3.1 Population structure: I. Ancestry estimation

In which we discuss how genetic data are used to study the population structure, ancestry, and mixing of modern human populations. Specifically we ask: How can we use genotype data from a collection of individuals to learn about population structure? We close with a discussion of the relationship between ancestry and cultural concepts of race.

In Chapter 2, we showed how barriers to random mating—most notably due to the geography of where we live and who we reproduce with—allow allele frequencies to drift apart. This leads to population structure: i.e., differences in allele frequencies or haplotype frequencies among different groups or populations within a species. A closely related concept, ancestry, refers to how much of a person’s genome comes from each of a set of defined groups or populations.

In this chapter we’ll describe how genetic data is used to study population structure, and to estimate the ancestry of individuals. The key analysis methods here will have a different feel from approaches we’ve used so far. In particular, we’ll make heavy use of clustering techniques. In statistical data analysis, “clustering” refers to a variety of methods for grouping objects that share similarities—in this case, for grouping individuals with similar genotypes.

While these approaches are extremely useful for understanding human variation, we should always remember that they are tools to model a much more complex reality. Human populations are structured at a range of geographic scales from the level of continents down to, in some cases, differences between nearby towns or even extended families. As we’ll see, different analyses focus on ancestry at different scales.

Moreover, population structure is not fixed over time. We are familiar with the idea that modern societies are often melting pots of peoples from many different places; but as we will discuss, ancient populations were also highly mobile, and population mixing has been a constant force in human genetic history.

Another key point is that each of us has ancestors from many locations and likely even from all continents. As I will explain, estimated genetic ancestry actually corresponds to complicated statements about which groups of individuals have similar mixtures of ancestors.

For all these reasons, there is no single “correct” description of structure. As you read the next three chapters, pay attention to how different methods, and different data sets, tell us about structure and ancestry at a range of geographic and temporal scales; consider also what aspects of history may be entirely invisible to us with any given data set.

Lastly, at the end of the chapter we will touch on another complicated issue: namely, the relationship between ancestry and the socially-defined concepts of race and ethnicity.

Figure 3.1: “I come from the Black Lagoon, but it turns out I’m 14 percent Atlantic dolphin.”

Cartoon copyright 2019 Robert Leighton. Used with permission.
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*An Owner’s Guide to the Human Genome, by J. R. Pritchard. April 13, 2024. Original material distributed under a CC BY 4.0 license.*
The concept of clustering. In data analysis we often want to sort things into groups of similar objects. This is called clustering. For example, consider the following items in a grocery store:

ice cream, wine, tea, apples, oranges, onions, celery, sausages, steaks, frozen peas, beer, milk, chocolates, coffee.

How might we cluster these into groups? Perhaps by food category:

{beer, wine, tea, coffee, milk}, {apples, oranges, onions, celery, frozen peas}, {sausages, steaks}, {ice cream, chocolates}.

Maybe you think some of these clusters are too broad – you might prefer to split the drinks more narrowly:

{beer, wine}, {tea, coffee}, {milk}.

Or maybe you prefer to group by aisle in the store:

{beer, wine}, {tea, coffee}, {apples, oranges, onions, celery}, {milk, sausages, steaks}, {ice cream, frozen peas}, {chocolates}.

This example shows how clusters can capture meaningful structure in the data. And yet you may be bothered that there’s no obviously “correct” clustering: reasonable observers may differ on how finely to define the clusters (should beer and tea be in the same cluster?) or on which features to emphasize (are frozen peas more like onions or ice cream?)

Our next example shows how we can do a bit better by allowing objects to have membership in multiple clusters.

Suppose we want to cluster Wikipedia pages into topics on the basis of the words they use. How should we do this? To illustrate this I picked out interesting words from 7 different Wikipedia pages. The colors highlight words with similar themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jennifer Doudna</th>
<th>Sewall Wright</th>
<th>CRISPR gene editing</th>
<th>David Beckham</th>
<th>sickle cell disease</th>
<th>Manchester United</th>
<th>population genetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>born</td>
<td>genetics</td>
<td>CRISPR</td>
<td>football</td>
<td>haemoglobin</td>
<td>football</td>
<td>genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>evolution</td>
<td>gene</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>club</td>
<td>selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patent</td>
<td>born</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>born</td>
<td>genetics</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>drift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>clinical</td>
<td>career</td>
<td>mutation</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edit</td>
<td>population</td>
<td>engineering</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td>malaria</td>
<td>Beckham</td>
<td>synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISPR</td>
<td>selection</td>
<td>nuclease</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>selection</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td>evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genetic</td>
<td>statistical</td>
<td>therapy</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>allele</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>mutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disease</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>Nobel</td>
<td>scored</td>
<td>CRISPR</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel</td>
<td>enzymes</td>
<td>patent</td>
<td>corner</td>
<td>therapy</td>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>statistical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How should we cluster these 7 Wikipedia pages?

Some of the same issues we saw in the grocery store example come up again. Is the Jennifer Doudna page more related to the other biographies (Wright and Beckham) or to CRISPR editing, which she developed?

To solve this, we introduce a concept called a topic. Each topic has a characteristic set of word frequencies: for example we could define...
a topic named *biography* (blue), that uses words like *born, died, school, mother, career* at higher frequency.

Crucially, we allow each page to have fractional membership in multiple topics. We might estimate that the Doudna page is 30% *biography*, 50% *genome editing*, and 20% *genetics*. In a formal model, this would mean that 30% of the words in the Doudna page come from the word distribution for *biography* and similarly for the other topics.

Similarly, each topic contributes to multiple pages: here, *evolution* (olive-color) contributes to at least three of the pages: Sewall Wright, Sickle Cell, and Population Genetics.

*In this chapter we use similar ideas to model population structure.* In this analogy, the Wikipedia pages are like people’s genomes, and the topics are like different populations. Someone’s ancestry is defined by the mixture of different “topics” that are represented in their genome. We’ll explore a variety of techniques for understanding ancestry.

**Genotype clustering.** Suppose we collect genotype data for a sample of individuals, using SNPs spread across the genome.

