

# A Nonparametric Significance Test for Sampled Networks

Andrew Elliott<sup>1,\*</sup>, Elizabeth Leicht<sup>1</sup>, Alan Whitmore<sup>4</sup>, Gesine Reinert<sup>3</sup>, and Felix Reed-Tsochas<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CABDyN Complexity Centre, Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, Park End Street, Oxford OX1 1HP, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>e-Therapeutics plc, 17 Blenheim Office Park, Long Hanborough, OX29 8LN, United Kingdom

\*Correspondence should be addressed to [andrew.elliott@spc.ox.ac.uk](mailto:andrew.elliott@spc.ox.ac.uk)

Monday 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2022

## Abstract

Our work is motivated by an interest in constructing a protein-protein interaction network that captures key features associated with Parkinson's disease. While there is an abundance of subnetwork construction methods available, it is often far from obvious which subnetwork is the most suitable starting point for further investigation. We provide a method to assess whether a subnetwork constructed from a seed list (a list of nodes known to be important in the area of interest) differs significantly from a randomly generated subnetwork.<sup>1</sup> The proposed method uses a Monte Carlo approach. As different seed lists can give rise to the same subnetwork, we control for redundancy by constructing a minimal seed list as the starting point for the significance test. The null model is based on random seed lists of the same length as a minimum seed list that generates the subnetwork; in this random seed list the nodes have (approximately) the same degree distribution as the nodes in the minimum seed list. We use this null model to select subnetworks which deviate significantly from random on an appropriate set of statistics and might capture useful information for a real world protein-protein interaction network.

## 1 Introduction

Network sampling is used in many different fields, such as biology (Lim *et al.* (2006)) and sociology (Bernard *et al.* (2010); Frank and Snijders (1994)). Many studies sample a known network to produce a subnetwork which is believed to be more relevant to their research goals than the initial network such as a subnetwork associated with metabolism. Frequently protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks are sampled to form subnetworks that are associated with the disease or cellular processes of interest e.g. Hwang *et al.* (2008); Lim *et al.* (2006); Gao *et al.* (2011); Goehler *et al.* (2004); Chuang *et al.* (2007); Sharma *et al.* (2015); Ghiassian *et al.* (2015). An advantage of such sampling is that on a small network an in-depth analysis, such as verifying existing links, may be feasible. Network sampling can also reflect empirical limitations such as the availability of partial data for a given network (Bernard *et al.* (2010); Frank and Snijders (1994)), or the exclusion

---

<sup>1</sup>The software and datasets used in this paper are available for download at <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~spet3111/>.

of vertices that cannot be detected (Salganik (2006)), with consequences for measured network statistics (Kossinets *et al.* (2006)).

Subnetwork construction methods are not without their own problems, since they may induce artefacts in the subnetworks that they generate. Even the use of a PPI interactome as a starting point already intrinsically reflects the effects of sampling, since different experimental methods vary in their ability to identify particular interactions. There are also inherent biases in the levels of evidence available for different interactions, and generally PPI networks are known to exhibit high rates of both false positives and false negatives (Ali *et al.* (2011)). Notably there is no gold standard method for constructing a network representing a cellular process, although several techniques have been proposed to achieve this aim. Some studies test interactions between a subset of proteins believed to be important to a disease process experimentally (Lim *et al.* (2006); Goehler *et al.* (2004)). Another approach is to locate proteins present in the same cellular compartment as the process of interest, and add edges between these proteins using a PPI database (Gao *et al.* (2011)). One can also form subnetworks from a larger PPI dataset using a seed list in conjunction with a construction method, e.g. snowball sampling (Martin *et al.* (2010)), path based methods (Berger *et al.* (2007)), Steiner trees (White and Ma'ayan (2007)) or the inclusion of nodes based on significance testing (Ghiassian *et al.* (2015); Sharma *et al.* (2015)). Finally one can also take a network directly from a pathway database e.g. KEGG (Hwang *et al.* (2008)).

The sampling techniques in this paper start from a list of seed nodes and apply what we call a *construction method* to generate a subnetwork from these seed nodes. Seed nodes are typically believed to have certain attributes or associations, e.g. proteins implicated in a disease. With the underlying PPI network available, this approach is subtly different from the standard use of these network sampling techniques, namely sampling a large unknown network with the aim of estimating global properties (Frank (1977); Newman (2010); Bernard *et al.* (2010)). The construction methods used in this paper following prior work on biological systems (Martin *et al.* (2010); Shi *et al.* (2014); Berger *et al.* (2007); Li *et al.* (2012)) are as follows: (i) 1-hop snowball sampling; (ii) 2-hop snowball sampling; (iii) all paths up to a given length; (iv) all shortest paths between seed nodes. Snowball sampling has been used in biological systems through easy to use plugins to popular software applications; e.g. the Cytoscape plugin Bisogenet (Martin *et al.* (2010)) and to find hidden populations (e.g. drug users) in Sociology (Frank (1977); Salganik (2006); Bernard *et al.* (2010)). All paths up to a given length has been used in biology through the Genes2Networks web app (Berger *et al.* (2007)). We are not aware of a published software package that uses shortest path sampling, although Li *et al.* (2012) have used shortest path sampling in a study on colorectal cancer. It is important to note that in general the effect of network sampling on network statistics is non-trivial, and only well understood for very limited combinations of sampling methods and underlying networks. For instance, the degree distribution of a network uniformly sampled from a scale free network is not itself scale free (Stumpf *et al.* (2005)). To select good subnetworks, guidance about typical samples, or indeed untypical subnetworks, is required.

Here we provide a method to assess when a given subnetwork differs significantly from randomly generated subnetworks. A subnetwork which differs significantly from a random network could be viewed as containing relevant information, assuming that the comparison with the random network is meaningful. Hence a key question concerns the rules for constructing an appropriate null model, or a correctly randomised subnetwork.

As there is no generally accepted parametric model of PPI networks (Rito *et al.* (2010)), we are unable to construct a general null model based on an ensemble of PPI networks. Instead, our method compares a statistic of interest against that obtained for an ensemble of subnetworks generated from the same underlying network using a set of seed lists which are randomly chosen under certain constraints. Firstly, we match the degree of the seeds with those of the original seed list; by contrast, the popular configuration model would match the degree of all nodes in the subnetwork. Secondly, there is a further feature in our null model, which relates to redundancy

in the seed list. Many different seed lists may give rise to the same subnetwork. Hence given the construction method, we must also control for the construction of the seed list. Some of these seed lists can be constructed by removing nodes from the original seed list so that the subnetwork that is generated from the modified seed list is identical to the original one. The seed nodes that can be removed without changing the subnetwork we refer to as ‘redundant seed nodes’. On this basis we can then construct a meaningful null model using subnetworks generated at random with the same (approximate) degree distribution as the smallest subset of the original seed list which generates the same network (the minimum seed list). We use this null model in a nonparametric significance test for features of sampled networks. Our null model allows us to assess the significance of network features given a construction method, rather than given a construction method and a fixed seed list.

