

Fast computation of approximate weak common intervals in multiple indeterminate strings

Daniel Doerr¹ and Bernard M.E. Moret²

¹*Institute for Medical Biometry and Bioinformatics, Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf, Germany*

²*School of Computer and Communication Sciences, EPFL, CH-1015, Lausanne, Switzerland*

Abstract

In ongoing work to define a principled method for syntenic block discovery and structuring, work based on homology-derived constraints and a generalization of common intervals, we faced a fundamental computational problem: how to determine quickly, among a set of indeterminate strings (strings whose elements consist of subsets of characters), contiguous intervals that would share a vast majority of their elements, but allow for sharing subsets of characters subsumed by others, and also for certain elements to be missing from certain genomes. An algorithm for this problem in the special case of determinate strings (where each element is a single character of the alphabet, i.e., “normal” strings) was described by Doerr et al., but its running time would explode if generalized to indeterminate strings. In this paper, we describe an algorithm for computing these special common intervals in time close to that of the simpler algorithm of Doerr et al. and show that can compute these intervals in just a couple of hours for large collections (tens to hundreds) of bacterial genomes.

1 Introduction

The rapidly increasing number of whole-genome sequences in public repositories is creating a demand for an effective means of comparing multiple whole genomes. Such comparisons not only enrich our knowledge about present-day organisms, they also open a window into their evolutionary past. Many genomes of interest (such as vertebrate genomes) are much too large for base-pair by base-pair comparisons and such comparisons are made all the harder when multiple genomes are being considered. Thus large-scale whole-genome comparative studies are limited by two factors: (i) the size of the genomes (typically in the billions of base pairs for vertebrates) and (ii) the number of genomes one wishes to compare. The standard approach to the first problem over the last 15 years has been to decompose the genomes into *syntenic blocks*. In their most common form, syntenic blocks are contiguous blocks ranging from 10^4 to 10^7 base pairs that form clearly conserved units across the genomes—as attested by the conservation of closely related sets of *genomic markers*. Rather than comparing

genomes base-pair by base-pair, or even marker by marker, one compares them syntenic block by syntenic block. In other words, genomes with billions of base pairs are represented by several thousands of syntenic blocks. As most of the work on such decompositions was carried out using genes as genomic markers, one can view the ordering of syntenic blocks along each genome as a generalization of the ordering of genes along each genome: just as genes in each genome are homologous to genes in other genomes and form gene families, so do syntenic blocks. (The other problem, of having to compare multiple genomes, is perhaps best carried out in a phylogenetic context, where direct comparisons, the number of which grows quadratically with the number of genomes, are eschewed in favor of comparisons between descendants and common ancestors [7], but it is not our focus here.)

In ongoing work to define a principled method for syntenic block discovery and structuring, work based on homology-derived constraints [4] and a generalization of *common intervals* [5], we faced a fundamental computational problem: how to determine quickly, among a set of indeterminate strings (strings whose elements consist of subsets of characters), contiguous intervals that would share a vast majority of their elements, but allow for sharing subsets of characters subsumed by others, and also for certain elements to be missing for certain genomes. An algorithm for this problem in the special case of determinate strings (where each element is a single character of the alphabet, i.e., “normal” strings) was described by Doerr *et al.* [3], but its running time would explode if generalized in the “obvious” way to indeterminate strings. In this paper, we describe an algorithm for computing these special common intervals in time close to that of the simpler algorithm of Doerr *et al.* [3] that makes it possible to compute these intervals at the scale of complete vertebrate genomes.

2 Background

We begin with a quick sketch of our approach to the discovery of syntenic blocks in multiple genomes, to put in proper perspective the computational problem that is the focus of this paper.

The identification of large conserved regions across genomes, i.e., syntenic blocks, is in itself useful, as it allows us to circumscribe regions of interest and focus our studies on these. However, syntenic blocks can be also be used to describe whole genomes at a higher level of abstraction, enabling further analyses to be conducted at this new level. Indeed, the number of levels of decomposition (or abstraction) need not be limited to two or three: at one extreme, each position in a genomic sequence can be viewed as a syntenic block while, at the other extreme, each whole genome can be viewed as a single syntenic block. Neither extreme is of much interest and the study of short subsequences is well advanced, so our design starts at the level of *genomic markers*, that is, short sequences that are both short enough to be found in (exactly or much) the same form in other genomes and long enough that their conservation is statistically significant. Such markers can be obtained through genome segmentation [6] or, more commonly, using already available annotations of the genomic sequences that mark conserved regions such as noncoding and protein-coding genes.

