points using weighted least squares (WLS), where the weight of each point decreases with increasing distance from the location of interest. The approaches of Pike et al. [1999] and Harrison and Feinberg [2008] are used routinely to estimate FORC distributions.

Additional consideration has been given to the measurement resolution required to identify specific features in a FORC distribution [Egli et al., 2010] and methods to select an optimal value of SF for a given data set [Heslop and Muxworthy, 2005; Harrison and Feinberg, 2008]. Little attention, however, has been given to the statistical significance of features within a FORC distribution. As interpretation of FORC distributions becomes more quantitative, it is essential that subtle features can be demonstrated to be statistically significant and not simply an artifact of measurement noise or the algorithm employed to estimate $\rho$. In this paper we demonstrate how significance levels and confidence intervals can be calculated for estimated values of $\rho$ from the approaches of Pike et al. [1999] and Harrison and Feinberg [2008]. The significance levels can be mapped in the $\{B_a, B_b\}$ plane to illustrate which parts of a calculated FORC distribution are significantly non-zero, while the confidence intervals provide crucial information when profiles through a distribution are analyzed.

3. Estimating $\rho(B_a, B_b)$ and Its Significance Level

We consider the regression problem of fitting a second-order polynomial surface to a collection of $M(B_a, B_b)$ points using the OLS approach of Pike et al. [1999] and WLS approach of Harrison and Feinberg [2008]. The initial step in both techniques is to select $n$ points around a location of interest in the $\{B_a, B_b\}$ plane (where $n$ is a function of SF). A design matrix, $X$, is then constructed to contain the regressors, with each row of the matrix containing a constant and field terms $(1, B_a, B_a^2, B_b, B_b^2, B_a B_b)$ for one of the n selected points. The magnetization values of the $n$ selected points are then placed in the column vector, $y$. Using matrix notation, the magnetization values are related to the design matrix by the linear model:

$$y = X a + e,$$

(2)

where $a$ is a vector containing the coefficients $a_1$ to $a_6$ and $e$ is an $n$-by-1 vector of errors. An estimate of the vector of regression coefficients, $\hat{a}$, then provides an estimate of $\rho(B_a, B_b)$ from $\hat{a}_6$. Because $\hat{a}_6$ is only an estimate of the true value of $a_6$ and thus of $\rho(B_a, B_b)$, it is essential to examine the result statistically. Specifically, this requires calculation of a $p$-value for the null hypothesis that $a_6 = 0$ and thus that $\rho(B_a, B_b) = 0$. To test the null hypothesis, an estimate of the error on $\hat{a}_6$ must be made.

It is important to consider the ability of a local second-order polynomial surface to represent the FORC function of a collection of sampled points. Generally such a trend-surface should perform well in most regions of the FORC diagram providing that data have been collected at sufficient resolution. In such regions the $e$ term in the linear model (equation (2)) should correspond to the measurement errors. The central ridge of a
FORC distribution (produced by noninteracting single domain particles) is a more complicated case. Because the ridge results from a discontinuous FORC function, its form cannot be represented using a second-order polynomial surface [Egli et al., 2010]. Therefore part of the FORC signal will be incorrectly assigned to $e$ because the fitted function provides an inadequate representation of the true function. The implications of this issue will be considered in more detail below.

The linear model presented in equation (2) could be extended easily to fit FORC diagrams using higher-order polynomial functions with more flexible surfaces. This would simply require addition of appropriate terms to the design matrix and a corresponding adjustment to the degrees-of-freedom in the statistical analysis presented below.

3.1. Ordinary Least Squares

Using the OLS approach, a solution to equation (2) is found by minimizing the sum of squared errors:

$$e^T e = (y - X\hat{\beta})^T(y - X\hat{\beta}),$$  

which yields:

$$\hat{\beta} = (X^T X)^{-1}X^T y.$$  

The measured magnetizations of the selected points, $y$, and their estimates from the regression model, $\hat{y}$, can be related by the so-called “hat” matrix, $H$. If $\hat{y} = Hy$ then:

$$H = X(X^T X)^{-1}X^T.$$  

The mean squared error, MSE, of the fitted regression model can be found using the hat matrix:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{y^T(I - H)y}{n - 6},$$  

where $I$ is a $n$-by-$n$ identity matrix. Once the MSE has been found, the variance-covariance matrix of the regression coefficients can be estimated:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_a = (X^T X)^{-1}\text{MSE}.$$  

