
HIGH-DIMENSIONAL MULTI-TRAIT GWAS BY REVERSE PREDICTION OF GENOTYPES

Muhammad Ammar Malik
Computational Biology Unit
Department of Informatics
University of Bergen
muhammad.malik@uib.no

Adriaan-Alexander Ludl
Computational Biology Unit
Department of Informatics
University of Bergen
adriaan.ludl@uib.no

Tom Michoel*
Computational Biology Unit
Department of Informatics
University of Bergen
tom.michoel@uib.no

ABSTRACT

Multi-trait genome-wide association studies (GWAS) use multi-variate statistical methods to identify associations between genetic variants and multiple correlated traits simultaneously, and have higher statistical power than independent univariate analysis of traits. Reverse regression, where genotypes of genetic variants are regressed on multiple traits simultaneously, has emerged as a promising approach to perform multi-trait GWAS in high-dimensional settings where the number of traits exceeds the number of samples. We extended this approach and analyzed different machine learning methods (ridge regression, random forests and support vector machines) for reverse regression in multi-trait GWAS, using genotypes, gene expression data and ground-truth transcriptional regulatory networks from the DREAM5 SysGen Challenge and from a cross between two yeast strains to evaluate methods. We found that genotype prediction performance, in terms of root mean squared error (RMSE), allowed to distinguish between genomic regions with high and low transcriptional activity. Moreover, model feature coefficients correlated with the strength of association between variants and individual traits, and were predictive of true trans-eQTL target genes, with complementary findings across methods.

1 Scientific Background

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) aim to find statistical associations between genetic variants and traits of interest using data from a large number of individuals [1, 2]. When multiple correlated traits are studied simultaneously, joint, multi-trait approaches can be more advantageous than studying the traits individually, due to increased power from taking into account cross-trait covariances and reduced multiple-testing burden by performing a single test for association to a set of traits [3, 4].

The most commonly used multi-trait GWAS approaches are based on a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) or canonical correlation analysis (CCA) [4]. However, these are applicable only to cases where the number of traits is small. When analysing the effects of genetic variants on molecular traits (gene or protein expression levels, metabolite concentrations) or imaging features, we have to deal with a large number, often an order of magnitude or more greater than the sample size, of correlated traits simultaneously. For such cases, the standard procedure is still to conduct univariate linear regression or ANOVA tests for each genetic variant against each trait separately. While efficient algorithms exist to undertake this task, [5, 6, 7] the massive multiple-testing problem results in a significant loss of statistical power.

An alternative approach to multi-trait GWAS has been to reverse the functional relation between genotypes and traits, and fit a multivariate regression model that predicts genotypes from multiple traits simultaneously, instead of the usual approach to regress traits on genotypes. The first study to do this explicitly used logistic regression and showed a significant increase in power compared to univariate methods [8]. Although the method as presented in [8] is still only valid when the number of traits is small, extending multivariate regression methods to high-dimensional settings is straightforward. Thus a recent study used L2-regularized linear regression of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) on gene expression traits to identify trans-acting expression quantitative trait loci (trans-eQTLs), and showed that this approach aggregates evidence from many small trans-effects while being unaffected by strong expression correlations [9].

*Corresponding author

Despite these advances, several limitations and open questions remain unanswered in high-dimensional GWAS. First, linear models effectively search for the linear combination of traits that is most strongly associated to the genetic variant, but there is no *a priori* biological reason why only linear combinations should be considered. Second, while regularization allows to deal with high-dimensional traits, it does not address the problem of variable selection. For instance, in the case of gene expression, we expect that trans-eQTLs are potentially associated with *many*, but not *all* genes. Indeed, in [9] a secondary set of univariate tests is carried out to select genes associated to trans-eQTLs identified by the initial multi-variate regression. Finally, a systematic biological validation and comparison of the available methods is lacking. Here we address these questions by considering a wider range of machine learning methods (in particular, random forests regression (RFR) and support vector regression (SVR)) for reverse genotype prediction from gene expression traits. Hypothesizing that true trans-eQTL associations are mediated by transcription regulatory networks, we use simulated data from the DREAM5 Systems Genetics Challenge, and real data from 1,012 segregants of a cross between two budding yeast strains [10] together with the YEASTRACT database of known transcriptional interactions [11], to validate and compare these methods against L2-regularized linear regression (ridge regression (RR)).

