

Coding for Strand Breaks in Composite DNA

Frederik Walter*, and Yonatan Yehezkeally*†

*Institute for Communications Engineering, Technical University of Munich, 80333 Munich, Germany

†School of Computing, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 5TG, United Kingdom

Abstract—Even though DNA can be considered as a very stable long term storage medium, errors must be expected during storage. From experiments it is evident that the most common error type due to storage are strand breaks. We address the problem of correcting strand breaks in DNA sequences resulting from composite DNA synthesis. We introduce a novel channel model with realistic assumptions about the errors resulting from long term storage. Our proposed coding scheme employs marker codes to correct single breaks. For this purpose, we generalize run-length-limited codes for the composite setting and derive bounds on the code size.

I. INTRODUCTION

Storing data on DNA molecules presents a promising solution for archiving vast amounts of information due to its high density and long-term stability. Traditional digital storage media, such as hard drives and magnetic tapes, are limited by their physical size and susceptibility to degradation over time. In contrast, DNA, the molecule that carries genetic information in living organisms, offers a compact and durable medium for data storage. This potential has been demonstrated in several pioneering studies [1]–[4].

In conventional DNA data storage systems, binary data is encoded into sequences of the four DNA bases: adenine (A), cytosine (C), guanine (G), and thymine (T). These sequences are then synthesized into DNA molecules, known as *strands*, through the biochemical process of DNA synthesis. The synthesized strands are stored collectively in a tube, or encapsulated in silica particles where they can remain very stable for thousands of years under proper conditions [5]. To retrieve the stored binary data, the strands are read using *DNA sequencing* technologies, which determine the order of the bases in the DNA molecules. The sequenced data is then decoded back into its original binary form.

However, the process of storing and retrieving data using DNA is not without challenges. One significant issue is the occurrence of errors during DNA synthesis, storage, and sequencing. These errors can include substitutions, insertions, deletions, and, notably, strand breaks. Strand breaks occur when the DNA molecule is cleaved into two or more fragments, which can complicate the process of accurately reconstructing the original data. The problem of correcting breaks in traditional DNA data storage channels has been addressed in several studies [6]–[8], which propose various coding schemes to mitigate the impact of such errors.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101115134.

Recent advancements have introduced the composite DNA synthesis method to enhance the information capacity of DNA data storage systems. This method, as described in [9], leverages the inherent redundancy in DNA synthesis, where each sequence is synthesized to millions of molecules. These multiple copies of DNA strands are used to create composite DNA symbols, defined by mixtures of DNA bases and their ratios at specific positions in the strands. This effectively extends the alphabet beyond the four standard bases. A composite DNA symbol is represented as a quartet of probabilities $\{p_A, p_C, p_G, p_T\}$, where each p_X denotes the fraction of base $X \in \{A, C, G, T\}$ in the mixture, and $p_A + p_C + p_G + p_T = 1$. Identifying composite symbols requires sequencing multiple reads and estimating the base fractions at each position. Coding for various models of the composite channel has been proposed in [10]–[12].

This paper addresses the problem of correcting breaks in DNA sequences originating from composite DNA synthesis. We propose a coding scheme that employs marker codes to correct single breaks and introduce a generalization for run-length-limited codes applicable to the composite setting. Our approach aims to enhance the reliability and efficiency of data retrieval in composite DNA storage systems, ensuring that the stored information can be accurately reconstructed even in the presence of strand breaks.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we provide the necessary definitions and formally state the problem we aim to solve. In Section III, we introduce and analyze composite run-length-limited (RLL) codes, including bounds on their redundancy. Section IV presents our proposed marker based coding scheme for correcting single breaks in DNA sequences. Finally, Section V concludes the paper and discusses potential directions for future research.

II. DEFINITIONS AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

For positive integers $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[k, n] = \{k, k+1, \dots, n\}$. The binomial coefficient n choose k is denoted by $\binom{n}{k}$. Our approach to model composite DNA is described as follows. For ease of notation, we normalize the probabilities of the composite letters to an integer $M \in \mathbb{N}$, which we call the resolution parameter, as in [9]. We then define the composite matrix as follows.

Definition 1 (Composite Matrix). *Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ be the size of the base alphabet (in the case of DNA, it is 4), $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the length of the strands, and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ the resolution parameter. Then,*

$X^{(c)} \in [0, M]^{q \times n}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^q X_{i,j}^{(c)} = M \forall j \in [1, n]$ is a composite matrix representing the probability distribution of the composite DNA pool.

