

On Achievable Rates Over Noisy Nanopore Channels

V. Arvind Rameshwar
IUDX Program Unit

Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, India
Email: arvind.rameshwar@datakaveri.org

Nir Weinberger

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Technion, Haifa 3200003, Israel
Email: nirwein@technion.ac.il

Abstract—In this paper, we consider a recent channel model of a nanopore sequencer proposed by McBain, Viterbo, and Saunderson (2024), termed the *noisy nanopore channel* (NNC). In essence, an NNC is a noisy duplication channel, whose input source has a specific Markov structure. We present bounds on the channel capacity of selected NNCs, via simple information-theoretic inequalities. In particular, we provide a (tight) lower bound on the capacity of the *noiseless* NCC and demonstrate that for an NNC with erasure noise, the capacity approaches 1 for nanopore memories that scale roughly logarithmically in the length of the input sequence.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, significant progress has been made in the problem of storing information on synthetically generated DNA strands [1]–[5], leading to widespread interest in DNA as a viable medium for the storage of archived data. In this light, various works, for example [6]–[8] considered the fundamental information-theoretic limits of a channel model for DNA-based storage, which takes into account processes such as Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) amplification, random sampling from a pool of DNA strands, and subsequent reconstruction from noisy reads. Such a model assumes a sequencer that can only read short DNA strands, which are typically a few hundred bases long. More recently, nanopore sequencers revolutionized DNA sequencing [9], [10] as they can sequence DNA strands of lengths that are roughly 10–100 Kilo-bases.

Given the growing interest in nanopore sequencing, various papers [11]–[15] proposed channel models for the sequencer, in an attempt to model the several sources of inaccuracies during reading. These include intersymbol interference (ISI), random dwell times of bases in the motor protein of the nanopore, “backtracking” and “skipping” (or equivalently, base insertions and deletions), fading, and so on. With the aid of simulation studies conducted using the Scrapie technology demonstrator [16] (now archived) of Oxford Nanopore Technologies, [14], [15] introduced a channel model that seemingly accurately models the physical nanopore channel at the raw signal (or sample) level. Essentially, such a *noisy nanopore channel* (NNC) is given by the cascade of a duplication channel with a memoryless channel; further, the input to the duplication channel is a sequence of τ -tuples of bases (also called τ -mers), which has a specific Markov structure. The lumping of bases into τ -mers models ISI, with τ representing the “memory” (or “stationarity”) of the pore model; the duplication channel reflects the random dwell times of τ -mers, and the memoryless channel is a model for the noise in the sequencing process.

After the introduction of the NNC in [17], the authors in [18] established that the classical Shannon capacity, given by

the maximum mutual information between (constrained) inputs and outputs, is indeed the channel capacity of the NNC (and, more generally, of noisy duplication channels with a Markov source). Furthermore, preliminary numerical estimates of the capacity were obtained for simple Markov-constrained noisy duplication channels; however, these do not accurately model the ISI effects in the NNC setting. This leaves open the question of accurately characterizing, or obtaining explicit estimates of, the capacity of the NNC. The goal of the current paper is to make some progress towards this goal.

In particular, we make use of tools and results from the literature on capacity computation for channels with synchronization errors (such as insertion and deletion channels) to obtain estimates of the capacity of selected NNCs. Starting from the seminal paper by Dobrushin [19], much work has been carried out on such channels; a selection of papers on capacity computation over such channels is [20]–[29]. On a related note, several works have also considered the question of constructing explicit codes over channels with synchronization errors, and these are surveyed in [30].

In this paper, we first present a lower bound on the capacity of the NNC when there is no noise in the sequencing process. The proof of our bound for the *noiseless* NCC is a much simplified presentation of a result that can also be adapted from the main result in [25]; the arguments in [25] in fact show that this lower bound is tight. Next, we consider the NNC with erasure noise. For such a channel, we show via information-theoretic and operational arguments that the capacity can be made to approach 1 in two regimes of interest: (i) where the memory of the nanopore grows with the length of the input sequence, and (ii) where the capacity is computed for each fixed memory length and analyzed in the limit as the memory tends to infinity. Finally, we present simple, computable upper bounds on the capacities of general NNCs.

II. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation

For a positive integer n , we use $[n]$ as shorthand for $\{1 : n\}$. Random variables are denoted by capital letters, e.g., X, Y , and small letters, e.g., x, y , denote their instantiations. Sets are denoted by calligraphic letters, e.g., \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} . Notation such as $P(x), P(y|x)$ are used to denote the probabilities $P_X(x), P_{Y|X}(y|x)$, when it is clear which random variables are being referred to. The notations $H(X) := \mathbb{E}[-\log P(X)]$, $H(Y | X) := \mathbb{E}[-\log P(Y | X)]$, and $I(X; Y) := H(Y) - H(Y | X)$ denote the entropy of X , conditional entropy of Y given X , and




Fig. 1: The noisy nanopore channel W_{nn}

mutual information between X and Y , respectively. Given any real $p \in [0, 1]$, we let $h_b(p) := -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p)$, where h_b denotes the binary entropy function; here, the base of the logarithm will be made clear from the context. The notation $\text{Ber}(p)$ and $\text{Bin}(n, p)$ refer, respectively, to the Bernoulli distribution with parameter p and the Binomial distribution with parameters n and p , where $p \in [0, 1]$ and n is a positive integer.

Given a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{X}^n$, for some finite alphabet \mathcal{X} and integer $n \geq 1$, we let $\ell(\mathbf{b})$ denote its length. We define a *run* of a symbol $x \in \mathcal{X}$ in \mathbf{b} to be any vector of contiguous indices $(i, i+1, \dots, i+k-1)$, such that $b_j = x$, for all $i \leq j \leq i+k-1$; here, we call k the *runlength* of the run of the symbol x of interest. Next, we let $\rho(\mathbf{b})$ denote the vector of runlengths of runs in \mathbf{b} , in the order that the runs appear, and $\iota(\mathbf{b})$ to be the vector of symbols associated with each run, again in the order that the runs appear. For example, if $\mathbf{b} = (1, 3, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 4)$, we have $\rho(\mathbf{b}) = (1, 1, 3, 2, 1)$ and $\iota(\mathbf{b}) = (1, 3, 1, 2, 4)$. Further, given the vector of runlengths $\rho(\mathbf{b})$, we define the vector $\rho^{(x)}(\mathbf{b})$ to be the vector of runlengths in \mathbf{b} corresponding to the symbol $x \in \mathcal{X}$, in the order of appearance of the runs. In the previous example, for instance, we will have $\rho^{(1)} = (1, 3)$ and $\rho^{(3)} = 1$.

