

# Algorithms in Bioinformatic

Julian Löffler

University of Freiburg, Germany

Advisor: Omer Alkhnbashi

December 20, 2018

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Pairwise Sequence-Alignment</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Needleman-Wunsch-Algorithm . . . . .	1
1.2	example: . . . . .	2
1.3	Gotoh-Algorithm . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Phylogeny/Clustering</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	UPGMA/WPGMA . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Multiple Sequence-Alignment</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Needleman-Wunsch-Algorithm for $n = 3$ sequences . . . . .	9
3.2	Sum-of-Pairs-Algorithm . . . . .	9
3.3	Feng-Doolittle-Algorithm . . . . .	9
	<b>References</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Pairwise Sequence-Alignment

Pairwise sequence alignment methods are used to find the best-matching piecewise (local or global) alignments of two query sequences. Pairwise alignments can only be used between two sequences at a time, but they are efficient to calculate and are often used for methods that do not require extreme precision (such as searching a database for sequences with high similarity to a query). The technique of dynamic programming can be applied to produce global alignments via the Needleman-Wunsch algorithm, and local alignments via the Smith-Waterman algorithm. In typical usage, protein alignments use a substitution matrix to assign scores to amino-acid matches or mismatches, and a gap penalty for matching an amino acid in one sequence to a gap in the other. DNA and RNA alignments may use a scoring matrix, but in practice often simply assign a positive match score, a negative mismatch score, and a negative gap penalty. (In standard dynamic programming, the score of each amino acid position is independent of the identity of its neighbors, and therefore base stacking effects are not taken into account.)([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sequence\\_alignment#Pairwise\\_alignment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sequence_alignment#Pairwise_alignment))

## 1.1 Needleman-Wunsch-Algorithm

Needleman-Wunsch is used for to calculate the pairwise alignments of sequences. The idea is to use dynamic programming, to calculate the optimal alignment of two sequences  $seq_1, seq_2$  (or more general for two strings), and store information, which sequence of operations we have to perform, to convert  $seq_1$  to  $seq_2$ . Operations are insertions ( $\uparrow$ ), deletions ( $\leftarrow$ ) and matches ( $\nwarrow$ ). An insertion means, we align a gap in  $seq_1$  to a character in  $seq_2$ . A deletion means, we align a character in  $seq_1$  to a gap in  $seq_2$ . A match means, we match the current characters in  $seq_1$  and  $seq_2$ . Let  $S, T$  be matrices of size  $|seq_1| + 1 \times |seq_2| + 1$ , in  $S$  we store scores and in  $T$  we store traceback cells, traceback cells are lists of tuples of predecessors of a cell, of the form (operation, predecessor) The algorithm works as follows:

1. Input: 2 sequences of length  $m, n$ .
2. Initialize  $S, T$ :
  - $S[0][0] = 0, S[0][j] = gapcost * j, S[i][0] = gapcost * i,$   
for  $1 \leq i \leq |seq_1| + 1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq |seq_2| + 1$
  - $T[0][0] = [], T[0][j] = [(\leftarrow, T[0][j-1])], T[i][0] = [(\uparrow, T[i-1][0])],$   
for  $1 \leq i \leq |seq_1| + 1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq |seq_2| + 1$
3. Calculate the rest of the matrix.:
  - $S[i][j] = max((\nwarrow, S[i-1][j-1] + score(seq_1[i], seq_2[j])), (\leftarrow, S[i][j-1]), (\uparrow, S[i-1][j]))$
  - $T[i][j]$  is the list of predecessors, which contains everything that is a maximum in the above case.

4. The bottom right element in S, i.e.  $S[-1][-1]$ , stores the score of the optimal alignment,
5. The bottom right element in T, i.e.  $T[-1][-1]$ , stores the traceback cell of the optimal alignment.

To obtain all paths back to the root  $T[0][0]$ , we traverse through all predecessors, until we reach  $T[0][0]$ .

## 1.2 example:

- Consider the sequences AAT and AAC,
- Scoring: match = 1, mismatch = -1, gap penalty = -1.
- 1. Initialize matrices S,T:

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -2. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 2. calc  $S[1][1]$ ,  $T[1][1]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & 0. \\ -2. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 2. calc  $S[1][2]$ ,  $T[1][2]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & 0. \\ -2. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 3. calc  $S[1][3]$ ,  $T[1][3]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 4. calc  $S[2][1]$ ,  $T[2][1]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 0. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \uparrow & 0 \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 5. calc  $S[2][2]$ ,  $T[2][2]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 2. & 0. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \swarrow & \uparrow & \swarrow \\ \uparrow & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 6. calc  $S[2][3]$ ,  $T[2][3]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 2. & 1. \\ -3. & 0. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nearrow & \nwarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nwarrow & | & \nwarrow \\ \uparrow & \uparrow & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 7. calc  $S[3][1]$ ,  $T[3][1]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 2. & 1. \\ -3. & -1. & 0. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nearrow & \nwarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nwarrow & | & \nwarrow \\ \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- 8. calc  $S[3][2]$ ,  $T[3][2]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 2. & 1. \\ -3. & -1. & 1. & 0. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nearrow & \nwarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nwarrow & | & \nwarrow \\ \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \end{bmatrix}$$