Our method relies on predefined *homologies* between these genomic markers. (Recall that homology is an equivalence relation that denotes shared an-

cestry.) Based on homologies between genomic markers, we derive homologies between syntenic blocks using the formal criteria first enunciated by Ghiurcuta and Moret [4]. Informally, according to their criterion, two syntenic blocks are homologous if each of their constituent genomic markers is homologous to a genomic marker in the opposite block.

From a conceptual point of view, shared origin is a common feature of genomic markers; in fact, a perfect oracle for homology would not provide very useful information—it would lack differentiability and thus be ineffective for synteny analysis. It is thus fortunate, in a way, that the divergence of sequences through mutational changes renders inference of homology impossible after a certain amount of time. Unfortunately, this same divergence renders the process of homology inference error-prone and unlikely to result in an equivalence relation. Most current algorithms for homology inference rely on some type of clustering, often based almost entirely on sequence similarity, but homology should also take into account relative placements within each genome. In other words, homology assignments between markers are required for synteny analysis, yet their embedding in syntenic blocks provides a powerful indicator of true homology. We break this circularity by not requiring that the inferred homologies describe an equivalence relation: we drop the requirement of transitivity. This relaxation leads to a decisive advantage in practice: genomic markers no longer need to be clustered into families, so that the synteny analysis can be directly performed on pairwise sequence similarities.

We address the problem of identifying syntenic blocks under weak homology by identifying sets of *approximate weak common intervals* (AWCIs) in indeterminate strings—and this is the computational problem we address in this paper. Informally, indeterminate strings are sequences in which each position is associated with a (nonempty) subset of alphabet characters. Two intervals in two indeterminate strings are *weak common intervals* if each position of both intervals contains at least one character that is also present in the other interval. If a character encoding for two indeterminate strings represents (non-transitive) homologies between markers of two genome sequences, weak common intervals are equivalent to homologous syntenic blocks. Using AWCIs, we identify syntenic blocks that mildly violate the synteny criterion by allowing for a limited number of missing homology statements. We do this to account for (i) false negative errors in the inferred homology assignment and (ii) insertions or deletions of one or a few genomic markers that are a result of genome evolution.

3 A First Algorithm

3.1 Basic definitions

We recall some basic definitions of common intervals in indeterminate strings from Doerr *et al.* [3]. An indeterminate string S with n index positions is a string over the power set $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma) \setminus \emptyset$ of an alphabet Σ . That is, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $S[i] \subseteq \Sigma$ and $S[i] \neq \emptyset$, where $S[i]$ denotes the character set associated with the i -th position in S . We denote the *length* of an indeterminate string S with n index positions by $|S| \equiv n$ and its *cardinality*, i.e., the number of *all* elements in S , by $\|S\| \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n |S[i]|$. Two positions i and j , $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |S|$, induce the (indeterminate) *substring* $S[i, j] \equiv S[i] S[i+1] \dots S[j]$. To distinguish intervals




Figure 1: Example of three indeterminate strings S_1, S_2, S_3 . The black underlined intervals form a closed set of 1-approximate weak common intervals.

in different indeterminate strings, we indicate the affiliation of an interval $[i, j]$ to indeterminate string S by the subscript notation $[i, j]_S$.

