

DNA Sequence Complexity Reveals Structure Beyond GC Content in Nucleosome Occupancy

Hector Zenil^{1,2} * Peter Minary¹

January 27, 2023

¹ Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K.

² Algorithmic Dynamics Lab, Unit of Computational Medicine, SciLife Lab, Centre for Molecular Medicine, Department of Medicine Solna, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

Abstract

We introduce methods that rapidly evaluate a battery of information-theoretic and algorithmic complexity measures on DNA sequences in application to potential binding sites for nucleosomes. The first application of this new tool demonstrates structure beyond GC content on DNA sequences in the context of nucleosome binding. We tested the measures on well-studied genomic sequences of size 20K and 100K bps. The measures reveal the known in vivo versus in vitro predictive discrepancies, but they also uncover the internal structure of G and C within the nucleosome length, thus disclosing more than simply GC content when one examines alphabet transformations that separate and scramble the GC content signal and the DNA sequence. Most current prediction methods are based upon training (e.g. k -mer discovery), the one here advanced, however, is a training-free approach to investigating informative measures of DNA information content in connection with structural nucleosomic packing.

Keywords: Nucleosome positioning/occupancy; DNA sequence complexity; DNA structure; genomic information content

1 The challenge of Predicting Nucleosome Organization

DNA in the cell is organized into a compact form, called chromatin. Nucleosome organization in the cell is referred to as the *primary chromatin structure* and can depend on the ‘suitability’ of a sequence for accommodating a nucleosome, which may in turn be influenced by the packing of neighbouring nucleosomes. Depending on the context, nucleosomes can inhibit or facilitate transcription

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: hector.zenil@algorithmicnaturelab.org

factor binding and are thus a very active area of research. The location of low nucleosomic occupancy is key to understanding active regulatory elements and genetic regulation that is not directly encoded in the genome but rather in a structural layer of information.

Structural organization of DNA in the chromosomes is widely known to be heavily driven by GC content, involving a simple count of G and C occurrences in the DNA sequence. Despite its simplicity, uncovering exactly how (and to what extent) GC content drives/affects nucleosome organization is among the central questions in modern molecular biology.

GC content, local and short-range signals carried by DNA sequence ‘motifs’ or fingertips (k -mer statistical regularities), have been found (Refs. [1] and [2]) to be able to determine a good fraction of the structural (and thus functional) properties of DNA, such as nucleosome occupancy, but the explanatory (and predictive) power of GC content (the G or C count in a sequence) alone and sequence motifs display very significant differences in vivo versus in vitro [3].

Despite intensive analysis of the statistical correspondence between in vitro and in vivo positioning, there is a lack of consensus as to the degree to which the nucleosome landscape is intrinsically specified by the DNA sequence [4], as well as in regards to the apparently profound difference in dependence in vitro versus in vivo. Because the nucleosome landscape is known to be significantly dependent on the DNA sequence, it encodes the structural information of the DNA (particularly demonstrated in vitro). We consider this an opportunity to compare the performance of complexity measures, in order to discover how much of the information encoded in a sequence in the context of the nucleosome landscape can be recovered from information-content versus algorithmic complexity measures. Nucleosome location is thus an ideal test case to probe how informative sequence-based indices of complexity can be in determining a structural (and ultimately functional) property of genomic DNA.

1.1 Algorithmic Information Theory in Genomic Sequence Profiling

Previous applications of measures based upon algorithmic complexity include experiments on the evaluation of lossless compression lengths of sets of genomes [5, 7] and more recently [13] with interesting results. For example, in a landmark paper in the area, a measure of algorithmic mutual information was introduced to distinguish sequence similarities by way of minimal encodings and lossless compression algorithms in which a mitochondrial phylogenetic tree that conformed to the evolutionary history of known species was reconstructed [6, 7]. These approaches have, however, either been purely theoretical or have effectively been reduced to applications of Shannon entropy rather than of algorithmic complexity because, implementations of lossless compression are actually entropy estimators [8, 38]. In some other cases, control tests have been missing. For example, in the comparison of the compressibility indices of different genomes [6, 7], GC content (counting every G and C in the sequence) can reconstruct the same if not a more accurate phylogenetic tree. This is because

two species that are close to each other evolutionarily will have similar GC content (see e.g. [9]). Species close to each other will have similar DNA sequence entropy values, allowing lossless compression algorithms to compress statistical regularities of genomes of related species with similar compression rates. Here we intend to go beyond previous attempts, in breadth as well as depth, using better-grounded algorithmic measures and more biologically relevant test cases.

1.2 Current Sequence-based Prediction Methods

While the calculation of GC content is extremely simple, the reasons behind its ability to predict the structural properties of DNA are largely unknown [10, 11]. For example, it has been shown that low GC content can explain low occupancy, but high GC content can mean either high or low occupancy [12].

Current algorithms that build upon while probing beyond GC content have been largely influenced by sequence motif ([14, 2]) and dinucleotide models [15]—and to a lesser degree by k -mers [1], DNA sequence motifs that are experimentally isolated and used for their informative value in determining the structural properties of DNA.

Table 1 (SI) shows the *in vitro* nucleosome occupancy dependence on GC content, with a correlation of 0.684 (similar to that reported by Kaplan [3]) for the well-studied 20K bp genomic region (187K – 207K) of Yeast Chromosome 14 [16]. Knowledge-based methods dependent on observed sequence motifs [17, 18] are computationally cost-efficient alternatives for predicting genome-wide nucleosome occupancy. However, they are trained on experimental statistical data and are not able to predict anything that has not been observed before. They also require context, as it may not be sufficient to consider only short sequence motifs such as dinucleotides [19, 3].

More recently, deep machine learning techniques have been applied to DNA accessibility related to chromatin and nucleosome occupancy [17]. However, these techniques require a huge volume of data for training if they are to predict just a small fraction of data with marginally improved accuracy as compared to more traditional approaches based on k -mers, and they have not shed new light on the sequence dependence of occupancy.

