

Parallel Computation of Alpha Complexes for Biomolecules

Talha Bin Masood¹ 

Scientific Visualization Group, Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden
talha.bin.masood@liu.se

Tathagata Ray

BITS Pilani, Hyderabad Campus, Hyderabad, India
rayt@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in

Vijay Natarajan 

Department of Computer Science and Automation, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
vijayn@iisc.ac.in

Abstract

The alpha complex, a subset of the Delaunay triangulation, has been extensively used as the underlying representation for biomolecular structures. We propose a GPU-based parallel algorithm for the computation of the alpha complex, which exploits the knowledge of typical spatial distribution and sizes of atoms in a biomolecule. Unlike existing methods, this algorithm does not require prior construction of the Delaunay triangulation. The algorithm computes the alpha complex in two stages. The first stage proceeds in a bottom-up fashion and computes a superset of the edges, triangles, and tetrahedra belonging to the alpha complex. The false positives from this estimation stage are removed in a subsequent pruning stage to obtain the correct alpha complex. Computational experiments on several biomolecules demonstrate the superior performance of the algorithm, up to a factor of 50 when compared to existing methods that are optimized for biomolecules.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Parallel algorithms; Computing methodologies → Shape modeling; Applied computing → Molecular structural biology

Keywords and phrases Delaunay triangulation, parallel algorithms, biomolecules, GPU

Supplement Material Source code available at: https://bitbucket.org/vgl_iisc/parallelac/

Funding *Vijay Natarajan*: This work is partially supported by a Swarnajayanti Fellowship from the Department of Science and Technology, India (DST/SJF/ETA-02/2015-16); a Mindtree Chair research grant; and the Robert Bosch Centre for Cyber Physical Systems, IISc.

Acknowledgements Part of this work was done when the first author was at Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore. The authors would like to thank Sathish Vadhiyar and Nikhil Ranjanikar for helpful discussions and suggestions during the early phase of this work.

1 Introduction

The alpha complex of a set of points in \mathbb{R}^3 is a subset of the Delaunay triangulation. A size parameter α determines the set of simplices (tetrahedra, triangles, edges, and vertices) of the Delaunay triangulation that are included in the alpha complex. It is an elegant representation of the shape of the set of points [16, 18, 14] and has found various applications, particularly in molecular modeling and molecular graphics. The atoms in a biomolecule are represented by weighted points in \mathbb{R}^3 , and the region occupied by the molecule is represented by the union of balls centered at these points. The geometric shape of a biomolecule determines its function, namely how it interacts with other biomolecules. The alpha complex represents

¹ Corresponding author

the geometric shape of the molecule very efficiently. It has been widely used for computing and studying geometric features such as cavities and channels [25, 26, 10, 30, 33, 28, 23]. Further, an alpha complex based representation is also crucial for accurate computation of geometric properties like volume and surface area [24, 12, 27].

Advances in imaging technology have resulted in a significant increase in the size of molecular structure data. This necessitates the development of efficient methods for storing, processing, and querying these structures. In this paper, we study the problem of efficient construction of the alpha complex with particular focus on point distributions that are typical of biomolecules. In particular, we present a parallel algorithm for computing the alpha complex and an efficient GPU implementation that outperforms existing methods. In contrast to existing algorithms, our algorithm does not require the explicit construction of the Delaunay triangulation.

1.1 Related work

The Delaunay triangulation has been studied within the field of computational geometry for several decades and numerous algorithms have been proposed for its construction [1]. Below, we describe only a few methods that are most relevant to this paper.

A tetrahedron belongs to the Delaunay triangulation of a set of points in \mathbb{R}^3 if and only if it satisfies the *empty circumsphere* property, namely no point is contained within the circumsphere of the tetrahedron. The Bowyer-Watson algorithm [4, 34] and the incremental insertion algorithm by Guibas *et al.* [21] are based on the above characterization of the Delaunay triangulation. In both methods, points are inserted incrementally and the triangulation is locally updated to ensure that the Delaunay property is satisfied. The incremental insertion method followed by bi-stellar flipping works in higher dimensions also [20] and can construct the Delaunay triangulation in $O(n \log n + n^{\lceil d/2 \rceil})$ time in the worst case, where n is the number of input points in \mathbb{R}^d . A second approach for constructing the Delaunay triangulation is based on its equivalence to the convex hull of the points lifted onto a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional paraboloid [19].

A third divide-and-conquer approach partitions the inputs points into two or generally multiple subsets, constructs the Delaunay triangulation for each partition, and merges the pieces of the triangulation finally. The merge procedure depends on the ability to order the edges incident on a vertex and hence works only in \mathbb{R}^2 . The extension to \mathbb{R}^3 requires that the merge procedure be executed first [6]. The divide-and-conquer strategy directly extends to a parallel algorithm [31, 5]. The DeWall algorithm [6] partitions the input point set into two halves and first constructs the triangulation of points lying within the boundary region of the two partitions. The Delaunay triangulation of the two halves is then constructed in parallel. The process is repeated recursively resulting in increased parallelism. Cao *et al.* [5] have developed a GPU parallel algorithm, *gDel3D*, that constructs the Delaunay triangulation in two stages. In the first stage, points are inserted in parallel followed by flipping to obtain an approximate Delaunay triangulation. In the second stage, a star splaying procedure works locally to convert non-Delaunay tetrahedra into Delaunay tetrahedra. The algorithm can be extended to construct the weighted Delaunay triangulation for points with weights. Cao *et al.* report a speed up of up to a factor of 10 over a sequential implementation for constructing the weighted Delaunay triangulation of 3 million weighted points.

Existing algorithms for constructing the alpha complex [11, 18, 27, 9] often require that the Delaunay triangulation be computed in a first step, with the exception of a recent method that guarantees output sensitive construction under mild assumptions on weights [32] or a possible construction from Čech complexes [2]. Simplices that belong to the alpha complex

are identified using a size filtration in a second step. Simplices that belong to the alpha complex are identified using a size filtration in a second step. In the case of biomolecules, only small values of the size parameter are of interest and the number of simplices in the alpha complex is a small fraction of those contained in the Delaunay triangulation. Hence, the Delaunay triangulation construction is often the bottleneck in the alpha complex computation. The key difficulty lies in the absence of a direct characterization of simplices that belong to the alpha complex.

1.2 Summary of results

We propose an algorithm that avoids the expensive Delaunay triangulation computation and instead directly computes the alpha complex for biomolecules. The key contributions of this paper are summarized below:

- A new characterization of the alpha complex – a set of conditions necessary and sufficient for a simplex to be a part of the alpha complex.
- A new algorithm for computing the alpha complex of a set of weighted points in \mathbb{R}^3 . The algorithm identifies simplices of the alpha complex in decreasing order of dimension without computing the complete weighted Delaunay triangulation.
- An efficient CUDA-based parallel implementation of this algorithm for biomolecular data that can compute the alpha complex for a 10 million point dataset in approximately 10 seconds.
- A proof of correctness of the algorithm and comprehensive experimental validation to demonstrate that it outperforms existing methods.

While the experimental results presented here focus on biomolecular data, the algorithm is applicable to data from other application domains as well. In particular, the efficient GPU implementation may be used for points that arise in smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) simulations, atomistic simulations in material science, and particle systems that appear in computational fluid dynamics (CFD).


2 Background

In this section, we review the necessary background on Delaunay triangulations required to describe the algorithm and also establish a new characterization of the alpha complex that does not require the Delaunay triangulation. For a detailed description of Delaunay triangulations, alpha complexes, and related structures, we refer the reader to various books on the topic [1, 13, 15].

