Supplementary Material

Population structure of the swordfish, *Xiphias gladius***, across the Indian Ocean using Next Generation Sequencing**

Thomas Chevrier (0009-0006-4108-5698)^{1,2*}, Dominique A. Cowart (0000-0002-2581-0355)², Anne-Elise Nieblas (0000-0002-3974-8484)², Grégory Charrier (0000-0002-8730-9267)³, Serge Bernard (0000-0003-1772-0592)⁴, Hugues $Evano¹$, , Blandine Brisset (0009-0003-3549-1698)¹, Jérémie Chanut (0009-0002-8808-9689)², Sylvain Bonhommeau $(0000-0002-0882-5918)^1$

¹ IFREMER Délégation Océan Indien, Rue Jean Bertho, 97822 Le Port, La Réunion, France ²Company for Open Ocean Observations and Logging (COOOL), Saint-Leu, La Réunion, France

³Univ. Brest, CNRS, IRD, Ifremer, LEMAR, Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280 Plouzané, France ⁴LIRMM-CNRS, rue Ada, 34000 Montpellier, France

*Corresponding author :

t.chevrier.cooolresearch@gmail.com

Tables

Figures

Supplemental protocol :

DArTseq™ represents a combination of DArT complexity reduction methods and next generation sequencing platforms (Sansaloni et al, 2011; Kilian et al, 2012; Courtois et al, 2013; Raman et al. 2014; Cruz et al. 2013). Therefore, DArTseq™ represents a new implementation of sequencing of complexity reduced representations (Altshuler et al, 2000) and more recent applications of this concept on the next generation sequencing platforms (Baird et al, 2008; Elshire et al, 2011). Similarly, to DArT methods based on array hybridisations the technology is optimized for each organism and application by selecting the most appropriate complexity reduction method (both the size of the representation and the fraction of a genome selected for assays). Based on testing several enzyme combinations for complexity reduction the PstI-SphI method was selected for Xiphias. DNA samples were processed in digestion/ligation reactions principally as per Kilian et al (2012) but replacing a single PstI-compatible adaptor with two different adaptors corresponding to two different Restriction Enzyme (RE) overhangs. The PstI-compatible adapter was designed to include Illumina flowcell attachment sequence, sequencing primer sequence and "staggered", varying length barcode region, similar to the sequence reported by Elshire et al, 2011). Reverse adapter contained flowcell attachment region and SphI-compatible overhang sequence.

Only "mixed fragments" (PstI-SphI) were effectively amplified in 30 rounds of PCR using the following reaction conditions:

Figure S1: Specification for the temperature cycle for the PCR

After PCR equimolar amounts of amplification products from each sample of the 96-well microtiter plate were bulked and applied to c-Bot (Illumina) bridge PCR followed by sequencing on Illumina NovaSeq6000. The sequencing (single read) was run for 100 cycles.

Sequences generated from each lane were processed using proprietary DArT analytical pipelines. In the primary pipeline the fastq files were first processed to filter away poor quality sequences, applying more stringent selection criteria to the barcode region compared to the rest of the sequence. In that way the assignments of the sequences to specific samples carried in the "barcode split" step were very reliable.

Filtering was performed on the raw sequences using the parameters described in Table S1.

Table S1: Parameters used to filter the raw sequencing data

Approximately 2,500,000 sequences per barcode/sample were identified and used in marker calling. Finally, identical sequences were collapsed into "fastqcoll files". The fastqcoll files were "groomed" using DArT PL's proprietary algorithm which corrects low quality base from singleton tag into a correct base using collapsed tags with multiple members as a template. The "groomed" fastqcoll files were used in the secondary pipeline for DArT PL's proprietary SNP and SilicoDArT (presence/absence of restriction fragments in representation) calling algorithms (DArTsoft14). For SNP calling all tags from all libraries included in theDArTsoft14 analysis are clustered using DArT PL's C++ algorithm at the threshold distance of 3, followed by parsing of the clusters into separate SNP loci using a range of technical parameters, especially the balance of read counts for the allelic pairs. Additional selection criteria were added to the algorithm based on analysis of approximately 1,000 controlled cross populations. Testing for Mendelian distribution of alleles in these populations facilitated selection of technical parameters discriminating well true allelic variants from paralogous sequences. In addition, multiple samples were processed from DNA to allelic calls as technical replicates and scoring consistency was used as the main selection criteria for high quality/low error rate markers.

Calling quality was assured by high average read depth per locus, average across all markers was over 10 reads/locus. Approximately 10% of the samples had technical replicates which were used to estimate reproducibility of reported markers (>99%). The Average Reproducibility was calculated as a fraction of allele calls which are consistent among the technical replicates (libraries) generated from the same DNA samples in a fully independent manner. Reproducibility fraction was calculated for each of the two alleles and averaged for the marker.

