

# DNA Sequence Classification with Compressors

Şükrü Ozan

digiMOST GmbH, Dieselstraße 7, Marl, 45770,  
Nordrhein-Westfalen, Deutschland  
Email: [sukruozan@digimost.de](mailto:sukruozan@digimost.de)

January 26, 2024

## Abstract

Recent studies in DNA sequence classification have leveraged sophisticated machine learning techniques, achieving notable accuracy in categorizing complex genomic data. Among these, methods such as k-mer counting have proven effective in distinguishing sequences from varied species like chimpanzees, dogs, and humans, becoming a staple in contemporary genomic research. However, these approaches often demand extensive computational resources, posing a challenge in terms of scalability and efficiency. Addressing this issue, our study introduces a novel adaptation of Jiang et al.'s compressor-based, parameter-free classification method, specifically tailored for DNA sequence analysis. This innovative approach utilizes a variety of compression algorithms, such as Gzip, Brotli, and LZMA, to efficiently process and classify genomic sequences. Not only does this method align with the current state-of-the-art in terms of accuracy, but it also offers a more resource-efficient alternative to traditional machine learning methods. Our comprehensive evaluation demonstrates the proposed method's effectiveness in accurately classifying DNA sequences from multiple species. We present a detailed analysis of the performance of each algorithm used, highlighting the strengths and limitations of our approach in various genomic contexts. Furthermore, we discuss the broader implications of our findings for bioinformatics, particularly in genomic data processing and analysis. The results of our study pave

the way for more efficient and scalable DNA sequence classification methods, offering significant potential for advancements in genomic research and applications.

## 1 Introduction

The pursuit of efficient deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) sequence classification is an important operation in genomic research, and as a natural consequence of recent advances in artificial intelligence, it has been significantly driven by machine learning. Traditional methods, more specifically k-mer counting and thresholding, have been widely used to effectively classify DNA sequences.

Traditional methods of processing DNA sequences often result in vectors of varying lengths, which poses a challenge for classification or regression algorithms that require uniform length inputs. To overcome this, sequences are typically truncated or padded. DNA and protein sequences can be conceptualized as a language, with the genome as a book, subsequences as sentences and chapters, k-mers as words, and nucleotide bases as alphabets. This analogy to natural language suggests the potential applicability of natural language processing (NLP) methods to genomic sequences.

The k-mer counting method involves decomposing long biological sequences into overlapping sequences ('words') of length 'k'. For example, a sequence like "ATGCATGCA" is broken down into k-mers of length 6 (hexamers) to produce "ATGCAT", "TGCATG", "GCATGC", "CATGCA", where 'A', 'G', 'C' and 'T' represent nitrogenous bases found in DNA. Python's natural language processing tools can facilitate the k-mer counting process, making it manageable and straightforward. There are numerous works publicly shared by machine learning enthusiasts on DNA sequence classification using k-mer counting, such as Singh [2023a].

Juneja et al.'s exploration of k-mer counting in DNA sequence classification Juneja et al. [2022] highlights its efficacy in distinguishing species-specific sequences, emphasizing the influence of k-mer size on classification accuracy. This method was used in Orozco-Arias et al. [2021] to classify long terminal repeats retrotransposons (LTRs) from genomic sequences obtained from a public plant genome database.

In a parallel line of research focusing on feature selection in microRNA data, a significant contribution has been made by employing advanced meta-heuristic algorithms. A noteworthy study in this realm is presented by Jaddi

and Saniee Abadeh [2022], where the authors enhanced the cell separation meta-heuristic algorithm (CSA) for effective feature selection in cancer classification. This improved approach, termed I-CSA, demonstrated remarkable performance in selecting discriminative features from high-dimensional genomic data, achieving an outstanding classification accuracy. Their methodology underscores the importance of efficient feature selection in genomic research, providing valuable insights that complement traditional methods.

In Sarkar et al. [2021], the authors employed the k-mer method in a novel way for information recovery from DNA sequences. They developed a three-part algorithm that uses a finite impulse response digital filter to calculate the density of k-mer or q-gram words in a sequence. This calculated density is then analyzed using principal component analysis to assess the dissimilarity between sequences, leading to the formation of clusters that aid in constructing phylogenetic relationships.

