

Regression and Classification of Compositional Data via a novel Supervised Log Ratio Method

Jing Ma

Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center

Kristyn Pantoja, David E. Jones

Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University

April 4, 2023

Abstract

Compositional data in which only the relative abundances of variables are measured are ubiquitous. In the context of health and medical compositional data, an important class of biomarkers is the log ratios between groups of variables. However, selecting log ratios that are predictive of a response variable is a combinatorial problem. Existing greedy-search based methods are time-consuming, which hinders their application to high-dimensional data sets. We propose a novel selection approach called the supervised log ratio method that can efficiently select predictive log ratios in high-dimensional settings. The proposed method is motivated by a latent variable model and we show that the log ratio biomarker can be selected via simple clustering after supervised feature screening. The supervised log ratio method is implemented in an R package, which is publicly available at <https://github.com/drjingma/slr>. We illustrate the merits of our approach through simulation studies and analysis of a microbiome data set on HIV infection.

Keywords: balances; clustering; compositional data; log ratios; supervised learning; variable screening

1 Introduction

In many high-throughput sequencing studies, it is often costly to measure the absolute abundance of each feature, e.g. microbial taxa, metabolites, or genes (Barlow et al., 2020). In contrast, feature relative abundances are easily generated in metagenomics, metabolomics, and single-cell transcriptomics, resulting in compositional data. A key objective of these studies is to identify interpretable biomarkers that can predict a health outcome (Sepich-Poore et al., 2021).

Methods for predictive modeling of compositional data date back to the pioneering work of Aitchison and Bacon-Shone (1984) which proposed the log contrast regression model. The log contrast model is invariant to the scale of compositional data and has recently been extended to high-dimensional settings by incorporating ℓ_1 (Lin et al., 2014; Shi et al., 2016) or tree-based regularization (Wang and Zhao, 2017a,b; Bien et al., 2021). However, the log contrast model selects individual features as biomarkers which can be difficult to interpret because the underlying set of features is subject to the unit-sum constraint.

Alternatively, one can select interpretable biomarkers in the form of log ratios (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018; Quinn and Erb, 2020). Ratios circumvent the limitation of not knowing the absolute abundances (Morton et al., 2019) and also offer robustness against multiplicative bias that arises from the sequencing process (McLaren et al., 2019). Log ratios enforce symmetry around zero and constitute interpretable biomarkers that preserve the principles of compositional data analysis, e.g. scale-invariance. However, selecting log ratio biomark-

ers is a combinatorial problem. The greedy search algorithm (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018) is computationally prohibitive and scales poorly to high-dimensional settings. Another work by Bates and Tibshirani (2019) considers pairwise log ratios, which unfortunately has identifiability issues.

In this paper, we propose a new approach, called the *supervised log ratio* (SLR) method, for selecting log ratio biomarkers in high-dimensional regression and classification problems. SLR is motivated by a latent variable model where the latent variable is directly associated with both the response and a sparse set of predictors. The problem of selecting the log ratio biomarker thus reduces to inference for the latent variable. The implementation of SLR consists of two main steps. In the first step, SLR screens for active variables by performing univariate regression of the response on each predictor after a log ratio transformation. In the second step, SLR clusters active variables into two groups on a suitably defined dissimilarity measure and defines a biomarker using the log ratio between the two groups. Intuitively, the screening step removes spurious variables such that a simple clustering can effectively define the log ratio biomarker. As a result, SLR is able to select sparse and interpretable log ratios. We compare SLR with several existing methods in simulation studies, and show that SLR outperforms the competing approaches in both prediction of the response and variable selection. When applied to two microbiome data sets, SLR yields more robust variable selection than existing methods (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018; Gordon-Rodriguez et al., 2022).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews existing models for

regression and classification of compositional data. In Section 3, we introduce the proposed method and discuss its properties. We then illustrate the merits of SLR via simulation studies in Section 4 and two real data analyses in Section 5. Discussion can be found in Section 6.

2 Regression Analysis of Compositional Data

Suppose we have n independent and identically distributed observations (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,p})^\top \in \mathcal{S}^p$ is a vector of relative abundances and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous response variable. Here $\mathcal{S}^p = \{(x_1, \dots, x_p)^\top : x_j \geq 0 \ (j = 1, \dots, p), \ x_1 + \dots + x_p = 1\}$ denotes the p -dimensional simplex. Our goal is to identify a set of biomarkers, defined as functions of \mathbf{x}_i , that can predict the response y_i . We begin by reviewing existing models that are scale-invariant and hence suitable for compositional data.

