arXiv:2611.09848v1 [cs.IT] 6 Nov 2026

How far does a hash-only sender go? A pre-registered map of sender memory versus bits for short text messages

Marcelo Samoilenko
Winserv
msamoilenko@winserv.com.br
ORCID: 0009-0008-1760-0228

November 2026

Abstract

Can a sender that only computes hashes, with a language model only at the receiver, transmit short human text more cheaply than a classical sender trained on the same domain? We answer with one pre-registered run on 1,000 English user utterances from Taskmaster-1. The primary endpoint is the cost per message to deliver 100% of the messages (hash bits, plus a 2-byte negative acknowledgement and the raw text when the first attempt fails), paired against an in-domain PPM order-1 sender. The hash-only sender delivered 857 of 1,000 messages on the first attempt and cost 192.8 bits per message, 18.4 bits more than PPM order 1 (95% bootstrap interval 10.9 to 26.3); by the pre-registered rule it spends more and is not equivalent within one byte. As secondary results we map measured sender memory against bits. The hash-only sender (8,190 B on a host build, keyed BLAKE2b tag included, as in every method) was the cheapest point in bits from 8,190 B up to, but excluding, PPM order 1 at 24,844 B, 45 to 46 bits below smaz2 and Unishox2; from PPM order 1 upwards, in-domain senders spend fewer bits, except order 2 pruned to 16 KiB. In airtime it loses to PPM order 1 on all five links priced, to Unishox2 on four, and to raw text with a tag on two, because each failure costs an acknowledgement frame and a fallback frame. A wider receiver search recovers half of the failures and makes the cost 7.7 bits lower than PPM order 1, at about three minutes of receiver time per failure, and still loses in airtime on four of five links. We report the measurement as a delimitation, with every deviation of the run.

1 Introduction

Some links charge dearly per bit or per frame: LoRa, LoRaWAN at low data rates, APRS, satellite short-burst data. We use these links only to price bits and frames; we do not claim a market for free text on them. Language models compress text well, but a compressor that codes with a model's predictions needs the same model at the decoder, and in practice at both ends [14, 4]. (For LLMZip this is our inference from the scheme, not a statement of its abstract.) We ask the opposite question: can the sender stay modest, computing only hashes at run time, while a receiver with a language model reconstructs the message?

Slepian–Wolf coding [11], of which DISCUS [9] is a classical construction, lets a decoder with side information recover a source from fewer bits than the source alone would need. We use it only as background and inspiration. Our receiver has a prior (a language model), not a correlated observation; the asymmetry we exploit is computational, not informational.

The question we measure is not whether the scheme "wins". The primary endpoint is the paired cost to deliver every message against an in-domain PPM order-1 sender. As a secondary result we place every sender in the plane of sender memory against bits per message to deliver every message. The analysis was fixed before the run, and the result is reported whether or not it favours the scheme. It does not.

Our contributions are:

- a lossless, tag-verified protocol in which the sender runs no model and holds no table at run time, and a language-model receiver reconstructs the message by hash-pruned beam search, with a negative acknowledgement and a fallback that deliver every message (Section 2);
- a pre-registered, single-run comparison on 1,000 human utterances against in-domain PPM senders and two short-text compressors, with identical 40-bit overhead in every method and sender memory measured by one instrument on one platform (Section 3);
- a negative, delimiting result: the scheme is the cheapest sender in bits only in a narrow memory band, and it loses in airtime on most links priced (Section 4).

2 The scheme

Sender. A message of $L \le 255$ bytes is cut into 2-byte chunks. For each chunk, the sender transmits the top bits of a keyed BLAKE2b hash [1], keyed by a secret shared by both ends, of the chunk index and of the whole prefix up to that chunk: 10 bits for chunks that start in the first 8 bytes and 4 bits afterwards (we call this profile `10:4`). It also sends an 8-bit length field and a 32-bit tag (keyed BLAKE2b of the whole message). For $L \ge 8$ the message costs a deterministic, length-dependent

$$B_{\text{scheme}}(L) = 80 + 4\left\lceil \frac{L-8}{2} \right\rceil \text{ bits}, \tag{1}$$

so 28 to 49 bytes cost 120 to 164 bits. The sender runs no model and holds no table at run time. It is not free of model knowledge: the `10:4` profile was calibrated on development data with the receiver model.