Let $B = \{b_i\}$ denote a set of balls or weighted points, where $b_i = (p_i, r_i)$ represents a ball centered at p_i with radius r_i . We limit our discussion to balls in \mathbb{R}^3 , so $p_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Further, we assume that the points in B are in general position, *i.e.*, no two points have the same location, no three points are collinear, no four points are coplanar, and no subset of five points are equidistant from a point in \mathbb{R}^3 . Such configurations are called *degeneracies*. In practice, a degenerate input can be handled via symbolic perturbation [17].

2.1 Simplex and simplicial complex

A d -dimensional *simplex* σ^d is defined as the convex hull of $d + 1$ affinely independent points. Assuming the centres of balls in B are in general position, all $(d + 1)$ sized subsets of B form a simplex $\sigma^d = (p_0^\sigma, p_1^\sigma, \dots, p_d^\sigma)$. For simplicity, we sometimes use b_i instead of the center p_i to refer to points incident on a simplex. For example, we may write $\sigma^d = (b_0^\sigma, b_1^\sigma, \dots, b_d^\sigma)$.



■ **Figure 1** 2D weighted Delaunay triangulation and alpha complex. (a) A set of weighted points B in \mathbb{R}^2 shown as disks. (b) The weighted Voronoi diagram of B . Voronoi edges and vertices are highlighted in green. (c) The weighted Delaunay complex is the dual of the weighted Voronoi diagram. (d) The alpha complex K_α for $\alpha = 0$ is shown in red. This is the dual of the intersection of the weighted Voronoi diagram and union of balls. (e) The alpha complex shown for an $\alpha > 0$. It is the dual of the intersection of the weighted Voronoi diagram and union of balls after growing them to have radius $\sqrt{r_i^2 + \alpha}$.

A non-empty strict subset of σ^d is also a simplex but with dimension smaller than d . Such a simplex is called a *face* of σ^d . Specifically, a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional face of σ^d is referred to as a *facet* of σ^d . A set of simplices K is called a *simplicial complex* if: 1) a simplex $\sigma \in K$ implies that all faces of σ also belong to K , and 2) for two simplices $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in K$, either $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2 \in K$ or $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2 = \emptyset$.

2.2 Power distance and weighted Voronoi diagram

The *power distance* $\pi(p, b_i)$ between a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and a ball $b_i = (p_i, r_i) \in B$ is defined as

$$\pi(p, b_i) = \|p - p_i\|^2 - r_i^2.$$

The *weighted Voronoi diagram* is an extension of the Voronoi diagram to weighted points. It is a partition of \mathbb{R}^3 based on proximity to input balls b_i in terms of the power distance. Points $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ that are closer to the ball b_i compared to all other balls $b_j \in B$ ($j \neq i$) constitute the *Voronoi region* of b_i . Points equidistant from two balls $b_i, b_j \in B$ and closer to these two balls compared to other balls constitute a *Voronoi face*. Similarly, points equidistant from three balls and four balls constitute *Voronoi edges* and *Voronoi vertices* of the weighted Voronoi diagram, respectively. Figure 1b shows the weighted Voronoi diagram for a set of 2D weighted points or disks on the plane. Similar to the unweighted case, the Voronoi regions of the weighted Voronoi diagram are convex and linear. However, the weights may lead to a configuration where the Voronoi region of b_i is disjoint from b_i . This occurs when b_i is contained within another ball b_j . Further, the Voronoi region of b_i may even be empty.

2.3 Weighted Delaunay triangulation

The *weighted Delaunay triangulation* is the dual of the weighted Voronoi diagram, see Figure 1c. It is a simplicial complex consisting of simplices that are dual to the cells of the weighted Voronoi diagram. The following equivalent definition characterizes a simplex σ^d belonging to a Delaunay triangulation D .

► **Definition 1** (Weighted Delaunay Triangulation). *A simplex $\sigma^d = (p_0^\sigma, p_1^\sigma, \dots, p_d^\sigma)$, $0 \leq d \leq 3$, belongs to the weighted Delaunay triangulation D of B if and only if there exists a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that*

DT1: $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) = \pi(p, b_1^\sigma) = \dots = \pi(p, b_d^\sigma)$, and

DT2: $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) \leq \pi(p, b_i)$ for $b_i \in B - \sigma^d$.

A point p that satisfies the above two conditions, DT1 and DT2, is called a *witness* for σ^d . We call a point that minimizes the distance $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma)$ and satisfies both conditions as the *closest witness*, denoted by p_{\min}^σ . This minimum distance $\pi(p_{\min}^\sigma, b_0^\sigma)$ is called the *Size* of the simplex σ^d . A point that minimizes the distance $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma)$ and satisfies DT1 is called the *ortho-center* p_{ortho}^σ of simplex σ^d . The distance $\pi(p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma, b_0^\sigma)$ is called the *OrthoSize* of the simplex σ^d . Clearly, the *Size* of a simplex is lower bounded by its *OrthoSize*. Figure 2 shows the two possible scenarios, namely when *OrthoSize* = *Size* and *OrthoSize* < *Size*.

2.4 Alpha complex

Given a parameter $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we can construct a subset of the weighted Delaunay triangulation by filtering simplices whose *Size* is less than or equal to α , see Figures 1d and 1e. The resulting subset, called the *alpha complex*, is a subcomplex of the Delaunay complex and is denoted K_α :

$$K_\alpha = \{\sigma^d \in D \text{ such that } \text{Size}(\sigma^d) \leq \alpha\}.$$

The following equivalent definition characterizes simplices of the alpha complex without explicitly referring to the Delaunay triangulation.

► **Definition 2** (Alpha complex). *A d -dimensional simplex $\sigma^d = (p_0^\sigma, p_1^\sigma, \dots, p_d^\sigma)$, $0 \leq d \leq 3$, belongs to the alpha complex K_α of B if and only if there exists a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that the following three conditions are satisfied:*

AC1: $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) = \pi(p, b_1^\sigma) = \dots = \pi(p, b_d^\sigma)$,

AC2: $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) \leq \pi(p, b_i)$ for $b_i \in B - \sigma^d$, and

AC3: $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) \leq \alpha$ or equivalently, the *Size* of σ^d is at most α .


3 Algorithm

We now describe an algorithm to compute the alpha complex and prove its correctness. The algorithm utilizes the characterizing conditions introduced above. It first identifies the tetrahedra that belong to the alpha complex, followed by the set of triangles, edges and vertices. Figure 3 illustrates the algorithm as applied to disks on the plane.

3.1 Outline

The alpha complex of a point set in R^3 consists of simplices of dimensions 0–3, $K_\alpha = K_\alpha^0 \cup K_\alpha^1 \cup K_\alpha^2 \cup K_\alpha^3$, where $K_\alpha^d \subset K_\alpha$ is the set of d -dimensional simplices in K_α . We initialize $K_\alpha^d = \emptyset$ and construct K_α in five steps described below:

Step 1: For $0 \leq d \leq 3$, compute the set of all simplices σ^d such that $\text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^d) \leq \alpha$. Let



■ **Figure 2** Size and OrthoSize of a simplex. (a) A set B of weighted points. Two edges (bold) belong to the Delaunay triangulation. (b) The Size of edge b_1b_2 is equal to its OrthoSize. Points p , p' , p_{\min} and p_{ortho} are *witnesses*. Each one is equidistant from b_1 and b_2 and farther away from other disks in B . The distance is proportional to the length of the tangent to the disk that represents the weighted point. The next closest disk from these points is b_3 . In this case, p_{\min} and p_{ortho} coincide and hence $\text{Size} = \text{OrthoSize}$. (c) b_4b_5 is also a Delaunay edge. The location of a neighboring disk b_6 could lead to a different configuration. The point p_{ortho} is closest to b_4 and b_5 among all the points that are equidistant from both. However p_{ortho} is closer to b_6 as compared to b_4 and b_5 . The closest point p_{\min} that satisfies DT1 and DT2 is farther away, hence for b_4b_5 Size is greater than OrthoSize.

this set be denoted by $\Sigma_{\text{ortho}} = \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^0 \cup \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^1 \cup \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^2 \cup \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^3$.

