

Cell-type specific mediation project update

Andrea Lane

2/22/2020

Outline

1. Project idea reminder
2. EM max.iter and tol parameters
3. TOAST results
4. EM results

Project idea reminder

$$\begin{aligned} Y &\sim N(\theta_0 + \theta_1 E + \sum_k \theta_2^k m_k, \gamma^2) \\ M &\sim N(\sum_k m_k \pi_k, \sigma^2) \\ m_k &\sim N(\beta_0^k + \beta_1^k E, \tau_k^2) \end{aligned}$$

- Use TOAST to get β initial values and reduce number of sites to go through EM
- Run EM algorithm one site at a time to get estimates of Θ
- Calculate observed indirect effect $\hat{\beta}_1 \hat{\theta}_2$
- Use percentile bootstrap to assess significance of the indirect effect for each site and cell type

EM initial values

I wanted to evaluate the efficiency and accuracy of the EM algorithm to set the tolerance and maximum iteration parameters. Up to this point, I had set max.iter=500 and tol=0.001.

Table 1: Final iteration Theta2 estimates (true values in parentheses)

	Cell 1 (0)	Cell 2 (0)	Cell 3 (0)	Cell 4 (0.4)
Initial values: true values				
500; .01	-0.1799810	0.0351150	0.0358092	0.4047087
500; .001	-0.1799810	0.0351150	0.0358092	0.4047087
2000; .0001	0.0053486	0.0317210	-0.0786960	0.3854218
Initial values: 0				
500; .01	-0.1979723	0.0688971	-0.2234888	0.1747376
500; .001	-0.0321125	0.0561223	-0.3536296	0.1920167
2000; .0001	0.0041869	0.0366775	-0.3592493	0.1854096

Comments:

- odd that convergence is faster with 0s as initial values than true values as initial values?
- estimates not as good with 0s as initial values (to be expected)
- have been using max.iter=500, tol=.001

EM results

To assess the EM/boosstrap procedure, I ran it with only the mediating sites using the true values as initial values.

Settings/Notes:

- N=500
- To account for multiple testing, the $(.025/N_{\text{cell}}*N_{\text{site}}, 1-(.025/N_{\text{cell}}*N_{\text{site}}))$ quantile is used for bootstrap samples.
- for EM, max.iter=500 and tol=0.001
- EM initial values:
 - beta: from TOAST
 - theta: true values
 - tau, sigma: sampled from inverse gamma distribution with mean 0.001 (based on HIRE, which states that variance initial values are sampled from inverse gamma distribution with small mean but does not specify the mean)
 - gamma: true value 0.0004
- Scripts used: “Lane_Mediation_sim12821_cluster.R” and “mediation_sim_functions_1120.R” (functions script contains EM julia code)

Table 2: 1 site - 200 bootstrap

Theta = 0.2				Theta = 0.4			
Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4	Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4
317	78	167	194	874	94	162	94
315	678	115	68	158	998	79	37
80	24	942	65	23	13	998	15
57	14	42	984	19	7	13	999

Table 3: 2 sites - 200 bootstrap

Theta = 0.2				Theta = 0.4			
Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4	Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4
358	112	209	213	895	71	163	65
317	2	2	0	790	3	3	0
320	710	165	77	352	995	159	79
4	277	1	2	7	711	2	2
160	52	896	51	40	16	990	79
83	37	886	14	45	31	997	12
51	12	21	831	19	8	52	987
155	47	36	999	101	33	37	1000

Table 4: Average across mediating and nonmediating sites/cell types 200 bootstrap

	1 site	2 sites	1 site	2 sites
	Theta = 0.2		Theta = 0.4	
	Power		Power	
Power	0.730	0.659	0.967	0.921
Type 1 error	0.102	0.076	0.060	0.057

Table 5: 1 site - 1000 bootstrap

Theta = 0.2				Theta = 0.4			
Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4	Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4
307	65	133	166	855	73	132	82
273	659	104	47	113	998	51	28
61	15	934	50	20	6	999	12
35	14	36	981	9	4	11	999

Table 6: Average across mediating and nonmediating sites/cell types 1000 bootstrap

	Theta = 0.2	Theta = 0.4
Power	0.720	0.963
Type 1 error	0.083	0.045

For reference, I also present the power and type 1 error from the last set of results where I used 0 for the initial theta values.

Table 7: Average across mediating and nonmediating sites/cell types 0s as initial values (theta=0.4)

	1 site	2 sites	3 sites
Power	0.691	0.696	0.692
Type 1 error	0.308	0.160	0.155