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Abstract

The process of DNA-based data storage (DNA storage for short) can be mathematically modelled as a communication channel, termed DNA storage channel, whose inputs and outputs are sets of unordered sequences. To design error correcting codes for DNA storage channel, a new metric, termed the sequence-subset distance, is introduced, which generalizes the Hamming distance to a distance function defined between any two sets of unordered vectors and helps to establish a uniform framework to design error correcting codes for DNA storage channel. We further introduce a family of error correcting codes, referred to as sequence-subset codes, for DNA storage and show that the error-correcting ability of such codes is completely determined by their minimum distance. We derive some upper bounds on the size of the sequence-subset codes including a Singleton-like bound and a Plotkin-like bound. We also propose some constructions, which imply lower bounds on the size of such codes.

I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of storing data in synthetic DNA sequences has been around since 1988 and DNA-based data storage has been progressing rapidly in recent years with the development of DNA synthesis and sequencing technology. Compared to traditional magnetic and optical media, DNA storage has competing advantages including extreme high density, long durability, and low energy consumption.

A DNA sequence is mathematically represented by a quaternary sequence, each symbol represent one of the four types of base nucleotides: adenine (A), cytosine (C), guanine (G) and thymine (T). Basically, in a DNA-based storage system, the original binary data is first encoded to a set of quaternary sequences. Then the corresponding DNA nucleotide sequences (oligos) are synthesized and stored. To retrieve the original data, the stored oligos are sequenced to generate a set of quaternary sequences, which then are decoded to the original binary data. The process of DNA synthesizing, storing and sequencing can be mathematically modelled as a communication channel, called the DNA storage channel, which can be depicted by Fig. 1.

Unlike the conventional magnetic or optical recording systems, the DNA sequences are stored in “pools”, where structured addressing is not allowed. Therefore, the inputs of the DNA storage channel can only be viewed as sets of unordered DNA sequences.

The output of the DNA storage channel may be distorted by five types of errors:

- **Sequence deletion**: One or more of the input sequences are lost. As a result, the number of output sequences is smaller than the number of input sequences.
- **Sequence insertion**: One or more sequences that do not belong to the set of input sequences are added into the output sequences. As a result, the number of output sequences is larger than the number of input sequences.
- **Symbol deletion**: One or more symbols in a sequence are removed. As a result, the length of the sequence is decreased.
- **Symbol insertion**: One or more symbols are added into a sequence. As a result, the length of the sequence is increased.
- **Symbol substitution**: One or more symbols in a sequence are replaced by other symbols. In this case, the length of the sequence remains unchanged.

Note that sequence deletion and sequence insertion can take place simultaneously. If the number of sequence deletions equals the number of sequence insertions, then the total number of input sequences remain unchanged. In this case, the combining effect of sequence deletion and sequence insertion is equivalent to symbol substitutions.

To combat different types of errors in DNA synthesizing and sequencing, various coding techniques are used by DNA storage. Most demonstration researches employ constrained coding combined with classical error correcting codes (e.g. Reed-Solomon...
codes) [2]-[10]. In addition, to combat the lack of ordering of the transmitted sequences, a unique address (index) is added to each sequence.

Codes that can correct \( s \) (or fewer) losses of sequences and \( e \) (or fewer) substitutions in each of \( t \) (or fewer) sequences were studied in [11] by considering the so-called error ball. Codes dealing with insertion/deletion errors were also studied in [11]. Codes that can correct a total of \( K \) substitution errors were studied in [12] using the sphere packing arguments, which is essentially the same as the error ball arguments.

A. Our Contribution

In this paper, we consider error control for DNA storage channel by introducing a new metric, termed the sequence-subset distance, over the power set of the set of all vectors over a finite alphabet with fixed length, which is the space of the inputs/outputs of the DNA storage channel. This metric is a generalization of the classical Hamming distance and can help to establish a uniform framework to design codes for DNA storage channel that can correct errors of sequence deletion, sequence insertion and symbol substitution.

We study error correcting codes with respect to the sequence-subset distance, which we refer to as sequence-subset codes, for DNA storage. We show that similar to codes with respect to the classical Hamming distance, a sequence-subset code \( C \) can correct any number of \( n_D \) sequence deletions, \( n_I \) sequence insertions, and \( n_S \) symbol substitutions, provided \( n_S + L \cdot \max\{n_I, n_D\} \leq \frac{d_S(C)-1}{L} \), where \( L \) is the length of the sequences and \( d_S(C) \) is the minimum distance of \( C \).

We derived some upper bounds on the size of the sequence-subset codes including a Singleton-like bound and a Plotkin-like bound.

We give a construction of optimal codes (with respect to size) for the special case that \( L \mid d \) and \( M_0^L \) is an integer, where \( M_0 = \frac{1}{L} \). We also give some general constructions, which imply lower bounds of the size of such codes.

B. Other Related Work

In [13], the input and output of the DNA storage channel are both viewed as a multi-set, rather than set, of DNA molecules, where the numbers of the input sequences and output sequences may be different. The fundamental limits of the DNA storage model was investigated under the assumption that each sampled molecule is read in an error-free manner.

Another different channel model for DNA storage was studied in [14], where the process of DNA storage is modelled by two successive channels, i.e., the synthesis channel and the sequencing channel, and the output of the sequencing channel is a set of DNA fragments which can be represented by a profile vector. And three types of errors, namely, substitution errors due to synthesis, coverage errors, and \( \ell \)-gram substitution errors due to sequencing, are considered.

There are other communication channels similar to DNA storage channel. The permutation channel considered in [15] has input and output as vectors over a finite alphabet and the transmitted vector is corrupted by a permutation on its co-ordination. Permutation channel with impairments was considered in [16], where the input and output are multi-sets, rather than vectors, of symbols from a finite alphabet. Such models are not appropriate for DNA storage because in these models, sequences are treated in the symbol level and the structure information of sequences is neglected.

C. Organization

In Section II, we introduce the sequence-subset distance and provide the basic properties of codes with sequence-subset distance. We analyze the upper bound on the size of sequence-subset codes in Section III and give some constructions of such codes in Section IV. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section V.

D. Notations

The following notations will be used in this paper:
1) For any positive integer \( n \), \( [n] := \{1,2,\cdots,n\} \).
2) For any set \( A \), \( |A| \) denotes the size (i.e., cardinality) of \( A \) and \( \mathcal{P}(A) \) denotes the power set of \( A \), i.e., the collection of all subsets of \( A \).
3) For any two sets \( X \) and \( Y \), \( X \setminus Y \) is the set of all elements of \( X \) that do not belong to \( Y \).
4) For any \( n \)-tuple \( x \in A^n \) and any \( i \in [n] \), \( x(i) \) denotes the \( i \)th coordinate of \( x \) and \( x \) is denoted as \( x = (x(1),x(2),\cdots,x(n)) \).

