

Numeric Lyndon-based feature embedding of sequencing reads for machine learning approaches

Paola Bonizzoni¹, Matteo Costantini¹, Clelia De Felice², Alessia Petescia¹, Yuri Pirola¹, Marco Previtali¹, Raffaella Rizzi¹, Jens Stoye³, Rocco Zaccagnino², and Rosalba Zizza²

¹Dip. di Informatica, Sistemistica e Comunicazione, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

²Dip. di Informatica, University of Salerno, Salerno, Italy

³Faculty of Technology and Center for Biotechnology (CeBiTec), University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

Feature embedding methods have been proposed in literature to represent sequences as numeric vectors to be used in some bioinformatics investigations, such as family classification and protein structure prediction.

Recent theoretical results showed that the well-known Lyndon factorization preserves common factors in overlapping strings [1]. Surprisingly, the *fingerprint* of a sequencing read, which is the sequence of lengths of consecutive factors in variants of the Lyndon factorization of the read, is effective in preserving sequence similarities, suggesting it as basis for the definition of novel representations of sequencing reads.

We propose a novel feature embedding method for Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) data using the notion of *fingerprint*. We provide a theoretical and experimental framework to estimate the behaviour of fingerprints and of the k -mers extracted from it, called k -fingers, as possible feature embeddings for sequencing reads. As a case study to assess the effectiveness of such embeddings, we use fingerprints to represent RNA-Seq reads and to assign them to the most likely gene from which they were originated as fragments of transcripts of the gene.

We provide an implementation of the proposed method in the tool *lyn2vec*, which produces Lyndon-based feature embeddings of sequencing reads.

1 Introduction

Massive data growth in the era of Big Data, has made data mining and data analytics [2] some of the fundamental technologies for discovering knowledge and interesting patterns



© 2022. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons “Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International”](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) license.

in data [3]. In particular, mining *sequence* data has attracted a lot of attention for two main reasons. First, sequential representation for data and events is common for many real-life applications. Second, knowing the useful patterns from sequences can benefit a number of applications, such as web access analysis, event prediction, pattern discovery, time-aware recommendation, DNA sequence detection [4], and *feature embedding* [5].

Feature embedding is a challenging task in sequence mining [6, 7, 8], whose goal is to provide a machine-interpretable representation for the sequence data that may increase performance of learning algorithms.

In the specific context of *biological sequences*, the main trend for feature embedding is based on the presumed existence of a conceptual analogy between the languages adopted by humans to communicate and the sophisticated languages used by biological organism to convey information within and between cells. Most of the approaches proposed in literature [9, 10], indeed, adopt existing methods in Natural Language Processing (NLP) such as `word2vec` [11] in attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the language of life, with the goal of discovering functions encoded within biological sequences [12, 13, 14, 15]. As well as the common techniques in Bioinformatics for analyzing sequences, also such methods involves fixed-length overlapping n-grams [16, 17, 18]. However, usually n-grams are not used directly in feature extraction, but for training an embedding model adopted for the feature extraction task. In addition to other limitations discussed in Section 2, we remark that most of the existing methods either limit themselves by extracting only short-term patterns or suffer from a significant increasing computation upon extracting the long-term patterns.

1.1 Contributions of this work

In this article, we focus on a novel approach for the feature embedding of sequencing reads. Unlike the works proposed in the literature which essentially consist of elaborate applications of NLP techniques, in this work we propose a theoretical investigation of combinatorial properties that would guarantee compact embedded representations of the sequences able to preserve similarities. In this section, we provide a discussion about the motivations; then we give an overall description of the proposed method, and finally we explain our main contributions.

Motivations. The main question addressed in this paper is whether there exists a “similarity signature” that can be: (i) easily detected while reading the sequence, and (ii) used to define an effective feature embedding method. We answer to this question by exploiting one of the most well-known factorization in combinatorics on words: the *Lyndon factorization* [19, 20]. Such a factorization has some main desired properties: (i) it is unique for a word, (ii) it can be computed in linear time, and more recently it has been proved in [1, 21] that (iii) a read shares a sequence of consecutive common Lyndon factors with the Lyndon factorization of a superstring of the read itself. The notion of Lyndon word is not novel in the field of Bioinformatics, since it was used to locate short motifs [22] and more recently it was explored in the development of bijective Burrows-Wheeler Transforms [23]. Surprisingly, in this paper we discover that the length

of factors in a Lyndon factorization of a read is enough to define a notion of signature that captures sequence similarity. We have defined such a sequence of lengths as the *fingerprint* of a read.

Proposed method. In this paper we propose a novel sequence feature embedding method which given a sequencing read uses the fingerprint of the read to produce embedded representations. To the best of our knowledge, it represents one of the first attempts to build feature embedded representations based on theoretical combinatorial properties proved to capture sequence similarities and also suitable for machine learning techniques.

Our contributions. The main contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We have implemented the proposed method in the tool `lyn2vec`, which produces Lyndon-based feature embeddings of sequencing reads.
2. Unlike NLP-based embedding methods, `lyn2vec` does not require any previous training on text corpus, but it is based on combinatorics on words properties to capture sequence similarities. In Section 3.1 and Section 4, we investigate properties of the embedded representations w.r.t. some parameters, such as the specific Lyndon factorization variant used to compute the fingerprint and the value of k used to extract the k -fingers from the computed fingerprint.
3. The computational complexity of `lyn2vec` is related to the complexity of the algorithms computing the Lyndon factorizations; as described in Section 3.1, such algorithms are linear in the length of the sequence, and so the complexity of the `lyn2vec` is linear in the total length of sequences.
4. We introduce the theoretical notion of collision rate to investigate limitations of the use of Lyndon-based representations and we address the problem of how the lexicographic ordering of the alphabet may affect the collision phenomenon.
5. As a proof of concept of the possible use of the proposed embedding representations in machine learning tasks, we have evaluated the effectiveness of such representations when used in the context of assigning RNA-Seq reads to the most likely gene from which they originated as fragments of gene transcripts. In classifying simulated reads belonging to 100 genes, we get high precision and recall and show that our method outperforms other existing embedding methods.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the main contributions in literature and the differences with our work. In Section 3 we present the properties of various notions of Lyndon-based factorization, including one inspired by the double-stranded nature of the genomic sequences. In Section 4, we propose some experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of the representations produced by `lyn2vec`. Finally, in Section 5 we discuss the results and some future work.

2 Related work

The past years have seen impressive advances in sequence mining. State-of-the-art sequence mining methods could be categorized as follows: (i) sequence alignment [24, 25, 26], (ii) string kernels [27, 28, 29], (iii) time-series classification [30, 31, 32, 33], and (iv) pattern discovery [34, 35, 36]. In the following we will focus on the feature embedding of *sequencing reads*.

Recent results in the NLP [11, 37] exploited the *word embedding* in the identification of terms with a similar linguistic context. In this approach, known as **word2vec**, words or phrases are mapped to vectors of real numbers in a low-dimensional space. By training a neural network over a large text corpus, words with similar linguistic context may be mapped close by in the Euclidean space.

In [9] the **word2vec** framework is applied to the feature extraction from biological sequences. The embeddings generated from their algorithm is named **BioVec** for general biological sequences and **ProtVec** for the specific case of proteins. Such representations may be utilized for several common bioinformatics tasks, such as protein-space analysis, protein family classification, and disordered proteins visualization and classification. **seq2vec** [10] extends the idea proposed in [9] by modeling a sequence as a sentence in a text corpus and the k -mers derived from such a sequence as words in the sentence, which are given as input to the embedding algorithm. In [38], authors propose a novel model for fast classification of DNA sequences, named **fastDNA**, produced by next-generation sequencing methods. It is based on **FastText** [39], which is an extension of **word2vec**, where the main difference is that instead of using individual words to train the Neural Network, words are broken into several n -grams. In [40], instead, another well known NLP model, the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT), is adapted to model DNA general embeddings. The result is **DNABERT**, a novel pre-trained bidirectional encoder representations for DNA-language.

The main differences between such sequence embedding methods and the one proposed in this paper, is that they essentially consist of elaborate applications of NLP techniques, in which an embedding model is first trained on a large text corpus, and then used to transform biological sequences in numeric vectors to be used by learning algorithms. Therefore, the increasing space and the computational effort required to embed a sequence dataset remain critical issues. Instead, in our approach we change the initial point of view: we investigate combinatorial properties that would guarantee compact embedding representations of the sequences able to preserve similarities. As a result, we define novel embedding representations which can be computed, for each sequence, in linear time respect to the length of the sequence itself, without requiring any previous training. Furthermore, the ability to capture similarities can be controlled by tuning some parameters, such as the specific factorization used.

3 Lyndon-based-factorizations and lyn2vec

In this section, we first present the notion of fingerprint and *Lyndon-based factorization* [19], a factorization of a string which is defined starting from the well-known Lyndon factorization denoted by CFL. The acronym CFL was used for the first time in [41], and built using the initial letters of the authors' surname of the *Lyndon factorization* (Chen, Fox, and Lyndon). Then, we provide details of lyn2vec.

3.1 Lyndon-based factorizations and overlapping strings

Basics. Let Σ be a finite alphabet and let $s = a_1 \cdots a_n$ be a *string* over Σ , i.e., a sequence of n characters of Σ ; the *length* n will be also denoted by $|s|$. The character of s at position i (that is, a_i) is denoted by $s[i]$. The *substring* (or *factor*) of s from position i to position j is denoted by $s[i : j]$. When $i = 1$ (resp. $j = |s|$) the factor is named *prefix* (resp. *suffix*) of s , denoted also by $s[: j]$ (resp. $s[i :]$). In addition, if $j \neq |s|$ (resp. $i \neq 1$), the prefix (resp. suffix) of s is *proper*.

In the following, Σ is supposed to be totally ordered w.r.t. the lexicographic order, denoted by $<$. We classically extend this notion on Σ^* , by defining $s \prec v$ (resp. $s \preceq v$) if s is a proper prefix (resp. s is a prefix of v) of v or $s = xay, v = xbz, a < b$. Symmetrically, $v \succ s$ (resp. $v \succeq s$) if $s \prec v$ (resp. $s \preceq v$) [42].

For two nonempty strings s, v , we write $s \ll v$ if $s \prec v$ and s is not a proper prefix of v [43].

Finally, due to the particular context considered for assessing the proposed embedding representations (Section 4), we must introduce the definition of *reverse and complement* of a string s over the DNA alphabet $\{A, C, G, T\}$, which is a typical notion in Bioinformatics originating from the double-stranded nature of the genomic DNA. Precisely, given s , then its reverse and complement is the equal length string \bar{s} , such that symbol $\bar{s}[i]$ is the complement of symbol $s[|s| - i + 1]$, where the *complement* of a symbol is the operation transforming a symbol A into a symbol T (or vice versa) and a symbol C into a symbol G (or vice versa).

