

# *RasBhari*: optimizing spaced seeds for database searching, read mapping and alignment-free sequence comparison

Lars Hahn      Chris-André Leimeister      Burkhard Morgenstern

April 30, 2022

## Abstract

Many algorithms for sequence analysis use *patterns* or *spaced seeds* consisting of *match* and *don't-care* positions, such that only characters at the *match positions* are considered when sub-words of the sequences are counted or compared. The performance of these approaches depends on the underlying patterns. Herein, we show that the *overlap complexity* of a pattern set that was introduced by Ilie and Ilie is closely related to the *variance* of the number of *spaced-word* matches between two evolutionarily related sequences, with respect to this pattern set. We propose an improved hill-climbing algorithm to optimize sets of patterns or *multiple seeds* for database searching, read mapping and alignment-free sequence comparison. Experimental results show that our approach generates seeds with higher *sensitivity* than existing approaches. In our *spaced-words* approach to alignment-free sequence comparison, pattern sets calculated with *RasBhari* led to more accurate estimates of phylogenetic distances than the randomly generated pattern sets that we previously used. Our software is available at <http://spaced.gobics.de/content/RasBhari.tar.gz>

## 1 Introduction

Many fundamental algorithms for sequence comparison rely on counting or comparing *sub-words* of sequences. Pairs of similar words are used as *seeds* in the *hit-and-extend* approach to database searching and read mapping [1, 28, 11]; in alignment-free sequence comparison, sequences are represented as word-frequency vectors to estimate distances or similarities between them, *e.g.* as a basis for phylogeny reconstruction [6, 29, 34, 16], see [33] for a review.

It is well known that many of these approaches produce better results if *spaced seeds* are used instead of the initially used *contiguous* words or word matches. That is, for a pre-defined binary pattern  $P$  of *match* and *don't-care* positions, one considers only those positions in a sub-word of the same length that correspond to *match* positions in the pattern. The performance of these approaches can be further improved if *multiple* patterns are used instead of single patterns.

Spaced seeds have been first proposed by Ma *et al.* and were implemented in the *PatternHunter* software [22]; multiple spaced seeds are now a standard *filtering* step in homology searching [9, 4]. Spaced words or seeds have also been shown to be superior to contiguous words in metagenome sequence clustering [5], protein classification [26], read mapping [27, 24] and phylogeny reconstruction [18]. Similarly, the *average common substring (ACS)* approach [32] could be improved by allowing for mismatches [10, 19, 31, 30]. Brejova *et al.* extended the concept of *spaced seeds* to detect homologies among protein-coding regions [2] and to *vector seeds* [3]. In general, the advantage of spaced words compared to contiguous words is the fact that spaced-word occurrences at neighbouring sequence positions are statistically less dependent than occurrences of contiguous words [21, 23].

If (multiple) spaced seeds are used for sequence comparison, the underlying patterns of match and don't-care positions are of crucial importance for the quality of the results. Generally, non-periodic patterns are preferred since they minimize the redundancy of overlapping matches and lead to a more even distribution of hits or matches. Noé and Martin [25] defined a *coverage criterion* for multiple spaced seeds and showed that it is well related to the *Hamming distance* between two sequences.

In the hit-and-extend approach to database searching, one wants to maximize *sensitivity* of seeds, *i.e.* the probability to find a match in a homology region with a given length  $L$  and match probability  $p$  between a query and a database sequence. Calculating the sensitivity of a pattern or seed is *NP hard*. The sensitivity can be approximated by dynamic programming [22, 20], but this is still exponential in the length of the pattern, in *PatternHunter II*, a *greedy* algorithm is used. In 2007, Ilie and Ilie introduced the *overlap complexity* for sets of patterns or multiple seeds and showed that this quantity is closely related to the *sensitivity* in database searching [14]. In contrast to the sensitivity, however, the overlap complexity of a seed can be easily calculated. To find optimal seeds, Ilie and Ilie proposed a *hill-climbing algorithm* that minimizes the overlap complexity. They implemented their algorithm in a software tool called *SpEED* [15], which is several orders of magnitude faster than previous approaches and is now considered

the state-of-the-art in seed optimization.