B. Channel Model

The noisy nanopore channel (NNC), as mentioned earlier, is a noisy duplication channel with an input source that is constrained to have a specific Markov structure. The NNC $W_{\text{nn}} = W_{\text{nn}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \tau, P_K, W)$ that we describe here is a generalization of that introduced in [14], in that the noise is assumed to arise from a general memoryless channel, and not specifically from an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel. We shall define each of the parameters of W_{nn} , below.

Let \mathcal{X} denote the alphabet of possible bases B ; a natural choice of \mathcal{X} is the set $\{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{C}\}$ of nucleotides. The input to the channel is a sequence (S_1, \dots, S_m) of “states” or “ τ -mers”, where each $S_i \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$, $i \in [m]$, for some fixed integer $\tau \geq 1$. The integer τ models the memory (also called “stationarity”) of the nanopore; while small values of τ lead to a smaller state alphabet and hence more tractable detection algorithms [15], we mention that the model in Scrapie assumes that τ is large.

The τ -mers S_i , $i \in [m-1]$, are such that if $S_i = (B_1, \dots, B_\tau)$, for some (random) bases $B_j \in \mathcal{X}$, $j \in [\tau]$, then it must hold that $S_{i+1} = (B_2, \dots, B_\tau, B_{\tau+1})$, for some $B_{\tau+1} \in \mathcal{X}$. In other words, the τ -mer S_{i+1} is a left-shifted version of S_i , for $i \in [m-1]$. The random process S^m hence is a structured first-order Markov process, which we call a *de-Bruijn Markov process*. Following [18], we assume here that S^m is stationary

and ergodic, i.e., irreducible and aperiodic. Let $P_{S|S^-}$ denote its (stationary) transition kernel.

Now, consider an i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) duplication process $K^m = (K_1, \dots, K_m)$, with $T_i := \sum_{j \leq i} K_j$, for $i \in [m]$; here, we let $K_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_K$, where the distribution P_K is supported on a set $\Lambda \setminus \{0\}$ of positive integers. The input sequence S^m is passed through the duplication channel, resulting in the output Z^{T_m} , where $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{T_1}) = (S_1, \dots, S_1)$, and

$$(Z_{T_{i-1}+1}, \dots, Z_{T_i}) = (S_i, \dots, S_i), \quad (1)$$

for $i \geq 2$. Finally, the sequence Z^{T_m} (of random length) is passed through a memoryless channel W , resulting in the final output sequence $Y^{T_m} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{T_m})$, where each $Y_j \in \mathcal{Y}$; here, \mathcal{Y} is called the output alphabet. The channel law of the DMC W obeys

$$P(Y^{T_m} = \mathbf{y} \mid Z^{T_m} = \mathbf{z}) = P(Y^{T_m} = \mathbf{y} \mid Z^{T_m} = \mathbf{z}, T_m = \ell(\mathbf{z})) \quad (2)$$

$$= \prod_{j=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{z})} W(y_j \mid z_j). \quad (3)$$

A pictorial depiction of the channel is shown in Fig. 1.

C. Channel capacity

We define the ergodic-capacity $C(W_{\text{nn}})$ of W_{nn} as the supremum over all rates achievable with vanishing error probability, when the de-Bruijn Markov input process S^m is constrained to be stationary and ergodic. The following theorem holds as a corollary of [18, Thm. 4]:

Theorem II.1. *The ergodic-capacity $C(W_{\text{nn}})$ is given by*

$$C(W_{\text{nn}}) = \sup_{P_{S|S^-}} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Y^{T_m}),$$

where the supremum is over all stationary and ergodic transition kernels $P_{S|S^-}$ of the de-Buijn Markov process S^m .

In the sections that follow, we first state a (tight) lower bound on the ergodic-capacity of the *noiseless* nanopore channel, which follows from results on rates achieved over duplication channels; next, we establish simple lower and upper bounds for the setting with noise, via either direct manipulations of the mutual information in Theorem II.1, or by constructing coding schemes.

III. CAPACITY OF THE NOISELESS NANOPORE CHANNEL

In this section, we consider the simple setting of the noiseless nanopore channel \overline{W}_{nn} , which is a special case of W_{nn} where the DMC W is a “clean” channel, i.e.,

$$W(y \mid z) = \mathbb{1}\{y = z\},$$

for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. For this special case, we shall derive a simple, single-letter lower bound on the mutual information $I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) = I(S^m; Z^{T_m})$, which will then directly give rise to a simple lower bound for the ergodic-capacity.

A proof of the capacity lower bound that we derive can also be obtained after some manipulation from the work in [25, Thm. 1], which employs sophisticated tools, but we present a simple exposition, for clarity. Further, while the arguments here only

show that the expression we derive is a lower bound on the capacity, the arguments in [25, Thm. 1] show that this lower bound is in fact the exact expression for $C(\overline{W}_{\text{nn}})$. We mention however that identifying the exact capacity of W_{nn} when W is noisy is a significantly harder problem, primarily because of loss of information about runs of symbols in the input sequence.

We shall now introduce some further notation. For any symbol (or base) $b \in \mathcal{X}$, we let $\nu_b(S^m)$ denote the number of runs in S^m corresponding to the τ -mer ${}^\tau b := (b, b, \dots, b)$, and let $\nu(S^m)$ denote the vector $(\nu_b(S^m) : b \in \mathcal{X})$. Further, let G_b denote the (common) distribution of the runlengths $\rho_j^{(\tau b)} := (\rho^{(\tau b)}(S^m))_j$, $1 \leq j \leq \nu_b(S^m)$, corresponding to the τ -mer ${}^\tau b$. This is a geometric distribution with mean defined to be $1/p_b$, where p_b is the probability (under $P_{S|S^-}$) of “leaving” the state (or τ -mer) ${}^\tau b$ in the corresponding Markov chain. Let $({}^b \tau)^+$ denote the collection of τ -mers of the form (b, b, \dots, b, a_1) , where $a_1 \neq b$, and let $({}^b \tau)^-$ denote the collection of τ -mers of the form (a_2, b, \dots, b, b) , where $a_2 \neq b$. Further, for a fixed (de-Buijn Markov) kernel $P_{S|S^-}$, let π denote the stationary distribution of the corresponding Markov chain.

