
A PHYLOGENY-BASED TEST OF MEDIATION EFFECT IN MICROBIOME

A PREPRINT

Qilin Hong

Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53715, U.S.A.

Guanhua Chen

Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53715, U.S.A.
gchen25@wisc.edu

Zheng-Zheng Tang

¹ Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53715, U.S.A.
² Wisconsin Institute for Discovery
Madison, WI 53715, U.S.A.
tang@biostat.wisc.edu

February 5, 2022

ABSTRACT

Recent studies suggest that the microbiome can be an important mediator in the effect of a treatment on an outcome. Microbiome data generated from sequencing experiments contain the relative abundance of a large number of microbial taxa with their evolutionary relationships represented by a phylogenetic tree. The compositional and high-dimensional nature of the microbiome mediator invalidates standard mediation analyses. We propose a phylogeny-based mediation analysis method (PhyloMed) for the microbiome mediator. PhyloMed models the microbiome mediation effect through a cascade of independent local mediation models on the internal nodes of the phylogenetic tree. Each local model captures the mediation effect of a subcomposition at a given taxonomic resolution. The method improves the power of the mediation test by enriching weak and sparse signals across mediating taxa that tend to cluster on the tree. In each local model, we further empower PhyloMed by using a mixture distribution to obtain the subcomposition mediation test p -value, which takes into account the composite nature of the null hypothesis. PhyloMed enables us to test the overall mediation effect of the entire microbial community and pinpoint internal nodes with significant subcomposition mediation effects. Our extensive simulations demonstrate the validity of PhyloMed and its substantial power gain over existing methods. An application to a real study further showcases the advantages of our method.

Keywords Composite null hypothesis; Joint significance test; Mediation analysis; Microbiome; Phylogenetic tree.

1 Introduction

Recent microbiome studies have revealed important associations between microbiome and treatment responses [Koeth et al., 2013, Zeevi et al., 2015, Taur and Pamer, 2016, Kuntz and Gilbert, 2017]. For example, gut microbes are found to greatly influence the potency of immunotherapy and some chemotherapies with immunostimulatory functions in the treatments for cancer [Fessler et al., 2019]. These studies suggest that the human microbiome is emerging as a crucial mediator between the treatment and its outcomes. Finding the mediating microbial taxa and elucidating the mechanism

behind the mediation can greatly facilitate the development of strategies to manipulate the microbiome to augment therapeutic responses.

Mediation analysis provides the statistical framework to investigate if a treatment or exposure affects an outcome through a mediator. The traditional mediation analysis studies the mediation effect of a single mediator [Baron and Kenny, 1986, MacKinnon, 2012]. More recent developments have extended that to multiple and even high-dimensional mediators [VanderWeele and Vansteelandt, 2014, Daniel et al., 2015, Zhang et al., 2016, Huang and Pan, 2016, Huang, 2019].

Microbiome data from sequencing experiments contain the relative abundance of a large number of different microbes. The compositional and high-dimensional nature of the microbiome mediators poses a great challenge to standard mediation analyses. Distance-based mediation tests MedTest [Zhang et al., 2018] and MODIMA [Hamidi et al., 2019] have been developed for testing the mediation effect of the entire microbial community. These global tests can achieve good power when many microbial taxa in the community mediate the treatment effect on the outcome. However, their power is limited when the number of mediating taxa is small (i.e. sparse mediation signal). Moreover, this type of method is not designed to identify mediating taxa.

Another mediation analysis methods for microbiome data assume sparse mediation effects and estimate the effects via regularization [Sohn et al., 2019, Wang et al., 2020, Zhang et al., 2021]. These methods aim to select mediating taxa and some provide global tests of the overall mediation effect at the community level. These global tests are potentially more powerful than the distance-based tests in the scenario of sparse mediation. However, these methods need to model the high-dimensional microbial composition, which is a daunting task due to the complex structure of microbiome data such as compositionality, over-dispersion, and high zero-inflation. Misspecification of the model can lead to biased estimates and tests of mediation effects.

In this paper, we develop a new phylogeny-based mediation analysis method (PhyloMed) for high-dimensional microbial composition mediators. Microbial taxa are evolutionarily related and their relationship is represented by a phylogenetic tree. Incorporating phylogenetic information into the analysis of microbiome data has been shown to greatly improve the performance of a variety of statistical analyses [Washburne et al., 2018]. Phylogenetic distances such as UniFrac [Lozupone and Knight, 2005] are useful in improving the power of association testing and the accuracy of sample classification. Another common way of utilizing the tree information is to break down full microbial composition according to the tree structure, which allows more flexible modeling of microbiome data and locating the signals to a certain taxonomic level [Tang et al., 2017, Wang and Zhao, 2017]. This idea motivates the development of PhyloMed. PhyloMed models the microbiome mediation effect through a cascade of independent local mediation models of subcompositions on the internal nodes of the phylogenetic tree. Hence, PhyloMed avoids the difficulty of directly modeling the high-dimensional full composition. Depending on the depth of internal nodes on the tree, these subcompositions represent the relative abundance of groups of taxa at various taxonomic resolutions. Descendants of each internal node share a certain degree of evolutionary affinity and tend to have similar biological functions. Therefore, mediating taxa are likely to cluster on the tree and PhyloMed can potentially enrich mediation signal and improve the power of mediation analysis.

In each local model of PhyloMed, we test the mediation effect of a subcomposition in the treatment \rightarrow outcome pathway. The mediation effect is commonly expressed as a product of two parameters, the treatment-mediator association and the mediator-outcome association conditional on the treatment. The null hypothesis of no mediation effect is composite: either one of those associations is zero or both are zeros. Traditional tests such as Sobel's test [Sobel, 1982] and joint significance test are overly conservative and yield low power because they ignore the composite nature of the null hypothesis [MacKinnon et al., 2002, Barfield et al., 2017]. To address this problem, we estimate the proportions of component null hypotheses among all the local mediation models and obtain the subcomposition mediation test p -value using a mixture distribution with three components, each of which corresponds to one type of null hypothesis. This indicates another advantage of decomposing the full composition mediation model into multiple subcomposition local models: a large number of local tests provides the opportunity to accurately estimate the proportions of different nulls so that the mediation tests based on the mixture distribution have the proper size.