2.1 Linear log contrast model

The linear log contrast model (Aitchison and Bacon-Shone, 1984) transforms the composition \mathbf{x}_i in \mathcal{S}^p into a $(p - 1)$ -dimensional real space via the additive log ratio (alr) transformation $z_{i,j} = \log(x_{i,j}/x_{i,p})$ for $j = 1, \dots, p - 1$. Under the linear log contrast model, the mean of the response y_i is given by

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \beta_j z_{i,j}. \quad (1)$$

The model in (1) requires the choice of a reference component, but this requirement can be relaxed by incorporating a zero sum constraint on the coefficients

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j \log(x_{i,j}) \quad (\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_p = 0). \quad (2)$$

In high-dimensional settings, the model in (2) can be solved by the constrained Lasso algorithm (Lin et al., 2014). Properties of the constrained Lasso and its variations have been studied extensively in the literature (Shi et al., 2016; Wang and Zhao, 2017a,b; Bien et al., 2021). The linear log contrast model has also been studied in the context of classification problems (Lu et al., 2019).

Lasso penalized linear log contrast regression with the unit-sum constraint on the coefficients is referred to as *coda-lasso* in Susin et al. (2020). While *coda-lasso* emphasizes the selection of individual variables, Susin et al. (2020) pointed out that its output can also be understood as the log ratio between two weighted geometric means. A closely related method that is very popular in the applied literature is to perform Lasso penalized regression on centered log ratio transformed predictors without the unit-sum constraint, referred to as *clr-lasso* in Susin et al. (2020). For a compositional vector \mathbf{x}_i , the centered log ratio (clr) transformation is defined as $z_{i,j} = \log(x_{i,j}/g(\mathbf{x}_i))$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$), where $g(\cdot)$ is the geometric mean function. However, variables selected by *clr-lasso* are difficult to interpret because the reference, which is the geometric mean, is defined by all variables.

2.2 Pairwise log ratio model

Log ratio based regression models have been proposed to address the interpretability limitation of coda-lasso and clr-lasso. Pairwise log ratio regression (Bates and Tibshirani, 2019) considers the following linear model for the expected response

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} \theta_{j,k}^{\text{plr}} \log \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i,k}}. \quad (3)$$

The coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{plr}} = (\theta_{1,2}^{\text{plr}}, \dots, \theta_{p-1,p}^{\text{plr}})^\top$ is connected to the log contrast coefficient vector in (2) by the relation $\boldsymbol{\beta} = C^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{plr}}$, where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p^* \times p}$ ($p^* = p(p-1)/2$) is a matrix with entries belonging to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. For example, when $p = 4$, we have

$$C^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The relationship $\boldsymbol{\beta} = C^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{plr}}$ implies that $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ satisfies the constraint $\sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j = 0$ automatically.

Although scale-invariant and interpretable, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{plr}}$ is not identifiable even when the sample size $n > p^*$, because the design matrix with p^* pairwise log ratios is not of full column rank. As illustrated in Bates and Tibshirani (2019), an addition of the ℓ_1 penalty on $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{plr}}$

is not sufficient to guarantee uniqueness of the solution.

2.3 Balance regression model

Balance regression (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018) seeks to find the subsets I_+ and I_- such that the mean of the response y_i is given by

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 B(\mathbf{x}_i; I_+, I_-), \quad (4)$$

where the balance between two groups of variables is defined as

$$B(X; I_+, I_-) = \log \frac{g(X_{I_+})}{g(X_{I_-})} = \frac{1}{|I_+|} \sum_{j \in I_+} \log X_j - \frac{1}{|I_-|} \sum_{j \in I_-} \log X_j. \quad (5)$$

Here $|I|$ denotes the size of the subset I , and X_I denotes the sub-vector of X whose elements are the variables indexed by I . Without loss of generality, assume $\theta_1 \geq 0$ so that I_+ includes variables in the numerator of the balance. The original definition of balances in Egozcue and Pawlowsky-Glahn (2005) also has a normalizing constant in front of the log ratio in (5), which is unnecessary here because it will be absorbed into the regression coefficient θ_1 in (4). It is straightforward to expand Equation (4) into the linear log contrast model with coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ defined as $\beta_j = \theta_1/|I_+|$ for $j \in I_+$, $\beta_j = -\theta_1/|I_-|$ for $j \in I_-$, and zero elsewhere.

Finding the optimal active sets I_+ and I_- is a combinatorial problem. Existing work

(Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018) considers greedy search for the best subsets, which is computationally expensive. More recently, Gordon-Rodriguez et al. (2022) uses a continuous relaxation to approximate the underlying combinatorial problem, which is similar in spirit to approximating the ℓ_0 penalty with the ℓ_1 penalty. The resulting procedure is computationally more efficient than greedy search, but tends to yield high false positives, as we will explore in our simulation studies.

3 Supervised Log Ratio Method

We propose a new approach, called the supervised log ratio (SLR) method, to identify the active sets I_+, I_- , and hence the predictive balance. The method consists of the following steps:

1. Compute the univariate regression coefficients for clr transformed variables. Form a reduced data matrix with variables whose univariate coefficients exceed a threshold $\tau \geq 0$ in absolute value (τ is chosen via cross-validation).
2. Perform clustering of the variables on a suitable dissimilarity derived from the reduced data matrix to get two clusters. Use the resulting balance to predict y .

