

ASSIGNMENT OF ENDOGENOUS RETROVIRUS INTEGRATION SITES USING A MIXTURE MODEL

BY DAVID R. HUNTER¹ AND LE BAO¹ AND MARY POSS²

*Department of Statistics¹, Penn State University, University Park, PA,
USA*

Department of Biology², Penn State University, University Park, PA, USA

*E-mail: lebao@psu.edu; dhunter@stat.psu.edu; mposs@bx.psu.edu
Pennsylvania State University*

Structural variation occurs in the genomes of individuals because of the different positions occupied by repetitive genome elements like endogenous retroviruses, or ERVs. The presence or absence of ERVs can be determined by identifying the junction with the host genome using high-throughput sequence technology and a clustering algorithm. The resulting data give the number of sequence reads assigned to each ERV-host junction sequence for each sampled individual. Variability in the number of reads from an individual integration site makes it difficult to determine whether a site is present for low read counts. We present a novel two-component mixture of negative binomial distributions to model these counts and assign a probability that a given ERV is present in a given individual. We explain how our approach is superior to existing alternatives, including another form of two-component mixture model and the much more common approach of selecting a threshold count for declaring the presence of an ERV. We apply our method to a data set of ERV integrations in mule deer [*Odocoileus hemionus*], a species for which no genomic resources are available, and demonstrate that the discovered patterns of shared integration sites contain information about animal relatedness.

1. Introduction. Determining how genome sequences vary among individuals and populations is an important research area because genetic differences can confer phenotypic differences. The most commonly reported variations in genome sequence between two individuals are those that occur at the nucleotide level, e.g, single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). These are typically identified by comparing the nucleotide at each position of a query sequence to that of a reference genome. Individual genomes can also differ in the relative position and number of homologous genome regions. For example, a genetic locus can be duplicated, deleted, inverted or moved to a new location in one genome compared to another. These changes in the

Keywords and phrases: Mixture Model; Negative Binomial; Read Count Data

genome are called genome structural variations (GSVs) and are more difficult to analyze than SNPs, particularly if a region is present in the query but absent from the reference. Transposable elements (TEs) are an important type of GSV that comprise over 50% of most eukaryote genomes (Cordaux and Batzer, 2009). TEs are capable of moving in the genome by several mechanisms, including a copy-paste mechanism (Kazazian, 2004). Although many TEs are fixed in the genome of a species—that is, all individuals will have the TE at a specific location in the genome—others are present in some individuals and absent in others, which results in polymorphism at the site of the TE insertion.

Because TEs have important phenotypic consequences on the host genome (Kazazian, 2004; Böhne et al., 2008; Bourque, 2009; O’Donnell and Burns, 2010; Fedoroff, 2012; Kapusta et al., 2013; Kokošar and Kordiš, 2013), it is important to have robust methods to determine the location of a specific element in genomes so as to know if the element is present or absent from an individual. These data can be obtained by molecular approaches that amplify the region spanning the end of the TE and the adjacent genome region of the host; a product is obtained only if the TE is present. Multiple methods have been developed to detect different classes of TEs in the genomes of individuals via high throughput sequencing (O’Donnell and Burns, 2010; Iskow et al., 2010), allowing investigators to identify the location of all TEs of a specific type in an individual genome. Yet even in a well-annotated genome like the human genome, new mobile elements are sometimes discovered in poorly annotated regions (Contreras-Galindo et al., 2013). For this reason, mapping the sequence reads representing the sites of element integration to a reference genome is insufficient even in well-annotated genomes. Furthermore, in many species, no genome exists or, if it does, the completeness is much less than for humans. Indeed, in the case that we consider here, no genome exists for any member of the cervidae.

Bao et al. (2014) reported recently on a method to detect an endogenous retrovirus (ERV), which is a type of TE derived from an infectious retrovirus, in the genome of the Cervid mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), a species that lacks a reference genome. Each Cervid endogenous retrovirus (CrERV) is present at a unique position in the genome (Elleder et al., 2012; Wittekindt et al., 2010)—which we refer to as an “insertion site” throughout this article—and because the infections giving rise to the CrERVs are relatively recent, the prevalence of individual CrERVs can vary from a single animal to a majority of the population. Animals that share an insertion site must be related because once acquired, ERVs are inherited along family lineages like any host gene. Thus, animals with similar profiles of CrERV

insertion sites in their genomes share an ancestral lineage and have the potential to display similar phenotypic effects of CrERV compared to animals without CrERVs at those sites. In order to investigate the consequences of CrERV integration on the mule deer host, [Malhotra et al. \(2016\)](#) developed a de novo clustering approach that groups all insertion sites that occupy the same genomic region from different animals. Each cluster of sequences may be represented by a single consensus sequence that in turn represents the site in the host genome where the virus has integrated. The resulting data are an $m \times n$ matrix X , where the (i, j) element X_{ij} gives the count of sequences (the read count) from animal j that are assigned to CrERV-host junction i , which will henceforth be referred to as insertion site i . Here, m and n are the total numbers of sites and animals, respectively.




FIG 1. Schematic diagram showing the steps used to generate the junction fragment libraries and some of the sources of error leading to variation in read count data. Red lines indicate host genomic DNA and the blue diamond represents the site of a mobile element insertion—in our case, a retrovirus. The right hand box gives some of the reasons that read counts vary among animals and replicates. Additional potential sources of error include unequal mixing, barcode contamination ([Faircloth and Glenn, 2012](#)), and sequencing error, which can affect clustering.

