

Bayesian Variable Selection For Survival Data Using Inverse Moment Priors

Amir Nikooienejad^{*1}, Wenyi Wang^{†2} and Valen E. Johnson^{‡3}

¹*Department of Global Statistical Sciences, Eli Lilly and Company*

²*Department of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, University of Texas MD
Anderson Cancer Center*

³*Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University*

Abstract

Efficient variable selection in high-dimensional cancer genomic studies is critical for discovering genes associated with specific cancer types and for predicting response to treatment. Censored survival data is prevalent in such studies. In this article we introduce a Bayesian variable selection procedure that uses a mixture prior composed of a point mass at zero and an inverse moment prior in conjunction with the partial likelihood defined by the Cox proportional hazard model. The procedure is implemented in the R package BVSNLP, which supports parallel computing and uses a stochastic search method to explore the model space. Bayesian model averaging is used for prediction. The proposed algorithm provides better performance than other variable selection procedures in simulation studies, and appears to provide more consistent variable selection when applied to actual genomic datasets.

1 Introduction

Recent developments in sequencing technology have made it easier to collect massive genomic datasets that can be used to study cancer and other diseases. Given such data, there is great interest in linking genomic data to patient outcomes, and in many cases such outcomes are censored survival times.

^{*}Supported by NIH grant R01CA158113 prior to joining Eli Lilly and Company.

Email: nikooienejad_amir@lilly.com

[†]Supported by 1R01CA174206, 1R01CA183793, 5R01CA158113 and P30CA016672.

Email: wwang7@mdanderson.org

[‡]Supported by NIH grant R01CA158113.

Email: vjohnson@stat.tamu.edu

Survival times for patients generally represent either the time to death or disease progression, the time to study termination or the time until the subject is lost to follow up. In the latter cases the subject’s survival time is *censored*. The relation between survival times and covariates is modeled through the hazard function, which is the limiting rate of death in the interval $(t, t + \Delta t)$ as Δt becomes small, given patient covariates. More precisely, the hazard function h for patient i may be defined as

$$h(t | \mathbf{x}_i) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} P(t \leq T \leq t + \Delta t | T \geq t, \mathbf{x}_i), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x}_i is a p vector of covariates thought to influence survival. We denote by \mathbf{X} the $n \times p$ design matrix obtained by stacking n patient covariate vectors. Proportional hazard models take the form

$$h(t | \mathbf{x}_i) = h_0(t) \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \quad (2)$$

with an identifiability constraint of $\Phi(\mathbf{0}) = 1$. In this formula, $h_0(t)$ denotes the baseline hazard function. The Cox proportional hazards model (Cox, 1972) is defined by taking $\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i) = \exp\{\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\}$, leading to

$$h(t | \mathbf{x}_i) = h_0(t) e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}}. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of coefficients.

An important feature of the proportional hazards model is that it yields a partial likelihood function that is independent of the baseline hazard function, h_0 . For complete survival analyses, however, the baseline hazard function is necessary for predicting survival times and can be estimated nonparametrically. Further details regarding the Cox proportional hazard model may be found in Cox and Oakes (1984), Kalbfleisch and Prentice (1980) or Cox (1972).

Gene expression datasets usually contain measurements on thousands of genes collected for only hundreds of subjects. Biologically, it seems plausible that only a relatively small number of these genes contribute significantly to survival. This implies that most of the elements in the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are small or close to zero. The challenge is to find covariates with nonzero coefficients or, equivalently, those genes that contribute the most in determining the survival outcome.

Many common penalized likelihood methods originally introduced for linear regression have been extended to survival data. These methods include LASSO (Tibshirani *et al.*, 1997), in which an L_1 penalty is imposed on regression coefficients. Zhang and Lu (2007) utilized adaptive LASSO methodology for time to event data, while Antoniadis *et al.* (2010) adopted the Dantzig selector for survival outcomes. The extension of nonconvex penalized likelihood approaches, in particular SCAD, to the Cox proportional hazard model is discussed in Fan and Li (2002). The Iterative Sure Independence Screening (ISIS) approach introduced by Fan and Lv (2008) is also extended for ultrahigh dimensional survival data in Fan *et al.* (2010), where it is used on Cox proportional hazard models and the SCAD penalty is employed for variable selection.

Some Bayesian approaches have also been introduced. Faraggi and Simon (1998) proposed a method based on approximating the posterior distribution of the parameters in the

proportional hazard model by defining a Gaussian prior on regression coefficients. A loss function was then imposed to select a parsimonious model. A semiparametric Bayesian approach was utilized by Ibrahim *et al.* (1999), who employed a discrete gamma process for the baseline hazard function and a multivariate Gaussian prior for the coefficient vector. Sha *et al.* (2006) considered Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) models along with data augmentation to impute failure times. A mixture prior proposed by George and McCulloch (1997) was used to impose sparsity. In more recent work, Held *et al.* (2016) proposed the use of a g -prior model for the coefficient vector and employed test-based Bayes factors (Johnson, 2005) to the Cox proportional hazard models. However, this method is intended for use only when the number of covariates is less than the number of observations, that is, when $p < n$.

To our knowledge, all previous Bayesian procedures for variable selection in survival data have used local priors on model coefficients. In Bayesian hypothesis tests, local priors put a positive probability on the null value of the parameter, in this case zero, whereas nonlocal priors put zero probability on the null value. Johnson and Rossell (2010) can be consulted for more discussion on properties of local and nonlocal priors in the context of Bayesian testing. In this article we propose a Bayesian method based on a mixture prior comprised of a point mass at zero and a nonlocal prior on the regression coefficients. To handle the computational burden of implementing the resulting procedure, we employ a stochastic search method, S5 (Shin *et al.*, 2018), which we implement in an R package BVSNLP. We also discuss a general procedure for setting the tuning parameter of the nonlocal prior.

This article is structured as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation and discuss the modeling of the problem in a Bayesian framework. Section 3 discusses the proposed method, with details of parameter selection, model search and assessment of the accuracy of the proposed variable selection procedure. Sections 4 and 5 provide simulation and real data analyses with various predictive performance measures to demonstrate how the proposed method compares to several other competing methods. Section 6 concludes with discussion.

2 Problem Modeling

2.1 Preliminaries

Let T_i denote the survival time and C_i denote the censoring time for individual i . Each element in the observed vector of survival times, \mathbf{y} , is defined as $y_i = \min\{T_i, C_i\}$. The status for each individual is defined as $\delta_i = I(T_i \leq C_i)$. The status vector is represented by $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n)^T$. We assume that the censoring mechanism is “at random,” meaning that C_i and T_i are conditionally independent given \mathbf{x}_i , where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the covariates for individual i and comprise the i^{th} row of \mathbf{X} . The observed data is of the form $\{(y_i, \delta_i, \mathbf{x}_i); i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Model \mathbf{k} is defined as $\mathbf{k} = \{k_1, \dots, k_j\}$, where $(1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_j \leq p)$, and it is assumed that $\beta_{k_1} \neq 0, \dots, \beta_{k_j} \neq 0$ and all other elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are 0. The design matrix corresponding to model \mathbf{k} is denoted by $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the regression vector by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}} = (\beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_2}, \dots, \beta_{k_j})^T$.

Let $\mathcal{R}(t) = \{i : y_i \leq t\}$ represent the *risk set* at time t , the set of all individuals who are

still present in the study at time t and are neither dead nor censored. We assume throughout this article that the failure times are distinct. In other words, only one individual fails at a specific failure time. With this assumption and letting $\xi_{\mathbf{k}_i} = \exp\{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}\}$, the partial likelihood (Cox, 1972) for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ in model \mathbf{k} can be written as

$$L_p(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}_i}}{\sum_{j \in R(y_i)} \xi_{\mathbf{k}_j}} \right]^{\delta_i}. \quad (4)$$

Our method uses this partial likelihood as the sampling distribution in our Bayesian model selection procedure. We acknowledge that there is some information loss in (4) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$. For instance, Basu (Ghosh, 1988) argues that partial likelihoods cannot usually be interpreted as sampling distributions. On the other hand, Berger *et al.* (1999) encourage the use of partial likelihoods when the nuisance parameters are marginalized out.

Sorting the observed unique survival times in ascending order and, consequently, reordering the status vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ as well as the design matrix \mathbf{X} with respect to the ordered \mathbf{y} , the sampling distribution of \mathbf{y} for model \mathbf{k} can be written as

$$\pi(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{e^{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}}}{\sum_{j=i}^n e^{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}}} \right]^{\delta_i}. \quad (5)$$

A Bayesian hierarchical model can be defined in which $\pi(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})$ in (5) represents the sampling distribution, $\pi_{\mathbf{k}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})$ is the prior of model coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $P(\mathbf{k})$ is the prior for model \mathbf{k} . Using Bayes rule, the posterior probability for model \mathbf{j} is written as

$$P(\mathbf{j} | \mathbf{y}) = \frac{P(\mathbf{j})m_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{y})}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{J}} P(\mathbf{k})m_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y})}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{J} is the set of all possible models and the marginal probability of the data under model \mathbf{k} is defined by

$$m_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}) = \int \pi(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}) \pi_{\mathbf{k}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}) d\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (7)$$

The prior density for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the prior on the model space impact the overall performance of the selection procedure and the amount of sparsity imposed on candidate models. Note that the sampling distribution in (5) is continuous in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$, and in Section 2.3 we define an inverse moment prior (Johnson and Rossell, 2010) on each of the coefficients in model \mathbf{k} .