A recent study by Wen et al. Wen et al. [2019] integrated k-mer counting with convolutional neural networks to enhance feature extraction in Long-chain non-coding ribonucleic acid (lncRNA) and messenger RNA (mRNA) classification. Furthermore, Arias et al. Millán Arias et al. [2022] demonstrated the potential of unsupervised learning techniques, such as clustering algorithms, in identifying patterns in genomic sequences.

The field of explainable AI (XAI) in bioinformatics, as discussed in Yagin et al.'s work Yagin et al. [2023], provides frameworks for interpreting the results of machine learning models on COVID-19 metagenomic next-generation sequencing (mNGS) samples. Additionally, researchers like Salman Khan et al. [2020] are developing scalable solutions like cloud-based tools and parallel computing strategies to handle the increasing volume of genomic data.

In related literature, a study by Jiang et al. Jiang et al. [2023] claims to achieve text classification accuracy comparable to deep neural networks (DNNs) using a solution that embodies Occam's Razor principle. This alternative method combines a compressor algorithm, like gzip, with a k-nearest-neighbor classifier, requiring no training parameters. This approach outperforms BERT on benchmark datasets and excels in few-shot settings where labeled data are too scarce to train DNNs effectively.

This study introduces a novel adaptation of Jiang et al.'s method tailored for DNA sequence classification. We explore the performance of various compressor algorithms, including Gzip, Snappy, Brotli, LZ4, Zstandard, BZ2, and LZMA, each with its unique strengths and suitability for DNA sequencing. This approach diverges from traditional deep learning models,

offering a resource-efficient alternative that competes in accuracy.

We demonstrate the efficacy of these compressor algorithms in accurately classifying DNA sequences, proposing a significant advancement in genomic research. This method aligns with current state-of-the-art accuracy and addresses possible computational resource constraints in bioinformatics.

## 2 Material and Methods

Our methodology integrates the compressor-based classification method proposed by Jiang et al. with various compression algorithms for DNA sequence classification. The method employs a non-parametric approach using compressors and a k-nearest-neighbor classifier. This absence of training parameters makes it significantly resource-efficient. The method involves comparing a given sequence with all previously labeled (training) data to determine its similarity to each sample. The similarity metric is calculated by capturing the amount of compression rate after concatenating the given sequence with the samples in the training data. Since compression algorithms natively capture the similarities in a given sequence, the amount of compression constitutes a good metric to detect similarity between two sequences.

In this study, the method is adapted for DNA sequences, where the sequence data is processed through different compressors like Gzip, Snappy, Brotli, LZ4, Zstandard, BZ2, and LZMA. Each compressor’s performance is evaluated based on its specific algorithmic characteristics, such as compression speed, efficiency, and suitability for DNA sequence data from different species (i.e. human, chimpanzee and dog).

This approach allows us to ascertain the most effective compressor for DNA sequence classification, considering factors like computational resource constraints and the nature of genomic data. The detailed performance analysis of each compressor will provide insights into their applicability and efficiency in DNA sequence classification, contributing to the field of bioinformatics with a novel, resource-efficient classification method.

In the next section, we will further elaborate on the competitiveness of selected compressor algorithms by demonstrating classification accuracy assessments.

## 2.1 Dataset

The dataset used in this study is a collection of DNA sequences from a limited variety of organisms, namely human, chimpanzee and dog, sourced from a publicly available Kaggle dataset Singh [2023b]. Each sequence in the dataset represents a segment of genetic material, encoded in a standard format with characters representing nucleotide bases namely Adenine (A), Thymine (T), Cytosine (C), and Guanine (G).

The sequences have been categorized to facilitate supervised learning tasks. Each sequence is labeled, allowing for clear classification and analysis. The sequences are presented in a format conducive to machine learning applications, with each nucleotide base represented by its corresponding character. This format simplifies the process of numerical or categorical encoding necessary for machine learning algorithms.

