

On pairwise distances and median score of three genomes under DCJ

Sergey Aganezov, Jr.¹ and Max A. Alekseyev^{*1,2}

¹Algorithmic Biology Laboratory, St. Petersburg Academic University, St. Petersburg, Russia

²Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA

Email: Max A. Alekseyev^{*} - maxal@cse.sc.edu;

^{*}Corresponding author

Abstract

In comparative genomics, the rearrangement distance between two genomes (equal the minimal number of genome rearrangements required to transform them into a single genome) is often used for measuring their evolutionary remoteness. Generalization of this measure to three genomes is known as the *median score* (while a resulting genome is called *median genome*). In contrast to the rearrangement distance between two genomes which can be computed in linear time, computing the median score for three genomes is NP-hard. This inspires a quest for simpler and faster approximations for the median score, the most natural of which appears to be the halved sum of pairwise distances which in fact represents a lower bound for the median score.

In this work, we study relationship and interplay of pairwise distances between three genomes and their median score under the model of Double-Cut-and-Join (DCJ) rearrangements. Most remarkably we show that while a rearrangement may change the sum of pairwise distances by at most 2 (and thus change the lower bound by at most 1), even the most “powerful” rearrangements in this respect that increase the lower bound by 1 (by moving one genome farther away from each of the other two genomes), which we call *optimal*, do not necessarily affect the median score. This observation implies that the two measures are not as well-correlated as one’s intuition may suggest.

We further prove that the median score attains the lower bound exactly on the triples of genomes that can be obtained from a single genome with optimal rearrangements. While the sum of pairwise distances with the factor $2/3$ represents an upper bound for the median score, its tightness remains unclear. Nonetheless, we show that the difference of the median score and its lower bound is not bounded by a constant.

Background

The number of large-scale rearrangements (such as reversals, translocations, fissions, and fusions) between two genomes is often used as a measure of their evolutionary remoteness. The minimal number of such rearrangements required to transform one genome into the other is called *rearrangement distance*. Computing rearrangement distances between the genomes of interest is often a pre-requisite for their comparative analysis (e.g., phylogeny reconstruction).

Double-Cut-and-Join (DCJ) rearrangements [1, 2] (also known as *2-breaks* [3]) represent a convenient model of reversals, translocations, fissions, and fusions, which allows one to compute the corresponding *DCJ distance* between two genomes in linear time.

Phylogeny reconstruction for three given genomes involves reconstruction of their *median genome* that minimizes the total distance from the given genomes. This minimal total distance, called the *median score* [4], represents a natural generalization of the DCJ distance to the case of three genomes. In contrast to DCJ distance between two genomes, computing the median score of three genomes is NP-hard [4, 5]. While there exist exact [6, 7] and heuristic [8–10] algorithms for this problem, they can hardly be used for large genomes. This inspires a quest for simpler and faster approximations for the median score.

The simplest and easily computable approximation for the median score of three genomes is given by the sum of their pairwise DCJ distances, which we call the *triangle score*. In this work, we study the tightness of this approximation. In particular, we show that with the factor $1/2$ it represents a lower bound and with the factor $2/3$ it represents an upper bound for the median score. We further prove that the lower bound is attained exactly for the triples that can be obtained from a single genome by *optimal* rearrangements that increase the triangle score by 2 (by moving one genome farther away from each of the other two genomes). In other words, optimal rearrangements are those that increase the lower bound by 1. From this perspective, it is natural to expect that optimal rearrangements always increase the median score. However, we disprove this expectation with a counterexample.

While tightness of the upper bound remains unclear, we remark that a better upper bound for the median score may improve performance of algorithms for computing median score based on the adequate subgraph decomposition [6, 7]. Still, we make an initial step in this direction by proving that there is no upper bound equal the lower bound plus a constant.




Figure 1: Breakpoint graph $BG(A, B, C)$ of genomes $A = (1)(2)$ (red edges), $B = (1, 2)$ (blue edges), and $C = (1, -2)$ (green edges), where $(1^t - 1^h - 2^t - 2^h - 1^t)$ is an AB -cycle, $(1^t - 1^h - 2^h - 2^t - 1^t)$ is an AC -cycle, and $(1^t - 2^h - 2^t - 1^h - 1^t)$ is a BC -cycle.

