

Testing for genetic interactions in complex disease with distance correlation

Fernando Castro-Prado¹, Javier Costas², Dominic Edelmann³, Wenceslao González-Manteiga¹, and David R. Penas^{1,4}

¹ Department of Statistics, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Santiago de Compostela, Rúa Lope Gómez de Marzoa s/n, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

² Psychiatric Genetics Laboratory, Santiago Health Research Institute (IDIS), University Hospital, Travesía da Choupana s/n, 15706 Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

³ Biostatistics Department, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Im Neuenheimer Feld 280, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

⁴ Computational Biology Laboratory, Spanish National Research Council (MBG-CSIC), Pazo de Salcedo, 36143 Pontevedra, Spain.

Received zzz, revised zzz, accepted zzz

Understanding epistasis (genetic interaction) may shed some light on the genomic basis of common diseases, including disorders of maximum interest due to their high socioeconomic burden, like schizophrenia. Distance correlation is an association measure that characterises general statistical independence between random variables, not only the linear one. Here, we propose distance correlation as a novel tool for the detection of epistasis from case-control data of single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). On the methodological side, we highlight the derivation of the explicit asymptotic distribution of the test statistic. We show that this is the only way to obtain enough computational speed for the method to be used in practice, in a scenario where the resampling techniques found in the literature are impractical. Our simulations show satisfactory calibration of significance, as well as comparable or better power than existing methodology. We conclude with the application of our technique to a schizophrenia genetics dataset, obtaining biologically sound insights.

Key words: Association measures; Distance correlation; Epistasis; Genomics of complex diseases; Schizophrenia.

1 Introduction

The role of heredity in psychiatry has been studied for almost a century, with Pearson (1931) not having “the least hesitation” in asserting its relevance. Today it is known that a majority of psychiatric disorders are multifactorial, complex traits. They occur as a result of a combination of genetic and environmental factors, none of which are necessary or sufficient. Furthermore, the individual effect of each of them is generally trifling. More precisely, the genome can explain up to 80 % of the susceptibility to suffer some of these diseases, like schizophrenia (Sullivan *et al.*, 2018).

The genetic susceptibility to a psychiatric disorder lies on a large number of variants along the genome. Although the specialised literature usually focuses simply on additive models (International Schizophrenia Consortium, 2009), biological knowledge suggests that gene-gene interactions (or *epistasis*) could be one

*Corresponding author: e-mail: f.castro.prado@usc.es, Phone: +34 8818 13390
E-mail addresses of the coauthors: javier.costas.costas@sergas.es; dominic.edelmann@dkfz-heidelberg.de; wenceslao.gonzalez@usc.es; david.rodriguez.penas@csic.es

of the factors that explain the phenomenon of *missing heritability*, which contributes to the inefficiency of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) when it comes to explaining causality of complex diseases (Manolio *et al.*, 2009; Brandes *et al.*, 2022). Evidence from studies on model organisms also support the importance of genetic interactions in the understanding of complex traits (Mackay and Moore, 2014).

We are interested in datasets of case-control GWASs (i.e., a collection of genotypes of “healthy” individuals and “patients”) for schizophrenia. The statistical challenge hinges on using this data to detect pairs of genetic variants that significantly increase or decrease the susceptibility to develop schizophrenia, which further research can confirm with biological criteria.

This data corresponds to *single-nucleotide polymorphisms* (SNPs), which are variants on one of the “letters” of the DNA (i.e., each of them occurs at one specific point of the genome). Given that we will only consider autosomal variants, each individual can carry 0, 1 or 2 copies of the *minor* allele (the least frequent of the two variants) on their diploid genome.

The aforementioned setting requires performing statistical inference in a context of high dimension and low sample size, where the covariates are *ternary* (discrete with support of cardinality 3).

Appendix A on the supporting information reviews the extremely wide variety of approaches to the detection of epistasis that can be found on the the biostatistical literature. The main conclusion of that study effort is that there is no clear winner among the different available techniques, which justifies the maintained interest in this problem over the past few years.

On Table S1, it is shown that one conspicuous epistasis detector (Kam-Thong *et al.*, 2011) is based on scanning for differential behaviours of (Pearson’s) correlations between cases and controls. This is unsurprising, since several authors (De la Fuente, 2010; Camacho *et al.*, 2005; D’Haeseleer *et al.*, 2000) support the idea of correlation tests in this context when the data is continuous (gene expression, metabolomics and so forth), which however is not the case of SNPs (ternary variables).

Moreover, such techniques usually rely on the normality of the covariates, a hypothesis that turns out to be excessively restrictive in most cases. Therefore, the procedure by Cai and Liu (2016) contains an interesting approach, as they manage to establish a rigorous theoretical framework for the kind of correlation tests that are convenient for epistasis detection. This recent technique is part of the hot topic of hypothesis testing on high-dimensional covariance structure, that has been developed almost from scratch during the past few years (Cai, 2017). A short technical introduction to large-scale correlation tests (LCTs) can be found in appendix B, on the supporting information.

The LCTs of Cai and Liu (2016) have been implemented in the *R* programming language for the purposes of the present article. In order to check the validity of the code, the real-data example on the original article was reproduced step by step, obtaining an adjacency matrix (Fig. 1a) that is identical to the one in Cai and Liu (2016), which uses the method encoded as “LCT-B”.

Namely, the database is the one by Singh *et al.* (2002), in which dimensionality was trimmed down to 500 using the Welch–Satterthwaite test (Behrens–Fisher problem). Since the variables involved are assumed to be continuous, the LCT-B yields believable results; in the sense that the resulting matrix is sparse, but not too much. However, a biological validation of all those results would be extremely difficult to accomplish.

On the other hand, when the schizophrenia SNP data (remarkably discrete) are analysed, the adjacency matrix looks very differently (Fig. 1b) to the previous one (Fig. 1a). The only nonzero elements are close to the diagonal, owing to the fact that the only pairs that are being detected are in linkage disequilibrium (i.e., the frequency of such SNP pairs is significantly different from the product of the marginal frequencies, due to their physical proximity within a certain chromosome). Such findings are useless from the point of view of psychiatric genetics because they do not show an association that is related to schizophrenia, but rather one that is independent of this disease.

Some authors, like Kam-Thong *et al.* (2011), argue that treating clearly discrete SNP data as continuous is an acceptable simplification. Nevertheless, even if that could be anecdotally true in some specific setting, this is clearly not the case, as Fig. 1b clearly displays.




Figure 1 Adjacency matrix of the putative epistatic network detected by the LCT-B, for (a) gene expression data for prostate cancer (Broad Institute) and (b) SNP data for schizophrenia (Health Research Institute, Santiago de Compostela)

The unsatisfactory behaviour of the LCT-B, one of the most robust techniques for epistasis detection (when applied to a different setting from the one it was originally intended to), is the main motivation of the present article. In this context, it is justified to wonder which association measures characterise the independence of ternary variables, as well as how to extend the LCTs by Cai and Liu (2016) to less stringent conditions so that they become applicable to SNP data.

The scope of this work will be address those questions, using an association measure named *distance correlation*. The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 summarises the state of the art in the characterisation of independence in metric spaces. Section 3 introduces a novel testing procedure for independence in ternary data. Some results of our simulation study are reported in Section 4. In Section 5, we apply the method to a genomic dataset of schizophrenia. Concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

2 Distance correlation in metric spaces

The *energy of data* (Székely and Rizzo, 2017) is a branch of mathematical statistics that has been recently developed and it includes the characterisation of statistical independence in Euclidean spaces via an association measure called *distance correlation*.

The extension of distance correlation to metric spaces is a nontrivial issue, that will be concisely summarised hereinafter. For a more detailed review of this theoretical framework, please refer to Castro-Prado and González-Manteiga (2020).

2.1 Distance correlation in Euclidean spaces

When two random elements (vectors) \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are Euclidean-space-valued (let \mathbf{X} be L -dimensional and \mathbf{Y} be M -dimensional, for $L, M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$), it is possible to define an association measure that characterises their independence that is called *distance correlation* (Székely *et al.*, 2007). Firstly, distance covariance should be defined, as a weighted L^2 norm of the difference of the joint characteristic function and the product of the marginals:

$$\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \|\varphi_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} - \varphi_{\mathbf{X}}\varphi_{\mathbf{Y}}\|_w \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^L \times \mathbb{R}^M} |\varphi_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}}(t, s) - \varphi_{\mathbf{X}}(t)\varphi_{\mathbf{Y}}(s)|^2 w(t, s) dt ds};$$

where w is a weight function which is dependent of the dimension of the Euclidean spaces in which the supports of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are contained. As usually: $\varphi_{\mathbf{X}}(t) := \mathbb{E}[\exp(i \langle t, \mathbf{X} \rangle)]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^L$.

Logically, distance correlation is defined as the quotient of variance and the product of standard deviations (as long as none of the latter vanish):

$$\text{dCor}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \frac{\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) \text{dCov}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y})}},$$

and so it has no sign. It is an improved version of Pearson's correlation squared because it has values in $[0,1]$ and, more importantly, it is zero if *and only if* \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are (statistically) independent.

