ETH
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Seminar for Statistics

Department of Mathematics

Semester Project Autumn 2015

arXiv:1704.00588v1 [stat.AP] 3 Apr 2017

Emiliano Díaz

Causality and Surrogate Variable Analysis

Submission Date: July 8 2016

Adviser:
Adviser: Prof. Dr. Marloes Maathuis

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Marloes Maathuis for all her patience and guidance.

Abstract

Gene expression depends on thousands of factors and we usually only have access to tens or hundreds of observations of gene expression levels meaning we are in a high-dimensional setting. Additionally we don't always observe or care about all the factors. However, many different gene expression levels depend on a set of common factors. By observing the joint variance of the gene expression levels together with the observed *primary variables* (those we care about) Surrogate Variable Analysis (SVA) seeks to estimate the remaining unobserved factors. The ultimate goal is to assess whether the primary variable (or vector) has a significant effect on the different gene expression levels, but without estimating unobserved factors first the various regression models and hypothesis tests are dependent which complicates significance analysis.

In this work we define a class of additive gene expression structural equation models (SEMs) which are convenient for modeling gene expression data and which provides a useful framework to understand the various steps of the SVA methodology. We justify the use of this class from a modeling viewpoint but also from a causality viewpoint by exploring the independence and causality properties of this class and comparing to the biologically driven data assumptions. For this we use some of the theory that has been developed elsewhere on graphical models and causality. We then give a detailed description of the SVA methodology and its implementation in the R package `sva` referring each step to different parts of the additive gene expression SEM defined previously.

Given the possible dependency of the primary variable with unobserved factors, recovering these factors accurately presents several issues. SVA tries to solve some of them by obtaining unobserved factors that are *allowed* to be correlated to the primary variable, however the exact form of this dependency is not *modeled* and so is not necessarily accurate. We perform simulation experiments and sensibility analysis to assess the performance of SVA, comparing it to other methods designed for the same purpose, and to identify for which parameters of the additive gene expression SEM, SVA performs better. In general, we found SVA performs comparably well at estimating unobserved factors to SVDR and much better than all other methods at capturing the dependence of these factors to the primary variable. Additionally the significance analysis performed were shown to be much closer to being valid for SVA than those for other methods. However, for the base scenario simulated this did not translate into significant improvement in the accuracy of the estimation of the effect of the primary variable on gene expression levels. Using sensitivity analysis we found that, assuming that performance measures vary independently with respect to the different parameters, for gene expression SEMS with low number of unobserved factors, high level of gene expression variables, high sparsity (low number of edges in the SEM), a lower variance for unobserved factors than for the primary variable and low complexity for the signals from the primary variable to the unobserved factors and to the gene expression

level variables, SVA has superior performance to the other methods considered, including in terms of the accuracy of the estimation of the effect of the primary variable on gene expression levels.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Structure . . . 1
1.2 Surrogate Variable Analysis . . . 1

2 Causality **5**
2.1 DAGs and SEMs . . . 5
2.2 Causality . . . 13
2.3 Additive Gene Expression SEMs . . . 15

3 SVA Methodology **19**
3.1 Overview . . . 19
3.2 Estimation of span($\{c_l\}$) . . . 19
3.2.1 Estimation procedure . . . 19
3.2.2 Estimation of basis function model . . . 22
3.2.3 Factorization of residuals using SVD . . . 23
3.2.4 Parallel Analysis . . . 26
3.3 Estimation of span($\{h_k\}$) . . . 30
3.3.1 General description . . . 30
3.3.2 Finding the signature of c_l . . . 31
3.3.3 FDR based significance analysis . . . 34

4 Simulation Expermiments **43**
4.1 Methods to be compared . . . 43
4.2 Low-dimensional experiments . . . 44
4.2.1 Design . . . 44
4.2.2 Result for one repetition . . . 45
4.2.3 Results for 1000 repetitions . . . 50
4.3 High-dimensional experiments . . . 53
4.3.1 Design . . . 53
4.3.2 Results for 100 repetitions . . . 54
4.3.3 Sensitivity analysis . . . 55

5 Summary **75**
5.1 Future Work . . . 77

Bibliography **79**

Appendices **79**

Appendix A Proofs **81**
A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.3.0.2 . . . 81

Appendix B R Code **83**
B.1 Functions . . . 83
B.2 Script . . . 104

List of Figures

2.1 Gene expression SEM . . . 7
2.2 A simple SEM . . . 9
2.3 DAGs $\mathcal{G}$ in gene expression class . . . 12
2.4 Non-identifiability . . . 13
2.5 CPDAG of a Markov equivalence class . . . 13
2.6 Additive gene expression DAG . . . 16

3.1 3 steps of SVA estimation . . . 19
3.2 Reduced equation model DAG . . . 20
3.3 examples of p-value distribution . . . 34
3.4 estimation of π_0 . . . 36
3.5 $\hat{\pi}_0$ as a function of λ . . . 37
3.6 $FDR(t)$ . . . 38
3.7 $q^*(t)$ . . . 39

4.1 DAG of simulated low dimensional SEM . . . 45
4.2 Comparison of $\hat{f}_{x_j}(y)$ using SVA to the real f_{x_j} . . . 46
4.3 Comparison of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[x_j|y, \hat{h}_k^{sva}]$ for the vanilla and SVA methods . . . 47
4.4 A comparison of the residuals produced with the four methods, van, SVDX, SVDR and SVA . . . 48
4.5 Tukey-Anscombe residual plot, with $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k$ on the x-axis . . . 49
4.6 Evaluation of performance for low-dim sem with 1000 repetitions: c_l and h_k node span estimation, dependence between h_k nodes and y and f_{x_j} estimation . . . 52
4.7 Evaluation of performance for high-dim sem with 100 repetitions: c_l and h_k node span estimation, dependence between h_k nodes and y and f_{x_j} estimation . . . 54
4.8 Sensitivity of parameter J . . . 56
4.9 Sensitivity of parameters (K, J) . . . 58
4.10 Sensitivity of parameter p_{0k} . . . 59
4.11 Sensitivity of parameter p_{0j} . . . 61
4.12 Sensitivity of parameter $p_{0\beta}$ . . . 62
4.13 Sensitivity of parameters $(p_{0j}, p_{\text{d-sep}})$ . . . 64
4.14 Sensitivity of parameter σ_{c_l} . . . 66
4.15 Sensitivity of parameter $\sigma_{N_{x_j}}$ . . . 68
4.16 Sensitivity of parameter $d^{\max}$ . . . 70
4.17 Sensitivity of parameter n . . . 72

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Structure

The report is organized as follows. In Section 1.2 we describe the problem *Surrogate Variable Analysis* (SVA) tries to solve in its original *gene expression* context.

Chapter 2 introduces the basic *graphical models*, *structural equation models* (SEMs) and *causality* concepts and results necessary to frame the gene expression modeling problem in the context of causality. We also define a class of structural equation models, which we call *additive gene expression* SEMs. This class of SEMs can be used to model gene expression and forms the basis for the SVA methodology. We conclude the section by deriving some of the properties of this class.

In Chapter 3 the SVA methodology is described in detail. Section 3.1 gives a general overview of the methodology which consists of three main steps: estimation of the span of the c_l and h_k variables, respectively, from the additive gene expression SEM, and estimation of effects f_{x_j} of y on x_j. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 give a detailed description of the first two steps.

In Chapter 4 we evaluate the performance of the SVA methodology by applying it to simulated data. Section 4.1 describes other methods that can be used to estimate the gene expression SEM. In Sections 4.2 and 4.3 we we will apply these methods, together with SVA, in order to provide benchmarks for the SVA methodology. Section 4.2 includes the results of *low dimensional* experiments, where the number of gene expression variables is less than 10. The results of *high dimensional* experiments, where the number of gene expression variables in the order of 1000, are included in Section 4.3. This Section also includes sensitivity analysis on certain simulation parameters to gauge the efectiveness of SVA in different data environments.

In Chapter 5 we summarize the key findings and list possible future lines of investigation.

1.2 Surrogate Variable Analysis

Gene expression is the biological process by which the information contained in a gene is used to produce material such as proteins or RNA. The degree to which this process occurs

can be measured on a continuous scale and we call this measurement the gene expression level.

It has been shown that genetic, environmental, demographic and other factors have an effect on gene expression levels. Often it is of interest to study the effect of one, or a group, of *primary* variables on the expression levels of a group of genes. Other *unmodeled* variables which also have an effect on gene expression may not be studied explicitly because measurements are not available or because it is inconvenient to do so - the relationship between the unmodeled variable and gene expression maybe too complex or limited sample size may restrict the number of variables that can be used as predictors. The following model can be used to describe this situation:

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_l g_l + N_{x_j} \tag{1.2.0.1}$$

Where,

- $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$,
- $x_1, ..., x_J$ are the gene expression levels of the J genes of interest,
- y is the primary variable (which may be a vector) of interest, the variable whose effect on the gene expression levels $\underline{x} = (x_1, ..., x_J)^T$ we want to study,
- $g_l := \sum_{p=1}^{P} g_{lp}(w_p)$ and $w_1, ..., w_P$ are the *unmodeled* variables, and
- N_{x_j} is a white noise random process.

The choice of an additive model is quite general as it has been shown in **?** that an appropriate choice of non-linear basis, i.e. the right choice of functions $f_{x_j}, g_{11}, ..., g_{lp}$, can be used to accurately represent even complicated non-linear functions of the variables $y, w_1, ..., w_p$. Notice that the above model is a multivariate regression model since there are J response variables involved.

Example 1.2.0.1 (Disease state and age)**.** As a simple illustrative example take the hypothetical human expression study proposed in **?**. The disease state of a certain tissue is the primary variable. Additionally, changes in expression are also influenced by the age of the individuals. The expression level of some genes depends on the disease state, the expression level of other genes depends on age and for others still, expression level depends on both variables. We are only interested in the influence of disease state on expression level. The age of the individuals corresponding to the collected samples is unknown to us. The corresponding model is:

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_l g_l + N_{x_j} \tag{1.2.0.2}$$

Where,

- $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$,
- $x_1, ..., x_J$ are the gene expression levels of the J genes of interest,

- $y \in \{0, 1\}$ is the primary variable, disease state,
- $g_l := g_l(w)$ and w is the age of the individual, and
- N_{x_j} is a white noise random process.

Since we can't observe $w_1, ..., w_p$ normal regression techniques can't be used to estimate the model. We also know from multiple regression that if we omit the variables $w_1, ..., w_p$ from the model, i.e. if we estimate the simplified model:

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \epsilon_j \tag{1.2.0.3}$$

we will obtain a model with systematic error such that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{ij}] \neq 0$. Additionally, since we are dealing with a multivariate regression model, omitting the variables $w_1, ..., w_p$ leads to correlation among residuals ϵ_i and ϵ_j, for $i \neq j$ which complicates significance analysis.

To avoid this we need not estimate $g_1, ..., g_L$ individually, it suffices to estimate $\sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_l g_l$. We could, for example, estimate variables $h_1, ..., h_K$ as long as there exist $\beta_1, ..., \beta_K$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k h_k = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_l g_l$. This is what the *Surrogate Variable Analysis* methodology (SVA) proposed in **?** tries to do. It aims to estimate *surrogate variables* $h_1, ..., h_K$ which generate the same linear space of the unmodeled factors $g_1, ..., g_L$ so that we can then accurately estimate $f_{x_1}, ..., f_{x_J}$ and produce valid significance analysis.

The variables $h_1, ..., h_K$ must include signal from other sources than the primary variable y, i.e. from certain unobserved $w_1, ..., w_p$. However, the linear space generated by $h_1, ..., h_K$ need not be orthogonal to $f_{x_j}(y)$ so the estimation of the surrogate variables must allow for potential *overlap* in signal with the primary variable. The model to estimate is then:

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k h_k + N_{x_j} \tag{1.2.0.4}$$

Where,

- $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$,
- $x_1, ..., x_J$ are the gene expression levels of the J genes of interest,
- y is the primary variable (which may be a vector) of interest, the variable whose effect on the gene expression levels $\underline{x} = (x_1, ..., x_J)^T$ we want to study,
- N_{x_j} is a white noise random process,
- h_k are surrogate variables such that $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k h_k = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_l g_l$, to be estimated using SVA,
- h_k can't be modelled as $h_k = f(y) + N$, where N is a white noise process, i.e. it must include signal from *unmodeled* variables, and
- typically $Cor(f_{x_j}(y), h_k) \neq 0$ for some k.

There are an estimated 20,000-25,000 human protein-coding genes while typically, the cost of measuring gene expression levels means we only have available in the order of tens or

hundreds of samples with the gene expression level and primary variable measurements. This means we are in a high-dimensional setting where $J >> n$, where n is the sample size. Any estimation technique designed to estimate model 1.2.0.4 must take this into account, as does SVA.

In SVA as in techniques such as *Canonical Correlation Analysis* (CCA) and *Reduced Rank Regression* (RRR) response variables (in this case gene expression levels) are considered simultaneously. Where as in CCA and RRR the characterization of the space spanned by the response variables is used to estimate model parameters, in the case of SVA it is used to recover the effects of unmodeled variables so as to produce an analysis that essentially includes all relevant variables.

Chapter 2

Causality

In **?** the relationship between, on the one hand, the primary variable y and unmodeled variables $w_1, ..., w_p$ and, on the other, the gene expression levels $x_1, ..., x_J$ is not explicitly described as *causal* in nature. Nevertheless, emphasis is made on measuring the *effect* of the first group of variables on the second, suggesting an underlying causal structure. Additionally, the SVA methodology can be succintly described and justified within the framework of *Causality* if we assume these relationships to be *causal*. We give some definitions and results necessary to frame the problem in this setting. The rest of this section follows **?** closely.

2.1 DAGs and SEMs

Causal relations are defined in the context of structural equation models (SEMs). Every SEM $\mathcal{M}$ has an associated graph $\mathcal{G}$ that summarizes the functional dependencies of the SEM. As we will see each SEM induces a unique joint probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ for the variables in the SEM. We will be interested in SEMs whose graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). In this case the graph also represents, through the d-separation relation, the independence relations of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and can be used to refute claims about causal relationships between variables.

Definition 2.1.0.1 (Directed acyclic graph (DAG))**.** *A directed acyclic graph (DAG) is a tuple $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{V}$ is a finite set of nodes and the set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is such that if $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v \neq w$ then $(v, v) \notin \mathcal{E}$ and if $(v, w) \in \mathcal{E}$ then $(w, v) \notin \mathcal{E}$.*

Definition 2.1.0.2 (D-separation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a DAG, with $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, ..., x_p\}$. Then:*

i. ***Notation.*** *We may refer to node x_{i_k} or a sequence of nodes $x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_n} \in \mathcal{V}$ by their indices, e.g. node i_k or nodes $i_1, ..., i_n$. If there is an edge between node i and j, i.e. if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, we write $i \to j$ (or $j \leftarrow i$). If $\mathcal{V}$ includes nodes labeled with different letters we don't use the indices to refer to them as, for example, when $\mathcal{V} = \{y, h_1, ..., h_K, x_1, ..., x_J\}$*

ii. ***Parent.*** *A node i is a parent of j in DAG $\mathcal{G}$ if $i \to j$. The set of parents of node j is denoted $PA_j^{\mathcal{G}}$.*

iii. ***Path.*** *There is a path between nodes i_1 and i_n if there exists a sequence of nodes $i_1, i_2, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$ such that either $i_k \to i_{k+1}$ or $i_{k+1} \to i_k$ for $k = 1, ..., n-1$.*

iv. ***Directed path.*** *There is a directed path between nodes i_1 and i_n if there exists a sequence of nodes $i_1, i_2, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $i_k \to i_{k+1}$ for $k = 1, ..., n-1$.*

v. ***Descendent.*** *We say node i_k is a descendant of node i_1 if there is a directed path from i_1 to i_k. The sets of descendent and non-descendant nodes to node i in DAG $\mathcal{G}$ are denoted $DE_i^{\mathcal{G}}$ and $ND_i^{\mathcal{G}}$ respectively.*

vi. ***Collider.*** *A node i_k is a collider in a path $i_1, ..., i_n$ if $i_{k-1} \to i_k \leftarrow i_{k+1}$. The structure $i_{k-1} \to i_k \leftarrow i_{k+1}$ is referred to as a v-structure.*

vii. ***Blocking set.*** *The set S blocks the path from i_1 to i_n if either:*

- *$i_k \in S$ and $i_{k-1} \to i_k \to i_{k+1}$, $i_{k-1} \leftarrow i_k \leftarrow i_{k+1}$ or $i_{k-1} \leftarrow i_k \to i_{k+1}$, or*
- *$i_k \notin S$, $DE_{i_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \cap S = \emptyset$ and $i_{k-1} \to i_k \leftarrow i_{k+1}$ (i.e. i_k is a collider).*

viii. ***D-separation.*** *Let $A, B, S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ disjoint. A is d-separated from B by S, if S blocks all paths between nodes in A and nodes in B. We denote this as $A \,\text{d-sep}_{\mathcal{G}}\, B \,\text{by}\, S$.*

ix. ***D-connection.*** *We say that A is d-connected from B by S, if A is not d-separated from B by S. We denote this as $A \,\text{d-conn}_{\mathcal{G}}\, B \,\text{by}\, S$.*

Definition 2.1.0.3 (Structural equation model (SEM))**.** *A structural equation model (SEM) for variables $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_p\}$ is defined as a tuple $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}})$ where $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, ..., S_p\}$, a collection of p equations, and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}$, a joint probability distribution, are such that:*

$$S_j : x_j = f_j(x_{PA_j}, N_j) \tag{2.1.0.1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{P}^{N_1,...,N_p} = \mathbb{P}^{N_1} ... \mathbb{P}^{N_p} \tag{2.1.0.2}$$

Where,

- *$j \in \{1, ..., p\}$,*
- *x_{PA_j} is the set of variables upon which x_j functionally depends, where $PA_j \subseteq \{1, ..., p\}$ denotes the indices of those variables; we require the functions f to* really *depend on the set of parent variables x_{PA_j}, i.e. for all $x_i \in x_{PA_j}$ and for all values of $x_{PA_j \setminus i}$ and N_j there must exist values x_i^1 and x_i^2 such that $f_j(x_i^1, x_{PA_j \setminus i}, N_j) \neq f_j(x_i^2, x_{PA_j \setminus i}, N_j)$. If this is not the case we may simply redefine $x_{PA_j} \leftarrow x_{PA_j \setminus i}$,*
- *N_j are random noise variables, and*
- *$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the joint distribution of noise variables, which we require to be jointly independent.*

Definition 2.1.0.4 (Graph of a SEM)**.** *The graph of a SEM for variables $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_p\}$ is $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, ..., p\}$ and $i \to j$ if and only if $i \in PA_j$. If the resulting graph $\mathcal{G}$ is a DAG then $PA_j^{\mathcal{G}} = PA_j \; \forall j$. From now on we only consider SEMs that induce a DAG graph.*

Example 2.1.0.5 (A gene expression SEM)**.** As a an example of a SEM consider $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}})$ where $\mathbb{X} = \{y, h_1, ..., h_K, x_1, ..., x_J\}$ and the joint noise distribution is a multivariate normal composed of independent standard normal variables $\mathbb{N} \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, I_p)$ with $p = K + J + 1$, $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$, $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is such that:

$$S_y : y = N_y \tag{2.1.0.3}$$
$$S_{h_k} : h_k = f_{h_k}(y, N_{h_k}) \tag{2.1.0.4}$$
$$S_{x_j} : x_j = f_{x_j}(y, h_1, ..., h_k, N_{x_j}) \tag{2.1.0.5}$$

If $J = 3$ and $K = 2$ the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ corresponding to this SEM is:




Figure 2.1: Gene expression SEM

Proposition 2.1.0.6 (Distribution of a SEM)**.** *A SEM for variables $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_p\}$, with an acyclic structure (i.e. a DAG graph), defines a unique distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ over these variables.*

Proof. See Proposition 2.1.2 in **?**. □

This means that by specifying the SEM we implicitly specify the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. However, as we will see the SEM also includes additional information that allows us to determine which dependence relations between the variables in $\mathbb{X}$ are causal (and incidentally, other information that allows us to make *counterfactual* statements).

We have seen that a SEM $\mathcal{M}$ induces a unique graph $\mathcal{G}$ and joint probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. We now study the relationship between the DAG of a SEM and its joint probability distribution to see to what degree the DAG structure accurately describes the independence relations encoded in the joint probability distribution.

Definition 2.1.0.7 (Markov properties)**.** *We say that the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ (which we require to have a density p with respect to some product measure) has the following Markov properties with respect to the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ over variables $\mathbb{X}$ if it satisfies the corresponding conditions:*

i. the global Markov property if A d-sep$_{\mathcal{G}}$ B by $C \Rightarrow A \perp\!\!\!\perp B|C$ where $A, B, C \in \mathcal{V}$ are disjoint.

ii. the local Markov property if $x_j \perp\!\!\!\perp ND_j^{\mathcal{G}} | PA_j^{\mathcal{G}}$ $\forall j \in \mathcal{V}$.

iii. the Markov factorization property if $p(\mathbb{X}) = \prod_{j=1}^{p} p(x_j | x_{PA_j^{\mathcal{G}}})$ *in which case we say that* $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *factorizes over* $\mathcal{G}$.

Notice that the global Markov property implies that:

$$A \text{ d-conn}_{\mathcal{G}} B \text{ by } C \Leftarrow A \not\perp\!\!\!\perp B | C \tag{2.1.0.6}$$

Proposition 2.1.0.8 (Equivalence of Markov properties)**.** *If* $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *has a density* p *(with respect to a product measure), then all Markov properties of 2.1.0.7 are equivalent.*

Proof. See Theorem 3.27 in **?**. □

Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})$ denote the set of all independencies implied by the d-separations in $\mathcal{G}$ when we equate $A \text{ d-sep}_{\mathcal{G}} B \text{ by } C$ to $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B | C$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is an I-map for a set of independencies $\mathcal{I}$ if:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{I} \tag{2.1.0.7}$$

A DAG $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be an I-map for a joint probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is Markov with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. This is represented as:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}) \tag{2.1.0.8}$$

Where:

- $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}})$ denotes all independencies in $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$.

So if $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is Markov with respect to a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ it means d-separation on $\mathcal{G}$ is a *sound* procedure for obtaining the independencies in $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$: we can *read-off* independencies from the graph.

Proposition 2.1.0.9 (The joint distribution of a SEM is Markov)**.** *If* $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *are induced by a SEM* $\mathcal{M}$ *then* $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *is Markov with respect to* $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. See Theorem 1.4.1 in **?**. □

This means that the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ of any SEM $\mathcal{M}$ is an I-map for its joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. Using that figure 2.1 is an I-map for the SEM of example 2.1.0.5 we can now deduce, for example, that $y \perp\!\!\!\perp h_1 | x_1, x_2, x_3$ and $x_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp x_3 | h_1, h_2, y$. The *faithfulness* property of a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ will allow us to check if d-separation is a *complete* procedure for finding the indpendencies of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$.

Definition 2.1.0.10 (Faithfulness)**.** *We say that the the joint probability distribution* $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *is faithful with respect to DAG* $\mathcal{G}$ *over variables* $\mathbb{X}$ *if it satisfies the following condition:*

$$A \text{ d-sep}_{\mathcal{G}} B \text{ by } C \Leftarrow A \perp\!\!\!\perp B | C \tag{2.1.0.9}$$

Notice that the faithfulness property implies that:

$$A \text{ d-conn}_{\mathcal{G}} B \text{ by } C \Rightarrow A \not\perp\!\!\!\perp B | C \tag{2.1.0.10}$$

If a joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is faithful with respect to DAG $\mathcal{G}$ we write:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) \supseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}) \tag{2.1.0.11}$$

This means that if a joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is faithful with respect to DAG $\mathcal{G}$ we are able to *read-off* dependencies from the graph. If a joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is Markov and faithful with respect to a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ we say $\mathcal{G}$ is a perfect I-map for $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and write:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}) \tag{2.1.0.12}$$

In this case d-separation on $\mathcal{G}$ is a sound and complete procedure for obtaining the independencies in $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and we can read-off dependencies and independencies from the graph. Unfortunately, neither the fact that a joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ factorizes over $\mathcal{G}$ nor the fact that a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ and a joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ are induced by the same SEM $\mathcal{M}$ guarantees that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is faithful with respect $\mathcal{G}$. We can verify this using a simplified version of example 2.1.0.5:

Example 2.1.0.11 (A simple SEM)**.** Consider the SEMs $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}})$ where $\mathbb{X} = \{y, h, x\}$, the joint noise distribution is a multivariate normal composed of independent standard normal variables $\mathbb{N} \sim \mathcal{N}_3(0, I_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is such that :

$$S_y : y = N_y \tag{2.1.0.13}$$
$$S_h : h = f_h(y, N_h) = ay + N_h \tag{2.1.0.14}$$
$$S_x : x = f_x(y, h, N_x) = by + ch + N_x \tag{2.1.0.15}$$

The DAG $\mathcal{G}$ corresponding to this SEM is:




Figure 2.2: A simple SEM

First notice that $\mathbb{X} \sim \mathcal{N}_3(0, \Sigma)$ where the covariance matrix Σ depends on a, b and c. We may rexpress the equation S_x as:

$$x = by + ch + N_x = bN_y + c(aN_y + N_h) = (b + ca)N_y + cN_h \tag{2.1.0.16}$$

From which we can calculate the covariance between y and x:

$$Cov(y, x) = Cov(N_y, (b + ca)N_y + cN_h) = (b + ca)Var(N_y) = b + ca \tag{2.1.0.17}$$

Where we have used the bi-linear properties of the covariance and the fact that the noise variables N_y and N_h are independent. Now if a, b and c are such that $b + ca = 0$, y and x are not correlated and since $\mathbb{X}$ has a multivariate normal distribution this means that y is independent of x. This in turn implies that if a, b and c are such that $b + ca = 0$ then $\mathcal{G}$ is not faithful to $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$.