2.2 Prior on Model Space

Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{k}} = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p\}$ denote a binary vector indicating which covariates are included in model \mathbf{k} . Suppose the size of model \mathbf{k} is k . That is, there are k nonzero indices in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{k}}$. The nonzero indices of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{k}}$ represent the indices of the nonzero elements in the coefficient vector, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, which a priori are modeled as independent Bernoulli random variables with success

probability $P(\gamma_i = 1) = \theta$ for every $1 \leq i \leq p$. As discussed in [Scott et al. \(2010\)](#), no fixed value for θ adjusts for multiplicity. As a result, it is necessary to define a prior on θ , say $\pi(\theta)$. The resulting marginal probability for model \mathbf{k} in a fully Bayesian approach may then be written as

$$p(\mathbf{k}) \propto \int \theta^k (1 - \theta)^{p-k} \pi(\theta) d\theta. \quad (8)$$

A common choice for $\pi(\theta)$ is the beta distribution, $\theta \sim \text{Beta}(a, b)$, where in the special case of $a = b = 1$, $\pi(\theta)$ is a uniform distribution. The marginal probability for model \mathbf{k} derived from (8) is then equal to

$$p(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{B(a + k, b + p - k)}{B(a, b)}, \quad (9)$$

where $B(\cdot)$ is the Beta function. *A priori*, the model size, k , thus follows a Beta-binomial distribution. By choosing $b = p - a$, the mean and variance of the selected model size k is

$$\mathbb{E}(k) = a, \quad \text{Var}(k) = \frac{2p^2 a(p - a)}{p^3} \approx 2a. \quad (10)$$

The approximation in the variance formula follow from a large p and a fairly small a under the sparsity assumption on the true model size. To incorporate the belief that the optimal predictive models are sparse, we recommend setting $a = 1$ and $b = p - a$. The resulting prior assigns comparatively small prior probabilities to models that contain many covariates.

2.3 Product Inverse MOMent (piMOM) Prior

We impose nonlocal prior densities on the nonzero coefficients, $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$. Specifically, we assume the prior densities on the nonzero coefficients in model \mathbf{k} take the form of a product of independent iMOM priors, or piMOM densities ([Johnson and Rossell, 2012](#)), expressible as

$$\pi(\beta_{\mathbf{k}} | \tau, r) = \frac{\tau^{rk/2}}{\Gamma(r/2)^k} \prod_{i=1}^k |\beta_i|^{-(r+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{\beta_i^2}\right), \quad r, \tau > 0. \quad (11)$$

The hyperparameter τ represents a scale parameter that determines the dispersion of the prior around $\mathbf{0}$, while r determines the tail behavior of the density. These priors have two symmetric modes with Cauchy-like tails when $r = 1$, and assign negligible probability to a region around zero. In comparison to local priors, this characteristic of nonlocal priors potentially leads to smaller false positive rates in selection procedures by discouraging the selection of variables with small coefficients. On the other hand, piMOM priors possess Cauchy-like tails which introduce comparatively small penalties on large coefficients. Unlike many penalized likelihood methods, large values of regression coefficients are thus not heavily penalized by these priors. As a result, they do not necessarily impose significant penalties




Figure 1: iMOM prior with $r = 1$ and $\tau = 0.5$.

on nonsparse models provided that the estimated coefficients in those models are not small. For these reasons piMOM priors work well as a default choice of priors on nonnegligible coefficients in variable selection problems. An example of an iMOM prior is depicted in Figure 1 for $r = 1$ and $\tau = 0.5$.

Another nonlocal prior that might be considered as a potential candidate for the prior densities on the nonzero coefficients in model \mathbf{k} is the product of independent MOM priors, or the pMOM densities (Johnson and Rossell, 2012). A detailed discussion on the pMOM priors and their properties is provided in Section 3 of the ?? (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020). A simulation analysis to compare the performance of piMOM and pMOM in the selection process is also provided. For the reasons discussed there, piMOM-based procedures are more effective for variable selection in $p \gg n$ settings and, therefore, is our choice for the analyses of the simulation and real data in this article.

3 Methods

3.1 Selection of Hyperparameters

We use the procedure described in Nikooienejad *et al.* (2016) to select hyperparameter values for the piMOM prior. In that method, the null distribution of the maximum likelihood estimator for $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ (i.e., all components of $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ are 0), obtained from randomly selected design matrices $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$, is compared to the prior density on $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ for various values of (r, τ) . Fixing $r = 1$ to achieve Cauchy-like tails, a value of τ is chosen so that the overlap between the two densities is less than a specified threshold, $1/\sqrt{p}$, and is denoted by τ_1 . It can be shown that the maximum of the iMOM prior occurs at $\pm\sqrt{\tau}$. We also allow users to input a prior parameter α that controls where the modes in the prior occur. This can be useful in constraining the prior density when covariates are highly correlated (resulting in an over-dispersed prior when the sampling distribution of the null MLE under the null model becomes

overly broad). We then set the value of τ according to

$$\tau = \min(\tau_1, \alpha^2). \quad (12)$$

To implement the procedure for computing τ_1 for survival models, we generate response vectors under the null model using the procedure described by [Bender *et al.* \(2005\)](#). Survival times are sampled from a standard exponential model.

Let \mathbf{t}^s and \mathbf{c}^s be the vector of sampled survival times and censoring times, respectively. The sampled survival time and status for each observation is then computed as

$$y_i^s = \min\{t_i^s, c_i^s\} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_i^s = I(t_i^s \leq c_i^s), \quad (13)$$

which comprise \mathbf{y}^s and $\boldsymbol{\delta}^s$ under the null model. Using the pair $(\mathbf{y}^s, \boldsymbol{\delta}^s)$, the MLE from a Cox model is computed. It should be noted that the asymptotic distribution of the MLE for the Cox model under the null hypothesis is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$, where $I(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the information matrix of the partial likelihood function. Thus, it is appropriate to approximate the pooled estimated coefficients in that algorithm with a normal density function. When the sample size gets large, the variance of the MLE decreases and causes the overlap to become small and, consequently, small values of τ are selected.

In general, we find that $r = 1$ and $\tau = 0.25$ are good default values if one chooses not to run the hyperparameter selection algorithm. When $r = 1$, the peaks of the iMOM prior occur at $-\sqrt{\tau}$ and $\sqrt{\tau}$. By equating $\sqrt{\tau}$ to the absolute value of the expected effect size for a given application, insight can be gained on what value of τ is appropriate. Further details regarding this algorithm can be found in [Nikooienejad *et al.* \(2016\)](#).

3.2 Computing Posterior Probability of Models

Computing the posterior probability for each model requires the marginal probability of observed survival times under each model, as shown in (6) and (7). The marginal probability is approximated using the Laplace approximation, where the regression coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ are integrated out. This leads to

$$m_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}_n) = \pi(\mathbf{y}_n | \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}) \pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}) (2\pi)^{k/2} |G_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}}|^{-1/2}. \quad (14)$$

Here, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$, $G_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}}$ is the Hessian of the negative of the log posterior function,

$$g(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}) = -\log(\pi(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})) - \log(\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})), \quad (15)$$

computed at $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and k is the size of model \mathbf{k} . Finding the MAP of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is equivalent to finding the minimum of $g(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})$.

The details of computing the gradient and Hessian matrix of $g(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}})$ are discussed in Section 1 of the ?? ([Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020](#)). The gradient and Hessian matrix, described by equations (3) to (7) there, are used to find the MAP and to compute the Laplace ap-

proximation of the marginal probability of \mathbf{y} . We use the limited memory version of the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno optimization algorithm (L-BFGS) (Liu and Nocedal, 1989) to find the MAP. The initial value for the algorithm is $\hat{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}$, the MLE for the Cox proportional hazard model.

Having all the components of formula (6), it is possible to define a MCMC framework to sample from the posterior distribution on the model space. A birth-death scheme, similar to that used in Nikooienejad *et al.* (2016), could be used for this purpose. However, for computational reasons we use another stochastic algorithm to search the model space; this algorithm is described in the next section.

