

Haplotype Assembly: An Information Theoretic View

Hongbo Si, Haris Vikalo, and Sriram Vishwanath

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

The University of Texas at Austin

1 University Station, C0806, Austin, TX 78712

Email: hongbosi@utexas.edu, {hvikalo, sriram}@ece.utexas.edu

Abstract—This paper studies the haplotype assembly problem from an information theoretic perspective. A haplotype is a sequence of nucleotide bases on a chromosome, often conveniently represented by a binary string, that differ from the bases in the corresponding positions on the other chromosome in a homologous pair. Information about the order of bases in a genome is readily inferred using short reads provided by high-throughput DNA sequencing technologies. In this paper, the recovery of the target pair of haplotype sequences using short reads is rephrased as a joint source-channel coding problem. Two messages, representing haplotypes and chromosome memberships of reads, are encoded and transmitted over an erasure channel, where the channel model reflects salient features of high-throughput sequencing. In the absence of sequencing noise, both the necessary and sufficient conditions are presented with order-wise optimal bounds for perfect haplotype recovery. A brief discussion of the erroneous scenario is also included.

I. INTRODUCTION

Diploid organisms, including humans, have homologous pairs of chromosomes where one chromosome in a pair is inherited from mother and the other from father. The two chromosomes in a pair are similar and essentially carry the same type of information but are not identical. In particular, chromosomes in a pair differ at a small fraction of positions (i.e., loci). Such variations are referred to as single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs); in humans, frequency of SNPs is 1 in 1000. A haplotype is the string of SNPs on a single chromosome in a homologous pair. Haplotype information is essential for understanding genetic causes of various diseases and for advancement of personalized medicine. However, direct measurement and identification of the entire haplotype is generally challenging, costly, and time and labor intensive. Alternatively, single individual haplotypes can be assembled from short reads provided by high-throughput sequencing systems. These systems rely on so-called shotgun sequencing to oversample the genome and generate a redundant library of short reads. The reads are mapped to a reference and the individual genome is assembled following consensus of information provided by the reads. The length of each read (i.e., DNA fragment) in state-of-the-art sequencing systems is typically 100 – 1000 base pairs [1]. Note that this length is comparable to the average distance between SNPs on chromosomes. Therefore, a single read is unlikely to cover more than one variant site which is needed for the haplotype




Fig. 1: Paired-end reads generated from two chromosomes in a homologous pair. Rectangles linked by the lines above and below the target chromosome pair represent paired-end reads, and their relative positions indicate their location along the chromosomes.

assembly. Moreover, origin of a read (i.e., to which chromosome in a pair the read belongs) is unknown and needs to be inferred [2]. Paired-end sequencing [3], also known as mate-paired sequencing [4], helps overcome these problems. This process generates pairs of short reads that are spaced along the target genome, where the spacing (so-called insert size) between the two reads in a pair is known. The mate-pairs allow acquisition of the information about distant SNPs on the same haplotype, and thus help assemble the haplotype. Fig. 1 illustrates the procedure of generating paired-end reads from a pair of chromosomes, where each read may cover two or more variant sites. The goal of haplotype assembly is to identify the chromosome from which fragments are sampled, and to reconstruct the haplotype sequences. When there are no sequencing errors, a fragment conflict graph framework [5] converts the original problem into partitioning of the set of reads into two subsets, each collecting the reads that belong to the same chromosome in a pair. For erroneous data, it poses haplotyping as an optimization problem of minimizing the number of transformation steps needed to generate a bipartite graph [6]. This leads to various formulations of the haplotype assembly problem including minimum fragment removal, minimum SNP removal, and minimum error correction. The last one, minimum error correction, has been the most widely used criterion for haplotype assembly.

