

# Strategies of Loop Recombination in Ciliates

Robert Brijder<sup>1</sup>, Hendrik Jan Hoogeboom<sup>1</sup>, and Michael Muskulus<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science, Universiteit Leiden,  
Niels Bohrweg 1, 2333 CA Leiden, The Netherlands,  
rbrijder@liacs.nl

<sup>2</sup> Mathematical Institute, Universiteit Leiden,  
Niels Bohrweg 1, 2333 CA Leiden, The Netherlands

## Abstract

Gene assembly in ciliates is an extremely involved DNA transformation process, which transforms a nucleus, the micronucleus, to another functionally different nucleus, the macronucleus. In this paper we characterize which loop recombination operations (one of the three types of molecular operations that accomplish gene assembly) can possibly be applied in the transformation of a given gene from its micronuclear form to its macronuclear form. We also characterize in which order these loop recombination operations are applicable. This is done in the abstract and more general setting of so-called legal strings.

## 1 Introduction

Ciliates are a large group of one-cellular organisms having two functionally different nuclei: the micronucleus and the macronucleus. An involved DNA transformation process called gene assembly transforms a micronucleus into a macronucleus. The process is accomplished using three types of DNA transformations, which operate on special DNA sequences called pointers. These three types of operations are called loop recombination, hairpin recombination, and double-loop recombination.

For every gene in its micronuclear form, there can be several sequences of operations to transform this gene to its macronuclear form. We call such a sequence a strategy. For a given micronuclear gene strategies may differ in the number of hairpin and double-loop recombination operations. It has been shown that the number of loop recombination operations is independent of the chosen strategy [4, 3], and that this number can be efficiently calculated [1].

In this paper we further investigate the loop recombination operation, called the string negative rule in the string pointer reduction system, a formal model of gene assembly introduced in [2]. We characterize for a given set of pointers  $D$ ,

---

LIACS Technical Report 2006-01, Universiteit Leiden, January 2006

whether or not there is a strategy that applies loop recombination operations on exactly these pointers. We show that this characterization implies an efficient algorithm that determines this for given  $D$ . Also, we characterize the order in which the pointers of  $D$  can possibly be applied in strategies. These results are obtained using the reduction graph, a graph similar to the breakpoint graph in the theory of sorting by reversal, introduced in [1].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall basic notions and terminology concerning mainly strings and graphs, and in Section 3 we recall a formal model of the gene assembly process: the string pointer reduction system. In Section 4 we recall the notion of reduction graph and some theorems related to this notion. In Section 5 we define the pointer-component graph, a graph that depends on the reduction graph, and we discuss a natural operation on this graph. In Section 6 we show that spanning trees of the pointer-component graphs reveal interesting properties concerning the string negative rule. Section 7 shows that merging and splitting of vertices in pointer-component graphs relate to the removal of pointers. Using the results of Sections 6 and 7, we characterize in Section 8 for a given set of pointers  $D$ , whether or not there is a strategy that applies string negative rules on exactly these pointers. Section 9 strengthens results of Section 8 by also characterizing in which order the string negative rules can be applied on the pointers. We conclude this paper with Section 10.

## 2 Basic Notions and Notation

In this section we recall some basic notions concerning functions, strings, and graphs. We do this mainly to fix the basic notation and terminology.

The *composition* of functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$  is the function  $gf : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $(gf)(x) = g(f(x))$  for every  $x \in X$ . The restriction of  $f$  to a subset  $A$  of  $X$  is denoted by  $f|_A$ , and for  $D \subseteq X$  we denote by  $f[D]$  the set  $\{f(x) \mid x \in D\}$ .

We will use  $\lambda$  to denote the empty string. For strings  $u$  and  $v$ , we say that  $v$  is a *substring* of  $u$  if  $u = w_1vw_2$ , for some strings  $w_1, w_2$ ; we also say that  $v$  *occurs in*  $u$ .

For alphabets  $\Sigma$  and  $\Delta$ , a *homomorphism* is a function  $\varphi : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Delta^*$  such that  $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$  and for all  $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ . Let  $\varphi : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Delta^*$  be a homomorphism. If there is a  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$  such that

$$\varphi(a) = \begin{cases} a & a \notin \Gamma \\ \lambda & a \in \Gamma \end{cases},$$

then  $\varphi$  is denoted by *erase* $_{\Gamma}$ .

We now turn to graphs. A (*undirected*) *graph* is a tuple  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V$  is a finite set and  $E \subseteq \{\{x, y\} \mid x, y \in V\}$ . The elements of  $V$  are called *vertices* and the elements of  $E$  are called *edges*. We allow  $x = y$ , and therefore edges can be of the form  $\{x, x\} = \{x\}$  — an edge of this form should be seen as an edge connecting  $x$  to  $x$ , i.e., a ‘loop’ for a vertex.

Isomorphisms between graphs are defined in the usual way. Two graphs  $G = (V, E)$  and  $G' = (V', E')$  are *isomorphic*, denoted by  $G \approx G'$ , if there is a

bijection  $\alpha : V \rightarrow V'$  such that  $\{x, y\} \in E$  iff  $\{\alpha(x), \alpha(y)\} \in E'$ , for all  $x, y \in V$ . A *walk* in a graph  $G$  is a string  $\pi = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$  over  $E$  with  $n \geq 1$  such that there are vertices  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}$  where  $e_i = \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$  and  $e_{i+1} = \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}\}$  for  $1 \leq i < n$  (allowing  $\{x, x\} = \{x\}$  for all vertices  $x$ ). We then also say that  $\pi$  is a *walk from  $x_1$  to  $x_{n+1}$*  or a *walk between  $x_1$  and  $x_{n+1}$* . We say that walk  $\pi$  is *simple* if  $x_i \neq x_j$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ . A walk from  $v$  to  $v$  for some  $v \in V$  is called a *cycle*. Note that a loop is a cycle. We say that  $G$  is *acyclic* if there are no cycles in  $G$ . We say that  $G$  is *connected* if for every two vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  of  $G$  with  $v_1 \neq v_2$ , there is a walk from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ . We say that  $G$  is a *tree*, if it is a connected acyclic graph. If we fix a certain vertex of the tree as the *root*, then the usual terminology of trees is used, such as the *father* of a vertex, and a *child* of a vertex, etc. Vertex  $x$  is *isolated* in  $G$  if there is no edge  $e$  of  $G$  with  $x \in e$ . The *restriction of  $G$  to  $E' \subseteq E$* , denoted by  $G|_{E'}$ , is  $(V, E')$ .

Graph  $G' = (V', E')$  is an *induced subgraph of  $G$*  if  $V' \subseteq V$  and  $E' = E \cap \{\{x, y\} \mid x, y \in V'\}$ . We also say that  $G'$  is the *subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $V'$* . A subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  induced by  $V_H \subseteq V$  is a *connected component of  $G$*  if  $H$  is connected, and for every edge  $e \in E$  either  $e \subseteq V_H$  or  $e \subseteq V \setminus V_H$ .

A (*undirected*) *multigraph* is a (undirected) graph  $G = (V, E, \epsilon)$ , where parallel edges are possible. Therefore,  $E$  is a finite set of edges and  $\epsilon : E \rightarrow \{\{x, y\} \mid x, y \in V\}$  is the *endpoint mapping*. Clearly, if  $\epsilon$  is injective, then such a multigraph is equivalent to a (undirected) graph. We let  $\Upsilon_1$  denote the set of undirected multigraphs.

