Annealed variational mixtures for disease subtyping and biomarker discovery

Emma Prévot^{1,2}, Rory Toogood^{1,3}, Filippo Pagani^{1,4}, Paul D. W. Kirk¹

¹MRC Biostatistics Unit, University of Cambridge, East Forvie Building, Robinson Way, Cambridge, CB2 0SR, UK.

²Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, 24-29 St Giles', Oxford, OX1 3LB, UK.

³Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK.

⁴Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK.

Contributing authors: emma.prevot@exeter.ox.ac.uk; rory.toogood@btinternet.com; filippo.pagani@warwick.ac.uk; paul.kirk@mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk;

Abstract

Cluster analyses of high-dimensional data are often hampered by the presence of large numbers of variables that do not provide relevant information, as well as the perennial issue of choosing an appropriate number of clusters. These challenges are frequently encountered when analysing omics datasets, such as in molecular precision medicine, where a key goal is to identify disease subtypes and the biomarkers that define them. Here we introduce an annealed variational Bayes algorithm for fitting high-dimensional mixture models while performing variable selection. Our algorithm is scalable and computationally efficient, and we provide an open source Python implementation, *VBVarSel*. In a range of simulated and real biomedeical examples, we show that VBVarSel outperforms the current state of the art, and demonstrate its use for cancer subtyping and biomarker discovery.

Keywords: Variational Inference, Variational Bayes, Mixture Models, Annealing, Variable Selection, Cancer Subtyping, Biomarker Discovery

Precision medicine has the potential to revolutionise the treatment and prevention of diseases by tailoring healthcare strategies and therapies to the specific characteristics of particular groups of individuals (Wang and Wang, 2023). A significant factor driving advances in precision medicine, particularly in oncology (Cremin et al, 2022), is the wealth of high-dimensional omics datasets. These datasets are frequently analysed using clustering algorithms to identify disease subtypes, followed by a characterisation of the clusters in terms of the biomarkers that define them, with the ultimate goal of deepening our understanding of diseases and improving patient outcomes (Golub et al, 1999; Weinstein et al, 2013). However, this process faces substantial challenges due to the high dimensionality and heterogeneity of the data (Witten and Tibshirani, 2010; Fop and Murphy, 2018; Kirk et al, 2023).

In many applications, it has been common to include all available variables in the modeling process, based on the assumption that using all the information will enhance the performance of a clustering algorithm (Law et al, 2004). However, in practice, this approach can be computationally expensive, and may negatively impact the stratification process by including irrelevant or "noisy" variables (Hastie et al, 2004; Bouveyron and Brunet-Saumard, 2014; Gnanadesikan et al, 1995). To address this, variable selection techniques can be employed to simplify result interpretation and enhance the quality of data classification (Fop and Murphy, 2018).

Bayesian approaches, such as Bayesian mixture models, have proven effective in facilitating both stratification and feature selection in high-dimensional unsupervised settings, where there are no available labels to guide selection and subtyping (Fop and Murphy, 2018). Many existing algorithms rely on Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods (Bensmail and Meulman, 1998) for inference, as these can quantify uncertainty in the allocation of observations to clusters, as well as the number of clusters. However, MCMC is computationally demanding and tends to scale poorly in high-dimensional settings, making its application to real biomedical datasets often slow and impractical, or requiring dimensionality reduction. In contrast, Variational Inference (VI) typically provides a more scalable and efficient alternative for inference (Blei et al, 2017), although does not by itself address the issue of the presence of (large numbers of) irrelevant variables.

There are several existing algorithms for variable selection in clustering (for reviews, see Steinley and Brusco, 2008; Celeux et al, 2013; Fop and Murphy, 2018), most of which are either heuristic, rely on maximum likelihood estimation via the expectation maximisation (EM) algorithm, or use MCMC. For example, Kmeans sparse clustering (available in the sparcl R package Witten and Tibshirani, 2013) alternates between fixing variable weights to optimise clustering and adjusting them based on the between-cluster sum of squares (BCSS). While computationally efficient in high-dimensional data, it requires the number of clusters either to be known in advance or to be optimised by considering a range of values for K, which comes at a computational cost. The Sequential Updating and Greedy Search (SUGS) algorithm (Wang and Dunson, 2011; Zhang et al, 2014), which avoids computationally costly MCMC methods for Bayesian clustering using a sequential, greedy algorithm, was recently adapted to the variable selection setting (SUGSVarSel; Crook et al, 2019), but this greedy approach may sometimes lead to suboptimal solutions. The PReMiuM R package (Liverani et al. 2014) uses MCMC to perform inference for Dirichlet process mixtures that may permit variable selection, but is computationally intensive. Other approaches, like VarSelLCM (Marbac and Sedki, 2018) and VSCC (Andrews and McNicholas, 2014), optimise information criteria such as the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) or integrated complete-data likelihood (MICL). However, these methods often require navigating a large and combinatorially complex state space, which can limit their scalability. A VIbased approach for clustering and variable selection ('feature saliency') was provided by Constantinopoulos et al (2006). However, the authors do not report run-times or provide a generally useable implementation, and the method's performance was primarily assessed on image classification tasks with small sample sizes. which may not generalize well to high-dimensional biomedical datasets. The existing methods highlight the need for a more flexible and computationally efficient solution, capable of handling the complexity and scale of modern biomedical datasets.

A frequently overlooked challenge in both MCMC and VI is the issue of local optima, where it becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to escape local optima in multi-modal landscapes. As a result, performance is highly dependent on the number of local optima in the objective function, the initialisation of the algorithm, and the quality of the assumptions on the prior probability distributions. A general approach to addressing the local optima problem and improving inference is through simulated annealing (Rose et al, 1990; Ueda and Nakano, 1998; Katahira et al, 2008). Rooted in principles from statistical mechanics, annealing introduces a temperature parameter into the objective function, which is gradually adjusted according to a time-dependent schedule. This smooths the objective function, helping to prevent the optimisation process from getting trapped in shallow local optima.

In the context of mixture models, we find that annealing can be particularly beneficial due to the inherent multi-modality of these models. However, to the best of our knowledge, no existing literature has provided a comprehensive annealing framework specifically tailored to our problem context. Tadesse et al (2005) mention the use of parallel tempering (Earl and Deem, 2005) for Bayesian mixture models, but do not provide mathematical or empirical details. In contrast, Ruffieux et al (2020) offer a detailed annealed VI framework, focused on variable selection and show that it provides more robust and stable inference, but only consider regression tasks with numerous predictors and multiple outcomes.

In this work, we present a scalable and computationally efficient algorithm for simultaneous clustering and variable selection, utilizing Variational Inference. We demonstrate the scalability of our method, making it suitable for extremely large and high-dimensional datasets, while maintaining accuracy, reliability, and good performance. Additionally, we incorporate annealing into the algorithm to improve inference when handling multi-modal posterior distributions, which are frequently encountered in the settings of this work.

Methods

Statistical model

We approach the task of subtyping via unsupervised model-based clustering. The model we adopt is a finite mixture of probability distributions, where each distribution, or component, characterises a distinct cluster (Fraley and Raftery, 2002; Lau and Green, 2007; McNicholas, 2016). Unlike conventional techniques (e.g. k-means (MacQueen et al, 1967), hierarchical clustering (Ward Jr, 1963)), Bayesian mixtures offer a robust statistical framework for a probabilistic interpretation of cluster allocations (McNicholas, 2016), which is particularly relevant in biomedical applications. Importantly, as we follow the unsupervised learning approach, our model will discover hidden structures (clusters) within unlabeled data.

Finite mixture model

Using a notation similar to Bishop (2006), let $X = {\mathbf{x}_n}_{n=1}^N$ be the data matrix, where \mathbf{x}_n is a *J*-dimensional vector of random variables, *J* being the number of features. A finite mixture model with *K*-components (clusters) is defined as

$$p(X|\Phi,\pi) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k f_X(\mathbf{x}_n|\Phi_k), \qquad (1)$$

where π_k is the mixture weight corresponding to component k. That is to say, π_k is the probability that observation \mathbf{x}_n was generated from $f_X(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)$, the individual likelihood for the mixture component k, which depends on the set of parameters Φ_k . Once the data has been generated from the model above, the goal is to infer which observations (\mathbf{x}_i) were generated from which cluster component.

A persistent challenge in clustering methods, including mixture models, is selecting the maximum number of clusters K appropriately. Selecting a K that is lower than the true number of clusters in the data leads to model misspecification. Selecting K to be much larger than the true number of clusters results in wasted computational effort. We adopt an approach similar to (Rousseau and Mengersen, 2011), using an overfitted mixtures with a large but finite K, where the "extra" components are shrunk towards zero during the inference process.

Feature selection

Clustering becomes more challenging when the data are high-dimensional and heterogeneous (Kirk et al, 2023). While using all the available features can theoretically improve clustering performance (Law et al, 2004), it is often suboptimal from the perspective of computational efficiency. Some features may be unrelated to the clustering structure and add noise to the process (Miao and Niu, 2016; Hancer et al, 2020). Additionally, using all the features contributes to well-known problems such as over-parametrisation, and the curse of dimensionality (Bellman, 1957; Gnanadesikan et al, 1995; Hastie et al, 2004; Bouveyron and Brunet-Saumard, 2014). Hence, employing variable selection techniques can reduce the computational burden, improve model fit, and simplify the interpretation of results (Fop and Murphy, 2018).

For our purpose, algorithms can be divided into two broad classes: filter methods, which involve variable selection as a separate pre-processing or post-processing step, and wrapper methods, where variable selection is integrated within the learning process (Fop and Murphy, 2018; Hancer et al, 2020). We concentrate on wrapper methods, specifically Bayesian variants, as they can simultaneously perform variable selection and clustering, an approach that has several benefits (Kirk et al, 2023). In this framework, we model variable selection via a set of latent variables that determine whether the covariate contributes to the clustering structure or not. Simultaneously, we infer cluster assignments from the posterior based on the subset of active covariates.

Starting from the mixture model in Equation (1), we assume that conditional on the clustering allocation, the covariates are independent from each other. This allows us to factorise the functional form $f(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)$ as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{x}_n|\Phi_k) = \prod_{j=1}^J f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj}), \qquad (2)$$

with a separate $f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})$ for each covariate. We then introduce a latent binary variable $\gamma_j \in \{0,1\}$, indicating whether feature j should be used to infer the clustering structure $(\gamma_j = 1)$ or not $(\gamma_j = 0)$. The likelihood becomes

$$f(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k, \gamma) = \prod_{j=1}^J f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{kj})^{\gamma_j} f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{0j})^{1-\gamma_j}, \qquad (3)$$

where Φ_{0j} denotes parameter estimates obtained under the null assumption that the j^{th} feature is not relevant to the clustering structure¹. Note that the clustering structure only depends on relevant covariates, and is independent of irrelevant ones (Fop and Murphy, 2018).

