

Barcoding-free BAC Pooling Enables Combinatorial Selective Sequencing of the Barley Gene Space

Stefano Lonardi^{1*}, Denisa Duma¹, Matthew Alpert¹, Francesca Cordero^{5,6},
Marco Beccuti⁵, Prasanna R. Bhat^{2,3}, Yonghui Wu^{1,4}, Gianfranco Ciardo¹,
Burair Alsaihati¹, Yaqin Ma², Steve Wanamaker², Josh Resnik², Timothy J. Close²

¹ Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

² Department of Botany & Plant Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

³ Monsanto Research Centre, Bangalore, 560092, India

⁴ Google, Inc., Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

⁵ Department of Computer Science, Università di Torino, 10149 Torino, Italy

⁶ Department of Clinical and Biological Science, Università di Torino, 10043 Torino, Italy

* Corresponding author. Email: stelo@cs.ucr.edu

Abstract

We propose a new sequencing protocol that combines recent advances in combinatorial pooling design and second-generation sequencing technology to efficiently approach *de novo* selective genome sequencing. We show that combinatorial pooling is a cost-effective and practical alternative to exhaustive DNA barcoding when dealing with hundreds or thousands of DNA samples, such as genome-tiling gene-rich BAC clones. The novelty of the protocol hinges on the computational ability to efficiently compare hundreds of million of short reads and assign them to the correct BAC clones so that the assembly can be carried out clone-by-clone. Experimental results on simulated data for the rice genome show that the deconvolution is extremely accurate (99.57% of the deconvoluted reads are assigned to the correct BAC), and the resulting BAC assemblies have very high quality (BACs are covered by contigs over about 77% of their length, on average). Experimental results on real data for a gene-rich subset of the barley genome confirm that the deconvolution is accurate (almost 70% of left/right pairs in paired-end reads are assigned to the same BAC, despite being processed independently) and the BAC assemblies have good quality (the average sum of all assembled contigs is about 88% of the estimated BAC length).

Data availability: Barley raw sequencing data for one set of 2,197 MTP gene-enriched BACs can be obtained from NCBI Sequence Read Archive ([http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra?term=\(SRA047913\)](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra?term=(SRA047913)))

Keywords: genome sequencing and assembly, combinatorial pooling, second-generation sequencing

Introduction

The second generation of DNA sequencing instruments currently on the market is revolutionizing the way molecular biologists design and carry out scientific investigations in genomics and genetics. Illumina, ABI SOLiD, Helicos, and Ion Torrent sequencing instruments produce billions of sequenced reads at a fraction of the cost of Sanger-based technologies, but read lengths are 100-150 bases, much shorter than Sanger reads of typically 700–900 bases. While the number (and to a lesser extent the length) of reads keeps increasing at each update of these instruments, the number of samples that can be run has remained small (e.g., two sets of seven *lanes* on the Illumina HiSeq). Since the number of reads produced by the instrument is essentially fixed, when DNA samples to be sequenced are relatively “short” (e.g., BAC clones) and the correspondence between reads and their source has to be maintained, several samples must be “multiplexed” on the same lane to optimize the trade-off between cost and sequencing depth. Multiplexing is traditionally achieved by adding a DNA barcode to each sample in the form of an additional (oligo) adapter, but this does not scale readily to thousands of samples. Although it is theoretically possible to barcode such a number of samples, the procedure becomes unfeasible as the number of sample is in the hundreds: the task is tedious, time consuming, error-prone, and relatively expensive. While the task could be carried out in principle by robotic instruments, most facilities do not have access to these devices. Another significant disadvantage of exhaustive barcoding is called “barcoding bias” which results in very strongly non-uniform distribution of reads for each barcoded sample (see, e.g., [Alon et al., 2011, Craig et al., 2008]).

In this paper, we demonstrate that multiplexing can be achieved without exhaustive barcoding. We propose a protocol based on recent advances in combinatorial pooling design. Combinatorial pooling has been used previously in the context of genome analysis, but this is the first attempt to use it for *de novo* genome sequencing. Earlier works are CAPSS and PGI, where BACs are arranged on a 2D matrix, each row and column of the grid constituting a pool that is then sequenced [Cai et al., 2001, Csuros and Milosavljevic, 2002, Csuros et al., 2003, Milosavljevic et al., 2005]. However, this simple grid design is very vulnerable to noise and behaves poorly when several objects are positive; it is also far from optimal in terms of the number of pools it produces. Later works have combined pooling with second-generation sequencing technology [Prabhu and Pe’er, 2009, Erlich et al., 2009, Hajirasouliha et al., 2008]. The domain of application of “DNA Sudoku” is the detection of microRNA targets in *Arabidopsis* and human genes [Erlich et al., 2009], whereas the pooling strategies discussed in [Prabhu and Pe’er, 2009, Hajirasouliha et al., 2008] are used for targeted resequencing (i.e., when a reference genome is available). To the best of our knowledge, there is no prior work on the feasibility of combinatorial pooling and second-generation sequencing technology for *de novo* genome sequencing.

In our approach to *de novo* sequencing, subsets of non-redundant genome-tiling BACs are chosen to form intersecting pools. Each pool is then sequenced individually on a fraction of a flowcell via standard multiplexing. Due to the short length of a BAC (typically ≈ 130 kb), cost-effective sequencing requires each BAC pool to contain hundreds or thousands of BACs. We show later in this report that attempting to directly assemble short reads originating from a mix of hundreds BACs is likely to produce low-quality assemblies,

as the assembler is unable to partition the reads to individual BACs. Moreover, it would be impossible to trace subset of the contigs to a specific BAC address. If instead reads could be assigned (or *deconvoluted*) to individual BACs, then the assembly could proceed clone-by-clone. The goal of assigning sequenced reads to specific BACs can be achieved if one chooses a pooling strategy in which each BAC is present in a carefully designed set of pools such that the identity of each BAC is encoded within the pooling pattern (rather than by its association with a particular barcode). By transitivity, the identity of each read is similarly encoded within the pattern of pools in which it occurs. Reads that can be assigned to a given BAC are collected in a set, which is then individually assembled.

To demonstrate the efficacy and performance of our approach, we apply the proposed sequencing protocol to two plant genomes, namely rice and barley, using the same pooling design parameters. For rice, we started from a fingerprint-based physical map, identified BACs on a minimum tiling path (MTP), pooled the MTP BACs according to a shifted transversal design [Thierry-Mieg, 2006], generated reads *in silico* from the pools (introducing some sequencing errors), deconvoluted the reads to BACs, and finally assembled the reads clone-by-clone. The sequence of the rice genome is used as the “ground truth” to evaluate the accuracy of our method. The results of the simulation show that only 18.5% of the short reads do not deconvolute. The deconvolution process is surprisingly accurate: 99.57% of the deconvoluted reads are assigned to the original BAC. Most of the non-assignable reads are those that appear in almost every pool, i.e., highly repetitive reads. An additional advantage of our approach is protection against these repetitive reads, which can hamper the assembly. We show that the resulting BAC assemblies have very high quality, with large contigs covering on average 77% of the rice BAC sequence.

For barley, we also start from a fingerprint-based physical map of gene-enriched BACs, identify BACs on a minimum tiling path (MTP), then pool subsets of MTP BACs according to a shifted transversal design. However, for barley we work on the actual clones and generate sequence *de novo*. We are currently in the process of sequencing seven sets of BAC pools, for a total of 14,763 MTP BACs. Here, we report results on one set of 91 pools representing 2,197 BACs. In barley, a slightly larger number of reads did not deconvolute due to the higher repeat content and length of this genome: 71.3% of the reads were assigned to 1–3 BACs, for a total of about 87% of the bases. The deconvolution process is also quite accurate on barley: almost 70% of left/right pairs in paired-end reads are assigned to the same BAC, despite being processed independently. The assembly statistics for barley show a lower average N50 than rice, but the the average sum of all assembled contigs is about 88% the estimated BAC length. An objective measure of quality for barley BAC assemblies is harder to implement due to the absence of the “ground truth”. As a workaround we measure the degree to which EST consensus sequences (or *unigenes*) known to be located in these BACs are represented in the assemblies. The analysis shows that only 10% of the final BAC assemblies miss the expected unigene. For the remaining 90% of the assemblies which contain the expected unigenes, the average coverage of those unigenes is about 90% of their length. Finally, we compare barley BAC assemblies to (1) the assembly of each pool of 169 BACs (before deconvolution), (2) the assembly of the whole set of 91 pools containing a total of 2,197 BACs (before deconvolution) and (3) the assembly of the whole barley genome via shotgun sequencing (31x coverage). The comparison shows that our BAC-by-BAC protocol is

likely to be the most effective strategy to obtain the largest possible N50¹ for barley.

