Identification of Receptors for Eating Disorders using Gap Statistic Methods
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ABSTRACT
Eating disorders are an important cause of physical and psychosocial morbidity in adolescent girls and young adult women [1]. Eating disorders (EDs) are classified into three main types, anorexia nervosa (AN), bulimia nervosa (BN), and binge eating disorder. Other rare disorders include, Purging disorder (purgung without binge eating) and Night eating syndrome (excessive night time food consumption), Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder, Rumination Disorder etc [2]. Eating disorders and certain associated with genetic predisposition and traits. There is a clear and possibly substantial genetic contribution to both anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. Factors that contribute EDs include several risk factors including biological, psychological, social and interpersonal factors.

Network analysis—the study of molecular interactions equates with the mathematical field of graph theory, in which the assembly of pair wise connections (edges) between discrete objects (nodes) coalesces to form a network, or graph [3].
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1. INTRODUCTION
Eating disorders are central reason of physical and psycho-social morbidity. Several factors have been identified as being associated with the prevalence and progression of eating disorders in humans. Advancements in molecular and neurobiology revealed the regulatory mechanism of neurotransmitters, neuropeptides, neurohormones etc acting on the hypothalamus and cortical brain regions influencing intake of food materials, mood variations, response to stress and cognition. Few investigations in this field of eating disorders identified significant role of peripheral signals (serotonin, adipokine leptin and ghrelin) in influencing central nervous system (CNS) processes towards eating patterns.

Eating disorders (EDs) are classified into three main types, anorexia nervosa (AN), bulimia nervosa (BN), and binge eating disorder. Other rare disorders include, Purging disorder (purgung without binge eating) and Night eating syndrome (excessive night time food consumption), Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder, Rumination Disorder etc [1]. People with anorexia nervosa may see themselves as overweight, even when they are dangerously underweight. People with bulimia nervosa have recurrent and frequent episodes of eating unusually large amounts of food and feeling a lack of control over these episodes. People with binge-eating disorder lose control over his or her eating [5]. Although AN and BN are very similar, people with anorexia are usually very thin and underweight, but those with bulimia may be an average weight or can be overweight. EDs include extreme sensations, attitudes and behaviors with respect to body weight and food issues including stern sensitive and physical problems which might be life-threatening for either females or males.

1.1 Anorexia Nervosa
In anorexia nervosa, the pursuit of weight loss is successful in that a very low weight is achieved. This loss of weight is primarily the result of a severe and selective restriction of food intake, with foods viewed as fattening being excluded. In most instances there is no true anorexia as such. In some patients, the restriction over food intake is also motivated by other psychological processes, including asceticism, competitiveness.

1.2 Bulimia Nervosa
The main feature that distinguishes bulimia nervosa from anorexia nervosa is that attempts to restrict food intake are punctuated by repeated binges (episodes of eating during which there is an aversive sense of loss of control and an unusually large amount of food is eaten).The amount consumed in these binges varies, but is typically between 4·2 MJ (1000 kcals) and 8·4 MJ(2000 kcals) [6].

1.3 Genetics
Eating disorders and certain associated traits run in families [7]. There seems to be cross-transmission between anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa, and the atypical eating disorders, suggesting a shared familial liability [8].

Figure 1: Representation of temporal movement between eating disorders
There is a clear and possibly substantial genetic contribution to both anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. Molecular genetic studies are being undertaken to identify the underlying loci and genes. Genetic association studies have focused on polymorphisms in serotonin (5-HT)-related genes, because this neurotransmitter system is important in regulation of eating and mood. Particular attention was drawn to the 5-HT2AR (HTR2A) gene after an association was reported between allelic variation in the promoter region (-1438 A→G) and anorexia nervosa [9]. Main risk factors for anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa [10, 11, 12 and 13].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS
2.1 K-Means Algorithm
Non hierarchical procedures do not involve the tree-like construction process. Instead, these methods assign objects into clusters once the number of clusters to be formed is specified. The number of clusters may be either specified in advance or determined as part of the clustering procedure. Non hierarchical methods start from either from (1) an initial partition of items into groups or (2) an initial set of seed points, which will form the nuclei of clusters.

# Gap statistic
# gap statistic for kmeans
set.seed(123)
gap_stat <- clusGap(dfNorm, FUN = kmeans, K.max = 10, B = 50)
fviz_gap_stat(gap_stat)

# gap statistic-PAM
set.seed(123)
gap_stat <- clusGap(dfNorm, FUN = pam, K.max = 10, B = 50)
fviz_gap_stat(gap_stat)

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
3.1 GAP Statistics
The gap statistic which can be applied to any clustering method has been published by R. Tibshirani et al. [14] The gap statistic compares the total within intracluster variation for different values of k with their expected values under null reference distribution of the data, i.e. a distribution with no obvious clustering.

The clus Gap function from the cluster package calculates a goodness of clustering measure, called the “gap” statistic. For each number of clusters k, it compares \( W(k) \) with \( E^*(W(k)) \) where the latter is defined via bootstrapping, i.e. simulating from a reference distribution. The reference dataset is generated using Monte Carlo simulations of the sampling process. That is, for each variable \( (x_i) \) in the data set we compute its range \([\min(x_i), \max(x_j)]\) and generate values for the n points uniformly from the interval \( \min \) to \( \max \).

