Discussion

Wei Pan¹

¹Division of Biostatistics, School of Public Health

University of Minnesota

ENAR Meeting on March 19, 2014

Outline

- General: why/how does KMR work? its connections to other methods.
- Specifics: choice of the kernel
- Main refs:
 - Pan (2009, Genetic Epi): SSU, SSU = an EB test of Goeman et al (2006, JRSS-B);
 - Han and Pan (2011, Genetic Epi): SSU = GDBR (Wessel and Schork 2006, AJHG; McArdle and Anderson 2001, Ecology);
 - Pan (2011, Genetic Epi): KMR = SSU = GDBR

KMR, SSU, Goeman's EB test, GDBR, ...

- My experiences mainly with SNP/seq data:
 - 1) SNP data: Goeman's test (Chapman and Whittaker 2008); SSU=Goeman's test (Pan 2009);
 - 2) SNP data: GDBR (Lin and Schaid 2009);
 - 3) Seq data (RVs): SSU=KMR (Basu and Pan 2011); SKAT (Wu et al 2011, 2012, ...)

Recently, neuroimaging data.

• KMR: a semi-parametric model

$$Logit Pr(Y_i = 1) = \beta_0 + h(X_i), \tag{1}$$

h() is unspecified, but determined by a kernel K.

- $h = (h_1(X_1), ..., h_n(X_n))' \sim F(0, \tau^2 K),$ $K = K(\rho) = (K_{ij}) \text{ with } K_{ij} = K(X_i, X_j).$
- H_0' : h=0 becomes H_0 : $\tau=0$.

• Score test statistic for H_0 is (proportional to)

$$Q = (Y - \bar{Y}1)'K(Y - \bar{Y}1).$$

- Since K is symmetric and p.s.d, K = ZZ'. A linear kernel K = XX', Z = X.
- Fit a parametric logistic reg model:

Logit
$$Pr(Y=1) = \beta_0 + Z\beta,$$
 (2)

- Score vector $U = Z'(Y \bar{Y}1)$
- SSU test: $T_{SSU} = U'U = Q \Longrightarrow SSU = KMR$ if K = ZZ'. $T_{Sco} = U'Cov(U)^{-1}U$.
- GDBR: nonparametric MANOVA

$$F = \frac{tr(HGH)}{tr[(I-H)G(I-H)]},$$

$$G = (I - 11'/n)A(I - 11'/n), A = (-D_{ij}^2/2), D = (D_{ij})$$
 with

$$D_{ij} = d(X_i, X_j).$$

$$H = y(y'y)^{-1}y'.$$

- If G = ZZ', then $F = T_{SSU}$. More, if K = ZZ', then $F = T_{SSU} = Q$, GDBR=SSU=KMR!
- SSU = Goeman's test (Pan 2009).

 Ballard et al (2009): Goeman's test = a variance component-based score test (Tzeng and Zhang 2007).
- Why these relevant?
- 1) Choice of the kernel: not easy,

 K has to be p.s.d., why? if not, then ...

 SSU=KMR: use transformed Z, not X, in logistic reg;

 BUT
- 2) Can use multiple kernels, even transformed Z, then combine, or use other tests (e.g. Score test) (Han and Pan 2011);

- 3) Can generalize KMR, through SSU, to more complex data (Wang et al 2013);
- 4) Some optimality property:
 Goeman's test: highest **average** local power (Goeman et al 2006).
 - No (local) uniformly most powerful test for multiple parameters (Cox and Hinkley 1974).
- Extensions to multivariate phenotypes: Hua and Ghosh (2014).

Specific choice of the kernel

• Metabolomic data:

Two types: missing (0) or not; if not then abundance. Missing: truncation and more?

• A distance kernel:

$$K_d(X_i, X_j) = \exp\left\{\frac{-d^2(X_i, X_j)}{\rho}\right\}.$$

$$d(X_i, X_j) = \sqrt{\sum_{k} I(\delta_{X_{ik}} = \delta_{X_{jk}}) + \sum_{k} (X_{ik} - X_{jk})^2}.$$

- +: use the two types of data; challenge: trade-off b/w the two components;
- A stratified kernel: 1) if the same missing pattern $(\delta_{X_i} = \delta_{X_i})$, then

$$K_s(X_i, X_j) = K_d(X_i, X_j);$$

2) o/w,
$$K_s(X_i, X_j) = 0$$
;

- +: more general, but maybe too extreme.
- Other features: testing a group of metabolites; An interesting grouping method: connected subgraphs based on marginal $Corr(X_i, X_j)$'s.

Acknowledgement: This research was supported by NIH.

You can download our papers from http://www.biostat.umn.edu/rrs.php

Thank you!