

Waste Not, Want Not: Why Rarefying Microbiome Data Is Inadmissible

July 29, 2021

Paul J. McMurdie¹, Susan Holmes^{1*}

¹ Statistics Department, Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA

* E-mail: susan@stat.stanford.edu

Abstract

The interpretation of count data originating from the current generation of DNA sequencing platforms requires special attention. In particular, the per-sample library sizes often vary by orders of magnitude from the same sequencing run, and the counts are overdispersed relative to a simple Poisson model. These challenges can be addressed using an appropriate mixture model that simultaneously accounts for library size differences and biological variability. This approach is already well-characterized and implemented for RNA-Seq data in R packages such as edgeR and DESeq. Unfortunately, this class of techniques has been overlooked in the microbiome literature, where the currently-recommended library size normalization is done by computing proportions or by *rarefying* counts through random subsampling until each library has the same sum. We use statistical theory, extensive simulations, and empirical data to show that variance stabilizing normalization using a mixture model like the negative binomial is appropriate for microbiome count data. In simulations detecting differential abundance, normalization procedures based on a Gamma-Poisson mixture model provided systematic improvement in performance over crude proportions or rarefied counts – both of which led to a high rate of false positives. In simulations evaluating clustering accuracy, we found that the rarefying procedure discarded samples that were nev-

ertheless accurately clustered by alternative methods, and that the choice of minimum library size threshold was critical in some settings, but with an optimum that is unknown in practice. Techniques that use variance stabilizing transformations by modeling microbiome count data with a mixture distribution, such as those implemented in edgeR and DESeq, substantially improved upon techniques that attempt to normalize by rarefying or crude proportions. Based on these results and well-established statistical theory, we advocate that investigators avoid rarefying altogether. We have provided microbiome-specific extensions to these tools in the R package, phyloseq.

Introduction

Modern, massively parallel DNA sequencing technologies have changed the scope and technique of investigations across many fields of biology [7, 8]. In gene expression studies the standard measurement technique has shifted away from microarray hybridization to direct sequencing of cDNA, a technique often referred to as *RNA-Seq* [9]. Even though the statistical methods available for analyzing microarray data have matured to a high level of sophistication [10], these methods are not directly applicable to RNA-Seq data because it consists of discrete counts (DNA sequencing *reads*) rather than continuous values derived from fluorescence intensity. In high throughput sequencing, the total reads per sample (*library size*; sometimes referred to as *depths of coverage*) can vary by orders of magnitude within a single sequencing run. Comparison across samples with different library sizes requires more than a simple linear scaling adjustment because it also implies different levels of uncer-

tainty, as measured by the sampling variance of the proportion estimate for each gene.

Variation in read counts among technical replicates with comparable library sizes is adequately modeled by a Poisson random variable in most cases [11]. However, we are usually interested in understanding variation among biological replicates, wherein a mixture model is necessary to account for the added uncertainty [12]. Taking a hierarchical model approach with the Gamma-Poisson has provided a satisfactory fit to RNA-Seq data [13], as well as a valid regression framework that uses generalized linear models [14]. A Gamma mixture of Poisson variables gives the negative binomial (NB) distribution [12, 13] and several RNA-Seq analysis packages now model the counts, K , for gene i , in sample j according to:

$$K_{ij} \sim NB(s_j \mu_i, \phi_i) \quad (1)$$

where s_j is a linear scaling factor for sample j that accounts for its library size, μ_i is the mean proportion for gene i , and ϕ_i is the dispersion parameter for gene i . The variance is $\nu_i = s_j \mu_i + \phi_i s_j \mu_i^2$, with the NB distribution becoming Poisson when $\phi = 0$. Recognizing that $\phi > 0$ and estimating its value is important in gene-level tests. This reduces false positive genes that appear significant under a Poisson distribution, but not after accounting for non-zero dispersion.

The uncertainty in estimating ϕ_i for every gene when there is a small number of samples — or a small number of biological replicates — can be mitigated by sharing information across the thousands of genes in an experiment, leveraging a systematic trend in the mean-dispersion relationship [13]. This approach substantially increases the power to detect differences in proportions (differential expression) while still adequately controlling for false positives [3]. Many R packages implementing this model of RNA-Seq data are now available, differing mainly in their approach to modeling dispersion across genes [15].

Analogous to the development of gene expression research, culture independent [16] microbial ecology research has migrated away from detection of species (or Operational Taxonomic Units, OTUs) through microarray hybridization of rRNA gene PCR amplicons [17] to direct sequencing of highly-variable regions of these amplicons [18], or even direct *shotgun* sequencing of microbiome metagenomic DNA [19]. Although these latter

microbiome investigations use the same DNA sequencing platforms and represent the processed sequence data in the same manner — a feature-by-sample contingency table where the features are OTUs instead of genes — the modeling and normalization methods just described for RNA-Seq analysis have not been transferred to microbiome research [4, 5].

Standard microbiome analysis workflows begin with an *ad hoc* library size normalization by random subsampling without replacement, or so-called *rarefying* [6]. Rarefying is most often defined by the following steps.

1. Select a minimum library size, N_L .
2. Discard libraries (samples) that are smaller than N_L in size.
3. Subsample the remaining libraries without replacement such that they all have size N_L .

Often N_L is chosen to be equal to the size of the smallest library that is not considered an artifact, though in experiments with large variation in library size identifying *artifact* samples can be subjective. In many cases researchers have also failed to repeat the random subsampling step or record the pseudorandom number generation seed/process — both of which are essential for reproducibility. To our knowledge, rarefying was first recommended for microbiome counts in order to moderate the sensitivity of the UniFrac distance [20] to library size, especially differences in the presence of rare OTUs attributable to library size [21]. In these and similar studies the principal objective is to compare microbiome samples from different sources, a research task that is increasingly accessible with declining sequencing costs and the ability to sequence many samples in parallel using barcoded primers [22, 23]. Rarefying is now an exceedingly common precursor to microbiome multivariate workflows that seek to relate sample covariates to sample-wise distance matrices [6, 24, 25]; for example, integrated as a recommended option in QIIME’s [26] `beta_diversity_through_plots.py` workflow, in `Sub.sample` in the mothur software library [27], and in `daisy_chopper.pl` [28]. This perception in the microbiome literature of “rarefying to even sampling depth” as a standard normalization procedure appears to explain why *rarefied* counts are also used in studies that attempt

to detect differential abundance of OTUs between predefined classes of samples [29–33], in addition to studies that use proportions directly [34].

