

Hierarchical Relative Lempel-Ziv Compression*

Philip Bille
phbi@dtu.dk

Inge Li Gørtz
inge@dtu.dk

Simon J. Puglisi
simon.puglisi@helsinki.fi

Simon R. Tarnow

Abstract

Relative Lempel-Ziv (RLZ) parsing is a dictionary compression method in which a string S is compressed relative to a second string R (called the reference) by parsing S into a sequence of substrings that occur in R . RLZ is particularly effective at compressing sets of strings that have a high degree of similarity to the reference string, such as a set of genomes of individuals from the same species. With the now cheap cost of DNA sequencing, such data sets have become extremely abundant and are rapidly growing. In this paper, instead of using a single reference string for the entire collection, we investigate the use of different reference strings for subsets of the collection, with the aim of improving compression. In particular, we form a rooted tree (or hierarchy) on the strings and then compressed each string using RLZ with parent as reference, storing only the root of the tree in plain text. To decompress, we traverse the tree in BFS order starting at the root, decompressing children with respect to their parent. We show that this approach leads to a twofold improvement in compression on bacterial genome data sets, with negligible effect on decompression time compared to the standard single reference approach. We show that an effective hierarchy for a given set of strings can be constructed by computing the optimal arborescence of a completed weighted digraph of the strings, with weights as the number of phrases in the RLZ parsing of the source and destination vertices. We further show that instead of computing the complete graph, a sparse graph derived using locality sensitive hashing can significantly reduce the cost of computing a good hierarchy, without adversely affecting compression performance.

1 Introduction

Given a collection of m strings $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ of total length n , the relative Lempel-Ziv (RLZ) compression scheme parses each string S_i , $i > 1$, into a sequence of z substrings of the string S_1 (we give a formal definition below). If the strings in \mathcal{S} are highly similar, the

number of substrings—called phrases—in the parsing is small relative to the total length of the collection. In order to achieve compression, phrases (substrings) are replaced by their starting and ending positions in S_1 .

RLZ is a natural choice for compressing sets of full genome sequences of individuals of the same species [18, 6, 5, 34, 23], which, because of the high degree of sequence similarity, tend to result in parsings with relatively few phrases. Enormous reductions over the past two decades in the cost of DNA sequencing has led to large and growing databases containing hundreds of thousands of full genome sequences of strains of many known bacteria and viruses. These databases are key, for example, to the field of genomic epidemiology, to screen patient samples (which are sequenced and compared against the genome database) for known pathogenic strains to arrive at diagnosis and suitable treatments (see, e.g., [20]).

For a given bacteria, *E.coli* say, a genome database may contain genome sequences of thousands of different strains. While all these strains are relatively similar to each other, some share a higher degree of similarity with genomes in a cluster of related strains than they do with other sequences in the database. With this in mind, while RLZ may result in good compression when a single arbitrary sequence is selected as the reference, intuitively it would seem that even more effective compression of the database could be achieved by selecting a different reference for each cluster of strains.

Our contribution. In this paper we explore the use of more than one reference sequence in the context of RLZ compression. In particular, we show that arranging the sequencing in \mathcal{S} into a hierarchy can lead to significantly better compression than the use of an arbitrarily selected reference, on viral and bacterial genome sets. Finding a hierarchy for a given set of genome sequences leads us into a number of interesting algorithmic problems. In particular:

1. To derive an effective hierarchical arrangement for a given set of strings we compute the optimal arborescence of a complete weighted digraph of the

*This work was supported in part by the Academy of Finland via grants 339070 and 351150 and the Danish Research Council via grant DFF-8021-002498.

strings, with edge weights assigned as the number of phrases in the RLZ parsing of the source and destination vertices. We show that this scheme leads to a factor of 2 improvement to compression on bacterial genomes, and up to a factor 10 on viral genomes, without adversely affecting the speed of decompression.

2. While the optimal arborescence leads to pleasing compression improvements, it adds significantly to compression time. We show that by sparsifying the graph via locally sensitive hashing compression time can be kept reasonable, while not sacrificing compression gains.
3. Along the way, we describe an efficient implementation of the optimal arborescence algorithm of Tarjan [30] that uses a two-level heap, which may be of independent interest.

In the remainder of this section we review related work on RLZ compression. Section 2 then lays out notation and basic concepts used throughout. In Section 3 we formally define hierarchical relative Lempel-Ziv compression, and then go on to describe efficient methods for computing it in Section 4 and Section 5. Section 6 describes our engineering of the arborescence algorithm of Tarjan [30]. Our experimental results on three genomic data sets are presented in Section 7, before conclusions and reflections are offered.

Related Work. To the best of our knowledge, the idea of using a hierarchy of reference sequences in RLZ is new. A related notion is mentioned cryptically in Storer and Szymanski [29], but appears never to have been implemented. The closest work we could find in the literature is due to Deorowicz and Grabowski [6], who describe an RLZ-based scheme for genome compression in which a sequence is compressed relative to multiple reference sequences, with each phrase storing which reference sequence it is from (see also [5]). Another more recent hierarchical compression scenario is the persistent strings model [3]. Both of these are quite different to the hierarchical arrangement of sequences we describe here.