However convoluted the initial definition of $dCor$ is, the sample version can easily be computed. Given a paired sample $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{Y}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ IID (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) ; let $a_{ij} := d(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_j)$ be the Euclidean distances between the \mathbf{X} 's with indices $i, j \in [1, n] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Then, the doubly-centred distances are:

$$A_{ij} := a_{ij} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n a_{kj} + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k,l=1}^n a_{kl}$$

If $\{b_{ij}\}_{i,j}$ and $\{B_{ij}\}_{i,j}$ are analogously defined for $\{\mathbf{Y}_i\}_i$, the empirical distance covariance is the non-negative square root of:

$$\text{d}\hat{\text{Cov}}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})^2 := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij} B_{ij}$$

The above estimator is reminiscent of the following alternative representation of dCov^2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dCov}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})^2 = & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') - \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}'')\} - \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{X}''')\} + \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{X}'', \mathbf{X}''')\} \right) \right. \\ & \left. \times \left(d(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}') - \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}''')\} - \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{Y}', \mathbf{Y}''''')\} + \mathbb{E}\{d(\mathbf{Y}''''', \mathbf{Y}''''''')\} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is valid as long as moments of order 2 are finite (Jakobsen, 2017). Primed letters refer to IID copies of the corresponding random vector.

Whenever $\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ are independent and have finite first moments, the asymptotic distribution of a scaled version of the preceding statistic is a linear combination of independent chi-squared variables with one degree of freedom. More precisely:

$$n \text{d}\hat{\text{Cov}}_n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})^2 \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j Z_j^2,$$

where $\{Z_j\}_j$ are IID $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and where $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{R}^+$.

Unfortunately, knowing the form of the theoretical null distribution is often not helpful in practice. As a result, all the distance correlation literature we are aware of resorts to resampling techniques when it comes to approximating the critical values for the independence test (usually, permutation tests are used), making no usage of the theoretical quadratic form, due to the difficulty of computing the λ_j 's and their sample counterparts. See, for example Jakobsen (2017) or Székely *et al.* (2007).

Instead, it is resampling techniques that should be used. The most sensible choice when it comes to approximating the null distribution of the test statistic is to base the design of the resampling scheme on the information that H_0 provides, which in this case (independence) leads to permutation tests.

2.2 The generalised distance covariance

Let θ be a (Borel) probability distribution on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ are separable metric spaces. Its distance covariance is defined as:

$$\text{dcov}(\theta) := \int_{(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^2} d_{\mu}(x, x') d_{\nu}(y, y') d\theta^2((x, y), (x', y')),$$

where (μ, ν) are the marginals of θ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ and are assumed to both have finite first moments (Lyons, 2013; Jakobsen, 2017). Functions d_{μ} and d_{ν} are the doubly-centred versions of $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $d_{\mathcal{Y}}$ respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mu} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (x_1, x_2) &\longmapsto d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_1, x_2) - a_{\mu}(x_1) - a_{\mu}(x_2) + D(\mu); \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\mu} : \mathcal{X} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ x &\longmapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x') d\mu(x'); \\ D(\mu) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} a_{\mu} d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} d_{\mathcal{X}} d\mu \times \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Like ordinary covariance, dcov vanishes under independence as a result of Fubini's theorem:

$$\text{dcov}(\mu \times \nu) = \{D(\mu) - 2D(\mu) + D(\mu)\}\{D(\nu) - 2D(\nu) + D(\nu)\} = 0.$$

2.3 Distance covariance in negative type spaces

The fact that:

$$\theta = \mu \times \nu \Rightarrow \text{dcov}(\theta) = 0,$$

makes it natural to wonder which spaces ensure that the reciprocal implication also holds. The answer is: *strong negative type* spaces, since in them $\text{dcov}(\theta)$ can be presented as an injective function of $\theta - \mu \times \nu$.

A metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is said to be of negative type if and only if:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+; \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}^n : 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i, y_j) \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \{d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i, x_j) + d_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i, y_j)\}.$$

There are many familiar examples of negative type spaces, including all Hilbert spaces (and therefore, all Euclidean geometries).

If $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ has negative type, the inequality $D(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \leq 0$ holds for any probability distributions μ_1, μ_2 on \mathcal{X} with finite first moments. On top of that, if the operator D separates probability measures (with finite first moments) in $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$, that space is said to have *strong negative type*:

$$D(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \mu_2.$$

Whenever \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} have strong negative type,

$$\text{dcov}(X, Y) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \text{dcov}(\theta) = 0 \Leftrightarrow X, Y \text{ independent,}$$

for any random element $(X, Y) \sim \theta$ with values in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

2.4 Nonparametric test of independence in metric spaces

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the *empirical measure* associated to a certain sample, $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ IID $(X, Y) \sim \theta$, is defined as customarily:

$$\theta_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_i, Y_i)},$$

where δ_z denotes point mass at $z \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

It is easy to see that the natural estimator $\text{dcov}(\theta_n)$ is a V -statistic

$$\text{dcov}(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{n^6} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \cdots \sum_{i_6=1}^n h((X_{i_\lambda}, Y_{i_\lambda})_{\lambda=1}^6),$$

whose (nonsymmetric) kernel h is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} h : (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^6 &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ ((x_i, y_i))_{i=1}^6 &\longmapsto \{d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_1, x_2) + d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_3, x_4) - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_1, x_3) - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x_2, x_4)\} \\ &\quad \times \{d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_1, y_2) + d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_5, y_6) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_1, y_5) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_2, y_6)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If θ is the product of its marginals and these are nondegenerate, the asymptotic null distribution of the V -statistic is:

$$n \text{dcov}(\theta_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (Z_i^2 - 1) + D(\mu)D(\nu);$$

where $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ IID $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and where $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are unknown (dependent on θ). The most logical approach is, once again, resorting to permutation tests.

3 Distance correlation-based test for epistasis

Thus far, the theoretical basis for the usage of distance correlation within certain metric spaces has been set. Upon this, extensions and applications can be formulated. There are not many examples of this in the literature, the most relevant ones being in the fields of time series (Davis *et al.*, 2018) and of discretised stochastic processes (Dehling *et al.*, 2020).

What is about to be presented is the particularisation of the theoretical framework to spaces of cardinality 3, to then design a procedure that is adapted to epistasis detection and that at the same time solves the inadequacy of the tests by Cai and Liu (2016) to this setting (as shown on Fig. 1).

3.1 Distance correlation in spaces of cardinality 3

Clearly, in a finite space, the finiteness of moments (of any order) and separability are not an issue. Alternatively, one can resort to brute-force and solve the system of inequations that are derived from simply using the definitions (Klebanov, 2005; Lyons, 2013), obtaining a direct —albeit cumbersome—proof of the fact that any 3-point space $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ is necessarily of strong negative type. Such proof is, in principle, superfluous, as long as one wants to make use of strong theorems, such as Schoenberg's: $(\mathcal{X}, \sqrt{d_{\mathcal{X}}})$ can clearly be embedded into a Hilbert space, isometric to the vertices of a triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 (note that the square root transformation preserves the triangle inequality of the metric). Nevertheless, it is interesting to check that, when the metric structure becomes so simple, abstract arguments (such as the ones that arise in the proof of Schoenberg's theorem) become unnecessary. In light of this, the study of the mathematical

statistics behind energy statistics in the context of 3-point spaces may well be a promising line for future research.

Let $\mathcal{X} := \{0, 1, 2\}$ be the set of the three possible genotypes for each SNP. There is no biological reason to assume that $2 \in \mathcal{X}$ copies of the minor allele affect twice as much as one (Bush and Moore, 2012), neither when it comes to increasing the susceptibility to a psychiatric disorder nor to decreasing it. As a matter of fact, in some cases this susceptibility is maximal under heterozygosis (Costas *et al.*, 2011), which is coded by $1 \in \mathcal{X}$.

Therefore, there is no rationale for prioritising the Euclidean distance:

$$d(0, 2) = 2d(0, 1) = 2d(1, 2),$$

instead of more general (non-“linear”) metric spaces. And this is why distance correlation turns out to be a way to extend the ideas of Cai and Liu (2016). As previously commented, the marked discreteness of SNP data provides another incentive for transcending the idea of linear correlation.

No specific type of interaction is being looked for—the aim is to simply detect epistasis. For this reason, and also for the sake of respecting the maximum length allowed for this paper, the *equilateral distance* (also known as the discrete metric) will be the one used in every simulation shown on this manuscript:

$$d(0, 1) = d(1, 2) = d(0, 2) = 1.$$

Three further conspicuous distances are to be defined, which are the degenerate ones (in which two of the vertices of the triangle are the same point), that will be especially illustrative in the analysis of real data because they allow a straightforward interpretation of the allelic model that is being studied:

1. Recessive (distance “0=1”): $d(0, 1) = 0$; $d(0, 2) = d(1, 2) = 1$.
2. Heterozygous (distance “0=2”): $d(0, 2) = 0$; $d(0, 1) = d(2, 1) = 1$.
3. Dominant (distance “1=2”): $d(1, 2) = 0$; $d(1, 0) = d(2, 0) = 1$.

Technically, the three previous distances are not metrics, but rather pseudometrics, as they yield $d(x, y) = 0$ for $x \neq y$. However, one can modify the labels on the initial 3-point space so that it becomes a 2-point space, in which then the former pseudometric is an actual metric for which all the theoretical results of Jakobsen (2017) immediately follow. More importantly, distance covariance could also be defined for semimetric spaces (i.e., by dropping the triangle inequality), using the definition by Sejdinovic *et al.* (2013). Therefore, having a premetric space would suffice for a notion of generalised distance covariance to exist.