Definitions. Now, we recall the notions of a *factorization* and introduce the notion of a *fingerprint*. These are the main ingredients we use to capture the overlap between two reads.

A *factorization* of a string s by a given factorization algorithm F , is a sequence $F(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ such that $s = f_1 f_2 \dots f_n$. We define the *fingerprint* of s with respect to $F(s)$ as the sequence $\mathcal{L}(s)$ of the lengths of the factors in $F(s)$, that is, $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle |f_1|, |f_2|, \dots, |f_n| \rangle$. Given a fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ and an integer k ($1 \leq k \leq n$) a *k-finger* is any subsequence $\langle l_i, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{i+k-1} \rangle$ of k consecutive lengths, that is, a *k-mer* of $\mathcal{L}(s)$. We say that $f_i f_{i+1} \dots f_{i+k-1}$ is the *supporting string* of the *k-finger*. Let S and F be a set of strings and a given factorization algorithm. Let L_S be the set of fingerprints obtained by applying F on each sequence $s \in S$. Let K be the set of *k-fingers* extracted from the fingerprints of L_S . We denote by S_k the supporting

strings of the k -fingers in K . Clearly, given a k -finger in K , we may have more than one string in S_k supporting it. This situation will be discussed in the following Section 3.2.

Example 3.1. *Let us consider the factorization $F(s) = \langle GC, ATC, ACCTCT, CT, ACAG, TAT, A \rangle$. Then, the fingerprint is $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle 2, 3, 5, 2, 4, 3, 1 \rangle$ and $\langle 2, 4, 3 \rangle$ is a k -finger for $k = 3$, whose supporting string is $CTACAGTAT$, given by the concatenation of the fourth, fifth and sixth factors CT , $ACAG$ and TAT .*

Fingerprints used for capturing overlaps are based on factorizations into *Lyndon Words* [44, 45]. A string s is a *Lyndon word* if and only if it is strictly smaller than any of its proper suffixes. For example, $s = aabbab$ over alphabet $\{a, b\}$, $a < b$, is a Lyndon word, whereas string $s' = abaabb$ is not a Lyndon word, since the suffix $aabb$ is smaller than s' . It is well known that any nonempty string s has a unique factorization $F(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ such that $f_1 \succeq f_2 \succeq \dots \succeq f_n$ and each factor f_i is a Lyndon word. Such a factorization is called the *Lyndon factorization* and is usually denoted by CFL [19, 20]. Given s , the Duval algorithm computes $\text{CFL}(s)$ in linear time and constant space [41].

Example 3.2. *Let us consider $s = bbababbaa$ and $s' = aaabbbabab$, with $a < b$. Then, $\text{CFL}(s) = \langle b, b, ababb, a, a \rangle$, whereas $\text{CFL}(s') = \langle aaabbbabab \rangle$, since no suffix is greater than s' and the prefix aaa of s' is smaller than each of its suffixes.*

Conservation property. We now report a crucial property of CFL [1]. To this aim, we need to recall the definition of *simple* substring given in [21]. A substring x occurring in a string s is *simple* with respect to a factorization $F(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ if, for each occurrence of x in s , there is an index j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) such that x is a substring of f_j . Informally, every occurrence of x needs to be within some factor f_j . This definition can be restricted to a *simple* prefix or suffix by requiring that x is substring of f_1 or f_n .

Let $w = xz$ and $w' = zy$ be two substrings of a string $s = xzy$, i.e., w and w' share a common overlap z in s and suppose that z is a non-simple w.r.t. $F(s)$. As a consequence of Lemma 13.2 in [1], the strings w, w' share common Lyndon substrings between $\text{CFL}(w)$ and $\text{CFL}(w')$ and with $\text{CFL}(s)$. More precisely, assume that $\text{CFL}(w) = \langle h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n \rangle$ and $\text{CFL}(w') = \langle g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \rangle$. If z is both a non-simple suffix of $F(w)$ and a non-simple prefix of $F(w')$, then there will exist two indexes i, j , with $1 \leq i < n$, $1 < j \leq m$, such that $z = h_i'' h_{i+1} \dots h_n = g_1 \dots g_{j-1} g_j'$, where h_i'' is a suffix of h_i and g_j' is a prefix of g_j . Given $\text{CFL}(h_i'') = \langle m_1, \dots, m_r \rangle$ and $\text{CFL}(g_j') = \langle v_1, \dots, v_t \rangle$, then, by the above mentioned result, we have $\text{CFL}(z) = \langle m_1, \dots, m_r, h_{i+1}, \dots, h_n \rangle = \langle g_1, \dots, g_{j-1}, v_1, \dots, v_t \rangle$.

We can reformulate the above result as a *Conservation property* as follows. Let s be a string such that $\text{CFL}(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ and let w, w' be substrings of s such that $w = xz$ and $w' = zy$ share a common overlap z , where $z = f_l' f_{l+1} \dots f_t f_{t+1}'$ for some indexes l, t with $1 < l, t < n$, and $f_l = f_l'' f_l'$, $f_{t+1} = f_{t+1}' f_{t+1}''$. The Conservation property states that $\text{CFL}(w)$ and $\text{CFL}(w')$ share the consecutive factors f_{l+1}, \dots, f_t , i.e., $\text{CFL}(w) = \langle \text{CFL}(x f_l'), f_{l+1}, \dots, f_t, \text{CFL}(f_{t+1}') \rangle$ and $\text{CFL}(w') = \langle \text{CFL}(f_l'), f_{l+1}, \dots, f_t, \text{CFL}(f_{t+1}' y) \rangle$. Similarly, $\mathcal{L}(w)$ and $\mathcal{L}(w')$ share the consecutive lengths $|f_{l+1}|, \dots, |f_t|$. It follows that two overlapping strings w and w' share consecutive common Lyndon factors in their Lyndon




Figure 1: An example of Conservation property for the words s such that $\text{CFL}(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{10} \rangle$ and z where $z = f'_4 f_5 f_6 f_7 f'_8$, f'_4 and f'_8 are a suffix and a prefix respectively of f_4 and f_8 . Then $\text{CFL}(z) = \langle \text{CFL}(f'_4), f_5, f_6, f_7, \text{CFL}(f'_8) \rangle$.

factorizations. Thus, the fingerprints of w and w' will share consecutive integers. Figure 1 illustrates the conservation property.

Such an interesting property suggests the possibility of using directly k -fingers as features. Indeed, as we will see in Section 4, to assess such an intuition, we also proposed an approach in which we used k -fingers for classifying sequencing reads.

Lyndon-based factorizations. To summarize, as a consequence of the above discussion, two main properties can be observed: (i) the fingerprint ability of preserving similarities, (ii) the possibility of tuning the k value to control the size of the overlapping substrings. The latter property suggests a further investigation on variants of the Lyndon factorization (that we call *Lyndon-based*) which could guarantee similar properties. Specifically, we introduce two types of Lyndon-based factorization: *single-stranded* factorization (for dealing with sequencing reads derived from a unique genome strand) and *double-stranded* factorization (for dealing with sequencing reads derived from both strands of a genome).

At this point, we recall the notion of *inverse Lyndon word* given in [42]: a string s is an Inverse Lyndon word if each proper suffix is strictly smaller than s . For instance, $a, b, aaaaa, bbba, baaab, bbaba$ are Inverse Lyndon words over $\{a, b\}$, with $a < b$.

A factorization $F(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ of a string s is an *Inverse Lyndon factorization* if f_j is an Inverse Lyndon word for $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $f_1 \ll f_2 \ll \dots \ll f_n$. Bonizzoni et al. [42] proposed a linear time algorithm to produce a special Inverse Lyndon factorization which is unique for the string, called *Canonical Inverse Lyndon factorization* or *Inverse CFL* (referred in the following by ICFL). Also ICFL (as well as CFL) both guarantees uniqueness and linear time computation. In addition, by definition of ICFL, a factor in ICFL cannot be a prefix of the next one, thus ICFL is less prone to split a string in two different factors. Interestingly, as proved in [42], ICFL allows to split any Lyndon word, thus allowing to further factorize long Lyndon factors of Lyndon factorizations (as well as CFL allows to split any inverse Lyndon word).

Example 3.3. Let us consider the sequences $s = bbababba$ and $s' = aaabbbabab$ used in Example 3.2. We have that $\text{ICFL}(s) = \langle s \rangle$, since s is an inverse Lyndon word, and $\text{ICFL}(s') = \langle aaa, bbbabab \rangle$.

For an extended discussion of the theoretical background of these factorizations, we

refer to [42] with particular attention to examples 4.7 and 7.2 for a comparison between CFL and ICFL.

We call CFL_ICFL the factorization obtained by applying first the CFL, and then the ICFL to factors longer than a given threshold T (a similar definition can be done for ICFL_CFL, by symmetry). In other words, given T and $\text{CFL}(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$, we obtain CFL_ICFL by replacing each f_i longer than T with $\text{ICFL}(f_i)$. The CFL_ICFL has several advantages over CFL or ICFL. Indeed, the ICFL factorization, applied on long factors of a CFL factorization, enriches the factorization (and the fingerprint) in terms of number of factors. A similar advantage is provided by ICFL_CFL and a discussion is given in paragraph *Factor length distribution in Lyndon-based factorizations* below. Examples below show applications of CFL_ICFL and ICFL_CFL.

Example 3.4. Let $a < b < c < d$ and $s'' = \text{dabadabdabdadac}$. We have that $\text{CFL}(s'') = \langle d, \text{abadabdabdadac} \rangle$ whereas $\text{ICFL}(s'') = \langle \text{daba}, \text{dabdab}, \text{dadac} \rangle$. Now, we can split the second factor of $\text{CFL}(s'')$ by applying ICFL on this factor, i.e., $\text{CFL_ICFL}(s'') = \langle d, \langle a, \text{ba}, \text{dabdab}, \text{dadac} \rangle \rangle$.

Example 3.5. Let $a < b < c < d$ and $s'' = \text{dabadabdabdadac}$. $s''' = \text{adbadbadb}$ and $\text{CFL}(s''') = \langle \text{adb}, \text{adb}, \text{adb}, a \rangle$ and $\text{ICFL}(s''') = \langle a, \text{dbadbadbadb} \rangle$. Finally, $\text{ICFL_CFL}(s''') = \langle a, \langle d, b, \text{adb}, \text{adb}, a \rangle \rangle$.

