



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Albrecht, T., Slabaugh, G. G., Alonso, E. & Al-Arif, M. R. (2017). Deep Learning for Single-Molecule Science. *Nanotechnology*, 28(42), 423001. doi: 10.1088/1361-6528/aa8334

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/17949/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6528/aa8334>

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

---

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

# Deep Learning for Single-Molecule Science

Tim Albrecht<sup>1\*</sup> Gregory Slabaugh<sup>2</sup>, Eduardo Alonso<sup>2</sup> and SM Masudur Rahman Al Arif<sup>2</sup>


<sup>1</sup> \*Department of Chemistry, Imperial College London, Exhibition Road, London SW7 2AZ,  
United Kingdom. \*email: [t.albrecht@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:t.albrecht@imperial.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Computer Science, City, University of London, Northampton Square,  
London EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom

Single-molecule experiments typically produce large datasets, which can be challenging to analyse. Hypothesis-driven data exploration, informed by an expectation of the signal characteristics, can lead to interpretation bias or loss of information. The latest developments in Machine Learning, so-called Deep Learning (DL) methods offer an interesting, new avenue to address such challenges. A DL algorithm 'learns' certain data features towards an optimal prediction (*e.g.*, a base call in DNA sequencing). In some applications, such as speech and image recognition, DL has been able to outperform conventional Machine Learning strategies and even human performance. However, to date DL has not been applied in single-molecule science, to the best of our knowledge. We illustrate how it can be used, and discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. In particular, a 'deep' neural network has many features of a 'black box', which marks a significant departure from hypothesis-led data interpretation.

Single-molecule sensing, sequencing and characterisation based on electric or optical techniques can generate very large datasets, in some cases in a (semi-) automated fashion<sup>1-4</sup>. This data is typically one-dimensional, in the sense that the conductance, intensity or current is being recorded as a function of a single, independent variable, for example time or electrode distance, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The analysis can be very challenging, not only because of the sheer size of the dataset, but also due to insufficient knowledge about the characteristic signal features and poor signal-to-noise ratio (S/N). Some hypothesis-driven data exploration and selection is often required: Led by an expectation that may for example be informed by a physical model or even intuition, the experimenter inspects the data either manually or

automatically using some statistical criteria. They would aim to extract data signatures of interest ('signal'), rejecting supposedly uninteresting 'background' or 'noise'. While this approach undoubtedly has its merits, it can lead to important information content being missed, to the omission of unexpected results and to bias in the interpretation of the results. Hand selection may also be highly impractical for large datasets.



**Figure 1 | Single-molecule methods and illustrations of typical outputs.** A common feature in various single-molecule detection and characterisation techniques is that they often produce large amounts of one-dimensional data, potentially with relatively complex sub-structure. With limited *a priori* knowledge about the data, exploration and interpretation can be very challenging. Deep Learning can help explore these complexities.

An alternative is 'all-data point' analysis, where the complete dataset is analysed without data selection. The disadvantages with this approach include a potentially very low S/N, depending on the event frequency, an inherent focus on the most abundant event type, and an inability to identify and quantify sub-populations in the data.

Tunnelling current-distance ( $I(s)$ ) spectroscopy used in single-molecule charge transport studies is a good example in this context. Here, the tunnelling current is measured as two electrodes are pulled apart, which may be temporarily bridged by

one or more molecules at a time. The process is automated relatively easily, so tens if not hundreds of thousands of  $I(s)$  traces can be generated relatively quickly. The formation of a molecular bridge is typically thought to result in a constant current ('plateau'), as long as charge transport through the molecule dominates (as opposed to 'through space' tunnelling)<sup>5</sup>. Sub-populations in the data may arise from different numbers of molecules in the junction, different molecular configurations or bonding patterns between the molecule of interest and the electrode surface(s)<sup>6-13</sup>. The dynamic stretching process may also affect the junction and hence the measured tunnelling conductance. Some of these events may be 'rare' by some standards, but nevertheless physically meaningful and may be probed by variations in the experimental parameters (*e.g.*, the temperature).

Unfortunately, the exact manifestation of these effects in the  $I(s)$  trace is normally not *a priori* known, rendering hypothesis-led data exploration difficult, and they may be too 'rare' to feature in 'all-data' analyses. In cases where multiple event classes occur simultaneously with comparable probability, the latter approach can even produce misleading results<sup>14</sup>. Thus, neither of the two strategies appears entirely satisfactory in this regard.