Variational Inference

Our approach relies on Variational Inference (VI), which we also refer to as Variational Bayes (VB), an optimisation-based method that minimises a function of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the true posterior $p(\theta|X)$, and a flexible and tractable approximation $q(\theta)$. The KL divergence (Kullback and Leibler, 1951) is a measure of the difference between two distributions, and can be defined as

$$KL(q||p) = -\int q(\theta) \ln\left(\frac{p(\theta|X)}{q(\theta)}\right) d\theta, \qquad (4)$$

where $KL(q||p) \ge 0$, with equality holding if and only if $q(\theta) = p(\theta|X)$. However, minimizing the KL divergence directly is a difficult task. Instead, researchers typically aim to find the $q(\theta)$ that maximizes the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO),

$$\mathcal{L}(q) = \int q(\theta) \ln\left(\frac{p(X,\theta)}{q(\theta)}\right) d\theta, \qquad (5)$$

which is a quantity intrinsically related to the KL divergence in the following way:

$$\ln p(X) = \mathcal{L}(q) + KL(q||p).$$
(6)

While the choice of $q(\theta)$ is arbitrary, we follow a framework that originated in physics and is known as mean-field theory (Parisi, 1979). In order to simplify the optimisation problem, we define $q(\theta)$ as

$$q(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{M} q_i(\theta_i) \,. \tag{7}$$

The optimisation process then simplifies to the iterative refinement of each factor $q_i(\theta_i)$ of $q(\theta)$, based on the current estimates of the other factors, following the equation

$$q_l^*(\theta_l) = \frac{\exp\left(\mathbb{E}_{i\neq l}[\ln p(X,\theta)]\right)}{\int \exp\left(\mathbb{E}_{i\neq l}[\ln p(X,\theta)]\right) d\theta_l} \,. \tag{8}$$

As the problem is convex with respect to each factor $q_l(\theta_l)$, the ELBO increases with every iteration of Equation (8) and is guaranteed to converge to a local optimum (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004).

Annealing

One major challenge in VI is escaping poor local optima, which can prevent the algorithm from finding the global optimum (Rose et al, 1990; Tadesse et al, 2005). This is particularly relevant in clustering and

¹The parameters Φ_{0j} are easily computable via Maximum Likelihood, and in order to increase computational efficiency, we can sample from the posterior conditional on the values of the precomputed $\{\Phi_{0j}\}_{j=1}^{J}$.

biomarker identification, where multiple plausible clustering structures may exist (Kirk et al, 2023). In order to address this, we use a technique called annealing, which is based on principles of statistical mechanics and maximum entropy, and can help navigate intricate posterior landscapes (Rose et al, 1990; Ueda and Nakano, 1998; Katahira et al, 2008). We introduce a temperature parameter T into the ELBO that allows us to gradually transition from the prior to the (approximate) posterior while we explore the state space. The annealed version of the ELBO can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}(q) = \int q(\theta) \ln p(X, \theta) d\theta - T \int q(\theta) \ln q(\theta) d\theta$$
(9)

When T = 1, Equation (9) reduces to the standard ELBO, which encourages exploitation in the exploration/exploitation dichotomy. When T > 1 the term corresponding to the prior distribution (which for obvious reasons is known as the "entropy term") is given more weight, while in relative terms, the log of the joint distribution loses weight. As a result, increasing the temperature causes the variational distribution $q(\theta)$ to align more closely with the prior. This has the effect of flattening the variational objective function, which helps to prevent the optimization from becoming trapped in shallow local optima (Mandt et al, 2016).

The update equation for $q_l^*(\theta_l)$ with annealing can be written as follows:

$$q_l^*(\theta_l) = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_{i\neq l}[\ln p(X,\theta)]\right)}{\int \exp\left(\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_{i\neq l}[\ln p(X,\theta)]\right)d\theta_l}.$$
(10)

The VBVarSel algorithm

In this paper we present the algorithm VBVarSel, which uses annealed VI and variable selection to improve on the performance of the state-of-the-art methods on challenging clustering problems. Algorithm 1 below shows the pseudocode implementation of our algorithm, and we provide full mathematical details in Section 1 of the Supplementary Material.

The algorithm begins by initialising the variational parameters and calculating initial parameter estimates via Maximum Likelihood. A crucial component of VBVarSel is the annealing temperature schedule, which dictates how the temperature T is initialized, set, and varied throughout the inference process. Since there is no consensus in the literature on the optimal type of schedule, we determine our approach empirically. We implement fixed schedules, as well as both geometric and harmonic temperature schedules to balance exploration and exploitation during optimization. For the geometric schedule we follow Ruffieux et al (2020) and Kirkpatrick et al (1983). The temperature at each iteration i is defined as:

$$T_i = T_0 \alpha^i$$

where T_0 is the initial temperature and α is the cooling rate calculated as:

$$\alpha = \left(\frac{1}{T_0}\right)^{1/(i_a - 1)}$$

This ensures that the temperature gradually decreases to T = 1 after a specified number of annealed iterations i_a . We also implement a harmonic schedule for a slower, more gradual decline in temperature:

$$T_i = \frac{T_0}{1 + \alpha i},$$

with the cooling rate:

$$\alpha = \frac{T_0 - 1}{i_a}.$$

Both schedules facilitate a "balancing act" between *exploration* and *exploitation*. High temperatures in early iterations encourage exploration, allowing the algorithm to find various configurations and avoid getting trapped in shallow local optima. As iterations progress, decreasing the temperature shifts the focus toward exploitation, enabling the algorithm to refine and optimize the best solutions found so far.

Importantly, when using a *fixed temperature* greater than one, as suggested by Katahira et al (2008) and Mandt et al (2016), the inference targets an annealed approximate posterior throughout. In contrast, using either the geometric or harmonic schedule ultimately retrieves the same approximate posterior as non-annealed inference since the temperature gradually decreases to T = 1. This distinction is accounted for during empirical comparisons to assess the effectiveness of each schedule.

Throughout the iterative process, VBVarSel updates the variational parameters, evaluates cluster allocations $Z = \{z_n\}_{n=1}^N$ and variable selection indicators $\gamma = \{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^J$, and computes the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) to monitor convergence. The algorithm continues until convergence criteria are met or a maximum number of iterations is reached. It is important to note that during our implementation, we addressed several potential numerical instabilities to prevent underflow and overflow, ensuring the robustness of our algorithm. Full mathematical details and parameter initialization procedures are provided in Section 1 of the Supplementary Material.

Algorithm 1: The VBVarSel algorithm

Input: Data $X = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$, maximum number of clusters K, temperature schedule, initial temperature T_0 , maximum iterations itr_{max} , convergence threshold ϵ **Output:** Cluster allocations $Z = \{z_n\}_{n=1}^N$ Variable selection indicators $\gamma = \{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^J$ Initialise variational parameters; Calculate parameter estimates for Φ_{0j} via Maximum Likelihood; $converged \leftarrow False;$ $i \leftarrow 0;$ while $i < itr_{max}$ do if *T_schedule* is geometric OR harmonic then $T \leftarrow \text{eval_temp_schedule}(T_0, i, i_a)$ else $\mid T \leftarrow T_0$ end Update variational parameters Evaluate Z and γ Compute ELBO according to Eq. (62) $improve \leftarrow \text{ELBO}[i] - \text{ELBO}[i-1]$ if i > 0 and $0 < improve < \epsilon$ then $converged \leftarrow True$ break end $i \leftarrow i + 1$ end

Performance evaluation

When applying VBVarSel to new datasets for the first time, we experiment with various parameter initializations and temperature schedules to determine the optimal configuration. We assess each setup by monitoring the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) and select the one that maximizes it. After identifying the best parameter initialization for a specific experiment, we run VBVarSel for 10–20 repetitions using this chosen configuration. To mitigate the influence of stochastic elements inherent in the inference process, we randomize the ordering of data covariates in each repetition. This approach helps ensure that our results are robust and not dependent on a particular data arrangement or random seed. Performance evaluation was twofold. First, a qualitative analysis was carried out through visualisation tools such as scatter plots and heatmaps. Then a quantitative assessment was done using the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) (Rand, 1971; Hubert and Arabie, 1985), and an analysis of selected versus discarded covariates. The Rand index (RI) is a measure of similarity between two data clusterings evaluated as the number of pairs of observations that are either in the same or different clusters in both partitions. The RI is *adjusted* to account for the fact that some agreement can occur by chance using the formula:

$$ARI = \frac{RI - \mathbb{E}[RI]}{\max(RI) - \mathbb{E}[RI]}.$$
(11)

The ARI's range from -1 to 1, where 1 indicates perfect agreement, 0 indicates random agreement, and < 0 corresponds to assignments that are worse than random. For the quantitative evaluation of our experiments, we report median scores, together with upper and lower quartiles, evaluated on 10-20 repetitions.

Results

Simulation study

We first assessed the performance of our algorithm in simulation studies where the "ground truth" is known. We replicated the simulation setup from (Crook et al. 2019), which uses three *p*-dimensional Gaussian distributions with mixing weights 0.5, 0.3, and 0.2. These distributions have spherical covariance, and are centred at (0, 0, ..., 0), (2, 2, ..., 2), and (-2, -2, ..., -2) respectively. The irrelevant variables are generated according to standard Gaussian distributions. We generated either n = 100 or 1000 data points, and while we kept the total number of variables fixed to 200, we varied the percentage of relevant variables to be either 5%, 10%, 25%, or 50%. We compared the performance of VBVarSel to i) hierarchical clustering and ii) K-means sparse clustering from sparcl R package (Witten and Tibshirani, 2010) (Witten and Tibshirani, 2013), iii) SUGSVarSel (Crook et al, 2019), iv) VSCC (Andrews and McNicholas, 2014), and v) VarSelLCM (Marbac and Sedki, 2017). The results are shown in Table 1 through Table 4, and we provide details of prior specifications for the different algorithms in Table 1 of the Supplementary Materials. For each table we show the runtime (in seconds), the proportion of both relevant and irrelevant variables that were correctly identified, and the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) (Rand, 1971; Hubert and Arabie, 1985) between the inferred clustering and the ground-truth labels from the generated data. Each cell in the tables shows the median value, and the upper and lower quartiles calculated over 10 repetitions of the experiment. All algorithms were executed on the same High Performance Cluster to ensure fair runtime comparisons. However, it should be noted that VBVarSel is implemented in Python, whereas the other methods are R packages with optimised C++ code, potentially giving them a speed advantage.

