

How complex is the microarray dataset? A novel data complexity metric for biological high-dimensional microarray data

Zhendong Sha, Li Zhu, Zijun Jiang, Yuanzhu Chen, and Ting Hu

Abstract—Data complexity analysis quantifies the hardness of constructing a predictive model on a given dataset. However, the effectiveness of existing data complexity measures can be challenged by the existence of irrelevant features and feature interactions in biological micro-array data. We propose a novel data complexity measure, *depth*, that leverages an evolutionary-inspired feature selection algorithm to quantify the complexity of micro-array data. By examining feature subsets of varying sizes, the approach offers a novel perspective on data complexity analysis. Unlike traditional metrics, *depth* is robust to irrelevant features and effectively captures complexity stemming from feature interactions. On synthetic micro-array data, *depth* outperforms existing methods in robustness to irrelevant features and identifying complexity from feature interactions. Applied to case-control genotype and gene-expression micro-array datasets, the results reveal that a single feature of gene-expression data can account for over 90% of the performance of multi-feature model, confirming the adequacy of the commonly used differentially expressed gene (DEG) feature selection method for the gene-expression data. Our study also demonstrates that constructing predictive models for genotype data is harder than gene expression data. The results in this paper provide evidence for the use of interpretable machine learning algorithms on microarray data.

Index Terms—Data complexity, feature selection, feature interaction, genetic algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE increasing availability of micro-array datasets has led to the use of machine learning algorithms to unveil disease-associated genetic variables [1], [2]. These datasets are structured in the form of X and y , where X represents the set of input genetic variables that describe the observations, and y represents the corresponding target variable.

While being powerful at exploring disease-associated variables, many machine learning algorithms are hard to understand given their “black-box” nature of internal architectures. It is challenging to balance the trade-off between model interpretability and predictive capability. Micro-array data is often difficult to model using interpretable approaches, owing to the presence of a large number of irrelevant features [3] and feature interactions [4], [5]. Adopting more powerful “black-box”

machine learning models can compromise the interpretability of the prediction results. To address this, it is essential to quantify the complexity of a dataset before constructing a predictive model. This quantitative understanding helps the design of a prediction algorithm that maintains sufficient predictive capability while preserving as much interpretability as possible.

Data complexity metrics are used to quantify the difficulty of constructing predictive models for a given dataset [6], [7]. These metrics offer insights into the complexity of the dataset and facilitate the selection of appropriate machine learning algorithms. Data complexity metrics have been applied in various domains, including meta-learning [8], where they provide learning task representation [9], deep learning, where they are used to analyze the effectiveness of different layers of neural networks in separating classes [10], and automation of deep neural networks [11]. However, the effectiveness of current data complexity metrics on microarray datasets remains to be investigated. Different from conventional data, microarray datasets are known to possess a large number of irrelevant features and exhibit feature interaction. Feature interaction, or epistasis, refers to the phenomenon where the effect of one feature on the outcome is dependent on the value of another feature [12].

A. Existing data complexity measures

Data complexity analysis is an active research field, and existing complexity measures can be classified into several types. Feature-based measures describe the influence of features to separate classes in a classification problem. Maximum Fisher’s discriminant ratio ($f1$) is a measure of overlap between the values of the features in different classes [6]. The directional-vector maximum Fisher’s discriminant ratio ($f1v$) is a complement to $f1$. $f1v$ quantifies the degree of overlapping between different classes by utilizing vector representations that have optimized for the separation of classes [13]. The magnitude of the overlapping region ($f2$) calculates the overlap of the distribution of feature values. The maximum individual feature efficiency ($f3$) captures the maximum efficiency of each feature in separating the classes [6], [14], while collective feature efficiency ($f4$) quantifies how features work together [13].

Linearity measures quantify whether the classes are linearly separable. $l1$ computes the averaged error distance of the misclassified instances to the hyperplane derived from support

Zhendong Sha, Li Zhu, Zijun Jiang, Yuanzhu Chen, and Ting Hu are with the School of Computing, Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada, K7L 2N8. E-mail: {zhendong.sha, 18lz, 19zj6, yuanzhu.chen, ting.hu}@queensu.ca.

Manuscript received [July] XX, 20XX; revised [Month] XX, 20XX. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada, Discovery Grant [RGPIN-2023-03302 to T.H.]. (Corresponding author: Ting Hu.)
Digital Object Identifier no. #####

vector machine (SVM) [6], [15]. $l2$ measures the error rate of an SVM classifier [6], [15], while $l3$ describes the non-linearity of a linear classifier by measuring the classifier’s error rate on synthesized points of the dataset [16]. The synthetic points are obtained by linearly interpolating instances of each class.

Neighborhood measures characterize the presence and density of same or different classes in local neighborhoods. $n1$ creates a minimum spanning tree from the instances in the data and computes the percentage of edges connecting data instances from different classes [6], [17]. $n2$ computes the ratio of the sum of the distances between each example and its closest neighbor from the same class and the sum of the distances between each example and its closest neighbor from different classes [6], [17]. $n3$ is the error rate of a 1-Nearest-Neighbor classifier [6], [17], while $n4$ uses the predictive performance of the NN classifier to describe the complexity of the dataset [6], [18]. $t1$ measures the ratio between the number of hyperspheres needed to cover the dataset and the total number of instances in the dataset [6], and LSC is calculated as the average cardinality between all instances and their nearest instance of different classes [19].

Network-based complexity measures [6] model a dataset as a graph and preserve the similarity between instances for modeling the dataset. The graph represents instances as nodes and edges are selected based on Gower similarity [20]. *density* measures the number of edges divided by the total possible number of edges in a graph. *ClsCoef* measures the density of each node’s neighborhood. For each node, the number of edges between its neighbors is divided by the maximum possible number of edges. The final value of *ClsCoef* is obtained by subtracting the sum of all values divided by the total number of nodes from 1. *Hubs* is obtained by subtracting the averaged hub score of nodes in a graph from 1 [21]. The hub score of node v_i is the principal eigenvector of $A^t A$, where A is the adjacency matrix of a graph.

Dimensionality measures evaluate data sparsity based on the number of samples relative to the data dimensionality. $t2$ divides the number of instances in the dataset by their dimensionality [22]. $t3$ is calculated as the number of components needed for principle component analysis (PCA) to represent 95% of data variability divided by the number of instances [23]. $t4$ is calculated as the number of PCA components divided by the number of features in the original dataset [23].

Class imbalance measures consider the ratio of the numbers of examples between classes. $c1$ captures the imbalance in a dataset by computing the entropy of class proportions [23]. $c2$ is a well-known index computed for measuring class balance [24].

To date, at least three open-source libraries has been published. `DCoL` implements 14 basic complexity metrics in C++ language [13]. `ECoL` implements 22 metrics for classification and 12 metrics for regression task in R [21], [25]. `proplexity` implements an equivalent amount of metrics in Python language [7].

We identify two major limitations of existing complexity measures. First, metrics that rely on machine learning models are not robust to irrelevant features. This may lead to inac-

curate data complexity estimates. Second, there is currently no metric available to directly characterize feature interaction. Although several metrics exist for measuring linearity, but none directly addresses feature interaction. These limitations make it difficult to accurately describe the complexity of high-dimensional micro-array datasets that contain feature interactions [4].

B. Existing feature selection methods

We intend to leverage feature selection method to enable data complexity metrics to account for irrelevant features and feature interactions. Feature selection can extract a subset of relevant features from data to construct predictive models. Existing feature selection approaches can be categorized into three types and have been utilized to identify feature interaction.