Step 1 of SLR reduces the dimensionality of the predictors, while Step 2 partitions active variables into two subsets which are then used to define a balance biomarker. SLR and clr-lasso both operate on clr transformed variables, but there are two important distinctions

between the two methods. First, SLR uses univariate feature screening as opposed to Lasso penalization to perform dimensionality reduction. Second, SLR uses an extra clustering step to define a balance biomarker, which is more interpretable compared to biomarkers that are defined with respect to the geometric mean of all variables.

We now describe the procedure in detail. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \text{clr}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ denote clr transformed version of the i -th observation. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^j = (\tilde{x}_{1,j}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{n,j})^\top$ denote the vector of observations for the j -th feature. Let $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ denote the sample mean of \mathbf{y} and $\hat{\psi}_j$ denote the univariate regression coefficient for measuring the univariate effect of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^j$ on \mathbf{y} :

$$\hat{\psi}_j = \frac{(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^j - \bar{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^j)}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^j - \bar{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}^j\|^2}. \quad (6)$$

Note that the scale estimate $\hat{\sigma}$ common to all variables cancels out. Let C_τ be the collection of indices such that $|\hat{\psi}_j| \geq \tau$, i.e. the variables selected by Step 1 of SLR. For Step 2, a variety of dissimilarity measures can be used to cluster the variables in C_τ . Since our features are proportions, we use the variation matrix (Aitchison, 1986) $\hat{A}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{|C_\tau| \times |C_\tau|}$ defined as

$$\hat{A}(\tau)_{j,k} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\log \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i,k}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i'=1}^n \log \frac{x_{i',j}}{x_{i',k}} \right)^2 \quad (j, k \in C_\tau).$$

Given the dissimilarity $\hat{A}(\tau)$, variables in C_τ can be partitioned into two groups by either hierarchical clustering or spectral clustering.

3.1 A latent variable model

We provide some intuition underlying SLR. Consider the following latent variable model where the response y and independent variables X_j are simultaneously driven by a latent variable u such that

$$y = \theta_0 + \theta_1 u + \varepsilon, \quad (7)$$

$$\log \frac{X_j}{X_p} = \alpha_{0,j} + \alpha_{1,j} u + \epsilon_j. \quad (8)$$

Here X_p is an inactive variable whose index p belongs to $I_0 = \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{I_+ \cup I_-\}$. For non-negative constants c_1 and c_2 , we assume that the coefficients $\alpha_{1,j}$ satisfy $\alpha_{1,j} = c_1$ for $j \in I_+$, $\alpha_{1,j} = -c_2$ for $j \in I_-$, $\alpha_{1,j} = 0$ for $j \notin I_+ \cup I_-$, and $\sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{1,j} = 0$. The zero-mean errors ε and ϵ_j are assumed to be independent of each other and independent of u . The latent variable model in (7)-(8) can also be viewed a special case of an *errors-in-variables* model (Griliches and Ringstad, 1970).

Intuitively, we can think of u as the desired balance between the two active sets I_+ and I_- . Indeed, one can verify that under model (8) the balance $B(X; I_+, I_-)$ is a scaled and perturbed version of the latent variable u :

$$B(X; I_+, I_-) = \tilde{\alpha}_0 + (c_1 + c_2)u + \tilde{\epsilon},$$

where

$$\tilde{\alpha}_0 = \frac{1}{|I_+|} \sum_{j \in I_+} \alpha_{0,j} - \frac{1}{|I_-|} \sum_{j \in I_-} \alpha_{0,j}, \quad \tilde{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{|I_+|} \sum_{j \in I_+} \epsilon_j - \frac{1}{|I_-|} \sum_{j \in I_-} \epsilon_j.$$

Together with model (7), it is clear that the response y is also linear in $B(X; I_+, I_-)$

$$y = \theta_0 - \tilde{\alpha}_0 \frac{\theta_1}{c_1 + c_2} + \frac{\theta_1}{c_1 + c_2} B(X; I_+, I_-) + \varepsilon - \frac{\theta_1}{c_1 + c_2} \tilde{\epsilon}. \quad (9)$$

Remark 1. Without loss of generality, the latent variable model in (8) uses the p -th variable as the reference, and hence assumes that it is not in either active set, but the reference can be any inactive variable. The coefficients $\alpha_{1,j}$ are invariant under a change of reference. In addition, the error terms ϵ_j 's are allowed to be weakly correlated, which introduces correlation between active and inactive variables. The SLR framework is inspired by the supervised principal components approach in Bair et al. (2006). However, since our goal is to select predictive balances, the approach in Bair et al. (2006) is not directly applicable.

3.2 Model estimation

To recover u , we are faced with two challenges: the number of variables p is large and the active set $I_+ \cup I_-$ is unknown.

