

# T Cell Receptor Protein Sequences and Sparse Coding: A Novel Approach to Cancer Classification

Zahra Tayebi\*, Sarwan Ali\*, Prakash Chourasia, Taslim Murad, and Murray Patterson

Georgia State University, Atlanta GA 30302, USA

\*Equal Contribution

**Abstract.** Cancer is a complex disease marked by uncontrolled cell growth, potentially leading to tumors and metastases. Identifying cancer types is crucial for treatment decisions and patient outcomes. T cell receptors (TCRs) are vital proteins in adaptive immunity, specifically recognizing antigens and playing a pivotal role in immune responses, including against cancer. TCR diversity makes them promising for targeting cancer cells, aided by advanced sequencing revealing potent anti-cancer TCRs and TCR-based therapies. Effectively analyzing these complex biomolecules necessitates representation and capturing their structural and functional essence. We explore sparse coding for multi-classifying TCR protein sequences with cancer categories as targets. Sparse coding, a machine learning technique, represents data with informative features, capturing intricate amino acid relationships and subtle sequence patterns. We compute TCR sequence  $k$ -mers, applying sparse coding to extract key features. Domain knowledge integration improves predictive embeddings, incorporating cancer properties like Human leukocyte antigen (HLA) types, gene mutations, clinical traits, immunological features, and epigenetic changes. Our embedding method, applied to a TCR benchmark dataset, significantly outperforms baselines, achieving 99.8% accuracy. Our study underscores sparse coding's potential in dissecting TCR protein sequences in cancer research.

**Keywords:** Cancer classification · TCR sequence· embeddings.

## 1 Introduction

T cell receptors (TCRs) play a crucial role in the immune response by recognizing and binding to antigens presented by major histocompatibility complexes (MHCs) on the surface of infected or cancerous cells, Figure 1[44]. The specificity of TCRs for antigens is determined by the sequence of amino acids that make up the receptor, which is generated through a process of genetic recombination and somatic mutation. This enables T cells to produce a diverse repertoire of receptors capable of recognizing a wide range of antigens [12].

MHC molecules bind to peptide fragments that originate from pathogens and present them on the cell surface. This allows for recognition by the corresponding

T cells [24]. TCR sequencing involves analyzing the DNA or RNA sequences that code for the TCR protein on T cells, and it can be used to identify changes in the TCR repertoire that occur in response to cancer, as well as to identify specific TCR sequences that are associated with particular types of cancer [27].




Fig. 1: T-cells mount a targeted immune response against the invading pathogen of cancerous cells.

Embedding-based methods, exemplified by Yang et al.[51], transform protein sequences into low-dimensional vector representations. They find applications in classification and clustering[11]. These embeddings empower classifiers to predict functional classes for unlabeled sequences [23] and identify related sequences with shared features [51].

Embedding-based methods in protein sequence analysis face challenges related to generalizability and complexity [35]. Deep learning techniques, including Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), and transformer networks, offer promising solutions [37]. These models, trained on extensive and diverse datasets, enhance generalization and enable accurate predictions for new sequences. However, factors like data quality, model architecture, and optimization strategies significantly influence performance [36]. Furthermore, the interpretability of deep learning models remains a challenge, necessitating careful evaluation. While deep learning enhances generalizability, it may not completely resolve the problem.

In our study, we propose a multi-class classification approach for predicting cancer categories from TCR protein sequences. We employ sparse coding [38], a machine-learning technique using a dictionary of sparse basis functions. By representing TCR protein sequences as sparse linear combinations of these basis functions, we capture inherent data structure and variation, improving cancer classification accuracy. Preprocessing involves encoding amino acid sequences as numerical vectors and utilizing a  $k$ -mer dictionary for sparse coding.

We assess our approach using multiple metrics and benchmark it against state-of-the-art methods. Our results clearly show its superior classification performance and highlight its key properties: invariance, noise robustness, interpretability, transferability, and flexibility.

In general, our contributions to this paper are the following:

1. We introduce an efficient method using sparse coding and  $k$ -mers to create an alignment-free, fixed-length numerical representation for T cell sequences. Unlike traditional one-hot encoding, we initially extract  $k$ -mers and then apply one-hot encoding, preserving context through a sliding window approach.

2. Leveraging domain knowledge, we enhance supervised analysis by combining it with sparse coding-based representations. This fusion enriches the embeddings with domain-specific information, preserving sequence details, facilitating feature selection, promoting interpretability, and potentially boosting classification accuracy.
3. Our proposed embedding method achieves near-perfect predictive performance, significantly surpassing all baselines in classification accuracy. This highlights the effectiveness of our approach in distinguishing T cell sequences despite their short length.

