Supplementary Material: Feature selection and causal analysis for microbiome studies in the presence of confounding using standardization

Emily Goren

May 2, 2021

Contents

S1 Additional simulation results	2
S2 Real data analysis: correlation structure and assumption checks	9

List of Tables

S1	Simulation results:	TPR and FPR, $n = 1$	0, Poisson features		2
----	---------------------	----------------------	---------------------	--	---

List of Figures

S1	Simulation results: AUC, $n = 50$, Poisson features	3
S2	Simulation results: AUC, $n = 50$, negative binomial features	4
S3	Simulation results: AUC, $n = 100$, negative binomial features	5
S4	Simulation results: FDP, $n = 50$, Poisson features	6
S5	Simulation results: FDP, $n = 50$, negative binomial features	7
$\mathbf{S6}$	Simulation results: FDP, $n = 100$, negative binomial features $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	8
S7	Sorghum data: pairwise OTU correlations	9
$\mathbf{S8}$	Sorghum data: conditional residuals vs. predicted	9
$\mathbf{S9}$	Sorghum data: conditional residual Q-Q plot	10

S1 Additional simulation results

Table S1: Simulation results: true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR) for identification of population coefficients for n = 100 and Poisson features, reported as means over 100 simulation replications. For the debiased LASSO with iterative SIS and BH procedure (labeled "iterSIS-dbLASSO-BH"), FDR control was at the 0.05 level.

		iterSIS	S-dbLASSO-BH	V ⊥iterSI	ariable Sel S-LASSO	ection LiterSI	Method S-SCAD	L L A	SSO	SC	AD
Simulation Scenario	Model	TPR	FPR	TPR	FPR	TPR	FPR	TPR	FPR	TPR	FPR
Strong Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.05	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
p = 50, 0% confounded	Select L	0.04	0.04	0.96	0.96	0.87	0.80	0.96	0.96	0.87	0.80
	Select L EffMod	0.96	0.00	0.96	0.08	0.97	0.05	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00
	Require L EffMod	0.03	0.03	0.95	0.95	0.80	0.81	1 00	0.95	0.80	0.81
	Ignore L	0.09	0.09	0.96	0.95	0.86	0.80	0.96	0.95	0.87	0.80
	Ignore L EffMod	0.97	0.00	0.97	0.08	0.97	0.04	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
Strong Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.04	0.99	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
p = 50, 60% contounded	Select L Select L EffMed	0.18	0.05	0.97	0.95	0.81	0.79	0.97	0.95	0.81	0.79
	Bequire L	0.90	0.03	0.95	0.94	0.90	0.03 0.79	0.95	0.03 0.94	0.81	0.79
	Require L EffMod	0.89	0.00	0.96	0.08	0.96	0.04	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L	0.29	0.10	0.95	0.94	0.82	0.79	0.95	0.94	0.82	0.79
Strong Effort Modifor	Ignore L EffMod	0.90	0.00	0.96	0.09	0.97	0.05	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
n = 50, 100% confounded	Select L	0.32	0.01	0.94	0.02	0.81	0.00	0.95	0.02	0.81	0.00
p = 50, 10070 combanded	Select L EffMod	0.91	0.04	0.99	0.06	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Require L	0.24	0.02	0.93	0.89	0.81	0.72	0.93	0.89	0.81	0.72
	Require L EffMod	0.92	0.00	0.99	0.06	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L Ignore L EffMod	0.44	0.07	0.92	0.89	0.81	0.71	0.92	0.89	0.81	0.71
Strong Effect Modifier	Conditional Std	0.52	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.63	0.02	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 0% confounded	Select L	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02
	Select L EffMod	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Require L	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02
	Ignore L	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L EffMod	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
Strong Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	0.48	0.00	0.52	0.01	0.54	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 60% confounded	Select L	0.06	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.02
	Select L EffMod	0.11	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.17	0.01	0.99	U.01	1.00	U.00
	Require L EffMod	0.01 0.13	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.09 0.17	0.01	0.10	0.04	1 00	0.02
	Ignore L	0.07	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.02
	Ignore L EffMod	0.12	0.00	0.16	0.01	0.17	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
Strong Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.98	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 100% confounded	Select L EffMod	0.10	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.24	0.01	0.17	0.04	0.11	0.02
	Require L	0.03	0.00	0.22	0.01	0.30 0.24	0.01	0.17	0.04	0.11	0.02
	Require L EffMod	0.32	0.00	0.36	0.01	0.37	0.01	0.98	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L	0.19	0.01	0.22	0.01	0.25	0.01	0.17	0.04	0.11	0.02
No Effect Medifier	Ignore L EffMod	0.31	0.00	0.37	0.01	0.39	0.01	0.98	0.01	1.00	0.00
n = 50, 0% confounded	Select L	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02 0.14	1.00	0.05
p oo, o, o onioanada	Select L EffMod	0.97	0.00	0.97	0.08	0.97	0.04	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00
	Require L	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.04
	Require L EffMod	0.97	0.00	0.97	0.08	0.97	0.04	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L EffMod	0.97	0.11	0.97	0.14	0.97	0.03	1.00	$0.14 \\ 0.02$	1.00	0.00
No Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.04	0.99	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
p = 50, 60% confounded	Select L	0.99	0.05	0.99	0.13	1.00	0.03	0.99	0.13	1.00	0.03
	Select L EffMod	0.77	0.00	0.96	0.09	0.96	0.05	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Require L EffMod	0.97	0.00	0.97	0.03	1.00	0.03	0.97	0.03	1.00	0.03
	Ignore L	0.99	0.07	0.99	$0.00 \\ 0.12$	1.00	0.03	0.99	0.12	1.00	0.03
	Ignore L EffMod	0.76	0.00	0.96	0.09	0.96	0.05	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
No Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
p = 50, 100% confounded	Select L Select L EffMed	0.98	0.04	0.98	0.13	0.99	0.03	0.98	0.14	0.99	0.03
	Bequire L	0.95	0.01	0.96	0.05	0.99	0.03	0.96	0.05	0.99	0.02
	Require L EffMod	0.70	0.00	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L	0.98	0.05	0.98	0.13	0.99	0.03	0.98	0.13	0.99	0.03
No Effect Modifier	Ignore L EffMod	0.69	0.00	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
n = 2000 0% confounded	Select L	0.55	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03 0.64	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 070 comounded	Select L EffMod	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Require L	0.40	0.00	0.57	0.01	0.60	0.01	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	Require L EffMod	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L EffMod	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
No Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	0.48	0.00	0.53	0.01	0.54	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 60% confounded	Select L	0.54	0.00	0.56	0.01	0.62	0.01	0.96	0.01	0.97	0.00
	Select L EffMod	0.11	0.00	0.19	0.01	0.19	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Require L FfMad	0.42 0.12	0.00	0.55	0.01	0.59	0.01	0.92	0.00	0.97	0.00
	Ignore L	0.12	0.00	0.59	0.01	0.65	0.01	0.96	0.01	0.97	0.00
	Ignore L EffMod	0.12	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.20	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
No Effect Modifier,	Conditional Std	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.00
p = 2000, 100% confounded	Select L	0.75	0.00	0.76	0.01	0.82	0.00	0.91	0.01	0.92	0.00
	Require L	0.23 0.65	0.00	$0.44 \\ 0.73$	0.01	$0.45 \\ 0.78$	0.01	0.83	0.01	0.99 0.94	0.00
	Require L EffMod	0.24	0.00	0.44	0.01	0.46	0.01	0.98	0.01	1.00	0.00
	Ignore L	0.78	0.00	0.78	0.01	0.88	0.00	0.91	0.01	0.92	0.00
	Ignore L EffMod	0.23	0.00	0.44	0.01	0.45	0.01	0.98	0.01	1.00	0.00



