

Adjusting scoring matrices to correct overextended alignments

Lauren J. Mills¹ and William R. Pearson^{2,*}¹Department of Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology and ²Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22908, USA

Associate Editor: John Hancock

ABSTRACT

Motivation: Sequence similarity searches performed with BLAST, SSEARCH and FASTA achieve high sensitivity by using scoring matrices (e.g. BLOSUM62) that target low identity (<33%) alignments. Although such scoring matrices can effectively identify distant homologs, they can also produce local alignments that extend beyond the homologous regions.

Results: We measured local alignment start/stop boundary accuracy using a set of queries where the correct alignment boundaries were known, and found that 7% of BLASTP and 8% of SSEARCH alignment boundaries were overextended. Overextended alignments include non-homologous sequences; they occur most frequently between sequences that are more closely related (>33% identity). Adjusting the scoring matrix to reflect the identity of the homologous sequence can correct higher identity overextended alignment boundaries. In addition, the scoring matrix that produced a correct alignment could be reliably predicted based on the sequence identity seen in the original BLOSUM62 alignment. Realignment with the predicted scoring matrix corrected 37% of all overextended alignments, resulting in more correct alignments than using BLOSUM62 alone.

Availability: RefProtDom2 (RPD2) sequences and the FASTA software are available from <http://faculty.virginia.edu/wrpearson/fasta>.

Contact: wrp@virginia.edu

Received on July 12, 2013; revised on August 28, 2013; accepted on August 29, 2013

1 INTRODUCTION

Sequence similarity search algorithms are used to identify evolutionary homologs and to generate hypotheses for the function of unknown proteins. These algorithms assign homology between sequences achieving statistically significant similarity scores with high fidelity, even between highly divergent sequences sharing low similarity (Brenner *et al.*, 1998; Pearson, 1995; Pearson and Sierk, 2005). However, the same methodology that provides for the sensitive identification of homology at low identity can also lead to alignments that include non-homologous sequence adjacent to, or between, higher identity homologous sequences (Gonzalez and Pearson, 2010a).

Homologous overextension was first identified as a source of error during iterative similarity searches (Gonzalez and Pearson, 2010a). Overextension occurs when alignments extend past the boundaries of the homologous region in the library, query or both sequences, leading to the inclusion of non-homologous sequence in an alignment (Fig. 1). The inclusion of

non-homologous sequence has been identified in alignments between highly identical DNA sequences (Chao *et al.*, 1993) and has been termed the ‘mosaic effect’ (Arslan *et al.*, 2001).

Overextension occurs because local sequence alignment boundaries depend on the scoring matrix. The popular BLASTP (Altschul *et al.*, 1997) tool, along with other sequence alignment tools (e.g. SSEARCH and FASTA; Pearson, 2000), creates local alignments between similar sequences using scoring matrices. Scoring matrices assign a similarity score to each pair of aligned amino acids based on the probability that the amino acid transition has occurred more often through evolution than by chance. Amino acid replacements that are common through evolution are assigned high similarity scores, whereas rare replacements are assigned negative scores. Scoring matrices have an implicit evolutionary model, which allows different matrices to target different evolutionary distances (Altschul, 1991; Dayhoff *et al.*, 1978; Henikoff and Henikoff, 1992; Muller *et al.*, 2002). Scoring matrices that target long evolutionary times (deep scoring matrices) allow more amino acid substitutions and gaps, whereas shallower matrices favor higher sequence identity and have higher gap penalties. The scoring matrix dictates the local alignment boundaries; increasing or decreasing the length of the optimal local alignment reduces the total alignment score. Likewise, changing the scoring matrix can result in a different alignment.

Ideally, a local alignment of homologous domains in different sequence contexts will align every residue in the homologous region, and no residues outside the domain boundaries, so that the alignment boundaries reflect the domain boundaries. Overextended alignments include additional sequence from outside the homologous domain boundaries. For example, in Figure 1 artificial, randomly shuffled, sequence from the query appears to be homologous to a real protein.


