

Maximally informative models and diffeomorphic modes in problems of parametric inference

Justin B. Kinney^{1, 2} and **Gurinder S. Atwal**¹

¹Simons Center for Quantitative Biology, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory,
Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724

² Please direct correspondence to jkinney@cshl.edu.

Keywords: mutual information; machine learning; statistical inference; sensory neuroscience; transcriptional regulation

Abstract

Motivated by data-rich experiments in transcriptional regulation and sensory neuroscience, we consider the following general problem in statistical inference. A system of interest, when exposed to a stimulus S , adopts a deterministic response R of which a noisy measurement M is made. Given a large number of measurements and corre-

sponding stimuli, we wish to identify the correct “response function” relating R to S . However the “noise function” relating M to R is unknown a priori. Here we show that maximizing likelihood over both response functions and noise functions is equivalent to simply identifying *maximally informative* response functions – ones that maximize the mutual information $I[R; M]$ between predicted responses and corresponding measurements. Moreover, if the correct response function is in the class of models being explored, maximizing mutual information becomes equivalent to simultaneously maximizing every dependence measure that satisfies the Data Processing Inequality. We note that experiments of the type considered are unable to distinguish between parametrized response functions lying along certain “diffeomorphic modes” in parameter space. We show how to derive these diffeomorphic modes and observe, fortunately, that such modes typically span a very low-dimensional subspace of parameter space. Therefore, given sufficient data, maximizing mutual information can pinpoint nearly all response function parameters without requiring any model of experimental noise.

1 Introduction

This paper discusses a familiar problem in statistical inference, but focuses on an understudied limit which is becoming increasingly relevant in both neuroscience and molecular biology. Consider an experiment having the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & \text{response function} & & \text{noise function} & \\
 & \theta(S) & & \pi(M|R) & \\
 S & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M \\
 \text{stimulus} & & \text{response} & & \text{measurement}
 \end{array} \tag{1}$$

When presented with a stimulus S , a system of interest adopts a deterministic response R , of which a noisy measurement M is made. Specifically, stimuli are drawn from a

probability distribution $p(S)$, the response R to each stimulus is determined by a “response function” θ , and a measurement M is then generated with probability given by the “noise function” $\pi(M|R)$. We refer to this as an “SRM-type” experiment. From a large number of independent stimulus-response pairs, $\{S_n, M_n\}_{n=1}^N$, we wish to reconstruct θ .

This is a standard regression problem (Bishop, 2006) and is typically solved by first assuming a specific noise function π , then searching a space Θ of possible response functions for the one $\theta \in \Theta$ which maximizes the likelihood $p(\{M_n\} | \{S_n\}, \theta, \pi) = e^{NL(\theta, \pi)}$ where,

$$L(\theta, \pi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \pi(M_n | \theta(S_n)), \quad (2)$$

is the per-datum log likelihood. For instance, the method of least squares regression corresponds to maximum likelihood inference assuming a Gaussian noise function π . Often the assumed noise function π is only approximate, or is adopted primarily for analytical convenience. Nevertheless, an incorrect π can work reasonably well, allowing one to infer a tolerably accurate response model when the data are limiting.

However, when data sets are well-sampled, systematic error in θ caused by use of an incorrect noise function π can dominate over the uncertainty due to finite sampling. This situation is illustrated in Fig. 1A. An alternative inference procedure that circumvents the need for an assumed noise function is to maximize the mutual information (Cover & Thomas, 1991),

$$I(\theta) = I[R; M] = \int dR dM p(R, M) \log \frac{p(R, M)}{p(R)p(M)}, \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Likelihood versus mutual information. (A) The per-datum log likelihood L depends on both the response function θ and noise function π , and is maximized at (θ^*, π^*) (black dot). Maximizing likelihood with an incorrect assumed noise function π' will generally yield an incorrect response function θ' (white dot). (B) Mutual information depends only on θ and is globally maximized at θ^* . The KL divergence $D(\theta, \pi)$ vanishes at the empirical noise function $\hat{\pi}_\theta$ observed for each θ (dotted line). Note that $\pi^* = \hat{\pi}_{\theta^*}$.

between predictions R and measurements M .¹ Here, $p(R, M)$ is the empirical joint distribution between predictions and measurements, and thus depends implicitly on θ .² This method has been proposed and applied in the specific contexts of both receptive field inference (Sharpee et al., 2004; Sharpee et al., 2008; Paninski, 2003; Pillow & Simoncelli, 2006) and transcriptional regulation (Kinney et al., 2007; Elemento et al., 2007; Kinney, 2008; Kinney et al., 2010; Melnikov et al., 2012). However, a general

¹The notation $I(\theta)$ and $I[R; M]$ will be used interchangeably.