The filter approach involves using metrics to rank features based on their correlation with the target label. The top-ranked features are then selected for model construction. In micro-array data analysis, the most commonly used filter approach is differently expressed genes (DEG) [26]. This approach selects features with the highest uni-variable correlation with the target label.

The wrapper approach performs feature selection by using a machine learning model to evaluate the predictive performance of feature subsets. Evolutionary algorithms, such as genetic algorithm (GA), are popular search strategies for wrapper approaches [27]–[31]. Various machine learning algorithms, including linear regression [32], logistic regression [33], Naive Bayes [34]–[36], support vector machines (SVM) [30], [35], [37], and artificial neural networks (ANN) [38]–[40], are used to evaluate the goodness of a feature subset. Different evaluation algorithms can lead feature search algorithms to discover features with different types of association.

The embedded approach performs feature selection while constructing a predictive model. Random forest [41] is a popular learning method with embedded feature selection [42]–[44]. During the construction of the forest, irrelevant features are discarded. Regularization techniques, such as Lasso or Ridge regression [45], can automatically select the most important features by incorporating the loss function to penalize the inclusion of less important features.

Feature selection can also be utilized to identify epistasis. For instance, multifactor dimensionality reduction (MDR) [5] has been used to search for combinations of genetic variables associated with epistasis. Random forest has also been applied to genetic data analysis to identify feature interaction [42]. Evolutionary computation approaches, such as ant colony optimization [46] and differential evolution [47], have been utilized as search strategies to identify epistasis in high-dimensional data [48], [49].

C. The proposed approach

We introduce a novel method named *depth* to evaluate data complexity within biological micro-array datasets. This approach effectively tackles the challenges associated with irrelevant features and feature interaction by investigating the




Fig. 1. Flowchart of the prediction problem complexity quantification procedure. Several cohorts of feature selection runs (based on Figure 2) are executed using varying $\text{size_limit} = \{s^1, \dots, s^n\}$ values. The resulting feature subset's predictive performance is then evaluated using the validation data. Since the data complexity is generated from the depth plot, so we refer to this method as *depth*.

predictive performance of feature subsets with varying size limits (Figure 1). We employ feature selection algorithms (Section II-A) to detect irrelevant features. Additionally, we address data complexity arising from epistasis by performing a non-linear feature selection based on decision tree fitness evaluation (Section II-B). In the subsequent sections, we present the proposed data complexity metrics in Section II-C. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we first apply it to synthetic data (Section III-B), followed by an analysis of real high-dimensional micro-array data (Section III-C and III-D). Finally, we summarize our experimental results and discuss the implications of *depth* in Section IV.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The application of existing data complexity measures to biological micro-array datasets is very challenging due to the high dimensionality and the presence of epistasis. To address these challenges, we propose a novel data complexity measure *depth* based on a feature selection method. This approach is designed with an improved robustness to irrelevant features and feature interactions, as outlined in Figure 1 and Section II-C.

A. Feature selection based on genetic algorithm

Feature selection, which selects a subset of relevant features, seeks to optimize the performance of a predictive model. Identifying the optimal feature subset is a combinatorial optimization problem that can be solved using a genetic algorithm (GA), a heuristic optimization strategy inspired by biological evolution [50]. GA has been demonstrated to be effective in finding near-optimal feature subsets for high-dimensional data.

In GA, a feature subset is represented as a binary vector of length d , where d is the total number of features in the data, and the value of each element of the vector indicates whether a feature is selected (1) or not (0). GA performs feature selection by generating a population of random feature subsets, each of which is evaluated to determine its overall relevancy for predictive model construction. Feature subsets with better performance have an evolutionary advantage and are more likely to be used for subset reproduction. Increasing the number of subsets in GA enhances its search capability but




Fig. 2. Flowchart of the GA algorithm.

requires greater computational resources. The feature subset reproduction process includes:

- 1) Fitness evaluation: Each feature subset is evaluated for fitness using the mean testing area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC-ROC) of five-fold cross-validation based on a machine learning algorithm (explained in Section II-B).
- 2) Selection: The subsets with higher fitness values are selected from the population as parents for the next generation using tournament selection [51].
- 3) Crossover: Each pair of parental subsets exchange their selected features randomly.
- 4) Mutation: Some feature subsets may undergo bit-flip mutation, which either adds or removes a feature.

The GA process (see Figure 2) continues until a specified number of generations are reached, and the fittest feature subset is outputted. The performance of GA depends on several parameters such as population size, tournament selection size, and the probabilities of crossover and mutation. Thus, parameter tuning is necessary to achieve better result.

B. Fitness evaluations

GA evaluates a feature subset based on the prediction performance of a machine learning model that uses the feature subset. The selection of such a machine learning algorithm will result in selecting features that contributing to the prediction

in different ways. For instance, the use of an additive model holds the assumption that the influence of each feature on the target variable is independent of others [52], [53]. This section introduces two fitness evaluations based on different machine learning algorithms.

Logistic regression [54], a linear model often deployed in polygenic risk predictive models [55], aims at discerning the polygenic association between features and the target variable. Thus, the fitness evaluation underpinned by logistic regression prioritizes features demonstrating a high uni-variable association with the target.

In contrast, a decision tree is a non-parametric model capable of capturing non-linear interactions between features [56]. The objective of the decision tree-based fitness evaluation is to exploit the decision tree’s capacity to capture the interactions among features present in a dataset. Unlike logistic regression, fitness evaluation using the decision tree algorithm selects features demonstrating both uni-variable association and non-linear feature interaction.

Based on these two fitness evaluations, *depth* can detect data complexity originating from epistasis. In the following sections, the evaluations based on logistic regression and decision tree algorithms will be referred to as *linear* and *non-linear* evaluations, respectively.

C. Depth plot and prediction problem complexity quantification

The potential of the GA-based feature selection algorithm to discern relevant features depends on the number of features d included in each subset. We utilize a parameter, named *size_limit*, to control the maximum number of features in each subset, which can be expressed as $d \leq \text{size_limit}$. By modulating *size_limit*, the predictive performance of the resulting feature subset can be used to describe the complexity of the data. The correlation between *size_limit* and predictive performance is illustrated in a depth plot, wherein the horizontal axis indicates the *size_limit* values and the vertical axis represents the predictive performances of the feature subsets.

The depth plot is generated from multiple cohorts of feature selection runs with varying *size_limit* values (Figure 1). By gradually increasing the *size_limit* while retaining the population size constant, the change in the predictive performance of feature subsets with different *size_limit* values can be examined. For each *size_limit* value, the GA algorithm is iterated multiple times, and the predictive performances of the resulting feature subsets are summarized within the “depth plot”. The average predictive performance of subsets across various *size_limit* values is delineated by a curve.

The slope of the curve in the depth plot is used to characterize the complexity of the prediction problem for a given dataset. Owing to this reason, we name the proposed approach *depth*. We first identify the *size_limit* value yielding the best averaged predictive performance (100%). Then, the minimum *size_limit* values capable of achieving 90%, 95%, 99%, and 99.5% of the peak performance are determined. Additionally, we identify the elbow point [57] in the

curve where further increasing the *size_limit* does not significantly improve the predictive performance.

To address overfitting, we evaluate the predictive performance of a feature subset using both the observations used for feature selection runs and unseen observations. The dataset is partitioned into three sections: training (60%), testing (20%), and validation (20%). The training and testing folds are employed for feature selection, the testing fold is used to assess the predictive performance of the resulting feature subsets on known data, and the validation fold is used to access the predictive performance on unseen data. To evaluate a feature subset, a predictive algorithm is initially constructed based on the training fold. Following this, its predictive performance is evaluated across all three folds to characterize its predictive performance. The overall complexity quantification procedure is visualized in Figure 1.

