

Accurate and Efficient Estimation of Small P-values with the Cross-Entropy Method: Applications in Genomic Data Analysis

Yang Shi^{1,2,3}, Mengqiao Wang¹, Weiping Shi⁴, Ji-Hyun Lee^{2,5}, Huining Kang^{2,5*} and Hui Jiang^{3,6*}

¹Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University, Chendu, Sichuan 610041, P. R. China.

²Biostatistics Shared Resource, University of New Mexico Comprehensive Cancer Center and ⁵Department of Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico School of Medicine, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA.

³Department of Biostatistics and ⁶Center for Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA.

⁴College of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin 130012, P. R. China.

*To whom the correspondence should be addressed.

ABSTRACT

Motivation: Small p -values are often required to be accurately estimated in large scale genomic studies for the adjustment of multiple hypothesis tests and the ranking of genomic features based on their statistical significance. For those complicated test statistics whose cumulative distribution functions are analytical intractable, existing methods usually do not work well with small p -values due to lack of accuracy or computational restrictions. We propose a general approach for accurately and efficiently calculating small p -values for a

broad range of complicated test statistics based on the principle of the cross-entropy method and Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling techniques.

Results: We evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm through simulations and demonstrate its application to three real examples in genomic studies. The results show that our approach can accurately evaluate small to extremely small p -values (e.g. 10^{-6} to 10^{-100}). The proposed algorithm is helpful to the development of new test procedures in genomic studies.

Availability: R programs for implementing the algorithm and reproducing the results are available at: <https://github.com/shilab2017/MCMC-CE-codes>.

Contact: hukang@salud.unm.edu and jianghui@umich.edu

Supplementary information: Supplementary text is submitted together with the manuscript. Supplementary tables are available at: <https://github.com/shilab2017/MCMC-CE-codes>.

1. INTRODUCTION

P -value is the most widely used metric to assess the statistical significance of genomic features in large-scale genomic studies such as genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and high-throughput differential gene expression analysis. In those studies, very small p -values are often required to be accurately calculated, because: (1) A large number of tests are often performed in those studies and most of the methods used for multiple comparisons adjustment in genomic studies, such as the Bonferroni correction for family-wise error rate and the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for controlling false discovery rate (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995), work directly on the p -values associated with the genomic features.

Therefore, it is essential to accurately evaluate p -values at very small scales so that those procedures are reliable. (2) In practice, it is desirable to rank the significant genomic features by their p -values (often together with their effect sizes) so that the researchers can prioritize and follow up with those significant genomic features for further biological studies, which also requires that the small p -values associated with those features to be accurately estimated. In the literature, it is not uncommon to see that very small p -values associated with the most significant genomic features to the order of less than 10^{-100} are reported [e.g. (Burton, et al., 2007) and (Cauchi, et al., 2007)]. More examples can be found in (Bangalore, et al., 2009)].

1.1 Problem formulation

The problem addressed in this work is how to estimate small p -values for a group of complicated test statistics whose cumulative distribution functions (CDF) are analytical intractable. Specifically, the question can be formulated as follows: the goal is to estimate the p -value defined as

$$p = Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q | H_0], \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{Y} is the data or transformed data that follow some probability distribution (e.g. multivariate normal distribution), $T(\mathbf{Y})$ is the test statistic which is a function of \mathbf{Y} , q is the test statistic calculated based on the observed data that can be either a scalar or a vector, and H_0 means that the probability is obtained under the null hypothesis, which will be dropped for simplicity hereafter. In most commonly used test procedures (e.g. two-sample t -test), the p -values are obtained by deriving the exact or asymptotic distributions of $T(\mathbf{Y})$ under H_0 . However, the problem we often encounter is that $T(\mathbf{Y})$ is complicated whose CDF under H_0 cannot be derived analytically, and existing approaches do not work for

estimating very small p -values either due to lack of accuracy or unaffordable computational burden.

We illustrate this problem with the following three real world examples in genomic studies.

Example 1: Gene set/pathway enrichment analysis.

Here the goal is to test the significance of the association between some clinical outcomes of interest and the global expression pattern of a gene set or pathway (for brevity, gene set will be used hereafter), where gene sets are pre-specified groups of genes according to the biological functions or genomic locations of the genes. For a study with n independent subjects and a gene set with q genes, Goeman *et al* proposed to fit the following model,

$$E(\mathbf{y}) = g^{-1}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{y} is the $n \times 1$ outcome vector, \mathbf{Z} is an $n \times q$ the expression matrix of the q genes in n subjects, \mathbf{X} is an $n \times p$ matrix for the p covariates that needs to be adjusted, g is the canonical link function for the distribution of \mathbf{y} (e.g. g is the identity function for normal distributed data and the logistic function for binomial distributed data), and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are the corresponding vectors of coefficients. The association between \mathbf{Z} and outcome \mathbf{y} can be assessed by testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ using the following test statistic

$$Q_1 = n^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T (\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the expectation of \mathbf{y} under H_0 (Goeman, et al., 2004; Goeman, et al., 2011). A similar approach is also proposed in (Liu, et al., 2007), where the matrix $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T$ in Eq. (3) is replaced by a kernel function to account for the interaction of genes in the same gene set.

Example 2: GWAS – joint testing a group of genetic markers in a genomic region

To increase the power of GWAS, approaches for joint testing a group of genetic markers (SNPs) in a genomic region instead of testing individual genetic markers are developed. Wu *et al* proposed an approach under similar framework as in Example 1, and the following model is fit

$$E(\mathbf{y}) = g^{-1}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{y} is the $n \times 1$ phenotype vector, \mathbf{G} is an $n \times q$ genotype matrix for the q SNPs in the genomic region that need to be tested, \mathbf{X} is an $n \times p$ matrix for the p covariates that needs to be adjusted, g is the canonical link function for the distribution of \mathbf{y} , and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are the vectors of coefficients. The association between \mathbf{G} and phenotype \mathbf{y} can be assessed by testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ using the following test statistic

$$Q_2 = (\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{G} (\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the expectation of \mathbf{y} under H_0 and \mathbf{W} is a diagonal matrix containing the weights of the q SNPs (Wu, et al., 2011). If the weight of each SNP is 1, then Q_2 is the same as Q_1 in Example 1 up to a constant. Similarly, the matrix $\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{G}$ can be replaced by a kernel matrix to account for the epistatic effects of the SNPs (Wu, et al., 2011).