Beyond genomics applications, RLZ has also found wider use as a compressor for large text corpora in contexts where random-access support for individual documents is needed [14, 32, 33, 24, 19, 2] and as a general data compressor [17, 16]. In those contexts, S_1 is usually first constructed using substrings sampled from other strings in the collection (Hoobin et al. [14] show that random sampling works well) in a preprocessing phase. The structure of the RLZ parsing reveals a great deal about the repetitive structure of the string collec-

tion and several authors have shown that this can be exploited to design efficient compressed indexes for pattern matching [13, 8, 22]. More recently, the practical utility of RLZ as a more general tool for compressed data structuring has also been demonstrated, compressing suffix arrays [25, 27], document arrays [26] and various components of suffix trees [9].

2 Basics

Throughout we will consider a *string* $S = S[1..n] = S[1]S[2] \dots S[n]$ on an integer alphabet Σ of σ symbols. The *substring* of S that starts at position i and ends at position j , $j \geq i$, denoted $S[i..j]$, is the string $S[i]S[i+1] \dots S[j]$. If $i > j$, then $S[i..j]$ is the empty string ε . A *suffix* of S is a substring with ending position $j = n$, and a *prefix* is a substring with starting position $i = 1$.

Parsings A *parsing* of a string S wrt. a reference string R is a sequence of substrings of R —called *phrases*— $R[i_1, i_1 + l_1 - 1], R[i_2, i_2 + l_2 - 1], \dots, R[i_z, i_z + l_z - 1]$ such that $S = R[i_1, i_1 + l_1 - 1] \cdot R[i_2, i_2 + l_2 - 1] \dots R[i_z, i_z + l_z - 1]$. The *encoding* of a parsing consists of the sequence of starting indices and lengths of the phrases $(i_1, l_1), (i_2, l_2), \dots, (i_z, l_z)$.

The *greedy parsing* of S wrt. R is the parsing obtained by processing S from left to right and choosing the longest possible phrase at each step. For example, let $R = actccta$ and $S = ctctcc$. The greedy parsing of S wrt. R gives the phrases $R[2, 4] = ctc$, $R[3, 5] = tcc$ and the encoding $(2, 3), (3, 3)$. We can construct the parsing in $O(|R| + |S|)$ time using a suffix tree.

Relative Lempel-Ziv Compression Throughout the rest of the paper let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ be a collection of m strings of total length $n = \sum_{i=1}^m |S_i|$. The *relative Lempel-Ziv* (RLZ) compression of \mathcal{S} greedily parses each string S_i , $i > 1$, wrt. S_1 . The *RLZ compressed representation* of \mathcal{S} then consists of S_1 and the encoding of the parsings of each for the strings S_2, \dots, S_m . For each string we also save the number of phrases. In total, compression takes $O(n)$ time. Let $z_R = \sum_{i=2}^m z_i$. The size of the RLZ compression is thus $O(|S_1| + z_R)$. Note that the size depends on the choice of the reference string (i.e. S_1) among the strings in \mathcal{S} . To decompress, we decode the phrases of each string using the explicitly stored reference string. This uses $O(\sum_{i=1}^m |S_i|) = O(n)$ time.

Throughout this paper we use the number of phrases as the measure of compression. In a real compressor, the phrase positions and lengths undergo further processing in order to reduce the total number of bits used by the encoding (see, e.g., [11]). We remark that our hierarchical RLZ methods can be trivially adapted to use different encoding costs.

Graphs Let G be a weighted directed strongly connected graph G . A *spanning arborescence* A of G with root r is a subgraph of G that is a directed rooted tree where all nodes are reachable from r . The weight of an arborescence S is the sum of the weight of the edges in A . A *minimum weight spanning arborescence* (MWSA) A is a spanning arborescence of minimum weight. Note that the root is not fixed in our definition and can thus be any node. For simplicity we have assumed that G is strongly connected in our definition of MWSA since this is always the case in our scenario. Finally, for a node v in a tree, the parent of a node is denoted $\text{parent}(v)$.

3 Hierarchical Relative Lempel-Ziv Compression

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ be a collections of strings of total size n as above. We construct a rooted tree H , with root r , such that each node v represents a unique string $S(v)$ from \mathcal{S} . The *hierarchical relative Lempel-Ziv* (HRLZ) compression of \mathcal{S} wrt. H greedily parses $S(v)$ wrt. $S(\text{parent}(v))$ for each non-root node v . In total, compression takes $O(n)$ time. The *HRLZ compressed representation* consists of $S(r)$, the edges of H , and the encoding of the $m - 1$ parsings of the non-root strings. Let $z_H = \sum_{v \in H \setminus \{r\}} z_v$, where z_v is the number of phrases in the parsing of $S(v)$. Thus the size of the HRLZ compression is $O(|H| + |S(r)| + z_H) = O(|S(r)| + z_H)$. Note that the size depends on the choice of tree and assignment of strings from \mathcal{S} to the nodes.