Receiver. A beam search over the tokens of a language model (Qwen2.5-0.5B [10], pinned revision, fp16 on Apple MPS), with candidates grouped by decoded byte position, keeps only candidates whose prefix hashes match the received bits. In the primary configuration the beam holds 64 candidates and each expansion considers the 32,768 most probable tokens. Complete candidates are tested against the tag in score order, at most 1,024 per attempt, so a wrong message is accepted with probability at most $1024 \cdot 2^{-32} \approx 2.4 \times 10^{-7}$ per attempt; with the two extra attempts of secondary analysis B (Section 3.5), at most $3 \cdot 1024 \cdot 2^{-32} \approx 7.2 \times 10^{-7}$ per message.

Delivering every message. When the receiver fails, it returns a 2-byte negative acknowledgement (NACK) and the sender falls back to the raw text ($8L + 40$ bits) or, as a secondary variant, to Unishox2. With $d \in \{0, 1\}$ indicating first-attempt delivery, the cost per message to deliver 100% is

$$C = B_{\text{scheme}}(L) + (1-d)\,(16 + B_{\text{fallback}}), \qquad B_{\text{fallback}} = 8L + 40 \text{ for raw text.} \tag{2}$$

3 Experimental design

3.1 Data and selection

The source is Taskmaster-1 [2], self-dialogues, user turns, released under CC BY 4.0. The test pool is the official `dev` split (770 conversations; 768 after removing two conversations used in development). Eligible utterances are user turns, whitespace-stripped, of 28 to 49 bytes, without line breaks or a leading `#`, with exact duplicates removed: 2,517 of them, and 2,376 after removing the 141 identical to some training utterance. We selected $N = 1{,}000$ (42% of the pool) as the utterances with the smallest SHA-256 of a seeded string. N was fixed for precision (expected half-width of about ± 7 bits), without any number from the pool. The pre-registration, with the SHA-256 of the list and every frozen parameter, was committed and pushed before any decoding; the list itself was not read before that commit. By the local repository and run logs, the commit was made at 13:43:08, the push at 13:43:10 and the decoder process started at 13:43:47 (UTC−3, 5 November 2026); these are local records, not an independent timestamp.

3.2 Baselines and fair accounting

Every method carries the same 8-bit length and 32-bit tag (40 bits of overhead), including raw text and the fallback. Classical senders are trained on the official Taskmaster-1 training split without the development conversations (68,272 user utterances, about 2.4 MB): PPM-C with exclusion [3, 6] of order 1, of order 2 (full, and pruned to 16, 32 and 64 KiB of tables by a rule fixed before the data), and of order 3. The pruning rule removes order-2 context entries in increasing order of count, with lexicographic tie-breaking, until the tables fit the target, and recomputes the PPM-C escape from the pruned counts. We also include two general-purpose short-text compressors, smaz2 [12] and Unishox2 [13], and raw text. PPM bits are ideal code lengths; a C arithmetic coder written as a measuring instrument stayed within 2 bits of them on every development message, and we report a +2-bit termination sensitivity.

3.3 Sender memory

We use one definition for every sender: code plus read-only data of the complete sender, tag included, measured as the section delta of a dead-stripped executable against an identical empty driver (`size -m`). There is one platform: host arm64 (Mach-O), Apple clang 21, `-Os`. This is not a microcontroller; an ARM embedded toolchain was not available. The keyed BLAKE2b reference implementation alone is 7,720 B of code: 94% of the hash-only sender and 31% of PPM order 1, but 8% of the full PPM order 2 and under 2% of order 3. Increments over the tag-only sender are: hash-only scheme +366 B, smaz2 +2,536 B, Unishox2 +7,873 B, PPM order 1 +17,020 B. Static RAM is zero for the scheme and the PPM senders, 2,056 B for smaz2 and 450 B for Unishox2.

3.4 Endpoint and reading rule

The primary endpoint is the mean over the N messages of the paired difference between the scheme's cost C (raw fallback) and the in-domain PPM order-1 sender (ideal bits + 40). The 95% interval is a paired percentile bootstrap with 10,000 resamples and a fixed seed; a normal approximation is reported as sensitivity. The interval is read by two exhaustive labels, both fixed in advance:

- *sign*: entirely below 0, the scheme spends less; entirely above 0, it spends more; containing 0, indeterminate;

- *equivalence*: entirely within ±8 bits (one byte, the payload granularity of the links priced), equivalent within one byte; otherwise not.