D. Dataset preparation

In this study, we aim to assess the efficacy of our proposed methodology across three data types: synthetic data, colorectal cancer genotype data, and gene expression data.

1) *Synthetic datasets*: To evaluate the effectiveness of our method, we utilize six pre-generated datasets provided by the Penn Machine Learning Benchmarks (PMLB) [58], [59]. These datasets, generated using GAMETES [60], a software extensively employed in genetic studies for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. GAMETES simulates genetic data embodying feature interaction models of varying complexities and irrelevant features. Five of these datasets include 20 attributes generated using epistatic models with differing complexities. We also use another dataset containing 1000 attributes that serve as irrelevant features, thereby extending the 20-attributes datasets to configurations with 100 and 1000 attributes (Table S1). The resulting GAMETES datasets will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed method in the context of irrelevant features and epistasis.

2) *Colorectal cancer genotype data*: We will apply our proposed method to the colorectal cancer genotype dataset from transdisciplinary (CORECT) consortium [61]. Genotyping was conducted using a custom Affymetrix genome-wide platform on two physical genotyping chips, with a total of 696 samples (200 colorectal cancer cases and 496 controls) genotyped using the first chip and 656 cases genotyped using the second chip. The data processing procedure consists of three parts: pre-imputation processing, imputation, and post-imputation processing.

We performed quality control using PLINK [61]. The pre-imputation process removed samples with a genotyping call rate less than 95%, sex labeling not consistent with the chromosome, and sample heterozygosity not within three standard deviations from the mean. It also removed SNPs with a minor allele frequency less than 1%. The two cohorts genotyped using different chips are merged and prepared to meet the requirements of the Michigan Imputation Server (MIS) [62] following the guidelines provided by its official tutorial¹. During the imputation step, the Michigan Imputation

¹<https://imputationserver.readthedocs.io/en/latest/prepare-your-data/>

Server use the eagle phasing algorithm [63], the hg19 reference panel, and the option of mixed population to accommodate the multi-racial population structure. The post-imputation process excludes low-quality SNPs based on the imputation R2 of minimac3 ($R2 > 0.3$) [62]. We extract all SNPs of the dataset used for MIS submission based on chromosome position and perform minor allele frequency (> 0.01) and linkage disequilibrium filtering ($r2 = 0.2$). We will also remove first-degree relatives based on IBD. Samples in the second dataset were removed if the PI_HAT value was above 0.5 with any samples in the first dataset.

Finally, a total of 197,497 SNPs and 1137 individuals are selected for subsequent analysis. Of which, 198 cases and 491 healthy controls are from the first dataset and 448 cases are from the second.

3) *GEO datasets*: In addition to synthetic data and genotype data, we extend the application of our proposed method to gene expression data. Specifically, we have chosen 13 gene expression datasets from CuMiDa [64], a repository that offers publicly accessible datasets suitable for machine learning analysis. Our selection criteria for these datasets are that each must contain more than 100 observations and a binary target label (Table S3).

III. RESULTS

In this study, synthetic data is used to demonstrate the superiority of our proposed methodology in dealing with irrelevant features and feature interactions. We also apply our proposed methodology to genotype data and GEO datasets, in order to evaluate the prediction complexity posed by real micro-array datasets.

A. Evaluation of conventional data complexity metrics using synthetic datasets

The effectiveness of existing dataset complexity metrics for high-dimensional datasets remains underexplored. Many current complexity metrics depend on procedures which can be compromised by the existence of irrelevant features and epistasis, thus undermining their efficacy.

In this section, we first employ five synthetic datasets (referred to as G6, G7, G8, G9, and G10 in Table S1), provided by PMLB [58], [59], to conduct complexity analysis. Each synthetic dataset comprises two balanced classes and every observation in the dataset is described using 20 features. The generation of these synthetic datasets is governed by several parameters, such as the degree of non-linear feature interaction, just name a few. These parameters describe the extent of correlation between the epistatic features and the class outcome.

To investigate the impact of irrelevant features, we have also crafted three variations for each synthetic dataset. The first variation focuses on the complexity of the dataset sans irrelevant features (denoted as G1, G2, G3, G4, and G5 in Table S1). The second variation focuses on the scenario wherein the dataset encompasses a greater number of irrelevant features (labeled as G11, G12, G13, G14, and G15 in Table S1). The third variation concentrates on the scenario when the

dataset includes an excessive quantity of irrelevant features (referred to as G16, G17, G18, G19, and G20 in Table S1). Irrelevant features from a synthetic dataset of 1000 features on PMLB are used to create these variations. These variations are labelled "Low", "Median", and "High" in Table S1, and the original synthetic datasets labeled as "Normal".

Our complexity analysis, conducted using the Python library *proplexity* [65], shows that the effectiveness of multiple complexity metrics are impacted by the quantity of irrelevant features (Table S2). The complexity metrics can be encapsulated in a single scalar measure denoted as the *score* in Table S2. A surge in the number of irrelevant features reduces the average *score* from 0.576 (Low) to 0.513 (High). Further, the average values of individual metrics are also affected by the increase of irrelevant features. A substantial decrease of $f1v$ (from 0.995 to 0.131), $f2$ (from 1.0 to 0.0), and a slight decrease of the mean $f4$ (from 1.0 to 0.953) are observed as a result of the increase in irrelevant features. For linearity-based measures, significant decreases are observed for all three metrics when the quantity of irrelevant features is set to High. For neighborhood-based measures, $n1$ decreases from 0.305 (Low) to 0.248 (High), $n4$ decreases from 0.464 (Low) to 0.151 (High), and $t1$ increases from 0.935 (Low) to 1.0 (High). For network-based measures, minor increases of *density* (from 0.855 to 1.0) and *hubs* (from 0.754 to 0.996) are observed. For dimensionality-based measures, significant increases in $t2$ (from 0.002 to 0.625) and $t3$ (from 0.002 to 0.459) and a minor decrease of $t4$ (from 1.0 to 0.734) are observed.

The *score* of the synthetic data that encapsulates 3-way epistasis is significantly lower than the average *score* in the Low configuration. This indicates that an increase in the order of epistasis impacts the complexity metrics of synthetic datasets without irrelevant features (Low). The synthetic dataset with 3-way epistasis possesses lower linearity-based metrics ($l1$: 0.287, $l2$: 0.392, $l3$: 0.401) compared to the average ($l1$: 0.321, $l2$: 0.467, $l3$: 0.474). For neighborhood-based metrics, $n1$ and $n3$ of the 3-way epistasis data are lower than those of the 2-way epistasis data (see Table S2). For network-based metrics, the *density* (0.925) and *hubs* (0.851) of the 3-way epistasis data are higher than the average (*density*: 0.8554, *hubs*: 0.754). However, these differences disappear with the increase of irrelevant features.

In summary, the existence of irrelevant features can impact the complexity measures, underscoring the necessity for complexity metrics that are robust to irrelevant features. Furthermore, in the realm of high-dimensional biological data analysis, the importance of feature interactions has been receiving increased attention [4]. However, existing complexity measures are ineffective in capturing the classification difficulty stemming from higher-order epistasis [66]. Although higher-order epistasis affects some metrics, these effects disappear when uncorrelated features are present (Table S2).

In the following sections, we elaborate on how our proposed method characterizes feature interactions and irrelevant features (Section III-B1). We also evaluate the synthetic datasets using our proposed complexity metrics to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach (Section III-B2).