By combining all the subcomposition mediation test p -values across nodes of the phylogenetic tree, PhyloMed produces a global mediation test to evaluate the mediation signal at the microbial community level. Simulation studies show that the PhyloMed global test better controls the type I error and is substantially more powerful than existing global mediation tests in the presence of the sparse signal. In addition, by detecting significant subcomposition mediation test p -values, PhyloMed can pinpoint the nodes of the tree with groups of descendant taxa that are potential mediators. Simulation studies show that PhyloMed properly controls false discovery rate (FDR) in identifying mediating nodes and yields higher discovery power than the procedures that use Sobel's and joint significance tests to obtain subcomposition mediation p -values. In an application to a real microbiome study, PhyloMed reveals that the effect of antibiotics

treatment on weight gain is transmitted through perturbing the gut microbial community and highlights mediating subcompositions on the phylogenetic tree.

2 Methods

2.1 Phylogeny-based mediation model

The phylogeny is an estimation of the microorganisms' evolutionary history. Figure 1 shows an example of a simple rooted binary phylogenetic tree with 11 microbial taxa at terminal nodes and 10 internal nodes, representing the common ancestors of those taxa. The subcomposition on a given internal node consists of the relative abundance aggregated at its two child nodes. For example, the highlighted internal node in Figure 1 has a terminal node for taxon 5 as its left child node and the most recent common ancestor of taxa 6 and 7 as its right child node. Therefore, the subcomposition defined on that internal node has two components: one is the abundance of taxon 5 and the other is the aggregated abundance of taxa 6 and 7.




Figure 1: Example phylogenetic tree and causal path diagram of a local mediation model. PhyloMed divides the high-dimensional microbial composition into multiple subcompositions at internal nodes of the phylogenetic tree and tests the mediation effect of each subcomposition.

As depicted in Figure 1, we propose to construct a local mediation model for the subcomposition on each internal node of the phylogenetic tree. Suppose there are J internal nodes on the tree and data contain a random sample of n subjects from a population. For internal node $j = 1, \dots, J$ and subject $i = 1, \dots, n$, we let (M_{ij1}, M_{ij2}) be the subcomposition mediator, $\mathbb{N}_{ij} = M_{ij1} + M_{ij2}$ be the counts assigned to the j th internal node of the tree, T_i be the treatment variable, Y_i be the outcome variable, and \mathbf{X}_i be a set of confounders that may affect the treatment, mediator, and outcome.

Our method separately models subcomposition (M_{ij1}, M_{ij2}) conditional on \mathbb{N}_{ij} for each internal node j and assumes $\log(M_{ij1}/M_{ij2})$'s over internal nodes are mutually independent normal random variables. To represent the causal path diagram of the local mediation model at the j th internal node, we apply the following linear and generalized linear regression models

$$E \left\{ \log \left(\frac{M_{ij1}}{M_{ij2}} \right) \right\} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{jX}^T \mathbf{X}_i + \alpha_j T_i, \quad (1)$$

$$g\{E(Y_i)\} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{jX}^T \mathbf{X}_i + \beta_{jT} T_i + \beta_j \log \left(\frac{M_{ij1}}{M_{ij2}} \right), \quad (2)$$

where $g\{\cdot\}$ is the link function depending on the type of the outcome and we omit the intercept term in both models as it can be absorbed into \mathbf{X}_i . In both models, we use the log ratio of M_{ij1} to M_{ij2} as the mediator variable, which is a common scale-invariant transformation for compositions. Because $\log(M_{ij1}/M_{ij2})$'s over internal nodes are independent, rather than fitting the large joint model $[Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i, T_i, \log(M_{i11}/M_{i12}), \dots, \log(M_{iJ1}/M_{iJ2})]$, we can fit J low-dimensional models $[Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i, T_i, \log(M_{ij1}/M_{ij2})]$ as equation (2) for the purpose of hypothesis testing.

The potential outcome framework [Robins and Greenland, 1992, VanderWeele and Vansteelandt, 2009, Imai et al., 2010] has established a series of identifiability assumptions such that models (1) and (2) lead to quantification of the causal mediation effect. A rigorous definition of causal mediation using potential outcomes framework is provided in Web Appendix A.1. An extension of the model to allow for the treatment-mediator interaction is described in the Web Appendix A.2.

Our method concerns the mediation effects at internal nodes, rather than leaf nodes of a tree. Note that the meaning of “mediation effect” at internal nodes and leaf nodes are not exactly equivalent. Web Figure S1 uses a simple example to show different scenarios of mediation null and alternative hypotheses at the leaves and at the upper level after aggregating leaf-level taxa. The presence/absence of the mediation effect at the upper-level nodes corresponds to that at the leaf nodes, except for the situation shown in the last column of the figure. In that scenario, the set of treatment-associated taxa and the set of outcome-associated taxa are completely separate. After aggregating these taxa at their common ancestors, the upper-level nodes will have the mediation effect, though the treatment and outcome associations are contributed by different descendants. Therefore, if we want to interpret the significant test results on the internal node down to the leaf level, we need to assume that at least one leaf-level descendant is associated with both the treatment and the outcome. This assumption is mild and unavoidable if one wants to perform analysis at any aggregated taxa.

2.2 Composite null hypothesis tests in local mediation models

In each local mediation model, we are interested in testing whether the subcomposition at the j th internal node lies in the causal pathway from the treatment to the outcome. The null and alternative hypotheses for this testing problem can be formulated as

$$H_0^j : \alpha_j \beta_j = 0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_a^j : \alpha_j \beta_j \neq 0. \quad (3)$$

The null hypothesis can be equivalently expressed as the union of three disjoint component null hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned} H_{00}^j &: \alpha_j = \beta_j = 0, \\ H_{10}^j &: \alpha_j \neq 0, \beta_j = 0, \\ H_{01}^j &: \alpha_j = 0, \beta_j \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Sobel’s test [Sobel, 1982] and joint significance test have been widely applied to test the mediation null hypothesis. Unfortunately, these tests have severely deflated type I error and lack power because they fail to take into account the composite nature of the null hypothesis [MacKinnon et al., 2002, Barfield et al., 2017].

