

Deep Learning for Genomics: A Concise Overview

Tianwei Yue

*School of Mathematics and Statistics
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China 710049*

TIANWEIYUE1997@OUTLOOK.COM

Haohan Wang

*School of Computer Science
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

HAOHANW@CS.CMU.EDU

Abstract

Advancements in genomic research such as high-throughput sequencing techniques have driven modern genomic studies into "big data" disciplines. This data explosion is constantly challenging conventional methods used in genomics. In parallel with the urgent demand for robust algorithms, deep learning has succeeded in a variety of fields such as vision, speech, and text processing. Yet genomics entails unique challenges to deep learning since we are expecting from deep learning a superhuman intelligence that explores beyond our knowledge to interpret the genome. A powerful deep learning model should rely on insightful utilization of task-specific knowledge. In this paper, we briefly discuss the strengths of different deep learning models from a genomic perspective so as to fit each particular task with a proper deep architecture, and remark on practical considerations of developing modern deep learning architectures for genomics. We also provide a concise review of deep learning applications in various aspects of genomic research, as well as pointing out potential opportunities and obstacles for future genomics applications.¹

1. Introduction

Even since [Watson et al. \(1953\)](#) first interpreted DNA molecules as the physical medium carrying genetic information, human beings have been striving to gather biological data and decipher the biological processes guided by the genetic information. By the time of 2001, the Human Genome Project launched in 1990 had drafted the raw information of a typical human genome ([Lander et al., 2001](#)). Many other genome projects, including FANTOM ([Kawai et al., 2001](#)), ENCODE ([Consortium et al., 2012](#)), Roadmap Epigenomics ([Kundaje et al., 2015](#)), were also launched in succession. These collaborative efforts made an abundance of DNA data available and thus allowed a global perspective on the genome of different species, leading to the prosperity of genomic research.

Genomic research aims to understand the genomes of different species. It studies the roles assumed by multiple genetic factors and the way they interact with the surrounding environment under different conditions. In contrast to genetics that focuses on the specific and limited number of genes, genomics takes a global view that involves the entirety of genes

1. Invited chapter for Springer Book: *Handbook of Deep Learning Applications*

possessed by an organism. For example, a study of homo sapiens involves searching through approximately 3 billion units of DNA, containing protein-coding genes, RNA genes, *cis*-regulatory elements, long-range regulatory element, and transposable elements (Bae et al., 2015). In addition, genomics is becoming increasingly data-intensive with the advancement in genomic research, such as the cost-effective next generation sequencing technology that produces the entire readout of DNA of an organism. This high-throughput technology is made available by more than 1,000 sequencing centers cataloged by OmicsMaps² on nearly every continent (Stephens et al., 2015). The vast trove of information generated by genomic research provides a potential exhaustive resource for scientific study with statistical methods. These statistical methods can be used to identify different types of genomic elements, such as exons, introns, promoters, enhancers, positioned nucleosomes, splice sites, untranslated region (UTR), *etc.* In addition to recognizing these patterns in DNA sequences, models can take other genetic and genomic information as input to build systems to help understand the biological mechanisms of underlying genes. A large variety of data types are available, such as genomic assays (*e.g.* microarray, RNA-seq expression), chromatin accessibility assays (*e.g.* DNase-seq, MNase-seq, FAIRE), transcription factor (TF) binding ChIP-seq data, gene expression profiles, histone modifications, *etc.* Combination of various data can bring about deeper insights to genes. Most of these data are available through portals like GDC³, dbGaP⁴, GEO⁵, just to name a few.

On the other hand, the development of deep learning methods has granted the computational power to resolve these complex research questions (LeCun et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017c). Its success has already been demonstrated by the revolutionizing achievements in the field of artificial intelligence, *e.g.*, image recognition, natural language processing, machine translation, *etc.* The boom of deep learning is supported by the successive introduction of a variety of deep architectures, including autoencoders (Fukushima, 1975) and their variants, multilayer perceptron (MLP; Rumelhart et al., 1985; Svozil et al., 1997), restricted Boltzmann machines (RBMs; Hinton and Sejnowski, 1986), deep belief networks (DBNs; Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006), convolutional neural networks (CNN; Fukushima and Miyake, 1982; LeCun et al., 1990), recurrent neural networks (RNN; Elman, 1990), Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM; Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997), and emergent architectures that will be introduced later in this article. The strong flexibility and high accuracy of deep learning methods guarantee them sweeping superiority over other existing methods on these classical tasks.

The intersection of deep learning methods and genomic research may lead to a profound understanding of genomics that will benefit multiple fields including medicine, pharmacy, agriculture, *etc.* Take medicine for example, the entire healthcare industry, from diagnostics, gene therapies, to personalized medicine, could be revolutionized by the combination of high-performance computing and abundant genomic data sets. Therefore, utilizing powerful and specially designed deep learning methods to foster the development of genomics industry becomes necessary. This article aims to offer a concise overview of the current deep learning

2. <http://omicsmaps.com/>

3. <https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/>

4. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gap>

5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/>

applications on genomic research, and, if possible, point out promising direction to further apply deep learning in genomic study.

The rest of this article is organized as following: we first briefly introduce the genomic study powered by deep learning characterized by deep learning architectures in Section 2, with additional discussions offered in Section 3. Then we discuss in details about how deep learning methods can help in genomic study by different application areas in Section 4, which is followed by our summarization of the current obstacles and potential opportunities in Section 5. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2. Deep Learning Architectures: Genomic Perspective

Various deep learning algorithms have their own advantages to resolve particular types of problem in genomic applications. For example, CNNs that are famous for capturing features in image classification tasks have been widely adopted to automatically learn local and global characterization of genomic data. RNNs that succeed in speech recognition problems are skillful at handling sequence data and thus were mostly used to deal with DNA sequence. Autoencoders are popular for both pre-training models and denoising or preprocessing the input data. When designing deep learning models, researchers could take advantages of these merits to efficiently extract reliable features and reasonably model the biological process. This section will review some details on each type of deep architectures, focusing on how each of their advantages can benefit the specific genomic research questions. This article will not cover the standard introduction of deep learning methods, readers can visit classical textbooks (*e.g.* Goodfellow et al., 2016) or concise tutorials (*e.g.* Wang et al., 2017c) if necessary.

2.1 Convolutional Neural Networks

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are one of the most successful deep learning models for image processing owing to their outstanding capacity to analyze spatial information. Early applications of CNNs in genomics adopted the essential building blocks of convolutional neural networks in computer vision (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). The adaptation of CNNs from computer vision to genomics is accomplished by assimilating a window of genome sequence as an image. Instead of processing 2D images with three color channels (R, G, B), researchers consider the genome sequence as a fixed length 1D sequence window with four channels (A, C, G, T) (Zeng et al., 2016). Therefore, CNNs are able to perform single sequence assays through 1D convolutional kernel. By this analogy, for example, the genomic problem of identifying protein-binding specificity of DNA sequences can be regarded as the computer vision task of two-class image classification.

The highlight of convolutional neural networks is the dexterity of performing adaptive feature extraction during the training process. For instance, CNNs can be applied to discover meaningful recurring patterns with small variances, such as genomic sequence motifs. The ability to detect a motif wherever it is in the sequence window perfectly suits the task of motif identification and hence binding classification (Lanchantin et al., 2016a).

Recently CNNs have been shown capable of solving several sequence-based problems with a performance superior to other existing learning methods. Alipanahi et al. (2015, DeepBind) and Zeng et al. (2016) successfully applied convolutional neural networks to

model the sequence specificity of protein binding. Zhou and Troyanskaya (2015, DeepSEA) developed a conventional three-layer CNN model to predict from only genomic sequence the effects of non-coding variants on transcription factor (TF) binding, DNA accessibility and histone marks of sequences. Kelley et al. (2016, Basset) adopted a similar architecture to study functional activities of DNA sequence.

CNNs have surpassed other existing methods, yet inappropriate structure design would yield poorer performance than conventional models. The adroitness of matching CNN architectures to a given task is of center to harness the power of CNNs. Researchers should have an in-depth understanding of CNN architectures as well as take into considerations of biological background. Zeng et al. (2016) developed a parameterized convolutional neural network to conduct a systematic exploration of CNNs on two classification tasks, motif discovery and motif occupancy. They performed hyper-parameter search using Mri⁶ and mainly examined the performance of nine variants of CNNs, and concluded that convolutional neural networks are not necessary to be deep for motif discovery task as long as the structure is appropriately designed. When applying convolutional neural networks in genomic, since deep learning models are always over-parameterized, simply changing the network depth would not account for much improvement of model performance. Researchers should pay more attention to particular techniques that can be used in CNNs, such as the kernel size, the number of feature map, the design of pooling or convolution kernels, the choice of window size of input DNA sequences, *etc.*

2.2 Recurrent Neural Networks

Known as designed to handle sequential data, Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) raised a surge of interest owing to the impressive results shown on challenging sequential prediction problems such as natural language processing, language translation, speech recognition, *etc.* RNNs outperform CNNs and other deep neural networks on data highly dependent on the ordering of the sequence in the way they are able to memorize long-range information through loops in networks. The input data are processed sequentially by RNNs, past information can be stored implicitly by recurrent computation in the hidden state units where cyclic connections exist, then model output will be an integrated result considering the current input and all previous inputs. Besides, Schuster and Paliwal (1997) proposed bidirectional recurrent neural networks (BRNNs) for other scenarios where both past and future inputs matters.

The cyclic structure makes a seemingly shallow RNN over long-time prediction actually very deep if unrolled in time. To resolve the problem of vanishing gradient rendered by this, Hochreiter and Schmidhuber (1997) substituted the hidden units in RNNs with Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) units to truncate the gradient propagation appropriately. Cho et al. (2014) introduced Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) with the similar propose.

Genomics data are typically sequential and often considered languages of biological nature. Recurrent models are thus applicable in many scenarios. Boža et al. (2017) developed DeepNano for base calling, Quang and Xie (2016) developed DanQ to quantify the function of non-coding DNA, Sønderby et al. (2015) developed a convolutional LSTM networks to predict protein subcellular localization from protein sequences. Another recent proposed

6. <https://github.com/Mri-monitoring/Mri-docs/blob/master/mriapp.rst>

seq-to-seq RNN that is able to map a variable-length input sequence to another sequence or fixed-size prediction might also be promising for some genomic research.

2.3 Autoencoders

Autoencoders, conventionally used as pre-processing tools to initialize the network weights, have been extended to stacked autoencoders (SAEs; [Bengio et al., 2007](#)), denoising autoencoders (DAs; [Vincent et al., 2008](#)), contractive autoencoders (CAEs; [Rifai et al., 2011](#)), *etc.* They have proved successful for feature extraction because of being able to learn a compact representation of input through the encode-decode procedure. For example, [Gupta et al. \(2015\)](#) applied stacked denoising autoencoders (SDAs) for gene clustering tasks. They extracted features from data by forcing the learned representation resistant to a partial corruption of the raw input. Besides, autoencoders are also used for dimension reduction in gene expression, *e.g.* [Tan et al. \(2014, 2016, 2017\)](#). When applying autoencoders, one should be aware that the better reconstruction accuracy does not necessarily lead to model improvement ([Rampasek and Goldenberg, 2017](#)).

Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), though named as "autoencoders", were rather developed as an approximate-inference method to model latent variables. Based on the structure of autoencoders, [Kingma and Welling \(2013\)](#) added stochasticity to the encoded units and added a penalty term encouraging the latent variables to produce a valid decoding. VAEs aim to deal with the problems of which each data has a corresponding latent representation, and are thus useful for genomic data, among which there are complex interdependencies. For example, [Rampasek and Goldenberg \(2017\)](#) presented a two-step VAE-based models for drug response prediction, which first predicts the post- from the pre-treatment state in an unsupervised manner, then extends it to the final semi-supervised prediction. This model was based on data from Genomics of Drug Sensitivity in Cancer (GDSC; [Yang et al., 2013](#)) and Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE; [Barretina et al., 2012](#)). Some other applications can be found in [Way and Greene \(2017b\)](#), [Way and Greene \(2017a\)](#), *etc.*

2.4 Emergent Deep Architectures

As deep learning constantly showing successes in genomics, researchers are expecting from deep learning higher accuracy than simply outperforming statistical or machine learning methods. To this end, the vast majority of work nowadays approached genomic problems from more advanced models beyond classic deep architectures, or employing hybrid models. Here we review some examples of recent appearing deep architectures by which skillfully modifying or combining classical deep learning models.