First, it’s convenient to code the genotype data as integers. As elsewhere in the book, we’ll code each possible genotype at a single SNP as the number of alternate or derived alleles, with possible values of 0, 1, or 2:

\[
\begin{align*}
AA & \rightarrow 0 \\
Aa & \rightarrow 1 \\
aa & \rightarrow 2
\end{align*}
\]

Then we can record a genotype data set in a matrix $G$, like this:

![Figure 3.2: The genotype matrix, $G$. Each entry, $g_{il}$, contains the number of derived alleles carried by individual $i$ at SNP $l$. Each row gives the full genotype for a single individual.](image)

where the rows (indexed by $i$) represent individuals and the columns (indexed by $l$ for locus) represent the SNPs. $G_i$ denotes a single row of $G$: that is, the genotype for individual $i$.

Our goal in this chapter is to use $G$ to study population structure.

*Before we go on, take a moment to look at a hypothetical example of $G$, below. Can you cluster the individuals into sensible groups by eye? If so, what criteria did you use?*
Early work on genotype clustering. The first studies of individual ancestry came in the 1990s, with the discovery that a simple measure of genetic distance can cluster individuals by continent.\(^{367}\) One of the first examples came in a 1997 paper by Joanna Mountain and Luca Cavalli-Sforza.\(^{368}\) They analyzed SNP data from 144 humans currently living in different parts of the world, at about 100 SNPs per person.\(^{369}\) They computed genotype distances between each pair of individuals, like this:

Next, they used a statistical method called hierarchical clustering to fit the pairwise distances between the 144 individuals. This results in a graph that clusters pairs of individuals with shorter genetic distances closer together, and pairs of individuals with greater genetic distances further apart. The total line distance between any two individuals in the graph is roughly proportional to the genetic distance between them:

---

**Figure 3.3:** Can you find structure in this genotype matrix? We’ll return to this example later.

**Figure 3.4:** A simple multi-SNP genotype distance. Here the two rows show the genotypes for two different individuals at L SNPs. The genotype distance between the two individuals is computed as the sum of the absolute genotype difference at each SNP, divided by L.

**Figure 3.5:** Hierarchical clustering of individuals based on genotype distances (1997). Each individual is represented by a tip on the graph. Line distances are roughly proportional to genetic distances. Key:
- ◇ African
- △ European
- □ Oceanian
- ○ East Asian

All of the individuals here are from native populations and not from recent immigrant populations. Credit: Figure 5 from Mountain and Cavalli-Sforza (1997). [Link] Used with permission.
As you see above, this produced the remarkable result that, using a small number of SNPs, individuals cluster according to continent.

This graph represents something quite different from the coalescent trees we talked about in previous chapters: here the **clustering represents the overall similarity of multi-SNP genotypes**, and it averages information over many independent SNPs. You should also notice some key points:

- Individuals from the same continent tend to appear together on the tree, reflecting genotype similarity to one another.
- And yet, differences between continents are quantitatively small: **individuals from the same population are only slightly more similar than individuals from different continents** – see figure on the right.
- No one SNP on its own would be enough to distinguish the different continental groupings; instead the signal comes from averaging weak information across many SNPs.

As you see here, this early type of model was already quite informative, but in the next few sections we’ll see how more advanced models, combined with modern data, can provide far more information.

**A genotype model with population structure.** As in other parts of the book, we’ll find it’s helpful to write down a simple model to understand the data.

First we need a concept of **populations**: in our **idealized model** we assume that populations are discrete groups of random-mating individuals. We assume that, within populations, SNPs are in Hardy Weinberg equilibrium and pairs of SNPs that are far apart in the genome are in linkage equilibrium. Different populations will generally have different allele frequencies.

We need to define some **notation**.

Assume that there are $K$ different populations, and we measure the genotypes for a panel of individuals at $L$ SNPs. We record the **allele frequencies** in a matrix $P$, where $p_{k,l}$ represents the derived allele frequency at the $l$th SNP in population $k$. $P_l$ will be a column of $P$ corresponding to the frequencies of SNP $l$ in each of the populations:

![Figure 3.6: Genetic distances within versus between populations.](image1)

*Figure 3.6: Genetic distances within versus between populations. Distances between two individuals from the same population (green path between two individuals from population A) are only slightly shorter than between two individuals from different populations (A to B). The branch with the green arrow shows the small extra distance between populations.*

![Figure 3.7: The allele frequency matrix, P.](image2)

*Figure 3.7: The allele frequency matrix, $P$. Each entry, $p_{k,l}$, contains the allele frequency of SNP $l$ in population $k.$*
Next, the matrix $Q$ contains the ancestry of each individual. Here, $q_{i,k}$ represents the fraction of ancestry that individual $i$ has from population $k$. By analogy with our Wikipedia example, you can think of $i$ as indexing a single page, and $q_{i,k}$ saying what fraction of that page is generated from topic $k$. I'll give another example of this shortly.

We’ll use $Q_i$ to indicate a single row of $Q$ – the ancestry vector for individual $i$.

A generative model. Now consider an individual $i$. Suppose I tell you their ancestry, $Q_i$, and the allele frequencies, $P$. How do we model their genotype $G_i$?

To start, we’ll assume that an individual’s genome comes entirely from a single population – this is known as a no-admixture model. Suppose that individual $i$ comes from population $k$. Then $Q_i$ will have a single entry of 1 in population $k$, and 0 for the other populations: e.g., $\{0, 0, 0, 1, 0\}$.

The genotype at SNP $l$ results from a random sampling process like this:

More formally, the genotype probabilities for SNP $l$ are:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pr(g_{i,l} = 0) &= (1 - p_{k,l})^2 \\
\Pr(g_{i,l} = 1) &= 2p_{k,l}(1 - p_{k,l}) \\
\Pr(g_{i,l} = 2) &= p_{k,l}^2
\end{align*}
$$

where $p_{k,l}$ is the relevant allele frequency for the population and SNP. These are simply the Hardy Weinberg proportions for population $k$.

