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## Biology Motivation

- Multiple Sequence Alignment:
- Assess sequence conservation of protein domains, tertiary and secondary structures and even individual amino acids or nucleotides.
- Evolutionary relationships or sequence conservation among homologous.
- Simultaneously compare several sequences.
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## Computation Problem

- Methods:
- Pairwise alignments
- Prograssive alignment construction
- Iterative methods
- Hidden Markov models
- Problems:
- Accuracy
- Computational complexity
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## Algorithm-Introduction

- Incorporate additional hits into the input sequences
- Hits that are not intermediate will introduce noise
- Use carefully defined intermediate sequences
- Align profiles instead of the sequences
- Construct a profile for each sequence
- Align the profiles by modifying the pair-HMM
- Obtain a secondary structure prediction


## Algorithm

- Finding intermediate sequences
- Choosing intermediate sequences
- Constructing sequence profiles
- Alignment via modified pair-HMM


## Finding Intermediate Sequence

- Definitions of Intermediate Sequence
- Between two input sequences:

Definition 1. Given two sequences $s_{1}$ and $s_{2}$, and a distance score $d\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ between them, a sequence $r$ is intermediate between $s_{1}$ and $s_{2}$ if $d\left(r, s_{1}\right)<$ $d\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ and $d\left(r, s_{2}\right)<d\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$.

- Between multiple sequences:

Definition 2. Given $n$ input sequences $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}$, and $m$ hits $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}$ from database search of these sequences, find all hits $r_{k}$ that are intermediate between some pair of input sequences $s_{i}$ and $s_{j}$.

## Finding Intermediate Sequence

- No need to compute pairwise distances between the potentially very large number of hits.
- The number of pairwise distance score computations: $O\left(m n+n^{2}\right)$
- The number of score comparisons is $O\left(m n^{2}\right)$.


## Choosing Intermediate Sequences

- The number of intermediate sequences can be very large
- Use a subset of intermediate sequences
- Similar sequences are likely to contain redundant information
- Choose a small subset of intermediate sequences using a greedy strategy
- Goal: identify a combined set of sequences as divergent as possible


## Choosing Intermediate Sequences

## - Definition

Definition 3. Given $n$ input sequences $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}, m$ intermediate sequences $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}$, add $k$ intermediate sequences from among $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}$, denoted by $s_{n+1}, \ldots, s_{n+k}$, so that the minimum distance between sequences in the combined set $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n+k}$ is the largest possible when distances between the input sequences $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}$ are ignored.

## Choosing Intermediate Sequences

- Greedy algorithm

Input: $n$ input sequences $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}, m$ intermediate sequences $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}$, distance score $d(r, s)$ between two sequences $r$ and $s$.
Output: $k$ intermediate sequences $s_{n+1}, \ldots, s_{n+k}$ added to $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}$.
$R \leftarrow\left\{r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}\right\} ;$
for each $r_{i}$ in $R$ do $\left\{d_{i} \leftarrow \min _{1 \leq j \leq n} d\left(r_{i}, s_{j}\right) ;\right\}$
for $j \leftarrow 1$ to $k$ do $\{$
$s_{n+j} \leftarrow r_{i}$ with the maximum $d_{i}$; remove $r_{i}$ from $R$; for each $r_{i}$ in $R$ do $\left.\left\{d_{i} \leftarrow \min \left(d_{i}, d\left(r_{i}, s_{n+j}\right)\right) ;\right\}\right\}$

## Choosing Intermediate Sequences

- Iteratively add the farthest intermediate sequence.
- Does not guarantee optimum divergence, but still reasonable.
- The number of pairwise score computations is $O(m(n+k))$.


## Constructing Sequence Profiles

- Assign each intermediate sequence $r_{i}(i=1$..m $)$ to the most similar sequence $s_{j}(j=1 . . n+k)$.
- Use star alignment for each sequence $s_{j}$ and the intermediate sequence assigned to it.
- The relative frequency of each residue of $s_{j}$ is used to construct a profile as a probability distribution.


## Constructing Sequence Profiles

- If the number of very closely related sequences assigned to $s_{j}$ is very large, It will have over-contribution.
- Solution: before choosing intermediate sequences, remove sequences from the original set so that none of the remaining sequences are very similar to each other.