Example 3: Ratio statistics in differential gene expression analysis

Consider the differential expression analysis comparing two groups of gene expression data. For a gene g to be tested, let \mathbf{x}_{g1} and \mathbf{x}_{g2} be the vectors of positive normalized gene expression values respectively for the two groups with sample sizes n_1 and n_2 . The following ratio statistic (a.k.a. fold change or proportion statistic) has been proposed to test the differential expression of g between the two groups (Segal, et al., 2017),

$$L = \max(y_1 / y_2, y_2 / y_1), \quad (6)$$

where y_1 and y_2 are the respective sample means of the two groups. Note that the p -value computed based on the test statistic (6) is the two-sided p -value based on the test statistic, y_1 / y_2 (Segal, et al., 2017). Hence, without loss of generality and for the ease of derivation, we will work on its one-sided counterpart by assuming $y_1 \geq y_2$ and using the test statistic,

$$L = y_1 / y_2. \quad (7)$$

Other approaches for testing differential gene expression based on the ratio statistics are also proposed in (Newton, et al., 2001; Chen, et al., 2002; Bergemann and Wilson, 2011)

The exact or asymptotic p -values with the test statistics in the above three examples can be expressed as the general form (1). To see this, for Examples 1 and 2, it can be shown that the test statistics Q_1 and Q_2 can be written as the following quadratic form

$$Q = T(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{Y}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{Y}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{Y} follows a multivariate normal (MVN) distribution either exactly if the outcome or phenotype data \mathbf{y} is assumed to follow normal distributions or asymptotically if \mathbf{y} is assumed to follow binomial distributions, and \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix containing the positive eigenvalues of $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T$ in Q_1 or $\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{G}$ in Q_2 . See (Duchesne and De Micheaux, 2010) for matrix calculations about how Q_1 and Q_2 can be expressed as Q . Therefore, the p -values with the test statistics Q_1 and Q_2 can be expressed in the form $Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q_1]$, where q_1 is the test statistic calculated based on the observed data. For Example 3, let q_2 be the ratio statistic calculated based on the observed data, then the p -value with the ratio statistic L can be further expressed as

$$p = Pr(y_1 / y_2 \geq q_2 \mid y_1, y_2 > 0) = Pr(\mathbf{CY} > \mathbf{0}), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q \end{pmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (y_1, y_2)^T$. Based on the central limit theorem, y_1 and y_2 respectively follow $N(\mu, \sigma^2 / n_1)$ and $N(\mu, \sigma^2 / n_2)$ either exactly if the expression data are assumed to be normal or asymptotically if the expression data are not normal, where μ and σ^2 are the population mean and variance under the null hypothesis that there is no differential expression between the two groups.

1.2 Related literature

In the literature, the quadratic form statistics (8), a.k.a. a linear combination or weighted sum of chi-squared random variables (Bausch, 2013), are used for testing the associations between genomic features and the outcomes or phenotypes under several settings in genomic studies. Several methods are proposed specifically to calculate the tail probabilities for this form of statistic (Imhof, 1961; Davies, 1980; Farebrother, 1984; Liu, et al., 2009). See (Duchesne and De Micheaux, 2010) for comparisons of them and (Bausch, 2013) for a review. As commented in (Bausch, 2013), most of those existing methods do not work well when p is very small due to lack of accuracy or computational restrictions. In addition, those approaches are aimed specifically for the quadratic form Q and cannot be generalized to other types of test statistics, which have a relative narrow scope of applications.

Alternative to the above methods, a more general type of approaches is the utilization of Monte Carlo (MC) sampling methods, where a large number of MC random samples can be generated under H_0 either via simulations from the distribution of \mathbf{Y} under H_0 or through permutation or bootstrap of the observed data (note that permutation and bootstrap

are special cases of MC methods, where the former samples the observed data without replacement and the latter samples with replacement), and then repeatedly calculate the test statistics using those MC samples and estimate p as the proportion of the test statistics based on the MC samples that are greater than or equal to the one based on the observed data. Yet if we want to accurately estimate very small p -values, this type of brute-force MC methods will need enormous computational effort.

In this paper, we propose a general approach for accurately and efficiently estimating small to extremely small p -values for any test statistic that can be expressed in the form (1). The basis of our approach contains two components. The first component is the cross-entropy (CE) method, which is originated from the concept of CE in information theory and has been widely used for rare event simulation in the operations research field (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004). The second component is Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling techniques. Therefore, our approach is referred as MCMC-CE algorithm hereafter. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we give a general introduction of the CE method and MCMC techniques used in our approach, and then present our algorithm for estimating small p -values. In Section 3, we evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm by comparing it with several existing approaches through simulations and demonstrate its applications with three genomic datasets. Discussions are given in Section 4.

2. METHODS

2.1 The CE method

Our goal is to calculate the p -value as expressed in Eq. (1), which can be further written as

$$p = Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q] = E_{\theta_0} [I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\}], \quad (10)$$

where the subscript $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ denotes the parameter vector of the probability distribution that \mathbf{Y} follows under H_0 [e.g. it is a MVN distribution in the above three examples. We use $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ to denote this distribution hereafter], and the expectation is taken with respect to $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ with $I(\cdot)$ as the indicator function.

