Deep Learning for Genomics: A Concise Overview

Tianwei Yue   tyue@andrew.cmu.edu
Wenping Wang   wenpingw@andrew.cmu.edu
Haohan Wang   haohanw@cs.cmu.edu
School of Computer Science
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

Abstract

This data explosion driven by advancements in genomic research, such as high-throughput sequencing techniques, 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 current challenges and potential research directions for future genomics applications.

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 deals with limited number of specific genes, genomics takes a global view that involves the entirety of genes possessed by an organism (JAX, 2018). 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 Omics-sMaps[1] 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 chromatin accessibility assays (*e.g.* MNase-seq, DNase-seq, FAIRE), genomic assays (*e.g.* microarray, RNA-seq expression), transcription factor (TF) binding ChIP-seq data, gene expression profiles, and histone modifications, *etc* (Libbrecht, 2016). Most of these data are available through portals like GDC[2], dbGaP[3], GEO[4], just to name a few. Combination of various data can bring about deeper insights to genes so as to help with researchers to locate the information of interests.

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., 2017d). Its success has already been demonstrated by the revolutionizing achievements in the field of artificial intelligence, *e.g.*, image recognition, object detection, audio recognition, and natural language processing, *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 other recent appearing 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 precision medicine (Leung et al., 2016), pharmacy (*i.e.* drug design), and even agriculture, *etc.* Take medicine for example, medical research and its applications such as gene therapies, molecular diagnostics, and personalized medicine could be revolutionized by tailoring high-performance computing methods to analyzing available genomic datasets. Also, the process of developing new drugs takes a long period and is usually very costly. To save time and cost, the general approach taken by pharmaceutical companies is to try to match the candidate protein identified by researchers with their known drug molecules. (Mitchell, 2017). All these benefits indicate the necessity of utilizing powerful and specially designed deep learning methods to foster the development of genomics industry. This article aims to offer a concise overview

---

1. http://omicsmaps.com/
2. https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/
3. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gap
4. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/

of the current deep learning applications on genomic research, and, if possible, point out promising directions of further applying 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 challenges and potential research directions 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 pre-processing 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., 2017d) 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 relied on the fundamental building blocks of convolutional neural networks in computer vision (Krizhevsky et al., 2012) to extract features. Zeng et al. (2016) described the adaptation of CNNs from the field of computer vision to genomics as accomplished by comprehending a window of genome sequence as an image.

The highlight of convolutional neural networks is the dexterity of automatically 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. This makes CNNs suitable for motif identification and therefore binding classification (Lanchantin et al., 2016a).

Recently CNNs have been shown to take a lead among current algorithms for solving several sequence-based problems. 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. Kelley et al. (2016, Basset) adopted a similar architecture to study functional activities of DNA sequence.

Though mulitple research has demenstrated the superiority of CNNs over other existing methods, inappropriate structure design would still result in the even poorer performance than conventional models Zeng et al. (2016). Therefore, what lies in the center for researchers to master and optimize the ability of CNNs is to skillfully match a CNN architecture to each particular given task. To achieve this, 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 Mri[5] 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.*, or include prior genomic information if possible.

2.2 Recurrent Neural Networks

Known as the capability of processing the streams of data, recurrent neural networks (RNNs) raised a surge of interest owning 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 sequential data in the way they are able to model the ordering dependence in sequences by memorizing long-range information through network loops. To be more specific, RNNs scan the input sequences sequentially, feed both the previous hidden layer and current input segement as the model input, so that the final output implicitly integrate both current and previous sequence information. 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. For example, Cao et al. (2017b, ProLanGO) built a LSTM-based Neural Machine Translation, which converts the task of protein function prediction to a language translation problem by understanding protein sequences as the language of Gene Ontology terms. Boža et al. (2017) developed DeepNano for base calling, Quang and Xie (2016) proposed DanQ to quantify the function of non-coding DNA, Sønderby et al. (2015) devised a convolutional LSTM networks to predict protein subcellular localization from protein sequences, *etc.* Another recent proposed seq-to-seq RNN that is able to map a variable-length input sequence to another sequence or

---

5. https://github.com/Mri-monitoring/Mri-docs/blob/master/mriapp.rst

fixed-size prediction is also promising for some genomic research. For instance, Busia et al. (2016) applied the idea of seq-to-seq learning to their model for protein secondary structure prediction to condition on previous predicted labels.

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.* Now 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. More examples can be found in Section 4.1.1. 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 intuitions to fit each particular problem with a more advanced and suitable model.

Motivated by the fact that protein folding is a progressive refinement (Min et al., 2017) 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 matter to refine the predictions of 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. (2017e) 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 it 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.*, pairwise contact, co-evolution information and distance potential). Then they are together fed into the second residual network, which consists of a series of 2D convolutional transformations. The combination of these two disparate residual nets makes possible a novel approach to integrate sequential features 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. Motivated by the fact that the motifs can be determined to some extent by the spatial arrangements and frequencies of combinations of DNA sequences (Quang and Xie, 2016), 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. Almagro Armenteros et al. (2017) proposed a bybrid integration of RNN, BLSTM, attention mechanism and a fully connected layer for protein subcellular localization prediction; each of the four modules is designed for specific purpose. These hybird models are increasingly favored by recent research, *e.g.* Singh et al. (2016b).

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 conductive to real-world applications.

