

Clustering Algorithms

Garrett Hellenthal
g.hellenthal@ucl.ac.uk

University College London

EMBO – Population Genomics: background and tools
May 24, 2017

Introduction

- ▶ this lecture/practical will cover *clustering algorithms*
- ▶ these classify individuals based on genetic similarity, so that interesting patterns emerge
- ▶ we will use SNP data, though some programs (e.g. *STRUCTURE*) should cope with microsatellites

Outline

STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE/FRAPPE

CHROMOPAINTER/fineSTRUCTURE

Outline

STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE/FRAPPE

CHROMOPAINTER/fineSTRUCTURE

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

- ▶ **Aim:** classify individuals into K clusters based on genetic similarity
- ▶ let $\{S_{i1}, \dots, S_{iL}\}$ be genetic data at locus l (L total loci) for ind i (note: $\times 2$ for diploids)
- ▶ assume individual i is assigned to cluster k
- ▶ then $\Pr(S_{il} = j) = p_{kjl}$, where p_{kjl} is frequency of allele j at locus l in cluster k

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

- ▶ **Aim:** classify individuals into K clusters based on genetic similarity
- ▶ let $\{S_{i1}, \dots, S_{iL}\}$ be genetic data at locus l (L total loci) for ind i (note: $\times 2$ for diploids)
- ▶ assume individual i is assigned to cluster k
- ▶ then $\Pr(S_{il} = j) = p_{kjl}$, where p_{kjl} is frequency of allele j at locus l in cluster k
- ▶ can infer p_{kjl} 's and cluster assignments of each ind by:
 - A. start with random assignment of inds to clusters $1, \dots, K$
 - B. infer each p_{kjl} by using $\text{freq}(j)$ at locus l among inds currently assigned to cluster k
 - C. test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit → move ind to different cluster
 - D. repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

1-SNP Example: classify 12 (haploid) individuals into $K = 2$ clusters:




- A. start with random assignment of inds to clusters 1 and 2
- B. infer each p_{kjl} by using freq(j) at SNP l among inds currently assigned to cluster k ($k = \square/\square$, $j = \bullet/\circ$, $l = 1$)
- C. test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit → move ind to different cluster
- D. repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

1-SNP Example: classify 12 (haploid) individuals into $K = 2$ clusters:




- A. start with random assignment of inds to clusters 1 and 2
- B. infer each p_{kjl} by using freq(j) at SNP l among inds currently assigned to cluster k ($k = \text{pink}/\text{blue}$, $j = \bullet/\circ$, $l = 1$)
- C. test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit \rightarrow move ind to different cluster
- D. repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

1-SNP Example: classify 12 (haploid) individuals into $K = 2$ clusters:




- start with random assignment of inds to clusters 1 and 2
- infer each p_{kjl} by using freq(j) at SNP l among inds currently assigned to cluster k ($k = \bullet/\circ$, $j = \bullet/\circ$, $l = 1$)
- test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit \rightarrow move ind to different cluster
- repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)

1-SNP Example: classify 12 (haploid) individuals into $K = 2$ clusters:




- start with random assignment of inds to clusters 1 and 2
- infer each p_{kjl} by using freq(j) at SNP l among inds currently assigned to cluster k ($k = \square/\square$, $j = \bullet/\circ$, $l = 1$)
- test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit \rightarrow move ind to different cluster
- repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)


1-SNP Example: classify 12 (haploid) individuals into $K = 2$ clusters:



- start with random assignment of inds to clusters 1 and 2
- infer each p_{kjl} by using freq(j) at SNP l among inds currently assigned to cluster k ($k = \bullet/\circ$, $j = \bullet/\circ$, $l = 1$)
- test how well (probability) each ind in k fits the inferred p_{kjl} from (B); if bad fit \rightarrow move ind to different cluster
- repeat (B)-(C) using Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC)

STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)


- ▶ There are different, much faster variants of *STRUCTURE*, which maximize the likelihood rather than sampling via MCMC:
 1. *FRAPPE* (Tang et al 2005, *Am J Hum Genet* 79:1) – maximize likelihood using Expectation-Maximization (E-M)
 2. *ADMIXTURE* (Alexander et al 2009, *Genome Research* 19:1655) – maximize likelihood using high-dimensional optimisation



STRUCTURE

(Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945)


- ▶ There are different, much faster variants of *STRUCTURE*, which maximize the likelihood rather than sampling via MCMC:
 1. *FRAPPE* (Tang et al 2005, *Am J Hum Genet* 79:1) – maximize likelihood using Expectation-Maximization (E-M)
 2. *ADMIXTURE* (Alexander et al 2009, *Genome Research* 19:1655) – maximize likelihood using high-dimensional optimisation
- ▶ There are different flavors of *STRUCTURE*:
 - ▶ “no admixture model” – assign each ind i to single cluster k
 - ▶ “admixture model” – assign each ind to multiple clusters (i.e. infer % of ind i 's genome assigned to clusters $1, \dots, K$)
 - ▶ “linkage model” – can identify regions of ind i assigned to each cluster (Falush et al 2003, *Genetics* 164:1567)



example of *FRAPPE* on HGDP (Li et al 2008, *Science* 319:1100)