A *2-edge coloured graph* is a (undirected) graph  $G = (V, E_1, E_2, f, s, t)$  where  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are two finite (not necessarily disjoint) sets of edges,  $s, t \in V$  are two distinct vertices called the *source vertex* and the *target vertex* respectively, and there is a vertex labelling function  $f : V \setminus \{s, t\} \rightarrow \Gamma$ . The elements of  $\Gamma$  are the *vertex labels*. We use  $\Upsilon_2$  to denote the set of all 2-edge coloured graphs.

Notions such as isomorphisms, walks, connectedness, and trees carry over to these two types of graphs. For example, for undirected multigraph  $G = (V, E, \epsilon)$  and  $E' \subseteq E$ , we have  $G|_{E'} = (V, E', \epsilon|_{E'})$ . Care must be taken for isomorphisms. Two 2-edge coloured graphs  $G = (V, E_1, E_2, f, s, t)$  and  $G' = (V', E'_1, E'_2, f', s', t')$  are *isomorphic*, denoted by  $G \approx G'$ , if there is a bijection  $\alpha : V \rightarrow V'$  such that  $\alpha(s) = s'$ ,  $\alpha(t) = t'$ ,  $f(v) = f'(\alpha(v))$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $\{x, y\} \in E_i$  iff  $\{\alpha(x), \alpha(y)\} \in E'_i$ , for all  $x, y \in V$ , and  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .

For 2-edge coloured graphs  $G$ , we say that a walk  $\pi = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$  in  $G$  is an *alternating walk in  $G$*  if, for  $1 \leq i < n$ , both  $e_i \in E_1$  and  $e_{i+1} \in E_2$  or the other way around.

### 3 String Pointer Reduction System

Three (almost) equivalent formal models for gene assembly were considered in [5, 2, 3]. In this section we briefly recall one of them: the string pointer reduction system. This is done mainly to fix the notation and terminology associated with this model. For a detailed motivation and other results concerning this model we refer to [3]. We continue to use the string pointer reduction system in the remainder of this paper.

We fix  $\kappa \geq 2$ , and define the alphabet  $\Delta = \{2, 3, \dots, \kappa\}$ . For  $D \subseteq \Delta$ , we define  $\bar{D} = \{\bar{a} \mid a \in D\}$  and  $\Pi = \Delta \cup \bar{\Delta}$ . The elements of  $\Pi$  will be called *pointers*. We use the ‘bar operator’ to move from  $\Delta$  to  $\bar{\Delta}$  and back from  $\bar{\Delta}$  to  $\Delta$ . Hence, for  $p \in \Pi$ ,  $\bar{\bar{p}} = p$ . For a string  $u = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n$  with  $x_i \in \Pi$ , the *inverse* of  $u$  is the string  $\bar{u} = \bar{x}_n\bar{x}_{n-1} \cdots \bar{x}_1$ . For  $p \in \Pi$ , we define  $\mathbf{p} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } p \in \Delta \\ \bar{p} & \text{if } p \in \bar{\Delta} \end{cases}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{p}$  is the ‘unbarred’ variant of  $p$ . The *domain* of a string  $v \in \Pi^*$  is  $\text{dom}(v) = \{\mathbf{p} \mid p \text{ occurs in } v\}$ . A *legal string* is a string  $u \in \Pi^*$  such that for each  $p \in \Pi$  that occurs in  $u$ ,  $u$  contains exactly two occurrences from  $\{p, \bar{p}\}$ .

**Definition 1**

Let  $u = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n$  be a legal string with  $x_i \in \Pi$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . For a pointer  $p \in \Pi$  such that  $\{x_i, x_j\} \subseteq \{p, \bar{p}\}$  and  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , the *p-interval* of  $u$  is the substring  $x_ix_{i+1} \cdots x_j$ . Two distinct pointers  $p, q \in \Pi$  *overlap* in  $u$  if both  $\mathbf{q} \in \text{dom}(I_p)$  and  $\mathbf{p} \in \text{dom}(I_q)$ , where  $I_p$  ( $I_q$ , resp.) is the *p-interval* (*q-interval*, resp.) of  $u$ . ■

**Example**

String  $u = \bar{4}37\bar{7}\bar{4}3$  is a legal string. However,  $v = 424$  is not a legal string. Also,  $\text{dom}(u) = \{3, 4, 7\}$  and  $\bar{u} = \bar{3}\bar{4}\bar{7}\bar{7}\bar{3}\bar{4}$ . The 3-interval of  $u$  is  $37\bar{7}43$ , and pointers 3 and 4 overlap in  $u$ .

The string pointer reduction system consists of three types of reduction rules operating on legal strings. For all  $p, q \in \Pi$  with  $\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{q}$ :

- the *string negative rule* for  $p$  is defined by  $\mathbf{snr}_p(u_1ppu_2) = u_1u_2$ ,
- the *string positive rule* for  $p$  is defined by  $\mathbf{spr}_p(u_1pu_2\bar{p}u_3) = u_1\bar{u}_2u_3$ ,
- the *string double rule* for  $p, q$  is defined by  $\mathbf{sdr}_{p,q}(u_1pu_2qu_3pu_4qu_5) = u_1u_4u_3u_2u_5$ ,

where  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_5$  are arbitrary (possibly empty) strings over  $\Pi$ . We also define  $\mathbf{Snr} = \{\mathbf{snr}_p \mid p \in \Pi\}$ ,  $\mathbf{Spr} = \{\mathbf{spr}_p \mid p \in \Pi\}$  and  $\mathbf{Sdr} = \{\mathbf{sdr}_{p,q} \mid p, q \in \Pi, \mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{q}\}$  to be the sets containing all the reduction rules of a specific type. For a pointer  $p$  and a legal string  $u$ , if both  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$  occur in  $u$  then we say that both  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$  are *positive* in  $u$ ; if on the other hand only  $p$  or only  $\bar{p}$  occurs in  $u$ , then both  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$  are *negative* in  $u$ .

Note that each of these rules is defined only on legal strings that satisfy the given form. For example,  $\mathbf{spr}_2$  is defined on legal string  $\bar{2}323$ , however  $\mathbf{spr}_2$  is not defined on this legal string. Also note that for every non-empty legal string there is at least one reduction rule applicable. Indeed, every non-empty legal string for which no string positive rule and no string double rule is applicable must have only non-overlapping negative pointers, thus there is a string negative rule which is applicable. This is formalized in Theorem 4.

**Definition 2**

The *domain* of a reduction rule  $\rho$ , denoted by  $\text{dom}(\rho)$ , equals the set of unbarred variants of the pointers that the rule is applied to, i.e.,  $\text{dom}(\mathbf{snr}_p) = \text{dom}(\mathbf{spr}_p) = \{\mathbf{p}\}$  and  $\text{dom}(\mathbf{sdr}_{p,q}) = \{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}\}$  for  $p, q \in \Pi$ . For a composition  $\varphi = \varphi_n \cdots \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of reduction rules  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n$ , the *domain*, denoted by  $\text{dom}(\varphi)$ , is the union of the domains of its constituents, i.e.,  $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{dom}(\varphi_2) \cup \cdots \cup \text{dom}(\varphi_n)$ . ■

**Example**

The domain of  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_2 \mathbf{spr}_4 \mathbf{sdr}_{7,5} \mathbf{snr}_9$  is  $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \{2, 4, 5, 7, 9\}$ .

**Definition 3**

Let  $S \subseteq \{Snr, Spr, Sdr\}$ . Then a composition  $\varphi$  of reduction rules from  $S$  is called an ( $S$ -)reduction. Let  $u$  be a legal string. We say that  $\varphi$  is a *reduction of  $u$* , if  $\varphi$  is a reduction and  $\varphi$  is applicable to (defined on)  $u$ . A *successful reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$*  is a reduction of  $u$  such that  $\varphi(u) = \lambda$ . We then also say that  $\varphi$  is *successful for  $u$* . We say that  $u$  is *successful in  $S$*  if there is a successful  $S$ -reduction of  $u$ . ■

Note that if  $\varphi$  is a reduction of  $u$ , then  $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \text{dom}(u) \setminus \text{dom}(\varphi(u))$ .