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Reverse genotype prediction

For genotype prediction using machine learning models, the expression values were treated as explanatory variables whereas the genotype value of a variant was treated as a response variable. The prediction performance was measured by computing the root mean squared error (RMSE) between the predicted and the actual genotype value of variants.

2.2 Trans-eQTL target prediction

Trans-eQTL target prediction was done using weights assigned to the features by the machine learning methods. We computed the area under the receiver operating characteristic (AUROC) curve to measure prediction performance. The weights (feature importance in case of RFR, and coefficients for RR and SVR) were compared against the true targets in the ground truth for each variant.

2.3 Datasets

The simulated data for our experiments was obtained from DREAM5 Systems Genetic Challenge A (<https://www.synapse.org/#!Synapse:syn2820440/wiki/>), generated by the SysGenSIM software [12]. The DREAM data consists of simulated genotype and transcriptome data of synthetic gene regulatory networks. The dataset consists of 15 sub-datasets, where 5 different networks are provided and for each network 100, 300 and 999 samples are simulated. Every sub-dataset contains 1000 genes. Due to space restrictions, only results for Network 1 and data with 999 samples will be shown.

In the DREAM data, each genetic variant is associated to a unique causal gene that mediates its effect. We therefore defined ground-truth trans-eQTL targets for each variant as the causal gene's direct targets in the ground-truth network. 25% of the variants acted in *cis*, meaning they affected expression of their causal gene directly. The remaining 75% of the variants acted in *trans*. Since the identities of the *cis* and *trans* eQTLs are unknown, we computed the P-values of genotype-gene expression associations between matching variant-gene pairs using Pearson correlation and selected all genes with P-values less than 1/750 to identify *cis*-acting eQTLs.

The yeast data used in this paper was obtained from [10]. The expression data contains expression values for 5,720 genes in 1,012 segregants. The genotype data consists of binary genotype values for 42,052 genetic markers in the same 1,012 segregants.

Batch and optical density (OD) effects, as given by the covariates provided in [10], were removed from the expression data using categorical regression, as implemented in the *statsmodels* python package. The expression data was then normalized to have zero mean and unit standard deviation with respect to each sample.

To match variants to genes, we considered the list of genome-wide significant eQTLs provided by [10] whose confidence interval (of variable size) overlapped with an interval covering a gene plus 1,000 bp upstream and 200 bp downstream of the gene position. We defined its matching variant as the most strongly associated variant from the list. This resulted in a list of 2,884 genes and for each of these genes.

Networks of known transcriptional regulatory interactions in yeast (*S. cerevisiae*) were obtained from the YEASTRACT (Yeast Search for Transcriptional Regulators And Consensus Tracking) [11]. Regulation matrices were obtained from <http://www.yeasttract.com/formregmatrix.php>. We retrieved the ground-truth matrix containing all reported interactions of the type *DNA binding and expression evidence*. Self regulation was removed from the ground-truths. The data from the ensembl database (release 83, December 2015) [13] was used to map




Figure 1: **A.** The RMSE distribution for all variants (blue) and for all trans-acting-only variants (red) in DREAM5 simulated data. **B.** The RMSE distribution for all variants using all genes (blue) and excluding genes on the same chromosome as the variant (red) as predictors in yeast data.

gene names to their identifiers. After overlaying the ground-truth with the set of genes with matching cis-eQTL, a ground-truth network of 80 transcription factors (TFs) with matching cis-eQTL and 3,394 target genes was obtained.

The expression dataset was then filtered to contain only the genes present in the ground truth network, and ground-truth trans-eQTL sets for 80 genetic variants were defined as direct targets of the corresponding TFs in the ground-truth network.

2.4 Experimental settings

For both datasets we used 90% of the samples as training samples, whereas the rest of 10% samples were held-out as test samples.

Ridge Regression (RR), Random Forest Regression (RFR), and Support Vector Regression (SVR) were implemented using Python library *scikit-learn*. The regularization strength (alpha) was set to 10,000 for RR (the higher value for alpha is chosen following [9]) and the rest of the parameters were set to their defaults. The default parameters were used for RFR and SVR. SVR was used with a linear kernel. For trans-eQTL predictions, univariate linear correlation was also used to compare with the regression methods mentioned above.

