

Bloom Filter Encoding for Machine Learning

John Cartmell^[0000-0002-7014-4005], Mihaela Cardei^{★[0000-0003-2359-6196]}, and Ionut Cardei^{★[0009-0000-1050-768X]}

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton FL 33431, USA
`{jcartmell2023, mcardei, icardei}@fau.edu`

Abstract. We present a method that uses the Bloom filter transform to preprocess data for machine learning. Each sample is encoded into a compact, privacy-preserving bit array. This reduces memory use and protects the original data while keeping enough structure for accurate classification. We test the method on six datasets: SMS Spam Collection, ECG200, Adult 50K, CDC Diabetes, MNIST, and Fashion MNIST. Four classifiers are used: Extreme Gradient Boosting, Deep Neural Networks, Convolutional Neural Networks, and Logistic Regression. Results show that models trained on Bloom filter encodings achieve accuracy similar to models trained on raw data or other transforms. At the same time, the method provides memory savings while enhancing privacy. These results suggest that the Bloom filter transform is an efficient preprocessing approach for diverse machine learning tasks.

Keywords: Bloom Filters · Machine Learning · Data Transforms.

1 Introduction

General-purpose preprocessing methods for machine learning that are both memory-efficient and privacy-preserving remain limited. Most existing approaches optimize either compactness or privacy. Rarely do they achieve both, and often they do not fully meet the intended goal [1], [2]. A method that reduces memory while preserving privacy, without sacrificing accuracy, is still needed.

Bloom filters have long been studied as space-efficient probabilistic data structures for set membership testing [3]. In machine learning, they have been used as auxiliary structures before training or after inference to improve efficiency or protect privacy [4], [5], [6], [7]. However, prior work has not applied Bloom filters to preprocess raw data and use the resulting bit arrays directly for training and inference.

Here, we introduce a method that encodes raw sample data with the Bloom filter transform. This produces compact, privacy-preserving encodings suitable for classification. The approach reduces memory use [1] and preserves data privacy [2], while retaining the structure needed for accurate learning.

[★] These authors contributed equally to this work.

We evaluate the transform on six publicly available datasets spanning text, time-series, tabular, and image types: SMS Spam Collection [8], ECG200 [9], Adult 50K [10], CDC Diabetes [11], MNIST [12], and Fashion MNIST [13]. We use four classifiers: Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGB) [14], Deep Neural Networks (DNN) [15], Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [16], and Logistic Regression (LR) [17].

Results show that the Bloom filter transform achieves classification accuracy comparable to raw data across a range of tabular and time-series datasets, with improvements in several cases. For example, on the EKG dataset, accuracy increases from 81.0% (raw) to 82.9% (+1.9%), and on Adult 50K using a DNN classifier, accuracy rises from 88.1% to 88.9% (+0.8%). On image datasets such as MNIST and Fashion MNIST, accuracy decreases slightly from 98.1% to 95.1% (-3.0%) and from 90.5% to 85.3% (-5.2%), respectively, reflecting the higher dimensionality and sensitivity of these datasets. In addition to maintaining strong predictive performance, the Bloom filter transform provides meaningful compression, reducing memory usage by 2–4 \times compared to raw data, while achieving high entropy (0.38–0.68) and moderate bit occupancy (0.13–0.60), indicating effective privacy-preserving properties. Parameter sweeps further show that filter size and number of hash functions can be tuned to balance accuracy, compression, and privacy, allowing flexible optimization for different applications.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents Bloom filter design, metrics, and characteristics. Section 3 describes transforms and encoding methods. Section 4 details the pipeline and its application to multiple datasets and classifiers. Section 5 presents results and analysis. Section 6 outlines future directions.

2 Bloom Filters

Bloom filters [3] are compact probabilistic data structures used to test set membership efficiently. Each item in a set is hashed by k independent functions, setting bits in an m -bit array. The final Bloom filter is produced by the logical OR of all item bit arrays, as illustrated in Fig. 1. To test membership, the candidate element is hashed, and the corresponding bits are checked: if any bit is unset, the element is absent; if all are set, it may be present.