**Example**

Again let  $u = \bar{4}37\bar{7}\bar{4}3$ . Then  $\varphi_1 = \mathbf{sdr}_{4,3} \mathbf{spr}_7$  is a successful  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction of  $u$ . However, both  $\varphi_2 = \mathbf{snr}_3 \mathbf{spr}_7$  and  $\varphi_3 = \mathbf{snr}_8$  are *not* reductions of  $u$ .

Since for every (non-empty) legal string there is an applicable reduction rule, by iterating this argument, we have the following well known result.

**Theorem 4**

For every legal string  $u$  there is a successful reduction of  $u$ .

## 4 Reduction Graph

In this section we recall the definition of reduction graph and some results concerning this graph. First we give the definition of pointer removal operations on strings, see also [1].

**Definition 5**

For a subset  $D \subseteq \Delta$ , the  $D$ -removal operation, denoted by  $\text{rem}_D$ , is defined by  $\text{rem}_D = \text{erase}_{D \cup \bar{D}}$ . We also refer to  $\text{rem}_D$  operations, for all  $D \subseteq \Delta$ , as *pointer removal operations*. ■

**Example**

Let  $u = 54372562\bar{7}346$  be a legal string. Then for  $D = \{4, 6, 7, 9\}$ , we have  $\text{rem}_D(u) = 532523$ . In the remaining examples we will keep using this legal string  $u$ .

Below we restate a lemma from [1]. The correctness of this lemma is easy to verify.

**Lemma 6**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and  $D \subseteq \Delta$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a composition of reduction rules.

1. If  $\varphi$  is applicable to  $\text{rem}_D(u)$  and  $\varphi$  does not contain string negative rules, then  $\varphi$  is applicable to  $u$ .
2. If  $\varphi$  is applicable to  $u$  and  $\text{dom}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{dom}(u) \setminus D$ , then  $\varphi$  is applicable to  $\text{rem}_D(u)$ .
3. If  $\varphi$  is applicable to both  $u$  and  $\text{rem}_D(u)$ , then  $\varphi(\text{rem}_D(u)) = \text{rem}_D(\varphi(u))$ .




Figure 1: An illustration of Lemma 6.

Figure 1 illustrates Lemma 6 for the case where there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $dom(\varphi_2) = D$ .

We now restate the definition of reduction graph (see [1]) in a less general form. We refer to [1] for a motivation and for more examples and results concerning this graph. The notion is similar to the breakpoint graph (or reality-and-desire diagram) known from another branch of DNA processing theory called sorting by reversal, see e.g. [8] and [7].

**Definition 7**

Let  $u = p_1 p_2 \dots p_n$  with  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \Pi$  be a legal string. The *reduction graph* of  $u$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{R}_u$ , is a 2-edge coloured graph  $(V, E_1, E_2, f, s, t)$ , where

$$V = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n\} \cup \{I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_n\} \cup \{s, t\},$$

$$E_1 = \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n\} \text{ with } e_i = \{I'_i, I_{i+1}\} \text{ for } 1 < i < n, e_0 = \{s, I_1\}, e_n = \{I'_n, t\},$$

$$E_2 = \{ \{I'_i, I_j\}, \{I_i, I'_j\} \mid i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ with } i \neq j \text{ and } p_i = p_j \} \cup \{ \{I_i, I_j\}, \{I'_i, I'_j\} \mid i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ and } p_i = \bar{p}_j \}, \text{ and}$$

$$f(I_i) = f(I'_i) = \mathbf{p}_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

■

The edges of  $E_1$  are called the *reality edges*, and the edges of  $E_2$  are called the *desire edges*. Notice that for each  $p \in dom(u)$ , the reduction graph of  $u$  has exactly two desire edges containing vertices labelled by  $p$ .

In depictions of reduction graphs, we will represent the vertices (except for  $s$  and  $t$ ) by their labels, because the exact identity of the vertices is not essential for the problems considered in this paper. We will also depict reality edges as ‘double edges’ to distinguish them from the desire edges.

**Example**

We continue the example. Reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_u$  is given in Figure 2, and  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2,7\}}(u)}$  is given in Figure 3.

Each reduction graph has a connected component with a linear structure containing both the source and the target vertex. This connected component is called the *linear component* of the reduction graph. The other connected components are called *cyclic components* because of their structure.

The definition of reduction functions and the remaining results are also taken from [1]. The  $p$ -reduction function removes vertices labelled by  $p$  and ‘contracts’ alternating walks via these vertices into a single edge.




Figure 2: The reduction graph of  $u$  from the Example.




Figure 3: The reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2,7\}}}(u)$  from the Example.

**Definition 8**

For each vertex label  $p$ , we define the  $p$ -reduction function  $rf_p : \Upsilon_2 \rightarrow \Upsilon_2$ , for  $G = (V, E_1, E_2, f, s, t) \in \Upsilon_2$ , by

$$rf_p(G) = (V', (E_1 \setminus E_{rem}) \cup E_{add}, E_2 \setminus E_{rem}, f|_{V'}, s, t),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} V' &= \{s, t\} \cup \{v \in V \setminus \{s, t\} \mid f(v) \neq p\}, \\ E_{rem} &= \{e \in E_1 \cup E_2 \mid f(x) = p \text{ for some } x \in e\}, \text{ and} \\ E_{add} &= \{\{y_1, y_2\} \mid e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n \text{ with } n > 2 \text{ is an alternating walk in } G \\ &\quad \text{with } y_1 \in e_1, y_2 \in e_n, f(y_1) \neq p \neq f(y_2), \text{ and} \\ &\quad f(x) = p \text{ for all } x \in e_i, 1 < i < n\}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Reduction functions commute under composition. Thus, for a reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_D(u)}$  and pointers  $p$  and  $q$ , we have

$$(rf_q rf_p)(\mathcal{R}_u) = (rf_p rf_q)(\mathcal{R}_u).$$

Any reduction can be simulated, on the level of reduction graphs, by a sequence of reduction functions with the same domain.

**Theorem 9**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $\varphi$  be a reduction of  $u$ . Then

$$(rf_{p_n} \cdots rf_{p_2} rf_{p_1})(\mathcal{R}_u) \approx \mathcal{R}_{\varphi(u)},$$

$$s \equiv \mathbf{p} \text{ --- } \mathbf{p} \equiv \mathbf{q} \text{ --- } \mathbf{q} \equiv \mathbf{p} \text{ --- } \mathbf{p} \equiv \mathbf{q} \text{ --- } \mathbf{q} \equiv t$$

Figure 4: The reduction graph of  $pq\bar{p}q$  (and  $pqpq$ ).

where  $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ .

The next lemma is an easy consequence from results in [1].

**Lemma 10**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and let  $p \in \Pi$ . Then  $\mathcal{R}_u$  has a cyclic component  $C$  consisting of only vertices labelled by  $\mathbf{p}$  iff either  $pp$  or  $\bar{p}\bar{p}$  is a substring of  $u$ . Moreover, if  $C$  exists, then it has exactly two vertices.

One of the motivations for the reduction graph is the easy determination of the number of string negative rules needed in each successful reduction [1].

**Theorem 11**

Let  $N$  be the number of cyclic components in the reduction graph of legal string  $u$ . Then every successful reduction of  $u$  has exactly  $N$  string negative rules.

