EPISTASIS AND ENTROPY

KRISTINA CRONA

ABSTRACT. Epistasis is a key concept in the theory of adaptation. Indicators of epistasis are of interest for large system where systematic fitness measurements may not be possible. Some recent approaches depend on information theory. We show that considering shared entropy for pairs of loci can be misleading. The reason is that shared entropy does not imply epistasis for the pair. This observation holds true also in the absence of higher order epistasis. We suggest a refined approach for identifying pairwise interactions using entropy.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, American University, Washington, DC

1. INTRODUCTION

Epistasis tends to be prevalent for antimicrobial drug resistance mutations. Sign epistasis means that the sign of the effect of a mutation, whether good or bad, depends on background Weinreich et al. (2005). Sign epistasis may be important for treatment strategies, both for antibiotic resistance and HIV drug resistance (Goulart et al., 2013; Desper et al., 1999; Beerenwinkel et al., 2007 a). For instance, there are sometimes constraints on the order in which resistance mutations occur. A particular resistance mutation may only be selected for in the presence of another resistance mutation. It is important to identify such constraints. A first question is how one can identify pairwise epistasis in a large system. We will discuss entropy (Shannon, 1948) and epistasis. Information theory has been used for HIV drug resistance mutations (Gupta and Adami, 2015) and more extensively for analyzing human genetic disease (e.g. Dong et al., 2008; Kang et al., 2008; Streiloff et al., 2010).

2. RESULTS

It is well established that genotypes are expected to be in equilibrium proportions if there is no epistasis in the system, i.e., if fitness is multiplicative. For instance, if two rare mutations have frequencies p and q, then the frequency of the genotype combining the two mutations is expected to be close to pq. This statement holds true regardless if recombination occurs or not (Otto and Lenormand, 2002).

We will explore the relation between entropy and epistasis for a system with constraints as described in the introduction.

Consider a 3-locus balletic system where a mutation at the first locus confers resistance, whereas mutations at the second and third loci are only selected for in the presence of the first mutation (otherwise they are deleterious). We represent the case with a fitness graph (Crona et al., 2013) (Figure 1). As conventional, 000 denotes the wild-type.



FIGURE 1. systems

For instance, one obtains a system with the fitness graph as in Figure 1 for the log-fitness values

 $w_{000} = 0, \quad w_{100} = 0.09531018 \quad w_{010} = -0.09531018 \quad w_{001} = -0.09531018$ $w_{110} = 0.1906204 \quad w_{101} = 0.1906204, \quad w_{011} = -0.1906204 \quad w_{111} = 0.2859305$

The two-way interactions can be described by the following sign pattern.

$$\begin{split} & w_{000} - w_{010} - w_{100} + w_{110} > 0 \\ & w_{001} - w_{011} - w_{101} + w_{111} > 0 \\ & w_{000} - w_{001} - w_{100} + w_{101} > 0 \\ & w_{010} - w_{011} - w_{110} + w_{111} > 0 \\ & w_{000} - w_{001} - w_{010} + w_{011} = 0 \\ & w_{100} - w_{101} - w_{110} + w_{111} = 0 \end{split}$$

The four inequalities express that there is positive epistasis for the first and second loci, as well as for the first and third loci. The two equalities show that there is no epistasis for the second and third loci. The total 3-way epistasis is zero as well,

$$w_{111} - w_{110} - w_{101} - w_{011} + w_{100} + w_{010} + w_{001} - w_{000} = 0.$$

For more background on gene interactions, see Beerenwinkel et al. (2007 b). We will compare epistasis and entropy. The starting point for adaptation is 000, and we use standard assumptions for the evolutionary process in an infinite population. The genotypes 010,001 and 011 being rare, we approximate their proportions to zero. By assumption, we expect equilibrium proportions for the subsystem 100, 110, 101, 111. Indeed, there is no epistasis for this subsystem.

Let p_{1**} be the proportion of genotypes with a substitution at the first locus, and p_{11*} the proportion with mutations at both the first and second loci at some point in time. By assumption, the expected proportion of each genotype is

 $\begin{array}{l} 000:1-p_{1**}, \\ 111:p_{1**}p_{11*}^2 \end{array} \quad 100:p_{1**}\left(1-p_{11*}\right)^2 \quad 110:p_{1**}p_{11*}(1-p_{11*}) \quad 101:p_{1**}p_{11*}(1-p_{11*}), \\ \end{array}$

For instance, suppose that $p_{1**} = 0.1$ at some point in time. The value of p_{11*} at that time will depend on mutation rate and population size. For some choice of parameters, one would get $p_{11*} = 0.1$ and consequently the proportions

 $000: 0.9, \quad 100: 0.081, \quad 110: 0.009, \quad 101: 0.009, \quad 111: 0.001.$

Consider the entropies for the second and third loci, H(2) and H(3), the joint entropy H(2,3), and the shared entropy I(2:3) (see the method section).

$$H(2) = H(3) = -0.99 \log 0.09 - 0.01 \log 0.01 = 0.08079314$$
$$H(2,3) = -0.981 \log 0.981 - 0.009 \log 0.009$$
$$-0.009 \log 0.009 - 0.001 \log 0.001$$
$$= 0.1563824$$

$$I(2:3) = H(2) + H(3) - H(2,3) = 0.002145886$$

The shared entropy for the second and third loci differs from zero. However, there is no 2-way epistasis for the pair of loci.

