# Detection of loci under selection from genome scans

Matthieu Foll 23.11.2011 Population Genomics course, Helsinki

### Methods to detect loci under selection



# Selection affects patterns of diversity between populations

**Cavalli Sforza 1966** Population structure and human evolution. Proc Roy Soc B. 164: 362–379

### Adaptation:

Recent selective sweep in a population or in a given region will increase genetic differentiation (FST) between populations

#### **Balancing selection:**

Balancing selection may maintain alleles at low frequencies between populations (frequency dependent selection) or maintain particular alleles at identical frequencies in many populations (heterozygote advantage).

This will decrease genetic differentiation between populations (low FST)

### FST and selection



### FST-based tests of selection

**Lewontin and Krakauer (1973)** have proposed to use the variance of  $F_{ST}$  across loci as a test of neutrality.

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{k F_{ST}^2}{n-1}$$

where  $k \le 2$ , and *n* is the number of sampled populations. This approach has been criticized:

- This variance seemed often underestimated for some types of population structure
  - Isolation by distance (Nei and Maruyama, 1975)
  - Shared ancestry (Robertson 1975)
- The test has not been used very much, also due to a lack of appropriate data sets.

### FST-based tests of selection

**Beaumont and Nichols (1996)** proposed to use the joint distribution of  $F_{ST}$  and heterozygosity between population, to detect outlier loci.

They used coalescent simulations under a finite island model to obtain the joint null distribution.



## FDIST2 algorithm

- Calculate Fst from the observe data
- Converts Fst into migration rate using

$$F_{ST} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{4Nmd}{(d-1)}}$$

- Simulate the joint null distribution of heterozygosity and Fst using coalescent simulations
- Calculate p-values for each locus based on the simulated distribution

### FST-based tests of selection

The FDIST2 method was shown by Beaumont and Nichols (1996) to be relatively robust to alternative structures of population (colonization model, stepping-stone model).

The method of Beaumont and Nichols (1996) has been used extensively with the advent of the first genome scans (since 2002)

## Problems with FST-based methods

A large number of outlier loci may be due to the same problem as incurred by the Lewontin and Krakauer test

This test was initially criticized by Robertson (1975) in that the variance of  $F_{ST}$  could be largely underestimated if the allele frequencies between sampled populations are correlated



FIGURE 1.—Two hypothetical structures of relationship of populations within species.

### But almost all current approaches assume that sampled populations are independent from each other

### Extension of FST based-approaches: Hierarchical island model

Slatkin and Voelm (1991) have studied a hierarchical island model where they related hierarchical G-statistics to migration rates within and between groups of demes.





This model was modified to get relationships between migration rates and F-statistics

These equations can be used to model a hierarchical island model leading to observed hierarchical F-statistics

# Detecting selection under a hierarchical island model

### Procedure

- 1. Estimate F-statistics from observed data under a given hierarchical genetic structure (assumed known) of the populations
- 2. Convert F-statistics into migrations rates  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , assuming a given deme size N
- 3. Obtain the joint null distribution of heterozygosity and  $F_{ST}$  by simulating genetic diversity at neutral loci under this model
- 4. Compute the *p*-values of observed loci

### HGDP data set



940 individuals in 53 populations ~600K SNPs in 22 chromosomes + X Li et al. 2008 (Illumina HumanHap 650K Beadchips)

### HGDP data structure



### Application to HGDP data set



Hofer et al, submitted

## False positive rate

We studied the false positive rate when data generated under a hierarchical island model are analysed under a finite island model STR data, 5 groups of 10 populations

<i>F<sub>SC</sub></i> =0.1; <i>F<sub>CT</sub></i> =0.05									
Expected	Balancii	ng selection	Directional selection						
positive rate	Finite island	Hierarchical island	Finite island	Hierarchical island					
0.001	0.0155	0.0059	0.0083	0.0012					
0.005	0.0301	0.0071	0.0233	0.0057					
0.01	0.0412	0.0091	0.0350	0.0111					
0.05	0.1023	0.0361	0.0875	0.0549					

## False positive rate

We studied the false positive rate when data generated under a hierarchical island model are analysed under a finite island model STR data, 5 groups of 10 populations

<i>F<sub>SC</sub></i> =0.1; <i>F<sub>CT</sub></i> =0.05				<i>F<sub>SC</sub></i> =0.05; <i>F<sub>CT</sub></i> =0.2				
Expected Balancing selection		Directional selection		Balancii	Balancing selection		Directional selection	
positive rate	Finite island	Hierarchical island	Finite island	Hierarchical island	Finite island	Hierarchical island	Finite island	Hierarchical island
0.001	0.0155	0.0059	0.0083	0.0012	0.1534	0.0065	0.0783	0.0012
0.005	0.0301	0.0071	0.0233	0.0057	0.2104	0.0089	0.1072	0.0046
0.01	0.0412	0.0091	0.0350	0.0111	0.2436	0.0130	0.1226	0.0091
0.05	0.1023	0.0361	0.0875	0.0549	0.3431	0.0495	0.1775	0.0455