We can compute the probability of individual $i$’s entire genotype, given their ancestry $Q_i$, by multiplying these probabilities across all $L$ SNPs:

$$
\Pr(G_i|Q_i) = \prod_{l=1}^{L} \Pr(g_{i,l}|Q_i)
$$

This is known as the likelihood. It’s an important principle of statistical theory that we should generally prefer models that produce the highest likelihoods.
The admixture model. The no-admixture model is very limiting because it can’t handle the fact that many of us have recent ancestry from multiple populations.

As in our Wikipedia example, we can make a much better model by allowing people to have fractional ancestry in each population. For example, suppose that $K = 5$, and a person has $1/4$ of their ancestry from population 1 and $3/4$ from population 3, then $q_i = (0.25, 0, 0.75, 0, 0, 0)$. This is known as an admixture model.

The way we interpret this is that each SNP allele now has to make two “decisions”: what population does it come from, and then what allele is it?

We can think of individual $i$ as having a “personal” allele frequency for SNP $l$ that depends on their ancestry proportions. This personal allele frequency is a weighted average of the allele frequencies across populations. In vector notation it’s the dot product of $Q_i$ and $P_l$:

$$\text{Personal Allele Freq}(i, l) = q_{i,1}p_{l,1} + q_{i,2}p_{l,2} + \cdots$$

$$= Q_i \cdot P_l \quad (3.3)$$

Then the genotype probabilities for the admixture model are like those in Equation 3.1 but using the personal allele frequency instead of $p_{k,l}$

Estimating $P$. So far we’ve been assuming that $P$ and $Q$ are known. How can we estimate these?

One standard approach is to start with labeled samples – for example, samples of individuals like the YRI (Yoruba) or BEB (Bengali) from the 1000 Genomes Project [Link]. If we are willing to assume these are representative of “true” populations then we can use them to estimate population-specific allele frequencies:

As a technical point, people often add so-called pseudocounts to the
allele counts data to avoid frequency estimates of zero as these can cause problems in the downstream analysis; see \footnote{374}.

**Estimating Q: Ancestry Estimation.** Next, if we have allele frequency estimates $P$ for reference populations, we can estimate ancestry of new unknown individuals.

Suppose that I tell you somebody’s genotype $G_i$. How can you infer their ancestry (starting with the \textbf{no-admixture model})? We can estimate their ancestry using a method called Bayes’ Rule of conditional probability \footnote{375}.

If all possible source populations are equally likely, then the probability that the individual comes from population $k$ is simply proportional to the probability of observing their genotype in population $k$:

\[ \Pr(\text{individual } i \text{ from population } k) = \frac{\Pr(G_i|k)}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} \Pr(G_i|j)} \quad (3.4) \]

The numerator is the likelihood of observing their genotype in population $k$, while the denominator is a sum of the likelihoods over all populations 1 to $K$. Remember that Equation 3.2 shows how to compute this likelihood.

Here’s how this works in a toy example assuming we know $P$:

![Figure 3.12: Population assignment of a single individual. Here $G_i$ shows the genotype for an individual at 5 SNPs and $P$ shows the allele frequencies for each SNP in two different populations. The rows at the bottom show likelihood calculations assuming either $k=1$ or $2$ (Eqs 3.1, 3.2). The likelihood of any specific genotype is always small, but the key point is that Population 1 has much higher likelihood than Population 2. The calculation to the right gives the posterior probability this individual is from Population 1 (Eq. 3.4).](image)

\[ \Pr(G_i|k=1) = 0.49 \times 0.64 \times 0.48 \times 0.36 \times 0.64 = 0.0347 \]
\[ \Pr(G_i|k=2) = 0.16 \times 0.25 \times 0.42 \times 0.64 \times 0.16 = 0.0017 \]
\[ \frac{0.0347}{0.0347 + 0.0017} = 0.95 \]

The admixture model is conceptually similar: we simply find the ancestry vector $Q_i$ that maximizes the individual’s genotype data $G_i$ given the population allele frequencies (but the math is a bit more complicated) \footnote{376}.

**Genetic clustering: the Structure/Admixture model.** Assignment tests like this are fine if you’re willing to assume that you know how to define the relevant populations in advance: for example based on sampling location, self-defined group, or language.

But how would we know that pre-defined populations actually reflect underlying structure in a sensible way? To address this limitation, a paper from 2000 by Pritchard, Stephens, and Donnelly asked if we can infer structure directly from the genotype matrix $G$ \footnote{377}.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Given the genotype matrix $G$ we want to estimate both the allele frequencies, $P$ and ancestry of individuals, $Q$.}
\end{quote}

**Some intuition.** Where does the information come from to allow us to identify populations? One way to think about this is that within populations
we can expect alleles to be independent: that is, individual SNPs should be in Hardy-Weinberg proportions, and unlinked SNPs should not be in LD.

But if we have a collection of individuals with different ancestries, this creates correlations between the genotypes even at unlinked SNPs. Here’s the hypothetical example I showed earlier. Notice how the coloring helps us to explain the correlation structure across SNPs:

![Figure 3.13: Inference of structure in a toy example with K = 2 and no admixture. Populations 1 and 2 are colored in red and blue respectively. The Q matrix shows population assignments for each individual (the columns show fraction of ancestry in each population). The P matrix shows possible (true) allele frequencies that could produce the observed data (the rows show allele frequencies for each population). You may like to suggest allele frequencies for SNPs 4–10 as an exercise.](image)

Of course in practice, we can’t infer the relevant populations by eye. We won’t go into the algorithms in full detail, but the overall goal is to find estimates of $P$ and $Q$ that maximize the likelihood of the genotype data $G$. Roughly speaking, you can think of the Structure algorithm as searching for a partition of individuals into $K$ populations (with admixture) that minimize Hardy-Weinberg and linkage disequilibrium within populations.

In short, the approach is to start from a random guess about $Q$ and then iterate toward the true estimates roughly as follows:

- **Initialization**: Set the ancestry for each individual, $Q_i$, at random (typically from a uniform distribution).

- **repeat**
  - **Update $P$ given $Q$**: For each SNP, update the allele frequency estimates according to the allele counts in each population.
  - **Update $Q$ given $P$**: For each individual, update their ancestry estimate $Q_i$ given the allele frequencies.

- **until converged**.

