

Protein-to-genome alignment with miniprot

Heng Li^{1,2}

¹Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, 450 Brookline Ave, Boston, MA 02215, USA, ²Harvard Medical School, 10 Shattuck St, Boston, MA 02215, USA

ABSTRACT

Motivation: Protein-to-genome alignment is critical to annotating genes in non-model organisms. While there are a few tools for this purpose, all of them were developed over ten years ago and did not incorporate the latest advances in alignment algorithms. They are inefficient and could not keep up with the rapid production of new genomes and quickly growing protein databases.

Results: Here we describe miniprot, a new aligner for mapping protein sequences to a complete genome. Miniprot integrates recent techniques such as syncmer sketch and SIMD-based dynamic programming. It is tens of times faster than existing tools while achieving comparable accuracy on real data.

Availability and implementation: <https://github.com/lh3/miniprot>

Contact: hli@ds.dfci.harvard.edu

1 INTRODUCTION

Sequencing technologies have been rapidly evolving in recent years. The advent of long-read sequencing, especially accurate long-read sequencing (Wenger et al., 2019), have enabled high-quality genome assembly at scale (Nurk et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2021, 2022). After we sequence and assemble the genome of a new species, the immediate next step is to annotate genes.

There are three ways to annotate gene structures: *ab initio* gene prediction, aligning RNA-seq data from the same species and mapping known genes with cross-species alignment. While *ab initio* gene prediction works well for bacterial genomes, it is error-prone for Eukaryotic genomes that may contain large introns. In a recent benchmark (Scalzitti et al., 2020), all the evaluated gene finders miss ~50% nucleotides in annotated exons and predict ~50% extra sequences not in exons. If we have RNA-seq data, we can map short or long RNA-seq reads (Dobin et al., 2013; Li, 2018) and reconstruct transcripts from the alignment (Kovaka et al., 2019). This will give much more accurate gene structures than *ab initio* gene prediction. Unfortunately, RNA sequencing adds extra cost and may miss genes lowly expressed in the tissues being sequenced. We still rely on cross-species alignment to derive a complete gene set and to transfer known functional annotations to the new genome.

For very closely related genomes, we can reconstruct gene structures from whole-genome alignment (Fiddes et al., 2018) or from the alignment of gene regions (Shumate and Salzberg, 2020). These methods would not work well for genomes at longer evolutionary distances because intron sequences are less conserved this will affect the quality of the alignment. Aligning the more conserved coding regions (Li et al., 2007; Gotoh, 2008) may alleviate the issue. However, for distantly related species, even coding nucleotide sequences are not conserved well. We almost exclusively use protein sequences to reconstruct the phylogeny of distant homologs instead. Ensembl (Aken et al., 2016) and mainstream gene annotation pipelines (Holt and Yandell, 2011; Brůna et al., 2021) also heavily rely on protein-to-genome alignment especially when the annotation of closely related species is not available.

There are several protein-to-genome aligners that pinpoint exact splice sites: GeneWise (Birney and Durbin, 1997; Birney et al., 2004), Exonerate (Slater and Birney, 2005), GeneSeqer (Usuka and Brendel, 2000), GenomeThreader (Gremme et al., 2005), genBlastG (She et al., 2011), ProSplign (Kapustin et al., 2008) and Spaln2 (Gotoh, 2008; Iwata and Gotoh, 2012). Among these, Spaln2 and GenomeThreader are the only tools practical for whole-genome alignment. They can align several hundred proteins per CPU hour and may take a couple of days to align a few hundred thousand proteins often needed to annotate a genome without closely homology. The alignment step time consuming.

It is challenging to develop a fast and accurate protein-to-genome alignment algorithm. The core of such alignment is a dynamic programming (DP) that jointly considers affine gap penalties, introns and frameshift. It is perhaps the most complex DP for pairwise alignment. In addition, as we will show later, a successful aligner functions like a gene finder and has to properly model splice signals, which is not a trivial task, either. On top of these, we need to fit these complex methods to an efficient implementation with modern computing techniques. This is partly why we have over a hundred short-read mappers (Alser et al., 2021) but only two protein-to-genome mappers capable of whole-genome alignment.

