

On the number of k-mers admitting a given lexicographical minimizer

Florian Ingels

florian.ingels@univ-lille.fr

Camille Marchet

camille.marchet@univ-lille.fr

Mikaël Salson

mikael.salson@univ-lille.fr

Univ. Lille, CNRS, Centrale Lille, UMR 9189 CRISAL, F-59000 Lille, France

Abstract

The minimizer of a word of size k (a k -mer) is defined as its smallest substring of size m (with $m \leq k$), according to some ordering on m -mers. minimizers have been used in bioinformatics — notably — to partition sequencing datasets, binning together k -mers that share the same minimizer. It is folklore that using the lexicographical order lead to very unbalanced partitions, resulting in an abundant literature devoted to devising alternative orders for achieving better balanced partitions. To the best of our knowledge, the unbalanced-ness of lexicographical-based minimizer partitions has never been investigated from a theoretical point of view. In this article, we aim to fill this gap and determine, for a given minimizer, how many k -mers would admit the chosen minimizer — i.e. what would be the size of the bucket associated to the chosen minimizer in the worst case, where all k -mers would be seen in the data. We show that this number can be computed in $O(km)$ space and $O(km^2)$ time. We further introduce approximations that can be computed in $O(k)$ space and $O(km)$ time. We also show on genomic datasets that the practical number of k -mers associated to a minimizer are closely correlated to the theoretical expected number. We introduce two conjectures that could help closely approximating the total number of k -mers sharing a minimizer. We believe that characterising the distribution of the number of k -mers per minimizer will help devise efficient lexicographic-based minimizer bucketting.

1 Introduction

1.1 Context & motivations

k -mers, fragments of sequences of fixed size k , are a key tool in bioinformatics for processing and analysing data from DNA or RNA sequencing, and have been used successfully to tackle problems such as genome assembly, sequence alignment, species assignment, gene quantification, and so on [19, 14]. Technological advances are resulting in increasingly larger datasets to process, which are growing faster than the computing capacity of computers [30, 33, 15] — requiring the implementation of ever more powerful methods and algorithms. In particular, even storing data on disk or loading it into memory — before any processing — is a challenge in itself. Consider for instance the Sequence Read Archive (SRA)¹ and the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA)², two examples of public databases that index tens of petabytes of sequencing data [32, 8].

¹<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra/>, accessed in December 2024.

²<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/browser/home>, accessed in December 2024.

A common strategy for addressing this problem is to partition the k -mers into bins, and process/store each bin separately. A popular approach to partitioning k -mers is to group together those that share a common *minimizer*. Introduced first in 2003 in [31], this technique is based on the following principle: for a fixed $m \leq k$, each k -mer is subdivided into its constitutive m -mers. Provided a total order over the set of all possible m -mers, e.g. the lexicographical order, the minimizer of a k -mer is defined as its smallest m -mer. Consecutive k -mers³ in the data often share the same minimizer, guaranteeing some form of locality preservation in partitioning. In addition, we can define super- k -mers, i.e. sequences obtained by concatenating all consecutive k -mers sharing the same minimizer. These super- k -mers are stored in bins corresponding to their minimizer, for a fraction of the space needed to store the corresponding k -mers directly [16, 5]. Very recent work has even taken this principle all the way to defining hyper- k -mers, see [22].

In the context of partitioning sequences using minimizers, many approaches in the literature rely on a common heuristic framework [26, 21, 20]. The process begins by selecting a minimizer using a primary hash-based method. Once the minimizer is chosen, its sequence is hashed using a reversible hash function, and the result is taken modulo b , the total number of partitions, to assign it to a specific partition. This process is used to address the observed imbalance happening in practice when k -mers are partitioned with super- k -mers. By allowing different minimizers to be mapped to the same partition, it distributes k -mers more evenly across all partitions.

As noted in [28], using the lexicographic order for m -mers generates undesirable effects as the partitions obtained are empirically highly skewed, where one would rather wish for a fairly balanced subdivision of the data space. Several examples of empirical imbalance are showed in Figure 1. This problem has been widely addressed in the literature, and several approaches have been proposed. Some suggest modifying the lexicographical order, for example by reversing the order of certain letters according to their observed frequency in the data [28], or by giving lower priority to minimizers that start with a certain combination of letters or have a particular pattern [5]. Others use random orders, obtained with hash functions, which counter the effect of lexicographic order, but without any guarantee that we will not find, nonetheless, highly repeated m -mers with low order, which would lead to partitions that are again very unbalanced, as remarked in [3]. There are also methods that order m -mers according to their frequency of appearance in the data [3] — or in a sample of the data [24, 10]. Finally, compact universal hitting sets — small sets of m -mers for which it is guaranteed that any k -mer contains at least one of them — have recently been introduced [25, 7]. A comparative study of most of these methods can be found in [18]. For practical applications of minimizers, we refer the interested reader to the recent review in [23].

Density, which measures the expected fraction of distinct minimizers sampled over a sequence, plays an important role when minimizers are used for sampling, alignment, or creating efficient k -mer set representations. The density of random orders is still being explored, with first results in 2003 in [31] until very recently [11]. To the best of our knowledge, density considerations are the only theoretical works addressing the behaviour of lexicographic minimizers [36]. However, when minimizers are applied for partitioning k -mers, an independent question arises: how challenging is it to achieve balanced partitioned buckets? In practice, heuristics often exclude certain minimizers, particularly those with low complexity [5] or “randomize” lexicographic minimizers in a reversible way [35], as they tend to attract an excessive number of k -mers. Consequently, most methods doing partitions have moved away from using lexicographic minimizers and instead rely on random minimizers [2, 21, 9].

In this article, we open a new perspective to better understand lexicographic partitions. We are interested in precisely quantifying the size of partitions in the worst possible case, i.e. if all k -mers admitting the same minimizer were to be observed in the data. More precisely, provided a certain m -mer w , we are interested in evaluating the number of k -mers admitting w as their minimizer.

We believe that a better theoretical understanding of the distribution of lexicographical minimizers would make it possible to design new partition heuristics to compensate for the imbalances observed, and give lex-

³I.e. k -mers that overlap over $k - 1$ characters.




Figure 1: Examples of empirical partitions obtained on different datasets — see Section 5.3 for details. The x-axis depicts the observed minimizers, sorted by lexicographical order, and the y-axis displays the number of k -mers found in the partition associated with each minimizer for that particular dataset.

icographical minimizers a new opportunity for practical use. Indeed, using lexicographic minimizers offers at least two key advantages. First, since the minimizer sequence is known, it eliminates the need for explicit storage, saving memory and reducing the number of bits written. Second, when minimizers are used for tasks like sampling, their sequences can be directly compared instead of relying on hash values. Comparing lexicographic signals leads to more precise comparisons, avoiding hash collisions and preserving the true relationships between sequences, with recent works showing it improves accuracy in measuring sequence distances [29, 12].

1.2 Preliminaries

Let Σ be a totally ordered set, called the alphabet, whose elements are called letters. As a convention, indeterminate letters will be noted a, b, c, \dots , while determined letters will be noted in small capitals A, B, C, \dots . A word over Σ is a finite sequence of letters $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$, with $a_i \in \Sigma$. As a convention, words will be denoted w, x, \dots . The size of w , denoted by $|w|$, is equal to n . A word of size $k > 0$ is called a k -mer, and the set of all k -mers over Σ is denoted by Σ^k . We recall that the lexicographical order over Σ^k is defined as follows. Let $x = a_1 \cdots a_k$ and $y = b_1 \cdots b_k$ be two k -mers; then $x > y$ if and only if either (i) $a_1 > b_1$ or (ii) there exists $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ so that $a_1 \cdots a_i = b_1 \cdots b_i$ and $a_{i+1} > b_{i+1}$. We denote by ε the empty word,

so that $\varepsilon < x$ for any k -mer x ; in particular, $\varepsilon < a$ for any letter $a \in \Sigma$. Finally, for $a \in \Sigma$, we define $\varphi_{>}(a)$ the number of letter strictly greater than a ; i.e. $\varphi_{>}(a) = |\{a' \in \Sigma : a' > a\}|$. By convention, $\varphi_{>}(\varepsilon) = |\Sigma|$. Besides, $\varphi_{>} : \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\} \rightarrow \llbracket 0, |\Sigma| \rrbracket$ is a bijection.

Since the motivation for this work comes from bioinformatics, we shall use the DNA alphabet $\Sigma = \{A, C, G, T\}$ for our examples. However, we stress that the results presented here are valid whatever the alphabet chosen. In particular, these results are also valid if the order associated with the alphabet is not the standard lexicographical order, but an arbitrary order on the letters. In particular, from the perspective of bioinformatics applications, this means that using the order $C < A < T < G$ as proposed by [28] in no way prevents the observation of unbalanced partitions in practice, as discussed in the introduction.

In this paper, we focus on the notion of lexicographical minimizers of k -mers. Let $1 \leq m \leq k$ and let $x = a_1 \cdots a_k$ be a k -mer.

Definition 1. *The minimizer of x , denoted by $\min(x)$, is the smallest m -mer contained in x .*

In other words, for any $1 \leq i \leq k - m + 1$, $\min(x) \leq a_i \cdots a_{i+m-1}$. We denote $f_{\min} : \Sigma^k \rightarrow \llbracket 1, k - m + 1 \rrbracket$ the function that returns the smallest index i so that $\min(x) = a_i \cdots a_{i+m-1}$ — i.e.

$$f_{\min}(x) = \min\{1 \leq i \leq k - m + 1 : a_i \cdots a_{i+m-1} \leq a_{i'} \cdots a_{i'+m-1}, \forall 1 \leq i' \leq k - m + 1\}$$

and $\min(x) = a_{f_{\min}(x)} \cdots a_{f_{\min}(x)+m-1}$. In the literature, the function f_{\min} can be defined for any total order over Σ^k , not necessarily the lexicographical order, and is called a minimizer scheme [28, 31].

Provided $1 \leq m \leq k$ and a m -mer w , we denote by Σ_w^k the set of k -mers that admit w as their minimizer; i.e. $\Sigma_w^k = \{x \in \Sigma^k : \min(x) = w\}$. Note that Σ_w^k is never empty, since it contains at least the k -mer formed by $k - m$ copies of $\max(\Sigma)$ followed by w . Therefore, we can partition Σ^k into the following disjoint union

$$\Sigma^k = \bigsqcup_{w \in \Sigma^m} \Sigma_w^k.$$

If k -mers were to be equally distributed over the Σ_w^k 's, we would have $|\Sigma_w^k| = |\Sigma|^{k-m}$. It is folklore that this is not the case and that this partition is very unevenly distributed, as stated in the introduction and illustrated in Figure 1. However, to the best of our knowledge, nobody seems to have actually determined theoretically to what extent. We introduce the following counting function, aimed to fill this gap.

Definition 2. *The minimizer counting function $\pi_k : \Sigma^m \rightarrow \llbracket 1, |\Sigma|^k \rrbracket$ is defined, for $w \in \Sigma^m$, by $\pi_k(w) = |\Sigma_w^k|$.*

The rest of the paper is organised as follows:

- Section 2, 3 and 4 are devoted to the computation of $\pi_k(w)$, by establishing systems of recursive equations that can be calculated using dynamic programming;
- Section 5 offers a number of numerical illustrations, in particular comparing theoretical values with those observed in practice;
- a conclusion outlining a number of future research directions.

In this paper, we use Iverson brackets [13] to denote indicator functions; that is, the Iverson bracket of property P , denoted by $[P]$, is defined as

$$[P] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P \text{ is true;} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2 Computing $\pi_k(w)$

In this section, we assume that $1 \leq m \leq k$ are fixed, as well as the m -mer $w = a_1 \cdots a_m$. Our goal is to compute $\pi_k(w)$, that is, as per Definition 2, the number of k -mers that admits w as their minimizer. In other words,

$$\pi_k(w) = |\Sigma_w^k| = |\{\chi \in \Sigma^k : \min(\chi) = w\}|.$$

2.1 General strategy

Let x be a k -mer, so that $\min(x) = w$. There exists (possibly empty) words y and z , so that $x = ywz$, and with $f_{\min}(x) = |y| + 1$. By definition of f_{\min} , all m -mers of x preceding w are necessarily $> w$; whereas all m -mers succeeding w are necessarily $\geq w$ — as illustrated in Figure 2. To respect these constraints, it should be noted that the letters in y are dependent on each other, as are those in z ; however, the letters in y and z are independent of each other. Finally, $|y| + |z| = k - m$.