The above SEM can actually be considered to be a *class* of SEMs parametrized by a, b and c. Although for many classes of SEMs, such as the one above, faithfulness cannot be guaranteed, a somewhat weaker condition called *causal minimality* can sometimes be guaranteed.

Definition 2.1.0.12 (Causal minimality)**.** *We say that a joint probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies causal miniimality with respect to the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ over variables $\mathbb{X}$ if it is Markov with respect to $\mathcal{G}$, but not with respect to $\mathcal{G}'$, where $\mathcal{G}'$ is a proper subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$.*

We say that a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ is a minimal I-map of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ if the following two conditions hold:

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}) \tag{2.1.0.18}$$

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}') \nsubseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}) \tag{2.1.0.19}$$

where $\mathcal{G}'$ is a proper subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. The idea is that, if $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies causal minimality, while a d-connection in the graph does not imply the corresponding dependency, if we take off any of the edges of DAG $\mathcal{G}$, to obtain the proper subgraph $\mathcal{G}'$, then we create new independencies which are not in $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ i.e. all the edges in $\mathcal{G}$ contribute to the Markov property of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. We now present a result that will help to discern if the joint distribution of a given SEM satisfies causal minimality with respect to its DAG.

Proposition 2.1.0.13 (Causal minimality condition for SEMs)**.** *Let the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ be Markov with respect to a DAG $\mathcal{G}$ over variables $\mathbb{X} = \{y, x_1, ..., x_p\}$ as is the case with the distribution and graph of a SEM. Assume the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ has a density with respect to some product measure. Then:*

$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ satisfies causal minimality with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ $\iff$ $\forall x_j$ and $\forall y \in PA_j^{\mathcal{G}}$ $x_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_j^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus \{y\}$

Proof. See Appendix A.2.5 in **?**. □

We now define general a class of SEMs which we assume can be used to accurately model the gene expression *causal* process. We don't assume this class of SEMs represents the actual data generating process as we know this is not likely to be additive, for example.

Definition 2.1.0.14 (Class of gene expression SEMs)**.** *We define the class of gene expression SEMs as the collection of SEMs for variables* $\mathbb{X} \cup A = \{y, h_1, ..., h_K, x_1, ..., x_J\} \cup A$ *such that:*

i.) $S_{x_j} : x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j} \ \forall j \in \{1, ..., J\}$

ii.) $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ *is such that* $y \not\perp\!\!\!\perp h_k \ \forall k \in \{1, ..., K\}$

iii.) A is the set of variables that are not parents of $x_1, ..., x_J$ *but form part of the SEM.*

The variables in A represent the part of the SEM which we are not so interested in but which we might need to estimate to understand the rest of the SEM. Specifically we are interested in estimating the functions f_{x_j}, which represent the the *direct* effect that y has on x_j. In this work we have assumed that the gene expression level x_j does not depend on any other expression level x_k with $k \in \{1, ..., J\} \setminus j$, however this is not implicit in the SVA methodology. It could be that a more appropriate SEM model for the x_j variables has the equations:

$$S_{x_j} : x_j = f_j(x_{\setminus j}) + f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j} \tag{2.1.0.20}$$

$\forall j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ where $x_{\setminus j}$ is a vector which includes all x_k variables such that $k \in \{1, ..., J\} \setminus j$. In this case the SVA methodology still works but does not estimate the *direct* effect of y on x_j rather the *filtered* effect of y on x_j: the effect of y that *passes through* the unobserved vatiables h_k has been filtered out.

Notice that since the joint probability distributions $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ of all SEMs are Markov with respect their DAGs $\mathcal{G}$, if A d-conn$_{\mathcal{G}}$ B by C then $A \not\perp\!\!\!\perp B|C$: we can satisfy condition 2 above by assuring that y d-conn$_{\mathcal{G}}$ h_k by $\emptyset$. We give some examples of DAGs that correspond to SEMs belonging to class 2.1.0.14.




Figure 2.3: DAGs $\mathcal{G}$ in gene expression class

Notice that in all the examples it holds that y d-conn$_{\mathcal{G}}$ h_k by $\emptyset$, so for a SEM with any of these DAGs, $\mathcal{G}$ is an I-map of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. The above class of SEMs is very large: the number of nodes is not parametrized and the functional form of the equations S_{h_k} is not determined. This leads to an identifiability problem which we discuss here.

Before we can estimate the parameters or functions of a SEM we must specify its structure, which means specifying the arguments of each equation in $\mathcal{S}$ or equivalently estimating the induced graph $\mathcal{G}$.

One way to approach the problem is not to assume any specific form of SEM, first learn the graph structure and then model each equation using observations from $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. The way we can learn the graph structure is by performing some form of independence test. Assume we have an infinite number of observations from $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$, then we can estimate the right set of independencies $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}})$ every time, which corresponds to having an independence oracle. Even in this situation, identifying most graph structures is impossible because different graphs can represent the same set of independencies: there exist $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 \neq \mathcal{G}_2$ such that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}_1) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}})$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}})$.

Example 2.1.0.15 (Non-identifiability)**.** As an example consider the variables x, y and z and suppose we want to find the DAG that is an I-map for $\mathcal{I} = \{x \perp\!\!\!\perp y | z\}$. Even for such a simple example there are 3 graphs that are I-maps for $\mathcal{I}$:




Figure 2.4: Non-identifiability

Something similar occurs in the example of figure 2.3 where the four DAGs are I-maps for sets of dependencies all of which include $y \not\perp\!\!\!\perp h_k$. This means that a SEM with any of the four DAGs can induce a $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ where $y \not\perp\!\!\!\perp h_k$.

Definition 2.1.0.16 (Markov equivalence class)**.** *The Markov equivalence class of DAGs, $\mathcal{K}$, for a set of independencies $\mathcal{I}$ is the set of DAGs $\mathcal{G}$ over variables $\mathbb{X}$, such that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{I}$.*

The Markov equivalence class of a DAGs, $\mathcal{K}$, can be represented using a completed directed acyclic graph (CPDAG) where:

1. The set of nodes of the graph is $\mathbb{X}$,
2. Directed edges correspond to nodes i, j which in all DAGs $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{K}$ are joined either with a $i \to j$ edge or a $i \leftarrow j$ edge, and
3. Undirected edges correspond to nodes i, j which in some DAGs $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{K}$ are joined with a $i \to j$ edge and in others with a$i \leftarrow j$ edge.

Example 2.1.0.17 (CPDAG of a Markov equivalence class)**.** The CPDAG representing the Markov equivalence class which contains the three DAGs shown in figure is:




Figure 2.5: CPDAG of a Markov equivalence class

We can obtain all the DAGs $\mathcal{G}$ in Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{K}$ by directing undirected edges in all possible ways that don't create cycles in the graph.

2.2 Causality

Using the observational distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ of an unknown SEM $\mathcal{M}$ we can only identify the correct DAG $\mathcal{G}$ up to its Markov equivalence class. This is why we deal with DAGs in the context of SEMs, instead of as models in themselves, because they allow us to define *interventional distributions*. Through intervention distributions we are able to define causal relationships. This gives us another tool in establishing the directionality of edges and thus the possibility of identifying the correct DAG structure. We don't always have access

to observations from the interventional distribution- in fact SVA works on the assumption that we don't - however sometimes we can express the interventional distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ in terms of the observational distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ (for example through *instrumental variables* or by *adjusting*) meaning we can establish causal relationships.

A second approach to establishing the causal structure is to assume that the SEM belongs to a more restricted class. Depending on the class of SEM assumed there are results available establishing whether the identifiability of the DAG is possible or not, and techniques for actually finding it (see Chapter 4 in **?** for an overview). The approach of SVA is more akin to this second approach. In fact, the assumptions that will be made about the underlying SEM in definition 2.3.0.1 almost completely determine the DAG structure.

We now study intervention distributions and causality so that we may give a causal interpretation of SVA. We are also interested in defining causal relationships so as to verify that the proposed SEM classes satisfy our assumption about the causal nature of the relationship between primary and unmodeled variables and the gene expression level variables.

Definition 2.2.0.1 (Intervention distribution)**.** *Consider a distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ induced by a SEM $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}})$. If we replace one (or more) of the equations $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ we obtain a new SEM $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, a new joint distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$, and new marginals $\mathbb{P}^{x_i}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ which we call intervention distributions and denote:*

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}|do(x_j = \tilde{f}(\widetilde{PA}_j, \widetilde{N}_j))}_{\mathcal{M}} \tag{2.2.0.1}$$

Where:

- *Some noise variables have been replaced but $(\widetilde{N}_1, ..., \widetilde{N}_p)$ is still mutually independent,*
- *$\widetilde{PA}_j$ can be any new set of nodes in $\mathcal{V}$ as long as there are no cycles in $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ but usually $\widetilde{PA}_j = \{\}$ (x_j is deterministic or just noise) or $\widetilde{PA}_j = PA_j$ (the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ stays the same but we change the noise or the function f)*
- *When $\tilde{f}(\widetilde{PA}_j, \widetilde{N}_j)$ puts a point mass on a real value b we simply write $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}|do(x_j=b)}_{\mathcal{M}}$*

If we already know the SEM $\mathcal{M}$ and the induced distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ we can obtain the interventional distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ from the above definition. If we don't know the SEM, are learning the DAG structure, and have access to data generating mechanism, we can perform interventions. This allows us to obtain observations from the corresponding interventional distributions and obtain the independence relations therein by performing independence tests. If we know the set of independencies in the interventional distribution, $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}})$, we can establishing causal relations between variables through definition 2.2.0.2 and proposition 2.2.0.3.

Definition 2.2.0.2 (Total causal effect)**.** *Given a SEM $\mathcal{M}$ there is a (total) causal effect from x to y if and only if $x \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}|do(x=\widetilde{N}_x)}_{\mathcal{M}}$ for some variable $\widetilde{N}_x$.*

Proposition 2.2.0.3 (Equivalent causality queries)**.** *Given a SEM $\mathcal{M}$, the following are equivalent:*

i.) There is a causal effect from x to y.

ii.) $\exists x_1, x_2 : x_1 \neq x_2$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{y|do(x=x_1)} \neq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{y|do(x=x_2)}$.

iii.) $\exists x_1$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{y|do(x=x_1)} \neq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{y}$.

iv.) $x \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbb{X}|do(x=\widetilde{N}_x)}$ for all $\widetilde{N}_x$ such that $\widetilde{p}(x) > 0 \ \forall x$. i.e. the pdf of $\widetilde{N}_x$ has full support.

Proof. See Appendix A.2.1 in **?**. □

Assume we have learned the Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{K}$ of DAGs that are I-maps to $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. The following result can help us to identify the DAG structure, from within $\mathcal{K}$, by establishing the directionality of undirected edges in the CPDAG.

Proposition 2.2.0.4 (Directed paths and causality)**.** *The following statements relate the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ of a SEM $\mathcal{M}$ to whether the relationships between its variables are causal or not.*

i. If there is no directed path from x to y, then there is no causal effect.

ii. If there is a directed path from x to y, there may not be a causal effect.

Proof. See Appendix A.2.2 in **?**. □

Notice that an equivalent form of statement i. is that if there is a causal effect from y to x then there must be a directed path from y to x. Suppose we have identified the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ up to the CPDAG that represents $\mathcal{K}$ using observations from $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. Using observations from $\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}^{\mathbb{X}}$ we can establish if variable y causes variable x. If y causes x we can then use the above proposition to direct undirected edges by making sure there is at least one directed path from y to x in $\mathcal{G}$.

2.3 Additive Gene Expression SEMs

We now define a class of gene expression SEMs that is more restricted than the one defined in 2.1.0.14. Below we argue that we may use this SEM to model the variables $\mathbb{X} = \{y, h_1, ..., h_K, x_1, ..., x_J\}$ since the distribution $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$ that both SEMs induce is essentially the same: in this case we use non-identifiability in our favour to model a set of variables with the simpler SEM.

Definition 2.3.0.1 (Class of additive gene expression SEMs)**.** *We define the class of additive gene expression SEMs as the collection of SEMs for variables $\mathbb{X} \cup C = \{y, c_1, ..., c_L, h_1, ..., h_K, x_1, ..., x_J\}$ such that:*

i.) $S_{h_k} : h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l + N_{h_k} \ \forall k \in \{1, ..., K\}$

ii.) $S_{x_j} : x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j} \ \forall j \in \{1, ..., J\}$

Remark: *Since we really care about modeling* x_j *and the term* $f_{x_j}(y)$ *can be made to include any constant term, we assume without loss of generality that*

- $\mathbb{E}[c_l] = \mathbb{E}[f_{h_k}(y)] = \mathbb{E}[h_k] = \mathbb{E}[N_{h_k}] = \mathbb{E}[N_{x_j}] = 0$ *and*
- $\mathbb{V}[c_l] = \mathbb{V}[h_k] = 1$

Clearly the class of additive gene expression SEMs is a subset of the class of gene expression SEMs of definition 2.1.0.14 since h_k depends on y. Since we assume that the larger class of gene expression SEMs can be used to accurately model the gene expression causal process why can we use this reduced class to model the data? We again use the justification, from **?**, proposed for the use of model 2.3.0.1 for modeling gene expression data. Since y and h_k must be dependent by condition ii.) of Definition 2.1.0.14 we know that for the right choice of non-linear basis $\{c_l\}_{\{l=1,...,L\}}$ we can model h_k as:

$$h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l + N_{h_k} \tag{2.3.0.1}$$

Where,

- $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$,
- $c_l := \sum_{p=1}^{P} c_{lp}(z_p)$ and $z_1, ..., z_P$ are *unmodeled* variables upon which h_k also depends, and
- N_{h_k} is a white noise random process.

This means we can replace condition ii.) in 2.1.0.14 with equation S_{h_k} of Definition 2.1.0.14.

The DAG corresponding to a SEM from the above class where $L = 3$, $K = 2$ and $J = 3$, and where $\gamma_{lk}, \beta_{kj} > 0 \ \forall l, k, j$ is:




Figure 2.6: Additive gene expression DAG

The f_{h_k}, f_{x_j}, γ_{lk} and β_{kj} edge labels do not form part of the DAG and are included to represent the SEM graphically.

Notice that the DAG $\mathcal{G}$ of any SEM in the class above will be the same as that shown in the figure up to choice of L, K and J, and deletion of edges (in the case that $\gamma_{lk} = 0$ or $\beta_{kj} = 0$ for any given l, k and j, or that any of the f_{x_j} or f_{h_k} functions are constant in y). This means that we have essentially identified the causal structure of the underlying SEM by assumming it belongs to the above class.

Also notice that if we use an alternative definition for a SEM, where the joint noise distribution is not necessarily mutually independent then we can define a class of additive gene expression SEMs without the need for the c_l variables, and instead allow the N_{h_k} variables to be mutually dependent.

Using the definitions and results presented in this Section we can establish the following properties for the additive gene expression class.

Proposition 2.3.0.2 (Properties of class of additive gene expression SEMs)**.** *Suppose the SEM $\mathcal{M}$ belongs to the class of additive gene expression SEMs and that $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}\cup C}$ are its induced DAG and joint distribution, respectively. Then:*

1. *$y \perp\!\!\!\perp c_l$ and $c_l \perp\!\!\!\perp c_m$ for all $l, m \in \{1, ..., L\}$.*
2. *$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}\cup C}$ satisfies causal minimality with respect to $\mathcal{G}$.*
3. *If $\beta_{kj} \neq 0$ then h_k is a cause of x_j.*
4. *If $f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y) \neq 0$ then y is a cause of x_j.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

As we can see the class of additive gene expression SEMs satisfy our assumption that y and h_k are causes of x_j. The causal effect of y on x_j can be described in terms of the interventional distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}^{x_j|do(y=y_1)}$. Although we have assumed that in the context of SVA we don't have access to observations from this distribution, we can express the interventional distribution in terms of the observational distribution if we can find a valid *adjustment set*:

$$p_{\mathcal{M},do(y=y_1)}(x_j) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p_{\mathcal{M}}(x_j|y, \mathcal{Z}) p_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{Z}) d\mathcal{Z} \tag{2.3.0.2}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}$ is a valid adjustment set of variables. Although we don't study why *adjustment* works or what is a criterion for a set of variables constituting a valid *adjustment set*, we mention that the c_l variables in the additive gene expression SEMs constitute a valid adjustment set for determining $p_{\mathcal{M},do(y=y_1)}(x_j)$. In Section 3.1.2 of **?** the adjustment principle is explained and valid adjustment criterions derived. Using the adjustment set $\mathcal{Z} = \{c_1, ..., c_L\}$ we can obtain $p_{\mathcal{M},do(y=y_1)}(x_j)$ from the observational distributions $p_{\mathcal{M}}(x_j|y, c_1, ..., c_L)$ and $p_{\mathcal{M}}(c_1, ..., c_L)$. This means we don't need to estimate the h_k variables to obtain the causal effect of y on x_j. However, as we mentioned following Definition 2.1.0.14 we are only interested in the part of the effect that y has on x_j which does not go through the unmodeled factors h_k. For this we must first estimate the variables h_k so that we may filter out the part of the effect that y has on x_j that goes through h_k. The SVA methodology developed by **?** provides a way to estimate the variables h_k.

Chapter 3

SVA Methodology

3.1 Overview

Given n i.i.d. observations of y and x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ the SVA methodology uses the model class 2.3.0.1 to fit the data. Although the goal is to estimate the effects f_{x_j} of y on x_j, to do this the variables $\{h_k\}_{k=1,...,K}$, or rather their span, must be estimated so that their effect on y can be filtered out. To estimate the span of $\{h_k\}_{k=1,...,K}$ it is necessary to first estimate the span of $\{c_l\}_{l=1,...,L}$ since the c_l variables are causes of the h_k variables. The basic steps of the SVA methodology are thus:

1. Estimate the span of $\{c_l\}_{l=1,...,L}$,
2. Estimate the span of $\{h_k\}_{k=1,...,K}$, and
3. Fit S_{x_j} equations from 2.3.0.1 to estimate f_{x_j}.




Figure 3.1: 3 steps of SVA estimation

3.2 Estimation of span($\{c_l\}$)

3.2.1 Estimation procedure

If we combine equations S_{x_j} and S_{h_k} from 2.3.0.1 we have

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j} \tag{3.2.1.1}$$

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} (f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l + N_{h_k}) + N_{x_j} \tag{3.2.1.2}$$

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} + N_{x_j} \tag{3.2.1.3}$$

$$x_j = (f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y)) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l (\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} \gamma_{lk}) + (\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} + N_{x_j}) \tag{3.2.1.4}$$

$$x_j = f_j(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \alpha_{lj} c_l + N_j \tag{3.2.1.5}$$

Where,

- $f_j(y) := f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y)$,
- $\alpha_{lj} := \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} \gamma_{lk}$, and
- $N_j := \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} + N_{x_j}$

The last expression suggests a reduced equation model class for variables y, c_k and x_j with the following set of equations:

$$S_{x_j} : x_j = f_j(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \alpha_{lj} c_l + N_j \tag{3.2.1.6}$$

and with the following associated DAG




Figure 3.2: Reduced equation model DAG

Notice that since $N_j = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} + N_{x_j}$ the noise variables N_j are not independent which means the above equation model is not a SEM as defined in 2.1.0.3, and we have,

with the theory shown here, no guarantee that the above DAG is an I-map of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X}}$. However for the same noise realizations of N_y and N_{c_k}, and for the above definition of the α_{lj} parameters, the above derivation shows that the reduced model would generate exactly the same realizations of x_j. This means that, as in the additive gene expression SEMs, $y \perp\!\!\!\perp c_l$ for all $l \in \{1, ..., L\}$ which implies that for the model:

$$x_j = f_j(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \alpha_{lj} c_l + N_j \tag{3.2.1.7}$$

we can estimate f_j separately from α_{lj} by fitting the model:

$$x_j = f_j(y) + \epsilon_j \tag{3.2.1.8}$$

and we can expect to have an equivalent estimate for f_j, in terms of bias and variance, by fitting model 3.2.1.8 as if we had fit model 3.2.1.7. If we define the *residuals* r_j of model 3.2.1.7 as:

$$r_j := x_j - f_j(y) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \alpha_{lj} c_l + N_j \tag{3.2.1.9}$$

or in vector form

$$r := x - f(y) = A^T c + N \tag{3.2.1.10}$$

where

- $r = (r_1, ..., r_J)^T$,
- $x = (x_1, ..., x_J)^T$,
- $f(y) = (f_1(y), ..., f_J(y))^T$
- $N = (N_1, ..., N_J)^T$,
- $c = (c_1, ..., c_L)^T$, and
- $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times J}$ with $A_{lj} = \alpha_{lj}$.

then we can estimate the span of $\{c_l\}_{l=1,...,L}$ by factorizing the data matrix R:

$$R := X - F \tag{3.2.1.11}$$

where

- $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times J}$ and X_{ij} is the i-th observation of variable x_j,

- $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and Y_i is the i-th observation of variable y,
- $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times J}$, F_{ij} is the i-th observation of $\hat{f}_j(y)$, that is $\hat{f}_j$ applied to Y_i, where $\hat{f}_j$ is the estimation of f_j obtained by fitting model 3.2.1.8.

In Section 3.2.2 we explore the way the functions f_j are estimated in the SVA methodology of **?** . Once the matrix F and then R are obtained we factorize R as:

$$R = C\Lambda + E \tag{3.2.1.12}$$

where

- $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times L}$ and C_{il} is the estimate for i-th unobserved realization of variable c_l,
- $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times J}$ is the estimate of A from 3.2.1.10 and
- $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times J}$ and E_{ij} is the estimate for the i-th unobserved realization of variable N_j.

The chosen factorization should reflect the fact that the set of c_l and N_j variables are mutually independent.

In SVA this factorization is obtained by applying singular value decomposition (SVD) to R as is detailed in Section 3.2.3. Before applying SVD, the number of c_l variables, L, must be estimated. In SVA this is done by using *parallel analysis* as described in Section 3.2.4.

3.2.2 Estimation of basis function model

To estimate the functions f_j the SVA methodology prescribes using standard basis models. The task is then to choose a feature mapping ϕ:

$$\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^p \tag{3.2.2.1}$$
$$y \mapsto (\phi_1(y), ..., \phi_p(y))^T \tag{3.2.2.2}$$

assuming that y is univariate so that:

$$f_j(y) = \mathbb{E}[x_j|y] := \sum_{k=1}^{p} \beta_{jk}\phi_k(y) \tag{3.2.2.3}$$

and estimating f_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ reduces to estimating the matrix $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times p}$. Least squares estimation is then applied to the regression model

$$x_j = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \beta_{jk}\phi_k(y) + \epsilon \tag{3.2.2.4}$$

or in vector form

$$X_j = \Phi\beta_j + \epsilon \tag{3.2.2.5}$$

Where

- $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the j-th column of the observation matrix X,
- $\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the j-th row of β as a column vector,
- $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ and $\Phi_{ik} = \phi_k(y_i)$.

The well known least squares solution for β_j is

$$\beta_j = (\Phi^T\Phi)^{-1}\Phi^T X_j \tag{3.2.2.6}$$

and the fitted values F are

$$F = HX = \Phi(\Phi^T\Phi)^{-1}\Phi^T X \tag{3.2.2.7}$$

where H is the hat matrix. Notice that since we choose one mapping ϕ to define all f_j then the hat matrix H, which only depends on Φ, is the same for all the models to be fitted. In the function `sva` of the `R` package `sva`, which implements the SVA methodology, the hat matrix H must be provided as input so that the choice of basis defined by ϕ and the estimation of functions f_j is done independently by the user. The matrix F is then calculated by the function `sva` as $F = HX$. Notice that this means that no regularization is applied to any of the J regression models to avoid overfitting. This is because since J is large, each regression model would need its separate regularization parameter λ which would be unfeasible - for example because cross validation would need to be performed for each model. This means that we must regularize by choosing a *simple* mapping ϕ. This is especially true since the number of observations n will usually be in the order of 10 meaning a complex f_j will tend to overfit the data.

3.2.3 Factorization of residuals using SVD

Suppose $J > n$. If we apply SVD to the residual matrix R we have:

$$R = QDS^T \tag{3.2.3.1}$$

Where

- $D \in \mathbb{R}^{nxJ}$ and $D = \text{diag}\{d_1, ..., d_n\}$ where $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq ... \geq d_n \geq 0$, d_i are the singular values of R and d_i^2 are the eigenvalues of R^TR and RR^T,
- $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and its columns $\{q_i\}_{i=1,...,n}$ are an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the eigenvectors of $RR^T = QDS^TSDQ^T = QD^2Q^T$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $\{d_i^2\}_{i=1,...,n}$,

- $S \in \mathbb{R}^{J\times J}$ and its columns $\{s_i\}_{i=1,\dots,J}$ are an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^J$ and the first n are the eigenvectors of $R^TR = SDQ^TQDS^T = SD^2S^T$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $\{d_i^2\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$.

In the following we suppose that we know exactly $L \leq n$ of the singular values d_i are significantly different from zero.