We use lowercase letters q to represent the base alphabet and uppercase letters Q to represent the size of the composite alphabet. Given a resolution parameter M , we get $Q = \binom{M+q-1}{q-1}$ composite symbols.

The composite matrix represents the probability distribution of the composite DNA pool. As shown in Figure 1, the DNA is synthesized into strands with the probability distribution for each position as given in the composite matrix. Due to the large number of strands produced with standard DNA synthesis methods, we can assume that the strands are independent and identically distributed.

Each strand is subject to at most t breaks, resulting in at most $t + 1$ fragments per strand, which are unordered. From this pool of DNA, we sample K fragments. The fragments are then sequenced, and we need to align them. Since the strands originate from composite DNA, we cannot rely on overlapping subsequences, as in standard alignment methods, to determine the correct position of the fragments.

Problem A. Given a set of K fragments, where each fragment is the result of at most t breaks in a composite DNA strand, create a code that allows the reconstruction of the position for each fragment.

In this paper, we do not consider probabilistic errors originating from the sampling process with repetition. A method to handle this, which can be applied here, can be found in [10].

To determine the correct position of the strands, we will employ a coding scheme that uses marker codes. Therefore, we need to ensure that the marker sequence is not part of the data.

Problem B. Generalize the concept of Run-Length-Limited (RLL) codes to the composite setting, determine bounds on the code size, and propose a construction.

Furthermore, given a composite run-length-limited code, we want to determine the ideal length of the marker sequence in terms of redundancy.

III. COMPOSITE RUN-LENGTH-LIMITED CODES

As we want to use marker sequences to identify the position of fragments, we need to ensure that the marker sequence is not part of the data. To achieve this, we will use run-length-limited (RLL) codes. These codes date back to magnetic media to avoid long runs of the same symbol, which can be misinterpreted as a marker sequence [13, Sections 1.1, 1.2].

The approach of [14], which achieves only one bit of redundancy for avoiding run lengths of $\log(n)$, is not applicable here. Therefore, we need a generalization of run-length-limited codes that apply to the composite setting. We define these codes as follows:

Definition 2 (Composite RLL Code). Given a composite matrix $X^{(c)}$ as in Definition 1 of length n with resolution

parameter M over a base alphabet of size q , we obtain an alphabet Σ of size $Q = \binom{M+q-1}{q-1}$ for the composite symbols. Of these composite symbols, let R symbols belong to an alphabet $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$. We say that a composite matrix is ℓ -run-length-limited if it does not contain symbols from Σ' in any ℓ consecutive indices $j \in [1, n]$, and denote the set of all such matrices by $\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)$.

In the following, we will derive bounds on the redundancy of these composite RLL codes. To do so, we will employ counting arguments to estimate the number of undesired sequences.

Theorem 3. A lower bound on the redundancy of $\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)$ is given by

$$\text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) \geq \log_Q(e) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \cdot \frac{n-2\ell}{2}.$$

Proof. To generalize the analysis of [14, Lem. 3], we partition the sequence into segments of length $\frac{n}{2\ell}$ and notice that if the whole sequence is ℓ -run-length-limited, then so is each and every segment. Formally:

$$\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n) \subseteq (\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, 2\ell))^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2\ell} \rfloor} \times \Sigma^{n \bmod 2\ell} \quad (1)$$

We aim to find the size of $\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, 2\ell)$, or equivalently, the size of $\Sigma^{2\ell} \setminus \text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, 2\ell)$. Note that a sequence of length 2ℓ cannot contain two disjoint runs of length larger than ℓ over Σ' ; therefore, we can count the number of undesired sequences by the index $j \in [1, \ell + 1]$ where such a run begins, and the length of the run $k \in [\ell, 2\ell - j]$. For each corresponding choice of j, k , the number $N_{j,k}$ of such sequences is given by

$$N_{j,k} = \begin{cases} R^{2\ell} & \text{if } j = 1, k = 2\ell \\ R^k Q^{2\ell-k-1} (Q - R) & \text{if } j = 1, k \leq 2\ell - 1 \\ R^k Q^{2\ell-k-1} (Q - R) & \text{if } j > 1, k = 2\ell - j + 1 \\ R^k Q^{2\ell-k-2} (Q - R)^2 & \text{if } j > 1, k < 2\ell - j + 1. \end{cases}$$