Considering this, we will proceed as follows: Section 2 covers related work, Section 3 presents our approach, Section 4 details the dataset and experimental setup, Section 5 reports results, and Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2 Related Work

TCR (T-cell receptor) sequencing data has emerged as a critical asset in biomedical research, revolutionizing our understanding of the immune system and its applications in fields such as immunotherapy and disease response. This technology has enabled the identification of neoantigens, which are crucial targets for immunotherapy in cancer treatment [5]. Moreover, it has played a pivotal role in decoding the adaptive immune response to viral diseases like the formidable SARS-CoV-2 [17]. TCR sequencing has also contributed significantly to the identification of T-cell clones associated with tumor regression in response to immunotherapy [33].

In the realm of biological data analysis, classification methods have proven invaluable for deciphering protein sequences and their implications in cancer research. Techniques like Support Vector Machines (SVM), Random Forest, and Logistic Regression have been instrumental in grouping protein sequences with shared features, aiding in the discovery of subpopulations related to specific cancer types [21]. For instance, SVM was employed to classify TCR sequences for predicting disease-free and overall survival in breast cancer patients [4]. K-means classification has demonstrated promise in distinguishing colorectal cancer patients from healthy individuals based on protein sequence analysis [19].

Deep learning methods have ushered in a new era of protein property prediction, encompassing structure, function, stability, and interactions [49]. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have proven effective in forecasting protein structure and function from amino acid sequences [6]. Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) excel at modeling temporal dependencies and long-range interactions within protein sequences [52]. The Universal Representation of Amino Acid Sequences (UniRep) employs an RNN architecture to embed protein sequences, yielding promising results across various biological data analysis tasks [3]. Innovative methods like ProtVec use word embedding techniques to create distributed representations of protein sequences for function prediction [39]. SeqVec introduces an alternative by embedding protein sequences using a hierarchical representation that captures both local and global features [20].

Lastly, ESM (Evolutionary Scale Modeling) employs a transformer-based architecture to encode protein sequences, forming part of the ESM family of protein models [31]. It is trained on extensive data encompassing protein sequences and structures to predict the 3D structure of a given protein sequence [22]. While deep learning enriches the generalizability of embedding-based techniques for protein sequence analysis, robust evaluation and consideration are essential to ensure the reliability of outcomes [31].

### 3 Proposed Approach

In this section, we delve into the utilization of cancer-related knowledge, introduce our algorithm, and offer an overview through a flowchart.

#### 3.1 Incorporating Domain Knowledge

This section gives some examples of the additional property values for the four cancers we mentioned. Many factors can increase the risk of developing cancer, including Human leukocyte antigen (HLA) types, gene mutations, clinical characteristics, immunological features, and epigenetic modifications.

**HLA types:** HLA genes encode cell surface proteins presenting antigens to T cells. Mutations in these genes due to cancer can hinder antigen presentation, enabling unchecked cancer growth [43].

**Gene mutations:** Besides HLA, mutations in genes like TP53 and BRCA1/2 raise cancer risks (breast, ovarian, colorectal) too [40].

**Clinical characteristics:** Age, gender, and family history influence cancer risk [29]. Certain cancers are age-specific, some gender-biased, while family history also shapes susceptibility.

**Immunological features:** The immune system crucially impacts cancer outcomes. Immune cells recognize and eliminate cancer cells [13]. Yet, cancer cells might evade immune surveillance, growing unchecked. Immune cell presence and activity within tumors influence cancer progression and treatment response [18].

**Epigenetic modifications:** Epigenetic changes, like DNA methylation, contribute to cancer development and progression. DNA methylation, adding a methyl group to DNA's cytosine base (CpG sites), leads to gene silencing or altered expression [26].

#### 3.2 Cancer Types and Immunogenetics

Cancer types exhibit intricate connections between immunogenetics, clinical attributes, and genetic factors. Breast cancer, a prevalent malignancy, demonstrates HLA associations such as HLA-A2, HLA-B7, and HLA-DRB1\*15:01 alleles, alongside gene mutations (BRCA1, BRCA2, TP53, PIK3CA) that elevate risk [30,25]. Clinical attributes encompass tumor size, grade, hormone receptor presence, and HER2 status. Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) and immune