B. Evaluation of depth using synthetic datasets

1) *The effect of fitness evaluations and size_limit parameter*: Our proposed approach deviates from directly applying machine learning algorithms, like Support Vector Machine (SVM) and 1-Nearest Neighbor (1-NN), to the dataset. Instead, it is built upon a feature selection algorithm that utilizes GA and leverages fitness evaluation based on decision tree algorithm to account for epistasis. This section presents the dataset preparation and parameter configuration for GA, following which, we illustrate the capabilities of different fitness evaluations in capturing epistatic features. The impact of the `size_limit` parameter on the feature selection results is also discussed.

The dataset is segmented into three parts: training (60%), testing (20%), and validation (20%) folds. The GA algorithm is supplied with the training and testing folds, whereas the validation fold is employed to assess the performance of the evolved feature subsets produced by the GA runs. To validate a feature subset, a predictive algorithm equivalent to the one employed in fitness evaluation, is trained using the training fold. The quality of the evolved feature subset is determined by assessing the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC-ROC) of this algorithm on the training, testing, and validation folds. The GA parameters are configured as follows: a mutation rate of 0.2, a crossover rate of 0.8, a tournament size of 6, a population size of 500, and a limit of 50 generations. The use of a lower mutation rate and higher crossover rate is the rule of thumb to optimize the feature selection result. This experiment investigates the effects of fitness measures using different classifiers (i.e., logistic regression and decision tree) and `size_limit` values ranging from 1 to 10. We execute 50 feature selection runs for GAs with diverse `size_limit` configurations.

We present the predictive performance results of all evolved feature subsets using the depth plot as described in Section II-C. Figure 3 shows that for all synthetic datasets with epistatic interactions, the GA runs with decision tree algorithm as the fitness measure can capture the epistatic features as the `size_limit` increases. However, the performance of GA with logistic regression as the fitness measure does not improve with the increase of `size_limit`.

Our results demonstrate that the decision tree fitness evaluation is crucial for GA-based feature selection to capture epistatic features. On the other hand, the logistic regression fitness measure is not effective in identifying feature subsets containing epistatic features, as logistic regression is based on linear regression and cannot recognize feature interactions. Furthermore, we find that increasing the `size_limit` enhances the GA's ability to identify target epistatic features. This phenomenon can be interpreted from two perspectives. First, the `size_limit` value should be greater than the order of the target epistatic features, as incomplete epistatic features do not provide evolutionary advantages during the GA's search process. Second, a further increase in the `size_limit` boost the GA's overall search power, increasing the possibility of capturing epistatic features.

2) *The complexity of synthetic datasets based on size_limit*: The complexity measure, *depth*, leverages the slope of the predictive performance as a function of `size_limit` to quantify the complexity of dataset. This section begins by briefly outlining how to extract the complexity metrics from the depth plot. This is followed by a comparison of the difficulties of synthetic datasets with different orders of epistatic features and epistatic heterogeneity. Epistatic heterogeneity means there are more than one epistatic model in the data. Datasets with higher-order epistatic interaction or more epistatic models (heterogeneity) are considered as more challenging for constructing a predictive algorithm.

The complexity determination procedure proposed in Section II-C aims to identify the smallest size-limit required to achieve a certain degree of maximum performance in a depth plot. This procedure is repeated on training, testing, and validation data. The depth plot derived from the feature selection based on logistic regression is excluded from this section as logistic regression is incapable of capturing epistatic features.

Given the same number of features ($N=20$), identifying 3-way epistasis is evidently more challenging than identifying 2-way epistasis. Table I and II compare the complexity of synthetic datasets containing 3-way epistasis with those containing 2-way epistasis. For all training, testing, and validation predictive performances, the complexity metrics (90%) for 3-way epistasis datasets (training: 4, testing: 4, and validation: 4) are higher than the metrics for 2-way epistasis datasets. We also observe that the heritability parameter of synthetic data influences the resulting validation complexity measure, making the validation predictive performance of dataset G6 smaller than that of G7. Heritability estimates the amount of variation in a particular trait that can be attributed to genetic variables [67]. As for the datasets containing heterogeneous epistatic models, their predictive performances converge when the `size_limit` reaches four, suggesting the minimum `size_limit` to detect two 2-way epistasis is four. The use of the 90% cut-off is not applicable here because the performance gain of the second epistasis model is overlooked by 90% cut-off.

The identification of epistatic features becomes more challenging when more irrelevant features are present, which requires larger `size_limit` values for GA-based feature selection to achieve a stable identification. We observe that the complexity metrics (90%) for the 3-way epistasis dataset configured as Median (training: 5, testing: 6, and validation: 7) are larger than those of the Normal configuration. We also find that the complexity metrics (90%) for the 2-way epistasis dataset (training: 3, testing: 3, and validation: 3) are lower than those of the 3-way dataset. So we consider the proposed complexity metric to be effective in the Median configuration (100 attributes). However, these metrics are not indicative when the number of irrelevant features exceeds the discovery capability of the GA. We observe that the feature selection algorithm suffers from overfitting on the 3-way data configured as High (1000 features), which causes the validation curve in the depth plot to not reflect the complexity of the data.




Fig. 3. The depth plots for synthetic datasets. The `size_limit` ranges from 1 to 10 and the averaged predictive performance on training (blue), testing (green) and validation (red) folds are represented on the y-axis. For each synthetic data, the depth plot based on linear and non-linear evaluation are provided.

Our results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed complexity metrics in the context of epistasis. Determining the threshold for the minimum `size_limit` is crucial for the precision of the resulting complexity metric. Our findings suggest that using a 90% threshold may overlook one of the two heterogeneous epistasis models due to one epistatic model capturing a sufficient amount of association. The precision of the complexity measure should depend on the requirements of the specific application domain. Furthermore, an increased number of irrelevant features can significantly hamper the effectiveness of the GA-based feature selection algorithm due to the exponentially increased search space, resulting in the failure of GA and crippling the efficacy of the proposed

metrics. We attribute this to the search power of GA, which is largely determined by the population size, being overwhelmed by the increasing search space of the data. Therefore, we emphasize that the power of GA should be determined with great care, and successful deployment of the proposed approach depends on allocating sufficient search power to GA.

C. Evaluation of depth using CRC genotype dataset

The genotype data contain individual as well as epistatic feature associations. In addition to the complexity measure based on decision trees, we also provide a complexity measure based on logistic regression. We divide the genotype dataset into training (60%), testing (20%), and validation (20%) sets

TABLE I
COMPLEXITY MEASURES FOR LOWER DIMENTIONAL SYNTHETIC DATA BASED ON NON-LINEAR DEPTH PLOT.

Data	Low					\bar{x}	Normal					\bar{x}
	G01	G02	G03	G04	G05		G06	G07	G08	G09	G10	
Train	90%	2	2	3	4	2.6	2	2	4	3	2	2.6
	95%	2	2	3	4	3	2.8	2	2	4	4	3
	99%	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	3	5	4	4
	99.50%	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	3	5	4	4
	100%	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	6	10	5	4
	elbow	2	2	3	4	2	2.6	2	2	4	4	4
Test	90%	2	2	3	2	2	2.2	2	2	4	2	2
	95%	2	2	3	4	2	2.6	2	2	4	3	2
	99%	2	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	5	4	3
	99.50%	2	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	6	4	3
	100%	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	6	7	5	4
	elbow	2	2	3	2	2	2.2	2	2	1	4	3
Validation	90%	2	2	3	4	2	2.6	2	2	4	4	2
	95%	2	2	3	4	2	2.6	2	2	4	4	2
	99%	2	2	3	4	4	3	2	2	5	4	4
	99.50%	2	2	3	4	4	3	2	2	6	4	4
	100%	2	2	3	4	4	3	2	2	6	5	4
	elbow	2	2	3	4	2	2.6	2	2	1	4	2

TABLE II
COMPLEXITY MEASURES FOR HIGHER DIMENTIONAL SYNTHETIC DATA BASED ON NON-LINEAR DEPTH PLOT.

