## GigaScience

# Best genome sequencing strategies for annotation of complex immune gene families in wildlife --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	GIGA-D-22-00064			
Full Title:	Best genome sequencing strategies for annotation of complex immune gene families in wildlife			
Article Type:	Research			
Funding Information:	Australian Research Council (DP180102465)	Prof Katherine Belov		
	Australian Research Council (CE200100012)	Prof Katherine Belov		
Abstract:	Background The biodiversity crisis and increasing impact health provides impetus for studying immun boom in genomes for wildlife species, immun model species owing to their high level of pro- organisation. Our research over the past de koalas highlights the importance of genomic investigate disease in wildlife. Given this, we minimum levels of genome quality required order to study immunogenetic diversity. Her manually annotating immune genes in five r genome to determine the impact of sequence automated annotation on accurate immune Results Genome quality is directly linked to our abili families, with long reads and scaffolding teo gene clusters and elucidate evolution, organ immune repertoire. Draft quality genomes g Chromium linked-reads were unable to achi scores of up to 94.1 % amongst the six gen incorrectly annotated up to 60% of manually assembly quality or method of automated an Conclusions Our results demonstrate that long-reads and manual annotation, are required to accurate wildlife species. Keywords: immune gene, genome, quality,	t of wildlife disease on animal and human e genes in wildlife. Despite the recent ine genes are poorly annotated in non- olymorphism and complex genomic cade and a half on Tasmanian devils and as and accurate immune annotations to e have increasingly been asked the to effectively annotate immune genes in e we set out to answer this question by marsupial genomes and one monotreme cing data type, assembly quality and annotation. ty to annotate complex immune gene hnologies required to reassemble immune nisation and true gene content of the enerated from short-reads with HiC or 10x eve this. Despite mammalian BUSCOv5 omes, automated annotation pipelines annotation.		
Corresponding Author:	Carolyn Hogg			
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:				
Corresponding Author's Institution:				
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:				
First Author:	Emma Peel			
First Author Secondary Information:				
Order of Authors:	Emma Peel			
	Luke Silver			
	Parice Brandies			
	Ying Zhu			

	Yuanyuan Cheng
	Carolyn Hogg
	Katherine Belov
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Are you submitting this manuscript to a special series or article collection?	No
Experimental design and statistics	No
Full details of the experimental design and statistical methods used should be given in the Methods section, as detailed in our <u>Minimum Standards Reporting Checklist</u> . Information essential to interpreting the data presented should be made available in the figure legends.	
Have you included all the information requested in your manuscript?	
If not, please give reasons for any omissions below. as follow-up to " <b>Experimental design</b> <b>and statistics</b>	The data included in this manuscript uses published genomic data to show complexities of immune gene annotation with varying degrees of genome quality. The method design is around genome assembly and annotation and all the relevant metrics are included in the manuscript.
Full details of the experimental design and statistical methods used should be given in the Methods section, as detailed in our <u>Minimum Standards Reporting Checklist</u> . Information essential to interpreting the data presented should be made available in the figure legends. Have you included all the information requested in your manuscript?	
" Resources	Yes
A description of all resources used, including antibodies, cell lines, animals	

and software tools, with enough information to allow them to be uniquely identified, should be included in the Methods section. Authors are strongly encouraged to cite <u>Research Resource</u> <u>Identifiers</u> (RRIDs) for antibodies, model organisms and tools, where possible.	
Have you included the information requested as detailed in our Minimum Standards Reporting Checklist?	
Availability of data and materials	Yes
All datasets and code on which the conclusions of the paper rely must be either included in your submission or deposited in <u>publicly available repositories</u> (where available and ethically appropriate), referencing such data using a unique identifier in the references and in the "Availability of Data and Materials" section of your manuscript.	
Have you have met the above requirement as detailed in our <u>Minimum</u> <u>Standards Reporting Checklist</u> ?	

- 1 Best genome sequencing strategies for annotation of complex
- 2 immune gene families in wildlife
- 3 Emma Peel<sup>1</sup>, Luke Silver<sup>1</sup>, Parice Brandies<sup>1</sup>, Ying Zhu<sup>2</sup>, Yuanyuan Cheng<sup>1</sup>, Carolyn J Hogg<sup>1</sup> & Katherine
- 4 Belov<sup>1\*</sup>
- 5 <sup>1</sup>School of Life and Environmental Sciences, The University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales,
- 6 Australia
- 7 <sup>2</sup> Sichuan Provincial Academy of Natural Resource Sciences, Chengdu, Sichuan, China
- 8 emma.peel@sydney.edu.au ORCID: 0000-0002-2335-8983
- 9 <u>luke.silver@sydney.edu.au</u> ORCID: 0000-0002-1718-5756
- 10 parice.brandies@sydney.edu.au ORCID: 0000-0003-1702-2938
- 11 <u>so\_zy2003@126.com</u>
- 12 yuanyuan.cheng@sydney.edu.au ORCID: 0000-0002-1747-9308
- 13 <u>carolyn.hogg@sydney.edu.au</u> ORCID: 0000-0002-6328-398X
- 14 \*Corresponding author kathy.belov@sydney.edu.au ORCID: 0000-0002-9762-5554

- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23

## 24 Abstract

#### 25 Background

26 The biodiversity crisis and increasing impact of wildlife disease on animal and human health provides 27 impetus for studying immune genes in wildlife. Despite the recent boom in genomes for wildlife 28 species, immune genes are poorly annotated in non-model species owing to their high level of 29 polymorphism and complex genomic organisation. Our research over the past decade and a half on 30 Tasmanian devils and koalas highlights the importance of genomics and accurate immune annotations 31 to investigate disease in wildlife. Given this, we have increasingly been asked the minimum levels of 32 genome quality required to effectively annotate immune genes in order to study immunogenetic 33 diversity. Here we set out to answer this question by manually annotating immune genes in five 34 marsupial genomes and one monotreme genome to determine the impact of sequencing data type, 35 assembly guality and automated annotation on accurate immune annotation.

#### 36 Results

Genome quality is directly linked to our ability to annotate complex immune gene families, with long reads and scaffolding technologies required to reassemble immune gene clusters and elucidate evolution, organisation and true gene content of the immune repertoire. Draft quality genomes generated from short-reads with HiC or 10x Chromium linked-reads were unable to achieve this. Despite mammalian BUSCOv5 scores of up to 94.1 % amongst the six genomes, automated annotation pipelines incorrectly annotated up to 60% of manually annotated immune genes regardless of assembly quality or method of automated annotation.

#### 44 Conclusions

45 Our results demonstrate that long-reads and scaffolding technologies, alongside manual annotation,

- 46 are required to accurately study the immune gene repertoire of wildlife species.
- 47 Keywords: immune gene, genome, quality, annotation, MHC, wildlife, disease

## 48 Background

Globally we are facing a biodiversity crisis, with 25% of known plant and animal species under threat and one million species facing extinction [1]. Disease is one of many drivers of global wildlife decline and extinction, with recent devastating examples such as chytridiomycosis in amphibians [2], white nose syndrome in bats [3] and devil facial tumour disease (DFTD) in Tasmanian devils (*Sarcophilus harrisii*) [4]. Habitat loss, fragmentation and climate change lead to population decline and subsequent loss of genetic diversity, which increases susceptibility of populations to new and existing disease threats [5].

56 Genomics is increasingly applied in conservation [6] facilitated by a boom in genomes for wildlife 57 species [7-10], with over 4,000 vertebrate genomes currently accessioned with the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) (March 2022). Genomics in conservation typically involves 58 59 technologies such as reduced representation sequencing which capture single nucleotide 60 polymorphisms (SNPs) with a bias towards neutral regions of the genome [11, 12]. This can be used 61 to investigate population genetic metrics such as heterozygosity, inbreeding and relatedness to inform 62 conservation management. This is a cost-effective approach for conservation and has been used in a 63 range of taxa to inform conservation actions, for examples see Tasmanian devils [13], gorillas (Gorillia 64 gorilla gorilla and Gorilla beringei graueri) [14], helmeted honeyeaters (Lichenostomus melanops cassidix) [15] and bilbies (Macrotis lagotis) [16]. 65

The COVID-19 pandemic is one of many examples which highlight the ever-increasing importance of understanding wildlife immunity and disease to better understand and manage disease spill over [17]. In the case of wildlife threatened by disease, conservation questions are more challenging to answer and typically involve immunogenetic diversity which relies on accurate immune gene annotations. Immune genes are some of the most polymorphic regions of the genome, owing to the need to generate diversity in response to ever-changing pathogenic pressures [18, 19]. Diversity within these gene families is generated through gene duplication, gene copy number variation, SNPs and rapid evolution, resulting in a complex genomic organisation and high level of pseudogenization [18].
Generally, immune genes are encoded within clusters in the genome, especially highly duplicated
families such as the major histocompatibility complex (MHC) and natural killer cell (NK) receptors [20].
Given these factors, accurate assembly and annotation of genomic regions encoding immune genes
can be challenging [21-23], especially in wildlife.

Automated annotation pipelines such as MAKER [24] and Fgenesh++ [25] are accurate at identifying the majority of protein-coding genes within a genome [26, 27]. However, they are less effective at characterising complex and highly variable gene families such as immune genes [28, 29] which are misassembled even in the high-quality human genome [21]. As such, manual annotation and curation of immune genes is required, which is conducted for model organism genomes accessioned with Ensembl [30]. Wildlife are not currently included in this scope, and hence immune genes are poorly annotated, or not annotated at all, in many species.

85 Advances in sequencing technology means chromosome-length genomes are now achievable for a 86 range of species [8]. Use of multiple sequencing, scaffolding, chromatin conformation and optical 87 mapping technologies leads to accurate assembly of complex and variable genomic regions, such as 88 immune genes [8]. However, the high input sample quantity and quality requirements are not always 89 feasible for wildlife [31]. This leads to the use of lower-input short-read sequencing to generate a 90 draft-quality genome assembled into scaffolds. However, short-read sequencing is well known to be 91 incompetent at resolving highly repetitive and complex gene regions [32, 33]. While scaffolding 92 technologies can improve contiguity of these assemblies, complex and variable regions often remain 93 fragmented. The need to balance budget, sample and genome assembly quality against accurate 94 immune gene annotation is essential to answer questions around disease and immunity.

Over the past decade and a half our research has focused on immunity and disease in two iconic
 marsupial species; the Tasmanian devil and koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*). During this period, we have
 worked with bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC) and complementary DNA (cDNA) libraries and draft

98 genomes of varying qualities. Our research, and that of others, has been crucial for understanding, 99 managing and preventing disease-induced decline [4, 34-36]. As the cost of sequencing has dropped, 100 and the appreciation of the power of genetics and genomics for population management has 101 increased, we have increasingly been asked about the minimum levels of genome quality required to 102 be able to effectively annotate immune genes in order to study levels of diversity in wild populations. 103 Here we set out to answer that question.

