

# Motif Caller: Sequence Reconstruction for Motif-Based DNA Storage

Parv Agarwal<sup>1,\*</sup> and Thomas Heinis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Imperial College London

\*p.agarwal23@imperial.ac.uk

## ABSTRACT

DNA data storage is rapidly gaining traction as a long-term data archival solution, primarily due to its exceptional durability. Retrieving stored data relies on DNA sequencing, which involves a process called basecalling — a typically costly and slow task that uses machine learning to map raw sequencing signals back to individual DNA bases (which are then translated into digital bits to recover the data). Current models for basecalling have been optimized for reading individual bases. However, with the advent of novel DNA synthesis methods tailored for data storage, there is significant potential for optimizing the reading process.

In this paper, we focus on Motif-Based DNA synthesis, where sequences are constructed from motifs — groups of bases — rather than individual bases. To enable efficient reading of data stored in DNA using Motif-Based DNA synthesis, we designed *Motif Caller*, a machine learning model built to detect entire motifs within a DNA sequence, rather than individual bases. Motifs can also be detected from individually identified bases using a basecaller and then searching for motifs, however, such an approach is unnecessarily complex and slow. Building a machine learning model that directly identifies motifs allows to avoid the additional step of searching for motifs. It also makes use of the greater amount of features per motif, thus enabling finding the motifs with higher accuracy. *Motif Caller* significantly enhances the efficiency and accuracy of data retrieval in DNA storage based on Motif-Based DNA synthesis.

## 1 Introduction


The volume of archival data is growing exponentially, driven by factors such as future analytics needs <sup>1</sup> and regulatory compliance requirements. As a result, the world's archived data continues to expand rapidly. However, it's estimated that at least 80% of the data being archived today will never be accessed again, or if it is, access will be very infrequent. This type of data is known as "cold data" <sup>2</sup>.

Traditional cold storage solutions, such as hard drives, tape, and optical devices, have limited lifespans — typically between 5 and 20 years, depending on the medium. This limitation means that long-term storage data must be periodically migrated to new media, increasing both costs and complexity over time.

Given this context, DNA — nature's own information storage system, refined over billions of years — has emerged as a promising medium for long-term data preservation <sup>3</sup>. DNA offers unmatched data density and durability. In fact, estimates suggest that all the digital data in the world could theoretically be stored in a space no larger than a shoebox <sup>4</sup>. However, despite its immense potential, the prohibitive cost of DNA synthesis remains a significant barrier to its widespread adoption <sup>5</sup>.

To address the high synthesis costs, approaches have emerged to circumvent the base-by-base process. One class of novel synthesis writes data to the DNA by using pre-synthesized motifs, which are a collection of bases or subsequences of DNA <sup>6</sup>. Doing so simplifies the synthesis and reduces the cost. In addition, when following a combinatorial approach, it increases the logical information density as well <sup>7</sup>. These are broadly classified as motif-based methods for synthesizing DNA for DNA storage. To read the data, the motifs must be recovered from the raw signal coming from DNA sequencing devices. This is usually done with a tool chain which first uses a basecaller to translate the raw signal from the sequencing device to a base level sequence and then finds the motifs in the sequence to decode the data.

This paper explores an innovative approach to short the process and develop a machine learning model — a Motif Caller — that directly maps the raw signal to motifs. Doing so means that the machine learning model can work with more features (mapping a number of bases in one go instead of just one) which increases the percentage of motifs detected per read. This, in turn, leads to a lower number of reads required to completely recover the stored information (i.e., effective sequencing coverage). We demonstrate the efficiency and accuracy of Motif Caller on an empirical dataset from an experimental run conducted by Helixworks<sup>7</sup> where we detect more motifs per read compared to the baseline, leading to a lower effective sequencing coverage. In addition, we demonstrate that by using more refined labels on a synthetic dataset, we can significantly outperform the baseline, leading to near perfect motif detection.



**Figure 1.** Illustration of the typical block-like oligo structure of the motif-based DNA storage pipeline. Using the bridge ( $B_x$ ), the spacers ( $S$ ) of two motifs are attached using their complementary overhangs. Motifs are added one by one, growing the sequence.

