Course organization



1

Introduction (Week 1-2)

- Course introduction
- A brief introduction to molecular biology
- A brief introduction to sequence comparison

• Part I: Algorithms for Sequence Analysis (Week 3 - 8)

- Chapter 1-3, Models and theories
 - » Probability theory and Statistics (Week 3)
 - » Algorithm complexity analysis (Week 4)
 - » Classic algorithms (Week 5)
- Chapter 4. Sequence alignment (week 6)
- Chapter 5. Hidden Markov Models (week 7)
- Chapter 6. Multiple sequence alignment (week 8)

• Part II: Algorithms for Network Biology (Week 9 - 16)

- Chapter 7. Omics landscape (week 9)
- Chapter 8. Microarrays, Clustering and Classification (week 10)
- Chapter 9. Computational Interpretation of Proteomics (week 11)
- Chapter 10. Network and Pathways (week 12,13)
- Chapter 11. Introduction to Bayesian Analysis (week 14,15)
- Chapter 12. Bayesian networks (week 16)





Introduction to Sequence Comparison

Chaochun Wei



The simple but powerful dot plot



A DNA dot plot of a human zinc finger transcription factor (GenBank ID NM_002383), showing regional self-similarity



Sequence comparison algorithms

- Simple identity (as in C's strcmp())
- Hashing
- Longest common substring



Longest common substring

	⊿	С	Α	G	С	С	U	С	G	с	U	U	Α	G	
⊿	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	'
A	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	
A	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.7	
U	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.7	
G	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	1.0	
С	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	$2 \cdot 0$	1.3	0.3	1.0	0.3	$2 \cdot 0$	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.3	
Ċ	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	1.0	3 ·0	1.7	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	
A	0.0	0.0	$2 \cdot 0$	0.7	0.3	1.7	2.7	1.3	1.0	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	
U	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.7	0.3	1.3	2.7	2.3	1.0	0.7	1.7	2.0	1.0	1.0	
U	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	1.3	1.0	2.3	$2 \cdot 3$	$2 \cdot 0$	0.7	1.7	2.7	1.7	1.0	
G	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.3	2.0	1.7	1.3	2.3	2.7	
A	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.7	$\overline{2 \cdot 0}$	3.0	1.7	1.3	$2 \cdot 3$	$2 \cdot 0$	
C	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	2.0	0.7	1.7	1.7	3.0	2.7	1.3	1.0	$2 \cdot 0$	
G	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	0.3	0.7	1.7	0.3	2.7	1.7	2.7	2.3	1.0	$2 \cdot 0$	
G	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.3	1.3	$2 \cdot 3$	1.3	$2 \cdot 3$	$2 \cdot 0$	$2 \cdot 0$	

FIG. 1. H_{ij} matrix generated from the application of eqn (1) to the sequences A-A-U-G-C-C-A-U-U-G-A-C-G-G and C-A-G-C-C-U-C-G-C-U-U-A-G. The underlined elements indicate the trackback path from the maximal element 3.30.

Smith and Waterman, JMB, 1981, 147, 195-197



Analysis of algorithms and big-O notation

Measure the Complexity of an algorithm: O()

- strcmp: O(n)
- longest common substring: O(nm)



Pattern matching algorithms

- Brute force
- Knuth/Morris/Pratt: a finite state automata solution
- Regular expressions and nondeterministic finite state automata



Dynamic programming sequence alignment algorithms

- Needleman/Wunsch global alignment
- Smith/Waterman local alignment
- Linear and affine gap penalties



Needleman/Wunsch global alignment (1970)

- Two sequences $X = x_1...x_n$ and $Y = y_1...y_m$
- Let F(i, j) be the optimal alignment score of $X_{1...i}$ of X up to x_i and $Y_{1...j}$ of Y up to Y_j ($0 \le i \le n, 0 \le j$ $\le m$), then we have

$$F(0,0) = 0$$

$$F(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} F(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j) \\ F(i-1, j) - d \\ F(i, j-1) - d \end{cases}$$



Needleman/Wunsch global alignment (1970)



$$F(0,0) = 0$$

$$F(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} F(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j) \\ F(i-1, j) - d \\ F(i, j-1) - d \end{cases}$$



3.5



Smith/Waterman local alignment (1981)

- Two sequences $X = x_1...x_n$ and $Y = y_1...y_m$
- Let F(i, j) be the optimal alignment score of $X_{1...i}$ of X up to x_i and $Y_{1...j}$ of Y up to Y_j ($0 \le i \le n, 0 \le j \le m$), then we have

$$F(0,0) = 0$$

$$F(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} 0 \\ F(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j) \\ F(i-1, j) - d \\ F(i, j-1) - d \end{cases}$$



Linear and affine gap penalties

- •Linear: w(k) = k d
- Affine: w(k) = d + (k-1) e
- Let M(i,j), $I_x(i,j)$, $I_y(i,j)$ be the best scores up to (i,j):
 - M(i,j): x_i is aligned to y_j ;
 - $I_x(i,j)$: x_i is aligned to a gap;
 - $I_y(i,j) y_j$ is aligned to a gap

then we have

$$M(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} M(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j), \\ I_x(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j), \\ I_y(i-1, j-1) + s(x_i, y_j); \end{cases}$$
$$I_x(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} M(i-1, j) - d, \\ I_x(i-1, j) - e; \end{cases}$$
$$I_y(i, j) = \max \begin{cases} M(i, j-1) - d, \\ I_y(i, j-1) - e. \end{cases}$$