104 Tasmanian devils are threatened by DFTD, a contagious cancer which has decimated over 80% of the 105 population since it was first documented in 1996 [4]. The Tasmanian devil reference genome was 106 sequenced using illumina short-reads in 2012 [37], generating a 3.17 Gbp genome with a scaffold N50 107 of 1.8 Mbp and contig N50 of 20kbp. The Major Histocompatibility Complex was not able to be 108 annotated in the draft genome due to the high levels of fragmentation, scattered across at least 15 109 scaffolds. But manual annotation was possible alongside transcriptomes [38-40] and targeted 110 sequencing of MHC-positive BAC clones [38, 41-45]. Development of MHC markers led to 111 determination of gene copy number and nucleotide variation amongst the devil population, revealing 112 devils have low MHC diversity, much of which is shared with DFTD [43, 46]. The low histocompatibility 113 barriers, coupled with downregulation of tumour MHC expression, allows DFTD to transmit between 114 individuals and evade the host immune response [44]. Recent MHC genotyping using long-read 115 sequencing enabled the identification of full-phased MHC alleles and separation of highly similar 116 alleles (1bp difference), resulting in the identification of new functional MHC diversity within the devil 117 population [47].

The koala is another iconic Australian marsupial where disease is a major contributing factor to population decline [48]. Chlamydiosis is one of many threatening processes affecting koalas, a disease caused by infection with the intracellular bacterium *Chlamydia pecorum* [48]. A chromosome-length koala reference genome was sequenced in 2018 using Pacfici Biosciences (PacBio) long-reads, Illumina short-reads and BioNano optical maps [49]. This generated a 3.19 Gbp assembly with a scaffold N50

of 480 Mbp and contig N50 of 11.4 Mbp [49], a 400-fold increase in scaffold contiguity compared to the Tasmanian devil genome assembly [37]. This high-quality koala genome enabled accurate annotation of immune gene families, including the first complete reconstruction of MHC and T cell receptor gene clusters from a genome sequence in marsupials [35, 50-52]. Preliminary genome resequencing identified that variants within IFNγ, TNFα and MHC genes are essential for clearance of *Chlamydia* in koalas [34]. MHC genotype has also been linked to disease susceptibility and severity in different koala populations [53, 54].

Understanding the role of immunogenetics in DFTD and chlamydiosis formed the basis for the development of vaccines in devils [55] and koalas [56] respectively. Several chlamydial vaccines have been developed for koalas over the past decade, culminating in a multivalent vaccine that induces a strong and protective immune response which may be therapeutic [34, 56]. Current DFTD vaccines in devils similarly hinge upon the host immune response and are based on IFNγ-treated DFTD cells which result in MHC expression on the cell surface resulting in immune recognition and clearance of the tumour [55].

137 In this study, our aim was to determine the impact of sequence data type, assembly quality and 138 automated annotation on accurate immune annotation. To achieve this, we manually annotated 139 immune genes in the genomes of five marsupials and one monotreme. These include recent published 140 genome assemblies of five marsupials; koala (Phascolarctos cinereus) [49, 57, 58], woylie (Bettongia 141 penicillata) [59], common wombat (Vombatus ursinus) [57, 58], brown antechinus (Antechinus 142 stuartii) [60] and numbat (Myrmecobius fasciatus) [61], and previous immune gene annotations from one monotreme, the platypus [33]. These six genomes differ in quality, from scaffold assemblies 143 144 generated using only 10x Chromium linked-reads (numbat, antechinus), short-read with high-145 throughput chromosome conformation capture (HiC) (wombat), long and short-read (woylie), to high-146 quality chromosome-length genomes generated using multiple data types (koala and platypus) (Table 147 1). In addition, we assess the accuracy of automated immune gene annotation by Fgenesh++, MAKER

and NCBI pipelines in these non-model species. Although this is not a perfect comparison given species-specific immune gene expansion/contraction, it provides a guide of the impact of genome quality on immune gene annotation. Here we show that high quality chromosome-length genomes are necessary for accurate immune annotation in the context of wildlife disease.

## 152 Analyses

153 Immune genes were annotated in the koala, woylie, wombat, antechinus, and numbat genomes and 154 transcriptomes using similarity-based search methods such as BLAST [62] and HMMER [63] with 155 known marsupial immune gene sequences as queries. This resulted in the manual characterisation of 156 over 2,700 immune genes amongst the five species, from six immune gene families or groups: toll-like 157 receptors (TLR), T cell receptors (TCR), immunoglobulins (IG), major histocompatibility complex 158 (MHC), natural killer (NK) cell receptors and cytokines (Table 2). Platypus immune gene families have 159 previously been annotated [33, 64-75], some of which had already been mapped within the current 160 genome assembly (MHC and TCR) [33] and the remainder were mapped in this study. Genomic 161 coordinates of all immune genes annotated in this study are available in Additional file 1. A 162 comprehensive summary of results for each immune gene family are available in Additional file 2.

163 Table 1. Assembly metrics for the five marsupial and one monotreme genome used in this study.

	Koala	Wovlie	Wombat	Antechinus	Numbat	Platypus
	[49, 57, 58]	[59]	[57, 58]	[60]	[61]	[33]
Data types	PacBio RS II	PacBio HiFi	Illumina	10x Chromium	10x Chromium	PacBio
	Illumina	Illumina	HiC (DNAzoo)	RNAseq (12	RNAseq (3	10x Chromium
	BioNano	RNAseq (4		transcriptomes)	transcriptomes)	BioNano
	HiC (DNAzoo)	transcriptomes)				HiC (Phase
	RNAseq (16					genomics &
	transcriptomes)					Dovetail)
						RNAseq (19
						transcriptomes)
Genome size	3.19	3.39	3.34	3.31	3.42	2.13
(Gbp)						
GC (%)	39.05	38.64	38.89	36.20	36.3	46.23
No. scaffolds	1,318	1,116	633,737	30,876	112,299	322
No. contigs	1,935	3,016	685,859	106,199	219,447	834

Scaffold N50	480.11	6.94	576.1	72.7	0.223	83.33
(Mbp)						
Contig N50	11.4	1.995	0.07	0.08	0.038	15.1
(Mbp)						
Gaps (%)	0.01	0.403	0.54	2.75	3.52	0.81
Complete	94.1%	94.1%	89.3%	92.5%	76.4%	83.0%
mammalian						
BUSCOv5.2.2						

164

#### 165 Table 2. Number of annotated immune genes in each of the five marsupials and one monotreme in

#### this study.

	Koala	Woylie	Wombat	Antechinus	Numbat	Platypus
TLR	10	10	10	10	10	10
TCR constant	10	12	10	11	9	19
TCR variable	103	122	95	126	104	252
IG constant	15	20	10	7	6	14
IG variable	289	226	98	145	121	118
MHCI	19	17	5	7	3	6
MHC II	16	23	7	14	8	5
MHC III	37	37	41	32	34	58
Ext. MHC &	27	28	31	25	32	20
framework						
genes						
NKC	17	17	11	11	17	122
LRC	25	60	32	49	38	4
Extended LRC	6	24	9	15	11	11
Cytokines	83	76	76	68	70	49
Total	657	672	435	520	463	678

167

168 Table 2 legend. Includes complete and partial gene sequences. A more detailed comparison of

immune genes annotated in this study, with those identified in other marsupials and humans is

available in Supplementary Table 2 within Additional file 2.

Overall, the immune gene repertoire of the koala, woylie, wombat, antechinus, and numbat was similar to other marsupials [50, 76], with marsupial-specific genes and eutherian orthologs identified. Relatively conserved immune genes such as TLRs and constant regions of TCR and IG, as well as polymorphic genes such as MHC and NK receptors, were identified in all five species. Numerous koala immune gene sequences have been characterised previously due to their involvement in chlamydiosis 176 and koala retrovirus which threaten populations [48]. These include MHC [49, 77-79], IG [50], TCR 177 [49], NK receptors [51] and selected cytokines [50, 80-83] (Supplementary Table S2 in Additional file 178 2). We mapped the location of these genes within the current version of the genome, and identified 179 additional new sequences within the LRC, IG and cytokine families (Table 2, Supplementary Table S2 180 in Additional file 2). Immune genes unique to the marsupial lineage were also characterised in the five 181 species studied here. These included MHC class II genes DA, DB and DC, TLR1/6 and TCRµ. Large 182 marsupial-specific gene expansions within the LRC NK receptors were characterised in all five species, 183 as well as reduced gene content within the NKC cluster of NK receptors. Consistent with other 184 marsupials investigated to date Ig\delta was not found in any of the five assemblies [84]. A detailed outline 185 of immune genes annotated in this study compared to those of other marsupials and humans is 186 provided in Supplementary Table S2 within Additional file 2.

#### 187 Automated versus manual immune gene annotation

188 For woylie, wombat, antechinus, numbat, and platypus genomes, we assessed how well our manual 189 immune gene annotation aligned with automated annotations by Fgenesh++ (woylie, antechinus, and 190 numbat), MAKER (wombat) and the NCBI pipeline (platypus). The koala was not included in the 191 comparison the available DNAzoo as genome on 192 (https://www.dnazoo.org/assemblies/Phascolarctos\_cinereus) has not been annotated. Inclusion of 193 the platypus NCBI annotation ensures that any differences in automated and manual immune gene 194 annotation are not due to deficiencies within the Fgenesh++ annotation pipeline, as the woylie, 195 antechinus and numbat genomes were all annotated with Fgenesh++ using the same parameters.

Automated annotation pipelines failed to characterise the complete immune repertoire of the platypus or any of the four marsupial species (Figure 1). Only 24.65%, 21.32%, 21.32%, 29.66%, 30.97% of immune genes were correctly annotated by the automated pipeline in platypus, woylie, wombat, antechinus, and numbat respectively, defined as ≥90% overlap in genomic coordinates of immune genes between our manual annotations and the automated annotations (Figure 1). Interestingly, more 201 immune genes were correctly annotated by the automated software in the low-quality wombat, 202 antechinus, and numbat genomes than the high-quality platypus and woylie genomes. This inverse 203 relationship between genome quality and proportion of correctly annotated immune genes is likely 204 related to the characterisation of additional divergent and polymorphic genes such as MHC class I and 205 II in woylie and platypus, which could not be identified by automated or manual annotation in the 206 wombat, antechinus, and numbat due to genome fragmentation (Table 3). The platypus and all four 207 marsupial genomes displayed a high proportion of immune genes which were very poorly annotated 208 by automated pipelines (<10% overlap between immune gene coordinates from manual versus 209 automated annotation); 34.48%, 47.46%, 69.98%, 31.79% and 31.17% for platypus, woylie, wombat, 210 antechinus, and numbat respectively (Figure 1). Most of these genes comprised immunoglobulin and 211 T cell receptor variable gene segments, and species-specific gene expansions in NKC and LRC families, 212 indicating the difficulty in automated annotation of these regions (Figure 3).

Figure 1. Percentage overlap of genomic coordinates between manual and automated annotations ofimmune genes in five genomes.

Figure 1 legend. Colours indicate proportion of immune genes with 0 to 100% overlap between manual and automated annotations, with 0 indicating manually annotated genes with no overlap of genomic coordinates with the automated annotation.

#### 218 Relationship between genome quality and manual immune gene annotation

Manual annotation of immune genes across the koala, woylie, wombat, antechinus and numbat genomes, and mapping of previous annotations to the new platypus genome, highlighted a clear relationship between immune gene fragmentation and genome quality (Figure 2). Overall, the highquality koala, platypus and woylie genomes all contained complete immune gene family clusters, which were highly fragmented in the lower quality wombat, antechinus, and numbat genomes. Fragmentation was particularly evident within families which contain genes that do not share orthology to those in eutherians, such as LRC NK receptors and TCRµ, and highly duplicated families such as MHC (Figure 3). To investigate this relationship further, we calculated the number of scaffolds
which encoded 50% (L50) and 90% (L90) of manually annotated immune genes in each of the five
species studied (Figure 2).