2.4.1 BEYOND CLASSIC MODELS

Most of these emergent architectures are of natural designs modified from classic deep learning models. Researchers began to leverage more genomic intuition to fit the problem with a suitable model.

Motivated by the fact that protein folding is a progressive refinement rather than an instantaneous process, [Lena et al. \(2012\)](#) designed DST-NNs for residue-residue contact prediction. It consists of a 3D stack of neural networks of which topological structures (same input, hidden, and output layer sizes) are identical in each stack. Each level of this stacked

network can be regarded as a distinct contact predictor and can be trained in a supervised manner to refine the predictions produced by the previous level, hence addressing the typical problem of vanishing gradients in deep architectures. The spatial features in this deep spatio-temporal architecture refer to the original model inputs, while temporal features are gradually altered so as to progress to the upper layers. Angermueller et al. (2017, DeepCpG) took advantage of two CNN sub-models and a fusion module to predict DNA methylation states. The two CNN sub-models take different inputs and thus focus on disparate purposes. CpG module accounts for correlations between CpG sites within and across cells, while DNA module detects informative sequence patterns (motifs). Then the fusion module can integrate higher-level features derived from two low-level modules to make predictions. Instead of subtle modifications or combinations, some works focused on the depth trying to improve the model performance by designing even deeper architectures. Wang et al. (2017d) developed an ultra-deep neural network consists of two deep residual neural networks to predict protein contacts from a sequence of amino acids. Each of the two residual nets in this model has its particular function. A series of 1D convolutional transformations are designed for extracting sequential features (*e.g.*, sequence profile, predicted secondary structure and solvent accessibility). The 1D output is converted to a 2D matrix by an operation similar to outer product and merged with pairwise features (*e.g.*, co-evolution information, pairwise contact and distance potential). Then they are together fed into the second residual network, a series of 2D convolutional transformations. The combination of these two disparate residual nets makes possible a novel approach to consider both sequential and pairwise features in one model.

2.4.2 HYBRID ARCHITECTURES

The fact that each type of deep neural networks has its own strength inspires researchers to develop hybrid architectures that could well utilize the potentials of multiple deep learning architectures. DanQ (Quang and Xie, 2016) is a hybrid convolutional and recurrent deep neural network for predicting the function of non-coding DNA directly from sequence alone. DNA sequence is input as the one-hot representation of four bases to a simple convolutional neural network with the purpose of scanning motif sites. Since motifs follow a regulatory grammar governed by physical constraints that involved with their spatial arrangements and frequencies of combinations of DNA sequences, the purported motifs learned by CNN are then feed into a BLSTM. Similar convolutional-recurrent design were further discussed by Lanchantin et al. (2016b, Deep GDashboard). They demonstrated how to understand three deep architectures: convolutional, recurrent, and convolutional-recurrent networks, and verified the validity of the features generated automatically by the model through visualization techniques. They argued that a CNN-RNN architecture outperforms CNN or RNN alone based on their experimental results on a transcription factor binding (TFBS) site classification task. The feature visualization achieved by Deep GDashboard indicated that CNN-RNN architecture are able to model both motifs as well as dependencies among them. Sønderby et al. (2015) added a convolutional layer between the raw data and LSTM input to address the problem of protein sorting or subcellular localization. In total there are three types of models proposed and compared in the paper, a vanilla LSTM, an LSTM with attention model used in hidden layer, and the ensemble of ten vanilla LSTMs. They

achieved higher accuracy than previous benchmark models in predicting subcellular location of proteins from DNA sequences while no human-engineered features involved.

3. Deep Learning Architectures: Insights and Remarks

Applications of deep learning in genomic problems have fully proven its power. Although the pragmatism of deep learning is surprisingly successful, this method suffers from lacking the physical transparency to be well interpreted so as to better assist the understanding of genomic problems. What auspicious in genomic research is that researchers have done lots of work to visualize and interpret their deep learning models. Besides, it is also constructive to take into additional considerations beyond the choice of deep learning architectures. In this section, we review some visualization techniques that bring about insights into deep learning architectures, and add remarks on model design that might be conducive to real-world applications.

3.1 Model Interpretation

People are expecting deep network approaches to success not only in predicting results, but also in identifying meaningful DNA sequence signals and giving further insights into the problems being solved. The interpretability of a model appears to be crucial when it comes to application. However, the technology of deep learning has exploded not only in prediction accuracy but also in complexity as well. Information is so diffuse in the networks because memory is encoded in the strength of multiple connections, rather than stored at specific locations as in a conventional database. People are carrying out efforts to remedy this pitfall since prediction accuracy alone does not guarantee the deep architectures a better choice over traditional statistical or machine learning methods in application.

Image classification field is where people started deciphering deep networks. [Zeiler and Fergus \(2014\)](#) gave insights into the function of intermediate features by mapping hidden layers back to input through deconvolution, a technique described in that paper. [Simonyan et al. \(2013\)](#) linearly approximate the network by first-order Taylor expansion and obtained Saliency Maps from a ConvNet by projecting back from the fully connected layers of the network. People also searched for an understanding of genes by deep networks. [Lanchantin et al. \(2016b, Dashboard\)](#) adopted Saliency Maps to measure nucleotide importance. Their work provided a suite of visualization strategies to extract motifs, or sequence patterns from deep neural network models, and discussed about features extracted by CNN and RNN. Similarly, [Alipanahi et al. \(2015\)](#) visualized the sequence specificities determined by DeepBind through mutation maps that indicate the effect of variations on bound sequences. Note that works conducted appropriately by classic models do not need additional techniques to visualize features, *e.g.* [Pärnamaa and Parts \(2017\)](#) trained a 11-layer CNN for prediction protein subcellular localization from microscopy images, and easily interpreted their model by features at different layers.

These work took promising steps in direction of uncovering the mystery of deep neural networks. Since people have been long aware of the necessity of model interpretation, recent works of deep learning applications usually proposed proper visualization strategies aligned with the model, *e.g.*, [Min et al. \(2016\)](#), [Singh et al. \(2016a\)](#), [Mikolov et al. \(2013\)](#), [Sønderby et al. \(2015\)](#), [Riesselman et al. \(2017\)](#).

3.2 Transfer Learning and Multitask Learning

The concept of transfer learning is naturally motivated by human intelligence that people can apply the knowledge they have already learned to address new problems. Transfer learning is such a framework that allows deep learning to utilize previously-acquired knowledge (model parameters) to solve new but similar problems more quickly and effectively. It has been successfully applied to other fields, such as language processing (Cireřan et al., 2012) or audio-visual recognition (Moon et al., 2014). Readers could find instructive surveys on transfer learning by Pan and Yang (2010) or Weiss et al. (2016). In addition, multitask learning is an approach that inductively transfer knowledge among multiple tasks. By learning related tasks in parallel while using shared architectures, what is learned by a single task can help those related. A good overview of multitask learning, which especially focuses on neural networks, can be found in Caruana (1998). Widmer and Rättsch (2012) briefly discussed multitask learning from a biological perspective.

Early adaptation of transfer learning in genomics was based on machine learning methods such as SVMs (Schweikert et al., 2009; Mei, 2013; Xu and Yang, 2011). Recent works have also involved deep learning. For example, Zhang et al. (2016) developed a CNN model to analyze gene expression images for automatic controlled vocabulary (CV) term annotation. They pre-trained their model on natural images (ImageNet⁷) to extract general features at different scales, and then fine-tuned the model by multitask learning to capture CV term-specific discriminative information. Liu et al. (2016a) developed an iterative PEDLA for enhancer prediction across diverse human cells and tissues. Inspired by the concept of using unsupervised pre-training followed by supervised fine-tuning, they initially trained PEDLA based on data derived from any cell type/tissue, then iteratively trained PEDLA on a subsequent cell type/tissue, using the trained model of the previous cell type/tissue as initialization. Qin and Feng (2017, TFImpute) adopted a CNN-based multi-task learning setting to borrow information across TFs and cell lines to predict cell-specific TF binding for TF-cell line combinations. They were able to predict TFs in new cell types by models trained unsupervisedly on TFs where ChIP-seq data are available, which took a right step in the direction of developing domain transfer model across cell types. Qi et al. (2010) proposed a semi-supervised multi-task framework for protein-protein interaction (PPI) predictions. They first trained a supervised MLP classifier for PPI interactions, then leveraged partially labeled examples to perform an auxiliary task by sharing the trained MLP layers. The loss of the auxiliary task is add to MLP loss; two tasks can be jointly optimized.

The idea of sharing information learnt across multiple related tasks (transfer learning) or sub-tasks (multitask learning) could utilize limited data, especially genomic data that obtained through high cost, more economically. Also, since it is usually time-consuming to train and tune a deep learning model, transfer learning might appears to be encouraging if well applied to set up a systematical structure for efficient modeling particular types of genomic problems.

3.3 Multi-view Learning

Multi-view deep learning is an encouraging direction for future deep learning research which exploits information from multi-platform inputs or multi-view data with heterogeneous fea-

7. <http://www.image-net.org/>

ture sets, and capture their high level associations for prediction, clustering and handling incomplete data. Readers can visit [Li et al. \(2016c\)](#) for a survey on multi-view methods if interested. In many applications, we can approach the same problem from different types of data, such as in computer visions when audio and video data are both available ([Kidron et al., 2005](#); [Wang et al., 2017b](#)). Genomics is an area where data of various types can be assimilated naturally. For example, the state-of-the-art high-throughput sequencing technologies has enabled the collection of multiple types of genomic data (*e.g.*, gene expression, DNA methylation, miRNA expression data) for the same set of tumor samples ([Liang et al., 2015](#)). Therefore, it is natural to think of leveraging multi-view information in genomics to achieve a better prediction than single view. [Gligorijević and Pržulj \(2015\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2016b\)](#) reviewed some methods for multi-view biological data integration with instructive considerations.

Multi-view learning can be achieved by, for example, concatenating features, ensemble methods, or multi-modal learning (selecting specific deep networks, as sub-networks of the main model, for each view, then integrate them in higher layers), just to name a few. Previously mentioned ultra-deep neural network ([Wang et al., 2017d](#)) is a case in point, where it adopted 1D and 2D convolutional neural networks respectively to for sequential features and spatial features. [Liang et al. \(2015\)](#) proposed a multi-modal DBN to integrate gene expression, DNA methylation, miRNA, and drug response data for tumor subtypes, defining ovarian cancer subtypes and cluster cancer patients. Their stacked gaussian restricted boltzmann machines (gRBM) are trained by contrastive divergence, different modalities are integrated via stacking hidden layers, and common features are effused from inherent features derived from multiple single modalities.

4. Genomic Applications

In this section, we review several aspects of genomic problems that can be approached from deep learning methods and discuss how deep learning move forward these fields.

4.1 Gene expression

Genes encode proteins and proteins dictate cell functions. This is a process of gene expression by which the genetic instructions in DNA are converted into a functional products, such as proteins and other molecules. Namely, genetic code of a gene, the nucleotide sequence, is used to direct protein synthesis and self-regulate the cell's functions by adjusting the amount and type of proteins it manufactures.

Gene expression is a highly regulated process that allows cells to respond to the changing environment, genes expressed in a particular cell could self-regulate its functions by adjusting the amount and type of proteins it manufactures. Here we review some research that applied deep learning to analyze how gene expression is regulated.

4.1.1 GENE EXPRESSION CHARACTERIZATION

Gene expression were historically measured by low-throughput fluorescencebased methods, quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR), microarray technologies, *etc.*, and recently shifted to the way of performing RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) to catalog whole transcrip-

tomes. Gene expression profiling has been widely used to characterize cellular states in response to various diseases, genetic perturbations, drug treatments, *etc.* Although recent breakthroughs have reduced the cost of whole-genome gene expression profiles, it still remains expensive to be used by typical academic labs to generate a compendium of gene expression over a large number of conditions.

Increasing number of genome-wide gene expression assays for different species have become available in public databases, *e.g.* the Connectivity Map (CMap) project was launched to create a reference collection of gene expression profiles that can be used to identify functionally connected molecules (Lamb et al., 2006), these databases greatly facilitated the computational models for biological interpretation of these data. The empirical results of early works that applied principal component analysis (PCA) on gene expression data to capture cluster structure have showed that this mathematical tool failed to allow some complicated biological considerations and thus ineffective (Yeung and Ruzzo, 2001). When applying deep learning on gene expression data, Chen et al. (2016c) presented a multi-task multi-layer feed-forward neural network model (D-GEX) and tested it on two types of expression data, the microarray expression data from the GEO and the RNA-Seq expression data from the Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project.

