

Faster exon assembly by sparse spliced alignment

Alexander Tiskin

Department of Computer Science, The University of Warwick,
Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom
tiskin@dcs.warwick.ac.uk

Abstract. Assembling a gene from candidate exons is an important problem in computational biology. Among the most successful approaches to this problem is *spliced alignment*, proposed by Gelfand et al., which scores different candidate exon chains within a DNA sequence of length m by comparing them to a known related gene sequence of length n , $m = \Theta(n)$. Gelfand et al. gave an algorithm for spliced alignment running in time $O(n^3)$. Kent et al. considered sparse spliced alignment, where the number of candidate exons is $O(n)$, and proposed an algorithm for this problem running in time $O(n^{2.5})$. We improve on this result, by proposing an algorithm for sparse spliced alignment running in time $O(n^{2.25})$. Our approach is based on a new framework of *quasi-local string comparison*.

1 Introduction

Assembling a gene from candidate exons is an important problem in computational biology. Several alternative approaches to this problem have been developed over time. Among the most successful approaches is *spliced alignment* [6], which scores different candidate exon chains within a DNA sequence by comparing them to a known related gene sequence. In this method, the two sequences are modelled respectively by strings a, b of lengths m, n . We usually assume that $m = \Theta(n)$. A subset of substrings in string a are marked as candidate exons. The comparison between sequences is made by string alignment. Gelfand et al. [6] give an algorithm for spliced alignment running in time $O(n^3)$.

In general, the number of candidate exons k may be as high as $O(n^2)$. The method of *sparse spliced alignment* makes a realistic assumption that, prior to the assembly, the set of candidate exons undergoes some filtering, after which only a small fraction of candidate exons remains. Kent et al. [9] give an algorithm for sparse spliced alignment that, in the special case $k = O(n)$, runs in time $O(n^{2.5})$. For asymptotically higher values of k , the algorithm provides a smooth transition in running time to the dense case $k = O(n^2)$, where its running time is asymptotically equal to the general spliced alignment algorithm of [6].

In this paper, we improve on the results of [9], by proposing an algorithm for sparse spliced alignment that, in the special case $k = O(n)$, runs in time $O(n^{2.25})$. Like its predecessor, the algorithm also provides a smooth transition in running time to the dense case. Our approach is based on a new framework of *quasi-local string comparison*, that unifies the semi-local string comparison from [12] and fully-local string comparison.

This paper is a sequel to paper [12]; we include most of its relevant material here for completeness. However, we omit some definitions and proofs due to space constraints, referring the reader to [12] for the details.

2 Semi-local longest common subsequences

We consider strings of characters from a fixed finite alphabet, denoting string concatenation by juxtaposition. Given a string, we distinguish between its contiguous *substrings*, and not necessarily contiguous *subsequences*. Special cases of a substring are a *prefix* and a *suffix* of a string. Given a string a , we denote by $a^{(k)}$ and $a_{(k)}$ respectively its prefix and suffix of length k . For two strings $a = \alpha_1\alpha_2\dots\alpha_m$ and $b = \beta_1\beta_2\dots\beta_n$ of lengths m, n respectively, the *longest common subsequence (LCS) problem* consists in computing the length of the longest string that is a subsequence both of a and b . We will call this length the *LCS score* of the strings.

We define a generalisation of the LCS problem, which we introduced in [12] as the *all semi-local LCS problem*. It consists in computing the LCS scores on substrings of a and b as follows:

- the *all string-substring LCS problem*: a against every substring of b ;
- the *all prefix-suffix LCS problem*: every prefix of a against every suffix of b ;
- symmetrically, the *all substring-string LCS problem* and the *all suffix-prefix LCS problem*, defined as above but with the roles of a and b exchanged.

It turns out that by considering this combination of problems rather than each problem separately, the algorithms can be greatly simplified.

A traditional distinction, especially in computational biology, is between global (full string against full string) and local (all substrings against all substrings) comparison. Our problem lies in between, hence the term “semi-local”. Many string comparison algorithms output either a single optimal comparison score across all local comparisons, or a number of local comparison scores that are “sufficiently close” to the globally optimal. In contrast with this approach, we require to output all the locally optimal comparison scores.