In this article, we show that scoring matrices have preferred alignment identities and alignment lengths, and that BLOSUM62 can produce overextended alignments, most often between sequences with >33% identity. We also show that using the correct scoring matrix can produce more accurate alignment boundaries. Finally, we show that we can produce more accurate alignment boundaries, even without true domain boundary knowledge, by using the initial BLOSUM62 alignment identity to specify a more appropriate scoring matrix.

2 METHODS

2.1 Construction of the RefProtDom 2 (RPD2) dataset

2.1.1 Selecting families for RPD2 For this study, we built an updated version of the RPD protein database (Gonzalez and Pearson,

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.



Deep scoring matrices can produce inaccurate alignment boundaries. Figure 1 shows an example of an overextended alignment created by BLASTP. The query was constructed using an E1-E2 ATPase (PF00122) domain from B0TE74_HELMI surrounded by shuffled sequence (dashed lines). This domain is homologous to the E1-E2 ATPase domain, also labeled PF00122, in the library sequence. The PF00122 domain extends from position 113

Table 1. Scoring matrices, gap penalties and mean identity, entropy and alignment length

Matrix	Open	Extend	Identity ^a	Entropy ^a	Length ^a
BLOSUM50	−10	−2	26%	0.24	178
BLOSUM62	−11	−1	30%	0.45	95
VT160	−12	−2	25%	0.28	155
VT140	−10	−1	31%	0.51	88
VT120	−11	−1	34%	0.63	67
VT100	−10	−1	40%	0.80	54
VT80	−11	−1	41%	0.82	54
VT40	−12	−1	65%	2.0	20
VT20	−15	−2	85%	3.3	11
VT10	−16	−2	93%	3.8	10

^aMeans measured from 136 random sequence searches (Fig. 3).

to 335 in the query. Any alignment that includes sequence from the query outside of the embedded domain includes shuffled sequence that is not homologous to the library sequence. In this example, the alignment extends from position 84 to 415 in the query, incorporating 109 residues of shuffled sequence or 33% of the total alignment length. The library sequence, like many proteins, consists of multiple domains. The alignment between these two sequences falsely indicates that shuffled sequence in the query is homologous to a neighboring Hydrolase (PF00702) domain in the library. BLASTP reports that the aligned sequences are 50% identical, but the homologous region is 64.1% identical, whereas the non-homologous flanking regions are 23% identical. The homologous region contributes 83% of the bit score (248.2 bits) and the non-homologous region only contributes 17%. This imbalance in the contributions of homologous compared with non-homologous regions to both alignment identity and score is a hallmark of overextended alignments.

3.2 Overextension occurs more frequently in alignments with higher sequence identity

To understand how often incorrect alignment boundaries occur, searches were performed with both BLASTP and SSEARCH, using BLOSUM62 (BL62) with the RPD2 query set and library. Each alignment boundary was measured and the results were divided into seven bins ranging from extremely incomplete (<−40 residues, i.e. >40 residues missing) to extremely overextended (>40 residues added; Fig. 2A). Although most of the alignment boundaries were within 10 residues of the embedded domain boundaries (71% BLASTP, 75% SSEARCH), BLASTP and SSEARCH also created incorrect alignment boundaries. Of the boundaries measured, 22% of BLASTP boundaries were incomplete and 7% were overextended, aligning random sequence with real protein residues. Seventeen percent of the SSEARCH boundaries were incomplete and 8% were overextended. Alignment identity was divided into quartiles. Each identity quartile shows similar representation within the group of ‘correct’ alignment boundaries (within ±10 residues of the embedded domain). In contrast, incomplete alignment boundaries are more