The estimated standard error, SE, on $\hat{a}_6$ is then given by the square root of the sixth diagonal element of $\hat{\Sigma}_a$. To obtain a $p$-value with which to test the null hypothesis (i.e., that $a_6 = 0$), the ratio of $\hat{a}_6$ to the SE is compared to a Student’s $t$-distribution in a two-sided manner (thus taking into consideration that $\hat{a}_6$ can be different from 0 in two ways; $\hat{a}_6 > 0$ and $\hat{a}_6 < 0$). The $p$-value is given by:

$$p = 2(1 - t_i([\hat{a}_6]/\text{SE})).$$  

where $t$ represents the value of the Student’s $t$-distribution with $n-6$ degrees of freedom at a specified $\alpha$ level. The $p$-value gives the probability that the null hypothesis is true given the observations. Thus, if $p$ falls below a pre-defined $\alpha$ significance level, the null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis ($a_6 \neq 0$) will be accepted. Typically, $\alpha$ would be set at a value of 0.05, which implies that there is a 5% chance that the test will incorrectly reject a true null hypothesis (i.e., the test returns $a_6 \neq 0$ incorrectly).

By applying the OLS method in the above manner the measurement errors of the magnetization in $y$ are assumed to be uncorrelated random variables with zero means and constant variance. The assumption of errors with constant variance is termed homoscedasticity and bias can be introduced into $\Sigma_a$ and in turn into SE and $p$, if the assumption is not met.

Errors that do not have a constant variance are termed heteroscedastic and require special consideration. For a small local grid of points over which the linear model (equation (2)) is fitted, errors in the measurement of $M$ and those related to the applied field can be assumed to be effectively homoscedastic. Instrument drift during FORC measurement will potentially induce different noise characteristics in each of the curves included in a local grid [Jackson and Solheid, 2010]. Such drift related errors must be considered to be heteroscedastic.

A heteroscedasticity-consistent standard error (HCSE) estimator is adopted, which should allow robust inferences to be drawn even if the assumption of homoscedasticity is violated. The HC3 estimator [MacKinnon and White, 1985] provides a heteroscedasticity robust estimator of $\Sigma_a$:

$$\text{HC3} = (X^T X)^{-1}X^T\text{diag}\left[\frac{e_i^2}{(1 - h_{ii})^2}\right]X(X^T X)^{-1},$$  

where $e = y - Hy$ and $h_{ii}$ are the diagonal elements of $H$. Once the HC3 estimate of $\Sigma_a$ is made, equation (8) can be solved to obtain $p$. Although a variety of HCSE estimators exist, empirical investigations demonstrate that HC3 performs well when using $t$-tests to assess regression coefficients in both homoscedastic and heteroscedastic cases [Long and Ervin, 2000].
To test the OLS approach outlined above, a numerical experiment was performed that mimicked the calculation of a FORC distribution. A regular grid of points in the interval \([-5, 5]\) was constructed to simulate calculation of \(\rho(0, 0)\) with \(SF = 5\). The true magnetization value of each point on the grid was set to zero, therefore it is known that the second-order polynomial surface defined by the error free magnetizations is given by \(a_1 = \cdots = a_6 = 0\). Random numbers were then added to the magnetizations to simulate measurement noise. These random numbers took two forms to investigate the homoscedastic and heteroscedastic scenarios, respectively.

In the homoscedastic case, random numbers were drawn from a normal distribution with a mean of 0 and a variance of 1, i.e., \(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)\) (Figure 2). To represent heteroscedastic errors a simple model of instrument drift was developed. It was assumed that drift within the segment of any given FORC included in a local grid is negligible, but the influence of drift between the different FORCs is important. To represent this effect the variance of the errors associated with each FORC was increased linearly between 0.01 and 1 as a function of \(B_a\) (Figure 2). Regression coefficients were estimated for both the homoscedastic and heteroscedastic cases and their corresponding \(p\)-values for the null hypothesis \(a_6 = 0\) were determined. This procedure was repeated for \(10^4\) realizations and the resulting distributions of \(p\) examined (Figure 3).