Method	n	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	1.30 [1.19, 2.79]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	0.99 [0.98, 1]
Hier-clust	100	5.27 [4.89, 5.66]	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.68 \ [0.64, \ 0.71]$
K-means	100	7.45 $[6.88, 7.95]$	1 [1, 1]	1 [1,1]	$0.61 \ [0.60, \ 0.61]$
SUGSVarSel	100	9.71 [9.98, 8.85]	0 [0, 0]	$0.72 \ [0.70, \ 0.75]$	0 [0, 0.01]
VSCC	100	5.64 [3.28, 6.69]	$1 \ [0.92, \ 1]$	$0.94 \ [0.93, \ 0.95]$	$1 \ [0.97, 1]$
VarSelLCM	100	321 [306, 331]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [0.97, \ 1]$
VBVarSel	1000	27.5 [27.4, 27.5]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	$0.95 \ [0.90, \ 0.96]$
Hier-clust	1000	$530 \ [499, \ 539]$	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0.79 \ [0.69, \ 0.85]$
K-means	1000	93 [90, 98]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.61 \ [0.61, \ 0.61]$
SUGSVarSel	1000	224 [198, 246]	0 [0,0]	$0.97 \ [0.95, \ 0.98]$	0 [0, 0.01]
VSCC	1000	99.7 [98.5, 101]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	0 [0, 0]
VarSelLCM	1000	49582 [46786, 50090]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$

Table 1: Simulation performance with 5% relevant variables. This table shows the results of applying VBVarSel on data simulated following the setup in (Crook et al, 2019), where 5% of the variables are relevant. The cells show the median, lower and upper quartile of each variable, calculated over 10 repetitions.

Method	n	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	3.23 $[1.30, 3.23]$	1 [1, 1]	1 [0.99, 1]	1 [0.98, 1]
Hier-clust	100	4.46 $[4.19, 4.60]$	$0.85 \ [0.80, \ 0.85]$	1 [1, 1]	$0.69 \ [0.68, \ 0.75]$
K-means	100	7.51 [7.01, 8.11]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	0.62 [0.61, 0.63]
SUGSVarSel	100	9.00[8.91, 9.46]	0[0,0]	$0.69 \ [0.68, \ 0.71]$	0.02 [0, 0.04]
VSCC	100	4.55 $[3.53, 6.60]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.97 \ [0.96, \ 0.98]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$
VarSelLCM	100	313 [298, 327]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [1, 1]$
VBVarSel	1000	27.6 [27.5, 28.3]	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [0.99, 1]$	0.92 [0.87, 0.99]
Hier-clust	1000	450 [438, 480]	$0.85 \ [0.85, \ 0.85]$	1 [1, 1]	$0.74 \ [0.71, \ 0.88]$
K-means	1000	95 [90, 97]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.61 \ [0.61, \ 0.61]$
SUGSVarSel	1000	211 [206, 249]	0 [0, 0]	$0.97 \ [0.96, \ 0.98]$	0 [0, 0]
VSCC	1000	$100 \ [99.6, \ 102]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	$0 \ [0, 0]$
VarSelLCM	1000	52993 [52321, 53738]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]

Table 2: Simulation performance with 10% relevant variables. This table shows the results of applying VBVarSel on data simulated following the setup in (Crook et al, 2019), where 10% of the variables are relevant. The cells show the median, lower and upper quartile of each variable, calculated over 10 repetitions.

Method	n	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	3.22 $[3.21, 3.23]$	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [1, 1]$
Hier-clust	100	4.14 [3.86, 4.63]	$0.59 \ [0.54, \ 0.62]$	1 [1, 1]	$0.73 \ [0.66, \ 0.75]$
K-means	100	7.63 $[7.36, 8.60]$	0.99 [0.98, 1]	1 [1, 1]	$0.62 \ [0.61, \ 0.62]$
SUGSVarSel	100	7.81 $[7.24, 7.94]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	$0.73 \ [0.70, \ 0.75]$	$0.01 \ [0, \ 0.03]$
VSCC	100	2.05 [1.98, 2.20]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$
VarSelLCM	100	$296 \ [295, \ 305]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$
VBVarSel	1000	27.5 [27.5, 27.5]	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [0.99, 1]$	1 [1, 1]
Hier-clust	1000	$429 \ [401, \ 484]$	$0.96 \ [0.95, \ 0.96]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0.74 \ [0.69, \ 0.88]$
K-means	1000	$94 \ [90, \ 99]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0.61 \ [0.61, \ 0.61]$
SUGSVarSel	1000	162 [130, 192]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$
VSCC	1000	$103 \ [97.0, \ 107]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	$0 \ [0, 0]$
VarSelLCM	1000	65652 [64364 , 66513]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$

Table 3: Simulation performance with 25% relevant variables. This table shows the results of applying VBVarSel on data simulated following the setup in (Crook et al, 2019), where 25% of the variables are relevant. The cells show the median, lower and upper quartile of each variable, calculated over 10 repetitions.

Method	n	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	3.25 $[3.24, 3.26]$	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]
Hier-clust	100	4.48 $[4.23, 4.67]$	$0.34 \ [0.30, \ 0.35]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.72 \ [0.67, \ 0.85]$
K-means	100	7.84 $[7.34, 8.35]$	$0.46 \ [0.45, \ 0.48]$	1 [1, 1]	$0.61 \ [0.60, \ 0.62]$
SUGSVarSel	100	6.25 $[6.18, 92.7]$	$0 \ [0, \ 0.49]$	$0.75 \ [0.54, \ 0.79]$	0 [0, 0.61]
VSCC	100	1.20 $[1.03, 1.24]$	1 [1, 1]	$0 \ [0, \ 0]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$
VarSelLCM	100	369 [353, 381]	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$
VBVarSel	1000	27.8 [27.7, 27.9]	1 [1, 1]	$1 \ [0.99, 1]$	1 [1, 1]
Hier-clust	1000	$499 \ [469, \ 523]$	$0.44 \ [0.42, \ 0.45]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0.71 \ [0.68, \ 0.77]$
K-means	1000	94 [93, 100]	$0.48 \ [0.48, \ 0.51]$	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$0.61 \ [0.61, \ 0.61]$
SUGSVarSel	1000	82.6 [77.6, 100]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]
VSCC	1000	173 [169, 181]	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.82 \ [0.18, \ 0.95]$	$0.95 \ [0.11, \ 1]$
VarSelLCM	1000	80599 [77222, 81929]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 1]

Table 4: Simulation performance with 50% relevant variables. This table shows the results of applying VBVarSel on data simulated following the setup in (Crook et al, 2019), where 50% of the variables are relevant. The cells show the median, lower and upper quartile of each variable, calculated over 10 repetitions.

In all simulations with n = 1000, VBVarSel is consistently the fastest method, outperforming the second fastest method by a factor of at least 2.5. When n = 100, VBVarSel continues to exhibit significant speed advantages, with only two cases where VSCC is marginally faster. However, despite its competitive runtime, VSCC performs poorly, often selecting all the variables without discrimination, resulting in clustering structures based on noise rather than signal.

In terms of clustering and feature extraction performance, VBVarSel and VarSelLCM are the only two methods that consistently achieve perfect results. For both moderately small (n = 100) and larger (n = 1000) simulated datasets, these methods can identify all relevant and irrelevant variables, and are able to recover the true clustering structure. However, VarSelLCM is at least at least 90 times slower when n = 100, and at least 2000 times slower than VBVarSel when n = 1000. This is due to the fact that when the true number of clusters is unknown, VarSelLCM needs to conduct an exhaustive search for a good estimate of this parameter, leading to high computational costs. In contrast, VBVarSel can automatically infer the number of clusters in the data, making it more efficient.

While K-means and Hierarchical Clustering (Hier-clust) have longer but manageable runtimes, they tend to be overly conservative in variable selection, often missing relevant variables, which negatively impacts their clustering accuracy. SUGSVarSel also has longer yet manageable runtimes, but performs poorly despite being evaluated in the simulation scenario proposed by its authors (Crook et al, 2019).

Overall, VBVarSel stands out as the fastest and most scalable method, drastically reducing runtime despite the inherent computational limitations of its programming language. It achieves this while maintaining high, and often perfect, accuracy in both stratification and variable selection.

Furthermore, VBVarSel exhibited a remarkable level of robustness to model misspecification, as shown in Tables 7 and 8 in the Supplementary Materials. Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in the Supplementary Materials instead demonstrate the benefits of annealing in overcoming common challenges faced when analysing realworld data, such as correlated data, sub-optimal parameter initialisation, and noise.

Breast cancer transcriptomic subtyping

Breast cancer, the most common cancer among women worldwide (NHS, 2022), exhibits diverse molecular traits and disease manifestations. Research has identified various subtypes (Sørlie et al, 2003; Prat et al, 2010; Curtis et al, 2012; Weinstein et al, 2013; Duan et al, 2013; Lock and Dunson, 2013; Akbani et al, 2014), with a widely accepted classification dividing them into five categories based on three receptor proteins: estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and HER2 (Network, 2012). These subtypes are Luminal A, Luminal B, HER2-enriched, Basal-like, and Normal-like (Prat et al, 2010; Orrantia-Borunda et al, 2022). Stratification largely relies on gene expression profiles, notably the PAM50 gene set, which is crucial for both identifying subtypes and predicting risk (Sørlie et al, 2003; Parker et al, 2009).

For our analysis, we utilised breast cancer transcriptomic data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), a comprehensive cancer genomics program that has molecularly characterised over 20,000 primary cancers, yielding extensive genomic, epigenomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic data (Weinstein et al, 2013).

Our extracted dataset comprises transcriptomic information from 348 breast cancer tumor samples (rows), each with gene expression data for 17,814 genes (columns). After the removal of 441 genes with missing (NaN) entries, we refined the dataset to 17,373 genes across the same number of samples. Notably, our dataset included the 50 genes from the PAM50 set, a recognised gene set for breast cancer subtyping. Demographic and clinical characteristics, along with 'ground-truth' labels for cluster assignments into five breast cancer subtypes, were obtained from the Supplementary Table 1 of (Network, 2012).

We first applied VBVarSel the full 348 x 17373 TCGA transcriptomic breast cancer dataset (Weinstein et al, 2013). It is worth noting that while most state of the art methods require various preprocessing steps due to scalability issues, our proposed algorithm converged in less than one hour.

In the final outcome, VBVarSel settled on a 4-5 clusters model where a median of 6723 covariates were selected, approximately 39% of the full set. Among the PAM50 genes, which are regarded as informative for breast cancer subtyping, the median rate of selection was 75%, which is similar to what was achieved with smaller dataset sizes, and significantly better than random (*Fisher Test*, $p \ll 0.00001$). This stratification is medically sensible and is in line with the literature, as can be seen from Figure 1.



Fig. 1: VBVarSel TCGA 4-cluster model. This figure shows the scatter plots of VBVarSel 4-cluster model on the complete TCGA dataset, when PCA is applied to either all covariates (a), or only the selected ones (b).

When we set up the algorithm to prioritise a lower number of larger clusters² we obtained a 2-clusters model, as shown in Figure 2. In this model, a median of 6203 covariates were selected, which is similar to the 4-5 clusters model. Among the PAM50, the median rate of selection was slightly higher, approximately 82%. Cluster 0 is significantly associated with Basal-like tumours (*Fisher Test,* $p \ll 0.00001$). In both models, variable selection produced smaller, tighter clusters and increased the separation between them.

