

1 **Title**

2 Kernel Approximate Bayesian Computation in Population Genetic Inferences

3

4 **Authors**

5 Shigeki Nakagome<sup>1</sup>, Kenji Fukumizu<sup>1</sup>, Shuhei Mano<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

6

7 **Affiliations**

8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematical Analysis and Statistical Inference, The Institute of Statistical  
9 Mathematics, 10-3 Midori-cho, Tachikawa, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan

10 <sup>2</sup>Japan Science and Technology Agency, 4-1-8, Honcho, Kawaguchi-shi, Saitama 332-0012,  
11 Japan

12

13 **\*Corresponding Author**

14 Shuhei Mano

15 Department of Mathematical Analysis and Statistical Inference, The Institute of Statistical  
16 Mathematics, 10-3 Midori-cho, Tachikawa, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan

17 Tel/Fax: +81-550-5533-8432/+81-42-526-4339

18 E-mail address: [smano@ism.ac.jp](mailto:smano@ism.ac.jp)

19

20 **Running Head**

21 Kernel Approximate Bayesian Computation

22

23

1 **Abstract**

2 Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC), which is a likelihood-free approach for  
3 Bayesian inferences, is a rejection-based method that applies a tolerance of dissimilarity  
4 between summary statistics from observed and simulated data. Although several  
5 improvements of the algorithm have been proposed, no algorithms are free from  
6 approximation introduced by two aspects: 1) the dimensional reduction: sampling is not  
7 from the true posterior density given data but from an approximate posterior density given  
8 summary statistics; 2) the non-zero tolerance: sampling from the posterior density given  
9 summary statistics is achieved only in the limit of the zero tolerance. For the first aspect,  
10 we can improve the approximation by adding summary statistic, but the increase of the  
11 number of summary statistics could introduce additional variance caused by the low  
12 acceptance rate. Consequently, many authors have been concentrated on techniques how to  
13 choose informative summary statistics. The aim of this study is to investigate whether a  
14 new kernel-based ABC method proposed by Fukumizu et al. (2010, arXiv:1009.5736 and  
15 2011, NIPS 24: 1549-1557) is useful for actual complex problems which demand large  
16 number of summary statistics, by applying the method to population genetic inferences. We  
17 report that, in contrast to conventional ABCs, kernel-ABC can incorporate large number of  
18 summary statistics with keeping consistency of the posterior estimates without  
19 compromising the performance of the inference.

20

21 **Keywords**

22 Bayesian computation, likelihood free inference, Kernel methods, Population genetics

23

## 1 **1. Introduction**

2 Approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) (Fu and Li 1997; Tavaré et al. 1997; Weiss  
3 and von Haeseler 1998; Pritchard et al. 1999; Beaumont et al. 2002) is a popular method to  
4 obtain an approximation of the posterior estimates without evaluating the likelihood. Assume  
5 data  $\mathcal{D}$  are generated by a model that has parameters of interest,  $\theta$ , which are generated by  
6 the prior density,  $\pi(\theta)$ . By Bayes' rule, the posterior density of  $\theta$  given the observed data  
7  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\pi(\theta|\mathcal{D}) \propto f(\mathcal{D}|\theta)\pi(\theta)$ , where  $f(\mathcal{D}|\theta)$  is the likelihood of the model.

8 Rejection-sampling is a basic algorithm for sampling parameters from the posterior density.  
9 The algorithm takes the following form:

### 10 **Algorithm A.**

11 A1. Generate  $\theta'$  from  $\pi(\cdot)$ .

12 A2. Accept  $\theta'$  with probability proportional to  $f(\mathcal{D}|\theta')$ , and go to A1.

13 Even when the likelihood is unknown, it is possible to sample parameters from the  
14 posterior density, as long as a data can be simulated under the model. In this case, A2 is  
15 replaced with the following:

16 A2'. Simulate data  $\mathcal{D}'$  by the model using  $\theta'$ .

17 A3'. Accept  $\theta'$  if  $\mathcal{D}=\mathcal{D}'$ , and go to A1.

18 While this algorithm gives samples from the true posterior density, the acceptance rate  
19 decreases sharply with increasing the dimensionality of the data. Therefore, we introduce  
20 summary statistics of  $\mathcal{D}$ , which is denoted by  $\mathbf{s}$ , and step A3' is replaced with A3'', as  
21 follows: accept  $\theta'$  if  $d(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}') < \delta$ , where  $d$  is a metric that measures the dissimilarity,  $\mathbf{s}'$   
22 is the summary statistics of  $\mathcal{D}'$ , and  $\delta$  is the tolerance (Fu and Li 1997). The algorithm  
23 involving rejection-sampling with A2' and A3'' corresponds to the basic ABC and is

1 specified hereafter as rejection-ABC.

2 Although several improvements of the algorithm have been proposed so far, no  
3 algorithms are free from approximation introduced by two aspects: 1) the dimensional  
4 reduction: sampling is not from the true posterior density given data  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})$  but from an  
5 approximate posterior density given summary statistics  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s})$ ; 2) the non-zero tolerance:  
6 sampling from the posterior density  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s})$  is achieved only in the limit  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , but the  
7 acceptance rate decreases with decreasing  $\delta$ .