Recently, we proposed to use *spaced-word* frequencies instead of word frequencies for alignment-free sequence comparison [18, 13]. We showed that phylogenetic trees calculated from spaced-word frequencies are more accurate than trees calculated from contiguous-word frequencies. As in database searching, our results could be improved by using *multiple* patterns. In our original study, we used randomly generated multiple patterns of *match* and *don't-care* positions. In a follow-up paper, we studied the number  $N$  of spaced-word matches between two DNA sequences for a given set of binary patterns [23]. Our data suggest that minimizing the variance of  $N$  for pattern sets improves alignment-free phylogeny reconstruction.

In this paper, we first show that the variance of the number of spaced-word matches for a given set of binary patterns is closely related to the *overlap complexity* proposed in [14], and we propose an improved hill-climbing algorithm to minimize the variance of  $N$  or overlap complexity, respectively. While the algorithm proposed in [14] iterates over all patterns  $P$  in a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of patterns and all pairs of positions in  $P$  to improve  $\mathcal{P}$ , we calculate for each pattern  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  how much  $P$  contributes to the variance or overlap complexity, respectively, of  $\mathcal{P}$ . We then modify those patterns first that contribute most to the variance or complexity.

The implementation of our approach is called *RasBhari* (*Rapid Approach for Seed optimization Based on a Hill-climbing Algorithm that is Repeated Iteratively*). Experimental results show that seeds calculated with *RasBhari* have a slightly higher sensitivity than seeds calculated with *SpEED* while the run time of both programs is comparable. In alignment-free sequence comparison we obtain more accurate phylogenetic distances if we use *RasBhari* to minimize the variance of  $N$  for the underlying pattern sets, than we obtained with the randomly generated pattern sets that we previously used.

## 2 Overlap complexity and variance of a set of patterns

### 2.1 Overlap complexity

We consider a set  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  of binary patterns, where  $\ell_r$  is the length of pattern  $P_r$  and  $\ell = \max_r \ell_r$ . That is, each  $P_r$  is a word of length  $\ell_r$  over the alphabet  $\{1, 0\}$ . A ‘1’ in a pattern  $P_r$  represents a *match* position, a ‘0’ a *don't-care* position. For a single pattern  $P_r$ , the number of match

positions is called its *weight*. For simplicity, we assume that all patterns in a set  $\mathcal{P}$  have the same *weight*.

In [23], we defined for patterns  $P_r, P_{r'}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  the number  $n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)$  of positions that are match positions of  $P_r$  or match positions of  $P_{r'}$ , if  $P_{r'}$  is shifted by  $s$  positions relative to  $P_r$ . For example, for  $P_r = 101011, P_{r'} = 111001$  and  $s = 2$ , there are 6 positions (marked by asterisks below) that are match positions of  $P_r$  or  $P_{r'}$ , if  $P_{r'}$  shifted by 2 positions, so in this case we have  $n(P_r, P_{r'}, 2) = 6$ :

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc}
 P_r : & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & & \\
 P_{r'} : & & & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 & & * & * & * & * & * & & * \\
 & & & \$ & & \$ & & & 
 \end{array}$$

For the same situation, Ilie and Ilie defined  $\sigma[s] = \sigma_{r,r'}[s]$  as the number of positions where  $P_r$  and  $P_{r'}$  have a match positions [14]. In the above example one would therefore have  $\sigma[2] = 2$  (positions marked by '\$'). The *overlap complexity (OC)* of a set of patterns  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  is then defined in [14] as

$$\sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s=1-\ell_{r'}}^{\ell_r-1} 2^{\sigma_{r,r'}[s]} \tag{1}$$

Ilie and Ilie showed experimentally that the *OC* is highly correlated to the *sensitivity* of a pattern set. They proposed to search for pattern sets with minimal *OC* for hit-and-extend approaches in database searching, since the *OC* is much easier to calculate than the *sensitivity*. Since for any two patterns  $P_r, P_{r'}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the equality

$$\sigma_{r,r'}[s] = 2w - n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)$$

holds, the *overlap complexity* of a set  $\mathcal{P}$  can be written as

$$\sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s=1-\ell_{r'}}^{\ell_r-1} 2^{\sigma_{r,r'}[s]} = 2^{2w} \cdot \sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s=1-\ell_{r'}}^{\ell_r-1} (1/2)^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} \tag{2}$$

## 2.2 Variance of the number of spaced-word matches

Let  $P$  be a pattern of weight  $w$  such that  $\hat{P}_n$  is the  $n$ -th match position in  $P$ . For two sequences  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  over an alphabet  $\Sigma$ , we say that there is a