To address this issue, several new mediation tests were recently developed [Huang et al., 2019, Dai et al., 2020, Liu et al., 2021]. In light of these methods, we propose a new testing procedure that handles the composite null hypothesis and produces well-controlled type I error for multiple local mediation tests. Let P_{α_j} and P_{β_j} denote the p -values for testing $\alpha_j = 0$ and $\beta_j = 0$, respectively. The P_{α_j} and P_{β_j} are asymptotically uniformly distributed under their respective null hypotheses and are independent under the no unmeasured confounding assumptions. In PhyloMed, we adopt score statistics and obtain the observed p -values p_{α_j} and p_{β_j} based on the reference asymptotic distribution or permutation (details in Web Appendix B). The permutation p -value is more accurate than its asymptotic counterpart when the study sample size is small, which is usually the case for microbiome studies of treatment response. We implement an adaptive procedure to efficiently and accurately obtain the permutation p -values (Web Appendix B.3).

We then define the mediation test statistic for H_0^j as

$$P_{\max_j} = \max(P_{\alpha_j}, P_{\beta_j}). \quad (4)$$

The classical joint significant test also takes P_{\max_j} as the mediation test statistic and determines statistical significance using the uniform distribution. In fact, P_{\max_j} follows a mixture distribution with three components, each of which corresponds to one type of null hypothesis H_{00}^j , H_{10}^j , or H_{01}^j . Let p_{\max_j} denote $\max(p_{\alpha_j}, p_{\beta_j})$, and π_{00} , π_{10} , and π_{01} be the probabilities of the three null hypotheses among the J local mediation models defined on the tree. The p -value of

mediation test in the j th local model is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& Pr(P_{\max_j} \leq p_{\max_j}) \\
&= \pi_{00} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j}, P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid H_{00}^j) \\
&\quad + \pi_{10} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j}, P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid H_{10}^j) + \pi_{01} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j}, P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid H_{01}^j) \\
&= \pi_{00} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j = 0) Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j = 0) \\
&\quad + \pi_{10} Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j = 0) Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0) \\
&\quad + \pi_{01} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j = 0) Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j \neq 0) \\
&= \pi_{00} p_{\max_j}^2 + \pi_{10} p_{\max_j} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0) + \pi_{01} p_{\max_j} Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j \neq 0). \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

In this formula, we need to estimate three probabilities: π_{00} , π_{10} , and π_{01} , and two power functions evaluated at p_{\max_j} : $Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$ and $Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j \neq 0)$.

We first employ the method proposed by Jin and Cai [2007] to estimate $\pi_{0\bullet}$, the proportion of null $\alpha_j = 0$, using p_{α_j} 's in all J local mediation models. Specifically, we convert the p_{α_j} to Z -score $Z_{\alpha_j} = \text{sign}(\hat{\alpha}_j) \times \Phi^{-1}(1 - p_{\alpha_j}/2)$, where $\text{sign}(\hat{\alpha}_j)$ is the sign of the α_j estimate and $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ is the quantile function of the standard normal. Jin and Cai [2007] use the empirical characteristic function and Fourier analysis to estimate the proportion of nulls. The empirical characteristic function is defined as

$$\varphi_J(t; Z_{\alpha_1}, \dots, Z_{\alpha_J}) = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J e^{itZ_{\alpha_j}},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. The proportion of nulls can be consistently estimated as

$$\hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} = \inf_{\{0 \leq t \leq \sqrt{\log(J)}\}} \left[\int_{-1}^1 (1 - |\xi|) \left\{ \text{Re}(\varphi_J(t\xi; Z_{\alpha_1}, \dots, Z_{\alpha_J})) e^{t^2 \xi^2 / 2} \right\} d\xi \right],$$

where $\text{Re}(x)$ denotes the real part of a complex number x . Similarly, we can obtain $\hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0}$, the estimated proportion of null $\beta_j = 0$ using p_{β_j} 's across all local models. Then, under H_{00}^j , the estimates of π_{00} , π_{10} , π_{01} are $\hat{\pi}_{00} = \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0} / \hat{\pi}_0$, $\hat{\pi}_{10} = (1 - \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet}) \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0} / \hat{\pi}_0$, and $\hat{\pi}_{01} = \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} (1 - \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0}) / \hat{\pi}_0$, where $\hat{\pi}_0 = \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} + \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0} - \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0}$.

For the two power functions, we employ the nonparametric estimates based on the Grenander estimator of the p -value density [Langaas et al., 2005]. We show below the procedure of obtaining $\hat{P}r(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$. Specifically, we use formula (9) in Langaas et al. [2005] to compute the Grenander estimator of the decreasing density at every p_{α_j} , denoted by $\hat{f}(p_{\alpha_j})$. Under H_0^j , P_{α_j} follows a mixture distribution composed of the uniform distribution (under H_{00}^j and H_{01}^j) and the power function (under H_{10}^j). Therefore, we can obtain the conditional density estimate $\hat{f}(p_{\alpha_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$ by solving the equation

$$\hat{f}(p_{\alpha_j}) = \hat{\pi}_{10} \hat{f}(p_{\alpha_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0) + \hat{\pi}_{00} + \hat{\pi}_{01}.$$

We can then estimate $\hat{P}r(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$ based on $\hat{f}(p_{\alpha_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$ at all observed p_{α_j} 's. Using the similar estimation procedure, we can obtain $\hat{P}r(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j \neq 0)$. Finally, the mediation test p -value at the j th node can be estimated as $p_j = \hat{\pi}_{00} p_{\max_j}^2 + \hat{\pi}_{10} p_{\max_j} \hat{P}r(P_{\alpha_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \alpha_j \neq 0) + \hat{\pi}_{01} p_{\max_j} \hat{P}r(P_{\beta_j} \leq p_{\max_j} \mid \beta_j \neq 0)$.