In this paper, we analyze the haplotype assembly problem from information-theoretic perspective. In particular, we determine necessary and sufficient conditions for haplotype

assembly, both in the absence of noise as well as for the case where data is erroneous. The paper is organized as follows. Section II formalizes the haplotype assembly problem. In Section III, we present an information theoretic view of haplotype assembly in the absence of sampling errors, and the erroneous case is discussed in Section IV. Finally, Section V concludes the paper.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) is the variation between two chromosomes where the corresponding bases in a specific location on the chromosomes differ from each other. Typically, diploid organisms have only two possible variants at one SNP site. For the sake of convenience, we will denote one of the two variants as 0, while the other one we will denote as 1. With this notation, a haplotype sequence \mathbf{h} comprising information about all SNP sites on one of the chromosomes in a pair can be represented by a binary string, while the haplotype associated with the other chromosome in the pair is its complement $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$, where we denote

$$\mathbf{h} = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n),$$

and n is the length of haplotypes.

Each paired-end read contains partial information about either of these two haplotypes. Consider an indicator random variable c_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ (m is the number of reads), which corresponds to the chromosome membership for read i . Here, c_i equals 0 if read i is sampled from \mathbf{h} and equals 1 otherwise. Due to the limitation of read lengths, only a small fraction of entries are observed. In other words, a paired-end read could be considered as a sequence drawn from the alphabet $\{0, 1, \times\}$, where “ \times ” refers to the lack of information about a site. The collection of all reads forms a matrix \mathbf{R} , whose rows correspond to m paired-end reads, and whose columns correspond to n SNP sites. The i th row of \mathbf{R} is denoted as \mathbf{r}_i , and the j th element of \mathbf{r}_i is denoted as r_{ij} . Typically, only few entries in each row are numerical, if the effect of burst variations is ignored.

In the absence of sampling noise, every observed element in matrix \mathbf{R} is obtained as an exclusive-OR (XOR) of the corresponding SNP and associated membership information [7]. Formally, this relationship is given by

$$r_{ij} = h_j \oplus c_i. \quad (1)$$

The observed matrix \mathbf{R} could be interpreted as being obtained from a rank 1 matrix \mathbf{S} , whose row is either \mathbf{h} or $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ based on the value of c_i , while most of its entries are erased in the reading process. Hence, the task of haplotype assembly is to recover haplotype \mathbf{h} and chromosome membership vector \mathbf{c} , or equivalently the matrix \mathbf{S} , from the observation matrix \mathbf{R} .

An example, illustrated by Fig. 1, corresponds to the scenario of 6 SNP sites and 8 paired-end reads. Since only the first 4 reads are (shotgun) sequenced from chromosome 1, we obtain the chromosome membership vector



Fig. 2: Information theoretic view of the haplotype assembly problem.

$\mathbf{c} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. If denoting the haplotype from chromosome 1 as $\mathbf{h} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$, then the observed reads matrix, without the influence of error, is given by

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \times & \times & 0 & \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & 1 & \times & \times & 0 & \times \\ 1 & \times & \times & 1 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 & 1 & \times & \times \\ 0 & \times & 1 & \times & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times & \times & 1 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times & 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times & \times & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

III. INFORMATION THEORETIC VIEW

From a joint source-channel coding perspective, haplotype assembly aims to recover two sources being communicated through an erasure channel (see Fig. 2). The first source is haplotype information, \mathbf{h} , and the second source is the chromosome membership vector \mathbf{c} . Both of these vectors are assumed to originate from a uniform distribution, i.e., their entries obey Bernoulli distribution with parameter 1/2. These two sources are encoded jointly using the function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$, and the encoded codeword $\mathbf{S} = f(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c})$. In particular, each entry in \mathbf{S} is given by $s_{ij} = h_j \oplus c_i$, which implies the encoder is a bijection. After receiving the output from channel, the decoder uses the decoding function to map its channel observations into an estimate of the message. Specifically, we consider the decoder (i.e., an algorithm for haplotype assembly) given by $g: \{0, 1\}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \times\}^{m \times n}$, such that $\hat{\mathbf{S}} = g(\mathbf{R})$, where $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ represents the estimate. We define the error probability of decoding as

$$P_e \triangleq \Pr\{\hat{\mathbf{S}} \neq \mathbf{S} | \mathbf{R}\}. \quad (3)$$

As in the conventional information-theoretic analysis of a communication channel, we consider all possible choices of matrix \mathbf{S} (denote the resulting ensemble by \mathcal{S}), and let m be large enough such that there exists at least one decoding function g with small probability of error.