Fig. 2. Boundary accuracy and sequence identity. Using the RPD2 embedded domain queries and sequence library, pairwise protein sequence alignments were calculated with BLASTP (B) and SSEARCH (S) using BLOSUM62. Boundary accuracy was measured for both the beginning and end of alignments between known homologs with E -score $\leq 10^{-6}$ as detailed in Methods. Alignment inaccuracy of less than −10 residues indicates an incomplete alignment; >10 residues is considered overextension. In panel (A), alignment identities were divided into quartiles. The data from the searches were binned by boundary accuracy (top) and sequence identity (color). In panel (B), incorrect alignment boundaries were isolated and alignments were divided into six identity bins. The boundary accuracy is given by the color of the bar. Identity bins are inclusive at the maximum

common in low identity alignments, whereas overextended alignment boundaries are more common in high identity alignments. Most incomplete alignment boundaries (73% for BLASTP, 76% for SSEARCH) were from alignments in the lowest two identity quartiles. The opposite is true for overextended alignments, where most had identities in the top two quartiles (52% for BLASTP, 54% for SSEARCH). When incorrect alignments are examined independently, the percentage of the boundaries that is overextended increases with identity (Fig. 2B).

Figure 2 reports incomplete and overextended alignment boundaries for the 397 123 homologs that were identified by BLASTP and SSEARCH. Because RPD2 was built from diverse domain families, most of these homologs are distant, with a median identity of 33%. In practice, one rarely examines every

significant match, so we also counted incomplete and overextended boundaries for the top 100 significant hits with each query. For the top 100 hits, the median alignment identity increases to 52%. In this more closely related set, the percentage of overextended alignments increases to 8% for BLASTP and 10% for SSEARCH and incomplete alignment decreases to 8% and 5%, respectively.

Incomplete alignments can occur when homologous domains are evolutionarily distant, so that the alignment captures only the most conserved regions of the homology. This contrasts with traditional false negatives, where the homology is missed altogether. In the traditional case, the reduced sensitivity of pairwise sequence comparisons compared with model-based (PSI-BLAST, PSI-SEARCH, HMMER) or structure-based methods is well recognized (Pearson and Sierk, 2005). Incomplete alignments are another example of inadequate alignment sensitivity.

Overextension, while recognized in pairwise genomic alignments (Chao *et al.*, 1993), had not been systematically measured in pairwise protein alignments. Missed homologs can be identified using transitive homology, protein family models or structures. But strategies for removing non-homologous sequence from pairwise protein alignments have not been described.

3.3 Scoring matrices, identity and alignment length

Alignment overextension often results from a mismatch between the evolutionary distance between the homologous sequences and the target identity of the scoring matrix used in the alignment. Unlike global sequence alignments, which use the full length of each sequence, the scoring matrix determines local alignment boundaries. To understand how different scoring matrices produce different alignment boundaries, we used shuffled sequences as queries against the RPD2 library.

‘Deeper’ scoring matrices (scoring matrices targeted to more evolutionary change) produce longer less identical alignments by chance, whereas ‘shallower’ scoring matrices produce shorter higher identity alignments (Fig. 3). Here, the same 136 shuffled queries were used with each matrix, so the resulting trends in identity and alignment length reflect the average properties of the matrices themselves. The target identities with gaps are lower, and the alignment lengths longer, than the values estimated from the scoring matrix alone. Remarkably, the entropies calculated analytically from the scoring matrix alone track closely between the gapped and ungapped empirical mean entropies. Including gaps (black boxes) makes scoring matrices ‘deeper’, thus lowering identity and increasing alignment length compared with the same matrix without gaps (gray circles). Different scoring matrices can produce different alignment boundaries.