In addition to standard integer indices $\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we use *odd half-integer* indices $\dots, -\frac{5}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}, \dots$. For two numbers i, j , we write $i \trianglelefteq j$ if $j - i \in \{0, 1\}$, and $i \triangleleft j$ if $j - i = 1$. We denote

$$[i : j] = \{i, i + 1, \dots, j - 1, j\}$$

$$\langle i : j \rangle = \{i + \frac{1}{2}, i + \frac{3}{2}, \dots, j - \frac{3}{2}, j - \frac{1}{2}\}$$

To denote infinite intervals of integers and odd half-integers, we will use $-\infty$ for i and $+\infty$ for j where appropriate. For both interval types $[i : j]$ and $\langle i : j \rangle$, we call the difference $j - i$ interval *length*.

We will make extensive use of finite and infinite matrices, with integer elements and integer or odd half-integer indices. A *permutation matrix* is a $(0,1)$ -matrix containing exactly one nonzero in every row and every column. An *identity matrix* is a permutation matrix I , such that $I(i, j) = 1$ if $i = j$, and




Fig. 1. An alignment dag and its implicit highest-score matrix

$I(i, j) = 0$ otherwise. Each of these definitions applies both to finite and infinite matrices.

A finite permutation matrix can be represented by its nonzeros' index set. When we deal with an infinite matrix, it will typically have a finite non-trivial *core*, and will be trivial (e.g. equal to an infinite identity matrix) outside of this core. An infinite permutation matrix with finite non-trivial core can be represented by its core nonzeros' index set.

Let D be an arbitrary numerical matrix with indices ranging over $\langle 0 : n \rangle$. Its *distribution matrix*, with indices ranging over $[0 : n]$, is defined by

$$d(i_0, j_0) = \sum D(i, j) \quad i \in \langle i_0 : n \rangle, j \in \langle 0 : j_0 \rangle$$

for all $i_0, j_0 \in [0 : n]$.

When matrix d is a distribution matrix of D , matrix D is called the *density matrix* of d . The definitions of distribution and density matrices extend naturally to infinite matrices. We will only deal with distribution matrices where all elements are defined and finite.

We will use the term *permutation-distribution matrix* as an abbreviation of “distribution matrix of a permutation matrix”.

We refer the reader to [12] for the definition of *alignment dag*. In the context of the alignment dag, a substring $\alpha_i \alpha_{i+1} \dots \alpha_j$ corresponds to the interval $[i - 1 : j]$; we will make substantial use of this correspondence in Section 4.

We also refer the reader to [12] for the definitions of (*extended*) *highest-score matrix*, and of its *implicit representation*. Figure 1 shows an alignment dag of two strings, along with the nonzeros of its implicit highest-score matrix. In particular, a nonzero (i, j) , where $i, j \in \langle 0 : n \rangle$, is represented by a “seaweed” curve¹, originating between the nodes $v_{0, i - \frac{1}{2}}$ and $v_{0, i + \frac{1}{2}}$, and terminating between the

¹ For the purposes of this illustration, the specific layout of the curves between their endpoints is not important. However, notice that each pair of curves have at most one crossing, and that the same property is true for highest-scoring paths in the alignment dag.

nodes $v_{m,j-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $v_{m,j+\frac{1}{2}}$. The remaining curves, originating or terminating at the sides of the dag, correspond to nonzeros (i, j) , where either $i \notin \langle 0 : n \rangle$ or $j \notin \langle 0 : n \rangle$. For details, see [12].

Essentially, an extended highest-score matrix represents in a unified form the solutions of the string-substring, substring-string, prefix-suffix and suffix-prefix LCS problems. In particular, row 0 of this matrix contains the LCS scores of string a against every prefix of string b . When considering such an array of $n + 1$ LCS scores on its own, we will call it *highest-score vector* for a against b . Every highest-score vector will be represented explicitly by an integer array of size $n + 1$ (as opposed to the implicit representation of the complete highest-score matrix, which allows one to store all the rows compactly in a data structure of size $O(m + n)$).

3 Fast highest-score matrix multiplication

Our algorithms are based on the framework for the all semi-local LCS problem developed in [12], which refines the approach of [11,1].

