Lei ZHANG

LIÈGE université Gembloux

**Agro-Bio Tech** 

Ma Y.; DEHARENG F.; Grelet C.; COLINET F.; GENGLER N.; SOYEURT H.

H

Can the calculation of a spectral Global H distance ensure the quality of international based MIR predictions?

Char ?

ICAR, Prague, 17/06/2019-21/06/2019



#### Milk Recording Scheme



#### Milk Analysis



#### Milk recording (About 1 month for each cow)





## What is Mid-infrared spectrum?

Approximately 2,500-25,000nm (4,000-400 cm<sup>-1</sup>)





### **Principle of MIR spectrometry**







#### How can we make a prediction ?





## Can we make a prediction for all spectra ?

, Can we make a prediction from those spectra?



## Can we make a prediction for all spectra ?

Can I make a prediction from those spectra?





**Mahalanobis Distance:** 

$$D_M(\vec{x}) = \sqrt{(\vec{x} - \vec{\mu})^T S^{-1} (\vec{x} - \vec{\mu})}$$

Where:  $\vec{x}$  is PC scores of one spectrum;  $\vec{\mu}$  is the mean of PC scores of spectra in the calibration set; S is covariance matrix between PC scores of the calibration spectra





solobal H which is the standardized Mahalanobis Distance





$$D_M(\vec{x}) = \sqrt{(\vec{x} - \vec{\mu})^T S^{-1} (\vec{x} - \vec{\mu})}$$

**GH:** Global H which is the Standardized Mahalanobis Distance

$$\mathsf{GH} = \frac{DM}{nPCs}$$

Where: DM is the distance calculated from the fomular; nPCs is the number of the principal components from PCA





#### What is the accuracy of prediction of international spectrum? Milk Recording STD MIR<sub>STD</sub> MIR<sub>Cal</sub> GH **Minimum** Moderat Mean SD Maximum **GH** limit GH GH ≤3 1.93 475.00 2.43 0.00 198,394 198,394 198,394 198,394 198,394 198,394 Ν GH records With **GH** 172,547 174,062 159,651 174,825 159,509 159,467 % Percent 19.62 13.03 12.26 19.53 19.60 11.88



#### **Descriptive statistics**

#### Table 1. Descriptive statistics of predicted value

Traits g/dL	<b>Reference value</b>		Predicted value		Predicted value (GH <= 3)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Fat	3.97	0.95	3.99	0.95	3.90	0.86
Protein	3.43	0.40	3.53	0.46	3.52	0.39
MFA	0.86	0.27	1.15	0.36		0.31
PFA	0.07	0.04	0.15	0.05	0.15	0.04
SFA	2.62	0.67	2.64	0.68	2.59	0.62
UFA	0.93	0.31	1.29	0.39	1.25	0.34



The correlation coefficient





## **Squared residual and GH**



**Traits** 



#### **GH limitation decreased RMSE for most traits**



## **Conclusion:**

- GH limitation helps to ensure the quality of the MIR predictions
- It allows avoiding spectral extrapolation
- More work needed to be done to get
  more accurate predictions...





#### **Thanks for your attention!**

Email: <a href="mailto:lei.zhang@doct.uliege.be">lei.zhang@doct.uliege.be</a>



Ma Y.; DEHARENG F.; Grelet C.; COLINET F.; GENGLER N.; SOYEURT H.,& Lei ZHANG

**BBB** 

Ħ

Ħ

H

1 mile

LIÈGE université Gembloux

**Agro-Bio Tech** 

Email: <a href="mailto:lei.zhang@doct.uliege.be">lei.zhang@doct.uliege.be</a>

ICAR, Prague, 17/06/2019-21/06/2019

# Additional information: Why do PCA?

- To decrease the dimensionality of the raw data
- To make it easy for calculating the inverse of the covariance matrix

POINTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### Principal component analysis

PCA helps you interpret your data, but it will not always find the important patterns.

Principal component analysis (PCA) simplifies the complexity in high-dimensional data while retaining trends and patterns. It does this by transforming the data into fewer dimensions, which act as summaries of features. Filgh-dimensional data are very common in biology and arise when multiple features, such as expression of many genes, are measured for each sample. This type of data presents several challenges that PCA mitigates computational expense and an increased error rate due to multiple test correction when testing each feature for association with an outcome. PCA is an unsupervised learning method and is similar to clustering<sup>11</sup>—If inflop atterns without reference to prior knowledge about whether the samples come from different treatment groups or have phenolypic differences. PCA reduces data by geometrically projecting them onto lower

dimensions called principal components (PCs), with the goal of finding the best summary of the data using a limited number of PCs. The first PC is chosen to minimize the total distance between the data and their projection onto the PC (Fig. 1a). By minimizing this distance, we also maximize the variance of the projected points, or <sup>2</sup> (Fig. 1b). The second (and subsecuent) PCs are selected similarly.

Sprin

-



Figure 2 [PCA reduction of nine expression profiles from six to two dimensions. (a) Expression profiles from nine genes (A-1) across six samples (a-f), coded by color on the basis of shape similarity, and the expression variance of each sample. (b) PC1-PC6 of the profiles in a PC1 and PC2 reflect (carby visible trends, and the remaining capture only small floctations. (c) Transformed profiles, expressed as PC scores and e<sup>2</sup> of each component score. (d) The profiles reconstructed using PC1-PC3. (e) The 2D coordinates of each anothe based on the scores of the first two PCs.

+  $y/\sqrt{2}$  (Fig. 1c). These coefficients are stored in a "PCA loading matrix", which can be interpreted as a rotation matrix that rotates data such that the projection with greatest variance goes along the first axis. At first glance, PC1 closely resembles the linear regression line<sup>4</sup> of yversus x or x versus y (Fig. 1c). However, PCA differs from linear ererestion in that PCA minimizes the perendicular distance.

Lever et al., 2017 Nature Method 2017



THIS MONTH

# **Additional information:**



