

Lightning-fast adaptive immune receptor similarity search by symmetric deletion lookup

Touchchai Chotisorayuth¹ and Andreas Tiffeau-Mayer^{2,3}

¹*Department of Computer Science*

²*Division of Infection and Immunity*

³*Institute for the Physics of Living Systems
University College London*

An individual’s adaptive immune receptor (AIR) repertoire records immune history due to the exquisite antigen specificity of AIRs. Reading this record requires computational approaches for inferring receptor function from sequence, as the diversity of possible receptor-antigen pairs vastly outstrips experimental knowledge. Identification of AIRs with similar sequence and thus putatively similar function is a common performance bottleneck in these approaches. Here, we benchmark the time complexity of five different algorithmic approaches to radius-based search for Levenshtein neighbors. We show that a symmetric deletion lookup approach, originally proposed for spell-checking, is particularly scalable. We then introduce XTNeighbor, a variant of this algorithm that can be massively parallelized on GPUs. For one million input sequences, XTNeighbor identifies all sequence neighbors that differ by up to two edits in seconds on commodity hardware, orders of magnitude faster than existing approaches. We also demonstrate how symmetric deletion lookup can speed up search with more complex sequence-similarity metrics such as TCRdist. Our contribution is poised to greatly speed up existing analysis pipelines and enable processing of large-scale immunosequencing data without downsampling.

Keywords: Adaptive immune receptor repertoire, approximate string search, TCR, BCR

Somatic recombination creates adaptive immune receptors (AIR) of immense diversity. Despite the independence of AIR generation across individuals, convergent selection on shared antigens has been commonly observed lead to the emergence of similar antibodies [1, 2] and T cell receptors (TCRs) [3–5] across individuals, so called public responses. This insight has driven the emergence of computational approaches for AIR repertoire analysis that leverage sequence-similarity to bridge the sequence-annotation gap in immunology [6–14].

While sequence-similarity searches have long been a mainstay of computational biology, bespoke approaches are beginning to be developed that are tailored to the particular data-distributional properties of AIR repertoires. Due to antigen-driven convergent selection and recombination biases repertoires often contain highly similar AIR sequences that differ by only a few edits in their hypervariable regions [5, 7, 8]. The rationale for AIR similarity search also differs from traditional homolog search [15], and instead exploits convergent selection on non-homologous proteins to predict function from sequence (for an example for similar ideas in the general protein bioinformatics literature see Littmann *et al.* [16]). These tailored tools cover a number of different use cases: First, identification of sequence near-overlaps between samples can be used to define measures of repertoire similarity using software packages such as VDJtools [6] and CompAIRR [13]. Second, unsupervised clustering of AIR repertoires can identify receptor groups with putatively shared specificity, called

metaclonotypes or specificity groups using tools such as TCRdist [8, 9], Glyph [17, 18], iSMART [14] and ClusTCR [11]. Third, the identification of similar sequences can be used for the supervised prediction of AIR specificity by annotation transfer using tools such as VDJMatch [10], TCRMATCH [12] and KA-Search [19].

Across applications, identification of pairs of sequences below a threshold similarity level represents a common performance bottleneck. Combinatorial lookup algorithms have recently been proposed [11, 13], which generate all possible variants of a query sequence below the threshold distance and then use exact hash-based comparisons to identify matches. This approach greatly reduces the computational complexity of finding single-edit neighbors compared to exhaustive search, but scales poorly to higher threshold distances.

In this paper, we present XTNeighbor (eXtreme T cell receptor Neighbor search) a parallel-ready algorithm for fast AIR similarity search that overcomes this limitation and can be applied to cohort-scale AIR datasets. Our novel contribution is to take a step beyond combinatorial lookup by using symmetric deletion on both query and reference sequences, adapting an approach pioneered by the spell checking tool SymSpell [20]. We demonstrate by extensive benchmarking that the symmetric deletion (SymDel) lookup algorithm is ideally suited for AIR similarity search and leads to large performance gain for practically relevant dataset sizes and similarity thresholds. Our second contribution is the development of variants of the SymDel lookup algorithm that can be efficiently parallelized on GPUs.




Figure 1. **Symmetric deletion lookup by examples.** (A) Reference sequences with insertions are identified by matches between their deletion variants and the queries. (B) References sequences with substitutions are identified by matches among deletion variants of both reference and query sequences. (C) Matches between multiple deleted variants of the same pair of sequence can lead to duplications. (D) Matches between deleted variants can sometimes exceed the threshold distance ($d = 1$ in this example). Post-processing can be used to cover the cases shown in C and D, i.e. to remove duplicates and pairs exceeding the threshold.

Taken together, our advances on algorithm design and parallelization provide a template for making AIR similarity search lightning fast.

The remainder of the paper is structured as followed: Section I introduces the SymDel lookup algorithm and our work on parallelizing this algorithm for GPU acceleration in XTNeighbor. Section II presents benchmarking results comparing SymDel lookup to other algorithms and existing tools on an AIR sequence dataset. In the final section we discuss potential applications of XTNeighbor and directions for future research.