8 If the set of summary statistics is sufficient we can sample from the true posterior  
9 density given data  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})$ , but we almost never have the set of sufficient statistics.  
10 Nevertheless, a simple observation gives a general rule for constructing a set of summary  
11 statistics that is superior to the existing set of summary statistics:

12 **Proposition.** *Suppose a set of summary statistics,  $\mathbf{T}$ , determines a refinement of a partition*  
13 *of a data that itself is determined by a set of summary statistics,  $\mathbf{S}$ . Then,  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{T})$  is*  
14 *always a better approximation of  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})$  than  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{S})$  in terms of the Kullback-Leibler*  
15 *divergence.*

16 **Proof:** Since  $\{\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{t}\} \subset \{\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{s}\}$ , it follows that  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{t}) \geq \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s})$ , and  
17  $D_{KL}(\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s})) - D_{KL}(\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{t})) = \int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) \log \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{t})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s})} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \geq 0 \quad \square$ .

18 In population genetics, for example, the site frequency spectrum (SFS) gives a refinement of  
19 a partition of data that is determined by conventional summary statistics, including the  
20 number of segregating sites; nucleotide diversity (Nei and Li 1979); Tajima's D (Tajima  
21 1989). Therefore we can expect that SFS gives better approximation of the true posterior  
22 density given data than the conventional summary statistics.

23 The proposition implies that we can improve the approximation of the true posterior

1 density given data by adding a summary statistic which introduces further refinement of the  
2 partition of a data. Unfortunately, the increase of the number of summary statistics does not  
3 always lead improvement of the approximation, since there is a trade-off between  
4 information added by a new statistic and additional variance caused by the low acceptance  
5 rate. Consequently, many authors have been concentrated on techniques how to choose  
6 informative summary statistics (Joyce and Marjoram 2008; Wegmann et al. 2009; Blum and  
7 Francois 2010; Nunes and Balding 2010; Fearnhead and Prangle 2012). Moreover, these  
8 studies have also revealed difficulties of the dimensional reduction. In an exhaust search  
9 huge number of combinations should be assessed, while in a greedy search the final set  
10 depends on the order in which statistics are tested for inclusion. Assuming a model between  
11 the parameters and the summary statistics, such as the partial linear regression is useful  
12 (Wegmann et al. 2009), but an assessment of the model fitting are computationally expensive.  
13 Moreover, Nunes and Balding (2010) reported that the optimal set of summary statistics was  
14 highly dataset specific, suggesting that there may be no generally optimal choice. Therefore,  
15 algorithms which are free from dimensional reduction would be useful.

16 Few studies addressed the approximation introduced by the non-zero tolerance. The  
17 choice of the positive tolerance involves bias-variance trade off: increase of the tolerance  
18 reduces variance by allowing a large number of accepted samples while concomitantly  
19 increasing bias arising from the prior values. Consistency of the estimator only attained in  
20 the limit of zero tolerance with the expense of intractable variance owing to the poor  
21 acceptance rate. Fearnhead and Prangle (2012) introduced noisy-ABC, which makes the  
22 estimator calibrated,  $P(\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} | P_{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} | \mathbf{s}) = p, \mathcal{D}) = p$  for  $\forall \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ , where  $P_{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} | \mathbf{s})$  is the  
23 probability assigned by the posterior density obtained by ABC with tolerance  $\delta$ . Noisy-ABC

1 is free from bias with expense of introducing additional variance.

2 Kernel-based methods provide systematic data analysis by mapping variables into a  
3 reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) to extract nonlinearity or higher-order moments  
4 of data (Hofmann et al. 2008). An advantage of kernel methods is their computational  
5 efficiency when processing high-dimensional data. Whereas kernel methods employ  
6 high-dimensional nonlinear mappings from the data space to RKHS, the inner products  
7 among data points are computed only with positive definite kernels instead of using the  
8 explicit form of the high-dimensional mapping. Thus, the computing cost does not increase  
9 with the dimensionality of the data (*i.e.*, number of summary statistics in ABC) but with the  
10 number of observations (*i.e.*, number of simulations in ABC). The mean of mappings into  
11 RKHS (*i.e.*, the kernel mean) recently was proposed to represent a probability distribution  
12 that could be applied to various data analyses (Smola et al. 2007). Fukumizu et al. (2010,  
13 2011) applied this research to develop kernel-based methods of implementing Bayes rule  
14 that enables one to compute the kernel mean representation of the posterior in the form of a  
15 weighted sum of the sampled values. In addition, Fukumizu et al. (2010, 2011) proposed a  
16 new ABC approach and demonstrated the performance by applying a toy problem.

17 The aim of the present study is to investigate whether the new ABC method is useful  
18 for actual complex problems which demand large number of summary statistics. Toward  
19 this end, we demonstrate an application of the kernel method to population genetic  
20 inferences. We refer to this new ABC approach as kernel-ABC. We report that, in contrast  
21 to conventional ABCs, kernel-ABC is able to incorporate large number of summary  
22 statistics with keeping consistency of the posterior estimates without compromising the  
23 performance of the inference.