Somewhat magically, this type of algorithm converges to sensible solutions for $P$ and $Q$. In Structure this is implemented as a fully Bayesian model using Markov chain Monte Carlo; Admixture frames it as a maximum likelihood problem and performs optimization using an Expectation-Maximization algorithm.

One last challenging question is how to choose the number of clusters ($K$). As in the grocery store example at the beginning of the chapter, increasing $K$ usually corresponds to adding increasingly finer subdivisions,
and there is usually not a single “best” choice of $K$. Instead, different values of $K$ reveal different aspects of the structure, as we’ll see below.

**Structure in practice.** The first large-scale application of the Structure algorithm was by Rosenberg, Pritchard, and others in 2002, using a worldwide sample of 51 populations from the Human Genome Diversity Panel (HGDP). The plot below is from an updated version of this data set published by Jun Li and colleagues in 2008.

In this plot, each cluster (population) is given a different color. Each individual is represented as a thin vertical line, and the colors indicate proportional membership in each of the 5 clusters:

![Structure/Admixture plot of human populations](image)

*Figure 3.14: Structure/Admixture plot of human populations.* This study collected genome-wide SNP data from 931 individuals representing 51 indigenous human groups, listed at bottom. The data were fit under a version of the Structure/Admixture model, assuming $K = 5$. The sampling labels were not used in the analysis. Credit: Figure 1A from Jun Li et al (2008). Used with permission.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the clustering results is that the main genetic clusters in this analysis correspond roughly to continental groupings. This occurs despite the fact that the clustering algorithm did not use population labels or geographic information.

Secondly, you’ll notice that some groups are mixtures of different clusters: especially in the Middle East populations where there is a Middle Eastern component (brown), but also variable amounts of ancestry from Europe (green), Central/South Asia (blue) and Sub-Saharan Africa (red). These signals reflect the location of the Middle East as a geographic crossroads that has experienced extensive immigration from each of these other regions during the past few thousand years.

Similarly, the Uygurs, a Turkic population of northwest China, appear as a mixture of multiple components including East Asian, Central Asian, and European, reflecting their geographic and historical position as a crossroads between these regions.

In certain other cases, there is highly variable ancestry within a population sample: for example individuals in the Maya group (from Mexico) carry varying amounts of admixture, mainly from Europeans, likely reflecting
historical Spanish migration into Central America.

**Finer-scale structure: Northeast Africa.** *This type of analysis also reveals much finer-scale structure within regions of the world.* For example, the analysis below by Nina Hollfelder and colleagues focuses on structure within Northeast Africa, and how it relates to geographically nearby groups. As hinted at by the global analysis above, we see that this region shows highly complex patterns of structure and mixing:

At \( K = 4 \) the genotypes are modeled as varying mixtures of three main components: a European/Middle Eastern cluster (green); a West African Bantu cluster (orange) and a North African Nilotic cluster (blue).

But at \( K = 10 \) the seemingly simple structure from \( K = 4 \) is broken down into a variety of subgroups: for example splitting the green cluster into European (green) and Middle Eastern clusters (brown); adding a light purple cluster to describe East African ancestry found in the Ethiopian populations as well as to lesser extents in the Sudanese and the Maasai (Kenya); and a pink cluster most associated with the Ari and Gumuz populations of Ethiopia.

I can’t do justice to the complex history and structure of North African populations here, but you can read more about this topic here: .

---

**Comments.** As you can see from these examples, *structure is usually both highly complex, and hierarchically nested.* Structure that may seem relatively simple in the global analysis is revealed to contain additional structuring within groups with more extensive local sampling of diverse ethnic
groups.
Moreover, in this example we see almost every population shows extensive admixture between clusters, reflecting the dynamic history of the region. Admixture is a ubiquitous process in human populations, and we’ll talk more about it in the next chapter.

Genetic clustering: PCA. A second major approach uses Principal Components Analysis (PCA). PCA is widely used in data science as a technique for linear dimension reduction in high-dimensional data. Most relevant to us, PCA has become another hugely important technique for studying population structure in genetic data, sometimes revealing different aspects of the data than Structure/Admixture.

As above, we start with a genotype matrix $G$, with $I$ rows and $L$ columns (individuals x loci). One way to think of $G$ is that it represents each individual’s genotype as a point in $L$-dimensional space. Since $L$, the number of SNPs, is extremely large, this is not directly useful for visualizing data.

PCA is an example of a technique for dimensionality reduction, which means that it “projects” the data into a “low-dimensional” approximation of the data that is far more useful for interpretation. In short, PCA tries to predict the genotype matrix $G$ as a product of two much smaller matrices: the “loadings” matrix $\Lambda$ and the “factors” matrix $F$.

In this model the expected value for a single genotype (the red dot in $G$, below) is predicted by the product of a row in $\Lambda$ times a column in $F$. We can visualize this here:

Mathematically, the first PC is chosen to explain as much of the variance in $G$ as possible; each subsequent PC is chosen to explain as much of the remaining variance that has not already been captured by earlier PCs. As we’ll discuss in the upcoming box, there’s a strong mathematical connection between PCA and the Structure model, if you think of $\Lambda$ as serving the role of $Q$, and $F$ being like $P$; meanwhile the PCA representation is mathematically more flexible (for better or worse, depending on context).

PCA provides a powerful tool for visualizing and modeling data. We’re usually most interested in the individual loadings, $\Lambda$, which reflect the ancestries of individuals. People often plot just the first two dimensions of this, known as principal components or PCs.

As one example, in what may be the single most famous data visualiza-

8 PCA is widely used in association studies (GWAS) as a tool for removing confounding effects of population structure (Chapter 4.5).

h A note on Greek letters: $\Lambda$ is the upper case Greek letter lambda; $\mathcal{E}$ is the upper-case epsilon.
tion in human genetics, John Novembre and colleagues showed a remarkable correspondence between geography and the PCA projection of European individuals. Novembre et al performed PCA on genome-wide SNP data for 1387 European individuals.