The test is first illustrated using simulated stochastic blockmodel data for a network with two groups. A stochastic block model assigns each node to a group and then places edges between a pair of nodes with a fixed probability based on the node’s groups. We demonstrate that significance under our test is correlated in all but one case with two well known measures: accuracy (a measure of the completeness of sample) and purity (a measure of the ability of the sampling method to select nodes from the correct group). We then compare subnetworks generated by two seed lists related to PD, namely gene data from the OMIM database (Hamosh *et al.* (2005)) and a seed list derived from expression data of a PD cell model (Conn *et al.* (2003)). We find that the networks generated from the expression data seed list under the “shortest path” sampling scheme and under the “Path $\leq 2$ ” sampling scheme have significant results under our null model (although the latter is only partially robust to parameter choice), and therefore may have interesting properties for further analysis for our work on PD.

We demonstrate the effect of redundant seed nodes, first through simulations with randomly selected seed lists. Second, we investigate the effect in our two seed lists related to Parkinson’s disease (PD), finding that redundant seed nodes can have a strong impact on the perceived significance of network statistics. We also demonstrate that our method compares favourably to the configuration model on this class of network sampling problems.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Network Sampling

The methods presented in this paper focus on techniques to form subnetworks using a given seed list, where we use the following three sampling techniques:

1. **Snowball Sampling** includes all nodes that are less than a given graph distance from the nodes in a seed list; an example can be found in Fig. 1A. Depending on the implementation, the subnetwork can include only edges that were involved in the sampling process, or also include additional edges between sampled nodes, which we call cross edges. In this paper we write Snow1 for 1-hop snowball sampling, and Snow2 for 2-hop snowball sampling.
2. **All Paths  $\leq k$**  (abbreviated Paths2, Paths3, Paths4) includes all nodes and edges that are on a path between seed nodes that is less than or equal to  $k$  in length. An example can be found in Fig. 1D.
3. **Shortest Path Sampling** (abbreviated Shortest) includes all shortest paths between all pairs of seed proteins. An illustration can be found in Fig. 1B.

To illustrate the method, and following the approach of Ratmann *et al.* (2009), we use a basket of commonly used network summary statistics, namely assortativity, average degree, clustering




Figure 1: **A** 2-Hop Snowball Sampling Example: The seed list consists of node 1 (circle), node shape represents distance from seed protein square, representing nodes 1 hop from the seed, diamond 2 hops from a seed, triangle 3 hops from a seed. Dashed edges represent cross-edges in a 2-hop snowball sample. The network in (C) represents the unsampled network. **B and D** show the network in C sampled with the ‘All Shortest Paths’ (B) ‘Paths $\leq 2$ ’ (D) respectively. Seed nodes are represented by circles.

coefficient and number of nodes, using the following definitions. Other approaches are also available, see for example Thorne and Stumpf (2012).

- **Assortativity:** The Pearson’s correlation coefficient between the degree of nodes on either side of an edge;
- **Average Degree:** The mean number of edges per node;
- **Average local Clustering Coefficient:** The average of the local clustering coefficient of each node. The local clustering coefficient is defined as the number of triangles a node is involved in divided by the number of possible triangles (i.e. the number of pairs of edges that a node has).
- **Number of Nodes:** The number of nodes in the sampled network.

We choose these summary statistics, as they are commonly used and have low computational complexity. In the case that assortativity is not defined, for example because in the path  $\leq k$  sampling method there are no paths  $\leq k$  between seed nodes, or because all nodes in the sampled network have the same degree, the value of assortativity is set to 0. Similarly, when there are no possible triangles (i.e. no nodes with degree greater than 1), the clustering coefficient is set to 0.

For Path $\leq k$  sampling, when a seed node is not connected to any of the other seed nodes with a path of length less or equal to  $k$ , this seed node is ignored for the calculation of the summary statistics. This choice is made to help interpret comparisons between subnetworks generated by different seed lists.

## 2.2 Network Data

To create our PPI network we use the yeast 2 hybrid (Y2H) experimental results in the BIOGRID database version 3.4.127 (Stark *et al.* (2006); Chatranyamontri *et al.* (2013)). We remove all interactions that do not include a human protein. We then reduce the Y2H BIOGRID network to its largest connected component, i.e. the graph formed from the largest group of nodes for which

there is a path between any pair of nodes. The resulting network has 8,292 nodes, 25,062 edges, a density of 0.00073, and an average local clustering coefficient of 0.045.

## 2.3 Seed Lists

We compare two different seed lists for PD. For the first seed list, which we abbreviate *OMIM*, we assemble a list of genes known to be involved in the disease taken from the OMIM database (Hamosh *et al.* (2005)). We convert the genes to proteins in the BioGrid database using the relations provided in the BioGrid database (Stark *et al.* (2006); Chatranyamontri *et al.* (2013)), resulting in a seed list with 16 proteins, of which 13 are present in our network, which form the OMIM seed list.

We construct the second seed list from differential expression data of 1185 genes in SH-SY5Y cells (a human cell line) before and after treatment with MPP+ (a toxin used as a model for PD) (Conn *et al.* (2003)). In Conn *et al.* (2003) 313 genes were differentially expressed, 48 of which were deemed to be statistically significant. This list includes genes that are up and down regulated by the cell when presented with MPP+. We convert the 48 significant genes to BioGrid gene identifiers using the BioGrid website. There are multiple mappings for some of these genes, resulting in 54 proteins, of which 46 are present in our network and these form the expression seed list.

There is no overlap between the Expression seed list and the OMIM seed list.

## 2.4 Minimum Seed Lists and Redundant Seed Nodes

As noted in the Introduction we define a ‘redundant seed node’ as a node in a seed list that can be removed without changing the resulting subnetwork. For a given seed list we then define the (set of) minimum seed list(s) as the smallest non redundant subset (or set of subsets) of the original seed list which produces the same subnetwork.

As an example consider a triangle with nodes 1, 2 and 3. In 1-hop snowball sampling with a seed list consisting of all nodes, the set of minimum seed lists is  $\{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$ . In contrast, the set of minimum seed lists using the seed list  $\{1, 2\}$  would be  $\{\{1\}, \{2\}\}$ . Note that  $\{3\}$  is not present, as it is not a subset of the original seed list.

Computing the minimum seed list for a given subnetwork by considering all possible seed lists is computationally prohibitive. If we can guarantee that removing seed nodes does not add any previously unseen nodes or edges to the subnetwork (which all tested techniques in this paper satisfy), we can use the procedure below:

1. Remove each seed in turn and check if the number of nodes and edges in the subnetwork do not change. If not, then add the node to the list of redundant seeds.
2. Form a list of the remaining seeds.
3. Define a dummy variable  $L$  and set  $L = 0$
4. For lists of redundant seeds of length  $L$ 
  - (a) Test if sampling with the list of the remaining seeds and the selected redundant seeds produce the same network.
  - (b) Store all seed lists which pass the test.
5. If there are no seed lists which pass the test, set  $L \rightarrow L + 1$  and go to step 4.
6. Return the smallest seed list(s) that produce the same network.