Step 2: For all tetrahedra $\sigma^3 \in \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^3$, check condition AC2 using $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. If σ^3 satisfies AC2 then insert it into K_α^3 .

Step 3: Insert all triangles that are incident on tetrahedra in K_α^3 into K_α^2 . Let $\Sigma_{\text{free}}^2 = \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^2 - \text{Facets}(K_\alpha^3)$, where $\text{Facets}(K_\alpha^3)$ denotes the set of facets of tetrahedra in K_α^3 . For all triangles $\sigma^2 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2$, check condition AC2 using $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. If σ^2 satisfies AC2 then insert it into K_α^2 .

Step 4: Insert all edges incident on triangles in K_α^2 into K_α^1 . Let $\Sigma_{\text{free}}^1 = \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^1 - \text{Facets}(K_\alpha^2)$, where $\text{Facets}(K_\alpha^2)$ denotes the set of facets of triangles in K_α^2 . For all edges $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$, check condition AC2 using $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. If σ^1 satisfies AC2 then insert it into K_α^1 .

Step 5: Insert all endpoints of edges in K_α^1 into K_α^0 . Let $\Sigma_{\text{free}}^0 = \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^0 - \text{Facets}(K_\alpha^1)$, where $\text{Facets}(K_\alpha^1)$ denotes the set of balls incident on edges in K_α^1 . For all balls $b_i = (p_i, r_i) \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^0$, check condition AC2 using $p = p_i$. If p_i satisfies AC2 then insert it into K_α^0 .

Step 1 selects simplices that satisfy AC3. Step 2 recognizes tetrahedra that belong to the alpha complex by checking AC2 using $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. Triangle faces of these tetrahedra also belong to K_α . The other “free” triangles belong to K_α^2 if they satisfy AC2. Step 4 identify edges similarly. First all edge faces of triangles in K_α^2 are inserted followed by those “free” edges that satisfy AC2. Vertices are identified similarly in Step 5.

A notion related to free simplices, called *unattached* simplices, was introduced by Edelsbrunner [11]. However, the characterization of unattached simplices depends on the fact that they belong to the Delaunay complex.

3.2 Proof of correctness

We now prove that the algorithm described above correctly computes the alpha complex of the given set of weighted points by proving the following four claims. Each claim states that the set of simplices computed in Steps 2, 3, 4 and 5 are exactly the simplices belonging to the alpha complex. We assume that the input is non-degenerate.

▷ **Claim 3. Step 2 computes K_α^3 correctly.**


Proof. For a tetrahedron σ^3 , p_{ortho}^σ is the only point that satisfies condition AC1. In Step 2 of the proposed algorithm, we check if AC2 holds for p_{ortho}^σ . If yes, then p_{ortho}^σ is a witness for σ^3 , i.e., $p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma = p_{\text{min}}^\sigma$. Further, since $\text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^3) \leq \alpha$ and $p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma = p_{\text{min}}^\sigma$, we have $\text{Size}(\sigma^3) \leq \alpha$ thereby satisfying AC3. Therefore, σ^3 belongs to K_α^3 because it satisfies all three conditions. ◀

We now prove that the algorithm correctly identifies the triangles of the alpha complex.

► **Lemma 4.** *A triangle $\sigma^2 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2$ belongs to K_α^2 if and only if it satisfies AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$.*

Proof. We first prove the backward implication, namely if $\sigma^2 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2$ satisfies AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$, then $\sigma^2 \in K_\alpha^2$. Note that p_{ortho}^σ satisfies AC1 by definition. Further, it satisfies AC2 by assumption and hence $\text{Size}(\sigma^2) = \text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^2)$. We also have $\text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^2) \leq \alpha$ because $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2 \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^2$. So, $\text{Size}(\sigma^2) \leq \alpha$ thereby satisfying AC3. The triangle σ^2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$ satisfies all three conditions and hence belongs to K_α^2 .


We will now prove the forward implication via contradiction. Suppose there exists a triangle $\sigma^2 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2$ that belongs to K_α^2 but does not satisfy AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. In other words, there exists a ball $b_i \in B - \sigma^2$ for which $\pi(p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma, b_i) < \pi(p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma, b_0^\sigma)$. Let B_v denote the



■ **Figure 3** Illustration of the proposed algorithm in 2D. (a) The set of disks B grown by the parameter α . (b) First, compute the set of edges Σ_{ortho}^1 whose $\text{OrthoSize} \leq \alpha$ (red). The triangles Σ_{ortho}^2 that satisfy this condition are also computed but they are not shown here. (c) Next, identify the triangles that satisfy AC2 (red). (d) Collect edges in Σ_{ortho}^1 that are not incident on triangles in K_α^2 into Σ_{ortho}^1 . Check if these edges satisfy AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. For example, the edge $b_1 b_2$ does not satisfy this condition because b_3 is closer to p_{ortho}^σ than b_1 and b_2 . (e) One edge survives the AC2 check and thus belongs to K_α . (f) The alpha complex is obtained as the union of K_α^2 , K_α^1 and K_α^0 .

set of all such balls b_i . The set of points that are equidistant from the three balls $(b_0^\sigma, b_1^\sigma, b_2^\sigma)$ corresponding to σ^2 form a line perpendicular to the plane containing σ^2 called the *radical axis*. Each ball $b_i \in B_v$ partitions the radical axis into two half-intervals based on whether the point on radical axis is closer to b_i or to b_0^σ , see Figure 4. Let $I^+(b_i)$ denote the half interval consisting of points that are closer to b_0^σ compared to b_i . Let $I^+(B_v)$ denote the intersection of all such half intervals $I^+(b_i)$. We have assumed that $\sigma^2 \in K_\alpha^2$, so there must exist a closest witness p_{\min}^σ , and it lies within $I^+(B_v)$. Thus, $I^+(B_v)$ is non-empty. In fact, $I^+(B_v) = I^+(b_j)$ for some $b_j \in B_v$ and p_{\min}^σ is exactly the end point of $I^+(b_j)$. This implies that p_{\min}^σ is also a closest witness for the tetrahedron $\sigma^3 = (b_0^\sigma, b_1^\sigma, b_2^\sigma, b_j)$. So, σ^3 belongs to K_α^3 and its Size is equal to $\text{Size}(\sigma^2)$. However, this means that $\sigma^2 \notin \Sigma_{\text{free}}^2$, a contradiction. So, the forward implication in the lemma is true. ◀

▷ **Claim 5.** Step 3 computes K_α^2 correctly.



