Concept Paper



# A Latency Spectrum Framework for Interpreting Genomic Memory Across Biological Time

Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi *

Posted Date: 27 February 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1

Keywords: temporal genomics, gene latency, latency spectrum, genomic memory, non-executing genomic states, conditional genomic accessibility

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1



*Concept Paper*

# A Latency Spectrum Framework for Interpreting Genomic Memory Across Biological Time

**Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi**

School of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Shaqra, Saudi Arabia, alrohaimi@su.edu.sa

**Abstract**

The prevailing binary paradigm of gene regulation—genes being either "on" or "off"—captures immediate transcriptional activity but remains insufficient for representing the temporal depth of biological systems [1,4]. Biological processes such as cellular memory, irreversible differentiation, and the ordered progression of chronic disease indicate that genomic elements can retain historical information that constrains future biological states [3,4]. While epigenetic mechanisms have substantially advanced understanding of regulatory persistence [1,7,8], existing frameworks provide limited means to describe, compare, or contextualize long-term genomic information that remains conditionally accessible yet non-executing across extended biological timescales [4]. Here, we propose a conceptual framework for temporal genomics based on a Latency Spectrum, in which genomic elements—coding or non-coding—are characterized by their capacity to preserve information in non-executing states that remain conditionally retrievable. We outline five illustrative dimensions of this spectrum—Depth, Capacity, Retrieval Cost, Fidelity, and Duration—and discuss plausible biological correlates and empirical strategies through which each dimension may be examined. By conceptualizing gene latency as a graded and interpretable property rather than a binary condition, this framework refines how genomic memory, plasticity, and irreversibility can be understood across development, aging, and disease [3,8]. We suggest that systematic analysis of latency landscapes provides a foundation for integrating biological time into functional genomics and for advancing temporally informed models of genomic regulation [4].

**Keywords**: temporal genomics, gene latency, latency spectrum, genomic memory, non-executing genomic states, conditional genomic accessibility

## 1. Introduction

Advances in genomic technologies have enabled unprecedented resolution in the characterization of molecular states, allowing detailed mapping of gene expression, chromatin architecture, and regulatory interactions across diverse biological contexts **[1,4]**. High-throughput sequencing, single-cell profiling, and integrative multi-omic approaches have transformed the ability to capture regulatory configurations with remarkable precision. Despite these achievements, a fundamental conceptual limitation persists: biological systems evolve through time, whereas most genomic interpretations remain anchored to static or quasi-static observations. Consequently, regulatory analyses often emphasize instantaneous molecular states while underrepresenting the cumulative influence of prior biological history.

This limitation becomes particularly evident in biological contexts dominated by temporal ordering, persistence, and path dependence. Genetically similar individuals frequently exhibit divergent disease trajectories despite comparable early molecular profiles, while chronic diseases typically emerge through ordered, multi-stage progression rather than discrete causal events **[3]**. Similarly, late-stage therapeutic interventions often fail even when molecular targets are successfully

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1



engaged, suggesting that biological behavior cannot be fully understood as a function of current regulatory state alone. Instead, it reflects constraints accumulated across extended temporal intervals that shape future system behavior.

## 2. Biological History and Trajectory-Based Interpretation

Biological systems are inherently historical. Present regulatory behavior is shaped not only by current stimuli, but also by prior states that influence how future regulatory options are accessed. In many physiological and pathological contexts, change unfolds gradually rather than abruptly. Extended periods of subclinical adaptation—such as low-grade inflammation, metabolic imbalance, compensatory signaling, or regulatory buffering—often precede overt phenotypic transitions. These prolonged phases are widely documented across development, aging, and chronic disease **[3,4]**, yet they remain difficult to reconcile with models that prioritize instantaneous regulation or isolated causal triggers.

Trajectory-based interpretations provide a complementary framework in which biological outcomes are understood as paths through a constrained regulatory space. From this perspective, systems are progressively shaped by the accumulation of prior constraints that restrict accessible future states. However, prevailing genomic frameworks continue to privilege state-based descriptions, implicitly treating regulatory configurations as reversible and context-independent. This emphasis obscures how long-term persistence of regulatory features can bias future behavior even in the absence of active execution.