The categorization includes seven sequence classes, described as follows:

1. **G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs):** These are cell membrane proteins that mediate cellular responses to various signals like hormones and neurotransmitters. These protein structures are labelled as Class #0 in the dataset.
2. **Receptor tyrosine kinase (RTKs):** Involved in the cellular response to growth factors such as insulin. They are labelled as Class #1 in the dataset.
3. **Protein tyrosine phosphatases (PTPs):** These enzymes remove phosphate groups from tyrosine residues on proteins, counteracting the action of tyrosine kinases, and thus serve as regulatory elements in signaling pathways. These structures are labelled as Class #2 in the dataset.
4. **Synthetases:** Enzymes that catalyze the joining of two molecules, typically using ATP, often involved in the synthesis of larger biomolecules from smaller components. These structures are labelled as Class #3 in the dataset.
5. **Synthases:** These enzymes catalyze the linking together of two molecules without the use of ATP, important in various biosynthetic pathways. These enzymes are labelled as Class #4 in the dataset.

6. **Ion channel receptors (ICRs):** Proteins that form pores in the cell membrane, allowing specific ions to pass through, contributing to a variety of cellular processes including the generation of electrical signals in neurons. These protein structures are labelled as Class #5 in the dataset.
7. **Transcription factors (TFs):** Proteins that bind to specific DNA sequences and regulate the transcription of genetic information from DNA to messenger RNA. They often contain DNA-binding domains and activation domains that interact with other proteins. These sequences are labelled as Class #6 in the dataset.

Each of these families plays distinct roles in cellular function, and their structural differences are integral to their specific mechanisms of action. Since the detailed structural and bio-chemical behaviour of these proteins are out of the scope of this study, interested readers can refer to a biology textbook such as Alberts [2014].

For the experiments we created a dataset by combining the given labelled DNA sequences. Total number of different gene families for each of three species can be seen in Table 1 . By applying an 80% - 20% split scheme for each class after shuffling, a train and test datasets of size 5505 and 1377 are obtained respectively. The distribution over class labels and corresponding species can further be seen in Table 2 and Figure 1 respectively. Figure 2 shows the total number of corresponding sequence classes in the whole gene pool consisting of all the information gathered from the human, chimpanzee and dog genomes.

Table 1: Dataset Composition by Species

Species	Train Size	Test Size
Chimpanzee	1345	337
Human	3504	876
Dog	656	164
<b>Total</b>	5505	1377

## 2.2 Classification Method with Compressors

Compression algorithms can capture similarities between two texts by analyzing patterns and repetitions within the data. These algorithms often use

Table 2: Distribution of Gene Family Samples by Species

Gene Family	Class Label	Chimpanzee	Human	Dog	Total
GPCRs	0	234	531	131	<b>896</b>
RTKs	1	185	534	75	<b>794</b>
PTPs	2	144	349	64	<b>557</b>
Synthetase	3	228	672	95	<b>995</b>
Synthase	4	261	711	135	<b>1107</b>
ICRs	5	109	240	60	<b>409</b>
TFs	6	521	1343	260	<b>2124</b>


techniques like dictionary-based encoding, where frequently occurring patterns are replaced with shorter representations. For instance, if two texts share common phrases or sequences, the algorithm will encode these similarities efficiently, using less space. This process inherently highlights the similarities between texts, as repeated patterns or sequences are compressed in a similar manner. The effectiveness of capturing these similarities depends on the algorithm’s design, with some being more adept at identifying and utilizing these patterns for efficient compression.

The classification method utilizes the normalized compression distance (NCD) Li et al. [2004] given as Equation 1. NCD is calculated by comparing the compression amounts of two strings and their concatenated versions. The flowchart of NCD can be depicted as Figure 3.


$$\text{NCD}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\mathcal{C}(\text{concat}(x_1, x_2)) - \min\{\mathcal{C}(x_1), \mathcal{C}(x_2)\}}{\max\{\mathcal{C}(x_1), \mathcal{C}(x_2)\}} \quad (1)$$

Table 3: Comparison of Compression Algorithms in DNA Sequence Classification in terms of computation time, accuracy, recall, precision and f1 score values.