■ **Figure 4** The radical axis of a triangle σ^2 is drawn such that p_{ortho}^σ is at the origin. A ball $b_i \in B - \sigma^2$ divides the radical axis into two half intervals. Points in the half interval $I^+(b_i)$ are closer to b_i as compared to b_0^σ , i.e. for all $p \in I^+(b_i)$, $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) < \pi(p, b_i)$. Consider the set B_v of balls that are closer to p_{ortho}^σ as compared to b_0^σ . So, $I^+(b_i)$ does not contain p_{ortho}^σ . The intersection of these intervals, denoted by $I^+(B_v)$, is equal to one of the intervals $I^+(b_i)$. Here, $I^+(B_v) = I^+(b_3)$. The end point of the interval $I^+(b_3)$ is the closest witness for the tetrahedron $\sigma^2 \cup b_3$.


Proof. If a simplex σ^3 belongs to K_α then naturally all of its faces also belong to K_α . The algorithm includes such triangles into K_α^2 and remove them from Σ_{ortho}^2 to obtain the set of free triangles Σ_{free}^2 . It follows directly from Lemma 4 that AC2 is a necessary and sufficient condition for a triangle in Σ_{free}^2 to belong to K_α^2 . Hence, Step 3 correctly computes the triangles belonging to K_α^2 . ◀

The above arguments need to be extended to prove that the edges of the alpha complex are also correctly identified.

► **Lemma 6.** An edge $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$ belongs to K_α^1 if and only if it satisfies the condition AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$.

Proof. First, we assume that $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$ satisfies AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. The point p_{ortho}^σ satisfies AC1 by definition. Further, it satisfies AC2 by assumption and hence $\text{Size}(\sigma^1) = \text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^1)$. We also have $\text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^1) \leq \alpha$ because $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1 \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{ortho}}^1$. So, $\text{Size}(\sigma^1) \leq \alpha$ thereby satisfying AC3. The edge σ^1 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$ satisfies all three conditions and hence belongs to K_α^1 .

We will prove the forward implication via contradiction. Suppose there exists an edge $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$ that belongs to K_α^1 but does not satisfy AC2 with $p = p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma$. In other words, there exists a ball $b_i \in B - \sigma^1$ such that $\pi(p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma, b_i) < \pi(p_{\text{ortho}}^\sigma, b_0^\sigma)$. Let B_v denote the set of all such balls b_i . The set of points that are equidistant from the two balls (b_0^σ, b_1^σ) corresponding to σ^1 form a plane perpendicular to the line containing σ^1 called the *radical plane*. Each ball $b_i \in B_v$ partitions the radical plane into two half-planes based on whether the point on the radical plane is closer to b_i or to b_0^σ , see Figure 5. Let $H^+(b_i)$ denote the half-plane consisting of points that are closer to b_0^σ compared to b_i . Let $H^+(B_v)$ denote the intersection of all such half-planes $H^+(b_i)$. We have assumed that $\sigma^1 \in K_\alpha^1$, so there must exist a closest witness p_{min}^σ , and it lies within $H^+(B_v)$. Thus, $H^+(B_v)$ is non-empty. In fact, p_{min}^σ lies on the envelope of $H^+(B_v)$ because it minimizes the distance to b_0^σ . Let p_{min}^σ lie on the bounding line corresponding to $H^+(b_j)$ for some $b_j \in B_v$. This implies that p_{min}^σ is also a closest witness for the triangle $\sigma^2 = (b_0^\sigma, b_1^\sigma, b_j)$. So, σ^2 belongs to K_α^2 , and its size



■ **Figure 5** The radical plane of an edge σ^1 is drawn such that p_{ortho}^σ is at the origin. A ball $b_i \in B - \sigma^1$ divides the radical plane into two half planes. The half plane $H^+(b_i)$ consists of points that are closer to b_0^σ as compared to b_i , i.e. for all $p \in H^+(b_i)$, $\pi(p, b_0^\sigma) < \pi(p, b_i)$. Let B_v denote the set of balls that are closer to p_{ortho}^σ as compared to b_0^σ . The half planes $H^+(b_i)$ do not contain p_{ortho}^σ . The intersection of these half planes, denoted by $H^+(B_v)$, is a convex region (yellow). The power distance from b_0^σ to a point $p \in H^+(B_v)$ is minimized at a point on the boundary of the convex region $H^+(B_v)$. But the boundary of $H^+(B_v)$ is a union of line segments that bound half planes $H^+(b_i)$. Here, the point at which the distance is minimum lies on the boundary of the half plane $H^+(b_3)$. This point is the closest witness for the triangle $\sigma^1 \cup b_3$.

is equal to $\text{Size}(\sigma^1)$. However, this means that $\sigma^1 \notin \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$, a contradiction. So, the forward implication in the lemma is also true. ◀

▷ **Claim 7. Step 4 computes K_α^1 correctly.**

Proof. All edge faces of triangles in K_α^2 naturally belong to K_α^1 . Step 4 inserts all edges incident on triangles in K_α^2 into K_α^1 as valid edges and removes them from Σ_{ortho}^1 to obtain the set of free edges Σ_{free}^1 . It follows directly from Lemma 6 that AC2 is a necessary and sufficient condition for an edge $\sigma^1 \in \Sigma_{\text{free}}^1$ to belong to K_α^1 . Therefore, Step 4 correctly computes the edges belonging to K_α^1 . ◀

▷ **Claim 8. Step 5 computes K_α^0 correctly.**

Proof. All vertices incident on K_α^1 naturally belong to K_α^0 . Step 5 inserts all such vertices in K_α^0 as valid vertices and removes them from Σ_{ortho}^0 to obtain the set of free vertices Σ_{free}^0 . Next, the vertices in Σ_{free}^0 for which the center of the ball $b_i = (p_i, r_i)$ satisfies AC2 are also inserted into K_α^0 . Clearly, these vertices also satisfy AC3 because they belong to Σ_{ortho}^0 . The condition AC1 is not relevant for 0-dimensional simplices. Therefore, these vertices clearly

belong to the alpha complex. Similar to Lemmas 4 and 6, it is easy to prove that checking for AC2 for $p = p_i$ is necessary and sufficient condition to decide whether a vertex in Σ_{free}^0 belongs to the alpha complex. That is, it is possible to show that vertices in alpha complex that have non-empty Voronoi regions but do not satisfy AC2 for $p = p_i$ would be incident on some edge in K_α^1 , and therefore must have been already detected by Step 4 and hence can not belong to Σ_{free}^0 . Therefore, Step 5 correctly computes the vertices belonging to K_α^0 . ◀

The arguments in the proofs of Lemma 4 and Lemma 6 are similar. A general result is likely true for d -dimensional simplices in Σ_{free}^d . However, given the focus on alpha complexes in \mathbb{R}^3 , we prefer to state and prove these results specific to lower dimensions. We also prefer to provide individual proofs for edges and triangles because it simplifies the exposition and could also potentially help in the design of improved data structures to accelerate computation of different steps of the algorithm.

4 Parallel algorithm for biomolecules

Although the algorithm as described above is provably correct, a straightforward implementation will be extremely inefficient with a worst-case running time of $O(n^5)$, where n is the number of weighted points in B . This is because Step 1 requires $O(n^4)$ time to generate all possible tetrahedra. In later steps, we need $O(n)$ effort per simplex to check AC2. However, the input corresponds to atoms in a biomolecule. We show how certain properties of biomolecules can be leveraged to develop a fast parallel implementation.