Methods

Breakpoint graphs and genome rearrangements

In this work, we focus on circular genomes consisting of one or more circular chromosomes. A circular genome on a set of n genes (say, $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$) can be represented as a perfect matching on $2n$ vertices [11, 12] where each gene is represented with a pair of vertices, corresponding to the gene’s extremities: “head” and “tail”; while each adjacency between two genes in the genome is represented with an edge between respective extremities. *Breakpoint graph* of genomes A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k , denoted $BG(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is defined as the superposition of k perfect matchings representing given genomes, each of its own color [12]. We refer to edges representing adjacencies in the genome A_i as A_i -edges ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$). When all genomes A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k are identical, their breakpoint graph is called an *identity breakpoint graph*. Every identity breakpoint graph consists of *trivial multicycles* formed by k parallel edges of all colors.

A *DCJ* rearrangement in genome A replaces a pair of A -edges with another pair of A -edges forming matching on the same four vertices. The *DCJ distance* between genomes A and B on the same set of n genes, denoted with $d_{dcj}(A, B)$, is defined as the minimal number of DCJs required to transform one genome into the other. The DCJ distance $d_{dcj}(A, B)$ is closely connected with the number $c(A, B)$ of alternating cycles (i.e., cycles with edges of alternating colors) in the breakpoint graph $BG(A, B)$ by the formula: $d_{dcj}(A, B) = n - c(A, B)$. We remark that $c(A, B)$ may range from 1 to n , implying that $0 \leq d_{dcj}(A, B) \leq n - 1$. A single DCJ in A or B can change $d_{dcj}(A, B)$ by at most 1 [1, 3, 13].

Let A, B, C be genomes on a set of n genes. Their breakpoint graph $BG(A, B, C)$ is formed by A -edges, B -edges, and C -edges so that each pair of genomes define alternating cycles, called respectively AB -cycles, AC -cycles, and BC -cycles (Fig. 1). We further define the *triangle score* $ts(A, B, C)$ as the sum of pairwise DCJ distances:

$$ts(A, B, C) = d_{dcj}(A, B) + d_{dcj}(A, C) + d_{dcj}(B, C).$$




Figure 2: A -edges (red) that belong to distinct AB -cycles and distinct AC -cycles, denoted by dashed blue lines and dashed green lines, respectively (left panel). A DCJ on these A -edges merges these AB -cycles and AC -cycles into a single AB -cycle and a single AC -cycle, and thus increases $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ by 2 (right panel).

Since a DCJ in one of the genomes can change each of the two corresponding distances by at most 1, it can change $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ by at most 2.

Lemma 1. *Let A, B, C be genomes on the same set of n genes such that $d_{dcj}(A, B)$ and $d_{dcj}(A, C)$ are less than $n - 1$. Then in $\text{BG}(A, B, C)$ there exists a pair of A -edges that belong to two distinct AB -cycles and two distinct AC -cycles.*

Proof. Since $d_{dcj}(A, B) < n - 1$, there exist at least two distinct AB -cycles in the breakpoint graph $\text{BG}(A, B, C)$. Therefore, the AB -cycles define a partition of the set of A -edges S_A into two or more nonempty subsets: $S_A = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \dots$

Similarly, since $d_{dcj}(A, C) < n - 1$, there exist at least two distinct AC -cycles in $\text{BG}(A, B, C)$ so that the AC -cycles define a partition of S_A into two or more nonempty subsets: $S_A = Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup \dots$. Intersecting the subsets in the two partitions, we get a partition of S_A into subsets, each consisting of A -edges that belong to the same AB -cycle and the same AC -cycle: $S_A = \bigcup_{i,j} (P_i \cap Q_j)$.

Suppose that there is no required pair of A -edges, implying that for any two non-empty intersections $P_i \cap Q_j$ and $P_{i'} \cap Q_{j'}$, we have either $i = i'$ or $j = j'$. Without loss of generality, assume that $P_1 \cap Q_1$ is non-empty. Then for every $i > 1$ and $j > 1$, $P_i \cap Q_j$ must be empty, implying that $P_i \subset Q_1$. In particular, $P_2 \cap Q_1 = P_2$ is non-empty and by the same reasoning, we have $P_1 \subset Q_1$. Therefore, $P_i \subset Q_1$ for all i , implying that $Q_1 = S_A$, a contradiction to non-emptiness of Q_2 . This contradiction proves that a required pair of A -edges exists. \square

