

Optimal two-stage testing of multiple mediators

Vera Djordjilović, Jesse Hemerik & Magne Thoresen

Department of Biostatistics, University of Oslo, Norway

March 18, 2022

Abstract

Mediation analysis in high-dimensional settings often involves identifying potential mediators among a large number of measured variables. For this purpose, a two step familywise error rate (FWER) procedure called ScreenMin has been recently proposed (Djordjilović et al. 2019). In ScreenMin, variables are first screened and only those that pass the screening are tested. The proposed threshold for selection has been shown to guarantee asymptotic FWER. In this work, we investigate the impact of the selection threshold on the finite sample FWER. We derive power maximizing selection threshold and show that it is well approximated by an adaptive threshold of Wang et al. (2016). We study the performance of the proposed procedures in a simulation study, and apply them to a case-control study examining the effect of fish intake on the risk of colorectal adenoma.

Keywords: high-dimensional mediation, familywise error rate, union hypothesis, partial conjunction hypothesis, intersection-union test, multiple testing, screening.

1 Introduction

Mediation analysis is an important tool for investigating the role of intermediate variables lying on the path between an exposure or treatment (X) and an outcome variable (Y) (VanderWeele, 2015). Recently, mediation analysis has been of interest in emerging fields characterized by an abundance of experimental data. In genomics and epigenomics, researchers search for potential mediators of lifestyle and environmental exposures on disease susceptibility (Richardson et al., 2019); examples include mediation by DNA methylation of the effect of smoking on lung cancer risk (Fasanelli et al., 2015) and of the protective effect of breastfeeding against childhood obesity (Sherwood et al., 2019). In neuroscience, researchers search for the parts of the brain that mediate the effect of an external stimulus on the perceived sensation (Woo et al., 2015; Chén et al., 2017). In these and other problems of this kind, researchers wish to investigate a large number of putative mediators, with the aim of identifying a subset of relevant variables to be studied further. This issue has been recognized as transcending the traditional (confirmatory) causal mediation analysis and has been termed *exploratory mediation analysis* (Serang et al., 2017).

Within the hypothesis testing framework, the problem of identifying potential mediators among m variables M_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, can be formulated as the problem of testing a collection of m union hypotheses of the form

$$H_i = H_{i1} \cup H_{i2}, \quad H_{i1} : M_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X, \quad H_{i2} : M_i \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (X, \mathbf{M}_{-i})^\top,$$

where $\mathbf{M}_{-i} = (M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}, M_{i+1}, \dots, M_m)$. Since m is typically large with respect to the study sample size, it might be challenging to make inference on the conditional

independence of M_i and Y given X and the entire $(m - 1)$ -dimensional vector \mathbf{M}_{-i} . Instead, one can consider each putative mediator marginally in this exploratory stage and replace H_{i2} with $H_{i2}^* : M_i \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid X$ (Sampson et al., 2018). For us, a variable M_i is a potential mediator if H_i is false, i.e., if both H_{i1} and H_{i2} (H_{i2}^*) are false. Our goal is to identify as many potential mediators as possible while keeping familywise error rate (FWER) below a prescribed level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Assume we have valid p -values, p_{ij} , for testing hypotheses H_{ij} . They would typically be obtained from two parametric models: a *mediator model* that models the relationship between X and \mathbf{M} , and an *outcome model* that models the relationship between Y and X and \mathbf{M} . Then, according to the intersection union principle, $\bar{p}_i := \max\{p_{i1}, p_{i2}\}$ is a valid p -value for H_i (Gleser, 1973). A simple solution to the considered problem consists of applying a standard multiple testing procedure, such as Bonferroni or Holm (1979), to a collection of m maximum p -values $\{\bar{p}_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}$. Unfortunately, due to the composite nature of the considered null hypotheses, \bar{p}_i will be a conservative p -value for some points of the null hypothesis H_i . For instance, when both H_{i1} and H_{i2} are true, \bar{p}_i will be distributed as the maximum of two independent standard uniform random variables, and thus stochastically larger than the standard uniform. This implies that the direct approach tends to be very conservative in most practical situations. Indeed, when only a small fraction of hypotheses H_{ij} is false – a plausible assumption in most applications considered above – the actual FWER can be shown to be well below α (Wang et al., 2016), resulting in a low powered procedure.

To attenuate this issue, we have recently proposed a two step procedure, ScreenMin, in which hypotheses are first screened on the basis of the minimum, $\underline{p}_i := \min\{p_{i1}, p_{i2}\}$, and only hypotheses that pass the screening get tested:

Procedure 1 (ScreenMin (Djordjilović et al., 2019)). *For a given $c \in (0, 1)$, select H_i if $\underline{p}_i \leq c$, and let $S = \{i : \underline{p}_i \leq c\}$ denote the selected set. The ScreenMin adjusted p -values are*

$$p_i^* = \begin{cases} \min\{|\bar{p}_i|, 1\} & \text{if } i \in S, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $|S|$ is the size of the selected set.

It has been proved that, under the assumption of independence of all p -values, the ScreenMin procedure maintains the asymptotic FWER control. Independence of p_{i1} and p_{i2} follows from the correct specification of the outcome and the mediator model, while independence between rows of the $m \times 2$ p -value matrix, i.e. within sets $\{p_{11}, \dots, p_{m1}\}$ and $\{p_{12}, \dots, p_{m2}\}$, is a common, although often unrealistic, assumption in the multiple testing framework that we discuss in Section 8. With regards to power, by reducing the number of hypotheses that are tested, the proposed procedure can significantly increase the power to reject false union hypotheses.