If the above procedure proves to be computationally prohibitive (which was not the case for results presented in this paper), we can reduce the problem to a NP complete problem and use current best known algorithms to solve the problem. In the case of snowball sampling finding the

global minimum seed list reduces to set cover, whereas in the case of the path sampling techniques it reduce to maximal clique finding in a specially defined graph. For the further explanation and the proof of the equivalence and some other optimisations for this problem see Supplementary Information 2.

With our greedy algorithm we cannot guarantee that there is not a smaller seed list that generates the same network that is not a subset of the original seed list. As an advantage our technique is globally applicable and computationally tractable.

## 2.5 The Null Model

For significance testing we would ideally want to use a parametric null model (in this case a parametrised random network ensemble), but currently no suitable parametric null model exists - for discussions on PPI networks see e.g. Ali *et al.* (2011) or Rito *et al.* (2010). As an alternative we create a null model using an ensemble of subnetworks that have been generated from a random seed list of the same size and (approximate) degree sequence as the original seed list. To adjust for redundancy, we use the smallest possible seed list that generates the same subnetwork. This model replicates the effect of the sampling procedure on the network.

**Monte Carlo Test** It is difficult to generalise these analytic results to other measures, and it is not computationally feasible to apply Equation (1) to large networks. Hence, we create a null model by estimating the underlying distribution using an ensemble of networks sampled using random seed lists of the same length and (approximate) degree distribution as the minimum seed list. We then calculate the  $p$ -values for the statistic of interest using a Monte Carlo test. Hence our procedure is as follows:

1. Construct the minimum seed list.
2. Generate many random seed lists with the same length and (approximate) degree distribution as the minimum seed list.
3. Generate a subnetwork for each seed list using the construction method under consideration (as described above).
4. Calculate the test statistic on each of the subnetworks.
5. Compute the  $p$ -value by counting the number of subnetworks with at least as extreme a test statistic as the subnetwork in question.

A  $p$ -value is defined as the probability, under the null model, of getting a value as least as extreme as the observed value. If  $T(X)$  is a test statistic and we observe  $T_{obs}$ , then  $p(T_{obs}) = P(T(X) \leq T_{obs})$ .

Strictly enforcing the degree distribution may introduce problems in finite networks as there is a finite number of nodes of a given degree, possibly leading to a small number of random choices for some seed nodes. In order to alleviate this bias, the nodes are binned by degree from the left, such that each bin contains at least a predefined number of nodes, and the random selection of nodes is performed inside each bin. Stability testing is then performed over different bin sizes (5, 10, 20, 30 and 50) to guarantee that the result is robust to the bin size. Here we show results for bin size 20 only. Results for other bin sizes are in the Supplementary Information 4; the conclusions drawn in this paper are robust to the bin size unless otherwise stated. This is why our method for constructing the null model specifies the (approximate) degree distribution and not the exact degree distribution.

## 2.6 Benchmarking the Approach

To gauge where it is appropriate to use this method, we test when the method successfully selects subnetworks that better represent the network of interest on a simple benchmark network. We construct the benchmark network with known groups from a stochastic blockmodel and then sample from it using a randomly selected seed list. We start with 4000 nodes, and assign the first 2000 nodes to Block 1 and the second 2000 nodes to Block 2. We place an edge between every pair of nodes in the same block with probability  $p = 0.01$ , and we place an edge between every pair of nodes in the different blocks with probability  $q = 0.001$ . We randomly select 20 nodes from Block 1 to form the seed list. We sample a network using this seed list and the construction methods of interest; we record the p-value under the null model proposed in this paper.

We then measure the success of the sampling by looking at the *accuracy* (a measure of the completeness of the sample) and the *purity* (also called precision, a measure of the ability of the sample to select nodes from the correct block) of the classification which would classify all nodes in the sampled subnetwork as Block 1 nodes. We define  $C_1$  as the set of nodes that are selected in the sample and  $C_2$  is the set of nodes that have not been selected.

In this context we define accuracy  $A_{cc}$  as:

$$A_{cc} = \frac{|C_1 \cap \text{Block 1}| + |C_2 \cap \text{Block 2}|}{|C_1| + |C_2|}$$

and purity  $P_{ur}$  as:

$$P_{ur} = \frac{|C_1 \cap \text{Block 1}|}{|C_1|}.$$

Due to computational demands of comparing these experiments over the ensemble, we restrict the minimum bin size to 20. The full results of this analysis are included in Supplementary Information 5. Here we compare seedlists for a fixed method. For an exploratory analysis we can also compare different methods for a fixed seedlist.

## 2.7 Assessing a Null Model Fit

To evaluate the significance of any statistic with respect to the possibility of it being generated by random chance, the result must be compared against a credible null model.

One basic test of the applicability of a null model to a particular random process is to test if the distribution of  $p$ -values of randomly generated results is uniform provided that the null distribution is continuous. We can assess this hypothesis using the following procedure:

1. Create  $M$  random seed lists from a given network.
2. For each seed list create a subnetwork with the given technique.
3. Measure the statistic of interest on the subnetwork.
4. Use the null model of choice to calculate the  $p$ -value for the statistic of interest.

If  $T_{obs}$  is drawn uniformly at random from the distribution of  $T_{obs}$  and if this distribution is continuous, then under the null hypothesis the random variable  $p(T_{obs})$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$ . We can therefore assess the appropriateness of the null model by performing a  $\chi^2$  goodness of fit test on the distribution of  $p$ .

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Analytic Null Model Statistics

The interdependence between seed nodes severely limits the range of sampling techniques and statistics for which we can define tractable analytic expressions for the distribution of the statistic of interest over an ensemble. However, one case where we can derive an analytic solution is the number of nodes in  $n$ -hop snowball sampling with a seed list of size  $s$ . Inspired by Frank (1977), we can derive the mean and variance of the number of nodes ( $X$ ) given the number of seed nodes ( $S$ ) (see Supplementary Information 1):

$$E(X|S=s) = |V| - \sum_{\substack{J \subset V \\ |J|=1}} h(J, s),$$

$$\text{Var}(X|S=s) = \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \alpha \sum_{\substack{J \subset V \\ |J|=\alpha}} h(J, s) \right) - \left( \sum_{\substack{J \subset V \\ |J|=1}} h(J, s) \right)^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $V$  is the set of all nodes (of size  $|V|$ ),  $X$  is the size of the sampled network,  $S$  is the number of seeds and  $h(M, s)$  is the probability that none of the  $s$  randomly chosen seed nodes are within  $n$  hops of the nodes in  $M$ . The probability  $h(M, s)$  is calculated via a hypergeometric distribution, considering the network as fixed. This approach can be extended to (approximate) degree distribution on the seed list by redefining  $h$  and  $S$  (see Supplementary Information 1)

The effect of seed list size on the distribution of the number of nodes in a 1-hop snowball sample in the BioGrid PPI network (Stark *et al.* (2006); Chatranyamontri *et al.* (2013)) can be found in Fig. 1 in the Supplementary Information. A small change in the number of seed nodes can have a large impact on the expected size of the network.

