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Abstract: Many modern sequence alignment tools implement fast string matching using the space efficient data structure called a FM-index. The succinct nature of this data structure presents unique challenges for the algorithm designers. In this paper, we explore the opportunities for parallelization of the exact and inexact matches, and present an efficient solution for the Occ portion of the algorithm that utilizes the instruction-level parallelism of the modern CPUs. Our implementation computes all eight Occ values required for the inexact match algorithm step in a single pass. We showcase the algorithm performance in a multi-core genome aligner and discuss effects of the memory prefetch.

1 INTRODUCTION

The FM-index has been developed as a space efficient index for string matching. The backward search over the index finds exact matches of a pattern in time that is linear relative to the length of the pattern, regardless the size of the reference. Even though the applications are numerous, for instance text compression (Navarro and Mäkinen, 2007), and indexing (Zhang et al., 2013a), the FM-index has become especially popular with the developers of DNA sequence aligners like Bowtie (Langmead et al., 2009), SOAPv2 (Li et al., 2009), and BWA (Li and Durbin, 2009). Next, we introduce the fundamentals of the FM-index construction and operation.

2 BACKGROUND

Let R be a string of length n over some alphabet Σ. A special character $ that is not part of the alphabet and is lexicographically smaller than any character in Σ is appended to the end of the string. $ denotes a character in R at position i, and R[i, j] is a substring of R ranging from i to j. Suffix array SA(R) is then defined as an integer array containing starting positions of all suffixes of R in a sorted order so that

\[ R[SA[i−1], n] < R[SA[i], n], 1 < i ≤ n \]  

(1)

Suffix array could be constructed by simply sorting all suffixes of a string. More sophisticated algorithms take into account the fact that all strings are related to each other and achieve much better asymptotic complexity and practical performance (Puglisi et al., 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>BWT</th>
<th>Occ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ACA</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAG</td>
<td>ACAG</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG$</td>
<td>AGSA</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAG$</td>
<td>CAG$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>GSAC</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA BWT Occ
A C G T
$ 0 0 1 0
ACAG 0 0 1 0
AG$ 0 1 0
CAG$ 1 1 1 0
GS 2 1 1 0

Figure 1: Data structures comprising FM-index are in boxes.

The Burrows-Wheeler Matrix \( BWM(R) \) is obtained by writing out all rotations of string \( R \) and sorting them lexicographically. The last column of the \( BW \) then forms a string known as the Burrows-Wheeler Transform \( BWT(R) \). Sorting string rotations is closely related to sorting prefixes as shown in Figure 1, and \( BWT(R) \) can be easily obtained form \( SA(R) \):

\[ BWT[i] = \begin{cases} 
R[SA[i−1], n], & SA[i] > 0 \\
$, & SA[i] = 0 
\end{cases} \]  

(2)

Next, for each character \( b \) in \( Σ \) and for every \( 0 ≤ k < n \) we record the number of occurrences of \( b \) in the \( BWT \) substring \( BWT[0, k] \), and store it in the table \( Occ \). Additionally, we store the total of occurrences of all characters lexicographically preceding \( b \)
in BWT into the table C. It is easy to compute C as an exclusive prefix sum of the last row of Occ. For any single character at position i in a pattern W, the interval of rows in the BWM starting with this character is easily computed from C:

\[ \{k,l\} = \{C[W[i]], C[W[i] + 1]\} \]  

(3)

From this initial interval, it is possible to extend the search backward from the starting position using the following recursive procedure:

**ExactRecursion** (W, i, k, l)
- if \( i < 0 \) then return \( \{k,l\} \)
- \( b \leftarrow W[i] \)
- \( k \leftarrow C(b) + \text{Occ}(b, k - 1) + 1 \)
- \( l \leftarrow C(b) + \text{Occ}(b, l) \)
- return **ExactRecursion** (W, i - 1, k, l)

Listing 1: Backward Exact Match.

After the search is complete, the final BWT interval is mapped back to the locations in reference using the suffix array.