If the active set is known, the desired balance can be defined by clustering variables in the active set into two subsets. To see this, it is instructive to examine the population Aitchison variation restricted to the active set. Indeed, assuming uncorrelated noise

variance ϵ_j 's, we have

$$\text{Var}\left(\log \frac{X_j}{X_k}\right) = \begin{cases} 2\sigma_\epsilon^2 & (j \in I_+, k \in I_+), \\ (c_1 + c_2)^2 \sigma_u^2 + 2\sigma_\epsilon^2 & (j \in I_+, k \in I_-), \\ 2\sigma_\epsilon^2 & (j \in I_-, k \in I_-). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that variables within each subset I_+ (I_-) are closer to each other than between the two subsets. The two subsets I_+ and I_- can thus be identified by clustering the Aitchison variation.

Unfortunately, the active set is not known *a priori*. A natural way to estimate the active set is to perform feature screening. Let ψ_j denote the univariate coefficient when regressing y onto the clr transformed proportions $Z_j = \log(X_j) - \log g(X)$. It is easy to derive that

$$Z_j - \mathbf{E}[Z_j] = \alpha_{1,j}u + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p (\epsilon_j - \epsilon_k).$$

By model (7)-(8), the population coefficient ψ_j is nonzero if j is an active variable and zero for inactive variables.

The curious reader might wonder if the desired balance can be identified by clustering the Aitchison variation of all variables directly. At first glance, this may seem reasonable because the population Aitchison variation does suggest there should be three clusters I_+ , I_- , and I_0 . In practice, however, the observed Aitchison variation is noisy and may not correctly separate active from inactive variables. Moreover, clustering on all variables

requires much more computation time compared to clustering on active variables only.

3.3 Extensions beyond the linear model

The SLR framework can be easily extended to accommodate other types of responses, where a generalized linear model can be used to perform feature screening. Consider, for example, a binary response variable $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. In this case, the univariate effect $\hat{\psi}_j$ does not have an explicit form as in (6). Nonetheless, $\hat{\psi}_j$ can be estimated by fitting a simple logistic regression, e.g. using the `glm` function in R.

4 Simulation Studies

We compared SLR with a number of existing approaches, including the constrained Lasso (Lin et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2019, `classo`), the greedy search algorithm (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018, `selbal`), the log ratio Lasso (Bates and Tibshirani, 2019, `llasso`), and CoDaCoRe (Gordon-Rodriguez et al., 2022). Two versions of SLR were evaluated: SLR with spectral clustering and SLR with hierarchical clustering using complete linkage.

We focus on two types of performance measures, one for prediction and another for variable selection. To evaluate the prediction performance, we simulated a training set and an independent test set. Models were fitted using the training set and prediction performance was evaluated on the test set. We computed the mean squared prediction error (MSE) defined as $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^{\text{test}} - \hat{y}_i)^2$ for continuous responses and area under the Receiver Op-

erating Characteristic curve (AUC) for binary responses. For each method, 10-fold cross validation with the One Standard Error Rule was used to select the optimal tuning parameter on the training set. Specifically, the One Standard Error Rule finds the model with the minimum cross validation error and then selects the most parsimonious model whose mean prediction error falls within one standard error of the minimum. For fair comparison of variable selection performance, we compared the estimated linear log contrast coefficients $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to the simulated truth because the linear log contrast coefficients can be recovered from the log ratio coefficients but not the other way around. For an estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and its corresponding truth $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, estimation error was evaluated as $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_j (\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2}$. Variable selection was assessed by computing the false positive rate (FPR), true positive rate (TPR), and F1 score. FPR, TPR (i.e., recall), and precision are defined, respectively, as

$$\text{FPR} = \frac{|\{j : \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0, \beta_j = 0\}|}{|\{j : \beta_j = 0\}|}, \quad \text{TPR} = \text{recall} = \frac{|\{j : \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0, \beta_j \neq 0\}|}{|\{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}|},$$

$$\text{precision} = \frac{|\{j : \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0, \beta_j \neq 0\}|}{|\{j : \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}|}.$$

The F1 score is the harmonic mean of the precision and recall. The F1 score takes value in the interval $[0, 1]$ with larger score indicating better performance in variable selection. All comparisons were evaluated with 100 replications.

We also recorded the run time of each method on a Linux machine that had an Intel Core i9 processor with 18 cores (36 threads) and 128 GB memory. The run time in each

replication counts the total time elapsed during model selection and estimation.

4.1 Simulation setup

We first sampled n copies of independent u_i from a uniform distribution on $(-0.5, 0.5)$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, p-1$, we sampled independent $\epsilon_{i,j}$'s from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 0.01. For given active sets I_+ and I_- , the coefficient vector α_1 is defined with $c_1 = 1/|I_+|$ and $c_2 = -1/|I_-|$. Given α_1, u_i and $\epsilon_{i,j}$, we sampled $w_{i,j}$'s from the latent variable model $w_{i,j} = \alpha_{1,j}u_i + \epsilon_{i,j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p-1$) and set $w_{i,p} = 0$. The compositional predictor $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ was obtained by applying the inverse alr transformation $x_{i,j} = e^{w_{i,j}} / (\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} e^{w_{i,k}} + 1)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, p$). We sampled continuous responses from the linear model $y_i = 0.5u_i + \varepsilon_i$, where ε_i 's are independent normal random variables with mean 0 and variance 0.01. We sampled binary responses from the Bernoulli distribution $y_i = \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i)$ with $\pi_i = e^{6u_i} / (e^{6u_i} + 1)$.