### 3.2 Evaluation on the benchmark data

To test whether there is a negative relationship between the  $p$ -value of our test and accuracy or purity, we use Kendall’s  $\tau$  statistic which is a measure for association. The value is in  $[-1, 1]$ ; the closer to  $\pm 1$ ; the stronger the association. We measure Kendall’s  $\tau$  with respect to the minimum of the  $p$  values of the two tails, as we do not specify in which direction the statistics differ.

Method	Kendall’s $\tau$ for Accuracy	Kendall’s $\tau$ for Purity
Snow1	-0.231	-0.184
Snow2	-0.115	-0.113
Shortest	0.534	-0.222
Path2	-0.594	-0.022
Path3	-0.265	-0.173
Path4	-0.113	-0.112

Table 1: Kendall’s  $\tau$  for the relationship between test  $p$ -value and accuracy or purity in the benchmark data set

The results in Table 1 show that for all of the single construction methods except for the shortest path construction method, there is the desired negative association (the smaller the  $p$ -value, the better the assignment to the block). The association is strongest for the Path2 method with respect to accuracy. The best-performing sampling methods have a tendency to stay in the same block as the seed nodes.




Figure 2: A scatter diagram of accuracy versus purity of benchmark networks in which the sample is significant under our test ( $P < 0.05/8$  due to a 2 tailed adjustment and a Bonferroni correction) where colour represents the construction method used: orange for Paths4, blue for Snow2, yellow for Shortest, Purple for Path3, red for Snow1 and green for Path2. An ideal method would have accuracy = 1 and purity = 1.

For differentiating between subnetwork construction methods we also investigated the trade-off between accuracy and purity. The results in Figure 2 show that care must be taken in selecting the correct construction method for the problem at hand by considering the trade off between purity and accuracy of each of the methods. The Paths4 method has can achieve high accuracy but does not achieve high purity between accuracy and purity, while Path2 achieves the highest purity overall, but has low accuracy.

### 3.3 Comparing Sampling Methods and Seed lists for PD

When trying to construct a subnetwork which reflects a disease process, one is faced with a plethora of choices. In order to address this problem in our work on Parkinson’s Disease (PD) we compare how far the subnetworks deviate from random according to the null model described earlier in this paper. While we do not know if the subnetwork that deviates the most from random will contain more (or less) biological information than other subnetworks, it is possible that there are certain subsets of the sampling techniques described above that identify interesting structural features which may also be biologically meaningful. As we cannot test all possible summary statistics, we use the statistics described in Subsection 2.1 as a comparison.

To illustrate our approach we compare our two different seed lists for PD, OMIM and Expression, across all of our sampling techniques and a reasonable parameter range.

To contrast the different sampling techniques, we compute the significance of all of the statistics in our set and select the smallest  $p$ -value. We set the significance level at 0.05, but as consider both tails and we compare multiple statistics we apply a Bonferroni correction resulting in a significance test at level  $0.05/8 = 0.00625$ . The significance results for the OMIM seed list and the expression seed list can be found in Fig. 3 A and B respectively. The  $p$ -values are plotted on a log-scale : the higher the box, the smaller the  $p$ -value. The 0.0125 threshold is marked by a red line.

Two networks show promising deviation from randomly sampled networks. In the expression seedlist path2 and shortest path are significant, the  $Path \leq 2$  method is robust in all but one bin size (50) and the shortest path is robust in all bin sizes. In the OMIM seedlist while Snow1 is not




Figure 3: Test results for different seed lists: smallest  $p$ -value, on a negative log scale. (A) OMIM seed list; (B) Expression seed list; (C) breakdown of the  $p$ -value for the 4 statistics evaluated for the Path2 Expression network. Blue: original seed list; yellow: minimum seed list; red: significance level (0.05/8). Note the negative log scale on the y axis, values above the red line are significant.

significant it is approaching significance with a  $p$ -value of 0.0063 and as such may deserve further consideration. While we cannot claim that the other networks do not have any information about the disease condition, the significance of these networks suggests that these may be a good networks on which to focus in depth analysis.

We also explored how many networks in each sampling technique have assortativity values which are assigned a value of 0. Most construction methods very rarely experience this, however 11% of the path2 OMIM null network ensemble and 27% of the minimum OMIM path2 seed list null network ensemble have assortativity values that are set to 0. This is mostly due to the short seed list.

In view of Figure 2 which shows poor accuracy for  $\text{Path}_{\leq 2}$  sampling, our preferred subnetworks are the networks created from the Expression seed list via all shortest paths and the OMIM seed list via snowball 1. This subnetwork contains 1,383 nodes of the 8292 nodes in BioGRID; it contains 4252 of the 25,062 edges in BioGRID. Its density of 0.0044 is markedly higher than the BioGRID density (0.00073), while the average local clustering coefficients are similar (0.044 vs 0.021).

### 3.4 Redundant Seed Nodes in PPI Networks

As our null model starts with random seed lists of the same length and (approximate) degree distribution as the chosen minimum seed list, our test relies crucially on a minimum seed list. Without reducing the original seed list to a minimum seed list, the test results could be very different - we call these resulting  $p$ -values *perceived  $p$ -values*, the  $p$ -values which we would perceive if we were not to correct for redundant seeds.

To demonstrate the effect of redundant seed proteins on perceived  $p$ -value of network features first we add redundant seed nodes to randomly selected seed lists in the BioGrid PPI network, and second we compare the perceived  $p$ -value on the networks based on PD seed lists. We illustrate our results for assortativity, average degree, clustering and number of nodes.

We investigate the importance of accounting for redundant seed proteins by comparing the significance of two seed lists that generate the same network. We construct an ensemble of random seed lists of length 25 sampled uniformly at random from all possible seed lists. For each seed list, we construct the longest seed list that generates the same network. We compute the difference between the perceived left  $p$ -value in the original seed list and the left  $p$ -value of the longest seed




Figure 4: Histogram of  $p$ -values of 100 2-hop Snowball Sample in the BioGrid PPI network with 25 initial random seed proteins and a bin size of 20 generated by adding additional redundant seed nodes.

list. If there is little difference we would expect the results to close to 0. The algorithm used to construct the longest possible seed list can be found in Supplementary Information 2. For simplicity in cases where there is more than 1 longest seed list we select one randomly.

On the BioGrid PPI network, (Fig. 4) we observed a large difference in  $p$  value in all statistics. Fig. 3 shows that while adjusting for minimum seeds often does not make a large difference to perceived  $p$ -value, in the case where it does (Fig. 3A Expression Seed list  $\text{Path} \leq 2$ ), the change can be large.