Ideally, one would like to look for common features in the data without making prior assumptions and be able to quantify those in a coherent manner. Only recently, a Machine Learning (ML) based technique has been introduced that goes some way towards this goal, namely Multi Parameter Vector Classification (MPVC)<sup>14</sup>. MPVC follows a different philosophy, compared to the approaches described above, in that each data trace is characterised by a classifier of  $N$  parameters and thus forms a point in  $N$ -dimensional vector space. In this space, similar data traces then make up clusters, which can readily be extracted using suitable clustering algorithms (albeit the definition of what constitutes a cluster is not always trivial). The physical interpretation of each cluster typically follows the clustering step, potentially with support from additional, independent experimental data or theory and simulations. While the formation of clusters does depend on the choice of classifiers and is thus to some extent subjective, MPVC does not make any assumptions about the signal shape as such and does not exclude any data. Very recent work by Wu *et al.* considers this aspect further by employing hierarchical and density-based clustering in analysing single-molecule charge transport, which indeed gave very promising results for their systems<sup>15</sup>.

Another area where ML techniques have resulted in a notable improvement in performance is in the field of DNA base detection and sequence analysis. Here, the challenge is to identify the four DNA bases (and potentially epigenetic and other DNA modifications) in an *a priori* unknown sample. While the signal characteristics of each individual base are typically known and may be used for 'training', the inherent structure within each event can be quite complex and base differentiation be fraught by low S/N and context-specific signal variation. To this end, Chang *et al.* have been able to demonstrate that a Support Vector Machine (SVM) could be used to enhance tunnelling-based detection of (oligo)nucleotides as well as amino acids<sup>16-18</sup>. A SVM is a type of learning model that uses hand-crafted features, *e.g.*, the event magnitude, duration or other statistical properties, combined in a classifier, to discriminate between a number of unidentified targets (such as the four DNA bases).<sup>19,20</sup> It is thus the job of the algorithm designer to identify and implement those features, in the hope of minimising the prediction error as much as possible.

However, even with the training data at hand, it is not at all obvious, which signal characteristics to choose for the most reliable and most accurate predictions. It would be advantageous to extract those characteristics from the available data itself, to arrive at the best possible result.

Interestingly, as a result of recent and dramatic progress in ML so-called "Deep Learning" (DL) methodologies may be able to do just that<sup>21-25</sup>. Once the architecture of a DL network has been designed, in terms of the number of layers that are meant to characterise the data, typically at different levels of abstraction (or 'resolution'), the 'content' of these layers is then 'learned' from the training data.


In numerous applications, DL has been shown to outperform earlier ML methods, including SVM, and in some cases such as image and speech recognition, and complex control tasks, it has even achieved results that surpass human performance<sup>26-28</sup>. In the specific case of DNA or peptide sequencing-by-tunnelling, this raises an interesting prospect: If the application of an SVM resulted in a significant, albeit from a technological point of view still insufficient improvement in detection performance, could DL enable such an important step? More generally in single-molecule sensing, sequencing, and characterisation, could DL help to identify features in a signal that were previously unknown or unexpected, but are nevertheless physically meaningful? In many ways, it could be a step change in the way data is explored, analysed and interpreted. But a comprehensive understanding of these methods in this new context

is crucial to reaping the benefits and to avoiding the pitfalls - especially, since the link between data analysis and interpretation on the one hand, and the experimenter's input and intuition on the other is somewhat weakened. Hence, in this Perspectives article, we aim to provide an insight into the 'internal workings' of a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), as a powerful DL tool for data classification and analysis. We start with a brief introduction to the field, in order to introduce the terminology and to explain the basic concepts. As a specific example, we then illustrate the use of a CNN for simulated, but realistic sets of tunnelling data, and compare its performance with SVM, as a more conventional ML methodology.

### **Artificial Neural Networks and Convolutional Neural Networks**

Supervised ML algorithms 'learn' a function, or model, given a set of training examples. Each example is in the form of an input and a matching output –for instance, in speech recognition, a ML algorithm can learn a function that recognizes text from audio signals after being trained with examples of recordings of spoken words and their corresponding text<sup>29,30</sup>.

Artificial Neural Networks (NN) are a type of supervised ML architecture formed of layers of units or neurons, in which, for each training example, information from an input layer is processed in a 'hidden' layer and the result compared against the target, forming the 'error', in the output layer. The goal of the NN is to minimize the error for all training examples. Once the neural network has been trained, its accuracy is evaluated against unseen datasets (see Fig. 2 Top and the technical Jargon Buster for a more detailed exposition of NN workings).



**Figure 2 | Top: A schematic representation of a 'shallow' Artificial Neural Network.**

A layer of normalized inputs is connected to a hidden layer in which neurons compute the weighted sum of all inputs. A non-linear activation function is applied to the latter, and the result passed on to the output layer. During training, the error is then back-propagated, the weights adjusted using an optimization algorithm and the process repeated until the output matches the target. **Bottom: CNN basic steps, convolution and max pooling.** (a) represents the source or input data and (b) a 3x3 kernel, filter or feature detector. The kernel is applied to the source by multiplying its values element-wise with the original matrix and summing up the result, (c). This operation is repeated over the source, by sliding (shifting or dilating) the kernel, in this case with 1 stride, which produces the convoluted map (d). Different kernels can be applied to a given input. Another CNN operation that reduces dimensionality is pooling: for example, in (e) we apply max pooling with a 2x2 stride to a source (*i.e.*, in the 2 by 2 submatrix, the maximum value is kept in the pooled result). A CNN typically involves several layers of convolving and pooling layers.