3.1 Model Interpretation

People are expecting deep netwroks 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. Connections among network units so are convoluted that the information is widespread through out the network and thus perplexing to be captured (Castelvecchi, 2016). 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 dense layers of the network. People also searched for an understanding of genes by deep networks. Denas and Taylor (2013) managed to pass the model knowledge back into the input space through the inverse of the activation function, so that biologically-meaningful patterns can be highlighted. Lanchantin et al. (2016b, Dashboard) adopted Saliency Maps to measure nucleotide importance. Their work provided a series of visualization techniques to detect motifs, or sequence patterns from deep learning models, and went further to discuss about the features extracted by CNNs and RNNs. 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 addi-

tional 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. (2013b), 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 that has already been acquired to address newly encountered problems. Transfer learning is such a framework that allows deep learning to adapt the previously-trained model to exploit a new but relevant problem more effectively (Lu et al., 2015). It has been successfully applied to other fields, such as language processing (Cireşan et al., 2012) or audio-visual recognition (Moon et al., 2014). Readers could find surveys on transfer learning by Pan and Yang (2010) or Weiss et al. (2016). In addition, multitask learning is an approach that inductively share knowledge among multiple tasks. By learning related tasks in parallel while using shared architectures, what is learned by a single task can be auxiliary to those related. An overview of multitask learning, which especially focuses on neural networks, can be found in Ruder (2017). Widmer and Rätsch (2012) briefly discussed multitask learning from a biological perspective.

Early adaptation of transfer learning in genomics was based on machine learing 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 ImageNet[6] to extract general features at different scales, then fine-tuned the model by multitask learning to capture CV term-specific discriminative information. Liu et al. (2016a) developed an iterative PEDLA to predict enhancers across multiple human cells and tissues. They first pre-trained PEDLA on data derived from any cell type/tissue an unsupervised manner, then iteratively fine-tuned the model on a subsequent cell type/tissue supervisedly, using the trained model of the previous cell type/tissue as initialization. Cohn et al. (2018) transferred deep CNN parameters between networks trained on different species/datasets for enhancer identification. 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 from only a small portion of available ChIP-seq data. 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 applied the MLP classifier trained supervisedly to perform an auxiliary task that leverages partially labeled examples. The loss of the auxiliary task is add to MLP loss so that two tasks can be jointly optimized. Wang et al. (2017b)

---

6. http://www.image-net.org/

worked on the same problem by introducing a multi-task convolutional network models for representation learning. Zhou and Troyanskaya (2015) incorporated multitask approach for noncoding-variant effects prediction on chromatin by jointly learn across diverse chromatin factors.

The idea of sharing information learnt across multiple related tasks (transfer learning) or sub-tasks (multitask learning) could extend the power of limited data, especially for genomic data that is costly to obtain. Transfer learning have also been adopted tackle the class-imbalanced problem (Al-Stouhi and Reddy, 2016). 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

As the current technology has made available data from multi-platform or multi-view inputs with heterogeneous feature sets, multi-view deep learning appears to be an encouraging direction for future deep learning research which exploits information across the datasets, capturing their high level associations for prediction, clustering as well as 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., 2017c). Genomics is an area where data of various types can be assimilated naturally. For example, abundant types of genomic data (*e.g.*, DNA methylation, gene expression, miRNA expression data) for the same set of tumor samples have been made available by the state-of-the-art high-throughput sequencing technologies (Liang et al., 2015). Therefore, it is natural to think of leveraging multi-view information in genomics to achieve a better prediction than that of a 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., 2017e) 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 to cluster cancer patients and define cancer subtypes. Their stacked gaussian restricted boltzmann machines (gRBM) are trained by contrastive divergence, differennt modalities are integrated via stacking hidden layers, and common features are effused from inherent features derived from multiple single modalities. More examples can be found in Pan and Shen (2017), Zhang et al. (2015), *etc.*

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

Gene expression is a highly regulated process by which the genetic instructions in DNA are converted into a functional products such as proteins and other molecules, and also respond to the changing environment accordingly. Namely, genes encode protein synthesis, and self-regulate the functions of the cell by adjusting the amount and type of proteins it produce (Nature, 2010). Here we review some research that applied deep learning to analyze how gene expression is regulated.

4.1.1 Gene expression Characterization

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. At the same time, recent works have suggested the better performance obtained by deep learning models on gene expression data; Urda et al. (2017) used a deep learning approach to outperform LASSO in analyzing RNA-Seq gene expression profiles 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 was not effective enough to allow some complicated biological considerations (Yeung and Ruzzo, 2001). Also, since the reliability of the cross-experiment datasets are limited by technical noise and unmatched experiment conditions (Tan et al., 2017), researchers are considering the denosing and enhancement of the available data instead of directly finding principal components.

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 can been proven effective in extracting biological insights. Danaee et al. (2017) adopted stacked denoising autoencoders (SDEs) to detect functional features in breast cancer from gene expression profiles data. Tan et al. (2014, ADAGE) presented an unsupervised approach that effectively applied SDA 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 to successfully extract both clinical and molecular features. 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. 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 aforementioned works.

Some other works moved to variational inference in autoencoders, which is assumed to be more skillful to capture the internal dependencies among 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 aforementioned ADAGE (Tan et al., 2014). Dincer et al. (2018) introduced the DeepProfile, a framework featuring VAE, to extract latent variables that are predictive for acute myeloid leukemia from expression data. Sharifi-Noghabi et al. (2018) proposed Deep Genomic Signature (DGS), a pair of VAEs that are trained over unlabelled and labelled data separately from expression data for predicting metastasis.

Another thread for utilizing deep learning to characterize gene expression is to describe the pairwise relationship. Wang et al. (2017b) 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, which is further extended by two shared-parameter networks (Cao et al., 2017a).

4.1.2 Gene expression Prediction

Deep learning approaches for gene expression prediction have outperformed other existing algorithms. For example, Chen et al. (2016c) presented a three-layer feed-forward neural network for gene expressions prediction of selected landmark genes achieved better performance than linear regression. This model, D-GEX, is of the multi-task setting and was tested on two types of expression data, the microarrays and RNA-Seqs. Xie et al. (2017) showed that their deep model based on MLP and SDAs outperformed Lasso and Random Forests in prediction gene expression quantifications from SNP genotypes.