Data	Median					\bar{x}	High					\bar{x}	
	G11	G12	G13	G14	G15		G16	G17	G18	G19	G20		
Train	90%	3	3	5	4	3	3.6	4	5	4	4	6	4.6
	95%	3	4	7	5	4	4.6	7	7	6	7	7	6.8
	99%	4	4	10	6	4	5.6	9	10	9	9	10	9.4
	99.50%	4	5	10	6	4	5.8	9	10	10	9	10	9.6
	100%	4	6	10	10	4	6.8	9	10	10	9	10	9.6
	elbow	3	4	7	5	4	4.6	5	7	5	4	7	5.6
Test	90%	3	3	6	3	3	3.6	3	4	2	2	5	3.2
	95%	4	4	8	4	4	4.8	5	5	3	4	8	5
	99%	4	4	10	6	4	5.6	9	10	7	8	10	8.8
	99.50%	4	6	10	6	4	6	9	10	7	8	10	8.8
	100%	9	9	10	10	6	8.8	9	10	9	9	10	9.4
	elbow	4	4	2	3	4	3.4	6	5	4	4	4	4.6
Validation	90%	3	4	7	4	3	4.2	1	5	1	6	7	4
	95%	4	4	10	5	4	5.4	8	9	1	8	8	6.8
	99%	4	6	10	6	4	6	9	10	1	9	10	7.8
	99.50%	4	6	10	8	4	6.4	9	10	1	9	10	7.8
	100%	4	8	10	9	4	7	9	10	1	9	10	7.8
	elbow	4	4	1	5	4	3.6	1	1	1	1	1	1

and use the same GA parameters as shown in Section III-B1. We investigate every other `size_limit` value ranging from 1 to 99 by replicating feature selection runs 50 times. As the genotype data has approximately 200,000 features, we set the population size of GA to 2,000, ensuring that the initial coverage of the GA population (with `size_limit` equals to 99) is equal to the number of features in the data. We consider that the population size not only affects the search capability of the GA but also determines the overall time complexity of the proposed method. Therefore, we also replicate the experiment with a population size of 500 to examine the performance of the proposed complexity metrics on the real dataset with less search power of GA.

The results confirm that increasing the `size_limit` improves the predictive performance of the feature subsets derived from GA (Figure 4). The depth plot of the logistic regression algorithm shows that both training and testing performance increase as the `size_limit` becomes larger. The highest validation performance (mean: 0.845) is achieved with a `size_limit` of 49, indicating that a `size_limit` larger

than 49 may result in overfitting. The depth plot of the decision tree algorithm follows a similar pattern, with the highest validation performance (mean: 0.777) achieved with a `size_limit` of 39. The complexity metrics for both logistic regression and decision tree are shown in Table III. We observe that the GA based on logistic regression and decision tree requires a minimum of 39 and 19 features, respectively, to achieve 95% of the best training performance. When we address overfitting, the minimum `size_limit` to achieve 95% of the best validation performance decreases to 7 and 3, respectively.

The decrease in population size from 2,000 to 500 slows down the convergence of predictive performance with respect to the `size_limit` value. The best validation depth values (logistic regression: 81 and decision tree: 95) are larger than the results obtained from the GA with a population size of 2,000. In addition, the best averaged validation performances (logistic regression: 0.8032, decision tree: 0.7592) are not as good as the results obtained from GA with a population size of 2,000 (logistic regression: 0.845, decision tree: 0.777).




Fig. 4. The depth plots for genotype dataset. The `size_limit` ranges from 1 to 99 and the averaged predictive performance on training (blue), testing (green) and validation (red) folds are represented on the y-axis. For each population size configuration (500 and 2000), the depth plot based on linear and non-linear evaluation are provided.

TABLE III
COMPLEXITY MEASURES FOR GENOTYPE DATA BASED ON DEPTH PLOT.

		500		2000	
		Linear	Non-linear	Linear	Non-linear
Train	90%	25	21	17	9
	95%	49	39	39	19
	99%	85	75	83	65
	99.50%	93	91	87	75
	100%	99	99	99	91
	elbow	27	23	25	19
Test	90%	13	9	9	7
	95%	27	23	19	25
	99%	71	67	55	83
	99.50%	73	87	71	93
	100%	89	93	99	99
	elbow	15	15	25	17
Validation	90%	13	3	3	3
	95%	27	21	7	3
	99%	71	49	27	19
	99.50%	71	87	41	19
	100%	81	95	49	39
	elbow	5	3	11	3

GA is a heuristic approach to feature selection. Our goal is to characterize the difficulty of the prediction problem for a given dataset using the slope of the predictive performance change. Therefore, the actual population size to be taken can be determined with flexibility and based on the computational resources that can be deployed. Nevertheless, when comparing the difficulties of different datasets, the population size for GA should be consistent across different datasets, in order to ensure that the resulting complexity values are comparable.

D. Evaluation of depth using GEO datasets

We also investigate the complexity of 13 gene-expression datasets available from CuMiDa [64] (Table S3). As these datasets have a smaller number of features than the genotype dataset, we set the population size of the GA to 500 and keep the other parameters unchanged.

The results show that the overall pattern of the depth plot for all GEO datasets (Figure 5) is similar to the plot of the genotype dataset. However, the feature selection runs for three Prostate datasets (GSE6919_U95B, GSE6919_U95Av2 and GSE6919_U95C) are unsuccessful due to overfitting is observed on the validation fold. For the remaining 10 datasets, the complexity measures (Table IV) based on the validation

curves suggest that most datasets only need 3 features to achieve 95% of the best validation performance. Any further improvement in validation performance requires increasing the number of features. The linear fitness-based validation complexities indicate that only a fraction of the datasets have a depth of 3 for achieving 95% validation performance, while the rest have a difficulty of 1. If the complexity threshold is increased to 99%, the most difficult data set changes to GSE19804. The nonlinear fitness-based validation complexity indicates that the most difficult datasets are GSE76427 (95%: 7) and GSE22820 (95%: 5).

In summary, the complexity of the genotype dataset is higher than that of the GEO datasets. Due to the fact that feature subsets in the genotype data have a higher degree of overfitting, the validation complexity of GEO datasets converges faster and has lower a complexity than the genotype dataset. Nevertheless, the training complexity of the GEO data is still significantly lower than that of the genotype data. It is not surprising that GEO data is less complex than genotype data, and our results elucidate this fact based on *depth*.




Fig. 5. The depth plots for GEO datasets. The $size_limit$ ranges from 1 to 99 and the averaged predictive performance on training (blue), testing (green) and validation (red) folds are represented on the y-axis. For each GEO datasets, the depth plot based on linear and non-linear evaluation are provided.

IV. CONCLUSION

We proposed a robust complexity metric—*depth*, for biomedical data that may contain irrelevant features and epistasis. The limitation of existing data complexity metrics lies in that they work well for low-dimensional synthetic data but are challenged in the presence of increasing irrelevant features and feature interactions, as shown in Table S2.

The main contribution of our approach is that *depth* integrates a well-established feature selection method and gives it a new meaning. Our methodology includes two components, 1) the implementation of a feature selection algorithm, which diminishes the impact of irrelevant features, and 2) the deployment of a decision tree predictive algorithm. This allows the proposed complexity measure to detect data complexity arising from feature interactions. The results obtained from this approach suggest that by controlling the value of $size_limit$, our proposed complexity measure is capable of distinguishing the complexity of synthetic data resulted by different orders of epistatic interactions (Figure 3 and Table I and II).