The reasoning for each line are as follows: 1. 2ℓ symbols from Σ' need to be chosen; 2. One chooses k symbols over Σ' , and a single symbol over $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma'$ for the index k , where the remaining $2\ell - k - 1$ symbols are chosen freely over Σ ; 3. One chooses k symbols over Σ' , and a single symbol over $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma'$ for the index $j - 1$, where the remaining $2\ell - k - 1$ symbols are chosen freely over Σ ; 4. One chooses k symbols over Σ' , and two symbols over $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma'$ for the indices $j - 1$ and $j + k$, where the remaining $2\ell - k - 2$ symbols are chosen freely over Σ . Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, 2\ell)| &= Q^{2\ell} - R^{2\ell} - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} R^{2\ell-j} Q^j \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-1} R^k Q^{2\ell-k} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-j-1} R^k Q^{2\ell-k} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2. \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 1. Model for the composite strand break channel.

We first note that for the first two summations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} R^{2\ell-j} Q^j \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) + \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-1} R^k Q^{2\ell-k} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \\
&= R^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} R^{\ell-j} Q^j + \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-1} R^{k-\ell} Q^{\ell+k-k} \right) \\
&= 2R^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} R^i Q^{\ell-i} \\
&= 2(QR)^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
&= 2(QR)^{\ell} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell}\right). \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly, for the last double sum we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-j-1} R^k Q^{2\ell-k} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \\
&= (RQ)^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-j-1} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
&= (RQ)^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1-i} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
&= (RQ)^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} (\ell-1-i) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
&= (RQ)^{\ell} \left[(\ell-1) \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \right] \\
&= (RQ)^{\ell} \left[(\ell-1) \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q} - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \right], \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where (4) is justified in the Appendix. To simplify the last sum, we note

$$\left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i - \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{i+1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} (j-1) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^j \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-2} (j-1) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^j - (\ell-2) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-2} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i - (\ell-2) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} i \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
&= \frac{R}{Q} - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} - (\ell-2) \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} \\
&= \frac{R}{Q} - (\ell-1) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} + (\ell-2) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows by substituting back into (5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{k=\ell}^{2\ell-j-1} R^k Q^{2\ell-k} \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)^2 \\
&= (QR)^{\ell} \left[(\ell-1) \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q} - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{R}{Q} + (\ell-1) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-1} - (\ell-2) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \right] \\
&= (QR)^{\ell} \left((\ell-1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \right) \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we have from (2), (3) and (6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, 2\ell)| \\
&= Q^{2\ell} - R^{2\ell} - 2(QR)^{\ell} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell}\right) \\
&\quad - (QR)^{\ell} \left((\ell-1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \right) \\
&= Q^{2\ell} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \left((\ell+1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) \right)\right) \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from (1) we can now derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)| \\
&\leq \left[Q^{2\ell} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \left((\ell+1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) \right) \right) \right]^{\lfloor n/2\ell \rfloor} Q^{n \bmod 2\ell} \\
&= Q^n \left[1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \left((\ell+1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) \right) \right]^{\lfloor n/2\ell \rfloor} \\
&\leq Q^n \exp \left[-\left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell} \left((\ell+1) - \ell \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2\ell}\right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq Q^n \exp \left[-\left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \cdot \frac{n-2\ell}{2} \right].$$

And it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\geq n - \log_Q \left[Q^n \exp \left[-\left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \cdot \frac{n-2\ell}{2} \right] \right] \\ &= \log_Q(e) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \cdot \frac{n-2\ell}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are moving on to the upper bound on the redundancy. Before commencing an analysis, we acknowledge the trivial bound

$$\begin{aligned} \text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\leq n - \log_Q \left((Q - R)^{\lfloor n/\ell \rfloor} Q^{n - \lfloor n/\ell \rfloor} \right) \\ &= -\lfloor n/\ell \rfloor \log_Q \left[1 - \frac{R}{Q} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

derived from the size of

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma^n : i \equiv (\ell - 1) \pmod{\ell} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \Sigma'\} \subseteq \text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n).$$

This bound may prove of use as baseline in finite-length analysis.