## 3. Epigenetic Persistence and Its Conceptual Limits

Epigenetic mechanisms have provided a critical advance toward incorporating temporal persistence into genomic interpretation. Chromatin modifications, DNA methylation, histone variants, and higher-order genome organization demonstrate how regulatory states can be maintained across cell divisions and environmental fluctuations **[1,7,8]**. These discoveries have substantially advanced understanding of cellular identity, lineage commitment, and regulatory stability.

Nevertheless, epigenetic frameworks have largely focused on the persistence of active or recently executed regulatory states. Conceptually, they are optimized to explain how transcriptional programs are stabilized, maintained, or reactivated following perturbation. By contrast, they offer limited tools for describing how genomic information may be preserved in non-executing states—states that are transcriptionally inactive yet remain informationally relevant across extended biological timescales **[4]**. As a result, long-term regulatory constraints that do not manifest as active expression often remain outside formal interpretation.

## 4. Latency as Conditional Non-Execution

To address this gap, genomic elements can be considered not only in terms of execution, but also in terms of conditional non-execution. Under this view, certain genomic regions persist in transcriptionally inactive configurations while retaining the capacity to influence future regulatory behavior under specific conditions. These regions are not silent in an absolute sense; rather, they occupy states that are insulated from immediate execution while remaining structurally, contextually, and topologically preserved.

We refer to this property as **gene latency**—a functional characterization describing how genomic information can remain non-executing while continuing to shape the temporal organization of biological systems. Latency emphasizes informational persistence rather than activity, focusing on how genomic elements maintain relevance across time even when not actively deployed.

## 5. Latency Is not Silence or Irrelevance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1



Importantly, latency should not be conflated with functional silence or evolutionary redundancy. A non-executing state does not imply inactivity in a broader biological sense, nor does it indicate lack of selective relevance. Instead, latency describes a mode of regulatory insulation in which genomic elements are shielded from immediate execution while preserving the potential to constrain or enable future responses. Such states may become consequential only under specific contextual conditions, including prolonged physiological stress, developmental transitions, environmental shifts, or cumulative system-level change.

From this perspective, latency represents a regulatory strategy rather than a failure of function, allowing biological systems to retain informational resources without incurring the costs or risks associated with continuous execution.

## 6. Time, Latency, and biological Memory

Viewed through this lens, latency introduces time as an explicit organizing dimension of genomic regulation. Rather than reflecting transient repression, latent states encode aspects of prior biological experience, allowing past conditions to influence how regulatory options are accessed in the future. In this sense, latency aligns with broader concepts of biological memory—not as stored outputs or discrete molecular marks, but as a constrained landscape of regulatory possibilities shaped by accumulated history **[4,8]**.

Such memory need not reside in a single molecular mechanism. Instead, it may emerge from coordinated persistence across multiple genomic features, including chromatin organization, sequence context, regulatory topology, and interaction networks. Latency thus provides a unifying interpretive framework for understanding how temporal constraints arise without invoking a single causal substrate.

## 7. Pseudogenes Within a temporal Genomic Framework

Within this temporal framing, pseudogenes provide a particularly illustrative example. Traditionally categorized as non-functional remnants of gene duplication or retrotransposition, pseudogenes have often been interpreted through structural or evolutionary lenses. However, their widespread conservation, frequent transcriptional engagement, and integration within regulatory networks suggest that their persistence cannot be fully explained by structural redundancy alone **[5,6]**.

Interpreted through latency, pseudogenes may be better understood as genomic elements whose primary relevance lies in long-term informational persistence rather than immediate execution. Their value may reside not in direct protein-coding capacity, but in their ability to influence regulatory topology, competitive interactions, or future accessibility under specific conditions. This perspective reframes pseudogenes not as failed genes, but as contributors to the temporal architecture of the genome.

## 8. Latency as a genome-Wide Property

Latency is not restricted to pseudogenes or any single class of genomic elements. Instead, it represents a property that may be expressed to varying degrees across coding genes, regulatory regions, and non-coding sequences. From this standpoint, latency reflects how genomic information is positioned within a regulatory landscape shaped by prior constraints, rather than a binary distinction between functional and non-functional DNA.

Conceptualizing latency as a graded, context-dependent property allows genomic elements to be evaluated in terms of their contribution to future regulatory potential rather than solely by immediate output. This view supports a more continuous and temporally informed understanding of genome organization.