Statistical motivation

Unfortunately, rarefying biological count data is unjustified despite its current ubiquity in microbiome analyses. The following is a minimal example to explain why rarefying is theoretically inadmissible, especially with regards to variance stabilization. A mathematical proof of the sub-optimality of the subsampling approach is presented in the supplementary material (Supporting Information File SA).

Suppose we want to compare two different samples, called *A* and *B*, comprised of 100 and 1000 reads, respectively. In these hypothetical communities only two types of microbes have been observed, *OTU1* and *OTU2*, according to Table 1, Left.

Table 1. A minimal example of the effect of rarefying on power.

	Original Abundance		Rarefied Abundance	
	A	B	A	B
<i>OTU1</i>	62	500	<i>OTU1</i>	62
<i>OTU2</i>	38	500	<i>OTU2</i>	38
Total	100	1000		100

Standard Tests for Difference			
P-value	χ^2	Prop	Fisher
Original	0.0290	0.0290	0.0272
Rarefied	0.1171	0.1171	0.1169

Hypothetical abundance data in its original (Left) and rarefied (Middle) form, with corresponding formal test results for differentiation (Right).

Formally comparing the two proportions according to a standard test is done either using a χ^2 test (equivalent to a two sample proportion test here) or a Fisher exact test. By rarefying (Table 1, middle) so that both samples have the same number of counts, we are no longer able to differentiate between them (Table 1, right). This loss of power is completely attributable to reducing the size of *B* by a factor of 10. Decreasing the number of observations in *B* increases the confidence intervals corresponding to each proportion, such that the proportions are no longer

distinguishable from those in *A*, even though they are distinguishable in the original data.

The variance of the proportion’s estimate \hat{p} is multiplied by 10 when the total count +is divided by 10. In this binomial example the variance of the proportion estimate is $Var(\frac{X}{n}) = \frac{pq}{n} = \frac{q}{n}E(\frac{X}{n})$, a function of the mean. This is a common occurrence and one that is traditionally dealt with in statistics by applying variance-stabilizing transformations. We show in Supporting Information File SA that the relation between the variance and the mean for microbiome count data can be estimated and the model used to find the optimal variance-stabilizing transformation. Calling the proportions of taxa *i* $p_i = K_{ij}/s_j$, we can see from the above example that it is inappropriate to compare them without accounting for the variability in the denominators, because of their unequal variances (known as heteroscedasticity). In other words, the *uncertainty* associated with each value in the table is fundamentally linked to the total number of observations, which varies widely across samples, often much more than the 10-fold difference in our example. This uncertainty must be considered when testing for a difference between proportions (an OTU), or sets of proportions (a microbial community). Although rarefying does equalize variances, it does so only by inflating the variances in all samples to the largest (worst) value among them at the cost of discriminating power (increased uncertainty). Rarefying adds additional uncertainty through the random subsampling step, such that Table 1 shows the best-case, approached only with a sufficient number of *repeated* rarefying trials (See Supporting Information File S3, minimal example). In this sense alone, the random step in rarefying is unnecessary. Each count value can be transformed to a *common-scale* by rounding $K_{ij}s_{min}/s_j$. Although this common-scale approach is an improvement over the rarefying method here defined, both methods suffer from the same problems related to lost data.

In this article we demonstrate the applicability of a variance stabilization technique based on a mixture model of microbiome count data. This approach simultaneously addresses both problems of (1) DNA sequencing libraries of widely different sizes, and (2) count data that varies more than expected under a Poisson model. We utilize the most popular implementations of this approach currently used in RNA-Seq analysis, namely edgeR [2] and DESeq [3], adapted here for microbiome data. This approach

allows valid comparison across OTUs while substantially improving both power and accuracy in the detection of differential abundance of microbes. We also compare the Gamma-Poisson mixture model performance against a method that models OTU proportions using a zero-inflated gaussian distribution, implemented in a recently-released package called metagenomeSeq [35].

Results




Figure 1. Variance versus mean for OTU counts. Each point in each panel represents a different OTU’s mean/variance estimate for a biological replicate and study. The data in this figure come from the “Global Patterns” survey [36] and the “Long-Term Dietary Patterns” study [37], with results from many more studies included in Supporting Information File S3. (Right) Variance versus mean abundance for rarefied counts. (Left) Common-scale variances and common-scale means, estimated according to Equations 7 and 6 from Anders and Huber [3], implemented in the DESeq package (Supporting Information File SA). The solid gray line denotes the $\sigma^2 = \mu$ case (Poisson; $\phi = 0$). The red curve denotes the fitted variance estimate using DESeq [3], with `method='pooled'`, `sharingMode='fit-only'`, `fitType='local'`. The distribution of library sizes (total counts per sample) from these studies spans several orders of magnitude.

We first demonstrate through a survey of publicly-available empirical microbiome data that the parameters of a NB model, especially ϕ_i , can be adequately estimated among biological replicates in microbiome data (Figure 1), despite a weak assertion to the contrary in White et al [38]. This also demonstrates that overdispersion is present ($\phi > 0$) in virtually all cases, before and after rarefying, as expected. In order to precisely quantify the negative effects of rarefying, and the relative benefits of an appropriate mixture model, we created two microbiome simulation workflows based on repeated subsampling from empirical data organized according to Figure 2. Simulation A represents a hypothetical experiment in which the main goal is to distinguish microbiome samples by distance measures and clustering. Simulation B represents a hypothetical experiment in which the goal is to detect microbes that are differentially abundant between two known classes of samples.