2.3 Global mediation test and mediating node detection

Under the global null mediation hypothesis that there is no mediation effect in any of the internal nodes (i.e. $H_0 : \cap_{j=1}^J H_0^j$), we show below that the mediation test statistics P_{\max_j} 's across all internal nodes are asymptotically mutually independent as the sample size goes to infinity.

First of all, under H_0^j , the two power function probabilities $Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq t_j \mid \alpha_j \neq 0)$ and $Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq t_j \mid \beta_j \neq 0)$ converge to 1 for a constant t_j when sample size goes to infinity. Therefore, based on formula (5), $Pr(P_{\max_j} \leq t_j)$ can be approximated by $\pi_{00} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq t_j \mid \alpha_j = 0) Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq t_j \mid \beta_j = 0) + \pi_{10} Pr(P_{\beta_j} \leq t_j \mid \beta_j = 0) + \pi_{01} Pr(P_{\alpha_j} \leq t_j \mid \alpha_j = 0) = \pi_{00} t_j^2 + \pi_{10} t_j + \pi_{01} t_j$. Clearly, the formula only involves probabilities of P_{α_j} and P_{β_j} under their respective nulls $\alpha_j = 0$ and $\beta_j = 0$.

Without loss of generality, we order the internal nodes $1, \dots, J$ such that each parent node always appears in front of its children. Let $\mathbb{N}_J = \{\mathbb{N}_{iJ}\}_{i=1}^n$ be the vector of aggregated relative abundance at the J th node for all subjects. Under the

global null hypothesis H_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^J (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \right\} &= E \left[Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^J (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \mid \mathbb{N}_J \right\} \right] \\ &\approx E \left[Pr(P_{\max_J} \leq t_J \mid \mathbb{N}_J) Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^{J-1} (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \mid \mathbb{N}_J \right\} \right] \\ &= Pr(P_{\max_J} \leq t_J) E \left[Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^{J-1} (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \mid \mathbb{N}_J \right\} \right] \\ &= Pr(P_{\max_J} \leq t_J) Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^{J-1} (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where \approx represents that P_{\max_J} is asymptotically independent of all other P_{\max_j} 's conditional on \mathbb{N}_J . This is because, conditional on \mathbb{N}_J , P_{α_J} is asymptotically independent of all other P_{α_j} 's and P_{β_J} is asymptotically independent of all other P_{β_j} 's under the respective nulls $\alpha_J = 0$ and $\beta_J = 0$. The second last equation holds because the two regressions in the local mediation models are operated via the scale-invariant log-ratio of the subcomposition, hence, $Pr(P_{\max_J} \leq t_J \mid \mathbb{N}_J) = Pr(P_{\max_J} \leq t_J)$.

Repeating the above procedure iteratively for $J - 1, J - 2, \dots, 1$ gives

$$Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^J (P_{\max_j} \leq t_j) \right\} \approx \prod_{j=1}^J Pr(P_{\max_j} \leq t_j). \quad (6)$$

As the tests on internal nodes are asymptotically independent, to control FDR in multiple testing, we can apply Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure [Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995] to identify a collection of nodes with significant mediation effects on the phylogenetic tree. To test the global mediation null hypothesis H_0 , we apply Simes's method [Simes, 1986] to combine all the local mediation test p -values. This global test focuses on a few smallest p -values and is powerful to detect the sparse mediation signal among subcompositions on the tree.

3 Simulation Studies

3.1 Simulation strategy

We performed extensive simulation studies to evaluate the type I error and power of the PhyloMed global mediation test. We considered using the asymptotic and permutation p -values of p_{α_j} and p_{β_j} in PhyloMed and referred to these two versions as PhyloMed.A and PhyloMed.P. We compared their performance with two distance-based tests MedTest [Zhang et al., 2018] and MODIMA [Hamidi et al., 2019]. In these distance-based methods, we considered Bray-Curtis, Jaccard, weighted and unweighted UniFrac distances. In addition, we considered a test based on the regularized mediation model CMM [Sohn et al., 2019]. We chose CMM as the representative of regularized methods because it provides a global test and has a relatively flexible mediator model for microbial full compositions. We used the normality-based and bootstrap methods for the CMM global test as described in their paper [Sohn et al., 2019].

To resemble reality, we used a real microbiome dataset from Zeevi et al. [2015] as a basis for the simulation. The data contained microbiome samples from 900 healthy subjects. In each round of the simulation, we randomly sampled $n = 50$ or 200 subjects out of the 900 and divided them into two equal-sized treatment groups ($T_i = 0$ or 1). We used the top 100 most abundant bacterial taxa and the associated phylogenetic tree with 99 internal nodes. Let \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β denote the set of treatment-associated and outcome-associated taxa, respectively, \mathcal{S} be the union of the two sets, and $|\mathcal{S}|$ be the number of elements in \mathcal{S} . Under the null of no mediation effect, these two sets of taxa do not overlap and we consider five combinations of $(|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|, |\mathcal{S}_\beta|)$ values: $(0, 0)$, $(3, 0)$, $(6, 0)$, $(0, 3)$, $(0, 6)$. Different values represent different mixtures of nulls H_{00} , H_{10} , and H_{01} : $(0, 0)$ pertains to the setting that all local models are under H_{00} ; $(3$ or $6, 0)$ pertains to the setting that some local models are under H_{00} and others are under H_{10} ; $(0, 3$ or $6)$ pertains to the setting that some local models are under H_{00} and others are under H_{01} . Under the alternative, we let the two sets of taxa completely or partially overlap. When $|\mathcal{S}| = 3$, we randomly selected a clade with three descendant taxa and worked with the three taxa. when $|\mathcal{S}| = 6$, we randomly selected two clades with three descendant taxa in each and worked with the six taxa. Therefore, in the setting where taxa in \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β are completely overlapped, we have 3 or 6 mediating taxa. In the setting where taxa in \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β are partially overlapped, we randomly selected one descendant under each clade as a mediating taxon such that we have 1 or 2 mediating taxa.