The highest posterior probability model (HPPM) is defined as the model having the highest posterior probability among all visited models. In practice, many models may be assigned probabilities that are close to the probability achieved by the HPPM. For this reason and for predictive purposes, it is useful to obtain the Median Probability Model (MPM) (Barbieri and Berger, 2004) which is the model containing covariates that have posterior inclusion probabilities of at least 0.5. According to Barbieri and Berger (2004), the posterior inclusion probability for covariate i is defined as

$$p_i = \sum_{\mathbf{k}: \gamma_{\mathbf{k}i}=1} P(M_{\mathbf{k}}|\mathbf{y}). \quad (16)$$

That is, the sum of posterior probabilities of all models that have covariate i as one of their variables. In this expression, $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}i}$ is a binary value determining the inclusion of the i^{th} covariate in model \mathbf{k} .

3.2.1 Stochastic Search Algorithm

To increase the efficiency of exploring the model space, we use the S5 algorithm. S5 was proposed by Shin *et al.* (2018) for variable selection in linear regression problems, and we adapt it here for survival models. It is a stochastic search method that screens covariates at each step. The algorithm is scalable and its computational complexity is only linearly dependent on p (Shin *et al.*, 2018).

Screening is the essential part of the S5 algorithm. In linear regression, screening is based on the correlation between excluded covariates and the residuals of the regression using the current model (Fan and Lv, 2008). The concept of screening covariates for survival response data is proposed in Fan *et al.* (2010) and is defined based on the marginal utility for each covariate.

To illustrate the screening technique, suppose that the current model is \mathbf{k} . Let \mathbf{k}^c denote the complement of set \mathbf{k} containing columns of the design matrix that are not in the current model, \mathbf{k} . The conditional utility of covariate $m \in \mathbf{k}^c$ represents the amount of information

covariate m contributes to the survival outcome, given model \mathbf{k} , and is defined as

$$u_{m|\mathbf{k}} = \max_{\substack{\beta_m \\ m \in \mathbf{k}^c}} \delta^T \left[(\beta_m \mathbf{X}_{(m)} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) - \log \left\{ \sum_{j=i}^n \exp(\beta_m x_{jm} + \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_j} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) \right\} \right]. \quad (17)$$

By comparing $u_{m|\mathbf{k}}$ to the Cox log-likelihood equation (Formula (1) in the ?? (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020)), it follows heuristically that the conditional utility is the maximum likelihood for covariate m after accounting for the information provided by model \mathbf{k} . Finding $u_{m|\mathbf{k}}$ is a univariate optimization procedure that can be computed rapidly.

With this background the S5 algorithm for survival data works as follows. At each step the d covariates with highest conditional utility are candidates to be added to the current model \mathbf{k} and comprise the addition set, Γ^+ . The deletion set, Γ^- contains the current model, except that one variable is removed. From the current model, \mathbf{k} , we consider moves to each of its neighbors in Γ^+ and Γ^- with a probability proportional to the marginal probabilities of these neighboring models.

To avoid local maxima, the model probabilities used in S5 are raised to the power of $1/t_l$, where t_l is the l^{th} temperature in an annealing schedule in which “temperatures” decrease. To increase the number of visited models, a specified number of iterations are performed at each temperature. At the end of the procedure, the model with the highest posterior probability of visited models is identified as the HPPM.

In our version of the S5 algorithm, we used 10 equally spaced temperatures varying from 3 to 1 and 30 iterations within each temperature. Section 4 of the ?? (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020) provides some discussion on how these values are chosen for this application. To increase the number of visited models, we parallelized the S5 procedure so that it could be distributed to multiple CPUs. Each CPU executes the S5 algorithm independently with a different starting model. All visited models are pooled together at the end, and the HPPM and MPM are determined. Using posterior probabilities of the visited models, the posterior inclusion probability for each covariate can be computed using (16). In our simulations we used 120 CPUs to explore the model space for design matrices with $O(10^4)$ covariates.

3.3 Predictive Accuracy Assessment

In addition to looking at the selected genes and their pathways to determine their biological relevance in analyzing the real datasets, we used the time dependent AUC, obtained from time dependent ROC curves as introduced by Heagerty *et al.* (2000), for survival times to summarize and compare the predictive performance of the various algorithms. This measure has a relatively straightforward interpretation and, unlike other summary measures such as the c-index (Harrell Jr *et al.*, 1982), can be computed without requiring specific conditions or additional assumptions to hold (Blanche *et al.*, 2018). However, predictive performance measures including the c-index, Integrated Brier Score (IBS) (Gerds and Schumacher, 2006)

and prediction error curves, are investigated and reported in Sections 4 and 5 for both simulation and real data sets.

There are different methods to estimate time dependent sensitivity and specificity. In our algorithm we adapted a method proposed by [Uno *et al.* \(2007\)](#), henceforth called Uno's method. In that method, after splitting data into training and test sets, sensitivity is estimated by

$$\widehat{\text{SE}}_{\mathbf{k}}(t, c) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i I(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}} > c, T_i \leq t) / \hat{G}(T_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i I(T_i \leq t) / \hat{G}(T_i)}, \quad (18)$$

and specificity is estimated by

$$\widehat{\text{SP}}_{\mathbf{k}}(t, c) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathbf{k}} \leq c, T_i > t)}{\sum_{i=1}^n I(T_i > t)}. \quad (19)$$

These values are estimated for the test set. Therefore, in the equations above, n is the number of observations in the test set, δ_i is the status of observation i and T_i is the observed time for that observation in the test set. The variable c is the discrimination threshold that is varied to obtain the ROC curve. The function \hat{G} is the Kaplan–Meier estimate of the survival function obtained from the training set. For each observation i in the test set with observed time T_i , $\hat{G}(T_i)$ is computed by a basic interpolation procedure. That is,

$$\hat{G}(T_i) = \hat{G}(T_{tr}^*), \quad \text{where } T_{tr}^* = \underset{T \in T_{tr}}{\operatorname{argmin}} |T - T_i|. \quad (20)$$

Here, T_{tr} is the set of all observed survival times in the training set. In (18) and (19), $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ represents the estimated coefficient under a specific model.

3.3.1 Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA)

BMA can be used to improve the predictive accuracy by accounting for the uncertainty in selected models. From (18) and (19) the final sensitivity and specificity using BMA may be defined as

$$\widehat{\text{SE}}_{\text{BMA}}(t, c) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\text{SE}}_{\mathbf{k}^j}(t, c) P(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}^j} | \mathbf{y}_n), \quad (21)$$

and

$$\widehat{\text{SP}}_{\text{BMA}}(t, c) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\text{SP}}_{\mathbf{k}^j}(t, c) P(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}^j} | \mathbf{y}_n), \quad (22)$$

where, $P(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}^i} | \mathbf{y}_n)$ is the posterior probability of model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}^i}$. The value of \mathcal{N} depends on what type of BMA is used. We use Occam's window, which means only models that have posterior probability of at least $w \times p(\mathcal{M}_{\text{HPPM}} | \mathbf{y}_n)$ are used in model averaging. We set $w = 0.01$ for our applications.

In the proposed method individual survival curves are estimated using the highest posterior probability model. Section 2 of the ?? (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020) provides the details of this procedure. Similar approaches were also adopted by Held *et al.* (2016) in estimating the survival curve for each individual in a study.

4 Simulation Results

To investigate the performance of the proposed model selection procedure, we applied our method to simulated datasets. We followed the guidance of Morris *et al.* (2019) as a basis for our simulation protocol. In particular, the simulation design was based on the ADEMP structure (Aims, Data generating mechanism, Estimands, Methods, and Performance measures) discussed in that article. We refer to each of those elements as we explain different parts of the simulation design below.

Regarding “*Methods*,” we compared the performance of our algorithm to ISIS-SCAD (Fan *et al.*, 2010) and GLMNET (Friedman *et al.*, 2010), two of the most highly used algorithms for high-dimensional variable selection for survival data. We used the published R packages of those two methods to run the simulations. We also performed a comparison with a case when pMOM priors are used as the prior for nonzero coefficients instead of piMOM priors.

The “*Aim*” of the simulation study was to compare the performance of our method with the other two methods with respect to the correlation structure between covariates in the design matrix. More specifically, we reported three different simulation settings that consider different combinations of correlation structure, true model size and the magnitude of true coefficients. This was the basis of our “*Data generating mechanism*”. The correlation structure used in those settings are similar to the simulations reported in Fan *et al.* (2010).

For Case 1, X_1, \dots, X_p were multivariate Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and marginal variance of 1. The correlation structure was $\text{corr}(X_i, X_5) = 0$ for all $i \neq 4, 5$, $\text{corr}(X_5, X_4) = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\text{corr}(X_i, X_j) = 0.5$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{4, 5\}$. The size of the true model was 5 with nonzero regression coefficients $\beta_1 = -1.5389, \beta_2 = 0.6839, \beta_3 = -0.8498, \beta_4 = -1.2716, \beta_5 = -1.1045$ and $\beta_i = 0$ for $i > 5$. The number of observations and covariates were $n = 400$ and $p = 1000$. The censoring rate for this case was approximately 27.6%. The survival and censoring times are both sampled from an exponential distribution. The rate parameter for the distribution of censoring times was set to 0.1.

