

FSG: Fast String Graph Construction for De Novo Assembly of Reads Data

Paola Bonizzoni, Gianluca Della Vedova, Yuri Pirola, Marco Previtali, and Raffaella Rizzi

Abstract—The string graph for a collection of next-generation reads is a lossless data representation that is fundamental for de novo assemblers based on the overlap-layout-consensus paradigm. In this paper, we explore a novel approach to compute the string graph, based on the FM-index and Burrows-Wheeler Transform. We describe a simple algorithm that uses only the FM-index representation of the collection of reads to construct the string graph, without accessing the input reads. Our algorithm has been integrated into the SGA assembler as a standalone module to construct the string graph.

The new integrated assembler has been assessed on a standard benchmark, showing that FSG is significantly faster than SGA while maintaining a moderate use of main memory, and showing practical advantages in running FSG on multiple threads.

Index Terms—string graph; external-memory algorithms



1 INTRODUCTION

DE novo sequence assembly continues to be one of the most fundamental problems in Bioinformatics. Most of the available assemblers [1], [12], [13], [19], [20], [25] are based on the notions of de Bruijn graphs and of k -mers (short k -long substrings of input data). Currently, biological data are produced by different Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) technologies which routinely and cheaply produce a large number of reads whose length varies according to the specific technology. For example, reads obtained by Illumina technology (which is the most used) have length between 50 and 150 bases [21].

To analyze datasets coming from different technologies, hence with a large variation of read lengths, an approach based on same-length strings is likely to be limiting, as witnessed by the recent introduction of variable-length de Bruijn graphs [9]. The *string graph* [18] representation is an alternative approach that does not need to break the reads into k -mers (as in the de Bruijn graphs), and has the advantage of immediately distinguishing the repeats that result in different arcs. The string graph is the main data representation used by assemblers based on the overlap-layout-consensus paradigm. Indeed, in a string graph, the vertices are the input reads and the arcs corresponds to overlapping reads, with the property that contigs are paths of the string graph. An immediate advantage of string graphs is that they can disambiguate some repeats that methods based on de Bruijn graphs might resolve only at later stages—for example, the repeats that are longer than $k/2$ but contained in a read.

Even without repetitions, analyzing only k -mers instead of the longer reads can result in some information loss, since bases of a read that are more than k positions apart are not part of the same k -mer, but might be part of the same read. Indeed, differently from de Bruijn graphs, any path of a string graph is a valid assembly of reads. On the other hand, string graphs are more computationally intensive to

compute [24], justifying our search for faster algorithms. From an algorithmic point of view, the most used string graph assembler is SGA [23], which first constructs the BWT [11] and the FM-index of a set of strings, and then uses those data structures to efficiently compute the arcs of the string graph (connecting overlapping reads). Another string graph assembler is Fermi [17] which implements a variant of the original SGA algorithm [23] that is tailored for SNP and variant calling. A number of recent works face the problem of designing efficient algorithmic strategies or data structures for building string graphs. Among those works we can find a string graph assembler [4], based on a careful use of hashing and Bloom filters, with performance comparable with the first SGA implementation [23]. Another important alternative approach to SGA is Readjoinder [15] which is based on an efficient computation of a subset of exact suffix-prefix matches, and by subsequent rounds of suffix sorting, scanning, and filtering outputs the non-redundant arcs of the graph.

All assemblers based on string graphs (such as SGA) need to both (1) query an indexing data structures (such as an FM-index), and (2) access the original reads set to detect prefix-suffix overlaps between the elements. Since the self-indexing data structures, such as FM-index, represent the whole information of the original dataset, an interesting problem is to design efficient algorithms for the construction of string graphs that only require to keep the index and do not need to access the read set together with the index. Improvements in this direction have both theoretical and practical motivations. Indeed, detecting prefix-suffix overlaps only by analyzing the (compressed) index is an almost unexplored problem, and managing such data structure is usually more efficient.

The information contained in the indexing data structure can be analyzed with different and almost orthogonal approaches. A natural and straightforward goal is to minimize the amount of data maintained in Random Access Memory (RAM); in this paper we will introduce a method that is able to build the whole string graph by a limited number

• P. Bonizzoni, G. Della Vedova, Y. Pirola, M. Previtali, R. Rizzi were with DISCo, Univ. Milano-Bicocca, Milano (Italy).

of sequential scans of the index. This property leads to the design of an algorithm that can easily exploit the external memory in order to lower the main memory requirements. Though based on a characterization of the string graph given in [7], where the main goal is to reduce the amount of main memory needed, our algorithm is based on an improved approach which allows us to have a memory and time efficient tool that may be directly integrated in a pipeline for assembling DNA reads using string graphs.

Following this research direction, we propose a new algorithm, called FSG, to compute the string graph of a set R of reads, whose $O(nm)$ time complexity matches that of SGA — n is the number of reads in R and m is the maximum read length. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first algorithm that computes a string graph using only the FM-index of the input reads. The vast literature on BWT and FM-index hints that this approach is amenable to further research. Our algorithm is based on a characterization of the string graph given in [7], but we follow a completely different approach.

An important observation is that SGA computes the string graph basically performing, for each read r , a query to the FM-index for each character of r , to compute the arcs outgoing from r . While this approach works in $O(nm)$ time, it can perform several redundant queries, most notably when the reads share common suffixes (a very common case). Our algorithm queries the FM-index in a specific order, so that each string is processed only once, while SGA might process more than once each repeated string.

It is important to notice that our novel algorithm uses a characterization of a string graph that is different, but equivalent, to the one in [18] stated in [7] and which is quite useful when processing reads with their FM-index. Moreover, since we have integrated our algorithm into SGA, the read correction and the assembly phases of SGA can be applied without any modification. These facts guarantees that the assemblies produced by our approach and SGA are the same. In a previous paper, we have tackled the problem of constructing the string graph in external memory [8] by taking advantages of some recent results on the external memory implementation of the FM-index [2]. Experimental results [8] have revealed that computing the FM-index and LCP (Longest Common Prefix) array are the two main limiting factors towards an efficient (in terms of running time and main memory requirements) external memory algorithm to construct the string graph. In fact, even the best known algorithms for these steps do not have an optimal I/O complexity [2], [3].

While the construction of the string graph in [8], once the FM-index is given, uses only 1GB of main memory, the investigation of an assembler that works entirely in external memory is only at the beginning and would require the improvement of some other steps in the assembly and FM-index construction. However, the research in [8] and in [7] suggested a characterization of the string graph alternative to the one in [18] which is quite useful when processing reads with their FM-index. has the potentiality of having the whole information needed to compute the string graph and thus the possibility of improving the efficiency in time of a tool which is entirely in main memory, such as SGA.

The FSG algorithm is quite simple and provides a

standalone approach to build a string graph that could be used for different specific read assembly purposes. We have implemented FSG and integrated it with the SGA assembler, by replacing in SGA the step related to the string graph construction. Our implementation follows the SGA guidelines, that is we use the correction step of SGA before computing the overlaps without allowing mismatches (which is also SGA’s default choice). only allows for perfect overlaps between the reads whereas SGA also permits to find overlaps within a given distance. Anyway, we want to point out that we before we perform the overlap computation and that SGA suggests to follow this approach too. Indeed, the guidelines to reproduce the assembly of the dataset NA12878 included in the SGA software package set the `--error-rate` parameter to 0, the default value. Therefore, it is fair to compare the performances of the two tools.

Notice that SGA is a finely tuned implementation that has performed very nicely in the latest Assemblathon competition [10].

We have compared FSG with SGA, where we have used the latter’s default parameter (that is, we compute overlaps without errors). Our experimental evaluation on a standard benchmark dataset shows that our approach is 2.3–4.8 times faster than SGA in terms of wall clock time (1.9–3 times in terms of user time). requiring only 2.2 times more memory than SGA. While the comparison of the running times points out that FSG makes fewer operations (and is therefore encouraging), the main memory comparison is partially skewed by the great quality of SGA implementation, which is a finely tuned implementation that has performed very nicely in the latest Assemblathon competition [10].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the definitions we will use in the following sections, in Section 3 we give a general presentation of the algorithm for building the string graph from a set R of reads, while only in Section 4 we discuss our efficient implementation based on the FM-index and Burrow-Wheeler Transform. In Section 5 an experimental analysis of an implementation of the algorithm is extensively discussed.