In this article, we will describe miniprot, a new protein-to-genome aligner developed from scratch. We will demonstrate its performance and accuracy on real data along with the few existing algorithms.

2 METHODS

Miniprot broadly follows the seed-chain-extend strategy used by minimap2 (Li, 2018). It indexes the genome with open syncmers (Edgar, 2021) in all six open reading frames (ORFs) on both strands. During alignment, miniprot extracts syncmers on a query protein, finds seed matches (aka anchors), and then performs chaining. It closes unaligned regions between anchors and extends from terminal anchors with dynamic programming (DP).

2.1 Notations of strings

For a string T , let $|T|$ be its length and $T[i]$, $i = 1 \dots |T|$, be the i -th symbol in T . $T[i, j]$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |T|$, is the substring starting at i and ending at j inclusively. In this article, T denotes the genome sequence over the nucleotide alphabet and P denotes the protein sequence over the amino acid alphabet.

An integer can be represented by a bit string. The notations above are also applicable to bit strings.

2.2 Reduced alphabet

There are twenty amino acids. We need at least five bits to encode each amino acid. To encode protein sequences more compactly, we reduce the amino acid alphabet using the SE-B(14) scheme by Edgar (2004), except that we merge N and D. More exactly, we map amino acid groups to integers as follows: A→0, ST→1, RK→2, H→3, ND→4, EQ→5, C→6, P→7, G→8, IV→10, LM→11, FY→12, W→13, *→14 and X→15, where * denotes the stop codon and X denotes an amino acid.

Under this encoding, if two amino acid groups only differ at the lowest bit (e.g. group 'A' and 'ST'), the two groups tend to be similar. We may flip

the lowest bit of an integer to generate more seeds and thus to increase the seeding sensitivity. We did not use this strategy as miniprot seems reasonably sensitive on real data.

2.3 Random open syncmers

Suppose $\phi(a)$ maps an amino acid a to an integer. The integer encoding of a k -long protein sequence P can be recursively defined as $\phi(P) = \phi(P[1, k-1]) \times 16 + \phi(P[k])$. $\phi(P)$ has $4k$ bits. Let $B = \psi(\phi(P))$ where $\psi(\cdot)$ is an invertible integer hash function (Li, 2016) over $[0, 2^{4k}]$. Then B can be considered as a bit string with $4k$ bits, too. For $s \leq k$, we can generate $\lfloor 4(k-s)/d \rfloor + 1$ shorter integers of $4s$ bits each: $B[1, 4s]$, $B[1+d, 4s+d]$, \dots , $B[1 + \lfloor 4(k-s)/d \rfloor \cdot d, 4s + \lfloor 4(k-s)/d \rfloor \cdot d]$. P is considered to be a (k, s, d) -syncmer if $B[1, 4s]$ is the smallest among these integers. The sample rate is $1/(\lfloor 4(k-s)/d \rfloor + 1)$.

Different from the original definition of open syncmer (Edgar, 2021), the miniprot definition operates in the bit space instead of the residue space and it applies an invertible hash function for randomization. This makes our strategy robust to uneven amino acid frequencies.

2.4 Indexing the genome

Internally, miniprot treats each genome sequence and its reverse complement as two independent sequences. It enumerates all ORFs of 15 amino acids or longer and extracts (6,4,2)-syncmers from translated ORFs. This samples 6-mers at a rate of 20% in average. For each syncmer R at position x , miniprot stores $(\psi(\phi(R)), \lfloor x/256 \rfloor)$ in a hash table with the key being $\psi(\phi(R))$ and the value being an array of positions. We do not retain the base resolution at the indexing step such that we can use 32-bit integers to store positions for a genome up to 2^{39} ($= 2^{32} \cdot 256/2$) base pairs in size. Without binning, miniprot would have to use 64-bit integers to store positions in a human genome, which would double the index size.

2.5 Chaining

The miniprot chaining algorithm is very similar to the minimap2 algorithm. However, because the miniprot index does not keep the exact genome positions, the gap size calculation needs to be modified. For completeness, we will describe the full chaining equation here.