3.4 Selecting the correct scoring matrix gives correct domain boundaries

To illustrate how ‘correct’ scoring matrices—scoring matrices with target identities that match the evolutionary distance of the homologous domains—improve accuracy, we examined alignment boundary changes with different scoring matrices. Beginning with 16 640 overextended alignments, we tracked the boundary accuracy produced by six VT with increasing target identity (Fig. 4). The alignment with the smallest cumulative difference between the embedded domain boundaries and the




Fig. 3. Scoring matrix target identity, entropy and alignment length. Queries were constructed from 136 shuffled protein domains. SSEARCH was used to search against the RPD2 library with these shuffled queries using either the gap penalties given in Table 1 (black squares) or gap penalties of $-1000/-1000$ for open/extend (gray circles), which effectively creates alignments with no gaps. The identity and alignment length from the highest scoring alignment was selected from each query. The (A) mean identity, (B) mean entropy and (C) mean alignment length is given by the point, and the standard deviation is indicated by the error bars for each scoring matrix. The analytical entropy calculated from the scoring matrix is shown as open triangles in panel (B)

alignment boundaries was identified, and 10 realignments from each of the VT scoring matrices were randomly selected. The maximum boundary errors for both the initial BLOSUM62 and final best alignment are shown in Figure 4. All of the realignments corrected the overextended boundary to within ± 10 residues of the embedded domain, producing alignments with higher identities. As the identity of the initial alignment increases, the target identity of the matrix that produces the corrected alignment also increases. However, the matrix required did not correlate with the amount of overextension in the original BLOSUM62 alignment in this dataset. Nor was there any correlation in alignments that used alternate shuffling strategies for the embedded domains.

In general, lower target identity matrices (VT120, VT100, VT80) correct lower identity alignments (the filled symbols




Fig. 4. Selecting the scoring matrix that creates the best alignment. (A) Sequence pairs with >33% identity and overextended alignment boundaries were selected from the results of the similarity search performed using SSEARCH with BLOSUM62. Each sequence pair was realigned using VT120, 100, 80, 40, 20 and 10 (Table 1). Boundary accuracy was calculated for each alignment and the alignment with the smallest cumulative difference between the embedded domain boundaries and the alignment boundaries was selected. Symbol shape and color (black, open) indicate the scoring matrix used for the alignment; lines connect alignments between the same sequence pairs. (B) Maximum boundary inaccuracy across every scoring matrix for two sequence pairs in (A) is shown. The rounded dashed line to the left in panel (A) and the higher line between VT120 and VT80 in panel (B) show a low identity alignment corrected by VT40; the square dash-dot line to the right in panel (A) and flat between VT120 and VT10 in panel (B) shows a high identity alignment corrected by VT120

tend to be on the left of the final distribution) and higher target identity matrices (VT40, VT20, VT10) correct higher identity alignments (the open symbols tend to be on the right). But this is not always the case; sometimes a high identity alignment is corrected by a distant matrix (dash-dot line) and vice versa (rounded-dash line).

Anomalous matrices can correct overextension because alignment boundary correction is robust to matrix selection. Figure 4B shows two extreme examples, a deep matrix (VT120) correcting a high identity alignment (dash-dot line) and a shallow matrix (VT40) correcting a low identity alignment (rounded-dash line). In both cases, a wide range of scoring matrices correct the alignment, including a matrix at the predicted

Table 2. Identity required to realign using each scoring matrix

Matrix	Identity range
VT120	36–50%
VT100	50–60%
VT80	60–70%
VT40	70–80%
VT20	80–85%
VT10	>85%

Note: Values are inclusive at the maximum for each matrix.

target identity (for the red low identity alignment, VT120, VT100 and VT80 produce an alignment that is off by two residues, whereas VT40 is perfect). The robustness of boundary correction to scoring matrix choice allows us to approximate the ‘correct’ alignment identity from the initial (possibly overextended) BLOSUM62 identity.

Because high identity alignments tend to be corrected by shallow scoring matrices while lower identity alignments can be corrected by less shallow scoring matrices (Fig. 4), we attempted to correct BLOSUM62 alignments using the scoring matrices and thresholds shown in Table 2.

Forty-seven percent of overextended boundaries came from alignments with >36% identity and, therefore, were candidates for the realignment algorithm. Of the overextended boundaries that could be realigned, 97% had reduced overextension with 86% of the overextended boundaries moving within ± 10 residues of the embedded domain boundaries. Overall, including overextended alignments that were not realigned, the total amount of overextension was reduced from 8 to 5%.