## Jargon Buster

A **signal** is a data trace 'as measured', *e.g.*, as a function of time or distance, including events and event-free segments.

An **event** is defined as a signal modulation due to some 'molecular' process. An event can have substructure, such as spikes.

A **feature** is a measurement that characterizes an example (*e.g.*, amplitude or duration of a signal in the context of single molecule sensing). A good feature is discriminative, enabling the machine learning algorithm to make a correct prediction. Deep learning methods learn the features that optimally perform this prediction, unlike methods like SVM that require hand-crafted features.

**Activation functions** are applied to weighted inputs to produce the NN output. In order to learn complex decision boundaries they must be non-linear (*e.g.*, sigmoid, tanh or ReLU). In two dimensions, the decision boundary can be thought of a line separating two clusters of data points in the best possible way.

The 'vanishing gradient' problem arises in deep NNs that use activation functions whose gradients are small and 'vanish' throughout the layers during backpropagation, preventing the network from learning long-range dependencies. The Rectified Linear Units (**ReLU**) activation function is a non-linear function defined by  $f(x) = \max(0, x)$  and used in CNNs to counteract this problem.

The **error** (aka loss function, cost function or, simply, the **objective function**) is a measure of the difference between the output and the target or ground truth. The error is fed into a backpropagation algorithm in order to update the weights that process the input in the neural network, in such a way that it generates less error.

**Backpropagation** is an algorithm that repeatedly applies the chain rule of calculus differentiation for partial derivatives starting from the error in the output layer and propagating the gradients (the ratio of the rate of change of the weights and the error) backwards.

**Gradient Descent** is an optimization algorithm used to minimize the error by iteratively updating the weight parameters in the direction of the gradient of the loss function. When we randomly select a single data point from our dataset to calculate the gradient, we call it Stochastic Gradient Descent.

**Convolutional Neural Networks** are deep neural networks, which use convolutions (the integrals measuring how much two functions overlap as one passes over the other) to extract features from local regions of an input. Their depth comes in sequences of convolutional, ReLU, pooling and dropout layers, and final fully-connected layers.

**The convolutional layer** in a CNN consists of a collection of filters or kernels that convolve (slide) across the input to produce feature maps. The underlying principle is that CNNs use local connectivity and shared weights (the filters) to search for the same features in the input, enforcing invariance and reducing dramatically the number of parameters as compared against traditional fully-connected networks. Importantly, a CNN learns the values of these filters (feature detectors) 'on its own' during the training process.

**Pooling** is a technique used in CNNs, and consists of sliding a window over patches of features, such as pixels, and taking the average or the maximum of all values within. It compresses (down-sampling) the input representation into a lower-dimensional representation.


**Softmax** is a function that takes a vector of real values and 'squashes' it to a vector of real values in the range  $[0, 1]$  that sum to one (essentially a normalisation procedure). The softmax output can be interpreted as a probability. Softmax is commonly seen as the last stage of a CNN used for classification, and gives a probability that the data being classified is an example of the learned classes.

A second problem that applies to all ML algorithms, is overfitting, which refers to co-adaptation on training data and poor generalization. Within the context of DL and CNNs in particular, **dropout** is a technique that prevents overfitting by randomly dropping units (along with their connections) from the neural network during training.

**Deep networks** learn multiple levels of abstractions of data through multiple processing layers. By doing so, the deep network **automatically** learns the representations (features) that minimize the objective function. In contrast, shallow networks do not learn the features, rather, these are engineered by the algorithm designer.

Neural networks and alternative shallow-structured ML architectures such as SVM or logistic regression show limited modelling and representational power – constraining their usefulness to simple, well-constrained problems. Deep neural networks (aka DL networks) are multi-layer NNs that offer a way to enhance shallow architectures with the necessary complexity in structure and richness in representation required to deal with real-life applications. More specifically, in contrast to conventional ML approaches, DL does not use manually defined, 'hand-crafted' features. Rather, DL defines hierarchies of layers that 'automatically' learn the data representation at different levels of abstraction. For instance, in an image recognition task, the algorithm will be presented with a large noisy set of raw pixels, and learn first basic low-level features such as curves or shadows, and then categories of increasing complexity, *e.g.*, nose, ear, elbow, then face, arm, leg, and finally the concept 'MAN'.

