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#### Abstract

Cowpea [Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp (Fabaceae)] is an important and major staple food crop in sub-Saharan Africa, especially in the dry savanna regions of West Africa. The crop provides food, cash, and fodder. As a food crop, cowpea is a primary source of protein for the ever-growing population of both rural and urban dwellers. The fodder and husks from cowpea also form an important source of protein, fiber, and energy for livestock. West Africa accounts for about $80 \%$ of the world's cowpea production. However, insect pests are major constraints to cowpea production in the West African sub-region. The crop is severely attacked at every stage of its growth by different insect pests from the pre-flowering stage right through storage. Damage by insect pests on cowpea can be as high as $80-100 \%$ if not effectively controlled. Current control measures against the insect pests, which mostly consist of chemical control, are not without limitations.


There is a need to develop a more comprehensive IPM strategy against cowpea insect pests by exploiting the knowledge of their biology, location of alternate host plants, and natural enemies, and combining these with the recent advances in genome sequencing technologies. This dissertation consists of five chapters and focuses on the integration of integrated pest management (IPM) and the current trends in genomic sequencing to cowpea IPM in West Africa with the aim of better understanding the insect pest populations of the cowpea crop and defining their population structure and movement patterns.

Chapter 1 which serves as the introduction to the whole thesis discusses in detail the advent of the genomics era and how IPM researchers must take advantage of the
recent development in genomic practices. It introduces the concept of IPM-omics and how this can be applied to cowpea cropping systems in West Africa. It also discusses the effective deployment of the research output to the end-users.

Chapters 2 and 3 answer questions regarding the timing and spatial scale of the migration patterns of one of the major insect pests of cowpea in West Africa, the legume pod borer (Maruca vitrata). I applied a set of microsatellite markers (Chapters 2 and 3) and mitochondrial cox1 haplotype data (Chapter 3) to characterize the M. vitrata populations across locations in West Africa [Burkina Faso, Niger and Nigeria (Chapter 2)] and also on four host plants of M. vitrata [cultivated cowpea (Vigna unguiculata), and three alternative host plants - Pueraria phaseoloides, Loncocarpus sericeus, and Tephrosia candida)] in southern Benin (Chapter 3). The findings from the studies in the two chapters enabled a much clearer understanding of the genetic variability, population structure, and gene flow among M. vitrata populations in those countries and the host plants sampled.

Chapter 4 compares the mitochondrial genome of M. vitrata from the New World (Puerto Rico) with the mitochondrial genome of the M. vitrata population from the Old World (Burkina Faso), and also with the mitogenomes of other Crambids. Species from the genus Maruca have a wide distribution from northern Australia and East Asia through sub-Saharan Africa to the Caribbean, Central America, and North America. The species are difficult to distinguish morphologically and have been surmised to be a species complex due to cryptic morphological differences. To be able to study evolutionary patterns among Maruca species, I sequenced and assembled the mitochondrial genome of the Maruca subspecies from Puerto Rico and compared this with the mitochondrial
genomes of M. vitrata from West Africa, and also with other available Crambid mitochondrial genomes. The study enabled the estimation of mutation tendencies in $M$. vitrata and also the construction of phylogenetic relationships, as well as comparative and molecular genome evolution patterns in M. vitrata.

Chapter 5 goes beyond my research on M. vitrata and concentrates on other destructive insect pests of cowpea in West Africa. In West Africa, besides M. vitrata, other serious insect pests also attack the cowpea crop. These insect pests include thrips (Megalurothrips sjostedti), aphids (Aphis craccivora) and pod sucking bug complex, (including Clavigralla tomentosicollis and Anoplocnemis curvipes). Collectively, these pests can wipe out a whole cowpea harvest. Part of the constraint in the application of effective control strategies against these pests is the lack of molecular markers that can enable the characterization of the pest populations. For this study, I applied Roche 454 sequencing technology to generate and subsequently assemble contigs from DNA sequencing reads for $A$. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti. These were then used to detect polymorphisms in the different populations of these insect pests across West Africa. Findings from this study identified putative single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), which can be used for characterizing the populations of the different insect pests, and also identified candidate genes putatively involved in insecticide resistance, regulation of insect growth, and response to disease transmission.

Overall, the output from the studies in this dissertation will facilitate the effective evaluation, modification, and optimization of practical cowpea IPM strategies which will in the short- and long-term help in the monitoring of the insect pest populations as well as aid in making decisions as to how, when, and where to apply appropriate control measures.
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## CHAPTER 1

## IPM-OMICS: FROM GENOMICS TO EXTENSION FOR INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT OF COWPEA ${ }^{1}$


#### Abstract

Insect pests often develop resistance to insecticides, and such resistance represents a serious management problem. Devising methods that concurrently delay resistance and minimize injury by insects to field crops and stored grain has long been a goal of integrated pest management (IPM). A centerpiece of IPM has been the combined use of biological control agents and prudent application of chemical insecticides. Unfortunately, successful application of IPM has remained a challenge. This chapter describes the use of emerging genomic technologies that may lead to a "systems" perspective of IPM for the control of pests of cowpea and other crops. This emerging field, which we refer to as "IPM-omics", builds upon recent advances in genome sequencing technologies and detection of large-scale gene polymorphisms, which are becoming economically feasible for pest insect systems. IPM-omics will also need to involve the use of information and communications technologies both to collect critical information on pest populations and to deploy practical IPM solutions. The information obtained on the temporal fluctuations, spatial distribution, and ecological diversification within target, non-target, and natural enemy populations can be overlaid on a geographic information systems (GIS) map to


[^0]predict pest outbreaks and to decide how to apply control measures. The "systems" perspective of organism communities provided through IPM-omics may also facilitate the effective evaluation, modification, and optimization of IPM strategies. However, any resultant IPM program for crop pests will also require that extension agents, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have the ability to easily access and deploy the IPM research findings through information and communications technologies. Thus, we also outline the need for an online system that facilitates the sharing and peer review of practical IPM outputs. Many of these tools are currently being developed to help farmers manage insect pests of cowpea in West Africa.

## INTRODUCTION

The Green Revolution, which introduced modern crop varieties and production techniques (Khush 1995; Evenson and Gollin 2003), greatly affected insect pest control. It caused a shift away from the use of crop rotation, field sanitation, flooding, and manual destruction of damaging insects and/or insect-infested plants (Smith et al. 1976) toward the use of high intensity monoculture cropping systems that depended on chemical insecticides to suppress pest insect populations. This shift began in industrialized nations in the 1940s and 1960s, and the consequent reliance on synthetic insecticides led to insecticide resistance, the suppression of beneficial insect populations, and the emergence of minor pests as major pests (Norris et al. 2003). Pesticides can provide excellent crop protection, but in addition to selecting for insecticide resistance, they have had numerous negative impacts on human health and the environment (Singh 2000; Wilson and Tisdell 2001; Georghiou 1986). In 1962, Rachel Carson’s book "Silent Spring" raised concerns
and public awareness of the environmental and ecological impacts of pesticide use, and toward the end of the 1970s, this concern and awareness motivated efforts to develop lower impact crop protection methods (Hassan and Bakshi 2005).

The term "integrated pest management" (IPM) was first used by Smith and van den Bosch in 1967 to describe concurrent application of multiple control measures to reduce damage caused by insects to crop plants. The development of IPM led to dramatic changes in the technologies available for pest management. Modern IPM approaches aim to provide economically viable and sustainable control of insect damage by relying upon biological, chemical, physical, host plant resistance, and cultural control tools. Conceptually, IPM strategies recognize that many environmental factors interact and work in concert to affect the abundance of insect pests. IPM strategies also strive to exploit the knowledge of the insect pest's biology, location of alternate plant hosts, and natural enemies to achieve more informed pest management decisions. Fundamentally, the application of an IPM strategy involves a holistic or "systems" approach to pest management, where interactions between pests and the community of natural enemies are evaluated in a tiered approach once the scale of the system in question is set (for more detail, see Wise and Whalon 2009). The systems approach to IPM requires an in-depth knowledge of how management practices affect the insect's biology and other trophic interactions. It also involves the monitoring of pest populations to identify appropriate control measures as well as aids in making decisions as to how, when, and where to apply them.

Analogous to a systems approach for IPM applications, the genomics "revolution" has led to efforts to understand an organism or community on a genome-wide scale.

Recent advances in genomics are now making it possible to better understand pest populations, and are likely to provide new approaches for studying and managing insects. Despite the decreasing costs of DNA sequencing and the development of affordable highthroughput platforms, with which entire genomes can be rapidly sequenced, IPM has not exploited the use of these genomic tools.

Researchers must begin to define how such genomic tools can be used in an inclusive manner with IPM to improve pest management decisions. In addition to the development of genomics, a second parallel "revolution" that has occurred in the past two decades is the ability to deploy pest management concepts through the electronic media. Many of the control strategies that have been developed remain difficult to deploy to extension agents and farmers in Africa and other developing regions because of the remoteness of the regions and the low literacy rates among the farming communities. IPM strategies will have large-scale impacts only if they can be coupled with effective educational deployment tools that can be rapidly updated as new and practical control approaches emerge. We use the term "IPM-omics" to describe the use of genomic (and other "omics") tools to better characterize pest populations and to provide a greater depth of knowledge for the development and deployment of IPM strategies. The remainder of this chapter describes how IPM-omics can be used in the management of cowpea insect pests and how IPM-omics has the potential to further cowpea IPM in West Africa.

## Advent of the genomics era

Despite the apparent prominence of molecular biology methods within modern laboratories, it is a relatively young discipline. Molecular biology techniques have made
gene cloning, sequencing, organism transformation, and genotyping of individuals almost commonplace. Many of these techniques became accessible with the development of polymerase chain reaction (PCR), which essentially is in vitro synthesis of millions of copies of defined genome regions. The PCR procedure has been credited to Kary Mullis, and the technique has now been adapted for many different applications such that PCR is now a fundamental and indispensable tool of molecular biology (Bartlett and Stirling 2003).

The development of genomic practices depended on the ability to perform highthroughput DNA sequencing at dramatically reduced costs along with an increased capacity to analyze large data sets. The initial sequencing of DNA by chemical modification and subsequent cleavage of specific nucleotides (i.e., Maxam-Gilbert sequencing; Maxam and Gilbert 1977), and by incorporation of di-deoxynucleotides that resulted in truncation of primer extension reactions at specific bases (i.e., Sanger sequencing; Sanger and Coulson 1975; Sanger et al. 1977) was time consuming. It also required expertise to separate DNA fragments (via denaturing polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis) and to interpret the results. Sequencing throughput was increased by the use of capillary gel electrophoresis platforms that automated the separation of up to 384 individual reaction products at a time and by the use of computers to analyze the data in the form of electropherograms. Despite improving the scale at which DNA fragments could be sequenced, these technologies or "platforms" were still not time- or costeffective for the sequencing of entire genomes. For example, the human genome project, which was launched in 1990, required more than 10 years to complete at a cost of about three billion USD (Venter et al. 2001). These earlier sequencing platforms were also used
to acquire whole genome sequences (WGS) for insects, including the pea aphid, Acyrthosiphon pisum Harris (Hemiptera: Aphididae) (The International Aphid Genomics Consortium 2010); the mosquitoes, Anopheles gambiae Giles (Diptera: Culicidae) (Holt et al. 2002) and Aedes aegypti Linnaeus (Diptera: Culicidae) (Nene et al. 2004); the honey bee, Apis mellifera Linnaeus (Hymenoptera: Apidae) (Weinstock et al. 2006); the silkmoth, Bombyx mori Linnaeus (Lepidoptera: Bombycidae) (International Silkworm Genome Consortium 2008); the fruit flies, Drosophila melanogaster Meigen (Diptera: Drosophilidae) (Adams et al. 2000) and D. pseudoobscura Fabricius (Diptera: Drosophilidae) (Richards et al. 2005); the wasp, Nasonia vitripennis Ashmead (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae) (Werren et al. 2010); the red flour beetle, Tribolium castaneum Herbst (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae) (Tribolium Genome Sequencing Consortium 2008); and the human body louse, Pediculus humanus humanus Linnaeus (Phthiraptera: Pediculidae) (Pittendrigh et al. 2006; Kirkness et al. 2010; Pittendrigh et al. 2011).

More recently, sequence-by-synthesis technologies that use pyrosequencing reactions to obtain DNA sequence data have been developed (Ronaghi et al. 1998; Morozova and Marra 2008; Simon et al. 2009). Adaptations to high-throughput platforms have the capacity to generate millions of de novo DNA base sequences from a single run (Margulies et al. 2005). These next generation sequencing (NGS) platforms have greatly facilitated the collection of DNA sequence data and have been especially useful for genomic research on non-model organisms (McCombie et al. 1992; Ellegren 2009). NGS has contributed to the emergence of insect genomics through the accumulation of WGS data for the wasp species, Nasonia giraulti and N. longicornis (Werren et al. 2010), and
(in ongoing projects) for Ixodes scapularis Say (Ixodida: Ixodidae), Rhodnius prolixus Stål (Hemiptera: Reduviidae), Glossina morsitans Westwood (Diptera: Glossinidae), Phlebotomus papatasi Scopoli (Diptera: Psychodidae), and Lutzomyia longipalpis Lutz and Neiva (Diptera: Psychodidae) (Megy et al. 2009). Additionally, NGS has proven useful for the rapid resequencing of wild strains of B. mori (Xia et al. 2009) and multiple Drosophila species (Hahn et al. 2007), as well as expressed sequence tags (ESTs) (Vera et al. 2008).

EST libraries are collections of short Sanger sequencing- or NGS-derived read data obtained from complementary DNA (cDNA). These sequences are representative of genes that are expressed in a particular tissue, at a specific developmental stage, by a particular phenotype, or under particular treatment conditions under which the libraries were constructed (Adams et al. 1991; Gaines et al. 2002; Nagaraj et al. 2006), and are derived from genomic regions that are actively transcribed. ESTs obviously provide information about gene-encoding regions and are considered as low-cost alternatives to a WGS project (Rudd 2003), even though ESTs are subject to sampling bias. More specifically, cDNAs are sampled from a larger pool of potential templates during the cloning and/or DNA sequencing phases, where errors of omission can occur because of stoichiometric differences between libraries (Liu and Graber 2006). Regardless, ESTs are recognized as an effective research approach for discovering genes (Bonaldo et al. 1996; Audic and Claverie 1997), obtaining gene expression information among tissues (Dimopoulos et al. 2000; Porcel et al. 2000), discovering alternate splicing patterns (Gupta et al. 2004), and predicting novel mutations (Coates et al. 2008). Moreover, the quantitative comparison of ESTs within and between libraries is increasingly used for
gene expression analysis (RNAseq; Simon et al. 2009; Fu et al. 2009). For further information on these developing aspects of genomics research, we direct the reader to the following review articles: Ungerer et al. 2008; Rokas and Abbot 2009; Wheat 2010.

The advent of NGS has also been paralleled by the development of molecular marker screening technologies that offer precision and reliability for differentiating allelic variations at single nucleotide positions. Precision and accuracy of allele calling also has been paired with high-throughput capacity that allows for hundreds to thousands of genotyping calls to be made within 24 h (Lyamichev et al. 1999; Tang et al. 1999; Kwok 2001; Tsuchihashi and Dracopoli 2002). These molecular genotyping assays and associated platforms used for detection rely on initial prediction of segregating mutations within individuals or populations of individuals.

## Core concepts underlying IPM-omics

IPM-omics, as we envision it, involves five major steps: (1) discover polymorphisms within insect populations (Figure 1.1), (2) use the polymorphisms to answer critical questions about these pest populations through detailed analysis of sets of individual insects collected from the field (Figure 1.2), (3) overlay this information with other available data sets (e.g., GIS) (Figures 1.3 and 1.4), (4) use the knowledge and outcomes to make better pest management decisions (Figure 1.5), and (5) use information and communication technologies to efficiently extend these materials to the target communities (i.e., those involved in the control of pests associated with the target crop) (Bello-Bravo et al. 2012). These steps are now possible because of the following current conditions. The advent of NGS allows one to sequence genes from a large pool of insects
from a given region in order to discover polymorphisms within these populations. The polymorphisms can then be used in high-throughput polymorphism detection systems to investigate details of pest populations. This information on its own or in combination with GIS systems should give us the ability to gain insights into pest populations that have not been previously possible, allowing for better pest management decisions. Finally, the advent of the Internet and cell phones can be used to communicate information on pest populations between farmers and researchers, and these same communication technologies can be used to provide farmers with practical pest management recommendations.

## Application of genomic tools to the current pest situation in cowpea

Cowpea, Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp. (Leguminosae: Papilionaceae), is an important grain legume crop in the semi-arid and dry savannah areas of the tropics (Singh and van Emden 1979). Insect pests feed on and damage cowpea at virtually every crop developmental stage and also feed on and damage the stored grain. The pest species that seriously damage cowpea are numerous (see Table 1.1) and in addition to causing direct feeding damage to vegetative and reproductive tissues, Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae) also vectors plant viruses that further decrease crop yields (Singh and van Emden 1979). Although all these insects cause serious damage to cowpea, the pod borer, Maruca vitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) is probably the most destructive (Jackai and Singh 1988).

The control of cowpea pests has relied largely on chemical insecticides but the efficacy of this method is variable due to the evolution of resistance to multiple classes of
insecticides (Ekesi 1999). In addition, the insecticides are prohibitively expensive or otherwise unavailable to low-income farmers in West Africa (Giga and Biscoe 1989; Alghali 1991; Bottenberg 1995; Alebeek 1996). The effective control of insect pests of cowpea has therefore relied upon conventional methods (see Introduction), which have been enhanced through the introduction of IPM strategies (Jackai and Adalla 1997). IPMomics is currently being used to identify possible genetic variations in populations of pest species and their related natural enemies, and also to study their geographic distributions and movement patterns. These data are critical for targeting and timing appropriate control measures in the field as well as for determining the coincidence of endogenous natural enemy populations.

Although the genomes of a number of insect pests have been sequenced, there is little or no DNA sequence information for most of the cowpea pests. This scenario, however, is quickly changing. Recently, Margam et al. (2011a) used mitochondrial DNA sequence data and molecular genetic markers to determine that $M$. vitrata from West Africa and Puerto Rico represent two distinct groups and even proposed that the samples are possibly a complex of sibling species. Moreover, these data indicated that M. vitrata collected from West Africa (Burkina Faso, Niger, and Nigeria), Taiwan, and Australia likely constitute a single species. Previous field studies in West Africa also indicated that M. vitrata is more abundant throughout the year in the southern region (Sudanian zone) of the cowpea producing areas, where the rainfall is relatively high, than in the drier northern regions (the Sahelian zone) (Ba et al. 2009; Margam et al. 2010). Furthermore, light trap studies conducted in Burkina Faso (Ba et al. 2009) strongly support the hypothesis that $M$. vitrata adults migrate to the northern drier regions from the south during the rainy season.

To study these movement patterns in greater detail, researchers are developing additional molecular genetic markers from genomic sequence data. EST sequence data were collected from the larval M. vitrata midgut and salivary gland tissues as well as from whole adult tissues (Margam et al. 2011b; National Center for Biotechnology Information, NCBI, dbEST accessions HS097571-HS099476). The assembly of these EST data into 3729 contiguous or overlapping contig sequences has also been used to predict the location of $\sim 1078$ putative single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Preliminary genotyping data have been collected from Burkina Faso, Niger, and Nigeria at 70 SNP loci, and resulting analyses indicated genetic differences among populations. More specifically, individuals from three sample locations in Burkina Faso (in an East-West pattern of collection) were more genetically different than individuals collected from either Niger or Nigeria (collected in a North-South pattern) (Pittendrigh, unpublished data). These results also suggested that M. vitrata populations are isolated by distance in that sample sites most geographically separated show the most genetic divergence. The current and ongoing application of IPM-omics within West Africa has advanced the knowledge of the population structure for pest insects and will likely be used next to investigate the contribution of alternate host plants to the maintenance of population variability. Although cowpea pest dynamics are incompletely understood, the rapid advances in IPM-omics are increasing our understanding. This information should result in better decisions about which pest controls to deploy, and when and where to deploy them.

Several parasitoids have been identified for the biological control of most cowpea insect pests. Although some of these control agents are indigenous, whether they are or
can become sufficiently abundant to help control the pest populations is unclear. Nonnative species from Taiwan also have been identified as potential biological control agents, and one example is Apanteles taragamae Viereck (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), which has already been experimentally released in Benin (Tamò et al. 2012). To verify the success of parasitoid releases, researchers could potentially study the parasitoid and pest populations to determine whether the pests are being controlled by the indigenous or exotic parasitoids. Molecular markers with polymorphisms unique to the introduced populations can potentially be used to determine whether parasitoids identified from the field (postrelease) are in fact those that were introduced by the biological control program.

## Integrating IPM with genomics: IPM-omics

In the last 60 years, the technologies available for pest management have changed dramatically. The previously described genomic tools provide IPM with new ways to understand and develop insect pest control strategies. We are now entering a time when molecular biology, or more precisely the new field of genomics, has the potential to be integrated into IPM to allow practitioners to make better decisions about pest control. The application of molecular genomics to the study of insect population ecology (i.e., ecological genomics) will become increasingly important as insect ecologists discover the power of these new tools (Sunnucks 2000). IPM can increase the durability of chemical and transgenic pest management tools by decreasing the selective pressure on pest populations to evolve resistance. Moreover, resistance management may be enhanced further if other management tools impose fitness costs on insecticide-resistant pests (Pittendrigh et al. 2008; Gassmann et al. 2009a). Fitness costs of resistance arise in the
absence of a control agent when those individuals with resistance alleles have lower fitness than homozygous susceptible individuals. Recent research on insects with resistance to insecticidal toxins produced by the bacterium Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) indicates that ecological factors can magnify the fitness costs of Bt resistance (Gassmann et al. 2009a). This is an example of ecological negative cross-resistance (Pittendrigh et al. 2008). IPM agents that also increase fitness costs of $B t$ resistance include entomopathogenic viruses (Raymond et al. 2007; Sarfarz et al. 2010), entomopathogenic nematodes (Gassmann et al. 2006; Gassmann et al. 2008; Gassmann et al. 2009b; Hannon et al. 2010), entomopathogenic fungi, and host-plant resistance (Raymond et al 2005; Bird and Akhurst 2007). Computer modeling indicates that IPM agents that magnify fitness costs of resistance can delay or prevent the evolution of insecticide resistance within pest populations (Carrière and Tabashnik 2001; Pittendrigh et al. 2004; Gassmann et al. 2008; Gassmann et al. 2009b). IPM-omics could lead to more efficient and broader application of ecological negative cross-resistance (Gassmann et al. 2009c). By understanding the genetic basis of resistance, it may be possible to predict which IPM practices will elicit the largest fitness costs, thereby maintaining pest susceptibility and preserving the utility of newly developed pest management tools such as $B t$ crops and biopesticides.

The use of genomics for understanding pest populations can be broadly placed into two categories, functional genomics and population genomics (the later being a neologism of the term population genetics). Functional genomics (and other related analysis tools such as proteomics, metabolomics, and systems biology analyses) can be and have been used to understand the detailed mechanisms of how insects respond to and evolve specific responses to challenges that they experience in their environment, such as host-plant
resistance factors and pesticides (Pedra et al. 2004; Li et al. 2009). Unfortunately, functional "omics" tools are currently resource intensive and are only used in the laboratory. The use of genomics for practical applications like the development of new pesticides or the identification of new host plant-resistance factors is predicted to occur in the future (Grimmelikhuijzen et al. 2007). Additionally, genes known to be critical for insect survival may ultimately be target sites for the expression of RNA interference (RNAi) constructs by transgenic plants. However, the use of transgenic plants expressing RNAi specific to insect target genes for the control of pest insects is still in its infancy, and questions concerning resistance management for this control strategy remain to be resolved. Although little is known about potential RNAi resistance in insects, multiple resistance mechanisms to dietary RNAi have already been identified in C. elegans (Winston et al. 2007). It follows that practical insect control measures that may emerge out of functional genomics will probably not occur in the short term.

One of the other challenges for functional "omics" is the general need for a complete genome sequencing, annotation, assembly of the genome, and categorization of the gene classes observed. For many insect species, large genomes filled with a high number of repetitive elements may in the short term make the sequencing of these genomes prohibitively expensive, especially for crop pests, for which resources may be limited. Even when resources are sufficient, however, genomes with a large number of repetitive elements may be difficult to reassemble. An additional problem is that an increased availability of genomes will also reduce the availability of individuals able to perform manual assembly and annotation.

With the advent of high-throughput sequencing, population genomics tools have the potential to be useful in insect control in the short- and medium-term. Knowledge can be rapidly gained about polymorphisms in insect populations, and this information can be used to understand insect population structure and dynamics. Briefly, a large number of insects can be collected from a target region to optimize the amount of polymorphisms observed in a given EST sequencing run. Those polymorphisms identified in the initial sequencing runs can then be used to answer detailed questions about those insect populations. One example within the context of biological control is to use such molecular markers, in conjunction with traditional pest population sampling, to help determine the source populations of the pests during the seasons when the target crop is not grown. By determining the source of host plants or regions where the pest populations originate (e.g., testing the hypothesis that $M$. vitrata migrates from the south to the north during the rainy season), pest managers can decide where to release biological control agents.

## Need for effective information sharing systems of polymorphism data and cost-effective

## long-term extension strategies

Finally, a mechanism will be needed to facilitate the flow of information in both directions between those scientists who develop IPM-omics strategies and those end users who apply the strategies. The scientists will need such information sharing systems to obtain the large amounts of polymorphic data required to continually and efficiently build on previous efforts. Extension agents will also require a centralized system for information exchange so that they can access information about practical pest control strategies.

## Geographic information systems (GIS)

The use of geo-statistics, GIS, satellite and photo aerial images, geographical positioning systems (GPS), and cellular technologies in combination with the latest advancements in molecular genetic analysis have dramatically changed the level of resolution applied in insect ecology and IPM. The spatial sciences combined with genetic studies of molecular markers such as polymorphisms are now being used to understand the major factors affecting the distribution of insects and to understand the mechanisms of dispersion and migration. These tools are also being used to study the spatial and temporal flow of genetic material within populations and to determine how biotic and abiotic factors along with selection-adaptation strategies may contribute to the genetic structure of an insect population (Lushai and Loxdale 2004).

The use of genomics data requires the development of databases that integrate information on genetic polymorphisms in insect pest populations with geo-referenced information such as geographic coordinates of collected specimens, the time of collection, and environmental conditions of the location. The information collected (or generated in the laboratory) is analyzed using geo-statistical methods and processed into a digital platform or GIS. The information can be displayed in multiple layers as synthetic maps where correlations are visually expressed (Manel et al. 2003; Ribes-Dasi et al. 2005). The revolutionary application of these technologies allows researchers to identify the insects that are being tracked and to track insect displacements at different geographic scales while enhancing the genetic resolution such that the genetics of an individual insect within a population could be characterized (Lushai and Loxdale 2004). From a methods perspective, the use of geo-statistical analysis and GIS programs may simplify the
collection, transmission, and handling of large databases. Through the analysis and manipulation of digital data, it is possible to generate scientific predictions based on a number of possible scenarios. A series of thematic maps are usually elaborated. These maps are very powerful application tools because they show values and correlations as visual variables, and this makes them easy to understand by technical personnel, decision makers, and participating producers (e.g., farmers).

If the current trends continue, our ability to access many polymorphisms across many loci and many insect samples will require a data repository that can then be linked with geographic and ecological data sets. These combined databases will allow researchers to answer important questions about insect pest populations and their environment such as: Does the population migrate? Is the population adapted to particular hosts? Is the population resistant to particular insecticides? With the answers to these and similar questions, researchers, government agencies, and farmers can make better decisions regarding human and environmental protection through the application of more rational pest management strategies.

## Extension systems

Ultimately, the success of any IPM strategy will hinge on the development, adaptation, and rapid deployment of educational materials that inform scientists and farmers about cost-effective pest control strategies. These materials will be developed and used by various stakeholders including scientists, development organizations (e.g., NGOs and Peace Corps volunteers), extension services, farmer organizations, and farmers themselves. For example, live-action videos have been created that describe the best
practices for rearing and deploying biological control agents. The sharing of these videos and similar educational materials through the Internet will help institutions in host countries develop effective biological control release programs (Bello-Bravo et al. 2012). Additionally, as innovations in these programs arise, a centralized Internet-based system will be needed so that groups can share these materials for peer review to assure the quality and easy access of the content.

A centralized Internet-based system is also needed so that practical pest control strategies can be deployed directly to NGOs, extension agents, farmer organizations, and farmers. To this end, an online peer-reviewed system (termed the Sustainable Development Virtual Knowledge Interface) is currently in development to provide for an online platform for the sharing of extension materials in an easily and widely accessible manner (Bello-Bravo et al. 2010). For example, educational videos containing useful information for cowpea farmers and designed for transmission and viewing with cell phones have already been produced. The language of these videos can be easily changed to match the language of the users. In addition, this centralized Internet-based cell phone system can be used for deploying text, Powerpoint ${ }^{\circledR}$, audio, and PDF files. Thus, older extension materials can be added to the centralized system and deployed by cell phone to the community of cowpea farmers and extension agents.

## CONCLUSIONS

Cost-effective educational strategies that produce tangible and useful educational materials will be critical for the long-term sustainability of any IPM program. Such materials will provide various stakeholders with the capacity to easily deploy such
information into their communities. It will also allow the end users to provide feedback on the educational materials. Thus, IPM-omics programs will need to integrate not only genomics (to increase the understanding of pest populations) but also GIS and other current tools that facilitate the efficient collection, analysis, and exchange of IPM information.
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## FIGURES AND TABLES



Figure 1.1. Hypothetical representation of the pooling of insect samples from different cowpea growing areas of West Africa for the construction of cDNA library (the arrows do not represent exact current sampling locations for any given insect species). The insects are taken from a diverse set of geographical locations, and the mRNA is pooled to create a cDNA library. Alignment of subsequent DNA sequence forms a set of expressed sequence tags (ESTs) potentially derived from the same locus, and thus representative of alleles at a locus. The presence of polymorphisms among alleles in the form of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) can readily be adapted for genotyping individuals with high-throughput systems.


Figure 1.2. Representation of a hypothetical population genomics study within the scope of IPM-omics in which individual insects from different locations (shown by the tubes) are collected from West Africa. Polymorphisms are detected among individual insect samples with high-throughput system(s) (shown as a blue plate), and are used to differentiate genotypes that are correlated back to geographic location, host plant, ecotype, or other ecological characteristics described at the initial collection. Polymorphisms detected between individual insects are indicated as the C/G to T/A differences at the bottom of the figure.


Figure 1.3. Hypothetical scenario of polymorphisms associated with the insect species in the different agro-ecological zones in West Africa. Scenario (A) would indicate a longitudinal movement pattern of an insect population, and scenario (B) would be consistent with the hypothesis that the insect populations are endemic in both areas with no major longitudinal movement patterns. These represent hypothetical situations in which polymorphisms could be used to test hypotheses associated with large-scale insect movement patterns.


Figure 1.4. Hypothetical use of molecular markers (short DNA sequences given in the blue and red boxes) for the study of local population structure in a pest population in the dry (I) and wet (II) seasons. When two defined source pest populations remain in the dry season (A and B in I), biocontrol agents are released in the areas where the pest populations are endemic (III) to suppress the pest population in the wet season (IV). During the wet season (II), the pest population without biocontrol agents expands as indicated by the sets of red and blue rings around the $A$ and $B$ source populations. In (IV), the biocontrol agents have reduced the pest population levels as indicated by the smaller and more lightly colored red and blue rings around the $A$ and $B$ source populations.


Figure 1.5. Hypothetical use of information gained from genomic studies of insect populations and how such information could be used in decisions associated with deployment of IPM strategies. Two hypothetical scenarios are illustrated: scenario A with biocontrol approach I and scenario B with biocontrol approach II. In scenario $A$, the insects move from the south to the north in the rainy season, and biocontrol agents are released in the south (in endemic regions) before migration for long-term suppression of the pest population (biocontrol approach I); temporary control measures (e.g., neem sprays) may be required in non-endemic regions if pest levels become too high. Apanteles taragamae is shown as an example of a biocontrol agent. In scenario $B$, the pest is endemic in both regions, with no significant longitudinal movement patterns. A possible pest control strategy in scenario B could involve the release of parasitoids (in both the south and north regions) (biocontrol approach II) as well as implementation of an education program concerning the temporary control (e.g., with neem sprays) if pest levels become damaging. Trichogramma eldanae is shown as an example of a parasitoid. The farmer in the figure is applying a plant-based extract spray and thus does not require personal protection equipment; if a synthetic pesticide were used in this extension material, the farmer would have to be shown with personal protection equipment.

Table 1.1. Summary of the major pests of cowpea in West Africa, important areas of research for IPM-omics strategies, genomics tools needed in the near future, and genomics tools currently available or currently being developed.

| Pest Species | Important research areas <br> of immediate concern | Current or potential <br> control strategies | Genomic tools needed <br> (short-term) | Genomic tools available or being <br> developed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maruca vitrata Fabricius | Local movement Patterns | 1) | Bt cowpea | 1) |

## Table 1.1. (cont.)

| Megalurothrips sjostedti | 1) | Population structure and <br> dynamics <br> Trybom (Thysanoptera: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thripidae) | 2) | Interactions: Host plant |
|  | resistance/tolerance - |  |
|  | biological control |  |
|  | 3)Insecticide resistance |  |

1) Host plant tolerance
2) Chemical pesticides
3) Bio-pesticides
4) Biological control
5) Cultural control
6) Population structure and dynamics
7) Interactions: Host plant resistance/tolerance biological control
8) Insecticide resistance
9) Presence of genetically different populations
10) Population structure and dynamics
11) Interactions: Host plant resistance/tolerance biological control
12) Insecticide resistance
13) Deployment systems for augmentative biological control
14) Host plant resistance/field tolerance
15) Chemical pesticides
16) Bio-pesticides
17) Biological control
18) Host plant resistance/field tolerance
19) Chemical pesticides
20) Biological control
21) EST libraries and sequence data generated
22) Molecular marker development for population studies
23) EST libraries sequenced and available (Agunbiade et al. 2013)

Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae)

Clavigralla tomentosicollis Stål (Hemiptera: Coreidae)

1) EST libraries and sequence data generated
2) Molecular marker development for population studies
3) EST libraries sequenced and available (Agunbiade et al. 2013)
4) EST libraries sequenced and available (Agunbiade et al. 2013)

## Table 1.1. (cont.)

| Sericothrips adolfifriderici <br> Karny (Thysanoptera: <br> Thripidae) | 1) <br> 2) <br> 3) | Population structure and dynamics <br> Interactions: Host plant resistance/tolerance biological control Insecticide resistance | 1) <br> 2) <br> 3) | Host plant resistance/field tolerance Chemical pesticides Biological control | 1) <br> 2) | EST libraries and sequence data generated Molecular marker development for population studies | 1) | EST libraries in progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anoplocnemis curvipes <br> Fabricius (Hemipera: <br> Coreidae) | 1) <br> 2) <br> 3) | Population structure and dynamics Insecticide resistance Deployment systems for augmentative biological control | 1) | Chemical pesticides Bio-pesticides Biological control | 1) | EST libraries and sequence data generated Molecular marker development for population studies | 1) | EST libraries sequenced and available (Agunbiade et al. 2013) |

## CHAPTER 2

# THE SPATIAL GENETIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE LEGUME POD BORER, MARUCA VITRATA F. (LEPIDOPTERA: CRAMBIDAE) POPULATIONS IN 

 WEST AFRICA ${ }^{2}$
#### Abstract

The legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata, is an endemic insect pest that causes significant yield loss to the cowpea crop in West Africa. The application of population genetic tools is important in the management of insect pests but such data on M. vitrata is lacking. We applied a set of 6 microsatellite markers to assess the population structure of M. vitrata collected at five sites from Burkina Faso, Niger and Nigeria. Observed polymorphisms ranged from one (marker 3393) to eight (marker 32008) alleles per locus. Observed and expected heterozygosities ranged from 0.0 to 0.8 and 0.0 to 0.6 , respectively. Three of the loci in samples from Nigeria and Burkina Faso deviated significantly from Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE), whereas no loci deviated significantly in samples from Niger. Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) indicated that $67.3 \%$ level of the genetic variation was within individuals compared to $17.3 \%$ among populations. A global estimate of $F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.1$ (ENA corrected $F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.1$ ) was significant $(P \leq 0.05)$ and corroborated by pairwise $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ values that were significant

^[ ${ }^{2}$ This chapter has been published as Agunbiade et al. 2012. The spatial genetic differentiation of the legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata F. (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) populations in West Africa. Bulletin of Entomological Research 102(5): 589-599. It is reprinted with the permission of the copyright owner and is available at http://journals.cambridge.org and DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0007485312000156. I acknowledge the contribution of co-authors to the publication. ]


among all possible comparisons. A significant correlation was predicted between genetic divergence and geographic distance between subpopulations $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.6, P=0.04\right)$, and cluster analysis by the program STRUCTURE predicted that co-ancestry of genotypes were indicative of three distinct populations. The spatial genetic variance among $M$. vitrata in West Africa may be due to limited gene flow, south-north seasonal movement pattern or other reproductive barriers. This information is important for the cultural, chemical, and biological control strategies for managing M. vitrata.

## INTRODUCTION

The legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Crambidae), is one of the major pests of grain legumes in the tropics and subtropics. Its emergence as a serious pest is attributed to an extensive host plant range, distribution and persistence. The geographic range of M. vitrata extends from northern Australia and East Asia through sub-Saharan Africa (Taylor 1967; Raheja 1974; Katayama and Suzuki 1984; Ke et al. 1985; Sharma 1998) to the Americas (Wolcott 1933; Taylor 1967; Munroe 1995). The larval stages of $M$. vitrata are destructive within agricultural and forest eco-systems as they feed on the tender parts of the plant stems, peduncles, flower buds, flowers and pods (Singh and Jackai 1988) of more than 39 host plants belonging mostly to the family Fabaceae (Singh and van Emden 1979; Sharma et al. 1999; Arodokoun et al. 2006).

In West Africa, M. vitrata is one of the major pests of cowpea, especially in the countries of Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso, which are the major cowpea producing areas. Cowpea production in West Africa accounts for more than $80 \%$ of the world's production (Ortiz 1998; FAOSTAT 2000; Sawadogo 2009), but typical infestations by $M$.
vitrata can cause yield reductions of 20 to $80 \%$ (Taylor 1967; Raheja 1974; Katayama and Suzuki 1984; Ke et al. 1985; Singh et al. 1990; Sharma 1998). The year-to-year crop losses and challenges faced in the effective field control have led to the identification of this pest as a major threat to economic and humanitarian well-being in developing and under-developed nations. Efforts to enhance the effectiveness of biological control agents that attack M. vitrata were partially successful following the importation of the parasitoid wasp, Apanteles taragamae, into Benin from Taiwan by the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) (Dannon et al. 2010). However, this has been hindered by the lack of population genetic data and information regarding the structure of M. vitrata populations in West Africa. Although significant advances have been made to understand the life-history and distribution patterns of $M$. vitrata using light trap and field studies ( Ba et al. 2009; Baoua et al. 2011), extensive population-level data are still needed for deployment of biocontrol agents to be effective (Margam et al. 2011). The application of population genetic data to biological control of M. vitrata will provide better information on how many distinct genotypes exist and the effect this can have on the parasitoid population over time. If different distinct genotypes exist, then this could result in the formation of specialized parasitoid populations on the different host genotypes in a process termed sequential speciation. So, over time, parasitoids on a particular genotype or host population may be isolated from other parasitoids on other populations. As herbivorous insects and their parasitoids interact with their environment on a fine spatial and temporal scale, sequential radiation may be quite common (Feder and Forbes 2010). More importantly, detailed population genetics data can be used to better target biological control interventions. First, the origin of a given pest can be traced by comparing the
population genetics of the same organism across continents where it occurs, thus allowing to focus the search for efficient natural enemies in areas where both the pest and its antagonistic organisms have co-evolved (Roderick 1996). Once the most efficient natural enemies have been identified, their deployment in the field can be guided by the genetic structure of the target pest population in the likely area of introduction (Roderick and Navajas 2003).

Prior studies in sub-Saharan Africa, including Burkina Faso, have suggested that seasonal flowering patterns of the different host plants on a south-north gradient may influence the migration of $M$. vitrata ( Ba et al. 2009). This seasonal movement occurs from temperate conditions along the coast into the Savannas of West Africa as the rainy season progresses (Bottenberg et al. 1997). Migrating M. vitrata find favorable feeding and reproductive conditions on a succession of different host plants and, thereby, increase the population size and density with each successive generation. Despite the results of previous studies, many questions remain regarding the timing and spatial scale of M. vitrata migration patterns. A preliminary survey that genotyped M. vitrata from West Africa using 11 single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers indicated that the population may show population subdivision (Margam et al. 2011). Corroborating evidence is still necessary in order to validate the conclusions drawn from prior SNP analyses and it is yet to be seen whether alternate molecular genetic markers, such as highly polymorphic microsatellites, have a similar potential to differentiate populations.

We developed and applied a set of microsatellite markers to estimate the genetic variability, population structure and gene flow among M. vitrata in the West African countries of Niger, Nigeria and Burkina Faso. The main objective of this study was to
assess the genetic variability in the M. vitrata populations across West Africa, where these data will be useful for (i) determining effective areas for the release of biocontrol agents and, (ii) the recommendation of insect resistance management (IRM) protocols aimed at minimizing the threat of selection for insecticide resistance alleles in the major cowpea producing areas in West Africa.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

## DNA sequence libraries

A combined assembly from Roche 454 reads of a premolt 4th to 5th instar $M$. vitrata larval EST library and Sanger-based EST reads from whole M. vitrata adults (referred to as the "reference assembly") was generated from M. vitrata collected from Maradi in Niger; Zaria in Nigeria; and Fada, Farakoba, and Kamboinse in Burkina Faso between 2005 and 2007 (see Margam et al. 2011; Figure 2.1 provides a map of the locations). Specifically, adult and larval samples from Nigeria were collected from a cowpea field around Zaria. The adults were collected using light traps. Samples from Niger were also collected from a light trap at Maradi field station while samples from Burkina Faso were collected in cowpea plots at the Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles (INERA) Fada, Farakoba, and Kamboinse stations. This microsatellite study was conducted using DNA samples from 72 individuals from Niger, 53 individuals from Nigeria, and 175 individuals from Burkina Faso (Fada - 40, Farakoba - 86, and Kamboinse - 49). Additionally, a microsatellite repeat enriched partial genomic library was constructed using biotinylated $(\mathrm{CA})_{15}$ and $(\mathrm{GA})_{15}$ probes. Biotin probeselected fragments were ligated into the pBluescript SK+ vector, which was used to
transform the Escherichia coli strain XL1 Blue (Stratagene) by electroporation. Transformants were plated on LB agar containing $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ampicillin and clones were picked, cultured, and plasmid DNA purified at the Purdue University Genomics Core Facility (PUGCF), West Lafayette, Indiana. Additionally, PUGCF performed sequencing of plasmid inserts on an ABI 3730XL sequencer, as well as vector sequence trimming, and Phred quality parameter assessment and trimming at $\mathrm{q}<30$ ( $99 \%$ base call accuracy). Sanger sequence reads from the microsatellite-enriched library were assembled with CAP3 (Huang and Madan 1999) using default parameters, and contig and singleton sequences pooled into a single FASTA-formatted file.

## Microsatellite prediction, repeat filtering, and marker development

The EST "reference assembly" and DNA sequence files were merged and used as input for the program SciRoKo (Kofler et al. 2007), where a search for arrays $\geq 10$ units at di-, tri-, and tetranucleotide repeat loci was specified. The $M$. vitrata sequence from +250 to -250 of predicted microsatellite repeats was parsed from FASTA files using "SciRoKo’s Little Helper" application (Chunk size 50000000; overhead 0), and corresponding positional information exported in tab-delimited format. Repetitive DNA has been described in proximity to microsatellite loci in Lepidopteran genomes and proven problematic for the development of locus-specific molecular genetic markers (please see Discussion). In order to identify repetitive DNA adjacent to M. vitrata microsatellites, we employed a bioinformatic pipeline to predict loci with homologies to known Lepidopteran transposable elements and showing sequence similarity to other unrelated M. vitrata microsatellites. To do this, the Bombyx mori transposon database was microsatellite sequences using the Blastn algorithm and results filtered for $E$-values $\leq 1 \times$ $10^{-15}$ (low-complexity filter was not used). NCBI nr database accessions identified as microsatellite loci from Lepidoptera were downloaded and queried with M. vitrata microsatellite sequences as described previously. Maruca vitrata sequences that produced a "hit" with an $E$-value $\leq 1 \times 10^{-15}$ to a B. mori transposon or Lepidopteran microsatellite sequence were removed from the merged $M$. vitrata dataset.

The remaining M. vitrata sequence were used as input for BatchPrimer3 (You et al. 2008; http://probes.pw.usda.gov/batchprimer3/index.html) and primer pairs were picked with the SSR screening and primers module [Pattern type $=$ di-, tri- or tetranucleotide; Product Size $=90$ to $300(150$ opt $) ;$ Primer Size $=18$ Min. 21 Opt. 26 Max.; Primer Tm = 58 Min. 60 Opt. 65 Max). Primer and predicted PCR amplified genome sequence information was used as input for the program MultiPLX 2.0 (Kaplinski et al. 2005; http://bioinfo.ut.ee/multiplx/), where potential primer-primer interactions were predicted using a monovalent salt concentration of 50 mM and a Mg concentration of 1.5 mM . Alignment energies for all primer pairs and products, and locus groupings used the normal stringency conditions according to author instructions. Oligonucleotides were synthesized and 5'-dye labels were added to forward primers by Integrated DNA technologies (Coralville, Iowa).

## Maruca vitrata sampling and genotyping

Maruca vitrata samples were collected from West African sites and genomic DNA extracted as described by Margam et al. (2011), and DNA concentrations were adjusted to $\sim 10 \mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{l}$ with nuclease free water. PCR reactions of $25 \mu \mathrm{l}$ were set up with 2.0 mM $\mathrm{MgCl}_{2}, 150 \mu \mathrm{M}$ dNTPs, $\sim 15 \mathrm{ng}$ DNA, 1.75 pmol each primer (multiplex reactions indicated in Table 2.1), $2 \mu \mathrm{l} 5 \mathrm{X}$ PCR buffer and 0.3125 U GoTaq DNA polymerase (Promega, Madison, WI), then amplified using the touchdown thermocycler program TD2 (Coates et al. 2009). A total of $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of each of the 5 PCR product for individual samples was pooled, diluted to a total volume of $128 \mu \mathrm{l}$, and a $5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ aliquot submitted to the Roy J . Carver Biotechnology Center at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for separation on an ABI Prism 3730xl Analyzer with the LIZ500 internal standard. Fragment analysis was performed using Peak Scanner software 1.0 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) for data scoring and GeneMapper software for the identification and classification of alleles present per locus and per individual.

## Genetic structure of M. vitrata

The mean number of alleles per locus, observed heterozygosity and expected heterozygosity were used to estimate within population genetic variability using Arlequin 3.5.1.2. (Excoffier and Lischer 2010). Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was also performed using Arlequin 3.5.1.2. Variance components were used to compute fixation indices, and their significance was tested at 1000 permutations as described by Weir and Cockerham (1984) in Arlequin. The program Micro-Checker 2.2.3 (Van Oosterhout et al. 2004) was used to estimate the frequency of null alleles and other genotyping errors such
as stuttering and allele drop out. Null alleles are suspected for a given locus when the Micro-Checker 2.2.3 program rejects Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE) among genotypes and if the excess homozygote genotypes are evenly distributed among allele size classes. Because some of the alleles harbored potential null alleles, corrected pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates were calculated for all populations by applying the ENA correction in the FREENA package (Chapuis and Estoup 2007; Chapuis et al. 2008). $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ values were estimated following Weir (1996) while the null allele frequencies for each locus and population was analyzed following the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm (Dempster et al. 1977). Exact tests using a Markov chain were used to test the deviation from HWE at each locus and population (Guo and Thompson 1992) as implemented in Arlequin 3.5.1.2. Locus-by-locus $F$-statistics and pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates were also calculated using Arlequin 3.5.1.2. Due to the fact that pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates among sample sites represent multiple comparisons that are considered simultaneously, applications of a significance threshold that treats these comparisons as a single comparison (that is $\alpha=0.05$ ) fails to recognize that as the number of comparisons increases the probability that any comparison will differ by random chance also increases (Miller 1981). Specifically, when multiple hypothesis tests are performed, the experimentwise (EW) Type I error is quickly increased at the rate of $1-(1-\alpha)^{k}$; where $k$ is the number of hypothesis tests performed. To account for the presence of multiple dependent tests within our pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates, we implicated a correction to the significance thresholds used and determined the critical value according to B-Y method by Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001). Isolation by distance (Slatkin 1993) was tested by analyzing the independence between geographical and genetic distances (Bohonak 2002). The
relationship was assessed by the Mantel test after 1000 permutations using a program IBD 1.52 (http://www.bio.sdsu.edu/pub/andy/IBD.html).

The program STRUCTURE 2.3.3 uses a model-based clustering to predict population structure using genotypic marker data from individual samples, where the model assigns proportions of individual genotypes to one of $K$ populations (Pritchard et al. 2000). To accomplish this we used an admixture model to define individual ancestry and included data of sampling location as a priori informative descriptors of potential shared co-ancestry among the genotypes (LOCPRIOR command) according to the STRUCTURE 2.3.3 modification described by Hubisz et al. (2009). STRUCTURE 2.3.3 was run using an initial burn-in of 100,000 iterations followed by 100,000 iterations. We ran ten replicates with each value of $K$ ranging from 1 to 10 . The "real" value of $K$ (number of potential unique populations represented by the $M$. vitrata genotypes within our sample) was estimated from the $\ln \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{X} \mid K)$ values output for each replicate of $K=1$ to $K=10$ using the $\mathrm{mL} "(K) / \mathrm{sL}(K)$ statistic described by Evanno et al. (2005). In brief, the "real" value of $K$ within our dataset was determined by where the $\ln \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{X} \mid K)$ maximized the value of $\mathrm{mL} "(K) / \mathrm{sL}(K)$. A graphical display of individual coancestry ( $Q$-matrix) data generated within STRUCTURE 2.3.3 output was performed using the program Distruct (Rosenberg 2004).

## RESULTS

## DNA sequence libraries

The combined assembly of M. vitrata EST read data produced a total of 3499 contigs of $452.9 \pm 279.9 \mathrm{bp}$ (see Margam et al. 2011 for details). Sequencing of 480
clones from the $(\mathrm{CT})_{\mathrm{n}}$ and $(\mathrm{GT})_{\mathrm{n}}$ microsatellite repeat resulted in a total of 461 high quality sequences of $285.8 \pm 200.8 \mathrm{bp}(131.8 \mathrm{~kb}$ total; GenBank Accession Numbers JN685509 - JN685580). Assembly of the (CT) ${ }_{n}$ and $(G T)_{n}$ microsatellite repeat sequences using CAP3 resulted in 46 contigs ( $5.9 \pm 7.2$ sequences per contig) and 69 singletons that were merged into a single dataset with a mean length of $442.1 \pm 300.3 \mathrm{bp}$.

## Microsatellite prediction, repeat filtering, and marker development

A search for microsatellite-like repeats within 115 sequences in file "MvMsatCAGA.fasta" predicted a total of 118,26 , and 11 di-, tri-, and tetranucleotide repeat motifs, respectively. All of the 118 putative dinucleotides were predicted from the (AC) and (AG) repeat enriched libraries, and respectively showed a mean length of 57.1 nt ( 28.5 repeats) and 56.6 nt ( 28.3 repeats; Table 2.2 ). In contrast, all putative tri- and tetranucleotide repeats were characterized from EST library sequences. The mean mismatch of nucleotides within the predicted array was $\geq 3.7$-fold higher among dinucleotides compared to either the tri- or tetranucleotide repeat groups. Filtering of sequences $\pm 250 \mathrm{bp}$ of putative $M$. vitrata microsatellite repeats against B. mori transposon-like sequences resulted in identification of 12 putative repetitive elements ( $E$ values $\leq 2.0 \times 10^{-16} ;$ similarity $\geq 81.5 \% ; \mathrm{L}=164.7 \pm 111.0 \mathrm{bp}$; remaining data not shown). An analogous Blastn search of the NCBI nr nucleotide database accessions from Lepidoptera that contained microsatellite sequences indicated that sequence similarities existed with 28 M . vitrata microsatellite flanking sequences ( $E$-values $\leq 2.0 \times 10^{-16}$; similarity $\geq 86.7 \% ; \mathrm{L}=245.5 \pm 77.8 \mathrm{bp} ;$ remaining data not shown). In total, 40 sequences were identified within $M$. vitrata microsatellite flanking sequences (34.8\%),
and were removed from the file prior to PCR primer design. All of the filtered sequences were derived from the anonymous (AC) and (AG) microsatellite-enriched library.

The design of oligonucleotide primers from the remaining 75 sequences using BatchPrimer3 resulted in 24 pairs (11 from anonymous microsatellite enriched library and 13 from EST sequence). Preliminary analysis by PCR resulted in the successful amplification for one of 11 anonymous microsatellite markers (9.1\%) and five of 13 ESTderived microsatellite markers (38.5\%; results not shown). PCR primer multiplex pair design using MultiPLX resulted in the prediction of two loci being suitable for coamplification (markers C3393 and C0444), where primer alignment energies were at a maximum of $-5.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ compared to $-6.0 \pm 0.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for all remaining possible primer pairs (remaining data not shown).

## Genetic structure of M. vitrata

The six microsatellite loci used to screen $M$. vitrata samples collected at five African sites showed significant deviation from HWE at 13 instances following 30 locus-by-site calculations (Appendix A), thus subsequent estimations of population subdivision used ENA corrected values to account for potential influence of null alleles. The mean number of alleles per locus was similar across all sample sites, and the overall observed heterozygosity was less than expected ( $F_{I S} \geq 0.1$ ) for all populations except at Fada, Burkina Faso $\left(F_{I S}=-0.0\right.$; Table 2.3). Also the $F_{I S}$ estimates were negative for only two loci (CO241 and CO325) across all populations (Table 2.4). The locus-by-locus $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates derived from the five populations ranged from -0.0 (ENA corrected $F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.0$; marker 32008) to 0.3 (ENA corrected $F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.0$; marker 7_02K06; remaining data not
shown). The subsequent global estimates of $F_{\text {ST }}$ across all loci and all populations were moderate (uncorrected $F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.1$, ENA corrected $\left.F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.1\right)$ and significant $(95 \% \mathrm{CI}=0.0$ $-0.3,95 \%$ CI with ENA correction $=0.0-0.2$, with the lower bounds rounded to zero in one decimal place). The partitioning of population genetic variance from AMOVA results indicated that $\geq 67.3 \%$ resides within individuals, and correspondingly $17.3 \%$ and $15.4 \%$ of the total genetic variation, was among populations and among individuals (Table 2.5). Pairwise comparison of $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimations showed that a significant level of differentiation exist for all the possible comparisons after the sequential B-Y adjustment for the ENA corrected $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates across all loci (Table 2.6). Specifically, a critical significance level was achieved at $0.05 / 2.929=0.017$. Results indicated that the $P$-values obtained from pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates $(\leq 0.005)$ were all statistically significant at the $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Y}$ adjusted thresholds (Table 2.6). Regression of uncorrected $F_{S T}$ estimates and geographic distance (km) among West African sample sites showed a significant dependence of genetic variation on geographic distance $\left(R^{2}=0.6\right.$, Mantel $\left.P=0.04\right)$, and showed the relative genetic similarity ( $F_{S T}$ estimates) of genotypes at Niger and Nigeria, and among Burkina Faso samples (Figure 2.2). The "real" number of populations $(K)$ estimated from the microsatellite-defined M. vitrata genotypes from the $\mathrm{mL} "(K) / \mathrm{sL}(K)$ statistic calculated from STRUCTURE 2.3.3 output achieved a maximum value of 14.5 at $K=3$ and suggested that three genetically-distinct M. vitrata ancestries exist in West Africa. The three genetically distinct ancestries across collection sites were represented in Figure 2.3 as vertical bars with Niger, Nigeria and Fada, Burkina Faso primarily red; Farakoba, Burkina Faso primarily green; Kamboinse, Burkina Faso primarily green and red and a minor cluster represented by yellow across all sites.

## DISCUSSION

## Microsatellite markers in Lepidoptera

The isolation and subsequent application of microsatellite loci as molecular genetic markers in Lepidopteran insects has often been difficult (Nève and Meglécz 2000; Ji and Zhang 2004; Zhang 2004), where studies have developed five or fewer loci for most species studied so far (reviewed in Ji et al. 2003). These difficulties have been attributed to the high degrees of nucleotide sequence similarity between regions that flank different microsatellite loci (Meglécz et al. 2004) or the low frequency of microsatellites in Lepidopteran genomes (Ji et al. 2003; Prasad et al. 2005). Additionally, evidence suggests that Lepidopteran microsatellites may be derived from and mobilized by transposable elements (TEs) (Coates et al. 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012; Tay et al. 2010). Despite these associations with repetitive DNA, microsatellite markers have been developed for more than 40 Lepidopteran species in 35 genera (GenBank, 15 August 2006) and have proven to be useful for population genetic analyses. Within this study, we initially identified 155 unique $M$. vitrata microsatellite loci from which six were eventually considered informative genetic markers. Forty of 155 loci ( $25.8 \%$ ) contained known repetitive element-like sequences previously identified within the $B$. mori genome assembly, which suggests that $M$. vitrata microsatellites may be associated with repetitive DNA as observed in other Lepidopteran species (Meglécz et al. 2004). High failure rates observed during microsatellite marker development are rarely reported, and the extent to which repetitive DNA can cause these failures has not been thoroughly investigated (Tay et al. 2010). In the current study, we aimed to identify M. vitrata microsatellite loci, which may contain repetitive sequence and remove them from consideration for molecular
marker development. Despite these measures, an approximate $25 \%$ success rate for $M$. vitrata microsatellite markers suggest that screening for repetitive DNA from distantly related species may not be sufficient to identify all affected loci.

Microsatellite loci that deviate significantly from HWE show evidence of null alleles according to the distribution of homozygote-size classes. Microsatellite null alleles are commonly found among a wide range of taxa, but have a particularly high incidence among species of Lepidoptera (Meglécz et al. 2004), Diptera (Lehmann et al. 1997), and Orthoptera (Chapius et al. 2005). The extent to which null alleles tend to overestimate the true population differentiation has not been investigated (Chapuis and Estoup 2007), but can lead to overestimates of population differentiation due to effects on subsequent calculations of $F_{S T}$ and genetic distances (Slatkin 1995; Paetkau et al. 1997). Although null alleles were present at all microsatellite loci, correction with the ENA algorithm nonetheless allowed effective population genetic analysis. Specifically, analysis of these microsatellite markers resulted in conclusions analogous to those obtained from M. vitrata single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers applied to the same populations (see next section).

## Genetic structure of M. vitrata in West Africa

At the population level, our ENA corrected microsatellite genotype data suggested that a moderate level of genetic differentiation may be present among M. vitrata sample sites in West Africa. Consistent with previous studies in other insects, a majority of the total genetic variation is within individuals compared to between sample sites (Coates and Hellmich 2003; Juan et al. 2004; Timmermans et al. 2005). Furthermore, our
microsatellite results agree with an analogous study using M. vitrata SNP markers in West Africa (Margam et al. 2011), where genetic structure was detected between Niger and Nigeria, and Burkina Faso sample sites and an overall $K=3$ obtained from STRUCTURE results. The current study also indicated three distinct populations of M. vitrata in West Africa and suggests that analysis of microsatellite and SNP markers can provide equivalent results and conclusions. The findings from that study, however, showed significant pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates between eastern (Niger and Nigeria) and western sample sites from Burkina Faso, and all other comparisons indicated a lack of genetic divergence while findings from our study indicated a significant divergence in all pairwise populations using a critical $P$-value determined using B-Y adjustment method (Benjamini and Yekutieli 2001). Our population differentiation results derived from microsatellite data may be expected since SNPs typically have two alleles per locus due to their low mutational rate (Hancock 1999; Zhang and Hewitt 2003) compared to multi-allelic microsatellites that have higher power per locus for estimating genetic divergence or gene flow when using $F$-statistics or assignment tests (Vignal et al. 2002; Brumfield et al. 2003; Morin et al. 2004). Studies further suggest that measures of pairwise genetic relationships using SNPs would require analysis of more than five times more loci as compared to microsatellites (Blouin et al. 1996; Glaubitz et al. 2003), and suggest that the current set of microsatellite markers will be more efficient at detecting population subdivision compared to SNP markers within future population genetic analyses.

## Effect of migration on the population structure in M. vitrata

Migration is a fundamental population process and is crucial to understanding the dynamics and persistence of populations of insects (Dingle 1996). Despite the field observations that $M$. vitrata has high rates of migration, significant difference in $F_{S T}$ estimates and partitioning of $17.3 \%$ of population variance between sample sites within AMOVA analysis suggested that $M$. vitrata show reduced gene flow and genetic structuring in West Africa. This is evidenced in the $F_{I S}$ estimates obtained for almost all the study sites except Fada, Burkina Faso where there was some evidence of outbreeding suggesting high gene flow in this population. Specifically, an isolation by distance (IBD) model suggested that subpopulation differentiation $\left(F_{S T}\right)$ or structured gene flow is a function of the geographical distance between them (Slatkin 1993). Our analyses indicate that although M. vitrata has a seasonal south-north migration, there appears to be evidence of reduced gene flow. In agreement with this, Peterson and Denno (1998) reported that insect species with high- and low-dispersal rates tend to show less IBD compared to species with moderate dispersal capabilities. High levels of gene flow tend to homogenize the observed genetic variation across a geographic range, whereas low gene flow can result in the effective genetic isolation of subpopulations and genetic drift. We observed a positive correlation between geographic and genetic distances among the M. vitrata sample sites within this study $\left(R^{2}=0.56\right)$, suggesting that $M$. vitrata may have a structured migratory pattern. Although isolation by distance is not typical for species with high mobility (Arguedas and Parker 2000), it has been reported for other Lepidoptera such as Chazara briseis Linnaeus (Lepidoptera: Satyridae) (Johannesen et al. 1997), and Hesperia dacotae Skinner (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae) (Britten and Glasford 2002). Light trap data
and sampling of M. vitrata in West Africa showed that M. vitrata does not infest cowpea during the dry season in the northern extremes of its geographic range, even if cowpea is present (Bottenberg et al. 1997; Ba et al. 2009). Climatic factors such as lack of rain, and temperature or relative humidity may influence this observed spatial restriction. Research has also shown that M. vitrata survive on alternate host plants within the more humid southern regions, and migrate to the northern regions over a period of several months (Bottenberg et al. 1997). During the seasonal migration, the population of M. vitrata finds favorable conditions for multiplying on a succession of different host plants, which may result in temporal mating barriers due to differential larval maturation rates on the alternate host plants. This serves to emphasize the importance of ecological migration (movement of individuals) on population genetic migration (transfer of alleles). Gene flow cannot occur without ecological migration, but the effects of ecological migration on the population genetic structure can be tempered by factors such as temporal mating barriers between dispersing and resident individuals.

## CONCLUSIONS

The implementation of effective cultural, chemical, and biological control strategies to limit $M$. vitrata feeding damage to cowpea crops in West Africa is dependent upon a basic understanding of population structure and migration. Our results and previous ecological studies have implications for IRM strategies involving Bt-cowpea in West Africa. The implication is that in the north, resistance may spread only slowly among $M$. vitrata populations because the populations eventually die out during the dry season; in other words, the southern populations in endemic zones act as a source
population. Also, the long-distance migration from the south to the north might be a source of susceptible populations into the northern part, which can slow down the evolution of resistance (if there are pockets of $M$. vitrata populations that survive in the north throughout the year). In the more humid south, M. vitrata can be found on different host plants throughout the year. Further studies should be conducted on population characterization on the different host plants, especially in the more humid south, to determine if there are differences in populations on the different host plants or if geographic barriers restrict gene flow between them. Migration results in changes in allele frequencies that are greater in the short term and smaller in the long term, leading to under- and overestimation of effective population size, respectively, if it is ignored (Wang and Whitlock 2003). Using these polymorphic markers, studies should also be conducted to test how migration rate affects the effective population size of the M. vitrata populations. The results of this study also have implications for the implementation of control strategies involving the release of biocontrol agents against $M$. vitrata. In keeping with an endemic zone to migratory zone hypothesis, the conclusions of this study agree with the conclusions by Margam et al. (2011), which suggested that the deployment of biocontrol agents (for classical biological control) would be most logical in the endemic zone directly south of migratory regions where $M$. vitrata is a significant pest during the cowpea growing season.
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Figure 2.1. Map showing locations in West Africa (Niger, Nigeria and Burkina Faso) where the M. vitrata samples were collected.


Figure 2.2. Geographic distance versus genetic distance among populations of $M$. vitrata using $\boldsymbol{F}_{S T}$. Correlations and probabilities were estimated from a Mantel test with $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ repeats of bootstrapping. $\Delta$, Comparisons among Burkina Faso (Fada, Farkoba and Kamboinse; •, Niger and Nigeria; $\Delta$, Niger and locations in Burkina Faso; $\circ$, Nigeria and locations in Burkina Faso are indicated.