Two types of active sets are considered: (i) $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $I_- = \{4, 5, 6\}$, and (ii) $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $I_- = \{6\}$. While the two subsets in case (i) have comparable sizes, the differing size of active sets in case (ii) leads to disparate coefficients c_1 and c_2 , which makes it harder to select the correct balance. The sample size was $n = 100$ and number of predictors was $p = 30$.

4.2 Results

Figure 1 compares different methods on data generated from the latent variable model with a continuous response using a log ratio formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $I_- = \{4, 5, 6\}$. SLR with either spectral clustering or hierarchical clustering has the smallest MSE, the smallest estimation error, and the highest F1 score. In terms of run time, SLR is comparable to CoDaCoRe, and faster than selbal and log ratio Lasso (llasso). The constrained Lasso (classo) is the fastest, the second best in terms of F1 score, but performs among the worst in terms of MSE. CoDaCoRe and llasso have moderate MSE, and CoDaCoRe has smaller estimation error and higher F1 score compared to llasso, although CoDaCoRe has the largest false positive rates among all methods. The greedy search algorithm selbal performs the worst in prediction, parameter estimation, variable selection, and is also the slowest method in run time.

When the log ratio is formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $I_- = \{6\}$, Figure 2 suggests that it is generally harder to select the variables as shown by the decreased F1 scores for all methods. The MSEs and estimation errors decrease slightly due to changes in the magnitude of the true log contrast coefficients. The relative performance of each method remains largely the same as in Figure 1 with two notable differences. First, llasso performs slightly better than CoDaCoRe in parameter estimation and variable selection, suggesting that CoDaCoRe may have a disadvantage when the true log contrast is formed with unbalanced subsets. Second, classo has substantial decrease in F1 score, indicating




Figure 1: Results when data were simulated from the latent variable model with a continuous response using a balance formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $I_- = \{4, 5, 6\}$. MSE: mean squared prediction error on the test set; EA2: ℓ_2 -norm error $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2$. Red cross indicates the mean.

poor variable selection in the presence of unbalanced subsets.

Results when data were simulated from a binary response and with the two types of active sets are shown, respectively, in Figures 3 and 4. In this case, we observed similar relative performance among the methods as in the continuous response case. Overall, SLR yields superior performance in prediction, parameter estimation and variable selection. The near constant performance of llasso in variable selection is due to the fact that llasso only selects a single pair of log ratio in most replications, though it may not be the same pair from one replication to the next. Unlike in the continuous response case, llasso as




Figure 2: Results when data were simulated from the latent variable model with a continuous response using a balance formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $I_- = \{6\}$. MSE: mean squared prediction error on the test set; EA2: ℓ_2 -norm error $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2$. Red cross indicates the mean.

opposed to classo is the fastest in run time.

5 Analysis of Microbiome Data

We applied SLR to the analysis of a microbiome data set on HIV infection, which is publicly available in the `selbal` R package. This data set contains the counts of 60 microbial taxa at the genus taxonomy rank across $n = 155$ subjects and the proportion of zero counts is about 35%. We removed taxa that appear in less than 20% of all samples which leaves




Figure 3: Results when data were simulated from the latent variable model with a binary response using a balance formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $I_- = \{4, 5, 6\}$. AUC: area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve on the test set; EA2: ℓ_2 -norm error $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2$. Red cross indicates the mean.

$p = 57$ genera. Remaining zeros were imputed using the Geometric Bayesian multiplicative method (Martín-Fernández et al., 2015) implemented in the `zCompositions` R package. The response variable is binary: 128 individuals are HIV positive and 27 are negative. We did not include the covariate, *Men who has sex with men (MSM) or not (nonMSM)*, because we wished to compare methods based on microbiome data alone. A microbiome data set with a continuous response is also analyzed and presented in the supplement.

To evaluate the out-of-sample prediction performance and stability in variable selection, we randomly partitioned the full data set into 70% training and 30% test data. In the case




Figure 4: Results when data were simulated from the latent variable model with a binary response using a balance formed with $I_+ = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $I_- = \{6\}$. AUC: area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve on the test set; EA2: ℓ_2 -norm error $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2$. Red cross indicates the mean.


of a binary response, we stratified the data by case and control when performing the randomized split. The out-of-sample prediction performance was evaluated using AUC. Because we do not know the ground truth log ratio biomarkers, we instead report the proportion of variables selected, as in Gordon-Rodriguez et al. (2022). For each method, 10-fold cross-validation using the One Standard Error Rule was used to select the model fit to the training set. The train/test data split procedure was repeated 20 times, and we report the selection frequencies of each variable over 20 train/test data splits. Lastly, we applied selbal, CoDaCoRe, l1lasso, and SLR to the full data set to identify the balance associated

with HIV status. Although classo does not return a balance biomarker, its variable selection results were also included for completeness. Model selection was done again by 10-fold cross-validation using the One Standard Error Rule. Since our simulation results show that SLR with spectral and hierarchical clustering have almost identical performance, in this section we only present SLR with spectral clustering.