Left SVD

Let $W = Q^TR$ then

$$R = QW = \begin{pmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix} = Q_1W_1 + Q_2W_2 \tag{3.2.3.2}$$

Where

- $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times L}$, $Q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(n-L)}$ and
- $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times J}$, $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times J}$, $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-L)\times J}$.

So if we make $C := Q_1$, $\Lambda := W_1$ and $E := Q_2W_2$ we have an estimate for the factorization of the observed residuals R in terms of the estimated realizations of c_l and N_j variables as in 3.2.1.10 and 3.2.1.12. Some of the properties of this factorization are:

1. Since the unobserved realizations of c_l are etimated as the l-th left eigenvector of R, which is orthonormal, the estimated realizations have a sample variance of 1 which is consistent with definiton 2.3.0.1.

2. Since the columns of C are the left eigenvectors of R and we assume the expected value of c_l to be zero, the estimated realizations of c_l have zero sample correlation with the estimated realizations of c_m for $l \neq m$:

$$\widehat{\text{Corr}}(c_l, c_m) = q_l^Tq_m = 0 \tag{3.2.3.3}$$

   This is consistent with property 1. of 2.3.0.2 however it is not sufficient to satisfy it since zero correlation does not imply independence except in the case of normally distributed c_l variables.

3. The estimated realizations of N_j are given by the j-th column of $E := Q_2W_2$ which is Q_2w_{2j} where w_{2j} is the j-th column of W_2. Since the columns of C are the left eigenvectors of R and we assume the expected value of c_l to be zero, the estimated realizations of c_l have zero sample correlation with the estimated realizations of N_j:

$$\widehat{\text{Corr}}(c_l, N_j) = q_l^T(Q_2w_{2j}) = (q_l^TQ_2)w_{2j} = 0 \tag{3.2.3.4}$$

   This is consistent with definition 2.3.0.1 however it is not sufficient to satisfy it since zero correlation does not imply independence except in the case of normally distributed c_l and N_j variables.

Right SVD

Let $Y = RS$ then:

$$R = YS^T = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1^T \\ S_2^T \end{pmatrix} = Y_1 S_1^T + Y_2 S_2^T \tag{3.2.3.5}$$

Where

- $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times J}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times L}$, $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times(J-L)}$ and
- $S \in \mathbb{R}^{J\times J}$, $S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{J\times L}$, $S_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{J\times(J-L)}$.

So if we make $C := Y_1$, $\Lambda := S_1$ and $E := Y_2 S_2$ we have an estimate for the factorization of the observed residuals R in terms of the estimated realizations of c_l and N_j variables as in 3.2.1.10 and 3.2.1.12. Notice that the matrix Y contains the principal components of the residuals R. Some of the properties of this factorization are:

1. Since the unobserved realizations of c_l are etimated as the l-th principal component of R, the estimated realizations have a sample variance of d_l^2. This is inconsistent with definiton 2.3.0.1 which assumes that the c_l variables have a variance of 1, but we may easily *fix* this by using $Z = YD^{-1} = RSD^{-1}$ so that $C := Z_1$ instead of Y_1.

2. Since the columns of C are the first L principal components of R and we assume the expected value of c_l to be zero, the estimated realizations of c_l have zero sample correlation with the estimated realizations of c_m for $l \neq m$:

$$\widehat{\text{Corr}}(c_l, c_m) = (Rs_l)^T(Rs_m) = s_l^T R^T R s_m = s_l^T S D^2 S^T s_m = e_l^T D^2 e_m = 0 \tag{3.2.3.6}$$

   Where e_l is the l-th canonical vector. This is consistent with property 1. of 2.3.0.2 however it is not sufficient to satisfy it since zero correlation does not imply independence except in the case of normally distributed c_l variables.

3. The estimated realizations of N_j are given by the j-th column of $E := Y_2 S_2^T$ which is $Y_2 \tilde{s}_{2j}$ where $\tilde{s}_{2j}$ is the j-th row of S_2 as a column vector. Since the columns of C are the first L principal components of R and we assume the expected value of c_l to be zero, the estimated realizations of c_l have zero sample correlation with the estimated realizations of N_j:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Corr}}(c_l, N_j) &= y_l^T(Y_2\tilde{s}_{2j}) = (Rs_l)^T(Y_2\tilde{s}_{2j}) && (3.2.3.7)\\ &= s_l^T R^T R S_2 \tilde{s}_{2j} = s_l^T S D^2 S^T S_2 \tilde{s}_{2j} && (3.2.3.8)\\ &= e_l D^2 (S^T S_2)\tilde{s}_{2j} = d_l^2 e_l \begin{pmatrix} 0_{L\times(J-L)} \\ I_{(J-L)\times(J-L)} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{s}_{2j} = 0 && (3.2.3.9) \end{aligned}$$

   Where y_l is the l-th column of Y_1 and $l \in \{1, ..., L\}$. This is consistent with definition 2.3.0.1 however it is not sufficient to satisfy it since zero correlation does not imply independence except in the case of normally distributed c_l and N_j variables.

Now from the SVD factorization of R and from left and right SVD factorizations above we have that:

$$R = YS^T = QW = QDS^T \tag{3.2.3.10}$$

So that

$$Y = RS = QWS = QD \tag{3.2.3.11}$$

$$YD^{-1} = Q \tag{3.2.3.12}$$

So we see that performing right and left SVD is equivalent up to standardization of the estimated c_l variables. Since Y is the matrix of principal components of R we also see that this factorization corresponds to obtaining the principal components and then standardizing them.

Equations 3.2.1.10 and 3.2.1.12 suggest that *factor analysis* may be a more suitable technique for extracting factors from the matrix R. However since in our setting $J > n$ factor analysis is not possible since it relies on the spectral decomposition of the covariance matrix $R^TR = SDQ^TQDS^T = SD^2S^T$ which in this case is not positive definite.

3.2.4 Parallel Analysis

The SVA methodology uses a parallel anlaysis method based on **?** to estimate the number factors L needed to approximate the residual matrix as:

$$R \approx C\Lambda \tag{3.2.4.1}$$

where

- $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times L}$ and
- $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times J}$ is the estimate of A from 3.2.1.10.

We assume that the $\{r_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,J}$ residual variables are mutually independent irrespective of the particular marginal distribuition of each r_j variable. Under this assumption a realization of r_j is not linked to any particular realization of r_k for $j \neq k$ meaning we can permute observations of the columns of R without altering the underlying joint distribution of $\{r_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,J}$. This assumption also implies that the population singular values for R (i.e. if $n \to \infty$) are $d_j = \sigma_{\psi(j)}$ where σ_j is the standard deviation of r_j and $\psi(j)$ is such that:

$$\psi(i) < \psi(j) \Rightarrow \sigma_{\psi(i)} \geq \sigma_{\psi(j)} \tag{3.2.4.2}$$

One method to choose the number of factors, for example in the context of PCA, is to choose the number of singular values such that:

$$\hat{d}_j^2 \geq \hat{\sigma}^2_{\psi(j)} \tag{3.2.4.3}$$

Where $\hat{d}_j$ is the estimate of the population singular value d_j made by applying SVD to R and $\hat{\sigma}^2_{\psi(j)}$ is the sample variance of $r_{\psi(j)}$. In the context of PCA this corresponds to choosing the number of principal components such that their corresponding eigenvalue is greater than one in the case that the data matrix has been standardized. We choose only the principal components that account for more of the variance than we would expect under the assumption of independence, or in other words we choose only those principal components that summarize the information of more than one variable. However, for limited data settings, the variance of $\hat{d}_j$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2_{\psi(j)}$ means that it is possible for $\hat{d}_j^2 \geq \hat{\sigma}^2_{\psi(j)}$ even when $d_j^2 < \sigma^2_{\psi(j)}$. To take this variance into account parallel analysis prescribes permuting the values of each column of R several times so that we obtain a distribution for each singular value under the independence assumption. For each column j, B permutations $\pi_{ij}(k)$ are generated where $i \in \{1, ..., B\}$ indicates the permutation number, $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ the column to which it will be applied and $k \in \{1, ..., n\}$ is the row index argument:

$$\pi_{ij} : \{1, ..., n\} \to \{1, ..., n\} \tag{3.2.4.4}$$
$$(1, ..., n) \mapsto (\pi_{ij}(1), ..., \pi_{ij}(n)) \tag{3.2.4.5}$$

In this way we obtain B realizations of the residual matrix R which we denote R_i^b. For each R_i^b we apply SVD so that we have B estimates d_{ij}^b of d_j for $i \in \{1, ..., B\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ under the assumption of independence. We then compare the estimated proportion of variance explained by each principal component under the assumption of independence to the estimated proportion of variance explained without this assumption, i.e. with the non-permuted R matrix:

$$\hat{\nu}_j = \frac{\hat{d}_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J \hat{d}_j^2} \tag{3.2.4.6}$$
$$\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b = \frac{(\hat{d}_{ij}^b)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J (\hat{d}_{ij}^b)^2} \tag{3.2.4.7}$$

If $d_j^2 \geq \sigma^2_{\psi(j)}$ then we expect that for *most* realizations $i \in \{1, ..., B\}$:

$$\hat{\nu}_j \geq \hat{\nu}_{ij}^b \tag{3.2.4.8}$$

If this is the case we say the corresponding singular value d_j is significant. To obtain an estimate for L we count the number of significant singular values.

Other considerations taken into account by **?** in their implementation of the parallel analysis algorithm suggested by **?** are:

1. **Degrees of freedom of model**: We know that:

$$R = X - HX \tag{3.2.4.9}$$

so that

$$\text{rank}(R) = \text{rank}(X) - \text{rank}(HX) \tag{3.2.4.10}$$

and if we assume that $n < J$ and X has full rank then

$$\text{rank}(R) = n - \text{rank}(H) = n - \text{tr}(H) \tag{3.2.4.11}$$

since H is an idempotent matrix. So we only consider $M := n - \lceil \text{tr}(H) \rceil \geq L$ non-zero singular values as potentially significant.

2. **Orthogonal residuals**: Since least squares is used to fit models 3.2.2.5 the residuals should be, by construction, orthogonal to the predictor variables: each column of R should be orthogonal to the linear span of Φ. However, by permuting the residuals in each column of R to create R_i^b we create a linear dependence beteween the columns of R_i^b and the linear span of Φ. This is fixed by projecting the permuted residuals R_i^b on the linear span of Φ using the hat matrix to create the *corrected* residuals $\tilde{R}_i^b$:

$$\tilde{R}_i^b := R_i^b - HR_i^b \tag{3.2.4.12}$$

3. **Quasi hypothesis test**: To decide if a singular value d_j is significant the proportion p_j^b of boostrap estimates $\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b$ such that $\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b \geq \hat{\nu}_j$ is calculated:

$$p_j^b := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{B} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b \geq \hat{\nu}_j\}}}{B} \tag{3.2.4.13}$$

and the null hypothesis that d_j^b is not significant is rejected if $p_j^b < 0.1$. The cutoff value 0.1 is arbitrarily chosen and since the distribution of the test statistic p_j^b is unknown the significance or power of this test is unknown.

4. **Non-increasing singular values**: Singular values d_j are non-increasing, meaning v_j should be non-increasing and, for a large enough B, p_j^b non-decreasing. However because of the randomness of the boostrap estimates and the limited data setting, the p_j^b values may not be non-decreasing. A corrected value $\tilde{p}_j^b$ is calculated:

$$\tilde{p}_j^b := \max(p_{j-1}^b, p_j^b) \tag{3.2.4.14}$$

for $j \in \{2, ..., M\}$.

With these consideration in mind we present the pseudo code for the parallel analysis algorithm described in **?** and implemented as the default method in the function `num.sv` of the R package `sva`.

Parallel analysis algorithm of ?

1. Estimate matrices X, F, R and the rank M of R:

$$H = \Phi(\Phi^T\Phi)^{-1}\Phi^T \tag{3.2.4.15}$$
$$F = HX \tag{3.2.4.16}$$
$$R = X - F \tag{3.2.4.17}$$
$$M = n - \lceil \mathrm{tr}\, H \rceil \tag{3.2.4.18}$$

2. Estimate singular values d_j by performing SVD on R:

$$R = QDS^T \tag{3.2.4.19}$$

   where $D = \mathrm{diag}\{\hat{d}_1, ..., \hat{d}_n\}$.

3. Estimate the proportion of variance explained by first M principal components:

$$\hat{\nu}_j = \frac{\hat{d}_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} \hat{d}_j^2} \tag{3.2.4.20}$$

   for $j \in \{1, ..., M\}$.

4. Calculate boostrap estimates $\hat{d}_{ij}^b$ for $i \in \{1, ..., B\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., M\}$.

   For $i = 1, ..., B$

   a. Generate J permutations $\pi_1, ..., \pi_J$ one for each column of R.

   b. Permute columns of R according to these permutations to create R_i^b:

$$R_i^b = \begin{pmatrix} R_{\pi_1(1),1} & R_{\pi_2(1),2} & \dots & R_{\pi_J(1),J} \\ R_{\pi_1(2),1} & R_{\pi_2(2),2} & \dots & R_{\pi_J(2),J} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{\pi_1(n),1} & R_{\pi_2(n),2} & \dots & R_{\pi_J(n),J} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2.4.21}$$

   c. Project each column of R_i^b onto the columns of Φ and calculate adjusted residuals:

$$\tilde{R}_i^b = R_i^b - HR_i^b \tag{3.2.4.22}$$

   d. Apply SVD to $\tilde{R}_i^b$ to obtain estimates $\hat{d}_{ij}^b$ under independence assumption.

$$\tilde{R}_i^b = Q_i^b D_i^b (S_i^b)^T \tag{3.2.4.23}$$

   where $D_i^b = \mathrm{diag}\{\hat{d}_1^b, ..., \hat{d}_n^b\}$.

e. Estimate the proportion of variance explained by first M principal components:

$$\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b = \frac{(\hat{d}_{ij}^b)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J (\hat{d}_{ij}^b)^2} \tag{3.2.4.24}$$

for $j \in \{1, ..., M\}$.

5. Calculate test statistics: For each singular value d_j, $j \in \{1, ..., M\}$ calculate the proportion of bootstrap estimates for which the variance explained is higher than the non-permuted estimate:

$$p_j^b := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^B \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\nu}_{ij}^b \geq \hat{\nu}_j\}}}{B} \tag{3.2.4.25}$$

6. Correct test statistics $\{p_1^b, ..., p_M^b\}$ to ensure they are non-decreasing:

$$\tilde{p}_j^b := \max(p_{j-1}^b, p_j^b) \tag{3.2.4.26}$$

7. Calculate the number of of singular values for which the corresponding corrected proportion of boostrap estimates p_j^b is lower than 0.1.

$$L = \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{p}_j^b \leq 0.1\}} \tag{3.2.4.27}$$

3.3 Estimation of $\text{span}(\{h_k\})$

3.3.1 General description

We can observe the x_j variables and have estimated the span of the c_l variables. We now want to estimate the span of the h_k variables. The x_j variables depend on three quantities - c_l, $f_{h_k}(y)$ and $f_{x_j}(y)$ - while the h_k variables only depend on c_l and $f_{h_k}(y)$. If we can somehow filter out the $f_{x_j}(y)$ *signature* from the x_j variables we could then reconstruct h_k from these filtered variables. The problem is it is impossible to separate the $f_{x_j}(y)$ and $f_{h_k}(y)$ *signals* since they both depend on y. The strategy will be to build an h_k variable for every c_l variable which contains the signal from c_l but which is also allowed to contain signal from y even if it is not exactly the $f_{h_k}(y)$ signal we would like it to have. This is important since not including the *overlap* in signal between y and h_k can lead to biased estimate of h_k as is pointed out in the third paragraph of the section titled *comparison with existing methods* of **?**. The basic algorithm has the following steps, which we will elaborate on in the subsequent subsections:

For $l \in \{1, ..., L\}$

i.) Identify the subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \{1, ..., J\}$ such that x_j for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ includes the *signature* of c_l.

ii.) Form an *enriched* matrix $X^{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times |\mathcal{S}|}$ which includes the observations of the x_j variables such that $j \in \mathcal{S}$.

iii.) Factorize enriched matrix $X^{\mathcal{S}}$ into M factors using left SVD of section 3.2.3 and the parallel analysis method of section 3.2.4.

iv.) Set estimate of h_l as the factor with highest absolute correlation with c_l. Let $q_1, ..., q_M$ be the eigen vectors of $X^{\mathcal{S}}(X^{\mathcal{S}})^T$ corresponding to eigenvalues $d_1^2 \geq d_2^2 \geq ... \geq d_M^2$

$$i^* = \underset{i \in \{1,...,M\}}{\arg\max} \widehat{\text{Corr}}(h_l, q_i) \tag{3.3.1.1}$$

$$\hat{h_l} = q_{i^*} \tag{3.3.1.2}$$

Before detailing what it means for a variable to include the *signature* of another variable and how this is done in the SVA methodology we remark on some advantages and disadvantages of the algorithm described above. We assume that the method for finding the variables x_j that contain the signature of c_l is adequate.

Advantages

- A lot of the f_{x_j} signal can be filtered out especially if $J >> L$ and the size of $\mathcal{S}$ is small (because a lot of the γ_{lk} and β_{kj} parameters are equal to zero),
- If for all the $j \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists k such that $\beta_{kj} \neq 0$ then the x_j contain the signal of f_{h_k}.

Disadvantages

- The f_{x_j} signal for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ is not filtered out,
- By taking the factor from the enriched matrix most correlated with c_l we ensure that the estimated span of h_k includes the signal from c_l but not necessarily the signal from f_{h_k} as that may be concentrated in the other factors,
- In general it is only clear that the estimated span of h_k allows for the inclusion of signal from y and that if J is large and $|\mathcal{S}|$ small, it may filter out most of the $f_{x_j}(y)$ signal, however it isn't clear how succesful it is in including the $f_{h_k}(y)$ signal.

3.3.2 Finding the signature of c_l

To find the set $\mathcal{S}$ with the indices of the variables x_j which have the signature of c_l the following regression models are fitted:

$$x_j = \beta_{j0} + \beta_{j1} c_l + \epsilon_j \tag{3.3.2.1}$$

for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$. We say that x_j contains the signature of c_l if we can reject the null hypothesis $H_{j0} : \beta_{j1} = 0$. This means that the set $\mathcal{S}$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{j : H_{j0} \text{ is rejected}\} \tag{3.3.2.2}$$

Clearly x_j also depend on y so that the hypothesis tests and corresponding p-values are dependent and a conventional significance analysis will be invalid. It is not clear to the author why the SVA methodology does not use the following model:

$$x_j = f_j(y) + \beta_{j1} c_l + N_j \tag{3.3.2.3}$$

instead of model 3.3.2.1. However, even in this case the hypothesis tests would be dependent since as we saw in 3.2.1.5 the error term N_j is composed of error terms N_{h_k} which are common accross different j:

$$N_j = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} + N_{x_j} \tag{3.3.2.4}$$

There are two difficulties with this multiple hypotheses strategy, one of which we have touched upon (dependence of hypotheses). Before exploring these difficulties further, we classify the m hypotheses of a multiple hypotheses problem according to the ground truth of the hypothesis and whether we reject them or not:

truth	**rejected**	**not rejected**	**total**
null	F	$m_0 - F$	m_0
alternative	T	$m_1 - T$	m_1
total	S	$m - S$	m

1. **Multiple hypotheses**: When we perform a single hypothesis ϕ and reject the null if the p-value is below a certain threshold we are controling the probability of making a Type I error:

$$\mathbb{P}[\phi(X) = 1 | H_0] \leq \alpha \tag{3.3.2.5}$$

where X is the sample upon which the hypothesis is based. If we perform multiple hypotheses ϕ_i and reject analogously this corresponds to controlling the *false positive rate* (FPR):

$$FPR = \frac{\mathbb{E}[F]}{m} \leq \alpha \tag{3.3.2.6}$$

However this does not provide effective control of the number of Type I errors we make. Typically, this is fixed by controlling the *familiy wise error rate* (FWER) instead of the false positive rate:

$$FWER = \mathbb{P}[F \geq 1] \leq \alpha \tag{3.3.2.7}$$

This can be achieved with the p-values by using the *Bonferroni correction*. Other methods exist which also control the FWER while increasing the power of the overall procedure. However, for many high dimensional applications this compound error measure is too strict because in these cases we often don't care that we make more than a few Type I errors so long as the proportion of these errors F, relative to the total number rejected hypotheses S is small. This is the case when we try and find the variables x_j that include the signature of a certain variable c_l. So long as the proportion of *false discoveries* F, those variables x_j which we declare contain the signature of c_l but which in reality don't, are a small proportion of the total *discoveries* S then we are satisfied. This is why the SVA methodology, in performing the $m = J$ tests as described in Section 3.3.1 seeks to control the *false discovery rate* (FDR):

$$FDR = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F}{S \vee 1}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F}{S}\middle| S > 0\right]\mathbb{P}[S > 0] \leq \alpha \tag{3.3.2.8}$$

Where the "$\vee$ 1" part takes care of the possibility that $S = 0$ by setting the whole quotient to zero.

2. **Dependent hypotheses tests**: We actually know that since the x_j variables depend on y for some $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ the hypotheses are dependent and so any joint significance analysis, which controlls either the FWER or the FDR, will be invalid in principle. However, if the signal $f_h(y)$ is weak compared to that of c_l then the significance may still be valid. To gauge whether this is the case we examine the p-value distribution. Qualitatively speaking it is simple to distinguish between valid and invalid p-value distributions. We may assume that each p-value has the following mixture distribution:

$$P_i \sim \pi_0 F_0 + \pi_1 F \tag{3.3.2.9}$$

where


- π_0 is the proportion of null hypothesis tests H_i,
- $\pi_1 = 1 - \pi_0$ is the proportion of alternative hypothesis tests H_i,
- $\mathcal{F}_0$ is the distribution of a uniform random variable with support on $[0, 1]$ since assuming a one-sided hypothesis test we have that:

$$\mathbb{P}[P_i \leq p|H_0] = \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{F}_0(T) \leq p] = \mathbb{P}[T \leq \mathcal{F}_0^{-1}(p)] = \mathcal{F}_0(\mathcal{F}_0^{-1}(p)) = p \tag{3.3.2.10}$$

and,

- $\mathcal{F}$ is a right-skewed probability distribution since it is the distribution of alternative p-values which have a greater probability of being on the low end of the $[0, 1]$ interval.

Graphically the a valid p-value distribution should be the superposition of a uniform distribution and a right-skewed distribution. Figure 3.3 shows examples of valid and invalid p-distributions.



(a) valid p-value distribution (b) invalid p-value distribution

Figure 3.3: examples of p-value distribution

The SVA methodology uses a *point-based* method - to be explored in Section 3.3.3 - for controlling the FDR which:

I. Is still valid under *weak dependence* of the hypotheses tests (see remark D of **?** or **?** for a definition of weak dependence) and,

II. In case of an invalid p-value distribution caused by dependence between the hypotheses tests automatically *detects* this so that the number of variables x_j estimated as having the signature of c_l is set to zero.

3.3.3 FDR based significance analysis

Two related quantities to the FDR are the *positive false discovery rate* (pFDR)

$$pFDR = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F}{S}\middle| S > 0\right] \tag{3.3.3.1}$$

and the *marginal false discovery rate* (mFDR)

$$mFDR = \frac{\mathbb{E}[F]}{\mathbb{E}[S]} \tag{3.3.3.2}$$

As **?** surmises, there is some disagreemnt as to which quantity is more adequate to control however, for settings when there is a large number of hypothesis and the probability that $S = 0$ is negligible FDR, pFDR and mFDR are similar.

There are two approaches to control FDR:

1. **FDR Control**. Fix FDR at a certain level α and come up with a data-dependent thresholding rule such as the *FDR controlling algorithm* proposed by **?** and proven to control FDR at level α by **?**.

2. **Point estimate of FDR**. Fix a p-value threshold t for rejecting hypothesis and estimate the corresponding $FDR(t)$ conservatively. *Q-values* and *local false discovery rates* (lFDR) represent two point estimate approaches for controling FDR.

? show that under a certain choice for the estimation of m_0 and threshold t the FDR controlling algorithm and q-value approach are equivalent.

We first focus on the q-value point estimation method and then go on to explore the local false discovery rate which is used in the R package `sva` to control the FDR. Let:

$$F(t) = \#\{\text{null } P_i \leq t : i = 1, ..., m\} \tag{3.3.3.3}$$
$$S(t) = \#\{P_i \leq t : i = 1, ..., m\} \tag{3.3.3.4}$$

Where P_i are i.i.d. random variables. We want to estimate FDR in terms of the threshold t. For m large we have that

$$FDR(t) \approx pFDR(t) \approx mFDR(t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(t)]}{\mathbb{E}[S(t)]} \tag{3.3.3.5}$$

We can estimate $\mathbb{E}[S(t)]$, the expected number of significant variables simply as the observed number of significant variables:

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[S(t)] = \#\{p_i \leq t, i = 1, ..., m\} \tag{3.3.3.6}$$

Now

$$\mathbb{E}[F(t)] = \mathbb{E}[\#\{\text{null } P_i \leq t\}] = m_0 t \tag{3.3.3.7}$$

since $P_i|H_0 \sim U[0, 1]$. We can estimate m_0, the total number of null hypotheses, in terms of the total number of hypotheses m and the proportion of null hypotheses π_0:

$$\hat{m}_0 = \hat{\pi}_0 m \tag{3.3.3.8}$$

We estimate π_0 using the p-value histogram. P-values greater than a certain threshold, say λ, will be mostly null p-values. We can estimate the proportion of null p-values as the height of the histogram for values larger than λ divided by the average height of the histogram.