Here we test the ability of a general set of measures, statistical and algorithmic, to be informative about nucleosome occupancy and/or about the relationship between the affinity of nucleosomes with certain sequences and their complexities.

2 Methods

2.1 The Dinucleotide Wedge Model

The formulation of models of DNA bending was initially prompted by a recognition that DNA must be bent for packaging into nucleosomes, and that bending would be an informative index of nucleosome occupancy. Various dinucleotide

models can account reasonably well for the intrinsic bending observed in different sets of sequences, especially those containing A-tracts [19].

The *Wedge model* [20] suggests that bending is the result of driving a wedge between adjacent base pairs at various positions in the DNA. The model assumes that bending can be explained by wedge properties attributed solely to an AA dinucleotide (8.7 degrees for each AA). No current model provides a completely accurate explanation of the physical properties of DNA such as bending [21], but the Wedge model (like the more basic Junction model which is less suitable for short sequences and less general [22]) reasonably predicts the bending of many DNA sequences [23]. Although it has been suggested that trinucleotide models may make for greater accuracy in explaining DNA curvature in some of the sequences, dinucleotide models remain the most effective [19].

2.2 The Segal Model

Segal et al. established a probabilistic model to characterize the possibility that one DNA sequence is occupied by a nucleosome [16]. They constructed a nucleosome-DNA interaction model and used a hidden Markov model (HMM) to obtain a probability score. The model is based mainly on a 10-bp sequence periodicity that indicates the probability of any base pair being covered by a nucleosome.

All k -nucleotide models, including that of Segal et al., are based upon knowledge-based sequence motifs and are thereby dependent on certain previously learned patterns. They can only account for local curvature and local predictions, not longer range correlations. Perhaps the fact that k -nucleotide models for $k > 2$ have not been proven to provide a significant advantage over $k = 2$ has led researchers to disregard longer range signals across DNA sequences involved in both DNA curvature and nucleosome occupancy [24]. To date, these models, including that of Kaplan [3] (which considers up to $k = 5$) and of Segal et al., are considered the gold standard for comparison purposes.

To study the extent of different signals in the determination of nucleosome occupancy, we applied some basic transformations to the original genomic DNA sequence. The SW transformation substitutes G and C for S (Strong interaction), and A and T for W (for Weak interaction). The RY transformation substitutes A and G for R (for puRines), and C and T for Y (pYrimidines).

2.3 Complexity-based Genomic Profiling

In what follows, we generate a function score f_c for every complexity measure c (detailed descriptions in the S.I.) by applying each measure to a sliding window of length 147 nucleotides (nts) across a 20K and 100K base pair (bps) DNA sequence from Yeast chromosome 14. At every position of the sliding window, we get a sequence score for every c that is used to compare against in vivo and in vitro experimental occupancy.

The following measures (followed by the name we refer to in parenthesis throughout the text) are here introduced. Among the measures considered are




Figure 1: Top: Correlation values of nucleosome occupancy (measured experimentally from chromosomal Yeast) on a sliding window of length 4K nt for both in vitro and in vivo against different measures/signals: the occupancy predictive Segal model (clearly better for in vitro). Middle: Calculated correlation values between the SW DNA transformation, carrying the GC content signal, found highly correlated to the Segal model but poorly explaining in vivo occupancy data. Bottom: The RY DNA transformation, an orthogonal signal to SW (and thus to GC content) whose values report a non-negligible max-min correlation, suggesting that the mixing of AT and GC carries some information about nucleosome occupancy (even if weaker than GC content), with in vivo values showing greatest correlation values unlike SW/GC and thus possibly neglected in predictive models (such as Segal's).

entropy-based ones (see Supplementary Material for exact definitions):

- Shannon entropy (Entropy) with uniform probability distribution.
- Entropy rate with uniform probability distribution.
- Lossless compression (Compress)

A set of measures of algorithmic complexity (see Supplementary Material for exact definitions):

- Coding Theorem Method (CTM) as an estimator of algorithmic randomness by way of algorithmic probability via the algorithmic Coding theorem (see Supplementary Material) relating causal content and classical probability [33, 34].
- Logical Depth (LD) as a BDM-based (see below) estimation of logical depth [25], a measure of sophistication that assigns both algorithmically simple and algorithmically random sequences shallow depth, and everything else higher complexity, believed to be related to biological evolution [26, 27].

And a hybrid measure of complexity combining local approximations of algorithmic complexity by CTM and global estimations of (block) Shannon entropy (see Supplementary Material for exact definitions):

- The Block Decomposition Method (BDM) that approximates Shannon entropy—up to a logarithmic term—for long sequences, but Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity otherwise, as in the case of short nucleotides [28].

We list lossless compression under information-theoretic measures and not under algorithmic complexity measures, because implementations of lossless compression algorithms such as Compress and all those based on LempelZivWelch (LZ or LZW) as well as derived algorithms (ZIP, GZIP, PNG, etc.) are actually entropy estimators [38, 8, 28].

BDM allows us to expand the range of application of both CTM and LD to longer sequences by using Shannon entropy. However, if sequences are divided into short enough subsequences (of 12 nucleotides) we can apply CTM and avoid any trivial connection to Shannon entropy and thus to GC content.

Briefly, to estimate the *algorithmic probability* [29, 30]—on which the measure BDM is based—of a DNA sequence (e.g. the sliding window of length 147 nucleotides or nt), we produce an empirical distribution [33, 34] to compare with by running a sample of up to 325 433 427 739 Turing machines with 2 states and 4 symbols (the number of nucleotide types in a DNA sequence) with empty input. If a DNA sequence is algorithmically random, then very few computer programs (Turing machines) will produce it, but if it has a regularity, either statistical or algorithmic, then there is a high probability of its being produced. Producing approximations to algorithmic probability provides approximations to algorithmic complexity by way of the so-called *algorithmic*

Coding Theorem [30, 33, 34]. Because the procedure is computationally expensive (and ultimately uncomputable) only the full set of strings of up to 12 bits was produced, and thus direct values can be given only to DNA sequences of up to 12 digits (binary for RY and SW and quaternary for full-alphabet DNA sequences).