Common intervals were first defined on permutations [5] and subsequently extended to ordinary, then indeterminate, strings [2, 3]. The idea behind common intervals is to compare substrings based on their character sets. The *character set* of an indeterminate string S is defined as $\mathcal{C}(S) \equiv \bigcup_{i=1}^n S[i]$. Given two indeterminate strings S and T , two intervals, $[i, j]$ in S and $[k, l]$ in T , are *weak common intervals* with *common character set* $C = \mathcal{C}(S[i, j]) \cap \mathcal{C}(T[k, l])$ if for each $i', i \leq i' \leq j$, we have $C \cap S[i'] \neq \emptyset$ and for each $k', k \leq k' \leq l$, we have $C \cap T[k'] \neq \emptyset$. We study a variant of weak common intervals that tolerates a limited number of insertions and deletions. Given some threshold $\delta \geq 0$, two intervals, $[i, j]$ in indeterminate string S and $[k, l]$ in indeterminate string T , are (δ) -*approximate weak common intervals* with *common character set* $C = \mathcal{C}(S[i, j]) \cap \mathcal{C}(T[k, l])$ if the number of *positions* with no intersection with C is limited by δ , i.e., if we can write

$$|\{x \mid i \leq x \leq j: S[x] \cap C = \emptyset\}| + |\{y \mid k \leq y \leq l: T[y] \cap C = \emptyset\}| \leq \delta$$

We shall call these positions *indels*. A set of intervals is a set of *approximate weak common intervals* if every pair of members satisfies the property.

Finally, we extend the property of pairs of *mutually closed* intervals of [3] to sets of two or more intervals:

Definition 1 (closed set of intervals) *A set \mathcal{I} of intervals is closed if each interval $[i, j]_S \in \mathcal{I}$ has neither immediate left nor immediate right neighboring position p with $S[p] \cap \mathcal{C}(S'[k, l]) \neq \emptyset$ for each $[k, l]_{S'} \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{[i, j]_S\}$.*

Note that closedness is a non-hereditary property of sets of intervals: a subset of a closed set of intervals need not be closed itself. Figure 1 shows an example of a closed set of 1-approximate weak common intervals.

4 Identifying Maximal Closed Sets of AWCI

A set is *maximal* if it cannot be extended by including further valid members.

Problem 1 (maximal closed sets) *Given m indeterminate strings S_1, \dots, S_m and indel threshold $\delta \geq 0$, discover all maximal closed sets of δ -approximate weak*

common intervals that have members in at least q out of the m indeterminate strings.

Because closedness of sets of intervals does not extend to subsets, each set of AWCIs that is identified in the course of the enumeration needs to be tested individually for this property. For the same reason, the closed pairs of AWCIs returned by the discovery algorithms described in [3] cannot be used for the construction of larger sets of AWCIs in multiple sequences, because non-closed pairs are omitted that could contribute to larger closed sets of AWCIs.

Since there can be exponentially many sets of AWCIs in a given set of indeterminate strings, we do not enumerate them explicitly, but instead construct a compact representation from which they can be extracted. Given a set of indeterminate strings, $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$, we construct a graph $G(S_1, \dots, S_m)$, where each vertex corresponds to an interval in one of the indeterminate strings and any two vertices are connected by an undirected edge if and only if their corresponding intervals form a pair of AWCIs. Identifying maximal closed sets of AWCIs then reduces to finding within the graph maximal cliques of vertices whose corresponding AWCIs are closed. In constructing the graph, we already omit intervals that cannot participate in sets of AWCIs of minimum size q . We test each vertex for possible participation in a closed set of AWCIs. That is, if the neighbors of a vertex v are all connected to a vertex u such that the interval I_v associated to vertex v is a proper subinterval of the interval I_u corresponding to vertex u , and if interval I_u extends to at most one position left and/or right of I_v that shares characters with neighbors of I_v , then vertex v can be discarded. The resulting graph is enriched with maximal closed cliques of AWCIs.

4.1 MACSI – An extension of ACSI

We now describe MACSI, a simple approach for enumerating AWCIs in indeterminate strings—see Algorithm 1. MACSI is a simple extension of Algorithm ACSI described by Doerr *et al.* [3]; however, unlike ACSI, it enumerates any pairs of AWCIs rather than only closed ones.

Instead of repeatedly determining intersections of character sets across positions of distinct indeterminate strings, the positions of intersecting character sets are identified and stored at the beginning. Given two indeterminate strings S_x and S_y , each position j , $1 \leq j \leq |S_y|$ in intersection table POS_{xy} is associated with a sorted list of positions in S_y that have a nonempty intersection with character set $S_x[j]$.