3.2 Proposal of a hypothesis test

Searching for epistasis consists in looking for differential dependence structures between the case and control groups, as previously discussed. To simplify notation, let Z_i and Z_j be random variables with support $\mathcal{Z} \in \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\}$, corresponding to two different SNPs, for which a joint sample of size $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is available:

$$(Z_{i,1}, Z_{j,1}), \dots, (Z_{i,n}, Z_{j,n}) \text{ IID } (Z_i, Z_j).$$

The aim is testing the independence of $\{Z_i, Z_j\}$ or, equivalently,

$$\begin{cases} H_{0ij} : \text{dcov}(Z_i, Z_j) = 0 \\ H_{1ij} : \text{dcov}(Z_i, Z_j) \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

with the philosophy of the large-scale multiple tests by Cai (2017).

In order to approximate the null distribution of the test statistic $\widehat{\text{dcov}}(Z_i, Z_j)$, one can take advantage of the beauty of finite marginal spaces, in which only a few of the coefficients of the quadratic form that gives the asymptotic null distribution of distance covariance will be non-null. Namely, we present two theorems for such distributions, both for the metric of maximum interest to us and for the Euclidean distance (i.e., for classical distance covariance). Proofs can be found on appendix B.

Theorem 3.1 *Let (X_1, \dots, X_n) and (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) be IID samples of jointly distributed random variables $(X, Y) \in \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1, 2\}$, with $p_j = P(X = j)$, $q_j = P(Y = j)$, $j = 1, 2$.*

Consider $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ equipped with the discrete metric.

Then, whenever X and Y are independent, for $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \widehat{\text{dCov}}_{\text{discrete}}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \lambda_1 \mu_1 Z_{11}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{12}^2 + \lambda_2 \mu_1 Z_{21}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{22}^2;$$

where $Z_{11}^2, Z_{12}^2, Z_{21}^2, Z_{22}^2$ are independently chisquare distributed with one degree of freedom. λ_1 and λ_2 are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1 - \sum p_j^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \sum p_j^2)^2}{4} - 3 \prod p_j}.$$

Similarly μ_1 and μ_2 are given by

$$\mu_{1,2} = \frac{1 - \sum q_j^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \sum q_j^2)^2}{4} - 3 \prod q_j}.$$

□

Theorem 3.2 *Let (X_1, \dots, X_n) and (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) be IID samples of jointly distributed random variables $(X, Y) \in \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1, 2\}$ with $p_j = P(X = j)$, $q_j = P(Y = j)$, $j = 1, 2$.*

Consider $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ equipped with the Euclidean metric.

Then, whenever X and Y are independent, for $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \widehat{\text{dCov}}_{\text{Euclidean}}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \lambda_1 \mu_1 Z_{11}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{12}^2 + \lambda_2 \mu_1 Z_{21}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{22}^2;$$

where $Z_{11}^2, Z_{12}^2, Z_{21}^2, Z_{22}^2$ are independently chisquare distributed with one degree of freedom. λ_1 and λ_2 are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2} = p_0(1 - p_0) + p_2(1 - p_2) \pm \sqrt{\left(p_0(1 - p_0) + p_2(1 - p_2)\right)^2 - 4 \prod p_j}.$$

Similarly μ_1 and μ_2 are given by

$$\mu_{1,2} = q_0(1 - q_0) + q_2(1 - q_2) \pm \sqrt{\left(q_0(1 - q_0) + q_2(1 - q_2)\right)^2 - 4 \prod q_j}.$$

□

Given L SNPs, $L^2 - L$ independence tests have to be performed, half of them in the case group (the X 's) and the other half for the controls (the Y 's). In a second stage, the absence of epistasis between two SNPs will be rejected whenever the independence is rejected for patients and not for healthy individuals. When the opposite scenario happens, it will be because of a spurious interaction resulting from population substructure (Brandes *et al.*, 2022).

Such a two-step procedure requires the significance threshold for the first step to be a modification of the nominal significance level, according to the multiplicity of the test, like in Pecanka *et al.* (2017). In order to accomplish such a control of the family-wise error rate (FWER), the Bonferroni correction will be used.

Table 1 Contingency table for model q_{exp}

$Z_i \setminus Z_j$	0	1	2	
0	$pr + q^e s - qs$	$ps - q^e s + qs$	$p(1 - r - s)$	p
1	$qr - q^e s + qs$	$q^e s$	$q(1 - r - s)$	q
2	$(1 - p - q)r$	$(1 - p - q)s$	$(1 - p - q)(1 - r - s)$	$1 - p - q$
	r	s	$1 - r - s$	1

It is crucial to note that the procedure that has been presented uses a two-step approach instead of directly testing for the equality of distance correlations, as Cai and Liu (2016) did, following the rationale by De la Fuente (2010) and others. In the present article, it has been taken into account that not every significant difference in (distance) correlations reflects epistasis, but only those in which one of the values is close to zero and the other is not. It is especially important not to forget this assumption in the case of distance correlation because, whereas its nullity characterises independence, the interpretation of how large or small its values are does not yield a simple way of analysing the intensity of dependence (unlike in the linear case) and, what is more, it produces some counter-intuitive phenomena (Székely and Rizzo, 2013).

4 Simulations

In this section, some illustrative simulations are shown, including some representative tables and figures. First, the ad hoc statistical models that were created are defined, to then present and discuss the results.

4.1 Design of population models for the validation of our methodology

The theoretical models that are about to be defined refer to the interaction between an arbitrary pair $\{Z_i, Z_j\}$, where Z is either X or Y , depending on the case. When it came to setting the marginal frequencies, instead of allowing for two degrees of freedom on each marginal, a further restriction was introduced (apart from the sum being one): allele and genotype frequencies were constrained to be in Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (Hardy, 1908), as all the SNPs in the schizophrenia database verify it (it is one of the quality controls that are used). So there is a single free parameter, which is the minor allele frequency, that is sampled from a uniform distribution on $[0.05, 0.2]$. The lower limit mimics standard GWAS quality control filters (in settings with moderate sample size) and the upper one was set so that the resulting true interactions are not the easiest to detect.

There are a few options in literature for simulating epistasis between SNPs. Some models (like the ones by Marchini *et al.* [2005]) are overly simplistic, e.g. by not allowing to adjust the interaction intensity in order to assess the robustness against different alternatives. Some recent approaches (like the ones studied by Russ *et al.* [2022]) make interpretability more difficult, in the sense that we are very interested in quantifying the intensity of interaction (i.e., deviation from the null hypothesis) when assessing the power of our test. In order to overcome such shortcomings, we introduce our own models for SNP–SNP interaction.

The most straightforward model is one in which the probability of each genotype is the product of the marginals (there is independence). For dependency, two kinds of models will be defined. On the one hand, models q_{exp} and r_{exp} convey dependence structures that become less intense as parameter $e \in [1, +\infty[$ increases, in the way that Tables 1–2 describe. Note that, for the same value of e , the intensity of interaction is higher for q_{exp} than for r_{exp} , as a result of Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium.

On the other hand, model q_{mult} has $g \in [0, 1]$ as its free parameter (Table 3). Again, the closer the parameter is to 1, the less notorious the association becomes.

Table 2 Contingency table for model `rexp`

$Z_i \setminus Z_j$	0	1	2	
0	pr	ps	$p(1-r-s)$	p
1	qr	$qs - [(1-p-q) - (1-p-q)^e](1-r-s)$	$q(1-r-s) + [(1-p-q) - (1-p-q)^e](1-r-s)$	q
2	$(1-p-q)r$	$(1-p-q)s + [(1-p-q) - (1-p-q)^e](1-r-s)$	$(1-p-q)^e(1-r-s)$	$1-p-q$
	r	s	$1-r-s$	1

Table 3 Contingency table for model `qmult`

$Z_i \setminus Z_j$	0	1	2	
0	$pr - (1-g)qs$	$ps + (1-g)qs$	$p(1-r-s)$	p
1	$qr + (1-g)qs$	gqs	$q(1-r-s)$	q
2	$(1-p-q)r$	$(1-p-q)s$	$(1-p-q)(1-r-s)$	$1-p-q$
	r	s	$1-r-s$	1




Figure 2 Nominal significance level (α) versus empirical power under the null hypothesis ($\hat{\alpha}$), for two different models: (a) `indep`; (b) `rexp` with $e = 10$. Blue dots correspond to `dcov`; the red ones were generated with `BOOST`. The grey shadow is a 95 % confidence band for $\hat{\alpha}$ given α .

4.2 Results of the simulation study

Each simulation consisted in the study of one of the models for a SNP pair. This is an acceptable simplification because the current setting is a problem of multiple testing and not a single high-dimensional test (see Cai [2017] for a discussion of the methodological and conceptual differences), that is, there are no underlying asymptotic results when $L \rightarrow \infty$ that require a whole $n \times L$ matrix to be built and replicated.

We now briefly show some simple, illustrative examples of the performance of our testing procedure.