Figure S1: Simulation results: box plots of the area under the curve (AUC) from 100 simulation replications for n = 50 and Poisson features using *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS).



Figure S2: Simulation results: box plots of the area under the curve (AUC) from 100 simulation replications for n = 50 and negative binomial features using *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS).



Figure S3: Simulation results: box plots of the area under the curve (AUC) from 100 simulation replications for n = 100 and negative binomial features using *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS).



Figure S4: Simulation results: mean estimated false discovery proportion (FDP) for n = 50 and Poisson features at varying nominal false discovery rate (FDR) values using Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS). The y = x line is shown in black; any values above this line indicate lack of FDR control.



Figure S5: Simulation results: mean estimated false discovery proportion (FDP) for n = 50 and negative binomial features at varying nominal false discovery rate (FDR) values using Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS). The y = x line is shown in black; any values above this line indicate lack of FDR control.



Figure S6: Simulation results: mean estimated false discovery proportion (FDP) for n = 100 and negative binomial features at varying nominal false discovery rate (FDR) values using Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted *p*-values based on the debiased LASSO estimate following iterative sure independence screening (iterative SIS). The y = x line is shown in black; any values above this line indicate lack of FDR control.

Pooled Nitrogen High Nitrogen Low Nitrogen



Figure S7: Sorghum microbiome data: Spearman's correlation between the top 150 marginally correlated OTUs for all samples, pooled across both nitrogen conditions (left) and stratified by nitrogen application (center and right).



Figure S8: Real data analysis: residuals versus conditional (nitrogen stratum-specific) predicted values from the conditional debiased iterative SIS-LASSO estimates.

9

S2Real data analysis: correlation structure and assumption checks



Figure S9: Real data analysis: Q-Q plot of residuals based on conditional (nitrogen stratum-specific) predicted values from the conditional debiased iterative SIS-LASSO estimates.