To decompress, we traverse the tree in breadth first search (BFS) order from the root. We decode the string at each node using the string of the parent node by decoding each phrase. As the string of the parent node is always decoded before or explicitly stored as the root node, this uses $O(\sum_{i=1}^m |S_i|) = O(n)$ time.

4 Constructing an Optimal Tree

We first give a simple and inefficient algorithm to construct an optimal tree for the HRLZ compression. The algorithm forms the basis of our efficient algorithm in the following section. Recall that the collection $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ consists of m strings of total size n . The algorithm proceeds as follows:

Step 1: Construct Cost Graph We first construct a complete weighted directed graph G with m nodes numbered $\{1, \dots, m\}$ called the *cost graph* of \mathcal{S} . Node i corresponds to the string S_i in \mathcal{S} and the weight of edge (i, j) is number of phrases in the greedy parsing of S_j wrt. S_i .

We have that G contains m nodes and m^2 edges. Computing the weight of edge (i, j) takes $O(|S_j|)$ time.

Thus in total we use $O((m-1) \sum_j |S_j|) = O(nm)$ time. The space is $O(m^2)$.

Step 2: Construct Minimum Weight Spanning Arborescence We then construct a MWSA A of the cost graph G using the algorithm by Tarjan [30, 4]. This uses $O(e \log m) = O(m^2 \log m)$ time. Here e denotes the number of edges in the graph.

Step 3: Construct Compressed Representation Finally, we construct the HRLZ compressed from the MWSA A . This uses $O(n)$ time.

In total the algorithm uses $O(mn)$ time and $O(m^2)$ space. Note that the algorithm constructs an optimal tree but not necessarily the optimal HRLZ compression since the HRLZ compression also needs to explicitly encode the string of root of the tree. It is straightforward to include the cost of encoding the root string in the algorithm, by adding an additional virtual root s and adding edges (s, i) to every other node i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, with weight $|S_i|$. The MWSA of the new graph G' will be rooted in the s and the unique edge out of s determines the optimal root string for HRLZ compression. While G' is not strongly connected, the MWSA is still well-defined and the MWSA algorithm produces the correct result in the same complexity. In practice, our data sets consists of very similar length strings and hence we have chosen not to implement this extension.

5 Sparsifying the Cost Graph via Locality Sensitive Hashing

The main bottleneck in the simple algorithm from Section 4 is the construction of the complete cost graph in step 1. In this section, we show how to efficiently sparsify the graph using locality sensitive hashing.

We first construct a sparse subgraph \overline{G} of the complete cost graph. We do this in rounds as follows. Initially, we set \overline{G} to be the graph with m nodes and no edges, and $R = \mathcal{S}$. We repeat the following step until \overline{G} is strongly connected.

Step 1: Generate fingerprints We first generate fingerprints for each string in R using locality sensitive hashing. Our locality sensitive hashing scheme is based on k -mers combined with min-hashing. More precisely, given parameters k and q we pick q hash functions h_1, \dots, h_q and hash each k -mer of each string S in R . The fingerprint of S is the sequence \min_1, \dots, \min_q where \min_i is a minimum value hash obtained with h_i . For fast hashing we use the simple *multiply-shift* hashing scheme [7].

Step 2: Generate edges Let C be a group of strings in R with the same fingerprint. For each ordered pair (i, j) of strings in C we add (i, j) to \overline{G} .

Step 3: Pruning R After every c 'th round for some tuneable parameter c we prune the set R as follows. For every connected component in \overline{G} pick the string s that has had the most number of collisions until now (the total number of collisions of a string s is equal to the sum of the size of the buckets it has been in). We then continue with R being the set of representatives.

Finally, we compute the weight of the edges of the strongly connected graph \overline{G} , i.e., for each edge (i, j) we compute the number of phrases in the greedy parsing of S_j wrt. S_i .

The computed cost graph is likely to be sparse and thus step 1 and step 2 of the algorithm from Section 4 will be much faster, leading to a much faster solution. Note that the constructed tree is no longer guaranteed to be optimal. We show experimentally in Section 7 that the size of the compression in nearly all cases is within 5% of optimal.

6 Speeding Up the Minimum Weight Spanning Arborescence Algorithm

We now show how to efficiently implement step 2 of the algorithm from Section 4 on the sparse cost graph computed in Section 5.

Let \overline{G} be the sparse cost graph with m nodes and e edges computed in Section 5. The MWSA algorithm by Tarjan [30, 4] uses m priority queues Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m , one for each node, where Q_i consists of all edges going into node v_i . The queues support the following operations:

- **init(L)**: Constructs a queue Q containing all the elements in the list L .
- **extract-min(Q_i)**: Returns and removes the minimum element in the queue.
- **add(Q_i, c)**: Adds a constant c to the value of all elements in the queue.
- **meld(Q_i, Q_j)**: Adds the elements from Q_j into Q_i .