1

## 2 **2. Method**

3 Consider a map  $\Phi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_S$  defined by  $\Phi(\mathbf{s}) = k(\cdot, \mathbf{s})$ , where  $\Omega$  is a space of  
4 summary statistics, and  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is the RKHS associated with a positive definite kernel,  $k$ . The  
5 most useful property of RKHS is the reproducing property: the function value is given by  
6 the inner product as  $\langle f(\cdot), k(\cdot, \mathbf{s}_i) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} = f(\mathbf{s}_i)$  for  $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}_S$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S}$  is the inner  
7 product in  $\mathcal{H}_S$ . In kernel methods, data  $\mathbf{s}$  are mapped into the RKHS as  $\Phi(\mathbf{s}) = k(\cdot, \mathbf{s})$ ,  
8 and  $\Phi(\mathbf{s})$  is regarded as a feature vector of  $s$ . The inner product between mappings  $\mathbf{s}$  and  
9  $\mathbf{s}_i$  is thus given by  $\langle \Phi(\mathbf{s}), \Phi(\mathbf{s}_i) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} = k(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_i)$ , which is called kernel trick, a basis of  
10 efficient computation of kernel methods. In kernel methods, a probability distribution of  $s$   
11 is expressed by the mean  $E[k(\cdot, x)]$  of the random feature vector  $k(\cdot, s)$  in RKHS, which is  
12 known to be sufficient to determine the distribution uniquely with an appropriate choice of  
13 kernel.

14 The distribution of  $\mathbf{s}$  is expressed by the mean of the random feature vector  $k(\cdot, \mathbf{s})$  in  
15 RKHS, which is called the kernel mean. The empirical estimator of the kernel posterior  
16 mean of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  given an observation  $\mathbf{s}$  by  $n$  simulations,  $\{(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \mathbf{s}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , is given by  
17  $\hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i k(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$  (Song et al. 2009; Fukumizu et al. 2010), where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$  is a set of  
18 parameters generated by the  $i$ -th simulation. The weight,  $w_i$ , is given by  $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (G_S +$   
19  $n\varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1}_{ij} k(\mathbf{s}_j, \mathbf{s})$ , where  $G_S$  is the Gram matrix consisting of  $(k(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{s}_j))_{i,j=1}^n$ ,  $\varepsilon_n$  is the  
20 coefficient of the Tikhonov-type regularization that biases the data to stabilize the matrix  
21 inversion, and  $I_n$  is the identity matrix. The estimator can be obtained by a systematic  
22 construction (Fukumizu et al. 2010, 2011), but it follows immediately from the kernel ridge  
23 regression of the parameter onto the summary statistics. Consider the estimate of the slope

1  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{H}_S$  by minimizing  $\sum_{i=1}^n \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \langle \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{s}_i) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S}\|^2 + n\varepsilon_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2$ . According to the representer  
2 theorem, the estimator of the posterior mean,  $E[\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}]$ , is given by  $\langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{s}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ .  
3 In the same manner, the posterior expectation of a function  $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ ,  $E[f(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\mathbf{s}]$  is estimated  
4 by  $\langle f(\cdot), \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ .

5 **Theorem (Song et al. 2009).** *The estimator  $\hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}}$  is consistent, i.e.*

6  $\langle f(\cdot), \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} - E[f(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\mathbf{s}] = O_p((n\varepsilon_n)^{-1/2} + \varepsilon_n^{1/2})$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

7 **Proof.** A proof is given in Appendix since Song et al. (2009) does not give the proof.  $\square$

8 **Remark.** The first term corresponds to variance, while the second term corresponds to bias  
9 introduced by the regularization.

10 The kernel ridge regression adapted here is reasonable, since we cannot avoid multi  
11 co-linearity among large number of summary statistics. An implementation of ABC, which  
12 is specified as regression-ABC hereafter (Beaumont et al. 2002), uses the locally weighted  
13 regression with a smoothing kernel, which is known to be weak for data of high dimension  
14 (more than several dimension) (Loader 1999). The kernel ridge regression, in contrast, is  
15 known to achieve the error bound that does not explicitly depend on the dimensionality  
16 (Caponnetto and De Vito 2007), if the target function is in a certain class of smooth  
17 functions, and thus expected to be preferable for large number of summary statistics.

18 The kernel-ABC algorithm to compute the posterior expectation of a function  $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$   
19 takes the following form:

20 **Algorithm B (Fukumizu et al. 2010).**

21 B1. Generate  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$  from  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ .

22 B2. Simulate data  $\mathcal{D}_i$  by the model using  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ .

23 B3. Compute the summary statistics  $\mathbf{s}_i$  for  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , and return to B1.



1 B4. Compute the estimator  $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$  with  $\{(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \mathbf{s}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ .  
2 For an estimator of the posterior density, step B4 is replaced with B4', as follows: Compute  
3 the estimator  $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}$  with  $\{(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \mathbf{s}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , although we do not have a rigorous proof of  
4 the consistency. Algorithm B looks similar to the importance sampling, but the weight  $w_i$   
5 are not positive-definite. Therefore the estimator could give a nonsense result when the  
6 number of simulations is too small. There is a sharp contrast between consistency of the  
7 estimators by conventional ABCs and kernel-ABC: conventional ABCs have consistency  
8 only in the limit  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , while kernel-ABC has consistency irrespective of the kernel  
9 choice for decreasing regularization coefficient  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ .

10 We implemented two conventional ABCs: rejection-ABC and regression-ABC  
11 (Beaumont et al. 2002). For the implementation of kernel ABC we used the Gaussian radial  
12 base function (RBF) kernel  $k(x, y) = \exp(-\|x - y\|^2 / (2\sigma^2))$ . The band width,  $\sigma$ , and  
13 the regularization parameter  $\varepsilon_n = a/\sqrt{n}$  were chosen by the 10-fold cross validation with  
14 minimizing  $\sum_{i=1}^{10} \left\| \frac{1}{|T_i|} \sum_{j \in T_i} \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}_j}^{[-i]} - \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{[i]} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^2$ , where  $T_i$  represents a set of indexes in the  
15  $i$ -th subsample,  $[i]$  represents the estimator based on the  $i$ -th subsample, and  $[-i]$   
16 represents the estimator based on the all subsamples except for the  $i$ -th subsample  
17 (Fukumizu et al. 2010, 2011).

18 In this study we assessed performance of inferences through an estimator of the mean  
19 squared error (MSE) of the posterior mean, which is obtained by  $l$ -times replications of  
20 construction of the estimator of the posterior mean according to the algorithm B:

21  $\frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left\| \hat{m}_{i|\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}} - m_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}} \right\|^2$ , where  $\hat{m}_{i|\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}}$  is the  $i$ -th estimate of the posterior mean and  $m_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}}$   
22 is the true value of the posterior mean. According to the weak law of the large number, the

1 estimator tends to MSE in probability as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . Throughout this study we set  $l = 100$ . For  
2 a case in which the likelihood is not available, the true value of the posterior mean was  
3 replaced by averaging 100 replications of the estimates obtained by kernel-ABC with  
4  $n = 16,000$  samples (See Section 3.3).

5 Several authors have assessed performance of inferences in terms of sum of squared  
6 error between the posterior estimates and the prior values (Beaumont et al. 2002; Wegmann  
7 et al. 2009; Nunes and Balding 2010). In contrast, in this study we considered MSE since  
8 MSE is a simple interpretation as sum of variance and squared bias of an estimator and our  
9 primary interest in this study was to investigate how well the consistency is kept with  
10 reducing variance by increasing the number of simulations.

11

## 12 **3. Results**

### 13 *3.1 Consistency*

14 We consider the constant size population model to evaluate consistency of the  
15 posterior mean. An advantage of the constant size model is its straightforward computation  
16 of likelihoods and the computation is implemented into the GENETREE software package  
17 (Griffiths and Tavaré 1994; Griffiths 2007). Therefore, we can sample from a true posterior  
18 density given data,  $\pi(\theta|\mathcal{D})$ , or given number of segregating sites ( $S_{Seg}$ ),  $\pi(\theta|S_{Seg})$ , with  
19 using a simple rejection-sampling.

20 We assumed a sample of 100 chromosomes taken from a population of constant size  
21 ( $N = 10,000$ ) and a large (100 kb) non-recombining region that was evolving under the  
22 infinite sites mutation model (Kimura 1969; Watterson 1975). We regard the population  
23 scaled mutation rate  $\theta = 4Mu$  as the parameter in which  $M$  is the population size and  $u$

1 is the fixed mutation rate per 100 kb per generation ( $2.5 \times 10^{-4}$ ). Therefore, the true  
2 value of the parameter for the sample was  $4Nu = 10$ . We assumed the log-normal  
3 distribution for the prior density of  $M$ , whose mean and variance are  $N$  and  $N^2$ ,  
4 respectively. All simulations were conducted using the program package *ms* that generates  
5 samples from the coalescent model (Hudson 2002).

6 The data  $\mathcal{D}$  are represented as numbers of sequences of several types, which are  
7 determined by the sequence of mutations experienced along the path to the most recent  
8 common ancestor of the sample. Data  $\mathcal{D}$  are summarized by the number of segregating  
9 sites ( $S_{Seg}$ ) or SFS. Because estimates of SFS are unstable for samples consisting of 100  
10 chromosomes, we used a coarse-grained spectrum consisting of 7 bins based on the Sturges'  
11 formula ( $1 + \log_2 S_{Seg}$ ), which is denoted as  $\mathbf{S}_{SFS}$ . The frequencies were binned as follows:  
12 0 – 8%, 8 – 16%, 16 – 24%, 24 – 32%, 32 – 40%, 40 – 48%, and 48 – 100%. We  
13 generated 10,000 simulated datasets and calculated the average of  $\mathbf{S}_{SFS}$ . Then we chose a  
14 typical dataset as an observation, which has the smallest sum of squared deviations from  
15 the average:  $s_{Seg} = 49$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{SFS} = (28,6,4,3,2,1,5)$ .

16 We computed the posterior mean given the number of segregating sites by the  
17 rejection-sampling simulations until 1 million samples were accepted. The estimate of the  
18 posterior mean, which was assumed to be the true value, was  $m_{\theta|S_{Seg}} = 9.695$ . We then  
19 estimated MSE of the posterior mean estimator obtained by kernel-ABC under different  
20 number of simulations:  $n=1,000$ , 2,000, 4,000, 8,000, and 16,000. The convergence of  
21  $\hat{m}_{\theta|S_{Seg}}$  to the true value with increasing number of simulations can be seen in Fig. 1. The  
22 consistency can be well confirmed by the fact that the MSE approaches zero and the  
23 variance reduces with increase of the number of simulations.