checkpoint molecules (PD-1, PD-L1, CTLA-4) play a substantial role in influencing breast cancer outcomes [32,47]. Similarly, colorectal cancer (CRC), originating in the colon or rectum, shows associations with HLA alleles (HLA-A11, HLA-B44) and gene mutations (APC, KRAS, TP53, BRAF) that impact its development [14,16]. The intricacies of CRC involve tumor attributes, lymph node involvement, TILs, and immune checkpoint molecules, all influencing disease progression [42]. Liver cancer (hepatocellular carcinoma), primarily affecting liver cells, displays connections with HLA alleles (HLA-A2, HLA-B35) and gene mutations (TP53, CTNNB1, AXIN1, ARID1A)[34,8]. Epigenetic DNA methylation abnormalities in CDKN2A, MGMT, and GSTP1 genes contribute to liver cancer’s development [53]. Urothelial cancer, affecting bladder, ureters, and renal pelvis cells, is associated with HLA types (HLA-A2, HLA-B7) and gene mutations (FGFR3, TP53, RB1, PIK3CA)[9].

### 3.3 Algorithmic Pseudocode and Flowchart

The pseudocode to compute sparse coding +  $k$ -mers-based embedding is given in Algorithm 1. This algorithm takes a set of sequences  $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, N\}$  and  $k$ , where  $N$  is the number of sequences and  $k$  is the length of  $k$ -mers. The algorithm computed the sparse embedding by iterating over all sequences and computing the set of  $k$ -mers for each sequence; see Figure 2 (1-b). Then it iterates over all the  $k$ -mers, computes the one-hot encoding (OHE) based representation for each amino acid within a  $k$ -mer (Figure 2 (1-c)), and concatenates it with the OHE embeddings of other amino acids within the  $k$ -mer (Figure 2 (1-d)). Finally, the OHE embeddings for all  $k$ -mers within a sequence are concatenated to get the final sparse coding-based representation (Figure 2 (1-e)). To avoid the curse of dimensionality, we used Lasso regression as a dimensionality reduction technique [41], (Figure 2 (f)). The objective function, which we used in lasso regression, is the following:  $\min(\text{Sum of square residuals} + \alpha \times |\text{slope}|)$

In the above equation, the  $\alpha \times |\text{slope}|$  is referred to as the penalty terms, which reduces the slope of insignificant features to zero. We use  $k = 4$  for experiments, which is decided using the standard validation set approach.

The same process repeated while we considered domain knowledge about cancer properties like HLA types, gene mutations, clinical characteristics, immunological features, and epigenetic modifications. For each property, we generate a one-hot encoding-based representation, where the length of the vector equals the total number of possible property values, see Figure 2 (2-b). All OHE representations of the property values are concatenated in the end to get final representations for all properties we consider from domain knowledge; see Figure 2 (2-c) to (2-d). The resultant embeddings from Sparse coding (from Algorithm 1) and domain knowledge are concatenated to get the final embedding. These embeddings are used to train machine-learning models for supervised analysis (Figure 2 (g))

**Algorithm 1** Sparse Coding Algorithm

---

**Input:** set of sequences  $S$ ,  $k$ -mers length  $k$   
**Output:** SparseEmbedding

```

1: totValues = 21 ▷ unique amino acid characters
2: final_sparse_embedding ← []
3: for i ← 0 to |S| do
4:   seq ← S[i]
5:   kmers ← GENERATEKMERS(seq, k) ▷ generate set of k-mers
6:   encoded_kmers ← []
7:   for kmer in kmers do
8:     encodedVec ← np.zeros(totValuesk) ▷ 213 = 9261 dimensional vector
9:     for i, aa in enumerate(kmer) do
10:      pos ← i × totValuesk-i-1
11:      encodedVec[pos:pos+totValues] ← ONEHOTENCODING(aa)
12:    end for
13:    encoded_kmers.append(encodedVec)
14:  end for
15:  final_sparse_embedding.append(np.array(encoded_kmers).flatten())
16: end for
17: SparseEmbedding ← LASSOREGRESSION(final_sparse_embedding) ▷ dim. reduction
18: return SparseEmbedding

```

---




Fig. 2: Flowchart of TCR sequence analysis

## 4 Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the details related to the dataset, baseline models, evaluation metrics, and data visualization. We employ a variety of machine learning classifiers, encompassing Support Vector Machine (SVM), Naive Bayes (NB), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) using  $K=3$ , Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Decision Tree (DT). We used a 70-30% train-test split based on stratified sampling to do classification. From the training set, we use 10% data as a validation set for hyperparameter tuning. Performance evaluation of the classifiers employed various evaluation

metrics. The results are computed 5 times, and the average results are reported. The experiments were performed on a system with an Intel(R) Core i5 processor @ 2.10 GHz and a Windows 10 64 bit operating system with 32 GB of memory. The model is implemented using Python, which is available online <sup>1</sup>.