Figure 2.3. Partitioning of the co-ancestry among microsatellite-defined M. vitrata genotypes generated from STRUCTURE using the LOCPRIOR command for Maradi, Niger; Zaria, Nigeria; and Fada, Farakoba and Kamboinse locations in Burkina Faso. For each, the estimated co-ancestry was derived from the $Q$-matrix for each individual and represented as vertical lines showing the proportion of the $K^{\text {th }}$ segments that made up the individual genotype.

Table 2.1. M. vitrata primer sequences used for microsatellite amplification reactions.

| Locus | Primer (dye label) and sequence (5'-3') | Repeat | Size (bp) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C32008 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | F- <br> (MAX)AAAAAGCGCTTATATGTTTGTTATAGT | $(\mathrm{CATA})_{3}$ | 163 |
| 7_02K06 ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | R-GAAATTTTTAACGGAGATACAATCA F-(FAM)ATTTGTCAGAATGGTATCTTACGT | $(\mathrm{GAT})_{6}$ | 151 |
| C3393 ${ }^{\text {E, } 1}$ | R-CCTCTGGGTCATAATTATATTGTTCA F-(ROX)AGACCCCCAAAGTGGAGAA | (GAA)5 | 91 |
| C0444 ${ }^{\text {E, } 1}$ | R-ACGTTCACGAACCTCCTGTT <br> F-(FAM)AAAGGAACTACGCCGTCAGG | $(\mathrm{CAA})_{8}$ | 102 |
| C0241 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | R-GTTGAGCGATCTTGGCACAG <br> F-(TAM)GACGAAACAAGGCCTACCAG | $(\mathrm{GAT})_{9}$ | 165 |
| $\mathrm{C} 0325^{\text {E }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R-GGTACTTCYGACGTTGTTCG } \\ & \text { F-(ROX)CGAAAAGAAACACCGCTCTG } \\ & \text { R-CAGTCTGTTCAGWCTCTTCAGTGG } \end{aligned}$ | $(\mathrm{GAA})_{7}$ | 173 |

E, EST-derived primer pair; A, anonymous genomic sequence-derived primer pair; 1, PCR multiplexed primers

Table 2.2. Microsatellite motifs predicted from M. vitrata DNA sequence sources (combined library), that was partitioned into (CA) and (GA) repeat enriched library (microsatellite library), and expressed sequence tag (EST) library (EST library) sources. The mean length of repeat arrays ( $L$ ) and frequency of nucleotide mismatch within repeat arrays (MisMch).

| Motif | Combined library |  |  | Microsatellite library |  | EST library |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | L | MisMch | Count | L | MisMch | Count | L | MisMch |
| AC | 107 | 57.1 | 1.6 | 107 | 57.1 | 1.6 | 0 |  |  |
| AG | 11 | 56.6 | 1.3 | 11 | 56.6 | 1.3 | 0 |  |  |
| ATC | 14 | 25.8 | 0.4 | 0 |  |  | 14 | 25.8 | 0.4 |
| AAT | 12 | 18.4 | 0.3 | 0 |  |  | 12 | 18.4 | 0.3 |
| AAAT | 11 | 17.8 | 0.2 | 0 |  |  | 11 | 17.8 | 0.2 |
|  | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2.3. Characteristics of the M. vitrata individuals across West Africa showing sample size ( N ), number of alleles ( Na ), observed heterozygosity ( Ho ), expected heterozygosity $\left(H_{\mathrm{E}}\right)$, and fixation index ( $F_{\mathrm{IS}}$ ) per sample site (values rounded up to 1 decimal place).

| Location | Na (Mean per locus) | $\boldsymbol{H o}$ | $\boldsymbol{H}_{\mathbf{E}}$ | $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {IS }}$ | Loci not <br> in HWE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Niger | $25(4.2)$ | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Nigeria | $27(4.5)$ | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 4 |
| Fada | $18(3.0)$ | 0.3 | 0.3 | -0.0 | 3 |
| Farakoba | $23(3.8)$ | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Kamboinse | $18(3.0)$ | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3 |

Table 2.4. Estimates of total number of alleles (Na), mean estimated frequency of null alleles, fixation index ( $F_{\mathrm{IS}}$ ) and $\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{ST}}$ across microsatellite loci (values rounded up to 1 decimal place).

| Locus | Na | Mean null <br> frequency | alleles | $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {IS }}$ | $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {ST }}$ <br> (ENA corrected) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C0444 | 7 | 0 | 0.1 | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| C32008 | 10 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $-0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| C3393 | 3 | 0.1 | 0.9 | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| 7_02K06 | 6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | $0.4(0.3)$ |  |
| CO241 | 7 | 0 | -0.1 | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| CO325 | 5 | 0 | -0.1 | $0.1(0.1)$ |  |

Table 2.5. Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) for Maradi, Niger; Zaria, Nigeria; and Fada, Farakoba, and Kamboinse locations in Burkina Faso.

| Source of Variation | Df | SS | \% of Variation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Among Population | 4 | 56.1 | 17.3 |
| Among Individuals | 295 | 190.5 | 15.4 |
| Within Individuals | 300 | 133 | 67.3 |
| Total | 599 | 379.6 | 100 |

Table 2.6. Pairwise comparisons of $M$. vitrata samples showing the corrected $\boldsymbol{F}_{S T}$ estimates (below diagonal) and significance of corresponding comparisons ( $P$-values) as indicated above the diagonal. Significance thresholds were evaluated using a Benjamini and Yekutieli (B-Y) adjusted $\alpha=0.017$.

|  | Niger | Nigeria | Fada | Farakoba | Kamboinse |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Niger | - | $0.005^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ | $0.001^{*}$ |
| Nigeria | 0.2 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ | $0.004^{*}$ |
| Fada | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $0.002^{*}$ |
| Farakoba | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | - | $0.001^{*}$ |
| Kamboinse | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - |

## CHAPTER 3

## GENETIC DIFFERENTIATION AMONG MARUCA VITRATA F.

## (LEPIDOPTERA: CRAMBIDAE) POPULATIONS ON CULTIVATED COWPEA AND WILD HOST PLANTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSECT RESISTANCE MANAGEMENT AND BIOLOGICAL CONTROL STRATEGIES ${ }^{3}$


#### Abstract

Maruca vitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) is a polyphagous insect pest that feeds on a variety of leguminous plants in the tropics and subtropics. The contribution of host-associated genetic variation on population structure was investigated using analysis of mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase 1 ( $\operatorname{cox} 1$ ) sequence and microsatellite marker data from M. vitrata collected from cultivated cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L. Walp.), and alternative host plants Pueraria phaseoloides (Roxb.) Benth. var. javanica (Benth.) Baker, Loncocarpus sericeus (Poir), and Tephrosia candida (Roxb.). Analyses of microsatellite data revealed a significant global $F_{S T}$ estimate of 0.05 ( $P \leq 0.001$ ). The program STRUCTURE estimated 2 genotypic clusters (co-ancestries) on the four host plants across 3 geographic locations, but little geographic variation was predicted among genotypes from different geographic locations using analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA; among group variation -0.68\%) or $F$-statistics ( $F_{\mathrm{ST}}{ }^{L o c}=-0.01 ; P=0.62$ ). These


[^2]results were corroborated by mitochondrial haplotype data $\left(\varphi_{S T}{ }^{L o c}=0.05 ; P=0.92\right)$. In contrast, genotypes obtained from different host plants showed low but significant levels of genetic variation $\left(F_{\mathrm{ST}}{ }^{\text {Host }}=0.04 ; P=0.01\right)$, which accounted for $4.08 \%$ of the total genetic variation, but was not congruent with mitochondrial haplotype analyses $\left(\varphi_{S T}{ }^{\text {Host }}=\right.$ $0.06 ; P=0.27$ ). Variation among host plants at a location and host plants among locations showed no consistent evidence for M. vitrata population subdivision. These results suggest that host plants do not significantly influence the genetic structure of M. vitrata, and this has implications for biocontrol agent releases as well as insecticide resistance management (IRM) for M. vitrata in West Africa.

## INTRODUCTION

Host plant adaptation by herbivorous insects has resulted in monophagous species that are highly specialized on a single host, whereas polyphagous insect species have evolved to feed upon a wide array of different host plants (e.g., Futuyma 1983; Jaenike 1990; Mitter and Farrell 1991). Host plants may have a major role in the differentiation and diversification of herbivorous insects, and are important in our current understanding of global biodiversity and niche exploitation by insect populations (Ehrlich and Raven 1964; Strong et al. 1984; Farrell 1998). The diversity of ecosystems, which polyphagous species encounter, makes the study of genetic variation based on host plants important for the understanding of adaptation and niche formation. Within a single species, genetic variation can arise among subpopulations that utilize different host plants through variation in oviposition or feeding preferences, rates of development on different host plants, as well as subsequent survivorship, fecundity and mating preferences of adults
(Funk et al. 2002). Mating barriers and reduced gene flow have been predicted among individuals from insect species that show adaptation to different host plants (Nason et al. 2002; Sword et al. 2005), and resulted in assortative mating within populations (Feder et al. 1998). In addition to broader implications in species formation, assortative mating based on host plant preference can impact the practical application of insect pest management strategies, such as the release of biocontrol agents and the implementation of insect resistance management (IRM) strategies based on genetically modified crops.

The legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) is a polyphagous insect pest of grain legumes that has a wide distribution throughout tropical and subtropical regions worldwide. Feeding damage caused by larval M. vitrata to cowpea crops occurs on flower buds, flowers and seed pods. This insect species develops without diapause and uses multiple alternative host plants during the dry season in West Africa when cowpea crops are not in cultivation (Taylor 1978; Bottenberg et al. 1997; Arodokoun et al. 2003). Larval M. vitrata feeding has been documented on over 50 alternative host plants (Taylor 1978; Arodokoun et al. 2003; Sharma 1998), and most often found on cultivated and wild host plants from the family, Fabaceae (Leumann 1994; Arodokoun 1996). Pterocarpus santalinoides L'Hér. ex DC., P. phaseoloides and Centrosema pubescens (except cv. Belalto) are used for oviposition and subsequent larval development during the long dry season, whereas Lonchocarpus sericeus and $L$. cyanescens (Schumach and Thonn.) Benth. are similarly used during the main rainy season, and Tephrosia platycarpa Guill. and Perr. during the short rainy season (Arodokoun et al. 2003). The reservoirs of M. vitrata maintained on alternative host plants results in difficulties for cultural and chemical insecticide control. As proposed by Tamò
et al. (2002), the possible Asian origin of M. vitrata may contribute to the lack of corresponding native natural enemies capable of regulating its populations in those alternative host plant habitats in West Africa, and thus might also lead to heavy infestations observed on cowpea crops. Efforts to introduce biological control candidate species have had limited success, and yet unrecognized biotic factors such as M. vitrata alternative host plant differentiation, could hinder the effective spread of introduced control agents (Tamò et al. 2012).

Protein crystalline (Cry) toxins produced by the gram-positive soil bacterium Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) show insecticidal activities against many Lepidopteran insects. Transgenic cowpea that express the $B t$ toxin $C r y 1 \mathrm{Ab}$ are being developed for the protection of this crop for use in West African cropping systems (Huesing et al. 2011). Although transgenic Bt-cowpea offers a promising approach to crop improvement, sustainability of the technology will likely depend on the mitigation of resistance development in M. vitrata populations and availability of suitable alternative host plants to act as refuges. Specifically, the high-dose refuge model is the most widely accepted IRM strategy (Alstad and Andow 1995), and has been implemented as an effective resistance management plan to delay the development of resistance to $B t$ in target pest insect populations (Gould 1998). The high-dose component of this IRM strategy requires that crops express levels of $B t$ toxin sufficient to kill $100 \%$ of homozygous susceptible and heterozygous larvae. Refuges are non-Bt plants in proximity to $B t$ crops on which the targeted pests can also complete development (Gould 1998). In theory, refuge plants are able to produce a large population of adults that will mate randomly with any potential homozygous resistant individual that might complete development on a Bt crop plant. By
shear stochastic sampling, rare homozygous resistant individuals that emerge from $B t$ fields are most likely to mate with a refuge plant-derived homozygous susceptible individual. This increases the probability that any resistant insects emerging from the $B t$ crops are more likely to mate with a susceptible adult emerging from the refuges, thereby generating heterozygous progeny that are not capable of surviving exposure to the high dose of $B t$ toxin expressed by transgenic crop in order to delay or prevent an increase in resistance allele frequency within target insect populations (Bourguet et al. 2000). Wildgrowing alternative host plants can also serve as natural refuges for target pests, and have been reported as effective refuges for IRM of transgenic crops (Zhang and Tang 2000; Tan et al. 2001; Wu et al. 2004; Abney et al. 2007; Jackson et al. 2008). In the case of $M$. vitrata, there are several alternative host plants which are available throughout the cowpea growing season and which might act as natural refuges. Assessing the suitability of alternative hosts as effective refuge plants for Bt-cowpea will be important for developing IRM programs for M. vitrata in West Africa. However, it is not clear when Bt-cowpea will be used broadly in West Africa, which highlights the need to enhance the efficacy of current pest control solutions.

The control of M. vitrata in West Africa currently relies on the use of cultural and chemical control methods and increasingly on the use of biological control agents. Alternative host plant use and any potential genetic differentiation among populations based on this biological phenomenon may also impact how biocontrol agents are deployed (Olivieri et al. 2004). The lack of alternative hosts may be a contributing factor in the observation that, although many biological control introductions result in establishment, most are unsuccessful in reducing pest densities (Gurr and Wratten 1999). Therefore, most
managers of agricultural systems seek to manipulate habitat complexity to encourage the conservation and enhancement of natural enemies in the hopes of improving pest suppression (see reviews by Wratten and van Emden 1995; Gurr et al. 2005; Landis et al. 2000). A key factor that enhances predator and parasitoid populations in complex landscapes is the availability of nectar and pollen subsidies. Many natural enemies, particularly Hymenopteran parasitoids, lacewings, syrphid flies, and tachinid flies are herbivorous as adults and require carbohydrates for successful reproduction. A literature review by Altieri and Letourneau (1982) showed that the successful establishment of certain parasitoids in cropping systems depends on the presence of weeds that provide nectar for the adult female wasps. Laboratory and field studies have also demonstrated positive impacts on parasitoid fecundity, lifespan, or searching efficiency as a result of floral resources in bordering non-crop areas (Lavandero et al. 2006; Gourdine et al. 2005; Lee and Heimpel 2008; Bianchi and Wäckers 2008). However, although alternative host plants have been reported to enhance parasitoid and predator efficiency in conservation biological control strategies, extensive population-level data are still needed for deployment of biocontrol agents to be effective. The application of population genetic data to biological control of M. vitrata will provide better information on how many distinct genotypes exist on the different host plants and the effect this can have on the parasitoid population over time. The use of population structure data will therefore enable the identification of the genetic differentiation of M. vitrata on cultivated cowpea and available alternative host plants and the effective host plants that can be planted alongside the cultivated cowpea in order to maximize parasitoid efficiency.

Genetic variation among M. vitrata larvae on four host plants including cowpea in West Africa was assessed using haplotype sequencing of the mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase-1 gene (cox1) fragment, as well as genotyping using a set of microsatellite markers previously developed by Agunbiade et al. (2012). Levels of genetic and haplotype variation, population structure, and gene flow were estimated among M. vitrata collected from different host plants in southern regions of Benin. The results of this research are important for assessing the effectiveness of alternative host plants for use as a refuge for $B t$-cowpea crops, and to potentially identify the most appropriate host plant to apply biocontrol agents. These data will be used to enhance ongoing efforts to reduce the impact of $M$. vitrata feeding damage and to improve yields in cowpea cropping systems of West Africa.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Insect sampling and DNA extraction

Larval M. vitrata were collected from cultivated cowpea (Vigna unguiculata), and three alternative host plants $-P$. phaseoloides (dry season host), T. candida (short rainy season host), and L. sericeus (main rainy season host), in three divisions representing 6 departments in Southern Benin in 2012 (Figure 3.1). The divisions were Mono-Couffo, Zou-Collines and Ouémé-Plateau. Within each division, we collected from different locations to lessen the possibility that the same female individual laid larvae collected. Forty-nine, 50 and 49 individual $M$. vitrata samples were collected from $V$. unguiculata in Ouémé-Plateau, Zou-Collines, and Mono-Couffo, respectively. Forty-seven and 45 individual $M$. vitrata samples were collected from L. sericeus in Ouémé-Plateau, and Zou-

Collines, respectively. Fifty-two, 52 and 58 individual M. vitrata samples were collected from T. candida in Ouémé-Plateau, Zou-Collines, and Mono-Couffo, respectively, and 49, 49 and 48 individual M. vitrata samples were collected from $P$. phaseoloides in OuéméPlateau, Zou-Collines, and Mono-Couffo, respectively. Genomic DNA was extracted from the insect samples using DNeasy animal tissue kit and following manufacturer instructions (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). The DNA concentrations were adjusted to $10 \mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{l}$ and used for genotyping.

## Microsatellite genotypes

Microsatellite markers C0241, 7_02K06, C0444, C32008 and 01_B12 were used for genotyping $M$. vitrata samples (Table 3.1), amplified in multiplex PCR reactions and detected as previously described by Agunbiade et al. (2012). The microsatellite markers were obtained as previously described in Agunbiade et al. (2012) and the DNA sequence libraries submitted to GenBank under the accession numbers from JN685509 to JN685580. The mean number of alleles per locus, observed heterozygosity and expected heterozygosity were calculated for genotypes by location and by host plant within each location using Arlequin 3.5.1.3 (Excoffier et al. 2005). The potential occurrence of null alleles and other genotyping errors (stuttering and allele drop out) were tested using the program Micro-Checker 2.2.3 (Van Oosterhout et al. 2004), and null alleles were suspected at a given locus when Micro-Checker rejects Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE) and excess homozygosity was evenly distributed among allelic size classes. Null allele-corrected pairwise $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ estimates were calculated for all populations by applying the ENA correction in the FREENA package (Chapuis and Estoup 2007; Chapuis et al. 2008;
available at http://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/URLB/). Uncorrected $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ values were estimated following Weir (1996), whereas corrected $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates were made when null allele were predicted following the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm (Dempster et al. 1977).

Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA), global $F$-statistics (Weir and Cockerham 1984) and pairwise $F_{S T}$ estimates were calculated also using Arlequin 3.5.1.3 (Excoffier et al. 2005). Four different analyses were performed based on assumed partitioning of the population based on host plant and/or geographic location; analysis 1 : variation among host plants (pooled across all locations), analysis 2: variation among geographic locations (pooled for all host plants), analysis 3: differentiation between host plant within each geographic location, and analysis 4: differentiation between geographic location for each host plant group. Significance for each comparison was corrected for Type I error by application of the B-Y method (Benjamini and Yekutieli 2001).

The program STRUCTURE 2.3.4 uses a model-based clustering to predict population structure using genotypic marker data from individual samples, where the model assigns proportions of individual genotypes to one of $K$ populations (Pritchard et al. 2000). STRUCTURE analysis of microsatellite genotype data was run using an initial burn-in of 100,000 iterations followed by 100,000 iterations, and ten replicates with each potential value of $K$ (range 1 to 10 ) were run with an assumed population admixture model. STRUCTURE runs were performed using LOCPRIOR command, where genotypes were defined based on host plant at each geographic location. The "real" value of $K$ (number of potential unique populations represented by the $M$. vitrata genotypes) was estimated as described by Evanno et al. (2005) using the program Structure harvester
(Earl and vonHoldt 2012; available at http://taylor0.biology.ucla.edu/structureHarvester/). A graphical display of individual co-ancestry ( $Q$-matrix) data was generated from STRUCTURE output using the program Distruct (Rosenberg 2004).

Isolation by distance (IBD) model of genetic differentiation was tested by comparing $F_{S T}\left(1-F_{S T}\right)$ with the logarithm of geographic distances, and significance evaluated using Mantel tests with 10,000 randomizations of the data. All IBD analyses were conducted using the IBDWS (Jensen et al. 2005; available at http://ibdws.sdsu.edu/~ibdws/).

## Mitochondrial haplotypes

Oligonucleotide primers HC02198 $5^{\prime}$-TAA ACT TCA GGG TGA CCA AAA AAT CA-3' and LCO1490 5'-GGT CAA CAA ATC ATA AAG ATA TTG G-3' (Folmer et al. 1994) were used for PCR amplification of $\sim 650 \mathrm{bp}$ mitochondrial cytochrome $c$ oxidase I (cox1) DNA barcode region. All PCR, SacI PCR-RFLP and DNA sequencing reactions were performed according to Margam et al. (2011a), except cycle sequencing using BigDye ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ reactions (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA), which were performed at the Iowa State University DNA Sequencing and Synthesis Facility, Ames, IA where data was trimmed for Phred scores < 20. The haplotype data were submitted to GenBank under the accession numbers from KJ175700 to KJ176247.

DNA sequence data were aligned for each individual using CLUSTALX 1.8 (Thompson et al. 1997). Haplotype differentiation of sequence data was estimated among 1) host plant or 2) geographic location from which samples were collected using $\varphi$ statistics, which is an approximation of $F$-statistics, based on haplotype frequencies
(Benjamini and Yekutieli 2001; Excoffier et al. 1992). The $\varphi$-statistics and AMOVA estimates were obtained using Arlequin as described previously, except the Kimura 2parameter model was used for $\varphi$-statistic calculation with an empirical estimated gamma parameter $=0.05$. AMOVA was used to partition haplotype variance between 1) host plants across geographic locations (sample sites) or 2) geographic location across different host plants. Pairwise $\varphi_{S T}$ estimates were made between host plant groups using Arlequin and significance for multiple tests within each comparison determined following application of the B-Y method (Benjamini and Yekutieli 2001) as described above.

## RESULTS

## Microsatellite genotypes

The observed heterozygosity $\left(H_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$ across all loci ranged from 0.02 to 0.89 while the expected heterozygosity ranged from 0.02 to 0.67 . Nineteen of the 55 exact tests across host plants and geographic locations showed significant deviation from HWE. Two of the markers were monomorphic (CO241 on L. sericeus at Zou-Collines and 7_02K026 on P. phaseoloides at Ouémé-Plateau) (Appendix B). Micro-Checker analysis indicated that markers 7_02K06 and C0241 showed evidence of null allele presence in all populations that were tested. There was no evidence of stuttering or allele drop out in any of the microsatellite markers. Results of genetic differentiation estimates among M. vitrata were based on four sets of analyses; analysis 1: variation among host plants (pooled across all locations), analysis 2: variation among geographic locations (pooled for all host plants), analysis 3: differentiation between host plants within each geographic location, and analysis 4: differentiation between geographic locations for each host plant group.

Analysis 1: When microsatellite genotypes were divided into four groups based on the host plants from which M. vitrata larvae were collected, the global estimates of subpopulation differentiation across all loci were low but significant based on uncorrected $\left(F_{S T}=0.06\right)$ and ENA-corrected microsatellite genotype data $\left(F_{S T}{ }^{\mathrm{ENA}}=0.05\right.$; Table 3.2). AMOVA results indicated that $93.03 \%$ of the genetic variation for M. vitrata was within host plant group while $5.71 \%$ was estimated among host plants (remaining data not shown). Pairwise $F_{S T}$ estimates of host plant differentiation based on uncorrected and ENA-corrected microsatellite data across all loci ranged from 0.01 to 0.09 (Table 3.3), and indicated that all comparisons were significant. Analysis 2: In comparison, microsatellite genotypes based on geographic location resulted in uncorrected $F_{S T}$ estimates of 0.02 $\left(F_{S T}{ }^{\mathrm{ENA}}=0.02\right.$; Table 3.2). Additionally, Mantel tests showed an absence of IBD through no detectable correlation between genetic and geographic distances $\left(R^{2}=-0.12 P=0.49\right.$; remaining results not shown). Analysis 3: Analysis of host plant variation within a single location effectively removed a potential confounding influence of geographic variation on host plant differentiation. Subsequent pairwise $F_{\text {ST }}$ estimates ranged from -0.01 to 0.28 , and significant differentiation was predicted for 11 of 15 comparisons at B-Y Method adjusted significant thresholds (Table 3.4). Analogously, Analysis 4 evaluated variation between geographic locations for M. vitrata collected from the same host plant, which predicted significant differentiation in 5 of 10 comparisons at B-Y adjusted significant thresholds (Table 3.5).

STRUCTURE analysis indicated that there were 2 populations among all the samples on the different host plants and across locations (Figure 3.2). A maximum value of 7.41 was generated for $\mathrm{mL} "(K) / \mathrm{sL}(K)$ at $K=2$, which represented the "real" population
number ( $K$ ) that STRUCTURE predicted from microsatellite dataset. The estimated coancestries were partitioned into these two distinct clusters among the $M$. vitrata microsatellite genotypes, and were partitioned among host plant groups from 3 geographic locations (Figure 3.2). Cluster 1 (orange) was proportionately most common among $M$. vitrata samples from V. unguiculata at Ouémé-Plateau and Mono-Couffo, Benin as well as from T. candida at Mono-Couffo, Benin.

## Mitochondrial haplotypes

The mitochondrial cox1 gene fragment that was PCR amplified in this study was also previously used to investigate haplotype variation among M. vitrata in West Africa by Margam et al. (2011a). Alignment of novel cox1 sequence data from 548 individuals collected from 4 different host plants at 3 different geographic locations resulted in a 619 bp consensus sequence which showed a mean nucleotide diversity of $0.0019 \pm 0.0014$ (mean number of pairwise sequence differences $1.17 \pm 0.76$ ). Results of AMOVA showed that $94.15 \%$ of the haplotype variation was within populations based on host plant from which larvae were collected, whereas $4.80 \%$ of the variation was among populations (remaining data not shown). A global estimate of haplotype differentiation among host plant groups was also low ( $\varphi_{S T}=0.05$ ) but significant $(P<0.001)$. Pairwise $\varphi_{S T}$ estimates which was analogous to analyses 1 to 4 used for microsatellite data (see previous section), ranged from -0.01 to 0.20 (Table 3.6), and showed significant differentiation for 11 of 55 comparisons at the B-Y adjusted significance threshold of 0.01 (Appendix B). For example, these results showed significant variation between $\varphi_{S T}$ estimates between $T$. candida and both $V$. unguiculata and L. sericeus at Ouémé-Plateau, Benin. Also, M.
vitrata collected from V. unguiculata at Ouémé-Plateau, Zou-Collines and Mono-Couffo, Benin showed no significant mitochondrial haplotype variation ( $P \geq 0.148$ ), but $M$. vitrata collected from T. candida showed significant variation between all 3 geographic locations ( $P \leq 0.002$ ).

## DISCUSSION

Microsatellite markers developed from species of Lepidoptera can have high frequencies of non-PCR amplifying "null" alleles that potentially result in the overestimation of homozygosity, and have been reported in population genetic studies from a range of taxa (Dakin and Avise 2004; DeWoody et al. 2006). Microsatellite markers from Lepidopteran insects and molluscs have been reported to have particularly high frequencies of null alleles (review in Chapuis and Estoup 2007). Associations between null alleles and highly variable flanking regions have been repeatedly demonstrated (see Chapuis and Estoup 2007). Recent evidence suggests that null alleles at some microsatellite loci may be affected by movement of transposable elements (Coates et al. 2010). Indeed, two of the microsatellite loci (7_02K06 and C0241) showed the presence of null alleles, but the molecular basis for the non-PCR amplification of alleles was not investigated. Regardless of the cause, resulting $F_{S T}$ estimates from this study were corrected using the ENA algorithm, which has previously been shown to allow for accurate analysis of population genetic microsatellite data. Both ENA-corrected as well as uncorrected $F_{S T}$ estimates from microsatellite data analyses provided congruent results that suggested significant levels of genetic variation exist between M. vitrata collected
from the different host plants, but this variation is not consistently present among comparisons at different geographic locations.

Larval M. vitrata are a major pest of cultivated cowpea, $V$. unguiculata, in the tropics and subtropics, and are difficult to control through applications of chemical insecticides because sprays cannot contact larvae that have burrowed into the flowers and pods. The development and implementation of cowpea that expresses the Bt Cry1 Ab toxin holds the promise to effectively control M. vitrata feeding damage, but the evolution of resistance in several species of Lepidoptera to $B t$ toxin has also raised concerns regarding the longevity of this technology (Murdock 2002). Prior to release of cowpea varieties to farmers in West Africa, an understanding of the biology, ecology, and population structure is fundamental in making sound and effective IRM decisions, which may prolong the field efficacy of this $B t$ technology. Significant levels of genetic differentiation were previously estimated among M. vitrata collected from V. unguiculata in the West African countries of Niger, Nigeria and Burkina Faso using data from SNPs (Margam et al. 2011b) and microsatellite markers (Agunbiade et al. 2012). Genetic differentiation among M. vitrata populations was positively correlated with geographic distance (Margam et al. 2011b). Additionally, mitochondrial haplotypes were previously shown to be differentiated among M. vitrata collected from cowpea in the West African nations of Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso, with 2 distinct haplotype groups being predicted (Margam et al. 2011a). Winged insects that are capable of long distance flight (reviewed by Showers 1997) are typically genetically homogenous (den Boer 1978; Llewellyn et al. 2003; Wei et al. 2013), where admixture effectively results in a single random mating population that lacks any significant gene flow barriers (Lyons et al. 2012). Maruca vitrata persist in southern
coastal repositories during the dry season and undergo a seasonal range expansion as the population migrates to northern regions when climatic conditions become more favorable at the onset of the rainy season (Bottenberg et al. 1997; Ba et al. 2009). This pattern of seasonal migration may cause genetic structuring due to the Wahlund effect or other unknown population genetic factors (Margam et al. 2011b; Agunbiade et al. 2012), but the influence of a number of other potential confounding factors was not previously investigated.

IRM programs for Bt-cowpea in West Africa will likely use a high-dose/refuge strategy, where refugia of non-transgenic plants will be essential for maintaining a reservoir of susceptible alleles. The high-dose/refuge strategy is considered central to managing resistance to $B t$ toxins, but the level of gene flow and random mating within and between populations of target insects is also important for the spread of susceptible genotypes in the population (Bourguet et al. 2000; Onstad et al. 2012). Refugia can be comprised of cultivated non-transgenic crop plants or perhaps any other host plants that can support significant population sizes for the targeted insect pest species. Weedy species that are alternative hosts to arthropod pests may also serve as an effective form of refugia. Models based on studies of maize cropping systems suggest that increased habitat diversity, including weedy vegetation, could reduce the rate of spread of rotation-resistant western corn rootworm (Onstad et al. 2003). Studies have also reported that the utilization of wild host plants can be effective refuges within IRM strategies for transgenic crops (Zhang and Tang 2000; Tan et al. 2001; Wu et al. 2004; Abney et al. 2007; Jackson et al. 2008). Although $M$. vitrata are known to feed on multiple non-cowpea plants, the level of gene flow between individuals feeding on cowpea and these other plants remains
unknown, and may affect the efficacy of IRM strategies. Many species of Lepidoptera are polyphagous and are opportunistic insects that feed on multiple alternative host plants, but instances of differential rates of development are proposed to result in reduced gene flow due to temporal variation in adult mating periods, such that assortative or structured mating systems have evolved (Malausa et al. 2005; Calcagno et al. 2007). Breakdown of gene flow between sympatric populations of a species has been hypothesized to cause host race formation (Nason et al. 2002).

Low but significant levels of genetic differentiation was estimated from microsatellite marker and mitochondrial haplotype data between M. vitrata collected from cultivated cowpea ( $V$. unguiculata) and alternative native host plants $P$. phaseoloides, $L$. sericeus and T. candida. Analogous sampling of M. vitrata from alternative hosts was not conducted in previous studies by Margam et al. (2011b), and Agunbiade et al. (2012), and provided new insights into possible genetic structure in West Africa. Results of the current study might suggest little host plant-related M. vitrata population structure from initial analyses of microsatellite $\left(F_{\mathrm{ST}}=0.05\right)$ and haplotype data $\left(\varphi_{S T}=0.04\right)$. Also in contrast to previous results by Margam et al. (2011b), and Agunbiade et al. (2012), genetic variation in this current study was shown to be low between the 3 collection sites and not correlated with geographic distance. This might be due to our sampling that was restricted to just the southern region of Benin. Additional analyses which potentially removed the confounding influence of geographic variance showed significant pairwise genetic differentiation between $M$. vitrata collected from all of the different host plants at Ouémé-Plateau, but this pattern was not consistent at the Zou-Collines or Mono-Couffo locations. Similar inconsistent results were observed among pairwise comparisons of M. vitrata from
different geographic locations but collected from the same host plant. These findings were supported by analysis with the program STRUCTURE, where co-ancestry represented by Cluster 2 (blue) was prevalent among M. vitrata collected from all different host plants, with the exception of individuals collected from V. unguiculata at Ouémé-Plateau and $T$. candida at Mono-Couffo.

With respect to the high dose-refuge strategy, the apparently weak and inconsistent genetic differentiation of $M$. vitrata on different host plants might suggest that high levels of gene flow would occur between susceptible individuals on wild alternative hosts and rare resistant individuals that survive on Bt-cowpea. Although not conclusive, our findings might also suggest that the wild hosts surveyed in this study may serve as effective refuge plants in any eventual implementation of Bt-cowpea in West Africa. Lack of consistent host plant differentiation among $M$. vitrata across multiple geographic locations might also suggest that the females have not become "tuned" for oviposition on specific host plants, such that host-races are not likely to have formed. More likely, complex temporal interactions between plant phenologies and attraction of female $M$. vitrata for oviposition may play a role in determining host plant usage and subsequent levels of gene flow at a specific locality in a specific year. Thus variation in local environments could influence oviposition and/or subsequent larval development on host plants, such that random and significant perturbations on genetic distribution might be detected. Alternatively, climatic conditions have been shown to support basal insect population sizes during conditions previously thought to be restrictive (Merret 1986), such that some alternative noncultivated hosts might harbor reservoirs of M. vitrata during the dry season. Sampling of these presumable small reservoir populations in this study might have inadvertently
skewed our estimates of within population differentiation, and could complicate any future population genetic studies where these confounding factors are not taken into account. Regardless, our data might not suggest that random mating will occur between rare resistant moths emerging from Bt-cowpea and susceptible moths derived from non Bt-cowpea or native host plant refuges. The rate of development among Bt resistant individuals has been documented, such that assortative mating might be possible due to temporal delay in emergence of subsequent adults. In such a scenario, the mating period of reproductive adults may show limited overlap and could result in reduced gene flow. Under the assumptions of the high-dose/refuge strategy, temporal delays between adult emergence from Bt-cowpea, non Bt-cowpea and alternative host plants will affect the probabilities at which the rare resistant individuals mate with susceptible adults, and could lead to the rapid increase in homozygous resistant genotypes within the pest insect population if significant temporal delays are encountered.

The interactions between insect pests, their natural enemies, and the natural vegetation often leads to more efficient biological control, not only because of the increased availability of refugia and alternative prey for natural enemies during offseasons, but also because of the higher diversity in the natural vegetation (e.g. Altieri et al. 1993; Waage and Hawksworth 1991). Tamò et al. (1997) reported that the availability of alternative host plants positively affects parasitism rates, and should consequently reduce overall pest densities. Because of the semi-migratory habit of $M$. vitrata, Tamò et al. (2003) suggested two different levels from which to consider possible biological control interventions. The first option during the cropping season in cowpea fields, would be the inundative release of locally available, mass-reared trichogrammatids, preferably in
conjunction with the use of pheromone trap-derived thresholds (Downham et al. 2002), particularly in areas where M. vitrata does not have suitable alternative host plants during the dry season, but rather invades the cowpea fields like a migrant pest (e.g., coming from the south, as it is the case for the Kano region, see Bottenberg et al. 1997). The second option would be more appropriate in areas where alternative host plants are abundant and constitute a major factor influencing the dynamics of $M$. vitrata populations. In this case, inoculative releases of larval parasitoids such as Therophilus javanus or T. marucae (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) will be targeting M. vitrata populations on those host plants, with the objective of reducing overall pod borer populations at the landscape level. Based on the results obtained in the present study, the second option would seem more appropriate in the introduction and release of biocontrol agents against $M$. vitrata.
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Figure 3.1. Map showing collection sites in southern Benin (red circles - MonoCouffo, blue circles - Zou-Collines, and green circles - Ouémé-Plateau).


Figure 3.2. Partitioned co-ancestries among microsatellite-defined M. vitrata genotypes generated using the program STURUTURE with the LOCPRIOR command. For each, the estimated co-ancestry was derived from the Q-matrix for each individual and represented as vertical lines showing the proportion of the $K=2$ segments that made up the individual genotype. Genotypes identified from the host plants V. unguiculata, L. sericeus, P. phaseoloides and T. candida across the locations are defined [OPV - Ouémé-Plateau (V. unguiculata), ZCV - Zou-Collines (V. unguiculata), MCV - Mono-Couffo (V. unguiculata), OPL - Ouémé-Plateau (L. sericeus), ZCL - Zou- Collines (L. sericeus), OPP - Ouémé-Plateau (P. phaseoloides), ZCP - Zou-Collines ( $\boldsymbol{P}$. phaseoloides), MCP - Mono-Couffo (P. phaseoloides), MCT -Mono-Couffo (T. candida), ZCT - Zou-Collines (T. candida) and OPT - OuéméPlateau (T. candida)].

Table 3.1. M. vitrata primer sequences used for microsatellite amplification reactions.

| Locus | Primer (dye label) and sequence ( $5^{\prime}-3{ }^{\prime}$ ) | Repeat | Size (bp) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C32008 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | F-(MAX)AAAAAGCGCTTATATGTTTGTTATAGT | (CATA)3 | 163 |
|  | R-GAAATTTTTAACGGAGATACAATCA |  |  |
| $7 \_02 \mathrm{~K} 06{ }^{\text {A }}$ | F-(FAM)ATTTGTCAGAATGGTATCTTACGT | $(\mathrm{GAT})_{6}$ | 151 |
|  | R-CCTCTGGGTCATAATTATATTGTTCA |  |  |
| C0444 ${ }^{\text {E, } 1}$ | F-(FAM)AAAGGAACTACGCCGTCAGG | $(\mathrm{CAA})_{8}$ | 102 |
|  | R-GTTGAGCGATCTTGGCACAG |  |  |
| C0241 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | F-(TAM)GACGAAACAAGGCCTACCAG | $(\mathrm{GAT})_{9}$ | 165 |
|  | R-GGTACTTCYGACGTTGTTCG |  |  |
| 01_B12 | F--(TAM)CGGGATGTTACATATACCCAGCA | (CA) ${ }_{12}$ | 119 |
|  | R-CGTACCAATTCATTGAGACTCTCTT |  |  |

E, EST-derived primer pair; A, anonymous genomic sequence-derived primer pair; 1, PCR multiplexed primers.

Table 3.2. Global and locus-by-locus estimates of subpopulation differentiation using uncorrected ( $F_{\mathbf{S T}}$ ) and ENA-corrected microsatellite genotype data ( $F_{\mathbf{S T}}{ }^{\mathrm{ENA}}$ ) between four host plant groups ( $V$. unguiculata, P. phaseoloides, L. sericeus, and T. candida) or geographic location in Benin (Ouémé-Plateau, Zou-Collines and Mono-Couffo).

| Locus | Host plant groups |  | Geographic location |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ | $F_{\mathrm{ST}}{ }^{\mathrm{ENA}}$ | $F_{\mathrm{ST}}$ | $F_{\mathrm{ST}}{ }^{\mathrm{ENA}}$ |
| Global | 0.056 | 0.054 | 0.016 | 0.024 |
| C0241 | 0.003 | 0.013 | 0.002 | 0.018 |
| 7_02K06 | 0.109 | 0.111 | 0.055 | 0.077 |
| 01_B12 | 0.123 | 0.111 | 0.012 | 0.019 |
| C32008 | 0.011 | 0.011 | 0.006 | 0.005 |
| C0444 | -0.001 | 0.002 | -0.002 | 0.002 |

Table 3.3. Pairwise estimates of subpopulation differentiation across all microsatellite loci with and without ENAcorrection ( $F_{S T}$ ) (below diagonal) and significance of corresponding comparisons ( $P$-values) as indicated above the diagonal.

|  | V. <br> unguiculata | L. sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides | V. <br> unguiculata | L. sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Uncorrected |  |  |  | Corrected |  |  |  |
| V. unguiculata | - | 0.001* | 0.010* | <0.001* | - | 0.001* | <0.001* | <0.001* |
| L. sericeus | 0.09 | - | <0.001* | <0.001* | 0.13 | - | <0.001* | <0.001* |
| T. candida | 0.02 | 0.03 | - | 0.010* | 0.01 | 0.09 | - | 0.010* |
| P. phaseoloides | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | - | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.01 | - |

Table 3.4. Estimates of M. vitrata subpopulation differentiation from pairwise $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {ST }}$ between host plant groups at each geographic location (below diagonal) and significance of corresponding comparisons ( $P$-values) as indicated above the diagonal.
a) Differentiation between host plant group within Oueme-Plateau, Benin (B-Y corrected $\alpha=0.020$ )

|  | V. unguiculata | L sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V. unguiculata | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| L. sericeus | 0.277 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| T. candida | 0.196 | 0.063 | - | $<0.003^{*}$ |
| P. phaseoloides | 0.22 | 0.172 | 0.028 | - |

b) Differentiation between host plant group within Zou-Collines, Benin (B-Y corrected $\alpha$ $=0.020$ )

|  | V. unguiculata | L sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V. unguiculata | - | 0.85 | 0.285 | $0.082^{*}$ |
| L. sericeus | 0.074 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| T. candida | -0.005 | 0.056 | - | 0.301 |
| $\boldsymbol{P}$. phaseoloides | 0.001 | 0.1 | 0.001 | - |

c) Differentiation between host plant group within Mono-Couffo, Benin (B-Y corrected $\alpha$ $=0.027$ )

|  | V. unguiculata | L sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\boldsymbol{V}$. unguiculata | - | NA | $0.010^{*}$ | $0.017^{*}$ |
| $\boldsymbol{L}$. sericeus | NA | - | NA | NA |
| $\boldsymbol{T}$. candida | 0.011 | NA | - | 0.055 |
| $\boldsymbol{P}$. phaseoloides | 0.005 | NA | 0.013 | - |

Table 3.5. Estimates of M. vitrata subpopulation differentiation from pairwise $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {ST }}$ between locations from the same host plant (below diagonal) and significance of corresponding comparisons ( $P$-values) as indicated above the diagonal.
a) Differentiation between geographic location for $V$. unguiculata (B-Y corrected $\alpha=$ 0.027)

|  | Oueme-Plateau | Zou-Collines | Mono-Couffo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oueme-Plateau | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| Zou-Collines | 0.157 | - | 0.082 |
| Mono-Couffo | 0.084 | 0.01 | - |

b) Differentiation between geographic location for $L$. sericeus (B-Y corrected $\alpha=0.05$ )

|  | Oueme-Plateau | Zou-Collines | Mono-Couffo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oueme-Plateau | - | 0.608 | NA |
| Zou-Collines | -0.006 | - | NA |
| Mono-Couffo | NA | NA | - |

c) Differentiation between geographic location for $T$. candida (B-Y corrected $\alpha=0.027$ )

|  | Oueme-Plateau | Zou-Collines | Mono-Couffo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oueme-Plateau | - | 0.604 | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| Zou-Collines | -0.003 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| Mono-Couffo | 0.072 | 0.046 | - |

d) Differentiation between geographic location for $P$. phaseoloides (B-Y corrected $\alpha=$ 0.027)

|  | Oueme-Plateau | Zou-Collines | Mono-Couffo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oueme-Plateau | - | 0.141 | $0.004^{*}$ |
| Zou-Collines | 0.005 | - | 0.219 |
| Mono-Couffo | 0.023 | 0.004 | - |

Table 3.6. Pairwise estimates of mitochondrial cox 1 haplotype differentiation among $M$. vitrata collected from different host plants ( $\varphi_{S T}$ ) (below diagonal) and significance of corresponding comparisons ( $P$-values) as indicated above the diagonal. Significance determined at a B-Y adjusted significance threshold of $\alpha \leq 0.020$.

|  | V. unguiculata | L. sericeus | T. candida | P. phaseoloides |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V. unguiculata | - | $0.010^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ | $0.020^{*}$ |
| L. sericeus | 0.02 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| T. candida | 0.02 | 0.01 | - | $<0.001^{*}$ |
| P. phaseoloides | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.06 | - |

## CHAPTER 4

# DEFINING THE SPECIES COMPLEX OF THE LEGUME POD BORER, MARUCA VITRATA (LEPIDOPTERA: CRAMBIDAE), BY COMPARATIVE MITOCHONDRIAL PHYLOGENOMICS 


#### Abstract

Mitochondrial DNA are useful tools for defining phylogenetic and evolutionary relationships of animal species. The legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) is a pan-tropical species of Lepidoptera that is comprised of two unique strains that respectively inhabit the American continents (New World strain), and regions spanning from Africa through Southeast Asia, and Northern Australia (Old World strain). In this study, we present the complete mitochondrial genome sequence of $M$. vitrata from the New World, assembled de novo from whole genome shotgun sequence data generated on an Illumina HiSeq 2000. Phylogenomic comparisons were made to other previously published mitochondrial genome sequences from Crambid moths including Old World strain of M. vitrata. The 15, 385 bp M. vitrata (New World) sequence has a $80.7 \% \mathrm{~A}+\mathrm{T}$ content, and encodes the 13 protein-coding, 2 ribosomal RNA, and 22 transfer RNA genes that have the typical orientation and arrangement of Lepidopteran mitochondrial DNAs. The derived arrangement of $t R N A^{M e t}-t R N A^{I l u}-t R N A^{G l n}$ following the A+T-rich control region, which has also been found in all Lepidoptera, is observed in M. vitrata (New World). The intergenic spacer region between $t R N A^{s e r}$ and $n a d 1$ genes contains the ATACTAA motif, which is also present in all the six available Crambid mitogenomes, included in this study. The A+T-rich control region contains an 18 bp poly-T repeat


preceded by ATAG motif, and three tandem repeats $(A T)_{3},(A T)_{4}$ and $(A T)_{9}$. Sequence variation between $M$. vitrata New World and Old World strains show an excess of synonymous substitution as a result of purifying selection, and suggest that divergence occurred $\sim 1.87$ mya. The phylogenetic relationships constructed based on amino acid sequences of the 13 protein coding genes also support the previously defined relationships among species of Lepidoptera. The mitochondrial genome of M. vitrata (New World strain) shares features common to those of other Crambid species, and prove quantitative estimation of divergence with the Old World strain. Furthermore, the de novo assembly of this mitochondrial genome from next generation sequencing (NGS) reads represents a readily available tool for the generation of data for similar phylogenomic studies.

## INTRODUCTION

The mitochondrial genome (mitogenome) encodes proteins that are involved in electron transport and oxidative phosphorylation that is essential for energy production of the cell (Wolstenholme 1992; Boore 1999; Cameron 2014). Insect mitogenomes are circular double stranded DNA (dsDNA) molecules that typically range in size from 14 to 20 kb (Boyce et al. 1989; Wolstenholme 1992), and contain a conserved set of 13 protein coding genes (PCGs), 22 transfer RNAs (tRNAs) and 2 ribosomal RNA genes (rRNAs) that are required for translation of mitogenome-encoded proteins (Boore 1999). The A+Trich non-coding control region that functions in the initiation of transcription and replication tends to be large in insect mitogenomes (Wolstenholme 1992), where the length is highly variable among different insects due to high rates of nucleotide substitution, insertions/deletions, and variable numbers of tandem repeats (Fauron and

Wolstenholme 1980; Inohira et al. 1997). Animal mitogenomes have a highly conserved gene content, maternal inheritance, and lack recombination (Avise 2000), which has facilitated their use in studies of phylogenetic relationships, population genetic structuring, as well as comparative evolution (Zhang et al. 1995; Boore 1999; Nardi et al. 2003; Arunkumar et al. 2006). Comparisons have allowed for estimation of short-term evolutionary patterns within and between closely related species (Ballard 2000; Coates et al. 2005). Although the gene content of the metazoan mitogenomes is highly conserved, variable lengths of A+T-rich coding regions, and gene order and orientation of tRNAs and PCGs are observed among insects (Hong et al. 2009).

To date, complete or near complete mitogenomes has been sequenced from more than 600 arthropod species (Cameron 2014). Although the insect order Lepidoptera contains approximately 200,000 species, 72 complete or near complete mitogenomes in 17 families and belonging to the Lepidopteran lineage Ditrysia are available (Cameron 2014). Among the family Crambidae, mitogenomes have been obtained for six species - Ostrinia nubilalis and O. furnacalis (Coates et al. 2005), Diatraea saccharalis (Li et al. 2011), Maruca vitrata (Old World) (Margam et al. 2011), Cnaphalocrocis medinalis (Chai et al. 2012), and Chilo suppressalis (Chai et al. 2012). Complete mitogenome sequences for Lepidoptera have been used to study the divergences between sibling and congeneric species (Yukuhiro et al. 2002; Coates et al. 2005), and as a stepping-stone to facilitate population level studies (Kim et al. 2006). Furthermore, full mitogenomes for Lepidoptera are important for the determination of phylogenetic relationships and identification of cryptic species (Lee et al. 2006; Chai et al. 2012).

Obtaining full mitogenome sequences has been a challenging and resource demanding task, where long-range PCR and subsequent primer walking (Huyse et al. 2007), or overlapping PCR products methods have been used to generate data by Sanger sequencing (Coates et al. 2005). Recently, next-generation sequencing (NGS) technologies have led to more straightforward pipelines for the assembly of complete mitogenome sequences (Jex et al. 2010a; Knaus et al. 2011; Ma et al. 2012). Mitogenomes have been sequenced from NGS libraries prepared from long-PCR amplified sequences (Maricic et al. 2010; Morin et al. 2010; Horn et al. 2011) or from sequence captured DNA molecules (Vasta et al. 2009). The long-range PCR strategies may remain useful for NGSbased sequencing, especially when limited genetic material can be recovered from small invertebrates (Jex et al. 2010b). Ultra-deep sequencing on NGS platforms can acquire data that is sufficient for the subsequent assembly of full mitogenomes at high read depth (Knaus et al. 2011; Ma et al. 2012). Also, due to the high copy number of mitochondria in most eukaryotic cells, NGS can reduce the impact of rare nuclear-integrated copies of mitochondrial DNAs or other non-target products (Ho and Gilbert 2010; Gilbert et al. 2007).

Species from the genus Maruca (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) are serious insect pests that feed on cowpea crops throughout the tropical and subtropical regions from northern Australia, and East Asia through sub-Saharan Africa to the Caribbean, Central America, and Hawaii (see Agunbiade et al. 2012 for references). Feeding by M. vitrata cause considerable crop loss and reduced yields to cultivated cowpea in many developing African countries, and is a target for improved and sustainable control methods (Agunbiade et al. 2012). Comparison of M. vitrata mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase
subunit I (cox1) sequence data originating from samples collected in Africa and Puerto Rico revealed a high and unexpected levels of sequence variation, which suggested the existence of related subspecies or strains - M. vitrata in Africa (Old World) and the subspecies of M. vitrata from Puerto Rico (New World) (Margam et al. 2011). An analogous relationship among New and Old World species of Lepidoptera has also been predicted between Helicoverpa zea and H. armigera (Behere et al. 2007), but accurate estimates of time since divergence between these species is often lacking. In this study, Illumina HiSeq2000 sequencing reads were obtained from M. vitrata (New World), and used to successfully assemble the full mitogenome sequence. These data were applied to detect mitogenome-wide variance with its sister species, M. vitrata (Old World) and estimate time divergence between these New and Old World species. Furthermore, this study provides a pipeline for the rapid NGS acquisition and assembly of mitogenomes.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Sample collection and DNA extraction

Insect samples of M. vitrata adults were collected from white bean (Phaseolus vulgaris) near Lares, Puerto Rico. All specimens were preserved in $100 \%$ ethanol and stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Total genomic DNA was extracted from a single individual adult using the DNeasy animal tissue kit following the manufacturer's instructions (QIAGEN, Valencia, CA) according to Margam et al. (2011). The quality of the DNA was assessed through electrophoresis on a $1 \%$ agarose gel before submission for library construction and sequencing.

## Illumina HiSeq2000 ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ library construction and sequencing

A shotgun genomic DNA library was constructed using the TruSeq DNA Sample prep kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA). Briefly, $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of genomic DNA was sonicated on a Covaris M220 (Covaris, Woburn, MA) using the default methods for sonication to a size of 500 bp library as described by the manufacturer. Sonicated DNA was blunt-ended, 3'end A-tailed and ligated to an indexed adaptor. The adaptor-ligated gDNA was amplified by PCR to selectively enrich for those fragments that have adapters on both ends. Amplification was carried out for 8 cycles with the Kapa HiFi polymerase (Kapa Biosystems, Woburn, MA) to reduce the likeliness of multiple identical reads due to preferential clonal amplification. The library was size selected on a $2 \%$ agarose gel for fragments 600 bp to 800 bp in length. The size selected library was run on Agilent bioanalyzer DNA 7500 LabChips (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) to determine the average fragment size and to confirm the presence of DNA of the expected size range and quantitated by qPCR on an ABI 7900. The indexed library was loaded onto a single lane of an 8-lane flowcell for cluster formation and paired-end sequenced at 100-bp lengths on an Illumina HiSeq $2000^{\mathrm{TM}}$ using the TruSeq SBS sequencing kits version 3. The raw .bcl files were converted into fastq files using the software Casava 1.8.2 (Illumina). All shotgun genomic DNA library construction and Illumina HiSeq $2000^{\mathrm{TM}}$ sequencing was carried out at the W. M. Keck Center for Comparative and Functional Genomics, Roy J. Carver Biotechnology Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

## Mitogenome assembly

Fastq output of read data was trimmed with Phred quality scores < 20 using the script TrimmingReads.pl (NGSToolKit; Patel and Jain 2012). A total of 30 million reads from the trimmed fastq sequence were loaded into the Velvet Assembler program 1.2.10 (Zerbino and Birney 2008) and assembled using the de Bruijn graph method with a hash size $(k$-mer $)=21$, no coverage cutoff, and a minimum contig length $\left(-m i n \_\right.$contig_lgth $)=$ 10000. Querying the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) nonredundant (nr) nucleotide database with the Blastn algorithm (http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi) (Altschul et al. 1997) identified resulting contigs containing mitogenome sequence. The contigs that produced database "hits" were filtered for those with $E$-values $\geq 10^{-40}$ and percent similarities $\geq 75$ to identify contigs with encoded mitochondrial gene sequences.

## Sequence annotation

The FASTA-formatted consensus sequence was imported into the MITOS web server (Bernt et al. 2013; http://mitos.bioinf.uni-leipzig.de/index.py), a program used for de novo metazoan mitogenome annotation. To better define the limits of PCGs, coding sequences for each mitochondrial gene were aligned to that from published Crambid mitogenomes (See Appendix C) using the alignment algorithm on the CLC Genomics Workbench 6.5.2. The $5^{\prime}$ end of the mitochondrial genes were inferred to be the first legitimate start codon in the open reading frame, and manual adjustments were made when needed. The 3 ' ends were inferred to be at the first in-frame stop codon encountered. When the stop codon was located within the sequence of a downstream gene encoded on
the same strand, a truncated stop codon $(\mathrm{T})$ adjacent to the beginning of the downstream gene was designated as the termination codon. The positions and secondary structures for the tRNAs genes were confirmed using ARWEN 1.2 (Laslett and Canback 2008; http://mbio-serv2.mbioekol.lu.se/ARWEN/index.html). The graphical circular structure of the mitogenome was drawn using GenomeVx, a suite of tools for generating physical maps of plastids and mitogenomes (Conant and Wolfe 2008; http://wolfe.ucd.ie/GenomeVx/). All annotations were transferred to Sequin 13.05 (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Sequin/), and submitted to the NCBI nr database under accession number KJ466365.

## Genome sequence analysis

The nucleotide sequences of the 13 PCGs of previously published 32 Lepidoptera species (Appendix C) were downloaded from the METAMIGA database (Feijao et al. 2006; http://amiga.cbmeg.unicamp.br/). The nucleotide compositions, codon usage and relative synonymous codon usage (RSCU) in the M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome were calculated with MEGA 5.2.2 (Tamura et al. 2011). The composition skew analysis was carried out to describe the base composition of nucleotide sequences, by measuring the relative number of As to Ts using the formula: AT skew $=[\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{T}] /[\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{T}]$ and GC skew $=[\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{C}] /[\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{C}]$, respectively (Perna and Kocher 1995).

The DNA and protein sequence similarities were calculated between PCGs of $M$. vitrata (New World) and orthologous genes from other species in the Family Crambidae using FASTA program, a tool for biological sequence comparison (Pearson and Lipman 1988; http://fasta.bioch.virginia.edu/fasta_www2/). The online program, microsatellite
repeats finder (http://insilico.ehu.es/mini_tools/microsatellites/) was used to analyze the A+T-rich control region for tandem repeats.

## Phylogenetics and comparative genomic analysis

The 13 PCGs from 32 complete or near complete mitogenome sequences for the Lepidopterans, and also the complete mitogenome of Drosophila melanogaster within GenBank (Appendix C) were downloaded using METAMIGA (Feijao et al. 2006; http://amiga.cbmeg.unicamp.br/). The PCGs of these mitogenomes and that of M. vitrata (New World) were then concatenated for each insect species and imported into MEGA 5.2.2 (Tamura et al. 2011) and a multiple sequence alignment was performed with the ClustalW algorithm using default parameters (gap opening penalty 15, gap extension penalty 6.66 , weight matrix IUB, and transition weight of 0.5 ). The mitogenome of $D$. melanogaster was included as an out-group. Maximum likelihood (ML) analysis of derived amino acid sequences, to infer the phylogenetic relationships among mitogenome sequences, was performed on MEGA 5.2.2. Support at each bifurcating node of the consensus tree was provided by 1000 bootstrap pseudo-replicates of the data (Felsenstein 1985). All gaps were deleted. Initial tree for the heuristic search was obtained automatically by applying Neighbor-Joining and BioNJ algorithms to a matrix of pairwise distances estimated using the Jones, Taylor, and Thorton (JTT) probability matrix (Jones et al. 1992), and then selecting the topology with best log likelihood value.

The Bayesian inference (BI) analysis was performed based on the concatenated 13 PCG amino acid sequences of the mitogenomes of the 34 insects, including M. vitrata (New World) using MrBayes 3.1.2 (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist 2001; Ronquist and

Huelsenbeck 2003) and the Markov's chains were run simultaneously for $1,000,000$ generations sampled every 1000 generations. The tree generated was viewed using FigTree 1.4.0 (Rambaut 2012).

## Estimation of divergence times

The nucleotide sequence of $M$. vitrata (Old World; GenBank accession HM751150.1) was downloaded in FASTA format, and aligned with the nucleotide sequence obtained in this study for the M. vitrata New World sample (GenBank accession KJ466365) using MEGA 5.2.2 (Tamura et al. 2011) with the parameters described above. Gaps in the resulting alignment due to ambiguous bases (Ns) in HM7511150.1 as well as overhangs were deleted. The number of nucleotide differences between the two aligned sequences were calculated using DiffSeq from the EMBOSS Package (Rice et al. 2000). A clock-like rate of $2 \%$ mitochondrial DNA sequence change per million years has been estimated among Drosophila species (Powell 1986). Since no analogous estimates are available among Lepidoptera, we applied the Drosophila rate estimation as described by Coates et al. 2005.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## Mitogenome assembly and annotation

Paired-end Illumina sequencing generated a total of 336, 472, 660 million reads, of which 30 million were subsampled, and used to successfully generate a $15,385 \mathrm{bp} \mathrm{de}$ novo assembly of the previously uncharacterized M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome (Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). The size of the complete mitogenome from M. vitrata (New

World) is similar to the size previously reported from other species of Lepidoptera; ranging from 15, 314 bp in Coreana raphaelis (Kim et al. 2006) to 15, 928 bp in Bombyx mandarina (Yukuhiro et al. 2002). The annotated M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome contains the 13 PCGs, 22 tRNAs, and 2 rRNA genes which are typical for metazoans (Wolstenholme 1992; Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). Analogous to all other Lepidopteran mitogenomes, of the total 37 genes, 23 were encoded on the major (forward) strand, whereas the 14 others were encoded on the minor (reverse) strand (Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). The 13 PCGs spanned $11,369 \mathrm{bp}$, and accounted for $73.9 \%$ of the entire M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome sequence. The M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome has the typical Lepidopteran gene order $t R N A^{\mathrm{Met}}-t R N A^{\mathrm{Il}}-t R N A^{\mathrm{Glu}}-n a d 2$ (Yukuhiro et al. 2002; Kim et al. 2006; Lee et al. 2006; Cameron and Whiting 2008a; Hong et al. 2008; Coates et al. 2005; Taylor et al. 1993), which differs from the ancestral gene order $t R N A^{\mathrm{Ie}}-t R N A^{\mathrm{Glu}_{-}}$ $t R N A^{\text {Met }} n a d 2$ found in other insects (Boore 1999). This translocation of $t R N A^{M e t}$ was also present in the M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome. This was first reported by Taylor et al. (1993) in Lycaenids and Noctuids, but has now been found in five Lepidopteran superfamilies (Papilionoidea, Noctuoidea, Pyraloidea, Tortricoidea, and Bombycoidea) and is likely a synapomorphic character of all Lepidopteran mtDNAs (Salvato et al. 2008).

The whole M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome showed a high A+T content of $80.70 \%(\mathrm{~A}=40.30 \%, \mathrm{~T}=40.4 \%, \mathrm{G}=7.99 \%$ and $\mathrm{C}=11.31 \%)$ (Table 4.2), which is consistent with the high A+T content of insect (Clary and Wolstenholme 1985; Crozier and Crozier 1993) and Lepidopteran mitogenomes (Liu et al. 2008). The nucleotide composition of the PCGs of the M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome, the A+T\%, and $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{C} \%$ values for the PCGs as well as the AT- and GC-skews, were calculated for all
available complete mtDNA genomes of the Crambids and are presented in the scatter plots of Figure 4.2. The average AT-skew of the Crambid mitogenomes is 0.01 , ranging from 0.002 to 0.03 , whereas the average GC-skew is -0.20 , ranging from -0.17 to -0.26 . The AT-skew of M. vitrata (New World) is -0.002 and the GC-skew is -0.17 . A similar negative AT-skew ( $-0.02 \%$ ) was also previously reported for $C$. medinalis (Chai et al. 2012) (Table 4.2).

## Protein-coding genes

The arrangement of the PCGs is consistent with those of other animal mitogenomes (Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). Nine of the PCGs were on the forward strand (nad2, cox1, cox2, atp8, atp6, cox3, nad3, nad6 and cytb) while the remaining 4 were on the reverse strand (nad1, nad4, nad4l and nad5). The putative start codons of PCGs used by M. vitrata (New World) (ATN; Table 4.1) are identical to those previously known in animal mitogenomes (Wolstenholme 1992). CGA was used as the start codon for cox 1 as previously reported for D. yakuba (Clary and Wolstenholme 1985) and also for Lepidopteran species such as B. mori (Yukuhiro et al. 2002), $O$. nubilalis and $O$. furnacalis (Coates et al. 2005), Adoxophyes honmai (Lee et al. 2006), C. raphaelis (Kim et al. 2006), Antheraea pernyi (Liu et al. 2008), B. mandarina (Pan et al. 2008), Ochrogaster lunifer (Salvato et al. 2008), Artogeia melete (Hong et al. 2009), Eriogyna pyretorum (Jiang et al. 2009), Hyphantria cunea (Liao et al. 2010) and M. vitrata (Old World) (Margam et al. 2011). The termination codon TAA was used in all PCGs with the exception of nad3, which had TAG. Also, consistent with some other insect mitogenomes, cox1 and cox2 both had incomplete stop codon, T (Coates et al. 2005; Clary and

Wolstenholme 1985) (Table 4.1). The presence of incomplete stop codons is a feature shared with all Lepidopteran mitogenomes sequenced to date (Yukuhiro et al. 2002; Kim et al. 2006; Lee et al. 2006; Cameron and Whiting 2008; Hong et al. 2008; Coates et al. 2005) and more in general with many arthropod mitogenomes (Boore 1999). Although the motif TTAG has been observed to be located immediately upstream of the putative CGA start codon of some Lepidopteran mitogenomes and proposed to serve in a non-standard initiation process (Yukuhiro et al. 2002), we observed the motif ATAG immediately upstream of the CGA start codon of the M. vitrata (New World) cox1 gene. This motif was and has been conserved in some Lepidopteran mitogenomes but lacking in some (Margam et al. 2011). Among the available Crambid mitogenomes, O. furnacalis and $O$. nubilalis both have the motif TTAG upstream of the start codon of the cox 1 gene while $M$. vitrata (Old World) has ATAG, which is similar to what obtains in M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome. Reduction in mitogenome size has led to minimal intergenic space as well as overlap between adjacent genes, where M. vitrata (New World) atp8 and atp6 PCGs have a predicted seven nucleotide overlap (Table 4.1). This feature is common to all Lepidopteran mitogenomes known (Yukuhiro et al. 2002; Kim et al. 2006; Lee et al. 2006; Cameron and Whiting 2008a; Hong et al. 2008; Coates et al. 2005) and is found in many animal mitogenomes (Boore 1999).