We start by introducing the context of DNA storage (Sec. 2) and providing the background required to motivate the problem. We then break down the two methods of motif-based synthesis (Sec. 3), the Helixworks<sup>7</sup> approach and the CatalogDNA<sup>6</sup> approach. Following this, we introduce our two methods, the baseline method of Motif Search (Sec. 4) and consequently our proposed approach of the Motif Caller (Sec. 5). We then introduce the datasets that we use to compare the methods (Sec. 6) and evaluate the methods on the datasets (Sec. 7). We conclude with a brief discussion about the results (Sec. 8) and their applications outside of DNA storage and how we can further improve the performance of the Motif Caller. By addressing the key challenge of sequencing efficiency, our research brings us one step closer to realizing the immense potential of DNA as a revolutionary data storage medium.

## 2 Context

DNA sequencing has experienced rapid advancement since the early days of Sanger sequencing<sup>8</sup>. Today, high-throughput technologies, such as Nanopore sequencers, are readily accessible, making sequencing more cost-effective<sup>5,9</sup>. Nanopore sequencing involves threading a DNA strand through a Nanopore that has an electrical current running through it<sup>10</sup>. As the DNA strand passes through, it disrupts the current, generating a series of electrical signal deflections that correspond to the individual bases. This produces a unique fingerprint for each base sequence. Machine learning based algorithms are then used to convert the recorded signal trace into a sequence of DNA bases, in a process known as basecalling.

Initially, basecalling was done by models like Hidden Markov Models (HMMs), with Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT) offering a cloud-based solution called Metrichor<sup>11</sup>. As Nanopore sequencing grew in popularity, ONT and open-source alternatives shifted to using neural network architectures, such as Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), to provide local basecalling with a higher base-level accuracy<sup>12,13</sup>. While ONT's basecallers used a segmentation approach to identify single bases, models like Chiron<sup>14</sup> (an open-source alternative) used an end-to-end approach using Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss in a Convolutional Recurrent Neural Network (CRNN) architecture, achieving comparable accuracy without a segmentation step. Currently, standard basecallers like Dorado and Guppy also use such an architecture.

With the advent of portable devices like ONT's MinION sequencer, Nanopore sequencing has gained widespread adoption, especially in the field of DNA storage. Nanopore sequencing is particularly advantageous in DNA data storage due to its ability to handle long reads, which are crucial for high recovery rates<sup>5</sup>.

In motif-based DNA storage, data retrieval hinges on accurately identifying motifs. The baseline method of Motif Search (described in Sec. 4) detects a small fraction of the motifs per read that are within an information block. The goal of this paper is to increase the percentage of motifs that are detected per read over an information block. Since the percentage of motifs detected will be a small amount compared to the total information stored in the block (owing to errors in synthesis and sequencing), the complete information will be recovered by combining motif predictions of a number of reads over the same information block. The number of reads that are required to recover all the information for a block is called the effective sequencing coverage. By identifying a higher percentage of motifs per read, we in turn, seek to minimize the effective sequencing coverage.

## 3 Motif-Based Synthesis

In motif-based DNA storage, information is coded over a set of motifs, which are a collection of bases or subsequences of DNA. These motifs are pre-synthesized and combined to create a single block of information within a long strand called an oligo. This concept is shown in Fig. 1, where the basic structure of an oligo resulting from motif-based synthesis is shown. One end of the oligo is attached to a solid support, and motifs are added one by one to the growing strand. Each motif is separated

by a spacer ( $S$ ), in order to distinguish the boundary between two motifs and use the bridge ( $B_x$ ) to join two motifs via the overhangs. The spacers attach to each other using the bridge, that connects the two sections of the 5' and 3' endings of the reverse complementary spacers.


### 3.1 Helixworks' Combinatorial approach

Helixworks have developed an approach to combinatorial, motif-based DNA storage<sup>7,15</sup>. In order to scale the logical density of each symbol, instead of coding over individual motifs, information is coded over how a subset of motifs are picked from the whole motif set. In this way, information per symbol can be scaled from  $\log M$  to  $\log \binom{M}{k}$ , where  $M$  is the size of the motif library and  $k$  is the number of motifs per symbol. In the Helixworks pipeline<sup>7</sup>, there are 2 address motifs and 8 payload slots within each block, which they call as the cycle. Each payload slot consists of 4 motifs that constitutes a single combinatorial symbol. There are therefore 32 information carrying (payload) motifs in total in each cycle. Our dataset described in Sec. 6 results from one of the experimental runs of this pipeline conducted in<sup>15</sup>, where a 5 MB image was retrieved using a capacity achieving error correcting scheme.