The gap statistic for a given \( k \) is defined as follows:

\[
\text{Gap}_k(k) = E^*\{\log(W_k)\} - \log(W_k)
\]

Where \( E^* \) denotes the expectation under a sample of size \( n \) from the reference distribution. \( E^* \) is defined via bootstrapping (B) by generating B copies of the reference datasets and, by computing the average \( \log(W^*k) \).

The output of gap statistic run is given below for kmeans.

Clustering Gap statistic ["clusGap"] from call:
clusGap(x = dfNorm, FUNcluster = kmeans, K.max = 10, B = 50)
B=50 simulated reference sets, k = 1..10; spaceH0="scaledPCA"
--> Number of clusters (method 'firstSEmax', SE.factor=1): 1

\begin{align*}
\text{logW} & \quad E.\text{logW} \quad \text{gap} \quad \text{SE.sim} \\
[1,] & 2.227211 \quad 2.646645 \quad 0.4194344 \quad 0.03298790 \\
[2,] & 2.075333 \quad 2.452160 \quad 0.3768280 \quad 0.03285850 \\
[3,] & 1.924599 \quad 2.339005 \quad 0.4144064 \quad 0.03045909 \\
[4,] & 1.816137 \quad 2.249723 \quad 0.4335862 \quad 0.03639677 \\
[5,] & 1.768342 \quad 2.175939 \quad 0.4075974 \quad 0.02913742 \\
[6,] & 1.639813 \quad 2.107224 \quad 0.4674101 \quad 0.02927924 \\
[7,] & 1.569332 \quad 2.046449 \quad 0.4825156 \quad 0.03387348 \\
[8,] & 1.480248 \quad 1.990852 \quad 0.5106043 \quad 0.03122305 \\
[9,] & 1.425718 \quad 1.939939 \quad 0.5142213 \quad 0.03141202 \\
[10,] & 1.325997 \quad 1.885395 \quad 0.5593979 \quad 0.03252470 \\
\end{align*}

Figure 2: Gap statistic method for kmeans clustering suggesting 1 optimal cluster
Clustering Gap statistic ["clusGap"] from call:
clusGap(x = dfNorm, FUNcluster = pam, K.max = 10, B = 50)
B=50 simulated reference sets, k = 1..10; spaceH0="scaledPCA"
--> Number of clusters (method 'firstSEmax', SE.factor=1): 1

logW E.logW gap SE.sim
[1,] 2.227211 2.647116 0.4199047 0.03948642
[2,] 2.081683 2.464945 0.3832618 0.03367742
[3,] 1.958471 2.354725 0.3962545 0.03552521
[4,] 1.826088 2.266835 0.4045793 0.0352521
[5,] 1.743325 2.190883 0.4475588 0.04326315
[6,] 1.662996 2.124162 0.46611653 0.04200321
[7,] 1.587480 2.059163 0.4716837 0.04026820
[8,] 1.499710 2.000077 0.5003668 0.03903657
[9,] 1.434125 1.946412 0.5122870 0.03993641
[10,] 1.358198 1.893584 0.5353859 0.04126343

Figure 3: Gap statistic method for PAM clustering suggesting 1 optimal cluster

Clustering Gap statistic ["clusGap"] from call:
clusGap(x = dfNorm, FUNcluster = hcut, K.max = 10, B = 50)
B=50 simulated reference sets, k = 1..10; spaceH0="scaledPCA"
--> Number of clusters (method 'firstSEmax', SE.factor=1): 1

logW E.logW gap SE.sim
[1,] 2.227211 2.647116 0.4199047 0.03948642
[2,] 2.073187 2.458218 0.3850313 0.03389733
[3,] 1.949309 2.341829 0.3925196 0.03882125
[4,] 1.828577 2.253156 0.4245791 0.03883815
[5,] 1.764041 2.176247 0.475588 0.04326315
[6,] 1.662996 2.124162 0.46611653 0.04200321
[7,] 1.587480 2.059163 0.4716837 0.04026820
[8,] 1.499710 2.000077 0.5003668 0.03903657
[9,] 1.434125 1.946412 0.5122870 0.03993641
[10,] 1.358198 1.893584 0.5353859 0.04126343

Figure 4: Gap statistic method for hierarchical clustering suggesting 1 optimal cluster

Finally from gap statistic, only one cluster solution is suggested. It should be noted that each method displayed different clusters. Table 8 given below compares the methods employed.

Table 1: Comparative data on optimal clusters generated by elbow, silhouette and gap statistic methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of optimal clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elbow</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silhouette</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap statistic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. CONCLUSION

Scientific investigations in the field of eating disorders identified significant role of peripheral signals in influencing central nervous system (CNS) processes towards eating patterns. Eating disorders (EDs) are classified as, anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa and binge eating disorder. For the better clusters, determination of optimal number of clusters was carried out using gap statistic. The optimal number of clusters, k for the 5-HT receptor dataset was found to have 3 cluster solutions proposed by 7 indices. Therefore, initial value of k=3 was used to perform k-means, hierarchical followed by hybrid HK means algorithm on the dataset.
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