The tool is available at <http://complexitycalculator.com/> where the user can calculate the information content and algorithmic complexity using the methods here introduced on any DNA segment for the purpose of similar of any other investigation of the structure of DNA and beyond.

3 Results

3.1 Complexity-based Indices

Fig. 1 shows the correlations between in vivo, in vitro, and the Segal model. In contrast, the SW transformation captures GC content, which clearly drives most of the nucleosome occupancy, but the correlation with the RY transformation that loses all GC content is very interesting. While significantly lower, it is existent and indicates a signal not contained in the GC content alone, as verified in Fig. 4.

In Table 1 (SI), we report the correlation values found between experimental nucleosome occupancy data and ab initio training-free complexity measures. BDM alone explains more than any other index, including GC content in vivo, and unlike all other measures LD is negatively correlated, as theoretically expected [35] and numerically achieved [28], it being a measure that assigns low logical depth to high algorithmic randomness, with high algorithmic randomness implying high entropy (but not the converse).

Surprisingly, entropy alone does not capture all the GC signals, which means that there is more structure in the distributions of Gs and Cs beyond the GC content alone. However, entropy does capture GC content in vivo, suggesting that local nucleotide arrangements (for example, sequence motifs) have a greater impact on in vivo prediction. Compared to entropy, BDM displays a higher correlation with in vivo nucleosome occupancy, thereby suggesting more internal structure than is captured by GC content and Shannon entropy alone.

3.2 Model Curvature versus Complexity Indices

The dinucleotide model incorporates knowledge regarding sequence motifs that are known to have specific natural curvature properties and adds to the knowledge and predictive power that GC content alone offers.

Using the Wedge dinucleotide model we first estimated the predicted curvature on a set of 20 artificially generated sequences (Table 4 (SI)) with different statistical properties, in order to identify possibly informative information-theoretic and algorithmic indices. As shown in Table 2 (SI), we found all measures negatively correlated to the curvature modelled, except for LD, which

displays a positive correlation—and the highest in absolute value—compared to all the others. Since BDM negatively correlates with curvature, it is expected that the minima may identify nucleosome positions (see next subsection).

An interesting observation in Table 2 (SI) concerns the correlation values between artificially generated DNA sequences and DNA structural curvature according to the Wedge nucleotide model: all values are negatively correlated, but curvature as predicted by the model positively correlates with LD, in exact inverse fashion vis-a-vis the correlation values reported in Table 1 (SI). This is consonant with the theoretically predicted relation between algorithmic complexity and logical depth [28]. All other measures (except for LD) behave similarly to BDM.

The results in Tables 1 and 2 (SI) imply that for all measures both extrema (min and max for BDM and max and min for LD) may be indicative of high nucleosome occupancy. In the next section we explore whether extrema of these measures are also informative about nucleosome locations.

3.3 Nucleosome Dyad and Centre Location Test

Positioning and occupancy of nucleosomes are closely related. Nucleosome positioning is the distribution of individual nucleosomes along the DNA sequence and can be described by the location of a single reference point on the nucleosome, such as its dyad of symmetry [36]. Nucleosome occupancy, on the other hand, is a measure of the probability that a certain DNA region is wrapped onto a histone octamer.

Fig. 2 shows the predictive capabilities of algorithmic indices for nucleosome dyad and centre location when nucleosomic regions are placed against a background of (pseudo-) randomly generated DNA sequences with the same average GC content as themselves (~ 0.5). BDM outperforms all methods in accuracy and strength. When taking the local min/max as potential indicators of nucleosome centres, we find that GC content fails (by design, as the surrounding sequences have the same GC content as the nucleosomic region of interest); lossless compression (Compress) performs well on the second half of the nucleosomes (left panel) but fails for the first half (right panel). Entropy performs as poorly as Compress—not surprisingly, as lossless compression algorithms are Entropy estimators.

The results for BDM and LD suggest that the first 4 nucleosomal DNA sequences, of which 3 are clones, display greater algorithmic randomness (BDM) than the statistically pseudo-randomly generated background (surrounding sequences), while all other nucleosomes are of significantly lower algorithmic randomness (BDM) and mixed (both high and low) structural complexity (LD). The same robust results were obtained after several replications with different pseudo-random backgrounds. Moreover, the signal produced by similar nucleosomes with strong properties [37], such as clones 601, 603 and 605, had similar shapes and convexity.

Fig. 3 shows the strength of the BDM signal at indicating the nucleosome centres based on the min/max value of the corresponding functions. The signal-




Figure 2: Nucleosome centre prediction (red dots) of 14 nucleosomes on an intercalated background of pseudo-random DNA segments of 147 nts with the same average GC content as the surrounding nucleosomic regions. Values are normalized between 0 and 1 and they were smoothed by taking one data point per 40 and using an interpolating order 2. Experimentally known nucleosome centres (called dyads) are marked with dashed lines. Panels on the right have their nucleotide centre estimated by the centre of the nucleosomic sequence (also dashed lines). Predictions are based on the local min/max values (up to 75 nts to each side) from the actual/estimated dyad/centre. Some red dots may appear to be placed slightly off but this is because there was a local min or max that vanished after the main curve was made smoother for visualization purposes.




Figure 3: Signal-to-noise ratio histogram. Distributions of centre predicted values demonstrating how BDM and LD are removed from a normal distribution thus picking a signal, unlike GC content that distributes values normally and performs no better than chance on a pseudo-random background with similar GC content. BDM carries the strongest signal followed by LD skewed in the opposite direction both peaking closer to the nucleosome centres than GC content. On the x -axis are complexity values arranged in bins of 1000 as reported in Fig. 2.

to-noise ratio is much stronger for BDM, and is also shifted by LD in the opposite direction (to BDM), as would be consistent with the relation between algorithmic complexity and logical depth (see S.I.).