For Case 2, X_1, \dots, X_p were multivariate Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and marginal variance of 1. The correlation structure between variables was $\text{corr}(X_i, X_j) = 0.5; i \neq j$. The size of the true model was 6 with nonzero regression coefficients $\beta_1 = 1.1201, \beta_2 = 0.8322, \beta_3 = -1.9620, \beta_4 = -1.7639, \beta_5 = 1.6782, \beta_6 = 1.8995$, and $\beta_i = 0$ for $i > 6$. The number of observations and covariates were $n = 400$ and $p = 1000$. In this case the survival times were sampled from a Weibull distribution with rate parameter $\lambda = 0.1$ and shape parameter $k = 15$. The censoring times were sampled uniformly from $[0, 8]$, and the resulting censoring rate for this case was approximately 14.8%.

For Case 3 the design matrix and correlation structure between variables was the same as Case 2, where $\text{corr}(X_i, X_j) = 0.5, i \neq j$. The size of the true model was 20 with nonzero

regression coefficients $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{20})$ equal to $(-1.6802, -1.2483, 2.9430, -2.6458, -2.5173, -2.8493, -2.0070, -1.5931, 0.8800, -0.9387, 1.6599, -2.9288, -1.2495, -2.6298, -2.3434, 1.9075, -1.1044, -0.7873, 2.6722, -0.6340)$, and $\beta_i = 0$ for $i > 20$. The number of observations and covariates were $n = 400$ and $p = 1000$. The censoring rate for this case was approximately 34.1%. The survival and censoring times were both sampled from an exponential distribution. The rate parameter for the distribution of censoring times was set to 0.1.

Each simulation case was then repeated 50 times, $n_{iter} = 50$, and each time with different random seed numbers in order to generate different datasets.

The primary targets of our simulation study, or the “*Estimands*,” according to [Morris et al. \(2019\)](#), were identifying the true model as well as estimating the vector of coefficients of the true model. Accordingly, we reported four different quantities as “*Performance measures*” for those estimands. The first two quantities are the mean l_1 norm of the error in estimating the vector of coefficients and the mean squared error (MSE). The mean l_1 norm was computed as $\frac{1}{n_{iter}} \sum_{i=1}^p |\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i|$, and the MSE was computed as $\frac{1}{n_{iter}} \sum_{i=1}^p (\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i)^2$. The third quantity is the mean model size of the selected models and was denoted by MMS. MTP and MFP denote mean false positive and mean true positive values for each algorithm. Formal definitions of MFP, MTP are provided in Section 3 of the ?? ([Nikooienejad et al., 2020](#)).

Table 1 compares the performance of our method, BVSNLP, the default settings of ISIS-SCAD and GLMNET algorithms. The λ parameter in GLMNET was picked by cross validation. Table 2 compares the Monte Carlo standard errors ([Morris et al., 2019](#)) of the MSEs for all three methods.

In the S5 algorithm 30 iterations were used within each temperature. The parameter d was chosen as $2\lceil \log(p) \rceil$. As described in Section 3.2.1, d represents the number of candidate covariates that were added to the current model to make the addition set, Γ^+ . Each S5 algorithm was run in parallel on 120 CPUs for all three simulation cases. The beta-binomial prior was imposed on the model space with $a = 1, b = p - a$. The hyperparameters of the piMOM prior were selected using the algorithm discussed in Section 3.1 with $\alpha = 0.8$ for all three simulation cases, imposed as the prior mode.

Finally, the average runtimes of the BVSNLP algorithm for the three simulation cases were 29, 20.23 and 27.99 seconds, respectively.

As demonstrated in Table 1, our method performs better than the other two methods according to all selected metrics, regardless of the size of the true model. The difference between BVSNLP and ISIS-SCAD is best illustrated as the size of the true model increases. GLMNET has significantly higher mean false positive rates than the other two methods.

Figures 2, 3a and 3b compare the average IBS over 50 iterations between the methods discussed above. IBS is computed using the R package `pec` ([Mogensen et al., 2012](#)) based on a five-fold cross-validation. A benchmark model based on Kaplan–Meier estimate, which includes no covariates, is also added to the figures as a reference for the comparison. The average c-index measures for all the methods are also reported in Table 3. The c-index measures are computed based on the method discussed in [van Houwelingen and Putter \(2011\)](#), using the `dynpred` package in R. Because a new dataset was created at each iteration,

Table 1: Comparison between BVSNLP, ISIS-SCAD and GLMNET for simulation Cases 1, 2, and 3 with $n = 400$ and $p = 1000$.

	BVSNLP	ISIS-SCAD	GLMNET
Case 1:			
MSE	0.141	0.792	1.441
Mean l_1 norm	0.488	2.200	4.072
MMS	4.96	8.84	51.46
MTP	4.92	4.62	4.00
MFP	0.04	4.22	47.46
Case 2:			
MSE	0.141	0.792	1.441
Mean l_1 norm	0.505	0.552	3.891
MMS	6	5.94	50.94
MTP	6	5.88	5.92
MFP	0	0.06	45.02
Case 3:			
MSE	0.602	5.287	4.701
Mean l_1 norm	2.680	22.962	22.824
MMS	20.08	14.76	105.62
MTP	19.94	12.80	19.96
MFP	0.14	1.96	85.66

it was not possible to get the average prediction errors, due to the fact that the times points where prediction errors change were different for different data sets.

As shown in the IBS plots, all three methods perform better than the reference. BVSNLP and ISIS-SCAD have a very similar performance. For Case 3, where the true model has 20 covariates, BVSNLP outperforms the other two methods, whereas in Case 2, GLMNET has the best performance. The c-index is similar for all methods and seems to provide a smaller penalty for model size. This feature of the c-index is discussed further in Section 6.

Table 2: Monte Carlo Standard Errors for the MSE of the coefficient vector for all three methods.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
BVSNLP	0.064	0.008	0.065
ISIS-SCAD	0.098	0.015	0.142
GLMNET	0.007	0.024	0.055




Figure 2: Average IBS for all methods in simulation case 1.




Figure 3: IBS plots for simulation cases 2 and 3.

Table 3: Average c-index measures over 50 iterations in each simulation case.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
BVSNLP	0.890	0.881	0.960
ISIS-SCAD	0.895	0.876	0.841
GLMNET	0.911	0.908	0.970

5 Application to Real Data

We applied our method to selected genes associated with patient survival times for two common cancer types using datasets from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) projects: kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC) ([Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2013](#)) and kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP) ([Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2016](#)). We compared the performance of our algorithm to ISIS-SCAD ([Fan *et al.*, 2010](#)), GLMNET ([Friedman *et al.*, 2010](#)) and Stability Selection ([Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2010](#)). Stability Selection was combined with a high-dimensional selection algorithm, such as GLMNET, and selects the most stable features for a given level of Type I error. To run the Stability Selection method, we used the `c060` R package ([Sill *et al.*, 2014](#)) and the recommended values for function arguments.

We included patients’ “Age, Gender” and a clinical stage variable, “Stage”, in the design matrix. On the advice of a clinician, the “Stage” variable was developed by combining the histological stage, pathological stage and clinical stage into one variable that is a summary of how advanced each subject’s cancer was when the tissue sample was taken. “Stage”, like “Gender”, is a categorical variable but with three levels, where “Stage i ” represents the i^{th} class of that variable; “Stage 3” represents the most advanced stage. To remove stromal contaminations from the gene expression data, the DeMixT algorithm ([Wang *et al.*, 2017](#)) was performed on the design matrix and the tumor-specific expression data were used in the analyses for all algorithms.

The predictive performance was measured by a time-dependent AUC, as discussed in Section 3.3, based on a five-fold cross-validation. The observations in each fold were randomly chosen under a constraint which balanced censoring rate between folds. The AUC values were computed for the test set using the model that was obtained by performing variable selection on the training set. The selected covariates for each cancer type were also compared. For our method, we report the covariates associated with the highest posterior probability model. The hyperparameter τ of the piMOM prior was selected using the algorithm in Section 3.1 with $\alpha = 0.1$ as the mode of the piMOM prior. This is our choice of α for real datasets. The results for each cancer type are discussed in separate sections below. Note that GLMNET has a random output when the hyperparameter is selected by cross-validation. As a result, based on the recommendation of the inventors of that algorithm, we ran it 100 times for each fold and took the average of results as the outcome for that fold.

We treated categorical variables “Stage” and “Gender”, as well as the continuous variable “Age”, as fixed covariates in our model. However, available ISIS-SCAD and Stability Selection software packages are not able to fix preselected covariates to be included in all models. For this reason, dummy variables associated to “Stage” and “Gender” were manually added to the design matrix and were subject to the selection procedure for those methods.

