Human Microbiome Mixture Analysis using Weighted Quantile Sum Regression

Shoshannah Eggers, PhD[1]*, Moira Bixby, MPH[1], Stefano Renzetti, PhD[2] , Paul Curtin, PhD[1], Chris Gennings, PhD[1]

Affiliation:

1- Department of Environmental Medicine and Public Health, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, 1 Gustave L. Levy Place, Box 1057, New York, NY 10029
2- Department of Medical-Surgical Specialties, Radiological Sciences and Public Health, Università degli Studi di Brescia, Brescia, Italy

*Corresponding Author: Shoshannah Eggers, shoshannah.eggers@mssm.edu

ABSTRACT

Studies of the health effects of the microbiome often measure overall associations by using diversity metrics, and individual taxa associations in separate analyses, but do not consider the correlated relationships between taxa in the microbiome. In this study, we applied random subset weighted quantile sum regression with repeated holdouts (WQS_{RSRH}), a mixture method successfully applied to 'omic data to account for relationships between many predictors, to processed amplicon sequencing data from the Human Microbiome Project. We simulated a binary variable associated with 20 operational taxonomic units (OTUs). WQS_{RSRH} was used to test for the association between the microbiome and the simulated variable, adjusted for sex, and sensitivity and specificity were calculated. The WQS_{RSRH} method was also compared to other standard methods for microbiome analysis. The method was further illustrated using real data from the Growth and Obesity Cohort in Chile to assess the association between the gut microbiome and body mass index. In the analysis with simulated data, WQS_{RSRH} predicted the correct directionality of association between the microbiome and the simulated variable, with an average sensitivity and specificity of 75% and 70%, respectively, in identifying the 20 associated OTUs. WQS_{RSRH} performed better than all other comparison methods. In the illustration analysis of the gut microbiome and obesity, the WQS_{RSRH} analysis identified an inverse association between body mass index and the gut microbe mixture, identifying *Bacteroides*, *Clostridium*, and *Ruminococcus* as important genera in the negative association. The application of WQS_{RSRH} to the microbiome allows for analysis of the mixture effect of all the taxa in the microbiome, while simultaneously identifying the most important to the mixture, and allowing for covariate adjustment. It outperformed other methods when using simulated data, and in analysis with real data found results consistent with other study findings.

Keywords: Human Microbiome; Microbiome Analysis; Mixture Analysis; Weighted Quantile Sum Regression

INTRODUCTION

The human microbiome is increasingly recognized as an important component of human health. Studies show links between the composition and function of the human gut microbiome and many health outcomes, including inflammatory and autoimmune conditions, obesity, infection, and neurological outcomes [1–4]. Animal studies have shown prospective changes in the microbiome from different exposures, and changes in physiology and health status after changes to the microbiome. While some clinical trials have been done, many human microbiome studies have been observational.

In observational studies, the microbiome is typically characterized in a few key ways. The first is by measuring and comparing within individual diversity, or α-diversity. These measures, adopted from the field of ecology, measure the number of different taxa present, and the evenness of abundance among those taxa within a single sample [5–7]. That diversity level can then be compared across individuals. However, α-diversity cannot be directly translated to health status, thus its meaningful utility is limited. A second way to characterize the microbiome is by assessing community composition, or β-diversity. This is typically done by measuring the similarity or dissimilarity of the composition of one sample compared to another, using the number of different taxa [8], the abundance of each taxa [9], and sometimes the phylogenetic relationships between taxa [10]. Researchers can compare groups, for instance exposed and unexposed groups, to see if the samples within one group are more similar than samples across

58 groups (i.e. controls are more similar to other controls than to the exposed group). We use these
59 measures of diversity to try to gain an understanding of the effect of or on the microbiome as a
60 whole, but changes in diversity can only indicate a general difference without indicating how
61 specifically the microbiome is different, or what the important players within the microbiome
62 are.

63 To determine which specific taxa contribute to differences in diversity, researchers can
64 also assess each taxa individually by measuring the amount of variability each one contributes,
65 or by assessing trends in the presence/absence or abundance of individual taxa. While
66 combinations of these strategies are often used, these scenarios must be adjusted for multiple
67 comparisons across hundreds or thousands of taxa, which limit the ability to identify statistically
68 significant associations. Furthermore, the microbiome is an ecosystem of bacterial communities
69 with complex interactions and associations, and using these modeling strategies to assess them
70 individually does not account for their intricate correlations.

71 Interest in microbiome research has grown rapidly over the last fifteen years, yet the
72 complexity of the data, e.g. zero inflation, variation across individuals, correlated taxa, etc.,
73 continues to be a challenge for researchers. There has been a push for new statistical
74 methodologies, including machine learning methods, and new microbial data applications of
75 existing statistical methods, in an effort to improve the accuracy of findings from microbiome
76 analyses[11]. Some of these methods include random forest[12], negative binomials[13], and
77 clustering[14], to name a few. Similarly, there has been a push in the field of environmental
78 epidemiology to develope new strategies to model the health effects of multiple co-exposures to
79 improve the accuracy of chemical exposure studies. Some of the newly developed methods allow
80 for analysis of overall mixture effects, and indicate the importance of each chemical within that

81 mixture. One such method is weighted quantile sum (WQS) regression[15]. WQS regression uses
82 an empirically-weighted index of many correlated chemical exposure measurements, and models
83 the mixture effect of the whole index, while also providing weights for each component within
84 the mixture to indicate the relative importance. WQS regression also allows for the inclusion of
85 covariates, to reduce the effects of confounding. Applying this method to analysis of microbiome
86 data allows for the evaluation of the overall mixture effect of the microbiome, and
87 simultaneously identifies the most important individual taxa in the mixture while accounting for
88 a correlated data structure.

89 The goal of this study is to demonstrate the novel application of WQS regression to
90 assess covariate adjusted associations between health exposures and microbiome sequencing
91 abundance data as a mixture of potentially correlated bacterial taxa. Our analysis adjusted and
92 combined WQS regression with random subset selection[16] and repeated holdout[17] (WQS_{RSRH})
93 frameworks, and applied them to publicly available Human Microbiome Project 16S amplicon
94 sequencing data. We further demonstrate the utility of the method using data from the Growth
95 and Obesity Cohort in Chile.

96 The random subset extension of WQS is used in cases where the number of components
97 in the WQS index is greater than the number of observations, and uses random subsets of
98 components to calculate the WQS index. The repeated holdout extension of WQS allows for
99 more robust estimates by using different observations in the training and validation sets of the
100 data over multiple iterations of WQS analysis. We illustrate the utility of WQS_{RSRH} and estimate
101 specificity (correctly determining OTUs were not associated with the outcome) and sensitivity
102 (correctly identifying associated OTUs) of the method. This methodological application allows

for more comprehensive investigation of the association between the gut microbiome and many health exposures and outcomes by assessing the microbiome as a mixture.

