arXiv:1711.01674v1 [stat.ME] 5 Nov 2017

A robust RUV-testing procedure via γ-divergence

Hung Hung

Institute of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Abstract

Identification of differentially expressed genes (DE-genes) is commonly conducted in modern biomedical researches. However, unwanted variation inevitably arises during the data collection process, which could make the detection results heavily biased. It is suggested to remove the unwanted variation while keeping the biological variation to ensure a reliable analysis result. Removing Unwanted Variation (RUV) is recently proposed for this purpose by the virtue of negative control genes. On the other hand, outliers are frequently appear in modern high-throughput genetic data that can heavily affect the performances of RUV and its downstream analysis. In this work, we propose a robust RUV-testing procedure via γ-divergence. The advantages of our method are twofold: (1) it does not involve any modeling for the outlier distribution, which is applicable to various situations; (2) it is easy to implement in the sense that its robustness is controlled by a single tuning parameter γ of γ-divergence, and a data-driven criterion is developed to select γ. In the Gender Study, our method can successfully remove unwanted variation, and is able to identify more DE-genes than conventional methods.

Key words: γ-divergence; negative control genes; robustness; RUV; unwanted variation.

1 Introduction

Identification of differentially expressed genes (DE-genes) is commonly conducted in modern biomedical researches. However, unwanted variation (e.g., batch effects) inevitably arises during the data collection process, which could make the detection results heavily biased. Let $\{Y_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{p}$ be the measurements of p genes and X_i be the covariate of interest (e.g., disease status) for the i-th subject, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The problem of identifying DE-genes in the presence of unwanted variation can be formulated as the following model:

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_j = \mathbf{1}_n \delta_j + \boldsymbol{X}\beta_j + \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Y}_j = (Y_{1j}, \ldots, Y_{nj})^\top$, $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)^\top$, β_j is the effect size of the j-th gene, $\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ represents possible confounding factors (i.e., the sources of unwanted variation) with the coefficient $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \in \mathbb{R}^k$, δ_j is the intercept term, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j = (\varepsilon_{1j}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{nj})^\top \sim N(0, \sigma_j^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n)$ is the error term with the gene-specific variance σ_j^2. The dimension k of $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the number of sources of unwanted variation. For example, the batch effect with $(k+1)$ batches corresponds to $\boldsymbol{W}$ with each element being zero or one, and the sum of each row of $\boldsymbol{W}$ is smaller than 1. In the rest of discussion, we assume that k is known, and discuss its selection separately. We also assume $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ have been centered such that $\delta_j = E(Y_{ij})$. Model (1) can be expressed in matrix form as

$$\boldsymbol{Y} = \mathbf{1}_n \boldsymbol{\delta} + \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \boldsymbol{Y}^* = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Y} = [\boldsymbol{Y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Y}_p]_{n\times p}$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = [\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_p]_{1\times p}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p]_{1\times p}$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_p]_{k\times p}$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_p]_{n\times p}$, and $\boldsymbol{Y}^* = \boldsymbol{Y} - \mathbf{1}_n\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is the (column) centered version of $\boldsymbol{Y}$. In practical implementation, $\boldsymbol{Y}^*$ is replaced by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^* = (\boldsymbol{I}_n - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^\top)\boldsymbol{Y}$. We also use the notation $\boldsymbol{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}$ with the subindex of a set $\mathcal{I}$ to denote the submatrix $[\boldsymbol{Y}_j : j \in \mathcal{I}]$, which is taken from the columns of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ in $\mathcal{I}$. A similar definition applies to $\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{\mathcal{I}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}}$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Provided that $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ is observable, identification of DE-genes under model (1) can be conducted by conventional multiple hypothesis testing procedure using the p-values for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$. The problem is not straightforward since one usually can only observe $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{X})$ while $\boldsymbol{W}$ is not available. In the absence of $\boldsymbol{W}$, directly using p-value for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ from fitting the model $\boldsymbol{Y}_j = \mathbf{1}_n \delta_j + \boldsymbol{X}\beta_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ can produce biased result. To overcome this problem, a two-stage procedure is commonly suggested:

(S1) Using certain procedure to estimate $\boldsymbol{W}$ by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}$.

(S2) Estimate β_j by fitting the model $\boldsymbol{Y}_j = \mathbf{1}_n \delta_j + \boldsymbol{X}\beta_j + \widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$.