Results

Protocol overview

The main steps of our *combinatorial sequencing* method are summarized next and illustrated in Figure 1. More details can be found in the Methods section.

- A. Obtain a BAC library for the target organism
- B. Select gene-enriched BACs from the library (optional)
- C. Fingerprint BACs and build a physical map
- D. Select a minimum tiling path (MTP) from the physical map [Engler et al., 2003, Bozdag et al., 2008]
- E. Pool the MTP BACs according to the shifted transversal design [Thierry-Mieg, 2006] for an appropriate choice of (P, L, Γ) , so that $P^{\Gamma+1} \geq N$, where N is the number of BACs and $\lfloor (L-1)/\Gamma \rfloor \geq 3$ (if the MTP was truly a set of minimally overlapping clones, a two-decodable pooling would be sufficient, but a three-decodable pooling gives additional protection against errors)
- F. Fragment the BACs in each pool, select for size, create a library for sequencing, sequence the DNA in each pool, trim reads based on quality scores, and remove *E. coli* and vector contamination
- G. Determine the *signature* of each read via k -mer analysis; assign reads to BACs by matching read signatures to BAC signatures
- H. Assemble reads assigned to each BAC into contigs using a short-read assembler

Next, we report experimental results on simulated data on the genome of *Oryza sativa* (rice) and real sequencing data on the genome of *Hordeum vulgare* L. (barley).

Simulation results on the rice genome

The physical map for *Oryza sativa* was assembled from 22,474 BACs fingerprinted at AGCoL, and contained 1,937 contigs and 1,290 singletons. From this map, we selected only BACs whose sequence could be uniquely mapped to the rice genome. We computed an MTP of this smaller map using our tool FMTP [Bozdag et al., 2008]. The resulting MTP contained 3,827 BACs with an average length of ≈ 150 kb, and spanned 91% of the rice genome (which is ≈ 390 Mb).

We pooled *in silico* a subset of 2,197 BACs from the set above according to the shifted transversal design [Thierry-Mieg, 2006]. Taking into consideration the format of the standard 96-well plate and the need for a

¹N50 indicates the minimum length of all contig/scaffolds that together account for 50% of the genome.

3-decodable pooling design for minimal tiling path BACs, we chose parameters $P = 13$, $L = 7$ and $\Gamma = 2$, so that $P^{\Gamma+1} = 2,197$ and $\lfloor (L - 1)/\Gamma \rfloor = 3$. Each of the $L = 7$ layers consisted of $P = 13$ pools, for a total of 91 BAC pools, which left some space for a few control DNA samples on the 96-well plate. In this pooling design, each BAC is contained in exactly $L = 7$ pools and each pool contains exactly $P^\Gamma = 169$ clones. The set of L pools to which a BAC is assigned, is called the *BAC signature*. Any two pools can share at most $\Gamma = 2$ BACs: specifically, 57.9% of the pool pairs have no BAC in common, 30.6% share one BAC, and 11.5% share two.

The 91 resulting rice BAC pools were “sequenced” *in silico* by generating one million paired-end reads of 104 bases with an insert size of 327 bases, and 1% sequencing error distributed uniformly along the read. A total of 208 million usable bases gave an expected $\approx 8x$ depth of sequencing coverage for a BAC in a pool. As each BAC is present in seven pools, this is an expected $\approx 56x$ combined coverage. We did not generate quality scores or artificially introduced vector contamination, so cleaning step **F** was irrelevant for these data.

The 91 read pools were processed for deconvolution using our tool HASHFILTER. For each read in the pool set, this tool first computes the occurrences of all distinct k -mers ($k = 26$ in our experiments) and stores them in a hash table. Then it scans all the reads again, this time fetching the set of pools that contain each constitutive k -mer of a read, i.e., the *k-mer signature*. HASHFILTER compares each k -mer signature against the set of 2,197 BAC signatures: if a match exists, that signature is declared *valid*. Given the set of valid k -mer signatures for a read, HASHFILTER finally determines the BACs to which the read should be assigned (see Methods for more details).

The computation was not very time consuming, but required significant amount of memory. On the rice dataset, the construction of the hash table required about 120 GB of RAM and 164 minutes running on one core of a Dell PowerEdge T710 server (dual Intel Xeon X5660 2.8Ghz, 12 cores, 144 Gb RAM). For the deconvolution phase, HASHFILTER took 33 minutes running on 10 cores; sorting the reads into 2,197 files took 22 minutes (one core).

Figure 3-TOP illustrates the distribution of signature sizes for all the distinct k -mers in the rice dataset. Observe that the distribution has clear peaks around $L = 7$, around the interval $[2L - \Gamma, 2L] = [12, 14]$ and the interval $[3L - 2\Gamma, 3L] = [17, 21]$. These peaks correspond to k -mers originating from one, two, and three overlapping BACs, respectively. We also have a rather large number of k -mers appearing in 1–5 pools. Observe that if the depth of sequencing coverage were high enough and there were no sequencing errors, the minimum number of occurrences for a k -mer would be $L = 7$. For a k -mer to have fewer than L occurrences, sequencing errors must have occurred (assuming the coverage to be sufficient). However, these k -mers containing sequencing errors are very likely to have an invalid signature, and they will not be used to determine the signature of their read. Figure 3-BOTTOM shows the distribution of signature sizes for all the reads in the rice dataset built from valid k -mer signatures. The vast majority of reads now have a signature size in the expected ranges, with the exception of reads that appear in over 80 pools. This latter set of reads cannot be deconvoluted and is discarded, but this is a feature, not a shortcoming, of our protocol: removing these “ubiquitous” reads protects the assembly from highly repetitive reads, thus improves the quality of

BAC assemblies.

The set of reads with a signature of size 7, 12–14 or 17–21 that could be deconvoluted was $\approx 81.5\%$ of the total. Table 2 and Supplemental File 2 report the number of reads assigned to one, two, or three BACs for each pool. Since we knew the BAC from which each read was generated, the accuracy of the deconvolution could be objectively determined. For rice, 99.57% of the deconvoluted reads were assigned to either the correct BAC or to a BAC overlapping the correct BAC (see Table 2 and Supplemental File 3). After deconvolution, the average depth of sequencing coverage for each BAC was $\approx 87x$, about 50% higher than the expected 56x. Even if we are losing about 18.5% of the reads due to their invalid signatures, reads that can be deconvoluted are frequently assigned to multiple BACs, thereby amplifying the sequencing depth. Part of this inflation can be attributed to the overlap between BACs in the MTP.

In the final step of the protocol, we independently assembled the set of reads assigned to each BAC. We carried out this step with VELVET [Zerbino and Birney, 2008] for each of the 2,197 BACs, for a variety of choices of k -mer size (hash length). We also tested SOAPDENOV0 [Li et al., 2010] and ABYSS [Simpson et al., 2009], but it was not obvious whether any of these brought any improvement in the assemblies (data not shown). For VELVET, we decided to report only the assembly that maximized the N50. This is an arbitrary choice that does not guarantee the “best” overall assembly. Supplemental File 3 reports all the experimental results (see Supplemental Text for a description of each column in the spreadsheet). If we average assembly statistics over all the 2,197 BACs, the percentage of reads used in the assembly was 82.3%, the average number of contigs was 41, the average N50 was 47,551 bp (31.4% of the average BAC length), the average largest contig was 57,258 bp (37.8% of the average BAC length), the average sum of all contig sizes was 137,050 bp (90.7% of the average BAC length). The N50 is very high, and so is the percentage of reads used by the assembler. While these numbers already indicate high quality assemblies, we wanted to determine whether BACs were correctly assembled. To do so, we BLAST-ed the BAC contigs against the rice genome and verified that VELVET actually reconstructed the portion of the genome corresponding to the original BAC. For all 2,197 BAC assemblies, we recorded the fraction of each original BAC covered by at least one contig, as well as the number and average length of gaps and overlaps in the assemblies. Supplemental File 3 (columns T–Y) shows these results. Considering these statistics over all the 2,197 BACs, the average BAC coverage was 76.8%, the average gap size was 263 bp, the average number of gaps was 138, the average overlap size was 107 bp, and the average number of overlaps was 75.

