

**Supp. Figure 1.** Error matrices where true allele counts are shown on x-axis and observed allele counts based on genotype calls are shown on y-axis. The SFS is inferred by either GATK or SAMtools with the multi-sample calling pipeline (A) or the single-sample calling pipeline (B). The first two columns show the error matrix with all allele counts and the next two columns show the error matrix with first five allele counts.



**Supp. Figure 2.** Evaluation of accuracy of inferred SFS by the call-based and direct estimation approach based on 100 replicates of genomic regions of length 100Kb when expected nucleotide diversity is  $2 * 10^{-4}$  and sequencing error rate is  $10^{-3}$ . A. Shapes of the inferred SFS (shown in colors in legend) compared to the ground-truth SFS (shown in grey) for coverage 2X, 5X, 10X, 20X, B. relative deviation of a fraction of sites with the non-reference allele counts of 1-4, C. a measure of a distance between the inferred and ground-truth SFS (KL divergence).



**Supp. Figure 3.** Evaluation of accuracy of inferred SFS by the call-based and direct estimation approach based on 100 replicates of genomic regions of length 100Kb when expected nucleotide diversity is  $5 * 10^{-3}$  and sequencing error rate is  $10^{-3}$ . A. Shapes of the inferred SFS (shown in colors in legend) compared to the ground-truth SFS (shown in grey) for coverage 2X, 5X, 10X, 20X, B. relative deviation of a fraction of sites with the non-reference allele counts of 1-4, C. a measure of a distance between the inferred and ground-truth SFS (KL divergence).



**Supp. Figure 4.** The distribution of observed error rates from sequencing experiment simulations given the sequencing error rate we used for simulations (shown in the title).



**Supp. Figure 5.** Shapes of the inferred SFS (shown in colors in legend) compared to the ground-truth SFS (shown in grey) for coverage 2X, 5X, 10X, 20X



**Supp. Figure 6.** The SFS from simulated genotype data of length 100kb. Data are simulated with a constant population size (blue), an exponential population growth with a rate of 0.01% (red), and an exponential population decline with a rate of -0.01% (blue). For each scenario, the SFS from 100 replicates are shown with thin lines and the mean SFS over 100 replicates is shown with a bold line.



**Supp. Figure 7.** Evaluation of accuracy of inferred SFS by the call-based and direct estimation approach based on 100 replicates of genomic regions of length 100Kb under an exponential population decline model (rate=-0.01%). A. Shapes of the inferred SFS (shown in colors in legend) compared to the ground-truth SFS (shown in grey) for coverage 2X, 5X, 10X, 20X, B. relative deviation of a fraction of sites with the non-reference allele counts of 1-4, C. a measure of a distance between the inferred and ground-truth SFS (KL divergence).



**Supp. Figure 8.** The empirical distribution of Tajima's D associated with sliding windows of length 100kb in a 10Mb genomic region. The dotted red line indicates top 1% (ranked in an increasing order).