Figure 2: Anatomy of a k -mer x so that $\min(x) = w$.

So, it appears that determining $\pi_k(w)$ is a matter of counting how many words y and words z there are for each of the possible starting positions of w in a k -mer. We introduce the concepts of antemers (corresponding to y , placed before w) and postmers (corresponding to z , placed after w) to this end. It is clear that both the possible antemers and postmers depend strongly on w ; in the sequel, this dependency on w will be implicitly assumed, and therefore omitted from the notations in order to simplify them.

Definition 3. An α -antemer is a word $y \in \Sigma^\alpha$ so that, for any m -mer w' of the word yw but the last one (which is w itself), we have $w' > w$.

We denote by $A(\alpha)$ the counting function of α -antemers — i.e. the number of α -mers that are antemers. Also, for $0 \leq i < m$, we denote by $A_i(\alpha)$ the number of α -antemers that share with w a prefix of size i . Note that $i = m$ is forbidden, otherwise there would be a m -mer equal to w in the antemer. Naturally, we have

$$A(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} A_i(\alpha) \quad (1)$$

and $A(0) = 1$. Note also that $A_i(\alpha) = 0$ for $i > \alpha$.

Definition 4. A β -postmer is a word $z \in \Sigma^\beta$ so that, for any m -mer w' of z , we have $w' \geq w$.

Remark 1. If we take $w = ACA$ and $z = ACC$, for example, then z is a postmer according to this definition, despite the word $wz = ACAACC$ containing the m -mer AAC which is $< w$. If we have not defined postmers by requiring that all m -mers of the word wz — instead of z as written — be $\geq w$, this is to simplify certain notations in the sequel, when recursively computing the number of postmers. To reconcile this concern for simplification with the issue mentioned above, in practice we will consider $(\beta + m)$ -postmers of the form wz , i.e. whose prefix is fixed and equal to w — while z remains to be determined.

We denote by $P(\beta)$ the counting function of β -postmers — *i.e.* the number of β -mers that are postmers. For $0 \leq i \leq m$, we also denote by $P_i(\beta)$ the number of β -postmers that share with w a prefix of size i . Again, we have

$$P(\beta) = \sum_{i=0}^m P_i(\beta) \quad (2)$$

and $P(0) = 1$. Note also that $P_i(\beta) = 0$ for $i > \beta$.

An example of antemers and postmers is provided in Figure 3.



Figure 3: Examples of antemers and postmers, with $w = AAC$ and $m = 3$. In Figure 3a, y is a 4-antemer because CGG, GGT, GTA and TAA are strictly greater than AAC . wz is a 8-postmer — cf. Remark 1 — because AAC, ACC, CCA, CAA, AAC and ACA are greater or equal than AAC . In Figure 3b, y' is not a 4-antemer because $AAA \leq AAC$. Thus, w is not a minimizer in Figure 3b.

As a result of the previous discussion and considering Remark 1, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.

$$\pi_k(w) = \sum_{\alpha+\beta=k-m} A(\alpha) \cdot P_m(\beta + m). \quad (3)$$

Proof. It is easy to see that it is not possible to generate the same k -mer via two distinct pairs (α, β) and (α', β') , by virtue of the fact that for $x = ywz$ with $|y| = \alpha$ and $|z| = \beta$, $f_{\min}(x) = \alpha + 1$. ✖

Remark 2. Words of the form yw (corresponding to antemers) or wz (corresponding to postmers we are interested in practice, in light of Remark 1) are designed in the literature by the term closed syncmers [6].

It has already been established that A and P are independent of each other; consequently in the following we will detail their calculation in a dedicated section for each. The strategy will be the same for both: find recurrence relations between the values of A and A_0, \dots, A_{m-1} (resp. P and P_0, \dots, P_m); in particular our approach is based on the study of words sharing a common prefix of size i with w , and the different ways of choosing the $(i + 1)$ -th letter of this word. Before proceeding with this analysis, we introduce our main tool in the next section.

2.2 Autocorrelation matrix

Classically, the autocorrelation vector of a word $w = a_1 \dots a_m$ is defined as a binary vector (b_1, \dots, b_m) where $b_i = 1 \iff a_i \dots a_m = a_1 \dots a_{m-i+1}$ — *i.e.* $b_i = 1$ if and only if the suffix of size $m - i + 1$ of w is equal to its prefix of size $m - i + 1$ [27]. In a similar way, we are interested in this section in how the various substrings of w compare with its prefixes — the reason of which will emerge later. More precisely, for any $1 \leq j \leq i \leq m$, we are interested in the lexicographic order between the substring $a_j \dots a_i$ and the prefix $a_1 \dots a_{i-j+1}$. Unlike for the autocorrelation vector, we do not just want to know whether these two substrings are equal; if they are different, we need to know whichever is greater than the other. Since our notion generalizes the autocorrelation vector, we propose to use the name autocorrelation matrix to designate these comparisons.

Definition 5. The autocorrelation matrix of w is defined as the lower triangular matrix denoted by \mathbf{R} , with $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \{<, =, >\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq i \leq m$, so that $a_j \cdots a_i \mathbf{R}_{i,j} a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$.

The practical computation of this matrix is covered in Appendix A. An illustration is provided in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Each prefix of the minimizer (first column, $j = 1$) must be compared to each substring of the minimizer having the same length as the prefix (substrings that are on the same diagonal as the prefix) for computing the autocorrelation matrix. The figure shows an example for $m = 6$, with $ACACAA$ as an example minimizer. For instance, the strings $A C A C A A$ ($(i, j) = (5, 1)$) and $C A C A A$ ($(i, j) = (6, 2)$) are both to be compared with the string $A C A C A A$ ($i - j + 1 = 5$) — leading, respectively, to $\mathbf{R}_{5,1} = "="$ and $\mathbf{R}_{6,2} = ">"$. The final autocorrelation matrix for this example can be found in upcoming Example 1.

To simplify notations, in the sequel we shall use the following binary variables.

Definition 6. For $\star \in \{<, =, >\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq i \leq m$, we define the binary variable $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^\star$, so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^\star$ is true if and only if $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} = \star$.


In other words, the sentence “if $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} = \star$ ” will simply be written “if $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^\star$ ”. Whenever useful, $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^\star$ will also be treated as a number in $\{0, 1\}$. By definition, the aforementioned classical autocorrelation vector corresponds to the binary vector $(\mathbf{R}_{1,m}^=, \dots, \mathbf{R}_{m,m}^=)$.

Example 1. In the sequel of this paper, we shall follow two minimizers examples, $w_1 = \overset{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6}{ACACAA}$ and $w_2 = \overset{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6}{ACACAC}$, whose autocorrelation matrices are given below (resp. left and right).

w_1	1	2	3	4	5	6		w_2	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	1	(=			1	(=
	2	(=	>	.	.	.			2	(=	>
	3	(=	>	=	.	.			3	(=	>	=	.	.	.
	4	(=	>	=	>	.			4	(=	>	=	>	.	.
	5	(=	>	=	>	=			5	(=	>	=	>	=	.
	6	(=	>	<	>	<	=		6	(=	>	=	>	=	>

2.3 Deductions from $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$

The autocorrelation matrix provides information about the constraints weighing on antemers and postmers. The $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{>}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{=}$ cases will be explored later; in this section we focus on $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$. Consider, for instance, one minimizer coming from Example 1, $w_1 = ACACAA$. For (i,j) being either $(6,3)$ or $(6,5)$, we have $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$. Imagine that w_1 is placed at the beginning of some k -mer, so that the situation is as follows:



We can immediately see that if the k -mer is large enough, no matter how we fill in the missing letters, we will obtain an m -mer $< w$, and so w will not be the minimizer anymore of the k -mer. This simple example motivates the following key result.

Proposition 1. *If there exist $2 \leq j \leq i \leq m$ so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$, then*

- $A_i(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \geq i$
- $P_i(\beta) = 0$ for $\beta \geq m + j - 1$

Proof. Let i, j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$. Let $\gamma > i$ and consider the γ -mer x sharing with w a prefix of size i , i.e. $x = a_1 \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_\gamma$. We can rewrite x as

$$x = \underbrace{a_1 \cdots a_j \cdots a_i}_{i} \underbrace{b_{i+1} \cdots b_\gamma}_{\gamma-i}.$$

Suppose m -mers of x to be either all $> w$ or all $\geq w$. $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^{<}$ translates into $a_j \cdots a_i < a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$. Among the $\gamma - i$ remaining letters of x , if there are enough to complete $a_j \cdots a_i$ into a m -mer, then this m -mer will be $< w$, regardless of the choice of remaining letters — thus a contradiction. Therefore we must have $(\gamma - i) + (i - j + 1) < m$, i.e. $\gamma < m + j - 1$.

We address the case of β -postmers by posing $\gamma = \beta$. We indeed have $P_i(\beta) = 0$ as soon as $\beta \geq m + j - 1$. Concerning α -antemers, given that we add w at the end when we consider the condition of m -mers $> w$, we have $\gamma = \alpha + m$. Remember that $A_i(\alpha) = 0$ if $\alpha < i$. With $\alpha \geq i \geq j - 1$, we do have $\alpha + m \geq m + j - 1$, hence the result. ✖

Applying Proposition 1 to the special case of $(\beta + m)$ -postmers sharing a prefix of size m with w , we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1. *If there exists $2 \leq j \leq m$ so that $\mathbf{R}_{m,j}^<$, then $P_m(\beta + m) = 0$ for $\beta \geq j - 1$.*

We derive from Corollary 1 the maximum value that β can take without $P_m(\beta + m)$ being zero.

Definition 7. $\beta_{\max}(w) = \min \left(k - m, \begin{cases} \min\{2 \leq j \leq m : \mathbf{R}_{m,j}^<\} - 2 & \text{if this set is non-empty;} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \right)$

Example 2. *Considering the minimizers $w_1 = \text{ACACAA}$ and $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$ from Example 1, a symbol $<$ can only be found for w_1 , with (i, j) equal to either $(6, 3)$ or $(6, 5)$. We derive from it that $P_m(\beta + m) = 0$ whenever $\beta \geq 2$, hence $\beta_{\max}(w_1) = \min(k - m, 1)$.*

Since $\alpha + \beta = k - m$, it follows that (3) can be rewritten as

$$\pi_k(w) = \sum_{\beta=0}^{\beta_{\max}(w)} A(k - m - \beta) \cdot P_m(\beta + m). \quad (4)$$

We immediately derive the following upper bound:

Lemma 1. $\pi_k(w) \leq (\beta_{\max}(w) + 1) \cdot |\Sigma|^{k-m}$.

Proof. Trivially, $A(k - m - \beta) \leq |\Sigma|^{k-m-\beta}$ and $P_m(\beta + m) \leq |\Sigma|^\beta$. ✱

From Proposition 1, we can also rewrite (1) as

$$A(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} A_i(\alpha) \quad (5)$$

where $i_{\max}(w)$ is defined as the following.

Definition 8. $i_{\max}(w) = \begin{cases} \min\{2 \leq i \leq m : \exists 2 \leq j \leq i, \mathbf{R}_{i,j}^<\} & \text{if this set is non-empty;} \\ m & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Example 3. *From Example 2, we deduce that $i_{\max}(\text{ACACAA}) = 6$ since the minimal i for which there exists j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^<$ is 6. In this case, it is equal to m and does not further restrict the size of the common prefix that an antemer can share with ACACAA.*

Both $\beta_{\max}(w)$ and $i_{\max}(w)$ can be computed on the fly while computing the autocorrelation matrix \mathbf{R} , see Appendix A.

3 Computing $A(\alpha)$

Recall that

$$A(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} A_i(\alpha) \quad (5)$$

where $i_{\max}(w)$ has been defined in Definition 8. In this section, we are interested in finding recurrence relationships between the values of $A(\alpha)$ and $A_i(\alpha)$, where $i < i_{\max}(w)$. It follows that we have, for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \{=, >\}$.

3.1 Edge cases

Case $i = 0$. In this case, we count the α -antemers $x = b_1 \cdots b_\alpha$ that share no prefix with w . Necessarily, $b_1 > a_1$ — therefore there are $\varphi_{>}(a_1)$ choices for b_1 . Then, there are $A(\alpha - 1)$ ways of completing $b_2 \cdots b_\alpha$.

Proposition 2. $A_0(\alpha) = \varphi_{>}(a_1) \cdot A(\alpha - 1)$.