Let 2-tuple (x, y) denote a seed match (aka anchor) between binned position x on the genome and residue position y on the protein. Suppose (x_i, y_i) and (x_j, y_j) are two seed matches with $x_i \leq x_j$ and $y_i < y_j$. The minimum possible gap size between the two anchors, in the unit of base pair, can be calculated by

$$g(i, j) = \begin{cases} 3\Delta y - 256(\Delta x - 1) & \text{if } 3\Delta y < 256(\Delta x - 1) \\ 3\Delta y - 256(\Delta x + 1) & \text{if } 3\Delta y > 256(\Delta x + 1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with $\Delta x = x_j - x_i$ and $\Delta y = y_j - y_i$. When $g(i, j) = 0$, we do not know if there is a gap due to binning. Meanwhile, $g(i, j) > 0$ indicates a definitive insertion to the genome and $g(i, j) < 0$ indicates a definitive deletion.

Given a list of anchors sorted by genomic position x , let $f(j)$ be the maximal chaining score up to the j -th anchor in the list. $f(j)$ can be calculated with

$$f(j) = \max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i < j} \{f(i) + \alpha(i, j) - \gamma(g(i, j))\}, k \right\} \quad (2)$$

where k is the length of open syncmers (6 amino acids by default), $g(i, j)$ is calculated by Eq. (1) and $\alpha(i, j) = \min\{y_j - y_i, k\}$ is the number of matching residues between the anchors. The gap penalty function $\gamma(\cdot)$ is

$$\gamma(g) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g = 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } |g| \geq G \\ g/3 + \beta \log_2(g+1) & \text{if } 0 < g < G \\ \min\{|g|/3, \beta \log_2(|g|+1)\} & \text{if } -G < g < 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here G is the maximum intron size (200 kb by default) and β is the weight of the logarithm gap penalty (0.75 by default). The logarithm term allows miniprot to join exons over introns.

After the initial round of chaining, miniprot selects top 30 chains and performs another round of chaining in local regions around these top chains. In the second round, miniprot chooses all 5-mers on both the genome and the protein without binning. This finds better chains and retains the base resolution of each anchor. Miniprot uses $g'(i, j) = 3\Delta y - \Delta x$ as the gap cost function.

2.6 Residue alignment with dynamic programming

Miniprot uses DP to close gaps between anchors in chains and to extend from terminal anchors. The DP aims to find gaps, frameshift and splicing at the same time as is demonstrated as follows (“Geno” for the genome sequence, “Tran” for the translated protein sequence in the alignment and “Prot” for the query protein sequence):

```
Geno: GAGGCC---CGCTCACCgt...agCACAAAGCGCTATAGCCTAC
Tran: E..A...--R..S..P.      .T..$$R..Y..+A..Y..
      | |      |      |      | | | | |
Prot: E A F R - P            T E R Y A Y
```

In this example, symbol “\$” denotes frameshift substitutions and “+” denotes frameshift insertions. In this section, we will first review the AE86 DP formulation for affine gap cost (Altschul and Erickson, 1986), and then derive the DP equation for protein-to-genome alignment.

2.6.1 DP with affine gap cost

Under the affine gap cost, a gap of length g costs $q+e \cdot g$. A direct formulation of the DP looks like

$$\begin{cases} M_{ij} &= \max\{M_{i-1, j-1}, I_{i-1, j-1}, D_{i-1, j-1}\} + s(i, j) \\ I_{ij} &= \max\{M_{i, j-1} - q, I_{i, j-1}, D_{i, j-1} - q\} - e \\ D_{ij} &= \max\{M_{i-1, j} - q, D_{i, j-1} - q, D_{i-1, j}\} - e \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where ‘ M ’ represents the matching state, ‘ I ’ the insertion state, ‘ D ’ the deletion state and $s(i, j)$ gives the score between the residue at position i on the target sequence and the residue at position j on the query. If we define

$$H_{ij} = \max\{M_{ij}, I_{ij}, D_{ij}\}$$

Eq. (4) becomes

$$\begin{cases} I_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i, j-1} - q, I_{i, j-1}\} - e \\ D_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-1, j} - q, D_{i-1, j}\} - e \\ H_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-1, j-1} + s(i, j), I_{ij}, D_{ij}\} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Eq. (5) is the AE86 formulation. It invokes fewer comparisons. When there are more states, AE86 may save more comparisons and simplify the DP equation.