3 Results

3.1 Random forest regression predicts genotypes best

We predicted the genotypes for variants using the expression data from genes as predictors, using Random Forest Regression (RFR), Support Vector Regression (SVR) and Ridge Regression (RR) methods. RMSE was then measured for each predicted variant on 100 held-out individuals.

RFR achieves the best prediction performance by achieving lowest RMSE for both simulated and yeast data (Fig. 1).

No difference was observed in the DREAM data between the RMSE distributions for all variants vs the 75% of trans-acting only variants (see Materials and Methods). In the yeast data, we observed that removing genes on the same chromosome as the variant lowered RMSE values, suggesting that part of the prediction performance can be explained by local cis-effects on gene expression (Fig. 1).

3.2 Feature importances are predictive of true trans-eQTL associations

To evaluate the ability of reverse genotype prediction methods to identify true trans-eQTL targets of a given variant, we defined true trans associations as direct target genes of a variant's causal gene in the ground-truth network and used feature importances/coefficients in the genotype prediction model to predict how likely a gene is a trans-eQTL of a given variant (see *Material and Methods*). Performance was measured using the area under the receiver operating curve (AUROC).

In DREAM5 simulated data, for all methods, more than $\sim 55\%$, resp. $\sim 65\%$ of variants with at least one trans-eQTL target in the ground-truth network had AUROC > 0.8 , resp. 0.7 , with univariate linear correlation and ridge regression performing slightly better than RFR and SVR (Fig. 2A). For yeast data, feature importances were only




Figure 2: **A.** Bar plots show the proportion of variants with trans-eQTL target prediction AUROC > 0.7 (blue) and > 0.8 (red) in DREAM5 simulated data. **B.** Bar plots show the number of variants with trans-eQTL target prediction AUROC ≥ 0.6 (blue) and ≥ 0.7 (red) in yeast data. Genes on the same chromosome were excluded as predictors for each SNP.




Figure 3: Scatter plots show trans-eQTL prediction accuracy (AUROC) vs genotype prediction performance (RMSE) for Random Forest Regression. **(A).** For DREAM5 simulated data. **(B).** For yeast data where genes on the same chromosome were excluded as predictors for each SNP.

modestly predictive, with 20-30%, resp. 10-15%, of TF cis-eQTLs obtaining AUROCs > 0.6, resp. > 0.7 (Fig. 2B).

Finally we tested whether genotype prediction accuracy can be used as a proxy for trans-eQTL prediction accuracy, that is, in the absence of ground-truth networks, can we use genotype prediction accuracy to filter variants whose model feature weights are indicative of true trans-eQTL targets? However, we did not observe any correlation between the genotype prediction accuracies and trans-eQTL target prediction accuracies for any of the methods. In Fig. 3, we only show the scatter plots for random forest regression (RFR). Similar trends were observed for the remaining methods as well but these are not shown here due to space limitations.

3.3 RMSE plotted against the whole genome produces a map of transcriptional hotspots

Transcriptional hotspots are regions of the genome associated with widespread changes in gene expression [10]. We learned prediction models for all 2,884 SNPs in the yeast genome that were associated with local changes in gene expression and plotted the RMSE for each predicted SNP against its genome position. RFR showed a wide variation in RMSE values for SNPs, across the whole genome, allowing to delineate genomic ranges with high and low regulatory activity. Whereas RR and SVR showed much less variation, and did not allow to separate high and low activity regions on most chromosomes (Fig. 4). The regions detected by RFR overlapped only partially with traditional hotspot maps based on univariate correlations, again suggesting that non-linear methods like random forest may detect biological signals missed by traditional methods.

4 Conclusion

We analyzed the use of machine learning regression methods for genotype prediction in high-dimensional multi-trait GWAS. Reverse genotype prediction from multiple trait combinations is based on the hypotheses that variants whose genotypes can be predicted with higher accuracy are more likely to have an effect on a large number of




Figure 4: Expression hotspot maps showing the RMSE values vs genome position for 2884 SNPs in the yeast genome, for random forest (RFR, top), ridge regression (Ridge, middle), and support vector regression (SVR, bottom). Genes on the same chromosome were excluded as predictors for each SNP.

traits, and that feature importances in the trained models indicate the strength of association between variants and individual traits. However, existing studies have not presented conclusive evidence for these hypotheses, because they only performed downstream analysis for the highest scoring variants.