I. XTNEIGHBOR

In the following section, we will motivate and describe the key considerations that have led us to develop the XTNeighbor algorithm. The descriptions are supplemented by step-by-step definitions and process diagrams of the algorithms provided in Appendix A.

A. The symmetric deletion lookup algorithm

Symmetric deletion (SymDel) lookup is a variation of the combinatorial lookup algorithm that uses exact matching of only deletion variants on both the query and reference side. This algorithm was introduced by Garbe [20] for spell-checking, but is not widely known

in the bioinformatics literature. We therefore review how this algorithm works through a collection of examples provided in Fig. 1. From the SymDel perspective, generating insertions on the query side is equivalent to generating deletions on the reference end of the comparison (Fig. 1A). Similarly, generating substitutions is equivalent to performing deletion on both sides with the substituting character being removed (Fig. 1B).

By generating only deletion variants, the SymDel algorithm achieves significant efficiency gains. At query time instead of generating all possible insertion / substitution / deletion variants of a query, only deletions need to be generated. This leads to a reduction of combinatorial complexity, for example a string of length 10 has 79,746 possible neighbors at Levenshtein distance 2 but only 56 deletion variants.

An attentive reader might have noticed that SymDel can return duplicated (Fig. 1C) or irrelevant matches (Fig. 1D) as consecutive character repeats and character swaps may lead to false positives. Fortunately, the number of returned candidate pairs is typically very small compared to all possible pairs that would be tested by a brute-force approach. Therefore, the output of the algorithm can be filtered in a post-processing step with minimal overhead.

B. Overcoming parallelization bottlenecks

In developing XTNeighbor our aim was to provide an implementation of SymDel lookup that can achieve the parallelization benefit provided by Graphical Processing Units (GPU). Achieving high performance requires removing parallelization bottlenecks and implementing all steps of the code using optimized parallel primitives.

Parallel primitives are optimized high-level operations designed to distribute the workload efficiently across GPU cores. XTNeighbor is written in C++ using the CUDA framework and uses six existing parallel primitives from the CUB library [21]: `map`, `sortKeyValues`, `sort`, `unique`, `uniqueCount`, and `if`. None of the existing parallel primitives support, however, mapping elements in a one-to-many fashion which is required for the symmetric deletion approach to generate multiple shortened sequences from the same input. We thus implemented a new parallel primitive `expand`, which takes small consecutive chunks of an array as input and produces consecutive chunks of an output array in one-to-many/many-to-many fashion. To allow parallelization, this primitive requires two conditions. First, the output must not overlap among chunks. Second, the number of outputs must be calculable ahead of time such that output memory can be allocated without race conditions. When these conditions are fulfilled, different chunks of input and output can be independently assigned to each GPU core for parallel processing.

A further hurdle in parallelizing SymDel lookup arises in the initialization of the multi-value hash map. Multiple independent processes could be inserting the same key, which leads to race condition problem. To avoid this, the most common implementations of hash tables on GPU do not natively support multi-value hash maps [22, 23]. To overcome this limitation, we replaced the multi-value hash map with a parallel key-grouping operation, which can be implemented using the `sortKeyValues` and `uniqueCount` primitives. Each group contains all identical keys and thus can be used to recreate the information that would be provided by a multi-value hash map.

C. Overcoming memory bottlenecks

At very large input sizes, the algorithm we have just described has large memory requirements. To reduce memory needs, we next implemented a streaming version of XTNeighbor. In this streaming algorithm, the input is divided into chunks which are processed only once in a forward direction to produce an output for downstream processing and then immediately discarded. Streaming allows XTNeighbor to operate at any scale with constant memory size.

However, two problems with the original parallelized algorithm need to be overcome to allow streaming: directional change and unbounded matching. Directional change occurs during the grouping operation, where the direction of the processed data is changed from its original order to a new grouped order. Unbounded matching occurs during duplication removal, which requires the matching of duplicated values across chunks. Both operations cannot directly be performed in a streaming fashion, as values from the current chunk would need to be unboundedly retained in order to anticipate the possible matching in future chunks.

To solve both problems, we introduced a 2-dimensional buffer which stores data in a sorted grid format such that data written in a row-wise manner can be accessed in a column-wise manner in another order. Such a buffer directly solves the directional change problem, if one of the access directions is in the grouping order. Furthermore, by binning the data into columns consistently, we can ensure that, regardless of chunk, a particular sequence is always assigned to the same column. If all repeated values are part of the same column, the unbounded matching problem is reduced to column-bounded matching, the latter of which is feasible with constant memory size.