2.1 Construction and Design Considerations

Designing a Bloom filter balances memory usage, error rate, and collision probability. Each inserted element or item sets k bits in the m -bit array. The expected fraction of bits set (bit occupancy) after n elements are inserted is [3]:

$$p_1 = 1 - e^{-kn/m} \quad (1)$$

Collisions occur when multiple writes target the same bit, with the expected collision rate being [5]:

$$\text{collision rate} = 1 - \frac{m}{kn} p_1 \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1. Bloom filter construction/test process for item not a member of set.

The false positive rate (FPR) depends on p_1 and is denoted by [5]:

$$\text{FPR} = (1 - e^{-kn/m})^k = p_1^k \quad (3)$$

Bit occupancy, collision rate, and FPR are proportional:

$$p_1 \uparrow \Rightarrow \text{collision rate} \uparrow \Rightarrow \text{FPR} \uparrow \quad (4)$$

The compression ratio is measured as [4]:

$$\text{Compression Ratio (CR)} = \frac{n \cdot S}{m} \quad (5)$$

where S is element size in bits. For example, if S is a byte it is 8 bits, if D is a two byte integer it is 16 bits. Entropy per bit, indicating uncertainty in the filter, is [4]:

$$H_{\text{bit}} = -[p_1 \log_2 p_1 + (1 - p_1) \log_2(1 - p_1)] \quad (6)$$

2.2 Hash Algorithm Selection

Bloom filter invertibility depends on bit occupancy p_1 , number of hash functions k , and secret key use [18], [19], [20]. The probability of inverting an element x of the set is as follows [18]:

$$P_{\text{invertible}}(x) = (1 - p_1)^k \quad (7)$$

Non-invertible hashes prevent recovery for large domains, while secret keys (e.g., HMAC-SHA256) further ensure privacy [20]. Invertible hash functions allow potential recovery of elements, while non-invertible keyed hashes make reconstruction computationally infeasible.

3 Transforms

A transform is a mathematical operation that takes data from one space and maps it into another space according to a defined formula or rule [21]. Bloom filters, while traditionally used for set membership, can also be used as a transform

that maps data from the original feature space into a bit array space, preserving relative similarities between inputs. The purpose of a transform is often to make the data easier to analyze, highlight certain features, or reduce dimensionality. Examples of distance-preserving transforms are shown in Table 1 [21].

Table 1. Distance-preserving transforms

Transform	Approx. Distance Preservation
Identity $T(x) = x$	Perfect preservation
Scaling $T(x) = ax$	All distances scaled by a
Rotation / Orthogonal transform	Perfect preservation
PCA	Preserves large distances
LDA	Preserves relative distances that maximize class separability
Bloom filter encoding	Preserves relative closeness in expectation via expected Hamming distance

Distance-preserving transforms maintain the geometry of the dataset: neighbors stay neighbors while distant points remain distant. This is crucial for downstream tasks where relative distances carry the information, while transformations that destroy this structure (e.g., random shuffling or constant mapping) make the transformed data uninformative and ill-suited for downstream tasks (such as machine learning in our instance).

Both Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) [22] and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [23] are two widely used transforms that provide an additional benefit: compression of the original data space into a smaller memory space [24]. While they provide a similar benefit, they are vastly different in how they achieve their data compression. PCA projects data to lower-dimensional space by maximizing variance, while LDA reduces dimensionality to maximize class separability.

3.1 Bloom Filter Transform

Bloom filters are distance-preserving transforms because the Hamming distance between encoded bits reflects the similarity of the original inputs [5], [6], [25]. Classifiers rely on relative structure in feature space, so for a preprocessing transform to be effective, it must retain enough structure for decision boundaries to remain learnable. Bloom filter bit arrays satisfy this requirement in expectation.

If we take two data points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (or sets of features) and apply k hash functions to those data points, this produces Bloom filter encodings $b(x), b(y) \in \{0, 1\}^m$. The Hamming distance between these Bloom filters is [5]:

$$d_H(b(x), b(y)) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{b(x)_i \neq b(y)_i\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function.