First-attempt delivery p is reported with a Wilson 95% interval, as a component and not as a decision. The pre-registered forecast, from 30 development utterances, was p between 0.744 and 0.965 (point 0.90) and a difference between −21.7 and +59.7 bits (point +2.3), with the expected reading "sign indeterminate, not equivalent".

3.5 Secondary analyses

Labelled as secondary and fixed in advance: the paired difference against every point of the frontier, by the same method and labels; a Unishox2 fallback in place of raw text; airtime on five links; **A**, an in-domain byte n-gram of order 5 as receiver on the same bits (beam 64, top 256 tokens, cap 1,024), to measure what the language model adds; and **B**, a wider receiver search on the primary failures only (beam 256 and, if that fails, beam 1,024), to measure what more receiver computation buys instead of a NACK.

3.6 Airtime model

Airtime is computed from per-message payload sizes, with the NACK as a 2-byte frame. LoRa time on air follows the Semtech formula, with CRC on and explicit header assumed. Meshtastic LongFast: 250 kHz, SF11, CR 4/5, 16-symbol preamble, 16-byte header and an assumed 4-byte protobuf envelope. LoRaWAN DR0: 13 bytes of MAC overhead per packet, 8-symbol preamble, SF10 with 11-byte application payloads (US915) and SF12 with 51-byte payloads (EU868), with fragmentation into as many packets as needed. APRS: AX.25 at 1200 bit/s, two digipeaters, TXDELAY 0.3 s, a message wrapper of 14 characters, binary payloads in Base91 and raw text as characters with the tag in 5 Base91 characters. RockBLOCK: one credit per 50 bytes or fraction. On LoRaWAN Class A a downlink only opens after an uplink, so there the NACK costs latency rather than device airtime; we count it as a frame on every link.

3.7 What development already showed

All of the following used data that is now development only and entered the design, not the test. On 30 Taskmaster-1 utterances, the scheme delivered 27 of 30 on the first attempt, with 143.1 bits per message and 11.8 s per message on an Apple M4; the three failures were search failures, the true prefix having fallen out of the 64-wide beam. A receiver-side hybrid (in-domain n-gram first, the language model on failure) delivered 23 of 30 on 30 utterances sampled from 2,443 of the official test split. On the 30 development utterances, the scheme's cost to deliver 100% with a raw fallback was 179.9 bits against 177.5 for the in-domain PPM order 1 (+2.4 bits), a difference 30 messages cannot sign. Pruning PPM order 2 to 16 KiB of tables with the pre-specified rule produced a point worse than PPM order 1 (264.3 bits): recomputing the PPM-C escape on a pruned context makes every novel byte cost about 13 bits. The rule was not changed.

Exposure. Before the pre-registration, an external reviewer consulted by the author computed pool-level values (PPM order 1, 174.3 bits; scheme, 140.7 bits; break-even first-attempt delivery, 0.906). They entered no parameter. Because N is 42% of the pool, they are close to the test values (174.4 and 140.9); we report them so that the reader can weigh this.

Table 1: Sender memory against mean bits per message to deliver 100% (N = 1,000; 40 bits of overhead in every row; PPM in ideal bits). The scheme row includes the NACK and the raw fallback of failed first attempts. Last column: paired mean of the scheme's cost minus the point's, with 95% bootstrap interval; negative means the scheme spends fewer bits.

Sender	Memory (B)	Bits for 100%	Scheme minus point
Raw text (tag only)	7,824	344.0	−151.1 (−159.1, −142.9)
Hash-only scheme (NACK + raw)	**8,190**	**192.8**	—
smaz2	10,360	238.2	−45.3 (−53.1, −37.4)
Unishox2	15,697	239.3	−46.4 (−54.2, −38.4)
PPM order 1	24,844	174.4	+18.4 (10.9, 26.3)
PPM order 2, pruned to 16 KiB	25,786	258.6	−65.8 (−74.1, −57.3)
PPM order 2, pruned to 32 KiB	42,168	143.7	+49.2 (41.8, 56.9)
PPM order 2, pruned to 64 KiB	74,938	140.5	+52.3 (44.8, 60.1)
PPM order 2, full	96,462	140.5	+52.3 (44.8, 60.2)
PPM order 3	440,626	114.6	+78.2 (70.7, 86.0)