In order to further test the robustness and accuracy of VBVarSel, we then created a semi-synthetic dataset composed by the PAM50 genes, and an increasing number of covariates selected at random from the full TCGA breast cancer dataset. The additional covariates had their rows permuted, in order to break the link between these genes and the clusters in the data, making these variables irrelevant for stratification. We then measured their probability of being selected as relevant. The experiments showed that the variable selection machinery was able to correctly discriminate between informative covariates from non-informative ones, independently from their location in the dataset and proximity with each other, while returning a sensible stratification. The details and results of these experiments are included in Section 4 of the Supplementary Material.

Pan-cancer proteomic characterisation

We complemented our TCGA data with protein expression data from The Cancer Proteome Atlas (TCPA) (Li et al, 2013; Akbani et al, 2014). TCPA provides protein expression levels across a broad spectrum of tumor and cell line samples, quantified using reverse-phase protein arrays (RPPAs) (Sheehan et al, 2005). Our TCPA dataset included 5,157 tumor samples (rows), with each sample featuring expression data for 217 proteins (columns). These proteins were pre-selected for their relevance to cancer biology and therapy (Akbani et al, 2014). The samples are classified into 19 different cancer types.

Compared to the TCGA data, TCPA data are relatively lower in dimension, with the number of observations surpassing the number of variables. Additionally, we observe a lesser degree of correlation between

²This can be done by either i) reducing α_0 and increasing b_{0j} , which are respectively the effective prior number of observations associated with each mixture component, and the scale parameter which influences the spread of the corresponding cluster, or ii) we implement a geometric annealing schedule to strike a balance between exploration and exploitation. See Sections 1 in the Supplementary Materials for details.



Fig. 2: VBVarSel TCGA 2-cluster model. This figure shows the scatter plots of VBVarSel 2-cluster model on the complete TCGA dataset, when PCA is applied to either all covariates (a), or only the selected ones (b).

covariates in TCPA. Despite the identification of 19 cancer types, there remains potential for discovering subtypes within these categories, as well as inter-cancer relationships (Weinstein et al, 2013; Uhlen et al, 2017; Network, 2012), presenting a unique challenge and opportunity for our analysis.

We applied VBVarSel to the full 5157 x 217 TCPA protein expression dataset (Weinstein et al, 2013). The algorithm identified on average 25 clusters with more than 20 observations. Figure 3 (a) shows the correspondence between the inferred clusters and the cancer subtypes. Most cancers were strongly associated with a unique cluster. When there was some overlap, this is in agreement with other relevant literature (Hoadley et al, 2014; Akbani et al, 2014; Crook et al, 2019). For instance, the cancers HNSC, LUAD, and LUSC which are all aero-digestive cancers were most often grouped together. Same applies to STAD, COAD, and READ which are cancers of the digestive tract. In contrast, breast cancer (BRCA) and endometrial cancer (UCEC) were split into subgroups (Akbani et al, 2014). Figure 3 (b) instead shows a heatmap of the stratification and the retained genetic expressions. We observe nice agreement between clusters, cancer subtypes, and genetic expressions.

Remarkably, despite very little knowledge about the data and expected performance to inform our parameter initialisation, VBVarSel was able to converge to sensible results with "standard" configurations obtained using the ELBO for model selection.

As for variable selection, VBVarSel usually retained most of the variables, with a median rate of retention of 90%. Given the profiled proteins in TCPA were already pre-selected (Akbani et al, 2014), and we obtained sensible stratification, there is no indication that the rate is inadequate. Moreover, with different parameter initialisation, such as lower d_0 or c_j , we were able to obtain a lower retention rate but the stratification obtained was considerably worse. To better assess variable selection, we permuted the rows of varying numbers of randomly selected covariates. As expected, at least 91% of the "perturbed" variables were deselected.



Fig. 3: VBVarSel clustering performance on TCPA data (a) A heatmap illustrating the correspondence between VBVarSel clusters and tissues of origin, with clusters containing fewer than 20 observations filtered out. Each entry is calculated with respect to the tissue of origin and it indicates the percentage of observations from a given tissue assigned to each VBVarSel cluster. (b) A heatmap of the TCPA gene expression data showing the VBVarSel stratification. The annotation bars indicate the different cancer subtypes and clusters.

Discussion

In this work, we introduced VBVarSel, a scalable and efficient annealed variational Bayes algorithm tailored for high-dimensional mixture models, aimed at disease subtyping and biomarker discovery. Our method addresses two fundamental challenges in the current clustering literature: the curse of dimensionality and local optima trap, by incorporating annealing and variable selection within a variational inference framework. Through our simulation studies and real-world applications, we demonstrated that VBVarSel outperforms existing methodologies in terms of both runtime and accuracy, making it a robust alternative in the computational toolbox. The simulation results indicate that VBVarSel consistently outperforms traditional methods, empirically demonstrating the benefits of Variational Inference as a computationally efficient alternative to other more popular inference methods in the field. VBVarSel's ability to infer relevant variables with minimal computational cost, while maintaining high accuracy in clustering structures, is particularly advantageous in real-world biomedical datasets where dimensionality is often high (Witten and Tibshirani, 2010; Fop and Murphy, 2018; Kirk et al, 2023). The comparison with VarSelLCM (Marbac and Sedki, 2017), for instance, highlights that while both methods can achieve high clustering accuracy, VBVarSel is significantly faster, making it more suitable for large-scale datasets.

A key feature of our method is its ability to incorporate annealing, which helps overcome the issue of local optima by gradually smoothing the optimisation landscape. This feature is especially important in biological data, where the presence of multiple plausible clustering structures can mislead traditional variational inference methods (Kirk et al, 2023). Our empirical findings supported the theoretical claims that establishing an effective balance between exploration and exploitation with a time-dependent temperature schedule would enhance inference in multi-modal posterior landscapes. Indeed, we observed increased robustness and adaptability to sub-optimal parameter initialisations, correlated data, and noise and a stabilised inference with both synthetic and real data.

In our real-world applications to breast cancer subtyping and pan-cancer proteomics, VBVarSel exhibited strong performance, not only in terms of stratification but also in identifying relevant biomarkers. The ability to handle full, high-dimensional datasets without the need for extensive preprocessing or dimensionality reduction steps underscores the practicality of the method. Moreover, the application to the TCGA breast cancer dataset and TCPA proteomics data showcases VBVarSel's flexibility across various cancer types, highlighting its broad applicability in precision medicine.

Despite its strengths, some limitations remain. Starting from the clustering task, while the model showed promising and sensible results on real data, pushing its stratification accuracy beyond a certain threshold was challenging. A future direction could be a semi-supervised approach, such as outcome-guided clustering. The idea is to introduce a measurable response variable, such as survival time, to guide clustering and find patterns associated with differences in outcomes. This could help improve the interpretability of stratification results in clinical settings. Another area for enhancement is our choice of the covariate selection indicator. We believe allowing both a continuous or binary indicator could offer a more nuanced understanding of each covariate's importance, particularly in datasets like TCPA, where the differences in variable salience are subtle. A flexible indicator system could provide more granular insights into how strongly each variable contributes to clustering. Finally, while the annealing process helps mitigate the local optima problem, its performance is still sensitive to the choice of temperature schedule. Careful tuning of this parameter is required, particularly in highly complex datasets.

VBVarSel presents a significant advancement in clustering and variable selection for high-dimensional biomedical datasets, offering both scalability and accuracy. Its applications in disease subtyping and biomarker discovery, as demonstrated in this study, suggest that it can serve as a powerful tool in the era of precision medicine, where understanding the molecular underpinnings of diseases is crucial for improving patient outcomes. Future work could extend the methodology to supervised learning settings or multi-omics data integration, further broadening its applicability in biomedical research.

Supplementary information. Supplementary Information is available for this paper.

Acknowledgments. E.P. is now a doctoral student at the University of Oxford, supported by the Oxford EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Health Data Science (EP/S02428X/1). F.P. was supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Programme number EP/R018561/1), and is now supported by the UKRI for grant EP/Y014650/1, as part of the ERC Synergy project OCEAN. P.D.W.K. acknowledges core MRC (UKRI) funding through Kirk's programme at the MRC Biostatistics Unit, as well as funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No. 847912.

Code availability. The full VBVarSel code in Python needed to reproduce the findings of this article is available at https://github.com/MRCBSU/vbvarsel as a package for PyPI.

Supplementary Material

1 Complete VBVarSel model

Given the data $X = {\mathbf{x}_n}_{n=1}^N$ where x_n is *J*-dimensional vector of random variables, we define the *K*-components generative mixture models as,

$$p(X|\Phi,\pi) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k f_X(\mathbf{x}_n|\Phi_k)$$
(12)

where $f_X(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)$ is the functional form for component k, parametrised by Φ_k . In our model, we focus on GMM, which are linear combinations of Gaussian distributions, mathematically presented as follows:

$$p(X|\Phi,\pi) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})$$
(13)

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mu_k, \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{-1}) = \frac{\sqrt{|\mathbf{\Lambda}_k|}}{(2\pi)^{J/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_k(\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)\right)$$
(14)

We used multivariate Gaussian distributions with parameters $\Phi_k = \{\mu_k, \Lambda_k\}$, respectively mean vector μ_k and precision matrix Λ_k . For each observation \mathbf{x}_n we introduce a latent variable \mathbf{z}_n , representing cluster assignment, which is a "1-of-K" binary vector of length K which has precisely one non-zero element (*one-hot* encoding). If $z_{nk} = 1$, then \mathbf{x}_n is associated with the k^{th} component. By conditioning on the latent variable Z, we can decompose the joint distribution as follows:

$$p(X, Z, \pi, \Phi) = p(X|Z, \Phi)p(Z|\pi)p(\pi)p(\Phi)$$
(15)

where $p(\pi)$ and $p(\Phi)$ are priors on the mixture weights and component-specific parameters (respectively). We can write down the conditional distribution of Z as

$$p(Z|\pi) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k^{z_{nk}};$$
(16)

and similarly the conditional distribution of the observed data as

$$p(X|Z,\Phi) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f_X(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)^{z_{nk}}.$$
(17)

In this formulation, we have implicitly assumed independence between observations and components, which allowed us to factorise in n and k. We make another critical assumption on the independence between covariates j, given the component allocations Z, which allows us to further factorise our functional form,

$$f_X(\mathbf{x}_n|\Phi_k) = \prod_{j=1}^J f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj}) = \prod_{j=1}^J \mathcal{N}_j(x_{nj}|\mu_{kj}, \tau_{kj}^{-1})$$
(18)

Where x_{nj} denotes the j^{th} dimension of \mathbf{x}_n , $\Phi_{kj} = \{\mu_{kj}, \tau_{kj}\}$ denotes the parameters associated with the k^{th} mixture component, restricted to the j^{th} covariate. This factorisation is equivalent to having Λ_k as a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries τ_{kj} . Our functional form is now a univariate Gaussian distribution:

$$f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj}) = \mathcal{N}_j(x_{nj}|\mu_{kj}, \tau_{kj}^{-1}) = \left(\frac{\tau_{kj}}{2\pi}\right)^{1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tau_{kj}(x_{nj}-\mu_{kj})^2\right)$$
(19)

We refer to our mixture model as a product of univariate - multivariate - Gaussians.