$P$ -match between  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  at  $(i, j)$  if  $S_1[i + \hat{P}_n - 1] = S_2[j + \hat{P}_n - 1]$  holds for  $1 \leq r \leq w$ . For example, for sequences

$$S_1 = ACTACAG \text{ and } S_2 = TATAGG$$

and  $P = 1101$ , there is a  $P$ -match at  $(3, 1)$ , since one has

$$S_1[3]S_1[4]S_1[6] = S_2[1]S_2[2]S_2[4] = TAA$$

For a set  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  of patterns, we say that there is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -match at  $(i, j)$  for each  $P_r \in \mathcal{P}$  that has a  $P$ -match at  $(i, j)$ . Note that there can be up to  $m$  different  $\mathcal{P}$ -matches at a pair  $(i, j)$  of positions.

In [23], we studied the number  $N = N(S_1, S_2, \mathcal{P})$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ -matches between sequences  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  under a simplified model of evolution without insertions and deletions, with a *match probability*  $p$  for pairs of homologous positions and a *background match probability* of  $q$ . It is easy to see that the *expected* number of  $\mathcal{P}$ -matches depends only on the number  $m$  of patterns in  $\mathcal{P}$  and on their lengths  $\ell_i$  and weight  $w$  (number of match positions) but *not* on the particular ‘shape’ of the patterns. The *variance* of  $Var(N)$ , however, does depend on ‘shape’ of the patterns.

As discussed in [23], many alignment-free distance or similarity measures are – explicitly or implicitly – a function of the number  $N$  of (spaced) word matches. To obtain stable distance measures for phylogeny reconstruction, it is therefore desirable to use pattern sets with minimal variance of  $N$ . For a given set  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  of patterns of lengths  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m$  and weight  $w$  each and the above simple sequence model, the variance of  $N$  can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} Var(N) \approx & (L - \ell + 1) \cdot \sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s \in R(r, r')} \left( p^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} - p^{2w} \right) \\ & + (L - \ell + 1) \cdot (L - \ell) \cdot \sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s \in R(r, r')} \left( q^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} - q^{2w} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $L$  is the length of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , respectively, and

$$R(r, r') = \begin{cases} \{1 - \ell_{r'}, \dots, \ell_r - 1\} & \text{if } r < r' \\ \{0, \dots, \ell_r - 1\} & \text{if } r = r' \end{cases}$$

is the *range* in which  $P_{r'}$  is to be shifted against  $P_r$ . Note that for different patterns  $P_{r'} \neq P_r$  we have to consider all  $\ell_{r'} + \ell_r - 1$  shifts between  $1 - \ell_{r'}$  and  $\ell_r - 1$  of  $P_{r'}$  against  $P_r$ , for example:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} P_r : & & & & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & & & & & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ P_{r'} : & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & & & & , & \dots & , & & & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ s : & & & & -4 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 3 \end{array}$$

By contrast, if a pattern  $P_r$  is shifted against itself, only shifts between 0 and  $\ell_r - 1$  need to be considered, to avoid double counting of shifts<sup>1</sup>, for example:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} P_r : & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & & & & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ P_r : & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & , & \dots & , & & & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ s : & & & 0 & & & & & & & & & 3 & \end{array}$$

On the right-hand side of (3), the first summand is the variance of the ‘homologous’ spaced-word matches (in a model without indels, these are spaced-word matches involving the same positions in both sequences), while the second summand comes from background matches. The *relative* weight of the background matches in (3) depends on the match probability  $p$  and the sequence length  $L$ ; Figure 1 shows that for  $p \gg q$  and small  $L$ , the variance of  $N$  is dominated by the ‘homologous’ term. Obviously, for larger  $L$ , the background spaced-word matches dominate the ‘homologous’ ones, since the number of background matches grows quadratically with  $L$ , while the ‘homologous’ matches grow only linearly.

Note that, for  $L, \ell$  and  $w$  fixed, minimizing the variance of  $N$  amounts to minimizing

$$\sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s \in R(r, r')} p^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} + (L - \ell) \cdot \sum_{r \leq r'} \sum_{s \in R(r, r')} q^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} \quad (4)$$

Comparison with (2) shows that, in the special case of  $p = 1/2$ , the first summand of (4) that corresponds to the *homologous* matches is almost identical with the *overlap complexity* defined by Ilie and Ilie (except for the range  $R(r, r)$  in which a pattern  $P_r$  is shifted against itself). For short sequences, the overlap complexity can therefore be seen as an approximation to the variance of the number of spaced-word matches.