Note that cross-experiment comparisons in public datasets are challenged by unmatched conditions and technical noise, instead of finding principal components, researchers are considering the denoising and enhancement of these microarray data. Denoising autoencoders came in hand since it do not merely retain the information of raw data, but also generalize meaningful and important properties of the input distribution across all input samples. Even shallow denoising autoencoders with one hidden layer have been proven effective in extracting biological insights. Tan et al. (2014, ADAGE) presented an unsupervised approach that effectively applied stacked denoising autoencoder to capture key biological principles in breast cancer data. ADAGE is an open-source project for extracting relevant patterns from large-scale gene expression datasets. Tan et al. (2016) further improved ADAGE, successfully constructing features that contain both clinical and molecular information. They were able to uncover similarities among genes that share KEGG pathways without prior knowledge, and stratify strains, model cellular responses to low oxygen when previously published microarray and transcriptome sequencing data are incorporated. To build better signatures that more consistent with biological pathways and enhance model robustness, Tan et al. (2017) developed an ensemble ADAGE (eADAGE) to integrate stable signatures across models. These three similar works were all experimented on *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* gene expression data. Way and Greene (2017a) trained VAE-based models to reveal the underlying patterns in the pathways of gene expression, and compared the their three VAE architectures to other dimensionality reduction techniques, including the above mentioned ADAGE (Tan et al., 2014). In addition, Gupta et al. (2015) demonstrated the efficacy of using the enhanced data by multi-layer denoising autoencoders to cluster yeast expression microarrays into known modules representing cell cycle processes. Motivated by the hierarchical organization of yeast transcriptomic machinery, Chen et al. (2016b) adopted a four-layered autoencoder network with each layer accounting for a specific biological process in gene expression. This work also introduced sparsity into autoencoders. Edges of denoising autoencoders over principle component analysis (PCA) and independent component analysis (ICA) were clearly illustrated in above mentioned works. These unsupervised

models are powerful for identifying gene signatures that may otherwise be overlooked. However, one should always be careful in feature interpretation, sometimes a particular model design or a simple batch operation might end up in non-biological features.

Another thread is to utilize deep learning to describe the pairwise relationship. Wang et al. (2017a) showed that CNN can be seen as an effective replacement for the frequently used Pearson correlation applied to pair of genes, therefore they built a multi-task CNN that can consider the information of GO semantics and interaction between genes together to extract higher level representations of gene pairs for further classification task.

4.1.2 GENE EXPRESSION PREDICTION

Deep learning approaches for gene expression prediction have surpassed other existing algorithms, one aforementioned example (Chen et al., 2016c) showed that even a simple feed-forward neural network with three hidden layers outperformed linear regression in predicting gene expressions of target genes from selected landmark genes.

When making prediction from gene sequences, deep learning models have been shown fruitful in identifying the context-specific roles of local DNA-sequence elements in transcriptional regulation, then the inferred regulatory rules can be used to predict expression patterns. Successful prediction usually rely much on proper utilization of biological knowledge. Therefore, it could be more efficient to first analyze the contextual information in DNA sequences than to directly make prediction. For example, when Beer and Tavazoie (2004) presented a Bayesian network for predicting gene expression from genomic sequences, they represented their carefully learned motifs with position weight matrices (PWMs) rather than k -mers or consensus words, and their description of the sequence constraints included the orientation, position, combinations, absence of motifs, and the order and spacing between particular motifs. They chose Bayesian framework because it is a natural choice to model the arbitrary interdependencies among genes. Admittedly, this work, though achieved satisfied performance, made too much preparation that is potentially redundant before the final prediction. Yuan et al. (2007) used only the sequence-motif matching scores provided by Beer and Tavazoie (2004) to train naive Bayes classifiers and achieved a better accuracy. They argued circumstantial the predicted information in Beer and Tavazoie (2004) was related to position and orientation of predicted binding sites.

In most applications, the powerful of deep learning algorithm is paled by biological restrictions. Therefore, instead of only using sequence information, combing epigenetic data into the model might add to explanatory power of the model. For example, the correlation between histone modifications and gene regulation was suggested experimentally in Lim et al. (2009), Cain et al. (2011) and Dong and Weng (2013). Early attempts for the task of gene expression prediction from histone modification features include linear regression (Karlić et al., 2010), Support Vector Machines (SVMs; Cheng et al., 2011), Random Forests (Dong et al., 2012), a detailed rule-based learning model (Ho et al., 2015), etc. To capture the subtle differences among the distributions of histone modification signals, Cheng et al. (2011) and Dong et al. (2012) developed a 'binning' strategy that divides the DNA region around the gene transcription start site (TSS) into consecutive smaller bins to modify the model input. Singh et al. (2016a) presented DeepChrome, a unified discriminative framework stacking a MLP on top of a CNN, and achieved an average AUC of 0.8 in

binary classification task that predicts high or low gene expression. A CNN automatically learns from 'binning' input the combinatorial interactions among different histone modification signals, excluding the need of human effort in feature engineering. The learned region representation is then fed into a MLP to learn a classification function mapping to gene expression levels. In addition, [Singh et al. \(2016a\)](#), DeepChrome) visualized high-order combinatorial to make the model interpretable. Other examples of epigenetic information that can be utilized in gene expression prediction tasks include DNA methylation, miRNA, chromatin features, *etc.* [Cheng et al. \(2011\)](#) adopted Bayesian networks to model the higher order relationships between the chromatin features and gene expression. Generative models were also adopted due to the ability to capture high-order, latent correlations. For example, to explore hypothetical gene expression profiles under various types of molecular and genetic perturbation, [Way and Greene \(2017b\)](#) trained a VAE on The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA; [Weinstein et al., 2013](#)) pan-cancer RNA-seq data to capture biologically-relevant features.

4.2 Regulatory Genomics

Gene expression regulation is the cellular process that controls the expression level of gene products (RNA or protein) to become high or low. Namely, a number of complex interactions between genes, proteins, RNA molecules, and other components jointly determines when and where specific genes are activated, as well as the amount of protein or RNA produced. The underlying interdependences behind the sequences render the biophysical models that directly predict these interactions confined to specific types of structures. Deep networks that could model over-representation of sequence information allow regulatory motifs to be identified according to their target sequences.

4.2.1 PROMOTERS AND ENHANCERS

The most efficient way of gene expression regulation for an organism is at the transcriptional level, which occurs at the early stage of gene regulation. Cis-regulatory elements (CREs) refer to the regions of non-coding DNA that function to control transcription by acting nearby or within a gene. Two most well characterized types of CREs are enhancers and promoters, both of which are structural regions of DNA that act as transcriptional regulators. Readers can visit [Wasserman and Sandelin \(2004\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2015a\)](#) for review of early approaches for identification of cis-regulatory elements.

Promoters locate near the transcription start sites of genes and thereby initiate transcription of particular genes. Conventional algorithms still perform poorly on promoter prediction, while the prediction is always accompanied with a high false positive rate ([Fickett and Hatzigeorgiou, 1997](#)). The compensate for sensitivity is usually achieved at the cost of specificity, and render the methods not effective for applications. One initial work by [Horton and Kanehisa \(1992\)](#) applied neural networks to predict E. coli promoter sites and provided a comparison of neural networks versus statistical methods. [Matis et al. \(1996\)](#) also applied neural networks to promoter recognition, albeit assisted by some rules which use the gene context information predicted by GRAIL. These early works of deep learning models have not shown noticeable meaningful improvements over the weight matrix matching methods. One recent study by [Umarov and Solovyev \(2017\)](#) used a CNN

with no more 3 layer well demonstrated the superiority of CNN over conventional methods in promoter recognition of five distant organism, with sensitivity and specificity exceeding 90%. Their trained model has been implemented as a CNNProm program that is available to run at web server.

PEDLA was developed by [Liu et al. \(2016a\)](#) as a deep learning based algorithmic framework for enhancer prediction. It is able to directly learn from massively heterogeneous and class-imbalanced data an enhancer predictor that can be generalized across various cell types/tissues. The model has embedded mechanism to handle class-imbalanced problem in which the prior probability of each class is directly estimated from the training data. PEDLA was first trained on 1,114-dimensional features from 9 types of data in H1 cells, then further extended with an iterative scheme that can learn generalize the predictor across multiple cell types/tissues. PEDLA was also compared with and outperformed some of the most typical methods for predicting enhancers.

[Min et al. \(2016, DeepEnhancer\)](#) adopted CNNs that surpass previous sequence-based SVM methods on the task of classifying enhancers from background genomic sequences. They compared various designs of CNNs and concluded the effectiveness of max-pooling and batch normalization in incrementing classification accuracy, while they also pointed out that simply increase the depth of deep architectures is not useful if inappropriately designed. Their final model was fine-tuned on ENCODE cell type-specific enhancer datasets from the model trained on the FANTOM5 permissive enhancer dataset by applying transfer learning.

Deep Feature Selection (DFS) is a promising attempt took by [Li et al. \(2015b\)](#) to introduce sparsity to deep architectures. Conventionally, the sparseness is realized through a regularization term (*e.g.*, LASSO, Elastic Net). [Li et al. \(2015b\)](#) took a novel approach by which they automatically select a subset of features right at the input level for multi-class data to restrict the number of features. This is implemented as an additional sparse one-to-one linear layer (named feature-selection layer) between the input data and the input layer of main model. The output of feature-selection layer, the point-wise product of parameter vector w and input data x , will then be fed into the first layer of main deep learning models. DFS can be applied to different deep architectures, for example, [Li et al. \(2015b\)](#) demonstrated MLP based DFS (shallow DFS), DNNs based DFS (Deep DFS), and pointed out that when back-propagation does not perform well for deep networks, people can resort to stacked contractive autoencoder (ScA) and DBN based DFS models that pre-trained in a greedy layer-wise way before fine-tuned by back-propagation. The author developed an open source package of DFS and illustrated the superiority of DFS over Elastic Net and Random Forest in the task of identifying enhancers and promoters. [Li et al. \(2016a\)](#) further implemented a supervised deep learning package named DECRES, a feed-forward neural network based on DFS, for genome-wide detection of regulatory regions. Their work is able to distinguish classes of CREs and activity states. Though it still remained difficult to distinguish between inactive enhancers and promoters, this work can well discriminate between active enhancers and promoters, as well as active and inactive elements. They also investigated the power of sequence properties to drive identification of promoters and enhancers, finding that few features were useful beyond CpG islands.

Enhancer-promoter interaction predictions are always based on non-sequence features from functional genomic signals. [Singh et al. \(2016b, SPEID\)](#) showed for the first time to infer enhancer-promoter interactions genome-wide from only sequence-based features, as

well as the locations of putative enhancers and promoters in a particular cell type. Their hybrid model has two parts. The first part is responsible for the differences of underlying features that could be learned between enhancers and promoters, and thus treats enhancers and promoters separately at input by two branches, where each branch is a one-layer CNN followed by a rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation layer. The second part is a LSTM, responsible for identifying informative combinations of the extracted subsequence features. Their work provided insights into the sequence determinants for long-range gene regulation.

4.2.2 FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

One of the serious shortcomings of previous approaches for predicting the functional output of DNA sequences is that sequence-based approaches immediately throw away position information to represent DNA as vectors of k-mer counts. Though [Ghandi et al. \(2014\)](#) upgraded the k-mer method by introducing an alternative gapped k-mers method (gkm-SVM), the limitation of model performance still lies in the sequential design itself. Further improvement would count on taking into consideration important position information. Position-specific sequence kernels exist but greatly add to the dimensionality of the raw input space to which the sequence is initially mapped. In contrast, CNNs naturally account for positional relationships between sequence signals and are computational efficient. [Kelley et al. \(2016, Basset\)](#) presented a 3-layer CNN trained on genomics data of 164 cell types, and got a remarkable improvement on predicting functional activities of DNA sequences. Basset is an open source package that enables researchers to perform single sequencing assay in their cell type of interest and simultaneously learn that cells chromatin accessibility code, and annotate the mutations in the genome with their influence on present accessibility as well as latent potentials.