METHODS

Figure 1 illustrates a simplified flow chart of the methods used for this study. All code used in this study, including the code used to access the publicly available HMP data, is accessible at: github.com/ShoshannahE/WQS-Microbiome (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6599722). All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations.

Data Source and Processing for Simulation

Data for the simulation analysis came from the Human Microbiome Project 1 (HMP), version 1, which has been well described in previous literature[18–20]. We used 16S amplicon sequencing data, processed using QIIME[19,21]. HMP guidelines were followed in this analysis and publication.

We used data from each participant's first stool sample (n=210). As a data reduction step, we filtered out any operational taxonomic unit (OTU) that had 0 abundance in more than 90% of samples, resulting in a total of 868 OTUs. This data reduction step also ensures that there are enough participants with non-zero values to calculate tertiles above zero for the WQS_{RSRH} indices. Relative abundances were calculated to account for variations between individuals within the sample population. These data processing steps were performed in SAS v 9.4, R v 3.6.1, and RStudio v 1.2.5001, using the HMP16SDATA package[22].

Data Simulation Method

126 Twenty OTUs were chosen based on a literature review of bacterial species that have
127 been linked to health-related variables such as body mass index (BMI) and smoking status (see
128 Table 1). These 20 OTUs were then randomly categorized to represent levels of association
129 (strong, medium, and weak) with a simulated binary variable. To simulate the "test" variable, the
130 intercept (β_0) was set to -5, and the potency adjusted relative abundance (calculated as
131 log2(log10(x+1)/log10(max+1)) for each of the 20 OTUs) was multiplied by a β coefficient of 8
132 for the strong group, 4 for the medium group, and 2 for the weak group. Potency adjustment was
133 needed to standardize the simulated association across samples because the abundance of each
134 OTU varied greatly, i.e. multiplying by 8 leads to a different scale of association for an
135 abundance of 5 vs. an abundance of 30. Beta coefficient values were chosen for each level of
136 association that would result in logit values across the range of OTUs between roughly -3.5 and
137 3.5. In prior attempts at simulation, larger coefficient values resulted in unlikely and extreme
138 logit values (i.e. greater than 3.5). All other OTUs were not assigned an association with the test
139 variable (i.e., assumed to be a value of 0). The resulting test variable was positive for 13% of the
140 participants. We adjusted the simulation model for sex using a beta coefficient of -1 for females;
141 i.e., males were the reference group. We also simulated a random "control" variable that was not
142 assigned an association to any OTU, and used it as a negative control to compare the ability of
143 each model to detect the intended simulated association.
144
145 *Weighted Quantile Sum Regression Analysis with Random Subsets and Repeated Holdouts*
146 WQS is a method applied to mixtures of variables (e.g. chemicals, or in this case OTUs)
147 by which the total effect of a group of potentially correlated predictors is estimated through the
148 derivation of an index, a weighted sum of the quantiled exposure variables[15]. The WQS index is

149 calculated as $WQS = \sum w_i q_{i,j}$, where WQS is the mixture index, $q_{i,j}$ is the quantiled variable for
150 the *i*th exposure variable and *j*th subject and w_i is the weight corresponding to q_i. In WQS with
151 Random Subsets (WQS_{RS}), subsets of the variables in the mixture are randomly chosen and used
152 to predict weights in order to maximize the association between the index and the outcome. Such
153 subsets are computed numerous times (e.g., 1,000 times) with adjustments for covariates. The
154 average weights across the subsets sum to 1 and are used to compute the final WQS index for a
155 given health outcome. For the calculation of the weighted index, effects can be constrained in the
156 positive or negative direction, or weights can be calculated without constraining direction. The
157 WQS index is then used in a generalized linear model (GLM), so that $g(\mu) \approx \alpha + \beta_1 WQS +$
158 δZ, where g() indicates a link function, μ is the sample mean, α is the intercept, β_1 is the effect
159 parameter corresponding to the WQS index, and Z represents a set of covariates with
160 corresponding effect estimates δ [16]. To increase generalizability, the weights are estimated and
161 tested in randomly selected training (40% subjects) and validation (60% subjects) datasets.
162 Although analysis can be constrained in the positive or negative direction for the weighted index
163 calculation, estimates from the GLM in the validation dataset are not constrained. Therefore,
164 GLM estimates can be in either direction regardless of constraint direction in the index
165 calculation. WQS_{RS} with Repeated Holdouts (WQS_{RSRH}) then repeats the WQS_{RS} process a
166 specified number of times, with different observations in the training and validation datasets, and
167 provides effect estimates and mixture weights for each repetition of the analysis. In each
168 repetition of the analysis, the predictors with the largest weights within the WQS index
169 contribute most to the estimated effect parameter. An equi-weight (1/the number of components
170 in the index) cut-point is often used to determine which components within the mixture are most
171 important, as it indicates if an individual weight is higher than if all components of the mixture

172 were given equal weight. Across repeated holdouts, average effect estimates and average
173 component weights are calculated for more robust estimates.

174 For this analysis, we looked at the association between the test variable and the gut
175 microbiome, in order to demonstrate the application of WQS to microbiome data. Because of the
176 large amount of zeros across the dataset, using quantiles in the WQS index was not ideal due to
177 having so many ties with a 0 score. Instead we ranked the relative abundance of each OTU to 4
178 levels, 0, 1, 2, or 3, where the observed 0s were scored as 0, and values above 0 were tertile
179 scored. Due to the large number of variables (OTUs) in the index, the random subset variation
180 of WQS was used in this analysis. To address generalizability we conducted 30 repeated holdout
181 analyses where the distribution of weights were based on the 30 training sets (40%) and the
182 distribution of the 30 estimates of β_1 was based on the 30 holdout validation sets (60%). The
183 weights within each training set were based on 1000 random subsets of size 30 OTUs. To
184 calculate the WQS index weights from the 1000 random subsets, three weighted averages were
185 evaluated using different signal functions. The signal function gives additional emphasis to
186 subsets with a larger association to the outcome, compared to those sets with negligible
187 association. The three signal functions tested were: (i) the default in the gWQS R package, which
188 weights each random subset based on the squared t statistic for the corresponding beta parameter;
189 (ii) a more severe weighted average, which weights using exp(t); i.e., the absolute value of the t
190 statistic exponentiated; and (iii) a less severe weighted average, using the abosulte value of the t
191 statistic.