Figure 2. L50 and L90 immune gene metric for six genomes, compared to log<sub>10</sub> contig N50.

230 The platypus, koala and woylie had an L90 of 10, 9 and 36 respectively, which suggests immune gene 231 families were highly contiguous within all three genomes (Figure 2). Complete coding sequences were 232 identified for 98% and 95% of immune genes in koala and woylie respectively. In addition, 90% of 233 annotated immune genes were located on scaffolds greater than 33.3 Mbp, 75 Mbp and 1 Mbp in 234 platypus, koala, and woylie respectively. Complex multi-gene immune families such as MHC, NK 235 receptors and TCR were highly intact in all three species. The koala and woylie MHC regions were both 236 located on a single scaffold (Figure 3). Class I and II genes were interspersed, and flanked by class III, 237 framework and extended class I and II gene clusters, which reflected the MHC organisation of other 238 marsupials (Figure 3) [49, 85]. Unlike marsupials, the platypus MHC is encoded within a 239 pseudoautosomal region of two sex chromosomes. MHC class I and II genes were interspersed in a 240 single cluster on chromosome X3, and class III, extended class I and II, and framework genes located 241 in a single cluster on chromosome X5 (Figure 3) [33]. Large gene expansions within the LRC NK 242 receptors were encoded on a single scaffold in koala and six scaffolds in woylie (Figure 3). The number 243 and type of monotreme NK receptor genes differs to marsupials, as they have a large expansion within 244 the NKC gene cluster and reduction within the LRC gene cluster [66]. More than 80% of platypus NKC 245 genes were located in a single cluster on chromosome 17, with LRC genes located on 5 different chromosomes [66]. Fragmentation of the LRC cluster is not a factor of genome quality but reflects the 246 247 evolutionary history of this immune family [66]. The four TCR loci ( $\alpha/\delta$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\mu$ ) were encoded in 248 single clusters on three chromosomes in platypus and single scaffolds in koala. The TCR loci were 249 fragmented across up to three scaffolds in woylie. This includes genes known to flank these loci in

other marsupials, which enabled resolution of TCR locus organisation in these species, and confirmed
 gene synteny across marsupials, human and mouse as identified previously [85].

Figure 3. Genomic organisation and gene content of the LRC (A) and MHC region (B) in five genomes.

Figure 3 legend. The number of genes within each cluster are given, as well as scaffold counts of orphan genes (genes on single scaffolds). In A, LRC genes are purple, extended LRC genes are teal. In B, MHC class I genes are red, class II blue, class III green, extended class I pink, extended class II yellow and framework genes orange. Large distances between genes are given below the scaffold, otherwise the distance between genes and/or clusters was within the expected range for each family. Figure created with BioRender.com.

259 Fragmentation of immune genes in the wombat genome differed between immune families, with an 260 L90 of 56 (Figure 2). 22% of scaffolds encoding immune genes were shorter than 100Kb and partial 261 coding sequences were identified for 7% of annotated immune genes. The MHC region was relatively contiguous in the wombat, with 92% of genes encoded on a single scaffold (Figure 3). Although, a 262 263 number of MHC genes were encoded as orphan genes to the main MHC cluster, indicating this family 264 is misassembled in the wombat genome. In addition, some MHC genes could not be identified in the 265 wombat genome, while only single copies could be identified for others which are known to be 266 duplicated in all other marsupials studied to date (Additional file 2). While this reduced MHC gene content in the wombat may reflect the true MHC gene repertoire of this species, it is likely MHC genes 267 268 could not be annotated due to assembly error. The LRC cluster was highly fragmented across 16 269 scaffolds (Figure 3), of which more than 80% encoded a single gene and were less than 10kb in length. 270 Extended LRC and LRC genes were interspersed, likely due to mis-assembly of the region as these 271 genes should be located in separate clusters as observed in koala and woylie (Figure 3). TCR $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ 272 loci were encoded on individual scaffolds, however TCRµ was fragmented across 10 scaffolds, with 273 34% of genes located on individual scaffolds of less than 15Kb. While the TCRβ locus was encoded in

a single cluster in the wombat, half of the locus was in the reverse orientation. This organisation is
unusual amongst mammalian TCR and is likely a result of the HiC scaffolding.

276 Immune gene families were highly fragmented in the antechinus and numbat genomes, with an L90 277 of 156 and 218 respectively (Figure 2). 29% and 43% of immune genes were located on scaffolds less 278 than 100Kb, and partial coding sequences were identified for 5.7% and 10.8% of immune genes, in 279 antechinus and numbat respectively. Complex multi-gene families such as MHC, NK receptors and TCR 280 were highly fragmented, with individual genes or exons located on short scaffolds. While 86% of MHC 281 genes were located on a single scaffold in antechinus (Figure 3), genome fragmentation prevented the 282 identification of additional MHC genes, hence the true MHC gene content could not be determined. 283 The numbat MHC region was highly fragmented across 52 scaffolds, 63% of which were less than 284 100Kb in length (Figure 3). Large gene expansions of LRC NK receptors were fragmented across 34 285 scaffolds in antechinus and numbat, of which 67% (antechinus) and 35% (numbat) were less than 286 10Kb, and 76% of scaffolds encoded individual LRC genes in both species (Figure 3). Similar to wombat, 287 extended LRC and LRC genes were interspersed, likely a mis-assembly as these genes should be 288 encoded within separate clusters as observed in koala and woylie. All four TCR loci were fragmented 289 in numbat, and all except TCR $\alpha$  in antechinus, with individual loci encoded across up to 6 scaffolds in 290 numbat and 19 in antechinus. Low contiguity within genomic regions encoding immune gene families 291 in the antechinus and numbat limited investigation of genomic organisation, synteny and evolution in 292 these species.

## 293 Discussion

By manually annotating immune genes in five marsupial and one monotreme genome of varying qualities, we have confirmed that genome quality is directly linked to our ability to annotate complex immune gene families. Without long reads and scaffolding technologies, immune genes are scattered across many individual scaffolds and gene family organisation and evolution cannot be elucidated. We

298 conclude that a kitchen sink approach, that uses long-read data combined with HiC technology, to 299 generate a high-quality genome assembly is required to investigate immunity and disease in wildlife.

300 The immune gene repertoire of the koala, woylie, wombat, antechinus and numbat was similar to 301 other marsupials such as Tasmanian devil [38, 41, 45], tammar wallaby (*Macropus eugenii*) [68, 86-89] 302 and grey short-tailed opossum (Monodelphis domestica) [76]. The platypus immune gene repertoire 303 has been characterised previously [33], and we identified their location within the current genome 304 assembly. Fewer MHC genes were identified in the wombat, antechinus, and numbat, compared to 305 the platypus, koala, and woylie (Table 2, Supplementary Table S2 in Additional file 2). This is likely due 306 to poor read assembly within this highly variable and duplicated region of the genome, rather than a 307 true reduction in MHC gene content within these three species. The assembly of a complete MHC 308 cluster in the platypus, koala and woylie is due to the ability of long reads to span duplicated and 309 variable sequences, which enables assembly algorithms to accurately reconstruct this complex region 310 of the genome.

#### 311 Automated annotation poorly characterises immune genes in non-model species

312 Despite mammalian BUSCOv5 scores of up to 94.1% amongst the six genomes in this study, indicating 313 that the genomes were "functionally complete", on average 42% of immune genes were not 314 accurately annotated and up to 61% of genes were not annotated by the automated software 315 Fgenesh++ and MAKER, nor the NCBI pipeline, compared to our manual annotations (Figure 3). The 316 majority of immune genes incorrectly annotated or missing from the automated annotations were 317 variable segments of TCR and IG, or divergent genes such as MHC with low or no BLAST homology to 318 nucleotide or protein databases. Gene models generated by automated annotation software are 319 hypotheses based on supporting evidence such as RNAseq data, which was used as evidence for the 320 automated annotation in the four marsupial and platypus genomes. While immune transcripts were 321 identified in the transcriptomes from these species, RNAseq data did not provide enough evidence to 322 support gene models for ~40% of immune genes within the genome. Some immune genes may not

have been expressed in the tissue sequenced, were expressed at low levels, or were fragmented. For human and mouse, comprehensive and curated gene sets such as GENCODE and RefSeq are available to guide gene model predictions, comprising data from more than 10,000 RNA experiments and decades of dedicated work in this field [90, 91]. Given time, budget and sample constraints for wildlife, these curated gene sets are not available, hence RNAseq evidence is incomplete resulting in deficient gene models by automated annotation software.

329 It is not surprising that TCR and IG V segments were not automatically annotated in the genomes in 330 this study. These genes are notoriously difficult to characterise and are manually annotated in the 331 human and mouse genome on Ensembl using the International Immunogenetics Information System 332 (IMGT) database [30, 92]. Alignment of mature IG and TCR sequences from RNAseq data to the 333 genome results in poor automated annotation, as V segments utilize different sequence signal splice 334 sites to introns, which are not recognized by the open reading frame prediction algorithms. V 335 sequences from three marsupials and two monotremes are available in IMGT, however as non-model 336 species, they are not included in the scope for manual annotation by Ensembl or NCBI, so these 337 important functional features are not annotated.

338 Our results highlight the importance of manual annotation of complex and variable immune genes, 339 and caution reliance on BUSCO metrics to assess functional completeness of a genome. If this pattern 340 is observed more widely across non-model species and other complex gene families, functionally 341 important genes may not be accurately represented in genome annotations, which will flow on to 342 downstream applications [28, 93]. While automated annotation is required to keep pace with the 343 rapid sequencing of genome assemblies, manual gene characterisation is still the gold standard for 344 genome annotation [90] and is conducted for the human, mouse, zebrafish and rat genomes on 345 Ensembl [94]. For non-model species, manual annotation is conducted by individual research groups 346 following genome assembly accession with NCBI or Ensembl, which conduct in-house automated 347 annotation for some but not all species [95, 96]. These highly valuable manual gene annotations are

348 not incorporated into the Ensembl annotation release but are often listed in the supplementary 349 materials of multiple individual publications. NCBI does have some capacity to incorporate manual 350 changes to existing annotation records [97]. Changes to multiple annotations, such as adding new 351 genes as is the case in this study, require the genome to be re-annotated, which is not feasible for all 352 research groups. In addition, it is not a requirement for manual changes to annotations to be tracked 353 between genome versions, hence this information could easily be lost. Given NCBI and Ensembl 354 annotations are widely used by the scientific community, these institutions should consider 355 incorporating manual gene annotations into the annotation record or provide scope for permanently 356 storing this valuable data alongside the respective assembly.

#### 357 Genome quality correlates with immune gene fragmentation

358 As expected, we found that genome quality directly correlates with likelihood that an immune gene 359 family was assembled and annotated correctly. Immune genes fragment as genome quality declines 360 (Figure 2 and 3). This highlights the importance of long reads and HiC scaffolding to re-assemble complex gene families (platypus, koala, woylie), which are poorly assembled in short read and linked-361 362 read assemblies (wombat, antechinus, numbat). Figure 4 provides a graphical representation of the 363 impact of different sequencing technologies on the assembly and fragmentation of immune gene 364 clusters. When the average read or contig length is shorter than the gene length, the assembly algorithm is unable to reconstruct genes, which are fragmented across multiple short contigs [93]. The 365 366 average immune gene in this study was ~10 kbp in length. Long reads greater than 10 kbp in the 367 platypus, koala and woylie genomes were able to span these genes, whereas the ~150 bp short reads 368 in the wombat, antechinus and numbat genomes were insufficient to re-assemble the entire gene, 369 resulting in gene fragments on short scaffolds. Gene families with copy number variation such as MHC 370 and NK receptors are notoriously difficult to assemble and annotate [18, 21], so it is not surprising 371 these gene families were highly fragmented in the antechinus and numbat genomes. Gene copies 372 within these families can contain almost identical domains, may be pseudogenes and are encoded in 373 clusters within the genome [28]. For example, koala NK LRC genes share up to 96% amino acid

sequence identity and are encoded within a single cluster. For these reasons, assembly and annotation
of MHC and NK receptors have been used to illustrate improvements in assembly quality. For example,
MHC class I genes were located on a single contig in a recent release of the human genome [21],
however the highly repetitive MHC class II locus remains unresolved [21].