Given a set of sequences S_1, \dots, S_m , each of its members acts once as *reference* (lines 2-19), over which the algorithm iterates, thereby fixing a left bound $i = 1, \dots, |S_x|$ (lines 3-20). The algorithm then determines candidates for right bounds $J \subseteq \{i + 1, \dots, |S_x|\}$, where each candidate interval $[i, j]_{S_x}$, $j \in J$, is potentially part of a set of AWCIs conserved in at least q out of the m sequences. Once the interval $[i, j]$ in reference string S_x is fixed, the algorithm iterates over the remaining $m - x$ sequences to enumerate all such candidate intervals (lines 7-14).

The construction of set J representing potential right interval bounds in S_x (line 4) is easily done in time linear in $|S_x|$. For each fixed interval $[i, j]$ in S_x , the enumeration of all intervals in S_y that are AWCIs with $[i, j]_{S_x}$ can be achieved in $\mathcal{O}(|S_y| \cdot \|S_y\|)$ amortized running time. The algorithm first collects and sorts

all positions $P_y \in S_y$ around which such intervals may lie (line 8). For each such position $p \in P_y$, all intervals with left bound larger than the previously processed position are identified (lines 10-13). Testing for the approximate common interval property of an interval pair $[i, j]_{S_x}, [k, l]_{S_y}$, $k \leq p \leq l$, can be done in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ by keeping track of observed indices of $[i, j]_{S_x}$,

$$C_{kl} = \{i' \in \text{Pos}_{yx}[k] \cup \text{Pos}_{yx}[l] \mid i \leq i' \leq j\}$$

and of the number of positions d_{kl} in $[k, l]_{S_y}$ whose character sets do not intersect with $[i, j]_{S_x}$. Then $[i, j]_{S_x}, [k, l]_{S_y}$ are AWCI iff $j - i + 1 - |C_{kl}| + d_{kl} \leq \delta$ holds and the enumeration of all intervals that are AWCI with $[i, j]_{S_x}$ can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|S_y| \cdot \|S_y\|)$ time.

The overall running time of Algorithm 1 is in $\mathcal{O}(m^2 \cdot n^2 \cdot N^2)$, with $n = \max_{x=1..m} |S_x|$ and $N = \max_{x=1..m} \|S_x\|$. This is close to optimal, since the number of pairwise AWCI can be as large as the total number of interval pairs, itself in $\mathcal{O}(m^2 \cdot n^4)$. Hereby we make the reasonable assumption that the cardinality $\|S\|$ of an indeterminate string S is in the order of $a \cdot |S|$ with $a \ll \Sigma$.

5 Speeding Up the Enumeration of AWCI for Synteny Analysis

We now study in more detail the construction of set J (line 4), which contains potential right interval bounds in S_x , and describe an approach that significantly improves the running time by taking advantage of two characteristics of genomes. First, there exist many characters shared only between a subset of all

Algorithm 1 MACSI enumerates all pairs of approximate weak common intervals that are shared by at least q out of m indeterminate strings.

Input: Indeterminate strings S_1, \dots, S_m , indel threshold δ , quorum q .

Output: All approximate weak common intervals of S_1, \dots, S_m with at most δ indels that are conserved in at least q strings

```

1: Construct character set intersection tables  $\text{Pos}_{xy}$  for all sequence pairs  $\{x, y\} \subseteq [1, m]$ 
2: for  $x \leftarrow 1$  to  $m - 1$  do
3:   for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $|S_x|$  do
4:     Determine set  $J$  of potential right bounds of AWCI pairs with left bound  $i$  in  $S_x$ 
5:     for each  $j$  in  $J$  do
6:       Initialize empty list INTS
7:       for  $y \leftarrow x + 1$  to  $m$  do
8:         construct sorted set  $P_y$  of positions  $\text{Pos}_{xy}[i] \cup \dots \cup \text{Pos}_{xy}[i + \delta]$ 
9:          $p_{prev} \leftarrow -1$ 
10:        for each  $p$  in  $P_y$  do
11:          Append to list INTS all intervals  $[k, l]$  in  $S_y$ ,  $p_{prev} < k \leq p \leq l$ , that are
          approximate weak common intervals with  $[i, j]$  in  $S_x$ 
12:           $p_{prev} \leftarrow p$ 
13:        end for
14:      end for
15:      if INTS contains intervals from at least  $q - y + 1$  sequences then
16:        report  $\{([i, j]_{S_x}, [k, l]_{S_y}) \mid [k, l]_{S_y} \in \text{INTS}\}$ 
17:      end if
18:    end for
19:  end for
20: end for