These read count data contain information about whether an individual carries specific integration sites. However, read counts may contain both false positives and false negatives: A small number of sequences may be attributed to an animal not carrying a particular insertion site due to either

measurement errors in the high-throughput methods or mis-assignment in the clustering process; and no sequences may be captured for an animal actually carrying a particular site when there are insufficient sequences. Some of the sources of error leading to highly variable read counts for an integration site are shown in Figure 1, which also gives an overview of the data pipeline. That figure illustrates that the DNA (red lines) is fragmented, fragments are selected for size compatible with the sequencing platform (typically 300–500 bp), and small DNA oligonucleotides (linkers, in green) are ligated to the ends. The fragments containing the mobile element are enriched by polymerase chain reaction or PCR, employing a primer specific to the 3' portion of the retrovirus and one in the linker, which yields a product containing the sequence of the host-retroviral junction. The linkers are engineered so that the primer cannot bind until the virus-specific primer has first generated a strand of DNA; thus, if the virus is not present, there is no amplification of the fragment. Individual libraries from different samples are mixed together in equal molar amounts after being tagged by library-specific DNA “barcode” sequences, and all libraries are sequenced together.

The problem of accuracy of low read counts is well known for high-throughput sequence data, as can be seen in the report by Baillie et al. (2011) and the subsequent reanalyses of the data by Evrony et al. (2012) and Evrony et al. (2016) that documented many false positives associated with inclusion of low read count data. It is therefore challenging to determine the true status of insertion site i in animal j when read counts are low. One approach is to set a threshold, and assume that a site is carried by an animal whenever the corresponding read count is above the threshold. This ad-hoc practice has serious drawbacks, as discussed in Bao et al. (2014): Essentially, it ignores differences in the genomic integration sites, some of which are more readily sequenced than others; quality of the DNA; laboratory error; and sequence quality, which varies between sequencing runs. Any of these factors can cause wide variation in total read number per animal and per integration site. Although Bao et al. (2014) move beyond the naive thresholding approach by proposing a mixture model, the mixture used in that article of a Poisson component and a truncated geometric component has several drawbacks. The present article presents a much-improved mixture model that attempts to account for these sources of variability. We then describe the reasons for modeling choices and discuss the results of fitting this model to the read count data.

We have made the following materials available as a supplementary .zip file: The original (unabridged) dataset of read counts obtained by the clustering algorithm, along with the abridged version used for the analyses in this

article; the code, written for the R computing environment ([R Core Team, 2016](#)), that reproduces all of the analyses, tables, and figures in this article; and the additional datasets used for the plotting the latitude/longitude coordinates of the animals as well as the wet-bench data obtained using PCR for ground-truthing a subset of the classification results obtained by various models.

2. A mixture model approach. Count data are sometimes modeled using a Poisson distribution or, if more flexibility is required, a negative binomial distribution. When in addition some of the counts are zeros created by a separate random mechanism, we may introduce a point mass at zero; the resulting “zero-inflated” count models are in fact simplistic mixture models. For our data, zero-inflation is not sufficient because even nonzero counts X_{ij} may occur when insertion site i is absent from animal j . Instead, we must account for counts both when site i is present and when it is absent. The counts that are observed in each of these two cases will be modeled as one component of our two-component mixture model. Our goal in developing this model is to respect model parsimony as well as the experimental realities of the sequencing processes used to obtain the data. This section explains our modeling choices and, in particular, why we have avoided the mixture of Poisson and truncated geometric distributions originally used by [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#), which appears to be the only previous mixture-model-based treatment in the literature of this type of count data.

2.1. Improving the Mixture Model. Let us first consider the situation in which animal j carries insertion site i , which we call the “present” case because site i is truly present, as opposed to the “absent” case where it is not. The first model that springs to mind for count data is something based on the Poisson distribution; indeed, this is the approach used by [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#). However, we have found strong evidence of over-dispersion—that is, evidence that the standard deviation of these present counts is larger than the square root of their mean—even when we use a model with a large number of parameters to account for the heterogeneities across animals and insertion sites. This over-dispersion is depicted in Figure 2, which compares the best-fitting Poisson and negative binomial models in terms of their Pearson residuals, which are the observed counts minus the estimated counts divided by the square roots of the estimated variances. On the other hand, the negative binomial family appears adequate for this modeling task.

To help explain how the plots in Figure 2 were created, we first introduce both the Poisson and negative binomial models for the “present” mixture component. In the Poisson case, “present” counts X_{ij} are assumed to be

distributed independently as $\text{Poisson}(a_i b_j)$ for parameters $a_1, \dots, a_m$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n$. Thus, the probability mass function for $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ is

$$(2.1) \quad P(X_{ij} = x) = \exp\{-a_i b_j\} \frac{(a_i b_j)^{x_{ij}}}{x_{ij}!},$$

and $E(X_{ij}) = \text{Var}(X_{ij}) = a_i b_j$. In the negative binomial plots, the assumption is that the X_{ij} are distributed independently as negative binomial random variables with parameters r_j and α_i for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. This gives

$$(2.2) \quad P(X_{ij} = x) = f_{ij}(x; r, \alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{x + r_j - 1}{x} \alpha_i^{r_j} (1 - \alpha_i)^x,$$

a mass function with mean $E(X_{ij}) = r_j(1 - \alpha_i)/\alpha_i$ and variance $\text{Var}(X_{ij}) = r_j(1 - \alpha_i)/\alpha_i^2$.