4.2.3 SPLICING

Splicing refers to the elimination of non-coding regions in transcribed pre-messenger ribonucleic acid (RNA). Discovering splice sites helps people not only to identify the basic units of genetic heredity but also to understand the way different proteins are produced ([Lee and Yoon, 2015](#)). Predicting "splicing code" has been a goal in past decades in order to understand the functional changes in splicing and how those changes are regulated and manifested. Initial machine learning attempts included naive Bayes model ([Barash et al., 2010](#)) and two-layer Bayesian neural network ([Xiong et al., 2011](#)) that utilized over a thousand sequence-based features. Early applications of neural networks in regulatory genomics simply replaced a classical machine learning approach with a deep model. For example, [Xiong et al. \(2015\)](#) adopted a fully connected feed-forward neural network trained on exon skipping events in the genome that can predict splicing regulation for any mRNA sequence. They applied their model to analyze more than half a million mRNA splicing sequence variants in the human genome and was able to identify thousands of known disease-causing mutations, as well as discover many new disease candidates. This is a case where high performance mainly results from a proper data source rather than a descriptive model design. [Lee and Yoon \(2015\)](#) presented DBN-based approach that is capable of class-imbalanced data to predict splice sites while also identify non-Canonical splice sites. They also proposed a new training method called boosted contrastive divergence with categorical gradi-

ents, and showed by their experiments its ability to improve prediction performance and shorten runtime compared to contrastive divergence or other methods.

In many cases happen the phenomenon of alternative splicing. That is, a single gene might end up coding for multiple unique proteins by varying the exon composition of the same mRNA during splicing process. This is a key post-transcriptional regulatory mechanism that affects gene expression and contributes to proteomic diversity (Juan-Mateu et al., 2016). Leung et al. (2014) developed a DNN model containing three hidden layers to predict alternative splicing patterns in individual tissues, as well as differences in splicing patterns across tissues. The hidden variables of the model are designed to jointly represent genomic features and cellular context (tissue types).

Recent deep learning approaches has made possible for further integrative studies that incorporate multiple kinds of epigenomic measurements, tissue identity as well as RNA binding partners of splicing factors (Ching et al., 2017). Jha et al. (2017) based on previously developed architectures to design an integrative deep learning models for alternative splicing. They first reconstructed previous BNN (Xiong et al., 2011) and DNN (Leung et al., 2014) models on their original dataset, and further developed these models by integrating additional types of experimental data (*e.g.* tissue type) or new target function. Their models are able to identify splicing regulators and their putative targets, as well as infer the corresponding regulatory mechanisms directly from genomic sequence.

4.2.4 TRANSCRIPTION FACTORS AND RNA-BINDING PROTEINS

Transcription factors and RNA-binding proteins assume essential roles in gene expression regulation as well as high level biological processes. Current high-throughput sequencing techniques are able to identify highly likely targets for certain transcription factors (TFs) but time-consuming and expensive, such as chromatin immunoprecipitation and massively parallel DNA sequencing (ChIP-seq). Researchers searching for computational approaches for TF binding sites prediction on DNA sequences initially utilized consensus sequences or its alternative, position weight matrices (Stormo, 2000). Later machine learning methods SVM using k-mer features (Ghandi et al., 2014), (Setty and Leslie, 2015) surpassed previous generative models.

Deep learning models for transcription factor binding site (TFBS) prediction task are mostly convolution-based since this task is in nature a motif-driven problem. Alipanahi et al. (2015, DeepBind) have showed successful using convolutional neural network models in large scale problem of TFBS tasks. Zeng et al. (2016) conducted a systematic analysis of CNN architectures for DNA sequence binding sites prediction based on large transcription factor datasets. Lanchantin et al. (2016b) further explored CNNs, RNNs and the combination of the two in the task of TFBS with comprehensive discussion and visualization techniques. Admittedly that CNNs can well capture most sequential and spatial features in DNA sequences, but recurrent networks as well as bidirectional recurrent networks are useful when accounting for motifs in both directions of the sequence. Besides, the same pattern may appear identically on one DNA strand and its reverse complement due to complementary base pairing of double-stranded DNA. By this intuition, Shrikumar et al. (2017) prosed a traditional convolution-based model which shares parameters of forward and reverse-complement versions of the same DNA sequences, and have shown robust on in vivo TF binding predic-

tion tasks using chromatin ChIP-seq data. This is a novel work that tailors conventional neural network to consider motifs through bidirectional characterizations.

In addition to convolutional neural networks, which proved powerful as long as being appropriately designed according to the specific problem, some other approaches deal with the different feature extraction or multiple data sources. Cross-source data usually shares common knowledge at a higher abstraction level beyond the basic observation, and thus need to be further integrated by the model. [Pan and Shen \(2017\)](#) developed a multi-modal deep learning model, iDeep, to predict RNA-binding protein interaction sites, consisting of DBNs and CNNs to integrate lower-level representations extracted from different data sources. [Cao and Zhang \(2017, gkm-DNN\)](#) based on gapped k-mers frequency vectors (gkm-fvs) to extract informative features. The gkm-fvs after normalization are taken as input for a multi-layer perceptron model trained by the standard error back-propagation algorithm and mini-batch stochastic gradient descent. By taking advantages of both gapped k-mer methods and deep learning, gkm-DNN achieved overall better performance compared with gkm-SVM. [Qin and Feng \(2017, TFImpute\)](#) proposed a CNN-based model that utilizes domain adaptation methods, which discussed more detailed in Section 3.2, to predict TFs in new cell types by models trained unsupervisedly on TFs where ChIP-seq data are available.

4.2.5 SUBCELLULAR LOCALIZATION

Subcellular localization is to analyze biological sequences and predict to which subcellular compartment a protein belongs. In order to interact with each other, proteins need to at least temporarily inhabit the same location or physically adjacent compartments, therefore, the knowledge of protein location sheds light on where a protein might function as well as what other proteins it might interact with. Current methods generally rely on neural networks and SVMs, and involve hand-generated features. For example, [Shatkay et al. \(2007, SherLoc\)](#) integrated different sequence and text-based features, and [Pierleoni et al. \(2006, BaCelLo\)](#) developed a hierarchy of binary SVMs. Some early works have also tried to move from SVM to neural network-based methods, such as [Emanuelsson et al. \(2000\)](#), [Hawkins and Bodén \(2006\)](#). [Mooney et al. \(2011\)](#) used a N-to-1 neural network to develop a subcellular localization predictor (SCLpred) which annotates the location of a protein into four classes for animals and fungi and five classes for plants. [Sønderby et al. \(2015\)](#) adopted LSTM to predict the subcellular location of proteins from only the protein sequence with high accuracy of 0.902. They further enhanced the model by adding a convolutional filters before LSTM, and introducing the attention mechanism that forces the LSTM to focus on particular parts of the protein. The validity of their convolutional filters and attention mechanisms were visualized in experiments.

High-throughput microscopy images are a rich but not well exploited source of biological data. One important problem involves utilizing microscopy images is the automatic detection of the cellular compartment. [Pärnamaa and Parts \(2017, DeepYeast\)](#) devised an 11-layer neural network, of which eight convolutional layers are succeeded by three fully connected layers, to classify fluorescent protein subcellular localization in yeast cells. Internal outputs of the model can be visualized and interpreted in terms of image characteristics. The author concluded that low-level network functions as basic feature extractor of image characteristics, while deeper layers separate localization classes in a population. DeepYeast

was trained on data from mapping thousands of yeast proteins, achieving best accuracy to date, which is 91% for per cell localization classification, and 99% for per protein accuracy on held-out images.

4.2.6 MUTATIONS AND VARIANT CALLING

So far we have primarily discussed the successful role of deep learning to analyze genomic data, in fact deep learning can also substantially improve the ability we obtain the genomic data itself (Ching et al., 2017). Accurate calling of SNPs and indels (insertions and deletions) can improve the accuracy of new types of data. Most existing methods relied on experts, which is time-consuming and limited by reliability of human knowledge, to build probabilistic models that separate signals from noises. An example in hand is a fully connected deep neural network developed by Torracinta and Campagne (2016). This model was built on fine-tuned, hand-developed 642 features for each candidate variant. One successful approach with no need of human experts is DeepVariant developed by Poplin et al. (2017), which achieved a high (>99%) precision at 90% recall for SNPs and indel calls from Illumina short-read data. This work leveraged a neural network trained for image classification by Google Brain (Inception) to encode reads around the candidate SNPs.

The effects of mutations are usually predicted by site independent or pairwise models, but these approaches do not sufficiently model higher-order dependencies. Schreiber et al. (2017, DeepSequence) took a generative approach to model mutation effects. They incorporated latent variables that jointly influence many positions at the same time, and then modeled the dependency of the DNA sequence on latent variables. Their better experiments results might indicated the effectiveness of DeepSequence to uncover high-order dependencies. The visualization of DeepSequence model parameters also illustrated the structural proximity and amino acid correlations captured by DeepSequence.

4.3 Structural Genomics

4.3.1 STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF PROTEINS

Most proteins usually share structural similarities with other proteins, among some of which have a common evolutionary origin (Lo Conte et al., 2000). The notion of protein structure classification first emerged in 1970s aiming to elucidate the basic principles of protein folding and protein structure evolution (Andreeva and Murzin, 2010). Grouping proteins into structural or functional categories also help with the understanding of increasing number of newly sequenced genome.

Early methods for similarity measures are mostly sequence similarity-based (*i.e.* alignment-based), such as FASTA (Pearson and Lipman, 1988), BLAST (Altschul et al., 1990), or PSI-BLAST (Altschul et al., 1997), and then were enhanced by discriminative methods like SVM (Liao and Noble, 2003), or using profiles and position-specific scoring matrices (PSSM) instead of the original sequences (Rangwala and Karypis, 2005). Currently, the top-performing protein classification methods rely on protein homology detection (one can visit Chen et al. (2016a) for a review) to deduce the 3D structure or function of a protein from its amino acid sequence. Hochreiter et al. (2007) suggested a model-based approach which uses LSTM for homology detection. They applied their model for protein classification and achieved a state-of-the-art performance as well as a relatively low time complexity.

This model-based method makes similarity measures such as BLOSUM or PAM matrices not a priori fixed, but instead suitably learned by LSTM with regard to each specific classification task. Liu et al. (2017, ProDec-BLSTM) conducted a similar work on protein remote homology detection, showed an improvement using BLSTM instead of LSTM (Hochreiter et al., 2007). Still based on homology, Cang et al. (2015) adopted a topological approach utilizing persistent homology to extract features, and successfully applied to the classification of protein domains, and the classification of protein superfamilies.

There are also some works base on available gene function annotation vocabularies (*e.g.* Gene Ontology (Park et al., 2005)) to perform protein classification (Ashburner et al., 2000). By Similar motivation, BioVec (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015) was designed as a deep learning method that could effectively learn a distributed representation of biological sequences with general applications in genomics including protein family classification. Each sequence is embedded in a high-dimension vector by BioVec, then the classification of protein families is reduced to a simple classification task that can be simply solved by SVM.

4.3.2 PROTEIN SECONDARY STRUCTURE

Protein secondary structure, refers to the 3D form of local segments of proteins, is important for studying protein structure and function. It also serves as a bridge linking the primary sequence and the tertiary structure. The protein SS is traditionally subdivided into 3 states (Pauling et al., 1951), or alternatively, 8 fine-grained states according to DSSP algorithm (Kabsch and Sander, 1983). To evaluate the model performance for above mentioned 3-state or 8-state prediction, Q3 or Q8 accuracy is always calculated, which represents the percentage of correctly predicted secondary conformation of amino acid residues. Note that 3-state SS prediction could be alternatively measured by segment of overlap (SOV) score (Zemla et al., 1999).