In this work, we look more closely at the role of the threshold for selection c . We show that the ScreenMin procedure does not guarantee non-asymptotic FWER for arbitrary thresholds, neither conditionally on $|S|$, nor unconditionally. We derive the upper bound for the finite sample FWER, and then investigate the optimal threshold, where optimality is defined in terms of maximizing the power while guaranteeing the finite sample FWER control. We formulate this problem as a constrained optimization problem, and solve it under the assumption that the proportion of the false hypotheses and the distribution of the non-null p -values is known. We show that the solution is the smallest threshold that satisfies the FWER constraint, and that the data dependent version of this oracle threshold leads to a special case of an adaptive threshold proposed recently in the context of testing general partial conjunction hypotheses by Wang et al. (2016). In their work, Wang et al. (2016) show that the proposed adaptive threshold

maintains FWER control; our results further show that is also (nearly) optimal in terms of power.

Recently, methodological issues pertaining to high-dimensional mediation analysis have been receiving increasing attention in the literature. Most proposed approaches focus on dimension reduction (Huang and Pan, 2016; Chén et al., 2017) or penalization techniques (Zhao and Luo, 2016; Zhang et al., 2016; Song et al., 2018), or a combination of the two (Zhao et al., 2020). An approach most similar to ours is a multiple testing procedure proposed by Sampson et al. (2018). The Authors adapt to the mediation setting the procedures proposed by Bogomolov and Heller (2018) within the context of replicability analysis. Indeed, both the problem of identifying potential mediators and the problem of identifying replicable findings across two studies, can be seen as a special case of testing multiple partial conjunction hypotheses (Benjamini and Heller, 2008).

2 Notation and setup

As already stated, we consider a collection \mathcal{H} of m null hypotheses of the form $H_i = H_{i1} \cup H_{i2}$. For each hypothesis pair (H_{i1}, H_{i2}) there are four possible states, $\{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}$, indicating whether respective hypotheses are true (0) or false (1). Let π_0 denote the proportion of $(0, 0)$ hypothesis pairs, i.e. pairs in which both component hypotheses are true; π_1 the proportion of $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ pairs in which exactly one hypothesis is true, and π_2 the proportion of $(1, 1)$ pairs in which both hypotheses are false. In mediation, $(1, 1)$ hypotheses are of interest, and our goal is to reject as many such hypotheses, while controlling FWER for \mathcal{H} .

We denote by p_{ij} the p -value for H_{ij} (whether we refer to a random variable or its realization will be clear from the context). We assume that the p_{ij} are continuous and independent random variables. We further assume that the distribution of the null p -values is standard uniform, that the density of the non-null p -values is strictly decreasing, and that F denotes its cumulative distribution function. This will hold, for example, when the test statistics are normally distributed with a mean shift under the alternative; we will use this setting for illustration purposes throughout. We further let \bar{p}_i (\underline{p}_i) denote the maximum (the minimum) of p_{i1} and p_{i2} .

For a given threshold $c \in (0, 1)$, let the selection event be represented by a vector $G = (G_1, \dots, G_m) \in \{0, 1\}^m$, so that $G_i = 1$ if $\underline{p}_i \leq c$ and $G_i = 0$ otherwise. The size of the selected set is then $|S| = \sum_{j=1}^m G_j$.

3 Finite sample FWER

Validity of the ScreenMin procedure relies on the maximum p -value, \bar{p}_i , remaining an asymptotically valid p -value after selection. We are thus interested in the distribution of \bar{p}_i conditional on the selection G . We first look at the distribution of \bar{p}_i conditional on the event that the i -th hypothesis has been selected.

Lemma 1. *If (H_{i1}, H_{i2}) is a $(0, 1)$ or a $(1, 0)$ pair, then the distribution of \bar{p}_i conditional on hypothesis H_i being selected is*

$$\Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq u \mid \underline{p}_i \leq c) = \begin{cases} \frac{uF(u)}{F(c) + c - cF(c)}, & \text{for } 0 < u \leq c \leq 1 \\ \frac{cF(u) + uF(c) - cF(c)}{F(c) + c - cF(c)}, & \text{for } 0 < c \leq u \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

If (H_{i1}, H_{i2}) is a $(0, 0)$ pair, then

$$\Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq u \mid \underline{p}_i \leq c) = \begin{cases} \frac{u^2}{c(2-c)}, & \text{for } 0 < u \leq c \leq 1 \\ \frac{2u-c}{2-c}, & \text{for } 0 < c \leq u \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The proof is in Section A.1. The conditional p -value in (1) will play an important role in the following considerations. Since it is a function of both the selection threshold c and the testing threshold u , we will denote it by $P_0(u, c)$.

Consider now the distribution of \bar{p}_i conditional on the entire selection event G (where we are only interested in selections for which $G_i = 1$). Given the independence of all p -values,

$$\Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq u \mid G) = \Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq u \mid G_i) = P_0(u, c)$$

for any fixed $u \in (0, 1)$. However, in the ScreenMin procedure we are not interested in all u ; we are interested in a data dependent threshold $\alpha/|S|$. Nevertheless, we can still use expression (1), since

$$\Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|} \mid G\right) = \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \sum_{j \neq i} G_j} \mid I[\underline{p}_i \leq c], \sum_{j \neq m} G_j\right) = P_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}, c\right), \quad (2)$$

where the first equality follows from observing that when the i -th hypothesis is selected we can write $|S| = 1 + \sum_{j \neq i} G_j$; and the second from the independence of \bar{p}_i and $\sum_{j \neq i} G_j$.