The plots in the left column of Figure 2 are obtained by fitting the counts X_{ij} using a slightly improved version of the model used by Bao et al. (2014), namely, a two-component mixture model where one component (“present”) is the Poisson distribution of Equation (2.1) and the other component (“absent”) is a truncated geometric distribution. In addition to maximum likelihood estimates of the a_i and b_j parameters, the fitting procedure yields estimates of the conditional probabilities of inclusion in the “present” component for each X_{ij} observation. In creating the plots, we consider only those X_{ij} with estimated probabilities greater than 0.5 in constructing the plots, which is a simplistic way to focus on the fit of only the “present” (Poisson) component. The Pearson residuals are calculated for these X_{ij} by subtracting the corresponding estimated mean $\hat{a}_i \hat{b}_j$ and dividing by the estimated standard deviation $(\hat{a}_i \hat{b}_j)^{1/2}$. Whenever an animal is replicated in the dataset—that is, whenever there exist two labels $j' \neq j$ for the same animal—we constrain the model so that the estimates of the “present” probability must be equal. This is different from the model used by Bao et al. (2014), which treated replicates as independent samples for the purposes of estimation. Finally, the theoretical distribution that forms the basis of comparison for the plots is obtained via simulation from the distribution determined by the fitted parameters. The plots in the right column of Figure 2 are obtained in the same way, except that the mixture model uses the negative binomial distribution of Equation (2.2) for the “present” component and another negative binomial distribution for the “absent” component. Further discussion about our choice for the “absent” component is provided below.

Based on Figure 2, the data clearly suggest discarding the Poisson model in favor of the negative binomial model for the “present” mixture component of the model. Interestingly, this choice is not merely in favor of the




FIG 2. The top two panels show the kernel density estimates of the Pearson residuals (solid lines) and their theoretical densities (dashed lines) for all counts with probability at least 0.5 of being from the “present” mixture component according to the mixture model. The lower panels are Q-Q plots of the observed vs. theoretical Pearson residuals.

model with more parameters, as is often the case when a negative binomial distribution fits better than a Poisson distribution; here, each model has the same number of parameters. In equation (2.2), we interpret α_i as an insertion site-specific parameter where $1 - \alpha_i$ approximates the enrichment of site i , and r_j as an animal-specific parameter. Thus, the mean and variance are both directly proportional to the animal-specific r_j parameter and they are decreasing functions of the site-specific α_i parameter.

In the “absent” case where animal j does not carry insertion site i , in principle we may choose an entirely different class of distributions to model the observed counts. We reject the class of Poisson distributions immediately because we need a distribution with a variance substantially larger than its

mean. The geometric distribution is an interesting potential alternative and has the advantage of simplicity since, like the Poisson, it only requires a single parameter. However, we reject the geometric for a different reason: The geometric mass function decays more slowly for large values than that of a negative binomial, even if the mean of the former is smaller than the mean of the latter, as illustrated in Figure 3. Thus, outlying large counts could




FIG 3. The two mass functions whose logarithms are shown here are a negative binomial with parameters $r = 10$ and $\alpha = 1/2$ (solid line) and a geometric with parameter $p = 1/4$ (dashed line). The means of the distributions are 10 and 3, respectively, even though the geometric has a larger mass function for large values.

be classified as coming from the absent component, which is nonsensical. [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#) sidestepped this issue by truncating the geometric distribution of counts from the absent component. However, we wish to avoid the problematic question of how to choose a truncation point.

Due to the considerations above, we reject both the Poisson and geometric models for counts from the absent mixture component in favor of a more flexible negative binomial model and posit that whenever animal j does not carry insertion site i , the mass function for the count X_{ij} is given by

$$(2.3) \quad g_{ij}(x; r, p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{x + r_j - 1}{x} p_{k(j)}^{r_j} (1 - p_{k(j)})^x, \quad x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

where $k(j)$ is the batch in which animal j was sequenced, r_j is the same

animal-specific parameter as in Equation (2.2), and the expected false-positive count for the $k(j)$ batch is a decreasing function of $p_{k(j)}$: As explained earlier, this expected count is $r_j(1 - p_{k(j)})/p_{k(j)}$.

Both negative binomial distributions, in Equation (2.2) and Equation (2.3), can be interpreted as a sum of r_j independent geometric distributions. This is a deliberate modeling choice that reflects the fact that the quality and quantity of each animal’s sample may vary, and this variation will affect counts from both the present class and the absent class in the same way.

The insertion site-specific effect is most relevant in the present case, as reflected by the fact that we allow counts from the present component to depend on the parameter α_i where i denotes the site number. In the absent case, counts may be considered to be “background noise” and therefore likely to depend on the particular batch but not the insertion site in question; for this reason, we allow the count distribution for the absent class to depend on $p_{k(j)}$, where $k(j)$ denotes the batch number of animal j .

We occasionally obtain distinct sets of counts from the same animal when samples from the same animal are run in different batches. In such a case, our model treats these counts as though they come from different animals, conditional on the mixture component from which the counts X_{ij} come. That is, each set of counts receives its own index j , so the r_j parameters may be different. This is important since different sets of counts come from distinct batches, and these often have dramatically different count profiles. In fact, allowing for this flexibility, which is enhanced by indexing the absent count distributions by $p_{k(j)}$, means that our model can easily accommodate new data as they are created in separate sequencing runs or on separate sequencing platforms. Accommodating new data is scientifically important, since our data are continually updated as new animals are sequenced; sequencing technology advances rapidly, and it is not always feasible nor cost-effective to rerun previously sequenced animals using newer technology. Thus, our method allows for seamless data integration by preventing us from having to discard useful data simply because technology changes or our set of sampled animals expands.

On the other hand, it is important that our model can account for cases in which multiple sets of counts come from the same animal in our dataset. This is done by placing appropriate constraints on the mixing probabilities π_{ij} , where π_{ij} represents the a priori probability that animal j carries insertion site i . Thus, we introduce the constraint $\pi_{ij} = \pi_{ij'}$ for any $j \neq j'$ for which j and j' index the sets of counts from two different runs on the same animal. Once we introduce the π_{ij} probabilities, the full likelihood of our mixture

model becomes

(2.4)

$$L(\pi, r, \alpha, p) = \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j \in U} \left[\pi_{ij} \prod_{j' \in S_j} f_{ij'}(x; r, \alpha) + (1 - \pi_{ij}) \prod_{j' \in S_j} g_{ij'}(x; r, p) \right],$$

subject to the constraints explained above, where $S_j = \{j' : j \text{ and } j' \text{ are the same animal}\}$ and U is any set containing exactly one element from each S_j ; that is, U is a set of indices for the unique animals. We experimented with three simple parameterizations of the π_{ij} parameters: (1) $\pi_{ij} = \pi$ for all i and j ; (2) $\pi_{ij} = \pi_i$ for all j ; and (3) $\pi_{ij} = \pi_j$ for all i . It may be surprising that, say, parameterization (1) is at all interesting; however, the question of whether animal j truly includes insertion site i —which clearly depends on i —is different from the question of whether the *proportion* of such inclusions depends on i . The latter is an empirical question that should be examined using the data. In Section 3.1, we find that option (2) attains the best Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC) score.