### 3.2 CatalogDNA's Combinatorial approach

CatalogDNA's<sup>6</sup> approach, introduces a novel method for combinatorial based motif storage that similarly increases the logical density of each symbol stored. They operate over a set of DNA fragments (Components) that are designed and partitioned into a fixed number of disjoint sets (Layers). The Components are prefabricated and are analogous to the concept of Motifs. Longer DNA molecules (Identifiers) are assembled from these Components by ligating them together, where only one Component from each Layer is chosen, and the Layers have a pre-defined fixed order. The Components are designed to have a unique central region and two edge sequences that are common to all Components within a Layer. The central region allows for random access, as it acts a unique primer binding site for the targeted selection of Identifiers. The edge sequences are single strand overhangs designed to facilitate ligation between Components of adjacent Layers.

The resulting Identifier space represents all the potential Identifiers derivable from the initial Component library. The complexity of the space grows exponentially with the number of Layers, mathematically expressed as  $\prod_{i=1}^N M_i$ , where  $N$  represents the total number of Layers and  $M_i$  indicates the number of Components in that Layer. To manage this space, CatalogDNA uses an ordered tree structure (called a C-tree), where each tree level corresponds to a specific Layer. The tree's architecture ensures a fixed branch ordering, with each branch representing a Component. This structure allows for a systematic collection of Identifiers through a post-order traversal, enabling the assignment of a unique rank to each Identifier. This ranking mechanism is used to encode information. By selectively assembling and pooling Identifiers corresponding to specific bit positions, the method can encode binary and potentially more complex information systems.



**Figure 2.** Figure illustrating the difference in operation between the Motif Search and Motif Caller pipelines for sequence reconstruction. A motif-based oligo containing the symbols  $M_1, M_2, M_4$  passes through the nanopore (a) and produces a trace of the bases in the squiggle (b). The signal is used to predict a base level sequence using basecalling (c). From this base level sequence, Motif Search (d) is used to obtain the final motif sequence prediction. The Motif caller (e) shorts the two-step reconstruction by predicting the motif sequence directly from the squiggle.

## 4 Basecalling & Motif Search - The Baseline

Fig. 2 (a-d) illustrates the baseline, a motif-based DNA storage sequencing pipeline. A motif-based oligo is passed through the nanopore (Fig. 2a) to produce a signal, called the squiggle (Fig. 2b). This squiggle is the deflection of the current as the bases of the strand pass through the nanopore. The remainder of the pipeline aims to reconstruct the motif sequence from the squiggle in two steps.

### 4.1 Basecalling

Basecalling (Fig. 2) reconstructs the sequence of bases from the squiggle created by the oligo passing through the nanopore. Basecallers learn the representation of individual bases within a squiggle, based on which they make inferences to reconstruct the base-level sequence.

As described in Sec. 2, basecalling models started from simple Hidden Markov Models (HMMs)<sup>11</sup> that used an external event segmentation step to extract the part of the squiggle that corresponds to a single base passing through the nanopore. These have evolved to more advanced, Deep Neural Network (DNN) methods that auto-align the sequence using Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss and do not require an external event segmentation step<sup>12,13</sup>. Modern basecalling models achieve a high base-level accuracy, and are used widely in biology applications<sup>16</sup>, but have an error characteristic that make them prone to deletion errors for next-generation sequencing technologies like nanopore sequencing<sup>17</sup>.

### 4.2 Motif Search

Once a base-level prediction is made from the squiggle, we can reconstruct the original stored motif sequence (Fig. 2d). The challenge is to infer the motifs from a noisy base-level prediction, which is especially prone to deletion errors. The baseline method of Motif Search<sup>18</sup> looks for exact matches of motifs, that is, subsequences of 25 bases to be predicted correctly to infer a single motif. Motif Search thus traverses the base-level prediction sequentially, looking for exact matches of motifs. The performance of the Motif Search pipeline is inherently limited by the ability of the basecaller to predict a sequence of bases correctly. This dependence leads to limited performance, and by aiming to train a model to predict motifs directly from the squiggle, we can circumvent this problem and potentially detect a higher number of motifs for each read.