**Example**

We continue the example. Since  $\mathcal{R}_u$  has three cyclic components, by Theorem 11, every successful reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$  has exactly three string negative rules. For example  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_6 \mathbf{snr}_4 \mathbf{snr}_2 \mathbf{spr}_7 \mathbf{sdr}_{5,3}$  is a successful reduction of  $u$ . Indeed,  $\varphi$  has exactly three string negative rules. Alternatively,  $\mathbf{snr}_6 \mathbf{snr}_4 \mathbf{snr}_3 \mathbf{spr}_2 \mathbf{spr}_5 \mathbf{spr}_7$  is also a successful reduction of  $u$ , with a different number of ( $\mathbf{spr}$  and  $\mathbf{sdr}$ ) operations.

The previous theorem and example should clarify that the reduction graph reveals crucial properties concerning the string negative rule. We now further investigate the string negative rule, and show that many more properties of this rule can be revealed using the reduction graph.

However, the reduction graph does not seem to be well suited to prove properties of the string positive rule and string double rule. If we for example consider legal strings  $u = pq\bar{p}q$  and  $v = pqpq$  for some distinct  $p, q \in \Pi$ , then  $u$  has a unique successful reduction  $\varphi_1 = \mathbf{spr}_{\bar{q}} \mathbf{spr}_p$  and  $v$  has a unique successful reduction  $\varphi_2 = \mathbf{sdr}_{p,q}$ . Thus  $u$  must necessarily be reduced by string positive rules, while  $v$  must necessarily be reduced by a string double rule. However, the reduction graph of  $u$  and the reduction graph of  $v$  are isomorphic, as shown in Figure 4. Also, whether or not pointers overlap is not preserved by reduction graphs. For example, the reduction graphs of legal strings  $pqp\bar{r}qr$  and  $pqr\bar{p}qr$  for distinct pointers  $p, q$  and  $r$  are isomorphic, however  $p$  and  $r$  do not overlap in the first legal string, but they do overlap in the latter legal string.

The next lemma is an easy consequence of Lemma 6 and Theorem 15.

**Lemma 12**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq \text{dom}(u)$ . There is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$  with  $\text{dom}(\varphi(u)) = D$  iff  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  does not contain cyclic components.






Figure 5: The graph  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  from the Example.

**Proof**

There is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$  with  $dom(\varphi(u)) = D$  iff there is a successful  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction of  $rem_D(u)$  (by Lemma 6) iff  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_D(u)}$  does not contain cyclic components (by Theorem 11). ■

We now consider the case where  $|D|$  is the number of cyclic components of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ .

**Lemma 13**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq dom(u)$ . There is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $dom(\varphi_2) = D$  iff  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_D(u)}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_u$  have 0 and  $|D|$  cyclic components, respectively.

**Proof**

We first prove the forward implication. By Lemma 12,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_D(u)}$  does not contain cyclic components. By Theorem 11,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_D(u)}$  has  $|D|$  cyclic components.

We now prove the reverse implication. By Lemma 12, there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $dom(\varphi_2) = D$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}_u$  has  $|D|$  cyclic components, by Theorem 11, every pointer in  $D$  is used in a string negative rule, and thus  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction. ■

## 5 Pointer-Component Graphs

If it is clear from the context which legal string  $u$  is meant, we will denote by  $\zeta$  the set of connected components of the reduction graph of  $u$ . We now define a graph on  $\zeta$  that we will use throughout the rest of this paper. The graph represents how the labels of a reduction graph are distributed among the connected components. This graph is particularly useful in determining which sets  $D$  of pointers correspond to strategies that apply loop recombination operations on exactly the pointers of  $D$ .

**Definition 14**

Let  $u$  be a legal string. The *pointer-component graph of  $u$*  (or of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ ), denoted by  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ , is an undirected multigraph  $(\zeta, E, \epsilon)$ , where  $E = dom(u)$  and  $\epsilon$  is, for  $e \in E$ , defined by  $\epsilon(e) = \{C \in \zeta \mid C \text{ contains vertices labelled by } e\}$ . ■

Note that for each  $e \in dom(u)$ , there are exactly two desire edges connecting vertices labelled by  $e$ , thus  $1 \leq |\epsilon(e)| \leq 2$ , and therefore  $\epsilon$  is well defined.

**Example**

We continue the example. Consider  $\mathcal{R}_u$  shown in Figure 2. Let us define  $C_1$  to be the cyclic component with a vertex labelled by 7,  $C_2$  to be the cyclic component with a vertex labelled by 5,  $C_3$  to be the third cyclic component, and  $R$  to be the linear component. Then  $\zeta = \{C_1, C_2, C_3, R\}$ . The pointer-component graph  $\mathcal{PC}_u = (\zeta, \text{dom}(u), \epsilon)$  of  $u$  is given in Figure 5.

We can use the definition of pointer-component graph to reformulate Theorem 11.

**Theorem 15**

Every successful reduction of a legal string  $u$  has exactly  $o(\mathcal{PC}_u) - 1$  string negative rules.

For reduction  $\varphi$  of a legal string  $u$ , the difference between  $\mathcal{R}_u$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi(u)}$  is formulated in Theorem 9 in terms of reduction functions. We now reformulate this result for pointer-component graphs. The difference (up to isomorphism) between the pointer-component graph  $PC_1$  of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  and the pointer-component graph  $PC_2$  of  $rf_p(\mathcal{R}_u)$  (assuming  $rf_p$  is applicable to  $\mathcal{R}_u$ ) is as follows: in  $PC_2$  edge  $p$  is removed and also those vertices  $v$  that become isolated, except when  $v$  is the linear component (since the linear component always contains the source and target vertex). Since the only legal string  $u$  for which the linear component in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is isolated is the empty string, in this case we obtain a graph containing only one vertex. This is formalized as follows. By abuse of notation we will also denote these functions as reduction functions  $rf_p$ .

**Definition 16**

For each edge  $p$ , we define the  $p$ -reduction function  $rf_p : \Upsilon_1 \rightarrow \Upsilon_1$ , for  $G = (V, E, \epsilon) \in \Upsilon_1$ , by

$$rf_p(G) = (V', E', \epsilon|_{E'}),$$

where  $E' = E \setminus \{p\}$  and  $V' = \{v \in V \mid v \in \epsilon(e) \text{ for some } e \in E'\}$  if  $E' \neq \emptyset$ , and  $V' = \{\emptyset\}$  otherwise. ■

Therefore, these reduction functions correctly simulate (up to isomorphism) the effect of applications of a reduction functions on the underlying reduction graph when the reduction functions correspond to an actual reduction. Note however, when these reduction functions do not correspond to an actual reduction, the linear component may become isolated while there are still other pointers present. Thus in general the reduction functions for pointer-component graphs do not faithfully simulate the reduction functions for reduction graphs. As a consequence of Theorem 9 we obtain now the following result.

**Theorem 17**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $\varphi$  be a reduction of  $u$ . Then

$$(rf_{p_n} \cdots rf_{p_2} rf_{p_1})(\mathcal{PC}_u) \approx (\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)}),$$

where  $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ .

Figure 6 illustrates Theorems 9 and 17.




Figure 6: An illustration of Theorems 9 and 17.




Figure 7: Pointer-component graph  $PC_1$  from the Example.

### Example

We continue the example. We have  $(\mathbf{snr}_4 \mathbf{sdr}_{5,3})(u) = 62\bar{7}726$ . The pointer-component graph  $PC_1$  of this legal string is shown in Figure 7. It is easy to see the graph obtained by applying  $(rf_5 rf_4 rf_3)$  to  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  (Figure 5) is isomorphic to  $PC_1$ .