Since Equations (2.2) and (2.3) represent the present and absent components, respectively, it seems reasonable to conjecture that $E(X_{ij})$ will be greater in Equation (2.2) than in Equation (2.3). These two means are given by $r_j(1 - \alpha_i)/\alpha_i$ and $r_j(1 - p_{k(j)})/p_{k(j)}$, respectively. Thus, since the r_j parameter is common to the two mass functions, the conjectured inequality may be guaranteed by enforcing the constraints $\alpha_i < p_k$ for all i and k during the estimation procedure. Enforcing such constraints in an algorithm, say, by always updating α_i as the smaller of the ECM algorithm estimate and the minimum current p_k value, would not in principle complicate the computations. However, such enforcement would potentially destroy the ascent property of the algorithm mentioned in Section 2.2 and, perhaps more importantly, it would raise the troubling question of how to interpret final parameter estimates for which some $\alpha_i = p_k$. If we instead choose to enforce some positive gap g between the largest α_i and the smallest p_k , then we are faced with the arbitrary choice of a value of g . We therefore opt not to enforce such constraints, yet we find nevertheless that our unconstrained point estimates satisfy $\alpha_i < p_k$. The fact that we obtain these results without enforcing them is an encouraging sign for the model fit. We discuss the actual estimated values in Section 3.1.

2.2. Parameter Estimation. Estimation of the model parameters is accomplished using maximum likelihood via a straightforward Expectation-Conditional Maximization (ECM) algorithm (Meng and Rubin, 1993). Essentially, an ECM algorithm is merely an EM algorithm in which only one

subset of the parameters is updated at each iteration or sub-iteration. The goal is to maximize the log-likelihood function of the parameters π , r , α , and p . This goal is complicated by the fact that we do not observe which data come from the first mixture component and which come from the second. Typically, one approaches this problem by defining indicator variables

$$Z_{ij} = I\{\text{animal } i \text{ carries insertion site } j\};$$

these Z_{ij} are then considered missing, or unobserved, data, and an EM algorithm aims to maximize the log-likelihood based on only the observed data by exploiting the mathematically simpler form of the log-likelihood based on the full data in a clever way, alternating between an E-step and an M-step.

In the E-step, given the iteration- t parameter values $\pi_{ij}^{(t)}$, $r_j^{(t)}$, $\alpha_i^{(t)}$, and $p_{k(j)}^{(t)}$, we calculate the probability that animal i carries insertion site j :

$$(2.5) \quad Z_{ij}^{(t)} = \frac{\pi_{ij}^{(t)} \prod_{j' \in S_j} f_{ij'}^{(t)}(x)}{\pi_{ij}^{(t)} \prod_{j' \in S_j} f_{ij'}^{(t)}(x) + (1 - \pi_{ij}^{(t)}) \prod_{j' \in S_j} g_{ij'}^{(t)}(x)}.$$

In the M-step (actually the CM-step), we update the parameters in four distinct subsets, in each case holding the other parameters fixed at their most up-to-date values. To wit, we first consider the α parameters. We find that the log-likelihood involving α_i is

$$\sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}^{(t)} \left[\log \left(\frac{x_{ij} + r_j^{(t)}}{x_{ij}} - 1 \right) + r_j^{(t)} \log(\alpha_i) + x_{ij} \log(1 - \alpha_i) \right],$$

which is maximized at

$$\alpha_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_j Z_{ij}^{(t)} r_j^{(t)}}{\sum_j Z_{ij}^{(t)} (x_{ij} + r_j^{(t)})}.$$

The estimate of α_i will be unstable if Z_{ij} is close to zero for all j , so in practice, we let

$$\alpha_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_j Z_{ij}^{(t)} r_j^{(t)} + 0.05}{\sum_j Z_{ij}^{(t)} (x_{ij} + r_j^{(t)}) + 0.1},$$

noting that the ascent property guaranteed by an ECM algorithm relies only on the assurance that the complete-data log likelihood increases its value at

each iteration; if the corrected version of $\alpha^{(t+1)}$ ever fails to produce such an increase, it may be replaced by the exact version.

The log-likelihood that involves $p_{k(j)}$ is maximized at

$$p_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{j \in A_k} (1 - Z_{ij}^{(t)}) r_j^{(t)}}{\sum_{j \in A_k} (1 - Z_{ij}^{(t)}) (x_{ij} + r_j^{(t)})},$$

where A_k denotes the set of animals coming from the k th batch. The log-likelihood that involves r_j is maximized at

$$\begin{aligned} r_j^{(t+1)} = \arg \max_{r_j} & \left\{ \sum_i \log \binom{x_{ij} + r_j - 1}{x_{ij}} \right. \\ & \left. + r_j \sum_i \left[Z_{ij}^{(t)} \log \alpha_i^{(t+1)} + (1 - Z_{ij}^{(t)}) \log p_{k(j)}^{(t+1)} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which will be solved numerically. Finally, there are several different update formulas for the π_{ij} parameters, depending on which of the three models we are using. We have

$$\pi^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n Z_{ij}^{(t)}, \quad \pi_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Z_{ij}^{(t)}, \quad \text{or} \quad \pi_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Z_{ij}^{(t)},$$

depending on the whether we select model (1), (2), or (3), respectively.