Algorithm	Computation Time (seconds)	Accuracy	Recall	Precision	F1 Score
Gzip	1735.81	0.962	0.962	0.963	0.962
Snappy	1726.49	0.932	0.932	0.933	0.932
Brotli	12551.60	<b>0.966</b>	<b>0.966</b>	<b>0.967</b>	<b>0.966</b>
LZ4	1618.27	0.942	0.942	0.943	0.942
Zstandard	<b>1560.72</b>	0.930	0.930	0.935	0.931
BZ2	2657.35	0.924	0.924	0.924	0.924
LZMA	9486.67	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.958



(a) Sequence Class distribution in the human genome.



(b) Sequence Class distribution in the chimpanzee genome.



(c) Sequence Class distribution in the human genome.

Figure 1: Sequence Class distribution in the genomes of the species namely the human (a), chimpanzee (b) and dog genomes (c).

Table 4: Performance Metrics of Compression Algorithms on DNA Sequence Classification for Different Species

Algorithm	Chimpanzee				Human				Dog			
	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
Gzip	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.944	0.945	0.944	0.944	0.988	0.989	0.988	0.988
Snappy	0.994	0.994	0.994	0.994	0.943	0.944	0.943	0.943	0.744	0.748	0.744	0.745
Brotli	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.947</b>	<b>0.950</b>	<b>0.947</b>	<b>0.948</b>	<b>0.994</b>	<b>0.994</b>	<b>0.994</b>	<b>0.994</b>
LZ4	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.944	0.946	0.944	0.944	0.817	0.829	0.817	0.819
Zstandard	0.994	0.994	0.994	0.994	0.900	0.909	0.900	0.901	0.963	0.967	0.963	0.963
BZ2	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.893	0.894	0.893	0.893	0.963	0.966	0.963	0.964
LZMA	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.936	0.937	0.936	0.936	0.988	0.989	0.988	0.988






Figure 2: Sequence Class distribution in the whole gene pool including the human, chimpanzee and dog genomes.




Figure 3: Flowchart illustrating the process of computing the Normalized Compression Distance (NCD) between two sequences  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  using a compressor and subsequent analysis.

## 3 Experiments

### 3.1 Compression algorithms

In this work, we aim to prove the applicability of the NCD based classification algorithm Jiang et al. [2023] to DNA sequence classification problem.






Figure 4: Confusion Matrix for the Entire Dataset. This matrix provides an overview of the classifier’s performance on the complete dataset, illustrating the accuracy of classification across all categories.

Whilst doing that, we also try different compression algorithms which are conventionally used by simply importing corresponding libraries in a Python script. Our selected compression algorithms are:


1. **Gzip:** Gzip uses the DEFLATE algorithm, which is a combination of LZ77 Ziv and Lempel [1977] and Huffman coding Huffman [1952]. It offers a good balance between compression ratio and speed, making it widely used for file compression and in web contexts.
2. **Snappy:** Developed by Google, Snappy is based on LZ77. It does not aim for maximum compression or compatibility with any other compression library; instead, it aims for very high speeds and reasonable compression. Often used in systems like databases and interprocess com-



(a) Confusion matrix for human DNA sequences



(b) Confusion matrix for chimpanzee DNA sequences



(c) Confusion matrix for dog DNA sequences

Figure 5: Confusion matrices for subspecies-wise classifications: Human, Chimpanzee, and Dog DNA. These matrices detail the classifier’s accuracy for each subspecies, highlighting the precision in distinguishing between the seven genomic classes labelled as ‘Class 0’ to ‘Class 6’.

munication where speed is more crucial than the degree of compression.

3. **Brotli:** Brotli is a mix of a modern variant of the LZ77 algorithm,

Huffman coding, and 2nd order context modeling. It provides higher compression ratios than Gzip, especially for text data. It's somewhat slower in compression but still very fast in decompression. Commonly used in web traffic for assets like HTML, CSS, and JavaScript due to its efficient compression of text.