II. Preliminary

We first introduce the sequence-subset distance. Then we discuss the error pattern and error correction in DNA storage channel using codes with sequence-subset distance.
A. Sequence-Subset Distance

Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be a fixed finite alphabet. For DNA data storage, typically, \( \mathcal{A} = \{A, T, C, G\} \), representing the four types of base nucleotides. In this work, for generality, we assume that \( \mathcal{A} \) is any fixed finite alphabet of size \( q \geq 2 \).

Let \( L \) be a positive integer. For any \( x, y \in \mathcal{A}^L \), the Hamming distance between \( x \) and \( y \), denoted by \( d_H(x, y) \), is defined as

\[
d_H(x, y) := |\{i \in [L]: x(i) \neq y(i)\}|.
\]

For any two subsets \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) of \( \mathcal{A}^L \) such that \( |X_1| \leq |X_2| \) and any injection \( \chi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \), denote

\[
d_{\chi}(X_1, X_2) := \sum_{x \in X_1} d_H(x, \chi(x)) + L(|X_2| - |X_1|).
\]

Then a natural way to generalize Hamming distance to unordered subsets of \( \mathcal{A}^L \) is as follows.

**Definition 1:** For any \( X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L \) such that \( |X_1| \leq |X_2| \). The sequence-subset distance between \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) is defined as

\[
d_{S}(X_1, X_2) = d_{S}(X_2, X_1) := \min_{\chi \in \mathcal{X}} d_{\chi}(X_1, X_2),
\]

where \( \mathcal{X} \) is the set of all injections \( \chi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \).

We first prove an important property of the function \( d_{S}(\cdot, \cdot) \). We then prove that it is really a metric.

**Lemma 1:** For any \( X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L \) such that \( |X_1| \leq |X_2| \), there exists a \( \chi_0 \in \mathcal{X} \) such that \( d_{S}(X_1, X_2) = d_{\chi_0}(X_1, X_2) \) and \( \chi_0(x) = x \) for all \( x \in X_1 \cap X_2 \).

**Proof:** The proof is given in Appendix A. \( \blacksquare \)

**Corollary 1:** For any two subsets \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) of \( \mathcal{A}^L \),

\[
d_{S}(X_1, X_2) = d_{S}(X_1 \setminus X_2, X_2 \setminus X_1).
\]

**Proof:** This corollary is just a direct consequence of Definition 1 and Lemma 1. \( \blacksquare \)

**Lemma 2:** Suppose \( X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L \) such that \( |X_1| < |X_2| \). Suppose \( X_2' \subseteq X_2 \) such that \( |X_1| \leq |X_2'| \). Then

\[
d_{S}(X_1, X_2') \leq d_{S}(X_1, X_2).
\]

**Proof:** The proof is given in Appendix B. \( \blacksquare \)

Now we prove that \( d_{S}(\cdot, \cdot) \) is really a distance function (metric) over \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^L) \).

**Theorem 1:** The function \( d_{S}(\cdot, \cdot) \) is a distance function over the power set \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^L) \).

**Proof:** The proof is given in Appendix C. \( \blacksquare \)

B. Error Pattern of DNA Storage Channel

In a DNA storage channel, the input of the channel is a set of sequences

\[
X = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_M\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L
\]

and the output is another set of sequences

\[
Y = \{y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_N\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L,
\]

where \( L \) is the length of each sequence. Due to the channel noise, \( Y \neq X \) in general. Sequences in the subset \( X \cap Y \) are correctly transmitted and sequences in \( (X \setminus Y) \cup (Y \setminus X) \) are erroneous. Let \( n_t \), \( n_d \) and \( n_s \) denote the number of sequence insertions, sequence deletions and symbol substitutions, respectively. To analyze the values of \( n_t \), \( n_d \) and \( n_s \), we consider the following three cases.

Case 1: \( M = M \), i.e., the number of output sequences equals the number of input sequences. Then \( n_d = n_t = 0 \) and there are only symbol substitutions in the output. Clearly, \( |X \setminus Y| = |Y \setminus X| \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X \setminus Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X \) such that each sequence \( x \in X \setminus Y \) is changed to the sequence \( \chi(x) \in Y \setminus X \) due to symbol substitution. Hence, the total number of symbol substitutions is \( n_s = \sum_{x \in X \setminus Y} d_H(x, \chi(x)) \).

Case 2: \( M < M \). In this case, \( n_t = 0 \) and there are \( n_d = M - M \) sequence deletions and (possibly) symbol substitutions in \( Y \). So the subset \( X \setminus Y \) can be further partitioned into two subsets \( X_D \cup X_S \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X_S \rightarrow Y \setminus X \) such that the sequences in \( X_D \) are lost and each sequence \( x \in X_S \) is changed to the sequence \( \chi(x) \in Y \setminus X \) due to symbol substitution. Hence, the total number of symbol substitutions is \( n_s = \sum_{x \in X_S} d_H(x, \chi(x)) \).

\footnote{A more accurate notation for the set \( \mathcal{X} \) is \( \mathcal{X}_{X_1, X_2} \) because it is related to the subsets \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \). However, we can omit the subscripts safely because they can be specified by the context.}
Case 3: \( \hat{M} > M \). In this case, \( n_D = 0 \) and there are \( n_L = \hat{M} - M \) sequence insertions and (possibly) symbol substitutions in \( Y \). So the subset \( Y \setminus X \) can be further partitioned into two subsets \( Y_1 \cup Y_3 \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X \setminus Y \rightarrow Y_3 \) such that the sequences in \( Y_1 \) are excessive and each sequence \( x \in X \setminus Y \) is changed to the sequence \( \chi(x) \in Y_3 \) due to symbol substitution. Hence, the total number of symbol substitutions is \( n_S = \sum_{x \in X \setminus Y} d_H(x, \chi(x)) \).

We will call the 3-tuple \((n_1, n_D, n_S)\) the **error pattern** of \( Y \). Note that at most one of \( n_1 \) and \( n_D \) is nonzero.

For the decoder, when receiving a subset \( Y \subseteq A^L \), its task is to find a possible input subset \( \hat{X} \subseteq A^L \) that is most similar to \( Y \). By the above discussion and Corollary \([1]\), clearly, the sequence-subset distance is a good choice of metric for similarity between \( Y \) and \( \hat{X} \). In the next subsection, we will discuss error correction in DNA storage channel using codes with sequence-subset distance.

**C. Codes with Sequence-Subset Distance**

A sequence-subset code over \( A^L \) is a subset \( C \) of the power set \( \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) of the set \( A^L \). We call each element of \( A^L \) a **sequence** and call \( L \) the **sequence length** of \( C \). The size \( |C| \) of \( C \) is called the code size of \( C \). In contrast, for each codeword \( X \in C \), the size of \( X \) (i.e., the number of sequences contained in \( X \)) is called the **codeword size** of \( C \). The maximum of codeword sizes of \( C \), i.e., \( M = \max \{ |X| : X \in C \} \), is called the **maximal codeword size** of \( C \). A sequence-subset code \( C \) is said to have constant **codeword size** if all codewords of \( C \) have the same codeword size.

The **code rate** of \( C \) is defined as

\[
R = \frac{\log_2 |C|}{\log_2 (\sum_{m=0}^{M} q^m)}
\]

where \( q = |A| \) and \( \sum_{m=0}^{M} (q^m) \) is the number of all subsets of \( A^L \) of size not greater than \( M \).