When making predictions from gene sequences, deep learning models have been shown fruitful in identifying the context-specific roles of local DNA-sequence elements, then the further inferred regulatory rules can be used to predict expression patterns (Beer and Tavazoie, 2004). Successful prediction usually rely much on proper utilization of biological knowledge. Therefore, it could be more efficient to pre-analyze the contextual information in DNA sequences than directly making prediction. Deep learning models could refer to two early machine learning works that applies Bayesian networks to predict gene expression were based on their learned motifs (Beer and Tavazoie, 2004; Yuan et al., 2007).

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 histon modifications and gene regulation was suggested experimentally in Lim et al. (2009), Cain et al. (2011) and Dong and Weng (2013), and has already been studied in some machine learning works before (Karlić et al., 2010; Cheng et al., 2011; Dong et al., 2012; Ho et al., 2015). 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 of gene expression level. The input was seperated into bins so as to discover the combinatorial interactions among different histone modification signals. The learned region representation is then fed into a MLP

classifier that maps 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.*

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. They have another previous work that evaluates VAEs of different architectures, provided with comparison among VAEs, PCA, ICA, non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) and aforementioned ADGAE (Way and Greene, 2017a).

4.2 Regulatory Genomics

Gene expression regulation is the cellular process that controls the expression level of gene products (RNA or protein) to be high or low. It increases the versatility of an organism so as to allow it to react towards and adapt to the surrounding environment. The underlying interdependencies behind the sequences limit the flexibility of conventional methods, but deep networks that could model over-representation of sequence information have the potentials to 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. Enhancers and promoters are two of most well characterized types functional elements in the regions of non-coding DNA, which belong to cis-regulatory elements (CREs). Readers can visit Wasserman and Sandelin (2004) and Li et al. (2015a) for review of early approaches for identification of CREs.

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 accurate enough 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 with some rules which use the gene context information predicted by GRAIL. These early works of deep learning models was not noticeable enough to demonstrate a clear edge over the weight matrix matching methods. One recent study by Umarov and Solovyev (2017) used a CNN with no more than three layers well demonstrated the superiority of CNN over conventional methods in promoter recognition of five distant organism.Their trained model has been implemented as a web application called CNNProm. A more latest CNN-based model for enhancer prediction applied transfer learning setting on different species/datasets (Cohn et al., 2018). Another highlight of their work lies the design of adversarial training data.

PEDLA was developed by Liu et al. (2016a) as an algorithmic framework for enhancer prediction based on deep learning. It is able to directly learn from heterogeneous and class-imbalanced data an enhancer predictor that can be generalized across multiple cell types/tissues. The model has an embedded mechanism to handle class-imbalanced problem in which the prior probability of each class is directly approximated from the training data. PEDLA was first trained on 9 types of data in H1 cells, then further extended with an iterative scheme that manages to generalize the predictor across various 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 identifying enhancers from background genomic sequences. They compared different designs of CNNs and concluded the effectiveness of max-pooling and batch normalization for improving classification accuracy, while they also pointed out that simply increasing the depth of deep architectures is not useful if being 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.

Yang et al. (2017) showed the possibility of predicting enhancers with DNA sequence alone with the presentation of BiRen, a hybrid of CNN and RNN. While demonstrating the possibility, there seems to be room to improve BiRen with the techniques that enables deep learning over heterogenity data (*e.g.* see Section 5.1.3) since BiRen still exhibits weaker predictive performance in comparison to the methods that consider the cell-type-/tissue-specific enhancer markers explicitly.

Deep Feature Selection (DFS) is an attempt took by Li et al. (2015b) to introduce sparsity to deep architectures. Conventionally, the sparseness is achieved by adding a regularization term (*e.g.*, LASSO, Elastic Net). Li et al. (2015b) took a novel approach by which they can automatically select an active subset of features at the input level to reduce the feature dimension. This is implemented as an additional sparse one-to-one (point-wise product) linear layer between the input data and the input layer of main model. DFS is widely applicable 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 layer-wisely in a greedy 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 identification of 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.

Enhancer-promoter interaction predictions are always based on non-sequence features from functional genomic signals. Singh et al. (2016b, SPEID) proposed the first deep learning approach to infer enhancer-promoter interactions genome-wide from only sequence-based features, as well as the locations of putative enhancers and promoters in a specific cell type. Their model was demonstrated to be superior to DeepFinder, which is based on machine learning (Whalen et al., 2016). This hybrid model consists of two parts. The first part accounts for the differences of underlying features that could be learned between en-

hancers 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 that is responsible for identifying informative combinations of the extracted subsequence features. Their work provided insights into the long-range gene regulation determined from the sequences.

The last point we want to highlight in this part is the class-imbalanced datasets, a common problem for enhancer or promoter identification (Firpi et al., 2010; Kleftogiannis et al., 2014). Steps taken to resolve this problem will be discussed later in Section 5.1.1, *e.g.* Liu et al. (2016a) and Singh et al. (2016b).

4.2.2 SPLICING

Splicing refers to the editing of pre-messenger RNA so as to produce a mature messenger RNA (mRNA) that can be translated into a protein. This process effectively add up to the diversity of protein isoforms. Predicting "splicing code" aims to understand how splicing regulate and manifest the functional changes of proteins, and is crucial for understanding different ways of how proteins are produced.

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 applic ations 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 code for human genome, and discovered many new disease-causing candidates while thousands of known disease-causing mutations being successfully identified. 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 dealing with 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 gradients, and showed by their experiments its ability to improve prediction performance and shorten runtime compared to contrastive divergence or other methods.