2 PRELIMINARIES

We briefly recall some standard definitions that will be used in the following. Let Σ be a constant-sized alphabet and let S be a string over Σ . We denote by $S[i]$ the i -th symbol of S , by $l = |S|$ the length of S , and by $S[i : j]$ the substring $S[i]S[i+1] \cdots S[j]$ of S . The *suffix* and *prefix* of S of length k are the substrings $S[l-k+1 : l]$ (denoted by $S[l-k+1 :]$) and $S[1 : k]$ (denoted by $S[: k]$) respectively. Given two strings (S_i, S_j) , we say that S_i *overlaps* S_j iff a nonempty suffix β of S_i is also a prefix of S_j , that is $S_i = \alpha\beta$ and $S_j = \beta\gamma$. In that case we say that that Z is the *overlap* of S_i and S_j , denoted as $ov_{i,j}$, that Y is the *right extension* of S_i with S_j , denoted as $rx_{i,j}$, and X is the *left extension* of S_j with S_i , denoted as $lx_{i,j}$.

In this paper we consider a set R of n strings over Σ that are terminated by the sentinel $\$,$ which is the smallest character. To simplify the exposition, we will assume that all input strings have exactly m characters, excluding the $\$.$ The *overlap graph* of a set R of strings is the directed graph

$G_O = (R, A)$ whose vertices are the strings in R , and each two overlapping strings $r_i = \alpha\beta$ and $r_j = \beta\gamma$ form the arc $(r_i, r_j) \in A$ labeled by α . In this case β is called the *overlap* of the arc and α is called the *extension* of the arc. Observe that the notion of overlap graph originally given by [18] is defined by labeling with γ the arc $(r_i, r_j) \in A$.

The notion of a string graph derives from the observation that in a overlap graph the label of an arc (r, s) may be obtained by concatenating the labels of a pair of arcs (r, t) and (t, s) and thus arc (r, s) can be removed from the overlap graph without loss of information, since all the valid paths are still in the graph after the removal of such arcs, called *redundant* arcs. In [18] redundant arcs are those arcs (r, s) labeled by $\alpha\beta$, for α the prefix of an arc (r, t) . In [7] we state an equivalent characterization of string graphs, which is given below. An arc $e_1 = (r_i, r_j)$ of G_O labeled by α is *transitive* (or *reducible*) if there exists another arc $e_2 = (r_k, r_j)$ labeled by δ where δ is a suffix of α . Therefore, we say that e_1 is *non-transitive* (or *irreducible*) if no such arc e_2 exists. The string graph of R is obtained from G_O by removing all reducible arcs.

This definition allows to use directly the FM-index to compute the labels of the string graph since the labels are obtained by backward extensions on the index.

The *Generalized Suffix Array (GSA)* [22] of R is the array SA where each element $SA[i]$ is equal to (k, j) if and only if the k -long suffix $r_j[|r_j| - k + 1 :]$ of the string r_j is the i -th smallest element in the lexicographic ordered set of all suffixes of the strings in R . The *Longest Common Prefix (LCP) array* of R , is the n -long array L such that $L[i]$ is equal to the length of the longest prefix shared by the k_i -suffix of r_{j_i} and the k_{i-1} -suffix of $r_{j_{i-1}}$, where $SA[i] = (k_i, j_i)$ and $SA[i-1] = (k_{i-1}, j_{i-1})$. Conventionally, $L[1] = -1$.

The *Burrows-Wheeler Transform (BWT)* of R is the sequence B such that $B[i] = r_j[|r_j| - k]$, if $SA[i] = (k, j)$ and $k > 1$, or $B[i] = \$$, otherwise. Informally, $B[i]$ is the symbol that precedes the k -long suffix of a string r_j where such suffix is the i -th smallest suffix in the ordering given by SA .

The i -th smallest (in lexicographic order) suffix is denoted by $LS[i]$, that is if $SA[i] = (k, j)$ then $LS[i] = r_j[|r_j| - k + 1 :]$. Given a string ω , all suffixes of R whose prefix is ω appear consecutively in LS . We call ω -interval [2] the maximal interval $[b, e]$ such that ω is a prefix of $LS[i]$ for each $i, b \leq i \leq e$ (we denote the ω -interval by $q(\omega)$). For any string ω , all suffixes of (the lexicographically sorted) SA whose prefix is ω appear consecutively in SA . Consequently, we define the ω -interval [2], denoted by $q(\omega)$, as the maximal interval $[b, e]$ such that $b \leq e$, $SA[b]$ and $SA[e]$ both have prefix ω . Notice that the width $e - b + 1$ of the ω -interval is equal to the number of occurrences of ω in some read of R . Since the BWT B and SA are closely related, we also say that $[b, e]$ is a ω -interval on B . Given a ω -interval and a character c , the *backward c -extension* of the ω -interval is the $c\omega$ -interval. (that is, the interval on the GSA of the suffixes sharing the common prefix $c\omega$). We recall that the FM-index [14] is essentially made of the two arrays C and Occ , where $C(c)$, with c a character, is the number of occurrences in B of characters that are alphabetically smaller than c , while $Occ(c, i)$ is the number of occurrences of c in the prefix $B[: i - 1]$ (hence $Occ(\cdot, 1) = 0$). Given a

string α and a character c , the backward c -extension of $q(\alpha)$ is $q(c\alpha) = [C(c) + Occ(c, b) + 1, C(c) + Occ(c, e) - 1]$ [14].

3 THE ALGORITHM

Our algorithm is based on two steps: the first is to compute the overlap graph, the second is to remove all transitive arcs. Given a string ω and R a set of strings (reads), let $R^S(\omega)$ and $R^P(\omega)$ be respectively the subset of R with suffix (resp. prefix) ω . As usual in string graph construction algorithms, we will assume that the set R is *substring free*, that is no string is a substring of another one. A fundamental observation is that the list of all nonempty overlaps β is a compact representation of the overlap graph, since all pairs in $R^S(\beta) \times R^P(\beta)$ are arcs of the overlap graph. Our approach to compute all overlaps between pairs of strings is based on the notion of *potential overlap*, which is a nonempty string $\beta^* \in \Sigma^+$, s.t. there exists at least one input string $r_i = \alpha\beta^*$ ($\alpha \neq \epsilon$) having suffix β^* , and there exists at least one input string $r_j = \gamma\beta^*\delta$ ($\delta \neq \epsilon$) having β^* as a substring (possibly a prefix). s.t. β^* is a suffix of some input string $r_i \in R$ and β^* is a substring, but not a suffix, of some input string $r_j = \gamma\beta^*\delta$ with $\delta \neq \epsilon$.

The first part of Algorithm 1 (lines 3–11) computes all potential overlaps, starting from those of length 1 and extending the potential overlaps by adding a new leading character. Each potential overlap is also checked to determine whether it is also an actual overlap. Lemma 1 is a direct consequence of the definition of potential overlap.

Lemma 1. *Let β be an overlap. Then all suffixes of β are potential overlaps.*

The second part of our algorithm, that is to detect all transitive arcs, can be sped up if we cluster together and examine some sets of arcs. We start considering the set of all arcs sharing the same overlap and a suffix of their extensions, as stated in the following definition.

Definition 1. *Assume that $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma^*, \beta \neq \epsilon$ and $X \subseteq R^P(\beta)$. The arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is the set $\{(r_1, r_2) : \alpha\beta \text{ is a suffix of } r_1, \beta \text{ is a prefix of } r_2 \text{ and } r_1 \in R, r_2 \in X\}$. The strings α and β are called the *extension* and the *overlap* of the arc-set. The set X is called the *destination set* of the arc-set.*

In other words, an arc-set contains the arcs with overlap β and having an extension with suffix α . An arc-set is *terminal* if there exists $r \in R$ s.t. $r = \alpha\beta$, while an arc-set is *basic* if $\alpha = \epsilon$ (that is the empty string). Since the arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is uniquely determined by strings $\alpha, \alpha\beta$, and X , the triple $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ will be used in our algorithm to encode the arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$.

Moreover, the arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is *correct* if X includes all irreducible arcs that have overlap β and extension with suffix α , that is $X \supseteq \{r_2 \in R^P(\beta) : r_1 \in R^S(\alpha\beta) \text{ and } (r_1, r_2) \text{ is irreducible}\}$. the destination set includes all irreducible arcs in the set $R^S(\alpha\beta) \times R^P(\beta)$. In other words, a correct arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ contains all irreducible arcs with extension α and overlap β . Observe that our algorithm computes only correct arc-sets and moreover terminal arc-sets only contain irreducible arcs (see Lemma 9).