```




Figure 2: The data structure RIDGE_{xy}^t ; lines indicate ridges, i.e., 1s across binary vectors $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[i']$ for some $i' \in [0, |S_x|]$.

sequences; and second, each sequence in the dataset is associated with a single genome representing a concatenation of one or more chromosomes or contigs, yet AWCIs are prohibited from spanning more than one. As a result, our sequences exhibit a non-negligible number of indels that can be trivially identified and used to preempt or terminate unsuccessful searches of sets of AWCIs.

Recall that we are interested in identifying sets of AWCIs with members in a quorum of at least $q \leq m$ strings. Sets of AWCIs enforce transitivity, but the AWCi property itself is not transitive. Therefore, even if we identify a set of intervals $I_{x+1..m}$ with members in at least $q - 1$ strings and which form AWCi pairs with a given interval $[i, j]_{S_x}$, we cannot guarantee that the intervals $I_{x+1..m}$ form AWCi pairs among themselves. Thus, for each interval $[i, j]_{S_x}$, we want to assess whether it could participate in at least one set of AWCIs that satisfies the quorum parameter prior to constructing set $I_{x+1..m}$.

Observation 1 *Given sequences S_1, \dots, S_m , an indel threshold δ , and a quorum q , an interval $[i, j]$ in S_x , for $1 \leq x \leq m$, is not a candidate for an AWCi pair if we have $|\{\mathcal{C}(S_x[i, j]) \setminus \mathcal{C}(S_y) \mid y \in [1, m] \setminus x\}| < q - 1$.*

To exploit this observation, we construct two types of tables, RIDGE_{xy}^c and RIDGE_{xy}^t , for $\{x, y\} \subseteq [1, m]$, where superscripts c and t stand for *cis* and *trans*, respectively. The first, RIDGE_{xy}^c , holds information within intersection table POS_{xy} to decide whether $[i, j]_{S_x}$ putatively participates in an AWCi pair, whereas RIDGE_{xy}^t holds information from RIDGE_{yx}^c , allowing to test whether interval $[i, j]_{S_x}$ is associated to intervals in S_y , with whom it potentially forms AWCi pairs. Each position $0 \leq p < |S_x|$ in table RIDGE_{xy}^c represents a count of the number of positions $0 \leq p' \leq p$ for which $S_x[p']$ contains no characters of $\mathcal{C}(S_y)$. Thus interval $[i, j]$ in string S_x cannot participate in any AWCi pair if $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[j] - \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[i - 1] > \delta$.

We now construct a similar test for trans pairs of our reference interval $[i, j]_{S_x}$ with the help of tables RIDGE_{xy}^t . We say that two positions i, j of string S_x , for $0 \leq i < j \leq |S_x|$, reside on the same *ridge* iff $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[j] - \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[i - 1] \leq \delta$ holds. For a trans string S_y , $x \neq y$, observe that the characters of $\mathcal{C}(S_x[i, j])$ can occur in many different positions in S_y and thus can be associated with different intervals that form an AWCi pair with $[i, j]_{S_x}$. For each candidate interval $[k, l]$ in S_y we must have $\text{RIDGE}_{yx}^c[k] - \text{RIDGE}_{yx}^c[l - 1] \leq \delta$. To test this property quickly, we construct binary vectors to identify ridges in S_y containing characters of $\mathcal{C}(S_x[i, j])$; an example is shown in Figure 2. Each index in any vector associated with positions $i..j$ in S_x corresponds to a distinct ridge in S_y . In order to test whether any two positions i', j' , $i \leq i' < j' \leq j$, contain characters that are located on common ridges in S_y , it then suffices to perform a simple bitwise AND operation between its associated binary vectors. Moreover,

using a bitwise AND of all vectors associated with positions in $i..j$ in S_y we can decide whether there exists at least one ridge in S_y that contains characters from all character sets $S_x[i']$, $i \leq i' \leq j$.