Fig. 2 shows the calibration of significance for some usual nominal levels, whereas the empirical power is represented on Fig. 3. In all cases, $R = 1000$ replicates were carried out. For each plot, we also display the results we obtained with the preexisting tool that is currently one of the most popular within the genomics community for the kind of epistasis we are studying, which is called `BOOST` (Wan *et al.*, 2010) and is easily accessible from the widely used genetics software package `PLINK` (Purcell *et al.*, 2022). As indicated on appendix A, there is an extremely large number of options in the literature to perform this task and therefore it is not feasible to compare our technique with a representative fraction of them.

On the basis of the aforementioned tables, it can be concluded that the calibration of significance is acceptable or even good for low levels of nominal α . In addition, the plots on Fig. 3 show that the power is very satisfactory and that, as expected, it increases as one gets further away from the null hypothesis. In the scenarios we studied, we have either comparable or more power than `BOOST`.




Figure 3 Empirical power when the SNP pair distributions for cases/controls are (a) q_{exp} with parameter $e \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and *indep*, and (b) q_{mult} with parameter $g \in [0, 1]$ and *indep*. Colour blue represents our distance covariance test; whereas red corresponds to BOOST.

All in all, the procedure here presented does not suffer from the same issues as the one by Cai and Liu (2016), at least from the theoretical point of view.

5 Application to a case-control study of schizophrenia

The genomic database that motivates this article is described in detail in appendix F, on the supporting information, for the sake of reproducibility. It contains observations of 6 371 078 SNPs across all the genome, from a case-control study of schizophrenia in Galicia (Rodríguez-López *et al.*, 2020), with $n_1 = 585$ cases and $n_2 = 573$ controls.

For a better understanding of the nature of the dataset and the quality controls (Ziegler *et al.*, 2008) and downstream analysis it underwent, we refer the reader to appendices F and G on the supplementary material. Appendix G also contains further details on reproducibility.

We now present two experimental setups we carried out to better understand our methodology, by using it to interrogate the schizophrenia dataset. In them, we interpret our analyses of DNA data at “higher” levels on the biomolecular hierarchy (proteins and RNA), based on missense SNPs and genetically-regulated gene expression, respectively.

5.1 Experiment I: Functional enrichment

Taking into account the goal of this first experiment, for the reasons stated on appendix G, it is sensible to restrict ourselves to a certain subset of the initial database, comprising $L = 8030$ missense SNPs.

Firstly, we apply our test procedure separately to cases and controls (as previously discussed), with a Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) nominal FDR threshold of 0.05. We only consider SNP pairs consisting of two variants that lay on different chromosomes or that are more than 1 Mb apart (i.e., not physically close). This prevents evident cases of spurious findings due to linkage disequilibrium (Wan *et al.*, 2010).

We thus obtain 113 out of $\binom{L}{2}$ SNP pairs that show association in cases and not in controls (which we would consider putative interactions), versus 95 in controls and not in cases (which just reflect population substructure). The difference (in proportions) is not significant; with a p -value of 0.12, which could

be lower. These 113 and 95 pairs correspond, respectively, to 222 and 189 unique SNPs, a proportion difference with p of 0.06. Those SNPs lay on 220 and 191 different genes. Removing the 13 that are common among both lists, we get 207 and 178 genes (p of 0.07).

We hypothesise that the genes involved in synapse (Koopmans *et al.*, 2019) (which is a brain function known to be closely related to schizophrenia) will be overrepresented in our group of putative interactions with respect to the spurious one. Intersecting, we see that 13 of the 207 and 9 out of 178 genes are known to be related to synapse. The proportion difference has a p -value of 0.26, so our results for this part are negative and we can show no (strong) evidence that we are detecting any signal related to synapse.

However, this is not to say that our method cannot offer interesting insight on this data. The current knowledge on complex disease genetics indicates that regulatory regions play a crucial role (Sullivan and Geschwind, 2019), so one should focus on genetically-regulated gene expression, rather than on missense SNPs. This motivates Experiment II.

5.2 Experiment II: Gene expression

With this second data example, we want to show that our results make sense at the level of genetically-regulated gene expression (i.e., mRNA).

For this task, as explained on the supplement, only some variables on our schizophrenia database can be used, comprising some $L = 6456$ SNPs that regulate gene expression in the brain, but not in any other tissue of the human body, according to data from the GTEx Consortium (2023).

We now apply our procedure as in Experiment I, seeing that there are significantly more pairs in putative interaction than in spurious one: 1272 versus 1137 (with p of 0.032), after applying the physical distance threshold of 1 Mb. These pairs represent 1539 and 1439 unique SNPs respectively, again a significant difference (p -value ≈ 0.0019 , which barely changes by removing SNPs in both sets: 0.0024).

We finally order the p -values we obtained for each of the $\binom{L}{2}$ tests we performed on cases, and do the same for controls. We then take the absolute value of both ranks for each SNP pair. We hypothesise that those absolute rank differences will tend to be greater on the true positive list than on the false positives. We perform a Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney U test and we find that we can confirm that it is the case, with a p -value of less than $2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$.

All in all, the results of Experiment II indicate that we are detecting some genuine signal, at the genetically-regulated gene expression level. This would be very unlikely if our method did not function correctly.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

Distance correlation has been shown to characterise independence in certain metric spaces, establishing how this theory is valid for the case of 3-point marginal spaces. With this approach, a hypothesis test based on the general characterisation of independence that distance correlation offers has been designed, extending the idea of LCTs (Cai and Liu, 2016) to ternary data.

We derive the explicit asymptotic distribution of the distance-covariance statistics that arise. To our knowledge, the usage of distance correlation in discrete spaces (in genomics or elsewhere) —and, in particular, its application to the search for SNP-SNP interactions— has no precedents in literature. Moreover, no previously published research has attempted to perform large-scale multiple testing with any of the techniques derived from energy statistics (Székely and Rizzo, 2017). However, what does exist in the literature is the usage of distance correlation for finding the association between genetic data (as observations of continuous random variables in Euclidean spaces) and a phenotype (Hua and Ghosh, 2015), which is another interesting problem, but completely different both regarding biological and mathematical factors.

Simulations show that the calibration of significance is adequate and that power is considerably high against various alternatives. We also show that we outperform the “gold standard” BOOST (Wan *et al.*, 2010) in the scenarios we have studied.

The schizophrenia database has been interrogated with our methodology, obtaining biologically sound results at the level of genetically-regulated gene expression. Some very recent studies show evidence of epistasis between regulatory regions of the human genome (Lin *et al.*, 2022; Patel *et al.*, 2022), which supports our findings.

In order to frame our results, we would like to emphasise that all popular epistasis detectors find large amounts of false positives and do not have a really high power (Russ *et al.*, 2022). Therefore, the main limitation of our method (as it is of any other for this task) is that it is very difficult to make any solid discoveries when working with real data. Epistasis detection is an extremely challenging problem, in which there is much still progress to be made, given its key role in human complex genetics (Van Steen and Moore, 2019).

Future work on our research line may include investigating other distances, e.g. trying to design a procedure to infer from the sample which metric is optimal. Another interesting point would be to adapt our techniques to the search for interactions between mitochondrial (haploid) and nuclear (diploid) genome, i.e., to the study of independence between binary and ternary variables. Finally, one could even aim at testing for independence between SNP data and a phenotype of interest (regardless of it being a continuous, binary or survival-type outcome), which would amount to testing for marginal effects of individual variants, which is a main goal of GWASs (Abdellaoui *et al.*, 2023).

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by grant MTM2016-76969-P of the Spanish Ministry of Economy. F. Castro-Prado's research was supported by the USC Institute of Mathematics (IMAT) and the German Cancer Research Centre (DKFZ). The schizophrenia dataset was generated under support of the Instituto de Salud Carlos III (grant number ISCIII/PI14/01020) to J. Costas, cofounded by European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). All authors are grateful to the Galician Supercomputing Centre (CESGA) for the access to their facilities.






References

- Abdellaoui, A., Yengo, L., Verweij, K. and Visscher, P. (2023). 15 years of GWAS discovery: Realizing the promise. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **110**, 179–194.
- 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)* **57**, 289–300.
- Brandes, N., Weissbrod, O. and Linial, M. (2022). Open problems in human trait genetics. *Genome Biology* **23**, 131.
- Bush, W. and Moore, J. (2012). GWA studies. *PLoS Computational Biology* **8**.
- Cai, T. T. (2017). Global testing and large-scale multiple testing for high-dimensional covariance structures. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **4**, 423–446.
- Cai, T. T. and Liu, W. (2016). Large-scale multiple testing of correlations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111**, 229–240.
- Camacho, D., De la Fuente, A. and Mendes, P. (2005). The origin of correlations in metabolomics data. *Metabolomics* **1**, 53–63.
- Castro-Prado, F. and González-Manteiga, W. (2020). Nonparametric independence tests in metric spaces: What is known and what is not. [Preprint.] Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14150>.
- Costas, J., Sanjuán, J., Ramos-Ríos, R., Paz, E., Agra, S., Ivorra, J. L. et al. (2011). Heterozygosity at catechol-O-methyltransferase Val158Met and schizophrenia: New data and meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* **45**, 7–14.
- Davis, R. A., Matsui, M., Mikosch, T. and Wan, P. (2018). Applications of distance correlation to time series. *Bernoulli* **24**, 3087–3116.
- De la Fuente, A. (2010). From differential expression to differential networking identification of dysfunctional regulatory networks in diseases. *Trends in Genetics* **26**, 326–333.