## 5 Motif Caller

The Motif Caller, illustrated in Fig. 2 (a, b & e), attempts to short the two step process of basecalling followed by Motif Search by predicting motifs directly from the squiggle. By replacing the two step pipeline to a model that predicts directly at the motif level, we can expect to detect a much higher percentage of motifs per read as compared to the baseline. With perfect data, we would expect a motif level accuracy similar to basecallers, or even superior - owing to a larger number of features per motif as compared to a base. However, generating perfect labels in a real world scenario is challenging, especially in the combinatorial pipeline, since the synthesis process leads to an uncertainty about the motifs within a particular block (described further in Sec. 6).

For the Motif Caller model, We use a similar architecture and training strategy as the standard basecalling models such as Dorado, Chiron and Guppy that use a Deep Convolutional Neural Network along with Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) Loss in order to operate directly with the unsegmented raw data<sup>14</sup>. The model architecture is shown in Fig 3. The convolutional layers extract the important features from the raw data and feed it to the sequential layers of the model, which are Bidirectional recurrent layers (BiGRU)<sup>19</sup>. These layers approximate the function that conduct the prediction for each input squiggle. The CTC Loss helps the model to learn the alignment between the squiggles and the motifs while it trains, without any explicit event segmentation. We expect the traditional basecalling architecture to generalize well to this use-case. The biggest difference between this model and standard basecalling models is going from predicting a sequence of bases with 4 unique bases to a sequence of motifs with 8 unique motifs.

### 5.1 Training Procedure

We aim to predict the motif sequence directly from the raw squiggle data without any segmentation steps. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the original set of motifs used to store information, comprising eight distinct motifs. Each motif  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  is a random sequence of bases of length  $l$ . In our datasets, all motifs have the same length of  $l = 25$  bases, without loss of generality. For this setup, each motif label  $y_i \in \mathcal{M}$ . We need to map the squiggle sequence input to their corresponding motif labels. Let the raw signal input be,  $s = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T]$ , which needs to be mapped to their respective motif labels  $y = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k]$  for each series of time steps that represent a motif label. Training samples are drawn from the dataset  $X = \{(s^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), (s^{(2)}, y^{(2)}), \dots\}$ . By using the model architecture and loss function described below, we can directly translate the input time series  $s$  to the sequence  $y$  without any segmentation steps.

For each training sample, the sequence is divided into windows, with the window length determined by the average number of squiggles per motif. An overlap between the windows is assigned based on the standard deviation of the number of squiggles

per motif. Due to this overlap, there is a larger number of windows as compared to labels, which allows the model to represent a single label as a combination of windows. We pass the sequence for each window to the model which outputs a probability array, expressing the likelihoods of each motif for that window. CTC introduces an additional "blank" token, denoted as  $\phi$ , to the set of possible labels. This token allows the model to indicate no output at a particular time step. The aggregated output is compared to the target sequence using the CTC loss criterion.

For each training sample, the model outputs a probability distribution over the possible output tokens for each window. From this output, we can produce a sequence of labels  $\pi = [\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_T]$ , by selecting a token at each window. Each  $\pi_i$  is one of the motifs in  $M$  or  $\phi$ . This sequence of labels is called an alignment. Each alignment  $\pi$  must be mapped to the target sequence  $y$ . This is done by removing the blanks and repeated characters. We remove the repeated characters as multiple windows passed to the model go over the same part of a sequence that may correspond to a single label, since there is an overlap between the windows. For example, the alignment  $[A, \phi, A, A, G]$  maps to the sequence  $[A, A, G]$ . The probability of an alignment  $\pi$  given the input sequence  $s$  is the product of the probabilities of the labels at each window  $t$ :  $P(\pi|s) = \prod_{t=1}^T P(\pi_t|s)$ . The total probability of the target sequence  $y$  given the input sequence  $s$  is the sum of the probabilities of all possible alignments that map to  $y$ :  $P(y|s) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{B}^{-1}(y)} P(\pi|s)$  where  $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(y)$  is the set of all alignments that collapse to  $y$ . The CTC loss is the negative log probability of the correct label sequence:  $\mathcal{L}_{CTC} = -\log P(y|s)$ .