If the assumptions of OLS are met then the observed \(p\)-values should be distributed uniformly in the interval \([0, 1]\), therefore their empirical cumulative distribution function, \(\hat{F}(p)\), will follow a line of unity between 0 and 1. In the case of the homoscedastic errors, both the traditional OLS and the HCSE methods perform well. Bias in the \(p\)-values, estimated simply as \(\hat{F}(p) - \hat{F}(p)\), where \(\hat{F}(p)\) is a uniform cumulative distribution function, is small. In contrast, the heteroscedastic case has a positive bias in \(p\) based on calculation of \(\hat{\Sigma}_d\) using equation (7). Such a bias would lead to the null hypothesis \(a_6 = 0\) being rejected too infrequently. The use of HC3 (equation (9)) yields a negligible bias compared to the traditional estimate (equation (7)). The good performance of HC3 regardless of the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity supports the recommendation of Long and Ervin [2000] that HCSE estimators should be used in OLS unless homoscedasticity can be guaranteed.

### 3.2. Weighted Least Squares

In the method of Harrison and Feinberg [2008], a vector of associated weights, \(w\), form an \(n\)-by-\(n\) diagonal matrix, \(W = \text{diag}(w)\) (i.e., all the elements of \(W\) are zero except along the main diagonal, which is filled with the values of \(w\)). The weight, \(w_i\), of a point, \(i\), is given by the tri-cube...
function [Cleveland, 1988; Harrison and Feinberg, 2008]:

\[ w = \left(1 - \frac{||\mathbf{r}^* - \mathbf{r}_i||}{\max ||\mathbf{r}^* - \mathbf{r}_j||}\right)^3, \]  

(10)

where \(\mathbf{r}^*\) defines the position in the \(\{B_a, B_b\}\) plane for which \(\rho\) is to be estimated, \(\mathbf{r}_i\) defines the position of the point for which the weight is being calculated and \(\max ||\mathbf{r}^* - \mathbf{r}_j||\) is the maximum Euclidean distance between \(\mathbf{r}^*\) and the points selected in the local grid. In the WLS approach, a solution to equation (2) is found by minimizing the weighted sum of squared errors:

\[ e^T W e = (y - X\hat{a})^T W(y - X\hat{a}). \]  

(11)

The weighted least squares estimate, \(\hat{a}\), of the vector \(a\) is given by:

\[ \hat{a} = (X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W y, \]  

(12)

and the corresponding hat matrix is:

\[ H = X(X^T W X)^{-1} X^T W. \]  

(13)

In WLS the mean squared error is:

\[ \text{MSE} = \frac{y^T (WWH)y}{n - 6}, \]  

(14)

and the estimate of the variance-covariance matrix, \(\hat{\Sigma}_a\), is given by:

\[ \hat{\Sigma}_a = (X^T W X)^{-1} \text{MSE}. \]  

(15)

The standard error on the WLS estimate of \(a_6\) is given by the square root of the sixth element on the main diagonal of \(\hat{\Sigma}_a\) and in turn the \(p\)-value of the null hypothesis (i.e., \(a_6 = 0\), can be obtained from equation (8).

[21] As with the OLS approach discussed in section 3.1, the statistics associated with the WLS method may be biased if certain assumptions are not met. In the formulation of the WLS method, the estimate \(\hat{a}\) will only be the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) when the weight of each point is equal to the reciprocal of the variance of the point (i.e., the reciprocal of the variance of the error on the magnetization). The tri-cube based weights do not meet this requirement and,
given their spatial autocorrelation, will induce heteroscedasticity in the estimated error terms. As with the OLS approach a HCSE can be adopted, this time in a weighted form:

$$HC3_w = (X^T WX)^{-1} X^T W \left[ \frac{w_i e_i^2}{(1-h_i)} \right] X (X^T WX)^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

### 3.2.1. Testing for Bias in WLS

The numerical experiment involving homoscedastic and heteroscedastic errors (section 3.1.1) was repeated for the outlined WLS procedure with sample weights calculated with respect to the center of the grid according to equation (10). In the case of homoscedastic errors, the WLS approach using the calculation of $\hat{\Sigma}_u$ in equation (15) produces a slight bias in $p$ (Figure 4). As discussed above this bias results from use of the tri-cube based weights that tend to induce heteroscedasticity, which means that $\hat{\alpha}_6$ is not BLUE. In contrast, use of HC3$_W$ reduces much of the bias.

For the heteroscedastic case, the values of $p$ obtained from $\hat{\Sigma}_u$ in equation (15) exhibit a similar bias to that observed for homoscedastic errors. This correspondence is a result of the weighting procedure employed in the WLS approach. The extremes of the grid where the relative differences in the drift are greatest are down-weighted, while the center of the grid, which exhibits smaller differences in the drift, are up-weighted. For the case of heteroscedasticity the bias in the traditional WLS approach can again be largely suppressed using HC3$_W$. As with the analysis of OLS and HC3, it is advisable to employ HC3$_W$ in both the homoscedastic and heteroscedastic cases when performing WLS to estimate FORC distributions.