## 9. Latent Constraints, Trajectories, and Irreversibility

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1



Framing genomic regulation in terms of latency also provides insight into biological irreversibility. As latent constraints accumulate, systems may progressively lose access to alternative regulatory configurations, resulting in trajectories that become increasingly difficult to redirect. Irreversible differentiation, age-associated decline, or resistance to late-stage intervention may thus arise not from isolated molecular failures, but from gradual restriction of accessible regulatory space **[3]**.

Biological outcomes are therefore shaped not only by present signals, but by the historical paths already taken and the latent states that delimit future possibilities.

## 10. Why latency Escapes Snapshot-Based Genomics

These dynamics help explain why latency-related effects are often difficult to detect using prevailing experimental approaches. Much of contemporary genomics relies on snapshot-based measurements that capture regulatory states at single moments in time. While such approaches yield exceptional molecular resolution, they are inherently limited in their ability to register cumulative, time-indexed constraints that emerge gradually across extended biological histories.

As a result, latent regulatory features may remain effectively invisible within standard analytical frameworks—not because they lack biological relevance, but because they fall outside the temporal scope of measurement.

## 11. Scope and Intent of the Framework

This framework does not propose a newly discovered molecular mechanism, nor does it seek to provide a unifying causal explanation for complex biological phenomena. It does not replace established models of gene regulation, epigenetic memory, or systems-level control. Instead, it offers a structured interpretive lens for understanding how non-executing genomic states may contribute to the temporal organization of biological systems. By focusing on interpretation rather than mechanism, this framework complements existing approaches and supports the development of temporally informed analyses in functional genomics.

## 12. Conclusions

In an era of steadily increasing molecular resolution, the central challenge confronting genomics may no longer reside solely in the ability to observe regulatory detail, but rather in the capacity to interpret how such detail persists, accumulates, and constrains biological systems over time. Contemporary genomic technologies excel at capturing instantaneous molecular states with extraordinary precision; however, they remain comparatively limited in their ability to account for the historical dimensions of regulation that shape future biological behavior. This imbalance risks overemphasizing execution while underrepresenting persistence as a fundamental determinant of system-level outcomes.

By foregrounding latency as an interpretable property of genome organization, this framework draws attention to a class of regulatory states that remain non-executing yet informationally consequential across extended timescales. Such states need not manifest as immediate molecular outputs to exert biological influence. Instead, they operate by modulating the accessibility, cost, and stability of future regulatory options, thereby shaping biological trajectories in a path-dependent manner. Latency thus provides a conceptual bridge between molecular state and biological history, offering a structured means to interpret how prior conditions continue to influence regulatory behavior long after their initiating signals have dissipated.

Recognizing these temporally embedded constraints reframes genomic function as a dynamic interplay between inherited regulatory configurations, accumulated biological experience, and future responsiveness. From this perspective, genome function cannot be fully described by what genes execute at a given moment, but must also account for how persistent, non-executing states delimit the space of possible responses. Incorporating latency into genomic interpretation therefore advances a view of genomics that is explicitly temporal—one that integrates past conditions with present

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.1963.v1



regulation to better understand the emergence of irreversibility, divergence, and long-term biological change.

**Conflicts of Interests:** The author declares no competing interests.

## References

1. Cavalli, G. & Heard, E. Advances in epigenetics link genetics to the environment and disease. *Nature* **571**, 489–499 (2019).
2. Wagner, A. Arrival of the fittest: solving evolution's greatest puzzle. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **20**, 717–735 (2019).
3. López-Otín, C. et al. Hallmarks of aging: An expanding universe. *Cell* **186**, 243–278 (2023).
4. Paldi, A. & Cavalli, G. Time as a dimension in gene regulation and cell identity. *Trends Cell Biol.* (2025).
5. Lin, Y.-H. et al. Pseudogene: relevant or irrelevant? *Biomed. J.* **48**, 100790 (2025).
6. Nourbakhsh, M. et al. Pseudogene-derived long noncoding RNAs in cancer. *Gene Dis.* (2025).
7. Ptashne, M. Epigenetics: mechanisms of stability and change. *Curr. Biol.* **31**, R111–R114 (2021).
8. Brewer, G. Epigenetic memory. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **24**, 96 (2024).