Lemma 2. Let $AT(\epsilon, \epsilon\beta, X)$ be an arc triple that is not empty. Then $\beta[i :]$ is a potential overlap for any i between 1 and $|\beta|$.

Definition 2 (Extension). Let $A = AT(\alpha\gamma, \alpha\gamma\beta, X_1)$ and $B = AT(\gamma, \gamma\beta, X_2)$ be two arc triples. Then A extends B (conversely B is extended by A).

Definition 3 (Terminal arc triple). Let $A = AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ be an arc triple. If there exists $r \in R$ s.t. $r = \alpha\beta$, then A is a terminal arc triple.

“included” arc-triple Notice that, $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\gamma, X_1) \subseteq AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X_2)$ for any string α, β, γ .

Recall that an arc (r_1, r_3) is *transitive* iff there exists an arc (r_2, r_3) s.t. pe_{23} is a suffix of pe_{13} , called *reducing arc* [8]. It is easy to see that there exists also the arc (r_1, r_2) , and that $r_2 = pe_{23}ov_{23}$, $r_1 = pe_{13}ov_{13}$ and $pe_{13} = pe_{12}pe_{23}$. Moreover, $ov_{23} = ov_{13}\alpha$ where α is a prefix of ex_{13} . Since an arc may be reduced by several arcs, then we call (r_2, r_3) *minimum reducing arc*, if the length $|pe_{23}|$ is the minimum among the lengths of the prefix-extensions of all the arcs reducing (r_1, r_3) . The length $|pe_{23}|$ is called *min reducing length* (or *mr-length* in short). We assume that a non-transitive arc has an infinite *mr-length*.

The fact that (r_1, r_3) is reduced by (r_2, r_3) implies the existence (1) of an arc-triple (P, S_1) , where $S_1 = ov_{13}$ and $P = pe_{23}$, representing all arcs, with overlap S_1 , outgoing from reads with suffix PS_1 (including r_1), and (2) of a terminal arc-triple (P, S_2) , with the same p-extension $P = pe_{23}$ where $S_2 = ov_{23} = ov_{13}\alpha$, which represents all arcs, with overlap S_2 , outgoing from r_2 . Both the outgoing sets $R^p(S_1)$ and $R^p(S_2)$ contain r_3 . Notice that $S_2 = S_1\alpha$, and an arc can be reduced by an arc with a greater overlap. Furthermore, the arc-triple (P, S_1) cannot be terminal; on the contrary, there would exist the read $r_1 = PS_1$ which is contained in r_2 . • RR: Occorre figura •

On the other hand, given an arc-triple (P, S_1) and a terminal arc-triple (P, S_2) , s.t. their outgoing sets share a read r , then there exists an arc going into r that is transitive. It is easy to see that (under the substring-free assumption) (P, S_1) cannot be terminal. Moreover, S_1 must be a proper prefix of S_2 , since both S_1 and S_2 are prefix in r , and if S_1 would contain S_2 as a proper prefix, there would exist a read PS_2 contained in all the reads with suffix PS_1 (represented by the string-interval $q(PS_1\$)$). Thus, we can state $S_2 = S_1\alpha$, and $r = S_1\alpha\beta = S_2\beta$. Let $r_1 = \gamma PS_1$ be one of the reads in the set $R^s(PS_1)$ (having suffix PS_1), and let $r_2 = PS_2 = PS_1\alpha$ be the (unique) read in the set $R^s(PS_2)$. By definition, arc (r_1, r) is reduced by arc (r_2, r) . More in general, given an arc-triple (P, S_1) and a terminal arc-triple (P, S_2) , s.t. $R^{int} = R^p(S_1) \cap R^p(S_2)$ is nonempty, then the arcs $\in R^s(PS_1) \times R^{int}$ are transitive. When $|P|$ is equal to their *mr-length*, then we call (P, S_2) *minimum reducing arc-triple* w.r.t. (P, S_1) . Observe that $q(PS_1\$) \prec q(PS_2\$)$.

A terminal arc-triple cannot reduce another terminal arc-triple. In fact, it is trivial to see that terminal arc-triples (P, S) and (P', S') with different p-extensions P and P' represent arcs with different prefix-extensions; moreover, it is possible to show that (under the substring-free assumption) given two terminal arc-triples (P, S_1) and (P, S_2) (sharing the p-extension P), it holds $R^p(S_1) \cap R^p(S_2) = \emptyset$.

Now, we introduce the notion of *reduced arc-triple*. A

reduced arc-triple is a pair $(q(PS\$), R_{red}^p(S))$, s.t. each arc $(r, r') \in R^s(PS) \times R_{red}^p(S)$ has a *mr-length* that is $\geq |P|$. The outgoing set $R_{red}^p(S)$ is clearly a subset of $R^p(S)$, and we will refer to the string-interval $q(\$S)$ (representing the set $R^p(S)$) as the *base-interval* related to the reduced arc-triple. Observe that the set $R^s(PS) \times R_{red}^p(S)$ may include non-transitive arcs (i.e., arcs of the string graph) having an infinite *mr-length*. A basic arc-triple $(\epsilon, S) = (q(\$S), R^p(S))$ is trivially a reduced arc-triple, since it represents all the arcs having *mr-length* ≥ 0 . In the following, we will only deal with reduced arc-triples, simply referred as arc-triples and denoted with (P, S) .

If an arc-triple (P, S) is terminal (i.e., it has a nonempty backward $\$$ -extension), then $A(P, S)$ is the set of the arcs, with overlap S , outgoing from the (unique) read PS ; it is easy to prove that (under the substring-free assumption) all the arcs in $A(P, S)$ are non-transitive. In other words, a (reduced) terminal arc-triple represents arcs of the string graph.

Definition 4. Let $A = AT(\alpha\gamma, \alpha\gamma\beta, X_1)$, $B = AT(\gamma, \gamma\beta\delta, X_2)$ be two arc triples, let B be terminal, and let $X_2 \subseteq X_1$ we say that B reduces A and we call the tuple $(\alpha\gamma, \alpha\gamma\beta, X_1 \setminus X_2)$ the *residual arc triple* of A with respect to B denoted by $A \setminus B$.

In the same fashion, let I be the a of arc triples that reduce A we call the triple $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X_1 \setminus X)$ the *residual arc triple* of A with respect to the set I where $X = \bigcup_{(\cdot, X_i) \in I} X_i$.

Definition 5. Let A be an arc triple (either residual or not), we say that A is *irreducible* if there does not exist another arc triple B that reduces A .

Lemma 3. Let $(r_1 = \gamma_1\gamma\beta, r_2 = \beta\delta\delta_1)$ be a transitive arc of the overlap graph, and let $r_3 = \gamma\beta\delta$ be a read maximizing $|\gamma| + |\delta|$. Then (r_3, r_2) is an *irreducible arc* that reduces (r_1, r_2) .

The following lemma shows that we can group together arcs in the same arc-set, since an irreducible arc can reduce all arcs of an arc-set incoming in the same vertex.

The following lemma shows the use of the notion of arc-set to detect transitive arcs.

Lemma 4. Let (r_1, r_2) be an arc with overlap β . Then (r_1, r_2) is transitive if and only if (i) there exist $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \eta \in \Sigma^*$, $\gamma, \eta \neq \epsilon$ such that $r_1 = \gamma\alpha\beta$, $r_2 = \beta\delta\eta$, (ii) there exists an input read $r_3 = \alpha\beta\delta$ such that (r_3, r_2) is an *irreducible arc* of a nonempty arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$.

Proof. Let $r_3 = \alpha\beta\delta$ be the input string maximizing $|\delta|$ so that $r_1 = \gamma\alpha\beta$, $r_2 = \beta\delta\eta$, for some $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \eta \in \Sigma^*$. Notice that such string r_3 exists iff (r_1, r_2) is transitive.

If no such input string r_3 exists, then the arc triples $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$, for each set X , are empty.

Assume now that such an input string r_3 exists, then the arc (r_3, r_2) reduces (r_1, r_2) . First we prove that (r_3, r_2) is irreducible. Assume to the contrary that (r_3, r_2) is transitive, hence there exists an arc (r_4, r_2) whose extension is a suffix of α . Since r_4 is not a substring of r_3 , this fact contradicts the assumption that r_3 maximizes $|\delta|$. Consequently (r_3, r_2) is irreducible.

