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Common genes: Unique genes:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{G}=\{a, b, c, d, e\} & \mathcal{A}=\{u, v, w\} \\
\mathcal{B}=\{x, z\}
\end{array}
$$

$\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \mid \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow[\downarrow \text { inversion }]{d} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{v}$

$$
\left.\xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \stackrel{e}{\stackrel{d}{d}}\right|_{\text {deletion } \downarrow} \stackrel{u}{v} \xrightarrow{w} \mid \stackrel{c}{\leftarrow}
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$$
\xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow[\text { insertion }]{\stackrel{e}{d}} \downarrow^{c}
$$

$$
\xrightarrow{b} \mid \underset{\text { fission }}{a} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{d} \underbrace{z} \underbrace{x}
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\xrightarrow{b} \underset{\downarrow \text { translocation }}{a} \left\lvert\, \frac{e}{d} z+\frac{c}{c}\right.
$$
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## Comparing genomes

Common genes: Unique genes:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{G}=\{a, b, c, d, e\} & \mathcal{A}=\{u, v, w\} \\
\mathcal{B}=\{x, z\}
\end{array}
$$

$\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \mid \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow[\text { inversion }]{\text { d }} \mid \xrightarrow{v} \xrightarrow{w}$


Insertions and Deletions - (Indels) or Substitutions change the content of the genome

Rearrangements change the organization of the genome and are modeled by the Double Cut and Join - (DCJ)
(Yancopoulos, Attie and Friedberg, 2005)
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{d} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{v} \xrightarrow{w} \stackrel{c}{\text { c }} \\
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Master graph $R(A, B)$ (no duplicated genes) [Friedberg et al., 2008]
$\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{d} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{v} \stackrel{w}{c} \circ$

$$
\stackrel{b^{t}}{\bullet} \quad b^{h} \quad a^{t} \quad a^{a^{h} u d^{h}} \quad d^{t} e^{t} \quad e^{e^{h}{ }_{v w} h} \quad c_{0}^{t} \quad \circ
$$


$\boldsymbol{B} \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} \circ \stackrel{\text { c }}{ } \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{Z}^{z} \xrightarrow{e} 0$
(The symbol o represents the telomeres in both genomes.)
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## Master graph $R(A, B) \quad$ (no duplicated genes) [Friedberg et al., 2008]



Components of $R(A, B)$ :

One clean BB-path
One clean $A B$-path
One $A B$-path with four labels
(collection of paths and cycles; the number of $A B$-paths is even)

$$
\boldsymbol{B} \circ \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \circ \quad \circ \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{d} \&^{z} \xrightarrow{e} 0
$$

(The symbol o represents the telomeres in both genomes.)

## DCJ model
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$$
\circ \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \circ \quad \circ \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{d} \stackrel{e}{l}
$$
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## DCJ distance

c: number of cycles in $R(A, B)$
b: number of $A B$-paths in $R(A, B)$

## Types of DCJ operations:

| DCJ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| optimal <br> neutral <br> counter-optimal on $R(A, B)$ | increase $c$ or $b$ <br> $c$ and $b$ unchanged <br> decrease $c$ or $b$ |

Bergeron et al. (2006): there is an optimal DCJ at each sorting step.

DCJ distance of $A$ and $B: \boldsymbol{d}_{\mathrm{DCJ}}(A, B)=|\mathcal{G}|-\left(c+\frac{b}{2}\right)$
( $\mathcal{G}$ : set of common genes of $A$ and $B$ )
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## DCJ model

Handling indels - accumulating labels in both genomes:

one $B B$-path, two $A B$-paths, and four labels

one $B B$-path, two $A B$-paths, one cycle and three labels

$B \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{X}|\xrightarrow{d}| \xrightarrow{z}$
( DCJ operations can increase the number of components and accumulate labels. )
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## Handling indels - the concept of run

Accumulating labels:


Runs:


Each run can be entirely accumulated into a single label with split DCJs.
A split DCJ is always optimal.
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## Indel-potential of a component $P$ [WABI 2010]

Minimum number of runs obtained sorting $P$ with split DCJs:

$$
\lambda(P)=\left\lceil\frac{\Lambda(P)+1}{2}\right\rceil \quad(\text { for } \Lambda(P) \geq 1)
$$

## Substitution-potential of a component $P$ [RECOMB-CG 2011]

Minimum number of pairs of runs obtained sorting $P$ with split DCJs:

$$
\sigma(P)=\left\lceil\frac{\Lambda(P)+1}{4}\right\rceil \quad(\text { for } \Lambda(P) \geq 1)
$$

| $\Lambda(P)$ | $\lambda(P)$ |  | $\sigma(P)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 2 | 2 |  | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 5 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 6 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 7 | 4 | 2 |  |
| $:$ | $\left\lceil\frac{\Lambda(P)+1}{2}\right\rceil$ | $\left\lceil\frac{\Lambda(P)+1}{4}\right\rceil$ |  |
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$>$ An upper bound is given by: $d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}^{i d}(A, B) \leq d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}(A, B)+\sum_{P \in R(A, B)} \lambda(P)$

- The exact distance can be computed in linear time.
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DCJ-indel distance [WABI 2010]
$\Rightarrow$ An upper bound is given by: $d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}^{i d}(A, B) \leq d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}(A, B)+\sum_{P \in R(A, B)} \lambda(P)$

- The exact distance can be computed in linear time.