2.6.2 DP for protein-to-DNA alignment

In a similar manner, we can derive the DP for protein-to-DNA alignment, allowing frameshifts but not splicing:

$$\begin{cases} I_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i, j-1} - q, I_{i, j-1}\} - e \\ D_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-3, j} - q, D_{i-3, j}\} - e \\ H_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-3, j} + s(i, j), I_{ij}, D_{ij}, H_{i-1, j-1} - f, \\ & \quad H_{i-2, j-1} - f, H_{i-1, j} - f, H_{i-2, j} - f\} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

It is similar to Eq. (5) except for codon phase transitions with a penalty of f . We have two types of frameshift. The first type is created by inserting one or two bases to the DNA sequence (symbol ‘+’ in the example above) and the second type by deleting one or two bases in a codon (‘\$’ in the example). These are modeled by the four H_{\cdot} terms on the last line of Eq. (6). This equation is broadly similar to Zhang et al. (1997).

2.6.3 DP for protein-to-genome alignment

When aligning proteins to genomes, we need to keep phases through introns. We add three additional states, A , B and C , for phase-0, phase-1 and phase-2 introns, respectively. Our final formulation is

$$\begin{cases} I_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i,j-1} - q, I_{i,j-1}\} - e \\ D_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-3,j} - q, D_{i-3,j}\} - e \\ A_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-1,j} - r - d(i-1), A_{i-1,j}\} \\ B_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-1,j-1} - r - d(i), B_{i-1,j}\} \\ C_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-1,j-1} - r - d(i+1), C_{i-1,j}\} \\ H_{ij} &= \max\{H_{i-3,j} + s(i,j), I_{ij}, D_{ij}, H_{i-1,j-1} - f, \\ & \quad H_{i-2,j-1} - f, H_{i-1,j} - f, H_{i-2,j} - f, \\ & \quad A_{ij} - a(i), B_{ij} - a(i-2), C_{ij} - a(i-1)\} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where r is cost of an intron, and $d(\cdot)$ and $a(\cdot)$ model splice signals. The great majority of introns start with GT and end with AG across all species. For a simple model, we may let

$$d(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T[i-1, i] = \text{AG} \\ p & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$a(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T[i+1, i+2] = \text{GT} \\ p & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This still allows non-GT-AG splicing but penalizes such introns by cost p . We will describe a more sophisticated model in the next section.

It is worth noting that when the DP transitions from state H to B at position i , the phase-1 intron B represents starts at $i+1$; when the DP transitions from B to H at j , the intron ends at $j-2$. The DP ignores the split codon bridging the two exons around the phase-1 intron. Phase-2 intron state C is treated similarly. Not scoring split codons is a weakness of our equation.

Though not explicitly derived from a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), Eq. (7) is similar to the Viterbi decoding of the 6-state HMM employed by GeneWise (Birney et al., 2004) and Exonerate (Slater and Birney, 2005). To that end, our formulation should have comparable accuracy to the two older aligners if they are parameterized the same way.

We implemented Eq.(7) with striped DP (Farrar, 2007). We used 16-bit integers to keep scores and achieved 8-way parallelization for x86_64 CPUs with SSE2 or ARM64 CPUs with the NEON instruction set. Our implementation is over 50 times faster than GeneWise and Exonerate in their exact mode. Actually for large genomes, residue alignment is not the performance bottleneck. Miniprot spends more time on initial chaining.

2.7 Splice models

We observed that under distant homology, the splice model may have a large influence on the junction accuracy, confirming Iwata and Gotoh (2012).

The most common splice pattern in all species is GT-AG with GT at the donor site (5'-end of an intron) and AG at the acceptor site (3'-end of an intron). We occasionally see GC-AG and AT-AC at $\sim 1\%$ frequency in total (Sheth et al., 2006). Among the GT-AG class, we more often observe GTR-YAG from yeasts to mammals (Irimia and Roy, 2008).