As discussed above, when p is small, using the brute-force MC method is computationally inefficient. The CE method is a general approach for the efficient estimation of small probabilities in MC simulations, which we briefly introduce below following the monograph on CE method (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004). The technique used in the CE method is importance sampling (IS). Let $g(\cdot)$ be the proposal density function used in IS, then the expectation in Eq. (10) can be re-expressed as

$$p = \int I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{g(\mathbf{Y})} g(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} = E_g[I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{g(\mathbf{Y})}], \quad (11)$$

where the subscript g denotes that the expectation is taken with respect to $g(\cdot)$ now. Then p can be estimated by the MC counterpart (a.k.a. stochastic counterpart) of (11),

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N I\{T(\mathbf{y}_l) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{g(\mathbf{y}_l)}, \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{y}_l 's, $l = 1, \dots, N$ are random samples drawn from $g(\cdot)$ now. There is an optimal proposal density under which the IS estimator (12) has zero MC sampling variance (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004; Rubinstein and Kroese, 2008), which is given by

$$g^*(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{p}. \quad (13)$$

However, g^* cannot be directly used as the proposal density for estimating p in IS, since it contains the unknown probability p that is the quantity we want to calculate. The

CE method provides a general solution to finding a proposal density $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is close to the optimal proposal density g^* within the same distribution family as $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ in the sense that the Kullback–Leibler divergence [a.k.a the Kullback–Leibler cross-entropy or cross-entropy (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004)] between $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and g^* is minimized:

$$\begin{aligned} D(g^*(\cdot), f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})) &:= \int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln \frac{g^*(\mathbf{Y})}{f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta})} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln g^*(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} - \int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y} \end{aligned}, \quad (14)$$

where $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is another distribution within the same family as $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Since the first term in the r.h.s. of the second equality in Eq. (14) does not contain $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that minimizes $D(g^*(\cdot), f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}))$ should maximize the second term. Hence, the problem of finding $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ turns into an optimization problem of finding $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that maximizes the second term. Originally, Rubinstein *et al* developed an adaptive algorithm to solve this optimization problem, which is referred as “multi-level CE method” in the literature (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004). We review this algorithm and discuss its limitations in the Supplementary Text.

One of the major limitations of the multi-level CE algorithm is that it is unreliable in high-dimensional settings, i.e. when the dimension of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is large. With recent progress in MCMC sampling techniques, here we apply and implement an improved version of CE method based on the theoretical work in (Chan and Kroese, 2012) that combines the CE criterion (14) and MCMC techniques, which is presented below. Observe that the second term in the r.h.s. of the second equality in (14) can be written as

$$\int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y} = E_{g^*}[\ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (15)$$

where the subscript g^* means that the expectation is taken with respect to the optimal proposal density g^* . Therefore, if we can draw random samples from g^* (in the next section, we will discuss the techniques to that end), the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that minimizes $D(g^*(\cdot), f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}))$ can be found by the maximization of the expectation in (15). By replacing the expectation in (15) with its MC counterpart, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be found by solving

$$\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N [\ln f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \quad (16)$$

where \mathbf{y}_l 's, $l = 1, \dots, N$ are random samples drawn from g^* . Problem (16) is a regular maximum likelihood estimation problem, which can be solved either analytically or numerically by widely used approaches such as Newton-Raphson or the EM algorithm.

2.2 Sampling from the optimal proposal density

Here we discuss the algorithms for sampling from g^* . From (13), observe that g^* is a truncated distribution with $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ restricted by the constraint $T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q$. With the recent progress in MCMC techniques, several algorithms are developed for sampling from a truncated distribution in the form of g^* and Table 1 summarizes four of them. The Gibbs sampler is a classical MCMC method for sampling from truncated distributions that consecutively draws samples from a sequence of conditional distributions (Geweke, 1991; Kotecha and Djuric, 1999). The hit-and-run sampler belongs to the class of line samplers, which reduces the problem of sampling from a multivariate constrained distribution to that of sampling from a univariate truncated distribution (Chen and Schmeiser, 1993; Kroese, et al., 2011). The Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Monte Carlo samplers are two more recently developed powerful tools for sampling from many complicated distributions, which

respectively use the principles of the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian dynamics in physics (Pakman and Paninski, 2014; Lan, et al., 2015). In our empirical comparisons, we find that the Gibbs sampler is more efficient for sampling from a truncated distribution with linear constraints such as Example 3, while Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Monte Carlo samplers are more efficient for sampling from a truncated distribution with quadratic constraints such as Example 1 and 2 (not shown here).

Table 1. Algorithms for sampling from the optimal proposal distribution

Algorithm	Reference
Gibbs sampler	(Geweke, 1991; Kotecha and Djuric, 1999)
Hit-and-run sampler	(Chen and Schmeiser, 1993; Kroese, et al., 2011)
Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampler	(Brubaker, et al., 2012; Pakman and Paninski, 2014)
Lagrangian Monte Carlo sampler	(Lan, et al., 2015)

2.3 The MCMC-CE algorithm for calculating small p -values

Combining the above discussions, our algorithm for calculating the small p -value $p = Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q]$ contains two steps: in the first step we draw random samples from g^* and solve the maximization problem (16), and in the second step we estimate p using regular IS with $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ as the proposal density. The algorithm is summarized as follows:

Algorithm (MCMC-CE method for estimating small p -values)

A. Parameters updating step:

1. Draw N random samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N$ from g^* using an efficient MCMC sampling algorithm (as shown in Table 1).
2. Solve the maximization problem (16) and obtain the CE optimal proposal density $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

B. Estimating step:

Draw M random samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_M$ from $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Estimate p as

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M I\{T(\mathbf{y}_l) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta})}.$$

3. RESULTS

3.1 Simulation studies

To evaluate the performance of the MCMC-CE algorithm, we perform numerical simulation studies. Our simulations focus on calculating $Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q]$ where \mathbf{Y} is a MVN variable. Specifically, we use the following two types of random variables whose true tail probabilities are available in most statistical packages, so that we can evaluate the errors and variations of MCMC-CE: (1) chi-squared variables, which can be expressed as a special case of quadratic functions of MVN variables, and (2) standard Cauchy variable, which is the ratio of two independent standard normal variables and can be expressed as a special case of linear functions of MVN variables. The details of the simulations are given in the Supplementary Text, and the results are shown in Tables S1-S5, which we briefly summarize below.

In the first experiment, we use the following four χ_m^2 's (denotes a chi-squared variable with m degrees of freedom): χ_5^2 , χ_{20}^2 , χ_{50}^2 and χ_{100}^2 , where the dimensions increase from 5 to 100. With each of them, we generate a sequence of true p -values on the order from 10^{-6} to 10^{-100} and compare the results of MCMC-CE and several other methods specific for calculating the tail probabilities of the quadratic form (8) of MVN variables, including Davies' method (Davies, 1980), Farebrother's method (Farebrother, 1984), and Imhof's method (Imhof, 1961). The details of this experiment are given in Supplementary

Text and the results are shown in Tables S1-S4. This experiment shows that MCMC-CE can accurately calculate p to the order of 10^{-100} with $<5\%$ absolute relative error in all the four settings, while none of other methods in the comparisons works well when p is smaller than 10^{-16} . Figure 1 gives a graphical demonstration of the concordance between MCMC-CE and the true p -values.