Data structure RIDGE_{xy}^t is of size $\mathcal{O}((\delta + 1) \cdot |S_x| \cdot \|S_y\|)$ and its use increases the overall running time of MACSI by a factor of $(\delta + 1)$. In practice, its size is far from its asymptotic bound and MACSI gains a significant speed-up. To minimize the size of these binary vectors in RIDGE_{xy}^t , we relax our requirement that each ridge be assigned a unique index across all binary vectors. We can do this without damaging the consistency of our data structure, since we do not compare arbitrary binary vectors against each other, but only those whose positions in S_x are at most δ trivial indels afar. Therefore we reuse indices of ridges in the binary vectors. Specifically, when constructing the data structure RIDGE_{xy}^t from left to right, at a given position j we assign a newly observed ridge $\text{RIDGE}_{yx}^c[k]$ (for some $k \in \text{POS}_{xy}[j]$) to a previously used index in the binary vector if the ridge associated to this index has not been observed in any of the previous positions in S_x that are no more than δ indels afar.

In Algorithm 2, we develop this approach to allow for a total of δ indels in $S_x[i, j]$ or any ridge in S_y , $[1, k] \setminus x$. In doing so, we make use of two data structures, ACTIVE^t and Δ^t , which are updated and queried in each iteration for testing interval $i..j$ in S_x with fixed left bound i and increasing right bound j .

Algorithm 2 Testing a position j in string S_x for the existence of some interval $[i', j']_{S_x}$, $i' \leq i \leq j \leq j'$ —, i.e., AWCI with intervals in at least $q - 1$ other indeterminate strings.

Input: start i and current position j in string S_x , tables RIDGE_{xy}^c and RIDGE_{xy}^t , temporary data structures ACTIVE^t and Δ^t , indel threshold δ , quorum q , reference x .
Output: Returns **True** if $S_x[i, j]$ is a candidate for an AWCI set in at least q strings with less than δ indels and **False** otherwise.

```

1: candidates  $\leftarrow 0$ 
2: for  $y$  in  $[1, k] \setminus x$  do
    // Determine the location of currently masked (trans-) ridges in  $\Delta^t[y]$ 
3:    $d \leftarrow \max(0, \delta + 1 + \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[i] - \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[j])$ 
    // Ridges that have been observed before but are not present at this position
4:    $a_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \text{ACTIVE}^t[y] \wedge \neg(\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j] \vee \Delta^t[y][d])$ 
    // Ridges that have not been observed before but are present in  $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j]$ 
5:    $a_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j] \wedge \neg(\text{ACTIVE}^t[y] \vee \Delta^t[y][d])$ 
    // Update  $\Delta^t[y]$  for all ridges in  $a_{\text{off}}$  and  $a_{\text{new}}$ 
6:   for  $d' \leftarrow 0$  to  $d$  do
7:      $\text{tmp} \leftarrow \Delta^t[y][d'] \wedge a_{\text{off}}$ 
8:      $\Delta^t[y][d'] \leftarrow \Delta^t[y][d'] \vee a_{\text{off}}$ 
    // Carry ridges of  $a_{\text{off}}$  already marked in  $\Delta^t[y][d']$  over to  $\Delta^t[y][d' + 1]$ 
9:      $a_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \text{tmp}$ 
10:    if  $d' < j - i$  then
11:       $\Delta^t[y][d'] \leftarrow \Delta^t[y][d'] \vee a_{\text{new}}$ 
12:    end if
13:  end for
    // Add ridges of current position to  $\text{ACTIVE}^t[y]$ 
14:   $\text{ACTIVE}^t[y] \leftarrow \text{ACTIVE}^t[y] \vee \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j]$ 
    // Test if  $S_x[i, j]$  has at least one ridge  $S_y$  with less than  $\delta$  indels
15:  if  $\text{ACTIVE}^t[y] \wedge \neg \Delta^t[y][d] \neq 0$  then
16:    candidates  $\leftarrow$  candidates + 1
17:  end if
18: end for
19: return candidates  $\geq q - 1$ 

