CSE 427
Computational Biology
Winter 2008

Sequence Alignment;

DNA Replication

Sequence Alignment

Part I

Motivation, dynamic programming, global alignment

Sequence Alignment

- What
- Why
- A Simple Algorithm
- Complexity Analysis
- A better Algorithm:
  "Dynamic Programming"

Sequence Similarity: What

G G A C C A

T A C T A A G

T C C A A T

Sequence Similarity: What

G G A C C A

T A C T A A G

| : | : | | :

T C C – A A T

Sequence Similarity: Why

- Most widely used comp. tools in biology
- New sequence always compared to sequence data bases

Similar sequences often have similar origin or function

- Recognizable similarity after 10^8 –10^9 yr

BLAST Demo

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/blast/

Try it!

pick any protein,
e.g. hemoglobin,
insulin, exportin,…

Taxonomy Report

root	64 hits	16 orgs	
. Eukaryota	62 hits	14 orgs	[cellular organisms]
. . Fungi/Metazoa group	57 hits	11 orgs	
. . . Bilateria	38 hits	7 orgs	[Metazoa; Eumetazoa]
. . . . Coelomata	36 hits	6 orgs	
. . . . . Tetrapoda	26 hits	5 orgs	[;;; Vertebrata;;;; Sarcopterygii]
. . . . . Eutheria	24 hits	4 orgs	[Amniota; Mammalia; Theria]
. . . . . Homo sapiens	20 hits	1 orgs	[Primates;; Hominidae; Homo]
. . . . . Murinae	3 hits	2 orgs	[Rodentia; Sciurognathi; Muridae]
. . . . . Rattus norvegicus	2 hits	1 orgs	[Rattus]
. . . . . Mus musculus	1 hits	1 orgs	[Mus]
. . . . . Sus scrofa	1 hits	1 orgs	[Cetartiodactyla; Suina; Suidae; Sus]
. . . . . Xenopus laevis	2 hits	1 orgs	[Amphibia;;;;;; Xenopodinae; Xenopus]
. . . . . Drosophila melanogaster	10 hits	1 orgs	[Protostomia;;;; Drosophila;;;]
. . . . Caenorhabditis elegans	2 hits	1 orgs	[; Nematoda;;;;;; Caenorhabditis]
. . . Ascomycota	19 hits	4 orgs	[Fungi]
. . . . Schizosaccharomyces pombe	10 hits	1 orgs	[;;;; Schizosaccharomyces]
. . . . Saccharomycetales	9 hits	3 orgs	[Saccharomycotina; Saccharomycetes]
. . . . . Saccharomyces	8 hits	2 orgs	[Saccharomycetaceae]
. . . . . Saccharomyces cerevisiae .	7 hits	1 orgs	
. . . . . Saccharomyces kluyveri ...	1 hits	1 orgs	
. . . . . Candida albicans	1 hits	1 orgs	[mitosporic Saccharomycetales;]
. . Arabidopsis thaliana	2 hits	1 orgs	[Viridiplantae; …Brassicaceae;]
. . Apicomplexa	3 hits	2 orgs	[Alveolata]
. . . Plasmodium falciparum	2 hits	1 orgs	[Haemosporida; Plasmodium]
. . . Toxoplasma gondii	1 hits	1 orgs	[Coccidia; Eimeriida; Sarcocystidae;]
. synthetic construct	1 hits	1 orgs	[other; artificial sequence]
. lymphocystis disease virus	1 hits	1 orgs	[Viruses; dsDNA viruses, no RNA …]

Terminology (CS, not necessarily Bio)

- *String:* ordered list of letters TATAAG
- *Prefix:* consecutive letters from front
  - empty, T, TA, TAT, ...
- Suffix: … from end
  - empty, G, AG, AAG, ...
- *Substring:* … from ends or middle
  - empty, TAT, AA, ...
- *Subsequence:* ordered, nonconsecutive
  - TT, AAA, TAG, ...

Sequence Alignment



Defn: An *alignment* of strings S, T is a pair of strings S', T' (with spaces) s.t.

(1) |S'| = |T'|, and (|S| = "length of S")

(2) removing all spaces leaves S, T

Alignment Scoring

Mismatch = -1
Match = 2

```
a c b c d b      a c - - b c d b
c a d b d        - c a d b - d -
                 -1 2 -1 -1 2 -1 2 -1
                 Value = 3*2 + 5*(-1) = +1
```

- The *score* of aligning (characters or spaces) x & y is $\sigma(x,y)$.
- *Value* of an alignment $\sum_{i=1}^{|S'|} \sigma(S'[i], T'[i])$
- An *optimal alignment:* one of max value