In many cases happens 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 across-tissue differences.The hidden variables of the model are designed to include cellular context (tissue types) information to extract genomic features. This is one of the initial works that adapt deep learning for splicing prediction. A recent work by Jha et al. (2017) based on previously developed BNN (Xiong et al., 2011) and DNN (Leung et al., 2014) models to design an integrative deep learning models for alternative splicing. They viewed previous work as the baseline on their original dataset, and further developed these models by integrating additional types of experimental data (*e.g.* tissue type) and proposed a new target function. Their mod-

els are able to identify splicing regulators and their putative targets, as well as infer the corresponding regulatory rules directly from the genomic sequence.

4.2.3 TRANSCRIPTION FACTORS AND RNA-BINDING PROTEINS

Transcription factors (TFs) refer to proteins that bind to promoters and enhancers on DNA sequence, and RNA-binding proteins, as the name suggested, are both crucial regulatory elements in biological processes. Current high-throughput sequencing techniques for selecting candidate binding targets for certain TFs are restricted by the low efficiency and high cost Ching et al. (2017). Researchers seeking 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.

Many existing deep learning methods approach transcription factor binding site (TFBS) prediction tasks through convolutional kernels. Alipanahi et al. (2015, DeepBind) have showed successful using CNN models in large scale problem of TFBS tasks. Chen et al. (2017) combined the advantage of representation learning from CNN and the explicity of reproducing kernel Hilbert space to introduce the Convolutional Kernel Networks to predict transcription factor binding site with interpretibility. Zeng et al. (2016) conducted a systematic analysis of CNN architectures for predicting DNA sequence binding sites 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. Motivated by the symmetry of double-stranded DNA, which means that identical patterns may appear on one DNA strand and its reverse complement, Shrikumar et al. (2017) proposed 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 TFBS prediction 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. Zhang et al. (2015) proposed a multi-modal deep belief network that is capable of automatic extraction of structural features from RNA sequences; they first successfully introduce tertiary structural features of RNA sequences to improve prediction of RNA-binding proteins interaction sites. Another multi-modal deep learning model for the same purpose was developed by Pan and Shen (2017, iDeep). This model consists 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.

4.3 Functional Genomics

4.3.1 MUTATIONS AND FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

One of the shortcomings of previous approaches for predicting the functional activities from DNA sequences is the insufficient utilization of positional information. Though Ghandi et al. (2014) upgraded the k-mer method by introducing an alternative gapped k-mers method (gkm-SVM), the improvement is not remarkable since the DNA sequence is still simply represented as vectors of k-mer counts without considering the position of each segment in the sequence. Though position-specific sequence kernels exist, they map the sequence into much higher dimension space and are thus not efficient enough (Kelley et al., 2016).

In contrast to conventional methods, deep learning methods such as CNNs naturally account for positional relationships between sequence signals and are computational efficient. Kelley et al. (2016, Basset) presented an open-source CNN-based package trained on genomics data of 164 cell types, and remarkably improved the prediction for functional activities of DNA sequences. Basset enables researchers to perform the single sequencing assay and annotate mutations in the genome with present chromatin accessibility learned at the same time. Zhou and Troyanskaya (2015, DeepSEA) contributed another open-source deep convolutional network for predicting from only genomic sequence the functional roles of non-coding variants on histone modifications, TFBS, and DNA accessibility of sequences with high nucleotide resolution.

The effects of mutations are usually predicted by site independent or pairwise models, but these approaches do not sufficiently model higher-order dependencies. Riesselman et al. (2017, DeepSequence) took a generative approach to tract mutation effects that are beyond pairwise by biologically-motivated beyasian deep latent networks. They introduced latent variables on which DNA depend, and visualized model parameters to illustrate the structural proximity and amino acid correlations captured by DeepSequence.

4.3.2 SUBCELLULAR LOCALIZATION

Subcellular localization is to predict the subcellular compartment a protein resides in the cell from its biological sequence. In order to interact with each other, proteins need to at least temporarily inhabit 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 (Shatkay et al., 2007). Most previous methods rely on the support vector machines, 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. Meinken et al. (2012) reported on previous tools and Wan and Mak (2015) covered the machine learning approaches for subcellular localization.

Some early deep learning works have shifted from SVMs to neural networks, such as Emanuelsson et al. (2000) and Hawkins and Bodén (2006). Mooney et al. (2011) based on a N-to-1 neural network to develop a subcellular localization predictor (SCLpred). Sønderby et al. (2015) adopted LSTM to predict protein subcellular locations from only sequence information with a high accuracy. They further enhanced the model by adding a convolutional filters before LSTM as a motif extractor, and introducing the attention mechanism that forces the LSTM to focus on particular segments of the protein. The validity of their convolutional filters and attention mechanisms were visualized in experiments. Almagro Armenteros et al. (2017) proposed similar integrative hybrid model DeepLoc consisting of four modules, including CNN, BLSTM, attention scheme and q fully connected dense layer.

High-throughput microscopy images are a rich source of biological data remain to be better exploited. One of the important utilization of microscopy images is the automatic detection of the cellular compartment. Pärnamaa and Parts (2017, DeepYeast) devised an eleven-layer deep model for fluorescent protein subcellular localization classification in yeast cells, of which eight convolutional layers are succeeded by three fully connected layers. Internal outputs of the model are visualized and interpreted from the perspective of image characteristics. The author concluded that low-level network functions as basic image feature extractor, while higher layers account for separating localization classes.

4.4 Structural Genomics

4.4.1 Structural Classification of Proteins

Proteins usually share structural similarities with other proteins, among some of which have a common evolutionary origin (Lo Conte et al., 2000). Classification of protein structure can be tracked back to 1970s aiming to comprehend the process of protein folding and protein structure evolution (Andreeva and Murzin, 2010). Grouping proteins into structural or functional categories also facilitate the understanding of increasing number of newly sequenced genome.