So, in Example 3.4, ICFL provides better results in terms of factor length distribution, whereas in Example 3.5, CFL is better than ICFL. Thus, in general, we cannot say which is the best factorization. However, we can only observe that while the Conservation property holds for CFL_ICFL (since ICFL splits again Lyndon factors), it is an open problem to formally prove the property for ICFL, which seems to hold also in this case, as suggested in the experiments.

Figure 2 below shows an example of CFL, ICFL and CFL_ICFL for two 125-long overlapping reads.

Double-stranded factorization. Due to the double-stranded nature of the genome, we are interested in signatures able to highlight the common regions between two overlapping reads originating from opposite strands. To this aim, given a Lyndon-based factorization F (see the previous Section 3.1), we introduce the definition of *double-stranded* factorization algorithm F^d built on the (basic) algorithm F , having the fundamental property stated by the following Theorem 1. The main idea is the following: given a sequence s , we would like a factorization such that the factorization of its reverse and complement \bar{s} is the reverse sequence of its reverse and complement factors. As we will see further in detail, this goal is reached by applying to s and \bar{s} a basic algorithm F and appropriately combining the two obtained fingerprints.

Theorem 1. Given a double-stranded factorization $F^d(s) = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \rangle$ of a string s , then the double-stranded factorization of the reverse and complement of s is $F^d(\bar{s}) = \langle \bar{f}_n, \bar{f}_{n-1}, \dots, \bar{f}_1 \rangle$, where \bar{f}_i is the reverse and complement of factor f_i .



Figure 2: CFL, ICFL and CFL_ICFL for a threshold $T = 10$ are depicted for two overlapping 125-long reads $s1$ and $s2$ (the overlap is highlighted in blue) together with their fingerprints. The common factors are underlined. The CFL produces the 3-finger $\langle 34, 19, 16 \rangle$, whereas there are no common factors for ICFL (observe the long factors at the end of each read). The CFL_ICFL-10, obtained by applying first CFL and then ICFL to factors longer than 10, yields 17 consecutive common factors between the reads, and a 17-finger in the fingerprints.

It follows that the fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ ($l_i = |f_i|$) is equal to the reverse of the fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s}) = \langle l'_1, l'_2, \dots, l'_n \rangle$ ($l'_i = |f_{n-i+1}|$). In particular, given a k -finger $\langle l_i, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{i+k-1} \rangle$ of $\mathcal{L}(s)$, we refer to the k -finger $\langle l_{n-i+1}, l_{n-i}, \dots, l_{n-i-k+2} \rangle$ of $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$ as its *counterpart*, since they are clearly supported by the same string except for a reverse and complement operation. Note that any k -finger of $\mathcal{L}(s)$ is the reverse of its counterpart on $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$. For this reason, in order to detect the common regions among a set of reads originating from both strands of the genome, it is necessary to perform the following operation on the k -fingers: given a k -finger, we need to consider the lexicographically smallest sequence of integers between the k -finger and its reverse version, assuming that the k -finger is a sequence over the alphabet of the positive integers. For example, the k -finger $\langle 4, 3, 7, 8, 5 \rangle$ outputs $\langle 4, 3, 7, 8, 5 \rangle$ itself, whereas the k -finger $\langle 5, 10, 7, 8, 5 \rangle$ outputs the reverse $\langle 5, 8, 7, 10, 5 \rangle$.

In the following we will provide the details about the construction of the double-stranded factorization for a string s (given a basic factorization algorithm F) and next we will prove Theorem 1. In order to do so, we firstly introduce the notion of *interval-sequence* of a fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ as the sequence $\mathcal{I}(s) = \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle$ such that $i_j = l_1 + \dots + l_j$ (ending position on string s of factor f_j). Moreover, given a fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s)$, we call *reversed interval-sequence* $\mathcal{I}^r(s)$ the interval-sequence of the reverse of $\mathcal{L}(s)$. For example, given $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle 1, 1, 7, 6 \rangle$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = \langle 1, 2, 9, 15 \rangle$ is the interval-sequence and $\mathcal{I}^r(s) = \langle 6, 13, 14, 15 \rangle$ is the reversed interval-sequence. Note that more in general the interval-sequence can be defined with respect to any sequence $\langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ of positive integers.

In the following we say that a strictly increasing sequence $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle$ of positive integers *induces* the sequence $\langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$, where $l_1 = i_1$ and $l_j = i_j - i_{j-1}$ for $1 < j \leq n$. In turn, this sequence $\langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ is the fingerprint that *induces* on s the factorization $\langle s[:i_1], s[i_1:i_2], \dots, s[i_{n-1}:] \rangle$.

At this point, given a (basic) factorization algorithm F , the double-stranded factorization F^d is defined as follows.

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{L}(s)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$ be the fingerprints for a string s and its reverse and complement \bar{s} (respectively) obtained by applying F . Let $\mathcal{I}(s)$ be the interval-sequence of $\mathcal{L}(s)$ and let $\mathcal{I}^r(\bar{s})$ be the reversed interval-sequence of $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$. The double-stranded factorization $F^d(s)$ for s is the factorization induced by the fingerprint induced by the increasing sequence obtained by merging $\mathcal{I}(s)$ and $\mathcal{I}^r(\bar{s})$.

Example 3.6. Let $s = GGATCTCGCAGGCGG$ be a string and $\bar{s} = CCGCCTGCGAGATCC$ be its reverse and complement. By considering CFL as basic factorization algorithm, we have $\text{CFL}(s) = \langle G, G, ATCTCGC, AGGCGG \rangle$ and $\text{CFL}(\bar{s}) = \langle CCGCCTGCG, AGATCC \rangle$. The fingerprint and the interval-sequence for s are $\langle 1, 1, 7, 6 \rangle$ and $\langle 1, 2, 9, 15 \rangle$ respectively, whereas the fingerprint and the reversed interval-sequence for \bar{s} are $\langle 9, 6 \rangle$ and $\langle 6, 15 \rangle$, respectively. The increasing sequence $\langle 1, 2, 6, 9, 15 \rangle$, obtained by merging $\langle 1, 2, 9, 15 \rangle$ and $\langle 9, 6 \rangle$, induces the sequence $\langle 1, 1, 4, 3, 6 \rangle$, which in turn induces the double-stranded factorization $\text{CFL}^d(s) = \langle G, G, ATCT, CGC, AGGCGG \rangle$. The double-stranded fingerprint of s will be $\langle 1, 1, 4, 3, 6 \rangle$.

Vice versa, the fingerprint and the interval-sequence for \bar{s} are $\langle 9, 6 \rangle$ and $\langle 9, 15 \rangle$, while the fingerprint and the reversed interval-sequence for s are $\langle 1, 1, 7, 6 \rangle$ and $\langle 6, 13, 14, 15 \rangle$. The increasing sequence $\langle 6, 9, 13, 14, 15 \rangle$, obtained by merging $\langle 9, 15 \rangle$ and $\langle 6, 13, 14, 15 \rangle$, induces on \bar{s} the sequence $\langle 6, 3, 4, 1, 1 \rangle$, which in turn induces on \bar{s} the double-stranded factorization $\text{CFL}^d(\bar{s}) = \langle CCGCCT, GCG, AGAT, C, C \rangle$. The double-stranded fingerprint of \bar{s} is $\langle 6, 3, 4, 1, 1 \rangle$.

The previous example gives an intuition of the proof of Theorem 1. $\text{CFL}^d(s)$ and $\text{CFL}^d(\bar{s})$ have both five factors and the i -th factor of $\text{CFL}^d(s)$ is the reverse and complement of the of the $(5 - i + 1)$ -th factor of $\text{CFL}^d(\bar{s})$. For example, the fourth factor CGC of $\text{CFL}^d(s)$ is the reverse and complement of the "symmetrical" second factor GCG of $\text{CFL}^d(\bar{s})$. As a consequence, observe that the fingerprint $\langle 1, 1, 4, 3, 6 \rangle$ of s is the reverse of fingerprint $\langle 6, 3, 4, 1, 1 \rangle$ of \bar{s} . The trivial k -finger $\langle 1, 4 \rangle$ of s supported by string $GATCT$

has its counterpart in the k -finger $\langle 4, 1 \rangle$ of \bar{s} supported by string *AGATC* and they are manifestly in a reverse and complement relation.

In order to prove Theorem 1, we need two technical lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1 = \langle l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n \rangle$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \langle l'_1, l'_2, \dots, l'_n \rangle$, be two sequences with the same number n of positive integers. Let $\mathcal{I}_1 = \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \langle i'_1, i'_2, \dots, i'_n \rangle$ be the respective interval-sequences. Then, \mathcal{L}_1 is equal to the reverse of \mathcal{L}_2 iff $i_j = i'_n - i'_{n-j}$, for $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$.*

Proof. The j -th element in \mathcal{L}_1 is $l_j = i_j - i_{j-1}$, by definition. If $i_j = i'_n - i'_{n-j}$, then $i_{j-1} = i'_n - i'_{n-j+1}$. Therefore,

$$l_j = i_j - i_{j-1} = i'_n - i'_{n-j} - i'_n + i'_{n-j+1} = i'_{n-j+1} - i'_{n-j}$$

which is, by definition, the $(n - j + 1)$ -th element of \mathcal{L}_2 . □

We denote by $\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$ the sequence *induced* by the increasing sequence obtained by merging the interval-sequences of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . It is not difficult to use Lemma 2 and prove that such *induced* sequence is equal to the reverse of the sequence induced by merging the interval-sequences of the reverse of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . Then, denoting by \mathcal{L}_1^r and \mathcal{L}_2^r the reverse of the sequences, the following Lemma can be stated.

Lemma 3. *Given two sequences \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 with the same number n of elements, then $\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$ is equal to the reverse of $\mathcal{L}_1^r \oplus \mathcal{L}_2^r$.*

Now, Theorem 1 can be proved as a consequence of Lemmas 2 and 3. By definition, the double-stranded factorization $F^d(s)$ is *induced* by the fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\bar{s})^r$ where $\mathcal{L}(s)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$ are the fingerprints of s and its reverse and complement \bar{s} (respectively) obtained by applying algorithm F . Similarly, $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s}) \oplus \mathcal{L}(s)^r$ is the fingerprint inducing $F^d(\bar{s})$. By Lemma 3, we have that $\mathcal{L}(s) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\bar{s})^r$ (fingerprint of s) is equal to the reverse of $\mathcal{L}(s)^r \oplus (\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})^r)^r$. Since $(\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})^r)^r$ is $\mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$, then $\mathcal{L}(s) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\bar{s})^r$ is the reverse of $\mathcal{L}(s)^r \oplus \mathcal{L}(\bar{s})$ (fingerprint of \bar{s}) and Theorem 1 is proved.