Theorem 4. *The redundancy of an $\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)$ code is upper bounded by*

$$\text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) \leq e \log_Q(e) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right).$$

Proof. Let's denote the probability to draw an $\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)$ sequence from a uniform distribution to Σ^n as $\Pr(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n))$. Then we have

$$\text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) = -\log_Q \Pr(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)).$$

Furthermore, we can represent the code as

$$\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n) = \Sigma^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-\ell+1} \mathcal{A}_i$$

where \mathcal{A}_i is the set of all sequences \mathbf{x} that contain a substring of length ℓ or larger over the alphabet Σ' starting at position i . That is $\mathbf{x}_{i-1} \notin \Sigma'$ and $\mathbf{x}_{i+k} \in \Sigma'$ for all $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$. We define the probability of drawing a sequence from \mathcal{A}_i as $\pi_1 = \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell$ if $i = 1$ and $\pi = \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)$ if $i > 1$. From the union bound we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-\ell+1} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) \\ &= 1 - \pi_1 - (n - \ell)\pi \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell - (n - \ell) \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right). \end{aligned}$$

When this lower bound is positive, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\leq -\log_Q \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right) \right) \\ &\leq \log_Q(e) \frac{\left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right)}{1 - \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We can replace the union bound with Lovasz's local lemma [15, Th. 1.1] as in [16, Th. 4, Cor. 5]. Let's define $\Gamma_i = \{\mathcal{A}_j : |i - j| < \ell + 1\}$ and we see that the events \mathcal{A}_i are independent of the events $\{\mathcal{A}_j \notin \Gamma_i\}$. So, there are at most $2\ell + 2$ events in Γ_i , of which at most one is \mathcal{A}_1 . From [16, Cor. 5] we have that if for all i there exists constants $0 < \phi_i < 1$ such that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) \leq \phi_i \exp \left(-\sum_{j \in \Gamma_i} \phi_j - \phi_i \right)$$

Then we get

$$\Pr \left(\Sigma^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-\ell+1} \mathcal{A}_i \right) \geq \exp \left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n-\ell+1} \phi_i \right). \quad (10)$$

We define $\phi = e\pi$ and $\phi_1 = e\pi_1$. If

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &\leq \phi \exp(-2\ell + 2)\phi - \phi_1 \\ &= \pi \exp(1 - e((2\ell + 2)\pi + \pi_1)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &\leq \phi_1 \exp(-(\ell - 1)\phi - \phi_1) \\ &= \pi_1 \exp(1 - e((\ell - 1)\pi + \pi_1)), \end{aligned}$$

which holds for ℓ not too large, by (10) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\geq \exp(-\phi_1 - (n - \ell)\phi) \\ &= \exp(-e(\pi_1 + (n - \ell)\pi)). \end{aligned}$$

Put differently

$$\begin{aligned} \text{red}(\text{RLL}_{Q,R}(\ell, n)) &\leq e \log_Q(e) (\pi_1 + (n - \ell)\pi) \\ &= e \log_Q(e) \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q}\right)(n - \ell)\right). \end{aligned}$$

This holds for sufficiently large n . However, if $\left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^\ell n$ is small, we get a tighter bound from (9). □

IV. CODE CONSTRUCTION

If we assume that the strands encounter at most one break the fragments will be either prefixes or suffixes of the original strands. In this case we can use marker codes to determine the correct position of the fragments. We will add a marker sequence of length $\ell + 2$ at the beginning and at the end to identify the position. The marker sequence for a q -ary base alphabet will be of the form $(1, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$ with ℓ zeros between the ones. Therefore, we need to discard any fragments that are of length $\ell + 2$ or less. As we can consider the sampling process with repetition as in Figure 1, discarding

a sample does not affect the probability distribution. The ones at the beginning and end of the sequences are necessary to determine if it is a prefix or suffix in the case when the data part of the fragment is only zeros. For the composite setting this means that the marker sequence is as in the following example.

Example 5. Let $X^{(c)}$ be a composite matrix as in Definition 1 over an alphabet of size q . Then the composite matrix with the marker sequence is given by:

$$X^{(c)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M & \cdots & M & 0 & x_{1,\ell+3} & \cdots & x_{1,n-\ell-2} & 0 & M & \cdots & M & 0 \\ M & 0 & \cdots & 0 & M & x_{2,\ell+3} & \cdots & x_{2,n-\ell-2} & M & 0 & \cdots & 0 & M \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & x_{3,\ell+3} & \cdots & x_{3,n-\ell-2} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & x_{q,\ell+3} & \cdots & x_{q,n-\ell-2} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Therefore, we can see that the marker sequence will result in classical non-composite letters in the synthesized strands. This is necessary as we need to determine the position for every segment individually and cannot rely on the combination of multiple fragments.

After introducing the composite marker sequences and composite RLL codes, we will now introduce a practical code construction where we assume that it is most likely for a strand to break 0 or 1 times.

Therefore, we will focus on the case with approximately one break and assume that the fragments are either prefixes or suffixes. If the fragment is neither a prefix nor a suffix and the strand has therefore undergone more than one break, we will discard the fragment.