The **minimum distance** of a sequence-subset code \( C \), denoted by \( d_S(C) \), is the minimum of the sequence-subset distance between any two distinct codewords of \( C \), that is,

\[
d_S(C) = \min \{ d_S(X, Y) : X, Y \in C, X \neq Y \}.
\]

In general, \( L, M, |C| \) and \( d_S(C) \) are the main parameters of \( C \), and we will call \( C \) an \((L, M, |C|, d_S(C))_q \) code.

Let \( C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) be a sequence-subset code. We denote \( \overline{C} = \{ \overline{X} : X \in C \} \), where \( \overline{X} = A^L \setminus X \). By Corollary \([1]\) for any \(X_1, X_2 \in C \), we have \( d_S(X_1, X_2) = d_S(X_1 \setminus X_2, X_2 \setminus X_1) = d_S(\overline{X_1}, \overline{X_2}) \). So \( \overline{C} \) and \( C \) have the same sequence length \( L \), code size \( |C| = |\overline{C}| \) and minimum distance \( d_S(C) = d_S(\overline{C}) \). Hence, for sequence-subset code with constant codeword size \( M \), it is reasonable to assume \( M \leq \frac{|A|^L}{2} \). Otherwise, we can consider \( C \), which has constant codeword size \( \overline{M} = |A|^L - M \leq \frac{|A|^L}{2} \).

A minimum-distance decoder for \( C \) is a function \( D : \mathcal{P}(A^L) \rightarrow C \) such that for any \( Y \in \mathcal{P}(A^L) \),

\[
D(Y) = \arg \min_{X \in C} d_S(X, Y).
\]

**Theorem 2:** Suppose \( C \) has minimum distance \( d_S(C) \) and

\[
n_S + L \cdot \max \{ n_1, n_D \} \leq \frac{d_S(C) - 1}{2}.
\]

Then any error of pattern \((n_1, n_D, n_S)\) can be corrected by the minimum-distance decoder for \( C \).

**Proof:** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_M\} \) be the set of input sequences and \( Y = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_M\} \) be the set of output sequences of the DNA storage channel. It is sufficient to prove that if \( Y \) has error pattern \((n_1, n_D, n_S)\), then

\[
d_S(X, Y) \leq n_S + L \cdot \max \{ n_1, n_D \}.
\]

According to the discussions in the last subsection, we can consider the following three cases.

**Case 1:** \( \hat{M} = M \). Then \( n_D = n_1 = 0 \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X \setminus Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X \) such that

\[
n_S = \sum_{x \in X \setminus Y} d_H(x, \chi(x)).
\]

From \( |Y| = \hat{M} = M = |X| \), we have \( |X \setminus Y| = |Y \setminus X| \). Denote \( X_1 = Y \setminus X \) and \( X_2 = X \setminus Y \). Then by \([1]\) and \([4]\),

\[
d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{x \in X_1} d_H(x, \chi(x)) + L(|X_2| - |X_1|)
\]

\[
= n_S + \max \{ n_1, n_D \},
\]

\[2\]The symbol insertions/deletions can be converted to sequence insertion or symbol substitutions as follows. For each received sequence \( y \) with length \( L' < L \), replace \( y \) by \( y' = (y, z) \) such that \( z \) is a randomly chosen sequence with length \( L - L' \); for each received sequence \( y \) with length \( L' > L \), replace \( y \) by \( y' \), where \( y' \) is the subsequence of \( y \) formed by the first \( L \) coordinates of \( y \). Then \( y' \) is either a sequence insertion or at most \( L \) symbol substitutions.
where the last equality is due to the fact that \( n_D = n_I = 0 \). Hence, from Corollary 1 and Definition 1 we have

\[
d_S(X, Y) = d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_X(X_1, X_2) = n_S + \max\{n_I, n_D\}.
\]

Case 2: \( \tilde{M} < M \). Then \( n_I = 0 \) and \( n_D = M - \tilde{M} \). Moreover, \( X\backslash Y \) can be partitioned into two subsets \( X_D \cup X_S \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X_S \to Y \setminus X \) such that

\[
n_S = \sum_{x \in X_S} d_H(x, \chi(x)).
\]

Denote \( X_1 = Y \setminus X \) and \( X_2 = X \setminus Y \). Then \( |X_2| - |X_1| = |X| - |Y| = M - \tilde{M} \) and \( \chi^{-1} \) is an injection from \( X_1 \) to \( X_2 \). So by (1) and (5), we have

\[
d_{\chi^{-1}}(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{y \in X_1} d_H(y, \chi^{-1}(y)) + L(|X_2| - |X_1|)
= \sum_{x \in X_S} d_H(x, \chi(x)) + L(|X_2| - |X_1|)
= n_S + L(M - \tilde{M})
= n_S + L \cdot n_D
= n_S + \max\{n_I, n_D\},
\]

where the last equality comes from the fact that \( n_I = 0 \). Hence, from Corollary 1 and Definition 1 we have

\[
d_S(X, Y) = d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_{\chi^{-1}}(X_1, X_2) = n_S + \max\{n_I, n_D\}.
\]

Case 3: \( \tilde{M} > M \). Then \( n_D = 0 \) and \( n_I = \tilde{M} - M \). Moreover, the subset \( Y \setminus X \) can be partitioned as \( Y_I \cup Y_S \) and there is a bijection \( \chi : X \setminus Y \to Y_S \) such that \( n_S = \sum_{x \in X \setminus Y} d_H(x, \chi(x)) \). Similar to Case 2, we can prove that

\[
d_S(X, Y) = d_S(X \setminus Y, Y \setminus X)
\leq d_X(X \setminus Y, Y \setminus X)
= n_S + L \cdot n_I
= n_S + \max\{n_I, n_D\}.
\]

By the above discussion, we proved

\[
d_S(X, Y) \leq n_S + L \cdot \max\{n_I, n_D\}.
\]

Combining this with (3), we have

\[
d_S(X, Y) \leq \frac{d_S(C) - 1}{2}.
\]

So \( X = \arg\min_{X \in C} d_S(X, Y) = D(Y) \). Hence, \( X \) can be correctly recovered by the minimum distance decoder.  

In [11] and [12], it was assumed that the number of output sequences is always smaller than the number of input sequences. In this work, we dismiss this assumption and allow the number of output sequences of the DNA storage channel to be larger than the number of input sequences.

### III. Bounds on the Size of Sequence Subset Codes

Let \( S_q(L, M, d) \) denote the maximum number of codewords in a sequence-subset code over a \( q \)-ary alphabet with sequence length \( L \), constant codeword size \( M \) and minimum sequence-subset distance at least \( d \). In this section, we always assume that \( A \) is an alphabet of size \( q \).

#### A. Upper Bound for the Special Case \( L \mid d \)

Clearly, for any code \( C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) with constant codeword size \( M \), the minimum distance \( d_S(C) \leq LM \), from which we have \( S_q(L, M, d) = 0 \) if \( M < \frac{d}{L} \). Now, suppose \( L \mid d \) and \( M_0 = \frac{d}{L} \). We present an upper bound on \( S_q(L, M_0, d) \).