Our main result in this section is encapsulated in the following theorem:

Theorem III.1. *The ergodic-capacity of the noiseless nanopore channel \overline{W}_{nn} is lower bounded as*

$$C(\overline{W}_{\text{nn}}) \geq \max_{P_{S|S^-}} \left[H(\mathcal{S}) - \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \pi({}^\tau b) H\left(G_b \left| \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j \right.\right) \cdot \sum_{s \in ({}^b \tau)^+} P(s|{}^\tau b) \right].$$

Remark. Intuitively, for large τ , one expects that optimizing distribution in Theorem III.1 should make the stationary probabilities $\pi({}^\tau b)$ of τ -mers of the form ${}^\tau b$ small for all $b \in \mathcal{X}$. This then implies that the capacity $C(\overline{W}_{\text{nn}})$ should increase to the entropy rate $H(\mathcal{S})$, as τ increases. This intuition is formalized in Section IV.

Before we formally prove Theorem III.1, we discuss some details regarding the computability of the lower bound in the theorem. Clearly, to obtain a computable expression for the capacity lower bound we need to evaluate the conditional entropy term $H(G_b | \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{X}$. We may note that the random variable G_b is independent from each of the random variables K_j in the conditioning. In what follows, we consider two simple, yet fundamental, duplication channels, and discuss the value of this conditional entropy for those settings.

Example III.1 (Elementary i.i.d. duplication channel). In this setting, each of the (i.i.d.) K_j random variables is of the form $K_j = 1 + \text{Ber}(p)$, for some $p \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j = G_b + \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} X_j, \quad (4)$$

where $X_j \sim \text{Ber}(p)$. The summation on the right above corresponds to a “thinning” [31] of the random variable G_b ; the thinned random variable is again a geometric random variable G with mean p/p_b (see the discussion after [31, Example

3]), which is independent of G_b . The conditional entropy $H(G_b | \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j)$ can hence be computed as

$$H\left(G_b \left| \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j \right.\right) = H\left(G_b, \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j\right) - H\left(\sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j\right) \quad (5)$$

$$= H(G_b) + H\left(\sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j \left| G_b\right.\right) - H\left(\sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j\right) \quad (6)$$

$$= H(G_b) + \frac{h_b(p)}{p_b} - H(G + G_b) \quad (7)$$

Note that in (7) above, we have used the fact that $H(\sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j | G_b) = \mathbb{E}[G_b] \cdot H(K) = \frac{h_b(p)}{p_b}$.

Example III.2 (Binomial duplication channel). The argument in Example III.1 above can be extended to the case when each $K_j = 1 + \text{Bin}(n, p)$, for some n . Indeed, one can then write $K_j = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^n Y_{j,r}$, where the random variables $Y_{j,r}$ are drawn i.i.d. according to $\text{Ber}(p)$. We then obtain, similar to (7), that in this case,

$$H\left(G_b \left| \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j \right.\right) = H(G_b) + \frac{H(K)}{p_b} - H(N + G_b), \quad (8)$$

where $K = \text{Bin}(n, p)$ and N is a negative binomial distribution, independent of G_b , with parameters n and p/p_b .

We conjecture that it is also possible to specialize the result in Theorem III.1 for other duplication distributions of interest, using perhaps the results in [32] for entropy computations. We now proceed towards a proof of Theorem III.1.

Fix a stationary, ergodic, de-Brujin Markov process S^m , with transition kernel $P_{S|S^-}$. We then write

$$I(S^m; Z^{T_m}) = H(S^m) - H(S^m | Z^{T_m}). \quad (9)$$

The first term $H(S^m)$ on the right above is easily computable to be $H(S_1) + (m-1)H(S_2 | S_1)$, with the entropy rate $H(\mathcal{S})$ of the stationary Markov chain with kernel $P_{S|S^-}$ being $H(S_2 | S_1)$. Hence, our task reduces to explicitly bounding the expression $H(S^m | Z^{T_m})$ that is the second term on the right above.

The next lemma presents an upper bound on $H(S^m | Z^{T_m})$; the essential idea behind its proof is that given the random vector Z^{T_m} , the only uncertainty in determining S^m is via the lengths of runs of its symbols. Furthermore, the only ambiguity in the runlengths of symbols in S^m , given Z^{T_m} , is in those runlengths corresponding to symbols of the form ${}^\tau b$, for some $b \in \mathcal{X}$. This is because *only such symbols* can have runlengths larger than 1 in S^m , owing to the structure of the de-Brujin Markov process.

Lemma III.1. *We have that*

$$H(S^m | Z^{T_m}) \leq \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\nu_b(S^m)] \cdot H\left(G_b \left| \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j \right.\right).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$H(S^m | Z^{T_m}) = H(\iota(S^m), \rho(S^m) | Z^{T_m}) \quad (10)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(\rho(S^m) | Z^{T_m}, \iota(S^m)) \quad (11)$$

$$= H(\rho(S^m) | Z^{T_m}, \iota(S^m), \nu(S^m)), \quad (12)$$

where (a) holds since given Z^{T_m} , the vector $\iota(S^m)$ is completely determined.

Now, by the structure of the de-Bruijn Markov input process S^m , the only runs of length larger than 1 are those that begin with the symbol ${}^\tau b$, for some $b \in \mathcal{X}$.

