

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

PROTEIN FOLDING: PLANAR CONFIGURATION SPACES OF DISC  
ARRANGEMENTS AND HINGED POLYGONS: *PROTEIN FOLDING IN*  
*FLATLAND*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science in Computer Science

by

Clinton Bowen

August 2014

The thesis of Clinton Bowen is approved:

---

Dr. Silvia Fernandez

---

Date

---

Dr. John Dye

---

Date

---

Dr. Csaba Tóth, Chair

---

Date

California State University, Northridge

# Table of Contents

<b>Signature page</b> . . . . .	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b> . . . . .	<b>iv</b>
 <b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Background</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
1.1 Graphs . . . . .	1
1.1.1 Trees . . . . .	2
1.1.2 Ordered Trees . . . . .	2
1.1.3 Graph Isomorphism . . . . .	2
1.2 Linkages. . . . .	5
1.3 Polygonal Linkages . . . . .	5
1.3.1 Disk Arrangements . . . . .	6
1.4 Configuration Spaces . . . . .	8
1.4.1 Configuration Spaces of Linkages . . . . .	8
1.4.2 Configuration Spaces of Polygonal Linkages . . . . .	9
1.4.3 Configuration Spaces of Disk Arrangements . . . . .	9
1.5 Satisfiability . . . . .	10
1.5.1 Not All Equal 3 SAT Problem . . . . .	10
1.5.2 Planar 3 SAT Problem . . . . .	10
1.5.3 Logic Engine . . . . .	10
1.5.4 Construction of the Logic Engine. . . . .	10
1.5.5 Encoding the Logic Engine. . . . .	11
1.6 Problem . . . . .	11
1.6.1 Problem Statement . . . . .	12
1.6.2 Decidability of Problem . . . . .	12

## ABSTRACT

PROTEIN FOLDING: PLANAR CONFIGURATION SPACES OF DISC ARRANGEMENTS AND

HINGED POLYGONS: *PROTEIN FOLDING IN FLATLAND*

By

Clinton Bowen

Master of Science in Computer Science

abstract goes here

## Chapter 1

### Background

In this section, we cover the background subjects needed to formally pose the problem and present solutions in this thesis. We start with two types of combinatorial structures, linkages and polygonal linkages. We then discuss the configuration spaces of linkages and polygonal linkages. We then look into an alternate representation of linkages, disk arrangements and state the disk arrangement theorem. We then look at satisfiability problems and then review a framework, the logic engine, which can encode a type of satisfiability problem. Finally, we cover the basic definitions of algorithm complexity for **P** and **NP**.

#### 1.1 Graphs

A *graph* is an ordered pair  $G = (V, E)$  comprising of a set  $V$  of vertices and a set  $E$  of edges or lines. Every edge  $e \in E$ , is an unordered pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in V$  ( the edge represents their adjacency,  $e = \{u, v\}$ ). With this definition of a graph, there are no loops (self adjacent vertices,  $\{v, v\}$ ) or multi-edges (several edges between the same pair of vertices).

A motivation for using graphs is modelling physical objects like molecules. This requires an embedding into the plane or  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . An *embedding* of the graph  $G = (V, E)$  is an injective mapping  $\Pi : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$  (see Figure 1.1).




Figure 1.1: An embedding of the Peterson graph.

##### 1.1.0.1 Edge Crossings

We define *plane embeddings* of a graph to be an embedding where the following degenerate configurations do not occur:

- (i) the interiors of two or more edges intersect, or
- (ii) an edge passes through a vertex




Figure 1.2: These figures exhibit the 4 types of edge crossings.

A graph is called *planar* if it admits a plane embedding. A *plane graph* is a graph together with a plane embedding.

### 1.1.1 Trees

A *path* is a sequence of vertices in which every two consecutive vertices are connected by an edge. A *simple cycle* of a graph is a sequence,  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{t-1}, v_t)$ , of distinct vertices such that every two consecutive vertices are connected by an edge, and the last vertex,  $v_t$ , connects to  $v_1$ . A graph is *connected* if for any two vertices, there exists a path between the two points.


A *tree* is a graph that has no simple cycles and is connected.

### 1.1.2 Ordered Trees

An *ordered tree* is a tree together with a cyclic order of the neighbors for each vertex. Embeddings of ordered trees are equivalent if for each node the counter-clockwise ordering of adjacent nodes are the same.

