# Supplementary Methods

# Discrimination of rosé wines using shotgun metabolomics with a genetic algorithm and MS ion intensity ratios

Mélodie Gil<sup>1</sup>, Christelle Reynes<sup>2</sup>, Guillaume Cazals<sup>3</sup>, Christine Enjalbal<sup>3</sup>, Robert Sabatier<sup>2</sup>, Cédric Saucier<sup>1,\*</sup>

- 1- Univ Montpellier, SPO, INRAE, Montpellier Supagro, Montpellier, France
- 2- Univ Montpellier, IGF, CNRS INSERM, Montpellier, France
- 3- Univ Montpellier, IBMM, Montpellier, France

\*Corresponding author at: Université de Montpellier, UMR 1083 INRAE Supagro Sciences pour l'Œnologie, 15 Avenue Charles Flahault, 34000 Montpellier, France. Tel.: +33411759567; fax: +33411759638. E-mail address: cedric.saucier@umontpellier.fr.



# Appendix 1. In-house rosé wine compounds database





![](_page_4_Picture_297.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_297.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_124.jpeg)

#### Appendix 2. Genetic algorithms

Genetic Algorithms (GAs) are inspired by nature and especially by natural selection (Goldberg, 1989), they are very useful in complex optimization issues. Here, the GA are used to find up optimal subsets of peak ratios. Thus, it can be considered as a feature selection issue, a field where GAs are widely used (Chandrashekar & Sahin, 2014), especially in metabolomics (Cavill et al., 2009). The algorithm begins with a population constituted of several individuals which correspond to potential solutions in the optimization problem. Thus, in our context, the individuals will be subsets of peak ratios. Then, this population evolves according to three operators described in the next paragraphs: crossover, mutation and selection. Selection is a crucial step allowing to keep the best individuals with regard to the fitness function. Mutation and crossover are run independently from the optimization issue, they allow the exploration of solution space. Then, any GA can be described as follows:

# Main steps of a GA:

- 1. Construction of the first generation
- 2. Selection

#### While stopping criteria not met do

- 3. Crossover
- 4. Mutation
- 5. Selection

End

#### Peak weighting

As the total number of potential solutions is huge (see main manuscript) we decided to associate a weight to each peak in order to favor peaks with two main properties: high values (that is to say high quantities) in at least one group and low within-group variability.

To favor peaks with high values in at least one group, we computed the mean intensities within each group:

$$
\bar{x}_j^k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in k} x_{ij}
$$

Where  $x_{ij}$  is the intensity value of the *i*-th sample for the *j*-th ( $i \in \{1,2,...,72\}$ ) peak and  $k (k \in \{1,2,3\})$ is the class (here the region). Then we extracted the maximum mean across classes:

$$
\bar{x}^{max}_j = \max_{k \in \{1,2,3\}} \bar{x}^k_j
$$

 Concerning variability, the coefficient of variation of each peak was computed within each group and the average value between groups was kept. In order to introduce a balance between those two criteria, each one was linearly normalized between 0 and 1 across the data. The average value of both normalized criteria was used as the final weight.

#### Fitness

Genetic algorithms are optimization methods. Hence, a criterion, called fitness, has to be defined in order to quantify the solution quality and to be optimized. As described in the main manuscript, a twofold cross-validated (2-FCV) accuracy obtained with Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) is used to quantify the ability of a subset of peak ratios to discriminate between wine origins (denoted classes in the following). However, in order to avoid overfitting, we favor solutions including few peak ratios. Hence, a penalty term was added to the 2-FCV good classification rate:

$$
fitness(S) = accuracy_{CV}(S) - 0.05 \times \frac{card(S) - C_{max}}{1 - C_{max}}
$$

Where S denotes a subset of ratios of size *card*(S) and  $C_{max}$  is the maximum number of ratios the user wants to put in a solution. The use of  $C_{max}$  only aims at hastening convergence and can be easily changed if the optimal solution reaches the boundary (in our applications  $C_{max}$ =10).  $accuracy_{CV}(S)$  is the average accuracy obtained by applying LDA to the subset S for 30 runs of 2-fold cross-validation

#### Initialization

The first population is randomly drawn in order to explore the set of potential solutions while favoring peaks with good inner properties (high intensities and low variability as described earlier). Then, a number of peak ratios is randomly drawn between 1 and  $C_{max}$ , and the corresponding number of peaks is chosen following the weights defined earlier. This process is repeated  $T_{pop}$  times (in our applications  $T_{pop} = 200$ ).

## Selection

This step, based on the fitness values, is defined as in Reeves and Rowe (2003). The individuals are ranked according to their fitness value, the best one having the highest rank. Then, the probability to keep one solution in the next generation is proportional to its rank, so that the sum of probabilities over individuals sums to 1 and that the best individual is twice as likely to be selected as the individual with median rank. Hence, the selection probability of the  $k$ -th ranked solution is defined by:

$$
p_{sel}(S_{(k)}) = 2 \times \frac{(T_{pop} - 2M) \times k + 1}{T_{pop}(3T_{pop} - 4M + 1)}
$$

Where *M* is median of all ranks.

Using those probabilities,  $T_{pop}$  -1 solutions are selected. In addition, elitism is applied, that is, the best solution of each generation is automatically introduced in the next one. We obtain a new population of size  $T_{pop}$ .

#### Crossover

The objective of this step is to produce new combinations of the previously retained ratios. It is performed through a usual single-point crossover (Reeves and Rowe, 2003) on ratios and applied to 50% of the individuals of a generation.

# Mutation

This step brings the necessary hazard to efficiently explore the solution space. It assures that any point of this space can be reached within a finite number of generations. It is applied to 90% of the individuals of a generation. For each individual to be mutated, three kinds of mutations are possible:

- one of the peak in randomly replaced by another one (still using the weights previously defined) with a probability of 50%;
- one of the ratios inside the solution is randomly chosen and removed with a probability of 25% ;
- one new ratios is added to the solution as performed in the initialization step with a probability of 25%.

# Convergence and stopping criterion

As theoretically proved in Bhandari et al. (1996), two conditions are necessary and sufficient for GA to converge as the number of iterations goes to infinity:

- The best solution in the present population has a fitness value no less than the fitness values of the optimal strings from the previous populations (verified through our selection step).
- Each solution has a positive probability of going to an optimal string within a finite number of iterations (verified through our mutation step).

The designed operators meet those conditions but an infinite number of generations is not praticable so the maximum number of generations is set to 2000. It has been set by studying the evolution of fitness function for several runs and by choosing a number at least twice as large as the number of generations required to reach criterion stability.

## Appendix 3. Random Forests

The Random Forest (RF) analysis was performed using the randomForest R package.

Use of importance parameters

In this package two measurements of variable importance are provided (Breiman, 2001): the mean decrease of accuracy (loss of accuracy when a variable is eliminated from trees) and the mean decrease of Gini Index (the same for the Gini Index which is used to choose the best variable and threshold value at each split). They were both used to choose the final set of selected ratios. For example, in the following figure (application to all the ratios), 8 ratios (red points) were selected as having high values of both indicators.

![](_page_11_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Bibliography

Bhandari, D., Murthy, C.A., Pal, S.K., 1996. Genetic algorithm with elitist model and its convergence. International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence 10 (6), 731–747.

Reeves, C.R., Rowe, J.E., 2003. Genetic Algorithms—Principles and Perspectives, A Guide to GA Theory. Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.

Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. Machine learning, 45(1), 5-32.