SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL ON METHODS

The observed data are represented as $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, where each column corresponds to one of n samples, quantifying the associated gene-expression values for all p genes under investigation. A factor model [1]–[4] is employed. Specifically, the data are assumed to satisfy

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{E} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$, $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ and $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. We assume that the gene-expression data are centered in advance of the analysis; otherwise, there should be an intercept added to the model. Considering the *j*th sample, x_j , corresponding to the *j*th column of \mathbf{X} , the model states that $x_j = \mathbf{A}s_j + e_j$, where s_j and e_j are the *j*th columns of \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{E} , respectively.

The columns of A represent the factor "loadings", and rows of S are often called factors. To address the fact that $n \ll p$, we impose a sparseness constraint on the columns of A [4], with the idea that each column of A should ideally correspond to a biological "pathway", which should be defined by a relatively small number of correlated genes. Within Bayesian formalisms, the sparse columns of A are imposed via spike-slab-like priors [4], [5], as discussed further below.

For the factor model in (1), r defines the number of factors responsible for the data X, and it is not known in general, and must be inferred. Within the analysis we consider K potential factors (K columns of A), with K set to a value anticipated to be large relative to r. We then infer the number of columns of A needed to represent the observed data X, with this number used as an estimate of r. Since we will be performing a Bayesian analysis, we will infer a posterior density function on r. Henceforth we assume A has K columns, with the understanding that we wish to infer the r < K columns that are actually needed to represent the data.

Let a_k represent the kth column of A, for k = 1, ..., K, and e_j and s_j represent respectively the *j*th columns of E and S (with j = 1, ..., n). Within the imposed prior, vectors e_j and s_j are generated as $s_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_K)$, and $e_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}(\psi_1^{-1}, ..., \psi_p^{-1}))$; \mathbf{I}_K is the $K \times K$ identity matrix and the precisions $(\psi_1, ..., \psi_p)$ are all drawn i.i.d. from a gamma prior. To define sparseness on the a_k [4] we employ a spike-slab prior:

$$A_{lk} \sim w_{lk} \delta_0 + (1 - w_{lk}) \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha_k^{-1}) \quad , \qquad w_{lk} \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \quad , \qquad \alpha_k \sim \text{Gamma}(c, d) \tag{2}$$

where (a, b) are selected as to strongly favor $w_{lk} \to 1$, δ_0 is a distribution concentrated at zero, and $l = 1, \ldots, p$.

The Beta Process (BP) is used to infer the number of needed factors r [6]–[9]. Specifically, for each of the K potential factors, there is an associated probability π_k , for k = 1, ..., K, and a particular data sample utilizes the kth factor with probability π_k , and doesn't use it with probability $1 - \pi_k$ (*i.e.*, Bernoulli). Within the model each of the π_k are drawn

$$\pi_k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha/K, \beta(K-1)/K) \tag{3}$$

Note that for finite settings of the parameters α and β , this is a degenerate beta distribution [6], which strongly favors $\pi_k \to 0$. Therefore, what this model is imposing is that as the number of potential factors K becomes large, only a small subset of the $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1,K}$ are likely to be large, and therefore only a small subset of factors are utilized to represent the data. The model therefore encourages a parsimonious use of factors for representation of the data; more details may be found in [6]–[9].

The computations are performed using Gibbs sampling, for which all needed conditional density functions are analytic. The results presented here correspond to using 5000 collection samples, after a burn-in of 2000 iterations. However, with 2000 burn-in iterations and 500 collection samples, the average results of the factor scores and factor loadings are almost identical to those found with 5000.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Rai and H. Daum'e III, "The infinite hierarchical factor regression model," in *Proc. Conf. Neural Information Proc. Systems* (*NIPS*), Vancouver, Canada, 2008.
- [2] D. Knowles and Z. Ghahramani, "Infinite sparse factor analysis and infinite independent components analysis," in 7th International Conference on Independent Component Analysis and Signal Separation, 2007.
- [3] E. Meeds, Z. Ghahramani, R. Neal, and S. Roweis, "Modeling dyadic data with binary latent factors," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2007, pp. 977–984.
- [4] C. Carvalho, J. Chang, J. Lucas, J. R. Nevins, Q. Wang, and M. West, "High-dimensional sparse factor modelling: Applications in gene expression genomics," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 103, pp. 1438–1456, 2008.
- [5] M. West, "Bayesian factor regression models in the "large p, small n" paradigm," in *Bayesian Statistics* 7, J. M. Bernardo, M. Bayarri, J. Berger, A. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. Smith, and M. West, Eds. Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 723–732.
- [6] R. Thibaux and M. Jordan, "Hierarchical beta processes and the Indian buffet process," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2007.
- [7] T. Griffiths and Z. Ghahramani, "Infinite latent feature models and the indian buffet process," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2005, pp. 475–482.
- [8] F. Doshi-Velez, K. Miller, J. V. Gael, and Y. Teh, "Variational inference for the indian buffet process," in AISTATS, 2009.
- [9] J. Paisley and L. Carin, "Nonparametric factor analysis with beta process priors," in Int. Conf. Machine Learning, 2009.