192 Sensitivity and specificity of this application were then calculated based on the WQS_{RSRH}
193 index weights of the OTUs across the 30 repeated holdout sets. Both sensitivity and specificity
194 were calculated over a range of cutpoints to guide cutpoint selection. Sensitivity was calculated

195 as the proportion of the 20 selected OTUs that had weights exceeding the given cutpoint;
196 specificity was calculated as the proportion of the remaining 848 OTUs that had weights below
197 the cutpoint. We evaluated the impact of the signal function in the weighted averages of the
198 WQS_{RSRH} indexes using analysis of variance for sensitivity and specificity for the 30 holdout
199 datasets across the 3 signal functions and selected cutpoints. Cutpoints ranged between 0.0005
200 and 0.002, where 1/868=0.00115 (the equi-weighted cutpoint). The test for interaction was used
201 as a goodness-of-fit test for the main effect ANOVA model.
202
203 *Comparison to Other Microbiome Analysis Methods*
204 We also compared the WQS_{RSRH} method to more standard methods of microbiome
205 analysis, using the same data set with the same test and control variables. We used the Vegan
206 package [23] in R to calculate α-diversity using the Shannon index[6], and β-diversity distance using
207 the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index[9]. We performed two linear regressions with Shannon
208 diversity as the outcome and the test variable, and the control variable as the primary exposure in
209 each model, both adjusted for sex. The adonis2 function in Vegan was then used to perform two
210 permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) analyses, based on the Bray-Curtis index,
211 with the same variables as the linear regression, using 9,999 permutations. As a sensitivity
212 analysis, we also conducted the same PERMANOVA anlysis using the Aitchison distance[24].
213 Similarity percentage (SIMPER) analysis was then used, with 999 permutations, to determine
214 which OTUs contributed 70% of the variance to the β-diversity differences between the levels of
215 the simulated variable, and the random variable in a separate analysis. As an additional
216 comparison, Random Forest analysis was conducted using the randomForest package [25], with
217 100 trees, to identify the OTUs most associated with the test and control variables. Separate

218 models were run with the test and control variables as the response in each model, and the 868
219 OTUs and sex as predictors.
220
221 *Data Source and Processing for Demonstration with Real Data*
222 We further demonstrated the utility of the WQS_{RSRH} method by using it to examine the
223 relationship between BMI and the gut microbiome using real (not simulated) data from a cohort
224 of adolescent girls from Chile. The study design of the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study
225 (GOCS) in Chile has been previously described[26,27], The current study assesses a subset of 161
226 girls that contributed stool samples, BMI z-score for age and sex, calculated using the World
227 Health Organization Anthro Survey Analysers, and complete covariate data. Covariate and
228 outcome data collected at the stool sample collection clinic visit include BMI, age, and antibiotic
229 use in the past six months (yes/no). Covariate data collected from survey at study baseline
230 (around 10 years of age) included birth mode (vaginal/c-section), maternal education (high
231 school or less versus more than high school), and number of days the girl was breastfed as an
232 infant.
233 Data for this project was obtained from the publicly available data in the Human Health
234 Exposure Analysis Resource (HHEAR) Data Repository, which has been approved under Icahn
235 School of Medicine at Mount Sinai IRB Protocol # 16-00947. HHEAR data use guidelines were
236 followed in this analysis and publication.
237 The microbiome taxonomy was assigned as amplicon sequence variant (ASV)s, as
238 previously described[26]. ASV data was then further processed by removing any ASVs with
239 ambiguous taxonomy, and limiting to ASVs detected in at least 10% of subjects (ASV n=500).
240 The relative abundance of ASVs were calculated for each subject.

241

242 *WQS_{RSRH} Demonstration with Real Data*

243 The WQS_{RSRH} method was applied to these data, with BMI category (normal vs
244 overweight/obese) as the outcome. The WHO BMI for sex- and age- z-score categories were
245 categorized as between -2 to +1 as normal weight, and 2+ as overweight/obese[28]. The ASV
246 relative abundances were scored into 3 groups such that 0 abundance was maintained at 0, and
247 the remaining abundances were split as less than the median (1) or greater than or equal to the
248 median (2). The WQS microbiome mixture was analyzed at the ASV level of taxonomy, thus
249 the weights estimated in relation to the BMI category were per ASV. Before implementing the
250 WQS_{RSRH}, WQS_{RS} analysis, adjusted for covariates, without directional constraints was run to
251 determine the directionality of the association between the microbiome mixture and BMI, and
252 then run again with directional constraints to confirm the direction of the association. There were
253 2000 random subsets with 22 ASVs randomly selected to contribute to each of the random
254 subsets. The WQS_{RSRH} analysis was run with 30 repeated holdouts with the same parameters
255 (2000 random subsets with 22 ASVs per subset) and adjusted for covariates. All WQS analyses
256 were trained on 40% of the subjects and validated on the remaining 60%. ASV weights were
257 then summed by taxonomy into genus-level weights, calculated as the sum of all ASVs within
258 the genus. A genus-level threshold was calculated as 1/c, c being the number of genera found in
259 the microbiome mixture. Weights above the 1/c threshold indicate that the genus was more
260 impactful on the outcome (BMI) than under the assumption that all genera were equally
261 weighted, such that all genera had the same impact on BMI.

262 Because the WQS_{RSRH} selects to train and validate on 40% and 60% of the subjects
263 respectively, the random selection of categorical variables (outcome and covariates) in this split

can select a subset that contains all of the same category (say 0 or 1) of one or more variables. In this case, the analysis will not run. To avoid this issue, we partitioned the data such that the training and validation splits across the repeated holdouts ensured the outcome in each analysis maintained variability by containing subjects with each categorical level.

RESULTS

OTU Distribution

Table 1 shows a description of the 20 OTUs that were assigned an association with the test variable. The percentage of the 210 participants that had 0 abundance for each of the 20 OTUs ranged between 35.2% and 88.1%, with the *Staphylococcus* OTU having the most non-zero abundance. The OTU with the highest maximum relative abundance was the *Dorea* genus, with a relative abundance of 19.75% for one participant.

WQS_{RSRH} Results

WQS_{RSRH} regression was conducted with an average of 13% positive in the test variable, and was adjusted for sex. Each model in the 30 repeated holdout sets used 1000 randomly selected sets of size 30 OTUs. The beta coefficient estimates in the 30 repeated holdout datasets were all positively associated with the test variable (Figure 2). In comparison, the WQS_{RSRH} index was not significantly associated with a random control variable in the same dataset (Figure 2). This test of association indicates that there is an association between the microbiome as a whole and the simulated test variable.