Early methods for similarity measures mostly rely on sequence properties (*i.e.* alignment-based), such as FASTA (Pearson and Lipman, 1988), BLAST (Altschul et al., 1990), or PSI-BLAST (Altschul et al., 1997), and were then upgraded by leveraging profiles derived from multiple sequence alignments and position-specific scoring matrices (PSSM) in addition to raw sequences (Rangwala and Karypis, 2005), or discriminative models like SVM (Liao and Noble, 2003). For example, Cang et al. (2015) adopted SVM with a topological approach utilizing persistent homology to extract features for classification of protein domains and superfamilies. Other top-performing deep learning works also 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. Their model 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). One drawback of homology based approaches for fold recognition is the lack of direct relationship between

the protein sequence and the fold, since current methods substantially rely on the fold of known template protein to classify the fold of new proteins (Hou et al., 2017). Therefore, Hou et al. (2017, DeepSF) proposed a deep 1D CNN for fold classification directly from protein sequences.

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 to compute a distributed representation of biological sequences with general genomic applications such as protein family classification. Each sequence is embedded in a high-dimension vector by BioVec, then the classification of protein families can reduced to a simple classification task.

4.4.2 PROTEIN SECONDARY STRUCTURE

Protein secondary structure refers to the 3D form of local segments of proteins, which is informative for studying protein structure, function as well as evolution. The protein SS is traditionally subdivided into 3 states (Pauling et al., 1951), or alternatively, 8 fine-grained states by DSSP algorithm (Kabsch and Sander, 1983). To evaluate the model performance for aforementioned 3-state or 8-state prediction, Q3 or Q8 accuracy are always calculated, which represents the percentage of correctly predicted secondary conformation of amino acid residues. An alternative measure for 3-state prediction is the segment of overlap (SOV) score (Zemla et al., 1999). The resonable goal of SS prediction is suggested by Rost et al. (1994) as a Q3 accuracy above 85%.

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; Kim and Park, 2003; Ward et al., 2003) were widely adopted. At that nascent age of neural networks, one of the earliest applications developed a shallow feed-forward network that predicts protein SS and homology from the amino acid sequences (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, reaching a Q3 accuracy of 64.3%. They based on the fully connected neural networks to develop a cascaded architecture, taking as input window DNA sequences with orthogonal encoding. There was no significant progress for 3-state prediction accuracy by neural networks until being improved to 70.8% by Rost and Sander (1993a,b). Claimed of the marginal influence of free parameters in the model, Rost and Sander (1993a) accredited their improvement to leveraging evolutionary information encoded in the input profiles derived from multiple alignments. Riis and Krogh (1996) achieved a practically identical performance by a structured neural network. They designed specific networks for each SS class according to biological knowledge and the output prediction was made from filtering and ensemble averaging. Based on the PSSM 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 were also widely applied for protein SS prediction (Baldi et al., 1999; Pollastri et al., 2002; Magnan and Baldi, 2014).

18

Emergent deep architectures for protein SS prediction have been widely explored with more prior knowledge and various features available. Faraggi et al. (2012, SPINE X) proposed an iterative six-step model, of which the neural network of each step follows similar structure and is designed for each specific purpose. Spencer et al. (2015) trained an deep belief network model, in which an additional hidden layer is constructed to facilitate the unsuperivsed layer-by-layer initialization of Restricted Boltzmann Machine (RBM). Li and Yu (2016) designed a cascaded model, which leverages CNN to extracts multi-scale local contextual features by different kernel size, then added a BRNN 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% by extending conditional neural fields (CDFs) to include convolutional designs. DeepCNF is able to capture both sequence-structure relationships and protein SS 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). Busia et al. (2016) explored the model performance of 8-stated prediction from simple feed-forward networks to the adaptation of recent CNN architectures (*e.g.* Inception, ResNet, and DenseNet). They modified the convolution operators of different scales and residual connections of successful CNN models in computer vision to suit the protein SS prediction task, and also highlighted the differences compared to vision tasks. As opposed to above-mentioned DeepCNF (Wang et al., 2016a) that included interdependencies between labels of adjacent residues by Conditional Random Field (CRF), Busia et al. (2016) condition the current prediction to on previous predicted labels by sequence-to-sequence modeling.

4.4.3 PROTEIN TERTIARY STRUCTURE AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The prediction of protein tertiary structure has proven crucial to huamn's understanding of protein functions (Breda et al., 2007), and can be applied to, for instance, drug designs (Jacobson and Sali, 2004). However, experimental methods for determining protein structures, such as X-ray crystallography, are costly and sometimes impractical. Though the number of experimentally solved protein structures included in protein data bank (PDB)[7] keeps growing, it only account for a small proportion of currently sequenced proteins (Kryshtafovych and Fidelis, 2009). Thus, a potentially practical approach to fill the gap between the number of known protein sequences and the number of found protein structures is through computational modeling.

Two essential challenges in protein structure prediction include the sampling and the ranking of protein structural models (Cao et al., 2015). Quality assessment (QA) is to predict the absolute or relative quality of the protein models before the native structure is available so as to rank them. Some previous research, such as (Ray et al., 2012, ProQ2) and (Uziela et al., 2016, ProQ3), was conducted based on machine learning models. Recent deep learning-based work from (Uziela et al., 2017, ProQ3D) achieved substantial improvement by replacing the SVMs in previous work by DNNs. As opposed to these existing methods that rely on energy or scoring functions, Nguyen et al. (2014) based solely on geometry to propose a sparse stacked autoencoder classifier that utilizes the contact map. Another

---

7. https://www.rcsb.org/

research by Cao et al. (2016) adopted a deep belief network protein structure prediction. Their model could be used to evaluate the quality of any protein decoy. Local quality assessment remains to be substantially improved compared with global prediction (Shin et al., 2017). Liu et al. (2016b) introduced three models based on stacked denoising autoencoders as benchmark of deep learning methods for assessing quality of individual protein models.