Moreover, let $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ be a generic correct arc triple (at least one such correct arc triple exists, when

$X = R^P(\beta\delta)$). Since (r_3, r_2) is correct, then $r_2 \in X$ hence $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ is nonempty. \square

A direct consequence of Lemma 4 is that a nonempty correct terminal arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ implies that all arcs of the form $(\gamma\alpha\beta, \beta\delta\eta)$, with $\gamma, \eta \neq \epsilon$ are transitive.

Proposition 5. *Let α, β be two strings. Let (r_1, r_3) and (r_2, r_3) be two arcs of $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, R^P(\beta))$. Let $r_4 = \alpha\beta\delta$ be a string distinct from r_1, r_2, r_3 . Then (r_4, r_3) reduces (r_1, r_3) if and only if (r_4, r_3) reduces (r_2, r_3) .*

Proposition 5 justifies the fact that all arcs in $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, R^P(\beta))$ are tested together to determine if they are reduced by a terminal correct arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, \cdot)$. Moreover, also by Lemma 4, a strategy is to enumerate all terminal nonempty arc triples AT and to remove all arc triple that are reduced by an arc of AT .

Let (r_1, r_2) be an arc with overlap β . Then (r_1, r_2) is transitive if and only if there exist $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \eta \in \Sigma^*$, $\gamma, \eta \neq \epsilon$ such that $r_1 = \gamma\alpha\beta$, $r_2 = \beta\delta\eta$, there exists an input read $r_3 = \alpha\beta\delta$, and all correct arc triples $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ are nonempty and terminal. Moreover (r_3, r_2) is an irreducible arc of $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$.

Another consequence of Lemma 4 is that an irreducible arc $(\alpha\beta\delta, \beta\delta\eta)$ with extension α and overlap $\beta\delta$ reduces all arcs with overlap β and extension $\gamma\alpha$, with $\gamma \neq \epsilon$.

Lemma 4 is the main ingredient used in our algorithm. More precisely, it computes terminal correct arc-sets of the form $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ for extensions α of increasing length. By Lemma 4, $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ contains arcs that reduce all the arcs contained in $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X')$ which have a destination in X . Since the transitivity of an arc is related to the extension α of the arc that is used to reduce it, and our algorithm considers extensions of increasing length, a main consequence of Lemma 4 is that it computes terminal arc-sets that are correct, that is they contain only irreducible arcs.

We will further speed up the computation by clustering together the arc-sets sharing the same extension.

Definition 6. *Let T be a set of arc-sets, and let α be a string. The cluster of α , denoted by $C(\alpha)$, is the union of all arc-sets of T whose extension is α .*

An interesting property of a cluster is that we cannot restrict the irreducible arcs contained.

Lemma 6 (Reduction in clusters). *Let $C(\alpha)$ be a cluster and let $e_1 = (r_1, r_2)$ be a generic arc of $C(\alpha)$. If e_1 is reduced by an arc $e_2 = (r_3, r_2)$ with extension α , then all arcs (r, r_2) in $C(\alpha)$ such that $r \neq r_3$ are transitive.*

Proof. Let β be the overlap of e_1 . Then $r_1 = \alpha_1\alpha\beta$ for some α_1 . Since the extension of e_2 is α , then $r_3 = \alpha\beta\delta$.

Let (r, r_2) be a generic arc of $C(\alpha)$. By construction of $C(\alpha)$, $r = \alpha_2\alpha\beta$. Notice that if $r \neq r_3$ then $\alpha_2 \neq \epsilon$. Since α is a suffix of $\alpha_2\alpha$, (r, r_2) is reduced by (r_3, r_2) . \square

In other words, if a cluster contains a transitive arc (r_1, r_2) , then such cluster contains at most an irreducible arc incoming in r_2 .

A Cluster is the union of disjoint arc triples.

At each step of the algorithm, we have only one arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ for each α, β .

We can now sketch Algorithm 1 which consists of two phases: the first phase (lines 3– 11) to compute the overlap graph, and the second phase (lines 13– 25) to remove all transitive arcs. In our algorithm we will store and manage the arcs as a set of triples $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$, where each triple encodes the arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$.

In our description, we assume that, given a string ω , we can compute in constant time (1) the number $\text{suff}(\omega)$ of input strings whose suffix is ω , (2) the number $\text{pref}(\omega)$ of input strings whose prefix is ω , (3) the number $\text{substr}(\omega)$ of occurrences of ω in the input strings. Moreover, we assume to be able to list the set $\text{listpref}(\omega)$ of input strings with prefix ω in $O(|\text{listpref}(\omega)|)$ time. In the next section we will describe how to compute such a data structure.

The first phase (lines 3– 11) exploits Lemma 1 to compute all overlaps. More in detail, potential overlaps can be defined inductively as follows. The empty string ϵ is a potential overlap of length 0, and given an i -long potential overlap β^* , the $(i + 1)$ -long string $c\beta^*$, for $c \in \Sigma$, is a potential overlap if and only if $\text{suff}(c\beta^*) > 0$ and $\text{substr}(c\beta^*) > \text{suff}(c\beta^*)$. Our algorithm uses this definition in order to build potential overlaps of increasing length, starting from the ones of length 1 which are symbols of Σ (line 2). We construct incrementally all potential overlaps, first by determining if, for each $a \in \Sigma$, the string a is a potential overlap: this corresponds to testing whether $\text{suff}(a) > 0$ and $\text{substr}(a) > \text{suff}(a)$. Then, starting from the potential overlaps of length 1, we iteratively compute the potential overlaps of increasing length by prepending each character $c \in \Sigma$ to each i -long potential overlap β^* (stored in the set *Last*), and we determine if $c\beta^*$ is an $(i + 1)$ -long potential overlap, testing whether $\text{suff}(c\beta^*) > 0$ and $\text{substr}(c\beta^*) > \text{suff}(c\beta^*)$: in this case we store the potential overlap in the set *New*.

The lists *Last* and *New* store the potential overlaps computed at the previous and at the current iteration respectively. By our previous observation, this procedure computes all potential overlaps. Observe that a potential overlap β^* is an overlap iff $\text{pref}(\beta^*) > 0$. Since each potential overlap is a suffix of some input string, there are at most nm distinct suffixes, where m and n are the length and the number of input strings, respectively. Each query $\text{suff}(\cdot)$, $\text{pref}(\cdot)$, $\text{substr}(\cdot)$ requires $O(1)$ time, thus the time complexity related to the total number of such queries is $O(nm)$. Given two strings β_1 and β_2 , when $|\beta_1| = |\beta_2|$ then no input string can be in both $\text{listpref}(\beta_1)$ and $\text{listpref}(\beta_2)$. Since each overlap is at most m long, the overall time spent in the $\text{listpref}(\cdot)$ queries is $O(nm)$. The first phase produces (line 7) the set of disjoint *basic* arc-sets $ARC(\epsilon, \beta, R^P(\beta))$ for each overlap β , whose union is exactly the set of arcs of the overlap graph. Recall that $\text{listpref}(\beta)$ gives the set of reads having prefix β , which has been denoted by $R^P(\beta)$. We recall that each arc-set $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is actually encoded as the triple $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$.

The second phase (lines 13– 25) classifies the arcs of the overlap graph into reducible or irreducible by computing arc-sets of increasing extension length, starting from the basic arc-sets $ARC(\epsilon, \epsilon\beta, R^P(\beta))$ obtained in the previous phase. By Lemma 4, we compute all correct terminal arc-sets $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ and we remove all arcs that are reduced by $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$. The set *Rdc* is used to store the destination

set X of the computed terminal arc-sets. Notice that if $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is terminal, then all of its arcs have the same origin $r = \alpha\beta$, that is $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X) = \{(r, x) : x \in X\}$. A consequence of Lemma 4 is that all arcs in the cluster $C(\alpha)$ with a destination in X and with an origin different from r are transitive and can be removed, simply by removing X from all destination sets in the arc-sets of $C(\alpha)$. Another application of Lemma 4 is that, when we find a terminal arc-set, then all of its arcs are irreducible, that is it is also correct. In fact, Lemma 4 classifies an arc to be transitive in relation to the existence of a read $r = \alpha\beta$ with extension α . Since the algorithm considers extensions α of increasing length, all arcs that have extensions shorter than α have been reduced in a previous step of the algorithm and thus terminal arc-set of previous iterations are all irreducible. More precisely, the test at line 18 is true iff the current arc-set is terminal. In that case, at line 19 all arcs of the arc-set are output as arcs of the string graph, and at line 20 the destination set X is added to the set Rdc that contains the destinations of $C(\alpha)$ that must be removed.