The WQS weights indicate the importance of each individual OTU on the association between the simulated variable and the microbiome. Here, the maximum average weight across

287 the repeated holdouts is 0.0107, roughly 10 times the size of the average weight, while the lowest
288 quartile weight was 0.00036, roughly 1/3 of the average weight.
289
290 *WQS_{RSRH} Sensitivity and Specificity*
291 A range of cutoff threshold values were evaluated for identifying OTUs associated with
292 the probability of observing the binary outcome variable. Sensitivity (the proportion correctly
293 identified with weights above the cutoff) and specificity (the proportion correctly not identified
294 with weights less than the cutoff) were evaluated for each cutoff (Supplemental Fig 1). The equi-
295 weighted cutoff is 1/868=0.00115. The specificity is improved from the equi-weighted cutoff
296 with a value of 0.00131 where both sensitivity and specificity are roughly 73%. Using the equi-
297 weighted cutoff, average sensitivity is 75%, average specificity is 70%. The two OTUs modeled
298 with a 'strong' association had average sensitivity of 87%; the 8 OTUs with a 'medium'
299 association had an average sensitivity of 90%; and on average 61% of the 10 weak components
300 were identified correctly (Table 2).
301
302 *WQS_{RSRH} Signal Functions*
303 We next evaluated potential differences in sensitivity and specificity using different
304 signal functions; i.e., (i) the absolute value of the t statistic corresponding to the beta coefficient
305 for WQS; (ii) the square of the t statistic; (iii) exp(t). In the analysis of both the sensitivity and
306 specificity estimates across the signal functions and cutpoints in ANOVA, the cross-product term
307 was not significant, indicating an adequate fit for the main-effects ANOVA model. In reduced
308 main-effect models, as anticipated, there was a significant improvement in specificity with more
309 severe weighting: i.e., in increasing order of abs(t), t^2, exp(t) ($p<0.001$; Supplemental Fig 2A).

310 However, there was no difference in sensitivity with changes in the signal function (p=0.597;
311 Supplemental Fig 2B).
312
313 *Diversity Comparison*
314 The average Shannon diversity (α-diversity) score was 4.14, ranging from 1.58-5.02. In a
315 linear regression with Shannon diversity as the outcome, the test variable was associated with
316 0.14 increased score (p=0.20), adjusted for sex (Male β= -0.06, p=0.41). The same regression
317 was performed with the random variable as the primary predictor, and found no association
318 between the random variable and Shannon diversity (β= -0.03, p=0.67).
319 β-Diversity was calculated with the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index (Figure 3). Using
320 PERMANOVA, we assessed the association between the test variable, adjusted for sex, and β-
321 diversity. We found no association with the test variable (R^2=0.005, p=0.35) or sex (R^2=0.005,
322 p=0.35). We also found no association in the model with the control variable (R^2=0.004, p=0.71)
323 and sex (R^2=0.005, p=0.47). In sensitivity analysis using the Aitchison distance instead of Bray-
324 Curtis, results were similar with no association found with the test variable (R^2=0.005, p=0.38)
325 or the control variable (R^2=0.005, p=0.54).
326
327 *Comparison of OTU Identification*
328 We used SIMPER analysis to identify the OTUs contributing 70% of the variance to the
329 differences in composition (β-diversity) by level of the exposure variable. We ran separate
330 analyses using the test and control variables as the exposure variable, obtaining very similar
331 results. Both analyses identified 1 of 2 OTUs assigned a strong association, 5 of 8 OTUs
332 assigned a medium association, and 2 of 10 OTUs assigned a weak association. Sensitivity and

333 specificity with the test variable as the exposure were 0.4 and 0.75, respectively (Table 3). The
334 model with the control variable as the exposure had an overall sensitivity of 0.4, and specificity
335 of 0.76.

336 As an alternative method of identifying OTUs associated with the response variable, we
337 conducted Random Forest analysis. Each model, one with the test variable as the response, and
338 one with the control variable, provides a score of importance of each predictor variable (OTUs +
339 sex). We converted each score to a proportion out of 1 and set a cutoff of importance at 1/869
340 (the total number of predictors) to calculate sensitivity and specificity. The random forest model
341 of the test variable was able to identify all of the strong (2) and medium (8) associated OTUs,
342 and 3 of 10 weak OTUs, for an overall sensitivity of 0.65 and specificity of 0.7. The model with
343 the control variable as the response identified 7 of the 20 OTUs associated with the simulated
344 variable, and had a specificity of 0.35 and sensitivity of 0.63.

345

346 *Results of Real Data Demonstration*

347 The study population was composed of 159 adolescent Chilean girls around age 15 with
348 complete covariate data. There were 119 girls of normal weight and 40 girls who were
349 overweight/obese. See Table 3 for further demographics and characteristics of the population.

350 Covariate adjusted WQS_{RS} without constraints in the positive or negative direction
351 showed that the microbiome mixture in relation to BMI had a negative association, where 1228
352 out of 2000 of the estimated coefficients linking the WQS_{RS} mixture to BMI were negatively
353 associated. We then ran a single adjusted WQS_{RS} with positive constraints (OR=0.08,
354 95%CI=0.001, 12.3), and a single adjusted WQS_{RS} with negative constraints (OR=0.11,
355 95%CI=0.002, 6.79) to confirm the negative direction before running the WQS_{RSRH}. Although

356 insignificant in both the negatively and positively constratined directions, the direction of the
357 estimated odds ratios from both models indicated an overall negative association between the
358 microbiome mixture and BMI group. The WQS_{RSRH} analysis was then performed with
359 constraints in the negative direction. The WQS_{RSRH} analysis (Table 4) showed that the
360 microbiome mixture had a negative association with BMI such that, for each unit increase in the
361 WQS microbiome mixture, there was a 98% decrease in the odds of being overweight/obese
362 versus normal weight (OR=0.03, 95%CI: (0.00, 2.09). Of the 30 repeated holdout iterations, 28
363 (93%) had WQS estimates in the negative direction. This indicates that, as the abundance and/or
364 the potency of the bacteria (with non-negligible weights) increase, the odds of being
365 overweight/obese seems to decrease.

366 The genus-level threshold that informs which taxa have a greater impact than taxa
367 assumed to be equally weighted can be found in Figure 4. Of 48 genera within the mixture, 7
368 were above the weight threshold, indicating that these genera had a greater contribution than all
369 other genera to the negative association between the microbiome mixture and the odds of being
370 overweight/obese in this population. These genera included*Bacteroides, Prevotella,*
371 *Colstridium, Ruminococcus*, and unidentified genera from the Firmicute, Actinobacter, and
372 Bacteroidetes phyla.