The MWSA algorithm uses a *pairing heap* [12] to support **init** in $O(|L|)$ time and the other operations in $O(\log m)$ time. The algorithm uses $O(m)$ **meld** and **init** operations, $O(e)$ **add** and **extract-min** operations, and the total length of the lists for the **init** operations is $O(e)$. Thus, the total run time of the queue operations in the MWSA algorithm is $O(e \log m)$, and this is also total runtime of the MWSA algorithm.

We present a simple and practical alternative to the pairing heap that we call a *two-level heap*. Our two-level heap leads to a slightly worse theoretical bound of $O(e \log m + m \log^2 m)$ time for the MWSA algorithm.

However, we have found that our implementation outperforms the pairing heap in practice.

The two-level heap consists of a *top heap* t and a list of q *bottom heaps* $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q\}$. All heaps are implemented using standard binary heaps [35]. Each heap h has an associated *offset* o_h , such that any stored element x in h represents that actual value $x + o_h$. The top heap t consists of the minimum element in each bottom heap $b \in B$. For each element in the top heap we also store which bottom heap it is from. We implement each of the operations as follows:

init(L). We construct a two-level heap consisting of a single bottom heap $B = \{b\}$ containing the elements of L and a top heap t containing the minimum element of b . We set the offsets o_b and o_t of b and t , respectively, to be 0. This uses $O(|L|)$ time and hence the total time for **init** in the MWSA algorithm is $O(e)$.

extract-min(Q_i). We extract the minimum element x from the top heap t and return $x + o_t$. Let b be bottom heap that stored x . We extract x from b , find the new minimum element y in b , and copy y into the top heap with offset o_b . This uses $O(\log m)$ time and hence the total time for **extract-min** in the MWSA algorithm is $O(e \log m)$.

add(Q_i, c). We add c to the offset of the top heap t , i.e., we set $o_t = o_t + c$. This takes constant time and hence the total time for **add** in the MWSA algorithm is $O(e)$.

meld(Q_i, Q_j). Let $Q_i = (t_i, B_i)$ and $Q_j = (t_j, B_j)$ be the two-level heaps that we want to meld. Let $|B_i|$ and $|B_j|$ be the number of bottom heaps associated with two-level heap Q_i and Q_j , respectively, and assume wlog. that $|B_i| \geq |B_j|$. We move each bottom heap $b \in B_j$ into B_i , insert the minimum element of b into t_i with offset $o_b + o_{t_j} - o_{t_i}$, and update the offset associated with b to $o_b = o_b + o_{t_j} - o_{t_i}$.

Each time an element in a bottom heap b is moved, we must insert the minimum element of b into a top heap using $O(\log m)$ time. We only move the bottom heaps of the two-level heap with the fewest bottom heaps and hence the number of times a bottom heap can be moved is $O(\log m)$. It follows that total time for **meld** in the MWSA algorithm is $O(m \log^2 m)$.

In total the MWSA algorithm implemented with the two-level heap uses $O(e \log m + m \log^2 m)$ time.

7 Experimental Results

We implemented the methods for building hierarchical references described in the previous sections and measured their performance on real biological data.

7.1 Implementation details In our experiments, we used k -mers of 256 characters in size and the number of hash functions $q = 4$. We pruned the set R every $c = 10$ rounds. If a group of strings C with identical fingerprints is larger than $2 \cdot \sqrt{m}$, we ignore it to avoid adding too many edges to the graph G . Furthermore if $|R| \leq 2 \cdot \sqrt{m}$ then for each ordered (i, j) of strings in R we add (i, j) to G , and thus finishing the process of construction G .

7.2 Setup Experiments were run on Nixos 21.11 kernel version 5.10.115. The compiler was `g++` version 11.3.0 with `-Wall -Wextra -pedantic -O3 -funroll-loops -DNDEBUG -fopenmp -std=gnu++20` options. OpenMP version 4.5 was used to compute the string fingerprints in parallel and compute the edge weights on the cost graph. The CPU was an AMD Ryzen 3900X 12 Core CPU clocked at 4.1 GHz with L1, L2 caches of size 64KiB, 512KiB, per core respectively and a shared L3 cache of size 64MiB. The system had 32GiB of DDR4 3600 MHz memory. We recorded the CPU wall time using GNU time and C++ chrono library. Source code is available on request.

7.3 Data Sets We evaluated our method using 2,048 copies of human chromosome 19 from the 1000 Genomes Project [31]; 10,000 *E. coli* genomes taken from the GenomeTrakr project [28], and 400,000 SARS-CoV2 genomes from EBI’s COVID-19 data portal [1]. See Table 1 for a brief summary of the datasets.

7.4 Methods Tested We included the following methods in our experimental evaluation.

RLZ. This corresponds to standard, single reference RLZ. Because the choice of reference can affect overall compression, we report results across a large number of reference selections (further details below).