#### 4.1 Dataset Statistics

We source sequence data from TCRdb, a comprehensive *T*-cell receptor sequence database with robust search functionality [10]. TCRdb consolidates 130+ projects and 8000+ samples, comprising an extensive sequence repository. Our focus identifies four prevalent cancer types by incidence rates. Extracting 23331 TCR sequences, we maintain the original data proportion via Stratified Shuffle-Split. Table 1a offers dataset statistics. Our embedding approach employs TCR sequences, cancer names, and cancer properties. Table 1b exemplifies TCR sequences, cancer names, and gene mutations specific to each cancer type. This includes 4 cancers with respective gene mutations that impact risk.

Cancer Name	Number of Sequences	Sequence Length Statistics		
		Min.	Max.	Average
Breast	4363	8	20	14.2264
Colorectal	10947	7	26	14.5573
Liver	3520	8	20	14.3005
Urothelial	4501	7	24	14.6538
Total	23331	-	-	-

(a)

Sequence	Cancer Name	Gene Mutation
CASSRGQYEYF	Breast	BRCA1, BRCA2, TP53, PIK3CA
CASSLEAGRAYEQYF	Colorectal	APC, KRAS, TP53, BRAF
CASSLGSGQETQYF	Liver	TP53, CTNNB1, AXIN1
CASSGQGSSNSPLHF	Urothelial	FGFR3, TP53, RB1, PIK3CA

(b)

Table 1: (a) Dataset Statistics. (b) Examples of sequences for different cancer types, including Breast, Colorectal, Liver, and Urothelial, along with their respective gene mutations.

To assess the effectiveness of our proposed system, we employed a variety of baseline methods, categorized as follows: (i) Feature Engineering methods: (One Hot Encoding (OHE) [28], Spike2Vec [1], PWM2Vec [2], and Spaced  $k$ -mers [46]), (ii) Kernel method (String kernel [15]), (iii) Neural network (Wasserstein Distance Guided Representation Learning (WDGRL) [45] and AutoEncoder [50]), (iv) Pre-trained Larger Language Model (SeqVec [20]), and (v) Pre-trained Transformer (ProteinBert [7]).

#### 4.2 Data Visualization

To see if there is any natural (hidden) clustering in the data, we use t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE) [48], which maps input sequences to 2D representation. The t-SNE plots for different embedding methods are shown in

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/zara77/T-Cell-Receptor-Protein-Sequences-and-Sparse-Coding.git>

Figure 3 for One hot encoding (OHE), Spike2Vec, PWM2Vec, Spaced  $K$ -mer, Autoencoder, and Sparse Coding, respectively. We can generally observe that OHE, Spike2Vec, PWM2Vec, and Autoencoder show smaller groups for different cancer types. However, the Spaced  $k$ -mers show a very scattered representation of data. Moreover, the proposed Sparse Coding approach does not show any scattered representation, preserving the overall structure better.




Fig. 3: t-SNE plots for different feature embedding methods. The figure is best seen in color. Subfigures (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are for Spike2Vec, PWM2Vec, Spaced  $k$ -mers, Autoencoder (AE), and Sparse Coding (SC), respectively.

## 5 Results And Discussion

In this section, we present the classification results obtained by our proposed system and compare them with various machine learning models. The results for different evaluation metrics are summarized in Table 2. This study introduces two novel approaches. First, we employ sparse coding (utilizing  $k$ -mers) for T-cell sequence classification. Second, we integrate domain knowledge into the embeddings. To our knowledge, these two methods have not been explored in the context of T-cells in existing literature. Consequently, we exclusively report results for the Sparse Coding method combined with domain knowledge embeddings. Our proposed technique (Sparse Coding) consistently outperforms all feature-engineering-based baseline models (OHE, Spike2Vec, PWM2Vec, Spaced  $k$ -mers) across every evaluation metric, except for training runtime. For example, Sparse Coding achieves 48.5% higher accuracy than OHE, 55.8% more than Spike2Vec, 58.4% more than PWM2Vec, and 48.6% more than Spaced  $k$ -mers when employing the LR classifier. This suggests that Sparse Coding-based feature embeddings retain biological sequence information more effectively for classification compared to feature-engineering-based baselines. Similarly, our technique outperforms the neural network-based baselines (WDGRL, Autoencoder). For instance, the WDGRL approach exhibits 53.03% lower accuracy than Sparse Coding, while Autoencoder attains 53.83% lower accuracy than Sparse Coding when using the SVM classifier. These results imply that feature vectors generated by neural network-based techniques are less efficient for classification compared to those produced by Sparse Coding. It’s worth noting that the SVM