**Theorem 3:** Suppose \( L \mid d \) and \( M_0 = \frac{d}{L} \). We have

\[
S_q(L, M_0, d) \leq \left\lfloor qM_0^{\frac{d}{L}} \right\rfloor.
\]

**Proof:** Suppose \( C = \{X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_N\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) is an arbitrary sequence-subset code with constant codeword size \( M_0 \) and minimum distance \( d \), where for each \( i \in [N] \), \( X_i = \{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \cdots, x_{i,M_0}\} \subseteq A^L \). Denote \( N = |C| \). We need to prove \( N \leq qM_0^{\frac{d}{L}} \). For each \( \ell \in [L] \) and \( i \in [N] \), let

\[
W_{i,\ell} = \bigcup_{j \in [M_0]} \{x_{i,j}(\ell)\}.
\]
From this we have

\[ q \leq |A| = q. \]  

(7)

Note that by the construction of \( W_i,\ell \), for each \( i \in [N] \) and \( j \in [M_0] \), \( x_{i,j} \in W_{i,1} \times W_{i,2} \times \cdots \times W_{i,L} \). And since each \( X_i = \{ x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,M} \} \) is a subset of \( A^L \), then we have

\[ |W_{i,1} \times W_{i,2} \times \cdots \times W_{i,L}| = \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} |W_{i,\ell}| \geq M_0. \]  

(8)

Now, consider (8). By the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means, for each \( \ell \in [L] \), we have

\[ \frac{q}{N} \geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |W_{i,\ell}| \geq \left( \prod_{i=1}^{N} |W_{i,\ell}| \right)^{\frac{1}{N}}. \]

Combining this with (8), we have

\[ \left( \frac{q}{N} \right)^L \geq \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{N} |W_{i,\ell}| \right)^{\frac{1}{L}} = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} |W_{i,\ell}| \right)^{\frac{1}{L}} \geq \left( M_0^N \right)^{\frac{1}{L}} = M_0. \]

From this we have \( \frac{q}{N} \geq M_0^{\frac{1}{L}} \), which implies \( N \leq qM_0^{-\frac{1}{L}} \). Hence,

\[ S_q(L, M_0, d) \leq qM_0^{-\frac{1}{L}}. \]

Since \( S_q(L, M_0, d) \) is an integer, so

\[ S_q(L, M_0, d) \leq \left[ qM_0^{-\frac{1}{L}} \right], \]

which completes the proof.

**B. Plotkin-like Bound**

We present the Plotkin-like Bound of sequence-subset codes as the following theorem.

**Theorem 4 (Plotkin-like Bound):** Let \( C \) be an \( (L, M, N, d)_q \) code such that \( rLM < d \), where \( r = 1 - \frac{1}{q} \). Then

\[ N \leq \frac{d}{d - rLM}. \]

**Proof:** Suppose \( C = \{ X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_N \} \) such that for each \( i \in [N] \), \( X_i = \{ x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \cdots, x_{i,M} \} \subseteq A^L \). First, we have the following claim, which we will prove later.

**Claim 1:** For any distinct \( i_1, i_2 \in [N] \),

\[ d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}). \]  

(9)

Let

\[ A = \sum_{i_1, i_2 \in [N]} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}). \]
Since $d$ is the minimum distance of $C$, we have
\[
\begin{aligned}
d \leq & \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{\{i_1,i_2\} \subseteq [N]} d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \\
= & \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in [N], i_1 \neq i_2} d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in [N]} d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in [N]} \sum_{j_1,j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}) \\
= & \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{M} \cdot A,
\end{aligned}
\]  
(10)

where the last inequality is obtained according to (9).

For each $a \in A$ and $\ell \in [L]$, let $n_{\ell,a}$ be the number of $(i, j) \in [N] \times [M]$ such that $x_{i,j}(\ell) = a$. Then
\[
\sum_{a \in A} n_{\ell,a} = NM
\]
and
\[
A = \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in [N]} \sum_{j_1,j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}) \\
= \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \sum_{a \in A} n_{\ell,a}(NM - n_{\ell,a}) \\
= L(NM)^2 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} n_{\ell,a}^2.
\]  
(11)

For each $\ell \in [L]$, by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,
\[
\left( \sum_{a \in A} n_{\ell,a} \right)^2 \leq q \sum_{a \in A} n_{\ell,a}^2,
\]
where $q = |A|$. Combining this with (11), we obtain
\[
A \leq L(NM)^2 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \frac{1}{q} \left( \sum_{a \in A} n_{\ell,a} \right)^2 \\
= L(NM)^2 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \frac{1}{q} \left( NM \right)^2 \\
= \left( 1 - \frac{1}{q} \right) L(NM)^2.
\]  
(12)

Combining (10) and (12), we have
\[
N \leq \frac{d}{d - rLM},
\]
where $r = 1 - \frac{1}{q}$.

**Proof of Claim 1:** Let $\mathcal{S}_M$ denote the permutation group on $[M]$. For each $j_1, j_2 \in [M]$, there are $(M-1)!$ permutations $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_M$ such that $\chi(j_1) = j_2$. So we have
\[
\sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_M} \sum_{j \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,\chi(j)}) \\
= (M-1)! \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}).
\]  
(13)
So by Definition 1, we have
\[
d_S(X_i, X_i) \leq \frac{1}{M!} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{P}_M} d_S(X_i, X_i)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{M!} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{P}_M} \sum_{j \in [M]} d_H(x_{i,j}, x_{i,j})
\]
\[
= \frac{(M-1)!}{M!} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2})
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in [M]} d_H(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}),
\]
where the second equality comes from (13).

**C. Singleton-like Bound**

For each code \( C = \{X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_N\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \), denote
\[
V(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} X_i.
\]  

Further, let \( \tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \) denote the maximum number of codewords in a sequence-subset code \( C \) over a \( q \)-ary alphabet \( A \) with sequence length \( L \), constant codeword size \( M \), minimum sequence-subset distance at least \( d \) and \( |V(C)| \leq K \). Clearly, for any \( K \leq q^L \),
\[
\tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \leq \tilde{S}_q(L, M, q^L, d) = \tilde{S}_q(L, M, d).
\]

We first prove a recursive bound on \( \tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \) as the following lemma.