Case $i = \alpha$. Here, the antemer is fixed and is equal to $a_1 \cdots a_i$. Therefore, $A_i(i) \in \{0, 1\}$, whether the word $a_1 \cdots a_i a_1 \cdots a_m$ is acceptable or not. Indeed, we must ensure that all m -mers (but the last one) of the word $a_1 \cdots a_i a_1 \cdots a_m$ are $> w$; that is, for all $1 \leq j \leq i$,

$$a_j \cdots a_i a_1 \cdots a_{m-i+j-1} > a_1 \cdots a_m$$


This equation trivially holds for any j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^>$. In the case where $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^=$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{a_j \cdots a_i}_{=a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}} a_1 \cdots a_{m-i+j-1} > a_1 \cdots a_m \\ \Leftrightarrow & a_1 \cdots a_{m-i+j-1} > a_{i-j+2} \cdots a_m \\ \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{R}_{m,i-j+2}^< \end{aligned}$$

We showed the following result.

Proposition 3. For $1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}(w) - 1$, we have $A_i(i) \in \{0, 1\}$ with $A_i(i) = \prod_{j=1}^i (\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^> + \mathbf{R}_{i,j}^= \cdot \mathbf{R}_{m,i-j+2}^<)$.

Example 4. Let us look first at $w_1 = ACACAA$. Below left, the equations for $i = 5$ are illustrated, and one can observe that $A_5(5) = 0$ for w_1 since there exists m -mers that are $< w_1$ in the associated antemer. Below right, one can find all values of $A_i(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 5$, as well as the associated word $a_1 \cdots a_i a_1 \cdots a_m$.



For $w_2 = ACACAC$, we leave it to the interested reader to convince themselves that $A_i(i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 5$.

3.2 General case

Let us consider an α -antemer x sharing with w a prefix of size exactly $0 < i < \min(\alpha, i_{\max}(w))$, that is, $x = a_1 \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_\alpha$, with $b_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$.⁴ We must ensure that all m -mers of xw (but the last one) are

⁴Otherwise, the common prefix between w and x would be of size at least $i + 1$.

$> w$. Our strategy is to consider the constraints on the possible letters for b_{i+1} , and then to consider the recursive cases arising from these alternatives. We are therefore only interested in the m -mers that contain b_{i+1} . Those m -mers are, with $1 \leq j \leq i$:

$$a_j \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_{m-1+j} > a_1 \cdots a_m \quad (i, j)$$

and

$$b_{i+1} \cdots b_{i+m} > a_1 \cdots a_m. \quad (i)$$

where, if necessary, $b_l = a_{l-\alpha}$ for $l > \alpha$.⁵

Recall that, first, since i is the size of the common prefix between x and w , we must also have

$$b_{i+1} > a_{i+1} \quad (\text{prefix})$$

Recall also that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \{=, >\}$. For any i, j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^>$, it is clear that (i, j) trivially holds. For the remainder of this section, we focus on the case $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^=$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{a_j \cdots a_i}_{=a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}} b_{i+1} \cdots b_{m-1+j} > a_1 \cdots a_m \\ \iff & b_{i+1} \cdots b_{m-1+j} > a_{i-j+2} \cdots a_m. \quad (i, j, =) \end{aligned}$$

Example 5. We illustrate the preceding equations with $w_1 = ACACAA$ and $i = 5$. We consider the word x of the form — simplifying b_{i+1} into b :

A C A C A b ...

Equation (prefix) translates into $b > A$; while equations (i, j) and (i) lead to the following system:

A C A C A b	>	A C A C A A	$\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^>$ X	\iff $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} b > A \\ b \quad > C A A \\ b \quad > C A C A A \end{array} \right. \quad (i, j, =)$
C A C A b	>	A C A C A A	✓	
A C A b	>	A C A C A A	X	
C A b	>	A C A C A A	✓	
A b	>	A C A C A A	X	
b	>	A C A C A A		

This system can be solved manually, leading to $b \geq C$. Note that choosing $b = C$ leads to the word $x = ACACAC \cdots$, which in turn contains prefixes of w (resp. $ACAC \cdots$ and $AC \cdots$) that must be taken into account recursively.

From $(i, j, =)$, we get that $b_{i+1} \geq a_{i-j+2}$. Remember that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^=$, thus $a_j \cdots a_i$ is here a prefix of w , namely $a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$. Therefore, either $b_{i+1} > a_{i-j+2}$ and the prefix stops here, either $b_{i+1} = a_{i-j+2}$ and the prefix continues and must be taken care of recursively — as shown in Example 5. The continued prefix is of size at least $i - j + 2$, therefore leading to the following fact:

⁵Indeed, as we iterate over the m -mers of the word xw , and depending on α and i , some m -mers containing b_{i+1} might overlap over w , and therefore some b_l 's may be contained in w rather than in x .

Lemma 2. For an α -antemer x , sharing with w a prefix of size exactly $0 < i < \min(\alpha, i_{\max}(w))$, i.e. $x = a_1 \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_\alpha$, if there exists j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$, then choosing $b_{i+1} = a_{i-j+2}$ leads to considering an $(\alpha - j + 1)$ -antemer $y = a_j \cdots a_i a_{i-j+2} b_{i+2} \cdots b_\alpha$ sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - j + 2$.

The next issue to consider is what if choosing $b_{i+1} = a_{i-j+2}$ leads to *simultaneously* extend several prefixes of w , as in Example 5? Suppose there exist $j' > j \geq 2$, so that (i) both $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$ and $\mathbf{R}_{i,j'}^-$; and (ii) $a_{i-j+2} = a_{i-j'+2} = a \in \Sigma$. Choosing $b_{i+1} = a$ simultaneously extends two prefixes with w : $a_j \cdots a_i a = a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1} a$ and $a_{j'} \cdots a_i a = a_1 \cdots a_{i-j'+1} a$. Since $j' > j$, this corresponds to the following word :

$$\overbrace{a_j \cdots a_{j'-1} a_{j'} \cdots a_i a}^{\text{prefix of size } \geq i-j+2} \cdots .$$

$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{prefix of size } \geq i-j'+2}$

In the light of Lemma 2, it is crucial here to remark that recursively treating an $(\alpha - j + 1)$ -antemer sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - j + 2$ allows us, at the same time, to treat the case of $(\alpha - j' + 1)$ -antemers sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - j' + 2$ — i.e. the case related to j' is completely included in the case related to j .

In other respects, consider (i). As we know nothing about the size of any common prefix between $b_{i+1} \cdots b_{i+m}$ and w , we deduce $b_{i+1} \geq a_1$. Either $b_{i+1} > a_1$, and there is no prefix to consider recursively, or $b_{i+1} = a_1$ and a new prefix is created, leading to consider $(\alpha - i)$ -antemers sharing with w a prefix of size at least 1. To mirror the discussion immediately preceding this very paragraph, suppose there exists $j \geq 2$ so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$ and $a_{i-j+2} = a_1$, then choosing $b_{i+1} = a_1$ also simultaneously extends several prefixes of w :

$$\overbrace{a_j \cdots a_i a_1 \cdots}^{\text{prefix of size } \geq i-j+2} \cdots .$$

$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{prefix of size } \geq 1}$

The conclusion is the same: recursively handling the longest prefix covers the smaller ones.

The whole discussion leads us to define what we call prefix-letter vectors of w . Recall that $[P]$ stands for the Iverson bracket of property P .

Definition 9. For $1 \leq i \leq m$, we define the i -th prefix-letter vector of w , denoted by \mathbf{T}_i , as a vector in $\mathbb{N}^{|\Sigma|}$, so that for all $a \in \Sigma$,

- $\mathbf{T}_1(a) = 2 \cdot [a = a_1]$,
- for all $2 \leq i \leq m$, $\mathbf{T}_i(a) = \begin{cases} \min\{2 \leq j \leq i : \mathbf{R}_{i,j}^- \wedge (a_{i-j+2} = a)\} & \text{if this set is not empty;} \\ (i+1) \cdot [a = a_1] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Following the discussion above, choosing $b_{i+1} = a$ when $\mathbf{T}_i(a) \neq 0$ leads to consider a $(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(a) + 1)$ -antemer sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - \mathbf{T}_i(a) + 2$, as per Lemma 2. In the case where $\mathbf{T}_i(a_1) = i + 1$, since $\alpha - (i + 1) + 1 = \alpha - i$ and $i - (i + 1) + 2 = 1$, we retrieve the conclusion we draw previously from (i).

Remark 3. Note that \mathbf{T}_i is defined for $i \geq i_{\max}(w)$, although this is not applicable to the specific case of this section, which deals with $i < i_{\max}(w)$ values. This is because the notion of prefix-letter vector will also be useful for postmers later on, which do not follow this constraint of $i < i_{\max}(w)$.

It should be noted that the practical computation of the \mathbf{T}_i 's can be performed on the fly while building the autocorrelation matrix \mathbf{R} , and is covered in Appendix A.

Example 6. We detail here the computation of the prefix-letter vectors of $w_1 = \overset{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6}{ACACAA}$ and $w_2 = \overset{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6}{ACACAC}$, whose autocorrelation matrices are given in Example 1. In both cases, $\mathbf{T}_1(\mathbf{a}) = 2 \cdot [\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{A}]$. For each minimizer, and each i , we provide tuples (j, \mathbf{a}) so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$ and $\mathbf{a}_{i-j+2} = \mathbf{a}$:

i	2	3	4	5	6
w_1	\emptyset	(3, C)	(3, A)	(3, C); (5, C)	(6, C)
w_2	\emptyset	(3, C)	(3, A)	(3, C); (5, C)	(3, A); (6, A)

Remember that, for a given i and letter \mathbf{a} , $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a})$ is computed by taking the smallest j in the tuples (j, \mathbf{a}) when applicable — otherwise it is $(i + 1) \cdot [\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_1]$. We obtain the following prefix-letter vectors (rows correspond to i values):-

w_1	A	C	G	T	w_2	A	C	G	T
1	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
2	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0
3	4	3	0	0	3	4	3	0	0
4	3	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0
5	6	3	0	0	5	6	3	0	0
6	7	6	0	0	6	3	0	0	0

The next result sums up the discussion so far.

Proposition 4. We have the following conditions on \mathbf{b}_{i+1} :

- (a) $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}$ — since x shares with w a prefix of size exactly i , as per (prefix);
- (b) $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} \geq \mathbf{a}_1$ — as per (i);
- (c) $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} \geq \mathbf{a}_{i-j+2}$ for each j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$ (equivalently so that $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{i-j+2}) \neq 0$) — as per (i, j, =);
- (d) if $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) = 0$, no further constraint is imposed on the subsequent letters \mathbf{b}_{i+2}, \dots ;
- (e) on the contrary, if $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) \neq 0$, this leads to recursively consider $(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) + 1)$ -antemers sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) + 2$ — as per Lemma 2 and Definition 9.

Since conditions (b) and (c) must apply simultaneously (when applicable), they should be reduced to the most stringent; let us define

$$\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i) = \max\{\mathbf{a} \in \Sigma : \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0\}; \quad (6)$$

then (b) and (c) collapse into a single condition, that is : $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} \geq \mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$. Note that $\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$ is well defined since \mathbf{a}_1 belongs to the set (coming from (b)). Besides, $\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$ can be computed at the same time as computing the autocorrelation matrix, see Appendix A.

In the end, it comes down to choosing one of these two options for \mathbf{b}_{i+1} :

- $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} = \mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$ — available only if $\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i) > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and we fall upon condition (e);
- $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} > \mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$ and $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}$. By definition of $\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)$, we must have $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{b}_{i+1}) = 0$ and we fall upon condition (d). There are $\min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1}))$ choices for \mathbf{b}_{i+1} with this option.

Example 7. Building upon Example 6, for $w_1 = ACACAA$ and $w_2 = ACACAC$, denoting for convenience \star instead of $\min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1}))$ and $*$ instead of $\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}$; we have :

w_1	i	1	2	3	4	5	6		w_2	i	1	2	3	4	5	6
	$\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}$	A	A	C	A	C	C			$\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}$	A	A	C	A	C	A
	\mathbf{a}_{i+1}	C	A	C	A	A	ε			\mathbf{a}_{i+1}	C	A	C	A	C	ε
	$*$	\times	\times	\times	\times	\checkmark	\checkmark			$*$	\times	\times	\times	\times	\times	\checkmark
	\star	2	3	2	3	2	2			\star	2	3	2	3	2	3

We can now derive our main result for this section.

Theorem 2. For all $0 < i < \min(i^*, \alpha)$,

$$A_i(\alpha) = \min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1})) \cdot A(\alpha - (i + 1)) \\ + [\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}] \cdot \sum_{i' = i - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} + 2)}^{i_{\max(i)} - 1} A_{i'}(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} + 1)).$$

Example 8. Building upon Examples 4, 6 and 7; as well as Proposition 2.