In any case, the overlap complexity and the variance of  $N$  for a set of pattern  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  both have the form

$$\sum_{r \leq r'} \alpha_{r, r'}(\mathcal{P}) \quad (5)$$

with

$$\alpha_{r, r'}(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{s=1-\ell_{r'}}^{\ell_r-1} 2^{\sigma_{r, r'}[s]} & (OC) \\ (L - \ell + 1) \sum_{s \in R(r, r')} \left( p^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} + (L - \ell) \cdot q^{n(P_r, P_{r'}, s)} \right) & (Var) \end{cases}$$

<sup>1</sup>In [23], we ignored this fact and gave a slightly different equation for  $Var(N)$ .




Figure 1: Contribution of the *homologue* and *background* variance to the total variance of the number  $N$  of spaced-word matches in equation (3) for different match probabilities  $p$  and sequence lengths  $L$ .

Our optimization problem is therefore: for integers  $m, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_m, w$ , find a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $m$  patterns of lengths  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m$  and weight  $w$  that minimizes the sum (5).

### 3 Hill-climbing algorithms to find sets of patterns with minimal $Var(N)$ or $OC$

Both *SpEED* and our new algorithm start with a randomly generated pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$  and apply hill-climbing algorithms to gradually reduce the  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ . After a pattern set with low  $OC$  is obtained in this way, its *sensitivity* is calculated, if the aim is maximal sensitivity. If  $Var(N)$  is to be minimized, this step is omitted, of course. This is repeated, and the pattern set with the overall highest sensitivity or lowest  $Var(N)$  is returned.

#### 3.1 Original hill-climbing algorithm

To improve the current pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$ , the hill-climbing algorithm implemented in *SpEED* looks at all triples  $(r, i, j)$  where  $P_r$  is a pattern in  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $i$  and  $j$  are a *match position* and a *don't-care* position in  $P_r$ , respectively. For each such triple  $(r, i, j)$ , the algorithm considers the pattern set that would be obtained from  $\mathcal{P}$  by swapping  $i$  and  $j$  in  $P_r$  – *i.e.* by turning  $i$  into a don't-care and  $j$  into a match position. The  $OC$  is calculated for all pattern sets that could be obtained in this way, and the one with the lowest  $OC$  is selected as the next pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$ . This is repeated iteratively.

There are  $O(m \cdot \ell^2)$  triples  $(r, i, j)$  to be considered to modify the current pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$ . For each of these triples, the  $OC$  is to be calculated for the pattern set that would be obtained by swapping  $i$  and  $j$  in  $P_r$ . To this end, the modified pattern  $P_r$  has to be compared to the  $m - 1$  remaining patterns in  $\mathcal{P}$  which, for each of the other patterns, involves  $O(\ell)$  shifts of two patterns against each other. In each shift, the number of common match positions is to be counted, which takes again  $O(\ell)$  time. Thus, calculating the  $OC$  of the pattern set obtained by swapping two positions  $i$  and  $j$  in a pattern  $P_r$  takes  $O(m \cdot \ell^2)$  time, so finding an optimal triple  $(r, i, j)$  to determine the next pattern set takes  $O(m^2 \cdot \ell^4)$  time.<sup>2</sup> This step is repeated a certain number of times; for the pattern set that is finally obtained by this hill-climbing routine, the *sensitivity* is calculated. This whole procedure is

---

<sup>2</sup>Ilie and Ilie specified the time complexity of this step of their algorithm as  $O(m^2 \cdot \ell^5)$ , but this seems to be a mistake.



repeated 5,000 times, and finally the set with the overall best sensitivity is returned.

### 3.2 Improved hill-climbing algorithm

In our improved hill-climbing algorithm, we also swap a match position  $i$  with a don't-care position  $j$  in a pattern in each step of the algorithm, and we evaluate the pattern set that would be obtained by this operation. If the current set  $\mathcal{P}$  is improved in this way, the swap is accepted. However, instead of looking at *all* possible triples  $(r, i, j)$ , we look at those patterns first that contribute most to the  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$ , respectively, of  $\mathcal{P}$ . The contribution  $C_r$  of a pattern  $P_r \in \mathcal{P}$  to the  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  can be calculated as

$$C_r = \sum_{r'} \alpha_{r,r'} \quad (6)$$

The values  $C_r$  are obtained as a by-product whenever  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$  are calculated, so this takes no extra time. We then sort the patterns in  $P_r \in \mathcal{P}$  according to their contributions  $C_r$ , and we process them in descending order of  $C_r$ , *i.e.* we look at those patterns first that contribute *most* to the  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