There are many methods developed to construct $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}$, including Price *et al.* (2006), Leek and Storey (2007), Friguet, Kloareg, and Causeur (2009), Gagnon-Bartsch and Speed (2012), Sun, Zhang, and Owen (2012), Gagnon-Bartsch, Jacob, and Speed (2013), Leek (2014), Risso *et al.* (2014) among others. By considering $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}$, the resulting p-value for $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ in (S2) is expected to be more reliable to identify DE-genes. Note that using an estimate of span$(\boldsymbol{W})$ in (S2) suffices to estimate β_j consistently.

Among the existing methods, one branch of methods called *Removing Unwanted Variation* (RUV) (Gagnon-Bartsch and Speed, 2012; Gagnon-Bartsch, Jacob, and Speed, 2013) attracts much attentions recently, which estimates $\boldsymbol{W}$ by utilizing the virtue of *negative control genes*. Negative control genes are genes that are known to have zero effects, i.e., $\beta_j = 0$. Examples of negative control genes include house-keeping genes and spike-in controls (Lippa *et al.*, 2010). As a result, variation that appears in negative control genes must be unwanted variation, and this fact provides a basis to estimate $\boldsymbol{W}$ without imposing further assumptions on the data. There are many versions of RUV, and we review the commonly used RUV2 and RUV4 below. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{nc}}$ be the index set of negative control genes. It follows from (2) that

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{\mathcal{I}_{\text{nc}}} = \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}_{\text{nc}}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{I}_{\text{nc}}}. \tag{3}$$

Based on (3), the RUV2 starts from applying singular value decomposition (SVD) to obtain $\boldsymbol{U}_k$, which consists of the leading k left singular vectors of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^*_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}$. The RUV2 estimator of $\boldsymbol{W}$ is then given by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_{\rm ruv2} = \boldsymbol{U}_k$. The RUV4 uses negative control genes with a rotation of $\boldsymbol{Y}^*$. Let $[\boldsymbol{R}_0, \boldsymbol{R}_1] \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be the orthogonal matrix such that $\mathrm{span}(\boldsymbol{R}_1) = \mathrm{span}(\boldsymbol{X})$. It implies from (2) that

$$\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{Y}^* = (\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{4}$$

$$\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{Y}^*_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} = (\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} + \boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}. \tag{5}$$

Applying SVD on $\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^*$ to obtain $(\boldsymbol{U}_k, \boldsymbol{V}_k)$ such that $\boldsymbol{U}_k^\top \boldsymbol{U}_k = \boldsymbol{I}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{U}_k \boldsymbol{V}_k^\top$ is the best rank-k approximation of $\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^*$. The RUV4 starts from (4) to estimate $(\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{W}} = \boldsymbol{U}_k$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \boldsymbol{V}_k^\top$. Second, from (5) with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}$ being replaced by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}$, an estimate of $\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{W}$ is obtained as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{W}} = (\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^*_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\top_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\top_{\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}})^{-1}$ from LSE. Finally, the RUV4 estimator of $\boldsymbol{W}$ is constructed to be $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_{\rm ruv4} = \boldsymbol{R}_0 \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{R}_0^\top \boldsymbol{W}} + \boldsymbol{R}_1 \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{W}}$. See also Gerard and Stephens (2017) for an insightful review of RUV methods.

A key step of the above RUV procedures is SVD, which is sensitive to outliers (i.e., when $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is contaminated) and the resulting estimation of $\boldsymbol{W}$ in (S1) can be heavily biased. The contaminated $\boldsymbol{Y}$ can also affect the estimation of β_j to produce unreliable p-values in (S2). Outliers, however, are frequently encountered in modern high-throughput genetic studies. Therefore, both the robustness for the RUV stage (S1) and the testing stage (S2) are critical to ensure a reliable analysis result. The aim of this study is to propose a robust RUV-testing procedure of (S1)-(S2), via utilizing the robust γ-divergence. An important merit of our method is that the robustness comes from the robust minimum γ-divergence estimation criterion, which does not involve any modeling for the outlier distribution (see Section 2.1 for details). That is, our method is flexible to adapt to various situations. We will also see that the robustness of our proposal is achieved by the concept of "weighted by the model", where the weight is induced from model (1) directly. As a result, our

method is easy to implement in the sense that, the robustness is merely controlled by a single tuning parameter γ of γ-divergence, and a data-driven selection criterion of γ is developed.