4.1 Biomolecular data characteristics

Atoms in a biomolecule are well distributed. The following three properties of biomolecules are most relevant:

- The radius of an atom is bounded. The typical radius of an atom in a protein molecule ranges between 1\AA to 2\AA [3]. Further, a protein molecule contains upwards of thousand atoms. So, the radius is small compared to the total size of the molecule.
- There is a lower bound on the distance between the centres of two atoms. This is called the *van der Waals contact distance*, beyond which the two atoms start repelling each other. In the case of atoms in protein molecules, this distance is at least 1\AA . This property together with the upper bound on atomic radii ensures that no atom is completely contained inside another. This means that the weighted Voronoi regions corresponding to the atoms in a biomolecule can be always be assumed to be non-empty.
- Structural biologists are interested in small values of α . The two crucial values are 0\AA and 1.4\AA . The former corresponds to using van der Waals radius and the latter corresponds to the radius of water molecule, which acts as the solvent.

In the light of the above three properties, we can say that the number of simplices of the alpha complex that are incident on a weighted point (atom) is independent of the total number of input atoms and hence bounded by a constant [22].

4.2 Acceleration data structure

The algorithm will benefit from an efficient method for accessing points of B that belong to a local neighborhood of a given weighted point. We store the weighted points in a grid-based data structure. Let r_{max} denote the radius of the largest atom and assume that the value of the parameter α is available as input. First, we construct a grid with cells of side length

$\sqrt{r_{max}^2 + \alpha}$ and then bin the input atoms into the grid cells. In our implementation, we do not store the grid explicitly because it may contain several empty cells. Instead, we compute the cell index for each input atom and sort the list of atoms by cell index to ensure that atoms that belong to a particular cell are stored at consecutive locations. The cell index is determined based on a row-major or column-major order. Alternatively, a space-filling curves like the Hilbert curve could also be used to order the cells.

After the atoms are stored in grid cells, the alpha complex is computed in two stages. In the first stage, we employ a bottom-up approach to obtain a conservative estimate of the edges, triangles, and tetrahedra belonging to the alpha complex. The false positives from the first stage are removed in a subsequent pruning stage resulting in the correct alpha complex. We describe these two stages in the following subsections.

4.3 Potential simplices

The first stage essentially corresponds to Step 1 of the algorithm described in the previous section. We compute the set Σ_{ortho} of potential simplices for which $\text{OrthoSize}(\sigma^d) \leq \alpha$. However, for efficiency reasons we process the simplices in the order of increasing dimension. First, we identify edges that satisfy the AC3 condition as described below. Given the size of the grid cell, endpoints of edges that satisfy the condition either lie within the same grid cell or in adjacent cells. So, the grid data structure substantially reduces the time required to compute the list of potential edges Σ_{ortho}^1 . Beginning from this set of edges, we construct the set of all possible triangles and retain the triangles whose OrthoSize is no greater than α , resulting in the set Σ_{ortho}^2 . Finally, we use the triangles in Σ_{ortho}^2 to construct the list of tetrahedra that satisfy the $\text{OrthoSize} \leq \alpha$ condition. The above procedure works because the OrthoSize of a simplex is always greater than or equal to the OrthoSize of its faces. The set of simplices identified in this stage contains all simplices of the alpha complex. False positives are pruned in the second stage described below.

4.4 Pruning

The second stage corresponds to Steps 2-5 of the algorithm and processes the potential simplices in the decreasing order of dimension. This stage checks the characterizing condition AC2 to prune Σ_{ortho} into K_α . The tetrahedra are processed by checking if any of the input balls are closer to the *ortho-center* than the balls incident on the tetrahedron. If yes, the tetrahedron is pruned away. Else, the tetrahedron is recognized as belonging to the alpha complex and inserted into K_α^3 . Triangles incident on these tetrahedra also belong to the alpha complex and are inserted into K_α^2 after they are removed from the list of potential triangles Σ_{ortho}^2 . Next, the triangles in Σ_{ortho}^2 are processed by checking if they satisfy AC2. If yes, they are inserted into K_α^2 . Otherwise, they are pruned away. All edges incident on triangles belonging to K_α^2 are inserted into K_α^1 and removed from the set Σ_{ortho}^1 . Next, the edges in Σ_{ortho}^1 are processed by checking if they satisfy AC2. Edges that satisfy AC2 are inserted into K_α^1 and the others are pruned away. All the vertices in Σ_{ortho}^0 are directly inserted into K_α^0 without the AC2 check because for biomolecular data we assume that Voronoi regions of all the atoms are non-empty. The check for condition AC2 for each simplex is again made efficient by the use of the grid data structure. Atoms that may violate AC2 lie within the same cell as that containing the *ortho-center* or within the adjacent cells. Atoms that lie within other cells may be safely ignored.

4.5 CUDA implementation

We use the CUDA framework [7] and the `thrust` library [8] within CUDA to develop a parallel implementation of the algorithm that executes on the many cores of the GPU. The grid computation is implemented as a CUDA kernel where all atoms are processed in parallel. The computation of potential simplices and pruning stages are broken down into multiple CUDA kernels and parallelized differently in order to increase efficiency. We now describe the parallelization strategy in brief.

For computing the set of potential edges, the initial enumeration of possible edges incident on an atom is done using the atoms in the corresponding grid cell and its neighbouring cells. This is done per atom in parallel, the thread corresponding to the atom i being responsible for generating the edges $ij, j > i$ to ensure no duplicate edges are generated. Subsequently, the AC3 condition is checked for the edges in parallel to finally generate the list of potential edges Σ_{ortho}^1 . For computing potential triangles Σ_{ortho}^2 , the potential edge list is used as a starting point for the initial enumeration of all possible triangles. This step is also parallelized per atom, the thread i being responsible for generation of triangles of the type $ijk; j, k > i$ if all three edges ij, ik and jk are potential edges. The AC3 condition for the triangle is checked next within a separate kernel and parallelized per triangle to generate the potential triangles Σ_{ortho}^2 . A similar strategy is used for computing the set of potential tetrahedra Σ_{ortho}^3 .

The pruning stage is parallelized per tetrahedron, triangle, and edge as required. So, computation of p_{ortho}^σ is done in parallel. The grid data structure is again useful in checking for potential violators of the AC2 condition. Only the balls belonging to the grid cell corresponding to p_{ortho}^σ or the those in neighbouring grid cells can violate the AC2 condition.

4.6 Handling large data sizes

Typical protein structures consist of up to 100,000 atoms. Our implementation can handle datasets of this size easily for reasonable values of α . However, the size of datasets is ever increasing. Protein complexes that are available nowadays may consist of millions of atoms, necessitating smart management of GPU memory while handling such data sets.

We propose two strategies and implement one of them. The first strategy is to partition the grid by constructing an octree data structure and choosing an appropriate level in the octree to create partitions. Each partition together with its border cells can be processed independently of other partitions. So, we can copy one partition and its border to the GPU memory, compute its alpha complex, and copy the results back from GPU to CPU memory. After all the partitions are processed, the list of simplices can be concatenated followed by duplicate removal to generate the final alpha complex.

The second strategy is to partition the sorted list of atoms into *chunks* of equal sizes and to process each chunk independently. Here, we assume that the complete list of atoms together with the grid data structure fits in the GPU memory. This is a reasonable assumption considering that datasets containing several million atoms can easily fit on modern GPUs, which typically have at least 2GB video memory. Also, the main difficulty in handling large protein structures is managing the large lists of simplices generated within the intermediate steps of the algorithm, when compared to handling the input list of atoms or the output list of simplices. We compute the alpha complex by executing the algorithm in multiple passes. Each pass computes the alpha complex for a single chunk and copies it back to the CPU memory. We have implemented this second strategy and can handle data sizes of up to 16 million atoms on a GPU with 2GB of memory. Results are reported in the next section.