The channel model reflects particular reading technique. Let us consider paired-end reads and the channel $W: \{0, 1\}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \times\}^{m \times n}$ described as follows:

- 1) Erasures happen independently across rows.
- 2) In each row, only 2 entries remain and their positions are random.

In other words, we observe precisely 2 entries in each row of \mathbf{S} , and the observations are independent across different rows. For each column of \mathbf{R} , the number of remaining entries approximately obeys Poisson distribution. Moreover, the expected length of insert size between 2 sampled entries in a row is given by $(n-2)/3$. We should point out that the insert

size in practice is indeed limited and cannot be made arbitrary large.

Based on this model for haplotype assembly, we consider the necessary and sufficient conditions for recovery.

Theorem 1. *Given 2 arbitrary observations in each row, the original haplotype matrix \mathbf{S} could be reconstructed only if the number of reads satisfies*

$$m = \Omega(n),$$

where n is the length of target haplotype. Moreover, if $m = \Theta(n \ln n)$, a reconstruction algorithm, erasure decoding, could determine \mathbf{S} accurately with high probability. Specifically, given a target small constant ε , there exists n large enough such that by choosing $m = \Theta(n \ln n)$ the probability of error $P_e \leq \varepsilon$.

A. Necessary Condition for Recovery

Using Fano's inequality [8], we find that:

$$H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{R}) \leq P_e \log |\mathcal{S}| \leq P_e(m+n), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{S} is the assemble of all possible \mathbf{S} , and its size is upper bounded by 2^{m+n} .

Let \mathbf{T} be the matrix comprising indicators of locations where \mathbf{S} is observed, i.e., $t_{ij} = 1$ if $r_{ij} \neq \times$ and $t_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Then, \mathbf{T} is independent of \mathbf{S} , and its rows are independent due to our channel assumption. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{S}) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{T}) \\ &= I(\mathbf{S}; \mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T}) + H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{R}) \\ &= I(\mathbf{S}; \mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T}) + H(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{R}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} I(\mathbf{S}; \mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T}) + P_e(m+n) \\ &= H(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T}) - H(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}) + P_e(m+n) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} H(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T}) + P_e(m+n) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m H(\mathbf{r}_i|\mathbf{t}_i) + P_e(m+n) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{=} 2m + P_e(m+n) \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from independence between \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} ; (b) from Fano's inequality, i.e., equation (4); (c) from the fact \mathbf{R} is deterministic if \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} are both known; (d) from the row independence assumption of our channel model; and (e) from the assumption that every row has exactly 2 entries observed.

Finally, by noting that $H(\mathbf{S}) = m + n$, we need

$$m \geq \frac{(1 - P_e)n}{1 + P_e}. \quad (5)$$

for accurate recovery. More precisely, roughly we need $m = \Omega(n)$ for recovery with arbitrary small probability of decoding error.

Remark 2. *Note that in this proof, channel model is only utilized when bounding $H(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{T})$. To this end, the necessary result*

is extendable to more channel models (reading techniques). In particular, the lower bound $m = \Omega(n)$ fits for deterministic choice of reading sites, paired-end reading with fixed insert size, and more importantly, reading techniques with more than 2 observations in each read. The essential condition for the establishment of necessary condition is to ensure the number of observed entries in the matrix is sparse, more precisely in proportion to n .