For the current pattern in the list, we randomly select a match position  $i$  and a don't-care position  $j$ . If swapping  $i$  and  $j$  does *not* improve the current pattern set, we move on to the next pattern in the list and proceed in the same way. This is repeated until we find a pattern where swapping the selected pair of random positions does improve  $\mathcal{P}$ . In this case, the modified pattern is accepted, all values  $C_r$  are updated, the patterns in  $\mathcal{P}$  are sorted accordingly, and we start again with the pattern  $P_r$  with maximum  $C_r$ . If we reach the last pattern in the list without obtaining any improvement, we start again with the first pattern, *i.e.* the pattern with the largest  $C_r$ , select new random positions  $i$  and  $j$  etc. Processing one pattern  $P_r$  in this way takes  $O(m \cdot \ell^2)$  time, since we look only at one single pair  $(i, j)$  and calculate the  $OC$  or  $Var(N)$  of the pattern set that would be obtained by swapping  $i$  and  $j$  in  $P_r$ .

The hill climbing is continued until a user-defined number of triples  $(r, i, j)$  have been processed then the current pattern set is returned; by default, 25,000 triples are considered. If we want to obtain a pattern set with maximal *sensitivity*, the described hill-climbing procedure is repeated 100 times, and for the pattern set with the lowest  $OC$  among the 100 obtained pattern sets, the *sensitivity* is calculated. Again, this whole process

is repeated 5,000 times, so for a total of 5,000 pattern sets the sensitivity is calculated during one program run. This is similar to *SpEED*, but in *SpEED* the time-consuming sensitivity calculation is carried out after *one* round of hill climbing. By contrast, we run our faster hill-climbing routine 100 times before we calculate the sensitivity for the *best* pattern set from these 100 runs. The final output of our program is the pattern set with the highest sensitivity from the 5,000 iterations.

The number  $m$  of patterns and their weight are to be specified by the user. If  $Var(N)$  is to be minimized for alignment-free sequence comparison, all patterns have the same length  $\ell$  which is also to be specified by the user. If the *sensitivity* is to be maximized for database searching and read alignment, better results are achieved if the patterns in  $\mathcal{P}$  have different lengths. In this case, the maximum and minimum pattern lengths need to be specified. The program then selects lengths  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m$  that are evenly distributed between these extreme values.

## 4 Test Results

To evaluate *RasBhari*, we first applied it to generate pattern sets, maximizing the *sensitivity* for database searching and read mapping. For the number  $m$  of patterns, the length  $H$  of the homology regions the *weight*  $w$  of the patterns and the *match probability*  $p$  in the homology regions, we used the parameter settings from *SHRiMP* [27], *PatternHunter II* [20] and *BFAST* [12]. We compared the patterns produced by *RasBhari* to the results of *Iedera* [17], *SpEED* [15], *AcoSeeD* [8], *FastHC* and *MuteHC* [7] as published by the authors of these programs.

The sensitivity values of all compared programs are shown in Table 1. The results of *AcoSeeD* in Table 1 are *average* values over 10 program runs reported in [8]. If the sensitivity of a pattern set is to be optimized, the run time of *RasBhari* is comparable to *SpEED*, since the most time-consuming step in each program is to calculate the sensitivity of a current pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$  which is done 5,000 per program run by both methods.

In addition, we wanted to know if alignment-free sequence comparison can be improved by using pattern sets generated with *RasBhari*. To this end, we simulated pairs of related DNA sequences and estimated their evolutionary distances with the spaced-words approach described in [23]. For each pair of sequences, we estimated their evolutionary distance (*a*) using a set of randomly generated patterns and (*b*) using a pattern set with minimized variance of  $N$ , generated by *RasBhari*. The distance values obtained from