Since, inspired by McCulloch-Pitts neuron model<sup>31</sup> and Donald Webb's work on synaptic learning<sup>32</sup>, NNs were first proposed<sup>33,34</sup>, a number of advancements in computational power and increasingly sophisticated learning algorithms (ReLU functions<sup>35,36</sup>, dropout techniques<sup>37</sup>) as well as in the availability of large datasets, have made DL very popular. Crucially, the drawbacks identified in Minsky and Papert's seminal paper<sup>38</sup>, namely that NNs were unable to learn complex non-linear models, were overcome with the invention of the backpropagation algorithm<sup>39,40</sup> and Hornik's proof that NNs are universal approximators<sup>41</sup>, leading to the development of DL technology in the form of Convolutional Neural Networks<sup>42,43</sup>, autoencoders<sup>44</sup>, Deep Belief Networks<sup>45-47</sup> and Recurrent Neural Networks<sup>48</sup> (see Fig. 3 for a historical perspective). The main principle remained the same as in traditional NN algorithms nonetheless: Outputs are compared against the target, that is, against the expected outcome. The error is then propagated back to the neurons in previous layers using a variation of the backpropagation algorithm and minimised by adjusting the weights of the neurons<sup>49</sup>.



**Figure 3 | Timeline of the history of Artificial Neural Networks and Deep Learning.**

Deep Learning's peak corresponds with Hinton's *et al.* breakthrough paper<sup>50</sup> and the increase in data size (number of examples) from  $10^5$  of MNIST handwritten dataset at the turn of the twenty-first century to  $10^9$  in, for example, the WMT 2014 English to French dataset<sup>51</sup>. Likewise, the number of neurons in DL networks has move from  $10^0$  in Rosenblatt's Perceptron to  $10^7$  in GoogLeNet<sup>52</sup>; and in the number of connections from  $10^1$  in ADALINE to  $10^4$  in COTS HPC unsupervised convolutional network<sup>53</sup>. Finally, during the last indiction GPUs have increased computational power to  $10^4$  GFLOPS.

In particular, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) learn to extract relevant information for the recognition of signals in a similar way that an infant has to learn to group elements in their visual scene in order to make sense of their visual input<sup>54</sup>. CNNs are biologically inspired multi-layer networks of convolutional and subsampling layers, which include constraints in the form of feature extraction (receptive fields that filter local features), feature mapping (weight sharing, which forces invariance), and subsampling (pooling or local averaging). The idea is to translate many low-level features (raw input) into compressed high-level representations by exploiting local correlation and enforcing local connectivity patterns between neurons of adjacent layers. In so doing, the CNN can detect hierarchies of features and complex patterns (see Jargon Buster box). Fig. 2 Bottom illustrates the basic steps in a CNN with a simple example taken from the analysis two-dimensional data (such as image classification).

## Simulated 'sequencing-by-tunnelling' data

But how can DL be applied to one-dimensional datasets, such as current-time, intensity-time or current-distance data? In order to explore this further, we produced simulated 'sequencing-by-tunnelling' data using a simulator developed in Matlab 2016b (Mathworks, Natick MA, script available on request). The simulator is inspired by experimental results, where binding of DNA bases in an STM junction was found to modulate the measured tunnelling conductance<sup>16</sup>. The occurrence of these binding events, their duration and the observed tunnelling conductance are stochastic in nature, and dependent on the identity of the molecule. The simulator takes this into account via the following parameters:


- The signal length,  $L$ , representing the total number of data points in each trace (here: 10,000)
- The number of events  $E$  in each signal of length  $L$  (a measure for the event frequency)
- A Normal distribution modelling the event duration,  $N(m_d, \sigma_d)$ , where  $m$  is the mean and  $\sigma$  the standard deviation
- A Normal distribution modelling the event height modulation (magnitude of the current modulation)  $N(m_m, \sigma_m)$
- A Normal distribution modelling the noise,  $N(m_n, \sigma_n)$
- A switching probability, representing the likelihood of an event having data points with zero conductance,  $p_s$ (telegraphic noise)

With the simulator, 10,000 signals (*i.e.* individual traces, with 10,000 data points each) for the five biomolecules representing DNA bases (A, C, G, T) and 5-methyl-cytosine (MethC) were generated (2,000 traces/biomolecule), with the specific simulation parameters shown in Table 1.

|       | $E$ | $N(m_d, \sigma_d)$ | $N(m_m, \sigma_m)$<br>$\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $N(m_n, \sigma_n)$<br>$\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $p_s$ |
|-------|-----|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| A     | 40  | $N(150, 50)$       | $N(2.5, 0.5)$                         | $N(2.0, 1.0)$                         | 0.3   |
| C     | 35  | $N(25, 15)$        | $N(4.5, 0.5)$                         | $N(2.0, 1.0)$                         | 0.0   |
| G     | 25  | $N(40, 15)$        | $N(5.0, 2.0)$                         | $N(2.0, 1.0)$                         | 0.0   |
| T     | 65  | $N(50, 25)$        | $N(4.0, 4.0)$                         | $N(2.0, 1.0)$                         | 0.05  |
| MethC | 55  | $N(5, 15)$         | $N(2.0, 0.5)$                         | $N(2.0, 1.0)$                         | 0.0   |

**Table 1** | Parameters used in the simulator to generate biomolecule conductance signals.

An example trace with several individual events for each of these five classes is shown in Fig. 4. As shown below, the CNN operates on entire traces, not individual events. Hence, initial event recognition and extraction is not required. However, the complexity of the event characteristics, and the significant overlap in their statistical properties, renders molecular identification from a trace an interesting pattern recognition problem.