Both BDM and LD spike at nucleosome positions stronger than GC content on a random DNA background with the same GC content, and perform better than entropy and compression. BDM is informative about every dyad or centre of nucleosomes, with 10 out of the 14 predicted within 1 to 3 bps distance and the rest within a 20 bps range. Unlike all other measures, LD performed better for the first half (left panel) of nucleosome centre locations than for the second half (right panel), suggesting that the nucleosomes of the first half may have greater structural organization.

Table 3 (SI) compares distances to the nucleosome centres and error percentages as predicted without any training with BDM, to GC content prediction. The average distance between the predicted and the actual nucleosome centre is calculated to the closest local extreme (minima or maxima) within a window of 41 base pairs or bps (20 bps to each side plus the centre) from the actual centre (the experimentally known dyad or the centre nucleotide when the dyad was not known). In accordance with the results in Table 1 (SI) the maxima of BDM (minima of LD) could be informative about nucleosome positions and for those sequences, whose natural curvature is a fit to the superhelix, the minima BDM (maxima of LD) could also indicate nucleosome locations. This latter finding is supported by results in Table 2 (SI).

Our results suggest that if some measures of complexity peak where GC

content is (purposely) tricked, there must be some structure different to GC content along the DNA sequence, either a distribution of GC content within the nucleosome length that is not related simply to the G and C count, or some other signal.

3.4 Informative Measures of High and Low Occupancy

To find the most informative measures of complexity c we maximized the potential separation by taking only the sequences with highest (X% high) and lowest (Y% low) nucleosome occupancy. To this end we took as cutoff values 2 and 0.2 respectively, generating 300 disjoint sequences each from a 100K DNA segment for highest and lowest nucleosome occupancy values. The 100K segment starting and ending points are 187K – 40K and 207K + 40K nts in the 14th Yeast chromosome, so 40K nts surrounding the original shorter 20K sequence first explored.

In Fig. 4 it was puzzling to find that the Segal model correlates less strongly than GC content alone for in vivo, suggesting that the model assigns greater weight to k -mer information than to GC content for these extreme cases given that we already knew that the Segal model is mostly driven by GC content (Fig. 1 middle). The box plot for the Segal model indicates that the model does not work as well for extreme sequences of high occupancy, with an average of 0.6 where the maximum over the segments on which these nucleosome regions are contained reaches an average correlation of ~ 0.85 (in terms of occupancy), as shown in Fig. 1 for in vitro data. This means that these high occupancy sequences are on the outer border of the standard deviation in terms of accuracy in the Segal model.

While the best model is the one that best separates the highest from the lowest occupancy, and therefore is clearly Segal’s model. Except for information-theoretic indices (entropy and Compress), all algorithmic complexity indices were found to be informative of high and low occupancy. Moreover, all algorithmic complexity measures display a slight reduction in accuracy in vivo versus in vitro, as is consistent with the limitations of current models such as Segal’s. All but the Segal model are, however, training-free measures, in the sense that they do not contain any k -mer information related to high or low occupancy and thus are naive indices, yet all algorithmic complexity measures were informative to different extents, with CTM and BDM performing best and LD performing worst, LD displaying inverted values for high and low occupancy as theoretically expected (because LD assigns low LD to high algorithmic complexity) [35]. Also of note is the fact that CTM and BDM applied to the RY transformation were informative of high versus low occupancy, thereby revealing a signal different to GC content that models such as Segal’s partially capture in their encoded k -mer information. Interestingly, GC content alone outperforms the Segal model for high occupancy both in vitro and in vivo, but the Segal model outperforms GC content for low occupancy.

Lossless compression was the worst behaved, showing how CTM and BDM outperform what is usually used as an estimator of algorithmic complexity [38,




Figure 4: Box plots reporting the informative value of complexity indices in vivo and in vitro for segments of lowest and highest occupancy, providing an overview of the informative value of sequence-dependent complexity measures. The occupancy score is given by the re-scaling of the complexity value f_c (y -axis) so that the highest value is 1 and the lowest 0. In the case of the Segal model, f_c is the direct score sequence based on the probability assigned by the model [16], with no re-scaling (because it is already scaled from origin with probability values between 0 and 1). Other cases not shown (e.g. entropy rate or Compress on RY or SW) had no significant results. Magenta and pink (bright colours) signify measures of algorithmic complexity; in dark gray colour are information-theoretic based measures.

8, 28]. Unlike entropy alone, however, lossless compression does take into consideration sequence repetitions, averaging over all k -mers up to the compression algorithm sliding window length. The results thus indicate that averaging over all sequence motifs—both informative and not—deletes all advantages, thereby justifying specific knowledge-driven k -mer approaches introduced in models such as Segal’s.

4 Conclusions

The Kaplan and Segal models are considered to be the most accurate and the gold standard for predicting in vitro nucleosome occupancy. However, previous approaches including Segal and Kaplan requires extensive (pre-)training. In contrast, all measures considered by our approach are training free.

These training-free measures revealed that there is more structure to nucleosome occupancy than GC content, and potentially to k -mer structure as well (e.g. non-AT-based mers), based on the correlations found in RY transformations indicative of low versus high occupancy.

The nucleotide location test suggests a complexity hierarchy in which natural non-nucleosomic regions are less algorithmically random than nucleosomic regions, which in turn are less algorithmically random than pseudo-randomly generated DNA sequences with GC content equal to the nucleosomic regions. When pseudo-random regions are placed between nucleosomes, we showed that BDM tends to identify nucleosomic regions with a preference for lower algorithmic randomness with relative accuracy, and more consistently than GC content, which showed no pattern and mostly failed, as was expected, when fooled with a background of similar GC content.

We have thus gone beyond previous attempts to connect and apply measures of complexity to structural and functional properties of genomic DNA, specifically in the highly active and open challenge of nucleosome occupancy in molecular biology.

A direction for future research suggested by our work is the exploration of the use of these complexity indices to complement current machine learning approaches for reducing the feature space, by, e.g., determining which k -mers are more and less informative, and thereby ensuring better prediction results. Another direction is a more extensive investigation of the possible use of genomic profiling for other types of structural and functional properties of DNA, with a view to contributing to, e.g., HiC techniques or protein encoding/promoter/enhancer region detection, and to furthering our understanding of the effect of extending the alphabet transformation of a sequence to epigenetics.