More specifically, we define a 2-dimensional buffer as follows. First, we divide the input stream into N separate chunks as $S = [s_1; s_2, \dots; s_N]$. Then, as we store it in the 2-dimensional buffer in row-order, we further divide it into smaller chunks c_{ij} by binning the sequences from the chunks into M equal-width bins in column order:

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & \dots & c_{1M} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ c_{N1} & & c_{NM} \end{bmatrix}, c_{ij} \in s_i, c_{ij} \in \text{bin}_j$$

With this definition, fetching data in a column-wise order with a sort operation $f_j = \text{sort}([c_{1j}; c_{2j}; \dots; c_{Nj}])$ yields sorted data across chunks and also guarantees that all data in the bins (which includes all possible matches) are contained in a single read.

One missing piece of this solution is that the buffer is required to store the entire output stream, which in itself requires substantial memory. However, we can simply process the data multiple times M , each time only focusing on a small number of bins. The number of bins can be calculated ahead of time by determining the number of elements falling in each bin and then solving a bin packing optimization problem [24] that minimizes M subject to memory constraints. Among the solutions to bin packing proposed in the literature we chose "Next-Fit Bin" [25] due to its conceptual simplicity and order-preserving property.

II. RESULTS

A. Computational complexity of algorithmic approaches to AIR similarity search

We first comprehensively benchmarked algorithmic approaches to AIR similarity search on an equal footing in the absence of parallelization. We thus focused our benchmark on determining how algorithm speed scales with the size of the input data and the threshold choice. By focusing on the empirical time complexity of the algorithms in relevant ranges of dataset sizes, we sought to understand the performance of the algorithms without being overly biased by implementation details.

We identified three alternative approaches from a literature search for exact Levenshtein distance radius-based similarity search on strings:

- Exhaustive search, the brute-force algorithm comparing all pairs of sequences
- Combinatorial lookup: a hashing-based approach based on generating all possible neighboring sequences [11, 13]
- BKtree: a tree-based edit distance neighbor search algorithm for strings [26]

For the BKtree algorithm we made use of the bktree library [27]. For all other algorithms we used our own Python implementations.

Sequence-to-vector representation approaches have gained tremendous popularity in bioinformatics applications over the last decade [28–31]. We thus additionally implemented a representation-based algorithm that allows exact Levenshtein distance radius searches as an exemplar of this paradigm, which is described in detail in Appendix B:

- K-d tree bag: a tree-based neighbor search algorithm for vectors, which can be applied to identify similar AIRs using a bag-of-amino-acids representation.

To make our benchmark realistic we used real-world TCR β sequencing data of complementarity determining region 3 (CDR3) sequences from a large cohort of healthy human subjects [32]. We filtered the data to keep only valid sequences of length between one and eighteen amino acids and removed all duplicate sequences. We created random subsets of the data of the following sizes: 1k, 3k, 10k, 30k, and 100k sequences. At each dataset size, we averaged run times over 30 randomly chosen samples. All benchmarks were performed using Google Colab (Intel Xeon CPU 1 core with 51GB of RAM) to make it easy to reproduce the results.

The benchmarking result shows substantial performance benefits of the SymDel approach compared to

other algorithms already at a threshold distance of a single edit (Fig. 2A), but in particular at the larger threshold of two edits (Fig. 2B).

To assess empirical scalability, we fitted each curve to a power-law, $\log(t) = A \log(n) + B$, where t denotes run time, n denotes number of inputs, and A/B are fitted parameters. The scaling exponents A are reported in Table I. The exhaustive search time scales empirically $\sim O(n^2)$, as expected as this algorithm considers all $n(n-1)/2$ pairs of sequences. Combinatorial lookup reduces empirical time complexity to $\sim O(n)$, again following theory expectations. Combinatorial lookup involves $O(n)$ hash table queries, each of which takes $O(1)$ time. BK-tree and k-d tree both show very similar performance each with scaling exponents intermediate between the other approaches. Finally, SymDel lookup empirically has a close to linear $\sim O(n)$ scaling, demonstrating that for tested sample sizes most time is spent on the neighbor candidate generation step (with expected $O(n)$ scaling) rather than on the postprocessing (with expected $O(n^2)$ scaling).

While both combinatorial lookup and SymDel lookup have a time complexity $\sim O(n)$, performance scales very differently with the threshold choice (Fig. 2C). Combinatorial lookup is about three orders of magnitude slower at a threshold $d = 2$. SymDel lookup in contrast scales much more favorably to $d = 2$, illustrating the power of the symmetric deletion trick.

B. Benchmarking XTNeighbor

We next used the same dataset to benchmark the performance gain achieved by XTNeighbor through parallelization. To this end, we compared single-core CPU performance of SymDel lookup with XTNeighbor performance on a commodity GPU (Nvidia Tesla T4). We benchmarked both the base version of XTNeighbor as well as its streaming equivalent XTNeighbor-streaming. To test scalability to larger sample sizes, we used the following sample sizes in this benchmark: 30K, 100K, 300K, 1M, 3M, 10M, and 30M.