Screening on the basis of the minimum \underline{p}_i , would ideally leave \bar{p}_i a valid p -value. Recall that a random variable is a valid p -value if its distribution under the null hypothesis is either standard uniform or stochastically greater than the standard uniform. For a given c , for the conditional p -value in (1), we should thus have $P_0(u, c) \leq u$ for $u \in (0, 1)$. Although this has been shown to hold asymptotically (Djordjilović et al., 2019), the following analytical counterexample shows this is not the case in finite samples.

Example 1. Let H_i be true, and let the test statistics for testing H_{i1} and H_{i2} be normal with a zero mean and a mean in the interval $[0, 5]$, respectively. We refer to the mean shift associated to H_{i2} as the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Figure 1 plots a 5% quantile of the conditional p -value distribution, $P_0(0.05, c)$, as a function of the SNR associated to H_{i2} . Although with increasing SNR the quantile under consideration converges to 0.05 (in line with the asymptotic ScreenMin validity), for small values of SNR and low selection thresholds, the conditional quantile surpasses 0.05. \square

According to Example 1 and expression (2), there are realizations of $|S|$ so that $P_0(\alpha/|S|, c)$ is not bounded by $\alpha/|S|$. This implies that the ScreenMin will not provide finite sample FWER *conditional* on $|S|$; however, it could still guarantee FWER control *on average* across all $|S|$. To investigate this hypothesis, we first derive the upper bound for the unconditional FWER for a given c .

Proposition 1. Let V denote the number of true union hypotheses rejected by the ScreenMin procedure. For the familywise error rate, we then have

$$\Pr(V \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\left[1 - \left\{ 1 - P_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}, c\right) \right\}^{|S|} \right] I[|S| > 0] \right), \quad (3)$$

with equality holding if and only if $\pi_1 = 1$.




Figure 1: Conditional p -value of the true union hypothesis: 5% quantile as a function of a signal to noise ratio of a possibly false component hypothesis. Dotted horizontal line $y = 0.05$ is added for reference.

Proof is in Section A.2.

We use this result to illustrate in the following analytical counterexample that the ScreenMin does not guarantee finite sample FWER control for arbitrary thresholds.

Example 2. Let $m = 10$, and let all pairs (H_{i1}, H_{i2}) be $(0, 1)$ or $(1, 0)$ type, so that $\pi_0 = \pi_2 = 0$ and $\pi_1 = 1$. Let the test statistics of all false H_{ij} be normal with mean 2 and variance 1, and consider one-sided p -values. If the level at which FWER is to be controlled is $\alpha = 0.05$, the default ScreenMin threshold for selection is $c = \alpha/m = 5 \times 10^{-3}$. The probability of selecting H_i is then $P_{sel} = F(c) + c - cF(c) \approx 0.29$. In this case, the size of the selected set is a binomial random variable $\text{Bi}(m, P_{sel})$. The conditional probability of rejecting a H_i when $|S| > 0$, i.e. $P_0(\alpha/|S|, c) = \Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq \alpha/|S| \mid I[\underline{p}_i \leq c], |S|)$, can be evaluated for each value of $|S|$ according to (1). The conditional distribution of the number of false rejections V given $|S|$ is also binomial with parameters $|S|$ and $P_0(\alpha/|S|, c)$. In this case, the exact FWER, obtained from (3), is $\Pr(V \geq 1) = 0.055 > \alpha$, so that the actual FWER of the ScreenMin procedure exceeds the nominal level α . \square

4 Oracle threshold for selection

According to the previous Section, not all thresholds for selection lead to finite sample FWER control. In this Section, we investigate the threshold that maximizes the power to reject false union hypotheses while ensuring finite sample FWER control.

Proposition 2. *The probability of rejecting a false union hypothesis conditional on the size of the selected set $|S|$ is*

$$\Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|}, p_i \leq c\right) = \begin{cases} 2F(c)F\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) - F^2(c) & \text{for } c|S| \leq \alpha; \\ F^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) & \text{for } c|S| > \alpha \end{cases} \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: Power and FWER of the ScreenMin procedure as a function of c . Dotted horizontal line $y = 0.05$ represents the nominal FWER. Dotted vertical line $x = c^*$ represents the oracle threshold, i.e. the solution to the optimization problem (6). Power of the standard Bonferroni procedure is added for reference.

for $|S| > 0$, and 0 otherwise. The unconditional probability of rejecting a false hypothesis is then obtained by taking the expectation over $|S|$.

See Section A.3 for the proof. Note that the distribution of S , as well as the distribution of V , depend on c , and in the following we emphasize this by writing $S(c)$ and $V(c)$. The threshold that maximizes the power while controlling FWER at α can then be found through the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\max_{0 < c \leq \alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[\Pr \left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S(c)|}, p_i \leq c \right) I[|S(c)| > 0] \right] \text{ subject to } \Pr(V(c) \geq 1) \leq \alpha. \quad (5)$$

In the above problem, both the objective function (the power) and the constraint (the FWER) are expected values of non-linear functions of the size of the selected set $|S|$, the distribution of which is itself non-trivial. To circumvent this issue, instead of (5), we consider its approximation based on exchanging the order of the function and the expected value:

$$\max_{0 < c \leq \alpha} \Pr \left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{\mathbb{E}|S(c)|}, p_i \leq c \right) \text{ subject to } \widehat{\Pr}(V(c) \geq 1) \leq \alpha, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\widehat{\Pr}(V(c) \geq 1) = 1 - \left\{ 1 - P_0 \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mathbb{E}|S(c)|}, c \right) \right\}^{\mathbb{E}|S(c)|}.$$

When π_0, π_1, π_2 and F are known, (6) can be solved numerically. We denote its solution by c^* , and refer to it as the *oracle* threshold in what follows.