The A+T content of the PCGs is $79.4 \%$, which is lower than the $\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{T}$ content of the mitogenome as a whole ( $80.7 \%$ ). The total number of codons in the forward strand excluding stop codons was 3777 and showed a strong bias toward AT-rich codons with the four most prevalent codons being Leu, UAA (481); Ile, AUU (443); Phe, UUU (344); Met, AUA (267) (Table 4.3). The codon usage prevalence is consistent with what obtains
in M. vitrata (Old World). Comparison of the 13 PCGs with the other six available Crambid mitogenomes showed between $75.3 \%$ and $97.9 \%$ nucleotide similarity, and $88.9 \%$ and $100 \%$ amino acid similarity with M. vitrata (New World) (Table 4.4). At the protein level, the average percentage similarity was highest in comparisons with $M$. vitrata (Old World) than with other Crambids. Derived cox1, cox3, atp6 and nad3 peptide sequences showed $100 \%$ similarity between M. vitrata (New World) and M. vitrata (Old World) (Table 4.4).

## Transfer and ribosomal RNA genes

The M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome encoded 22 tRNAs typically found in animal mitogenomes (Boore 1999), and all formed cloverleaf-like secondary structures with the exception of $t R N A^{\text {Serl }}$, in which its dihydrouridine (DHU) arm formed a simple loop (Figure 4.3). The lack of DHU arm in $t R N A^{\text {Serl }}$ is a common condition in metazoan mitogenomes (Lavrov et al. 2000) but is not reported for all Lepidopterans. For example, A. honmai has all the tRNAs with a complete clover leaf structure (Lee et al. 2006). Of the 22 tRNA genes, 14 genes are encoded on the forward strand while 8 are encoded on the reverse strand. The length of the tRNAs ranged from 63 bp to 71 bp .

Consistent with what is observed in all other insect mitogenomes, the mitogenome of M. vitrata (New World) contained two rRNAs with a total length of 2369 bp . The large rRNA ( $r r n L$ ) had a length of 1304 bp while the small rRNA ( $r r n S$ ) had a length of 765 bp (Table 4.1).

## Non-coding regions

The M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome contains characteristics typical of other Lepidopteran mitogenomes. The 7 bp intergenic spacer located between $t R N A^{\text {Ser2 }}$ and nadl contains the ATACTAA motif (Figure 4.4), which is conserved across the order Lepidoptera (Cameron and Whiting 2008). This motif is possibly fundamental to site recognition by the transcription termination peptide (mtTERM protein) (Taanman 1999) and is present in most insect mitogenomes (Cameron and Whiting 2008). Insect mitogenomes often contain a non-coding A+T-rich region, which varies considerably in length among insect species, or even within the same species (Zhang and Hewitt 1997). Another intergenic space and which is the largest consisted of the A+T-rich control region, which ranges in size in Crambid moth and is consistent with previous findings from other insects (Hua et al. 2008; Oliveira et al. 2008; Ma et al. 2009). Tandem repetitive sequences are common in the control region for most insects that can vary in length and copy number (Dotson and Beard 2001), but repeats in Lepidoptera are considered to share greater degrees of conservation compared to other insect groups (Cameron and Whiting 2008). The $\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{T}$ rich control region in M. vitrata (New World) was estimated at 341 bp and contained (AT) tandem repeats (Figure 4.5 and Appendix D). The A+T-rich region contained a conserved ATAG motif followed by an 18 bp poly-T stretch (Figure 4.5). This is similar to the pattern found in C. medinalis, C. suppressalis and $D$. saccharalis but the length of the poly-T stretch varies between species. This structure is suggested to function as a signal for mitochondrial DNA replication initiation (Hu et al. 2010; Yin et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2010). A poly-A commonly observed in other Lepidopteran mitogenomes was also found immediately upstream of $t R N A^{\text {Met }}$ but in $M$.
vitrata (New World), is 9bp long. The control region also has tandem repeats with the most common repeat being AT $-(\mathrm{AT})_{3},(\mathrm{AT})_{4}$ and $(\mathrm{AT})_{9}$ (Appendix D). Similar patterns were observed in Hyphantria cunea (AT) $8_{8}$ (Liao et al. 2010) and Ochrogaster lunifer (AT) 7 (Salvato et al. 2008).

## Phylogenetic and comparative genomic analysis

Phylogenetic analyses were carried out using nucleotide sequences of mitogenomes from 32 Lepidopteran insects, and rooted with $D$. melanogaster as an outgroup (Figures 4.6a and 4.6b). BI and ML analyses generated identical tree topologies (Figures 4.6a and 4.6b). The major division in Ditrysia, between moth and butterfly species was weakly supported, but the relationship among moth superfamilies Bombycoidea, Noctuoidea, Geometroidea, Pyraloidea and Tortricoidea mostly showed high levels of bootstrap support. The inter-relationships among superfamilies conformed to those proposed by Kristensen and Skalski (1999). These results suggest that molecular phylogenies based on derived protein sequence from complete mitogenomes may be valuable for deciphering Lepidopteran evolutionary lineages, although higher rates of mutation observed in mitochondrial sequences compared to nuclear loci may cause long branch attraction or other phenomenon which reduce the ability to resolve deeper branches within the tree. As expected, phylogenetic analysis of the mitogenome indicated that M. vitrata (Old World) and M. vitrata (New World) are highly related, and may comprise sister species similar to that shown between $O$. nubilalis and $O$. furnacalis (Coates et al. 2005).

Protein-coding sequence was shown to be highly similar between $M$. vitrata (New World) and M. vitrata (Old World) mitogenomes (see above; Table 4.4). Comparison between M. vitrata (New World) and M. vitrata (Old World) mitochondrial gene coding sequences predicted a total of 476 nt substitutions from a $11,250 \mathrm{nt}$ consensus ( $4.23 \%$ divergence) of which 74 were non-synonymous mutations that resulted in an amino acid change. This suggests that purifying selection may act to curb the rate of amino acid change in the genus Maruca, but has also been shown for most, if not, all insect mitogenomes. Alignment of entire mitogenome sequences from M. vitrata (Old World) and M. vitrata (New World) resulted in a 14,039 consensus (gaps excluded) and showed a total of 526 nucleotide differences (3.75\%) (Appendix E). Making a simple assumption of a clock-like rate of $2 \%$ change per million years estimated from the Drosophila species group (Powell 1986) and acknowledging the potential that variance in this rate may have affected the degree of haplotype divergence among Maruca subspecies, these species may have diverged $\sim 1.87$ mya. This simple method for estimation was used due to lack of fossil evidence to assist in calibrating a molecular clock.

## CONCLUSIONS

The mitogenome from M. vitrata (New World) is typical of mitogenomes from the insect Order Lepidoptera. Short-term evolutionary change in mitogenomes with the sister species M. vitrata (Old World) showed a distinct bias for substitution at non-synonymous sites. These results are important in ongoing efforts to define genetic and genomic variation between these two recently described sister species, and along with phylogenetic analyses presented herein suggest that whole mitogenome sequences may be tools for
species delineation. Furthermore, this study indicates that mitogenomes can be de novo assembled from NGS sequence data, and procedures outlined here may offer a rapid and computationally accessible method for future mitochondrial genomic studies.
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## FIGURES AND TABLES



Figure 4.1. Gene arrangements in the circular mitogenome of M. vitrata (New World).


Figure 4.2. Scatter plot of the AT\% vs AT-skew and GC\% vs GC-skew in Crambid mitogenomes.


Figure 4.3. Inferred secondary structures for the 22 tRNAs of M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome. The tRNAs are labeled with the abbreviations of their corresponding amino acids. Watson-Crick base pairing is indicated as pairs by lines.


Figure 4.3. (cont.)
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Figure 4.4. Alignment of the ATACTAA spacer region ( $\operatorname{nad} 1-\boldsymbol{t R N A}{ }^{\text {SER2 }}$ ) across the six available Crambid mitogenomes including M. vitrata (New World).

TATTGTAGGATTTTAGACATAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTATATATATAAAATTTAATATAAATTATTAAATATTAA ATAT

Origin of light strand replication $\quad(A T)_{4}$ Tandem repeats
TTTСТTTCTTTTTCTTCTTTATAACATTAATATTAAAAATTAATACGTAGATTCATCGATTAATAATCATTTAAATA AATAATTAATTAATATATTTTAAAATTAATTAAATTGAAATTTAAAATATTAATTTTACTAAATTAATTAATTAAT TTAATTAA
$(A T)_{3}$ Tandem repeats
TATTAAAAATATTAATAAATTAAATATTTAATATATATATATATATATAAATATAAACCGTTTTTAATATTTTTTC TATA
$(A T)_{9}$ Tandem repeats
AATAAAAAAAAA
9 bp Poly-A stretch

Figure 4.5. The structure of the A+T-rich Region of M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome.


Figure 4.6a. Phylogenetic relationships among species from the insect order Lepidoptera, which is rooted with D. melanogaster (Insecta: Diptera) as an out-group. Numbers at each node indicate maximum likelihood bootstrap support. The tree is based on a concatenated sequence of 13 derived proteins from complete or near-complete mitogenomes. GenBank accessions used for all species in the phylogenetic analysis are listed in Appendix C.


Figure 4.6b. Phylogenetic relationships among species from the insect order Lepidoptera, which is rooted with $D$. melanogaster (Insecta: Diptera) as an out-group. Numbers at each node indicate Bayesian posterior probabilities. The tree is based on a concatenated sequence of 13 derived proteins from complete or near-complete mitogenomes. GenBank accessions used for all species in the phylogenetic analysis are listed in Appendix C.

Table 4.1. Annotation of the full mitogenome of M. vitrata (New World).

| Gene | Strand | CDS <br> Positions | Size (bp) | Start Codon | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Stop } \\ \text { Codon } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Anticodon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tRNAMet | F | 1.. 68 | 68 |  |  | CAT |
| tRNAIle | F | $69 . .133$ | 65 |  |  | GAT |
| tRNAGIn | R | $130 . .200$ | 69 |  |  | TTG |
| nad2 | F | 269..1255 | 987 | ATA | TAA |  |
| tRNATrp | F | 1257..1324 | 68 |  |  | TCA |
| tRNACys | R | 1316..1382 | 65 |  |  | GCA |
| tRNATyr | R | 1383.. 1451 | 67 |  |  | GTA |
| cox 1 | F | 1458.. 2988 | 1531 | CGA | T-- |  |
| tRNALeuUUR | F | 2988.. 3056 | 67 |  |  | TAA |
| cox 2 | F | 3056..3737 | 682 | ATG | T- |  |
| tRNALys | F | 3737.. 3809 | 71 |  |  | CTT |
| tRNAAsp | F | 3811.. 3878 | 68 |  |  | GTC |
| atp8 | F | 3879.. 4040 | 162 | ATC | TAA |  |
| atp6 | F | 4034.. 4708 | 675 | ATG | TAA |  |
| cox 3 | F | 4715..5503 | 789 | ATG | TAA |  |
| tRNAGly | F | $5505 . .5573$ | 67 |  |  | TCC |
| nad3 | F | 5570.. 5926 | 357 | ATA | TAG |  |
| tRNAAla | F | $5924 . .5992$ | 66 |  |  | TGC |
| tRNAArg | F | 5990.. 6054 | 63 |  |  | TCG |
| tRNAAsn | F | $6054 . .6119$ | 66 |  |  | GTT |
| tRNASerAGN | F | $6122 . .6189$ | 66 |  |  | GCT |
| tRNAGlu | F | 6189.. 6256 | 66 |  |  | TTC |
| tRNAPhe | R | 6255.. 6324 | 68 |  |  | GAA |
| nad5 | R | 6307.. 8058 | 1752 | ATT | TAA |  |
| tRNAHis | R | 8058.. 8126 | 67 |  |  | GTG |
| nad4 | R | 8125.. 9465 | 1341 | ATG | TAA |  |

Table 4.1. (cont.)

| nad4L | R | $9465 . .9746$ | 282 | ATA | TAA |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tRNAThr | F | $9758 . .9823$ | 66 |  |  | TGT |
| tRNAPro | R | $9823 . .9890$ | 66 |  |  | TGG |
| nad6 | F | $9892 . .10422$ | 531 | ATT | TAA |  |
| Cytb | F | $10426 . .11574$ | 1149 | ATG | TAA |  |
| tRNASerUCN | F | $11573 . .11638$ | 66 |  |  | TGA |
| nad 1 | R | $11660 . .12790$ | 1131 | ATG | TAA |  |
| tRNALeuCUN | R | $12791 . .12859$ | 69 |  |  | TAG |
| rrnL | R | $12894 . .14197$ | 1304 |  |  |  |
| tRNAVal | R | $14210 . .14276$ | 67 |  |  | TAC |
| rrnS | R | $14280 . .15044$ | 765 |  |  |  |
| A+T-rich region |  | $15045 . .15385$ | 341 |  |  |  |

Table 4.2. Nucleotide composition in the whole mitogenomes of M. vitrata (New World) and other available mitogenomes from 6 additional species from the Lepidopteran family Crambidae.

| Species | A | T | A+T | AT-Skew | G | C | G+C | GC-Skew |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cnaphalocrocis medinalis | 40.36 | 41.58 | 81.94 | -0.02 | 7.45 | 10.61 | 18.06 | -0.17 |
| Chilo suppressalis | 40.64 | 40.03 | 80.67 | 0.01 | 7.39 | 11.94 | 19.33 | -0.23 |
| Diatraea saccharalis | 40.87 | 39.15 | 80.02 | 0.02 | 7.42 | 12.56 | 19.98 | -0.26 |
| Ostrinia furnacalis* | 41.46 | 38.92 | 80.38 | 0.03 | 7.91 | 11.71 | 19.62 | -0.19 |
| Ostrinia nubilalis* | 41.36 | 38.81 | 80.17 | 0.03 | 8.02 | 11.82 | 19.83 | -0.19 |
| Maruca vitrata (Old World)* | 40.14 | 39.89 | 80.03 | 0.003 | 8.21 | 11.76 | 19.97 | -0.18 |
| Maruca vitrata (New World) | 40.27 | 40.44 | 80.70 | -0.002 | 7.99 | 11.31 | 19.30 | -0.17 |

[^3]Table 4.3. Codon usage and relative synonymous codon usage (RSCU) in M. vitrata (New World) mitogenome.

| Amino Acid | Codon | Count | RSCU | Amino Acid | Codon | Count | RSCU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ala (A) | GCU | 78 | 2.22 | Pro (P) | CCU | 75 | 2.21 |
|  | GCC | 7 | 0.21 |  | CCC | 9 | 0.29 |
|  | GCA | 40 | 1.21 |  | CCA | 43 | 1.14 |
|  | GCG | 1 | 0.05 |  | CCG | 2 | 0.06 |
| Cys (C) | UGU | 26 | 1.31 | Gln (Q) | CAA | 63 | 2.00 |
|  | UGC | 4 | 0.23 |  | CAG | 0 | 0.00 |
| Asp (D) | GAU | 65 | 1.32 | Arg (R) | CGU | 13 | 0.90 |
|  | GAC | 3 | 0.22 |  | CGC | 0 | 0.00 |
| Glu (E) | GAA | 72 | 1.72 |  | CGA | 41 | 2.71 |
|  | GAG | 6 | 0.13 |  | CGG | 1 | 0.08 |
| Phe (F) | UUU | 344 | 1.81 | Ser1 (S) | AGU | 32 | 0.75 |
|  | UUC | 32 | 0.19 |  | AGC | 3 | 0.05 |
| Gly (G) | GGU | 67 | 1.23 |  | AGA | 81 | 1.89 |
|  | GGC | 4 | 0.09 |  | AGG | 0 | 0.00 |
|  | GGA | 122 | 2.15 | Ser2 (S) | UCU | 109 | 2.77 |
|  | GGG | 15 | 0.22 |  | UCC | 4 | 0.06 |
| His (H) | CAU | 57 | 1.34 |  | UCA | 87 | 2.39 |
|  | CAC | 12 | 0.35 |  | UCG | 4 | 0.09 |
| Ile (I) | AUU | 443 | 1.88 | Thr ( $\mathbf{T}$ ) | ACU | 89 | 2.23 |
|  | AUC | 26 | 0.12 |  | ACC | 9 | 0.31 |
| Lys (K) | AAA | 93 | 1.77 |  | ACA | 58 | 1.12 |
|  | AAG | 14 | 0.23 |  | ACG | 2 | 0.04 |
| Leu1 (L) | CUU | 27 | 0.31 | Val (V) | GUU | 86 | 2.22 |
|  | CUC | 3 | 0.04 |  | GUC | $2$ | 0.03 |
|  | CUA | 23 | 0.68 |  | GUA | 59 | 1.71 |
|  | CUG | 0 | 0.00 |  | GUG | 3 | 0.04 |
| Leu2 (L) | UUA | 481 | 4.86 | Trp (W) | UGA | 94 | 2.00 |
|  | UUG | 11 | 0.12 |  | UGG | 0 | 0.00 |
| Met (M) | AUA | 267 | 1.83 | Try (Y) | UAU | 183 | 1.84 |
|  | AUG | 23 | 0.17 |  | UAC | 13 | 0.16 |
| Asn (N) | AAU | 238 | 1.94 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AAC | 8 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.4. Percent nucleotide and amino acid similarity in the 13 protein-coding gene sequences of M. vitrata (New World) compared to orthologs in 6 other mitogenomes sequenced from species in the Lepidopteran family Crambidae.

| Genes | Mv |  | Cs |  | Cm |  | Ds |  | Of |  | On |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DNA } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Protein (\%) |
| nad2 | 97.9 | 99.3 | 84.6 | 98.5 | 86.5 | 97.6 | 78.7 | 93.9 | 83.9 | 97.3 | 83.9 | 97.3 |
| nad1 | 95.4 | 99.3 | 86.6 | 98.3 | 88.3 | 99.7 | 83.9 | 95.4 | 87.4 | 98.7 | 87.2 | 98.3 |
| cox 1 | 94.3 | 100 | 88.6 | 99.2 | 89.5 | 97.5 | 86.5 | 99 | 88.5 | 99.4 | 87.7 | 98.6 |
| cox 2 | 94.9 | 99.6 | 88 | 98.7 | 90 | 98.2 | 85.9 | 98.2 | 88.1 | 99.6 | 87.8 | 98.7 |
| cox 3 | 94.6 | 100 | 86.8 | 98.9 | 89 | 99.2 | 86.2 | 98.9 | 86.4 | 98.1 | 86.2 | 98.1 |
| atp8 | 93.8 | 98.1 | 81.2 | 88.9 | 78.6 | 85.5 | 75.3 | 88.7 | 85.8 | 94.3 | 85.2 | 94.3 |
| atp6 | 93.9 | 100 | 84 | 96 | 90.4 | 99.6 | 79.9 | 94.7 | 85.6 | 96.9 | 85.2 | 96.9 |
| nad3 | 94.3 | 100 | 84.9 | 97.4 | 88.4 | 99.1 | 81.5 | 98.3 | 84.4 | 98.3 | 84.2 | 98.2 |
| nad4 | 95.7 | 99.3 | 87.6 | 96.6 | 91.6 | 98.2 | 84.3 | 96 | 88.1 | 94.1 | 87.9 | 94.1 |
| nad41 | 96.4 | 93.6 | 89.4 | 97.8 | 91.8 | 97.8 | 87.9 | 96.8 | 89.7 | 94.6 | 89 | 93.5 |
| nad5 | 96.1 | 99.8 | 86 | 95.4 | 88.5 | 97.2 | 85.4 | 95.7 | 87.9 | 97.4 | 87.3 | 97.4 |
| nad6 | 96.8 | 96.9 | 82.5 | 93.2 | 85.8 | 96 | 78.5 | 92.6 | 83.7 | 96 | 83.3 | 96 |
| Cytb | 97.5 | 99.5 | 86.5 | 97.9 | 89.3 | 98.2 | 85.9 | 97.6 | 87.2 | 98.2 | 87.5 | 98.4 |

## CHAPTER 5

## DEVELOPMENT OF REFERENCE TRANSCRIPTOMES FOR THE MAJOR FIELD INSECT PESTS OF COWPEA: A TOOLBOX FOR INSECT PEST MANAGEMENT APPROACHES IN WEST AFRICA ${ }^{4}$


#### Abstract

Cowpea is a widely cultivated and major nutritional source of protein for many people that live in West Africa. Annual yields and longevity of grain storage is greatly reduced by feeding damage caused by a complex of insect pests that include the pod sucking bugs, Anoplocnemis curvipes Fabricius (Hemiptera: Coreidae) and Clavigralla tomentosicollis Stål (Hemiptera: Coreidae); as well as phloem-feeding cowpea aphids, Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae) and flower thrips, Megalurothrips sjostedti Trybom (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). Efforts to control these pests remain a challenge and there is a need to understand the structure and movement of these pest populations in order to facilitate the development of integrated pest management (IPM) strategies. Molecular tools have the potential to help facilitate a better understanding of pest populations. Towards this goal, we used 454 pyrosequencing technology to generate 319,126, 176,262, 320,722 and 227,882 raw reads from A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti, respectively. The reads were de novo assembled into 11,687, 7,647, 10,652 and 7,348 transcripts for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and $M$. sjostedti, respectively. Functional annotation of the resulting

^[ ${ }^{4}$ This chapter has been published as Agunbiade et al. 2013. Development of reference transcriptomes for the major field insect pests of cowpea: A toolbox for insect pest management approaches in West Africa. PLoS ONE 8(11): e79929. It is an open access article and is available at www.plosone.org and DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079929. I acknowledge the contribution of co-authors to the publication. ]


transcripts identified genes putatively involved in insecticide resistance, pathogen defense and immunity. Additionally, sequences that matched the primary aphid endosymbiont, Buchnera aphidicola, were identified among A. craccivora transcripts. Furthermore, 742, 97, 607 and 180 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were respectively predicted among A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti transcripts, and will likely be valuable tools for future molecular genetic marker development. These results demonstrate that Roche 454-based transcriptome sequencing could be useful for the development of genomic resources for cowpea pest insects in West Africa.

## INTRODUCTION

Crops of cowpea (Vigna Unguiculata (L). Walp) provide a major nutritional source of protein for about 200 million people in sub-Saharan Africa (Cork et al. 2009). Cowpea production is highest in the West African countries of Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso, where insect feeding damage by over 100 pest species is a major constraint on field production and in grain storage (Cork et al. 2009). Yield is most dramatically affected by insect pests that occur during the flowering and seed pod stages. These include flower and pod feeding insects such as flower thrips, Megalurothrips sjostedti Trybom (Thysanoptera: Thripidae); legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Crambidae); pod sucking insects, Clavigralla tomentosicollis Stål (Hemiptera: Coreidae) (Adati et al. 2007) and Anoplocnemis curvipes Fabricius (Hemiptera: Coreidae); and phloem-feeding cowpea aphids, Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae). Crop damage by these insect pests can be as high as 60 to $100 \%$ in the field (Singh and Allen 1980; Jackai and Daoust 1986; Dugje et al. 2009). Aphis craccivora can cause significant
damage even at low population densities due to its ability to transmit at least 14 viruses including the potyviruses, the cowpea aphid-borne mosaic virus (CABMV) (Thottappilly and Rossel 1985; Atiri et al. 1986) and the blackeye cowpea mosaic virus (BICMV) (Dijkstra et al. 1987). These viruses produce severe cowpea mottling, chlorosis, and seed shriveling (Brunt et al. 1990) which severely reduce yields (Bock and Conti 1974; Singh and van Emden 1979). In contrast to most plant viruses, which fail to cross into developing embryos from infected maternal tissues (Bennett 1969), CABMV and BICMV appear to propagate via vertical transmission from parent to progeny seed (Gillaspie et al. 1993; Bashir and Hampton 1996) and is exacerbated by horizontal transmissions by aphid vectors.

Much research has been directed towards developing strategies to control the feeding of the legume pod borer, M. vitrata on cowpea crops. Past use of chemical insecticides has resulted in increased frequencies of resistance in $M$. vitrata to three classes of insecticides in Nigeria (Ekesi 1999), and unfortunately fits within the paradigm where selection pressures imposed by widespread application of a chemical control agent can oftentimes lead to the evolution of insecticide resistance within targeted pest insect populations (Champ and Dyte 1976; Georghiou and Lagunes-Tejeda 1991). Additionally, chemical insecticides are often financially inaccessible to smallholder farmers in West Africa, and pose serious health and environmental risks when used indiscriminately by untrained applicators (Kamara et al. 2007; Oparaeke 2007). Therefore, recent shifts toward the use of affordable and sustainable biocontrol measures have been initiated within West Africa (Amevoin et al. 2007; Adati et al. 2007). Some of these potential M. vitrata control strategies have included the deployment of bio-pesticides (Oparaeke 2006;

Tamò et al. 2012) and the development of a transgenic cowpea that expresses Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) toxins (Bean/Cowpea CRSP 2001). Additionally, traps baited with the female M. vitrata sex pheromone blends, in a 100:5:5 ratio of $(E, E)-10,12-$ hexadecadienal, $(E, E)$-10,12-hexadecadienol and $(E)$-10-hexadecenal, have been distributed to farmers in Benin and used as a successful early warning tool (Downham et al. 2003). These baited traps have the potential for monitoring seasonal northward $M$. vitrata migrations during the rainy season, but the fidelity of pheromone blend, and trap position and design can affect the accuracy of resulting estimates of population size and route of migration (Bartels et al. 1997; Bradshaw et al. 1983; Lewis and Macaulay 1976). The population genetic structure of $M$. vitrata has been described through the application of next generation sequencing (NGS) and high throughput single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genotyping technologies (Margam et al. 2011) as well as microsatellite loci (Agunbiade et al. 2012a). In these aforementioned studies, M. vitrata population structure and estimates of gene flow (migration) within West African cowpea production area were assessed. The results of these studies have the potential to enhance integrated pest management (IPM) programs to determine the logical locations of natural enemy releases. This prior research on M. vitrata serves as a model for the application of genome-based approaches to increase the effectiveness of strategies used to control pest insect populations.

Since transgenic cowpea that express Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) Cry1 Ab toxin shows no toxicity towards non-Lepidopteran insects and a majority of biocontrol strategies for $M$. vitrata are species-specific, cowpea crops remain susceptible to continued feeding and plant disease transmission by thrips, aphids and pod sucking pests.

Thus, the only method widely available to date for the control of A. craccivora, A. curvipes, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti by indigenous farmers in West Africa has been the application of chemical insecticides. Since insecticide resistance had evolved within M. vitrata populations (Ekesi 1999), the establishment of effective insect resistance management (IRM) plans for A. craccivora, A. curvipes, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti may be critical for delaying the evolution of resistance. The absence of population genetic data for these species hinders the estimation of movement patterns of these insects within their endemic range such that the regional scales necessary for IRM programs to remain effective are difficult to devise. NGS technologies that include Roche 454 GS FLX, Solexa/Illumina Genome Analyzer, ABI/SOLiD Gene Sequencers and Helicos Genetic Analysis System platforms use massively parallel pyrosequencing technologies to collect millions of nucleotide sequences in very short time frames (Margulies et al. 2005; Moore et al. 2006; Wicker et al. 2006; Huse et al. 2007; Weber et al. 2007). Moreover, NGS technologies provide a rapid and cost-effective way to obtain large amounts of DNA sequence data from organisms where no prior information had existed (Margam et al. 2011). De novo transcriptome analysis has proven to be a valuable first step to obtaining sequence information and expression levels of genes involved in developmental and metabolic pathways, insecticide resistance, and to discover single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in all kinds of model and non-model organisms (Sloan et al. 2012; Xue et al. 2010; Mittapalli et al. 2010; Poelchau et al. 2011). SNPs are changes of a single nucleotide at a specific location within the genome of a species, and high-throughput assays have been developed for their detection and application as genetic markers (Tang et al. 1999; Vignal et al. 2002; Brumfield et al. 2003; Morin et al. 2004;

Schlötterer 2004). Estimation of allelic frequency variation at SNP loci are effective for describing population demographics (Coates et al. 2011) and are increasingly becoming the marker of choice in population genetic analysis.

In this study, we applied Roche 454 sequencing technology to generate and subsequently assemble contigs from DNA sequencing reads from independent normalized cDNA libraries for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti. Annotations of individual gene transcripts were used to identify candidate genes putatively involved in insecticide resistance, regulation of insect growth and response to disease transmission. This is the first report of genomic data for these insect pests and provides valuable tool for understanding molecular gene functions of several major field insect pests in cowpea cropping systems of West Africa. The application of this genomics data might ultimately lead to a better understanding of the pest populations, with the longterm potential to improve the effectiveness of IPM programs by better defining pestpathogen interactions, and pest population dynamics prior to deployment of biocontrol agents.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Development of reference transcriptome sequence assemblies

Insect samples were collected during the summer through fall of 2011 at 7, 11 and 9 locations in Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger respectively for A. craccivora, A. curvipes, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti (Figure 5.1). A total of 79, 1,920, 364 and 740 individual insect samples were collected respectively for A. craccivora, A. curvipes, $C$. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti from these locations. Both the larval and adult life stages
were sampled for all species and stored in RNAlater (Ambion, TX, USA) immediately after collection in the field. All samples from each species, from a single location, were pooled and total RNA was extracted from the insect samples at IITA Benin and INERA Burkina Faso using QIAGEN RNeasy RNA extraction kits (CA, USA) and following the manufacturer's instructions. The RNA was shipped to University of Illinois at UrbanaChampaign (UIUC), USA in $70 \%$ ethanol where it was resuspended in water and quantified by measuring the absorbance at 260 nm using a NanoDrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, DE, USA). The samples were then stored in an ultra-low temperature freezer $\left(-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.

Four normalized cDNA libraries were constructed and sequenced on a Roche 454 GS-FLX at the W.M. Keck Center for Comparative and Functional Genomics, Roy J. Carver Biotechnology Center, UIUC. Briefly, messenger RNA (mRNA) was isolated from $10 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of total RNA with the Oligotex kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). The mRNA-enriched fraction was converted to 454 barcoded cDNA libraries and normalized (Lambert et al. 2010). The barcoded libraries were pooled in equimolar concentration based on average fragment length and concentration. After library construction, the pooled libraries were quantified using a Qubit fluorometer (Invitrogen, CA, USA) and average fragment sizes were determined by analyzing $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of the samples on the Bioanalyzer (Agilent, CA, USA) using a DNA 7500 chip. The pooled library was diluted to $1 \times 10^{6}$ molecules $/ \mu 1$. Emulsion-based clonal amplification and sequencing on a full plate on the 454 Genome Sequencer FLX+ system was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions (454 Life Sciences, CT, USA). Signal processing and base calling were performed using the bundled 454 Data Analysis Software v2.6.

The raw sequence read data from the four insect pests were analyzed using the CLC Genomics Workbench 6.0.1 (Cambridge, MA, USA). Pre-processing of the raw reads from each of the four insect samples involved trimming each 454 read using a Phred quality score of 20 and also removing nucleotides < 50 bp from the ends. The adapter sequences were also trimmed from the raw reads. The processed read data from each of the four insect samples were assembled into contiguous sequences using parameters: mismatch $\operatorname{cost}=2$, insertion and deletion cost $=3$, length fraction $=60 \%$ and similarity $=$ $90 \%$. After assembly, the vector contamination were removed using the UniVec database and also after assembly, human, bacterial, fish (Danio rerio), mouse (Mus musculus), Salmonella enterica, archeal and viral contamination were removed using a web-based version of DeConSeq (Schmieder and Edwards 2011) using a coverage of $90 \%$ and a sequence identity threshold of $94 \%$. The clean transcriptomes, with the contaminations removed, were then deposited at $\mathrm{DDBJ} / E M B L / G e n B a n k$ for each of the four insect species.

## Functional gene annotation

Open reading frames (ORFs) were predicted from assembled contigs using the ORF-Predictor server (Min et al. 2005) using all 6 possible reading frames for prediction. The assembled transcripts were used as queries to search against NCBI's non-redundant (nr) database using the Blastx algorithm (Altschul et al. 1990), with a cut-off $E$-value of $\leq$ $10^{-6}$ and a high scoring segment pairs (HSP) length cut-off of 33 . The Blast2GO software package 2.6.5 (Ashburner et al. 2000) was used for automating Blastx searches as well as to retrieve associated gene ontology (GO) terms that allowed the prediction of transcript
functions (Ashburner et al. 2000; Shaw et al. 1999). The contigs with significant GO terms were determined with an $E$-value hit filter of $\leq 1 \times 10^{-6}$ and an annotation cut off of 55. Gene ontologies were categorized with respect to molecular function, biological process, and cellular component.

Annotations for A. craccivora, A. curvipes, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti gene functions were manually searched for those putatively involved in the expression of insecticide resistance traits, and pathogen defense and immunity, using each gene function as keywords to search GO terms. Prediction of candidate gene function was also obtained using InterProScan (Hunter et al. 2009; Quevillon et al. 2005) and Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) pathway analyses (Kanehisa and Goto 2000) using Blast2GO 2.6.5 (Ashburner et al. 2000).

## Prediction of putative SNPs

The associated SNP detection software on the CLC Workbench 6.0.1 was used for putative SNP discovery among Roche 454 reads for all species. Attempts to reduce the rate of false SNP discovery included applying a read coverage cut-off of $\geq 35$-fold and reporting SNPs that were present in $\geq 35 \%$ of the aligned reads. These criteria might reduce the false SNP discovery rate by potentially eliminating sequencing errors from the prediction. However, such stringent criteria likely increases type II error, therefore we also performed a prediction of putative SNPs using a reduced coverage cut off of $\geq 10 \%$. All putative indels and nucleotide variants involving > 2 nucleotides were excluded. Lastly, only SNPs located in an ORF were extracted and reported in this study. We checked whether SNPs introduced an amino acid change to differentiate non-synonymous and
synonymous SNPs by using the open reading frames of each of the contigs with SNPs, identifying the codons containing the SNPs and then translating and comparing the amino acids for each allele on CLC Workbench 6.0.1. We also checked the type of substitution, whether transition or transversion, using the CLC Workbench 6.0.1.

## Metagenomic identification of endosymbiont and pathogen transcripts

The bacterial endosymbiont, Buchnera aphidicola, was identified from a Blastn search against Buchnera (Taxid: 32199) in NCBI using the assembled A. craccivora contigs as queries. The A. craccivora contigs with relevant hits to Buchnera were extracted and further confirmatory analysis was performed using InterProScan on Blast2GO 2.6.5, and the associated KEGG pathways were investigated also using Blast2GO 2.6.5.

## Data deposition

The raw Roche 454 sequence data were submitted to the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) Sequence Read Archive (SRA) with accession numbers of SRR768514, SRR768515, SRR768524 and SRR768525 for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti, respectively. The Transcriptome Shotgun Assembly project for the four insect species were submitted to DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank under the accession numbers of GAJV00000000, GAJW00000000, GAJX00000000, and GAJY00000000 for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti, respectively. The version of the TSA accession numbers described in this paper is the first version for each of the four species.

## RESULTS

## Development of reference transcriptome sequence assemblies

Normalized species-specific libraries were successfully constructed from mRNA isolated from pooled samples of all tissues and pooled adult and larval life stages. A total of $319,126,176,262,320,722$ and 227,882 raw reads were respectively obtained from these A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti libraries. The bacterial and human contaminants discovered by DeConSeq were negligible across the four insect species. Seventeen, 2, 11 and 37 contigs were identified by DeConSeq as contaminants in A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti, respectively and were also subsequently removed from the transcripts. The remaining statistics for sequence and contig assemblies are reported in Table 5.1. After assembly and decontamination, the mean contig length ranged from 669.8 to 688.1 bp , from which ORFs with a mean length of between 498.5 and 524.5 bp was predicted (Table 5.1).

## Functional gene annotation

ORFs were predicted from $\geq 98 \%$ of A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti transcripts, and respectively showed mean lengths of 498.46, 514.28, 524.54 and 508.78 bp (Table 5.1). Blast2GO output indicated that Blastx hits were obtained for $6,430(55.02 \%), 7,647$ (79.94\%), 6,839 (64.19\%) and 4,292 ( $58.41 \%$ ) contigs in A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti, respectively. The contigs with significant Blastx matches were assigned GO terms into molecular function, biological process, and cellular components (Appendix F1 to F4). In the molecular function category, the most highly represented were assigned to binding
( $13.66 \%$ for A. curvipes, $13.64 \%$ for A. craccivora, $13.37 \%$ for C. tomentosicollis, and $13.47 \%$ for $M$. sjostedti), and catalytic activity ( $14.37 \%$ for A. curvipes, $13.09 \%$ for $A$. craccivora, $14.93 \%$ for $C$. tomentosicollis, and $13.47 \%$ for M. sjostedti). In the biological process category, the most highly represented were assigned to cellular process (4.65\% for A. curvipes, $4.68 \%$ for A. craccivora, $4.72 \%$ for C. tomentosicollis, and $4.74 \%$ for $M$. sjostedti), and metabolic process ( $5.36 \%$ for A. curvipes, $5.40 \%$ for A. craccivora, $5.80 \%$ for C. tomentosicollis, and $5.63 \%$ for $M$. sjostedti) while in the cellular component category, the most highly represented were assigned to cell (9.27\% for A. curvipes, $9.14 \%$ for A. craccivora, $9.45 \%$ for C. tomentosicollis, and $9.02 \%$ for $M$. sjostedti), and cell part ( $8.20 \%$ for A. curvipes, $8.03 \%$ for A. craccivora, $8.31 \%$ for C. tomentosicollis, and $8.15 \%$ for M. sjostedti) (Appendix F1 to F4).

The majority of the top Blastx hits in the four insect species were from insects. In A. curvipes, the most common were from Hemiptera [Riptortus pedestris (23.61\%)], Coleoptera [Tribolium castaneum (7.05\%)], Phthiraptera [Pediculus humanus (6.72\%)], and another Hemiptera [Acryrthosiphon pisum (5.99\%)] (Appendix G1). The most frequent hits from A. craccivora were from Hemiptera [A. pisum (83.67\%)], two fungi species [Rhizopus delemar (1.52\%); Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis (0.65\%)], and Phthiraptera $[P$. humanus ( $0.54 \%$ )] (Appendix G2). The most frequent in $C$. tomentosicollis were from Hemiptera [R. pedestris (27.72\%)], Coleoptera [T. castaneum (7.72\%)], another Hemiptera [A. pisum (7.00\%)], and Phthiraptera [P. humanus (6.65\%)] (Appendix G3) while the most frequent in M. sjostedti transcripts were from Coleoptera [T. castaneum (9.74\%)], Phthiraptera [P. humanus (8.36\%)], Lepidoptera [Danaus plexippus (6.45\%)], and Hymenoptera [Nasonia vitripennis (5.62\%)] (Appendix G4).

Blastx hits also revealed matches to other fungi species, bacteria, and a plant among $A$. craccivora contigs (Appendix G2), but these were not analogously observed within libraries from the other three insects.

Within the libraries constructed from A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti cDNA, a combined total of 23 candidate genes for detoxification, immunity and pathogen defense, development and communication were identified including cytochrome P450, glutathione s-transferase, esterase, cathepsin, heat shock protein, chitinase, defensin, c-Jun NH (2)-terminal kinase (jnk) stimulatory phosphatase, down syndrome critical region protein, epidermal growth factor, lysozyme, nimrod, nitric acid synthase, prophenol oxidase, ubiquinol cytochrome c reductase, peptidoglycan recognition protein, toll protein, chemosensory protein, juvenile hormone inducible protein, juvenile hormone esterase and juvenile hormone epoxide hydrolase, chemosensory binding protein as well as odorant binding protein (Figures 5.3a to 5.3 d ).

## Metagenomic identification of endosymbiont- and pathogen-derived transcripts

Thirty six Blastn hits to the NCBI nr protein database were identical to the primary endosymbiont of aphids, B. aphidicola, when transcripts from A. craccivora were used as queries of which 23 unique transcripts retrieved InterProScan annotations (Appendix H) and nine were predicted to be involved in nine different bacterial biochemical pathways (Table 5.2). Transcripts from six different fungi species were also predicted among $A$. craccivora transcripts, including Rhizopus delemar, and Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis (Appendix G2).

## Prediction of putative SNPs

All A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti contigs, that contained a putative ORF, were included in the SNP prediction pipeline (Appendix I1 to I4, Appendix J1 to J4). From these predictions, 258, 30, 225, and 63 contigs respectively from A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti had putative SNPs, which respectively contained a total of $742,97,607$, and 180 putative SNPs (Appendix I1 to I4, Appendix J1 to J4). The mean depth of reads aligned to the reference transcripts depth for all putative SNPs was $>60$ across all species (Table 5.3). The density of SNPs within transcripts was measured by estimates of mean number of putative SNPs per kilobase, and were $0.09,0.02,0.08$, and 0.04 respectively among A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti contigs (Table 5.3). The alternate $\geq 10 \%$ coverage cut off we used comparatively predicted $2,703,340,2,087$, and 780 putative SNPs for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti, respectively. As a consequence of 454-based sequence by synthesis methods used, resulting reads are prone to sequencing errors known as homopolymers, which comprise imprecise nucleotide numbers in long arrays of the same nucleotide. These errors can cause misalignment within contig assemblies such that incorrect SNP predictions can result in sequence regions flanking the homopolymer stretch. To compensate for these errors, the variants were also filtered for 454/Ion homopolymer INDELS in the SNP detection software in the CLC Genomics Workbench. To understand the effects of SNP mutations and associate them to the different transcripts obtained in our study, we differentiated synonymous SNPs from non-synonymous SNPs. Of the total number of SNPs obtained in
the four insect species, there were $425,72,419$, and 97 synonymous SNPs respectively in A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti and respectively 317, 25, 188, and 83 non-synonymous SNPs. In all four species, transitions were more frequent than transversions ( $\mathrm{Ts} / \mathrm{Tv}>1$ ) (Table 5.3).

## DISCUSSION

## Development of reference transcriptome sequence assemblies

Next generation sequencing technologies offer a rapid entry point into genomic research (Coates et al. 2011) and can generate valuable molecular resources for non-model species (Sloan et al. 2012; Harismendy et al. 2009) that are a foundation from which a diversity of research questions can be addressed (Harismendy et al. 2009; Rothberg and Leamon 2008). In the absence of complete genome sequences, transcriptome sequencing remain a useful molecular resource that can be applied to the identification of candidate insecticide resistance genes and mutations that can be developed into genetic markers for population genetic studies (Margam et al. 2011), as well as the identification of potential targets for RNAi knockdown. The Roche 454 platform provides long sequence read lengths that may better allow the assembly of de novo transcriptomes (Harismendy et al. 2009), but remain susceptible to sequencing errors in homopolymer regions. The Roche 454 transcriptome data presented in this study from A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti had a high median length ( $\geq 680 \mathrm{bp}$ ), and a majority of resulting contigs encoded a predicted ORF (= protein coding sequence, CDS). Despite this, a high number of contigs (> 35\%) had ORFs with no amino acid similarity to known proteins within the NCBI nr database and was especially the case for $A$. curvipes, $C$.
tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti transcripts. However, only $20.06 \%$ of the A. craccivora contigs had no similarity to known proteins in the NCBI nr database. Annotation of previous transcriptome assemblies have similarly revealed a high number of contigs with genes of unknown function (Karatolos et al. 2011; Bai et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2010; Shen et al. 2011) which may represent novel uncharacterized genes and reflect the limitation of inferring transcript functions by comparison to model species that have long evolutionary distances to the non-model species in question (Coates et al. 2008). Even within whole genome sequence assemblies, species-specific genes can comprise a high percentage of predicted ORFs (Tribolium Genome Sequencing Consortium 2008). The presence of these genes of unknown function could similarly suggest these proteins may be species-specific and, that de novo transcriptome assemblies from non-model insect pest species are useful for phylogenetic novel gene discovery. Furthermore, the resulting assembly of sequence data allow for the identification of novel gene pathways that have potentials for RNAi targeting within a suite of species-specific control tactics.

## Functional annotation

Functional annotations of assembled A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti transcripts allowed for the identification of candidate genes encoding proteins putatively involved in insecticide resistance, and pathogen defense and immunity. Transcriptomic approaches are powerful tools to identify new genes and gene functions and have been successfully applied to many organisms. In this study, we have identified genes putatively involved in the response to and the detoxification of xenobiotics in the four insect pests. Some of these xenobiotic response/detoxification genes will likely be
useful for the study of chemical insecticide resistance traits as well as their role in detoxification following exposure to plant allelochemicals. For example, strains of $A$. craccivora have elevated esterase activities that were linked to increased resistance to the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor agonist, dinotefuran, which belongs to the third generation of neonicotinoids (Mokbel and Mohamed 2009). Our results will provide a foundation that makes the future study of the involvement of these candidate genes in field-observed insecticide resistance traits in these insects more likely, and may also represent genetic markers that can be used to screen field populations (and compare resistant vs. susceptible individuals) to determine linkage (or not) of the locus to the resistant phenotype trait.

Our current understanding of insect immunity and stress responses comes from holometabolous insects and includes flies, butterflies, beetles, and bees (Gerardo et al. 2010). The four insect pests under study in this paper are all hemimetabolous insects with three of them (A. curvipes, A. craccivora, and C. tomentosicollis) falling into the same insect order of Hemiptera and the fourth insect $M$. sjostedti falling into the insect order, Thysanoptera. Because all studied species exhibit incomplete development, comparison with the genome of a hemimetabolous insect (i.e., pea aphid, A. pisum) may provide insights into immunity and defense mechanisms in these pest insects. It is also interesting to note that while the four insect species included in this study were not intentionally immunologically challenged, we still observed some transcripts putatively involved in insect defense and immunity based on studies conducted on other insects such as $A$. pisum. We did not observe as many immunity and defense transcripts in both $A$. craccivora and M. sjostedti as we observed in A. curvipes and C. tomentosicollis. The immune genes observed in this study include most genes involved in the IMD pathway in
insects and includes chitinase, defensin, down syndrome critical region protein, epidermal growth factor receptor, jnk stimulatory phosphatase, lysozyme, nimrod, nitric oxide synthase, odorant binding protein, peptidoglycan-recognition protein and pro-phenol oxidase. We also observed genes involved in toll signaling pathway. It is interesting to note that none of these genes are represented across all the four insect pests. Some insects have particular genes that others lack, and vice versa. For example, A. craccivora appears to be missing the defensin gene, however, a lack of such a gene would have to be verified in the future if a genomic project were to occur for this species. This is consistent with studies conducted on A. pisum, which shows the pea aphid is lacking many of the antimicrobial peptides, such as defensin, common to other insects (Zou et al. 2007). The reduced humoral immune system in A. pisum, including an apparently non-functional IMD signaling pathway and absence of PGRPs, has been suggested to be an adaptation for the symbiosis with the bacterium B. aphidicola (Douglas 1998). The presence of defensin in the human louse, $P$. humanus and in the ancient apterygote insect, the fire brat, Thermobia domestica (Altincicek and Vilcinskas 2007), suggests that defensins may have been lost during aphid evolution.

## Prediction of putative SNPs

Single nucleotide polymorphisms are rapidly becoming the marker of choice for many applications in population ecology, evolution and conservation genetics, because of the potential for high genotyping efficiency, data quality, genome-wide coverage and analytical simplicity (e.g. in modeling mutational dynamics) (Morin et al. 2004). Transcriptome-derived SNPs have several advantages over those developed from genomic
sequences (Hayes et al. 2007; Akey et al. 2003; Picoult-Newberg et al. 1999), including acquisition of actual gene sequences that allow for direct mapping and comparative genome studies among organisms (Wang et al. 2008, and references therein). SNPs derived from transcriptomes are also a source of candidate polymorphisms underlying important traits that can lead to the identification of quantitative trait nucleotides (QTN) (Jalving et al. 2004) linked to ecologically relevant genes. The applicability of SNPs from sequence data for marker development has been previously reported (Novaes et al. 2008; Wiedmann et al. 2008; Williams et al. 2010) and has been applied for the genetic mapping of insect orders such as Lepidoptera [Bombyx mori; Yamamoto et al. 2006)] and for population genetics of the Glanville fritillary butterfly, Melitaea cinxia (Orsini et al. 2008). The current study provides a set of at least $742,97,607$, and 180 putative SNPs respectively for A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti (predicted using the criteria that SNPs be present in $\geq 35 \%$ of aligned reads), and the segregating mutations that can be developed into molecular genetic markers for the study of the population genetic structure of these insect pests. Although a greater number of putative SNPs were predicted using a more lenient coverage cut off value of $10 \%$, these loci may be prone to type I error and secondary validation methods may likely be required to distinguish these from sequencing errors.

The frequency of SNPs in laboratory strains of Drosophila was reported at 5 SNP per kilobase (Berger et al. 2001) and at 1.3 SNPs per kilobase in the inbred Dazao strain of Bombyx mori (Cheng et al. 2004). Similarly, laboratory strains of the malaria mosquito, Anopheles funestus, were reported to have 7.2 SNPs per kilobase (Wondji et al. 2007), and 8.0 SNPs per kilobase in An. gambiae (Morlais et al. 2004). Compared to the
results obtained from the above studies, we did observe a lower amount of SNPs per kilobase in the present study. Although laboratory strains were used in those studies, we used field-collected insects in our study and usually a reduced SNP frequency is reported in laboratory strains because homozygosity may be increased by the effects of inbreeding or random genetic drift. Non-synonymous SNPs have commonly been reported to occur less frequently than synonymous SNPs, and is presumably due to the evolutionary constraints of negative selection that may eliminate deleterious substitutions from the population (Cargill et al. 1999). Non-synonymous SNPs are of particular interest because they are more likely to affect the function of the encoded protein and may influence phenotype. It has been estimated that $20-30 \%$ of non-synonymous SNPs affect protein function (Sunyaev et al. 2001; Chasman and Adams 2001). In our study, we did observe a higher number of synonymous SNPs than non-synonymous SNPs across transcripts from all the four insect species. In metazoan DNA sequences, an excess of transition vs. transversion mutations is often observed. This may be partly due to the relatively high rate of change of methylated cytosines to thymine, as well as post-mutation processes of selection on codon-usage bias within coding regions (Keller et al. 2007). The role of population genetic and biochemical effects on the rate and direction of nucleotide changes remains unknown, but are likely factors that affect the observed level of SNP allele frequencies within natural populations.

## Metagenomic identification of endosymbiont- and pathogen-derived transcripts

Aphids are sap-feeding insects that infest a wide range of plant species. Although sap fluids from plant phloem contain high concentrations of carbohydrates, they are
deficient in nitrogenous nutrients such as specific amino acids (Sandström and Moran 1999; Houk and Griffiths 1980). To overcome these nutritional deficiencies, species within Aphidoidea have established mutualistic relationships with the obligate intracellular endosymbiont, B. aphidicola (Lai et al. 1994; Munson et al. 1991). Buchnera endosymbionts produce essential amino acids that cannot be synthesized by aphids or obtained in sufficient quantities from plant saps (Lai et al. 1994; Douglas 1998). In return, aphids provide Buchnera with other nutrients required to survive (Wilkinson and Douglas 1995). Relationships between these two groups have existed for approximately 150 to 200 million years (Moran et al. 1993) resulting in drastic Buchnera genome reductions due to the loss of many genes needed for independent life and has led to the inability to survive outside host cells (Shigenobu et al. 2000). Therefore, aphids and associated Buchnera symbionts may be inseparable mutualistic partners. We observed 36 B. aphidicola transcripts among Blastn hits to our A. craccivora transcripts. These 36 B. aphidicola transcripts were annotated from twelve different strains of $B$. aphidicola. We also observed ubiquinone in the Blastx search of A. craccivora. Symbiotic B. aphidicola are aerobic bacteria, which due to gene reduction in metabolic pathways, cannot carry out respiration without obtaining gene products from the host (Zientz et al. 2004). The electron transport chain consists of a primary dehydrogenase and a terminal reductase, which are linked by ubiquinone (Unden and Bongaerts 1997). Ubiquinone is an essential redox component of the aerobic respiration of bacteria and mitochondria (Søballe and Poole 2000), and participates in the transfer of electrons and hydrogen between flavoproteins and cytochrome $b$ in the respiratory chain. Also, one of the 36 A. craccivora contigs with hits to B. aphidicola was annotated as the gene symbionin, which has been
reported to increase the transmission of plant viruses by binding to the read-through domain of the viral coat protein (Banerjee et al. 2004). Further study of these genes may likely lead to a better understanding of symbiosis and plant disease transmission by $A$. craccivora, and may lead to potential tactics to reduce or eliminate the disease vectoring capacity of A. craccivora.

Additionally, we observed Blastx hits to six fungi species among A. craccivora sequences. Rhizopus oryzae ( $R$. oryzae has been reclassified to include $R$. oryzae and $R$. delemar (Abe et al. 2007). Rhizopus delemar was observed in the Blastx hits in this study and was previously reported to be an entomopathogenic fungal species (Sharma et al. 2012). Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis causes chytridiomycosis and is a major cause of amphibian population decline worldwide (Friesen and Kuhn 2012) and the sequences within our aphid transcripts may be derived from a related fungal species that is capable of infecting A. craccivora in West Africa. In contrast, Melampsora larici-populina is a cause of rust in poplar trees (Yu et al. 2009). These may have resulted from environmental contamination or were present within gut contents of whole aphids that were used for library preparations. These results suggest that application of NGS may be used for the metagenomic identification of putative pathogen species, which in turn may be useful for the biological control of pest insect species.

## CONCLUSION

With the exception of prior studies that focused on M. vitrata, this study represents the first attempt to develop transcriptomic and molecular marker data for field insect pests of cowpea in West Africa. Although the sequence data, and biological functions of these
genes, may be of interest and importance to molecular biologists, the molecular markers are potentially of much greater near-term pragmatic importance for those interested in controlling these pests. Previous studies have already demonstrated that such molecular markers can give us important insights into pest movement patterns that ultimately will impact how pest control strategies for M. vitrata need to be developed in different agroecological zones in West Africa (Margam et al. 2011; Agunbiade et al. 2012a). For example, M. vitrata is an endemic pest in the southern part of the selected West African countries and migratory in the northern part; thus biocontrol agents need to be released in the south and spraying of pesticides or biopesticides (Tamò et al 2012) may be a better solution in areas where these insects are not endemic. This understanding has emerged from a combination of studies on the biology of this pest and through the use of molecular markers. We term this approach, combining traditional IPM strategies with knowledge that emerges from population genetics/genomics tools, IPM-omics (Agunbiade et al. 2012b). This study lays the foundation for research in other pest species, with the longterm goal to develop a comprehensive program that integrates genomics datasets into IPM and IRM programs in order to minimize the crop damage inflicted by pest insect species of cowpea in West Africa.
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## FIGURES AND TABLES



Figure 5.1. Map of Benin, Burkina Faso, and Niger showing the sites from which $\boldsymbol{A}$. curvipes, $A$. craccivora, $C$. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti were collected.


Figure 5.2a. Gene ontology classification into biological process, cellular component, and molecular function. Gene ontology terms were determined using an e-value of $\leq 1.0 \mathrm{e}^{-6}$ and sorted based on level 2 classifications in all the contigs of $A$. curvipes.


Figure 5.2b. Gene ontology classification into biological process, cellular component, and molecular function. Gene ontology terms were determined using an e-value of $\leq 1.0 \mathrm{e}^{-6}$ and sorted based on level 2 classifications in all the contigs of A. craccivora.


Figure 5.2c. Gene ontology classification into biological process, cellular component, and molecular function. Gene ontology terms were determined using an e-value of $\leq 1.0 \mathrm{e}^{-6}$ and sorted based on level 2 classifications in all the contigs of $C$. tomentosicollis.


Figure 5.2d. Gene ontology classification into biological process, cellular component, and molecular function. Gene ontology terms were determined using an e-value of $\leq 1.0 \mathrm{e}^{-6}$ and sorted based on level 2 classifications in all the contigs of $M$. sjostedti.
A. curvipes


Figure 5.3a. Transcripts putatively involved in responses to xenobiotic (e.g., insecticide resistance), and disease transmission in A. curvipes.


Figure 5.3b. Transcripts putatively involved in responses to xenobiotic (e.g., insecticide resistance), and disease transmission in A. craccivora.


Figure 5.3c. Transcripts putatively involved in responses to xenobiotic (e.g., insecticide resistance), and disease transmission in C. tomentosicollis.


Figure 5.3d. Transcripts putatively involved in responses to xenobiotic (e.g., insecticide resistance), and disease transmission in M. sjostedti.

Table 5.1. Statistics from Roche 454 sequencing of A. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis and M. sjostedti cDNA libraries generated from pools of all tissues and the larval and adult life stages.

|  | A. curvipes | A. craccivora | C. tomentosicollis | M. sjostedti |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Putative SNPs identified | 742 | 97 | 607 | 180 |
| Contigs with SNPs | 256 | 30 | 225 | 63 |
| Transition | 505 | 65 | 423 | 116 |
| Transversion | 237 | 32 | 184 | 64 |
| Transition/Transversion Ratio | 2.1 | 2 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| SNPs per Kilobase | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| Synonymous SNPs | 425 | 72 | 419 | 97 |
| Non-synonymous SNPs | 317 | 25 | 188 | 83 |
| Mean read depth of SNPs | 97.5 | 66.6 | 115.5 | 74.9 |

Table 5.2. The orthologs of A. craccivora contigs derived from the genome of the primary aphid endosymbiont, B. aphidicola (identified in GenBank accession BA000003.2.). Information regarding protein function can be retrieved from SwissProt database (http://enzyme.expasy.org/) by searches for EC number (not available for all B. aphidicola genes).

| Contig ID | Orthologous B. aphidicola gene | B. aphidicola protein $($ EC $)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aphis 1561 | D-fructose-6-phosphate amidotransferase (glmS) | BAB12753.1 (EC 2.6.1.16) |
| Aphis 5691 | UDP-N-acetylglucosamine pyrophosphorylase (glmU) | BAB12754.1 (EC 2.7.7.23) |
| Aphis 5225 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase (metK) | BAB13109.1 (EC 2.5.1.6) |
| Aphis 7020 | acetolactate synthase small subunit (ilvH) | BAB12941.1 (EC 2.2.1.6) |
| Aphis 6159 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase e1 component (sucA) | BAB13011.1 (EC 1.2.4.2) |
| Aphis 5021 | ABC transporter ATP-binding protein (uup) | BAB13068.1 |
| Aphis 376 | Spermidine synthase (speE) | BAB12926.1 (EC 2.5.1.16) |
| Aphis 3768 | 6-phsphoglucanate dehydrogenase (gnd) | BAB12826.1 (EC 1.1.1.44) |
| Aphis 3870 | Hypothetical GTP-binding protein (yfgK) | BAB13291.1 |

Table 5.3. Summary of the putative single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) predictions from reads mapped to reference $A$. curvipes, A. craccivora, C. tomentosicollis, and M. sjostedti transcripts.

|  | A.curvipes | A. craccivora | C. tomentosicollis | M. sjostedti |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Normalization | Normalized | Normalized | Normalized | Normalized |
| Total number of raw reads | 319,126 | 176,262 | 320,722 | 227,882 |
| Mean raw read lengths (bp) | 382.7 | 402.1 | 389.6 | 391.5 |
| Total number of processed reads after trimming | 304,110 | 166,565 | 306,666 | 211,626 |
| Mean trimmed read length (bp) | 315.5 | 356.5 | 327.1 | 340.9 |
| Final processed number of assembled contigs | 11,687 | 7,647 | 10,652 | 7,348 |
| Mean length of assembled contig (bp) | 688.1 | 669.8 | 685.8 | 683.7 |
| Total number of singletons | 219 | 211 | 180 | 115 |
| Mean ORF length (bp) | 498.5 | 514.3 | 524.5 | 508.8 |
| Total number of contigs with Blastx hits | 6,430 | 6,113 | 6,839 | 4,292 |

## APPENDIX A

Characteristics of the M. vitrata individuals in the three West African countries

| Population | Locus | N | Na | Ho | He | $\boldsymbol{F}$ | Probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Niger | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 444 \\ 32008 \\ 3393 \\ \text { 7_02K06 } \\ \text { CO241 } \\ \text { CO325 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 72 \\ 72 \\ 58 \\ 66 \\ 72 \\ 72 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 2.0 \\ 8.0 \\ 1.0 \\ 4.0 \\ 7.0 \\ 3.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline-0.0 \\ -0.0 \\ \text { \#N/A } \\ 0.9 \\ -0.2 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0 * * * \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Nigeria | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 444 \\ 32008 \\ 3393 \\ \text { 7_02K06 } \\ \text { CO241 } \\ \text { CO325 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 52 \\ 51 \\ 41 \\ 52 \\ 53 \\ 52 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.0 \\ & 8.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.3 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.2 \\ -0.0 \\ 1.0 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.0 \\ -0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.0 * * \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* *} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Fada | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 444 \\ 32008 \\ 3393 \\ \text { 7_02K06 } \\ \text { CO241 } \\ \text { CO325 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 39 \\ & 26 \\ & 39 \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ $40$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.6 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.0 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 0.8 \\ & -0.1 \\ & -0.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.0^{* *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Farakoba | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 444 \\ 32008 \\ 3393 \\ \text { 7_02K06 } \\ \text { CO241 } \\ \text { CO325 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 86 \\ 70 \\ 64 \\ 86 \\ 86 \\ 86 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 4.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.0 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 0.6 \\ & -0.1 \\ & -0.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.0^{* * *} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Kamboinse | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 444 \\ 32008 \\ 3393 \\ \text { 7_02K06 } \\ \text { CO241 } \\ \text { CO325 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 49 \\ 41 \\ 31 \\ 49 \\ 44 \\ 49 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.0 \\ & 6.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.0 \\ & 0.2 \\ & -0.0 \\ & 0.8 \\ & -0.1 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.0^{* *} \\ 0.1 \mathrm{~ns} \\ 0.0^{* *} * \\ 0.0^{* *} \\ 0.0^{* *} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Sample size (N), number of alleles (Na), observed heterozygosity (Ho), expected heterozygosity $(\mathrm{He}), F_{\text {IS }}$ per sample and loci (after Bonferroni adjusted threshold with corresponding $P$-values from $\leq 0.005$ to 0.05 and the probability ( $P<0.001^{* * *}, P<0.01-* *$ and $P<0.05-^{*}$ ).

APPENDIX B
Characteristics of the M. vitrata individuals

| Population | Locus | Na | Ne | Ho | He | $F_{\text {IS }}$ | Probability | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oueme-Plateau (V. unguiculata) | $\mathrm{C} 0241$ | 5 | 1.16 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.02 | * |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.93 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.32 | 0.02 | * |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.35 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.13 | $0.35$ | Ns |
|  | 32008 | 6 | 2.20 | 0.69 | $0.54$ | -0.27 | $0.31$ | Ns |
|  | C 0444 | 2 | 1.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | -0.04 | 0.77 | Ns |
| Zou-Collines (V. unguiculata) | C0241 | 5 | 1.29 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.20 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 | -0.08 | 0.59 | Ns |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.52 | 0.44 | 0.34 | -0.28 | 0.05 | * |
|  | 32008 | 5 | 3.00 | 0.80 | 0.67 | -0.19 | 0.43 | Ns |
|  | C0444 | 2 | 1.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | -0.04 | 0.77 | Ns |
| Mono-Couffo (V. unguiculata) | C0241 | 3 | 1.09 | 0.08 | 0.08 | -0.03 | 0.99 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.51 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 0.70 | 0.00 | *** |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.56 | 0.43 | 0.36 | -0.19 | 0.18 | Ns |
|  | 32008 | 6 | 2.66 | 0.65 | 0.62 | -0.05 | 0.00 | *** |
|  | C 0444 | 2 | 1.14 | 0.13 | $0.12$ | $-0.07$ | 0.64 | Ns |
| Oueme-Plateau (L. sericeus) | C0241 | 4 | 1.15 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 0.00 | *** |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | $1.02$ | $0.02$ | $0.02$ | $\text { - } 0.01$ | $0.94$ | Ns |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.97 | 0.37 | $0.49$ | $0.25$ | $0.14$ | Ns |
|  | 32008 | 3 | 2.37 | 0.75 | 0.58 | $-0.30$ | $0.01$ | ** |
|  | C0444 | 2 | 1.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.94 | Ns |

Number of alleles ( $N \mathrm{a}$ ), number of effective alleles $(N e)$, observed heterozygosity $\left(H_{0}\right)$, expected heterozygosity $\left(H_{\mathrm{E}}\right)$, fixation index ( $F_{\text {IS }}$ ), and probability per sample site.