**Figure 4 | Example current-time traces produced by the simulator for the five biomolecules.** Signals (or traces) consist of events which may have multiple spikes due to a finite switching probability  $p_s$  (perhaps due to bond formation and breaking). Event current histograms (bottom right) show that there is considerable overlap between data distributions, which would render differentiation between the molecules very difficult and resulting in a large error rate

### **Analysis of the simulated data by a CNN**

A deep convolutional neural network was thus designed to classify the simulated data produced. As these are one-dimensional time-domain signals, the network employs a

series of one-dimensional convolutional and pooling layers, as illustrated in the network diagram in Fig. 5.

In order to keep the computational cost low, we simplified each trace by identifying the maximum current value, centred this current value within a window of 500 data points. This is shown as the initial 'input signal' in Fig. 5 (top right). In principle, the network could also process the entire trace of 10,000 data points, which increases the complexity of the computational task.


There are six convolutional layers, arranged hierarchically so that the later layers learn a higher level representation of the signal. Each convolutional layer is followed by a batch normalization layer, a rectified linear unit (ReLU) layer and a max pooling layer that subsamples the data to produce a lower dimensional representation (a CNN network typically includes a dropout layer, as in the Jargon Buster; in our case, it was not needed).

In our case, all the convolutional filters are kernels of size 1x3 and applied to the temporal data. These can be filters are learned by back propagation, and the resulting filters are varied, and include local averaging with varying weighting factors (e.g. a conventional gliding average with window size 3 would have constant weighting factors of 1/3), differential filters and others. The CNN learns these kernels during training, i.e. by comparing the calculated output with the known outcome from the training sample. The error in the output is subsequently 'back-propagated' through all layers of the network, until the best outcome is achieved. During this process, the individual weighting factors, which may be assigned randomly at the start, are optimised, for example using a gradient descent method (as used here) or other techniques. We note that each convolutional layer has more than one filter - e.g., in Fig. 5 'conv1' has 64, 'conv2' 128 and so forth. Each filter acts on the respective input signal in a specific way - we show one example of the input signal at each convolutional layer as they evolve through the network (incl. the Fully Connected layer).

ReLU introduces non-linearity and helps to avoid the 'vanishing gradient' problem, as described in Jargon Buster box. We then employ pooling layers that halve the dimension of the input signal using a so -called 'max-pooling' technique with 1x2 window size and stride of 2 (cf. Fig. 2 Bottom). The final pooling layer is followed by a fully connected layer and a softmax layer. The softmax layer predicts the categorical

probability of the input signal over the class labels that represent the biomolecule identity.

In total, the network has 2,913,669 parameters, which are updated using a stochastic gradient descent during training. The training was done for 30 epochs (rounds of optimisation), using 7,500 detection events in a training set, 500 in a validation set, and 2,000 held out for independent testing. On this independent test set, the overall accuracy of the CNN classifier was 98.1%.



**Figure 5 | Convolutional neural network architecture for classifying the simulated biomolecule conductance signals.** A raw signal is input at the top of the figure, and goes through numerous layers of convolution, ReLU, and max pooling. A fully connected layer is then connected to a softmax, which produces output probabilities for the five classes (A, C, G, T, and MethC). In this way, a raw signal is transformed to a vector of probabilities. For the example above, there is a high probability it is an adenine molecule (A) and it is the highest probability that is selected as the output

class. The example on the right shows how a raw signal is transformed through the network and results in a prediction of a class A. These plots show one of the signals input to each convolutional and the fully connected layer.

### Comparison to shallow learning using hand-crafted features

For comparison, a shallow learning method was developed, inspired by Chang *et al*, employing a similar classifier<sup>16-18</sup>.

For a meaningful comparison, the same 7,500 signals were used to train the SVM as the CNN described above. Moreover, the same independent 2,000 signals were used to test the performance. The overall accuracy of the SVM classifier was 91.7%, which is a strong result and numerically similar in overall performance to<sup>16</sup> (bearing in mind that we use simulated data, direct comparison of the performances is not straightforward).

However, the results can be compared to the CNN method described above. Although further work could be performed to find additional hand-crafted features to improve the SVM performance, searching for features is a tedious, and not necessarily an optimal process. In addition, hand-crafting features may induce bias in the results. In contrast, the CNN learns its features automatically, and therefore is not susceptible to bias induced by hand-crafted features. The CNN in this experiment outperforms the SVM by a large margin that is statistically significant based on a paired t-test at the  $p < 0.05$  threshold. Looking at the misclassifications reveals that for both the CNN and SVM, the A, T, and MethC are classified with low error, however, C and G have a higher number of misclassifications in the SVM model as shown in Table 2. Overall, the CNN is better at distinguishing these classes.

|                | CNN          | SVM          |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| A              | 100%         | 99.5%        |
| C              | 96.4%        | 78.4%        |
| G              | 98.6%        | 83.4%        |
| T              | 96.4%        | 97.7%        |
| MethC          | 99.0%        | 99.5%        |
|                |              |              |
| <b>Overall</b> | <b>98.1%</b> | <b>91.7%</b> |

**Table 2** | Classification accuracies for the respective biomolecules for the CNN and SVM methods. The overall accuracy is for an independent test set.