$w$	$p$	<i>Iedera</i>	<i>SpEED</i>	<i>AcoSeeD</i>	<i>FastHC</i>	<i>MuteHC</i>	<i>RasBhari</i>
<b><i>SHRiMP: 4 seeds</i> (<math>H = 50</math>)</b>							
10	0.75	90.6820	90.9098	90.9513	90.7312	<b>92.6812</b>	90.9614
	0.80	97.7586	97.8337	97.8521	97.7625	<b>98.3836</b>	97.8554
	0.85	99.7437	99.7569	99.7614	99.7431	<b>99.8356</b>	99.7618
11	0.75	83.2413	83.3793	<b>83.4728</b>	83.3068	83.4127	83.4679
	0.80	94.9350	94.9861	95.037	94.9453	95.0194	<b>95.0386</b>
	0.85	99.2189	99.2431	99.2478	99.2250	99.2486	<b>99.2506</b>
12	0.80	90.3934	90.5750	90.6328	90.4735	90.5820	<b>90.6648</b>
	0.85	98.0781	98.1589	98.1766	98.1199	98.1670	<b>98.1824</b>
	0.90	99.8773	99.8821	99.8853	99.8771	99.8836	<b>99.8864</b>
16	0.85	84.5795	84.8212	<b>84.9829</b>	84.6558	84.8764	84.969
	0.90	97.2806	97.4321	97.4712	97.3556	97.4460	<b>97.5035</b>
	0.95	99.9331	99.9388	99.9419	99.9347	99.9424	<b>99.9441</b>
18	0.85	72.1695	73.1664	<b>73.27</b>	72.9558		73.2209
	0.90	93.0442	93.7120	93.7778	93.6030		<b>93.78</b>
	0.95	99.6690	99.7500	<b>99.7599</b>	99.7399		99.7557
<b><i>PatternHunterII: 16 seeds</i> (<math>H = 64</math>)</b>							
11	0.70	92.0708	93.2526		93.0585		<b>93.4653</b>
	0.75	98.3391	98.6882		98.6352		<b>98.7573</b>
	0.80	99.8366	99.8820		99.8750		<b>99.8907</b>
<b><i>BFAST: 10 seeds</i> (<math>H = 50</math>)</b>							
22	0.85	60.1535	60.8127		60.0943		<b>60.9919</b>
	0.90	87.9894	88.5969		88.0426		<b>88.8005</b>
	0.95	99.2196	99.3659		99.2923		<b>99.4099</b>

Table 1: Sensitivity of different programs for seed optimization in hit-and-extend database searching and read mapping. Parameter settings for the number  $m$  and weight  $w$  of patterns, the length  $H$  of the gap-free homology region between query and database sequences and the match probability  $p$  in the homology regions, are taken from three popular programs *SHRiMP*, *PatternHunter II* and *BFAST*. Results of existing programs are taken from their respective publications.

Substitutions per position	0 - 0.25	0.25 - 0.5	0.5 - 0.75	0.75 - 1.0
Random pattern sets	1.86E-06	5.10E-05	1.92E-03	3.11E-02
<i>RasBhari</i>	1.69E-06	4.51E-05	1.60E-03	3.01E-02

Table 2: Accuracy of pattern sets in alignment-free phylogeny reconstruction. Evolutionary distances between simulated DNA sequences were estimated based on the number  $N$  of spaced-word matches between them, using a previously published method [23]. Four sets of sequence pairs were generated, each with a substitution rate within the range specified in the table. Pattern sets were generated with *RasBhari*, minimizing the variance of  $N$ , and compared to randomly generated pattern sets. The table shows the mean quadratic difference between the estimated distances and the ‘real’ distances, *i.e.* the number of substitutions per position in the model used to generate the sequence pairs.

both program runs were compared to the ‘real’ distances, *i.e.* the number of substitutions per position that were used to generate the sequences.

As test data, we generated four categories of sequences with 10,000 pairs of DNA sequences of length 100kb each. In every category, we used a range of substitution rates as shown in Table 2; the substitution rate for a sequence pair was randomly chosen within this range. For each program run, we used a set of  $m = 3$  patterns of length 20 with 16 *match* and 4 *don’t-care* positions. Table 2 shows the *mean quadratic difference* between the estimated distances and the ‘real’ distance between the sequences. In all four categories, the pattern sets with minimal  $Var(N)$  generated with *RasBhari* were superior to the randomly generated pattern sets.

## 5 Conclusion

We developed a program called *RasBhari* to calculate sets of binary *patterns* or *spaced seeds* for read mapping, database searching and alignment-free sequence comparison. As the established program *SpEED*, we use a *hill-climbing* algorithm to find pattern sets with minimal *overlap complexity (OC)* in order to maximize the *sensitivity of seeds* in ‘hit-and-extend’ read mapping and database searching. Alternatively, our program can minimize the *variance* of the number  $N$  of *spaced-word matches* for alignment-free sequence comparison and phylogeny reconstruction. The hill-climbing algorithm is applied multiple times, and the best overall pattern set is returned.