A common pattern in the problems considered in this paper is partitioning the alignment dag into alignment subdags. Without loss of generality, consider a partitioning of an $(M + m) \times n$ alignment dag G into an $M \times n$ alignment dag G_1 and an $m \times n$ alignment dag G_2 , where $M \geq m$. The dags G_1, G_2 share a horizontal row of n nodes, which is simultaneously the bottom row of G_1 and the top row of G_2 ; the dags also share the corresponding $n - 1$ horizontal edges. We will say that dag G is the *concatenation* of dags G_1 and G_2 . Let A, B, C denote the extended highest-score matrices defined respectively by dags G_1, G_2, G . In every recursive call our goal is, given matrices A, B , to compute matrix C efficiently. We call this procedure *highest-score matrix multiplication*.

The implicit representation of matrices A, B, C consists of respectively $M + n, m + n, M + m + n$ non-trivial nonzeros.

The results of this paper are based on the following results from [12]; see the original paper for proofs and discussion.

Definition 1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let A, B, C be arbitrary numerical matrices with indices ranging over $[0 : n]$. The $(\min, +)$ -product $A \odot B = C$ is defined by $C(i, k) = \min_j (A(i, j) + B(j, k))$, where $i, j, k \in [0 : n]$.

Lemma 1 ([12]). Let D_A, D_B, D_C be permutation matrices with indices ranging over $\langle 0 : n \rangle$, and let d_A, d_B, d_C be their respective distribution matrices. Let $d_A \odot d_B = d_C$. Given the set of nonzero elements' index pairs in each of D_A, D_B , the set of nonzero elements' index pairs in D_C can be computed in time $O(n^{1.5})$ and memory $O(n)$.

Lemma 2 ([12]). Let D_A, D_B, D_C be permutation matrices with indices ranging over $\langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} D_A(i, j) &= I(i, j) && \text{for } i, j \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle \\ D_B(j, k) &= I(j, k) && \text{for } j, k \in \langle n : +\infty \rangle \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 2. An illustration of Lemma 2

Let d_A, d_B, d_C be their respective distribution matrices. Let $d_A \odot d_B = d_C$. We have

$$D_A(i, j) = D_C(i, j) \quad \text{for } i \in \langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle, j \in \langle n : +\infty \rangle \quad (1)$$

$$D_B(j, k) = D_C(j, k) \quad \text{for } j \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle, k \in \langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle \quad (2)$$

Given the set of all n remaining nonzero elements' index pairs in each of D_A, D_B , i.e. the set of all nonzero elements' index pairs (i, j) in D_A and (j, k) in D_B with $i \in \langle 0 : +\infty \rangle, j \in \langle 0 : n \rangle, k \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle$, the set of all n remaining nonzero elements' index pairs in D_C can be computed in time $O(n^{1.5})$ and memory $O(n)$.

The lemma is illustrated by Figure 2. Three horizontal lines represent respectively the index ranges of i, j, k . The nonzeros in D_A and D_B are shown respectively by top-to-middle and middle-to-bottom "seaweed" curves. The nonzeros in D_C described by (1), (2) are shown by top-to-bottom thick "seaweed" curves. The remaining nonzeros in D_C are not shown; they are determined by application of Lemma 1 from nonzeros in D_A and D_B shown by top-to-middle and middle-to-bottom thin "seaweed" curves.

Lemma 2 gives a method for multiplying infinite permutation-distribution matrices, in the special case where both multiplicands have semi-infinite core. We now consider the complementary special case, where one multiplicand's core is unbounded, and the other's is finite.

Lemma 3. Let D_A, D_B, D_C be permutation matrices with indices ranging over $\langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle$, such that

$$D_B(j, k) = I(j, k) \quad \text{for } j, k \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle \cup \langle n : +\infty \rangle$$

Let d_A, d_B, d_C be their respective distribution matrices. Let $d_A \odot d_B = d_C$. We have

$$D_A(i, j) = D_C(i, j) \quad \text{for } i \in \langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle, j \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle \cup \langle n : +\infty \rangle \quad (3)$$

Given the set of all n remaining nonzero elements' index pairs in each of D_A, D_B , i.e. the set of all nonzero elements' index pairs (i, j) in D_A and (j, k) in D_B with $i \in \langle -\infty : +\infty \rangle, j, k \in \langle 0 : n \rangle$, the set of all n remaining nonzero elements' index pairs in D_C can be computed in time $O(n^{1.5})$ and memory $O(n)$.