Fig. 1. Concordance between the true tail probabilities of the chi-squared variables and the ones calculated from MCMC-CE. In each figure, the line represents the true tail

probabilities and the dots represent the ones calculated from MCMC-CE. The exact values are presented in Table S1 – S5.

In the second experiment, we use MCMC-CE to calculate the small tail probabilities of the standard Cauchy variable and compare the results with the true values. The details of this experiment are given in Supplementary Text and the results are shown in Tables S5. The experiment shows that MCMC-CE can accurately calculate p -values to the order of 10^{-100} with <3% absolute relative errors.

3.2 Application to genomic data analysis

We apply MCMC-CE to the estimation of small p -values in three real world examples from genomic studies.

Example 1: Gene set/pathway enrichment analysis.

We apply MCMC-CE to a dataset containing gene expression measurements and clinical variables of melanoma patients, which is part of The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) project and publicly available from TCGA data portal: <https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/>. Particularly, the dataset contains the expression levels of 20531 genes from 355 melanoma patients measured by RNA-Seq, and we are interested in testing which gene sets are associated with the clinical variable of interest, Breslow thickness. The gene set annotations are extracted from the Gene Ontology Consortium (Ashburner, et al., 2000; Gene Ontology Consortium, 2017), where 22211 gene sets are curated. For each gene set, model (2) is fitted with log transformed Breslow thickness as the outcome variable and gender and age as the adjusted covariates. Since the computational time will be overwhelming if all the 22211 gene sets are to be tested using MCMC-CE and our purpose is to demonstrate the

strength of MCMC-CE, we first do the following screening test to filter out those less-significant gene sets: we calculate the approximated p -values for all the gene sets using the method implementing in the *globaltest* package (Goeman, et al., 2004), where the distribution of the test statistic Q_1 [Eq. (3)] is approximated by a scaled chi-square distribution. Based on this screening test, there are 35 gene sets with the approximated p -values less than 10^{-8} , and we use MCMC-CE to accurately calculate the p -values associated with those 35 gene sets. Table S6 presented the results for all the 35 gene sets and Table 2 presented the top 10 most significant ones. The results show that MCMC-CE can efficiently calculate extremely small p -values to the order of 10^{-54} .

Table 2. Top ten gene sets significantly associated with Breslow thickness ranked by their p -values

GO term	No. gene	P -value	S.D.	Time (s)	Description
GO:0048880	5	2.29×10^{-54}	4.73×10^{-56}	6.07	sensory system development
GO:1900019	5	7.17×10^{-53}	1.10×10^{-54}	6.28	regulation of protein kinase C activity
GO:1900020	5	7.20×10^{-53}	1.67×10^{-54}	6.32	positive regulation of protein kinase C activity
GO:0045499	9	1.25×10^{-48}	2.12×10^{-50}	5.17	chemorepellent activity
GO:0004415	8	1.50×10^{-45}	3.09×10^{-47}	6.11	hyaluronoglucosaminidase activity
GO:0016941	3	5.05×10^{-45}	7.49×10^{-47}	5.85	natriuretic peptide receptor activity
GO:0007168	10	5.19×10^{-45}	9.91×10^{-47}	5.71	receptor guanylyl cyclase signaling pathway
GO:2000020	8	6.46×10^{-35}	2.08×10^{-36}	4.38	positive regulation of male gonad development
GO:2000018	9	7.21×10^{-35}	2.14×10^{-36}	4.61	regulation of male gonad development
GO:0045163	3	1.85×10^{-34}	3.61×10^{-36}	5.35	clustering of voltage-gated potassium channels

No. gene: number of genes in the gene set; **P -value:** p -values calculated from MCMC-CE, which is the average of the results of 100 runs of the algorithm; **S.D.:** standard deviations of the results of 100 runs. **Time:** CPU time in seconds. A complete list of gene sets tested is presented in Table S6.

Example 2: GWAS – joint testing a group of genetic markers in a genomic region

We demonstrate the application of MCMC-CE in testing groups of SNPs in GWAS.

The dataset used is collected in a GWAS performed in the population of about 2000 heterogeneous stock mice phenotyped for over 100 traits (Valdar, et al., 2006), which is public available at: <https://wp.cs.ucl.ac.uk/outbredmice/heterogeneous-stock-mice/>. We are interested in testing which regions of SNPs are associated with the serum concentration of high-density lipoprotein (HDL). After preprocessing, the dataset contains 1640 subjects with complete HDL data and 10990 SNPs with complete genotype data. For demonstration purpose, we simply group each adjacent 20 SNPs based on their genomic locations as one region, which results in 549 groups of SNPs. For each group of SNPs, model (4) is fitted with HDL as the phenotype variable and gender and weight of the mice as the adjusted covariates, and MCMC-CE is used to calculate the p -value with the test statistic (5). Table S7 presents the 70 groups of SNPs that are significantly associated HDL with p -values less than 10^{-8} and Table 3 shows the top 10 most significant ones. Those results demonstrate that MCMC-CE can efficiently calculate extremely small p -values to the order of 10^{-38} . Our analyses based on SNP groups are also in agreement with the tests for individual SNP reported in the original study (Valdar, et al., 2006).

Table 3. Top ten groups of SNPs significantly associated with HDL ranked by their p -values

SNP group index	P -value	S.D.	Time (s)
Group 42	5.93×10^{-38}	1.11×10^{-39}	4.67
Group 44	5.65×10^{-36}	3.80×10^{-37}	4.76
Group 200	1.51×10^{-19}	6.27×10^{-21}	4.01
Group 214	1.88×10^{-19}	1.78×10^{-20}	4.62
Group 43	6.06×10^{-19}	1.98×10^{-20}	3.81
Group 314	1.03×10^{-17}	7.38×10^{-18}	4.23
Group 528	7.61×10^{-17}	8.03×10^{-18}	4.33
Group 213	4.64×10^{-16}	9.71×10^{-18}	4.35

Group 276	6.09×10^{-16}	9.56×10^{-17}	4.58
Group 273	7.71×10^{-16}	1.13×10^{-17}	4.05

P-value: p -values calculated from MCMC-CE, which is the average of the results of 100 runs of the algorithm; **S.D.:** standard deviations of the results of 100 runs; **Time:** CPU time in seconds. A complete list of SNP groups tested is presented in Table S7.