Theorem 2. *If between three genomes A, B, C on the same set of n genes at least two pairwise DCJ distances are less than $n - 1$, then there exists a DCJ (called optimal) that increases $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ by 2.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $d_{dcj}(A, B) < n - 1$ and $d_{dcj}(A, C) < n - 1$. By Lemma 1,

there are A -edges (x, y) and (u, v) that belong to distinct AB -cycles and distinct AC -cycles in $BG(A, B, C)$. Using any DCJ on these edges (Fig. 2), we decrease the number of AB -cycles as well as the number of AC -cycles by 1. Since BC -cycles remain intact, this DCJ increases $ts(A, B, C)$ by 2. \square

Theorem 3. *Let (p, q, r) be a triple of integers from the interval $[0, n - 1]$, satisfying the triangle inequality. There exist three genomes on a set of n genes whose pairwise DCJ distances are (p, q, r) . Moreover, these genomes can be obtained with $\lfloor \frac{p+q+r}{2} \rfloor$ optimal DCJs and possibly one other DCJ (when $p + q + r$ is odd) from a single genome.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $p \leq q \leq r$ and that $p = d_{dcj}(A, B)$, $q = d_{dcj}(A, C)$, and $r = d_{dcj}(B, C)$ where A, B, C are the genomes being constructed.

If $p + q + r$ is even, we start with A, B, C being the same genome and notice that

$$(p, q, r) = \frac{p + q - r}{2} \cdot (1, 1, 0) + \frac{p + r - q}{2} \cdot (1, 0, 1) + \frac{q + r - p}{2} \cdot (0, 1, 1)$$

where by the triangle inequality all coefficients are nonnegative. This identity instructs us to apply $\frac{p+q-r}{2}$ optimal DCJs to the genome A (increasing both $d_{dcj}(A, B)$ and $d_{dcj}(A, C)$), $\frac{p+r-q}{2}$ optimal DCJs to genome B , and $\frac{q+r-p}{2}$ optimal DCJs to genome C . Existence of such optimal DCJs is guaranteed by Theorem 2.

If $p + q + r$ is odd, then we have $p > 0$ as otherwise the triangle inequality would imply $q = r$ and thus even $p + q + r$. In this case we start with A, B, C being three genomes with pairwise DCJ distances $(1, 1, 1)$ such that $BG(A, B, C)$ consists of trivial multicycles, except for the vertices $1^t, 1^h, 2^t$, and 2^h connected as in Fig. 1. It is easy to see that these genomes can be obtained from the same genome by one optimal DCJ and one non-optimal DCJ. We further increase the pairwise DCJ distances between genomes A, B, C by $(p', q', r') = (p - 1, q - 1, r - 1)$ with $\frac{p'+q'+r'}{2}$ optimal DCJs as above (notice that $p' + q' + r'$ is even and (p', q', r') satisfies the triangle inequality). Therefore, the total number of optimal DCJs in this case is

$$1 + \frac{p' + q' + r'}{2} = \frac{p + q + r - 1}{2} = \left\lfloor \frac{p + q + r}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

\square

While all triples of pairwise DCJ distances are achievable with optimal DCJs, not all breakpoint graphs of three genomes can be constructed from an identity breakpoint graph this way. In particular, Figure 3 gives an example of breakpoint graph $BG(A, B, C)$ such that $ts(A, B, C)$ cannot be decreased by 2 with a DCJ. In this example, we have $ts(A, B, C) = 6$ but there is no sequence of three DCJs that would produce $BG(A, B, C)$ from an identity breakpoint graph.

In the next section we demonstrate how DCJs on three genomes can affect their median score.




Figure 3: Breakpoint graph $BG(A, B, C)$ of genomes $A = (1)(2)(3)(4)$ (red edges), $B = (1, 2)(3, 4)$ (blue edges), and $C = (1, -2)(3, -4)$ (green edges) with the property that no DCJ can decrease $ts(A, B, C)$ by 2.

Optimal rearrangements and median score

Median genome problem for given genomes A, B, C is to find a genome (which is called *median genome* and may not be unique) that attains the *median score* [4]:

$$ms(A, B, C) = \min_M d_{dcj}(A, M) + d_{dcj}(B, M) + d_{dcj}(C, M).$$

The median problem can be alternatively posed as finding the minimal number (equal $ms(A, B, C)$) of DCJs required to transform the genomes A, B, C into a single (median) genome (or, vice versa, to obtain A, B, C from a single genome). In fact, this formulation further generalizes and becomes particularly useful for phylogeny reconstruction of a larger number of genomes [12].