1.1 Covariate selection model

In our approach, model-based clustering is performed concurrently with the selection of relevant variables. In our formulation, we introduce a latent binary variable $\gamma_j \in \{0, 1\}$ indicating whether feature j should be used to infer the clustering structure ($\gamma_j = 1$) or not ($\gamma_j = 0$). We name γ_j as a covariate selection indicator. We extend Equation (18) as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k, \gamma) = \prod_{j=1}^J f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{kj})^{\gamma_j} f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{0j})^{1-\gamma_j}$$
(20)

$$=\prod_{j=1}^{J} \mathcal{N}_{j}(x_{nj}|\mu_{kj},\tau_{kj}^{-1})^{\gamma_{j}} \mathcal{N}_{j}(x_{nj}|\mu_{0j},\tau_{0j}^{-1})^{1-\gamma_{j}}$$
(21)

where Φ_{0j} denotes parameter estimates obtained under the null assumption that there is no clustering structure present in the j^{th} covariate. We pre-compute these estimates before starting the inference procedure by Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE) as the mean and the precision of the data. Given the data $X = \{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^N$ where \mathbf{x}_n is *J*-dimensional vector of random variables, for each dimension *j* we compute:

$$\mu_{0j}^{MLE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} x_{nj} \tag{22}$$

$$\tau_{0j}^{MLE} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (x_{nj} - \mu_{0j}^{MLE})^2\right)^{-1}$$
(23)

Given the introduction of the latent variable γ , we update the decomposed joint distribution as follows:

$$p(X, Z, \pi, \Phi, \gamma) = p(X|Z, \Phi, \gamma)p(Z|\pi)p(\pi)p(\Phi)p(\gamma)$$
(24)

where $p(\gamma)$ is the prior on the covariate selection indicators. We can write the conditional distribution of the observed data in Equation (17) as

$$p(X|Z,\Phi,\gamma) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{J} f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})^{\gamma_j} f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{0j})^{1-\gamma_j} \right]^{z_{nk}}$$
(25)

where the functional form f_j is given in Equation (19).

1.2 Prior distributions

As we proceed to introduce the priors over the parameters π , $\Phi = \{\mu, \tau\}$, and γ , we strategically choose to work with conjugate prior distributions.

We take our prior on π to be a symmetric Dirichlet distribution with fixed concentration parameter α_0 for each cluster, not subject to inference.

$$p(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \operatorname{Dir}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi} \mid \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0}\right) = C\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0}\right) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \pi_{k}^{\alpha_{0}-1}$$
(26)

where $C(\alpha)$ is just the normalisation constant. The α_0 parameter can be interpreted as *pseudocounts*, i.e. the effective prior number of observations associated with each mixture component. Given we do not want to impose a strong preliminary belief of how the proportions should be distributed, we set it to be the same for every component, meaning that all components are equally likely *a priori*. The role of α_0 is also crucial to automatically infer the number of clusters K. By setting $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$, we effectively favor clustering structures in which some of the mixing coefficients are zero, i.e. some clusters are shrunk to zero assignments.

We then proceed to discuss the prior distribution on $\Phi = \{\mu, \tau\}$. Each mixture component k is modeled as a product of independent univariate Gaussian distributions with parameters $\Phi_{kj} = \{\mu_{kj}, \tau_{kj}\}$. We take independent Gaussian-Gamma priors for all μ_{kj}, τ_{kj} , so that:

$$p(\Phi_{kj}) = p(\mu_{kj}, \tau_{kj}) = p(\mu_{kj} | \tau_{kj}) p(\tau_{kj})$$
(27)

$$= \mathcal{N}(\mu_{kj} | m_{0kj}, (\beta_{0kj} \tau_{kj})^{-1}) \Gamma(\tau_{kj} | a_{0kj}, b_{0kj})$$
(28)

and,

$$\Gamma(\tau_{kj}|a_{0kj}, b_{0kj}) = \frac{b_{0kj}^{a_{0kj}}}{\Gamma(a_{0kj})} \tau_{kj}^{a_{0kj}-1} \exp\left(-b_{0kj}\tau_{kj}\right)$$
(29)

where Γ is the Gamma distribution. Together these distributions constitute a Gaussian-Gamma conjugate prior distribution and their conjugacy guarantees that the posterior will take the form of a Gaussian-Gamma. We have introduced 4 hyperparameters. The mean parameter m_{0kj} influences the center of the corresponding Gaussian distribution in the mixture, while the shrinkage parameter β_{0kj} influences the tightness and spread of the cluster, with smaller shrinkage leading to tighter clusters. The degrees of freedom, a_{0kj} , controls the shape of the Gamma distribution, the higher the degree of freedom, the more peaked (i.e. less dispersed) the Gamma distribution will be. Hence, a_{0kj} directly influences the variability of the clusters and their overlap in the feature space. Finally, the scale parameter b_{0kj} scales the Gamma distribution, the larger b_{0kj} , the broader the range of potential precisions, which influences the spread of the corresponding cluster. We set β_0 , a_0 to be equal for every j^{th} dimension and every k^{th} cluster, while we set a m_{0j} and b_{0j} for every j^{th} dimension.

For the covariate selection indicators γ , we introduce another parameter δ , on which we condition to allow conjugacy. Indeed, for each γ_j , we take an independent Bernoulli conditional prior with parameter δ_j , so that:

$$p(\gamma_j|\delta_j) = \delta_j^{\gamma_j} (1 - \delta_j)^{1 - \gamma_j},\tag{30}$$

The conjugate prior of a Bernoulli distribution is the Beta distribution. Hence, we take independent symmetric Beta priors for δ_j , so that:

$$p(\delta_j) = \text{Beta}(d_0). \tag{31}$$

The value of δ_j represents the probability of $\gamma_j = 1$. We use a symmetric Beta distribution with fixed shape parameter d_0 , equal across every dimension j. The symmetry around 0.5 implies no prior preference for either $\gamma_j = 1$ or $\gamma_j = 0$. When $d_0 = 1$, the Beta distribution turns into a uniform distribution. For $d_0 < 1$, the Beta distribution is "U-shaped" and δ_j is more likely to take "extreme" values (0 or 1). For $d_0 > 1$ it is instead "bell-shaped", and middle values (≈ 0.5) are preferred.

1.3 Variational distribution

The complete joint distribution of all variables is given by:

$$p(X, Z, \pi, \mu, \tau, \gamma, \delta) = p(X|Z, \mu, \tau, \gamma)p(Z|\pi)p(\pi)p(\pi)p(\tau)p(\gamma|\delta)p(\delta)$$
(32)

For the variational distribution, we obtain the following factorisation between parameters and latent variables:

$$q(Z, \pi, \mu, \tau, \gamma, \delta) = q(Z)q(\pi) \prod_{j=1}^{J} q(\gamma_j | \delta_j) q(\delta_j) \prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\mu_{kj} | \tau_{kj}) q(\tau_{kj})$$
(33)

Each factor will be updated iteratively as we minimise the KL divergence between the variational distribution and the actual posterior distribution. To derive the update equations, we utilise the foundational formula presented earlier at Equation (8).

Updating Z

Starting with the latent cluster assignments Z, we derive the following:

$$\ln q^*(Z) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} z_{nk} \ln \rho_{nk} + const$$
(34)

where we define

$$\ln \rho_{nk} = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\ln \pi_k] + \mathbb{E}_{\Phi,\gamma}[\ln f(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)]$$
(35)

Note that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi,\gamma}[\ln f(\mathbf{x}_n|\Phi_k)] = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[\mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[\sum_{j=1}^{J} (\gamma_j \ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj}) + (1-\gamma_j) \ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{0j}))]$$
(36)

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(c_j \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} [\ln f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{kj})] + (1 - c_j) f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{0j}) \right)$$
(37)

where $c_j = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[\gamma_j]$. We introduce r_{nk} , the responsibility of the k^{th} component for the n^{th} observation.

$$r_{nk} = \frac{\rho_{nk}}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \rho_{nk}} = \mathbb{E}[z_{nk}] \tag{38}$$

Further, we make the following definition:

$$N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk} \tag{39}$$

which is the expected number of observations associated with the k^{th} component (note that N_k need not be a whole number).

Updating π

Next, we consider the mixing proportions π . We recognise $q^*(\pi)$ as an asymmetric Dirichlet distribution with parameter $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k]$, where

$$\alpha_k = \alpha_0 + N_k \tag{40}$$

Recall that N_k is a function of the responsibilities, r_{nk} , as given in Equation (39). Hence, the contribution of the covariate selection indicators on π occurs via the responsibilities, r_{nk} .

Updating Φ

We derive the following expression for $q^*(\Phi)$:

$$\ln q^*(\Phi_{kj}) = \sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk} c_j \ln f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{kj}) + \ln p(\Phi_{kj}) + const$$
(41)

Note that we weight the contribution of the log-likelihood, $\ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})$, by the factor $c_j = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[\gamma_j]$. Hence if the j^{th} covariate does not contribute to the clustering structure (i.e. $c_j \approx 0$), then Φ_{kj} will be dominated by the prior. Given the form of the conjugate prior on Φ_{kj} (Equation (27)) and the functional form $f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})$, we derive:

$$q^{*}(\Phi_{kj}) = q^{*}(\mu_{kj}|\tau_{kj})q^{*}(\tau_{kj})$$
(42)

$$= \mathcal{N}(\mu_{kj}|m_{kj}, (\beta_{kj}\tau_{kj})^{-1})\Gamma(\tau_{kj}|a_{kj}, b_{kj})$$

$$\tag{43}$$

We introduced the following parameters $(\beta_{kj}, m_{kj}, a_{kj}, b_{kj})$, and statistics (\bar{x}_{kj}, S_{kj}) of the observed data, with respect to the responsibilities:

$$\beta_{kj} = c_j \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} + \beta_0 \tag{44}$$

$$m_{kj} = \frac{1}{\beta_{kj}} \left(c_j \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} x_{nj} + m_{0j} \beta_0 \right)$$
(45)

$$a_{kj} = \frac{1}{2}c_j \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} + a_0 \tag{46}$$

$$b_{kj} = b_{0j} + \frac{1}{2} \left[c_j N_k S_{kj} + \frac{\beta_0 c_j N_k}{\beta_0 + c_j N_k} \left(\bar{x}_{kj} - m_{0j} \right)^2 \right]$$
(47)

$$\bar{x}_{kj} = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} x_{nj}$$
(48)

$$S_{kj} = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} (x_{nj} - \bar{x}_{kj})^2$$
(49)