²For $I(\theta)$ to work as an objective function, one typically expects $N \gg \dim(\theta)$ will be required for reliable estimation of $p(R, M)$ under all choices of θ . A rapid and accurate method for estimating the density $p(R, M)$ from finite data is also needed.

discussion of how maximizing mutual information relates to maximizing likelihood for arbitrary SRM-type systems has yet to be presented.

Here we study the general problem of identifying optimal response functions in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit when the noise function π is unknown *a priori*. We show that maximizing $L(\theta, \pi)$ over both θ and π is equivalent to maximizing $I(\theta)$ over θ alone, as illustrated in Fig. 1B. Furthermore, when the correct response function θ^* lies within the class of models being explored, maximizing $I(\theta)$ becomes equivalent to simultaneously maximizing every dependence measure that satisfies the Data Processing Inequality (DPI). We also show that SRM-type experiments are fundamentally unable to distinguish between response functions θ within certain equivalence classes of Θ . This leads to “diffeomorphic modes” in parameter space which cannot be pinned down by SRM-type data. An equation for diffeomorphic modes is presented, and is used to derive all the diffeomorphic modes of general linear models and a specific linear-nonlinear model studied in previous work (Kinney et al., 2010).

Throughout this manuscript, R is used to implicitly represent predictions of the model θ for stimulus S , i.e. $R = \theta(S)$. Similarly $R^* = \theta^*(S)$, $R_1 = \theta_1(S)$, etc.. Responses R are assumed to be multidimensional with components $\{R^\mu\}$, and $\partial_\mu \equiv \partial/\partial R^\mu$. θ is used to denote both a response model and the parameters of that model. Θ is used to represent both an abstract space of response models, as well as the space of parameters for models θ assumed to have a specific functional form. In the latter case, $\{\theta^i\}$ denotes coordinates in parameter space, and $\partial_i \equiv \partial/\partial \theta^i$.

2 Mutual information and likelihood

In the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the per-datum log likelihood be decomposed as follows,

$$L(\theta, \pi) = \int dR dM p(R, M) \log \pi(M|R) \quad (4)$$

$$= I(\theta) - D(\theta, \pi) - H[M]. \quad (5)$$

Here, $I(\theta)$ is the mutual information from Eq. 3, which is independent of the noise function π . The second term,

$$D(\theta, \pi) = \int dR dM p(R, M) \log \frac{p(M|R)}{\pi(M|R)}, \quad (6)$$

is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the empirical distribution $p(M|R)$, which results from the choice of θ , and the assumed noise function $\pi(M|R)$. The last term, $H[M] = - \int dM p(M) \log p(M)$, is the entropy of the measurements M . It is independent of both θ and π and can thus be ignored in the optimization problem.

We now show that the problem of finding response-function-noise-function pairs (θ, π) which maximize $L(\theta, \pi)$ in Eq. 4 is identical to the problem of only finding response functions θ which maximize the mutual information $I(\theta)$. This follows from the fact that, for any choice of θ , choosing $\pi = \hat{\pi}_\theta$, where $\hat{\pi}_\theta(M|R) \equiv p(M|R)$ is the empirical noise function, will both minimize and eliminate the $D(\theta, \pi)$ term in Eq. 5. The maximum likelihood problem therefore reduces to the problem of finding response functions θ which maximize $L(\theta, \hat{\pi}_\theta) = I(\theta) - H[M]$, which is identical to the problem of maximizing $I(\theta)$. This is illustrated in Fig. 1.

It has been noted (Kinney et al., 2007; Rajan et al., 2012) that when N is large and one's prior expectations about π can be formalized with a prior $p(\pi)$, then the per-datum

log of the likelihood after marginalization over π , i.e.,

$$L_m(\theta) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \log \int d\pi p(\pi) p(\{M_n\} | \{S_n\}, \theta, \pi), \quad (7)$$

is essentially equal (up to an additive constant) to the mutual information $I(\theta)$ when N is large. To see this, we decompose $L_m(\theta)$ as above, finding,

$$L_m(\theta) = I(\theta) - \Delta(\theta) - H[M], \quad (8)$$

where,

$$\Delta(\theta) = -\frac{1}{N} \log \left[\int d\pi p(\pi) e^{-ND(\theta, \pi)} \right]. \quad (9)$$

Note that $\Delta(\theta)$ is the only term affected by the choice of noise function prior $p(\pi)$. Under weak assumptions about $p(\pi)$, $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.³ Therefore, $L_m(\theta)$ is equal to $I(\theta)$ up to a constant and a θ -dependent correction that vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

3 DPI-optimal response models

In practice, one typically searches for optimal θ within a limited class Θ of model response functions. In this section, we present results that obtain when the correct