From perspective of this formulation, it becomes important to realize what triples of genomes can be obtained from a single genome with optimal DCJs. We start with proving a helpful lemma and bounds on the median score in terms of the triangle score.

Lemma 4. *For three genomes on the same set of genes, a DCJ in one of the genomes may change their median score by at most 1.*

Proof. Let A, B, C be genomes of the same set of genes. Consider a DCJ in a genome A and denote the resulting genome by A' . Let M be a median genome of the genomes A, B, C so that

$$ms(A, B, C) = d_{dcj}(A, M) + d_{dcj}(B, M) + d_{dcj}(C, M).$$

Clearly, $d_{dcj}(A, M) \geq d_{dcj}(A', M) - 1$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} ms(A, B, C) &= d_{dcj}(A, M) + d_{dcj}(B, M) + d_{dcj}(C, M) \\ &\geq d_{dcj}(A', M) + d_{dcj}(B, M) + d_{dcj}(C, M) - 1 \geq ms(A', B, C) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $ms(A', B, C) - ms(A, B, C) \leq 1$. Symmetrically, we also have $ms(A, B, C) - ms(A', B, C) \leq 1$ and thus $|ms(A, B, C) - ms(A', B, C)| \leq 1$. \square

Theorem 5. *For genomes A, B, C on the same set of genes, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C) \leq \text{ms}(A, B, C) \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C).$$

Proof. Consider a transformation of each of the genomes A, B, C into a median genome with DCJs. The total number of DCJs in this transformation is $\text{ms}(A, B, C)$. Since each DCJ decreases $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ by at most 2, we have $\text{ts}(A, B, C) \leq 2 \cdot \text{ms}(A, B, C)$, implying that $1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C) \leq \text{ms}(A, B, C)$.

On the other hand, the number of DCJs in any transformation of the genomes A, B, C into the genome A is at least $\text{ms}(A, B, C)$, implying that $d_{dcj}(B, A) + d_{dcj}(C, A) \geq \text{ms}(A, B, C)$. Similarly, we have $d_{dcj}(A, B) + d_{dcj}(C, B) \geq \text{ms}(A, B, C)$ and $d_{dcj}(A, C) + d_{dcj}(B, C) \geq \text{ms}(A, B, C)$. Summing up these three inequalities, we get $2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C) \geq 3 \cdot \text{ms}(A, B, C)$ and thus $\text{ms}(A, B, C) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$. \square

We remark that the lower bound and a slightly better upper bound $\text{ms}(A, B, C) \leq \min\{d_{dcj}(A, B) + d_{dcj}(A, C), d_{dcj}(A, B) + d_{dcj}(B, C), d_{dcj}(A, C) + d_{dcj}(B, C)\}$ was also used in [7].

The following theorem classifies all triples of genomes for which the median score coincides with its lower bound and links them with the genomes constructed in Theorem 3.

Theorem 6. *For genomes A, B, C on the same set of genes, $\text{ms}(A, B, C) = 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$ if and only if A, B, C can be obtained from a single genome with optimal DCJs.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{ms}(A, B, C) = 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$. Let M be a median genome of the genomes A, B, C . Then A, B, C can be obtained from M with $\text{ms}(A, B, C) = 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$ DCJs. This transformation increases the triangle score from $\text{ts}(M, M, M) = 0$ to $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$. Since each of $1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$ DCJs can increase the triangle score by at most 2, they all must be optimal.

Vice versa, suppose that A, B, C are obtained from a single genome with optimal DCJs. Lemma 4 implies that an optimal DCJ does not increase the difference between the median score and its lower bound. Since the transformation starts with the median score equal its lower bound (i.e., their difference is 0), they further remain equal along the whole transformation, resulting in $\text{ms}(A, B, C) = 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$. \square

It remains unclear how tight is the upper bound given in Theorem 5, while a better upper bound may improve performance of algorithms for computing median score based on the adequate subgraph decomposition [6, 7]. Below we prove however that the upper bound cannot be equal to the lower bound plus a constant.