## 6 Spanning Trees in Pointer-Component Graphs

In this section we consider spanning trees in pointer-component graphs, and we show that there is an intimate connection between these trees and applicable strategies of string negative rules. The **snr** rules in a reduction can be ‘postponed’ without affecting the applicability. Thus we can separate each reduction into a sequence without **snr** rules, and a tail of **snr** rules. We often use this ‘normal form’ for notational convenience. First, we characterize  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reductions in terms of pointer-component graphs.

### Theorem 18

Let  $\varphi$  be a reduction of legal string  $u$ , and let  $D = \text{dom}(\varphi(u))$ . Then  $\varphi$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction of  $u$  iff  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_D$ .

### Proof

We first prove the forward implication. By Theorem 4, there is a successful reduction  $\varphi'$  of  $\varphi(u)$ . By Theorem 15,  $(\varphi' \varphi)$  has  $o(\mathcal{PC}_u) - 1$  string negative rules. Since  $\varphi$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction of  $u$ ,  $\varphi'$  also has  $o(\mathcal{PC}_u) - 1$  string negative rules. Since  $\varphi'$  is a successful reduction of  $\varphi(u)$ , by Theorem 15,  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)}$  has the same number of vertices as  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ . Therefore, by the definition of reduction function and Theorem 17,  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_D$ .

We now prove the reverse implication. Let  $\varphi'$  be a successful reduction of  $\varphi(u)$ . If  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_D$ , then  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)}$  has the same number of vertices as  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ . Then, by Theorem 15,  $(\varphi' \varphi)$  has the same number of string negative rules as  $\varphi$ , therefore  $\varphi$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction of  $u$ . ■

It will be useful to separate loops from other edges in pointer-component graphs.

**Definition 19**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and let  $\mathcal{PC}_u = (V, E, \epsilon)$ . We define  $snrdom(u) = \{e \in E \mid |\epsilon(e)| = 2\}$ . ■

Thus,  $snrdom(u)$  is the set of vertex labels  $p$  for which there are vertices labelled by  $p$  in *different* connected components of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ .

**Example**

We continue the example. We have  $snrdom(u) = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ , and  $dom(u) \setminus snrdom(u) = \{7\}$ . Indeed, the only loop in Figure 5 is 7, indicating that this pointer occurs only in one connected component of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ .

The following corollary to Theorem 17 observes that an edge in  $dom(\varphi(u))$  is a loop in  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi(u)}$  iff it is a loop in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ .

**Corollary 20**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and  $\varphi$  a reduction of  $u$ . Then  $snrdom(\varphi(u)) = dom(\varphi(u)) \cap snrdom(u) = snrdom(u) \setminus dom(\varphi)$ .

The examples so far have shown connected pointer-component graphs. We now prove that these graphs are always connected.

**Theorem 21**

The pointer-component graph of any legal string is connected.

**Proof**

Let  $\varphi$  be a successful reduction of a legal string  $u$  ( $\varphi$  exists by Theorem 4). Assume that  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is not connected. Since  $\mathcal{PC}_\lambda$  is connected, we have by Theorem 17  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \rho \varphi_1$  for some reduction rule  $\rho$ , where  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  is not connected, but  $\mathcal{PC}_{\rho\varphi_1(u)}$  is. By Theorem 18,  $\rho$  cannot be a string double rule or a string positive rule, and therefore  $\rho = \mathbf{snr}_p$  for some  $p \in \Pi$ . Since  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  is not connected, but  $\mathcal{PC}_{\rho\varphi_1(u)}$  is, by the definition of reduction function, there is a connected component of  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  containing only the edge  $p$ . We consider two cases:  $\mathbf{p} \in snrdom(u)$  and  $\mathbf{p} \in dom(u) \setminus snrdom(u)$ . If  $\mathbf{p} \in snrdom(u)$ , then  $\mathcal{R}_{\rho\varphi_1(u)}$  would have two connected components less than  $\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  — a contradiction by Theorem 15. If  $\mathbf{p} \in dom(u) \setminus snrdom(u)$ , then  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  has a connected component containing only a vertex and a loop — a contradiction by Lemma 10. Thus in both cases we have a contradiction, and therefore  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is connected. ■

The next theorem characterizes successfulness in  $\{Snr\}$  using spanning trees.

**Theorem 22**

Let  $u$  be a legal string. Then  $u$  is successful in  $\{Snr\}$  iff  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is a tree.

**Proof**

If  $u$  is successful in  $\{Snr\}$ , then, by Theorem 15,  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  has  $|\zeta| - 1$  edges. By Theorem 21 it follows that  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is a tree.

If  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is a tree, then  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  has  $|\zeta| - 1$  edges. Since the number of edges is  $|dom(u)|$ , we have  $|dom(u)| = |\zeta| - 1$ , and by Theorem 15 every  $p \in dom(u)$  is used in a string negative rule, and thus  $u$  is successful in  $\{Snr\}$ . ■

It turns out that the pointers on which string negative rules are applied in a successful reduction of  $u$  form a spanning tree of  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ .

**Theorem 23**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq \text{dom}(u)$ . If there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $\text{dom}(\varphi_2) = D$ , then  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a tree.

**Proof**

By Theorem 22,  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  is a tree. By Theorem 18  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_D$ . ■

**Example**

We continue the example. We saw that  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_6 \mathbf{snr}_4 \mathbf{snr}_2 \mathbf{spr}_7 \mathbf{sdr}_{5,3}$  is a successful reduction of  $u$ . By Theorem 23,  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{\{2,4,6\}}$  is a tree. This is clear from Figure 5 where  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is depicted.

In the next few sections we prove the reverse implication of the previous theorem. This will require considerably more effort than the forward implication. The reason for this is that it is not obvious that when  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a tree, there is a reduction  $\varphi_1$  of  $u$  such that  $D = \text{dom}(\varphi_1(u))$ . We will use the pointer removal operation to prove this.

First, we consider a special case of the previous theorem. Since a loop can never be part of a tree, we have the following corollary to Theorem 23.

**Corollary 24**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and let  $p \in \text{dom}(u)$ . If  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$  is in a (successful) reduction of  $u$ , then  $p \in \text{snrdom}(u)$ .

**Example**

We continue the example. Since  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_6 \mathbf{snr}_4 \mathbf{snr}_2 \mathbf{spr}_7 \mathbf{sdr}_{5,3}$  is a successful reduction of  $u$ , we have  $2, 4, 6 \in \text{snrdom}(u)$ .

We show in Theorem 32 that the reverse implication of Corollary 24 also holds. Hence, the name  $\text{snrdom}(u)$  is explained: the pointers  $p \in \text{snrdom}(u)$  are exactly the pointers for which  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$  can occur in a (successful) reduction of  $u$ .

## 7 Merging and Splitting Components

In this section we consider the effect of pointer removal operations on pointer-component graphs. It turns out that these operations correspond to the merging and splitting of connected components of the underlying reduction graph. First, we formally introduce the merging operation.

**Definition 25**

For each edge  $p$ , the  $p$ -merge rule, denoted by  $\text{merge}_p$ , is a rule applicable to (defined on)  $G = (V, E, \epsilon) \in \Upsilon_1$  with  $p \in E$  and  $|\epsilon(p)| = 2$ . It is defined by

$$\text{merge}_p(G) = (V', E', \epsilon'),$$

where  $E' = E \setminus \{p\}$ ,  $V' = (V \setminus \epsilon(p)) \cup \{v'\}$  with  $\{v'\} \cap V = \emptyset$ , and  $\epsilon'(e) = \{h(v_1), h(v_2)\}$  iff  $\epsilon(e) = \{v_1, v_2\}$  where  $h(v) = v'$  if  $v \in \epsilon(p)$ , otherwise it is the identity. ■

Again, we allow both  $v_1 = v_2$  and  $h(v_1) = h(v_2)$  in the previous definition. Intuitively, the  $p$ -merge rule ‘merges’ the two endpoints of edge  $p$  into one vertex, and therefore the resulting graph has exactly one vertex less than the original graph. Note that  $p$ -merge rules commute under composition. Thus, if  $(merge_q merge_p)$  is applicable to  $G$ , then

$$(merge_q merge_p)(G) = (merge_p merge_q)(G).$$

**Theorem 26**

Let  $G = (V, E, \epsilon) \in \Upsilon_1$ , and let  $D = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \subseteq E$ . Then  $(merge_{p_n} \dots merge_{p_1})$  is applicable to  $G$  iff  $G|_D$  is acyclic.