Figure 5a shows that SLR outperforms CoDaCoRe based on AUC and selects a sparser model, although CoDaCoRe has the fastest run time. selbal has moderate AUC, and selects a sparse model, but is the slowest method. classo has the worst AUC among all methods with a few extreme outliers in variable selection. l1lasso does not perform well in terms of AUC either and is almost as slow as selbal.

Figure 5b shows the bar plot of selection proportions over the 20 train/test data splits. Variables are colored by whether they are included in the denominator (red) or numerator (blue) of the log ratio biomarker. While selbal only has one taxon with over 50% selection frequency, SLR has five, the first three coincides with those frequently selected by CoDaCoRe. The number of taxa with a selection proportion of less than 50% is 22 for selbal, 18 for CoDaCoRe, and 12 for SLR, suggesting that SLR tends to produce more stable variable selection than selbal and CoDaCoRe. As in the simulation studies, l1lasso again selects far fewer taxa than other methods. Overall, SLR achieves a good balance between robustness in variable selection, accuracy in prediction, and computational efficiency.

Table 1 shows the selected log ratio biomarker on the full data set. A ‘+’ sign indicates a variable is included in the numerator while a ‘-’ sign indicates a variable included in the



(a)



(b)

Figure 5: (a) Results on HIV status classification over the 20 train/test splits. (b) Bar plot of selection proportions. Color represents if the variables were included in the numerator (blue) or the denominator (red) of the balance.

denominator. Since classo only selects two taxa, its result can also be interpreted as a log ratio biomarker thanks to the sum to zero constraint on the log contrast coefficient. The log ratio biomarkers identified by the five methods are different, but they all have *g_Bacteroides* in the numerator of the balance. With the exception of selbal, the other methods identified *g_RC9_gut_group* as being in the denominator of the balance. In addition, SLR and CoDaCoRe both have *g_Oribacterium* in the denominator, although *g_Oribacterium* is not one of the most frequently selected variables by CoDaCoRe in Figure 5b. Comparing the results in Table 1 and the selection proportions in Figure 5b, SLR is the only method that identified all three variables consistently both on the full data set and on subsampled data sets. These results further demonstrate that SLR is more robust than existing methods in selecting log ratio biomarkers. Of taxa identified by SLR, *g_RC9_gut_group* is a member of the Rikenellaceae family while *g_Oribacterium* belongs to the Lachnospiraceae family. Enrichment of the Erysipelotrichaceae family and depletion of the Lachnospiraceae and Rikenellaceae families in HIV patients have been reported in several studies (Vujkovic-Cvijin and Somsouk, 2019), although we caution against any causal interpretation because the current analysis did not control for potential confounding factors of HIV such as sexual behaviors.

Table 1: Variables selected by different methods in the HIV classification data set. SLR refers to SLR with spectral clustering.

Taxa	selbal	classo	CoDaCoRe	lrlasso	SLR
g_Bacteroides	+	+	+	+	+
f_Erysipelotrichaceae_g_unclassified					+
g_RC9_gut_group		-	-	-	-
f_vadinBB60_g_unclassified					-
g_Oribacterium			-		-
f_Ruminococcaceae_g_Incertae_Sedis	-				

6 Discussion

We have introduced SLR, a new method for selecting interpretable log ratio biomarkers from high-dimensional compositional data. Unlike the greedy search algorithm selbal, SLR selects the log ratio predictor by clustering a subset of carefully screened active variables into the denominator and numerator groups. As a result, SLR achieves a balance between prediction accuracy and computational efficiency. The latent variable model underlying SLR can conveniently accommodate diverse types of response variables. Simulation studies and real data analyses also demonstrated that SLR provides more robust variable selection than existing methods including the more computationally efficient alternative CoDaCoRe. Although our examples use microbiome data, SLR can be applied to other settings where the features are compositional, e.g. high-throughput sequencing data from liquid biopsies (Gordon-Rodriguez et al., 2022).

The current formulation of SLR only allows one latent variable which naturally leads to the selection of a single log ratio biomarker. It is possible to extend the current model

to allow more than one latent variable provided that the latent variables are independent and they have different effects on the response variable. For example, if there are two independent latent variables corresponding to two log ratio biomarkers, the clustering step of SLR needs to involve hierarchical spectral clustering so as to identify in total four denominator and numerator groups. The requirement of distinct effect sizes among latent variables is to ensure identifiability.

It is worth contrasting our method with the supervised log ratio approach proposed by Quinn and Erb (2020). While SLR selects a single balance biomarker by using the response to screen active variables, Quinn and Erb (2020) use the response to aid the definition of a suitable dissimilarity measure on all variables. The 2- and 3-part balances defined using leaves of the dendrogram from clustering the selected dissimilarity are then selected as the biomarkers. Unlike SLR, the Quinn and Erb (2020) method is limited to classification problems.