373

374 DISCUSSION

375 This simulation study demonstrated the novel use of the WQS analysis framework in
376 microbiome data analysis. The WQS_{RSRH} model was able to detect a significant association in the
377 correct direction between the test variable and the microbiome, in a dataset of 210 microbiome
378 samples. With a WQS equi-weighted cut-point (1/868), average sensitivity and specificity across

379 30 random holdout models were 75% and 70%, respectively. In this simulation, we also
380 demonstrated that the signal function based on the exp(t) improved specificity but was not
381 different from less severe signal functions in assessing sensitivity.This method has potential for
382 broad applications within microbiome research. WQS_{RSRH} can be used to assess associations
383 between exposures of interest and the microbiome, as well as associations between the
384 microbiome and health outcomes. Compared to standard methods of microbiome analysis,
385 WQS_{RSRH} performed similarly or better than all other tested methods at identifying an overall
386 association in the correct direction, and in sensitivity and specificity at correctly identifying the
387 20 OTUs with an association to the test variable. In further demonstration of the method with
388 real data, the method was adjustable to accommodate the different composition of the dataset.
389 Furthermore, the WQS_{RSRH} model found a negative association between the gut microbiome and
390 BMI, and identified important bacterial taxa consistent with previously published studies.
391 Our simulated variable was associated with the abundance of several OTUs across all
392 participants. The abundance of those 20 OTUs contribute to the calculation of α-diversity,
393 however, because α-diversity evaluates the association of single sample composition, and
394 WQS_{RSRH} evaluates the OTU combination association across the population, it is not surprising
395 that WQS_{RSRH} was able to detect an association with the test variable while α-diversity analysis
396 was not.
397 Alternatively, β-diversity directly compares composition of each sample to all others.
398 There are many different methods to calculate similarity and dissimilarity distance for β-diversity
399 analysis. In this analysis we saw similar null results using both the Bray-Curtis and Aitchison
400 distances. If the OTUs that we used to simulate an association are not major contributors to the
401 overall composition of samples, PERMANOVA would not find significant variance by the test

402 variable. Moreover, if the 20 OTUs that were selected for association, were overwhelmed or
403 drowned out by the richness and abundance of the other OTUs in each sample being compared,
404 PERMANOVA would not detect a significant amount of variance associated with the test
405 variable. Likewise, SIMPER identifies which OTUs contributed the most to the variance
406 detected between levels of exposure, so again if the OTUs with a simulated association are not
407 major contributors to the composition of many of the samples, they would likely not contribute
408 much variance. It's noteworthy that SIMPER detected the same OTUs of the 20 simulated
409 associations for both the test and control variables. It indicates that SIMPER is really constructed
410 to identify the OTUs contributing most to the composition overall, those that are most abundant,
411 and not necessarily the OTUs most associated with an exposure.

412 WQS_{RSRH} in contrast does not compare samples directly to each other, it evaluates the
413 combination of all the OTUs across all samples, and weights the association of each OTU within
414 the combination. This allows for identification of important OTUs even when their relative
415 contribution to the composition of an individual sample may be small. It also allows for the
416 identification of important OTUs across samples with very different composition. For instance,
417 in observational studies, microbial composition of samples from different individuals can be
418 difficult to compare to each other because there may be limited overlap in OTU composition,
419 thus PERMANOVA and SIMPER analysis of β-diversity can fail to identify important
420 associations. But using WQS_{RSRH}, OTUs are evaluated in combination across all samples, so 2
421 samples with completely different composition can both contribute heavily weighted OTUs to
422 the combination, i.e. associated OTUs can be identified even when they are only in some of the
423 study samples. WQS evaluates the association of the combination of OTUs, and indicates which
424 are the most associated with exposure, without having to do direct sample comparisons, or

relying only on the most abundant OTUs. The signal function in the weighted average across the random subsets further enhances the impact of random sets with important OTUs.

The Random Forest analysis performed similarly to WQS_{RSRH} in sensitivity and specificity when using the simulated variable as the response. The test model also performed much better than the control model, indicating that it is better suited than methods like SIMPER to pick out the most associated OTUs. It is worth noting that when creating the simulated variable, all OTUs that were not assigned an association were assumed to have an association of 0. However, it is likely that some of those OTUs were correlated with some of the 20 OTUs that were assigned an association. These correlations likely account for some of the variation we see in sensitivity and specificity calculations across WQS_{RSRH}, Random Forest, and SIMPER.

While Random Forest performed well in this application, there are some potential advantages of using WQS_{RSRH} instead. WQS_{RSRH} simulatniously identifies the most important OTUs and estimates an overall mixture effect (or association in this case), instead of just identifying the importance of OTUs as the Random Forest does. In a situation like the one demonstrated in this simulation analysis, where there is an underlying association that is not detected by α and β-diversity, WQS_{RSRH} provides an additional measurement of association with the overall microbial composition that Random Forest does not. Additionally, incorporation and interpretation of covariates is simpler in WQS_{RSRH} models, as they are modeled as they would be in traditional regression methods instead of being included as a potential predictor along with the OTUs in a Random Forest model.

In the demonstration with data from GOCS, the WQS_{RSRH} method is adaptable to different datasets, and perfomed well in identifying bacteria related to high BMI. We were able to adjust the parameters of the model in several ways to accommodate the different datasets. We

448 set the ranking mechanism to split the ASV abundance into three levels rather than four as shown
449 in the simulation analysis. This adjustment was made to accommodate the smaller sample size
450 and fewer microbiome mixture components (ASVs) in the GOCS dataset. The ranking levels can
451 be adjusted to any number as appropriate for the dataset in use. Moreover, if the ranking is split
452 once at zero, the microbiome mixture can be analyzed with presence/absence data rather than
453 abudance. We also adjusted the number and size of the random subsets used to calculate the
454 weighted index. The size of the random subsets should correspond to the number of observations
455 in the dataset. The number of random subsets used is relatively arbitrary, but the larger the
456 number of subsets, the more robust the estimate. We were also able to specify the data subsets to
457 use in each repeated holdout iteration to ensure the variability of the categorical outcome in each
458 subset. Although the WQS_{RSRH} estimate was not statistically significantly associated with BMI
459 in this cohort, evidence of the trend in the negative direction was strengthened by 93% of the
460 repeated holdout iterations producing a negative estimate. Furthermore, the bacterial taxa
461 identified as heavily weighted within the negative association were consistent with bacterial
462 genera negatively associated with obesity in other studies. Although different species within the
463 same genera may associate differently with obesity[29], several other studies have found a negative
464 association between obesity and *Bacteroides*[30], *Ruminococcus*[31], and *Clostridium*[32] genera.
465 There are many potential advantages of using WQS_{RSRH} for microbiome analysis,
466 however, we are not suggesting that results from WQS_{RSRH} are statistically significantly better
467 than other methods that were compared. WQS_{RSRH} works with both continuous and categorical
468 variables, and allows for the adjustment of covariates in an interpretable fashion. It accounts for
469 the correlated nature of the taxa within the microbiome, and gives an overall effect estimate and
470 the weight of importance when all taxa in the index are considered together. WQS_{RSRH} allows for

471 analysis of associations in positive and negative directions separately, and allows flexibility in
472 choosing the signal function in the weighting step. It accommodates samples from populations
473 with widely varied microbial composition, identifying associations with OTUs present in a
474 relatively small proportion of the population. WQS_{RSRH} also gives robust estimates over many
475 repitions of the analysis. WQS_{RSRH} could be used in a broad range of health research, as well as
476 in a drug discovery framework. It could identify groups of bacteria that are associated together
477 with an outcome of interest, which could be targeted together in developing probiotics. When the
478 analyst is interested in determining a small subset of OTUs associated with the outcome, as in a
479 drug discovery framework, the bottom 90-95% of the weights can be set to zero to test for
480 significance in the top 5-10%. This may lead to better identification of bacteria to include in
481 probiotics that will be successful within the gut microbiome ecosystem.