Also adding redundant seed nodes to seed lists in the other sampling techniques, may result in considerable changes in  $p$ -value may occur, see Supplementary Information 3. The finding that redundant seed nodes can influence the  $p$ -value of statistics is not restricted to our real-world examples.

### 3.5 Comparison with the Configuration Model

A popular null model in network science is the configuration model, which has been widely used as a null model across application domains. In the configuration model, the network is rewired randomly while preserving the degree distribution of the network (Newman *et al.* (2001)). By contrast, the configuration model does not preserve the structure induced by sampling in a network.

We compare the distribution of  $p$ -values for this null model and the configuration model using the method presented in 2.7, using 1000 randomly chosen seed lists of length 25 for assortativity and clustering. Assortativity and clustering display a distribution which is approximately continuous. In the configuration model, the  $p$ -values under the  $\chi^2$  test of assortativity and clustering are numerically equal to 0, providing strong evidence to reject the configuration model. In contrast, under our model, the same test produces a  $p$ -value of 0.2380 in assortativity and 0.9522 in Clustering Coefficient; there is no evidence to reject our model. Results for the other sampling techniques can be found in Supplementary Material 5.

While we cannot generalise from these results to all possible networks ensembles, and it is highly likely that there are network models and parameters ranges where the configuration model performs well in subnetworks, the configuration model does not perform well in general when comparing subnetworks based on seed lists. This demonstrates the need for an alternative to the configuration model for this task.




Figure 5: *Histograms of the configuration models p-value and our null model for Assortativity and Clustering in 2-hop snowball sampling.*

## 4 DISCUSSION

There is a need for a robust and reliable nonparametric test when testing the significance of summary statistics for sampling techniques based on seed lists. Depending on the research question the configuration model does not fulfil this role. Here we propose an alternative null model that is based on an ensemble of seed lists generated from the minimum seed list.

We focus on the significance of network features, given a construction method, rather than given a construction method and a fixed seed list, as different seed lists may result in the same subnetwork.

We have demonstrated that accounting for seed list construction is important, by artificially increasing the significance of a randomly chosen seed lists in a biological network, and through observing the effect of this increase on the biologically motivated seed lists.

We have also shown through our benchmark that p-values from our test are negatively correlated with measures of purity and accuracy of the sample (i.e. on average small p-values result in more accurate/pure networks).

Our null model is not without issues. Notably, it is rare but possible for there to be more than one minimum seed list which then requires a comparison with multiple seed lists. A further problem is that the seed list does not have to be a global minimum; it is possible that there is a seed list that is smaller than the supposed ‘minimum seed list’. Finding this minimum seed list for an arbitrary technique is computationally prohibitive. We believe that the very tractable null model presented in this paper is superior to the model based on a globally minimum seed list, due to its applicability to many different problems.

For PPI networks, our nonparametric test allows us to choose a subnetwork which may have interesting properties for further analysis for our work on PD. On the statistics tested many of the generated networks do not appear to deviate significantly from random, unlike the results from the expression seed list using path2 and shortest paths. Our work also highlights the need to focus more attention on generative models of biological networks in order to generate parametric models of these systems.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Harriet A. Keane for very helpful conversations on Parkinson’s Disease. We would also like to thank Griffith Rees and Marta Sarzynska for many helpful discussions.

**Funding:** We acknowledge e-Therapeutics plc and the UK’s Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) for funding, via a studentship at the Systems Approaches to Biomedical Science Industrial Doctorate Centre at the University of Oxford. GR acknowledges support from EPSRC grant EP/K032402/1 and from the Oxford Martin School programme on Resource Stewardship. FRT acknowledges support from James Martin 21st Century Foundation grant LC1213-006

## References

- Ali,W. *et al.* (2011) Protein Interaction Networks and Their Statistical Analysis. *Handbook of Statistical Systems Biology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Berger,S. *et al.* (2007) Genes2Networks: connecting lists of gene symbols using mammalian protein interactions databases. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **8** 372.
- Bernard,H.R. *et al.* (2010) Counting hard-to-count populations: the network scale-up method for public health. *Sex Transm Infect*, **86** ii11-ii15
- Chatraymentri,A. *et al.* (2013) The BioGRID interaction database: 2013 update. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **41** D816-D823.
- Chuang,H.Y. *et al.* (2007) Network-based classification of breast cancer metastasis. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, **3** 140.
- Conn,K.J. *et al.* (2003) cDNA microarray analysis of changes in gene expression associated with MPP+ toxicity in SH-SY5Y cells. *Neurochem Res*, **28** 1873–1881.
- Frank,O. (1977) Survey sampling in graphs. *J. Stat. Plan. Infer.*, **1** 235–264.
- Frank,O. and Snijders,T. (1994) Estimating the Size of Hidden Populations Using Snowball Sampling. *J Off Stat.*, **10**, 53-67.
- Goehler,H. *et al.* (2004) A protein interaction network links GIT1, an enhancer of huntingtin aggregation, to Huntington’s disease. *Mol Cell*, **15** 853–865.
- Ghiassian,S.D. *et al.* (2015) A Disease Module Detection (DIAMOND) Algorithm Derived from a Systematic Analysis of Connectivity Patterns of Disease Proteins in the Human Interactome *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **11** e1004120.
- Hamosh,A. *et al.* (2005) Online mendelian inheritance in man (OMIM), a knowledgebase of human genes and genetic disorders. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **33** (suppl 1) D514–D517.
- Hwang,W-C. *et al.* (2008) Identification of information flow-modulating drug targets: A novel bridging paradigm for drug discovery. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*, **84** 563–572.
- Gao,J.T. *et al.* (2011) Modular coherence of protein dynamics in yeast cell polarity system. *PNAS*, **108** 7647–7652.
- Kossinets,G. *et al.* (2006) Effects of missing data in social networks. *Soc Networks*, **28** 247-268
- Li,B.Q. *et al.* (2012) Identification of Colorectal Cancer Related Genes with mRMR and Shortest Path in Protein-Protein Interaction Network. *PLoS ONE*, **7**.
- Lim,J. *et al.* (2006) A protein–protein interaction network for human inherited ataxias and disorders of purkinje cell degeneration. *Cell*, **125** 801–814.
- Martin,A. *et al.* (2010) BisoGenet: a new tool for gene network building, visualization and analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **11** 91+.
- Newman,M.E.J. *et al.* (2001) Random graphs with arbitrary degree distributions and their applications. *Phys Rev E*, **64** 026118.
- Newman,M.E.J. (2010) *Networks: An Introduction*. 1st edn. Oxford University Press.
- Ratmann,O. *et al.* (2009) Model criticism based on likelihood-free inference, with an application to protein network evolution. *PNAS* **106** 10576-10581.
- Rito,T. *et al.* (2010) How threshold behaviour affects the use of subgraphs for network comparison. *Bioinformatics*, **26** i611–i617.
- Salganik,M.J. (2006) Variance estimation, design effects, and sample size calculations for respondent-driven sampling. *J Urban Health* **83** 98-111.
- Sharma,A. *et al.* (2015) A disease module in the interactome explains disease heterogeneity, drug response and captures novel pathways and genes in asthma *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, **24** 3005-3020.