The main difference between *RasBhari* and *SpEED* is that, for a given pattern set  $\mathcal{P}$ , we calculate for each pattern  $P_r \in \mathcal{P}$  how much  $P_r$  contributes to the overlap complexity or variance of  $N$ , respectively. Our hill-climbing algorithm then modifies those patterns first that contribute most to the quantity that is to be minimized. A single round of hill-climbing in *RasBhari* is therefore faster than in *SpEED*, so we can carry out more rounds of hill-climbing in the same time. As a result, we obtain higher sensitivity values than *SpEED* in comparable time.

The increase in sensitivity that we obtain with our algorithm seems modest, the improvement is usually in the first or second digit after the decimal mark. In database searching and read mapping, however, even small improvements in sensitivity can lead to significantly better results. Ilie *et al.* pointed out that, for 100-fold coverage of the human genome, a mere 1% improvement in seed sensitivity would mean that 3 billion more nucleotides could be mapped [15]. The improvement in sensitivity that we achieved with our improved hill-climbing algorithm should thus be practically relevant in genome projects.

To our knowledge, there are no other algorithms to minimize the variance of the number  $N$  of spaced-word matches between two sequences. We therefore compared *RasBhari* to the *random* pattern sets that we previously used for alignment-free sequence comparison [18, 23]. Since the pattern sets produced by *RasBhari* were superior to those random patterns, we will integrate *RasBhari* into our web server for alignment-free sequence comparison at <http://spaced.gobics.de/> [13].

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Laurent Noé for helpful discussions and for pointing out the similarity between the overlap complexity and the variance of the number of spaced-word matches.

## References

- [1] Stephen F. Altschul, Warren Gish, Webb Miller, Eugene M. Myers, and David J. Lipman. Basic local alignment search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 215:403–410, 1990.
- [2] Brona Brejova, Daniel G. Brown, and Tomas Vinar. Optimal spaced seeds for homologous coding regions. *Journal of Bioinformatics and*

- Computational Biology*, 1:595–610, 2004. Early version appeared in CPM 2003.
- [3] Brona Brejova, Daniel G. Brown, and Tomas Vinar. Vector seeds: an extension to spaced seeds. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 70:364–380, 2005.
  - [4] Benjamin Buchfink, Chao Xie, and D. H Huson. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using diamond. *Nature Methods*, 12:59–60, 2015.
  - [5] Karel Brinda, Maciej Sykulski, and Gregory Kucherov. Spaced seeds improve  $k$ -mer-based metagenomic classification. *Bioinformatics*, 31:3584–3592, 2015.
  - [6] Benny Chor, David Horn, Yaron Levy, Nick Goldman, and Tim Massingham. Genomic DNA  $k$ -mer spectra: models and modalities. *Genome Biology*, 10:R108, 2009.
  - [7] Phan-Thuan Do and Cam-Giang Tran-Thi. An improvement of the overlap complexity in the spaced seed searching problem between genomic dnas. In *Proceedings of the 2nd National Foundation for Science and Technology Development Conference on Information and Computer Science (NICS)*, pages 271–276, 2015.
  - [8] Dong Do Duc, Huy Q. Dinh, Thanh Hai Dang, Kris Laukens, and Huan Hoang Xuan. AcoSeeD: An ant colony optimization for finding optimal spaced seeds in biological sequence search. In *ANTS'12*, pages 204–211, 2012.
  - [9] Martin C. Frith and Laurent Noé. Improved search heuristics find 20 000 new alignments between human and mouse genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 42:e59, 2014.
  - [10] Bernhard Haubold, Nora Pierstorff, Friedrich Möller, and Thomas Wiehe. Genome comparison without alignment using shortest unique substrings. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 6:123, 2005.
  - [11] Hannes Hauswedell, Jochen Singer, and Knut Reinert. Lambda: the local aligner for massive biological data. *Bioinformatics*, 30:i349–i355, 2014.
  - [12] Nils Homer, Barry Merriman, and Stanley F. Nelson. Bfast: An alignment tool for large scale genome resequencing. *PLoS ONE*, 4(11):e7767+, 2009.