Optimal HRLZ. This is the method described in Section 4, i.e., optimal hierarchical RLZ making use of full weight information.

Approximate HRLZ. The LSH variant of hierarchical RLZ described in Section 5.

LZ. As a compression baseline, we also compute the full LZ77 parsing of our data sets using the KKP-SE external memory algorithm and software of [15]¹. Because it allows phrases to have their source at any previous position in the collection, computing the LZ77 parsing is more computationally demanding than RLZ parsing, and so we compute it only for some prefixes

of the collections. For similar reasons, although in principle the above RLZ-based methods could attain parsings as small as the LZ77 parsing, we expect them not to.

7.5 Compression Performance In this section we compare the number of phrases generated by single reference RLZ to Optimal HRLZ and Approximate HRLZ on the datasets with LZ as a baseline. We also compare the compression time of RLZ and both variants of HRLZ.

In preliminary experiments we observed that the number of phrases generated by RLZ depends greatly on the particular reference sequence selected. In the experiments we present here therefore, we ran RLZ multiple times with a number different references and recorded the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum number of phrases generated (as well as mean and standard deviation in compression time) for RLZ across those reference sequences. In particular, we applied RLZ the 50, 1000, 100 different reference sequences from *E. coli*, *SARS-CoV2* and the *chr19* dataset, respectively.

Results are shown in Figures 1-3. We observe that, as expected, as the number of sequences increases the compression rate of both variants of HRLZ improves compared to RLZ, since HRLZ can change the reference used to compress a sequence while RLZ has to use the same reference for every sequence. The biggest difference—roughly a factor of 2—between the best single reference RLZ parsing size and that of the HRLZ variants is on the *E.coli* dataset. Differences between the mean single reference RLZ result and the other methods are more modest on *SARS-CoV2* and *chr19*, however, the plots show a consistently large difference between the worst (maximum) single reference parsing size and the HRLZ variants, emphasising just how badly compression performance can deteriorate for the single reference case if an ill-fitting reference happens to be chosen. We remark that LZ always provides the smallest parsing sizes, but was slower to run than approximate HRLZ, and, for larger datasets, required more disk space (>1TB) than our system had available.

The number of phrases generated by the approximate HRLZ variant is very close to that of the optimal HRLZ algorithm—within 5% on all runs. Moreover, we see that, as intended, compression time for the approximate HRLZ variant is significantly faster than that of optimal HRLZ on all the datasets—around 6 times faster on *E.coli*, three times faster on chromosome 19, and orders of magnitude faster on *SARS-CoV2*, due to the large number of sequences in that set.

While this improvement in compression time of ap-

¹Code available at https://www.cs.helsinki.fi/group/pads/em_lz77.html.

Name	Description	σ	n	m	n/m
<i>chr19</i>	Human chromosome 19 assemblies	5	59,125,151,874	1,000	59,125,151
<i>E.coli</i>	<i>E.coli</i> genomes	4	1,130,374,882	219	5,161,529
<i>SARS-CoV2</i>	Covid-19 genomes	5	11,949,531,820	400,000	29,873

Table 1: Data sets used in experimentation. Columns labelled σ , n , and m , give the alphabet size, total collection size, and number of sequences, respectively. The final column shows the average sequence length, for convenience.

proximate HRLZ over optimal HRLZ is pleasing, Figure 2 clearly shows that there is a significant overhead to deriving a good hierarchy—even an approximate one—and that the compression time of approximate HRLZ grows faster than single reference RLZ. We remark, however, that compression is often a once-off process, and that in most contexts (including genomic applications), having rapid decompression is much more important, an aspect we examine next.

7.6 Decompression Time Figure 4 displays decompression times for the various methods. The experiment measured the time to decompress the full data set and write it to disk. This kind of streaming decompression use case is typical for, e.g., multi-pass index construction, machine learning, and data mining processes [10]. All methods have to write the same amount of data to storage when decompressing. Our HRLZ variants decompress sequences in BFS order according to hierarchy imposed on the sequences. This may require sequences that have previously written to disk being read back into memory (at most once) when they are needed as a reference in the decompression of other sequences.

RLZ and the HRLZ variants have similar decompression performance characteristics. Interestingly, on the *E. coli* dataset both variants of HRLZ outperformed RLZ in decompression time. We believe this is because the longer phrases produced by the HRLZ variants result in fewer cache misses. On larger data sets, which approach the size of RAM on the test machine, RLZ and HRLZ have similar decompression times, which RLZ being occasionally marginally faster (on the largest of the *E.coli* data sets, for example). This can be explained by the above mentioned need for the HRLZ variants to read previously written sequences back into memory (when they are needed as reference sequences). Whenever the whole decompressed data set fits comfortably in RAM (32GB on our test machine), operating system caching is likely to make reads almost free, as no disk seek will be required. However, on larger data sets, reads more frequently result in disk seeks, slowing decompression. We observed that maximum node depth on all data sets was relatively low: 31, 36, and 206 for *chr19*, *E.coli*, and *SARS-CoV2*, respectively

(for Approximate HRLZ). This suggests it may be profitable to use a DFS decompression strategy, as the working set will remain relatively small—something we will explore in future work.