- Shi,S.H. *et al.* (2014) A network pharmacology approach to understanding the mechanisms of action of traditional medicine: bushen-huoxue formula for treatment of chronic kidney disease. *PLoS ONE*, **9** e89123.
- Stark,C. *et al.* (2006) BioGRID: a general repository for interaction datasets. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **34(suppl 1)** D535–D539.
- Stumpf,M.P.H. *et al.* (2005) Subnets of scale-free networks are not scale-free: Sampling properties of networks. *PNAS*, **102**, 4221–4224.
- Thorne,T and Stumpf,M.P.H. (2012) Graph spectral analysis of protein interaction network evolution *J. R. Soc. Interface.*, **9**, 2653–2666.
- White,A.G. and Ma'ayan,A. (2007) Connecting seed lists of mammalian proteins using steiner trees. In *Signals, Systems and Computers, 2007. Conference Record of the Forty-First Asilomar Conference on*, 155–159.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

## A Derivation of Analytic Results

The analytic results in this paper have been extended from results in Frank (1977) and follow some of the notation. We define the function  $h(M, s)$  as the probability that there does not exist a node in a  $n$ -hop snowball sample of  $M$  on a randomly selected seed list of size  $s$ . Let  $B(M)$  be the set of nodes within  $n$  hops of the nodes in  $M$ . If the selection is uniformly at random from all subsets of nodes of size  $s$  then we can use a hypergeometric distribution to derive an expression for  $h(M, s)$ , where we have  $|V| - s$  successful states, a population of size  $|V|$ , with  $|B(M)|$  draws and  $|B(M)|$  successes of not selecting a seed. This selection gives the probability

$$h(M, s) = \frac{\binom{|V|-s}{|B(M)|} \binom{|V|-(|V|-s)}{|B(M)|-|B(M)|}}{\binom{|V|}{|B(M)|}},$$

which simplifies to:

$$h(M, s) = \left( \prod_{i=0}^{s-1} \frac{1}{(|V| - i)} \right) \left( \prod_{i=0}^{s-1} (|V| - |N| - i) \right) = \prod_{i=0}^{s-1} \frac{|V| - |B(M)| - i}{|V| - i},$$

where  $N = B(M)$ . If we wish to fix degree (or with a small adjustment binned degree), we can use a similar approach to the uniform case, to derive the following form for  $h(M, t)$ :

$$h(M, t) = \prod_{u \in U(t)} \prod_{i=0}^{C(t,u)-1} \frac{D(V, u) - D(B(M), u) - i}{D(V, u) - i},$$

where  $t$  is the degree sequence of the seed list. Here  $C(h, a)$  is a counting function, it counts how many instances of  $a$  there are in  $h$  (e.g.  $C([1, 2, 3, 4, 1], 1) = 2$ ),  $U(l)$  returns the unique elements of  $l$  and  $D(M, r)$  is the number of elements in  $M$  of degree  $r$ . The seeds of different degrees are selected independently so we can calculate the probability for each unique degree in the seed degree list and then multiply them to get the final probability.

**Deriving the Mean and Variance** If we let  $X_i$  be an indicator variable for the presence of node  $i$  in the sample, then the number of nodes in a sample is  $Y = \sum_i X_i$ . We can compute the mean number of nodes as follows:

$$E[Y] = E\left[\sum_i X_i\right] = \sum_i E[X_i] = \sum_i 1 - h(\{i\}, s) = |V| - \sum_i h(\{i\}, s). \quad (2)$$

To compute the variance we can use the correlated variables formula:

$$\text{Var}\left(\sum_i X_i\right) = \sum_i \text{Var}(X_i) + 2 \sum_{i < j} \text{Cov}(X_i, X_j).$$

We can imagine each  $X_i$  as being a Bernoulli random variable with  $p = 1 - h(\{i\}, s)$ , therefore,

$$\text{Var}(X_i) = p(1 - p) = h(\{i\}, s)(1 - h(\{i\}, s)).$$

The covariance between the two variables is defined as:

$$\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j) = E[X_i X_j] - E[X_i]E[X_j];$$




Figure 6: Exact Results: Points represent the mean number of nodes given a number of seed nodes in a 1-hop snowball sample from the BioGrid PPI network. The error bars represent one standard deviation of the same quantity.

thus:

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_i X_j] &= E[(1 - (1 - X_i))(1 - (1 - X_j))] = 1 - E[1 - X_i] - E[1 - X_j] + E[(1 - X_i)(1 - X_j)] \\ &= 1 - h(\{i\}, s) - h(\{j\}, s) + h(\{i, j\}, s). \end{aligned}$$

Combining and simplifying all of the terms we obtain:

$$\text{Var}\left(\sum_i X_i\right) = \left(\sum_i h(\{i\}, s) - h(\{i\}, s)^2\right) + 2\left(\sum_{i < j} h(\{i, j\}, s) - h(\{i\}, s)h(\{j\}, s)\right).$$

We can then factor the expression to obtain the expression in Section 2.4 of the paper.

$$\text{Var}\left(\sum_i X_i\right) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \alpha \sum_{|L|=\alpha} h(L, s) - \left(\sum_i h(\{i\}, s)\right)^2.$$

Figure 6 illustrates the effect of seed list size on the distribution of the number of nodes in a 1-hop snowball sample in the BioGrid PPI network (Stark *et al.* (2006); Chatranyamontri *et al.* (2013)). As we do not have a seed list of interest in this case, we have assumed that there is no restriction on the degree sequence of the seed nodes.

As expected, the larger the number of seed nodes, the larger the average number of nodes in the resulting network. Further, a small change in the number of seed nodes can have a large impact on the expected size of the network. The number of nodes in a 2-hop snowball sample on, say 20 proteins from the PPI network may appear small when compared to subnetworks randomly generated from 30 seeds but large when compared to such subnetwork generated from 10 seeds.

## B Algorithms to add or remove redundant seeds.

To discover redundant seed nodes we need to be able to guarantee that a pair of labelled networks are identical. The trivial way to do this is to compare the node lists and the edge lists and if they are equal then the networks are equal. As we will have to check equality a large number of times

this approach can prove computationally constraining. Making use of the fact that we are adding or removing nodes from the seed list we can derive a simpler condition for this problem.

We take an arbitrary network with node set  $V$  and edge list  $E$  and a seed list  $t$ . Let  $[V_t, E_t] = f_{arb}(V, E, t)$ , where  $f_{arb}$  is an arbitrary network sampling function,  $t$  is a seed list and  $V_t$  and  $E_t$  are the subset of nodes and edges that are in the subnetwork.

