1 Background (courtesy of Dr. Jeremy Buhler)

The goal of this lab is to implement hashing as part of a tool for finding matching substrings in two text strings or files. In particular, we'll look at the application for comparing genomic DNA sequences. The approach to biosequence comparison that we'll use here is an important part of such well-known tools as FASTA (Pearson & Lipman 1988) and BLAST (Altschul et al. 1990, 1997).

A DNA sequence is a string of characters, called bases, from the alphabet \{a, c, g, t\}. Genomic DNA encodes a large collection of features, including:

- **genes** – the instructions for building proteins;
- **regulatory sites** – sequence markers recognized by cellular machinery that can increase or decrease the rate at which a given gene is used to make protein;
- **repeats** – junk left behind by transposable elements, pieces of DNA that can autonomously copy themselves and move around in the genome. Transposable elements proliferate, then die, leaving behind many inactive copies of themselves in the genome as repeats.

All DNA is subject to mutations that alter its sequence over time. However, functional sequence features like genes and regulatory sites are more resistant to mutation than DNA that doesn’t code for anything (because natural selection usually kills off organisms with too many mutations in these features). We can therefore find these features by comparing DNA sequences from two different organisms and seeing which parts of the sequences have remained similar to each other since their lineages split from their last common ancestor.

Abstractly, we are given two long strings \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) of characters, and we want to find short substrings (parts of the features) common to \(s_1\) and \(s_2\). In general, the common substrings might not be exactly the same because even functional sequences mutate over time; however, we often find that \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) still exhibit exactly matching substrings of at least 10 to 15 characters in the neighborhood of their shared features. By detecting these exact substring matches, we can find the most likely locations of the shared features in \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) and can then apply more sensitive but more expensive similarity search algorithms only at those locations.

Naively, we could find \(k\)-mers (i.e. substrings of length \(k\)) common to \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) by comparing every \(k\)-mer from one sequence to every \(k\)-mer from the other. Such an approach would take time \(\Theta(|s_1| \cdot |s_2|)\), which is unacceptable because interesting DNA sequences range from thousands to billions of characters in length (your own genome is about three billion characters long). Fortunately, there is a much better approach.

Call \(s_1\) the corpus string and \(s_2\) the pattern string, and assume we are searching for common substrings of length \(k\). We first construct a table \(T\) of every \(k\)-mer in the pattern string, remembering where in the pattern it occurs. Then, for each \(k\)-mer in the corpus string, we check whether it occurs in the table \(T\); if so, we have found a match between pattern and corpus. If \(T\) supports constant-time insertions and lookups (e.g. if it is a hash table), we can process the entire pattern and corpus in time \(\Theta(|s_1| + |s_2| + M)\) where \(M\) is the number of common substrings actually found. In general, this time cost is much lower than the cost of the naive algorithm. Fast substring matching based on hashing therefore forms the core of many of today’s high-speed biosequence matching algorithms.

To make things slightly more interesting, we will also allow the user to specify a mask string that contains “uninteresting” DNA. For example, if we’re looking for matching genes, we might not be interested in any common substrings that are part of known repeats. Any \(k\)-mer appearing in the mask string is removed from the table before searching for matches in the corpus.
2 Your Assignment

Part 1: Implement a Hash Table using Open Addressing (45 points)

We have provided you with code that implements most of a sequence matching tool. The provided code reads sequences from files, asks the data set number (or takes it from a command line argument), the dictionary size, and the desired match length (e.g., 15 characters), then performs the substring matching computation described above. However, there’s an important piece missing: a StringDictionary class that implements a dictionary where the keys are strings. Your implementation must use hashing with collisions resolution by open addressing with double hashing. When an item is inserted into the hash table it should reuse slots marked as deleted if they occur on the probe sequence.

Your hash table will associate each key with an object of type Record that store the association between a k-mer string (the key) and a list of positions in the pattern where that string occurs (the associated data). The StringDictionary class exports seven public methods with the following semantics. These semantics were selected to match that of the Java Dictionary class.

StringDictionary(int size): this constructor creates a new, empty hash table of the given size. You can assume for the purposes of this lab that the load factor will be kept sufficiently low. In reality, if the load factor would ever exceed 1/2, then you should have a method that would double the size of the dictionary and rebuild it. You would also typically have a constructor without an argument that initializes the hashtable size to some small value such as 16. But you aren’t required to provide that here.

Record put(String key, Record r): Associates the specified Record r with the specified key in the dictionary. If the dictionary already contains a Record for this key, the old Record is replaced by r. This function returns the previous value associated with specified key, or null if there was no mapping for key. A null return can also indicate that the map previously associated null with the specified key. NOTE: The code provided with the course textbook uses a different semantics.

boolean containsKey(String key): Returns true if the given key is contained in the dictionary. Otherwise, false is returned.

Record get(String key): Returns the Record associated with the specified key. Returns null if the dictionary does not contain any item with the given key. A return value of null does not necessarily indicate that the dictionary does not contain the key; it’s also possible that the map explicitly maps the key to null. The containsKey method may be used to distinguish between these two cases.

Record remove(String key): Removes key from the dictionary, if it is present. Returns the Record associated with the key if it was in use, or null if the key was not in the dictionary. (A null return can also indicate that the Record previously associated with the specified key was null.)

int size(): Returns the number of key-Record mappings in the dictionary.