Therefore, given the vector $\iota(S^m)$, the only uncertainty in the vector $\rho(S^m)$ is in the collection $\rho^{\text{alike}}(S^m) = \left\{ \left(\rho_1^{(\tau b)}, \dots, \rho_{\nu_b(S^m)}^{(\tau b)} \right) : b \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$. Hence, continuing from (12), we obtain that

$$H(S^m | Z^{T_m}) = H(\rho^{\text{alike}}(S^m) | Z^{T_m}, \iota(S^m), \nu(S^m)). \quad (13)$$

Now, owing to the Markovity of the process S^m , the runlengths in S^m are independent geometric random variables. Hence, from (13), we obtain that

$$H(S^m | Z^{T_m}) \quad (14)$$

$$= H(\rho^{\text{alike}}(S^m) | Z^{T_m}, \iota(S^m), \nu(S^m)) \quad (15)$$

$$= \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr[\nu_b(S^m) = n_b] \sum_{j=1}^{n_b} H\left(\rho_j^{(\tau b)} | Z^{T_m}, T_m, \iota(S^m)\right) \quad (16)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr[\nu_b(S^m) = n_b] \sum_{j=1}^{n_b} H\left(\rho_j^{(\tau b)} \mid \left(\rho^{(\tau b)}(Z^{T_m})\right)_j\right) \quad (17)$$

$$= \sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\nu_b(S^m)] \cdot H\left(G_b \mid \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j\right). \quad (18)$$

Here, the inequality follows since conditioning reduces entropy, and the last equality arises since each of the terms $H(\rho_j^{(\tau b)} | (\rho^{(\tau b)}(Z^{T_m}))_j)$ in (c) above equals $H(G_b | \sum_{j=1}^{G_b} K_j)$. \square

We reiterate that the upper bound in Lemma III.1 is actually tight, following the results in [25]. The simple lemma below presents a computable expression for the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\nu_b(S^m)]$, for any $b \in \mathcal{X}$.

Lemma III.2. *For any $b \in \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nu_b(S^m)] &= (m-1)\pi({}^\tau b) \cdot \sum_{s \in ({}^\tau b)^+} P(s|{}^\tau b) + \sum_{s' \in ({}^\tau b)^-} \pi(s')P({}^\tau b|s'). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows from the simple observation that

$$\nu_b(S^m) \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{1}\{S_i = {}^\tau b, S_{i+1} \neq {}^\tau b\} + \mathbb{1}\{S_{m-1} \neq {}^\tau b, S_m = {}^\tau b\}. \quad (20)$$

Employing the linearity of expectation and the structure of the de-Bruijn Markov input process S^m gives the statement of the lemma. \square

The proof of Theorem III.1 is now immediate.

Proof of Theorem III.1. The proof follows by putting together Lemmas III.1 and III.2 and then taking a maximum over de-Bruijn Markov input processes governed by kernels $P_{S|S^-}$ as in Theorem II.1. \square

In the next section, we discuss approaches for obtaining bounds on the capacity of the noisy nanopore channel W_{nn} , when the DMC W is not clean.

IV. ACHIEVABLE RATES OVER NNCs WITH ERASURE NOISE FOR LONG τ -MER LENGTHS

In this section, we focus on the special case when W is an erasure channel $\text{EC}(\epsilon)$, where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For such a channel, $\mathcal{Y} = \{?\} \cup \mathcal{X}^\tau$, with $W(y|z) = 1 - \epsilon$, if $y = z$, and $W(?|z) = \epsilon$, for all $z \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$. Thus, our channel is $W_{\text{nn, EC}} = W_{\text{nn}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^\tau \cup \{?\}, \tau, P_K, W)$. To make the dependence on the ‘‘memory’’ of the nanopore explicit, we write $C^{(\tau)}(W_{\text{nn, EC}})$ as the capacity of the NNC of interest.

Our main objective in this section is to show that for an NNC with erasure noise, one can achieve rates arbitrarily close to 1, so long as τ is large enough. We present our arguments in two regimes of possible interest: (i) when τ is allowed to grow as a function of m , and (ii) when the capacity $C^{(\tau)}(W_{\text{nn, EC}})$ is evaluated at every fixed $\tau \geq 1$ and then τ is allowed to grow to infinity. More formally, in the second regime, we wish to compute the iterated limit $\bar{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) := \sup_{P_{S|S^-}} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Y^{T_m})$ (see Theorem II.1). For the first regime, we let $\beta = \beta(m) := \frac{1}{(\log m)^{1+\delta}}$, for some small $\delta > 0$, and consider paths of $\tau = \tau(m)$ values such that $\tau(m) \geq \frac{\log(\beta \mathbb{E}[K] \cdot m)}{\log(1/\epsilon)}$ (the bases of the logarithms here are arbitrary, but fixed). We are then interested in computing the double limit $\bar{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) := \sup_{P_{S|S^-}} \lim_{m, \tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Y^{T_m})$, over such paths of τ values.

Our main result in this section is summarized in the theorem below:

Theorem IV.1. *We have that*

$$\bar{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = \bar{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1.$$

Interestingly, the theorem above suggests that longer memory lengths τ give rise to higher capacities of the associated NNC with erasure noise. At an intuitive level, such a result arises because larger τ values imply that in the de-Bruijn Markov input process, longer lengths of paths are with high probability uniquely determined by their endpoints, thereby allowing for longer bursts of erasures.

The proof of Theorem IV.1 relies on obtaining a lower bound for each of $\bar{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}})$ and $\bar{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}})$. The lower bounds are obtained by choosing a specific input process $P_{S|S^-}^*$, which is a maximal entropy de-Bruijn Markov input process, under the constraint that it *does not have self-loops* on any of its states $s \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$. Note that the only possible self-loops in a general de-Bruijn Markov input process are on states (or symbols) of the form ${}^\tau b$, for some $b \in \mathcal{X}$. The class of ‘‘no-self-loop’’ de-Bruijn Markov processes that we consider eliminates such self-loops. In what follows, we collect some useful facts about this class of input processes.

A. Properties of de-Bruijn Markov Processes With No Self-Loops

The main attribute of such input processes that is useful for our analysis is that all sequences (or codewords) generated by $P_{S|S^-}^*$ are such that any τ -mer in the codeword has runs of length only 1, if it occurs. We remark that if $S_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}$ denotes the constrained system that consists of sequences generated by de-Bruijn Markov input processes on \mathcal{X}^τ with no self-loops, then the code generated by $P_{S|S^-}^*$ has the largest rate $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}}$, which is also called the (noiseless) capacity of $S_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}$ (see [33, Chap. 3] for more details). Likewise, we let $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise}}$ denote the noiseless capacity of the constrained system S_τ consisting of sequences generated by any de-Bruijn Markov input process.

A simple observation about codewords generated by $P_{S|S^-}^*$ is presented as a lemma below (the proof is straightforward).