**Proof**

$(merge_{p_n} \dots merge_{p_1})$  is applicable on  $G$  iff for all  $p_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ),  $\epsilon(p_i) \not\subseteq \epsilon[\{p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}\}]$  and  $|\epsilon(p_i)| = 2$  iff  $G|_D$  is acyclic. ■

One of the most surprising aspects of this paper is that the pointer removal operation is crucial in the proofs of the main results. The next theorem compares  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  with  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  for a legal string  $u$  and  $p \in dom(u)$ . We distinguish three cases: either the number of vertices of  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  is one less, is equal, or is one more than the number of vertices of  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ . The proof of this theorem shows that the first case corresponds to merging two connected components of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  into one connected component, and the last case corresponds to splitting one connected component of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  into two connected components.

**Theorem 27**


Let  $u$  be a legal string.

- If  $p \in snrdom(u)$ , then  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)} \approx merge_p(\mathcal{PC}_u)$   
(and therefore  $o(\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}) = o(\mathcal{PC}_u) - 1$ ).
- If  $p \in dom(u) \setminus snrdom(u)$ , then  $o(\mathcal{PC}_u) \leq o(\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}) \leq o(\mathcal{PC}_u) + 1$ .


**Proof**

We first prove the  $p \in snrdom(u)$  case of the theorem. Then the two desired edges with vertices labelled by  $p$  belong to different connected components of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ . We distinguish two cases: whether or not there are cyclic components consisting of only vertices labelled by  $p$ .

If there is a cyclic component consisting of only vertices labelled by  $p$ , then by Lemma 10,  $pp$  or  $\bar{p}\bar{p}$  are substrings of  $u$ , and  $\mathcal{R}_u$  is



where we omitted the parts of the graph that are the same compared to  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$ . Now,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  is



Therefore  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  can be obtained (up to isomorphism) from  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  by applying the  $merge_p$  operation.

Now assume that there are no cyclic components consisting of only vertices labelled by  $p$ . Then,  $\mathcal{R}_u$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \text{---} q_1 \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} q_2 \text{---} \dots \\ & \\ \dots & \text{---} q_3 \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} q_4 \text{---} \dots \end{aligned}$$

where we again omitted the parts of the graph that are the same compared to  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$ . Now, depending on the positions of  $q_1, \dots, q_4$  relative to  $p$  in  $u$  and on whether  $p$  is positive or negative in  $u$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  is either

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \text{---} q_1 \text{====} q_4 \text{---} \dots \\ & \\ \dots & \text{---} q_3 \text{====} q_2 \text{---} \dots \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \text{---} q_1 \text{====} q_3 \text{---} \dots \\ & \\ \dots & \text{---} q_4 \text{====} q_2 \text{---} \dots \end{aligned}$$

Since  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  remain part of the same connected component (the same holds for  $q_3$  and  $q_4$ ), the two connected components are merged, and thus  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  can be obtained (up to isomorphism) from  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  by applying the  $merge_p$  operation.

We now prove the  $p \in dom(u) \setminus snrdom(u)$  case. Then the two desired edges with vertices labelled by  $p$  belong to the same connected component of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ . By Lemma 10, there are no cyclic components consisting of four vertices which are all labelled by  $p$ . We can distinguish two cases: whether or not there is a reality edge  $e$  connecting two vertices labelled by  $p$ . If there is such a reality edge  $e$  then  $\mathcal{R}_u$  is

$$\dots \text{---} q_1 \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} q_4 \text{---} \dots$$

where we again omitted the parts of the graph that are the same compared to  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$ . This occurs precisely when  $\bar{p}p$  or  $pp\bar{p}$  is a substring of  $u$ . Now,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  is

$$\dots \text{---} q_1 \text{====} q_4 \text{---} \dots$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  has  $N$  cyclic components.

If there is no such a reality edge  $e$ , then  $\mathcal{R}_u$  is

$$\dots \text{---} q_1 \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} q_2 \text{---} L \text{---} q_3 \text{====} p \text{---} p \text{====} q_4 \text{---} \dots$$

where  $L$  represents some (possibly empty) ‘linear subgraph’ of  $\mathcal{R}_u$ , and where we again omitted the parts of the graph that are the same compared to  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$ . Now,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  is either

$$\dots \text{---} q_4 \text{====} q_2 \text{---} L \text{---} q_3 \text{====} q_1 \text{---} \dots$$




Figure 8: Reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2\}}(u)}$  from the Example.





Figure 9:  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{2\}}(u)}$  from the Example.

or



Therefore,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{p\}}(u)}$  has either  $N$  cyclic components (corresponding with the first case) or  $N + 1$  cyclic components (corresponding with the second case). ■

### Example

We continue the example. By Theorem 27, we know from Figure 5 that  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{2\}}(u)} \approx merge_2(\mathcal{PC}_u)$ . Indeed, this is transparent from Figures 5, 8 and 9, where  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2\}}(u)}$ , and  $\mathcal{PC}_{rem_{\{2\}}(u)}$  are depicted, respectively.

Again by Theorem 27, we know from Figure 8 that  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2,7\}}(u)}$  has two or three cyclic components. Indeed, this is transparent from Figure 3, where  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{\{2,7\}}(u)}$  is depicted.

Note that by the definition of  $merge_p$ ,  $merge_p$  is applicable to  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  precisely when  $p \in snrdom(u)$ . Therefore, by Theorems 26 and 27, we have the following corollary.

### Corollary 28

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq dom(u)$ . If  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is acyclic, then

$$\mathcal{PC}_{rem_D(u)} \approx (merge_{p_n} \cdots merge_{p_1})(\mathcal{PC}_u),$$

where  $D = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ .

## 8 Applicability of the String Negative Rule

In this section we characterize for a given set of pointers  $D$ , whether or not there is a (successful) strategy that applies string negative rules on exactly these






Figure 10: A subgraph of the pointer-component graph from the Example.




Figure 11: A subgraph of the pointer-component graph from the Example.

pointers. First we will prove the following result which depends heavily on the results of the previous section. The forward implication of the result observes that by removing pointers from  $u$  that form a spanning tree in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  we obtain a legal string  $u'$  for which the reduction graph does not have cyclic components.

**Lemma 29**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq \text{dom}(u)$ . Then  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a tree iff  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_u$  have 0 and  $|D|$  cyclic components, respectively.

**Proof**

We first prove the forward implication. Let  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  be a tree. By Corollary 28,  $\mathcal{PC}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  contains a single vertex. Thus  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  has no cyclic components. Since  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a tree, we have  $|D| = |\zeta| - 1$ .