Optimal Alignment: A Simple Algorithm

for all subseqs A of S, B of T s.t. |A| = |B| **do**

align A[i] with B[i], 1 ≤ i ≤ |A|

align all other chars to spaces

compute its value

retain the max

end

output the retained alignment

S = abcd	A = cd
T = wxyz	B = xz
`-abc-d`	`a-bc-d`
`w--xyz`	`-w-xyz`

Analysis

- Assume |S| = |T| = n
- Cost of evaluating one alignment: ≥ n
- How many alignments are there: $\geq \binom{2n}{n}$

  pick n chars of S,T together
  say k of them are in S
  match these k to the k *un*picked chars of T
- Total time: $\geq n\binom{2n}{n} > 2^{2n}, \text{ for } n > 3$
- E.g., for n = 20, time is > 2^{40} operations

Polynomial vs Exponential Growth



Asymptotic Analysis

- How does run time grow as a function of problem size?

  n^2 or $100\ n^2 + 100\ n + 100$ vs 2^{2n}

- **Defn:** f(n) = O(g(n)) iff there is a constant c s.t. $|f(n)| \leq cg(n)$ for all sufficiently large n.

  $100\ n^2 + 100\ n + 100 = O(n^2)$ [e.g. c = 300, or 101]

  $n^2 = O(2^{2n})$

  2^{2n} is *not* $O(n^2)$

Utility of Asymptotics

- "All things being equal," smaller asymptotic growth rate is better
- All things are never equal
- Even so, big-O bounds often let you quickly pick most promising candidates among competing algorithms
- Poly time algorithms often practical; non-poly algorithms seldom are. (Yes, there are exceptions.)

Fibonacci Numbers

```
fib(n) {
    if (n <= 1) {
       return 1;
    } else {
       return fib(n-1) + fib(n-2);
    }
}
```

Simple recursion, but many repeated subproblems!!

=>

Time = $\Omega(1.61^n)$

Fibonacci, II

```
int fib[n];
fib[0] = 1;
fib[1] = 1;
for(i=2; i<=n; i++) {
    fib[i] = fib[i-1] + fib[i-2];
}
return fib[n];
```

"Dynamic Programming"

Avoid repeated work by tabulating solutions to repeated subproblems

=>

Time = O(n)

(in this case)

Candidate for Dynamic Programming?

- Common Subproblems?
  - Plausible: probably re-considering alignments of various small substrings unless we're careful.
- Optimal Substructure?
  - Plausible: left and right "halves" of an optimal alignment probably should be optimally aligned (though they obviously interact a bit at the interface).
- (Both made rigorous below.)

Optimal Substructure
(In More Detail)

- Optimal alignment *ends* in 1 of 3 ways:
  - last chars of S & T aligned with each other
  - last char of S aligned with space in T
  - last char of T aligned with space in S
  - (never align space with space; $\sigma(-, -) < 0$)
- In each case, the rest of S & T should be optimally aligned to each other

Optimal Alignment in $O(n^2)$ via "Dynamic Programming"

- Input: S, T, |S| = n, |T| = m
- Output: value of optimal alignment

Easier to solve a "harder" problem:

V(i,j) = value of optimal alignment of S[1], …, S[i] with T[1], …, T[j] for all $0 \le i \le n$, $0 \le j \le m$.

Base Cases

- V(i,0): first i chars of S all match spaces

$$V(i,0) = \sum_{k=1}^{i} \sigma(S[k], -)$$

- V(0,j): first j chars of T all match spaces

$$V(0,j) = \sum_{k=1}^{j} \sigma(-, T[k])$$

General Case

Opt align of S[1], …, S[i] vs T[1], …, T[j]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & S[i] \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & T[j] \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & S[i] \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & - \end{bmatrix}, \text{ or } \begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & - \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & T[j] \end{bmatrix}$$

Opt align of $S_1 \ldots S_{i-1}$ & $T_1 \ldots T_{j-1}$

$$V(i,j) = \max \begin{Bmatrix} V(i\text{-}1,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(S[i],T[j]) \\ V(i\text{-}1,j) + \sigma(S[i], \text{ - }) \\ V(i,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(\text{ - }, T[j]) \end{Bmatrix},$$

for all $1 \le i \le n,\ 1 \le j \le m.$

Calculating One Entry

$$V(i,j) = \max \begin{cases} V(i\text{-}1,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(S[i],T[j]) \\ V(i\text{-}1,j) + \sigma(S[i], \text{ - }) \\ V(i,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(\text{ - }, T[j]) \end{cases}$$



Example

Mismatch = -1
Match = 2

	j	0	1	2	3	4	5
i			c	a	d	b	d
0		0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
1	a	-1	-1	1			
2	c	-2	1				
3	b	-3					
4	c	-4					
5	d	-5					
6	b	-6					

←T

Time = O(mn)

