## Monday, September 10, 2012

## 0.1 Dynamic programming and DPP

For concreteness, we focus on Nussinov's DP algorithm. The ideas should work for general DPs. Suppose we have a fixed DNA/RNA sequence S of length L. Let y denote a particular secondary folding structure of the sequence. We try to follow the notations of the Supplementary Methods of Taskar's SDPP paper.

The factor graph has T = L(L-1) number of variable nodes, indexed by t = (i,j), i < j. The possible values for the variable node (i,j) is the set of energies possible for the subsequence S(i,j). There are also L(L-1) factor nodes indexed by (i,j), i < j. The factor node F(i,j) is connected to the variable nodes  $\{(i+1,j-1),(i+k,j),(k+1,j)\}, i < k < j$ . For  $(i,j) \neq (1,L)$ , the factor F(i,j) = 1 if the substructure y(i,j) has a consistent folding (no mismatched base-pairs, etc), and F(i,j) = 0 if the substructure is not consistent. For the "last" factor, F(1,L) = energy of the structure y.

## Saturday, September 22, 2012

To fill in a bit more and correct some mistakes from above.

We have a factor graph with  $T = \frac{L(L-1)}{2}$  variable nodes, indexed by t = (i, j). Similarly, there are  $\frac{L(L-1)}{2}$  factor nodes that we denote by F(i, j). The factor node F(i, j) is connected to the variable nodes  $\{(i+1, j-1), (k, j), (i, k)\}, i < k < j$ . Generic variable nodes are denoted by t, and generic factor notes are denoted by  $\alpha$ .

- 1. The values for  $y_t$  are the possible folding scores for the subsequence S(i, j). In the simplest case, the folding score equals to the number of base pairings, and  $y_t \in \{0, 1, ..., L/2\}$ .
- 2. For a factor node  $\alpha$ , we think of  $y_{\alpha}$  as a list of values  $\{y_{t_1}, y_{t_2}, ...\}$  where  $t_i$  is a variable node connected to  $\alpha$ . Let  $\alpha*$  denote the final factor node F(1, L).
- 3. A factor node is associated with weight  $w_{\alpha}(y_{\alpha})$ . We have

$$w_{\alpha}(y_{\alpha}) = (q^2(y_{\alpha}), q^2(y_{\alpha})\phi_r(y_{\alpha}), q^2(y_{\alpha})\phi_l(y_{\alpha}), q^2(y_{\alpha})\phi_r(y_{\alpha})\phi_l(y_{\alpha}))$$

4. For  $\alpha \neq \alpha *$ ,  $q(y_{\alpha}) = 1$  if the list  $y_{\alpha}$  is feasible, i.e. the score  $y_{ij}$  can be feasibly arrived from  $y_{(i+1)(j-1)}, y_{kj}, y_{ik}$  and the sequence S(i,j). And  $q(y_{\alpha}) = 0$  otherwise. For  $\alpha *$ ,  $y_{\alpha *} = y_{1L}$ , the score of the entire structure.

## Questions to address:

- 1. The two pass belief propagation computes  $\sum_{y} \prod_{\alpha} w_{\alpha}(y_{\alpha})$ , where  $y = \{y_{ij}\}$  is a list of scores over all substructures. What we actually need to compute is  $\sum_{s} \prod_{\alpha} w_{\alpha}(y_{s})$ , where the sum is over all feasible substructures. Seems like there is an straightforward bijection between y and the set of all possible structures for S. Need to verify.
- 2. For the two pass belief propagation to work, i.e. equation 3 of the supplement, we need the factor graph to be a tree. This is not true in our case, which has many loops. However, the weights at the factor nodes are simple,  $w_{\alpha}(y_{\alpha} = (0, 0, 0, 0))$  if  $y_{\alpha}$  is not feasible. So might still work.
- 3. As we discussed, the factor graph is densely connected. But for a given structure, only a few variable nodes  $y_t$  contribute. Need to work this out precisely.