This encourages the model to maximize the probability of the correct target sequence by considering all the possible alignments. The CTC criterion computes these alignments using a dynamic programming algorithm<sup>20</sup>, that allows dealing with large sequences without causing a blowup in computational complexity. However, by maximizing the space of all alignments that give the correct output, we still need to decode at inference in order to retrieve the best option for a prediction from the model output probability distribution. We stick to a simple greedy decoding approach, picking the most probable token at each window of the input sequence. We then collapse this alignment as described above, by removing repeated characters and blanks. In this way, we obtain our final motif prediction sequence at inference.

## 6 Dataset

### 6.1 Empirical Dataset

The empirical dataset used to train the Motif Caller model was sourced from an experimental run conducted by Helixworks (Sec. 33.1) who have developed an approach to combinatorial, motif-based DNA storage<sup>7,15</sup>. However, due to synthesis errors, there is an uncertainty in the motifs that are within a particular block of information. This creates a clear distinction between the original information that is stored (i.e., the pre-synthesis ground truth), and the actual motifs that are within a synthesized block. This leads to a challenge in creating labeled data to train the Motif Caller, since there is no way to be certain about the ground truth motif sequence of each block of information.

To generate labels, we make use of motif sequence predictions made by the Motif Search pipeline (Sec. 4) along with the pre-synthesis ground truth. A single deletion or insertion error in the motif prediction made by the Motif Search pipeline leads to the sequence falling out of order with the reference (the ground truth sequence). To solve this problem, a method called as alignment is used to make the best comparison of the sequence prediction to the reference<sup>21</sup>. This algorithm finds the best way to match the characters of the predicted sequence to the reference. Using alignment, we select those reads where the Motif Search pipeline detects the maximum percentage of motifs that align to the pre-synthesis ground truth. In this way, we aim to train the Motif Caller with the best labeled data we can create using the Motif Search pipeline. However, since the labels are generated in this fashion, the Motif Caller is inherently limited to the best performance of the Motif Search pipeline, where it detects around 10% of the motifs within a read. Despite this limitation, as we show in Fig. 4, due to the learning capacity of the model, it is able to generalize beyond the motifs that are present within the label, and predict motifs



**Figure 3.** Figure illustrating the model architecture used for the Motif Caller. The architecture is similar to models used for basecalling such as Guppy and Dorado.



within the pre-synthesis ground truth, even during training. As one would expect, with more refined labels, the performance of the Motif Caller has potential to be significantly improved.

In the empirical dataset, there are a total of  $\approx 4000$  blocks of information, with an average of  $\approx 200$  nanopore reads per cycle. Since the dataset was sourced from Helixworks<sup>7</sup>, each block consists of an address and 32 information carrying (payload) motifs which are separated by spacers unique to each position in the block. Each payload motif is of length 25 bases. In our training using this dataset, we aim to maximize the detection of payload motifs detected within a single read after aligning to the pre-synthesis ground truth. We ignore the address and spacer motifs within our analysis and seek to detect only the motifs that carry information. We train the model on 80% of the cycles and leave the rest of the cycles for the evaluation and to see how the model generalizes to unseen data.

## 6.2 Synthetic Dataset

Similar to the block structure of the empirical dataset, we create a synthetic dataset to mimic the scenario where the data has perfect labels. The data is generated by using Squigulator<sup>22</sup>, a tool to simulate nanopore sequencing data. The rest of the constraints of the dataset remain exactly the same as the empirical dataset. Additionally, we train a base-level model of the Motif Caller on the synthetic dataset, to compare its performance with a standard basecaller.


## 7 Results

To demonstrate the superiority of the Motif Caller pipeline, we first compare the performance of the Motif Caller with the standard Motif Search pipeline on the empirical dataset (Sec. 6). Since the labels generated empirically are imperfect, we aim to demonstrate the potential of the Motif Caller in a scenario where this is not the case by testing on the synthetic dataset. To test whether the Motif Caller can achieve basecalling level accuracy with perfect labels, we compare the Motif Caller with a model trained on the base-level on the synthetic data, and Bonito<sup>23</sup>, an open source state-of-the-art basecaller for Oxford Nanopore reads.