We now prove the reverse implication. Let  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  not contain cyclic components and  $|D| = |\zeta| - 1$ . By Theorem 27 we see that the removal of each pointer  $p$  in  $D$  corresponds to a  $\text{merge}_p$  operation, otherwise  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_D(u)}$  would contain cyclic components. Therefore,  $(\text{merge}_{p_n} \cdots \text{merge}_{p_1})$  is applicable to  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  with  $D = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ . Therefore, by Theorem 26,  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is acyclic. Again since  $|D| = |\zeta| - 1$ , it is a tree. ■

**Example**

We continue the previous example. Let  $D_1 = \{2, 3, 5\}$  and  $D_2 = \{2, 3, 4\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$  ( $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_2}$ , resp.) is given in Figure 10 (Figure 11, resp.). Notice that  $|D_1| = |D_2| = |\zeta| - 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$  is a tree and  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_2}$  is not a tree, by Lemma 29, it follows that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_{D_1}(u)}$  does not have cyclic components and that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_{D_2}(u)}$  does have at least one cyclic component. This is illustrated in Figures 12 and 13, where  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_{D_1}(u)}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_{D_2}(u)}$  are depicted respectively.




Figure 12: The reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rem}_{D_1}(u)}$  from the Example.




Figure 13: The reduction graph  $\mathcal{R}_{rem_{D_2}(u)}$  from the Example.

The next theorem is one of the main results of this paper. It improves Theorem 23 by characterizing exactly which string negative rules can be applied together in a successful reduction of a given legal string.

In this theorem we require that the string negative rules of  $\varphi$  are applied last. Recall that this is only a notational convenience since for every successful reduction of a legal string, we can postpone the application string negative rules to obtain a successful reduction of the given form.

**Theorem 30**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq dom(u)$ . There is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $dom(\varphi_2) = D$  iff  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a tree.

**Proof**

It directly follows from Lemma 29 and Lemma 13. ■

Since there are many well known and efficient methods for determining spanning trees in a graph, it is easy to determine, for a given set of pointers  $D$ , whether or not there is a successful reduction applying string negative rules on exactly the pointers of  $D$  (for a given legal string  $u$ ).

**Example**

We continue the example. By Theorem 30 and Figure 10, there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , for some  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction  $\varphi_1$  and  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction  $\varphi_2$  with  $dom(\varphi_2) = \{2, 3, 5\}$ . Indeed, we can take for example  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_5 \mathbf{snr}_2 \mathbf{snr}_3 \mathbf{spr}_7 \mathbf{sdr}_{4,6}$ .

By Theorem 30 and Figure 11, there is no successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $dom(\varphi_2) = \{2, 3, 4\}$ . For example,  $(\mathbf{spr}_5 \mathbf{spr}_7)(u) = 62\bar{3}42346$  and thus there is no string pointer rule for pointer 6 applicable to this legal string.

In the next corollary we consider the more general case  $|D| \leq |\zeta| - 1$ , instead of  $|D| = |\zeta| - 1$  in Theorem 30.

**Corollary 31**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $D \subseteq dom(u)$ . There is a (successful) reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$  such that for all  $p \in D$ ,  $\varphi$  contains either  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$  iff  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is acyclic.

**Proof**

We first prove the forward implication. By Theorem 30,  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  is a subgraph of a tree, and therefore acyclic.

We now prove the reverse implication. By Theorem 21,  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  is connected, and since  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_D$  does not contain cycles, we can add edges  $q \in \text{dom}(u) \setminus D$  from  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  such that the resulting graph is a tree. Then by Theorem 30, it follows that there is a (successful) reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$  containing either  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$  for all  $p \in D$ . ■

The previous corollary with  $|D| = 1$  shows that the reverse implication of Corollary 24 also holds, since  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{\{p\}}$  acyclic implies that the edge  $p$  connects two different vertices in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$ .

**Theorem 32**

Let  $u$  be a legal string and let  $p \in \text{dom}(u)$ . Then  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$  is in a (successful) reduction of  $u$  iff  $p \in \text{snrdom}(u)$ .

This theorem can also be proven directly.

**Proof**

To prove the reverse implication, let no reduction of  $u$  contain either  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$ . We prove that  $p \notin \text{snrdom}(u)$ . By iteratively applying  $\mathbf{snr}$ ,  $\mathbf{spr}$  and  $\mathbf{sdr}$  on pointers that are not equal to  $p$  or  $\bar{p}$ , we can reduce  $u$  to a legal string  $v$  such that for all  $q \in \text{dom}(v) \setminus \{p\}$ :

- $qq$  and  $\bar{q}\bar{q}$  are not substrings of  $v$ .
- $q$  is negative in  $v$ .
- $q$  does not overlap with any pointer in  $\text{dom}(v) \setminus \{p\}$ .

If  $\text{rem}_{\{p\}}(v) = \lambda$ , then  $v$  is equal to either  $p\bar{p}$ ,  $\bar{p}p$ ,  $pp$  or  $\bar{p}\bar{p}$ . If  $\text{rem}_{\{p\}}(v) \neq \lambda$ , then, by the last two conditions, there is a  $q \in \Pi$  such that  $qq$  is a substring of  $\text{rem}_{\{p\}}(v)$ . Then, by the first condition, either  $qpq$ ,  $q\bar{p}q$ ,  $qp\bar{p}q$ ,  $q\bar{p}p\bar{p}q$ ,  $qp\bar{p}p\bar{p}q$  or  $q\bar{p}\bar{p}p\bar{p}q$  is a substring of  $v$ .

Thus, either  $qpq$ ,  $q\bar{p}q$ ,  $p\bar{p}$ ,  $\bar{p}p$ ,  $pp$  or  $\bar{p}\bar{p}$  is a substring of  $v$ . Since no reduction of  $u$  contains  $\mathbf{snr}_p$  or  $\mathbf{snr}_{\bar{p}}$ , the last two cases are not possible. The first two cases correspond to the following part of  $\mathcal{R}_v$ .

$$\dots \text{===== } p \text{ ----- } p \text{ ===== } q \text{ ----- } q \text{ ===== } p \text{ ----- } p \text{ ===== } \dots$$

The cases where  $p\bar{p}$  or  $\bar{p}p$  is a substring of  $v$  correspond to the following part of  $\mathcal{R}_v$

$$\dots \text{===== } p \text{ ----- } p \text{ ===== } p \text{ ----- } p \text{ ===== } \dots$$

Consequently, in either case, the two desired edges of  $\mathcal{R}_v$  with vertices labelled by  $p$  belong to the same connected component. Thus  $p \notin \text{snrdom}(v)$ . By Corollary 20,  $p \notin \text{snrdom}(u)$ . ■

## 9 The Order of Loop Recombination

In this section we strengthen Theorem 30 to allow one to determine exactly which orderings of string negative rules in  $\varphi_2$  are possible. First we introduce orderings in a tree, which is similar to topological orderings in a directed acyclic graph. Here we order the edges instead of the vertices.

**Definition 33**

Let  $T = (V, E, \epsilon)$  be a tree. An *edge-topological ordering* of  $T$  (with root  $R \in V$ ) is a linear order  $E' = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$  on  $E$  such that if  $\epsilon(e_i) = \{C_x, C_y\}$ ,  $\epsilon(e_j) = \{C_y, C_z\}$ , and  $C_y$  ( $C_z$ , resp.) is the father of  $C_x$  ( $C_y$ , resp.) in  $T$  considering  $R$  as the root of  $T$ , then  $j > i$ . ■

**Example**

We continue the example. Consider again tree  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$  shown in Figure 10. Taking  $R$  as the root of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$ , it follows that  $(3, 2, 5)$  is an edge-topological ordering of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$ .

The next theorem characterizes exactly the possible orders in which string negative rules that can be applied in a successful reduction of a given legal string.

**Theorem 34**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and let  $L = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$  be an ordered set over  $dom(u)$ . There is a successful reduction

$$\varphi = \varphi_{n+1} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_n} \varphi_n \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_{n-1}} \cdots \varphi_2 \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi_1$$

of  $u$ , for some (possible empty)  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reductions  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{n+1}$  and  $\tilde{p}_i \in \{p_i, \bar{p}_i\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $n \geq 0$  iff  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  is a tree with  $L' = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$  and  $L$  is an edge-topological ordering of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  with the linear component  $R$  of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  as root.