- [13] Sebastian Horwege, Sebastian Lindner, Marcus Boden, Klaus Hatje, Martin Kollmar, Chris-André Leimeister, and Burkhard Morgenstern. *Spaced words* and *kmacs*: fast alignment-free sequence comparison based on inexact word matches. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 42:W7–W11, 2014.
- [14] Lucian Ilie and Silvana Ilie. Multiple spaced seeds for homology search. *Bioinformatics*, 23:2969–2977, 2007.
- [15] Lucian Ilie, Silvana Ilie, and Anahita M. Bigvand. SpEED: fast computation of sensitive spaced seeds. *Bioinformatics*, 27:2433–2434, 2011.
- [16] Se-Ran Jun, Gregory E. Sims, Guohong A. Wu, and Sung-Hou Kim. Whole-proteome phylogeny of prokaryotes by feature frequency profiles: An alignment-free method with optimal feature resolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107:133–138, 2010.
- [17] Gregory Kucherov, Laurent Noé, and Mikhail Roytberg. A unifying framework for seed sensitivity and its application to subset seeds. *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 4:553–569, 2006.
- [18] Chris-André Leimeister, Marcus Boden, Sebastian Horwege, Sebastian Lindner, and Burkhard Morgenstern. Fast alignment-free sequence comparison using spaced-word frequencies. *Bioinformatics*, 30:1991–1999, 2014.
- [19] Chris-André Leimeister and Burkhard Morgenstern. *kmacs*: the *k*-mismatch average common substring approach to alignment-free sequence comparison. *Bioinformatics*, 30:2000–2008, 2014.
- [20] Ming Li, Bin Ma, Derek Kisman, and John Tromp. PatternHunter II: Highly sensitive and fast homology search. *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 02:417–439, 2004.
- [21] Ming Li, Bin Ma, and Louxin Zhang. Superiority and complexity of the spaced seeds. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm*, SODA '06, pages 444–453, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2006. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [22] Bin Ma, John Tromp, and Ming Li. PatternHunter: faster and more sensitive homology search. *Bioinformatics*, 18:440–445, 2002.

- [23] Burkhard Morgenstern, Bingyao Zhu, Sebastian Horwege, and Chris-André Leimeister. Estimating evolutionary distances between genomic sequences from spaced-word matches. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 10:5, 2015.
- [24] Laurent Noé, Marta Gırdea, and Gregory Kucherov. Designing efficient spaced seeds for SOLiD read mapping. *Advances in Bioinformatics*, 2010:1–12, 2010.
- [25] Laurent Noé and Donald E. K. Martin. A coverage criterion for spaced seeds and its applications to SVM string-kernels and  $k$ -mer distances. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 12:947–963, 2014.
- [26] Taku Onodera and Tetsuo Shibuya. The gapped spectrum kernel for support vector machines. In Petra Perner, editor, *Machine Learning and Data Mining in Pattern Recognition*, volume 7988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–15. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [27] Stephen M. Rumble, Phil Lacroute, Adrian V. Dalca, Marc Fiume, Arend Sidow, and Michael Brudno. SHRiMP: Accurate mapping of short color-space reads. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 5:e1000386+, 2009.
- [28] Sophie Schbath, Véronique Martin, Matthias Zytnecki, Julien Fayolle, Valentin Loux, and Jean-Francois Gibrat. Mapping reads on a genomic sequence: An algorithmic overview and a practical comparative analysis. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 19:796–813, 2012.
- [29] Gregory E. Sims, Se-Ran Jun, Guohong A. Wu, and Sung-Hou Kim. Alignment-free genome comparison with feature frequency profiles (FFP) and optimal resolutions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106:2677–2682, 2009.
- [30] Sharma V. Thankachan, Sriram P. Chockalingam, Yongchao Liu, Alberto Apostolico, and Srinivas Aluru. ALFRED: a practical method for alignment-free distance computation. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 2015.
- [31] Sharma V. Thankachan, Sriram P. Chockalingam, Yongchao Liu, Ambujam Krishnan, and Srinivas Aluru. A greedy alignment-free distance estimator for phylogenetic inference. In *asdf*, ICCABS 2015, *accepted*, page accepted, 2015.



- [32] Igor Ulitsky, David Burstein, Tamir Tuller, and Benny Chor. The average common substring approach to phylogenomic reconstruction. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 13:336–350, 2006.
- [33] Susana Vinga. Editorial: Alignment-free methods in computational biology. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 15:341–342, 2014.
- [34] Susana Vinga, Alexandra M. Carvalho, Alexandre P. Francisco, Luís M. S. Russo, and Jonas S. Almeida. Pattern matching through chaos game representation: bridging numerical and discrete data structures for biological sequence analysis. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 7:10, 2012.