Overdispersion in Microbiome Data

We performed a survey of publicly available microbiome count data, to evaluate the variance-mean relationship for OTUs among sets of biological replicates (Figure 1). In every instance, the variances were larger than could be expected under a Poisson model (overdispersed), especially at larger values of the common-scale mean. By definition, these OTUs are the most abundant, and often receive the greatest interest in many studies. After rarefying, the absolute scales are decreased because of the omitted data, but the variance (increases, stays the same?) and overdispersion is still present (Figure 1, left).

Simulation Strategy

We performed extensive simulations of microbiome data followed by commonly used statistical analysis from the RNA-Seq and microbiome literature. Because the correct answer in every simulation is known, we are able to evaluate the resulting power and accuracy of each statistical method, and thus quantify the improvements one method provides over another in a given set of conditions. Our simulations include two major approaches intended to (1) assess the accuracy of clustering results when differentiating microbiome samples; and (2) detect microbial species (OTUs) that are differentially abundant between




Figure 2. Overview of our simulation strategies. Both clustering (A) and differential abundance (B) simulations are represented. All simulations begin with real microbiome count data from a survey experiment referred to here as “the Global Patterns dataset” [36]. A rectangle with tick marks and index labels represents an abundance count matrix (“OTU table”), while a much thinner rectangle with only OTU tick marks represents a multinomial of OTU counts/proportions. In both simulation designs, the variable m is used to refer to the effect size, but its meaning is different in each simulation. Small stars emphasize a multinomial or sample in which a perturbation (our effect) has been applied.




Figure 3. Clustering accuracy in simulated two-class mixing. The clustering accuracy (vertical axis) that results following different normalization and distance methods, represented by color shading and panel columns, respectively. The horizontal axis is the effect size, which in this context is an “unmixed factor”, the ratio of target to non-target simulated counts between two microbiomes that effectively have no overlapping OTUs (Fecal and Ocean microbiomes in the Global Patterns dataset [36]). Higher values of effect size indicate an easier clustering task. For further details see Methods section and Figure 2. Partitioning around medoids (PAM) was used as the clustering algorithm in all evaluations of accuracy. The solid path lines represent the mean values, with observations at the joints, and with a vertical bar representing one standard deviation above and below each observation.

two classes of microbiome samples. In both simulation types we vary the library and effect sizes across a range of levels that are relevant for recently-published microbiome investigations (Figure 2).

Sample Clustering

In simulations evaluating clustering accuracy, we found that rarefying undermined the performance of downstream clustering methods by discarding samples with small library sizes that nevertheless were accurately clustered by alternative procedures on the same simulated data (Figure 3). The extent to which rarefying procedures performed worse depended on the effect-size (difficulty of the clustering task), the typical library size of the samples in the simulation, and most of all, the choice of threshold for the minimum library size (Figure 4).

We further investigated this dependency on minimum library threshold in additional simulations. We found that samples were trivial to cluster for the largest library sizes using any distance method, even with the threshold set to the smallest sample size in the simulation (no samples discarded, all correctly clustered). However, at more modest sample sizes typical of highly-parallel experimen-

tal designs the optimum choice of library size threshold is less clear. A small threshold implies retaining more samples but with a smaller number of reads (less information) per sample; whereas a larger threshold implies more discarded samples, but with more reads/information in the samples that remain. In our simulations the optimum choice of threshold hovered around the 15th-percentile of sample sizes for most simulations and normalization/distance procedures (Figure 4). Regions within Figure 4 in which all distances have converged to the same negatively-sloped line are regions for which the minimum library threshold completely controls clustering accuracy (all samples not discarded are accurately clustered). Sections to the left of this convergence are regions in which there is a positive or neutral compromise between discarding fewer samples and retaining enough counts per sample for accurate clustering.

Differential Abundance Detection

Our simulations demonstrate improvement in sensitivity and specificity when normalization and subsequent tests are based upon a relevant mixture model (Figure 5). Multiple t-tests with correction for multiple inference did not




Figure 4. Normalization by rarefying only, dependency on library size threshold. Unlike the analytical methods represented in Figure 3, here rarefying is the only normalization method used, and with different values of the minimum library size threshold, indicated as sample-size quantile (horizontal axis). Panel columns, panel rows, and point/line shading indicate median library size, effect size, and distance method applied after rarefying, respectively. A thin guide line demarcates the maximum achievable accuracy (because discarded samples cannot be accurately clustered), $y = 1 - x$.

perform well on this data, whether on rarefied counts or on crude proportions. A direct comparison of the performance of more sophisticated parametric methods applied to both original and rarefied counts demonstrates strong potential of these methods and large improvements if rarefying is not used at all. Information File S1).

In general, the proportion of false positives from tests based on crude proportions or rarefied counts was unacceptably high, and increased with the effect size. This is an undesirable phenomenon in which the increased relative abundance of the true-positive OTUs (the effect) is large enough that the null (unmodified) OTUs appear significantly more abundant in the null samples than in the test samples. This explanation is easily verified by the sign of the test statistics of the false positive OTU abundances, which was uniformly positive (Supporting Information File S3). Importantly, this *side-effect* of a strong differential abundance was observed rarely in edgeR performance results, and was essentially absent in DESeq results – which had a false positive rate near-zero under most conditions and no correlation between false positive rate and effect size (Supporting Information File S1). In most simulations crude proportions outperformed rarefied counts (Figure 5), but also suffered from a higher rate of false positives at larger values of effect size (Supporting




Figure 5. Performance of differential abundance detection with and without rarefying. Performance summarized here by the “Area Under the Curve” (AUC) metric of a Receiver Operator Curve (ROC) [39] (vertical axis). Briefly, the AUC value varies from 0.5 (random) to 1.0 (perfect), and incorporates both sensitivity and specificity. The horizontal axis indicates the effect size, shown as the actual multiplication factor applied to the OTU abundances. Each curve traces the respective normalization method’s mean performance of that panel, with a vertical bar indicating a standard deviation in performance across all replicates and microbiome templates. The right-hand side of the panel rows indicates the median number of reads per sample (left), and the number of samples per simulated experiment (right). Colors indicate the type of normalization applied. The green “Model” color indicates that normalization is incorporated within the model used by the analysis method labeled above the first three panel columns. The right-most panel column, “mt”, are the results using a two-sample Welch t-statistic (unequal variances). All P-values were adjusted for multiple hypotheses using B-H, and a detection significance threshold of 0.05.

