Causal Computational Models for Gene Regulatory Networks

Sahil Loomba Parul Jain

Advisors Dr. Sumeet Agarwal Dr. Parag Singla



Reintroducing the GRN Problem



Where BTP1 finished...

- Correlation
- Granger Causality

$$\rho(X,Y) = \frac{\cos(X,Y)}{\sigma_X \sigma_Y}$$
$$x_t = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i x_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q b_i y_{t-i} + \epsilon_t$$

Mutual Information

I(X,Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y)

con(X V)

• Transfer Entropy $T(X,Y) = T_{Y \to X} = H(X_t | X_{t-1:t-d}) - H(X_t | X_{t-1:t-d}, Y_{t-1:t-d})$

Parameters: Size, quantisation, time, lag

Asides: Grid Search, Laplace Smoothing

 $TE \sim MI > GC > CO$

... is where BTP2 picks up



Convergent Cross Mapping

As Dynamical System

Convergent Cross Mapping [Sugihara et al. 2012] Diffeomorphism across Shadow Manifolds

- For weakly coupled dynamical systems
- New notion of causality: belonging to same dynamical system
- Library size ∝ Time series length
- Parameters:
 - Dimensions: M, E where $E \ge M$
 - \circ Lag: τ

$$C(X,Y) = \rho(X,\hat{X}_Y)$$



Convergent Cross Mapping Some Results



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 500

Network Size 100, Time Series Length = 500 ⁶

Normalisation should be the norm!



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 1000

Normalised Time Series data

High degrees are degrading!





Network Size 50, Average Degree = 7

High degrees are degrading!





Network Size 50, Average Degree = 2

Convergent Cross Mapping Some Results



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 1000

Network Size 100, Time Series Length = 1000 ¹⁰

Transfer Entropy Some Results





11

Mutual Information Some Results



Granger Causality Some Results



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 1000

Network Size 100, Time Series Length = 1000 13

Correlation Some Results



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 1000

Network Size 100, Time Series Length = 1000

ARACNE [Margilin et al. 2006] Graph Structure Estimation



Network Size 50, Time Series Length = 1000



Network Size 100, Time Series Length = 1000 15

Pairwise Metrics of Causality A Summary



CCM and Correlation *seem* to work the best at a pairwise level

Naive Edge Selection

- (Since all pairwise metrics are directly proportional to the strength of causality,) sort ⁿC₂ edges by metric value in decreasing order.
- 2. Choose top-k edges and output as graph G.

Smart Edge Selection Future Work

Use a "sophisticated" algorithm which selects top-k edges, by making use of graph connectivity and other constraints information.

Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation [Hino et al. 2015] Adjacency Matrix to Observation Matrix

 $f:\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$



 $\Theta \mapsto f(\Theta) = \Xi$

(Pairwise Metrics used here)

 $\xi_{ij} = c_i + c_{ij}\theta_{ij} + \sum_{k \in V} c_{ij}^k \theta_{ik} \theta_{kj} + \sum_{k,l \in V} c_{ij}^{kl} \theta_{ik} \theta_{kl} \theta_{lj} + \dots$ $t_{ij} = \xi_{ij} + \epsilon$

Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation [Hino et al. 2015] The Random Walk Model

$$f(\Theta) = \alpha e^{\beta L(\Theta)}$$
$$\rho = \{\alpha, \beta\}$$

Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation [Hino et al. 2015] Parameter Estimation Algorithm

$$J(\rho,\Theta) = \sum_{i,j\in V, i\neq j} \left(t_{ij} - [f(\Theta)]_{ij} \right)^2$$

In an EM style algorithm, iterating over k (number of edges in graph):

$$\Theta^{k} = f^{-1}(\Xi)$$

$$\rho_{k} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\rho} J(\rho, \Theta^{k})$$



Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation

Moving towards Multi-attribute Data



Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation Moving towards Multi-attribute Data

$$g(\Theta) = cat({}^{1}f(\Theta), {}^{2}f(\Theta), \dots, {}^{r}f(\Theta))$$
$$J(\rho, \Theta) = \sum_{1 \le q \le r} \left(\sum_{i,j \in V, i \ne j} \left({}^{q}t_{ij} - {}^{q}[g(\Theta)]_{ij}\right)^{2}\right)$$

$$\Theta^{k} = \frac{\sum_{1 \le q \le r} q f^{-1}(\Xi)}{r}$$

$${}^{q}\rho_{k} = \underset{\rho}{\arg\min} J(\rho, \Theta^{k})$$

Ideally, Θ should be exactly mapped by every ${}^q\!f^{-1}(\Xi)$

Intrinsic Graph Structure Estimation More Considerations & Postprocessing

- Imposing extra constraints on Θ
- Explore different ways to map g to Θ (hard versus soft constraints)
- For reduced computational complexity, use a small window of ${\bf k}$
- Further postprocessing: Data Processing Inequality

$$g_1 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow g_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow g_3$$
$$I(g_1, g_3) \le \min[I(g_1, g_2), I(g_2, g_3)]$$

Thank You

Questions and Feedback