## Conclusions

The key question that follows on from these results relates to the broader implications of the use of DL in single-molecule science, in comparison with more conventional approaches data analysis, including more advanced methods such as SVMs. Indeed, the fact that the above CNN performed better on average than the SVM is an interesting, but singular result. Both could be improved further, for example increasing the complexity of the network and size of the input data on the one hand, and by employing a larger number of handcrafted features on the other. That said, a difference in prediction accuracy of 6.4% can be very significant, especially when repeat observations lead to an accumulation of errors. For example, for 10 subsequent, uncorrelated observations, the total accuracy for the CNN is  $0.981^{10} = 0.825$  or 82.5%, whereas we obtain  $0.917^{10} = 0.420$  or 42.0% for the SVM. So the prediction accuracy is only approximately half that of the CNN.

The need to define hand-crafted features in an SVM has two sides. One the one hand, this is an opportunity to use features that are informed by some underpinning physical understanding of the process at hand, for example the magnitude of an event, its duration or some less obvious event properties characterisation potential sub-structure. On the other hand, finding good features can be tedious and it is generally difficult to know beforehand, whether a particular classifier will perform well or whether it is even close to the best achievable performance. In general, the experimenter retains a relatively high level of control - or intuitive understanding - of the analysis process.

The CNN operates in a very different way. While the initial design of the network includes (human) decisions on the number of layers, the nature of the filters, input data format etc., the contents of the individual layers after training can be very difficult to interpret, in terms of some physical meaning. Some attempts in this direction have been made in image recognition<sup>55,56</sup>, but at present it is not clear, how (or whether) a direct physical meaning can be assigned to these layers in the present context. So from a physical point of view, the CNN is very much a 'black box' - it

may perform very well in a particular task, but it may be difficult to comprehend the how and why.

An interesting feature of CNNs is that they can operate on entire data traces, as we have done here, rather than individual events. This avoids the need to produce potentially subjective 'event-defining' criteria, such as signal thresholds and the like. It may also be beneficial in cases, where event detection is complicated by strongly varying backgrounds, such that explicit background correction may no longer be necessary.

Another aspect of CNNs that should be borne in mind is that a particular combination of learned weights results from training on a particular training set. If a CNN were to be retrained with another training set, having been recorded under nominally the same or perhaps systematically varied conditions (say, at a different temperature), the new learned weights do not normally extrapolate to the original set. In this sense, the CNN does not contain any 'knowledge' of the system under study. 'Transfer Learning' is a relatively new branch in Machine Learning, where networks are trained for a particular task (*e.g.*, a particular computer game) and then confronted with new one (another computer game)<sup>57</sup>. This has been shown to work well in some situations and may be an interesting prospect in the present context.

Finally, could CNNs be used to explore data towards identifying unknown features in the data? This is not straightforward, but may be possible. For example, if a trained CNN were to be confronted with an unseen dataset that contain features that were not present in the training data, then the prediction accuracy would be correspondingly lower. One approach could then be to extract events, for which the CNN performs relatively poorly and then try to rationalize the origin of these deviations.

In conclusion, it appears that DL methods and CNNs in particular may have very interesting and obvious prospects in some areas of single-molecule science, such as single-molecule detection and sequencing. DL is still a rather new area in Machine Learning, with major breakthroughs since 2012. It is therefore likely that DL and other, state-of-the-art Machine Learning techniques will find their way into the physical sciences and into engineering. Equally, the ability to provide large amounts of data from rather well-defined experiments, the latter may also help to develop a better understanding of the internal workings of rather complex networks.