For each cluster $C(\alpha)$, we read twice all arc-sets that are included in $C(\alpha)$. The first time to determine which arc-sets are terminal and, in that case, to determine the set Rdc of reads that must be removed from all destinations of the arc-sets included in $C(\alpha)$. The second time, to compute the clusters $C(c\alpha)$ that will contain the nonempty arc-sets with extension $c\alpha$ consisting of the arcs that we still have to check if they are transitive or not (that is the arcs with destination set $X \setminus Rdc$). Notice that, in Algorithm 1, the cluster $C(\alpha)$ that is currently analyzed is stored in *CurrentCluster*, that is a list of the arc-sets included in the cluster. Moreover, the clusters that still have to be analyzed are stored in the stack *Clusters*. We use a stack to guarantee that the clusters are analyzed in the correct order, that is the cluster $C(\alpha)$ is analyzed after all the clusters $C(\alpha[i : \cdot])$ where $\alpha[i : \cdot]$ is a generic suffix of α . Moreover, we can prove that a generic irreducible arc (r_1, r_2) with extension α and overlap β belongs exactly to the clusters $C(\epsilon), \dots, C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha)$. Moreover, r_2 does not belong to the set Rdc when considering $C(\epsilon), \dots, C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[2 : \cdot])$, hence the arc (r_1, r_2) is correctly output by the algorithm when considering the cluster $C(\alpha)$.

The second part is to compute the irreducible arc triples corresponding to arcs of the string graph. In this case the procedure is iterative and proceeds by prepending a character to each left extension at each step. Therefore we can assume that we have all arc triples whose left extension has length i , all irreducible arc triples whose left extension has length $i - 1$, and all terminal arc triples whose left extension has length $i - 1$. At the end of the iteration, we compute (1) which arc triples whose left extension has length i are terminal and/or irreducible, and (2) all arc triples whose left extension has length $i + 1$.

An important invariant of our algorithm is that we do not keep all arc triples whose left extension has length i , but only those that are not reduced by an arc triple with a shorter left extension. Consequently an input arc triple $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ that is terminal is also irreducible.

Another observation is that arc triples are not managed separately, but are clustered together in *clusters*. The α -cluster consists of the set of the current arc triples whose

extension has suffix α .

Moreover the destination set of each arc triple (that is the set of the reads that are destination endpoints of an arc encoded by the arc triple) is updated, since all arc triples that are reducible are removed.

Each cluster is analyzed separately, and all arc triples in any given cluster are tested to determine if the arc triple is terminal. Notice that testing if $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ is terminal iff $\text{suff}(\$ \alpha\beta) > 0$. In that case, we add to the set of irreducible arc triples found in the current iteration arcs encoded by those terminal arc triples. All such arcs have label α . Moreover the outgoing set is added to the set D (called Rdc in Algorithm 1), initially empty for each cluster, that contains all the destination reads of all the irreducible arcs computed at the current iteration. We will use this information in the next step in order to remove all the arcs that have α as suffix of the label.

After having analyzed all arc triples in a cluster, those arc triples are scanned again. During this second scan, for each arc triple with extension α , overlap β , and outgoing set O , we test if there is at least a read in $O \setminus D$, that is a read of the outgoing set that has not been reduced. In that case, we split the α -cluster into the non-empty $c\alpha$ -cluster (such a cluster is nonempty iff $\text{suff}(c\alpha\beta) > 0$). The newly created cluster has destination set $O \setminus D$.

We can now prove that all irreducible arcs are actually output by our algorithm.

Lemma 7. *Let e_1 be an irreducible arc (r_1, r_2) with extension α and overlap β . Then e_1 belongs exactly to the $|\alpha| + 1$ clusters $C(\alpha), C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), \dots, C(\epsilon)$, while r_2 does not belong to the set Rdc when *currentCluster* is any of $C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), \dots, C(\epsilon)$. Moreover, e_1 is output by the algorithm when *currentCluster* is $C(\alpha)$.*

Proof. By construction, e_1 can belong only to the clusters $C(\alpha), C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), \dots, C(\epsilon)$.

Now we will prove that e_1 belongs to all clusters $C(\alpha), C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), \dots, C(\epsilon)$, while r_2 does not belong to the set Rdc when *currentCluster* is any of $C(\alpha[2 : \cdot]), C(\alpha[3 : \cdot]), \dots, C(\epsilon)$. Notice that $e_1 \in C(\epsilon)$. Assume to the contrary that there exists $i \geq 2$ such that $e_1 \in C(\alpha[i : \cdot])$ and $r_2 \in Rdc$ when considering a cluster $C(\alpha[i : \cdot])$. Since $r_2 \in Rdc$, by Lemma 4 there exists a nonempty terminal arc triple $AT(\alpha[i : \cdot], \alpha[i : \cdot]\beta\gamma, X)$ s.t. $r_2 = \beta\gamma\delta$ and $r_2 \in X$. Since it is terminal and nonempty, such arc triple contains the arc $(\alpha[i : \cdot]\beta\gamma, r_2)$ with extension $\alpha[i : \cdot]$. Since $\alpha[i : \cdot]$ is a suffix of α the arc e_1 is transitive, which is a contradiction.

In particular, when the algorithm examines $C(\alpha[2 : \cdot])$, $e_1 \in C(\alpha[2 : \cdot])$ and $r_2 \in X \setminus Rdc$. Moreover, e_1 belongs to the arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X \setminus Rdc)$ added to $\text{ExtendedClusters}[\alpha[1]]$ at line 25. Clearly, such arc triple is included in $C(\alpha)$. When the algorithm examines the cluster $C(\alpha)$, the arc triple containing e_1 satisfies the condition at line 18, hence such arc triple is output. \square

Corollary 8. *The set of arcs computed by the algorithm is a superset of the irreducible arcs of the string graph.*

Lemma 9. *Let $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$ be an arc-set inserted into a cluster by Algorithm 1. Then such arc-set is correct.*

Proof. Let e_1 be an irreducible arc (r_1, r_2) of $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$, and let α_1 be respectively the extension and the overlap β of e_1 . Since $e_1 \in AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$, α is a suffix of α_1 , therefore we can apply Lemma 7 which implies that $e_1 \in C(\alpha)$. Since the only arc triple contained in $C(\alpha)$ to which e_1 can belong is $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X)$, then $r_2 \in X$ which completes the proof. \square

We can now prove that no transitive arc is ever output.

Lemma 10. *Let e be an irreducible arc whose extension is α . Let α_1 be a suffix of α . Then $C(\alpha_1)$ is a current cluster at some iteration of lines 13–27.*

Lemma 11. *Let e_1 be a transitive arc (r_1, r_2) with overlap β . Then the algorithm does not output e_1 .*

Proof. Since e_1 is transitive, by Lemma 4 $r_1 = \gamma\alpha\beta$, $r_2 = \beta\delta\eta$, and there exists an input string $r_3 = \alpha\beta\delta$ such that the arc $e_2 = (r_3, r_2)$ with overlap $\beta\delta$ is irreducible, and all correct arc triples of the form $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X)$ are nonempty and terminal.

Assume to the contrary that e_1 is output by Algorithm 1, and notice that such arc can be output only when the current cluster is $C(\alpha)$ and the current arc triple is $AT(\gamma\alpha, \gamma\alpha\beta, X)$ with $r_2 \in X$.

By the construction of our algorithm, since the cluster $C(\gamma\alpha)$ is nonempty, also $C(\alpha)$ is nonempty: let us consider the iteration when the current cluster is $C(\alpha)$. By Lemma 9 the arc triple $AT(\alpha, \alpha\beta\delta, X_1)$ is correct, hence it contains the arc e_2 . But such arc triple satisfies the condition at line 18, hence $r_2 \in Rdc$ at that iteration. Consequently, $C(\alpha)$ cannot contain an arc triple with destination set with r_2 . \square

Corollary 12. *The set of arcs computed by the algorithm is a subset of the irreducible arcs of the string graph.*

Proof. For Lemma 11 the algorithm outputs all the irreducible arcs. \square

Theorem 13 is a direct consequence of Lemmas 7 and 11.