Before deep learning became popular for protein SS prediction, machine learning approaches including probabilistic graphical models (Schmidler et al., 2000; Maaten et al., 2011; Chu et al., 2004), hidden Markov models (Maaten et al., 2011) and SVMs (Hua and Sun, 2001; Ward et al., 2003; Kim and Park, 2003) were adopted in many research. At that nascent age of neural networks, one of the earliest applications for protein SS developed a feed-forward network using as inputs the amino acid sequences of test proteins for which the corresponding secondary structures known from experiments (Bohr et al., 1988). Other works for SS prediction adopted similar or slightly enhanced neural networks (Holley and Karplus, 1989; Kneller et al., 1990). Qian and Sejnowski (1988) conducted one of the influential works for 3-state prediction and reached a Q3 accuracy of 64.3%. They based on a fully connected neural networks to develop a cascaded architecture. The local input window is typical length 13 amino acids with orthogonal encoding, the intermediate output layer consisted of three sigmoidal units that encode three SS classes for the residue located at the center of the input window. Then a second network was designed to clean up the intermediate output of the previous network. The Q3 accuracy achieved by neural networks remained slightly above 60% at that time until a multi-layer networks using multiple sequence alignments as input take a significant improvement (Rost and Sander, 1993a,b). They used PHD scheme to predict the content of secondary structure and reached a overall 3-state accuracy of 70.8%. Rost and Sander (1993a) argued a marginal influence of free parameters in the

model, and their improvement mostly result from the input profiles derived from multiple alignments that can leverage evolutionary information. [Riis and Krogh \(1996\)](#) achieved a practically identical performance by a structured neural network. They designed different networks for each SS class leveraging prior biological knowledge and the output prediction was made from filtering and ensemble averaging. Based on the position specific scoring matrices generated by PSI-BLAST, [Jones \(1999, PSIPRED\)](#) used a 2-stage neural network to obtain an average Q3 score around 77%. Other popular deep learning methods such as bidirectional recurrent neural networks are also widely applied to protein SS prediction ([Baldi et al., 1999](#); [Pollastri et al., 2002](#); [Magnan and Baldi, 2014](#)).

Hybrid deep architectures for protein SS prediction have gained increasing popularity with more prior knowledge and various features available. [Magnan and Baldi \(2014\)](#) based on solved structures as templates to present a template-based method. Their method yielded better accuracy but rely much on the templates. When close templates are not available, the performance become slightly worse than PSIPRED ([Jones, 1999](#)). [Spencer et al. \(2015\)](#) trained an unsupervised deep belief network model, in which each layer is a Restricted Boltzmann Machine (RBM). [Li and Yu \(2016\)](#) designed a cascaded model, which leveraged convolutional neural networks to extract multi-scale local contextual features by different kernel size, then added a bidirectional recurrent neural network accounting for long-range dependencies in amino acid sequences to capture global contextual features. [Wang et al. \(2016a, DeepCNF\)](#) took a large step improving Q3 accuracy above 80%, the model combines the advantages of both conditional neural fields and deep CNNs, trying to capture both the complex sequence-structure relationship and also protein secondary structure label correlation among adjacent residues. They also achieved Q8 accuracy around 72%, outperforming Q8 accuracy of 66.4% obtained by a supervised generative stochastic network ([Zhou and Troyanskaya, 2014](#)).

4.3.3 CONTACT MAP

Protein residue-residue contact prediction it is to decide whether any two residues in a protein sequence are spatially close to each other in the folded 3D structure, and is thus important for protein structure prediction as well as other applications. [Lena et al. \(2012\)](#) stacked multiple standard 3-layer feedforward network sharing the same topology, taking into consideration both spatial and temporal features to predict protein residue-residue contact. [Wang et al. \(2017d\)](#) also developed an ultra-deep neural network consisting of two deep residual neural networks to predict protein contacts from a sequence of amino acids. Each of the two residual nets module deals with 1D and 2D features separately and subsequently in order to consider both sequential and pairwise features in one model. Recent years Hi-C has become effective to analyze genome organization and uncover essential regulatory features, but lack in abundant high-resolution data. [Zhang et al. \(2017, HiCPlus\)](#) contributed an open source computational tool to impute the high-resolution Hi-C data from those of low-resolution using deep CNNs. They first divided Hi-C matrix into multiple sub-squares with fixed size, then interpolated the low-resolution matrix to the size of high-resolution matrix. DeepCNNs was trained to predict high- from the low-resolution matrix, and the predicted high-resolution matrix were recombined to the entire Hi-C interaction matrix. [Schreiber et al. \(2017, Rambutan\)](#) developed an open source deep CNN

model that predicts Hi-C contacts at high resolution (1 kb) from nucleotide sequences and DNaseI assay signal data. Their model consists of two arms which process the two loci independently. Within each arm, DNA sequence data and DNase are processed independently and the learned feature maps are then concatenated for further training. The dense layers before the final output aim to combine the learned features with genomic distance.

5. Obstacles and Opportunities

We have witnessed the successes of deep learning in genomics in previous sections. In application, it is time-consuming to train and tune deep learning models. The performance is rather conditional if the model is not appropriately designed according to the problem. There are multiple worthwhile considerations and techniques involving model architectures, feature extraction, data limitation, *etc.*, that help deep learning models to better approach genomics. Here we briefly discuss some current obstacles that deserve attention, and several potential opportunities that might shed on light future development of deep learning applications in genomic research.

5.1 Data Limitation

Current genomic research has generated a large volume of biological data, some of which unfortunately suffer from problems such as lacking of true labels, being class-imbalance, or being heterogeneous. Scientists should notice these inherent data limitations when trying to apply deep learning to address genomic problems.

5.1.1 CLASS-IMBALANCED DATA

Large-scale biological data that gathered from assorted sources are usually inherently class-imbalanced. For example, epigenetic datasets in nature come with few differentially DNA methylated regions (DMR) along with a large number of non-DMR sites (Haque et al., 2014). It is also common in enhancer prediction problem where the number of enhancer classes is much smaller than that of non-enhancer classes (Firpi et al., 2010; Kleftogiannis et al., 2014). This data-imbalance issue has also been encountered in machine learning methods (Yoon and Kwek, 2005; He and Ma, 2013), while ensemble methods appear to be powerful (Haque et al., 2014). Sun et al. (2013) applied undersampling method together with majority vote to address the imbalanced data distribution inherent in gene expression image annotation tasks. In deep learning approaches, in addition to resorting to ensemble approaches by which combining multiple trained classifiers, which unfortunately result in a bloated model structure, researchers can manage to resolve class-imbalanced problem through model parameters or training process. For instance, Liu et al. (2016a, PEDLA) used an embedded mechanism utilizing the prior probability of each class directly estimated from the training data to reduce class-imbalanced influence. Lee and Yoon (2015) presented a method called boosted contrastive divergence with categorical gradients for training RBMs for class imbalanced prediction of splice junctions.

Researchers should be careful when evaluating model for imbalanced classification. Inappropriate metrics could be misleading and thus lose the sensitivity of evaluation. For example, the commonly used area under ROC curves (auROC), which evaluates the aver-

age recall across all false positive rate thresholds, is highly deceiving in class-imbalanced problems (Ching et al., 2017). A high true positive rate for the class with overwhelming more examples can be easily achieved by chance.

5.1.2 VARIOUS DATA SOURCES

Approaches integrating diverse types of biological data as discriminating features give more thorough representation of the problem and thus tend to improve the model performance compared to those using only single type of data. For example, Liu et al. (2016a, PEDLA) trained their model on nine categories of data to identify enhancers, including chromatin accessibility (DNase-seq), TFs and cofactors (ChIP-seq), histone modifications (ChIP-seq), transcription (RNA-Seq), DNA methylation (RRBS), evolutionary conservation, CpG islands, sequence signatures, and occupancy of TFBSs, resulting in better model performance in terms of multiple metrics compared with existing popular methods. (Angermueller et al., 2017, DeepCpG) predicted single-cell DNA methylation states from local DNA sequence windows and observed neighboring methylation states by two disparate sub-networks designed accordingly.

It pays off to manage to utilize the data of multiple views; though multi-view data challenge the models that could well integrate them, they might provide more information with great chance. More discussions of encompassing diverse data sources can refer to multi-view learning in Section 3.3.

5.1.3 HETEROGENEITY AND CONFOUNDING CORRELATIONS

The data in most genomic applications involving medical or clinical are heterogeneous due to population subgroups, or regional environments. One of the problems of integrating these different types of data is the underlying interdependencies among these heterogeneous data. Covariates are sometimes confounding, and render the model prediction inaccurate.

The Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS) is an example where both population-based confounders (population subgroups with different ancestry) and individual relatednesses produce spurious correlation among SNPs to the trait of interest. GWA studies investigate the entire genome to identify SNPs associated with diseases or traits of interest, enabling people to predict genetic predisposition of a disease and cure it by targeting corresponding SNPs. The challenges are two fold, one is to develop more expressive casual models, the other is to address confounding factors.

Most existing statistical methods estimate confounders before performing causal inference. These methods are based on linear regression (Yu et al., 2006; Astle et al., 2009), linear mixed model (LMM) (Kang et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2014), or others (Song et al., 2015). Wang and Yang (2016) tried to upgrade LMM and tested it on biological variable selection and prediction tasks. Though these LMM-based models (*e.g.* FaST-LMM, Lippert et al., 2011) are favored by some researchers and mathematically sufficient, their power pales when facing multiple nonlinear confounding correlations. The assumed Gaussian noise might overshadow true underlying causals, and LMM also fails to literally model the variable correlations. A seemingly more reliable approach is to through generative modeling, *e.g.* Hao et al. (2015). Tran and Blei (2017) and Louizos et al. (2017) both based on variational inference to present an implicit causal models for encoding complex, nonlinear

causal relationships, with consideration of latent confounders. [Tran and Blei \(2017\)](#) optimized their model iteratively to estimate confounders and SNPs, and their simulation study suggested a significant improvement.

5.2 Feature Extraction

Deep learning that performs automatic feature extraction saves great efforts of choosing hand-engineered features. [Tørng and Altman \(2017\)](#) also discussed the superiority of automatically generated features over manually selected features; but in precise application, researchers might still resort to task-specific feature extraction, which could strongly facilitate the model if skillfully designed, before automatic feature extraction by deep learning models.

5.2.1 MATHEMATICAL FEATURE EXTRACTION

Though deep neural networks are capable of capturing high level features from low level input data, the cost is unfortunately huge to directly learn features from biomolecules when complex interdependences and long range interactions are taken into consideration. The entangled geometric complexity and biological complexity underlying the 3D biomolecular structure of protein have greatly hindered the generalization of deep learning to tremendous biological problems ([Cang and Wei, 2017](#)). Some techniques borrowed from mathematics have great potentials to interpret the biological structures behind data and thus simplify and enhance the model. For example, topology is a promising choice to untangle the above mentioned complexity, and homology detection has been widely applied to protein classification tasks ([Hochreiter et al., 2007](#); [Cang et al., 2015](#)). DeepMethyl ([Wang et al., 2016b](#)) was developed as deep learning software using features inferred from 3D genome topology and DNA sequence patterns. It is based on stacked denoising autoencoders and is applied to predict the methylation state of DNA CpG dinucleotides. [Cang and Wei \(2017\)](#) introduced element specific persistent homology (ESPH) into convolutional neural networks to predict protein-ligand binding affinities and protein stability changes upon mutation, including globular protein mutation impacts and membrane protein mutation impacts.

5.2.2 FEATURE REPRESENTATIONS

By conceptual analogy of the fact that humans communicate through languages, biological organisms convey information within and between cells through information encoded in biological sequences. To exploit this "language of life", [Asgari and Mofrad \(2015\)](#) designed BioVec, an unsupervised data-driven distributed representation and feature extraction method, which embeds each 3-gram of biological sequence in an 100-dimensional vector that characterizes biophysical and biochemical properties of sequences. BioVec was trained from 546,790 sequences of Swiss-Prot database using a variant of MLP adopted from the skip-gram model ([Mikolov et al., 2013](#)), a typical method in natural language processing. BioVec modeled to embed each 3-gram in biological sequence in a 100-dimensional vector that characterizes its biophysical and biochemical properties, each sequence is thus represented as the summation of the vector representation of overlapping 3-grams, which is easy to be used for modeling. This type of feature representation can facilitate the work of genomics, such as the classification task on protein families [Asgari and Mofrad \(2015\)](#).

5.3 Model Design

5.3.1 PRIOR INFORMATION

Computational models are highly abstracted and simplified forms of real-world problems, thus scientist need to rely on proper available prior knowledge to enhance their models. A generative approach to model the problems is able to utilize task-specific prior knowledge, which is conducive to better fit the model to particular task. For example, the position-specific frequency matrix (PSFM, also know as PWM, PSSM), which summarize the frequencies of nucleic acids of aligned binding sites, is widely used to parameterize CNN pooling kernels (Lin et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2016b).