**InexactRecursion** (W, i, z, k, l)
- if \( z < 0 \) then return \( \emptyset \)
- if \( i < 0 \) then return \( \{k,l\} \)
- \( I \leftarrow I \cup \text{InexactRecursion}(W, i - 1, z - 1, k, l) \)
- for each \( b \in \Sigma \) do
  - \( k \leftarrow C(b) + \text{Occ}(b, k - 1) + 1 \)
  - \( I \leftarrow C(b) + \text{Occ}(b, l) \)
  - if \( k < l \) then
    - \( I \leftarrow I \cup \text{InexactRecursion}(W, i, z - 1, k, l) \)
  - if \( b = W[i] \) then
    - \( I \leftarrow I \cup \text{InexactRecursion}(W, i - 1, z, k, l) \)
  - else
    - \( I \leftarrow I \cup \text{InexactRecursion}(W, i - 1, z - 1, k, l) \)
- return \( I \)

Listing 2: Inexact Match.

Note that every step of the inexact match algorithm consumes eight Occ values compared to two Occ values required by the exact match. In theory, all Occ values could be precomputed, but holding the full Occ array for the human genome reference would consume approximately 100GB of memory. To save memory space, the FM-index over the DNA alphabet is often stored using a cache-friendly approach introduced in (Gog and Petri, 2014), that harks back to the bucket layout from the original FM-index paper (Ferragina and Manzini, 2000). Values of Occ(*, k) for every k that is a multiple of 128 are stored in memory followed by 128 characters of BWT in 2-bit encoding. Four Occ counters occupy 256 bits, as does the BWT string. For Occ counters that are not at the factor of 128 positions, the values must be calculated on the fly. Furthermore, the suffix array is compressed in a similar manner. Only values of SA[k] where k is a multiple of 32 are stored in memory, while all the values in between are recomputed using the Inverse Suffix Array relationships:

\[ \Psi^{-1}(i) = C[BWT[i]] + \text{Occ}(BWT[i], i) \]  

(4)

\[ SA[k] = SA[(\Psi^{-1})'(k)] + j \]  

(5)

It means that Equation 4 is applied over and over until for a value of j the result comes out to be a multiple of 32, and the SA value could be constructed according to Equation 5.

Even though the memory saving measures do not change the asymptotic complexity of the match algorithm, in reality they add hundreds of computations of Occ to every search. Given that the search is performed multiple times for each and every read out of billions required for the alignment of a human genome, Occ function performance becomes crucial.

### 3 SOLUTION

Our approach could be traced back to the algorithm by (Vigna, 2008) that performs memory table lookups to count character occurrences in each byte of the BWT string. We replace the memory lookups with the half-byte register lookups, building on an idea first proposed by Mula for the bit population count (Mula et al., 2017). Note however that we do not attempt to reduce the character counting problem to bit counting, and apply the half-byte technique directly to the BWT string. Inputs and outputs for all eight counters, that are required for one step of the inexact search, fit into a single AVX512 register and are computed with one vector pass.

The input BWT string is masked with zeros beforehand for situations when the character at position k is in the middle of the byte. The result of 256-bit occurrence count should be corrected for the extra 127 – k A characters.

### 3.1 Lookup

Every byte in the BWT string is split into its higher and lower half. Since each half byte value cannot be greater than 15, the lookup values now fit into a single vector register and could be retrieved via the VPUSHUFB instruction. The lookup returns all four counters in a 2-bit format packed into a byte. Two bits are sufficient as a half byte contains just two characters. Additionally, the OccLo result is pre-converted
3.2 Extraction

After the lookup phase, all counters are tightly packed into two vector registers. Any addition operation could result in overflowing the 2-bit values. Before proceeding we have to extract counters for a given character X.

Both OccLo and OccHi are shifted to bring OccX into the two lower bits of the byte. High bits of OccLo are then filled with ones and high bits of OccHi with zeros. At this point OccHi contains unsigned byte values of OccHiX and OccLo contains values of 255 – OccLoX. The merged values are then fed into the VPSADBW instruction. It sums the absolute differences of eight consecutive bytes and stores the result as a 64-bit integer. At the end of this operation the result vector contains four partial sums in the form of 2040 – \( \Sigma (\text{OccLo}X + \text{OccHi}X) \). The final horizontal sum yields 8160 – OccX, and the final subtraction is combinable with the correction for the extra A count.

3.3 Aggregation

The extraction sequence runs four times to collect partial sums for characters ACGT, CATG, TGCA, and GTAC in four vector registers. Aggregating four final sums within a single register then takes just three additions and three shuffle operations, only one of which crosses the 128-bit lane boundary. The absence of data dependencies between extraction operations facilitates efficient use of the SIMD pipeline and keeps all arithmetic ports busy. Outputs for all eight counters required for one step of the inexact search fit into a single AVX512 register and are computed with one vector pass.