2 Method

2.1 A review of γ-divergence

For any $\gamma > 0$, the γ-divergence between the model distribution f_θ (indexed by the parameter θ) and the true distribution g is defined to be

$$\mathcal{D}_\gamma(g, f_\theta) = \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma+1)} \left\{ \|g\|_{\gamma+1} - \int \left(\frac{f_\theta}{\|f_\theta\|_{\gamma+1}} \right)^\gamma g \right\}, \tag{6}$$

where $\|f_\theta\|_{\gamma+1} = (\int f_\theta^{\gamma+1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_\gamma(g, f_\theta) = 0$ if and only if $f_\theta = \lambda g$ for some $\lambda > 0$. In the limiting case, $\lim_{\gamma \to 0} \mathcal{D}_\gamma$ reduces to the KL-divergence. The minimum γ-divergence estimation criterion estimates θ by

$$\underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathcal{D}_\gamma(g, f_\theta) = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \int \left(\frac{f_\theta}{\|f_\theta\|_{\gamma+1}} \right)^\gamma g. \tag{7}$$

When the model f_θ is correctly specified (i.e., $g = f_{\theta_0}$ for some θ_0), one has $\theta_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \mathcal{D}_\gamma(g, f_\theta)$ which supports the consistency of (7). At the sample level, g is replaced by the empirical distribution of the data to obtain the estimate of θ_0.

In the presence of outliers, data is no longer generated from f_{θ_0} but the mixture $cf_{\theta_0} + (1-c)h$, where h is the outlier distribution and c is the mixing proportion. The robustness of γ-divergence can be observed by noting that

$$D_\gamma\{cf_{\theta_0} + (1-c)h, f_\theta\} = c\, D_\gamma(f_{\theta_0}, f_\theta) - \frac{1-c}{\gamma(\gamma+1)} \int \left(\frac{f_\theta}{\|f_\theta\|_{\gamma+1}} \right)^\gamma h + \tau, \tag{8}$$

where τ is a constant that is independent of θ. Thus, provided that $\int (\frac{f_\theta}{\|f_\theta\|_{\gamma+1}})^\gamma h$ is small at $\theta \approx \theta_0$, the minimizer of (8) is approximately equivalent to the minimizer of $D_\gamma(f_{\theta_0}, f_\theta)$,

which does not depend on (c, h). See Fujisawa and Eguchi (2008) and Kanamori and Fujisawa (2015) for more discussions about the robustness of γ-divergence.

2.2 The robust RUV procedure: γ-RUV

The target of the RUV procedure (S1) is the matrix $\boldsymbol{W}$, which is treated as the unknown parameter in this subsection. The basic idea of our robust RUV method is to re-formulate model (3) as a location-scale model, from which we can apply γ-divergence to robustly estimate $\boldsymbol{W}$. To develop our method, we assume the following two conditions on model (3) as our "working model" for negative control genes:

(C1) $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$ follows an arbitrary distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and non-singular covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{nc}}$.

(C2) $\sigma_j^2 = \sigma^2$, $j \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{nc}}$.

Assumption (C1) implies that model (3) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_j^* = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{\nu}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{nc}}, \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is the leading k eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\boldsymbol{W}^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_j = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ is a zero mean random vector with diagonal covariance matrix. Assumption (C2) further implies that $E(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathrm{cov}(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathrm{cov}(\boldsymbol{\nu}_j)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top + \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n$ with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ being the leading eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Note that $\mathrm{span}([\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}]) = \mathrm{span}(\boldsymbol{W})$ by the definitions of $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma})$ and, hence, a basis of $\mathrm{span}(\boldsymbol{W})$ can be estimated by $[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}]$. It also implies that a robust RUV procedure can be established by any robust estimator of $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ under model (9). There exist many robust methods for location and scale parameters in the literatures. We adopt the minimum γ-divergence estimation criterion (7) to estimate $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ as described below. Let f_θ with $\theta = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ be the pdf of the multivariate normal distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$

and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ induced from model (9). Substituting f_θ into (7), replacing g with the empirical distribution of $\{\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}}$, and taking differentiation with respect to θ, we obtain the estimating equations of $(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ to be

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} f_\theta^\gamma(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*)\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} f_\theta^\gamma(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*)} \tag{10}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = (\gamma+1)\frac{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} f_\theta^\gamma(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*)(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*-\boldsymbol{\mu})(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*-\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{\rm nc}} f_\theta^\gamma(\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*)}. \tag{11}$$

The solution $\widehat{\theta}=(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})$ of (10)-(11) provides a robust estimate of $(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$.