- Dehling, H., Matsui, M., Mikosch, T., Samorodnitsky, G. and Tafakori, L. (2020). Distance covariance for discretized stochastic processes. *Bernoulli* **26**, 2758–2789.
- GTEC Consortium (2023). The Genotype-Tissue Expression Project. Broad Institute. Online resource available at: <https://www.gtexportal.org>.
- D’Haeseleer, P., Liang, S. and Somogyi, R. (2000). Genetic network inference: from co-expression clustering to reverse engineering. *Bioinformatics* **16**, 707–726.
- Hardy, G. H. (1908). Mendelian proportions in a mixed population. *Science* **28**, 49–50.
- Hua, W.-Y. and Ghosh, D. (2015). Equivalence of kernel machine regression and kernel distance covariance for multi-dimensional phenotype association studies. *Biometrics* **71**, 812–820.
- International Schizophrenia Consortium (2009). Common polygenic variation contributes to risk of schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. *Nature* **460**, 748–752.
- Jakobsen, M. E. (2017). Distance covariance in metric spaces: Non-parametric independence testing in metric spaces. University of Copenhagen. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03490v1>.
- Kam-Thong, T., Czamara, D., Tsuda, K., Borgwardt, K., Lewis, C. M., Erhardt-Lehmann, A. et al. (2011). EPI-BLASTER —fast exhaustive two-locus epistasis detection strategy using graphical processing units. *European Journal of Human Genetics* **19**, 465–471.
- Klebanov, L. B. (2005). *ℳ-distances and their applications*. Prague: The Karolinum Press.
- Koopmans, F. et al. (2019). SynGO: An evidence-based knowledge base for the synapse. *Neuron* **103**, 217–234.
- Lin, X., Liu, Y., Liu, S., Zhu, X., Wu, L., Zhu, Y. et al. (2022). Nested epistasis enhancer networks for robust genome regulation. *Science* **377**, 1077–1085.
- Lyons, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *Annals of Probability* **41**, 3284–3305.
- Mackay, T. and Moore, J. (2014). Why epistasis is important for tackling complex human disease genetics. *Genome Medicine* **6**, 42.
- Manolio, T. A., Collins, F. S., Cox, N. J., Goldstein, D. B., Hindorf, L. A., Hunter, D. J. et al. (2009). Finding the missing heritability of complex diseases. *Nature* **461**, 747–753.
- Marchini, J., Donnelly, P. and Cardon, L. R. (2005). Genome-wide strategies for detecting multiple loci that influence complex diseases. *Nature Genetics* **37**, 413–417.
- Patel, R. A., Musharoff, S. A., Spence, J. P., Pimentel, H., Tcheandjieu, C., Mostafavi, H. et al. (2022). Genetic interactions drive heterogeneity in causal variant effect sizes for gene expression and complex traits. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **109**, 1286–1297.
- Pearson, K. (1931). On the inheritance of mental disease. *Annals of Eugenics* **4**, 362–380.
- Pecanka, J., Jonker, M., International Parkinson’s Disease Genomics Consortium, Bochdanovits, Z. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). A powerful and efficient two-stage method for detecting gene-to-gene interactions in GWAS. *Bio-statistics* **18**, 477–494.
- Purcell, S. et al. (2022). PLINK v1.9: whole genome association analysis toolset. Harvard University. Online resource available at: <https://zzz.bwh.harvard.edu/plink/index.shtml>.
- Rodríguez-López, J., Arrojo, M., Paz, E., Páramo, M. and Costas, J. (2020). Identification of relevant hub genes for early intervention at gene coexpression modules with altered predicted expression in schizophrenia. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **98**.
- Russ, D., Williams, J., Cardoso, V., Bravo-Merodio, L., Pendleton, S., Aziz, F., Acharjee, A. and Gkoutos, G. (2022). Evaluating the detection ability of a range of epistasis detection methods on simulated data for pure and impure epistatic models. *PLoS One*, **17**.
- Sejdinovic, D., Sriperumbudur, B., Gretton, A. and Fukumizu, K. (2013). Equivalence of distance-based and RKHS-based statistics in hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2263–2291.
- Singh, D., Febbo, P. G., Ross, K., Jackson, D. G., Manola, J., Ladd, C. et al. (2002). Gene expression correlates of clinical prostate cancer behavior. *Cancer Cell* **1**, 203–209.
- Sullivan, P. F., Agrawal, A., Bulik, C. M., Andreassen, O. A., Borglum, A. D., Breen, G. et al. (2017). Psychiatric genomics: An update and an agenda. *American Journal of Psychiatry* **175**, 15–27.
- Sullivan, P. and Geschwind, D. (2019). Defining the genetic, genomic, cellular, and diagnostic architectures of psychiatric disorders. *Cell* **177**, 162–183.
- Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2013). The distance correlation *t*-test of independence in high dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **117**, 193–213.

- Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2017). The energy of data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **4**, 447–479.
- Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L. and Bakirov, N. (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *Annals of Statistics* **35**, 2769–2794.
- Van Steen, K. and Moore, J. (2019). How to increase our belief in discovered statistical interactions via large-scale association studies?. *Human Genetics* **138**, 293–305.
- Wan, X., Yang, C., Yang, Q., Xue, H., Fan, X., Tang, N. L. S. and Yu, W. (2010). BOOST: A fast approach to detecting gene-gene interactions in genome-wide case-control studies. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **87**, 325–340.
- Ziegler, A., König, I. R. and Thompson, J. R. (2008). Biostatistical aspects of genome-wide association studies. *Biometrical Journal* **50**, 8–28.

**Supplement to:
Testing for genetic interactions in complex disease
with distance correlation**

Fernando Castro-Prado^{*,1,2}, **Javier Costas**², **Dominic Edelmann**³,
Wenceslao González-Manteiga¹, and **David R. Penas**^{1,4}

¹ Department of Statistics, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Santiago de Compostela, Rúa Lope Gómez de Marzoa s/n, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

² Psychiatric Genetics Laboratory, Santiago Health Research Institute (IDIS), University Hospital, Travesía da Choupana s/n, 15706 Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

³ Biostatistics Department, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Im Neuenheimer Feld 280, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

⁴ Computational Biology Laboratory, Spanish National Research Council (MBG-CSIC), Pazo de Salcedo, 36143 Pontevedra, Spain.

This supplement contains additional material to the main body of the manuscript.

*Corresponding author: e-mail: f.castro.prado@usc.es, Phone: +34 8818 13390

E-mail addresses of the coauthors: javier.costas.costas@sergas.es; dominic.edelmann@dkfz-heidelberg.de; wenceslao.gonzalez@usc.es; david.rodriguez.penas@csic.es

A Statistical approaches to epistasis detection

The recent development of the “-omic” disciplines has been parallel to the creation of bioinformatic tools to process the vast amount of data that these experimental sciences produce. The diversity of the available “-omic” software is so large that it has even been necessary to develop meta-tools to index the existing techniques. For example, the directory of one of them (Henry *et al.*, 2014) contains more than 20 000, 900 of which are designed for GWAS data analyses, which in turn contain a subset of 100 that are suitable for epistasis detection.

The existence of such a wide spectrum of proposed solutions for such a specific task owes to the surprising diversity of statistical methods that are valid for it—e.g. linear models (standard and generalised), logistic regression, tests on Pearson’s correlations, permutation tests, Bayesian nonparametric statistical inference, random forests, Markov chains, co-information indices, graph theory, and maximal entropy probability models.

Another cause of that diversity of alternatives is the fact that some of the available techniques only focus on a specific subproblem (pairwise gene-gene interactions versus higher orders, binary versus continuous response variable, pedigrees, stratified populations and so forth) and on the different computing strategies that they use in order to obtain results within reasonable amounts of time (for instance, biology-based initial filters, code parallelisation, graphical processing units, Boolean operations, machine learning approaches, and ant colony optimisation algorithms).

Table S1 Some remarkable epistasis detection tools for GWAS data analysis

Tool	Statistical techniques	Computational tricks	Reference
2S-LRM	Logistic regression	Pre-filtering	Pecanka <i>et al.</i> (2017)
AntEpiSeeker	χ^2 tests	Ant colony optimisation	Wang <i>et al.</i> (2010)
BEAM	Bayesian MCMC	None	Zhang and Liu (2007)
BOOST	Logistic regression	Boolean operations, parallelisation	Wan <i>et al.</i> (2010a)
BiForce	Linear regression	Boolean operations, parallelisation	Gyenesei <i>et al.</i> (2012)
CES	Evolutionary algorithms	Artificial intelligence	Moore and Hill (2015)
CINOEDV	Information theory	Swarm intelligence on hypergraphs	Shang <i>et al.</i> (2016)
EpiGPU	Linear regression	GPU architectures	Hemani <i>et al.</i> (2011)
EpiACO	Information theory	Ant colony optimisation	Sun <i>et al.</i> (2017)
EpiBlaster	Pearson’s correlations	GPU architectures	Kam-Thong <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Fiúncho	Information theory	Parallelisation	Ponte <i>et al.</i> (2022)
GLIDE	Linear regression	GPU architectures	Kam-Thong <i>et al.</i> (2012)
GWIS	ROC curve analysis	GPU architectures	Goudey <i>et al.</i> (2013)
IndOR	Logistic regression	Pre-filtering	Emily (2012)
MDR	Combinatorics, resampling	Pre-filtering	Ritchie <i>et al.</i> (2001)
Random Jungle	Random forests	Parallelisation	Schwarz <i>et al.</i> (2010)
SNPruler	Information theory	Branch and bound algorithms	Wan <i>et al.</i> (2010b)
Stage-wise LRT	GLMs, closed testing	Hierarchical testing	Frånberg <i>et al.</i> (2015)
Wtest	Logistic regression	None	Sun <i>et al.</i> (2019)

Table S1 summarises some of the existing methods, including the ones reviewed by Gusareva and van Steen (2014), Niel *et al.* (2015) and Russ *et al.* (2022) and some other that we consider representative. Some are very widely used, like BOOST, due to it being implemented in the popular genetics toolset PLINK (Purcell *et al.*, 2022); whereas other of the methods on the table have not been used much in practice.