## APPENDIX B. (cont.)

| Zou-Collines (L. sericeus) | $\mathrm{C} 0241$ | 1 | Monomorphic |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.94 | Ns |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.40 | $0.50$ | $0.21$ | $0.17$ | Ns |
|  | $32008$ | 4 | $2.25$ | $0.89$ | $0.56$ | $-0.60$ | $0.00$ | *** |
|  | C0444 | 2 | 1.09 | 0.09 | 0.08 | -0.05 | 0.76 | Ns |
| Oueme-Plateau (P.phaseoloides) | $\mathrm{C} 0241$ | 4 | 1.09 | 0.08 | 0.08 | -0.03 | 1.00 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 1 | Monomorphic |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.16 | 0.11 | 0.14 | $0.23$ | $0.12$ | Ns |
|  | $32008$ | $5$ | $2.82$ | $0.71$ | $0.65$ | $-0.11$ | $0.00$ | *** |
|  | C0444 | 2 | $1.13$ | $0.13$ | $0.12$ | -0.07 | $0.64$ | Ns |
| Zou-Collines (P.phaseoloides) | C0241 | 2 | 1.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | -0.04 | 0.77 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.11 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.79 | 0.00 | *** |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.30 | 0.18 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.12 | Ns |
|  | 32008 | 4 | 2.45 | 0.75 | 0.59 | -0.27 | 0.31 | Ns |
|  | C 0444 | 2 | 1.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.94 | Ns |
| Mono-Couffo (P.phaseoloides) | $\mathrm{C0241}$ | 3 | 1.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -0.02 | 1.00 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.34 | 0.13 | 0.25 | $0.50$ | $0.00$ | *** |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | 1.26 | 0.19 | 0.21 | $0.07$ | $0.61$ | Ns |
|  | 32008 | 4 | 2.17 | 0.77 | $0.54$ | $-0.43$ | $0.03$ | * |
|  | C 0444 | 2 | 1.09 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.48 | $0.00$ | *** |
| Mono-Couffo (T. candida) |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | $1.75$ | $0.21$ | $0.43$ | $0.52$ | $0.00$ | *** |
|  | 01_B12 | 2 | $1.27$ | $0.18$ | $0.22$ | $0.19$ | $0.16$ | Ns |
|  | $32008$ | 4 | $2.30$ | $0.67$ | $0.57$ | $-0.18$ | $0.00$ | *** |

APPENDIX B. (cont.)

|  | C0444 | 2 | 1.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.95 | Ns |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zou-Collines (T. candida) | C0241 | 4 | 1.19 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.41 | 0.00 | $* * *$ |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.19 | 0.18 | 0.16 | -0.10 | 0.49 | Ns |
|  | $\mathbf{0 1 \_ B 1 2}$ | 2 | 1.49 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.12 | 0.42 | Ns |
|  | $\mathbf{3 2 0 0 8}$ | 5 | 2.84 | 0.79 | 0.65 | -0.22 | 0.00 | $* *$ |
|  | $\mathbf{C 0 4 4 4}$ | 2 | 1.14 | 0.13 | 0.13 | -0.07 | 0.60 | Ns |
| Oueme-Plateau (T. candida) | $\mathbf{C 0 2 4 1}$ | 2 | 1.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -0.02 | 0.89 | Ns |
|  | 7_02K06 | 2 | 1.10 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.79 | 0.00 | $* * *$ |
|  | $\mathbf{0 1 \_ B 1 2}$ | 2 | 1.60 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.22 | 0.12 | Ns |
|  | $\mathbf{3 2 0 0 8}$ | 4 | 2.73 | 0.82 | 0.63 | -0.29 | 0.02 | $* *$ |
|  | $\mathbf{C 0 4 4 4}$ | 2 | 1.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.94 | Ns |

## APPENDIX C

## Information on the insect mitogenomes included in the phylogenetic analysis

| Species | Family | Length (bp) | Accession Number | Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Antheraea pernyi | Saturniidae | 15566 | AY242996 | Liu et al. 2008 |
| Antheraea yamamai | Saturniidae | 15338 | EU726630 | Kim et al. 2009 |
| Eriogyna pyretorum | Saturniidae | 15327 | FJ685653 | Jiang et al. 2009 |
| Saturnia boisduvalii | Saturniidae | 15360 | EF622227 | Hong et al. 2008 |
| Bombyx mori strain Xiafang | Bombycidae | 15664 | AY048187 | Lu et al. 2002 |
| Bombyx mandarina | Bombycidae | 15928 | AB070263 | Yukuhiro et al. 2002 |
| Manduca sexta | Sphingidae | 15516 | EU286785 | Cameron and Whiting 2008 |
| Phthonandria atrilineata | Geometridae | 15499 | EU569764 | Yang et al. 2009 |
| Helicoverpa armigera | Noctuidae | 15347 | GU188273 | Yin et al. 2010 |
| Sesamia inferens | Noctuidae | 15413 | JN039362 | Unpublished |
| Lymantria dispar | Erebidae | 15569 | FJ617240 | Unpublished |
| Hyphantria cunea | Arctiidae | 15481 | GU592049 | Liao et al. 2010 |
| Acraea issoria | Nymphalidae | 15245 | GQ376195 | Hu et al. 2010 |
| Apatura metis | Nymphalidae | 15236 | JF801742 | Zhang et al. 2012 |
| Calinaga davidis | Nymphalidae | 15267 | HQ658143 | Unpublished |
| Hipparchia autonoe | Nymphalidae | 15489 | GQ868707 | Kim et al. 2006 |
| Sasakia charonda | Nymphalidae | 15244 | AP011824 | Unpublished |
| Sasakia charonda kuriyamaensis | Nymphalidae | 15222 | AP011825 | Unpublished |
| Coreana raphaelis | Lycaenidae | 15314 | DQ102703 | Kim et al. 2006 |
| Papilio maraho | Papilionidae | 16094 | FJ810212 | Unpublished |
| Teinopalpus aureus | Papilionidae | 15242 | HM563681 | Unpublished |

## APPENDIX C. (cont.)

| Troides aeacus | Papilionidae | 15263 | EU625344 | Unpublished |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parnassius bremeri | Papilionidae | 15389 | FJ871125 | Kim et al. 2009 |
| Adoxophyes honmai | Tortricidae | 15680 | DQ073916 | Lee et al. 2006 |
| Grapholita molesta | Tortricidae | 15717 | HQ392511 | Buckley et al. 2000 |
| Spilonota lechriaspis | Tortricidae | 15368 | HM204705 | Zhao et al. 2011 |
| Chilo suppressalis | Crambidae | 15395 | JF339041 | Chat et al. 2012 |
| Cnaphalocrocis medinalis | Crambidae | 15388 | JN246082 | Chai et al. 2012 |
| Diatraea saccharalis | Crambidae | 15490 | FJ240227 | Li et al. 2011 |
| Maruca vitrata (Old World) | Crambidae | 14054 | HM751150 | Margam et al. 2011 |
| Ostrinia furnacalis | Crambidae | 14536 | AF467260 | Coates et al. 2005 |
| Ostrinia nubilalis | Crambidae | 14535 | AF442957 | Coates et al. 2005 |
| Maruca vitrata (New World) | Crambidae | 15385 | KJ466365 | This study |
| Drosophila melanogaster | Drosophilidae | 19517 | DMU37541 | Lewis et al. 1995 |

## APPENDIX D

Tandem repeats predicted in the mitogenome of M. vitrata (New World)

| Position | Length | Repeats | Sequence |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | 2 | 9 | TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT |
| 40 | 4 | 2 | ATATATAT |
| 62 | 3 | 2 | ATTATT |
| 81 | 4 | 2 | TTTCTTTC |
| 92 | 3 | 2 | TTCTTC |
| 141 | 3 | 2 | TAATAA |
| 152 | 4 | 2 | TAAATAAA |
| 161 | 4 | 2 | AATTAATT |
| 170 | 2 | 3 | ATATAT |
| 181 | 4 | 2 | AATTAATT |
| 219 | 4 | 4 | AATTAATTAATTAATT |
| 254 | 3 | 2 | TAATAA |
| 272 | 2 | 9 | ATATATATATATATATAT |
| 311 | 2 | 3 | TTTTTT |
| 319 | 4 | 2 | ATAAATAA |
| 328 | 2 | 3 | AAAAAA |

## APPENDIX E

Multiple sequence alignment of mitogenome sequences from M. vitrata (Old World) (MvOW), and M. vitrata (New World) (MvNW)

| MvNW |  | TTAAAAATAAGCTAAATTAAGCTTTTGGGTTCATACCTCAAATATAAAGG | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MvOW | 1 |  | 0 |
| MvNW | 51 | AATAACCTTTTTTTTAAAAATAAAGTGCCTGATTAAAGGATTATTCTGAT | 100 |
| MvOW | 1 |  | 0 |
| MvNW | 101 | AGGATAAATTAAGTAGTTTTTCTACCTTTATTATATTTTATAGAATTAAA | 150 |
| MvOW | 1 |  | 0 |
| MvNW | 151 | CTATATCTAATAGTATCAAAAACTATTGTGCATCTTACACTAAAATATAA | 200 |
| MvOW | 1 |  | 0 |
| MvNW | 201 | TTATAAATTTTTATTTATAAAAAGAATTCTTTTATTTTAAATTTTTTTC | 250 |
| MvOW | 1 |  | 0 |
| MvNW |  | AATTTTAATTCTAATAAAATATTTTTCTTATTTATTATTTTTTTCAGAAC <br>  | 300 |
| MvOW | 1 | ---TTAAATTCTAATAAAATATTTTTCTTATTTATTATTTTTTTCAGAAC | 47 |
| MvNW | 301 | ATTAATCTCTATTTCTTCTAATTCTTGATTTGGTTGCTGAATTGGATTAG <br>  | 350 |
| Mvow | 48 | ATTAATCTCTATTTCTTCTAATTCTTGATTTGGTTGCTGAATTGGATTAG | 97 |
| MvNW |  | AAATTAATTTATTAAGTTTTATCCCCCTAATTAATAATTCTAATAATATT <br>  | 400 |
| MvOW | 98 | AAATTAATTTATTAAGTTTTATCCCCCTAATTAATAATTCTAATAATATT | 147 |
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## MvOW
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## MvOW

MvNW
MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

401 TTATCTACAGAAGCCTCATTAAAATATTTTCTAGTACAATCAATTGCTTC

148 TTATCTACAGAAGCCTCATTAAAATATTTTCTAGTACAATCAATTGCTTC
451 TATTAATCTATTATTTTGTATTATTTTTAAAATAATCTTATTAAAAAATT

198 TATTAATCTATTATTTTGTATTATTTTTAAAATAATCTTATTAAAAAATT
501 TTGAAATAAATAATATTTTATCAATCTTAATTAATTCATCACTATTAATA

248 TTGAAATAAATAATATTTTATCAATCTTAATTAATTCATCACTATTAATA
551 AAAATGGGATCAACCCCTTTTCACTTTTGATTCCCTAATATTGTAGAAGG

298 AAAATGGGATCAACCCCTTTTCACTTTTGATTCCCTAATATTGTAGAAGG
601 ATtATCCTGATTTAATAATTTTATTTTAATAACTTGACAAAAAATTACCC

348 ATTATCCTGATTTAATAATTTTATTTTAATAACTTGACAAAAAATTACCC
651 CCATAATTTTATTATCATATTATTTTAATAAAAATTTTTTAATTATTATT

398 CCATAATTTTATTATCATATTATTTTAATAAAAATTTTTTAATTATTATT
701 ATTATTATAAATTCTATTATTGGTGCTATTGGAGGATTAAATCAAACTTC

448 ATTATTATAAATTCTATTATTGGTGCTATTGGAGGATTAAATCAAACTTC
751 TCTACGAAAATTAATGGCTTTTTCATCAATTAATAATTTAAGATGAATAA

498 TCTACGAAAATTAATGGCTTTTTCATCAATTAATAATTTAAGATGAATAA
801 TTTCTTCTTTAATAATCAGAGAAAATTTATGAATAATATATTTTTTTTTT

548 TTTCTTCTTTAATAATCAGAGAAAATTTATGAATAATATA----TTTTTT

## MvNW

MvOW

MvNW

MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

MvOW

MvNW
MvOW
MvNW

MvOW

MvNW

MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

MvOW

851 TATA-GTTTTTTAATTAGAATTATATGTTTATTATTTTACTTGACTAATA

594 TATATGTTTTTTAATTAGAATTATATGTTTATTATTTTACTTGACTAATA

900 TATATTTTATTAATCAATTATTTTTTTTTAATATAAATTACATAATTAAA
 644 TATATTTTATTAATCAATTATTTTTTTTTAATATAAATTACATAATTAAA

950 TTGTCTTTATTAATTAATTTTTTATCTTTAGGGGGTTTACCTCCATTTAT

694 TTGTCTTTATTAATTAATTTTTTATCTTTAGGGGGTTTACCTCCATTTAT
1000 TGGATTCTTTCCTAAATGAATCATTATTAATTTCTTACTAAAAAATAATT 1049

744 TGGATTTTTTCCTAAGTGAATTATTATTAATTTTCTATTAAAAAATAATT

794 TTTTTTTTTTAACTTTTATTTTAATTATAATAAGATTAGTTTTATTATTT
1100 TTTTATATTCGAATTTTATATTCATCATTCATATTTAATTACTTAAAATT 1149

844 TTTTATATTCGAATTTTATATTCATCATTTATATTTAATTATTTAAAATT
1150 AAAATGAATAAAAATTTTTATTAAAAATAAAATAATATATTTTATTAATT894 AAAATGAATAAAAATTTTCATCAAAAATAAAATAATATATTTTATTAATT
1200 TACTTTCACTTATTTCTTCTATAGGCTTAATTTTAAGTAATTTTTTTTAT944 TTCTTTCACTTATTTCTTCTATAGGTTTAATTTTAAGTAATTTTTTTTAT

1250 TTA------TAAGAAGGTTTTAAGTTAATTAAAACTAATAATCTTCAAAA

994 TTATAATTTTAAGAAGGTTTTAAGTTAATTTAAACTAATAATCTTCCAAA793843893943
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1294 TTATTTATAAAGAAACATTCTTTAAGCCTTAATAATTTTTTATACCTTAA

1044 TTACGTACAATGAAATATTCTTTAAGCCTTAATAATTTTTTATACCTTAA

1344 AATTTGCAATTTTATATCATTAATTT-GAATATAAGACCTATAATAAAAA

1094 AATTTGCAATTTTATATCTTTAATTTCGAATATAAGACGTATAACAAAAA
1393 AGAATTTTTCTTGTTAATAAATTTACAATTTATCGCTTATAACCTCAGCC

1144 AGAATTTTTGGCGTCAATAAATTTACAATTTATCGCTTATAACGTCAGCC
1443 ATTTTATTATTATAGCGAAAATGAATTTACTCAACAAATCATAAAGATAT

1194 ATTTTATTA--ATAGCGAAAATGAATTTACTCAACAAATCATAAAGATAT

1493 TGGAACATTATATTTTATTTTTGGAATTTGAGCAGGAATAGTAGGAACAT

1242 TGGTACATTATATTTTATTTTTGGAATTTGAGCAGGAATAGTAGGAACAT
1543 CTTTAAGTTTATTAATTCGAGCAGAATTAGGTAATCCAGGATCTTTAATT

1292 CTTTAAGTTTATTAATTCGAGCAGAATTAGGTAATCCTGGATCTTTAATT

1593 GGAGATGATCAAATTTATAATACTATTGTAACAGCTCACGCATTTATTAT

1342 GGAGATGATCAAATTTATAATACTATTGTAACAGCTCATGCATTTATTAT
1643 AATTTTTTTTATGGTTATACCTATTATAATTGGAGGATTTGGAAATTGAT

1392 AATTTTTTTTATAGTAATACCTATTATAATTGGAGGATTTGGAAACTGAT
1693 TAGTTCCTTTAATATTAGGAGCCCCAGATATAGCTTTTCCACGAATAAAT

1442 TAGTTCCTTTAATATTAGGAGCTCCAGATATAGCTTTCCCACGAATAAAT1193

MvNW
MvOW
MvNW
MvOW
MvNW
MvOW
MvNW

MvOW
MvNW
MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

## MvOW

MvNW
MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

| 1743 | AATATAAGATTCTGAATATTACCCCCATCATTAACTTTATTAATTTCGAG | 1792 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1492 | AATATAAGATTTTGAATATTACCCCCATCATTAACTTTATTAATTTCGAG | 1541 |
| 1793 | AAGAATTGTAGAAAATGGAGCAGGTACTGGATGAACAGTATACCCCCCTC <br>  | 1842 |
| 1542 | AAGAATTGTAGAAAATGGAGCAGGTACTGGATGAACAGTATACCCCCCTC | 1591 |
| 1843 | TTTCATCTAATATTGCTCATGGAGGAAGATCAGTTGATTTAGCTATTTTT | 1892 |
|  |  |  |
| 1592 | TCTCATCAAATATTGCCCACGGAGGTAGATCAGTTGATTTAGCTATTTTT | 1641 |
| 1893 | TCTTTACATTTAGCTGGAATTTCATCAATTTTAGGGGCAATCAATTTTAT | 1942 |
|  |  |  |
| 1642 | TCTTTACATTTAGCTGGTATTTCATCAATTTTAGGAGCAATTAATTTTAT | 1691 |
| 1943 | TACTACGATTATTAATATACGAGTAAATGGATTAACTTTTGATCAAATAC | 1992 |
|  |  |  |
| 1692 | TACCACAATTATTAATATACGAGTAAATGGACTATCCTTTGATCAAATAC | 1741 |
| 1993 | CTTTATTTGTTTGATCTGTTGGAATTACAGCTCTTTTATTATTACTTTCT | 2042 |
|  |  |  |
| 1742 | CTCTATTTGTTTGGTCTGTTGGAATTACAGCTCTTTTACTTTTACTTTCT | 1791 |
| 2043 | CTACCAGTTTTAGCAGGTGCTATTACTATACTTTTAACAGACCGAAATCT | 2092 |
|  |  |  |
| 1792 | TTACCAGTTTTAGCAGGTGCTATTACTATACTTTTAACAGATCGAAATTT | 1841 |
| 2093 | TAATACTTCTTTTTTTGATCCAGCTGGAGGAGGAGATCCAATTTTATATC | 2142 |
|  |  |  |
| 1842 | AAATACTTCTTTTTTTGACCCAGCTGGAGGAGGAGATCCAATTTTATATC | 1891 |
| 2143 | AACATTTATTTTGATTTTTTGGTCACCCTGAAGTTTATATTTTAATTCTT | 2192 |
|  |  |  |
| 1892 | AACATTTATTTTGATTTTTTGGACATCCAGAAGTTTACATTTTAATTTTA | 194 |
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2193 CCTGGATTTGGAATAATTTCCCATATTATTTCACAAGAAAGTGGAAAAAA
||||||||||.|||||||||||||||||.|||||||.||.|||||
1942 CCTGGATTTGGTATAATTTCCCATATTATTTCCCAAGAAAGAGGTAAAAA

2243 AGAAACATTTGGATCTTTAGGAATAATTTATGCTATAATAGCAATTGGAT

1992 GGAAACATTTGGATCTTTAGGGATAATTTATGCTATAATAGCAATTGGAT
2293 TATTAGGATTTGTAGTATGAGCTCATCATATATTTACAGTAGGTATAGAT

2042 TATTAGGATTTGTAGTATGAGCTCATCATATATTTACAGTAGGTATAGAT
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2643 TTATTTACTGGTCTTACTCTTAACCCTTTTATATTAAAGATTCAATTTTT

2392 TTATTTACAGGACTTACTCTTAATCCTTTCATACTAAAAATTCAATTCTT
2693 TACTATATTTATTGGAGTAAATTTAACATTTTTCCCACAACATTTCTTAG

2442 TACTATATTTATTGGAGTAAATTTAACATTCTTTCCTCAACACTTCTTAG
2743 GATTAGCAGGAATACCCCGACGATATTCTGATTATCCTGATGTTTATACT

2492 GATTAGCTGGAATACCTCGACGATATTCAGATTATCCTGATGTCTATACT
2793 TCATGAAATATTGCTTCTTCTTTAGGATCTTATATCTCTCTATTAGCAGT

2542 TCATGAAATATTGCTTCTTCATTAGGATCTTATATTTCTTTATTAGCTGT
2843 ATTATTATTTTTAATTATTATTTGAGAATCTATAATTAGTCAACGAATAA

2592 GATATTATTTCTAATTATTATTTGAGAATCAATAATTAGTCAACGAATAA
2893 TTTTATTTTCATTAAATTTATCATCTTCAATTGAATGATATCAAAATTTA |||||||||||||||||||||||||.||||||||||||||||||
2642 TTTTATTTTCATTAAATTTATCATCTTCTATTGAATGATATCAAAATTTA

2943 CCACCTGCAGAACATTCATATAATGAACTTCCAATTTTAAGAAATTTCTA

2692 CCACCTGCAGAACATTCATATAATGAACTTCCAATTTTAAGAAATTTCTA
2993 ATATGGCAGATTATATGTAATGGATTTAAACCCCATTTATAAAGGATTAT
 2742 ATATGGCAGATTATATGTAATGGATTTAAACCCCATTTATAAAGGATTAT

3043 CCTTTTTTTAGAAATGGCAACATGATCTAATTTTAACTTACAAAACGGAG

2792 CCTTTTTTTAGAAATGGCAACATGATCTAATTTTAACTTACAAAATGGAG
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3093 CATCTCCACTTATAGAACAAATTATTTTTTTCCATGATCATACTTTAATT

2842 CATCTCCACTTATAGAACAAATTATTTTTTTCCATGATCATACTTTAATT
3143 ATTTTAATTATAACTACTATTTTAGTAGGATATTTAATATTAAGTTTATT

2892 ATTTTAATTATAATTACTGTATTAGTAGGATATTTAATATTAAGATTATT
3193 TTTTAATAAATATATTAATCGATTTTTATTAGAAGGTCAAATAATTGAGT

2942 TTTTAATAAATATATTAATCGATTTTTATTAGAAGGTCAAATAATTGAAT
3243 TAATTTGAACAATTTTACCAGCTATTACTTTAATTTTTATTGCTTTACCT

2992 TAATTTGAACTATTTTACCAGCTATTACTTTAATTTTTATTGCTCTACCC
3293 TCATTACGTTTACTTTATTTATTAGATGAACTTAATAATCCATTAATTAC

3042 TCTTTACGTTTACTTTATTTATTAGATGAACTTAATAACCCATTAATTAC
3343 TTTAAAATCTATTGGCCATCAATGATATTGAAGATACGAATATTCAGATT

3092 CTTAAGATCTATTGGACATCAATGATATTGAAGATATGAGTATTCAGATT

3393 TTAATAATATTGAATTTGATTCATATATAACCCCTATGAATGAAATAAAT

3142 TTAACAATATTGAATTTGATTCATATATAACCCCTGTAAATGAAATGAAT
3443 AATAATAATTTTCGATTATTAGATGTTGATAATCGAATTGTTTTACCGAT

3192 AACAATAGTTTCCGATTATTAGATGTTGATAATCGAATTGTTTTACCAAT
3493 GGGGAATCAAATTCGAATTATAGTAACTGCTACAGATGTTATTCACTCAT

3242 GGGTAATCAAATTCGAATTATAGTAACTGCTACAGATGTTATCCATTCAT
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3543 GAACTATCCCATCTTTAGGTGTAAAAGTAGATGCTAATCCAGGACGATTA

3292 GAACCATCCCATCCTTAGGAGTAAAAGTAGATGCTAATCCAGGACGATTA
3593 AATCAAACAAATTTCTTTATTAATCGTCCTGGAATTTTTTATGGACAATG

3342 AATCAAACAAATTTCTTTATTAATCGACCTGGAATTTTTTATGGACAATG
3643 TTCTGAAATTTGTGGAGCAAACCACAGTTTTATACCTATTGTTATTGAAA

3392 TTCTGAAATTTGTGGTGCAAATCATAGTTTTATACCTATTGTTATTGAAA
3693 GAATTTCAATTAAAAATTTTATTAATTGAATTAATAATTATTCATCATTA

3442 GAATCTCAATTAAAAATTTTATTAATTGAATTAATAATTATTCATCATTA

3743 GATGACTGAAAGCAAGTACTGGTCTCTTAAACCATTTTATAGTAAATTAG

3492 GATGACTGAAAGCAAGTACTGGTCTCTTAAACCATTTTATAGTAAATTAG
3793 CATTTACTTCTAATGATTAAAGAATTAGTTAAACCTATAACATAAATATG ||||||||||||||.||||||||||||||..|||||||||.|||
3542 CATTTACTTCTAATGAATAAAGAATTAGTTAAATTTATAACATAAGTATG

3843 TCAAATTTAAATTATTATTTCAT-ATAATATTCTTTTATCCCTCAAATAA

3592 TCAAACTTAAATTATTA--TAATAATAATATTCTTTTATTCCTCAAATAA
3892 TACCAATTAATTGAATTTTTCTTTCTTTTTTTTTGTTATTATTTTTATT
 3640 TACCAATTAATTGAATTTTTTCTTTCTTTTTTTTTGTTATTGTTTTTATT

3942 ATTTTTAATATCATAAATTATTTTATTTTTATTAATAAAAATAATAGAAA

3690 ATTTTTAATATTATAAATTATTATATTTTTATTAATAAAAATAATAAAAA

3592
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3992 TAATATTTTTTTTCAAAAAAAAATAAAAACCTATTTTGAAAATGATAAC

3740 TAATATCTTTTTTTTAAAAAAAAATCAAAACTTATTTTGAAAATGATAAC
4042 TAATCTTTTTTCAATTTTTGACCCATCTACTAATTTATTATATTTACCTT

3790 TAATCTTTTTTCAATTTTTGACCCATCTACTAATTTATTATACTTACCTC
4092 TAAATTGAATTAGAACTTTATTAGGAATTATATTTATTCCTTATTCATTT

3840 TAAATTGAATTAGAACTTTATTAGGGATCATATTTATCCCTTATTCATTT
4142 TGATTAATCCCTAATCGATACTACTTATTTTGAAATTTTATTTTAAATAA

3890 TGATTAATTCCTAATCGATATTATTTATTTTGAAATTTCATTTTAAATAA
4192 ACTCCATAAAGAATTTAAAACTTTATTAGGAAATAATTCAAATGGATCGA
 3940 ACTTCATAAAGAATTTAAAACTTTATTAGGAAATAATTCAAATGGATCAA

4242 CTTTTATTTTTATTTCGATATTTACTTTTGTTCTATTTAATAATTTTTTA

3990 CTTTTATTTTTATTTCAATATTTACTTTTGTATTATTTAATAATTTTTTA
4292 GGATTATTCCCATATATTTTTACTAGAACAAGCCACTTAACCTTATCACT

4040 GGATTATTTCCTTATATTTTTACAAGAACAAGTCATTTAACTTTATCATT
4342 ATCAATTTCACTACCATTGTGATTAAGATTTATATTTTATGGATGAATTA
 4090 ATCAATTTCATTACCATTATGATTAAGATTTATATTTTATGGATGAATTA

4392 ATAATACTCAACATATATTTATTCACATAATTCCACAAGGTACTCCTGGT

4140 ATAATACTCAACATATATTTATTCATATAATTCCTCAAGGAACTCCAGGT

4041
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4442 ATtTTAATACCTTTTATAGTTTTAATTGAAACAATCAGAAATATTATTCG

4190 ATTTTAATACCTTTTATAGTTTTAATTGAAACAATTAGAAATATTATTCG
4492 ACCAGGAACATTAGCTGTTCGACTTACAGCCAATATAATTGCAGGACATT

4240 ACCAGGGACACTAGCTGTTCGACTTACAGCTAATATAATTGCAGGACATT
4542 TATTAATAACTTTATTAAGAGGGACAGGACCTAACTTACCTATTTATTTT

4290 TATTAATAACTTTACTAAGAGGAACAGGACCTAATTTACCTGTATATTTT
4592 ATTATTGTATTAATTATTATTCAAATTTTATTATTAGTTTTAGAATCAGC

4340 ATTGTAGTATTAGTTATTATTCAAATTTTACTACTAGTTTTAGAATCAGC
4642 AgTTGCGGTTATTCAATCTTATGTTATTGCTATTTTAAGACATTATATT

4390 AGTTGCGGTTATTCAATCTTATGTTATTGCTATTTTAAGAACATTATATT
4692 CTAGAGAAGTAAATTAATAT-CTAATGAAAAATAATTTTAATCACCCCTA

4440 CTAGAGAAGTAAATTAATCTACTAATGAAAAATAATTTTAATCACCCCTA
4741 TCATTTAGTTGATTATAGTCCATGACCCTTAACTGGTGCTGTTGGAGTTT

4490 TCACTTAGTTGATTATAGTCCATGACCTTTAACAGGAGCTATTGGAGTTT
4791 TAACCTTAGTAACTGGAATAGTAAAATGATTCCATAATTTTAATATAAAT
 4540 TAACTTTAGTAACTGGAATAGTAAAATGATTCCATAATTTTAATATAAAT

4841 TTATTAATTCTAGGATATTTTATTGTTATTTTAACTATATATCAATGATG

4590 TTATTAATTCTAGGATATTTTATTGTCATCTTAACTATATATCAATGATG

4491

MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

MvOW
MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

MvOW

MvNW
MvOW
MvNW

MvOW

MvNW

MvOW

MvNW
MvOW

MvNW

MvOW

4891 ACGAGATATTTGCCGAGAAGGAACTCTTCAAGGAAAACATACAATTTTAG

4640 ACGAGATATTTGTCGAGAAGGAACTCTTCAAGGTAAACATACGATTTTAG

4941 TAACTAAAGGATTACGATGAGGAATAATTTTATTTATTATTTCAGAAATT

4690 TAACTAAAGGATTACGATGAGGAATAATTTTATTTATTATTTCAGAAGTT
4991 TTCTTTTTTGTATCTTTTTTTTGAGCTTTTTTTCATAGAAGTTTATCACC ||.|||||.||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
4740 TTTTTTTTCGTATCTTTTTTTTGAGCTTTTTTTCATAGAAGTTTATCACC

5041 AAATATTGAAATTGGTGCTTTATGACCCCCTATAAGTATCACCCCATTTA

4790 AAATATTGAAATTGGTGCTTTATGACCTCCAATAAGTATTACTCCATTTA

5091 ATCCTTTCCAAATTCCTCTCTTAAATACTATTATTTTAATTACTTCAGGA
|||||||.||||||||||.||||||||||||||||||||| ||.|||
4840 ATCCTTTTCAAATTCCTCTTTTAAATACTATTATTTTAATTACATCCGGA
5141 ATTACAGTTACATGAGCTCATCATGCAATTATAGAAAATAATCATTCACA

4890 ATTACAGTTACATGAGCACATCATGCCATTATAGAAAATAACCATTCACA

5191 AATAACCCAAGGACTTTTTTTTACTATTATTTTAGGAATTTATTTTACAA

4940 AATAACTCAAGGACTCTTTTTTACTATTGTTTTAGGAATTTATTTTACTA

5241 TTTTACAAGCATATGAATATATTGAAGCACCTTTTTCTATTGCTGATAGT ||||||||||.||||||||||||||||||||||.||||||.|||||. 4990 TTTTACAAGCTTATGAATATATTGAAGCACCTTTTACTATTGCAGATAGA

5291 ATTTACGGATCAACTTTTTTTATAGCTACTGGATTTCATGGATTACATGT

5040 ATTTATGGATCAACTTTTTTTATAGCTACTGGATTCCATGGATTACATGT

4940
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5341 AATAATCGGAACATTATTTTTATTAATTTGTTTAATTCGGCATATTTATA

5090 AATAATTGGAACTTTATTTTTATTAATTTGCTTAATTCGACATATTTATA

5391 ATCATTTTTCTAATAATCATCATTTTGGCTTTGAAGCTGCTGCTTGATAT |||||||||||||||.||||||||||.||||||||||||.|||||
5140 ATCATTTTTCTAATAACCATCATTTTGGATTTGAAGCTGCTGCCTGATAT
5441 TGACATTTCGTAGATGTAGTTTGATTATTCCTTTATATTTCTATTTATTG

5190 TGACATTTCGTAGACGTAGTTTGATTATTCCTTTATATTTCTATTTATTG

5491 ATGAGGAAATTAATTATTTATATAATATATTTAGTATATTTGACTTCCAA
$||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||\mid$
5240 ATGAGGAAATTAATTATTTATATAATATATTTAGTATATTTGACTTCCAA

5541 TCAAAAAGTTTAATTTTTTTTTAATATAAATAATTTTATTAATTTTATAT
|||||||||||| ||.||||||||||||||||||||||||||.|||
5290 TCAAAAAGTTTAA-TTATTTTTAATATAAATAATTTTATTAATTTTTTAT
5591 ATGACCTTAATTTTAATTTTAATTTCTAATATTATAATATTTTTATCAAT

5339 ATAACTTTAATTTTAATTTTAATTTCTAATATTATAATATTTTTATCAAT

5641 TTTACTATCAAAAAAATCTTTTTCTGATCGAGAAAAATGTTCACCTTTCG
 5389 TTTATTATCAAAAAAATCTTTTTCTGACCGTGAAAAATGTTCACCTTTTG

5691 AATGTGGATTTGACCCAAAATCTTCTGCTCGAATCCCCTTTTCAATACAT
 5439 AATGTGGATTTGACCCTAAATCTTCTGCTCGAATTCCTTTCTCTATACAT

5741 TTTTTTTTAATTACTGTAATTTTTTTGATTTTTGATGTTGAAATTGCATT
 5489 TTTTTTTTAATTACCGTAATTTTTTTAATTTTTGATGTAGAAATTGCATT
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5791 AATCTTCCCAATTATTAATTTATTTAAAATTACTAATTTTATTATTTGAT


$$
5539 \text { AATTTTTCCAATTATTAATTTATTTAAAATTACTAATTTTATTATTTGAT }
$$

5841 CTAAAATTAGTTTTTTTTTTATTATTATTTTACTTTTAGGTTTATTTCAT
 5589 CTAAAATTAGTTTTTTTTTTATTATTATTTTACTTTTAGGATTATTTCAC

5891 GAATGAAATCAAAATATACTTAATTGAATTAATT---AGGATTATAGTTT

5639 GAATGAAATCAAAACATACTTAATTGAATTAATTAAAAGGATTATAGTTT
5938 AAAATAAAACATTTGATTTGCATTCAAAAAATATTGATTTATCAATTTAT

5689 -AAATAAAACTTTTGATTTGCATTCAAAAAATATTGATTTATCAATTTAT
5988 CTTAAGTAAGAAGCAATTATGCATTTAATTTCGACTTAAAAGACAGAGTA
 5738 CTTAAGTAAGAAGCAATTATGCATTTAATTTCGACTTAAAAGACAGAGTA

6038 CAAGACTCCTTACTTATTAATTGAAACCAAAAAGAGGTATATCACTGTTA

5788 TTTAACTCCTTACTTATTAATTGAAACCAAAAAGAGGTATATCACTGTTA
6088 ATGATAACATTGAATTTAAAATTCCAATTAAATTAGAAATATAAAGTTTA

5838 ATGATAACATTGAATTTAAAATTCCAATTAAATTAGAAATATAAAGTTTA
6138 AAATTAAGCTGCTAACTTAATTTTTAGTGGTTTAATTCCATTAATATTTC
 5888 AAATTAAGCTGCTAACTTAATTTTTAGTGGTTTAATTCCATTAATATTTC

6188 TTATTTATATAGTTTATTTAAAACATTACATTTTCATTGTAAAAATAAAA

5938 TTATTTATATAGTTTA-TTAAAACATTACATTTTCATTGTAAAAATAAAA
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6238 AAATT-TTTTTTATAAATATATTTAAAGATTAAAATAATCTCCCTAATAT

5987 AAATTATTTTTTATAAATATATTTAAAGATTAAAATAATCTCCCTAATAT

6287 CTTCAATATTATACTCTAAATTATAAGCTATTTAAATAAAATATAATTAT

6037 CTTCAATATTATACTCTAAATTATAAGCTATTTAAATAAAATATAATTAT
6337 TATTATAAAATAAATTATTATTCATAAAATAAAACTAAATAAATAAATTT
 6087 TATTATAAAATAAATTATTATTCATAAAATAAAACTAAATAAATAAATTT

6387 TATAATTAGTTAATTGAAATAAATTATATAAAACTGAATACTTTTTTAAA

6137 TATAATTAGTCAATTGAAATAAATTATATAAAACTGAATACTTTTTTAAA

6437 ATTATATAAATTCCATAACCGCTATAAACTTCTCTTCAACCTATATCAAT

6187 ATTATATAAATTCCATAACCGCTATAAACTTCTCTTCAACCTATATCAAT
6487 ATTTTTCAATAAATCATAACCAAAATTTAAAAAATGATAATTTAAACCAT

6237 ATTTTTCAATAAATCATAACCAAAATTTAAAAAATGATAATTTAAACCAT

6537 AAGTAGAAAGTCTAGGTATAAATCATATTATTCTTAAAAAATTTCTAACT
 6287 AAGTAGAAAGTCTAGGTATAAATCATATTATTCTTAAAAAACTTCTAATT

6587 TCATAACTAATAAGAAACTTATTAATTGAATAAATATTTATATTTCTAAC

6337 TCATAACTAATAATAAATTTATTTATTGAATAAATATTTATATTTCTAAT
6637 TAAATAACCTAATAGTAAACCTAAAATTCTAACATAAATTACTATTATTT

6387 TAAGTAACCTAATAATAAACCTAAAATACTAACATAAATTACTATTATCT
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6687 TTAAATTAAAAGGCAAATAAATTATATAAGGATAAGGAAAAATTATTCAC $|\cdot| \cdot||||||\cdot||||||||||||||||||||||||||\mid \cdot$
6437 TCATATTAAAAGGTAAATAAATTATATAAGGATAAGGAAAAATTATTCAT

6737 ATTAATATACTTCCTCTAATAATTCTTATAAATAATAAAATAAATATACT |||||.||.||.||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| 6487 ATTAACATTCTACCTCTAATAATTCTTATAAATAATAAAATAAATATACT

6787 TTTTAATATAGTAAAATCTTCATCATATAAATTATAAATAGATAATAAAT |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| 6537 TTTTAATATAGTAAAATCTTCATCATATAAATTATAAATAGATAATAAAT

6837 TAAAATCATTTACTATTAAATATATTGTTAAACGAAATCTATAAAATATT
 6587 TAAAATCATTCACTATTAAATATATTGTTAAACGAAATCTATAAAATATA

6887 GTTAATCCTGTAGAAATATAATATAATAAAAAAATAAAAAAATTTAAATT |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| 6637 GTTAATCCTGTAGAAATATAATATAATAAAAAAATAAAAAAATTTAAATT

6937 TCTTATTCTAACTATTTCTAAAATTAAATCCTTAGAATAAAAACCAGCTA

6687 TCTTATTCTTACTATTTCTAAAATTAAATCCTTAGAATAAAATCCAGCTA

6987 AAAAAGGAATACCACATAAAGCTATATTAGAAATATTTATACATAAAGAA
 6737 AGAAAGGGATACCACATAAAGCTATATTAGAAATATTTATACATAAAGAA

7037 GTTAAAGGAATAAATCTACCAATTCCCCCTATAAAACGAATATCTTGAAT |||||||||||||||||||||||||.||||||||||||||||||||| 6787 GTTAAAGGAATAAATCTACCAATTCCACCTATAAAACGAATATCTTGAAT

7087 ATCTAATATTATATGAATAATAACCCCAGCACATATAAATAATAAAGCTT ||||.||||||||||||||||||| |||||||||||||||||||||| 6837 ATCTGATATTATATGAATAATAACTCCAGCACATATAAATAATAAAGCTT
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7137 TAAATATAGCATGAGTTAGTAAATGAAAAAAAGCTAAATCAGGTAATCCC

6887 TAAATATAGCATGAGTTAATAAATGAAAAAAAGCTAAATCGGGTAATCCC

7187 ATTCTTAAAATTCTTATTATTAAACCTAATTGTCTTAAAGTAGATAAAGC |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||||
6937 ATTCTTAAAATTCTTATTATTAAACCTAATTGACTTAAAGTAGATAAAGC
7237 AATAATTTTTTTTAAATCAAATTCATAATTAGCAGAAATTCCAGCTATAA |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||| 6987 AATAATTTTTTTTAAATCAAATTCATAATTAGCAGAAATTCCTGCTATAA

7287 ATATAGTTAAACCAGATAATAATATTAAAAATTTTATAAACATTATATCA

7037 ATATAGTTAATCCAGATAATAATATTAAAAATTTTATAAATATTATATCA

7337 ACTAATAATAAATTAAAACGAATTAATAAATAAACTCCTGCTGTTACTAA ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||
7087 ACTAATAATAAATTAAAACGAATTAATAAATAAACACCTGCTGTTACTAA
7387 AGTAGAAGAATGCACTAAAGCAGAAACTGGAGTTGGTGCTGCTATTGCAG

7137 AGTAGAAGAATGAACTAAAGCAGATACTGGAGTTGGTGCTGCTATAGCAG

7437 CAGGTAATCAAGATCTAAAAGGAATTTGAGCACTTTTAGTTATAGCTGCT $||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||\cdot|||||| \cdot|$. 7187 CAGGTAATCAAGATCTAAAAGGAATTTGAGCACTTTTTGTTATAGCAGCA

7487 ATAATAATTATTCTACCGACTATTATTATATAATAATCATTCTTTATAAA ||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||||||||||.||.||||| 7237 ATAATAATTATTCTACCAACTATTATTATATAATAATCATTTTTCATAAA

7537 TTCTAAATAAAAAATATAATTTCATCTTCCATAATTTATTATTCAAGAAA

7287 TTCTAAATAAAAAATATAATTTCAACTCCCATAATTTATTATTCAAGAAA
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7587 TAACTATTAAAATAAATACATCCCCAATTCGATTAGATAAAGCAGTTAAT

7337 TAACTATTAAAATAAATACATCACCAATTCGATTAGATAGGGCTGTTAAT
7637 ATCCCAGCATTATATGATTTAATATTTTGATAATAAATTACCAAACAATA

7387 ATTCCAGCATTATATGATTTAATATTTTGATAATAAATGACTAAACAATA
7687 AGATACTAAACCTAAACCATCTCAACCTAATAAAATTCTAATAATATTAG

7437 AGATACTAATCCTAATCCATCCCAACCTAATAAAATTCTAATAATATTAG
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8037 AACAAATTGAATTTTTAAAAATAACTTAAAATGATATTTATCATATTTTC

7787 AACAAATTGAATTTTTAAAAATAACCTAAAATGATATTTATCATATATTC
7836

8087 GACACCACAAATCAATATTTTAATTTAAATTATTTAAGTTAAAATCAAAT ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
7837 GACACCACAAATCAATATTTTAATTTAAATTATTTAAGTTAAAATCAAAT

8137 TATTACATAATCAATCTTTATAACTAAAATATTTAAAGGTAATCAATGTA ||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||||||||||||
7887 TATTACATAATCAATCTTTATAATTAAAATATTTAAAGGTAATCAATGTA

8187 ATATTATTAATAAATATTCACGAGATAAGCCTGTATAAAATCTATAAATT

7937 ATATTATTAATAAATATTCACGAGATAAACCTATATAAAATCTATAAATT

8237 CCTGAATAATATTTACCATGTTGAATATAAGAATATAAATATAGTCTATA |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||.||||||
7987 CCTGAATAATATTTACCATGTTGAATATAAGAATATAAATATAATCTATA
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8487 TATGTAATCGTTCATAATTAATATTAGCTAAACAAAATATACCAGAAGAA

8237 TATGTAATCGTTCATAATTAATATTTGCTAAACAAAATATCCCAGAAGAA
8537 CATAATCCATGACCAATTATTAAAATATAAGAACCAATAAATCCTCAATA

8287 CATAATCCATGACCAATTATTAAAATATAAGAACCAATAAATCCTCAATA
8587 ATTTATTGTTATAATTCCACCAATAACTATTCTTATATGAGCAACCGAAG

8337 ATTTATAGTTATAATCCCCCCAATAACTATTCTTATATGAGCAACTGAAG
8637 AATAAGCAATTAATGATTTAATATCAACTTGACATAAACACTTTAATCTA

8387 AATAAGCAATTAAAGATTTAATATCAACTTGACAAAAACATTTTAATCTA

8687 ATATAAAATCCACCTACTAAACTAATAGTAATAAAAATGATATTATATTT

8437 ATATAAAAACCTCCAACTAAACTAATAGTAATAAAAATAATATTATATTT
8737 TAAATTTATATTTTGTAATATAATTATTAAACGAATTAAACCATAACCTC

8487 TAAATTTATATTTTGTAATATAATTATTAAACGAATTAGACCATACCCTC

8787 CTAATTTTAATATAATACCAGCTAAGATTATAGAACCTGAAACTGGTGCT

8537 CTAACTTTAATATAATTCCTGCTAAAATTATAGAACCTGAAACTGGAGCT

8837 TCAACATGAGCTTTAGGTAATCATAAATGAACAAAATATATTGGTATTTT ||||||||.||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| 8587 TCAACATGGGCTTTAGGTAATCATAAATGAACAAAATATATTGGTATTTT

8887 AACTAAAAAAGCTATAATTATAGAAAAATATAATAAATATAAATCAAAAT

8637 TACTAAAAAAGCTATAATTATAGAAAAATATAATAAATATAAATCAAAAT
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8937 TAAAAATTTCATAAAATAAATTATAATATGATTTACTTCATTAAAAATA
$\|\|\|\|\|\|\cdot\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\cdot\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\| \mid$
8687 TAAAAAATTTTATAAAATAAATTATAATATAATTTACTTCATTAAAAATA

8987 TAAAAAATACCTAATAATAAAGGTAAAGAAACAATAAAGTATAAAATAA

8737 TAAAAAATACCTAATAACAAAGGTAAAGAAACAAATAAAGTATAAAATAA
9037 TAAATATATTCCAGCTTGAATTCGTTCAGGTTGATAACCTCAACCAATAA

8787 TAAATATATTCCAGCTTGAATCCGTTCAGGTTGATAACCTCAACCAATAA
9087 TTAATAATAATGTAGGAATTAATCTTCCTTCAAAAAATAAATAAAATATA

8837 TTAATATTAAAGTAGGAATTAATCTCCCCTCAAAAAATAAATAAAATATA

9137 AATATATTTATAACTCTAAAAGTTAAATATAATATTATTAATAGAAAAAT

8887 AATATGTTTATAACTCTAAAAGTTAAATATAATATTATTAATAAAAAAAT
9187 TAAATTAAATAAAAAAAAATTTAAATAATAATCTTCTTTATATAAATTTT

8937 TAAATTGAATAAAAAAAAATTTAAATAATAACCCTGCTTATATAAATTTT

9237 CACTAGCCATAATTATTAAAATACAAATTCAAACTCTTAATATAATTAAA
 8987 CTCTAGCTATAATTATTAAAATACAAATTCAAACTCTTAATAAAATCAAA

9287 CCATAAGATAAAATATCACATGAATATATATAACTAAAATTACTATAAGT
 9037 CCATAAGATAAAATATCACATGAATATATATATCTAAAATTACAATAAGT

9337 TTCAATACTTAATGTTAAATTTATTAATAAAAATATTATAAAAAATAAAA

9087 TTCAATTCTTAATGTTAAATTTATTAATAAAAATATTATAAAAAATAAAA
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9387 TTATTTGAACCATTCAATATATATTAAAATTAAAACATAAAGGAATTATA

9137 TTATTTGAACCATTCAATATATATTAAAATTAAAACATAAAGGAATTAAA
9437 AAAATTATTATAAATAAAAATTTTATCATTATAATAAATTAAAACTTTGA
 9187 AAAATTATTATAAATAAAAATTTTATCATTATAATAAATTAAAACTTTGA

9487 AAATAATCATTTCCATGAGTACGAATTATTGAAACTAAAATTGATAAACC

9237 AAATAATCATTACCATGAGTACGAATTATTGAAACTAAAATTGATAAACC
9537 TAAAGCTCCCTCACAAACTGAGAAAACTAAAAAAACTATTAATATATATA

9287 TAAAGCCCCTTCACATACGGAAAAAACTAAAAAAACTATTAATATATATA
9587 TATCATATTCAATATAATTAAATAATAAAATTATAAAAAAAAAAATTCTT

9337 TATCATATTCAATATAATTAAATAATAAAATTATAAAAAAAAAATTCTT
9637 AAAACAATAAATTCTAATCTTAATAAAACAATCAATAAATGCTTATGTTT ||||||||||.||||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||||
9387 AAAACAATAAACTCTAATCTTAATAAAACAATTAATAAATGCTTATGTTT

9687 AGAAACAAAAATTATATTACCTAAAATAAATATAATAATAACTAAAATTC
 9437 AGAAACAAAAATTATATTTCCTAAAATAAACATAATAATAACTAAAATTC

9737 ATATATTTATAACTATCATTAGTTTTTATAGTTTAAAATAAAACATTGGT | | | | ||||||

9787 CTTGTAAATCAAAAATAAGATAAATTTTTTAAAAACATCAAAGAAAAAGA
 9497 CCTGTAAATCAAAAATAAGATAAATTTTTTAAAAACATCAAAGAAAAAGA
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9837 TTTTTCTTTATCAATAATCTCCAAAATTATTATTTTTATTAAACTATTCT

9547 TTTTTCTTTATCAATAATCTCCAAAATTATTATTTTTATTAAACTATTCT
9887 TTGAAATTATTAAAATATTCTTATCTCTATTAATTATTATATTTTCTTTT

9597 TTGAAATTATTAAAATATTCTTATCTCTATTAATTATTATATTTTCTTTT
9937 TTTATAATTTTTTTAAATCATCCTTTATCAATAGGATTAATAATTTTAAT

9647 CTAATAATTTTTCTAAATCATCCTTTATCAATAGGATTAATAATTTTAAT
9987 TCAAACTATATTAACTTGTTTAATTTCAAGAATTATAATATCAACATATT

9697 TCAAACTATATTAACTTGTTTAATTTCAAGAATTATAATATCAACATATT
10037 GATTCTCTTATATTTTATTTTTAACCTTTTTAGGAGGATTATTAGTATTA

9747 GATTCTCTTATATCTTATTTCTAACCTTTTTAGGAGGATTATTAGTATTA
10087 TTTATTTATGTATCTAGAATTGCATCAAATGAAATATTTACAATTTCATT

9797 TTTATTTATGTATCAAGAATTGCATCAAATGAAATATTTACAATTTCATT

10137 TACTATAAAAATCATAATAATAATTTGTTTTATTATTATTATTATTGTAA
 9847 TACTATAAAAATAATAATAATAATAAGAATTACTATCATTATTATTATAA

10187 GAATTATTAATATAAATAATTTAAAATGAATAAATTTTAATACAAATTTA
 9897 GAATTATTAAAATAAATAATTTAAAATGAATAAATTTTAATACAAATTTA

10237 GAAATAAATAATTTTTTTAATAAATTCATATTTTTTAATAATGAAAATAA

9947 GAAATAAATAAATTTTTTAATAAATTCATATTTTTTAATAATGAAAATAA
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MvOW

10287 AATTAATTTATCTAAATTATATAATAACCAAACATTTTTATTAATAATA

9997 AATTAATTTATCTAAATTATATAATAACCAAACATTTTTAATAATAATAA
10046

10337 TAATAATTATTTACTTATTTATTACATTAATTGCAGTAGTAAAAATCACA 10386
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
10047 TAATAATTATTTACTTATTTATTACATTAATTGCAGTAGTAAAAATCACA 10096
10387 AATATTTTTTATGGTCCTTTACGATCTTCATTTTAACAAATGATAAATAT 10436
|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| ||||||||||||
10097 AATATTTTTTATGGTCCTTTACGATCTTCATTTTAA-AAATGATAAATAT 10145

10437 ATTTAAACCAATTCGAAAAACACACCCTATTTTAAAAATTATTAATGGAT 10486
$|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||\mid$
10146 ATTTAAACCAATTCGAAAAACACACCCTATTTTAAAAATTATTAATGGAT
10195

10487 CTTTTGTAGATCTACCATCTCCATCAAATATTTCATCATTATGAAATTTT 10536
|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
10196 CTTTTGTAGATCTACCATCTCCATCAAATATTTCATCATTATGAAATTTT 10245
10537 GGATCACTTTTATTTATATGCTTAATAATTCAAATTATTACTGGATTATT 10586

10246 GGATCACTTTTATTTATATGCTTAATAATTCAAATTATTACTGGATTATT
10295

10587 TTTAACTATATATTATACAGCAAATATTGAATTAGCTTTTTATAGAGTAA 10636
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| 10296 TTTAACTATATATTATACAGCAAATATTGAATTAGCTTTTTATAGAGTAA

10345
10637 ATTATATTTGCCGAAATGTTAATTATGGATGATTAATTCGAACTTTACAT 10686
|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
10346 ATTATATTTGCCGAAATGTTAATTATGGATGATTAATTCGAACTTTACAT 10395

10687 GCAAATGGAGCATCTTTTTTTTTTATTTGTATTTATATTCATATTGGACG
|||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||||||||||||||||||||
10396 GCAAATGGAGCATCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTGTATTTATATTCATATTGGACG

## MvNW
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## MvOW
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10737 AGGAATTTATTATGAATCTTTTAATTACAAATACACATGAATAGTAGGTG

10446 AGGAATTTATTATGAATCTTTTAATTACAAATACACATGAATAGTAGGTG
10495
10787 TAATTATTTTATTTTTATTAATAGCAACAGCTTTTATAGGATATGTTCTC 10836

10496 TAATTATTTTATTTTTATTAATAGCAACAGCTTTTATAGGATATGTTCTC 10545
10837 CCTTGAGGACAAATATCATTTTGAGGTGCAACTGTTATTACTAATTTATT 10886

10546 CCTTGAGGACAAATATCATTTTGAGGAGCAACTGTTATTACTAATTTATT 10595
10887 ATCTGCCATCCCTTATTTAGGTACAACATTAGTAAATTGAATTTGAGGTG 10936

10596 ATCTGCCATCCCTTATTTAGGAACAACATTAGTAAATTGAATTTGAGGAG
10645
10937 GATTTGCTATTGATAATGCCACTTTAACTCGATTTTATACTTTTCATTTT 10986

10646 GATTTGCTATTGATAACACCACTTTAACGCGATTTTATACTTTTCATTTT 10695
10987 ATTTTACCTTTTATTATTTTAATAATAAGAATAATTCATTTATTATTCCT 11036

10696 ATTTTACCTTTTATTATATTAATAATAAGAATAATTCATTTACTATTCCT
10745
11037 TCATCAAACAGGATCTAATAATCCTTTAGGAATCAATAGAAATTTAGATA 11086

10746 TCATCAAACAGGATCTAATAATCCTTTAGGAATCAATAGAAATTTAGATA 10795
11087 AAATTCCTTTTCATCCATTTTTTATATTTAAGGATTTAATTGGATTTATT 11136

10796 AAATTCCTTTTCATCCATTTTTTATATTTAAGGATTTAATTGGATTTATT 10845
11137 TTAGTTATATTTATATTAATTTTATTAACACTTACAAACCCTTATTTATT

10846 TTAGTTATATTTATATTAATTTTATTAACACTTACAAACCCTTATTTATT

## MvNW
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11187 AGGAGATCCAGATAATTTTATCCCTGCCAATCCATTAGTAACTCCAATTC
 10896 AGGAGACCCAGATAATTTCATCCCAGCCAACCCATTAGTAACTCCAATTC

11237 ATATTCAACCAGAATGATATTTTTTATTTGCTTATGCTATTTTACGATCA

10946 ATATTCAACCAGAATGATATTTTTTATTTGCCTATGCTATTTTACGATCA
11287 ATTCCTAATAAATTAGGGGGAGTTATTGCTTTAGTAATATCAATTCTTAT 11336

10996 ATTCCTAATAAATTAGGAGGAGTTATTGCTTTAGTAATATCAATTCTTAT
11337 TTTAATTATTTTACCAATAACTTTTATAAAAAAAATACAAGGAATTCAAT

11046 TTTAATTATTTTACCAATAACTTTTAAAAAAAAAAAACAAGGAATTCAAT
11387 TTTATCCATTAAATCAAATTATATTTTGAATAATAGTAACAACAATTATT

11096 TTTACCCATTAAATCAAATTATATTTTGAATAATAGTAACAACAATTATT
11437 TTATTAACATGAATTGGAGCACGACCTGTAGAAGATCCTTATATTATTGT
.||.||||||||||||||||||||||||||||.|||||.||||| ||
11146 CTACTAACATGAATTGGAGCACGACCTGTAGAAGACCCTTACATTATCGT

11487 GGGACAAATTTTAACAATTTTATATTTTTCATATTATATCTTTAATCCTT
 11196 AGGACAAATTTTAACAATTTTATACTTCTCATATTATATCTTTAATCCCT

11537 TAGTTAGTATATACTGAGATAAATTAATTTTTAATTAATTAATGAGCTTG
 11246 TAATTAGAATATACTGAGATAAATTAATTTTTAATTAATTAATGAGCTTG

11587 TAAAAGCATTTGTTTTGAAAACTTAAGAAAGAATATATTATTCTATTAAT

11296 TAAAAGCATTTGTTTTGAAAACTTAAGAAAGAATAAATTATTCTATTAAT

11145 11295
11236

10945

11286
10995

11386

11436

11486
11195

11536
11245
11586

11636
11345
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11637 TTATACTAAAAATAATATAATAATTAAAAGAAAAAAATTTTTAATCCTAA 11686

11346 TTATACTAAAAATAATAT-----CTAAAAGAAAAAAATTTTTAATCCTAA
11390

11687 ATAAAATATCATAAAATTTAATGATAAAGGTAAATAAATTTTTCAAGCTA 11736

11391 ATAAAATATTATAAAATTTAATGATAAAGGTAAATAAATTTCTCAAGCTA 11440
11737 AATATATTAATTTATCATATCGATAACGAGGTAAAGTCCCTCGAACTCAA 11786

11441 AATATATTGACTTATCATATCGATAACGAGGTAAAGTCCCTCGAACTCAA 11490
11787 ATAAATAAAAAAGAAATTAATCTTAATTTTAAATAAAAAAAGAAATCTAA 11836

11491 ATAAATAAAAAAGAAATTAATCTCAACTTCAAATAAAAAAAAAAATCTAA

11837 TGAAAATCCACCTATATATAATAAAATAAATAATAATCTTATAAATAAAA

11541 TGAAAATCCTCCTATATATAATAAAACAAATAATAATCTTATAAATAAAA
11590
11887 TTCTAGAATATTCAGCTAAAAAAATTAATGCAAATCCACCTCTTCTATAT 11936

11591 TTCTAGAATATTCAGCTAAAAAAATTAATGCAAAACCCCCTCTTCTATAT
11640

11937 TCAATATTAAATCCTGAAACTAATTCTCTTTCCCCTTCAGCAAAATCAAA

11641 TCAATATTAAATCCTGAAACTAATTCTCTTTCCCCCTCAGCAAAATCAAA
11690
12036
11740
12086

11790
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## MvOW
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| 12087 | CTAATTATATTAAAATCTATAACTATAATAATTCTAGATATTAAAATTAA | 12136 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 11791 | CTAATTATATTAAAATCTATAATTATAATAATTCTAGATATTAAAATTAA | 11840 |
| 12137 | AGCTAAACTA | 12186 |
|  |  |  |
| 11841 | AGCTAAACTAACTTCATAAGAAATAGTTTGAGCTACAGCTCGTAAACCTC | 11890 |
| 12187 | CTAATAAAGAATAATTAGAATTAGAAGATCAACCAGCAATTATAACTGTA | 12236 |
|  |  |  |
| 11891 | CTAATAAAGAATAATTAGAATTAGAAGATCAACCAGCAATTATAACTGTA | 11940 |
| 12237 | TATACACCCATTCTCGTACAACATAAAAAAAATAAAATACCTAAATTAAA | 12286 |
|  |  |  |
| 11941 | TAAACACCTATTCTTGTACAACATAAAAAAAATAAAATACCTAAATTAAA | 11990 |
| 12287 | TCTAATAAAATTAAAATAATAAGGAATTATTATTCAAATTATTAAAGACA | 12336 |
|  |  |  |
| 11991 | TCTAATAAAATTAAAATAATAAGGAATTATTATTCAAATTATTAAAGATA | 12040 |
| 12337 | ATAAATCTAATGACAGGAGAAAAATAATAAATTAAATAATTAGAAAAT | 12386 |
|  |  |  |
| 12041 | AAATAAATCTAATTACAGGAGAAAAATAATAAGTTAAATAATTAGAAAAT | 12090 |
| 12387 | TTAGGATAAGTTTGTTCTTTAGTAAATAACTTAATAGCATCTGAAAAAGG | 12436 |
|  |  |  |
| 12091 | TTAGGATAAGTTTGTTCTTTAGTAAATAATTTAATAGCATCTGAAAAAGG | 12140 |
| 12437 | TTGTAAAATTCCTATTAAACCAACCTTATTAGGCCCTTTACGAATTTGAA | 12486 |
|  |  |  |
| 12141 | TTGTAAAATTCCTATAAAACCAACTTTATTAGGCCCTTTACGAATTTGAA | 121 |
| 12487 | TATAACCTAAAACTTTTCGCTCTAATAAAGTTAAGAAAGCAACACCAATT | 12536 |
|  | \||||.|||||||.||.||.||| |  |
| 21 | TATATCCTAAAACCTTACG | 122 |


| MvNW | 12537 | AAAACCCCTACAATTAAAATTAATAARCCTAAATTAGAAAATTTAGGATA | 12586 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvow | 12214 |  | 12213 |
| MvNW | 12587 | AGTtTGttctttagtanatancttantagcatctananaiggttgranai | 12636 |
| Mvow | 12214 |  | 12213 |
| MvNW | 12637 | tTCCTATTAAACCAACCTTATTAGGCCCtTTACGAATTTGAATATAACCT | 12686 |
| Mvow | 12214 |  | 1221 |
| MvNW | 12687 | AAAACTTTTCGCTCCAATAAAGTTAAGAAAGCAACACCAATTAAAACCCC <br>  | 12736 |
| Mvow | 12214 | -------------AATAAAGTTAAAAAAGCAACACCAATTAATACTCC | 12248 |
| MvNW | 12737 | TACAATTAAAATTAATAAACCTAAAAAAATTAAAATTATATCTAATATTA <br>  | 12786 |
| Mvow | 12249 | TAAAATTAAAATTAATAAACCTAAAAAAATTAAAATTATATCCAATATTA | 12298 |
| MvNW | 12787 | TCATTACTACCTATATAAATAAAATTATACATTTATGATTTCTAAAACCA <br>  | 12836 |
| Mvow | 12299 | tCAttactacctatatanatanattatacatttatgatttctanancca | 12348 |
| MvNW | 12837 | TTACATTTTTCTGCCAAAATAGCTTAATAAATTATTATAATATTTATTTT <br>  | 12886 |
| Mvow | 12349 | tTACATTTTTCTGCCAAAATAGCTTAATAAAACATATTAATTTTTAATTT | 12398 |
| MvNW | 12887 | ATAAATTCATTAATAAAATTCTT-TAATTAAATTTAATTTAAATATTTAT <br>  | 12935 |
| Mvow | 12399 | ATATATtTGTtAATAAAATTCTTCAAACTAAATTTAATTTAAATATtTAT | 12448 |
| MvNW | 12936 | TCCTTTCGTACTAAAATATTTTTTTTTATTTAAAGATAGAAACCAACCTGG <br>  | 12985 |
| Mvow | 12449 | TCCTTTCGTACTAAAATATCTTTITTTGCTTAAAGATAGAAACCAACCTGG | 12498 |
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12986 CTCACACCGGTTTGAACTCAGATCATGTAAGATTTTAATGATCGAACAGA
13035