We initialize the ECM algorithm at $Z_{ij}^{(0)} = \max(1, x_{ij}/10)$ and $r_j^{(0)} = 100$, and estimate parameters by iterating between the M-step and the E-Step described above.

We stop iterating when the sum of the absolute changes of all $Z_{ij}^{(t)}$ is less than 0.01; these values at convergence will be denoted by $\hat{Z}_{ij}$; they represent the probabilities, conditional on the observed data, that animal j has insertion site i when the parameter values are taken to be the maximum likelihood estimates. The $m \times n$ matrix of all such probabilities will be denoted $\hat{Z}$.

Because EM-based algorithms can be sensitive to starting parameter values, we also explore different starting values. Letting $Z_{ij}^{(0)} = \max(1, x_{ij}/c)$ where $c = 2, 3, \dots, 20$, and letting $r_j^{(0)}$ vary from 5 to 500, we find that all these combinations of starting values converge to essentially the same solution.

After the algorithm has converged, the entries of the matrix $\hat{Z}$ may be used as estimates of the probabilistic assignment of insertion sites to animals, which may in turn lead to insights into the relationships among animals. We revisit this topic in Section 3.3.

3. Results. The 1722×77 matrix X containing the read count data is provided in the supplementary materials in the file `ReadCount.csv`. This dataset is an abridged version of the original dataset, which is entitled `UnabridgedReadCount.csv`, that excludes any insertion sites that do not have at least two samples containing more than five reads. The reason for this choice is to focus on only rows that provide substantial evidence for relatedness of two or more animals; however, our model can in principle easily handle rows with low read counts. Of all the read counts in the abridged table, 82.6% are zero and another 6.3% are between one and ten, inclusive. The mean of all non-zero counts is 98.6.

3.1. Mixture model parameter estimates. Section 2.1 presents three models for the π_{ij} parameters, and we use “an information theoretic criterion,” also known as Akaike’s information criterion or AIC (Akaike, 1974), to select from among them. The results are displayed in Table 1. While there is no consensus about which of several possible model selection criteria based on penalized log-likelihood scores should be used in the context of mixture models, in this case the differences among the three likelihoods are so large that the choice is clear regardless of the criterion we use. Model (2) is selected

Model	Number of model parameters	Treatment of replicates	
		Independent samples	Identical animals
(1) $\pi_{ij} = \pi$	1803	346,013	324,245
(2) $\pi_{ij} = \pi_i$	3524	318,015	301,951
(3) $\pi_{ij} = \pi_j$	1879	344,276	324,246

TABLE 1

Akaike’s information criterion (AIC) scores, given by -2 times the maximized log-likelihood plus $2d$, where d is the number of model parameters.

as the best model regardless of whether we consider re-tested samples from the same animal as independent samples or not. This model assumes that the prevalence rates of insertion sites are heterogeneous, and the following analysis focuses on the $\pi_{ij} = \pi_i$ setting.

Our primary interest is in the matrix $\hat{Z}$, which is a 1722×77 matrix, and in addition to these values there are 3524 parameter estimates. Estimates of the sampling distributions of these parameters based on asymptotic normality are unlikely to be productive since the huge 3524×3524 covariance matrix will be impossible to estimate given only 1722×77 data points, and even with sparsity constraints the estimation would be difficult. A parametric bootstrap approach is possible whereby we use the estimated parameters to repeatedly simulate new entire count datasets, obtain sets of bootstrap parameter estimates for each one, and take the empirical multivariate dis-

tribution of the bootstrap estimates to estimate the sampling distributions of the original estimates. An interesting question of implementation arises as to whether we should treat the Z_{ij} as parameters or data: The former idea suggests that we should simulate site assignment indicator variables according to the estimated $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values, whereas the latter suggests that we should simulate site assignments using only the $\hat{\pi}_i$ estimates. To give a sense of the possibilities, we have included R code in the supplemental files that implements the former idea—though the code may be easily modified to implement the latter—and yields standard errors for the estimates $\hat{p}_1 = 0.967$, $\hat{p}_2 = 0.939$, and $\hat{p}_3 = 0.980$ of 0.005, 0.014, and 0.001, respectively, based on 500 bootstrap samples. We may conclude for instance that our three experiments yield statistically significantly different false positive rates $1 - p_k$. However, we do not undertake here a thorough exploration of the use of the bootstrap in this context.

For the model that takes replicated animals into account, the estimates of the 1722 α_i parameters range from 1.92×10^{-4} to 0.483, and the estimates of the $p_{k(j)}$ parameters are 0.967, 0.939, and 0.980. We see therefore that $\alpha_i < p_{k(j)}$ in each case, which is sensible as we noted in Section 2.1, even though we do not enforce this constraint in the optimization algorithm. This result guarantees that the expected read counts for the “present” case are always larger than those for the “absent” case.

Figure 4 depicts some characteristics of the α_i , r_j , and Z_{ij} estimates. The corresponding results for the model treating the replicated animals as independent are similar graphically, so we omit them here. The top plots show a roughly log-log relationship between total count and the corresponding α_i or r_j parameter. The bottom left plot shows that the estimated $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values are not a monotone function of the read counts X_{ij} , which demonstrates that the mixture model approach captures subtle individual heterogeneities among insertion sites and animals that a simplistic threshold cannot. We see that some $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values near zero correspond to counts at least as large as those corresponding to some $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values near one.