## References

1. Levene, M. J. Zero-Mode Waveguides for Single-Molecule Analysis at High Concentrations. *Science* **299**, 682-686 (2003).
2. Eid, J. *et al.* Real-Time DNA Sequencing from Single Polymerase Molecules. *Science* **323**, 133-138 (2009).
3. Gu, L. *et al.* Multiplex single-molecule interaction profiling of DNA-barcoded proteins, *Nature* **515**, 554-557 (2014).
4. Bell, N. A. W. & Keyser, U. F. Digitally encoded DNA nanostructures for multiplexed, single-molecule protein sensing with nanopores. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **11**, 645-651 (2016).
5. Quan, R., Pitler, C. S., Ratner, M. A. & Reuter, M.G. Quantitative Interpretations of Break Junction Conductance Histograms in Molecular Electron Transport. *ACS Nano* **9**, 7704-7713 (2015).
6. Albrecht, T., Mertens, S. F. L. & Ulstrup, J. Intrinsic multistate switching of gold clusters through electrochemical gating. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **129**, 9162-9167 (2007).
7. Inkpen, M. S. *et al.* New insights into single-molecule junctions using a robust, unsupervised approach to data collection and analysis. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **137**, 9971-9981 (2015).
8. Albrecht, T. Electrochemical tunnelling sensors and their potential applications. *Nat. Commun.* **3**, 829 (2012).
9. Yoshida, K. *et al.* Correlation of breaking forces, conductances and geometries of molecular junctions. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 9002 (2015).
10. Kihira, Y., Shimada, T., Matsuo, Y., Nakamura, E. & Hasegawa, T. Random telegraphic conductance fluctuation at Au-pentacene-Au nanojunctions. *Nano Lett.* **9**, 1442-1446 (2009).
11. Adak, O. *et al.* Flicker noise as a probe of electronic interaction at metal-single molecule interfaces. *Nano Lett.* **15**, 4143-4149 (2015).
12. Su, T. A., Li, H., Steigerwald, M. L., Venkataraman, L. & Nuckolls, C. Stereoelectronic switching in single-molecule junctions. *Nat. Chem.* **7**, 215-220 (2015).
13. Fujihira, M., Suzuki, M., Fujii, S. & Nishikawa, A. Currents through single molecular junction of Au/hexanedithiolate/Au measured by repeated

- formation of break junction in STM under UHV: effects of conformational change in an alkylene chain from gauche to trans and binding sites of thiolates on gold. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **8**, 3876-3884 (2006).
14. Lemmer, M., Inkpen, M.S., Kornysheva, K., Long, N.J. & Albrecht, T. Unsupervised vector-based classification of single-molecule charge transport data. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12922 (2016).
  15. Wu, B. H., Ivie, J. A., Johnson, T. K. & Monti, O.L.A. Uncovering hierarchical data structure in single molecule transport. *J. Chem. Phys.* **146**, 092321 (2017).
  16. Chang, S. *et al.* Chemical recognition and binding kinetics in a functionalized tunnel junction. *Nanotechnology* **23**, 235101(2012).
  17. Chang, S. *et al.* Palladium electrodes for molecular tunnel junctions. *Nanotechnology* **23**, 425202 (2012).
  18. Zhao, Y. A. *et al.* Single-molecule spectroscopy of amino acids and peptides by recognition tunnelling. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **9**, 466-473 (2014).
  19. Cortes, C. & Vapnik, V. Support-Vector Networks. *Machine Learning* **20**, 273-297 (1995).
  20. Dietterich, T. G. & Bakiri, G. Solving Multiclass Learning Problems via Error-Correcting Output Codes. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* **2**, 263-286 (1994).
  21. Bengio, Y. Deep Learning Architectures for AI. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* **2**, 1-127 (2009).
  22. Deng, L. & Yu, L. D. Deep Learning: Methods and Applications. *Foundations and Trends in Signal Processing* **7**, 1–199 (2013).
  23. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y. & Hinton, G. Deep Learning, *Nature* **521**, 436–444 (2015).
  24. Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y. & Courville, A. *Deep Learning* (The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016).
  25. Schmidhuber, J. Deep Learning in Neural Networks: An Overview. *Neural Netw.* **61**, 85-117 (2015).
  26. Simonyan, K. & Zisserman, A. Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. *ICLR 2015* (arXiv:1409.1556) (2015).
  27. Saon, G., Sercu, T., Rennie, S. & Kuo, H-K. J. The IBM 2016 English Conversational Telephone Speech Recognition System. *InterSpeech 2016* (arXiv:1604.08242v1) (2016).

28. Silver, D. *et al.* Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search. *Nature* **529**, 484-489 (2016).
29. Mitchell, T. *Machine Learning* (McGraw-Hill, New York City, NY, 1997).
30. Bishop, C. M. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning* (Springer, New York City, NY, 2006).
31. McCulloch, W. S. & Pitts, W. A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity. *Bull. Math. Biophys.* **5**, 115–133 (1943).
32. Hebb, D.O. *The organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory* (John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 1949).
33. Rosenblatt, F. The Perceptron: A Probabilistic Model for Information Storage and Organization in the Brain. *Psychol. Rev.* **65**, 386–408 (1958).
34. Widrow, B. *An Adaptive “Adaline” neuron using chemical “memistors”*. Number Technical Report 1553-2 (Stanford Electron. Labs, Stanford, CA, 1960).
35. Nair, V. & Hinton, G. E. Rectified linear units improve restricted Boltzmann machines. *ICML*, 807-814 (2010).
36. Glorot, X., Bordes, A. & Bengio, Y. Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. *ICAIS*, 315-323 (2011).
37. Hinton, G. E., Srivastava, N., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I. & Salakhutdinov, R.R. Improving neural networks by preventing co-adaptation of feature detectors (arXiv:1207.0580) (2012).
38. Minsky, M. & Papert, S. A. *Perceptrons: An Introduction to Computational Geometry* (The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1969).
39. Werbos, P. *Beyond Regression: New Tools for Prediction and Analysis in the Behavioral Sciences* (Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1974).
40. Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E. & Williams, R. J. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature* **323**, 533-536 (1986).
41. Hornik, K., Stinchcombe, M. & White, H. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Netw.* **2**, 359-366 (1989).
42. LeCun, Y. *et al.* Backpropagation Applied to Handwritten Zip Code Recognition, *Neural Comput.* **1**, pp.541-551 (1989).
43. LeCun, Y. *et al.* Comparison of learning algorithms for handwritten digit recognition. *ICANN*, 53-60 (1995).
44. Hinton, G. E. & Zemel, R. S. Autoencoders, Minimum Description Length