To establish a “baseline” for these assembly statistics, we considered the most optimistic scenario of a “perfect deconvolution”, which entails using the provenance annotation of each read to assign it back to the correct BAC with 100% accuracy. Supplemental File 4 reports the same statistics for all 2,197 BAC assemblies in this best-case scenario. If we compute the average over all the 2,197 BACs, the average fraction of the reads used by VELVET was 82.7% and the average N50 was 132,865 bp (88% of the average BAC length). The BLAST statistics showed an average BAC coverage of 96.3%, an average gap size of 52 bp, an average number of gaps of 97, an average overlap size of 29 bp, and an average number of overlaps of 54. Observe that, while the BAC coverage is about 20% higher, most of the other assembly statistics are comparable with the devolution via HASHFILTER.

The gene-space of barley

Barley’s diploid genome size is estimated at $\approx 5,300$ Mb and it composed of at least 80% highly repetitive DNA, predominantly LTR retrotransposons [Wicker et al., 2005]. The number of genes in barley is uncertain; estimates range from 35,000 to 60,000. Due to its size and repeat content, a shotgun approach for *de novo* second-generation sequencing would require a very high depth of sequencing, a mix of long insert paired-end reads of various length, and the longest possible reads. Our protocol allows us to tackle the assembly problem BAC-by-BAC, thus significantly reducing its complexity and increasing the fidelity of the resulting assemblies.

We started with a 6.3x genome equivalent barley BAC library created at Clemson University Genomics Institute which contains 313,344 BACs with an average insert size of 106 kb [Yu et al., 2000]. Nearly 84,000 gene-enriched BACs were identified, mainly by the overgo probing method [Madishetty et al., 2007] and [unpublished, 2011]. Gene-enriched BACs were fingerprinted at University of California, Davis using high-information-content fingerprinting [Ding et al., 2001, Luo et al., 2003]. From the fingerprinting of gene-bearing BACs, we produced a physical map [Bozdag et al., 2007, Soderlund et al., 2000] and derived a minimal tiling path of about 15,000 clones [Bozdag et al., 2008]. Seven sets of $N = 2,197$ clones were chosen to be pooled according to the shifted transversal design [Thierry-Mieg, 2006], which we internally call HV3, HV4, . . . , HV9 (HV1 and HV2 were pilot experiments). We used the same pooling parameters discussed in the previous section ($P = 13$, $L = 7$ and $\Gamma = 2$). As a consequence we had $P^{\Gamma+1} = N$ and decodability of $\lfloor (L-1)/\Gamma \rfloor = 3$. Recall that in this pooling design, each BAC is contained in exactly $L = 7$ pools and each pool contains exactly $P^\Gamma = 169$ clones. Any two pools can share at most $\Gamma = 2$ BACs.

Here we are reporting on the HV5 set containing 91 pools from a total of 2,197 MTP gene-rich barley BAC clones. Given the estimated 129.5 kb size of a BAC in the barley MTP (see section “Clone-by-clone Assembly” for a discussion of the MTP BAC size estimate), the total complexity of each pool of 169 BACs can be estimated at ≈ 22 Mb. As each BAC is replicated in seven pools, the total complexity of the 2,197 BACs in HV5 is ≈ 286 Mb. To take advantage of the high density of sequencing of the Illumina HiSeq2000, we multiplexed thirteen pools on each lane using custom multiplexing adapters. The total 91 pools used seven lanes, or one entire flowcell of the instrument.

After reads were sequenced and demultiplexed, we obtained an average of 12.4 million 94-base paired-end reads per pool. Reads were end-trimmed using quality scores and kept only if longer than 36 bases, then cleaned of *E. coli* contamination and spurious Illumina adapters. The percentage of *E. coli* in this particular set of BACs was rather high, averaging around 51%. An alternative DNA purification method can lower this amount to 8-10% (see ‘Barley BAC pooling’ in Methods). Supplemental File 5 reports the number of reads and bases after each step of the cleaning process.

The average number of usable paired-end reads after cleaning was about 5.5 million per pool with an average read length of 89 bases. The distribution of the number of paired-end reads in the set of 91 pools was between about 1M and 5.6M. Figure 1 in Supplemental Text illustrates the number of single-end reads in each pool. The total number of paired-end reads for HV5 was about 250M, for a total of about 44.8 billion

usable bases. When compared to the 286 Mb complexity of the sample, the average coverage (assuming a uniform distribution) was $\approx 157\times$.

The 91 read pools in the barley HV5 dataset were processed using HASHFILTER, and deconvoluted to one, two, or three BACs. HASHFILTER built the hash table in about 340 minutes on one core of a Dell PowerEdge T710 server and used about 43 Gb of RAM. The deconvolution phase took 99 minutes on 10 cores, and the sorting of reads into 2,197 files, one for each BAC, took 37 minutes on one core. Due to the higher repeat content of the barley genome compared to rice, HASHFILTER was able to deconvolute a smaller fraction of the reads, about 71.3% (see Table 1 in Supplemental Text and Supplemental File 6). The total number of bases was about 38.9 billion bases (about 87% of the bases in HV5 before deconvolution), which translated in an actual average coverage for each BAC of about $137\times$ (see Supplemental File 7, column I). While we cannot objectively measure the accuracy of the deconvolution for barley, six of the eight BACs that were assigned less than 20 reads matched exactly the list of BACs that were noted as not growing during the pooling carried out three years earlier (for a video of the pooling see Supplemental File 1).

We carried out an analysis of deconvoluted paired-end reads, to determine to what extent the left and the right mate agreed on their BAC(s) assignment. HASHFILTER treats paired-end as two separate single-end reads, which are deconvoluted independently. For each paired-end read r , we collected in L_r the set of BACs assigned to the left mate, and in R_r the set of BACs assigned to the right mate. Unless L_r and R_r were both empty, when $L_r \subseteq R_r$ or $R_r \subseteq L_r$ we declared the paired-end read r to be *concordant*. For barley, 68.7% of the deconvoluted paired-end reads were concordant, which indicates that the deconvolution was quite accurate (see Supplemental File 6). We note that about 22% of the paired-end reads in barley have one end for which the corresponding BAC set is empty, probably due to sequencing errors or repetitive content. In this case, HASHFILTER does not deconvolute the mate with the empty BAC set, and the other mate is assigned to one or more BACs as a single-end read. We could have modified HASHFILTER to exploit the paired-end association, but that would have prevented us from carrying out this analysis.

We assembled each set of reads assigned to a BAC individually using VELVET [Zerbino and Birney, 2008] for a variety of choices of k -mer size. From the assemblies obtained for different choices of k , we decided to report in Supplemental File 7 the assembly that maximized the N50 (see Supplemental Text for a description of each column in the spreadsheet). If we average the assembly statistics over the 2,197 BACs, the number of reads used in the assemblies was 87.6%, indicating that VELVET took advantage of most of the data; the average N50 was 7,210 bp (5.6% of the average BAC length); the average longest contig was 19,222 bp (14.9% of the average BAC length); the average sum of all the contigs in each assembly was 113,678 bp (87.8% of the average BAC length).

Barley Assembly Comparative Analysis and Validation via Illumina OPA

To understand the trade-offs between the number and the size of the assembled contigs, the target size (e.g., BACs, set of BACs, whole genome), and depth of sequencing coverage, we collected a set of critical

assembly statistics in Table 3. The first two rows contain average BAC assemblies statistics for rice data, assuming perfect deconvolution or deconvolution via HASHFILTER.

The average barley BAC assembly statistics are reported on the third row, where reads were assigned to BACs via HASHFILTER, then individually assembled with VELVET. The next row represents the average statistics obtained by assembling all the reads in each pool of 169 BACs via VELVET, using the k -mer size that maximized the N50 (see Supplemental File 7 for details). Recall that each BAC is replicated in 7 distinct pools, so the depth of sequencing coverage of one BAC in a pool is 1/7 of 180x, which is the coverage before deconvolution. The fifth row reports the assembly of all the reads in the 91 pools for HV5 using SOAPDENOV0. Finally, the last row reports the statistics of the whole shotgun assembly of the barley genome using SOAPDENOV0 with $k = 31$. The whole shotgun sequencing of barley was carried out at several locations: Ambry Genetics sequenced five (2×77 bases) paired-end lanes and four long-insert paired-end (LIPE) lanes (insert size of 2, 3 and 5 kb); University of Minnesota (courtesy of Gary Muehlbauer) sequenced two (2×100 bases) paired-end lanes; University of California, Riverside sequenced seven (2×100 bases) paired-end lanes. The number of usable paired-end bases after quality-based trimming was 159.31 Gb and 4.92 Gb of LIPE, for an overall 31x depth of sequencing coverage of the 5.3 Gb barley genome.