Fig. 3. An illustration of Lemma 3

Proof. By Lemma 1; see Appendix. □

The lemma is illustrated by Figure 3, using the same conventions as Figure 2.

Lemma 4. Consider the concatenation of alignment dags as described above, with highest-score matrices A, B, C . Given the implicit representations of A, B , the implicit representation of C can be computed in time $O(M + m^{0.5}n)$ and memory $O(M + n)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3; see Appendix. □

We will also need a separate efficient algorithm for obtaining highest-score vectors instead of full highest-score matrices. This algorithm, which we call *highest-score matrix-vector multiplication*, is complementary to the highest-score matrix multiplication algorithm of Lemma 1. An equivalent procedure is given (using different terminology and notation) in [10,5,9], based on techniques from [8,3].

Lemma 5 ([10,5,9]). Let D_A be a permutation matrix with indices ranging over $\langle 0 : n \rangle$, and let d_A be its distribution matrix. Let x, y be numerical (column) vectors with indices ranging over $\langle 0 : n \rangle$. Let $d_A \odot x = y$. Given the set of nonzero elements' index pairs in D_A , and the elements of x , the elements of y can be computed in time $O(n \log n)$ and memory $O(n)$.

4 Quasi-local string comparison

Consider an arbitrary set of substrings of string a . We call substrings in this set *prescribed substrings*, and denote their number by k . Our aim is to compare the LCS scores on substrings of a and b as follows:

- the *quasi-local LCS problem*: every prescribed substring of a against every substring of b .

This problem includes as special cases the semi-local string comparison from [12] and fully-local string comparison, as well as length-constrained local alignment from [2]. Note that the solution of the quasi-local LCS problem can be

represented in space $O(kn)$ by giving the implicit highest-score matrix for each prescribed substring of a against b . An individual quasi-local LCS score query can be performed on this data structure in time $O(\log^2 n)$ (or even $O(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ with a higher multiplicative constant).

In the rest of this section, we propose an efficient algorithm for the quasi-local LCS problem. For simplicity, we first consider the case $k = O(m)$. Intervals corresponding to prescribed substrings of a will be called *prescribed intervals*.

Algorithm 1 (Quasi-local LCS).

Input: strings a , b of length m , n , respectively; a set of $k = O(m)$ endpoint index pairs for the prescribed substrings in a .

Output: implicit highest-score matrix for every prescribed substring of a against full b .

Description. For simplicity, we assume that m is a power of 4. We call an interval of the form $[k \cdot 2^s : (k + 1) \cdot 2^s]$, $k, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, as well as the corresponding substring of a , *canonical*. In particular, all individual characters of a are canonical substrings. Every substring of a can be decomposed into a concatenation of $O(\log m)$ canonical substrings.

In the following, by processing an interval we mean computing the implicit highest-score matrix for the corresponding substring of a against b .

First phase. Canonical intervals are processed in a balanced binary tree, in order of increasing length. Every interval of length $2^0 = 1$ is canonical, and is processed by a simple scan of string b . Every canonical interval of length 2^{s+1} is processed as a concatenation of two already processed half-sized canonical intervals of length 2^s .

Second phase. We represent each prescribed interval $[i, j]$ by an odd half-integer *prescribed point* $(i, j) \in (0 : m)^2$ ⁽²⁾. On the set of prescribed points, we build a data structure allowing efficient orthogonal range counting queries. A classical example of such a data structure is the range tree [4].

We then proceed by partitioning the square index pair range $\langle 0 : m \rangle^2$ recursively into regular half-sized square blocks.

Consider an $h \times h$ block $\langle i_0 - h : i_0 \rangle \times \langle j_0 : j_0 + h \rangle$. The computation is organised so that when a recursive call is made on this block, either we have $i_0 \geq j_0$, or the interval $[i_0 : j_0]$ is already processed.