Discussion

Historically, the ecological community has favored the use of repeated subsampling without replacement to estimate sequencing/observation coverage and species richness [40]. This non-parametric approach, called *rarefaction*, can be justified for the generation and interpretation of accumulation curves. However, an analysis based upon a single subsampling of the data (*rarefying*) cannot be justified in a statistical framework because it requires the omission of available valid data. Some of the justification for the rarefying procedure appears to originate from microbiome-wide exploratory comparisons for which it was believed that a larger library size also captures more noise in the form of rare species, leading to a depth-dependent increase in both alpha-diversity measures and beta-diversity dissimilarities [21,41], especially UniFrac [42]. As we demonstrate here, it is more data-efficient to model the noise and address extra species using statistical normalization methods based on variance stabilization and robustification methods. Though beyond the scope of this work, a Bayesian approach to species abundance estimation would allow the inclusion of pseudo-counts from a Dirichlet prior that should also substantially decrease this sensitivity.

We enumerate the following statistical costs associated with the rarefying procedure:

1. Rarefied counts represent only a small fraction of the original data, implying an increase in Type-II error (Table 1, Supporting Information File S2).
2. Rarefied counts remain overdispersed relative to a Poisson model, implying an increase in Type-I error. Overdispersion is theoretically expected for counts of this nature, and we unambiguously detected overdispersion in our survey of publicly available microbiome counts (Figure 1). Estimating overdispersion is also more difficult after rarefying because of the lost information (Figure 5). In our simulations, Type-I error was much worse for rarefied counts than original counts (Supplementary Information File S1).
3. Rarefying counts requires an arbitrary selection of a library size minimum threshold that affects down-

stream inference (Figure 4), but for which an optimal value is not known for new empirical data.

4. The random aspect of subsampling is unnecessary and adds artificial uncertainty (Supporting Information File S3, minimal example, bottom). Subsampling could be achieved instead by rounding the expected value of each count in the new smaller library size ($K_{ij} s_{min}/s_j$), avoiding the additional sampling error as well as the often-ignored need to record/publish the random seed and repeat the random step [21].

Microbiome Sample Comparisons

The costs listed above may be tolerable for experiments in which the the primary goal is to interpret distances between microbiome samples — such as clustering, principle coordinate analysis, multivariate regression [43], etc. — provided that the effect-size(s) distinguishing pattern(s) of interest or the original library sizes are large enough to compensate for the lost data. For novel or subtle effects, it is unknown if either the minimum library or effect sizes are large enough to adequately compensate. These sizes tolerating rarefied counts were evident in the right-hand side of the plots in Figure 3, especially the larger library sizes in the bottom panels. Even in these large-size scenarios there remains a practical cost of rarefying, because most or all discarded samples would have been accurately clustered were they not discarded (Figure 4). This latter point might also be tolerable if there is also an excess of biological replicates. However, in complex experimental settings with subtle effects or a restriction on library sizes, the cost of rarefying should not be considered tolerable. Furthermore, clustering on rarefied counts was matched or outperformed by clustering on sample proportions, particularly when Bray-Curtis or weighted-UniFrac was used as distance (Figure 3).

Microbial Differential Abundance

In clinical settings and other hypothesis-driven experiments, we are typically interested in detecting differential abundance of species/OTUs between two or more sample *classes*. In this setting we find that the costs of rarefying are substantial and intolerable in essentially all sce-

narios. Both rarefied counts and sample proportions result in an unacceptably high rate of false positive OTUs. As we described theoretically in the introduction, this is explained by differences among biological replicates that manifest as overdispersion, leading to a subsequent underestimate of the true variance if a relevant mixture model is not used. We detected overdispersion among biological replicates in all publicly available microbiome count datasets that we surveyed (Figure 1). Failure to account for this overdispersion – by using crude proportions or rarefied counts – results in a systematic bias that increases the Type-I error rate even after correcting for multiple-hypotheses (e.g. Benjamini-Hochberg [44]). In other words, we predict that many previously reported differentially abundant OTUs are false positives attributable to a noise model that underestimates uncertainty.

In our simulations this propensity for Type-I error *increased* with the effect size, e.g. the fold-change in OTU abundance among the true-positive OTUs. For rarefied counts, we also detected a simultaneous increase in Type-II error attributable to the forfeited data (Supporting Information File S2), consistent with the loss of power described in the Introduction’s minimal example (see Table 1). It may be tempting to imagine that the increased variance estimate due to rarefying could be counterbalanced by the variance underestimate that results from omitting a relevant mixture model. However, such a scenario constitutes an unlikely special case, and false positives will not compensate for the false negatives in general. In our simulations both Type-I and Type-II error increased for rarefied counts (Figure 5).

Fortunately, we have demonstrated that strongly-performing alternative methods for normalization and inference are already available. In particular, an analysis that models counts with the Negative Binomial implemented in DESeq [3] was able to accurately and specifically detect differential abundance over the full range of effect sizes, replicate numbers, and library sizes that we simulated (Figures 5). DESeq-based analyses are routinely applied to more complex tests and experimental designs using the generalized linear model interface in R [45], and so are not limited to a simple two-class design.

Based on our simulation results and the widely enjoyed success for highly similar RNA-Seq data, we recommend using DESeq to perform analysis of differen-

tial abundance in microbiome experiments. It should be noted that we did not comprehensively explore all available RNA-Seq analysis methods, which is an active area of research. Comparisons of many of these methods on empirical [46, 47] and simulated [15, 48, 49] data find consistently effective performance for detection of differential expression. One minor exception is an increased Type-I error for edgeR compared to later methods [46], which was also detected in our results relative to DESeq (Supplementary Information File S1). Generally speaking, the reported performance improvements between these methods are incremental relative to the large gains attributable to applying a relevant mixture model of the noise with shared-strength across OTUs (features). However, some of these alternatives from the RNA-Seq community may outperform DESeq on microbiome data meeting special conditions, for example a large proportion of true positives and sufficient replicates [50], small sample sizes [15], or extreme values [51].

