#### Hardware Acceleration of the Pair HMM Algorithm for DNA Variant Calling

**Sitao Huang**<sup>1</sup>, Gowthami Jayashri Manikandan<sup>1</sup>, Anand Ramachandran<sup>1</sup>, Kyle Rupnow<sup>2</sup>, Wen-mei W. Hwu<sup>1</sup>, Deming Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

<sup>2</sup>Advanced Digital Sciences Center, Singapore







#### **Genomic Variation and Mutations**

- Humans have two sets of 3 billion bases in their genomes
- No two humans have identical genome sequences
  - About 0.1 % of genomes are not identical
- These differences lead to people
  - Having different susceptibility or resistance to diseases
  - Responding differently to the same medication
- There are also somatic variations that lead to cancer

ECE ILLINOIS





# The Importance of Mutations and Variant Calling

- The study of mutations is important (e.g. in cancer study)
  - They create cancer
  - They enable cancer to survive
  - They enable cancer to spread
  - They enable cancer to kill
- Variant calling is a set of analytics that tries to identify mutations in a sequenced genome compared to a standard reference

Variant Calling is critical in cancer research and clinical applications

**GATK's HaplotypeCaller** is one of the most popular variant calling tools available today.



# Accelerating the Pair HMM in GATK

#### Why Pair HMM Needs to Be Accelerated?

- Pair HMM computations constitute the bottleneck of HaplotypeCaller
- The full HaplotypeCaller is time consuming
  - Full HaplotypeCaller run on 80xWGS PCR-Free NA12878 dataset: 13 days on single CPU



Profiling result of a typical HaplotypeCaller run on CPU

#### Why Using Hardware (FPGA)?

- Parallelism in pair HMM could be better utilized by the fine-grained processing elements in FPGA
- FPGA is good at processing streaming applications (alignment algorithms' nature)







#### Pair HMM

(candidate to be verified) (data from sequencing machine)

Another possible alignment:

- Input: two sequences  $S_h$  and  $S_r$  ( $S_h$ : haplotype  $S_r$ : read)
- Goal: find a similarity score of  $S_h$  and  $S_r$

One possible alignment:



There are many action sequences mapping  $S_r$  to  $S_h$ .

• Similarity score is defined over a pair Hidden Markov Model



# Pair HMM – Dynamic Programming



- **Output:**  $score(S_h, S_r) = f^D(N_h, N_r) + f^M(N_h, N_r) + f^I(N_h, N_r)$
- Complexity:

$$O(M_h \times M_r \times N_h \times N_r)$$

# haplotype
sequences

# read
sequences





#### How to Accelerate?

#### **PE: Processing Elements**



Process "frontier" elements at the same time to maximize parallelism Number of PEs Needed = Matrix Height What if matrix height is larger than number of PEs FPGA can host?





- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:







- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups



Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8



- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups

Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8





- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups

Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8





- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups

Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8





- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups

Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8





- Connects the first PE and the last PE with FIFO
- Divide matrix rows to groups

Processing Element (PE) Ring:



8





#### **Challenges in Designing PE for Pair HMM**

- PE structure is designed according to the data dependencies in the algorithm
- Each PE passes its intermediate computing result to the next PE

9



 $v(PE_i) = f(v'(PE_i), v'(PE_{i-1}), v''(PE_{i-1}))$ 





#### **Challenges in Designing PE for Pair HMM – Cont.**

- Floating point operations
  - Long latency
  - Need sophisticated FSM
- Complicated arithmetic operations in DP
  - Elements in three DP matrices depend on each other

$$\begin{split} f^{D}(i,j) &= a_{MD} f^{M}(i,j-1) + a_{DD} f^{D}(i,j-1) \\ f^{I}(i,j) &= a_{MI} f^{M}(i-1,j) + a_{II} f^{I}(i-1,j) \\ f^{M}(i,j) &= prior \cdot \left( a_{MM} f^{M}(i-1,j-1) + a_{IM} f^{I}(i-1,j-1) + a_{IM} f^{I}(i-1,j-1) + a_{IM} f^{I}(i-1,j-1) \right) \end{split}$$



netic Operations Within a PE (Original)

 $+a_{DM}f^{D}(i-1,j-1)$ 



ECE ILLINOIS 10



Optimized *f*<sup>M</sup> Calculation

Arithmetic Operations Within a PE (Original)





#### **Optimization 2: Pipelining and resource sharing**





#### **Optimization 3: Tuning PE ring size and number of PE rings**

- Same amount of HW resource can accommodate more shorter PE rings (calculating multiple matrices)
- Shorter PE rings have fewer idle PEs