482 While this demonstration of the application of WQS to microbiome data establishes a
483 novel analytical method with potential for broad use, it does have some limitations. The first is
484 that, while the overall WQS_{RSRH} estimate identifies the direction of association between the
485 variable of interest and the abundance of taxa within the microbiome, it is not directly
486 translatable to a value measure (i.e. a measureable unit of some health outcome). However, the
487 current standard microbiome analyses using α-diversity, β-diversity, and principal components
488 analysis suffer from a similar limitation. Another limiting consideration is that the sensitivity and
489 specificity of this WQS_{RSRH} method application depends on the number of taxa in the data set,
490 and the cutoff point chosen to identify the taxa of most importance. Of course, in an analysis of
491 microbiome data with a real variable with unknown association, we would not know the truth to
492 determine a good cutoff for both sensitivity and specificity. As demonstrated with the GOCS
493 data, the equiweighted cutpoint can be used as a default with unkown sensitivity and specificity.

But relevant cut points could be determined by investigating the significance of the index across repeated holdout data sets. Lastly, in calculating the α and β-diversity for comparison to WQS_{RSRH}, we used the same data set, which was limited to OTUs detected in at least 10% of samples, and converted to relative abundance. These processing steps affected the diversity calculations that rely on singletons. While this allows us to do a direct comparison with the WQS_{RSRH} method, these calculated values are not generalizable outside this study.

This simulation study is the first step in exploring the use of WQS methods on the analysis of microbiome data. We plan to apply WQS methods to other forms of microbiome data beyond 16s rRNA amplicon sequencing, including metagenomic sequence data. Further development of the general WQS method is still underway, including the use of stratification, and Bayesian statistical applications, thus as those methods continue to develop, we will test their application on microbiome data.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated the application of WQS_{RSRH} to microbiome sequencing abundance data. In our analysis, the WQS_{RSRH} method was able to detect a significant association between the test variable and the overall abundance of the microbiome in the correct direction, and identified the assigned associated OTUs with acceptable levels of sensitivity and specificity. In further demonstration with real data, the model identified a direction of association with heavily weighted taxa consistent with other studies of BMI and the gut microbiome. This method has potential for broad application within microbiome research, and we plan to continue to refine and apply WQS methods to different analyses of microbiome data.

REFERENCES

517 1. Verdam, F. J. *et al.* Human intestinal microbiota composition is associated with local and
518 systemic inflammation in obesity. *Obes. Silver Spring Md* **21**, E607-615 (2013).
519 2. Wei, Y. *et al.* Alterations of gut microbiome in autoimmune hepatitis. *Gut* **69**, 569–577
520 (2020).
521 3. Hakim, H. *et al.* Gut Microbiome Composition Predicts Infection Risk During
522 Chemotherapy in Children With Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. *Clin. Infect. Dis. Off. Publ.*
523 *Infect. Dis. Soc. Am.* **67**, 541–548 (2018).
524 4. Aarts, E. *et al.* Gut microbiome in ADHD and its relation to neural reward anticipation. *PloS*
525 *One* **12**, e0183509 (2017).
526 5. Simpson, E. H. Measurement of Diversity. *Nature* **163**, 688–688 (1949).
527 6. Shannon, C. E. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **27**, 379–423
528 (1948).
529 7. Gotelli, N. J. & Colwell, R. K. Estimating species richness. *Biol. Divers. Front. Meas.*
530 *Assess.* **12**, 39–54 (2011).
531 8. Jaccard, P. The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. 1. *New Phytol.* **11**, 37–50 (1912).
532 9. Bray, J. R. & Curtis, J. T. An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern
533 Wisconsin. *Ecol. Monogr.* **27**, 325–349 (1957).
534 10. Lozupone, C., Lladser, M. E., Knights, D., Stombaugh, J. & Knight, R. UniFrac: an effective
535 distance metric for microbial community comparison. *ISME J.* **5**, 169–172 (2011).
536 11. Moreno-Indias, I. *et al.* Statistical and Machine Learning Techniques in Human Microbiome
537 Studies: Contemporary Challenges and Solutions. *Front. Microbiol.* **12**, 635781 (2021).

538 12. Topçuoğlu, B. D., Lesniak, N. A., Ruffin, M. T., Wiens, J. & Schloss, P. D. A Framework
539 for Effective Application of Machine Learning to Microbiome-Based Classification
540 Problems. *mBio* **11**, e00434-20 (2020).
541 13. Love, M. I., Huber, W. & Anders, S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion
542 for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 550 (2014).
543 14. Costea, P. I. *et al.* Enterotypes in the landscape of gut microbial community composition.
544 *Nat. Microbiol.* **3**, 8–16 (2018).
545 15. Carrico, C., Gennings, C., Wheeler, D. C. & Factor-Litvak, P. Characterization of Weighted
546 Quantile Sum Regression for Highly Correlated Data in a Risk Analysis Setting. *J. Agric.*
547 *Biol. Environ. Stat.* **20**, 100–120 (2015).
548 16. Curtin, P., Kellogg, J., Cech, N. & Gennings, C. A random subset implementation of
549 weighted quantile sum (WQSRS) regression for analysis of high-dimensional mixtures.
550 *Commun. Stat. - Simul. Comput.* **0**, 1–16 (2019).
551 17. Tanner, E. M., Bornehag, C.-G. & Gennings, C. Repeated holdout validation for weighted
552 quantile sum regression. *MethodsX* **6**, 2855–2860 (2019).
553 18. Methé, B. A. *et al.* A framework for human microbiome research. *Nature* **486**, 215–221
554 (2012).
555 19. Human Microbiome Project Consortium. Structure, function and diversity of the healthy
556 human microbiome. *Nature* **486**, 207–214 (2012).
557 20. Turnbaugh, P. J. *et al.* The Human Microbiome Project. *Nature* **449**, 804–810 (2007).
558 21. Caporaso, J. G. *et al.* QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing
559 data. *Nat. Methods* **7**, 335–336 (2010).