DCJ-substitution distance [RECOMB-CG 2011]
$\Rightarrow$ An upper bound is given by: $d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}^{s b}(A, B) \leq d_{\mathrm{DCJ}}(A, B)+\sum_{P \in R(A, B)} \sigma(P)$

- The exact distance can be computed in linear time.
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## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

- The labels in the same component of the master graph seem to be somehow related.
- This includes, but is not limited to, the case of adjacencies (when the unknown or mis-annotated genes are adjacent to genes of the same family in both genomes).
- Could this information be used to improve the annotation (missing homology assignment and duplicate disambiguation) of the genomes?
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& A \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{d} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{e} \\
& \therefore a^{t} a_{0}^{h} d^{t} a_{0}^{h} c_{0}^{t} c_{0}^{h} b^{t} b_{0}^{h} e^{t} e_{0}^{h} \quad e_{0}^{0}
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? A-label and B-label in distinct components


We "remove" two subst., but increase the number of common genes and decrease the number of comp.
The distance does not decrease if $x$ and $y$ are homologous, independently of their relative orientations.

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component
$\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b}$
$B \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{c}$

Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b} \\
& \circ a^{a^{t}} \quad a^{h} \quad c^{t} \\
& c^{h} \hat{x} b^{t} \\
& b^{h} \\
& d^{t} \\
& d^{h}
\end{aligned} \circ .
$$

Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? $A$-label and $B$-label in the same component


Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component

$$
\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b}
$$



Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component

$B \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{c}$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$

Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? $A$-label and $B$-label in the same component

$\sigma=1$ (one substitution)
DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$


Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

Substitution or homology? $A$-label and $B$-label in the same component

$\sigma=1$ (one substitution)
DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$

$$
\boldsymbol{A} \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{c} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{d}
$$



Using the DCJ model to improve annotation
Substitution or homology? $A$-label and $B$-label in the same component

$B \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{y} \xrightarrow{d}$
$\sigma=1$ (one substitution)
DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$


B $\xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{d}$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



DCJ distance $=4-1-2 / 2=2$
DCJ-substitution distance $=3$

## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



## Using the DCJ model to improve annotation

## Substitution or homology? A-label and $B$-label in the same component



$$
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The distance decreases if $x$ and $y$ are homologous, for one of their two possible relative orientations.
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We "remove" one subst., increase the number of common genes and may increase the number of comp.
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$\Lambda=4 ; \sigma=2$ (two subst.)
DCJ distance $=7-1=6$


$$
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| Comparison | D | SC | LC | $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\mathbf{1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq \mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| R.pr. $x$ R.ty. | 1 | 797 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| R.co. $x$ R.af. | 1 | 874 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| R.co. $x$ R.ma. | 3 | 867 | 2 | 9 | 0 |
| R.af. $x$ R.ma. | 2 | 868 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| R.pr. $x$ R.co. | 4 | 789 | 1 | 38 | 1 |
| R.ty. $x$ R.co. | 5 | 787 | 2 | 37 | 1 |
| R.pr. $x$ R.af. | 3 | 788 | 1 | 39 | 1 |
| R.ty. $x$ R.af. | 4 | 786 | 2 | 38 | 1 |
| R.pr. $x$ R.ma. | 3 | 786 | 3 | 43 | 1 |
| R.ty. $x$ R.ma. | 4 | 784 | 4 | 42 | 1 |
| R.pr. $x$ R.fe. | 11 | 777 | 4 | 59 | 2 |
| R.ty. $x$ R.fe. | 12 | 775 | 5 | 58 | 2 |
| R.co. $x$ R.fe. | 11 | 844 | 3 | 38 | 2 |
| R.af. $x$ R.fe. | 10 | 845 | 3 | 39 | 2 |
| R.ma. $x$ R.fe. | 10 | 851 | 3 | 37 | 4 |

D = DCJ distance; SC = short cycle; LC = long cycle
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- two pairs of genes that could be homologous between R. felis and the three species R. conorii, R. africae and R. massiliae.
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## D = DCJ distance; SC = short cycle; LC = long cycle

With a quick look, we could find:

- two pairs of genes that could be homologous between R. felis and the three species R. conorii, R. africae and R. massiliae.
$\square$ two pairs of genes that could be homologous between R. prowazekii and R. typhi and the four species $R$. felis, R. conorii, R. africae and R. massiliae.
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## Resolving duplications

- The master graph is only defined for genomes without duplicated genes.
- However, duplicates could be represented as labels in the components of the graph.
- The information of the components could help to disambiguate the duplications.
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## Resolving duplications - pairs from the same or from distinct components

Two cycles:

$\hat{x}$

$\hat{x}$


Pairs from distinct cycles


Pairs from the same cycle


Assigning pairs in the same cycle is better or at least as good as assigning pairs in distinct cycles.
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## Summary

- In genome rearrangements, the analysis usually has three main steps:

1. Find genes in the given genomes
2. Annotate genes
3. Compute distance according to some rearrangement model

- In the development of approaches to solve step (3), it is often assumed that steps (1) and (2) are given.
- Here we have shown that the graph structure used in step (3) for the DCJ model, that actually requires some annotation of the genomes, can be used to improve the annotation itself.
- However, finding candidates for homology in a component of the graph can be difficult, if the component is long and with many labels.
- Fortunately, for some datasets (in particular closely related genomes such as Rickettsia), the components are usually short and have few labels.
- There is a potential in the use of this graph to disambiguate duplicate genes.
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