With the above derivations, the robust estimator of $\boldsymbol{W}$ is proposed to be

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma = [\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k], \tag{12}$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k$ is the leading k eigenvectors of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$, and $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})$ are the solutions of (10)-(11) with $\boldsymbol{Y}_j^*$ being replaced by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{Y}}_j^*$. We call the RUV procedure using $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma$ in (S1) as γ-RUV.

2.3 The robust testing procedure: γ-LSE

Although γ-RUV can robustly estimate $\boldsymbol{W}$ in (S1), outliers can still affect the performance of the downstream analysis in (S2). To overcome this problem, we use γ-divergence to develop a robust testing procedure for $H_0:\beta_j=0$ under model (1). In this section, $\boldsymbol{W}$ is assumed to be known and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$ is treated as the unknown but fixed parameter. In practical implementation, $\boldsymbol{W}$ will be replaced by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma$ when combined with γ-RUV.

For any $1\le j\le p$, we start by re-expressing model (1) as

$$Y_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top \boldsymbol{Z}_i + \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad i=1,\ldots,n, \tag{13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j=(\delta_j,\beta_j,\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^\top)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}_i=(1,X_i,\boldsymbol{W}_i^\top)^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{W}_i^\top$ being the i-th row of $\boldsymbol{W}$. Model (13) is equivalent to assuming $Y_{ij}|\boldsymbol{Z}_i\sim f_{\theta_j}(y|\boldsymbol{Z}_i)$, where $f_{\theta_j}(y|\boldsymbol{z})$ with $\theta_j=(\boldsymbol{\eta}_j,\sigma_j^2)$ is the pdf of the normal distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top\boldsymbol{z}$ and variance σ_j^2. Based on the data

$\{(Y_{ij}, \boldsymbol{Z}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we follow Hung, Zou, and Huang (2017) to estimate θ_j via the modified minimum γ-divergence estimation criterion (to adapt to a regression setting):

$$\max_{\theta_j} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{f_{\theta_j}(Y_{ij}|\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{\|f_{\theta_j}(\cdot|\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\|_{\gamma+1}} \right)^{\gamma}. \tag{14}$$

Direct differentiation gives the estimating equations of θ_j to be

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_j = (\boldsymbol{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\theta_j}^{\gamma} \boldsymbol{Z})^{-1} \boldsymbol{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\theta_j}^{\gamma} \boldsymbol{Y}_j \tag{15}$$

$$\sigma_j^2 = (\gamma+1) \frac{(\boldsymbol{Y}_j - \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\theta_j}^{\gamma} (\boldsymbol{Y}_j - \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{\eta}_j)}{\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\theta_j}^{\gamma})}, \tag{16}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\theta_j} = \mathrm{diag}\{f_{\theta_j}(Y_{1j}|\boldsymbol{Z}_1), \ldots, f_{\theta_j}(Y_{nj}|\boldsymbol{Z}_n)\}$ and $\boldsymbol{Z} = [\boldsymbol{Z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Z}_n]^\top$. Denote the solution by $\widehat{\theta}_j = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_j, \widehat{\sigma}_j^2)$ with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_j = (\widehat{\delta}_j, \widehat{\beta}_j, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j^\top)^\top$, which we call γ-LSE of θ_j.

The asymptotic covariance matrix can be empirically estimated by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j$. The null distribution of $\widehat{\beta}_j$ can then be approximated by $N(0, [\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j]_{\beta_j}/n)$, where $[\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j]_{\beta_j}$ is the diagonal element of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j$ that corresponds to β_j. Consequently, a robust p-value for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ is constructed to be

$$\rho_j = 1 - F_{\chi_1^2}\left(n\widehat{\beta}_j^2 / [\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j]_{\beta_j} \right), \tag{17}$$

where $F_{\chi_1^2}$ is the cdf of the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom 1.