### 1.1.3 Graph Isomorphism

To determine when two graphs are equivalent, we need to define an isomorphism for graphs. Given two graphs  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ , a *graph isomorphism* is a bijective function  $f : V_1 \mapsto V_2$  such that for any two vertices  $u, v \in V_1$ , we have  $\{u, v\} \in E_1$ , if and only if  $(f(u), f(v)) \in E_2$ .



(a) An embedding of the Peterson graph with a simple cycle of  $(2, 7, 9, 6, 1, 0, 5, 8, 3)$ .




Figure 1.4: A tree with two embeddings with different cyclic orderings around vertices.

Graph	Vertices	Edges
$G_1$	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	$\{ab, (b, c), (c, d), (d, e), (e, a)\}$
$G_2$	$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$	$\{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 5), (5, 1)\}$

Table 1.1: Two graphs that are isomorphic with the alphabetical isomorphism  $f(a) = 1, f(b) = 2, f(c) = 3, f(d) = 4, f(e) = 5$ .




Figure 1.5: This figure depicts the graph isomorphism shown in Table (??) between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in the plane.



## 1.2 Linkages




Figure 1.6: An embedded linkage

When graphs model physical objects, distances between adjacent vertices matter. The length assignment of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $\ell : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ . A *linkage* is a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with a length assignment  $\ell : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ .

We consider embeddings of a graph that respects the length assignment. A *realization* of a linkage,  $G$  and  $\ell$ , is an embedding of a graph,  $\Pi$ , such that for every edge  $\{u, v\} \in E$ ,  $\ell(\{u, v\}) = |\Pi(u) - \Pi(v)|$ . A *plane realization* is a plane embedding with the property,  $\ell(\{u, v\}) = |\Pi(u) - \Pi(v)|$ .

## 1.3 Polygonal Linkages




Figure 1.7: (a) A polygonal linkage with a non-convex polygon and two hinge points corresponding to three polygons. Note that hinge points correspond to two distinct polygons. (b) Illustrating that two hinge points can correspond to the same boundary point of a polygon.

A generalization of linkages are polygonal linkages where the edges of given lengths are replaced by rigid polygons. Formally, a *polygonal linkage* is an ordered pair  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a finite set of polygons and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a finite set of hinges; a *hinge*  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  corresponds to two points on the boundary of two distinct polygons in  $\mathcal{P}$ . A *realization* of a polygonal linkage is an interior-disjoint placement of congruent copies of

the polygons in  $\mathcal{P}$  such that the points corresponding to each hinge are identified (Fig. ??). This definition of realization rules well known geometric dissections (e.g. Fig. 1.8).




Figure 1.8: Two configurations of polygonal linkage where the polygons touch on boundary segments instead of hinges. These two realizations of the polygonal linkage are invalid to our definitions.




Figure 1.9: (a) A polygonal linkage with a non-convex polygon and a hinge point corresponding to three polygons. (b) A polygonal linkage with 8 regular polygons.

### 1.3.1 Disk Arrangements

It turns out the disk arrangements are an equivalent way to to represent plane graphs. By representing vertices as interior disjoint disks and by representing edges as as points of intersections (contact), *kissing points* between two disks. The graph corresponding to a given disk arrangement,  $\mathcal{D}$ , is said to be the *contact graph*. A *disk arrangement* is a set,  $\mathcal{D}$ , of pairwise interior-disjoint disks in the plane,  $\mathcal{D} = \{C_i\}_{i=1}^n$ .  $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^n$  such that for any circle  $C \in \{C_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $C$

A classical result by Thurston and Koebe is that every disk arrangement embedded into the plane had a corresponding plane graph.

**Theorem 1.3.1** (Disk Packing Theorem). *For every graph  $G$ , there is a disk arrangement in the plane whose contact graph is isomorphic to  $G$ .*

**Proposition 1.3.1.** *For every linkage  $L$ , there is a disk arrangement in the plane whose contact graph is isomorphic to  $L$ .*

1. Show the relation between polygonal linkages and disk arrangements.

#### 1.3.1.1 Ordered Disk Arrangement

Suppose we're given a tree. By the disk packing theorem we can ascertain a sense of order for the isomorphic disk packing. An *ordered disk arrangement* is a rooted tree in which the counter-clockwise ordering of adjacent vertices.