Figure 4. Impact of different sequencing technologies on the assembly of immune gene clusters suchas the MHC.

380 Figure 4 legend. The impact of long-read (A – platypus, koala and woylie), short-read (B – wombat) 381 and 10x Chromium linked read (C – antechinus and numbat) sequencing technologies, alone or in 382 combination with HiC scaffolding (i – koala & platypus, and ii – wombat), on the assembly of complex 383 and repetitive immune gene clusters such as the MHC. Colour gradient represents gene orientation 384 (A) Long read sequencing generates reads which span complex and repetitive sequences, resulting in 385 long contigs and scaffolds which contain multiple immune genes with complete coding sequences. (B) 386 Short-read sequencing generated reads which are unable to span immune genes, hence reads are 387 assembled into multiple short contigs which end when the algorithm is unable to assemble a repetitive 388 and complex immune gene sequence. (C) In linked-read sequencing, individual DNA molecules are 389 partitioned into gel beads and identical barcodes attached, then sequenced using short-read 390 technology resulting in read clouds [98]. As no individual read within the cloud spans the entire length 391 of the DNA molecule, the algorithm is unable to assemble repetitive and complex sequences, resulting 392 in multiple short contigs similar to a short-read assembly. Short contigs in B and C result in 393 fragmentation of immune genes, leading to false pseudogenization and "missing" genes. (i) HiC 394 sequencing provides contact information for DNA sequences located in close proximity within the 395 nucleus, as frequency decreases with increasing linear distance within the genome assembly [99]. This 396 contact information can be used to cluster, order and orient contigs into chromosome-size scaffolds 397 [100]. Long contigs scaffolded with HiC result in near-complete reconstruction of immune gene 398 clusters. (ii) Short contigs scaffolded with HiC generates what appears to be long scaffolds, however complex immune gene clusters are incomplete. As multiple HiC contacts can span the length of the contig, the correct contig orientation is not apparent leading to inversions and mis-placed contigs during scaffolding. This leads to incorrect orientation of genes, which can cause pseudogenization and/or gene fragmentation. Manual immune gene annotation reveals that the true gene complement of the immune cluster is not contained within the scaffolded sequence. Figure created with BioRender.com.

405 HiC scaffolding of contigs derived from platypus and koala long reads resulted in complete and 406 accurate reassembly of immune gene clusters in both genomes (Figure 4 A). Conversely, HiC 407 scaffolding of contigs from wombat short reads resulted in immune gene fragmentation (Figure 4 B), 408 reflected in the high immune gene L90 for the wombat genome (Figure 2). Both the koala and wombat 409 genomes were scaffolded with DNAzoo HiC data using the same 3D-DNA pipeline [57, 58, 101]. This 410 result underscores the importance of assessing annotations when determining genome quality, as the 411 wombat genome is classified as chromosome-length yet is highly fragmented within functionally 412 important genomic regions. Input genome assembly contiguity is known to influence HiC scaffolding 413 ordering and orientation errors [102], despite claims that HiC scaffolding with 3D-DNA generates 414 chromosome-length scaffolds from US\$1,000 short read contigs [57]. Problems with HiC scaffolding 415 within repetitive and duplicated regions are well documented [23, 102, 103], which is exacerbated by 416 short contigs [102]. Modelling of human genome scaffolding performance using 3D-DNA revealed 417 scaffold chimeras, ordering and orientation errors increased as contig length decreased [102]. While 418 the koala and platypus genomes used as input to HiC scaffolding benefited from polishing with short 419 read data and optical mapping [49], HiC scaffolding is insufficient to recover the majority of immune 420 clusters from a fragmented genome.

The 3D-DNA pipeline orientates contigs within scaffolds by maximizing contact frequency between contig ends [58]. Short contigs, such as those from the wombat, would have multiple contacts that span the length of the contig. This means both true and false contig orientations would have a similar

frequency, resulting in errors such as the partial inversion of the TCRB locus which is likely false (Additional file 2). At a gene level, these errors lead to the misplacement of genes on short scaffolds outside the main immune cluster and false pseudogenisation (Figure 4 B). Long contigs, such as those from the koala, would have fewer contacts that span the length of the contig, hence the true orientation of the contig would be clear from the higher contact frequency at the correct joining end. The combination of long contigs which span repetitive and highly heterozygous regions with HiC scaffolding maximizes contiguity within immune gene clusters (Figure 4 A).

431 10x Chromium linked-read sequencing was insufficient to accurately re-assemble immune gene 432 clusters in our study (Figure 4 C). Complete marsupial immune gene clusters can span hundreds of 433 kilobases to megabases, as shown by annotation of the complete MHC, NK receptor and TCR regions 434 in the koala (Additional file 2). DNA molecules input to 10x library preparation were on average 74 435 kbp and 23 kbp in antechinus and numbat respectively. For most immune gene clusters, these 436 molecules would not span an entire cluster, nor even multiple immune genes in the case of the 437 numbat. This is reflected in our results, where smaller immune clusters such as the 70 kbp TRG locus 438 were intact in the antechinus, while no cluster was intact in the numbat. Interestingly, the antechinus 439 MHC cluster appears to be intact (Figure 3), however manual annotation revealed multiple genes were 440 "missing" within the scaffold and instead were located on individual short scaffolds. Even in humans, 441 10x linked reads are unable to resolve repetitive sequences which are larger than the input DNA 442 molecule [104]. Molecule length is influenced by input DNA quality [105], which was >40 kbp for both 443 antechinus [60] and numbat. DNA from human blood and cell lines routinely achieve molecule lengths 444 greater than 100 Mbp [106]. Given the challenges surrounding sampling of wildlife, this outcome 445 would be unlikely for many wildlife genomics projects using 10x linked read sequencing.

Regardless of input DNA molecule length, 10x libraries are still subject to the limitations of short-read
sequencing regarding assembly of complex sequences. Antechinus and numbat 10x libraries were
sequenced as short ~150 bp reads, hence while reads can be assigned back to the corresponding input

449 DNA molecule, no single read spans the molecule length. Gaps between the reads make de novo 450 assembly of repetitive and complex immune sequences difficult, often resulting in termination of 451 contig extension and gene fragments scattered across short scaffolds [104, 107, 108]. These gene 452 fragments can be misinterpreted as pseudogenes owing to loss of up/downstream coding regions 453 (Figure 4C). For example, antechinus and numbat NK LRC genes share up to 97% and 98% amino acid 454 sequence identity amongst the 91 and 70 immunoglobulin superfamily (IGSF) domains identified in 455 each species respectively. The LRC should be encoded within a single cluster, as in the koala genome 456 (Figure 3). Instead, the antechinus and numbat LRC clusters are fragmented across 33 and 34 scaffolds 457 respectively.

As the global biodiversity crisis deepens, the need to sequence eukaryotic life while it remains is imperative [1, 7, 8]. High quality genomes, using a combination of long-read and HiC, have recently been generated for a number of wildlife species [8], which have been used to answer questions involving chromosome evolution [109], comparative genomics [110] and runs of homozygosity [111] amongst others. Our results show that high-quality genomes are also necessary to study immune genes in wildlife.

464 Draft quality de novo genomes, in this study the antechinus and numbat (linked reads), have limited 465 capacity for usefully informing immunogenetics studies as only partial sequences will be identified for 466 most immune genes. A scaffold-quality genome, in this study the woylie (long-reads) or wombat 467 (short-reads with HiC), would be suitable for immune marker development targeting most immune 468 gene families, and studying TCR and IG diversity. Long-reads will provide contiguity within duplicated 469 MHC and NK families, which should reassemble into complete clusters. HiC data may resolve some 470 immune gene clusters from a short-read assembly, however, may introduce errors as discussed 471 earlier. Finally, the kitchen sink approach, in this study the platypus and koala genomes (multiple data 472 types), will accurately assemble immune gene clusters, which is essential for investigating genomic 473 organisation, synteny and evolution. In the context of wildlife disease, it may be necessary to wait for an opportunistic sample from an individual that is euthanised, or acquire ethics to euthanise an
individual, in order to obtain sufficient sample quantity and quality to generate high-quality
chromosome-length genome assemblies and associated transcriptomes [7, 9, 112-114].

## 477 Potential implications

478 The biodiversity crisis and increasing impact of wildlife disease on animal and human health provides 479 impetus for studying immune genes in wildlife. Genomes are now available for many wildlife species, 480 however utility of these assemblies for annotating complex immune gene families is unknown. We 481 have provided an assessment of complex immune gene annotation across genomes of varying quality, 482 using immune genes in five marsupials and one monotreme as an example. Genome quality directly 483 influenced the reassembly of immune gene clusters, and ability to investigate evolution, organisation, 484 and true gene content of the immune repertoire. A high-quality genome generated from long-reads 485 with HiC accurately assembles immune gene clusters. However, draft-quality genomes generated 486 from short-reads with HiC or 10x Chromium linked-reads were unable to achieve this. Aside from 487 genome quality, manual annotation of immune genes is required to cover the shortfall in deficient 488 gene models used by automated annotation software. Our results highlight the limitations of different 489 sequencing technologies and established workflows for genome annotation and quality assessment, 490 when applied to non-model species and the investigation of wildlife disease and immunity.

## 491 Methods

Five published marsupial genomes, koala [49, 57, 58], woylie [59], wombat [57], antechinus [60] and numbat [61] (Table 1), and one monotreme genome, platypus [33], were selected for this study based on use of different sequencing technologies (alone and in combination) and variation in assembly quality. These include assemblies generated using multiple data types (koala and platypus), long and short-reads (woylie), short-reads and HiC (wombat) or 10x Chromium linked-reads (antechinus and numbat). BUSCO scores were generated by uploading the six genome assemblies to the Galaxy web

498 platform [115], where the public server at galaxy.org was used to run BUSCOv5.2.2 [27] against the499 mammalian database.

