Variance Stabilizing Transformations for image-based compound profiling features

LEonard Wafula

August 25, 2017

Introduction

Image-based multi-parameteric compound profiling features

☐ Biological method used as a proxy for distinguishing compounds in the drug discovery chain using a range of features extracted from image-based assays by applying High Throughput Microscopy (HTM)

☐ The features provide information on

i. Intracellular biomarkers: texture, intensity, spatial distribution etc
ii. Cells: shape, geometry, quantity .. .

☐ Why

i. understand how compounds induce their desired properties and describe their mechanisms of action
ii. preferentially identify highly specific compounds having a desired effect on a given biological target
iii. early detection of undesired compound effects on cells + cellular activity: toxicity

.. introduction

It's all good, but .... Most of these features often

- are highly correlated: need to limit features used for analysis
- have non-normal distributions: mean-variance relationship present
  - multivariate classification methods hugely depend on variance



Aim of the analysis

To assess the:

I. effect of glog transformation on separation of treatment replicates from non-replicates

II. effect of glog transformation on proportion of actively-called treatments

III. performance of a glog transformation on treatments separation when applied at cell- or well-level

♣ Treatment: a compound at a given concentration (a compound can have 4 or 5 concentration levels - 1 μM (microMolar), 3 μM, 3.34 μM, 9 μM and 11.1 μM)

Data, the glog transformation and data pre-processing



Data

i. 2 cancer cell lines: Liver & Colon
ii. a plate had btwn 134909 & 281177 (152679 & 330117) in $1^{st}(2^{nd})$ data
iii. a well had btwn 73 & 1812 (95 & 2120) cells in the $1^{st}(2^{nd})$ data
iv. 311 compounds including DMSO control
v. we tested a total of 1253 treatments
vi. 462 features extracted from each cell

..Data, the glog transformation and data pre-processing

Glog transformation

- formula

$$z = \text{Log}(y - \alpha + \sqrt{(y - \alpha)^2 + \lambda})$$

- where
  - z: glog-transformed data
  - y: untransformed data
  - α: feature mean across DMSO controls
  - λ: transformation parameter

Data pre-processing

- Aggregation - calculating mean for each feature per well
- Normalization -

$$\frac{\text{feature}_{value} - \text{mean.feature}_{DMSO}}{\text{pooled.SD.feature}_{across.plates}}$$

- Feature selection
  - MRMR: identify set of features with low pairwise correlation & high reproducibility among replicates.
  - AUC value for btwn 2-75 features
  - optimal feature: maximizes separation of treatment replicates within 1 Std error of AUC
- Active calling: treatments with $\geq 50\%$ active replicates

Methodology

⋆ Hotelling's T^2 method

⇝ measures difference in 2 multivariate means

⇝ formula

$$T^2 = \frac{(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2)\prime(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2)}{\boldsymbol{S}_p(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2})}$$

⇝ normality assumptions for optimal results

⇝ Only actively-called treatments in pre- & post-transformation used

⇝ + shift in T^2 distribution indicate improved treatment separation

⋆ AUC method

2-steps involved in AUC-calculation

⇝ Pearson correlation btwn pairs of replicates (& non-replicates) were calculated & distributions plotted

⇝ separation btwn the 2 distribution quantified by constructing an ROC curve using a series of correlation thresholds & calculating an AUC value

⇝ transformations leading to higher AUC values ⇢ improved treatments separation compared to corresponding untransformed data

Results: EDA

No. of replicates(% of sample treatments)		
9 (%)	36 (%)	45 (%)
1192(95.208)	28(2.236)	32(2.556)

- ★ DMSO control replicated across 1512 wells
- ★ For both data sets
- ★ Implications
  - ⋆ For calculation of Hotelling's T^2, a limited number of selected features was used to maximize its power
  - ⋆ 10 highest ranked features from MRMR used to calculate T^2

Transformations effects on treatments separation

Prologue

◇ Only glog transformations of λ equal to 0.1 and, 0.5 to 25 at 0.5 interval investigated for both T^2 and AUC methods

◇ Each transformed data compared to its corresponding untransformed data defined by actively-called treatments present both pre- and post-transformation

◇ Improved treatments separation shown by $+$ve shifts in distribution (and/or associated statistics) of T^2 for transformed compared to untransformed, and/or higher AUC values

◇ Results presented for the first cell line only since results largely led to similar conclusions for both cell lines

Transformations effects on treatments separation - T^2

⁂ Presence of very high [very different] and very low [highly similar] values

⁂ Some led to slight but negligible improvements (e.g $\lambda = 10.5$)



⁂ Others led to no improvements (e.g $\lambda = 10$)



Transformations effects on treatments separation - AUC



- high AUC b4-transformation
- some (e.g $\lambda = 0.1$) led to marginal increases
- others (e.g $\lambda = 5.5$) separated slightly poorer
- the differences were however very minimal & non-significant

Transformations effects on treatments separation- Epilogue

◇ In both methods, minimal & insignificant differences were observed: Transformations failed to improve treatments separation

◇ Why?

1. Transformation effect on features distributions









2. Differentiating ability of features selected (before transformation)





Effect of transformation on treatments active-calling



- lower % of active-calling
- intriguing relationship btwn number of features selected & prop. of active-calling
- similar relationship in 2^{nd} cell line

Transform at cell- or well-level? [T^2 & AUC approaches]





$\sim$ For $\lambda = 10.5$

$\sim$ Minimal non-significant improvement in treatment separation when transformed at cell-level $>$ well level

$\sim$ High AUC values pre-transformation

$\sim$ No clear preference for cell- or well-level transformation

Discussion

From our study, we observed that:

$\sim$ Transformations did not improve treatments separation beyond what was seen pre-transformation

$\sim$ Transformations led to lower(higher) proportion of active-calling in $1^{st}(2^{nd})$ data

$\sim$ Inverse relationship between proportion of active-calling and number of features selected was evident

$\sim$ There was no preference in transforming data at cell- or well-level