Although we did not explore the topic in the simulations here described, a procedure for further improving differential expression detection performance, called *Independent Filtering* [52], theoretically applies to microbial differential abundance as well. Some heuristics for filtering low-abundance OTUs are already described in the documentation of various microbiome analysis workflows [26, 27], and in many cases these are a form of Independent Filtering. More effort is needed to optimize Independent Filtering for differential abundance detection, and rigorously define the theoretical basis and heuristics applicable to microbiome data. Ideally a formal application of Independent Filtering of OTUs would replace the current *ad hoc* approach, which includes a troubling amount of flexibility, poor justification, and the opportunity to introduce bias.

Implications

Our results have substantial implications for past and future microbiome analyses, particularly regarding the interpretation of differential abundance. Most microbiome studies utilizing high-throughput DNA sequencing to acquire culture-independent counts of species/OTUs have used either proportions or rarefied counts to address widely varying library sizes. The theoretical and simulated results presented here suggest that findings of dif-

ferential abundance based on rarefied counts or proportions are biased toward false positives, and might warrant re-evaluation. Current and future investigations into microbial differential abundance should avoid using rarefied counts. Instead, uncertainty should be modeled using a hierarchical mixture model, such as the Poisson-Gamma or Binomial-Beta models, and normalization should be done using the relevant variance-stabilizing transformations. This can easily be put into practice using powerful implementations in R, like edgeR and DESeq, that performed well on our simulated microbiome data. We have provided convenient wrappers for edgeR and DESeq that are tailored for microbiome count data, and these wrappers are included in the most recent release of the phyloseq package [53] with corresponding tutorials. We have also provided the complete code and documentation necessary to exactly reproduce the simulations, analyses, surveys, and examples shown here, including all figures (Supplementary Information File S3). This example of fully reproducible research can and should be applied to future publication of microbiome analyses [54–56].

Materials and Methods

We have included in Supporting Information File S3 the complete source code for computing the survey, simulations, normalizations, and performance assessments described in this article. Where applicable, this code includes the RNG seed so that the simulations and random resampling procedures can be reproduced *exactly*. Interested investigators can inspect and modify this code, change the random seed and other parameters, and observe the results (including figures). For ease of inspection, we have authored the source code in *R flavored markdown* [57], through which we have generated HTML5 files for each simulation that include our extensive comments interleaved with code and results. Our simulation output can be optionally-modified and re-executed using the `knit2html` function in the `knitr` package. This function will take the location of the simulation source files as input, evaluate its R code in sequence, generate graphics and markdown, and produce the complete HTML5 output file that can be viewed in any modern web browser. These simulations, analyses, and graphics rely upon the `cluster` [58], `foreach` [59], `gg-`

`plot2` [60], `phyloseq` [53], `plyr` [61], `reshape2` [62], and `ROCR` [39] R packages; in addition to the `DESeq` [3], `edgeR` [2], and `PoiClaClu` [63] R packages for RNA-Seq data, and tools available in the standard R distribution [64]. The Global Patterns [36] dataset included in `phyloseq` was used as empirical microbiome template data. The code to perform the survey and generate Figure 1 is also included as a R Markdown source file in Supporting Information File S3, and includes the code to acquire the data using the `phyloseq` interface to the `microbio.me/qiime` server.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the developers of the open source packages leveraged here for improved insights into microbiome data, in particular Gordon Smyth and his group for `edgeR` [2], to Mihail Pop and his team for metagenome-Seq [35] and Wolfgang Huber and his team for `DESeq` and `DESeq2` [3]; whose useful documentation and continued support have been invaluable. The Bioconductor and R teams [64, 65] have provided valuable support for our development and release of code related to microbiome analysis in R. We would also like to thank Rob Knight and his lab for QIIME [26], which has drastically decreased the time required to get from raw phylogenetic sequence data to OTU counts. Hadley Wickham created and continues to support the `ggplot2` [60] and `reshape` [62]/`plyr` [61] packages that have proven useful for graphical representation and manipulation of data, respectively. RStudio and GitHub have provided immensely useful and free applications that were used in the respective development and versioning of the source code published with this manuscript.

This work was funded by NIH R01 grant GM086884 to SPH.