### 7.1 Empirical Dataset

#### 7.1.1 Percentage of motifs detected per read

In Fig. 5, we compare the percentage of motifs detected between the Motif Caller and the Motif Search pipeline, over the reads for all the unseen blocks of information of the empirical dataset. After inference, we align our reads to the pre-synthesis ground truth (Sec. 6). We can see that the Motif Caller (blue) consistently detects a higher percentage of motifs in every cycle, as compared to the Motif Search pipeline (orange). Owing to searching for exact matches, the Motif Search pipeline has a lower variance as compared to the Motif Caller, that picks the most likely token (between the set of motifs and a blank) at each part of the read. Since the Motif Search pipeline is dependent on exact matches of a whole motif, at the base-level, it requires 25 bases to be identified in a row without any errors. Due to the error prone nature of basecalling, this is unlikely. On the other hand, even though the labels generated by the reads of the Motif Search pipeline are imperfect, the Motif Caller is able to learn a representation of the motifs within the squiggle signal, in a way that it can detect motifs outside even its training set. This results in it being able to identify different and a larger percentage of motifs per read, on the unseen blocks of the data.



**Figure 4.** Even with imperfect labels generated by the Motif Search pipeline, the Motif Caller is able to learn the general motif trace to predict motifs outside of its labels, even within the training samples. The figure compares the percentage of motifs that it learns to predict within training that are within its labels and the ones that are not, but are within the pre-synthesis ground truth.



**Figure 5.** Comparing the percentage of motifs identified per read between the Motif Caller and the Motif Search pipeline on the unseen blocks of information. We can see that on average, the Motif Caller identifies 5% more motifs per read, despite its labels being generated by the Motif Search pipeline. Since the Motif Search pipeline predicts a motif only when it has a perfect match, it has a lower variance as compared to the Motif Caller pipeline, that is dependent on the confidences of each motif at a particular part of the signal.

### 7.1.2 Information recovered per block with increasing reads

In Fig. 6, we compare the average amount of information recovered in all the blocks for an increasing amount of reads. We can see in the figure that the Motif Caller (blue), recovers all the information at a lower amount of reads as compared to the Motif Search (orange) pipeline. The Motif Caller recovers all the information at 90 reads, whereas the Motif Search pipeline requires greater than a 100 reads on average. In order to see how the methods compare reaching a recovery percentage close to full recovery, we mark the Threshold Recovery at 95%. We can see that both the methods converge to the marked threshold at a higher rate as compared to converging to reach full recovery. This is due to specific erroneous reads and would be appropriately tackled by integrating with a suitable error correction scheme<sup>15</sup>. We can see that the Motif Caller reaches the threshold recovery at about 40 reads, whereas the Motif Search pipeline requires almost twice as many reads. Even with a 5% difference in the motifs detected per read, the overall sequencing coverage required can be almost halved. Such an improvement can greatly improve the efficiency of the sequencing pipeline.

By training the basecaller on the set of motifs, even with imperfect labels, we can significantly reduce the effective sequencing coverage required over the blocks of information. As we show below in our comparison on synthetic data, by having perfect labels, we can improve this performance and achieve a prediction accuracy similar to a basecaller at base-level, which would equate to detecting five times as many motifs per read.

## 7.2 Synthetic Dataset


### 7.2.1 Percentage of motifs detected per read

In Fig 8, we compare the percentage of motifs detected per read post alignment on the synthetic dataset, between the Motif Caller and the Motif Search pipeline. We can see that the Motif Caller (blue), significantly outperforms the Motif Search pipeline (orange). As compared to the empirical dataset, both the Motif Search and caller pipelines detect a larger percentage of motifs per read owing to the less noisy synthetic data. By having refined labels, the Motif Caller is able to achieve a near perfect motif identification accuracy. The Motif Search pipeline on the other hand, is inherently limited by the basecallers' ability to predict sequence of bases correctly, which even with perfect data, is low. This creates a significant difference in performance between the pipelines, and suggests that by refining the empirical data collection strategy, we have the ability to greatly improve the performance of the Motif Caller and approach its performance on the synthetic data.

### 7.2.2 Comparing Motif Calling to Basecalling


Empirical Dataset			
Method	Percentage of Motifs detected per read		Effective Sequencing Coverage
Motif Search	8.83		66
Motif Caller	<b>15.90</b>		<b>37</b>
Synthetic Dataset			
Method	Identity %	Mismatch %	Gap %
Motif Search	26.09	<b>0.81</b>	73.10
Motif Caller	<b>78.84</b>	3.28	<b>17.88</b>
Base Caller	65.73	1.45	33.82
Bonito	77.73	0.85	21.42

**Table 1.** Table summarizing the performance of the different methods on the empirical and synthetic datasets. Each metric is reported after alignment to the reference sequence. Identity is the percentage of bases that match with the reference, Mismatch are the percentage of bases that are incorrect and Gaps are the percentage of spaces in the prediction. The Effective Sequencing Coverage is the average amount of reads over all the blocks to recover 95% of the information stored.