8 Concluding Remarks

We have shown that traditional, single-reference RLZ compression can be significantly outperformed by imposing a hierarchy on the sequences to be compressed using a sequence’s parent in the hierarchy as its reference sequence. Moreover, we have described efficient methods by which hierarchies can be efficiently obtained. Our experiments show that the time to subsequently decompress the set of sequences are at worst negligibly slower, and sometimes even faster than the single reference baseline.

There are many directions future work could take. Apart from compression, another feature of RLZ that makes it attractive in a genomic context is its ready support for efficient random access to individual sequences (and indeed substrings): having a compact, easily accessible representation of the genome sequences complements popular indexing methods that do not readily support random access themselves (e.g., [21]). Supporting random access (and indeed indexed search) to HRLZ compressed data is an interesting avenue for future work.

As noted in the Introduction, several recent works have demonstrated the practical utility of using RLZ as a tool for compressed data structuring [9, 25, 27, 26]. In that context, an artificial reference sequence is usually constructed from repeated pieces (e.g., subarrays, or subtrees) of the data structure to be compressed. It would be interesting to see if our methods could be adapted to construct better artificial reference sequences for use in those scenarios.

Finally, in this work we have used purely algorithmic methods to derive hierarchies for datasets: no biological characteristics of the sequences have been used. However, the field of phylogenetics has developed many techniques for imposing a hierarchy on a set of individuals based on biologically meaningful features in their genomic content. It may be interesting to examine any similarities between phylogenetic trees and our RLZ-




Figure 1: Number of phrases generated and the compression time for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the *E. coli* dataset.




Figure 2: Number of phrases generated (left and center) and the compression time (right) for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the SARS-CoV2 dataset. In the center plot we have removed RLZ mean and SD and the Maximum sampled RLZ in order to more clearly display the points for the other series.

based hierarchies, and whether phylogenetic trees may serve as good hierarchies in the context of compression.

References

- [1] Coronavirus genomes — NCBI datasets. Accessed 18/05/2022, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/datasets/coronavirus/genomes/>.
- [2] P. Bille, A. R. Christiansen, P. H. Cording, I. L. Gørtz, F. R. Skjoldjensen, H. W. Vildhøj, and S. Vind. Dynamic relative compression, dynamic partial sums, and substring concatenation. *Algorithmica*, 80(11):3207–3224, 2018.
- [3] P. Bille and I. L. Gørtz. Random access in persistent strings. In *Proc. 31st ISAAC*, 2020.
- [4] P. M. Camerini, L. Fratta, and F. Maffioli. A note on




Figure 3: Number of phrases generated and the compression time for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the human chromosome 19 dataset.




Figure 4: Decompression time as a function of the number of sequences in the E. coli (left), SARS-CoV2 (center) and human chromosome 19 dataset (right) dataset.

- finding optimum branchings. *Networks*, 9(4):309–312, 1979.
- [5] S. Deorowicz, A. Danek, and S. Grabowski. Genome compression: a novel approach for large collections. *Bioinformatics*, 29(20):2572–2578, 2013.
 - [6] S. Deorowicz and S. Grabowski. Robust relative compression of genomes with random access. *Bioinformatics*, 27(21):2979–2986, 2011.
 - [7] M. Dietzfelbinger, T. Hagerup, J. Katajainen, and M. Penttonen. A reliable randomized algorithm for the closest-pair problem. *J. Algorithms*, 25(1):19–51, 1997.
 - [8] H. H. Do, J. Jansson, K. Sadakane, and W. Sung. Fast relative lempel-ziv self-index for similar sequences. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 532:14–30, 2014.
 - [9] A. Farruggia, T. Gagie, G. Navarro, S. J. Puglisi, and J. Sirén. Relative suffix trees. *Comput. J.*, 61(5):773–788, 2018.
 - [10] P. Ferragina and G. Manzini. On compressing the textual web. In *Proc. 3rd WSDM*, pages 391–400, 2010.
 - [11] P. Ferragina, I. Nitto, and R. Venturini. On the bit-complexity of Lempel-Ziv compression. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(4):1521–1541, 2013.
 - [12] M. L. Fredman, R. Sedgwick, D. D. Sleator, and R. E. Tarjan. The pairing heap: A new form of self-adjusting heap. *Algorithmica*, 1(1):111–129, 1986.
 - [13] T. Gagie, P. Gawrychowski, J. Kärkkäinen, Y. Nekrich, and S. J. Puglisi. A faster grammar-based self-index. In *Proc. 6th LATA*, pages 240–251, 2012.
 - [14] C. Hoobin, S. J. Puglisi, and J. Zobel. Relative Lempel-Ziv factorization for efficient storage and retrieval of web collections. *Proc. VLDB Endowment*, 5(3):265–273, 2011.
 - [15] J. Kärkkäinen, D. Kempa, and S. J. Puglisi. Lempel-