Theorem 13. *Given as input a set of strings R , Algorithm 1 computes exactly the arcs of the string graph.*

Lemma 14. *Irreducible terminal arc pairs can be computed iteratively starting from the set of arc-triples $\{AP(\epsilon, \alpha) : \alpha \in \Sigma^*\}$.*

We can now sketch the time complexity of the second phase. Previously, we have shown that the first phase produces at most $O(nm)$ arc-sets, one for each distinct overlap β . Since each string $\alpha\beta$ considered in the second phase is a suffix of an input string, and there are at most nm such suffixes, at most nm arc-sets are considered in the second phase. In the second phase, for each cluster a set Rdc is computed. If Rdc is empty, then each arc-set of the cluster can be examined in constant time, since all unions at line 20 are trivially empty and at line 25 the set $X \setminus Rdc$ is equal to X , therefore no operation must be computed. The interesting case is when $X \neq \emptyset$ for some arc-set. In that case the union at line 20 and the difference $X \setminus Rdc$ at line 25 are computed. Let $d(n)$ be the time complexity of those two operations on n -element sets (the actual time complexity depends on the data structure used). Notice that X is not empty only if we have found an irreducible arc, that is an arc of the string graph. Overall, there can be at most $|E|$ nonempty such sets X , where E is the set of arcs

Algorithm 1: Compute the string graph

Input : The set R of input strings

Output: The string graph of R , given as a list of arcs

```

1 Cluster  $\leftarrow$  empty list;
2 Last  $\leftarrow$   $\{c \in \Sigma \mid \text{suff}(c) > 0 \text{ and } \text{substr}(c) > \text{suff}(c)\}$ ;
3 while Last is not empty do
4   New  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ ;
5   foreach  $\beta^* \in$  Last do
6     if  $\text{pref}(\beta^*) > 0$  then
7       Append  $(\epsilon, \beta^*, \text{listpref}(\beta^*))$  to Cluster;
8     for  $c \in \Sigma$  do
9       if  $\text{suff}(c\beta^*) > 0$  and  $\text{substr}(c\beta^*) > \text{suff}(c\beta^*)$ 
10        then
11          Add  $c\beta^*$  to New;
12 Last  $\leftarrow$  New;
13 Clusters  $\leftarrow$  the stack with Cluster as its only element;
14 while Clusters is not empty do
15   CurrentCluster  $\leftarrow$  Pop(Clusters);
16   Rdc  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ ;
17   Let ExtendedClusters be an array of  $|\Sigma|$  empty
18   clusters;
19   foreach  $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X) \in$  CurrentCluster do
20     if  $\text{substr}(\alpha\beta) = \text{pref}(\alpha\beta) = \text{suff}(\alpha\beta) > 0$  then
21       Output the arcs  $(\alpha\beta, x)$  with label  $\alpha$  for
22       each  $x \in X$ ;
23       Rdc  $\leftarrow$  Rdc  $\cup$   $X$ ;
24   foreach  $(\alpha, \alpha\beta, X) \in$  CurrentCluster do
25     if  $X \not\subseteq$  Rdc then
26       for  $c \in \Sigma$  do
27         if  $\text{suff}(c\alpha\beta) > 0$  then
28           Append  $(c\alpha, c\alpha\beta, X \setminus \text{Rdc})$  to
29           ExtendedClusters $[c]$ ;
30   Push each non-empty cluster of ExtendedClusters
31   to Clusters;
```

of the string graph. Hence, the time complexity of the entire algorithm is $O(nm + |E|d(n))$.

to X , therefore no operation must be computed. In the second phase, each β is extended with all possible extensions α such that $\alpha\beta$ is a suffix of some input string: since there are n input strings, each m characters long, there can be at most nm such suffixes $\alpha\beta$. Anyway, each suffix can be examined m times by the algorithm, each time considering different extensions and overlaps (extension ab and overlap c , or extension a and overlap bc). Overall, at most $O(nm^2)$ arc triples are considered by Algorithm 1. Each time, besides computing $\text{substr}(\cdot)$, $\text{pref}(\cdot)$, $\text{suff}(\cdot)$, the algorithm computes the union and the difference of two sets, and a copy of a set. The latter operations depend on the actual data structure used to represent a set: let us use $d(n)$ to compute the maximum time necessary for those operations on n -element sets. The overall time complexity is therefore $O(nm^2d(n))$. We point out that a trivial representation based on a bitvector implies a time complexity $O(n^2m^2)$.

4 DATA REPRESENTATION

Our algorithm entirely operates on the (potentially compressed) FM-index of the collection of input reads. Indeed, each processed string ω (both in the first and in the second

phase) can be represented in constant space by the ω -interval $[b_\omega, e_\omega]$ on the BWT (*i.e.*, $q(\omega)$), instead of using the naïve representation with $O(|\omega|)$ space. Notice that in the first phase, the i -long potential overlaps, for a given iteration, are obtained by prepending a symbol $c \in \Sigma$ to the $(i-1)$ -long potential overlaps of the previous iteration (lines 8-10). In the same way the arc-sets of increasing extension length are computed in the second phase. In other words, our algorithm needs in general to obtain string $c\omega$ from string ω , and, since we represent strings as intervals on the BWT, this operation can be performed in $O(1)$ time via backward c -extension of the interval $q(\omega)$ [14].

An important property of our algorithm formalized in Lemma 15, is that all strings are computed by prepending a character at the beginning of another processed string.

Lemma 15. *Let ω be a string processed by Algorithm 1 and $|\omega| > 1$, then the string $\omega[2:]$ is processed by Algorithm 1 before ω .*

This property allows the algorithm to entirely operate only on the (potentially compressed) FM-index of the collection of input reads. Indeed, each string ω the algorithm processes is a substring of some input read, hence it can be represented in constant space by the extremes of the ω -interval on the BWT (*i.e.*, $q(\omega)$), instead of using the naïve representation with $O(|\omega|)$ space. Furthermore, the FM-index allows to compute in $O(1)$ time $q(c\omega)$ from $q(\omega)$ for any character $c \in \Sigma \cup \{\$\}$ [14].

Moreover, both queries $\text{pref}(\omega)$ and $\text{substr}(\omega)$ can be answered in $O(1)$ time. In fact, given $q(\omega) = [b_\omega, e_\omega]$, then $\text{substr}(\omega) = e_\omega - b_\omega + 1$ and $\text{pref}(\omega) = e_{\$\omega} - b_{\$\omega} + 1$ where $q(\$\omega) = [b_{\$\omega}, e_{\$\omega}]$ is the result of the backward $\$$ -extension of $q(\omega)$. Similarly, it is easy to compute $\text{listpref}(\omega)$ as it corresponds to the set of reads that have a suffix in the interval $q(\omega)$ of the GSA. The interval $q(\omega\$) = [b_{\omega\$}, e_{\omega\$}]$ allows to answer to the query $\text{suff}(\omega)$ which is computed as $e_{\omega\$} - b_{\omega\$} + 1$. The interval $q(\omega\$)$ is maintained along with $q(\omega)$. Moreover, since $q(\omega\$)$ and $q(\omega)$ share the lower extreme $b_\omega = b_{\omega\$}$ (recall that $\$$ is considered smaller than all the other symbols), each string ω can be compactly represented by the three integers $b_\omega, e_{\omega\$}, e_\omega$. While in our algorithm a substring ω of some input read can be represented by those three integers, we exploited the following representation for greater efficiency.

In the first phase of the algorithm we mainly have to represent the set of potential overlaps. (*i.e.*, the sets *Last* and *New*). At each iteration, the potential overlaps in *Last* (in *New*, resp.) have the same length, hence their corresponding intervals on the BWT are disjoint. Therefore, we can store those intervals using a pair of $n(m+1)$ -long bitvectors. For each potential overlap $\beta \in \text{Last}$ (in *New*, resp.) represented by the β -interval $[b_\beta, e_\beta]$, the first bitvector has 1 in position b_β and the second bitvector has 1 in positions $e_{\beta\$}$ and e_β . Recall that we want also to maintain the interval $q(\beta\$) = [b_{\beta\$}, e_{\beta\$}]$. Since $\text{substr}(\beta) > \text{suff}(\beta)$, $e_{\beta\$}$ and e_β are different and can be stored in the same bitvector.