You do not need to copy Records to store them – the calling program is responsible for properly maintaining the records, the dictionary’s job is just to store a reference to them and return this reference as appropriate.

Your StringDictionary will need some internal methods that implement its hash functions. I have provided three of these methods: int toHashKey(String s) maps a String s to an integer value that you can pass to the hash functions. I’ve also provided the primary hash function,
int baseHash(int hashKey), and the secondary hash function, int stepHash(int hashKey).
In order for the secondary hash function to reach all slots (which is a property you want), the hash
table size is required to be a power of 2. Do not change any of these provided functions. You
will also want to add a private class that encapsulates the key and Record into one object and
most likely an additional private functions within StringDictionary that performs the work that
is needed by several of the public methods.

Naturally, you may not use the Java HashSet or HashMap classes (or any source of code for
hashing with open addressing) to implement your dictionary! You may look at the code provided
in the CD that came with your textbook, but to make the changes needed for the different semantics,
you will need to understand open addressing. You are expected to implement the provided methods
in an efficient and clean way versus using “round-about” ways because it enables you to use provided
code as is versus modifying it.

The interface above is for the Java implementation. For the C++ version, things are just slightly
different: the methods take and return pointers to Records, and the constructor also takes the sub-
string match length to store in an instance variable, matchLength so that you can pass raw character
arrays instead of String objects as keys, and NULL is used instead of null. Also, a C++ equals
method is provided that returns true if and only if the first matchLength characters of two provided
character arrays are equal.

The provided driver to perform the matching algorithm does not test all aspects of the required
methods. For example, put is never called with a key already in use and put is never called after
remove. Thus a driver Lab2PutTester is also provided. When providing the output from this driver
you are to include (from within your StringDictionary) the sequence of slots probed AND for put,
the slot where the item is placed.

It is your job to be sure that your code provides the functionality described correctly using
hashing with open addressing. The TAs will be checking this in your code and deductions will be
made if there are errors even if you obtained the correct output for the test data. So do your own
testing in addition to the test provided for you.

Part 2: Empirically Study Number of Probes (5 points)
Each time you examine an entry in the hash table within the contains method, that is called a
probe. This includes the table entry that ends the search (i.e. the one with the key if is in the hash
table or an empty slot if it is not there). In order to see how the performance of your hash table
varies with the load factor, here you modify your implementation to compute the average number
of probes used by the get method call made from within findMatches of the driver for various
hash table sizes. You can modify the driver and/or your code to do this. See the below section on
“What to Submit” for details on what you will need to submit.

Command Syntax and Reading From Files
The provided Java driver program has the following command syntax:

java Lab2 <transcript file> <corpus file> <pattern file> [ < mask file> ]

The corpus, pattern, and mask files contain their respective sequences, while the transcript file
stores a record of the program’s output. Note that the mask file is an optional argument. Also,
since I know some students do not know how to pass command line arguments, if no command line
arguments are provided then the main program will ask the user to input which data set (1,2,3 or
4) should be used and then it will uses the appropriate files (with the provided names) and also
save a transcript file. More details is included in the comments in Lab2.java.
The C++ version of the driver omits the transcript file argument, so you'll have to capture its output some other way such as using the transcript program provided within Unix.

A Note on Compatibility

The provided Java code has been tested with JDK 1.2 and higher, but it may not compile on JDK 1.1.x. You may be able to make the code work on older JDK’s by replacing all uses of the ArrayList data type with the older Vector type.

What to Submit

Please staple the following items and write your name on each page. You should have a cover sheet (with all portions filled in including your name and signature) stapled to the front.

1. Turn in your StringDictionary class. If you modify the Record classes in any way, turn that in along with the code for any new classes created. (Include any new/revised header files for those using C++). There should be no need to submit any of the other provided code. Just summarize any changes you made (if any).

2. If your implementation is buggy and you were unable to fix the bugs, please tell us what you think is wrong and give us a test case that shows the error. You'll lose fewer points for a wrong answer if you indicate that you know it’s wrong (and, if possible, why it’s wrong).

3. The output from Lab2PutTester where you show the sequence of probes made by both put and remove, and also output the final slot where the item is placed by put. Be sure to check your output is correct and note any problems. To help you check that everything works, here are the values of the hash functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dragon</th>
<th>ape</th>
<th>dog</th>
<th>bat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baseHash</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stepHash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On the course web page (under labs) are four sets of DNA sequences on which to run your program; two of these sets include the correct outputs within the provided README file. Provide the output of FastMatch on all four test sets using the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data Set 1</th>
<th>Data Set 2</th>
<th>Data Set 3</th>
<th>Data Set 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dictionary size</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32768</td>
<td>262144</td>
<td>131072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match length</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You’ll find more information about the Data sets in the provided README file. Be sure to remove any print lines from within your StringDictionary that output the probe sequence. The only output in these tests runs should be those from FastMatch.

5. If you did Part II, you should report the average number of probes of the get method over all calls made by findMatches when using Data Set 2 with a match length of 15. Gather data for hash table sizes of 16384, 32768, 65536, 131072, and 262144. Report the load factor and average number of probes for each of the five hash table sizes. In computing the load factor you should divide the number of slots either in use or marked as deleted by the table size. To do this you may need to modify your String Dictionary to keep track of the number of slots used or flagged as deleted. Finally, briefly answer the following questions: How does the average number of collisions relate with the load factor? Is this what you expected? Why or why not? If not, try to explain why.