Hash functions are deterministic even though their outputs appear random. Because each feature value always maps to the same bit positions, shared features produce identical bits in their Bloom filter bit array encodings, helping preserve relative distances between samples. In expectation over multiple hash functions, the Hamming distance between Bloom filters is a monotonic function of the original distance between x and y [5]:

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(b(x), b(y))] \approx F(D_{\text{orig}}(x, y)), \quad (9)$$

where $D_{\text{orig}}(x, y)$ is a distance metric in the original space and F is monotonic. This means relative closeness is maintained: points that are closer in the original space tend to have Bloom filters bit arrays that are closer in Hamming space, and points that are farther apart tend to have Bloom filters bit arrays that are farther apart. Specifically, if x is closer to y than to z in the original space, then in expectation $b(x)$ is closer to $b(y)$ than to $b(z)$ in Hamming space. In machine learning tasks such as classification or clustering, the Hamming distance between Bloom filter bit arrays can be directly used to approximate similarity between data points. This allows models to operate on compressed or privacy-preserving representations while retaining sufficient information to learn decision boundaries.

While Bloom filters are approximate distance-preserving transforms, their combination of deterministic hashing and bitwise representation ensures that the geometry of the dataset is preserved in expectation. These characteristics make them useful for compression and privacy-preserving encoding. This preservation of relative distances ensures that classifiers trained on encoded Bloom filters can approximate decision boundaries similar to those learned on raw data. We demonstrate this distance-preservation later in this paper.

4 Methodology

The overall workflow is shown in Fig. 2. The process begins with the data being sourced. The data is then segmented into training and testing sets. Following this segmentation phase, the encoded Bloom filter bit array for each sample is constructed in the training and testing sets. The encoded Bloom filter bit arrays from the training set are solely used to train the model, while those from the testing set are used to evaluate model performance. The inference results are compared against the known classification of the test samples. Furthermore, the data compression ratio and security metrics of the encoded Bloom filter bit arrays are calculated and evaluated.

4.1 Datasets

Six publicly available datasets were used, spanning text, time-series, tabular, and image data types. The SMS Spam Collection dataset contains 5,574 English messages labeled as ‘ham’ or ‘spam’ [8]. The EKG (ECG200) dataset consists




Fig. 2. Training/Test data split, processing from n-feature samples to m-bit Bloom filter array, model training, inference and analysis

of 200 heartbeat recordings, evenly split between normal and abnormal rhythms [9]. Tabular datasets include Adult 50K (48,842 instances, 14 features, income classification) [10] and CDC Diabetes (250,000 instances, 23 features) [11]. Image datasets comprise MNIST (70,000 handwritten digits across 10 classes) [12] and Fashion MNIST (70,000 fashion images across 10 classes) [13]. For the datasets not already split between training and test sets, 5-fold cross validation was used.

4.2 Encoded Bloom Filter Transform

Our transform step converts each sample into its own encoded Bloom filter bit array and uses the encoded Bloom filter bit arrays as input to train classification models. This process is shown in Fig. 3 and described in Algorithm 1. Each sample's n features are inserted as elements into its encoded Bloom filter bit array. Once all features are encoded, the Bloom filter for that sample is complete. Each sample is encoded into an m -bit Bloom filter, optionally stored in a byte-packed format, but the classifier always operates on the decompressed binary vector $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

Importantly, the bits are not split or grouped into bytes, integers, or sub-features for model training or inference. The dimensionality of the machine-learning input space is exactly m , regardless of packing for storage. This ensures that the Bloom filter preserves Hamming-distance properties, introduces no artificial correlations, and provides a similarity-preserving input space.

Therefore, all reported results correspond to models trained directly on the Bloom filter bit vectors, not on packed bytes or any other derived encoding. Inference follows the same procedure: the n features of a new sample are encoded into a Bloom filter bit array, and the trained model predicts its class.