- 9. calc  $S[3][3]$ ,  $T[3][3]$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0. & -1. & -2. & -3. \\ -1. & 1. & 0. & -1. \\ -2. & 0. & 2. & 1. \\ -3. & -1. & 1. & 1. \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} - & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nearrow & \nwarrow & \leftarrow \\ \uparrow & \nwarrow & | & \nwarrow \\ \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \nwarrow \end{bmatrix}$$

- Our traceback matrix stored all predecessors of each cell, so we simply track back and obtain the set of tracebacks

$$tracebacks = \{[\nwarrow, \nwarrow, \nwarrow]\}$$

In this case there is only one traceback.

- The optimal alignment is obtained by iterating over the traceback. We start at the start of the sequences. And handle each traceback element as follows.
  - If we read  $\nwarrow$ , we align the current characters and move forward 1 position in both sequences.
  - If we read  $\leftarrow$ , we align a gap "-" to the current character in  $seq_2$  align and move forward 1 position in  $seq_2$ .
  - If we read  $\uparrow$ , we align a gap "-" to the current character in  $seq_1$  align and move forward 1 position in  $seq_1$ .

If we do that for our example, we obtain the alignment:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & A & T \\ A & A & C \end{array}$$

### 1.3 Gotoh-Algorithm

Gotohs algorithm is similar to needleman Wunsch. Just the recursion changes, we are now using 3 matrices D,Q,P, where the recursions are as follows:

$$D[i][j] = \max(D[i-1][j-1] + w(a, b))$$

$$P[i][j] = \max(D[i-1][j] + g(1), P[i-1][j] + \beta)$$

$$Q[i][j] = \max(D[i][j-1] + g(1), Q[i][j-1] + \beta)$$

The traceback now goes through those 3 matrices. We handle it as before, and store the operations in a single traceback matrix.

## 2 Phylogeny/Clustering

### 2.1 UPGMA/WPGMA

We now explain UPGMA and WPGMA, based on [1, 2]. Consider some set of sequences, which is shown in Figure 1.

```

A:  TCAACTAC
B:  ACTGCAAA
C:  GGCTGTAA
D:  AGTTGCAA
E:  TTTGAACT

```

Figure 1: Example sequences

The aim is **grouping** the most **similar sequences**, regardless of their evolutionary rate or phylogenetic affinities. **Unweighted / Weighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic Mean (UPGMA/WPGMA)** is a hierarchical clustering method used for the **creation of guide trees**. The algorithm works as follows:

1. Compute the **distance between each pair of sequences**.
2. Treat **each sequence** as a **cluster  $C$**  by itself.
3. **Merge the two closest clusters**. The distance between two clusters is the **average distance between all their sequences**:

$$d(C_i, C_j) = \frac{1}{|C_i||C_j|} \sum_{r \in C_i, s \in C_j} d(r, s)$$

where  $C_i, C_j$  are clusters and  $i \neq j$ .

4. Repeat 2. and 3. until only one cluster remains.

In **WPGMA** the **distance between clusters** is calculated as a **simple average**:

$$d(C_i \cup C_j, C_k) = \frac{d(C_i, C_k) + d(C_j, C_k)}{2}$$

WPGMA is computationally easier than **UPGMA**. **Unequal numbers of taxa** in the clusters cause problems, this means the distances in the original matrix **do not contribute equally** to the intermediate calculations. The branches do not preserve the original distances, the final result is therefore said to be **weighted**.

Clustering works only if the data are **ultrametric**. Ultrametric distances are defined by the satisfaction of the **three-point condition**:

- For any three taxa it holds:

$$d(A, C) \leq \max(d(A, B), d(B, C))$$

So we assume that all taxa evolve with the same constant rate. The runtime is  $O(n^3)$  for the trivial approach,  $O(n^2 \log(n))$ , when using a heap for each cluster and  $O(k3^k n^2)/O(n^2)$  implementations for special cases. (by Fionn Murtagh, by Day and Edelsbrunner)

**Example 1** (UPGMA example)

Let  $A, B, C, D, E$  be sequences. Say we have calculated a distance matrix  $D$  using a pairwise alignment algorithm, which were explained in Section 1.  $D$  is shown in Figure 2

	A	B	C	D	E
A	0	8	4	6	8
B	8	0	8	8	4
C	4	8	0	6	8
D	6	8	6	0	8
E	8	4	8	8	0

Figure 2: Distance matrix  $D$  of A,B,C,D,E

We now want to create the guide tree for sequences  $A, B, C, D, E$ . The sequences are from now on treated as clusters.  $\{A\}, \{B\}, \{C\}, \{D\}, \{E\}$

1. Figure 3 illustrates the initialization of the algorithm. We start with the whole distance matrix and create a guide tree, which consists just of leaf nodes that represent the clusters.