Observe that as the target size increases from one BAC to the whole genome, both the N50 and the number of reads used by the assembler are monotonically decreasing, and so is sum of all contig sizes as a fraction of the target size. This clearly indicates that the effectiveness of the assembler decreases as the complexity of the assembly problem increases, which strongly advocates the use of a BAC-by-BAC approach for the assembly of large, highly repetitive genomes.

Barley BAC assemblies were also compared against BAC-unigene lists obtained using the Illumina GoldenGate oligonucleotide pool assay (OPA) [Fan et al., 2006] developed for barley [Close et al., 2009]. We used the Illumina OPAs on the same seven sets of barley pools described above (637 pools in total) and determined which BAC clones were positive for two sets of 1,536 SNP loci/unigenes (see Methods for details).

The GoldenGate assays allowed us to uniquely map a total of 1,849 unique unigenes to BACs. Table 1 summarizes the results of unigene-BAC BAC-unigene assignment broken down by chromosome and chromosome arms. The ratio of BACs to unigenes is 1.37, which provides an estimate the amount of overlap among MTP clones. BACs were anchored to a total of 333 unigenes mapped on barley chromosome 5H, the maximum of any chromosome. Chromosome arm 5HL carries the maximum number of unigenes to which BACs were anchored for a single arm at 253 unigenes. Supplemental File 9 contains all the solved BAC-unigene relationships along with their chromosomal location.

Analysis of the assembly of the 2,197 barley BACs in the HV5 set was carried out by using the results of the OPA as the “ground truth”. First, we extracted a total of 221 SNP loci/unigenes (assembly B35) that were mapped to a total of 202 distinct BACs in HV5. We obtained the sequence of these 221 unigenes from HARVEST (<http://harvest.ucr.edu>) and BLAST-ed them against the HV5 BAC contigs. Out of 202 BACs that were expected to contain those genes, only 20 BAC assemblies (10%) missed entirely the

expected SNP loci/unigenes (see Supplemental File 7, columns U–X). For the other 90% of the assemblies which contained the expected unigenes, the average coverage of those unigenes was about 90% of their length. This suggests that these BAC assemblies contain the majority of the barley genes.

Discussion

The challenges of *de novo* sequence assembly originate from a variety of issues, but two are the most prominent. First, sequencing instruments are not 100% accurate, and sequencing errors in the form of substitutions, insertion, or deletions complicate the detection of overlaps between reads. Second, large eukaryotic genomes contains many highly repetitive elements. During the assembly process, all reads that belong to those repetitive regions get *over-compressed* and lead to mis-assemblies.

To ameliorate the problems caused by repeats, two strategies can be used, namely *paired-end* and *clone-by-clone* sequencing. In paired-end sequencing, pairs of reads are obtained from both ends of inserts of various sizes [Roach et al., 1995, Weber and Myers, 1997]. Paired-end reads resolve repeats during assembly simply by jumping across them (abandoning the effort to fully resolve them) and disambiguating the ordering of flanking unique regions. Combined with shotgun sequencing, this strategy has been successfully used to assemble several complex genomes, including *H. influenzae* [Fleischmann et al., 1995], *D. melanogaster* [Myers et al., 2000], *H. sapiens* [Venter et al., 2001], and *M. musculus* [Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium, 2002] – but with the caveat that the resulting endpoint sequence is rarely 100% complete.

In clone-by-clone sequencing, chunks of the genome (100–150 kb) are cloned, typically in BACs, and then reads are obtained independently from each clone [Green, 2001]. By separating reads into sets that represent individual BACs, sequences that are repetitive in the context of the whole genome are more likely to have only a single copy in each BAC; this greatly simplifies the assembly. Hierarchical sequencing was used to sequence several genomes including *S. cerevisiae* [Oliver et al., 1992, Mewes et al., 1997], *C. elegans* [The *C. elegans* Sequencing Consortium, 1998], *A. thaliana* [The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative, 2000] and *H. sapiens* [International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium, 2001].

The second generation of sequencing technologies based on flow cells (e.g., Illumina, Helicos Heliscope and ABI SOLiD), has significantly reduced the cost of sequencing, but the sequenced reads are much shorter than Sanger reads. Shorter read length makes the problem of *de novo* genome assembly significantly harder. Although it has been recently demonstrated that whole genome shotgun assembly from short reads of a large eukaryotic genome (giant panda, *Ailuropoda melanoleura*) is possible [Li et al., 2010], the contigs produced are relatively short, even considering the fact that the sequencing depth was over 70x.

To the best of our knowledge, no clone-by-clone sequencing protocol for second-generation instruments has been proposed so far. We believe that the major technical hurdle for a clone-by-clone approach is the limitation of these instruments in handling hundreds or thousand of BACs in a way that would allow reads to be assigned back to their source. DNA barcoding can be used, but it does not scale well to hundreds or thousands of samples, in part because an error rate of 0.1 to 1% confounds demultiplexing of incorrectly read barcode adapters. Here, we have demonstrated an efficient alternative: instead of ligating barcodes

to each BAC sample before sequencing, we encode the “signature” of a BAC in the unique set of pools to which it is assigned. By transitivity, reads belonging to that BAC will also share the same signature.

Although our method is not entirely barcoding-free because we multiplexed 13 BAC pools on the same lane of the sequencing instrument, in principle it could be made completely free of DNA barcodes by pooling a larger number of BACs and changing the pooling parameters. The decision to pool 2,197 BACs was made to be compatible with the time required to manually create the pools in one day of work for an average size lab.

Experimental results on simulated data for rice and actual sequencing data for barley show that the clone-by-clone approach can be employed with second-generation sequencing instruments. Our method deconvolutes reads to BAC with very high accuracy (99.57% on rice), and as a consequence the assemblies of the resulting BAC clones are of high quality. For the synthetic data (containing 1% sequencing errors) on the rice genome, we were able to reconstruct on average 77% of the BACs content. On the barley data, the assembly successfully reconstructed 90% of the expected unigenes, with an average coverage of the unigenes of about 90%. This amount of sequence will be adequate for most practical purposes such as map-based cloning and nearby marker development for marker assisted breeding.

Combinatorial pooling provides an efficient approach to clone-by-clone sequencing on second-generation instruments. Clone-by-clone sequencing allows selectivity (e.g., gene-enriched portion of a genome) and enables the distribution of the sequencing work to multiple locations by partitioning the BACs to be sequenced. It also decreases the sequencing and computational costs needed to produce high quality assemblies, especially for large highly repetitive genomes. Combinatorial pooling has added benefits which were not obvious before we started this project. First, the deconvolution process discards highly repetitive reads without any prior knowledge; these repetitive reads would degrade the assembly quality. Second, pooling enables a very reliable detection and correction of sequencing errors, a task currently under development in our group.

Methods

The steps in our *combinatorial clone-by-clone sequencing* method are illustrated in Figure 1 and described next in detail.

Pooling (gene-rich) minimum-tiling-path BACs (Steps A-E)

While our method can in general be applied to any set of clones that cover a genome or a portion thereof, the protocol we are proposing here for selective genome sequencing uses a physical map of (gene-bearing) BACs to identify a set of minimally redundant clones. The construction of a physical library and the selection of a minimum tiling path are well-known procedures. More details can be found in, e.g., [Ding et al., 2001, Luo et al., 2003, Soderlund et al., 2000, Bozdag et al., 2007, Bozdag et al., 2008] and references therein.

Once the set of clones that need to be sequenced has been identified, they must be pooled according to a scheme that allows the deconvolution of the sequenced reads back to their corresponding BACs. In

Combinatorics, the design of a pooling method reduces to the problem of constructing a *disjunctive* matrix (see [Du and Hwang, 1993]). Each row of the disjunctive matrix corresponds to a BAC to be pooled and each column corresponds to a pool. Let us call w a subset of the rows (BAC clones) in the disjunctive matrix, and let us define $u(w)$ as the set of pools that contain at least one BAC in w . A design (or a matrix) is said to be *d-decodable* if $u(w_1) \neq u(w_2)$ when $w_1 \neq w_2$, $|w_1| \leq d$, and $|w_2| \leq d$. The construction of *d-decodable* pooling designs has been extensively studied [Du and Hwang, 1993]. The popular 2D grid design is simple to implement but cannot be used for the purposes of this work because it is only one-decodable.