5.3.2 CHOICE OF DEEP LEARNING ARCHITECTURE

Integration of human experts and deep learning algorithms always achieve better performance than either individually when addressing problems, since prior knowledge can be implicitly incorporated in the framing of the model. Therefore, researchers should make a careful choice over various deep learning algorithm according to background knowledge of particular tasks, and jointly utilize those that allow the biological process to be accurately encoded. Section 2 that discuss deep learning models from the genomic perspective might provide intuition on this point.

6. Conclusion and Outlook

Genomics is a challenging application area of deep learning that entails unique challenges compared to others such vision, speech, and text processing, since we have limit ability ourselves to interpret the genome information but expect from deep learning a superhuman intelligence to explore beyond our knowledge. Yet deep learning is undoubtedly an auspicious direction that has rejuvenated and moved forward the genomic research in recent years. Breakthroughs of deep learning applications in genomics has currently surpassed previous state-of-the-art computational methods with regard to predictive performance, though slightly lags behind some traditional statistical inference in terms of interpretation. By careful selection of data sources and features, or appropriate design of model structures, deep learning is moving towards to a bright direction which produces more accurate and interpretable prediction.

Despite the dominance of deep learning over competing methods in multiple areas of genomics, current applications have not brought about a watershed revolution in genomic research. A plethora of new deep learning methods is constantly being proposed but awaits artful applications in genomics. The predictive performances in most problems have not reach the expectation for real-world applications, neither have the interpretations of these abstruse models elucidate insightful knowledge. We need to bear in mind numerous challenges beyond simply improving predictive accuracy to seek for essential advancements and revolutions in deep learning for genomics.

References

- Babak Alipanahi, Andrew Delong, Matthew T. Weirauch, and Brendan J. Frey. Predicting the sequence specificities of dna- and rna-binding proteins by deep learning. *Nat Biotech*, 33(8):831–838, Aug 2015. ISSN 1087-0156. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3300>. Computational Biology.
- Stephen F Altschul, Warren Gish, Webb Miller, Eugene W Myers, and David J Lipman. Basic local alignment search tool. *Journal of molecular biology*, 215(3):403–410, 1990.
- Stephen F Altschul, Thomas L Madden, Alejandro A Schäffer, Jinghui Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Webb Miller, and David J Lipman. Gapped blast and psi-blast: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic acids research*, 25(17):3389–3402, 1997.
- Antonina Andreeva and Alexey G Murzin. Structural classification of proteins and structural genomics: new insights into protein folding and evolution. *Acta Crystallographica Section F: Structural Biology and Crystallization Communications*, 66(10):1190–1197, 2010.
- Christof Angermueller, Heather J. Lee, Wolf Reik, and Oliver Stegle. Deepcpg: accurate prediction of single-cell dna methylation states using deep learning. *Genome Biology*, 18(1):67, Apr 2017. ISSN 1474-760X. doi: 10.1186/s13059-017-1189-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-017-1189-z>.
- Ehsaneddin Asgari and Mohammad RK Mofrad. Continuous distributed representation of biological sequences for deep proteomics and genomics. *PloS one*, 10(11):e0141287, 2015.
- Michael Ashburner, Catherine A Ball, Judith A Blake, David Botstein, Heather Butler, J Michael Cherry, Allan P Davis, Kara Dolinski, Selina S Dwight, Janan T Eppig, et al. Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature genetics*, 25(1):25–29, 2000.
- William Astle, David J Balding, et al. Population structure and cryptic relatedness in genetic association studies. *Statistical Science*, 24(4):451–471, 2009.
- Byoung-Il Bae, Divya Jayaraman, and Christopher A Walsh. Genetic changes shaping the human brain. *Developmental cell*, 32(4):423–434, 2015.
- Pierre Baldi, Søren Brunak, Paolo Frasconi, Giovanni Soda, and Gianluca Pollastri. Exploiting the past and the future in protein secondary structure prediction. *Bioinformatics*, 15(11):937–946, 1999.
- Yoseph Barash, John A Calarco, Weijun Gao, Qun Pan, Xinchun Wang, Ofer Shai, Benjamin J Blencowe, and Brendan J Frey. Deciphering the splicing code. *Nature*, 465(7294):53–59, 2010.
- Jordi Barretina, Giordano Caponigro, Nicolas Stransky, Kavitha Venkatesan, Adam A Margolin, Sungjoon Kim, Christopher J Wilson, Joseph Lehár, Gregory V Kryukov, Dmitriy Sonkin, et al. The cancer cell line encyclopedia enables predictive modelling of anticancer drug sensitivity. *Nature*, 483(7391):603–607, 2012.

- Michael A Beer and Saeed Tavazoie. Predicting gene expression from sequence. *Cell*, 117(2):185–198, 2004.
- Yoshua Bengio, Pascal Lamblin, Dan Popovici, and Hugo Larochelle. Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 153–160, 2007.
- Henrik Bohr, Jakob Bohr, Søren Brunak, Rodney MJ Cotterill, Benny Lautrup, Leif Nørskov, Ole H Olsen, and Steffen B Petersen. Protein secondary structure and homology by neural networks the α -helices in rhodopsin. *FEBS letters*, 241(1-2):223–228, 1988.
- Vladimír Boža, Broňa Brejová, and Tomáš Vinař. Deepnano: Deep recurrent neural networks for base calling in minion nanopore reads. *PloS one*, 12(6):e0178751, 2017.
- Carolyn E Cain, Ran Blekhman, John C Marioni, and Yoav Gilad. Gene expression differences among primates are associated with changes in a histone epigenetic modification. *Genetics*, 187(4):1225–1234, 2011.
- Zixuan Cang and Guo-Wei Wei. Topologynet: Topology based deep convolutional and multi-task neural networks for biomolecular property predictions. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(7):1–27, 07 2017. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005690. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005690>.
- Zixuan Cang, Lin Mu, Kedi Wu, Kristopher Opron, Kelin Xia, and Guo-Wei Wei. A topological approach for protein classification. *Molecular Based Mathematical Biology*, 3(1), 2015.
- Zhen Cao and Shihua Zhang. gkm-dnn: efficient prediction using gapped k-mer features and deep neural networks. *bioRxiv*, page 170761, 2017.
- Rich Caruana. Multitask learning. In *Learning to learn*, pages 95–133. Springer, 1998.
- Junjie Chen, Mingyue Guo, Xiaolong Wang, and Bin Liu. A comprehensive review and comparison of different computational methods for protein remote homology detection. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, page bbw108, 2016a.
- Lujia Chen, Chunhui Cai, Vicky Chen, and Xinghua Lu. Learning a hierarchical representation of the yeast transcriptomic machinery using an autoencoder model. *BMC bioinformatics*, 17(1):S9, 2016b.
- Yifei Chen, Yi Li, Rajiv Narayan, Aravind Subramanian, and Xiaohui Xie. Gene expression inference with deep learning. *Bioinformatics*, 32(12):1832–1839, 2016c.
- Chao Cheng, Koon-Kiu Yan, Kevin Y Yip, Joel Rozowsky, Roger Alexander, Chong Shou, and Mark Gerstein. A statistical framework for modeling gene expression using chromatin features and application to modencode datasets. *Genome biology*, 12(2):R15, 2011.

- Travers Ching, Daniel S Himmelstein, Brett K Beaulieu-Jones, Alexandr A Kalinin, Brian T Do, Gregory P Way, Enrico Ferrero, Paul-Michael Agapow, Wei Xie, Gail L Rosen, et al. Opportunities and obstacles for deep learning in biology and medicine. *bioRxiv*, page 142760, 2017.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.
- Wei Chu, Zoubin Ghahramani, and David L Wild. A graphical model for protein secondary structure prediction. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, page 21. ACM, 2004.
- Dan C Cireşan, Ueli Meier, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Transfer learning for latin and chinese characters with deep neural networks. In *Neural Networks (IJCNN), The 2012 International Joint Conference on*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2012.
- ENCODE Project Consortium et al. An integrated encyclopedia of dna elements in the human genome. *Nature*, 489(7414):57–74, 2012.
- Xianjun Dong and Zhiping Weng. The correlation between histone modifications and gene expression. 2013.
- Xianjun Dong, Melissa C Greven, Anshul Kundaje, Sarah Djebali, James B Brown, Chao Cheng, Thomas R Gingeras, Mark Gerstein, Roderic Guigó, Ewan Birney, et al. Modeling gene expression using chromatin features in various cellular contexts. *Genome biology*, 13(9):R53, 2012.
- Jeffrey L Elman. Finding structure in time. *Cognitive science*, 14(2):179–211, 1990.
- Olof Emanuelsson, Henrik Nielsen, Søren Brunak, and Gunnar Von Heijne. Predicting subcellular localization of proteins based on their n-terminal amino acid sequence. *Journal of molecular biology*, 300(4):1005–1016, 2000.
- James W Fickett and Artemis G Hatzigeorgiou. Eukaryotic promoter recognition. *Genome research*, 7(9):861–878, 1997.
- Hiram A Firpi, Duygu Ucar, and Kai Tan. Discover regulatory dna elements using chromatin signatures and artificial neural network. *Bioinformatics*, 26(13):1579–1586, 2010.
- Kunihiko Fukushima. Cognitron: A self-organizing multilayered neural network. *Biological cybernetics*, 20(3-4):121–136, 1975.
- Kunihiko Fukushima and Sei Miyake. Neocognitron: A self-organizing neural network model for a mechanism of visual pattern recognition. In *Competition and cooperation in neural nets*, pages 267–285. Springer, 1982.
- Mahmoud Ghandi, Dongwon Lee, Morteza Mohammad-Noori, and Michael A Beer. Enhanced regulatory sequence prediction using gapped k-mer features. *PLoS computational biology*, 10(7):e1003711, 2014.

- Vladimir Gligorijević and Nataša Pržulj. Methods for biological data integration: perspectives and challenges. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 12(112):20150571, 2015.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- Aman Gupta, Haohan Wang, and Madhavi Ganapathiraju. Learning structure in gene expression data using deep architectures, with an application to gene clustering. In *Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM), 2015 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1328–1335. IEEE, 2015.
- Wei Hao, Minsun Song, and John D Storey. Probabilistic models of genetic variation in structured populations applied to global human studies. *Bioinformatics*, 32(5):713–721, 2015.
- M Muksitul Haque, Michael K Skinner, and Lawrence B Holder. Imbalanced class learning in epigenetics. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 21(7):492–507, 2014.
- John Hawkins and Mikael Bodén. Detecting and sorting targeting peptides with neural networks and support vector machines. *Journal of bioinformatics and computational biology*, 4(01):1–18, 2006.
- Haibo He and Yunqian Ma. *Imbalanced learning: foundations, algorithms, and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Geoffrey E Hinton and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *science*, 313(5786):504–507, 2006.
- Geoffrey E Hinton and Terrence J Sejnowski. Learning and relearning in boltzmann machines. *Parallel Distributed Processing*, 1, 1986.
- Bich Hai Ho, Rania Mohammed Kotb Hassen, and Ngoc Tu Le. Combinatorial roles of dna methylation and histone modifications on gene expression. In *Some Current Advanced Researches on Information and Computer Science in Vietnam*, pages 123–135. Springer, 2015.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- Sepp Hochreiter, Martin Heusel, and Klaus Obermayer. Fast model-based protein homology detection without alignment. *Bioinformatics*, 23(14):1728–1736, 2007.
- L Howard Holley and Martin Karplus. Protein secondary structure prediction with a neural network. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 86(1):152–156, 1989.
- Paul B Horton and Minoru Kanehisa. An assessment of neural network and statistical approaches for prediction of e. coli promoter sites. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 20(16):4331–4338, 1992.
- Sujun Hua and Zhirong Sun. A novel method of protein secondary structure prediction with high segment overlap measure: support vector machine approach. *Journal of molecular biology*, 308(2):397–407, 2001.

