

Supplemental Figure 1. Population genetic statistics on chromosomes of *C. reinhardtii*. Upper panels are nucleotide diversity (π) , lower panels are Kelly's ZnS in non-overlapping windows of 5 kb. Trend lines were fit using Loess regression.

Supplemental Figure 2. Decay of linkage disequilibrium (LD) on 17 chromosomes of *C. reinhardtii.* LD is measured as the squared correlation coefficient (r²) between SNP pairs*.*

.

Supplemental Figure 3. Growth rates of strains under heterotrophic conditions. The rates are measured as the amount of color intensity produced by the NADH reduction of a tetrazolium-based redox dye. Values are means + S.E.

Supplemental Figure 4. Growth rates for *C. reinhardtii* strains under phototrophic conditions. The rates are measured as change in absorbance at $\lambda = 680$ nm per hour for 8-12 days. Values are means + S.E.

Supplemental Figure 5. Chlorophyll content in strains of *C. reinhardtii.* Content was measured from Allophycocyanin (APC-A) fluorescence intensities. Values are means + S.E.

Supplemental Table 1. Summary of STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al. 2001) analyses.

^aMean log-likelihood of K
^bStandard deviation of the

^bStandard deviation of the log likehood of K \degree See definitions in Evanno et al. (2005)

Supplemental Table 2. Candidate major effect mutations in metabolic enzymes of *C. reinhardtii.*

Supplemental Table 3. Summary of *de novo* assembly results.

^ak-mer length specified in Velvet (Zerbino and Birney 2008)

Supplemental Table 4. InterProScan5 predictions of PFAM domains for *de novo* assembled contigs. Gene model identifiers are default identifiers produced by Augustus. Identical gene model identifiers from different strains do not imply they are the same gene.

Supplemental Table 5. Genome segments in laboratory strains that are not identical-by-descent (IBD) with CC-503. The boundaries of the segments were identified by manual inspection of non-reference SNP counts in nonoverlapping windows of 25 kb. The reported intervals are inclusive of the boundary but may include a small number of bases that are IBD with CC-503 owing to a lack of precision using the window-based approach.

Supplemental Table 6. Chromosomal breakpoints of large copy number gains in strains of *C. reinhardtii* relative to CC-503. Breakpoints were identified by manually inspecting normalized coverage depth in 499 bp windows.

Supplemental Table 7. Summary of SNP-filtering protocol including cut-off thresholds.

Chr	Position	Transcript	AA	REF^b -	REF-	ALT^c -	$ALT-$	REF-Strain	ALT-Strain
			Change ^a	Illumina	Sanger	Illumina	Sanger		
1	2209754	Cre01.g012100.t1.3	$Y267*$	T	$\mathbf T$	G	G	125	1373
	2210377	Cre01.g012100.t1.3	Y321*	\mathcal{C}	$\overline{}$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}		1373
1	2215883	Cre01.g012126.t1.2	$Y48*$	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125, 2937	2935
	3533275	g523.t1	W14*	G	G	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125	2931
	7078063	g1132.t1	$Q31*$	$\mathbf C$	${\bf C}$	$\mathbf T$	$\rm T$	2931	1373
$\mathbf{2}$	4421439	Cre02.g099850.t1.3	W30*	${\bf G}$	${\bf G}$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125, 2290	2937
$\mathbf{2}$	4421646	Cre02.g099850.t1.3	$L44*$	$\boldsymbol{\mathrm{T}}$	$\mathbf T$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125, 2290	2937
3	1409312	Cre03.g151050.t1.3	$Q86*$	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	T	T	2838	2931
3	7198504	Cre03.g207918.t1.2	Y294*	$\boldsymbol{\mathrm{T}}$	T	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125	2343
$\overline{4}$	15343	g4492.t1	W247*	G	$\mathbf G$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	2343	2290
4	2175298	Cre04.g219796.t1.2	W206*	G	G	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	2935	2342
4	2304507	g4809.t1	W85*	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	T	$\mathbf T$	125	2290
5	313924	Cre05.g233400.t1.3	$E5*$	G	G	T	$\mathbf T$	125	2290
6	1150879	g5779.t1	$Y32*$	G	$\mathbf G$	\mathcal{C}	$\mathbf C$	125	2935
6	1651003	g5865.tl	$Q19*$	G	G	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125	2938
6	2349518	g6002.t1	K81*	$\mathbf T$	$\mathbf T$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125	2931
6	3486202	g6244.tl	$R19*$	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	$\mathbf T$	$\rm T$	1373, 2935	2344
$\overline{7}$	2617704	g7686.t1	$Q64*$	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	T	T	125	2931
$10\,$	210521	Cre10.g419200.t1.3	S59*	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	2931, 2343	2935
10	713044	Cre10.g422550.t1.2	E746*	$\mathsf C$	$\mathbf C$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{A}	125	2935
10	5378206	Cre10.g458350.t3.1	Q552*	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{C}	T	$\mathbf T$	125	2343
11	7934	g11450.t1	S91*	$\mathbf G$	$\mathbf G$	$\mathbf T$	G	125	2342, 1952, 2290
11	8163	g11450.t1	$R15*$	G	G	\mathbf{A}	G	2931	1952, 2290, 2342,
11	626316	g11543.t1	W13*	$\mathbf C$	$\mathbf C$	$\mathbf T$	$\mathbf T$	125	2343, 2344 2935