Our pipeline uses HMAC-SHA256 with a secret key [26]. Multiple independent hash functions are derived by appending an index i to each feature f and value v . The HMAC-SHA256 operation is

$$\text{HMAC}(K, f, v) = H((K' \oplus \text{opad}) \parallel H((K' \oplus \text{ipad}) \parallel (f \parallel v \parallel i))), \quad (10)$$

where K is the secret key, $H(\cdot)$ is SHA-256, and \parallel denotes concatenation. The adjusted key K' is padded or hashed to the block size, and ipad/opad are fixed byte constants used to form the inner and outer padded keys. Each HMAC




Fig. 3. Process for transforming samples into Bloom Bit Arrays for classifier training.

output is reduced modulo the Bloom filter size m :

$$\text{hash_val} = \text{HMAC}(K, f, v) \bmod m. \quad (11)$$

Algorithm 1: Bloom Filter Encoding of Samples

Input: List of samples, Bloom filter size m , number of hash functions k , secret key K
Output: List of Bloom filters BF_List , one per sample
 Initialize empty list $BF_List \leftarrow []$;
foreach $sample s$ **in** $samples$ **do**
 Initialize blank Bloom filter BF of m bits;
 foreach $feature n, value v$ **in** s **do**
 for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** k **do**
 $Digest \leftarrow \text{HMAC-SHA256}(K \parallel n \parallel v \parallel i)^*$;
 $Hash_val \leftarrow (\text{integer value of } Digest) \bmod m$;
 $BF[Hash_val] \leftarrow 1$;
 Append BF to BF_List ;
return BF_List ;
 Note* \parallel indicates concatenation of K , n , v , and i

4.3 Model Training and Inference

As detailed in the previous section, each training sample is first transformed into an encoded Bloom filter bit array, which serves as the input feature representation for the classification algorithms. In this study, we employ four widely used classifiers: Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGB) [14], Deep Neural Networks (DNN) [15], Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [16], and Logistic Regression (LR) [17]. During inference, each test sample undergoes the same encoded Bloom filter transformation as the training samples. The trained model then applies its decision function to the resulting bit array to produce a predicted class. Model performance is measured by comparing these accuracy and F_1 scores.

The use of multiple classifiers spanning linear (LR), ensemble (XGB), and neural network-based (DNN, CNN) approaches provides a comprehensive evaluation of the Bloom filter transform. By assessing performance across a diverse set of models and datasets, we can robustly determine whether the Bloom filter representation preserves sufficient structure for effective classification.

4.4 Analysis

The following metrics will be evaluated to analyze the value of the encoded Bloom filter transform:

- Classification Accuracy, F_1 [25], and Area-under-the-curve [14]
- Compression Ratio
- Entropy and Bit Occupancy

For each dataset, the Bloom filter size, m , and number of hash functions, k were swept and the results collected. This sweeping allowed the performance of the Bloom filter transform over a wide range of Bloom filter settings to be evaluated. Each of the six datasets were processed using the encoded Bloom filter transform described previously. Table 2 denotes the transform applied, the classifiers used and the accuracy metric used to evaluate the performance of the encoded Bloom filter transform proposed in this paper for each of the datasets.

F_1 of the positive class was selected for the SMS Spam and EKG datasets. The accuracy of the classification for spam messages and irregular EKG rhythms are paramount, therefore, F_1 of the positive class is the proper metric to track [25]. Since both the Adult 50K and CDC Diabetes datasets have high class imbalances, the area-under-the-curve gives a good indication of the quality of the learned classification decision function [14]. For the image data, since both sets are equally balanced among their class distribution, the F_1 score across all classes is an important metric to monitor [7].

5 Results

5.1 Accuracy

The accuracy of the various classifiers for the different datasets using the different transforms is shown in Fig. 4. Across datasets, the encoded Bloom filter transform achieves accuracy that is competitive with, and in several cases slightly better than, results from the raw data. In all cases the comparison is made with exactly the same classification and hyperparameters but with different input space and dimensionality. For example, on the EKG dataset the Bloom filter encoding improves accuracy from 81.0% (raw) to 82.9% (+1.9%), and for the Adult 50K dataset using a DNN classifier accuracy increases from 88.1% (raw) to 88.9% (+0.8%). Even when raw data performs slightly better, such as Adult 50K with XGBoost (88.6% raw vs. 88.2% Bloom, -0.4%), the differences are small. Compared to standard dimensionality reduction methods