Example 3: Ratio statistic in differential gene expression analysis

We demonstrate the application of MCMC-CE in calculating small p -values based on the ratio statistic (6) in differential gene expression analysis. The dataset used is a leukemia microarray dataset published in (Golub, et al., 1999), which is available from *bioconductor* as the *golubEsets* package. It contains 38 leukemia patients with 27 acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) patients and 11 acute myeloid leukemia (AML) patients for which 7129 gene expression levels are measured. We are interested in testing which genes are differentially expressed between ALL and AML patients. We first perform normalization and variance stabilizing transformation of the data using the package *vsr* (Huber, et al., 2002), and then use the ratio statistic (6) to test differential gene expression. To calculate the p -values for each gene, we first do a screening test with 10^6 brute-force permutations, and this step identifies 293 genes with p -values $< 10^{-5}$. Then we use MCMC-CE to accurately calculate the small p -values for those 293 genes. Table S8 and S9 presents the results of all the genes, separated by up-regulated and down-regulated genes, respectively, and Table 4 presents the top 10 significantly up-regulated or down-regulated genes. As a comparison, we also do the differential analysis using the *samr* package (Tusher, et al., 2001). For the 293 genes with p -values $< 10^{-5}$, the results of *samr* show that all of them have false discovery rate (FDR) less than 4.587% and 164 of them have FDR equal to 0 (Table 4, S8 and S9). Those results indicate a good agreement between *samr* and the tests

using the ratio statistic (6). Comparing with *samr*, the strength of MCMC-CE is that it can fast and accurately calculate extremely small *p*-values and provide ranking of the significant signals based on them.

Table 4. Top ten significantly up-regulated or down-regulated genes between ALL and AML patients ranked by their *p*-values

	Probe name	Gene name	Mean (ALL)	Mean (AML)	<i>P</i> -value	S.D.	Samr FDR (%)
Up	X95735_at	ZYX	8.13	11.32	3.01×10^{-16}	4.88×10^{-18}	0
	M27891_at	CST3	6.88	12.15	1.91×10^{-13}	2.15×10^{-15}	0
	M16038_at	LYN	8.39	10.54	5.02×10^{-12}	1.22×10^{-13}	0
	Y12670_at	LEPROT	8.59	10.17	5.26×10^{-12}	1.15×10^{-13}	0
	U50136_rna1_at	LTC4S	9.89	11.18	3.77×10^{-11}	5.12×10^{-13}	0
	L09209_s_at	APLP2	8.59	10.96	4.94×10^{-11}	7.81×10^{-13}	0
	M81933_at	CDC25A	6.96	8.03	5.43×10^{-10}	5.49×10^{-12}	0
	U82759_at	-	7.82	9.58	5.70×10^{-10}	1.13×10^{-11}	0
	M11147_at	FTL	12.81	13.89	1.05×10^{-9}	1.25×10^{-11}	0
	U12471_cds1_at	THBS1	7.53	8.21	1.84×10^{-9}	2.06×10^{-11}	0
Down	M31523_at	TCF3	10.14	8.26	4.36×10^{-16}	6.38×10^{-18}	0
	M91432_at	ACADM	9.51	7.780	3.37×10^{-15}	4.38×10^{-17}	0
	U22376_cds2_s_at	MYB	11.71	9.24	2.68×10^{-14}	5.28×10^{-16}	0
	U32944_at	DYNLL1	10.30	8.31	3.94×10^{-14}	4.94×10^{-16}	0
	X74262_at	RBBP4	10.19	8.01	5.58×10^{-14}	4.48×10^{-15}	0
	M89957_at	CD79B	8.18	4.39	7.52×10^{-14}	1.19×10^{-15}	0.241
	Z15115_at	TOP2B	11.83	10.26	7.63×10^{-14}	7.77×10^{-16}	0
	M12959_s_at	TRAC	10.56	9.00	2.01×10^{-13}	2.54×10^{-15}	0
	U72936_s_at	ATRX	8.72	7.41	2.66×10^{-13}	4.18×10^{-15}	0
	L41870_at	RB1	8.24	6.94	2.95×10^{-13}	3.98×10^{-15}	0

Mean(ALL): the average of gene expression values in ALL patients; **Mean(AML):** the average of gene expression values in AML patients; ***P*-value:** *p*-values calculated from MCMC-CE, which is the average of the results of 100 runs of the algorithm; **S.D.:** standard deviations of the results of 100 runs; **Samr FDR:** FDR calculated by *samr* package. A complete list of genes tested are presented in Table S8 and S9.

4. DISCUSSION

In summary, we propose an algorithm, MCMC-CE for accurate and efficient estimation of small p -values for test statistics that can be expressed in the form of Eq. (1), and demonstrate its application in genomic data analysis. To apply MCMC-CE, the following requirements should be met: (1) The test statistic needs to be written as a function of \mathbf{Y} , and \mathbf{Y} follows a certain distribution that belongs to a parametric family of distributions, as denoted by $f(\cdot; \cdot)$ in Section 2; (2) It is feasible to generate random samples from $f(\cdot; \cdot)$; (3) The density of $f(\cdot; \cdot)$ can be evaluated pointwisely. Nonetheless, MCMC-CE can estimate small p -values for a broad range of test statistics. Although we demonstrate the application of MCMC-CE for the test statistics that are quadratic or linear functions of MVN variables in the examples and simulations in this paper, MCMC-CE can also work for more complicated test statistics that are not limited to the functions of MVN variables (Chan and Kroese, 2012; Pakman and Paninski, 2013). Therefore, it can help researchers develop new test procedures in genomic studies.