5.1 Kidney Renal Clear Cell Carcinoma (KIRC)

After removing covariates with missing expressions and observations with missing survival times, the KIRC dataset ([Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2013](#)) contains 490 ob-

Table 4: Selected genes and covariates for KIRC across different variable selection algorithms

BVSNLP	Age SUDS3	Gender AR	Stage
ISIS-SCAD	Stage 3 HEBP1 MTERF2 SERPINI1 INAFM2	AR ATP2C1 ADGRL3 SP6	Age GADD45A GPSM1 ZNF815P
GLMNET	Stage HEBP1 PCBP4 E2F5 RAB28 HACD1 TRAIP GPR162	AR SEC61A2 FAHD2A SLC5A6 DONSON MARS RPL17P50 INAFM2	Age TRMT6 MCM8 NARF GPSM1 FASN SLC26A6 ACACA
Stability Selection	Stage 3 INAFM2	AR	Age

servations with 13,267 covariates, . The censoring rate for this dataset is 66.94%. Table 4 shows the covariates selected by each method. As mentioned previously, GLMNET produces random outputs at each run, and therefore, for this table, only the output for one of the runs are indicated; other runs produced a similar number of selected covariates.

In addition to the categorical covariate “Stage”, BVSNLP selects “AR” and “SUDS3” in the HPPM as the most significant covariates in the design matrix. The posterior inclusion probabilities for “AR” and “SUDS3” are 0.80 and 0.08, respectively. The “Age”, “Gender”, and “Stage” were fixed in all models and thus were selected with probability 1. The MAP estimates for the coefficients of “Age, Gender Male, Stage 2, Stage 3, AR” and “SUDS3” were 0.33, -0.11 , 0.45 , 1.61 , -0.60 and 0.36 , respectively. These coefficients indicate that patients with the most advanced stages of cancer had the poorest survival rates, and that a patient with a tumor sample characterized as advanced has a hazard rate that was $\exp(1.61) \approx 5$ times higher than a patient with tumor sample characterized as localized, when all other covariates were the same. These coefficients also show that the hazard rate in females is 1.12 times that in males, and age has an unfavorable impact on the hazard rate, as expected. Moreover, the negative sign for the “AR” gene indicates it has a favorable impact on survival for KIRC. “AR”, the Androgen Receptor gene, functions as a steroid-hormone activated transcription factor. It has been well documented that “AR” promotes the progression of renal cell carcinoma (RCC) through hypoxia-inducible factors HIF- 2α and vascular endothelial growth factor regulation (Fenner, 2016). The favorable impact of the “AR” gene was also studied by Hata *et al.* (2017) in bladder cancer. “SUDS3” is a regulatory protein that




Figure 4: Average AUC of different variable selection methods based on a five fold cross-validation for KIRC dataset.

is part of the SIN3A corepressor complex component that potentially has a role in tumor suppressor pathways through regulation of apoptosis. There was previous evidence of the down-regulation of the SIN3A gene in tumorigenesis of lung cancer (Suzuki *et al.*, 2008).

It is noteworthy that the algorithm selected the same highest posterior probability model for different values of the hyperparameter τ in the range $[0.01, 0.9]$. This shows the robustness of the proposed variable selection algorithm to the choice of hyperparameter τ for a range of plausible values.

For this particular run of GLMNET, a much larger model was selected with 24 variables including two of the variables reported by BVSNLP. ISIS-SCAD selected 13 covariates, which included the four covariates that were selected by the Stability Selection method. “AR” and the last level of “Stage” are the common covariates among all methods.

The time dependent AUC plot for all four methods, obtained by performing a five-fold cross validation, is depicted in Figure 4. BVSNLP has slightly better predictive accuracy than GLMNET and Stability Selection. However, it achieves this accuracy with a much sparser model. We investigated the covariates that were selected by each of those algorithms in all five folds and found that BVSNLP, in addition to those fixed covariates, selects only 10 unique genes in total, where ‘AR’ is selected in three of the five folds.

GLMNET selected 160 different covariates across all five folds. Only five out of 24 selected covariates in Table 4 were selected in all five training datasets in cross-validation. Those include “Age, Stage” and “AR”. GLMNET was run 100 times for each fold. ISIS-SCAD selected 45 different covariates, and only “Stage 3” was selected in all training datasets in cross-validation. The Stability Selection method selected sparser models compared to ISIS-SCAD and GLMNET by selecting 13 different covariates. It picked only “Age” and “Stage 3” in all five folds.

Figures 5a and 5b compare IBS and prediction error curves, respectively, between different methods for the KIRC dataset. These two measures were computed based on a five-fold cross-




Figure 5: IBS and prediction error of BVSNLP for the KIRC dataset.

validation. Computation of IBS and prediction error were done using the R package `pec` (Mogensen *et al.*, 2012). A benchmark model based on the Kaplan–Meier estimate, which includes no covariates, was also added to the figures as a reference for the comparison. The c-index measures are also reported in Table 5. The c-index was computed as it was in Section 4 using the `dynpred` package in R.

Table 5: Average c-index measure of different methods for the KIRC dataset.

	BVSNLP	GLMNET	ISIS-SCAD	Stability Selection
c-index measure	0.804	0.816	0.846	0.797

GLMNET has almost the same IBS curve as the reference Kaplan–Meier curve. BVSNLP outperforms ISIS-SCAD, and Stability selection has the best IBS performance among all. For prediction error curves, BVSNLP is second to ISIS-SCAD, and GLMNET and Stability Selection have almost the same performance. A different behavior can be seen for c-index measures where GLMNET and ISIS-SCAD have higher c-indices than BVSNLP.

BVSNLP was run on 120 CPUs, Stability Selection was run on four CPUs, while GLMNET and ISIS-SCAD were run on a single CPU. The average runtime for different methods in each fold of the cross validation was 6.4, 180, 5, and 1.3 minutes for BVSNLP, GLMNET, ISIS-SCAD and Stability Selection.

In our previous study of binary outcomes using the same dataset (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2016), we performed hierarchical clustering on the deconvolved tumor-specific expression matrix and identified two clusters of patient samples. We saw these two groups of patients present significantly different survival outcomes and, therefore, assigned good vs. bad survival to the groups. The dichotomization was based solely on the clustering results of deconvolved gene expression levels. Survival times and censoring did not play any role in

that process. However, there was a loss of information in dichotomizing a survival dataset and analyzing it with logistic regression. Now, with BVSNLP, we are able to use the original survival time to event with censoring information. To compare the biological implications between the two analyses, we looked for known expression regulation networks between the gene sets found in the binary analysis, SAV1 and NUMBL, and the new genes found in this analysis, AR and SUDS3, using Pathway Studio[®] (Nikitin *et al.*, 2003; Elsevier, 2018). We found that the well-studied cancer genes TGFB1, BCL2, PPARG, NEDD4, and CTNNB1, and a regulatory microRNA, MIR21, constitute the shortest paths between SAV1 and AR. Similarly, we found cancer genes CDKN1A, WNT3A, two genes that determine cell fate (SOX17 (connected with CTNNB1) and NANOG) and PAX6 that regulates transcription, to constitute the shortest paths between NUMBL and SUDS3. These are depicted in Section 6 of the ?? (Nikooienejad *et al.*, 2020). These findings suggest a high biological consistency between our two analyses that used BVSNLP to select features for binary and survival outcomes.

In summary, the binary model using SAV1 and NUMBL to predict overall survival of patients with kidney cancer is not as effective as the model using AR and SUDS3, as shown in Figure 6. Thus, although the findings of Nikooienejad *et al.* (2016) were biologically justified, some limitations were associated with those findings due to the information loss incurred by clustering and dichotomizing the data, and the BVSNLP survival model provides better insight on the genes associated with this cancer type.




Figure 6: Comparison between BVSNLP model selection using survival and dichotomized versions of the KIRC dataset.

5.2 Kidney Renal Papillary Cell Carcinoma (KIRP)

The KIRP dataset (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2016) contains 244 samples with 13,335 covariates (after necessary data cleaning) and has a fairly high censoring rate of 85.7%. The covariates selected by each method are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Selected covariates for KIRP across different variable selection algorithms

BVSNLP	Age CDK1	Gender	Stage
ISIS-SCAD	CDK1	COL6A1	C19orf33
GLMNET	<i>No covariates were selected</i>		
Stability Selection	Stage 3	MTC02P12	RPL39P3

In addition to the fixed covariates “Age, Gender”, and “Stage”, BVSNLP selects the “CDK1” gene in the HPPM as the most significant covariate in the design matrix. The posterior inclusion probability for “CDK1” was 0.12. The MAP estimates for the coefficients of “Age, Gender Male, Stage 2, Stage 3” and “CDK1” were 0.12, -0.10 , 0.11, 0.79 and 1.13, respectively. This shows that a unit increase in “CDK1” (Cyclin dependent kinase 1) gene expression increases the hazard rate by a factor of three for given values of the other covariates. CDK1 is a cell cycle regulator and has been reported previously as a prognostic marker gene for various cancer types. Many experimental studies have been performed to further understand the molecular mechanism behind the complex functions of CDK1 ([Malumbres and Barbacid, 2009](#)). This is the first time, however, that CDK1 has been reported as a prognostic marker gene in human data for papillary renal cell carcinoma. As expected, patients at the most advanced stage cancer have a hazard rate that is 2.2 times higher than patients at a localized stage of cancer, given the values of all other covariates. As in the case of KIRC patients, age and male gender have unfavorable and favorable impacts on the hazard rate, respectively.