12499 CTCACACCGGTTTGAACTCAGATCATGTAAGATTTTAATGATCGAACAGA12548
13036 TCAAAATTTTAGACTTTTGCA-TATAAATTTTATCTTAATCCAACATCGA ..... 1308412549 TC-AAATTTTAAACTTTTGCATTATAAA--TTATCTTAATCCAACATCGA12595
13085 GGTCGCAAACTTTTTTTTTTATTTGAACTAAAAAAAAAAATTACGCTGTT ..... 1313412596 GGTCGCAAACTTTTTTTTTTATTTGAACTAAAAAAAAAAATTACGCTGTT12645
13135 ATCCCTAAGGTAATTTTTTCTTTTAATCAAAATAATTTTGGATCATATAC12646 ATCCCTAAGGTAATTTTTTCTTCTAATCAAAATAATTTTGGATCAAATAT12695
13185 TCACTTATTAATGAATCTTATTAAAAAAAAGTTAATTATATTTTTCTATC ..... 13234
12745
13235 ACCCCAACAAAATAAATATTATTATTTTAATTATTAACTATATAAATAAT ..... 1328412795
13285 TTTAATAAAAAAATTTATCAAACTCTATAGGGTCTTCTCGTCTTTTAAGT12796 TTCAATAAAAACGTTTATTAAACTCTATAGGGTCTTCTCGTCTTTTAAAT1284513335 TTATTTTAACTTTTTAATTAAAAAATTAAATTTTTTTAATAAAATTGAGA 1338412846 TTATTTTAACTTTTTAATTAAAAAATTAAATTTTTCTAATAAAATTGAGA12895
13385 CAGTTTATATTTCATCCAATCTTTCATACAAGTCACCAATTAAGAGACTA  ..... 1343412896 CAGTTTATATTTCATCCAATCTTTCATACAAGTCACCAATTAAGAGACTA

| MvNW | 13435 | ATGATTATGCTACCTTTGTACAGTCAATATACTGCAGCCCTTTAATTAAA \\|।।।।।।।।।।।| | 13484 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MvOW | 12946 | ATGATTATGCTACCT | 12960 |
| MvNW | 13485 | AATCAGTGGGCAGATTAGACTTTAAATTATTATTCAAAAAGACATGTTTT | 13534 |
| MvOW | 12961 |  | 12960 |
| MvNW | 13535 | TGATAAACAAGTG | 13547 |
| Mvow | 12961 | -TGGNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN | 12999 |
| MvNW | 13548 |  | 13547 |
| MvOW | 13000 | NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN | 13049 |
| MvNW | 13548 | ------AATATAAAATTTTGCCGAATTACTTAATTTTATTTTTCA <br>  | 13586 |
| MvOW | 13050 | NNNNNNNNNNNAATATAAAATTTTGCCGAATTACTTAACTTTATTTTTCA | 13099 |
| MvNW | 13587 | ATAAATTATTAATACTATTTAATTATTAAATACTAATTTTATCATTATAA <br>  | 13636 |
| MvOW | 13100 | ATAA---ATTAATATTATTTATTTATTAAATACTAATTTTATCATTATAT | 13146 |
| MvNW | 13637 | TTAATTTTTAATTATTAAAAATTATTTTTTTATAAAAAATTAAA---CTT | 13683 |
|  |  | \|||||.||||.|||||||||.||||||||||||||||||| .|| |  |
| MvOW | 13147 | TTAATCTTTATTTATTAAAAAATATTTTTTTATAAAAAATTAAATTTTTT | 13196 |
| MvNW | 13684 | TTTTAAATTTTAATTTAATTAAAATTAATTTATAATAAATTAAAAATTAT <br>  | 13733 |
| Mvow | 13197 | TTTTAAATTTTAATTAAATTAAAATTAATTTATAATAAATTAAAAATTAT | 13246 |
| MvNW | 13734 | AAACAATATAAATTTTAAAAATTTTAATT-AATACATTATTATTATTATA | 13782 |
|  |  |  |  |
| MvOW | 13247 | AAACAATATAATTTTAAAATTTTAATTAAAAAC--AATATTATTATA | 13293 |
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| 13783 AATATTTAATTTAAAGCTTATCCCTTAAAATATAATTTTTTACTTATAAT |  | 13832 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 13294 | AATATTTAATTT-AAGCTTA-CCCTTAAAATATAATTTTTTCTTTATAAT | 13341 |
| 13833 |  | 13882 |
|  |  |  |
| 13342 | AAATTAATTAATTAATTTATTATAAAG-AAAAATAAAATTAAATTTTTTT |  |
| 13883 | CTAAAAAAACTAGATATCTTAAAAAACGATTAACATTTCATTTCAAATTA | 139 |
|  |  |  |
| 13391 | CTAAAAAAACT-GATATCTTAAAAAACGATTAACA-TCCATTTCAAATTA | 13438 |
| 13933 | AT | 13982 |
|  |  |  |
| 13439 | ATTATTTAAAATATTTAGGC-ACAATAACTTTTATAATTAATTATCTCTT | 13487 |
| 13983 | TTTAATTCGAGAAATATTTTAACTAAAATTTTAATTAATAAACTCTGATA | 14032 |
|  |  |  |
| 13488 | TTTAATTCGAGAATTATTTTAACTAAAATTTTAATTAATAAACTC-GATA | 13536 |
| 14033 | CACAAGATACAATAAATAAAATTTACTTTTAAATAAATTCATTTTCAAAT | 14082 |
|  |  |  |
| 13537 | CAC-AGATACAATAAATAAAATTTACTTTTAAATAAATTCATTTTCAAAT | 5 |
| 14083 | TTATTTAAAATTTCTTATACAATACTAATTGACTATAAAATTTATAATTT |  |
|  |  |  |
| 13586 | TTATTTAAAACTTCTTATACAATACTATTACACTATAAAACTTATAATTT | 13635 |
| 14133 | TTTTTTTATTAATACTAAAACCCCCATTTTAATATTAAAATTATTTTTAT | 14182 |
|  |  |  |
| 13636 | TTTTTTTATTAATACT-AAACCCCCATTTTAATATTAAAATTATTTTTAT | 13684 |
| 14183 | TATTTATAAATTATTAATTATTCATCTTCAAATTAATTGAATAACATCAA | 14232 |
|  |  |  |
| 13685 | TATTTATAAATTATTAATTATTAATTTTCAAATT-ATTGAATAATATCAA | 13733 |

$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\text { MvNW } & 14233 \text { TATCATTTCAATGTAAATGAAATACTTAATCAAGCTCTAATTTGTTATTT } & 14282 \\ & & 11111111111111111111111.11111111111111 .11111\end{array}\right)$

| Mvow | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MvNW | 14733 | TTTATAAATAAAATTTATTAAATCATAAATAAAAATTTAATTTTAATTAA | 14782 |
| Mvow | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 14783 | ATTAAAATTTCACCTTATAATTTAATATTTAATTAAAAAAATATTAATTA | 14832 |
| Mvow | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 14833 | TTAATTACTAATAAATTTTAATTTAATTTTTGTTTAACCGCAACTGCTGG | 14882 |
| Mvow | 14055 | ------------------------------------------------------ | 14054 |
| MvNW | 14883 | CACAAAATTTGTTATTAATTTAAATATTACTAAATCTTAATTTCTTAAAT | 14932 |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 14933 | TTTTAATATTAATTACTACTTGTATTTATTAAATATTATTAAAATAGTTA | 14982 |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 14983 | ATAATTAACACTAAAATTTATATGCAAAATAAATTTATAATAAAATCTTT | 15032 |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15033 | AAACTATAAAAAATTATTTATTGTAGGATTTTAGACATAGTTTTTTTTT | 15082 |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15083 | TTTTTTTTTATATATATAAAATTTAATATAAATTATTAAATATTAAATAT | 15132 |
| MvOW | 14055 | ---------------------------------------------------------------- | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15133 | TTTCTTTCTTTTTCTTCTTTATAACATTAATATTAAAAATTAATACGTAG | 15182 |
| Mvow | 14055 | --- | 14054 |


| MvNW | 15183 | Attcatcgattantantcatttanatanatanttanttantatatttran | 15232 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15233 | AATTAATTAAATTGAAATTTAAAATATTAATTTTACTAAATTAATTAATT | 15282 |
| MvOW | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15283 | AATtTAATtAATATTAAAAATATtAATAAATTAAATATtTAATATATATA | 15332 |
| Mvow | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15333 | tatatatatanatatanaccatttttantattttttctatanatananan | 15382 |
| Mvow | 14055 |  | 14054 |
| MvNW | 15383 | AAA 15385 |  |
| MvOW | 14055 | --- 14054 |  |

## APPENDIX F

Counts of all the genes identified in gene ontology analysis of all contigs

## APPENDIX F1. A. curvipes.

| GO Level | Term (Name) | \#Sequence | Parents (Name) | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | metabolic process | 2166 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism process | 1313 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism cellular process | 1088 | single-organism process, cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | primary metabolic process | 1616 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cellular process | 1880 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | regulation of biological process | 870 | biological regulation, biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | multicellular organismal development | 684 | single-multicellular organism process, developmental process | Biological Process |
| 2 | developmental process | 748 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular component organization | 755 | cellular component organization or biogenesis | Biological Process |
| 3 | organic substance metabolic process | 1588 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein metabolic process | 962 | primary metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | response to stimulus | 684 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 4 | transport | 638 | establishment of localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | catabolic process | 519 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | nucleobase-containing compound metabolic process | 564 | heterocycle metabolic process, primary metabolic process, organic cyclic compound metabolic process, cellular aromatic compound metabolic process, cellular nitrogen compound metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | biological regulation | 914 | biological_process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| Null | single-multicellular organism process | 685 | multicellular organismal process, single-organism process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | cellular metabolic process | 1270 | metabolic process, cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | biosynthetic process | 713 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | cell differentiation | 427 | cellular developmental process | Biological Process |
| 5 | cellular protein metabolic process | 693 | protein metabolic process, cellular macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cellular component organization or biogenesis | 755 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 5 | organelle organization | 473 | single-organism cellular process, cellular component organization | Biological Process |
| 3 | macromolecule metabolic process | 1050 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 6 | translation | 376 | cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process, cellular protein metabolic process, gene expression | Biological Process |
| 4 | anatomical structure morphogenesis | 359 | anatomical structure development, developmental process | Biological Process |
| 4 | signal transduction | 336 | single organism signaling, cell communication, cellular response to stimulus, regulation of cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to stress | 334 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 6 | cellular protein modification process | 331 | cellular protein metabolic process, protein modification process | Biological Process |
| 3 | establishment of localization | 638 | biological_process, localization | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular macromolecule metabolic process | 770 | cellular metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | heterocycle metabolic process | 564 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular nitrogen compound metabolic process | 564 | cellular metabolic process, nitrogen compound metabolic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| Null | organic cyclic compound metabolic process | 564 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | cellular aromatic compound metabolic process | 564 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | anatomical structure development | 401 | developmental process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell cycle | 299 | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell communication | 422 | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 2 | multicellular organismal process | 685 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single organism signaling | 409 | single-organism process, signaling | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular developmental process | 427 | developmental process, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 6 | cytoskeleton organization | 256 | organelle organization | Biological Process |
| 2 | reproduction | 243 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 4 | gene expression | 399 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process | 376 | cellular macromolecule metabolic process, cellular biosynthetic process, macromolecule biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of cellular process | 336 | cellular process, regulation of biological process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular response to stimulus | 336 | response to stimulus, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 5 | protein modification process | 331 | macromolecule modification, protein metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | localization | 639 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | nitrogen compound metabolic process | 564 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | carbohydrate metabolic process | 185 | primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |


| APPENDIX F1. (cont.) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | generation of precursor metabolites and energy | 184 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 6 | protein transport | 184 | organic substance transport, establishment of protein localization | Biological Process |
| 2 | signaling | 409 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 5 | ion transport | 145 | single-organism transport | Biological Process |
| 4 | embryo development | 140 | single-organism developmental process, multicellular organismal development, anatomical structure development | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell death | 136 | death, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular biosynthetic process | 376 | cellular metabolic process, biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | macromolecule biosynthetic process | 376 | organic substance biosynthetic process, macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | macromolecule modification | 331 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | lipid metabolic process | 115 | primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic process, single-organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | organic substance transport | 184 | Transport | Biological Process |
| 5 | establishment of protein localization | 184 | establishment of localization, protein localization | Biological Process |
| 6 | DNA metabolic process | 108 | nucleic acid metabolic process, cellular macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell-cell signaling | 105 | single organism signaling, cell communication | Biological Process |
| 3 | behavior | 105 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to external stimulus | 103 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular homeostasis | 95 | homeostatic process, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 2 | growth | 97 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism metabolic process | 148 | metabolic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 2 | cell proliferation | 89 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Null | single-organism transport | 145 | single-organism process, transport | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism developmental process | 140 | single-organism process, developmental process | Biological Process |
| 2 | death | 136 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| Null | organic substance biosynthetic process | 376 | organic substance metabolic process, biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to abiotic stimulus | 79 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to biotic stimulus | 77 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein localization | 185 | macromolecule localization | Biological Process |
| 5 | nucleic acid metabolic process | 108 | macromolecule metabolic process, nucleobase-containing compound metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | homeostatic process | 95 | regulation of biological quality | Biological Process |
| 6 | mitochondrion organization | 53 | organelle organization | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to endogenous stimulus | 43 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | macromolecule localization | 185 | Localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | secondary metabolic process | 38 | single-organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | regulation of biological quality | 95 | biological regulation | Biological Process |
| 2 | viral reproduction | 29 | multi-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell recognition | 25 | single-multicellular organism process, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 7 | regulation of gene expression, epigenetic | 25 | regulation of gene expression | Biological Process |
| 5 | cytoplasm organization | 22 | single-organism cellular process, cellular component organization | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 3 | cell growth | 19 | growth, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Null | multi-organism cellular process | 29 | multi-organism process, cellular process | Biological Process |
| 2 | multi-organism process | 32 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 4 | symbiosis, encompassing mutualism through parasitism | 16 | interspecies interaction between organisms | Biological Process |
| 6 | regulation of gene expression | 25 | gene expression, regulation of macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | interspecies interaction between organisms | 16 | multi-organism process | Biological Process |
| 5 | regulation of macromolecule metabolic process | 25 | macromolecule metabolic process, regulation of metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of metabolic process | 25 | regulation of biological process, metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 7 | glycine receptor clustering | 1 | postsynaptic membrane organization, neurotransmitter-gated ion channel clustering | Biological Process |
| 8 | neurotransmitter-gated ion channel clustering | 1 | receptor clustering, synapse assembly | Biological Process |
| 4 | postsynaptic membrane organization | 1 | cellular membrane organization | Biological Process |
| 6 | synapse assembly | 1 | nervous system development, synapse organization, cellular component assembly | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular membrane organization | 1 | single-organism cellular process, membrane organization | Biological Process |
| 7 | receptor clustering | 1 | protein localization to membrane | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein localization to membrane | 1 | cellular membrane organization, cellular protein localization | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular component assembly | 1 | cellular component biogenesis, cellular component organization | Biological Process |


| APPENDIX F1. (cont.) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | membrane organization <br> nervous system <br> development | 1 | cellular component organization |  |
| 5 | synapse organization | 1 | single-organism cellular process, cellular component <br> organization <br> multicellular organismal development, anatomical structure <br> development <br> cellular macromolecule localization, protein localization | Biological Process |
| 4 | system development | 1 | cellular component organization or biogenesis | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular protein localization <br> cellular component | 1 | 1 | Biological Process |
| biogenesis |  |  |  |  |
| cellular macromolecule |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 7 | nucleus | 656 | intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 2 | organelle | 1692 | cellular_component | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 2 | macromolecular complex | 966 | cellular_component | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 3 | membrane-bounded organelle | 1287 | Organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle | 687 | intracellular organelle, non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | mitochondrion | 424 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 7 | cytoskeleton | 312 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | cytosol | 273 | cytoplasmic part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 3 | non-membrane-bounded organelle | 687 | Organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | ribosome | 245 | ribonucleoprotein complex, cytoplasmic part, intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | lipid particle | 199 | cytoplasmic part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | nuclear part | 278 | intracellular organelle part, nucleus | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | plasma membrane | 187 | cell part, cell periphery, membrane | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 7 | nuclear lumen | 236 | nuclear part, intracellular organelle lumen | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | nucleoplasm | 147 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 5 | ribonucleoprotein complex | 245 | macromolecular complex, intracellular part | Cellular <br> Component |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | intracellular organelle part | 321 | organelle part, intracellular organelle, intracellular part | Cellular <br> Component |
| 6 | endoplasmic reticulum | 132 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular <br> Component |
| 2 | extracellular region | 186 | cellular_component | Cellular <br> Component <br> Cellular |
| 4 | cell periphery | 188 | cell part | Component <br> Cellular |
| 2 | membrane | 187 | cellular_component | Component |
| 6 | nucleolus | 106 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen, intracellular non-membrane- <br> bounded organelle <br> cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Component <br> Cellular |
| 6 | Golgi apparatus | 104 | intracellular organelle part, organelle lumen <br> Component |  |
| 6 | intracellular organelle <br> lumen <br> chromosome | 236 | 95 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 5 | nuclear envelope | 48 | nuclear part, organelle envelope, endomembrane system | Cellular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | membrane-bounded vesicle | 67 | Vesicle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | cytoplasmic vesicle | 67 | cytoplasmic part, vesicle, intracellular organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 2 | membrane-enclosed lumen | 236 | cellular_component | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | cytoskeletal part | 57 | intracellular organelle part, cytoskeleton | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 8 | microtubule cytoskeleton | 57 | Cytoskeleton | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | nuclear chromosome | 30 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen, chromosome | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | organelle envelope | 48 | intracellular organelle part, membrane-bounded organelle, | Cellular |
|  |  |  | envelope | Component |
| 4 | endomembrane system | 48 | cell part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | vacuole | 36 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 3 | vesicle | 67 | Organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | endosome | 24 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 7 | peroxisome | 21 | Microbody | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | envelope | 49 | cell part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | proteinaceous extracellular | 15 | extracellular region part, extracellular matrix | Cellular |
|  | matrix |  |  | Component |
| 8 | lysosome | 13 | lytic vacuole | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 6 | microbody | 21 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 2 | extracellular matrix | 15 | cellular_component | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 5 | cilium | 8 | cell projection, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 7 | lytic vacuole | 13 | Vacuole | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | cell projection | 8 | cell part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 6 | plastid | 4 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 4 | external encapsulating | 3 | cell part, cell periphery | Cellular |
|  | structure |  |  | Component |
| 5 | cell envelope | 1 | Envelope | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 5 | cell wall | 1 | external encapsulating structure | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 5 | thylakoid | 1 | intracellular part | Cellular |
|  |  |  |  | Component |
| 2 | binding | 2108 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 2 | catalytic activity | 2218 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 4 | nucleotide binding | 806 | small molecule binding, nucleoside phosphate binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | hydrolase activity | 925 | catalytic activity | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | protein binding | 668 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | organic cyclic compound | 1169 | Binding | Molecular |
|  | binding |  |  | Function |


| APPENDIX F1. (cont.) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| null | heterocyclic compound <br> binding <br> small molecule binding | 1164 | Binding | Binding | | Molecular |
| :--- |
| Function |
| null |$\quad$| nucleoside phosphate |
| :--- |
| binding |
| transferase activity |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 5 | translation factor activity, | 82 | RNA binding | Molecular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | calcium ion binding | 72 | metal ion binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 2 | electron carrier activity | 63 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | actin binding | 62 | cytoskeletal protein binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | phosphotransferase activity, | 101 | transferase activity, transferring phosphorus-containing groups | Molecular |
|  | alcohol group as acceptor |  |  | Function |
| 3 | lipid binding | 53 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 4 | receptor binding | 47 | protein binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 2 | receptor activity | 45 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 4 | hydrolase activity, acting | 99 | hydrolase activity | Molecular |
|  | on ester bonds |  |  | Function |
| 5 | metal ion binding | 72 | cation binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | nuclease activity | 41 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | sequence-specific DNA | 40 | nucleic acid binding transcription factor activity | Molecular |
|  | binding transcription factor activity |  |  | Function |
| 7 | phosphoprotein | 40 | phosphatase activity | Molecular |
|  | phosphatase activity |  |  | Function |
| 3 | carbohydrate binding | 39 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| Null | transcription regulator | 37 | obsolete_molecular_function | Molecular |
|  | activity |  |  | Function |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 6 | ion channel activity | 28 | substrate-specific channel activity, ion transmembrane | Molecular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | transporter activity | Function |
| 3 | signal transducer activity | 27 | molecular transducer activity | Molecular |
| 4 | cation binding | 72 | ion binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 8 | motor activity | 25 | nucleoside-triphosphatase activity | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 6 | phosphatase activity | 41 | phosphoric ester hydrolase activity | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 2 | nucleic acid binding transcription factor activity | 40 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| Null | obsolete_molecular_function | 37 |  | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 2 | nutrient reservoir activity | 21 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | chromatin binding | 21 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | carboxylic ester hydrolase activity | 17 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | ion transmembrane | 28 | substrate-specific transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular |
|  | transporter activity |  |  | Function |
| 5 | substrate-specific channel | 28 | substrate-specific transmembrane transporter activity, channel activity | Molecular |
|  | activity |  |  | Function |
| 2 | molecular transducer activity | 27 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 3 | ion binding | 72 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 7 | nucleoside-triphosphatase activity | 25 | pyrophosphatase activity | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 5 | phosphoric ester hydrolase activity | 41 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |

## APPENDIX F1. (cont.)

| 2 | antioxidant activity | 13 | molecular_function | Molecular |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 4 | substrate-specific | 28 | substrate-specific transporter activity, transmembrane | Molecular |
|  | transmembrane transporter activity |  | transporter activity | Function |
| 5 | channel activity | 28 | passive transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 6 | pyrophosphatase activity | 25 | hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides, in phosphorus- | Molecular |
|  |  |  | containing anhydrides | Function |
| 3 | transmembrane transporter | 28 | transporter activity | Molecular |
|  | activity |  |  | Function |
| 3 | substrate-specific | 28 | transporter activity | Molecular |
|  | transporter activity |  |  | Function |
| 4 | passive transmembrane | 28 | transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular |
|  | transporter activity |  |  | Function |
| 2 | translation regulator | 6 | molecular_function | Molecular |
|  | activity |  |  | Function |
| 5 | hydrolase activity, acting | 25 | hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides | Molecular |
|  | on acid anhydrides, in |  |  | Function |
|  | phosphorus-containing |  |  |  |
|  | anhydrides |  |  |  |
| 4 | hydrolase activity, acting | 25 | hydrolase activity | Molecular |
|  | on acid anhydrides |  |  | Function |
| 8 | inositol monophosphate | 1 | inositol phosphate phosphatase activity | Molecular |
|  | phosphatase activity |  |  | Function |
| 3 | oxygen binding | 1 | Binding | Molecular |
|  |  |  |  | Function |
| 7 | inositol phosphate | 1 | phosphatase activity | Molecular |
|  | phosphatase activity |  |  | Function |

## APPENDIX F2. A. craccivora.

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GO } \\ & \text { Level } \end{aligned}$ | Term (Name) | \#Sequence | Parents (Name) | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | regulation of biological process | 946 | biological regulation, biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 | metabolic process | 2170 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | catabolic process multicellular organismal | 565 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | development nucleobase-containing | 566 | process <br> heterocycle metabolic process, primary metabolic process, organic cyclic compound metabolic process, cellular aromatic compound metabolic process, cellular nitrogen | Biological Process |
| 4 | compound metabolic process | 614 | compound metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | biosynthetic process | 806 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | transport | 651 | establishment of localization single organism signaling, cell communication, cellular | Biological Process |
| 4 | signal transduction | 408 | response to stimulus, regulation of cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | cell differentiation cellular component | 401 | cellular developmental process | Biological Process |
| 3 | organization cellular protein modification | 654 | cellular component organization or biogenesis cellular protein metabolic process, protein modification | Biological Process |
| 6 | process | 358 | process <br> cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 6 | translation | 328 | protein metabolic process, gene expression primary metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein metabolic process anatomical structure | 906 | process | Biological Process |
| 4 | morphogenesis | 316 | anatomical structure development, developmental process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 3 | response to stress | 287 | response to stimulus <br> single-organism cellular process, cellular component <br> organization | Biological Process |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | organelle organization | 413 | 245 | single-organism cellular process <br> biological_process <br> primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic <br> process |
| 3 | cell cycle | reproduction | carbohydrate metabolic process | 203 |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 3 | secondary metabolic process <br> response to endogenous | 50 | single-organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | stimulus |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 2 | response to stimulus organic substance metabolic | 662 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | process | 1638 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular developmental process | 401 | developmental process, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular biosynthetic process organic substance biosynthetic | 328 | cellular metabolic process, biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| Null | process <br> single-organism cellular | 328 | organic substance metabolic process, biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| Null | process <br> cellular protein metabolic | 1023 | single-organism process, cellular process protein metabolic process, cellular macromolecule | Biological Process |
| 5 | process <br> single-organism metabolic | 671 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| Null | process <br> anatomical structure | 210 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | development | 352 | developmental process | Biological Process |
| Null | multi-organism cellular process cellular macromolecule | 41 | multi-organism process, cellular process cellular macromolecule metabolic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 5 | biosynthetic process cellular macromolecule | 328 | biosynthetic process, macromolecule biosynthetic process cellular metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process | 760 | process | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of metabolic process cellular component | 24 | regulation of biological process, metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | organization or biogenesis | 654 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 | multi-organism process | 46 | biological_process <br> gene expression, regulation of macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 6 | regulation of gene expression | 24 | process | Biological Process |
| 4 | heterocycle metabolic process | 614 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | organic substance transport establishment of protein | 185 | Transport | Biological Process |
| 5 | localization | 185 | establishment of localization, protein localization | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 2 | death | 112 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Null | single organism signaling | 480 | single-organism process, signaling macromolecule metabolic process, nucleobase-containing | Biological Process |
| 5 | nucleic acid metabolic process regulation of macromolecule | 117 | compound metabolic process macromolecule metabolic process, regulation of metabolic | Biological Process |
| 5 | metabolic process | 24 | process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism process macromolecule metabolic | 1256 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 1002 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | homeostatic process cellular nitrogen compound | 71 | regulation of biological quality cellular metabolic process, nitrogen compound metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process | 614 | process | Biological Process |
| 2 | signaling | 480 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism transport single-organism developmental | 185 | single-organism process, transport | Biological Process |
| Null | process | 136 | single-organism process, developmental process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to chemical stimulus organic cyclic compound | 1 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| Null | metabolic process multicellular organismal | 614 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | process <br> macromolecule biosynthetic | 566 | biological_process organic substance biosynthetic process, macromolecule | Biological Process |
| 4 | process | 328 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | biological regulation | 970 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | macromolecule localization nitrogen compound metabolic | 185 | Localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 614 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | establishment of localization | 651 | biological_process, localization | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of cellular process | 408 | cellular process, regulation of biological process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 4 | cellular aromatic compound metabolic process | 614 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | response to drug interspecies interaction | 1 | response to chemical stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | between organisms | 21 | multi-organism process | Biological Process |
| 4 | gene expression | 351 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| Null | all | 0 |  | Biological Process |
| 4 | macromolecule modification | 358 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular metabolic process | 1300 | metabolic process, cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular response to stimulus | 409 | response to stimulus, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein localization | 185 | macromolecule localization | Biological Process |
| 2 | developmental process single-multicellular organism | 636 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | process | 566 | multicellular organismal process, single-organism process | Biological Process |
| 5 | protein modification process | 358 | macromolecule modification, protein metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | protein complex | 790 | macromolecular complex | Cellular Component |
| 2 | cell | 2405 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cytoplasm | 1340 | intracellular part | Cellular Component |
| 7 | nucleus | 690 | intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | intracellular | 2046 | cell part cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | mitochondrion | 314 | organelle <br> ribonucleoprotein complex, cytoplasmic part, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 6 | ribosome | 275 | non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nucleoplasm | 244 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen | Cellular Component |
| 7 | cytoskeleton | 244 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | plasma membrane | 207 | cell part, cell periphery, membrane | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 6 | cytosol | 190 | cytoplasmic part | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | nucleolus | 129 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen, intracellular non-membranebounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 7 | chromosome | 153 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | endoplasmic reticulum | 122 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | organelle | 1602 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 6 | lipid particle | 87 | cytoplasmic part <br> cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | Golgi apparatus | 86 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | extracellular region cytoplasmic membrane- | 112 | cellular_component cytoplasmic vesicle, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 7 | bounded vesicle | 53 | organelle, membrane-bounded vesicle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nuclear chromosome | 50 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen, chromosome | Cellular Component |
| 5 | nuclear envelope | 48 | nuclear part, organelle envelope, endomembrane system cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | endosome | 38 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 7 | microtubule organizing center | 38 | microtubule cytoskeleton, cytoskeletal part | Cellular Component |
| 4 | extracellular space | 30 | extracellular region part cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | vacuole | 48 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 8 | lysosome | 21 | lytic vacuole | Cellular Component |
| 7 | peroxisome <br> proteinaceous extracellular | 19 | Microbody | Cellular Component |
| 4 | matrix | 19 | extracellular region part, extracellular matrix cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | plastid | 13 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cell wall | 7 | external encapsulating structure | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 5 | cilium | 6 | cell projection, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | external encapsulating structure | 11 | cell part, cell periphery | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cell envelope | 1 | Envelope <br> intracellular organelle part, membrane-bounded organelle, | Cellular Component |
| 4 | organelle envelope | 48 | envelope | Cellular Component |
| 3 | extracellular region part | 47 | cellular_component, extracellular region | Cellular Component |
| 7 | lytic vacuole | 21 | Vacuole | Cellular Component |
| 4 | endomembrane system | 48 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| 3 | membrane-bounded organelle | 1184 | Organelle | Cellular Component |
| 3 | vesicle | 53 | Organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | envelope | 49 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| 6 | intracellular organelle lumen | 334 | intracellular organelle part, organelle lumen | Cellular Component |
| Null | all | 0 |  | Cellular Component |
| 2 | extracellular matrix | 19 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 6 | intracellular non-membrane- | 713 | intracellular organelle, non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | bounded organelle | organelle lumen | 334 | organelle part, membrane-enclosed lumen |
| 6 | nuclear part | intracellular organelle part, nucleus | Cellular Component |  |
| 3 | non-membrane-bounded | 369 | 713 | Organelle |
| organelle | intracellular membrane- |  |  | Cellular Component |
| 6 | bounded organelle | 1184 | intracellular organelle, membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | membrane-bounded vesicle | 53 | Vesicle | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cytoplasmic part | 910 | intracellular part, cytoplasm | Cellular Component |
| 3 | cell part | cell, cellular_component | Cellular Component |  |
| 6 | cytoskeletal part | intracellular organelle | 3114 | 1531 |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 2 | membrane-enclosed lumen | 334 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | ribonucleoprotein complex | 275 | macromolecular complex, intracellular part <br> cellular_component <br> cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded <br> organelle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | membrane | 207 | cellular Component |  |
| 6 | microbody | 19 | 53 | cytoplasmic part, vesicle, intracellular organelle |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 3 | nucleic acid binding | 592 | heterocyclic compound binding, organic cyclic compound <br> binding <br> kinase activity, phosphotransferase activity, alcohol group <br> as acceptor | Molecular Function |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | protein kinase activity | 122 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | enzyme regulator activity <br> translation factor activity, | 101 | 89 | RNA binding |
| 5 | nucleic acid binding | calcium ion binding | 87 | metal ion binding <br> transferase activity, transferring phosphorus-containing |
| 6 | kinase activity | 208 | groups | Molecular Function |
| 5 | lipid binding | 65 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | actin binding | receptor activity | cytoskeletal protein binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | sequence-specific DNA | 53 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | binding transcription factor | 53 |  | Molecular Function |
|  | activity | nucleic acid binding transcription factor activity | Molecular Function |  |
| 3 | phosphoprotein phosphatase | 51 | phosphatase activity | Molecular Function |
| 7 | activity | carbohydrate binding | 50 | Binding |
| 3 | electron carrier activity | 48 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | receptor binding | 42 | protein binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | cytoskeletal protein binding | 95 | protein binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | nuclease activity | 38 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 5 | chromatin binding | 37 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | signal transducer activity | 30 | molecular transducer activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | motor activity | 29 | nucleoside-triphosphatase activity | Molecular Function |
| 8 | transcription regulator activity | 28 | obsolete_molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| Null |  |  | Molecular Function |  |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 2 | antioxidant activity | 19 | molecular_function substrate-specific channel activity, ion transmembrane | Molecular Function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | ion channel activity organic cyclic compound | 16 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | binding carboxylic ester hydrolase | 1213 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity | 9 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 2 | translation regulator activity neurotransmitter transporter | 2 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 4 | activity | 2 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 6 | lead ion binding | 1 | metal ion binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | small molecule binding | 829 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | oxygen binding substrate-specific | 1 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | transmembrane transporter activity <br> hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides, in phosphorus-containing | 16 | substrate-specific transporter activity, transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | anhydrides | 29 | hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides | Molecular Function |
| 2 | molecular transducer activity ion transmembrane transporter | 30 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity | 16 | substrate-specific transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | metal ion binding | 88 | cation binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | channel activity phosphoric ester hydrolase | 16 | passive transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity | 51 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 4 | cation binding | 88 | ion binding | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

| 4 | hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides | 29 | hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | ester bonds <br> transmembrane transporter | 98 | hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | activity | 16 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 6 | phosphatase activity | 51 | phosphoric ester hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | phosphotransferase activity, alcohol group as acceptor nucleic acid binding | 122 | transferase activity, transferring phosphorus-containing groups | Molecular Function |
| 2 | transcription factor activity | 53 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| Null | all substrate-specific transporter | 0 |  | Molecular Function |
| 3 | activity | 16 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | ion binding <br> passive transmembrane | 88 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | transporter activity | 16 | transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| Null | obsolete_molecular_function | 28 |  | Molecular Function |
| Null | nucleoside phosphate binding | 828 | heterocyclic compound binding, organic cyclic compound binding <br> hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides, in | Molecular Function |
| 6 | pyrophosphatase activity | 29 | phosphorus-containing anhydrides | Molecular Function |
| Null | heterocyclic compound binding nucleoside-triphosphatase | 1203 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 7 | activity substrate-specific channel | 29 | pyrophosphatase activity substrate-specific transmembrane transporter activity, | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity | 16 | channel activity | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F2. (cont.)

transferase activity, transferring phosphorus-

## APPENDIX F3. C. tomentosicollis.

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GO } \\ & \text { Level } \end{aligned}$ | Term (Name) | \#Sequence | Parents (Name) | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | metabolic process | 2379 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | regulation of biological process multicellular organismal development | 850 680 | biological regulation, biological_process single-multicellular organism process, developmental process | Biological Process Biological Process |
| 3 | catabolic process nucleobase-containing | 619 | metabolic process <br> heterocycle metabolic process, primary metabolic process, organic cyclic compound metabolic process, cellular aromatic compound metabolic process, cellular nitrogen compound metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | compound metabolic process cellular component organization | 572 708 | process cellular component organization or biogenesis | Biological Process Biological Process |
| 4 | cell differentiation | 413 | cellular developmental process | Biological Process |
| 4 | transport | 620 | establishment of localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | biosynthetic process | 759 | metabolic process primary metabolic process, | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein metabolic process | 998 | macromolecule metabolic process cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process, cellular protein metabolic | Biological Process |
| 6 | translation | 371 | process, gene expression single organism signaling, cell communication, cellular response to | Biological Process |
| 4 | signal transduction anatomical structure | 360 | stimulus, regulation of cellular process anatomical structure development, | Biological Process |
| 4 | morphogenesis | 347 | developmental process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 6 | cellular protein modification process | 344 | cellular protein metabolic process, protein modification process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | response to stress | 316 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell cycle generation of precursor | 249 | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolites and energy | 235 | cellular metabolic process single-organism cellular process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 5 | organelle organization | 420 | component organization | Biological Process |
| 2 | reproduction | 217 | biological_process primary metabolic process, organic | Biological Process |
| 4 | carbohydrate metabolic process | 216 | substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 6 | cytoskeleton organization | 206 | organelle organization organic substance transport, establishment | Biological Process |
| 6 | protein transport | 199 | of protein localization single-organism developmental process, multicellular organismal development, | Biological Process |
| 4 | embryo development | 163 | anatomical structure development | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell death | 159 | death, single-organism cellular process primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic process, single- | Biological Process |
| 4 | lipid metabolic process | 157 | organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | ion transport | 133 | single-organism transport | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to external stimulus | 111 | response to stimulus <br> single organism signaling, cell | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell-cell signaling | 110 | communication | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular homeostasis | 110 | homeostatic process, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 3 | behavior | 100 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | growth | 104 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cell proliferation | 89 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to biotic stimulus | 74 | response to stimulus <br> nucleic acid metabolic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 6 | DNA metabolic process | 72 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to abiotic stimulus | 68 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 6 | mitochondrion organization response to endogenous | 55 | organelle organization | Biological Process |
| 3 | stimulus | 43 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | secondary metabolic process | 41 | single-organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | viral reproduction | 39 | multi-organism cellular process single-multicellular organism process, | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell recognition | 30 | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell communication | 450 | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | primary metabolic process symbiosis, encompassing | 1712 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | mutualism through parasitism | 22 | interspecies interaction between organisms | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell growth regulation of gene expression, | 20 | growth, single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 7 | epigenetic | 19 | regulation of gene expression single-organism cellular process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 5 | cytoplasm organization | 18 | component organization | Biological Process |
| 5 | intracellular signal transduction | 3 | signal transduction | Biological Process |
| 2 | death | 159 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cellular process | 1936 | biological_process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 3 | regulation of biological quality | 110 | biological regulation | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | localization | 620 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 | response to stimulus organic substance metabolic | 648 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 1697 | metabolic process developmental process, single-organism | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular developmental process | 413 | cellular process cellular metabolic process, biosynthetic | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular biosynthetic process organic substance biosynthetic | 371 | process organic substance metabolic process, | Biological Process |
| Null | process <br> single-organism cellular | 371 | biosynthetic process | Biological Process |
| Null | process <br> cellular protein metabolic | 1038 | single-organism process, cellular process protein metabolic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 5 | process <br> single-organism metabolic | 698 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| Null | process anatomical structure | 186 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | development | 398 | developmental process | Biological Process |
| Null | multi-organism cellular process cellular macromolecule | 39 | multi-organism process, cellular process cellular macromolecule metabolic process, cellular biosynthetic process, | Biological Process |
| 5 | biosynthetic process cellular macromolecule | 371 | macromolecule biosynthetic process cellular metabolic process, macromolecule | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process | 744 | metabolic process regulation of biological process, metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of metabolic process | 19 | process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 2 | cellular component organization or biogenesis | 708 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | multi-organism process | 44 | biological_process gene expression, regulation of | Biological Process |
| 6 | regulation of gene expression | 19 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | heterocycle metabolic process | 572 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | organic substance transport establishment of protein | 199 | Transport establishment of localization, protein | Biological Process |
| 5 | localization | 199 | localization | Biological Process |
| Null | single organism signaling | 431 | single-organism process, signaling macromolecule metabolic process, nucleobase-containing compound | Biological Process |
| 5 | nucleic acid metabolic process regulation of macromolecule | 72 | metabolic process macromolecule metabolic process, | Biological Process |
| 5 | metabolic process | 19 | regulation of metabolic process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism process macromolecule metabolic | 1285 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 1054 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | homeostatic process cellular nitrogen compound | 110 | regulation of biological quality cellular metabolic process, nitrogen | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process | 572 | compound metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | signaling | 431 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism transport single-organism developmental | 133 | single-organism process, transport single-organism process, developmental | Biological Process |
| Null | process | 163 | process | Biological Process |
| Null | organic cyclic compound metabolic process | 572 | organic substance metabolic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 2 | multicellular organismal process | 680 | biological process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | macromolecule biosynthetic process | 371 | organic substance biosynthetic process, macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | biological regulation | 879 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | macromolecule localization nitrogen compound metabolic | 199 | Localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 572 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | establishment of localization | 620 | biological_process, localization cellular process, regulation of biological | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of cellular process cellular aromatic compound | 360 | process | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process interspecies interaction | 572 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | between organisms | 22 | multi-organism process | Biological Process |
| 4 | gene expression | 390 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| Null | all | 0 |  | Biological Process |
| 4 | macromolecule modification | 344 | macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular metabolic process | 1322 | metabolic process, cellular process response to stimulus, single-organism | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular response to stimulus | 360 | cellular process | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein localization | 199 | macromolecule localization | Biological Process |
| 2 | developmental process single-multicellular organism | 741 | biological_process multicellular organismal process, single- | Biological Process |
| Null | process | 680 | organism process macromolecule modification, protein | Biological Process |
| 5 | protein modification process | 344 | metabolic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 3 | protein complex | 765 | macromolecular complex | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | cell | 2588 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cytoplasm | 1564 | intracellular part | Cellular Component |
| 6 | mitochondrion | 465 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 7 | nucleus | 642 | intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | intracellular | 2204 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| 7 | cytoskeleton | 317 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle ribonucleoprotein complex, cytoplasmic part, intracellular non-membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | ribosome | 242 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | cytosol | 232 | cytoplasmic part | Cellular Component |
| 4 | plasma membrane | 219 | cell part, cell periphery, membrane | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nucleoplasm | 159 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen | Cellular Component |
| 6 | lipid particle | 144 | cytoplasmic part cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 6 | endoplasmic reticulum | 137 | bounded organelle nuclear part, nuclear lumen, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nucleolus | 103 | non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | organelle | 1728 | cellular_component cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 6 | Golgi apparatus | 97 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | extracellular region | 153 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 7 | chromosome | 107 | intracellular non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)



## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 4 | endomembrane system | 34 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | membrane-bounded organelle | 1307 | Organelle | Cellular Component |
| 3 | vesicle | 66 | Organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | envelope | 34 | cell part intracellular organelle part, organelle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | intracellular organelle lumen | 241 | lumen | Cellular Component |
| Null | all | 0 |  | Cellular Component |
| 2 | extracellular matrix intracellular non-membrane- | 14 | cellular_component intracellular organelle, non-membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 6 | bounded organelle | 695 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | organelle lumen | 241 | organelle part, membrane-enclosed lumen | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nuclear part <br> non-membrane-bounded | 272 | intracellular organelle part, nucleus | Cellular Component |
| 3 | organelle intracellular membrane- | 695 | Organelle intracellular organelle, membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 6 | bounded organelle | 1307 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | membrane-bounded vesicle | 66 | Vesicle | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cytoplasmic part | 1098 | intracellular part, cytoplasm | Cellular Component |
| 3 | cell part | 2276 | cell, cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 6 | cytoskeletal part | 56 | intracellular organelle part, cytoskeleton | Cellular Component |
| 5 | intracellular organelle | 1663 | organelle, intracellular part | Cellular Component |
| 2 | membrane-enclosed lumen | 241 | cellular_component macromolecular complex, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 5 | ribonucleoprotein complex | 242 | part | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 2 | membrane | 219 | cellular_component <br> cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-- <br> bounded organelle <br> cytoplasmic part, vesicle, intracellular <br> organelle <br> cellular_component <br> organelle part, intracellular organelle, <br> intracellular part | Cellular Component <br> 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | microbody | 23 | Cellular Component |  |
| 2 | cytoplasmic vesicle | macromolecular complex | 1003 | Cellular Component Component |
| 4 | intracellular organelle part | 312 | 241 | nuclear part, intracellular organelle lumen | | Cellular Component |
| :--- |
| 7 |
| nuclear lumen |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 4 | RNA binding | 284 | 177 | nucleic acid binding <br> nucleic acid binding <br> heterocyclic compound binding, organic <br> cyclic compound binding <br> kinase activity, phosphotransferase <br> activity, alcohol group as acceptor <br> mNA binding |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 3 | signal transducer activity | 31 | molecular transducer activity | Molecular Function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | chromatin binding | 30 | Binding substrate-specific channel activity, ion | Molecular Function |
| 6 | ion channel activity | 30 | transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 2 | antioxidant activity | 29 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 5 | nuclease activity | 28 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 8 | motor activity <br> carboxylic ester hydrolase | 26 | nucleoside-triphosphatase activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity organic cyclic compound | 17 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 3 | binding neurotransmitter transporter | 1247 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | activity | 3 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 2 | translation regulator activity | 1 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | protein tag | 1 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 6 | 7SK snRNA binding inositol phosphate phosphatase | 1 | snRNA binding | Molecular Function |
| 7 | activity | 1 | phosphatase activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | oxygen binding <br> substrate-specific | 1 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | transmembrane transporter activity hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides, in | 30 | substrate-specific transporter activity, transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | phosphorus-containing anhydrides | 26 | hydrolase activity, acting on acid anhydrides | Molecular Function |
| 2 | molecular transducer activity | 31 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| 5 | ion transmembrane transporter activity | 30 | substrate-specific transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | metal ion binding | 83 | cation binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | channel activity phosphoric ester hydrolase | 30 | passive transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | activity | 47 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| 4 | cation binding | 83 | ion binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | acid anhydrides | 26 | hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| 4 | ester bonds transmembrane transporter | 92 | hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | activity | 30 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | snRNA binding | 1 | RNA binding | Molecular Function |
| 6 | phosphatase activity phosphotransferase activity, | 47 | phosphoric ester hydrolase activity transferase activity, transferring | Molecular Function |
| 5 | alcohol group as acceptor | 124 | phosphorus-containing groups | Molecular Function |
| 3 | small molecule binding nucleic acid binding | 865 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 2 | transcription factor activity | 53 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| Null | all <br> substrate-specific transporter | 0 |  | Molecular Function |
| 3 | activity | 30 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | ion binding <br> passive transmembrane | 83 | Binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | transporter activity | 30 | transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| Null | obsolete_molecular_function | 33 |  | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F3. (cont.)

| Null | nucleoside phosphate binding | 865 | heterocyclic compound binding, organic <br> cyclic compound binding <br> hydrolase activity, acting on acid <br> anhydrides, in phosphorus-containing <br> anhydrides | Molecular Function |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | pyrophosphatase activity <br> heterocyclic compound binding | 26 | 1243 | Binding |
| Null | nucleoside-triphosphatase <br> activity <br> substrate-specific channel <br> activity <br> transferase activity, <br> transferring phosphorus- <br> containing groups | 26 | pyrophosphatase activity <br> substrate-specific transmembrane <br> transporter activity, channel activity | Molecular Function |
| 5 | 212 | Molecular Function |  |  |
| 4 | transferase activity | Molecular Function |  |  |

## APPENDIX F4. M. sjostedti.

| GO <br> Level | Term (Name) | \#Sequence | Parents (Name) | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | metabolic process | 1862 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| Null | single-organism process single-organism cellular | 1001 | biological_process single-organism process, | Biological Process |
| Null | process | 810 | cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | primary metabolic process | 1402 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cellular process | 1567 | biological_process biological regulation, | Biological Process |
| 3 | regulation of biological process | 644 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 | developmental process multicellular organismal | 544 | biological_process single-multicellular organism | Biological Process |
| 3 | development cellular component | 495 | process, developmental process cellular component | Biological Process |
| 3 | organization organic substance metabolic | 557 | organization or biogenesis | Biological Process |
| 3 | process | 1384 | metabolic process primary metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein metabolic process nucleobase-containing | 817 | process <br> heterocycle metabolic process, primary metabolic process, organic cyclic compound metabolic process, cellular aromatic compound metabolic process, cellular nitrogen | Biological Process |
| 4 | compound metabolic process | 512 | compound metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | transport | 506 | establishment of localization | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 3 | catabolic process | 428 | metabolic process metabolic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | cellular metabolic process | 1123 | process | Biological Process |
| 2 | response to stimulus | 477 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 2 5 | biological regulation cellular protein metabolic process | 655 608 | biological_process protein metabolic process, cellular macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process Biological Process |
| 3 5 | biosynthetic process | 641 396 | metabolic process single-organism cellular process, cellular component | Biological Process |
| 5 4 | organelle organization cell differentiation | $\begin{aligned} & 396 \\ & 355 \end{aligned}$ | organization <br> cellular developmental process <br> cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process, cellular protein metabolic process, gene | Biological Process <br> Biological Process |
| 6 | translation <br> macromolecule metabolic | 352 | expression organic substance metabolic | Biological Process |
| 3 | process ${ }^{\text {single-multicellular organism }}$ ( | 889 | process <br> multicellular organismal process, single-organism | Biological Process |
| null | process cellular component | 495 | process | Biological Process |
| 2 | organization or biogenesis | 557 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 4 | heterocycle metabolic process cellular nitrogen compound | 512 | cellular metabolic process cellular metabolic process, nitrogen compound metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolic process organic cyclic compound | 512 | process <br> organic substance metabolic | Biological Process |
| null | metabolic process | 512 | process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 4 | cellular aromatic compound metabolic process | 512 | cellular metabolic process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | cellular macromolecule metabolic process | 677 | cellular metabolic process, macromolecule metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 6 | cellular protein modification process | 265 | cellular protein metabolic process, protein modification process | ological Process |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | establishment of localization | 506 | biological_process, localization anatomical structure | Biological Process |
| 4 | anatomical structure morphogenesis | 260 | development, developmental process | Biological Process |
|  |  |  | single-organism cellular |  |
| 3 | cell cycle | 257 | process | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to stress | 240 | response to stimulus single organism signaling, cell communication, cellular response to stimulus, regulation | Biological Process |
| 4 | signal transduction anatomical structure | 232 | of cellular process | Biological Process |
| 3 | development | 303 | developmental process macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | gene expression | 367 | process | Biological Process |
| 6 | cytoskeleton organization | 216 | organelle organization developmental process, single- | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular developmental process | 355 | organism cellular process <br> cellular macromolecule <br> metabolic process, cellular | Biological Process |
| 5 | cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process | 352 | biosynthetic process, macromolecule biosynthetic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 3 |  |  | single-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | cell communication multicellular organismal | 308 |  |  |
| 2 | process | 495 | biological_process single-organism process, signaling | Biological Process |
| null | single organism signaling | 292 |  | Biological Process |
| 2 | reproduction <br> nitrogen compound metabolic | 184 | biological_process | Biological Process |
| 3 | process <br> generation of precursor | 512 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | metabolites and energy | 164 | cellular metabolic process macromolecule modification, protein metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 5 | protein modification process | 265 |  | Biological Process |
| 2 | localization | 506 | biological_process organic substance transport, establishment of protein | Biological Process |
| 6 | protein transport | 153 | localization cellular process, regulation of | Biological Process |
| 4 | regulation of cellular process | 232 | biological process response to stimulus, single- | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular response to stimulus | 232 | organism cellular process primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | carbohydrate metabolic process | 136 | process | Biological Process |
| 5 | ion transport | 128 | single-organism transport cellular metabolic process, | Biological Process |
| 4 | cellular biosynthetic process macromolecule biosynthetic | 352 | biosynthetic process organic substance biosynthetic process, macromolecule | Biological Process |
| 4 | process | 352 | metabolic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 4 | embryo development | 122 | single-organism developmental process, multicellular organismal development, anatomical structure development | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | signaling | 292 | biological_process primary metabolic process, organic substance metabolic process, single-organism | Biological Process |
| 4 | lipid metabolic process | 111 | metabolic process death, single-organism cellular | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell death | 109 | process <br> macromolecule metabolic | Biological Process |
| 4 | macromolecule modification | 265 | process <br> nucleic acid metabolic process, cellular macromolecule | Biological Process |
| 6 | DNA metabolic process | 95 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 2 | cell proliferation | 95 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| 5 | organic substance transport establishment of protein | 153 | transport establishment of localization, | Biological Process |
| 5 | localization | 153 | protein localization <br> single organism signaling, cell | Biological Process |
| 3 | cell-cell signaling single-organism metabolic | 85 | communication | Biological Process |
| null | process | 129 | metabolic process single-organism process, | Biological Process |
| null | single-organism transport organic substance biosynthetic | 128 | transport organic substance metabolic | Biological Process |
| null | process | 352 | process, biosynthetic process | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 3 | behavior | 74 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | response to external stimulus | 74 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| null | process | 122 | developmental process homeostatic process, single- | Biological Process |
| 3 | cellular homeostasis | 70 | organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 2 | death | 110 | single-organism process | Biological Process |
| 2 | growth | 67 | biological_process macromolecule metabolic process, nucleobase-containing compound | Biological Process |
| 5 | nucleic acid metabolic process | 95 | metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 4 | protein localization | 153 | macromolecule localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to abiotic stimulus | 55 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 4 | homeostatic process | 70 | regulation of biological quality | Biological Process |
| 2 | viral reproduction | 39 | multi-organism cellular process | Biological Process |
| 6 | mitochondrion organization | 38 | organelle organization | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to biotic stimulus | 36 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | macromolecule localization | 153 | localization | Biological Process |
| 3 | response to endogenous stimulus | 30 | response to stimulus | Biological Process |
| 3 | secondary metabolic process | 27 | single-organism metabolic process | Biological Process |
| 3 | regulation of biological quality | 70 | biological regulation multi-organism process, cellular | Biological Process |
| null | multi-organism cellular process | 39 | process | Biological Process |
| 2 | multi-organism process <br> symbiosis, encompassing | 43 | biological_process <br> interspecies interaction between | Biological Process |
| 4 | mutualism through parasitism | 21 | organisms | Biological Process |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{lllll}\hline 3 & \begin{array}{l}\text { cell growth } \\
\text { regulation of gene expression, } \\
\text { epigenetic }\end{array} & 20 & \begin{array}{l}\text { growth, single-organism } \\
\text { cellular process }\end{array}
$$ \& Biological Process <br>
7 \& cytoplasm organization \& 19 \& \begin{array}{l}regulation of gene expression <br>
single-organism cellular <br>
process, cellular component <br>
organization <br>
single-multicellular organism <br>
process, single-organism <br>

cellular process\end{array} \& Biological Process\end{array}\right]\)| Biological Process |
| :--- |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 5 | intracellular organelle | 1402 | organelle, intracellular part intracellular membrane- | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | nucleus | 579 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | macromolecular complex | 859 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 2 6 | organelle intracellular non-membranebounded organelle | 1434 636 | cellular_component intracellular organelle, non-membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 3 | membrane-bounded organelle | 1057 | organelle <br> cytoplasmic part, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 6 | mitochondrion | 315 | membrane-bounded organelle intracellular non-membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 7 | cytoskeleton non-membrane-bounded | 276 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 3 | organelle | 636 | organelle <br> ribonucleoprotein complex, cytoplasmic part, intracellular non-membrane-bounded | Cellular Component |
| 6 | ribosome | 219 | organelle | Cellular Component |
| 6 | cytosol | 204 | cytoplasmic part intracellular organelle part, | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nuclear part | 270 | nucleus nuclear part, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 7 | nuclear lumen | 239 | organelle lumen cell part, cell periphery, | Cellular Component |
| 4 | plasma membrane | 161 | membrane | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nucleoplasm | 141 | nuclear part, nuclear lumen macromolecular complex, | Cellular Component |
| 5 | ribonucleoprotein complex | 219 | intracellular part organelle part, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 4 | intracellular organelle part | 297 | organelle, intracellular part | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 6 | lipid particle | 126 | cytoplasmic part | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | endoplasmic reticulum | 110 | cytoplasmic part, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle intracellular organelle part, | Cellular Component |
| 6 | intracellular organelle lumen | 239 | organelle lumen nuclear part, nuclear lumen, intracellular non-membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nucleolus | 102 | bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 4 | cell periphery | 161 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| 2 | membrane | 161 | cellular_component intracellular non-membrane- | Cellular Component |
| 7 | chromosome | 101 | bounded organelle cytoplasmic part, intracellular | Cellular Component |
| 6 | Golgi apparatus | 82 | membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| 3 | organelle part | 297 | cellular_component, organelle | Cellular Component |
| 2 | extracellular region | 86 | cellular_component organelle part, membrane-enclosed | Cellular Component |
| 4 | organelle lumen cytoplasmic membrane-bounde | 239 | lumen <br> cytoplasmic vesicle, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle, | Cellular Component |
| 7 | vesicle | 61 | membrane-bounded vesicle nuclear part, nuclear lumen, | Cellular Component |
| 6 | nuclear chromosome | 43 | chromosome nuclear part, organelle envelope, | Cellular Component |
| 5 | nuclear envelope | 43 | endomembrane system | Cellular Component |
| 2 | membrane-enclosed lumen | 239 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 4 | membrane-bounded vesicle | 61 | vesicle | Cellular Component |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

\(\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\hline 6 \& cytoplasmic vesicle \& 61 \& \begin{array}{l}cytoplasmic part, vesicle, <br>
intracellular organelle <br>
microtubule cytoskeleton, <br>
cytoskeletal part <br>
cytoplasmic part, intracellular <br>
membrane-bounded organelle <br>
cytoplasmic part, intracellular <br>

membrane-bounded organelle\end{array} \& Cellular Component\end{array}\right]\) Cellular Component | intracellular organelle part, |
| :--- |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 5 | cilium | 4 | cell projection, intracellular membrane-bounded organelle | Cellular Component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | extracellular matrix | 6 | cellular_component | Cellular Component |
| 4 | cell projection | 4 | cell part | Cellular Component |
| 5 | cell wall | 1 | external encapsulating structure | Cellular Component |
| 4 | external encapsulating structure | 1 | cell part, cell periphery | Cellular Component |
| 2 | binding | 1760 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | catalytic activity | 1766 | molecular_function small molecule binding, | Molecular Function |
| 4 | nucleotide binding | 683 | nucleoside phosphate binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | hydrolase activity | 744 | catalytic activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | protein binding organic cyclic compound | 567 | binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | binding | 1016 | binding | Molecular Function |
| Null | heterocyclic compound binding | 1010 | binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 Null | small molecule binding | 683 683 | binding heterocyclic compound binding, organic cyclic | Molecular Function |
| Null | nucleoside phosphate binding | 683 | compound binding | Molecular Function |
| 3 | transferase activity | 470 | catalytic activity heterocyclic compound binding, organic cyclic | Molecular Function |
| 3 | nucleic acid binding | 506 |  | Molecular Function |
| 2 | structural molecule activity | 280 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | transporter activity | 255 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 4 | RNA binding | 256 | nucleic acid binding | Molecular Function |
| 4 | peptidase activity | 174 | hydrolase activity | Molecular Function |
| 4 | DNA binding | 159 | nucleic acid binding | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

\(\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\hline \& \& \& \begin{array}{l}transferase activity, <br>
transferring phosphorus- <br>

containing groups\end{array} \& Molecular Function\end{array}\right]\)| Molecular Function |
| :--- |
| 5 |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

| 4 | cation binding | 78 | ion binding | Molecular Function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | hydrolase activity, acting on |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | 73 | phosphoric ester hydrolase | Molecular Function |
| 6 | phosphatase activity | 42 | activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | chromatin binding | 25 | binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | nuclease activity | 24 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| null | transcription regulator activity | 22 | obsolete_molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 3 | carbohydrate binding | 22 | binding | Molecular Function |
| 2 | receptor activity nucleic acid binding | 21 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 2 | transcription factor activity nucleoside-triphosphatase | 35 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 7 | activity | 30 | pyrophosphatase activity substrate-specific channel activity, ion transmembrane | Molecular Function |
| 6 | ion channel activity | 18 | transporter activity | Molecular Function |
| 3 | ion binding | 78 | binding | Molecular Function |
| 5 | phosphoric ester hydrolase activity | 42 | hydrolase activity, acting on ester bonds | Molecular Function |
| null | obsolete_molecular_function | 22 |  | Molecular Function |
| 2 | antioxidant activity | 12 | molecular_function | Molecular Function |
| 3 | signal transducer activity | 12 | molecular transducer activity substrate-specific | Molecular Function |
| 5 | ion transmembrane transporter activity | 18 | transmembrane transporter activity | Molecular Function |

## APPENDIX F4. (cont.)

\(\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\hline \& \& \& \begin{array}{l}hydrolase activity, acting on <br>
acid anhydrides, in <br>
phosphorus-containing <br>
anhydrides <br>
substrate-specific <br>
transmembrane transporter <br>
activity, channel activity <br>

molecular_function\end{array} \& Molecular Function\end{array}\right]\)| Molecular Function |
| :--- |
| 5 |

APPENDIX G
Species distribution of the top Blastx hits
APPENDIX G1. A. curvipes.


- Riptortus pedestris
- Tribolium castaneum
- Pediculus humanus
- Acyrthosiphon pisum
- Nasonia vitripennis
- Megachile rotundata
- Ceratitis capitata
- Camponotus floridanus
- Harpegnathos saltator
- Dendroctonus ponderosae
- Acromyrmex echinatior
- Bombus impatiens
- Apis mellifera
- Aedes aegypti
- Solenopsis invicta
- Bombus terrestris
- Danaus plexippus
- Daphnia pulex
- Apis florea
- Anopheles gambiae
- Culex quinquefasciatus
- Drosophila melanogaster
- Drosophila willistoni
- Ixodes scapularis
- Drosophila mojavensis
- Drosophila ananassae
- Anopheles darlingi
- Drosophila virilis
- Nilaparvata lugens
- Others


## APPENDIX G2. A. craccivora.



- Acyrthosiphon pisum
- Rhizopus delemar
- Batrachochytrium dendrobatidi
- Pediculus humanus
- Hordeum vulgare
- Buchnera aphidicola
- Ubiquinone
- Toxoptera citricida
- Tribolium castaneum
- Aphis gossypii
- Aphis glycines
- Harpegnathos saltator

Dendroctonus ponderosae

- Megachile rotundata
- Nasonia vitripennis
- Acromyrmex echinatior
- Crassostrea gigas
-Culex quinquefasciatus
- Stereum hirsutum

Rhodosporidium toruloides

- Danaus plexippus
- Drosophila melanogaster
- Tuber melanosporum
- Melampsora larici-populina
- Apis florea

Others

## APPENDIX G3. C. tomentosicollis.



APPENDIX G4. M. sjostedti.