The default miniprot splice model considers the signals above. Using human data from Sibley et al. (2016), we estimated that 99.81% of acceptor sites are AG and only 0.10% are AC. In the BLOSUM scaling (Henikoff and Henikoff, 1992), an AC acceptor site would be penalized by $2 \log_2 99.81/0.10 \approx 20$. We can adapt this approach for three bases at either the donor or the acceptor sites. In our final model, miniprot does not penalize if it sees GTR at donor or YAG at acceptor. It applies a penalty of 8 for GTY at donor or RAG at acceptor; 15 for GC at donor; 21 for AT at donor or AC at acceptor; 30 for all other types of donor or acceptor sites.

In mammals and even *Drosophila*, the last exon base adjacent to a donor site is more often a G and we often see a poly-pyrimidine (i.e. C or T) sequence close to an acceptor site. Our human splice model considers these signals. It is also applicable to species with the sequence features above, including *Drosophila*.

Exonerate uses a position-specific weight matrix over ~ 10 positions to model splice sites. Spaln2 additionally considers branching sites and provides pre-trained models for a variety of species. Miniprot adopts a relatively simple model with fewer parameters. This makes the model more general but may affect the accuracy of alignment. We are considering a second pass with a splice model trained from the first pass. This strategy is often used in mainstream gene finders (Br una et al., 2021).

2.8 Avoiding pseudogenes

If a spliced gene has an unspliced pseudogene, the unspliced pseudogene may get a better DP score because the alignment to the pseudogene does not pay intron penalties. To reduce the effect of pseudogenes, miniprot recalculates a DP score between the query protein and the translated coding region without introns. In addition, miniprot further penalizes single-exon alignment by intron open score r in Eq.(7) in case a pseudogene is aligned better by chance.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Evaluation datasets

To evaluate the accuracy of miniprot, we collected the protein-coding gene annotations of various species: human (*Homo sapiens*) from Gencode v41, mouse (*Mus musculus*) from Gencode M30, zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) and fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) from Ensembl v107 and mosquito (*Anopheles gambiae*) from Ensembl metazoan v54. We selected the longest protein for each gene to reduce redundant sequences. We mapped zebrafish and mouse proteins to the primary assembly of the human reference genome GRCh38 and mapped mosquito proteins to the *Drosophila* BDGP6 genome.

3.2 Evaluated tools

To evaluate what aligners can map proteins to a whole genome, we randomly sampled 1% of zebrafish proteins and mapped with various aligners. Only miniprot-0.5, Spaln2-2.4.13c (Iwata and Gotoh, 2012) and GenomeThreader-1.7.3 (Gremme et al., 2005) could finish the alignment in an hour. GenomeThreader found less than 30% of coding regions in Spaln2 or miniprot alignment. It is not sensitive enough for the human-fish divergence and thus not evaluated on the full dataset. We also evaluated MetaEuk-r6 (Levy Karin et al., 2020). Although MetaEuk does not find exact splice sites, it may be still useful for locating coding regions (Manni et al., 2021).

In principle, we could localize a protein with a whole-genome mapper above and then run GeneWise, GeneSeqer and Exonerate in local regions. However, this would not evaluate mapping accuracy. In addition, Iwata and Gotoh (2012) have already shown Spaln2 outperformed these older tools. We thus ignored them in evaluation.

When running Spaln2, we applied option “-Q7 -T# -yS -LS -yB -yZ -yX2” where “#” specifies the species-specific splice model. Option “-LS” enables local alignment and yields slightly better alignment overall. Option “-yB -yZ -yX2” apparently has no effect for human-zebrafish alignment but it greatly improves the junction accuracy of the fly-mosquito alignment. We let Spaln2 choose the maximum intron and gene size automatically. Miniprot finds introns up to 200 kbp in length by default. We changed this value to 50 kbp for fly-mosquito alignment. We tuned the maximum intron size to 200 kb in the MetaEuk human-zebrafish alignment, in consistent with the miniprot setting.