Surprisingly, GLMNET does not select any covariates. Stability Selection picked three




Figure 7: Average AUC of BVSNLP based on a five fold cross-validation for the KIRP dataset.




Figure 8: IBS and prediction error of BVSNLP for the KIRP dataset.

covariates, with only “Stage 3” in common with BVSNLP. As in the previous dataset, we tested BVSNLP for different choices of τ in the interval $[0.01, 0.9]$, and the same model was selected for all values within this range. The total runtime of BVSNLP for this dataset was around five minutes using 120 CPUs.

Figure 7 shows the predictive accuracy for the proposed method based on a five-fold cross-validation. The outcomes for GLMNET, ISIS-SCAD and Stability Selection are not displayed in the plot because those methods did not converge or failed to produce results for at least one of the five folds in the cross-validation experiment. The small AUC values in this plot for $t < 1$ warrant comment. Because there were few events soon after entry of tissue samples into the TCGA database, the AUC for early timepoints falls close to the 50% benchmark reflecting no predictive value.

Figures 8a and 8b, respectively, depict IBS and prediction error curves of the BVSNLP method, based on a five-fold cross validation for the KIRP dataset, and compares it to the reference curve obtained by the Kaplan–Meier method. The c-index measure for the BVSNLP method is 0.876. The average runtime for BVSNLP in each fold of the cross-validation was 3.6 minutes on 120 CPUs.

6 Discussion

In this article a Bayesian variable selection method, BVSNLP, was proposed for selecting variables in high and ultrahigh dimensional datasets with survival time as outcomes. BVSNLP uses an inverse moment nonlocal prior density on nonzero regression coefficients. Analyses of simulated and real data suggest that BVSNLP performs comparably or better than other existing methods for variable selection for survival data. Moreover, the real data results indicated that the proposed algorithm is robust to the choice of the hyperparameter

τ in the piMOM prior for values of τ in the range $[0.01, 0.9]$.

Various outputs are provided by the algorithm. These include the HPPM, MPM and the posterior inclusion probability for each covariate in the model. For real datasets, Bayesian model averaging is used to incorporate uncertainty in selected models when computing time dependent AUC plots using Uno’s method (Uno *et al.*, 2007). Finally, an R package named BVSNNLP has been implemented to make the algorithm freely available and adaptable to interested researchers. The package can be run in parallel fashion where hundreds of CPUs can be exploited in order to increase the number of visited models in the search for the highest posterior probability model. The BVSNNLP package is available in the R repository, CRAN, at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BVSNNLP>. The user manual for the package is also available from this site.

Two real cancer genomic datasets from the TCGA website were considered in this article. Compared to other methods, BVSNNLP found sparser models with biologically relevant genes. The proposed method showed a reliable predictive accuracy as measured by AUC using substantially fewer variables.

We have based our assessments on time dependent AUC and biological interpretation of the results, but other measures, like IBS, prediction error and the concordance index (also known as the c-index or Harrell’s c-index) were also reported. Difficulties associated with such measures are identified in Blanche *et al.* (2018). In particular, the authors of that article demonstrate that the concordance index can favor misspecified models over the correctly specified model because it is based on the order of event times rather than the event status at the prediction horizon. This may explain the slightly higher c-index values for GLMNET in both simulation and real datasets. The time dependent AUC does not suffer from this deficiency. Of course, different evaluation criteria can be expected to result in different rankings of models, and criteria that emphasize prediction error over low false positive rates can be expected to favor larger models. Similarly, criteria that place a higher premium on eliminating false positives will tend to select smaller models.

Acknowledgments: Portions of this research were conducted with the advanced computing resources provided by Texas A&M High Performance Research Computing (HPRC).

References

- Antoniadis, A., Fryzlewicz, P., and Letu  , F. (2010). The dantzig selector in cox’s proportional hazards model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **37**(4), 531–552.
- Barbieri, M. M. and Berger, J. O. (2004). Optimal predictive model selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, **32**(3), 870–897.
- Bender, R., Augustin, T., and Blettner, M. (2005). Generating survival times to simulate cox proportional hazards models. *Statistics in Medicine*, **24**(11), 1713–1723.

- Berger, J. O., Liseo, B., Wolpert, R. L., *et al.* (1999). Integrated likelihood methods for eliminating nuisance parameters. *Statistical Science*, **14**(1), 1–28.
- Blanche, P., Kattan, M. W., and Gerds, T. A. (2018). The c-index is not proper for the evaluation of t -year predicted risks. *Biostatistics*, **20**(2), 347–357.
- Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network (2013). Comprehensive molecular characterization of clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *Nature*, **499**(7456), 43–49.
- Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network (2016). Comprehensive molecular characterization of papillary renal-cell carcinoma. *New England Journal of Medicine*, **374**(2), 135–145.
- Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, **36**(2), 187–220.
- Cox, D. R. and Oakes, D. (1984). *Analysis of Survival Data*, volume 21. CRC Press.
- Elsevier (2018). *PathwayStudio*[®], volume pathwaystudio.com. Elsevier Inc.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2002). Variable selection for cox’s proportional hazards model and frailty model. *Annals of Statistics*, **30**(1), 74–99.
- Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **70**(5), 849–911.
- Fan, J., Feng, Y., Wu, Y., *et al.* (2010). High-dimensional variable selection for coxs proportional hazards model. In *Borrowing Strength: Theory Powering Applications—A Festschrift for Lawrence D. Brown*, pages 70–86. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Faraggi, D. and Simon, R. (1998). Bayesian variable selection method for censored survival data. *Biometrics*, **54**(4), 1475–1485.
- Fenner, A. (2016). Kidney cancer: Ar promotes rcc via lncrna interaction. *Nature Reviews Urology*, **13**(5), 242.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **33**(1), 1–22.
- George, E. I. and McCulloch, R. E. (1997). Approaches for bayesian variable selection. *Statistica Sinica*, **7**(2), 339–373.
- Gerds, T. A. and Schumacher, M. (2006). Consistent estimation of the expected brier score in general survival models with right-censored event times. *Biometrical Journal*, **48**(6), 1029–1040.
- Ghosh, J. (1988). Statistical information and likelihood: A collection of critical essays by dr. d. basu. *Lect. Notes in Statist*, **45**.

- Harrell Jr, F. E., Califf, R. M., Pryor, D. B., Lee, K. L., Rosati, R. A., *et al.* (1982). Evaluating the yield of medical tests. *JAMA*, **247**(18), 2543–2546.
- Hata, S., Ise, K., Azmahani, A., Konosu-Fukaya, S., McNamara, K. M., Fujishima, F., Shimada, K., Mitsuzuka, K., Arai, Y., Sasano, H., *et al.* (2017). Expression of ar, 5 α r1 and 5 α r2 in bladder urothelial carcinoma and relationship to clinicopathological factors. *Life Sciences*, **190**, 15–20.
- Heagerty, P. J., Lumley, T., and Pepe, M. S. (2000). Time-dependent roc curves for censored survival data and a diagnostic marker. *Biometrics*, **56**(2), 337–344.
- Held, L., Gravestock, I., and Sabanés Bové, D. (2016). Objective bayesian model selection for cox regression. *Statistics in Medicine*, **35**(29), 5376–5390.
- Ibrahim, J. G., Chen, M.-H., and MacEachern, S. N. (1999). Bayesian variable selection for proportional hazards models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **27**(4), 701–717.
- Johnson, V. E. (2005). Bayes factors based on test statistics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **67**(5), 689–701.
- Johnson, V. E. and Rossell, D. (2010). On the use of non-local prior densities in bayesian hypothesis tests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **72**(2), 143–170.
- Johnson, V. E. and Rossell, D. (2012). Bayesian model selection in high-dimensional settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **107**(498), 649–660.
- Kalbfleisch, J. and Prentice, R. (1980). *The statistical analysis of time failure data*. John Wiley and Sons New York.
- Liu, D. C. and Nocedal, J. (1989). On the limited memory bfgs method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, **45**(1-3), 503–528.
- Malumbres, M. and Barbacid, M. (2009). Cell cycle, cdks and cancer: a changing paradigm. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, **9**(3), 153.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2010). Stability selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **72**(4), 417–473.
- Mogensen, U. B., Ishwaran, H., and Gerds, T. A. (2012). Evaluating random forests for survival analysis using prediction error curves. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **50**(11), 1–23.
- Morris, T. P., White, I. R., and Crowther, M. J. (2019). Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods. *Statistics in Medicine*, **38**(11), 2074–2102.
- Nikitin, A., Egorov, S., Daraselia, N., and Mazo, I. (2003). Pathway studio—the analysis and navigation of molecular networks. *Bioinformatics*, **19**(16), 2155–2157.