The implementation of the algorithm can be further optimized. For instance, throughout all the simulations and applications in this paper we simply repeat the algorithm 100 times by drawing $N = 10000$ random samples in the parameter updating step and $M = 10000$ importance samples in the estimating step (see the algorithm in Section 2.3). The number of repetitions and random samples can be further optimized which can make the algorithm even faster. In addition, systematic evaluations of the performance of those MCMC techniques (Table 1) for sampling from truncated distributions will be informative for the application of our proposed algorithm. Those are considered as our future work.

Acknowledgements

YS thanks Drs. Maureen Sartor and Xiaoquan Wen (University of Michigan) for reading and helpful discussions on Section 2, which is part of his doctoral dissertation (Shi, 2016).

Funding

This work was partly supported by two startup grants from Sichuan University (YS & MW) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China Grant J1310022 (WS).

Conflict of Interest: none declared.

REFERENCES

- Ashburner, M., *et al.* (2000) Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology, *Nature genetics*, **25**, 25-29.
- Bangalore, S.S., Wang, J. and Allison, D.B. (2009) How accurate are the extremely small P-values used in genomic research: An evaluation of numerical libraries, *Computational statistics & data analysis*, **53**, 2446-2452.
- Bausch, J. (2013) On the efficient calculation of a linear combination of chi-square random variables with an application in counting string vacua, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, **46**, 505202.
- Benjamini, Y. and 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)*, 289-300.
- Bergemann, T.L. and Wilson, J. (2011) Proportion statistics to detect differentially expressed genes: a comparison with log-ratio statistics, *BMC bioinformatics*, **12**, 228.
- Brubaker, M., Salzmann, M. and Urtasun, R. (2012) A family of MCMC methods on implicitly defined manifolds. *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. pp. 161-172.
- Burton, P.R., *et al.* (2007) Genome-wide association study of 14,000 cases of seven common diseases and 3,000 shared controls, *Nature*, **447**, 661-678.
- Cauchi, S., *et al.* (2007) TCF7L2 is reproducibly associated with type 2 diabetes in various ethnic groups: a global meta-analysis, *Journal of molecular medicine*, **85**, 777-782.
- Chan, J.C. and Kroese, D.P. (2012) Improved cross-entropy method for estimation, *Statistics and computing*, **22**, 1031-1040.
- Chen, M.-H. and Schmeiser, B. (1993) Performance of the Gibbs, hit-and-run, and Metropolis samplers, *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, **2**, 251-272.
- Chen, Y., *et al.* (2002) Ratio statistics of gene expression levels and applications to microarray data analysis, *Bioinformatics*, **18**, 1207-1215.
- Davies, R.B. (1980) Algorithm AS 155: The distribution of a linear combination of χ^2 random variables, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, **29**, 323-333.
- Duchesne, P. and De Micheaux, P.L. (2010) Computing the distribution of quadratic forms: Further comparisons between the Liu–Tang–Zhang approximation and exact methods, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **54**, 858-862.
- Farebrother, R. (1984) Algorithm AS 204: the distribution of a positive linear combination of χ^2 random

variables, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, **33**, 332-339.

Gene Ontology Consortium (2017) Expansion of the Gene Ontology knowledgebase and resources, *Nucleic acids research*, **45**, D331-D338.

Geweke, J. (1991) Efficient simulation from the multivariate normal and student-t distributions subject to linear constraints and the evaluation of constraint probabilities. *Computing science and statistics: Proceedings of the 23rd symposium on the interface*. Citeseer, pp. 571-578.

Goeman, J.J., *et al.* (2004) A global test for groups of genes: testing association with a clinical outcome, *Bioinformatics*, **20**, 93-99.

Goeman, J.J., Van Houwelingen, H.C. and Finos, L. (2011) Testing against a high-dimensional alternative in the generalized linear model: asymptotic type I error control, *Biometrika*, 381-390.

Golub, T.R., *et al.* (1999) Molecular classification of cancer: class discovery and class prediction by gene expression monitoring, *Science*, **286**, 531-537.

Huber, W., *et al.* (2002) Variance stabilization applied to microarray data calibration and to the quantification of differential expression, *Bioinformatics*, **18 Suppl 1**, S96-104.

Imhof, J. (1961) Computing the distribution of quadratic forms in normal variables, *Biometrika*, **48**, 419-426.

Kotecha, J.H. and Djuric, P.M. (1999) Gibbs sampling approach for generation of truncated multivariate gaussian random variables. *Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1999. Proceedings., 1999 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, pp. 1757-1760.

Kroese, D.P., Taimre, T. and Botev, Z.I. (2011) *Handbook of Monte Carlo Methods*. Wiley.

Lan, S., *et al.* (2015) Markov Chain Monte Carlo from Lagrangian Dynamics, *Journal of computational and graphical statistics : a joint publication of American Statistical Association, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Interface Foundation of North America*, **24**, 357-378.

Liu, D., Lin, X. and Ghosh, D. (2007) Semiparametric Regression of Multidimensional Genetic Pathway Data: Least - Squares Kernel Machines and Linear Mixed Models, *Biometrics*, **63**, 1079-1088.

Liu, H., Tang, Y. and Zhang, H.H. (2009) A new chi-square approximation to the distribution of non-negative definite quadratic forms in non-central normal variables, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **53**, 853-856.

Newton, M.A., *et al.* (2001) On differential variability of expression ratios: improving statistical inference about gene expression changes from microarray data, *Journal of computational biology*, **8**, 37-52.

Pakman, A. and Paninski, L. (2013) Auxiliary-variable exact Hamiltonian Monte Carlo samplers for binary distributions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. pp. 2490-2498.

Pakman, A. and Paninski, L. (2014) Exact hamiltonian monte carlo for truncated multivariate gaussians, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **23**, 518-542.

Rubinstein, R.Y. and Kroese, D.P. (2004) *The Cross-Entropy Method: A Unified Approach to Combinatorial Optimization, Monte-Carlo Simulation and Machine Learning*. Springer.

Rubinstein, R.Y. and Kroese, D.P. (2008) *Simulation and the Monte Carlo Method*. Wiley.

Segal, B.D., *et al.* (2017) Fast approximation of small p - values in permutation tests by partitioning the permutations, *Biometrics*.