To perturb the abundance of each treatment-associated taxon $k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, we increased its abundance in each subject i in the treatment group by adding a random count sampled from $\text{Binomial}(N_i, A f_k)$, where N_i is the sequencing depth of subject i , f_k is the average observed proportion of taxon k across all the samples in the data, A controls the strength of the treatment-mediator association, and we set $A = 1$. To simulate the outcome, we used the log-contrast regression model [Lin et al., 2014] that imposes a zero-sum constraint on the association coefficients to account for the compositional nature of the covariates. The log-contrast model was also used as the outcome model in CMM. In our

simulation, we considered both continuous and binary outcomes. For the continuous outcome, we generated data from the linear log-contrast regression model

$$Y_i = \beta_T T_i + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_\beta} \beta_k \log(f_{ik}) + \epsilon_i, \quad \text{subject to } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_\beta} \beta_k = 0,$$

where f_{ik} is the observed proportion of taxon k in subject i and ϵ_i is the zero-mean normal error. For the binary outcome, we generated data from the logistic log-contrast regression model

$$\text{logit}\{Pr(Y_i = 1)\} = \beta_T T_i + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_\beta} \beta_k \log(f_{ik}), \quad \text{subject to } \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_\beta} \beta_k = 0.$$

In these models, the coefficient β_T was sampled from $Uniform(0, 1)$ and β_k 's were sampled from $Uniform(0, B)$, where B controls the strength of the mediator-outcome association, and we set $B = 1$. The values of β_k 's were centered such that the zero-sum constraint was satisfied. We used 2000 replicates of simulation to evaluate empirical type I error and power of the global mediation tests at the 0.05 significance level.

To evaluate the performance of different methods when the mediation signals are denser and the mediating taxa are randomly scattered rather than clustered on the tree, we conducted another set of simulations. Specifically, we considered 3, 6, and 15 randomly scattered mediating taxa (taxa in \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β are completely overlapped). We also lowered the mediation effect size by decreasing A to 0.001 and B to 0.5 to better see the separation of different methods.

In addition to the global mediation test, we also evaluated the empirical FDR and power in identifying mediating nodes on the tree. All the ancestor nodes of the mediating taxa are mediating nodes. To evaluate power, we focused on the discovery rate of identifying the most recent common ancestor nodes of the mediating taxa because the signal on the upper-level ancestor nodes was diluted by the non-mediating taxa, therefore, difficult to detect. Besides the mixture-distribution-based test implemented in PhyloMed, we performed standard Sobel's test and joint significance test to obtain the p -value for testing the subcomposition mediation effect in each local model. We then applied the BH procedure to select significant mediating nodes while controlling FDR at the 0.05 level.

3.2 Simulation results

For the distance-based global mediation tests MedTest and MODIMA, we present their results of Jaccard distance since it has the highest power among all distances considered. For the CMM global mediation test, we present the result from the normality-based test as it is very similar to the one from the bootstrap test. The current implementation of CMM cannot handle binary outcomes and the situation where the number of taxa is larger than the sample size. Therefore, the CMM result is only available for the continuous outcome and large sample size $n = 200$.

The empirical type I error of different global mediation tests is provided in Table 1. The type I error of PhyloMed is properly controlled and closer to the significance level of 0.05 than the other methods in almost all scenarios. The permutation version of PhyloMed (PhyloMed.P) controls type I error better than the asymptotic version (PhyloMed.A), especially when the sample size is small ($n = 50$). MedTest and MODIMA tests are generally conservative. When $|\mathcal{S}_\alpha| = |\mathcal{S}_\beta| = 0$ (i.e. all taxa are under H_{00}), their conservativeness is worse than other scenarios where some taxa are under H_{10} or H_{01} . In contrast, the performance of the PhyloMed global test is less affected by the mixture proportions of different nulls. The CMM test is too liberal in our simulation study, probably because its mediator model does not adequately fit the full microbial composition.

In Figure 2 and Web Figure S2, the control of the type I error is also demonstrated by the quantile-quantile plots of p -values from different tests under various null hypothesis settings. The PhyloMed global test yields p -values that are mostly aligned with the diagonal line, whereas MedTest and MODIMA tests are deflated and CMM test is inflated.

Figure 3 displays the power results for the setting where there are 3 or 6 mediating taxa clustered on the tree. PhyloMed is substantially more powerful than the MedTest and MODIMA in all settings. PhyloMed is also more powerful than CMM even though CMM's power is overestimated due to the inflation of the type I error. The power gain is because PhyloMed tests subcompositions on the ancestor nodes of mediating taxa, at which mediation signals were condensed. Moreover, PhyloMed employs the mixture distribution in testing the subcomposition mediation effect, which is more efficient than traditional mediation tests. The conclusion remains the same when taxa in \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β are partially overlapped (Web Figure S3).

Web Figure S4 displays the power results when the mediating taxa are randomly scattered. When the mediation effect is large, PhyloMed is more powerful than other methods. When the effect is small, the distance-based methods can be more powerful than PhyloMed as mediation signals become denser under the small sample size (upper right panel of Web Figure S4).

Table 1: Empirical type I error of different global mediation tests.

n	$ \mathcal{S}_\alpha $	$ \mathcal{S}_\beta $	PhyloMed.A	PhyloMed.P	MedTest	MODIMA	CMM
Continuous outcome							
50	0	0	0.020	0.027	0.004	0.005	-
50	3	0	0.028	0.034	0.026	0.027	-
50	6	0	0.033	0.040	0.053	0.041	-
50	0	3	0.032	0.039	0.021	0.011	-
50	0	6	0.026	0.033	0.035	0.019	-
200	0	0	0.023	0.027	0.005	0.004	0.309
200	3	0	0.039	0.042	0.035	0.040	0.480
200	6	0	0.036	0.038	0.052	0.055	0.504
200	0	3	0.039	0.042	0.035	0.029	0.149
200	0	6	0.044	0.045	0.045	0.042	0.091
Binary outcome							
50	0	0	0.022	0.026	0.003	0.002	-
50	3	0	0.028	0.041	0.033	0.016	-
50	6	0	0.029	0.035	0.046	0.033	-
50	0	3	0.025	0.035	0.013	0.006	-
50	0	6	0.026	0.041	0.014	0.009	-
200	0	0	0.021	0.024	0.002	0.004	-
200	3	0	0.037	0.039	0.042	0.036	-
200	6	0	0.037	0.042	0.049	0.046	-
200	0	3	0.038	0.038	0.019	0.010	-
200	0	6	0.031	0.032	0.034	0.020	-




Figure 2: Quantile-quantile plots of different global mediation tests in the simulation study for the continuous outcome.