- Nikooienejad, A. *et al.* (2020). Supplement to “bayesian variable selection for survival data using inverse moment priors”.
- Nikooienejad, A., Wang, W., and Johnson, V. E. (2016). Bayesian variable selection for binary outcomes in high-dimensional genomic studies using non-local priors. *Bioinformatics*, **32**(9), 1338–1345.
- Scott, J. G., Berger, J. O., *et al.* (2010). Bayes and empirical-bayes multiplicity adjustment in the variable-selection problem. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**(5), 2587–2619.
- Sha, N., Tadesse, M. G., and Vannucci, M. (2006). Bayesian variable selection for the analysis of microarray data with censored outcomes. *Bioinformatics*, **22**(18), 2262–2268.
- Shin, M., Bhattacharya, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2018). Scalable bayesian variable selection using nonlocal prior densities in ultrahigh-dimensional settings. *Statistica Sinica*, **28**(2), 1053–1078.
- Sill, M., Hielscher, T., Becker, N., and Zucknick, M. (2014). c060: Extended inference with lasso and elastic-net regularized cox and generalized linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **62**(5), 1–22.
- Suzuki, H., Ouchida, M., Yamamoto, H., Yano, M., Toyooka, S., Aoe, M., Shimizu, N., Date, H., and Shimizu, K. (2008). Decreased expression of the sin3a gene, a candidate tumor suppressor located at the prevalent allelic loss region 15q23 in non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*, **59**(1), 24–31.
- Tibshirani, R. *et al.* (1997). The lasso method for variable selection in the cox model. *Statistics in Medicine*, **16**(4), 385–395.
- Uno, H., Cai, T., Tian, L., and Wei, L. (2007). Evaluating prediction rules for t-year survivors with censored regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **102**(478), 527–537.
- van Houwelingen, H. and Putter, H. (2011). *Dynamic Prediction in Clinical Survival Analysis*. CRC Press.
- Wang, Z., Morris, J. S., Cao, S., Ahn, J., Liu, R., Tyekucheva, S., Li, B., Lu, W., Tang, X., Wistuba, I. I., *et al.* (2017). Transcriptome deconvolution of heterogeneous tumor samples with immune infiltration. *bioRxiv*, page 146795.
- Zhang, H. H. and Lu, W. (2007). Adaptive lasso for cox’s proportional hazards model. *Biometrika*, **94**(3), 691–703.

Supplement to Bayesian Variable Selection For Survival Data Using Inverse Moment Priors

Amir Nikooienejad, Wenyi Wang and Valen E. Johnson

1 Calculating the Gradient and Hessian of $g(\beta_{\mathbf{k}})$

Let $l(\mathbf{y}; \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) = \log(\pi(\mathbf{y} | \beta_{\mathbf{k}}))$ and $l_{\pi}(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}) = \log(\pi(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}))$. For a $n \times p$ matrix \mathbf{A} , let $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ denote the $n \times 1$ vector corresponding to the i^{th} column of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}_j denote the $1 \times p$ vector corresponding to the j^{th} row of \mathbf{A} . Also let $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_i = (\mathbf{A}_{i:n,})^T$, where $\mathbf{A}_{i:n,}$ is the sub-matrix of \mathbf{A} from row i to the last row where all columns are included. This makes the dimension of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_i$ equal to $p \times (n - i + 1)$. Similarly, for a vector α of size n , let $\bar{\alpha}_i$ denote the sub-vector of α components $i, i + 1, \dots, n$, a vector of size $(n - i + 1)$.

Let $\psi_{\mathbf{k}_i} = \sum_{j=i}^n e^{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}_j} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}}$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{k}} = (\psi_{\mathbf{k}_1}, \dots, \psi_{\mathbf{k}_n})^T$. Also let η denote the $n \times 1$ column vector $\exp\{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}\}$. The logarithm of $\pi(\mathbf{y} | \beta_{\mathbf{k}})$ in (2.2) can then be expressed as

$$l(\mathbf{y}; \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) = \delta^T (\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} - \log(\psi_{\mathbf{k}})). \quad (1)$$

For each $n \times k$ design matrix $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ vector, define a new $k \times n$ matrix $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$, with i^{th} column

$$\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}(i)} = \frac{(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{k}_i})(\bar{\eta}_i)}{\psi_{\mathbf{k}_i}}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{k}_i}$ and $\bar{\eta}_i$ are obtained from matrix $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and vector η , respectively, using the notation described in the beginning of this section.

The negative gradient of $l(\mathbf{y}; \beta_{\mathbf{k}})$ can then be written as

$$-\frac{\partial l(\mathbf{y}; \beta_{\mathbf{k}})}{\partial \beta_{\mathbf{k}}} = [\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}^T] \delta. \quad (3)$$

To compute the Hessian matrix, let $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}_{ij}}$ be the (i, j) element of $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$. The $k \times k$ identity matrix is denoted by \mathbf{I}_k and $D(\alpha)$ denotes a diagonal matrix with the elements of the vector α on its diagonal. Finally, let $\zeta^j = \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}(j)}$ denote the j^{th} column of $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$.

Row j of the $k \times k$ Hessian matrix of $-l(\mathbf{y}; \beta_{\mathbf{k}})$ is defined as

$$-\frac{\partial^2 l(\beta_{\mathbf{k}})}{\partial \beta_{\mathbf{k}_j} \partial \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^T} = \delta_{1 \times n}^T \Omega_{n \times k}^j. \quad (4)$$

The $\Omega_{n \times k}^j$ matrix itself is constructed row by row, with row i equal to

$$\Omega_i^j = \left[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{k}_i} \frac{D(\bar{\zeta}_i^j)}{\psi_{\mathbf{k}_i}} \bar{\eta}_i - \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}_{ji}} \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}(i)} \right]^T. \quad (5)$$

Computing the Hessian can be implemented with a computational complexity of $O(n)$.

The gradient and Hessian of the logarithm of the piMOM prior is more straightforward, and is given by

$$-\frac{\partial l_\pi(\beta_{\mathbf{k}})}{\partial \beta_{\mathbf{k}_i}} = \frac{r+1}{\beta_{\mathbf{k}_i}} - \frac{2\tau}{\beta_{\mathbf{k}_i}^3}. \quad (6)$$

The Hessian of $-l_\pi(\beta_{\mathbf{k}})$ is a diagonal matrix, $D(\alpha)$, where

$$\alpha_i = \frac{6\tau}{\beta_{\mathbf{k}_i}^4} - \frac{r+1}{\beta_{\mathbf{k}_i}^2}. \quad (7)$$

2 Estimating Individual Survival Curves

In the Cox proportional hazard model the survival function for individual i under model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is defined as

$$S_i(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \exp \{ -H_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}) \}^{\exp \{ \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^T \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \}} \quad (8)$$

where $H_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \int_0^t h_0(\tau; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}) d\tau$ is the cumulative baseline hazard function, which can be estimated by

$$\hat{H}_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \sum_{i: t_i \leq t} \frac{\delta_i}{\sum_{j=i}^n \exp \{ \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}_j}^T \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \}}. \quad (9)$$

This is known as the Breslow estimator of $H_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}})$ (the observed times are sorted as in (2.2)). At this point three approaches can be exploited to estimate the survival curve for individual i . The first approach is to compute the HPPM survival curve by replacing $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{HPPM}}$, and use the MAP estimate of β under the HPPM, $\hat{\beta}_{\text{HPPM}}$, in (8) and (9). That is,

$$\hat{S}_i(t) = \exp \{ -\hat{H}_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\text{HPPM}}) \}^{\exp \{ \mathbf{X}_{\text{HPPM}_i}^T \hat{\beta}_{\text{HPPM}} \}}. \quad (10)$$

The second approach is computationally more intensive but takes into account the uncertainty of the posterior samples of the model space. In this approach, samples from the posterior distribution of the survival function are generated by replacing \mathbf{k} in (8) with every posterior sample of the model space. The estimated survival curve is then obtained by taking the average of the posterior samples. That is,

$$\hat{S}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \exp \{ -\hat{H}_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}_j}) \}^{\exp \{ \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}_j i}^T \hat{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}_j} \}}, \quad (11)$$

where \mathcal{K} is the number of posterior samples.