Also interesting is the effect on certain $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values of the requirement that samples from the same animal must have the same estimated probabilities of inclusion in the “present” mixture component. Because there is so much variability present in the read counts, it is not uncommon to find wildly different counts for the same animal at the same insertion site. As an example, let us consider animal 01 from the dataset, which occurs in two different batches, labeled the S batch and the M batch. Table 2 gives the ten largest read counts for this animal that are paired with counts not greater than 2. When such cases arise in the model that considers replicate information, we




FIG 4. *Top row: Sums of row counts plotted against corresponding α_i and r_j parameter estimates. Bottom left: Boxplots of $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ as a function of read count for counts up to 8. Bottom right: Histogram of $\log_{10} \hat{Z}_{ij}$ values for $0.01 \leq \hat{Z} \leq 0.99$. We obtain 61% of $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ values less than .01 and 15% greater than 0.99.*

see that they are essentially classified with probability one as “present”—that is, a single large count is sufficient for such a classification even in the presence of a low count in a different batch. In other words, a single large count appears sufficient to categorize an animal into the “present” component, and when the same animal/site combination also yields small counts, the model can adjust both by allowing for a large variance and because each sample has a unique r_j parameter even if it comes from an animal with more than one sample. On the other hand, for the model that considers all samples as independent, a low count can result in a small estimate of the “present” probability even though the presence or absence of a given insertion site in a given animal should not change from batch to batch.

Site (Cluster)	Observed Counts		Independent NB Probabilities		Independent PTG Probabilities		Replicate NB and PTG Probabilities
	batch S	batch M	batch S	batch M	batch S	batch M	
Cluster107	0	498	0.20	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster436	0	84	0.08	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster315	2	72	0.99	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster296	44	0	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.00	1.00
Cluster591	0	42	0.01	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster403	42	1	1.00	0.05	1.00	0.00	1.00
Cluster166	41	1	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	1.00
Cluster62	0	37	0.53	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster199	2	35	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cluster1729	0	33	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

TABLE 2

Probabilities of “present” for various models for 10 examples of extremely divergent counts for the same animal/site combination, all taken from animal 01. Here, “NB” stands for the negative binomial model of Equations (2.2) and (2.3), whereas “PTG” stands for the Poisson-truncated geometric model of Bao et al. (2014).

3.2. Ground-truthing various models. It is possible to verify the presence or absence of a particular insertion site in a particular animal by directly visualizing the DNA fragment amplified at a particular integration site using PCR. In this way, as in Bao et al. (2014), we have obtained the true status of 6 insertion sites in 32 unique animals, as summarized in the supplemental file `PCRVerificationData.csv`. Some of these animals occur in more than one batch, so we have a total of 45 samples to consider, comprising a total of $6 \times 45 = 270$ probability assignments to the “present” mixture component. Some of these probabilities will be constrained to be equal when we consider models that take replications of animals into consideration.

As a measure of model performance, we report area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, or AUC (Bradley, 1997), which in this case may be calculated as follows: First, we note that 47 of the 270 probability assignments correspond to truly present integration sites, whereas the remaining 223 correspond to absent sites. We examine all 47×233 pairs of discordant pairs, and calculate the proportion of these pairs in which the estimated probability for the truly present site exceeds the estimated probability for the absent site. For purposes of this calculation, cases in which the estimated probabilities are equal for a discordant pair are counted as one-half. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3. In addition to four different statistical models, we also consider the read counts themselves, which may be subjected to the same AUC calculation. We may view this model-free analysis an upper bound on the potential performance of any possible thresholding procedure, since such a procedure uses a fixed read

Model	AUC	Counts out of 47×233			Mean “False Positives”	Mean “False Negatives”
		Reversed	Tied	Correct		
Read counts only (model-free)	0.957	238	429	9814	N/A	N/A
P-TG, independent samples	0.932	583	259	9639	0.031	0.148
P-TG, replicates recognized	0.951	371	294	9816	0.031	0.064
NB-NB, independent samples	0.963	258	259	9964	0.100	0.050
NB-NB, replicates recognized	0.975	118	294	10,069	0.092	0.030

TABLE 3

Area under curve and mean probabilities of false assignment for different models. *P-TG* refers to the Poisson-Truncated Geometric model of [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#), whereas *NB-NB* is the negative binomial-negative binomial model introduced in this article.

count as the cutoff between “absent” and “present”.

The fact that all four methods achieve AUC scores near 100% indicates the relative ease of assignment for the particular six integration sites considered. However, despite the high scores, the striking differences in the performance of the methods is evident from the proportion of discordant pairs *not* correctly categorized, obtained by subtracting AUC from one. By this measure, the Poisson-Truncated Geometric model of [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#) makes roughly 2.7 times as many errors as the model we propose in this article. In addition, the AUC scores indicate that recognizing animal replicates is important, as errors are reduced by almost a third by doing so. Finally, we make the interesting and important observation that the model we propose in this article performs better on these test data than the read count data themselves, which serve as a sort of benchmark for an idealized thresholding method. In fact, no thresholding method could likely do this well, since some discordant pairs that are scored as correct using the read counts are likely to fall entirely above or below whatever read count threshold is chosen, which would lower the number of correct pairs. At the same time, no discordant pair scored as reversed or tied according to the read counts could possibly become correct using a thresholding method, although it is true that some reversals could change to ties.

In addition to AUC, Table 3 reports the mean probabilities of incorrect assignment for both the 47 present sites and the 233 absent sites. In other words, the mean “false positive” probability is the mean value of $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ for the 233 absent sites, and the mean “false negative” probability is the mean value of $1 - \hat{Z}_{ij}$ for the 47 present sites. We see that by this measure, the Poisson-truncated geometric models of [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#) do a better job for these particular data in the case where the sites are absent, but the reverse is true when the sites are present. Not surprisingly, both models are better when replicates are considered, since this uses more of the available information.

3.3. Summarizing animal relationships. There are many potential methods to analyze the probabilistic assignment of virus insertion sites—or, more generally, TEs and alleles—to animals represented by the $\hat{Z}$ matrix derived from our mixture model and estimation procedure. Broadly speaking, a suite of population genetics tools exists to utilize allele frequency data to estimate population parameters. Several of these methods accommodate probabilistic assignments as well. As an example, [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#) demonstrate a hierarchical clustering method that uses such probabilistic assignments.