B. Sufficient Condition for Recovery

The goal of a decoding algorithm is to recover \mathbf{S} (or equivalently \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{c}) from \mathbf{R} with high confidence. Here, we show a simple and effective algorithm, called "erasure decoding", for haplotype assembly. Detailed steps of this algorithm are described as follows:

- 1) Choose the "seed" s as arbitrary non-erased entry in the first row, i.e. $s = r_{1j}$, where j is randomly chosen such that $r_{1j} \neq \times$. Evaluate the membership of first row as $c_1 = 0$.
- 2) Find all other rows with position j not erased, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A} = \{k | r_{kj} \neq \times, k \neq 1\}. \quad (6)$$

- 3) Evaluate the membership of all rows with indices in \mathcal{A} as

$$c_k = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r_{kj} = r_{1j}, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

for every $k \in \mathcal{A}$.

- 4) Decode SNPs in the first row by

$$r_{1l} = r_{kl} \oplus c_k, \quad (8)$$

for every $k \in \mathcal{A}$ and $r_{kl} \neq \times$.

- 5) Delete all rows with indices in \mathcal{A} .
- 6) Arbitrary choose another non-erased entry in the first row as the new seed $s = r_{1j}$, which has not been chosen as seed in any of the former steps. Repeat Step 2) to 6) until no row could be further erased.
- 7) If the first row is the only remaining one and its entries are all decoded, claim $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{r}_1$; otherwise claim a failure.

Remark 3. *In this algorithm, we arbitrary evaluate a chromosome membership for the first row, but it may not be the correct one. In fact, if the algorithm successfully decodes both \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{c} , then all elements could be flipped due to an incorrect choice of initial membership. However, the recovered matrix \mathbf{S} remains the same, due to the particular exclusive-OR operation to generate \mathbf{S} . At this point, the choice of initial membership does not influence the decoding performance.*

Remark 4. *Erasure decoding is closely connected to the bipartite partition interpretation [2]. Note that if our algorithm successfully recovers the message matrix \mathbf{S} , we can realign its rows such that the matrix could be partitioned into two submatrices with different chromosome memberships. To this end, the erasure decoding provides a practical algorithm to fulfill partition a bipartite for haplotype assembly.*




Fig. 3: Erasure decoding of the example illustrated in Fig. 1. In every round (Step 2) to 6)), the seed is marked in a rectangle, with its column index given by j . Rows that share the same positions observed as the seed are collected in assemble \mathcal{A} . A straight line crossing a whole row of the matrix represents a deletion.

Fig. 3 shows the details of decoding procedures for the example illustrated in Fig. 1, where the read matrix is given by (2).

Here, we analyze the performance of this proposed algorithm. More precisely, we show that if the number of reads sample is large enough, i.e. $m = \Theta(n \ln n)$, the source matrix \mathbf{S} could be recovered correctly with high probability. Observe that in the absence of sampling errors, the erasure decoding algorithm ensures the output to be the correct haplotype if both of the following conditions are satisfied.

- 1) All rows except for the first one are deleted.
- 2) All entries in the first row are decoded

At this point, decoding error occurs if at least one of the following events happen.

- 1) The event E_1 : at least one of the columns in \mathbf{R} is erased such that the corresponding SNP could not be decoded;
- 2) The event E_2 : there exist a partition of row indices $\{1, \dots, m\} = \mathcal{U}_1 \cup \mathcal{U}_2$, and a partition of column indices $\{1, \dots, n\} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$, such that $|\mathcal{V}_1| \geq 2$ and $|\mathcal{V}_2| \geq 2$ (to make sure 2 entries could be sampled from each row), and $r_{ij} = \times$ for any $(i, j) \in (\mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2) \cup (\mathcal{U}_2 \times \mathcal{V}_1)$. In other words, the sampled entries could be considered as originated from two disjoint subsets of target haplotypes and thus there is no hope to recover it due to the lack of information bridging these subsets.