- Tribolium castaneum
- Pediculus humanus
- Danaus plexippus
- Nasonia vitripennis
- Megachile rotundata
- Harpegnathos saltator
- Camponotus floridanus
- Aedes aegypti
- Acyrthosiphon pisum
- Bombyx mori
- Dendroctonus ponderosae

Solenopsis invicta

- Apis mellifera
- Papilio xuthus
- Daphnia pulex
- Acromyrmex echinatior
- Bombus impatiens
- Apis florea
- Riptortus pedestris
- Bombus terrestris
- Anopheles gambiae
- Culex quinquefasciatus
- Papilio polytes
- Coptotermes formosanus
- Ceratitis capitata
- Anopheles darlingi

Branchiostoma floridae

- Spodoptera frugiperda
- Frankliniella occidentalis
- Others


## APPENDIX H

InterProScan results from A. craccivora contigs that showed Blastn hits to B. aphidicola

| Contig ID | InterProScan |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 47 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | SignalP-NN(euk) (SIGNALP) |
| Aphis 47 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | tmhmm (TMHMM) |
| Aphis 47 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 65 | IPR025472 | Protein of unknown function DUF4323 | Family | PF14211 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 65 | IPR025472 | Protein of unknown function DUF4323 | Family |  |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | PR00094 (PRINTS) |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | PTHR23359 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | PF00406 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | GO:0005524 |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | GO:0006139 |
| Aphis 221 | IPR000850 | Adenylate kinase | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0019205 } \\ & \text { SSF52540 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 221 | IPR027417 | P-loop containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 221 | IPR027417 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{loop}$ containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain |  |
| Aphis 221 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:3.40.50.300 <br> (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 221 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 367 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | SignalP-NN(euk) (SIGNALP) |
| Aphis 367 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR001347 | Sugar isomerase (SIS) | Domain | PF01380 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR001347 | Sugar isomerase (SIS) | Domain | PS51464 (PROFILE) |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR001347 | Sugar isomerase (SIS) | Domain | GO:0005975 |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 1561 | IPR001347 | Sugar isomerase (SIS) | Domain | GO:0030246 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR005855 | Glucosamine-fructose-6-phosphate aminotransferase, isomerising | Family | PTHR10937:SF0 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR005855 | Glucosamine-fructose-6-phosphate aminotransferase, isomerising | Family | GO:0004360 |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR005855 | Glucosamine-fructose-6-phosphate aminotransferase, isomerising | Family | GO:0005737 |
| Aphis 1561 | IPR005855 | Glucosamine-fructose-6-phosphate aminotransferase, isomerising | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0016051 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:3.40.50.10490 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 1561 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 1561 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR10937 (PANTHER) SSF53697 |
| Aphis 1561 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 1561 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 2076 | IPR002508 | Cell wall hydrolase/autolysin, catalytic | Domain | G3DSA:3.40.630.40 (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 2076 | IPR002508 | Cell wall hydrolase/autolysin, catalytic | Domain | PF01520 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 2076 | IPR002508 | Cell wall hydrolase/autolysin, catalytic | Domain | GO:0008745 |
| Aphis 2076 | IPR002508 | Cell wall hydrolase/autolysin, catalytic | Domain | GO:0009253 |
| Aphis 2076 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR30404 (PANTHER) <br> PTHR30404:SF0 |
| Aphis 2076 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 2076 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 2391 | IPR001353 | Proteasome, subunit alpha/beta | Family | PF00227 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 2391 | IPR001353 | Proteasome, subunit alpha/beta | Family | GO:0004298 |
| Aphis 2391 | IPR001353 | Proteasome, subunit alpha/beta | Family | GO:0005839 |
| Aphis 2391 | IPR001353 | Proteasome, subunit alpha/beta | Family | GO:0051603 |

APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 2391 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:3.60.20.10 <br> (GENE3D) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 2391 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR32194 (PANTHER) <br> PTHR32194:SF0 |
| Aphis 2391 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | (PANTHER) SSF56235 |
| Aphis 2391 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 2391 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004160 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, C-terminal | Domain | PF03143 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004160 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, C-terminal | Domain | GO:0005525 |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004161 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, domain 2 | Domain | PF03144 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004161 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, domain 2 | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0005525 } \\ & \text { PTHR23115:SF31 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004541 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, bacterial/organelle | Family | (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004541 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, bacterial/organelle | Family | GO:0003746 |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004541 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, bacterial/organelle | Family | GO:0005525 |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004541 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, bacterial/organelle | Family | GO:0005622 |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR004541 | Translation elongation factor EFTu/EF1A, bacterial/organelle | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0006414 } \\ & \text { SSF50447 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR009000 | Translation elongation/initiation factor/Ribosomal, beta-barrel | Domain | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR009000 | Translation elongation/initiation factor/Ribosomal, beta-barrel Translation elongation factor EF1A/initiation factor | Domain | SSF50465 |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR009001 | IF2gamma, C-terminal <br> Translation elongation factor EF1A/initiation factor | Domain | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 2472 | IPR009001 | IF2gamma, C-terminal | Domain |  |
| Aphis 2472 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:2.40.30.10 <br> (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 2472 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR23115 (PANTHER) |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 2472 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | PF01250 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | TIGR00166 (TIGRFAMs) |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | SSF54995 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | GO:0003735 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | GO:0005840 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | GO:0006412 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR000529 | Ribosomal protein S6 | Family | GO:0019843 |
|  |  |  | Domain | G3DSA:3.30.70.60 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR014717 | Translation elongation factor EF1B/ribosomal protein S6 | (GENE3D) |  |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR014717 | Translation elongation factor EF1B/ribosomal protein S6 | Domain |  |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR020815 | Ribosomal protein S6, conserved site | Conserved_site | PS01048 (PROSITE) |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR020815 | Ribosomal protein S6, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0003735 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR020815 | Ribosomal protein S6, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0005840 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR020815 | Ribosomal protein S6, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0006412 |
| Aphis 2530 | IPR020815 | Ribosomal protein S6, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0019843 |
| Aphis 2736 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | SignalP-NN(euk) |
| (SIGNALP) |  |  |  |  |
| Aphis 2736 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 3831 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N-terminal | Domain | PF04760 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 3831 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N-terminal | Domain | GO:0003743 |
| Aphis 3831 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N-terminal | Domain | GO:0006413 |
| Aphis 3831 | IPR009061 | DNA binding domain, putative | Domain | SSF46955 |
| (SUPERFAMILY) | Domain | GO:0000166 |  |  |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 3831 | IPR013575 | Initiation factor 2 associated domain, bacterial | Domain | PF08364 (PFAM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 3831 | IPR013575 | Initiation factor 2 associated domain, bacterial | Domain |  |
| Aphis 3831 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:3.30.56.50 <br> (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 3831 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 3870 | IPR016484 | GTP-binding protein EngA | Family | PTHR11649:SF5 <br> (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 3870 | IPR016484 | GTP-binding protein EngA | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0005525 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:3.40.50.300 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 3870 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 3870 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR11649 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 3870 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR000795 | Elongation factor, GTP-binding domain | Domain | PF00009 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR000795 | Elongation factor, GTP-binding domain | Domain | GO:0003924 |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR000795 | Elongation factor, GTP-binding domain | Domain | GO:0005525 |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR005225 | Small GTP-binding protein domain | Domain | TIGR00231 (TIGRFAMs) |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR005225 | Small GTP-binding protein domain | Domain | GO:0005525 |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N-terminal | Domain | PF04760 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N -terminal | Domain | GO:0003743 |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR006847 | Translation initiation factor IF-2, N -terminal | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0006413 } \\ & \text { PTHR23115:SF41 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR015760 | Translation initiation factor IF-2 | Family | (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR015760 | Translation initiation factor IF- 2 | Family |  |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR027417 | P-loop containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SSF52540 } \\ & \text { (SUPERFAMILY) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 4564 | IPR027417 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{loop}$ containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain |  |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 4564 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:3.40.50.300 (GENE3D) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 4564 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR23115 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 4564 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 4568 | IPR000819 | Peptidase M17, leucyl aminopeptidase, C-terminal | Domain | PF00883 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 4568 | IPR000819 | Peptidase M17, leucyl aminopeptidase, C-terminal | Domain | GO:0004177 |
| Aphis 4568 | IPR000819 | Peptidase M17, leucyl aminopeptidase, C-terminal | Domain | GO:0005622 |
| Aphis 4568 | IPR000819 | Peptidase M17, leucyl aminopeptidase, C-terminal | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0006508 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:3.40.630.10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 4568 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 4568 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR11963 (PANTHER) PTHR11963:SF4 |
| Aphis 4568 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (PANTHER) <br> SSF53187 |
| Aphis 4568 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 4568 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 5021 | IPR027417 | P-loop containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SSF52540 } \\ & \text { (SUPERFAMILY) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 5021 | IPR027417 | P-loop containing nucleoside triphosphate hydrolase | Domain |  |
| Aphis 5021 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | G3DSA:3.40.50.300 <br> (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 5021 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR19211 (PANTHER) PTHR19211:SF7 |
| Aphis 5021 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 5021 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR002133 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase | Family | PTHR11964 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR002133 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase | Family | GO:0004478 |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR002133 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase | Family | GO:0005524 |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 5225 | IPR002133 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase | Family | GO:0006556 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022628 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase, N-terminal | Domain | PF00438 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022628 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase, N-terminal | Domain | GO:0004478 |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022628 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase, N-terminal | Domain | GO:0006556 |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022636 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase superfamily | Domain | SSF55973 |
| (SUPERFAMILY) |  |  |  |  |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022636 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase superfamily | Domain | GO:0004478 |
| Aphis 5225 | IPR022636 | S-adenosylmethionine synthetase superfamily | Domain | GO:0006556 <br> G3DSA:3.30.300.10 |
| Aphis 5225 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 5225 noIPR Unintegrated unintegrated | PTHR11964:SF0 |  |  |  |
| (PANTHER) |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 5691 | IPR005882 | Bifunctional UDP-N-acetylglucosamine pyrophosphorylase/glucosamine-1-phosphate N acetyltransferase Bifunctional UDP-N-acetylglucosamine | Family | GO:0003977 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR005882 | pyrophosphorylase/glucosamine-1-phosphate Nacetyltransferase <br> Bifunctional UDP-N-acetylglucosamine | Family | GO:0005737 |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR005882 | pyrophosphorylase/glucosamine-1-phosphate N acetyltransferase | Family | GO:0009103 |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR005882 | Bifunctional UDP-N-acetylglucosamine pyrophosphorylase/glucosamine-1-phosphate Nacetyltransferase | Family | GO:0009252 |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR005882 | Bifunctional UDP-N-acetylglucosamine pyrophosphorylase/glucosamine-1-phosphate N acetyltransferase | Family | GO:0019134 |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR011004 | Trimeric LpxA-like | Domain | SSF51161 <br> (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 5691 | IPR011004 | Trimeric LpxA-like | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0016740 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:2.160.10.10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 5691 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 5691 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR22572 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 5691 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR001844 | Chaperonin Cpn60 | Family | PR00298 (PRINTS) |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR001844 | Chaperonin Cpn60 | Family | GO:0005737 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR001844 | Chaperonin Cpn60 | Family | GO:0042026 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR002423 | Chaperonin Cpn60/TCP-1 | Family | PTHR11353 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR002423 | Chaperonin Cpn60/TCP-1 | Family | PF00118 (PFAM) |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 5984 | IPR002423 | Chaperonin Cpn60/TCP-1 | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SSF48592 } \\ & \text { (SUPERFAMILY) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR002423 | Chaperonin Cpn60/TCP-1 | Family | GO:0005524 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR002423 | Chaperonin Cpn60/TCP-1 | Family | GO:0044267 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR018370 | Chaperonin Cpn60, conserved site | Conserved_site | PS00296 (PROSITE) |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR018370 | Chaperonin Cpn60, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0005524 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR018370 | Chaperonin Cpn60, conserved site | Conserved_site | GO:0005737 |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR018370 | Chaperonin Cpn60, conserved site | Conserved_site | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0006457 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:3.50.7.10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR027409 | GroEL-like apical domain | Domain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (GENE3D) } \\ & \text { SSF52029 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR027409 | GroEL-like apical domain | Domain | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR027409 | GroEL-like apical domain | Domain |  |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR027413 | GroEL-like equatorial domain | Domain | G3DSA:1.10.560.10 (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 5984 | IPR027413 | GroEL-like equatorial domain | Domain |  |
| Aphis 5984 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | PTHR11353:SF10 <br> (PANTHER) |
| $\text { Aphis } 5984$ | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 6159 | IPR011603 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase, E1 component | Family | PTHR23152 (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 6159 | IPR011603 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase, E1 component | Family | GO:0004591 |
| Aphis 6159 | IPR011603 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase, E1 component | Family | GO:0006099 |
| Aphis 6159 | IPR011603 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase, E1 component | Family | GO:0030976 |
| Aphis 6159 | IPR011603 | 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase, E1 component | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0055114 } \\ & \text { PTHR23152:SF0 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 6159 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (PANTHER) |
| Aphis 6159 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 6899 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | SignalP-NN(euk) (SIGNALP) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 6899 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 7020 | IPR002903 | Ribosomal RNA small subunit methyltransferase H | Family | PF01795 (PFAM) |
| Aphis 7020 | IPR002903 | Ribosomal RNA small subunit methyltransferase H | Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GO:0008168 } \\ & \text { G3DSA:3.40.1280.10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Aphis 7209 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 7209 | noIPR | unintegrated | unintegrated |  |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR000454 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C | Family | PR00124 (PRINTS) <br> G3DSA:1.20.20.10 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR000454 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C | Family | (GENE3D) |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR000454 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C | Family | GO:0015078 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR000454 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C | Family | GO:0015986 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR002379 | V-ATPase proteolipid subunit C-like domain | Domain | PF00137 (PFAM) SSF81333 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR002379 | V-ATPase proteolipid subunit C-like domain | Domain | (SUPERFAMILY) |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR002379 | V-ATPase proteolipid subunit C-like domain | Domain | GO:0015078 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR002379 | V-ATPase proteolipid subunit C-like domain | Domain | GO:0015991 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR005953 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C, bacterial/chloroplast | Family | TIGR01260 (TIGRFAMs) |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR005953 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C, bacterial/chloroplast | Family | GO:0015078 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR005953 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C, bacterial/chloroplast | Family | GO:0015986 |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR020537 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C, DCCD-binding site | Binding_site | PS00605 (PROSITE) |
| Aphis 7344 | IPR020537 | ATPase, F0 complex, subunit C, DCCD-binding site | Binding_site |  |

## APPENDIX H. (cont.)

| Aphis 7344 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | SignalP-NN(euk) <br> (SIGNALP) <br> Aphis 7344 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated | tmhmm (TMHMM) |  |
| Aphis 7344 | noIPR | Unintegrated | unintegrated |  |

APPENDIX I
Summary of all SNPs detected in contigs including sequence description, length, organism, minimum e-value, number of GOs, and number of SNPs associated with each contig.

APPENDIX I1. A. curvipes.

| Contig ID | Sequence Description | Length (bp) | Organism | Minimum E-value | \#GOs | \#SNPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 7 | elongation factor 1-alpha | 2152 | Riptortus pedestris | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Anop 13 | atp synthase subunit mitochondrial-like | 2165 | Toxoptera citricida | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Anop 14 | ankyrin repeat protein | 1054 | Candidatus Amoebophilus asiaticus | 5.64E-58 | 6 | 4 |
| Anop 15 | ankyrin repeat protein | 874 | Candidatus Amoebophilus asiaticus | 4.05E-47 | 6 | 10 |
| Anop 17 | cg7630 cg7630-pa | 772 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $3.58 \mathrm{E}-18$ | 0 | 2 |
| Anop 23 | rrna intron-encoded homing endonuclease | 2738 | Oxytricha trifallax | $1.17 \mathrm{E}-55$ | 1 | 1 |
| Anop 25 | cg41536 cg41536- partial | 3200 | Daphnia pulex | 1.90E-57 | 0 | 7 |
| Anop 26 | trifunctional purine biosynthetic protein adenosine-3 | 1487 | Tribolium castaneum | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Anop 27 | transferrin | 305 | Riptortus clavatus | $9.41 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 4 | 4 |
| Anop 31 | transferrin | 1344 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Anop 33 | achain crystal structure of engineered northeast structural genomics consortium target | 639 | synthetic construct | $1.17 \mathrm{E}-31$ | 4 | 3 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 34 | orf16-lacz fusion protein | 1781 | Heliobacterium modesticaldum Icel | 2.91E-53 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 35 | N/A | 851 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 50 | atp-citrate synthase | 3596 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 6 |
| Anop 51 | atp synthase f0 subunit 6 | 321 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $1.47 \mathrm{E}-38$ | 4 |
| Anop 52 | atp synthase f0 subunit 6 | 315 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $5.60 \mathrm{E}-37$ | 4 |
| Anop 53 | atpase subunit 6 | 310 | Riptortus pedestris | $2.66 \mathrm{E}-22$ | 4 |
| Anop 54 | atp synthase f0 subunit 6 | 393 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $5.99 \mathrm{E}-47$ | 4 |
| Anop 55 | pleiotrophin-like protein | 1400 | Tribolium castaneum | 4.47E-40 | 2 |
| Anop 58 | basic juvenile hormone sensitive hemolymph protein | 714 | Riptortus clavatus | 2.30E-119 | 6 |
| Anop 64 | midline fasciclin | 3028 | Tribolium castaneum | $5.98 \mathrm{E}-81$ | 3 |
| Anop 71 | arylphorin receptor | 4026 | Calliphora vicina | 0 | 3 |
| Anop 72 | N/A | 355 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 84 | apolipophorins | 4036 | Apis mellifera | $3.14 \mathrm{E}-102$ | 1 |
| Anop 87 | adp atp translocase | 1573 | Triatoma infestans | 0 | 4 |
| Anop 92 | 15-hydroxyprostaglandin dehydrogenase | 1077 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $3.00 \mathrm{E}-43$ | 4 |
| Anop 97 | ribosomal protein s18 | 571 | Cicindela campestris | 2.94E-86 | 4 |
| Anop 99 | hemi_pyrap ame: full=hemiptericin | 603 | Hemiptericin | $5.33 \mathrm{E}-23$ | 3 |
| Anop 106 | cytochrome b | 463 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $3.73 \mathrm{E}-61$ | 7 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 107 | cytochrome b | 849 | Hydaropsis longirostris | 3.70E-129 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 112 | enolase | 3401 | Dendroctonus ponderosae | 0 | 4 |
| Anop 113 | atp synthase subunit mitochondrial | 1231 | Apis mellifera | 0 | 6 |
| Anop 120 | glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase | 400 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $4.12 \mathrm{E}-31$ | 7 |
| Anop 121 | glyceraldhyde-3-phosphate partial | 389 | Apolygus lucorum | $1.51 \mathrm{E}-64$ | 3 |
| Anop 123 | glyceraldehyde 3 phosphate dehydrogenase 1 | 535 | Apolygus lucorum | $1.06 \mathrm{E}-97$ | 8 |
| Anop 125 | cytochrome c oxidase subunit partial | 519 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $1.65 \mathrm{E}-86$ | 8 |
| Anop 133 | apolipophorin-iii precursor | 580 | Riptortus clavatus | $1.13 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 3 |
| Anop 152 | tropomyosin 1 | 1814 | Megachile rotundata | $2.51 \mathrm{E}-158$ | 3 |
| Anop 153 | myosin heavy muscle isoform 1 | 6145 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 42 |
| Anop 159 | N/A | 358 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 161 | trifunctional enzyme beta subunit (tp-beta) | 832 | Tribolium castaneum | $3.07 \mathrm{E}-135$ | 7 |
| Anop 162 | vitellogenin | 4518 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 2 |
| Anop 163 | cytochrome c oxidase subunit iii | 1109 | Stictopleurus subviridis | 5.33E-55 | 4 |
| Anop 164 | cytochrome c oxidase subunit iii | 367 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $1.94 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 4 |
| Anop 165 | proactivator polypeptide | 2113 | Tribolium castaneum | 1.32E-137 | 4 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 169 | lipoyltransferase mitochondrial-like | 3307 | Bombus terrestris | 4.31E-122 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 175 | fatty acid synthase | 7421 | Nasonia vitripennis | 0 | 6 |
| Anop 184 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 5 | 604 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $6.57 \mathrm{E}-35$ | 4 |
| Anop 187 | hexamerin 1 | 784 | Riptortus clavatus | 8.69E-113 | 6 |
| Anop 188 | vitellogenin | 2422 | Riptortus clavatus | $7.45 \mathrm{E}-168$ | 4 |
| Anop 198 | ribosomal protein 19 | 709 | Tribolium castaneum | $5.21 \mathrm{E}-119$ | 4 |
| Anop 205 | actin | 1506 | Drosophila melanogaster | 0 | 13 |
| Anop 213 | ribosomal protein s25 | 413 | Diaphorina citri | $1.57 \mathrm{E}-40$ | 3 |
| Anop 214 | probable bax inhibitor 1-like | 1533 | Triatoma infestans | $2.98 \mathrm{E}-111$ | 1 |
| Anop 215 | N/A | 295 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 236 | heat shock protein 70 | 776 | Pyrrhocoris apterus | 6.14E-154 | 2 |
| Anop 238 | N/A | 382 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 241 | mitochondrial porin | 1644 | Homalodisca vitripennis | 4.96E-133 | 11 |
| Anop 249 | cathepsin l-like | 438 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $5.67 \mathrm{E}-63$ | 1 |
| Anop 258 | ribosomal protein s9 | 690 | Meladema coriacea | $7.39 \mathrm{E}-119$ | 5 |
| Anop 261 | heat shock protein 70 | 571 | Pyrrhocoris apterus | $9.12 \mathrm{E}-96$ | 4 |
| Anop 266 | heat shock protein 90 | 1073 | Camponotus floridanus | 0 | 4 |
| Anop 274 | serine threonine-protein phosphatase 6 regulatory ankyrin repeat subunit a-like | 290 | Strongylocentrotus purpuratus | $1.32 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 2 |
| Anop 275 | imaginal disc growth factor | 901 | Oncometopia nigricans | $3.47 \mathrm{E}-105$ | 2 |
| Anop 277 | imaginal disc growth factor | 419 | Pieris rapae | $3.05 \mathrm{E}-34$ | 4 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 282 | cytochrome oxidase subunit 1 | 610 | Sethenira ferruginea | $1.40 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 285 | N/A | 434 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 290 | N/A | 424 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 291 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 2 | 455 | Chauliops fallax | $3.37 \mathrm{E}-24$ | 5 |
| Anop 293 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 2 | 553 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $9.67 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 5 |
| Anop 296 | N/A | 673 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 300 | cytochrome oxidase subunit 1 | 356 | Homoeocerus sp. ST-2009 | $5.22 \mathrm{E}-28$ | 10 |
| Anop 304 | probable atp-dependent rna helicase ddx17-like | 2214 | Tribolium castaneum | 0 | 6 |
| Anop 316 | ribosomal protein p 1 | 526 | Triatoma infestans | $7.86 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 3 |
| Anop 318 | N/A | 508 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 324 | N/A | 563 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 325 | vitellogenin | 2012 | Lethocerus deyrollei | $1.28 \mathrm{E}-124$ | 2 |
| Anop 332 | cytochrome p450 | 901 | Tribolium castaneum | $3.01 \mathrm{E}-34$ | 2 |
| Anop 334 | cytochrome oxidase subunit i | 219 | Cletus punctiger | $4.87 \mathrm{E}-35$ | 10 |
| Anop 337 | ribosomal protein 123a | 1033 | Tribolium castaneum | 8.98E-79 | 7 |
| Anop 344 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 2 | 360 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $3.83 \mathrm{E}-13$ | 4 |
| Anop 348 | apolipophorin-iii precursor | 477 | Riptortus clavatus | $3.45 \mathrm{E}-59$ | 3 |
| Anop 349 | apolipophorin-iii precursor | 472 | Riptortus clavatus | $5.47 \mathrm{E}-63$ | 3 |
| Anop 351 | ankyrin repeat domain protein | 951 | Strongylocentrotus purpuratus | $8.78 \mathrm{E}-35$ | 3 |
| Anop 354 | hypothetical protein EAI_16042 | 681 | Harpegnathos saltator | $9.95 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0 |
| Anop 358 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit i | 1020 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $1.09 \mathrm{E}-108$ | 4 |
| Anop 364 | cytochrome b | 848 | Riptortus pedestris | 8.85E-42 | 7 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 365 | disulfide isomerase | 1998 | Litopenaeus vannamei | 0 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 376 | abp2_ripcl ame: full=probable antibacterial peptide flags: precursor | 945 | Riptortus clavatus | $2.01 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 1 |
| Anop 377 | superoxide dismutase | 778 | Triatoma infestans | $2.65 \mathrm{E}-82$ | 4 |
| Anop 380 | ubiquitin | 228 | Cherax quadricarinatus | $1.16 \mathrm{E}-46$ | 61 |
| Anop 389 | N/A | 518 |  |  | 4 |
| Anop 392 | atp synthase delta mitochondrial | 566 | Culex quinquefasciatus | $1.11 \mathrm{E}-53$ | 4 |
| Anop 395 | 40s ribosomal protein s2 | 1113 | Tribolium castaneum | 4.75E-139 | 4 |
| Anop 422 | N/A | 342 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 433 | ribosomal protein 17a | 943 | Solenopsis invicta | 2.72E-97 | 2 |
| Anop 447 | ornithine decarboxylase | 1221 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $1.12 \mathrm{E}-42$ | 2 |
| Anop 467 | mitochondrial phosphate carrier protein | 1338 | Aedes aegypti | 7.12E-164 | 4 |
| Anop 471 | cytochrome oxidase subunit partial | 361 | Anoplocnemis phasianus | $1.43 \mathrm{E}-51$ | 10 |
| Anop 473 | cytochrome oxidase subunit 1 | 330 | Leptocorisa vericornis | $7.21 \mathrm{E}-55$ | 10 |
| Anop 480 | ribonuclease uk114-like isoform 1 | 816 | Drosophila virilis | $3.86 \mathrm{E}-58$ | 2 |
| Anop 485 | ankyrin repeat protein | 524 | synthetic construct | $9.81 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 1 |
| Anop 494 | N/A | 662 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 503 | AGAP010360-PA | 817 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $4.83 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 3 |
| Anop 517 | N/A | 244 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 520 | ribosomal protein 124 | 544 | Bombyx mori | $9.31 \mathrm{E}-61$ | 2 |
| Anop 523 | ribosomal protein 114 | 544 | Lygus lineolaris | $1.26 \mathrm{E}-68$ | 3 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 527 | luciferin-regenerating enzyme | 1169 | Nasonia vitripennis | $4.87 \mathrm{E}-70$ | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 534 | N/A | 602 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 541 | isoform cra_b | 403 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | 8.92E-20 | 7 |
| Anop 552 | acyl- -binding protein | 702 | Rhodnius prolixus | $3.61 \mathrm{E}-39$ | 2 |
| Anop 561 | i-type lysozyme | 512 | Nilaparvata lugens | $3.77 \mathrm{E}-41$ | 3 |
| Anop 568 | peroxiredoxin 1 | 1112 | Coptotermes formosanus | $8.53 \mathrm{E}-79$ | 10 |
| Anop 569 | elongation factor 1 delta | 753 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $6.56 \mathrm{E}-65$ | 9 |
| Anop 576 | alpha-glucosidase | 1276 | Aedes aegypti | $3.27 \mathrm{E}-90$ | 4 |
| Anop 582 | cg31997 cg31997-pa | 616 | Megachile rotundata | $2.14 \mathrm{E}-43$ | 3 |
| Anop 597 | polyadenylate-binding protein 1-like isoform 1 | 2456 | Bombus terrestris | 0 | 4 |
| Anop 602 | luciferin-regenerating enzyme | 843 | Nasonia vitripennis | $2.46 \mathrm{E}-45$ | 3 |
| Anop 609 | cathepsin 1 | 523 | Drosophila mojavensis | $1.20 \mathrm{E}-61$ | 5 |
| Anop 615 | cg12324 protein | 466 | Triatoma infestans | $8.81 \mathrm{E}-86$ | 5 |
| Anop 622 | pheromone-degrading enzyme | 734 | Pyrrhocoris apterus | $4.12 \mathrm{E}-50$ | 1 |
| Anop 643 | phosphatidylethanolamine-binding protein | 325 | Apis mellifera | $9.09 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 0 |
| Anop 648 | N/A | 733 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 658 | N/A | 374 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 662 | ferritin heavy chain | 1009 | Nasonia vitripennis | $2.92 \mathrm{E}-56$ | 6 |
| Anop 664 | salivary secreted cystatin 3 precursor | 574 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $6.72 \mathrm{E}-16$ | 5 |
| Anop 674 | odorant-binding protein | 732 | Apolygus lucorum | $3.77 \mathrm{E}-17$ | 1 |
| Anop 678 | superoxide dismutase | 1406 | $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{Zn}$ | 8.83E-50 | 18 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 683 | N/A | 350 |  |  | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 708 | N/A | 1002 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 714 | N/A | 686 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 729 | ubiquinol-cytochrome c reductase complex 14 kda protein | 709 | Papilio xuthus | 5.40E-43 | 6 |
| Anop 744 | mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit 5b isoform 1 | 562 | Triatoma infestans | 8.47E-51 | 4 |
| Anop 758 | N/A | 451 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 759 | cytochrome c | 651 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $1.71 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 9 |
| Anop 771 | N/A | 830 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 772 | fructose -bisphosphate aldolase | 1414 | Daphnia pulex | 0 | 21 |
| Anop 782 | PREDICTED: hypothetical protein LOC100648520 | 386 | Bombus terrestris | 7.11E-07 | 0 |
| Anop 799 | cytochrome c oxidase polypeptide iv | 673 | Locusta migratoria | 4.36E-71 | 7 |
| Anop 800 | ribosomal protein 110 | 771 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.12 \mathrm{E}-147$ | 3 |
| Anop 805 | N/A | 402 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 807 | 40s ribosomal protein s8-like | 709 | Triatoma infestans | $1.59 \mathrm{E}-123$ | 3 |
| Anop 809 | ribosomal protein 131 | 696 | Harpegnathos saltator | $1.71 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 3 |
| Anop 818 | glutamine synthetase 2 | 867 | Nilaparvata lugens | $1.07 \mathrm{E}-173$ | 7 |
| Anop 825 | transferrin | 1095 | Riptortus clavatus | $4.20 \mathrm{E}-136$ | 4 |
| Anop 828 | 60s ribosomal protein 15 | 972 | Laodelphax striatella | $4.66 \mathrm{E}-168$ | 7 |
| Anop 829 | N/A | 644 |  |  | 0 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 843 | fk506-binding protein | 638 | Daphnia pulex | $1.31 \mathrm{E}-63$ | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 849 | 40 s ribosomal protein s11 | 667 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $3.68 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 3 |
| Anop 850 | peripheral-type benzodiazepine receptor | 1056 | Drosophila grimshawi | $3.22 \mathrm{E}-40$ | 3 |
| Anop 857 | N/A | 731 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 877 | suppressor of g2 allele of skp1 homolog | 1438 | Gorilla gorilla gorilla | $8.00 \mathrm{E}-47$ | 6 |
| Anop 878 | inter-alpha-trypsin inhibitor heavy chain h4 precursor | 2250 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 9.23E-130 | 2 |
| Anop 886 | pancreatic triacylglycerol lipase | 1779 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 1 |
| Anop 902 | cathepsin b-like proteinase | 1396 | Daphnia pulex | $1.62 \mathrm{E}-157$ | 3 |
| Anop 906 | heat shock protein 70 | 2713 | Lycorma delicatula | 0 | 5 |
| Anop 908 | guanine nucleotide-binding protein subunit beta-like | 1042 | Blattella germanica | 0 | 2 |
| Anop 911 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 4 | 2548 | Riptortus pedestris | $2.50 \mathrm{E}-119$ | 5 |
| Anop 958 | arginine kinase | 1742 | Anasa tristis | 0 | 3 |
| Anop 967 | N/A | 323 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 971 | N/A | 818 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 982 | N/A | 558 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1000 | thiamin pyrophosphokinase 1 | 1131 | Tribolium castaneum | $1.82 \mathrm{E}-55$ | 1 |
| Anop 1017 | gelsolin precursor | 2022 | Culex quinquefasciatus | $1.14 \mathrm{E}-175$ | 2 |
| Anop 1027 | N/A | 636 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1050 | phosphoenolpyruvate isoform a | 2429 | Tribolium castaneum | 0 | 4 |
| Anop 1084 | pneumolysin | 567 | Streptococcus mitis SK597 | $1.69 \mathrm{E}-19$ | 10 |
| Anop 1085 | serine rich protein | 2575 | Nematostella vectensis | $5.49 \mathrm{E}-54$ | 5 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 1109 | unknown | 1096 | Lygus lineolaris | $3.06 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 1125 | eukaryotic translation initiation factor x -chromosomal-like | 999 | Triatoma infestans | $2.40 \mathrm{E}-78$ | 7 |
| Anop 1126 | arylphorin subunit a4 | 708 | Calliphora vicina | $1.25 \mathrm{E}-140$ | 2 |
| Anop 1136 | N/A | 558 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1163 | sugar phosphate exchanger 2-like isoform 2 | 2076 | Megachile rotundata | $3.04 \mathrm{E}-179$ | 3 |
| Anop 1166 | N/A | 407 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1170 | cathepsin d | 1027 | Callosobruchus maculatus | $8.02 \mathrm{E}-97$ | 1 |
| Anop 1173 | N/A | 363 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1189 | vitellogenin | 624 | Riptortus clavatus | $5.41 \mathrm{E}-65$ | 2 |
| Anop 1193 | phosphoserine aminotransferase | 1277 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $8.67 \mathrm{E}-168$ | 4 |
| Anop 1201 | apolipoprotein d-like | 919 | Nasonia vitripennis | $1.28 \mathrm{E}-95$ | 1 |
| Anop 1202 | chemosensory protein 1 | 414 | Apolygus lucorum | $2.14 \mathrm{E}-40$ | 0 |
| Anop 1207 | cathepsin b | 1027 | Branchiostoma floridae | $3.92 \mathrm{E}-107$ | 3 |
| Anop 1217 | ribosomal protein 113 | 787 | Xenopsylla cheopis | $8.21 \mathrm{E}-86$ | 3 |
| Anop 1229 | cytosolic malate dehydrogenase | 1484 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $2.23 \mathrm{E}-164$ | 8 |
| Anop 1233 | citrate synthase | 1848 | Aedes aegypti | 0 | 5 |
| Anop 1236 | ribosomal protein s15e | 445 | Diaphorina citri | $1.33 \mathrm{E}-66$ | 6 |
| Anop 1237 | N/A | 650 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1243 | N/A | 703 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1268 | translationally controlled tumor protein | 866 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $2.33 \mathrm{E}-103$ | 1 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 1269 | atp synthase-like protein | 1078 | Papilio xuthus | $2.13 \mathrm{E}-86$ | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anop 1276 | N/A | 1450 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1277 | N/A | 1292 |  | 1 |  |
| Anop 1294 | ribosomal protein 128 | 506 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $2.64 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 3 |
| Anop 1295 | ankyrin repeat protein | 954 | Synechococcus sp. JA-3-3Ab | $7.39 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 0 |
| Anop 1302 | cg31997 cg31997-pa | 540 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $7.78 \mathrm{E}-47$ | 1 |
| Anop 1312 | N/A | 727 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1349 | maltase a3 | 1179 | Nilaparvata lugens | $8.19 \mathrm{E}-96$ | 1 |
| Anop 1357 | N/A | 843 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1361 | N/A | 938 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1375 | N/A | 1357 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1384 | N/A | 493 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Anop 1411 | vitellogenin | 1922 | Riptortus clavatus | 2 |  |
| Anop 1426 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 5 | 295 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $1.02 \mathrm{E}-49$ | 5 |
| Anop 1518 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 5 | 962 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $6.06 \mathrm{E}-76$ | 5 |
| Anop 1524 | elongation factor 1 beta | 772 | Triatoma infestans | $1.17 \mathrm{E}-108$ | 3 |
| Anop 1526 | N/A | 450 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1550 | N/A | 441 |  | 0 |  |
| Anop 1553 | N/A | 939 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Anop 1563 | ribosomal protein l3 | 1276 | Bombus terrestris | 0 | 3 |
| Anop 1627 | small heat shock protein | 823 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $2.50 \mathrm{E}-46$ | 1 |
| Anop 1666 | chemosensory protein 1 | 558 | Apolygus lucorum | $3.24 \mathrm{E}-51$ | 0 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 1686 | odorant binding protein 2 | 843 | Apolygus lucorum | $6.23 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 1692 | cellular retinaldehyde-binding protein | 1260 | Tribolium castaneum | $4.14 \mathrm{E}-120$ | 3 |
| Anop 1703 | N/A | 467 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1766 | phosphoglycerate mutase | 991 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 1.66E-140 | 2 |
| Anop 1776 | cytochrome p 4504 g 15 | 1857 | Acromyrmex echinatior | 0 | 6 |
| Anop 1794 | atp synthase-coupling factor mitochondrial | 809 | Aedes albopictus | $2.43 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 4 |
| Anop 1815 | pyrimidine-specific ribonucleoside hydrolase riha-like | 1189 | Bombus impatiens | 4.91E-65 | 1 |
| Anop 1823 | lyzozyme m1 | 844 | Wolbachia endosymbiont of Drosophila simulans wNo | 5.29E-74 | 2 |
| Anop 1835 | acyl-protein thioesterase | 1828 | Camponotus floridanus | 2.65E-96 | 3 |
| Anop 1842 | 40s ribosomal protein s3a | 879 | Triatoma infestans | $4.32 \mathrm{E}-164$ | 3 |
| Anop 1844 | serine proteinase stubble | 809 | Megachile rotundata | $1.69 \mathrm{E}-43$ | 2 |
| Anop 1855 | chkov1 | 468 | Drosophila persimilis | $1.80 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 4 |
| Anop 1856 | N/A | 849 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1896 | aminopeptidase -like | 1463 | Apis mellifera | 2.74E-177 | 2 |
| Anop 1909 | N/A | 430 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 1945 | heat shock protein 60 | 2658 | Apis mellifera | 0 | 13 |
| Anop 1989 | catalase | 1763 | Schistocerca gregaria | 0 | 0 |
| Anop 2003 | heat shock protein | 963 | Schistocerca gregaria | $1.63 \mathrm{E}-53$ | 2 |
| Anop 2142 | ribosomal protein 17 | 912 | Papilio polytes | $1.52 \mathrm{E}-103$ | 2 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 2149 | heat shock protein 90 | 419 | Apis mellifera | $1.70 \mathrm{E}-70$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anop 2178 | thiol-activated cytolysin | 1072 | Streptococcus mitis | $2.69 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 1 |
| Anop 2212 | glutathione s-transferase | 417 | Aphis gossypii | $5.51 \mathrm{E}-18$ | 1 |
| Anop 2312 | hemi_pyrap ame: full=hemiptericin | 395 | Pyrrhocoris apterus | $8.00 \mathrm{E}-24$ | 3 |
| Anop 2378 | brain protein 44-like | 450 | Ixodes scapularis | $1.30 \mathrm{E}-34$ | 3 |
| Anop 2385 | N/A | 302 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 2440 | ribosomal protein 111 | 679 | Triatoma infestans | $6.41 \mathrm{E}-120$ | 7 |
| Anop 2477 | puromycin-sensitive aminopeptidase | 2848 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $1.90 \mathrm{E}-68$ | 0 |
| Anop 2534 | cytochrome p450 | 1594 | Culex quinquefasciatus | $2.25 \mathrm{E}-45$ | 8 |
| Anop 2559 | cytochrome b-c1 complex subunit mitochondrial-like | 1535 | Tribolium castaneum | $5.04 \mathrm{E}-67$ | 6 |
| Anop 2571 | AGAP001981-PB | 818 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | 1.85E-09 | 0 |
| Anop 2593 | N/A | 513 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 2635 | cathepsin 1 | 868 | Litopenaeus vannamei | $3.20 \mathrm{E}-87$ | 1 |
| Anop 2636 | fatty acid binding protein | 529 | Lygus lineolaris | $1.02 \mathrm{E}-59$ | 3 |
| Anop 2804 | N/A | 468 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 2828 | N/A | 673 |  |  | 0 |
| Anop 2833 | GJ21142 | 344 | Drosophila virilis | $4.70 \mathrm{E}-23$ | 0 |
| Anop 2861 | dihydrolipoamide dehydrogenase e3 subunit | 1732 | Pediculus humanus corporis | 0 | 5 |
| Anop 2926 | kda midgut protein | 332 | Lygus lineolaris | $6.26 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 0 |
| Anop 3353 | probable maltase 1-like | 376 | Nilaparvata lugens | $6.25 \mathrm{E}-18$ | 1 |

## APPENDIX I1. (cont.)

| Anop 3481 | small heat shock protein | 946 | Lygus hesperus | $2.82 \mathrm{E}-65$ | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anop 3688 | N/A | 321 |  | 3 |  |
| Anop 3823 | 3-hydroxyacyl-coa dehyrogenase | 1100 | Papilio xuthus | $6.73 \mathrm{E}-134$ | 4 |
| Anop 4243 | N/A | 339 |  | 0 | 2 |
| Anop 5253 | N/A | 411 |  | 0 | 3 |
| Anop 6789 | N/A | 659 |  | 0 | 3 |
| Anop 8555 | N/A | 534 |  | 0 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I2. A. craccivora.

| Contig ID | Sequence Description | Length (bp) | Organism | Minimum E-value | \#GOs | \#SNPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 41 | adp atp translocase | 1789 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Aphis 45 | enolase | 1701 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Aphis 85 | mitochondrial atp synthase f chain | 877 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.73 \mathrm{E}-66$ | 5 | 2 |
| Aphis 90 | 60s acidic ribosomal protein p 2 | 454 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.16 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 3 | 3 |
| Aphis 102 | 60s ribosomal protein 111-like | 682 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.86 \mathrm{E}-133$ | 7 | 6 |
| Aphis 103 | ribosomal protein s2 | 968 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 8.25E-154 | 5 | 2 |
| Aphis 111 | myosin light chain 2 | 1283 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.41 \mathrm{E}-91$ | 2 | 1 |
| Aphis 117 | acypi000079 | 453 | Toxoptera citricida | $2.55 \mathrm{E}-65$ | 8 | 2 |
| Aphis 133 | ribosomal protein 110 | 762 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 6.87E-159 | 3 | 2 |
| Aphis 200 | PREDICTED: hypothetical protein LOC100169357 isoform 1 | 1943 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $4.44 \mathrm{E}-68$ | 0 | 3 |
| Aphis 212 | muscle actin | 1670 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Aphis 215 | elongation factor 1 alpha | 2548 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Aphis 242 | elongation factor 2 | 2425 | Toxoptera citricida | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Aphis 255 | zinc finger protein 512b-like | 917 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $2.55 \mathrm{E}-49$ | 0 | 11 |

## APPENDIX I2. (cont.)

| Aphis 273 | 40s ribosomal protein s8-like | 972 | Hordeum vulgare subsp. vulgare | $1.37 \mathrm{E}-131$ | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aphis 309 | ribosomal protein s16 | 743 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $2.57 \mathrm{E}-91$ | 3 | 1 |
| Aphis 321 | $\mathrm{h}+$ transporting atp synthase subunit g | 745 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.46 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 4 | 9 |
| Aphis 359 | malate cytoplasmic-like | 2642 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 8 | 10 |
| Aphis 365 | cytochrome oxidase subunit i | 2550 | Aphis nerii | $6.23 \mathrm{E}-154$ | 10 | 7 |
| Aphis 384 | N/A | 442 |  |  | 0 | 13 |
| Aphis 433 | ribosomal protein s13 | 811 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $2.32 \mathrm{E}-101$ | 4 | 2 |
| Aphis 480 | ribosomal protein 121 | 585 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $2.50 \mathrm{E}-93$ | 3 | 1 |
| Aphis 525 | 60s ribosomal protein 14-like | 1633 | Hordeum vulgare subsp. vulgare | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Aphis 645 | cyclophilin 1 | 935 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.44 \mathrm{E}-135$ | 9 | 2 |
| Aphis 668 | ribosomal protein s 7 | 723 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 3.81E-136 | 3 | 1 |
| Aphis 704 | ribosomal protein 118a | 629 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.55 \mathrm{E}-117$ | 3 | 3 |
| Aphis 906 | PREDICTED: hypothetical protein LOC100570527 | 393 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.92 \mathrm{E}-36$ | 0 | 1 |
| Aphis 1221 | cg12324 protein | 831 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $5.08 \mathrm{E}-87$ | 5 | 1 |
| Aphis 1468 | isoform a | 495 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $2.32 \mathrm{E}-36$ | 0 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I2. (cont.)

Aphis 1725 tpa: cuticle protein

746
Acyrthosiphon pisum
4.30E-59 1

## APPENDIX I3. C. tomentosicollis.

| Contig ID | Sequence Description | Length (bp) | Organism | Minimum E-value | \#GOs | \#SNPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 2 | hexamerin 1 | 1165 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Clavig 6 | N/A | 407 |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| Clavig 7 | serine rich protein | 389 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $2.35 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0 | 6 |
| Clavig 9 | N/A | 439 |  |  | 0 | 6 |
| Clavig 17 | tropomyosin 1 | 1786 | Lethocerus indicus | $3.78 \mathrm{E}-158$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 18 | fk506-binding protein | 445 | Daphnia pulex | $1.12 \mathrm{E}-65$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 19 | fk506-binding protein | 412 | Daphnia pulex | $8.07 \mathrm{E}-48$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 20 | rrna intron-encoded homing endonuclease | 4211 | Oxytricha trifallax | $2.21 \mathrm{E}-55$ | 1 | 2 |
| Clavig 26 | N/A | 717 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 37 | cathepsin 11 | 319 | Ornithorhynchus anatinus | 7.19E-43 | 4 | 2 |
| Clavig 39 | serine rich protein | 393 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $1.50 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 45 | cathepsin 1 | 310 | Nematostella vectensis | $1.19 \mathrm{E}-48$ | 6 | 6 |
| Clavig 46 | ribosomal protein s6 | 808 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $4.56 \mathrm{E}-136$ | 3 | 3 |
| Clavig 50 | apolipophorin-iii precursor | 464 | Riptortus clavatus | $4.79 \mathrm{E}-48$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 51 | $\mathrm{h}+$ transporting atp synthase subunit d | 809 | Papilio polytes | 4.82E-71 | 10 | 3 |
| Clavig 53 | N/A | 437 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 66 | N/A | 491 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 67 | heat shock protein 90 | 1349 | Lygus hesperus | $4.57 \mathrm{E}-177$ | 4 | 3 |
| Clavig 69 | N/A | 1089 |  |  | 0 | 8 |
| Clavig 70 | gluten hydrolyzing proteinase | 668 | Triatoma brasiliensis | 4.11E-35 | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 75 | elongation factor 1-alpha | 1607 | Riptortus pedestris | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| Clavig 76 | elongation factor 1 alpha | 1434 | Riptortus pedestris | 0 | 7 | 2 |

## APPENDIX I3. (cont.)

| Clavig 81 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 1 | 1531 | Stictopleurus subviridis | $8.91 \mathrm{E}-24$ | 4 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 85 | ribosomal protein s4e | 890 | Lygus lineolaris | $1.66 \mathrm{E}-179$ | 4 | 5 |
| Clavig 89 | lipoyltransferase mitochondrial-like | 2480 | Bombus terrestris | $9.43 \mathrm{E}-91$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 91 | odorant binding protein 24 | 619 | Anopheles funestus | $1.26 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 103 | cathepsin 1 | 689 | Aedes aegypti | $3.99 \mathrm{E}-96$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 106 | cathepsin 1 | 497 | Dermacentor variabilis | $5.99 \mathrm{E}-68$ | 3 | 9 |
| Clavig 107 | ankyrin repeat protein | 1315 | Candidatus Amoebophilus asiaticus 5a2 | $2.14 \mathrm{E}-60$ | 3 | 5 |
| Clavig 111 | cathepsin 1-like | 483 | Apis florea | $2.55 \mathrm{E}-60$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 115 | hexamerin 1 | 2153 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Clavig 116 | hexamerin 1 | 2098 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Clavig 126 | gluten hydrolyzing proteinase | 1035 | Lygus lineolaris | $1.61 \mathrm{E}-63$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 127 | N/A | 246 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 129 | cathepsin 1 | 948 | Triatoma brasiliensis | 3.59E-107 | 3 | 3 |
| Clavig 131 | transferrin | 2166 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 142 | N/A | 819 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 149 | N/A | 351 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 151 | N/A | 336 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 158 | N/A | 382 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 159 | lysozyme | 728 | Anopheles gambiae | $1.01 \mathrm{E}-46$ | 2 | 1 |
| Clavig 166 | tubulin beta-1 chain | 1550 | Manduca sexta | 0 | 13 | 3 |
| Clavig 167 | N/A | 1319 |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| Clavig 168 | unknown | 1008 | Lygus lineolaris | $9.72 \mathrm{E}-13$ | 0 | 4 |
| Clavig 172 | atp synthase subunit mitochondrial-like | 1949 | Tribolium castaneum | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| Clavig 174 | N/A | 1534 |  |  | 0 | 2 |

## APPENDIX 13. (cont.)

| Clavig 176 | heat shock protein 70 | 3830 | Riftia pachyptila | 0 | 37 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 177 | protein disulfide isomerase | 1026 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $1.90 \mathrm{E}-138$ | 14 | 2 |
| Clavig 178 | peritrophic matrix protein 1-b precursor | 430 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $8.15 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 3 | 5 |
| Clavig 180 | peritrophic matrix protein 1-b precursor | 384 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $7.20 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 187 | cuticle protein 34 | 426 | Dendroctonus ponderosae | $1.36 \mathrm{E}-24$ | 1 | 5 |
| Clavig 191 | 60s ribosomal protein 14-like | 1360 | Bombus impatiens | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 192 | probable maltase 1-like | 665 | Nilaparvata lugens | $2.79 \mathrm{E}-26$ | 2 | 2 |
| Clavig 196 | ribosomal protein 131 | 466 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $1.00 \mathrm{E}-53$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 201 | apolipophorins | 3607 | Nilaparvata lugens | $3.75 \mathrm{E}-121$ | 14 | 2 |
| Clavig 206 | cg31997 cg31997-pa | 618 | Megachile rotundata | $8.50 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 214 | myosin heavy muscle isoform 1 | 6145 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 25 | 8 |
| Clavig 215 | ribosomal protein 113 | 760 | Xenopsylla cheopis | $1.68 \mathrm{E}-84$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 227 | N/A | 493 |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| Clavig 238 | N/A | 613 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 239 | alpha-amylase | 1615 | Blattella germanica | $3.91 \mathrm{E}-178$ | 3 | 9 |
| Clavig 242 | maltase a3 | 775 | Nilaparvata lugens | $2.63 \mathrm{E}-41$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 243 | N/A | 1804 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 247 | N/A | 301 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 251 | serine rich protein | 488 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | 4.72E-19 | 0 | 4 |
| Clavig 256 | atp-citrate synthase-like | 3916 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 10 | 5 |
| Clavig 261 | ribosomal protein 114 | 562 | Lygus lineolaris | $5.10 \mathrm{E}-68$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 266 | ribosomal protein 115 | 739 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $6.99 \mathrm{E}-118$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 284 | fatty acid synthase | 3168 | Nasonia vitripennis | 0 | 5 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I3. (cont.)

| Clavig 293 | serine rich protein | 1438 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $8.70 \mathrm{E}-24$ | 0 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 296 | alpha amylase catalytic region | 439 | Fusarium oxysporum Fo5176 | $2.59 \mathrm{E}-45$ | 3 | 12 |
| Clavig 297 | alpha partial | 492 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $1.73 \mathrm{E}-42$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 298 | probable maltase h-like | 577 | Tribolium castaneum | $1.99 \mathrm{E}-71$ | 3 | 5 |
| Clavig 300 | maltase 1 | 2668 | Nilaparvata lugens | 6.02E-144 | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 301 | N/A | 335 |  |  | 0 | 8 |
| Clavig 318 | N/A | 719 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 320 | ribosomal protein 123a | 1016 | Tribolium castaneum | $2.30 \mathrm{E}-82$ | 7 | 2 |
| Clavig 322 | ribosomal protein 17 | 894 | Papilio polytes | $3.66 \mathrm{E}-127$ | 1 | 3 |
| Clavig 332 | N/A | 511 |  |  | 0 | 7 |
| Clavig 345 | cytochrome c | 647 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $1.65 \mathrm{E}-62$ | 5 | 1 |
| Clavig 349 | atp synthase-coupling factor mitochondrial | 482 | Tribolium castaneum | $3.73 \mathrm{E}-36$ | 10 | 2 |
| Clavig 356 | 60s acidic ribosomal protein p2-like protein | 478 | Bombyx mori | $3.88 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 366 | probable phosphoserine aminotransferase-like | 1161 | Harpegnathos saltator | 3.28E-180 | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 372 | conserved hypothetical protein | 432 | Culex quinquefasciatus | $4.59 \mathrm{E}-13$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 378 | N/A | 334 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 384 | cathepsin 1-like | 656 | Artemia salina | $1.29 \mathrm{E}-80$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 386 | N/A | 988 |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| Clavig 398 | N/A | 849 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 399 | accessory gland protein | 1512 | Gryllus firmus | $5.08 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0 | 2 |

## APPENDIX 13. (cont.)

| Clavig 406 | abp2_ripcl ame: full=probable antibacterial peptide flags: precursor | 444 | Riptortus clavatus | $2.64 \mathrm{E}-34$ | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 408 | N/A | 1245 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 410 | cytochrome c oxidase subunit iii | 2075 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $1.12 \mathrm{E}-128$ | 5 | 2 |
| Clavig 426 | aminopeptidase n-like | 3964 | Strongylocentrotus purpuratus | $7.23 \mathrm{E}-39$ | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 433 | 50 kda midgut protein | 737 | Nasonia vitripennis | $1.24 \mathrm{E}-20$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 456 | AGAP004851-PA | 376 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $3.62 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 466 | heat shock protein 70 | 2783 | Culex quinquefasciatus | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| Clavig 475 | vitellogenin | 435 | Riptortus clavatus | $1.59 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 484 | N/A | 365 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 487 | cathepsin 1-like | 432 | Camponotus floridanus | $9.24 \mathrm{E}-58$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 490 | N/A | 424 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 497 | N/A | 596 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 501 | vitellogenin | 3404 | Riptortus clavatus | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Clavig 509 | odorant-binding protein partial | 371 | Rhodnius prolixus | $3.25 \mathrm{E}-36$ | 1 | 2 |
| Clavig 513 | cytochrome b | 625 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $2.71 \mathrm{E}-96$ | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 518 | cytochrome b | 626 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $1.43 \mathrm{E}-92$ | 6 | 2 |
| Clavig 524 | odorant-binding protein partial | 586 | Adelphocoris lineolatus | $4.22 \mathrm{E}-14$ | 1 | 3 |
| Clavig 533 | actin | 1748 | Drosophila melanogaster | 0 | 15 | 5 |
| Clavig 544 | odorant binding protein 19d | 698 | Apolygus lucorum | $1.17 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 1 | 4 |
| Clavig 564 | N/A | 377 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 576 | peripheral-type benzodiazepine receptor | 1114 | Drosophila pseudoobscura pseudoobscura | 3.85E-36 | 4 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I3. (cont.)

| Clavig 587 | isoform a | 597 | Drosophila willistoni | $7.77 \mathrm{E}-18$ | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 590 | N/A | 406 |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| Clavig 591 | hypothetical protein DAPPUDRAFT_70492 | 597 | Daphnia pulex | $2.39 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 605 | N/A | 761 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 606 | af373879_1peritrophin-like protein 1 | 1921 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $1.53 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 607 | serine rich protein | 417 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $4.33 \mathrm{E}-20$ | 0 | 23 |
| Clavig 614 | ornithine decarboxylase | 1037 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $8.89 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 2 | 2 |
| Clavig 615 | hypothetical protein AaeL_AAEL015254 | 1063 | Aedes aegypti | $6.46 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 625 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit i | 827 | Aeschyntelus notatus | $2.17 \mathrm{E}-78$ | 4 | 3 |
| Clavig 626 | fructose -bisphosphate aldolase | 1457 | Daphnia pulex | $1.97 \mathrm{E}-157$ | 19 | 11 |
| Clavig 640 | gamma-interferon-inducible lysosomal thiol reductase-like | 1580 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $3.11 \mathrm{E}-23$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 643 | acetyl- mitochondrial | 1139 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 0 | 14 | 4 |
| Clavig 670 | gluten hydrolyzing proteinase | 617 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $2.16 \mathrm{E}-37$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 686 | ankyrin repeat protein | 1050 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $2.88 \mathrm{E}-49$ | 0 | 5 |
| Clavig 692 | beta-tubulin | 1737 | Manduca sexta | 0 | 13 | 5 |
| Clavig 711 | nucleoside diphosphate kinase | 787 | Aedes aegypti | $1.19 \mathrm{E}-80$ | 15 | 1 |
| Clavig 716 | elongation factor 1-gamma | 1340 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $2.52 \mathrm{E}-137$ | 13 | 1 |
| Clavig 726 | N/A | 523 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 745 | N/A | 304 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 757 | N/A | 521 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 765 | ankyrin repeat protein | 1330 | Trichomonas vaginalis G3 | $1.41 \mathrm{E}-39$ | 1 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I3. (cont.)

| Clavig 768 | counting factor associated protein dlike | 1722 | Periplaneta americana | 0 | 6 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 775 | apolipoprotein d | 1114 | Pediculus humanus corporis | 4.88E-85 | 1 | 2 |
| Clavig 784 | N/A | 645 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 799 | N/A | 654 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 817 | serine rich protein | 1196 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $4.24 \mathrm{E}-19$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 858 | ribosomal protein 117 | 596 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $3.37 \mathrm{E}-97$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 861 | ankyrin repeat protein | 913 | Diplorickettsia massiliensis 20B | $1.06 \mathrm{E}-17$ | 1 | 2 |
| Clavig 869 | endocuticle structural glycoprotein bd1 | 2627 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | $8.82 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 891 | phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase | 2001 | Tribolium castaneum | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Clavig 936 | spike protein | 4244 | Hana virus | $5.94 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 0 | 8 |
| Clavig 939 | N/A | 1018 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 945 | heat shock 70 kda protein cognate 3 | 2376 | Nasonia vitripennis | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 953 | N/A | 746 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 954 | N/A | 448 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 959 | ribosomal protein 110 | 298 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $8.66 \mathrm{E}-48$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 960 | ribosomal protein 110 | 396 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $1.03 \mathrm{E}-89$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 964 | N/A | 972 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 965 | mitochondrial atp synthase gammasubunit | 808 | Graphocephala atropunctata | 8.95E-142 | 8 | 1 |
| Clavig 984 | mitochondrial-processing peptidase subunit beta-like | 1569 | Anopheles gambiae str. PEST | 0 | 12 | 1 |

## APPENDIX 13. (cont.)

| Clavig 992 | polyadenylate-binding protein 1-like isoform 1 | 3350 | Bombus terrestris | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 993 | N/A | 1126 |  |  | 0 | 10 |
| Clavig 996 | thiamin pyrophosphokinase 1 | 1356 | Tribolium castaneum | $1.65 \mathrm{E}-56$ | 4 | 3 |
| Clavig 1003 | ribosomal protein 122 | 748 | Danaus plexippus | $1.54 \mathrm{E}-30$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1007 | mdl1 | 592 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $3.38 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1029 | malic enzyme | 480 | Pediculus humanus corporis | $3.40 \mathrm{E}-29$ | 4 | 2 |
| Clavig 1038 | phosphate carrier mitochondrial-like | 1349 | Aedes aegypti | 1.98E-158 | 2 | 1 |
| Clavig 1049 | fatty acid desaturase | 1866 | Acheta domesticus | 3.52E-164 | 15 | 2 |
| Clavig 1052 | N/A | 1094 |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| Clavig 1054 | ribosomal protein 126e | 456 | Triatoma infestans | $1.10 \mathrm{E}-80$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1055 | isoform c | 1333 | Drosophila ananassae | $4.28 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 3 | 8 |
| Clavig 1058 | hexamerin 1 | 576 | Riptortus clavatus | $1.36 \mathrm{E}-99$ | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 1075 | mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit 5 b isoform 1 | 565 | Tribolium castaneum | $2.35 \mathrm{E}-53$ | 6 | 3 |
| Clavig 1079 | serine protease | 613 | Triatoma infestans | 5.38E-32 | 3 | 8 |
| Clavig 1087 | ribosomal protein s9 | 665 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $6.36 \mathrm{E}-123$ | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 1088 | ribosomal protein s9 | 641 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $4.65 \mathrm{E}-123$ | 4 | 2 |
| Clavig 1125 | chitin binding peritrophin-a domaincontaining partial | 1714 | Drosophila ananassae | $5.52 \mathrm{E}-45$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 1126 | mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit 5 b isoform 1 | 533 | Triatoma infestans | 7.91E-51 | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 1167 | nucleoplasmin-like protein | 1088 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | $1.64 \mathrm{E}-55$ | 1 | 1 |

## APPENDIX I3. (cont.)

| Clavig 1182 | N/A | 217 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 1187 | N/A | 369 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1213 | N/A | 568 |  |  | 0 | 8 |
| Clavig 1243 | 60s ribosomal protein 17a | 840 | Solenopsis invicta | 1.82E-136 | 2 | 1 |
| Clavig 1251 | aminopeptidase -like | 957 | Solenopsis invicta | 1.91E-105 | 5 | 1 |
| Clavig 1261 | N/A | 850 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 1280 | N/A | 976 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1286 | 40s ribosomal protein s16 | 591 | Apis florea | $3.29 \mathrm{E}-91$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1292 | cathepsin 1 precursor | 365 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $1.08 \mathrm{E}-18$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 1319 | ribosomal protein s12 | 422 | Manduca sexta | $5.41 \mathrm{E}-61$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1321 | ribosomal protein 127e | 514 | Hister sp. APV-2005 | $1.61 \mathrm{E}-54$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1347 | ribosomal protein 113a | 650 | Bombus terrestris | $2.78 \mathrm{E}-113$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1350 | imaginal disc growth factor | 1070 | Oncometopia nigricans | $1.76 \mathrm{E}-133$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 1364 | 15-hydroxyprostaglandin dehydrogenase | 1045 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $1.04 \mathrm{E}-53$ | 2 | 5 |
| Clavig 1401 | atp synthase subunit mitochondrial | 2063 | Megachile rotundata | 0 | 9 | 4 |
| Clavig 1418 | cg12324 protein | 468 | Triatoma infestans | $2.56 \mathrm{E}-84$ | 7 | 1 |
| Clavig 1429 | N/A | 899 |  |  | 0 | 6 |
| Clavig 1431 | kininogen-1 isoform 2 precursor | 635 | Oncopeltus fasciatus | $2.74 \mathrm{E}-19$ | 4 | 6 |
| Clavig 1501 | odorant-binding protein | 972 | Apolygus lucorum | $5.66 \mathrm{E}-16$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 1509 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 5 | 1560 | Hydaropsis longirostris | $3.27 \mathrm{E}-160$ | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 1522 | atp-dependent rna helicase-like protein | 797 | Trypanosoma brucei gambiense DAL972 | $1.78 \mathrm{E}-22$ | 4 | 3 |
| Clavig 1573 | guanine nucleotide-binding protein subunit beta-like | 1073 | Blattella germanica | 0 | 2 | 1 |

## APPENDIX 13. (cont.)

| Clavig 1605 | N/A | 358 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 1606 | N/A | 565 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1626 | N/A | 581 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1697 | nadh dehydrogenase subunit 4 | 455 | Riptortus pedestris | 3.18E-34 | 4 | 1 |
| Clavig 1708 | p8 nuclear protein | 860 | Amblyomma variegatum | $1.83 \mathrm{E}-26$ | 2 | 1 |
| Clavig 1724 | N/A | 396 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 1772 | calmodulin | 1707 | Drosophila melanogaster | 3.64E-96 | 35 | 1 |
| Clavig 1782 | hypothetical protein | 558 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $2.02 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 1785 | midline fasciclin | 1385 | Tribolium castaneum | $3.08 \mathrm{E}-58$ | 1 | 3 |
| Clavig 1842 | af414430_1trypsin precursor | 601 | Lygus lineolaris | $4.91 \mathrm{E}-48$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 1849 | cathepsin 1 | 1503 | Triatoma brasiliensis | $9.22 \mathrm{E}-133$ | 3 | 5 |
| Clavig 1913 | lyzozyme m1 | 832 | Wolbachia endosymbiont of Drosophila ananassae | $2.41 \mathrm{E}-76$ | 2 | 5 |
| Clavig 1979 | translocon-associated protein subunit beta | 1392 | Maconellicoccus hirsutus | 5.91E-68 | 9 | 1 |
| Clavig 1983 | endocuticle structural glycoprotein bd- | 637 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | $8.20 \mathrm{E}-22$ | 1 | 1 |
| Clavig 2008 | cathepsin 1 | 2153 | Harpegnathos saltator | $1.27 \mathrm{E}-109$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 2035 | serine protease | 674 | Ranatra unicolor | $7.66 \mathrm{E}-45$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 2045 | ribosomal protein 130 | 426 | Daphnia pulex | $1.52 \mathrm{E}-63$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 2054 | 15-hydroxyprostaglandin dehydrogenase | 1011 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $1.69 \mathrm{E}-43$ | 2 | 13 |
| Clavig 2077 | cathepsin d | 1339 | Triatoma infestans | $8.43 \mathrm{E}-100$ | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 2094 | 60s ribosomal protein 118 | 627 | Camponotus floridanus | $2.24 \mathrm{E}-103$ | 3 | 2 |
| Clavig 2104 | sorbitol dehydrogenase | 1123 | Pyrrhocoris apterus | 0 | 4 | 1 |

## APPENDIX 13. (cont.)

| Clavig 2132 | N/A | 262 |  |  | 0 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clavig 2209 | N/A | 338 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Clavig 2326 | elongation factor 1 delta | 825 | Graphocephala atropunctata | $9.39 \mathrm{E}-61$ | 8 | 4 |
| Clavig 2422 | salivary secreted peptide | 491 | Lygus lineolaris | $2.08 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 0 | 3 |
| Clavig 2438 | serine 3-dehydrogenase | 861 | Triatoma infestans | $2.43 \mathrm{E}-47$ | 2 | 3 |
| Clavig 2677 | cytochrome c oxidase polypeptide iv | 624 | Locusta migratoria | $2.37 \mathrm{E}-71$ | 8 | 1 |
| Clavig 2823 | 10 kda heat shock mitochondrial-like | 819 | Lygus hesperus | 7.81E-55 | 4 | 3 |
| Clavig 2828 | ubiquinol-cytochrome c reductase complex core protein | 1515 | Tribolium castaneum | $6.13 \mathrm{E}-98$ | 6 | 1 |
| Clavig 2851 | N/A | 583 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Clavig 2856 | protein 5nuc-like | 2073 | Camponotus floridanus | 5.06E-121 | 3 | 1 |
| Clavig 2888 | PREDICTED: uncharacterized protein LOC100863228 | 1252 | Apis florea | $1.48 \mathrm{E}-37$ | 0 | 7 |
| Clavig 3671 | voltage-dependent anion-selective channel protein 2 | 557 | Homalodisca vitripennis | 1.70E-78 | 7 | 1 |
| Clavig 4404 | v -type proton atpase subunit g-like | 475 | Acyrthosiphon pisum | 2.19E-27 | 5 | 2 |

## APPENDIX I4. M. sjostedti.

| Contig ID | Sequence Description | Length (bp) | Organism | Minimum E-value | \#GOs | \#SNPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Megal 1 | elongation factor 2 | 1780 | Schistocerca gregaria | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Megal 11 | N/A | 1006 |  |  | 2 | 9 |
| Megal 13 | vitellogenin | 4590 | Trigonotylus caelestialium | 0 | 2 | 31 |
| Megal 25 | storage protein 1 | 2148 | Chilo suppressalis | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Megal 34 | vitellogenin | 2855 | Trigonotylus caelestialium | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Megal 47 | arylphorin-type storage protein | 462 | Omphisa fuscidentalis | $2.77 \mathrm{E}-71$ | 3 | 1 |
| Megal 49 | mitochondrial aldehyde dehydrogenase | 624 | Danaus plexippus | 8.33E-107 | 4 | 3 |
| Megal 68 | ribosomal protein 127ae | 517 | Camponotus floridanus | $5.94 \mathrm{E}-64$ | 3 | 3 |
| Megal 72 | ribosomal protein 14 | 1323 | Biphyllus lunatus | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Megal 76 | 60s ribosomal protein 15-like | 1257 | Helianthus annuus | $6.70 \mathrm{E}-165$ | 5 | 1 |
| Megal 85 | arylphorin precursor | 1485 | Omphisa fuscidentalis | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Megal 92 | ribosomal protein s12 | 543 | Apis florea | $2.42 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 3 | 2 |
| Megal 107 | vitellogenin | 379 | Lethocerus deyrollei | $7.45 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 4 | 2 |
| Megal 143 | N/A | 423 |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Megal 157 | N/A | 987 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Megal 183 | actin | 1612 | Ornithodoros moubata | 0 | 13 | 1 |
| Megal 191 | heat shock protein 90 | 2413 | Megachile rotundata | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Megal 193 | 40s ribosomal protein s15 | 545 | Diaphorina citri | $1.09 \mathrm{E}-81$ | 6 | 1 |
| Megal 199 | mitochondrial atp synthase coupling factor 6 | 537 | Tribolium castaneum | $4.06 \mathrm{E}-25$ | 5 | 2 |