### 4. Statistically Significant Regions in FORC Distributions

If the $p$-value for each point in a FORC distribution has been determined it becomes possible to map the statistically significant regions of $\rho$ in the...
collection of $g$ tests is to be made on a data set, then the significance level for each individual test should be set at $\alpha/g$ rather than $\alpha$. With the Bonferroni correction in place, the significance level for the FORC distribution as a whole, rather than at any single location, should be $\alpha$. Therefore, the region of the FORC distribution that is statistically significant at the $\alpha$ level can be identified by mapping $p < \alpha/g$ in the $\{B_c, B_n\}$ plane.

[26] In section 3 the inability of a local second-order polynomial surface to fit the central ridge of a FORC function was considered. If part of the FORC signal is assigned incorrectly to the model errors, the MSE will increase. In turn, the corresponding $p$-value will be elevated, increasing the probability that the null hypothesis ($a_0 = 0$) will be accepted incorrectly. This implies that significance levels around a central ridge must be considered carefully. However, the high values of $\rho$ associated with central ridges suggest that the regions will remain statistically significant even when the errors are artificially high. An example of this is shown below.

[27] Finally, it is important to note that the significant regions of a FORC distribution will depend on the SF employed in the calculation of $\rho$. It would therefore be inappropriate to tune the SF to ensure that certain parts of the distribution become significant. Instead, an optimal SF should be preselected on the basis of an independent method [Heslop and Muxworthy, 2005; Harrison and Feinberg, 2008].

### 4.1. Calculation of Confidence Intervals

[28] Recent studies have shown that fitting parametric functions to profiles taken through FORC distributions, for example, along the line $B_c = 0$, provides information concerning the composition and grain size of the magnetic mineral assemblage [Egli, 2006; Chen et al., 2007; Egli et al., 2010; Roberts et al., 2011]. By providing confidence intervals on such profiles robust assessment of the level of mismatch between the data and fitted model can be achieved. For example, if confidence intervals on a profile are large, it may demonstrate that a close data-model match cannot be expected and inferences drawn from the modeling results should be treated with caution.

[29] Once the SE on $a_0$ has been found, it is a simple task to calculate a $100(1 - \alpha)$% confidence interval that incorporates the Bonferroni correction for the estimated value of $\rho$:

$$\rho = -0.5(\hat{a}_0 \pm t^{-1}(\alpha/2g)\text{SE})$$

Figure 5. (top) FORC distribution calculated from an analytical Preisach model [from Pike et al., 1999] with a simulated noise contribution. The thick contour line indicates the regions of the FORC distribution that are significant at the 0.05 level once the Bonferroni correction is taken into consideration. (bottom) The gray band represents the 95% confidence interval for the $\rho$ values along $B_n = 0$ mT for the FORC distribution in Figure 5 (top). The black line represents the $\rho$ values estimated from the data.
where \( g \) is the number of points included in the profile and \( t^{-1} \) is the inverse of the Student’s \( t \)-distribution with \( n - 6 \) degrees of freedom.

As with the discussion of significance levels it is important to consider the behavior of confidence intervals around a central ridge. Because a second-order polynomial surface is inadequate to represent the central ridge, artificially high errors will increase the confidence interval associated with a given point. In this way the calculated confidence interval is a conservative estimate of the true confidence interval.

5. Examples

To demonstrate our approach, a number of brief examples are provided below. All FORC distributions were calculated using the LOESS approach of Harrison and Feinberg [2008], which allows estimation to \( B_c = 0 \) without employing the extended FORC protocol of Pike [2003]. Additionally, standard errors on the calculated values of \( \hat{a}_0 \) were estimated using the weighted HCSE approach to limit the influence of heteroscedasticity.

5.1. A Basic Preisach Model

A smooth FORC diagram was constructed analytically using a basic Preisach model [Preisach, 1935] as employed by Pike et al. [1999]. The diagram was constructed from hysterons with a normal distribution of local interaction fields with zero mean and a standard deviation of 9 mT and a log-normal distribution of switching fields with a mean of \( \log(60 \text{ mT}) \) and a standard deviation of 0.3. To simulate measurement noise, random numbers were
drawn from the normal distribution $N(0, 10^{-8})$ and were added to the magnetization values. The calculated FORC distribution (SF = 2) is shown in Figure 5 with a contour indicating the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. A profile through the FORC distribution at $B_u = 0$ mT is also shown in Figure 5 with the associated 95% confidence interval for each estimated value of $\rho$. The lognormal distribution of switching fields used to construct the model consistently lies within the 95% confidence interval of the estimated $\rho$ values along the profile.