4.4.4 CONTACT MAP

Protein contact map is a binary 2D matrix denoting the spatial closeness of any two residues in the folded 3D protein structure. Predicting residue-residue contact is thus curcial to protein structure prediction, and has been early studied by shallow neural networks (Torracinta and Campagne, 2016). Recent works proceeded to deeper networks. Lena et al. (2012) stacked together multiple standard three-layer feedforward network sharing the same topology, taking into consideration both spatial and temporal features to predict protein residue–residue contact. Wang et al. (2017e) also developed an ultra-deep model to predict protein contacts from amino acids sequence. Their model consists of two deep residual neural networks that process 1D and 2D features separately and subsequently in order to consider both sequential and pairwise features into the whole model. Zhang et al. (2017) and Schreiber et al. (2017) both contributed an open-source multi-modal CNN model for Hi-C contact map prediction. Zhang et al. (2017, HiCPlus) first interpolated the low-resolution Hi-C matrix to the size of the high, then trained their model to predict high- from the low-resolution matrix. The final output were recombined to the entire Hi-C interaction matrix. Schreiber et al. (2017, Rambutan) predicted Hi-C contacts at high resolution (1 kb) from nucleotide sequences and DNaseI assay signal data. Their model consists of two arms, with each arm processing one type of data independently. The learned feature maps are then concatenated for further combination with genomic distance in the dense layers.

5. Challenges and Opportunities

With the discussion of successes of applications of deep learning in genomics, now we proceed to discuss some current challenges. As deep learning models are usually over-parametrized, the performance can be conditional if the models are not appropriately designed according to the problem. There are multiple worthwhile considerations and techniques involving model architectures, feature extraction, data limitation, *etc.*, which help deep learning models to better approach genomics. Here we briefly discuss some current challenges that deserve attention, and several potential research directions that might shed on light future development of deep learning applications in genomic research.

5.1 The Nature of Data

An inevitable challenge of transferring the success of deep learning in conventional vision or text data into genomics is raised due to the nature of the genomic data, such as the unavailability of true labels due to the lack of knowledge of genetic process, the imbalanced case and control samples due to the rarity of certain disease, and the heterogeneity of data due to the expensiveness of large-scale data collection.

5.1.1 Class-Imbalanced Data

Large-scale biological data that gathered from assorted sources are usually inherently class-imbalanced. Take epigenetic datasets for example, there are in nature much fewer DNA methylated regions (DMR) sites than non-DMR sites (Haque et al., 2014). It is also common in enhancer prediction problem where the number of non-enhancer classes overwhelmingly exceeds that of 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, Al-Stouhi and Reddy (2016) based on boosting to propose an instance-transfer model to reduce the class-imbalanced influence while also improve the performance by leveraging data from an auxiliary domain. In addition to resorting to ensemble approaches, 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 compensate for the imbalance of classes. Lee and Yoon (2015) presented a method called boosted contrastive divergence with categorical gradients for training RBMs for class imbalanced prediction of splice junctions. Singh et al. (2016b) performed data augmentation by slightly shifting each positive promoter or enhancer within the window since the true label is not sensitive to these minimal changes. They also designed the training procedure accordingly to avoid the high false positive rate resulting from the augmented dataset.

5.1.2 Various Data Types

Intuitively, integrating diverse types of data as discriminating features will lead to more predictive power of the models. For example, Liu et al. (2016a, PEDLA) trained their model on nine types of data to identify enhancers, including chromatin accessibility (DNase-sseq), TFs and cofactors (ChIP-seq), histone modifications (ChIP-seq), transcription (RNA-Seq), DNA methylation (RRBS), sequence signatures, evolutionary conservation, CpG islands, 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 by two disparate sub-networks designed accordingly for CpG sites and DNA sequences.

It pays off to manage to utilize the data of multiple views; though merging the information from various data sources challenge the models that could well integrate them, this effort 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 related-nesses produce spurious correlation among SNPs to the trait of interest. 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 et al. (2017a) 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 Guassian noise might overshadows 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.

On the methodology perspective, several deep learning methods that are not designed exclusively for confounder correction, such as the domain adversarial learning (Ganin et al., 2016), select-additive learning (Wang et al., 2017c), and confounder filtering (Wu et al., 2018), can be re-used, once the identification of confounder is presented.

5.2 Feature Extraction

Deep learning that performs automatic feature extraction saves great efforts of choosing hand-engineered features, Torng and Altman (2017) also discussed the superiority of automatically generated features over manually selected features. However, in practice, it is unfortunately time-consuming to directly learning features from genomic sequences when complex interdependences and long range interactions are taken into consideration. Researchers might still resort to task-specific feature extraction before automatic feature detection, which could strongly facilitate the model if skillfully designed.

5.2.1 MATHEMATICAL FEATURE EXTRACTION

Techniques borrowed from mathematics have great potentials to interpret the complex biological structures behind data that otherwise will hinder the generalization of deep learning. For example, topology is a promising choice to untangle the geometric complexity underlying the 3D biomolecular structure of protein (Cang and Wei, 2017), and homology detection has been widely applied to protein classification problems (Hochreiter et al., 2007; Cang et al., 2015). DeepMethyl (Wang et al., 2016b) was developed as deep learning software using features derived from 3D genome topology and DNA sequence patterns. It is based on stacked denoising autoencoders and is applied to predict methylation states 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 mutations impacts.