References

- [1] Gu C et al. (2015) DNA structural correlation in short and long ranges. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 119(44):13980–13990.
- [2] Schep AN et al. (2015) Structured nucleosome fingerprints enable high-resolution mapping of chromatin architecture within regulatory regions. *Genome research* 25(11):1757–1770.
- [3] Kaplan N et al. (2009) The DNA-encoded nucleosome organization of a eukaryotic genome. *Nature* 458(7236):362–366.
- [4] Gracey LE et al. (2010) An in vitro-identified high-affinity nucleosome-positioning signal is capable of transiently positioning a nucleosome in vivo. *Epigenetics & chromatin* 3(1):1.
- [5] Rivals E, Delahaye JP, Dauchet M, Delgrange O (1996) Compression and genetic sequence analysis. *Biochimie* 78:315–322.
- [6] Li M, Chen X, Li X, Ma B, Vitányi PM (2004) The similarity metric. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory* 50(12):3250–3264.
- [7] Cilibrasi R, Vitányi PM (2005) Clustering by compression. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory* 51(4):1523–1545.
- [8] Zenil H, Kiani, NA, Tegnér, J (2017) Low Algorithmic Complexity Entropy-deceiving Graphs *Phys Rev E*. (accepted)
- [9] Pozzoli U et al. (2008) Both selective and neutral processes drive GC content evolution in the human genome. *BMC evolutionary biology* 8(1):1.
- [10] Tillo D, Hughes TR (2009) G+C content dominates intrinsic nucleosome occupancy. *BMC bioinformatics* 10(1):1.
- [11] Galtier N, Piganeau G, Mouchiroud D, Duret L (2001) GC-content evolution in mammalian genomes: the biased gene conversion hypothesis. *Genetics* 159(2):907–911.
- [12] Minary P, Levitt M (2014) Training-free atomistic prediction of nucleosome occupancy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(17):6293–6298.
- [13] Diogo Pratas, Armando J. Pinho (2017) On the Approximation of the Kolmogorov Complexity for DNA *Lecture Notes in Computer Science book series (LNCS)*, vol. 10255:pp 259–266.
- [14] Cui F, Zhurkin VB (2010) Structure-based analysis of DNA sequence patterns guiding nucleosome positioning in vitro. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics* 27(6):821–841.

- [15] Trifonov, E. N., and Sussman, J. L. (1980) The pitch of chromatin DNA is reflected in its nucleotide sequence. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 77, pp. 3816–3820.
- [16] Segal E et al. (2006) A genomic code for nucleosome positioning. *Nature* 442(7104):772–778.
- [17] Kelley DR, Snoek J, Rinn JL (2016) Basset: Learning the regulatory code of the accessible genome with deep convolutional neural networks. *Genome research*.
- [18] Lee W et al. (2007) A high-resolution atlas of nucleosome occupancy in yeast. *Nature genetics* 39(10):1235–1244.
- [19] Kanhere A, Bansal M (2003) An assessment of three dinucleotide parameters to predict DNA curvature by quantitative comparison with experimental data. *Nucleic acids research* 31(10):2647–2658.
- [20] Ulanovsky LE, Trifonov EN (1986) Estimation of wedge components in curved DNA. *Nature* 326(6114):720–722.
- [21] Burkhoff AM, Tullius TD (1988) Structural details of an adenine tract that does not cause DNA to bend. *Nature* 331:455–457.
- [22] Crothers DM, Haran TE, Nadeau JG (1990) Intrinsically bent DNA. *J. Biol. Chem* 265(13):7093–7096.
- [23] Sinden RR (2012) *DNA structure and function*. (Elsevier).
- [24] van der Heijden T, van Vugt JJ, Logie C, van Noort J (2012) Sequence-based prediction of single nucleosome positioning and genome-wide nucleosome occupancy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(38):E2514–E2522.
- [25] Bennett CH (1995) Logical depth and physical complexity. *The Universal Turing Machine, A Half-Century Survey* pp. 207–235.
- [26] Bennett CH (1993) Dissipation, information, computational complexity and the definition of organization in *Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity -Proceedings Volume-*. (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company), Vol. 1, pp. 215–215.
- [27] Hernández-Orozco S, Hernández-Quiroz F, Zenil H (2016) The limits of decidable states on open-ended evolution and emergence in *ALIFE Conference*. (MIT Press).
- [28] Zenil H, Soler-Toscano F, Kiani NA, Hernández-Orozco S, Rueda-Toicen A (2016) A decomposition method for global evaluation of Shannon entropy and local estimations of algorithmic complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.00110*.

- [29] Solomonoff RJ (1964) A formal theory of inductive inference. parts i and ii. *Information and control* 7(1):1–22 and 224–254.
- [30] Levin LA (1974) Laws of information conservation (nongrowth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 10(3):30–35.
- [31] Kolmogorov AN (1968) Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *International Journal of Computer Mathematics* 2(1-4):157–168.
- [32] Chaitin GJ (1969) On the length of programs for computing finite binary sequences: statistical considerations. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 16(1):145–159.
- [33] Delahaye JP, Zenil H (2012) Numerical evaluation of algorithmic complexity for short strings: A glance into the innermost structure of randomness. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 219(1):63–77.
- [34] Soler-Toscano F, Zenil H, Delahaye JP, Gauvrit N (2014) Calculating kolmogorov complexity from the output frequency distributions of small Turing machines. *PloS one* 9(5):e96223.
- [35] Soler-Toscano F, Zenil H, Delahaye JP, Gauvrit N (2013) Correspondence and Independence of Numerical Evaluations of Algorithmic Information Measures *Computability*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp 125–140.
- [36] Klug A, Rhodes D, Smith J, Finch J, Thomas J (1980) A low resolution structure for the histone core of the nucleosome. *Nature* 287(5782):509–516.
- [37] Gaykalova DA et al. (2011) A polar barrier to transcription can be circumvented by remodeler-induced nucleosome translocation. *Nucleic acids research* p. gkq1273.
- [38] Zenil H (2013) Algorithmic data analytics, small data matters and correlation versus causation in *Computability of the World? Philosophy and Science in the Age of Big Data*, eds. Pietsch W, Wernecke J, Ott M. (Springer Verlag). In press.
- [39] Collier JD (1998) Information increase in biological systems: how does adaptation fit? in *Evolutionary systems*. (Springer), pp. 129–139.
- [40] Rado T (1962) On non-computable functions. *Bell System Technical Journal* 41(3):877–884.