Example 3. Consider an example featuring $m = 100$ union hypotheses with proportions of different hypotheses being $\pi_0 = 0.75$, $\pi_1 = 0.25$ and $\pi_2 = 0.05$. Let the test statistics be normal with a zero mean for true null hypotheses and a mean shift (SNR) of 1.5, 2, or 3 for false null hypotheses (variance equal to 1 in both cases). As before we consider one sided p -values. Plots in Figure 2 show power and FWER as functions of the selection threshold for three different values of SNR.

We first note that for very small values of c , actual FWER is above α , and in order for FWER to be controlled, c needs to be large enough. In all three cases, the value of the threshold that maximizes the (unconstrained) power to reject a false union hypothesis is low and does not satisfy the FWER constraint (dashed line is above the nominal FWER

level set to 0.05). The solution to problem (6) is then the smallest c that satisfies the FWER constraint. \square

In the above example the power maximizing selection threshold is the smallest threshold that guarantees FWER control. This can be shown to hold in general under mild conditions (see Section A.4 for details).

For a threshold to satisfy the FWER control in (6), it needs to be at least as large as the solution to

$$1 - \left\{ 1 - P_0 \left(\frac{\alpha}{E|S(c)|}, c \right) \right\}^{E|S(c)|} = \alpha.$$

If m is large, we can consider a first order approximation of the left-hand side leading to

$$P_0 \left(\frac{\alpha}{E|S(c)|}, c \right) \approx \frac{\alpha}{E|S(c)|}. \quad (7)$$

The intuition corresponding to (7) is straightforward: for a given c , the probability that a conditional null p -value is less or equal to the “average” testing threshold, i.e. $\alpha/E|S(c)|$, should be exactly $\alpha/E|S(c)|$. Finally, when m is large, the solution to (7) can be closely approximated by the solution to

$$c E|S(c)| = \alpha, \quad (8)$$

(see Section A.4) so that the constrained optimization problem in (6) can be replaced with a simpler problem of finding a solution to equation (8).

5 Adaptive threshold for selection

Solving equation (8) is easier than solving the constrained optimization problem of (6); however, it still requires knowing F, π_0 and π_1 . To overcome this issue one can try to estimate these quantities from data in an approach similar to the one of Lei and Fithian (2018) who employ an expectation-maximization algorithm.

Another possibility is to consider the following strategy. Instead of searching for a threshold optimal *on average*, we can adopt a *conditional* approach and replace $E|S(c)|$ in (8) with its observed value $S(c)$. Since $S(c)$ takes on integer values, $c|S(c)|$ has jumps at $\underline{p}_1, \dots, \underline{p}_m$ and might be different from α for all c . We therefore search for the largest $c \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$c|S(c)| \leq \alpha. \quad (9)$$

Let c_a be the solution to (9). This solution has been proposed in Wang et al. (2016) in the following form

$$\gamma = \max \left\{ c \in \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{m}, \dots, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha \right\} : c|S(c)| \leq \alpha \right\}$$

Obviously, due to a finite grid, γ need not necessarily coincide with c_a ; however, they lead to the same selected set S and thus to equivalent procedures. Interestingly, in their work Wang et al. (2016), search for a single threshold that is used for both selection and testing, and define it heuristically as a solution to the above maximization problem. When the two thresholds coincide, $P_0(c, c)$ is bounded by c for all $c \in (0, 1)$ (from (1)), and it is straightforward to show that the FWER control is maintained also for the data dependent threshold $c = \gamma$. Our results show, that in addition to providing non-asymptotic FWER control, this threshold is also nearly optimal in terms of power.

6 Simulations

We used simulations to assess the performance of different selection thresholds. Our data generating mechanism is as follows. We considered a small, $m = 200$, and a large, $m = 10000$, study. The proportion of false union hypotheses, π_2 , was set to 0.05 throughout. The proportion of $(1, 0)$ hypothesis pairs with exactly one true hypothesis, π_1 , was varying in $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$. Independent test statistics for false H_{ij} were generated from $N(\sqrt{n}\mu_j, 1)$, where n is the sample size of the study, and $\mu_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2$, is the effect size associated with false component hypotheses. Test statistics for true component hypothesis were standard normal. For $m = 200$, the SNR, $\sqrt{n}\mu_j$, was either the same for $j = 1, 2$ and equal to 3, or different and equal to 3 and 6, respectively. For $m = 10000$, the signal-to-noise ratio was set to 4, and in case of unequal SNR it was set to 4 and 8. P -values were one-sided. FWER was controlled at $\alpha = 0.05$. We also considered settings under positive dependence: in that case the test statistics were generated from a multivariate normal distribution with a compound symmetry variance matrix (the correlation coefficient $\rho \in \{0.3, 0.8\}$).

The FWER procedures considered were 1) Oracle SM: the ScreenMin procedure with the oracle threshold c^* (assuming F, π_1, π_2 to be known); 2) AdaFilter: the ScreenMin procedure with the adaptive threshold γ ; 3) Default SM: the ScreenMin procedure with a default threshold $c = \alpha/m$; 4) MCP_S : the FWER procedure proposed in Sampson et al. (2018); and 5) Bonf.: the standard Bonferroni Procedure.

When applying the MCP_S procedure, we used the implementation in MultiMed R package (Boca et al., 2018) with the default threshold $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha/2$. We note that the threshold for this procedure can also be improved in an adaptive fashion by incorporating plug-in estimates of proportions of true hypotheses among H_{i1} , and H_{i2} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, as presented in Bogomolov and Heller (2018). Implementation of the remaining procedures, along with the reproducible simulation setup, is available at github.com/veradjordjilovic/screenMin.