In the second phase of the algorithm, we mainly have to represent clusters. A cluster groups together arc-sets whose overlap is either pairwise different or one is the prefix of the other. Thus, the corresponding intervals on the BWT are either disjoint or one contained in the other (*i.e.*, partial

overlap of the intervals cannot happen). Moreover, also the destination set of the *basic* arc-sets can be represented by a set of pairwise disjoint or contained intervals on the BWT (since $\text{listpref}(\beta)$ of line 7 correspond to the interval $q(\beta)$). Furthermore, it is easy to see that the loop at lines 13–25 preserves the following invariant: let $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta_1, X_1)$ and $ARC(\alpha, \alpha\beta_2, X_2)$ be two arc-sets of the same cluster $C(\alpha) \in \text{Clusters}$ with β_1 prefix of β_2 , then $X_2 \subseteq X_1$. As a consequence, in our algorithm, each subset of arc-sets whose extensions plus overlaps share a common nonempty prefix γ is represented by means of the following three vectors: two integers vectors V_b, V_e of length $e_\gamma - b_\gamma + 1$ and a bitvector B_x of length $e_{\$\gamma} - b_{\$\gamma} + 1$, where $[b_\gamma, e_\gamma]$ is the γ -interval and $[b_{\$\gamma}, e_{\$\gamma}]$ is the $\$\gamma$ -interval. More specifically, $V_b[i]$ ($V_e[i]$, resp.) is the number of arc-sets whose representation (BWT interval) of the overlap starts (ends, resp.) at $b_\gamma + i$, while $B_x[i]$ is 1 iff the read at position $b_{\$\gamma} + i$, in the lexicographic order of the GSA, belongs to the destination set of all the arc-sets. The main advantages of such a representation is that allows (1) to compactly represents the destination sets of the arc triples (indeed, only the maximal, according to the containment relation, destination sets need to be explicitly represented) and (2) to visit the arc triples of the cluster in the lexicographic order of their overlap. In particular, these two advantages allow to reduce the theoretical worst-case time complexity of our algorithm given in the previous section. Since a finer analysis of the time complexity would require too much space, we only mention that, from Lemma 15, it is also easy to see that our algorithm processes each substring α of some input read at most once.

As a consequence, the number of backward extensions performed by Algorithm 1 is at most $O(nm)$, while SGA performs $\Theta(nm)$ extensions.

5 EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

A C++ implementation of our approach, called FSG (short for Fast String Graph), has been integrated in the SGA suite and is available at <http://fsg.algolab.eu> under the GPLv3 license. Our implementation uses the Intel® Threading Building Blocks library in order to manage the parallelism. The software is conceptually divided in the two phases illustrated in the previous section, and each phase has been implemented as a computational pipeline using the `pipeline` construct made available by the library. We have evaluated the performance of FSG on a standard benchmark of 875 million 101bp-long reads sequenced from the NA12878 individual of the International HapMap and 1000 genomes project (extracted from <ftp://ftp-trace.ncbi.nih.gov/1000genomes/ftp/technical/working/201>) and comparing the running time of FSG with SGA. We have run SGA with its default parameters, that is SGA has compute exact overlaps after having corrected the input reads. Since the string graphs computed by FSG and SGA are the same, we have not compared the entire pipeline, but only the string graph construction phase. We could not compare FSG with Fermi, since Fermi does not split its steps in a way that allows to isolate the running time of the string graph construction—most notably, it includes reads correction and scaffolding.

TABLE 1

Comparison of FSG and SGA, for different minimum overlap lengths and numbers of threads. The wall-clock time is the time used to compute the string graph. The CPU time is the overall execution time over all CPUs actually used.

Min. overlap	no. of threads	Wall time [min]			Work time [min]		
		FSG	SGA	$\frac{\text{FSG}}{\text{SGA}}$	FSG	SGA	$\frac{\text{FSG}}{\text{SGA}}$
55	1	1,485	4,486	0.331	1,483	4,480	0.331
	4	474	1,961	0.242	1,828	4,673	0.391
	8	318	1,527	0.209	2,203	4,936	0.446
	16	278	1,295	0.215	3,430	5,915	0.580
	32	328	1,007	0.326	7,094	5,881	1.206
65	1	1,174	3,238	0.363	1,171	3,234	0.363
	4	416	1,165	0.358	1,606	3,392	0.473
	8	271	863	0.315	1,842	3,596	0.512
	16	255	729	0.351	3,091	4,469	0.692
	32	316	579	0.546	6,690	4,444	1.505
75	1	1,065	2,877	0.37	1,063	2,868	0.371
	4	379	915	0.415	1,473	2,903	0.507
	8	251	748	0.336	1,708	3,232	0.528
	16	246	561	0.439	2,890	3,975	0.727
	32	306	455	0.674	6,368	4,062	1.568
85	1	1,000	2,592	0.386	999	2,588	0.386
	4	360	833	0.432	1,392	2,715	0.513
	8	238	623	0.383	1,595	3,053	0.523
	16	229	502	0.457	2,686	3,653	0.735
	32	298	407	0.733	6,117	3,735	1.638

Especially on the DNA alphabet, short overlaps between reads may happen by chance. (*i.e.*, they do not necessarily indicate that the two reads have been sequenced from the same region of the genome). Hence, for genome assembly purposes, only overlaps whose length is larger than a user-defined threshold are considered. The value of the minimum overlap length threshold that empirically showed the best results in terms of genome assembly quality is around the 75% of the read length [24]. In order to assess how graph size affects performance, different values of minimum overlap length (called τ) between reads have been used (clearly, the lower this value, the larger the graph). The minimum overlap lengths used in this experimental assessment are 55, 65, 75, and 85, hence the chosen values test the approaches also on larger-than-normal ($\tau = 55$) and smaller-than-normal ($\tau = 85$) string graphs.

Another aspect that we have wanted to measure is the scalability of FSG. We have run the programs with 1, 4, 8, 16, and 32 threads. In all cases, we have measured the elapsed (wall-clock) time and the total CPU time (the time a CPU has been working). All experiments have been performed on an Ubuntu 14.04 server with four 8-core Intel[®] Xeon E5-4610v2 2.30GHz CPUs (hyperthreading was enabled for a total of 16 threads per processor). The server has a NUMA architecture with 64GiB of RAM for each node (256GiB in total). To minimize the effects of the architecture on the executions, we used `numactl` to preferably allocate memory on the first node where also the threads have been executed (with 32 threads also the second node was used).

In terms of memory, SGA does not maintain the computed string graph in memory, hence its peak memory usage is only dependent on the input size and in these experiments was always about 63GiB. Also the peak memory usage of our approach was approximately equal to 138GiB for all the configurations. As a consequence, the memory usage of our

approach is practically only dependent on the input size since it compactly stores the arc triples of the first phase and the stack maintaining the clusters to be processed in the second phase does not grow to have more than $|\Sigma| \cdot (m - \tau)$ elements.

Table 1 summarizes the running times of both approaches on the different configurations of the parameters. Notice that LSG approach is from 2.3 to 4.8 times faster than SGA in terms of wall-clock time and from 1.9 to 3 times in terms of CPU time. On the other hand, FSG uses approximately 2.2 times the memory used by SGA — on the executions with at most 8 threads.

While FSG is noticeably faster than SGA on all instances, there are some other interesting observations. FSG makes a better use than SGA of the available threads for shorter overlaps or up to 8 threads. The latter value of 8 threads seems to be a sweet spot for the parallel version of FSG.

On a larger number of threads, and in particular the fact that the elapsed time of FSG on 32 threads is larger than that on 16 threads suggests that, in its current form, FSG might not be suitable for a large number of threads. However, since the current implementation of FSG is almost a proof of concept, future improvements to its codebase and a better analysis of the race conditions of our tool will likely lead to better performances with a large number of threads. Furthermore, notice that also the SGA algorithm, which is (almost) embarrassingly parallel and has a stable implementation, does not achieve a speed-up better than 6.4 with 32 threads. As such, a factor that likely contributes to a poor scaling behaviour of both FSG and SGA could be also the NUMA architecture of the server used for the experimental analysis, which makes different-unit memory accesses more expensive (in our case, the processors in each unit can manage at most 16 logical threads, and only 8 on physical cores). Notice that, FSG uses more memory than SGA. The reason is that genome assemblers have to correctly manage reads extracted from both strands of the genome. In our case, this fact has been addressed by adding each reverse-and-complement read to the set of strings on which the FM-index has been built, hence immediately doubling the size of the FM-index. Moreover, FSG needs some additional data structures to correctly maintain potential overlaps and arc-sets: two pairs of $n(m+1)$ -long bitvectors and the combination of two (usually) small integer vectors and a bitvector of the same size. Our experimental evaluation shows that the memory required by the latter is usually negligible, hence a better implementation of the four bitvectors could help in lessening the memory usage. The main goal of FSG is to improve the running time, and not necessarily to decrease memory usage.