Updating γ_j

For the covariate selection indicator γ_j we unsurprisingly obtain a Bernoulli distribution,

$$q^*(\gamma_j|\delta_j) = c_j^{\gamma_j} (1 - c_j)^{1 - \gamma_j}$$
(50)

where

$$c_j = \frac{\eta_{1j}}{\eta_{1j} + \eta_{2j}} = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[\gamma_j], \tag{51}$$

and

$$\ln \eta_{1j} = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln(\delta_j)] + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk} \mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[\ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})]$$
(52)

$$\ln \eta_{2j} = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_j} [\ln(1 - \delta_j)] + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk} \ln f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{0j})].$$
(53)

Updating δ_j

Next, we consider δ_j , for which we obtain an asymmetric Beta distribution:

$$q^*(\delta_i) = \text{Beta}(c_i + d_0, 1 - c_i + d_0).$$
(54)

Evaluating r_{nk} and c_j

Having derived update equations for the variational distributions, we are left to evaluate r_{nk} and c_j , which are the expected value of the cluster allocations and the covariate selection indicators respectively. Recall that we have:

$$r_{nk} = \frac{\rho_{nk}}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \rho_{nk}} = \mathbb{E}[z_{nk}] \quad \text{and} \quad c_j = \frac{\eta_{1j}}{\eta_{1j} + \eta_{2j}} = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[\gamma_j],$$
(55)

where to evaluate ρ_{nk} , η_{1j} and η_{2j} as in Equations (35), (52), and (53) respectively, we require expressions for $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\ln \pi_k]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[\ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln \delta_j]$, and $\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln(1-\delta_j)]$. We can easily write the value for $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\ln \pi_k]$ from standard properties of the Dirichlet distribution:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\ln \pi_k] = \psi(\alpha_k) - \psi\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k\right),\tag{56}$$

where ψ denotes the digamma function.

We evaluate $\mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[\ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})]$ as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[\ln f_j(x_{nj}|\Phi_{kj})] = -\frac{1}{2}\ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{kj}}[\ln \tau_{kj}] - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{kj},\tau_{kj}}[(x_{nj}-\mu_{kj})^2\tau_{kj}],\tag{57}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{kj}}[\ln \tau_{kj}] = \psi(a_{kj}) - \ln b_{kj} \tag{58}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{kj},\tau_{kj}}[(x_{nj}-\mu_{kj})^2\tau_{kj}] = \frac{a_{kj}}{b_{kj}}(x_{nj}-m_{kj})^2 + (\beta_{kj})^{-1}.$$
(59)

Finally, from standard properties of the Beta distribution we evaluate:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln \delta_j] = \psi(c_j + d_0) - \psi(2d_0 + 1)$$
(60)
(61)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln(1-\delta_j)] = \psi(1-c_j+d_0) - \psi(2d_0+1).$$
(61)

1.4 Inference

The inference process itself, which concerns the optimisation of the variational posterior distribution, can be divided into two steps, much like the EM algorithm. It begins with a *variational E-step*, during which the current distributions and the current estimate of the parameters, are used to evaluate the expected values in Equations (56), (58), (59), (60), and (61). These are then used to evaluate the current estimate of the cluster assignments $\mathbb{E}[z_{nk}] = r_{nk}$, and the covariate selection indicators $\mathbb{E}[\gamma_j] = c_j$. Then, in the *variational M-step*, r_{nk} and c_j are kept fixed and used to re-compute an estimate of the posterior variational distributions. The algorithm cycles through E and M steps until convergence is achieved.

Variational lower bound and convergence

In our variational framework, we evaluate the ELBO as 3 :

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\mathbf{Z}} \iiint q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \ln \left\{ \frac{p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})}{q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})} \right\} d\boldsymbol{\pi} d\boldsymbol{\mu} d\boldsymbol{\tau} d\boldsymbol{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{\delta}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})] - \mathbb{E}[\ln q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})] + \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\mathbf{Z} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi})] + \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\boldsymbol{\pi})] + \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau})] + \mathbb{E}[\ln p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})]$$

$$- \mathbb{E}[\ln q(\mathbf{Z})] - \mathbb{E}[\ln q(\boldsymbol{\pi})] - \mathbb{E}[\ln q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\tau})] - \mathbb{E}[\ln q(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\delta})].$$
(62)

1.5 Annealed Variational framework

Previous derivations followed the standard variational inference procedure for a general model with latent variables. To introduce annealing in the framework, we proceed as before but start from the annealed foundational formula in Equation (9). In most cases, this only yields an additional 1/T factor in the parameter update. We report only the equations for the parameters updates that are directly influenced by the temperature parameter. For the latent variables Z and γ , we get:

$$\ln \rho_{nk} = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\ln \pi_k] + \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\Phi,\gamma} [\ln f(\mathbf{x}_n | \Phi_k)]$$
(63)

$$\ln \eta_{1j} = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_j} [\ln(\delta_j)] + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk} \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} [\ln f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{kj})]$$
(64)

$$\ln \eta_{2j} = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_j} [\ln(1 - \delta_j)] + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk} \ln f_j(x_{nj} | \Phi_{0j})]$$
(65)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln \delta_j] = \psi \left(\frac{1}{T} (c_j + d_0 + T - 1) \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{T} (2d_0 + 2T - 1) \right)$$
(66)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_j}[\ln(1-\delta_j)] = \psi\left(\frac{1}{T}(T-c_j+d_0)\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{T}(2v+2T-1)\right)$$
(67)

which are then used to evaluate r_{nk} and c_j as in Equations (55). The annealed posterior distributions over π and Φ are parametrised by:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{T} \left(N_k + \alpha_0 + T - 1 \right) \tag{68}$$

$$\beta_{kj} = \frac{1}{T} \left[c_j \sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk} + \beta_{0j} \right] \tag{69}$$

$$m_{kj} = \frac{1}{T\beta_{kj}} \left(c_j \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} x_{nj} + m_{0j} \beta_{0j} \right)$$
(70)

$$a_{kj} = \frac{1}{T} \left[\frac{1}{2} c_j \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_{nk} + a_{0j} + T - 1 \right]$$
(71)

$$b_{kj} = \frac{1}{T} b_{0j} + \frac{1}{2T} \left[c_j N_k S_{kj} + \frac{\beta_{0j} c_j N_k}{\beta_{0j} + c_j N_k} \left(\bar{x}_{kj} - m_{0j} \right)^2 \right]$$
(72)

 $^{^{3}}$ To keep the notation easier, given the equation is already involved itself, we have omitted the subscripts on the expectation operator. In reality, each expectation is taken with respect to all the variables in its argument.

And the annealed posterior distribution of δ becomes:

$$q^*(\delta_j) = \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{T}(c_j + d_0 + T - 1), \frac{1}{T}(T - c_j + d_0)\right)$$
(73)

The annealed variational lower-bound is as in Equation (62) but with an additional T factor in front of the negative terms and is also indirectly affected by the updated annealed parameters. Importantly, when T = 1, we retrieve the standard (non-annealed) variational inference.

2 Summary of prior specifications

We provide a summary of prior specifications which we found worked well for the given datasets.

Experiment	K	$lpha_0$	m_{0j}	eta_{0j}	a_{0j}	b_{0j}	d_0	c_{j}
Synthetic TCGA	[3,10] [5, 8]	[0.1, 1] [0.01, 0.1]	$\max(X_j)$ $\max(X_j)$	10^{-3} 10^{-3}	3. 3.	$[0.1, 1] \\ [0.1, 1]$	$0.9 \\ [1, 5]$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.5, 1 \end{bmatrix}$
A-TCGA TCPA	[5, 7] [25, 40]	$\frac{1/K}{10^{-3}}$	$\max(X_j)$ $\max(X_j)$	10^{-3} 10^{-3}	$\begin{bmatrix} 3, \ 10 \end{bmatrix} \\ 3.$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1, \ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0.1$	$[0.9, 5] \\ 0.5$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ [0.8, 1] \end{bmatrix}$

Table 1: Parameter initialisations. For some parameters we provide fixed values, for others a range of values that worked well. We omit z_{nk} and δ_j as we always sample them from the corresponding distributions.

Legend:

- K: maximum number of clusters in the overfitted mixture.
- α_0 : concentration of the Dirichlet prior on the mixture weights π (Eq. (26))
- m_{0j} and β_{0j} : mean and shrinkage of the Gaussian conditional prior on the components mean μ_{kj} (Eq. (27))
- a_{0j} and b_{0j} : degrees of freedom and scale of the Gamma prior on the components precision τ_{kj} (Eq. (27))
- d_0 : shape of the Beta prior on the covariate selection probabilities δ_j (Eq. (31))
- c_j : covariate selection indicator
- z_{nk} : cluster assignment

3 Simulation Study: additional experiments

In this section we provide additional experiments on the simulated dataset to further evaluate VBVarSel's clustering ad feature selection performance when using annealing.

3.1 Prior specifications for simulation studies

For VBVarSel, our experiments showed that the model is quite robust to the initialisation of β_0 , m_{0j} , a_0 and K. On the contrary, the model performance was influenced by the concentration parameter α_0 , the shape parameter d_0 , and most significantly the scale b_{0j} . Starting with α_0 , this parameter strongly affected the ability to "empty" extra clusters. Nonetheless, any value < 0.5 consistently allowed convergence to the true K in this simulated environment. As for d_0 , values < 0.5 led to higher deselection rate, and the opposite is true for $d_0 > 5$; in between the performance was stable on perfect selection. Most importantly, VBVarSel requires very careful tuning of b_{0j} . Even slight deviations from optimal would significantly and detrimentally impact the quality of the stratification.

3.2 Evaluating benefits of annealing

We demonstrate the benefits of annealing in overcoming common challenges faced in real-world data scenarios, such as correlated data, sub-optimal parameter initialisation, and noise. We explore different temperature schedules. We begin with T = 2, 3 or 4, which either remain constant throughout inference or follow the geometric or harmonic schedule. For time-varying schedules, we set 5 or 10 maximum annealed iterations, given we normally converge in less than 15 iterations. We report the performance of the annealing approaches that allowed more significant advantages, and also the non-annealed model (T = 1) for reference.

We simulate (Crook et al, 2019) synthetic data with n = 100 observations and 200 variables, of which 20 (10%) are relevant. In order to show the benefits of annealing, we make this simulated data more realistic by first introducing correlation. Instead of using identity variance-covariance matrices to generate relevant variables, we introduce different degrees of correlation, i.e. off-diagonal non-zero entries. Table 2 reports the performance of VBVarSel when randomly sampling the correlation for each cluster and each covariate between 0 and 0.5. Table 3 reports the performance of VBVarSel with fixed and equal covariance across all dimensions in all components, and Table 4 with randomly sampled correlation for each cluster, but fixed across all covariates. All experiments were run with *optimal* parameter initialisations and results are averaged across 10 independent runs.