The results show that XTNeighbor is able to leverage

Algorithm	$d = 1$	$d = 2$
Combinatorial Lookup	1.02	1.00
SymDel Lookup	0.95	1.08
BK-tree	1.71	1.91
k-d tree	1.71	2.00
Exhaustive search	2.11	2.11

Table I. Empirical time complexity of algorithms on the CPU benchmark (Fig. 2) as determined by power-law fits for Levenshtein distance thresholds of $d = 1$ and $d = 2$.




Figure 2. **Benchmark of AIR sequence similarity search algorithms on CPU.** Time measured in seconds for near-sequence neighbor search as a function of input size for various algorithms at Levenshtein distance threshold (A) $d = 1$ and (B) $d = 2$. Lines are linear fits on log-log scale. (C) Side-by-side comparison of search time at different thresholds for 3,000 sequences. In bold: Algorithms that have not previously been applied to AIR similarity search to our knowledge. Note that BKtree and k-d tree bag performance overlaps in A.




Figure 3. **Benchmark of GPU-accelerated similarity search.** Time measured in seconds as a function of input size at Levenshtein distance threshold (A) $d = 1$ and (B) $d = 2$. The most scalable CPU algorithm SymDel lookup is compared to the GPU algorithms XTNeighbor and XTNeighbor-streaming. Lines are linear fits on log-log scale. Only the largest three input sizes at which each algorithm could be run were used for fitting due to non-linear scaling in small samples.

parallelization effectively to reduce computing time by 10x-100x compared to SymDel lookup on CPU (Fig. 3). XTNeighbor shows sublinear scaling presumably due to overheads in using GPU in small samples. The base XTNeighbor algorithm is faster than its streaming equivalent but, given memory limitations of the tested GPU, does not scale to 30 million sequences. In comparison, XTNeighbor-streaming can process 30 million sequences at distance 1 in about a minute, and 10 million sequences at distance 2 in about three minutes. Taken together, these results demonstrate the scalability of XTNeighbor to cohort-size datasets.

C. Comparison with existing tools

We next sought to compare SymDel lookup and XTNeighbor to existing AIR similarity search tools. Many tools use heuristics to speed-up neighbor search, such as fuzzy preclustering [11] or fixed-length prealignments [19], and are thus not directly comparable. For a fair comparison, we decided to compare our tools against CompAIRR [13], as this software also allows exact radius-based similarity search. CompAIRR uses combinatorial lookup, but differs from our own implementation of this algorithmic approach by being imple-




Figure 4. **Benchmark of repertoire overlap computation speed against CompAIRR.** Time measured in seconds as a function of the number of input repertoires at Hamming distance threshold (A) $d = 1$ and (B) $d = 2$. XTNeighbor-streaming is the fastest algorithm across thresholds and dataset sizes thanks to GPU acceleration and symmetric deletion.

mented in C++ and by using a custom Bloom filter for lookups [33]. CompAIRR does not support Levenshtein distance neighbor search with $d > 1$, so we needed to adjust our benchmarking task to a Hamming distance neighbor search instead. To apply our algorithms to Hamming distance, we modified the last step of the algorithm to filter by Hamming instead of Levenshtein distance. We again used data from Emerson et al. [32], but we focused on a slightly different task, namely the computation of repertoire overlap among different numbers of repertoires, which we sampled without replacement as follows: 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64.

XTNeighbor-streaming is the fastest algorithm across thresholds and dataset sizes in this benchmark and is $\sim 50x$ faster at threshold distance 2 than CompAIRR (Fig. 4). Our CPU implementation of SymDel lookup in pure Python is slower than CompAIRR at distance 1, but faster at distance 2. This illustrates how the more favorable scaling of the symmetric deletion algorithm to higher distance thresholds can outweigh improvements in the scaling prefactors achievable by optimizing implementations. We note that Hamming distance neighbors are somewhat easier to identify by combinatorial lookup because fewer neighbors need to be considered than for Levenshtein distance, so we expect symmetric deletion to perform even more favorably for identifying Levenshtein distance neighbors.

D. SymDel lookup can be combined with more advanced similarity metrics

We next asked how the algorithmic improvements in the identification of similar sequences according to Levenshtein distance can be combined with more complex




Figure 5. **SymDel lookup can be combined with TCRdist filtering.** (A) Time measured in seconds for similarity search among 40,000 sequences using exhaustive TCRdist calculations (Exh) or a combination of SymDel lookup and TCRdist filtering (SymDel with $d = 3$ or $d = 2$). (B) Percentage of TCR pairs with a Levenshtein distance $d \leq 2$ and $d \leq 3$ at different TCRdist thresholds.