Embeddings	Algo.	Acc. $\uparrow$	Prec. $\uparrow$	Recall $\uparrow$	F1 (Weig.) $\uparrow$	F1 (Macro) $\uparrow$	ROC AUC $\uparrow$	Train Time (sec.) $\downarrow$
OHE	SVM	0.5101	0.5224	0.5101	0.4073	0.3152	0.5592	790.5622
	NB	0.2036	0.3533	0.2036	0.0917	0.1213	0.5107	1.0560
	MLP	0.4651	0.4368	0.4651	0.4370	0.3714	0.5764	221.0638
	KNN	0.4464	0.4044	0.4464	0.4100	0.3354	0.5617	7.2748
	RF	0.5156	0.5003	0.5156	0.4521	0.3751	0.5824	18.7857
	LR	0.5143	0.5241	0.5143	0.4327	0.3492	0.5701	61.8512
	DT	0.4199	0.4129	0.4199	0.4160	0.3616	0.5737	1.0607
Spike2Vec	SVM	0.4309	0.4105	0.4309	0.4157	0.3543	0.5711	19241.67
	NB	0.2174	0.3535	0.2174	0.1931	0.2081	0.5221	6.1309
	MLP	0.4191	0.4081	0.4191	0.4128	0.3490	0.5671	227.2146
	KNN	0.4397	0.4105	0.4397	0.4087	0.3400	0.5673	40.4765
	RF	0.5183	0.5078	0.5183	0.4519	0.3738	0.5836	138.6850
	LR	0.4404	0.4189	0.4404	0.4251	0.3626	0.5728	914.7739
	DT	0.4510	0.4307	0.4510	0.4365	0.3745	0.5805	40.3568
PWM2Vec	SVM	0.4041	0.3760	0.4041	0.3836	0.3138	0.5452	10927.61
	NB	0.2287	0.3758	0.2287	0.2109	0.2220	0.5273	23.9892
	MLP	0.4053	0.3820	0.4053	0.3888	0.3226	0.5467	253.6387
	KNN	0.4454	0.3890	0.4454	0.3930	0.3069	0.5475	10.2005
	RF	0.4994	0.4745	0.4994	0.4370	0.3548	0.5716	126.5780
	LR	0.4143	0.3861	0.4143	0.3937	0.3237	0.5484	991.8051
	DT	0.4339	0.4078	0.4339	0.4140	0.3496	0.5636	34.9344
Spaced k-mers	SVM	0.5109	0.5221	0.5109	0.4095	0.3143	0.5582	824.215
	NB	0.2157	0.3713	0.2157	0.1296	0.1510	0.5144	0.1883
	MLP	0.4524	0.4203	0.4524	0.4236	0.3550	0.5663	207.685
	KNN	0.4527	0.4078	0.4527	0.4132	0.3351	0.5607	3.3905
	RF	0.5204	0.5233	0.5204	0.4294	0.3393	0.5679	41.3547
	LR	0.5121	0.5053	0.5121	0.4318	0.3441	0.5674	25.7664
	DT	0.4006	0.4009	0.4006	0.4006	0.3433	0.5629	14.2816
Auto Encoder	SVM	0.4597	0.2113	0.4597	0.2896	0.1575	0.5000	14325.09
	NB	0.2601	0.3096	0.2601	0.2682	0.2317	0.5005	0.3491
	MLP	0.3996	0.3132	0.3996	0.3226	0.2252	0.5017	110.76
	KNN	0.3791	0.3245	0.3791	0.3329	0.2445	0.5068	5.9155
	RF	0.4457	0.3116	0.4457	0.3023	0.1792	0.5003	76.2106
	LR	0.4520	0.3170	0.4520	0.2982	0.1712	0.5004	98.5936
	DT	0.3131	0.3119	0.3131	0.3124	0.2525	0.5016	25.1653
WDGRL	SVM	0.4677	0.2188	0.4677	0.2981	0.1593	0.5000	15.34
	NB	0.4469	0.3231	0.4469	0.3397	0.2213	0.5105	0.0120
	MLP	0.4749	0.4659	0.4749	0.3432	0.2184	0.5163	15.43
	KNN	0.3930	0.3415	0.3930	0.3523	0.2626	0.5156	0.698
	RF	0.4666	0.4138	0.4666	0.3668	0.2578	0.5255	5.5194
	LR	0.4676	0.2187	0.4676	0.2980	0.1593	0.4999	0.0799
	DT	0.3604	0.3606	0.3604	0.3605	0.2921	0.5304	0.2610
String Kernel	SVM	0.4597	0.2113	0.4597	0.2896	0.1575	0.5000	2791.61
	NB	0.3093	0.3067	0.3093	0.3079	0.2463	0.4980	0.2892
	MLP	0.3287	0.3045	0.3287	0.3121	0.2402	0.4963	125.66
	KNN	0.3683	0.3106	0.3683	0.3229	0.2330	0.5001	3.1551
	RF	0.4469	0.3251	0.4469	0.3041	0.1813	0.5010	55.3158
	LR	0.4451	0.3080	0.4451	0.3026	0.1787	0.5000	2.0463
	DT	0.3073	0.3082	0.3073	0.3077	0.2502	0.4998	17.0352
Protein Bert	_	0.2624	0.4223	0.2624	0.1947	0.209	0.5434	987.354
SeqVec	SVM	0.432	0.422	0.432	0.415	0.377	0.530	100423.017
	NB	0.192	0.530	0.192	0.086	0.117	0.505	77.271
	MLP	0.428	0.427	0.428	0.427	0.371	0.580	584.382
	KNN	0.432	0.385	0.432	0.391	0.306	0.544	227.877
	RF	0.525	0.524	0.525	0.445	0.360	0.576	350.057
	LR	0.420	0.414	0.420	0.417	0.356	0.571	90626.797
	DT	0.397	0.397	0.397	0.397	0.344	0.562	2626.082
Sparse Coding (ours)	SVM	0.9980	0.9950	0.9980	0.9960	0.9970	0.9950	16965.48
	NB	0.9970	0.9960	0.9970	0.9970	0.9960	0.9980	404.2999
	MLP	0.9950	0.9950	0.9950	0.9950	0.9947	0.9956	5295.811
	KNN	<b>0.9990</b>	<b>0.9990</b>	<b>0.9990</b>	<b>0.9990</b>	<b>0.9989</b>	<b>0.9991</b>	346.7334
	RF	<b>0.9990</b>	0.9970	<b>0.9990</b>	0.9950	0.9950	0.9960	1805.593
	LR	<b>0.9990</b>	0.9940	<b>0.9990</b>	0.9980	0.9980	0.9940	<b>134.8503</b>
	DT	0.9970	0.9980	0.9970	0.9960	0.9980	0.9970	449.9304

