

# Differential Expression Analysis Techniques for Single-Cell RNA-seq Experiments

for the Computational Biology Doctoral Seminar (CMPBIO 293),  
organized by N. Yosef & T. Ashuach, Spring 2018, UC Berkeley

Kevin Benac and Nima Hejazi

Group in Biostatistics,  
University of California, Berkeley

11 April 2018

# Outline

## Introduction

- Data (Kevin)

- Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

- ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

- DropLasso (Nima)

- Comparison

## Conclusions

- Review

# The Data: Single-Cell RNA-seq



# The Data: Single-Cell RNA-seq



# The Data: Single-Cell RNA-seq



# Outline

## Introduction

Data (Kevin)

Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

DropLasso (Nima)

Comparison

## Conclusions

Review

# The Objective: Differential Expression

- ▶ Why “differential”? The goal is to find a subset of relevant biomarkers with respect to a particular condition of interest (e.g., disease, tissue of origin).
- ▶ Many experimental settings seek to isolate a subset of biomarkers from the full (larger) assayed set in order to identify biological patterns and better inform future biological experiments.
- ▶ Since experimental costs are high and modern biotechnologies allow numerous biological targets (e.g., genes) to be assayed, the result is a very high-dimensional statistical problem.

# The Objective: Differential Expression

- Regularized Linear Models:

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(w, x_i, y_i) + \lambda \Omega(w) \right\}$$

- Lasso for continuous outcomes (squared-error loss):

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( y_i - \sum_{j=1}^d w_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^d |w_j| \right\}$$



# Outline

## Introduction

Data (Kevin)

Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

DropLasso (Nima)

Comparison

## Conclusions

Review

# ZINB-WaVE I

► ...

► ...

# ZINB-WaVE II

► ...

► ...

# ZINB-WaVE III

► ...

► ...

# ZINB-WaVE IV

► ...

► ...

# Outline

## Introduction

Data (Kevin)

Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

**DropLasso (Nima)**

Comparison

## Conclusions

Review

# DropLasso I

- ▶ Consider the following data structure:
  - ▶  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  — design matrix of scRNA-seq counts
  - ▶  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  — cell-level outcome of interest (e.g., tissue of origin)
  - ▶  $\delta_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$  s.t.  $\delta_i \sim \text{Bern}(p)^d$  — random dropout mask
  - ▶  $\delta \odot x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  — corrupted pattern for scRNA-seq dropout
  - ▶  $P(\delta_i = 1) = p$  — probability of *not* being censored by dropout
- ▶ The DropLasso procedure seeks to identify differentially expressed genes based on cell-level differences while accounting for the dropout noise that masks scRNA data.

# DropLasso II

- ▶ Introducing dropout ( $\delta_i \sim \text{Bern}(p)^d$ ):

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\delta_i} \mathcal{L} \left( w, \delta_i \odot \frac{x_i}{p}, y_i \right) + \lambda \|w\|_1 \right\}$$

- ▶ Independence from  $p$  in expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^d w_j \left( \delta_i \odot \frac{x_i}{p} \right)_j &= \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\delta_i} w_j \delta_{i,j} \frac{x_{i,j}}{p} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d w_j x_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$



## DropLasso III

- ▶ Introducing the dropout term  $\delta$  amounts to censoring the observed data and adjusting (i.e.,  $\frac{x_p}{p}$ ) such that the effects of dropout noise are removed.
- ▶ This places a *statistical model* on the dropout noise — i.e.,  $\delta_i \sim \text{Bern}(p)^d$ 
  - ▶ Dropout noise is independent across samples and genes. (Fine starting point but probably untrue scientifically.)
  - ▶ Modeling dropout noise in a more flexible manner could likely improve DropLasso performance and is identified as an item of future work.
- ▶ Merely introducing the simple dropout correction significantly improves performance under standard modeling metrics (e.g., AUC).

# DropLasso IV

Dataset	Number of variables	LASSO	Dropout	Elastic net	DropLasso
EMTAB2805	100	0.95	0.94	<b>0.966</b>	0.964
	1 000	0.956	0.989	0.980	<b>0.990 *</b>
	10 000	0.764	0.961	0.817	<b>0.961 *</b>
	All (20 614)	0.72	0.928	0.796	<b>0.946 **</b>
GSE74596	100	0.997	0.996	0.994	<b>0.998</b>
	1 000	0.988	0.997	0.994	<b>0.999</b>
	10 000	0.769	0.960	0.909	<b>0.990*</b>
	All (14 172)	0.844	0.915	0.943	<b>0.966</b>
GSE45719	100	0.999	0.990	0.999	<b>0.999</b>
	1 000	0.997	0.999	0.999	<b>1</b>
	10 000	0.995	0.998	0.998	<b>1 *</b>
	All	0.990	0.999	0.999	<b>1</b>
GSE63818-GPL16791	100	0.94	0.977	0.984	<b>0.998 *</b>
	1 000	0.945	0.998	0.985	<b>1 *</b>
	10 000	0.951	0.995	0.987	<b>0.998 *</b>
	All	0.932	0.970	0.976	<b>0.989</b>
GSE48968-GPL13112	100	0.995	0.992	0.996	<b>0.997</b>
	1 000	0.962	0.992	0.996	<b>0.997</b>
	10 000	0.939	0.97	0.978	<b>0.992 *</b>
	All	0.948	0.962	0.96	<b>0.987 *</b>

Figure 1: Excerpt from table 3 of “DropLasso: A robust variant of Lasso for single cell RNA-seq data” Khalfaoui & Vert (2018)

# Outline

## Introduction

Data (Kevin)

Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

DropLasso (Nima)

Comparison

## Conclusions

Review

# ZINB-WaVE v. DropLasso I

► ...

► ...

## ZINB-WaVE v. DropLasso II

► ...

► ...

## ZINB-WaVE v. DropLasso III

► ...

► ...

# Outline

## Introduction

- Data (Kevin)

- Objective (Nima)

## Methodology

- ZINB-WaVE (Kevin)

- DropLasso (Nima)

- Comparison

## Conclusions

- Review

# Review

► ...

► ...



# References I

- Beyrem Khalfaoui and Jean-Philippe Vert. DropLasso: A robust variant of Lasso for single-cell RNA-seq data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09381*, 2018.
- Davide Risso, Fanny Perraudeau, Svetlana Gribkova, Sandrine Dudoit, and Jean-Philippe Vert. ZINB-WaVE: A general and flexible method for signal extraction from single-cell RNA-seq data. *bioRxiv*, 2017.