↑ S

Mismatch = -1
Match = 2

Example

i	j	0	1 c	2 a	3 d	4 b	5 d
0		0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
1	a	-1	-1	1	0	-1	-2
2	c	-2	1	0	0	-1	-2
3	b	-3	0	0	-1	2	1
4	c	-4	-1	-1	-1	1	1
5	d	-5	-2	-2	1	0	3
6	b	-6	-3	-3	0	3	2

←T

↑S

Finding Alignments: Trace Back

	j	0	1	2	3	4	5
i			c	a	d	b	d
0		0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
1	a	-1	-1	1	0	-1	-2
2	c	-2	1	0	0	-1	-2
3	b	-3	0	0	-1	2	1
4	c	-4	-1	-1	-1	1	1
5	d	-5	-2	-2	1	0	3
6	b	-6	-3	-3	0	3	2

←T

S

Complexity Notes

- Time = O(mn), (value and alignment)
- Space = O(mn)
- Easy to get value in Time = O(mn) and Space = O(min(m,n))
- Possible to get value *and alignment* in Time = O(mn) and Space = O(min(m,n)) but tricky.

Sequence Alignment

Part II

Local alignments & gaps

Variations

- Local Alignment
  - Preceding gives *global* alignment, i.e. full length of both strings;
  - Might well miss strong similarity of part of strings amidst dissimilar flanks
- Gap Penalties
  - 10 adjacent spaces cost 10 x one space?
- Many others

Local Alignment:Motivations

- "Interesting" (evolutionarily conserved, functionally related) segments may be a small part of the whole
  - "Active site" of a protein
  - Scattered genes or exons amidst "junk", e.g. retroviral insertions, large deletions
  - Don't have whole sequence
- Global alignment might miss them if flanking junk outweighs similar regions

Local Alignment

Optimal *local alignment* of strings S & T:
Find substrings A of S and B of T
having max value global alignment

S = abcxdex A = c x d e

T = xxxcde B = c - d e value = 5

The "Obvious" Local Alignment Algorithm

for all substrings A of S and B of T
    Align A & B via dynamic programming
    Retain pair with max value
end ;

Output the retained pair

Time: $O(n^2)$ choices for A, $O(m^2)$ for B, $O(nm)$ for DP, so $O(n^3m^3)$ total.

[Best possible? Lots of redundant work…]

Local Alignment in O(nm) via Dynamic Programming

- Input: S, T, |S| = n, |T| = m
- Output: value of optimal local alignment

Better to solve a "harder" problem
for all $0 \le i \le n$, $0 \le j \le m$:

V(i,j) = max value of opt (global)
alignment of a suffix of S[1], …, S[i]
with a suffix of T[1], …, T[j]

Report best i,j

Base Cases

- Assume $\sigma(x,-) \leq 0$, $\sigma(-,x) \leq 0$
- V(i,0): some suffix of first i chars of S; all match spaces in T; best suffix is empty

  V(i,0) = 0
- V(0,j): similar

  V(0,j) = 0

General Case Recurrences

Opt suffix align S[1], …, S[i] vs T[1], …, T[j]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & S[i] \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & T[j] \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & S[i] \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & - \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sim\sim\sim\sim & - \\ \sim\sim\sim\sim & T[j] \end{bmatrix}, \text{or} \begin{bmatrix} & \\ & \end{bmatrix}$$

Opt align of suffix of $S_1 \ldots S_{i-1}$ & $T_1 \ldots T_{j-1}$

$$V(i,j) = \max \begin{cases} V(i\text{-}1,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(S[i], T[j]) \\ V(i\text{-}1,j) + \sigma(S[i], \text{ - }) \\ V(i,j\text{-}1) + \sigma(\text{ - }, T[j]) \\ 0 \end{cases},$$

$$\text{for all } 1 \le i \le n,\ 1 \le j \le m.$$

opt suffix alignment has: 2, 1, 1, 0 chars of S/T

Scoring Local Alignments

	j	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i			x	x	x	c	d	e	←T
0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	a	0							
2	b	0							
3	c	0							
4	x	0							
5	d	0							
6	e	0							
7	x	0							
	↑ S								

Finding Local Alignments

	j	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i			x	x	x	c	d	e	←T
0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	b	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	c	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	
4	x	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	
5	d	0	1	1	1	1	3	2	
6	e	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	
7	x	0	2	2	2	1	1	4	
	↑ s								

Notes

- Time and Space = O(mn)
- Space O(min(m,n)) possible with time O(mn), but finding alignment is trickier

- Local alignment: “Smith-Waterman”
- Global alignment: “Needleman-Wunsch”

Alignment With Gap Penalties

- *Gap:* maximal run of spaces in S' or T'

  ```
  ab----c-d
  a-ddddcbd
  ```

  2 gaps in S', 1 in T'