Nevertheless, our proposed methodology *depth* works less effective on synthetic 3-way epistasis data with 1000 features. There could be two major reasons for this. Firstly, the expansion of the feature set considerably enlarges the search

space for the feature selection algorithm, thereby exceeding its search capacity. Secondly, the increasing presence of irrelevant features could increase false positives for feature selection. Consequently, the selected feature subsets may demonstrate fitness values comparable to those of the target features on the training dataset but fail to replicate their performance on the validation dataset.

A. The power of feature selection

The effectiveness of our feature selection genetic algorithm depends on its parameters, specifically the population size and the $size_limit$. The population size determines the quantity of feature subsets that the algorithm evaluates. An increase in population size enhances the algorithm's capacity to discover new feature subsets. However, this also increases the computational burden for the algorithm. Our complexity analysis conducted on simulated and genotype data indicates that the expansion of the search space and a decrease in population size, distorts the depth plot's curve, resulting in a higher complexity score. Moreover, our assessment of synthetic data with 3-way epistasis and 1000 features suggests that larger population size can not guarantee the identification of epistatic

TABLE IV
COMPLEXITY MEASURES FOR GEO DATAS BASED ON THE VALIDATION CURVE OF DEPTH PLOT.

Data	Fitness	90%	95%	99%	99.50%	100%	elbow
GSE22820	Linear	1	1	1	1	13	3
	Non-linear	1	5	49	63	63	5
GSE42568	Linear	1	1	1	3	9	9
	Non-linear	1	1	15	33	35	1
GSE70947	Linear	1	3	15	35	63	11
	Non-linear	1	3	13	15	15	15
GSE44076	Linear	1	1	1	3	63	3
	Non-linear	1	1	1	5	89	1
GSE63270	Linear	1	1	5	7	65	9
	Non-linear	1	3	3	3	51	3
GSE14520_U133A	Linear	1	1	7	13	93	13
	Non-linear	1	1	3	3	3	3
GSE76427	Linear	1	1	17	41	67	3
	Non-linear	1	7	71	79	79	7
GSE19804	Linear	1	1	23	31	93	3
	Non-linear	1	1	41	77	91	1
GSE6919_U95Av2	Linear	1	1	3	3	33	3
	Non-linear	3	3	3	7	7	3
GSE6919_U95B	Linear	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Non-linear	1	3	5	5	5	5
GSE6919_U95C	Linear	1	3	5	83	83	5
	Non-linear	3	3	13	13	13	3
GSE53757	Linear	1	1	1	1	11	1
	Non-linear	1	1	13	13	91	3
GSE42743	Linear	1	3	45	45	45	11
	Non-linear	3	3	19	29	29	3

feature. As such, we consider the proposed method augments the resilience of the metrics to irrelevant features.

In contrast, altering the `size_limit` enhances the fundamental discovery capability of the algorithm. The resulting depth plot is a graphical representation illustrating the predictive performance of the chosen feature subsets as a function of the size of selected feature subsets. Utilizing a larger `size_limit` allows the algorithm to uncover larger feature subsets containing more relevant features. Nevertheless, a larger `size_limit` can increase the risk of overfitting. We have noted that overfitting is a prevalent issue in real data (Figure 4 and Figure 5). Consequently, it is essential to consider the validation curve in the depth plot.

B. Complexity measures for micro-array data

Unlike synthetic data, real data exhibits both linear and non-linear associations between features and target labels. To accommodate these characteristics, we employ two complementary fitness measures for evaluating data complexity. Based on the derived complexity metrics, we subsequently offer guidelines for interpreting the complexity outcomes.

In the context of genotype data, the complexity deduced from the linear depth curve appears to surpass that of the non-linear curve, as illustrated in (Table III). This disparity may stem from the GA's restricted search capabilities. Our simulation study suggests that the GA-based feature selection method may struggle to identify 3-way epistasis in synthetic data with 1000 features (G18 in Figure 3). Furthermore, we observe that decreasing the parameter population size results in a flatter depth curve in the plot, thereby skewing the complexity estimation. Nevertheless, a reduction in computational power (need for a greater population size) does not influence

the relative difference between the linear and non-linear complexity in terms of validation predictive performance. In other words, the relative complexity of the data remains invariant to the search power.

According to our complexity metrics, the GEO data seems less complex compared to genotype data. When employing equivalent search power (population size of 500), we find that both the linear and non-linear difficulties (validation at 99%) of genotype data exceed those of most GEO datasets. An exception is the non-linear validation difficulty of GSE76427, although its 95% validation difficulty (7) is lower than that of the genotype data (21). Based on the validation curve of the majority of GEO datasets, achieving a 90% predictive performance only need the use of just one feature. This implies that a feature selection method based on Differentially Expressed Genes (DEG) is appropriate for most GEO datasets.

Our proposed complexity measure enables us to estimate the difficulty of a prediction problem for a dataset from both linear and non-linear perspectives. This helps with crafting a prediction model that aligns with the data's specific properties. Moreover, the depth curve in the plot can be utilized to determine the optimal number of features for the feature selection method. Selecting a smaller set of features enhances interpretability and reduces the risk of overfitting.

C. Limitations and future work

The feature selection algorithm is important for the efficacy of our proposed data complexity measure. In our feature selection genetic algorithm, its parameter population size is a good indicator of its search effort. The computational overhead resulted by increased population size can be a limitation of our approach.

Exploring more efficient feature selection methods can be a promising next-step direction. A more efficient search strategy than GA may reduce the computational cost of the complexity measure. For high-dimensional data, the search space increase exponentially with the number of features. So increasing population size of the GA may not be always effective. We use GA as the search strategy also because its working processes, including `size_limit`, mutation and crossover, are highly interpretable and controllable.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

- Table S1: The metadata of synthetic datasets.
- Table S2: The complexity measures for synthetic datasets based on `problimity`.
- Table S3: The metadata for GEO datasets.
- Table S4: The complexity measures for GEO datasets based on `problimity`.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The simulation datasets can be accessed through the Penn Machine Learning Benchmarks [58], [59]. The genotype data can be accessed through the colorectal cancer transdisciplinary (CORECT) consortium [61]. The GEO datasets can be accessed through the Curated Machine Learning Datasets (CuMiDa) [64].

CODE AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The code that supports the findings of this study is openly accessible. It can be found on the GitHub platform at the following link².

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Digital Research Alliance of Canada and Wireless Networking and Mobile Computing Laboratory for providing computing infrastructures. We are also grateful to Matthew Vandergrift for providing feedback on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. W. Libbrecht and W. S. Noble, "Machine learning applications in genetics and genomics," *Nature Reviews Genetics*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 321–332, Jun 2015.
- [2] H. L. Nicholls, C. R. John, D. S. Watson, P. B. Munroe, M. R. Barnes, and C. P. Cabrera, "Reaching the end-game for gwas: Machine learning approaches for the prioritization of complex disease loci," *Frontiers in Genetics*, vol. 11, 2020.
- [3] D. C. Bauer, C. Gaff, M. E. Dinger, M. Caramins, F. A. Buske, M. Fenech, D. Hansen, and L. Cobiac, "Genomics and personalised whole-of-life healthcare," *Trends in Molecular Medicine*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 479–486, 2014.
- [4] X. Liu, Y. I. Li, and J. K. Pritchard, "Trans effects on gene expression can drive omnigenic inheritance," *Cell*, vol. 177, no. 4, pp. 1022–1034.e6, May 2019.
- [5] M. D. Ritchie, L. W. Hahn, N. Roodi, L. R. Bailey, W. D. Dupont, F. F. Parl, and J. H. Moore, "Multifactor-dimensionality reduction reveals high-order interactions among estrogen-metabolism genes in sporadic breast cancer," *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 138–147, 2001.