Lemma IV.1. *For any codeword $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ generated by $P_{S|S^-}^*$, we have that for all $i, j \in [n]$ such that $i \leq j \leq i + \tau$, the symbols c_i and c_j completely determine c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{j-1} .*

We next present some additional facts about the noiseless capacities $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}}$ and $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise}}$; before we do so, we need additional notation. For any fixed $\tau \geq 1$, let G_τ denote the (irreducible, lossless) graph that presents S (see [33, Ch. 2] for definitions). Further, let A_{G_τ} denote the $|\mathcal{X}|^\tau \times |\mathcal{X}|^\tau$ adjacency matrix of G_τ . Likewise, let $G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}$ denote the graph presenting the constrained system $S_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}$, and let $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ denote its adjacency matrix. For any square matrix B , let $\lambda(B)$ denote its largest eigenvalue.

The following lemma, proved in Appendix A, will be of use to us.

Lemma IV.2. *For any $\tau \geq 2$, we have that*

$$\lambda(A_{G_{\tau-1}^{\text{no-loop}}}) < \lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}).$$

With this lemma in place, the theorem that follows holds. The proof, which is presented below, relies on key ideas in the theory of constrained systems (see [33] for more details).

Theorem IV.2. *We have that*

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} C_\tau^{\text{no-noise}} = 1.$$

Proof. By the definition of a de-Bruijn Markov process, we see that each row of A_{G_τ} consists of $|\mathcal{X}|$ 1s and $|\mathcal{X}|^\tau - |\mathcal{X}|$ 0s. From [33, Thm. 3.23], we have that $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise}} = \log_{|\mathcal{X}|}(\lambda(A_{G_\tau}))$, where $\lambda(A_{G_\tau})$ is the largest eigenvalue of A_{G_τ} . By standard arguments (see, e.g., [33, Prop. 3.14]), we have that $\lambda(A_{G_\tau}) = |\mathcal{X}|$, implying that for any $\tau \geq 1$, we have $C_\tau^{\text{no-noise}} = 1$.

Hence, it remains to be shown that $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}} = 1$. Now, observe that those rows of $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ corresponding to a state of the form ${}^\tau b$, for some $b \in \mathcal{X}$, have exactly $|\mathcal{X}| - 1$ 1s, and all other rows have exactly $|\mathcal{X}|$ 1s. Again, from [33, Prop. 3.14] and [33, Thm. 3.23], we see that

$$\log_{|\mathcal{X}|}(|\mathcal{X}| - 1) \leq C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}} = \log_{|\mathcal{X}|}(\lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}})) \leq 1. \quad (21)$$

From Lemma IV.2, we see that $\lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}})$ strictly increases with τ , thereby proving the theorem. \square

In Section IV-B, we prove that $\overline{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$, and in Section IV-C, we prove that $\overline{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$. Putting together these results will conclude the proof of Theorem IV.1.

B. Proof that $\overline{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$

Recall that we have fixed the input distribution to be a maximal entropy de-Bruijn Markov input process $P_{S|S^-}^*$, within the class of no-self-loop de-Bruijn Markov processes. Now, fix $m \geq 1$ and let S_1, \dots, S_m denote the inputs to the duplication channel (see Fig. 1). Further, let the memory of the nanopore $\tau = \tau(m) \geq \frac{\log(\beta \mathbb{E}[K] \cdot m)}{\log(1/\epsilon)}$, where ϵ is the erasure probability, and $\beta = \frac{1}{(\log m)^{1+\delta}}$, for some $\delta > 0$ small. For each $\ell \in [m]$, we let $f_\ell : (\mathcal{X}^\tau)^{\ell-1} \times \mathcal{Y}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^\tau$ be the maximum a posteriori probability (MAP) estimator of S_ℓ given $(S^{\ell-1}, Y^{T_m})$. It is well known that f_ℓ has the lowest error probability among all possible estimators of S_ℓ given $(S^{\ell-1}, Y^{T_m})$. For each $\ell \in [m]$, we then define

$$\mathcal{E}_\ell := \{S_\ell = f_\ell(S^{\ell-1}, Y^{T_m})\} \quad (22)$$

as the event that f_ℓ returns the correct value of S_ℓ . Since the memory τ increases with m , it is reasonable to expect that with sufficiently large probability, for large m , we will have that S_ℓ , for any $\ell \in [m]$, will be completely determined by $(S^{\ell-1}, Y^{T_m})$. The following lemma makes this intuition precise.

Lemma IV.3. *We have that for all $\ell \in [m]$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[\mathcal{E}_\ell] = 1$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{E} denote the following event:

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\text{all bursts of erasures in } Y^{T_m} \text{ have length at most } \tau - 1\}.$$

Note that the probability that a given burst of erasures has length at least τ , equals ϵ^τ . From the structure of the no-self-loop Markov input process, we see from Lemma III.1 that for any $\ell \in [m]$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_\ell] \geq \Pr[\mathcal{E}] \quad (23)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\Pr[\mathcal{E} | T_m]] \quad (24)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}[1 - T_m \cdot \epsilon^\tau] = 1 - \mathbb{E}[T_m] \cdot \epsilon^\tau. \quad (25)$$

Here, the inequality is via a simple union bound on the probability of a burst of erasures of length at least τ , starting at some index $i \in [T_m]$, for fixed T_m . Plugging in our choice of $\tau = \tau(m)$ values, we see that the lemma holds. \square

Lemma IV.3 then affords a proof of the first part of Theorem IV.1.

Proof that $\overline{C}_1(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$. Fix the input distribution $P_{S|S^-}^*$ and the chosen paths of $\tau = \tau(m)$ values. We then have that

$$\frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m} [H(S_1) + (m-1)H(S_2 | S_1) - H(S^m | Y^{T_m})] \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m} \left[H(S_1) + (m-1)H(S_2 | S_1) - \sum_{\ell=1}^m H(S_\ell | S^{\ell-1}, Y^{T_m}) \right] \quad (28)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{m} \left[(m-1)H(S_2 | S_1) - \right] \quad (29)$$

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m (h_b(\Pr[\mathcal{E}_\ell]) + (1 - \Pr[\mathcal{E}_\ell]) \cdot \tau \log |\mathcal{X}|) \right). \quad (30)$$

Here, the last inequality follows by an application of Fano's inequality [34, Thm. 2.10.1]. From Lemma IV.3 and by our choice of $\tau(m)$ and $\beta(m)$, we obtain that each term inside the summation above vanishes to zero, in the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, under the distribution $P_{S|S^-}^*$ and our chosen paths of τ values, we obtain that

$$1 \geq \lim_{m, \tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) \geq H(S) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} C_\tau^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}}. \quad (31)$$

Appealing to Theorem IV.2 then completes the proof of this part of Theorem IV.1. \square

C. Proof that $\bar{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$

Our argument for the second part of the proof of Theorem IV.1 closely mirrors, but is somewhat different from the proof in Section IV-B. Importantly, we advance an operational argument for the proof, unlike that in the previous section, which used information-theoretic inequalities. More precisely, we demonstrate that for any fixed $\tau \geq 1$, it is possible to achieve rates over an NNC with $W = \text{EC}(\epsilon)$ that are equal to those over an NNC with a much lower erasure probability $\bar{\epsilon} := \epsilon^\tau$.