³ In certain cases $\Delta(\theta)$ can be computed explicitly and thus be shown to vanish (Kinney et al., 2007). More generally, when π is taken to be finite-dimensional, a saddle-point computation (valid for large N) gives $\Delta(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{2N} \text{Tr}[\log \partial\partial\tilde{D}] + \text{const.}$ Here, $\partial\partial\tilde{D}$ is the π -space Hessian of $\tilde{D}(\theta, \pi) \equiv D(\theta, \pi) - \frac{1}{N} \log p(\pi)$ computed at $\pi = \hat{\pi}_\theta$. If $\log p(\pi)$ and its derivatives are bounded, then the θ -dependent part of $\Delta(\theta)$ decays as N^{-1} . If π is infinite dimensional, this saddle-point computation becomes a problem in field theory akin to the inference problem studied by Bialek et al. (1996). If this field theory is properly formulated through an appropriate choice of $p(\pi)$, $\Delta(\theta)$ can be expected to exhibit different decay behavior, but still vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$. See also (Rajan et al., 2012).




Figure 2: Different DPI-satisfying dependence measures, e.g. I , \mathcal{D}_1 , and \mathcal{D}_2 , will in general be maximized by different sets of response functions, represented here by Θ_I , $\Theta_{\mathcal{D}_1}$, and $\Theta_{\mathcal{D}_2}$, respectively. The set Θ_{DPI} is comprised of response functions that maximize every DPI-satisfying measure. θ^* indicates the correct response model. (A) Mutual information has the important property that $\Theta_I = \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$ when $\theta^* \in \Theta$, something that is not true of all DPI-satisfying measures. (B) However, $\Theta_I \neq \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$ in general when $\theta^* \notin \Theta$.

response function θ^* resides within Θ . First we observe that $\theta = \theta^*$ globally maximizes $I(\theta)$. To see this, consider any hypothesized θ together with θ^* . Letting π^* denote the true noise function, the chain of stochastic variables,

$$R \xleftarrow{\theta(S)} S \xrightarrow{\theta^*(S)} R^* \xrightarrow{\pi^*(M|R^*)} M, \quad (10)$$

forms a Markov chain (Cover & Thomas, 1991). The fact that mutual information satisfies DPI allows us to read off from Eq. 10 the inequality,

$$I[R; M] \leq I[S; M] = I[R^*; M], \quad (11)$$

proving that $\theta = \theta^*$ globally maximizes $I[R; M] = I(\theta)$.

As has been noted (Paninski , 2003), the same argument can be made not just for mutual information, but for any dependence measure $\mathcal{D}[M; R]$ which satisfies DPI: the simple fact that Eq. 10 is a Markov chain implies $\mathcal{D}[R; M] \leq \mathcal{D}[R^*; M]$, proving that $\theta = \theta^*$ globally maximizes $\mathcal{D}(\theta) \equiv \mathcal{D}[R; M]$.⁴ Letting $\Theta_{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \Theta$ denote the set of all $\theta \in \Theta$ which maximize a dependence measure $\mathcal{D}(\theta)$, we see that if $\theta^* \in \Theta$, then $\theta^* \in \Theta_{\mathcal{D}}$ for every \mathcal{D} satisfying DPI. So in fact θ^* must be contained within the intersection of all such $\Theta_{\mathcal{D}}$. We use Θ_{DPI} to denote this set of ‘‘DPI-optimal’’ response functions, i.e. response functions that maximize *every* DPI-satisfying dependence measure.

At first blush this might suggest that we try locating θ^* by maximizing not only mutual information but a variety of other DPI-satisfying measures as well. Fortunately this is not necessary, since the set of response functions that maximize mutual information is *identical* to the set of functions maximizing *all* DPI-satisfying dependence measures, i.e.,

$$\Theta_I = \Theta_{\text{DPI}}. \quad (13)$$

This is represented schematically in Fig. 2. To show Eq. 13, first note that, because

⁴We note that there are an infinite number of dependence measures other than mutual information which satisfy DPI. For instance, information measures of the F -divergence form (Csiszár & Shields, 2004),

$$I_F[M; R] \equiv \int dR dM p(R)p(M) F\left(\frac{p(R, M)}{p(R)p(M)}\right) \quad (12)$$

satisfy DPI when the function $F(x)$ is convex for $x \geq 0$. Mutual information corresponds to $F(x) = x \log x$, while $F(x) = (x^\alpha - 1)/(\alpha - 1)$ yields a more general measure that is monotonically related to the Rényi divergence between $p(R, M)$ and $p(R)p(M)$ and reduces to mutual information for $\alpha = 1$ (Rényi, 1961; Kouh & Sharpee, 2009).

mutual information itself satisfies DPI, $\Theta_{\text{DPI}} \subseteq \Theta_I$. Next, consider any $\theta \in \Theta_I$. Because $\theta^* \in \Theta_I$ as well, $I(\theta) = I(\theta^*)$. From Eq. 10 we see that $R \leftrightarrow R^* \leftrightarrow M$ forms a Markov Chain. The key point is that, because $I[R; M] = I[R^*; M]$, $R^* \leftrightarrow R \leftrightarrow M$ is *also* a Markov Chain.⁵ So for all measures \mathcal{D} satisfying DPI, $\mathcal{D}[R; M] = \mathcal{D}[R^*; M]$, and hence $\theta \in \Theta_{\mathcal{D}}$. This shows that $\Theta_I \subseteq \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$, completing the proof of Eq. 13.

