## TF SCEPTRE vs Seurat in monocytes, with same QC

## 2023-04-04

## Introduction

Here we analyze the performance of SCEPTRE and Seurat on the broad condition gene sets from the HTFtarget database. You can input the TF you wan tto analyze in the code chunk below.

```
#get the TF name
#TF_names = c("STAT1", "STAT2", "BRD4", "MYC", "SMAD4", "IRF1")
TF_name = "SMAD4"
```

## Compare SCEPTRE and Seurat results with ChIP-seq scores

Let's first look at how the SCEPTRE and Seurat discoveries align with each other.

Table 1: Comparing SCEPTRE versus Seurat discoveries.

SCEPTRE	Seurat	FALSE	TRUE
FALSE TRUE		$7538 \\ 864$	1154 3700

This table suggests that SCEPTRE and Seurat results have decent, but imperfect, agreement. Also note that the total numbers of discoveries made by the two methods are nearly the same. Next, let's look at how the SCEPTRE and Seurat discoveries align with the ChIP-seq target genes (as identified by either the hTFtarget database or directly from the ChIP-seq data).

Table 2: Comparing SCEPTRE to database.

Database	SCEPTRE	FALSE	TRUE	Prop
FALSE		7865	4031	0.339
TRUE		827	533	0.392
Prop		0.095	0.117	

Table 3: Comparing Seurat to database.

Database	Seurat	FALSE	TRUE	Prop
FALSE		7599	4297	0.361
TRUE		803	557	0.41
Prop		0.096	0.115	

The proportions are the proportion of TRUE values in each row or column. For example, 0.576 of the genes found by SCEPTRE are marked as TF targets in the database (i.e. SCEPTRE has specificity 0.576). From these tables, we see that SCEPTRE has slightly lower sensitivity and specificity than Seurat. We can summarize each 2-by-2 table via its odds ratio (the p-values are all extremely small). The resulting odds ratios are shown below.

Table 4: Enrichment odds ratios, comparing to database and our ChIP-seq target assignments.

Ground truth	Method	SCEPTRE	Seurat
database pvalue		1.257 $0.000$	1.227 $0.001$