5.2.2 FEATURE REPRESETATION

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 understand this language of life, Asgari and Mofrad (2015) designed BioVec, an unsupervised data-driven feature representation method, which embeds each trigram of biological sequence in an 100-dimensional vector that characterizes biophysical and biochemical properties of sequences. BioVec was trained by a variant of MLP adapted from word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013b,a), a typical method in natural language processing. Ng (2017) furhter utilized shallow two-layer neural networks to compute the representation of variable-length k-mers of DNA sequences that is consistent across different lengths. In contrast to representation by BioVec for individual kmers, Kimothi et al. (2016) based on doc2vec algorithm, an extension of word2vec, to proposed distributed representation of complete protein sequence, and successfully applied to protein classification following the settings of Asgari and Mofrad (2015). These types of feature representation have potential to facilitate the work of genomics.

6. Conclusion and Outlook

Genomics is a challenging application area of deep learning that encounters unique challenges compared to other fields such as vision, audio, and text processing, since we have limited abilities to interpret the genomic information but expect from deep learning a superhuman intelligence that explores beyond our knowledge. Yet deep learning is undoubtedly an auspicious direction that has constantly rejuvenated and moved forward the genomic research in recent years. As discussed in this review, recent breakthroughs of deep learning applications in genomics have surpassed many previous state-of-the-art computational methods with regard to predictive performance, though slightly lag behind traditional statistical inferences in terms of interpretation.

Cuurent applications, however, have not brought about a watershed revolution in genomic research. 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. A plethora of new deep learning methods is constantly being proposed but awaits artful applications in genomics. By careful selection of data sources and features, or appropriate design of model structures, deep learning can be driven towards a bright direction which produces more accurate and interpretable prediction. 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

Samir Al-Stouhi and Chandan K Reddy. Transfer learning for class imbalance problems with inadequate data. *Knowledge and information systems*, 48(1):201–228, 2016.

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.

Jose Juan Almagro Armenteros, Casper Kaae Sønderby, Søren Kaae Sønderby, Henrik Nielsen, and Ole Winther. Deeploc: prediction of protein subcellular localization using deep learning. *Bioinformatics*, 33(21):3387–3395, 2017.

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, Xinchen 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.

Ardala Breda, Napoleao Fonseca Valadares, Osmar Norberto de Souza, and Richard Charles Garratt. Protein structure, modelling and applications. 2007.

Akosua Busia, Jasmine Collins, and Navdeep Jaitly. Protein secondary structure prediction using deep multi-scale convolutional neural networks and next-step conditioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01503*, 2016.

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.

Jingjun Cao, Zhengli Wu, Wenting Ye, and Haohan Wang. Learning functional embedding of genes governed by pair-wised labels. In *Computational Intelligence and Applications (ICCIA), 2017 2nd IEEE International Conference on*, pages 397–401. IEEE, 2017a.

Renzhi Cao, Debswapna Bhattacharya, Badri Adhikari, Jilong Li, and Jianlin Cheng. Large-scale model quality assessment for improving protein tertiary structure prediction. *Bioinformatics*, 31(12):i116–i123, 2015.

Renzhi Cao, Debswapna Bhattacharya, Jie Hou, and Jianlin Cheng. Deepqa: improving the estimation of single protein model quality with deep belief networks. *BMC bioinformatics*, 17(1):495, 2016.

Renzhi Cao, Colton Freitas, Leong Chan, Miao Sun, Haiqing Jiang, and Zhangxin Chen. Prolango: Protein function prediction using neural machine translation based on a recurrent neural network. *Molecules*, 22(10):1732, 2017b.

Zhen Cao and Shihua Zhang. gkm-dnn: efficient prediction using gapped k-mer features and deep neural networks. *bioRxiv*, page 170761, 2017.

Davide Castelvecchi. Can we open the black box of ai? Nature, 2016. URL https://www.nature.com/news/can-we-open-the-black-box-of-ai-1.20731?goal=0_997ed6f472-4f7.

Dexiong Chen, Laurent Jacob, and Julien Mairal. Predicting transcription factor binding sites with convolutional kernel networks. *bioRxiv*, page 217257, 2017.

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.

Dikla Cohn, Or Zuk, and Tommy Kaplan. Enhancer identification using transfer and adversarial deep learning of dna sequences. *bioRxiv*, page 264200, 2018.

ENCODE Project Consortium et al. An integrated encyclopedia of dna elements in the human genome. *Nature*, 489(7414):57–74, 2012.

Padideh Danaee, Reza Ghaeini, and David A Hendrix. A deep learning approach for cancer detection and relevant gene identification. In *PACIFIC SYMPOSIUM ON BIOCOMPUTING 2017*, pages 219–229. World Scientific, 2017.

Olgert Denas and James Taylor. Deep modeling of gene expression regulation in an erythropoiesis model. In *Representation Learning, ICML Workshop*, 2013.

Ayse Berceste Dincer, Safiye Celik, Naozumi Hiranuma, and Su-In Lee. Deepprofile: Deep learning of patient molecular profiles for precision medicine in acute myeloid leukemia. *bioRxiv*, page 278739, 2018.

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.

Eshel Faraggi, Tuo Zhang, Yuedong Yang, Lukasz Kurgan, and Yaoqi Zhou. Spine x: improving protein secondary structure prediction by multistep learning coupled with prediction of solvent accessible surface area and backbone torsion angles. *Journal of computational chemistry*, 33(3):259–267, 2012.

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.

Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Victor Lempitsky. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2096–2030, 2016.

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 releaming in boltzmann machines. *Parallel Distrilmted 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.

Jie Hou, Badri Adhikari, and Jianlin Cheng. Deepsf: deep convolutional neural network for mapping protein sequences to folds. *Bioinformatics*, 2017.

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.

Matthew Jacobson and Andrej Sali. Comparative protein structure modeling and its applications to drug discovery. 2004.

The Jackson Laboratory JAX. Genetics vs. genomics, 2018. URL https://www.jax.org/personalized-medicine/precision-medicine-and-you/genetics-vs-genomics

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-yee 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.