We pause to offer some intuition for these results. For any hypothesized response function θ , the resulting joint distribution $p(R, M)$ will be a convolution of the true joint distribution $p(R^*, M)$ with the conditional distribution $p(R|R^*)$,

$$p(R, M) = \int dR^* p(R|R^*) p(R^*, M). \quad (14)$$

In general the reverse is *not* true, i.e. $p(R^*, M)$ is not a convolution of $p(R, M)$ because $p(R^*|R) \neq p(R^*|R, M)$. This reflects a basic asymmetry among joint distributions $p(R, M)$: sometimes one can be derived from another by convolution, sometimes not.

All DPI-satisfying measures $\mathcal{D}[R, M]$ are either decreased or left unchanged by such convolutions. Every such \mathcal{D} therefore imposes a weak ordering on the space of joint distributions. When neither of two distributions $p(R, M)$ and $p(R', M)$ can be expressed as a convolution of the other, different DPI satisfying measures \mathcal{D} can potentially rank these distributions differently. However, when $p(R, M)$ can be gotten from $p(R', M)$ by convolution, then $\mathcal{D}[R; M] \leq \mathcal{D}[R'; M]$ is guaranteed. Thus, because all $p(R, M)$ under consideration derive from a single $p(R^*, M)$ by a convolution of the form in Eq. 14, *every* DPI-satisfying measure \mathcal{D} ranks $p(R^*, M)$ no lower than any other

⁵ R contains no information about M which is not conveyed by R^* , so $I[R^*; M] = I[R^*, R; M]$. As a result, $I[R^*; M|R] = I[R^*, R; M] - I[R; M] = I[R^*; M] - I[R; M] = 0$. This implies $p(R^*, M|R) = p(R^*|R)p(M|R)$, which proves that $R^* \leftrightarrow R \leftrightarrow M$ is a Markov chain.

$p(R, M)$. So if $\theta^* \in \Theta$, $\theta^* \in \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$ as well (see Fig. 2A). However, if $\theta^* \notin \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$, there is no guarantee that the weak orderings produced by different DPI-satisfying measures will come to such a consensus (see Fig. 2B).

The equivalence $\Theta_I = \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$, realized when $\theta^* \in \Theta$, stems from the fact that mutual information is maximally sensitive to such convolutions: if $\mathcal{D}[R; M] < \mathcal{D}[R^*; M]$ for *any* measure \mathcal{D} satisfying DPI, then $I[R; M] < I[R^*; M]$. We note that mutual information is not unusual in this regard. For example, every F -information measure $I_F[M; R]$ for which $F(x)$ is *strictly convex* satisfies $\Theta_{I_F} = \Theta_{\text{DPI}}$. There are, however, some dependence measures that are less sensitive than mutual information (Fig. 2A). For instance, the trivial dependence measure $\mathcal{D} = 0$ satisfies DPI but reveals nothing about $p(R, M)$.

4 Information equivalence and diffeomorphic modes

Certain response models cannot be distinguished from one another by *any* SRM-type experiment because their predictions are always equally informative about measurements. We say that two such models θ_1 and θ_2 are “information equivalent”, and write $\theta_1 \simeq \theta_2$, since this insensitivity of SRM-type experiments leads to a natural equivalence relation among response functions. While Θ_I can sometimes be influenced by a specific experiment’s stimulus distribution $p(S)$ and noise function $\pi^*(M|R)$ (an issue we do not pursue here), information equivalence places hard constraints on the structure of Θ_I regardless of experimental specifics, implying that certain equivalence classes within Θ must either be fully contained within Θ_I or fully excluded.

We now prove that $\theta_1 \simeq \theta_2$ if and only if the predictions of θ_1 and θ_2 are isomorphic, i.e. there exists an invertible function f such that $\theta_1(S) = f(\theta_2(S))$ and $\theta_2(S) = f^{-1}(\theta_1(S))$ for all possible stimuli S . First, such an isomorphism implies $p(M|R_1) = p(M|R_2)$, which means $I[R_1; M] = I[R_2; M]$, and thus $\theta_1 \simeq \theta_2$. Going the other direction, we can imagine an SRM-type experiment in which $\theta^* = \theta_1$ and $p(M|R^*) = \delta(M - R^*)$. Earlier we showed that, if $I[R_2; M] = I[R^*; M]$, then $R^* \leftrightarrow R_2 \leftrightarrow M$ is a Markov chain. With our choice of response function and noise function, $R_1 \leftrightarrow R_2 \leftrightarrow R_1$ is thus a Markov chain, implying R_1 must be a deterministic function of R_2 . Imagining the same experiment with $\theta^* = \theta_2$ instead, we see that this function must be invertible.