Supplemental Table 8. PCR and Sanger-based sequencing validation of randomly selected nonsense SNPs.

^aAmino acid change
^bREF refers to the reference genotype
^cALT refers to the alternate genotype

Supplemental Methods

Genome sequencing. Cells were grown on liquid media and genomic DNA extracted using Qiagen DNeasy Plant Maxi kits at $OD_{680} = 0.8$ followed by ethanol precipitation to concentrate DNA to 20 ng/uL. Paired-end libraries were constructed using Illumina TruSeq kits with 1 microgram of the concentrated genomic DNA. DNA was sheared using the Covaris sonicator with settings suggested in the TruSeq manual. Library preparation was carried out using agarose gel purification to select for insert sizes of approximately 400 bps. PCR amplification was performed for 10 cycles using Kapa HiFi DNA polymerase, which ensures higher fidelity in the GC-rich portions of *Chlamydomonas* DNA. Completed library quality was assessed on an Agilent Bioanalyzer using the DNA 1000 analysis kit, and concentration was determined by quantitative PCR (Kapa Biosystems Library Quantification Kit - Illumina/LightCycler® 480). 2 X 51 paired-end sequencing was performed on a HiSeq 2000 (Illumina). A small proportion of read pairs were discarded prior to alignment due to an imaging problem encountered for some samples.

Sequence alignment and processing. The *Chlamydomonas* reference genome (JGI v5) and annotation (v5.3.1) was downloaded from Phytozome (http://www.phytozome.net/) (Goodstein et al., 2011). The reference genome was modified to include chloroplast Genbank: BK000554.2 (Maul et al., 2002) and mitochondrial genome (Genbank: U03843.1) sequences. Raw HiSeq 2000 image data were processed with the Casava 1.8.2 (Illumina) pipeline and reads failing Illumina's default quality control filters

removed. Paired-end reads were aligned with the Burrows-Wheeler Aligner (BWA 0.6.1) (Li et al., 2008) aln and sampe programs with default settings. Sample BAM files were processed by running FixMateInformation (Picard-tools v. 1.62; http://picard.sourceforge.net), removing pairs of sequence reads where at least one read was marked as a duplicate by MarkDuplicates (Picard-tools), and re-aligning reads using the Genome Analysis Toolkit RealignerTargetCreator/IndelRealigner (GATK, version 2.6-4; DePristo et al., 2011) to minimize the number of SNPs called in indel regions. The sample alignments were then used in various downstream steps including TE insertion polymorphism and structural variant prediction. For SNP-calling, sample alignment files were merged with MergeSamFiles (Picard-tools v. 1.62) and sequence reads globally realigned across samples using the RealignerTargetCreator/IndelRealigner.

Variant calling and genotyping. SNP-calling was performed using the Unified Genotyper (UG) v.2.6-4 (DePristo et al., 2011) configured for haploid genomes. Reads with mapping quality zero and with low base quality were filtered prior to SNP calling per the GATK default settings. Base qualities were capped at their mapping quality, and bases close to indels adjusted during the SNP-calling step using the Base Alignment Quality (BAQ) method to reduce false positives near indels (Li and Durbin, 2009).