Based on the developed γ-RUV and γ-LSE, the robust identified index set of DE-genes is proposed to be

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{de}} = \left\{ j : \rho_j < \frac{\alpha}{p} \right\} \tag{18}$$

with the family-wise error rate being controlled at α by Bonferroni correction, where ρ_j is obtained from (17) with $\boldsymbol{W}$ being replaced by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma$. We remind the readers that (18) can be used with any estimation method of $\boldsymbol{W}$ and is not limited to γ-RUV. However, a non-robust estimate of $\boldsymbol{W}$ will make the p-values unreliable, even combined with the robust γ-LSE. The robustness of both RUV and testing stages should be taken into account in order to ensure a reliable analysis result.

3 Simulation Studies

3.1 Simulation settings

We generate each element of $\boldsymbol{X}$ from Bernoulli(0.5). The latent source of unwanted variation $\boldsymbol{W} = [\boldsymbol{W}_{(1)}, \boldsymbol{W}_{(2)}]$ consists of two parts, where $\boldsymbol{W}_{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 4}$ represents the batch effect with 5 batches, and $\boldsymbol{W}_{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 3}$ represents the random unwanted variation. We generate each row of $\boldsymbol{W}_{(1)}$ from Multinomial$(1, \frac{1}{5}\mathbf{1}_5)$, and set $\boldsymbol{W}_{(2)} = 2\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \boldsymbol{E}$, where $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times 3}$ follows the uniform distribution on the 3-dimensional sphere, and each element of $\boldsymbol{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 3}$ follows $N(0,1)$. It gives the proportion of variation of $\boldsymbol{W}$ explained by $\boldsymbol{X}$ to be 25%. Given $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$, the uncontaminated data $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ is generated from model (2) as $\boldsymbol{Y}_0 = \mathbf{1}_n\boldsymbol{\delta} + \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where each element of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is generated from $N(0, 2^2)$. For $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, we set the first 100 genes to be DE-genes with effect sizes $\beta_j \sim N(1, 0.2^2)$ and set $\beta_j = 0$ for $j > 100$. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, each $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$ is generated from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_7)$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$. For the error term $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, each $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ is generated from $N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_j^2\boldsymbol{I}_n)$, where σ_j^2 follows the inverse-gamma distribution with parameters $(3, 0.5)$ such that $E(\sigma_j^2) = \text{var}(\sigma_j^2) = 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$.

To mimic the presence of outliers, we generate the outlier matrix by

$$\boldsymbol{O} = [\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}_{(1)}]\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\text{o}} + \boldsymbol{E}_{\text{o}}, \tag{19}$$

where each element of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\text{o}} \in \mathbb{R}^{5\times p}$ is generated from $N(0, \sigma_{\text{o}}^2)$, and each element of $\boldsymbol{E}_{\text{o}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ is generated from $N(0,1)$. We then randomly select $p(1 - \sqrt{\pi_{\text{o}}})$ columns of $\boldsymbol{O}$ and set their values to be zeros. For the rest non-zero $p\sqrt{\pi_{\text{o}}}$ columns, each element is further set to be zero with probability $(1 - \sqrt{\pi_{\text{o}}})$. Finally, the observed (contaminated) data is $\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{Y}_0 + \boldsymbol{O}$ with about $100\pi_{\text{o}}\%$ elements being contaminated.

For each simulation run, we use the last 200 genes of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ as the negative control genes, i.e., $\mathcal{I}_{\text{nc}} = \{p-199, p-198, \ldots, p\}$, to obtain $\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma$ by γ-RUV, and then obtain the robust p-values ρ_j's by fitting γ-LSE on $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{X}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma)$. We also report the results from fitting

LSE on $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{X}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\gamma)$ to demonstrate the influence of outliers in the stage of testing. Since a good RUV-testing procedure is expected to produce p-values that can well separate DE-genes and non DE-genes, the AUC value from the two groups $\{\rho_j : 1 \leq j \leq 100\}$ and $\{\rho_j : 101 \leq j \leq p - 200\}$ is used as the performance measure (exclude negative control genes from calculating AUC). A large AUC value indicates a good performance of the RUV-testing procedure. Besides AUC, the true positive (TP) and false positive (FP) values from the identified set of DE-genes $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{de}}$ under $\alpha = 0.05$ are reported. The simulation results from RUV2 and RUV4 are also reported for comparisons. Moreover, we report the results without the RUV stage (i.e., ignore the effect of $\boldsymbol{W}$, denoted as "Ignore-$\boldsymbol{W}$"), and the results from $(\boldsymbol{Y}_0, \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ (i.e., use the uncontaminated data $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ and true $\boldsymbol{W}$, denoted as "Ideal") as the wort and best situations, respectively. It gives a total of 10 RUV-testing procedures (5 RUV strategies combined with 2 testing methods). We use the term "A[+B]" to denote a combination of RUV-testing procedure, where "A" is the RUV strategy used in (S1) and "B" is the testing method used in (S2). Simulation results are reported with 100 replicates.