- [6] T. K. Ho and M. Basu, "Complexity measures of supervised classification problems," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 289–300, 2002.
- [7] J. Komorniczak and P. Ksieniewicz, "problimity—an open-source python library for supervised learning problem complexity assessment," *Neuro-computing*, vol. 521, pp. 126–136, 2023.
- [8] J. Vanschoren, "Meta-learning: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03548*, 2018.
- [9] M. M. Meskhi, A. Rivolli, R. G. Mantovani, and R. Vilalta, "Learning abstract task representations," in *AAAI Workshop on Meta-Learning and MetaDL Challenge*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, I. Guyon, J. N. van Rijn, S. Treguer, and J. Vanschoren, Eds., vol. 140, PMLR, 09 Feb 2021, pp. 127–137.
- [10] T. Kam Ho, "Complexity of representations in deep learning," in *2022 26th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 2022, pp. 2657–2663.
- [11] E. Konuk and K. Smith, "An empirical study of the relation between network architecture and complexity," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) Workshops*, Oct 2019.
- [12] J. H. Moore and S. M. Williams, "Epistasis and its implications for personal genetics," *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, vol. 85, no. 3, pp. 309–320, 2009.
- [13] A. Orriols-Puig, N. Macia, and T. K. Ho, "Documentation for the data complexity library in c++," *Universitat Ramon Llull, La Salle*, vol. 196, no. 1-40, p. 12, 2010.
- [14] T. K. Ho and H. S. Baird, "Pattern classification with compact distribution maps," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 101–110, 1998.
- [15] F. Smith, "Pattern classifier design by linear programming," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. C-17, no. 4, pp. 367–372, 1968.
- [16] A. Hoekstra and R. Duin, "On the nonlinearity of pattern classifiers," in *Proceedings of 13th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, vol. 4, 1996, pp. 271–275 vol.4.
- [17] J. H. Friedman and L. C. Rafsky, "Multivariate Generalizations of the Wald-Wolfowitz and Smirnov Two-Sample Tests," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 697 – 717, 1979.
- [18] T. Cover and P. Hart, "Nearest neighbor pattern classification," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 21–27, 1967.
- [19] E. Leyva, A. González, and R. Pérez, "A set of complexity measures designed for applying meta-learning to instance selection," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 354–367, 2015.
- [20] J. C. Gower, "A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties," *Biometrics*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 857–871, 1971.
- [21] A. C. Lorena, L. P. F. Garcia, J. Lehmann, M. C. P. Souto, and T. K. Ho, "How complex is your classification problem? a survey on measuring classification complexity," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 52, no. 5, sep 2019.
- [22] M. Basu and T. K. Ho, *Data complexity in pattern recognition*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [23] A. C. Lorena, I. G. Costa, N. Spolaôr, and M. C. de Souto, "Analysis of complexity indices for classification problems: Cancer gene expression data," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 33–42, 2012, brazilian Symposium on Neural Networks (SBRN 2010) International Conference on Hybrid Artificial Intelligence Systems (HAIS 2010).
- [24] A. K. Tanwani and M. Farooq, "Classification potential vs. classification accuracy: A comprehensive study of evolutionary algorithms with biomedical datasets," in *Learning Classifier Systems*, J. Bacardit, W. Browne, J. Drugowitsch, E. Bernadó-Mansilla, and M. V. Butz, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 127–144.
- [25] A. C. Lorena, A. I. Maciel, P. B. C. de Miranda, I. G. Costa, and R. B. C. Prudêncio, "Data complexity meta-features for regression problems," *Machine Learning*, vol. 107, no. 1, pp. 209–246, Jan 2018.
- [26] S. Anders and W. Huber, "Differential expression analysis for sequence count data," *Nature Precedings*, Mar 2010.
- [27] W. Siedlecki and J. Sklansky, "A note on genetic algorithms for large-scale feature selection," in *Handbook of pattern recognition and computer vision*. World Scientific, 1993, pp. 88–107.
- [28] M. Al-Rajab, J. Lu, and Q. Xu, "Examining applying high performance genetic data feature selection and classification algorithms for colon cancer diagnosis," *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 146, pp. 11–24, 2017.
- [29] M. Swerhun, J. Foley, B. Massop, and V. Mago, "A summary of the prevalence of genetic algorithms in bioinformatics from 2015 onwards," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.09017*, 2020.