“linkage model” STRUCTURE – Hidden Markov Model (HMM)

- ▶ S_l = (observed state) SNP data at locus l of haploid i
- ▶ X_l = (hidden state) cluster $1, \dots, k$ assignment at SNP l



- ▶ each cluster is depicted with a unique color here
- ▶ assume “switches” in cluster assignment occur as a Poisson process of rate $\propto r$, the “time since admixture”
- ▶ “switches” also depend on genetic distance (cM) between SNPs

“linkage model” STRUCTURE (Falush et al 2003, *Genetics* 164:1567)

Some mathematical details of “linkage model”
STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE/FRAPPE:

- ▶ models $\Pr(x_{l+1}^{(i)})$, the probability that haploid i is assigned to cluster k at SNPs($l + 1$), as:

$$\Pr(x_{l+1}^{(i)} = k \mid x_l^{(i)} = k') = \begin{cases} \exp(-d_l r) + (1 - \exp(-d_l r)) q_k^{(i)} & \text{if } k = k' \\ (1 - \exp(-d_l r)) q_k^{(i)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


$$\Pr(s_{l+1}^{(i)} = a \mid x_{l+1}^{(i)} = k) = \Pr(\text{cluster } k \text{ carries allele } a \text{ at site } l + 1) \equiv P_{(l+1)a}^{(k)}$$

- ▶ where $s^{(i)}$ = data, d_l = genetic distance btwn l and $l + 1$, r = “time since admixture”
- ▶ estimate $\Pr(x_l^{(i)})$ and $q_k^{(i)}$, for fixed number of clusters K using MCMC

STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al 2000, *Genetics* 155:945), etc

► Advantages:

- ▶ *ADMIXTURE*, *FRAPPE* are computationally fast
- ▶ find clear structure in data (e.g. separate continents)
- ▶ can detect admixture (e.g. **Europe** in **Maya** from Mexico)



example of *FRAPPE* on HGDP (Li et al 2008, *Science* 319:1100)

► Disadvantages:

- ▶ how to interpret results? Drift/admixture/other can result in similar signals
- ▶ genetic loci (e.g. SNPs) assumed independent
- ▶ K is fixed (though see *STRUCTURAMA* – (Huelsenbeck & Andolfatto 2007, *Genetics* 175:1787))


Outline

STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE/FRAPPE

CHROMOPAINTER/fineSTRUCTURE

Incorporating haplotype information: chromosome painting


(Lawson et al 2012, *PLoS Genet* 8:e1002453)



- ▶ use some sampled chromosomes (e.g. h_1, h_2, h_3) as “donors”
- ▶ match (or “paint”) other chromosomes (e.g. h_4) to donors’ DNA
- ▶ → cluster based on who shares many **blocks of SNPs** rather than who shares similar **SNP frequencies**

Incorporating haplotype information: chromosome painting


(Lawson et al 2012, *PLoS Genet* 8:e1002453)



- ▶ use some sampled chromosomes (e.g. h_1 , h_2 , h_3) as “donors”
- ▶ match (or “paint”) other chromosomes (e.g. h_4) to donors’ DNA
- ▶ → cluster based on who shares many **blocks of SNPs** rather than who shares similar **SNP frequencies**
- ▶ can do “painting” using many approaches, e.g:
 1. *CHROMOPAINTER* (Lawson et al 2012, *PLoS Genet* 8:e1002453)
 2. *HAPMIX* (Price et al 2009, *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000519)
 3. *RFMIX* (Maples et al 2013, *AJHG* 93:278)
 4. *MULTIMIX* (Churchhouse & Marchini 2013, *Genet Epidemiol* 37:1)

CHROMOPAINTER – Hidden Markov Model (HMM)

- ▶ S_l = (observed state) SNP data at locus l of haploid i
- ▶ X_l = (hidden state) donor haploid $1, \dots, d$ copied at SNP l



- ▶ each donor haploid is depicted with a unique color here
- ▶ assume “switches” in donor copied occur as a Poisson process of rate $\propto g_l$, the cM distance between SNPs l and $l + 1$

Copying Model (HMM) (Lawson et al 2012, PLoS Genet 8:e1002453)

(based on Li & Stephens 2003, Genetics 165:2213)