**Figure 6.** Information recovered over the information blocks for an increasing number of reads. We can see that the Motif Search recovers all the information at a lower number of reads due to the higher percentage of motifs detected per read. Both the methods converge to the threshold percentage at a faster rate, and take longer to reach 100% recovery, due to specific erroneous motifs within the blocks. This would be tackled by integrating with an appropriate error correcting scheme.


To compare the performance of the Motif Caller to a base-level model, we train a model with the same procedure as the Motif Caller, but on the base level for the synthetic dataset. In Fig. 7, we compare the performance of the Motif Caller to this base-level model and Bonito<sup>23</sup>, a standard open-source basecaller for Oxford Nanopore Reads. We can see for one that the Motif Caller has a higher accuracy than both base-level models, owing primarily to a larger number of features per motif, due to the length of the trace being close to 20x a single base. We see a comparable error profile between the Motif Caller and Bonito. Bonito outperforms the base-level trained model, suggesting that refined training strategies have the potential to improve the performance of the Motif Caller, since Bonito is iteratively adapted for high accuracy outputs. In spite of this, we observe that the Motif Caller can demonstrate base-level performance at the motif level, completely circumventing the Motif Search step.



**Figure 7.** Comparing the performance of the Motif Caller with base-level models. The Base Caller here is the Motif Caller model trained at the base-level for the synthetic dataset. We can see here that the Motif Caller outperforms both Bonito and the Base Caller in its accuracy post alignment. Bonito performs better than the Base Caller, suggesting that refinements in the training procedure could lead to an improved performance of the Motif Caller.

## 8 Discussion

In this paper, we introduced Motif Caller, an approach for sequence reconstruction for motif-based DNA storage directly from the squiggle. Even by training on imperfect labels generated by the top-n reads of the baseline sequencing pipeline of Motif Search, the Motif Caller is able to generalize beyond the label and detect 30 % more motifs per read than the baseline. Owing to this, the Motif Caller halves the effective sequencing coverage required per block of information stored. We further show that by improving the labels and testing on synthetically generated data, we significantly outperform the Motif Search pipeline. We achieve an identity accuracy comparable to traditional basecalling, owing to a higher number of features per motif. We are able to achieve base-level performance at the motif level. This circumvents inferring motifs from a typically noisy base level prediction for the motif sequence reconstruction, that identifies a small percentage of the motifs within a read.



**Figure 8.** Comparing the performance of the Motif Caller with the Motif Search pipeline on the synthetic dataset. The Motif Caller detects a higher percentage of motifs per read as compared to the Motif Search pipeline. In contrast to the empirical dataset, with perfect labels, the Motif Caller significantly improves its performance.

However, there is a gap in performance of the Motif Caller between the empirical dataset and the synthetic dataset. This arises from the challenge of generating labels in a real world scenario. There are a number of ways to tackle this problem. First, high-accuracy sequencing can be used with a small amount of reads to generate data to calibrate the Motif Caller. Second, modeling the synthesis process and using it effectively to incorporate the ground truth pre-synthesis, will allow the Motif Caller to use the prior information, even if its not explicitly within the generated labels. This will help to create a low friction method of achieving better performance. Using these methods, the Motif Caller can come closer to its performance displayed on the synthetic dataset.

The Motif Caller may have applications outside the field of DNA storage, specifically, in motif detection in a natural biology context<sup>24</sup>. Looking for certain sequences of motifs in a large library of DNA samples is a challenging problem that similarly attempts to reconstruct motifs by inferring them from a noisy base level prediction. As we show in this paper, using an approach that detects motifs directly from the squiggle can perform significantly better when trained with good data and labels, something that is available in the natural biology context due to the use of high-accuracy sequencers.

The Motif Caller provides a major improvement to the efficiency and performance of the sequence reconstruction pipeline for motif-based DNA storage. Along with advancements in error correcting coding and DNA synthesis methods, this paper makes a step forward in making DNA storage a practical reality.