4. **LZ4:** LZ4 is based on LZ77 but is designed for very fast compression and decompression. It trades off compression ratio for speed, being one of the fastest compressors in terms of both compression and decompression. Ideal for scenarios where processing speed is more important than reducing data size, such as real-time applications.
5. **Zstandard (Zstd):** Zstd also combines LZ77 with Huffman coding but introduces new techniques like a fast dictionary-based compression. Offers a wide range of compression levels, providing a balance between speed and compression ratio. It's adaptable to different types of data. Versatile for various scenarios, from real-time communication to archival storage, due to its scalability in compression levels.
6. **BZ2 (Bzip2):** Bzip2 uses the Burrows-Wheeler transform Burrows [1994] followed by the Move-To-Front transform Bentley et al. [1986] and Huffman coding. Generally provides higher compression ratios than Gzip, but at the cost of slower compression speed. Suitable for applications where compression ratio is more important than compression or decompression speed.
7. **LZMA (Lempel-Ziv-Markov chain algorithm):** LZMA uses a dictionary compression scheme (like LZ77) and a range coding (similar to arithmetic coding). Known for its very high compression ratios, but with slower compression and decompression speeds compared to others like Gzip or LZ4. Ideal for applications where the compressed size is the primary concern, and time is not a constraint, such as compressing large backups or software distribution.

Each of these algorithms has its unique strengths and weaknesses. The choice of which one to use depends on the specific requirements of the application, such as the need for fast compression, fast decompression, or maximizing the compression ratio. For the specific problem of this work we also validate and show the trade-off between computation speed and accuracy in Section 4.

## 3.2 Computation

To utilize the parallel processing capability of the computer, we used the 'pathos' python library. In the code segment shown in Listing 1, two main functions to construct the distance matrix can be seen.

`create_distance_matrix` utilizes pooling and further accepts a variable for selecting the compression algorithm. `distance_calc` function is used to calculate the normalized compression distance (see Equation 1) for a given pair of training and test sample.

The experiments are performed on a computer with M1 chip-set and 8 cores. A Python notebook and a Conda environment were used for simplicity, portability and reproducibility. The notebook and the Conda environment configuration files are shared in our repository Ozan [2023].

Running the code as separate Python scripts is faster than executing the same scripts within Python notebooks. Nevertheless, the experimental setup provides insights into the running times of different compression algorithms. In Table 3 the computation times for each selected compression algorithms can be seen.

```
1 def distance_calc(compression, test, train, i, j):
2     test_string = test.iloc[i]['sequence']
3     train_string = train.iloc[j]['sequence']
4     if compression in ['gzip', 'snappy', 'brotli', 'bz2']:
5         compressor = globals().get(compression)
6         Cx1 = len(compressor.compress(test_string))
7         Cx2 = len(compressor.compress(train_string))
8         Cxix2 = len(compressor.compress((" ".join([test_string, train_string])))
9     elif compression == 'lz4':
10        Cx1 = len(lz4.frame.compress(test_string))
11        Cx2 = len(lz4.frame.compress(train_string))
12        Cxix2 = len(lz4.frame.compress((" ".join([test_string, train_string])))
13    elif compression == 'zstandard':
14        Cx1 = len(zstd.compress(test_string.encode()))
15        Cx2 = len(zstd.compress(train_string.encode()))
16        Cxix2 = len(zstd.compress((" ".join([test_string, train_string])))
17    elif compression == 'lzma':
18        Cx1 = len(lzma.compress(test_string.encode()))
19        Cx2 = len(lzma.compress(train_string.encode()))
20        Cxix2 = len(lzma.compress((" ".join([test_string, train_string])))
21    distance = (Cxix2 - min(Cx1, Cx2)) / max(Cx1, Cx2)
22    return [i, j, distance]
23
24 def create_distance_matrix(train, test, pool, compression='gzip'):
25     distance_matrix = np.zeros((len(test), len(train)))
26     for i in range(len(test)):
27         result = pool.map(partial(distance_calc, compression, test, train, i), range(len(train)))
28         for j in result:
29             distance_matrix[j[0]][j[1]] = j[2]
30     return distance_matrix
```

Listing 1: Python functions to construct the distance matrix. Elements of the matrix corresponds to a normalized compression distance between the samples from the training set and the test set.

## 4 Results

The classification method in Jiang et al. [2023] utilizes both NCD and K-nearest neighborhood classification. The number of neighbors is typically selected as 3. However, in our work, we opted for the single nearest neighbor, using its class information for prediction. The method yields results comparable to state-of-the-art techniques for the DNA sequence classification problem. Table 3 summarizes the experiment results. The confusion matrix of the proposed classifier algorithm utilizing Brotli compression for the whole dataset can be seen in Figure 4.