If all $\theta \in \Theta$ have a specific parametric form, information-equivalence implies that moving a response model θ along certain directions in parameter space will not change $I(\theta)$. Consider what happens when θ , having parameters $\{\theta^i\}$, is infinitesimally transported along a vector field $g^i(\theta)$. This yields a new model θ' with components $\theta'^i = \theta^i + \epsilon g^i(\theta)$. Each prediction R , having components $\{R^\mu\}$ in response space, will thus be transformed to $R'^\mu = R^\mu + \epsilon \sum_i g^i(\theta) \partial_i R^\mu$. As shown above, if θ' is information-equivalent to θ , R' and R must be related by an invertible transformation. As a result, the change $R'^\mu - R^\mu = \epsilon \sum_i g^i(\theta) \partial_i R^\mu$ cannot depend on the stimulus S except through the value of R . There must therefore be a vector field $h^\mu(R, \theta)$ in response space satisfying

$$\sum_i g^i(\theta) \partial_i R^\mu = h^\mu(R, \theta). \quad (15)$$

We refer to vector fields $g^i(\theta)$ which satisfy this equation as “diffeomorphic modes,” since movement of any model θ along its corresponding vector g^i induces a diffeomor-

phism of responses defined by flows of the vector field h^μ .⁶

Importantly, diffeomorphic modes correspond to continuous changes of model parameters which cannot, in principle, be constrained by SRM-type data. The parametric form assumed for all $\theta \in \Theta$ determines which diffeomorphic modes exist, and identifying these modes analytically is critical when analyzing real data. For instance, if one is able to sample Θ_I , e.g. using Monte Carlo techniques, then the position of $\theta \in \Theta_I$ along diffeomorphic modes may have to be manually fixed in order to arrive at values for nondiffeomorphic model parameters. We therefore turn to the problem of computing diffeomorphic modes for models having various functional form.

4.1 General linear response models

Linear response models are of particular interest. In neuroscience they are commonly used to represent neuron receptive fields, and the resulting challenge of identifying “maximally informative dimensions” in stimulus space has received focused attention (Sharpee et al., 2004; Sharpee et al., 2008). In transcriptional regulation, linear “energy matrix” models are often used to represent the sequence-dependent binding energies of transcription factors, and mutual information maximization has been used to infer these models from microarray data (Kinney et al., 2007; Elemento et al., 2007) and from

⁶Alternatively, one can define diffeomorphic modes in terms of the generator equation (Kinney, 2008),

$$\sum_i g^i(\theta) \partial_i = \sum_\mu h^\mu(R, \theta) \partial_\mu. \quad (16)$$

We have found that working with this formulation eases notation and aids interpretability when deriving the diffeomorphic modes of a specific parametric model, but we will use Eq. 15 in what follows for the sake of concreteness.

DNA sequence data (Kinney, 2008; Kinney et al., 2010; Melnikov et al., 2012).

Here we derive the diffeomorphic modes of arbitrary linear response models. Assume the system response R is given by,

$$R^\mu = \sum_i \theta^i F_i^\mu(S) \quad (17)$$

for some set of stimulus features $F_i^\mu(S)$. Note that response models of this form are linear in their parameters θ^i but not necessarily linear in the stimulus S . To find the diffeomorphic modes, we apply Eq. 15 to Eq. 17, giving $\sum_i g^i(\theta) F_i^\mu(S) = h^\mu(\sum_i \theta^i F_i^\nu(S), \theta)$. The left hand side is linear in stimulus features, and so $h^\mu(R, \theta)$ must also be a linear function of R , i.e. have the highly restricted form,⁷

$$h^\mu(R, \theta) = a^\mu(\theta) + \sum_\nu b_\nu^\mu(\theta) R^\nu. \quad (18)$$

Thus, the number of diffeomorphic modes of a general linear model, given by the number of parameters (a^μ and b_ν^μ) on which h^μ depends at fixed θ , is bounded above by $\dim(R)[\dim(R) + 1]$. Importantly, this bound is independent of the number of stimulus features (i.e. $\dim(S)$); it depends only on the dimension of response space. In particular, if R is a scalar, then $h = a + bR$. Thus there are at most 2 diffeomorphic modes, corresponding to additive and multiplicative transformations of R .

4.2 A linear-nonlinear response model

We now illustrate how combining multiple linear response models into a single linear-nonlinear model can eliminate diffeomorphic modes. This fact proved useful in a recent

⁷There are exceptions to this statement, e.g. if the various features $F_i^\mu(S)$ exhibit complicated interdependencies, either because of their functional form or because stimuli S are restricted to a particular subspace. We ignore such pathological cases here.