The third approach is to use Bayesian model averaging. As discussed in the previous section, we use Occam's window where only the models with posterior probability of at least $0.01 \times p(\mathcal{M}_{\text{HPPM}} | \mathbf{y}_n)$ are used in model averaging. Suppose \mathcal{N} models fall in Occam's window. Then

$$\hat{S}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \exp \{ -\hat{H}_0(t; \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}_j}) \}^{\exp \{ \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{k}_j i}^T \hat{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}_j} \}} p(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}_j} | \mathbf{y}_n). \quad (12)$$

3 Comparison With pMOM Prior

Another nonlocal prior that might be considered as a potential candidate for the prior densities on the non-zero coefficients in model \mathbf{k} is the product of independent MOM priors, or the pMOM densities (Johnson and Rossell, 2012), specified by

$$\pi(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}|\tau, r) = (2\pi)^{-k/2} \tau^{(-rk-k/2)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta'_{\mathbf{k}}\beta_{\mathbf{k}}}{2\tau}\right) \prod_{i=1}^k \beta_i^{2r}, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}, \tau > 0. \quad (13)$$

The hyperparameter τ has the same role as in piMOM densities in (2.8) and r is the order of the density. An example of a MOM prior for $r = 1$ and $\tau = 0.5$ is depicted in Figure S1.

Following the discussion of nonlocal priors in Section 2.3, we again note that for $r = 1$ and a fixed τ , piMOM densities assign negligible probability to a wider region around zero than do pMOM densities. More specifically, pMOM densities decrease to zero at only an inverse polynomial rate while piMOM densities decrease at a rate that is order $\exp(-\tau/\beta^2)$, which is much faster. Consequently, smaller false positive rates are expected for procedures based on piMOM priors than those based on pMOM priors. On the other hand, pMOM densities have tails that converge to zero at an exponential rate, while piMOM densities have heavier, Cauchy-like tails. Consistency properties of piMOM priors for linear models were studied in Shin *et al.* (2018). In that setting it was shown that piMOM priors are consistent for $p = O(e^{n^\nu})$, $0 < \nu < 1$. By comparison, this property does not hold for pMOM priors. The source of inconsistency for pMOM priors in $p \gg n$ settings stems from the fact that their densities go to zero only at an inverse polynomial rate in a neighborhood of the origin. For these reasons, piMOM-based procedures are more effective for variable selection in $p \gg n$ settings.

To better demonstrate the practical importance of these properties, we performed 20 simulation studies where the number of observations and covariates were $n = 200$ and $p = 10,000$. The true model had size 6 with true coefficients equal to $(0.5, 0.85, 1.00, 1.50, 1.85, 2.5)$. The sign of coefficients were chosen randomly with probability 0.5 in each simulation. The columns of the design matrix were multivariate Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and marginal variance of 1. The correlation between every two variables was 0.5. In each of the simulations, we fixed $r = 1$ and assigned $\tau = 15$ different values in the interval $[0.01, 10]$. The survival times were simulated from an exponential distribution with mean 10.

The proposed variable selection algorithm was implemented on the simulation data using both pMOM and piMOM priors. Table S1 summarizes the outcome of the selection procedure using different hyperparameter values for both priors. The numbers are averaged over 20 simulations. In that table, MTPR is the mean true positive rate, MFPR is the mean false positive rate and TMP is the proportion of times that the true model was found without any false positives.

As shown in Table S1, the pMOM model never finds the true model for any of the τ values. Moreover, the average true positive rate for pMOM is always 5 times less than that for piMOM, and the average false positive rate for pMOM is higher than it is for piMOM. This suggests variable selection based on piMOM priors in ultrahigh dimensional settings is likely to perform better than variable selection based on pMOM priors.

Table S1: Comparison of variable selection outcomes between pMOM and piMOM for different values of hyperparameter, τ , over 20 simulations.

Hyperparameter τ	MTPR(%)		MFPR(%)		TMP	
	piMOM	pMOM	piMOM	pMOM	piMOM	pMOM
0.01	100	22.50	0	0.15	1	0
0.2	100	21.67	0	0.12	0.9	0
0.4	99.17	21.67	0.01	0.12	0.9	0
0.6	99.17	20.83	0.01	0.12	0.9	0
0.8	97.50	20.83	0.01	0.12	0.85	0
1.0	95	20.83	0	0.12	0.70	0
1.25	95	20.83	0	0.12	0.70	0
1.6	94.16	20	0	0.12	0.65	0
2.0	93.33	20	0	0.12	0.60	0
2.3	93.33	19.17	0	0.12	0.60	0
3.8	90.83	18.33	0	0.12	0.45	0
5.4	87.50	18.33	0	0.12	0.35	0
6.9	85	18.33	0	0.12	0.30	0
8.4	81.67	18.33	0	0.12	0.20	0
10.0	81.67	18.33	0	0.12	0.20	0




Figure S1: iMOM and MOM prior with $r = 1$ and $\tau = 0.5$.

4 Discussion on the parameters of the S5 algorithm

The goal of the S5 algorithm is to accurately estimate the HPPM, which is determined as the highest posterior probability among those models visited. Thus, the main objective in our algorithm is to increase the number of visited models.

There are two important parameters in the S5 algorithm. The temperature vector for the annealing schedule, and the number of iterations at each temperature. We use 10 equally spaced temperature values decreasing from 3 to 1, where at temperature t_l the posterior probability is




Figure S2: Average number of unique visited models by BVSNLP for different iterations in S5 algorithm, for simulation case 3.

raised to the power of $1/t_l$. Values of $t < 1$ increase the posterior probability to unreasonably large values, making S5 susceptible to being trapped in local extremes, this reducing the number of visited models. Therefore, 1.0 is the lowest chosen temperature for the annealing schedule. Values higher than 3, on the other hand, were found empirically to not improve the performance of the algorithm because it then visited too high a proportion of models with comparatively low posterior probability.

The other parameter, the number of iterations at each temperature, can be chosen by the user in the R package. Theoretically, the higher number of iterations, the more models that will be visited. For the analyses in this paper, the number of iterations was chosen to be 30. This choice was based on a sensitivity analysis performed on simulation data for different numbers of iteration values ranging from 20 to 50, where we investigated the identification of the HPPM and number of visited models. The details of this experiment follow.

We defined a simulation batch as 50 different datasets that were generated with the same settings as Case 3 of the simulations discussed in Section 4, but with true model size of 6 and coefficients equal to $\beta_1 = -1.5140, \beta_2 = 1.2799, \beta_3 = -1.5307, \beta_4 = 1.5164, \beta_5 = -1.3020, \beta_6 = 1.5833$, and $\beta_i = 0$ for $i > 6$. A run of the BVSNLP was run on each dataset to find the simulation truth. For each simulation batch, in addition to the average number of unique visited models, the proportion of times (out of 50) that the algorithm selected the true model, without any false positives or false negatives, was also recorded. The `niter` parameter of the S5 algorithm was varied for each simulation batch, ranging from 10 to 50 in increments of 5.

The outcome of the sensitivity analysis for this parameter of the S5 algorithm is summarized in Figure S2 for the average number of unique visited models. The difference between the minimum and maximum average number of visited models in all cases was only 324 models, and the proportion of times the true model was found with no false positives or negatives was 100% in all simulation cases.

These results suggest the S5 algorithm's performance in finding the true model was not significantly impacted by the parameter `niter`, and that the number of visited unique models just changed 1.73% from an average of 18,674.78 unique models in 10 iterations per temperature to

18,997.64 unique models in 50 iterations per temperature in the S5 algorithm. This experiment suggests that the BVSNLP algorithm is relatively insensitive to the parameters of the S5 stochastic search algorithm, at least within the range of values considered in this study.

5 Definitions of MTP and MFP

Let S_i be the set of all covariates selected as the final model by the method at iteration i . Also let \mathbf{k} be the set of covariates in the true model.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{TP})_i &= |S_i \cap \mathbf{k}|, \text{ and} \\ (\text{FP})_i &= |S_i \setminus \mathbf{k}|, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $|A|$ denotes cardinality of set A and $A \setminus B$ denotes the set minus operation.


Following the definitions above, MTP and MFP are obtained as follows:

$$\text{MTP} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\text{TP})_i; \quad \text{MFP} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\text{FP})_i, \tag{15}$$


where m is the total number of iterations.

6 Expression Regulation Networks for The KIRC Dataset

Figure S3 depicts the regulation networks relative to the analysis of the KIRC dataset in Section 5.1 of the main manuscript. This illustration shows that the genes identified by the survival analysis and logistic regression analyses have strong functional relationships.



(a)



(b)

Figure S3: Expression regulation networks connecting the old and new gene sets. a) This diagram shows all genes that are in the shortest pathways through the expression regulation between SAV1 and AR. b) This diagram shows all genes in the shortest pathways through expression regulation between NUMBL and SUDS3.

References

Johnson, V. E. and Rossell, D. (2012). Bayesian model selection in high-dimensional settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **107**(498), 649–660.

Shin, M., Bhattacharya, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2018). Scalable bayesian variable selection using nonlocal prior densities in ultrahigh-dimensional settings. *Statistica Sinica*, **28**(2), 1053–1078.