sequence similarity metrics. We reasoned that SymDel lookup could be used to rapidly identify candidate neighbors, which could then be filtered according to a slower to compute but more accurate sequence metric. We expected that by reducing the number of pairs of sequence for which the full metric needs to be computed, we can attain a sizable speed-up while retaining most sequence neighbors. As a proof-of-principle, we implemented a TCRdist [8] filtering step following SymDel lookup. TCRdist builds on the base Levenshtein distance by weighting substitutions by their amino acid

similarity and by also computing V gene similarity. We tested the combined algorithm by identifying all pairs with Levenshtein distance $d \leq 2$ using SymDel lookup and then filtering them according to different TCRdist thresholds. We thus implemented TCRdist filtering as a post-processing step following SymDel lookup. We benchmarked the combined algorithm against the out-of-memory implementation of sparse neighbor finding provided by the TCRdist3 Python package [9], on a dataset consisting of 40,000 TCR β sequences from a single donor from [32]. The candidate identification by SymDel lookup allowed us to obtain a ~ 100 -fold and ~ 20 -fold speed-up for similarity search (Fig. 5A), when using Levenshtein distance thresholds of $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, respectively. At the same time, despite pre-filtering $>99\%$ of sequence pairs up to TCRdist ~ 20 and ~ 30 where retained (Fig. 5B) at these Levenshtein thresholds. Taken together, these results demonstrate how the SymDel paradigm can be combined with downstream processing to speed-up similarity search with more advanced metrics.

III. DISCUSSION

In this work, we have benchmarked algorithms for AIR similarity search, and have provided a novel parallelized implementation of the best-performing algorithm, SymDel lookup. The resulting software tool XTNeighbor scales to the processing of AIR repertoire data from entire cohorts and efficiently searches for similar AIRs up to larger threshold similarities than alternative approaches.

Our algorithmic advance can be readily incorporated into existing analysis pipelines for increased speed and scalability. Pairwise sequence-neighbor statistics have direct applications in the comparison of immune repertoires [5, 13]. Potential downstream applications include AIR clustering [8, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18] to discover potential groups of antigen-specific AIRs in an unsupervised manner. Another application are fuzzy database lookups [6, 12], where the query-side is the repertoire obtained from patient and the database-side are known disease-associated AIRs.

As a proof-of-concept, our current work focused on similarity search among CDR3 sequences, which are the most hypervariable AIR loop, and we focused on single chain data. Both limitations could be readily addressed by concatenating CDR3 sequences from both chains with a non-deletable joining token, and by including CDR1 and CDR2 regions in the similarity search. Such approaches might increase the accuracy as all six CDR regions (three from each chain) collectively determine AIR binding specificity [5, 34].

To benchmark the scaling of search time with input data set size and threshold choices, we compared five different algorithms using Python implementations. While this gave us important insights into the computational complexity of different approaches, actual search times also depend on the prefactors in the scaling relationships which might vary between different implementations. For instance, we found that the highly-optimized combinatorial lookup implementation provided by the CompAIRR C++ package [13] can boost the range of sample sizes for which this algorithm is competitive, but these performance gains were outweighed by the algorithmic improvements provided by SymDel at larger threshold similarities. We have also restricted our comparisons to other tools that also support exact radius-based search for edit distance neighbors, excluding potential speed gains attainable by imprecise neighbor search, used e.g. in ClusTCR [11] based on the Faiss library [35], or by fixed length pre-alignments, used e.g. in KA-search [19]. By making exact Levenshtein distance search at scale possible our work will enable further investigation of the accuracy-speed trade-offs inherent in relaxations of exact search.

Another direction for future research is to accelerate downstream tasks using parallelization and streaming. For example, clustering algorithms, like DBSCAN or single-link hierarchical clustering, could be implemented in a streaming fashion to supplement XTNeighbor. Ultimately, this would allow fast end-to-end AIR analysis on GPU.

With the steady advancement in throughput of immunosequencing pipelines – including progress in approaches for paired chain single-cell sequencing [36] – we anticipate that scalable computational methods such as XTNeighbor will become increasingly important to extract immunological insights from large amounts of AIR repertoire sequencing data. Fast mining of sequence neighbor pairs from repertoires using XTNeighbor might also be used to provide new training data for weakly supervised approaches to the prediction of TCR and antibody specificity [37], and thus help overcome limitations with currently available labelled data [38, 39].

Code Availability. A CPU implementation of the SymDel lookup algorithm for AIR sequence analysis applications is available as a part of the Python library Pyrepseq at <https://github.com/andim/pyrepseq>. The GPU code and benchmarking code is available at <https://github.com/heartnetkung/XT-neighbor>.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Yuta Nagano, Martina Milighetti, James Henderson, and Rishika Saxena for useful discussions and beta-testing. The work was supported in parts by funding by the Wellcome Leap HOPE Program.