- Anupama Jha, Matthew R Gazzara, and Yoseph Barash. Integrative deep models for alternative splicing. *bioRxiv*, page 104869, 2017.
- David T Jones. Protein secondary structure prediction based on position-specific scoring matrices. *Journal of molecular biology*, 292(2):195–202, 1999.
- Jonàs Juan-Mateu, Olatz Villate, and Décio L Eizirik. Mechanisms in endocrinology: alternative splicing: the new frontier in diabetes research. *European journal of endocrinology*, 174(5):R225–R238, 2016.
- Wolfgang Kabsch and Christian Sander. Dictionary of protein secondary structure: pattern recognition of hydrogen-bonded and geometrical features. *Biopolymers*, 22(12):2577–2637, 1983.
- Hyun Min Kang, Jae Hoon Sul, Noah A Zaitlen, Sit-yeek Kong, Nelson B Freimer, Chiara Sabatti, Eleazar Eskin, et al. Variance component model to account for sample structure in genome-wide association studies. *Nature genetics*, 42(4):348–354, 2010.
- Rosa Karlić, Ho-Ryun Chung, Julia Lasserre, Kristian Vlahoviček, and Martin Vingron. Histone modification levels are predictive for gene expression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(7):2926–2931, 2010.
- J Kawai, A Shinagawa, K Shibata, M Yoshino, M Itoh, Y Ishii, T Arakawa, A Hara, Y Fukunishi, H Konno, et al. Functional annotation of a full-length mouse cDNA collection. *Nature*, 409(6821):685–690, 2001.
- David R. Kelley, Jasper Snoek, and John L. Rinn. Basset: learning the regulatory code of the accessible genome with deep convolutional neural networks. *Genome Res*, 26(7):990–999, Jul 2016. ISSN 1088-9051. doi: 10.1101/gr.200535.115. URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4937568/>. 27197224[pmid].
- Einat Kidron, Yoav Y Schechner, and Michael Elad. Pixels that sound. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2005. CVPR 2005. IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, volume 1, pages 88–95. IEEE, 2005.
- Hyunsoo Kim and Haesun Park. Protein secondary structure prediction based on an improved support vector machines approach. *Protein Engineering*, 16(8):553–560, 2003.
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- Dimitrios Klefogiannis, Panos Kalnis, and Vladimir B Bajic. Deep: a general computational framework for predicting enhancers. *Nucleic acids research*, 43(1):e6–e6, 2014.
- DG Kneller, FE Cohen, and R Langridge. Improvements in protein secondary structure prediction by an enhanced neural network. *Journal of molecular biology*, 214(1):171–182, 1990.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.

- Anshul Kundaje, Wouter Meuleman, Jason Ernst, Misha Bilenky, Angela Yen, Alireza Heravi-Moussavi, Pouya Kheradpour, Zhizhuo Zhang, Jianrong Wang, Michael J Ziller, et al. Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes. *Nature*, 518(7539):317–330, 2015.
- Justin Lamb, Emily D Crawford, David Peck, Joshua W Modell, Irene C Blat, Matthew J Wrobel, Jim Lerner, Jean-Philippe Brunet, Aravind Subramanian, Kenneth N Ross, et al. The connectivity map: using gene-expression signatures to connect small molecules, genes, and disease. *science*, 313(5795):1929–1935, 2006.
- Jack Lanchantin, Ritambhara Singh, Zeming Lin, and Yanjun Qi. Deep motif: Visualizing genomic sequence classifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.01133*, 2016a.
- Jack Lanchantin, Ritambhara Singh, Beilun Wang, and Yanjun Qi. Deep gdashboard: Visualizing and understanding genomic sequences using deep neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1608.03644, 2016b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1608.03644>.
- Eric S Lander, Lauren M Linton, Bruce Birren, Chad Nusbaum, Michael C Zody, Jennifer Baldwin, Keri Devon, Ken Dewar, Michael Doyle, William FitzHugh, et al. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature*, 409(6822):860–921, 2001.
- Yann LeCun, Bernhard E Boser, John S Denker, Donnie Henderson, Richard E Howard, Wayne E Hubbard, and Lawrence D Jackel. Handwritten digit recognition with a back-propagation network. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 396–404, 1990.
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- Taehoon Lee and Sungroh Yoon. Boosted categorical restricted boltzmann machine for computational prediction of splice junctions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2483–2492, 2015.
- Pietro D Lena, Ken Nagata, and Pierre F Baldi. Deep spatio-temporal architectures and learning for protein structure prediction. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 512–520, 2012.
- Michael KK Leung, Hui Yuan Xiong, Leo J Lee, and Brendan J Frey. Deep learning of the tissue-regulated splicing code. *Bioinformatics*, 30(12):i121–i129, 2014.
- Yifeng Li, Chih-yu Chen, Alice M Kaye, and Wyeth W Wasserman. The identification of cis-regulatory elements: A review from a machine learning perspective. *Biosystems*, 138:6–17, 2015a.
- Yifeng Li, Chih-Yu Chen, and Wyeth W Wasserman. Deep feature selection: Theory and application to identify enhancers and promoters. In *RECOMB*, pages 205–217, 2015b.
- Yifeng Li, Wenqiang Shi, and Wyeth W Wasserman. Genome-wide prediction of cis-regulatory regions using supervised deep learning methods. *bioRxiv*, page 041616, 2016a.

- Yifeng Li, Fang-Xiang Wu, and Alioune Ngom. A review on machine learning principles for multi-view biological data integration. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, page bbw113, 2016b.
- Yingming Li, Ming Yang, and Zhongfei Zhang. Multi-view representation learning: A survey from shallow methods to deep methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.01206*, 2016c.
- Zhen Li and Yizhou Yu. Protein secondary structure prediction using cascaded convolutional and recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07176*, 2016.
- Muxuan Liang, Zhizhong Li, Ting Chen, and Jianyang Zeng. Integrative data analysis of multi-platform cancer data with a multimodal deep learning approach. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics (TCBB)*, 12(4):928–937, 2015.
- Li Liao and William Stafford Noble. Combining pairwise sequence similarity and support vector machines for detecting remote protein evolutionary and structural relationships. *Journal of computational biology*, 10(6):857–868, 2003.
- Pek S Lim, Kristine Hardy, Karen L Bunting, Lina Ma, Kaiman Peng, Xinxin Chen, and Mary F Shannon. Defining the chromatin signature of inducible genes in t cells. *Genome biology*, 10(10):R107, 2009.
- Zeming Lin, Jack Lanchantin, and Yanjun Qi. Must-cnn: A multilayer shift-and-stitch deep convolutional architecture for sequence-based protein structure prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.03004*, 2016.
- Christoph Lippert, Jennifer Listgarten, Ying Liu, Carl M Kadie, Robert I Davidson, and David Heckerman. Fast linear mixed models for genome-wide association studies. *Nature methods*, 8(10):833–835, 2011.
- Bin Liu, Junjie Chen, and Shumin Li. Protein remote homology detection based on bidirectional long short-term memory. *BMC bioinformatics*, 18(1):443, 2017.
- Feng Liu, Hao Li, Chao Ren, Xiaochen Bo, and Wenjie Shu. Pedla: predicting enhancers with a deep learning-based algorithmic framework. *Scientific reports*, 6:28517, 2016a.
- Yihui Liu, Yehong Chen, and Jinyong Cheng. Feature extraction of protein secondary structure using 2d convolutional neural network. In *Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and Informatics (CISP-BMEI), International Congress on*, pages 1771–1775. IEEE, 2016b.
- Loredana Lo Conte, Bart Ailey, Tim JP Hubbard, Steven E Brenner, Alexey G Murzin, and Cyrus Chothia. Scop: a structural classification of proteins database. *Nucleic acids research*, 28(1):257–259, 2000.
- Christos Louizos, Uri Shalit, Joris M Mooij, David Sontag, Richard Zemel, and Max Welling. Causal effect inference with deep latent-variable models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6449–6459, 2017.

- Laurens Maaten, Max Welling, and Lawrence K Saul. Hidden-unit conditional random fields. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 479–488, 2011.
- Christophe N Magnan and Pierre Baldi. Sspro/accpro 5: almost perfect prediction of protein secondary structure and relative solvent accessibility using profiles, machine learning and structural similarity. *Bioinformatics*, 30(18):2592–2597, 2014.
- Sherri Matis, Ying Xu, Manesh Shah, Xiaojun Guan, J Ralph Einstein, Richard Mural, and Edward Uberbacher. Detection of rna polymerase ii promoters and polyadenylation sites in human dna sequence. *Computers & chemistry*, 20(1):135–140, 1996.
- Suyu Mei. Probability weighted ensemble transfer learning for predicting interactions between hiv-1 and human proteins. *PLoS One*, 8(11):e79606, 2013.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119, 2013.
- Xu Min, Ning Chen, Ting Chen, and Rui Jiang. Deepenhancer: Predicting enhancers by convolutional neural networks. In *Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM), 2016 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 637–644. IEEE, 2016.
- Seungwhan Moon, Suyoun Kim, and Haohan Wang. Multimodal transfer deep learning with applications in audio-visual recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3121*, 2014.
- Catherine Mooney, Yong-Hong Wang, and Gianluca Pollastri. Sclpred: protein subcellular localization prediction by n-to-1 neural networks. *Bioinformatics*, 27(20):2812–2819, 2011.
- Sinno Jialin Pan and Qiang Yang. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 22(10):1345–1359, 2010.
- Xiaoyong Pan and Hong-Bin Shen. Rna-protein binding motifs mining with a new hybrid deep learning based cross-domain knowledge integration approach. *BMC bioinformatics*, 18(1):136, 2017.
- Dae-Won Park, Hyoung-Sam Heo, Hyuk-Chul Kwon, and Hea-Young Chung. Protein function classification based on gene ontology. *Information Retrieval Technology*, pages 691–696, 2005.
- Tanel Pärnamaa and Leopold Parts. Accurate classification of protein subcellular localization from high-throughput microscopy images using deep learning. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics*, 7(5):1385–1392, 2017.
- Linus Pauling, Robert B Corey, and Herman R Branson. The structure of proteins: two hydrogen-bonded helical configurations of the polypeptide chain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 37(4):205–211, 1951.

- William R Pearson and David J Lipman. Improved tools for biological sequence comparison. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 85(8):2444–2448, 1988.
- Andrea Pierleoni, Pier Luigi Martelli, Piero Fariselli, and Rita Casadio. Bacello: a balanced subcellular localization predictor. *Bioinformatics*, 22(14):e408–e416, 2006.
- Gianluca Pollastri, Darisz Przybylski, Burkhard Rost, and Pierre Baldi. Improving the prediction of protein secondary structure in three and eight classes using recurrent neural networks and profiles. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 47(2):228–235, 2002.
- Ryan Poplin, Dan Newburger, Jojo Dijamco, Nam Nguyen, Dion Loy, Sam S Gross, Cory Y McLean, and Mark A DePristo. Creating a universal snp and small indel variant caller with deep neural networks. *BioRxiv*, page 092890, 2017.
- Yanjun Qi, Ozgur Tastan, Jaime G Carbonell, Judith Klein-Seetharaman, and Jason Weston. Semi-supervised multi-task learning for predicting interactions between hiv-1 and human proteins. *Bioinformatics*, 26(18):i645–i652, 2010.
- Ning Qian and Terrence J Sejnowski. Predicting the secondary structure of globular proteins using neural network models. *Journal of molecular biology*, 202(4):865–884, 1988.
- Qian Qin and Jianxing Feng. Imputation for transcription factor binding predictions based on deep learning. *PLoS computational biology*, 13(2):e1005403, 2017.
- Daniel Quang and Xiaohui Xie. Danq: a hybrid convolutional and recurrent deep neural network for quantifying the function of dna sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 44(11):e107–e107, Jun 2016. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkw226. URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4914104/>. 27084946[pmid].
- Ladislav Rampasek and Anna Goldenberg. Dr. vae: Drug response variational autoencoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08203*, 2017.
- Huzefa Rangwala and George Karypis. Profile-based direct kernels for remote homology detection and fold recognition. *Bioinformatics*, 21(23):4239–4247, 2005.
- Adam J Riesselman, John B Ingraham, and Debora S Marks. Deep generative models of genetic variation capture mutation effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06527*, 2017.
- Salah Rifai, Pascal Vincent, Xavier Muller, Xavier Glorot, and Yoshua Bengio. Contractive auto-encoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 833–840. Omnipress, 2011.
- Søren Kamaric Riis and Anders Krogh. Improving prediction of protein secondary structure using structured neural networks and multiple sequence alignments. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 3(1):163–183, 1996.
- Burkhard Rost and Chris Sander. Prediction of protein secondary structure at better than 70% accuracy. *Journal of molecular biology*, 232(2):584–599, 1993a.