1

### 2 *3.2 Improvement of approximation by high-dimensional summary statistics*

3 We computed the posterior mean given data  $\mathcal{D}$  using the rejection-sampling. The  
4 likelihood surface of  $\theta$  was approximated by averaging the likelihoods at each point from  
5 0.1 to 35.1 (bin width 1.0; total 35 points) over 0.1 billion simulations of GENETREE.  
6 We repeated the rejection-sampling simulations using the likelihood surface until 1 million  
7 samples were accepted. The posterior mean of  $\theta$  given  $\mathcal{D}$ , which was assumed to be the  
8 true value, was  $m_{\theta|\mathcal{D}} = 10.498$ .

9 Since SFS determines a refinement of a partition given by the number of segregating  
10 sites, we can expect that SFS improves approximation of the true posterior mean given data  
11 compared with the number of segregating site. The posterior mean given SFS,  $\hat{m}_{\theta|S_{SFS}}$  was  
12 estimated using kernel-ABC by averaging 100 replications with  $n = 16,000$  samples. It  
13 was 10.510 with the standard deviation was 0.044. We concluded that  $S_{SFS}$  seems to  
14 give improvement of  $S_{Seg}$ , as expected, because of the significant deviation of  $m_{\theta|S_{Seg}} =$   
15 9.695 from  $m_{\theta|\mathcal{D}} = 10.498$ , in contrast to  $\hat{m}_{\theta|S_{SFS}} = 10.510$ .

16

### 17 *3.3 Comparison with Conventional ABCs*

18 The performances of kernel-ABC and conventional ABCs were evaluated by the costs  
19 of computing times against fixed MSE values. Throughout this study we implemented all  
20 computations in the C/C++ languages. Computations were conducted using an Intel Xeon  
21 X5680 3.33 GHz processor. To this end, we had to find the true posterior means of the  
22 parameters. The value of  $m_{\theta|S_{Seg}} = 9.695$  had been generated by rejection-sampling (See  
23 Section 3.1), while by kernel-ABC we estimated  $\hat{m}_{\theta|S_{Seg}} = 9.686$  by averaging 100

1 replications with  $n = 16,000$  samples. The closeness suggests that the averaging 100  
2 replications of the estimates by kernel-ABC with  $n = 16,000$  samples is likely to give  
3 reliable estimates of the true value. In contrast, the rejection-ABC cannot achieve  $\delta = 0$   
4 with  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SFS}}$ ; we found that no samples were accepted under  $\delta = 0$  during a 2-week  
5 simulation. Therefore, we assumed the true value of the posterior mean given  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SFS}}$  was an  
6 average of 100 replication of the estimates obtained by kernel-ABC with  $n=16,000$   
7 samples.

8 Estimates of the MSEs of  $\hat{m}_{\theta|\mathcal{S}_{\text{Seg}}}$  and  $\hat{m}_{\theta|\mathcal{S}_{\text{SFS}}}$  were calculated at different sizes of  
9 simulations in kernel-ABC ( $n = 1,000, 2,000, 4,000,$  and  $8,000$ ) and at different  
10 acceptance rates in two conventional ABC algorithms: rejection-ABC and regression-ABC.  
11 For rejection-ABC, the tolerances were chosen so that 1,000 samples are accepted for each  
12 run of the simulation. Acceptance rate in regression-ABC was defined as the proportion at  
13 which the Epanechnikov kernel gives non-zero value. We set a band width of the kernel and  
14 simulated samples until 1,000 samples are accepted. The results, displayed as computing  
15 time versus estimates of MSEs, are depicted with the standard deviations of the estimates  
16 (Fig. 2 and 3). When  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Seg}}$  was used, the computational cost against a fixed value of MSE  
17 was lower in conventional ABCs than in the kernel-ABC (Fig. 2). However, in contrast to  
18 the case with  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Seg}}$ , we observed that kernel-ABC with  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SFS}}$  significantly outperformed  
19 conventional ABCs in terms of computing time at a fixed value of MSEs (Fig. 3). Our  
20 results suggest that kernel-ABC gives better performance than conventional ABCs when  
21 higher-dimensional summary statistics are used. We also found that regression-ABC  
22 outperforms rejection-ABC when  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SFS}}$  is used. However, as was reported previously  
23 (Beaumont et al. 2002), regression-ABC did not exhibit monotonic decrease of MSE with

1 decreasing tolerance. Beaumont et al. (2002) found that regression-ABC eventually  
2 under-perform rejection-ABC with decreasing tolerance. This tendency cannot be referred  
3 to increase of variance since we fixed the number of accepted samples. Rather, it comes  
4 from the curse of dimensionality, where many simulated summary statistics are closer to  
5 the boundary of the bands when large number of summary statistics are used (Hastie et al.  
6 2009).