 This yielded a set of 8,331,693 SNPs which were then filtered to reduce false positives including artefacts reported for deep sequencing data (Li, 2014). First, heterozygous genotypes in haploid samples are enriched for false positives (Li, 2014). To identify such problematic variants, SNPs were called with a parallel diploid run of the UG and variants with heterozygous genotype(s) excluded from further analysis. Second,

low complexity regions harbor a large proportion of artifactual SNPs and indels in high coverage data (Li, 2014). Approximately 8 Mb (7% of the genome assembly) of low complexity sequence was identified using mdust (http://bit.ly/mdust-LC) and SNPs in these regions were removed. Third, we partitioned the SNP data into bins based on individual summary statistics (e.g., depth, quality, degree of strand bias etc.) and estimated the ts:tv ratio in each bin. Tails of the distribution of each statistic were filtered if tails bins had unusually low ts:tv as these SNPs are likely enriched for false positives (DePristo et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012). Finally, a small number of SNPs (~2,700) with non-reference base calls in the re-sequenced reference strain (CC-503) were filtered from our final call set. These SNPs represent either base-calling errors in the reference assembly or artifacts in the re-sequenced CC-503. Details of the filtering thresholds are listed in Supplemental Table 7.

Insertion/deletion (indel) polymorphisms were called using the UG configured for haploid genomes. Indels were filtered in a similar fashion to SNPs by excluding variants in low complexity regions (Li, 2014), excluding indels with heterozygote genotypes called in a diploid call set, and excluding indels with non-reference genotype calls in the re-sequenced CC-503. We also examined possible frameshift mutations, but the high number of frameshift calls, and their similar frequency in genes with *Arabidopsis* homologs versus those without suggested a high false positive rate for indel detection. We excluded indels from further consideration.

SNP effects were inferred with snpEff v. 3.5a (http://snpeff.sourceforge.net, Cingolani et al., 2012) including the -canon option. In cases where SNPs had multiple effect classifications, the effect predictions were simplified to the single most "damaging"

effect category (Cingolani et al. 2012) using the GATK VariantAnnotator (DePristo et al., 2011). A large percentage of *Chlamydomonas* codons segregate for multiple SNPs. The effect of such SNPs (e.g., nonsense, nonsynonymous or synonymous) can be misclassified by snpEff which only considers the impact of individual SNPs in isolation. We therefore removed these SNPs from analysis of nonsense polymorphisms and summaries of SNP counts. However, to avoid excluding multi-SNP codons from diversity estimates, we adopted an evolutionary pathways approach (Nei and Gojobori, 1986) implemented using the software SNAP (Korber, 2000) to estimate nonsynonymous nucleotide diversity (π_N) and synonymous nucleotide diversity (π_S) . Sites masked by our low complexity filter are not excluded in synonymous and nonsynonymous site counts in the π_N and π_S estimates. This is expected to have a minor impact on diversity estimates owing to the relatively small number of sites masked as low complexity in CDS regions $(958,359/38,532,900 = 0.025)$.

Population genetic analysis. Population genetic parameters were estimated directly from the processed BAM alignments using POPBam v. 0.3 (Garrigan, 2013) in sliding windows. These window-based estimates of population parameters were therefore not subject to the filtering protocol described for SNP calls made by the Unified Genotyper. POPBam infers consensus bases at each genome position, applies a limited filtering protocol (e.g., eliminating calls from low coverage samples, requiring no missing data at a site), and is appropriate for population genetic inferences in haploid organisms. We inferred genome-wide levels of nucleotide diversity (Nei, 1987) and Kelly's ZnS (Kelly, 1997) statistics in sliding windows of 5, 10, or 25 kb. These summary statistics were

estimated by including one laboratory strain CC-125 (137c) as an additional independent sample, and excluding strain CC-2290 (a clonemate of CC-1952) (Gross et al., 1988) and CC-4414 (a field isolate which our analysis found to be almost identical to CC-125/CC-503). Inspection of polymorphism levels along chromosomes suggested that chromosome ends may have lower diverisity and higher LD compared with other genomic regions. We evaluated this by dividing the genome into intervals of 10 kb, estimating nucleotide diversity and Kelly's ZnS, and testing if the terminal-most 10 intervals (i.e., 100 kb) of each chromosome had different levels of diversity or LD than the remaining intervals with a two-tailed Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test. Principal component analysis (PCA) of SNP genotypes was conducted using SNPRelate (Zheng et al., 2012). The neighbor-joining (NJ) tree was constructed using a custom perl script to generate the Jukes-Cantor distance (Jukes and Cantor, 1969) matrix from the filtered SNP data and MEGA6 (Tamura et al., 2013) to implement the NJ method. The linkage disequilibrium statistic r^2 was inferred using the hap-r2 method in vcftools v 0.1.12a (Danecek et al., 2011).