Here we outline how to bound the probability of each of the two error events. First, note that by coupon collector effect, if $m = \Theta(n \ln n)$ then every column is covered by at least one read with high probability. More precisely, by taking $m = n \ln n$, the error event (or equivalently the tail distribution for coupon

collector problem) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr\{E_1\} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n-i}{2}^m}{\binom{n}{2}^m} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{(n-i)(n-i-1)}{n(n-1)} \right]^m \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} n^i e^{-m \frac{2in-i(i+1)}{n(n-1)}} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} O(n^{-i}) \\
 &= O(n^{-1}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

On the other hand, the second error event E_2 could be further decomposed into sub-events $E_2^{u,v}$ which represent the type 2 error event with particular $u = |\mathcal{U}_1|$ and $v = |\mathcal{V}_1|$. Then, we have

$$\Pr\{E_2^{u,v}\} = \frac{\binom{n}{v} \binom{m}{u} \binom{v}{2}^u \binom{n-v}{2}^{m-u}}{\binom{n}{2}^m}. \tag{10}$$

Observe that the right hand side in (10) is maximized by two extreme points on the feasible (u, v) -region, i.e. for any u and v , $\Pr\{E_2^{u,v}\} \leq \Pr\{E_2^{1,2}\} = \Pr\{E_2^{m-1, n-2}\}$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr\{E_2^{1,2}\} &= \frac{\binom{n}{2} \binom{m}{1} \binom{2}{2}^1 \binom{n-2}{2}^{m-1}}{\binom{n}{2}^m} \\
 &= \frac{m[(n-2)(n-3)]^{m-1}}{[n(n-1)]^{m-1}} \\
 &\leq n \ln n \left(1 - \frac{4n-6}{n(n-1)} \right)^{n \ln n - 1} \\
 &\leq n \ln n e^{-\frac{4n-6}{n(n-1)} (n \ln n - 1)} \\
 &= O(n^{-3} \ln n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the probability of the second error event is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr\{E_2\} &= \sum_{u=1}^{m-1} \sum_{v=2}^{n-2} \Pr\{E_2^{u,v}\} \\
 &\leq (m-2)(n-4) \Pr\{E_2^{1,2}\} \\
 &\leq n^2 \ln n O(n^{-3} \ln n) \\
 &= O(n^{-1} (\ln n)^2).
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Combining these two bounds together, we obtain

$$P_e \leq \Pr\{E_1\} + \Pr\{E_2\} = O(n^{-1}) + O(n^{-1} (\ln n)^2) < \varepsilon,$$

for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n .

Remark 5. Note that there is a log-factor gap between the lower and upper bounds. As analyzed in [9], this log-factor ensures enough entries sampled from each column for accurate recovery. If a more systematic reading method could be adopted to generate the observation matrix, this log-factor may not be essential for reconstruction.

Remark 6. An alternative interpretation for quantifying the minimum number of entries needed to recover a rank-1 matrix is based on optimality. In this branch of work [10] [11] [12], an optimization approach is utilized to determine the necessary conditions, and the recovery is facilitated by solving the resulting convex program.

IV. DISCUSSION OF ERRONEOUS CASE

When sequencing errors are present, some of the binary entries in \mathbf{R} are flipped. Here, we assume errors are independent and identically distributed. More precisely, generation of errors could be modeled as messages passing through a set of independent binary symmetric channels with parameter p , where p is the probability of flipping. Denoting the noise as matrix \mathbf{N} , where n_{ij} are i.i.d. $\text{Ber}(p)$ distributed, the final observed matrix is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{R} \oplus \mathbf{N}. \quad (12)$$

Hence, the system model for the erroneous case could be considered as the one for error-free case concatenated with binary symmetric channels. However, note that the original matrix \mathbf{S} is impossible to recover, if only two entries could be observed in each row, because the identification of error source is infeasible when exactly one error happens. To this end, we aim to recover the row space, i.e., the haplotype \mathbf{h} , from matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ with high probability. More precisely, if denoting the estimate from a recovery algorithm as $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$, we define the probability of error as

$$\tilde{P}_e = \Pr\{\hat{\mathbf{h}} \neq \mathbf{h} | \tilde{\mathbf{R}}\},$$

to evaluate the recovery accuracy. We desire this probability to be arbitrary small, on an average across all possible implementation of \mathbf{S} .