For $w_1 = ACACAA$, we have :

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 1) \\ A_1(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 2) \\ A_2(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 3) \\ A_3(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 4) \\ A_4(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 5) \\ A_5(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 6) + A_4(\alpha - 2) + A_5(\alpha - 2) \end{aligned}$$

with $A(0) = 1$; $A_1(1) = A_3(3) = A_5(5) = 0$ and $A_2(2) = A_4(4) = 1$.

For $w_2 = ACACAC$, we have :

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 1) \\ A_1(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 2) \\ A_2(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 3) \\ A_3(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 4) \\ A_4(\alpha) &= 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 5) \\ A_5(\alpha) &= 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 6) \end{aligned}$$

with $A(0) = 1$; and $A_i(i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 5$.

3.3 Computation and bounds

Using Propositions 2 and 3, as well as Theorem 2, and (5), we have.

Proposition 5. $A(\alpha)$ can be computed with dynamic programming, with time complexity $O(\alpha \cdot |w|^2)$ and space

complexity $O(\alpha \cdot |w|)$.

Proof. There are at most $\alpha \cdot (i_{\max}(w) + 1) = O(\alpha \cdot |w|)$ values to compute, each one requiring at most $O(i_{\max}(w))$ time. \times

Example 9. Using the formulas of Example 8, one can compute the first values of $A(\alpha)$.

For $w_1 = ACACAA$, we have:

$A_i(\alpha)$	α											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
0	1	3	9	36	135	513	1944	7371	27945	105948	401679	
1	.	0	2	6	24	90	342	1296	4914	18630	70632	
i	2	.	.	1	3	9	36	135	513	1944	7371	27945
	3	.	.	.	0	2	6	24	90	342	1296	4914
	4	1	3	9	36	135	513	1944
	5	0	3	9	36	135	513
$A(\alpha)$	1	3	12	45	171	648	2457	9315	35316	133893	507627	

For $w_2 = ACACAC$, we have:

$A_i(\alpha)$	α											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
0	1	3	9	33	126	477	1809	6858	25992	98517	373410	
1	.	0	2	6	22	84	318	1206	4572	17328	65678	
i	2	.	.	0	3	9	33	126	477	1809	6858	25992
	3	.	.	.	0	2	6	22	84	318	1206	4572
	4	0	3	9	33	126	477	1809
	5	0	2	6	22	84	318
$A(\alpha)$	1	3	11	42	159	603	2286	8664	32839	124470	471779	

Note that the only recursive formula involving A_i 's is that of Theorem 2. Remark that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq \sum_{i'=i-\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i))+2}^{i_{\max}(i)-1} A_{i'}(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)) + 1) &\leq \sum_{i'=1}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} A_{i'}(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)) + 1) \\
&= A(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)) + 1) - A_0(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)) + 1) \\
&= A(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)) + 1) - \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_1) \cdot A(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)));
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is obtained using Proposition 2. As a result, we can easily calculate upper and lower bounds on $A_i(\alpha)$, by adding $\min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max}(i)), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1})) \cdot A(\alpha - (i+1))$ to each term of the above inequality. Recall from Equation (5) that $A(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} A_i(\alpha)$; this lead us to define the following two sequences $A^-(\alpha)$ and $A^+(\alpha)$.

Definition 10. Let $A^-(0) = A^+(0) = 1$ and

$$A^-(\alpha) = \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_1) \cdot A^-(\alpha - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} \min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1})) \cdot A^-(\alpha - (i + 1))$$

$$A^+(\alpha) = \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_1) \cdot A^+(\alpha - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{i_{\max}(w)-1} \left(\min(\varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}), \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_{i+1})) \cdot A^+(\alpha - (i + 1)) \right. \\ \left. + [\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}] \cdot (A^+(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}) + 1) - \varphi_{>}(\mathbf{a}_1) \cdot A^+(\alpha - \mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)}))) \right)$$

By construction, we have the following result.

Proposition 6. $\forall \alpha \geq 0, A^-(\alpha) \leq A(\alpha) \leq A^+(\alpha)$. Furthermore, both $A^-(\alpha)$ and $A^+(\alpha)$ can be computed with dynamic programming in $O(\alpha)$ space and $O(\alpha \cdot |w|)$ time.

One can notice that if $[\mathbf{a}_{\max(i)} > \mathbf{a}_{i+1}]$ were to be 0 for all values of i , then $A^-(\alpha) = A(\alpha) = A^+(\alpha)$.

Example 10. For $w_1 = \text{ACACAA}$, from Example 8, we can bound $A_5(\alpha)$ with

$$2 \cdot A(\alpha - 6) \leq A_5(\alpha) \leq 2 \cdot A(\alpha - 6) + A(\alpha - 2) - 3 \cdot A(\alpha - 3);$$

which leads to the following values of $A^-(\alpha)$ and $A^+(\alpha)$:

α	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$A^+(\alpha)$	1	3	12	45	173	663	2543	9750	37384	143337	549584
$A(\alpha)$	1	3	12	45	171	648	2457	9315	35316	133893	507627
$A^-(\alpha)$	1	3	11	42	159	603	2286	8664	32839	124470	471779

Note that the row of A^- corresponds exactly to the values we have for A with $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$. Indeed, by looking at the system in Example 8, the system corresponding to w_2 is exactly the one used for the lower bound for w_1 . Speaking of $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$, notice that $A^- = A = A^+$ for w_2 since no A_i 's are involved in its equation system.

4 Computing $P(\beta)$

Recall that

$$P(\beta) = \sum_{i=0}^m P_i(\beta). \quad (2)$$

In this section, we are interested in finding recurrence relationships between the values of $P(\beta)$ and $P_i(\beta)$. With Proposition 1, we take the case where β is such that $P(\beta) \neq 0$. In other words, for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \{=, >\}$.

Example 11. In Example 2, we saw that for $w_1 = \text{ACACAA}$, $P_m(\beta + m) = 0$ as soon as $\beta \geq 2$; for this reason in this section, we shall consider as an example only the word $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$ — for which there are no restrictions on the value of $P_m(\beta + m)$.

4.1 First values

We are interested here in the first values of β , namely when $0 < \beta \leq m$. We proceed by disjunction of cases.

Case $0 < \beta \leq m - 1$. Here, we build β -postmers of length strictly less than $|w|$: the condition that all m -mers are $\geq w$ is therefore trivially verified since there are no m -mer to consider at all. It follows that $P(\beta) = |\Sigma|^\beta$.

However, let us take a moment to detail the computation of $P_i(\beta)$.

For $i = 0$, the first letter of any β -postmer must be $\neq a_1$. It follows that $P_0(\beta) = (|\Sigma| - 1) \cdot P(\beta - 1)$. For $i = \beta$, there is only one i -postmer sharing with w a prefix of size i , therefore $P_\beta(\beta) = 1$.

Now, for $0 < i < \beta$. We consider β -postmers of the form $x = a_1 \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_\beta$. Since i is the size of the prefix, it follows that $b_{i+1} \neq a_{i+1}$ — leaving $|\Sigma| - 1$ choices for b_{i+1} . Let us denote a the chosen letter. If there exists $j \geq 2$ so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$, i.e. $a_j \cdots a_i = a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$, and $a_{i-j+2} = a$, we reconnect with the discussion in Section 3.2, leading us to recursively consider $(\beta - j + 1)$ -postmers sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - j + 2$. If there exist j, j' satisfying the precedent condition, the conclusion is identical and lead to only consider the recursive case corresponding to $\min(j, j')$: we retrieve \mathbf{T}_i of Definition 9.

The final conditions on b_{i+1} are reminiscent of the ones of Proposition 4 :

- (a') $b_{i+1} \neq a_{i+1}$ — since x share with w a prefix of size exactly i ;
- (b') if $\mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) = 0$, no further constraint is imposed on the subsequent letters b_{i+2}, \dots ;
- (c') on the contrary, if $\mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) \neq 0$, this lead to recursively consider $(\beta - \mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) + 1)$ -postmers sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - \mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) + 2$ — as per Lemma 2 and Definition 9.

Finally, we have the following result.

Proposition 7. For $0 < \beta \leq m - 1$, we have

$$P_0(\beta) = (|\Sigma| - 1) \cdot P(\beta - 1);$$

and, for $0 < i < \beta$,

$$P_i(\beta) = |\Sigma_{=0}(i)| \cdot P(\beta - (i + 1)) + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)} \sum_{i' = i - \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) + 2}^{\beta - \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) + 1} P_{i'}(\beta - \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) + 1)$$

where $\Sigma_{=0}(i) = \{\alpha \in \Sigma : (\alpha \neq a_{i+1}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) = 0)\}$ and $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) = \{\alpha \in \Sigma : (\alpha \neq a_{i+1}) \wedge (\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) \neq 0)\}$; and finally $P_\beta(\beta) = 1$.

Note that $\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) \geq 2$ whenever $\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) \neq 0$, therefore we have $\beta - \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) + 1 \leq \beta - 1$ — and the same equation system apply recursively to the $P_{i'}$'s. Note also that $|\Sigma_{=0}(i)| + |\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)| = |\Sigma| - 1$. Both sets can be precomputed — see Appendix A.

Example 12. With $w = ACACAC$, we have :

i	α_{i+1}	$\mathbf{T}_i(A)$	$\mathbf{T}_i(C)$	$\mathbf{T}_i(G)$	$\mathbf{T}_i(T)$	$\Sigma_{=0}(i)$	$\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)$
1	C	2	0	0	0	{G, T}	{A}
2	A	3	0	0	0	{C, G, T}	\emptyset
3	C	4	3	0	0	{G, T}	{A}
4	A	3	0	0	0	{C, G, T}	\emptyset

This leads to the following system of equations, for $1 \leq \beta \leq 5$: $P_i(\beta) = 0$ for $i > \beta$ and $P_\beta(\beta) = 1$; otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 1) \\ P_1(\beta) &= 2 \cdot P(\beta - 2) + \sum_{i'=1}^{\beta-1} P_{i'}(\beta - 1) \\ P_2(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 3) \\ P_3(\beta) &= 2 \cdot P(\beta - 4) + \sum_{i'=1}^{\beta-3} P_{i'}(\beta - 3) \\ P_4(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 5) \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the following first values for $P(\beta)$:

$P_i(\beta)$	β										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	3	12	48	192	768					
1	.	1	3	12	48	192					
2	.	.	1	3	12	48					
i	3	.	.	.	1	3	12				
	4	1	3				
	5	1				
	6	1			
$P(\beta)$	1	4	16	64	256	1024					

Note that $P(\beta) = |\Sigma|^\beta$. The dashed bar indicates the limit up to which the above equations are valid.

Case $\beta = m$. A m -postmer $\chi = b_1 \cdots b_m$ contain only one m -mer, itself, that must be $\geq w$. Let $0 \leq i < m$ be the length of the common prefix between χ and w . Then $b_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$ and the choice of b_{i+2}, \dots, b_m is free; therefore, for all $0 \leq i < m$, $P_i(m) = \varphi_{>}(a_{i+1}) \cdot |\Sigma|^{k-(i+1)}$. Besides, $P_m(m) = 1$.

Definition 11. We denote by $\Phi_{>}(w)$ the number in base $|\Sigma|$ given by the vector $(\varphi_{>}(a_1), \dots, \varphi_{>}(a_m))$.

From the previous discussion, we have $P(m) = 1 + \Phi_{>}(w)$.

Remark 4. $\Phi_{>}(w)$ is also the number of m -mer strictly greater than w ; as well as their rank among all m -mers, in decreasing order. $|\Sigma^m| - \Phi_{>}(w)$ provides the rank in increasing order.

Example 13. With $w_2 = ACACAC$, we have $\Phi_{>}(w_2) = 3822$, associated to the vector $(3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2)$ — in light of Definition 11. We can fill in the column $\beta = 6$ of the first values of $P(\beta)$.

$P_i(\beta)$	β										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	3	12	48	192	768	3072				
1	.	1	3	12	48	192	512				
2	.	.	1	3	12	48	192				
i	3	.	.	1	3	12	32				
	4	.	.	.	1	3	12				
	5	1	2				
	6	1				
$P(\beta)$	1	4	16	64	256	1024	3823				

4.2 Subsequent values

Now, suppose $\beta > m$. Let $x = b_1 \cdots b_\beta$ be a β -postmer, and let $0 \leq i \leq m$ be the size of the common prefix between x and w . We proceed by disjunction of cases.