Although the scoring matrix identity thresholds in Table 2 dramatically decrease overextension errors, they can also produce incomplete alignments (Fig. 5). In contrast to Figure 4, where we selected the most accurate alignment, Figure 5 shows the results of realignment based solely on the identity of the initial BLOSUM62 alignment (the thresholds in Table 2). Looking at all alignments with >36% identity, 16 411 alignment boundaries changed accuracy bins. Of the alignment boundaries that changed accuracy bins, 68% moved from being overextended (>10 residues, blue colors) to within ± 10 residues, whereas 20% moved from being within ± 10 residues or overextended to incomplete. Most (73%) of the realigned incomplete alignment boundaries fall into the $-20 : -11$ bin (orange). The most overextended alignments (>40 residues, Fig. 2) decreased by 2217 alignment boundaries, whereas the most incomplete alignments increased by 399 boundaries. The final distribution of all alignment boundaries had 7863 more boundaries within 10 residues of the embedded domain boundary and 3189 additional incomplete boundaries, or 2.5 additional boundaries within ± 10 residues for each additional incomplete boundary.

Alignment boundary correction is much more effective when applied to the highest scoring alignments. Focusing on the top 100 alignments from each query, 83% of the overextended boundaries were from alignments with >36% identity of which 90% moved within 10 residues of the embedded domain




Fig. 5. Realignment algorithm results only results from sequence pairs that were realigned by the algorithm are shown. Gray dashed bars indicate the initial boundary accuracy before realignment; colored bars indicate the final distribution of alignment boundary errors. The colors in the final distribution bars show the original accuracy before realignment

boundaries reducing the amount of overextension from 10 to 3%. The top 100 alignments produced many fewer incomplete alignments; 1645 boundaries moved to within 10 residues of the embedded domain, whereas only 233 boundaries became worse than less than -10 residues incomplete, a ratio of 7 corrected boundaries for each additional incomplete boundary.

4 DISCUSSION

Mismatches between the sequence identity of aligned homologous domains and the target identity of the scoring matrix used to produce the local sequence alignment can lead to overextended alignments (Figs. 1 and 2). Similarity scoring matrices have preferred alignment lengths and identity. Deep scoring matrices create longer alignments and have lower target identity compared with shallower matrices (Fig. 3). Alignments created by BLOSUM62, most often between sequences with higher identity ($>33\%$), can extend past the boundaries of the homologous domain to include non-homologous sequence (Fig. 2). Using a shallower scoring matrix that targets the correct sequence identity can correct overextension (Fig. 4). Predicting the scoring matrix that will lead to a better alignment, using initial (possibly overextended) identity given by BLOSUM62, can correct overextended alignments. In our RPD2 database, 37% of overextended alignments were corrected to within ± 10 residues, or 86% of the alignments with high enough identity ($>36\%$) to be considered for realignment. However, realignment has a cost; a fraction of correctly aligned domains are incompletely realigned.

The observation that ‘deep’ scoring matrices produce overextended alignments between domains that are less evolutionarily distant (have higher identity) than the scoring matrix target identity is not surprising, though the relationship between alignment boundaries (in contrast to internal alignment accuracy) and scoring matrices has not been extensively studied. Traditional internal alignment accuracy decreases as evolutionary distance

increases; different sequences are difficult to align accurately. In contrast, alignment overextension occurs most often when closely related sequences are aligned, and thus becomes more frequent as sequence databases grow.