B Derivation of the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

B.1 Proof of theorem 3.1 (discrete metric)

By Edelman and Goeman (2022, theorem 7.4), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_{\text{discrete}}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \lambda_1 \mu_1 Z_{11}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{12}^2 + \lambda_2 \mu_1 Z_{21}^2 + \lambda_1 \mu_2 Z_{22}^2,$$

where $(Z_{ij}^2)_{i,j=1}^3$ are IID χ_1^2 ; whereas $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^2$ and $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^2$ are the non-zero eigenvalues of certain matrices. Namely, λ_1 and λ_2 are the non-zero eigenvalues of

$$\begin{pmatrix} (1 - 2p_0 + \sum p_j^2) p_0 & (-p_0 - p_1 + \sum p_j^2) p_1 & (-p_0 - p_2 + \sum p_j^2) p_2 \\ (-p_0 - p_1 + \sum p_j^2) p_0 & (1 - 2p_1 + \sum p_j^2) p_1 & (-p_1 - p_2 + \sum p_j^2) p_2 \\ (-p_0 - p_2 + \sum p_j^2) p_0 & (-p_1 - p_2 + \sum p_j^2) p_1 & (1 - 2p_2 + \sum p_j^2) p_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By multiplying the rows of the matrix by p_0 , p_1 and p_2 , respectively and adding up the rows, one easily sees that this matrix singular. Using the relation $p_0 + p_1 + p_2 = 1$ and carrying out elementary, but lengthy calculations, we obtain the characteristic polynomial of the matrix $P(\lambda)$,

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda \left(\lambda^2 - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 p_j^2 \right) \lambda + 3 \prod_{j=1}^3 p_j \right).$$

Calculating the zeros of $P(\lambda)$ yields λ_1 and λ_2 . The derivation of μ_1 and μ_2 follows the same strategy.

B.2 Proof of theorem 3.2 (Euclidean distance)

Throughout the proof, we will use the notation:

$$M = 2p_0p_1 + 2p_1p_2 + 4p_0p_2 = 2p_0(1 - p_0) + 2p_2(1 - p_2).$$

Applying Huang and Huo (2022, theorem 4.12), we obtain that, when $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_{\text{Euclidean}}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \lambda_i \mu_j Z_{ij}^2;$$

where $(Z_{ij}^2)_{i,j=1}^3$ are IID χ_1^2 and $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^3$, $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^3$ are non-negative real numbers. By Huang and Huo (2022, lemma 4.14), $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are the eigenvalues of

$$\begin{pmatrix} (2p_1 + 4p_2 - M) p_0 & (-1 + p_1 + 3p_2 - p_0 + M) p_1 & M p_2 \\ (-1 + p_1 + 3p_2 - p_0 + M) p_0 & (2p_2 + 2p_0 - M) p_1 & (-1 + 3p_0 + p_1 + p_2 - M) p_2 \\ M p_0 & (-1 + 3p_0 + p_1 + p_2 - M) p_1 & (2p_1 + 4p_0 - M) p_2 \end{pmatrix};$$

with μ_1, μ_2, μ_3 being defined analogously.

Computing the characteristic polynomial of this matrix and proceeding as in we did for theorem 3.1 completes the current proof.

C Large-scale correlation tests (LCTs)

The LCTs that have been considered in the present article are the ones by Cai and Liu (2016). Given $L \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ SNPs, let $\mathbf{X} = (X_j)_{j=1}^L$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_j)_{j=1}^L$ be the corresponding random vectors of 0's,

1's and 2's for case and control individuals, respectively. If their correlation matrices are: $(\rho_{ij1})_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ and $(\rho_{ij2})_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$, the aim is testing:

$$\begin{cases} H_{0ij} : \rho_{ij1} = \rho_{ij2} \\ H_{1ij} : \rho_{ij1} \neq \rho_{ij2} \end{cases}$$

for each pair $(i, j) \in ([1, L] \cap \mathbb{Z})^2$ so that $i < j$; using samples $\{\mathbf{X}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_1}$ IID \mathbf{X} and $\{\mathbf{Y}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_2}$ IID \mathbf{Y} , which are assumed to be independent of each other.

C.1 LCT: classical approach

A scarcely innovative approach would be to stabilise the variance of the sample correlation coefficients via Fisher's Z transformation (*atanh*). One could think of combining this strategy with a procedure that controls the false discovery rate (FDR), such as the ones by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) or Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001), thus establishing the desired large-scale correlation test (LCT). The main drawback to this idea is that, when normality is not ensured, the behaviour of the test statistic differs from the well-known asymptotic distribution of the Gaussian case. Simulation studies (Cai and Liu, 2016) show that this method performs very poorly (both with Benjamini–Hochberg and Benjamini–Yekutieli), especially when compared to the LCTs that will be introduced next.

C.2 LCT with normal approximation (LCT-N)

The first test that Cai and Liu (2016) devised, the LCT-N, is based on the test statistic

$$T_{ij} := \frac{\hat{\rho}_{ij1} - \hat{\rho}_{ij2}}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{\kappa}_1}{3n_1} (1 - \tilde{\rho}_{ij}^2)^2 + \frac{\hat{\kappa}_2}{3n_2} (1 - \tilde{\rho}_{ij}^2)^2}},$$

where $\hat{\kappa}_1$ and $\hat{\kappa}_2$ are the respective sample kurtoses of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , and $\tilde{\rho}_{ijl}$ is a thresholded version of $\hat{\rho}_{ijl}$, for $l \in \{1, 2\}$; with $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^2 := \max\{\hat{\rho}_{ij1}^2, \hat{\rho}_{ij2}^2\}$.

H_{0ij} will be rejected when $|T_{ij}|$ is greater than a certain threshold $\hat{t}_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, which depends on the nominal value $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ under which one wants to maintain the FDR. The formula for computing \hat{t}_α works under the assumption that the initial distributions are Gaussian or are not very far away from being so (elliptical contours). Consequently, the LCT-N should not be used in other contexts.

C.3 LCT with bootstrap (LCT-B)

If the distributions of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are totally unknown, it is reasonable to use resampling techniques in order to approximate the tail of the distribution of T_{ij} , which determines \hat{t}_α . The bootstrap scheme that Cai and Liu (2016) built to this purpose is consistent and leads to a threshold \hat{t}_α^* , which defines the LCT-B. This test is supported by strong theoretical results, that were proven by the original authors.

D A resampling approach to the test procedure

We initially attempted to approximate the p -values of our test by using a permutation-based approach, which is the gold standard in the distance covariance literature (Székely and Rizzo, 2017). We briefly discuss this brute-force approach, as a “negative result” that can be of utility to other scientists. Although theoretically sound, this strategy leads to such high computation times that it is not suitable for most applications. This is particularly true for genomics, which is so data-intensive that not even the high-performance computing (HPC) described on the next section make resampling feasible. Nonetheless, for other scenarios (of lower dimensionality, or in which no theoretical derivation of the asymptotic null distribution is possible) the following approach might be of interest.

In order to approximate the null distribution of the test statistic $\widehat{\text{dcov}}(Z_i, Z_j)$, it is possible to devise a resampling scheme according to the relevant information that is available under the null hypothesis, which in this case is the independence of Z_i and Z_j . As a result, the reasonable thing to do is not to resample from $\{(Z_{i,k}, Z_{j,k})\}_k$, but to do it separately from $\mathcal{Z}_i := \{Z_{i,k}\}_k$ and $\mathcal{Z}_j := \{Z_{j,k}\}_k$ (permutation tests). Thus, it suffices to compute $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ statistics $\widehat{\text{dcov}}(\mathcal{Z}_i^{*(b)}, \mathcal{Z}_j^{*(b)})$ to obtain a Monte–Carlo approximation of the sampling distribution of the empirical distance covariance under H_{0ij} .

The usage of permutation tests in this context of metric spaces was inspired by the excellent performance of the same scheme in Euclidean spaces (Székely *et al.*, 2007; Székely and Rizzo, 2017; Edelman *et al.*, 2022). It has the drawback that there is not the same kind of fully-fledged formal justification of consistency (as the one by Arcones and Giné [1992] for the naïve bootstrap that Jakobsen [2017, page 100] outlined), which should not be a source of concern in practice, like in the Euclidean case. Some preliminary experimental checks (data not shown) point to a better performance of permutation tests versus the naïve bootstrap approach in the ternary variable setting, but further studies would be needed to verify it.