## References

1. Borovica-Gajić, R., Appuswamy, R. & Ailamaki, A. Cheap data analytics using cold storage devices. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* **9**, 1029–1040 (2016).
2. Storage, C.-b. C. Cold storage in the cloud: Trends, challenges, and solutions. <https://www.intel.com/content/dam/www/public/us/en/documents/white-papers/cold-storage-atom-xeon-paper.pdf>. Accessed: 2024-12-20.
3. Church, G. M., Gao, Y. & Kosuri, S. Next-generation digital information storage in DNA. *Science* **337**, 1628–1628 (2012).
4. Erlich, Y. & Zielinski, D. DNA Fountain enables a robust and efficient storage architecture. *Science* **355**, 950–954 (2017).
5. Ceze, L., Nivala, J. & Strauss, K. Molecular digital data storage using DNA. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **20**, 456–466 (2019).
6. Roquet, N. *et al.* DNA-based data storage via combinatorial assembly. *bioRxiv* 2021–04 (2021).
7. Yan, Y., Pinnamaneni, N., Chalapati, S., Crosbie, C. & Appuswamy, R. Scaling logical density of DNA storage with enzymatically-ligated composite motifs. *Sci. Reports* **13**, 15978 (2023).
8. Deamer, D., Akeson, M. & Branton, D. Three decades of nanopore sequencing. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **34**, 518–524 (2016).
9. Mardis, E. R. Next-generation sequencing platforms. *Annu. Rev. Anal. Chem.* **6**, 287–303 (2013).
10. Mikheyev, A. S. & Tin, M. M. A first look at the Oxford Nanopore MinION sequencer. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **14**, 1097–1102 (2014).
11. Goldman, N. *et al.* Towards practical, high-capacity, low-maintenance information storage in synthesized DNA. *Nature* **494**, 77–80 (2013).
12. Wick, R. R., Judd, L. M. & Holt, K. E. Performance of neural network basecalling tools for Oxford Nanopore sequencing. *Genome biology* **20**, 1–10 (2019).
13. Boža, V., Brejová, B. & Vinař, T. Deepnano: deep recurrent neural networks for base calling in minion nanopore reads. *PLoS one* **12**, e0178751 (2017).
14. Teng, H. *et al.* Chiron: translating nanopore raw signal directly into nucleotide sequence using deep learning. *GigaScience* **7** (2018).
15. Sokolovskii, R., Agarwal, P., Croquevielle, L. A., Zhou, Z. & Heinis, T. Coding Over Coupon Collector Channels for Combinatorial Motif-Based DNA Storage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04141* (2024).
16. Ledergerber, C. & Dessimoz, C. Basecalling for next-generation sequencing platforms. *Briefings bioinformatics* **12**, 489–497 (2011).
17. Rang, F. J., Kloosterman, W. P. & de Ridder, J. From squiggle to basepair: computational approaches for improving nanopore sequencing read accuracy. *Genome Biol.* **19**, 90, DOI: [10.1186/s13059-018-1462-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-018-1462-9) (2018).
18. Yiqing, Y. Motif search. In <https://gitlab.eurecom.fr/yan1/motif-search> (2022).
19. Schuster, M. & Paliwal, K. K. Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Process.* **45**, 2673–2681 (1997).
20. Graves, A., Fernández, S., Gomez, F. & Schmidhuber, J. Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine learning*, 369–376 (2006).
21. Li, H. & Homer, N. A survey of sequence alignment algorithms for next-generation sequencing. *Briefings bioinformatics* **11**, 473–483 (2010).
22. Gamaarachchi, H., Ferguson, J. M., Samarakoon, H., Liyanage, K. & Deveson, I. W. Simulation of nanopore sequencing signal data with tunable parameters. *Genome Res.* **34**, 778–783, DOI: [10.1101/gr.278730.123](https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.278730.123) (2024).
23. Chris Seymour, Oxford Nanopore Technologies Ltd. Bonito: A pytorch basecaller for oxford nanopore reads. <https://github.com/nanoporetech/bonito> (2019). Oxford Nanopore Technologies, Ltd. Public License, v. 1.0.
24. Das, M. K. & Dai, H.-K. A survey of DNA motif finding algorithms. *BMC bioinformatics* **8**, 1–13 (2007).