5 Experimental results

We now present results of computational experiments, which demonstrate that the parallel algorithm is fast in practice and significantly better than the state-of-the-art. We also performed runtime profiling to better understand the bottlenecks and effect of the parameter α on the runtime. We present results for α in the range 0.0 to 2.0. This range is important for structural analysis of biomolecules as it corresponds to *solvent accessible surface* of the biomolecule for typical solvent molecules like water (van der Waals radius = 1.4Å). The value $\alpha = 0$ corresponds to the *van der Waals* surface of the biomolecule. All experiments, unless stated otherwise, were performed on a Linux system with an nVidia GTX 660 Ti graphics card running CUDA 8.0 and a 2.0GHz Intel Xeon octa core processor with 16 GB of main memory. The default number of threads per block was set at 512 for all the CUDA kernels.

Mach and Koehl describe two techniques for computing alpha complex of biomolecules called *AlphaVol* and *UnionBall* in their paper [27]. Both approaches construct the weighted Delaunay triangulation of input atoms first followed by a filtering step to obtain the alpha complex. *UnionBall* is the state-of-the-art technique for alpha complex computation for biomolecules on multi-core CPU. It uses heuristics and optimizations specific to biomolecular data to improve upon *AlphaVol*. For biomolecules containing 5 million atoms, *AlphaVol* takes approximately 8600 seconds for computing the alpha complex, while *UnionBall* takes approximately 150 seconds. Our method computes the alpha complex in less than 3 seconds for similar sized data, see Table 1.

5.1 Comparison with *gReg3D*

We are not aware of any available software that can compute the alpha complex directly without first constructing the complete Delaunay triangulation. In order to compare the performance, we chose the state-of-the-art parallel algorithm for computing the weighted Delaunay triangulation in 3D, *gReg3D* [5]. The CUDA implementation of *gReg3D* is available in the public domain. Table 1 compares the running times of our proposed algorithm with that of *gReg3D* for twelve different biomolecules at $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$. As evident from the table, we consistently observe significant speedup over *gReg3D*. The observed speedup is as high as a factor of 22 for the biomolecule 1X9P at $\alpha = 0$, one of the largest molecules in our dataset. Clearly, the speedup goes down for $\alpha = 1$ when compared to $\alpha = 0$ because of the increased number of simplices in the output alpha complex. We also report the number of simplices in the alpha complex compared to the total number of simplices in the Delaunay triangulation under the column ‘%Simplex’. This makes it clear why the speedup decreases as α is increased from 0 to 1. For example, for the protein 1AON, the fraction of alpha complex simplices increases from 15.9% to 30% as α is increased from 0 to 1. Correspondingly, the speedup decreases from a factor of 13.5 to 5.5. We repeated the experiment on a MS Windows system with an nVidia GTX 980 Ti card running CUDA 8.0 and observed similar speedups. However, the individual runtimes both for our algorithm and for *gReg3D* were higher on the GTX 980 Ti.

The starred entries in Table 1 are results for execution using the data partitioning approach. This is necessitated because these four large molecules generate large intermediate simplex lists that can not fit into the GPU memory if all the atoms in the molecule are processed at once. We observe that *gReg3D* is able to successfully compute the Delaunay complex for only one out of these four large molecules and runs out of GPU memory for the remaining three molecules.

■ **Table 1** Runtime comparison of the proposed algorithm with *gReg3D* on an nVidia GTX 660 Ti graphics card. Timings are reported in milliseconds. %Simplex refers to the size of the alpha complex as a percentage of the size of the weighted Delaunay triangulation. The last column shows the speedup in runtime of our algorithm over *gReg3D*. ‘*’ indicates the data was partitioned and processed in chunks. ‘-’ indicates that the code could not execute due to insufficient memory.

α	PDB id	#Atoms	K_α		<i>gReg3D</i>		%Simplex	Speed up
			#Simplices	Time(ms)	#Simplices	Time(ms)		
0.0	1GRM	260	932	13	6295	117	14.8	9.0
	1U71	1505	5696	13	40878	115	13.9	11.1
	3N0H	1509	5739	14	41244	137	13.9	10.0
	4HHB	4384	38796	29	150141	193	25.8	6.6
	2J1N	8142	29642	18	227719	229	13.0	12.7
	1K4C	16068	62851	27	446383	347	14.1	12.9
	2OAU	16647	123175	56	466586	344	26.4	6.2
	1AON	58674	262244	65	1650841	879	15.9	13.5
	1X9P*	217920	924086	113	6142811	2555	15.0	22.6
	1IHM*	677040	2713083	277	-	-	-	-
	4CWU*	5905140	23450403	2709	-	-	-	-
	3IYN*	5975700	24188892	2874	-	-	-	-
1.0	1GRM	260	1598	15	6295	117	25.4	7.9
	1U71	1505	10828	17	40878	115	26.5	8.5
	3N0H	1509	10965	30	41244	137	26.6	4.6
	4HHB	4384	65987	86	150141	193	44.0	2.2
	2J1N	8142	58205	30	227719	229	25.6	7.6
	1K4C	16068	118467	52	446383	347	26.5	6.7
	2OAU	16647	199101	159	466586	344	42.7	2.2
	1AON	58674	495683	160	1650841	879	30.0	5.5
	1X9P*	217920	1653778	196	6142811	2555	26.9	13.0
	1IHM*	677040	5058507	605	-	-	-	-
	4CWU*	5905140	44411353	5118	-	-	-	-
	3IYN*	5975700	45790463	5501	-	-	-	-

5.2 Runtime profiling

The two stages of our parallel algorithm (potential simplices and pruning) are further divided into three steps each, corresponding to the computation of edges, triangles, and tetrahedra respectively. A grid computation step precedes the two stages. We study the computation effort for each of these seven steps of the algorithm. We also report the time spent in memory transfers from CPU to GPU and vice-versa. Thus, we report the split up of the total runtime into eight categories namely, ‘Memory transfer’, ‘Grid computation’, ‘Potential edges’, ‘Potential triangles’, ‘Potential tetrahedra’, ‘AC2 tetrahedra’, ‘AC2 triangles’ and ‘AC2 edges’.

Table 2 summarizes the observed split up of runtime for eight different biomolecules. Figure 6 shows the actual time spent for different steps and Figure 7 shows relative time spent for each step. From these figures, it is clear that the pruning stage consumes the maximum amount of time. The pruning stage involves checking the neighboring balls for violations of the AC2 condition for each simplex. Specially, the tetrahedra-pruning step (red) takes approximately 25% of the total time required for alpha complex computation.

We performed additional experiments to determine the average split up over multiple runs. We computed the relative time spent for each step for different values of α between 0.0 and 2.0. These observations are reported in Figure 8. It is clear that the memory transfers and grid computation combined do not take more than 10% of the total time. The potential-simplices-estimation stage consumes 30% of the time. However, the pruning stage is most expensive, taking up roughly 60% of the computation time. The pruning-tetrahedra step takes up 35% of the time on average. This suggests that this step should be the focus of the optimization efforts in future. It should be noted that proportion of time spent for each step depends on the distribution of atoms in the biomolecule as well as the value of α . This explains the significant deviation from the averages as shown by the error bars.