Recall that we employ the input process $P_{S|S^-}^*$, which is a no-self-loop de-Brujin Markov process. Now, Lemma IV.1 directly implies that the decoder can employ a "clean-up phase" $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ that proceeds as follows. The objective of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ is to replace all bursts of erasures of length $\tau - 1$ or less with the collection of true symbols that were erased, in the same order, but repeated arbitrarily so that the length of the decoded burst of erasures equals the length of the burst itself. Indeed, observe from Lemma IV.1 that given the symbols immediately before the start and after the end of such a burst of erasures, the actual sequence of τ -mers in the transmitted codeword corresponding to the burst can be decoded. The decoder $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ then repeats each symbol in this actual sequence of τ -mers arbitrarily, so that the length of the decoded output equals the length of the burst.

The above discussion shows that $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ "self-corrects" all bursts of erasures of length $\tau - 1$ or less. It can thus be verified that, with overwhelming probability, for large enough m , the number of erasures that remain after the clean-up phase lies in, with high probability, for large m , lies in $[\mathbb{E}[T_m] \epsilon^\tau - \Theta(\sqrt{m}), \mathbb{E}[T_m] \epsilon^\tau + \Theta(\sqrt{m})]$. Therefore, the channel $W = \text{EC}(\epsilon)$ has been effectively replaced by the channel $W^{(\tau)} = \text{EC}(\bar{\epsilon})$. Finally, by cascading the clean-up phase $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ by the optimal decoder for the NNC $W_{\text{nn, EC}}^{(\tau)} := W_{\text{nn}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^\tau \cup \{?\}, \tau, P_K, W^{(\tau)})$, we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem IV.3. *Any rate achievable using the input distribution $P_{S|S^-}^*$ over $W_{\text{nn, EC}}^{(\tau)}$ is also achievable using $P_{S|S^-}^*$ over $W_{\text{nn, EC}}$.*

The proof of the second part of Theorem IV.1 then follows immediately.

Proof that $\bar{C}_2(W_{\text{nn, EC}}) = 1$. In particular, observe that in the limit as τ increases to infinity, the probability of erasure in $W_{\text{nn, EC}}^{(\tau)}$ decreases to zero, giving rise to a noiseless nanopore channel. Further, from Theorem IV.2, we have that in the limit

as τ increases to infinity, $C^{\text{no-noise, no-loop}}$ increases to 1, thereby completing the proof of the result. \square

V. GENERAL UPPER BOUNDS ON THE CAPACITY OF THE NOISY NANOPORE CHANNEL

In this section, we present general, computable upper bounds on $C(W_{\text{nn}})$, when W is an arbitrary, noisy channel. Our first bound is naïve, but the second makes use of more structural information about W_{nn} . We mention that our bounds hold generally for *any* stationary, ergodic Markov input process $P_{S|S^-}$, which is not necessarily a de-Brujin Markov input process.

Let $C(W)$ denote the capacity of the memoryless channel W in the definition of the channel W_{nn} . Our first bound is as follows.

Theorem V.1. *We have that*

$$C(W_{\text{nn}}) \leq \mathbb{E}[K] \cdot C(W),$$

where $K \sim P_K$.

Proof. Observe that

$$I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) \leq I(S^m; Y^{T_m}, K^m) \quad (32)$$

$$= I(S^m; K^m) + I(S^m; Y^{T_m} | K^m) \quad (33)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(S^m; Y^{T_m} | K^m). \quad (34)$$

Here, (a) holds due to the independence of the duplication process K^m from the input process S^m . Further, we write $I(S^m; Y^{T_m} | K^m)$ as $H(Y^{T_m} | K^m) - H(Y^{T_m} | K^m, S^m)$. Now,

$$H(Y^{T_m} | K^m, S^m) = H(Y^{T_m} | K^m, S^m, T_m) \quad (35)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[T_m] \cdot H(Y | Z), \quad (36)$$

where Z, Y are random variables with the stationary marginal distributions of Z^{T_m} and Y^{T_m} , respectively. Here, (36) follows via Wald's lemma (see, e.g., [35, Thm. 13.3]).

Moreover,

$$H(Y^{T_m} | K^m) \leq H(Y^{T_m} | T_m) = \mathbb{E}[T_m] \cdot H(Y). \quad (37)$$

Putting together (36) and (37) and plugging back into (a) above, we obtain that $I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) \leq \mathbb{E}[T_m] \cdot (H(Y) - H(Y | Z))$. This then leads to

$$C(W_{\text{nn}}) \leq \left(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}[T_m] \right) \cdot \max(H(Y) - H(Y | Z)) \quad (38)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[K] \cdot C(W), \quad (39)$$

since $\mathbb{E}[T_m] = m \mathbb{E}[K]$, where $K \sim P_K$, giving rise to the statement of the theorem. \square

While the upper bound above related the capacity of W_{nn} with the capacity of the DMC W , another simple upper bound (via the data processing inequality [34, Thm. 2.8.1]) on $C(W_{\text{nn}})$ is:

$$C(W_{\text{nn}}) \leq C(\bar{W}_{\text{nn}}) \quad (40)$$

Using [25, Lemma 1], it is possible to show, as mentioned earlier, that the lower bound on $C(\bar{W}_{\text{nn}})$ in Theorem III.1 is in fact tight, thereby resulting in a single-letter upper bound on $C(W_{\text{nn}})$, via (40).

In the following theorem, we present an upper bound on $C(W_{\text{nn}})$ that, for selected duplication distributions P_K and

DMCs W , improves on the bound in (40). For any fixed $P_{S|S^-}$, let Z, Y be random variables with the stationary marginal distributions of Z^{T_m} and Y^{T_m} , respectively.