-
- [1] I. Setliff, W. J. McDonnell, N. Raju, R. G. Bombardi, A. A. Murji, C. Scheepers, R. Ziki, C. Mynhardt, B. E. Shepherd, A. A. Mamchak, N. Garrett, S. A. Karim, S. A. Mallal, J. E. Crowe, L. Morris, and I. S. Georgiev, *Cell Host Microbe* **23**, 845 (2018).
- [2] M. I. J. Raybould, A. R. Rees, and C. M. Deane, *mAbs* **13**, 1996732 (2021).
- [3] V. Venturi, D. a Price, D. C. Douek, and M. P. Davenport, *Nature Reviews Immunology* **8**, 231 (2008).
- [4] Y. Elhanati, Z. Sethna, C. G. Callan, T. Mora, and A. M. Walczak, *Immunological Reviews* **284**, 167 (2018).
- [5] A. Mayer and C. G. Callan, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2213264120 (2023).
- [6] M. Shugay, D. V. Bagaev, M. A. Turchaninova, D. A. Bolotin, O. V. Britanova, E. V. Putintseva, M. V. Pogorelyy, V. I. Nazarov, I. V. Zvyagin, V. I. Kirgizova, K. I. Kirgizov, E. V. Skorobogatova, and D. M. Chudakov, *PLOS Computational Biology* **11**, e1004503 (2015).
- [7] A. Madi, A. Poran, E. Shifrut, S. Reich-Zeliger, E. Greenstein, I. Zaretsky, T. Arnon, F. V. Laethem, A. Singer, J. Lu, P. D. Sun, I. R. Cohen, and N. Friedman, *eLife* **6**, 1 (2017).
- [8] P. Dash, A. J. Fiore-Gartland, T. Hertz, G. C. Wang, S. Sharma, A. Souquette, J. C. Crawford, E. B. Clemens, T. H. Nguyen, K. Kedzierska, N. L. La Gruta, P. Bradley, and P. G. Thomas, *Nature* **547**, 89 (2017).
- [9] K. Mayer-Blackwell, S. Schattgen, L. Cohen-Lavi, J. C. Crawford, A. Souquette, J. A. Gaevvert, T. Hertz, P. G. Thomas, P. Bradley, and A. Fiore-Gartland, *Elife* **10** (2021).
- [10] M. V. Pogorelyy and M. Shugay, *Frontiers in Immunology* **10**, 1 (2019).
- [11] S. Valkiers, M. Van Houcke, K. Laukens, and P. Meysman, *Bioinformatics* **37**, 4865 (2021).
- [12] W. D. Chronister, A. Crinklaw, S. Mahajan, R. Vita, Z. n, Z. Yan, J. A. Greenbaum, L. E. Jessen, M. Nielsen, S. Christley, L. G. Cowell, A. Sette, and B. Peters, *Front Immunol* **12**, 640725 (2021).
- [13] T. Rognes, L. Scheffer, V. Greiff, and G. K. Sandve, *Bioinformatics* **38**, 4230 (2022).
- [14] H. Zhang, L. Liu, J. Zhang, J. Chen, J. Ye, S. Shukla, J. Qiao, X. Zhan, H. Chen, C. Wu, Y. Fu, and B. Li, *Clinical Cancer Research* **26**, 1359 (2020).
- [15] W. R. Pearson, *Current Protocols in Bioinformatics* **42** (2013), 10.1002/0471250953.bi0301s42.
- [16] M. Littmann, M. Heinzinger, C. Dallago, T. Olenyi, and B. Rost, *Scientific Reports* **11**, 1160 (2021).
- [17] J. Glanville, H. Huang, A. Nau, O. Hatton, L. E. Wagar, F. Rubelt, X. Ji, A. Han, S. M. Krams, C. Pettus, N. Haas, C. S. Arlehamm, A. Sette, S. D. Boyd, T. J. Scriba, O. M. Martinez, and M. M. Davis, *Nature* **547**, 94 (2017).
- [18] H. Huang, C. Wang, F. Rubelt, T. J. Scriba, and M. M. Davis, *Nat Biotechnol* **38**, 1194 (2020).
- [19] T. H. Olsen, B. Abanades, I. H. Moal, and C. M. Deane, *Scientific Reports* **13**, 11612 (2023).
- [20] W. Garbe, “1000x Faster Spelling Correction algorithm,” <https://seekstorm.com/blog/1000x-spelling-correction/> (2012), [Accessed 12-11-2023].
- [21] NVIDIA Research, “CUB: Main Page — nvlabs.github.io,” <https://nvlabs.github.io/cub/index.html> (2013), [Accessed 12-11-2023].
- [22] M. A. Awad, S. Ashkiani, S. D. Porumbescu, M. Farach-Colton, and J. D. Owens, in *SIAM Symposium on Algorithmic Principles of Computer Systems*, APOCS23 (2023) pp. 33–50.
- [23] D. Jünger, R. Kobus, A. Müller, C. Hundt, K. Xu, W. Liu, and B. Schmidt, in *27th IEEE International Conference on High Performance Computing, Data, and Analytics, HiPC 2020, Pune, India, December 16-19, 2020* (IEEE, 2020) pp. 11–20.
- [24] B. Korte and J. Vygen, “Bin-packing,” in *Combinatorial Optimization: Theory and Algorithms* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000) pp. 407–422.
- [25] V. Vazirani, *Approximation Algorithms* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013).
- [26] W. A. Burkhard and R. M. Keller, *Commun. ACM* **16**, 230–236 (1973).
- [27] R. Fox, “GitHub - ryanfox/bktree: A pure-python implementation of BK-Trees — github.com,” <https://github.com/ryanfox/bktree> (2016), [Accessed 29-07-2023].
- [28] K. Schütze, M. Heinzinger, M. Steinegger, and B. Rost, *Front. Bioinform.* **2**, 1033775 (2022).
- [29] Y. Dong, P. Indyk, I. Razenshteyn, and T. Wagner, “Learning space partitions for nearest neighbor search,” (2020), arXiv:1901.08544 [cs.LG].
- [30] A. Baloi, B. Belean, F. Turcu, and D. Peptenatu, *Soft Computing* (2023).
- [31] J. Brandt, in *IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2010) pp. 1815–1822.
- [32] R. O. Emerson, W. S. DeWitt, M. Vignali, J. Gravley, J. K. Hu, E. J. Osborne, C. Desmarais, M. Klinger, C. S. Carlson, J. A. Hansen, M. Rieder, and H. S. Robins, *Nature Genetics* **49**, 659 (2017).
- [33] B. H. Bloom, *Commun. ACM* **13**, 422–426 (1970).
- [34] C. G. Rappazzo, M. L. Fernández-Quintero, A. Mayer, N. C. Wu, V. Greiff, and J. J. Guthmiller, *The Journal of Immunology* **211**, 311 (2023).
- [35] J. Johnson, M. Douze, and H. Jégou, *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* **7**, 535 (2019).
- [36] G. X. Y. Zheng, J. M. Terry, P. Belgrader, P. Ryvkin, Z. W. Bent, R. Wilson, S. B. Ziraldo, T. D. Wheeler, G. P. McDermott, J. Zhu, M. T. Gregory, J. Shuga, L. Montesclaros, J. G. Underwood, D. A. Masquelier, S. Y. Nishimura, M. Schnall-Levin, P. W. Wyatt, C. M. Hindson, R. Bharadwaj, A. Wong, K. D. Ness, L. W. Beppu, H. J. Deeg, C. McFarland, K. R. Loeb, W. J. Valente, N. G. Ericson, E. A. Stevens, J. P. Radich, T. S. Mikkelsen, B. J. Hindson, and J. H. Bielas, *Nature Communications* **8**, 14049 (2017).
- [37] J. A. Ruffolo, J. J. Gray, and J. Sulam, in *NeurIPS*:

- Machine Learning for Structural Biology Workshop* (2021).
- [38] D. Hudson, R. A. Fernandes, M. Basham, G. Ogg, and H. Koohy, *Nature Reviews Immunology* **23**, 511 (2023).
- [39] A. M. Hummer, C. Schneider, L. Chinery, and C. M. Deane, *Investigating the Volume and Diversity of Data Needed for Generalizable Antibody-Antigen Delta Delta G Prediction*, Preprint (Bioinformatics, 2023).
- [40] J. L. Bentley, *Commun. ACM* **18**, 509 (1975).

Appendix A: Supplementary Methods

1. Symmetric deletion lookup step-by-step (Fig. 6)

0. Given a list of AIR sequences and a distance threshold.
1. Generate all possible deletions up to the threshold as x .
2. Store x in a multi-value hash map where the key is x and the value is the index of the original string.
3. Reuse x to lookup the hash map and store the result as y .
4. Filter y for threshold validity and duplication, then return.

2. XTNeighbor algorithm step-by-step

0. Given a list of AIR sequences and a distance threshold.
1. Compress all AIR strings into integers.
2. For each AIR, generate all possible deletions up to the threshold. [map, cumulativeSum, expand]
3. Store the results as a list of key-value pairs where keys are the shortened strings and the value is the index of the original string.
4. Group the key-value pairs by the keys and obtain the offset of each group [sortKeyValues, uniqueCount, cumulativeSum]
5. For each group, generate all possible index pairs where each pair represents potential neighboring AIRs. [map, cumulativeSum, expand]
6. Remove duplicate pairs. [sort, unique]
7. Calculate Levenshtein distances for each pair and filter pairs exceeding the threshold. [map, if]

3. XTNeighbor-Streaming step-by-step (Fig. 7)

0. Given a stream of AIR sequences and a distance threshold.
1. Initialize 2D buffers b_1, b_3 and queue buffer b_2 .
2. Compress AIR strings into integers.
3. Start stream S_1 from the input.




Figure 6. Process diagram of SymDel lookup algorithm.




Figure 7. Process diagram of the XTNeighbor-streaming algorithm.