STRUCTURE (v. 2.3.4, Pritchard et al. 2000) was used to cluster samples into populations. The input SNP dataset was prepared by randomly sampling approximately 10,000 SNPs from the filtered dataset described above to limit the impact of linkage on clustering (Pritchard et al. 2000). Analyses were conducted using the admixture model and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) performed with a burn in of 150,000 steps and chain lengths of 350,000. Runs were conducted on 10 field isolates (excluding CC-4414) including only CC-1952 from the known clonemates (i.e., CC-2290/CC-1952) and one laboratory strain (CC-125) with correlated allele frequencies among populations, without

prior location information and assuming no linkage among SNPs. Analyses were repeated 10 times for each value of K (i.e., $K=1$ to $K=6$) to ensure predicted admixture proportions and model likelihoods were consistent among replicate runs. One run at $K=3$ yielded admixture proportions inconsistent with the other runs. This run and an arbitrarily selected run from each of the other K's were removed from further consideration (Supplemental Table 1). The Evanno method (Evanno et al. 2005) was implemented using a standalone version of Structure Harvester (version vA.1; Dent and vonHoldt 2012) to assist in identification of the optimal number of clusters. A spike in ∆K (Evanno et al. 2005) at $K=3$ (Supplemental Table 1) and the existence of largely unadmixed individuals representing each of the clusters at this value of K, but not $K=4$, suggest that three distinct populations exist in our sample set (Pritchard et al. 2000). Admixture proportions of individuals across multiple replicate runs were determined using CLUMPP (Jakobsson and Rosenberg 2007) and presented in Figure 2C.

Structural variation. Gene deletions were identified using the following coverage breadth criterion. Gene models with coverage breadth of at least 90% (i.e., 90% of sites covered by at least one read) in the resequenced reference strain, but less than 15% coverage breadth in at least one of the 19 non-reference strains were called deletions and those with less than 50% coverage were called partial deletions. For genes with multiple alternative splice variants, this criterion was applied to the canonical (i.e., longest) transcripts. Coverage breadth was determined using bedtools v. 2.17.0 (Quinlan and Hall, 2010). We were concerned that unusually high GC content (64%) in *Chlamydomonas* (Merchant et al., 2007) and 70% or higher in many coding regions might lead to low

coverage sequencing in gene regions and introduce false positives for gene deletions. This issue was addressed by requiring that gene models CC-503 be covered at 90% of nucleotide sites in order for the gene to be considered a deletion in a non-reference strain.

Regions with probable copy number gains were identified by calculating coverage per sample in 499 bp intervals using the GATK (DePristo et al., 2011) DepthOfCoverage tool. Normalized coverage was calculated as the log₂ ratio of sample coverage per interval / median sample coverage across all windows. Large tracts (greater than approximately 30 kb) in which normalized coverage was approximately 2-fold higher than typical values were identified as duplications by manual inspection.

Additional classes of structural variation were predicted using a paired-end mapping (PEM) approach with SVDetect (version 0.8b, Zeitouni et al. 2010). For this analysis, sample alignments used for SNP-calling were further processed to remove read pairs where one or both reads had mapping quality less than 20 to reduce false positives associated with mis-mapping of reads (Lucas Lledó and Cáceres 2013). The processing script BAM preprocessingPairs.pl (Zeitouni et al. 2010) was used to extract anomalous read pairs for input into the SVD etect linking program and to obtain σ length and μ length parameters from read pairs with normal forward/reverse orientations. SVDetect clusters were identified using window sizes calculated as $2^*\mu + 2^*\sigma$ and step length $(2^*\mu)$ $+ 2[*]\sigma$ /4 where μ and σ represent the mean and standard deviation of normally paired reads following the example in Zeitouni et al. (2010). Strand and order filtering were applied as described in Zeitouni et al. (2010) using μ and σ parameters as inputs and the minimum number of read pairs for a cluster to be retained was set to 20 read pairs. The σ threshold for each indel and duplication thresholds was set to 3. Predicted variants

associated with scaffolds, cpDNA, or mtDNA were removed from the final set of SV predictions. Additional filters were applied using default settings.