Figure 3: Biophysical model of transcriptional regulation analyzed by Kinney et al. (2010). The fractional transcription rate T was assumed equal to the occupancy of RNAP in thermodynamic equilibrium. This quantity T is invertibly related to the “regulation factor” R as shown. The stimulus S corresponds to the nucleotide sequence of DNA to which the proteins CRP and RNAP bind. The regulation factor R is determined by the binding energy Q of CRP to DNA, the binding energy P of RNAP to DNA, and the interaction energy γ between CRP and RNAP. Q and P depend on non overlapping regions of S , while γ is independent of S .

study by Kinney et al. (2010). In the context of their work, each stimulus S was a mutated version of a 75 base pair region of DNA from the *lac* promoter of *Escherichia coli*, as illustrated in Fig. 3. A linear response function P was used to model the binding energy of RNA polymerase (RNAP) to its site on this promoter, while a separate linear function Q was used to model the interaction of the transcription factor CRP

to its promoter binding site.⁸ The resulting rate T of mRNA transcription, expressed as a fraction of the maximal transcription rate, was then modeled as the equilibrium occupancy of RNAP at its binding site, which is given by,

$$T = \frac{1}{1 + R^{-1}} \quad \text{where} \quad R = e^{-P} \frac{1 + e^{-Q-\gamma}}{1 + e^{-Q}}. \quad (19)$$

The quantity R shown here has been termed the ‘‘regulation factor’’ of the promoter (Bintu et al., 2005). It depends on the DNA sequence S through the values of P and Q . R also depends on the sequence-independent interaction energy γ between CRP and RNA polymerase.⁹ Because T is an invertible function of R , these two quantities are information equivalent and either can therefore be chosen as the response of the system; we choose R because of its simpler algebraic form.

We now derive the diffeomorphic modes of R . Since P and Q depend on separate DNA binding sites, these energies can be varied independently by changing S . Therefore, any diffeomorphic mode of R has to be a diffeomorphic mode of *both* P and Q . Since P and Q are linear in their parameters, and the only other parameter in the model is γ , any diffeomorphic mode of R must have the form,

$$\sum_i g^i \partial_i R = h = (a_P + b_P P) \partial_P R + (a_Q + b_Q Q) \partial_Q R + a_\gamma \partial_\gamma R. \quad (20)$$

Again, the coefficients $a_P, b_P, a_Q, b_Q, a_\gamma$ can be arbitrary functions of the model parameters, but cannot depend on S . Computing the derivatives and then substituting for P in

⁸Specifically, Kinney et al. (2010) chose $Q = \sum_{bl} \theta_Q^{bl} F_{bl}(S)$ and $P = \sum_{bl} \theta_P^{bl} F_{bl}(S)$ where b indexes the four possible bases A,C,G,T, l indexes nucleotide positions within the 75 bp promoter DNA region, $\{\theta_Q^{bl}\}$ and $\{\theta_P^{bl}\}$ are the model parameters, and $F_{bl}(S)$ is an indicator function equal to 1 if base b occurs at position l and equal to zero otherwise.

⁹The energies P, Q , and γ are taken to be in units of $k_B T$.

terms of Q and R , we find,

$$h = -R \left[a_P - b_P \log \left\{ \frac{R(1 + e^{-Q})}{1 + e^{-Q-\gamma}} \right\} - \frac{(a_Q + b_Q Q)e^{-Q}(1 - e^{-\gamma})}{(1 + e^{-Q-\gamma})(1 + e^{-Q})} + \frac{a_\gamma e^{-Q-\gamma}}{1 + e^{-Q-\gamma}} \right]. \quad (21)$$

For g^i to be a diffeomorphic mode, the right hand side must be independent of S for fixed R . But Q depends on S , so we must have $b_P = a_Q = b_Q = a_\gamma = 0$.¹⁰ Diffeomorphic modes g^i of R are thus defined by only one parameter, a_P , and satisfy,

$$\sum_i g^i \partial_i R = -a_P R. \quad (22)$$

This single diffeomorphic mode corresponds to multiplication of R by a constant, which results from an additive shift in the value of P .

In (Kinney et al., 2010), measurements for $\sim 5 \times 10^4$ mutant *lac* promoters were used to infer models for P and Q individually, as well as in the context of the more complicated biophysical model for R . When P and Q were inferred individually, each was determined only up to an unknown affine transformation. However, when P and Q were inferred simultaneously by fitting R , three of the four diffeomorphic modes of P and Q vanished, leaving only the additive mode shown in Eq. 22. Thus, inferring the nonlinear function R allowed the binding energies of RNA polymerase and CRP to be determined in the meaningful physical units of $k_B T$. The intracellular concentration of CRP, which manifests as an additive contribution to Q , was also determined in this manner (Kinney et al., 2010). In fact, of the 204 independent parameters which defined the model in Eq. 19, the only parameter which could not be pinned down by data was the single diffeomorphic mode in Eq. 22, corresponding to changes in RNA polymerase concentration.