Figure 3: Power comparison of different global mediation tests when the treatment-associated taxa set and the outcome-associated taxa set are completely overlapped. The mediating taxa are clustered on the tree.

In the procedure of detecting mediating nodes, the FDR is controlled for all mediation tests applied to local models (Web Table S1). Web Table S2 shows the discovery rate of the most recent common ancestor nodes of the mediating taxa. PhyloMed that is based on the mixture distribution has much higher power than the standard Sobel’s and joint significance tests in identifying those mediating nodes.

4 Real Data Application

In the United States, the largest use of antibiotics is within farms, with low doses fed to farm animals to stimulate weight gain. However, there is a growing concern that antibiotic exposure may have long-term consequences. Studies have shown that antibiotics can have a great impact on the abundance of bacteria in the gut community. It is interesting to investigate whether the subtherapeutic antibiotic treatment effect on body weight is mediated through the perturbation of the gut microbiome and study the underlying mechanisms. Cho et al. [2012] conducted an experiment by administering different low-dose antibiotic treatments to young mice and evaluated changes in body fat and compositions of the microbiome in cecal and fecal samples. Specifically, mice were randomly assigned to five treatment groups (four types of antibiotics + no antibiotics), with 10 mice in each group. The body fat percentage was measured and used as the outcome in our analysis. The microbiome composition was established by 16S rRNA gene sequencing. The sequencing reads were preprocessed using the QIIME pipeline [Caporaso et al., 2010] and clustered at a 97% similarity threshold, resulting in 6547 unique microbial taxa. The phylogenetic tree for these taxa was also generated from the pipeline.

In our analysis, the mediators include the top 100 most abundant taxa that make up 80% and 87% of the cecal and fecal microbial compositions, respectively. The sequencing read counts assigned to these taxa were transformed into proportions after adding 0.5 to the count matrix, which is a common practice in compositional data analysis to avoid zeros in log-ratio transformation [Aitchison, 1986]. We combined samples from the four antibiotics groups and compared them with samples from the no antibiotics group (controls). After removing samples with low sequencing depth, we had 48 samples (38 in antibiotics vs 10 in controls) for cecal data analysis and 46 samples (36 in antibiotics vs 10 in controls) for fecal data analysis. No confounders were included in the mediation model since we assume they had been well-controlled in the randomized experiment.




Figure 4: Identified mediating node on the phylogenetic tree and the corresponding subcomposition associations with the treatment and the body fat outcome in cecal data analysis. Top: phylogenetic tree, the size of the circle at each internal node is proportional to $-\log_{10}(\text{local subcomposition mediation test } p\text{-value})$ and the clade under the identified node is highlighted in a blue rectangle; Bottom left: association between the treatment and the log-ratio transformed subcomposition mediator; Bottom right: association between the log-ratio transformed subcomposition mediator and the body fat percentage residual after adjusting for treatment effect.

The mice in the antibiotic group have a higher average body fat percentage than those in the control group (Web Figure S5). We used PhyloMed to investigate if the cecal and fecal microbiome mediates the effect of the antibiotics on body fat increase. We used permutation to obtain p_{α_j} 's and p_{β_j} 's in local models due to the small sample size of the study. Among all the local models in PhyloMed, the estimated proportions for different nulls H_{00} , H_{10} , and H_{01} are $\hat{\pi}_{00} = 0.65$, $\hat{\pi}_{10} = 0.30$ and $\hat{\pi}_{01} = 0.05$ for cecal data, and $\hat{\pi}_{00} = 0.88$, $\hat{\pi}_{10} = 0.12$ and $\hat{\pi}_{01} = 0$ for fecal data. The PhyloMed global mediation test gives p -values of 0.088 and 0.078 for cecal and fecal data analyses.

We then used PhyloMed to identify internal nodes with significant mediation effects on the phylogenetic tree while controlling FDR at 0.1. Figure 4 visualizes the identified mediating nodes in cecal data analysis and the relevant treatment-subcomposition and subcomposition-outcome associations. The log-ratio of subcomposition at the identified node is significantly associated with the treatment and the outcome ($p_{\alpha_j} = 2.8 \times 10^{-5}$ and $p_{\beta_j} = 7.3 \times 10^{-3}$). The descendants of the mediating node are a group of evolutionarily close taxa that likely share similar biological functions and jointly contribute to the mechanism of antibiotics' effect on body fat change. The results for the fecal data analysis were visualized similarly in Web Figure S6. When we employed Sobel's test and joint significance test in local models, the subcomposition mediation test p -values were much less significant than those in PhyloMed (Web Figure S7) and no mediating nodes were identified.

We applied MedTest and MODIMA to the same dataset and results are not significant at the 0.1 level for all distances (Bray-Curtis, Jaccard, weighted and unweighted UniFrac, Web Table S3). To apply CMM, the number of taxa needs to

be equal to or smaller than the sample size. We aggregated taxa along the phylogenetic tree to obtain a smaller number of taxa. None of the methods give significant p -values on this set of aggregated taxa (Web Table S3).

5 Discussion

This article has introduced a new framework PhyloMed for testing the mediation effect in high-dimensional microbial composition. The method leverages the hierarchical phylogeny relationship among different microbial taxa to decompose the complex mediation model on the full microbial composition into multiple simple independent local mediation models on subcompositions. This tree-guided approach effectively enriches mediation signals that tend to cluster on the phylogeny tree and boosts the power of the test for weak and sparse mediation effects among taxa. Moreover, PhyloMed properly takes into account the composite null hypothesis of the mediation test and produces well-calibrated p -values for testing local subcomposition mediation effects. Our simulation studies have shown that PhyloMed controls the type I error better and has substantially higher power than existing methods MedTest, MODIMA, and CMM. Besides testing the global mediation effect of the microbial community, PhyloMed enables us to pinpoint clusters of mediating taxa at various taxonomic resolutions, represented by subcompositions with significant local mediation p -values. The usefulness of PhyloMed was demonstrated in the real data analysis evaluating the mediating role of the gut microbiome in the antibiotic effect on body fat.