4 Results

4.1 Primary endpoint

The cost to deliver 100% with a raw fallback exceeded the in-domain PPM order 1 by **18.4 bits per message (95% bootstrap interval 10.9 to 26.3)**. By the pre-registered rule the scheme *spends more* and is *not equivalent* within one byte. The expected reading at the forecast point, "sign indeterminate", failed. The value lies inside the forecast range (−21.7 to +59.7) but well above its point (+2.3). By accounting, not by a measured cause, most of the gap follows from a first-attempt delivery of 85.7% (857 of 1,000; Wilson 83.4% to 87.7%) instead of 90%: at $p = 0.90$ the same arithmetic on the test means gives +2.5 bits. The normal approximation gives 10.7 to 26.2; adding 2 bits of arithmetic-coder termination to PPM gives 16.4 (8.9 to 24.3). The mean cost to deliver 100% was 192.8 bits (bootstrap 185.0 to 201.0), of which 140.9 are the scheme's own bits. No wrong message was accepted.

4.2 The frontier in bits

Table 1 and Figure 1 place every pre-registered sender in the plane of measured memory against bits to deliver 100%.

In bits, no measured point dominates the scheme from 8,190 B up to, but excluding, PPM order 1 at 24,844 B; from PPM order 1 upwards every in-domain PPM spends fewer bits, except order 2 pruned to 16 KiB, which the pre-specified pruning rule makes worse than order 1. Order 2 pruned to 64 KiB matches the full order 2 in bits with 22% less memory. We did not measure a PPM of order 0, which would sit in the 8 to 25 KB band; it was not pre-registered. With a Unishox2 fallback instead of raw text, the mean cost was 178.4 bits and the difference against PPM order 1 was +4.0 bits (−1.4 to 9.6): sign indeterminate, not equivalent.

4.3 Airtime

Table 2 gives the mean airtime per message to deliver 100% under the frame model of Section 3.

In airtime the scheme loses to PPM order 1 on all five links and to Unishox2 on four; it wins against Unishox2 only on US915 DR0, whose 11-byte packets reward its deterministic size. Its




Figure 1: Measured sender memory (host arm64 build, keyed BLAKE2b tag included in every sender) against mean bits per message to deliver 100%, on the 1,000 test utterances. The grey step is the lowest cost among the pre-registered senders that fit within a given memory; the scheme sets it from 8,190 B up to PPM order 1 at 24,844 B. The open diamond is the same sender with secondary analysis B, which changes receiver effort only. Values are in Table 1.

advantage in bits over Unishox2 disappears because each failure pays a NACK frame and a fallback frame. On APRS and RockBLOCK it also loses to raw text with a tag, which needs less memory: on those links raw text dominates the scheme in both memory and airtime.

4.4 Secondary A: the receiver model

With an in-domain byte n-gram of order 5 as receiver on the same bits, first-attempt delivery fell to 723 of 1,000 (1.55 s per message). The language model delivered 183 messages that the n-gram missed and missed 49 that the n-gram delivered (674 delivered by both): a net gain of 134 per 1,000. With the n-gram receiver, the cost to deliver 100% exceeded PPM order 1 by 70.9 bits (60.8 to 81.2).

4.5 Secondary B: more receiver search instead of a NACK

Retrying the 143 failures with a beam of 256 recovered 46; retrying the remaining 97 with a beam of 1,024 recovered 26, so 929 of 1,000 were delivered without a NACK (Wilson 91.1% to 94.3%). The mean cost to deliver 100% then fell to 166.7 bits, 7.7 bits *below* PPM order 1 (-13.2 to -1.8), at 46 s per attempt at beam 256 and 191 s at beam 1,024 (slowest 402 s): about three minutes of receiver time per failure on average, or 25.2 s per message over all 1,000. With B the scheme still spends more than PPM order 2 pruned to 32 KiB (+23.1 bits), full order 2 (+26.3) and order 3 (+52.1), and it still loses to PPM order 1 in airtime on four of five links; it wins only on US915 DR0 (0.860 against 0.891 s).

Table 2: Mean airtime per message to deliver 100% (seconds; RockBLOCK in credits), $N = 1{,}000$. The scheme rows include the NACK and fallback frames of failed first attempts. Order 2 is the full model.