They plotted each individual into a 2-dimensional scatterplot based on their loadings in the first two PCs (i.e., the first two columns of the loadings matrix $\Lambda$). When each point was colored according to the country of origin of their grandparents, the data showed a remarkable correspondence between the position of individuals in the PC coordinate space, and the geography of the populations in Europe:

![PCA projection of European individuals](image)

You may wonder why the population structure of Europe is so regular. In theory, this kind of PCA pattern can result from stable population structure with short-range migration and drift. But in Europe, the lead PCs arise because modern Europeans are derived from varying mixtures of three different ancestral populations who spread into Europe from different directions: Western Hunter Gatherers, who dominated Europe 10,000 years ago; Anatolian farmers who spread into Europe from modern-day Turkey around 8000 years ago; and herders who spread from the Russian steppes around 5000 years ago. We’ll revisit this in Chapter 3.4.

---

**Optional details: PCA, and its relationship to Structure.**

As above, with Structure, we start with a genotype matrix $G$, with $I$ rows and $L$ columns (individu-
als x loci). For PCA it’s conventional to center and rescale the data to make a new genotype matrix $G^*$ where each entry $g^*_{i,l}$ is calculated as

$$g^*_{i,l} = \frac{g_{i,l} - 2p_l}{\sqrt{2p_l(1 - p_l)}},$$  

(3.5)

where $p_l$ is the allele frequency for SNP $l$ in the sample. The numerator of this expression $(g_{i,l} - 2p_l)$ centers the genotypes so that every SNP has a mean of 0. The denominator $(\sqrt{2p_l(1 - p_l)})$ rescales the data so that every SNP has variance $\approx 1$. This effectively upweights rare SNPs so that every SNP contributes equally to the PCA.

PCA provides a low-dimensional projection of the individuals into $K$ dimensions. For data visualization, $K$ is usually chosen as 2, but people regularly use 10 or more PCs as covariates to control for structure in GWAS analyses (Chapter 4.5). In matrix notation, we can write the PCA projection as predicting the genotype matrix $G^*$ as a linear combination of two much smaller matrices:

$$E(G^*) = \Lambda F$$  

(3.6)

where the loadings matrix $\Lambda$ is an $n \times K$ matrix, and the factors matrix $F$ is $K \times L$. Equivalently, we can write this in terms of the expected genotype for a single SNP in a single individual:

$$E(g^*_{i,l}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_{i,k} f_{k,l}$$  

(3.7)

where $\lambda_{i,k}$ and $f_{k,l}$ are elements of the $\Lambda$ and $F$ matrices. The meaning of the expectation here is that we predict the expected genotype matrix as well as possible given the individual ancestries (i.e., $\Lambda$) and the allele frequency shifts for each population (i.e., $F$).

How are $\Lambda$ and $F$ chosen? I won’t go into the linear algebra here, but the key idea is that to get the first principal component, we solve for the first column of $\Lambda$ and row of $F$ that minimize the squared error in predicting $G^*$. The second principal component then fits the “residual” error that is left behind after removing the first principal component: i.e., it minimizes the squared error in $G^* - \Lambda_{.,1} F_{1,..}$. And so on, for subsequent PCs.

**Relationship between PCA and Structure.** At first glance, PCA and Structure seem like very different models. However, both algorithms essentially aim to estimate the allele frequencies in an individual as a linear combination of $K$ factors that reflect *individual ancestry $\times$ population allele frequencies*. In the case of PCA we can rearrange Equation 3.7 to show that each individual genotype $g_{i,l}$ is predicted as

$$E(g_{i,l}) = 2p_l + c \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_{i,k} f_{k,l}$$  

(3.8)

where $c$ is $\sqrt{2p_l(1 - p_l)}$.

Meanwhile, in the Structure model, we can think of each individual $i$ as having a “personal” expected allele frequency $r_{i,l}$ at SNP $l$ that depends on their ancestry vector $Q_i$ and the population allele frequencies $P_l$:

$$r_{i,l} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} q_{i,k} P_{k,l}.$$  

(3.9)
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Here, $q_{i,k}$ takes the place of the loading $\lambda_{i,k}$ while $p_{k,l}$ takes the role of the factor $f_{k,l}$. In Structure, the individual’s genotype at this SNP is a binomial sample of two alleles given $r_{i,l}$:

$$g_{i,l} = \text{Binomial}(2, r_{i,l})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

However, there are important differences between the two models. Compared to PCA, Structure is motivated by an explicit genetic model, and hence the ancestry components $q$ are non-negative and add to 1 for each individual, while the allele frequencies $p$ are required to be in $[0,1]$. In contrast, in PCA, both the $\lambda$s and the $f$s are typically centered around 0 and can take on any real value. Since PCA minimizes total squared error, it also makes an implicit assumption that the squared errors $(g_{i,l} - E[g_{i,l}])^2$ should be weighted equally across all SNPs. Unlike in Structure, the PCA factors are constructed to be orthogonal to one another.

These specific differences between the algorithms, including the difference in how $\lambda$ versus $q$ are represented, often give rise to visualizations that may be more or less appealing for one or other method. I find that PCA is usually easier to interpret for geographic structure at local scales, especially when it is fairly continuous, as in the European example. However, for more complex structure, with meaningful loadings on more than two dimensions, the standard PCA plots quickly become overplotted and hard to interpret. For this reason, Structure/Admixture plots provide better visualization for complicated structure with many distinct clusters as in the examples above.

So far we have been treating SNPs as independent. But we can potentially gain a different type of information by looking at haplotype sharing between individuals.

**Haplotype-based clustering.** When we use SNPs for clustering, we rely on genetic drift to produce allele frequency differences between groups. However, drift occurs very slowly in large populations, and allele frequencies in closely related populations are extremely similar. But with haplotype sharing, we may be able to identify pairs of individuals with recent shared ancestors. Those pairs of individuals are more likely to come from the same, or closely related, populations. *Clustering approaches that use this kind of information can often identify structure at remarkably recent, and local, timescales.*

One version of this, known as fineSTRUCTURE 394, starts from the Li and Stephens copying algorithm that we covered in Chapter 2.3, in the context of phasing and imputation. Other recent approaches have used sharing of IBD (identity-by-descent) segments 395 and sharing of recent coalescent events in an ancestral recombination graph 396.