Theorem 7. *The difference $\text{ms}(A, B, C) - 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$ of the median score and its lower bound is not bounded from above by a constant.*

Proof. To prove the theorem, for every $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we will construct three genomes A_n, B_n, C_n on the same $4n$ genes for which $\text{ms}(A_n, B_n, C_n) - 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A_n, B_n, C_n) = n$.

We start with genomes $A_1 = (1) (2) (3) (4)$, $B_1 = (1, 2) (3, 4)$, and $C_1 = (1, -2) (3, -4)$. The breakpoint graph $\text{BG}(A_1, B_1, C_1)$ consists of two strongly adequate subgraphs (Fig. 3). We have $\text{ms}(A_1, B_1, C_1) = 4$ and $\text{ts}(A_1, B_1, C_1) = 6$, resulting in $\text{ms}(A_1, B_1, C_1) - 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A_1, B_1, C_1) = 1$.

To construct $\text{BG}(A_n, B_n, C_n)$ we take n copies of $\text{BG}(A_1, B_1, C_1)$ and relabel their vertices appropriately. In particular, for $n = 2$ we get genomes $A_2 = (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8)$, $B_2 = (1, 2) (3, 4) (5, 6) (7, 8)$, and $C_2 = (1, -2) (3, -4) (5, -6) (7, -8)$. Since edges of a median genome do not connect strongly adequate subgraphs of the breakpoint graph [6, 7], every copy of $\text{BG}(A_1, B_1, C_1)$ in $\text{BG}(A_n, B_n, C_n)$ contributes 4 to the median score. It is also clear that every copy of $\text{BG}(A_1, B_1, C_1)$ contributes 6 to the triangle score, implying that $\text{ms}(A_n, B_n, C_n) - 1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A_n, B_n, C_n) = 4n - 3n = n$. \square

We conclude our analysis with the last but not the least observation about the lower bound $1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C) \leq \text{ms}(A, B, C)$. According to Lemma 4, a DCJ in one of the genomes A, B, C can either increase/decrease the right hand side of this inequality (i.e., the median score) by 1, or keep it intact. For an optimal DCJ (moving one genome farther away from each of the other two genomes), the left hand side of the inequality is increased by 1. From this perspective, it is very natural to expect that an optimal DCJ should also increase the median score (e.g., it was so in the proof of Theorem 6). Surprisingly, this intuition fails: Figure 4 gives a counterexample of a breakpoint graph of three genomes with an optimal DCJ that does not increase the median score.

Results and discussion

We studied two measures of evolutionary remoteness of three genomes A, B, C : the triangle score $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ (equal the sum of the pairwise rearrangement distances) and the median score $\text{ms}(A, B, C)$ (equal the minimum total rearrangement distance from a single genome). While computing $\text{ts}(A, B, C)$ takes linear time and computing $\text{ms}(A, B, C)$ is NP-hard, they are connected by the inequality $1/2 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C) \leq \text{ms}(A, B, C) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{ts}(A, B, C)$ (Theorem 5) giving the lower and upper bounds for the median score in terms of the triangle score.

In view of the median genome problem as finding a transformation of the given genomes into a single genome (or a reverse transformation of a single genome into the given genomes) with the smallest number of genome rearrangements, it is important to understand how rearrangements can change the median score




Figure 4: **Left panel:** Breakpoint graph of genomes $A = (1, -6, -7, -8, -9, -10, -11)(2, 5, 4, 3)$ (red edges), $B = (1, 8, 9, 10, 11)(2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)$ (blue edges), $C = (1, -3, 4, 10, -8, 11, 9, 5, -7, 6, 2)$ (green edges), and their median genome $M = (1, -6, -5, -2, -3, -4, -7, -10, -11, 8, 9)$ (dashed edges) with $ts(A, B, C) = 24$ and $ms(A, B, C) = 15$. The pairwise DCJ distances are $d_{dcj}(A, B) = d_{dcj}(A, C) = d_{dcj}(C, B) = 8$, $d_{dcj}(A, M) = 3$, $d_{dcj}(B, M) = 5$, and $d_{dcj}(C, M) = 7$.