To identify prefixes and suffixes, we will use a marker sequence of length $\ell+2$ at the beginning and end of the strands. The marker sequence will be as depicted in Example 5. To avoid the marker sequence in the data, we will employ a composite RLL code utilizing breaker symbols as used for (8). This leads to the following code construction.

Construction A. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of all possible composite matrices over the base alphabet q with resolution parameter M and length n . We define the code $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ as all composite matrices $C^{(c)}$ with entries $c_{i,j}$ where the following conditions are fulfilled:

$$c_{i,1} = c_{i,\ell+1} = c_{i,n-\ell-2} = c_{i,n} = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } i = 2 \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq 2 \end{cases}$$

$$c_{i,j} = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } i = 1 \forall j \in [2, \ell - 1] \cup [n - \ell - 1, n - 1] \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq 1 \forall j \in [2, \ell - 1] \cup [n - \ell - 1, n - 1] \end{cases}$$

$$c_{1,j} = 0 \text{ if } j + 2 \bmod \ell = 0 \forall \ell + 3 \leq j \leq n - \ell - 2$$

Given the behavior of the composite strand break channel, it is clear that this code can reconstruct the data if most strands have experienced not more than one break. An illustration for this can be found in Figure 2.

From the length of the marker and (8), we get the redundancy of the code \mathcal{C} as

$$\text{red}(\mathcal{C}) = 2\ell + 4 + \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell} \rfloor \log_Q \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q} \right).$$

Next, we want to determine the optimum value for ℓ . We will do this by minimizing the redundancy. For simplicity, we will assume that n is a multiple of ℓ .

Lemma 6. Given that n is a multiple of ℓ , the redundancy of the code \mathcal{C} is minimized for

$$\ell = \left(\frac{n}{2} \log_Q \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. To minimize the redundancy, we determine its derivative as

$$\frac{d}{d\ell} \text{red}(\mathcal{C}) = 2 - \frac{n}{\ell^2} \log_Q \left(1 - \frac{R}{Q} \right) \quad (11)$$

which, when set to zero, gives the desired result as we are only interested in the positive solution. \square

The following example illustrates the code construction for the 4-ary alphabet as used in DNA.

Example 7. Let $q = 4$, the resolution parameter $M = 6$, and therefore the number of composite symbols $Q = \binom{q+M-1}{q-1} = 84$. The number of unwanted symbols every ℓ positions in the data part is $R = Q - \binom{q-1+M-1}{q-1-1} = 56$. Then we get the optimal marker length as $\ell \approx 0.24\sqrt{n}$. A depiction of the code is shown in Figure 2.

Assuming the marker consists of a run of A's, the RLL-Breaker symbols appear every ℓ positions in the data part where the A's ratio is set to 0. Hence, there are only $Q - R = \binom{q-1+M-1}{q-1-1} = 28$ symbols left for these positions.




Fig. 2. Example of a codeword with marker sequence and an RLL code

We conjecture that using an RLL encoder with redundancy on the order of magnitude given by Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 would minimize the redundancy of our construction for $\ell = \log(n) - \log \log(n) + O(1)$. Due to space limitations, the arguments supporting this conjecture will be presented in a future version of this work.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper introduced a novel channel model to address strand breaks in composite DNA data storage. The channel model is designed to reflect realistic behavior. We proposed a marker-based coding scheme to retrieve information when many strands experience a single break, aligning with experimental observations. Additionally, we generalized the concept of run-length-limited (RLL) codes for the composite setting and derived both lower and upper bounds on the redundancy of these codes. A practical code construction was presented, and the optimal marker length was determined. Future work could focus on improving the RLL code to narrow the gap to the theoretical bounds. Moreover, the code construction could be extended to handle multiple breaks or other error types such as insertions, deletions, or substitutions.