Supplementary Material

5 Indices of Information and of Algorithmic Complexity

Here we describe alternative measures to explore correlations from an information-theoretic and algorithmic (hence causal) complexity perspective.

5.1 Shannon Entropy

Central to information theory is the concept of Shannon's information entropy, which quantifies the average number of bits needed to store or communicate a message. Shannon's entropy determines that one cannot store (and therefore communicate) a symbol with n different symbols in less than $\log(n)$ bits. In this sense, Shannon's entropy determines a lower limit below which no message can be further compressed, not even in principle. Another application (or interpretation) of Shannon's information theory is as a measure for quantifying the *uncertainty* involved in predicting the value of a random variable.

For an ensemble $X(R, p(x_i))$, the Shannon information content or entropy of X is then given by

$$H(X) = - \sum_{i=1}^n p(x_i) \log_2 p(x_i)$$

where R is the set of possible outcomes (the random variable), $n = |R|$ and $p(x_i)$ is the probability of an outcome in R .

5.1.1 Entropy Rate

The function R gives what is variously denominated as rate or block entropy and is Shannon entropy over blocks or subsequences of X of length b . That is,

$$R(X) = \min_{b=1}^{b=|X|} H(X_b)$$

If the sequence is not statistically random, then $R(X)$ will reach a low value for some b , and if random, then it will be maximally entropic for all blocks b . $R(X)$ is computationally intractable as a function of sequence size, and typically upper bounds are realistically calculated for a fixed value of b (e.g. a window length). Notice that, as discussed in the main text, having maximal entropy does not by any means imply algorithmic randomness (c.f. 5.3).

5.2 Compression algorithms

Two widely used lossless compression algorithms were employed.

5.2.1 Bzip2

Bzip2 is a lossless compression method that uses several layers of compression techniques stacked one on top of the other, including Run-length encoding (RLE), BurrowsWheeler transform (BWT), Move to Front (MTF) transform, and Huffman coding, among other sequential transformations. Bzip2 compresses more effectively than LZW, LZ77 and Deflate, but is considerably slower.

5.2.2 Compress

Compress is a lossless compression algorithm based on the LZW compression algorithm. LempelZivWelch (LZW) is a lossless data compression algorithm created by Abraham Lempel, Jacob Ziv, and Terry Welch, and is considered universal for an infinite sliding window (in practice the sliding window is bounded by memory or choice). It is considered *universal* in the sense of Shannon entropy, meaning that it approximates the entropy rate of the source (an input in the form of a file/sequence). It is the algorithm of the widely used Unix file compression utility ‘Compress’, and is currently in the international public domain.

5.3 Measures of Algorithmic Complexity

A binary sequence s is said to be random if its Kolmogorov complexity $C(s)$ is at least twice its length. It is a measure of the computational resources needed to specify the object. Formally,

$$C(s) = \min\{|p| : T(p) = s\}$$

where p is a program that outputs s running on a universal Turing machine T . A technical inconvenience of C as a function taking s to the length of the shortest program that produces s is its uncomputability. This is usually considered a major problem. The measure was first conceived to define randomness and is today the accepted objective mathematical measure of complexity, among other reasons because it has been proven to be mathematically robust (by virtue of the fact that several independent definitions converge to it).

The invariance theorem guarantees that complexity values will only diverge by a constant (e.g. the length of a compiler, a translation program between T_1 and T_2) and will converge at the limit. Formally,

$$|C(s)_{T_1} - C(s)_{T_2}| < c$$

5.3.1 Lossless Compression as Approximation to C

Lossless compression is traditionally the method of choice when a measure of algorithmic content related to Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity C is needed. The Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity of a sequence s is defined as the length of the

shortest computer program p that outputs s running on a reference universal Turing machine T . While lossless compression is equivalent to algorithmic complexity, actual implementations of lossless compression (e.g. Compress) are heavily based upon entropy rate estimations [38, 8, 28] that mostly deal with statistical repetitions or k -mers of up to a window length size L , such that $k \leq L$.

5.3.2 Algorithmic Probability as Approximation to C

Another approach consists in making estimations by way of a related measure, *Algorithmic Probability* [33, 34]. The Algorithmic Probability of a sequence s is the probability that s is produced by a random computer program p when running on a reference Turing machine T . Both algorithmic complexity and Algorithmic Probability rely on T , but invariance theorems for both guarantee that the choice of T is asymptotically negligible.

One way to minimize the impact of the choice of T is to average across a large set of different Turing machines all of the same size. The chief advantage of algorithmic indices is that causal signals in a sequence may escape entropic measures if they do not produce statistical regularities. And it has been the case that increasing the length of k in k -nucleotide models of structural properties of DNA have not returned more than a marginal advantage.

The Algorithmic Probability [29] (also known as Levin’s semi-measure [30]) of a sequence s is a measure that describes the expected probability of a random program p running on a universal prefix-free Turing machine T producing s . Formally,

$$m(s) = \sum_{p:T(p)=s} 1/2^{|p|}$$

The Coding theorem beautifully connects $C(s)$ and $m(s)$:

$$C(s) \sim -\log m(s)$$

5.3.3 Bennett’s Logical Depth

Another measure of great interest is *logical depth* [25]. The logical depth (LD) of a sequence s is the shortest time logged by the shortest programs p_i that produce s when running on a universal reference Turing machine. In other words, just as algorithmic complexity is associated with lossless compression, LD can be associated with the shortest time that a Turing machine takes to decompress the sequence s from its shortest computer description. A multiplicative invariance theorem for LD has also been proven [25]. Estimations of Algorithmic Probability and logical depth of DNA sequences were performed as determined in [33, 34].