References

- [1] Robinson MD, Smyth GK (2007) Moderated statistical tests for assessing differences in tag abundance. *Bioinformatics* (Oxford, England) 23: 2881–2887.
- [2] Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK (2009) edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* (Oxford, England) 26: 139–140.
- [3] Anders S, Huber W (2010) Differential expression analysis for sequence count data. *Genome biology* 11: R106.
- [4] Di Bella JM, Bao Y, Gloor GB, Burton JP, Reid G (2013) High throughput sequencing methods and analysis for microbiome research. *Journal of microbiological methods* .
- [5] Segata N, Boernigen D, Tickle TL, Morgan XC, Garrett WS, et al. (2013) Computational meta’omics for microbial community studies. *Molecular systems biology* 9: 666.
- [6] Koren O, Knights D, González A, Waldron L, Segata N, et al. (2013) A guide to enterotypes across the human body: meta-analysis of microbial community structures in human microbiome datasets. *PLoS computational biology* 9: e1002863.
- [7] Shendure J, Lieberman Aiden E (2012) The expanding scope of DNA sequencing. *Nature biotechnology* 30: 1084–1094.
- [8] Shendure J, Ji H (2008) Next-generation DNA sequencing. *Nature biotechnology* 26: 1135–1145.
- [9] Mortazavi A, Williams BA, McCue K, Schaeffer L, Wold B (2008) Mapping and quantifying mammalian transcriptomes by RNA-Seq. *Nature methods* 5: 621–628.
- [10] Allison DB, Cui X, Page GP, Sabripour M (2006) Microarray Data Analysis: from Disarray to Consolidation and Consensus. *Nat Rev Genet* 7: 55–65.
- [11] Marioni JC, Mason CE, Mane SM, Stephens M, Gilad Y (2008) Rna-seq: an assessment of technical reproducibility and comparison with gene expression arrays. *Genome research* 18: 1509–1517.
- [12] Lu J, Tomfohr JK, Kepler TB (2005) Identifying differential expression in multiple SAGE libraries: an overdispersed log-linear model approach. *BMC Bioinformatics* 6: 165.
- [13] Robinson MD, Smyth GK (2007) Small-sample estimation of negative binomial dispersion, with applications to SAGE data. *Biostatistics* (Oxford, England) 9: 321–332.
- [14] Cameron AC, Trivedi P (2013) Regression analysis of count data .
- [15] Yu D, Huber W, Vitek O (2013) Shrinkage estimation of dispersion in Negative Binomial models for RNA-seq experiments with small sample size. *Bioinformatics* (Oxford, England) 29: 1275–1282.
- [16] Pace NR (1997) A molecular view of microbial diversity and the biosphere. *Science* 276: 734–740.
- [17] Wilson KH, Wilson WJ, Radosevich JL, DeSantis TZ, Viswanathan VS, et al. (2002) High-Density Microarray of Small-Subunit Ribosomal DNA Probes. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 68: 2535–2541.
- [18] Huse SM, Dethlefsen L, Huber JA, Mark Welch D, Welch DM, et al. (2008) Exploring microbial diversity and taxonomy using SSU rRNA hypervariable tag sequencing. *PLoS genetics* 4: e1000255.
- [19] Riesenfeld CS, Schloss PD, Handelsman J (2004) Metagenomics: genomic analysis of microbial communities. *Annu Rev Genet* 38: 525–552.
- [20] Lozupone C, Knight R (2005) UniFrac: a new phylogenetic method for comparing microbial communities. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71: 8228–8235.
- [21] Lozupone C, Lladser ME, Knights D, Stombaugh J, Knight R (2010) UniFrac: an effective distance metric for microbial community comparison. *The ISME Journal* .
- [22] Hamady M, Walker JJ, Harris JK, Gold NJ, Knight R (2008) Error-correcting barcoded primers for pyrosequencing hundreds of samples in multiplex. *Nature Methods* 5: 235–237.

- [23] Liu Z, DeSantis TZ, Andersen GL, Knight R (2008) Accurate taxonomy assignments from 16S rRNA sequences produced by highly parallel pyrosequencers. *Nucleic Acids Research* 36: e120.
- [24] Hamady M, Lozupone C, Knight R (2009) Fast unifracs: facilitating high-throughput phylogenetic analyses of microbial communities including analysis of pyrosequencing and phylochip data. *The ISME Journal* .
- [25] Yatsunenkov T, Rey FE, Manary MJ, Trehan I, Dominguez-Bello MG, et al. (2012) Human gut microbiome viewed across age and geography. *Nature* 486: 222–227.
- [26] Caporaso J, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J, Bittinger K, Bushman F, et al. (2010) QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nature methods* 7: 335–336.
- [27] Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, et al. (2009) Introducing mothur: Open-Source, Platform-Independent, Community-Supported Software for Describing and Comparing Microbial Communities. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 75: 7537–7541.
- [28] Gilbert JA, Field D, Swift P, Newbold L, Oliver A, et al. (2009) The seasonal structure of microbial communities in the Western English Channel. *Environmental Microbiology* 11: 3132–3139.
- [29] Charlson ES, Chen J, Custers-Allen R, Bittinger K, Li H, et al. (2010) Disordered microbial communities in the upper respiratory tract of cigarette smokers. *PLoS ONE* 5: e15216.
- [30] Price LB, Liu CM, Johnson KE, Aziz M, Lau MK, et al. (2010) The effects of circumcision on the penis microbiome. *PLoS ONE* 5: e8422.
- [31] Kembel SW, Jones E, Kline J, Northcutt D, Stenson J, et al. (2012) Architectural design influences the diversity and structure of the built environment microbiome. *The ISME Journal* 6: 1469–1479.
- [32] Flores GE, Bates ST, Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Leff JW, et al. (2013) Diversity, distribution and sources of bacteria in residential kitchens. *Environmental Microbiology* 15: 588–596.
- [33] Kang DW, Park JG, Ilhan ZE, Wallstrom G, Labaer J, et al. (2013) Reduced incidence of prevotella and other fermenters in intestinal microflora of autistic children. *PLoS ONE* 8: e68322.
- [34] Segata N, Haake SK, Mannon P, Lemon KP, Waldron L, et al. (2012) Composition of the adult digestive tract bacterial microbiome based on seven mouth surfaces, tonsils, throat and stool samples. *Genome biology* 13: R42.
- [35] Paulson JN, Stine OC, Bravo HC, Pop M (2013) Robust statistical methods for differential abundance analysis of marker gene survey data in submission.
- [36] Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters WA, Berg-Lyons D, Lozupone CA, et al. (2011) Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of sequences per sample. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108: 4516–4522.
- [37] Wu GD, Chen J, Hoffmann C, Bittinger K, Chen YY, et al. (2011) Linking long-term dietary patterns with gut microbial enterotypes. *Science* 334: 105–108.
- [38] White JR, Nagarajan N, Pop M (2009) Statistical methods for detecting differentially abundant features in clinical metagenomic samples. *PLoS computational biology* 5: e1000352.
- [39] Sing T, Sander O, Beerenwinkel N, Lengauer T (2005) ROCr: visualizing classifier performance in R. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 21: 3940–3941.
- [40] Sanders HL (1968) Marine benthic diversity: A comparative study. *The American Naturalist* 102: pp. 243–282.
- [41] Chao A, Chazdon RL, Colwell RK, Shen TJ (2005) A new statistical approach for assessing similarity of species composition with incidence and abundance data - Chao - 2004 - *Ecology Letters* - Wiley Online Library. *Ecology Letters* .