- Ziv parsing in external memory. In *Proc. 24th DCC*, pages 153–162, 2014.
- [16] D. Kempa and B. Langmead. Fast and space-efficient construction of AVL grammars from the LZ77 parsing. In *Proc. 29th ESA*, pages 56:1–56:14, 2021.
- [17] D. Kosolobov, D. Valenzuela, G. Navarro, and S. J. Puglisi. Lempel-ziv-like parsing in small space. *Algorithmica*, 82(11):3195–3215, 2020.
- [18] S. Kuruppu, S. J. Puglisi, and J. Zobel. Relative Lempel-Ziv compression of genomes for large-scale storage and retrieval. In *Proc. 17th SPIRE*, pages 201–206, 2010.
- [19] K. Liao, M. Petri, A. Moffat, and A. Wirth. Effective construction of relative lempel-ziv dictionaries. In *Proc. 25th WWW*, pages 807–816, 2016.
- [20] T. Mäklin, T. Kallonen, J. Alanko, Ø. Samuelsen, K. Hegstad, V. Mäkinen, J. Corander, E. Heinz, and A. Honkela. Bacterial genomic epidemiology with mixed samples. *Microbial Genomics*, 7(11), 2021.
- [21] T. Mun, A. Kuhnle, C. Boucher, T. Gagne, B. Langmead, and G. Manzini. Matching reads to many genomes with the r-index. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 27(4):514–518, 2020.
- [22] G. Navarro and V. Sepulveda. Practical indexing of repetitive collections using relative Lempel-Ziv. In *Proc. 29th DCC*, pages 201–210, 2019.
- [23] G. Navarro, V. Sepulveda, M. Marín, and S. González. Compressed filesystem for managing large genome collections. *Bioinformatics*, 35(20):4120–4128, 2019.
- [24] M. Petri, A. Moffat, P. C. Nagesh, and A. Wirth. Access time tradeoffs in archive compression. In *Proc. 11th AIRS*, pages 15–28, 2015.
- [25] S. J. Puglisi and B. Zhukova. Relative Lempel-Ziv compression of suffix arrays. In *Proc. SPIRE*, LNCS 12303, pages 89–96. Springer, 2020.
- [26] S. J. Puglisi and B. Zhukova. Document retrieval hacks. In *Proc. 19th SEA*, pages 12:1–12:12, 2021.
- [27] S. J. Puglisi and B. Zhukova. Smaller RLZ-compressed suffix arrays. In *Proc. 31st DCC*, 2021.
- [28] E. Stevens et al. The public health impact of a publicly available, environmental database of microbial genomes. *Front. Microbiol.*, 8(808), 2017.
- [29] J. A. Storer and T. G. Szymanski. Data compression via textual substitution. *J. ACM*, 29(4):928–951, 1982.
- [30] R. E. Tarjan. Finding optimum branchings. *Networks*, 7(1):25–35, 1977.
- [31] The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium. A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature*, 526:68–74, 2015.
- [32] J. Tong, A. Wirth, and J. Zobel. Compact auxiliary dictionaries for incremental compression of large repositories. In *Proc. 23rd CIKM*, pages 1629–1638, 2014.
- [33] J. Tong, A. Wirth, and J. Zobel. Principled dictionary pruning for low-memory corpus compression. In *Proc. 37th SIGIR*, pages 283–292, 2014.
- [34] D. Valenzuela, T. Norri, N. Välimäki, E. Pitkänen, and V. Mäkinen. Towards pan-genome read alignment to improve variation calling. *BMC Genom.*, 19(S2), 2018.
- [35] J. W. J. Williams. Algorithm 232: heapsort. *Commun. ACM*, 7:347–348, 1964.

A Additional Figures

This appendix contains additional plots as well as data used to generate plots in the main document.

Size	lz	rlz mean	rlz phrases SD	rlz min	rlz max	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
50	1379061	11655549.5	559931.7	10538134	12897990	7119429	7937736
100	1556541	23757023.7	810846.0	22548503	26054391	13284440	14972229
150	1681574	35834782.4	1047249.5	34465391	39177365	19369695	21595326
200	1787317	47959074.9	1440738.5	46250237	52215699	25087136	27773606
219	1815168	52703827.2	1775967.6	50474351	57142680	27307037	28874750

Table 2: Number of phrases generated for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the *E. coli* data set.

Size	lz mean	lz SD	rlz mean	rlz SD	opt-hrlz mean	opt-hrlz SD	approx-hrlz mean	approx-hrlz SD
50	29.9	0.0	7.3	0.3	73.4	0.0	50.1	0.0
100	62.2	0.0	14.8	0.4	259.9	0.0	95.7	0.0
150	97.7	0.0	22.7	0.8	562.3	0.0	155.0	0.0
200	134.5	0.0	29.6	0.7	976.3	0.0	195.8	0.0
219	146.8	0.0	32.5	0.8	1169.2	0.0	257.0	0.0

Table 3: Compression time for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the *E. coli* data set.