Figure 3.4: estimation of π_0

$$\hat{\pi}_0(\lambda) = \frac{\#\{p_i > \lambda\}}{m(1-\lambda)} \tag{3.3.3.9}$$

To the right of some point λ close to 1 there are almost only null p-values so we could use this λ to calculate π_0. However, the closer we get to $\lambda = 1$ the less data points we use to compute $\hat{\pi}_0$ so the the higher the variance of the estimator: there is a bias-variance trade-off in choosing λ. For the histogram of figure 3.4 we may plot the estimate $\hat{\pi}_0$:




Figure 3.5: $\hat{\pi}_0$ as a function of λ

As prescribed in **?** a natural cubic spline $\hat{f}(\lambda)$ is fitted to $\hat{\pi}_0(\lambda)$ and π_0 is estimated as $\hat{f}(1)$. This method borrows strength accross $\hat{\pi}_0(\lambda)$ giving a balance between variance and bias as is explained in remark B of **?**.

Notice that if we have an invalid p-value distribution such as that of figure 3.3b then $\hat{\pi}_0 >= 1$. If we set values larger than 1 to 1, then as mentioned at the end of Section 3.3.2 we have a way of automatically detecting invalid p-value distributions and setting the number of discoveries to zero.

Going back to our estimate of $FDR(t)$ we have:

$$\widehat{FDR}(t) = \frac{\hat{\mathbb{E}}[F(t)]}{\hat{\mathbb{E}}[S(t)]} = \frac{m\hat{\pi}_0 t}{\#\{p_i \leq t, i = 1, ..., m\}} \tag{3.3.3.10}$$

Notice that if we threshold p-values with $t = 1$ then $FDR(1) = \hat{\pi}_0$, in other words if we fail to reject all hypothesis our FDR will be $\hat{\pi}_0$.

Since $FDR(t)$ is a non-increasing function, we can't simply choose a level α and then find a t such that if we threshold the p-values with a value of t or lower we guarantee that that $FDR(t) \leq \alpha$. This means the p-value loses its meaning of expressing the significance of each feature because a feature might have a lower p-value, but thresholding at the lower p-value might induce a higher FDR. For illustrative purposes suppose we have 6 hypothesis tests with the following p-values which we have ordered for convenience:

Hypothesis	p-value
$p_0 :=$	0
p_1	0.05
p_2	0.1
p_3	0.2
p_4	0.35
p_5	0.6
p_6	0.85
$p_7 :=$	1




Figure 3.6: $FDR(t)$

We can see that we could threshold p-values at t_1 or t_2 and obtain the same FDR. We need a new definition for a value which expresses the significance of each feature. This value is called the *q-value*. The q-value of a feature is the minimum FDR that can be attained if we include a feature (call it significant):

$$q_i = q(p_i) := \min_{t \geq p_i} FDR(t) = \min_{t \geq p_i} pFDR(t) \tag{3.3.3.11}$$

This definition ensures we can use q-values to control FDR since we choose the thresholding value that minimizes FDR and in doing so implicitly define a strictly increasing function q^* which we can use to control FDR. Define the function q^* as:

$$q^*(t) := \inf_{s \in [t,1]} \widehat{FDR}(s) \tag{3.3.3.12}$$

Also note that

$$\widehat{FDR}(t) = \frac{m\hat{\pi}_0 t}{\#\{p_i \leq t, i = 1, ..., m\}} = m\hat{\pi}_0 t \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{i} \mathbb{1}_{[p_{(i)}, p_{(i+1)}]}(t) \tag{3.3.3.13}$$

for $t \in [p_{(1)}, 1]$ and

$$\frac{d\widehat{FDR}(t)}{dt} = m\hat{\pi}_0 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{i} \mathbb{1}_{[p_{(i)}, p_{(i+1)}]}(t) \tag{3.3.3.14}$$

for $t \in [p_{(1)}, 1] \setminus \{p_1, ..., p_m\}$

We can see how $q*(t)$ can be used to set the p-value threshold t and to obtain the significance q-values for each feature graphically.




Figure 3.7: $q^*(t)$

Note that since:

$$p_i \leq t \iff q_i = q^*(p_i) \leq q^*(t) \leq \widehat{FDR}(t) = \alpha \iff q_i \leq \alpha \tag{3.3.3.15}$$

we can threshold the q-values themselves at α to control the FDR at this level.

To find the variables x_j which contain the signature of c_l then, one could either choose the $\hat{m}_0 = \hat{\pi}_0 * m$ variables x_j with the lowest p-values for the hypothesis $H_{j0} : \beta_{j1} = 0$ or equivalently calculate the q-values and threshold at a the desired level α. For reasons that are not clear to the author, in the implementation of the R package `sva` (specifically function `edge.lfdr`), another *point estimate* approach is used based on *local false discovery rates* (lFDR). This approach follows from a Bayesian interpretation of q-values.

In Theorem 1 of **?**, **?** proves that the positive false discovery rate for a given threshold t for the p-value, $pFDR(t)$ is equal to the conditional probability that the corresponding hypothesis is null given that the p-value is below the threshold:

$$pFDR(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F(t)}{S(t)}\middle| S(t) > 0\right] = \mathbb{P}[H_i = 0 | P_i \leq t] \tag{3.3.3.16}$$

This allows us to interpret the $pFDR(t)$ as a posterior Bayesian Type I error where the prior probability of a hypotheses being null is π_0. Since

$$q_i = q(p_i) = \min_{t \geq p_i} pFDR(t) \tag{3.3.3.17}$$

we can interpret the q-value as a posterior Bayesian p-value. We can then express $pFDR(t)$ as:

$$pFDR(t) = \mathbb{P}[H = 0 | P \leq t] = \int \mathbb{P}[H = 0 | P = p] dG(p | p \leq t) \tag{3.3.3.18}$$

Where G is the distribution of P_i from 3.3.2.9. We then define the local false discovery rate $lFDR(p)$ of a hypothesis as:

$$lFDR(p) := \mathbb{P}[H = 0 | P = p] \tag{3.3.3.19}$$

Notice that this is not a function of the p-value thresholding level t and so it gives a measure of significance of the p-value without taking into account the multiple hypotheses being carried out. Using Bayes' Theorem we have

$$lFDR(p) = \mathbb{P}[H = 0 | P = p] = \frac{f_{P_0}(p)\pi_0}{f_P(p)} = \frac{\pi_0}{f_P(p)} \tag{3.3.3.20}$$

where

- $f_P(p)$ is the density of the p-values and
- $f_{P_0}(p) = 1$ is the density of the null p-values which we know is uniform by 3.3.2.10.

To estimate $lFDR(p)$ we estimate π_0 as was illustrated in figures 3.4 and 3.5. To estimate $f_P(p)$ standard kernel-density estimators can be used however these tend to not perform very well for random variables with bounded support, and so in the R package `sva` (specifically function `edge.lfdr`), the p-values are first transformed so that the underlying random variable has unbounded support. A standard change of variable theorem (see for example pg 153 of **?**) is then used to calculate the density of the P-values in terms of the density of the transformed P-values which we an estimate effectively using kernel-density estimation. Let $S = \Phi^{-1}(P)$ where Φ is the standard normal cumulutive distribution function, with associated ϕ probability density function, then:

$$f_P(p) = \frac{f_S(s)}{\phi(s)} = \frac{f_S(\Phi^{-1}(p))}{\phi(\Phi^{-1}(p))} \tag{3.3.3.21}$$

The estimate for $lFDR(p)$ is then:

$$\widehat{lfDR}(p) = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0}{\hat{f}_P(p)} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_0 \phi(\Phi^{-1}(p))}{\hat{f}_s(\Phi^{-1}(p))} \tag{3.3.3.22}$$

Chapter 4

Simulation Expermiments

4.1 Methods to be compared

Given n i.i.d. observations of y and x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ simulated from model 1.2.0.4, following **?**, we will fit 4 different models to the data:

$$x_j = f(y) + \epsilon_j \tag{4.1.0.1}$$

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \beta_{kj} \hat{h}_k^{svdx} + \epsilon_j \tag{4.1.0.2}$$

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{M} \beta_{kj} \hat{h}_k^{svdr} + \epsilon_j \tag{4.1.0.3}$$

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \beta_{kj} \hat{h}_k^{sva} + \epsilon_j \tag{4.1.0.4}$$

$$\tag{4.1.0.5}$$

for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ where

- $f(y)$ and $f_{x_j}(y)$ are polynomials of the form $a_1 y + a_2 y^2 + ... + a_n y^n$,
- $\hat{h}_k^{svdx}$ is the estimate of h_k obtained by performing SVD on the observation matrix X (instead of on residual matrix R) to obtain K factors, as per sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. The factor h_k with largest absolute correlation with y is removed and the remaining $K-1$ factors are included as covariates. The idea is that if we exclude the strongest part of the y signal we will only be left with the unobserved h_k signal, however the other factors may still include undersirable $f_{x_j}(y)$ signal and the removed factor could also include desirable $f_{h_k}(y)$ signal,
- $\hat{h}_k^{svdr}$ is the estimate of h_k obtained by performing SVD on the observation matrix R as in section 3.2.3 to obtain M estimates for the c_l factors. The estimates for c_l are plugged in as the h_k estimates. In this case we completely filter out all y signal including $f_{h_k}(y)$ signal meaning that $\hat{h}_k^{svdr}$ are uncorrelated to y which may lead to bias in the estimate of h_k, and

- $\hat{h}_k^{sva}$ is the estimate of h_k obtained by performing SVA on the observations of y and x_j.

The four models are forthwith refered to as *vanilla* (or *van*), SVDX, SVDR and SVA. The main objective is to see if the SVA method has significant advantages in estimating $f_{x_j}(y)$ for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$. This also entails that valid significance analysis is produced for the joint hypotheses tests $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y) = 0$.

4.2 Low-dimensional experiments

4.2.1 Design

As a first approximation we simulated $n = 100$ observations of the following low-dimensional SEM so as to follow the performance of each estimate $\hat{f}_{x_j}$:

- $J = K = L = 4$
- $y = N_y \sim N(0, 1)$
- $c_l = N_{c_l} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $l \in \{1, ..., 4\}$
- $h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + c_l$ for $k \in \{1, ..., 4\}$
- $f_{h_1}(y) = f_{h_2}(y) = 0$
- $f_{h_3}(y) = -0.28y + 1.29y^2$
- $f_{h_4}(y) = 1.54y + 0.59y^2$
- $x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j}$ for $j \in \{1, ..., 4\}$
- Non-zero β_{kj} values were generated randomly with standard normal generator:
- $f_{x_1}(y) = f_{x_2}(y) = 0$
- $f_{x_3}(y) = -0.92y$
- $f_{x_4}(y) = 1.24y - 1.48y^2$, and
- $N_{x_j} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $j \in \{1, ..., 4\}$

The DAG for this SEM is the following:




Figure 4.1: DAG of simulated low dimensional SEM

We chose a SEM with this DAG so that we get variety in the way x_j depend on y:

1. x_1: depends on y only through f_{h_4},
2. x_2: doesn't depend on y,
3. x_3: depends on y through f_{h_3} and f_{x_3}, and
4. x_4: depends on y only through f_{x_4}.

Moreover for the estimation of $f_j(y)$ and $f_{x_j}(y)$ we chose polynomials of the form:


$$g(y) = a_1 y + a_2 y^2 \tag{4.2.1.1}$$

4.2.2 Result for one repetition

For x_j with $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ we display the results of the simulation with the following graphs:

- A comparison of $\hat{f}_{x_j}(y)$ using SVA to the real f_{x_j},
- A comparison of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[x_j|y, \hat{h}_k^{sva}]$ for the vanilla and SVA methods,
- A comparison of the residuals produced with the four methods, van, SVDX, SVDR and SVA, and
- A Tukey-Anscombe residual plot, with $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k$ on the x-axis.

$\hat{f}_{x_j}(y)$ using SVA




(a) x_1 (b) x_2

(c) x_3 (d) x_4


Figure 4.2: Comparison of $\hat{f}_{x_j}(y)$ using SVA to the real f_{x_j}

We can see that the SVA method does fairly well in estimating f_{x_j} when it has similar complexity to the polynomial being used to estimate it (in this case a quadratic polynomial). This is because the SVA method does not apply regularization since this would not be feasible for high dimensional cases. Since we are using quadratic polynomials to estimate first, f_j and subsequently, f_{x_j}, we overfit the data.

$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[x_j|y, \hat{h}_k^{sva}]$



(a) x_1 (b) x_2




(c) x_3 (d) x_4

Figure 4.3: Comparison of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[x_j|y, \hat{h}_k^{sva}]$ for the vanilla and SVA methods

The SVA estimation seems to have very poor performance for $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[x_1|y, \hat{h}_k^{sva}]$ where overfitting was worse. This could be because the overfitting of $f_1(y)$ leads to bad estimation of the β_{k1} coefficients to compensate. This shows up in the graph with a green SVA line that is *noisier* than the underlying true $\mathbb{E}[x_1|y, h_k]$.

Comparison of residuals for 4 methods




(a) x_1 (b) x_2

(c) x_3 (d) x_4

Figure 4.4: A comparison of the residuals produced with the four methods, van, SVDX, SVDR and SVA

A *good* estimation method would show residuals similar to those of the real errors N_{x_j}. None of the methods show consistency in this respect accross the four r_j. Again for r_4 where the true model complexity is similar to the basis function model fitted SVA appears to do well.

Tukey-Anscombe plots



(a) x_1 (b) x_2

(c) x_3 (d) x_4

Figure 4.5: Tukey-Anscombe residual plot, with $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k$ on the x-axis

In general we see that SVA outperforms the vanilla method, and especially for r_3 and r_4 where the true model complexity is similar to the basis function model being fitted.

If the significance analysis is done properly, if it is valid, then under the null hypotheses $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y) = 0$ p-values should be distributed uniformly. In this case, with only one repetition of the experiment, there are only 4 p-values per method (one for each j) so that confirming uniformity is not possible. However in some cases it is clear that we can rule out the possibility of the p-values being uniformly distributed. The following table shows the p-values for each j and method. These were obtained by simulating under the null.

j	**sva**	**svdx**	**svdr**	**van**
1	0.820	0.000	0.000	0.000
2	0.230	0.000	0.016	0.390
3	0.235	0.000	0.000	0.014
4	0.804	0.000	0.016	0.055

It seems that only the SVA method produces null p-values which could potentially be uniformly distributed.

4.2.3 Results for 1000 repetitions

We repeated the above simulation experiments this time for $M = 1000$ repetitions and tracked the following variables to measure the performance of the four methods:

1. **c_l-node span estimation.** % overlap between estimated c_l-node span and real c_l-node span. Using canonical correlation analysis (CCA) we measured what % of the linear span of c_l and $\hat{c}_l$ is shared. This measures our ability to accurately estimate the c_l-node span. Since SVA is the only method that estimates the span of c_l differently to the span of h_k we only measure this for the SVA method.

2. **h_k-node span estimation.** % overlap between estimated h_k-node span and real h_k-node span (using CCA). In this case we are able to compare the SVA, SVDR and SVDX methods since each has an estimate for h_k ($\hat{h}_k^{sva}$, $\hat{h}_k^{svdr}$ and $\hat{h}_k^{svdx}$ as described in Section 4.1). This measures our ability to accurately estimate the h_k-node span.

3. **Dependence between h_k nodes and y.** R2 between real y and h_k nodes minus R2 between real y and estimated h_k nodes. The R2 corresponds to a simple linear regression with y as the independent variable and h_k or $\hat{h}_k$ as the dependent variables. This measures our ability to accurately model the dependence between h and y (to linear approximation).

4. **f_{x_j} estimation.** Mean absolute error in estimation of f_{x_j} calculated as:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_{x_j}(y_i) - \hat{f}_{x_j}(y_i)|}{n} \tag{4.2.3.1}$$

   The ultimate goal of all four methods is to estimate $f_{x_j}(y)$ accurately and this measure helps us evaluate this.

5. **Valid significance analysis.** We perform a *nested* Kolgomorov-Smirnov hypothesis test (nested KS test) to see if, under the null hypotheses $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y) = 0$ for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$, the p-values are distributed for this hypothesis test are distributed uniformly. This measures whether we are performing valid significance analysis.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test Suppose we have a sample of n realizations from a random variable X. We want to perform the hypothesis test $H_0 : X_i \sim F$ vs. $H_a : X_i \sim F' \neq F$. We may use the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic D_n for F. We know $\sqrt{n}D_n$ converges in distribution to a Kolmogorov random variable K and so can perform an asymptotic test with this statistic:

$$D_n = \sup_x |F_n(x) - F_(x)| \tag{4.2.3.2}$$

$$\sqrt{n} D_n \xrightarrow{d} K \tag{4.2.3.3}$$

where


- F_n is the empirical distribution function: $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{[-\infty,x](x_i)}$ and
- K is a Kolmogorov random variable

For a large enough n if $\sqrt{n} D_n > K_\alpha$, where $\mathbb{P}[K \leq K_\alpha] = 1 - \alpha$, then H_0 is rejected.


Nested KS test

The idea of the nested KS test is that for a given repetition of the experiment m we have J p-values (call these outer p-values) and use the test statistic D_n for $F \sim U[0,1]$ to test for uniformity. Under the null H_{m0}^{outer} : $\{J$ outer p-values uniform$\}$ the p-value (call this a nested p-value) for this test is again uniform. If we collect the M nested p-values from M KS tests, one for each repetition of the J hypothesis tests $H_{mj0} : f_{x_j}(y) = 0$, then under the null they should be distributed uniformly. We perform another *nested* KS test H_0^{nested} : $\{M$nested p-values uniform$\}$ to conclude on the uniformity of the nested p-value distribution. As is mentioned in the section *definition of a correct procedure* of **?** the nested KS test is more robust to chance fluctuations as a set of individual outer p-values corresponding to a repetition m, H_{mj0}, $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ may not be uniform due to chance fluctuations, but this will only contribute one of M nested p-values.


The following figure shows the first four indicators for the results of the 1000 repetitions of our low-dimensional simulation experiment.




(a) c_l node span SVA



(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.6: Evaluation of performance for low-dim sem with 1000 repetitions: c_l and h_k node span estimation, dependence between h_k nodes and y and f_{x_j} estimation

The graphs above show that not only does SVA produce estimates of the span of h_k with a large overlap with the real span of h_k but it also manages to capture the relationship between h_k and y better than the other methods. However, this did not translate into more accurate estimates for f_{x_j}. Lets see how valid the significance analysis for each method is by looking at the nested KS test statistic and p-values.

	sva	**svdx**	**svdr**	**van**
KS statistic	0.308	0.312	0.527	0.265
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Although in all cases we reject the hypothesis that p-values under null $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y)$ are

distributed uniformly, and so in all cases significance analyses are invalid, we are closer to not rejecting for vanilla method. Since the vanilla method also produced the most accurate estimates of f_{x_j} it seems that the SVA methodology does not perform well in this low-dimensional setting.

4.3 High-dimensional experiments


4.3.1 Design

We now explore a high-dimensional setting more akin to the gene expression setting for which SVA was designed. We simulated $M = 100$ repetitions of experiments with $n = 100$ realizations. The simulated SEM had the following characteristics:

- $J = 1000$, $K = L = 10$
- $y = N_y \sim N(0, 1)$
- $c_l = N_{c_l} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $l \in \{1, ..., 10\}$
- $h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + c_l$ for $k \in \{1, ..., 10\}$
- $f_{h_k}(y) = b_k y$
- $x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j}$ for $j \in \{1, ..., 1000\}$
- Non-zero β_{kj} values were generated randomly with standard normal generator.
- $f_{x_j}(y) = a_j y$
- $N_{x_j} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $j \in \{1, ..., 1000\}$
- Non-zero a_j and b_k values were generated randomly with standard normal generator.
- We control the *sparsity* of the SEM, the number of edges it has, with four parameters:
  i. p_{0j}: the proportion of $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $f_{x_j}(y) = 0$. We set this to 0.5. The j are chosen uniformly at random from $\{1, ..., J\}$. Denote this randomly selected set as $\mathcal{J}_0$
  ii. p_{0k}: the proportion of $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ such that $f_{h_k}(y) = 0$. We set this to 0.5. The k are chosen uniformly at random from $\{1, ..., K\}$. Denote this randomly selected set as $\mathcal{K}_0$
  iii. $p_{0\beta}$: the **minimum** proportion of $(k, j) \in \{1, ..., K\} \times \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $\beta_{kj} = 0$. We set this to 0.5. The pairs (k, j) are chosen uniformly at random from $\{1, ..., K\} \times \{1, ..., J\}$. Denote this randomly selected set as $\mathcal{B}_0$
  iv. $p_{\text{d-sep}}$: the proportion of $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ such that x_j d-sep$_{\mathcal{G}}$ y by $\emptyset$. We set this to 0.25. For this to be possible we need $p_{\text{d-sep}} \leq p_{0j}$. We sample $\lceil J * p_{\text{d-sep}} \rceil$ uniformly at random from $\mathcal{J}_0$. Denote this randomly selected set as $\mathcal{J}_{\text{d-sep}} \subset \mathcal{J}_0$. Then for all (k, j) such that $k \notin \mathcal{K}_0$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{d-sep}}$ we set $\beta_{kj} = 0$. Notice that the actual proportion of $(k, j) \in \{1, ..., K\} \times \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $\beta_{kj} = 0$ is $\frac{|\mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_{\text{d-sep}}|}{J}$, which we do not control and can be larger than $p_{0\beta}$ for a given random selection of $\mathcal{J}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$.

4.3.2 Results for 100 repetitions

The following figure shows the first four indicators for the results of the 100 repetitions of our high-dimensional simulation experiment.



(a) c_l node span SVA

(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX

(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX

(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.7: Evaluation of performance for high-dim sem with 100 repetitions: c_l and h_k node span estimation, dependence between h_k nodes and y and f_{x_j} estimation

In this case the estimation of the span of the c_l nodes with SVA is between 98.8% and 99.9% a lot higher than for the low dimensional experiment. The estimation of the span of h_k nodes is clearly better with SVA and SVDR than with SVDX. In the median SVA is superior to SVDR in this respect although there is much more variance accross the different M repetitions. For modeling of the dependence between y and h_k in the high dimensional setting, SVA really stands out as for more than 95% of repetitions the R2

difference between the real y and h_k and the real y and estimated h_k was of 0.25 or less while for SVDR and SVDX the difference was of 0.5 or more for 90% of repetitions. The result of this in terms of the accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation is not clear-cut as for the median all methods perform similarly but SVA displays much greater variance accross repetitions having much better accuracy for some and much worse for others. Lets see how valid the significance analysis for each method is by looking at the nested KS test statistic and p-values.

	sva	**svdx**	**svdr**	**van**
KS statistic	0.099	0.637	0.622	0.457
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Although in all cases we reject the hypothesis that p-values under null $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y)$ are distributed uniformly, and so in all cases significance analyses are invalid, we are closer to not rejecting for SVA method. The modeling of the relationship between the y and h_k nodes and the validity of the significance analysis show some evidence that SVA is superior to the other three methods considered.

Additional remark: We observed that in general more variables x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ are found to be contain the signature of c_l, for l small than for l large. This seems to indicate that the first few factors (standardized principal components) are composed of *more* residuals r_j variables than the latter factors (or rather the corresponding weights are more even).

The experiments carried out here were somewhat different to those carried out in **?** especially in terms of:

- f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} complexity: in **?** only simple step functions where used while in this case we used linear functions , and
- sparsity of the sems involved: the sems implicitly simulated in **?** are somewhat sparser than those simulated here.

In the following sections we explore how the performance of SVA and other methods changes as we change certain parameters of the simulated SEM, including the complexity of the functions f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} and the sparsity.

4.3.3 Sensitivity analysis


We performed univariate sensitivity analysis on the following parameters of the additive gene expression SEMs:

- Dimension of the additive gene expression SEM, specifically parameters K and J,
- Sparsity of the additive gene expression SEM, specifically parameters p_{0k}, p_{0j}, $p_{0\beta}$ and $p_{\text{d-sep}}$,
- Variance of noise variables, specifically parameters σ_{c_l} and $\sigma_{N_{x_j}}$,
- Complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k}, specifically the maximum degree of the polynomials, and
- Number of observations.


In the following sections all parameters are as described in Section 4.3.1 unless explicitly stated otherwise.

Dimension of additive gene expression SEM


We let the number of gene expression level variables take the following values $J \in \{100, 200, ..., 1000\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van


Figure 4.8: Sensitivity of parameter J

Increasing J from 100 to 200 seems to improve all 5 measures studied for SVA both in absolute terms and in comparison with the other methods. Between $J = 200$ and $J = 500$ the estimation of the h_k-node span for SVA is high and has little variance. For higher values of J it is still as high as for SVDR however there is much greater variance. This seems to be reflected in the accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation since for values less than $J = 500$ SVA is the most accurate method but for higher values the median accuracy is for all methods is similar but SVA has much more variance. For the range of J values analyzed the nested KS statistic shows that significance analysis for SVA is much more valid than for the other three methods.


We let the number of gene expression level variables and the number of unobserved factors take the following values $(K, J) \in \{(4, 40), (37, 370), (70, 700), ..., (300, 3000)\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.9: Sensitivity of parameters (K, J)


Increasing the number of factors K while keeping the $K : J$ ratio equal worsens all five measures for SVA both in absolute terms and in comparison with the other methods. For K up to a value of 40 SVA has better or similar accuracy in the estimation of f_{x_j} to the other methods but beyond this value it performs consistently worse.