- [42] Schloss PD (2008) Evaluating different approaches that test whether microbial communities have the same structure. *The ISME Journal* 2: 265–275.
- [43] Zapala MA, Schork NJ (2006) Multivariate regression analysis of distance matrices for testing associations between gene expression patterns and related variables. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103: 19430–19435.
- [44] Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)* 57: 289–300.
- [45] Hastie TJ, Pregibon D (1992) Generalized linear models. In: Chambers JM, Hastie TJ, editors, *Statistical Models in S*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, chapter 6.
- [46] Nookaew I, Papini M, Pornputtapong N, Scalcinati G, Fagerberg L, et al. (2012) A comprehensive comparison of RNA-Seq-based transcriptome analysis from reads to differential gene expression and cross-comparison with microarrays: a case study in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Nucleic Acids Research* 40: 10084–10097.
- [47] Bullard J, Purdom E, Hansen K, Dudoit S (2010) Evaluation of statistical methods for normalization and differential expression in mrna-seq experiments. *BMC bioinformatics* 11: 94.
- [48] Sun J, Nishiyama T, Shimizu K, Kadota K (2013) TCC: an R package for comparing tag count data with robust normalization strategies. *BMC Bioinformatics* 14: 219.
- [49] Sonesson C, Delorenzi M (2013) A comparison of methods for differential expression analysis of RNA-seq data. *BMC Bioinformatics* 14: 91.
- [50] Hardcastle TJ, Kelly KA (2010) baySeq: empirical Bayesian methods for identifying differential expression in sequence count data. *BMC Bioinformatics* 11: 422.
- [51] Ozer HG, Parvin JD, Huang K (2012) DFI: gene feature discovery in RNA-seq experiments from multiple sources. *BMC genomics* 13 Suppl 8: S11.
- [52] Bourgon R, Gentleman R, Huber W (2010) Independent filtering increases detection power for high-throughput experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 107: 9546–9551.
- [53] McMurdie PJ, Holmes S (2013) phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS ONE* 8: e61217.
- [54] Gentleman R, Temple Lang D (2004) Statistical analyses and reproducible research. *Bioconductor Project Working Papers* : 2.
- [55] Peng RD (2011) Reproducible research in computational science. *Science* 334: 1226-1227.
- [56] Donoho DL (2010) An invitation to reproducible computational research. *Biostatistics (Oxford, England)* 11: 385–388.
- [57] Allaire J, Horner J, Marti V, Porte N The markdown package: Markdown rendering for R. Accessed 2013 March 22. URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=markdown>. R package version 0.5.4.
- [58] Maechler M, Rousseeuw P, Struyf A, Hubert M, Hornik K (2013) cluster: Cluster Analysis Basics and Extensions. R package version 1.14.4 — For new features, see the 'Changelog' file (in the package source).
- [59] Analytics R (2011) foreach: Foreach looping construct for R. R package version 1.3.2.
- [60] Wickham H (2009) ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer New York.
- [61] Wickham H (2011) The split-apply-combine strategy for data analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software* 40: 1–29.
- [62] Wickham H (2007) Reshaping data with the reshape package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 21: 1–20.

- [63] Witten DM (2011) Classification and clustering of sequencing data using a Poisson model. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 5: 2493–2518.
- [64] R Development Core Team (2011) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- [65] Gentleman RC, Carey VJ, Bates DM, Bolstad B, Dettling M, et al. (2004) Bioconductor: open software development for computational biology and bioinformatics. *Genome Biology* 5: R80.
- [66] Lu J, Tomfohr J, Kepler T (2005) Identifying differential expression in multiple sage libraries: an overdispersed log-linear model approach. *BMC bioinformatics* 6: 165.
- [67] Rice JA (2007) *Mathematical statistics and data analysis*. Cengage Learning.
- [68] Anscombe FJ (1948) The transformation of poisson, binomial and negative-binomial data. *Biometrika* 35: 246–254.
- [69] Berger JO (1985) *Statistical decision theory and Bayesian analysis*. Springer.
- [70] Zhou YH, Xia K, Wright FA (2011) A powerful and flexible approach to the analysis of RNA sequence count data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 27: 2672–2678.

A Mathematical Supplement

In this supplementary material we go over some of the statistical details pertaining to the use of hierarchical mixture models such as the Negative Binomial and the Beta Binomial, which are appropriate for addressing additional sources of variability inherent to microbiome experimental data, while still retaining statistical power. We have concentrated our comparison efforts on the Gamma-Poisson mixture model as some authors [66] have remarked that this approach seems to be the most statistically robust approach in the sense that the presence of outliers and model misspecification does not over-perturb the results. We show how a Negative Binomial distribution can occur in different ways leading to different parameterizations. We then show that there are transformations we can apply to these random variables, such that the transformed data have a variance which is much closer to constant than the original. These *variance stabilizing transformations* lead to more efficient estimators and give better decision rules than those obtained via the normalization-through-subsampling method known as *rarefying*.

Two parameterizations of the negative binomial

In classical probability, the negative binomial is often introduced as the distribution of the number of successes in a sequence of Bernoulli trials with probability of success p before the number r failures occur. Thus with the two parameters r and p , the probability distribution for the negative binomial is given as

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim NB(r; p) \\ P(X = k) &= \binom{k+r-1}{k} (1-p)^r p^k \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(k+r)}{k! \Gamma(r)} (1-p)^r p^k \end{aligned}$$

The mean of the distribution is $m = \frac{pr}{1-p}$ and the variance $Var(X) = \frac{pr}{(1-p)^2}$. Sometimes the distribution is given a different parameterization which we use here. This takes as the two parameters: the mean m and $r = \frac{1-p}{p}m$, then

the probability mass distribution is rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim NB(m; r) \\ P(X = k) &= \binom{k+r-1}{k} \left(\frac{r}{r+m}\right)^r \left(\frac{m}{r+m}\right)^k \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(k+r)}{k! \Gamma(r)} \left(\frac{r}{r+m}\right)^r \left(\frac{m}{r+m}\right)^k \end{aligned}$$

The variance is $Var(X) = \frac{m(m+r)}{r} = m + \frac{m^2}{r}$, we will also use $\phi = \frac{1}{r}$ and call this the overdispersion parameter, giving $Var(X) = m + \phi m^2$. When $\phi = 0$ the distribution of X will be Poisson(m). This is the (mean= m , overdispersion= ϕ) parametrization we will use from now on.