4 IMPLEMENTATION

We have implemented the half-byte Occ algorithm using the AVX2 instruction set. The AVX512 version computing 8 values in parallel has also been integrated in the inexact search algorithm. The assembly code along with the Intel Architecture Code Analyzer throughput report is listed in the Appendix. The code is indeed well balanced: 49 out of 65 micro operations are evenly spread across the ports 0, 1, and 5 available for the arithmetics and shuffles. The code is expected to bottleneck on the backend meaning that the memory access pattern is crucial for the real word performance. High utilization of every bit and the branchless nature of the algorithm make it also a good candidate for implementing on a field-programmable gate array hardware (FPGA).
4.1 Experimental Setup

The computer platform is an Intel Xeon Platinum 8168 system with 16 cores running at 2.7 GHz and 32GB of RAM. To test the software performance we have run the BWA alignment tool with 16 threads (-t 16) on a 30X Human genome sample NA12878 from the 1000 Genomes database using hg38 as a reference. We have executed the BWA version 7.15 to establish the baseline, and then replaced the Occ code with our AVX2 and AVX512 implementations. The total run times got collected from the BWA reports, and the percentage of time spent in the BWT and SA code versus the rest of BWA have been measured via profiling.

4.2 Results

![Figure 4: Execution times for NA12878.](image)

The vectorized SA code runs twice as fast as the scalar version, mostly due to the predictable memory prefetch pattern. The BWT code exhibits only a 30% speedup, and the switch to AVX512 does not bring any gains. At this point the BWT code is completely memory bound. To utilize the vectorization performance gains completely, we would have to explore ideas for improving the cache locality of the FM-index (Chacon et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2013b). Despite the memory bottlenecks, the overall runtime is improved by 25%.
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APPENDIX

Intel Architecture Code Analyzer report for the AVX implementation of $\Psi^{-1}$.
Throughput Analysis Report

Block Throughput: 20.63 Cycles

Throughput Bottleneck: Backend

Generated File: throughput.dat

Port Binding In Cycles Per Iteration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>0 - DV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 - D</th>
<th>3 - D</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycles</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uops</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 - D</th>
<th>3 - D</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2ël | | | | | | | | | | | | | 153
| 1 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | 153
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | Vectorized Character Counting for Faster Pattern Matching

Intel(R) Architecture Code Analyzer Version - v3.0-28-g1ba2cbb build date: 2017-10-23;17:30:24
Analyzed File - bwa.exe
Binary Format - 64Bit
Architecture - SKL
Analysis Type - Throughput

Port Count: 22
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vpsadbw ymm1, ymm3, ymm5 |
| 2ˆ | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 0.5 | 0.5 0.5 | | | | | vpaddd ymm5, ymm8, ymmword ptr [rip+0x21dffe] |
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vpermlpd ymm0, ymm1, 0x5 |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.6 | | | | | | | vpaddq ymm4, ymm0, ymm1 |
| 1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 0.5 | 0.5 0.5 | | | | | vpaddd ymm0, xmm9, xmmword ptr [rip+0x21debc] |
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vpmovsxwq ymm1, xmm0 |
| 2ˆ | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 0.5 | 0.5 0.5 | | | | | vpaddd ymm2, ymm1, ymmword ptr [rdx+0x8] |
| 2ˆ | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 0.5 | 0.5 0.5 | | | | | vpaddd ymm3, ymm2, ymmword ptr [rcx] |
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vpermq ymm0, ymm4, 0x4e |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.6 | | | | | | | vpaddd ymm1, ymm0, ymm4 |
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vmovq xmm0, r8 |
| 1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | | | | | | | vpsubq ymm2, ymm3, ymm1 |
| 1 | | | | | | 1.0 | | | vpermd ymm4, ymm5, ymm2 |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.6 | | | | | | | vpcmpeqq xmm1, xmm10, xmm0 |
| 1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | | | | | | | vpadnd xmm0, xmm1, xmm4 |
| 1 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | vmovq r8, xmm0 |

Total Num Of Uops: 65

Analysis Notes:
Backend allocation was stalled due to unavailable allocation resources.