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Supervised principal components

- method for predicting a quantitative measurement (especially survival time of a patient), useful when number of predictors \( p \gg N \), the sample size
- motivated by genomics applications, but could be useful in other problems
- Main application: gene expression measurements from microarrays. Each feature measurement \( x_{ij} \) is the expression of gene \( j \) for patient sample \( i \).
- A possibly censored survival time \( y_i \) is also available for each patient. We wish to find genes \( j \) whose high or low expression is predictive of patient survival.
- In our main example: \( N = 180 \) patients with kidney cancer, with measurements on 14,000 genes.
Usual approaches

- **Unsupervised approach** - cluster patients into groups, then hope that they differ in survival. Strategy widely used by Pat Brown, David Botstein and colleagues at Stanford. A bit of a “crapshoot”.

- **Supervised approach** - build a prediction model for survival time as a function of gene expression. Some sort of regularization is needed (e.g. ridge regression or lasso ($L_1$)), since number of genes $\gg$ number of patients. Tends to overfit - gets confused by noisy genes.
The Lasso

(Tibshirani, 1996)

- Least squares fitting with an L1 constraint
- Minimize over $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_p)$:
  \[
  \sum_i (y_i - \sum_j x_{ij} \beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_j |\beta_j|
  \]
- Gives a sparse set of coefficients $\hat{\beta}_j$
- LAR algorithm of Efron, Hastie, Johnstone, Tibshirani (2002) gives a fast method for computing entire path of solutions. Has led to other path algorithms for SVMs, etc.
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A semi-supervised approach

Underlying conceptual model: survival time is a noisy surrogate for cell type, a real determinant of survival. Idea: rather than predict survival time directly, try to uncover the cell types and use these to predict survival time.
Principal components

- Principal components are the linear combinations of the features showing the highest variation across the samples.
- High variation is potentially interesting, but in our setting, only if it correlates with the outcome of interest.
- Need to encourage principal components to find linear combinations that possess both high variance and significant correlation with the outcome.
**Supervised principal components**

Idea is to choose genes whose correlation with the outcome is largest, and using only those genes, extract the first (or first few) principal components. These “supervised principal components” are used to predict the outcome.

1. Compute correlation (Cox scores) between each feature (gene) and survival time
2. Form a reduced data matrix consisting of only those features whose correlation exceeds a threshold $\theta$ in absolute value ($\theta$ is estimated by cross-validation)
3. Compute the first (or first few) principal components of the reduced data matrix
4. Use these principal component(s) in a survival prediction model
Kidney cancer example

For illustration, we treat all survival times as uncensored
• Suppose we have a response variable $Y$ which is related to an underlying \textit{latent variable} $U$ by a linear model

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 U + \varepsilon.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

• In addition, we have expression measurements on a set of genes $X_j$ indexed by $j \in \mathcal{P}$, for which

$$X_j = \alpha_{0j} + \alpha_{1j} U + \epsilon_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{P}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

We also have many additional genes $X_k$, $k \notin \mathcal{P}$ which are independent of $U$. We can think of $U$ as a discrete or continuous aspect of a cell type, which we do not measure directly.
In this model, standard principal components is not consistent in general— the large number of “noise” features corruptions the estimate.

In contrast, the supervised PC approach estimates the latent variables consistently as $p, N \to \infty$ ($p = \# \text{ of features}$, $N = \# \text{ of samples}$)
Consistency of supervised principal components

We consider a latent variable model of the form (1) and (2) for data with $N$ samples and $p$ features.

$$\begin{align*}
X &= N 	imes p \\
p_1/N &\to \gamma \in (0, \infty) \\
p_1/N &\to 0 \text{ fast}
\end{align*}$$
Kidney cancer study

with Jim Brooks, Hongjuan Zhao

14,000 genes; 180 samples - 90 in each of training and test
Results

- Supervised principal component score correlates with groups found by hierarchical clustering, but is a stronger predictor of survival.
- Supervised principal component score has additional predictive power over and above traditional clinical measurements like tumor grade and stage.
Kidney cancer study ctd...
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Further challenges

- given the SPC predictor $\hat{y}$, how can we find a reduced predictor that uses only a small number of genes?

- one approach: “pre-conditioning” – apply lasso to outcome $\hat{y}$. Works much better than usual lasso (applied to raw outcome) when $p \gg N$. (Paul, Bair, Hastie, Tibshirani)
Kidney cancer example—again

For illustration, we treat all survival times as uncensored
Test error vs. Proportion of features in model (retained for spc)

Lasso and Supervised principal components

Test error vs. Proportion of features in model

Lasso and Pre-conditioned lasso