```

ACTIVE^t[y] is a binary vector that captures all ridges in S_y containing characters from $\mathcal{C}(S_x[i, j])$. $\Delta^t[y]$ is a data structure made of $\delta + 1$ vectors that act as counters for indels in ridges of S_y — $\Delta^t[y][d']$ records all ridges in S_y that accumulated $0 < d' \leq \delta$ indels. Clearly, if $d^* = \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[j] - \text{RIDGE}_{xy}^c[i]$ trivial indels have been observed in $S_x[i, j]$ (line 3), then only $\delta - d^*$ indels are allowed to occur in any ridge in S_y . Algorithm 2 uses the $(\delta + 1 - d^*)^{\text{th}}$ vector in $\Delta^t[y]$ as a *mask* to ignore all ridges that exceed δ indels in subsequent calculations.

At each iteration j , ridges of S_y can be classified in three categories: (i) ridges in $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j]$ previously observed in any of the $i..j-1$ iterations; (ii) previously observed ridges not in $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j]$; (iii) new ridges of $\text{RIDGE}_{xy}^t[j]$. The last two categories require an update of Δ^t and hence are assigned to vectors a_{off} and a_{new} , respectively (lines 4, 5). The counter for indels of all ridges of a_{off} gets increased by one, whereas for a_{new} the counter gets increased by $\min(j - i, \delta)$; both updates occur in the **for** loop on lines 6-13. After updating ACTIVE^t[y] vector (line 14), Algorithm 2 can test whether there exists at least one ridge in S_y that satisfies the indel constraint with $S_x[i, j]$ (lines 15-17). Algorithm 2 returns **True** only if $q - 1$ strings fulfill the indel constraint; otherwise, the current position j in reference string S_x gives rise to set $J = [i, j]$ (Algorithm 1, line 4).

Further improvements in speed are made by individually refining the set of characters J for each position of set P_y , which is constructed in line 8 in Algorithm 1. In doing so, we improve on a technique already described in [3]. Note that P_y is not dependent on the candidate set of right bounds J of intervals in S_x , but rather on the left candidate-interval bound i and therefore can be computed prior to iterating through set J . For each position $p \in P_y$ of indeterminate string S_y , we collect indices $J_p \subseteq J$ in all sets $\text{POS}_{yx}[k^*].. \text{POS}_{yx}[l^*]$ such that k^* and l^* , $k^* \leq p \leq l^*$, are at most δ trivial indels from p afar, i.e. $J_p = (\text{POS}_{yx}[k^*] \cup \dots \cup \text{POS}_{yx}[l^*]) \cap J$. Thus we use Algorithm 2 on each position k' of indeterminate string S_y that is visited while walking from p towards k^* . In doing so, we test for the possible existence of AWCI sets that have members in at least $q - 2$ strings other than S_y and S_x and contain some interval $[k, l]_{S_y}$, $k \leq k' \leq p \leq l$. We stop progressing towards k^* if Algorithm 2 returns **False**. This process also applies to positions l' , $p \leq l' \leq l^*$.

Just as described in [3], sets J_p , $p \in P_y$, can then be used to refine the candidate set J of right interval bounds of S_x . Unlike in [3], however, the refinement is performed across multiple sequences. For any set of positions P_y , we identify the rightmost interval bound found in the neighborhood of any $p \in P_y$ that satisfies the indel treshold in S_x , i.e.,

$$j_y^* := \max_{p \in P_y} \{j_p \mid |J_p \cap [i, j_p]| \leq \delta\}$$

Then the new candidate set of right interval bounds of the next iteration is

$$J = \left[i, \max_{\substack{Z \subseteq [1, m] \setminus x \\ |Z| \geq q-1}} \left(\min_{z \in Z} j_z^* \right) \right]$$

We repeat this process to refine each of the sets J_p . In practice, fewer than 3 iterations suffice to converge to stable sets J and J_p .




Figure 3: **(a)** Runtimes of MACSI and **(b)** bit vector sizes (per position) in data structure RIDGE_{xy}^t on genome sets of different sizes with indel thresholds $\delta \in \{0, 2\}$; **(c)** Runtimes of MACSI with indel threshold $\delta = 0$ on sampled sets of 20 genomes with varying quorum settings.