- Burkhard Rost and Chris Sander. Improved prediction of protein secondary structure by use of sequence profiles and neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 90(16):7558–7562, 1993b.
- David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. Learning internal representations by error propagation. Technical report, California Univ San Diego La Jolla Inst for Cognitive Science, 1985.
- Scott C Schmidler, Jun S Liu, and Douglas L Brutlag. Bayesian segmentation of protein secondary structure. *Journal of computational biology*, 7(1-2):233–248, 2000.
- Jacob Schreiber, Maxwell Libbrecht, Jeffrey Bilmes, and William Noble. Nucleotide sequence and dnasei sensitivity are predictive of 3d chromatin architecture. *bioRxiv*, page 103614, 2017.
- Mike Schuster and Kuldip K Paliwal. Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 45(11):2673–2681, 1997.
- Gabriele Schweikert, Gunnar Rätsch, Christian Widmer, and Bernhard Schölkopf. An empirical analysis of domain adaptation algorithms for genomic sequence analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1433–1440, 2009.
- Manu Setty and Christina S Leslie. Seqgl identifies context-dependent binding signals in genome-wide regulatory element maps. *PLoS computational biology*, 11(5):e1004271, 2015.
- Hagit Shatkay, Annette Hglund, Scott Brady, Torsten Blum, Pierre Dnnes, and Oliver Kohlbacher. Sherlock: high-accuracy prediction of protein subcellular localization by integrating text and protein sequence data. *Bioinformatics*, 23(11):1410–1417, 2007. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btm115. URL [+http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm115](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm115).
- Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. Reverse-complement parameter sharing improves deep learning models for genomics. *bioRxiv*, page 103663, 2017.
- Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6034*, 2013.
- Ritambhara Singh, Jack Lanchantin, Gabriel Robins, and Yanjun Qi. Deepchrome: deep-learning for predicting gene expression from histone modifications. *Bioinformatics*, 32(17):i639–i648, 2016a.
- Shashank Singh, Yang Yang, Barnabas Poczos, and Jian Ma. Predicting enhancer-promoter interaction from genomic sequence with deep neural networks. *bioRxiv*, page 085241, 2016b.
- Søren Kaae Sønderby, Casper Kaae Sønderby, Henrik Nielsen, and Ole Winther. Convolutional lstm networks for subcellular localization of proteins. In *International Conference on Algorithms for Computational Biology*, pages 68–80. Springer, 2015.

- Minsun Song, Wei Hao, and John D Storey. Testing for genetic associations in arbitrarily structured populations. *Nature genetics*, 47(5):550, 2015.
- Matt Spencer, Jesse Eickholt, and Jianlin Cheng. A deep learning network approach to ab initio protein secondary structure prediction. *IEEE/ACM transactions on computational biology and bioinformatics*, 12(1):103–112, 2015.
- Zachary D Stephens, Skylar Y Lee, Faraz Faghri, Roy H Campbell, Chengxiang Zhai, Miles J Efron, Ravishankar Iyer, Michael C Schatz, Saurabh Sinha, and Gene E Robinson. Big data: astronomical or genetical? *PLoS biology*, 13(7):e1002195, 2015.
- Gary D Stormo. Dna binding sites: representation and discovery. *Bioinformatics*, 16(1):16–23, 2000.
- Qian Sun, Sherin Muckatira, Lei Yuan, Shuiwang Ji, Stuart Newfeld, Sudhir Kumar, and Jieping Ye. Image-level and group-level models for drosophila gene expression pattern annotation. *BMC bioinformatics*, 14(1):350, 2013.
- Daniel Svozil, Vladimir Kvasnicka, and Jiri Pospichal. Introduction to multi-layer feed-forward neural networks. *Chemometrics and intelligent laboratory systems*, 39(1):43–62, 1997.
- Jie Tan, Matthew Ung, Chao Cheng, and Casey S Greene. Unsupervised feature construction and knowledge extraction from genome-wide assays of breast cancer with denoising autoencoders. In *Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing Co-Chairs*, pages 132–143. World Scientific, 2014.
- Jie Tan, John H Hammond, Deborah A Hogan, and Casey S Greene. Adage-based integration of publicly available pseudomonas aeruginosa gene expression data with denoising autoencoders illuminates microbe-host interactions. *mSystems*, 1(1):e00025–15, 2016.
- Jie Tan, Georgia Doing, Kimberley A Lewis, Courtney E Price, Kathleen M Chen, Kyle C Cady, Barret Perchuk, Michael T Laub, Deborah A Hogan, and Casey S Greene. Unsupervised extraction of stable expression signatures from public compendia with eadage. *bioRxiv*, page 078659, 2017.
- Wen Torng and Russ B. Altman. 3d deep convolutional neural networks for amino acid environment similarity analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 18(1):302, Jun 2017. ISSN 1471-2105. doi: 10.1186/s12859-017-1702-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-017-1702-0>.
- Rémi Torracinta and Fabien Campagne. Training genotype callers with neural networks. *bioRxiv*, page 097469, 2016.
- Dustin Tran and David M Blei. Implicit causal models for genome-wide association studies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10742*, 2017.
- Ramzan Kh Umarov and Victor V Solovyev. Recognition of prokaryotic and eukaryotic promoters using convolutional deep learning neural networks. *PloS one*, 12(2):e0171410, 2017.

- Pascal Vincent, Hugo Larochelle, Yoshua Bengio, and Pierre-Antoine Manzagol. Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 1096–1103. ACM, 2008.
- Haohan Wang and Jingkang Yang. Multiple confounders correction with regularized linear mixed effect models, with application in biological processes. In *Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM), 2016 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1561–1568. IEEE, 2016.
- Haohan Wang, Aman Gupta, and Ming Xu. Extracting compact representation of knowledge from gene expression data for protein-protein interaction. *International Journal of Data Mining and Bioinformatics*, 17(4):279–292, 2017a.
- Haohan Wang, Aaksha Meghawat, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Eric P Xing. Select-additive learning: Improving generalization in multimodal sentiment analysis. In *Multimedia and Expo (ICME), 2017 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 949–954. IEEE, 2017b.
- Haohan Wang, Bhiksha Raj, and Eric P Xing. On the origin of deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07800*, 2017c.
- Sheng Wang, Jian Peng, Jianzhu Ma, and Jinbo Xu. Protein secondary structure prediction using deep convolutional neural fields. *Sci Rep*, 6:18962, Jan 2016a. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/srep18962. URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4707437/26752681>[pmid].
- Sheng Wang, Siqi Sun, Zhen Li, Renyu Zhang, and Jinbo Xu. Accurate de novo prediction of protein contact map by ultra-deep learning model. *PLoS computational biology*, 13(1): e1005324, 2017d.
- Yiheng Wang, Tong Liu, Dong Xu, Huidong Shi, Chaoyang Zhang, Yin-Yuan Mo, and Zheng Wang. Predicting dna methylation state of cpg dinucleotide using genome topological features and deep networks. 6:19598 EP –, Jan 2016b. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep19598>. Article.
- Jonathan J Ward, Liam J McGuffin, Bernard F. Buxton, and David T. Jones. Secondary structure prediction with support vector machines. *Bioinformatics*, 19(13):1650–1655, 2003.
- Wyeth W Wasserman and Albin Sandelin. Applied bioinformatics for the identification of regulatory elements. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 5(4):276–287, 2004.
- James D Watson, Francis HC Crick, et al. Molecular structure of nucleic acids. *Nature*, 171(4356):737–738, 1953.
- Gregory P Way and Casey S Greene. Evaluating deep variational autoencoders trained on pan-cancer gene expression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04828*, 2017a.
- Gregory P Way and Casey S Greene. Extracting a biologically relevant latent space from cancer transcriptomes with variational autoencoders. *bioRxiv*, page 174474, 2017b.

- John N Weinstein, Eric A Collisson, Gordon B Mills, Kenna R Mills Shaw, Brad A Ozenberger, Kyle Ellrott, Ilya Shmulevich, Chris Sander, Joshua M Stuart, Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, et al. The cancer genome atlas pan-cancer analysis project. *Nature genetics*, 45(10):1113–1120, 2013.
- Karl Weiss, Taghi M Khoshgoftaar, and DingDing Wang. A survey of transfer learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 3(1):9, 2016.
- Christian Widmer and Gunnar Rätsch. Multitask learning in computational biology. In *Proceedings of ICML Workshop on Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*, pages 207–216, 2012.
- Hui Y. Xiong, Babak Alipanahi, Leo J. Lee, Hannes Bretschneider, Daniele Merico, Ryan KC Yuen, Yimin Hua, Serge Gueroussov, Hamed S. Najafabadi, Timothy R. Hughes, Quaid Morris, Yoseph Barash, Adrian R. Krainer, Nebojsa Jojic, Stephen W. Scherer, Benjamin J. Blencowe, and Brendan J. Frey. The human splicing code reveals new insights into the genetic determinants of disease. *Science*, 347(6218):1254806–1254806, Jan 2015. ISSN 0036-8075. doi: 10.1126/science.1254806. URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4362528/>. 25525159[pmid].
- Hui Yuan Xiong, Yoseph Barash, and Brendan J Frey. Bayesian prediction of tissue-regulated splicing using rna sequence and cellular context. *Bioinformatics*, 27(18):2554–2562, 2011.
- Qian Xu and Qiang Yang. A survey of transfer and multitask learning in bioinformatics. *Journal of Computing Science and Engineering*, 5(3):257–268, 2011.
- Jian Yang, Noah A Zaitlen, Michael E Goddard, Peter M Visscher, and Alkes L Price. Advantages and pitfalls in the application of mixed-model association methods. *Nature genetics*, 46(2):100–106, 2014.
- Wanjuan Yang, Jorge Soares, Patricia Greninger, Elena J. Edelman, Howard Lightfoot, Simon Forbes, Nidhi Bindal, Dave Beare, James A. Smith, I. Richard Thompson, Sridhar Ramaswamy, P. Andrew Futreal, Daniel A. Haber, Michael R. Stratton, Cyril Benes, Ultan McDermott, and Mathew J. Garnett. Genomics of drug sensitivity in cancer (gdsc): a resource for therapeutic biomarker discovery in cancer cells. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 41(D1):D955–D961, 2013. doi: 10.1093/nar/gks1111. URL [+http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks1111](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks1111).
- Ka Yee Yeung and Walter L. Ruzzo. Principal component analysis for clustering gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 17(9):763–774, 2001.
- Kihoon Yoon and Stephen Kwek. An unsupervised learning approach to resolving the data imbalanced issue in supervised learning problems in functional genomics. In *Hybrid Intelligent Systems, 2005. HIS'05. Fifth International Conference on*, pages 6–pp. IEEE, 2005.
- Jianming Yu, Gael Pressoir, William H Briggs, Irie Vroh Bi, Masanori Yamasaki, John F Doebley, Michael D McMullen, Brandon S Gaut, Dahlia M Nielsen, James B Holland,

- et al. A unified mixed-model method for association mapping that accounts for multiple levels of relatedness. *Nature genetics*, 38(2):203–208, 2006.
- Yuan Yuan, Lei Guo, Lei Shen, and Jun S Liu. Predicting gene expression from sequence: a reexamination. *PLoS computational biology*, 3(11):e243, 2007.
- Matthew D Zeiler and Rob Fergus. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 818–833. Springer, 2014.
- Adam Zemla, Āeslovas Venclovas, Krzysztof Fidelis, and Burkhard Rost. A modified definition of sov, a segment-based measure for protein secondary structure prediction assessment. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 34(2):220–223, 1999.
- Haoyang Zeng, Matthew D Edwards, Ge Liu, and David K Gifford. Convolutional neural network architectures for predicting dna–protein binding. *Bioinformatics*, 32(12):i121–i127, 2016.
- Wenlu Zhang, Rongjian Li, Tao Zeng, Qian Sun, Sudhir Kumar, Jieping Ye, and Shuiwang Ji. Deep model based transfer and multi-task learning for biological image analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2016.
- Yan Zhang, Lin An, Ming Hu, Jijun Tang, and Feng Yue. Hicplus: Resolution enhancement of hi-c interaction heatmap. *bioRxiv*, page 112631, 2017.
- Jian Zhou and Olga G Troyanskaya. Deep supervised and convolutional generative stochastic network for protein secondary structure prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 745–753, 2014.
- Jian Zhou and Olga G Troyanskaya. Predicting effects of noncoding variants with deep learning-based sequence model. *Nature methods*, 12(10):931–934, 2015.