SLR also has some limitations. Like other log ratio based methods, SLR takes as input strictly positive compositional data. This requires replacing zeros in the raw data with suitable positive values prior to applying SLR. There is considerable heterogeneity in how to deal with observed zeros in the literature (Silverman et al., 2020). Some zeros may be biological due to absence of a feature in one sample, while others may be sampling zeros arising from limited sequencing depth. Extension of SLR to zero-inflated compositional data is beyond the scope of this paper.

7 Data and Code Availability

All code needed to reproduce the results in the simulation studies and data analyses is available at <https://github.com/drjingma/LogRatioReg>. SLR is also available as an R package at <https://github.com/drjingma/slr>.

8 Acknowledgement

This work is supported by NIH grant GM145772.

9 Appendix: Additional data analysis

9.1 Microbiome and sCD14 inflammation


In this analysis, we used compositional microbiome data to predict soluble CD14 (sCD14) measurements, a continuous variable. sCD14 is a marker of microbial translocation and has been associated with mortality in HIV patients (Sandler et al., 2011). The number of samples was $n = 151$, and the number of genera was $p = 57$ after removing 3 rare taxa that appear in less than 20% of all samples. Remaining zeros were imputed using the Geometric Bayesian multiplicative method (Martín-Fernández et al., 2015) implemented in the `zCompositions` R package. For consistency, we used the original scale of the sCD14 marker, as in `selbal` (Rivera-Pinto et al., 2018).

Figure 6a shows the results of predicting sCD14 inflammation from genus abundances. Due to the large variance of the response variable, the MSEs from all methods are comparably large, although CoDaCoRe may have a slight advantage. In terms of variable selection, classo tends to select a very sparse model with several large outliers. CoDaCoRe and l1lasso also have large variability in variable selection. By contrast, selbal and SLR are more stable in terms of the percentage of variables selected. Computationally, CoDaCoRe is still the fastest while l1lasso is the slowest. The relative slowness of l1lasso run time is more pronounced for this analysis than for those already mentioned.


A bar plot of selection proportions over the 20 train/test data splits is shown in Figure 6b. Once again due to the large variability in the response variable, all the methods have unstable variable selection. Nonetheless, the variable *g_Collinsella* was identified as being negatively associated with sCD14 inflammation more than half of the time by all but l1lasso. It is also interesting to note that SLR identified a subset of six variables as being sometimes positively and sometimes negatively associated with sCD14 inflammation, although in almost all cases there is a dominant direction. This is because active variables obtained from the screening step cannot be reliably clustered into two subsets, leading to inconsistencies in the definition of denominators and numerators across random data splits. We suspect that such behavior was due to the weaker association between microbiome and the response variable in this data set, as evidenced by the unstable variable selection by the other methods. One possible remedy is to replace the clustering step of SLR with a greedy search of the best balance predictor. In other words, after obtaining the active variables,

one can test all possible combinations of balances and select the one that yields the highest association with the response. Note this greedy search will be over a much smaller subset of combinations and hence will still be more computationally efficient than selbal.

Results on variable selection on the full data set are shown in Table 2. Interestingly, classo did not select any variable when using the One Standard Error Rule for model selection. The other four methods all identified *g_Collinsella* as being in the denominator of the log ratio biomarker, and *g_Collinsella* is also the most frequently selected variable in Figure 6b. SLR and CoDaCoRe both selected *f_Defluviitaleaceae_g_Incertae_Sedis*, which is their second most frequently selected variable in Figure 6b, as being in the numerator of the balance. SLR, l1lasso, and selbal identified *g_Subdoligranulum* as being included in the numerator and *f_Lachnospiraceae_g_unclassified* in the denominator of the log ratio biomarker. Another interesting observation is that l1lasso selected a lot more variables in this data set than in the HIV data set, although none has high selection frequency in Figure 6b when subsampling the full data set. The genus *g_Subdoligranulum* is classified into the Ruminococcaceae family. Overall, the SLR and selbal results suggest that taxa in the Ruminococcaceae and Lachnospiraceae families are implicated in mucosal inflammation as measured by sCD14. The association of these two bacterial families with HIV was also reported in Vujkovic-Cvijin and Somsouk (2019) and Vujkovic-Cvijin et al. (2020).



(a)



(b)

Figure 6: (a) Results on sCD14 prediction over the 20 train/test splits. (b) Bar plot of selection proportions in the sCD14 data set. Color represents if the variables were included in the numerator (blue) or the denominator (red) of the balance.

Table 2: Variables selected by different methods in the sCD14 data set. SLR refers to SLR with spectral clustering.