Dhananjay Kimothi, Akshay Soni, Pravesh Biyani, and James M Hogan. Distributed representations for biological sequence analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05949*, 2016.

Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.

Dimitrios Kleftogiannis, 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.

Andriy Kryshtafovych and Krzysztof Fidelis. Protein structure prediction and model quality assessment. *Drug discovery today*, 14(7-8):386–393, 2009.

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.

Michael KK Leung, Andrew Delong, Babak Alipanahi, and Brendan J Frey. Machine learning in genomic medicine: a review of computational problems and data sets. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):176–197, 2016.

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.

Maxwell Wing Libbrecht. *Understanding human genome regulation through entropic graph-based regularization and submodular optimization.* PhD thesis, 2016.

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.

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.

Tong Liu, Yiheng Wang, Jesse Eickholt, and Zheng Wang. Benchmarking deep networks for predicting residue-specific quality of individual protein models in casp11. *Scientific reports*, 6:19301, 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.

Jie Lu, Vahid Behbood, Peng Hao, Hua Zuo, Shan Xue, and Guangquan Zhang. Transfer learning using computational intelligence: a survey. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 80:14–23, 2015.

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.

John Meinken, Jack Min, et al. Computational prediction of protein subcellular locations in eukaryotes: an experience report. *Computational Molecular Biology*, 2(1), 2012.

Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013a.

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, 2013b.

Seonwoo Min, Byunghan Lee, and Sungroh Yoon. Deep learning in bioinformatics. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 18(5):851–869, 2017.

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.

Marit Mitchell. Deep genomics applies machine learning to develop new genetic medicines, 2017. URL http://news.engineering.utoronto.ca/deep-genomics-applies-machine-learning-develop-new-ge

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.

Nature. Gene expression. Nature Education, 2010. URL https://www.nature.com/scitable/nated/topicpage/gene-expression-14121669.

Patrick Ng. dna2vec: Consistent vector representations of variable-length k-mers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06279*, 2017.

Son P Nguyen, Yi Shang, and Dong Xu. Dl-pro: A novel deep learning method for protein model quality assessment. In *Neural Networks (IJCNN), 2014 International Joint Conference on*, pages 2071–2078. IEEE, 2014.

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.

Yanjun Qi, Oznur 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.

Arjun Ray, Erik Lindahl, and Björn Wallner. Improved model quality assessment using proq2. *BMC bioinformatics*, 13(1):224, 2012.

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.

Burkhard Rost, Chris Sander, and Reinhard Schneider. Redefining the goals of protein secondary structure prediction. *Journal of molecular biology*, 235(1):13–26, 1994.

Sebastian Ruder. An overview of multi-task learning in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05098*, 2017.

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.

Hossein Sharifi-Noghabi, Yang Liu, Nicholas Erho, Raunak Shrestha, Mohammed Alshalalfa, Elai Davicioni, Colin C Collins, and Martin Ester. Deep genomic signature for early metastasis prediction in prostate cancer. *bioRxiv*, page 276055, 2018.

Hagit Shatkay, Annette Höglund, Scott Brady, Torsten Blum, Pierre Dönnes, and Oliver Kohlbacher. Sherloc: 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.

Woong-Hee Shin, Xuejiao Kang, Jian Zhang, and Daisuke Kihara. Prediction of local quality of protein structure models considering spatial neighbors in graphical models. *Scientific reports*, 7:40629, 2017.

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 genomical? *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.

Daniel Urda, Julio Montes-Torres, Fernando Moreno, Leonardo Franco, and José M Jerez. Deep learning to analyze rna-seq gene expression data. In *International Work-Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 50–59. Springer, 2017.

Karolis Uziela, Nanjiang Shu, Björn Wallner, and Arne Elofsson. Proq3: Improved model quality assessments using rosetta energy terms. *Scientific reports*, 6:33509, 2016.

Karolis Uziela, David Menéndez Hurtado, Nanjiang Shu, Björn Wallner, and Arne Elofsson. Proq3d: improved model quality assessments using deep learning. *Bioinformatics*, 33(10): 1578–1580, 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.

Shibiao Wan and Man-Wai Mak. *Machine learning for protein subcellular localization prediction*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2015.

Haohan Wang, Bryon Aragam, and Eric P Xing. Variable selection in heterogeneous datasets: A truncated-rank sparse linear mixed model with applications to genome-wide association studies. *bioRxiv*, page 228106, 2017a.

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, 2017b.

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, 2017c.

Haohan Wang, Bhiksha Raj, and Eric P Xing. On the origin of deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07800*, 2017d.

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, 2017e.

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.

Sean Whalen, Rebecca M Truty, and Katherine S Pollard. Enhancer–promoter interactions are encoded by complex genomic signatures on looping chromatin. *Nature genetics*, 48 (5):488, 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.

Zhenglin Wu, Haohan Wang, Mingze Cao, Yin Chen, and Eric P Xing. Fair deep learning prediction for healthcare applications with confounder filtering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07276*, 2018.

Rui Xie, Jia Wen, Andrew Quitadamo, Jianlin Cheng, and Xinghua Shi. A deep auto-encoder model for gene expression prediction. *BMC genomics*, 18(9):845, 2017.

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.

Bite Yang, Feng Liu, Chao Ren, Zhangyi Ouyang, Ziwei Xie, Xiaochen Bo, and Wenjie Shu. Biren: predicting enhancers with a deep-learning-based model using the dna sequence alone. *Bioinformatics*, 33(13):1930–1936, 2017.

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.

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, Česlovas 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.

Sai Zhang, Jingtian Zhou, Hailin Hu, Haipeng Gong, Ligong Chen, Chao Cheng, and Jianyang Zeng. A deep learning framework for modeling structural features of rna-binding protein targets. *Nucleic acids research*, 44(4):e32–e32, 2015.

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.