It should also be clarified that authors such as Cai and Liu (2016) and Székely *et al.* (2007) argue that the number of resamples B is relatively unimportant for their methods to work, as long as it is not extremely small. With this in mind, and also taking into account that the execution time is $O(B)$, it has been decided to use a moderate value for B in the present article, namely the one devised by Székely *et al.* (2007) as a function of sample size n :

$$B(n) = 200 + \lfloor 5000/n \rfloor,$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is the floor function. Some empirical checks confirm that increasing B with respect to the value above causes barely noticeable improvements (if any) both in terms of the calibration of significance levels (as long as the nominal value is not extremely small) and of power.

Nevertheless, if the goal was to control the false discovery rate (FDR), the situation would be quite different: both Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) and Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001) are based on ordering p -values and, consequently, B cannot be too small with respect to the number of hypotheses that are tested, in order to avoid an excessive build-up of null p -values. Unfortunately, when it comes to analysing real data, this becomes unfeasible (see the empirical issues in appendix E, on the supporting information). To tackle this, a FWER approach has been chosen (instead of FDR), which has the slight drawback of neglecting the weak dependencies among the $\binom{L}{2}$ hypothesis tests (both due to one of the SNPs being the same and due to linkage disequilibrium). Despite this, it appears to be the most sensible choice.

E Computational challenge of the resampling approach

The implementation of the test, as presented on the previous section, was an extremely challenging issue from the computational point of view, given the high dimensionality of the data, the amount of samples, and the high number of hypothesis tests resulting from the combinatorial explosion. Thus, a quite sophisticated set of computer technologies and strategies was required to obtain results within somewhat manageable computational times.

As a general rule, any statistical technique based on GWAS data will suffer from the issues that are inherent to such input (high dimension and low sample size). To illustrate this point, Table S2 compares the running times of the original R code with another one, whose core is implemented in the compiled language C , this way making the numerical crunching far swifter. This second code—labelled “ R & C ” on the table—also includes some high-performance computing (HPC) improvements and, what is more, it can be executed in sequential or in parallel mode (i.e., the workload can be distributed among different processors, decreasing the execution time by a factor that is approximately equal to the number of available processors). For a comparison of performance like the one on Table S2, it is crucial to carry on the experiments in

the same environment—in our case, the supercomputer *Finisterrae II* (Galician Supercomputing Centre, CESGA).

Table S2 Comparison of running times for the different versions of the code, all of them referring to the permutation testing approach. It should be noted that the times for the largest GWAS are estimations.

Code version	Simulation, $R = 10^3$	GWAS, $L = 1000$	GWAS, $L = 4000$
R sequential	12 h 10 min	42 days 1 h	2 years
R & C sequential	3 h 59 min	2 days 1 h	30 days
R & C parallel	50 min	2 h 41 min	2 days

Hence, in light of the order of magnitude of these times (the R version would need up to two years in large-scale settings, while the R & C parallel implementation only requires ten hours), it is fully justified to resort to HPC strategies in a compiled language, especially if one takes into account that a GWAS can easily involve millions SNPs, with the running time being a linear and monotonically increasing function of $\binom{L}{2}$ and, consequently, $O(L^2)$; as illustrated by the ratio between the GWAS columns of Table S2.

For the parallel version of the R & C code, in each case, the lowest amount of hardware that yielded results within a reasonable amount of time was used: 12 cores for simulations, and 48 processors for real data analyses. To reduce the times by a factor of f , it would suffice to increase the number of processors f times, as long as economic and logistic constraints make it possible.

Moreover, the algorithm was parallelised in two alternative ways:

1. using a shared-memory paradigm via the OpenMP library, distributing the computational effort among the different cores that exist within a processor;
2. applying a distributed-memory strategy, where different computational nodes—that belong to various machines—are able to share workload via a message protocol, which in this case is the MPI library.

The first parallelisation (that is very easy to implement in the main loop of the algorithm) was useful to apply the test in simulated data, where the dimensionality was not too problematic. However, the number of parallel execution threads to add is limited by the number of cores available on a CPU processor chip, which is not enough to address real data examples. For this reason, a distributed-memory parallelisation was developed, with a classical master/slave paradigm, where hundreds of processors can work together to reduce complexity. It consists in:

1. A processor (*master*) calls R routines that load the matrices that contain the input, split it and distribute it among several processors (*slaves*).
2. Each processor works with one fragment of the matrix, running the iterations that have been assigned to it (i.e., performing independence tests for a fraction of the total of SNP pairs).
3. Once each slave finishes its part, it sends the results to its master.
4. Finally, the master builds the final p -value matrix, which is later used to wrap up the results in R .

The R & C version combines an interface in the programming language R with a core in C , with the latter being devoted to perform low-level computations in a time-efficient manner. Another important factor that helps to decrease the computational time in our implementation is the use of specific libraries to codify low-level operations that involve large vector and matrices. Namely, the well-known Intel MKL libraries and SIMD (Single Instruction, Multiple Data) techniques have been applied to exploit data-level parallelism—using an extension in the registers and the arithmetic and logic instructions present in modern

microprocessors, they can process the same operation simultaneously on the elements of an array through a single instruction. In the present case, it was particularly useful to implement matrix operations.

It was not possible to resort to preexisting software because the most efficient distance-correlation-related algorithms (like the one by Chaudhuri and Hu, 2019) are only designed for the Euclidean case and, therefore, not adaptable to the structure of the 3-point spaces that are the scope of the present article.

F Genomic database

The SNP data around which the whole present article pivots comes from a case-control study of schizophrenia, which was performed on $n_1 = 585$ patients and $n_2 = 573$ control blood donors, all of them of Galician origin, as previously described (Rodríguez-López *et al.*, 2020).

Each individual's genome was sequenced using microarray *PsychArray-24 BeadChip* (Illumina, San Diego, California). After genotyping, several conventional quality controls were performed. Namely, to avoid experiment-derived problems, it was decided to leave out from the database every SNP that verified any of the following conditions:

1. The minor allele frequency (MAF) is less than 1 % in our samples.
2. The genotype proportions differ significantly from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium in the control sample, for nominal $\alpha = 0.001$.
3. The *call rate* (proportion of non-missing data after genotyping) is under 95 %, or either it is significantly different between cases and controls (p -value of less than 0.001).

Had not the previous conditions been imposed, many badly-behaved SNPs would remain in the database, that is, for many SNPs it would not be possible to clearly discriminate between the three possible genotypes.

Individuals were removed when, after the SNP quality control, the genotyping for more than 5 % of their SNPs was missing. For assessing cryptic relatedness, we computed the identity by descent proportion (pi-hat statistic) for each pair of individuals and, for every pair in which $\hat{\pi} > 0.15$ one of its members was removed.

All the aforementioned restrictions were applied with the default algorithms and implementations for GWAS quality controls on PLINK (Purcell *et al.*, 2022).

The final SNP count for the schizophrenia database, which is used in the main manuscript for illustrating our methodology, is $L = 6\,371\,078$. It contains observations of $n_1 = 585$ cases and $n_2 = 573$ controls.

Data recollection followed the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, was approved by the Galician Ethical Committee for Clinical Research, and participants signed an informed consent; as stated in Rodríguez-López *et al.* (2020).

G Technical details of the real data application

We now explain some non-essential technicalities that were left out of the explanation of the experimental procedure on the main manuscript.

G.1 Experiment I: Functional enrichment

For this experiment, among all the autosomal SNPs, only the missense SNPs (i.e., those that induce a change in the aminoacid sequence of a protein) are considered, as a way to detect interaction at the protein level.

To determine which SNPs are missense and which not, our reference was the ENSEMBL Biomart database (ENSEMBL, 2023). Since our schizophrenia data refers to the GRCh37.p13 (hg19) assembly of

the human genome, we chose the Biomart version accordingly. For a comprehensive review on ENSEMBL and Biomart, we refer the reader to Kinsella *et al.* (2011).

As we want to have some ability to detect some signal, and it is remarkably difficult to detect any instance of epistasis in real data (Russ *et al.*, 2022), we restrict ourselves to the SNPs for which the least frequent of the two alleles is observed with a frequency of at least 0.05 in our samples and 0.01 on ENSEMBL (2023). The latter filter also ensures that the missense SNPs we are studying are well-known and annotated. This yields a SNP count of 19 356.

We then remove all the SNPs that lay on any of the 25 small regions of the human genome which are known to suffer from *long-range linkage disequilibrium* (LD), a phenomenon that can cause confusion between true SNP-SNP interactions related to schizophrenia and associations due to the architecture of chromosomes (Price *et al.*, 2008). The list of those 25 regions we referred to can be found, for example, on Facal *et al.* (2021).

Furthermore, once the high LD regions were removed, we followed standard practice among geneticists (Abdellaoui *et al.*, 2013) and *pruned* those SNPs from the remaining 18 268 showing evidence of short-range LD, setting $r^2 < 0.1$ in PLINK 1.9 (Purcell *et al.*, 2022). We used windows of width 500 SNPs, shifting them +1 SNP on each step. Thus, we obtained the $L = 8030$ SNPs that were analysed with our method on Experiment I.