Computational complexity of Lyndon-based factorization algorithms. The computational complexity of the algorithms to compute the Lyndon-based factorizations plays a crucial role in the realization of `lyn2vec`. As explained above, CFL and ICFL can be computed in linear time and constant space. Let us consider CFL_ICFL for simplicity (the algorithm for CFL_ICFL^d will be pretty similar). Then We are able to compute them in linear time. The idea is to use a main process for computing the CFL factorization of the input read, and, as the CFL factors are computed, a new (parallel) process applies ICFL on each of them. In conclusion, the factorization can be computed in linear time.

Factor length distribution in Lyndon-based factorizations and conservation property.

The conservation property allows to capture the similarity between two strings. However, in the degenerate case of factorizations consisting of singleton factors, the conservation property does not apply. Moreover, the property has been proved for CFL and its extension




Figure 3: Distribution of the number of factors. The factorization algorithms are listed in the legend by decreasing peak.

to CFL_ICFL and CFL_ICFL^d is a trivial consequence of the fact that we factorize the long CFL factors obtained in the common substrings of two strings. We currently do not have a proof that the conservation property holds for ICFL, but the high accuracy of experimental results suggest the validity of this conjecture. Undoubtedly, the number of factors in a factorization affects the possibility of detecting common regions of two substrings: the higher the number of factors is, the more likely the detection of the common regions will be.

An experimental analysis has been performed to investigate the distribution of the number of factors for the Lyndon-based factorizations computed on a simulated error-free dataset. The dataset was simulated by using `dwgsim` [46] and includes 21 million 150-long reads extracted from the region 960,000-80,960,000 of the human Chromosome 1, for a total of 80 million bases.

Figure 3 shows, for each factorization algorithm, the distribution of the number of factors per read. Note that CFL_ICFL^d produces about twice as much factors than any other factorization, whereas CFL, ICFL, and ICFL^d produce a small number of factors with a low variance in the distribution.

In general it is worth observing that the question on how many factors are present in a Lyndon factorization has been recently faced in [47].

3.2 Uniqueness of the fingerprint and k-fingers: the collision phenomenon

The properties discussed above play an important role in `lyn2vec`'s effectiveness, since they allow us to state that our representation method can capture higher orders of similarities without significant increase in the computation.

In this section, we face the following problem: given a sequence, the corresponding representation produced by its fingerprint or by its k-fingers is *unique*? As we will see, such a property is closely related to the *collision phenomenon*.

Collision definition. We recall that one of our main aim is to use k -fingers for capturing the similarity of two sequences. As already said, we must pay attention to the fact that distinct strings may have have common k -fingers as shown in the example below.

Example 3.7. Let us consider $x = CCGGTT$ and $y = AACCGG$. Then $\text{ICFL}(x) = \langle CC, GG, TT \rangle$ and $\text{ICFL}(y) = \langle AA, CC, GG \rangle$. Thus, $\mathcal{L}(x) = \langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{L}(y) = \langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle$. Now, if we set $k = 3$, we obviously have that $\langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle$ is a k -finger which is supported by x and by y .

The example above describes the collision phenomenon when we use Lyndon-based factorizations. We can define the k -finger collision in our context as follows.

Definition 2 (k -finger collision). Let $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ be two strings and let F be a Lyndon-based factorization. Let $\mathcal{L}(x)$ and $\mathcal{L}(y)$ be the fingerprints for x and y with respect to F , respectively. Let \mathcal{K}_x be a k -finger of $\mathcal{L}(x)$ and \mathcal{K}_y be a k -finger of $\mathcal{L}(y)$. Let $s_{\mathcal{K}_x}$ and $s_{\mathcal{K}_y}$ be two factors of x and y supporting \mathcal{K}_x and \mathcal{K}_y , respectively. If $\mathcal{K}_x = \mathcal{K}_y$ and $s_{\mathcal{K}_x} \neq s_{\mathcal{K}_y}$, then we say that there exists a collision between $s_{\mathcal{K}_x}$ e $s_{\mathcal{K}_y}$ (w.r.t. the same k -finger \mathcal{K}_x).

Let w be a sequence of length s and let Σ_s be the alphabet of the lengths of a fingerprint of w . Clearly, a k -finger of w is a k -mer over the alphabet Σ_s . The collision phenomenon can be studied by exploiting results already obtained in literature in the case of k -mers [48, 49]. Observe that, the length of the fingerprints can vary for each read considered, and so, to extend those results to our case we will indicate with s the *mean length* of a generic set of reads considered.

Collision measure. Given a dataset S of sequences, a Lyndon-based factorization, and a value for k , the next question is: "How can we measure the collisions?".

A naive counting method could be the following: for each k -finger \mathcal{K}_x , consider all the sequences in $S_{\mathcal{K}_x}$ that support \mathcal{K}_x , and define $\text{count}(s_{\mathcal{K}_x})$ the number of occurrences of the string $s_{\mathcal{K}_x} \in S_{\mathcal{K}_x}$ as supporting sequence of \mathcal{K}_x . We denote all the different pairs of such supporting strings by $c_{\mathcal{K}_x} = \prod_{s_{\mathcal{K}_x} \in S_{\mathcal{K}_x}} \text{count}(s_{\mathcal{K}_x})$. Loosely speaking, $c_{\mathcal{K}_x}$ represents the effective number of possible collisions with respect to \mathcal{K}_x . Finally, let \mathcal{K} be the set of different k -fingers generated, the total number of collisions which can occur is $\sum_{\mathcal{K}_x \in \mathcal{K}} c_{\mathcal{K}_x}$. The reference to \mathcal{K}_x is dropped if it is clear from the context.

Example 3.8. Let $\alpha = \langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle$ be a k -finger. Let $s_1 = AACCGG$, $s_2 = AACCTT$ and $s_3 = CCGGTT$ be the different corresponding sequences in S with $\text{count}(s_1) = 3$,

$\text{count}(s_2) = 4$ and $\text{count}(s_3) = 5$. Then the number of collisions with respect to the k -finger \mathcal{K}_x is $c_{\mathcal{K}_x} = \text{count}(s_1) \times \text{count}(s_2) \times \text{count}(s_3) = 3 \times 4 \times 5 = 60$.

When used on large datasets, such a method presents several obvious disadvantages. First, the numbers generated can be huge and the time required to calculate them can be too much expensive. Second, such calculated numbers do not give any statistical information which can then be used for comparisons.

Thus, we need of a novel metric to measure the phenomenon defined above. Here we propose a novel metric, named *collision rate*.

Definition 3 (*Collision rate*). Let S be a set of sequences, F be a factorization, L_S be the set of fingerprints obtained by applying F on each string in S . Let K be the set of distinct k -fingers extracted from L_S , and S_K be the set of distinct sequences supporting the k -fingers in K . Then, the collision rate is $c_r = \frac{|S_K|}{|K|}$.

Example 3.9. Let $K = \{\langle 2, 2, 2 \rangle\}$ be the set of distinct k -fingers extracted, and let $S_K = \{AACCGG, AACCTT, CCGGTT\}$ be the set of distinct subsequences corresponding to the k -fingers in K . Then, the collision rate is $c_r = \frac{|S_K|}{|K|} = \frac{3}{1} = 3$.

“What does this metric express?”. Intuitively, the collision rate represents the average number of distinct sequences corresponding to the same k -finger. Let us observe, that such a metric is obviously related to the collision phenomenon. In fact, in the best case $|K| = |S_K|$ and so $c_r = 1$, i.e., for each k -finger there exists a single corresponding sequence, thus no collision can occur. As the size of S_K increases, then also the number of possible sequences corresponding to each k -finger increases and therefore the probability of collision also increases. In the next paragraph, we prove some theoretical properties regarding the causes of the collisions. Then, we investigate if the order of the characters in the alphabet may intervene in this problem. It is worth of note that in general, the questions of finding an optimal alphabet ordering for Lyndon factorization (i.e., such that number of Lyndon factors is at most, or at least, n , for a given number n) is hard ([47]).

Collision-free perspectives: the superfingerprint. For a string s , $\text{alph}(s)$ denotes the set of symbols in s . In the following we denote by $\Sigma = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ a finite alphabet and (a_1, \dots, a_n) the totally ordered alphabet $(\Sigma, <)$, where $<$ is defined by $a_i < a_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. In other words, $<$ is such that (a_1, \dots, a_n) is a sorted list in increasing order.

In what follows, Π_Σ stands for the set of all totally ordered alphabets defined by the possible orderings of the symbols in Σ . For each $p \in \Pi_\Sigma$, we write $<_p$ to denote the lexicographic order induced by p . Moreover, if $L \in \{\text{CFL}, \text{ICFL}\}$, then L_p will be referred to $<_p$. When $p = (A, C, G, T)$, we denote by $\bar{p} = (T, G, C, A)$ the inverse ordering of p .

Example 3.10. Let $\Sigma = \{A, C, G, T\}$, $x = CAG$ and $y = ACG$. Let $p, p' \in \Pi_\Sigma$, where $p = (A, C, G, T)$, $p' = (C, A, G, T)$. We have $y <_p x$ and $x <_{p'} y$.

Example 3.11. Let $\Sigma = \{A, C, G, T\}$ and $x = CAACAC$. Let $p, p' \in \Pi_\Sigma$, where $p = (A, C, G, T)$, $p' = (C, A, G, T)$. Then $\text{ICFL}_p(x) = \langle CAA, CAC \rangle$, while $\text{ICFL}_{p'}(x) = \langle C, AACAC \rangle$.

The position of even a few symbols in the order of the used alphabet may have a significant impact on the Lyndon-based factorizations. Under some conditions, even just by changing the relative position of two symbols, some words that were Lyndon words before the change may no longer be (see Proposition 1), thus leading to a change in the whole factorization.

The following proposition shows that given two words having distinct alphabet, then they have distinct Lyndon-based factorizations under permutations of the alphabet.

Proposition 1. *Let Σ be a finite alphabet. Let $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ be such that $\text{alph}(x) \neq \text{alph}(y)$ and $|x| = |y| > 1$. For any $p \in \Pi_\Sigma$ there exists $p' \in \Pi_\Sigma$ such that only one of the orderings of $\text{alph}(x)$ and of $\text{alph}(y)$ is changed in p' . Moreover, if x and y are both Lyndon (resp. inverse Lyndon) words with respect to $<_p$, then only one of x and y is a Lyndon (resp. inverse Lyndon) word with respect to $<_{p'}$.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ be such that $\text{alph}(x) \neq \text{alph}(y)$ and $|x| = |y| > 1$. Set

$$x = a_1 \cdots a_n, \quad y = a'_1 \cdots a'_n$$

Since $\text{alph}(x) \neq \text{alph}(y)$, one of the following two cases can occur (the other cases are symmetric)

- (1) $a'_1 \notin \text{alph}(x)$.
- (2) There exists i , $1 < i \leq n$, such that $a'_i \notin \text{alph}(x)$.