Sparsity of additive gene expression SEM


We let the proportion of values $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ such that $f_{h_k}(y) = 0$ take the following values $p_{0k} \in \{0, 0.11, 0.22, ..., 0.88, 1\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.10: Sensitivity of parameter p_{0k}


For values of p_{0k} of 0.78 or higher h_k-node span estimation, $h_k - y$ dependence modeling, f_{x_j} estimation and validity of significance analysis all improve for SVA both in absolute

terms and relative to the other methods. This seems to indicate that for SVA to work better than the other methods the dependence between the h_k-node span and the primary variable y must not be too strong.


We let the proportion of values $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $f_{h_j}(y) = 0$ take the following values $p_{0j} \in \{0.25, 0.33, 0.42, 0.5, 0.58, 0.67, 0.75, 0.83, 0.92, 1\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van


Figure 4.11: Sensitivity of parameter p_{0j}

For very high values of $p_{0.j}$, when the primary variable only affects 8% or less of the gene expression levels, the h_k-node span estimation and the modeling of the $h_k - y$ dependency for SVA improves significantly resulting in better accuracy in the estimation of f_{x_j} for this method than the other methods.


We let the proportion of values $(k, j) \in \{1, ..., K\} \times \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $\beta_{kj} = 0$ take the following values $p_\beta \in \{0, 0.11, 0.22, ..., 0.99\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.12: Sensitivity of parameter $p_{0\beta}$


Sparsity in the *edges* that link h_k nodes and x_j nodes, represtented by the β_{kj} coefficients improves the accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation for all four methods. This is due to the fact that the h_k estimations become less important since, as $p_{0\beta}$ increases, the x_j gene expression levels depend less on these variables. For low values of $p_{0\beta}$ the the estimation accuracy of

f_{x_j} is similar for all four methods however the variance is much higher for SVA. For high values of $p_{0\beta}$ we start to see higher accuracy and similar variance for SVA compared to the other methods.


We let the proportion of $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ such that $f_{h_j}(y) = 0$ take the following values $p_{0j} \in \{0, 0.11, 0.22, ..., 0.99\}$ and we let the proportion of $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ such that x_j d-sep$_{\mathcal{G}}$ y by $\emptyset$ be the square of the corresponding p_{0j} value, ie we let $(p_{0j}, p_{\text{d-sep}}) \in \{(0, 0), (0.11, 0.0121), (0.22, 0.0484), ..., (0.99, 0.9801)\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van



(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van


Figure 4.13: Sensitivity of parameters $(p_{0j}, p_{\text{d-sep}})$

The sensitivity of all 5 measures to changes in $p_{\text{d-sep}}$ behaves similarly to that for changes to $p_{0\beta}$: for increases in both parameters (individually) estimation of the span of h_k nodes


and of the $h_k - y$ dependence gets worse, but the accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation gets better. As $p_{\text{d-sep}}$ increases, the gene expression levels depend less on the primary variable y and more on the unobserved factors h_k, the opposite of what happens as $p_{0\beta}$ increases. In terms of the accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation, it would seems SVA performs better when either the dependence on y or the dependence on the span of h_k is weak. However, this is hard to explain in this case since for high values of $p_{\text{d-sep}}$, the x_j variables depend predominantly on the unobserved factors h_k but these are now poorly estimated. The poor estimation of the span of h_k nodes is due to a poor estimaton of the span of c_l nodes. One reason for this could be that there is overfitting of the $f_j(y)$ functions in the initial step of SVA due to the fact that many x_j variables don't depend on y. This would cause a bad estimation of residuals and therefore of the span of c_l nodes. The fact that estimation f_{x_j} estimation for SVA still improves despite the poor estimation of the span of h_k nodes could be explained by the fact that most functions $f_{x_j} = 0$.

Variance of noise variables


We let the standard deviation of the c_l noise variables take the following values $\sigma_{N_{c_l}} \in \{1/10, 1/5, 1/3, 1/2, 1, 2\}$




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.14: Sensitivity of parameter σ_{c_l}


Greater variance in the noise of c_l nodes results in poorer estimation of span of h_k nodes. This leads to more variance in the estimation of the $h_k - y$ dependency. For low values

(0.1-0.5) of σ_{c_l} SVA is the most accurate method for estimating f_{x_j} however for higher values (>0.5) it is worse both in terms of the median and the variance. Although SVA is still the best method for producing valid significance analysis even for high levels of σ_{c_l} the quality of the significance analyis drops dramatically as this parameter increases.


We let the standard deviation of the x_j noise variables take the following values $\sigma_{N_{x_j}} \in \{1/10, 1/5, 1/3, 1/2, 1, 2, 5, 10\}$




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van



(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van


Figure 4.15: Sensitivity of parameter $\sigma_{N_{x_j}}$

As the x_j node noise variance, σ_{x_j} gets larger it is harder to recover the contribution of the h_k and c_l nodes so the estimation of their span worsens, and consequently that of the $h_k - y$ dependency. However, since the h_k nodes constitute an ever decreasing component of the gene expression levels x_j it is possible to model them with or without an estimate for


h_k and so all methods perform equally well for high σ_{x_j} values. This also means that the significance analysis for the multiple hypothesis $H_{j0} : f_{x_j}(y) = 0$ become less dependent and so significance analysis for all 4 methods becomes more valid.

Complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k}


We let the maximum degree for any $f_{x_j}(y)$ or $f_{h_k}(y)$ polynomial function take the following values $d^{\max} \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. This is also the order of the polynomial basis function model used in estimation. **Remark**: the actual degree of any polynomial $f_{x_j}(y)$ for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ and $f_{h_k}(y)$ for $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ is sampled uniformly from the set $\{1, ..., d^{\max}\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van




(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.16: Sensitivity of parameter $d^{\max}$


As the maximum order of the polynomials f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} increases the estimation of the c_l-node span for SVA deteriorates probably because the variance of the signal from y to x_j dominates the signal coming from the c_l nodes to x_j making it hard to recover the latter. This in turn means that as complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} increases the h_k-node span and $h_k - y$ dependency estimation deteriorates leading to ever poorer f_{x_j} estimation. However, greater f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} complexity lead to poorer f_{x_j} estimation for all four methods. The validity of significance analysis also deteriorated for all four methods as the complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} increased. This is probably because the dependence of the gene expression levels x_j on h_k is stronger.

Number of observations


We let the number of observations n simulated for each repetition $m \in \{1, 2, ..., 100\}$ take the following values $n \in \{25, 133, 242, ..., 1000\}$.




(a) c_l node span SVA




(b) h_k node span SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(c) y-h_k dependence SVA, SVDR and SVDX



(d) f_{x_j} estimation SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van



(e) Validity of significance analysis: Nested KS for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and van

Figure 4.17: Sensitivity of parameter n

As n increases above 500 observations the performance measures for the SVA estimation do not seem to improve, if anything they get worse. This may relate to what **?** refer to as

a *reversal of the curse of dimensionality* where a *low dimensional kernel*, in this case the K h_k unobserved variables, *fully captures the dependence structure in an observed high-dimensional data set*, in this case the x_j variables. As n increases the the data set of x_j variables approaches a non high-dimensional setting so it may become harder to capture the dependence structure with a low dimensional set of variables.

The sensibility analysis carried out is univariate meaning we can't choose the best parameter values form each sensitvity analysis to obtain a set of parameters where SVA performs ideally or better than the other methods. However assuming that performance measures vary with respect to the different sensitivity parameters somewhat independently this analyis suggests the following parameters for ideal SVA performance:

- **Dimension**: Low number of unobserved factors h_k and high number of gene expression levels x_j (J 20 to 50 times bigger than K based on sensitivity analysis),
- **Sparsity**: High level of sparsity in gene expression SEM favours a high level of accuracy of f_{x_j} estimation for SVA both in absolut terms and in comparison with other methods ($p_{0k} \geq 0.88$, $p_{0j} \geq 0.92$, $p_{0\beta} \geq 0.88$ and $p_{\text{d-sep}} \geq 0.77$ as roughly indicated by sensitivity analysis),
- **Variance of noise**: Sensitivity analysis suggests that lower variance for c_l variables than for y variable and a slightly higher variance for x_j variables than for y variable are ideal conditions for SVA both in absolute terms and relative to other methods (sensitivity analysis suggests $\sigma_{c_l} \leq 0.5$, $\sigma_y = 1$ and $\sigma_{N_{x_j}} = 2$ are good values for example)
- **Complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k}**: simpler functions lead to better estimation accross all four methods,
- **Number of observations**: There is some evidence that SVA performs better relative to other methods when n is smaller, probably in relation to K and J.

Chapter 5

Summary

In Chapter 1 we introduced the SVA methodology in the context of the modeling of a large number of gene expression levels, x_j with $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$, in terms of an observed primary variable (or vector) y and unobserved factors g_l. We justified the use of an additive model of the form in 2.3.0.1 and argued that we must estimate the variables g_l in order to obtain an unbiased estimate of $f_{x_j}(y)$ which is the ultimate goal. We concluded that it is not necessary to obtain an explicit estimate of g_l for $l \in \{1, ..., L\}$ rather we can estimate variables h_k for $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ such that they generate the same linear space as the g_l variables.

In Chapter 2 we framed the SVA modeling problem as a SEM, graphical model and causality estimation problem. In Section 2.1 we defined DAGs and SEMs, established their relationship and the properties, such as the Markov property, faithufulness and causal minimality, that determine whether a given DAG is a sound and complete map for the independencies implicit in a corresponding SEM. We defined a class of *gene expression* SEMs (2.1.0.14) that we assume can be used to model gene expression data but concluded that it is too large since it includes SEMs with different *unidentifiable* DAG structures. In Section 2.2 we defined the interventional distribution of a SEM and used it to define causal effects. We explored causality as a tool for identifying the DAG structure of a SEM and gave some results that help establish the causal relationships between the variables in a SEM with a given DAG. In Section 2.3 we defined a subset class of SEMs denoted *additive gene expression* SEMs (2.3.0.1) and justified the use of this smaller class to model gene expression data whose behavior, we assumed previously, could be that of any SEM from the broader class. All the DAGs of this class are equivalent, up to deletion of edges, and so identifiability is not a problem when working with this class. Using the theory developed through out the chapter we derive some of the independence and causality porperties of the additive gene expression SEMs.

Chapter 3 gives a detailed description of the SVA estimation methodology including its implementation in the R package `sva`. Section 3.1 gives a general overview of the three main steps involved and how they relate to the class of additive gene expression SEMs defined in Section 2.3. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 give a detailed description of the first two steps. The third step simply involves fitting a standard basis function model so a further description is not given. Section 3.2 shows how the span of c_l for $l \in \{1, ..., L\}$, from the additive gene expression SEM, is estimated. In Section 3.2.1 we showed how the first step of SVA, involving fitting a standard basis function model of the form $x_j = f_j(y) + \epsilon$

and factorizing the residuals, corresponds to estimating the span of the c_l variables from the additive gene expression SEM. In Section 3.2.2 we detailed the type of standard basis function model fitted in the R package `sva`. Section 3.2.3 describes the SVD factorization of residuals to estimate the span of the c_l variables and its relationship to principal component analysis (PCA), while in Section 3.2.4 we described the parallel analysis method used to select the number of factors to be used and detailed how this method is implemented in the R package `sva`. Section 3.3 shows how the span of h_k for $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ from the additive gene expression SEM is estimated. Section 3.3.1 describes the filtering procedure in general and remarks on its limitations. Part of this procedure involves finding the *signature* of c_l variables in the x_j gene expression level variables. Section 3.3.2 describes the J regressions, and subsequent FDR based significance analysis of the corresponding hypotheses, that is carried out for this purpose. In Section 3.3.3 we develop various concepts related to FDR such as positive FDR (pFDR), marginal FDR (mFDR), local FDR (lFDR) and q-values, and show how they can be used to control the FDR at a certain level α. We show how q-values control FDR and describe a method for estimating them conservatively. We also show how lFDR is estimated and used to decide which hypotheses tests are significant (discoveries) in the R package `sva`, as part of the procedure for finding the signature of a variable c_l in x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$.

Chapter 4 includes the simulations carried out to evaluate the performance of the SVA methodology in different, relevant data environments. Section 4.1 includes the description of three alternate methods for estimating the effect of y on the x_j variables which serve as benchmarks for SVA. In Section 4.2 we assess the performance of SVA for a low dimensional additive gene expression SEM, specifically when $J = K = L = 4$. Section 4.2.1 includes the details of the simulation design. Section 4.2.2 includes the simulation results for $M = 1$ repetition of a simulation with $n = 100$ observations. The results seem to show that SVA has good performance when the complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} is similar to the complexity of the standard basis model chosen. By the same token there is a clear potental for overfitting for cases when, for example, the complexity of f_{x_j} for at least one $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$, is less than the standard basis function model chosen. This is a weakness of the methodology borne of the fact that regularization for large J is costly. In Section 4.2.3 we perform $M = 1000$ repetitions of the simulation experiment reporting five metrics which evaluate different aspects of the SVA methodology:

1. c_l-node span estimation,
2. h_k-node span estimation,
3. dependence between span of h_k nodes and y,
4. f_{x_j} estimation accuracy, and
5. validity of significance analysis.

We conclude that in this low dimensional setting, SVA had good performance for metrics 1-3 and 5, but this did not translate into a more accurate estimation of the f_{x_j} effects.

In Section 4.3 we assess the performance of SVA in a high dimensional setting, specifically when $J = 1000$ and $K = L = 10$. Section 4.3.1 includes the details of a *base* simulation design. Section 4.3.2 includes the results of performing $M = 100$ repetititons of the simulation experiment each with $n = 100$ observations. The results of this base scenario show that SVA outperforms the SVDR and SVDX methods in terms of h_k-node span estimantion and modeling of the dependence between the span of h_k and y and also in

terms of the validity of the significance analysis but this did not translate into consistently better results in terms of the accuracy of the f_{x_j} estimation. In Section 4.3.3 we perform univariate sensitivity analysis with the scenario described in Section 4.3.1 as the base scenario to explore for what type of additive gene expression SEMs and for what parameter settings SVA performs better. We performed sensitivity analysis on the dimension of the additive gene expression SEM (K and J parameters), the sparsity of the additive gene expression SEM (p_{0k}, p_{0j}, $p_{0\beta}$ and $p_{\text{d-sep}}$ parameters), variance of noise variables (σ_{c_l} and $\sigma_{N_{x_j}}$ parameters), complexity of f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} (maximum degree of polynomials) and number of observations. We found that, assuming that performance measures vary independently with respect to the different parameters, for gene expression SEMS with low number of unobserved factors h_k, high level of gene expression variables x_j (around 20 to 50 times), high sparsity, a low variance ratio $\frac{\sigma_{c_l}}{\sigma_y}$ and low complexity for the signals f_{x_j} and f_{h_k} SVA has superior performance to the other methods considered.

5.1 Future Work

The following is a list of possible ways to extend or improve the work presented here:

- Define the class of additive gene expression SEMs in terms of the more general case where x_j can depend on x_k for $j \neq k$. Also add this feature to simulation experiments,
- Explore the possibility of using Independent Component Analysis (ICA) to factorize and obtain independent and not only uncorrelated c_l variables,
- Understand why the model $x_j = \beta_0 + \beta_1 c_l + \epsilon$ instead of the model $x_j = f_j(y) + \beta_1 c_l + N_j$ is used to find the variables x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ with the signature of c_l,
- Understand why local false discovery rates instead of q-values are used to find the variables x_j for $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$ with the signature of c_l,
- Perform simulations from non additive genetic expression sems and see how good the approximation is to test the approximation of real life gene expression data generating mechanisms with additive gene expression SEMs,
- In simulation experiments include noise for h_k equations and allow h_k nodes to be affected by more than one c_l variable,
- Investigate if the error shown in low-dim experiment is mainly due to overfitting of $f_j(y)$,
- Perform simulations with default conditions closer to those of the simulation of experiments in **?** where the functions $f_{x_j}(y) and f_{h_k}(y)$ are simple step functions of the form $g(y) = \mathbb{1}_{y \leq a} + \mathbb{1}_{y > a}$ and the simulated SEMs are sparser. Perform sensitivity analysis with these default conditions as a starting point,
- Provide performance measures for different categories of x_j variables separately: those that depend on y only, on the span of h_k only or on both,
- Separate sensibility analysis of f_{x_j} complexity from f_{h_k} complexity, and
- Perform a multivariate sensitivity analysis based upon different scenarios for the additive gene expression SEM parameters.

Appendices

Appendix A

Proofs

A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.3.0.2

Proof.

1. All paths from y to c_l or from c_l to c_m must go through at least one of four types of v-structures:

   - $y \to h_k \leftarrow c_s$
   - $y \to x_j \leftarrow h_k$,
   - $h_k \to x_j \leftarrow h_r$ or
   - $c_s \to h_k \leftarrow c_t$.

   Where $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$, $k, r \in \{1, ..., K\}$ and $s, t \in \{1, ..., L\}$. This means that y is d-separated from c_l by the empty set and c_l is d-separated from c_m by the empty set. Since the DAG is induced by a SEM, by Proposition 2.1.0.9 $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X} \cup C}$ is Markov with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ which means that $y \perp\!\!\!\perp c_l$ and $c_l \perp\!\!\!\perp c_m$.

2. Suppose $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X} \cup C}$ does not satisfy causal minimiality with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. Then by Proposition 2.1.0.13 we have that there must exist a variable $w \in \{x_1, ..., x_J, h_1, ..., h_K\}$ with a parent $z \in PA_w^{\mathcal{G}} \subset \{y, h_1, ..., h_K, c_1, ..., c_L\}$ such that $w \perp\!\!\!\perp z | PA_w^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus z$.

   a. Suppose $w = h_k$. This means that $z \in PA_w^{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \{y, c_1, ..., c_L\}$.

      i. Suppose $z = y$. This means that $h_k \perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y$, but given $PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y \subseteq \{c_1, ..., c_L\}$ we have that $h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l = f_{h_k}(y) + b$ where b is a constant. Since $y \in PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}}$ we have that $f_{h_k}(y)$ is not constant. This leads to the contradictory conclusion that $h_k \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y$.

      ii. Suppose $z = c_l$. This means that $h_k \perp\!\!\!\perp c_l | PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus c_l$, but given $PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus c_l \subseteq \{y, c_1, ..., c_{l-1}, c_{l+1}, ..., c_L\}$ we have that $h_k = f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l = \gamma_{lk} c_l + b$ where b is a constant. Since $c_l \in PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}}$ we have that $\gamma_{lk} \neq 0$. This leads to the contradictory conclusion that $h_k \not\perp\!\!\!\perp c_l | PA_{h_k}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus c_l$.

   b. Suppose $w = x_j$. This means that $z \in PA_w^{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \{y, h_1, ..., h_K\}$.

i. Suppose $z = y$. This means that $x_j \perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y$, but given $PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y \subseteq \{h_1, ..., h_K\}$ we have that $x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k = f_{x_j}(y) + b$ where b is a constant. Since $y \in PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}}$ we have that $f_{x_j}(y)$ is not constant. This leads to the contradictory conclusion that $x_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus y$.

ii. Suppose $z = h_k$. This means that $x_j \perp\!\!\!\perp h_k | PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus h_k$, but given $PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus h_k \subseteq \{y, h_1, ..., h_{k-1}, h_{k+1}, ..., h_K\}$ we have that $x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k = \beta_{kj} h_k + b$ where b is a constant. Since $h_k \in PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}}$ we have that $\beta_{kj} \neq 0$. This leads to the contradictory conclusion that $x_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y | PA_{x_j}^{\mathcal{G}} \setminus h_k$.

We conclude that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{X} \cup C}$ satisfies causal minimality.

3. We look at the SEM $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ that results from replacing the equations S_{h_k} of Definition 2.3.0.1 with $\widetilde{S}_{h_k} = \widetilde{N}_{h_k}$ where $\widetilde{N}_{h_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, say. This means that for j such that $\beta_{kj} \neq 0$ we have:

$$x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{r=1}^{K} \beta_{rj} h_r + N_{x_j} = f_{x_j}(N_y) + \sum_{r \neq k} \beta_{rj} N_{h_r} + N_{x_j} + \beta_{kj} \widetilde{N}_{h_k} \tag{A.1.0.1}$$

Since $\beta_{kj} \neq 0$ and the random noise variables are mutually independent it is clear that $x_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp h_k$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}}^{\mathbb{X} \cup C}$.

4. Since y has no parents, intervening on y corresponds to changing N_y with some $\widetilde{N}_y$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_j &= f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} h_k + N_{x_j} && \text{(A.1.0.2)} \\
&= f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} (f_{h_k}(y) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{lk} c_l + N_{h_k}) + N_{x_j} && \text{(A.1.0.3)} \\
&= \Big(f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y) \Big) + \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \beta_{kj} \gamma_{lk} c_l + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} \Big) + N_{x_j} && \text{(A.1.0.4)} \\
&= f_j(y) + \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \beta_{kj} \gamma_{lk} c_l + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} \Big) + N_{x_j} && \text{(A.1.0.5)} \\
&= f_j(\widetilde{N}_y) + \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \beta_{kj} \gamma_{lk} N_{c_l} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} N_{h_k} \Big) + N_{x_j} && \text{(A.1.0.6)}
\end{aligned}$$

Where $f_j(y) := f_{x_j}(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{kj} f_{h_k}(y)$. Since $f_j(y)$ is assumed not to be constant and the random noise variables are mutually independent it is clear that $x_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp y$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}}^{\mathbb{X} \cup C}$.

□

Appendix B

R Code

We include the code in R that was used to produce all results in this work.