Case $i = 0$. Necessarily, $b_1 > a_1$ — with $\varphi_{>}(a_1)$ possible choices. Therefore, we have:

Proposition 8. $P_0(\beta) = \varphi_{>}(a_1) \cdot P(\beta - 1)$.

Case $1 \leq i \leq m$. We have $x = a_1 \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_\beta$. Since all m -mers of x must be $\geq w$, we retrieve a system of equation similar to the one of Section 3.2, namely :

$$a_j \cdots a_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_{m-1+j} \geq a_1 \cdots a_m \quad (i, j; \text{bis})$$

and

$$b_{i+1} \cdots b_{i+m} \geq a_1 \cdots a_m. \quad (i; \text{bis})$$

However, those equations are not necessarily defined for all values of $1 \leq j \leq i$. Indeed, one must have $\beta \geq m - 1 + j$ for $(i, j; \text{bis})$ to be defined, and $\beta \geq i + m$ for $(i; \text{bis})$. Note that since $j \leq i$, $\beta \geq m + i \implies \beta \geq m - 1 + j$. Conversely, if there exists j so that $\beta < m - 1 + j$, then surely $\beta < m + i$.⁶

Since $i \leq m < \beta$, there exists at least one letter to choose, b_{i+1} . We retrieve similar conclusions to the one of Proposition 4, namely:

(a'') $b_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$ (if $i = m$, we use $a_{m+1} = \varepsilon$) — since (prefix) also holds;

(b'') $b_{i+1} \geq a_1$ (if and only if $\beta \geq m + i$);

(c'') $b_{i+1} \geq a_{i-j+2}$ for each j so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^-$ (if and only if $\beta \geq m - 1 + j$).

Normally, the value of $\mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1})$ would determine which recursive case to consider; but we must take into account that some equations might not be defined. We adapt Definition 9 as follows.

Definition 12. For $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $a \in \Sigma$, we define $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta) = \mathbf{T}_i(a) \cdot [\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a)]$.

⁶From $\beta < m - 1 + j$ we get $\beta < m - 1 + i$, i.e. $\beta \leq m + i$. But $\beta = m + i$ leads to $j > i + 1$ which is absurd.

This definition is consistent with the previous discussion, since we retrieve that $b_{i+1} \geq a$ for some letter a if and only if $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta) \neq 0$. Note that for a_1 , in the event that $\mathbf{T}_i(a_1) = i + 1$, we retrieve $\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a_1) = m + i$.

If $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(b_{i+1}, \beta) = 0$, then no further constraint is put on b_{i+2}, \dots ; otherwise we must consider the recursive case of $(\beta - \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(b_{i+1}, \beta) + 1)$ -postmers sharing with w a prefix of size at least $i - \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(b_{i+1}, \beta) + 2$.

We define, similarly to (6), the most stringent condition for (b'') and (c''); that is $b_{i+1} \geq \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ where

$$\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta) = \max \left(\{\varepsilon\} \cup \left\{ a \in \Sigma : \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta) \neq 0 \right\} \right) \quad (7)$$

Contrary to $a_{\max}(i)$, a_1 might not belong to the set used to define $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ — hence the presence of ε to ensure that $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ is well defined. Both the values for $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta)$ and $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ can be precomputed — see Appendix A.

In the end, it also comes down to choosing one of these two options for b_{i+1} :

- $b_{i+1} = \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ — possible only if $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta) > a_{i+1}$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and we get to the usual recursive cases;
- $b_{i+1} > \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ and $b_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$. By definition of $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$, we have $\mathbf{T}_i(b_{i+1}) = 0$ and no further conditions are imposed on the letters b_{i+2}, \dots . There are $\min(\varphi_{>}(a_{i+1}), \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)))$ choices for b_{i+1} with this option. Recall that $\varphi_{>}(\varepsilon) = |\Sigma|$.

Example 14. With $w_2 = ACACAC$, $a_1 = A$ and we have :

i	a_{i+1}	$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(A, \beta)$	$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(C, \beta)$	$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(G, \beta)$	$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(T, \beta)$	$\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$	$\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta) > a_{i+1} ?$
1	C	$2 \cdot [\beta \geq 7]$	0	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 7; \\ A & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	x
2	A	$3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8]$	0	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 8; \\ A & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	x
3	C	$4 \cdot [\beta \geq 9]$	$3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8]$	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 8; \\ C & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	x
4	A	$3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8]$	0	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 8; \\ A & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	x
5	C	$6 \cdot [\beta \geq 11]$	$3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8]$	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 8; \\ C & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	x
6	ε	$3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8]$	0	0	0	$\begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \beta < 8; \\ A & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	$\checkmark \iff \beta \geq 8$

Note that $a_{i+1} > \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ implies that $\min(\varphi_{>}(a_{i+1}), \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta))) = \varphi_{>}(a_{i+1})$ so the equations associated to w_2 will not depend at all on $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ except for $i = 6$.

Finally, we have proven the following.

Theorem 3. For $\beta > m$ and all $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$P_i(\beta) = \min(\varphi_{>}(\alpha_{i+1}), \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta))) \cdot P(\beta - (i + 1)) \\ + [\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta) > \alpha_{i+1}] \cdot \sum_{i'=i-\widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta)+2}^m P_{i'}(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1).$$

Example 15. With $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$, we have the following system of equations, with $\beta \geq m + 1 = 7$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 1) \\ P_1(\beta) &= 2 \cdot P(\beta - 2) \\ P_2(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 3) \\ P_3(\beta) &= 2 \cdot P(\beta - 4) \\ P_4(\beta) &= 3 \cdot P(\beta - 5) \\ P_5(\beta) &= 2 \cdot P(\beta - 6) \end{aligned}$$

As well as $P_6(7) = 4 \cdot P(0)$; and, for $\beta \geq 8$,

$$P_6(\beta) = 3 \cdot P(\beta - 7) + P_5(\beta - 2) + P_6(\beta - 2).$$

4.3 Computation and bounds

Using the results of Section 4.1, Proposition 8, as well as Theorem 3, and (2), we have the following result.

Proposition 9. $P(\beta)$ can be computed with dynamic programming, with time complexity $O(\beta \cdot |w|^2)$ and space complexity $O(\beta \cdot |w|)$.

$P_m(\beta + m)$ — the value we are interested in, remember (4), p. 9 — is computed in $O(\beta \cdot |w|^2 + |w|^3)$ time and $O(\beta \cdot |w| + |w|^2)$ space.

Proof. There are at most $\beta \cdot (m + 1) = O(\beta \cdot |w|)$ values to compute, each one requiring at most $O(|w|)$ time. Plugging $\beta + m$ in place of β give the second result. ✖

Example 16. With $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$, we have the following values:

$P_i(\beta)$	β										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	3	12	48	192	768	3072	11469	43419	164664	624249
1	.	1	3	12	48	192	512	2048	7646	28946	109776
2	.	.	1	3	12	48	192	768	3072	11469	43419
i	3	.	.	1	3	12	32	128	512	2048	7646
4	1	3	12	48	192	768	3072
5	1	2	8	32	128	512
6	1	4	15	60	239
P_β	1	4	16	64	256	1024	3823	14473	54888	208083	788913

To obtain bounds on $P(\beta)$, we follow a similar reasoning to that of the Section 3.3. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \sum_{i'=i-\widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta)+2}^m P_{i'}(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) \\
&\leq \sum_{i'=1}^m P_{i'}(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) \\
&= P(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) - P_0(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) \\
&= P(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) - \varphi_{>}(\alpha_1) \cdot P(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta)).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to Definition 10, we define the following sequences $P^-(\beta)$ and $P^+(\beta)$.

Definition 13. Let $P^-(\beta) = P^+(\beta) = |\Sigma|^\beta$ for $0 \leq \beta < m$, $P^-(m) = P^+(m) = 1 + \Phi_{>}(w)$ — remember Definition 11 — and

$$\begin{aligned}
P^-(\beta) &= \varphi_{>}(\alpha_1) \cdot P^-(\beta - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^m \min(\varphi_{>}(\alpha_{i+1}), \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta))) \cdot P^-(\beta - (i + 1)) \\
P^+(\beta) &= \varphi_{>}(\alpha_1) \cdot P^+(\beta - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\min(\varphi_{>}(\alpha_{i+1}), \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta))) \cdot P^+(\beta - (i + 1)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + [\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta) > \alpha_{i+1}] \cdot (P^+(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta) + 1) - \varphi_{>}(\alpha_1) \cdot P^+(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta), \beta))) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Since we are actually interested in bounding $P_m(\beta)$, we introduce two secondary sequences $P_m^-(\beta)$, and $P_m^+(\beta)$.

Definition 14. Let $P_m^-(m) = P_m^+(m) = 1$, and for $\beta \geq m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_m^-(\beta) &= \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(m, \beta)) \cdot P^-(\beta - (m + 1)) \\
P_m^+(\beta) &= \varphi_{>}(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(m, \beta)) \cdot P^+(\beta - (m + 1)) \\
&\quad + [\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(m, \beta) \neq \varepsilon] \cdot (P^+(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(m, \beta), \beta) + 1) - \varphi_{>}(\alpha_1) \cdot P^+(\beta - \widetilde{T}_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(m, \beta), \beta)))
\end{aligned}$$

We have the following result.

Proposition 10.

- $\forall \beta \geq 0, P^-(\beta) \leq P(\beta) \leq P^+(\beta)$;
- $\forall \beta \geq m, P_m^-(\beta) \leq P_m(\beta) \leq P_m^+(\beta)$.

Furthermore, both $P^-(\beta)$ and $P^+(\beta)$ can be computed with dynamic programming in $O(\beta)$ space and $O(\beta \cdot |w|)$ time, whereas $P_m^-(\beta)$ and $P_m^+(\beta)$ are computed in $O(1)$ space and $O(1)$ time, once P^- and P^+ are computed.

Example 17. With $w_2 = \text{ACACAC}$, we start by bounding the values of $P(\beta)$ as follows:

β	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$P^+(\beta)$	1	4	16	64	256	1 024	3 823	14 473	55 636	213 319	818 287
$P(\beta)$	1	4	16	64	256	1 024	3 823	14 473	54 888	208 083	788 913
$P^-(\beta)$	1	4	16	64	256	1 024	3 823	14 473	54 885	208 062	788 797

and the values of $P_m(\beta)$ as follows:

β	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$P_m^+(\beta)$	1	4	763	3 052	12 409	47 179	181 402	694 657	2 663 689	10 215 016	39 174 430
$P_m(\beta)$	1	4	15	60	239	956	3 823	14 473	54 888	208 083	788 913
$P_m^-(\beta)$	1	4	12	48	192	768	3 072	11 469	43 419	164 655	624 186

Combining this result and Proposition 6 with

$$\pi_k(w) = \sum_{\beta=0}^{\beta_{\max}(w)} A(k-m-\beta) \cdot P_m(\beta+m), \quad (4)$$

one can define $\pi_k^-(w)$ and $\pi_k^+(w)$ as

$$\pi_k^-(w) = \max \left(1, \sum_{\beta=0}^{\beta_{\max}(w)} A^-(k-m-\beta) \cdot P_m^-(\beta+m) \right)$$

$$\pi_k^+(w) = \min \left((\beta_{\max}(w) + 1) \cdot |\Sigma|^{k-m}, \sum_{\beta=0}^{\beta_{\max}(w)} A^+(k-m-\beta) \cdot P_m^+(\beta+m) \right)$$

Proposition 11. For all $k \geq |w|$, $\pi_k^-(w) \leq \pi_k(w) \leq \pi_k^+(w)$.

Example 18. With $w_1 = ACACAA$, we obtain the following values :

k	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$\pi_k^+(w_1)$	1	7	24	93	353	1 355	5 195	19 922	76 384	292 873	1 122 932
$\pi_k(w_1)$	1	7	24	93	351	1 332	5 049	19 143	72 576	275 157	1 043 199
$\pi_k^-(w_1)$	1	7	23	86	327	1 239	4 698	17 808	67 495	255 826	969 659

And with $w_2 = ACACAC$, we obtain the following values :

k	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$\pi_k^+(w_2)$	1	7	48	256	1 280	6 144	28 672	131 072	589 824	2 621 440	11 534 336
$\pi_k(w_2)$	1	7	38	191	911	4 202	18 923	82 889	356 478	1 511 583	6 337 559
$\pi_k^-(w_2)$	1	7	35	170	795	3 615	16 110	69 873	298 273	1 257 505	5 247 521

Finally, we have the following result.