- and Helmholtz Free Energy. *NIPS*, 3-10 (1993).
45. Neal, R. M. Connectionist learning of belief networks. *Artificial intelligence* **56**, 71-113 (1992).
  46. Hinton, G. E., Dayan, P., Frey, B. J. & Neal, R. M. The wake-sleep algorithm for unsupervised neural networks. *Science* **268**, 1158-1161 (1995).
  47. Dayan, P., Hinton, G. E. & Neal, R. M. The Helmholtz Machine. *Neural Comput.* **7**, 889-904 (1995).
  48. Goller, C. & Küchler, A. Learning task-dependent distributed representations by backpropagation through structure. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 347-352 (1996).
  49. Bengio, Y., Lamblin, P., Popovici, D. & Larochelle, H. Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. *NIPS* **19**, 153-160 (2007).
  50. Hinton, G. E., Osindero, S. & Teh, Y-W. A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. *Neural Comput.* **18**, 1527-1554 (2006).
  51. Schwenk, H. Cleaned subset of WMT'14 dataset. <http://www.statmt.org/wmt14/translation-task.html> (2014).
  52. Szegedy, C. *et al.* Going deeper with convolutions (arXiv:1409.4842) (2014).
  53. Coates, A. *et al.* Deep learning with COTS HPC systems. *ICML* **28**, 1337-1345 (2013).
  54. LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y. & Haffner, P. Gradient-Based Learning Applied to Document Recognition. *Proc. IEEE* **86**, 2278-2324 (1998).
  55. Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A. & Zisserman, A. Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps. *ICLR* (arXiv:1312.6034) (2014).
  56. Zeiler, M. D., & Fergus R. Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks. *ECCV*, 818-833 (2014).
  57. Yosinski, J., Clune, J., Bengio, Y. & Lipson, H. How Transferable are Features in Deep Neural Networks? *NIPS*, 3320-3328 (2014).

## Acknowledgements

We thank E. Mondragón for help with figures.

## Author contributions

T.A., and E.A. established the background of the manuscript. G.S. and S.M.M.R.A.A. performed the experiments. T.A., E.A. and G.S. analysed the data, discussed the results and wrote the paper.

## Additional information

The authors declare no competing financial interests. Supplementary information accompanies this paper at [Data availability](#) and [Code availability](#) above. Correspondence and requests for material should be addressed to T.A.

## Deep Learning Resources

### Software

- Theano, <http://deeplearning.net/software/theano/>, an open source deep learning library for Python.
- PyLearn2, <http://deeplearning.net/software/pylearn2/> an open source deep learning library for Python built on top of Theano.
- Torch, <http://torch.ch> an open source deep learning library and scripting language for Lua.
- Caffe, <http://caffe.berkeleyvision.org>, an open source deep learning library for Python and Matlab.
- MXNet, <http://mxnet.io> an open source deep learning library for Python, Scala, R, Julia, and C++.
- TensorFlow, <https://www.tensorflow.org>, an open source deep learning library for Python and C++ developed by Google.
- DeeplearningforJ, <https://deeplearning4j.org>, an open source deep learning library written for Java and Scala.
- MatConvNet, <http://www.vlfeat.org/matconvnet/>, a Matlab library for Convolutional Neural Networks.

### Datasets

- MNIST, database of handwritten digits, available from this page, has a training set of 60,000 examples, and a test set of 10,000 examples.  
<http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>
- ImageNet, a large image database for visual recognition research according to the WordNet hierarchy (a large lexical database of English), in which each node of the hierarchy is depicted by hundreds and thousands of images. Currently we have an average of over five hundred images per node. The ImageNet project runs the Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC).  
<http://www.image-net.org/>
- The CIFAR-10 dataset consists of 60000 32x32 colour images in 10 classes, with 6000 images per class. There are 50000 training images and 10000 test images.  
<https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html>
- Sports-1M is a database containing 1,133,158 video URLs which have been annotated automatically with 487 Sports labels using the YouTube Topics API.  
<https://github.com/gtodderici/sports-1m-dataset/>
- UC Irvine Machine Learning Repository, general repository with 360 data sets, including the popular Iris.  
<http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/>