Our results support the hypotheses only partially. We observed that RMSE values vary across genetic variants and could be used as a measure for transcriptional activity, and that model feature importances were predictive of how likely a given gene is a true trans-eQTL target of a given variant. However, RMSE values and AUROCs for target prediction showed no correlation between them. This is further illustrated by the fact that RFR achieved best prediction performance overall among the tested methods, yet performed somewhat weaker on the target prediction task. However it should be noted that computing feature importances for correlated features in machine learning models is a non-trivial task [14], and this may explain the suboptimal performance of RFR on this task.

In summary, feature importance weights in machine learning models that predict genotypes from high-dimensional sets of traits identify biologically relevant variant-trait associations, but comparing the relative importance of variants through these models in a GWAS-like manner using a single test statistic remains an open challenge.

References

- [1] M. I. McCarthy, G. R. Abecasis, L. R. Cardon, D. B. Goldstein, J. Little, J. P. Ioannidis, and J. N. Hirschhorn, “Genome-wide association studies for complex traits: consensus, uncertainty and challenges,” *Nature reviews genetics*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 356–369, 2008.
- [2] T. A. Manolio, “Bringing genome-wide association findings into clinical use,” *Nature Reviews Genetics*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 549–558, 2013.
- [3] D. B. Allison, B. Thiel, P. S. Jean, R. C. Elston, M. C. Infante, and N. J. Schork, “Multiple phenotype modeling in gene-mapping studies of quantitative traits: power advantages,” *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 1190–1201, 1998.

-
- [4] M. A. Ferreira and S. M. Purcell, “A multivariate test of association,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 132–133, 2009.
- [5] A. A. Shabalín, “Matrix eqtl: ultra fast eqtl analysis via large matrix operations,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 28, no. 10, pp. 1353–1358, 2012.
- [6] J. Qi, H. F. Asl, J. Björkegren, and T. Michoel, “kruz: matrix-based non-parametric eqtl discovery,” *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2014.
- [7] H. Ongen, A. Buil, A. A. Brown, E. T. Dermitzakis, and O. Delaneau, “Fast and efficient qtl mapper for thousands of molecular phenotypes,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 1479–1485, 2016.
- [8] P. F. O’Reilly, C. J. Hoggart, Y. Pomyen, F. C. Calboli, P. Elliott, M.-R. Jarvelin, and L. J. Coin, “Multiphen: joint model of multiple phenotypes can increase discovery in gwas,” *PLoS one*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. e34861, 2012.
- [9] S. Banerjee, F. L. Simonetti, K. E. Detroids, A. Kaphle, R. Mitra, R. Nagial, and J. Söding, “Tejaas: reverse regression increases power for detecting trans-eqtls,” *Genome biology*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2021.
- [10] F. W. Albert, J. S. Bloom, J. Siegel, L. Day, and L. Kruglyak, “Genetics of trans-regulatory variation in gene expression,” *Elife*, vol. 7, p. e35471, 2018.
- [11] P. T. Monteiro, J. Oliveira, P. Pais, M. Antunes, M. Palma, M. Cavalheiro, M. Galocha, C. P. Godinho, L. C. Martins, N. Bourbon, *et al.*, “Yeasttract+: a portal for cross-species comparative genomics of transcription regulation in yeasts,” *Nucleic acids research*, vol. 48, no. D1, pp. D642–D649, 2020.
- [12] A. Pinna, N. Soranzo, I. Hoeschele, and A. de la Fuente, “Simulating systems genetics data with sysgensim,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 27, no. 17, pp. 2459–2462, 2011.
- [13] A. D. Yates, P. Achuthan, W. Akanni, J. Allen, J. Allen, J. Alvarez-Jarreta, M. R. Amode, I. M. Armean, A. G. Azov, R. Bennett, *et al.*, “Ensembl 2020,” *Nucleic acids research*, vol. 48, no. D1, pp. D682–D688, 2020.
- [14] C. Cammarota and A. Pinto, “Variable selection and importance in presence of high collinearity: an application to the prediction of lean body mass from multi-frequency bioelectrical impedance,” *Journal of Applied Statistics*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 1644–1658, 2021.