For each setting, we estimated FWER as the proportion of generated datasets in which at least one true union hypothesis was rejected. We estimated power as the proportion of rejected false union hypotheses among all false union hypotheses, averaged across 1000 generated datasets.

Results under independence are shown in Figure 3. All considered procedures successfully control FWER. When most hypothesis pairs are $(0, 0)$ pairs and π_1 is low, all procedures are conservative, but with increasing π_1 their actual FWER approaches α . The opposite trend is seen with the power: it is maximum for $\pi_1 = 0$ and decreases with increasing π_1 . When the signal-to-noise ratio is equal (columns 1 and 3), Oracle SM and AdaFilter outperform the rest in terms of power. Interestingly, the adaptive threshold (AdaFilter) is performing as well as the oracle threshold which uses the knowledge of F, π_0 and π_1 . Under unequal signal-to-noise ratio, the oracle threshold is computed under a misspecified model (assuming signal to noise ratio is equal for all false hypotheses) and in this case the Default SM outperforms the other approaches. MCP_S performs well in this setting and its power remains constant with increasing π_1 .

Results under positive dependence are shown in Figure 4. FWER control is maintained for all procedures. All procedures are more conservative in this setting than under independence, especially when the correlation is high, i.e. when $\rho = 0.8$. With regards to power, most conclusions from the independence setting apply here as well. When the signal-to-noise ratio is equal, Oracle SM and AdaFilter outperform competing procedures. Under unequal signal to noise ratio, Default SM performs best, and MCP_S performs well with power constant with increasing π_1 . In the high-dimensional setting ($m = 10000$), the power is higher than under independence for $\pi_1 = 0$, but it is rapidly decreasing with increasing π_1 and drops to zero when $\pi_1 = 0.4$.




Figure 3: Estimated FWER (first row) and power (second row) as a function of π_1 based on 1000 simulated datasets. The proportion of false union hypotheses is $\pi_2 = 0.05$. In columns 1 and 2: $m = 200$, in column 3 $m = 10000$. Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) is 3 for all false component hypotheses in column 1; 3 for H_{i1} and 6 for H_{i2} in column 2, 4 in column 3.




Figure 4: Estimated FWER (first row) and power (second row) under dependence based on 1000 simulated datasets. SNR as in Figure 3.

7 Application: Navy Colorectal Adenoma study

The Navy Colorectal Adenoma case-control study (Sinha et al., 1999) studied dietary risk factors of colorectal adenoma, a known precursor of colon cancer. A follow-up study investigated the role of metabolites as potential mediators of an established association between red meat consumption and colorectal adenoma. While red meat consumption is shown to increase the risk of adenoma, it has been suggested that fish consumption might have a protective effect. In this case, the exposure of interest is a daily fish intake estimated from dietary questionnaires; potential mediators are 149 circulating metabolites; and the outcome is a case-control status. Data for 129 cases and 129 controls, including information on age, gender, smoking status, and body mass index, are available in the `MultiMed` R package (Boca et al., 2018).

For each metabolite, we estimated a mediator and an outcome model. The mediator model is a normal linear model with the metabolite level as outcome and daily fish intake as predictor. The outcome model is logistic with case-control status outcome and fish intake and metabolite level as predictors. Age, gender, smoking status, and body mass index were included as predictors in both models. To adjust for the case-control design, the mediator model was weighted (the prevalence of colorectal adenoma in the considered age group was taken to be 0.228 as suggested in Boca et al. (2013)).

Screening with a default ScreenMin threshold $0.05/149 = 3.3 \times 10^{-4}$ leads to 13 hypotheses passing the selection. The adaptive threshold (AdaFilter) is higher (2.2×10^{-3}) and results in selecting 22 hypotheses. Testing threshold for the default ScreenMin is then $0.05/13 = 3.8 \times 10^{-3}$. With the adaptive procedure, the testing threshold coincides with the screening threshold and is slightly lower (2.2×10^{-3}). Unadjusted p -values for the selected metabolites are shown in Table 1. The lowest maximum p -value among the selected hypotheses is 8.3×10^{-3} (for DHA and 2-aminobutyrate) which is higher than both considered thresholds, meaning that we are unable to reject any hypotheses at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Our results are in line with those reported in Boca et al. (2013), where the DHA was found to be the most likely mediator although not statistically significant (FWER adjusted p -value 0.06).

One potential explanation for the negative findings is illustrated in Figure 5. Figure 5 shows a scatterplot of the p -values for the association of metabolites with the fish intake (p_1) against the p -values for the association of metabolites with the colorectal adenoma (p_2). While a significant number of metabolites shows evidence of association with adenoma (cloud of points along the $y = 0$ line), there seems to be little evidence for the association with the fish intake. In addition, data provide limited evidence of the presence of the total effect of the fish intake on the risk of adenoma (p -value in the logistic regression model adjusted for age, gender, smoking status and body mass index is 0.07).