Shi, Y. (2016) *Statistical and Computational Methods for Differential Expression Analysis in High-throughput Gene Expression Data*. University of Michigan.

Tusher, V.G., Tibshirani, R. and Chu, G. (2001) Significance analysis of microarrays applied to the ionizing

radiation response, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **98**, 5116-5121.

Valdar, W., *et al.* (2006) Genome-wide genetic association of complex traits in heterogeneous stock mice, *Nature genetics*, **38**, 879-887.

Wu, M.C., *et al.* (2011) Rare-variant association testing for sequencing data with the sequence kernel association test, *American journal of human genetics*, **89**, 82-93.

Accurate and Efficient Estimation of Small P-values with the Cross-Entropy Method: Applications in Genomic Data Analysis

Supplementary Text

Yang Shi^{1,2,3}, Mengqiao Wang¹, Weiping Shi⁴, Ji-Hyun Lee^{2,5}, Huining Kang^{2,5} and Hui Jiang^{3,6}

¹Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University, Chendu, Sichuan 610041, P. R. China.

²Biostatistics Shared Resource, University of New Mexico Comprehensive Cancer Center and ⁵Department of Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico School of Medicine, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA.

³Department of Biostatistics and ⁶Center for Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA.

⁴College of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin 130012, P. R. China.

1. Review of the multi-level CE method

For a complete introduction of the CE method, here we briefly review the multi-level CE method, which is an earlier alternative to the MCMC-CE method presented in the main text. Our goal is to find θ that maximize the second term in the r.h.s. of the second equality in Eq. (14) in the main text, $\int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \theta) d\mathbf{Y}$. The multi-level CE method uses Eq. (13) in the main text and expresses the second term in the r.h.s. of the second equality in

Eq. (14) in the main text as

$$\begin{aligned} \int g^*(\mathbf{Y}) \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y} &= \int \frac{I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{p} \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y} \\ &= \frac{1}{p} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} [I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S1})$$

therefore, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ should maximize (S1), which is the solution to the following problem:

$$\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} [I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \quad (\text{S2})$$

The key idea of the multi-level CE method [Chapter 3 of (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004)] is to solve problem (S2) adaptively via importance sampling (IS). By using IS again with the proposal density $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$, problem (S2) can be expressed as

$$\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k} [I\{T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)} \ln f(\mathbf{Y}; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \quad (\text{S3})$$

The MC counterpart of (S3) is

$$\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N [I\{T(\mathbf{y}_l) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)} \ln f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \quad (\text{S4})$$

where \mathbf{y}_l 's, $l = 1, \dots, N$ are random samples drawn from the proposal density $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$.

Rubinstein *et al* developed the following multi-level algorithm for solving (S4):

Algorithm S1 (multi-level CE algorithm for calculating small probabilities)

A. Adaptive updating step:

(1) Specify a constant $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Start with parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$; Set the iteration counter $k = 0$.

(2) At the k th iteration, generate random samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N$ from $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$. Calculate the statistics $T(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, T(\mathbf{y}_N)$, and compute q_k as their sample $(1 - \rho)$ quantile provided

$q_k < q$. If $q_k \geq q$, set $q_k = q$.

(3) Updating the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1}$, which is the solution to the following problem:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N [I\{T(\mathbf{y}_l) \geq q_k\} \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta})} \ln f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \quad (\text{S5})$$

Note that the difference between (S4) and (S5) is q in (S4) is substituted by q_k in (S5).

(4) If $q_k < q$, set $k = k + 1$ and reiterate from Step (2); else, proceed to the following step.

B. Estimating step:

Use $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$ as the proposal density and generate random samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_M$ from it.

Estimate p as $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^M [I\{T(\mathbf{y}_l) \geq q\} \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)}]$.

Here we briefly discuss the rationale of the above multi-level CE algorithm: The adaptive updating step of the algorithm iteratively generates a sequence of updated parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k, k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ and a sequence of threshold values $\{q_k, k = 0, 1, \dots\}$. According to the work of Rubinstein *et al*, under rather mild regularity conditions, $\{q_k, k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ is monotonically non-decreasing and the target threshold value q can be reached with high probability in a finite number of iterations for small ρ (Rubinstein, 1999; Rubinstein and Kroese, 2004). Hence, the updated parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k, k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ is more and more close to the optimal parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that we want to find in problem (S4). The estimating step is simply a regular importance sampling that uses $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$ as the proposal density.

Based on the relevant literature and our studies of implementing and testing the above multi-level CE algorithm (Shi, 2016; Shi, et al., 2016), we find this algorithm have the following two limitations: First, it becomes unreliable with large biases and variations in high-dimensional settings, i.e. when the dimension of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is large. As discussed in (Chan

and Kroese, 2012; Rubinstein and Glynn, 2009), one important reason is that the likelihood ratio $\frac{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(\mathbf{y}_l; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)}$ involved in (S5) becomes unstable in high dimensions, thus the proposal density $f(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k)$ obtained from Algorithm S1 can be far from the optimal proposal density g^* in high-dimensional settings. Second, the determination of the parameter ρ is heuristic, which often needs trial and error. Therefore, we apply the improved version of CE method (Chan and Kroese, 2012) in calculating small p -values as discussed in Section 2.1 in the main text. The improved CE method can overcome the above limitations of the multi-level CE method, but requires sampling from the optimal proposal density g^* as discussed in Section 2.2 of the main text.

2. Simulation studies

We perform simulations to evaluate the performance of MCMC-CE algorithm. Since the tail probabilities of some functions of the multivariate normal variables can be calculated analytically (e.g. the sum of squares of independent standard normal variables is chi-squared distribution) and several methods are developed specifically for calculating the tail probabilities of the quadratic form of MVN variables, our numerical experiments below focus on calculating $Pr[T(\mathbf{Y}) \geq q]$ where \mathbf{Y} is a MVN random variable, so that we can obtain the errors and variations of MCMC-CE.

2.1 Quadratic function of MVN variables

Here we use MCMC-CE to evaluate the small tail probabilities of quadratic form of MVN variables and compare it with several approaches specific for calculating the tail probabilities of this form of statistic, including Davies' method (Davies, 1980), Farebrother's method (Farebrother, 1984), and Imhof's method (Imhof, 1961), which are

all implemented in the R package *CompQuadForm* (Duchesne and De Micheaux, 2010).