Here, we illustrate one type of analysis based on the information provided by the $\hat{Z}$ matrix to estimate how variation in CrERV integration sites is distributed among the animals from the four sampled populations. By considering each column of this matrix as a point in m -dimensional space, we may perform principal components analysis (PCA) and visualize the first two principal components. In Figure 5, we see a depiction of the result after the first two PC scores are rotated and scaled so as to make their two-dimensional locations comparable with the geographic locations where the animals were found.

The deer depicted separately from the others in the lower left quadrant of Figure 5 are the blacktail deer subspecies of mule deer that emerged about 20,000 years ago. The close association of Oregon and Montana mule deer to each other and the more distant relationship of Wyoming animals is an unexpected finding, given that previous studies have reported low population subdivision in mule deer ([Powell et al., 2013](#); [Cullingham et al., 2011](#)).




FIG 5. *First two principal component scores (left) and geographic locations (right) of the deer. In the legends, BT stands for blacktail and MT, OR, and WY stand for Montana, Oregon, and Wyoming.*

4. Discussion. The goal of our research was to determine which individuals share a genomic feature, in this case a newly described endogenous retrovirus, at a particular site in the genome. The data used to determine

the presence of a polymorphic genome feature are often based on the number of reads assigned to it. Read count data are heavily skewed toward small numbers, creating uncertainty in the presence/absence status of any particular element. Our article demonstrates the utility of using a mixture model to assign a probability that an insertion site is present in a given individual. Because these retroviruses are inherited like any host gene, animals that share more insertion sites are more closely related. Our results show that animals from Wyoming can be distinguished from those from the adjacent state of Montana based on the profile of shared virus integration sites. This is a surprising finding because mule deer are migratory animals and can move between these two geographic locations. In fact, based on these analyses, the Montana mule deer appear more closely related to those in Oregon. Studies using traditional approaches report that mule deer have little population structure throughout this region (Latch et al., 2014; Powell et al., 2013; Cullingham et al., 2011).

While we demonstrate the utility of using a mixture model for read count data for an endogenous retrovirus, our methodology is applicable to any data meant to determine the presence or absence of any polymorphic element—for instance, a different class of mobile element such as a long interspersed nuclear element, or LINE (Akagi et al., 2008; Evrony et al., 2012; Burns and Boeke, 2012; Richardson, Morell and Faulkner, 2014). Indeed, these methods could apply beyond the biological realm to other situations in which data subjected to multiple sources of variability include a large number of “zeros” that may not always be recorded as zeros as in the present application; the vast literature on zero-inflated models indicates that such applications could be myriad.

The primary statistical contributions of this article are twofold: First, it reinforces and provides additional evidence to support the argument made in Bao et al. (2014) that a two-component mixture model for estimating probabilities of binary outcomes being positive, given observed count data, is more flexible, principled, and accurate than the commonly-used approach of dichotomizing results based on a count threshold. Second, it significantly advances the mixture approach proposed by Bao et al. (2014) by carefully considering the statistical features of these data. As one indication that the fitted model gives sensible results, we find that in all cases, the best-fitting parameters imply that $E(X_{ij}|j \text{ contains } i) > E(X_{ij}|j \text{ does not contain } i)$ even though, as explained in Section 2.1, we do not enforce this inequality using constraints.

Our approach has the additional feature that it allows seamless integration of data from multiple batches. This is prudent because not all samples

included in an analysis are processed at the same time. Experimental realities such as different “absent” count distributions for different batches and samples that are replicated in more than one experiment can be automatically accounted for by the model. As a case in point, the read counts we analyze in this article are a superset of the counts used by [Bao et al. \(2014\)](#).

In our dataset, the counts from multiple experiments all used the same Ion Torrent sequencing platform; yet in principle the model we propose can incorporate data from different platforms as well, which is important because sequencing technology advances rapidly and so techniques such as ours that do not necessitate discarding “old” runs are both scientifically prudent and economical. Indeed, the adoption of our method enables the experimenter to consider designing experiments that include some replicated animals between experiments since this overlap will serve to validate the results. This leads to further questions of how to design such experiments optimally to achieve the best tradeoff of statistical accuracy and experimental cost, which could be considered in future work.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to the editor, associate editor, and two reviewers for numerous insightful comments that led to substantial improvements.

References.

- AKAGI, K., LI, J., STEPHENS, R. M., VOLFOVSKY, N. and SYMER, D. E. (2008). Extensive variation between inbred mouse strains due to endogenous L1 retrotransposition. *Genome Research* **18** 869–880.
- AKAIKE, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE transactions on automatic control* **19** 716–723.
- BAILLIE, J. K., BARNETT, M. W., UPTON, K. R., GERHARDT, D. J., RICHMOND, T. A., DE SAPIO, F., BRENNAN, P. M., RIZZU, P., SMITH, S., FELL, M., TALBOT, R. T., GUSTINCICH, S., FREEMAN, T. C., MATTICK, J. S., HUME, D. A., HEUTINK, P., CARNINCI, P., JEDDELOH, J. A. and FAULKNER, G. J. (2011). Somatic retrotransposition alters the genetic landscape of the human brain. *Nature* **479** 534–537.
- BAO, L., ELLEDER, D., MALHOTRA, R., DEGIORGIO, M., MARAVEGIAS, T., HORVATH, L., CARREL, L., GILLIN, C., HRON, T., FÁBRYOVÁ, H., HUNTER, D. R. and POSS, M. (2014). Computational and Statistical Analyses of Insertional Polymorphic Endogenous Retroviruses in a Non-Model Organism. *Computation* **2** 221–245.
- BÖHNE, A., BRUNET, F., GALIANA-ARNOUX, D., SCHULTHEIS, C. and VOLFF, J.-N. (2008). Transposable elements as drivers of genomic and biological diversity in vertebrates. *Chromosome research* : **16** 203–15.
- BOURQUE, G. (2009). Transposable elements in gene regulation and in the evolution of vertebrate genomes. *Current opinion in genetics & development* **19** 607–12.
- BRADLEY, A. P. (1997). The use of the area under the ROC curve in the evaluation of machine learning algorithms. *Pattern recognition* **30** 1145–1159.
- BURNS, K. H. and BOEKE, J. D. (2012). Human transposon tectonics. *Cell* **149** 740–52.