For the current block, we query the number of prescribed points it contains. If this number is zero, no further computation on the block or recursive partitioning is performed. Otherwise, we have $j - i \in \{-h, 0, h, 2h, \dots\}$. If $j - i = -h$, then the intervals $[i_0 - h : j_0]$, $[i_0 : j_0 + h]$ have length 0, and the interval $[i_0 - h : j_0 + h]$ is canonical. If $j - i \geq 0$, we process the intervals $[i_0 - h : j_0]$, $[i_0 : j_0 + h]$, $[i_0 - h : j_0 + h]$. Each of these intervals can be processed by Lemma 4, appending and/or prepending a canonical interval of length h to the already processed

² The overall algorithm structure is essentially equivalent to building a one-dimensional range tree [4] on the interval $[0 : m]$, and then performing on this range tree a batch query consisting of all the prescribed points. However, in contrast with standard range trees, the cost of processing nodes in our algorithm is not uniform.

interval $[i_0 : j_0]$. We then perform further partitioning of the block, and call the procedure recursively on each of the four subblocks.

The base of the recursion is $h = 1$. At this point, we process all 1×1 blocks containing a prescribed point, which is equivalent to processing the original prescribed intervals. The computation is completed.

Cost analysis.

First phase. The computation is dominated by the cost of the bottom level of the computation tree, equal to $m/2 \cdot O(n) = O(mn)$.

Second phase. The recursion tree has maximum degree 4, height $\log m$, and $O(m)$ leaves corresponding to the prescribed points.

Consider the top-to-middle levels of the recursion tree. In each level from the top down to the middle level, the maximum number of nodes increases by a factor of 4, and the maximum amount of computation work per node decreases by a factor of $2^{0.5}$. Hence, the maximum amount of work per level increases in geometric progression, and is dominated by the middle level $\frac{\log m}{2}$.

Consider the middle-to-bottom levels of the recursion tree. Since the tree has $O(m)$ leaves, each level contains at most $O(m)$ nodes. In each level from the middle down to the bottom level, the maximum amount of computation work per node still decreases by a factor of $2^{0.5}$. Hence, the maximum amount of work per level decreases in geometric progression, and is again dominated by the middle level $\frac{\log m}{2}$.

Thus, the computational work in the whole recursion tree is dominated by the maximum amount of work in the middle level $\frac{\log m}{2}$. This level has at most $O(m)$ nodes, each requiring at most $O(m^{0.5}n)/2^{0.5 \cdot \frac{\log m}{2}} = O(m^{0.25}n)$ work. Therefore, the overall computation cost of the recursion is at most $O(m) \cdot O(m^{0.25}n) = O(m^{1.25}n)$. \square

The same algorithm can be applied in the case of general k , $1 \leq k \leq \binom{m}{2}$. For $1 \leq k \leq m^{2/3}$, the first phase dominates, so the overall computation cost is $O(mn)$. For $m^{2/3} \leq k \leq \binom{m}{2}$, the second phase dominates. The dominant level in the recursion tree will have k nodes, each requiring at most $O(m^{0.5}n/k^{0.25})$ work. Therefore, the overall computation cost will be at most $k \cdot O(m^{0.5}n/k^{0.25}) = O(m^{0.5}k^{0.75}n)$. In the fully-local case $k = \binom{m}{2}$, the cost is $O(m^2n)$; the same result can be obtained by m independent runs of algorithms from [11,1], at the same asymptotic cost.

5 Sparse spliced alignment

We now consider the problem of sparse spliced alignment. We keep the notation and terminology of the previous sections; in particular, candidate exons are represented by prescribed substrings of string a . We say that prescribed substring $a' = \alpha_{i'} \dots \alpha_{j'}$ precedes prescribed substring $a'' = \alpha_{i''} \dots \alpha_{j''}$, if $j' < i''$. A chain of substrings is a chain in the partial order of substring precedence. We identify every chain with the string obtained by concatenating all its constituent substrings in the order of precedence.

Our sparse spliced alignment algorithm is based on the efficient method of quasi-local string comparison developed in the previous section. This improves the running time of the bottleneck procedure from [9]. The algorithm also uses a generalisation of the standard network alignment method, equivalent to the one used by [9]. For simplicity, we describe our algorithm for the special case of unit-cost LCS score.

Algorithm 2 (Sparse spliced alignment).

Input: strings a, b of length m, n , respectively; a set of $k = O(m)$ endpoint index pairs for the prescribed substrings in a .

Output: the chain of prescribed substrings in a , giving the highest LCS score against string b .