Theorem 4. For all $k \geq m$, with $|w| = m$, $\pi_k(w)$ can be computed in $O(km)$ space and $O(km^2)$ time.

Furthermore, both $\pi_k^-(w)$ and $\pi_k^+(w)$ can be computed in $O(k)$ space and $O(km)$ time.

Proof. First, computing \mathbf{R} — see Appendix A — is done in $O(m^2)$. Then, from (4) and the definitions of π^+ and π^- , it is sufficient to calculate the values of $A(k-m)$ and $P_m(\beta_{\max}(w)+m)$ and store the intermediate values in memory. According to Propositions 5 and 9, we have:

	Space	Time
$A(k-m)$	$O((k-m) \cdot m)$	$O((k-m) \cdot m^2)$
$P_m(\beta_{\max}(w)+m)$	$O(\beta_{\max}(w) \cdot m + m^2)$	$O(\beta_{\max}(w) \cdot m^2 + m^3)$

Since $\beta_{\max}(w) \leq k - m$, and since the computation of $\pi_k(w)$ from the $A(\cdot)$'s and $P_m(\cdot)$'s is $O(k - m)$, we have the result.

Concerning A^+ , A^- , P^+ and P^- , one can notice from Propositions 6 and 10 that the complexities are simply divided by a factor m compared to the exact values of A and P . ✖

Note that incorporating hard rules on the particular structure of certain minimizers could speed up the calculation of $\pi_k(w)$ for them. For example, if the minimizer starts with $\max(\Sigma)$, we can immediately return $\pi_k(w) = 1$ in $O(1)$ — as can be observed in Figure 5.

5 Numerical results

The methods developed in this article have been implemented in Python and can be found on Github⁷, as well as the scripts and actual data used to produce the figures in this section.

Note that all results of this section use the DNA alphabet.

We recall that $\pi_k(w)$ count the number of k -mers (among all $|\Sigma|^k$ possible k -mers) that admits w as their lexicographical minimizer.

5.1 Theoretical partition of k -mers

Since we now know how to calculate $\pi_k(w)$ for any word w and any $k \geq |w|$, we can explicitly calculate the theoretical distribution of k -mers across the partition formed by their minimizers.

For m and $k \geq m$ fixed, we enumerate the set of m -mers and calculate, for each such m -mer w , the associated value $\pi_k(w)$. Please note that we do not need to enumerate the k -mers, but only the m -mers, for this computation. The results for $k = 21, m = 8$ and $k = 31, m = 10$ are given in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Theoretical partition of all k -mers into their lexicographical minimizers of size m , for different values of (k, m) . Minimizers are sorted lexicographically from left to right, and $\pi_k(\cdot)$'s values are given in log-scale. The horizontal red line stands for 4^{k-m} , that is, the size of buckets one would expect if the k -mers were evenly distributed across all minimizers.

As one can see, the two distributions are very similar, and support folklore: they are indeed extremely unbalanced. One can also observe plateaus (where many successive minimizers share the same value of

⁷At https://github.com/fingels/minimizer_counting_function.

π_k) and rapid oscillations (where π_k cyclically increases and decreases over consecutive minimizers). These observations can be explained as follows:

- The plateaus correspond to certain common prefixes (which are therefore naturally consecutive over a long series of minimizers) which strongly constrain the number of k -mers in their partition. For example, consider the minimizer $w = CA \cdots A$. Since $A < C$, one extra letter after w is sufficient to change the minimizer, so w is necessarily placed at the end of k -mer — and $\beta_{\max}(w) = 0$. The letters that can be placed before w , necessarily, can be freely chosen from C, G or T . It is easy to see that the same constraints apply to all minimizers starting with $CA \cdots$, hence the observed plateau, which also occurs for $GA \cdots$ and $TA \cdots$. In particular, all minimizers starting with a T have exactly one k -mer in their bucket.
- The oscillations can be explained — at least partially — by the suffixes of the minimizers. Consider the followed examples $w_1 = ACACAA$ and $w_2 = ACACAC$. Because of the suffix $AA < AC$, we have $\beta_{\max}(w_1) = 1$ for $k > m$ whereas $\beta_{\max}(w_2) = k - m$. So, since w_2 benefits from more starting positions than w_1 within a k -mer, it is natural to observe $\pi_k(w_2) > \pi_k(w_1)$ — even though there are more antemers for w_1 than for w_2 — remember Example 9!⁸ A few minimizers later, we move from $ACACTT$ to $ACAGAA$, and we expect π_k to decrease again because of the same argument.

5.2 Approximating π_k

We have seen in Theorem 4 that calculating π_k can be relatively costly in terms of time and space, especially when repeated over millions or billions of minimizers. It would be useful to have quick approximations of π_k , if one is interested in the order of magnitude rather than the exact value. Note that this section is intended to be more of a discussion, opening up avenues of research, than a truly exhaustive study answering the question.

Bounds on π_k We start by considering the bounds $\pi_k^-(w)$ and $\pi_k^+(w)$ defined in Section 4.3, and how closely they match the theoretical value $\pi_k(w)$. In Figure 6a, we show the results for $k = 31$ and $m = 10$, for all m -mers.

Despite the sometimes large differences between the bounds and the theoretical value, we can also see that the bounds are relatively close to the real values, and sometimes even equal, for certain minimizers. On this example, we encountered 820 061 (over 1 048 576 minimizers) tight bounds — i.e. at least one bound is equal to the actual value — representing 78% of all minimizers; among which they were 262 144 equal bounds — 25% of all minimizers. Those equal bounds correspond to all minimizers starting with a T .

Figure 6b shows the relative errors in terms of order of magnitude, i.e. for each minimizer we computed

$$\eta^+(w) = \frac{\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k^+(w) - \log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w)}{\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta^-(w) = \frac{\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w) - \log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k^-(w)}{\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w)}.$$

We found that each time only one bound was tight, it was $\pi_k^+(w)$. However, $\pi_k^+(w)$ is not necessarily a good estimate of $\pi_k(w)$, since we can see that for a large number of minimizers, the relative error in order of magnitude is rather high. This is particularly striking if we compare Figures 6a and 5b. On the other hand, $\pi_k^-(w)$ is more consistent, especially on small minimizers.

⁸It is actually not that counterintuitive : from Equation (4), we have $\pi_k(w_1) = A(k-6) \cdot P_6(6) + A(k-7) \cdot P_6(7)$ — with $P_6(6) = 1$ and $P_6(7) \leq 4$ (since there is only one free letter). So $\pi_k(w_1)$ depends mainly on just two terms $A(k-6)$ and $A(k-7)$, while $\pi_k(w_2)$ depends on $k-m$ terms of the form $A(k-m-\beta) \cdot P_m(\beta+m)$, both $A(\cdot)$ and $P_m(\cdot)$ increasing exponentially. Therefore the surplus of antemers for w_1 does not compensate for this terms.




Figure 6: Relations between $\pi_k(w)$, $\pi_k^-(w)$ and $\pi_k^+(w)$ for $k = 31$, $m = 10$.

Using $\pi_k^+(w)$ or $\pi_k^-(w)$ as an approximation of $\pi_k(w)$ saves a factor m in temporal and spatial complexity, but, as we have just seen, at the cost of an approximation that is not necessarily reliable — despite almost 80% of minimizers having a tight bound. Are there competing approaches to approximate $\pi_k(w)$ quickly and with better precision?

Normalization We have already pointed out that the curves of Figure 5a and 5b are particularly similar. To what extent?

For k, m fixed, and any m -mer w , note that $0 \leq \Phi_>(w) \leq |\Sigma|^m - 1$ — where $\Phi_>(w)$ is defined in Definition 11 and correspond to the lexicographical rank of w among all m -mers. Note also that

$$\pi_k(w) \leq (k - m + 1) \cdot |\Sigma|^{k-m}$$

by the upper bound of Lemma 1, with $\beta_{\max}(w) \leq k - m$.

Therefore, we can represent any m -mer by a point $p(w)$ in the unit square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ of coordinates

$$p(w) = \left(\frac{\Phi_>(w)}{|\Sigma|^m - 1}, \frac{\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w)}{(k - m) + \log_{|\Sigma|}(k - m + 1)} \right) \quad (8)$$

— using $\log_{|\Sigma|}$ to avoid all the points being squashed on the x -axis.

Figure 7 shows the results we obtained with several values of k and m . In Figure 7a, we have considered small values of m : $m = 2, 3, 4$. It can be seen that oscillations and plateaus appear as m increases. In Figure 7b, by setting $m = 3$ — to keep the curve simple — we can see that by increasing k some parts of the curve increase, others decrease, but locally the increase/decrease is consistent, and seems to diminish as k increases. The same phenomenon can be seen in Figure 7c, where this time we chose a larger value $m = 10$. Restricting ourselves to high values of k , we compare the curves obtained for $m = 8$ and $m = 10$ in Figure 7d. Although the values of m are distinct, we can see that the curves seem to align almost perfectly.

These observations lead us to formulate the following conjecture. Let us define $f_{k,m} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the piecewise linear function such that for all $w \in \Sigma^m$, denoting $p(w) = (x, y)$, we have $f_{k,m}(x) = y$, as well as $f_{k,m}(0) = 1$ and $f_{k,m}(1) = 0$.




Figure 7: $p(w)$ for several values of k, m .

Conjecture 1. *There exist a function $f_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ so that $(f_{k,m})$ converges to f_∞ in a sense to be determined as $k, m \rightarrow \infty$.*

If this is the case, and provided that the function f_∞ is easy to calculate, then we can approximate $\pi_k(w)$ by

$$\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w) \approx f_\infty \left(\frac{\Phi_{>}(w)}{|\Sigma|^m - 1} \right) \cdot \left((k - m) + \log_{|\Sigma|} (k - m + 1) \right).$$

Proving (or disproving) such a conjecture is beyond the scope of this article. However, it is conceivable to employ computing power to calculate this curve for values of k, m as high as possible, and then, for a given minimizer, to look for the point in this curve closest to $p(w)$ — which we do not intend to do in this article either.

Asymptotics of $\pi_k(w)$ The values obtained for $\pi_k(\text{ACACAA})$ and $\pi_k(\text{ACACAC})$ in Example 17 seem to indicate an exponential growth of $\pi_k(w)$ as k increases, at least for these two examples. This is visually confirmed in log-scale in Figure 8a, alongside some other examples.

Consider the following linear regression model:

$$\log_{|\Sigma|} \pi_k(w) = A_w \times k + B_w + \varepsilon_w.$$

Then Figure 8b shows the estimated values for \widehat{A}_w using the least squares method, together with the associated coefficient of determination R^2 , for all m -mers with $m = 6$, computed on the values obtained with $m \leq k \leq m + 100$. As can be seen, with the exception of minimizers starting with T (for which we have $\pi_k(w) = 1$), we obtain R^2 values extremely close to 1, underlining the relevance of the model. The value of the slope is globally decreasing, with oscillations and plateaus which reproduce what was observed in Section 5.1.




Figure 8: Asymptotics of $\pi_k(w)$.

Extrapolating from these results, we formulate the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2. For any m -mer $w \in \Sigma^m$ with $m \geq 1$, if w does not start by $\max(\Sigma)$, then

$$\pi_k(w) \sim \alpha(w) \cdot |\Sigma|^{\beta(w)k}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for some constants $\alpha(w), \beta(w) > 0$.

This conjecture, if true, would provide yet another way of approximating $\pi_k(w)$, in addition to Conjecture 1 — and assuming that $\alpha(w)$ and $\beta(w)$ are easy to compute. Again, we shall not pursue this question further in this article.

5.3 Imbalance in practice

In this section, we consider typical bioinformatics datasets and study the relationship between the empirical partitions and what the theory predicts. This section is also intended as a discussion rather than an exhaustive study, the aim of which is to raise directions for future research that would use our theoretical approach to improve in practice the partition methods used in bioinformatics.

Datasets Table 1 gives, for each dataset, the number of k -mers, as well as the number of minimizers encountered for different values of m .