Theorem V.2. *We have that*

$$C(W_{\text{nn}}) \leq \max_{P_{S|S^-}} \left[\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Z^{T_m}) - (\mathbb{E}[K] \cdot H(Z | Y) - H(K)) \right].$$

For distributions P_K with low entropy, but relatively high expected value in comparison, the upper bound in Theorem V.2 is likely to be tighter than that in (40).

Proof. For any input transition kernel $P_{S|S^-}$, we write

$$I(S^m; Y^{T_m}) = H(S^m) - H(S^m | Y^{T_m}). \quad (41)$$

Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} H(S^m | Y^{T_m}) &= H(S^m, Z^{T_m} | Y^{T_m}) - H(Z^{T_m} | S^m, Y^{T_m}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} H(S^m, Z^{T_m} | Y^{T_m}) - H(Z^{T_m} | S^m) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$= H(Z^{T_m} | Y^{T_m}) + H(S^m | Z^{T_m}, Y^{T_m}) - H(Z^{T_m} | S^m) \quad (43)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} H(Z^{T_m} | Y^{T_m}) + H(S^m | Z^{T_m}) - mH(K) \quad (44)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} m(\mathbb{E}[K] \cdot H(Z | Y) - H(K)) + H(S^m | Z^{T_m}). \quad (45)$$

Here, (a) holds since conditioning reduces the entropy and (b) holds since $S^m - Z^{T_m} - Y^{T_m}$ forms a Markov chain. Finally, (c) follows from the fact that $H(Z^{T_m} | Y^{T_m}) = \mathbb{E}[T_m] \cdot H(Z | Y)$, by the memorylessness of the channel W ; further, we have $\mathbb{E}[T_m] = m\mathbb{E}[K]$. Plugging into (41) gives us the theorem. \square

Remark. The limiting mutual information rate $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} I(S^m; Z^{T_m})$, for any fixed $P_{S|S^-}$ can be computed from Lemmas III.1 and III.2, given the tightness of the bound in Lemma III.1, as proved in [25]. Further, the joint distribution $P_{Z,Y}$ obeys $P_{Z,Y}(z, y) = \pi(z)W(y|z)$, which allows for a computation of $H(Z | Y)$ in Theorem V.2.

Up until this point, we have derived explicit lower bounds (achievable rates) and upper bounds (converse) based on manipulations of information-theoretic inequalities. In the next section, we turn our attention to present an explicit coding scheme over W_{nn} , in the simple case that the channel W is an erasure channel.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we took up the study of the noisy nanopore channel (NNC), introduced in [14], and presented bounds on its capacity, for some special noise distributions of interest. In particular, we discussed a (tight) computable lower bound on the capacity of the *noiseless* nanopore channel. Further, for an NNC with erasure noise, we derived an upper bound on the growth of the nanopore memory, as a function of the input sequence length, which will give rise to a noise-free channel. We then discussed computable upper bounds on the capacity of NNCs with general noise distributions.

An interesting direction for future research will be to extend our results on NNCs with erasure noise to more general noise

distributions, such as when the noise is introduced by symmetric channels, for instance. Another direction is to obtain computable lower bounds for general noise distributions, for *fixed* memory lengths.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research of NW was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), grant no. 1782/22.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. M. Church, Y. Gao, and S. Kosuri, "Next-generation digital information storage in DNA," *Science*, vol. 337, no. 6102, pp. 1628–1628, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1226355>
- [2] N. Goldman, P. Bertone, S. Chen, C. Desimoz, E. M. LeProust, B. Sipsos, and E. Birney, "Towards practical, high-capacity, low-maintenance information storage in synthesized DNA," *Nature*, vol. 494, no. 7435, pp. 77–80, Jan. 2013.
- [3] R. N. Grass, R. Heckel, M. Puddu, D. Paunescu, and W. J. Stark, "Robust chemical preservation of digital information on DNA in silica with error-correcting codes," *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 2552–2555, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/anie.201411378>
- [4] Y. Erlich and D. Zielinski, "DNA Fountain enables a robust and efficient storage architecture," *Science*, vol. 355, no. 6328, pp. 950–954, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aaj2038>
- [5] L. Organick, S. D. Ang, Y.-J. Chen, R. Lopez, S. Yekhanin, K. Makarychev, M. Z. Racz, G. Kamath, P. Gopalan, B. Nguyen, C. N. Takahashi, S. Newman, H.-Y. Parker, C. Rashtchian, K. Stewart, G. Gupta, R. Carlson, J. Mulligan, D. Carmean, G. Seelig, L. Ceze, and K. Strauss, "Random access in large-scale DNA data storage," *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 242–248, Mar 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4079>
- [6] I. Shomorony and R. Heckel, "Information-theoretic foundations of DNA data storage," *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–106, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/0100000117>
- [7] N. Weinberger and N. Merhav, "The DNA storage channel: Capacity and error probability bounds," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5657–5700, 2022.
- [8] A. Lenz, P. H. Siegel, A. Wachter-Zeh, and E. Yaakobi, "The noisy drawing channel: Reliable data storage in DNA sequences," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 2757–2778, 2023.
- [9] D. Deamer, M. Akeson, and D. Branton, "Three decades of nanopore sequencing," *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 518–524, May 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3423>
- [10] Oxford Nanopore Technologies. [Online]. Available: <https://nanoporetech.com>
- [11] W. Mao, S. N. Diggavi, and S. Kannan, "Models and information-theoretic bounds for nanopore sequencing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 3216–3236, 2018.
- [12] R. Hulett, S. Chandak, and M. Wooters, "On coding for an abstracted nanopore channel for DNA storage," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2465–2470.
- [13] B. Hamoum, E. Dupraz, L. Conde-Canencia, and D. Lavenier, "Channel model with memory for DNA data storage with nanopore sequencing," in *2021 11th International Symposium on Topics in Coding (ISTC)*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [14] B. McBain, E. Viterbo, and J. Saunderson, "Information rates of the noisy nanopore channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 8, pp. 5640–5652, 2024.
- [15] B. McBain and E. Viterbo, "An information-theoretic approach to nanopore sequencing for DNA storage," *IEEE BITS the Information Theory Magazine*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 95–108, 2023.
- [16] Scrapie technology demonstrator. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/nanoporetech/scrapie>
- [17] B. McBain, E. Viterbo, and J. Saunderson, "Finite-state semi-Markov channels for nanopore sequencing," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2022, pp. 216–221.
- [18] B. McBain, J. Saunderson, and E. Viterbo, "On noisy duplication channels with Markov sources," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 3438–3443.
- [19] R. L. Dobrushin, "Shannon's theorems for channels with synchronization errors," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 11–26, 1967.