References

Altshuler D, Pollara VJ, Cowles CR, Van Etten WJ, Baldwin J, et al. (2000) An SNP map of the human genome generated by reduced representation shotgun sequencing. Nature 407: 513-516.

Baird NA, Etter PD, Atwood TS, Currey MC, Shiver AL, et al. (2008) Rapid SNP discovery and genetic mapping using sequenced RAD markers. PLoS One 3: e3376.

Courtois B, Audebert A, Dardou A, Roques S, Ghneim- Herrera T, et al. (2013) Genome-Wide Association Mapping of Root Traits in a Japonica Rice Panel. PLoS ONE 8(11): e78037

Cruz VM, Kilian A, Dierig DA (2013) Development of DArT marker platforms and genetic diversity assessment of the U.S. collection of the new oilseed crop lesquerella and related species. PLoS One 8(5): e64062.

Elshire RJ, Glaubitz JC , Sun Q, Poland JA, Kawamoto K, et al. (2011) A robust, simple genotyping-by-sequencing (GBS) approach for high diversity species. PLoS One, 6(5):e19379.

Kilian, A., Wenzl, P., Huttner, E., Carling, J., Xia, L., Blois, H., Caig, V., et al. (2012). Diversity arrays technology: a generic genome profiling technology on open platforms. Methods in Molecular Biology, 888, 67-89. doi:10.1007/978-1-61779-870-2

Raman H, Raman R, Kilian A, Detering F, Carling J, et al. (2014) Genome-Wide Delineation of Natural Variation for Pod Shatter Resistance in Brassica napus. PLoS ONE 9(7). e101673.

Sansaloni C, Petroli C, Jaccoud D, Carling J, Detering F, Grattapaglia D, Kilian A (2011) Diversity Arrays Technology (DArT) and next generation sequencing combined: genome-wide, high throughput, highly informative genotyping for molecular breeding of Eucalyptus. BMC Proceedings 5(Suppl 7):P54

Supplemental table 1 : Sample selection from IOSSS project.

Supplementary table 2 : DArT metadata.

Supplementary table 3 : Filtering workflow.

NEUT = 2,373 SNPs (neutral SNPs)*****

***** Only apply to the dataset with neutral loci

Supplementary table 4 : Confidence interval at 95% for FST value calculated using 10 000 bootstrap samples for the three dataset. The yellow cells indicate the lower limit and blue cells indicate the upper limit.

Supplementary table 5 : Outliers SNPs and their biological functions

Supplemental Figure 1: Goodness of fit (Bayesian Information Criteria) for the different numbers of clusters assessed according to the *K*-means clustering method using the *adegenet* package for (A) the dataset with only neutral loci and (B) the dataset with loci under potential selection.

Supplemental Figure 2: DAPC cross-validation plot with the number of PCs retained in each DAPC.

To carry out a DAPC the number of retained PCs must be determined. The number of PCs can have a substantial impact on the results of the analysis. Cross-validation (carried out with the function *xvalDapc*) provides an objective optimization procedure for identifying the 'goldilocks point' in the trade-off between retaining too few and too many PCs in the model.

In cross-validation, the data are divided into two sets: a training set (typically comprising 90% of the data) and a validation set (which contains the remainder (by default,10%) of the data). With *xvalDapc*, the validation set is selected by stratified random sampling. This ensures that at least one member of each group or population in the original data is represented in both training and validation sets. DAPC is carried out on the training set with variable numbers of PCs retained, and the degree to which the analysis is able to accurately predict the group membership of excluded individuals (those in the validation set) is used to identify the optimal number of PCs to retain. At each level of PC retention, the sampling and DAPC procedures are repeated n.reptimes. When xval.plot is TRUE, a scatter plot of the DAPC cross-validation is generated. The number of PCs retained in each DAPC varies along the x-axis, and the proportion of successful outcome prediction varies along the y-axis. Individual replicates appear as points, and the density of those points in different regions of the plot is displayed in blue. Based on the model validation literature, it is recommended to use the number of PCs associated with the lowest root mean squared error (RMSE) as the 'optimum' n.pca in the DAPC analysis. In our case, the optimum n.pca was obtained at 200 PCA axes.

Supplemental Figure 3: DAPC for samples from swordfish (*X. gladius*) adults during reproductive period (November - April) for (A) Neutral SNPs and (B) Neutral + SNPs with a selection signature.

Supplemental Figure 4 : Heatmap representations of the pairwise fixation index (FST) between the different sampling areas for adult swordfish (*X. gladius*) sampled during their reproduction period (November - April) for (Left) ALL dataset (Top right) NEUT dataset and (Bottom right) OUTLIERS dataset.

Supplemental Figure 5 : Principal component analysis (PCA) according to the first two axes, with samples grouped by their sampling areas for dataset with neutral and outliers loci

Supplemental Figure 6 : Linkage Disequilibrium (LD) across each chromosome calculating r² between each pair of SNPs. The LD plot was not made for the 24th chromosome due to a lack of data.