Sender	Meshtastic	US915 DR0	EU868 DR0	APRS	RockBLOCK
Scheme + raw fallback	0.693	0.999	2.293	0.992	1.310
Scheme + Unishox2 fallback	0.679	0.941	2.214	0.987	1.286
Scheme + B + raw fallback	0.612	0.860	2.016	0.881	1.154
Raw text (tag only)	0.719	1.590	2.700	0.908	1.155
smaz2	0.620	1.156	2.132	0.868	1.000
Unishox2	0.622	1.161	2.134	0.869	1.000
PPM order 1	0.566	0.891	1.887	0.807	1.000
PPM order 2	0.534	0.751	1.748	0.772	1.000
PPM order 3	0.508	0.675	1.642	0.745	1.000

4.6 Receiver cost and search diagnostics

The primary receiver took 11.9 s per message on an Apple M4 (median 11.5 s), with up to 2.4 GB of resident memory and 5.6 GB of GPU driver memory; secondary B reached 2.9 GB and 10.4 GB. The cap of 1,024 tag checks truncated the list of complete candidates on all 1,000 messages, and every one of the 143 primary failures exhausted the cap (142 of the 277 failures of A).

4.7 Deviations

The primary run was interrupted twice by an unrelated local model started on the same machine (SIGTERM after 727 messages, SIGKILL after 729). It was resumed as the pre-registration allows: no completed row was redone or discarded, and model revision, library versions and device were the same before and after. Decode times of messages 650 to 728 are inflated (one took 304 s). Delivery does not depend on load, because the decoder has no time limit and its cache budget is fixed; the failure rate there was 11 of 79, against 132 of 921 elsewhere. A provisional analysis of the primary run and of A was computed while B was still running; the decision to run B had been recorded before any endpoint was computed.

5 Related work

We opened every source cited in this section, but for all except DISCUS (metadata only) we read only the abstract. Language-model compressors code with the model's predictions [14, 4]. Distributed source coding sends syndromes of a linear code and decodes with side information [9]; learned decoders for distributed compression are reviewed by Ozyilkan and Erkip [7], for abstract sources and images, not text. Merhav [5] shows that a universal Slepian–Wolf rate region is attainable with an incremental scheme and a low-rate feedback link, a theoretical counterpart of our NACK; we did not read the original incremental scheme by Draper. The closest regime we found is a 2026 preprint that names the "weak-sender/strong-receiver" setting and compresses text by deletion, with a language model reconstructing at the receiver [15]; it is lossy and has no reconstruction check, while ours is lossless and checked by a tag. Another 2026 preprint uses a language model to propose corrections that LDPC parity then verifies [8]; that is channel decoding, not source coding. None of this proves novelty; our search of prior work was not systematic.

6 Limitations

- One corpus (Taskmaster-1, staged dialogues, same distribution as development), one receiver model, one language (English), one length band (28 to 49 bytes); messages were decoded without the dialogue context. Contamination of the receiver model by Taskmaster-1 was not measured.
- The in-domain PPM was trained on 2.4 MB of the same corpus: the best case for the classical sender.
- Sender memory was measured on a host arm64 build, not a microcontroller; the BLAKE2b reference is most of the size of the smallest senders, and a compact implementation was not measured. Non-constant tables of smaz2 and Unishox2 count as RAM in our definition; on a microcontroller their initial image would also occupy flash.
- The pruning rule for PPM order 2 is naive; a pruning that re-estimates escapes is future work. No PPM of order 0 was measured.
- Airtime depends on frame assumptions (2-byte NACK, header sizes, the NACK counted as a frame on LoRaWAN).
- The receiver runs in fp16 on Apple MPS; we do not claim bit-identical results on other machines.
- There is no wire format and no cryptographic review: the BLAKE2b tag stands in for an audited message authentication code.

7 Conclusion

With a NACK and a raw fallback, a sender that only computes hashes delivers every message, losslessly and verified by a tag, while a receiver with a language model does the modelling. Measured against an in-domain classical sender, it does not pay on our pre-registered endpoint: it spends 18.4 bits more per message than PPM order 1. It is the cheapest sender in bits only between 8,190 B and PPM order 1 at 24,844 B (on a host build, with 7,720 B of shared BLAKE2b in both), and in airtime its failures cost frames that erase its bit savings on most links. A wider receiver search makes it cheaper than PPM order 1 in bits, but not in airtime, and only at minutes of receiver time per failure. We did not identify a device class that sends typed free text and cannot hold a PPM order-1 sender; this is our inference, not a measurement. For this regime, a small in-domain model at both ends was the better design in our measurements. We publish the map so that claims about receiver-side language models can be weighed against an in-domain classical sender with measured memory.