Assume that case (1) holds. For any $p \in \Pi_\Sigma$, let $p' \in \Pi_\Sigma$ be such that $a < a'_1$, for any $a \in \Sigma \setminus \{a'_1\}$, whereas the order on the other symbols remains unchanged. In particular, the ordering of $\text{alph}(x)$ is not changed in p' . Assume that x and y are both Lyndon words with respect to $<_p$. Since y is a Lyndon word and $|y| > 1$, there exists $a'_j \in \text{alph}(y)$ with $a'_j \neq a'_1$. Thus $y = a'_1 \cdots a'_n >_{p'} a'_j \cdots a'_n$ and y is not a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$. On the contrary, since the ordering of $\text{alph}(x)$ is not changed in p' , x is still a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$.

Assume that case (2) holds. For any $p \in \Pi_\Sigma$, let $p' \in \Pi_\Sigma$ be such that $a'_i < a$, for any $a \in \Sigma \setminus \{a'_i\}$, whereas the order on the other symbols remains unchanged. In particular, the ordering of $\text{alph}(x)$ is not changed in p' . Assume that x and y are both Lyndon words with respect to $<_p$. Thus $y = a'_1 \cdots a'_n >_{p'} a'_i \cdots a'_n$ and y is not a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$. On the contrary, the ordering of $\text{alph}(x)$ is not changed in p' , hence x is still a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$. \square

Example 3.12. *Let $\Sigma = \{A, C, G, T\}$. The words $x = ACG$ and $y = ACT$ are both Lyndon words with respect to $p = (A, C, G, T)$. Let $p' = (T, A, C, G)$ as in the proof of Proposition 1. We see that the ordering of $\text{alph}(x)$ is not changed in p' , hence x is still a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$. On the contrary, y is not a Lyndon word with respect to $<_{p'}$ because $y \succ T$.*

The properties described above show that the choice of a specific ordering of the initial alphabet can have a significant impact on the collision phenomenon. However, the

problem of understanding which particular order minimizes this phenomenon remains open, and as explained in Section 5, future investigations will be devoted to it. However, in this work we have carried out experiments by combining the regular ordering with the inverse ordering to verify the impact it could have the combined use of different orderings. As we will see in Section 4, results suggest that, from a practical point of view, the addition within the representation of a sequence of information coming from the application of the factorization with respect to the inverse alphabet, reduces the probability of collisions. Thus, we extend the notion of fingerprint by defining the superfingerprint, which concatenates the fingerprint of the sequence with respect to the lexicographic ordering (A, C, G, T) , and the fingerprint of the sequence with respect to the inverse ordering (T, G, C, A) .

Definition 4 (Superfingerprint). *Let $\Sigma = \{A, C, G, T\}$ be an alphabet and $p = (A, C, G, T)$. Let x be a sequence on Σ and F be a Lyndon-based factorization. Then, the superfingerprint of x is $\langle \mathcal{L}_p(x), \$, \mathcal{L}_{\bar{p}}(x) \rangle$, where $\mathcal{L}_p(x)$ is the fingerprint of $F(x)$ obtained by considering the ordering p when applying F , $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{p}}(x)$ is the fingerprint obtained by considering the ordering \bar{p} when applying F and the symbol $\$$ is not in Σ .*

3.3 lyn2vec: a tool for Lyndon-based sequence embedding

We have implemented `lyn2vec`, a novel tool for providing sequencing read embeddings based on *Lyndon-based factorizations*. `lyn2vec` takes as input a file in FASTA or FASTQ format and, for each input read s , executes a Lyndon-based factorization algorithm (specified as input) for computing a numerical vector that can be used as a representation of s . Specifically, `lyn2vec` produces the following representations for s :

- the fingerprint of s
- the sequence of the k -fingers extracted from the fingerprint of s (for a fixed value of k specified as input parameter)
- the sequence of the k -fingers extracted from the superfingerprint (see Definition 4) of s , discarding the k -fingers containing the symbol $\$$

As an example, let us consider $s = GCATCACCGCTCTACAG$. By using the factorization algorithm CFL_ICFL with $T = 30$ and $k = 3$, the factorization and the fingerprint of s will be $\text{CFL_ICFL}(s) = \langle G, C, ATC, ACCGCTCT, ACAG \rangle$ and $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle 1, 1, 3, 8, 4 \rangle$, respectively.

Observe that $\text{CFL_ICFL}'(s) = \langle G, CA, TCACCGC, TCTACAG \rangle$ is the factorization of s w.r.t. the inverse alphabet $\bar{\Sigma} = \langle T, G, C, A \rangle$ and the superfingerprint of s will be given by concatenating the fingerprint $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle 1, 1, 3, 8, 4 \rangle$ with the fingerprint $\langle 1, 2, 7, 7 \rangle$ obtained from $\text{CFL_ICFL}'(s)$ and interposing a symbol $\$$. In other words, the superfingerprint of s is $\mathcal{S}(s) = \langle 1, 1, 3, 8, 4, \$, 1, 2, 7, 7 \rangle$. By assuming $k = 3$, `lyn2vec` will output one of the following three representations for such sequence:

- the *fingerprint* $\mathcal{L}(s) = \langle 1, 1, 3, 8, 4 \rangle$ from $\text{CFL_ICFL}(s)$

- the sequence $\langle\langle 1, 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3, 8 \rangle, \langle 3, 8, 4 \rangle\rangle$ of the k -fingers extracted from $\mathcal{L}(s)$
- the sequence $\langle\langle 1, 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3, 8 \rangle, \langle 3, 8, 4 \rangle, \langle 1, 2, 7 \rangle, \langle 2, 7, 7 \rangle\rangle$ of the k -fingers extracted from $\mathcal{S}(s)$

`lyn2vec` is written in Python by using the library *Scikit-learn*¹. The source code and all the files used and produced during the evaluation study are available online².

4 Experiments

In this section, we provide details of the experiments carried out to assess the effectiveness of `lyn2vec`, i.e., its capability to provide suitable numerical representations for biological sequences that can be effectively learned by for machine learning models. To this aim, as a preliminary study we have selected a typical classification problem in Bioinformatics, referred as *read-gene classification* problem. We can state the problem as follows: given a sample of RNA-Seq reads, assign each read to a putative origin gene. Indeed, a RNA-Seq read is a transcript fragment obtained by Next-Generation Sequencing. From a computational point of view, a read is a sequence over the alphabet $\{A, C, G, T\}$ and is a substring of a transcript (messenger RNA, mRNA). A gene is a genomic *locus* (a piece of the genomic DNA of an organism) expressing transcripts. Hence, the origin gene of a RNA-Seq read is the gene expressing the transcript which the read has been sequenced from. The goal of our experiments is to test the capability (in a machine learning context) of the embedding representations produced by `lyn2vec` to highlight common regions between reads and gene transcripts in order to assign each read to an origin gene. Precisely, the idea is to train a machine learning model to learn the mapping between the read representations and the transcripts (and ultimately to the genes) and use such trained model in order to perform such mapping to be used for classifying the reads.

We remark that the application of Lyndon-based features for the specific case of RNA-Seq data is a proof of concept of the possible use of the proposed representations in dealing with the comparison of sequenced reads w.r.t. others embeddings proposed in literature. The motivation for assigning RNA-Seq data to an origin gene derives by the fact that we want to evaluate the quality of the embeddings in representing nucleotide sequences even in situation where typically the quantification of reads per transcript could make the task difficult for machine learning based representations.

We assume the reader is familiar with the basic notions of machine learning. However, for further details we refer to [50].

Tasks. We remark that, as described in Section 3.3, `lyn2vec` is able to provide three types of representation for a read. As a consequence, we have faced the read-gene classification problem in three different ways, that is, considering each time one of the three representations provided by `lyn2vec`.

¹<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>

²<https://github.com/rzaccagnino/lyn2vec>

To this, we have organized our experiments into three groups (we call *tasks*), each one assessing one of the read representations produced by `lyn2vec`, and corresponding to a specific question:

- T1.** *“How effective is the fingerprint produced by `lyn2vec` as read representation in the read-gene classification problem?”*
- T2.** *“How effective is the sequence of k -fingers extracted from the fingerprint produced by `lyn2vec` as read representation in the read-gene classification problem?”*
- T3.** *“How effective is the sequence of k -fingers extracted from the superfingerprint produced by `lyn2vec` as read representation in the read-gene classification problem?”*

As we will see, the use of a specific representation in each task will affect the way in which the read-gene classification problem will be solved.

Regarding T1, each machine learning model will directly use the fingerprints of the reads as *feature vectors* (each fingerprint will correspond to one feature vector) on which to be trained. We remark that, in a classification problem, the feature vector represents the list of features of an object considered important for training a model to classify the object itself.

Regarding T2 (resp. T3), we will solve the read-gene classification problem in two steps: *(i)* first, each machine learning model will be trained to assign each k -finger extracted from the fingerprint (resp. superfingerprint) of a read to a gene (each k -finger will correspond to one feature vector), and *(ii)* then, we will define a special classifier (see Section 4.2) which, given the sequence of k -fingers extracted from the fingerprint (resp. superfingerprint) of a read, will use the result of the classification of these k -fingers for assigning the read to a gene.

As it will be seen further, the fingerprint representation can work very well in case of error-free data, while the performance degrade in presence of sequencing errors. In response, the k -finger-based representation (extracted from the fingerprints) is shown to be more robust to the presence of such errors. Finally, we have empirically proved the usage of the k -finger-based representation (extracted from the superfingerprints) enable to reduce the collision phenomenon and to improve performances (see Section 4.3; we remark that the problem of the choice of best order of the alphabet on a theoretical point of view remains currently open).

Data setting. We have used the annotation of the human 6040 genes of chromosomes 1, 17 and 21 (`havana` and `ensembl_havana`) and randomly selected 100 genes out of them in order to obtain a small set of genes for assessing the effectiveness of our embedding representation. For each one of those genes we have considered all their transcripts, for a total of 17,314 sequences (4 transcripts per gene on average). Then, from each transcript we have extracted all the 100-mers, thus obtaining a total of 797,407 100-long substrings used as input error-free *reads* to be used for our experiments. A *read* clearly belongs to one of the considered 100 classes (one class for each gene).