5.2. Magnetite-Bearing Plagioclase

In their description of the FORCinel algorithm, Harrison and Feinberg [2008] gave an example of a magnetite-bearing plagioclase sample with an optimal SF of $\sim 3$. The calculated FORC distribution and $\alpha = 0.05$ significance levels for this sample are shown in Figure 6. The $\alpha = 0.05$ contour follows the main body of the FORC distribution and demonstrates how far the central ridge propagates along the $B_c$ axis. The profile of normalized $\rho$ values along $B_u = 0$ mT has relatively wide 95% confidence intervals. This implies that any unmixing analysis based on fitting appropriate distributions to the profile should be performed with caution while taking uncertainty in the $\rho$ values into account.

5.3. Crostolo River Section, Italy

Sediments from the Crostolo River section contain a magnetic assemblage that is dominated by authigenic greigite [Tric et al., 1991; Roberts et al., 2005], with strong magnetic interactions (Figure 7). When calculated with an optimal SF of 5, the interacting SD greigite particles produce
a large vertical spread in the FORC distribution; even away from the main body of the distribution values remain significant at the 0.05 level (Figure 7). Profiles through the distribution along \( B_u = -4 \) mT and \( B_c = 65 \) mT reveal the extent of the distribution, the magnitude of the magnetic interactions, and the relatively small confidence intervals associated with the individual values of \( \rho \).

5.4. Marine Sediments, Eastern Indian Ocean

[35] A sample of carbonate-rich sediment was analyzed from core MD002361, which was recovered offshore of northwestern Australia at a water depth of \( \sim 1800 \) m [Spooner et al., 2011]. An age model based on correlation of \( ^{18}O \) to a pre-existing orbital chronology suggests that the studied sediment sample originates from marine isotope stage 8 [Spooner et al., 2011]. A FORC distribution for this sample (Figure 8a, SF = 4) has vertical spreading indicative of pseudosingle domain and interacting single domain particles [Roberts et al., 2000; Muxworthy and Dunlop, 2002] and a central ridge that may correspond to noninteracting single domain particles [Roberts et al., 2000; Egli et al., 2010]. The relatively large noise contribution means that the apparent ridge structure is poorly defined at \( B_c \) values above \( \sim 60 \) mT, but \( \rho \) remains significant until \( B_c \approx 80 \) mT (Figure 8a). A profile along \( B_u = 0 \) mT confirms this observation, with large uncertainties indicating that \( \rho \) is poorly defined at higher values of \( B_c \) (Figure 8b). Additionally, a small significant region at \( B_c \approx 90 \) mT indicates that, if a ridge is present, it may extend further across the diagram than suggested by the main significant region.

[36] As recommended by Egli et al. [2010], repeat measurements of the sediment sample were undertaken to determine if the high field region of the central ridge structure was being suppressed by noise. After averaging nine measurement runs, values are clearly significant at higher \( B_c \) values and the high field part of the ridge has been recovered from the noise (Figure 8c). The averaged FORC distribution and the confidence intervals on the corresponding \( B_u = 0 \) mT profile (Figure 8d) indicate that the central ridge is statistically significant until \( B_c \approx 95 \) mT, which is in good agreement with earlier work [Egli et al., 2010]. This example demonstrates that parts of a FORC distribution can be rendered ambiguous by large noise contributions. Determination of statistical significance and confidence intervals can not only identify these regions, but also reveal if the regions become significant after repeat measurement.

6. Conclusions

[37] First-order reversal curve distributions have become a popular tool with which to characterize complex magnetic mineral assemblages. We have presented simple extensions to existing FORC processing algorithms whereby significance levels and confidence intervals can be estimated for experimentally and numerically determined distributions. This information aids interpretation and quantification of FORC distributions because it enables assessment of whether given features are statistically significant. Additionally, where parametric functions are to be fitted to profiles through FORC distributions, calculation of confidence intervals quantifies the level of uncertainty in the distribution and therefore the level of uncertainty that can be tolerated by any attempt to fit components to such distributions. We recommend use of a heteroscedasticity-consistent standard error estimator when calculating FORC distributions. Such estimators remove the necessity for an assumption of errors with constant variance that, if violated, can introduce large biases into calculated significance levels.
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