## APPENDIX I4. (cont.)

| Megal 202 | N/A | 1411 |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Megal 215 | 60s ribosomal protein 112 | 865 | Drosophila ananassae | $2.02 \mathrm{E}-98$ | 5 | 1 |
| Megal 236 | hexamerin 2 beta | 2534 | Helicoverpa armigera | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Megal 238 | vitellogenin | 974 | Lethocerus deyrollei | $4.17 \mathrm{E}-80$ | 4 | 7 |
| Megal 312 | ribosomal protein s7 | 650 | Carabus granulatus | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-113$ | 3 | 2 |
| Megal 346 | cuticle protein 1 | 349 | Lonomia obliqua | $1.10 \mathrm{E}-35$ | 1 | 3 |
| Megal 360 | 40s ribosomal protein s14 | 569 | Dascillus cervinus | $8.78 \mathrm{E}-73$ | 4 | 2 |
| Megal 362 | cytochrome c oxidase subunit iii | 398 | Frankliniella intonsa | $1.84 \mathrm{E}-41$ | 4 | 1 |
| Megal 370 | heat shock protein 70 | 1555 | Frankliniella occidentalis | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Megal 376 | troponin i | 871 | Loxostege sticticalis | $1.48 \mathrm{E}-85$ | 1 | 1 |
| Megal 378 | ribosomal protein s8 | 713 | Megachile rotundata | $1.45 \mathrm{E}-124$ | 3 | 1 |
| Megal 408 | N/A | 216 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Megal 419 | ribosomal protein 135 | 512 | Chrysomela tremula | $1.03 \mathrm{E}-50$ | 3 | 1 |
| Megal 471 | atp synthase-like protein | 1067 | Culex quinquefasciatus | $9.70 \mathrm{E}-64$ | 2 | 1 |
| Megal 475 | actin | 688 | Diaphorina citri | $1.76 \mathrm{E}-159$ | 3 | 1 |
| Megal 491 | ribosomal protein s3 | 781 | Scarabaeus laticollis | $4.38 \mathrm{E}-156$ | 16 | 2 |
| Megal 533 | N/A | 662 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Megal 537 | partial | 721 | Trigonotylus caelestialium | $3.39 \mathrm{E}-103$ | 2 | 3 |
| Megal 551 | ribosomal protein s28 | 408 | Biphyllus lunatus | $1.09 \mathrm{E}-27$ | 4 | 1 |
| Megal 569 | N/A | 806 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Megal 572 | N/A | 475 |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Megal 591 | tubulin alpha-1 chain | 1518 | Pediculus humanus corporis | 0 | 12 | 1 |
| Megal 603 | ribosomal protein s18 | 523 | Cicindela campestris | $2.71 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 4 | 1 |
| Megal 608 | N/A | 533 |  |  | 0 | 4 |

## APPENDIX I4. (cont.)

| Megal 624 | 60s ribosomal protein 123a-like | 716 | Tribolium castaneum | $3.42 \mathrm{E}-73$ | 7 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Megal 656 | endocuticle structural glycoprotein bd-8-like | 784 | Papilio xuthus | $1.42 \mathrm{E}-28$ | 1 | 1 |
| Megal 675 | ribosomal protein 134 | 437 | Spodoptera frugiperda | $1.04 \mathrm{E}-74$ | 3 | 3 |
| Megal 716 | cytochrome oxidase subunit viic | 447 | Ixodes pacificus | $4.41 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 1 | 1 |
| Megal 749 | apolipoprotein d-like | 672 | Aedes aegypti | $9.06 \mathrm{E}-39$ | 6 | 1 |
| Megal 829 | tpa: cuticle protein | 374 | Papilio xuthus | $1.95 \mathrm{E}-17$ | 1 | 2 |
| Megal 836 | female neotenic-specific protein 3 | 1303 | Trigonotylus caelestialium | $1.58 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 2 | 1 |
| Megal 861 | glutathione s-transferase | 633 | Choristoneura fumiferana | $2.54 \mathrm{E}-100$ | 2 | 6 |
| Megal 909 | alo2_acrlo ame: full=antimicrobial peptide alo-2 | 338 | Acrocinus longimanus | $1.42 \mathrm{E}-14$ | 3 | 9 |
| Megal 952 | ribosomal protein 121 | 534 | Euphydryas aurinia | $9.58 \mathrm{E}-81$ | 3 | 1 |
| Megal 1068 | N/A | 2803 |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Megal 1087 | histone h2a | 809 | Crassostrea gigas | $1.18 \mathrm{E}-75$ | 5 | 1 |
| Megal 1114 | N/A | 723 |  |  | 4 | 2 |
| Megal 1118 | pyruvate dehydrogenase | 1656 | Acromyrmex echinatior | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Megal 1263 | trypsin-like serine protease | 676 | Ostrinia nubilalis | $1.55 \mathrm{E}-101$ | 3 | 4 |
| Megal 1348 | elongation factor-1alpha partial | 366 | Blasticotoma filiceti | $3.34 \mathrm{E}-79$ | 5 | 1 |
| Megal 1482 | ribosomal protein s11 | 492 | Bombyx mori | $1.03 \mathrm{E}-92$ | 3 | 2 |
| Megal 1626 | 60s acidic ribosomal protein p0 | 650 | Blaptica dubia | $3.76 \mathrm{E}-135$ | 5 | 1 |
| Megal 1634 | odorant-binding protein | 638 | Danaus plexippus | $6.46 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 1 | 6 |
| Megal 1739 | translocon-associated protein subunit delta | 718 | Acromyrmex echinatior | $2.53 \mathrm{E}-52$ | 2 | 1 |

## APPENDIX J

List of all SNPs including consensus positions on contigs, alleles, coverage, and frequency
APPENDIX J1. A. curvipes.

| Serial <br> Number | Contig | Consensus <br> Position | Consensus | Allele | Coverage | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Anop 7 | 904 | C | T | 365 | 35.3 |
| 2 | Anop 13 | 186 | C | T | 70 | 35.7 |
| 3 | Anop 14 | 616 | C | T | 36 | 44.4 |
| 4 | Anop 14 | 649 | T | A | 73 | 37.0 |
| 5 | Anop 14 | 708 | C | G | 85 | 35.3 |
| 6 | Anop 14 | 745 | T | A | 58 | 37.9 |
| 7 | Anop 15 | 166 | T | C | 135 | 36.3 |
| 8 | Anop 15 | 197 | A | G | 138 | 37.0 |
| 9 | Anop 15 | 285 | G | A | 193 | 45.6 |
| 10 | Anop 15 | 297 | A | T | 174 | 48.3 |
| 11 | Anop 15 | 310 | A | G | 207 | 44.0 |
| 12 | Anop 15 | 396 | A | G | 229 | 49.3 |
| 13 | Anop 15 | 428 | C | T | 239 | 47.3 |
| 14 | Anop 15 | 433 | T | G | 244 | 47.5 |
| 15 | Anop 15 | 458 | T | C | 231 | 47.6 |
| 16 | Anop 15 | 469 | A | G | 212 | 46.7 |
| 17 | Anop 17 | 431 | C | T | 118 | 40.7 |
| 18 | Anop 17 | 557 | A | G | 105 | 46.7 |
| 19 | Anop 23 | 1301 | C | T | 684 | 36.6 |
| 20 | Anop 25 | 2181 | G | A | 63 | 39.7 |
| 21 | Anop 25 | 2216 | A | G | 53 | 37.7 |
| 22 | Anop 25 | 2230 | A | G | 64 | 35.9 |
| 23 | Anop 25 | 2232 | A | G | 64 | $35.9$ |
| 24 | Anop 25 | 2244 | T | C | $65$ | $36.9$ |
| 25 | Anop 25 | 2247 | T | C | $65$ | $36.9$ |
| 26 | Anop 25 | 2282 | G | A | $70$ | $40.0$ |
| 27 | Anop 26 | 219 | G | A | $41$ | $36.6$ |
| 28 | Anop 26 | $354$ | C | T | $45$ | $48.9$ |
| 29 | Anop 27 | 173 | C | A | $96$ | $36.5$ |
| 30 | Anop 27 | 216 | A | G | $87$ | $40.2$ |
| 31 | Anop 27 | 283 | G | A | $88$ | 45.5 |
| 32 | Anop 27 | 286 | G | A | 87 | 44.8 |
| 33 | Anop 31 | 83 | A | G | 114 | 43.9 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 34 | Anop 31 | 431 | A | G | 247 | 38.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | Anop 31 | 863 | G | A | 71 | 45.1 |
| 36 | Anop 31 | 911 | C | T | 85 | 48.2 |
| 37 | Anop 31 | 976 | A | T | 78 | 47.4 |
| 38 | Anop 33 | 375 | A | G | 1013 | 39.1 |
| 39 | Anop 33 | 568 | T | C | 73 | 46.6 |
| 40 | Anop 33 | 599 | G | A | 61 | 47.5 |
| 41 | Anop 34 | 387 | T | C | 956 | 45.7 |
| 42 | Anop 34 | 1178 | A | G | 498 | 48.2 |
| 43 | Anop 35 | 92 | T | C | 162 | 35.2 |
| 44 | Anop 35 | 110 | T | A | 165 | 38.8 |
| 45 | Anop 35 | 284 | T | A | 274 | 41.2 |
| 46 | Anop 35 | 709 | A | G | 135 | 45.9 |
| 47 | Anop 50 | 354 | C | T | 36 | 36.1 |
| 48 | Anop 50 | 960 | A | G | 51 | 45.1 |
| 49 | Anop 50 | 1048 | C | A | 46 | 41.3 |
| 50 | Anop 50 | 1119 | G | A | 47 | 42.6 |
| 51 | Anop 50 | 1575 | G | C | 63 | 36.5 |
| 52 | Anop 50 | 1848 | G | A | 96 | 37.5 |
| 53 | Anop 50 | 1893 | C | G | 97 | 47.4 |
| 54 | Anop 50 | 1911 | G | A | 110 | 41.8 |
| 55 | Anop 50 | 1992 | C | T | 91 | 53.8 |
| 56 | Anop 50 | 2169 | T | C | 138 | 37.7 |
| 57 | Anop 50 | 2607 | T | C | 133 | 42.1 |
| 58 | Anop 50 | 2703 | A | G | 126 | 37.3 |
| 59 | Anop 51 | 77 | G | A | 151 | 45.0 |
| 60 | Anop 51 | 166 | A | G | 137 | 35.8 |
| 61 | Anop 52 | 116 | G | A | 142 | 38.0 |
| 62 | Anop 53 | 72 | C | T | 227 | 42.3 |
| 63 | Anop 53 | 171 | C | T | 270 | 44.1 |
| 64 | Anop 53 | 174 | G | A | 258 | 39.5 |
| 65 | Anop 53 | 278 | C | T | 241 | 44.4 |
| 66 | Anop 54 | 20 | T | C | 116 | 44.0 |
| 67 | Anop 54 | 71 | A | G | 153 | 37.9 |
| 68 | Anop 55 | 1071 | C | T | 49 | 49.0 |
| 69 | Anop 58 | 386 | C | G | 77 | 50.6 |
| 70 | Anop 64 | 31 | C | T | 46 | 43.5 |
| 71 | Anop 64 | 549 | A | G | 101 | 49.5 |
| 72 | Anop 64 | 588 | A | G | 69 | 47.8 |
| 73 | Anop 64 | $1419$ | A | G | 58 | 39.7 |
| 74 | Anop 64 | 1491 | C | T | 51 | 37.3 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 75 | Anop 64 | 1507 | C | T | 58 | 41.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76 | Anop 71 | 345 | T | A | 37 | 37.8 |
| 77 | Anop 71 | 383 | C | T | 45 | 40.0 |
| 78 | Anop 71 | 390 | C | G | 52 | 44.2 |
| 79 | Anop 71 | 414 | A | G | 52 | 48.1 |
| 80 | Anop 71 | 555 | G | A | 76 | 47.4 |
| 81 | Anop 71 | 696 | C | T | 88 | 44.3 |
| 82 | Anop 71 | 765 | G | A | 84 | 47.6 |
| 83 | Anop 71 | 795 | A | G | 77 | 46.8 |
| 84 | Anop 71 | 1520 | A | G | 38 | 39.5 |
| 85 | Anop 71 | 1532 | G | A | 37 | 43.2 |
| 86 | Anop 71 | 1595 | T | C | 50 | 48.0 |
| 87 | Anop 72 | 102 | A | G | 414 | 47.3 |
| 88 | Anop 72 | 217 | G | A | 439 | 46.9 |
| 89 | Anop 72 | 327 | T | C | 282 | 46.1 |
| 90 | Anop 84 | 369 | G | A | 260 | 47.7 |
| 91 | Anop 84 | 391 | T | A | 256 | 49.2 |
| 92 | Anop 84 | 1613 | G | A | 37 | 40.5 |
| 93 | Anop 87 | 97 | A | G | 117 | 37.6 |
| 94 | Anop 92 | 446 | G | A | 41 | 39.0 |
| 95 | Anop 92 | 620 | T | C | 36 | 47.2 |
| 96 | Anop 97 | 109 | G | T | 72 | 40.3 |
| 97 | Anop 99 | 176 | C | T | 41 | 36.6 |
| 98 | Anop 106 | 152 | T | C | 320 | 35.6 |
| 99 | Anop 106 | 386 | A | G | 290 | 35.5 |
| 100 | Anop 106 | 419 | T | C | 257 | 38.1 |
| 101 | Anop 106 | 445 | C | T | 231 | 44.2 |
| 102 | Anop 107 | 299 | A | G | 422 | 35.8 |
| 103 | Anop 107 | 452 | G | A | 685 | 49.3 |
| 104 | Anop 107 | 488 | A | G | 825 | 37.2 |
| 105 | Anop 107 | 507 | T | C | 850 | 35.8 |
| 106 | Anop 107 | 596 | T | C | 770 | 35.7 |
| 107 | Anop 112 | 29 | G | C | 83 | 38.6 |
| 108 | Anop 112 | 101 | C | T | 93 | 50.5 |
| 109 | Anop 112 | 428 | A | C | 112 | 40.2 |
| 110 | Anop 112 | 458 | A | G | 135 | 48.9 |
| 111 | Anop 112 | 563 | T | C | 114 | 49.1 |
| 112 | Anop 112 | 794 | C | T | 107 | 37.4 |
| 113 | Anop 112 | 965 | T | C | 223 | 44.4 |
| 114 | Anop 112 | 1251 | A | G | 51 | 43.1 |
| 115 | Anop 113 | 248 | G | A | 71 | 35.2 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 116 | Anop 113 | 581 | T | G | 47 | 36.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117 | Anop 120 | 339 | G | A | 369 | 42.0 |
| 118 | Anop 121 | 200 | T | A | 176 | 44.3 |
| 119 | Anop 123 | 344 | G | A | 327 | 41.0 |
| 120 | Anop 123 | 416 | C | T | 251 | 49.0 |
| 121 | Anop 123 | 506 | A | G | 158 | 46.8 |
| 122 | Anop 125 | 237 | T | C | 1011 | 39.9 |
| 123 | Anop 125 | 443 | G | A | 1378 | 37.7 |
| 124 | Anop 133 | 565 | T | C | 76 | 40.8 |
| 125 | Anop 152 | 431 | A | G | 43 | 41.9 |
| 126 | Anop 152 | 1532 | G | T | 61 | 44.3 |
| 127 | Anop 153 | 5795 | A | T | 114 | 48.2 |
| 128 | Anop 159 | 339 | G | C | 61 | 41.0 |
| 129 | Anop 161 | 291 | T | C | 36 | 38.9 |
| 130 | Anop 162 | 378 | G | C | 664 | 47.1 |
| 131 | Anop 162 | 1004 | A | T | 70 | 48.6 |
| 132 | Anop 162 | 1070 | A | C | 61 | 52.5 |
| 133 | Anop 162 | 1093 | G | C | 55 | 45.5 |
| 134 | Anop 162 | 1172 | G | T | 59 | 45.8 |
| 135 | Anop 162 | 1412 | A | G | 46 | 45.7 |
| 136 | Anop 163 | 866 | C | T | 549 | 40.1 |
| 137 | Anop 164 | 348 | C | T | 240 | 46.3 |
| 138 | Anop 165 | 1961 | T | C | 35 | 45.7 |
| 139 | Anop 169 | 1319 | A | C | 39 | 38.5 |
| 140 | Anop 169 | 1535 | A | G | 48 | 50.0 |
| 141 | Anop 169 | 1588 | C | T | 42 | 47.6 |
| 142 | Anop 169 | 1666 | C | T | 51 | 35.3 |
| 143 | Anop 169 | 1757 | A | C | 51 | 43.1 |
| 144 | Anop 169 | 1971 | A | T | 68 | 41.2 |
| 145 | Anop 169 | 2096 | C | T | 51 | 41.2 |
| 146 | Anop 175 | 5260 | C | A | 49 | 46.9 |
| 147 | Anop 175 | 5377 | C | G | 48 | 35.4 |
| 148 | Anop 175 | 6334 | C | T | 160 | 42.5 |
| 149 | Anop 175 | 6742 | C | T | 98 | 37.8 |
| 150 | Anop 184 | 456 | C | T | 173 | 48.6 |
| 151 | Anop 184 | 515 | C | T | 121 | 40.5 |
| 152 | Anop 187 | 234 | A | T | 84 | 38.1 |
| 153 | Anop 187 | 249 | C | G | 65 | 40.0 |
| 154 | Anop 187 | 306 | T | G | 109 | 43.1 |
| 155 | Anop 187 | 325 | T | C | 116 | 44.0 |
| 156 | Anop 187 | 327 | G | A | 116 | 45.7 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 157 | Anop 187 | 368 | A | G | 120 | 43.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 158 | Anop 187 | 477 | A | T | 116 | 37.9 |
| 159 | Anop 187 | 479 | T | A | 116 | 37.9 |
| 160 | Anop 187 | 498 | T | C | 105 | 39.0 |
| 161 | Anop 187 | 513 | A | G | 107 | 39.3 |
| 162 | Anop 188 | 317 | A | G | 67 | 52.2 |
| 163 | Anop 188 | 347 | A | G | 68 | 35.3 |
| 164 | Anop 188 | 665 | T | C | 35 | 48.6 |
| 165 | Anop 198 | 468 | G | T | 138 | 44.2 |
| 166 | Anop 205 | 843 | T | C | 136 | 47.8 |
| 167 | Anop 213 | 69 | C | T | 95 | 40.0 |
| 168 | Anop 214 | 1160 | C | A | 39 | 35.9 |
| 169 | Anop 215 | 199 | T | A | 120 | 40.8 |
| 170 | Anop 215 | 207 | C | A | 122 | 41.0 |
| 171 | Anop 215 | 225 | C | T | 117 | 42.7 |
| 172 | Anop 215 | 227 | C | T | 117 | 42.7 |
| 173 | Anop 215 | 228 | A | G | 117 | 42.7 |
| 174 | Anop 215 | 234 | G | A | 124 | 42.7 |
| 175 | Anop 215 | 276 | G | C | 104 | 41.3 |
| 176 | Anop 236 | 297 | C | A | 170 | 42.4 |
| 177 | Anop 236 | 431 | A | C | 140 | 44.3 |
| 178 | Anop 238 | 226 | T | C | 36 | 41.7 |
| 179 | Anop 238 | 315 | T | C | 36 | 38.9 |
| 180 | Anop 241 | 631 | A | G | 60 | 38.3 |
| 181 | Anop 249 | 193 | A | G | 56 | 39.3 |
| 182 | Anop 258 | 165 | G | A | 111 | 42.3 |
| 183 | Anop 258 | 309 | G | A | 165 | 38.2 |
| 184 | Anop 261 | 186 | T | G | 45 | 40.0 |
| 185 | Anop 261 | 187 | T | C | 45 | 40.0 |
| 186 | Anop 261 | 386 | C | T | 52 | 42.3 |
| 187 | Anop 266 | 699 | G | A | 49 | 38.8 |
| 188 | Anop 266 | 768 | G | T | 45 | 42.2 |
| 189 | Anop 266 | 876 | G | A | 44 | 43.2 |
| 190 | Anop 274 | 123 | G | C | 52 | 40.4 |
| 191 | Anop 275 | 44 | G | A | 62 | 50.0 |
| 192 | Anop 275 | 47 | A | C | 64 | 48.4 |
| 193 | Anop 275 | 56 | C | T | 77 | 45.5 |
| 194 | Anop 275 | 155 | C | T | 94 | 52.1 |
| 195 | Anop 275 | 182 | C | T | 113 | 46.0 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 196 | Anop 275 | 190 | A | G | 114 | 37.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 197 | Anop 275 | 786 | C | T | 81 | 46.9 |
| 198 | Anop 277 | 362 | T | C | 156 | 38.5 |
| 199 | Anop 282 | 245 | T | C | 236 | 46.6 |
| 200 | Anop 282 | 357 | C | T | 234 | 36.8 |
| 201 | Anop 282 | 591 | T | C | 66 | 45.5 |
| 202 | Anop 285 | 88 | C | G | 116 | 37.1 |
| 203 | Anop 285 | 195 | G | C | 104 | 37.5 |
| 204 | Anop 290 | 85 | G | C | 241 | 43.6 |
| 205 | Anop 290 | 148 | A | G | 337 | 48.1 |
| 206 | Anop 290 | 325 | T | C | 247 | 42.5 |
| 207 | Anop 291 | 62 | C | T | 150 | 44.7 |
| 208 | Anop 291 | 191 | C | T | 91 | 41.8 |
| 209 | Anop 291 | 316 | T | C | 63 | 42.9 |
| 210 | Anop 291 | 333 | G | A | 61 | 36.1 |
| 211 | Anop 291 | 379 | T | C | 43 | 41.9 |
| 212 | Anop 293 | 245 | A | G | 60 | 43.3 |
| 213 | Anop 293 | 418 | C | T | 80 | 51.3 |
| 214 | Anop 296 | 415 | G | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 215 | Anop 300 | 85 | T | C | 85 | 43.5 |
| 216 | Anop 304 | 1717 | T | A | 57 | 43.9 |
| 217 | Anop 304 | 1971 | T | C | 40 | 47.5 |
| 218 | Anop 316 | 247 | C | T | 396 | 37.1 |
| 219 | Anop 318 | 177 | G | A | 76 | 47.4 |
| 220 | Anop 318 | 297 | C | G | 78 | 43.6 |
| 221 | Anop 324 | 288 | C | A | 83 | 41.0 |
| 222 | Anop 324 | 327 | T | G | 86 | 44.2 |
| 223 | Anop 325 | 1563 | A | G | 42 | 45.2 |
| 224 | Anop 325 | 1575 | C | T | 39 | 38.5 |
| 225 | Anop 325 | 1645 | C | A | 41 | 48.8 |
| 226 | Anop 332 | 395 | T | G | 41 | 41.5 |
| 227 | Anop 332 | 606 | T | G | 39 | 35.9 |
| 228 | Anop 334 | 105 | C | T | 253 | 49.0 |
| 229 | Anop 334 | 142 | T | C | 244 | 48.0 |
| 230 | Anop 334 | 213 | C | T | 52 | 36.5 |
| 231 | Anop 337 | 544 | T | C | 39 | 56.4 |
| 232 | Anop 344 | 32 | G | T | 52 | 40.4 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 233 | Anop 344 | 339 | C | T | 78 | 47.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 234 | Anop 348 | 30 | A | G | 97 | 41.2 |
| 235 | Anop 349 | 423 | G | A | 73 | 38.4 |
| 236 | Anop 351 | 568 | C | T | 42 | 42.9 |
| 237 | Anop 351 | 706 | C | T | 70 | 51.4 |
| 238 | Anop 351 | 712 | G | T | 70 | 51.4 |
| 239 | Anop 351 | 715 | T | C | 71 | 50.7 |
| 240 | Anop 351 | 720 | G | A | 53 | 39.6 |
| 241 | Anop 351 | 741 | T | C | 64 | 46.9 |
| 242 | Anop 351 | 742 | C | G | 64 | 46.9 |
| 243 | Anop 351 | 743 | T | A | 64 | 46.9 |
| 244 | Anop 351 | 758 | A | G | 75 | 46.7 |
| 245 | Anop 351 | 759 | A | C | 75 | 45.3 |
| 246 | Anop 351 | 818 | C | A | 69 | 37.7 |
| 247 | Anop 351 | 843 | A | G | 66 | 39.4 |
| 248 | Anop 351 | 847 | C | A | 67 | 35.8 |
| 249 | Anop 351 | 888 | G | A | 62 | 38.7 |
| 250 | Anop 351 | 901 | T | C | 62 | 40.3 |
| 251 | Anop 351 | 930 | A | G | 45 | 35.6 |
| 252 | Anop 354 | 298 | A | G | 39 | 43.6 |
| 253 | Anop 354 | 340 | T | C | 41 | 43.9 |
| 254 | Anop 358 | 146 | G | A | 104 | 35.6 |
| 255 | Anop 358 | 403 | C | T | $161$ | $35.4$ |
| 256 | Anop 358 | $430$ | G | A | $119$ | $36.1$ |
| 257 | Anop 358 | $578$ | T | C | $45$ | $48.9$ |
| 258 | Anop 358 | $606$ | A | G | $151$ | $35.1$ |
| 259 | Anop 358 | 678 | A | G | $144$ | $36.1$ |
| 260 | Anop 364 | 214 | G | A | 192 | 39.1 |
| 261 | Anop 364 | 215 | T | C | 195 | 40.5 |
| 262 | Anop 364 | 292 | T | C | 210 | 36.7 |
| 263 | Anop 364 | 406 | T | C | 199 | 41.2 |
| 264 | Anop 364 | 460 | C | T | 192 | 41.7 |
| 265 | Anop 364 | 654 | G | A | 86 | 40.7 |
| 266 | Anop 365 | 1350 | C | T | 52 | 46.2 |
| 267 | Anop 376 | 77 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 268 | Anop 376 | 139 | A | C | 54 | 46.3 |
| 269 | Anop 376 | 314 | G | A | 53 | 47.2 |
| 270 | Anop 376 | 444 | A | G | 46 | 50.0 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 271 | Anop 376 | 736 | G | T | 45 | 37.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 272 | Anop 376 | 832 | A | T | 44 | 43.2 |
| 273 | Anop 377 | 286 | T | C | 61 | 42.6 |
| 274 | Anop 377 | 310 | C | T | 63 | 39.7 |
| 275 | Anop 380 | 90 | C | A | 39 | 35.9 |
| 276 | Anop 380 | 96 | C | T | 37 | 37.8 |
| 277 | Anop 380 | 99 | C | T | 38 | 42.1 |
| 278 | Anop 380 | 105 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 279 | Anop 380 | 108 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 280 | Anop 389 | 261 | A | G | 613 | 41.9 |
| 281 | Anop 389 | 426 | C | T | 737 | 50.1 |
| 282 | Anop 392 | 165 | T | A | 129 | 49.6 |
| 283 | Anop 392 | 309 | A | G | 145 | 45.5 |
| 284 | Anop 392 | 345 | T | G | 110 | 40.9 |
| 285 | Anop 395 | 266 | C | T | 148 | 45.3 |
| 286 | Anop 395 | 620 | G | T | 215 | 49.8 |
| 287 | Anop 395 | 743 | T | C | 218 | 49.1 |
| 288 | Anop 422 | 9 | G | A | 62 | 40.3 |
| 289 | Anop 422 | 33 | G | A | 93 | 39.8 |
| 290 | Anop 422 | 124 | G | C | 122 | 43.4 |
| 291 | Anop 422 | 136 | C | T | 116 | 42.2 |
| 292 | Anop 422 | 264 | G | A | 91 | 45.1 |
| 293 | Anop 422 | 301 | C | T | 87 | 46.0 |
| 294 | Anop 422 | 323 | C | A | 54 | 38.9 |
| 295 | Anop 433 | 152 | A | G | 67 | 46.3 |
| 296 | Anop 433 | 164 | T | C | 74 | 36.5 |
| 297 | Anop 447 | 407 | T | C | 63 | 38.1 |
| 298 | Anop 467 | 145 | A | C | 75 | 45.3 |
| 299 | Anop 467 | 250 | T | C | 89 | 42.7 |
| 300 | Anop 467 | 469 | C | T | 55 | 43.6 |
| 301 | Anop 467 | 532 | G | A | 70 | 47.1 |
| 302 | Anop 471 | 281 | G | A | 55 | 40.0 |
| 303 | Anop 473 | 255 | A | G | 51 | 43.1 |
| 304 | Anop 480 | 465 | T | C | 44 | 43.2 |
| 305 | Anop 485 | 56 | T | C | 112 | 39.3 |
| 306 | Anop 485 | 67 | C | T | 101 | 36.6 |
| 307 | Anop 485 | 76 | C | T | 104 | 35.6 |
| 308 | Anop 494 | 159 | T | A | 59 | 35.6 |
| 309 | Anop 494 | 274 | A | C | 44 | 40.9 |
| 310 | Anop 494 | 276 | C | T | 44 | 50.0 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 311 | Anop 494 | 281 | T | C | 42 | 50.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 312 | Anop 494 | 339 | A | G | 49 | 42.9 |
| 313 | Anop 494 | 423 | T | C | 43 | 37.2 |
| 314 | Anop 503 | 75 | T | C | 76 | 39.5 |
| 315 | Anop 503 | 99 | A | G | 82 | 40.2 |
| 316 | Anop 503 | 307 | C | T | 91 | 36.3 |
| 317 | Anop 503 | 399 | G | C | 82 | 47.6 |
| 318 | Anop 503 | 482 | A | T | 82 | 52.4 |
| 319 | Anop 517 | 67 | T | C | 36 | 38.9 |
| 320 | Anop 520 | 301 | T | C | 127 | 44.9 |
| 321 | Anop 523 | 451 | G | T | 96 | 50.0 |
| 322 | Anop 527 | 446 | G | T | 45 | 35.6 |
| 323 | Anop 534 | 350 | G | A | 113 | 38.1 |
| 324 | Anop 534 | 392 | G | C | 118 | 35.6 |
| 325 | Anop 534 | 545 | T | G | 93 | 44.1 |
| 326 | Anop 541 | 381 | C | G | 420 | 36.2 |
| 327 | Anop 552 | 309 | C | T | 127 | 44.9 |
| 328 | Anop 552 | 354 | C | T | 136 | 42.6 |
| 329 | Anop 561 | 405 | G | A | 47 | 38.3 |
| 330 | Anop 568 | 290 | C | G | 37 | 45.9 |
| 331 | Anop 568 | 435 | T | C | 75 | 41.3 |
| 332 | Anop 569 | 368 | A | G | 46 | 50.0 |
| 333 | Anop 576 | 27 | T | A | 37 | 43.2 |
| 334 | Anop 576 | 70 | C | T | 41 | 43.9 |
| 335 | Anop 576 | 215 | A | T | 44 | 36.4 |
| 336 | Anop 576 | 251 | G | A | 44 | 36.4 |
| 337 | Anop 576 | 257 | C | T | 49 | 42.9 |
| 338 | Anop 576 | 266 | G | A | 47 | 46.8 |
| 339 | Anop 576 | 599 | T | C | 57 | 47.4 |
| 340 | Anop 576 | 611 | C | T | 51 | 43.1 |
| 341 | Anop 576 | 632 | G | A | 48 | 45.8 |
| 342 | Anop 576 | 635 | T | C | 45 | 37.8 |
| 343 | Anop 576 | 860 | T | A | 62 | 41.9 |
| 344 | Anop 576 | 1061 | C | T | 100 | 41.0 |
| 345 | Anop 576 | 1226 | T | A | 37 | 43.2 |
| 346 | Anop 582 | 430 | G | A | 92 | 37.0 |
| 347 | Anop 597 | 1191 | A | G | 39 | 48.7 |
| 348 | Anop 597 | 1737 | T | A | 45 | 37.8 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 349 | Anop 602 | 335 | C | G | 80 | 36.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 350 | Anop 602 | 423 | T | A | 62 | 43.5 |
| 351 | Anop 602 | 431 | A | C | 66 | 43.9 |
| 352 | Anop 602 | 432 | G | A | 66 | 43.9 |
| 353 | Anop 602 | 465 | C | T | 70 | 37.1 |
| 354 | Anop 602 | 486 | A | G | 62 | 46.8 |
| 355 | Anop 602 | 569 | T | C | 56 | 46.4 |
| 356 | Anop 602 | 587 | A | G | 60 | 46.7 |
| 357 | Anop 602 | 588 | T | C | 60 | 46.7 |
| 358 | Anop 602 | 632 | C | T | 79 | 41.8 |
| 359 | Anop 602 | 648 | T | A | 71 | 47.9 |
| 360 | Anop 602 | 731 | T | C | 54 | 55.6 |
| 361 | Anop 609 | 108 | T | C | 37 | 43.2 |
| 362 | Anop 609 | 260 | C | T | 47 | 46.8 |
| 363 | Anop 615 | 72 | A | T | 197 | 42.6 |
| 364 | Anop 622 | 333 | T | C | 54 | 42.6 |
| 365 | Anop 622 | 339 | G | C | 53 | 47.2 |
| 366 | Anop 622 | 369 | G | A | 45 | 40.0 |
| 367 | Anop 622 | 414 | A | G | 49 | 38.8 |
| 368 | Anop 622 | 435 | C | T | 48 | 47.9 |
| 369 | Anop 622 | 444 | A | G | 52 | 48.1 |
| 370 | Anop 622 | 498 | T | C | 61 | 47.5 |
| 371 | Anop 622 | 530 | G | A | 63 | 46.0 |
| 372 | Anop 643 | 22 | G | A | 75 | 48.0 |
| 373 | Anop 643 | 113 | T | C | 90 | 42.2 |
| 374 | Anop 643 | 116 | T | C | 89 | 41.6 |
| 375 | Anop 643 | 130 | T | C | 87 | 47.1 |
| 376 | Anop 643 | 291 | A | C | 48 | 35.4 |
| 377 | Anop 648 | 553 | A | G | 35 | 40.0 |
| 378 | Anop 648 | 566 | C | G | 36 | 36.1 |
| 379 | Anop 648 | 582 | A | G | 35 | 45.7 |
| 380 | Anop 658 | 20 | A | G | 58 | 36.2 |
| 381 | Anop 658 | 21 | G | T | 58 | 36.2 |
| 382 | Anop 658 | 44 | A | C | 59 | 40.7 |
| 383 | Anop 658 | 137 | A | G | 86 | 41.9 |
| 384 | Anop 658 | 355 | G | A | 49 | 40.8 |
| 385 | Anop 662 | 404 | C | T | 133 | 35.3 |
| 386 | Anop 664 | 97 | G | A | 60 | 43.3 |
| 387 | Anop 664 | 250 | G | C | 71 | 38.0 |
| 388 | Anop 664 | 324 | C | T | 77 | 37.7 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 389 | Anop 674 | 241 | A | G | 49 | 44.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 390 | Anop 678 | 1051 | A | G | 38 | 44.7 |
| 391 | Anop 683 | 51 | G | C | 139 | 44.6 |
| 392 | Anop 683 | 90 | G | C | 141 | 47.5 |
| 393 | Anop 683 | 93 | A | G | 139 | 48.2 |
| 394 | Anop 683 | 103 | C | T | 123 | 48.8 |
| 395 | Anop 683 | 112 | T | C | 104 | 43.3 |
| 396 | Anop 683 | 225 | A | C | 126 | 46.8 |
| 397 | Anop 683 | 277 | G | C | 106 | 43.4 |
| 398 | Anop 683 | 328 | C | G | 88 | 40.9 |
| 399 | Anop 708 | 600 | T | C | 43 | 44.2 |
| 400 | Anop 708 | 687 | T | C | 45 | 48.9 |
| 401 | Anop 708 | 690 | G | C | 41 | 46.3 |
| 402 | Anop 708 | 699 | T | C | 38 | 55.3 |
| 403 | Anop 708 | 705 | T | G | 40 | 52.5 |
| 404 | Anop 708 | 720 | A | G | 42 | 50.0 |
| 405 | Anop 714 | 459 | C | T | 51 | 45.1 |
| 406 | Anop 714 | 478 | T | C | 46 | 37.0 |
| 407 | Anop 729 | 138 | C | A | 39 | 46.2 |
| 408 | Anop 729 | 158 | G | T | 41 | 46.3 |
| 409 | Anop 729 | 273 | C | T | 61 | 45.9 |
| 410 | Anop 744 | 205 | T | C | 215 | 46.0 |
| 411 | Anop 744 | 393 | G | A | 217 | 47.0 |
| 412 | Anop 758 | 32 | A | T | 38 | 36.8 |
| 413 | Anop 758 | 198 | A | T | 47 | 40.4 |
| 414 | Anop 758 | 384 | T | C | 49 | 36.7 |
| 415 | Anop 759 | 146 | T | C | 222 | 40.1 |
| 416 | Anop 759 | 251 | C | T | 346 | 39.9 |
| 417 | Anop 759 | 359 | G | A | 332 | 35.2 |
| 418 | Anop 771 | 581 | A | G | 124 | 37.1 |
| 419 | Anop 771 | 591 | A | T | 117 | 40.2 |
| 420 | Anop 771 | 634 | T | C | 53 | 43.4 |
| 421 | Anop 771 | 695 | T | A | 47 | 40.4 |
| 422 | Anop 771 | 696 | G | A | 47 | 40.4 |
| 423 | Anop 771 | 739 | A | G | 37 | 45.9 |
| 424 | Anop 772 | 315 | T | G | 87 | 44.8 |
| 425 | Anop 772 | 338 | A | T | 89 | 36.0 |
| 426 | Anop 772 | 395 | G | A | 73 | 54.8 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 427 | Anop 772 | 1103 | C | T | 156 | 36.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 428 | Anop 782 | 101 | C | A | 45 | 44.4 |
| 429 | Anop 782 | 138 | T | G | 55 | 41.8 |
| 430 | Anop 782 | 175 | G | C | 56 | 37.5 |
| 431 | Anop 782 | 211 | A | G | 42 | 35.7 |
| 432 | Anop 782 | 213 | C | T | 50 | 38.0 |
| 433 | Anop 782 | 297 | T | A | 37 | 40.5 |
| 434 | Anop 799 | 402 | T | C | 115 | 36.5 |
| 435 | Anop 800 | 266 | A | G | 172 | 47.1 |
| 436 | Anop 805 | 67 | A | G | 65 | 47.7 |
| 437 | Anop 805 | 130 | G | C | 82 | 40.2 |
| 438 | Anop 805 | 204 | A | C | 86 | 43.0 |
| 439 | Anop 805 | 266 | A | G | 73 | 45.2 |
| 440 | Anop 805 | 278 | T | C | 53 | 45.3 |
| 441 | Anop 805 | 383 | C | T | 48 | 43.8 |
| 442 | Anop 807 | 378 | C | T | 223 | 55.6 |
| 443 | Anop 809 | 278 | C | T | 139 | 38.1 |
| 444 | Anop 809 | 545 | T | C | 99 | 36.4 |
| 445 | Anop 818 | 205 | G | C | 36 | 36.1 |
| 446 | Anop 818 | 244 | C | T | 36 | 36.1 |
| 447 | Anop 818 | 265 | C | G | 39 | 38.5 |
| 448 | Anop 818 | 342 | G | A | 38 | 42.1 |
| $449$ | Anop 818 | 661 | C | T | $45$ | $40.0$ |
| $450$ | Anop 825 | $133$ | C | T | $49$ | $36.7$ |
| $451$ | Anop 825 | $661$ | T | A | $44$ | $45.5$ |
| $452$ | Anop 828 | $157$ | C | T | 88 | $45.5$ |
| $453$ | Anop 829 | 516 | A | G | 36 | 38.9 |
| $454$ | Anop 843 | 239 | T | A | 96 | 39.6 |
| $455$ | Anop 843 | 284 | C | G | 97 | 41.2 |
| 456 | Anop 849 | 108 | T | A | 84 | 42.9 |
| 457 | Anop 850 | 346 | C | T | 39 | 46.2 |
| 458 | Anop 857 | 264 | A | G | 71 | 42.3 |
| 459 | Anop 877 | 378 | A | G | 35 | 51.4 |
| 460 | Anop 877 | 379 | C | T | 35 | 37.1 |
| 461 | Anop 878 | 783 | C | G | 35 | 37.1 |
| 462 | Anop 878 | 851 | T | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 463 | Anop 878 | 1657 | C | T | 56 | 39.3 |
| 464 | Anop 878 | 1666 | G | T | 51 | 39.2 |
| 465 | Anop 878 | 1674 | A | T | 40 | 37.5 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 466 | Anop 878 | 1678 | A | C | 46 | 52.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 467 | Anop 878 | 1702 | C | G | 63 | 39.7 |
| 468 | Anop 886 | 148 | A | G | 58 | 46.6 |
| 469 | Anop 886 | 238 | T | C | 59 | 44.1 |
| 470 | Anop 886 | 289 | C | G | 54 | 44.4 |
| 471 | Anop 886 | 391 | A | G | 52 | 48.1 |
| 472 | Anop 902 | 489 | T | C | 46 | 43.5 |
| 473 | Anop 906 | 183 | T | G | 144 | 42.4 |
| 474 | Anop 906 | 252 | C | A | 147 | 42.9 |
| 475 | Anop 906 | 336 | G | A | 141 | 43.3 |
| 476 | Anop 906 | 707 | A | G | 102 | 43.1 |
| 477 | Anop 906 | 1199 | A | G | 55 | 38.2 |
| 478 | Anop 906 | 1262 | A | G | 39 | 38.5 |
| 479 | Anop 906 | 1700 | G | A | 78 | 41.0 |
| 480 | Anop 906 | 2552 | G | A | 50 | 48.0 |
| 481 | Anop 908 | 233 | C | T | 39 | 41.0 |
| 482 | Anop 908 | 302 | T | C | 50 | 48.0 |
| 483 | Anop 908 | 677 | A | G | 81 | 43.2 |
| 484 | Anop 911 | 343 | T | C | 38 | 39.5 |
| 485 | Anop 911 | 370 | G | A | 41 | 36.6 |
| 486 | Anop 911 | 1170 | G | A | 161 | 45.3 |
| 487 | Anop 911 | 1230 | G | A | 179 | 49.7 |
| 488 | Anop 911 | 1461 | G | A | 165 | 38.8 |
| 489 | Anop 911 | 1503 | A | G | 177 | 41.8 |
| 490 | Anop 911 | 1606 | G | A | 48 | 39.6 |
| 491 | Anop 911 | 1630 | C | T | 69 | 47.8 |
| 492 | Anop 911 | 1954 | C | T | 56 | 42.9 |
| 493 | Anop 958 | 1107 | T | C | 36 | 50.0 |
| 494 | Anop 958 | 1191 | T | A | 44 | 38.6 |
| 495 | Anop 967 | 29 | A | G | 67 | 37.3 |
| 496 | Anop 967 | 50 | G | C | 68 | 47.1 |
| 497 | Anop 967 | 97 | C | A | 115 | 40.9 |
| $498$ | Anop 967 | 140 | A | C | 120 | 44.2 |
| 499 | Anop 971 | 335 | T | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 500 | Anop 971 | 358 | C | T | 42 | 38.1 |
| $501$ | Anop 971 | $393$ | A | C | 36 | 47.2 |
| $502$ | Anop 982 | 55 | C | T | 52 | 36.5 |
| 503 | Anop 982 | 150 | C | G | 62 | 35.5 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 504 | Anop 982 | 162 | C | G | 76 | 38.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 505 | Anop 982 | 277 | A | G | 75 | 46.7 |
| 506 | Anop 982 | 393 | G | C | 74 | 43.2 |
| 507 | Anop 1000 | 1076 | G | A | 76 | 42.1 |
| 508 | Anop 1017 | 502 | G | A | 42 | 54.8 |
| 509 | Anop 1017 | 598 | A | G | 53 | 47.2 |
| 510 | Anop 1017 | 784 | T | C | 36 | 38.9 |
| 511 | Anop 1017 | 937 | G | A | 47 | 36.2 |
| 512 | Anop 1017 | 943 | C | T | 47 | 44.7 |
| 513 | Anop 1027 | 93 | C | G | 36 | 41.7 |
| 514 | Anop 1027 | 95 | A | G | 36 | 41.7 |
| 515 | Anop 1027 | 110 | C | T | 39 | 43.6 |
| 516 | Anop 1027 | 111 | G | T | 39 | 41.0 |
| 517 | Anop 1027 | 131 | C | G | 39 | 41.0 |
| 518 | Anop 1027 | 150 | C | T | 36 | 47.2 |
| 519 | Anop 1027 | 154 | A | T | 36 | 44.4 |
| 520 | Anop 1027 | 359 | A | T | 37 | 48.6 |
| 521 | Anop 1050 | 195 | G | A | 51 | 47.1 |
| 522 | Anop 1050 | 240 | T | C | 51 | 41.2 |
| 523 | Anop 1050 | 252 | C | T | 50 | 42.0 |
| 524 | Anop 1050 | 383 | A | G | 56 | 41.1 |
| 525 | Anop 1050 | 384 | G | A | 56 | 41.1 |
| 526 | Anop 1050 | 609 | T | C | 41 | 43.9 |
| 527 | Anop 1050 | 621 | C | G | 38 | 47.4 |
| 528 | Anop 1050 | 645 | C | G | 37 | 37.8 |
| 529 | Anop 1084 | 343 | G | A | 377 | 47.2 |
| 530 | Anop 1085 | 2116 | A | G | 35 | 42.9 |
| 531 | Anop 1085 | 2344 | C | T | 36 | 36.1 |
| 532 | Anop 1109 | 333 | C | T | 232 | 36.6 |
| 533 | Anop 1125 | 641 | A | G | 46 | 47.8 |
| 534 | Anop 1126 | 20 | A | G | 63 | 49.2 |
| 535 | Anop 1126 | 176 | A | G | 84 | 39.3 |
| 536 | Anop 1126 | 188 | A | G | 82 | 39.0 |
| 537 | Anop 1126 | 197 | G | A | 87 | 37.9 |
| 538 | Anop 1136 | $279$ | A | G | 60 | 48.3 |
| 539 | Anop 1163 | $1920$ | C | A | 59 | 39.0 |
| 540 | Anop 1166 | $165$ | A | C | 43 | 39.5 |
| 541 | Anop 1166 | 214 | C | G | 43 | 44.2 |

APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 542 | Anop 1170 | 213 | C | T | 64 | 45.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 543 | Anop 1170 | 598 | C | T | 36 | 38.9 |
| 544 | Anop 1173 | 20 | T | C | 43 | 51.2 |
| 545 | Anop 1173 | 26 | T | C | 45 | 48.9 |
| 546 | Anop 1173 | 32 | C | T | 51 | 45.1 |
| 547 | Anop 1173 | 344 | G | A | 67 | 47.8 |
| 548 | Anop 1189 | 376 | T | C | 453 | 47.7 |
| 549 | Anop 1189 | 529 | C | A | 271 | 45.0 |
| 550 | Anop 1193 | 465 | C | T | 72 | 48.6 |
| 551 | Anop 1193 | 466 | C | T | 72 | 48.6 |
| 552 | Anop 1201 | 322 | C | T | 46 | 41.3 |
| 553 | Anop 1201 | 433 | A | G | 55 | 43.6 |
| 554 | Anop 1201 | 466 | C | T | 54 | 40.7 |
| 555 | Anop 1201 | 499 | A | G | 50 | 48.0 |
| 556 | Anop 1202 | 317 | A | G | 130 | 49.2 |
| 557 | Anop 1202 | 343 | T | C | 112 | 41.1 |
| 558 | Anop 1207 | 457 | A | T | 40 | 42.5 |
| 559 | Anop 1207 | 554 | A | G | 56 | 50.0 |
| 560 | Anop 1207 | 621 | G | C | 52 | 40.4 |
| 561 | Anop 1217 | 339 | T | C | 97 | 45.4 |
| 562 | Anop 1217 | 698 | C | T | 56 | 35.7 |
| 563 | Anop 1229 | 788 | G | A | 75 | 44.0 |
| 564 | Anop 1229 | 1358 | A | C | 36 | 36.1 |
| 565 | Anop 1233 | 430 | C | T | 77 | 48.1 |
| 566 | Anop 1233 | 955 | A | G | 75 | 48.0 |
| 567 | Anop 1236 | 294 | A | T | 166 | 36.1 |
| 568 | Anop 1237 | 286 | G | C | 54 | 38.9 |
| 569 | Anop 1237 | 430 | C | T | 53 | 41.5 |
| 570 | Anop 1237 | 454 | G | A | 55 | 47.3 |
| 571 | Anop 1243 | 336 | G | A | 93 | 38.7 |
| 572 | Anop 1243 | 429 | T | C | 90 | 35.6 |
| 573 | Anop 1243 | 573 | G | A | 72 | 36.1 |
| 574 | Anop 1268 | 144 | T | C | 104 | 49.0 |
| 575 | Anop 1269 | 437 | A | G | 95 | 46.3 |
| 576 | Anop 1276 | 951 | T | C | 63 | 36.5 |
| 577 | Anop 1276 | 1012 | G | T | 45 | 42.2 |
| 578 | Anop 1276 | 1013 | T | C | 45 | 42.2 |
| 579 | Anop 1276 | 1032 | A | T | 51 | 45.1 |
| 580 | Anop 1277 | 574 | G | A | 39 | 35.9 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 581 | Anop 1294 | 160 | G | A | 185 | 35.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 582 | Anop 1294 | 175 | A | C | 202 | 44.1 |
| 583 | Anop 1295 | 302 | G | A | 37 | 45.9 |
| 584 | Anop 1295 | 311 | T | A | 36 | 41.7 |
| 585 | Anop 1295 | 534 | A | T | 93 | 38.7 |
| 586 | Anop 1295 | 536 | T | G | 93 | 38.7 |
| 587 | Anop 1295 | 707 | A | T | 57 | 47.4 |
| 588 | Anop 1295 | 846 | C | T | 67 | 41.8 |
| 589 | Anop 1295 | 859 | G | A | 66 | 42.4 |
| 590 | Anop 1302 | 272 | G | A | 78 | 42.3 |
| 591 | Anop 1302 | 288 | C | T | 77 | 35.1 |
| 592 | Anop 1312 | 488 | C | A | 41 | 46.3 |
| 593 | Anop 1312 | 498 | G | C | 37 | 40.5 |
| 594 | Anop 1312 | 531 | G | A | 36 | 36.1 |
| 595 | Anop 1312 | 569 | G | T | 42 | 47.6 |
| 596 | Anop 1349 | 30 | A | G | 35 | 37.1 |
| 597 | Anop 1349 | 51 | G | A | 35 | 37.1 |
| 598 | Anop 1357 | 98 | G | A | 63 | 39.7 |
| 599 | Anop 1361 | 603 | C | A | 64 | 42.2 |
| 600 | Anop 1361 | 604 | C | G | 64 | 35.9 |
| 601 | Anop 1361 | 775 | C | A | 36 | 47.2 |
| 602 | Anop 1375 | 455 | T | G | 39 | 48.7 |
| 603 | Anop 1384 | 203 | T | A | 35 | 42.9 |
| 604 | Anop 1384 | 287 | C | G | 35 | 42.9 |
| 605 | Anop 1411 | 317 | A | G | 79 | 39.2 |
| 606 | Anop 1426 | 150 | T | C | 35 | 40.0 |
| 607 | Anop 1518 | 573 | T | C | 56 | 48.2 |
| 608 | Anop 1524 | 115 | C | T | 44 | 43.2 |
| 609 | Anop 1526 | 114 | G | C | 37 | 43.2 |
| 610 | Anop 1526 | 126 | C | T | 37 | 43.2 |
| 611 | Anop 1526 | 255 | T | C | 38 | 36.8 |
| 612 | Anop 1526 | 258 | G | A | 38 | 36.8 |
| 613 | Anop 1526 | 304 | T | C | 35 | 37.1 |
| 614 | Anop 1550 | 136 | T | G | 58 | 43.1 |
| 615 | Anop 1553 | 338 | A | T | 44 | 38.6 |
| 616 | Anop 1553 | 426 | A | T | 46 | 45.7 |
| 617 | Anop 1563 | 245 | C | A | 39 | 41.0 |
| 618 | Anop 1627 | 419 | G | C | 42 | 47.6 |
| 619 | Anop 1627 | 437 | G | A | 64 | 37.5 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 620 | Anop 1627 | 440 | G | T | 62 | 51.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 621 | Anop 1627 | 506 | G | A | 46 | 41.3 |
| 622 | Anop 1627 | 616 | G | A | 49 | 40.8 |
| 623 | Anop 1627 | 625 | G | T | 41 | 36.6 |
| 624 | Anop 1666 | 201 | C | T | 86 | 37.2 |
| 625 | Anop 1686 | 109 | A | T | 56 | 42.9 |
| 626 | Anop 1686 | 265 | G | A | 64 | 40.6 |
| 627 | Anop 1686 | 381 | A | G | 89 | 51.7 |
| 628 | Anop 1686 | 514 | G | A | 74 | 45.9 |
| 629 | Anop 1692 | 506 | A | C | 60 | 41.7 |
| 630 | Anop 1692 | 640 | C | A | 64 | 37.5 |
| 631 | Anop 1692 | 1018 | A | G | 54 | 46.3 |
| 632 | Anop 1703 | 20 | A | G | 52 | 38.5 |
| 633 | Anop 1703 | 414 | T | G | 78 | 43.6 |
| 634 | Anop 1703 | 460 | T | C | 70 | 40.0 |
| 635 | Anop 1766 | 311 | T | C | 69 | 46.4 |
| 636 | Anop 1776 | 1451 | A | G | 47 | 38.3 |
| 637 | Anop 1794 | 472 | A | G | 102 | 45.1 |
| 638 | Anop 1815 | 468 | T | C | 43 | 39.5 |
| 639 | Anop 1815 | 518 | C | A | 36 | 38.9 |
| 640 | Anop 1823 | 458 | A | G | 51 | 41.2 |
| 641 | Anop 1823 | 472 | T | C | 49 | 46.9 |
| 642 | Anop 1835 | 199 | C | T | 42 | 42.9 |
| 643 | Anop 1835 | 205 | A | C | 43 | 37.2 |
| 644 | Anop 1842 | 372 | A | G | 168 | 38.1 |
| 645 | Anop 1844 | 131 | C | T | 39 | 48.7 |
| 646 | Anop 1844 | 158 | G | A | 41 | 41.5 |
| 647 | Anop 1844 | 218 | T | C | 47 | 40.4 |
| 648 | Anop 1844 | 272 | C | T | 40 | 45.0 |
| $649$ | Anop 1844 | 296 | A | T | 47 | 42.6 |
| $650$ | Anop 1855 | 233 | A | G | 35 | 45.7 |
| $651$ | Anop 1856 | 475 | G | C | 50 | 42.0 |
| 652 | Anop 1856 | 491 | C | T | 44 | 43.2 |
| 653 | Anop 1856 | 493 | G | C | 44 | 43.2 |
| 654 | Anop 1856 | 498 | G | C | 54 | 35.2 |
| 655 | Anop 1856 | 578 | A | T | 39 | 56.4 |
| 656 | Anop 1856 | 608 | T | C | 45 | 40.0 |
| 657 | Anop 1856 | 743 | T | G | 35 | 37.1 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 658 | Anop 1896 | 783 | T | C | 38 | 39.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 659 | Anop 1896 | 1023 | T | C | 48 | 56.3 |
| 660 | Anop 1896 | 1026 | C | T | 59 | 35.6 |
| 661 | Anop 1909 | 220 | A | T | 94 | 43.6 |
| 662 | Anop 1909 | 221 | A | C | 94 | 43.6 |
| 663 | Anop 1945 | 2065 | A | T | 43 | 46.5 |
| 664 | Anop 1989 | 1383 | A | G | 39 | 46.2 |
| 665 | Anop 2003 | 415 | C | T | 80 | 42.5 |
| 666 | Anop 2142 | 615 | T | G | 87 | 40.2 |
| 667 | Anop 2149 | 396 | T | A | 37 | 40.5 |
| 668 | Anop 2178 | 361 | C | T | 45 | 46.7 |
| 669 | Anop 2178 | 596 | T | C | 52 | 40.4 |
| 670 | Anop 2178 | 732 | G | C | 44 | 43.2 |
| 671 | Anop 2212 | 206 | G | A | 38 | 39.5 |
| 672 | Anop 2312 | 20 | C | G | 59 | 47.5 |
| 673 | Anop 2312 | 29 | T | A | 61 | 49.2 |
| 674 | Anop 2378 | 263 | G | A | 39 | 35.9 |
| 675 | Anop 2385 | 100 | A | G | 38 | 47.4 |
| 676 | Anop 2385 | 166 | C | T | 40 | 50.0 |
| 677 | Anop 2385 | 255 | C | G | 38 | 36.8 |
| 678 | Anop 2385 | 274 | G | A | 39 | 46.2 |
| 679 | Anop 2385 | 283 | A | G | 38 | 42.1 |
| 680 | Anop 2440 | 516 | C | T | 99 | 37.4 |
| 681 | Anop 2440 | 600 | A | G | 59 | 35.6 |
| 682 | Anop 2477 | 199 | G | T | 36 | 50.0 |
| 683 | Anop 2534 | 1254 | C | T | 35 | 45.7 |
| 684 | Anop 2559 | 1182 | T | C | 67 | 40.3 |
| 685 | Anop 2571 | 67 | C | T | 39 | 46.2 |
| 686 | Anop 2571 | 106 | T | C | 45 | 46.7 |
| 687 | Anop 2571 | 301 | A | C | 56 | 44.6 |
| 688 | Anop 2593 | 350 | G | C | 42 | 42.9 |
| 689 | Anop 2635 | 643 | C | T | 37 | 45.9 |
| 690 | Anop 2635 | 739 | C | T | 40 | 47.5 |
| 691 | Anop 2636 | 263 | C | T | 59 | 45.8 |
| 692 | Anop 2636 | 281 | A | G | 62 | 38.7 |
| 693 | Anop 2636 | 449 | G | T | 55 | 43.6 |
| 694 | Anop 2804 | 321 | C | T | 87 | 40.2 |
| 695 | Anop 2828 | 152 | G | A | 42 | 38.1 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 696 | Anop 2828 | 323 | G | A | 58 | 48.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 697 | Anop 2833 | 171 | A | C | 36 | 36.1 |
| 698 | Anop 2833 | 173 | G | A | 36 | 36.1 |
| 699 | Anop 2833 | 181 | C | A | 36 | 36.1 |
| 700 | Anop 2833 | 198 | A | C | 37 | 37.8 |
| 701 | Anop 2833 | 201 | C | T | 37 | 37.8 |
| 702 | Anop 2833 | 222 | T | A | 38 | 39.5 |
| 703 | Anop 2833 | 263 | T | C | 40 | 35.0 |
| 704 | Anop 2833 | 264 | A | T | 39 | 38.5 |
| 705 | Anop 2833 | 283 | A | G | 39 | 35.9 |
| 706 | Anop 2861 | 1141 | T | C | 40 | 47.5 |
| 707 | Anop 2926 | 86 | G | A | 72 | 40.3 |
| 708 | Anop 2926 | 117 | C | T | 72 | 36.1 |
| 709 | Anop 3353 | 39 | G | C | 43 | 37.2 |
| 710 | Anop 3353 | 74 | C | A | 51 | 35.3 |
| 711 | Anop 3353 | 75 | T | A | 51 | 35.3 |
| 712 | Anop 3353 | 99 | C | T | 55 | 36.4 |
| 713 | Anop 3353 | 105 | A | G | 55 | 36.4 |
| 714 | Anop 3353 | 148 | G | A | 55 | 36.4 |
| 715 | Anop 3353 | 158 | C | T | 57 | 40.4 |
| 716 | Anop 3353 | 170 | C | G | 54 | 37.0 |
| 717 | Anop 3353 | 172 | T | A | 53 | 35.8 |
| 718 | Anop 3353 | 174 | G | A | 54 | 35.2 |
| 719 | Anop 3353 | 184 | C | G | 59 | 39.0 |
| 720 | Anop 3353 | 186 | T | A | 59 | 39.0 |
| 721 | Anop 3353 | 188 | C | A | 59 | 39.0 |
| 722 | Anop 3353 | 233 | T | G | 61 | 37.7 |
| 723 | Anop 3353 | 246 | T | A | 58 | 36.2 |
| 724 | Anop 3481 | 591 | G | C | 74 | 43.2 |
| 725 | Anop 3481 | 597 | C | A | 77 | 46.8 |
| 726 | Anop 3481 | 744 | T | A | 61 | 45.9 |
| 727 | Anop 3688 | 185 | G | A | 49 | 40.8 |
| 728 | Anop 3688 | 190 | A | C | 44 | 47.7 |
| 729 | Anop 3688 | 196 | C | T | 40 | 40.0 |
| 730 | Anop 3688 | 202 | T | A | 49 | 46.9 |
| 731 | Anop 3688 | 272 | A | G | 47 | 40.4 |
| 732 | Anop 3688 | 303 | T | C | 44 | 40.9 |
| 733 | Anop 3823 | 637 | G | C | 38 | 47.4 |

## APPENDIX J1. (cont.)

| 734 | Anop 3823 | 643 | A | G | 39 | 41.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 735 | Anop 4243 | 124 | C | A | 53 | 39.6 |
| 736 | Anop 5253 | 227 | C | G | 43 | 41.9 |
| 737 | Anop 5253 | 312 | A | G | 37 | 37.8 |
| 738 | Anop 5253 | 328 | A | G | 36 | 38.9 |
| 739 | Anop 6789 | 324 | C | T | 38 | 42.1 |
| 740 | Anop 6789 | 327 | A | G | 38 | 42.1 |
| 741 | Anop 6789 | 339 | G | T | 39 | 48.7 |
| 742 | Anop 8555 | 451 | C | T | 311 | 35.0 |

APPENDIX J2. A. craccivora.

| Serial Number | Contig | Consensus Position | Consensus | Allele | Coverage | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Aphis 41 | 98 | A | T | 39 | 35.9 |
| 2 | Aphis 41 | 918 | C | T | 88 | 38.6 |
| 3 | Aphis 45 | 1329 | T | C | 45 | 48.9 |
| 4 | Aphis 85 | 138 | C | T | 62 | 48.4 |
| 5 | Aphis 85 | 289 | T | C | 70 | 42.9 |
| 6 | Aphis 90 | 144 | G | A | 67 | 49.3 |
| 7 | Aphis 90 | 164 | C | T | 67 | 47.8 |
| 8 | Aphis 90 | 221 | C | T | 68 | 50.0 |
| 9 | Aphis 102 | 282 | A | G | 59 | 49.2 |
| 10 | Aphis 102 | 333 | T | C | 79 | 36.7 |
| 11 | Aphis 102 | 429 | T | A | 74 | 36.5 |
| 12 | Aphis 102 | 468 | C | T | 72 | 36.1 |
| 13 | Aphis 102 | 480 | C | T | 64 | 39.1 |
| 14 | Aphis 102 | 489 | A | G | 71 | 39.4 |
| 15 | Aphis 103 | 215 | G | A | 51 | 45.1 |
| 16 | Aphis 103 | 437 | T | A | 112 | 43.8 |
| 17 | Aphis 111 | 462 | T | C | 167 | 49.1 |
| 18 | Aphis 117 | 101 | T | C | 54 | 44.4 |
| 19 | Aphis 117 | 445 | C | T | 56 | 44.6 |
| 20 | Aphis 133 | 565 | G | A | 53 | 47.2 |
| 21 | Aphis 133 | 595 | A | G | 40 | 52.5 |
| 22 | Aphis 200 | 245 | A | C | 43 | 41.9 |
| 23 | Aphis 200 | 317 | C | G | 56 | 41.1 |
| 24 | Aphis 200 | 488 | G | A | 40 | 47.5 |
| 25 | Aphis 212 | 1286 | C | G | 84 | 48.8 |
| 26 | Aphis 215 | 1480 | T | A | 165 | 49.1 |
| 27 | Aphis 215 | 1534 | T | C | 152 | 40.8 |
| 28 | Aphis 242 | 1886 | G | A | 57 | 36.8 |
| 29 | Aphis 255 | 72 | G | A | 37 | 37.8 |
| 30 | Aphis 255 | 81 | C | T | 41 | 41.5 |
| 31 | Aphis 255 | 93 | C | T | $41$ | 43.9 |
| 32 | Aphis 255 | 120 | A | G | 44 | 40.9 |
| 33 | Aphis 255 | 123 | G | A | 44 | 40.9 |
| 34 | Aphis 255 | 126 | C | T | 45 | 40.0 |
| 35 | Aphis 255 | 132 | A | T | 46 | 39.1 |
| 36 | Aphis 255 | 136 | A | G | 44 | 36.4 |
| 37 | Aphis 255 | 231 | A | G | 46 | 52.2 |

APPENDIX J2. A. craccivora.

| 38 | Aphis 255 | 255 | G | A | 52 | 40.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | Aphis 255 | 701 | A | G | 54 | 48.1 |
| 40 | Aphis 273 | 67 | T | C | 72 | 43.1 |
| 41 | Aphis 273 | 171 | C | T | 87 | 47.1 |
| 42 | Aphis 273 | 468 | A | T | 94 | 46.8 |
| 43 | Aphis 273 | 489 | G | A | 98 | 42.9 |
| 44 | Aphis 309 | 319 | A | G | 50 | 36.0 |
| 45 | Aphis 321 | 372 | A | G | 41 | 46.3 |
| 46 | Aphis 321 | 462 | G | A | 44 | 50.0 |
| 47 | Aphis 321 | 471 | G | A | 43 | 48.8 |
| 48 | Aphis 321 | 498 | A | G | 44 | 47.7 |
| 49 | Aphis 321 | 507 | T | A | 44 | 47.7 |
| 50 | Aphis 321 | 570 | C | T | 43 | 48.8 |
| 51 | Aphis 321 | 579 | A | G | 43 | 48.8 |
| 52 | Aphis 321 | 632 | T | C | 41 | 48.8 |
| 53 | Aphis 321 | 636 | G | T | 42 | 50.0 |
| 54 | Aphis 359 | 553 | A | G | 73 | 49.3 |
| 55 | Aphis 359 | 556 | T | C | 79 | 46.8 |
| 56 | Aphis 359 | 562 | G | A | 77 | 35.1 |
| 57 | Aphis 359 | 649 | A | C | 85 | 55.3 |
| 58 | Aphis 359 | 706 | T | A | 113 | 38.9 |
| 59 | Aphis 359 | 712 | A | G | 94 | 43.6 |
| 60 | Aphis 359 | 714 | C | T | 94 | 43.6 |
| 61 | Aphis 359 | 715 | A | T | 94 | 43.6 |
| 62 | Aphis 359 | 725 | T | C | 121 | 35.5 |
| 63 | Aphis 359 | 730 | T | C | 123 | 44.7 |
| 64 | Aphis 365 | 1829 | T | G | 97 | 41.2 |
| 65 | Aphis 365 | 1837 | G | A | 95 | 42.1 |
| 66 | Aphis 365 | 1850 | A | T | 75 | 41.3 |
| 67 | Aphis 365 | 1852 | G | A | 75 | 41.3 |
| 68 | Aphis 365 | 1856 | C | T | 80 | 43.8 |
| 69 | Aphis 365 | 1865 | G | A | 69 | 44.9 |
| 70 | Aphis 365 | 1874 | G | A | 68 | 47.1 |
| 71 | Aphis 384 | 16 | A | G | 37 | 35.1 |
| 72 | Aphis 384 | 41 | A | T | 45 | 37.8 |
| 73 | Aphis 384 | 104 | G | A | 51 | 37.3 |
| 74 | Aphis 384 | 110 | C | G | 51 | 37.3 |
| 75 | Aphis 384 | 133 | G | C | 42 | 47.6 |