X_l = (unknown) “donor” haplotype copied at SNP l

S_l = observed data at SNP l

$$\Pr(X_{l+1} = d \mid X_l = d') = \begin{cases} \exp(-g_l N_e) + (1 - \exp(-g_l N_e)) q_d & \text{if } d = d' \\ (1 - \exp(-g_l N_e)) q_d & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


$$\Pr(S_{l+1} = s \mid S_{X_{l+1}} = s_X) = \begin{cases} 1 - \theta & s = s_X \\ \theta & s \neq s_X \end{cases}$$

- ▶ where g_l = genet distance btwn SNPs l and $l + 1$, N_e = “scaling term”, θ = mutation (emission) rate, $q_d = \Pr(\text{copy } d)$
- ▶ estimates proportion copied from donor d conditional on data
- ▶ can sample X_l along genome

Summarizing *CHROMOPAINTER* painting: Heatmaps

- ▶ allow each individual i to copy from every other individual $j \neq i$ using the copying model
- ▶ calculate y_{ij} – expected number of “chunks” ind i copies from ind j
 - ▶ if you assume each SNP is a “chunk” (i.e. “no-linkage” model) you capture information equivalent to PCA of genetic data
 - ▶ considerably more power if you use haplotype-based model


Simulated Example – 5 pops (150 5-Mb regions)




- ▶ Heatmap: each square is the number of DNA segments that each column (recipient) copies from each row (donor)
- ▶ upper left triangle: ignoring haplotypes
lower right triangle: using haplotypes

Simulated Example – 5 pops (PCA of heatmap)

Unlinked PCA



Linked PCA



top row: ignoring haplotypes (equivalent to regular PCA)


bottom row: using haplotypes

fineSTRUCTURE: cluster using *CHROMOPAINTER* paintings

B) Population Tree




fineSTRUCTURE: cluster using *CHROMOPAINTER* paintings




- ▶ paint each individual i using all other inds as “donors”
- ▶ calculate y_{ij} – number of DNA segments of ind i painted by ind j

fineSTRUCTURE: cluster using *CHROMOPAINTER* paintings




- ▶ paint each individual i using all other inds as “donors”
- ▶ calculate y_{ij} – number of DNA segments of ind i painted by ind j
- ▶ cluster individuals who have similar painting patterns (MCMC):
 1. start with random assignment of inds to clusters $1, \dots, K$
 2. $(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iK}) \sim \text{Mult}(P_{A1}, \dots, P_{AK})$ for ind i assigned to cluster A
 3. infer P_{Ak} by using number of segments inds in cluster A are painted with inds in cluster k
 4. if $\Pr(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iK})$ low \longrightarrow move ind i to different cluster




Simulated Example – 5 pops (classification)


B) Population Tree




B) Barplot



European populations (Lawson et al 2012, *PLoS Genet* 8:e1002453)



United Kingdom – clustering using haplotype info



(Leslie et al 2015, *Nature* 519:309)

- ▶ dots = individuals / colors = clusters
- ▶ **left:** ignore haplotypes (as in PCA, STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE)
- ▶ **right:** using haplotypes shows more localised (though subtle!) correspondence of genetics and geography

► Advantages:


- ▶ increased power – finds more subtle structure in data missed by *ADMIXTURE* (e.g. Europe, United Kingdom)
- ▶ heatmaps can show clear structure/admixture
- ▶ current implementation infers number of clusters K automatically, and builds “tree” relating these clusters

► Disadvantages:

- ▶ how to interpret results? Drift/admixture/other can result in similar signals
- ▶ requires phased data (e.g. using *SHAPEIT*)
- ▶ currently only has “no admixture” model
- ▶ computationally slow (relative to *ADMIXTURE*), more complicated to use

Caution: Clustering individuals


- ▶ can be difficult to interpret → drift, admixture, ancient relatedness can give similar signals



example of *STRUCTURE* (Rosenberg et al 2002, *Science* 298:2381)

Caution: Clustering individuals

- ▶ can be difficult to interpret → drift, admixture, ancient relatedness can give similar signals



example of *STRUCTURE* (Rosenberg et al 2002, *Science* 298:2381)

- ▶ with $K = 6$ clusters, the *Kalash* of Pakistan assigned to own **yellow** cluster because they are relatively drifted
(live within mountainous region → genetically isolated)
- ▶ has been interpreted as the Kalash being an ancient genetic isolate (Ayub et al 2015, *AJHG* 96:775)
- ▶ but recent work has shown ancestors of Kalash have recently intermixed with outside groups within last $\approx 3k$ years (Hellenthal et al 2014)

Summary

- ▶ clustering algorithms highlight genetic differences/similarities among groups (e.g. correlations between genetics and geography)
- ▶ more challenging to get at factors driving genetic differences
- ▶ *STRUCTURE/ADMIXTURE/FRAPPE* – assumes SNPs are independent, computationally quick (the latter two methods)
- ▶ *CHROMOPAINTER + fineSTRUCTURE* – uses correlations among SNPs (haplotype information) to increase power, computationally slower