Table 2. Datasets, Preprocessing, Classifier, and Accuracy Metric Combinations

Dataset	Encoders	Classifiers	ML Metrics
SMS Spam	Bloom filter Raw	Logistic Regression	F_1 Positive Class
EKG	Bloom filter Raw	XGBoost	F_1 Positive Class
Adult 50K	Bloom filter Raw LDA PCA	XGBoost DNN	Area-Under-Curve
CDC Diabetes	Bloom filter Raw LDA PCA	XGBoost DNN	Area-Under-Curve
MNIST	Bloom filter Raw	DNN CNN	F_1 All Classes
Fashion MNIST	Bloom filter Raw	DNN CNN	F_1 All Classes

such as PCA and LDA, Bloom filters consistently outperform both: on Adult 50K (XGB), Bloom achieves 88.2% accuracy vs. 86.5% (PCA) and 85.6% (LDA), and on CDC Diabetes (DNN) Bloom achieves 82.2% vs. 78.2% (PCA) and 80.5% (LDA). Similar trends hold across classifiers and datasets, with Bloom filters exceeding PCA and LDA by 1–4 percentage points.

For the image datasets, raw data still performs best, but the gap is modest. On MNIST, accuracy decreases from 98.1% (raw) to 95.1% (Bloom), a 3.0 percentage point reduction. For Fashion MNIST, accuracy decreases from 90.5% to 85.3% (-5.2%). These declines are expected: image datasets have extremely high-dimensional inputs and ten output classes [15], [16], making them more sensitive to encoding collisions.

5.2 Compression

The compression ratio results are shown in Fig. 5. This figure shows the compression ratio achieved by applying the different transforms as compared to the raw data size. For example, for the EKG dataset, the encoded Bloom filter transform produces a $4.00\times$ reduction, meaning each sample is 75% smaller than the raw representation. Looking at the various transforms, the LDA transform significantly reduces the memory footprint of the samples—for the Adult 50K dataset LDA achieves a $14.29\times$ reduction (approximately $6.5\times$ more compression than the Bloom filter, which achieves $2.63\times$). Likewise, for the CDC Diabetes dataset, LDA reaches a $16.67\times$ reduction, which is $4\times$ higher compression than the Bloom filter ($4.17\times$) and over $50\times$ higher than PCA ($0.29\times$). However, referring back to the accuracy results, this compression is achieved at the expense of classification accuracy. Comparing PCA and Bloom filter transforms, the Bloom filter transform produces both higher compression (e.g., $2.63\times$ vs. $2.17\times$ on Adult 50K,




Fig. 4. Accuracy by Dataset, Classifier, and Transform (Color = Transform, Hatch = Dataset).

and $4.17 \times$ vs. $0.29 \times$ on CDC) and higher accuracy across the Adult 50K and CDC Diabetes datasets, resulting in a more accurate classifier with a smaller memory footprint.




Fig. 5. Compression Ratio by Dataset and Transform (Color = Transform, Hatch = Dataset).

5.3 Entropy and Bit Occupancy

Figure 6 summarizes the privacy-related metrics of entropy and bit occupancy, calculated according to Equations 6 and 1. Across all datasets, the entropy values range between 0.38 and 0.68, which indicates a generally high level of uncertainty




Fig. 6. Entropy and Bit Occupancy per Dataset for Encoded Bloom Filter Transform (Color = Metric, Hatch = Dataset).

per bit in the encoded Bloom filter representations. The bit occupancy values are 0.13 at the low-end up to 0.60. These results show that the encoded Bloom filters are not fully saturated and maintain a moderate fraction of bits set to 1. Datasets with higher bit occupancy, such as the EKG and MNIST, are closer to the desirable 0.5, suggesting better balance between privacy and information content.