## Modified Pair-HMM

- Original model:

- $\delta$ : the gap opening probability
- $\varepsilon$ : the gap extension probability


## Modiffed Pair-HMM

- Add the probability distribution of residues at each position:
- $p_{1}(x, i)$ : residue $x$ at position $i$ in $X$.
- $p_{2}(y, j)$ : residue $y$ at position $j$ in $Y$.
- New emission probability of state M :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\prime}(i, j)=\sum_{x} \sum_{y} p_{1}(x, i) p_{2}(y, j) e(x, y) \\
& e^{\prime}(i)=\sum_{x} p_{1}(x, i) e(x) \quad e^{\prime}(j)=\sum_{y} p_{2}(x, i) e(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Modified Pair-HMM

- Secondary structure predictions:
- In state M, introduce an additional parameter $\alpha$
- Subdivide the emission probability $e^{\prime}(i, j)$ into two cases to obtain the state $M(\alpha)$ with emission probability $\alpha e^{\prime}(i, j)$ if ( $x, y$ ) at position $i$ in $X$ and $j$ in $Y$ have the same secondary structure type.
- (1- $\alpha$ ) $e^{\prime}(i, j)$ otherwise.
- Decrease in emission will allow more gaps:
- Use $\beta$ to compensate for the change


## Modified Pair-HMM

## - Secondary structure prediction


original

modified
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## Performance

- Benchmark Sets:
- BAliBASE 3.0
- HOMSTRAD
- PREFAB
- SABmark
- Compare with:
- MAFFT 5.8
- ProbCons 1.10
- SPEM


## Performance

|  | SPS |  |  |  | CS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MAFFT | ProbCons | SPEM | ISPAlign | MAFFT | ProbCons | SPEM | ISPAlign |
| 1V1 \{38\} | 64.8 | 64.5 | 73.1 | 76.0 | 44.6 | 40.4 | 51.6 | 56.9 |
| 1V2 $\{42\}$ | 92.8 | 93.4 | 92.1 | 93.5 | 83.9 | 85.6 | 82.6 | 85.8 |
| $1(\mathrm{Vl}-\mathrm{V} 2)\{80\}$ | 79.5 | 79.7 | 83.1 | 85.2 | 65.2 | 64.2 | 67.9 | 72.1 |
| (vs MAFFT) |  |  | (4e-5) | (5e-8) |  |  | (0.01) | (2e-7) |
| (vs ProbCons) |  |  | (7e-4) | (2e-6) |  |  | (0.01) | (2e-5) |
| (vaspem) |  |  |  | (0.002) |  |  |  | (9e-5) |
| $2\{37\}$ | 91.8 | 89.7 | 88.0 | 91.9 | 46.0 | 40.8 | 47.1 | 53.8 |
| $3\{29\}$ | 81.4 | 78.8 | 82.8 | 83.5 | 56.8 | 54.3 | 51.4 | 59.9 |
| $4\{36\}$ | 89.2 | 86.8 | 87.5 | 90.3 | 67.9 | 60.9 | 55.4 | 63.3 |
| $5\{14\}$ | 88.2 | 87.5 | 87.0 | 90.3 | 57.6 | 59.4 | 55.9 | 63.9 |
| All (1-5) $\{196\}$ | 84.5 | 83.3 | 85.0 | 87.5 | 60.3 | 57.3 | 58.3 | 64.6 |
| (vs MAFFT) |  |  | (0.005) | (2e-11) |  |  | (-) | (2e-10) |
| (va ProbCons) |  |  | (5e-4) | $(2 \mathrm{e}-13)$ |  |  | (-) | (4e-10) |
| (vs SPEM) |  |  |  | $(3 \mathrm{e}-7)$ |  |  |  | (5e-11) |

## Performance

|  | SPS |  |  | CS |  |  | SPEM | ISPAlign | ISPAlig |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ProbCons | SPEM | ISPAlign | ProbGons | SPEM | ISPAlign | (vs ProbCons) | (va ProbCons) | (vaspem) |
| 0-20\% \{156\} | 49.7 | 67.2 | 68.5 | 43.1 | 61.0 | 62.7 | (4e-23) | (5e-24) | (4e-5) |
| 20-40\% \{459\} | 80.5 | 85.6 | 86.8 | 74.7 | 80.4 | 81.9 | (2e-29) | (2e-53) | (7e-7) |
| 40-70\% \{348\} | 94.8 | 94.9 | 95.5 | 92.2 | 92.3 | 93.2 | (0.03) | (2e-9) | (0.003) |
| 70-100\% \{69\} | 99.1 | 98.5 | 99.0 | 99.1 | 98.4 | 98.9 | (0.007*) | (-) | (-) |
| All $\{1032\}$ | 81.9 | 86.8 | 87.8 | 77.4 | 82.7 | 84.0 | (2e-46) | (8e-87) | (1e-12) |