Transposable element (TE) insertion polymorphism. Transposable element insertions in sample genomes relative to the reference assembly were predicted using RetroSeq (Keane et al. 2013, https://github.com/tk2/RetroSeq). We used the soft-clipped, unaligned parts of the sequence reads covering the insertion sites to distinguish between independent insertions at closely situated sites. Retroseq identifies inconsistently mapped reads where one end is mapped with confidence (anchored reads), while it mate is either unmapped or mapped to a distant location with low mapping quality. In the discovery phase, discordant read pairs that may support a TE insertion were identified in each sample alignment (see above). We supplied a file specifying a set of TE types obtained from Repeatmasker (www.repeatmasker.org) and a corresponding BED file of locations in the reference genome using the option -refTEs. The output of the discovery phase is a list of read pair names per TE type were provided to the calling phase. The calling phase was run separately for each strain. For insertion predictions, we required a minimum mapping quality of 50 for the anchoring reads and only events supported by at least 24 read pairs including at least 12 forward oriented anchored reads upstream and 12 reverse oriented anchored reads downstream. We required that the distance from the last forward oriented upstream anchor to the first reverse oriented downstream anchor to be less than 120 bp. We used the –filter option and provided a set of TE predictions in the CC-503 reference TEs to limit redundancy of calls TE regions. The final call set was then filtered to include only the most confident TE insertion predictions with an FL tag value of 8 in the output VCF. Finally, we generate presence/absence matrix of the TE insertions in the

different *Chlamydomonas* strains (Supplemental Dataset 1) using bedtools (Quinlan and Hall, 2010)

Functional annotation. Gene Ontology (GO), Panther, PFAM, KEGG Orthology, and Arabidopsis homologs terms were retrieved from Phytozome version 9.0 (Goodstein et al., 2011) and KEGG Pathway assignments were obtained KEGG Orthology mapping (Kanehisa and Goto, 2000). Additional gene classifiers were obtained from specialized sources including GreenCut2 (Karpowicz et al., 2011), plantTFDB v3.0 (Zhang et al., 2011) (http://planttfdb.cbi.pku.edu.cn/), and Cildb v3.0 (Arnaiz et al., 2009) (http://cildb.cgm.cnrs-gif.fr/), which was the source for the flagellar proteome data of Pazour et al. (Pazour et al., 2005). GOSlim terms were obtained using the stand-alone version of the AgBase GOSlimViewer tool (http://www.agbase.msstate.edu/) (McCarthy et al., 2006). The *Chlamydomonas*-specific gene analysis and gene family-based analysis were based on predictions in the GreenPhylv4 database (http://www.greenphyl.org; (Rouard et al., 2011). Gene identifier mapping across genome versions were necessary to incorporate the GreenCut2 gene set into the analysis. Identifier mapping was performed using a table available from Phytozome 10 which is based on prediction from the Algal Functional Annotation Tool (Lopez et al., 2011). The v5 gene models in the Creinhardtii_236 reference annotation (Goodstein et al., 2011) used in our study had previously been filtered to remove genes overlapping > 30% overlap to transposable elements (Blaby et al., 2014). An additional 202 of 17,737 genes were found with TErelated PFAM domains (Piriyapongsa et al., 2007) and were excluded from the analysis.

All gene-level analyses are based on these 17,535 canonical transcripts (i.e., longest CDS) in the Phytozome version 9.0 annotation (i.e., Creinhardtii 236 gene.gff3).

De novo **assembly and gene prediction**. Reads that failed to map to the reference genome were trimmed using Trimmomatic (Bolger et al., 2014) and *de novo* assembled using Velvet v. 1.2.08 (Zerbino and Birney, 2008). VelvetOptimiser (http://bioinformatics.net.au/software.velvetoptimiser.shtml) was used to identify the optimum k-mer lengths, expected coverage, and coverage cutoffs for each sample (VelvetOptimiser.pl -s 21 -e 45). Assembled contigs greater than 400 bps were retained and genes predicted with Augustus v. 2.7 (Stanke et al., 2004) incorporating *Chlamydomonas* species settings and allowing for partial gene models. Functional annotations were then predicted with InterProScan 5 (Jones et al., 2014) and a gene included in our *de novo* assembled gene set if the protein contained one or more PFAM domains found in eukaryotes (Phylodome, Novatchkova et al., 2005) and did not contain TE-related domains (Piriyapongsa et al., 2007). Predicted proteins were then confirmed by BLAST (Altschul et al., 1990) similarity searches against the non-redundant database (Pruitt et al., 2005) and manually scrutinized for potential contaminants. Proteins meeting these criteria were then searched against the CC-503 reference proteome using BLAST (Altschul et al., 1990) to verify they are unrelated to reference genes, and against the 345 kb mating type mt- locus (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/GU814015) (Ferris et al., 2010) to identify genes specific to the mt- locus that are absent from the CC-503 assembly. We note that the total assembled lengths of these contigs can exceed 10% of the CC-503 assembly.