Recently, a new family of “smart” pooling methods has generated considerable attention [Du et al., 2006, Thierry-Mieg, 2006, Vermeirssen et al., 2007, Prabhu and Pe’er, 2009, Erlich et al., 2009, Hajirasouliha et al., 2008]. Among these, we selected the *shifted transversal* design [Thierry-Mieg, 2006] due to its ability of handling multiple positives and its robustness to noise. The parameters of a shifted transversal design pooling are defined by three integers (P, L, Γ) , where P is a prime number, L defines the number of layers, and Γ is a small integer. A *layer* is a partition of BACs and consists of exactly P pools: the larger the number of layers, the higher is the decodability. By construction the total number of pools is $P \times L$. If we set Γ to be the smallest integer such that $P^{\Gamma+1} \geq N$ where N is the number of BACs that need to be pooled, then the decodability of the design is $\lfloor (L - 1)/\Gamma \rfloor$.

An important property of this pooling design is that any two pools only share at most Γ BACs. By choosing a small value for Γ one can make pooling extremely robust to errors. In our experiments, we use $\Gamma = 2$, so that at least ten errors are needed to mistakenly assign a read to the wrong BAC. In contrast, two errors are sufficient to draw an erroneous conclusion with the 2D grid-design.

Barley BAC pools were obtained as follows. *Escherichia coli* strain DH10B BAC cultures were grown individually in 96-well plates covered by a porous membrane for 36 hr in 2YT medium with 0.05% glucose and 30 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ chloramphenicol at 37°C in a shaking incubator. Following combinatorial pooling of 50 μl aliquots from each of 169 BAC cultures, each of 91 collected pools (≈ 8.3 ml each) was distributed into five 1.5 ml aliquots and then centrifuged to create cell pellets. The pellets were frozen and then used for extraction of BAC DNA using Qiagen plasmid DNA isolation reagents. Each BAC pool DNA sample was then dissolved in 45 μl of TE buffer, and the five samples combined for a total of ≈ 225 μl at an estimated final concentration of 20 ng/ μl . For gene-BAC assignment using the Golden Gate assays, a total of 10 μl (≈ 200 ng) of this DNA was then digested for 1 hour at 37°C by using 2 units of *NotI* enzyme with 100 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ BSA in a volume of 100 μl . The *NotI* enzyme was then heat inactivated at 65°C for 20 min.

BAC DNAs were prepared using a procedure that yields on average 65% BAC DNA and 35% *E. coli* DNA. Although these BAC DNAs performed well for SNP locus detection in the GoldenGate assay, we were unaware of the extent of *E. coli* in the samples until we began BAC pool sequencing, after all BAC pool DNAs had been prepared. Attempts were made to remove *E. coli* DNA from the BAC DNA samples through selective digestion by using exonucleases, and to reduce highly repetitive DNA using a denaturation/renaturation and double strand nuclease method. These procedures provided little or no reduction of the proportion of *E. coli* DNA in the samples. A cost-benefit analysis determined that the cost of replacing all of the BAC pools by applying an alternative BAC DNA purification procedure yielding an average of

94% BAC DNA and 6% *E. coli* DNA would be no more advantageous than simply repeating the sequencing of samples for which more DNA sequence information was needed to support the sequence-to-BAC deconvolution.

A video showing 44 seconds of the pooling process is available as Supplemental File 1.

Sequencing and Processing Paired-end Reads (step F)

Sequencing of the barley BAC pools was carried out on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 at UC Riverside. Paired-end reads from each pool were quality-trimmed using a sliding window and a minimum Phred quality of 23. Next, Illumina PCR adapters were removed with FAR (Flexible Adapter Remover, can be obtained from <http://sourceforge.net/projects/theflexibleadap/>), and discarded either if shorter than 36 bases or if containing any 'N'. Finally, reads were cleaned of *E. coli* (DH10B) and vector contamination (pBeloBAC11) using BWA [Li and Durbin, 2009] and additional scripts.

According to our simulations, the depth of sequencing coverage of each BAC after deconvolution is required to be at least 50x to obtain good BAC assemblies. The parameters of the pooling design should be chosen so that the coverage pre-deconvolution is at least 150x-200x, to compensate for non-uniformity in the molar concentrations of individual BACs within each pool, BAC vector and *E. coli* contamination, and loss of reads due to the deconvolution process.

Deconvoluting Paired-end Reads to BACs (step G)

To understand how deconvolution is achieved, let us make for a moment the simplifying assumption that clones in the MTP do not overlap. i.e., that the MTP BACs form a non-redundant tiling for the genome under study, or a fraction thereof. Let us pool the MTP BACs according to a shifted transversal design with L layers and obtain a set of reads from them. Now, consider a read r occurring only once in the portion of the genome covered by the BACs. If there are no sequencing errors and depth of sequencing is sufficient, r will appear in the sequenced output of exactly L pools (see Figure 2, case 1). To determine the BAC to which a read r should be assigned, search for a BAC signature that matches the list of positive pools for r .

For the most realistic scenario where at most d MTP clones overlap, the pooling must be at least d -decodable for the deconvolution to work. We expect each non-repetitive read to belong to at most two BACs if the MTP has been computed perfectly, or rarely three BACs when considering imperfections, so we set $d = 3$. When a read belongs to the overlap between two clones (again assuming no sequencing errors), it will appear in the sequenced output for $2L, 2L - 1, \dots, 2L - \Gamma$ pools (see Figure 2, case 2). The case for three clones is analogous.

In general, the deconvolution method proceeds as follows. Recall that in step E the number of pools is $M = P \times L$. Let us call R_i the set of reads obtained by sequencing pool i , for all $i \in [1, M]$. For each set R_i , we first compute the frequency $count_i$ of all its distinct k -mers. Specifically, for each k -mer $w \in R_i$, $count_i(w) = c$ if w or its reverse complement occurs exactly c times in R_i . These counts are stored in a hash table. For each distinct k -mer w , the table stores a frequency vector of M numbers, namely

$[count_1(w), count_2(w), \dots, count_M(w)]$. Once the table is built, we process each read as follows. Given a read r in a pool, we fetch the frequency vectors for all its k -mers. Recall that by construction each BAC is assigned to L pools, thus the *signature* of a BAC is a set of L numbers in the range $[1, M]$. Due to our pooling design, two BAC signatures cannot share more than Γ numbers (see Theorem I in [Thierry-Mieg, 2006]). Each k -mer signature is matched against the BAC signatures, allowing for a small number of missing/extra pool entries: if no good match exists, its frequency vector is discarded. At the end of this process, the frequency vectors with a valid signature are combined to form the *signature* of read r . This signature is matched again against the BAC signatures to determine the BAC(s) to which it belongs.

This algorithm is implemented in the tool HASHFILTER which has been extensively tested under Linux platforms. The source code and manual can be downloaded as Supplemental File 11.

Clone-by-clone Assembly (step H)

Once the reads were assigned to individual BACs, sets of single and paired-end reads were assembled clone-by-clone using VELVET [Zerbino and Birney, 2008]. VELVET requires an expected coverage, which can be computed using the amount of sequenced bases assigned to each BAC and the estimated BAC size. For barley, BAC sizes were estimated from the number of bands in the restriction fingerprinting data. First, we computed the average number of bands in the 72,055 BACs fingerprinted at University of California, Davis using high-information-content fingerprinting [Ding et al., 2001, Luo et al., 2003] (see also <http://phymap.ucdavis.edu/barley/>). Assuming that the average BAC length in this set was 106 kb, we computed the multiplier to apply to the number of bands to obtain the estimated BAC length, which turned out to be 1175 bases. We used that constant to obtain estimated sizes for all BAC in HV5 (see Supplemental File 7, column F). Note that the average size of 129.5 kb is much larger than the library average size of 106 kb; this indicates that the MTP selection favors larger BACs.

We also tested SOAPDENOV0 [Li et al., 2010] and ABYSS [Simpson et al., 2009] on simulated data (data not shown). We evaluated the assembly for several choices of the k -mer (hash) size, but only reported the assembly that maximized the N50. We recorded the number of contigs, their N50/median/max/sum statistics, and the number of reads used in the assembly.

For rice assemblies, we BLAST-ed the BAC contigs to the rice genome. We computed the fraction of the original (source) BAC covered by at least one contig, and the number of gaps and overlaps in the assembly. The parameters used for BLAST are reported in the Supplemental Text.

For barley BAC assemblies, we carried out a validation based on the known BAC-unigene associations from the Illumina GoldenGate assay described in the next section. The validation involved BLAST-ing #35 unigenes (Harvest:Barley assembly #35 unigenes, <http://harvest.ucr.edu>) against the BAC assemblies. To reduce spurious hits, we applied three filters. First, we masked highly repetitive regions by computing the frequency of all distinct 26-mers in the cleaned/trimmed HV5 data, then masking any 26-mers that occurred at least 11,000 times from the assembled contigs by replacing the occurrences of those k -mers with Xs. Second, we did not consider a hit when a unigene was covered less than 50% of its length.