These results demonstrate that the chosen Bloom filter parameters (bit m , number of hash functions k) successfully produce encoded Bloom filter that retain enough information for classification and randomized sufficiently to mitigate structural leakage. In particular, the entropy near 0.5–0.68 for most datasets indicates that the Bloom filter representation retains variability in the bit patterns, which is crucial for privacy-preserving transformations. Bit occupancies near 0.5 help minimize the risk of collisions and false positives. Overall, the figure confirms that the Bloom filter transform achieves a reasonable trade-off between compression, privacy, and the ability to preserve dataset structure.

5.4 Bloom Filter Configuration Sweep

As part of the pipeline for the SMS dataset we swept the Bloom filter size, m , and the number of hash functions, k , to measure the effect on accuracy, compression rate, entropy, and bit occupancy. The results are shown in Fig. 7.

The accuracy strongly correlates with the size of the encoded Bloom filter m regardless of the number of hash functions. A larger Bloom filter retains more of the characteristics of the original dataset and this increased representational capacity directly improves ML performance. For example, increasing the Bloom filter size from $m = 50$ to $m = 200$ increases test accuracy from roughly 78% to over 90%, a gain of more than 12 percentage points. Conversely, when m is




Fig. 7. SMS Spam Dataset - Sweeping Bloom Filter size and number of hash functions.

too small, multiple features collide into the same bit positions, which increases information loss and reduces classifier fidelity.

The compression ratio is also shown with various encoded Bloom filter sizes producing different memory savings. For instance, reducing m from 200 to 50 increases the compression ratio from approximately 0.65 to over 0.90, reflecting the expected trade-off between accuracy and compactness. For entropy and bit occupancy, as the encoded Bloom filter grows in size, both entropy and bit occupancy decrease. This aligns with the theory, as larger encoded Bloom filters are sparser; for example, occupancy drops from about 22% at $m = 50$ to under 10% at $m = 200$, which has a direct downward effect on both entropy and bit occupancy.

The missing effect on ML performance is captured in the joint behavior of m and k : increasing m improves accuracy by reducing collisions, while increasing k increases the reliability of feature encoding but can also raise the collision rate if m is fixed or reduced. As seen in Fig. 7, accuracy improves when k increases from 2 to 4, but performance degrades for $k \geq 6$ when m is small. For example, at $m = 100$, accuracy rises from about 84% at $k = 2$ to 88% at $k = 4$, but then drops below 82% at $k = 8$ due to excessive hash collisions. Thus, ML performance is maximized when m is large enough to avoid saturation and k is chosen to balance redundancy with collision control. The most critical takeaway from Fig. 7 is that the encoded Bloom filter transform allows for making

informed trade-offs between accuracy, data compression, and privacy. A learning system can be designed to maximize any of these characteristics or tuned to find the sweet-spot for a particular use case. Optimizing this trade-off for specific application remains an open area for future work.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a novel application of the Bloom filter transform as a preprocessing step in machine learning. We showed that models trained on encoded Bloom filter representations achieve comparable accuracy to models trained on raw data and outperform other transforms such as LDA and PCA. Encoded Bloom filters also provide memory savings and preserve the privacy of the original data, a finding confirmed across diverse datasets and classifiers.

Future work includes extending this approach to regression tasks and distributed learning architectures, where both compression and privacy are nearly as critical as accuracy. We also plan to evaluate additional datasets and classifiers to further validate the generality of the method, and to investigate puncturing and folding techniques to increase entropy and compression with minimal loss of accuracy. Finally, we plan to investigate a hybrid approach where the Bloom filter encodings are augmented with specific characteristics of the data to evaluate whether this technique improves performance while not sacrificing compression or privacy.

Bloom filters offer a compact, privacy-preserving preprocessing method that maintains high accuracy. Moreover, the trade-offs between accuracy, compression, and privacy can be controlled by adjusting the Bloom filter configuration, including the number of bits m , the number of hash functions k , and the choice of hash functions.