Unlike algorithmic (Kolmogorov-Chaitin) complexity C , logical depth is a measure related to ‘structure’ rather than randomness. LD can be identified

with biological complexity [26, 39] and is therefore of great interest when comparing different genomic regions.

5.4 Measures Based on Algorithmic Probability and on Logical Depth

The *Coding theorem method* (or simply CTM) is a method [33, 34] rooted in the relation between $C(s)$ and $m(s)$ specified by Algorithmic Probability, that is, between frequency of production of a sequence from a random program and its Kolmogorov complexity as described by Algorithmic Probability. Essentially, it uses the fact that the more frequent a sequence the lower its Kolmogorov complexity, and sequences of lower frequency have higher Kolmogorov complexity. Unlike algorithms for lossless compression, the Algorithmic Probability approach not only produces estimations of C for sequences with statistical regularities, but it is deeply rooted in a computational model of Algorithmic Probability, and therefore, unlike lossless compression, has the potential to identify regularities that are not statistical (e.g. a sequence such as 1234...), that is, sequences with high entropy or no statistical regularities but low algorithmic complexity [38, 8].

Let (n, m) be the space of all n -state m -symbol Turing machines, $n, m > 1$ and s a sequence, then:

$$D(n, m)(s) = \frac{|\{T \in (n, m) : T \text{ produces } s\}|}{|\{T \in (n, m)\}|} \quad (1)$$

T is a standard Turing machine as defined in the Busy Beaver problem by Radó [40] with 4 symbols (in preparation for the calculation of the DNA alphabet size).

Then using the relation established by the Coding theorem, we have:

$$CTM(s) = -\log_2(D(n, m)(s)) \quad (2)$$

That is, the more frequently a sequence is produced the lower its Kolmogorov complexity, and vice versa. CTM is an upper bound estimation of Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity.

From CTM, a measure of Logical Depth can also be estimated—as the computing time that the shortest Turing machine (i.e. the first in the quasi-lexicographic order) takes to produce its output s upon halting. CTM thus produces both an empirical distribution of sequences up to a certain size, and an LD estimation based on the same computational model.

Because CTM is computationally very expensive (equivalent to the Busy Beaver problem [40]), only short sequences (currently only up to length $k = 12$) have associated estimations of their algorithmic complexity. To approximate the complexity of genomic DNA sequences up to length $k = 12$, we calculated $D(5, 4)(s)$, from which $CTM(s)$ was approximated.

To calculate the Algorithmic Probability of a DNA sequence (e.g. the sliding window of length 147 nt) we produced an empirical Algorithmic Probability

Table 1: Spearman correlations between complexity indices with in vivo and in vitro experimental nucleosome occupancy data from position 187 001 bp to 207 000 bp on the 14th Yeast chromosome

	in vitro	in vivo
in vitro	1	0.5
in vivo	0.5	1
GC content	0.684	0.26
LD	-0.29	-0.23
Entropy	0.588	0.291
BDM	0.483	0.322
Compress	0.215	0.178

distribution from (5, 4) to compare with by running a sample of 325 433 427 739 Turing machines with up to 5 states and 4 symbols (the number of nucleotides in a DNA sequence) with empty input (as required by Algorithmic Probability). The resulting distribution came from 325 378 582 327 non-unique sequences (after removal of those sequences only produced by 5 or fewer machines/programs).

5.5 Relation of BDM to Shannon Entropy and GC Content

The Block Decomposition Method (BDM) is a divide-and-conquer method that can be applied to longer sequences on which local approximations of $C(s)$ using CTM can be averaged, thereby extending the range of application of CTM. Formally,

$$BDM(s, k) = \sum_{s_k} \log(n) + CTM(r). \quad (3)$$

The set of subsequences s_k is composed of the pairs (r, n) , where r is an element of the decomposition of sequence s of size k , and n the multiplicity of each subsequence of length k . $BDM(s)$ is a computable approximation from below to the algorithmic information complexity of s , $C(s)$. BDM approximations to K improve with smaller departures (i.e. longer k -mers) from the Coding Theorem method. When k decreases in size, however, we have shown [28] that BDM approximates the Shannon entropy of s for the chosen k -mer distribution. In this sense, BDM is a hybrid complexity measure that in the ‘worst case’ behaves like Shannon entropy and in the best approximates K . We have also shown that BDM is robust when instead of partitioning a sequence, overlapping subsequences are used, but this latter method tends to over-fit the value of the resultant complexity of the original sequence that was broken into k -mers.

Table 2: Spearman correlation values of complexity score functions versus the Wedge dinucleotide model prediction of DNA curvature on 20 synthetically generated DNA sequences

	GC content	Entropy	Entropy rate (4)	Compress	BZip2	BDM	LD
<i>p</i>	0.047	0.051	0.0094	0.0079	0.048	0.0083	0.0019
<i>rho</i>	-0.45	-0.44	-0.57	-0.58	-0.45	-0.57	0.65

Table 3: Distance in nucleotides to local min/max within a window of 2 tests, around 40 and 140 nts around the centre on a pseudo-randomly generated DNA background with the same GC content as the mean of the GC content of the next contiguous nucleosomic region. Clearly the experiment is designed for GC content to fail, yet BDM predicts the nucleosome position (by its centre) in a high number of cases and with great accuracy, with 10 out of the 14 centres predicted to within a 1 to 3 nt distance, thereby suggesting that there is more structure than GC content. Contrast this to GC content performing no better than chance, with an average fractional distance of 0.538 versus 0.105 for BDM from the predicted centre. Likewise for windows around the centre of 40 nt and 140 nt. All other methods (not included) reported intermediate values between GC content and BDM

BDM							
601	603	605	5Sr DNA	pGub	chicken β-globulin		
-48	-2	-1	-1	19	25		
msat	CAG	TATA	CA	NoSecs	TGGA	TGA	BadSecs
2	1	1	1	14	1	1	1

Table 4: The 20 short artificial DNA sequences generated covering a wide range of patterns and regularities used to find informative measures of DNA curvature.

