

# Faster MEM-finding in $O(r + \bar{r} + g)$ space

Travis Gagie

Faculty of Computer Science  
Dalhousie University

To reduce reference bias, researchers and physicians have started moving away from aligning reads against single-genome references and towards aligning them against representations, such as pangenome graphs, of hundreds or thousands of genomes. It is not a trivial task, however, to modify a popular aligner such as BWA-MEM [7] to work with multi-genome references. For example, the auxiliary data structures that let FM-indexes find maximal exact matches (MEMs) quickly do not scale well. In addition, a MEM may occur in many of the genomes in the reference but all of those occurrences may correspond to only one location in the pangenome graph, so it is a waste of time to report or even examine the occurrences one by one. Indexing the pangenome graph itself efficiently imposes heavy constraints on the structure of the graph and, even if we accept those constraints, querying the graph alone can produce chimeric matches — and tends to do so more and more as we increase the number of genomes in our reference.

Bannai, Gagie and I [3] described a compact index to find the MEMs of a pattern  $P[1..m]$  (such as a read) with respect to a text  $T[1..n]$  (such as the concatenation of reference genomes). Their index takes  $O(r + g)$  space, where  $r$  is the number of runs in the Burrows-Wheeler Transform (BWT) of  $T$  and  $g$  is the number of rules in a given straight-line program (SLP) for  $T$ , and lists all the MEMs'  $k$  occurrences in  $T$  in  $O(m \log n + k \log \log n)$  total time. Rossi et al. [10] implemented this index in their tool MONI and it has been used in several subsequent tools [1, 2, 11]. By applying a result by Nishimoto and Tabei [8], we can reduce the query time to  $O(m \log n + k)$  without increasing the index's space.

Bannai et al.'s index actually computes the matching statistics  $\text{MS}[1..m]$  of  $P$  with respect to  $T$ , and then computes the MEMs from  $\text{MS}[1..m]$  in  $O(m)$  time. The  $i$ th matching statistic  $\text{MS}[i]$  consists of a pointer  $\text{MS}[i].\text{pos}$  to a position in  $T$  and a length  $\text{MS}[i].\text{len}$ , such that

$$T[\text{MS}[i].\text{pos}..\text{MS}[i].\text{pos} + \text{MS}[i].\text{len} - 1] = P[i..i + \text{MS}[i].\text{len} - 1]$$

and  $P[i..i + \text{MS}[i].\text{len}]$  does not occur in  $T$ . Specifically, their index first computes the matching-statistics pointers  $\text{MS}[1..m].\text{pos}$ , and then uses the SLP for  $T$  to compute  $\text{MS}[i].\text{len}$  for each  $i$  with  $\text{MS}[i - 1].\text{pos} \neq \text{MS}[i].\text{pos} - 1$ . If the alphabet size  $\sigma$  is at most polylogarithmic in  $n$  and we apply Nishimoto and Tabei's result, then computing  $\text{MS}[1..m].\text{pos}$  takes  $O(m)$  time. With the following lemma and constant-time access to the Karp-Rabin hashes of the substrings of  $P$ , computing  $\text{MS}[i].\text{len}$  takes  $O(\log n)$  time and works correctly with high probability. Prezza [9] showed how we can build a data structure supporting constant-time access to the hashes of the substrings of  $P$  in  $O(m \log(\sigma) / \log n) \subseteq O(m)$  time.

**Lemma 1** (Depuydt et al. [5]). *Given an SLP for  $T$  with  $g$  rules we can build an  $O(g)$ -space data structure with which, given  $i$  and  $j$  and constant-time access to the Karp-Rabin hashes of the substrings of  $P$ , we can return the length of the longest prefix of  $P[i..m]$  and  $T[j..n]$  — or the length of the longest common suffix of  $P[1..i]$  and  $T[1..j]$  — in  $O(\log n)$  time and correctly with high probability.*

Very recently, Depuydt et al. [5] showed that if we have the structure from Lemma 1, a z-fast trie [4] for the prefixes ending at the positions in a so-called suffixient set for  $T$ , and constant-time access to the hashes of the substrings of  $P$ , then we can find the MEMs using  $O(\log n)$  time for every edge we would partially or completely descend in the suffix tree of  $T$  while finding the MEMs, again correctly with high probability. A suffixient set for  $T$  is a set of positions such that for any vertex  $v$  in the suffix tree and any edge  $e$  descending from  $v$ , for some  $j$  in the suffixient set  $T[1..j]$  ends with  $v$ 's path label followed by  $e$ 's first character. Depuydt et al. proved that the positions in  $T$  of the characters at the boundaries of the  $\bar{r}$  runs in the BWT of the reverse of  $T$  are a suffixient set, and thus their index takes  $O(\bar{r} + g)$  space.