References

1. S. Nayak and R. Patgiri, “RobustBF: A High Accuracy and Memory Efficient 2D Bloom Filter,” *arXiv preprint*, 2021, arXiv:2106.04365.
2. H. Tirmazi, “A Privacy Model for Classical & Learned Bloom Filters,” *arXiv preprint*, 2025, arXiv:2501.15751.
3. B. H. Bloom, “Space/time trade-offs in hash coding with allowable errors,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 422–426, 1970, doi: 10.1145/362686.362692.
4. M. Mitzenmacher, “Compressed Bloom Filters,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 604–612, 2002, doi: 10.1109/TNET.2002.803823.
5. A. Broder and M. Mitzenmacher, “Network Applications of Bloom Filters: A Survey,” *Internet Mathematics*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 485–509, 2005, doi: 10.1080/15427951.2004.10129096.
6. L. Nitz and A. Mandal, “DGA Detection Using Similarity-Preserving Bloom Encodings,” in *Proc. European Interdisciplinary Cybersecurity Conference (EICC)*, Stavanger, Norway, June 14-15 2023, pp. 116-120, doi:10.1145/3590777.3590795.
7. S. Randall, H. Wichmann, A. Brown *et al.*, “A blinded evaluation of privacy preserving record linkage with Bloom filters,” *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 22, no. 1, Art. 22, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s12874-022-01510-2.

8. UCI Machine Learning Repository, “SMS Spam Collection Dataset,” Kaggle, 2011.
9. R. Olszewski, *Generalized Feature Extraction for Structural Pattern Recognition in Time-Series Data*, Ph.D. dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University, 2001.
10. D. Dua and C. Graff, “UCI Machine Learning Repository: Adult Data Set,” 1996.
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), “Diabetes Health Indicators Dataset,” 2020.
12. Y. LeCun and C. Cortes, “MNIST Handwritten Digit Database,” 1998.
13. X. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, “Fashion-MNIST: A Novel Image Dataset for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms,” 2017.
14. T. Chen and C. Guestrin, “XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2016, pp. 785–794, doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939785.
15. G. E. Hinton and R. R. Salakhutdinov, “Reducing the Dimensionality of Data with Neural Networks,” *Science*, vol. 313, no. 5786, pp. 504–507, 2006, doi: 10.1126/science.1127647.
16. A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 25, 2012.
17. D. R. Cox, “The Regression Analysis of Binary Sequences,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 215–242, 1958.
18. N. Fleischhacker, K. G. Larsen, M. Obremski, and M. Simkin, “Invertible Bloom Lookup Tables with Less Memory and Randomness,” in *Proc. 32nd Annu. Eur. Symp. Algorithms (ESA 2024)*, Leibniz Int. Proc. Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 308, pp. 54:1–54:17, 2024, doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2024.54.
19. N. Sengupta, A. Bagchi, S. Bedathur, and M. Ramanath, “Sampling and Reconstruction Using Bloom Filters,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.03308*, 2017.
20. H. Krawczyk, M. Bellare, and R. Canetti, “HMAC: Keyed-hashing for message authentication,” *RFC 2104*, Internet Eng. Task Force (IETF), 1997, doi: 10.17487/RFC2104.
21. J. Liu and M. Vinck, “Improved visualization of high-dimensional data using the distance-of-distances transformation,” *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 9, no. 1, Art. 72, 2022, doi: 10.1186/s40537-022-00525-5.
22. R. A. Fisher, “The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems,” *Annals of Eugenics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 179–188, 1936.
23. I. T. Jolliffe, *Principal Component Analysis*, 2nd ed., Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2002.
24. F. Anowar, S. Sadaoui, and B. Selim, “Conceptual and empirical comparison of dimensionality reduction algorithms (PCA, KPCA, LDA, MDS, SVD, LLE, ISOMAP, LE, ICA, t-SNE),” *Computer Science Review*, vol. 40, p. 100378, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cosrev.2021.100378.
25. H. S. P. Vidanage, T. Ranbaduge, P. Christen, and D. Vatsalan, “Privacy-preserving record linkage using Bloom filters: A systematic literature review,” *J. Inf. Secur. Appl.*, vol. 54, p. 102493, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jisa.2020.102493.
26. M. Sönmez Turan and L. T. A. N. Brandão, “Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC): Specification and Recommendations (Initial Public Draft),” NIST Special Publication 800-224 (IPD), Jun. 2024.