AAAAAAAAAAAA	ATATATATATAT	AAAAAATTTTTT
AAAAAAAAAATA	AAAAAAAAACAAT	AAGATCTACACT
ATAGAACGCTCC	ACCTATGAAAGC	TAGGCGGCGGGC
TCGTTCGCGAAT	TGCACGTGTGGA	CTAAACACAATA
CTCTCAGGTCGT	CTCGTGGATATC	CCACGATCCCGT
GGCGGGGGGTGG	GGGGGGGCGGGC	GGGGGGCCCCC
GCGCGCGCGCGC	GGGGGGGGGGGG	

Table 5: 14 Experimental nucleosome sequences [24]. Only the first 6 have known dyads

name	dyad position	sequence
601	74	ACAGGATGTATATATCTGACACGTGCCTGGAGACTAGGGAGTA ATCCCCTTGGCGGTAAACGCGGGGACAGCGGTACGTGCG TTTAAGCGGTGCTAGAGCTGTCTACGACCAATTGAGCGGCCTCG GCACCGGGATTCTCCAG
603	154	CGAGACATACGGAATATGGCGTTTTCTAGTACAAATCACCCCA GCGTGACGCGTAAATAATCGACACTCTCGGGTGCCAGTTGCG GCGCCACCTACCGTGTGAAGTCGTCCTCGGGCTTCTAAGTACG CTTAGGCCACGGTAGAGGGCAATCCAAGGCTAACCCCGTGCAT CGATGTTGAAAGAGGCCCTCCGTCCTTATTACTTCAAGTCCCTGG GGTACCGTTTC
605	132	TACTGGTTGGTGTGACAGATGCTCTAGATGGCGATACTGACAGG TCAAGGTTTCGGACGACGCGGGATATGGGGTGCCTATCGCACATT GAGTGCAGACCGGTCTAGATACGCTTAAACGACGTACAACCC TAGCCCCGTCGTTTTAGCCGCCAAGGGTATTCAAGCTCGACGCT AATCACCTATTGAGCGGTATCCACCGTCACGACCATATTAATAG GACACGCCG
5Sr DNA	74, 92	AACGAATAACTTCCAGGGATTTATAAGCCGATGACGTACATAACAT CCCTGACCCTTAAATAGCTTAACTTTTCATCAAGCAAGAGCCTAC GACCATACCATGCTGAATATACCGGTTCTCGTCCGATCACCGAAG TCAAGCAGCATAGGGCTCGGTTAGTACTTGGATGGGAGACCGCC TGGGAATACCG
pGub	84, 104	GATCCTCTAGACGGAGGACAGTCTCCGGTTACCTTCGAACACAGT GGCCGCTAGATGCTGACTCATGTGCGACACGCGTAGATCTGCTAG CATCGATCCATGGACTAGTCTCGAGTTTAAAGATATCCAGCTGCC GGGAGGCCCTTCGCGAAATATGGTACCCTATGGAATCGAGGGATC
chicken β -globulin	125	CTGGTGTGCTGGGAGGAAGGACCCAACAGACCCAAGCTGTGGTC TCCTGCCTCACAGCAATGCAGAGTGTGTGGTTTTGGAATGTGTGA GGGGCACCCAGCCTGGCGCGCGCTGTGCTCACAGCACTGGGGTG AGCACAGGGTGCCATGCCACACCGTGCATGGGGATGTATGGCGC ACTCCGGTATAGAGCTGCAGAGCTGGGAATCGGGGGG
mouse minor satellite		ATTTGTAGAACAGTGTATATCAATGAGCTACAATGAAAATCATGGA AAATGATAAAAACACACTGTAGAATATTAGATGAGTGAAGTTA CACTGAAAAACACATCCGTTGGAAACCGGCAT
CAG		AGCAGCAGCAGCAACAGTAGTAGAAGCAGCAGCACTAACGACAG CACAGCAGTAGCAGTAATAGAAGCAGCAGCAGCAGCAGTAGCAG TAGCAGCAGCAGCAGCAATTTCAACAACAGCAGCAGCAGCT
TATA		AGGTCTATAAGCGTCTATAAGCGTCTATGAACGTCTATAAAGTCT ATAAAGCCTATAAAGCCTATAAAGCCTATAAAGCCTATAAAGCCTATAAAG GCCTATACAGTCTATGCACGACTATACAGTCT
CA		GAGAGTAACACAGGCACAGGTGTGGAGAGTAACACAGGCACAG GTGTGGGAGAGTGACACACAGGCACAGGTGAGGAGAGTACACA CAGGCACAGGTGTGGAGAGCAGCAGCAGGTGCGGAGAG
NoSecs		GGGCTGTAGAATCTGATGGAGGTGTAGGATGGATGGACAGTATGA CAAAAGGGTACTAGCCTGGGACAGCAGGATTGGTGGAAAGGTTA CAGGCAGGCCAGCAGGCTCGGACGCTGTATAGAG
TGGA		AGATGGATGGATGATGGATGGATGATGGATAGATGGATGATGGAT GGATGGATGATGATGGATGAATAGATGGATGGATGGATGATGGAT GGATGGACGATGGATGGATAGATGGATGGATGG
TGA		ATAGATGGATGAGTGGATGGATGGGTGGATGGATAGATGGGTGG ATGGGTGGATGGGTGGATGGATGATGGATGGATGAGTGGATGGA TGGATGGATGGGTGGATGGGTGGACGG
BadSecs		TCTAGAGTGTACAATATCTACCCTGTAGGCATCAAGTCTATTTCCG TAATCACTAGTTGCATCATTTCGATACGTTGCTCTTGCTTCGCTAG CAACGGACGATCGTACAAGCAC