Under the PhyloMed framework, alternative mediator models can be used and replace equation (1). We have considered using Dirichlet-multinomial (DM) regression [La Rosa et al., 2012] and quasi-likelihood regression [Tang et al., 2017] to link subcomposition count data to the treatment. The type I error results (Web Table S4) shows that the DM-based test can be too liberal and the quasi-likelihood test is more conservative than the log-ratio linear model equation (1) adopted by PhyloMed.

The performance of PhyloMed can be affected by the accuracy of the estimates $\hat{\pi}_{00}$, $\hat{\pi}_{10}$, $\hat{\pi}_{01}$. We considered an alternative approach (details in Web Table S5) to first use Storey’s method [Storey, 2002] to obtain estimates $\hat{\pi}_{00}$, $\hat{\pi}_{0\bullet}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0}$ and then calculate $\hat{\pi}_{01} = \hat{\pi}_{0\bullet} - \hat{\pi}_{00}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{10} = \hat{\pi}_{\bullet 0} - \hat{\pi}_{00}$. This approach flexibly accommodates any distribution of $(\pi_{00}, \pi_{01}, \pi_{10})$. Under our simulation setting, this approach yields similar performance as the approach described in the Method Section (Web Table S5). In addition, regardless of the estimation method we used, $\hat{\pi}_{00}$, $\hat{\pi}_{10}$, and $\hat{\pi}_{01}$ will generally be less accurate when the mediation signal is weak. We evaluated how this may affect the performance of PhyloMed by decreasing the mediation effect size in the simulation. Although the estimated proportions of nulls are less accurate (Web Table S6) and the type I error is more deflated comparing to the large-effect-size setting (Web Table S7), the power is still significantly better than the existing methods in most scenarios (Web Figures S4 and S8).

PhyloMed is designed to detect the sparse mediation signal among taxa. Since all p -values across local mediation models are independent under the mediation null hypothesis, many standard p -value combination methods and FDR-controlling procedures can be employed. In this article, we focus on Simes’s p -value combination that is sensitive to detect the sparse signal. If the mediation signal is dense (i.e. many taxa in the microbial community have mediation effects), alternative methods such as Fisher’s and harmonic mean p -value combination methods [Wilson, 2019] may yield better power. In addition, there are FDR-controlling procedures that leverage the hierarchical tree structures [Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2003, Li and Barber, 2019, Lei et al., 2021] and potentially have superior performance when mediation hypotheses defined on the nearby or nested clades are more likely to be jointly true or false. Evaluating these different methods is beyond the scope of this paper.

In this article, we focused on using a known binary phylogenetic tree with each subcomposition on the internal node consists of two components. The method can be extended to non-binary trees (e.g. taxonomic trees) that have more than two children at internal nodes. In this case, the local mediation model will have more than one log-ratio transformed mediator. We may develop a variance-component mediation test similar to the one proposed in Huang [2019] to test multivariate mediators. Furthermore, for the microbiome data derived from shotgun metagenomics sequencing, multiple phylogenetic trees can be constructed, each of which is based on sequencing data of a set of marker genes. The structures of these trees may or may not agree with each other and may be subject to various degrees of error. Evaluating the robustness of the method against tree misspecification is a future effort.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the NIH grant R01GM140464, NSF grant DMS-2054346, and Data Science Initiative Award provided by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Office of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education with funding from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation. The work was also supported

in part by the NIH/National Institute on Aging through the University of Wisconsin Madison Center for Demography of Health and Aging Pilot Grant (P30AG017266).

Supporting Information

A software implementation of our method as well as all code to reproduce the results in this paper is available online with the posting of this article, or on Github at <https://github.com/KiRinHong/miMediation>.

References

- Robert A Koeth, Zeneng Wang, Bruce S Levison, Jennifer A Buffa, Elin Org, Brendan T Sheehy, Earl B Britt, Xiaoming Fu, Yuping Wu, Lin Li, et al. Intestinal microbiota metabolism of L-carnitine, a nutrient in red meat, promotes atherosclerosis. *Nature Medicine*, 19(5):576–585, 2013.
- David Zeevi, Tal Korem, Niv Zmora, David Israeli, Daphna Rothschild, Adina Weinberger, Orly Ben-Yacov, Dar Lador, Tali Avnit-Sagi, Maya Lotan-Pompan, et al. Personalized nutrition by prediction of glycemic responses. *Cell*, 163(5):1079–1094, 2015.
- Ying Taur and Eric G Pamer. Microbiome mediation of infections in the cancer setting. *Genome Medicine*, 8(1):40, 2016.
- Thomas M Kuntz and Jack A Gilbert. Introducing the microbiome into precision medicine. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 38(1):81–91, 2017.
- Jessica Fessler, Vyara Matson, and Thomas F Gajewski. Exploring the emerging role of the microbiome in cancer immunotherapy. *Journal for Immunotherapy of Cancer*, 7(1):108, 2019.
- Reuben M Baron and David A Kenny. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6):1173, 1986.
- David P MacKinnon. *Introduction to statistical mediation analysis*. Routledge, 2012.
- Tyler VanderWeele and Stijn Vansteelandt. Mediation analysis with multiple mediators. *Epidemiologic methods*, 2(1):95–115, 2014.
- Rhian M Daniel, Bianca L De Stavola, SN Cousens, and Stijn Vansteelandt. Causal mediation analysis with multiple mediators. *Biometrics*, 71(1):1–14, 2015.
- Haixiang Zhang, Yinan Zheng, Zhou Zhang, Tao Gao, Brian Joyce, Grace Yoon, Wei Zhang, Joel Schwartz, Allan Just, Elena Colicino, et al. Estimating and testing high-dimensional mediation effects in epigenetic studies. *Bioinformatics*, 32(20):3150–3154, 2016.
- Yen-Tsung Huang and Wen-Chi Pan. Hypothesis test of mediation effect in causal mediation model with high-dimensional continuous mediators. *Biometrics*, 72(2):402–413, 2016.
- Yen-Tsung Huang. Variance component tests of multivariate mediation effects under composite null hypotheses. *Biometrics*, 75(4):1191–1204, 2019.
- Jie Zhang, Zhi Wei, and Jun Chen. A distance-based approach for testing the mediation effect of the human microbiome. *Bioinformatics*, 34(11):1875–1883, 2018.
- Bashir Hamidi, Kristin Wallace, and Alexander V Alekseyenko. MODIMA, a method for multivariate omnibus distance mediation analysis, allows for integration of multivariate exposure–mediator–response relationships. *Genes*, 10(7):524, 2019.
- Michael B Sohn, Hongzhe Li, et al. Compositional mediation analysis for microbiome studies. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13(1):661–681, 2019.
- Chan Wang, Jiyan Hu, Martin J Blaser, and Huilin Li. Estimating and testing the microbial causal mediation effect with high-dimensional and compositional microbiome data. *Bioinformatics*, 36(2):347–355, 2020.
- Haixiang Zhang, Jun Chen, Yang Feng, Chan Wang, Huilin Li, and Lei Liu. Mediation effect selection in high-dimensional and compositional microbiome data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 40(4):885–896, 2021.
- Alex D Washburne, James T Morton, Jon Sanders, Daniel McDonald, Qiyun Zhu, Angela M Oliverio, and Rob Knight. Methods for phylogenetic analysis of microbiome data. *Nature Microbiology*, 3(6):652–661, 2018.
- Catherine Lozupone and Rob Knight. Unifrac: a new phylogenetic method for comparing microbial communities. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 71(12):8228–8235, 2005.