To study the necessary condition, one may still rely on the Fano's equality, i.e.,

$$H(\mathbf{h} | \tilde{\mathbf{R}}) \leq \tilde{P}_e n.$$

Using this, we obtain

$$H(\mathbf{h}) \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{T}) - H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{T}) + \tilde{P}_e n.$$

In this case, $H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{T})$ does not vanish due to the influence of noise. In particular, by noting noises are assumed to be i.i.d., we have

$$H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{T}) \geq H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}) = \sum_{i=1}^m H(\tilde{r}_i | \mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_i) = 2mH(p).$$

Combining with the observations that $H(\tilde{\mathbf{R}} | \mathbf{T}) = 2m$ and $H(\mathbf{h}) = n$, we have

$$m \geq \frac{(1 - \tilde{P}_e)n}{2[1 - H(p)]}, \quad (13)$$

which is still an $m = \Omega(n)$ scale lower bound.

On the other hand, from the perspective of sufficient condition, if errors happen, erasure decoding algorithm may not apply. In fact, an effective algorithm for haplotype assembly

from a small number of reads remains open. Most state-of-the-art algorithms are based on an optimization formulation, may adopt different objective criteria [5] [6], and their algorithms basically consider the number of reads as a known parameter for analysis, rather than regarding it as the essential measurement to argue sufficient condition for haplotyping.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we consider the haplotype assembly problem from an information theoretic perspective. To determine chromosome membership of reads provided by high-throughput sequencing systems and to reconstruct haplotypes, we consider them as messages that are encoded and transmitted over an erasure channel. This channel model reflects the salient features of the paired-end sequencing technology, e.g., that every row in a data matrix contains few randomly placed entries. In the case of error-free sequencing, we show that the required number of reads needed for reconstruction is at least of the same order as the length of the haplotype sequence, and that the erasure decoding algorithm ensures reconstruction with the optimal order regardless of a log-factor gap. The necessary condition for erroneous sampling case is analogue while the sufficient condition remains to be an open problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. C. Schuster, "Next-generation sequencing transforms today's biology," *Nature*, vol. 200, no. 8, 2007.
- [2] R. Schwartz, "Theory and algorithms for the haplotype assembly problem," *Communications in Information & Systems*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 23–38, 2010.
- [3] P. J. Campbell, P. J. Stephens, E. D. Pleasance, S. O'Meara, H. Li, T. Santarius, L. A. Stebbings, C. Leroy, S. Edkins, C. Hardy *et al.*, "Identification of somatically acquired rearrangements in cancer using genome-wide massively parallel paired-end sequencing," *Nature genetics*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 722–729, 2008.
- [4] A. Edwards, H. Voss, P. Rice, A. Civitello, J. Stegemann, C. Schwager, J. Zimmermann, H. Erfle, C. T. Caskey, and W. Ansorge, "Automated DNA sequencing of the human HPRT locus," *Genomics*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 593–608, 1990.
- [5] G. Lancia, V. Bafna, S. Istrail, R. Lippert, and R. Schwartz, "SNPs problems, complexity, and algorithms," in *Algorithms-ESA 2001*. Springer, 2001, pp. 182–193.
- [6] R. Lippert, R. Schwartz, G. Lancia, and S. Istrail, "Algorithmic strategies for the single nucleotide polymorphism haplotype assembly problem," *Briefings in bioinformatics*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 23–31, 2002.
- [7] Z. Puljiz and H. Vikalo, "A message-passing algorithm for haplotype assembly," in *Proc. of the Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, 2013.
- [8] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [9] S. Vishwanath, "Information theoretic bounds for low-rank matrix completion," in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2010 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1508–1512.
- [10] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, "The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2053–2080, 2010.
- [11] B. Recht, "A simpler approach to matrix completion," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 7, pp. 3413–3430, 2011.
- [12] J. Wright, A. Ganesh, S. Rao, Y. Peng, and Y. Ma, "Robust principal component analysis: Exact recovery of corrupted low-rank matrices via convex optimization," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2009, pp. 2080–2088.