Regarding computation speed, the Zstandard’ compression algorithm appears to be the fastest. Conversely, the ‘Brotli’ compression, while being the slowest, demonstrates the best overall accuracy over the dataset with species-wise and gene-class-wise distribution given in Table 2.

A more detailed accuracy comparison with species breakdown can be seen in Table 4. We see that Brotli compression has the best performance over the three species’ DNA samples. The depiction of the confusion matrices of three species, human, chimpanzee and dog, can be seen in Figures 5a, 5b and 5c respectively.



## 5 Discussion and Conclusion

This study addresses a bioinformatics problem related to DNA sequence classification. The nature of the problem typically restricts the dataset size, hence the problem is mostly considered not well fitted for deep learning. Researchers tend to prefer to use machine learning and NLP inspired methods such as k-mers. As a state-of-the-art result in Juneja et al. [2022] the authors reported an overall accuracy of 98.4% over the same data base we use in this study. Our NCD approach yielded a maximum overall accuracy of 96.6% which makes the approach considerable for the DNA sequence classification problem.

In Figure 6, we can see the histogram of 1, 2, 3 and 4-mer nucleotide sequence histograms in Class 6 sequences of Human Genome (see Table 2). From these figures it can be interpreted that as  $n$  increases n-mers constitute more discriminative features. This is the reason why the n-mer based classification methods such as Juneja et al. [2022] works successfully. These distributions also validate why the compression based methods work as well.



(a) Histogram of basic nucleotide bases in Human DNA sequences. (b) Histogram of 2-mer nucleotide sequences in Human DNA sequences.



(c) Histogram of 3-mer nucleotide sequences in Human DNA sequences. (d) Histogram of 4-mer nucleotide sequences in Human DNA sequences.

Figure 6: a to d: Shows the histograms of 1, 2, 3, and 4-mer nucleotide sequences in Human DNA sequences.

The compressors are inherently robust in finding common patterns and compress the data accordingly. If there are more common segments in two given sample sequences, they compress more with respect to two sequences which share less common segments.

We saw that most of the chosen compression algorithms give over 90% accuracy. However, the Brotli compressor achieves the highest accuracies across all species. However, despite its fast computation time, the Zstandard algorithm only reaches 89.3% accuracy for human DNA and another fast compressor Snappy only reaches 74.4% accuracy for dog DNA.

As highlighted in Jiang et al. [2023], the NCD approach’s computational complexity is  $O(n^2)$  which makes the method not suitable for very large datasets. As a further study, addressing the computational complexity of the NCD method and finding a method to make it also applicable for larger

datasets can be an interesting work. As an alternative text classification method the NCD approach seems to be a good alternative also for DNA sequence classification problem of the bioinformatics literature.

## **Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process**

During the preparation of this work the author used OpenAI ChatGPT in order to improve language and readability. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

## **Supplementary Material**

For the purpose of ensuring transparency and reproducibility in this research, the complete codebase and dataset used in this study are made publicly available. Interested researchers and practitioners can access these resources through the corresponding GitHub repository Ozan [2023]. The repository contains all data and source code used for the implementation of the proposed DNA sequence classification algorithm. This includes scripts for data pre-processing, model training, evaluation, and any additional utility functions. Accompanying the code, the dataset employed in this study is also available for download. This dataset is crucial for researchers looking to replicate this study or build upon it. Comprehensive documentation is provided to guide users through the setup, execution, and understanding of the code and data. We welcome contributions and collaborations from the community. Researchers can utilize the repository as a starting point for their investigations or to compare with alternative methodologies in DNA sequence classification or other similar problems.

## **References**

Bruce Alberts. *Molecular biology of the cell*. Garland Publishing, New York, NY, 6 edition, November 2014.