Let us assume that we have two seed lists  $s$  and  $r$  and let us assume that  $s \subseteq r$ . Let us assume that our sampling technique ( $f_{arb}$ ) guarantees that  $V_s \subseteq V_r$  and  $E_s \subseteq E_r$  if  $s \subseteq r$ .

Trivially for sets  $X$  and  $Y$  if  $X \subseteq Y$  and  $|X| = |Y|$ , therefore  $X = Y$ . Thus, if  $|E_s| = |E_r|$  and  $|V_s| = |V_r|$  then  $E_s = E_r$  and  $V_s = V_r$ . Therefore we can use the condition:

$$|E_s| = |E_r| \text{ and } |V_s| = |V_r|. \quad (3)$$

Note, we must condition both on the set of edges and the set of nodes as they are both required to fully define the subnetwork.

Therefore if we can guarantee using our sampling techniques that if  $s \subseteq r$  then  $V_s \subseteq V_r$  and  $E_s \subseteq E_r$  then we can simply test for equality in the number of nodes and edges.

**Snowball Sampling** In snowball sampling the contribution from each of the nodes on the seed list is independent, as it is simply the number of nodes within a certain radius of the each of the seeds. Therefore the expression for the  $V_s$  is as follows:

$$V_s = \bigcup_{x \in s} V_x.$$

If we take  $s \subseteq t$ , then  $V_t = V_s \cup V_{t \setminus s}$  and therefore trivially  $V_s \subseteq V_t$ . We can use the same argument for  $E_s$ . We can therefore use the condition in Equation 3 for Snowball sampled networks given that the seed list is a subset or a superset of the original seed list.

**Deterministic Path Based Sampling Techniques** In deterministic path based sampling techniques in undirected networks, the sampled network is a function of every unique pair of nodes in the seed list:

$$V_s = \{x : x \in P_{arb}^{(V)}(y, z) \mid y, z \in s\}, \text{ and } E_s = \{x : x \in P_{arb}^{(E)}(y, z) \mid y, z \in s\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $P_{arb}^{(V)}(y, z)$  and  $P_{arb}^{(E)}(y, z)$  are the set of the sampled nodes and edges respectively on the path(s) between  $y$  and  $z$  defined by the sampling technique in question. Let  $t$  and  $s$  be seed lists and let  $s \subseteq t$ , then

$$V_t = V_s \cup V_{t \setminus s} \cup \{x : x \in P_{arb}^{(V)}(y, z) \mid y \in s, z \in t \setminus s\} \cup \{x : x \in P_{arb}^{(V)}(y, z) \mid z \in s, y \in t \setminus s\}.$$

Therefore  $V_s \subseteq V_t$ , and by similar argument  $E_s \subseteq E_t$ . Thus we can use the condition in Equation 3 for all deterministic path sampling techniques.

### B.0.1 Algorithm to add additional redundant seed nodes.

For  $n$ -hop snowball sampling, we can construct a list of possible seed nodes using the following simplified procedure:

```
listofSeeds=[]
OutsideNodes=list of nodes in (n+1)-hop snowball sample but not in n-hop sample
for node in Subnetwork for outNode in OutsideNodes
    if shortest path length between node and outNode is less than n+1
```

```

        failed=1
        break
    if failed==0
        add node to listofSeeds

```

In the other two construction methods we cannot use such a simple construction due to interdependence between the seed nodes. Thus we must compare the size of the sampled network with the original sampled network (by comparing the number of nodes and edges) when any seed is added to the seed list. We can speed this procedure up when we are only interested in adding a small number of random redundant seed nodes, by shuffling the order of the nodes in the sampled network, adding each in node, in turn and testing if it proves to be a redundant seed node.

## B.0.2 Optimised Algorithm for Finding Redundant Seed Nodes

The algorithm presented in Section 2.4 of the paper is the following:

1. Remove each seed in turn and check if the number of nodes and edges in the subnetwork do not change. If not, then add the node to the list of redundant seeds.
2. Form a list of the remaining seeds.
3. Define a dummy variable  $L$  and set  $L = 0$
4. For lists of redundant seeds of length  $L$ 
  - (a) Test if sampling with the list of the remaining seeds and the selected redundant seeds produce the same network.
  - (b) Store all seed lists which pass the test.
5. If there are no seed lists which pass the test, set  $L \rightarrow L + 1$  and go to step 4.
6. Return the smallest seed list(s) that produce the same network.

The major problem in this procedure is the large number of options that may need to be checked to find the minimum seed list. As stated in the paper finding the minimum seed list for snowball sampled networks is equivalent to the set cover problem which is NP complete. If we construct a graph where the nodes are each of the seed nodes in question and each pair of nodes has an edge between them if we can remove them together. Then the maximal clique of this graph is the largest set of nodes that can be removed at once. Therefore we can use a standard clique finding algorithm to then find the largest set of nodes that can be safely removed.

To prove this is the case, let  $\tilde{A}_{ij}$  be the adjacency matrix for the graph just described, i.e.  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = 1$  if  $i$  and  $j$  can be removed together, and zero otherwise. Further, let  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ , and let us assume that the  $v_1, \dots, v_s$  are the seed nodes and  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  is a clique in  $\tilde{A}$ . If we can remove each of the nodes then we know that:

$$B(\{v_i\}) \subset \bigcup_{j \neq i} B(\{v_j\})$$

Further, by the definition of  $\tilde{A}_{ij}$  we know that:

$$B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j\}} B(\{v_x\}) \text{ if } \tilde{A}_{ij} = 1$$

$$B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j\}} B(\{v_x\}) \text{ if } \tilde{A}_{ij} = 0$$

Consider:

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^k (B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\})) \subseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^k \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

$$B(\{v_i\}) \cup \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^k B(\{v_j\}) \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{1,2,\dots,k\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

$$B(\{v_i\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{1,2,\dots,k\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

Therefore for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$  every element of  $B(\{v_i\})$  is included in at least one of  $B(\{v_j\})$ , for  $k < j \leq n$ . Therefore we can remove every clique of nodes in  $\tilde{A}$  safely. Which simply leaves us to prove that if a set of nodes is not a clique in  $\tilde{A}$  then we cannot remove all of the nodes.

$$B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

$$\implies \exists y \in B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \quad y \notin \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

$$\text{To remove } i, j, \alpha \text{ then we need } B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \cup B(\{v_\alpha\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j,\alpha\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

$$\text{But: } y \in B(\{v_i\}) \cup B(\{v_j\}) \cup B(\{v_\alpha\}) \text{ and } y \notin \bigcup_{x \notin \{i,j,\alpha\}} B(\{v_x\})$$

Which contradicts our assumption that we can remove  $i, j$  and  $x$ .

Thus we can clearly not remove a set of nodes for which one pair does not have an edge. Therefore QED.