**Proof**

We first prove the forward implication. Clearly, we can postpone the application of string negative rules, thus  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_n} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_{n-1}} \cdots \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi'$  is also a successful reduction of  $u$ , where  $\varphi' = \varphi_{n+1} \varphi_n \cdots \varphi_1$ . By Theorem 30,  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  is a tree.

We prove that  $L$  is an edge-topological ordering of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  with root  $R$ . By Theorem 18,  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi'(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$ . If  $n > 0$ , then  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1}$  is applicable to  $\varphi'(u)$ . By Theorem 10, edge  $p_1$  is connected to a leaf of  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi'(u)}$ . By Theorem 17,  $\mathcal{PC}_{(\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi')(u)}$  is isomorphic to the graph obtained from  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi'(u)}$  by removing  $p_1$  and its leaf. Now (assuming  $n > 1$ ), since  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_2}$  is applicable to  $(\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi')(u)$ ,  $p_2$  is connected to a leaf in  $\mathcal{PC}_{(\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi')(u)}$ . By iterating this argument, it follows that  $L$  is an edge-topological ordering of  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi'(u)} \approx \mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  with root  $R$ .

We now prove the reverse implication. Since  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  is a tree, by Theorem 30 there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$  of  $u$ , where  $\varphi_1$  is a  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction and  $\varphi_2$  is a  $\{Snr\}$ -reduction with  $dom(\varphi_2) = L'$ . Let  $L$  be an edge-topological ordering of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'}$  with the linear component  $R$  of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  as root. Again, by Theorem 18,  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{L'} \approx \mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$ .

If  $n > 0$ , then  $p_1$  is connected to a leaf  $C_1$  of  $\mathcal{PC}_1$ . Consequently,  $C_1$  has only vertices labelled by  $p_1$ . By Lemma 10,  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1}$  is applicable to  $\varphi_1(u)$  for some  $\tilde{p}_1 \in \{p_1, \bar{p}_1\}$ . By Theorem 17,  $\mathcal{PC}_{(\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1} \varphi_1)(u)}$  is isomorphic to the graph obtained from  $\mathcal{PC}_{\varphi_1(u)}$  by removing  $p_1$  and its leaf. By iterating this argument, it follows that  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_n} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_{n-1}} \cdots \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}_1}$  is a successful reduction of  $u$  for some  $\tilde{p}_i \in \{p_i, \bar{p}_i\}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$  with  $n \geq 0$ . ■

**Example**

We continue the example. Since  $(3, 2, 5)$  is an edge-topological ordering of tree  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_1}$  with root  $R$ , by Theorem 34 there is a successful reduction  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \varphi_1$




Figure 14: A subgraph of the pointer-component graph from the Example.

of  $u$ , for some  $\{Spr, Sdr\}$ -reduction  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2 = \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{5}} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{2}} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{3}}$  for some  $\tilde{p} \in \{p, \bar{p}\}$  for  $p \in \{2, 3, 5\}$ . Indeed, we can take for example  $\varphi = \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{5}} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{2}} \mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{3}} \mathbf{spr}_{\tilde{7}} \mathbf{sdr}_{4,6}$ .

We say that two reduction rules  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  can be applied in *parallel* to  $u$  if both  $\rho_2 \rho_1$  and  $\rho_1 \rho_2$  are applicable to  $u$  (see [6]).

**Corollary 35**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and  $p, q \subseteq \text{dom}(u)$  with  $p \neq q$ . Then  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}}$  and  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{q}}$  can be applied in parallel to  $u$  for some  $\tilde{p} \in \{p, \bar{p}\}$ ,  $\tilde{q} \in \{q, \bar{q}\}$  iff there is a spanning tree  $T$  in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  such that  $p$  and  $q$  both connect to leaves (considering the linear component of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  as the root).

The next corollary considers the case whether or not  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}}$  and  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{q}}$  can *eventually* be applied in parallel.

**Corollary 36**

Let  $u$  be a legal string, and  $p, q \subseteq \text{dom}(u)$  with  $p \neq q$ . Then  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{p}}$  and  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{q}}$  can be applied in parallel to  $\varphi(u)$  for some  $\tilde{p} \in \{p, \bar{p}\}$ ,  $\tilde{q} \in \{q, \bar{q}\}$  and reduction  $\varphi$  iff there is a spanning tree  $T$  in  $\mathcal{PC}_u$  such that there is no simple walk in  $T$  from the linear component of  $\mathcal{R}_u$  (the root) to another vertex of  $T$  containing both edges  $p$  and  $q$ .

**Example**

We continue the example. Let  $D_3 = \{2, 4, 6\}$ . Then in tree  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_3}$ , depicted in Figure 14, there is no simple walk from  $R$  to another vertex of  $\mathcal{PC}_u|_{D_3}$  containing both edges 2 and 4. By Corollary 36,  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{2}}$  and  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{4}}$  can be applied in parallel to  $\varphi(u)$  for some  $\tilde{2} \in \{2, \bar{2}\}$ ,  $\tilde{4} \in \{4, \bar{4}\}$  and reduction  $\varphi$  of  $u$ . Indeed, if we take  $\varphi = \mathbf{spr}_{\tilde{7}} \mathbf{sdr}_{3,5}$ , then  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{2}}$  and  $\mathbf{snr}_{\tilde{4}}$  can be applied in parallel to  $\varphi(u) = 622446$ .

## 10 Conclusion

This paper showed that one can efficiently determine the possible sequences of loop recombination operations that can be applied in the transformation of a given gene from its micronuclear to its macronuclear form. Formally, one can determine which string negative rules can be applied in which order to a legal string  $u$ , given only the reduction graph of  $u$ . This is characterized in terms of graphs defined on the reduction graphs. Future research could focus on similar characterizations for the string positive rules and the string double rules.

## Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) project 635.100.006 ‘VIEWS’.

## References

- [1] R. Brijder, H.J. Hoogeboom, and G. Rozenberg. Reducibility of gene patterns in ciliates using the breakpoint graph. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* (2006), to appear. [arXiv:cs.LO/0601122].
- [2] A. Ehrenfeucht, T. Harju, I. Petre, D.M. Prescott, and G. Rozenberg. Formal systems for gene assembly in ciliates. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 292:199–219, 2003.
- [3] A. Ehrenfeucht, T. Harju, I. Petre, D.M. Prescott, and G. Rozenberg. *Computation in Living Cells – Gene Assembly in Ciliates*. Springer Verlag, 2004.
- [4] A. Ehrenfeucht, I. Petre, D.M. Prescott, and G. Rozenberg. Circularity and other invariants of gene assembly in ciliates. In M. Ito et al., editors, *Words, Semigroups, and Transductions*, pages 81–97. World Scientific, Singapore, 2001.
- [5] A. Ehrenfeucht, I. Petre, D.M. Prescott, and G. Rozenberg. String and graph reduction systems for gene assembly in ciliates. *Math. Struct. in Comput. Sci.*, 12:113–134, 2002.
- [6] T. Harju, C. Li, I. Petre, and G. Rozenberg. Parallelism in gene assembly. In C. Ferretti et al., editors, *DNA*, volume 3384 of *LNCS*, pages 138–148. Springer, 2004.
- [7] P.A. Pevzner. *Computational Molecular Biology: An Algorithmic Approach*. MIT Press, 2000.
- [8] J.C. Setubal and J. Meidanis. *Introduction to Computational Molecular Biology*. PWS Publishing Company, 1997.