Table 2: Classification results (averaged over 5 runs) for different evaluation metrics. The best values are shown in bold.

consistently delivers the best results among all classifiers, including WDGRL and Autoencoder methods. Our method also surpasses the kernel-based baseline (String Kernel), achieving 53.83% higher accuracy with the SVM model. This highlights the efficiency of Sparse Coding in generating numerical vectors for protein sequences. Additionally, we compare Sparse Coding’s performance with pre-trained models (SeqVec and Protein Bert), and Sparse Coding outperforms them across all evaluation metrics, except training runtime. This indicates that

pre-trained models struggle to generalize effectively to our dataset, resulting in lower predictive performance. As one of our key contributions is the incorporation of domain knowledge, we do not report results for domain knowledge + baseline methods in this paper. However, our evaluation demonstrates that the proposed method consistently outperforms domain knowledge + baseline methods in terms of predictive performance. Moreover, our proposed method without domain knowledge also outperforms baselines without domain knowledge, thanks to the incorporation of  $k$ -mers-based features into Sparse Coding-based embeddings, which enhances their richness.

## 6 Conclusion

Our study introduced a novel approach for cancer classification by leveraging sparse coding and TCR sequences. We transformed TCR sequences into feature vectors using  $k$ -mers and applied sparse coding to generate embeddings, incorporating cancer domain knowledge to enhance performance. Our method achieved a maximum accuracy of 99.9%, along with higher F1 and ROC AUC scores. While our immediate focus is accurate cancer-type classification, our findings have broader implications for personalized treatment and immunotherapy development. Future research can explore sparse coding in other biological data, and optimize it for diverse cancers and TCR sequences.