Third, we excluded from the hit count any unigene that hit more than ten individual BACs overall. We recorded the number of unigenes hitting a BAC, and compared them with the expected unigenes according to the Illumina assay.

Barley GoldenGate oligonucleotide pool assay

Samples for the GoldenGate assay were prepared by combining 5 μl of *NotI*-digested BAC pool DNA (≈ 10 ng) with 4 μl of sonicated *E. coli* DNA pre-dialyzed into TE buffer at a concentration of 500 ng/ μl (2000 ng) and 16 μl of TE buffer. The final volume of each sample was thus 25 μl , composed of ≈ 0.4 ng/ μl of digested BAC pool DNA and 80 ng/ μl of additional *E. coli* DNA. These DNA samples were provided to Joe DeYoung at the University of California, Los Angeles, California, or to Shiaoman Chao at the US Department of Agriculture genotyping facility in Fargo, North Dakota. The DNA concentrations were then readjusted to 50 ng/ μl and a total of 5 μl of each DNA sample was used for each GoldenGate assay.

Each Illumina GoldenGate oligonucleotide pool assay (OPA) allows interrogation of a DNA sample for the presence of 1536 SNP loci. In [Close et al., 2009], five OPAs were designed from approximately 22,000 SNPs from EST and PCR amplicon sequence alignments. Details of the development of three test phase (POPA1, POPA2, and POPA3) and two production scale (BOPA1 and BOPA2) can be found in [Close et al., 2009].

We genotyped the barley BAC pools described in Section “The gene space of barley” on BOPA1 and BOPA2. Supplemental File 10 shows which BOPA was applied to which set of barley BACs. The output from Illumina GoldenGate assay was first converted to binary data by visual inspection of the theta/R space in BeadStudio. A positive reading meant that the SNP locus (and its corresponding unigene) is present in at least one BAC within the pool (refer to Figure 2 in Supplemental Text for an example).

Given the genotyping data for all unigene-pool pairs, we designed an algorithm that computes the optimal assignment of unigenes to BACs so that the number of errors is minimized. For a particular unigene g under consideration, let O_g be the signature set of corresponding positive pools. Let S be an arbitrary set of BACs, where $1 \leq |S| \leq 3$ and U_S be the union of the pools that contain at least a BAC clone in S . The number of errors E_S associated with this particular choice of S is defined to be the number of extra observations (equal to $|U_S \setminus O_g|$) plus the number of missing observation (equal to $|O_g \setminus U_S|$). Among all possible choices of S , we chose S^* such that the value of E_{S^*} is minimized. When the number of errors associated with the final solution was too large (say, more than 3), we declared that unigene to be *non-decodable*.

This procedure resulted in 1849 unigenes mapped to one, two, or three BACs. As a verification step, when a unigene was mapped to more than one BAC, we verified that with a very low conflict frequency all those BACs belonged to the same contig in the barley physical map [Bozdag et al., 2007, Soderlund et al., 2000]. Using the genetic map developed in [Close et al., 2009, Muñoz-Amatriaín et al., 2011] we were also able to assign these unigene-anchored BACs to a barley genetic map position (Supplemental File 9).

Data and Software Access

Barley raw sequencing data for the HV5 set can be obtained from NCBI Sequence Read Archive (direct link [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra?term=\(SRA047913\)](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra?term=(SRA047913))). When sequencing and analysis are completed, we plan to release barley BAC assemblies for each set of MTP BACs on HARVEST:BARLEY (<http://harvest.ucr.edu>) and GENBANK (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/>). The 31x shotgun genome assembly of barley can be accessed via our BLAST server hosted at the address <http://www.harvest-blast.org/>, by selecting “Barley Genome” from the database menu. This assembly will be made available on HARVEST:BARLEY (<http://harvest.ucr.edu>) and GENBANK (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/>). The source code of HASHFILTER is available for download as Supplemental File 11.

Author Contributions

SL and TJC designed and supervised the project. SL wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. TJC, PRB, SW, and JR produced the BAC pools for barley. TJC supervised the collection of sequencing and genotyping data for barley. DD generated the synthetic data from the rice genome, wrote a preliminary version of the tool to deconvolute reads to BACs and evaluated the accuracy of the deconvolution. TJC called the Illumina OPA data to assign genes to BACs. MA generated the assemblies for rice and barley using VELVET, SOAPDENOV0, and ABYSS and wrote scripts to evaluate their quality. FC, MB, and GC designed and implemented the tool HASHFILTER that computes the read signature and deconvolutes of the reads. YW wrote the tool to deconvolute SNP loci/unigenes to BAC from the Illumina OPA data. BA wrote a preliminary tool to compute the all-pair prefix-suffix overlap using hash tables. YM prepared BAC DNA from cell pellets and produced the sequencing libraries. SW wrote the scripts to demultiplex and clean/trim the barley sequencing data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We thank M. C. Luo (UC Davis) for fingerprinting barley BACs and building an initial physical map, Serdar Bozday (NIH) for building a compartmentalized physical map and selecting the MTP clones, Raymond D. Fenton (UC Riverside) for assistance with BAC pooling and determining gene-BAC relationships using the Illumina GoldenGate assay, Shiaoman Chao (USDA) and Joseph DeYoung (UC Los Angeles, Southern California Genotyping Consortium) for providing Illumina GoldenGate services, and John Weger (UC Riverside Institute of Integrative Genome Biology) for Illumina sequencing services. This research was supported in part by NSF CAREER IIS-0447773, USDA 2009-65300-05645, NSF DBI-1062301, NSF 0321756, and USDA-CSREES-NRI 2006-55606-16722.

Figures




Figure 1: Proposed sequencing protocol (see text for details).




Figure 2: An illustration of the three cases we are dealing with during the deconvolution process (clones belong to a MTP).




Figure 3: Frequency distribution for the signatures of all distinct 26-mers (TOP) and all the reads (BOTTOM) in the 91 pools of synthetic sequencing data for rice; the x-axis represents the size of the signature, the y-axis is the frequency.




Figure 4: Frequency distribution for the signatures of all distinct 26-mers (TOP) and all reads (BOTTOM) for a set of 91 pools of gene-enriched MTP BACs for barley (HV5); the x-axis represents the signature size, the y-axis is the frequency.

Tables

Chromosome	Short arm	Long arm	Uncertain	Total
1H	52 / 76	140 / 201	38 / 57	230 / 334
2H	114 / 181	211 / 297	2 / 5	327 / 483
3H	80 / 119	195 / 272	0 / 0	275 / 391
4H	74 / 103	132 / 181	1 / 1	207 / 285
5H	68 / 94	263 / 346	2 / 3	333 / 443
6H	77 / 116	124 / 179	0 / 0	201 / 295
7H	146 / 207	126 / 183	0 / 0	272 / 390
Unmapped			1225 / 25	12 / 25
Total	611 / 896	1191 / 1659	55 / 91	1857 / 2646
Unique				1849 / 2541

Table 1: Chromosomal distribution of unigenes (assembly #35) contained in BACs (black numbers), and BACs containing unigenes (red numbers), according to GoldenGate assays.