Whenever we assign SNPs to genes, we once again follow the annotations on ENSEMBL Biomart.

G.2 Experiment II: Gene expression

On Experiment II, we will only use SNPs that regulated gene expression (i.e., eQTLs) in any of the brain tissues, and nowhere else within the human body, according to data from the GTEx Consortium (2023). With this aim, we downloaded `GTEx_Analysis_v7-eQTL.tar.gz` (single tissue cis-eQTL data for GTEx Analysis V7, dbGAP accession `phs000424.v7.p2`) from <https://www.gtexportal.org/home/datasets>, which again refers to the GRCh37.p13 (hg19) assembly of the human genome. There we simply removed anything that is not a SNP (e.g., insertions), we created lists of SNPs that regulate gene expression on brain and non-brain, and performed a set difference.

We therefore chose those SNPs present on our study which were also among the 97 913 SNPs that act as eQTLs only in brain (and not in other tissues). Removing data on sexual chromosomes, as well as the high LD regions (as in Experiment I), the SNP count drops to 56 395. After once again pruning the short-range LD, we get the final SNP list for this experiment, which has length $L = 6456$.

References

- Abdellaoui, A., Hottenga, J., de Knijff, P., Nivard, M., Xiao, X., Scheet, P. et al. (2013). Population structure, migration, and diversifying selection in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Human Genetics* **21**, 1277–1285.
- Arcones, M. Á. and Giné, E. (1992). On the bootstrap of U and V -statistics. *Annals of Statistics* **20**, 655–674.
- 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)* **57**, 289–300.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Annals of Statistics* **29**, 1165–1188.
- Cai, T. T. and Liu, W. (2016). Large-scale multiple testing of correlations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111**, 229–240.
- Chaudhuri, A. and Hu, W. (2019). A fast algorithm for computing distance correlation. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **135**, 15–24.
- Edelmann, D. and Goeman, J. J. (2022). A regression perspective on generalized distance covariance and the Hilbert–Schmidt independence criterion. *Statistical Science* **37**, 562–579.
- Edelmann, D., Welchowski, T. and Benner, A. (2021). A consistent version of distance covariance for right-censored survival data and its application in hypothesis testing. *Biometrics* **78**, 867–879.

- Emily, M. (2012). IndOR: a new statistical procedure to test for SNP-SNP epistasis in genome-wide association studies. *Statistics in Medicine* **31**, 2359–2373.
- ENSEMBL (2023). ENSEMBL Biomart. EMBL's European Bioinformatics Institute. Online resource available at: <https://grch37.ensembl.org/biomart>.
- Facal, F., Flórez, G., Blanco, V., Rodríguez, J., Pereiro, C., Fernández, J. M. et al. (2021). Genetic predisposition to alcohol dependence: The combined role of polygenic risk to general psychopathology and to high alcohol consumption. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* **221**, 108556.
- Frånberg, M., Gertow, K., Hamsten, A., PROCARDIS consortium, Lagergren, J., and Sennblad, B. (2015). Discovering genetic interactions in large-scale association studies by stage-wise likelihood ratio tests. *PLoS Genetics* **11**, e1005502.
- Goudey, B., Rawlinson, D., Wang, Q., Shi, F., Ferra, H., Campbell, R. M. et al. (2013). GWIS — Model-free, fast and exhaustive search for epistatic interactions in case-control GWAS. *BMC Genomics* **14**.
- GTEx Consortium (2023). The Genotype-Tissue Expression Project. Broad Institute. Online resource available at: <https://www.gtexportal.org>.
- Gusareva, E. S. and Van Steen, K. (2014). Practical aspects of genome-wide association interaction analysis. *Human Genetics* **133**, 1343–1358.
- Gyenesi, A., Moody, J., Semple, C. A. M., Haley, C. S. and Wei, W.-H. (2012). High-throughput analysis of epistasis in genome-wide association studies with BiForce. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 1957–1964.
- Hemani, G., Theocharidis, A., Wei, W.-H. and Haley, C. S. (2011). EpiGPU: Exhaustive pairwise epistasis scans parallelized on consumer level graphics cards. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 1462–1465.
- Henry, V. J., Bandrowski, A. E., Pepin, A.-S., González, B. J. and Desfeux, A. (2014). OMICtools: an informative directory for multi-omic data. *Database* **2014**, article bau069.
- Huang, C. and Huo, X. (2022). A statistically and numerically efficient independence test based on random projections and distance covariance. *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics* **7**, article 79841.
- Jakobsen, M. E. (2017). Distance covariance in metric spaces: Non-parametric independence testing in metric spaces. University of Copenhagen. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03490v1>.
- Kam-Thong, T., Czamara, D., Tsuda, K., Borgwardt, K., Lewis, C. M., Erhardt-Lehmann, A. et al. (2011). EPI-BLASTER —fast exhaustive two-locus epistasis detection strategy using graphical processing units. *European Journal of Human Genetics* **19**, 465–471.
- Kam-Thong, T., Azencott, C.-A., Cayton, L., Pütz, B., Altmann, A., Karbalai, N. et al. (2012). GLIDE: GPU-Based linear regression for detection of epistasis. *Human Heredity*, **73**, 220–236.
- Kinsella, R., Kähäri, A., Haider, S., Zamora, J., Proctor, G., Spudich, G. et al. (2011). Ensembl BioMarts: a hub for data retrieval across taxonomic space. *Database* **2011**.
- Moore, J. H. and Hill, D. P. (2015). Epistasis analysis using artificial intelligence. *Methods in Molecular Biology* **1253**, 327–346.
- Niel, C., Sinoquet, C., Dina, C. and Rocheleau, G. (2015). A survey about methods dedicated to epistasis detection. *Frontiers in Genetics* **6**.
- Pecanka, J., Jonker, M. A., International Parkinson's Disease Genomics Consortium, Bochdanovits, Z. and van der Vaart, A. W. (2017). A powerful and efficient two-stage method for detecting gene-to-gene interactions in GWAS. *Biostatistics* **18**, 477–494.
- Ponte-Fernández, C., González-Domínguez, J. and Martín, M.J. (2022). Fiuncho: a program for any-order epistasis detection in CPU clusters. *Journal of Supercomputing* **78**, 15338–15357.
- Price, A., Weale, M., Patterson, N., Myers, S., Need, A., Shianna, K. et al. (2008). Long-range LD can confound genome scans in admixed populations. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **83**, 132–135.
- Purcell, S. et al. (2022). PLINK v1.9: whole genome association analysis toolset. Harvard University. Online resource available at: <https://zzz.bwh.harvard.edu/plink/index.shtml>.
- Ritchie, M. D., Hahn, L. W., Roodi, N., Bailey, L. R., Dupont, W. D., Parl, F. F. and Moore, J. H. (2001). Multifactor-dimensionality reduction reveals high-order interactions among estrogen-metabolism genes in sporadic breast cancer. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **69**, 138–147.
- Rodríguez-López, J., Arrojo, M., Paz, E., Páramo, M. and Costas, J. (2020). Identification of relevant hub genes for early intervention at gene coexpression modules with altered predicted expression in schizophrenia. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **98**, 109815.

- Russ, D., Williams, J., Cardoso, V., Bravo-Merodio, L., Pendleton, S., Aziz, F., Acharjee, A. and Gkoutos, G. (2022). Evaluating the detection ability of a range of epistasis detection methods on simulated data for pure and impure epistatic models. *PLoS One*, **17**.
- Schwarz, D. F., König, I. R. and Ziegler, A. (2010). On safari to random jungle: A fast implementation of random forests for high-dimensional data. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 1752–1758.
- Shang, J., Sun, Y., Liu, J. X., Xia, J., Zhang, J. and Zheng, C. H. (2016). CINOEDV: A co-information-based method for detecting and visualizing n -order epistatic interactions. *BMC Bioinformatics* **17**, 214.
- Sun, R., Xia, X., Chong, K. C., Zee, B. C. Y., Wu, W. K. K. and Wang, M. H. (2019). Wtest: An integrated R package for genetic epistasis testing. *BMC Medical Genomics* **12**, 180.
- Sun, Y., Shang, J., Liu, J.-X., Li, S. and Zheng, C.-H. (2017). EpiACO – a method for identifying epistasis based on ant colony optimization algorithm. *BioData Mining* **10**.
- Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2017). The energy of data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **4**, 447–479.
- Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L. and Bakirov, N. (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *Annals of Statistics* **35**, 2769–2794.
- Wan, X., Yang, C., Yang, Q., Xue, H., Fan, X., Tang, N. L. S. and Yu, W. (2010a). BOOST: A fast approach to detecting gene-gene interactions in genome-wide case-control studies. *American Journal of Human Genetics* **87**, 325–340.
- Wan, X., Yang, C., Yang, Q., Xue, H., Tang, N. L. S. and Yu, W. (2010b). Predictive rule inference for epistatic interaction detection in genome-wide association studies. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 30–37.
- Wang, Y., Liu, X., Robbins, K. and Rekaya, R. (2010). AntEpiSeeker: Detecting epistatic interactions for case-control studies using a two-stage ant colony optimization algorithm. *BMC Research Notes* **3**, 117.
- Zhang, Y. and Liu, J. S. (2007). Bayesian inference of epistatic interactions in case-control studies. *Nature Genetics* **39**, 1167–1173.