## References

1. Ali, S., Patterson, M.: Spike2vec: An efficient and scalable embedding approach for covid-19 spike sequences. In: IEEE Big Data. pp. 1533–1540 (2021)
2. Ali, Sarwan Ali, S., Bello, B., et al.: Pwm2vec: An efficient embedding approach for viral host specification from coronavirus spike sequences. MDPI Biology (2022)
3. Alley, E.C., Khimulya, et al.: Unified rational protein engineering with sequence-based deep representation learning. Nature methods **16**(12), 1315–1322 (2019)
4. Bai, et al.: Use of peripheral lymphocytes and support vector machine for survival prediction in breast cancer patients. Translational Cancer Research **7**(4) (2018)
5. van den Berg, J.H., Heemskerk, B., van Rooij, et al.: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes (til) therapy in metastatic melanoma: boosting of neoantigen-specific t cell reactivity and long-term follow-up. Journal for immunotherapy of cancer **8**(2) (2020)
6. Bileschi, et al.: Using deep learning to annotate the protein universe. BioRxiv p. 626507 (2019)
7. Brandes Brandes, N., Ofer, D., et al.: ProteinBERT: a universal deep-learning model of protein sequence and function. Bioinformatics **38**(8), 2102–2110 (02 2022)
8. Bufe, S., et al.: Pd-1/ctla-4 blockade leads to expansion of cd8+ pd-1int tils and results in tumor remission in experimental liver cancer. Liver Cancer (2022)
9. Carosella, E.D., Ploussard, G., LeMaoult, J., Desgrandchamps, F.: A systematic review of immunotherapy in urologic cancer: evolving roles for targeting of ctla-4, pd-1/pd-l1, and hla-g. European urology **68**(2), 267–279 (2015)
10. Chen, et al.: Tcrdb: a comprehensive database for t-cell receptor sequences with powerful search function. Nucleic Acids Research **49**(D1), D468–D474 (2021)

11. Chourasia, P., Ali, S., Ciccolella, S., Vedova, G.D., Patterson, M.: Reads2vec: Efficient embedding of raw high-throughput sequencing reads data. *Journal of Computational Biology* **30**(4), 469–491 (2023)
12. Courtney, A.H., Lo, W.L., Weiss, A.: Tcr signaling: mechanisms of initiation and propagation. *Trends in biochemical sciences* **43**(2), 108–123 (2018)
13. De Visser, K.E., Eichten, A., Coussens, L.M.: Paradoxical roles of the immune system during cancer development. *Nature reviews cancer* **6**(1), 24–37 (2006)
14. Dunne, et al.: Characterising the prognostic potential of hla-dr during colorectal cancer development. *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy* **69**, 1577–1588 (2020)
15. Farhan, M., Tariq, J., Zaman, A., Shabbir, M., Khan, I.U.: Efficient approximation algorithms for strings kernel based sequence classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
16. Fodde, R.: The apc gene in colorectal cancer. *European journal of cancer* **38**(7), 867–871 (2002)
17. Gittelman, R.M., Lavezzo, E., Snyder, T.M., Zahid, H.J., Carty, C.L., et al.: Longitudinal analysis of t cell receptor repertoires reveals shared patterns of antigen-specific response to sars-cov-2 infection. *JCI insight* **7**(10) (2022)
18. Gonzalez, et al.: Roles of the immune system in cancer: from tumor initiation to metastatic progression. *Genes & development* **32**(19-20), 1267–1284 (2018)
19. Hee, B.J., Kim, et al.: Feature selection for colon cancer detection using k-means clustering and modified harmony search algorithm. *Mathematics* **9**(5), 570 (2021)
20. Heinzinger, M., Elnaggar, et al.: Modeling aspects of the language of life through transfer-learning protein sequences. *BMC bioinformatics* **20**(1), 1–17 (2019)
21. Hoadley, K.A., Yau, et al.: Cell-of-origin patterns dominate the molecular classification of 10,000 tumors from 33 types of cancer. *Cell* **173**(2), 291–304 (2018)
22. Hu, M., Yuan, F., Yang, K.K., Ju, F., Su, J., Wang, H., Yang, F., Ding, Q.: Exploring evolution-based &-free protein language models as protein function predictors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06583* (2022)
23. Iqbal, M.J., Faye, I., Samir, B.B., Md Said, A.: Efficient feature selection and classification of protein sequence data in bioinformatics. *The Scientific World Journal* **2014** (2014)
24. Janeway Jr, C.A.: The major histocompatibility complex and its functions. In: *Immunobiology: The Immune System in Health and Disease*. 5th edition. Garland Science (2001)
25. Johnson, N., Fletcher, O., Palles, C., Rudd, M., Webb, E., Sellick, et al.: Counting potentially functional variants in brca1, brca2 and atm predicts breast cancer susceptibility. *Human molecular genetics* **16**(9), 1051–1057 (2007)
26. Kelly, T.K., De Carvalho, D.D., Jones, P.A.: Epigenetic modifications as therapeutic targets. *Nature biotechnology* **28**(10), 1069–1078 (2010)
27. Kidman, et al.: Characteristics of tcr repertoire associated with successful immune checkpoint therapy responses. *Frontiers in Immunology* **11**, 587014 (2020)
28. Kuzmin, K., et al.: Machine learning methods accurately predict host specificity of coronaviruses based on spike sequences alone. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* **533**(3), 553–558 (2020)
29. Lee, A., Mavaddat, N., Wilcox, A.N., Cunningham, A.P., Carver, T., Hartley, et al.: Boadicea: a comprehensive breast cancer risk prediction model incorporating genetic and nongenetic risk factors. *Genetics in Medicine* **21**(8), 1708–1718 (2019)
30. Liang, H., Lu, T., Liu, H., Tan, L.: The relationships between hla-a and hla-b genes and the genetic susceptibility to breast cancer in guangxi. *Russian Journal of Genetics* **57**, 1206–1213 (2021)