Temperature	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
T = 1 $T = 2G$ $T = 2$	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [1, 1] \\ \hline 1 \ [1, 1] \\ \hline 1 \ [1, 1] \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 0.99 \; [0.99, 0.99] \\ 1 \; [1, 1] \\ 1 \; [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.48 \; [0.41, 0.54] \\ 0.69 \; [0.69, 0.71] \\ 0.59 \; [0.40, 0.71] \end{array}$

 Table 2: Annealed VBVarSel performance on synthetic data modified to include randomly sampled covariances across all clusters and relevant covariates. G: Geometric schedule and the initial temperature.

Across all varying degrees of introduced covariance, we observe a general improvement with annealing. This enhancement manifests in several aspects, whether it is an improved stratification or variable selection accuracy, or increased stability across experiments. This is even more pronounced when we amplify the randomness and variability in the correlation structure (Table 2). Indeed, as the stochasticity in the correlation structure increases, we observe that implementing an effective exploration-exploitation balance with a geometric schedule becomes more beneficial. Notably, the geometric schedule we used is relatively straightforward, thus demonstrating that annealing does not require intensive fine-tuning efforts to show its benefits in a simulated environment.

Covariance	Temperature	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
0.1	T = 1 $T = 2H$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [0.99,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.97 \; [0.97, 0.97] \\ 1 \; [0.97, 1] \end{array}$
0.5	T = 1 $T = 3G$	$egin{array}{c} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} 1 \; [0.99, 1] \ 1 \; [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.68 \; [0.50, 0.71] \\ 0.76 \; [0.76, 1] \end{array}$
0.1 0.5	T = 2 $T = 2$	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, \ 1] \\ 1 \ [1, \ 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}1 \ [1, 1]\\0.70 \ [0.70, \ 0.73]\end{array}$

Table 3: Annealed VBVarSel performance on synthetic data modified to include fixed covariance. G: Geometric, H: Harmonic schedule and the initial temperature is given.

Temperature	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
T = 1 $T = 2G$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1 [0.99, 1] \ 1 [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.65 \; [0.65, 0.70] \ 0.74 \; [0.74, 1] \end{array}$
T = 2	$1 \ [1, \ 1]$	$1 \ [1, 1]$	$0.71 \ [0.67, 1]$

 Table 4: Annealed VBVarSel performance on synthetic data modified to include randomly sampled covariances for each cluster. G: Geometric schedule and the initial temperature is
 Table 5 show the performance of VBVarSel with sub-optimal parameter initialisations. We refer to *optimal* parameter initialisation as the one used in previous simulations, reported in Table 1, experiment *synthetic*. As for the *sub-optimal* initialisation, we vary the scale b_{0j} since it is the parameter to which VBVarSel is more sensitive. We randomly choose a value for b_{0j} between 0.01 and 1 in each of the 10 randomisations of the data we ran, and we report the median scores with upper and lower quartiles.

Table 6 show the performance of VBVarSel with added Gaussian noise. Starting from the original (Crook et al, 2019) synthetic dataset, we add Gaussian noise with zero mean and a varying standard deviation (noise level). Even though in real-world scenarios the noise might not always follow a Gaussian distribution, it is a sensible approximation, providing a good balance between simplicity and realism.

We observe how little changes in the initialisation affect the performance of the non-annealed VBVarSel but introducing annealing generally allowed the optimiser to better explore the posterior space and ultimately reach the global optimum. Furthermore, across all varying Gaussian noise levels, although the VBVarSel algorithm is already reasonably robust to noise, introducing even a straightforward temperature schedule yields improved performance and stability, without increasing the computational complexity of the model.

Initialisation	Temperature	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
Optimal	T = 1 $T = 3G$ $T = 2H$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}1 \ [1, \ 1] \\1 \ [1, \ 1] \\1 \ [1, \ 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}1 \ [1, \ 1] \\1 \ [1, \ 1] \\1 \ [1, \ 1] \end{array}$
Sub-optimal	T = 1 $T = 3G$ $T = 2H$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1, \ 1] \ 1 & [1, \ 1] \ 1 & [1, \ 1] \ 1 & [1, \ 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98 [0.97, 0.99] \\ 1 [1, 1] \\ 1 [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.84 [0.75, 0.88] \\ 1 [0.70, 1] \\ 1 [0.94, 1] \end{array}$
Optimal Sub-optimal	T = 2 $T = 2$	$egin{array}{c} 1 & [1, 1] \ 1 & [1, 1] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1, 1] \ 1 & [1, 1] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [0.84, 1] \end{array}$

Table 5: Annealed VBVarSel performance on (Crook et al, 2019) synthetic data using *optimal* and *sub-optimal* parameter initialisations. G: Geometric, H: Harmonic schedule and the initial temperature is given.

Noise Level	Temperature	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
0.1	T = 1 $T = 3G$ $T = 3H$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98 [0.98, 1] \\ 1 [1, 1] \\ 1 [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.89 \; [0.86, 0.95] \\ 1 \; [0.93, 1] \\ 1 \; [1, 1] \end{array}$
0.5	T = 1 $T = 2G$ $T = 2H$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98 [0.97, 0.98] \\ 1 [1, 1] \\ 1 [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.90 [0.65, 0.92] \\ 1 [0.77, 1] \\ 1 [1, 1] \end{array}$
0.1 0.5	T = 2 $T = 4$	$egin{array}{c} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} 1 & [1,1] \ 1 & [1,1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, \ 1] \\ 1 \ [0.70, \ 1] \end{array}$

Table 6: Annealed VBVarSel performance on synthetic data modified to include Gaussian noise. We averaged across 10 independent runs. G: Geometric, H: Harmonic schedule and the initial temperature is given.

3.3 Model misspecification

We generated synthetic data in two scenarios: one where we added Student's t-distributed noise to our simulated data, and another where the relevant variables data directly followed a Student's t multivariate distribution.

OPTION 1: Gaussian multivariate dist but with student t noise. Clusters generated as in Crook, student t noise added with DoF [2, 3, 3] (no normalisation)

OPTION 2: Student t multivariate. similar configs as crook simulation df : 3 (normalisation)

Method	n	%	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	$10 \\ 25 \\ 50$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.2 \ [2.5, \ 5.2] \\ 4.2 \ [1.9, \ 5.6] \\ 2.7 \ [1.6, \ 4.6] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [1, \ 1] \ 1 & [1, \ 1] \ 1 & [1, \ 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.99 \; [0.98, 1] \\ 1 \; [1, 1] \\ 0.99 \; [0.99, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.60 \; [0.58, 0.68] \\ 0.56 \; [0.49, 0.65] \\ 0.46 \; [0.40, 0.55] \end{array}$
VBVarSel	1000	$ \begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 25 \\ 50 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 10.5 \ [10.2, \ 13.6] \\ 9.8 \ [9.1, \ 11.2] \\ 8.4 \ [8.0, \ 12.6] \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 & [1, 1] \\ 1 & [1, 1] \\ 1 & [1, 1] \\ 1 & [1, 1] \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [1, 1] \\ 1 \ [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.69 \ [0.67, \ 0.73] \\ 0.78 \ [0.72, \ 0.88] \\ 0.69 \ [0.66, \ 0.78] \end{array}$

Table 7	7
---------	---

Method	n	%	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
VBVarSel	100	$25 \\ 50$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.6 \ [2.6, \ 5.2] \\ 4.6 \ [2.4, \ 5.3] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.82 \; [0.72, 0.9] \\ 0.96 \; [0.85, 0.99] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{cccc} 1 & [0.99, 1] \ 1 & [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.68 \; [0.62, 0.78] \\ 0.74 \; [0.71, 0.80] \end{array}$
VBVarSel	1000	$25 \\ 50$	$\begin{array}{c} 11.2 \; [9.1, 13.7] \\ 10.1 \; [9.3, 15.6] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.92 \; [0.69, 0.98] \\ 0.88 \; [0.86, 0.93] \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} 1 \; [1, 1] \ 1 \; [1, 1] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.59 \; [0.57, 0.63] \\ 0.58 \; [0.56, 0.68] \end{array}$

Ta	ble	8
Lа	JULE	୍ତ

4 TCGA Data: additional experiments

In this section we provide additional experiments on the breast cancer transcriptomic data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) (Weinstein et al, 2013) to further evaluate VBVarSel's clustering ad feature selection performance.

4.1 Unsupervised model-based clustering on PAM50 genes

We assessed the clustering capabilities of VBVarSel, while temporarily neglecting variable selection. We extract only the PAM50 genes from the full dataset, which should constitute only relevant information, we fix the covariate selection indicators at 1, and disable inference on those.

When using a scale $b_{0j} = 1$, we obtained 5 clusters that reasonably resemble the breast cancer subtypes (ARI ≈ 0.54). Cluster A is associated with Luminal A samples, while Cluster C is mostly associated with Luminal B samples. Cluster B contains only HER2-enriched samples, but it gathers those that are most "distant" in feature space from Luminal B. Cluster D perfectly represents Basal-like samples, and Cluster E seems to have identified the Normal-like samples despite very few occurrences. The overlap between clusters in feature space, which is due to an existing similarity in some genetic expressions, presents the most significant challenge to our model's accuracy. However, the results obtained are aligned with established literature (Crook et al, 2019; Network, 2012).

When instead initialising lower b_{0j} and α_0 , the algorithm converged to a 2-clusters model, one containing only basal-like samples, and the other grouping together the remaining types. This stratification was indeed maximising the ELBO.

4.2 Simultaneous stratification and biomarker selection on semi-synthetic breast cancer data

Having established that our model's clustering performance aligns with the current literature and expected outcomes, we proceed to enable variable selection. We maintain the PAM50 genes in our dataset, but also progressively add covariates randomly selected from the full dataset and permute the rows of these. The aim is to disrupt or "break" the existing clustering information in the permuted genes, making them irrelevant for stratification, and observe if the model discards them. In fact, while PAM50 genes are backed by research as relevant markers, it's crucial to understand that not all other genes are inherently irrelevant. However, by artificially rendering additional genes irrelevant in this semi-synthetic environment, we aim to rigorously assess our algorithm's ability to discern truly informative variables from noise.

The dataset used always includes the PAM50 genes, to which we add progressively p = 50, 100, and 500 genes to simulate scenarios where the number of covariates is either lower, comparable or larger than the number of observations.

Table 9 shows the resulting averaged performance of the VBVarSel algorithm for varying numbers of p additional randomly sampled and permuted genes. The first row reports the results obtained with PAM50 genes only. We report the time, in seconds, the number of retained PAM50 genes, together with the total number of relevant and irrelevant variables, and the ARI between the inferred stratification and the ground-truth cancer subtype of each observation. We present the median scores with the upper and lower quartiles across 10 independent runs on different data randomisation.