3.2 Simulation results

Simulation results with $k = 8$ under $(n, p) = (100, 1000)$ and $(\pi_{\text{o}}, \sigma_{\text{o}}) = (0.05, 20)$ are placed in Figure 1. We first evaluate the performances of the RUV methods by inspecting the simulation results under the conventional LSE fitting. Observe the large differences between (TP, FP, AUC) of Ignore-$\boldsymbol{W}$[+LSE] and Ideal[+LSE], it indicates the potential of RUV to improve the detection abilities. However, both RUV2[+LSE] and RUV4[+LSE] can only produce AUC values around 0.7, and there still has a large space for improvement in comparison with Ideal[+LSE]. On the other hand, γ-RUV[+LSE] can achieve AUC value about 0.9, which is significantly larger than RUV2[+LSE] and RUV4[+LSE].

We also detect larger (lower) values of TP (FP) for γ-RUV[+LSE]. It indicates that the conventional RUV procedures can be sensitive to the presence of outliers, while the proposed γ-RUV is able to correctly recover $\boldsymbol{W}$ without being affected much by outliers.

We next evaluate the performance of γ-LSE. It can be seen that γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] has a larger AUC value than γ-RUV[+LSE]. It demonstrates that γ-RUV can only produce a robust estimate of $\boldsymbol{W}$, while outliers can still affect the detection powers in (S2). As a result, we can detect a further improvement from the robust γ-LSE fitting over LSE. It suggests that a combination of γ-RUV and γ-LSE, which can robustly estimate both $\boldsymbol{W}$ and β_j, is preferred in practice. One can observe that all the lines connecting the results of LSE and γ-LSE in Figure 1 (a) and (c) show increasing trends (i.e., an improvement from fitting γ-LSE over LSE), except for the case of Ideal. Note that LSE is the most efficient method in estimating β_j when the model is correctly specified, and it is reasonable that Ideal[+LSE] outperforms Ideal[+γ-LSE].

To have more insights about the advantages of γ-RUV and γ-LSE, we report the $(-\log_{10})$-transformed p-values from one simulation run in Figure 2. It can be seen that the p-values from RUV2[+LSE], RUV4[+LSE], and Ignore-$\boldsymbol{W}$[+LSE] cannot well separate DE-genes and non DE-genes, while a more clear separation is observed for γ-RUV[+LSE], indicating the robustness of γ-RUV. One can also observe that γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] tends to produce larger (smaller) $(-\log_{10})$-transformed p-values for DE-genes (non-DE genes) than γ-RUV[+LSE], indicating the robustness of γ-LSE. More specifically, there are 9 genes that are falsely identified by γ-RUV[+LSE], but the problem vanishes for γ-RUV[+γ-LSE]. It demonstrates the superiority of γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] in the presence of outliers.

4 Gender Study

The Gender Study (GS) data is originally from Vawter *et al.* (2004) to investigate the effects of genes on brain under different gender statuses. The data collects for each of 10 patients (5 male and 5 female) gene expressions from three regions of brain (the anterior cingulate cortex, the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, and the cerebellar hemisphere), where each chip is carried out in one of the three labs (UC Irvine, UC Davis, and University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) and one of the two platforms (Affymetrix HG-U95A and Affymetrix HG-U95Av2). The original data can be found in Gene Expression Omnibus (GSE2164). In our analysis, we use the same data with Gagnon-Bartsch and Speed (2012) after BG-QN-LS preprocessing, which consists of 12600 gene expressions for each of 84 chips as $\boldsymbol{Y}$. The factor of interest X is gender, and the 488 genes on the X/Y chromosome are treated as DE-genes. The negative control genes are 799 house-keeping (HK) genes from Eisenberg, and Levanon (2003). Gagnon-Bartsch and Speed (2012) have analyzed the GS data to evaluate the performance of RUV2, by inspecting the number of the identified DE-genes. Since gene expression data can subject to the problem of outliers, the aim of our analysis is to re-analyze the GS data by γ-RUV and γ-LSE (with $\ell = 0.95$).