Figure 1.10: This example represents a disk arrangement transformed to and from its corresponding graph  $G_2$

### 1.3.1.2 Disk Packing Confinement Problem

Given inputs of radii By adding constraints to the embeddings of disk arrangements, we can devise realizability problem by a volume argument.

1. Round 1: Start with a disk of unit radius.
2. Round 2: Add two kissing disks, each of diameter 2, that do not intersect with any other disk (they may kiss other disk).
3. Round 3 and Higher: For each new kissing disk added, add two more non-intersecting kissing disks of diameter 2 to it.

For each round  $i$  we are adding  $2^{(i-1)}$  disks, each with an of  $\pi$ . The area that the disk arrangement is bounded by at round  $i$  is a box of length  $2 \cdot (2 \cdot (i-1) + 1)$  totalling to an area of  $(4 \cdot i^2 - 4 \cdot i + 1)$ . Meanwhile the total area of the disk arrangement at round  $i$  is  $\pi \cdot (2^i - 1)$ . The exponential growth rate of the disk packing will exceed its bounded area for sufficiently large  $i$ .

Figure (1.11) illustrates the iterative problem. The problem with this is that the area in which is necessary to contain this disk growing disk arrangement will exceed the area needed to contain it.




Figure 1.11: The gradual growth of disk arrangements by adding two kissing disks to each of the previously generated disks. By continuing this arrangement growth, the space needed to contain the kissing disks will exceed the area containing the disk arrangements.

## 1.4 Configuration Spaces

Just as one can compose colors or forms, so one can compose motions.

Alexander Calder, 1933

We'd like to describe motions and range of motions of embedded graphs, linkages, polygonal linkages, and disk arrangements. Table 1.4 provides the definition of *reconfiguration* for each type of object covered so far:

Object Type	Definition of Reconfiguration
Graph	a continuous motion of the vertices that preserves the lengths of the edges and never causes the edges to intersect.
Linkage	same as graph
Polygonal Linkage	a continuous motion of polygons that preserves shapes of polygons, hinge point pairings, and never causes the polygonal sides to intersect.
Disk Arrangement	a continuous motion of disks that preserves disk radii, pairs of contact points, and never causes disks to intersect.

### 1.4.1 Configuration Spaces of Linkages

Let's focus on the space of embeddings of a linkage. If there are  $n$  vertices of a linkage, the *configuration space* of a linkage is said to be a vector space of dimension  $2 \cdot n$  where edge length is preserved. A *configuration space* for a linkage  $G$  and corresponding proper embedding,  $L_1$  is said to be for any other




Figure 1.12: (a) and (b) show a linkage in two embeddings.

proper embedding of a linkage  $G$ ,  $L_2$ , such that the lengths of every edge of  $G$  is preserved between the two embeddings, i.e.:

$$l((u, v)) = |L_1(u) - L_1(v)| = |L_2(u) - L_2(v)|$$

Equivalent embeddings include translations and rotations about the center of mass on  $L(V)$ . We further our embeddings by requiring that one vertex is pinned to the point of origin on the plane as well as a neighboring

vertex.

**Theorem 1.4.1** ([?, ?]Carpenter's Rule Theorem). *Every realization of a linkage can be continuously moved (without self-intersection) to any other realization. In other words, the realization space of such a linkage is always connected.*




Figure 1.13: A linkage whose complete configuration space is discontinuous. These two examples above are two configurations of the same linkage that cannot continuously transform into the other without edge crossing.

A *reconfiguration* of a linkage whose graph is  $G = (V, E)$  and length assignment is  $\ell$  is a continuous function  $f : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{2 \cdot |V|}$  specifying a configuration of the linkage for every  $t \in [0, 1]$  where length assignment  $\ell$  is preserved, edges do not cross and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|t_1 - t_2| < \delta$  implies

$$|f(t_1) - f(t_2)| < \varepsilon$$

## 1.4.2 Configuration Spaces of Polygonal Linkages

Some text goes here

## 1.4.3 Configuration Spaces of Disk Arrangements




Figure 1.14: A linkage whose complete configuration space is discontinuous. These two examples above are two configurations of the same linkage that cannot continuously transform into the other without edge crossing.