Our simulations are based on the chi-squared variables. Note that a chi-squared variable χ_m^2 with m degrees of freedom can be written as

$$\chi_m^2 = \mathbf{Y}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{Y}$$

where \mathbf{Y} follows $\text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}_{m \times 1}, \mathbf{I}_{m \times m})$ and $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1)$ – a diagonal matrix with m 1's on the diagonal. Therefore, χ_m^2 is a special case of quadratic form of MVN variables whose true tail probabilities are available in most statistical packages (e.g. it can be calculated from the *pchisq* function in R), so that we can evaluate the errors of MCMC-CE and other approaches.

We use the following four χ_m^2 's: χ_5^2 , χ_{20}^2 , χ_{50}^2 and χ_{100}^2 in the experiment. For each of them, we use a sequence of q 's and obtain the p -values $p = \text{Pr}(\mathbf{Y}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{Y} \geq q)$ on orders ranging from 10^{-6} to 10^{-100} , and we use different approaches (Davies, Farebrother, Imhof and MCMC-CE) to estimate p 's and the errors. For MCMC-CE, we generate $N = 10^4$ random samples in the parameters updating step using the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampler, which we find is much faster than other MCMC samplers (Table 1 in the main text) for this problem, and $M = 10^4$ random samples in the estimating step (see the MCMC-CE algorithm in the main text). Furthermore, to assess the variations of MCMC-CE, we repeat the algorithm 100 times for each combination of Q and q , and use the average of \hat{p} 's from the 100 runs of MCMC-CE as the final estimation of p . The results are presented in Table S1 – S4. We can see that Davies' method works well when p is on the orders up to $10^{-9} \sim 10^{-10}$; Farebrother's method works well when p is on the orders up to $10^{-15} \sim 10^{-16}$; Imhof's method works well when p is on the order of $10^{-9} \sim 10^{-10}$. None of those methods

works well when p is smaller than 10^{-16} . In all the four settings, MCMC-CE can accurately calculate p to the order of 10^{-100} with $<5\%$ absolute relative errors (Table S1-S4, Column ARE_{MC}). For variations of MCMC-CE (see Table S1-S4, Column $SMSE_{MC}$, which stands for standardized mean squared error), we can see that $SMSE$ is controlled at $<15\%$ for all the p -values in low-dimensional settings (χ^2_5 , Table S1 and χ^2_{20} , Table S2) and for p -values to the order of 10^{-80} with χ^2_{50} (Table S3) or 10^{-60} with χ^2_{100} (Table S4), while $SMSE$ increases to 20%-30% when the order of p -value grows to 10^{-100} in high-dimensional settings (χ^2_{50} , Table S3 and χ^2_{100} , Table S4).

2.2 Ratio of normal variables

Here we use MCMC-CE to calculate the small tail probabilities of the ratio of two independent normal random variables, $p = Pr(y_1 / y_2 \geq q)$, where y_1 follows $N(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$, y_2 follows $N(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)$ and q is a scalar. This ratio can be written as a linear function of MVN variables (see also Example 3 in the main text):

$$p = Pr(\mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{Y} > \mathbf{0}) + Pr(\mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{Y} > \mathbf{0})$$

where $\mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{C}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & q \end{pmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (y_1, y_2)^T$ following

MVN $\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix}\right]$. Note that we do not add the constraint $y_1, y_2 > 0$ here as in

Example 3 in the main text.

Specifically, the ratio of two independent standard normal variables follows the standard Cauchy distribution, whose true tail probabilities are available in most statistical packages (e.g. it can be calculated from the *pcauchy* function in R). Therefore, our simulations here are based on the ratio of two independent standard normal variables so

that we can evaluate the errors and variations of MCMC-CE. With the standard Cauchy distribution, we use a sequence of q 's and obtain the values of p on orders ranging from 10^{-6} to 10^{-100} , and we use MCMC-CE to calculate p 's and the errors. Here we generate $N = 10^4$ random samples in the parameters updating step using the Gibbs sampler, which we find is much faster than other MCMC samplers (Table 1 in the main text) for this problem, and $M = 10^4$ random samples in the estimating step (see the MCMC-CE algorithm in the main text). Similar to the previous experiment, we repeat the algorithm 100 times for each q , and use the average of \hat{p} 's from the 100 runs of MCMC-CE as the final estimation of p . The results are presented in Table S5. We can see that MCMC-CE can accurately estimate p to the order of 10^{-100} with $<3\%$ absolute relative errors and $<10\%$ standardized mean squared errors (Table S5).

References

- Chan, J.C. and Kroese, D.P. (2012) Improved cross-entropy method for estimation, *Statistics and computing*, **22**, 1031-1040.
- Davies, R.B. (1980) Algorithm AS 155: The distribution of a linear combination of χ^2 random variables, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, **29**, 323-333.
- Duchesne, P. and De Micheaux, P.L. (2010) Computing the distribution of quadratic forms: Further comparisons between the Liu–Tang–Zhang approximation and exact methods, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **54**, 858-862.
- Farebrother, R. (1984) Algorithm AS 204: the distribution of a positive linear combination of χ^2 random variables, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, **33**, 332-339.
- Imhof, J. (1961) Computing the distribution of quadratic forms in normal variables, *Biometrika*, **48**, 419-426.
- Rubinstein, R. (1999) The cross-entropy method for combinatorial and continuous optimization, *Methodology and computing in applied probability*, **1**, 127-190.
- Rubinstein, R.Y. and Glynn, P.W. (2009) How to deal with the curse of dimensionality of likelihood ratios in Monte Carlo simulation, *Stochastic Models*, **25**, 547-568.
- Rubinstein, R.Y. and Kroese, D.P. (2004) *The Cross-Entropy Method: A Unified Approach to Combinatorial Optimization, Monte-Carlo Simulation and Machine Learning*. Springer.
- Shi, Y. (2016) Statistical and Computational Methods for Differential Expression Analysis in High-throughput Gene Expression Data. University of Michigan.

Shi, Y., *et al.* (2016) Efficiently estimating small p-values in permutation tests using importance sampling and cross-entropy method, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00053*.