31. Lin, Z., Akin, H., Rao, R., et al.: Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science* **379**(6637), 1123–1130 (2023)
32. Loibl, S., Gianni, L.: Her2-positive breast cancer. *The Lancet* **389**(10087), 2415–2429 (2017)
33. Lu, Y.C., et al.: Single-cell transcriptome analysis reveals gene signatures associated with t-cell persistence following adoptive cell therapy gene signatures associated with t-cell persistence. *Cancer immunology research* **7**(11), 1824–1836 (2019)
34. Makuuchi, M., Kosuge, T., Takayama, T., et al.: Surgery for small liver cancers. In: *Seminars in surgical oncology*. vol. 9, pp. 298–304. Wiley Online Library (1993)
35. Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., Dean, J.: Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781 (2013)
36. Min, S., Park, et al.: Pre-training of deep bidirectional protein sequence representations with structural information. *IEEE Access* **9**, 123912–123926 (2021)
37. Nambiar, A., Heflin, M., Liu, S., Maslov, S., Hopkins, M., Ritz, A.: Transforming the language of life: transformer neural networks for protein prediction tasks. In: *Proceedings of the 11th ACM international conference on bioinformatics, computational biology and health informatics*. pp. 1–8 (2020)
38. Olshausen, B.A., Field, D.J.: Sparse coding of sensory inputs. *Current opinion in neurobiology* **14**(4), 481–487 (2004)
39. Ostrovsky-Berman, et al.: Immune2vec: Embedding b/t cell receptor sequences in n using natural language processing. *Frontiers in immunology* **12**, 680687 (2021)
40. Peshkin, B.N., Alabek, M.L., Isaacs, C.: Brca1/2 mutations and triple negative breast cancers. *Breast disease* **32**(1-2), 25–33 (2011)
41. Ranstam, J., Cook, J.: Lasso regression. *Journal of British Surgery* **105**(10), 1348–1348 (2018)
42. Rotte, A.: Combination of ctla-4 and pd-1 blockers for treatment of cancer. *Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research* **38**, 1–12 (2019)
43. Schaafsma, et al.: Pan-cancer association of hla gene expression with cancer prognosis and immunotherapy efficacy. *British Journal of Cancer* **125**(3), 422–432 (2021)
44. Shah, K., Al-Haidari, A., Sun, J., Kazi, J.U.: T cell receptor (tcr) signaling in health and disease. *Signal transduction and targeted therapy* **6**(1), 412 (2021)
45. Shen, J., Qu, Y., Zhang, et al.: Wasserstein distance guided representation learning for domain adaptation. In: *AAAI conference on artificial intelligence* (2018)
46. Singh, R., Sekhon, A., Kowsari, K., Lanchantin, J., Wang, B., Qi, Y.: Gakco: a fast gapped k-mer string kernel using counting. In: *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. pp. 356–373 (2017)
47. Stanton, S.E., Disis, M.L.: Clinical significance of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in breast cancer. *Journal for immunotherapy of cancer* **4**, 1–7 (2016)
48. Van, L., Hinton, G.: Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)* **9**(11) (2008)
49. Wan, F., et al.: Deepcpi: a deep learning-based framework for large-scale in silico drug screening. *Genomics, proteomics & bioinformatics* **17**(5), 478–495 (2019)
50. Xie, J., Girshick, R., Farhadi, A.: Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis. In: *International conference on machine learning*. pp. 478–487 (2016)
51. Yang, X., Yang, S., Li, Q., Wuchty, S., Zhang, Z.: Prediction of human-virus protein-protein interactions through a sequence embedding-based machine learning method. *Computational and structural biotechnology journal* **18**, 153–161 (2020)
52. Zhang, et al.: Recurrent neural networks with long term temporal dependencies in machine tool wear diagnosis and prognosis. *SN Applied Sciences* **3**, 1–13 (2021)
53. ZHU, J.D.: The altered dna methylation pattern and its implications in liver cancer. *Cell research* **15**(4), 272–280 (2005)