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, Sep. 28, 2012. DOI: 10.1126/science.1226355. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1226355> (visited on 08/02/2023).
- [2] N. Goldman, P. Bertone, S. Chen, *et al.*, "Towards practical, high-capacity, low-maintenance information storage in synthesized DNA," *Nature*, vol. 494, no. 7435, pp. 77–80, 7435 Feb. 2013, ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/nature11875. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature11875> (visited on 08/02/2023).
- [3] Y. Erlich and D. Zielinski, "DNA Fountain enables a robust and efficient storage architecture," *Science*, vol. 355, no. 6328, pp. 950–954, Mar. 3, 2017. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaj2038. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aaj2038> (visited on 09/20/2023).
- [4] L. Organick, S. D. Ang, Y.-J. Chen, *et al.*, "Random access in large-scale DNA data storage," *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 242–248, 3 Mar. 2018, ISSN: 1546-1696. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.4079. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/nbt.4079> (visited on 08/02/2023).
- [5] 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 Ed. in English)*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 2552–2555, Feb. 16, 2015, ISSN: 1521-3773. DOI: 10.1002/anie.201411378. PMID: 25650567.
- [6] I. Shomorony and A. Vahid, "Torn-Paper Coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 7904–7913, Dec. 2021, ISSN: 1557-9654. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2021.3120920.
- [7] A. N. Ravi, A. Vahid, and I. Shomorony, "Capacity of the Torn Paper Channel with Lost Pieces," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Jul. 2021, pp. 1937–1942. DOI: 10.1109/ISIT45174.2021.9518272.
- [8] D. Bar-Lev, E. Yaakobi, Y. Yehezkeally, and S. Marcovich, "Adversarial Torn-paper Codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pp. 1–1, 2023, ISSN: 0018-9448, 1557-9654. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2023.3292895. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10174677/> (visited on 08/10/2023).
- [9] L. Anavy, I. Vaknin, O. Atar, R. Amit, and Z. Yakhini, "Data storage in DNA with fewer synthesis cycles using composite DNA letters," *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1229–1236, Oct. 2019, ISSN: 1087-0156, 1546-1696. DOI: 10.1038/s41587-019-0240-x. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-019-0240-x> (visited on 09/19/2023).
- [10] W. Zhang, Z. Chen, and Z. Wang, "Limited-Magnitude Error Correction for Probability Vectors in DNA Storage," in *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, Seoul, Korea, Republic of: IEEE, May 16, 2022, pp. 3460–3465, ISBN: 978-1-5386-8347-7. DOI: 10.1109/ICC45855.2022.9838471. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9838471/> (visited on 09/19/2023).
- [11] F. Walter, O. Sabary, A. Wachter-Zeh, and E. Yaakobi, "Coding for Composite DNA to Correct Substitutions, Strand Losses, and Deletions," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Athens, Greece: IEEE, Jul. 7, 2024, pp. 97–102, ISBN: 9798350382846. DOI: 10.1109/ISIT57864.2024.10619202. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10619202/> (visited on 01/15/2025).
- [12] O. Sabary, I. Preuss, R. Gabrys, Z. Yakhini, L. Anavy, and E. Yaakobi, "Error-Correcting Codes for Combinatorial Composite DNA," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Athens, Greece: IEEE, Jul. 7, 2024, pp. 109–114, ISBN: 9798350382846. DOI: 10.1109/ISIT57864.2024.10619334. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10619334/> (visited on 01/15/2025).
- [13] B. H. Marcus, R. M. Roth, and P. H. Siegel, "An introduction to coding for constrained systems," *Lecture notes*, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://ronny.cswp.cs.technion.ac.il/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2016/05/chapters1-9.pdf> (visited on 01/16/2025).
- [14] M. Levy and E. Yaakobi, "Mutually Uncorrelated Codes for DNA Storage," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 3671–3691, Jun. 2019, ISSN: 1557-9654. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2018.2873138. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8478310> (visited on 08/06/2024).
- [15] J. Spencer, "Asymptotic lower bounds for Ramsey functions," *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 20, pp. 69–76, 1977, ISSN: 0012365X. DOI: 10.1016/0012-365X(77)90044-9. [Online]. Available: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0012365X77900449> (visited on 01/22/2025).
- [16] Y. Yehezkeally and N. Polyanski, "On Codes for the Noisy Substring Channel," *IEEE Transactions on Molecular, Biological, and Multi-Scale Communications*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 368–381, Jun. 2024, ISSN: 2372-2061, 2332-7804. DOI: 10.1109/TMBMC.2024.3382499. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10480728/> (visited on 01/22/2025).

APPENDIX

A. Change of Summation in (4)

We have the double summation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-j-1} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i \\
 &= \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 + \dots + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-3} + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-2} \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 + \dots + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-3} \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 \\
 &= \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 + \dots + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^0 \{ \ell - 2 \text{ times} \} \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 + \dots + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^1 \{ \ell - 3 \text{ times} \} \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-3} + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-3} \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^{\ell-2} \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1-i} \left(\frac{R}{Q}\right)^i
 \end{aligned}$$