To avoid overloading the paper with too many figures, we are not going to show the results for all possible values of m for each dataset. However, the data and scripts for reproducing all the figures are available on

Dataset	k	Number of k-mers	Number of minimizers					
			m = 8	m = 9	m = 10	m = 11	m = 12	m = 21
Human chromosome 1 (GRCh38)	31	204 155 258	✗	✗	332 999	1 001 678	2 740 352	37 716 694
Chromosome Y (GRCh38)	31	17 680 259	20 612	62 197	173 673	426 104	862 743	✗
<i>Escherichia Coli</i> (MG12655_V1)	21	4 543 786	26 344	84 431	232 361	491 574	761 243	✗
RNA human lung dataset (SRR8616107)	61	190 917 566	17 410	55 118	175 405	532 489	✗	✗

Table 1: Statistics of the datasets

GitHub⁹. Note that, overall, for close values of m (i.e. all of them except 21), the observations are similar — therefore the conclusions as well.

Please note that in this section, unlike the results presented in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, the theoretical values $\pi_k(w)$ have only been calculated for the minimizers actually encountered in the data, and not for all the $|\Sigma|^m$ possible minimizers. In particular, please pay attention to the x-axis on the figures: unlike, say, Figure 5, the figures in this section — e.g., upcoming Figure 9, it is clear that the entire space of minimizers is not explored; with a bias in favour of minimizers starting with an A.

Comparing partitions What we did for each minimizer w we encountered in the data was to compute the theoretical value $\pi_k(w)$ and compare this with the observed empirical value $\widehat{\pi}_k(w)$ — where $\widehat{\pi}_k(w)$ counts the number of k -mers from the data that admit w as a minimizer. The results are shown in Figure 9.

As one can see, we are a long way from filling the buckets. Remarkably, local decreases in $\pi_k(w)$ are also visible in $\widehat{\pi}_k(w)$ (for example, the plateau at the end of the distribution in Figure 9d). This indicates that the values observed empirically are not totally uncorrelated with what the theory predicts — even if this is not true in all cases; for example, the local drop at the end of the distribution in Figure 9b, indicated by a red arrow, is not as obvious empirically as it is in theory. These alignments between theory and practice become all the more apparent in upcoming Figure 10.

Comparing frequencies Since the empirical and theoretical partitions appear to be correlated, we are interested here in comparing frequencies, i.e.

$$f_k(w) = \frac{\pi_k(w)}{|\Sigma|^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{f}_k(w) = \frac{\widehat{\pi}_k(w)}{\text{Number of k-mers in the data}}.$$

We compare them on a logarithmic scale, which in practice means translating the curves in Figure 9; this brings us to Figure 10.

Quite remarkably, with the exception of Figure 10b, we see that the theoretical frequency seems to approximate the empirical frequency, particularly for small minimizers — and not so much for large ones. Notably the local drops in the number of k -mers coincide very well between the empirical and theoretical distribution. It is not our ambition to quantify precisely to what extent $f_k(w)$ can correctly approximate $\widehat{f}_k(w)$ in this article, but it opens up an interesting avenue: using the theoretical frequency (or a transformation of it) to predict the empirical frequency. We can imagine partition heuristics that would use this oracle to guide the choice of minimizers, for example. We leave this question open for future work.

Quantifying the influence of m We have seen that $f_k(w)$ and $\widehat{f}_k(w)$ do not align as well as for the other data in Figure 10b. Among the data shown, this is the only one for which we have $m = 21$. If we generate the same figure exclusively for this dataset (human chromosome 1) but with varying values of m , we obtain Figure 11.

⁹At https://github.com/fingels/minimizer_counting_function.




Figure 9: Comparing the empirical partition $\widehat{\pi}_k(w)$ and the theory $\pi_k(w)$.

We can already see, simply by looking at the x -axis, that as m increases, the minimizers selected become increasingly smaller. Furthermore, the theoretical curve seems to shift downwards as m increases, explaining the poor fit when $m = 21$. However, one can imagine looking for a renormalization factor depending on m to “pull up” the theoretical curve — if one wish to use $f_k(w)$ as an oracle for $\widehat{f}_k(w)$, as discussed above.

Conclusion

In this article, we focused on quantifying theoretically $\pi_k(w)$, i.e. how many k -mers admit a given m -mer w as a lexicographic minimizer. In a context of partitioning k -mer according to their minimizer, this amounts to calculating the size of the associated bucket in the worst case. Most of the article has been devoted to establishing the recursive equations for calculating these quantities. We showed that $\pi_k(w)$ can be computed in $O(km)$ space and $O(km^2)$ time, and proposed approximations that can be computed in $O(k)$ space and $O(km)$ time.

The results we obtained numerically in Section 5 open up a number of perspectives for further research, which we hope to explore in the future. In particular, from a theoretical point of view:

Conjecture 1 We found that the functions $w \in \Sigma^m \mapsto \pi_k(w)$ are highly similar, and when renormalised




Figure 10: Comparing the empirical frequencies $\log_{|\Sigma|} \hat{f}_k(w)$ and the theory $\log_{|\Sigma|} f_k(w)$.

correctly, they overlap almost perfectly. Is there a limit function to which those functions converge?

Conjecture 2 We also found that, at a fixed w , the function $k \mapsto \pi_k(w)$ was remarkably well approximated by an exponential function. Is it possible to derive theoretically that $\pi_k(w) \sim \alpha(w) \cdot |\Sigma|^{\beta(w)k}$ for some constants $\alpha(w), \beta(w)$?

When considering genomic data, we found that, for small values of m , the empirical frequency was susceptible of being approximated by the theoretical frequency — and that local variations in $\pi_k(w)$ could be retrieved empirically. As detailed in the introduction, it should be remembered that there are arguments in favour of using lexicographic minimizers, such as reduced storage and fine-grained comparisons, if only we could counterbalance the empirical skewness of the partitions. In the future, we intend to pursue our work in this direction, using the theoretical frequency as an oracle for the empirical frequency, and devise new partitions heuristics.

More generally, we believe that a better theoretical understanding of the distribution of lexicographic minimizers can lead to the development of new relevant practical methods. One of the theoretical directions we think it would be useful to explore in the future is the link between minimizers of different sizes — especially in light of the recent article [1]. Suppose w and w' are two words of different length where w' is a substring of w . Is there any link between $\pi_k(w')$ and $\pi_k(w)$?

We are also interested in the distribution of *canonical* k -mers among lexicographic minimizers. A k -mer




Figure 11: Comparing the empirical frequencies $\log_{|\Sigma|} \hat{f}_k(w)$ and the theory $\log_{|\Sigma|} f_k(w)$ for the chromosome 1 dataset, with different values of m , and $k = 31$.

$x = a_1 \cdots a_k$ is said to be canonical if $x \leq rc(x)$, where $rc(x) = \bar{a}_k \cdots \bar{a}_1$ is called the reverse complement of x , and where $\bar{\cdot}$ is an involution of the DNA alphabet, defined by $\bar{A} = T$ and $\bar{C} = G$. Canonical k -mers are absolutely central to bioinformatics — and are specific to this discipline, see [17]. It would be of utmost interest to also be able to compute a minimizer counting function for canonical k -mers, that we would define as

$$\pi_k^c(w) = |\{x \in \Sigma^k : (\min(x) = w) \wedge (x \text{ is canonical})\}|.$$

To give a brief overview of this question, we have enumerated, in brute force, all k -mers for $k = 12$, and calculated, for those that were canonical, their lexicographic minimizer (with $m = 4$), and compared the distribution obtained with that of “regular” k -mers. We obtained Figure 12.

Note that there are roughly half the number of canonical k -mers compared to regular one (see [34] for a precise count), which may explain why the canonical curve is globally below the regular curve. Observe that the plateaus disappear, as many minimizers are not found in the canonical k -mers. Nevertheless, we note that the curves are sufficiently different to justify our interest in canonical k -mers, and sufficiently close to each other to hope to use the same kind of methods developed in this article.

Closing remark Through this work, we hope to convince the bioinformatics community that there are still things to explore in terms of lexicographic minimizers, with the hope of bringing them back into practical




Figure 12: Distribution of 12-mers among minimizers of size $m = 4$ depending on whether they are canonical or not. The “Empty” line corresponds to minimizer that were not seen in the context of canonical k -mers but do exist nonetheless for regular k -mers.

applications, in view of the perspectives mentioned above.

Acknowledgements

This work is funded by a grant from the French ANR: Full-RNA ANR-22-CE45-0007.

References

- [1] Jarno Niklas Alanko, Elena Biagi, and Simon John Puglisi. “Finimizers: Variable-length bounded-frequency minimizers for k -mer sets”. In: *bioRxiv* (2024), pp. 2024–02.
- [2] Rayan Chikhi, Antoine Limasset, and Paul Medvedev. “Compacting de Bruijn graphs from sequencing data quickly and in low memory”. In: *Bioinformatics* 32.12 (2016), pp. i201–i208.
- [3] Rayan Chikhi et al. “On the representation of de Bruijn graphs”. In: *Research in Computational Molecular Biology: 18th Annual International Conference, RECOMB 2014, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, April 2-5, 2014, Proceedings 18*. Springer. 2014, pp. 35–55.
- [4] Haskell B Curry. “Some philosophical aspects of combinatory logic”. In: *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Vol. 101. Elsevier, 1980, pp. 85–101.
- [5] Sebastian Deorowicz et al. “KMC 2: fast and resource-frugal k -mer counting”. In: *Bioinformatics* 31.10 (2015), pp. 1569–1576.
- [6] Robert Edgar. “Syncmers are more sensitive than minimizers for selecting conserved k -mers in biological sequences”. In: *PeerJ* 9 (2021), e10805.
- [7] Barış Ekim, Bonnie Berger, and Yaron Orenstein. “A randomized parallel algorithm for efficiently finding near-optimal universal hitting sets”. In: *International Conference on Research in Computational Molecular Biology*. Springer. 2020, pp. 37–53.
- [8] *European Nucleotide Archive. Ena statistics – Reads growth - Reads doubling time*. <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/about/statistics..> Accessed: 2024-12.
- [9] Jason Fan et al. “Fulgor: a fast and compact k -mer index for large-scale matching and color queries”. In: *Algorithms for Molecular Biology* 19.1 (2024), p. 3.
- [10] Dan Flomin, David Pellow, and Ron Shamir. “Data set-adaptive minimizer order reduces memory usage in k -mer counting”. In: *Journal of Computational Biology* 29.8 (2022), pp. 825–838.

- [11] Shay Golan and Arseny M Shur. “Expected Density of Random Minimizers”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16968* (2024).
- [12] Grant Greenberg, Aditya Narayan Ravi, and Ilan Shomorony. “LexicHash: sequence similarity estimation via lexicographic comparison of hashes”. In: *Bioinformatics* 39.11 (2023), btad652.
- [13] Kenneth E Iverson. “A programming language”. In: *Proceedings of the May 1-3, 1962, spring joint computer conference*. 1962, pp. 345–351.
- [14] Katharine M Jenike et al. “Guide to k-mer approaches for genomics across the tree of life”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01519* (2024).
- [15] Kenneth Katz et al. “The Sequence Read Archive: a decade more of explosive growth”. In: *Nucleic acids research* 50.D1 (2022), pp. D387–D390.
- [16] Yang Li et al. “MSPKmerCounter: a fast and memory efficient approach for k-mer counting”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.06550* (2015).
- [17] Guillaume Marçais, Shane Elder, and Carl Kingsford. “k-nonical space: sketching with reverse complements”. In: *bioRxiv* (2024), pp. 2024–01.
- [18] Guillaume Marçais et al. “Improving the performance of minimizers and winnowing schemes”. In: *Bioinformatics* 33.14 (2017), pp. i110–i117.
- [19] Guillaume Marçais et al. “Sketching and Sublinear Data Structures in Genomics”. In: *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science* 2.1 (2019), pp. 93–118. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-072018-021156. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-072018-021156>.
- [20] Camille Marchet, Mael Kerbiriou, and Antoine Limasset. “BLight: efficient exact associative structure for k-mers”. In: *Bioinformatics* 37.18 (2021), pp. 2858–2865.
- [21] Camille Marchet and Antoine Limasset. “Scalable sequence database search using partitioned aggregated Bloom comb trees”. In: *Bioinformatics* 39.Supplement_1 (2023), pp. i252–i259.
- [22] Igor Martayan et al. “Hyper-k-mers: efficient streaming k-mers representation”. In: *bioRxiv* (2024), pp. 2024–11.
- [23] Malick Ndiaye et al. “When less is more: sketching with minimizers in genomics”. In: *Genome Biology* 25.1 (2024), p. 270.
- [24] Johan Nyström-Persson, Gabriel Keeble-Gagnère, and Niamat Zawad. “Compact and evenly distributed k-mer binning for genomic sequences”. In: *Bioinformatics* 37.17 (2021), pp. 2563–2569.
- [25] Yaron Orenstein et al. “Compact universal k-mer hitting sets”. In: *Algorithms in Bioinformatics: 16th International Workshop, WABI 2016, Aarhus, Denmark, August 22-24, 2016. Proceedings* 16. Springer. 2016, pp. 257–268.
- [26] Giulio Ermanno Pibiri, Yoshihiro Shibuya, and Antoine Limasset. “Locality-preserving minimal perfect hashing of k-mers”. In: *Bioinformatics* 39.Supplement_1 (2023), pp. i534–i543.
- [27] Eric Rivals and Sven Rahmann. “Combinatorics of periods in strings”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 104.1 (2003), pp. 95–113.
- [28] Michael Roberts et al. “Reducing storage requirements for biological sequence comparison”. In: *Bioinformatics* 20.18 (2004), pp. 3363–3369.
- [29] Timothé Rouzé et al. “Fractional Hitting Sets for Efficient and Lightweight Genomic Data Sketching”. In: *WABI (workshop on algorithms in bioinformatics)*. 2023.
- [30] Michael C Schatz, Ben Langmead, and Steven L Salzberg. “Cloud computing and the DNA data race”. In: *Nature biotechnology* 28.7 (2010), pp. 691–693.
- [31] Saul Schleimer, Daniel S Wilkerson, and Alex Aiken. “Winnowing: local algorithms for document fingerprinting”. In: *Proceedings of the 2003 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 2003, pp. 76–85.