500 Immune genes were annotated in the koala (phaCin\_unsw\_v4.1\_HiC) [49, 57, 58], antechinus 501 (anrechinusM\_pseudohap2.1) [60], woylie (mBetpen1.pri.20210916) [59], wombat (vu-2k) [57, 58] 502 and numbat genome (mMyrfas1.pri.20210917) [61] using multiple search strategies. BLAST was used 503 to search genome assemblies, associated annotation files and/or transcriptomes using published 504 marsupial, monotreme and eutherian immune gene sequences as queries, with default parameters 505 and an e-value threshold of 10 so as not to exclude any potential gene candidates. HMMERv3.2 [116] 506 was also used to identify putative genes within immune families that are known to contain 507 duplications in other marsupials, such as NK receptors. Hidden markov models (HMM) were 508 constructed using ClustalW alignments of published marsupial and eutherian immune gene sequences 509 constructed in BioEditv7.2.5 [117], which were then used to search all genomes and transcriptomes 510 using HMMER v3.2 with an e-value threshold of 10. For variable segments of T cell receptor and 511 Immunoglobulin families, recombination signal sequences (RSS) downloaded from the IMGT database 512 [92] and published koala sequences [49], were aligned using ClustalW in BioEditv7.2.5 [117] and used 513 to construct HMM. These RSS HMM were then used to search each genome using HMMERv3.2 [116], 514 to identify conserved RSS which flank each variable segment. For NK receptors, putative NKC and LRC 515 sequences from BLAST+v2.7.1 [62] and HMMERv3.2 [116] searches were queried against the swissprot 516 nonredundant database, and any sequences with top hits to swissprot NK genes, marsupial-specific 517 NK genes or the protein families database (Pfam) [118]immunoglobulin domain PF00047 or C-type 518 lectin domain PF00059 HMM model were retained. IGSF domains within putative NK sequences from 519 each species were identified using the simple modular architecture research tool (SMART) database 520 [119], and IGSF domains within 5 kbp were considered exons of a single LRC gene. Putative immune 521 genes were named following the appropriate nomenclature for each family, with duplicated genes 522 named according to their genomic location from the 5' to 3' end of the locus. For each immune gene 523 family, amino acid sequences from all five species, in addition to other marsupial, monotreme and

- 524 eutherian sequences, were aligned using ClustalW in BioEditv7.2.5 [117]. This alignment was then
- 525 used to construct neighbour-joining phylogenetic trees in MEGAXv10.2.4 [120] using the p-distance
- 526 method, pairwise deletion and 1000 bootstrap replicates.

## 527 Additional files

- 528 File name: Additional file 1
- 529 File format: .xls
- 530 Title of data: Supplementary Table S1
- 531 Description of data: Genomic coordinates of manually annotated immune genes in the koala, woylie,
- 532 wombat, antechinus and numbat genomes. The genomic coordinates of published platypus immune
- 533 genes used in this study are also included.
- 534 File name: Additional file 2
- 535 File format: .doc
- 536 Title of data: Supplementary results
- 537 Description of data: A comprehensive comparison of manually annotated immune genes in this
- 538 study to those in other marsupials and humans is provided in Supplementary Table 2. For each
- immune gene family characterised in this study, a summary of results and phylogenetic analysis is
- 540 provided. This includes genes encoding toll-like receptors, natural killer receptors, cytokines
- 541 (interferons, interleukins and tumour necrosis factors), T cell receptor constant and variable regions
- 542 (all five chains in marsupials and monotremes), immunoglobulin constant and variable regions
- 543 (heavy and light chains) and major histocompatibility complex class I, II and III genes. Additional file 2
- 544 contains 7 tables and 14 figures.

## 545 Data availability

546 The published woylie and numbat genome and global transcriptome assemblies are available through 547 Amazon Web Services Open Datasets Program https://registry.opendata.aws/australasian-548 genomics/, NCBI under BioProject accession PRJNA763700 and GigaDB for woylie and PRJNA786364 and GigaDB [121] for numbat. The published koala genome assembly and annotation 549 550 (phaCin unsw v4.1 HiC.fasta) are available from the DNAzoo website 551 https://www.dnazoo.org/assemblies/Phascolarctos\_cinereus. The published wombat genome 552 assembly and annotation (vu-2k.fasta) are also available from the DNAzoo website 553 https://www.dnazoo.org/assemblies/Vombatus ursinus. The published antechinus genome 554 assembly and annotation (anrechinusM pseudohap2.1.fasta) are available from NCBI under 555 BioProject accession PRJNA664282 and GigaDB [122], and published platypus genome assembly and annotation (mOrnAna1.pri.v4) under BioProject accession PRJNA489114. Genomic coordinates for all 556 557 immune gene sequences annotated in this study are available in Additional file 1. Supporting 558 information for this study is available in Additional file 2.

## 559 **Declarations**

#### 560 List of abbreviations

561 Bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC), basic local alignment search tool (BLAST), benchmarking single 562 copy gene orthologs (BUSCO), complementary DNA (cDNA), devil facial tumour disease (DFTD), giga-563 base-pair (Gpb), high-throughput chromosome conformation capture (HiC), hidden markov model 564 (HMM), immunoglobulin (IG), immunoglobulin superfamily (IGSF), interferon (IFN), international 565 immunogenetic information system (IMGT), kilo-base-pair (kbp), leukocyte receptor complex (LRC), 566 major histocompatibility complex (MHC), mega-base-pair (Mbp), National Center for Biotechnology 567 Information (NCBI), natural killer complex (NKC), natural killer receptor (NK), Pacific Biosciences 568 (PacBio), protein families database (Pfam), recombination signal sequence (RSS), simple modular

- 569 architecture research tool (SMART), single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), T cell receptor (TCR)
- 570 and toll-like receptor (TLR).
- 571 Consent for publication
- 572 Not applicable

#### 573 Competing interests

- 574 The authors declare that they have no competing interests
- 575 Funding
- 576 This work has been funded by the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Innovations in
- 577 Peptide and Protein Science (CE200100012) and Discovery Project (DP180102465). LS was supported
- 578 by LP180100244 and PB was supported by an Australian Postgraduate award. YZ is supported by the
- 579 China Scholarship Council.

#### 580 Authors' contributions

- 581 LS assembled and annotated the woylie genome and transcriptomes, PB assembled and annotated
- the numbat genome and transcriptomes, EP assisted with both. EP, PB, LS, YC and YZ annotated
- 583 immune genes. KB, CJH and EP designed the study. EP drafted the manuscript, all authors read and
- 584 commented on drafts of the manuscript and have approved the submission.

#### 585 Acknowledgements

- 586 The authors would also like to acknowledge the generous contribution of the Presbyterian Ladies'
- 587 College Sydney and Bioplatforms Australia.

## 588 References

- Diaz S, Settle J, Brondizio ES, Ngo HT, Gueze M, Agard J, et al. *IPBES (2019): Summary for* policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem servies of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2019.
   Bonn, Germany.
- Scheele BC, Pasmans F, Skerratt LF, Berger L, Martel A, Beukema W, et al. Amphibian fungal panzootic causes catastrophic and ongoing loss of biodiversity. Science. 2019;363
   6434:1459. doi:10.1126/science.aav0379.
- 596 3. Hoyt JR, Kilpatrick AM and Langwig KE. Ecology and impacts of white-nose syndrome on 597 bats. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2021;19 3:196-210. doi:10.1038/s41579-020-00493-5.
- Woods GM, Lyons AB and Bettiol SS. A Devil of a Transmissible Cancer. Tropical Medicine
   and Infectious Disease. 2020;5 2:50.

600 5. Rohr JR, Civitello DJ, Halliday FW, Hudson PJ, Lafferty KD, Wood CL, et al. Towards common 601 ground in the biodiversity-disease debate. Nature Ecology & Evolution. 2020;4 1:24-33. 602 doi:10.1038/s41559-019-1060-6. 603 6. Hohenlohe PA, Funk WC and Rajora OP. Population genomics for wildlife conservation and management. Molecular Ecology. 2021;30 1:62-82. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15720. 604 605 7. Lewin H, Robinson G, Kress WJ, Baker W, Coddington J, Crandall K, et al. Earth BioGenome 606 Project: Sequencing life for the future of life. Proceedings of the National Academy of 607 Sciences (PNAS). 2018;115 17:4325-33. doi:10.1073/pnas.1720115115. 608 8. Rhie A, McCarthy SA, Fedrigo O, Damas J, Formenti G, Koren S, et al. Towards complete and 609 error-free genome assemblies of all vertebrate species. Nature. 2021;592 7856:737-46. 610 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03451-0. 9. 611 Teeling EC, Vernes SC, Dávalos LM, Ray DA, Gilbert MTP and Myers E. Bat Biology, Genomes, 612 and the Bat1K Project: To Generate Chromosome-Level Genomes for All Living Bat Species. 613 Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2018;6 1:23-46. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-022516-614 022811. 615 10. Zhang G. Bird sequencing project takes off. Nature. 2015;522 7554:34-. 616 doi:10.1038/522034d. Peterson BK, Weber JN, Kay EH, Fisher HS and Hoekstra HE. Double Digest RADseq: An 617 11. 618 Inexpensive Method for De Novo SNP Discovery and Genotyping in Model and Non-Model 619 Species. PLOS ONE. 2012;7 5:e37135. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037135. 620 12. Sansaloni CP, Petroli CD, Carling J, Hudson CJ, Steane DA, Myburg AA, et al. A high-density 621 Diversity Arrays Technology (DArT) microarray for genome-wide genotyping in Eucalyptus. 622 Plant Methods. 2010;6 1:16. doi:10.1186/1746-4811-6-16. McLennan EA, Grueber CE, Wise P, Belov K and Hogg CJ. Mixing genetically differentiated 623 13. 624 populations successfully boosts diversity of an endangered carnivore. Animal Conservation. 625 2020;23 6:700-12. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12589. Scally A, Yngvadottir B, Xue Y, Ayub Q, Durbin R and Tyler-Smith C. A Genome-Wide Survey 626 14. 627 of Genetic Variation in Gorillas Using Reduced Representation Sequencing. PLOS ONE. 628 2013;8 6:e65066. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065066. 629 15. Robledo-Ruiz DA, Pavlova A, Clarke RH, Magrath MJL, Quin B, Harrisson KA, et al. A novel 630 framework for evaluating in situ breeding management strategies in endangered 631 populations. Molecular Ecology Resources. 2021;n/a n/a doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-632 0998.13476. 633 16. Lott MJ, Wright BR, Kemp LF, Johnson RN and Hogg CJ. Genetic Management of Captive and 634 Reintroduced Bilby Populations. The Journal of Wildlife Management. 2020;84 1:20-32. 635 doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.21777. 636 17. Irving AT, Ahn M, Goh G, Anderson DE and Wang L-F. Lessons from the host defences of 637 bats, a unique viral reservoir. Nature. 2021;589 7842:363-70. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-638 03128-0. 639 18. Horton R, Wilming L, Rand V, Lovering RC, Bruford EA, Khodiyar VK, et al. Gene map of the 640 extended human MHC. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2004;5 12:889-99. doi:10.1038/nrg1489. 641 19. Robinson J, Waller MJ, Parham P, Groot Nd, Bontrop R, Kennedy LJ, et al. IMGT/HLA and 642 IMGT/MHC: sequence databases for the study of the major histocompatibility complex. Nucleic Acids Research. 2003;31 1:311-4. doi:10.1093/nar/gkg070. 643 644 20. Trowsdale J and Parham P. Mini-review: Defense strategies and immunity-related genes. 645 European Journal of Immunology. 2004;34 1:7-17. 646 doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.200324693. 647 21. Jain M, Koren S, Miga KH, Quick J, Rand AC, Sasani TA, et al. Nanopore sequencing and 648 assembly of a human genome with ultra-long reads. Nature Biotechnology. 2018;36 4:338-649 45. doi:10.1038/nbt.4060.