Recall that the Li and Stephens algorithm models each genome as a copying path from a panel of other individuals. The key concept for fineSTRUCTURE is that an individual should be more likely to copy from individuals in the same, or closely related populations, than from distantly related populations.

\(^1\) For an ARG-based approach to this see Chapter 3.3.
fineSTRUCTURE starts by estimating a matrix of copying rates between all pairs of individuals in the sample. It uses that matrix to cluster individuals into groups that share similar copying rates. Critically, in a large sample, copying often takes place from individuals who are genetically related within the last few tens of generations, and this provides power to detect clusters of individuals with very recent shared ancestry.

Stephen Leslie and colleagues used this approach to study population structure in Britain and Northern Ireland. The authors genotyped 2,039 British individuals, sampled on the basis that all four grandparents were born close together. PCA and conventional Structure provide only limited resolution in this data set. FineSTRUCTURE clustered the individuals into 17 groups. These show a remarkable agreement with geography, often identifying structure at extraordinarily fine geographic scales:
For example in the southwest corner of England, the algorithm identifies distinct clusters from the neighboring counties of Cornwall and Devon, each of which is only about 50 miles across.

Even the clusters that are geographically dispersed in the plot above are likely informative. For example, two clusters that are shared between Northern Ireland and Scotland (in yellow and lime) likely reflect extensive historical migration in both directions, including the Ulster Scots migration to Ireland in the 17th Century, and the Great Famine migration from Ireland back to Scotland in the 19th Century.

We can expect that similarly high resolution estimates of genetic ancestry will be attainable in many parts of the world, as high-density data are increasingly available.

*In summary, it’s interesting to contemplate the advances in resolution in studies of population genetic structure since the early work from the 1990s, using ~100 SNPs to identify continent-level clustering, to present day studies at or below the scale of countries or even counties.*

*In the last sections of this chapter we step back a little to consider what clustering does, and doesn’t, tell us about ancestry and race.*

**Population clusters and their interpretation.** Clustering techniques are important because they play a central role in how we understand human variation and human history, and are an essential tool for data analysis in genome-wide association studies. And yet it’s also important to understand what these models *don’t* teach us.

• First: What do the population clusters represent? One way to think about this is in terms of an individual’s ancestors. Remember that each of our genomes is made up of many segments of DNA, inherited from many different ancestors. Going backward in time, you can think about these ancestors as occupying a distribution across geographic space or populations.

Perhaps counterintuitively, there’s a strong mathematical argument that we all share pedigree ancestors within the past few thousand years. Even when we look at individuals from different clusters – even from different continents – they all share many ancestors.

Instead clustering works on something much more subtle: individuals who are genetically similar – for example, the two blue individuals below – have similar *distributions* of ancestors across space and time, while both differ from the red individual. But if we go back a bit further in time, to the two upper time-slices, all three individuals have very similar distributions of ancestors in space:
So, even though we all share many ancestors, a helpful way to think about clustering is that individuals who cluster together tend to have similar distributions of ancestors at each point in time.

Different methods implicitly reflect distributions of ancestors at different time-scales. Notably, fineSTRUCTURE and other haplotype-based methods can achieve high geographic resolution because they are designed to detect similarity of ancestors at the most recent timescales.

- Second, while clustering techniques do clearly identify real signals of structure in the data – e.g., consider the PCA of Europeans – it’s important to be aware that the precise results are often sensitive to the numbers of samples, precisely which samples are included, and the details of the analysis.

In large part this is because true population structure is usually complex, including both continuous variation and hierarchical levels of structure at different geographic scales, and potentially non-random mating according to ethnicity, religion, or social group. Clustering methods generally capture the major axes of variation within this complex reality, so small changes in the sample composition can change which aspects of the structure are emphasized by the main PCs or population clusters.

- Third, clusters are not necessarily stable over historical time as population movements, splitting, and merging are constant forces in human evolution. For example, I mentioned above that the genomes of modern Europeans are mixtures of at least 3 distinct ancestral groups (western hunter gatherers, Anatolian farmers, and herders from the Russian steppes). For this reason, many inhabitants of Europe prior to the Steppe admixture do not cluster especially closely to any modern day populations. What we might describe in modern samples as “European ancestry” did not exist in anything like the current form until just 5,000 years ago.

This complex genetic history of Europe was largely invisible to us until the application of ancient DNA techniques starting around 2010. Similar complexities have emerged almost everywhere that ancient DNA is available. Thus, we should think of population clusters as relating only to the population structure detectable in the available samples.
• Last, human genetics doesn’t occur in isolation from the rest of society, and there’s an important concern that our concepts can be misinterpreted by nonscientists. In particular, the use of clusters may encourage patterns of typological thinking: i.e., the incorrect notion that humans fall into a limited set of distinct forms or types.\(^1\)

Moreover, the clustering techniques we use may sometimes exaggerate the homogeneity within groups, and the differences between them. A compelling essay by Graham Coop argues that we should move away from a focus on ancestry groups to focusing on genetic similarity.\(^2\)

Coop proposes that one should say, for example: ‘Graham is genetically similar to the GBR 1000 genome samples (on the first 10 principal components)’ rather than ‘Graham has Northwestern European genetic ancestry’.\(^3\) He notes that while statements about similarity may seem awkward, they side-step the limitations of clumping all humans into a finite number of discrete groups (and their mixtures). For additional nuanced discussion about when ‘similarity’ or ‘ancestry’ may be most appropriate see.\(^4\)

Race and ancestry. So far we have talked at length about population structure and genetic ancestry. We close this chapter by touching on the complicated relationship between ancestry and popular conceptions of race as used in cultural settings. Race categories are socially constructed labels that group people based on features such as ancestral origins, culture, and often physical characteristics such as skin pigmentation and hair type. Conceptions of race and ethnicity vary among countries, and can change through time, but generally have some imprecise relationship with the concept of ancestry.