Reading materials

- 1. "A general method applicable to the search for similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins", Needleman, SB and Wunsch, CD. J. Mol. Biol. 48:443-453, 1970
- "Identification of Common Molecular Subsequences", Smith, TF and Waterman, MS. J. Mol. Biol. 147: 195-197, 1981 The Smith/Waterman algorithm

Other recommended background:

- "An improved algorithm for matching biological sequences", Gotoh, O. J. Mol. Biol. 162:705-708, 1982 The efficient form of the Needleman/Wunsch and Smith/Waterman algorithms.
- "Optimal alignment in linear space", Myers, E. W. and Miller, W. CABIOS 4: 11-17, 1988. More advanced reading: a divide and conquer method to reduce the memory cost from O(n^2) to O(n)



BLAT: Blast-Like Alignment Tool

Not BLAST

- Indexed on database (BLAST indexed on the query)
 - Need ~1G memory for human genome
- Need some extra time for database initialization (index)
- Can be 500 times faster than BLAST
- Can display results in the UCSC genome browser



BLAT

- Designed to quickly find
 - DNA sequences of 95% and greater similarity of length 25 bases or more.
 - Protein sequences of 80% and greater similarity of length 20 amino acids or more.
- In practice
 - DNA BLAT works well on primates, and
 - protein blat on land vertebrates



BLAT—The BLAST-Like Alignment Tool

Timing of BLAT vs.WU-TBLASTX on a Data Set of 1000 Mouse Reads against a RepeatMasked Human Chromosome 22

Method	Κ	Ν	Matrix	Time
WU- TBLASTX	5	1	+15/-12	2736 s
WU- TBLASTX	5	1	BLOSUM62	2714 s
BLAT	5	1	+2/-1	61 s
BLAT	4	2	+2/-1	37 s

K: the size of the perfectly matching as a seed for an alignment

N: the number of hits in a gapless 100-aa window required to trigger a detailed alignment. Matrix: column describes the match/mismatch scores or the substitution score matrix used.

Comparison of sequencing platforms (2018.2)

Platforms	Sanger	454	HiSeq X Ten *	MiSeq *	NovaSeq *	PacBio RS II**	Nanopore
Read length	650- 1100	150- 1000	150	36-300	2x150	Up to 60k	Very long
# of reads/run	96	0.4-2M	5.3-6 B	12M – 50M	1.6-20B	~55,0 00	Up to 500
Error rate	10^-3	<10^-2	~10^-3	~10^-3	~10^-3	~10%	Varies
Cost (\$/Mbp)	5000	~5	< 0.01	~0.5	<0.001	~1.5	~1
Time/run	~3 hours	~7 hours	<3 days	4-56 hours	19-40hr	0.5-4 hours	No fixed run tim
Throughput	100Kb	~1Gb	1.6-1.8Tb	540Mb- 15Gb	167Gb- 6Tb	500M b-1Gb	Up to 1 Gb

* http://www.illumina.com/systems
** http://files.pacb.com/pdf/PacBio_RS_II_Brochure.pdf

How to map billions of short reads onto genomes

Cole Trapnell & Steven L Salzberg

Mapping the vast quantities of short sequence fragments produced by next-generation sequencing platforms is a challenge. What programs are available and how do they work?

50

new generation of DNA sequencers that can rapidly and inexpensively sequence billions of bases is transforming genomic science. These new machines are quickly becoming the technology of choice for whole-genome sequencing and for a variety of sequencing-based assays, including gene expression, DNA-protein interaction, human resequencing and RNA splicing studies1-3. For example, the RNA-Seq protocol, in which processed mRNA is converted to cDNA and sequenced, is enabling the identification of previously unknown genes and alternative splice variants; the ChIP-Seq approach, which sequences immunoprecipitated DNA fragments bound to proteins, is revealing networks of interactions between transcription factors and DNA regulatory elements4; and the whole-genome sequencing of tumor cells is uncovering previously unidentified cancer-

Table 1 A selection of short-read analysis software							
Program	Website	Open source?	Handles ABI color space?	Maximum read length			
Bowtie	http://bowtie.cbcb.umd.edu	Yes	No	None			
BWA	http://maq.sourceforge.net/bwa-man.shtml	Yes	Yes	None			
Maq	http://maq.sourceforge.net	Yes	Yes	127			
Mosaik	http://bioinformatics.bc.edu/marthlab/Mosaik	No	Yes	None			
Novoalign	http://www.novocraft.com	No	No	None			
SOAP2	http://soap.genomics.org.cn	No	No	60			
ZOOM	http://www.bioinfor.com	No	Yes	240			

In this case, to make sense of the reads, their positions within the reference sequence must be determined. This process is known as aligning or 'mapping' the read to the reference. In one version of the mapping problem, reads must be aligned without allowing large gaps in to understand why the mapping problems are computationally difficult, which difficulties have been overcome and what challenges and opportunities remain.

Challenges of mapping short reads

Nature Biotechnology 27, 455-457(2009)



Latest progress of sequence alignment/mapping

Aligning (mapping) billions of short reads

- Bowtie
- SOAP
- BWA
- Tophat



Algorithms (a) based on spaced-seed indexing; (b) based on Burrows-Wheeler transform

Nature Biotechnology 27, 455-457(2009)