As log-odds matrices, every scoring matrix has a target evolutionary distance, or percent identity, which can be approximated from the homologous replacement frequencies that are the numerator of the log-odds ratio (Altschul, 1991). As evolutionary distance and the number of replacements increase, the replacement frequencies for identities decrease and the non-identical replacement frequencies increase, which reduces the target identity of the matrix when aligning random sequences (Fig. 3). Overextension occurs when a scoring matrix that models a longer period of evolution (a deeper scoring matrix) by allowing more mutations is used to align sequences with less evolutionary change. A deep scoring matrix produces a less identical alignment because it accepts more amino acid replacements. Gap penalties also modify alignment length and identity; increased gap penalties produce shorter higher identity alignments, whereas lower gap penalties produce longer lower identity alignments (Fig. 3). Lower mismatch penalties and lower gap penalties in deep matrices allow the local alignment algorithm to add additional identities that are occurring by chance from non-homologous sequence for the sake of modest increases in score. Thus, in Figure 1, 83% of the score was produced by 67% of the alignment. Overextended alignments are locally optimal, but they are not biologically correct.

RPD2 was designed to simulate the most common similarity search—searches against full-length proteins in a comprehensive sequence database. RPD2 sequences were selected from the set of sequences annotated by Pfam release 26, which samples both SwissProt and TrEMBL protein sequences. The RPD2 library is large (528 742 sequences) and diverse. Queries were engineered from long (>200 residues) protein domains, allowing BLOSUM62 searches to identify distant homologs. These domains are surrounded by shuffled protein sequence, providing known alignment boundaries. Alignments that extend into the flanking random sequence are thus guaranteed to be non-homologous.

Our initial searches with 136 independent embedded domain queries produced both incomplete alignments (22% BLASTP, 17% SSEARCH, both with BLOSUM62) and overextended alignments (7% BLASTP, 8% SSEARCH). Incomplete alignments reflect the reduced sensitivity of pairwise alignment compared with the HMM based methods used to annotate the Pfam domains in RPD2, and the fact that in the diverse set of homologous RPD2 domains, half of the detectable homologs share $<33\%$ sequence identity.

In characterizing $>2 \times 200\,000$ alignment boundaries in the 136 query domain searches, we consider far more distant alignments than would typically be examined during the genome annotation process, where sequences sharing at least 40% identity might be used to transfer annotation. Restricting the analysis to the top 100 significant hits for each query increases the median alignment identity to 53%, which in turn decreases incomplete alignments to 5%, and increases the overextension to 10%. Restricting the analysis to the top 25 homologs further decreases incomplete alignment to 2%, whereas increasing overextension to 11%. When the thresholds in Table 2 are used to correct the

top 100 alignments for each query, overextension is corrected 73% of the time, whereas incomplete alignments are produced only about 10% of the time. For the top 25, overextension is corrected 86% of the time, whereas alignments become incomplete only 1% of the time.

We believe our estimates of alignment overextension (7–10% of alignments) are conservative, both because sequence databases are growing, allowing similarity searches to identify closer homologs, and because many proteins comprise multiple domains. In this study, we examine alignment overextension from a single domain. Many proteins contain multiple domains separated by non-homologous regions; proteins that contain multiple widely dispersed common domains, like Ankyrin, fn3 or SH3 domains, will have many more chances to overextend across non-homologous regions.

Although we understand why high identity alignments might overextend when aligned with low target–identity scoring matrices like BLOSUM62, matrix/target–identity mismatch only accounts for about half of the overextensions we observed. In our diverse sequence set, 53% of overextensions occur in alignments that are <36% identical. Unfortunately, we cannot predict which lower identity alignments will overextend. The amount of overextension does not correlate well with the difference between alignment identity and scoring matrix target identity. Likewise, overextension does not occur significantly more often in domains that have more identity at their ends. The increased frequency of overextended boundaries in alignments between high identity sequences (Fig. 2B) is the only meaningful trend that we identified.

In contrast to high identity overextension, where the difference in target–identity between the homologous region and the scoring matrix can explain overextension, low identity overextension may simply reflect the propensity of deep matrices to produce long alignments, even between unrelated sequences (Fig. 3). The long alignments in Figure 3 are not statistically significant, but when they occur by chance near a (low identity) homologous domain, they can contribute to overextension. Overextension occurs more frequently in higher identity alignments because of target–identity mismatch, but the majority of overextension we measured occurs by chance in low identity alignments, because most of our alignments are low identity.