The term race is not easily defined, but ‘race’ is usually thought of as relating to ancestral origins and physical characteristics. In the US, current conceptions of race include categories such as Black/African American, White and Asian.\(^5\) The term ethnicity is also used in the US as another categorization alongside race: these categories usually include a cultural component: for example, Latino/Hispanic, which identify people from Latin America or Spanish-speaking countries, respectively. Brazil – another country with diverse ancestry – classifies people somewhat differently, and the official census includes categories of branco (white), pardo (brown or mixed), preto (black), amarelo (yellow/ East Asian), and indígena. (Brazilians living in the US might self-identify for census purposes as both Latino and a race category.)

A common source of confusion is that race/ethnicity categories usually overlap—though imperfectly—with genetically-inferred ancestry categories. For example, as we will discuss in the next chapter, most African Americans have mixed west African and European ancestry, albeit in varying proportions. Latinos often have mixed ancestry including potentially various native American groups, European, and west African, though the proportions vary greatly across individuals.
Which is more relevant: race, or ancestry? In genetics research and clinical genetics (and for the purpose of this book), the concept of ancestry is more precise and, usually, more relevant than race. I’ll give three examples. First, in genome-wide association mapping, genetic ancestry can act as a confounding variable, and may lead to biased effect-size estimates and spurious signals if not controlled for within the analysis (we’ll cover this topic in a later chapter). Second, a completely different issue arises in clinical genetics, where it is common to screen patients for rare variants in known disease-causing genes, as such variants may underlie the disease. A standard filter would be to ignore variants that are found at appreciable frequencies in healthy control samples; this kind of filter is less useful if we don’t have enough control samples of similar ancestry to the patient. Third, for studies of human population genetics, it’s usually more useful to focus on genetic ancestry.

But for many other situations in research and healthcare, race/ethnicity may actually be more relevant than ancestry. For example, social categories of race/ethnicity often correlate with many aspects of lived experience such as culture, the neighborhoods people live in, resourcing of public schools, health-care access, and experiences of discrimination. All of these factors affect health outcomes, and all are likely more related to social perceptions of race than to genetically-measured ancestry. Thus, race can serve as a label that correlates with important, but hard to measure, environmental aspects of environment. When using measures of race in research, however, is important to avoid the facile assumption that racial differences – for example in health and disease – are mainly due to genetic differences between ancestries. There is a common tendency in society, and even among some geneticists, to over-emphasize the role of genetics, and under-emphasize the role of systemic environmental effects.

In this chapter we have discussed methods for studying contemporary population structure and recent admixture. In the next chapter we’ll expand on the theme of admixture between populations.

\[^1\] For a deeper dive into this topic I recommend the National Academies Report on Population Descriptors [Link], including especially Chapter 5 and Table 5.1.
Notes and References.
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366 This problem is known as topic modeling and has wide applications in computer science but has also been used in other areas including single cell RNA-seq modeling. A classical approach to this treats each document as an unstructured bag of words, and each topic is defined by a probability distribution over all words. The most widely-used approach for this problem is known as Latent Dirichlet Allocation [Link], and is closely related to models for genetic structure (see Pritchard et al 2000, cited below). The classic LDA citation is:


367 Aspects of this work go back to the 1970s and 1980s, however the data were very limited at that time:


368 The plot shown below is from

Mountain JL, Cavalli-Sforza LL. Multilocus genotypes, a tree of individuals, and human evolutionary history. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 1997;61(3):705-18,

building on ideas from an earlier paper using STRs


This work was led by Luca Cavalli-Sforza, who was a giant of 20th century human population genetics – pioneering the use of genetic data to study human history, and posing some of the key questions in the field. He also served on my PhD committee, and I like to think of him at age 76, peddling his ancient bike to my PhD defense, his long white hair streaming behind him.

For early methods work using the Mountain and Cavalli data for population assignment see


369 The data were actually RLFPs which are an old-fashioned technique that approximates SNP typing.

370 This fact is very closely related to the observation that $F_{ST}$ is generally low between human populations, topping out at about 0.15 (Chapter 2.4).

371 As described here, this generative model treats $Q$ and $P$ as fixed parameters. If you prefer, you could consider the allele frequencies at each site as the random outcome of mutation and drift in a population genetic model as outlined in Chapter 2.4. This could be straightforwardly using SLiM or tskit. Similarly you could model $Q$ as the result of a random process: for example as the result of some specified sampling and/or admixture model, or as a sample from a generic probability distribution such as a Dirichlet (see Pritchard et al 2000, cited below).

372 This standard set of assumptions implies that the two alleles are inherited independently given $Q$. This isn’t precisely correct for very recent pedigree ancestors: for example you can’t get two alleles from the same great grandparent! but it works well in practice and it’s a useful simplification for the much more complicated patterns of ancestry that usually crop up in real life.

373 In other words, the most basic model ignores fine-scale LD between SNPs. This is works well for the basic model because any given LD block only contains a tiny fraction of the genome so the error of ignoring LD is negligible. However, we’ll discuss later in this chapter and in the next chapter, in some cases we can learn more by making specific use of LD and haplotype patterns.

374 The basic problem is this. Suppose that a particular allele is rare in population $k$, and not observed in our initial sample. The simple point estimate assigns this allele a frequency of zero, even though it may not be truly zero. Suppose we later sample an individual from population $k$ who does carry this allele. Now their genotype likelihood in population $k$ is zero, and we could never assign them to $k$, even though it is the correct population. If we look at a large enough number of SNPs this will almost certainly occur somewhere in the genome. To solve this, people often add $a$ to the numerator and $2a$ to the denominator for each population to avoid zeroes in the frequency data. This procedure corresponds
to computing the posterior mean under a beta-binomial sampling model, with a prior of Beta(α, α) (Section 3.4 [Link]). A typical choice would be α = 1.

Bayes’ Rule, named after the 18th century mathematician Thomas Bayes provides a mathematical rule for calculating conditional probabilities. We compute the probability that some outcome A is true given observed data B as follows:

\[
Pr(A|B) = \frac{Pr(B|A)Pr(A)}{\sum_{A' \in S} Pr(B|A')Pr(A')},
\]

(3.11)

where \(A'\) is a possible outcome and \(S\) is the set of all possible outcomes. In this expression \(Pr(B|A)\) is known as the likelihood: it is the probability of the data assuming outcome \(A\) is true. \(Pr(A)\) is known as the prior: it contains our subjective probability that outcome \(A\) is true before collecting data.