By mixing Bannai et al.'s and Depuydt et al.'s strategies — specifically, whenever we successfully match  $\lg n$  characters in a row through backward stepping (Bannai, Gagie and I's strategy) we switch to using the structure from Lemma 1 and a z-fast trie (Depuydt et al.'s strategy) until querying those matches fewer than  $\lg n$  characters, and then we switch back to backward stepping — we can build an  $O(r + g)$ -space index that is never more than a constant factor slower than either of their indexes and sometimes faster than both. Depuydt et al. will include a full analysis in their paper.

Goga et al. [6] showed that if we assign each character in  $T$  a tag — such as locations in the pangenome graph for alignment, or species IDs for metagenomic classification — then we can build a an  $O(t + g)$ -space index, where  $t$  is the number of runs in the so-called tag array of  $T$ , such that if we are given a MEM and constant-time random access to the hashes of the substrings of  $P$ , then we can list the distinct tags assigned to the first characters of occurrences in  $T$  of that MEM in  $O(\log n)$  time plus constant time per distinct tag listed and correctly with high probability. The tag array is the list of tags sorted into the lexicographic order of the suffixes starting at the characters the tags are assigned to.

If we combine all these results so that given  $P$  we can find its MEMs with respect to  $T$  and list the distinct tags for each MEM correctly with high probability, then the bottleneck is likely to be computing  $\text{MS}[1..m].\text{len}$  or, equivalently, finding the lengths of the MEMs. Fortunately, as we show now, it is easy to sidestep that bottleneck. In our proof, we will use an array symmetric to the matching statistics, but for matching suffixes of prefixes instead of matching prefixes of suffixes. Specifically, let  $\text{MS}'[1..m]$  be the array with  $\text{MS}'[i]$  consisting of  $\text{MS}'[i].\text{pos}$  and  $\text{MS}'[i].\text{len}$  such that

$$T \left[ \text{MS}'[i].\text{pos} - \text{MS}'[i].\text{len} + 1.. \text{MS}'[i].\text{pos} \right] = P \left[ i - \text{MS}'[i].\text{len} + 1..i \right]$$

and  $P \left[ i - \text{MS}'[i].\text{len}..i \right]$  does not occur in  $T$ .

**Lemma 2.** *There is an  $O(r + \bar{r} + g)$ -space index such that if the alphabet size is at most polylogarithmic in  $n$  then when we are given  $P[1..m]$  we can compute the MEMs of  $P$  with respect to  $T$  in  $O(m)$  time plus  $O(\log n)$  time per MEM and correctly with high probability.*

*Proof.* As we have seen, there is an  $O(r + g)$ -space index with which we can compute  $\text{MS}[1..m].\text{pos}$  in  $O(m)$  time. By symmetry, there is an  $O(\bar{r} + g)$ -space index with which we can compute  $\text{MS}'[1..m].\text{pos}$  in  $O(m)$  time given  $P$ .

If we know that  $P[i]$  is the left end of a MEM, then we can apply Lemma 1 to  $i$  and  $\text{MS}[i].\text{pos}$  to find the length of that MEM — that is, the length of the longest common prefix of  $P[i..m]$  and  $T \left[ \text{MS}[i].\text{pos}..n \right]$  — and thus that MEM's right end  $P[j]$ , in  $O(\log n)$  time and correctly with high probability. We know  $P[j + 1]$  is in the next MEM to the right, and we can apply Lemma 1 to  $j$  and  $\text{MS}'[j].\text{pos}$  to find  $P[j]$ 's position in that next MEM — that is, the length of the longest common prefix of  $P[1..j]$  and  $T \left[ 1.. \text{MS}'[j].\text{pos} \right]$  — and thus that next MEM's left end, in  $O(\log n)$  time and correctly with high probability.

Starting with the left end  $P[1]$  of the first MEM, we can find both endpoints of all the MEMs using  $O(\log n)$  time for each MEM and correctly with high probability.  $\square$

In case there are many short and uninformative MEMs, we can adapt the ideas from Lemma 2 so we ignore them.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose we have the  $O(g)$ -space data structure from Lemma 1 and we are given*

- $MS[1..m].pos$  and  $MS'[1..m].pos$ ,
- constant-time access to the hashes of substrings of  $P$ ,
- $L \geq 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Then we can report all the MEMs of length at least  $L$  in  $O\left(\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon L} + \mu_{(1-\epsilon)L}\right) \log n\right)$  time and correctly with high probability, where  $\mu_{(1-\epsilon)L}$  is the number of MEMs of length at least  $(1-\epsilon)L$ .*

