

UROP Notes

MICHAEL DIAO

1 RCTD

Our ultimate goal is to determine the fractional contributions of each cell type to a particular sample. We do this by maximum likelihood, using the following hierarchical model:

$$Y_{i,j} \mid \lambda_{i,j} \sim \text{Poisson}(N_i \lambda_{i,j})$$
$$\log \lambda_{i,j} = \log(\vec{\beta}_i \cdot \vec{\mu}_j) + \alpha_i + \gamma_j + \varepsilon_{i,j},$$

where

- $Y_{i,j}$ is the random variable corresponding to the observed expression of gene j at pixel i ,
- N_i is the number of transcripts for pixel i ,
- $\vec{\beta}_i$ is the K -dimensional row vector of contributions from each cell type (where K is the number of cell types in question) at pixel i ,
- $\vec{\mu}_j$ is the K -dimensional column vector of mean expressions of gene j for each cell type,
- α_i is a fixed pixel-specific effect.
- γ_j and $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are random effects that introduce noise. γ_j in particular is intended to account for platform effects that may over- or underrepresent certain genes. We let these be normally distributed with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_\gamma, \sigma_\varepsilon$ respectively.

Therefore, determining the fractional contributions of each cell type reduces to finding the maximum likelihood parameter $\vec{\beta}_i$ for each i .

Question 1.1. Now we have a ton of parameters, potentially thousands. β alone introduces $K \times J$ of them. How do we do any useful estimation here?

We proceed in the following steps:

1. Supervised estimation of cell type profiles.

Using a reference dataset, we estimate the parameters μ_j of expression levels for gene j , giving $\hat{\mu}_j$ which will be used in the next steps.

We can do this by obtaining a (e.g. scRNA-seq) reference annotated with cell types, after which $\hat{\mu}_j$ can be estimated as the empirical average normalized expression of gene j within each cell type.

2. Gene filtering.

Using the estimated expression profiles $\hat{\mu}_j$, we filter out genes that are not highly variable across cell types.

We can do this by taking the expression profiles $\hat{\mu}_j$ and selecting genes with a minimum average expression and sufficiently high variance.

3. Platform Effect Normalization.

With an estimate for $\vec{\mu}_j$, it turns out we now have a way to estimate the platform effects γ_j as well. The idea is that we can consider the average observed expression across pixels

$$M_j = \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I Y_{i,j},$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E}_{M_j | \vec{\lambda}_j} [M_j | \lambda_{1,j}, \dots, \lambda_{I,j}] &= \log \left(\frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I N_i \lambda_{i,j} \right) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I N_i \exp \left(\log(\vec{\beta}_i \cdot \vec{\mu}_j) + \alpha_i + \gamma_j + \varepsilon_{i,j} \right) \right) \\ &= \gamma_j + \log \left(\frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I N_i (\vec{\beta}_i \cdot \vec{\mu}_j) \exp(\alpha_i + \varepsilon_{i,j}) \right) \\ &= \gamma_j + \log \left(\frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{i,k} \cdot \mu_{k,j} \right) N_i \exp(\alpha_i + \varepsilon_{i,j}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

does this discard genes that are, say, only expressed in one cell type? (average might be low, but gene could be good marker)

j++j

j++j