B.1 Functions

```
1
2
3  ############################################################################
4  # SVA PACKAGE FUNCTIONS (MODIFIED BY EMILIANO DIAZ)
5  ############################################################################
6  #' A function for estimating surrogate variables with the two step approach of
       Leek and Storey 2007
7  #' Taken from R package sva and modified.
8  #'
9  #' @param dat: The transformed data matrix with the variables in rows and samples
       in columns
10 #' @param y: Primary variable observations
11 #' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data
12 #' @param n.sv.r: The number of surogate variables to estimate for SVA and SVDR
13 #' @param n.sv.x: The number of surogate variables to estimate for SVDX
14 #' @param beta: The matrix of beta coefficients linking hk to xj nodes.
15 #' If passed SVA doesnt have to do regression analysis to figure out enriched
       matrix.
16 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
17 #'
18 #' @return sv: The estimated surrogate variables, one in each column
19 #' @return svd.x: the result of performing SVD on X matrix
20 #' @return svd.r:
21 #' @return svd.r.red:
22 #' @return pprob.gam: A vector of the posterior probabilities each gene is
       affected by heterogeneity
23 #' @return pprob.b: A vector of the posterior probabilities each gene is affected
       by mod (this is always null for the two-step approach)
24 #' @return n.sv.r: The number of significant surrogate variables
25 #' @return n.sv.x:
26 #' @return n.sv.r.ini:
27 #'
28 sva.mod <- function(dat, y, mod, n.sv.r, n.sv.x, beta=NULL, trace=FALSE){
29   if(trace) print("enters sva.mod function")
30   n <- ncol(dat)
31   m <- nrow(dat)
32   n.sv.r.ini <- n.sv.r
33
34   # Calculate Regression Hat Matrix
35   H <- mod %*% solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod)
36
37   # Calculate residuals R = X - S = X - H*B(Y)
```

```
38  res ← dat - t(H %*% t(dat))
39
40  # Singular value decomposition of residuals and data
41  uu.r ← svd(res)
42  uu.x ← svd(dat)
43
44  #Construction of T statistic for selection of number of eigenvalues.
45  #However this is actually not used here. We can ignore or even coment
46  #out next two lines of code.
47  #ndf ← n - ceiling(sum(diag(H)))
48  #dstat ←  uu$d[1:ndf]^2/sum(uu$d[1:ndf]^2)
49
50  # Obtain the n.sv right eigenvectors of residuals - ie. the residual eigengenes
51  res.sv ← as.matrix(uu.r$v[,1:n.sv.r])
52  res.sv.red ← res.sv
53  x.sv   ← as.matrix(uu.x$v[,1:n.sv.x])
54  cors ← as.numeric(cor(x.sv, y))
55  indx.max ← which.max(abs(cors))
56  x.sv ← x.sv[,-indx.max]
57
58  # For each eigengene, an "enriched" data matrix will be constructed.
59  # Use.var will indicate which expression genes each data matrix should be
        constructed from.
60  # pp[,i] includes p-values for regressing each of the m variables against
        residual eigengene i.
61
62
63
64
65  if(!is.null(beta)){
66
67  use.var ← t(beta) != 0
68
69  } else{
70  use.var ← matrix(rep(FALSE, n.sv.r*m), nrow=m, ncol=n.sv.r)
71  pp ← matrix(rep(FALSE, n.sv.r*m), nrow=m, ncol=n.sv.r)
72    # we search for the gene expression variables x_i, which will make up the
          enriched data matrix
73    # for each residual eigengene e_k
74    for(i in 1:n.sv.r) {
75      #print(i)
76    #We want to test if residual eigengene i is associated with any of the m
          expression variables
77    #so we construct the null model-matrix which corresponds to the model X = mu
          + epsilon and
78    # the model matrix  corresponding to the model X = mu + e_i + epsilon
79      mod ← cbind(rep(1,n),res.sv[,i])
80      mod0 ← cbind(rep(1,n))
81
82    # Obtain the m p-values corresponding to the models X = mu + e_i + epsilon(we
          regress e_i on each x_j, j=1,...,m)
83      pp[,i] ←f.pvalue(dat,mod,mod0)
84
85
86
87
88    # we only use variables whose p-values have a local FDR rate of less than
          10%.
89    # I don't know exactly what local FDR is but it might be beyond the scope of
          my project.
90
91    sigVars ← edge.lfdr(p=pp[,i]) < 0.10
92    use.var[,i] ← sigVars
93
94    hist(pp[,i], main=paste("num. of xs sig. with d ", i, " = ", sum(sigVars)),
          xlab="p-values",ylab="frequency")
95    #lambda.t ← seq(0,0.999, length.out=100)
96    #pi0.t ← sapply(lambda.t, function(lam) sum(pp[,i]>lam)/(m*(1-lam)))
97    #plot(lambda.t, pi0.t)
98
```

```
99
100
101     }
102   }
103
104   #If the number of gene expression variables chosen for which a certain residual
          eigengene e_k is a factor
105   # is less than m then we don't take into account this residual eigengene and we
          adjust the number of eigen values
106   # This isn't in original algorithm. Might have to take this out at least for
        when m < n
107
108   for(i in ncol(use.var):1) {
109     if(sum(use.var[,i]) <= 1) {
110       use.var ← as.matrix(use.var[,-i])
111       n.sv.r ← n.sv.r - 1
112     res.sv.red ← matrix(res.sv.red[,-i],n,n.sv.r)
113       if(n.sv.r <= 0){break}
114     }
115   }
116
117   mk ← apply(use.var, 2, sum)
118
119
120   # For each residual eigengene we form its corresponding enriched gene
        expression matrix, perform svd on it, and
121   # take the eigengene most correlated with the eigengene
122   if(n.sv.r >0){
123   #initialize the surrogate variable matrix
124     sv ← matrix(0,nrow=n,ncol=n.sv.r)
125   #Center matrix by rows (genes)
126     dat ← t(scale(t(dat),scale=FALSE))
127
128
129   mk.diff ← unique(mk)
130   list.track.xs ← lapply(1:length(mk.diff), function(el) as.character())
131   list.track.sv  ← lapply(1:length(mk.diff), function(el) as.numeric())
132   take.off ← as.numeric()
133   for(i in 1:n.sv.r) {
134   #print(i)
135
136     indx.mk ← match(mk[i], mk.diff)
137       vars.mk ← which(use.var[,i])
138     vars.char ← paste(vars.mk, collapse=".")
139
140
141
142
143       #enriched matrix: take only rows (genes) associated with residual eigengene
              e_i
144         uu.ex ← svd(dat[use.var[,i],],n,mk[i])
145         maxcor ← 0
146
147       #we only consider first n-1 eigengenes from enriched matrix and look for
              one with most correlation to
148       #corresponding residual eigengene.
149
150       for(j in 1:min(n,mk[i])) {
151         #print(j)
152        ifelse(mk[i]==1,v.eig ←uu.ex$u[,j],v.eig ←uu.ex$v[,j])
153
154           if(abs(cor(v.eig, res.sv.red[,i])) > maxcor) {
155             maxcor ← abs(cor(v.eig, res.sv.red[,i]))
156             sv[,i] ← v.eig
157         choose.sv ← j
158           }
159         }
160
161
```

```
      if(any(vars.char %in% list.track.xs[[indx.mk]] & choose.sv %in% list.track.sv[[indx.mk]])){
        take.off ← c(take.off, i)
      } else{
        list.track.xs[[indx.mk]] ← c(list.track.xs[[indx.mk]], vars.char)
        list.track.sv[[indx.mk]] ← c(list.track.sv[[indx.mk]], choose.sv)
      }
    }

  if(length(take.off)>0){
    sv ← matrix(sv[,-take.off],n,n.sv.r-length(take.off))
    res.sv.red ← matrix(res.sv.red[,take.off], n, n.sv.r-length(take.off))
    use.var ← matrix(use.var[,-take.off],m, n.sv.r-length(take.off))
    n.sv.r ← n.sv.r - length(take.off)
  }

  pprob.gam ← use.var %*% rep(1,n.sv.r) > 0
    retval ← list(sv=sv, svd.x=x.sv, svd.r=res.sv, svd.r.red=res.sv.red, pprob.gam=pprob.gam,pprob.b=NULL,n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.sv.x, n.sv.r.ini=n.sv.r.ini)
    if(trace) print("exits sva.mod function")
  return(retval)
  } else{
  stop("no surrogate variables found")
    sv ← rep(0,n)
    ind ← rep(0,m)
    n.sv.r ← 0
    retval ← list(sv=sv, svd.x=x.sv, svd.r=res.sv, svd.r.red=res.sv.red, pprob.gam=rep(0,m),pprob.b = NULL,n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.sv.x, n.sv.r.ini=n.sv.r.ini)
    if(trace) print("exits sva.mod function")
  return(retval)
  }
}

############################################################################
#' A function for quickly calculating f statistic p-values for use in sva
#'
#' This function does simple linear algebra to calculate f-statistics
#' for each row of a data matrix comparing the nested models
#' defined by the design matrices for the alternative (mod) and and null (mod0) cases.
#' The columns of mod0 must be a subset of the columns of mod.
#'
#' @param dat: The transformed data matrix with the variables in rows and samples in columns
#' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data
#' @param mod0: The null model being compared when fitting the data
#'
#' @return p: A vector of F-statistic p-values one for each row of dat.
#'
f.pvalue ← function(dat,mod,mod0){
  n ← dim(dat)[2]
  m ← dim(dat)[1]
  df1 ← dim(mod)[2]
  df0 ← dim(mod0)[2]
  p ← rep(0,m)
  Id ← diag(n)

  resid ← dat %*% (Id - mod %*% solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod))
  rss1 ← rowSums(resid*resid)
  rm(resid)

  resid0 ← dat %*% (Id - mod0 %*% solve(t(mod0) %*% mod0) %*% t(mod0))
  rss0 ← rowSums(resid0*resid0)
  rm(resid0)

  fstats ← ((rss0 - rss1)/(df1-df0))/(rss1/(n-df1))
  p ←  1-pf(fstats,df1=(df1-df0),df2=(n-df1))
  return(p)
```

```
}

########################################################################
#' A function for calculating the number of surrogate variables to estimate in a model
#'
#' This function estimates the number of surrogate variables that should be included
#' in a differential expression model. The default approach is based on a permutation
#' procedure originally prooposed by Buja and Eyuboglu 1992. The function also provides
#' an interface to the asymptotic approach proposed by Leek 2011 Biometrics.
#'
#' @param dat: The transformed data matrix with the variables in rows and samples in columns
#' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data
#' @param method: One of "be" or "leek" as described in the details section
#' @param vfilter: You may choose to filter to the vfilter most variable rows before performing the analysis
#' @param B: The number of permutaitons to use if method = "be"
#' @param seed: Set a seed when using the permutation approach
#'
#' @return n.sv: The number of surrogate variables to use in the sva software
#'
num.sv <- function(dat, mod, method=c("be","leek"), vfilter=NULL, B=20, seed=NULL) {

  # mod is the basis predictors which are functions of y... its in n x p
  # dat is the multivariate X response variables..... its in n x J

  if(!is.null(vfilter)){
    if(vfilter < 100 | vfilter > dim(dat)[1]){
      stop(paste("The number of genes used in the analysis must be between 100 and",dim(dat)[1],"\n"))
    }
    tmpv = rowVars(dat)
    ind = which(rank(-tmpv) < vfilter)
    dat = dat[ind,]
  }

  method <- match.arg(method)
  if(method=="be"){
    if(!is.null(seed)){set.seed(seed)}
    warn <- NULL
    n <- ncol(dat)
    m <- nrow(dat)
    H <- mod %*% solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod)
    res <- dat - t(H %*% t(dat))
    uu <- svd(res)

  #rank(R) = rank(X - H%*%X) = rank((I-H)X)  where rank(X) = min(J,n), rank(I-H)= tr(I-H) = tr(I) - tr(H) = n - tr(H)

  # rank(X - HX) <= rank(X) - rank(HX) = min(m,n) -


    #ndf <- min(m,n) - ceiling(sum(diag(H)))
  ndf <- min(min(m,n),ceiling(abs(min(m,n)-sum(diag(H)))))
  dstat <- uu$d[1:ndf]^2/sum(uu$d[1:ndf]^2)
    dstat0 <- matrix(0,nrow=B,ncol=ndf)

    for(i in 1:B){

    #permute ORIGINAL residuals according to Bth sample permutation
      res0 <- t(apply(res, 1, sample, replace=FALSE))

    # the permutation may have created certain "artificial" dependence between
    # residuals and predictors X, so we apply model again projecting on to X with
    # H matrix and ensuring residuals are again orthogonal to x
```

```
      res0 ← res0 - t(H %*% t(res0))
      uu0 ← svd(res0)

    # % of variance in corresponding principal component
      dstat0[i,] ← uu0$d[1:ndf]^2/sum(uu0$d[1:ndf]^2)
    }


    psv ← rep(1,n)
    for(i in 1:ndf){

   #for each eigenvalue we see what fraction of the repetitions was higher with
       the permutations than without. If its
   #truly a non zero eigenvalue then we expect the non-permuted eigen-value to be
        higher most of the time so the corresponding
   # psv value should be low
      psv[i] ← mean(dstat0[,i] >= dstat[i])
    }
    for(i in 2:ndf){

   #we make sure psv is its non-decreasing: true eigenvalues are decreasing so %
       of times "random" eigenvalues are bigger than true ahs to be
   # increasing
      psv[i] ← max(psv[(i-1)],psv[i])
    }

    nsv ← sum(psv <= 0.10)
    return(as.numeric(list(n.sv = nsv)))
  }else{
    dat ← as.matrix(dat)
    dims ← dim(dat)
    a ← seq(0,2,length=100)
    n ← floor(dims[1]/10)
    rhat ← matrix(0,nrow=100,ncol=10)
    P ← (diag(dims[2])-mod %*% solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod))
    for(j in 1:10){
      dats ← dat[1:(j*n),]
      ee ← eigen(t(dats) %*% dats)
      sigbar ← ee$values[dims[2]]/(j*n)
      R ← dats %*% P
      wm ← (1/(j*n))*t(R) %*% R - P*sigbar
      ee ← eigen(wm)
      v ← c(rep(T, 100), rep(F, dims[2]))
      v ← v[order(c(a*(j*n)^(-1/3)*dims[2],ee$values), decreasing = TRUE)]
      u ← 1:length(v)
      w ← 1:100
      rhat[,j] ← rev((u[v==TRUE]-w))
    }
    ss ← rowVars(rhat)

    bumpstart ← which.max(ss > (2*ss[1]))
    start ← which.max(c(rep(1e5,bumpstart),ss[(bumpstart+1):100]) < 0.5*ss[1])
    finish ← which.max(ss*c(rep(0,start),rep(1,100-start)) > ss[1])
    if(finish==1){finish ← 100}

    n.sv ← modefunc(rhat[start:finish,10])
    return(n.sv)
    print(method)
  }
}

#############################################################################
#' A function for estimating the local false discovery rates (lfdr) of a vector
     of p-values
#'
#' Estimates the local false discovery rate of  a vector of p-values.
#' See section 3.3.3 of project report for details on the methodology.
#'
#' @param p: vector of p-values
#'
```

```
#' @return n.sv: The number of surrogate variables to use in the sva software
#'
edge.lfdr <- function (p)
{
  #default parameters
  trunc = TRUE
  monotone = TRUE
  adj = 1.5
  eps = 10^-8
  lambda = 0.8

  #estimate pi_0, the proportion of null genes (out of the m genes)
    pi0 <- mean(p >= lambda)/(1 - lambda)
    pi0 <- min(pi0, 1)

  # calculate number of p values
    n = length(p)

  # we bound p-values below to eps=10^-8
    p = pmax(p, eps)

  # we bound p-values above to 1- eps
    p = pmin(p, 1 - eps)

  # we transform values in (0,1) to (-inf,inf) using F_norm_std
    x = qnorm(p)

  # calculates a non-parametric, gaussian-kernel density estimator for
      transformed p-values
  # by default its calculated at 512 equally spaced points
    myd = density(x, adjust = adj)
  #plot(myd$x, myd$y, type="l")

  # we fit a spline to the kernel-density estimator
    mys = smooth.spline(x = myd$x, y = myd$y)
  #plot(mys$x, mys$y, type="l")

  # we obtain the value of the density at the transformed p-values
    y = predict(mys, x)$y
  #indx <- order(x)
  #plot(x[indx], y[indx], type="l")

  # with dnorm(x)/y we compare how far our non-parametric density is from the
      normal
  # under the null (model x_i = mu + ek + epsilon) our pvalues are distribute
      uniformly so x
  # should be distributed normally and dnorm(x)/y should be close to 1
    lfdr = pi0 * dnorm(x)/y


  #by default trunc=TRUE
  if (trunc) {
        lfdr[lfdr > 1] = 1
    }

  #by default monotone=TRUE
    if (monotone) {
        lfdr = lfdr[order(p)]
        lfdr = mono(lfdr)
        lfdr = lfdr[rank(p)]
    }
    return(lfdr)
}

########################################################################
#' A function for making the local false discovery rates of vector of p-values
    montone
#'
#' @param lfdr: vector of local false discovery rates
#'
```

```
#' @return: montone local false discovery rates
#'
mono ← function(lfdr)
{
    .Call("monotone", as.numeric(lfdr), PACKAGE = "sva")
}


##########################################################################
# FUNCTIONS BY EMILIANO DIAZ
##########################################################################

#' A function for simulating the parameters of an genetic expression SEM with polynomial functions fxj and fhk
#'
#' This function simulates the coefficients of the f_x(y) and f_h(y) polynomial functions
#' and also the linear coefficients beta. It does it for the hole SEM: "y" node, K "h" and
#' "c" nodes and J "x" nodes.
#'
#' @param K The number of "c" and "h" nodes (number of eigengenes)
#' @param J The number of "x" nodes (number of genes)
#' @param deg.max The maximum degree of the polynomial functions
#' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
#'
#' @return sem.lim A list with:
#'    fhd  - a k-length vector with the degree of polynomials 1,...,k
#'    fha  - a k x deg.max matrix with thee coefficients of polynomials 1,...,k
#'    fxd  - an m-length vector with the degree of polynomials 1,...,m
#'    fxa  - an m x deg.max matrix with the coefficients of polynomials 1,..., m
#'    beta - a k x m matrix with the coefficients of all possible links from h nodes to x nodes.
#'
sim.sem ← function(K, J, deg.max, trace=FALSE){
  if(trace) print("enters sim.sem function")

  fh.d ← sample(1:deg.max, size=K, replace=T)
  fh.a ← matrix(rnorm(deg.max*K), K, deg.max)
  fx.d ← sample(1:deg.max, size=J, replace=T)
  fx.a ← matrix(rnorm(n=deg.max*J), nrow=J, ncol=deg.max)
  beta ← matrix(rnorm(J*K), K, J)
  sem.lin ← list(fh.d=fh.d, fh.a=fh.a, fx.d=fx.d, fx.a=fx.a, beta=beta)

  if(trace) print("exits sim.sem function")
  return(sem.lin)
}

##########################################################################
#' A function for simulating the parameters of an genetic expression SEM with polynomial functions fxj and fhk
#' In this case we can control the sparsity of the SEM with additional parameters.
#'
#' This function simulates the coefficients of the f_x(y) and f_h(y) polynomial functions
#' and also the linear coefficients beta. It does it for the hole SEM: "y" node, K "h" and
#' "c" nodes and J "x" nodes.
#'
#' @param K: The number of "c" and "h" nodes (number of eigengenes)
#' @param J: The number of "x" nodes (number of genes)
#' @param deg.max: The maximum degree of the polynomial functions
#' @param p0_fh: The proportion of fh(y)=0 functions
#' @param p0_fx: The proportion of fx(y)=0 functions
#' @param p_isox: The proportion of xs d-separated from y
#' @param p0_beta: The minimum proportion of betas = 0
#' @param beta: In case you want to pass a specific beta matrix for the sem
#' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
#'
```

```
#' @return sem.lim A list with:
#     fhd  - a k-length vector with the degree of polynomials 1,...,k
#     fha  - a k x deg.max matrix with thee coefficients of polynomials 1,...,k
#     fxd  - an m-length vector with the degree of polynomials 1,...,m
#     fxa  - an m x deg.max matrix with the coefficients of polynomials 1,..., m
#     beta - a k x m matrix with the coefficients of all possible links from h nodes to x nodes
#     effect.yh - in case of deg.max=1 (linear functions) the effect of y on h
#     effect.yx - in case of deg.max=1 (linear functions) the effect of y on x
#'
sim.sem.sparse <- function(K, J, deg.max, p0_fh=0, p0_fx=0, p_isox=0, p0_beta=0, beta=NULL, trace=FALSE){
  if(trace) print("enters sim.sem.sparse function")

  #if there are less j such that fxj(y)=0 than p_isox*J then we cant keep p_isox*J xjs d-separated from y
  if(p_isox > p0_fx) stop("cannot have more isolated xs than fx=0")

  #number of ks such that fhk(y)=0
  num.h.ds0 <- ceiling(p0_fh*K)

  #number of ks such that fhk(y) not equal to 0
  num.h.ds.not0 <- K - num.h.ds0

  #fh.d is the degree of the polynomial. We fix the first num.h.ds0 as 0
  fh.d <- c(rep(0,num.h.ds0) , sample(1:deg.max, size=num.h.ds.not0, replace=T))

  #we initialize the coefficients of all the fh polynomials up to the maximum degree (a_{k,1},...a_{k,degmax}). Well later set to zero all a_{k,i} where i > fh.d_k
  fh.a <- matrix(rnorm(deg.max*K), K, deg.max)

  #number of js such that fxj(y)=0
  num.x.ds0 <- ceiling(p0_fx*J)

  #number of js such that fxj(y) not equal to 0
  num.x.ds.not0 <- J - num.x.ds0

  #fx.d is the degree of the polynomial. We fix the first num.x.ds0 as 0
  fx.d <- c(rep(0,num.x.ds0), sample(1:deg.max, size=num.x.ds.not0, replace=T))

  #we initialize the coefficients of all the fx polynomials up to the maximum degree (a_{j,1},...a_{j,degmax}). Well later set to zero all a_{j,i} where i > fx.d_j
  fx.a <- matrix(rnorm(n=deg.max*J), nrow=J, ncol=deg.max)

  if(is.null(beta)){

    #we create a J*K matrix with the beta coefficients p0_beta% of which are randomly zero.
    num.beta0 <- ceiling(p0_beta*J*K)
    num.beta.not0 <- J*K - num.beta0
    beta.vec <- c(rep(0, num.beta0), rnorm(num.beta.not0))
    beta.vec <- beta.vec[sample(1:(J*K), size=J*K, replace=F)]
    beta <- matrix(beta.vec,K,J)

    #additionally we want p_isox% of the J x's to be be d-separated from y.  We have arlready checked that p_isox >= p0_fx so we know that we can achieve this by controlling the betas. For J*p_isox of the j's such that fxj=0, we need to make sure that for all k such that fhk \neq 0 then beta_kj = 0.

    #first we calculate the number of j's this is. Since we know the first p0_fx*J js are such that fxj=0 we now that the js we are looking for are 1:num.beta1.0
    num.beta1.0  <- ceiling(p_isox*J)

    #we just check that not all the fhk =0, because in that case we don't need to do anything as the number of d-separate xjs from y will be p0_fx*J
    if(num.h.ds0 < K ){
```

```
      # beta has hs in rows and xs in columns
      # for rows which correspond to all non zero fhk's then we make sure that
          first num.beta1.0 columns have beta_kj = 0
      mat.indx ← expand.grid(indx.row=(num.h.ds0+1):K, indx.col=1:num.beta1.0)
      beta[as.matrix(mat.indx)] ← 0
    }


  }
  if(trace) print(paste("%0s beta: ", round(sum(beta==0)/(J*K),2)))


    # for linear polynomials we can easily calculate the effect of y on h and
        then y on x
  effect.yh ← NULL
  effect.yx ← NULL
  if(deg.max==1){
    effect.yh ← as.numeric(fh.a)
    effect.yx ← as.numeric(fx.a) + sapply(1:J, function(i) sum(sapply(1:K,
        function(j) fh.a[j,1]*beta[j,i])))
  }

  sem.lin ← list(fh.d=fh.d, fh.a=fh.a, fx.d=fx.d, fx.a=fx.a, beta=beta, effect.yh
      =effect.yh, effect.yx = effect.yx)
  if(trace) print("exits sim.sem.sparse function")
  return(sem.lin)
}

#########################################################################
#' A function for evaluating multiple polynomials
#'
#' This function takes multiple polynomials represented in matrix form, one row
     per polynomal
#' one column per degree of the term of the polynomial, and evaluates each
     polynomial at
#' every value of the vector x
#'
#'
#' @param x: a vector of values at which we wish to evaluate the polynomials
#' @param d: the degree of each polynomial, one for each row of a
#' @param a: a matrix with the coefficients of each polynomial, one polynomial
     per row
#' 'd' over rides 'a': any term a[i,j] where j > d[i] is actually zero even if in
      a it is
#' not the case
#' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
#'
#' @return P:  A matrix where the i,j term corresponds to the j-th polynomial
#' evaluated at the i-th observation
polyn ← function(x, d, a, trace=FALSE){
  if(trace) print("enters polyn function")
  d.max ← dim(a)[2]
  n ← length(x)
  K ← length(d)

  # we create a matrix which indicates for each degree if the corresponding
      coefficient
  # is zero or non-zero, so that we can set it to zero in a
  Y ← matrix(sapply(d, function(y) c(rep(1,y), rep(0,d.max-y))), dim(a)[2], dim(a
      )[1])

  # we correct 'a' so that zero-coefficient terms are fixed at zero
  a.aux ← a*t(Y)

  # we create a matrix with x elevated to 1,2,...,deg.max
  X ← t(matrix(sapply(x, function(y) y^(1:d.max)),d.max, n))

  # we evaluate the polynomials by applying the dot product of each row of a.aux
  # with each row of X
  P ← t(sapply(1:n, function(i) sapply(1:K, function(K) sum(X[i,]*a.aux[K,]))))
```

```
595   if(trace) print("exits sim.sem function")
596   return(P)
597 }
598 
599 ##########################################################################
600 #' A function for simulating an additive genetic expression SEM
601 #'
602 #' This function simulates a sem with the structure described in section 4.3.1 (
      see DAG therein)
603 #' The sem must be specified in a list such as is produced by the functions sim.
      sem or sim.sem.sparse.
604 #'
605 #' @param sem: an additive gene experession SEM specified in a list.
606 #' @param y.c.signal: the ratio of the standard deviation of the y variable to
      the
607 #' standard deviation of the c variables which is 1.
608 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
609 #'
610 #' @return a list with:
611 #     y       - observations for y variable
612 #     cs      - observations for c_l variables for all l
613 #     hs      - observations for h_k variables for all k
614 #     xs      - observations for x_j variables for all j
615 #     xs0     - observations for x_j variables for all j under null: f_{x_j}(y)=0.
616 #     fx      - observations of y evaluated at f_{x_j} for all j
617 #     exp.xs - expected value of x_j observations given y and h_k observations (i.
      e without white noise)
618 #     fh      - observations of y evaluated at f_{h_k} for all k
619 #     fg      - observations of y evaluated at f_j for all j
620 #     nx      - observations of N_{x_j} for all j
621 #'
622 sim.lin ← function(sem, n, sigma, y.c.signal, trace=FALSE){
623   if(trace) print("enters sim.lin function")
624   J ← dim(sem$fx.a)[1]
625   K ← dim(sem$fh.a)[1]
626   y ← rnorm(n, 0, sd=y.c.signal)
627   nx ← matrix(rnorm(n*J,0, sd=sigma), n, J)
628   cs ← matrix(rnorm(n*K, 0, 1),n,K)
629   fh ← polyn(x=y, d=sem$fh.d, a=sem$fh.a, trace)
630   hs ← cs + fh
631   fx ← polyn(y, sem$fx.d, sem$fx.a, trace)
632   fg ← fx + fh%*%sem$beta
633   exp.xs ← fx +hs%*%sem$beta
634   xs ←   exp.xs + nx
635   xs0 ← hs%*%sem$beta + nx
636   if(trace) print("exits sim.lin function")
637   return(list(y=y,cs=cs,hs=hs, xs=xs, xs0=xs0, fx=fx, exp.xs=exp.xs, fh=fh, fg=fg
        , nx=nx))
638 }
639 
640 
641 ##########################################################################
642 #' A function for calculating p-values for J hypothesis tests H_{j0}: f_{x_j}(y)
      =0
643 #'
644 #' This function calculates the J p-values for multiple hypotheses H_{j0}: f_{x_j
      }(y)=0
645 #' from the regression model x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + sum_{l=1}^L beta_{l}*c_l +
      epsilon_j  where j in {1,...,J}
646 #'
647 #' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data including standard
      basis variables from standard basis function model f(y) and c_l vars
648 #' @param x: x_j ariable matrix in reals^{n x J}
649 #' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
650 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
651 #'
652 #' @return p.val: The J pvalues one for each regression model
653 #'
654 pval ← function(mod, x, ord, trace=FALSE){
655   if(trace) print("enters pval function")
```

```
  n ← dim(x)[1]
  C ← diag(dim(mod)[2])
  C ← matrix(C[2:(ord+1),],ord,dim(C)[2])
  q ← dim(C)[1]
  r ← dim(C)[2]
  g ← rep(0,q)
  beta_hat ← solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod) %*% x
  #print("beta_hat")
  #print(beta_hat)
  res ← mod%*%beta_hat-x
  se2 ← diag(t(res)%*%res)/ (n-r)  #to match R's calculation we devide by n-r
      instead of n-r-1
  #print("se2")
  #print(se2)
  Fstat ← diag(t(C%*%beta_hat-g)%*%solve(C%*%solve(t(mod)%*%mod)%*%t(C))%*%(C %*%
      beta_hat-g)) / (q*se2)
  #print("Fstat")
  #print(Fstat)
  p.val ← 1-pf(Fstat, df1=q, df2=n-r)
  if(trace) print("exits pval function")
  return(p.val)
}

##########################################################################
#' A function for calculating the mean absolute error in the estimation of f_{x_j
    }(y) at points y_1,...,y_n
#'
#' This function calculates the mean absolute error in the estimation of f_{x_j}(
    y). The real values of f_{x_j}(y)
#' are passed and also the estimated ones in the form of the matrix mod which
    contains the standard basis model for y.
#'
#' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data consisting of standard
     basis variables from standard basis function model f(y)
#' @param x: x_j ariable matrix in reals^{n x J}
#' @param fx.real: the real function f_{x_j}(y) evaluated at observed points y_
    1,...,y_n
#' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
#' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
#'
#' @return err.fx: The mean absolute error of hat{f_{x_j}(y)} at y_1,...,y_n
#'

fx.err ← function(mod, x, fx.real, ord, trace=FALSE){
  if(trace) print("enters fx.err function")
  beta_hat ← solve(t(mod) %*% mod) %*% t(mod) %*% x
  #print("beta_hat")
  #print(beta_hat)
  fx ← mod[,1:(ord+1)] %*% beta_hat[1:(ord+1),]
  err.fx ← apply(abs(fx-fx.real), 2, mean)
  if(trace) print("exits fx.err function")
  return(err.fx)
}


##########################################################################
#' A function for calculating the 5 performance measures for the different
    methods (where possible): SVA, SVDR, SVDX, VANILLA
#'
#' With the simulated gene expression SEM, the standard basis variables and the
    estimated surrogate variables
#' this function constructs the various performance measures: estimation of c_l
    node span, estimation of h_k node span,
#' y-span{h_k} dependence, f_{x_j} estimation and validity of significance
    analysis.
#'
#' @param sem.sim: simulation of sem which includes a simulation under the null (
    f_{x_j}(y)=0 for all j) and under alternative.
#' @param sva.lin: estimated SVA model, including surrogate variables, with
    alternative hypothesis simulation
```

```
713 #' @param sva.lin0: estimated SVA model, including surrogate variables, with null
        hypothesis simulation
714 #' @param mod: The model matrix being used to fit the data consisting of standard
        basis variables from standard basis function model f(y)
715 #' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
716 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
717 #'
718 #' @return a list with:
719 #     cancor.cs.sva  - % overlap between estimated c_l-node span and real c_l-node
        span. Using canonical correlation analysis (CCA) we measure _what % of the
      linear span of c_l and \hat{c}_l is shared. Since SVA is the only method that
        estimates the span of c_l differently to the span of h_k we only measure
      this for the SVA method.
720 #     cancor.hs      - % overlap between estimated h_k-node span and real h_k-node
        span (using CCA). In this case we are able to compare the SVA, SVDR and SVDX
        methods since each has an estimate for h_k
721 #     r2yh           - R2 between real y and h_k nodes minus R2 between real y and
        estimated h_k nodes. The R2 corresponds to a simple linear regression with y
        as the independent variable and h_k or \hat{h}_k as the dependent variables.
722 #     err.fx         - Mean absolute error in estimation of f_{x_j}(y) at y_1,...,
      y_n
723 #     pval0          - P-values for hypothesis test H_{j0}: f_{x_j}(y)=0 under
      null (that is we simulated f_{x_j}(y)=0 for all j)
724 #     ext.rate       - Number of C-nodes extracted by sva algorithm as a % of the
      initial number detected by num.sv
725 #'
726 measures.sem ← function(sem.sim, sva.lin, sva.lin0, mod, ord, trace=FALSE){
727   if(trace) print("enters measures.sim")
728   K ← dim(sem.sim$cs)[2]
729
730   #I. sum of K max correlations between real and estimated c-nodes (only for SVA)
731     #SVA
732     if(trace) print("calculate c-node overlap")
733     cancor.cs.sva ← sum(cancor(sem.sim$cs, sva.lin$svd.r, xcenter = TRUE, ycenter
          = TRUE)$cor)/K
734
735
736   #II. sum of K max correlations between real and estimated h-nodes (surrogate
        variables)
737     #SVA
738     if(trace) print("calculate h-node overlap")
739     cancor.hs.sva ← sum(cancor(sem.sim$hs, sva.lin$sv, xcenter = TRUE, ycenter =
          TRUE)$cor)/K
740     #SVD.X
741     cancor.hs.svdx ← sum(cancor(sem.sim$hs, sva.lin$svd.x, xcenter = TRUE,
          ycenter = TRUE)$cor)/K
742     #SVD.R
743     cancor.hs.svdr ← sum(cancor(sem.sim$hs, sva.lin$svd.r, xcenter = TRUE,
          ycenter = TRUE)$cor)/K
744     #ALL
745     cancor.hs ← c(sva=cancor.hs.sva, svdx=cancor.hs.svdx, svdr=cancor.hs.svdr)
746
747
748   #III. Measure correlation between y and real h-nodes and y and estimated h
        nodes
749     if(trace) print("estimate y-h correlation")
750     r2y.h    ← summary(lm(sem.sim$y∼sem.sim$hs))$r.squared
751     #SVA
752     r2y.hhat ← summary(lm(sem.sim$y∼sva.lin$sv))$r.squared
753     r2yh.sva ← r2y.h - r2y.hhat
754     #SVD.X
755     r2y.hhat ← summary(lm(sem.sim$y∼sva.lin$svd.x))$r.squared
756     r2yh.svdx ← r2y.h - r2y.hhat
757     #SVD.R
758     r2y.hhat ← summary(lm(sem.sim$y∼sva.lin$svd.r))$r.squared
759     r2yh.svdr ← r2y.h - r2y.hhat
760     #ALL
761     r2yh ← c(sva=r2yh.sva, svdx=r2yh.svdx, svdr=r2yh.svdr)
762
```

```
763   #IV. Sum of squares of fx estimation for 2 models, and 3 different surrogate
          variable estimations
764     if(trace) print("estimate fx estimation error")
765     #SVA
766     mod.sva   <- cbind(mod, sva.lin$sv)
767     err.fx.sva <- mean(fx.err(mod=mod.sva, x=sem.sim$xs , fx.real=sem.sim$fx, ord,
            trace))
768     #SVD.X
769     mod.svdx   <- cbind(mod, sva.lin$svd.x)
770     err.fx.svdx <- mean(fx.err(mod=mod.svdx, x=sem.sim$xs , fx.real=sem.sim$fx,
            ord, trace))
771     #SVD.R
772     mod.svdr   <- cbind(mod, sva.lin$svd.r)
773     err.fx.svdr <- mean(fx.err(mod=mod.svdr, x=sem.sim$xs , fx.real=sem.sim$fx,
            ord, trace))
774     #vanilla
775     err.fx.van <- mean(fx.err(mod, x=sem.sim$xs , fx.real=sem.sim$fx, ord, trace))
776     #ALL
777     err.fx <- c(sva=err.fx.sva, svdx=err.fx.svdx, svdr=err.fx.svdr, van=err.fx.van
            )
778
779   #V. Null p-values for 2 models, and 3 different surrogate variable estimations
780     if(trace) print("calculate null p-values")
781     #SVA
782     mod.sva0   <- cbind(mod, sva.lin0$sv)
783     pval.sva0 <- pval(mod=mod.sva0, x=sem.sim$xs0, ord, trace)
784     #SVDX
785     mod.svdx0  <- cbind(mod, sva.lin0$svd.x)
786     pval.svdx0 <- pval(mod=mod.svdx0, x=sem.sim$xs0, ord, trace)
787     #SVDR
788     mod.svdr0  <- cbind(mod, sva.lin0$svd.r)
789     pval.svdr0 <- pval(mod=mod.svdr0, x=sem.sim$xs0, ord, trace)
790     #VANILLA
791     pval.van0 <- pval(mod=mod, x=sem.sim$xs0, ord, trace)
792     #ALL
793     pval0 <- cbind(sva=pval.sva0, svdx=pval.svdx0, svdr=pval.svdr0, van=pval.van0)
794
795   #VI. Number of C-nodes extracted by significance algorithm as a % of the
          initial number detected by num.sv
796     ext.rate <- sva.lin$n.sv.r/ sva.lin$n.sv.r.ini
797
798     if(trace) print("exits measures.sim")
799   return(list(cancor.cs.sva=cancor.cs.sva, cancor.hs=cancor.hs, r2yh=r2yh, err.fx
          =err.fx, pval0=pval0, ext.rate=ext.rate))
800 }
801
802 ##########################################################################
803 #' A function which fits the four regression models - SVA, SVDR, SVDX and VANILLA
        - and calculates its various components
804 #'
805 #' This function fits the four regression models to the simulated sem sem.sim:
806 #' 1) x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + sum_{i=1}^K \hat{h}^{SVA}_k  + epsilon_j (SVA)
807 #' 2) x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + sum_{i=1}^K \hat{h}^{SVDR}_k + epsilon_j (SVDR)
808 #' 3) x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + sum_{i=1}^K \hat{h}^{SVDX}_k + epsilon_j (SVDX)
809 #' 4) x_j = f_{x_j}(y)                                + epsilon_j (VANILLA)
810 #'
811 #' Also calculates various model components such as model design matrix, hat
       matrix,
812 #' expected/estimated x_j, beta_hat, f_{x_j}(y) and f_j(y) for y1,...,y_n and
       residuals.
813 #'
814 #' @param sem.sim: simulation of sem which includes a simulation under the null (
       f_{x_j}(y)=0 for all j) and under alternative.
815 #' @param sva.lin: estimated SVA model, including surrogate variables, with
       alternative hypothesis simulation
816 #' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
817 #'
818 #' @return a list with:
819 #    x.hat       -  an array (reals^{n x 5 x J}) with expected x_j for SVA, SVDR,
       SVDX, VANILLA and real data  (without noise)
```

```
#     fg.hat      -  an array (reals^{n x 3 x J}) with estimated f_j(y) for y_1,...,y_n for SVA, VANILLA and real data
#     fx.hat      -  an array (reals^{n x 4 x J}) with estimated f_{x_j}(y) for y_1,...,y_n for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and real data
#     betah.hat   -  an array (reals^{n x 4 x J}) with estimated sum_{k=1}^k beta_{kj} for SVA, SVDR, SVDX and real data
#     res         -  an array (reals^{n x 5 x J}) with estimated residuals for SVA, SVDR, SVDX, VANILLA and real data
#'
get.Models <- function(sem.sim, sva.lin, ord){
  reps <- dim(sem.sim$xs)[1]
  J <- dim(sem.sim$xs)[2]

  # Vanilla model
  mod.van <- model.matrix(~poly(sem.sim$y, ord, raw=TRUE))
  H.van <- mod.van %*% solve(t(mod.van) %*% mod.van) %*% t(mod.van)
  x.van.hat <-  H.van %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.van.hat <- solve(t(mod.van) %*% mod.van) %*% t(mod.van) %*% sem.sim$xs
  res.van <- sem.sim$xs - x.van.hat

  # SVA model
  mod.sva <- cbind(mod.van, sva.lin$sv)
  H.sva <- mod.sva %*% solve(t(mod.sva) %*% mod.sva) %*% t(mod.sva)
  x.sva.hat <-  H.sva %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.sva.hat <- solve(t(mod.sva) %*% mod.sva) %*% t(mod.sva) %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.sva.sv.hat <- matrix(beta.sva.hat[(ord+2):dim(beta.sva.hat)[1],], dim(sva.lin$sv)[2], dim(beta.sva.hat)[2])
  fx.sva.hat <- mod.sva[,1:(ord+1)] %*% beta.sva.hat[1:(ord+1),]
  fg.sva.hat <- fx.sva.hat +  (sva.lin$sv - sva.lin$svd.r.red) %*% beta.sva.sv.hat
  res.sva <- sem.sim$xs - x.sva.hat
  beta.hs.sva.hat <- sva.lin$sv %*% beta.sva.sv.hat

  # SVD.R model
  mod.svdr <- cbind(mod.van, sva.lin$svd.r)
  H.svdr <- mod.svdr %*% solve(t(mod.svdr) %*% mod.svdr) %*% t(mod.svdr)
  x.svdr.hat <-  H.svdr %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.svdr.hat <- solve(t(mod.svdr) %*% mod.svdr) %*% t(mod.svdr) %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.svdr.sv.hat <- matrix(beta.svdr.hat[(ord+2):dim(beta.svdr.hat)[1],], dim(sva.lin$svd.r)[2], dim(beta.svdr.hat)[2])
  fx.svdr.hat <- mod.svdr[,1:(ord+1)] %*% beta.svdr.hat[1:(ord+1),]
  res.svdr <- sem.sim$xs - x.svdr.hat
  beta.hs.svdr.hat <- sva.lin$svd.r %*% beta.svdr.sv.hat

  # SVD.X model
  mod.svdx <- cbind(mod.van, sva.lin$svd.x)
  H.svdx <- mod.svdx %*% solve(t(mod.svdx) %*% mod.svdx) %*% t(mod.svdx)
  x.svdx.hat <-  H.svdx %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.svdx.hat <- solve(t(mod.svdx) %*% mod.svdx) %*% t(mod.svdx) %*% sem.sim$xs
  beta.svdx.sv.hat <- matrix(beta.svdx.hat[(ord+2):dim(beta.svdx.hat)[1],], dim(sva.lin$svd.x)[2], dim(beta.svdx.hat)[2])
  fx.svdx.hat <- mod.svdx[,1:(ord+1)] %*% beta.svdx.hat[1:(ord+1),]
  res.svdx <- sem.sim$xs - x.svdx.hat
  beta.hs.svdx.hat <- sva.lin$svd.x %*% beta.svdx.sv.hat


  # Real
  beta.hs.real.hat <- sem.sim$hs %*% sem.lin$beta

  x.hat <- abind(real=sem.sim$exp.xs, van=x.van.hat, sva=x.sva.hat, svdr=x.svdr.hat, svdx=x.svdx.hat, along=3)
  dimnames(x.hat) <- list(reps=1:reps, J=1:J, method=c("real","van","sva","svdr","svdx"))
  fg.hat <- abind(real=sem.sim$fg, van=x.van.hat, sva=fg.sva.hat, along=3)
  dimnames(fg.hat) <- list(reps=1:reps, J=1:J, method=c("real","van","sva"))
  fx.hat <- abind(real=sem.sim$fx, sva=fx.sva.hat, svdr=fx.svdr.hat, svdx=fx.svdx.hat, along=3)
  dimnames(fx.hat) <- list(reps=1:reps, J=1:J, method=c("real","sva","svdr","svdx"))
  betah.hat <- abind(real=beta.hs.real.hat, sva=beta.hs.sva.hat, svdr=beta.hs.svdr.hat, svdx=beta.hs.svdx.hat, along=3)
```

```
878   dimnames(betah.hat) ← list(reps=1:reps, J=1:J, method=c("real","sva","svdr","
          svdx"))
879   res ← abind(real=sem.sim$nx, van=res.van, sva=res.sva, svdr=res.svdr, svdx=res.
          svdx, along=3)
880   dimnames(res) ← list(reps=1:reps, J=1:J, method=c("real","van","sva","svdr","
          svdx"))
881
882   return(list(x.hat=x.hat, fg.hat=fg.hat, fx.hat=fx.hat, betah.hat=betah.hat, res
          =res))
883 }
884
885 ##########################################################################
886 #' Simulates a SEM and then n observations of that SEM once. Calculates surrogate
        variables and performance measures.
887 #'
888 #' This function  first simulates a SEM (i.e. simulates the parameters which
       define an additive gene expression SEM)
889 #' then performs n observations of that SEM once. It then fits 4 models and
       calculates performance measures.
890 #'
891 #' @param K: The number of "c" and "h" nodes (number of eigengenes)
892 #' @param J: The number of "x" nodes (number of genes)
893 #' @param deg.max: The maximum degree of the polynomial functions
894 #' @param n: the number of observations of the sem to simulate.
895 #' @param sigma: the standard deviation of the N_{x_j} noise variables.
896 #' @param y.c.signal: the ratio of the standard deviation of the y variable to
       the
897 #' standard deviation of the c variables which is 1.
898 #' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
899 #' @param sem: an additive gene expression SEM specified in a list.
900 #' @param cheat: if TRUE the real beta is passed to sva.lin so that it can
901 #' calculate the enriched matrix based on beta
902 #' @param sparse: if TRUE simulates a SEM with controlled sparsity
903 #' @param p0_fh: The proportion of fh(y)=0 functions
904 #' @param p0_fx: The proportion of fx(y)=0 functions
905 #' @param p_isox: The proportion of xs d-separated from y
906 #' @param p0_beta: The minimum proportion of betas = 0
907 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
908 #'
909 #' @return msrs.sem: the performance measures for the simulation as produced by
       function measures.sem
910 #'
911 do.one.rep ← function(K, J, deg.max, n, sigma, y.c.signal, ord, sem=NULL, cheat=
        FALSE, sparse=FALSE, p0_fh=0, p0_fx=0, p_isox=0, p0_beta=0, trace=FALSE){
912   if(trace) print("enters do.one.rep")
913
914   # Simulate the SEM from class of SEMS
915   if(trace) print("simulate sem structure")
916   if(is.null(sem)){
917     if(!sparse){
918       sem.lin ← sim.sem(K, J, deg.max, trace)
919     } else{
920       sem.lin ← sim.sem.sparse(K, J, deg.max, p0_fh, p0_fx, p_isox, p0_beta, beta
              =NULL, trace=trace)
921     }
922   } else{
923     sem.lin ← sem
924   }
925
926   # Simulate the repetitions of the hole SEM which is now fixed
927   if(trace) print("simulate sem realization")
928   sem.sim ← sim.lin(sem.lin, n, sigma, y.c.signal,  trace)
929
930   # estimate surrogate variables
931   mod ← model.matrix(~poly(sem.sim$y, ord, raw=TRUE))
932
933
934   if(cheat){
935     n.sv.r ← min(n,K)                #normally should be n.sv.r ← num.sv(dat, mod
          )
```

```
936     n.sv.x ← min(min(n,J),2*K)              #normally should be n.sv.x ← fa.
            parallel(cor(t(dat)))
937     beta ← sem.lin$beta       #normally should be NULL
938
939   } else{
940     n.sv.r ← max(2,num.sv(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), mod))
941     n.sv.x ← n.sv.r #min(min(n,J),2*K)  #max(3, fa.parallel(t(sem.sim$xs), fa="pc
            ", n.iter=20)$ncomp)
942     beta ← NULL
943   }
944
945   if(trace) print("estimate sv's")
946   sva.lin   ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=
          n.sv.x, beta=beta, trace)
947   sva.lin0 ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs0), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=
          n.sv.x, beta=beta, trace)
948
949   # Calculate some performance measures for our simulated sem
950   if(trace) print("calculate performance measures")
951
952   msrs.sem ← measures.sem(sem.sim, sva.lin, sva.lin0, mod, ord, trace)
953
954   if(trace) print("exits do.one.rep")
955   return(msrs.sem)
956
957 }
958
959 ##########################################################################
960 #' Simulates a SEM and then n observations of that SEM reps times. Calculates
        surrogate variables and performance measures
961 #' for each rep and then collects and orders them.
962 #'
963 #' This function calls do.one.rep which first simulates a SEM (i.e. simulates the
        parameters which define an additive gene expression SEM)
964 #' then performs n observations of that SEM. It then fits 4 models and calculates
        performance measures. Repeats M times and then collects
965 #' and orders all the performance measures.
966 #'
967 #' @param reps: Number of times it will simulate an additive gene expression SEM
        with n observations
968 #' @param K: The number of "c" and "h" nodes (number of eigengenes)
969 #' @param J: The number of "x" nodes (number of genes)
970 #' @param deg.max: The maximum degree of the polynomial functions
971 #' @param n: the number of observations of the sem to simulate.
972 #' @param sigma: the standard deviation of the N_{x_j} noise variables.
973 #' @param y.c.signal: the ratio of the standard deviation of the y variable to
        the
974 #' standard deviation of the c variables which is 1.
975 #' @param ord: order of the polynomial standard basis model f(y)
976 #' @param sem: an additive gene expression SEM specified in a list.
977 #' @param cheat: if TRUE the real beta is passed to sva.lin so that it can
978 #' calculate the enriched matrix based on beta
979 #' @param sparse: if TRUE simulates a SEM with controlled sparsity
980 #' @param p0_fh: The proportion of fh(y)=0 functions
981 #' @param p0_fx: The proportion of fx(y)=0 functions
982 #' @param p_isox: The proportion of xs d-separated from y
983 #' @param p0_beta: The minimum proportion of betas = 0
984 #' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
985 #'
986 #' @return a list with following matrices (matrices in reals^{no.reps x no.
        methods}):
987 #     cancor.cs.sva  - % overlap between estimated c_l-node span and real c_l-node
        span
988 #     cancor.hs      - % overlap between estimated h_k-node span and real h_k-node
        span
989 #     r2yh           - R2 between real y and h_k nodes minus R2 between real y and
        estimated h_k nodes.
990 #     err.fx         - Mean absolute error in estimation of f_{x_j}(y) at y_1,...,
        y_n
```

```
#     ks.nested       - nested KS statistic for hypothesis H0: nested null p-values uniformly distributed
#     count.no.svs    - number of repetitions where no surrogate variable was able to be calculated
#     ext.rate        - Number of C-nodes extracted by sva algorithm as a % of the initial number detected by num.sv
#'
do.n.reps <- function(reps, K, J, deg.max, n, sigma, y.c.signal, ord, sem=NULL, cheat=FALSE, sparse=FALSE, p0_fh=0, p0_fx=0, p_isox=0, p0_beta=0, trace=FALSE){
  if(trace) print("enters do.n.reps")

  count.no.svs <- 0
  count <- 0
  mrs.sem.list <- list()
  for(i in 1:reps){
     print("***********************************")
     print(paste("sim: ",i, sep=""))
     print("***********************************")
     res <- try(do.one.rep(K,J,deg.max,n,sigma, y.c.signal, ord,sem, cheat, sparse, p0_fh, p0_fx, p_isox, p0_beta, trace))
     if(inherits(res, "try-error")){
       count.no.svs <- count.no.svs + 1
     } else{
       count <- count + 1
       mrs.sem.list[[count]] <- res

     }

   }

  cancor.cs.sva <- sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$cancor.cs.sva)
  cancor.hs <- t(sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$cancor.hs, simplify="array"))
  r2yh <- t(sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$r2yh, simplify="array"))
  err.fx <- t(sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$err.fx, simplify="array"))
  pval0 <- sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$pval0, simplify="array")
  dimnames(pval0) <- list(J=1:J, method=c("sva","svdx","svdr","van"), rep=1:count)
  ks.outer <- apply(pval0,c("method","rep"), function(el) ks.test(el, "punif", alternative = "two.sided")$p.value)
  ks.nested <- apply(pval0, "method", function(el){
    test <- ks.test(el, "punif",alternative = "two.sided")
    return(c(stat=test$statistic, pval=test$p.value))
  })
  ext.rate <- sapply(mrs.sem.list, function(el) el$ext.rate)
  if(trace) print("exits do.n.reps")
    return(list(cancor.cs.sva=cancor.cs.sva, cancor.hs=cancor.hs, r2yh=r2yh, err.fx=err.fx, ks.nested=ks.nested, count.no.svs=count.no.svs, ext.rate=ext.rate))
}

##########################################################################
#' Performs sensibility analysis by simulating reps repetitions of n observations for each parameter set.
#'
#' This function calls do.n.reps once for each row of data.frame params which contains one column for each simulation parameter.
#'
#' @param reps: Number of times it will simulate an additive gene expression SEM with n observations
#' @param params: A data.frame containing one row per parameter set and one column per parameter (K, J, d_max, n, sigma_{x_j}, sigma_{c_l}, ord, p_{0k}, p_{0j}, p_{\dsep} and p:{0\beta})
#' @param sem: an additive gene expression SEM specified in a list.
#' @param cheat: if TRUE the real beta is passed to sva.lin so that it can
#' calculate the enriched matrix based on beta
#' @param sparse: if TRUE simulates a SEM with controlled sparsity
#' @param trace: whether or not to print out a trace of steps carried out
#'
```

```
#' @return a list with following matrices (arrays in reals^{no.reps x no.methods x no.parameter sets}):
#     cancor.cs.sva  - % overlap between estimated c_l-node span and real c_l-node span
#     cancor.hs      - % overlap between estimated h_k-node span and real h_k-node span
#     r2yh           - R2 between real y and h_k nodes minus R2 between real y and estimated h_k nodes.
#     err.fx         - Mean absolute error in estimation of f_{x_j}(y) at y_1,..., y_n
#     ks.nested      - nested KS statistic for hypothesis H0: nested null p-values uniformly distributed
#     count.no.svs   - number of repetitions where no surrogate variable was able to be calculated
#     ext.rate       - Number of C-nodes extracted by sva algorithm as a % of the initial number detected by num.sv
#'
sens.model <- function(reps, params, sem=NULL ,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=FALSE){
  res <- list()
  for(i in 1:dim(params)[1]){
    print("******************************")
    print(paste("parameter set: ", i, sep=""))
    print("parameters: ")
    print(params[i,])
    res[[i]] <- do.n.reps(reps, K=params$K[i], J=params$J[i], deg.max=params$deg.max[i], n=params$n[i], sigma=params$sigma[i], y.c.signal=params$y.c.signal[i], ord=params$ord[i], sem=sem ,cheat=cheat, sparse=sparse, p0_fh=params$p0_fh[i], p0_fx=params$p0_fx[i], p_isox=params$p_isox[i], p0_beta=params$p0_beta[i], trace=trace)
    print("******************************")
  }

  count.no.svs <- sapply(res, function(el) el$count.no.svs)
  ext.rate <- sapply(res, function(el) el$ext.rate)
  cancor.cs.sva <- sapply(res, function(el) el$cancor.cs.sva)
  cancor.hs <- sapply(res, function(el) el$cancor.hs, simplify="array")
  r2yh <- sapply(res, function(el) el$r2yh, simplify="array")
  err.fx <- sapply(res, function(el) el$err.fx, simplify="array")
  ks.nested <- sapply(res, function(el) el$ks.nested[1,], simplify="array")

  return(list(cancor.cs.sva=cancor.cs.sva, cancor.hs=cancor.hs, r2yh=r2yh, err.fx=err.fx, ks.nested=ks.nested, count.no.svs=count.no.svs, ext.rate=ext.rate))
}

##########################################################################
#' Graphs n observations a simulated gene expression SEM and one or more of the different estimation methods for one j in {1,...,J}
#'
#' Produces 5 graphs comparing different components of each estimated model:
#'
#' @param sem.sim: simulation of sem which includes a simulation under the null (f_{x_j}(y)=0 for all j) and under alternative.
#' @param models: list of arrays containing the model components for all methods as produced by function get.Models
#' @param select: models which one wants to compare. Must be one or more of real, sva, svdr, svdx and van
#' @param j: model x_j = f_{x_j}(y) + sum_{k=1}^K beta_{kj}h_k + epsilon_j with j in {1,...,J} that one wants to visualize
#'
graph.Models <- function(sem.sim, models, select = c("real","sva","svdr","svdx","van"), j){

  x.hat     <- models$x.hat[,j,]
  fg.hat    <- models$fg.hat[,j,]
  fx.hat    <- models$fx.hat[,j,]
  betah.hat <- models$betah.hat[,j,]
  res       <- models$res[,j,]
  indx <- order(sem.sim$y)
```

```
1094    tab ← data.frame(select = c("real","sva","svdr","svdx","van"), cols = c("
            black","green","red","brown","blue"), labs=c('real','SVA','SVD.R',"SVD.X"
            ,'vanilla'), stringsAsFactors=F)
1095
1096  #compare SVA, SVD.r, SVD.x and Vanilla model
1097    #1) E[x|y]
1098    select.aux ← intersect(select, colnames(x.hat))
1099    key ← match(select.aux, tab$select)
1100    sel ← match(select.aux, colnames(x.hat))
1101    rng ← range(cbind(x.hat[,sel],sem.sim$xs[,j]))
1102    plot(sem.sim$y[indx], sem.sim$xs[indx,j], main=paste("E[x_",j, "|y] ",sep="")
            , xlab="y", ylab="f(y)", ylim=rng)
1103    for(k in 1:length(sel)) lines(sem.sim$y[indx], x.hat[indx, sel[k]] , col=tab$
            cols[key[k]])
1104    legend('bottomright', legend=tab$labs[key], col=tab$cols[key], lwd=rep(3.5,
            length(sel)))
1105
1106    #2) f_g
1107    select.aux ← intersect(select, colnames(fg.hat))
1108    key ← match(select.aux, tab$select)
1109    sel ← match(select.aux, colnames(fg.hat))
1110    rng ← range(cbind(fg.hat[,sel],sem.sim$xs[,j]))
1111    plot(sem.sim$y[indx], sem.sim$xs[indx,j], main=paste("f(y)=f_x_",j, "(y) +
            beta*f_h(y) ",sep=""), xlab="y", ylab="f(y)", ylim=rng)
1112    for(k in 1:length(sel)) lines(sem.sim$y[indx], fg.hat[indx, sel[k]] , col=tab
            $cols[key[k]])
1113    legend('bottomright', legend=tab$labs[key], col=tab$cols[key], lwd=rep(3.5,
            length(sel)))
1114
1115    # 3) fx
1116    select.aux ← intersect(select, colnames(fx.hat))
1117    key ← match(select.aux, tab$select)
1118    sel ← match(select.aux, colnames(fx.hat))
1119    rng ← range(cbind(sem.sim$xs[,j], fx.hat[,sel]))
1120    plot(sem.sim$y[indx], sem.sim$xs[indx,j], main=paste("f_x_",j, "(y) ",sep="")
            , xlab="y", ylab="f(y)", ylim=rng)
1121    for(k in sel) lines(sem.sim$y[indx], fx.hat[indx,sel[k]],col=tab$cols[key[k
            ]])
1122    legend('bottomright', legend=tab$labs[key], col=tab$cols[key], lwd=rep(3.5,
            length(sel)))
1123
1124    #4) beta*h
1125    select.aux ← setdiff(intersect(select, colnames(betah.hat)),"real")
1126    key ← match(select.aux, tab$select)
1127    sel ← match(select.aux, colnames(betah.hat))
1128    rng ← range(betah.hat[,sel])
1129    plot(1,1, col="white", main=paste("beta*h_",j, "vs beta_hat*h_hat_",j,sep="")
            , xlab=paste("beta*h_",j,sep=""), ylab=paste("beta_hat*h_hat_",j,sep=""),
            ylim=rng, xlim=range(betah.hat[,"real"]))
1130    for(k in 1:length(sel)){
1131       lines(betah.hat[,"real"], betah.hat[,sel[k]],col=tab$cols[key[k]], type="p
               ", pch=k)
1132       if(! all(betah.hat[,"real"]==0)) abline(lm(betah.hat[,sel[k]]~betah.hat[,"
               real"]), col=tab$cols[key[k]])
1133    }
1134    abline(a=0,b=1, col="red")
1135
1136    legend('bottomright', legend=tab$labs[key], col=tab$cols[key], pch=1:length(
            sel))
1137
1138
1139    #5) residuals
1140    boxplot(res, main=paste("residuals E[x_",j, "|y]"))
1141    select.aux ← intersect(select, colnames(res))
1142    key ← match(select.aux, tab$select)
1143    sel ← match(select.aux, colnames(res))
1144    rng ← range(res[,sel])
1145    plot(1, 1, col="white", main=paste("Tukey Anscombe residuals E[x_",j,"|y]",
            sep=""), xlab="beta*h", ylab="", ylim=rng, xlim=range(betah.hat[,"real"])
            )
```

```
1146      indx.x ← order(betah.hat[, "real"])
1147      for(k in 1:length(sel)){
1148        lines(betah.hat[,"real"], res[,sel[k]], type="p", col=tab$cols[key[k]], pch
              =k)
1149        if(! all(betah.hat[,"real"]==0)){
1150          sm ← smooth.spline(betah.hat[indx.x, "real"], res[indx.x, sel[k]])
1151          lines(sm, col=tab$cols[key[k]])
1152        }
1153      }
1154      legend('bottomright', legend=tab$labs[key], col=tab$cols[key], pch=1:length(
            sel),lwd=rep(3.5, length(sel)))
1155  }
1156
1157  ##########################################################################
1158  #' Produces boxplots of a perfromance measure for one set of parameters for
        different methods
1159  #'
1160  #' It is used to produce plots for all performance measures. Each boxplot
        corresponds to one method.
1161  #'
1162  #' @param mat: A matrix with n rows, one per observation, and p columns one per
        level of the sensibility parameter
1163  #' @param title: desired title for plot
1164  #'
1165  boxPlot ← function(mat, title){
1166    data ← melt(mat)
1167    colnames(data) ← c("rep","method","value")
1168    p ← ggplot(data)
1169    p ← p + geom_boxplot(aes(x=method, y=value))
1170    p ← p + ggtitle(title)
1171    p
1172  }
1173
1174  ##########################################################################
1175  #' Produces boxplots of a performance measure for one method accross a set of
        parameters
1176  #'
1177  #' It is used to produce the sensibility c_l-node estimation plot which only
        applies to SVA method. Each boxplot
1178  #' corresponds to one parameter
1179  #'
1180  #' @param mat: A matrix with n rows, one per observation, and p columns one per
        level of the sensibility parameter
1181  #' @param title: desired title for plot
1182  #'
1183  boxPlot2 ← function(mat, labs, xaxis, yaxis, title){
1184    data ← melt(mat)
1185    colnames(data) ← c("rep","param","value")
1186    data$param ← as.factor(data$param)
1187    p ← ggplot(data)
1188    p ← p + geom_boxplot(aes(x=param, y=value))
1189    p ← p + ggtitle(title)
1190    p ← p + scale_x_discrete(breaks=levels(data$param),labels=labs)
1191    p ← p + xlab(xaxis) + ylab(yaxis)
1192    p
1193  }
1194
1195  ##########################################################################
1196  #' Produces boxplots of a performance measure for various methods accross a set
        of parameters
1197  #'
1198  #' It is used to produce the sensibility h_k-node, h_k-y dependence and f_{x_j}
        estimation plots which apply to various methods.
1199  #' Each group of boxplots corresponds to one parameter, each color to a different
         estimation method (SVA, SVDR, SVDX, VAN).
1200  #'
1201  #' @param mat: An array in reals^{n x num.methods x num.params}
1202  #' @param labs: labels for x-axis (changing parameter values)
1203  #' @param xaxis: x-axis title
1204  #' @param yaxis: y-axis title
```

```
#' @param title: desired title for plot
#'
boxPlot3 ← function(mat, labs, xaxis, yaxis,  title){
  data ← melt(mat)
  colnames(data) ← c("rep","method","param","value")
  data$param ← as.factor(data$param)

  p ← ggplot(data)
  p ← p + geom_boxplot(aes(x=param, y=value, fill=method))
  #p ← p + facet_grid(method~.)
  p ← p + ggtitle(title)
  p ← p + scale_x_discrete(breaks=levels(data$param),labels=labs)
  p ← p + xlab(xaxis) + ylab(yaxis)
  p
}

#########################################################################
#' Produces a line graph of a nested ks statistics for various methods accross a set of parameters
#'
#' It is used to produce the nested ks-plot
#' Each line corresponds to one method accross the different parameter values
#'
#' @param ks.nested: An array in reals^{n x num.methods x num.params}
#' @param labs: labels for x-axis (changing parameter values)
#' @param xaxis: x-axis title
#' @param yaxis: y-axis title
#'
ks.plot ← function(ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis){
  plot(ks.nested[1,], ylim=range(ks.nested), main="Nested KS statistic", ylab=yaxis, xlab=xaxis, xaxt="n", type="b")
  for(i in 1:dim(ks.nested)[1]) lines(ks.nested[i,], col=i, type="b")
  axis(1, at=1:dim(ks.nested)[2],labels=labs)
  legend('bottomright', legend=rownames(ks.nested), col=1:dim(ks.nested)[1], lwd=rep(3.5, dim(ks.nested)[1]))
}
```