650	22.	Ming L, Wang Z, Yi L, Batmunkh M, Liu T, Siren D, et al. Chromosome-level assembly of wild
651		Bactrian camel genome reveals organization of immune gene loci. Molecular Ecology
652		Resources. 2020;20 3:770-80. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13141.
653	23.	Bickhart DM, Rosen BD, Koren S, Sayre BL, Hastie AR, Chan S, et al. Single-molecule
654		sequencing and chromatin conformation capture enable de novo reference assembly of the
655		domestic goat genome. Nature Genetics. 2017;49 4:643-50. doi:10.1038/ng.3802.
656	24.	Holt C and Yandell M. MAKER2: an annotation pipeline and genome-database management
657		tool for second-generation genome projects. BMC Bioinformatics. 2011;12 1:491.
658		doi:10.1186/1471-2105-12-491.
659	25.	Solovyev V, Kosarev P, Seledsov I and Vorobyev D. Automatic annotation of eukaryotic
660		genes, pseudogenes and promoters. Genome Biology. 2006;7 Suppl 1:S10. doi:10.1186/gb-
661		2006-7-s1-s10.
662	26.	Rhie A, McCarthy SA, Fedrigo O, Damas J, Formenti G, Koren S, et al. Towards complete and
663		error-free genome assemblies of all vertebrate species. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 2020.
664	27.	Seppey M, Manni M and Zdobnov EM. BUSCO: Assessing Genome Assembly and Annotation
665		Completeness. In: Kollmar M, editor. Gene Prediction: Methods and Protocols. New York,
666		NY: Springer New York; 2019. p. 227-45.
667	28.	Mudge JM and Harrow J. The state of play in higher eukaryote gene annotation. Nature
668		Reviews Genetics. 2016;17 12:758-72. doi:10.1038/nrg.2016.119.
669	29.	Guigó R, Flicek P, Abril JF, Reymond A, Lagarde J, Denoeud F, et al. EGASP: the human
670		ENCODE genome annotation assessment project. Genome Biology. 2006;7 Suppl 1:S2.
671		doi:10.1186/gb-2006-7-s1-s2.
672	30.	Ensembl: Annotation of immunoglobulin and T cell receptor genes.
673		https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/ig_tcr.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.
674	31.	Hogg CJ, Ottewell K, Latch P, Rossetto M, Biggs J, Gilbert A, et al. Threatened Species
675		Initiative: Empowering conservation action using genomic resources. Proceedings of the
676		National Academy of Sciences. 2022;119 4:e2115643118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2115643118.
677	32.	Gordon D, Huddleston J, Chaisson Mark JP, Hill Christopher M, Kronenberg Zev N, Munson
678		Katherine M, et al. Long-read sequence assembly of the gorilla genome. Science. 2016;352
679		6281:aae0344. doi:10.1126/science.aae0344.
680	33.	Zhou Y, Shearwin-Whyatt L, Li J, Song Z, Hayakawa T, Stevens D, et al. Platypus and echidna
681		genomes reveal mammalian biology and evolution. Nature. 2021; doi:10.1038/s41586-020-
682		03039-0.
683	34.	Quigley BL and Timms P. The Koala Immune Response to Chlamydial Infection and Vaccine
684		Development—Advancing Our Immunological Understanding. Animals. 2021;11 2:380.
685	35.	Madden D, Whaite A, Jones E, Belov K, Timms P and Polkinghorne A. Koala immunology and
686		infectious diseases: How much can the koala bear? Developmental & Comparative
687		Immunology. 2018;82:177-85. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2018.01.017</u> .
688	36.	Peel E and Belov K. Lessons learnt from the Tasmanian devil facial tumour regarding immune
689		function in cancer. Mammalian Genome. 2018; doi:10.1007/s00335-018-9782-3.
690	37.	Murchison EP, Schulz-Trieglaff OB, Ning Z, Alexandrow LB, Bauer MJ, Fu B, et al. Genome
691		sequencing and analysis of the Tasmanian devil and its transmissible cancer. Cell.
692		2012;148:780-91.
693	38.	Morris B, Cheng Y, Warren W, Papenfuss AT and Belov K. Identification and analysis of
694 сог		divergent immune gene families within the Tasmanian devil genome. BMC Genomics.
695 COC	20	2015;10 1. Murchisen ED, Teuer C, Heu AL, Des des HC, Khansdesen D, Daldard C, CA, et al. The T
696 607	39.	iviurchison EP, Tovar C, Hsu AL, Bender HS, Kneradpour P, Rebbeck CA, et al. The Tasmanian
6097		aevir transcriptome reveals schwann cell origins in a cionally transmissible cancer. Science.
030		

699 40. Hewavisenti RV, Morris KM, O'Meally D, Cheng Y, Papenfuss AT and Belov K. The 700 identification of immune genes in the milk transcriptome of the Tasmanian devil (Sarcophilus 701 harrisii). PeerJ. 2016;4:1569. 702 Cheng Y, Stuart A, Morris K, Taylor R, Siddle HV, Deakin JE, et al. Antigen-presenting genes 41. 703 and genomic copy number variations in the Tasmanian devil MHC. BMC Genomics. 704 2012;13:87. 705 42. Morris KM, Wright B, Grueber CE, Hogg C and Belov K. Lack of genetic diversity across 706 diverse immune genes in an endangered mammal, the Tasmanian devil (Sarcophilus harrisii). 707 Molecular Ecology. 2015;24:3860-72. 708 Siddle HV, Kreiss A, Eldridge MDB, Noonan E, Clarke CJ, Pyecroft S, et al. Transmission of a 43. 709 fatal clonal tumor by biting occurs due to depleted MHC diversity in a threatened 710 carnivorous marsupial. PNAS. 2007;104 41:16221-6. 711 44. Siddle HV, Kreiss A, Tovar C, Yuen CK, Chen Y, Belov K, et al. Reversible epigenetic down-712 regulation of MHC molecules by devil facial tumour disease illustrates immune escape by a 713 contagious cancer. PNAS. 2013;110 13:5103-8. 714 45. Siddle HV, Sanderson CE and Belov K. Characterization of major histocompatability complex 715 class I and II genes from the Tasmanian devil (Sarcophilus harrisii). Immunogenetics. 716 2007;59:753-60. Cheng Y, Sanderson CE, Jones M and Belov K. Low MHC class II diversity in the Tasmanian 717 46. 718 devil. Immunogenetics. 2012;64:525-33. 719 47. Cheng Y, Grueber C, Hogg CJ and Belov K. Improved high-throughput MHC typing for non-720 model species using long-read sequencing. Molecular Ecology Resources. 2021;n/a n/a 721 doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13511. 722 48. Quigley BL and Timms P. Helping koalas battle disease - Recent advances in Chlamydia and 723 koala retrovirus (KoRV) disease understanding and treatment in koalas. FEMS Microbiology 724 Reviews. 2020; doi:10.1093/femsre/fuaa024. 725 Johnson RN, O'Meally D, Chen Z, Etherington GJ, Ho SYW, Nash WJ, et al. Adaptation and 49. 726 conservation insights from the koala genome. Nature Genetics. 2018;50 8:1102-11. 727 doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0153-5. 728 50. Morris K, Prentis PJ, O'Meally D, Pavasovic A, Brown AT, Timms P, et al. The koala 729 immunological toolkit: sequence identification and comparison of key markers of the koala 730 (Phascolarctos cinereus) immune response. Australian Journal of Zoology. 2014;62:195-9. Morris KM, Matthew M, Waugh C, Ujvari B, Timms P, Polkinghorne A, et al. Identification, 731 51. 732 characterisation and expression analysis of natural killer receptor genes in Chlamydia 733 pecorum infected koalas (Phascolarctos cinereus). BMC Genomics. 2015;16 1. 734 52. Morris KM, O'Meally D, Zaw T, Song X, Gillett A, Molloy MP, et al. Characterisation of the 735 immune compounds in koala milk using a combined transcriptomic and proteomic approach. 736 Scientific Reports. 2016;6:e35011. 737 Lau Q, Griffith JE and Higgins DP. Identification of MHCII variants associated with chlamydial 53. 738 disease in the koala (Phascolarctos cinereus). PeerJ. 2014;2:443. 739 54. Robbins A, Hanger J, Jelocnik M, Quigley BL and Timms P. Koala immunogenetics and 740 chlamydial strain type are more directly involved in chlamydial disease progression in koalas 741 from two south east Queensland koala populations than koala retrovirus subtypes. Scientific 742 Reports. 2020;10 1:15013. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-72050-2. 743 55. Owen RS and Siddle HV. Devil Facial Tumours: Towards a Vaccine. Immunological 744 Investigations. 2019;48 7:719-36. doi:10.1080/08820139.2019.1624770. 745 Phillips S, Quigley BL and Timms P. Seventy years of Chlamydia vaccine research - limitations 56. 746 of the past and directions for the future. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2019;10 70. 747 57. Dudchenko O, Shamim MS, Batra SS, Durand NC, Musial NT, Mostofa R, et al. The Juicebox 748 Assembly Tools module facilitates de novo assembly of mammalian genomes with 749 chromosome-length scaffolds for under \$1000. bioRxiv. 2018:254797. doi:10.1101/254797.

750 58. Dudchenko O, Batra SS, Omer AD, Nyquist SK, Hoeger M, Durand NC, et al. De novo 751 assembly of the Aedes aegypti genome using Hi-C yields chromosome-length scaffolds. 752 Science advances. 2017;356:92-5. Peel E, Silver L, Brandies P, Hogg CJ and Belov K. A reference genome for the critically 753 59. 754 endangered woylie, Bettongia penicillata ogilbyi. Gigabyte. 2021;1 755 doi:https://doi.org/10.46471/gigabyte.35. 756 60. Brandies PA, Tang S, Johnson RSP, Hogg CJ and Belov K. The first Antechinus reference 757 genome provides a resource for investigating the genetic basis of semelparity and age-758 related neuropathologies. Gigabyte. 2020;2020:0. doi:10.46471/gigabyte.7. 759 Peel E, Silver L, Brandies PA, Hayakawa T, Belov K and Hogg CJ. Genome assembly of the 61. 760 numbat (Myrmecobius fasciatus), the only termitivorous marsupial. Gigabyte. 2022; 761 doi:https://doi.org/10.46471/gigabyte.47. 762 62. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, et al. BLAST+: 763 architecture and applications. BMC bioinformatics. 2009;10 421. 764 63. Eddy SR. A probabilistic model of local sequence alignment that simplifies statistical 765 significance estimation. PLOS Computational Biology. 2008;4 5:e1000069. 766 64. Belov K, Lam MKP, Hellman L and Colgan DJ. Evolution of the major histocompataibility 767 complex: isolation of the class II beta cDNAs from two monotremes, the platypus and the 768 short-beaked echidna. Immunogenetics. 2003;55:402-11. 769 65. Belov K and Hellman L. Immunoglobulin genetics of Ornithorhynchus anatinus (platypus) and 770 Tachyglossus aculeatus (short-beaked echidna). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. 2003;136:811-9. 771 772 66. Wong ESW, Sanderson CE, Deakin JE, Whittington CM, Papenfuss AT and Belov K. 773 Identification of natural killer cell receptor clusters in the platypus genome reveals an 774 expansion of C-type lectin genes. Immunogenetics. 2009;61:565-79. 775 67. Dohm JC, Tsend-Ayush E, Reinhardt R, Grutzner F and Himmelbauer H. Distribution and 776 pseudoautosomal localization of the major histocompatability complex in monotremes. 777 Genome Biology. 2007;8:R175-R.16. 778 68. Papenfuss AT, Feng Z, Krasnec K, Deakin JE, Baker ML and Miller RD. Marsupials and 779 monotremes possess a novel family of MHC class I genes that is lost from the eutherian 780 lineage. BMC Genomics. 2015;16:535. 781 69. Nowak MA, Parra ZE, Hellman L and Miller RD. The complexity of expressed kappa light 782 chains in egg-laying mammals. Immunogenetics. 2004;56:555-63. 783 70. Johansson J, Aveskogh M, Munday BL and Hellman L. Heavy chain V region diversity in the 784 duck-billed platypus (Ornithorhynchus anatinus): long and highly variable complementary-785 determining region 3 compensates for limited germline diversity. The Journal of 786 Immunology. 2002;168:5155-62. 787 71. Johansson J, Salazar JN, Aveskogh M, Munday B, Miller RD and Hellman L. High variability in 788 complementarity-determining regions compensates for a low number of V gene families in 789 the  $\lambda$  light chain locus of the platypus. European Journal of Immunology. 2005;35 10:3008-790 19. doi:<u>https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.200425574</u>. Parra ZE, Arnold T, Nowak MA, Hellman L and Miller RD. TCR gamma chain diversity in the 791 72. 792 splen of the duckbill platypus (Ornithorhynchus anatinus). Developmenal and Comparative 793 Immunology. 2006;30:699-71. 794 73. Parra ZE, Lillie M and Miller RD. A model for the evolution of the mammalian T-cell receptor 795 alpha/delta and mu loci based on evidence from the duckbill platypus. Molecular Biology 796 and Evolution. 2012;29 10:3205-14. 797 74. Wang X, Parra ZE and Miller RD. Platypus TCRmu provides insight into the origins and 798 evolution of a uniquely mammalian TCR locus. The Journal of Immunology. 2011;187:5246-799 54.