Software, data and reproducibility

Receiver model Qwen2.5-0.5B, revision `060db6499f32faf8b98477b0a26969ef7d8b9987`. Third-party C sources at pinned commits: BLAKE2 `ed1974ea` (CC0, OpenSSL or Apache-2.0), Unishox2 `6ec2ff07` (Apache-2.0), smaz2 `71ecc43e` (MIT). Taskmaster-1 is used under CC BY 4.0. The pre-registration was committed as `919fd75` and the frozen code as `4013e6f`; the per-message results, the analysis scripts and an audit script that recomputes the reported numbers from the result files

are in the public repository `https://github.com/msamoilenko/hash-sender-llm-receiver`, a snapshot of the files needed to check this article. The development repository, with the commit history cited above, the decision log and its errata, is available from the author on request.

Use of generative AI

This work made substantial use of language models. Claude (Anthropic), through Claude Code, was the main assistant and orchestrated the work under the author's direction: it wrote the experiment code, the analysis scripts and drafts of this text, and a Claude subagent reviewed the code before the pre-registration and the manuscript before submission. Other tools served as support or reviewers: Perplexity for literature search; Gemini, DeepSeek and ChatGPT to critique the design and the manuscript; and a separate coding agent (Deep Code), which ran the test suite and the audit script during development. Every suggestion was checked against the code and data and accepted or rejected by the author. The author made the final design decisions, approved the pre-registration, and takes responsibility for the content. No generative model is an author of this paper.

References

[1] J.-P. Aumasson, S. Neves, Z. Wilcox-O'Hearn, and C. Winnerlein. BLAKE2: simpler, smaller, fast as MD5. In *Applied Cryptography and Network Security (ACNS 2013)*, LNCS 7954, pages 119–135. Springer, 2013.

[2] B. Byrne, K. Krishnamoorthi, C. Sankar, A. Neelakantan, B. Goodrich, D. Duckworth, S. Yavuz, A. Dubey, K.-Y. Kim, and A. Cedilnik. Taskmaster-1: Toward a realistic and diverse dialog dataset. In *Proceedings of EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019*, pages 4516–4525. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.

[3] J. G. Cleary and I. H. Witten. Data compression using adaptive coding and partial string matching. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 32(4):396–402, 1984.

[4] G. Delétang, A. Ruoss, P.-A. Duquenne, et al. Language modeling is compression. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. arXiv:2309.10668.

[5] N. Merhav. Universal Slepian–Wolf coding for individual sequences. arXiv:2403.07409, 2024.

[6] A. Moffat. Implementing the PPM data compression scheme. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 38(11):1917–1921, 1990.

[7] E. Ozyilkan and E. Erkip. Distributed compression in the era of machine learning: A review of recent advances. arXiv:2402.07997, 2024.

[8] S. Park, H. Lyu, J. Choi, and H. J. Yang. LLM-assisted LDPC decoding via syndrome-verified semantic priors. arXiv:2608.14280, 2026. Preprint.

[9] S. S. Pradhan and K. Ramchandran. Distributed source coding using syndromes (DISCUS): design and construction. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(3):626–643, 2003.

[10] Qwen Team (A. Yang, B. Yang, B. Zhang, B. Hui, et al.). Qwen2.5 technical report. arXiv:2412.15115, 2024.

[11] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf. Noiseless coding of correlated information sources. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 19(4):471–480, 1973.

[12] S. Sanfilippo. SMAZ2: compression for very short messages for LoRa and embedded devices. Software, `https://github.com/antirez/smaz2`, 2024; we used commit `71ecc43e`.

[13] A. Ramanathan. Unishox: A hybrid encoder for short Unicode strings. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7(69):3919, 2022. Software: `https://github.com/siara-cc/Unishox2`; we used commit `6ec2ff07`.

[14] C. S. K. Valmeekam, K. Narayanan, D. Kalathil, J.-F. Chamberland, and S. Shakkottai. LLMZip: Lossless text compression using large language models. arXiv:2306.04050, 2023.

[15] Y. Zou, J. Tong, and J. Li. Text-preserving lossy text compression: A study of strategic deletion and LLM reconstruction. arXiv:2605.29000, 2026. Preprint.