- (a) Generate all key-value pairs (k, v) where k are deletion forms and v are indices of the input. `[map, cumulativeSum, expand]`
- (b) Store all generated (k, v) to b_1 in equal bins specified by k . `[sortByKeyValues, histogram]`
4. Solve bin packing problem to optimize the reading of b_1 . `[expand, cumulativeSumByKey, expand, maxByKey]`
5. Start stream S_2 from b_1 .
 - (a) Group all pairs by k and obtain the offset of each group. `[sortByKeyValues, uniqueCount, cumulativeSum]`
 - (b) For each group, generate all pairs of neighboring AIRs (i, j) but record only the histogram of $\min(i, j)$. `[map, cumulativeSum, expand, histogram]`
 - (c) Write the unmodified input into to b_2 .
6. Solve bin packing problem to calculate the number of bins to process in each loop using the histogram. Get the upper bound of those bins, then pick the first value u . `[expand, cumulativeSumByKey, expand, maxByKey]`
7. Start stream S_3 from b_2 .
 - (a) Group all pairs by k and obtain the offset of each group. `[uniqueCount, cumulativeSum]`
 - (b) For each group, generate all pairs of neighboring AIRs (i, j) where $\min(i, j) \leq u$. `[map, cumulativeSum, expand]`
 - (c) Save (i, j) pairs to b_3 in equal bins specified by $\min(i, j)$. `[sort, histogram]`
 - (d) Remove all key value pairs (k, v) from the stream where $v \leq u$. `[map, if]`
 - (e) Save the remaining (k, v) pairs to b_2 .




Figure 8. Process-diagram of the k-d tree bag-of-amino-acid algorithm.

8. Solve bin packing problem to optimize the reading of b_3 . [expand, cumulativeSumByKey, expand, maxByKey]
9. Start stream S_4 from b_3 .
 - (a) Remove the duplicates. [sort, unique]
 - (b) Calculate Levenshtein/Hamming distance d for each (i, j) pair. [map]
 - (c) Verify Levenshtein distance, then immediately return the (i, j, d) triplets. [if]
10. Continue the loop in step 4 with the next upper bound until all items are processed.

4. Compression of TCR sequences in XTNeighbor

String representations of the CDR3 region of the TCRs are not memory-optimal since there are only 20 amino acids but each character in C++ is stored using 8 bits. To optimize the encoding of short amino acid sequences, our GPU implementation of XTNeighbor uses a 12 byte representation of CDR3s by simple binary assignment allowing the representation of up to 18 amino acid long sequences where each amino acid requires 5 bits.

Appendix B: A sequence representation that lower-bounds edit distance

Converting sequences to vectors opens up applications of highly-optimized algorithms for vector-based similarity search. We here illustrate this approach by using the k-d tree algorithm [40] on a vector representation of the AIR sequence. To ensure comparable output, we propose a "bag-of-amino-acids" representation that allows us to upper bound sequence edit distance by the Euclidean distance in representation space (see proof below).

The representation is a 20-dimensional vector, where each element records the number of amino acids of each type in the sequence. In this space, we can show that whenever two sequences have an edit distance of d , their vector counterparts have an Euclidean distance $\leq \sqrt{2}d$. Using this property, we can utilize k-d tree to identify nearest neighbors within a $\sqrt{2}d$ radius in representation space and then filter any false positives (which is the consequence of bag-of-amino-acids discarding all positional information) as a post-processing step. An overall schematic of this approach is provided in Fig. 8.

Theorem (Lower-bound inequality). *Let x be the bag-of-amino-acids vector representation of a sequence, and y_d the bag-of-amino-acids vector representation of a sequence that differs from x by d edits.*

Then: $\|x - y_d\| \leq \sqrt{2}d$

This theorem can be proved by induction. Let i, j be any two orthogonal unit vectors in 20 dimensions representing an addition or deletion of an amino acid.

Initial Case ($d = 1$):

$$y_1 = \begin{cases} x + i & \text{for insertion} \\ x - i & \text{for deletion} \\ x + i - j & \text{for substitution} \end{cases}$$

$$\|x - y_1\| = \begin{cases} \|x - (x \pm i)\| = \|\pm i\| = 1 \leq \sqrt{2} & \text{for insertion and deletion} \\ \|x - (x + i - j)\| = \|j - i\| = \sqrt{2} & \text{for substitution} \end{cases}$$

Induction Step:

$$y_{d+1} = \begin{cases} y_d + i & \text{for insertion} \\ y_d - i & \text{for deletion} \\ y_d + i - j & \text{for substitution} \end{cases}$$

$$\|x - y_{d+1}\| = \begin{cases} \|x - (y_d \pm i)\| & \text{for insertion and deletion} \\ \|x - (y_d + i - j)\| & \text{for substitution} \end{cases}$$

From the triangle inequality it follows:

$$\|x - y_{d+1}\| \leq \begin{cases} \|x - y_d\| + \|\pm i\| \leq \sqrt{2}d + 1 < \sqrt{2}(d + 1) & \text{for insertion and deletion} \\ \|x - y_d\| + \|j - i\| \leq \sqrt{2}d + \sqrt{2} = \sqrt{2}(d + 1) & \text{for substitution} \end{cases}$$