We apply Bayes’ Rule to estimate the source of an individual given the data (the genotypes \(G\) and allele frequencies \(P\)) and any prior information \(\pi_j\) about where the individual is from as follows (no-admixture):

\[
Pr(\text{individual } i \text{ from population } k) = \frac{Pr(G_i|q_{i,k} = 1)\pi_k}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} Pr(G_i|q_{i,j} = 1)\pi_j}
\]

(3.12)

Here, \(\pi_j\) is known as the prior probability that this individual is from population \(j\). The prior probability reflects any information we may have in advance about where someone is from, for example based on sampling location (Hubisz et al 2009). However in most applications it’s difficult to quantify the prior information and in any event this information tends to be weak compared to the genotype likelihood. For this reason it’s most common to ignore prior information altogether and simply set all \(\pi_j = 1/K\). In that case, the priors cancel, and we get simply

\[
Pr(\text{i from population } k) = \frac{Pr(G_i|q_{i,k} = 1)}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} Pr(G_i|q_{i,j} = 1)}
\]

(3.13)

In the admixture case, \(Q\) is a vector of \(K\) non-negative real numbers that sum to 1, so we want to estimate a posterior density. The form of this is similar, except that the denominator is an integral over all possible values of \(Q\):

\[
Pr(Q_i = \hat{Q}_i) = \frac{Pr(G_i|\hat{Q}_i)\pi_{\hat{Q}}}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} Pr(G_i|Q')\pi_{Q'}dQ'}
\]

(3.14)

Here, \(\pi_{\hat{Q}}\) is the prior, and again it’s convenient to set this to be uniform so that it cancels out. The integral in the denominator is hard to compute so in practice most people just use the maximum likelihood estimate of \(\hat{Q}_i\), i.e., simply finding \(\hat{Q}_i\) that maximizes \(Pr(G_i|\hat{Q}_i)\).


I’ve been skating over a rather thorny issue: everything above assumes that we have already chosen a particular value of \(K\), the number of clusters. But usually we do not know in advance what \(K\) should be and we would like to choose \(K\) based on the data. Both the Structure and Admixture software packages recommend criteria for selecting \(K\), but in practice it’s often difficult to choose a single best value—indeed this makes sense as identifying the “correct” number of clusters is frequently not a well-defined problem in practical settings where the data may not completely fit the idealized Structure notion of discrete ancestral populations. Structure is usually hierarchical, including additional local structure within the larger populations, and often varying continuously across geographic space rather than being entirely discrete. For these reasons, there is not usually a single “true” value of \(K\). I find that Structure/Admixture are best viewed as tools for visualizing population structure and generally prefer to choose values of \(K\) that are useful for understanding the data, and many papers choose to present results for multiple values of \(K\) that are useful for visualization and interpretation.


You can see a map of the HGDP populations in Chapter 1.2. The HGDP is a panel of DNA and cell lines from around 1000 unrelated individuals, sampled from 51 populations from around the world. The HGDP was collected by a network
of scientists in the 1980s and 1990s, and aimed to capture the genetic diversity of indigenous populations around the world. The HGDP is complementary to the 1000 Genomes data set: it is about one third as large, but has much better sampling of diverse human populations albeit with important gaps, including among Native North Americans, Native Australians, and from India.

The variance adjustment in the denominator (which is optional) is sometimes motivated by noting that drift occurs at a rate proportional to the variance of the allele frequencies in a population. This adjustment is used because otherwise the first principal component reflects the mean allele frequencies. Science. 2008;319(5866):1100-4.

The data analysis applied a maximum likelihood algorithm called Frappe that is similar to Structure/Admixture:


In this plot, the Mozabite have been labeled with the Middle Eastern populations, although in fact they are located in the northern Sahara region of Algeria. In the ancestry analysis they have a small Sub-Saharan component (red), as well as larger Middle Eastern and European components.

For a somewhat mathy tutorial see:


Novembre and Stephens explored how PCA represents the data in isolation-by-distance models


We’ll cover this topic more thoroughly in Chapter 3.4, but for a look at spatial patterns of the main ancestral groups in Europe see


The mean adjustment is used because otherwise the first principal component reflects the mean allele frequencies. The variance adjustment in the denominator (which is optional) is sometimes motivated by noting that drift occurs at a rate proportional to \( \sqrt{2p_i(1 - p_i)} \); so with this rescaling the amount of drift at each SNP is approximately independent of \( p \). Patterson et al. (2006) rationalized use of this denominator by noting that it gives each SNP approximately equal weighting, and also with reference to the Nicholson and Donnelly drift model (2002). However in certain nonstandard contexts use of the denominator may complicate analysis (McVean 2009; Pickrell and Pritchard 2012). While the variance reweighting is conventional it usually doesn’t impact the results much.

There are several different ways of writing the mathematics of PCA, as well as motivating it; my notation here follows an unusually clear description by Barbara Engelhardt and Matthew Stephens:


It’s beyond our scope here, but there’s also an important connection between PCA and pairwise coalescent times: specifically, the individual loadings onto PC axes can be interpreted as functions of pairwise coalescent times, such that pairs of individuals separated by greater average coalescent times will project apart than individuals with smaller coalescent times:


This section follows the exposition in Engelhardt and Stephens (2010)


Another example of fineSTRUCTURE examines genetic structure of the Iberian Peninsula, showing a striking concordance with history:


For an excellent and in-depth consideration of these topics see a 2023 report from the National Academy of Sciences [Link]:


See also


The results are heavily influenced by the numbers and distributions of samples. It’s been argued that the particular locations of the HGDP samples tend to accentuate the gaps between continental clusters: for example with better sampling across northeast Africa we would see a more gradual shift of ancestry components from African to Middle Eastern ancestry, as evident in the Holfelder et al analysis


As human geneticists we have a responsibility to be aware that our work can be misinterpreted by nonscientists, or weaponized by extremists who promote a pseudoscientific form of racism:


Coop 2022, p11. Italics are mine.

National Academies Report, including Chapter 5 and especially Table 5.1 [Link].

For a range of views on this topic see the NAS review as well as