Figure 3 (a) reports the TP of the top ranking genes at $k = 10$. One can see that the best performer is γ-RUV[+γ-LSE], followed by γ-RUV[+LSE] and RUV2[+LSE]. It shows that both γ-RUV and γ-LSE have their own contribution to the identification of DE-genes. Moreover, the differences between the γ-divergence based methods and the conventional method implies the existence of some abnormal data points, which can be influential to the analysis result if not properly handled.

The performance of a RUV-testing procedure can be evaluated via the relative log expression (RLE) plots. For the i-th chip with $\{Y_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{p}$, its RLE plot is the boxplot of $\{Y_{ij} - m_j\}_{j=1}^{p}$, where m_j is the median of $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i=1}^{n}$. A chip with good quality (i.e.,

when the unwanted variation is properly removed) generally has the RLE plot centered around zero with the interquartile range (IQR) being smaller than 0.2. See Bolstad *et al.* (2005) and Gandolfo and Speed (2017) for more descriptions about the RLE plots. Figure 3 (d)-(f) give the RLE plots of the adjusted data ($\boldsymbol{Y} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$), where $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ is obtained from a certain RUV-testing procedure with $k = 10$, and the corresponding mean IQR over 84 chips are reported in Table 1. One can see that all methods produce satisfactory RLE plots, which indicates that the outlyingness is not severe for the GS data. However, γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] is still able to improve the conventional RUV-testing procedure (see Figure 3 (a)), and achieves the smallest mean IQR value 0.172.

Figure 3 (b) reports the TP of the top 100 genes at different k values, and the corresponding ratios of cumulative eigenvalues are plotted in Figure 3 (c). The ratios of cumulative eigenvalues support the selection of $k = 10$ such that the proportion of explained variation is about 90%. Note that in Figure 3 (b), the TP value of γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] achieves the maximum value 30 at $k = 10$, and has similar values for k near 10. It indicates the appropriateness for the selection of k by inspecting the ratios of cumulative eigenvalues of the robust $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$.

To more clearly demonstrate the power of our proposal, we report the analysis results of the GS data with artificially added outliers. Specifically, we generate the outlier matrix $\boldsymbol{O}$ as in (19), except $\boldsymbol{W}_{(1)}$ is the batch effect taken from the GS data, and the new analysis results with $(\pi_{\mathrm{o}}, \sigma_{\mathrm{o}}) = (0.05, 20)$ are placed in Figure 4. Comparing with the results in Figure 3, γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] can produce roughly the same results with the original analysis. However, the non-robust γ-RUV[+LSE] and RUV2[+LSE] are heavily affected by $\boldsymbol{O}$, and their TP values are largely decreased (see Figure 4 (a)). From the RLE plots in Figure 4 (d)-(f) and the mean IQR values in Table 1, it becomes clear that γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] is the best performer in removing unwanted variation, and achieves the smallest mean IQR value 0.186. On the other hand, the RLE plots reveal the non-

robustness RUV2[+LSE], where a portion of subjects tend to have non-zero centers or IQR values larger than 0.2 (with the mean IQR value 0.440). From Figure 4 (c), the ratios of cumulative eigenvalues still support the selection of $k = 10$ for γ-RUV, and a high TP value is achieved by γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] at $k = 10$ (see Figure 4 (b)). However, the ratios of cumulative eigenvalues of RUV2 no longer provide appropriate choice of k, and a low TP value is detected even with increasing k (see Figure 4 (b)). Our extra analysis confirms the robustness of γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] in real data.

References

Bolstad, B. M., Collin, F., Brettschneider, J., Simpson, K., Cope, L., Irizarry, R. A., and Speed, T. P. (2005). Quality assessment of Affymetrix GeneChip data. *Bioinformatics and computational biology solutions using R and bioconductor*, 33-47. Springer New York.

Friguet, C., Kloareg, M., and Causeur, D. (2009). A factor model approach to multiple testing under dependence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(488), 1406-1415.

Fujisawa, H. and Eguchi, S. (2008). Robust parameter estimation with a small bias against heavy contamination, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 99, 2053-2081.

Gagnon-Bartsch, J. A., and Speed, T. P. (2012). Using control genes to correct for unwanted variation in microarray data. *Biostatistics*, 13, 539-552.