Pool	1 BAC	2 BACs	3 BACs	%Total	%Correct	Pool	1 BAC	2 BACs	3 BACs	%Total	%Correct
1	390,925	1,021,202	218,965	81.55%	99.57%	47	415,306	958,780	238,508	80.63%	99.53%
2	401,930	1,010,577	226,119	81.93%	99.45%	48	395,628	988,326	244,361	81.42%	99.39%
3	446,845	1,019,560	199,438	83.29%	99.59%	49	341,453	1,062,420	232,221	81.8%	99.55%
4	460,513	1,012,335	187,729	83.03%	99.59%	50	440,861	943,720	244,218	81.44%	99.55%
5	455,705	947,515	222,519	81.29%	99.52%	51	441,704	983,305	192,133	80.86%	99.55%
6	391,456	1,044,628	198,262	81.72%	99.63%	52	410,569	962,425	242,805	80.79%	99.62%
7	391,010	1,045,500	230,553	83.35%	99.62%	53	400,208	1,018,204	211,243	81.48%	99.53%
8	388,850	991,831	243,614	81.21%	99.58%	54	380,140	969,012	253,479	80.13%	99.49%
9	381,752	975,607	256,767	80.71%	99.58%	55	420,342	1,007,343	211,307	81.95%	99.56%
10	346,968	1,045,075	243,428	81.77%	99.64%	56	449,944	979,593	215,811	82.27%	99.57%
11	394,704	964,910	227,215	79.34%	99.57%	57	393,856	1,060,639	209,274	83.19%	99.55%
12	420,363	936,500	222,287	78.96%	99.49%	58	368,063	1,062,521	224,716	82.77%	99.62%
13	411,143	969,745	239,441	81.02%	99.6%	59	382,411	1,064,979	191,622	81.95%	99.56%
14	386,831	1,028,001	226,478	82.07%	99.62%	60	394,017	992,574	235,947	81.13%	99.62%
15	360,496	1,053,183	245,686	82.97%	99.59%	61	428,393	968,451	234,017	81.54%	99.62%
16	413,108	1,031,143	193,165	81.87%	99.6%	62	511,416	934,536	204,130	82.5%	99.59%
17	426,155	984,613	202,242	80.65%	99.54%	63	323,162	1,019,112	248,197	79.52%	99.41%
18	425,161	972,202	229,742	81.36%	99.55%	64	447,481	936,733	230,762	80.75%	99.64%
19	377,124	993,507	256,679	81.37%	99.62%	65	392,007	968,324	242,245	80.13%	99.58%
20	392,747	1,012,836	216,100	81.08%	99.55%	66	346,148	1,021,575	231,422	79.96%	99.49%
21	358,849	1,016,130	237,873	80.64%	99.49%	67	410,069	922,582	230,421	78.15%	99.38%
22	438,686	998,197	214,066	82.55%	99.55%	68	432,649	952,708	224,847	80.51%	99.56%
23	440,145	959,963	230,235	81.52%	99.61%	69	373,656	983,368	260,897	80.9%	99.61%
24	470,767	970,915	207,429	82.46%	99.48%	70	399,624	1,040,903	203,423	82.2%	99.61%
25	413,950	968,673	229,748	80.62%	99.57%	71	417,006	1,032,484	204,127	82.68%	99.59%
26	380,879	993,435	225,879	80.01%	99.56%	72	430,118	1,002,137	212,012	82.21%	99.51%
27	409,336	1,011,286	204,935	81.28%	99.61%	73	430,159	1,020,881	199,634	82.53%	99.66%
28	413,659	970,618	230,663	80.75%	99.58%	74	389,350	983,376	246,105	80.94%	99.56%
29	478,045	956,413	219,851	82.72%	99.63%	75	485,180	968,794	207,182	83.06%	99.58%
30	437,710	958,018	239,748	81.77%	99.62%	76	427,825	999,602	229,448	82.84%	99.64%
31	312,489	1,051,366	263,548	81.37%	99.59%	77	348,986	1,047,405	238,092	81.72%	99.61%
32	399,797	1,001,191	223,652	81.23%	99.45%	78	394,006	1,008,216	227,993	81.51%	99.57%
33	368,754	1,049,749	209,490	81.4%	99.51%	79	349,668	1,028,294	220,179	79.91%	99.51%
34	394,542	1,029,862	193,241	80.88%	99.54%	80	422,887	975,647	231,153	81.48%	99.46%
35	384,702	1,067,284	185,431	81.87%	99.51%	81	404,990	998,443	222,417	81.29%	99.55%
36	381,991	988,185	228,927	79.96%	99.52%	82	429,214	985,137	219,765	81.71%	99.58%
37	447,843	909,650	263,912	81.07%	99.52%	83	391,829	1,046,567	175,777	80.71%	99.56%
38	453,436	996,709	210,853	83.05%	99.69%	84	418,626	999,325	229,379	82.37%	99.63%
39	403,907	995,495	241,792	82.06%	99.57%	85	412,015	977,566	239,830	81.47%	99.62%
40	383,803	1,010,100	230,899	81.24%	99.56%	86	415,146	973,912	220,785	80.49%	99.43%
41	406,096	998,748	211,387	80.81%	99.53%	87	399,776	980,706	242,806	81.16%	99.57%
42	457,064	1,002,075	188,545	82.38%	99.62%	88	372,785	1,026,350	238,468	81.88%	99.57%
43	430,717	1,028,726	196,809	82.81%	99.6%	89	436,803	988,090	225,036	82.5%	99.63%
44	380,624	1,031,742	210,096	81.12%	99.63%	90	385,299	1,018,026	238,231	82.08%	99.62%
45	357,076	992,491	257,128	80.33%	99.58%	91	445,759	986,738	205,512	81.9%	99.59%
46	426,502	1,023,330	224,662	83.72%	99.62%	Avg	406,612	998,798	224,167	81.48%	99.57%

Table 2: Number of reads per pool deconvoluted to one, two, or three BACs; the percentage column reports the fraction of the total number of reads that were deconvoluted and the total number of correct reads (rice synthetic data).

<i>Target</i>	<i>Size (Mb)</i>	<i>Coverage</i>	<i>% reads used^c</i>	<i>L50 (bp)</i>	<i>% Sum</i>
Rice, 1 BAC (perfect deconvolution) ^a	0.151	56x	82.7%	132,865	98.7%
Rice, 1 BAC (HASHFILTER deconvolution) ^a	0.151	87x	82.3%	47,551	90.7%
Barley, 1 BAC (HASHFILTER deconvolution) ^a	0.129	137x	87.6%	7,210	87.8%
Barley, 169 BACs ^b (no deconvolution)	20	25.7x	67.1%	4,270	69.5%
Barley, 2,197 BACs ($k = 25$, no deconvolution)	250	180x	25.3%	3,845	56.6%
Barley, whole genome ($k = 31$)	5,300	31x	13.3%	2,857	30.5%

Table 3: Summary of the statistics of the various assemblies obtained using VELVET (rows 1–4) and SOAP-DENOVO (rows 5–6); “% Sum” is the the sum of all contig sizes as percentage of the target size; ^aaverage over 2,197 assemblies; ^baverage over 91 assemblies; ^cVELVET reports the number of reads used in the assembly but SOAPDENOVO does not: for the last two assemblies, we used BOWTIE to align reads to the assemblies (1 mismatch)

References

- [Alon et al., 2011] Alon, S., Vigneault, F., Eminaga, S., Christodoulou, D. C., Seidman, J. G., Church, G. M., and Eisenberg, E. (2011). Barcoding bias in high-throughput multiplex sequencing of miRNA. *Genome Research*, 21(9):1506–1511.
- [Bozdag et al., 2007] Bozdag, S., Close, T., and Lonardi, S. (2007). A compartmentalized approach to the assembly of physical maps. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Bioinformatics & Bioengineering (BIBE'07)*, pages 218–225.
- [Bozdag et al., 2008] Bozdag, S., Close, T. J., and Lonardi, S. (2008). Computing the minimal tiling path from a physical map by integer linear programming. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics (WABI'08)*, pages 148–161.
- [Cai et al., 2001] Cai, W.-W., Chen, R., Gibbs, R. A., and Bradley, A. (2001). A clone-array pooled strategy for sequencing large genomes. *Genome Research*, 11:1619–1623.
- [Close et al., 2009] Close, T., Bhat, P., Lonardi, S., Wu, Y., Rostoks, N., Ramsay, L., Druka, A., Stein, N., Svensson, J., Wanamaker, S., Bozdag, S., and *et al.* (2009). Development and implementation of high-throughput SNP genotyping in barley. *BMC Genomics*, 10(1):582.
- [Craig et al., 2008] Craig, D. W., Pearson, J. V., Szelinger, S., Sekar, A., Redman, M., Corneveaux, J. J., Pawlowski, T. L., Laub, T., Nunn, G., Stephan, D. A., and *et al.* (2008). Identification of genetic variants using bar-coded multiplexed sequencing. *Nature Methods*, 5(10).
- [Csuros et al., 2003] Csuros, M., Li, B., and Milosavljevic, A. (2003). Clone-array pooled shotgun mapping and sequencing: design and analysis of experiments. In *Proceedings of GIW*.
- [Csuros and Milosavljevic, 2002] Csuros, M. and Milosavljevic, A. (2002). Pooled genomic indexing (PGI): mathematical analysis and experiment design. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics*, LNCS 2452, pages 10–28.
- [Ding et al., 2001] Ding, Y., Johnson, M. D., Chen, W. Q., Wong, D., Chen, Y.-J., Benson, S. C., Lam, J. Y., Kim, Y.-M., and Shizuya, H. (2001). Five-color-based high-information-content fingerprinting of bacterial artificial chromosome clones using type IIS restriction endonucleases. *Genomics*, 74(2):142–154.
- [Du et al., 2006] Du, D.-Z., Hwang, F., Wu, W., and Znati, T. (2006). New construction for transversal design. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 13(4):990–995.
- [Du and Hwang, 1993] Du, D.-Z. and Hwang, F. K. (1993). *Combinatorial Group Testing and Applications*. (Series on Applied Mathematics). World Scientific Publishing Company.
- [Engler et al., 2003] Engler, F. W., Hatfield, J., Nelson, W., and Soderlund, C. A. (2003). Locating sequence on FPC maps and selecting a minimal tiling path. *Genome Research*, 13(9):2152–2163.
- [Erlich et al., 2009] Erlich, Y., Chang, K., Gordon, A., Ronen, R., Navon, O., Rooks, M., and Hannon, G. J. (2009). DNA sudoku – harnessing high-throughput sequencing for multiplexed specimen analysis. *Genome Research*, 19(7):1243–1253.
- [Fan et al., 2006] Fan, J.-B., Chee, M. S., and Gunderson, K. L. (2006). Highly parallel genomic assays. *Nat Rev Genet*, 7(8):632–644.