The combined analysis of the CPU time and the wall-clock time on at most 8 threads (which is the number of physical cores of each CPU on our server) suggests that FSG is more CPU efficient than SGA and is able to better distribute the workload across the threads. In our opinion, our greater efficiency is achieved by operating only on the FM-index of the input reads and by the order on which extension operations (*i.e.*, considering a new string $c\alpha$ after α has been processed) are performed. These two characteristics of our algorithm allow to eliminate the redundant queries to the index which, instead, are performed by SGA.

In fact, FSG considers each string that is longer than the threshold at most once, while SGA potentially reconsiders the same string once for each read in which the string occurs. Indeed, FSG uses 2.3–3 times less user time than SGA when $\tau = 55$ (hence, when such sufficiently-long substrings occur more frequently) and “only” 2–2.6 times less user time when $\tau = 85$ (hence, when such sufficiently-long substrings are more rare).

5.1 Nuove sperimentazioni

Verificare che gli string graph di LSG e SGA siano uguali. (1) controllare il numero di archi. (2) contare il numero di archi diversi (3) controllare i contig, mappando ogni contig di SGA in quello più simile di LSG (e viceversa)

6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We present FSG: a tool implementing a new algorithm for constructing a string graph that works directly querying a FM-index representing a collection of reads, instead of processing the input reads. Our main goal is to provide a simpler and fast algorithm to construct string graphs, so that its implementation can be easily integrated into an assembly pipeline that analyzes the paths of the string graph to produce the final assembly. Indeed, FSG could be used for related purposes, such as transcriptome assembly [5], [16], and haplotype assembly [6], and variant detection via aligning paths of the string graph against a reference genome. These topics are some of the research directions that we plan to investigate. test our implementation to compute the string graphs for large collection of strings with different characteristics than genomic reads, such as for example when the alphabet is of larger sizes or the input data consists of strings of variable length. More precisely, our algorithm uses string queries that are efficiently implemented using the information provided by the index and takes advantage of a lexicographic based-ordering of string queries that allows to reduce the total number of such queries to build the string graph. Since FSG reduces the total number of queries and does not process the input to compute the transitive reduction as done by SGA, the current state of art tool for computing the string graph, we are able to show that FSG is significantly faster than SGA over genomic data. It would be interesting to test our implementation to compute the string graphs for large collection of strings with different characteristics than genomic reads, such as for example when the alphabet is of larger sizes or the input data consists of strings of variable length.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the support of the MIUR PRIN 2010-2011 grant “Automi e Linguaggi Formali: Aspetti Matematici e Applicativi” code 2010LYA9RH, of the Cariplo Foundation grant 2013-0955 (Modulation of anti cancer immune response by regulatory non-coding RNAs), of the FA 2013 grant “Metodi algoritmici e modelli: aspetti teorici e applicazioni in bioinformatica” code 2013-ATE-0281, and of the FA 2014 grant “Algoritmi e modelli computazionali: aspetti teorici e applicazioni nelle scienze della vita” code 2014-ATE-0382.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bankevich, S. Nurk, D. Antipov, et al. SPAdes: A new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. *J. of Computational Biology*, 19(5):455–477, 2012.
- [2] M. Bauer, A. Cox, and G. Rosone. Lightweight algorithms for constructing and inverting the BWT of string collections. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 483:134–148, 2013.
- [3] M. Bauer, A. Cox, G. Rosone, and M. Sciortino. Lightweight LCP construction for next-generation sequencing datasets. In *Algorithms in Bioinformatics*, volume 7534 of LNCS, pages 326–337, Berlin, Germany, 2012. Springer.
- [4] I. Ben-Bassat and B. Chor. String graph construction using incremental hashing. *Bioinformatics*, 30(24):3515–3523, 2014.
- [5] S. Beretta, P. Bonizzoni, G. Della Vedova, Y. Pirola, and R. Rizzi. Modeling alternative splicing variants from RNA-Seq data with isoform graphs. *J. of Computational Biology*, 16(1):16–40, 2014.
- [6] P. Bonizzoni, G. Della Vedova, R. Dondi, and J. Li. The haplotyping problem: An overview of computational models and solutions. 18(6):675–688, 2003.
- [7] P. Bonizzoni, G. Della Vedova, Y. Pirola, M. Previtali, and R. Rizzi. Constructing string graphs in external memory. In D. G. Brown and B. Morgenstern, editors, *Algorithms in Bioinformatics - 14th International Workshop, WABI 2014, Wroclaw, Poland, September 8-10, 2014. Proceedings*, volume 8701 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 311–325. Springer, 2014.
- [8] P. Bonizzoni, G. Della Vedova, Y. Pirola, M. Previtali, and R. Rizzi. LSG: An external-memory tool to compute string graphs for NGS data assembly. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 23(3):137–149, Mar. 2016.
- [9] C. Boucher, A. Bowe, T. Gagie, S. J. Puglisi, and K. Sadakane. Variable-order de bruijn graphs. In *Data Compression Conference (DCC)*, 2015, pages 383–392. IEEE, 2015.
- [10] K. R. Bradnam, J. N. Fass, A. Alexandrov, P. Baranay, M. Bechner, I. Birol, S. Boisvert, J. A. Chapman, G. Chapuis, R. Chikhi, et al. Assemblathon 2: evaluating de novo methods of genome assembly in three vertebrate species. *GigaScience*, 2(1):1–31, 2013.
- [11] M. Burrows and D. J. Wheeler. A block-sorting lossless data compression algorithm. Technical report, Digital Systems Research Center, 1994.
- [12] R. Chikhi, A. Limasset, S. Jackman, J. T. Simpson, and P. Medvedev. On the representation of de bruijn graphs. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 22(5):336–352, 2015.
- [13] R. Chikhi and G. Rizk. Space-efficient and exact de Bruijn graph representation based on a Bloom filter. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 8:22, 2013.
- [14] P. Ferragina and G. Manzini. Indexing compressed text. *J. of the ACM*, 52(4):552–581, 2005.
- [15] G. Gonnella and S. Kurtz. Readjoinder: a fast and memory efficient string graph-based sequence assembler. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 13(1):82, 2012.
- [16] V. Lacroix, M. Sammeth, R. Guigo, and A. Bergeron. Exact transcriptome reconstruction from short sequence reads. In *Algorithms in Bioinformatics*, volume 5251 of LNCS, pages 50–63. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [17] H. Li. Exploring single-sample SNP and INDEL calling with whole-genome de novo assembly. *Bioinformatics*, 28(14):1838–1844, July 2012.
- [18] E. Myers. The fragment assembly string graph. *Bioinformatics*, 21(suppl. 2):ii79–ii85, 2005.
- [19] Y. Peng, H. C. Leung, S.-M. Yiu, and F. Chin. IDBA-UD: a de novo assembler for single-cell and metagenomic sequencing data with highly uneven depth. *Bioinformatics*, 28(11):1420–1428, 2012.
- [20] K. Salikhov, G. Sacomoto, and G. Kucherov. Using cascading bloom filters to improve the memory usage for de bruijn graphs. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 9:2, 2014.
- [21] S. L. Salzberg et al. GAGE: A critical evaluation of genome assemblies and assembly algorithms. *Genome research*, 22(3):557–567, 2012.
- [22] F. Shi. Suffix arrays for multiple strings: A method for on-line multiple string searches. In *Concurrency and Parallelism, Programming, Networking, and Security*, volume 1179 of LNCS, pages 11–22. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [23] J. Simpson and R. Durbin. Efficient construction of an assembly string graph using the FM-index. *Bioinformatics*, 26(12):i367–i373, 2010.

- [24] J. Simpson and R. Durbin. Efficient de novo assembly of large genomes using compressed data structures. *Genome Research*, 22:549–556, 2012.
- [25] J. Simpson, K. Wong, S. Jackman, et al. ABySS: a parallel assembler for short read sequence data. *Genome Research*, 19(6):1117–1123, 2009.