Basic methodology. We have performed the following steps:

1. *Feature Extraction.* This step produces the datasets of feature vectors (samples) to train the machine learning models in our experiments (a dataset is related to an experiment).

More in detail, a total of 10 factorization algorithms have been considered: the four algorithms CFL, ICFL, CFL^d and ICFL^d plus the two algorithms CFL_ICFL and CFL_ICFL^d applied for the three values {10, 20, 30} of the parameter T . For each algorithm we have computed (by using `lyn2vec`) the fingerprint and superfingerprint of each input read, thus obtaining 10 datasets of fingerprints (*i.e.*, the 10 experiments of task T1 where the feature vectors are fingerprints) and 10 datasets of superfingerprints (*i.e.*, used for the experiments of task T3 where the feature vectors are the k -fingers extracted from the superfingerprints).

Then, from each one of the 10 fingerprint (resp. superfingerprint) datasets we have extracted the k -fingers for k from 3 to 8 (six values), thus obtaining a total of 60 datasets of k -fingers, *i.e.*, the 60 experiments of task T2 (resp. task T3) where the feature vectors are k -fingers. We point out that the considered feature vectors are clearly composed of a variable number of elements (integers); consequently, since the length of the feature vectors in a given dataset must be constant, each feature vector must be padded with trailing values equal to -1 in order to reach the maximum length inside the dataset itself. This observation is also valid for k -fingers even though they have constant length by definition. Indeed, a read fingerprint might be shorter than k and such fingerprint is padded in order to extract one only k -finger.

2. *Dataset Labeling.* Each feature vector (fingerprint, k -finger from fingerprint or superfingerprint), in each one of the datasets obtained in the previous step, has been labeled in order to link it to its origin class (that is, to its origin gene).
3. *Learning.* We have considered the following machine learning models: *Random Forest* (RF), *Logistic Regression* (LR), and *Multinomial Naive Bayes* (MNB). Each model has been trained on each one of the labeled datasets previously constructed. First, we have normalized the data by using the *MinMaxScaler* technique. The normalization is used to set the values of the features in a fixed range (usually $[0, 1]$), usually providing better results with respect to the case in which features have values in different ranges. Then, the dataset has been split into a *Training Set* (80% of the samples), and a *Testing Set* (20% of the samples) using *Stratification*³, which guarantees that in both sets all the considered 100 classes (genes) are represented maintaining the same proportions of the dataset. We remark that both stratification and normalization are two well-known techniques in machine learning. Then, to validate the classifiers and obtain the best hyper-parameters for each of them, we have performed a 5-fold cross-validation by using the *GridSearchCV* method.

³The stratification has been performed by using the method `train_test_split` of *Scikit-learn* Python library.

4. *Evaluation.* The goal of this step is assess the *generalization* capability of the trained models, i.e., the capability to reach high performance on unseen samples. To this aim, the trained models have been applied for classifying the elements of the *Testing Set* using the best parameters found in the previous step.
5. *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads.* The goal of the Testing step described above was to assess the generalization capability of the chosen machine learning models on the Testing set (20% of the samples). In this step, instead, the goal is to use best trained model obtained previously for classifying a set of reads originating from the 100 gene of the data setting. To this aim, we have produced a set of 285,628 RNA-Seq reads simulated from the panel of 100 genes by means of Flux Simulator [51]. More in detail, 10 million 100-long reads were simulated with Flux Simulator for different expression levels from the 17,314 transcripts of the human genes of chromosomes 1, 17, and 21. The reads were simulated with default parameters, the default Illumina error model and disabling the generation of Poly-A tails. Then, only the 285,628 reads related to our panel of 100 genes were retained and used in this step. The origin gene (class) of each read is clearly known. We point out that the set of obtained reads is unbalanced. Indeed, 142,266 reads were simulated from gene ENSG00000132517 (the most expressed in the dataset), whereas only 2 reads were simulated from gene ENSG00000116205 (the least expressed in the dataset). Observe that, since fingerprints represent entire reads, then the class of a read is trivially the class of its fingerprint. On the other hand, when a read is represented by the set of its k -fingers, then its class must be inferred from the classes of its k -fingers. In Section 4.2 a rule-based classifier to this aim is presented.

Performance scores. Due to the multi-class nature of the considered problem, we will report the performance of the chosen machine learning models obtained both in *Evaluation* and in *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads* steps (described above) experiments not only in terms of *accuracy*, but also of *precision*, *recall* and *F-score*. Such metrics are originally defined for binary classification problems, where only two classes are taken into account, the positive one and the negative one, and they are given by, respectively, $\frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$, $\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$, $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$ and $2 \cdot \frac{\text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}$. In particular, accuracy measures the correct portion of correctly predicted samples, the precision indicates how many instances classified in a class actually belongs to such a class, and the recall gives the amount of samples of a given class which are correctly assigned to that class. Finally, the F-score is the harmonic mean between precision and recall, so that it can be used as a useful summary metric. In the case of multi-class classification problems, the global performance of a classifier can be obtained by first averaging the metrics calculated for each single class, and then considering the arithmetic or weighted mean. In this work, due to the unbalanced datasets obtained during the experiments, we will use the averaged values of these metrics weighted for the number of actual samples belonging to each class.

We remark that, in order to evaluate the generalization capability of the trained machine learning models, we will report the results obtained, in terms of such metrics, on the sets used for the testing (both for the Evaluation and Testing on simulated RNA-Seq

Table 1: Performance of the RF model in task T1.

Factorization		Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F-score
CFL		0.43	0.45	0.43	0.43
ICFL		0.40	0.45	0.40	0.41
CFL_ICFL	T=10	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
	T=20	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
	T=30	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.88
CFL ^d		0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72
ICFL ^d		0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
CFL_ICFL ^d	T=10	0.92	0.93	0.92	0.93
	T=20	0.93	0.94	0.93	0.94
	T=30	0.92	0.93	0.92	0.92

reads steps).

The following three sections give the performance scores obtained during our experiments (each section groups together the experiments of a specific task).

The last section presents the results of a study carried out in order to analyze the behavior of the classification errors obtained during the experiment providing the best results.

4.1 Effectiveness of the fingerprint representation (task T1)

We recall that the feature vector used in task T1 is the fingerprint and an experiment has been performed on each one of the 10 fingerprint datasets obtained in the *Feature Extraction* step, for a total of 10 experiments. As a result we have observed that the RF model always outperforms the other models and we only report its results on the testing set (see Table 1). As the table shows, the RF model trained with the fingerprints obtained with CFL_ICFL^d outperforms the RF model trained with the other factorization algorithms. In particular, the best results (highlighted in bold) have been obtained by using $T = 20$. Furthermore, for CFL_ICFL^d the performance does not vary significantly with the parameter T . This may be due to the fact that the longest factors to break are the same, and they are most probably longer than 30 bases.

To assess the effectiveness of `lyn2vec` we compared its results with those obtained by using other embedding techniques, in particular `BioVec`, `fastDNA` and `DNABERT`. In particular, we have performed a further experiment on the same data set obtained with CFL_ICFL^d, $T = 20$. Afterwards, we performed once again the classification task by feeding the new embedded features to the RF model which was the one providing the best results the experiments. As it is shown further in Table 2, the results obtained with the other representations were systematically lower than then those obtained using `lyn2vec`.

Results obtained by our approach on this task are shown to be the highest, with

Table 2: Performance of the RF model with the embeddings by BioVec, fastDNA and DNABERT. The first row (labeled by `lyn2vec` is a copy of the performance scores reported in Table 1 for CFL_ICFL^d and T = 20 (task T1).

Factorization	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F-score
<code>lyn2vec</code>	0.93	0.94	0.93	0.94
BioVec	0.83	0.85	0.83	0.83
fastDNA	0.67	0.65	0.67	0.67
DNABERT	0.37	0.36	0.35	0.36

accuracy of 0.93, precision of 0.94 and a recall of 0.93, outperforming the ones obtained by using the other proposed tools. Also, the dataset produced by applying `lyn2vec` is way smaller than the one produced by other representation, due to the fixed size of the embedding vectors they produce.

Finally, we have carried out the *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads* step by using the RF model trained with the fingerprints from CFL_ICFL^d and $T = 20$. We have obtained a precision of 0.85, a recall of 0.42, and a F-score of 0.55. Such results are related to the presence of sequencing errors in the simulated RNA-Seq reads datasets, since we remind that changes in the sequences lead to corrupted fingerprints, which differ from those used during the training of the classifier.

4.2 Effectiveness of the k -finger-based representation (task T2)

We recall that the feature vector used in task T2 is the k -finger and an experiment has been performed on each one of the 60 datasets obtained in the *Feature Extraction* step, by considering values of k from 3 to 8. From a technical point of view, the k -mers extracted from the fingerprints computed by `lyn2vec`, *i.e.*, the k -fingers, can be used as feature vectors. Our goal is assessing the effectiveness of the k -fingers as feature vectors in the read-gene classification to improve performance in presence of sequencing errors.

As for task T1, the RF model outperforms the other models. Figure 4 provides an overall insight: experiments conducted with $k = 3, 4, 5$ show that CFL_ICFL^d always results in lower accuracy compared to other factorization algorithms. The same reflects into the F-score plot.

We only report the results of the RF model on the testing set in Tables 3 and 4. We observed that in most cases the performance scores increase with the increase of k , so we only report the values $\{3, 6, 8\}$. The best result (highlighted in bold in the tables) has been obtained by using $k = 8$, CFL_ICFL with $T = 20$ and CFL_ICFL^d with $T = 30$.

At this point, before giving the results of the *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads* step, we need to describe the *rule-based classifier* used for inferring the class of a read from the classes of its k -fingers.

During some preliminary tests we have defined many *criteria* to deduce the classification of a read using the results of the classification of its k -fingers. By empirical observations

Table 3: Performance of the RF model in classifying the k -fingers (task T2) by using CFL, ICFL and CFL_ICFL.

Factorization	k value	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F-score	
CFL	3	0.53	0.61	0.43	0.49	
	6	0.73	0.75	0.66	0.69	
	8	0.79	0.81	0.78	0.80	
ICFL	3	0.57	0.60	0.46	0.51	
	6	0.71	0.77	0.47	0.53	
	8	0.81	0.80	0.42	0.48	
CFL_ICFL	T=10	3	0.47	0.58	0.31	0.37
		6	0.91	0.91	0.87	0.89
		8	0.93	0.94	0.93	0.93
	T=20	3	0.50	0.57	0.36	0.42
		6	0.92	0.92	0.89	0.90
		8	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.94
	T=30	3	0.55	0.62	0.41	0.47
		6	0.91	0.92	0.88	0.90
		8	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.92

Table 4: Performance of the RF model in classifying the k -fingers (task T2) by using CFL^d, ICFL^d and CFL_ICFL^d.