- [Fleischmann et al., 1995] Fleischmann, R., Adams, M., White, O., Clayton, R., Kirkness, E., Kerlavage, A., Bult, C., Tomb, J., Dougherty, B., Merrick, J., and *et al.* (1995). Whole-genome random sequencing and assembly of *Haemophilus influenzae* Rd. *Science*, 269(5223):496–512.
- [Green, 2001] Green, E. (2001). Strategies for the systematic sequencing of complex genomes. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 2:573–583.
- [Hajirasouliha et al., 2008] Hajirasouliha, I., Hormozdiari, F., Sahinalp, S. C., and Birol, I. (2008). Optimal pooling for genome re-sequencing with ultra-high-throughput short-read technologies. *Bioinformatics*, 24(13):i32–i40.
- [International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium, 2001] International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium (2001). Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature*, 409:860–921.
- [Li and Durbin, 2009] Li, H. and Durbin, R. (2009). Fast and accurate short read alignment with BurrowsWheeler transform. *Bioinformatics*, 25(14):1754–1760.
- [Li et al., 2010] Li, R., Fan, W., Tian, G., Zhu, H., He, L., Cai, J., Huang, Q., Cai, Q., Li, B., Bai, Y., and *et al.* (2010). The sequence and *de novo* assembly of the giant panda genome. *Nature*, 463(7279):311–317.
- [Luo et al., 2003] Luo, M.-C., Thomas, C., You, F. M., Hsiao, J., Ouyang, S., Buell, C. R., Malandro, M., McGuire, P. E., Anderson, O. D., and Dvorak, J. (2003). High-throughput fingerprinting of bacterial artificial chromosomes using the snapshot labeling kit and sizing of restriction fragments by capillary electrophoresis. *Genomics*, 82(3):378–389.
- [Madishetty et al., 2007] Madishetty, K., Condamine, P., Svensson, J. T., Rodriguez, E., and Close, T. J. (2007). An improved method to identify BAC clones using pooled overgos. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 35(e5).
- [Mewes et al., 1997] Mewes, H., Albermann, K., Bahr, M., Frishman, D., Gleissner, A., Hani, J., Heumann, K., Kleine, K., Maierl, A., Oliver, S., Pfeiffer, F., and Zollner, A. (1997). Overview of the yeast genome. *Nature*, 387:7–65.
- [Milosavljevic et al., 2005] Milosavljevic, A., Harris, R., Sodergren, E., Jackson, A., Kalafus, K., Hodgson, A., Cree, A., Dai, W., Csuros, M., Zhu, B., de Jong, P., Weinstock, G., and Gibbs, R. (2005). Pooled genomic indexing of *Rhesus macaque*. *Genome Research*, 15(2):292–301.
- [Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium, 2002] Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium (2002). Initial sequencing and comparative analysis of the mouse genome. *Nature*, 420:520–562.
- [Muñoz-Amatriaín et al., 2011] Muñoz-Amatriaín, M., Moscou, M. J., Bhat, P. R., Svensson, J. T., Bartoš, J., Suchánková, P., Šimková, H., Endo, T. R., Fenton, R. D., Lonardi, S., Castillo, A. M., Chao, S., Cistué, L., Cuesta-Marcos, A., Forrest, K. L., Hayden, M. J., Hayes, P. M., Horsley, R. D., Makoto, K., Moody, D., Sato, K., Vallés, M. P., Wulff, B. B., Muehlbauer, G. J., Doležel, J., and Close, T. J. (2011). An improved consensus linkage map of barley based on flow-sorted chromosomes and single nucleotide polymorphism markers. *The Plant Genome*, 4:1–12.
- [Myers et al., 2000] Myers, E. W., Sutton, G. G., Delcher, A. L., Dew, I. M., Fasulo, D. P., Flanigan, M. J., Kravitz, S. A., Mobarry, C. M., Reiner, K. H. J., Remington, K. A., and *et al.* (2000). A whole-genome assembly of *Drosophila*. *Science*, 287(5461):2196–2204.
- [Oliver et al., 1992] Oliver, S.G. van der Aart, Q., Agostoni-Carbone, M., Aigle, M., Alberghina, L., and *et al.* (1992). The complete DNA sequence of yeast chromosome III. *Nature*, 357(6373):38–46.

- [Prabhu and Pe'er, 2009] Prabhu, S. and Pe'er, I. (2009). Overlapping pools for high-throughput targeted resequencing. *Genome Research*, 19(7):1254–1261.
- [Roach et al., 1995] Roach, J., Boysen, C., Wang, K., and Hood, L. (1995). Pairwise end sequencing: a unified approach to genomic mapping and sequencing. *Genomics*, 26:345–353.
- [Simpson et al., 2009] Simpson, J. T., Wong, K., Jackman, S. D., Schein, J. E., Jones, S. J., and Birol, I. (2009). ABySS: A parallel assembler for short read sequence data. *Genome Research*, 19(6):1117–1123.
- [Soderlund et al., 2000] Soderlund, C., Humphray, S., Dunham, A., and French, L. (2000). Contigs built with fingerprints, markers, and FPC v4.7. *Genome Research*, 10(11):1772–1787.
- [The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative, 2000] The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative (2000). *Arabidopsis thaliana* genome. *Nature*, 408:791–815.
- [The C. elegans Sequencing Consortium, 1998] The C. elegans Sequencing Consortium (1998). Genome sequence of the nematode *C. elegans*: A platform for investigating biology. *Science*, 282:2012–2018.
- [Thierry-Mieg, 2006] Thierry-Mieg, N. (2006). A new pooling strategy for high-throughput screening: the shifted transversal design. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 7(28).
- [Venter et al., 2001] Venter, J., Adams, M., Myers, E., Li, P., Mural, R., and *et al.* (2001). The sequence of the human genome. *Science*, 291(5507):1304–1351.
- [Vermeirssen et al., 2007] Vermeirssen, V., Deplancke, B., Barrasa, M. I., Reece-Hoyes, J. S., Arda, H. E., Grove, C. A., Martinez, N. J., Sequerra, R., Doucette-Stamm, L., Brent, M. R., and Walhout, A. J. M. (2007). Matrix and Steiner-triple-system smart pooling assays for high-performance transcription regulatory network mapping. *Nat Meth*, 4(8):659–664.
- [Weber and Myers, 1997] Weber, J. and Myers, E. (1997). Human whole-genome shotgun sequencing. *Genome Research*, 7:401–409.
- [Wicker et al., 2005] Wicker, T., Zimmermann, W., Perovic, D., Paterson, A., Ganai, M., and Stein, N. (2005). A detailed look at 7 million years of genome evolution in a 439 kb continuous sequence at the barley Hv-eIF4E locus: recombination, rearrangements and repeats. *The Plant J.*, 41:184–194.
- [Yu et al., 2000] Yu, Y., Tomkins, J. P., Waugh, R., Frisch, D. A., Kudrna, D., Kleinhofs, A., Bruggeman, R. S., Muehlbauer, G. J., Wise, R. P., and Wing, R. A. (2000). A bacterial artificial chromosome library for barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) and the identification of clones containing putative resistance genes. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, 101(7):1093–1099.
- [Zerbino and Birney, 2008] Zerbino, D. and Birney, E. (2008). VELVET: Algorithms for *de novo* short read assembly using de Bruijn graphs. *Genome Research*, 8(5):821–9.