|  | MAFFT ${ }^{2}$ ProbCons $^{2} \mathrm{MAFFT}^{50} \mathrm{ProbCons}^{50} \mathrm{SF}^{2} \mathrm{ISPAlign}^{2}\left(\mathrm{vs} \mathrm{MAFFT}{ }^{50}\right)\left(\mathrm{vs} \mathrm{MAFFT}^{50}\right)\left(\mathrm{vs} \mathrm{SF}^{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-20\% \{887\} | 36.2 | 38.9 | 56.7 | 55.6 | 64.6 | 64.8 | (3e-36) | (5e-46) | (0.03) |
| 20-40\% \{588\} | 81.0 | 82.8 | 87.1 | 87.2 | 89.7 | 90.1 | (2e-16) | (6e-28) | (0.01) |
| 40-70\% \{112\} | 96.2 | 96.4 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 95.3 | 97.6 | (0.02*) | (-) | (-) |
| 70-100\% \{95\} | 97.9 | 97.8 | 98.0 | 97.3 | 97.2 | 98.0 | (6e-4*) | (-) | (0.005) |
| All $\{1682\}$ | 59.4 | 61.4 | 72.3 | 71.7 | 77.3 | 77.7 | (le-46) | (7e-69) | (2e-4) |

## Performance

|  | $f_{\mathrm{D}}$ |  |  | $f_{\mathrm{M}}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ProbGons | SPEM | ISPAlign | ProbGons | SPEM | 1SPAlign |
| Twilight $\{205\}$ | 29.3 | 44.2 | 46.1 | 21.0 | 30.8 | 32.0 |
| (vs ProbGons) |  | $(2 \mathrm{e}-26)$ | $(6 \mathrm{e}-29)$ |  | $(1 \mathrm{e}-27)$ | $(3 \mathrm{e}-29)$ |
| (vs spem) |  |  | $(0.01)$ |  |  | $(0.005)$ |
| Superfamily $\{422\}$ <br> (vs ProbGons) | 57.1 | 68.3 | 69.0 | 43.6 | 50.9 | 51.6 |
| (vs sPEM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | HOMSTRAD CS |  |  |  |  | PREFAB Q |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ProbCons | Method 1 | Method2 | Methods | Method 4 | ProbCons | Method 1 | Method2 | Method3 | Method 4 |
| 0-20\% | 43.1 | 59.1 | 59.2 | 59.4 | 62.7 | 38.9 | 58.2 | 58.6 | 61.3 | 64.8 |
| (vs previous) |  | (3e-22) | (-) | (0.04) | (6e-8) |  | (2e-103) | (-) | (6e-12) | (7e-29) |
| 20-40\% | 74.7 | 79.1 | 79.6 | 81.4 | 81.9 | 82.8 | 88.7 | 89.0 | 89.7 | 90.1 |
| (vs previous) |  | (2e-24) | (0.003) | (7e-14) | (0.005) |  | $(9 \mathrm{e}-45)$ | (-) | (2e-4) | (0.004) |
| 40-70\% | 92.2 | 92.1 | 92.5 | 93.1 | 93.2 | 96.4 | 94.4 | 96.6 | 97.8 | 97.6 |
| (vs previous) |  | (-) | (8e-4) | (0.001) | (-) |  | (-) | (0.002) | (-) | (0.008*) |
| 70-100\% | 99.1 | 98.2 | 99.1 | 99.2 | 98.9 | 97.8 | 97.0 | 96.9 | 98.1 | 98.0 |
| (vs previous) |  | (6e-4*) | (1e-4) | (-) | (0.003*) |  | (0.04*) | (0.02) | (-) | (-) |
| All | 77.4 | 81.7 | 82.2 | 83.2 | 84.0 | 61.4 | 73.5 | 73.9 | 75.7 | 77.7 |
| (vs previous) |  | (5e-38) | (1e-6) | (1e-14) | (1e-6) |  | (7e-146) | (-) | (2e-15) | (4e-28) |

## Future Work

- Adding intermediate sequence
- Rather than a fixed number, the number to add depends on the number of the input.
- Or until the minimum distances fall below a threshold.
- Retain the pair-HMM using a set of confirmed secondary structures.
- Use other profile method
- Use 3D structures if possible
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Thank you!

## Questions or Comment?