- Zheng-Zheng Tang, Guanhua Chen, Alexander V Alekseyenko, and Hongzhe Li. A general framework for association analysis of microbial communities on a taxonomic tree. *Bioinformatics*, 33(9):1278–1285, 2017.
- Tao Wang and Hongyu Zhao. A Dirichlet-tree multinomial regression model for associating dietary nutrients with gut microorganisms. *Biometrics*, 73(3):792–801, 2017.
- Michael E Sobel. Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. *Sociological Methodology*, 13:290–312, 1982.
- David P MacKinnon, Chondra M Lockwood, Jeanne M Hoffman, Stephen G West, and Virgil Sheets. A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1):83, 2002.
- Richard Barfield, Jincheng Shen, Allan C Just, Pantel S Vokonas, Joel Schwartz, Andrea A Baccarelli, Tyler J VanderWeele, and Xihong Lin. Testing for the indirect effect under the null for genome-wide mediation analyses. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 41(8):824–833, 2017.
- James M Robins and Sander Greenland. Identifiability and exchangeability for direct and indirect effects. *Epidemiology*, 3(2):143–155, 1992.
- Tyler J VanderWeele and Stijn Vansteelandt. Conceptual issues concerning mediation, interventions and composition. *Statistics and its Interface*, 2(4):457–468, 2009.
- Kosuke Imai, Luke Keele, and Teppei Yamamoto. Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science*, 25(1):51–71, 2010.
- Yen-Tsung Huang et al. Genome-wide analyses of sparse mediation effects under composite null hypotheses. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13(1):60–84, 2019.
- James Y Dai, Janet L Stanford, and Michael LeBlanc. A multiple-testing procedure for high-dimensional mediation hypotheses. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2020. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2020.1765785.
- Zhonghua Liu, Jincheng Shen, Richard Barfield, Joel Schwartz, Andrea A Baccarelli, and Xihong Lin. Large-scale hypothesis testing for causal mediation effects with applications in genome-wide epigenetic studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2021. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1914634.
- Jiashun Jin and T Tony Cai. Estimating the null and the proportion of nonnull effects in large-scale multiple comparisons. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(478):495–506, 2007.
- Mette Langaas, Bo Henry Lindqvist, and Egil Ferkingstad. Estimating the proportion of true null hypotheses, with application to DNA microarray data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(4):555–572, 2005.
- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300, 1995.
- R John Simes. An improved Bonferroni procedure for multiple tests of significance. *Biometrika*, 73(3):751–754, 1986.
- Wei Lin, Pixu Shi, Rui Feng, Hongzhe Li, et al. Variable selection in regression with compositional covariates. *Biometrika*, 101(4):785–797, 2014.
- Ilseung Cho, Shingo Yamanishi, Laura Cox, Barbara A Methé, Jiri Zavadil, Kelvin Li, Zhan Gao, Douglas Mahana, Kartik Raju, Isabel Teitler, et al. Antibiotics in early life alter the murine colonic microbiome and adiposity. *Nature*, 488(7413):621–626, 2012.
- J Gregory Caporaso, Justin Kuczynski, Jesse Stombaugh, Kyle Bittinger, Frederic D Bushman, Elizabeth K Costello, Noah Fierer, Antonio Gonzalez Pena, Julia K Goodrich, Jeffrey I Gordon, et al. QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nature Methods*, 7(5):335–336, 2010.
- John Aitchison. *The statistical analysis of compositional data*. CRC Press, London, 1986.
- Patricio S La Rosa, J Paul Brooks, Elena Deych, Edward L Boone, David J Edwards, Qin Wang, Erica Sodergren, George Weinstock, and William D Shannon. Hypothesis testing and power calculations for taxonomic-based human microbiome data. *PloS ONE*, 7(12):e52078, 2012.
- John D Storey. A direct approach to false discovery rates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 64(3):479–498, 2002.
- Daniel J Wilson. The harmonic mean p-value for combining dependent tests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(4):1195–1200, 2019.
- Yoav Benjamini and Daniel Yekutieli. Hierarchical FDR testing of trees of hypotheses. Technical report, Technical report, Department of Statistics and Operations Research, Tel Aviv . . . , 2003.

- Ang Li and Rina Foygel Barber. Multiple testing with the structure-adaptive Benjamini–Hochberg algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 81(1):45–74, 2019.
- Lihua Lei, Aaditya Ramdas, and William Fithian. A general interactive framework for false discovery rate control under structural constraints. *Biometrika*, 108(2):253–267, 2021.