SNP Validation. Thirty-three candidate SNPs were chosen from the set of predicted nonsense mutations for experimental validation. The target sequences were amplified by PCR, and the putative SNP checked by Sanger-based sequencing of one strain that has a reference allele genotype and at least one strain with the alternate allele. 31 of the 33 SNPs and the corresponding genotypes were confirmed to be correct using this approach (Supplemental Table 8).

Statistical analyses. GO-term enrichment analysis was performed using TopGO (Alexa and Rahnenfuhrer, 2010). Additional tests were performed using a two-tailed 2x2 Fisher's Exact Test or Chi-Square Test. All statistical analyses were performed using the R Statistical Programming Language v3.0 (http://www.r-project.org/).

Supplemental References

Alexa, A., and Rahnenfuhrer, J. (2010). topGO: Enrichment analysis for Gene Ontology. R package version 2.18.0.

Altschul, S.F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E.W., and Lipman, D.J. (1990). Basic local alignment search tool. J Mol Biol **215**, 403-410.

Arnaiz, O., Malinowska, A., Klotz, C., Sperling, L., Dadlez, M., Koll, F., and Cohen, J. (2009). Cildb: a knowledgebase for centrosomes and cilia. Database (Oxford) **2009**, bap022.

Blaby, I.K., Blaby-Haas, C.E., Tourasse, N., Hom, E.F., Lopez, D., Aksoy, M., Grossman, A., Umen, J., Dutcher, S., Porter, M., King, S., Witman, G.B., Stanke, M., Harris, E.H., Goodstein, D., Grimwood, J., Schmutz, J., Vallon, O., Merchant, S.S., and Prochnik, S. (2014). The Chlamydomonas genome project: a decade on. Trends Plant Sci **19**, 672-680.

Bolger, A.M., Lohse, M., and Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. Bioinformatics **30**, 2114-2120.

Cingolani, P., Platts, A., Wang, l.L., Coon, M., Nguyen, T., Wang, L., Land, S.J., Lu, X., and Ruden, D.M. (2012). A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster strain w1118; iso-2; iso-3. Fly (Austin) **6**, 80-92.

Danecek, P., Auton, A., Abecasis, G., Albers, C.A., Banks, E., DePristo, M.A., Handsaker, R.E., Lunter, G., Marth, G.T., Sherry, S.T., McVean, G., Durbin, R., and Group, G.P.A. (2011). The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics **27**, 2156-2158.

DePristo, M.A., Banks, E., Poplin, R., Garimella, K.V., Maguire, J.R., Hartl, C., Philippakis, A.A., del Angel, G., Rivas, M.A., Hanna, M., McKenna, A., Fennell, T.J., Kernytsky, A.M., Sivachenko, A.Y., Cibulskis, K., Gabriel, S.B., Altshuler, D., and Daly, M.J. (2011). A framework for variation discovery and genotyping using nextgeneration DNA sequencing data. Nat Genet **43**, 491-498.

Earl, D.A., vonHoldt, B.M. (2012). STRUCTURE HARVESTER: a website and program for visualizing STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method. Conservation Genetic Resources. **4**: 359-361.

Evanno, G., Regnaut, S., and Goudet, J. (2005). Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. Mol Ecol **14**, 2611- 2620.

Garrigan, D. (2013). POPBAM: Tools for Evolutionary Analysis of Short Read Sequence Alignments. Evol Bioinform Online **9**, 343-353.

Goodstein, D.M., Shu, S., Howson, R., Neupane, R., Hayes, R.D., Fazo, J., Mitros, T., Dirks, W., Hellsten, U., Putnam, N., and Rokhsar, D.S. (2012). Phytozome: a comparative platform for green plant genomics. Nucleic Acids Res **40**, D1178-1186.

Jakobsson, M., and Rosenberg, N.A. (2007). CLUMPP: a cluster matching and permutation program for dealing with label switching and multimodality in analysis of population structure. Bioinformatics **23**, 1801-1806.