- CONTRERAS-GALINDO, R., KAPLAN, M. H., HE, S., CONTRERAS-GALINDO, A. C., GONZALEZ-HERNANDEZ, M. J., KAPPES, F., DUBE, D., CHAN, S. M., ROBINSON, D., MENG, F., DAI, M., GITLIN, S. D., CHINNAIYAN, A. M., OMENN, G. S. and MARKOVITZ, D. M. (2013). HIV infection reveals widespread expansion of novel centromeric human endogenous retroviruses. *Genome Research* **23** 1505–1513.
- CORDAUX, R. and BATZER, M. A. (2009). The impact of retrotransposons on human genome evolution. *Nature reviews. Genetics* **10** 691–703.
- CULLINGHAM, C. I., NAKADA, S. M., MERRILL, E. H., BOLLINGER, T. K., PYBUS, M. J. and COLTMAN, D. W. (2011). Multiscale population genetic analysis of mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus hemionus*) in western Canada sheds new light on the spread of chronic wasting disease. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **89** 134–147.
- ELLEDER, D., KIM, O., PADHI, A., BANKERT, J. G., SIMEONOV, I., SCHUSTER, S. C., WITTEKINDT, N. E., MOTAMENY, S. and POSS, M. (2012). Polymorphic integrations of an endogenous gammaretrovirus in the mule deer genome. *Journal of virology* **86** 2787–96.
- EVRONY, G. D., CAI, X., LEE, E., HILLS, L. B., ELHOSARY, P. C., LEHMANN, H. S., PARKER, J. J., ATABAY, K. D., GILMORE, E. C., PODURI, A., PARK, P. J. and WALSH, C. A. (2012). Single-neuron sequencing analysis of L1 retrotransposition and somatic mutation in the human brain. *Cell* **151** 483–496.
- EVRONY, G. D., LEE, E., PARK, P. J. and WALSH, C. A. (2016). Resolving rates of mutation in the brain using single-neuron genomics. *eLife* **5** e12966.
- FAIRCLOTH, B. C. and GLENN, T. C. (2012). Not all sequence tags are created equal: designing and validating sequence identification tags robust to indels. *PLOS ONE* **7** e42543.
- FEDOROFF, N. V. (2012). Transposable Elements , Epigenetics , and Genome Evolution. *Science* **338** 758–67.
- ISKOW, R. C., MCCABE, M. T., MILLS, R. E., TORENE, S., PITTARD, W. S., NEUWALD, A. F., VAN MEIR, E. G., VERTINO, P. M. and DEVINE, S. E. (2010). Natural mutagenesis of human genomes by endogenous retrotransposons. *Cell* **141** 1253–61.
- KAPUSTA, A., KRONENBERG, Z., LYNCH, V. J., ZHUO, X., RAMSAY, L., BOURQUE, G., YANDELL, M. and FESCHOTTE, C. (2013). Transposable Elements Are Major Contributors to the Origin, Diversification, and Regulation of Vertebrate Long Noncoding RNAs. *PLoS genetics* **9** e1003470.
- KAZAZIAN, H. H. (2004). Mobile elements: drivers of genome evolution. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* **303** 1626–32.
- KOKOŠAR, J. and KORDIŠ, D. (2013). Genesis and Regulatory Wiring of Retroelement-Derived Domesticated Genes: A Phylogenomic Perspective. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **30** 1015–1031.
- LATCH, E. K., REDING, D. M., HEFFELFINGER, J. R., ALCALÁ-GALVÁN, C. H. and RHODES, O. E. (2014). Range-wide analysis of genetic structure in a widespread, highly mobile species (*Odocoileus hemionus*) reveals the importance of historical biogeography. *Molecular ecology* **23** 3171–3190.
- MALHOTRA, R., ELLEDER, D., BAO, L., HUNTER, D. R., ACHARYA, R. and POSS, M. (2016). Clustering pipeline for determining consensus sequences in targeted next-generation sequencing. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (BICOB 2016)*.
- MENG, X.-L. and RUBIN, D. B. (1993). Maximum Likelihood Estimation via the ECM Algorithm: A General Framework. *Biometrika* **80** 267–278.
- O'DONNELL, K. A. and BURNS, K. H. (2010). Mobilizing diversity: transposable element insertions in genetic variation and disease. *Mobile DNA* **1** 21.

- POWELL, J. H., KALINOWSKI, S. T., HIGGS, M. D., EBINGER, M. R., VU, N. V. and CROSS, P. C. (2013). Microsatellites indicate minimal barriers to mule deer *Odocoileus hemionus* dispersal across Montana, USA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2981/11-081>.
- RICHARDSON, S. R., MORELL, S. and FAULKNER, G. J. (2014). L1 retrotransposons and somatic mosaicism in the brain. *Annual Review of Genetics* **48** 1–27.
- R CORE TEAM (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- WITTEKINDT, N. E., PADHI, A., SCHUSTER, S. C., QI, J., ZHAO, F., TOMSHO, L. P., KASSON, L. R., PACKARD, M., CROSS, P. and POSS, M. (2010). Nodeomics: pathogen detection in vertebrate lymph nodes using meta-transcriptomics. *PloS one* **5** e13432.