¹⁰This assumes $\gamma \neq 0$.

5 Discussion




Figure 4: (A) Likelihood $L(\theta, \pi)$, evaluated using the correct noise model π^* , constrains both diffeomorphic modes and nondiffeomorphic modes in parameter space. (B) Mutual information $I(\theta)$ does not provide any constraints on diffeomorphic modes. (C) Noise-model-averaged likelihood $L_m(\theta)$ may constrain diffeomorphic modes, but these constraints are due solely to the prior $p(\pi)$ on possible noise functions and do not get stronger as N increases.

Its inability to pin down diffeomorphic modes distinguishes mutual information from likelihood in an important and revealing way. When maximizing likelihood with an assumed noise model, all response model parameters are constrained by data.¹¹ However, the constraints likelihood places on diffeomorphic modes come entirely from the KL-divergence (Eq. 5), which enforces the assumption that the empirical noise function $p(M|R)$ should match the assumed noise function $\pi(M|R)$. The relative likelihood

¹¹This excludes parameters of θ which have no effect on R , or which affect R in ways that do not alter the M -distribution $\pi(M|R)$. Such parameters have no effect on experimental measurements.

of response models θ along diffeomorphic modes is $\exp[-ND(\theta, \pi)]$, and so the weight given to one's assumed noise function π grows with N (Fig. 4A). If there is any uncertainty whatsoever about what the true noise function is, this term will become overly presumptuous when N is sufficiently large.

A more principled approach is to assume an explicit prior on possible noise functions π , and then optimize the response model θ using the marginal likelihood in Eq. 7. This allows one's prior belief about the noise function to influence the choice of response model when N is small, but the relative influence of this prior diminishes as N becomes large (Fig. 4C). This "noise-function-averaged" or "error-model-averaged" likelihood can be computed explicitly in certain cases and has proven useful on DNA microarray data characterizing transcription factor binding (Kinney et al., 2007). However, in the large N limit the resulting inference procedure essentially amounts to first identifying maximally informative θ (Fig. 4B), then using the prior on π to constrain the diffeomorphic modes.

Regardless of the specific implementation, one's inference procedure should reflect the fact that SRM-type experiments are fundamentally insensitive to diffeomorphic modes of the response model. Any constraints along diffeomorphic modes must come from a source of information other than the SRM data itself, e.g. a separate calibration experiment.

One might worry that a large number of response model parameters will be diffeomorphic, and that SRM-type experiments will still require an assumed noise function if they are to actually yield useful results. Such situations are conceivable, but in practice this is often not the case. When the stimulus S is high-dimensional and the response

R is low dimensional, the vast majority of model parameters will typically be involved in reducing the dimensionality of S ; very few will only parametrize diffeomorphisms of R . We showed that when θ is linear in its parameters, the number of diffeomorphic modes will not exceed $\dim(R)[\dim(R) + 1]$ (except in pathological cases). This holds regardless of how large $\dim(\theta)$ is. In the specific linear-nonlinear model considered by Kinney et al. (2010), which is shown in Eq. 19, only one of the 204 independent parameters turned out to be diffeomorphic. So although diffeomorphic modes do appear in real-world applications, they are often very limited in number, and in such cases the vast majority of response model parameters can be inferred from SRM-type data without any systematic error stemming from an incorrect noise function.

Unfortunately, using mutual information as an objective function can present practical difficulties. One must be able to rapidly and reliably estimate $I(\theta)$ from finite data, and the resulting $I(\theta)$ may present a rugged optimization landscape. Still, various methods for estimating mutual information have been implemented, e.g. (Khan S et al., 2007; Panzeri et al., 2007), and the information optimization problem has been successfully addressed in specific situations using stochastic gradient ascent (Sharpee et al., 2004; Sharpee et al., 2008), standard Metropolis Monte Carlo (Kinney et al., 2007), and parallel tempering Monte Carlo (Kinney et al., 2010; Melnikov et al., 2012). How best to address these practical issues remains an open question, but we believe the exciting applications in neuroscience and molecular biology provide compelling reasons to make progress on these problems.

Acknowledgments

We thank Bill Bialek, Curtis Callan, Bud Mishra, Swagatam Mukhopadhyay, Anand Murugan, Mike Schatz, Bruce Stillman, and Gašper Tkačik for helpful conversations. Support for this project was provided by the Simons Center for Quantitative Biology at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.