8 Discussion

In this article we have investigated power and non-asymptotic FWER of the ScreenMin procedure as a function of the selection threshold. We have found an upper bound for the finite sample FWER that is exact when $\pi_1 = 1$. We have posed the problem of finding an optimal selection threshold as a constrained optimization problem in which the power to reject a false union hypothesis is maximized under the condition guaranteeing FWER control. We have called this threshold the oracle threshold since it is derived under the assumption that the mechanism generating p -values is fully known. We have shown that the solution to this optimization problem is the smallest threshold that satisfies the FWER condition, and that it is well approximated by the solution to the equation $cE|S(c)| = \alpha$. A data-dependent version of the oracle threshold is a special

Table 1: P -values of the 22 metabolites that passed the screening with the adaptive threshold. Metabolites are sorted in an increasing order with respect to \underline{p} . Top 13 metabolites passed the screening with the default ScreenMin threshold. The last column (Min.Ind) indicates whether the minimum, \underline{p} , is the p -value for the association of a metabolite with the fish intake (1) or with the colorectal adenoma (2).

| | Name | \underline{p} | \bar{p} | Min.Ind |
|----|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | 2-hydroxybutyrate (AHB) | 1.2×10^{-6} | 1.5×10^{-2} | 2 |
| 2 | docosahecanoate (DHA; 22:6n3) | 1.9×10^{-6} | 8.3×10^{-3} | 1 |
| 3 | 3-hydroxybutyrate (BHBA) | 7.8×10^{-6} | 2.2×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 4 | oleate (18:1n9) | 2.5×10^{-5} | 7.3×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 5 | glycerol | 3.9×10^{-5} | 8.4×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 6 | eicosenoate (20:1n9 or 11) | 5.9×10^{-5} | 4.1×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 7 | dihomo-linoleate (20:2n6) | 9.0×10^{-5} | 2.6×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 8 | 10-nonadecenoate (19:1n9) | 9.4×10^{-5} | 5.4×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 9 | creatine | 1.7×10^{-4} | 9.2×10^{-1} | 1 |
| 10 | palmitoleate (16:1n7) | 1.7×10^{-4} | 6.3×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 11 | 10-heptadecenoate (17:1n7) | 2.8×10^{-4} | 7.1×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 12 | myristoleate (14:1n5) | 2.9×10^{-4} | 8.2×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 13 | docosapentaenoate (n3 DPA; 22:5n3) | 3.0×10^{-4} | 2.9×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 14 | methyl palmitate (15 or 2) | 5.4×10^{-4} | 1.8×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 15 | N-acetyl-beta-alanine | 5.9×10^{-4} | 1.3×10^{-1} | 1 |
| 16 | linoleate (18:2n6) | 8.8×10^{-4} | 6.7×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 17 | 3-methyl-2-oxobutyrate | 8.9×10^{-4} | 2.0×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 18 | palmitate (16:0) | 9.9×10^{-4} | 5.6×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 19 | fumarate | 1.4×10^{-3} | 5.0×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 20 | 2-aminobutyrate | 1.4×10^{-3} | 8.3×10^{-3} | 2 |
| 21 | linolenate [alpha or gamma; (18:3n3 or 6)] | 1.6×10^{-3} | 5.4×10^{-1} | 2 |
| 22 | 10-undecenoate (11:1n1) | 1.8×10^{-3} | 3.2×10^{-1} | 2 |

case of the AdaFilter threshold proposed by Wang et al. (2016) for $n = r = 2$. Our simulation results suggest that the performance of this adaptive threshold is almost indistinguishable from the oracle threshold, and we suggest its use in practice.

The ScreenMin procedure relies on the independence of p -values. While independence between columns in the p -value matrix is satisfied in the context of mediation analysis (under correct specification of the mediator and the outcome model), independence within columns of the p -value matrix is likely to be unrealistic in a number of practical contexts. Our simulation results show that FWER control is maintained under mild and strong positive dependence within columns, but we do not have theoretical guarantees. The challenge with relaxing the independence assumption lies in the fact that when \bar{p}_i is not independent of $\sum_{j \neq i} G_j$, then the equality regarding conditional p -values (2) no longer necessarily holds. Finding sufficient conditions that relax the assumption of independence while keeping the conditional distribution of p -values tractable is an open question.

In this work we have focused on FWER, but it is tempting to consider combining screening based on \underline{p}_i with an FDR procedure such as Benjamini and Hochberg (1995). Unfortunately, analyzing non-asymptotic FDR of such two step procedures is significantly more involved since their adaptive testing threshold is a function of $\bar{p}_1, \dots, \bar{p}_m$, as opposed to $\alpha/|S|$ in the two stage Bonferroni procedure presented here. To the best of our knowledge, the only method that has provable finite sample FDR control in this context has been proposed by Bogomolov and Heller (2018), and further investigation




Figure 5: P -values for the association of 149 metabolites with the fish intake (p_1) and the risk colorectal adenoma (p_2). Each dot represents a single metabolite. Shaded area highlights p -value pairs in which the minimum is below $\alpha = 0.05$.

into the problem of optimizing the threshold for selection in this setting is warranted.

References

- Benjamini, Y. and Heller, R. (2008). Screening for partial conjunction hypotheses. *Biometrics*, 64(4):1215–1222.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 57(1):289–300.
- Boca, S. M., Heller, R., and Sampson, J. N. (2018). *MultiMed: Testing multiple biological mediators simultaneously*. R package version 2.4.0.
- Boca, S. M., Sinha, R., Cross, A. J., Moore, S. C., and Sampson, J. N. (2013). Testing multiple biological mediators simultaneously. *Bioinformatics*, 30(2):214–220.
- Bogomolov, M. and Heller, R. (2018). Assessing replicability of findings across two studies of multiple features. *Biometrika*, 105(3):505–516.
- Chén, O. Y., Crainiceanu, C., Ogburn, E. L., Caffo, B. S., Wager, T. D., and Lindquist, M. A. (2017). High-dimensional multivariate mediation with application to neuroimaging data. *Biostatistics*, 19(2):121–136.
- Djordjilović, V., Page, C. M., Gran, J. M., Nøst, T. H., Sandanger, T. M., Veierød, M. B., and Thoresen, M. (2019). Global test for high-dimensional mediation: Testing groups of potential mediators. *Statistics in Medicine*, 38(18):3346–3360.