Table 1. Evaluation on the human-mouse dataset

Genome species	human	human	human	human	human	human	human	fruit fly	fruit fly
Protein species	zebrafish	zebrafish	zebrafish	zebrafish	zebrafish	mouse	mouse	mosquito	mosquito
Aligner	miniprot	miniprot	Spaln2	Spaln2	MetaEuk	miniprot	Spaln2	miniprot	Spaln2
Splice model	human	general	human	default	N/A	human	human	human	fruit fly
Elapsed time (sec)	460	471	12,716	13,024	2,518	314	3,736	29	2,528
Peak RAM (GB)	18.0	18.6	9.2	9.6	22.0	15.3	5.6	3.2	2.7
# proteins	30,313	30,313	30,313	30,313	30,313	21,844	21,844	13,094	13,094
# mapped	19,998	19,998	17,860	17,780	12,665	19,303	18,840	7,211	6,125
# single-exon	1,836	1,703	990	606	2,230	2,810	1,975	1,308	495
# predicted junc.	178,096	181,169	183,519	252,893	79,656	165,458	171,241	21,178	27,582
# non-ovlp. junc.	462	750	1,426	18,738	216	316	852	459	877
# confirmed junc.	165,084	164,102	165,826	156,980	5,761	161,113	162,551	18,630	22,606
% confirmed junc.	92.69%	90.58%	90.36%	62.07%	7.23%	97.37%	94.93%	87.97%	81.96%
% base SN	59.92%	59.97%	57.69%	56.28%	48.32%	89.48%	88.62%	52.71%	50.13%
% base SP	95.76%	95.28%	92.54%	84.30%	91.58%	97.44%	95.27%	96.78%	97.38%

Protein-to-genome alignments are compared to the annotated genes in “Genome species”. A splice junction (junc.) is confirmed if it is annotated in “Genome species” with exact boundaries; is non-overlapping (non-ovlp.) if the intron in the junction is not overlapping with annotated introns. Base sensitivity (base SN) is the fraction of annotated coding regions on the longest transcripts that are covered by alignments. Base specificity (base SP) is the fraction of genomic bases in alignments that are covered by annotated coding regions.

3.3 Evaluating protein-to-genome alignment

We aligned zebrafish proteins to GRCh38 with miniprot, Spaln2 and MetaEuk (Table 1). When we apply human-specific splice models to both miniprot and Spaln2, miniprot is doing slightly better than Spaln2 at the base level and on the junction specificity. Spaln2 finds 0.5% more confirmed junctions, implying higher sensitivity. We looked at proteins Spaln2 aligned better. It seems that Spaln2 is more sensitive to small introns and small exons, while miniprot tends to merge them to adjacent alignments. We speculate this may be caused by two factors. First, Spaln2 uses a more sophisticated splice model and may be putting more weight on splice signals than residue alignment. It may create an intron even if the alignment is weak. Second, the Spaln2 developers observed that heuristics may be doing better than strict DP around short introns or exons. In one case, Spaln2 correctly created an exon with one amino acid. Miniprot under the current setting would never produce such an alignment.

For both miniprot and Spaln2, species-specific models improved alignment though the default Spaln2 model performed worse. MetaEuk did not pinpoint exact splice junctions, as is expected. It also aligned fewer proteins and had lower base-level sensitivity. We therefore did not evaluate it on other datasets.

For the human-mouse alignment, Spaln2 again has higher junction sensitivity and miniprot is better on other metrics. On the more challenging fly-mosquito dataset, the trend continues. Overall miniprot and Spaln2 have comparable accuracy.

Miniprot is over an order of magnitude faster than Spaln2. The performance gap increases with divergence. This is potentially because Spaln2 has to invoke DP through introns more often when it does not see overlapping high-scoring segment pairs (HSPs) and cannot initiate “sandwich DP” (Wu and Watanabe, 2005) to skip introns. With a much faster DP implementation, miniprot can afford to align through all introns regardless of sequence divergence. It thus has more stable performance. Always aligning through introns

might be a contributing factor to the higher specificity of miniprot even though Spaln2 has a more careful algorithm.