#### **Experiment Result 1: Comparison to Other Implementations**

- Compared to CPU, vector processor, GPU, multicore, previous FPGA implementations
- Using "10s" dataset
- Arria 10 has more logic and DSP resources. It also has hard floating-point DSP block

Platform	Runtime(ms)	Speedup
Java on CPU	10800	$1 \times$
C++ on CPU	1267	$9 \times$
Intel Xeon AVX Single Core	138	$78 \times$
NVidia K40 GPU	70	$154 \times$
Intel Xeon AVX 24 Cores	15	$720 \times$
Altera OpenCL (Stratix V)*	8.3	1301×
<b>Our Design (Stratix V)</b>	5.3	<b>2038</b> ×
Altera OpenCL (Arria 10)*	2.8	3857×
Our Design (Arria 10)	2.6	<b>4154</b> ×

Theoretical runtime lower bound (assuming no idle PE) for 64 PEs: 4.7ms

\* Altera. Accelerating genomics research with OpenCL and FPGAs, 2016.





#### **Experiment Result 2:** Impact of PE Ring Size

 Shorter PE rings benefit from higher PE utilization and smaller PE initialization overhead





ECE ILLINOIS

15

#### **Summary**

- Pair HMM forward algorithm is computationintensive. It is the bottleneck of HaplotypeCaller.
- Ring-based hardware structure exhibits flexibility in configuration and high data reuse.
- PE ring structure based pair HMM implementation can achieve significant speedup compared to the software implementation, and it also outperforms the published best hardware implementation.

#### BACKUP SLIDES

#### HaplotypeCaller







#### **Emission and Transition Probabilities**

BACKUP SLIDES

$$prior = \begin{cases} 1 - Q_{base}; & \text{if the bases match} \\ Q_{base}; & \text{if the bases don't match} \end{cases}$$

$$a_{MM} = 1 - (Q_i + Q_d) & - \text{ match continuation} \\ a_{IM} = 1 - Q_g & - \text{ insertion to match} \\ a_{DM} = 1 - Q_g & - \text{ deletion to match} \\ a_{MI} = Q_i & - \text{ deletion to insertion} \\ a_{II} = Q_g & - \text{ insertion continuation} \\ a_{MD} = Q_d & - \text{ match to deletion} \\ a_{DD} = Q_g & - \text{ deletion continuation} \end{cases}$$

$$Q_{base} : \text{Base Error Rate} \\ Q_i : \text{Base Insertion Probability} \\ Q_d : \text{Base Deletion Probability} \\ Q_g : \text{Gap Continuation Penalty} \end{cases}$$





#### What's in PE?









BACKUP SLIDES



# Why sequence alignment?

- Comparing genes or regions from different species
  - to find important regions
  - determine function
  - uncover evolutionary forces
- Assembling fragments to sequence DNA
- Compare individuals to looking for mutations





#### **Problem Statement**



(candidate to be verified) (data from sequencing machine)

- Input: two sequences  $S_h$  and  $S_r$  ( $S_h$ : haplotype  $S_r$ : read)
- Goal: find a similarity score of  $S_h$  and  $S_r$



• Similarity score is defined over a pair Hidden Markov Model





#### Pair HMM – Action Sequence

• Action(Delete, Insert, Match/Mismatch) sequence  $\{a_t\}$  s.t.  $S_r \xrightarrow{\{a_t\}} S_h$ 



There are many action sequences mapping  $S_r$  to  $S_h$ .





BACKUP

**SLIDES** 

#### Pair HMM - Probability



• Each action sequence is associated with a probability:







# Similarity score – Dynamic Programming

$$score(S_h, S_r) = \sum_{\{a_t\}: S_h \xrightarrow{\{a_t\}} S_r} P(\{a_t\}) = f^D(N_h, N_r) \qquad \text{Last action: delete} \\ + f^M(N_h, N_r) \qquad \text{Last action: match / mismatch} \\ + f^I(N_h, N_r) \qquad \text{Last action: insert} \end{cases}$$

$$S_r[0:j-1]$$
 $S_r$ G?T?AA $S_h[0:i]$  $S_h$ AGGTA – $\{a_t\}$  $\{a_t\}$ ????Dprobability dependency (Markov)







#### BACKUP **SLIDES**

#### Recursion

• Similarly:



$$f^{M}(i,j) = prior \cdot \left( a_{MM} f^{M}(i-1,j-1) + a_{IM} f^{I}(i-1,j-1) + a_{DM} f^{D}(i-1,j-1) \right)$$

- Output:  $score(S_h, S_r) = f^D(N_h, N_r) + f^M(N_h, N_r) + f^I(N_h, N_r)$
- Complexity:

$$O(M_h \times M_r \times N_h \times N_r)$$

# haplotype sequences

# read sequences