- Motivations, e.g.:
  - mutation might insert/delete several or even many residues at once
  - matching cDNA (no introns) to genomic DNA (exons and introns)
  - Some parts of proteins less critical

A Protein Structure: (Dihydrofolate Reductase)



Topoisomerase I



http://www.rcsb.org/pdb/explore.do?structureId=1a36

Sequence Evolution

Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution

Theodosius Dobzhansky, 1973

Changes happen at random

Deleterious/neutral/advantageous changes unlikely/possibly/likely spread widely in a population

Changes are less likely to be tolerated in positions involved in many/close interactions, e.g.

enzyme binding pocket

protein/protein interaction surface

…

Gap Penalties

- Score = f(gap length)
- Kinds, & best known alignment time
  - general  $O(n^3)$
  - convex  $O(n^2 \log n)$
  - affine  $O(mn)$

Global Alignment with Affine Gap Penalties

V(i,j) = value of opt alignment of
S[1], …, S[i] with T[1], …, T[j]

G(i,j) = …, s.t. last pair matches S[i] & T[j]

F(i,j) = …, s.t. last pair matches S[i] & –

E(i,j) = …, s.t. last pair matches – & T[j]

Time: O(mn) [calculate all, O(1) each]

Affine Gap Algorithm

Gap penalty = g + s*(gap length), g,s ≥ 0

V(i,0) = E(i,0) = V(0,i) = F(0,i) = -g-i*s

V(i,j) = max(G(i,j), F(i,j), E(i,j))

G(i,j) = V(i-1,j-1) + σ(S[i],T[j])

F(i,j) = max(F(i-1,j)-s , V(i-1,j)-g-s)

E(i,j) = max(E(i,j-1)-s , V(i,j-1)-g-s)

old gap new gap

Summary

- Functionally similar proteins/DNA often have recognizably similar sequences even after eons of divergent evolution
- Ability to find/compare/experiment with “same” sequence in other organisms is a huge win
- Surprisingly simple scoring model works well in practice: score each position separately & add, possibly w/ fancier gap model like affine
- Simple “dynamic programming” algorithms can find *optimal* alignments under these assumptions in poly time (product of sequence lengths)
- This, and heuristic approximations to it like BLAST, are workhorse tools in molecular biology

Weekly Bio Interlude

DNA Replication

DNA Replication: Basics



Issues & Complications, I

- 1st ~10 nt's added are called the *primer*
- In simple model, DNA pol has 2 jobs: prime & extend
- Priming is error-prone
- So, specialized *primase* does the priming; pol specialized for fast, accurate extension



- Still doesn't solve the accuracy problem (hint: primase makes an *RNA* primer)

Issue 2: Rep Forks & Helices

- "Replication Fork": DNA double helix is progressively unwound by a DNA helicase, and both resulting single strands are duplicated
- DNA polymerase synthesizes new strand 5' -> 3'(reading its template strand 3' -> 5')
- That means on one (the "leading") strand, DNA pol is chasing/pushing the replication fork
- But on the other "lagging" strand, DNA pol is running away from it.



Issue 3: Fragments

- Lagging strand gets a series of “Okazaki fragments” of DNA (~200nt in eukaryotes) following each primer
- The RNA primers are later removed by a *nuclease* and *DNA* pol fills gaps (more accurate than primase)
- Fragments joined by *ligase*





Issue 4: Coord Lead/Lag



Alberts et al., Mol. Biol. of the Cell, 3rd ed, p258



(B)


newly synthesized
leading strand
parental
DNA
helix
newly
synthesized
lagging
strand

(C)

Issue 5: Twirls & Tangles

- Unwinding helix (~10 nucleotides per turn) would cause stress. *Topoisomerase I* cuts DNA backbone on *one* strand, allowing it to spin about the remaining bond, relieving stress
- *Topoisomerase II* can cut & rejoin *both* strands, after allowing another double strand to pass through the gap, de-tangling it.



Issue 6: Proofreading

- Error rate of pol itself is ~10^{-4}, but overall rate is 10^{-9}, due to proofreading & repair, e.g.
  - pol itself can back up & cut off a mismatched base if one happens to be inserted
  - priming the new strand is hard to do accurately, hence RNA primers, later removed & replaced
  - other enzymes scan helix for “bulges” caused by base mismatch, figure out which strand is original, cut away new (faulty) copy; DNA pol fills gap
  - which strand is original? In bacteria, some A’s are “methylated”, but not immediately after replication

Replication Summary

- Speed: 50 (eukaryotes) - 500 (prokaryotes) bp/sec
- Accuracy: 1 error per 10^9 bp
- Complex & highly optimized
- Highly similar across all living cells

- More info:
  Alberts et al., Mol. Biol. of the Cell