- Jon Louis Bentley, Daniel D. Sleator, Robert E. Tarjan, and Victor K. Wei. A locally adaptive data compression scheme. *Communications of the ACM*, 29(4):320–330, April 1986. ISSN 1557-7317. doi: 10.1145/5684.5688. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/5684.5688>.
- Michael Burrows. A block-sorting lossless data compression algorithm. *SRS Research Report*, 124, 1994.
- David Huffman. A method for the construction of minimum-redundancy codes. *Proceedings of the IRE*, 40(9):1098–1101, September 1952. ISSN 0096-8390. doi: 10.1109/jrproc.1952.273898. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/JRPROC.1952.273898>.
- Najmeh Sadat Jaddi and Mohammad Saniee Abadeh. Cell separation algorithm with enhanced search behaviour in mirna feature selection for cancer diagnosis. *Information Systems*, 104:101906, February 2022. ISSN 0306-4379. doi: 10.1016/j.is.2021.101906. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.is.2021.101906>.
- Zhiying Jiang, Matthew Yang, Mikhail Tsirlin, Raphael Tang, Yiqin Dai, and Jimmy Lin. “low-resource” text classification: A parameter-free classification method with compressors. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6810–6828, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.426. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.426>.
- Sapna Juneja, Annu Dhankhar, Abhinav Juneja, and Shivani Bali. An approach to dna sequence classification through machine learning: Dna sequencing, k mer counting, thresholding, sequence analysis. *International Journal of Reliable and Quality E-Healthcare*, 11(2):1–15, August 2022. ISSN 2160-956X. doi: 10.4018/ijrqeh.299963. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/IJRQEH.299963>.
- Salman Khan, Mukhtaj Khan, Nadeem Iqbal, Maozhen Li, and Dost Muhammad Khan. Spark-based parallel deep neural network model for classification of large scale rnas into pirnas and non-pirnas. *IEEE Access*, 8: 136978–136991, 2020. ISSN 2169-3536. doi: 10.1109/access.2020.3011508. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3011508>.

- Ming Li, Xin Chen, Xin Li, Bin Ma, and Paul M. B. Vitányi. The similarity metric. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 50(12):3250–3264, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2004.838101. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2004.838101>.
- Pablo Millán Arias, Fatemeh Alipour, Kathleen A. Hill, and Lila Kari. Delucs: Deep learning for unsupervised clustering of dna sequences. *PLOS ONE*, 17(1):e0261531, January 2022. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0261531. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261531>.
- Simon Orozco-Arias, Mariana S. Candamil-Cortés, Paula A. Jaimes, Johan S. Piña, Reinel Tabares-Soto, Romain Guyot, and Gustavo Isaza. K-mer-based machine learning method to classify ltr-retrotransposons in plant genomes. *PeerJ*, 9:e11456, May 2021. ISSN 2167-8359. doi: 10.7717/peerj.11456. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11456>.
- Sukru Ozan. Dna sequence classification. <https://github.com/sukruozan/DNA-Sequence-Classification>, 2023.
- Bimal Kumar Sarkar, Ashish Ranjan Sharma, Manojit Bhattacharya, Garima Sharma, Sang-Soo Lee, and Chiranjib Chakraborty. Determination of k-mer density in a dna sequence and subsequent cluster formation algorithm based on the application of electronic filter. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), July 2021. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-93154-3. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-93154-3>.
- Nagesh Singh. Demystify dna sequencing with machine learning. <https://www.kaggle.com/code/nageshsingh/demystify-dna-sequencing-with-machine-learning/notebook>, 2023a.
- Nagesh Singh. Dna sequence dataset. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/nageshsingh/dna-sequence-dataset>, 2023b.
- Jianghui Wen, Yeshu Liu, Yu Shi, Haoran Huang, Bing Deng, and Xinpeng Xiao. A classification model for lncrna and mrna based on k-mers and a convolutional neural network. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20(1), September 2019. ISSN 1471-2105. doi: 10.1186/s12859-019-3039-3. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12859-019-3039-3>.

Fatma Hilal Yagin, İpek Balikci Cicek, Abedalrhman Alkhateeb, Burak Yagin, Cemil Colak, Mohammad Azzeh, and Sami Akbulut. Explainable artificial intelligence model for identifying covid-19 gene biomarkers. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 154:106619, 2023. ISSN 0010-4825. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2023.106619>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010482523000847>.

J. Ziv and A. Lempel. A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 23(3):337–343, 1977. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1977.1055714.