5.3 Effect of the value of alpha



We also performed experiments to observe the runtime performance as the value of α is varied between 0.0 and 2.0. Figures 9 and 10 show the results for the proteins 1K4C and 1AON, respectively. We also show how the number of simplices in the computed alpha complex increases as the value of α is increased. The runtime and total number of simplices follow a near-linear trend. However, increase in time required for pruning, especially for pruning the tetrahedra, is greater than time required for other steps of the algorithm. Note that although both graphs appear linear, this is not guaranteed behavior for other input. The scaling behavior depends on the distribution of the atoms in the molecule and on the range of α values for which the experiment is conducted.

5.4 Numerical issues

The proposed algorithm requires computation of OrthoSize for each simplex, which in turn requires solving systems of linear equations. These computations require higher precision

■ **Table 2** Time spent within different steps of the algorithm. Timings are reported in milliseconds for memory transfer, grid computation, computing potential simplices, and pruning. The last column shows the total time taken for all steps.

α	PDB id	#Atoms	#Simplices	Memory	Grid	Potential Simplices			Pruning			Total
						Edges	Tris	Tets	Tets	Tris	Edges	
0.0	1GRM	260	932	0.8	1.0	2.8	1.1	1.0	1.2	3.1	1.9	13.0
	1U71	1505	5696	0.9	0.8	2.3	1.7	1.0	1.8	2.6	1.9	13.0
	3N0H	1509	5739	0.7	0.9	2.3	1.4	2.5	1.8	2.5	1.5	13.7
	4HHB	4384	38796	1.1	0.8	2.7	2.0	6.0	8.3	4.6	3.7	29.2
	2J1N	8142	29642	1.1	1.2	3.7	1.6	1.3	2.0	3.9	3.2	18.1
	1K4C	16068	62851	1.7	2.0	4.3	1.5	1.6	3.8	7.6	4.3	26.9
	2OAU	16647	123175	2.1	1.3	4.7	4.3	5.8	21.9	9.5	6.0	55.5
	1AON	58674	262244	4.6	2.8	11.1	5.6	4.1	16.7	10.9	9.4	65.2
1.0	1GRM	260	1598	1.2	1.4	2.7	1.2	2.0	1.8	2.7	1.8	14.7
	1U71	1505	10828	0.9	0.8	2.3	1.5	3.4	2.5	3.2	2.5	17.1
	3N0H	1509	10965	0.9	1.4	2.4	1.7	14.6	2.6	3.5	2.9	30.0
	4HHB	4384	65987	1.5	1.9	3.4	5.4	23.7	32.8	12.4	4.8	86.0
	2J1N	8142	58205	1.4	1.1	3.4	2.5	3.6	9.0	4.6	4.5	30.3
	1K4C	16068	118467	2.1	1.8	6.1	3.0	3.4	19.5	8.3	7.9	52.2
	2OAU	16647	199101	3.0	1.7	6.0	10.2	28.3	90.0	12.1	7.5	158.9
	1AON	58674	495683	6.3	2.0	12.4	9.9	12.5	87.9	17.9	11.0	159.9

(a) $\alpha = 0.0$ (b) $\alpha = 1.0$

■ **Figure 6** Time spent for different steps of the algorithm.

than is available on the GPU. So, the results may contain numerical errors. These numerical errors ultimately manifest as misclassification of a simplex as belonging to K_α or not. We performed extensive experimentation and observed that the alpha complex was correctly computed in several cases. In cases where the results were not correct, the number of false positives and negatives (extra or missing simplices) is extremely small as compared to the total number of simplices in the alpha complex. We observed a worst case error rate of 0.001 in our experiments, see Table 3. This error rate is tolerable for several applications. If exact computation is required, we could use a tolerance threshold to tag some simplices as requiring further checks, which can in turn be performed on the CPU or GPU using a multi-precision library [?]. The use of multi-precision libraries will adversely affect the computation time. Our implementation can be extended to use such a hybrid strategy. However, it will require additional experimentation to identify appropriate tolerance thresholds and performance optimization. We plan to implement this in future.




(a) $\alpha = 0.0$ (b) $\alpha = 1.0$

Figure 7 Proportion of time spent for different steps during the execution of the algorithm. The pruning stage (AC2 tetrahedra, triangles and edges checks) takes significantly more effort compared to other steps. Also, the time spent for this step increases with α .

6 Conclusions

We proposed a novel parallel algorithm to compute the alpha complex for biomolecular data that does not require prior computation of the complete Delaunay triangulation. The useful characterization of simplices that belong to the alpha complex may be of independent interest. The algorithm was implemented using CUDA, which exploits the characteristics of the atom distribution in biomolecules to achieve speedups of up to a factor of 22 compared to the state-of-the-art parallel algorithm for computing the weighted Delaunay triangulation, and up to a factor of 50 speedup over the state-of-the-art implementation that is optimized for biomolecules. In future work, we plan to further improve the runtime efficiency of the parallel implementation and to resolve the numerical issues using real arithmetic.

Applications of alpha complex outside the domain of biomolecular analysis often require the complete filtration of Delaunay complex. The algorithm as presented here is not best suited for such cases. However, the algorithm may be modified to utilize a previously computed alpha complex to efficiently compute the alpha complex for higher values of α .



■ **Figure 8** The average proportion of the execution time accounted for by various steps of computation. This average was taken over all the molecules in our dataset at various values of α varying from 0 to 2.0. As evident from the error bars, there is significant variability. But, in general the pruning stage of the algorithm, specially the tetrahedra computation step takes the maximum time.

We plan to investigate this extension in future work.

References

- 1 Franz Aurenhammer, Rolf Klein, and Der-Tsai Lee. *Voronoi Diagrams and Delaunay Triangulations*. World Scientific, 2013. doi:10.1142/8685.
- 2 Ulrich Bauer and Herbert Edelsbrunner. The Morse theory of Čech and Delaunay filtrations. In Siu-Wing Cheng and Olivier Devillers, editors, *30th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, SOCG'14, Kyoto, Japan, June 08 - 11, 2014*, page 484. ACM, 2014. doi:10.1145/2582112.2582167.
- 3 A Bondi. van der Waals volumes and radii. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 68(3):441–451, 1964.
- 4 Adrian Bowyer. Computing Dirichlet tessellations. *Comput. J.*, 24(2):162–166, 1981. doi:10.1093/comjnl/24.2.162.
- 5 Thanh-Tung Cao, Ashwin Nanjappa, Mingcen Gao, and Tiow Seng Tan. A GPU accelerated algorithm for 3d Delaunay triangulation. In John Keyser and Pedro V. Sander, editors, *Symposium on Interactive 3D Graphics and Games, I3D '14, San Francisco, CA, USA - March 14-16, 2014*, pages 47–54. ACM, 2014. doi:10.1145/2556700.2556710.

- 6 Paolo Cignoni, Claudio Montani, and Roberto Scopigno. DeWall: A fast divide and conquer Delaunay triangulation algorithm in E^d . *Comput. Aided Des.*, 30(5):333–341, 1998. doi: 10.1016/S0010-4485(97)00082-1.
- 7 Nvidia Corporation. CUDA Zone. <https://developer.nvidia.com/cuda-zone>, 2020. [Online; accessed 17-March-2020].
- 8 Nvidia Corporation. Thrust. <https://developer.nvidia.com/thrust>, 2020. [Online; accessed 17-March-2020].
- 9 Tran Kai Frank Da, Sébastien Lorient, and Mariette Yvinec. 3D alpha shapes. In *CGAL User and Reference Manual*. CGAL Editorial Board, 4.11 edition, 2017. URL: <http://doc.cgal.org/4.11/Manual/packages.html#PkgAlphaShapes3Summary>.
- 10 Joe Dundas, Zheng Ouyang, Jeffery Tseng, T. Andrew Binkowski, Yaron Turpaz, and Jie Liang. CASTp: computed atlas of surface topography of proteins with structural and topographical mapping of functionally annotated residues. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 34(Web-Server-Issue):116–118, 2006. doi:10.1093/nar/gkl282.
- 11 H. Edelsbrunner. *Weighted alpha shapes*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Computer Science, 1992.
- 12 H. Edelsbrunner and P. Koehl. The geometry of biomolecular solvation. In *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, pages 243–275. MSRI Publications, 2005.