By extrapolation, consider an analogous system for *L*-loci. Then L - 1 mutations are selected for only if the first mutation has occurred, but there are no other interactions. We would find shared entropy for $\binom{L}{2}$ pairs of loci, although there is 2-way epistasis for L - 1 pairs of loci only.

We suggest the following refined approach for identifying pairwise epistasis.

2.1. A refined approach. Suppose that we have identified shared entropy for a particular pair of loci $\{k, l\}$. Let $S_1^{k,l}$ denote the set of loci such that the shared entropy

$$I(k:i) \neq 0$$
 or $I(l:i) \neq 0$

Let $S_2^{k,l}$ denote the set of loci with non-zero shared entropy for some locus in S_1 , and so forth. Let $S^{k,l} = \bigcup S_i \setminus \{k, l\}$.

Let v denote one of the $2^{|S|}$ possible states for S, and consider the subsystem of genotypes determined by v. If the shared entropy $I^v(k : l) \neq 0$, this is an indicator of epistasis for $\{l, k\}$, on the genetic background defined by v. We have reduced the problem to analyzing 2-loci systems.

KRISTINA CRONA

We can apply the refined approach for the second and third loci in our example. Then

$$I(2:3) \neq 0, \quad S = \{1\}, \quad I^{(0)}(2:3) = I^{(1)}(2:3) = 0.$$

One concludes that there is no epistasis for the second and third loci.

3. DISCUSSION

We have demonstrated that shared entropy for two loci does not imply epistasis for the pair. This observation holds true also in the absence of 3-way epistasis in a single environment. Entropy based approaches to epistasis are coarse. We have suggested a refined approach, which filters out cases where shared entropy depends on states at other loci.

There are obviously other reasons for caution in interpretations of entropy for drug resistance mutations. Different drugs constitute different environments. Some resistance mutations may be correlated if they are beneficial in the presence of a particular drug, but not for other drugs. In such cases entropy would not not imply epistasis.

Our results show that observations on entropy and epistasis based on 2-locus systems can be misleading for general systems. From a theoretical point of view, a better understanding of large systems would be useful for handling drug resistance data.

4. METHODS

Let x and y be discrete random variables with states x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 . Let p_i denote the frequency of x_i , and p_{ij} the frequency for the combination of x_i and y_j . The entropy (Shannon, 1948) H(x) and the joint entropy H(x, y) are defined as

$$H(x) = -p_1 \log(p_1) - (1 - p_1) \log(1 - p_1)$$
$$H(x, y) = -p_{11} \log p_{11} - p_{12} \log (p_{12})$$
$$-p_{21} \log p_{21} - p_{22} \log (p_{22})$$

The shared entropy is the quantity I(x : y) = H(x) + H(y) - H(x, y). In general $I(x : y) \ge 0$, and the shared information s a measure of dependence.

REFERENCES

- Beerenwinkel, N., Eriksson, N. and Sturmfels, B. (2007). Conjunctive Bayesian networks. *Bernoulli*; 13:893–909.
- Beerenwinkel, N., Pachter, L. and Sturmfels, B. (2007). Epistasis and shapes of fitness landscapes. *Statistica Sinica* 17:1317–1342.
- Crona, K., Greene, D. and Barlow, M. (2013). The peaks and geometry of fitness land-scapes. *J. Theor. Biol.* 317: 1–13.
- Desper, R., Jiang, F., Kallioniemi, O.P., Moch, H., Papadimitriou, C.H. and Schäffer, A.A. (1999). Inferring tree models for oncogenesis from comparative genome hybridization data. *Comput. Biol* 6 37–51.
- Dong, C., Chu, X., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Jin, L. (2008). Exploration of gene-gene interaction effects using entropy-based methods. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* 16: 229-235

- Goulart, C. P., Mentar, M., Crona, K., Jacobs, S. J., Kallmann, M., Hall, B. G., Greene D., Barlow M. (2013). Designing antibiotic cycling strategies by determining and understanding local adaptive landscapes. *PLoS ONE* 8(2): e56040. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0056040.
- Gupta, A. and Adami, C. (2015). Changes in epistatic interactions in the long-term evolution of HIV-1 protease. arXiv:1408.2761.
- Kang G, Yue W, Zhang J, Cui Y, Zuo Y, et al. (2008) An entropy-based approach for testing genetic epistasis underlying complex diseases, J. Theor. Biol. 250
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* vol. 27, pp. 379-423 and 623-656, July and October, 1948.
- Strelioff, C. C., Lenski R. E. and Ofria, C. (2010) J. Theor. Biol. 266 (4), pp. 584-594
- Otto, S. P. and Lenormand, T. (2002). Resolving the paradox of sex and recombination. *Nature Reviews Genetics*; 3:252-261.
- Weinreich, D.M, Watson, R. A. and Chao, L. (2005) Sign epistasis and genetic constraint on evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution*.