²<https://github.com/shazhendong/DataComplexityAnalysisUsingGA>

- [30] S. Sayed, M. Nassef, A. Badr, and I. Farag, "A nested genetic algorithm for feature selection in high-dimensional cancer microarray datasets," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 121, pp. 233–243, 2019.
- [31] P. García-Díaz, I. Sánchez-Berriel, J. A. Martínez-Rojas, and A. M. Díez-Pascual, "Unsupervised feature selection algorithm for multiclass cancer classification of gene expression rna-seq data," *Genomics*, vol. 112, no. 2, pp. 1916–1925, 2020.
- [32] R. Leardi, R. Boggia, and M. Terrile, "Genetic algorithms as a strategy for feature selection," *Journal of Chemometrics*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 267–281, 1992.
- [33] Z. Sha, T. Hu, and Y. Chen, "Feature selection for polygenic risk scores using genetic algorithm and network science," in *2021 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, 2021, pp. 802–808.
- [34] S. F. Da Silva, M. X. Ribeiro, J. d. E. B. Neto, C. Traina-Jr, and A. J. Traina, "Improving the ranking quality of medical image retrieval using a genetic feature selection method," *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 810–820, 2011.
- [35] A. M. Canuto and D. S. Nascimento, "A genetic-based approach to features selection for ensembles using a hybrid and adaptive fitness function," in *The 2012 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1–8.
- [36] P. Sousa, P. Cortez, R. Vaz, M. Rocha, and M. Rio, "Email spam detection: A symbiotic feature selection approach fostered by evolutionary computation," *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*, vol. 12, no. 04, pp. 863–884, 2013.
- [37] J.-H. Seo, Y. H. Lee, and Y.-H. Kim, "Feature selection for very short-term heavy rainfall prediction using evolutionary computation," *Advances in Meteorology*, vol. 2014, 2014.
- [38] S. M. Winkler, M. Affenzeller, W. Jacak, and H. Stekel, "Identification of cancer diagnosis estimation models using evolutionary algorithms: a case study for breast cancer, melanoma, and cancer in the respiratory system," in *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference Companion on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, 2011, pp. 503–510.
- [39] F. Souza, T. Matias, and R. Araújo, "Co-evolutionary genetic multilayer perceptron for feature selection and model design," in *ETFA2011*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–7.
- [40] S. Oreski and G. Oreski, "Genetic algorithm-based heuristic for feature selection in credit risk assessment," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 2052–2064, 2014.
- [41] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–32, 2001.
- [42] F. Dorani, T. Hu, M. O. Woods, and G. Zhai, "Ensemble learning for detecting gene-gene interactions in colorectal cancer," *PeerJ*, vol. 6, p. e5854, 2018.
- [43] Q. Pan, T. Hu, J. D. Malley, A. S. Andrew, M. R. Karagas, and J. H. Moore, "Supervising random forest using attribute interaction networks," in *European Conference on Evolutionary Computation, Machine Learning and Data Mining in Bioinformatics*. Springer, 2013, pp. 104–116.
- [44] J. H. Moore, F. W. Asselbergs, and S. M. Williams, "Bioinformatics challenges for genome-wide association studies," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 445–455, 2010.
- [45] T. S. H. Mak, R. M. Porsch, S. W. Choi, X. Zhou, and P. C. Sham, "Polygenic scores via penalized regression on summary statistics," *Genetic Epidemiology*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 469–480, 2017.
- [46] Y. Wang, X. Liu, K. Robbins, and R. Rekaya, "Antepiseeker: detecting epistatic interactions for case-control studies using a two-stage ant colony optimization algorithm," *BMC research notes*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2010.
- [47] R. Storn and K. Price, "Differential evolution—a simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces," *Journal of global optimization*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 341–359, 1997.
- [48] X. Cao, J. Liu, M. Guo, and J. Wang, "Hissi: high-order snp-snp interactions detection based on efficient significant pattern and differential evolution," *BMC medical genomics*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 1–12, 2019.
- [49] B. Guan, Y. Zhao, Y. Yin, and Y. Li, "A differential evolution based feature combination selection algorithm for high-dimensional data," *Information Sciences*, vol. 547, pp. 870–886, 2021.
- [50] J. H. Holland, "Genetic algorithms," *Scientific American*, vol. 267, no. 1, pp. 66–73, 1992.
- [51] B. L. Miller, D. E. Goldberg *et al.*, "Genetic algorithms, tournament selection, and the effects of noise," *Complex systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 193–212, 1995.
- [52] R. A. Fisher, "Xv.—the correlation between relatives on the supposition of mendelian inheritance," *Earth and Environmental Science Transactions of The Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. 52, no. 2, p. 399–433, 1919.
- [53] J. Zhou, M. S. Wong, W.-C. Chen, A. R. Krainer, J. B. Kinney, and D. M. McCandlish, "Higher-order epistasis and phenotypic prediction," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 119, no. 39, p. e2204233119, 2022.
- [54] D. R. Cox, "The regression analysis of binary sequences," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 215–232, 1958.
- [55] S. W. Choi, T. S.-H. Mak, and P. F. O'Reilly, "Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score analyses," *Nature Protocols*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 2759–2772, 2020.
- [56] L. Breiman, *Classification and regression trees*. Routledge, 2017.
- [57] X. Tolsa, "Principal values for the cauchy integral and rectifiability," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 128, no. 7, pp. 2111–2119, 2000.
- [58] R. S. Olson, W. La Cava, P. Orzechowski, R. J. Urbanowicz, and J. H. Moore, "Pmlb: a large benchmark suite for machine learning evaluation and comparison," *BioData Mining*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 36, Dec 2017.
- [59] J. D. Romano, T. T. Le, W. La Cava, J. T. Gregg, D. J. Goldberg, P. Chakraborty, N. L. Ray, D. Himmelstein, W. Fu, and J. H. Moore, "Pmlb v1.0: an open source dataset collection for benchmarking machine learning methods," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00058v2*, 2021.
- [60] R. J. Urbanowicz, J. Kiralis, N. A. Sinnott-Armstrong, T. Heberling, J. M. Fisher, and J. H. Moore, "Gametes: a fast, direct algorithm for generating pure, strict, epistatic models with random architectures," *BioData Mining*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 16, Oct 2012.
- [61] F. R. Schumacher *et al.*, "Genome-wide association study of colorectal cancer identifies six new susceptibility loci," *Nature Communications*, vol. 6, p. 7138, Jul 2015.
- [62] S. Das, L. Forer, S. Schönherr, C. Sidore, A. E. Locke, A. Kwong, S. I. Vrieze, E. Y. Chew, S. Levy, M. McGue *et al.*, "Next-generation genotype imputation service and methods," *Nature Genetics*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1284–1287, 2016.
- [63] P.-R. Loh, P. Danecek, P. F. Palamara, C. Fuchsberger, Y. A. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, S. Schoenherr, L. Forer, S. McCarthy, G. R. Abecasis *et al.*, "Reference-based phasing using the haplotype reference consortium panel," *Nature genetics*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 1443–1448, 2016.
- [64] B. C. Feltes, E. B. Chandelier, B. I. Griscic, and M. Dorn, "Cumida: An extensively curated microarray database for benchmarking and testing of machine learning approaches in cancer research," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 376–386, 2019, PMID: 30789283.
- [65] J. Komorniczak and P. Ksieniewicz, "problexity—an open-source python library for supervised learning problem complexity assessment," *Neuro-computing*, vol. 521, pp. 126–136, 2023.
- [66] D. A. Elizondo, R. Birkenhead, M. Gamez, N. Garcia, and E. Alfaro, "Linear separability and classification complexity," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 7796–7807, 2012.
- [67] E. E. Eichler, J. Flint, G. Gibson, A. Kong, S. M. Leal, J. H. Moore, and J. H. Nadeau, "Missing heritability and strategies for finding the underlying causes of complex disease," *Nature Reviews Genetics*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 446–450, 2010, ISSN 1471-0064.

Zhendong Sha Zhendong Sha received the B.Sc. degree from Nanjing University Jinling College, Nanjing, China, in 2013 and the Master degree in Computer Science from the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, Canada, in 2018. Under the supervision of Drs. Ting Hu and Yuanzhu Chen at Queen's University, his ongoing Ph.D. research covers developing machine learning methods for high-dimensional genetic data with an emphasis on gene-gene interaction and genetic heterogeneity. Zhendong's primary research area is feature selection using information theory, evolutionary computation and network science. Through his long-term research goals, Zhendong aims to develop a comprehensive analytical framework that will provide clinicians with disease risk predictive models and personalized treatment plans based on a patient's genetic background.

Li Zhu Li Zhu received the Bachelor's degree in computing from the Queen's University, Canada, in 2023. He is currently working toward the Master's degree with the University College London, England.

Zijun Jiang Zijun Jiang received the Bachelor's degree in computing from Queen's University, Canada, in 2023. He is currently working toward the Master's degree with the University of New South Wales, Australia.

Yuanzhu Chen Yuanzhu Chen received the B.Sc. degree from Peking University, China, in 1999, and the Ph.D. degree from Simon Fraser University, Canada, in 2004. He has been a Professor of computing science since 2005 and is currently affiliated with School of Computing, Queen's University. From 2004 to 2005, he was a Postdoctoral Researcher with Simon Fraser University. In 2005, Dr. Chen joined Memorial University as a tenure-track Assistant Professor. While at Memorial, he was the Deputy Head for Undergraduate Studies from 2012 to 2015, the Deputy Head for Graduate Studies from 2016 to 2019, and Department Head from 2019 to 2021. He then joined Queen's School of Computing in 2021. Dr. Chen's research interests include complex networks, computer networking, online social networks, mobile computing, graph theory, Web information retrieval, and evolutionary computation, with funding from national agencies and various university programs and awards. He was a recipient of the President's Award for Distinguished Teaching in 2018.

Ting Hu Ting Hu is currently an Associate Professor from the School of Computing at Queen's University in Canada. She received a B.Sc. degree in applied mathematics and an M.Sc. degree in computer science from Wuhan University, China, in 2003 and 2005, respectively, and a Ph.D. degree in computer science from Memorial University, Canada, in 2010. She received her postdoctoral training in computational genetics at the Geisel School of Medicine, Dartmouth College in USA. She was previously an Assistant Professor at the Department of Computer Science, Memorial University in Canada. Her research interests include computational intelligence, machine learning, and bioinformatics. She has served on the editorial board of international journals including Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines, Entropy, Genes, and has chaired international conferences including European Conference on Genetic Programming, Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference GP track, European Conference on Evolutionary Computation, Machine Learning and Data Mining in Bioinformatics.