### 7 8 3.4 A Realistic Model

9 As a more realistic model in population genetic inference, we assumed a population  
10 size bottleneck and subsequent expansion. We considered a sample of 100 chromosomes  
11 taken from a population and a large recombining region (100 kb) where recombination  
12 was set at a fixed scaled rate of  $\rho = 4N_3u$ . The assumed population demography was as  
13 follows: the ancestral size was  $N_1 = 10,000$ , and at time  $T_2 = 4,000$  generations ago, the  
14 size instantaneously shrank to  $N_2 = 2,000$ . The size remained constant at size  $N_2$  until  
15  $T_1 = 2,000$  generations ago, when it began expanding exponentially to reach size  
16  $N_3 = 20,000$  at present time. We regard  $\theta = (M_1, M_2, M_3, U_1, U_2)$  as the parameters; the  
17 true values are  $(N_1, N_2, N_3, T_1, T_2)$ . We assume a log-normal distribution for the prior  
18 density for the parameters. The means and variances of the parameters are the true values  
19 and the squared true values, respectively. We assumed  $\mathbf{s}_{\text{SFS}} = (16, 1, 1, 1, 1, 4)$  for the  
20 observed data using the same procedure as the constant size model. Since the SFS cannot  
21 account for recombination, we added a haplotype frequency spectrum (HFS) for summary  
22 statistics that consisted of haplotype frequencies in the sample. The SFS+HFS refines a  
23 partition of data given by SFS alone. The number of bins in SFS and their intervals were

1 identical to those in the constant size model. HFS was segregated into 7 bins as follows:  
2 0 – 2%, 2 – 4%, 4 – 6%, 6 – 8%, 8 – 10%, 10 – 12%, 12 – 100%. For the SFS+HFS,  
3 we assumed  $\mathbf{s}_{\text{SFS+HFS}} = (18,0,0,0,1,0,1,13,2,1,0,0,0,2)$ .

4 We compared the performances of kernel-ABC and rejection-ABC. We did not include  
5 the results for regression-ABC, since MSE inflated with decreasing tolerance as long as  
6 1,000 samples were accepted for each run of the simulation. Although increase of the  
7 number of accepted samples recovers the performance of regression-ABC, it demands huge  
8 cost of the computational time. In Fig. 4 and 5, computational times versus estimates are  
9 depicted with the standard deviation in which  $\mathbf{s}_{\text{SFS}}$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{\text{SFS+HFS}}$  are given. To scale the  
10 summary statistics, we calculated MSEs with standardized by the assumed true values,  
11 namely, the  $i$ -th estimate of the posterior mean,  $\hat{m}_{i|\theta|s}$  is standardized as  $(\hat{m}_{i|\theta|s} -$   
12  $m_{\theta|s})/m_{\theta|s}$  where  $m_{\theta|s}$  is the true value of the posterior mean. The figures show that the  
13 computing time for kernel-ABC was substantially lower at any fixed MSEs, compared with  
14 those using rejection-ABC.

15

#### 16 **4. Discussion**

17 The performance of inference is discussed how well we approximate the posterior  
18 estimate given data. It will be reasonable to use large number of summary statistics from  
19 the perspective of increasing complexity of models, such as in population genetic analysis  
20 with vast genomic data. Two basic techniques of conventional ABCs to keep the  
21 computation tractable have been: 1) the dimensional reduction due to using summary  
22 statistics and 2) non-zero tolerance to enrich acceptance rate. However, both of these  
23 techniques also indulge performance of the inference by introducing biases. Consequently,

1 one of the main streams of recent progress of ABC algorithm have been concentrated on  
2 techniques how to choose more informative summary statistics (Joyce and Marjoram 2008;  
3 Wegmann et al. 2009; Blum and Francois 2010; Nunes and Balding 2010; Fearnhead and  
4 Prangle 2012).

5 In this study, we pursued another direction without reducing number of summary  
6 statics with an aid of a kernel-based method. We have demonstrated that kernel-ABC  
7 successfully reduces these difficulties associated with conventional ABCs by applying  
8 ABCs to population genetic inferences. We found that kernel-ABC is more efficient than  
9 conventional ABCs regarding computational times against fixed MSE values. We  
10 demonstrated that kernel-ABC can accommodate large number of summary statistics  
11 without compromising performance of the inference. With regard to the tolerance, a  
12 posterior estimate obtained by kernel-ABC keeps consistency. Therefore, MSE of the  
13 estimators can be reduced simply by decreasing variance with increasing the number of  
14 simulations. For the increase of the number of simulations, the low-rank matrix  
15 approximation (Fine and Scheinberg 2002) can substantially reduce the computation time  
16 involved in the Gram matrix inversion.

17 Choosing the band width and the regularization parameters by the cross-validation is a  
18 computationally expensive step. We investigated a simpler alternative method for choosing  
19 these parameters. For the band width, the median of pairwise Euclidean distances in the  
20 simulated summary statistics generally worked well. For the regularization parameter, by  
21 assessing bias-variance trade-off in terms of MSE gives similar values to those obtained by  
22 the cross validation.