- Fasanelli, F., Baglietto, L., Ponzi, E., Guida, F., Campanella, G., Johansson, M., Grankvist, K., Johansson, M., Assumma, M. B., Naccarati, A., et al. (2015). Hypomethylation of smoking-related genes is associated with future lung cancer in four prospective cohorts. *Nature Communications*, 6:10192.
- Gleser, L. (1973). On a theory of intersection union tests. *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Bulletin*, 2(233):9.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scand Stat Theory Appl*, 6(2):65–70.
- Huang, Y.-T. and Pan, W.-C. (2016). Hypothesis test of mediation effect in causal mediation model with high-dimensional continuous mediators. *Biometrics*, 72(2):402–413.
- Lei, L. and Fithian, W. (2018). AdaPT: an interactive procedure for multiple testing with side information. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80(4):649–679.
- Richardson, T. G., Richmond, R. C., North, T.-L., Hemani, G., Davey Smith, G., Sharp, G. C., and Relton, C. L. (2019). An integrative approach to detect epigenetic mechanisms that putatively mediate the influence of lifestyle exposures on disease susceptibility. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 48(3):887–898.
- Sampson, J. N., Boca, S. M., Moore, S. C., and Heller, R. (2018). FWER and FDR control when testing multiple mediators. *Bioinformatics*, 34(14):2418–2424.
- Serang, S., Jacobucci, R., Brimhall, K. C., and Grimm, K. J. (2017). Exploratory mediation analysis via regularization. *Structural Equation Modeling: a Multidisciplinary Journal*, 24(5):733–744.
- Sherwood, W. B., Bion, V., Lockett, G. A., Ziyab, A. H., Soto-Ramírez, N., Mukherjee, N., Kurukulaaratchy, R. J., Ewart, S., Zhang, H., Arshad, S. H., et al. (2019). Duration of breastfeeding is associated with leptin (LEP) DNA methylation profiles and BMI in 10-year-old children. *Clinical Epigenetics*, 11(1):128.
- Sinha, R., Chow, W. H., Kulldorff, M., Denobile, J., Butler, J., Garcia-Closas, M., Weil, R., Hoover, R. N., and Rothman, N. (1999). Well-done, grilled red meat increases the risk of colorectal adenomas. *Cancer Research*, 59(17):4320–4324.
- Song, Y., Zhou, X., Zhang, M., Zhao, W., Liu, Y., Kardia, S., Roux, A. D., Needham, B., Smith, J. A., and Mukherjee, B. (2018). Bayesian shrinkage estimation of high dimensional causal mediation effects in omics studies. *bioRxiv*, page 467399.
- VanderWeele, T. (2015). *Explanation in causal inference: methods for mediation and interaction*. Oxford University Press.
- Wang, J., Su, W., Sabatti, C., and Owen, A. B. (2016). Detecting replicating signals using adaptive filtering procedures with the application in high-throughput experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03330*.
- Woo, C.-W., Roy, M., Buhle, J. T., and Wager, T. D. (2015). Distinct brain systems mediate the effects of nociceptive input and self-regulation on pain. *PLoS Biology*, 13(1):e1002036.
- Zhang, H., Zheng, Y., Zhang, Z., Gao, T., Joyce, B., Yoon, G., Zhang, W., Schwartz, J., Just, A., Colicino, E., et al. (2016). Estimating and testing high-dimensional mediation effects in epigenetic studies. *Bioinformatics*, 32(20):3150–3154.

Zhao, Y., Lindquist, M. A., and Caffo, B. S. (2020). Sparse principal component based high-dimensional mediation analysis. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 142:106835.

Zhao, Y. and Luo, X. (2016). Pathway lasso: estimate and select sparse mediation pathways with high dimensional mediators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07749*.

A Technical details

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Consider first the distribution of the minimum \underline{p}_i (to simplify notation, we omit the index i in what follows):

$$\Pr(\underline{p} \leq c) = 1 - \Pr(\underline{p} > c) = 1 - \Pr(p_1 > c, p_2 > c) = 1 - \prod_{j=1}^2 \Pr(p_j > c). \quad (10)$$

The joint distribution of \bar{p} and \underline{p} is

$$\Pr(\bar{p} \leq u, \underline{p} \leq c) = \Pr(\bar{p} \leq u) = \prod_{j=1}^2 \Pr(p_j \leq u), \quad (11)$$

for $0 < u \leq c \leq 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\bar{p} \leq u, \underline{p} \leq c) &= \Pr(\bar{p} \leq c) + \Pr(\underline{p} \leq c, c < \bar{p} \leq u) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^2 \Pr(p_j \leq u) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \Pr(p_j \leq c) \{\Pr(p_{-j} \leq u) - \Pr(p_{-j} \leq c)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for $0 < c < u \leq 1$, where p_{-j} is p_2 for $j = 1$, and p_1 for $j = 2$.