**Lemma 3:** Suppose \( d \leq LM \) and \( K \leq q^L \). We have
\[
\tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \leq \frac{K}{M} \tilde{S}_q(L, M-1, K-1, d).
\]

**Proof:** Let \( C = \{X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_N\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) be a sequence-subset code with constant codeword size \( M \), minimum distance at least \( d \) such that \( |V(C)| \leq K \) and size \( |C| = N = \tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \), where \( X_i = \{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \cdots, x_{i,M}\} \subseteq A^L \) for each \( i \in [N] \). For each \( x \in V(C) \), let
\[
C(x) = \{X \in C : x \in X\}
\]
and
\[
\overline{C}(x) = \{X = X \setminus \{x\} : X \in C(x)\}.
\]

Then \( \overline{C}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A^L) \) has constant codeword size \( M - 1 \), size \( |\overline{C}(x)| = |C(x)| \) and
\[
|V(\overline{C}(x))| \leq K - 1.
\]

Moreover, for any distinct \( \overline{X}_{i,1}, \overline{X}_{i,2} \in \overline{C}(x) \), by the construction of \( \overline{C}(x) \), we have \( \overline{X}_{i,1} = \overline{X}_{i,2} \setminus \{x\} \) and \( \overline{X}_{i,2} = \overline{X}_{i,2} \setminus \{x\} \) for some distinct \( X_{i,1}, X_{i,2} \in C(x) \). So \( \overline{X}_{i,1} \setminus \overline{X}_{i,2} = X_{i,1} \setminus X_{i,2} \) and \( \overline{X}_{i,2} \setminus \overline{X}_{i,1} = X_{i,2} \setminus X_{i,1} \), and hence by Corollary 1,
\[
d_\overline{S}(\overline{X}_{i,1}, \overline{X}_{i,2}) = d_\overline{S}(X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}).
\]

So we have \( d_\overline{S}(\overline{C}(x)) = d_\overline{S}(C(x)) \). On the other hand, since \( C(x) \subseteq C \), then \( d_\overline{S}(C(x)) \geq d_\overline{S}(C) = d \). Hence, \( d_\overline{S}(\overline{C}(x)) \geq d \).

By the above discussion, for each \( x \in V(C) \), we have
\[
|\overline{C}(x)| \leq \tilde{S}_q(L, M-1, K-1, d).
\]

Now we estimate \( |\overline{C}(x)| \). Since \( |\overline{C}(x)| = |C(x)| \), it is sufficient to estimate \( |C(x)| \). By a simple counting technique, we have
\[
\sum_{x \in V(C)} |C(x)| = \sum_{X \in C} |X| = MN.
\]

So there exists an \( x_0 \in V(C) \) such that
\[
|C(x_0)| \geq \frac{MN}{|V(C)|} \geq \frac{MN}{K}.
\]

Hence,
\[
N \leq \frac{K}{M} |\overline{C}(x_0)| = \frac{K}{M} |C(x_0)|.
\]
Note that $|\mathcal{C}| = \tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) = N$. Then we have

$$\tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \leq \frac{K}{M} \tilde{S}(S_0).$$

This, combining with (17), implies that

$$\tilde{S}_q(L, M, K, d) \leq \frac{K}{M} \tilde{S}_q(L, M - 1, K - 1, d),$$

which completes the proof.

**Theorem 5 (Singleton-like Bound):** Suppose $rLM_0 < d \leq LM_0$, where $r = 1 - \frac{1}{q}$ and $M_0 = \lceil \frac{q}{k} \rceil$. Then

$$S_q(L, M, d) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{M-M_0-1} \frac{qL-k}{M-k} \cdot f(L, M_0, q),$$

where

$$f(L, M_0, q) = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{qM_0 - d}{L} \right\rfloor & \text{if } d = LM_0; \\ \frac{d}{d - rLM_0} & \text{if } rLM_0 < d < LM_0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

**Proof:** Denote $\overline{M} = M + M_0$. Repeatedly using Lemma 5 we have

$$\tilde{S}_q(L, M, qL, d) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{M_0-1} \frac{qL-k}{M-k} \tilde{S}_q(L, M_0, qL - M, d).$$

Moreover, according to (15), we have

$$S_q(L, M, d) = \tilde{S}_q(L, M, qL, d)$$

and

$$\tilde{S}_q(L, M_0, qL - M_0, d) \leq S_q(L, M_0, qL, d) = S_q(L, M, d).$$

Combining the above equations, we have

$$S_q(L, M, d) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{M-M_0-1} \frac{qL-k}{M-k} \cdot S_q(L, M_0, d). \quad (19)$$

Let $f(L, M_0, q)$ be defined as in (18). By Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 we have

$$S_q(L, M_0, d) \leq f(L, M_0, q).$$

Combining this with (19), we have

$$S_q(L, M, d) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{M-M_0-1} \frac{qL-k}{M-k} \cdot f(L, M_0, q),$$

which completes the proof.

**Remark 1:** It is easy to see that

$$\left(\frac{qL}{M}\right) = \left(\prod_{k=0}^{M-M_0-1} \frac{qL-k}{M-k}\right) \left(\frac{qL-M+M_0}{M_0}\right).$$

So the bound in Theorem 5 gives a bound on the code rate as

$$\frac{S_q(L, M, d)}{\left(\frac{qL}{M}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{\left(\frac{qL-M+M_0}{M_0}\right)} \cdot f(L, M_0, q),$$

where $f(L, M_0, q)$ is defined as in (18).

**IV. Constructions of Sequence-Subset Codes**

In this section, we give some constructions of sequence-subset codes.
A. Construction of Optimal Codes

In this subsection, we give a construction of optimal \((L, M_0, d)_q\) code (with respect to the code size) for the special case that \(L | d\) and \(M_0^\frac{1}{d}\) is an integer, where \(M_0 = \frac{d}{L}\).

**Theorem 6:** Suppose \(L | d\) and \(M_0^\frac{1}{d}\) is an integer, where \(M_0 = \frac{d}{L}\). There exists an \((L, M_0, d)_q\) sequence-subset code whose code size is \(qM_0^\frac{1}{d}\).

**Proof:** To simplify notation, denote \(N = \left\lfloor qM_0^\frac{1}{d} \right\rfloor\). Then

\[
g \geq NM_0^\frac{1}{d}.
\]

Let \(\mathbb{A} = [q] = \{1, 2, \ldots, q\}\). Since \(g \geq NM_0^\frac{1}{d}\), then we can partition \(\mathbb{A}\) into \(N\) mutually disjoint subsets \(W_1, W_1, \ldots, W_N\) such that for each \(i \in [N]\), \(|W_i| \geq M_0^\frac{1}{d}\). So the size of the Cartesian product \(W_i^L\) of \(L\) copies of \(W_i\) is greater than \(|M_0|\), and hence we can pick a subset \(X_i = \{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,M_0}\} \subseteq W_i^L\). Now, let \(C = \{X_i; i \in [N]\}\). Then \(C \subseteq \Pi(\mathbb{A}^L)\) is a sequence-subset code with constant codeword size \(M_0\) and \(|C| = N = \left\lfloor qM_0^\frac{1}{d} \right\rfloor\). Moreover, since \(W_1, W_1, \ldots, W_N\) are mutually disjoint, it is easy to verify that for any distinct \(i_1, i_2 \in [N]\) and any \(j_1, j_2 \in [M_0]\),

\[
d_S(x_{i_1,j_1}, x_{i_2,j_2}) = L.
\]

So

\[
d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = LM_0 = d
\]

for any distinct \(i_1, i_2 \in [N]\), and hence \(d_S(C) = d\).