References

- Bialek, W., Callan, C., & Strong, S. (1996). Field theories for learning probability distributions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77(23):4693 – 4697.
- Bintu, L., Buchler, N., Garcia, H., Gerland, U., Hwa, T., Kondev, J., & Phillips, R. (2005). Transcriptional regulation by the numbers: models. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*, 15(2), 116 – 24.
- Bishop, C. (2006). *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer, New York.
- Brenner, N., Strong, S.P., Koberle, R., Bialek, W., & de Ruyter van Steveninck, R.R. (2000). Synergy in a neural code. *Neural Comput.*, 12(7):1531 – 1552.
- Cover, T. & Thomas, J. (1991). *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Csiszár, I. & Shields, P.C. (2004). *Information theory and statistics: a tutorial* now Publishers, Hanover MA.
- Elemento, O., Slonim, N., & Tavazoie, S. (2007). A universal framework for regulatory element discovery across all genomes and data types. *Mol. Cell*, 28(2):337 – 50.

- Khan, S., Bandyopadhyay, S., Ganguly, A., Saigal, S., Erickson III, D., Protopopescu, V., & Ostrouchov, G. (2007). Relative performance of mutual information estimation methods for quantifying the dependence among short and noisy data. *Phys. Rev. E*, 76(2):026209.
- Kinney, J.B., Tkačik, G., & Callan, C.G. (2007). Precise physical models of protein-DNA interaction from high-throughput data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 104(2):501 – 506.
- Kinney, J.B. (2008). *Biophysical models of transcriptional regulation from sequence data*. PhD thesis, Princeton University.
- Kinney, J.B., Murugan, A., Callan, C.G., & Cox, E. (2010). Using deep sequencing to characterize the biophysical mechanism of a transcriptional regulatory sequence. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA*, 107(20):9158 – 9163.
- Kouh, M. & Sharpee, T. (2009). Estimating linear-nonlinear models using Rényi divergences. *Network*, 20(2):49 – 68.
- Kwasnieski, J.C., Mogno, I., Myers, C.A., Corbo, J.C., & Cohen, B.A. (2012). Complex effects of nucleotide variants in a mammalian *cis*-regulatory element. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. US*, 109(47):19498 – 19503.
- Melnikov, A., Murugan, A., Zhang, X., Tesileanu, T., Wang, L., Rogov, P., Feizi, S., Gnirke, A., Callan, C.G., Kinney, J.B., Kellis, M., Lander, E.S., & Mikkelsen, T.S. (2012). Systematic dissection and optimization of inducible enhancers in human cells using a massively parallel reporter assay. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 30(3):271 – 277.

- Paninski, L. (2003). Convergence properties of three spike-triggered analysis techniques. *Network-Comp. Neural.*, 14:437 – 464.
- Panzeri, S., Senatore, R., Montemurro, MA., & Petersen, RS. (2007). Correcting for the sampling bias problem in spike train information measures. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 98(3):1064 – 1072.
- Patwardhan, R.P., Lee, C., Litvin, O., Young, D., Pe'er, D., & Shendure, J. (2009). High-resolution analysis of DNA regulatory elements by synthetic saturation mutagenesis. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 27(12):1173 – 1175.
- Patwardhan, R.P., Hiatt, J.B., Witten, D.M., Kim, M.J., Smith, R.P., May, D., Lee, C., Andrie, J.M., Lee, S., Cooper, G.M., Ahituv, N., Pennacchio, L.A., & Shendure, J. (2012). Massively parallel functional dissection of mammalian enhancers in vivo. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 5, 188 – 200.
- Pillow, J.W. & Simoncelli, E.P. (2006). Dimensionality reduction in neural models: an information-theoretic generalization of spike-triggered average and covariance analysis. *J. Vision*, 6(4):414 – 428.
- Rajan, K., Marre, O., & Tkačik. (2012). Learning quadratic receptive fields from neural responses to natural stimuli. *arXiv:1209.0121 [q-bio.NC]*.
- Rényi, A. (1961). On measures of entropy and information. *Proc. 4th Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. and Prob.*, 1:547 – 561.
- Schwartz, O., Pillow, J., Rust, N., & Simoncelli, E.(2006). Spike-triggered neural characterization. *J. Vision*, 6(4):484 – 507.

- Sharon, E., Kalma, Y., Sharp, A., Raveh-Sadka, T., Levo, M., Zeevi, D., Keren, L., Yakhini, Z., Weinberger, A., & Segal, E. (2012). Inferring gene regulatory logic from high-throughput measurements of thousands of systematically designed promoters. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, *30*:521 – 530.
- Sharpee, T., Rust, N., & Bialek, W. (2004). Analyzing neural responses to natural signals: maximally informative dimensions. *Neural Comput.*, *16*(2):223 – 250.
- Sharpee, T., Sugihara, H., Kurgansky, A., Rebrik, S., Stryker, M., & Miller, K. (2008). Adaptive filtering enhances information transmission in visual cortex. *Nature*, *439*(7079):936 – 942.