6 Results and Discussion

We demonstrate the applicability of MACSI in comparing genomic sequences on a dataset of 93 bacterial genomes that was also used in evaluating the algorithms for discovering pairs of AWCI presented in Doerr *et al.* [3] and that were originally obtained from Ciccarelli *et al.* [1]. Doerr *et al.* transformed the genomic sequences into indeterminate strings, by using annotations of protein-coding genes and by computing pairwise BLASTP hits between genes. The resulting indeterminate strings have an average length of 2726 elements and each pair of indeterminate strings contains 6499 positions with intersecting character sets.

MACSI is implemented in Python; our implementation allows for parallel computation, but for the purpose of assessing the runtime of our method, all computations were performed in a single thread. In addition to indel parameter δ and quorum, our implementation allows to set a minimum size for reported AWCI, where size is measured between pairs of AWCI by the number of positions that contain shared characters. Throughout our experiments, we set the minimum size to 10. Experiments were run on a machine with sixty-four 2.3 GHz cores. To assess the running time of our implementation we sampled genome sets of different sizes from the pool of 93 bacterial genomes and then ran MACSI using different parameter settings. The sampling was repeated 10-fold in all experiments. Figure 3 shows the results. Since our speed-up relies on the frequency of indels, the indel threshold δ has the most dramatic effect on the running time of the algorithm; in comparison, lowering the quorum has only a mild effect. Comparing 40 full bacterial genomes took on average just around 3.5 hours of computation.

The number of reported AWCI pairs as well as the data structure RIDGE_{xy}^t have the most decisive effect on the space requirements of our algorithm. Because the former is less prone to algorithmic improvements, we monitored only the latter in our experiments. Figure 3 (b) illustrates the sizes of bit vectors in RIDGE_{xy}^t in our experiments and shows that fewer than 500 bits were needed in runs with $\delta = 0$ and fewer than 1400 bits with $\delta = 2$.

7 Conclusion

We presented a fast algorithm for the discovery of approximate weak common interval in multiple indeterminate strings. Our main contributions are data structures that allow for efficient filtering of intervals that cannot be members of AWCI sets of a given minimal size. We exploited genomic properties, in particular the fact that our indeterminate strings will exhibit many trivial indels, yielding easily identifiable boundaries for AWCI. How to speed up the general algorithm in the absence of trivial indels remains an open question.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author's Contributions

BM initiated and directed the research project, DD designed and implemented the herein presented algorithms and ran the experiments; both authors wrote the manuscript, and read and approved its final version.

References

- [1] F. D. Ciccarelli, T. Doerks, C. von Mering, C. J. Creevey, B. Snel, and P. Bork. Toward automatic reconstruction of a highly resolved tree of life. *Science*, 311(5765):1283–1287, 2006.
- [2] G. Didier, T. Schmidt, J. Stoye, and D. Tsur. Character sets of strings. *J. Discr. Alg.*, 5(2):330–340, 2007.
- [3] D. Doerr, J. Stoye, S. Böcker, and K. Jahn. Identifying gene clusters by discovering common intervals in indeterminate strings. In *Proc. 12th RECOMB Satellite Workshop on Comparative Genomics RECOMB-CG'14*, volume 15 (Suppl. 6) of *BMC Genomics*, page S2, 2014.
- [4] C. Ghiurcuta and B. Moret. Evaluating synteny for improved comparative studies. In *Proc. 22nd Symp. on Intelligent Systems for Mol. Bio. ISMB'14*, volume 30(12) of *Bioinformatics*, pages i9–18, 2014.
- [5] T. Uno and M. Yagiura. Fast algorithms to enumerate all common intervals of two permutations. *Algorithmica*, 26(2):290–309, 2000.
- [6] M. Visnovská, T. Vinař, and B. Brejová. Dna sequence segmentation based on local similarity. In *Proc. 13th Conf. on Info. Technologies—Applications and Theory ITAT'13*, pages 36–43, 2013.
- [7] X. Zhang and B. Moret. Refining regulatory networks through phylogenetic transfer of information. *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 9(4):1032–1045, 2012.