In this study, we have focused on overextension in pairwise alignments because pairwise similarity searches are widely used to annotate newly sequenced genomes. Alignment overextension also occurs with model-based searches like PSI-BLAST; we initially identified overextension as the major cause of model contamination with PSI-BLAST (Gonzalez and Pearson, 2010a). Our strategy for reducing overextension—re-alignment with a more correct scoring matrix—is most easily applied to pairwise alignment because a traditional non–position-specific scoring matrix like BLOSUM62 or VT120 has an easily characterized target identity and the alignment between two sequences has a natural evolutionary distance. It is more difficult to interpret the ‘distance’ between a sequence and a position-specific scoring matrix or HMM, and it is unclear how such models might be scaled to reduce overextension.

The expansion of modern protein databases has led to an increase in the identification of higher identity homologs. Accurate function prediction requires a higher level of sequence identity and an accurate alignment, two factors that are at odds with deep scoring matrices. With modern comprehensive databases, it is common to identify many homologs that are >40% identical. In our diverse RPD2 protein set, the median sequence identity for the top 100 homologs was 53%, much higher than the target identity range for BLOSUM62. With more high identity homologs and increased sequence and structural annotation, pairwise alignments can provide essential insights to the function of novel proteins, but only if the alignment boundaries are accurate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank R. Clark and F. Elliot for technical support, and A. J. Mackey for useful discussions. They also thank a reviewer for suggesting an explanation for low identity overextension.

Conflict of Interest: none declared.

REFERENCES

- Altschul,S.F. (1991) Amino acid substitution matrices from an information theoretic perspective. *J. Mol. Biol.*, **219**, 555–565.
- Altschul,S.F. *et al.* (1997) Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **25**, 3389–3402.
- Arslan,A.N. *et al.* (2001) A new approach to sequence comparison: normalized sequence alignment. *Bioinformatics*, **17**, 327–337.
- Brenner,S.E. *et al.* (1998) Assessing sequence comparison methods with reliable structurally identified distant evolutionary relationships. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **95**, 6073–6078.
- Camacho,C. *et al.* (2009) Blast+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinform.*, **10**, 421.
- Chao,K.M. *et al.* (1993) Locating well-conserved regions within a pairwise alignment. *Comput. Applic. Biosci.*, **9**, 387–396.
- Dayhoff,M. *et al.* (1978) A model of evolutionary change in proteins. In: *Atlas of Protein Sequence and Structure*. Vol. 5, National Biomedical Research Foundation, Washington DC, pp. 345–358.
- Gonzalez,M.W. and Pearson,W.R. (2010a) Homologous over-extension: a challenge for iterative similarity searches. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **38**, 2177–2189.
- Gonzalez,M.W. and Pearson,W.R. (2010b) RefProtDom: a protein database with improved domain boundaries and homology relationships. *Bioinformatics*, **26**, 2361–2361.
- Henikoff,S. and Henikoff,J. (1992) Amino-acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **89**, 10915–10919.
- Muller,T. *et al.* (2002) Estimating amino acid substitution models: A comparison of dayhoff's estimator, the resolvent approach and a maximum likelihood method. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **19**, 8–13.
- Pearson,W.R. (1995) Comparison of methods for searching protein sequence databases. *Protein Sci.*, **4**, 1145–1160.
- Pearson,W.R. (2000) Flexible sequence similarity searching with the FASTA3 program package. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, **132**, 185–219.
- Pearson,W.R. and Sierk,M.L. (2005) The limits of protein sequence comparison? *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, **15**, 254–260.
- Punta,M. *et al.* (2012) The pfam protein families database. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **40**, D290–D301.
- Reese,J.T. and Pearson,W.R. (2002) Empirical determination of effective gap penalties for sequence comparison. *Bioinformatics*, **18**, 1500–1507.