Table 1 only considers the best hit of each protein. Miniprot by default may output multiple suboptimal alignments. If we count all human-zebrafish alignments, we could improve the base sensitivity to 65.32% but with junction accuracy dropped to 90.87%. The base specificity drops further to 84.96% because miniprot starts to report pseudogenes.

4 DISCUSSIONS

Miniprot is a fast protein-to-genome aligner comparable to existing tools in accuracy. It can assist gene annotation but does not replace full-pledge gene annotation pipelines such as BRAKER2 (Brůna et al., 2021). Miniprot aligns each protein independently. When multiple proteins are mapped to the same locus, miniprot is unable to merge identical gene models or resolve conflicts between alignments. In addition, although miniprot has a realistic splice model, it is not as sophisticated as the BRAKER2 model and is not trained on the target genome. More importantly, BRAKER2 has an *ab initio* gene prediction component and may find genes with weak homology to the input proteins. We are considering to improve our splice model and to develop a separate tool to reconcile overlapping gene models in simple cases. This may provide a convenient annotation pipeline when closely related species are available.

We are also evaluating the possibility to support HMMER profiles (Eddy, 2011) as queries. As a HMMER profile summarizes a gene family from multiple species, it may reduce the number of queries and improve the sensitivity of miniprot for distant homologs. There are two algorithmic challenges: seeding and alignment. For seeding, we could generate seeds from the most probable protein or sample multiple seeds directly from the profile; for alignment, we could introduce position-specific substitution cost and gap cost.

Nonetheless, the exact solution to these challenges and how much HMMER profiles may improve the alignment remain unknown.

The Vertebrate Genome Project (Rhie et al., 2021), the Darwin Tree of Life project, the Earth Biogenome Project (Lewin et al., 2018) and many other sequencing efforts are going to sequence hundreds of thousands of species to the reference quality in coming years. The annotation of these genomes is as important as the assembly. While we have seen rapid evolution of sequencing technologies and assembly algorithms in recent years, we still heavily rely on core annotation tools developed more than a decade ago. Minipro is one effort to replace the protein-to-genome alignment step with modern techniques. We look forward to renewed development of other core annotation tools from the community.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Fergal Martin, Richard Durbin and Ewan Birney for helpful discussions on the minipro algorithm.

Funding: NHGRI R01HG010040 and Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative

REFERENCES

- Aken, B. L. et al. (2016). The Ensembl gene annotation system. *Database (Oxford)*, 2016:baw093.
- Alser, M. et al. (2021). Technology dictates algorithms: recent developments in read alignment. *Genome Biol*, 22:249.
- Altschul, S. F. and Erickson, B. W. (1986). Optimal sequence alignment using affine gap costs. *Bull Math Biol*, 48:603–16.
- Birney, E. and Durbin, R. (1997). Dynamite: a flexible code generating language for dynamic programming methods used in sequence comparison. *Proc Int Conf Intell Syst Mol Biol*, 5:56–64.
- Birney, E. et al. (2004). Genewise and genomewise. *Genome Res*, 14:988–95.
- Brůna, T. et al. (2021). BRAKER2: automatic eukaryotic genome annotation with GeneMark-EP+ and AUGUSTUS supported by a protein database. *NAR Genom Bioinform*, 3:lqaa108.
- Cheng, H. et al. (2021). Haplotype-resolved de novo assembly using phased assembly graphs with hifiasm. *Nat Methods*, 18:170–175.
- Cheng, H. et al. (2022). Haplotype-resolved assembly of diploid genomes without parental data. *Nat Biotechnol*, 40:1332–1335.
- Dobin, A. et al. (2013). STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*, 29:15–21.
- Eddy, S. R. (2011). Accelerated profile HMM searches. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 7:e1002195.
- Edgar, R. (2021). Syncmers are more sensitive than minimizers for selecting conserved k-mers in biological sequences. *PeerJ*, 9:e10805.
- Edgar, R. C. (2004). Local homology recognition and distance measures in linear time using compressed amino acid alphabets. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 32:380–5.
- Farrar, M. (2007). Striped smith-waterman speeds database searches six times over other simd implementations. *Bioinformatics*, 23:156–61.
- Fiddes, I. T. et al. (2018). Comparative Annotation Toolkit (CAT)-simultaneous clade and personal genome annotation. *Genome Res*, 28:1029–1038.
- Gotoh, O. (2008). Direct mapping and alignment of protein sequences onto genomic sequence. *Bioinformatics*, 24:2438–44.
- Gremme, G. et al. (2005). Engineering a software tool for gene structure prediction in higher organisms. *Inf. Sofw. Technol.*, 47:965–978.
- Henikoff, S. and Henikoff, J. G. (1992). Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 89:10915–9.
- Holt, C. and Yandell, M. (2011). MAKER2: an annotation pipeline and genome-database management tool for second-generation genome projects. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12:491.
- Irimia, M. and Roy, S. W. (2008). Evolutionary convergence on highly-conserved 3' intron structures in intron-poor eukaryotes and insights into the ancestral eukaryotic genome. *PLoS Genet*, 4:e1000148.
- Iwata, H. and Gotoh, O. (2012). Benchmarking spliced alignment programs including spaln2, an extended version of spaln that incorporates additional species-specific features. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 40:e161.
- Kapustin, Y. et al. (2008). Splign: algorithms for computing spliced alignments with identification of paralogs. *Biol Direct*, 3:20.
- Kovaka, S. et al. (2019). Transcriptome assembly from long-read rna-seq alignments with stringtie2. *Genome Biol*, 20:278.
- Levy Karin, E. et al. (2020). MetaEuk-sensitive, high-throughput gene discovery, and annotation for large-scale eukaryotic metagenomics. *Microbiome*, 8:48.
- Lewin, H. A. et al. (2018). Earth BioGenome Project: Sequencing life for the future of life. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 115:4325–4333.
- Li, H. (2016). Minimap and miniasm: fast mapping and de novo assembly for noisy long sequences. *Bioinformatics*, 32:2103–10.
- Li, H. (2018). Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics*, 34:3094–3100.
- Li, H. et al. (2007). A cross-species alignment tool (CAT). *BMC Bioinformatics*, 8:349.
- Manni, M. et al. (2021). BUSCO update: Novel and streamlined workflows along with broader and deeper phylogenetic coverage for scoring of eukaryotic, prokaryotic, and viral genomes. *Mol Biol Evol*, 38:4647–4654.
- Nurk, S. et al. (2020). HiCanu: accurate assembly of segmental duplications, satellites, and allelic variants from high-fidelity long reads. *Genome Res*, 30:1291–1305.
- Rhie, A. et al. (2021). Towards complete and error-free genome assemblies of all vertebrate species. *Nature*, 592:737–746.
- Scalzitti, N. et al. (2020). A benchmark study of ab initio gene prediction methods in diverse eukaryotic organisms. *BMC Genomics*, 21:293.
- She, R. et al. (2011). genblast: using blast searches to build homologous gene models. *Bioinformatics*, 27:2141–3.
- Sheth, N. et al. (2006). Comprehensive splice-site analysis using comparative genomics. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 34(14):3955–67.
- Shumate, A. and Salzberg, S. L. (2020). Liftoff: accurate mapping of gene annotations. *Bioinformatics*, 37:1639–1643.
- Sibley, C. R. et al. (2016). Lessons from non-canonical splicing. *Nat Rev Genet*, 17:407–421.
- Slater, G. S. C. and Birney, E. (2005). Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 6:31.
- Usuka, J. and Brendel, V. (2000). Gene structure prediction by spliced alignment of genomic dna with protein sequences: increased accuracy by differential splice site scoring. *J Mol Biol*, 297:1075–85.
- Wenger, A. M. et al. (2019). Accurate circular consensus long-read sequencing improves variant detection and assembly of a human genome. *Nat Biotechnol*, 37:1155–1162.
- Wu, T. D. and Watanabe, C. K. (2005). Gmap: a genomic mapping and alignment program for mrna and est sequences. *Bioinformatics*, 21:1859–75.
- Zhang, Z. et al. (1997). Aligning a DNA sequence with a protein sequence. *J Comput Biol*, 4:339–49.