Negative Binomial as a hierarchical mixture for read counts

In biological contexts such as RNA-seq and microbial count data the negative binomial distribution arises as a hierarchical mixture of Poisson distributions. This is due to the fact that if we had technical replicates with the same read counts, we would see Poisson variation with a given mean. However, the variation among biological replicates and library size differences both introduce additional sources of variability.

To address this, we take the means of the Poisson variables to be random variables themselves having a Gamma distribution with (hyper)parameters shape r and scale $p/(1-p)$. We first generate a random mean, λ , for the Poisson from the Gamma, and then a random variable, k , from the Poisson(λ). The marginal distribution is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(X = k) &= \int_0^\infty P_{O\lambda}(k) \times \gamma_{(r, \frac{p}{1-p})} d\lambda \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda} \times \frac{\lambda^{r-1} e^{-\lambda \frac{1-p}{p}}}{(\frac{p}{1-p})^r \Gamma(r)} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{(1-p)^r}{p^r k! \Gamma(r)} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{r+k-1} e^{-\lambda/p} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{(1-p)^r}{p^r k! \Gamma(r)} p^{r+k} \Gamma(r+k) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(r+k)}{k! \Gamma(r)} p^k (1-p)^r \end{aligned}$$

Variance Stabilization

Statisticians usually prefer to deal with errors across samples or in regression situations which are independent and identically distributed. In particular there is a strong preference for homoscedasticity (equal variances) across all the noise levels. This is not the case when we have unequal sample sizes and variations in the accuracy across instruments. A standard way of dealing with heteroscedastic noise is to try to decompose the sources of heterogeneity and apply transformations that make the noise variance almost constant. These are called *variance stabilizing transformations*.

Take for instance different Poisson variables with mean μ_i . Their variances are all different if the μ_i are different. However, if the square root transformation is applied to each of the variables, then the transformed variables will have approximately constant variance¹. More generally, choosing a transformation that makes the variance constant is done by using a Taylor series expansion, called the delta method. We will not give the complete development of variance stabilization in the context of mixtures but point the interested reader to the standard texts in Theoretical statistics such as [67] and one of the original articles on variance stabilization [68]. Anscombe showed that there are several transformations that stabilize the variance of the Negative Binomial depending on the values of the parameters m and r , where $r = \frac{1}{\phi}$, sometimes called the *exponent* of the Negative Binomial. For large m and constant $m\phi$, the transformation

$$\sinh^{-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{\phi} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{x + \frac{3}{8}}{\frac{1}{\phi} - \frac{3}{4}}}$$

gives a constant variance around $\frac{1}{4}$. Whereas for m large and $\frac{1}{\phi}$ not substantially increasing, the following simpler transformation is preferable

$$\log\left(x + \frac{1}{2\phi}\right)$$

These two transformations are actually used in what is often known as a *generalized logarithmic* transformation applied in microarray variance stabilizing transformations and RNA-seq normalization [3].

¹Actually if we take the transformation $x \rightarrow 2\sqrt{x}$ we obtain a variance approximately equal to 1.

Modeling read counts

If we have technical replicates with the same number of reads s_j , we expect to see Poisson variation with mean $\mu = s_j u_i$, for each taxa i whose incidence proportion we denote by u_i . Thus the number of reads for the sample j and taxa i would be

$$K_{ij} \sim \text{Poisson}(s_j u_i)$$

We use the notational convention that lower case letters designate fixed or observed values whereas upper case letters designate random variables.

For biological replicates within the same group – such as treatment or control groups or the same environments – the proportions u_i will be variable between samples. A flexible model that works well for this variability is the Gamma distribution, as it has two parameters and can be adapted to many distributional shapes. Call the two parameters r_i and $\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}$. So that U_{ij} the proportion of taxa i in sample j is distributed according to $\text{Gamma}(r_i, \frac{p_i}{1-p_i})$. Thus we obtain that the read counts K_{ij} have a Poisson-Gamma mixture of different Poisson variables. As shown above we can use the Negative Binomial with parameters ($m = u_i s_j$) and ϕ_i as a satisfactory model of the variability.

Now we can add to this model the fact that the samples belong to different conditions such as treatment and control or different environments. This is done by separately estimating the values of the parameters, for each of the different biological replicate conditions/classes. We will use the index c for the different conditions, we then have the counts for the taxa i and sample j in condition c having a Negative Binomial distribution with $m_c = u_{ic} s_j$ and ϕ_{ic} so that the variance is written

$$u_{ic} s_j + \phi_{ic} s_j^2 u_{ic}^2 \quad (2)$$

We can estimate the parameters u_{ic} and ϕ_{ic} from the data for each OTU and sample condition. This is usually best accomplished by leveraging information across OTUs – taking advantage of a systematic relationship between the observed variance and mean – to obtain high quality shrunken estimates. The end result provides a variance stabilizing transformation of the data that allows a statistically efficient comparisons between conditions. This application of a hierarchical mixture model is very


similar to the random effects models used in the context of analysis of variance. A very complete comparison of this particular choice of Gamma-Poisson mixture to the Beta-Binomial and nonparametric approaches can be found in [15].


By comparison, the procedures involving a systematic downsampling (rarefying) are inadmissible in the statistical sense, because there is another procedure that dominates it using a mean squared error loss function. With a Bayesian formalism we can show that the hierarchical Bayes model gives a Bayes rule that is admissible [69].

Other mixture models

If instead of modeling the read counts one uses the proportions as the random variables, with differing variances due to different library sizes, the Beta-Binomial model is the standard approach. This has also been used for RNA-seq data [70] and the package `metaStats` [38] uses this model although they don't use variance stabilizing transformations of the data.

Supporting Information Legends





Supporting Information File S2 Power results for detection of differentially abundant microbes.

Supporting Information File S3 A **zip file with all Rmd source code and HTML output.**