560 22. Schiffer, L. *et al.* HMP16SData: Efficient Access to the Human Microbiome Project
561 Through Bioconductor. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **188**, 1023–1026 (2019).
562 23. Oksanen, J. *et al. vegan: Community Ecology Package*. (2019).
563 24. Aitchison, J. The Statistical Analysis of Compositional Data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B*
564 *Methodol.* **44**, 139–160 (1982).
565 25. Cutler, F. original by L. B. and A. & Wiener, R. port by A. L. and M. *randomForest:*
566 *Breiman and Cutler's Random Forests for Classification and Regression*. (2018).
567 26. Yoon, L. S. *et al.* The Association Between Breast Density and Gut Microbiota Composition
568 at 2 Years Post-Menarche: A Cross-Sectional Study of Adolescents in Santiago, Chile.
569 *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **11**, 794610 (2021).
570 27. Corvalán, C., Uauy, R., Stein, A. D., Kain, J. & Martorell, R. Effect of growth on
571 cardiometabolic status at 4 y of age. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **90**, 547–555 (2009).
572 28. Growth reference 5-19 years - BMI-for-age (5-19 years). https://www.who.int/tools/growth-
573 reference-data-for-5to19-years/indicators/bmi-for-age.
574 29. Indiani, C. M. D. S. P. *et al.* Childhood Obesity and Firmicutes/Bacteroidetes Ratio in the
575 Gut Microbiota: A Systematic Review. *Child. Obes. Print* **14**, 501–509 (2018).
576 30. Haro, C. *et al.* Intestinal Microbiota Is Influenced by Gender and Body Mass Index. *PloS*
577 *One* **11**, e0154090 (2016).
578 31. Schwiertz, A. *et al.* Microbiota and SCFA in Lean and Overweight Healthy Subjects.
579 *Obesity* **18**, 190–195 (2010).
580 32. Tims, S. *et al.* Microbiota conservation and BMI signatures in adult monozygotic twins.
581 *ISME J.* **7**, 707–717 (2013).

582 33. Nolan-Kenney, R. *et al.* The Association Between Smoking and Gut Microbiome in
583 Bangladesh. *Nicotine Tob. Res.* **22**, 1339–1346 (2020).
584 34. Ferrer, M. *et al.* Microbiota from the distal guts of lean and obese adolescents exhibit partial
585 functional redundancy besides clear differences in community structure. *Environ. Microbiol.*
586 **15**, 211–226 (2013).
587 35. Levin, A. M. *et al.* Joint effects of pregnancy, sociocultural, and environmental factors on
588 early life gut microbiome structure and diversity. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 31775 (2016).
589 36. Bervoets, L. *et al.* Differences in gut microbiota composition between obese and lean
590 children: a cross-sectional study. *Gut Pathog.* **5**, 10 (2013).
591 37. Collado, M. C., Derrien, M., Isolauri, E., de Vos, W. M. & Salminen, S. Intestinal Integrity
592 and Akkermansia muciniphila, a Mucin-Degrading Member of the Intestinal Microbiota
593 Present in Infants, Adults, and the Elderly. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **73**, 7767–7770 (2007).
594 38. McLean, C., Jun, S. & Kozyrskyj, A. Impact of maternal smoking on the infant gut
595 microbiota and its association with child overweight: a scoping review. *World J. Pediatr.* **15**,
596 341–349 (2019).
597 39. Tun, H. Exposure to tobacco smoke in prenatal and early postnatal life alters infant gut
598 microbiota and increases risk of childhood overweight. *J Dev Orig. Health Dis* **8**, (2017).
599 40. Furet, J.-P. *et al.* Differential Adaptation of Human Gut Microbiota to Bariatric Surgery–
600 Induced Weight Loss. *Diabetes* **59**, 3049–3057 (2010).
601 41. Gosalbes, M. J. *et al.* Meconium microbiota types dominated by lactic acid or enteric
602 bacteria are differentially associated with maternal eczema and respiratory problems in
603 infants. *Clin. Exp. Allergy J. Br. Soc. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **43**, 198–211 (2013).
604

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors would like to thank all involved with Human Microbiome Project, the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study, and the Human Health Exposure Analysis Resource for the use of their data. S.E. was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (T32 HD049311), and the National Institue of Environmental Health Sciences (K99 ES032884). M.B. and C.G. were supported by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences through the Mount Sinai Transdisciplinary Center on Early Environmental Exposures Biostatistics and Bioinformatics Facility Core (P30ES023515), and the HHEAR Statistical Services and Analysis Resource Core (U2CES026555).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SE contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, data curation, project administration, and writing – original draft preparation. MB contributed to the methodology, data curation, formal analysis, and writing – review and editing. PC and SR contributed to the formal analysis, conceptualization, and writing – review and editing. CG contributed to conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, visualization, supervision, and writing – review and editing.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data come from The Human Microbiome Project I, the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study, and the Human Health Exposure Analysis Resource, and are publicly available at

https://www.hmpdacc.org/hmp/, and DOIs doi.org\\ 10.36043/1977_480 and doi.org\\ 10.36043/1977_490. Code used in this analysis is available at github.com/ShoshannahE/WQS-Microbiome (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6599722).

ETHICAL APPROVAL

This study is exempt from review by the Mount Sinai Institutional Review Board as the data are de-identified and publicly available.

635 FIGURES



636 **Figure 1**: **Study Schematic.** A simplified flow-chart of the study procedures. Abbreviations:
637 Amplicon Sequence Variant (ASV); Body Mass Index (BMI); Human Health Exposure Analysis
638 Resource (HHEAR); Human Microbiome Project (HMP); Operational Taxonomic Unit (OTU);
639 Permutational Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA); Quantitative Insights Into Microbial
640 Ecology (QIIME); Similarity Percentage (SIMPER); Weighted Quantile Sum Regression with
641 Random Subsets (WQS_{RS}); Weighted Quantile Sum Regression with Random Subsets and
642 Repeated Holdouts (WQS_{RSRH}).



Figure 2: **Simulated Variable Associations with the Human Gut Microbiome.** Box plots show the beta coefficients estimated as the association between the human gut microbiome and the simulated test and control variables, using weighted quantile sum regression with random subsets and 30 repeated holdouts. Associations with error bars that do not cross 0 are considered statistically significant. Data come from the Human Microbiome Project I with simulated test and control variables. Abbreviations: Weighted Quantile Sum Regression (WQS).



Figure 3: Human Gut Microbiome Beta Diversity by Level of the Simulated Variables. Bray-Curtis dissimilarity distance (beta diversity) shown using multidimentional scaling (MDS) ordination plots of (a) the test variable, and (b) the control variable. Data points represent individual observations. Data points closer together represent gut microbiome composition that is more similar, while data points farther apart represent gut microbiome composition that is more different. Data come from the Human Microbiome Project I with simulated test and control variables.



Figure 4: Bacterial Genera Negatively Associated with Obesity. Data points indicate the sum of weights in association with BMI level for each of the 30 repeated houdout analyses (from weighted quantile sum regression with random subsets and 30 repeated holdouts) for amplicon sequence variants (ASVs), pooled by genus and sorted by phylum. Only genera with pooled weights above the equiweighted threshold are shown, and are considered important within the gut microbiome mixture. Box plots show 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of the sum of weights within genera. Closed diamonds show the sum of the mean weights within each genus. Data come from the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study.