Gagnon-Bartsch, J., Jacob, L., and Speed, T. P. (2013). Removing unwanted variation from high dimensional data with negative controls. Technical Report 820, Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley.

Gandolfo, L. C., and Speed, T. P. (2017). RLE Plots: Visualising Unwanted Variation in High Dimensional Data. arXiv:1704.03590.

Gerard, D. and Stephens, M. (2017). Unifying and Generalizing Methods for Removing Unwanted Variation Based on Negative Controls. arXiv:1705.08393.

Henderson, H. V. and Searle, S. R. (1979). Vec and vech operators for matrices, with some uses in Jacobians and multivariate statistics. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 7, 65-81.

Hung, H., Jou, Z. Y., and Huang, S. Y. (2017). Robust mislabel logistic regression without modeling mislabel probabilities. *Biometrics*. (DOI:10.1111/biom.12726)

Kanamori, T. and Fujisawa, H. (2015). Robust estimation under heavy contamination using unnormalized models. *Biometrika*, 102, 559-572.

Leek, J. T. and Storey, J. D. (2007). Capturing heterogeneity in gene expression studies by surrogate variable analysis. PLoS genetics, 3(9), e161.

Leek, J. T. (2014). svaseq: removing batch effects and other unwanted noise from sequencing data. Nucleic acids research, 42(21), e161-e161.

Lippa, K. A., Duewer, D. L., Salit, M. L., Game, L., and Causton, H. C. (2010). Exploring the use of internal and external controls for assessing microarray technical performance. *BMC Research Notes*, 3(1), 349.

Price, A. L., Patterson, N. J., Plenge, R. M., Weinblatt, M. E., Shadick, N. A., and Reich, D. (2006). Principal components analysis corrects for stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nature genetics*, 38(8), 904.

Risso, D., Ngai, J., Speed, T. P., and Dudoit, S. (2014). Normalization of RNA-seq data using factor analysis of control genes or samples. *Nature biotechnology*, 32(9), 896-902.

Sun, Y., Zhang, N. R., and Owen, A. B. (2012). Multiple hypothesis testing adjusted for latent variables, with an application to the AGEMAP gene expression data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 6(4), 1664-1688.

Teschendorff, A. E., Zhuang, J., and Widschwendter, M. (2011). Independent surrogate variable analysis to deconvolve confounding factors in large-scale microarray profiling studies, *Bioinformatics*, 27, 1496-1505.




Figure 1: The simulation results of γ-RUV, RUV2, and RUV4 combined with γ-LSE and LSE. Each line represents an RUV method combined with LSE (the left point) and γ-LSE (the right point). (a) The mean of TP. (b) The mean of FP. (c) The mean of AUC.




Figure 2: One realization of the $-(\log_{10})$-transformed p-values for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, 1000$, from different RUV-testing procedures. The first 100 genes (in the left of the vertical line) are DE-genes, and the rest are non-DE genes. The horizontal line represents the critical value under the family-wise error rate 0.05.




Figure 3: The analysis results of the GS data. (a) The TP of the top ranking genes at $k = 10$. (b) The TP of the top 100 genes at different k. (c) The ratios of cumulative eigenvalues at different k. (d) The RLE plots of γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] at $k = 10$. (e) The RLE plots of γ-RUV[+LSE] at $k = 10$. (f) The RLE plots of RUV2[+LSE] at $k = 10$.




Figure 4: The analysis results of the GS data with artificially added outlier matrix $\boldsymbol{O}$. (a) The TP of the top ranking genes at $k = 10$. (b) The TP of the top 100 genes at different k. (c) The ratios of cumulative eigenvalues at different k. (d) The RLE plots of γ-RUV[+γ-LSE] at $k = 10$. (e) The RLE plots of γ-RUV[+LSE] at $k = 10$. (f) The RLE plots of RUV2[+LSE] at $k = 10$.

Table 1: The mean IQR values (standard deviations) of $(\boldsymbol{Y} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{W}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ in the GS data. The first row represents the results of the original data, and the second row represents the results with artificially added outlier matrix $\boldsymbol{O}$.

	γ-RUV[+γ-LSE]	γ-RUV[+LSE]	RUV2[+LSE]
Without $\boldsymbol{O}$	0.172 (0.028)	0.178 (0.029)	0.183 (0.031)
Adding $\boldsymbol{O}$	0.186 (0.031)	0.244 (0.039)	0.440 (0.148)