*Proof.* We set a pointer  $q = 1$  to the start of  $P$  and work right, repeating a simple procedure until we reach the end of  $P$ . Specifically, we compute  $\ell = MS'[q+L-1].len$  in  $O(\log n)$  time with the SLP, and consider two cases:

- if  $\ell = L$  then there is a MEM of length at least  $L$  starting at  $P[q]$ , so we compute its length  $MS[q].len$ , report it, set  $q$  to  $q+1$  and continue;
- if  $\ell < L$  then there is no MEM of length at least  $L$  starting in  $P[q..(q+L-1)-\ell]$  but there is a MEM of length at least  $(1-\epsilon)L$  starting at  $P[(q+L-1)-\ell+1]$ , so we set  $q$  to  $(q+L-1)-\ell+1$  and continue.

In the first case, we charge the two SLP queries to the MEM of length at least  $L$  that we report. In the second case, if  $\ell \geq (1-\epsilon)L$  then there is a MEM of length at least  $(1-\epsilon)L$  starting at  $P[(q+L-1)-\ell+1]$ , so we charge the SLP query to that MEM. If  $\ell < (1-\epsilon)L$  then  $P[q..(q+L-1)-(1-\epsilon)L]$  has length at least  $\epsilon L$ , we charge a  $\frac{1}{\epsilon L}$  fraction of the SLP query to each of those characters.

Since we charge a at most constant number of  $O(\log n)$ -time SLP queries to each MEM of length at least  $(1-\epsilon)L$  and at most a  $\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon L}\right)$ -fraction of such a query to each character in  $P$ , we use  $O\left(\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon L} + \mu_{(1+\epsilon)L}\right) \log n\right)$  time in total.  $\square$

It is tedious but not difficult to modify the Lemma 2 such that finding a MEM takes time proportional to the minimum of  $\lg n$  and that MEM's length. It is also possible to avoid computing  $MS'[1..m].pos$  by using a suffixient set for  $T$ , and then we can prove a slightly better time bound: if we would match  $\ell_j$  characters in the label of the  $j$ th edge we would descend in the suffix tree of  $T$ , then we use  $O\left(\sum_j \min(\ell_j, \log n)\right)$  total time to find the MEMs. Again, Depuydt et al. will give details in their paper. Combining Lemma 2 as it stands now with Goga et al.'s result, however, we obtain the following theorem:

**Theorem 4.** *There is an  $O(r + \bar{r} + g + t)$ -space index for  $T[1..n]$  such that if the alphabet size is at most polylogarithmic in  $n$  then when given  $P[1..m]$  we can compute the MEMs of  $P$  with respect to  $T$  in  $O(m)$  time plus  $O(\log n)$  time per MEM and then list the distinct tags for each MEM in constant time per tag listed, all correctly with high probability.*

## References

- [1] Omar Ahmed, Massimiliano Rossi, Sam Kovaka, Michael C Schatz, Travis Gagie, Christina Boucher, and Ben Langmead. Pan-genomic matching statistics for targeted nanopore sequencing. *Iscience*, 24(6), 2021.
- [2] Omar Y Ahmed, Massimiliano Rossi, Travis Gagie, Christina Boucher, and Ben Langmead. Spumoni 2: improved classification using a pangenome index of minimizer digests. *Genome Biology*, 24(1):122, 2023.
- [3] Hideo Bannai, Travis Gagie, and I Tomohiro. Refining the r-index. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 812:96–108, 2020.
- [4] Djamal Belazzougui, Paolo Boldi, Rasmus Pagh, and Sebastiano Vigna. Fast prefix search in little space, with applications. In *18th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 427–438. Springer, 2010.
- [5] Lore Depuydt et al. Suffixient sets. In preparation; preliminary version at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01359>.
- [6] Adrián Goga, Andrej Baláž, Travis Gagie, Gonzalo Navarro, Alessia Petescia, Simon Heumos, and Jouni Sirén. Wheeler maps. In *16th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics (LATIN)*, 2024. To appear.
- [7] Heng Li. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.3997*, 2013.
- [8] Takaaki Nishimoto and Yasuo Tabei. Optimal-time queries on BWT-runs compressed indexes. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [9] Nicola Prezza. In-place sparse suffix sorting. In *29th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1496–1508. SIAM, 2018.
- [10] Massimiliano Rossi, Marco Oliva, Ben Langmead, Travis Gagie, and Christina Boucher. MONI: a pangenomic index for finding maximal exact matches. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 29(2):169–187, 2022.
- [11] Vikram S Shivakumar, Omar Y Ahmed, Sam Kovaka, Mohsen Zakeri, and Ben Langmead. Sigmoni: classification of nanopore signal with a compressed pangenome index. *bioRxiv*, 2023.