## False positive rate

We studied the false positive rate when data generated under a hierarchical island model are analysed under a finite island model STR data, 5 groups of 10 populations



Hierarchical island model

Finite island model

### Demo

# A realistic demographic model ?



# The F-model

- Used in many software
  - STRUCTURE
  - Geneland
  - BAPS
  - Hickory
  - Bayenv
  - GESTE, BayeScan
  - •
- Flexible Bayesian description of the genetic structure



## Island - Mainland model

A with frequency p a with frequency I- p

## Island - Mainland model

A with frequency p a with frequency I- p

## Island - Mainland model

m

A with frequency p a with frequency I- p

# Island - Mainland model m Allele frequency in the island ? A with frequency p a with frequency I-p

## Sewall Wright, 1931



FIGURE 6.—Distribution of frequencies of a gene among subdivisions of a population in which  $q_m = 1/2$  (or probability array of gene within a subdivision) under various amounts of intermigration.  $y = Cq^{4Nmq_m-1}(1-q)^{4Nm(1-q_m)-1}$ .

## Sewall Wright, 1931



FIGURE 6.—Distribution of frequencies of a gene among subdivisions of a population in which  $q_m = 1/2$  (or probability array of gene within a subdivision) under various amounts of intermigration.  $y = Cq^{4Nmq_m-1}(1-q)^{4Nm(1-q_m)-1}$ .

## Sewall Wright, 1931

 $p \sim \text{Beta}(\theta p, \theta(1-p))$ 









# Infinite island approximation



# Observed data

- In each population j:
  - Two alleles: A with frequency  $\widetilde{p_i}$  and a  $I \widetilde{p_i}$
  - We sample n<sub>i</sub> alleles randomly
  - Number of A is binomial with parameters  $n_j et p_j$ Population

Sample

# Observed data

- In each population j:
  - Two alleles: A with frequency  $\widetilde{p_i}$  and a  $I \widetilde{p_i}$
  - We sample n<sub>i</sub> alleles randomly

Population

• Number of A is binomial with parameters  $n_j et p_j$ 

Sample



Pj

ni





# Identifying selection



# Identifying selection

- Decompose genome wide and locus specific effects
- For population j and locus i:

 $log(\theta_{ij}) = \beta_j + \alpha_i$  $\theta = F_{ST} / (I - F_{ST})$ 

Beaumont and Balding 2004

# Identifying selection

- Decompose genome wide and locus specific effects
- For population j and locus i:

 $log(\theta_{ij}) = \beta_j + \alpha_i$  $\theta = F_{ST} / (I - F_{ST})$ 



## Extension

- Bayesian model choice, with two alternative models:
  - $M_N: log(\theta_{ij}) = \beta_j$  ( $\alpha_i = 0$ )
  - $M_{S}: log(\theta_{ij}) = \beta_j + \alpha_i$
- Estimates probability of both models for each locus using RJ-MCMC

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{P} \left( M_{S} | D \right) \text{ and } \mathbf{P} \left( M_{N} | D \right) = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{p}$$

• Implemented in software BayeScan



log10(q value)



log10(q value)



log10(q value)

## Hierachical population structure



## Island model









![](_page_47_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

### 1.7% of SNPs under directional selection at FDR=0.01 no balancing selection

![](_page_49_Picture_2.jpeg)

### TYRP1 chr12 (pigmentation)

![](_page_50_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_0.jpeg)

### PIK3R3 chr1 (Pygmy size)

![](_page_52_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Conclusion

- Taking into accounts hierarchical population structure lowers number of false significants
- Useful when some populations are evolutionarily related or geographically close
- Hierarchical genetic structure is assumed known or needs to be estimated separately
  - Slightly wrong hierarchical genetic structure leads to less false positives that assuming populations are independent
- Hierarchical model is still an approximation. Reality may be more complex and false positives may emerge
  - Spatial expansions

## Practicals

- We provide a small subset of 100 SNPs chosen at random (almost...) from chromosome 16 of HGDP data
- Use Arlequin to identify SNPs under selection
- Try both island and hierarchical-island models and see the effect on the number of outlier markers identified
- Find more details about significant SNPs at the 1% level under hierachical-island model:
  - <u>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/SNP/</u>
  - <u>http://hgdp.uchicago.edu</u>