

Supplementary Material for: High Information Density and Low  
Coverage Data Storage in DNA with Efficient Channel Coding  
Schemes

Yi Ding, Xuan He, Tuan Thanh Nguyen, Wentu Song, Zohar Yakhini, Eitan Yaakobi,  
Linqiang Pan, Xiaohu Tang, and Kui Cai

## 1 Outer decoder performance comparison

In the experiment, the modified-BFA algorithm was employed to decode fountain code. In prior work [2], the belief propagation (BP) decoding was used. As the BP has an extremely bad performance for decoding raptor code due to the pre-coding, in this section, another decoding algorithm, Structured Gaussian Elimination (SGE) is evaluated.

The SGE, also known as inactivation decoding, is identified as the maximum likelihood (ML, i.e., optimal) decoder, for decoding fountain codes for the erasure channel. Compared to standard Gaussian elimination (GE), the SGE retains the effectiveness while decreasing the complexity, especially when the (generator) matrix is sparse. This is achieved by involving a triangulation.

We slightly modified the SGE by incorporating a reliability ranking. To be specific, strings with higher read numbers were considered more reliable. This was followed by performing SGE on the most reliable strings. In our experiments, after the ranking, we iteratively examined these strings, according to the established ranking, until an incorrect string was identified. Thereafter, the SGE was applied to all the preceding strings. The successful decoding of the SGE was achieved if and only if the input strings were all correct and form a matrix of full rank. We remark that when the source data cannot be accessed, we cannot identify which string is the first incorrect one in the ranking list. However, inputting the strings into the SGE decoder one by one will result in the same full data recovery successful rate, at the cost of a higher decoding complexity.

The decoding performance comparison between adopted modified-BFA and SGE is depicted in Figure S1 and S2. It's shown that modified-BFA significantly outperforms the SGE.




Figure S1: Full data recovery success rate among 1,000 experiments, with different decoding algorithms for Scheme 1.




Figure S2: Full data recovery success rate among 1,000 experiments, with different decoding algorithms for Scheme 2.

## 2 An upper bound for the outer code decoding performance

An upper bound for the outer code is to perform the SGE exclusively on the correct symbols. In such a case, the channel is transformed into an erasure channel, leading to successful decoding contingent solely on the adequacy of received symbols. The comparisons of the performance of the theoretical outer upper bound and that of our adopted outer decoders for both schemes are depicted in Figure S3 and S4, respectively. This comparison highlights that our outer decoder, particularly, the modified-BFA decoder, achieved near-optimal performance across both Schemes 1 and 2.




Figure S3: Full data recovery success rate among 1,000 experiments, with BFA and the upper bound for Scheme 1.




Figure S4: Full data recovery success rate among 1,000 experiments, with BFA and the upper bound for Scheme 2.

### 3 An upper bound for the inner code decoding performance

We define the ‘uncovered strand’ as strands that either have zero read or one incorrect read. These strands are beyond the reach of any sequence reconstruction algorithm for recovery. Let ‘uncovered rate’ refer to the ratio of the number of uncovered strands to the number of source oligos, representing the percentage of uncovered strands. It is evident that if the uncovered rate exceeds  $(1 - \text{outer code rate})$ , constrained by that there is no enough information for outer decoder, decoding will inevitably fail. Let  $R_1^{out} = 0.95$ ,  $R_2^{out} = 0.9657$  represent the outer code rate of Schemes 1 and 2, respectively. The simulation results of the uncovered rate (Figure S5 and S6) demonstrate that the successful decoding becomes possible only when coverages are at least 4.2 and 5.3 for Scheme 1 and Scheme 2, respectively. These thresholds can be considered as inner code’s performance upper bounds. Compared to the decoding outcomes, revealing that there is minimal potential for further enhancement in the performance of the inner code.




Figure S5: Uncovered rate at given coverage compared to the outer code rate for Scheme 1.




Figure S6: Uncovered rate at given coverage compared to the outer code rate for Scheme 2.

## 4 The upper bound of the constrained code rate

In this experiment, each synthesized oligo adhered to 3 run length constraint (no homopolymer longer than 3) and GC-content constraint of 0.05 (proportion of nucleotide G and C between 45% and 55%). The redundancy was introduced in two stages to ensure that each oligo meet these constraints. The first stage involved the encoding of modified sequence replacement technique (modified-SRT), where 5nts were used as redundancy to remove the long homopolymers. The second stage entailed extending the length of the seed. For the generation of 30,000 oligos, a minimum of  $\lceil \log_2 30,000 \rceil = 15$  bits are required for the seed. Nevertheless, one additional bit was added to create more candidate oligos, ensuring a sufficient number adhere to the constraints. To summarize, 11 bits were added as redundancy to meet the constraints, resulting a constrained code rate of  $2 *$

$(1 - \frac{11}{2^{248}}) = 1.9556$ . Motivated by [1], we evaluated the capacity using computational

programming, demonstrating that the capacity is 1.9820. Therefore, the coding efficiency

we achieved is  $\frac{1.9556}{1.9820} = 98.67\%$ . The most relevant architecture was proposed in [2], where

fountain code was also adopted to ensure the run length constraint of 3 and GC-content constrain of [0.45, 0.55]. In [2], 32 bits were introduced as the seed of the fountain code to generate 72,000 oligos with 152 nucleotides. While minimum of 17 bits ( $\lceil \log_2 72000 \rceil = 17$ ) were required for the seed, 15 bits can be considered as the constrained code

redundancy. Therefore, the constrained code rate is  $2 * (1 - \frac{15}{2^{152}}) = 1.9013$ .

Considering the code capacity 1.9806, the corresponding code efficiency is  $\frac{1.9013}{1.9806} =$

96.00%. To the best of our knowledge, this is the highest coding efficiency achieved by constrained codes among all the experimental works, while ours outperforms it. The so called “base 3 encoding” strategy, i.e., encode binary data into oligos in base 3 rather than base 4, has been widely utilized to adhere to run length constraint. It is trivial to know constrained code schemes based on this strategy usually has significantly low code rate as it directly loss about quarter capacity.

In the experiment, a two-stage constrained code encoding was involved. Specifically, modified-SRT was initially employed to remove the long homopolymers. And after the inner code redundancy was added, the fountain codes scanning rejected oligos didn't satisfy either homopolymer or GC-content constraint. We claim that, compared to which in [2], where only scanning was used, the adopted constrained code encoding significantly reduced the encoding complexity. In other words, fewer encoding rounds were needed to generate the same number of oligos. In our experiments, 50,718- and 39,438-times encoding were conducted to generate 30,000 oligos for Scheme 1 and 2, respectively. It led a scanning pass rate of 59.19% and 76.07%. As a contrast, the pass rate of [2] was only 16.00% [1].



## Reference

- [1] Liu, Y. He, X. Tang, X. "Capacity-Achieving Constrained Codes with GC-Content and Runlength Limits for DNA Storage," *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Espoo, Finland, 2022, pp. 198-203, doi: 10.1109/ISIT50566.2022.9834494.
- [2] Erlich, Y. Zielinski, D. "DNA Fountain enables a robust and efficient storage architecture." *science* 355.6328 (2017): 950-954.