669 TABLES

Table 1. Description of the 20 operational taxonomic units (OTUs) that were assigned an association with the simulated binary (test) variable. In the weighted quantile sum regression, relative abundance of each OTU within the gut microbiome from each participant was ranked as 0 if relative abundance was 0, and then by tertiles above 0 for ranks 1-3. Table columns represent the taxonomy, sample size, row percent of observations at each rank level, median and maximum of non-zero relative abundance, and level of assigned association with the test variable (β=8, 4, 2 for strong, medium, and weak, respectively) for the 20 OTUs assigned an association.

Phylum	Family	Genus	N	Rank 0 %	Rank 1 %	Rank 2 %	Rank 3 %	Median of non-zero values[a]	Maximum[a]	Assigned Association
Actinobacteria	Micrococcaceae	*Rothia*[33]	210	81.4	6.2	6.2	6.2	0.12	8.33	Medium
	Coriobacteriaceae	*Atopobium*[33]	210	82.9	5.7	5.7	5.7	0.03	0.94	Weak
		unclassified[33]	210	83.3	5.7	5.2	5.7	0.05	1.65	Medium
Bacteroidetes	Bacteroidaceae	*Bacteroides*[34]	210	82.4	5.7	6.2	5.7	0.03	0.75	Strong
	Rikenellaceae	*Alistipes*[1]	210	87.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	0.37	16.06	Medium
Firmicutes	Staphylococcaceae	*Staphylococcus*[35]	210	35.2	21.4	21.9	21.4	0.51	4.71	Weak
	Lactobacillaceae	*Lactobacillus*[36,37]	210	85.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.03	0.88	Weak
	Eubacteriaceae	*Eubacterium*[32,34]	210	63.8	11.9	12.4	11.9	0.24	3.79	Medium
	Lachnospiraceae	*Coprococcus*[38,39]	210	86.7	4.3	4.8	4.3	0.05	2.03	Weak
		Dorea[38,39]	210	58.1	13.8	14.3	13.8	0.81	19.75	Medium
		Roseburia[1,32]	210	57.6	14.3	13.8	14.3	0.19	3.25	Weak
		unclassified[38,39]	210	58.6	13.8	13.8	13.8	0.28	14.60	Strong
	Ruminococcaceae	*Faecalibacterium*[1,40]	210	61.9	12.9	12.4	12.9	0.22	4.90	Medium
		unclassified[35]	210	85.2	4.8	5.2	4.8	0.07	2.80	Weak
	Erysipelotrichaceae	*Coprobacillus*[33]	210	81.0	6.2	6.7	6.2	0.05	1.24	Medium
		Holdemania[33]	210	87.6	4.3	3.8	4.3	0.05	1.97	Weak
		Solobacterium[33]	210	86.2	4.8	4.3	4.8	0.02	0.83	Weak
		Turicibacter[33]	210	84.8	5.2	4.8	5.2	0.04	1.24	Medium
Proteobacteria	Enterobacteriaceae	*Serratia*[41]	210	80.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	0.03	0.84	Weak
Verrucomicrobia	Verrucomicrobiaceae	*Akkermansia*[35]	210	88.1	3.8	4.3	3.8	0.03	1.65	Weak

a = shown in percent relative abundance

670

Table 2: Sensitivity and specificity in identifying the 20 associated operational taxonomic units (OTUs) for weighted quantile sum regression with random subsets and repeated holdouts (WQS_{RSRH}), similarity percentage (SIMPER), and Random Forest models. For WQS_{RSRH} the sensitivity and specificity were averaged across 30 repeated holdout datasets with a cutoff of 0.00115 (= 1/868). For SIMPER, one model was conducted with 999 permutations, and the cutoff of importance was 70% cumulative variance. For Random Forest, one model was conducted with 100 trees, and importance scores were converted to a proportion, with a cutoff of 0.00115.

	Denominator	WQS_{RSRH} Proportion[1]	SIMPER Proportion[1]	Random Forest Proportion[1]
Overall Sensitivity	20	0.75 (0.60-0.90)	0.40 (0.19-0.61)	0.65 (0.44-0.86)
Overall Specificity	848	0.70 (0.54-0.86)	0.75 (0.72-0.78)	0.70 (0.67-0.73)
Sensitivity: Strong	2	0.87	0.50	1.00
Sensitivity: Medium	8	0.90	0.63	1.00
Sensitivity: Weak	10	0.61	0.20	0.30

[1] Confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated as $p \pm 1.96 * \sqrt{pq/n}$, where p is the proportion estimate, q is $1-p$, and n is the number of observations. For the WQS_{RSRH} CI, n = 30 for the number of repeated holdouts averaged in the estimate, and for SIMPER and Random Forest CIs, n = the value from the denominator column. CIs are included for the overall estimates of specificity and sensitivity, but not for the subset sensitivity analyses due to small denominators. CIs are provided to demonstrate the reasonable range of the estimate, not to indicate statistical significance between the methods.

683

684 **Table 3**: Description of the study population from the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study data used in the illustration analysis.

Characteristic	**N**	**Normal Weight**, N = 119[1]	**Overweight/Obese**, N = 40[1]	**P-value**[2]
Age (years)	159	15.4 (0.6)	15.3 (0.6)	0.2
Number of days breastfed as infant	159	89.8 (76.4)	104.4 (87.8)	0.4
Birth mode (vaginal versus c-section)	159			0.2
C-section		31 (26%)	15 (38%)	
Vaginal		88 (74%)	25 (62%)	
Were antibiotics used in the past 6 months (yes vs no)	159	19 (16%)	5 (12%)	0.6
Maternal education	159			0.12
High school or less		94 (79%)	36 (90%)	
More than high school		25 (21%)	4 (10%)	

[1]Mean (SD); n (%) [2]Welch Two Sample t-test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

685

686

687 **Table 4**. Estimates of association with body mass index (BMI), shown as odds ratios from the Weighted Quantile Sum regression
688 with Random Subsets and Repeated Holdouts analysis. The weighted quantile sum (WQS) variable represents the estimate for the
689 association between the gut microbiome mixture and BMI. Odds ratios with confidence intervals (CIs) that do not cross 1.0 are
690 considered statistically significant. Data come from the Growth and Obesity Cohort Study.

Variable	OR (95% CI)
WQS	0.03 (0.00, 2.09)
Maternal Education (More than High School)	0.22 (0.00, 89.77)
Birth Mode (Vaginal)	0.72 (0.34, 1.52)
Age at Stool Sample	0.68 (0.37, 1.25)
Number of Days Breastfed as an Infant	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)
Antibiotic Use in Past 6 Months	0.50 (0.00, 3.08)

691

692