Factorization	k value	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F-score	
CFL ^d	3	0.56	0.63	0.45	0.51	
	6	0.90	0.91	0.86	0.89	
	8	0.90	0.93	0.86	0.89	
ICFL ^d	3	0.65	0.68	0.57	0.61	
	6	0.92	0.92	0.87	0.90	
	8	0.87	0.91	0.78	0.84	
CFL_ICFL ^d	T=10	3	0.38	0.55	0.21	0.25
		6	0.89	0.89	0.86	0.87
		8	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.93
	T=20	3	0.40	0.55	0.23	0.25
		6	0.91	0.91	0.88	0.89
		8	0.94	0.94	0.92	0.93
	T=30	3	0.42	0.51	0.24	0.28
		6	0.91	0.91	0.88	0.89
		8	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.94




Figure 4: F-score of the RF model and k from 3 to 8 (task T2).

two possible criteria for our problem have been selected:

- *Majority.* Given a read, then a gene G reaches the majority for that read, if at least half of its k -fingers are assigned to G ; therefore the read is assigned to G .
- *Threshold.* Given a read, for each of its k -finger the *classification margin* is computed, and the read is assigned to the gene for which the highest value of this margin is achieved. The *classification margin* is obtained by subtracting the lowest probability whereby a k -finger was correctly classified during the training step to the probability by which it was currently classified.

We remark that in our experiments we have tested such two criteria both individually and combined in different orders. Best results were obtained when they are combined by applying *Majority* first and *Threshold* where the first criterion can not be reached.

In this step, we have used the RF model trained with the k -fingers produced by ICFL^d and $k = 5$, which achieves the best scores in the read classification (recall that the RF model with CFL_ICFL^d , $T = 30$ and $k = 8$ has achieved the best scores in the k -finger classification as described before during Training). Such a phenomenon can be explained by reminding that (i) errors in sequencing can modify the resulting fingerprint, making more difficult for the classifier to recognize it, and (ii) the rule-based classifier relies on the classifications of the k -fingers in order to classify an entire fingerprint (corresponding to a read). By using a lower value of k , a higher number of k -fingers can be extracted by a single fingerprint. In this way, it is more likely that a higher number of k -fingers will be correctly classified, since the eventual error should affect a lower number of k -fingers. We obtained a precision of 0.91, a recall of 0.77, and a F-score of 0.82, instead of precision of 0.85, a recall of 0.42, and a F-score of 0.55 obtained in task T1, by directly using

the entire fingerprint as feature vector. Such a huge different in the performance can be explaining again by the fact that, in presence of errors, k -fingers are able to extract the parts of the fingerprint which are not corrupted, while in the case of the direct classification of the fingerprint, the classifier must infer the read class relying only on a (probably) single corrupted feature vector.

4.3 Superfingerprints to overcome the impact of k -finger collisions on the read classification (task T3)

In this task, we have repeated the experiments carried out in task T2, using the k -fingers extracted from the superfingerprints (see Definition 4) instead of those obtained from the fingerprint representations. A total of 60 datasets of k -fingers extracted from superfingerprints were obtained, one for each k (from 3 to 8) and for each one of the 10 factorization algorithms.

The results of this task have achieved a significant improvement over T2, both in *Evaluation* and *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads*. Specifically, in *Evaluation*, for the (best performing) RF model trained with CFL-ICFL^d, $T = 30$ and $k = 8$, we have reached 0.97 as accuracy, 0.96 as precision, 0.95 as recall and 0.95 as F-score against the accuracy 0.94, precision 0.93, recall 0.94 and f-score 0.94 obtained in the same step in task T2 for the same factorization. Finally, in *Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads* we have obtained 0.95 as precision, 0.83 as recall and 0.88 as F-score with ICFL^d and $k = 5$, against 0.91, 0.77 and 0.82 obtained in T2 in the same step and, also in this case, for the same factorization.

In our opinion, the increase of the classification scores with respect to task T2 can be explained by the fact that the rule-based classification (for inferring the class of a read from the class of its k -fingers) is somehow more robust and less affected by collisions, since the collision rate may even not decrease.

We remark that superfingerprints are proposed as a possible solution to reduce the impact of collisions (see Section 3.2) on the classification results and, consequently, to improve the classification performance. This can be explained noticing that, even though other collisions could occur also in the case of the k -fingers extracted from the fingerprint built on the inverse alphabet, concatenating the two fingerprints reduce the overall probability of collision, since the probability that both fingerprints are affected by the collision phenomenon is lower than the probability of collision of the two fingerprints taken singularly. In terms of how the rule-based classifier works, this means that, even if the absolute number of k -fingers being collisions may increase, their incidence on the total number of k -fingers obtained will be lower, leading to a higher number of correct classifications. Still, the theoretical demonstration of the superfingerprint capacity to reduce the collisions remains open, so task T3 has been carried out as a first attempt to empirically asses its effectiveness.

4.4 Error analysis

We have carried out a preliminary analysis to investigate the errors due to the use of k -fingers in classifying reads; indeed, k -fingers are the most suitable to this aim, since we wanted to investigate how effectively they are able to highlight common regions in different reads. We have considered the results obtained in task T2 (with the RF model) during the *Training* step on the six datasets of k -fingers produced with the CFL_ICFL^d factorization, $T = 30$ and k from 3 to 8 (see Section 4.2). Recall that the best results (in the training step of task T2) were obtained for CFL_ICFL^d, $T = 30$ and $k = 8$. Each one of the six datasets (training set plus testing set, in order to consider also the errors produced by the model in the training set) has been given as input to the rule-based classifier (see Section 4.2) in order to infer the classification of the reads of the data setting (for each k from 3 to 8). A misclassification occurs when a read is assigned to the wrong class (gene) and can be related to one of the following three facts: (i) the read shares substrings with transcripts coming from the wrong gene, (ii) some k -fingers of the read collide (see Section 3.2) with k -fingers of reads coming from the wrong gene and (iii) some k -fingers of the read are close (in terms of integers) to k -fingers of the wrong gene and therefore the trained model makes a wrong assignment of the read k -fingers. For example $k_1 = \langle 2, 5, 8, 7, 20 \rangle$ and $k_2 = \langle 2, 5, 7, 7, 19 \rangle$. We have decided to perform the analysis on the error-free reads of the data setting (instead of the reads used in the Testing on simulated RNA-Seq reads step) in order to discard the noise due to sequencing errors.

For each one of the obtained (six) datasets of classified reads, we have carried out the following analysis. Given the set D of the 100 genes of our data setting, we have considered all the elements (G_T, G_A) of the cartesian product D^2 , such that $G_T \neq G_A$ (a total of 9900 elements). G_T will be referred as *target gene*, while G_A as *assignment gene*. For each pair (G_T, G_A) we have computed the number of reads originated from G_T but assigned to G_A , referred in the following as *misclassification number*.

Overall, for each value of k we have observed a large number of pairs with a misclassification number below 30 (on average, 9832).

The most interesting results were obtained for $k = 5$ and $k = 8$.

k=8 We have detected a total of 229 pairs having a misclassification number over 30 and involving 34 distinct genes. The number of exchanges ranged from 0 to 113. On average, we have found that 36 distinct k -fingers per pair were misclassified due to reason (iii) related to numerically close k -fingers.

Still, the fact that only 229 pairs out of the 9900 considered are misclassified more than 30 times is surprising. Such a few number of misclassified pairs and the high performance scores (see the results reported for CFL_ICFL^d with T=30 in Table 4) suggest that the `lyn2vec` provides effective representations of a string.

k=5 In this case we have detected only 29 pairs having a misclassification number over 30; they involve 27 distinct genes. The number of exchanges ranged from 0 to 158. On average, the number of (distinct) misclassified k -fingers per pair is 20. In general,

about the 65% of the misclassified k -fingers are shared between the two genes, of which, only the 15% actually correspond to common substrings whereas the other ones were misclassified due to reason (ii). Not surprisingly, these results suggest that for higher values of k , the collision rate is lower.

This analysis highlights how different values of the parameter k lead to different behavior of the k -fingers and, consequently, to different results. $k = 8$ seems to be the best choice in terms of results in the current machine learning task, achieving 0.94 and 0.93 of precision and recall on the k -finger representation. Limitations of the choice of higher k are related to the fact that the method can misclassify similar k -fingers. Clearly, the length of the reads could be also another parameter to take into account to allow higher values of k .

Those results suggest that different parameters and models applied in combination with the `lyn2vec` representation could lead to different uses whose investigation can be carried out in future works.

4.5 Discussion and perspectives

The results obtained in this section, allow us to confirm that the `lyn2vec` method is effective in providing representations of sequencing reads useful in machine learning problems. The representation based on the basic notion of fingerprint (see Section 4.1) already provided results (precision 0.94 and recall 0.93) overcoming the results obtained using other well-known representation methods, i.e., `BioVec`, `fastDNA` and `DNABERT`.

Later, in Section 4.2, we further assessed our method by applying it on RNA-Seq reads simulated with Flux Simulator with different gene-expression levels and errors, showing that using a hybrid approach in which k -fingers were used in combination with a rule-based classifier, significantly increases performance, by reaching high precision 0.91 and recall 0.77, despite of a precision of 0.85 and a recall of 0.42 reached by directly classifying the whole fingerprints of such data.

Finally, in Section 4.3 the problem of collisions was addressed in a positive way using the notion of superfingerprint as a `lyn2vec` representation. Results obtained outperforms that obtained in T1 and T2 tasks, by reaching precision 0.95 and recall 0.83.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we propose `lyn2vec`, a novel feature embedding method using the notion of fingerprint to represent sequencing reads. Differently from NLP-based feature embedding, our method relays on theoretical investigation of combinatorial properties which guarantee to capture similarities among sequences. In particular, the computation complexity of `lyn2vec` is linear in the number of sequences represented, no training of embedding model is necessary and the size of the built datasets is certainly smaller with respect those obtained with NLP-based sequence embedding methods. Since the main goal of the present work is the investigation of the potentiality of `lyn2vec` as an embedding method in a machine learning approach, to evaluate its effectiveness, we have decided to use the read representations provided for assigning RNA-Seq data with respect to the origin gene.