23 Another main stream of recent progress of ABC algorithm is use of Markov chain



1 Monte Carlo or sequential Monte Carlo methods (Marjoram et al. 2003; Sisson et al. 2007;  
2 Beaumont et al. 2009; Wegmann et al. 2009). We did not address the issue in the present  
3 study, but kernel-based methods could be also useful to improve such methods.  
4

## 5 **Acknowledgements**

6 The authors thank Mark Beaumont and Kevin Dawson for helpful discussions and  
7 comments. S.N. was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for the Japan Society for the  
8 Promotion of Science (JSPS) Research fellow (24-3234). K.F. was supported in part by  
9 JSPS KAKENHI (B) 22300098.  
10

## 11 **References**

- 12 Baker, C. R. 1973. Joint Measures and Cross-Covariance Operators. *T Am Math Soc*  
13 **186**:273-289.
- 14 Beaumont, M. A., J. M. Cornuet, J. M. Marin, and C. P. Robert. 2009. Adaptive  
15 approximate Bayesian computation. *Biometrika* **96**:983-990.
- 16 Beaumont, M. A., W. Zhang, and D. J. Balding. 2002. Approximate Bayesian computation  
17 in population genetics. *Genetics* **162**:2025-2035.
- 18 Blum, M. G. B., and O. Francois. 2010. Non-linear regression models for Approximate  
19 Bayesian Computation. *Stat Comput* **20**:63-73.
- 20 Caponnetto, A., and E. De Vito. 2007. Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares  
21 algorithm. *Found Comput Math* **7**:331-368.
- 22 Fearnhead, P., and D. Prangle. 2012. Constructing summary statistics for approximate  
23 Bayesian computation: semi-automatic approximate Bayesian computation. *J R Stat*

1           Soc B **74**:419-474.

2   Fine, S., and K. Scheinberg. 2002. Efficient SVM training using low-rank kernel  
3           representations. *J Mach Learn Res* **2**:243-264.

4   Fu, Y. X., and W. H. Li. 1997. Estimating the age of the common ancestor of a sample of  
5           DNA sequences. *Mol Biol Evol* **14**:195-199.

6   Fukumizu, K., L. Song, and A. Gretton. 2010. Kernel Bayes' rule: Bayesian inference with  
7           positive definite kernels. **arXiv:1009.5736**.

8   Fukumizu, K., L. Song, and A. Gretton. 2011. Kernel Bayes' rule. *Advances in Neural*  
9           Information Processing Systems 24 edited by J. Shawe-Taylor and R.S. Zemel and P.  
10          Bartlett and F. Pereira and K.Q. Weinberger:1549-1557.

11   Griffiths, R. C. 2007. GENETREE version 9.0  
12          <http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/~griff/software.html>.

13   Griffiths, R. C., and S. Tavaré. 1994. Sampling Theory for Neutral Alleles in a Varying  
14          Environment. *Philos T Roy Soc B* **344**:403-410.

15   Hastie, T., R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. 2009. *The elements of statistical learning*.  
16          Springer-Verlag, New York.

17   Hofmann, T., B. Scholkopf, and A. J. Smola. 2008. *Kernel methods in machine learning*.  
18          *Ann Stat* **36**:1171-1220.

19   Hudson, R. R. 2002. Generating samples under a Wright-Fisher neutral model of genetic  
20          variation. *Bioinformatics* **18**:337-338.

21   Joyce, P., and P. Marjoram. 2008. Approximately sufficient statistics and Bayesian  
22          computation. *Stat Appl Genet Mol* **7**.

23   Kimura, M. 1969. The number of heterozygous nucleotide sites maintained in a finite

1 population due to steady flux of mutations. *Genetics* **61**:893-903.

2 Loader, C. 1999. *Local Regression and Likelihood*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

3 Marjoram, P., J. Molitor, V. Plagnol, and S. Tavaré. 2003. Markov chain Monte Carlo  
4 without likelihoods. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**:15324-15328.

5 Nei, M., and W. H. Li. 1979. Mathematical-Model for Studying Genetic-Variation in Terms  
6 of Restriction Endonucleases. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **76**:5269-5273.

7 Nunes, M. A., and D. J. Balding. 2010. On Optimal Selection of Summary Statistics for  
8 Approximate Bayesian Computation. *Stat Appl Genet Mol* **9**.

9 Pritchard, J. K., M. T. Seielstad, A. Perez-Lezaun, and M. W. Feldman. 1999. Population  
10 growth of human Y chromosomes: A study of Y chromosome microsatellites. *Mol*  
11 *Biol Evol* **16**:1791-1798.

12 Sisson, S. A., Y. Fan, and M. M. Tanaka. 2007. Sequential Monte Carlo without likelihoods.  
13 *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**:1760-1765.

14 Smola, A., A. Gretton, L. Song, and B. Scholkopf. 2007. Hilbert space embedding for  
15 distributions. *Algorithmic Learning Theory, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*  
16 **4754/2007**:13-31.

17 Song, L., J. Huang, A. Smola, and K. Fukumizu. 2009. Hilbert space embeddings of  
18 conditional distributions with applications to dynamics systems. In *Proceedings of*  
19 *the 26th International Conference on Machine Learning*:961-968.

20 Tajima, F. 1989. Statistical-Method for Testing the Neutral Mutation Hypothesis by DNA  
21 Polymorphism. *Genetics* **123**:585-595.

22 Tavaré, S., D. J. Balding, R. C. Griffiths, and P. Donnelly. 1997. Inferring coalescence time  
23 from DNA sequence data. *Genetics* **145**:505-518.

1 Watterson, G. A. 1975. On the number of segregating sites in genetical models without  
2 recombination. *Theor Popul Biol* **7**:256-276.

3 Wegmann, D., C. Leuenberger, and L. Excoffier. 2009. Efficient Approximate Bayesian  
4 Computation Coupled With Markov Chain Monte Carlo Without Likelihood.  
5 *Genetics* **182**:1207-1218.

6 Weiss, G., and A. von Haeseler. 1998. Inference of population history using a likelihood  
7 approach. *Genetics* **149**:1539-1546.