Figure 9 Running time for varying values of α for 1K4C. The number of simplices in the output alpha complex is also shown (black line). The number of simplices increases almost linearly with α as expected from the distribution of atoms in typical biomolecules. The running time also increases almost linearly with α for this molecule. Also, the fraction of time spent for tetrahedra computation step (red) increases with α .



■ **Figure 10** Running time for varying values of α for 1AON. The number of simplices in the output alpha complex is also shown (black line). The running time increases almost linearly with α for this molecule.

- 13 Herbert Edelsbrunner. *Geometry and Topology for Mesh Generation*, volume 7 of *Cambridge monographs on applied and computational mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- 14 Herbert Edelsbrunner. Alpha shapes – a survey. In R. van de Weygaert, G. Vegter, J. Ritzerveld, and V. Icke, editors, *Tessellations in the Sciences: Virtues, Techniques and Applications of Geometric Tilings*, 2011.
- 15 Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational Topology - an Introduction*. American Mathematical Society, 2010. URL: <http://www.ams.org/bookstore-getitem/item=MBK-69>.
- 16 Herbert Edelsbrunner, David G. Kirkpatrick, and Raimund Seidel. On the shape of a set of points in the plane. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 29(4):551–558, 1983. doi:10.1109/TIT.1983.1056714.
- 17 Herbert Edelsbrunner and Ernst P. Mücke. Simulation of simplicity: a technique to cope with degenerate cases in geometric algorithms. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 9(1):66–104, 1990. doi:10.1145/77635.77639.
- 18 Herbert Edelsbrunner and Ernst P. Mücke. Three-dimensional alpha shapes. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 13(1):43–72, 1994. doi:10.1145/174462.156635.
- 19 Herbert Edelsbrunner and Raimund Seidel. Voronoi diagrams and arrangements. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 1:25–44, 1986. doi:10.1007/BF02187681.
- 20 Herbert Edelsbrunner and Nimish R. Shah. Incremental topological flipping works for regular triangulations. *Algorithmica*, 15(3):223–241, 1996. doi:10.1007/BF01975867.

■ **Table 3** Incorrectly identified simplices of the alpha complex.

α	PDB id	#Atoms	#Simplices	#Misclassified Simplices				Error rate
				Edges	Triangles	Tetrahedra	Total	
0.0	1GRM	260	932	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	1U71	1505	5696	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	3N0H	1509	5739	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	4HHB	4384	38796	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	2J1N	8142	29642	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	1K4C	16068	62851	15	33	16	64	0.0010
	2OAU	16647	123175	12	21	5	38	0.0003
	1AON	58674	262244	22	39	21	82	0.0003
1.0	1GRM	260	1598	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	1U71	1505	10828	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	3N0H	1509	10965	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	4HHB	4384	65987	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	2J1N	8142	58205	0	0	0	0	0.0000
	1K4C	16068	118467	20	34	14	68	0.0006
	2OAU	16647	199101	10	22	10	42	0.0002
	1AON	58674	495683	10	26	21	57	0.0001

- 21 Leonidas J. Guibas, Donald E. Knuth, and Micha Sharir. Randomized incremental construction of delaunay and voronoi diagrams. *Algorithmica*, 7(4):381–413, 1992. doi:10.1007/BF01758770.
- 22 Dan Halperin and Mark H. Overmars. Spheres, molecules, and hidden surface removal. *Comput. Geom.*, 11(2):83–102, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0925-7721(98)00023-6.
- 23 Michael Krone, Barbora Kozlíková, Norbert Lindow, Marc Baaden, Daniel Baum, Július Parulek, Hans-Christian Hege, and Ivan Viola. Visual analysis of biomolecular cavities: State of the art. *Comput. Graph. Forum*, 35(3):527–551, 2016. doi:10.1111/cgf.12928.
- 24 J. Liang, H. Edelsbrunner, P. Fu, P.V. Sudhakar, and S. Subramaniam. Analytical shape computation of macromolecules: I. molecular area and volume through alpha shape. *Proteins Structure Function and Genetics*, 33(1):1–17, 1998.
- 25 J. Liang, H. Edelsbrunner, P. Fu, P.V. Sudhakar, and S. Subramaniam. Analytical shape computation of macromolecules: II. inaccessible cavities in proteins. *Proteins Structure Function and Genetics*, 33(1):18–29, 1998.
- 26 J. Liang, H. Edelsbrunner, and C. Woodward. Anatomy of protein pockets and cavities. *Protein Science*, 7(9):1884–1897, 1998.
- 27 Paul Mach and Patrice Koehl. Geometric measures of large biomolecules: Surface, volume, and pockets. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 32(14):3023–3038, 2011. doi:10.1002/jcc.21884.
- 28 Talha Bin Masood and Vijay Natarajan. An integrated geometric and topological approach to connecting cavities in biomolecules. In Chuck Hansen, Ivan Viola, and Xiaoru Yuan, editors, *2016 IEEE Pacific Visualization Symposium, PacificVis 2016, Taipei, Taiwan, April 19-22, 2016*, pages 104–111. IEEE Computer Society, 2016. doi:10.1109/PACIFICVIS.2016.7465257.
- 29 Talha Bin Masood, Tathagata Ray, and Vijay Natarajan. Parallel computation of alpha complex for biomolecules. *CoRR*, abs/1908.05944, 2019. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.05944>, arXiv:1908.05944.

- 30 Talha Bin Masood, Sankaran Sandhya, Nagasuma R. Chandra, and Vijay Natarajan. CH-EXVIS: a tool for molecular channel extraction and visualization. *BMC Bioinform.*, 16:119:1–119:19, 2015. doi:10.1186/s12859-015-0545-9.
- 31 Ashwin Nanjappa. *Delaunay triangulation in \mathbb{R}^3 on the GPU*. PhD thesis, National University of Singapore, 2012.
- 32 Donald R. Sheehy. An output-sensitive algorithm for computing weighted α -complexes. In *Proceedings of the 27th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, CCCG 2015, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, August 10-12, 2015*. Queen’s University, Ontario, Canada, 2015. URL: <http://research.cs.queensu.ca/cccg2015/CCCG15-papers/42.pdf>.
- 33 Raghavendra Sridharamurthy, Talha Bin Masood, Harish Doraiswamy, Siddharth Patel, Raghavan Varadarajan, and Vijay Natarajan. Extraction of robust voids and pockets in proteins. In Lars Linsen, Bernd Hamann, and Hans-Christian Hege, editors, *Visualization in Medicine and Life Sciences III*, Mathematics and Visualization, pages 329–349. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-24523-2_15.
- 34 David F Watson. Computing the n-dimensional Delaunay tessellation with application to Voronoi polytopes. *The Computer Journal*, 24(2):167–172, 1981.