In summary, \(C\) is an \((L, M_0, d)_q\) sequence-subset code of size \(qM_0^\frac{1}{d}\). \(\blacksquare\)

Note that by Theorem 3, if \(L | d\) and \(M_0 = \frac{d}{L}\), then \(S_g(L, M_0, d) \leq \left\lfloor qM_0^\frac{1}{d} \right\rfloor\). So the code \(C\) constructed in Theorem 6 is optimal with respect to size, and we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 2:** Suppose \(L | d\) and \(M_0^\frac{1}{d}\) is an integer, where \(M_0 = \frac{d}{L}\). We have

\[
S_g(L, M_0, d) = \left\lfloor qM_0^\frac{1}{d} \right\rfloor.
\]

B. Construction Based on Binary Codes

The construction given in this subsection is a modification of the Construction 2 of [11].

Let \(C_1 = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_K\} \subseteq \mathbb{A}^L\) be a code over \(\mathbb{A}\) and \(C_2 = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_N\} \subseteq \Pi^R\) be a binary code. For each \(w_i \in C_2\), let

\[
X_i = \{x: j \in \text{supp}(w_i)\},
\]

where \(\text{supp}(w_i) = \{j \in [K]; w_i(j) \neq 0\}\) is the support of \(w_i\). Further, let

\[
C = \{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N\}.
\]

Then we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 7:** Suppose \(C_1\) has minimum (Hamming) distance \(d_1\) and \(C_2\) has minimum (Hamming) distance \(d_2\). Then \(C\) has sequence length \(L\), code size \(|C| = N\), and the minimum sequence-subset distance \(d_S(C)\) satisfies

\[
d_S(C) \geq d_1 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rfloor.
\]

**Proof:** Clearly, \(C\) has sequence length \(L\) and code size \(|C| = N\). We only need to prove that \(d_S(C) \geq d_1 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rfloor\).

Let \(X_{i_1}\) and \(X_{i_2}\) be any distinct codewords of \(C\). We need to prove \(d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \geq d_1 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rfloor\). Without loss of generality, assume that \(|X_{i_1}| \leq |X_{i_2}|\). Then we have \(|X_{i_1} \setminus X_{i_2}| \leq |X_{i_2} \setminus X_{i_1}|\). To simplify notation, denote

\[
\overline{X}_{i_1} = X_{i_1} \setminus X_{i_2}
\]

and

\[
\overline{X}_{i_2} = X_{i_2} \setminus X_{i_1}.
\]

For an arbitrary injection \(\chi : X_{i_1} \rightarrow X_{i_2}\), by [1],

\[
d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = \sum_{x \in X_{i_1}} d_H(x, \chi(x)) + L(|X_{i_2} \setminus |X_{i_1}|).
\]
Since $C_1$ has minimum (Hamming) distance $d_1$ and by construction of $C$, $x$ and $\chi(x)$ are distinct codeword in $C_1$, so
\[ \sum_{x \in X_i} d_H(x, \chi(x)) \geq |X_i| \cdot d_1. \]

Moreover, since $C_1 \subseteq A^L$, then $L \geq d_1$. Hence, by (20),
\[ d_H(x, \chi(x)) \geq |X_i| \cdot d_1 + d_1(|X_i| - |X_i|) = d_1 \cdot |X_i|, \]
where $d_2$ is the minimum (Hamming) distance of $C_2$. Note that $|X_i| \leq |X_i|$. Then by the above equation, we have $|X_i| \geq \frac{d_2}{2}$. Moreover, since $|X_i|\}$ is an integer, so
\[ |X_i| \cdot \left\lceil \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rceil. \]
Combining this with (21), we have
\[ d_H(x, \chi(x)) \geq d_1 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rceil. \]

Note that $\chi : X_i \rightarrow X_i \setminus X_i$ is an arbitrary injection. So by Definition I and Corollary I, we have
\[ d_S(X_i, X_i) = d_S(X_i \setminus X_i, X_i \setminus X_i) \geq d_1 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{d_2}{2} \right\rceil, \]
which completes the proof.

**Remark 2:** The code $C$ constructed in this subsection may or may not have constant codeword size, depending on whether $C_2$ is a constant weight binary code. In fact, if $C_2$ is a constant weight code, then $C$ has constant codeword size. Otherwise, $C$ does not have constant codeword size.

### C. Construction Based on Block Codes

In this subsection, if $x = (x(1), x(2), \ldots, x(L)) \in A^L$ and $I = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m\} \subseteq [L]$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m$, then we denote $x(I) = (x(i_1), x(i_2), \ldots, x(i_m))$.

The construction given in this subsection is an improvement of the Construction 1 of [11].

Let $C_1 = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_M\} \subseteq A^{L_1}$ be a code over $A$ with block length $L_1$ and minimum (Hamming) distance $d_1$, and $C_2 = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N\} \subseteq A^{d_1 M}$ be a code over $A$ with block length $d_1 M$ and minimum (Hamming) distance $d_2$. For each $j \in [M]$, let
\[ I_j = \{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}; (j - 1)d_1 \leq \ell \leq jd_1\} \]
and for each $i \in [N]$, let
\[ X_i = \{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,M}\} \]
such that for each $j \in [M], \ x_{i,j} = (s_j, u_i(I_j)). \]

Finally, let
\[ C = \{X_i; i \in [N]\}. \]

Then we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 8:** The code $C$ constructed by (22) has sequence length $L = L_1 + d_1$, constant codeword size $M$, code size $|C| = N$, and minimum sequence-subset distance
\[ d_S(C) \geq d_2. \]

**Proof:** Clearly, $C$ has sequence length $L = L_1 + d_1$, constant codeword size $M$ and code size $|C| = N$. We only need to prove that $d_S(C) \geq d_2$. 

Let \( i_1, i_2 \in [N] \) be any two distinct elements of \([N]\), we need to prove that \( d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \geq d_2 \), where \( X_{i_1} = \{x_{i_1,1}, x_{i_1,2}, \ldots, x_{i_1,M}\} \) and \( X_{i_2} = \{x_{i_2,1}, x_{i_2,2}, \ldots, x_{i_2,M}\}\). For any permutation \( \chi : [M] \rightarrow [M] \), let

\[
N = \{j \in [M]; \chi(j) = j\}
\]

and

\[
\overline{N} = \{j \in [M]; \chi(j) \neq j\}.
\]

Then \( \mathcal{N} \cap \overline{\mathcal{N}} = \emptyset \) and \( \mathcal{N} \cup \overline{\mathcal{N}} = [M] \). Moreover, by (1), we have

\[
d_{\chi}(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,\chi(j)})
\]

\[
= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,\chi(j)}) + \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,\chi(j)})
\]

\[
= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}) + \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}).
\]

(23)

We will estimate the two terms of the right side of (23) separately.