800 75. Wong ESW, Papenfuss AT, Miller RD and Belov K. Hatching time for monotreme 801 immunology. Australian Journal of Zoology. 2006;57:185-98. 76. 802 Belov K, Sanderson CE, Deakin JE, Wong ESW, Assange D, McColl KA, et al. Characterization 803 of the opossum immune genome provides insight into the evolution of the mammalian 804 immune system. Genome Research. 2007;17:982-91. 805 77. Lau Q, Jobbins SE, Belov K and Higgins DP. Characterisation of four major histocompatibility 806 complex class II genes of the koala (Phascolarctos cinereus). Immunogenetics. 2013;65:37-807 46. 808 78. Jobbins SE, Sanderson CE, Griffith JE, Krockenberger MB, Belov K and Higgins DP. Diversity of 809 MHC class II DAB1 in the koala (Phascolarctos cinereus). Australian Journal of Zoology. 810 2012;60 1:1-9. doi:<u>https://doi.org/10.1071/Z012013</u>. 811 79. Cheng Y, Polkinghorne A, Gillett A, Jones EA, O'Meally D, Timms P, et al. Characterisation of 812 MHC class I genes in the koala. Immunogenetics. 2018;70:125-33. 813 80. Matthew M, Beagley KW, Timms P and Polkinghorne A. preliminary characterisation of 814 tumour necrosis factor alpha and interleukin-10 responses to Chlamydia pecorum infection 815 in the koala (Phascolarctos cinereus). PLOS one. 2013;8 3:e59958. 816 81. Matthew M, Pavasovic A, Prentis PJ, Beagley KW, Timms P and Polkinghorne A. Molecular 817 characterisation and expression analysis of Interferon gamma in response to natural 818 Chlamydia infection in the koala, Phascolarctos cinereus. Gene. 2013;527:570-7. 819 82. Mathew M, Waugh C, Beagley KW, Timms P and Polkinghorne A. Interleukin 17A is an 820 immune marker for chlamydial disease severity and pathogenesis in the koala (Phascolarctos 821 cinereus). Developmental & Comparative Immunology. 2014;46 2:423-9. 822 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2014.05.015. 823 83. Maher IE, Griffith JE, Lau Q, Reeves T and Higgins DP. Expression profiles of the immune 824 genes CD4, CD8 beta, IFN gamma, IL-4, IL-6 and IL-10 in mitogen-stimulated koala 825 lymphocytes (Phascolarctos cinereus) by qRT-PCR. PeerJ. 2014;2. 826 84. Miller RD. Those other mammals: The immunoglobulins and T cell receptors of marsupials 827 and monotremes. Seminars in Immunology. 2010;22:3-9. 828 85. Parra ZE, Baker ML, Hathaway J, Lopez AM, Trujillo J, Sharp A, et al. Comparative genomic 829 analysis and evolution of the T cell receptor loci in the opossum Monodelphis domestica. 830 BMC Genomics. 2008;9 111:1-19. 831 86. Siddle HV, Deakin JE, Coggill P, Whilming LG, Harrow J, Kaufman J, et al. The tammar wallaby 832 major histocompatability complex shows evidence of past genomic instability. BMC 833 Genomics. 2011;12:421. 834 87. Cheng Y, Siddle HV, Beck S, Eldridge MDB and Belov K. High levels of genetic variation at 835 MHC class II DBB loci in the tammar wallaby (Macropus eugenii). Immunogenetics. 836 2009;61:111-8. 837 Zuccolotto P, Harrison GA and Deane EM. Cloning of marsupial T cell receptor alpha and 88. 838 beta constant region cDNAs. Immunology and Cell Biology. 2000;78 2:103-9. 839 89. Daly KA, Digby M, Lefevre C, Mailer S, Thomson P, Nicholas KR, et al. Analysis of the 840 expression of immunoglobulins throughout lactation suggests two periods of immune 841 transfer in the tammar wallaby (Macropus eugenii). Veterinary Immunology and 842 Immunopathology. 2007;120:187-200. 90. Frankish A, Diekhans M, Ferreira A-M, Johnson R, Jungreis I, Loveland J, et al. GENCODE 843 844 reference annotation for the human and mouse genomes. Nucleic Acids Research. 2018;47 845 D1:D766-D73. doi:10.1093/nar/gky955. Pertea M, Shumate A, Pertea G, Varabyou A, Breitwieser FP, Chang Y-C, et al. CHESS: a new 846 91. 847 human gene catalog curated from thousands of large-scale RNA sequencing experiments 848 reveals extensive transcriptional noise. Genome Biology. 2018;19 1:208. 849 doi:10.1186/s13059-018-1590-2.