Right panel: Breakpoint graph of the same genomes A (red edges), C (green edges), and genome $B' = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)$ (blue edges) obtained from B by a single fusion. The genomes A, B', C have a different median genome $M' = (1, -3, -4, -5, -2, -6, 7, -10, -11, 8, 9)$ (dashed edges) with the same median score $ms(A, B', C) = 15$ and larger triangle score $ts(A, B', C) = 26$. The pairwise DCJ distances are $d_{dcj}(A, B') = d_{dcj}(C, B') = 9$, $d_{dcj}(A, C) = 8$, $d_{dcj}(A, M') = 4$, $d_{dcj}(B', M') = 6$, and $d_{dcj}(C, M') = 5$. The median genomes M and M' were computed with GASTS [14].

and its bounds. When A, B, C equal the same genome M , the median score trivially coincides with its lower and upper bounds as $ts(M, M, M) = ms(M, M, M) = 0$. Since each rearrangement may change the triangle score by at most 2 and the median score by at most 1 (Lemma 4), we are particularly interested in optimal rearrangements that increase the triangle score by 2 (and thus increase the lower bound by 1).

We showed that the median score attains its lower bound (i.e., $ms(A, B, C) = 1/2 \cdot ts(A, B, C)$) exactly on the triples of genomes that can be obtained from a single genome with optimal rearrangements (Theorem 6). We proved that optimal rearrangements are common enough to exist for any triple of genomes as soon as at least two of their pairwise distances are smaller than the maximum (Theorem 2) and to produce a triple of genomes with the prescribed pairwise distances (Theorem 3). From this perspective, it comes as a total surprise that optimal rearrangements are not “powerful” enough to always increase the median score as illustrated by the counterexample in Fig. 4. This counterexample implies that the median score and the

triangle score are not as well-correlated as one's intuition may suggest.

It remains unclear how tight is the upper bound for the median score, while a better upper bound may improve performance of existing algorithms for computing the median score. Nonetheless, we made an initial step in this direction by proving that there is no upper bound equal the lower bound plus a constant (Theorem 7).

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the Government of the Russian Federation (grant 11.G34.31.0018).

References

1. Yancopoulos S, Attie O, Friedberg R: **Efficient sorting of genomic permutations by translocation, inversion and block interchange.** *Bioinformatics* 2005, **21**(16):3340–3346.
2. Bergeron A, Mixtacki J, Stoye J: **A Unifying View of Genome Rearrangements.** *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2006, **4175**:163–173.
3. Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA: **Multi-Break Rearrangements and Chromosomal Evolution.** *Theoretical Computer Science* 2008, **395**(2-3):193–202.
4. Tannier E, Zheng C, Sankoff D: **Multichromosomal median and halving problems under different genomic distances.** *BMC Bioinformatics* 2009, **10**:120.
5. Caprara A: **The Reversal Median Problem.** *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 2003, **15**:93–113.
6. Xu AW, Sankoff D: **Decompositions of Multiple Breakpoint Graphs and Rapid Exact Solutions to the Median Problem.** *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2008, **5251**:25–37.
7. Xu AW: **A Fast and Exact Algorithm for the Median of three Problem: a Graph Decomposition Approach.** *Journal of Computational Biology* 2009, **16**:1369–1381.
8. Lenne R, Solnon C, Tannier E, Birattari M: **Effective Stochastic Local Search Algorithms for the Genomic Median Problem.** In *In: Doctoral Symposium on Engineering: Stochastic Local Search Algorithms (SLS-DS). IRIDIA Technical Report Series* 2007:1–5.
9. Rajan V, Xu A, Lin Y, Swenson K, Moret B: **Heuristics for the inversion median problem.** *BMC Bioinformatics* 2010, **11**(Suppl 1):S30.
10. Goeffon A, Nikolski M, Sherman DJ: **An efficient probabilistic population-based descent for the median genome problem.** In *Proceedings of the 10th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation (GECCO)* 2008:315–322.
11. Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA: **Are There Rearrangement Hotspots in the Human Genome?** *PLoS Computational Biology* 2007, **3**(11):e209.
12. Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA: **Breakpoint Graphs and Ancestral Genome Reconstructions.** *Genome Research* 2009, **19**(5):943–957.
13. Alekseyev MA: **Multi-Break Rearrangements and Breakpoint Re-uses: from Circular to Linear Genomes.** *Journal of Computational Biology* 2008, **15**(8):1117–1131.
14. Xu AW, Moret BME: **GASTS: Parsimony Scoring under Rearrangements.** *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2011, **6833**:351–363.