

Homework exercise 4

Due date: 22 January 2026 **before class**

1. The effect of population structure on heritability estimation.

Assume that a population is composed of two genetically distinct sub-populations, which almost never not interbreed (say Jews and Arabs). Furthermore assume both sub-populations are exposed to exactly the same environments, and that we are investigating heritability of a trait with a pure, clean architecture: $Y = \mu + G + E$, and G is also additive, so heritability is cleanly defined as

$$H^2 = \sigma_g^2 / \sigma_y^2.$$

Note the addition of μ , the overall (sub)-population mean explicitly to the expression. We assume that the two sub-populations have means μ_1, μ_2 , not necessarily equal. However, we do assume that within each of the two subpopulations H^2 is the same.

- (a) Will heritability be the same, higher or lower in the joint population made of the union of the two populations? You can base your answer mostly on simulations, but a theoretical argument (or at least convincing intuition) is also required.
- (b) Assume we are sampling pairs of twins from the joint population and using the standard estimate we discussed in class $\hat{H}^2 = 2(r_{MZ} - r_{DZ})$. Is this an estimate of the heritability within each sub-population or in the overall population? Explain

2. The effects of case-control sampling in the liability threshold model.

We assume the normal liability threshold model, i.e., $L = G + E$, with $G \sim N(0, \sigma_g^2)$, $E \sim N(0, 1 - \sigma_g^2)$ independent, and $Y = I\{L > t\}$ for $t = \Phi^{-1}(1 - K)$.

We are interested in investigating a balanced “case-control population”, i.e., one where the weight of observations for which $L > t$ is inflated to 0.5. Our first task is to draw random samples from this population (which are case-control samples in the original population), and then investigate the marginal and joint distributions.

We will work with $K = 0.001$, $H^2 = \sigma_g^2 = 0.5$, representative values for human disease.

- (a) Draw a case control sample by drawing a 10^6 sample from the original population (G,E,L,Y sets) and keeping all cases and $K/(1 - K)$ of controls (justify this choice). Also keep a random sample of size 2000 from the original population.
- (b) The code in <http://tau.ac.il/~saharon/StatGen2025/MCMC.r> implements a simple Markov Chain Monte Carlo (Metropolis) approach for sampling from the same case control distribution. Run it to generate a sample of 2000.
- (c) (* Extra credit) Write the proposal distribution and acceptance rule as explicit formulas and explain them. You can also experiment with different formulations for the proposal distribution. For those familiar with the topic, you can try asymmetric ones and Hastings rule, or even better – change the sampling probability and do importance sampling. Investigate the different approaches in terms of the variance of the estimates they generate of various quantities (like $E(L)$) in the case control population.

(d) Compare the two samples in item a. and the case-control samples you drew in a. and b. according to the following criteria:

- Empirical mean of G, L .
- Empirical variance of G, L .
- Empirical heritability.
- Empirical distribution of L (use `plot(density(...))` in R).

Comment on the effects of the case control sampling on these quantities, and try to explain it intuitively.

(e) Calculate analytically the mean of L in the case-control population using the formula that for $X \sim N(0, 1)$ we have

$$E(X|X > t) = \frac{\phi(t)}{1 - \Phi(t)}.$$

(f) (* Extra credit) Do the same for the variance of L using the law of total variation and the appropriate conditional formulas for higher moments.