APPENDIX J2. (cont.)

| 76 | Aphis 384 | 137 | G | A | 50 | 38.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 77 | Aphis 384 | 147 | A | T | 50 | 38.0 |
| 78 | Aphis 384 | 152 | T | G | 35 | 54.3 |
| 79 | Aphis 384 | 153 | T | A | 35 | 54.3 |
| 80 | Aphis 384 | 176 | C | A | 53 | 37.7 |
| 81 | Aphis 384 | 179 | G | A | 53 | 35.8 |
| 82 | Aphis 384 | 220 | G | T | 53 | 35.8 |
| 83 | Aphis 384 | 257 | C | A | 53 | 35.8 |
| 84 | Aphis 433 | 293 | T | G | 173 | 47.4 |
| 85 | Aphis 433 | 440 | A | T | 176 | 48.3 |
| 86 | Aphis 480 | 157 | A | G | 44 | 45.5 |
| 87 | Aphis 525 | 993 | T | A | 62 | 43.5 |
| 88 | Aphis 645 | 570 | C | T | 48 | 43.8 |
| 89 | Aphis 645 | 645 | G | A | 48 | 41.7 |
| 90 | Aphis 668 | 637 | A | T | 64 | 48.4 |
| 91 | Aphis 704 | 419 | C | T | 59 | 39.0 |
| 92 | Aphis 704 | 431 | C | T | 53 | 37.7 |
| 93 | Aphis 704 | 447 | C | A | 45 | 44.4 |
| 94 | Aphis 906 | 122 | T | A | 44 | 36.4 |
| 95 | Aphis 1221 | 723 | G | A | 111 | 45.9 |
| 96 | Aphis 1468 | 302 | T | C | 37 | 45.9 |
| 97 | Aphis 1725 | 250 | C | A | 38 | 47.4 |

APPENDIX J3. C. tomentosicollis.

| Serial <br> Number | Contig | Consensus Position | Consensus | Allele | Coverage | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Clavig 2 | 393 | A | G | 37 | 45.9 |
| 2 | Clavig 2 | 482 | A | C | 35 | 45.7 |
| 3 | Clavig 6 | 42 | T | A | 182 | 38.5 |
| 4 | Clavig 6 | 47 | C | T | 184 | 38.0 |
| 5 | Clavig 6 | 104 | G | C | 229 | 35.8 |
| 6 | Clavig 6 | 299 | T | A | 176 | 35.2 |
| 7 | Clavig 7 | 276 | T | C | 154 | 42.9 |
| 8 | Clavig 7 | 279 | C | T | 157 | 35.0 |
| 9 | Clavig 7 | 315 | T | C | 166 | 41.6 |
| 10 | Clavig 7 | 326 | C | G | 162 | 43.2 |
| 11 | Clavig 7 | 333 | C | T | 161 | 43.5 |
| 12 | Clavig 7 | 340 | T | C | 157 | 44.6 |
| 13 | Clavig 9 | 24 | A | G | 219 | 53.4 |
| 14 | Clavig 9 | 36 | T | C | 259 | 46.7 |
| 15 | Clavig 9 | 47 | C | G | 262 | 48.1 |
| 16 | Clavig 9 | 54 | C | T | 258 | 49.2 |
| 17 | Clavig 9 | 61 | T | C | 259 | 51.0 |
| 18 | Clavig 9 | 420 | C | T | 35 | 45.7 |
| 19 | Clavig 17 | 726 | C | T | 56 | 42.9 |
| 20 | Clavig 18 | 89 | T | C | 57 | 36.8 |
| 21 | Clavig 19 | 268 | T | C | 55 | 45.5 |
| 22 | Clavig 19 | 349 | G | A | 53 | 39.6 |
| 23 | Clavig 20 | 1709 | C | T | 1244 | 43.2 |
| 24 | Clavig 20 | 2517 | T | C | 100 | 36.0 |
| 25 | Clavig 26 | 213 | T | A | 156 | 42.3 |
| 26 | Clavig 37 | 144 | G | A | 193 | 42.0 |
| 27 | Clavig 37 | 248 | G | A | 211 | 45.5 |
| 28 | Clavig 39 | 211 | T | C | 78 | 43.6 |
| 29 | Clavig 39 | 374 | T | C | 62 | 38.7 |
| 30 | Clavig 45 | 67 | T | G | 302 | 43.0 |
| 31 | Clavig 45 | 68 | T | C | 302 | 43.0 |
| 32 | Clavig 45 | 125 | T | C | 321 | 39.9 |
| 33 | Clavig 45 | 191 | T | C | 319 | 46.1 |
| 34 | Clavig 45 | 266 | A | C | 329 | 45.6 |
| 35 | Clavig 45 | 278 | T | C | 277 | 39.4 |

APPENDIX J3. (Cont.)

| 36 | Clavig 46 | 224 | A | G | 116 | 35.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | Clavig 46 | 314 | A | G | 114 | 36.8 |
| 38 | Clavig 46 | 389 | T | A | 141 | 47.5 |
| 39 | Clavig 50 | 258 | G | A | 495 | 36.4 |
| 40 | Clavig 50 | 276 | A | T | 465 | 43.0 |
| 41 | Clavig 51 | 372 | A | G | 90 | 35.6 |
| 42 | Clavig 51 | 396 | T | C | 96 | 46.9 |
| 43 | Clavig 51 | 678 | C | T | 68 | 48.5 |
| 44 | Clavig 53 | 325 | G | A | 278 | 39.9 |
| 45 | Clavig 66 | 91 | A | G | 244 | 43.9 |
| 46 | Clavig 66 | 202 | A | T | 302 | 48.7 |
| 47 | Clavig 67 | 349 | G | A | 44 | 45.5 |
| 48 | Clavig 67 | 403 | C | T | 53 | 41.5 |
| 49 | Clavig 67 | 574 | A | G | 54 | 40.7 |
| 50 | Clavig 69 | 142 | C | T | 56 | 35.7 |
| 51 | Clavig 69 | 301 | A | C | 108 | 46.3 |
| 52 | Clavig 69 | 302 | C | A | 108 | 46.3 |
| 53 | Clavig 69 | 519 | G | A | 102 | 42.2 |
| 54 | Clavig 69 | 575 | G | A | 121 | 43.0 |
| 55 | Clavig 69 | 855 | C | T | 75 | 46.7 |
| 56 | Clavig 69 | 874 | A | G | 68 | 38.2 |
| 57 | Clavig 69 | 875 | T | G | 68 | 38.2 |
| 58 | Clavig 70 | 261 | A | G | 36 | 50.0 |
| 59 | Clavig 75 | 795 | G | A | 345 | 42.3 |
| 60 | Clavig 75 | 1005 | G | A | 228 | 38.6 |
| 61 | Clavig 75 | 1413 | G | T | 158 | 35.4 |
| 62 | Clavig 76 | 580 | C | T | 47 | 44.7 |
| 63 | Clavig 76 | 601 | C | T | 52 | 42.3 |
| 64 | Clavig 81 | 366 | A | G | 240 | 35.4 |
| 65 | Clavig 85 | 259 | C | T | 60 | 35.0 |
| 66 | Clavig 85 | 571 | C | G | 68 | 47.1 |
| 67 | Clavig 85 | 604 | A | T | 64 | 39.1 |
| 68 | Clavig 85 | 610 | A | G | 52 | 40.4 |
| 69 | Clavig 85 | 679 | T | C | 36 | 36.1 |
| 70 | Clavig 89 | 2195 | A | T | 39 | 38.5 |
| 71 | Clavig 91 | 164 | C | T | 62 | 37.1 |
| 72 | Clavig 103 | 256 | T | A | 67 | 49.3 |
| 73 | Clavig 103 | 365 | A | T | 66 | 37.9 |
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| 74 | Clavig 106 | 72 | C | T | 410 | 50.7 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 75 | Clavig 106 | 109 | C | T | 392 | 37.8 |
| 76 | Clavig 106 | 147 | T | A | 594 | 38.4 |
| 77 | Clavig 106 | 151 | G | T | 594 | 38.2 |
| 78 | Clavig 106 | 162 | C | T | 614 | 44.6 |
| 79 | Clavig 106 | 222 | G | A | 721 | 44.1 |
| 80 | Clavig 106 | 299 | T | G | 577 | 39.5 |
| 81 | Clavig 106 | 300 | T | C | 577 | 39.5 |
| 82 | Clavig 106 | 423 | T | C | 290 | 54.5 |
| 83 | Clavig 107 | 259 | A | G | 48 | 47.9 |
| 84 | Clavig 107 | 303 | A | G | 50 | 44.0 |
| 85 | Clavig 107 | 321 | C | T | 45 | 53.3 |
| 86 | Clavig 107 | 609 | T | C | 55 | 43.6 |
| 87 | Clavig 107 | 693 | T | A | 35 | 48.6 |
| 88 | Clavig 111 | 106 | A | G | 180 | 35.6 |
| 89 | Clavig 115 | 137 | T | A | 362 | 45.0 |
| 90 | Clavig 115 | 538 | T | C | 338 | 41.7 |
| 91 | Clavig 116 | 354 | T | G | 115 | 41.7 |
| 92 | Clavig 116 | 1733 | T | A | 40 | 45.0 |
| 93 | Clavig 126 | 192 | A | G | 42 | 45.2 |
| 94 | Clavig 127 | 31 | G | A | 65 | 36.9 |
| 95 | Clavig 129 | 152 | G | A | 168 | 44.0 |
| 96 | Clavig 129 | 241 | C | T | 236 | 36.4 |
| 97 | Clavig 129 | 439 | A | T | 406 | 45.3 |
| 98 | Clavig 131 | 492 | A | G | 36 | 50.0 |
| 99 | Clavig 142 | 147 | A | G | 58 | 43.1 |
| 100 | Clavig 149 | 20 | C | T | 38 | 42.1 |
| 101 | Clavig 151 | 268 | G | A | 262 | 47.7 |
| 102 | Clavig 158 | 16 | G | C | 528 | 40.3 |
| 103 | Clavig 158 | 60 | G | A | 569 | 37.1 |
| 104 | Clavig 158 | 90 | G | A | 493 | 47.9 |
| 105 | Clavig 159 | 379 | C | T | 246 | 47.6 |
| 106 | Clavig 166 | 462 | T | C | 66 | 36.4 |
| 107 | Clavig 166 | 966 | G | A | 45 | 40.0 |
| 108 | Clavig 166 | 1158 | A | T | 85 | 38.8 |
| 109 | Clavig 167 | 378 | T | C | 36 | 47.2 |
| 110 | Clavig 167 | 577 | T | C | 58 | 37.9 |
| 111 | Clavig 167 | 603 | G | A | 60 | 36.7 |
| 112 | Clavig 167 | 662 | G | C | 63 | 47.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX J3. (Cont.)

| 113 | Clavig 167 | 967 | C | G | 46 | 37.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 114 | Clavig 168 | 454 | A | G | 908 | 39.3 |
| 115 | Clavig 168 | 574 | A | T | 1015 | 40.2 |
| 116 | Clavig 168 | 799 | A | G | 610 | 47.2 |
| 117 | Clavig 168 | 966 | G | C | 315 | 46.7 |
| 118 | Clavig 172 | 136 | T | C | 36 | 44.4 |
| 119 | Clavig 172 | 980 | G | A | 73 | 35.6 |
| 120 | Clavig 172 | 1350 | C | A | 121 | 38.8 |
| 121 | Clavig 174 | 353 | C | A | 40 | 47.5 |
| 122 | Clavig 174 | 1132 | G | A | 39 | 41.0 |
| 123 | Clavig 176 | 3000 | T | G | 35 | 37.1 |
| 124 | Clavig 177 | 789 | A | T | 56 | 48.2 |
| 125 | Clavig 177 | 909 | A | G | 45 | 48.9 |
| 126 | Clavig 178 | 68 | T | A | 468 | 37.4 |
| 127 | Clavig 178 | 71 | T | C | 464 | 45.0 |
| 128 | Clavig 178 | 103 | T | C | 442 | 47.1 |
| 129 | Clavig 178 | 290 | A | T | 448 | 41.5 |
| 130 | Clavig 178 | 296 | C | T | 395 | 39.7 |
| 131 | Clavig 180 | 169 | T | A | 89 | 42.7 |
| 132 | Clavig 187 | 103 | C | T | 62 | 50.0 |
| 133 | Clavig 187 | 104 | C | A | 62 | 50.0 |
| 134 | Clavig 187 | 124 | T | C | 72 | 45.8 |
| 135 | Clavig 187 | 142 | A | G | 69 | 39.1 |
| 136 | Clavig 187 | 250 | G | A | 79 | 39.2 |
| 137 | Clavig 191 | 374 | C | T | 144 | 43.8 |
| 138 | Clavig 191 | 908 | G | A | 125 | 42.4 |
| 139 | Clavig 192 | 61 | A | G | 37 | 48.6 |
| 140 | Clavig 192 | 296 | C | T | 163 | 46.6 |
| 141 | Clavig 196 | 202 | C | T | 50 | 48.0 |
| 142 | Clavig 201 | 21 | G | A | 51 | 39.2 |
| 143 | Clavig 201 | 418 | G | C | 87 | 47.1 |
| 144 | Clavig 206 | 351 | C | T | 165 | 35.8 |
| 145 | Clavig 214 | 3416 | T | C | 66 | 42.4 |
| 146 | Clavig 214 | 3724 | T | C | 50 | 54.0 |
| 147 | Clavig 214 | 3872 | G | T | 73 | 35.6 |
| 148 | Clavig 214 | 3881 | A | G | 73 | 35.6 |
| 149 | Clavig 214 | 3944 | A | G | 76 | 35.5 |
| 150 | Clavig 214 | 4088 | T | C | 61 | 44.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX J3. (Cont.)

| 151 | Clavig 214 | 4115 | T | C | 59 | 47.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152 | Clavig 214 | 6027 | T | C | 71 | 45.1 |
| 153 | Clavig 215 | 470 | G | C | 119 | 37.0 |
| 154 | Clavig 227 | 82 | G | T | 192 | 37.5 |
| 155 | Clavig 227 | 99 | C | A | 189 | 37.0 |
| 156 | Clavig 227 | 100 | A | C | 189 | 37.0 |
| 157 | Clavig 227 | 214 | G | A | 205 | 47.3 |
| 158 | Clavig 227 | 368 | C | T | 248 | 35.1 |
| 159 | Clavig 238 | 365 | T | G | 141 | 36.2 |
| 160 | Clavig 239 | 208 | C | T | 95 | 44.2 |
| 161 | Clavig 239 | 352 | T | C | 78 | 43.6 |
| 162 | Clavig 239 | 536 | C | A | 75 | 37.3 |
| 163 | Clavig 239 | 670 | A | G | 84 | 47.6 |
| 164 | Clavig 239 | 745 | A | G | 74 | 40.5 |
| 165 | Clavig 239 | 757 | G | A | 80 | 35.0 |
| 166 | Clavig 239 | 802 | T | A | 80 | 42.5 |
| 167 | Clavig 239 | 1276 | T | C | 89 | 49.4 |
| 168 | Clavig 239 | 1312 | T | C | 73 | 41.1 |
| 169 | Clavig 242 | 260 | G | T | 41 | 41.5 |
| 170 | Clavig 243 | 533 | T | A | 191 | 49.7 |
| 171 | Clavig 243 | 566 | T | A | 173 | 37.0 |
| 172 | Clavig 247 | 177 | C | T | 66 | 45.5 |
| 173 | Clavig 251 | 114 | T | C | 67 | 37.3 |
| 174 | Clavig 251 | 118 | T | C | 58 | 43.1 |
| 175 | Clavig 251 | 244 | C | G | 169 | 47.9 |
| 176 | Clavig 251 | 268 | T | A | 167 | 36.5 |
| 177 | Clavig 256 | 2843 | C | T | 36 | 44.4 |
| 178 | Clavig 256 | 2879 | T | G | 39 | 48.7 |
| 179 | Clavig 256 | 2882 | T | C | 39 | 38.5 |
| 180 | Clavig 256 | 3044 | A | G | 39 | 46.2 |
| 181 | Clavig 256 | 3080 | C | T | 38 | 47.4 |
| 182 | Clavig 261 | 323 | T | A | 101 | 43.6 |
| 183 | Clavig 266 | 72 | G | C | 86 | 45.3 |
| 184 | Clavig 284 | 625 | G | A | 55 | 47.3 |
| 185 | Clavig 293 | 996 | G | A | 66 | 45.5 |
| 186 | Clavig 293 | 1049 | A | T | 66 | 50.0 |
| 187 | Clavig 296 | 65 | T | A | 103 | 36.9 |
|  | Clavig 296 | 74 | G | T | 94 | 47.9 |
| 189 | Clavig 296 | 145 | C | G | 109 | 37.6 |

APPENDIX J3. (Cont.)

| 190 | Clavig 296 | 146 | A | C | 109 | 37.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 191 | Clavig 296 | 152 | G | C | 98 | 42.9 |
| 192 | Clavig 296 | 166 | A | G | 83 | 43.4 |
| 193 | Clavig 296 | 167 | G | A | 83 | 43.4 |
| 194 | Clavig 296 | 196 | A | G | 84 | 42.9 |
| 195 | Clavig 296 | 197 | A | T | 84 | 42.9 |
| 196 | Clavig 296 | 200 | T | C | 92 | 38.0 |
| 197 | Clavig 296 | 215 | A | T | 94 | 35.1 |
| 198 | Clavig 296 | 218 | A | T | 96 | 38.5 |
| 199 | Clavig 297 | 170 | G | A | 69 | 46.4 |
| 200 | Clavig 298 | 289 | C | A | 68 | 35.3 |
| 201 | Clavig 298 | 345 | C | T | 46 | 41.3 |
| 202 | Clavig 298 | 360 | A | G | 39 | 43.6 |
| 203 | Clavig 298 | 363 | C | T | 39 | 43.6 |
| 204 | Clavig 298 | 372 | C | G | 35 | 42.9 |
| 205 | Clavig 300 | 690 | A | T | 41 | 39.0 |
| 206 | Clavig 300 | 948 | T | G | 40 | 40.0 |
| 207 | Clavig 301 | 12 | T | C | 55 | 40.0 |
| 208 | Clavig 301 | 279 | T | A | 50 | 46.0 |
| 209 | Clavig 301 | 285 | T | C | 71 | 35.2 |
| 210 | Clavig 301 | 288 | A | T | 64 | 35.9 |
| 211 | Clavig 301 | 297 | T | A | 63 | 38.1 |
| 212 | Clavig 301 | 304 | G | T | 57 | 38.6 |
| 213 | Clavig 301 | 312 | A | C | 55 | 38.2 |
| 214 | Clavig 301 | 327 | A | T | 44 | 36.4 |
| 215 | Clavig 318 | 577 | A | G | 81 | 40.7 |
| 216 | Clavig 318 | 580 | T | C | 87 | 36.8 |
| 217 | Clavig 318 | 700 | T | A | 84 | 40.5 |
| 218 | Clavig 320 | 446 | G | A | 87 | 42.5 |
| 219 | Clavig 320 | 656 | T | C | 64 | 42.2 |
| 220 | Clavig 322 | 113 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 221 | Clavig 322 | 159 | T | C | 45 | 40.0 |
| 222 | Clavig 322 | 161 | G | A | 45 | 40.0 |
| 223 | Clavig 332 | 24 | G | A | 309 | 44.0 |
| 224 | Clavig 332 | 30 | A | G | 318 | 44.3 |
| 225 | Clavig 332 | 60 | C | T | 345 | 44.3 |
| 226 | Clavig 332 | 87 | T | C | 349 | 41.0 |
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| 227 | Clavig 332 | 291 | T | C | 285 | 38.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 228 | Clavig 332 | 303 | T | G | 267 | 35.6 |
| 229 | Clavig 332 | 402 | T | C | 148 | 37.8 |
| 230 | Clavig 345 | 385 | A | G | 56 | 42.9 |
| 231 | Clavig 349 | 256 | A | T | 84 | 46.4 |
| 232 | Clavig 349 | 283 | T | C | 77 | 42.9 |
| 233 | Clavig 356 | 58 | T | C | 149 | 45.0 |
| 234 | Clavig 366 | 979 | G | A | 55 | 41.8 |
| 235 | Clavig 372 | 128 | G | A | 252 | 48.4 |
| 236 | Clavig 378 | 71 | T | A | 70 | 44.3 |
| 237 | Clavig 378 | 72 | A | G | 70 | 44.3 |
| 238 | Clavig 378 | 101 | A | T | 77 | 41.6 |
| 239 | Clavig 384 | 352 | A | C | 118 | 35.6 |
| 240 | Clavig 386 | 152 | T | C | 94 | 43.6 |
| 241 | Clavig 386 | 359 | A | G | 83 | 37.3 |
| 242 | Clavig 386 | 425 | G | A | 132 | 45.5 |
| 243 | Clavig 386 | 456 | G | A | 151 | 50.3 |
| 244 | Clavig 398 | 320 | C | T | 72 | 37.5 |
| 245 | Clavig 398 | 509 | A | G | 41 | 36.6 |
| 246 | Clavig 399 | 1011 | T | A | 41 | 36.6 |
| 247 | Clavig 399 | 1044 | A | G | 41 | 36.6 |
| 248 | Clavig 406 | 201 | G | T | 47 | 44.7 |
| 249 | Clavig 406 | 211 | C | T | 46 | 47.8 |
| 250 | Clavig 406 | 283 | C | T | 42 | 42.9 |
| 251 | Clavig 406 | 312 | C | G | 36 | 44.4 |
| 252 | Clavig 408 | 739 | T | C | 35 | 40.0 |
| 253 | Clavig 408 | 936 | G | C | 40 | 35.0 |
| 254 | Clavig 410 | 849 | C | T | 228 | 37.7 |
| 255 | Clavig 410 | 1817 | T | C | 399 | 46.6 |
| 256 | Clavig 426 | 1283 | G | A | 41 | 39.0 |
| 257 | Clavig 433 | 186 | G | A | 275 | 37.1 |
| 258 | Clavig 456 | 165 | A | G | 43 | 37.2 |
| 259 | Clavig 456 | 285 | A | T | 50 | 36.0 |
| 260 | Clavig 466 | 1806 | C | T | 86 | 37.2 |
| 261 | Clavig 466 | 1845 | G | A | 86 | 40.7 |
| 262 | Clavig 466 | 2325 | C | T | 175 | 45.1 |
| 263 | Clavig 466 | 2373 | A | G | 161 | 46.6 |
| 264 | Clavig 466 | 2411 | G | A | 139 | 46.0 |
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| 265 | Clavig 466 | 2447 | C | T | 177 | 44.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 266 | Clavig 466 | 2480 | T | A | 189 | 49.7 |
| 267 | Clavig 466 | 2679 | T | C | 73 | 35.6 |
| 268 | Clavig 466 | 2685 | A | C | 74 | 37.8 |
| 269 | Clavig 475 | 35 | G | T | 78 | 35.9 |
| 270 | Clavig 484 | 297 | T | C | 69 | 39.1 |
| 271 | Clavig 484 | 333 | G | A | 78 | 38.5 |
| 272 | Clavig 487 | 92 | A | G | 50 | 36.0 |
| 273 | Clavig 490 | 237 | A | G | 57 | 35.1 |
| 274 | Clavig 490 | 351 | C | T | 58 | 36.2 |
| 275 | Clavig 490 | 355 | G | A | 57 | 36.8 |
| 276 | Clavig 497 | 218 | C | T | 392 | 37.8 |
| 277 | Clavig 497 | 495 | C | T | 132 | 37.1 |
| 278 | Clavig 501 | 1806 | G | A | 49 | 40.8 |
| 279 | Clavig 501 | 2163 | C | T | 58 | 39.7 |
| 280 | Clavig 501 | 2331 | T | C | 58 | 36.2 |
| 281 | Clavig 501 | 2391 | G | A | 62 | 37.1 |
| 282 | Clavig 501 | 2577 | G | A | 51 | 39.2 |
| 283 | Clavig 501 | 2718 | C | T | 77 | 36.4 |
| 284 | Clavig 501 | 2832 | G | A | 97 | 35.1 |
| 285 | Clavig 501 | 3162 | A | G | 125 | 50.4 |
| 286 | Clavig 509 | 148 | T | C | 54 | 40.7 |
| 287 | Clavig 509 | 313 | A | G | 50 | 50.0 |
| 288 | Clavig 513 | 261 | G | A | 279 | 35.1 |
| 289 | Clavig 518 | 393 | T | C | 164 | 37.8 |
| 290 | Clavig 518 | 515 | A | G | 177 | 42.4 |
| 291 | Clavig 524 | 254 | A | G | 188 | 45.7 |
| 292 | Clavig 524 | 293 | A | T | 202 | 45.1 |
| 293 | Clavig 524 | 431 | A | G | 119 | 48.7 |
| 294 | Clavig 533 | 71 | C | T | 106 | 36.8 |
| 295 | Clavig 533 | 77 | T | C | 112 | 35.7 |
| 296 | Clavig 533 | 92 | C | T | 111 | 41.4 |
| 297 | Clavig 533 | 314 | C | T | 161 | 49.1 |
| 298 | Clavig 533 | 1055 | G | T | 156 | 44.2 |
| 299 | Clavig 544 | 42 | C | G | 67 | 46.3 |
| 300 | Clavig 544 | 287 | C | T | 181 | 42.0 |
| 301 | Clavig 544 | 481 | A | C | 51 | 39.2 |
| 302 | Clavig 544 | 499 | C | T | 59 | 42.4 |
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| 303 | Clavig 564 | 317 | A | G | 173 | 42.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 304 | Clavig 576 | 369 | A | T | 36 | 47.2 |
| 305 | Clavig 587 | 155 | T | C | 57 | 35.1 |
| 306 | Clavig 590 | 20 | T | C | 43 | 46.5 |
| 307 | Clavig 590 | 91 | G | A | 52 | 38.5 |
| 308 | Clavig 590 | 98 | A | G | 52 | 38.5 |
| 309 | Clavig 590 | 137 | G | A | 59 | 49.2 |
| 310 | Clavig 590 | 321 | G | T | 47 | 42.6 |
| 311 | Clavig 591 | 124 | C | T | 59 | 44.1 |
| 312 | Clavig 605 | 399 | T | C | 71 | 38.0 |
| 313 | Clavig 606 | 725 | G | A | 267 | 38.2 |
| 314 | Clavig 607 | 7 | T | A | 101 | 41.6 |
| 315 | Clavig 607 | 9 | T | C | 101 | 41.6 |
| 316 | Clavig 607 | 39 | A | G | 127 | 40.9 |
| 317 | Clavig 607 | 48 | A | T | 137 | 40.1 |
| 318 | Clavig 607 | 63 | C | T | 155 | 42.6 |
| 319 | Clavig 607 | 84 | C | T | 172 | 40.7 |
| 320 | Clavig 607 | 90 | A | T | 182 | 41.8 |
| 321 | Clavig 607 | 102 | C | T | 173 | 44.5 |
| 322 | Clavig 607 | 108 | T | C | 173 | 45.1 |
| 323 | Clavig 607 | 113 | C | G | 178 | 43.8 |
| 324 | Clavig 607 | 117 | A | G | 169 | 42.6 |
| 325 | Clavig 607 | 132 | T | G | 198 | 37.9 |
| 326 | Clavig 607 | 144 | C | T | 208 | 37.5 |
| 327 | Clavig 607 | 152 | A | C | 204 | 36.8 |
| 328 | Clavig 607 | 153 | T | C | 204 | 36.8 |
| 329 | Clavig 607 | 163 | G | T | 199 | 43.2 |
| 330 | Clavig 607 | 165 | C | T | 199 | 43.2 |
| 331 | Clavig 607 | 172 | A | T | 197 | 40.6 |
| 332 | Clavig 607 | 174 | C | T | 197 | 40.6 |
| 333 | Clavig 607 | 183 | T | C | 223 | 46.6 |
| 334 | Clavig 607 | 186 | C | T | 216 | 47.7 |
| 335 | Clavig 607 | 250 | A | T | 225 | 36.4 |
| 336 | Clavig 607 | 255 | T | C | 217 | 42.9 |
| 337 | Clavig 614 | 496 | T | A | 46 | 39.1 |
| 338 | Clavig 614 | 691 | G | A | 97 | 47.4 |
| 339 | Clavig 615 | 291 | T | G | 106 | 47.2 |
| 340 | Clavig 615 | 615 | T | A | 219 | 42.0 |
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| 341 | Clavig 625 | 298 | T | C | 117 | 43.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 342 | Clavig 625 | 310 | A | G | 126 | 44.4 |
| 343 | Clavig 625 | 602 | T | C | 47 | 42.6 |
| 344 | Clavig 626 | 676 | T | C | 71 | 36.6 |
| 345 | Clavig 626 | 796 | T | C | 65 | 40.0 |
| 346 | Clavig 626 | 898 | G | A | 42 | 59.5 |
| 347 | Clavig 626 | 1009 | T | A | 54 | 46.3 |
| 348 | Clavig 626 | 1027 | G | A | 53 | 49.1 |
| 349 | Clavig 626 | 1033 | A | G | 55 | 45.5 |
| 350 | Clavig 626 | 1039 | T | C | 52 | 44.2 |
| 351 | Clavig 626 | 1051 | G | A | 43 | 46.5 |
| 352 | Clavig 626 | 1063 | G | T | 50 | 40.0 |
| 353 | Clavig 626 | 1084 | T | C | 45 | 35.6 |
| 354 | Clavig 626 | 1225 | G | A | 47 | 36.2 |
| 355 | Clavig 640 | 1247 | G | T | 45 | 42.2 |
| 356 | Clavig 643 | 629 | C | T | 43 | 39.5 |
| 357 | Clavig 643 | 737 | G | A | 44 | 45.5 |
| 358 | Clavig 643 | 794 | C | T | 57 | 47.4 |
| 359 | Clavig 643 | 851 | C | T | 59 | 45.8 |
| 360 | Clavig 670 | 410 | T | C | 88 | 40.9 |
| 361 | Clavig 670 | 590 | C | T | 72 | 44.4 |
| 362 | Clavig 686 | 414 | C | A | 70 | 50.0 |
| 363 | Clavig 686 | 418 | C | G | 69 | 47.8 |
| 364 | Clavig 686 | 450 | A | G | 71 | 46.5 |
| 365 | Clavig 686 | 456 | G | A | 70 | 44.3 |
| 366 | Clavig 686 | 719 | G | A | 58 | 36.2 |
| 367 | Clavig 692 | 654 | T | C | 38 | 39.5 |
| 368 | Clavig 692 | 735 | A | G | 53 | 35.8 |
| 369 | Clavig 692 | 834 | T | C | 74 | 48.6 |
| 370 | Clavig 692 | 1206 | C | T | 62 | 46.8 |
| 371 | Clavig 692 | 1224 | A | G | 54 | 46.3 |
| 372 | Clavig 711 | 436 | A | G | 203 | 40.9 |
| 373 | Clavig 716 | 1083 | A | G | 40 | 45.0 |
| 374 | Clavig 726 | 69 | C | A | 108 | 44.4 |
| 375 | Clavig 726 | 74 | T | C | 102 | 42.2 |
| 376 | Clavig 726 | 291 | T | G | 129 | 38.0 |
| 377 | Clavig 745 | 72 | T | C | 71 | 40.8 |
| 378 | Clavig 757 | 328 | C | G | 63 | 41.3 |
| 379 | Clavig 765 | 446 | G | A | 165 | 43.0 |
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| 380 | Clavig 768 | 744 | C | T | 54 | 35.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 381 | Clavig 768 | 873 | A | C | 67 | 43.3 |
| 382 | Clavig 768 | 1245 | C | T | 148 | 50.0 |
| 383 | Clavig 768 | 1629 | T | C | 60 | 45.0 |
| 384 | Clavig 775 | 411 | C | T | 78 | 47.4 |
| 385 | Clavig 775 | 421 | A | G | 82 | 37.8 |
| 386 | Clavig 784 | 372 | A | G | 36 | 41.7 |
| 387 | Clavig 799 | 426 | A | T | 193 | 37.3 |
| 388 | Clavig 799 | 566 | A | G | 158 | 40.5 |
| 389 | Clavig 817 | 348 | G | A | 48 | 43.8 |
| 390 | Clavig 858 | 251 | A | G | 179 | 35.8 |
| 391 | Clavig 861 | 127 | C | T | 41 | 41.5 |
| 392 | Clavig 861 | 422 | G | A | 131 | 39.7 |
| 393 | Clavig 869 | 2293 | C | G | 69 | 39.1 |
| 394 | Clavig 891 | 1655 | A | G | 37 | 35.1 |
| 395 | Clavig 936 | 413 | A | T | 40 | 42.5 |
| 396 | Clavig 936 | 440 | A | G | 41 | 39.0 |
| 397 | Clavig 936 | 551 | T | C | 38 | 39.5 |
| 398 | Clavig 936 | 590 | G | A | 46 | 47.8 |
| 399 | Clavig 936 | 593 | G | A | 44 | 50.0 |
| 400 | Clavig 936 | 638 | A | G | 42 | 38.1 |
| 401 | Clavig 936 | 680 | G | A | 40 | 37.5 |
| 402 | Clavig 936 | 686 | A | G | 38 | 42.1 |
| 403 | Clavig 939 | 101 | A | G | 38 | 47.4 |
| 404 | Clavig 945 | 1355 | T | C | 43 | 44.2 |
| 405 | Clavig 953 | 253 | A | G | 59 | 42.4 |
| 406 | Clavig 953 | 475 | A | T | 71 | 47.9 |
| 407 | Clavig 953 | 604 | A | G | 76 | 42.1 |
| 408 | Clavig 954 | 143 | A | T | 61 | 47.5 |
| 409 | Clavig 954 | 239 | G | A | 63 | 39.7 |
| 410 | Clavig 959 | 59 | A | G | 54 | 48.1 |
| 411 | Clavig 960 | 89 | C | T | 55 | 45.5 |
| 412 | Clavig 960 | 173 | G | A | 51 | 43.1 |
| 413 | Clavig 964 | 151 | G | A | 512 | 42.4 |
| 414 | Clavig 964 | 322 | G | A | 1016 | 40.8 |
| 415 | Clavig 964 | 649 | C | T | 334 | 38.9 |
| 416 | Clavig 965 | 269 | G | A | 43 | 39.5 |
| 417 | Clavig 984 | 1274 | C | T | 35 | 51.4 |
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| 418 | Clavig 989 | 2004 | A | G | 41 | 41.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 419 | Clavig 993 | 435 | T | C | 147 | 46.3 |
| 420 | Clavig 993 | 471 | C | A | 149 | 37.6 |
| 421 | Clavig 993 | 519 | T | A | 152 | 50.0 |
| 422 | Clavig 993 | 565 | C | G | 181 | 45.9 |
| 423 | Clavig 993 | 566 | A | T | 181 | 45.9 |
| 424 | Clavig 993 | 585 | A | C | 182 | 46.2 |
| 425 | Clavig 993 | 694 | T | A | 197 | 46.2 |
| 426 | Clavig 993 | 708 | C | T | 191 | 47.1 |
| 427 | Clavig 993 | 810 | C | T | 91 | 38.5 |
| 428 | Clavig 993 | 846 | G | A | 83 | 44.6 |
| 429 | Clavig 996 | 60 | A | T | 48 | 45.8 |
| 430 | Clavig 996 | 457 | A | C | 67 | 37.3 |
| 431 | Clavig 996 | 692 | A | T | 53 | 50.9 |
| 432 | Clavig 1003 | 381 | T | A | 43 | 48.8 |
| 433 | Clavig 1007 | 391 | G | C | 106 | 41.5 |
| 434 | Clavig 1029 | 235 | G | A | 36 | 41.7 |
| 435 | Clavig 1029 | 385 | A | G | 36 | 47.2 |
| 436 | Clavig 1038 | 420 | T | G | 81 | 43.2 |
| 437 | Clavig 1049 | 981 | G | A | 48 | 45.8 |
| 438 | Clavig 1049 | 1593 | G | A | 39 | 46.2 |
| 439 | Clavig 1052 | 754 | A | G | 38 | 50.0 |
| 440 | Clavig 1052 | 791 | T | A | 42 | 47.6 |
| 441 | Clavig 1052 | 834 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 442 | Clavig 1052 | 929 | A | G | 43 | 39.5 |
| 443 | Clavig 1054 | 245 | T | C | 75 | 46.7 |
| 444 | Clavig 1055 | 246 | T | C | 44 | 47.7 |
| 445 | Clavig 1055 | 393 | C | T | 73 | 43.8 |
| 446 | Clavig 1055 | 554 | G | A | 69 | 44.9 |
| 447 | Clavig 1055 | 791 | G | C | 81 | 38.3 |
| 448 | Clavig 1055 | 800 | G | A | 81 | 48.1 |
| 449 | Clavig 1055 | 842 | A | G | 75 | 49.3 |
| 450 | Clavig 1055 | 977 | C | T | 40 | 35.0 |
| 451 | Clavig 1055 | 982 | T | C | 44 | 40.9 |
| 452 | Clavig 1058 | 338 | C | T | 37 | 48.6 |
| 453 | Clavig 1075 | 45 | T | C | 53 | 35.8 |
| 454 | Clavig 1075 | 138 | A | G | 144 | 43.8 |
| 455 | Clavig 1075 | 144 | C | T | 151 | 43.7 |
| 456 | Clavig 1079 | 330 | G | C | 39 | 35.9 |
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| 457 | Clavig 1079 | 332 | T | A | 39 | 35.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 458 | Clavig 1079 | 341 | C | T | 40 | 40.0 |
| 459 | Clavig 1079 | 342 | G | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 460 | Clavig 1079 | 344 | C | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 461 | Clavig 1079 | 412 | G | A | 43 | 37.2 |
| 462 | Clavig 1079 | 413 | A | G | 43 | 37.2 |
| 463 | Clavig 1079 | 437 | A | T | 42 | 38.1 |
| 464 | Clavig 1087 | 356 | G | A | 135 | 39.3 |
| 465 | Clavig 1088 | 317 | A | T | 39 | 43.6 |
| 466 | Clavig 1088 | 338 | C | T | 36 | 41.7 |
| 467 | Clavig 1125 | 1505 | C | G | 35 | 48.6 |
| 468 | Clavig 1125 | 1535 | T | C | 37 | 40.5 |
| 469 | Clavig 1126 | 153 | C | T | 37 | 43.2 |
| 470 | Clavig 1167 | 685 | A | G | 98 | 51.0 |
| 471 | Clavig 1182 | 104 | A | G | 41 | 46.3 |
| 472 | Clavig 1187 | 121 | G | A | 42 | 42.9 |
| 473 | Clavig 1213 | 25 | C | T | 47 | 38.3 |
| 474 | Clavig 1213 | 40 | C | T | 58 | 44.8 |
| 475 | Clavig 1213 | 41 | T | C | 58 | 44.8 |
| 476 | Clavig 1213 | 141 | T | A | 80 | 38.8 |
| 477 | Clavig 1213 | 336 | A | C | 81 | 46.9 |
| 478 | Clavig 1213 | 339 | A | T | 80 | 47.5 |
| 479 | Clavig 1213 | 340 | C | G | 80 | 47.5 |
| 480 | Clavig 1213 | 351 | T | C | 78 | 48.7 |
| 481 | Clavig 1243 | 389 | A | G | 114 | 44.7 |
| 482 | Clavig 1251 | 518 | A | T | 44 | 36.4 |
| 483 | Clavig 1261 | 497 | G | A | 39 | 38.5 |
| 484 | Clavig 1261 | 504 | A | C | 41 | 39.0 |
| 485 | Clavig 1280 | 541 | A | T | 41 | 51.2 |
| 486 | Clavig 1286 | 280 | G | A | 135 | 44.4 |
| 487 | Clavig 1292 | 287 | G | A | 52 | 48.1 |
| 488 | Clavig 1319 | 306 | T | A | 94 | 43.6 |
| 489 | Clavig 1321 | 175 | T | A | 79 | 36.7 |
| 490 | Clavig 1347 | 591 | C | G | 44 | 45.5 |
| 491 | Clavig 1350 | 185 | C | T | 38 | 39.5 |
| 492 | Clavig 1350 | 890 | C | T | 43 | 41.9 |
| 493 | Clavig 1364 | 400 | C | T | 51 | 49.0 |
| 494 | Clavig 1364 | 417 | T | C | 52 | 48.1 |
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| 495 | Clavig 1364 | 493 | T | C | 81 | 46.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 496 | Clavig 1364 | 703 | G | T | 54 | 61.1 |
| 497 | Clavig 1364 | 803 | T | C | 48 | 45.8 |
| 498 | Clavig 1401 | 169 | G | A | 70 | 44.3 |
| 499 | Clavig 1401 | 187 | C | T | 63 | 42.9 |
| 500 | Clavig 1401 | 787 | C | T | 106 | 39.6 |
| 501 | Clavig 1401 | 1120 | C | T | 109 | 45.0 |
| 502 | Clavig 1418 | 416 | A | T | 77 | 45.5 |
| 503 | Clavig 1429 | 404 | C | G | 58 | 36.2 |
| 504 | Clavig 1429 | 513 | T | C | 75 | 44.0 |
| 505 | Clavig 1429 | 552 | T | C | 68 | 51.5 |
| 506 | Clavig 1429 | 576 | A | G | 70 | 52.9 |
| 507 | Clavig 1429 | 582 | G | C | 73 | 49.3 |
| 508 | Clavig 1429 | 675 | C | T | 45 | 37.8 |
| 509 | Clavig 1431 | 152 | G | A | 37 | 48.6 |
| 510 | Clavig 1431 | 155 | C | G | 37 | 48.6 |
| 511 | Clavig 1431 | 170 | C | T | 35 | 48.6 |
| 512 | Clavig 1431 | 180 | A | T | 37 | 43.2 |
| 513 | Clavig 1431 | 186 | A | G | 37 | 40.5 |
| 514 | Clavig 1431 | 280 | C | T | 37 | 43.2 |
| 515 | Clavig 1501 | 344 | C | T | 40 | 50.0 |
| 516 | Clavig 1509 | 854 | A | G | 57 | 43.9 |
| 517 | Clavig 1522 | 201 | T | A | 44 | 43.2 |
| 518 | Clavig 1522 | 268 | G | C | 82 | 48.8 |
| 519 | Clavig 1522 | 557 | T | C | 59 | 49.2 |
| 520 | Clavig 1573 | 243 | A | G | 63 | 38.1 |
| 521 | Clavig 1605 | 324 | C | T | 68 | 44.1 |
| 522 | Clavig 1605 | 333 | A | G | 65 | 46.2 |
| 523 | Clavig 1606 | 177 | T | C | 35 | 37.1 |
| 524 | Clavig 1626 | 178 | T | C | 49 | 46.9 |
| 525 | Clavig 1697 | 363 | T | C | 35 | 45.7 |
| 526 | Clavig 1708 | 334 | C | T | 44 | 36.4 |
| 527 | Clavig 1724 | 95 | T | C | 36 | 36.1 |
| 528 | Clavig 1724 | 212 | A | C | 36 | 44.4 |
| 529 | Clavig 1772 | 759 | C | T | 36 | 47.2 |
| 530 | Clavig 1782 | 325 | A | G | 56 | 46.4 |
| 531 | Clavig 1785 | 786 | G | A | 36 | 36.1 |
| 532 | Clavig 1785 | 945 | T | A | 44 | 43.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| 533 | Clavig 1785 | 1084 | A | G | 42 | 38.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 534 | Clavig 1842 | 384 | A | G | 35 | 40.0 |
| 535 | Clavig 1849 | 925 | T | C | 55 | 40.0 |
| 536 | Clavig 1849 | 961 | A | C | 57 | 42.1 |
| 537 | Clavig 1849 | 962 | T | C | 57 | 42.1 |
| 538 | Clavig 1849 | 1006 | C | T | 63 | 41.3 |
| 539 | Clavig 1849 | 1129 | A | G | 42 | 45.2 |
| 540 | Clavig 1913 | 117 | C | A | 42 | 40.5 |
| 541 | Clavig 1913 | 151 | G | A | 49 | 44.9 |
| 542 | Clavig 1913 | 223 | C | T | 55 | 36.4 |
| 543 | Clavig 1913 | 388 | T | G | 96 | 44.8 |
| 544 | Clavig 1913 | 484 | T | G | 77 | 36.4 |
| 545 | Clavig 1979 | 521 | C | T | 41 | 39.0 |
| 546 | Clavig 1983 | 500 | G | A | 142 | 47.2 |
| 547 | Clavig 2008 | 1727 | G | A | 68 | 41.2 |
| 548 | Clavig 2035 | 196 | C | T | 38 | 36.8 |
| 549 | Clavig 2035 | 304 | A | G | 39 | 38.5 |
| 550 | Clavig 2045 | 164 | C | T | 62 | 45.2 |
| 551 | Clavig 2054 | 112 | T | C | 65 | 36.9 |
| 552 | Clavig 2054 | 181 | T | C | 79 | 38.0 |
| 553 | Clavig 2054 | 283 | T | C | 71 | 43.7 |
| 554 | Clavig 2054 | 301 | T | C | 75 | 41.3 |
| 555 | Clavig 2054 | 331 | T | C | 51 | 39.2 |
| 556 | Clavig 2054 | 367 | G | A | 70 | 40.0 |
| 557 | Clavig 2054 | 406 | A | G | 68 | 47.1 |
| 558 | Clavig 2054 | 412 | T | C | 81 | 38.3 |
| 559 | Clavig 2054 | 601 | T | A | 123 | 46.3 |
| 560 | Clavig 2054 | 862 | T | A | 88 | 48.9 |
| 561 | Clavig 2054 | 925 | G | T | 81 | 49.4 |
| 562 | Clavig 2054 | 979 | C | G | 46 | 41.3 |
| 563 | Clavig 2054 | 980 | G | C | 46 | 41.3 |
| 564 | Clavig 2077 | 839 | A | G | 42 | 47.6 |
| 565 | Clavig 2094 | 251 | T | C | 153 | 40.5 |
| 566 | Clavig 2094 | 398 | T | G | 163 | 36.2 |
| 567 | Clavig 2104 | 413 | G | A | 93 | 43.0 |
| 568 | Clavig 2132 | 42 | T | C | 102 | 42.2 |
| 569 | Clavig 2132 | 53 | T | C | 105 | 52.4 |
| 570 | Clavig 2132 | 70 | C | A | 107 | 38.3 |
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| 571 | Clavig 2132 | 79 | A | G | 109 | 41.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 572 | Clavig 2132 | 81 | T | A | 109 | 41.3 |
| 573 | Clavig 2132 | 91 | C | G | 107 | 35.5 |
| 574 | Clavig 2132 | 120 | G | A | 106 | 35.8 |
| 575 | Clavig 2132 | 129 | A | T | 111 | 42.3 |
| 576 | Clavig 2132 | 135 | T | C | 111 | 40.5 |
| 577 | Clavig 2132 | 138 | T | A | 110 | 40.9 |
| 578 | Clavig 2132 | 231 | T | C | 88 | 36.4 |
| 579 | Clavig 2209 | 139 | T | C | 37 | 35.1 |
| 580 | Clavig 2326 | 179 | G | A | 54 | 46.3 |
| 581 | Clavig 2326 | 245 | C | T | 50 | 42.0 |
| 582 | Clavig 2326 | 290 | A | C | 48 | 35.4 |
| 583 | Clavig 2326 | 572 | T | C | 39 | 38.5 |
| 584 | Clavig 2422 | 46 | T | A | 77 | 40.3 |
| 585 | Clavig 2422 | 65 | C | T | 83 | 39.8 |
| 586 | Clavig 2422 | 178 | A | G | 71 | 38.0 |
| 587 | Clavig 2438 | 194 | T | C | 41 | 46.3 |
| 588 | Clavig 2438 | 287 | T | C | 50 | 38.0 |
| 589 | Clavig 2438 | 335 | A | G | 44 | 38.6 |
| 590 | Clavig 2677 | 400 | T | C | 40 | 37.5 |
| 591 | Clavig 2823 | 384 | T | C | 54 | 46.3 |
| 592 | Clavig 2823 | 390 | G | A | 55 | 38.2 |
| 593 | Clavig 2823 | 399 | C | T | 58 | 48.3 |
| 594 | Clavig 2828 | 693 | C | T | 39 | 46.2 |
| 595 | Clavig 2851 | 256 | T | C | 39 | 46.2 |
| 596 | Clavig 2851 | 310 | A | G | 45 | 44.4 |
| 597 | Clavig 2856 | 1279 | C | T | 41 | 46.3 |
| 598 | Clavig 2888 | 523 | T | C | 41 | 46.3 |
| 599 | Clavig 2888 | 573 | A | G | 40 | 45.0 |
| 600 | Clavig 2888 | 591 | T | C | 43 | 41.9 |
| 601 | Clavig 2888 | 594 | A | G | 42 | 38.1 |
| 602 | Clavig 2888 | 603 | C | T | 38 | 36.8 |
| 603 | Clavig 2888 | 627 | C | T | 42 | 40.5 |
| 604 | Clavig 2888 | 630 | C | A | 44 | 40.9 |
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| 605 | Clavig 3671 | 348 | G | T | 40 | 35.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 606 | Clavig 4404 | 116 | A | G | 38 | 52.6 |
| 607 | Clavig 4404 | 160 | T | C | 47 | 46.8 |

## APPENDIX J4. M. sjostedti.

| Serial <br> Number | Contig | Consensus <br> Position | Consensus | Allele | Coverage | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Megal 1 | 1197 | G | A | 63 | 36.5 |
| 2 | Megal 11 | 244 | C | T | 53 | 47.2 |
| 3 | Megal 11 | 331 | C | T | 79 | 45.6 |
| 4 | Megal 11 | 342 | C | T | 82 | 46.3 |
| 5 | Megal 11 | 353 | T | G | 79 | 43.0 |
| 6 | Megal 11 | 382 | C | T | 81 | 50.6 |
| 7 | Megal 11 | 442 | T | C | 95 | 38.9 |
| 8 | Megal 11 | 496 | C | T | 93 | 46.2 |
| 9 | Megal 11 | 547 | C | T | 83 | 38.6 |
| 10 | Megal 11 | 548 | G | A | 83 | 38.6 |
| 11 | Megal 13 | 2980 | T | C | 43 | 46.5 |
| 12 | Megal 13 | 3020 | C | G | 50 | 38.0 |
| 13 | Megal 13 | 3161 | A | C | 90 | 42.2 |
| 14 | Megal 13 | 3173 | A | T | 82 | 37.8 |
| 15 | Megal 13 | 3174 | G | C | 82 | 37.8 |
| 16 | Megal 13 | 3175 | C | T | 82 | 37.8 |
| 17 | Megal 13 | 3202 | C | G | 69 | 56.5 |
| 18 | Megal 13 | 3208 | C | G | 63 | 38.1 |
| 19 | Megal 13 | 3209 | A | T | 63 | 38.1 |
| 20 | Megal 13 | 3210 | A | C | 63 | 38.1 |
| 21 | Megal 13 | 3217 | G | C | 84 | 36.9 |
| 22 | Megal 13 | 3275 | A | C | 80 | 37.5 |
| 23 | Megal 13 | 3303 | A | C | 83 | 36.1 |
| 24 | Megal 13 | 4102 | C | T | 47 | 42.6 |
| 25 | Megal 13 | 4153 | T | C | 49 | 38.8 |
| 26 | Megal 13 | 4233 | A | G | 96 | 41.7 |
| 27 | Megal 13 | 4262 | C | A | 115 | 35.7 |
| 28 | Megal 13 | 4368 | G | A | 153 | 35.9 |
| 29 | Megal 13 | 4371 | C | A | 125 | 43.2 |
| 30 | Megal 13 | 4433 | C | A | 141 | 36.2 |
| 31 | Megal 13 | 4448 | C | A | 118 | 38.1 |
| 32 | Megal 13 | 4484 | G | C | 105 | 35.2 |
| 33 | Megal 13 | 4526 | A | G | 77 | 48.1 |
| 34 | Megal 13 | 4528 | G | C | 77 | 48.1 |
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| 35 | Megal 13 | 4539 | C | T | 101 | 35.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 36 | Megal 13 | 4540 | G | A | 101 | 35.6 |
| 37 | Megal 13 | 4545 | C | T | 101 | 36.6 |
| 38 | Megal 13 | 4557 | G | T | 100 | 35.0 |
| 39 | Megal 13 | 4559 | T | A | 100 | 37.0 |
| 40 | Megal 13 | 4561 | G | A | 100 | 35.0 |
| 41 | Megal 13 | 4572 | C | T | 91 | 36.3 |
| 42 | Megal 25 | 804 | G | A | 67 | 49.3 |
| 43 | Megal 25 | 888 | C | T | 60 | 38.3 |
| 44 | Megal 25 | 1074 | A | G | 65 | 47.7 |
| 45 | Megal 25 | 1383 | G | A | 40 | 35.0 |
| 46 | Megal 25 | 1419 | G | A | 45 | 42.2 |
| 47 | Megal 34 | 2117 | G | A | 37 | 43.2 |
| 48 | Megal 34 | 2200 | T | C | 40 | 40.0 |
| 49 | Megal 47 | 254 | A | G | 168 | 36.3 |
| 50 | Megal 49 | 416 | C | T | 42 | 47.6 |
| 51 | Megal 49 | 419 | A | G | 42 | 47.6 |
| 52 | Megal 49 | 438 | T | A | 39 | 48.7 |
| 53 | Megal 68 | 141 | C | T | 229 | 48.9 |
| 54 | Megal 68 | 276 | T | G | 241 | 45.6 |
| 55 | Megal 68 | 285 | G | A | 233 | 37.3 |
| 56 | Megal 72 | 832 | T | A | 163 | 48.5 |
| 57 | Megal 72 | 1228 | A | G | 47 | 61.7 |
| 58 | Megal 76 | 572 | G | A | 46 | 37.0 |
| 59 | Megal 85 | 72 | C | T | 52 | 38.5 |
| 60 | Megal 85 | 450 | G | A | 64 | 39.1 |
| 61 | Megal 92 | 88 | T | C | 92 | 37.0 |
| 62 | Megal 92 | 121 | T | A | 113 | 41.6 |
| 63 | Megal 107 | 285 | A | G | 44 | 45.5 |
| 64 | Megal 107 | 331 | C | T | 38 | 39.5 |
| 65 | Megal 143 | 61 | G | A | 52 | 42.3 |
| 66 | Megal 143 | 122 | T | C | 72 | 41.7 |
| 67 | Megal 143 | 241 | A | T | 73 | 38.4 |
| 68 | Megal 157 | 763 | G | T | 40 | 40.0 |
| 69 | Megal 183 | 175 | T | C | 64 | 42.2 |
| 70 | Megal 191 | 432 | G | A | 48 | 41.7 |
| 71 | Megal 191 | 652 | T | C | 56 | 50.0 |
| 72 | Megal 191 | 894 | C | T | 60 | 43.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX J4. (cont.)

| 73 | Megal 191 | 954 | T | C | 67 | 46.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 74 | Megal 193 | 178 | G | A | 256 | 41.4 |
| 75 | Megal 199 | 145 | A | G | 45 | 37.8 |
| 76 | Megal 199 | 205 | G | A | 75 | 36.0 |
| 77 | Megal 202 | 708 | A | T | 50 | 40.0 |
| 78 | Megal 202 | 865 | G | A | 66 | 43.9 |
| 79 | Megal 202 | 999 | T | C | 45 | 44.4 |
| 80 | Megal 202 | 1030 | G | T | 37 | 37.8 |
| 81 | Megal 215 | 725 | A | G | 50 | 48.0 |
| 82 | Megal 236 | 440 | C | A | 66 | 48.5 |
| 83 | Megal 236 | 752 | A | G | 51 | 41.2 |
| 84 | Megal 236 | 803 | A | G | 47 | 44.7 |
| 85 | Megal 236 | 830 | A | G | 50 | 48.0 |
| 86 | Megal 236 | 854 | G | A | 45 | 46.7 |
| 87 | Megal 236 | 866 | A | T | 47 | 38.3 |
| 88 | Megal 236 | 1043 | G | T | 42 | 50.0 |
| 89 | Megal 236 | 1133 | A | G | 38 | 50.0 |
| 90 | Megal 236 | 1181 | A | C | 40 | 35.0 |
| 91 | Megal 236 | 1225 | T | A | 36 | 44.4 |
| 92 | Megal 238 | 560 | G | A | 36 | 52.8 |
| 93 | Megal 238 | 592 | C | G | 41 | 46.3 |
| 94 | Megal 238 | 646 | G | A | 50 | 40.0 |
| 95 | Megal 238 | 661 | A | T | 39 | 51.3 |
| 96 | Megal 238 | 670 | C | G | 48 | 47.9 |
| 97 | Megal 238 | 792 | A | T | 37 | 45.9 |
| 98 | Megal 238 | 838 | G | A | 35 | 45.7 |
| 99 | Megal 312 | 169 | T | C | 390 | 37.7 |
| 100 | Megal 312 | 391 | T | A | 421 | 46.6 |
| 101 | Megal 346 | 91 | A | G | 40 | 40.0 |
| 102 | Megal 346 | 126 | C | T | 36 | 38.9 |
| 103 | Megal 346 | 198 | C | T | 37 | 37.8 |
| 104 | Megal 360 | 298 | T | C | 257 | 42.4 |
| 105 | Megal 360 | 334 | C | T | 254 | 44.1 |
| 106 | Megal 362 | 198 | A | T | 39 | 38.5 |
| 107 | Megal 370 | 1151 | C | G | 67 | 44.8 |
| 108 | Megal 370 | 1166 | G | C | 79 | 46.8 |
| 109 | Megal 376 | 294 | T | C | 41 | 41.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX J4. (cont.)

| 110 | Megal 378 | 257 | A | G | 138 | 39.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 111 | Megal 408 | 33 | A | T | 110 | 41.8 |
| 112 | Megal 419 | 288 | T | A | 71 | 36.6 |
| 113 | Megal 471 | 219 | A | G | 53 | 43.4 |
| 114 | Megal 475 | 306 | G | A | 36 | 47.2 |
| 115 | Megal 491 | 113 | T | A | 59 | 35.6 |
| 116 | Megal 491 | 386 | A | G | 129 | 42.6 |
| 117 | Megal 533 | 374 | A | G | 67 | 44.8 |
| 118 | Megal 533 | 537 | G | T | 47 | 36.2 |
| 119 | Megal 537 | 100 | T | C | 53 | 35.8 |
| 120 | Megal 537 | 249 | C | G | 55 | 38.2 |
| 121 | Megal 537 | 360 | T | C | 60 | 35.0 |
| 122 | Megal 551 | 319 | C | T | 40 | 47.5 |
| 123 | Megal 569 | 351 | G | A | 152 | 43.4 |
| 124 | Megal 569 | 421 | A | C | 162 | 38.9 |
| 125 | Megal 572 | 72 | C | T | 52 | 44.2 |
| 126 | Megal 572 | 139 | T | A | 56 | 42.9 |
| 127 | Megal 591 | 676 | A | G | 39 | 48.7 |
| 128 | Megal 603 | 159 | T | C | 91 | 40.7 |
| 129 | Megal 608 | 259 | T | C | 85 | 43.5 |
| 130 | Megal 608 | 289 | C | T | 85 | 44.7 |
| 131 | Megal 608 | 433 | T | A | 61 | 39.3 |
| 132 | Megal 608 | 441 | C | T | 74 | 47.3 |
| 133 | Megal 624 | 201 | C | T | 93 | 36.6 |
| 134 | Megal 624 | 222 | T | C | 54 | 40.7 |
| 135 | Megal 656 | 198 | C | T | 37 | 43.2 |
| 136 | Megal 675 | 270 | T | C | 38 | 42.1 |
| 137 | Megal 675 | 294 | C | T | 38 | 42.1 |
| 138 | Megal 675 | 342 | C | T | 38 | 36.8 |
| 139 | Megal 716 | 340 | G | A | 70 | 47.1 |
| 140 | Megal 749 | 508 | A | C | 38 | 36.8 |
| 141 | Megal 829 | 133 | C | T | 50 | 40.0 |
| 142 | Megal 829 | 148 | G | A | 54 | 38.9 |
| 143 | Megal 836 | 491 | C | T | 39 | 38.5 |
| 144 | Megal 861 | 17 | C | T | 40 | 35.0 |
| 145 | Megal 861 | 121 | A | C | 113 | 46.0 |
| 146 | Megal 861 | 285 | A | G | 127 | 35.4 |
| 147 | Megal 861 | 432 | G | A | 114 | 44.7 |
| 148 | Megal 861 | 465 | T | C | 63 | 39.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX J4. (cont.)

| 149 | Megal 861 | 474 | T | A | 82 | 35.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 150 | Megal 909 | 20 | C | G | 40 | 47.5 |
| 151 | Megal 909 | 23 | G | T | 40 | 47.5 |
| 152 | Megal 909 | 71 | T | G | 46 | 43.5 |
| 153 | Megal 909 | 107 | T | C | 48 | 37.5 |
| 154 | Megal 909 | 205 | C | T | 49 | 44.9 |
| 155 | Megal 909 | 267 | G | A | 44 | 43.2 |
| 156 | Megal 909 | 301 | T | G | 41 | 48.8 |
| 157 | Megal 909 | 313 | T | C | 43 | 44.2 |
| 158 | Megal 909 | 330 | C | T | 38 | 39.5 |
| 159 | Megal 952 | 114 | T | C | 97 | 36.1 |
| 160 | Megal 1068 | 346 | A | T | 35 | 40.0 |
| 161 | Megal 1087 | 477 | C | T | 57 | 38.6 |
| 162 | Megal 1114 | 107 | T | A | 44 | 47.7 |
| 163 | Megal 1114 | 135 | G | C | 47 | 40.4 |
| 164 | Megal 1118 | 625 | A | T | 49 | 44.9 |
| 165 | Megal 1118 | 793 | A | G | 49 | 46.9 |
| 166 | Megal 1263 | 122 | C | T | 49 | 42.9 |
| 167 | Megal 1263 | 419 | T | C | 66 | 39.4 |
| 168 | Megal 1263 | 587 | T | A | 60 | 35.0 |
| 169 | Megal 1263 | $610$ | G | A | 48 | 37.5 |
| 170 | Megal 1348 | 182 | G | A | 43 | 41.9 |
| 171 | Megal 1482 | $178$ | G | A | 45 | 37.8 |
| 172 | Megal 1482 | $256$ | G | T | 46 | 39.1 |
| 173 | Megal 1626 | $136$ | T | C | 87 | 43.7 |
| 174 | Megal 1634 | $238$ | G | A | 55 | 41.8 |
| 175 | Megal 1634 | $256$ | G | C | 56 | 46.4 |
| $176$ | Megal 1634 | $354$ | C | T | 38 | 42.1 |
| 177 | Megal 1634 | $360$ | A | G | $39$ | $41.0$ |
| 178 | Megal 1634 | $375$ | C | T | 40 | 42.5 |
| 179 | Megal 1634 | $465$ | C | G | 40 | 45.0 |
| 180 | Megal 1739 | 401 | G | A | 46 | 43.5 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This chapter has been published as Agunbiade et al. 2012. IPM-omics: From genomics to extension for integrated pest management of cowpea. In Boukar O, Coulibaly O, Fatokun C, Lopez K, Tamò M (Eds.), Improving livelihoods in the cowpea value chain through advancements in science. Proceedings of the 5th World Cowpea Research Conference, pp. 231 - 248. It is reprinted with the permission of the copyright owner. I acknowledge the contribution of coauthors to the publication.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ This chapter has been published as Agunbiade et al. 2014. Genetic differentiation among Maruca vitrata F. (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) populations on cultivated cowpea and wild host plants: Implications for insect resistance management and biological control strategies. PLoS ONE 9(3): e92072. It is an open access article and is available at www.plosone.org and DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0092072. I acknowledge the contribution of co-authors to the publication.

[^3]:    * partial mitogenome sequences which lacked portions of the AT-rich control region sequence.