Figure 3: Initialization. On the left side, we see the distance matrix  $D$ . On the right side we see the guide tree.

2. Figure 4 illustrates this step of the algorithm.  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$  are the closest clusters, so the algorithm merges  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$  into  $\{A, C\}$ . In the guide tree a new node is added, and nodes  $A$  and  $C$  connected to it. Each branch gets a total distance of  $\frac{d(\{A\}, \{C\})}{2} = \frac{4}{2}$ .




Figure 4: Merge of  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$ . On the left side, we see the distance matrix  $D$ . On the right side we see the guide tree, where the orange colored nodes branches represent the changes made to the guide tree.

3. Figure 5 illustrates the distance matrices, before and after the merge of  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$ . The distance between  $\{A, C\}$  and the other clusters is the *average distance between all their sequences*. Example: the new distance between  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{B\}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(\{A, C\}, \{B\}) &= \frac{1}{|\{A, C\}||\{B\}|} (d(\{A\}, \{B\}) + d(\{C\}, \{B\})) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} (8 + 8) = 8
 \end{aligned}$$






Figure 5: Recalculation of distances, after the merge of  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$ . On the left side, we see the old distance matrix. On the right side we see the new distance matrix, where  $\{A\}$  and  $\{C\}$  are merged.

4. Figure 6 illustrates this step of the algorithm.  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$  are the closest clusters, such that the algorithm merges  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$  into  $\{B,E\}$ . In the guide tree a new node is added, and nodes  $B, E$  are connected to it. It assigns  $\frac{d(\{B\},\{E\})}{2} = \frac{4}{2} = 2$  to each branch.




Figure 6: Merge of  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$ . On the left side, we see the distance matrix. On the right side we see the guide tree, where the orange colored nodes branches represent the changes made to the guide tree.

5. Figure 7 illustrates the distance matrices, before and after the merge of  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$ . The distance between  $\{B, E\}$  and the other clusters is the *average distance between all their sequences*.




Figure 7: Recalculation of distances, after the merge of  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$ . On the left side, we see the old distance matrix. On the right side we see the new distance matrix, where  $\{B\}$  and  $\{E\}$  are merged.

6. Figure 8 illustrates this step of the algorithm.  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$  are the closest clusters, the algorithm merges  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$  into  $\{A, C, D\}$ . Again a new node is introduced in the guide tree, to which we connect D and the common node of A and C. It assigns  $\frac{d(\{A, C\}, \{D\})}{2} = \frac{6}{2} = 3$  total length to each branch. Observe, that the 1 is obtained calculating  $3 - 2 = 1$ .




Figure 8: Merge of  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$ . On the left side, we see the distance matrix. On the right side we see the guide tree, where the orange colored nodes branches represent the changes made to the guide tree.

7. Figure 9 illustrates the distance matrices, before and after the merge of  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$ . The distance between  $\{A, C, D\}$  and  $\{B, E\}$  is the average distance between all their sequences.




Figure 9: Recalculation of distances, after the merge of  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$ . On the left side, we see the old distance matrix. On the right side we see the new distance matrix, where  $\{A, C\}$  and  $\{D\}$  are merged.

8. Figure 10 illustrates this step of the algorithm.  $\{A, C, D\}$  and  $\{B, E\}$  are remaining. The algorithm merges  $\{A, C, D\}$  and  $\{B, E\}$  into  $\{A, C, D, B, E\}$ . In the guide tree a new node is introduced, the node which connects A, C and D and the node which connects B and E, are connected to it. The algorithm assigns  $\frac{d(\{A, C, D\}, \{B, E\})}{2} = \frac{8}{2} = 4$  total length to each branch. Observe, that the 1 is obtained calculating  $4 - 3 = 1$ . Observe, that the 2 is obtained calculating  $4 - 2 = 2$ .




Figure 10: Merge of  $\{A,C,D\}$  and  $\{B,E\}$ . On the left side, we see the distance matrix. On the right side we see the guide tree, where the orange colored nodes branches represent the changes made to the guide tree.

9. There are no more clusters to merge, the algorithm terminates. Figure 11 illustrates the final state of the distance matrix and guide tree.




Figure 11: On the left side, we see the final distance matrix. On the right side we see the final guide tree

### 3 Multiple Sequence-Alignment

#### 3.1 Needleman-Wunsch-Algorithm for $n = 3$ sequences

#### 3.2 Sum-of-Pairs-Algorithm

#### 3.3 Feng-Doolittle-Algorithm

## References

- [1] R. Durbin, S. R. Eddy, A. Krogh, and G. Mitchison, *Biological Sequence Analysis: Probabilistic Models of Proteins and Nucleic Acids*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [2] A. Apostolico, M. Comin, A. W. M. Dress, and L. Parida, “Ultrametric networks: a new tool for phylogenetic analysis,” *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, vol. 8, p. 7, 2013.