Description. The algorithm runs in two phases.

First phase. By running Algorithm 1, we compute the implicit highest-score matrix for every prescribed substring of a against b .

Second phase. We represent the problem by a *dag* (directed acyclic graph) on the set of nodes u_i , where $i \in [0 : m]$. For each prescribed substring $\alpha_i \dots \alpha_j$, the dag contains the edge $u_{i-1} \rightarrow u_j$. Overall, the dag contains $k = O(m)$ edges.

The problem can now be solved by dynamic programming on the representing dag as follows. Let $s[i, j]$ denote the highest LCS score for a chain of prescribed substrings in prefix string $a^{(i)}$ against prefix string $b^{(j)}$. With each node v_i , we associate the integer vector $s[i, \cdot]$. The nodes are processed in increasing order of their indices. For the node u_0 , vector $s[0, \cdot]$ is initialised by all zeros. For a node u_j , we consider every edge $u_{i-1} \rightarrow u_j$, and compute the highest-score matrix-vector product between vector $s[i-1, \cdot]$ and the highest-score matrix corresponding to prescribed string $\alpha_i \dots \alpha_j$ by the algorithm of Lemma 5. Vector $s[j, \cdot]$ is now obtained by taking the elementwise maximum between vector $s[j-1, \cdot]$ and all the above highest-score matrix-vector products.

The solution score is given by the value $s[m, n]$. The solution chain of prescribed substrings can now be obtained by tracing the dynamic programming sequence backwards from node u_m to node u_0 .

Cost analysis.

First phase. Algorithm 1 runs in time $O(m^{1.25}n)$.

Second phase. For each of the $k = O(m)$ edges in the representing dag, the algorithm of Lemma 5 runs in time $O(n \log n)$. Therefore, the total cost of this phase is $O(m) \cdot O(n \log n) = O(mn \log n)$.

The overall cost of the algorithm is dominated by the cost of the first phase, equal to $O(m^{1.25}n)$. □

In the case of general k , the analysis of the previous section can be applied to obtain a smooth transition between the sparse and dense versions of the problem.

By a constant-factor blow-up of the alignment dag, our algorithms can be extended from the LCS score to the more general edit score, where the insertion, deletion and substitution costs are any constant rationals.

6 Conclusions

We have presented an improved algorithm for sparse spliced alignment, running in time $O(n^{2.25})$, and providing a smooth transition in the running time to the dense case. A natural question is whether this running time can be further improved.

Our algorithm is based on the previously developed framework of semi-local string comparison by implicit highest-score matrix multiplication. The method compares strings locally by the LCS score, or, more generally, by an edit score where the insertion, deletion and substitution costs are any constant rationals. It remains an open question whether this framework can be extended to arbitrary real costs, or to sequence alignment with non-linear gap penalties.

7 Acknowledgement

The problem was introduced to the author by Michal Ziv-Ukelson.

References

1. C. E. R. Alves, E. N. Cáceres, and S. W. Song. An all-substrings common subsequence algorithm. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 19:133–139, 2005.
2. A. N. Arslan and Ö. Eğecioglu. Approximation algorithms for local alignment with length constraints. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 13(5):751–767, 2002.
3. G. Benson. A space efficient algorithm for finding the best nonoverlapping alignment score. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 145:357–369, 1995.
4. J. L. Bentley. Multidimensional divide-and-conquer. *Communications of the ACM*, 23(4):214–229, 1980.
5. M. Crochemore, G. M. Landau, B. Schieber, and M. Ziv-Ukelson. Re-use dynamic programming for sequence alignment: An algorithmic toolkit. In *String Algorithms*, volume 2 of *Texts in Algorithmics*. King’s College Publications, 2004.
6. M. S. Gelfand, A. A. Mironov, and P. A. Pevzner. Gene recognition via spliced sequence alignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 93(17):9061–9066, 1996.
7. D. Gusfield. *Algorithms on Strings, Trees, and Sequences: Computer Science and Computational Biology*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
8. S. K. Kannan and E. W. Myers. An algorithm for locating non-overlapping regions of maximum alignment score. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 25(3):648–662, 1996.
9. C. Kent, G. M. Landau, and M. Ziv-Ukelson. On the complexity of sparse exon assembly. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 13(5):1013–1027, 2006.
10. G. M. Landau and M. Ziv-Ukelson. On the common substring alignment problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 41(2):338–359, 2001.
11. J. P. Schmidt. All highest scoring paths in weighted grid graphs and their application to finding all approximate repeats in strings. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(4):972–992, 1998.
12. A. Tiskin. Semi-local longest common subsequences in subquadratic time. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*. To appear, available from <http://www.dcs.warwick.ac.uk/~tiskin/pub>.