- [32] *Sequence Read Archive. We want to hear from you about changes to NIH’s Sequence Read Archive data format and storage.* <https://ncbiinsights.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2020/06/30/sra-rfi/>. Accessed: 2024-12.
- [33] Zachary D Stephens et al. “Big data: astronomical or genetical?” In: *PLoS biology* 13.7 (2015), e1002195.
- [34] Roland Wittler. “General encoding of canonical k-mers”. In: *Peer Community Journal* 3 (2023).
- [35] Derrick E Wood, Jennifer Lu, and Ben Langmead. “Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2”. In: *Genome biology* 20 (2019), pp. 1–13.
- [36] Hongyu Zheng, Carl Kingsford, and Guillaume Marçais. “Improved design and analysis of practical minimizers”. In: *Bioinformatics* 36.Supplement_1 (2020), pp. i119–i127.

A Preprocessing algorithm

In this section, we propose an algorithm for computing all the important quantities mentioned in the paper, i.e.

- \mathbf{R} — Definition 5;
- $\beta_{\max}(w)$ — Definition 7;
- $i_{\max}(w)$ — Definition 8;
- $\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha)$ — Definition 9;
- $\alpha_{\max}(i)$ — Equation (6);
- $\Sigma_{=0}(i)$ and $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)$ — Proposition 7;
- $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(\alpha, \beta)$ — Definition 12;
- $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ — Equation (7).

While \mathbf{R} can be computed in $O(m^2)$, it verifies the following properties that may speed up its computation.

Lemma 3. *Let $1 \leq i \leq m$.*

- $\mathbf{R}_{i,1}^=$;
- *if there exists $1 \leq j \leq i$ so that $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^<$ (resp. $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^>$), then for all $i' > i$, $\mathbf{R}_{i',j}^<$ (resp. $\mathbf{R}_{i',j}^>$).*

Proof. The first item is trivial. For the second one, it suffices to notice that, since $i' > i$, $a_j \cdots a_i$ is a prefix of $a_j \cdots a_{i'}$ and $a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$ is a prefix of $a_1 \cdots a_{i'-j+1}$. Therefore, as soon as either $a_j \cdots a_i$ or $a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$ becomes larger than the other, this propagates to the larger words of which they are prefixes. ✖

Algorithm 1 allows to compute \mathbf{R} , $\beta_{\max}(w)$, $i_{\max}(w)$, $\mathbf{T}_i(\alpha)$, and $\alpha_{\max}(i)$ at the same time. Assuming $O(|\Sigma|) = O(1)$, the algorithm runs in $O(m^2)$. Note that the value of $\beta_{\max}(w)$ returned by the algorithm is not exactly $\beta_{\max}(w)$ as defined in Definition 7, to avoid the dependency on k . The actual value of $\beta_{\max}(w)$ is the minimum between $k - m$ and the value returned by the algorithm. We leave it to the reader to convince themselves of the correctness of the algorithm.

The remaining quantities to be calculated, $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)$, $\Sigma_{=0}(i)$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(\alpha, \beta)$, and $\widetilde{\alpha}_{\max}(i, \beta)$, are developed in Algorithm 2, running in $O(m)$ — once again assuming $O(|\Sigma|) = O(1)$. $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i)$ and $\Sigma_{=0}(i)$ can be computed in a straightforward fashion from their definition — see Proposition 7. Although we only need the values for $1 \leq i \leq m - 2$, we decided to include the calculation for $m - 1$ and m in the pseudocode to avoid burdening it with extra conditions.

Concerning $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(\alpha, \beta)$, recall from Definition 12 that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha) \cdot [\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(\alpha)]$$

Algorithm 1: PREPROCESSING

Input: $w = a_1 \cdots a_m$

- 1 Initialize \mathbf{R} as a lower triangular matrix of size m
- 2 $i_{\max}(w) \leftarrow m$ and $\beta_{\max}(w) \leftarrow \infty$
- 3 **for** $1 \leq i \leq m$ **do**
- 4 $\mathbf{R}_{i,1} \leftarrow "="$
- 5 Initialize \mathbf{T}_i as a vector of size $|\Sigma|$ filled with the value ∞
- 6 Initialize $a_{\max}(i)$ as the set $\{a_1\}$
- 7 **for** $a \in \Sigma$ **do**
- 8 $\mathbf{T}_1(a) \leftarrow 2 \cdot [a = a_1]$
- 9 **for** $2 \leq j \leq m$ **do**
- 10 $b \leftarrow \perp$ and $s \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 11 **for** $j \leq i \leq m$ **do**
- 12 **if** $b = \perp$ **then**
- 13 $x \leftarrow a_j \cdots a_i$ and $y \leftarrow a_1 \cdots a_{i-j+1}$
- 14 **if** $x = y$ **then**
- 15 $s \leftarrow "="$
- 16 $\mathbf{T}_i(a_{i-j+2}) \leftarrow \min(\mathbf{T}_i(a_{i-j+2}), j + 1)$
- 17 $a_{\max}(i) \leftarrow a_{\max}(i) \cup \{a_{i-j+2}\}$
- 18 **else if** $x < y$ **then**
- 19 $s \leftarrow "<"$
- 20 $b \leftarrow \top$
- 21 $i_{\max}(w) \leftarrow \min(i_{\max}(w), i)$
- 22 $\beta_{\max}(w) \leftarrow \min(\beta_{\max}(w), j - 2)$
- 23 **else**
- 24 $s \leftarrow ">"$
- 25 $b \leftarrow \top$
- 26 $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \leftarrow s$
- 27 **for** $a \in \Sigma$ **do**
- 28 **if** $\mathbf{T}_j(a) = \infty$ **then**
- 29 $\mathbf{T}_j(a) \leftarrow (j + 1) \cdot [a = a_1]$
- 30 **for** $1 \leq i \leq m$ **do**
- 31 $a_{\max}(i) \leftarrow \max(a_{\max}(i))$
- 32 **return** $\mathbf{R}, i_{\max}(w), \beta_{\max}(w), (\mathbf{T}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (a_{\max}(i))_{1 \leq i \leq m}$

To avoid conditional loops every time we need to know whether $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta)$ is 0 or not depending on the value of β , we prefer to use currying [4] and define the following functions:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a) : (\beta \mapsto \mathbf{T}_i(a) \cdot [\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a)]),$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta)$ in the text of the paper is replaced by calling $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a)(\beta)$ in the implementation. Obviously, if $\mathbf{T}_i(a) = 0$, then $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta) = 0$ for any value of β , so in this case we directly use $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a) : (\beta \mapsto 0)$ to accelerate evaluation.

Algorithm 2: PREPROCESSINGBIS

Input: $w = a_1 \cdots a_m, (\mathbf{T}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$


- 1 **for** $1 \leq i \leq m$ **do**
- 2 $\Sigma_{=0}(i) \leftarrow \emptyset$ and $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 3 Initialize $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i$ as a vector of size $|\Sigma|$ filled with the zero function $\beta \mapsto 0$
- 4 Let $f : 0 \mapsto \varepsilon$ be a dictionary
- 5 **for** $a \in \Sigma$ **do**
- 6 **if** $\mathbf{T}_i(a) \neq 0$ **then**
- 7 $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) \leftarrow \Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) \cup \{a\}$
- 8 $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a) \leftarrow (\beta \mapsto \mathbf{T}_i(a) \cdot [\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a)])$ // Currying
- 9 Define $f(m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a)) = a$
- 10 **else**
- 11 $\Sigma_{=0}(i) \leftarrow \Sigma_{=0}(i) \cup \{a\}$
- 12 $\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) \leftarrow \Sigma_{\neq 0}(i) \setminus \{a_i\}$
- 13 $\Sigma_{=0}(i) \leftarrow \Sigma_{=0}(i) \setminus \{a_i\}$
- 14 Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the values for which f is defined, sorted in increasing order
- 15 Let I be a table of size n with $I[j] = \max(\{f(x_{j'}) : j' \leq j\})$
- 16 $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i) \leftarrow \left(\beta \mapsto \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} I[j] \cdot [x_j \leq \beta < x_{j+1}] \right) + I[n] \cdot [\beta \geq x_n] \right)$ // Currying
- 17 **return** $(\Sigma_{\neq 0}(i))_{1 \leq i \leq m-2}, (\Sigma_{=0}(i))_{1 \leq i \leq m-2}, (\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i))_{1 \leq i \leq m}$

For $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$, from Equation (7) and the previous discussion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta) &= \max \left(\{\varepsilon\} \cup \left\{ a \in \Sigma : \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(a, \beta) \neq 0 \right\} \right) \\ &= \max \left(\{\varepsilon\} \cup \left\{ a \in \Sigma : (\mathbf{T}_i(a) \neq 0) \wedge (\beta \geq m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a)) \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the list of pairs $(a, m - 1 + \mathbf{T}_i(a))$ for which $\mathbf{T}_i(a) \neq 0$, also containing the pair $(\varepsilon, 0)$. Sorting the second item of each pair in increasing order, we get a list x_1, \dots, x_n (with $x_1 = 0$). Note that since there cannot be two letters $a \neq b$ with $\mathbf{T}_i(a) = \mathbf{T}_i(b)$ (as soon as these values are not 0, of course), the x_j 's are unique. Note also that $n \leq |\Sigma| + 1$.

Let us denote b_j the letter associated to x_j (hence $b_1 = \varepsilon$). b_j belongs to the set used to evaluate $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ if and only if $\beta \geq x_j$. Since the x_j 's are sorted, if $x_{j+1} > \beta \geq x_j$, then $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ is exactly the maximum letter among $\{b_1, \dots, b_j\}$, as illustrated below.



To match the notations of the pseudocode, let us denote $I[j] = \max\{b_1 \cdots b_j\}$. We now have a piecewise reformulation of $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$:

$$\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta) = I[1] \cdot [x_1 \leq \beta < x_2] + \cdots + I[n-1] \cdot [x_{n-1} \leq \beta < x_n] + I[n] \cdot [\beta \geq x_n]$$

where addition is understood as character concatenation, and where $a \cdot [P] = a$ if P is true, and ε otherwise.

Once again, currying is used in practice, where $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i) : (\beta \mapsto \widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta))$ (using the above reformulation) and occurrences of $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i, \beta)$ in the equations are transformed into evaluations of $\widetilde{a}_{\max}(i)(\beta)$ in the implementation.

Example 19. From Example 14, for $w_2 = ACACAC$ and $i = 5$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(A, \beta) = 6 \cdot [\beta \geq 11] \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_i(C, \beta) = 3 \cdot [\beta \geq 8];$$

the other values being 0.

Following the above procedure, we constitute the following list: $(\varepsilon, 0)$, $(A, 11)$ and $(C, 8)$. Sorting the list by the second item, we have $x_1 = 0$, $x_1 = 8$ and $x_2 = 11$, as well as $b_1 = \varepsilon$, $b_2 = C$ and $b_3 = A$. We then compute $I[1] = \varepsilon$ and $I[2] = I[3] = C$, leading to

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_{\max}(i, \beta) = \varepsilon \cdot [0 \leq \beta < 8] + C \cdot [8 \leq \beta < 11] + C \cdot [\beta \geq 11].$$