<ul> <li>international ImMunoGeneTics information system* 25 years on. Nucleic Acids Research. 2015;43 D1:D413-D22. doi:10.1093/nar/gku1056.</li> <li>Salzberg SL. Next-generation genome annotation: we still struggle to get it right. Genome Biology. 2019;20:192. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1715-2.</li> <li>Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-76. doi:10.1101/gr.21487.116.</li> <li>Uberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Uu J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juitebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walera ZP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li></ul>	850	92.	Lefranc M-P, Giudicelli V, Duroux P, Jabado-Michaloud J, Folch G, Aouinti S, et al. IMGT <sup>®</sup> , the
<ul> <li>2015;43 D1:0413-022. doi:10.1093/nar/gku1056.</li> <li>Salzberg SL. Next-generation genome annotation: we still struggle to get it right. Genome Biology. 2019;20:1:92. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1715-2.</li> <li>Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome cords. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 575-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Uieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Lu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. Rharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.11371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Gh</li></ul>	851		international ImMunoGeneTics information system <sup>®</sup> 25 years on. Nucleic Acids Research.
<ol> <li>Satzberg SL. Next-generation genome annotation: we still struggle to get it right. Genome Biology. 2019;20 1:92. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1715-2.</li> <li>Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/aenebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 19th Augy 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Willims L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Raege Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.118169.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurve J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLoS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1101/gr.214423.118.</li> <li>Sutton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JD and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin int</li></ol>	852		2015;43 D1:D413-D22. doi:10.1093/nar/gku1056.
<ul> <li>Biology. 2019;20.1:92. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1715-2.</li> <li>Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana.</li> <li>https://mesembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl.</li> <li>https://mensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBak genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 19th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1317/journal.pcbi.101.038/htt2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.10101/</li></ul>	853	93.	Salzberg SL. Next-generation genome annotation: we still struggle to get it right. Genome
<ol> <li>Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuid/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuid/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Ueberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Jusebax provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/htb.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj</li></ol>	854		Biology. 2019;20 1:92. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1715-2.
<ul> <li>https://m.ensembi.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembi: Gene annotation in Ensembi. https://m.ensembi.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefing in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8: e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assembly Breaded on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/hbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectru</li></ul>	855	94.	Ensembl: Manual gene annotation by Havana.
<ul> <li>July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl.</li> <li>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Fisembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl.</li> <li>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 14h August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nb1.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R,</li></ul>	856		https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/manual_havana.html (2021). Accessed 19th
<ul> <li>95. National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>96. Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>97. National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>98. Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>99. Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>100. Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bab033.</li> <li>101. Durand MC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>102. Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>103. Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/htt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.</li></ul>	857		July 2021.
<ul> <li>Pipeline. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs.update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27: 575-76. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5550:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.103/bi/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of Lenovo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/htb.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>No Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/d</li></ul>	858	95.	, National Center for Biotechnology Information: The NCBI Eukaryotic Genome Annotation
<ul> <li>19th July 2021.</li> <li>96. Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl.</li> <li>https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>97. Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-76. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>99. Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>100. Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>101. Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for HI-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>102. Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8: e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>103. Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Bario AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bhardwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. DtX Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/denovoassembly/software/operines/0.234576.019-0130-9.</li> <li>106. At Genomic</li></ul>	859		Pipeline, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/ (2021), Accessed
<ul> <li>Ensembl: Gene annotation in Ensembl. https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for HI-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>DK Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Morks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full s</li></ul>	860		19th July 2021.
<ul> <li>https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021). Accessed 19th July 2021.</li> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NJ, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberann-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A Comprehensive versive of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8: e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:633-453. doi:10.1010/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Woneroav version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE.</li></ul>	861	96	Ensemble Gene annotation in Ensemble
<ul> <li>National Center for Biotechnology Information: Updating information on GenBank genome records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLoS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/denovo-assembly/software/opellengt/atst/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;23 : 171-89. doi:10.1038/s4157</li></ul>	862	50.	https://m.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/index.html (2021) Accessed 19th July 2021
<ul> <li>records. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/wgs_update/ (2021). Accessed 4th August 2021.</li> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr_214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;11 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/denovo-assembly/software/optelines/latest/opteformance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Wills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-C</li></ul>	863	97	National Center for Biotechnology Information: Undating information on GenBank genome
<ul> <li>Netroda Integration of the second seco</li></ul>	864	57.	records https://www.pchi.plm.pib.gov/genbank/wgs_update/(2021) Accessed 4th August
<ul> <li>Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM and Jaffe DB. Direct determination of diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:75-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/hbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>IOS. I0X Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021. 10X Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021. 107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li></ul>	865		2021 2021 Accessed 4th August
<ol> <li>Weiselneid vi, Kuna V, Stan Y, Church DW and PDS. 2017;27:575-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326:5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 40:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Le</li></ol>	803	00	2021. Waisanfald NI, Kumar V, Shah D, Church DM and Jaffa DP. Direct determination of diploid
<ul> <li>genotic sequences. Genomic Research. 2017;27:37:37-07. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.</li> <li>Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A, et al.</li> <li>Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the</li> <li>Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding</li> <li>methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox</li> <li>provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems.</li> <li>2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with</li> <li>assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15</li> <li>8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale</li> <li>scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature</li> <li>Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full</li> <li>spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/purpformance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/purpformance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/purpformance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/purpformance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/purpformance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-ass</li></ul>	000	90.	weiserneid Ni, Kumar V, Shan P, Church Divi and Jane DB. Direct determination of diploid
<ol> <li>Deberman-Auder E, Van Berkum NC, Winnans E, Imakaev M, Angoczy T, Telmig A, et al. Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>Mo Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1104/annurev-an</li></ol>	807	00	genome sequences. Genome Research. 2017;27 5:757-67. doi:10.1101/gr.214874.116.
<ul> <li>Comprehensive Mapping of Löng-Kange Interactions Reveals Prolong Principles of the Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2002;13:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.11046/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>Zoonomia Consortium. A com</li></ul>	808	99.	Lieberman-Alden E, van Berkum NL, windens L, imakaev Wi, Ragoczy T, Teining A, et al.
<ul> <li>Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/Science.1181369.</li> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>IoX Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>IoX Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924</li></ul>	869		Comprehensive Mapping of Long-Range Interactions Reveals Folding Principles of the
<ol> <li>Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scatfolding methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/formance. 0200. Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;91:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>109.</li></ol>	870	4.0.0	Human Genome. Science. 2009;326 5950:289. doi:10.1126/science.1181369.
<ul> <li>methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.</li> <li>101. Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>102. Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>103. Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>107. Conomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2</li></ul>	8/1	100.	Luo J, Wei Y, Lyu M, Wu Z, Liu X, Luo H, et al. A comprehensive review of scaffolding
<ol> <li>Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</u></li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</u></li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi</li></ol>	8/2		methods in genome assembly. Briefings in Bioinformatics. 2021; doi:10.1093/bib/bbab033.
<ul> <li>provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems. 2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15</li> <li>8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>Cux Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Ann</li></ul>	873	101.	Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MD, Machol I, Mesirov JP, Lander ES, et al. Juicebox
<ul> <li>2016;3:99-101.</li> <li>102. Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15</li> <li>8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>103. Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnabla JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>900 wi</li></ul>	874		provides a visualisation system for Hi-C contact maps with unlimited zoom. Cell Systems.
<ol> <li>Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15 8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen</u> (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance</u> (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109</li></ol>	875		2016;3:99-101.
<ul> <li>assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15</li> <li>8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale</li> <li>scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature</li> <li>Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full</li> <li>spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews</li> <li>Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology</li> <li>for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19</li> <li>doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of</li> <li>Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and</li> <li>conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows</li> <li>into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	876	102.	Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Schmitt A, Selvaraj S, Pop M, et al. Integrating Hi-C links with
<ul> <li>8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.</li> <li>8079</li> <li>103. Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/ntrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	877		assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly. PLOS Computational Biology. 2019;15
<ul> <li>Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29 4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>Os. Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>104. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>105. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrr.2017.109.</li> </ul>	878		8:e1007273. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273.
<ul> <li>scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature</li> <li>Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>104. Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full</li> <li>spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-</li> <li>assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-</li> <li>novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews</li> <li>Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology</li> <li>for assemblig large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19</li> <li>doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of</li> <li>Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and</li> <li>conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows</li> <li>into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	879	103.	Burton JN, Adey A, Patwardhan RP, Qiu R, Kitzman JO and Shendure J. Chromosome-scale
<ul> <li>Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.</li> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19</li> <li>doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nre.2017.109.</li> </ul>	880		scaffolding of de novo genome assemblies based on chromatin interactions. Nature
<ul> <li>Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full</li> <li>spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculeen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19</li> <li>doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	881		Biotechnology. 2013;31 12:1119-25. doi:10.1038/nbt.2727.
<ul> <li>spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29</li> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo- assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	882	104.	Marks P, Garcia S, Barrio AM, Belhocine K, Bernate J, Bharadwaj R, et al. Resolving the full
<ul> <li>4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.</li> <li>105. 10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/denovo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	883		spectrum of human genome variation using Linked-Reads. Genome Research. 2019;29
<ul> <li>10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/denovo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>10x Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>10x Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	884		4:635-45. doi:10.1101/gr.234443.118.
<ul> <li>assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	885	105.	10x Genomics: Molecule length calculation. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-novo-</u>
<ul> <li>106. 10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. https://support.10xgenomics.com/de- novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>107. Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	886		assembly/software/pipelines/latest/output/moleculelen (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.
<ul> <li>novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.</li> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>11. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	887	106.	10x Genomics: Supernova version 2.x performance. <u>https://support.10xgenomics.com/de-</u>
<ul> <li>Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	888		novo-assembly/software/overview/latest/performance (2020). Accessed 22nd July 2021.
<ul> <li>Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.</li> <li>Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>11. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	889	107.	Ho SS, Urban AE and Mills RE. Structural variation in the sequencing era. Nature Reviews
<ul> <li>108. Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19 doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	890		Genetics. 2020;21 3:171-89. doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0180-9.
<ul> <li>for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19</li> <li>doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of</li> <li>Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>I10. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and</li> <li>conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>I11. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows</li> <li>into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	891	108.	Ott A, Schnable JC, Cheng-Ting Y, Wu L, Liu C, Heng-Cheng H, et al. Linked read technology
<ul> <li>doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z</u>.</li> <li>Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>I10. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>I11. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	892		for assembling large complex and polyploid genomes. BMC Genomics. 2018;19
<ul> <li>109. Damas J, Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>110. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	893		doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-018-5040-z
<ul> <li>Animal Biosciences. 2021;9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurev-animal-020518-114924.</li> <li>I10. Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>I11. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	894	109.	Damas J. Corbo M and Lewin HA. Vertebrate Chromosome Evolution. Annual Review of
<ul> <li>Interpretation of the provided of the</li></ul>	895		Animal Biosciences, 2021:9 1:1-27. doi:10.1146/annurey-animal-020518-114924.
<ul> <li>conservation. Nature. 2020;587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.</li> <li>111. Ceballos FC, Joshi PK, Clark DW, Ramsay M and Wilson JF. Runs of homozygosity: windows</li> <li>into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	896	110.	Zoonomia Consortium. A comparative genomics multitool for scientific discovery and
<ul> <li>Ketalis in the second se</li></ul>	897		conservation. Nature. 2020:587 7833:240-5. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6
<ul> <li>into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19 4:220-34.</li> <li>doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.</li> </ul>	898	111	Ceballos FC. Joshi PK. Clark DW. Ramsav M and Wilson IF. Runs of homozygosity: windows
900 doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.	899		into population history and trait architecture. Nature Reviews Genetics 2018:19 4:220-34
	900		doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.109.

- 901112.Genome 10K Community of Scientists. Genome 10K: a proposal to obtain whole-genome902sequence for 10 000 vertebrate species. Journal of Heredity. 2009;100 6:659-74.
- 113. Kingan SB, Heaton H, Cudini J, Lambert CC, Baybayan P, Galvin BD, et al. A High-Quality De
  novo Genome Assembly from a Single Mosquito Using PacBio Sequencing. Genes. 2019;10
  1:62. doi:10.3390/genes10010062.
- 114. Lawniczak M, Blaxter M, Johnson WE, Pettersson OV, Barker K and The Sample Collection and Processing Subcommittee. *Report on sample collection and processing standards*.
  March 2021 2021. Earth Biogenomne Project,.
- 909 115. Afgan E, Baker D, Batut B, van den Beek M, Bouvier D, Čech M, et al. The Galaxy platform for
  910 accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update. Nucleic Acids
  911 Research. 2018;46 W1:W537-W44. doi:10.1093/nar/gky379.
- 912 116. Mistry J, Finn RD, Eddy SR, Bateman A and Punta M. Challenges in homology search:
  913 HMMER3 and convergent evolution of coiled-coil regions. Nucleic Acids Research. 2013;41
  914 12:e121-e. doi:10.1093/nar/gkt263.
- 915 117. Hall T. BioEdit v7.2.2 ed.: Ibis Biosciences, 2013.
- 916 118. Mistry J, Chuguransky S, Williams L, Qureshi M, Salazar Gustavo A, Sonnhammer ELL, et al.
  917 Pfam: The protein families database in 2021. Nucleic Acids Research. 2020;49 D1:D412-D9.
  918 doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa913.
- 919119.Letunic I, Khedkar S and Bork P. SMART: recent updates, new developments and status in9202020. Nucleic Acids Research. 2020;49 D1:D458-D60. doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa937.
- 120. Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C and Tamura K. MEGA X: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics
   Analysis across Computing Platforms. Molecular biology and evolution. 2018;35 6:1547-9.
   doi:10.1093/molbev/msy096.
- Peel E, Silver L, Brandies PA, Hayakawa T, Belov K and Hogg CJ. Supporting data for "Genome assembly of the numbat (*Myrmecobius fasciatus*), the only termitivorous marsupial. GigaDB.
  2022; doi:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.5524/100999</u>.
- 927 122. Peel E, Silver L, Brandies PA, Hogg CJ and Belov K. Supporting data for "A reference genome for the critically endanfered woylie, *Bettongia penicillata ogilbyi*". GigaDB. 2021;
  929 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5524/100951.

100%













Supplementary Material

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material Additional file 1.xlsx Supplementary Material

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material Additional file 2.docx

±



Professor Katherine Belov AO BSc (Hons) PhD Pro Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement

 $24^{th}$  March 2022

Dr Scott Edmunds Chief Editor GigaScience

Dear Dr Edmunds,

Please find attached our manuscript "*Best genome sequencing strategies for annotation of complex immune gene families in wildlife*" which we are submitting as a research article for publication in GigaScience. The text of the manuscript totals 7139 words, with four figures, two tables and two additional files.

Globally we are in the midst of a biodiversity crisis and infectious diseases are a major driver of wildlife decline. The COVID-19 pandemic highlights the impact of wildlife disease on animal and human health, and provides impetus for studying immune genes in wildlife. Despite the recent increase in genomes for wildlife species, our understanding of immune genes in these species is limited owing to their high level of polymorphism and complex genomic organisation which makes assembly and annotation notoriously difficult.

Our research over the past decade and a half on Tasmanian devils and koalas highlights the importance of genomics and accurate immune annotation for wildlife disease investigations. As such, we are increasingly asked the minimum genome quality required to effectively annotate immune genes which underpin wildlife disease investigations. In this manuscript we aim to answer this question by manually annotating immune genes in five marsupial genomes and one monotreme genome of different qualities to determine the impact of sequencing strategy and automated annotation on accurate immune annotation.

We determined that high-quality chromosome-length genome assemblies generated using long-reads and scaffolding technologies are required to accurately annotate immune genes. Draft-quality genomes generated using short-reads and HiC technology, or 10x Chromium linked-read technology, resulted in highly fragmented immune genes which led to incorrect annotation and prevented interpretation of genomic organisation and gene family evolution.

While the six genomes in this study displayed BUSCO scores of up to 94.1% indicating functional completeness, we also show that automated annotation programs need improvement, as up to 60% of manually annotated immune genes were not accurately annotated by automated programs. Deficient annotations within functionally important immune gene families will flow through to downstream analysis and result in spurious results.



We have targeted GigaScience as this work provides a strong example for the importance of gold standard genome assemblies for studying wildlife disease and will appeal to researchers involved in sequencing, assembly, annotation and translation of genomics data. The content of this manuscript has not been published or submitted for publication elsewhere. The authors declare no competing interests, and all have approved the manuscript for submission. We hope you will agree that this work represents an important contribution to GigaScience.

Yours sincerely,

KBelow.

Professor Kathy Belov Corresponding Author On Behalf of co-authors Emma Peel, Luke Silver, Parice Brandies, Ying Zhu, Yuanyuan Cheng and Carolyn Hogg