First, since \( C_2 \) has minimum (Hamming) distance \( d_2 \) and for each \( i \in [N] \) and \( j \in [M] \), \( u_i(I_j) \) has length \( d_1 \), then by construction of \( C \), we have

\[
\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}) - \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j})
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=1}^{M} d_H(u_{i_1}(I_j), u_{i_2}(I_j)) - \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(u_{i_1}(I_j), u_{i_2}(I_j))
\]

\[
\geq d_2 - |\overline{\mathcal{N}}| \cdot d_1.
\]

Second, since \( C_1 \) has minimum (Hamming) distance \( d_1 \), then by construction of \( C \), we have

\[
\sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}) \geq \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(s_j, s_{\chi(j)}) \geq |\overline{\mathcal{N}}| \cdot d_1.
\]

Combining the above two inequalities with (23), we obtain

\[
d_{\chi}(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}) + \sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}} d_H(x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j})
\]

\[
\geq (d_2 - |\overline{\mathcal{N}}| \cdot d_1) + |\overline{\mathcal{N}}| \cdot d_1
\]

\[
= d_2.
\]

Since \( \chi : [M] \rightarrow [M] \) is an arbitrary bijection, then by Definition (1) we have

\[
d_S(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) \geq d_2.
\]

Moreover, since \( i_1 \) and \( i_2 \) are any two distinct elements of \([N]\), so we have

\[
d_S(C) \geq d_2,
\]

which completes the proof.

Remark 3: Using the product of multiple copies of \( C \), the construction in this subsection can be further extended as follows. Let \( n \) be a given positive integer. For each \( n \)-tuple \( i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_n) \in [N]^n \), let

\[
X_i = \{x_{i_1,1}, x_{i_1,2}, \ldots, x_{i_1,M}\}
\]

such that for each \( j \in [M] \),

\[
x_{i,j} = (s_j, u_{i_1}(I_j), \ldots, u_{i_n}(I_j)).
\]

Note that any bijection between \( X_{i_1} \) and \( X_{i_2} \) is equivalent to a permutation on the index set \([M]\). So in (1), we can use permutations on \([M]\) to replace bijections between \( X_{i_1} \) and \( X_{i_2} \).
Finally, let
\[ \mathcal{C} = \{ \mathbf{X}_i; i = (i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n) \in [N]^n \}. \]
Then the code \( \mathcal{C} \) has sequence length \( L = L_1 + nd_1 \), constant codeword size \( M \), code size \( |\mathcal{C}| = N^n \), and minimum sequence-subset distance
\[ d_s(\mathcal{C}) \geq d_2. \]

V. CONCLUSIONS

We introduced a new metric over the power set of the set of all vectors over a finite alphabet, which generalizes the classical Hamming distance and was used to establish a uniform framework to design error-correcting codes for DNA storage channel. Some upper bounds on the size of the sequence-subset codes were derived and some constructions of such codes were proposed.

It is still an open problem to analyze the tight upper bounds on the size of sequence-subset codes and design optimal codes for general parameters of sequence length, codeword size and minimum distance.

Another interesting problem is how to design sequence-subset codes for DNA storage channel that can be efficiently encoded and decoded.

The sequence-subset distance (Definition 1) can be directly applied to multisets of \( \mathcal{A}_0^L \). So studying of the properties of codes over the space of all multisets of \( \mathcal{A}_0^L \) with sequence-subset distance is also a possible research direction.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

If \( \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 = \emptyset \), the claim is naturally true. So we assume that \( \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \neq \emptyset \).

First, we claim that for each \( \chi \in \mathscr{X} \) such that \( d_{S}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = d_{\chi}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \) and each \( y \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \), there exists an \( x \in \mathbf{X}_1 \) such that \( y = \chi(x) \). This can be proved, by contradiction, as follows. Suppose there is a \( y \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \) such that \( y \neq \chi(x) \) for all \( x' \in \mathbf{X}_1 \). Then we can let \( \chi' : \mathbf{X}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_2 \) be such that \( \chi'(y) = y \) and \( \chi'(x') = \chi(x') \) for all \( x' \in \mathbf{X}_1 \setminus \{y\} \) (see Fig. 2 for an illustration). Note that \( d_{H}(y, \chi'(y)) = 0 < d_{H}(y, \chi(y)) \) and \( d_{H}(x', \chi'(x')) = d_{H}(x', \chi(x')) \) for all \( x' \in \mathbf{X}_1 \setminus \{y\} \). So by (1), we have \( d_{\chi'}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) < d_{\chi}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \), which contradicts to (2). Hence, by contradiction, for each \( y \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \), there exists an \( x \in \mathbf{X}_1 \) such that \( y = \chi(x) \).

Fig 2. An illustration of the bijections in the proof of Lemma 1. For the bijection \( \chi \), we have \( \chi(y) = y_0 \neq y \), where \( y \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \). We modify the bijection \( \chi \) to a different bijection \( \chi' \) by letting \( \chi'(y) = y \), and the image of all other elements of \( \mathbf{X}_1 \) keeping unchanged.

Now, pick a \( \chi \in \mathscr{X} \) such that \( d_{S}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = d_{\chi}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \) and let
\[ \mathcal{N}(\chi) = \{ y' \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2; \chi(y') \neq y' \}. \]
If \( \mathcal{N}(\chi) = \emptyset \), then by the definition of \( \mathcal{N}(\chi) \), \( \chi(x) = x \) for all \( x \in \mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2 \) and we can choose \( \chi_0 = \chi \). Otherwise, pick a \( y \in \mathcal{N}(\chi) \) and we have \( \chi(y) = y_0 \) for some \( y_0 \in \mathbf{X}_2 \setminus \{y\} \). Moreover, by previous discussion, there exists an \( x \in \mathbf{X}_1 \) such that
y = \chi(x). Then we can let \chi': X_1 \to X_2 be such that \chi'(x) = y_0, \chi'(y) = y and \chi'(x') = \chi_0(x') for all x' \in X_1 \setminus \{x, y\} (see Fig. 3 for an illustration). Note that

\[ d_H(x, \chi'(x)) + d_H(y, \chi'(y)) = d_H(x, y_0) + d_H(y, y) \]
\[ \leq d_H(x, y) + d_H(y, y_0) \]
\[ = d_H(x, \chi(x)) + d_H(y, \chi(y)) \]

and

\[ d_H(x', \chi'(x')) = d_H(x', \chi(x')), \forall x' \in X_1 \setminus \{x, y\}. \]

So by (2), we have

\[ d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2) = d_{\chi}(X_1, X_2) = d_{\chi}(X_1, X_2). \]

By construction of \chi', we have \mathcal{N}(\chi') = \mathcal{N}(\chi) \setminus \{y\}, where

\[ \mathcal{N}(\chi') = \{y \in X_1 \cap X_2; \chi'(y) \neq y\}. \]

If \mathcal{N}(\chi') = \emptyset, then by the definition of \mathcal{N}(\chi'), \chi'(x) = x for all x \in X_1 \cap X_2 and we can choose \chi_0 = \chi'. Otherwise, by the same discussion, we can construct a \chi'': X_1 \to X_2 such that \mathcal{N}(\chi'') = \mathcal{N}(\chi') \setminus \{y\}, and so on. Since \mathcal{N}(\chi') \subseteq X_1 \cap X_2 is a finite set, we can always find a \chi_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\chi') such that \mathcal{N}(\chi_0) = \{y \in X_1 \cap X_2; \chi_0(y) \neq y\} = \emptyset.