The choice of this framework is due to the fact that it is an ideal context to compare the effectiveness of the notions of fingerprint, k -finger and finally superfingerprint to capture subsequence similarities. We have also run an experimental analysis to investigate the error due to misclassification of the reads. The carried out study has pointed out that `lyn2vec` performance can be greatly improved by k -fingers with higher k thus leading to possible uses for long reads instead of short reads. Long read sequencing technologies are becoming more relevant in various applications in bioinformatics [52]. While this work is mainly a proof of concept that `lyn2vec` is effective to represent sequencing reads; future investigations will be needed to understand the use of the proposed representations in developing practical applications on real data. Furthermore, it could be of interest to evaluate the effectiveness of `lyn2vec` in other types of machine learning contexts such as clustering and structure prediction, or other problems such as pattern discovering.

Funding. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number [872539].

References

- [1] Paola Bonizzoni, Clelia De Felice, Rocco Zaccagnino, and Rosalba Zizza. On the longest common prefix of suffixes in an inverse Lyndon factorization and other properties. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 862:24–41, 2021.
- [2] Ming-Syan Chen, Jiawei Han, and Philip S. Yu. Data mining: an overview from a database perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and data Engineering*, 8(6):866–883, 1996.
- [3] Wensheng Gan, Jerry Chun-Wei Lin, Han-Chieh Chao, and Justin Zhan. Data mining in distributed environment: a survey. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 7(6):e1216, 2017.
- [4] Wenonah Vercoutere and Mark Akeson. Biosensors for dna sequence detection. *Current opinion in chemical biology*, 6(6):816–822, 2002.
- [5] Pradeep Kumar, Pradeep Kumar, P Radha Krishna, and S Bapi Raju. *Pattern discovery using sequence data mining: applications and studies*. IGI Publishing, 2011.
- [6] Jiawei Han, Jian Pei, Behzad Mortazavi-Asl, Helen Pinto, Qiming Chen, Umeshwar Dayal, and Meichun Hsu. Prefixspan: Mining sequential patterns efficiently by prefix-projected pattern growth. In *proceedings of the 17th international conference on data engineering*, pages 215–224. IEEE Washington, DC, USA, 2001.
- [7] Ramakrishnan Srikant and Rakesh Agrawal. Mining sequential patterns: Generalizations and performance improvements. In *International Conference on Extending Database Technology*, pages 1–17. Springer, 1996.

- [8] Wensheng Gan, Jerry Chun-Wei Lin, Jiexiong Zhang, Han-Chieh Chao, Hamido Fujita, and Philip S. Yu. Proum: Projection-based utility mining on sequence data. *Information Sciences*, 513:222–240, 2020.
- [9] Ehsaneddin Asgari and Mohammad RK Mofrad. Continuous distributed representation of biological sequences for deep proteomics and genomics. *PloS one*, 10(11):e0141287, 2015.
- [10] Dhananjay Kimothi, Akshay Soni, Pravesh Biyani, and James M Hogan. Distributed representations for biological sequence analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05949*, 2016.
- [11] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [12] Mark D Yandell and William H Majoros. Genomics and natural language processing. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 3(8):601–610, 2002.
- [13] David B Searls. The language of genes. *Nature*, 420(6912):211–217, 2002.
- [14] Kenta Motomura, Tomohiro Fujita, Motosuke Tsutsumi, Satsuki Kikuzato, Morikazu Nakamura, and Joji M Otaki. Word decoding of protein amino acid sequences with availability analysis: a linguistic approach. *PloS one*, 7(11):e50039, 2012.
- [15] Yizhi Cai, Matthew W Lux, Laura Adam, and Jean Peccoud. Modeling structure-function relationships in synthetic dna sequences using attribute grammars. *PLoS computational biology*, 5(10):e1000529, 2009.
- [16] M. Ganapathiraju, D. Weisser, R. Rosenfeld, J. Carbonell, R. Reddy, and J. Klein-Seetharaman. Comparative n-gram analysis of whole-genome protein sequences. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Human Language Technology Research*, HLT '02, page 76–81, 2002.
- [17] Satish M Srinivasan, Suleyman Vural, Brian R King, and Chittibabu Guda. Mining for class-specific motifs in protein sequence classification. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 14(1):96, 2013.
- [18] John K Vries and Xiong Liu. Subfamily specific conservation profiles for proteins based on n-gram patterns. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 9(1):72, 2008.
- [19] K. T. Chen, R. H. Fox, and R. C. Lyndon. Free Differential Calculus, iv. the quotient groups of the lower central series. *Annals of Mathematics*, 68(1):81–95, 1958.
- [20] M Lothaire. *Combinatorics on words*. Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- [21] Paola Bonizzoni, C. De Felice, Rocco Zaccagnino, and Rosalba Zizza. Lyndon words versus inverse Lyndon words: Queries on suffixes and bordered words. In Alberto Leporati, Carlos Martín-Vide, Dana Shapira, and Claudio Zandron, editors, *LATA*

- 2020, volume 12038 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 385–396. Springer, 2020.
- [22] Olivier Delgrange and Eric Rivals. Star: an algorithm to search for tandem approximate repeats. *Bioinformatics*, 20(16):2812–2820, 2004.
- [23] Dominik Köppl, Daiki Hashimoto, Diptarama Hendrian, and Ayumi Shinohara. In-Place Bijective Burrows-Wheeler Transforms. In *31st Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching (CPM 2020)*, volume 161 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 21:1–21:15. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [24] Jens Stoye, Vincent Moulton, and Andreas WM Dress. Dca: an efficient implementation of the divide-and-conquer approach to simultaneous multiple sequence alignment. *Bioinformatics*, 13(6):625–626, 1997.
- [25] Robert C Edgar. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than blast. *Bioinformatics*, 26(19):2460–2461, 2010.
- [26] Limin Fu, Beifang Niu, Zhengwei Zhu, Sitao Wu, and Weizhong Li. Cd-hit: accelerated for clustering the next-generation sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*, 28(23):3150–3152, 2012.
- [27] Christina S Leslie, Eleazar Eskin, Adiel Cohen, Jason Weston, and William Stafford Noble. Mismatch string kernels for discriminative protein classification. *Bioinformatics*, 20(4):467–476, 2004.
- [28] Rui Kuang, Eugene Ie, Ke Wang, Kai Wang, Mahira Siddiqi, Yoav Freund, and Christina Leslie. Profile-based string kernels for remote homology detection and motif extraction. *Journal of bioinformatics and computational biology*, 3(03):527–550, 2005.
- [29] Eleazar Eskin, Jason Weston, William Noble, and Christina Leslie. Mismatch string kernels for SVM protein classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 15:1441–1448, 2002.
- [30] Anthony Bagnall, Jason Lines, Jon Hills, and Aaron Bostrom. Time-series classification with COTE: the collective of transformation-based ensembles. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 27(9):2522–2535, 2015.
- [31] Jon Hills, Jason Lines, Edgaras Baranauskas, James Mapp, and Anthony Bagnall. Classification of time series by shapelet transformation. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 28(4):851–881, 2014.
- [32] Aaron Bostrom and Anthony Bagnall. Binary shapelet transform for multiclass time series classification. In *Transactions on Large-Scale Data-and Knowledge-Centered Systems XXXII*, pages 24–46. Springer, 2017.

- [33] Jason Lines, Sarah Taylor, and Anthony Bagnall. Hive-cote: The hierarchical vote collective of transformation-based ensembles for time series classification. In *2016 IEEE 16th international conference on data mining (ICDM)*, pages 1041–1046. IEEE, 2016.
- [34] Matteo Comin and Davide Verzotto. Alignment-free phylogeny of whole genomes using underlying subwords. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 7(1):34, 2012.
- [35] Gilles Didier, Eduardo Corel, Ivan Laprevotte, Alex Grossmann, and Claudine Landés-Devauchelle. Variable length local decoding and alignment-free sequence comparison. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 462:1–11, 2012.
- [36] Mohammed J Zaki. SPADE: An efficient algorithm for mining frequent sequences. *Machine learning*, 42(1-2):31–60, 2001.
- [37] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26:3111–3119, 2013.
- [38] Romain Menegaux and Jean-Philippe Vert. Continuous embeddings of dna sequencing reads and application to metagenomics. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 26(6):509–518, 2019.
- [39] Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146, 2017.
- [40] Yanrong Ji, Zhihan Zhou, Han Liu, and Ramana V Davuluri. DNABERT: pre-trained Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers model for DNA-language in genome. *Bioinformatics.*, 02 2021.
- [41] Jean Pierre Duval. Factorizing words over an ordered alphabet. *Journal of Algorithms*, 4(4):363 – 381, 1983.
- [42] Paola Bonizzoni, Clelia De Felice, Rocco Zaccagnino, and Rosalba Zizza. Inverse Lyndon words and inverse Lyndon factorizations of words. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 101:281–319, Oct 2018.
- [43] Hideo Bannai, I Tomohiro, Shunsuke Inenaga, Yuto Nakashima, Masayuki Takeda, and Kazuya Tsuruta. A new characterization of maximal repetitions by Lyndon trees. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 562–571, 2015.
- [44] Roger C Lyndon. On Burnside’s problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 77(2):202–215, 1954.
- [45] Jean Berstel and Dominique Perrin. The origins of combinatorics on words. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 28(3):996 – 1022, 2007.

- [46] Nils Homer. Dwgsim. <https://github.com/nh13/DWGSIM>, 2017.
- [47] Daniel Gibney and Sharma V. Thankachan. Finding an Optimal Alphabet Ordering for Lyndon factorization is Hard. In *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS2021)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), pages 1–15, 2021.
- [48] Konstantin Berlin, Sergey Koren, Chen-Shan Chin, James P Drake, Jane M Landolin, and Adam M Phillippy. Assembling large genomes with single-molecule sequencing and locality-sensitive hashing. *Nature biotechnology*, 33(6):623–630, 2015.
- [49] Brian D Ondov, Todd J Treangen, Páll Melsted, Adam B Mallonee, Nicholas H Bergman, Sergey Koren, and Adam M Phillippy. Mash: fast genome and metagenome distance estimation using MinHash. *Genome biology*, 17(1):132, 2016.
- [50] Pang-Ning Tan, Michael Steinbach, and Vipin Kumar. *Introduction to data mining*. Pearson Education India, 2016.
- [51] Thasso Griebel, Benedikt Zacher, Paolo Ribeca, Emanuele Raineri, Vincent Lacroix, Roderic Guigó, and Michael Sammeth. Modelling and simulating generic RNA-Seq experiments with the flux simulator. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 40(20):10073–10083, 2012.
- [52] Glennis Logsdon, Mitchell Vollger, and Evan Eichler. Long-read human genome sequencing and its applications. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 21:597–614, 2020.