р	Time (seconds)	Relevant	Irrelevant	ARI
$0 \\ 50 \\ 100$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.10 \ [1.50, \ 3.15] \\ 3.27 \ [2.82, \ 4.09] \\ 5.20 \ [4.88, \ 6.17] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 44 \ [43, \ 45] \\ 41 \ [39, \ 43] \\ 49 \ [47, \ 50] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6 \ [5,\ 7] \\ 59 \ [57,\ 61] \\ 101 \ [100,\ 103] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.39 \; [0.38, 0.49] \\ 0.41 \; [0.40, 0.45] \\ 0.41 \; [0.38, 0.43] \end{array}$
500	23 [17.9, 40.9]	$62 \ [58, 65]$	$488 \ [485, \ 492]$	$0.38 \ [0.34, \ 0.44]$

 Table 9:
 VBVarSel performance on varying subsets of TCGA data.

Statistically, the retention of PAM50 genes is significantly better than random across all experiments (*Fisher Test*, p < 0.00001). The stratification quality remains constant, demonstrating that VBVarSel scales well with increasing number of covariates and the performance stays approximately constant amidst noisy variables. The algorithm also scales very well in terms of runtime.

4.3 Benchmarking on pre-processed TCGA expression dataset

To allow comparison with existing literature, we pre-process the complete TCGA dataset as in (Lock and Dunson, 2013) and (Crook et al, 2019). We keep 645 genes for each of the 348 tumour samples, of which 14 are from the PAM50 subset. Initialising lower α_0 and b_{0j} , VBVarSel converges to two clusters, and 318 variables are selected to discriminate between the two groups, which includes all the 14 PAM50 genes (*Fisher Test*, p < 0.00005). These results are comparable to what is reported in (Crook et al, 2019), although VBVarSel tends to select more variables overall, and they are also in agreement with stratifications and selection rates obtained in previous experiments. Indeed, we again observe smaller, tighter, and more separable clusters when focusing on the retained variables.

References

- Akbani R, Ng PKS, Werner HM, et al (2014) A pan-cancer proteomic perspective on the cancer genome atlas. Nature communications 5(1):3887
- Andrews JL, McNicholas PD (2014) Variable selection for clustering and classification. Journal of Classification 31(2):136–153
- Bellman R (1957) Dynamic Programming. Princeton University Press.
- Bensmail H, Meulman JJ (1998) MCMC inference for model-based cluster analysis. In: Rizzi A, Vichi M, Bock HH (eds) Advances in Data Science and Classification. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 191–196
- Bishop CM (2006) Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg
- Blei DM, Kucukelbir A, McAuliffe JD (2017) Variational inference: A review for statisticians. Journal of the American Statistical Association 112(518):859–877. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2017.1285773
- Bouveyron C, Brunet-Saumard C (2014) Model-based clustering of high-dimensional data: A review. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 71:52–78. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2012.12.008
- Boyd SP, Vandenberghe L (2004) Convex optimization. Cambridge university press
- Celeux G, Martin-Magniette ML, Maugis-Rabusseau C, et al (2013) Comparing model selection and regularization approaches to variable selection in model-based clustering. Journal de la Societe francaise de statistique (2009) 155
- Constantinopoulos C, Titsias MK, Likas A (2006) Bayesian feature and model selection for gaussian mixture models. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 28(6):1013–1018. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2006.111
- Cremin CJ, Dash S, Huang X (2022) Big data: Historic advances and emerging trends in biomedical research. Current Research in Biotechnology 4:138–151. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crbiot.2022.02. 004, URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590262822000090
- Crook OM, Gatto L, Kirk PDW (2019) Fast approximate inference for variable selection in dirichlet process mixtures, with an application to pan-cancer proteomics. Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology 18(6):20180065. https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/sagmb-2018-0065
- Curtis C, Shah SP, Chin SF, et al (2012) The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. Nature 486(7403):346–352
- Duan Q, Kou Y, Clark N, et al (2013) Metasignatures identify two major subtypes of breast cancer. CPT: pharmacometrics & systems pharmacology 2(3):1–10
- Earl DJ, Deem MW (2005) Parallel tempering: Theory, applications, and new perspectives. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics 7(23):3910–3916
- Fop M, Murphy TB (2018) Variable selection methods for model-based clustering. Statistics Surveys 12:18 65. https://doi.org/10.1214/18-SS119
- Fraley C, Raftery AE (2002) Model-based clustering, discriminant analysis, and density estimation. Journal of the American Statistical Association 97(458):611–631. https://doi.org/10.1198/016214502760047131

- Gnanadesikan R, Kettenring J, Tsao S (1995) Weighting and selection of variables for cluster analysis. Journal of Classification 12:113–136. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01202271
- Golub TR, Slonim DK, Tamayo P, et al (1999) Molecular classification of cancer: class discovery and class prediction by gene expression monitoring. science 286(5439):531–537
- Hancer E, Zhang M, Xue B (2020) A survey on feature selection approaches for clustering. Artificial Intelligence Review 53:4519–4545. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-019-09800-w
- Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J, et al (2004) The elements of statistical learning: Data mining, inference, and prediction. Math Intell 27:83–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02985802
- Hoadley KA, Yau C, Wolf DM, et al (2014) Multiplatform analysis of 12 cancer types reveals molecular classification within and across tissues of origin. Cell 158(4):929–944
- Hubert LJ, Arabie P (1985) Comparing partitions. Journal of Classification 2:193–218
- Katahira K, Watanabe K, Okada M (2008) Deterministic annealing variant of variational bayes method. Journal of Physics: Conference Series 95(1):012015. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/95/1/012015, URL https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/95/1/012015
- Kirk PDW, Pagani F, Richardson S (2023) Bayesian outcome-guided multi-view mixture models with applications in molecular precision medicine. 2303.00318
- Kirkpatrick S, Gelatt Jr CD, Vecchi MP (1983) Optimization by simulated annealing. science 220(4598):671–680
- Kullback S, Leibler RA (1951) On information and sufficiency. The annals of mathematical statistics 22(1):79–86
- Lau J, Green P (2007) Bayesian model-based clustering procedures. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics - J COMPUT GRAPH STAT 16. https://doi.org/10.1198/106186007X238855
- Law MH, Figueiredo MA, Jain AK (2004) Simultaneous feature selection and clustering using mixture models. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 26(9):1154–1166. https://doi. org/10.1109/TPAMI.2004.71
- Li J, Lu Y, Akbani R, et al (2013) TCPA: a resource for cancer functional proteomics data. Nature Methods 10:1046–1047
- Liverani S, Hastie DI, Azizi L, et al (2014) PReMiuM: An R package for profile regression mixture models using dirichlet processes. 1303.2836
- Lock EF, Dunson DB (2013) Bayesian consensus clustering. Bioinformatics 29(20):2610–2616
- MacQueen J, et al (1967) Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In: Proceedings of the fifth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability, Oakland, CA, USA, pp 281–297
- Mandt S, McInerney J, Abrol F, et al (2016) Variational tempering. 1411.1810
- Marbac M, Sedki M (2017) Variable selection for model-based clustering using the integrated complete-data likelihood. Statistics and Computing 27:1049–1063
- Marbac M, Sedki M (2018) VarSelLCM: an R/C++ package for variable selection in model-based clustering of mixed-data with missing values. Bioinformatics 35(7):1255–1257. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty786

McNicholas PD (2016) Model-based clusterig. Journal of Classification 33:331–373

- Miao J, Niu L (2016) A survey on feature selection. Procedia Computer Science 91:919–926. https://doi. org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.07.111
- Network TCGA (2012) Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours. Nature 490(7418):61–70
- NHS (2022) Breast cancer in women. URL https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/breast-cancer/, accessed: 2023-07-06
- Orrantia-Borunda E, Anchondo-Nuñez P, Acuña-Aguilar LE, et al (2022) Subtypes of breast cancer. Breast Cancer [Internet]
- Parisi G (1979) Toward a mean field theory for spin glasses. Physics Letters A 73(3):203-205
- Parker JS, Mullins M, Cheang MC, et al (2009) Supervised risk predictor of breast cancer based on intrinsic subtypes. Journal of clinical oncology 27(8):1160
- Prat A, Parker JS, Karginova O, et al (2010) Phenotypic and molecular characterization of the claudin-low intrinsic subtype of breast cancer. Breast cancer research 12(5):1–18
- Rand WM (1971) Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods. Journal of the American Statistical Association 66(336):846–850. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1971.10482356
- Rose K, Gurewitz E, Fox G (1990) A deterministic annealing approach to clustering. Pattern Recognition Letters 11(9):589–594. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8655(90)90010-Y
- Rousseau J, Mengersen K (2011) Asymptotic behaviour of the posterior distribution in overfitted mixture models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology 73(5):689–710
- Ruffieux H, Davison AC, Hager J, et al (2020) A global-local approach for detecting hotspots in multiple-response regression. The Annals of Applied Statistics 14(2):905 928. https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AOAS1332
- Sheehan KM, Calvert VS, Kay EW, et al (2005) Use of reverse phase protein microarrays and reference standard development for molecular network analysis of metastatic ovarian carcinoma. Molecular & Cellular Proteomics 4(4):346–355
- Sørlie T, Tibshirani R, Parker J, et al (2003) Repeated observation of breast tumor subtypes in independent gene expression data sets. Proceedings of the national academy of sciences 100(14):8418–8423
- Steinley D, Brusco MJ (2008) Selection of variables in cluster analysis: An empirical comparison of eight procedures. Psychometrika 73(1):125–144
- Tadesse MG, Sha N, Vannucci M (2005) Bayesian variable selection in clustering high-dimensional data. Journal of the American Statistical Association 100(470):602–617. https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000001565
- Ueda N, Nakano R (1998) Deterministic annealing EM algorithm. Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society 11(2):271–282. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0893-6080(97)00133-0
- Uhlen M, Zhang C, Lee S, et al (2017) A pathology atlas of the human cancer transcriptome. Science 357(6352):eaan2507
- Wang L, Dunson DB (2011) Fast bayesian inference in dirichlet process mixture models. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 20(1):196–216. https://doi.org/10.1198/jcgs.2010.07081

- Wang RC, Wang Z (2023) Precision medicine: Disease subtyping and tailored treatment. Cancers 15(15). https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers15153837, URL https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/15/15/3837
- Ward Jr JH (1963) Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. Journal of the American statistical association 58(301):236–244
- Weinstein JN, Collisson EA, Mills GB, et al (2013) The cancer genome atlas pan-cancer analysis project. Nature genetics 45(10):1113–1120
- Witten DM, Tibshirani R (2010) A framework for feature selection in clustering. Journal of the American Statistical Association 105(490):713–726
- Witten DM, Tibshirani R (2013) sparcl: Perform sparse hierarchical clustering and sparse k-means clustering. R package version 1(3)
- Zhang X, Nott DJ, Yau C, et al (2014) A sequential algorithm for fast fitting of dirichlet process mixture models. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 23(4):1143–1162. https://doi.org/10.1080/10618600.2013.870906