- [20] S. Diggavi and M. Grossglauser, "On information transmission over a finite buffer channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1226–1237, 2006.
- [21] S. Diggavi, M. Mitzenmacher, and H. D. Pfister, "Capacity upper bounds for the deletion channel," in *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2007, pp. 1716–1720.
- [22] E. Drinea and M. Mitzenmacher, "On lower bounds for the capacity of deletion channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4648–4657, 2006.
- [23] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Drinea, "A simple lower bound for the capacity of the deletion channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4657–4660, 2006.
- [24] E. Drinea and M. Mitzenmacher, "Improved lower bounds for the capacity of i.i.d. deletion and duplication channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 2693–2714, 2007.
- [25] A. Kirsch and E. Drinea, "Directly lower bounding the information capacity for channels with i.i.d. deletions and duplications," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 86–102, 2010.
- [26] D. Fertoni and T. M. Duman, "Novel bounds on the capacity of the binary deletion channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2753–2765, 2010.
- [27] A. R. Iyengar, P. H. Siegel, and J. K. Wolf, "On the capacity of channels with timing synchronization errors," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 793–810, 2016.
- [28] H. Mercier, V. Tarokh, and F. Labeau, "Bounds on the capacity of discrete memoryless channels corrupted by synchronization and substitution errors," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4306–4330, 2012.
- [29] M. Rahmati and T. M. Duman, "Achievable rates for noisy channels with synchronization errors," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 3854–3863, 2014.
- [30] N. J. A. Sloane, *On single-deletion-correcting codes*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2002, pp. 273–292. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198119.273>
- [31] P. Harremoës, O. Johnson, and I. Kontoyiannis, "Thinning and the law of small numbers," in *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2007, pp. 1491–1495.
- [32] M. Cheraghchi, "Expressions for the entropy of binomial-type distributions," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2018, pp. 2520–2524.
- [33] B. H. Marcus, R. M. Roth, and P. H. Siegel, "An introduction to coding for constrained systems," lecture notes. [Online]. Available: <https://ronny.cswp.cs.technion.ac.il/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2016/05/chapters1-9.pdf>
- [34] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. Wiley-India, 2010.
- [35] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal, *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA IV.2

Proof of Lemma IV.2. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$, for some positive integer q . Consider the adjacency matrix $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ for some fixed $\tau \geq 2$. We first reorder the rows and columns of $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ so that they are indexed by states $s \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$ in the standard lexicographic order on strings in \mathcal{X}^τ , i.e., if $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ and $\mathbf{z}' = (z'_1, \dots, z'_m)$ are two states, then, \mathbf{z} occurs before \mathbf{z}' iff for some $i \geq 1$, we have $z_j = z'_j$ for all $j < i$, and $z_i < z'_i$.

Let

$$A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & B_{1,1} & B_{1,2} & \dots & B_{1,|\mathcal{X}|-1} \\ B_{2,1} & A_2 & B_{2,2} & \dots & B_{2,|\mathcal{X}|-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_{|\mathcal{X}|,1} & B_{|\mathcal{X}|,2} & B_{|\mathcal{X}|,3} & \dots & A_{|\mathcal{X}|} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

where each A_i , $i \in [q]$ and each $B_{i,j}$, $i \in [q]$, $j \in [q-1]$, is a matrix of order $q^{\tau-1} \times q^{\tau-1}$. By the structure of de-Bruijn

Markov processes (without self-loops), it can be checked that

$$A_{G_{\tau-1}^{\text{no-loop}}} = \sum_{i=1}^q A_i. \quad (47)$$

To see why, observe that via our ordering of states, each A_i , $i \in [q]$, is such exactly $q^{\tau-2}$ of its rows have non-zero entries; these are precisely those rows $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$ of $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ lying in A_i (i.e., with $z_1 = i-1$) such that $z_2 = i-1$. Now, let us define

$$\bar{A} := \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & A_2 & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & A_{|\mathcal{X}|} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the all-zeros matrix of order $|\mathcal{X}|^{\tau-1} \times |\mathcal{X}|^{\tau-1}$. Let \bar{G}_τ denote the directed graph whose adjacency matrix is \bar{A} .

From [33, Problem 3.26] and [33, Prop. 3.12], we obtain that $\lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}) > \lambda(\bar{A})$. We now claim that $\lambda(\bar{A}) \geq A_{G_{\tau-1}^{\text{no-loop}}}$. In what follows, we prove this claim. Let P_t^* be the transition kernel corresponding to a max-entropic Markov chain supported on the graph $G_t^{\text{no-loop}}$, for any $t \geq 1$, and let $H(P_{\tau-1}^*)$ denote its entropy rate. Also, let \bar{P}_τ^* denote the max-entropic Markov chain supported on \bar{G}_τ . Further, for each $i \in \mathcal{X}$, let S_i denote the collection of states $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}^\tau$ with $z_1 = z_2 = i-1$; recall that these are precisely the rows of $A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}}$ lying in A_i that have at least one non-zero entry.

The following sequence of inequalities then holds:

$$\log_{|\mathcal{X}|}(\lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}})) = H(P_{\tau-1}^*) \quad (49)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^q H(S | S^- \in S_i) \Pr[S^- \in S_i] \quad (50)$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [q]} H(S | S^- \in S_i) \quad (51)$$

$$\leq H(\bar{P}_\tau^*) \quad (52)$$

$$= \log_{|\mathcal{X}|}(\lambda(\bar{A})), \quad (53)$$

implying that $\lambda(\bar{A}) \geq \lambda(A_{G_{\tau-1}^{\text{no-loop}}})$. Here, the second inequality holds via the structure of Markov chains supported on \bar{G}_τ (see also [33, Thm. 3.1]). Finally, using the fact that $\lambda(\bar{A}) < \lambda(A_{G_\tau^{\text{no-loop}}})$, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square