## 1.5 Algorithm Complexity

*Algorithms* are a set of procedural calculations. Determining the time and space that algorithms use determine their efficiency. The *worst-case* running time is the largest possible running time that an algorithm could have over all inputs of a given size  $N$ . *Brute force* is when an algorithm tries all possibilities to see if any formulates a solution. An algorithm is said to be *efficient* if it achieves qualitatively better worst-case performance, at an analytical level, than brute force search.

### 1.5.1 Running Time

For combinatorial problems, as the number of inputs of the problem grows, the solution space tends to grow exponentially. In general, as problems grow, it is desirable to minimize the running time for an algorithm. *Polynomial running time* is if the input size increases from  $N$  to  $2 \cdot N$ , the bound on the running time increases from  $c \cdot (2N)^d = c \cdot 2^d \cdot N^d$ .

## 1.6 Satisfiability

**Problem 1.6.1** (Satisfiability Problem). Let  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be boolean variables, and  $t_i \in \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\bar{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . A *clause* is said to be a disjunction of distinct terms:

$$t_1 \vee \cdots \vee t_{j_k} = C_k$$

Then the *satisfiability problem* is the decidability of a conjunction of a set of clauses, i.e.:

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^m C_i$$

[?] A *3-SAT problem* is a SAT problem with all clauses having only three boolean variables.

**Definition 1.6.1** (Planar 3-SAT Problem). Given a boolean 3-SAT formula  $B$ , define the associated graph of  $B$  as follows:

$$G(B) = (\{v_x | v_x \text{ represents a variable in } B\} \cup \{v_C | v_C \text{ represent a clause in } B\}, \{(v_x, v_C) | x \in C \text{ or } \bar{x} \in C\}) \quad (1.1)$$

If  $G(B)$  in equation (1.1) is planar, then  $B$  is said to be a *Planar 3-SAT Problem* [?].

### 1.6.1 Not All Equal 3 SAT Problem

**Problem 1.6.2** (Not All Equal 3 SAT Problem). Give a set of clauses  $C$ , each containing three boolean variables, can each clause contain at least one true variable and one false variable?

### 1.6.2 Planar 3 SAT Problem

**Problem 1.6.3** (Planar 3 SAT Problem). A planar 3SAT instance is a 3SAT instance for which the graph built using the following rules is planar:

1. add a vertex for every  $x_i$  and  $\bar{x}_i$
2. add a vertex for every clause  $C_j$
3. add an edge for every  $(x_i, \bar{x}_i)$  pair
4. add an edge from vertex  $x_i$  (or  $\bar{x}_i$ ) to each vertex that represent a clause that contains it
5. add edges between two consecutive variables  $(x_1, x_2), (x_2, x_3), \dots, (x_n, x_1)$

In particular, rule 5 builds a "backbone" that splits the clauses in two distinct regions.

### 1.6.3 Logic Engine

The logic engine simulates the well known Not All Equal 3 SAT Problem (NAE3SAT).

### 1.6.4 Construction of the Logic Engine

The components of the logic engine are as follows: the rigid frame, the shaft, the armatures, the chains, and the flags. The *rigid frame* is a rectangular enclosure with a horizontal shaft place at mid-height. The *armatures* are concentric rectangular frames contained within the rigid frame. Each armature can rotate about the shaft; other motions on the armature are disallowed. Given an NAE3SAT, for each variable there is a corresponding armature. On each armature, there are chains. A pair of *chains*,  $a_j$  and  $\bar{a}_j$  correspond to the variable  $x_j$  and  $\bar{x}_j$  respectively. The pair is placed on each armature, reflected at a height of  $h$  above and below the shaft, i.e. one place above the shaft at a height of  $h$ , the other placed below the shaft at a height of  $-h$ .

### 1.6.5 Encoding the Logic Engine

For each clause of an NAE3SAT, there exists a set of corresponding chains, namely the  $h^{\text{th}}$  clause is the set of chains on the armatures at the  $h^{\text{th}}$  row above and below the shaft. A chain is *flagged* if the corresponding variable resides within the clause. The flag can point in either the left or right directions indicating a truth assignment for that variable within the clause. A flag is attached to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  chain of every  $a_j^{\text{th}}$  and  $\bar{a}_j^{\text{th}}$  chain with the following exceptions:

1. if the variable  $x_j$  is in clause  $C_i$ , then link  $i$  of  $a_j$  is unflagged,
2. if the variable  $\bar{x}_j$  is in clause  $C_i$ , then link  $i$  of  $a_j$  is unflagged.