Jones, P., Binns, D., Chang, H.Y., Fraser, M., Li, W., McAnulla, C., McWilliam, H., Maslen, J., Mitchell, A., Nuka, G., Pesseat, S., Quinn, A.F., Sangrador-Vegas, A., Scheremetjew, M., Yong, S.Y., Lopez, R., and Hunter, S. (2014). InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics **30**, 1236-1240.

Jukes, T., and Cantor, C. (1969). Evolution of protein molecules. In: Mammalian Protein Metabolism. Munro, H. N. (eds). Illus. Academic Press: New York, N.Y., U.S.A. Vol. III. Xvii: 571p.

Kanehisa, M., and Goto, S. (2000). KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res **28**, 27-30.

Karpowicz, S.J., Prochnik, S.E., Grossman, A.R., and Merchant, S.S. (2011). The GreenCut2 resource, a phylogenomically derived inventory of proteins specific to the plant lineage. J Biol Chem **286**, 21427-21439.

Keane, T.M., Wong, K., and Adams, D.J. (2013). RetroSeq: transposable element discovery from next-generation sequencing data. Bioinformatics **29**, 389-390.

Kelly, J.K. (1997). A test of neutrality based on interlocus associations. Genetics **146**, 1197-1206.

Korber, B. (2000). HIV signature and sequence variation analysis. In: Rodrigo AG, Learn GH. (eds) Computational Analysis of HIV Molecular Sequences. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Li, H. (2014). Toward better understanding of artifacts in variant calling from highcoverage samples. Bioinformatics **30**, 2843-2851.

Li, H., and Durbin, R. (2009). Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. Bioinformatics **25**, 1754-1760.

Li, H., Ruan, J., and Durbin, R. (2008). Mapping short DNA sequencing reads and calling variants using mapping quality scores. Genome Res **18**, 1851-1858.

Liu, Q., Guo, Y., Li, J., Long, J., Zhang, B., and Shyr, Y. (2012). Steps to ensure accuracy in genotype and SNP calling from Illumina sequencing data. BMC Genomics **13** Suppl 8, S8.

Lopez, D., Casero, D., Cokus, S.J., Merchant, S.S., and Pellegrini, M. (2011). Algal Functional Annotation Tool: a web-based analysis suite to functionally interpret large gene lists using integrated annotation and expression data. BMC Bioinformatics **12**, 282.

Lucas LledÛ, J.I., and C·ceres, M. (2013). On the power and the systematic biases of the detection of chromosomal inversions by paired-end genome sequencing. PLoS One **8**, e61292.

Maul, J.E., Lilly, J.W., Cui, L., dePamphilis, C.W., Miller, W., Harris, E.H., and Stern, D.B. (2002). The Chlamydomonas reinhardtii plastid chromosome: islands of genes in a sea of repeats. Plant Cell **14**, 2659-2679.

McCarthy, F.M., Wang, N., Magee, G.B., Nanduri, B., Lawrence, M.L., Camon, E.B., Barrell, D.G., Hill, D.P., Dolan, M.E., Williams, W.P., Luthe, D.S., Bridges, S.M., and Burgess, S.C. (2006). AgBase: a functional genomics resource for agriculture. BMC Genomics **7**, 229.