## 9 **Appendix: Proof of Theorem**

10 This proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 6.1 in Fukumizu et al. (2010). Denote  
11 variance and covariance operators by  $C_{ss}$  and  $C_{\theta s}$ , respectively, and the empirical  
12 estimators of them by  $\hat{C}_{ss}$  and  $\hat{C}_{\theta s}$ , respectively. We have (Fukumizu et al. 2010, 2011)  
13  $\langle f(\cdot), \hat{\mu}_{\theta|s} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_S} - E[f(\theta)|s] = \langle k(\cdot, \theta), \hat{C}_{\theta s}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) - C_{\theta s} C_{ss}^{-1} f(\cdot) \rangle$ .

14 We want to establish

$$15 \left\| \hat{C}_{\theta s}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) - C_{\theta s} C_{ss}^{-1} f(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_\theta} = O_p((n\varepsilon_n)^{-1/2} + \varepsilon_n^{1/2}). \quad [1]$$

16 First we show

$$17 \left\| \hat{C}_{\theta s}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) - C_{\theta s}(C_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_\theta} = O((n\varepsilon_n)^{-1/2}). \quad [2]$$

18 The left hand side is upper bounded by

$$19 \left\| (\hat{C}_{\theta s} - C_{\theta s})(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_\theta} + \\
20 \left\| \hat{C}_{\theta s}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1}(\hat{C}_{ss} - C_{ss})(C_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} f(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_\theta}. \quad [3]$$

21 By the decomposition  $\hat{C}_{\theta s} = \hat{C}_{\theta\theta}^{1/2} \hat{W}_{\theta s} \hat{C}_{ss}^{1/2}$  with  $\|\hat{W}_{\theta s}\| \leq 1$  (Baker 1973), we have

$$22 \left\| \hat{C}_{\theta s}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1} \right\| = \left\| \hat{C}_{\theta\theta}^{1/2} \hat{W}_{\theta s} \right\| \left\| \hat{C}_{ss}^{1/2}(\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1/2} \right\| \left\| (\hat{C}_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1/2} \right\| =$$

23  $O(\varepsilon_n^{-1/2})$ . With the  $\sqrt{n}$  consistency of the variance operator, we see that the second term

1 of [3] is  $O(\varepsilon_n^{-1/2})$ . In a similar argument gives that the first term of [3] is  $O((n\varepsilon_n)^{-1/2})$ .

2 Therefore we have [2]. Then, we show

3 
$$\|C_{\theta_s}(C_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1}f(\cdot) - C_{\theta_s}C_{ss}^{-1}f(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}_\theta} = O(\varepsilon_n^{1/2}). \quad [4]$$

4 The left hand side is upper bounded by  $\|C_{\theta\theta}^{1/2}W_{\theta_s}\| \|C_{ss}^{1/2}(C_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1}f(\cdot) - C_{ss}^{-1/2}f(\cdot)\|$ .

5 By the eigendecomposition  $C_{ss} = \sum_i \lambda_i \phi_i \langle \phi_i, \cdot \rangle$ , where  $\{\lambda_i\}$  are the eigenvalues and  $\{\phi_i\}$

6 are the corresponding unit eigenvectors, we have a expansion

7 
$$\|C_{ss}^{1/2}(C_{ss} + \varepsilon_n I_n)^{-1}f(\cdot) - C_{ss}^{-1/2}f(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}_s}^2 = \sum_i \langle \phi_i, f \rangle^2 \left( \frac{\varepsilon_n \lambda_i^{1/2}}{\lambda_i + \varepsilon_n} \right)^2,$$

8 Where

$$\frac{\varepsilon_n \lambda_i^{1/2}}{\lambda_i + \varepsilon_n} = \frac{\lambda_i^{1/2}}{(\lambda_i + \varepsilon_n)^{1/2}} \frac{\varepsilon_n^{1/2}}{(\lambda_i + \varepsilon_n)^{1/2}} \varepsilon_n^{1/2} = O(\varepsilon_n^{1/2}).$$

9 Therefore we have [4]. Then, [1] follows from [2] and [4]  $\square$ .

10

11

12

13

14

15


16

17


18

19

20




**Figure 1.** The rate of convergence of  $\hat{m}_{\theta|S_{Seg}}$  on  $m_{\theta|S_{Seg}}$ . The x-axis indicates the number of simulations. The y-axis indicates MSE values.



10 **Figure 2.** Comparisons of kernel-ABC and conventional ABCs under the constant size  
 11 model using  $s_{seg}$ . Computational costs scaled by  $10^y$  seconds (y-axis) are plotted against  
 12 MSE values (x-axis). Acceptance rates are also shown for rejection-ABC and  
 13 regression-ABC.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9




10 **Figure 3.** Comparisons of kernel-ABC and conventional ABCs under the constant size  
 11 model using  $s_{SFS}$ . The inset compares the performances of the kernel-ABC and the  
 12 rejection-ABC.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23



**Figure 4.** Comparisons of kernel-ABC and rejection ABCs under the realistic model using  $s_{SFS}$ .

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23



**Figure 5.** Comparisons of kernel-ABC and rejection ABCs under the realistic model using  $\mathbf{s}_{\text{SFS}} + \mathbf{S}_{\text{HFS}}$ .