This argument can then be extended to paths by using the same argument on edges (i.e.  $P_{arb}^{(E)}$  rather than  $B$ ).

**Further Optimisations** A further optimisation, which is sampling technique dependent, can be performed on sampling techniques that scale with number of nodes in the whole network and that only depend on the information in the subnetwork. Sampling in the subnetwork rather than in the wider network can be more efficient while still guaranteeing the result. One example of this procedure is shortest path sampling. All of the information about shortest paths is included in the subnetwork. Therefore sampling with the reduced seed list in the subnetwork saves time (as shortest path scales with number of nodes and edges depending on implementation) and guarantees that the result is correct as long as the seed list is a subset of the original seed list.

## C Further Results: Adding Redundant Seed Results

We showed that redundant seed nodes have to be taken into account; in particular in Figure 1 of the SI we demonstrated that the significance of randomly chosen seed lists can be changed in the BioGrid network under 2-hop snowball sampling. A very similar effect can be observed in the other sampling techniques and other graphs as can be seen in Figure 2.




Figure 7: Histogram of differences in  $p$ -values of 100 of each of the sampling techniques in the BioGrid PPI network with 25 initial random seed proteins and a bin size of 20 generated by adding additional redundant seed nodes. For most sampling methods and summary statistics the difference of  $p$ -values can be close to 1 or -1, and hence redundant seeds can have a large influence.

## D Empirical Seed Lists: Additional Results

To test whether the results we see in the paper are robust with respect to the bins that we use to generate the random seed lists, we recalculate the results in the paper using a minimum bin size of 5, 10, 20, 30 and 50. The smaller the bin size the closer the degree sequence will match the test sequence, whereas the larger minimum bin sizes produce seed lists which have degree sequences which are further from the test list, but have a lower likelihood of selecting the same small set of seed nodes. Figure 3 shows the results for the OMIM sed list and Figure 4 shows the results for the expression seed list.

## E Comparison with Configuration Model

The configuration model may not preserve the structural features of the original network. For example in the 2 hop snowball sample in Fig. 1A in the paper, there is a very clear structure, with a maximum path length of 4 between any pair of nodes. This structure will not be preserved in the configuration model Fig. 11 shows a simple comparison between the distribution of shortest path length in the snowball sampled network compared against an ensemble of configuration models of the same network. We also compared the configuration model with all of the other sampling techniques using the method described in the main paper. The results can be seen in Figure 12. We use a  $\chi^2$  test to compare the distributions with the uniform distribution taking as observations the p-values of the statistic of interest from 1000 networks generated by selecting 25 random seeds (Table 2). We see that in all sampling techniques we reject the null hypothesis for the configuration model and for Snow1, Snow2 and all shortest paths we do not reject the null hypothesis for our null model. For Path3 in clustering we reject the null at the 5% level but not at the 1% and further visual inspection of the distribution also does not draw any concern.

In the case of the clustering in Path2, we have to consider the distribution of local clustering coefficient in the network, as can be seen in Figure 13. This clustering coefficient is far from continuously distributed. For non-continuous distributions, rather than the uniform distribution, we would expect to see the generalised inverse of the cumulative density function as distribution of the p-values. Fig. 14 shows that the distribution of average local clustering coefficients for path2 networks sampled with 25 random seeds is indeed still discontinuous and therefore we should not be surprised to see a non-uniform null distribution. In contrast with the same distribution from Snowball 1 shown in Fig. 15 is approximately continuously distributed and therefore the uniform distribution appears as the null distribution as expected.

Table 2: Goodness of fit  $\chi^2$  p-value results for different sampling techniques under our null model and the Configuration Model. 1000 networks are generated by selecting 25 random seeds, and assortativity and average local clustering coefficient are calculated. For each network we observe the  $p$ -value for deviation from a random network (our null model and the configuration model). If the null hypothesis is correct and the distribution under the null hypothesis is continuous then these  $p$ -values, viewed as random observations, should be approximately uniformly distributed on the interval  $[0, 1]$ . This table gives the results from a  $\chi^2$  test for goodness to the uniform distribution.

	Our Null		Configuration model	
	Assortativity	Clustering	Assortativity	Clustering
Path3	0.3115	0.0255	0	0
Path4	0.9659	0.0734	0	0
Shortest	0.8343	0.4788	0	0
Snow1	0.4654	0.4788	0	0
Snow2	0.2380	0.9522	0	0




Figure 8: Test results for the OMIM seed list: smallest  $p$ -value, on a negative log scale under our null model. Multiple bars demonstrate the robustness of the method to the minimum number of items in each bin chosen when accounting for degree. Red: significance level (0.05/8). Left: Full seed list, right minimum seed list. Note negative logarithmic scale, e.g. only results that are above the Red significance line are considered significant. Only in Snowball 1 sampling is the result significant and only for the clustering coefficient.




Figure 9: Test results for the Expression seed list: smallest  $p$ -value, on a negative log scale under our null model. Multiple bars demonstrate the robustness of the method to the minimum number of items in each bin chosen when accounting for degree. Red: significance level (0.05/8). Left: Full seed list, right minimum seed list. Note negative logarithmic scale, e.g. only results that are above the Red significance line are considered significant. Significant results are observed in number of nodes in Shortest path sampling and in number of nodes in Paths less than or equal to 2 with the minimum seed list.




Figure 10: 2-Hop Snowball Sampling Example: The seed list consists of node 1 (circle), node shape represents distance from seed protein square, representing nodes 1 hop from the seed, diamond 2 hops from a seed, triangle 3 hops from a seed. Dashed edges represent cross-edges in a 2-hop snowball sample.




Figure 11: Comparison of distribution of shortest path lengths in the original network and over an ensemble of networks generated by a configuration model from the same network.




Figure 12: Distribution of  $p$ -value results for different sampling techniques under our null model and the Configuration Model. 1000 networks are generated by selecting 25 random seeds, assortativity and average local clustering coefficient are calculated. For each network we observe the  $p$ -value for deviation from a random network (our null model and the configuration model). For our null model the  $p$ -values are approximately uniformly distributed, indicating a reasonable fit of the null model. For the configuration model the distribution is far from uniform, indicating a poor fit.




Figure 13: Distribution of Local Clustering Coefficient in BIOGRID Y2H Network, the distribution is approximately continuous.




Figure 14: Distribution of Average Clustering Coefficient Path2 sampled from BIOGRID network with 25 randomly chosen seeds




Figure 15: Distribution of Average Clustering Coefficient Snow1 sampled from BIOGRID network with 25 randomly chosen seeds

# References

- Chatraramontri, A. *et al.* (2013) The BioGRID interaction database: 2013 update. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **41** D816-D823.
- Frank, O. (1977) Survey sampling in graphs. *J STAT PLAN INFER*, **1** 235-264.
- Stark, C. *et al.* (2006) BioGRID: a general repository for interaction datasets. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **34(suppl 1)** D535-D539.