Hence, we have \chi_0(x) = x for all x \in X_1 \cap X_2, which completes the proof.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 2**

It suffices to prove that if \(X_2' \subseteq X_2\) and \(|X_1| \leq |X_2'| = |X_2| - 1\), then

\[ d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2') \leq d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2). \]

Without loss of generality, we can assume

\[ X_1 = \{x_1, \cdots, x_n\} \]

and

\[ X_2 = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_{n+1}, \cdots, y_{n+s-1}, y_{n+s}\}, \]

where \(s \geq 1\), such that

\[ X_2' = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_{n+1}, \cdots, y_{n+s-1}\} \]

and

\[ d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2') = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + L(s-1). \]

By Definition 4 we can suppose

\[ d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + Ls, \]

where \(\{\ell_i; i = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}\) is a subset of \(\{1, 2, \cdots, n + s\}\). We have the following two cases.

Case 1: \(n + s \notin \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \cdots, \ell_n\}\). In this case, we have

\[ d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2') = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + L(s-1) \]
\[ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + L(s-1) \]
\[ < \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_H(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + Ls) \]
\[ = d_{\mathcal{N}}(X_1, X_2), \]

where the first inequality is obtained by (2).
Without loss of generality, we can assume that $d$ and $d'$ for any three subsets $X$. Inequality, that is, Corollary 1, $d$ such that $k / \ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n$. Since $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{H}^L$, we have

$$d_{H}(x_j, y_k) - d_{H}(x_j, y_{\ell_j}) \leq L.$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

Denote $\ell'_j = k$ and $\ell'_i = \ell_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \backslash \{j\}$. Then we have

$$d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H}(x_i, y_i) + L(s - 1) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H}(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + L(s - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_{H}(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) - d_{H}(x_j, y_{\ell_j}) + d_{H}(x_j, y_k) + L + (s - 1)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H}(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + Ls = d_S(X_1, X_2),$$

where the first inequality is obtained by (2) and the second inequality is obtained by (24).

Hence, we always have $d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_S(X_1, X_2)$, which completes the proof.

**APPENDIX C**

**PROOF OF THEOREM I**

By Definition 1 it is easy to see that for any two subsets $X_1$ and $X_2$ of $\mathbb{H}^L$, $d_S(X_1, X_2) = d_S(X_2, X_1) \geq 0$. Moreover, by Corollary 1, $d_S(X_1, X_2) = 0$ if and only if $X_1 = X_2$. To show that $d_S(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a distance function, we need to prove the triangle inequality, that is,

$$d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_S(X_1, X_3) + d_S(X_2, X_3)$$

for any three subsets $X_1, X_2$ and $X_3$ of $\mathbb{H}^L$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $|X_1| \leq |X_2|$. Then we have the following three cases.

**Case 1.** $|X_1| \leq |X_2| \leq |X_3|$. In this case, we can fix a subset $X'_3 \subseteq X_3$ of size $|X'_3| = |X_3|$. Then by Lemma 2, $d_S(X_1, X'_3) \leq d_S(X_1, X_3)$ and $d_S(X_2, X'_3) \leq d_S(X_2, X_3)$. So it suffices to prove that

$$d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_S(X_1, X'_3) + d_S(X_2, X'_3).$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume

\[ X_1 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}, \]
\[ X_2 = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n, y_{n+1}, \ldots, y_{n+s}\}, \]
\[ X'_3 = \{z_1, \ldots, z_n, z_{n+1}, \ldots, z_{n+s}\} \]

such that

\[ d_S(X_1, X'_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H}(x_i, z_i) + Ls, \]
\[ d_S(X_2, X'_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_{H}(y_i, z_i) \]

and

\[ d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H}(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + Ls, \]
where \( \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \cdots, \ell_n\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \cdots, n+s\} \). Then we have

\[
d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_{\ell_i}) + Ls
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + Ls
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_H(x_i, z_i) + d_H(y_i, z_i)) + Ls
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, z_i) + Ls + \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_i)
\]

\[
= d_S(X_1, X'_3) + d_S(X_2, X'_3)
\]

\[
\leq d_S(X_1, X_3) + d_S(X_2, X_3),
\]

where the first inequality is obtained by \((2)\) and the last inequality is obtained by Lemma \((2)\).

**Case 2.** \( |X_1| \leq |X_3| \leq |X_2| \). In this case, we can assume

\[
X_1 = \{x_1, \cdots, x_n\},
\]

\[
X_3 = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_{n+1}, \cdots, y_{n+s}\},
\]

\[
X_2 = \{z_1, \cdots, z_n, z_{n+1}, \cdots, z_{n+s}, z_{n+s+1}, \cdots, z_{n+s+t}\}
\]

such that

\[
d_S(X_1, X_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + Ls,
\]

\[
d_S(X_2, X_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_i) + Lt
\]

and

\[
d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, z_{\ell_i}) + L(s + t),
\]

where \( \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \cdots, \ell_n\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \cdots, n+s+t\} \). Then we have

\[
d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, z_{\ell_i}) + L(s + t)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, z_i) + L(s + t)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_H(x_i, y_i) + d_H(y_i, z_i)) + L(s + t)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + Ls + \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_i) + Lt
\]

\[
= d_S(X_1, X_3) + d_S(X_2, X_3),
\]

where the first inequality is obtained by \((2)\).

**Case 3.** \( |X_3| \leq |X_1| \leq |X_2| \). In this case, we can assume

\[
X_3 = \{x_1, \cdots, x_n\},
\]

\[
X_1 = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_{n+1}, \cdots, y_{n+s}\},
\]

\[
X_2 = \{z_1, \cdots, z_n, z_{n+1}, \cdots, z_{n+s}, z_{n+s+1}, \cdots, z_{n+s+t}\}
\]

such that

\[
d_S(X_1, X_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, y_i) + Ls,
\]

\[
d_S(X_2, X_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(x_i, z_i) + L(s + t)
\]
and
\[ d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_{\ell_i}) + Lt, \]
where \( \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n+s+t\} \). Then we have
\[
d_S(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_{\ell_i}) + Lt \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+s} d_H(y_i, z_{\ell_i}) + Lt \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_H(x_i, y_i) + d_H(x_i, z_i)) + Lt \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^n d_H(x_i, y_i) + Ls + \sum_{i=1}^n d_H(x_i, z_i) + L(s+t) \\
= d_S(X_1, X_3) + d_S(X_2, X_3),
\]
where the first inequality is obtained by (2), and the third inequality is obtained from the simple fact that \( d_H(\cdot, \cdot) \leq L \).
For all cases, we have proved that
\[ d_S(X_1, X_2) \leq d_S(X_1, X_3) + d_S(X_2, X_3). \]
So \( d_S(\cdot, \cdot) \) satisfies the triangle inequality.

By the above discussion, we proved that \( d_S(\cdot, \cdot) \) is a distance function over \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}^L) \).
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