Merchant, S.S., Prochnik, S.E., Vallon, O., Harris, E.H., Karpowicz, S.J., Witman, G.B., Terry, A., Salamov, A., Fritz-Laylin, L.K., MarÈchal-Drouard, L., Marshall, W.F., Qu, L.H., Nelson, D.R., Sanderfoot, A.A., Spalding, M.H., Kapitonov, V.V., Ren, Q., Ferris, P., Lindquist, E., Shapiro, H., Lucas, S.M., Grimwood, J., Schmutz, J., Cardol, P., Cerutti, H., Chanfreau, G., Chen, C.L., Cognat, V., Croft, M.T., Dent, R., Dutcher, S., Fern·ndez, E., Fukuzawa, H., Gonz·lez-Ballester, D., Gonz·lez-Halphen, D., Hallmann, A., Hanikenne, M., Hippler, M., Inwood, W., Jabbari, K., Kalanon, M., Kuras, R., Lefebvre, P.A., Lemaire, S.D., Lobanov, A.V., Lohr, M., Manuell, A., Meier, I., Mets, L., Mittag, M., Mittelmeier, T., Moroney, J.V., Moseley, J., Napoli, C., Nedelcu, A.M., Niyogi, K., Novoselov, S.V., Paulsen, I.T., Pazour, G., Purton, S., Ral, J.P., RiaÒo-PachÛn, D.M., Riekhof, W., Rymarquis, L., Schroda, M., Stern, D., Umen, J., Willows, R., Wilson, N., Zimmer, S.L., Allmer, J., Balk, J., Bisova, K., Chen, C.J., Elias, M., Gendler, K., Hauser, C., Lamb, M.R., Ledford, H., Long, J.C., Minagawa, J., Page, M.D., Pan, J., Pootakham, W., Roje, S., Rose, A., Stahlberg, E., Terauchi, A.M., Yang, P., Ball, S., Bowler, C., Dieckmann, C.L., Gladyshev, V.N., Green, P., Jorgensen, R., Mayfield, S., Mueller-Roeber, B., Rajamani, S., Sayre, R.T., Brokstein, P., Dubchak, I., Goodstein, D., Hornick, L., Huang, Y.W., Jhaveri, J., Luo, Y., MartÌnez, D., Ngau, W.C., Otillar, B., Poliakov, A., Porter, A., Szajkowski, L., Werner, G., Zhou, K., Grigoriev, I.V., Rokhsar, D.S., and Grossman, A.R. (2007). The Chlamydomonas genome reveals the evolution of key animal and plant functions. Science **318**, 245-250.

Nei, M., and Gojobori, T. (1986). Simple methods for estimating the numbers of synonymous and nonsynonymous nucleotide substitutions. Mol Biol Evol **3**, 418-426. **Nei, M.** (1987). Molecular Evolutionary Genetics. New York: Columbia Univ. Press. pp 512.

Novatchkova, M., Wildpaner, M., Schweizer, D., and Eisenhaber, F. (2005). PhyloDome--visualization of taxonomic distributions of domains occurring in eukaryote protein sequence sets. Nucleic Acids Res **33**, W121-125.

Pazour, G.J., Agrin, N., Leszyk, J., and Witman, G.B. (2005). Proteomic analysis of a eukaryotic cilium. J Cell Biol **170**, 103-113.

Piriyapongsa, J., Rutledge, M.T., Patel, S., Borodovsky, M., and Jordan, I.K. (2007). Evaluating the protein coding potential of exonized transposable element sequences. Biol Direct **2**, 31.

Pritchard, J.K., Stephens, M., and Donnelly, P. (2000). Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data. Genetics **155**, 945-959.

Quinlan, A.R., and Hall, I.M. (2010). BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features. Bioinformatics **26**, 841-842.

Rouard, M., Guignon, V., Aluome, C., Laporte, M.A., Droc, G., Walde, C., Zmasek, C.M., PÈrin, C., and Conte, M.G. (2011). GreenPhylDB v2.0: comparative and functional genomics in plants. Nucleic Acids Res **39**, D1095-1102.

Stanke, M., Steinkamp, R., Waack, S., and Morgenstern, B. (2004). AUGUSTUS: a web server for gene finding in eukaryotes. Nucleic Acids Res **32**, W309-312.

Tamura, K., Stecher, G., Peterson, D., Filipski, A., and Kumar, S. (2013). MEGA6: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis version 6.0. Mol Biol Evol **30**, 2725-2729.

Zeitouni, B., Boeva, V., Janoueix-Lerosey, I., Loeillet, S., Legoix-nÈ, P., Nicolas, A., Delattre, O., and Barillot, E. (2010). SVDetect: a tool to identify genomic structural variations from paired-end and mate-pair sequencing data. Bioinformatics **26**, 1895-1896.

Zerbino, D.R., and Birney, E. (2008). Velvet: algorithms for de novo short read assembly using de Bruijn graphs. Genome Res **18**, 821-829.

Zhang, H., Jin, J., Tang, L., Zhao, Y., Gu, X., Gao, G., and Luo, J. (2011). PlantTFDB 2.0: update and improvement of the comprehensive plant transcription factor database. Nucleic Acids Res **39**, D1114-1117.

Zheng, X., Levine, D., Shen, J., Gogarten, S.M., Laurie, C., and Weir, B.S. (2012). A high-performance computing toolset for relatedness and principal component analysis of SNP data. Bioinformatics **28**, 3326-3328.