B.2 Script

```
#########################################################################
# SCRIPT
#########################################################################

library(reshape)
library(ggplot2)
library(sva)
library(abind) #bind arrays

source("./functions.R")

#########################################################################
# LOW DIMENSIONAL SEM
#########################################################################

# Simulate the SEM from class of SEMS
seed ← 4
K ← 4
J ← 4
deg.max ← 2
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0
p0_beta ← 0
set.seed(seed)
beta ← matrix(rnorm(k*m),k,m)
mat.indx ← matrix(c(2,3,3,3,4,4,4,1,2,4,2,4),6,2)
```

```
beta[mat.indx] ← 0
sem.lin ← sim.sem.sparse(K,J, deg.max,p0_fh, p0_fx, p_isox, p0_beta, beta)

# Simulate the repetitions of the hole SEM which is now fixed
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
set.seed(seed)
sem.sim ← sim.lin(sem=sem.lin, n, sigma, y.c.signal)

# estimate surrogate variables
ord ← deg.max
n.sv.r ← max(2,num.sv(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), mod))
n.sv.x ← min(min(n,m),2*k)  #max(3, fa.parallel(t(sem.sim$xs), fa="pc", n.iter
    =20)$ncomp)
beta ← NULL
mod ← model.matrix(~poly(sem.sim$y, ord, raw=TRUE))
sva.lin   ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.
    sv.x, beta=beta)
sva.lin0 ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs0), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.
    sv.x, beta=beta)

# Visualize different models
models ← get.Models(sem.sim, sva.lin, ord)
graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 1)
graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 2)
graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 3)
graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 4)


# Calculate some performance measures for our simulated sem
(msrs.sem ← measures.sem(sem.sim, sva.lin=sva.lin, sva.lin0=sva.lin0, mod, ord))

# Perform some repetitions

reps ← 1000
K ← 4
J ← 4
deg.max ← 1
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max


set.seed(1)
pm ← proc.time()
mrs.sem.reps ← do.n.reps(reps, K,J, deg.max, n, sigma, y.c.signal,  ord, sem=sem.
    lin ,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_
    beta=p0_beta, trace=TRUE)
proc.time() - pm

#217 seconds for reps = 10,000
#414 seconds for reps = 20,000

mrs.sem.reps$count.no.svs
hist(mrs.sem.reps$ext.rate, main="c-node extraction rate")
hist(mrs.sem.reps$cancor.cs.sva, main="c-node overlap SVA")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$cancor.hs, "h-node overlap")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$r2yh, "real r2 - est. r2 (y ~ hs)")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$err.fx, "mean absolute error")
mrs.sem.reps$ks.nested

#########################################################################
# HIGH DIMENSIONAL SEM
#########################################################################
```

```
93
94  # Simulate the SEM from class of SEMS
95  seed ← 4
96  K ← 10
97  J ← 1000
98  deg.max ← 2
99  p0_fh ← 0.5
100 p0_fx ← 0.5
101 p_isox ← 0.25
102 p0_beta ← 0.5
103 set.seed(seed)
104 sem.lin ← sim.sem.sparse(K,J, deg.max,p0_fh, p0_fx, p_isox, p0_beta)
105
106 # Simulate the repetitions of the hole SEM which is now fixed
107 n ← 100
108 sigma ← 1
109 y.c.signal ← 1
110 set.seed(seed)
111 sem.sim ← sim.lin(sem=sem.lin, n, sigma, y.c.signal)
112
113 # estimate surrogate variables
114 ord ← deg.max
115 mod ← model.matrix(~poly(sem.sim$y, ord, raw=TRUE))
116
117 n.sv.r ← max(2,num.sv(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), mod))
118 n.sv.x ← n.sv.r  #max(3, fa.parallel(t(sem.sim$xs), fa="pc", n.iter=20)$ncomp)
119 beta ← NULL
120
121 sva.lin  ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.
        sv.x, beta=beta)
122 sva.lin0 ← sva.mod(dat=t(sem.sim$xs0), y=sem.sim$y, mod, n.sv.r=n.sv.r, n.sv.x=n.
        sv.x, beta=beta)
123
124 # Visualize different models
125 models ← get.Models(sem.sim, sva.lin, ord)
126 graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 1)
127 graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 2544)
128 graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 6664)
129 graph.Models(sem.sim, models, select=c("real","sva","van"), 8532)
130
131
132 # Calculate some performance measures for our simulated sem
133 (msrs.sem ← measures.sem(sem.sim, sva.lin=sva.lin, sva.lin0=sva.lin0, mod, ord))
134 hist(msrs.sem$pval0[,"sva"])
135 hist(msrs.sem$pval0[,"svdr"])
136 hist(msrs.sem$pval0[,"van"])
137 ks.test(msrs.sem$pval0[,"sva"], "punif",alternative = "two.sided")
138 ks.test(msrs.sem$pval0[,"svdr"], "punif",alternative = "two.sided")
139 ks.test(msrs.sem$pval0[,"van"], "punif",alternative = "two.sided")
140
141 # Perform 100 repetitions
142
143 reps ← 100
144 K ← 10
145 J ← 1000
146 deg.max ← 1
147 p0_fh ← 0.5
148 p0_fx ← 0.5
149 p_isox ← 0.25
150 p0_beta ← 0.5
151 n ← 100
152 sigma ← 1
153 y.c.signal ← 1
154 ord ← deg.max
155
156
157 set.seed(2)
158 pm ← proc.time()
159 mrs.sem.reps ← do.n.reps(reps, K,J, deg.max, n, sigma, y.c.signal,  ord, sem=NULL
        ,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=
```

```
    p0_beta, trace=TRUE)
proc.time() - pm

#40 minutes for reps = 20, K=100, J=10,000
#6.7 minutes for reps = 20, K=50, J=2,500


mrs.sem.reps$count.no.svs
hist(mrs.sem.reps$ext.rate, main="c-node extraction rate")
hist(mrs.sem.reps$cancor.cs.sva, main="c-node overlap, SVA")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$cancor.hs, "h-node overlap")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$r2yh, "real r2 - est. r2 (y ~ hs)")
boxPlot(mrs.sem.reps$err.fx, "mean absolute error")
mrs.sem.reps$ks.nested


##############################################################################
# SENSIBILITY
##############################################################################

#############################
# size of model (just J)
#############################


reps <- 100
K <- 10
J <- round(seq(100, 1000, length.out=10))
deg.max <- 1
n <- 100
sigma <- 1
y.c.signal <- 1
ord <- deg.max
p0_fh <- 0.5
p0_fx <- 0.5
p_isox <- 0.25
p0_beta <- 0.5
params <- expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)


set.seed(2)
pm <- proc.time()
sens.sem.km <- sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=FALSE)
proc.time() - pm
# 47 mins

labs <- as.character(J)
xaxis <- "J"
yaxis <- ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.km$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.km$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~
    hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absolute error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.km$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)

#############################
# size of model (K and J)
#############################

reps <- 100
K <- round(seq(4,300, length.out=10))
J <- round(K/0.1)
deg.max <- 1
n <- 100
sigma <- 1
y.c.signal <- 1
ord <- deg.max
```

```
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
params ← expand.grid(K=K,deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.signal
    , ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)
params$J ← round(params$K/0.1)

set.seed(2)
pm ← proc.time()
sens.sem.km ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=FALSE)
proc.time() - pm
#178 mins

labs ← paste(K,J, sep="-")
xaxis ← "K-J"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.km$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.km$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~
    hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.km$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absolute error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.km$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)


##############################
# sparsity of model p0_h
##############################

reps ← 100
K ← 10
J ← 1000
deg.max ← 1
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max
p0_fh ← seq(0,1,length.out=10)
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)

set.seed(2)
pm ← proc.time()
sens.sem.sp_fh ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=TRUE)
proc.time() - pm
#78 mins

labs ← as.character(round(p0_fh,2))
xaxis ← "% fh(y)=0"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_fh$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_fh$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fh$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap"
    )
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fh$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y
     ~ hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fh$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absolute
    error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.sp_fh$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)

##############################
# sparsity of model p0_x
##############################

reps ← 100
K ← 10
```

```
J ← 1000
deg.max ← 1
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← seq(0.25,1,length.out=10)
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)

set.seed(2)
pm ← proc.time()
sens.sem.sp_fx ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=TRUE)
proc.time() - pm
#100 reps, 78 mins

labs ← as.character(round(p0_fx,2))
xaxis ← "% fx(y)=0"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_fx$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_fx$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fx$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fx$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~ hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_fx$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absolute error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.sp_fx$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)

##############################
# sparsity of model p0_beta
##############################

reps ← 100
K ← 10
J ← 1000
deg.max ← 1
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← seq(0,0.99,length.out=10)
params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)

set.seed(2)
pm ← proc.time()
sens.sem.sp_beta ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=FALSE)
proc.time() - pm
#75 mins

labs ← as.character(round(p0_beta,2))
xaxis ← "% beta=0"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(mat=sens.sem.sp_beta$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, yaxis="",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_beta$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_beta$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_beta$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~ hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_beta$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absolute error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.sp_beta$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)
```

```
352
353
354 ##############################
355 # sparsity of model p0_isox
356 ##############################
357
358 reps ← 100
359 K ← 10
360 J ← 1000
361 deg.max ← 1
362 n ← 100
363 sigma ← 1
364 y.c.signal ← 1
365 ord ← deg.max
366 p0_fh ← 0.5
367 p0_fx ←  seq(0,0.99,length.out=10)
368 p_isox ← p0_fx^2 ; plot(p0_fx, p_isox)
369 p0_beta ← 0.5
370 params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p0_beta=p0_beta)
371 params$p_isox ← params$p0_fx^2
372
373 set.seed(2)
374 pm ← proc.time()
375 sens.sem.sp_isox ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=FALSE)
376 proc.time() - pm
377 #103 mins
378
379 labs ← paste(round(p0_fx,2),round(p_isox,2),sep="-")
380 xaxis ← "% fx(y)=0-% p_isox=0"
381 yaxis ← ""
382 boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_isox$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate
    ")
383 boxPlot2(sens.sem.sp_isox$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
384 boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_isox$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node
    overlap")
385 boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_isox$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2
    (y ∼ hs)")
386 boxPlot3(sens.sem.sp_isox$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absoulute
    error")
387 ks.plot(sens.sem.sp_isox$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)
388
389
390 ##############################
391 # y.c.signal
392 ##############################
393
394 reps ← 100
395 K ← 10
396 J ← 1000
397 deg.max ← 1
398 n ← 100
399 sigma ← 1
400 y.c.signal ← c(1/10, 1/5, 1/3, 1/2, 1, 2)
401 ord ← deg.max
402 p0_fh ← 0.5
403 p0_fx ← 0.5
404 p_isox ← 0.25
405 p0_beta ← 0.5
406 params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)
407
408 set.seed(2)
409 pm ← proc.time()
410 sens.sem.y.c.signal ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=
    TRUE)
411 proc.time() - pm
412 #69 mins
413
414 labs ← as.character(round(y.c.signal,2))
```

```
xaxis ← "y.c.signal"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.y.c.signal$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction
    rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.y.c.signal$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap"
    )
boxPlot3(sens.sem.y.c.signal$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node
    overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.y.c.signal$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est.
    r2 (y ~ hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.y.c.signal$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean
    absoulute error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.y.c.signal$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)

############################
# nx noise
############################

reps ← 100
K ← 10
J ← 1000
deg.max ← 1
n ← 100
sigma ← c(1/10, 1/5, 1/3, 1/2, 1, 2, 5, 10)
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)

set.seed(2)
pm ← proc.time()
sens.sem.sigma ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=TRUE)
proc.time() - pm
#91 mins

labs ← as.character(round(sigma,2))
xaxis ← "x-node noise"
yaxis ← ""
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sigma$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
boxPlot2(sens.sem.sigma$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sigma$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap"
    )
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sigma$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y
     ~ hs)")
boxPlot3(sens.sem.sigma$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absoulute
    error")
ks.plot(sens.sem.sigma$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)

#################################
# degree of functions fx and fh
#################################
reps ← 100
K ← 10
J ← 1000
deg.max ← seq(5)
n ← 100
sigma ← 1
y.c.signal ← 1
ord ← deg.max
p0_fh ← 0.5
p0_fx ← 0.5
p_isox ← 0.25
p0_beta ← 0.5
params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)
params$ord ← params$deg.max
```

```
475
476 set.seed(2)
477 pm ← proc.time()
478 sens.sem.deg ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=TRUE)
479 proc.time() - pm
480 #50 mins
481
482 labs ← as.character(round(deg.max,2))
483 xaxis ← "fx and fh order"
484 yaxis ← ""
485 boxPlot2(sens.sem.deg$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
486 boxPlot2(sens.sem.deg$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
487 boxPlot3(sens.sem.deg$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
488 boxPlot3(sens.sem.deg$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~
      hs)")
489 boxPlot3(sens.sem.deg$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absoulute error
    ")
490 ks.plot(sens.sem.deg$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)
491
492 ############################
493 # number of points n
494 ############################
495
496 reps ← 100
497 K ← 10
498 J ← 1000
499 deg.max ← 1
500 n ← round(seq(25,1000, length.out=10),0)
501 sigma ← 1
502 y.c.signal ← 1
503 ord ← deg.max
504 p0_fh ← 0.5
505 p0_fx ← 0.5
506 p_isox ← 0.25
507 p0_beta ← 0.5
508 params ← expand.grid(K=K,J=J, deg.max=deg.max, n=n, sigma=sigma, y.c.signal=y.c.
    signal, ord=ord, p0_fh=p0_fh, p0_fx=p0_fx, p_isox=p_isox, p0_beta=p0_beta)
509
510 set.seed(2)
511 pm ← proc.time()
512 sens.sem.n ← sens.model(reps, params,cheat=FALSE, sparse=TRUE, trace=TRUE)
513 proc.time() - pm
514 #31 hours!!!
515
516 labs ← as.character(round(n,2))
517 xaxis ← "sample size"
518 yaxis ← ""
519 boxPlot2(sens.sem.n$ext.rate, labs, xaxis, "",title="c-node extraction rate")
520 boxPlot2(sens.sem.n$cancor.cs.sva, labs,xaxis,"", title="c-node overlap")
521 boxPlot3(sens.sem.n$cancor.hs, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="h-node overlap")
522 boxPlot3(sens.sem.n$r2yh, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="real r2 - est. r2 (y ~
    hs)")
523 boxPlot3(sens.sem.n$err.fx, labs, xaxis, "method" , title="mean absoulute error")
524 ks.plot(sens.sem.n$ks.nested, labs, xaxis, yaxis)
```