Taxa	selbal	classo	CoDaCoRe	l1lasso	SLR
f_Defluviitaleaceae_g_Incertae_Sedis			+		+
g_Subdoligranulum	+			+	+
f_Lachnospiraceae_g_Incertae_Sedis	+			+	
g_Bacteroides				+	
g_Dorea				+	
g_Dialister				+	
f_Lachnospiraceae_g_unclassified	-			-	-
g_Collinsella	-		-	-	-
g_Bifidobacterium				-	
g_Mitsuokella				-	
g_Parabacteroides				-	

References

- Aitchison, J. (1986). *The Statistical Analysis of Compositional Data*. Chapman & Hall, Ltd., GBR.
- Aitchison, J. and Bacon-Shone, J. (1984). Log contrast models for experiments with mixtures. *Biometrika* **71**, 323–330.
- Bair, E., Hastie, T., Paul, D., and Tibshirani, R. (2006). Prediction by supervised principal components. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**, 119–137.
- Barlow, J. T., Bogatyrev, S. R., and Ismagilov, R. F. (2020). A quantitative sequencing framework for absolute abundance measurements of mucosal and luminal microbial communities. *Nature communications* **11**, 2590.

- Bates, S. and Tibshirani, R. (2019). Log-ratio lasso: Scalable, sparse estimation for log-ratio models. *Biometrics* **75**, 613–624.
- Bien, J., Yan, X., Simpson, L., and Müller, C. L. (2021). Tree-aggregated predictive modeling of microbiome data. *Scientific Reports* **11**, 1–13.
- Egozcue, J. J. and Pawłowsky-Glahn, V. (2005). Groups of parts and their balances in compositional data analysis. *Mathematical Geology* **37**, 795–828.
- Gordon-Rodriguez, E., Quinn, T. P., and Cunningham, J. P. (2022). Learning sparse log-ratios for high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **38**, 157–163.
- Griliches, Z. and Ringstad, V. (1970). Error-in-the-variables bias in nonlinear contexts. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* pages 368–370.
- Lin, W., Shi, P., Feng, R., and Li, H. (2014). Variable selection in regression with compositional covariates. *Biometrika* **101**, 785–797.
- Lu, J., Shi, P., and Li, H. (2019). Generalized linear models with linear constraints for microbiome compositional data. *Biometrics* **75**, 235–244.
- Martín-Fernández, J.-A., Hron, K., Templ, M., Filzmoser, P., and Palarea-Albaladejo, J. (2015). Bayesian-multiplicative treatment of count zeros in compositional data sets. *Statistical Modelling* **15**, 134–158.

- McLaren, M. R., Willis, A. D., and Callahan, B. J. (2019). Consistent and correctable bias in metagenomic sequencing experiments. *eLife* **8**,
- Morton, J. T., Marotz, C., Washburne, A., Silverman, J., Zaramela, L. S., Edlund, A., Zengler, K., and Knight, R. (2019). Establishing microbial composition measurement standards with reference frames. *Nature Communications* **10**, 1–11.
- Quinn, T. P. and Erb, I. (2020). Interpretable log contrasts for the classification of health biomarkers: a new approach to balance selection. *mSystems* **5**,
- Rivera-Pinto, J., Egozcue, J., Pawlowsky-Glahn, V., Paredes, R., Noguera-Julian, M., and Calle, M. (2018). Balances: a new perspective for microbiome analysis. *MSystems* **3**, e00053–18.
- Sandler, N. G., Wand, H., Roque, A., Law, M., Nason, M. C., Nixon, D. E., Pedersen, C., Ruxrungtham, K., Lewin, S. R., Emery, S., et al. (2011). Plasma levels of soluble cd14 independently predict mortality in hiv infection. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* **203**, 780–790.
- Sepich-Poore, G. D., Zitvogel, L., Straussman, R., Hasty, J., Wargo, J. A., and Knight, R. (2021). The microbiome and human cancer. *Science* **371**, eabc4552.
- Shi, P., Zhang, A., Li, H., et al. (2016). Regression analysis for microbiome compositional data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **10**, 1019–1040.

- Silverman, J. D., Roche, K., Mukherjee, S., and David, L. A. (2020). Naught all zeros in sequence count data are the same. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal* **18**, 2789–2798.
- Susin, A., Wang, Y., Lê Cao, K.-A., and Calle, M. L. (2020). Variable selection in microbiome compositional data analysis. *NAR Genomics and Bioinformatics* **2**, lqaa029.
- Vujkovic-Cvijin, I. and Somsouk, M. (2019). Hiv and the gut microbiota: composition, consequences, and avenues for amelioration. *Current HIV/AIDS Reports* **16**, 204–213.
- Vujkovic-Cvijin, I., Sortino, O., Verheij, E., Sklar, J., Wit, F., Kootstra, N., Sellers, B., Brenchley, J., Ananworanich, J., Loeff, M. S. v. d., et al. (2020). Hiv-associated gut dysbiosis is independent of sexual practice and correlates with noncommunicable diseases. *Nature Communications* **11**, 2448.
- Wang, T. and Zhao, H. (2017a). Constructing predictive microbial signatures at multiple taxonomic levels. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112**, 1022–1031.
- Wang, T. and Zhao, H. (2017b). Structured subcomposition selection in regression and its application to microbiome data analysis. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **11**, 771–791.