Size	lz	rlz mean	rlz SD	rlz min	rlz max	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
3125	50164	1750673.1	1217565.0	205590	7428924	82549	126276
6250	81991	2466793.8	1813057.6	390365	12676001	141909	191162
12500	133149	3520189.7	3267927.5	721806	42117838	227037	310147
25000	236196	7420125.1	7371156.9	1472814	86128962	nan	584710
50000	408189	14991942.6	14499649.9	2928707	102551328	nan	1055514
100000	714174	28248696.0	26879832.7	5623338	202889182	nan	1899434
200000	1262731	59936818.4	57547861.2	11299760	423360338	nan	3457888
400000	2235801	124068851.9	122098365.7	22646367	1325084761	nan	6240673

Table 4: Number of phrases generated for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the SARS-CoV2 data set

Size	lz	rlz mean	rlz SD	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
3125	9.4	0.2	0.1	55.1	11.2
6250	19.2	0.3	0.2	202.3	23.4
12500	43.6	0.5	0.4	759.6	49.8
25000	90.7	1.1	0.9	nan	106.7
50000	203.1	2.2	1.8	nan	231.8
100000	460.5	4.3	3.2	nan	494.0
200000	980.3	8.9	7.2	nan	1114.2
400000	2200.1	18.2	16.3	nan	2837.9

Table 5: Compression time for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the SARS-CoV2 data set.

Size	lz	rlz mean	rlz SD	rlz min	rlz max	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
125	5024871	14099089.1	1182233.9	13153108	17085211	12196621	12470163
250	5526491	28344818.1	2449630.5	26299422	34412724	24174861	24688193
500	6263992	56212384.1	4308102.0	52240721	68983696	47547689	48888371
1000	nan	113964055.0	10176846.9	105106697	137596020	94684015	98157745

Table 6: Number of phrases generated for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the human chromosome 19 data set.




Figure 5: The average node depth and maximum node depth for the generated rooted tree for HRLZ as a function of the number of sequences in the *E. coli* (left), SARS-CoV2 (center) and human chromosome 19 dataset (right) dataset.

Size	lz	rlz mean	rlz SD	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
125	1135.5	24.1	1.4	694.7	941.9
250	2528.4	45.5	2.9	2238.0	2366.1
500	6231.0	85.6	5.2	7765.9	3641.0
1000	nan	193.6	12.5	28886.1	10073.1

Table 7: Compression time for each algorithm as a function of the number of sequences on the human chromosome 19 data set.

Size	rlz	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
3125	0.159	0.138	0.126
6250	0.397	0.260	0.279
12500	0.680	0.522	0.483
25000	1.235	nan	1.061
50000	2.360	nan	1.900
100000	4.492	nan	4.366
200000	13.252	nan	7.852
400000	26.827	nan	32.835

Table 8: Decompression time as a function of the number of sequences in the *E. coli* data set.

Size	rlz	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
50	0.576	0.466	0.497
100	1.193	0.902	0.942
150	1.771	1.479	1.407
200	2.257	1.719	1.782
219	2.642	1.913	1.988

Table 9: Decompression time as a function of the number of sequences in the SARS-CoV2 (center) data set.

Size	rlz	opt-hrlz	approx-hrlz
125	11.071	11.186	8.759
250	25.200	19.592	21.600
500	51.297	49.011	50.697
1000	120.984	113.942	120.307

Table 10: Decompression time as a function of the number of sequences in the human chromosome 19 data set (right) data set.

Size	opt-hrlz average	opt-hrlz max	approx-hrlz average	approx-hrlz max
50	7.6	14	5.3	10
100	10.1	19	8.5	17
150	17.2	35	10.7	21
200	14.4	26	10.9	19
219	16.9	34	16.7	37

Table 11: The average node depth and maximum node depth for the generated rooted tree for HRLZ as a function of the number of sequences in the *E. coli* data set.

Size	opt-hrlz average	opt-hrlz max	approx-hrlz average	approx-hrlz max
3125	13.6	27	45.1	75
6250	14.1	36	34.4	60
12500	16.4	36	61.0	125
25000	nan	nan	52.6	99
50000	nan	nan	46.5	92
100000	nan	nan	95.8	181
200000	nan	nan	103.8	176
400000	nan	nan	100.2	206

Table 12: The average node depth and maximum node depth for the generated rooted tree for HRLZ as a function of the number of sequences in the SARS-CoV2 data set.

Size	opt-hrlz average	opt-hrlz max	approx-hrlz average	approx-hrlz max
125	9.1	15	17.4	26
250	12.3	20	12.6	26
500	13.8	25	20.2	35
1000	22.1	42	17.9	31

Table 13: The average node depth and maximum node depth for the generated rooted tree for HRLZ as a function of the number of sequences in the human chromosome 19 data set.