A Proof of Lemma 3

Proof (Lemma 3). It is straightforward to check equality (3), by (2) and Definition 1. Informally, each nonzero of D_C appearing in (3) is obtained as a direct combination of a non-trivial nonzero of D_A and a trivial nonzero of D_B . All remaining nonzeros of D_A and D_B are non-trivial, and determine collectively the remaining nonzeros of D_C . However, this time the direct one-to-one relationship between nonzeros of D_C and pairs of nonzeros of D_A and D_B need not hold.

Observe that all the nonzeros of D_A appearing in (3) with $j \in \langle -\infty : 0 \rangle$ are dominated by each of the remaining nonzeros of D_A . Furthermore, none of the nonzeros of D_A appearing in (3) with $j \in \langle n : +\infty \rangle$ can be dominated by any of the remaining nonzeros of D_A . Hence, the nonzeros appearing in (3) cannot affect the computation of the remaining nonzeros of D_C . We can therefore simplify the problem by eliminating all half-integer indices i, j, k that correspond to nonzero index pairs (i, j) and (j, k) appearing in (3), and then renumbering the remaining indices i , so that their new range becomes $\langle 0 : n \rangle$ (which is already the range of j, k after the elimination). More precisely, we define permutation matrices D'_A, D'_B, D'_C , with indices ranging over $\langle 0 : n \rangle$, as follows. Matrix D'_A is obtained from D_A by selecting all rows i with a nonzero $D_A(i, j)$, $j \in \langle 0 : n \rangle$, and then selecting all columns that contain a nonzero in at least one (in fact, exactly one) of the selected rows. Matrix D'_B is obtained from D_B by selecting all rows j and columns k , where $j, k \in \langle 0 : n \rangle$. Matrix D'_C is obtained from D_C by selecting all rows i with a nonzero $D_C(i, k)$, $k \in \langle 0 : n \rangle$, and then selecting all columns that contain a nonzero in at least one (in fact, exactly one) of the selected rows. We define d'_A, d'_B, d'_C accordingly. The index order is preserved by the above matrix transformation, so the dominance relation is not affected. Both the matrix transformation and its inverse can be performed in time and memory $O(n)$.

It is easy to check that $d'_A \odot d'_B = d'_C$, iff $d_A \odot d_B = d_C$. Matrices D'_A, D'_B, D'_C satisfy the conditions of Lemma 1. Therefore, given the set of nonzero index pairs of D'_A, D'_B , the set of nonzero index pairs of D'_C can be computed in time $O(n^{1.5})$ and memory $O(n)$. \square

B Proof of Lemma 4

Proof (Lemma 4). By Lemma 3, all but n non-trivial nonzeros of D_C can be obtained in time and memory $O(M + n)$. We now show how to obtain the remaining non-trivial nonzeros in time $O(m^{0.5}n)$, instead of time $O(n^{1.5})$ given by Lemma 3.

The main idea is to decompose matrix d_B into a $(\min, +)$ -product of permutation-distribution matrices with small core. The decomposition is described in terms of density matrices, and proceeds recursively. In each recursive step, we define infinite permutation matrices D'_B, D''_B , that are obtained from the density matrix D_B as follows.