**Theorem 1.6.1.** *An instance of NAE3SAT is a “yes” instance if and only if the corresponding logic engine has a flat, collision-free configuration.*

**Proof 1.6.1.** *If an instance of NAE3SAT is a “yes”, then every clause in  $C$  contains at least one true variable and one false variable. Now suppose the following truth assignment:*

$$t(x_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_j \text{ and } \bar{x}_j \text{ are placed at the top and bottom respectively} \\ 0 & x_j \text{ and } \bar{x}_j \text{ are placed at the bottom and top respectively} \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

*For each clause  $c_i \in C$ , there exists a variables in  $c_i$  such that  $t(y_i) = 1$  and  $t(z_i) = 0$ . This implies that there exists an unflagged chain in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $-i^{\text{th}}$  row of the frame. To avoid a collision in each row, trigger the flags to point towards the unflagged link. Thus, the corresponding logic engine has a flat, collision-free configuration.*

*If the corresponding logic engine has a flat, collision-free configuration, then there must exist an unflagged link in each row. Without loss of generality, we have that the variables  $y_j$  and  $z_i$  is in clause  $C_i$  such that  $t(y_i) = 1$  and  $t(z_i) = 0$  for each  $i$ . Thus, we have an instance of NAE3SAT is a “yes” instance. [?]*

## 1.7 Problem

The *realizability* problem for a polygonal linkage asks whether a given polygonal linkage has a realization (resp., orientated realization). For a weighted planar (resp., plane) graph, it asks whether the graph is the contact graph (resp., ordered contact graph) of some disk arrangement with specified radii. These problems, in general, are known to be NP-hard. Specifically, it is NP-hard to decide whether a given planar (or plane) graph can be embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with given edge lengths [?, ?]. Since an edge of given length can be modeled by a suitably long and skinny rhombus, the realizability of polygonal linkages is also NP-hard. The recognition of the contact graphs of unit disks in the plane (a.k.a. coin graphs) is NP-hard [?], and so the realizability of weighted graphs as contact graphs of disks is also NP-hard. However, previous reductions crucially rely on configurations with high genus: the planar graphs in [?, ?] and the coin graphs in [?] have many cycles.

In this paper, we consider the above four realizability problems when the union of the polygons (resp., disks) in the desired configuration is simply connected (i.e., contractible). That is, the contact graph of the disks is a tree, or the “hinge graph” of the polygonal linkage is a tree (the vertices in the *hinge graph* are the polygons in  $\mathcal{P}$ , and edges represent a hinge between two polygons). Our main result is that realizability remains NP-hard when restricted to simply connected structures.

**Theorem 1.7.1.** *It is NP-complete to decide whether a polygonal linkage whose hinge graph is a tree can be realized (both with and without orientation).*

**Theorem 1.7.2.** *It is NP-complete to decide whether a given tree (resp., plane tree) with positive vertex weights is the contact graph (resp., ordered contact graph) of a disk arrangements with specified radii.*

The unoriented versions, where the underlying graph (hinge graph or contact graph) is a tree can easily be handled with the logic engine method (Section ??). We prove Theorem 1.6.1 for *oriented* realizations with a reduction from PLANAR-3SAT (Section ??), and then reduce the realizability of ordered contact trees to the oriented realization of polygonal linkages by simulating polygons with arrangements of disks (Section ??).

### 1.7.1 Problem Statement

*Problem 1.7.1 (Unordered Realizability Problem for Linkages).* For a linkage, it asks whether its corresponding graph is the contact graph (resp., ordered contact graph) of some disk arrangement with specified radii.

*Problem 1.7.2 (Unordered Realizability Problem for Polygonal Linkages).* The *realizability* problem for a polygonal linkage asks whether a given polygonal linkage has a realization.

*Problem 1.7.3 (Ordered Realizability Problem for Linkages).* For a linkage, it asks whether its corresponding graph is the ordered contact graph of some disk arrangement with specified radii.

*Problem 1.7.4 (Ordered Realizability Problem for Polygonal Linkages).* The *realizability* problem for a ordered polygonal linkage asks whether a given polygonal linkage has a realization with respect to order.

### 1.7.2 Decidability of Problem

test