The distribution of \bar{p} conditional on the hypothesis H_i being selected is $\Pr(\bar{p} \leq u \mid \underline{p} \leq c)$. If the hypothesis H_i is true then at least one of the p -values p_1 and p_2 is null and thus uniformly distributed. Without loss of generality, let H_{i1} be true, so that $\Pr(p_1 \leq x) = x$. Let F be the distribution function of p_2 , so that $\Pr(p_2 \leq x) = F(x)$. Then from (10)

$$\Pr(\underline{p} \leq c) = 1 - (1 - c) \{1 - F(c)\} = c + F(c) - cF(c),$$

and similarly for the joint distribution from (11) and (12)

$$\Pr(\bar{p} \leq u, \underline{p} \leq c) = \begin{cases} uF(u), & \text{for } 0 < u \leq c \leq 1, \\ uF(c) + cF(u) - cF(c), & \text{for } 0 < c < u \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

From this expression (1) follows. To obtain the result of the (0,0) pair, it is sufficient to replace $F(x)$ with x in the above expression.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 1

Let I_0 denote the index set of true union hypotheses, i.e. the index set of (0,0), (0,1) and (1,0) pairs. Consider the probability of making no false rejections conditional on

the selection G . It is 1 if no hypothesis passes the selection, i.e. if $\sum_{j=1}^m G_j = 0$, and otherwise

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(V = 0 \mid G) &= \Pr\left(\bigcap_{i: G_i=1 \wedge i \in I_0} I\left[\bar{p}_i \geq \frac{\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^m G_j}\right] \mid G\right) \\
&\geq \Pr\left(\bigcap_{i: G_i=1} I\left[\bar{p}_i \geq \frac{\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^m G_j}\right] \mid G\right) \tag{13} \\
&= \prod_{i: G_i=1} \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \geq \frac{\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^m G_j} \mid G\right) \\
&= \prod_{i: G_i=1} \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \sum_{j \neq i} G_j} \mid G\right) \\
&= \prod_{i: G_i=1} \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \sum_{j \neq i} G_j} \mid I[\underline{p}_i \leq c], \sum_{j \neq m} G_j\right) \\
&= \prod_{i: G_i=1} \left\{1 - \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|} \mid I[\underline{p}_i \leq c], |S|\right)\right\} \\
&\geq \left\{1 - P_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}, c\right)\right\}^{|S|}. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

In (13), equality holds when for a given G , all selected hypotheses are true. This is true for all G if and only if $I_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$. In (14), equality holds if further all hypotheses are either a $(0, 1)$ or a $(1, 0)$ type. The conditional FWER can be found as $\Pr(V \geq 1 \mid G) = 1 - \Pr(V = 0 \mid G)$. The expression (3) for the unconditional FWER is obtained by taking the expectation over $|S|$.

A.3 Probability of rejecting a false union hypothesis

To reject H_i , two events need to occur: \underline{p}_i needs to be below the selection threshold c , and \bar{p}_i needs to be below the testing threshold $\alpha/|S|$. The probability of rejecting H_i conditional on $|S|$ is then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left(\underline{p}_i \leq c, \bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) &= \Pr(\bar{p}_i \leq c) + \Pr\left(\underline{p}_i \leq c, c < \bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) \\
&= F^2(c) + 2F(c) \left[F\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) - F(c)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

if $\alpha/|S| \geq c$, and

$$\Pr\left(\underline{p}_i \leq c, \bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) = \Pr\left(\bar{p}_i \leq \frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right) = F^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{|S|}\right),$$

if $\alpha/|S| < c$.

A.4 Oracle threshold and FWER constraint

We show that the threshold that maximizes the power under the FWER constraint, is the smallest threshold that satisfies the FWER constraint. First, we will show that c satisfies the FWER constraint if it belongs to an interval $(c^*, 1)$, where c^* is defined

below. We will then show that c^* is well approximated by \bar{c} , where \bar{c} solves the equation $c = \alpha/E|S(c)|$. But, according to (4), the power to reject a false union hypothesis is decreasing with c for $c > \bar{c}$, so that the threshold that maximizes the (constrained) power is approximately $\bar{c} \approx c^*$.

First order approximation of the FWER constraint in (6) states:

$$E|S(c)|P_0\left(\frac{\alpha}{E(S(c))}, c\right) \leq \alpha. \quad (15)$$

It is straightforward to check that when c is close to zero, (15) does not hold, while for $c = \bar{c}$, where \bar{c} solves $c = \alpha/E|S(c)|$, the constraint is satisfied. Namely, for \bar{c} the selection threshold and the testing threshold coincide and according to (1) we have

$$P_0(c, c) = c \frac{F(c)}{F(c) + c\{1 - F(c)\}} \leq c \quad (16)$$

for all $c \in (0, 1)$, with equality holding if and only if $F(c) = 1$. Given the continuity of P_0 , this implies that there is a value c^* in $(0, \bar{c})$ such that the constraint holds with the equality. We now show that c^* will be very close to \bar{c} .

Denote $u_c = \alpha/E|S(c)|$. The equation $P_0(u_c, c) = u_c$ simplifies to $F(u_c) - F(c) = u_c\{1 - F(c)\}$ according to (1) since $c < u_c$. When m is large, the interval $(0, \bar{c})$ will be very small, and if we assume that F is locally linear in the neighbourhood of c , we can substitute $F(u_c) \approx F(c) + f(c)(u_c - c)$, where $f(\cdot)$ is the density associated to F , to obtain

$$u_c \approx c \frac{f(c)}{f(c) + F(c) - 1},$$

Since the density is strictly decreasing, for small values of c , $|f(c)| \gg |F(c) - 1|$, so that the above equation becomes

$$u_c \approx c \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \alpha/E|S(c)| \approx c.$$

Therefore, the smallest threshold that satisfies the FWER constraint can be approximated by \bar{c} . Among all $c \in (\bar{c}, 1)$, this threshold will maximize power, since for $c \geq \bar{c}$, the power to reject a false union hypothesis is decreasing according to (4).