Recall that non-trivial nonzeros in D_B belong to the index pair range $\langle -m : n \rangle \times \langle 0 : m+n \rangle$. Intuitively, the idea is to split the range of each index into two blocks:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle -m : n \rangle &= \langle -m : \frac{n}{2} \rangle \cup \langle \frac{n}{2} : n \rangle \\ \langle 0 : m+n \rangle &= \langle 0 : \frac{n}{2} \rangle \cup \langle \frac{n}{2} : m+n \rangle\end{aligned}$$

Note that the splits are not uniform, and that among the resulting four index pair blocks in D_B , the block $\langle \frac{n}{2} : n \rangle \times \langle 0 : \frac{n}{2} \rangle$ cannot contain any nonzeros. We process the remaining three index pair blocks individually, gradually introducing nonzeros in matrices D'_B, D''_B until they become permutation matrices. Non-trivial nonzeros in D'_B, D''_B will belong respectively to the index ranges $\langle -m : \frac{n}{2} \rangle \times \langle 0 : m + \frac{n}{2} \rangle$ and $\langle \frac{n}{2} : m+n \rangle \times \langle m + \frac{n}{2} : 2m+n \rangle$.

First, we consider all nonzeros in D_B with indices $(j, k) \in \langle -m : \frac{n}{2} \rangle \times \langle 0 : \frac{n}{2} \rangle$. For every such nonzero, we introduce a nonzero in D'_B at index pair (j, k) . We also consider all nonzeros in D_B with indices $(j, k) \in \langle \frac{n}{2} : n \rangle \times \langle \frac{n}{2} : m+n \rangle$. For every such nonzero, we introduce a nonzero in D''_B at index pair $(m+j, m+k)$.

Now consider all nonzeros in D_B with indices $(j, k) \in \langle -m : \frac{n}{2} \rangle \times \langle \frac{n}{2} : m+n \rangle$. There are exactly m such nonzeros. Denote their index pairs by $(j_0, k_0), (j_1, k_1), \dots, (j_{m-1}, k_{m-1})$, where $j_0 < j_1 < \dots < j_{m-1}$. For each nonzero with index pair (j_t, k_t) , we introduce a nonzero in D'_B at index pair $(j_t, \frac{n+1}{2} + t)$, and a nonzero in D''_B at index pair $(\frac{n+1}{2} + t, m+k_t)$.

Finally, we introduce the trivial nonzeros in D'_B, D''_B at index pairs (j, k) , $k-j = m$, outside the above non-trivial ranges. The recursive step is completed.

Let d'_B, d''_B be the distribution matrices of D'_B, D''_B . Let $d_B^* = d'_B \odot d''_B$, and $d_C^* = d_A \odot d_B^* = d_A \odot d'_B \odot d''_B$, and define D_B^*, D_C^* accordingly. By the construction of the decomposition of d_B , matrices D_B and D_B^* (as well as d_B and d_B^*) are related by a simple shift: for all (i, k) , $i, k \in \langle -\infty, +\infty \rangle$, we have $D_B(j, k) = D_B^*(j, k+m)$. Consequently, matrices D_C and D_C^* are related by a similar shift: for all (i, k) , $i, k \in \langle -\infty, +\infty \rangle$, we have $D_C(i, k) = D_C^*(i, k+m)$.

The described decomposition process continues recursively, as long as $n \geq m$. The problem of computing matrix d_C is thus reduced, up to an index shift, to n/m instances of multiplying permutation-distribution matrices. In every instance, one of the multiplied matrices has core of size $O(m)$. By Lemma 3, the non-trivial part of every such multiplication can be performed in time $O(m^{1.5})$ and memory $O(m)$. The trivial parts of all these multiplications can be combined into a single scan of the nonzero sets of D_A, D_B , and can therefore be performed in time and memory $O(M+n)$. Hence, the whole computation can be performed in time $O(M + (n/m) \cdot m^{1.5}) = O(M + m^{0.5}n)$ and memory $O(M+n)$. \square

The decomposition of matrix D_B in the proof of Lemma 4 is illustrated by Figures 4, 5. The rectangle corresponding to D_B is split into two half-sized rectangles, corresponding to D'_B and D''_B . Each of the new rectangles is completed to a full-sized rectangle by trivial extension; then, the rectangles are arranged vertically with a shift by m . The ‘‘seaweed’’ curves that do not cross the partition are preserved by the construction, up to a shift by m . The ‘‘seaweed’’




Fig. 4. Proof of Lemma 4: the original matrix D_B




Fig. 5. Proof of Lemma 4: the decomposition of D_B

curves that cross the partition are also preserved up to a shift by m , by passing them through a parallelogram-shaped “buffer zone”. Note that this construction makes the latter class of curves uncrossed in D'_B , and preserves all their original crossings in D''_B .