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Abstract

The sweetpotato whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* is a highly destructive agricultural and ornamental crop pest. It damages host plants through both phloem feeding and vectoring plant pathogens. Introductions of *B. tabaci* are difficult to quarantine and eradicate because of its high reproductive rates, broad host plant range, and insecticide resistance. A total of 791 Gb of raw DNA sequence from whole genome shotgun sequencing, and 13 BAC pooling libraries were generated by Illumina sequencing using different combinations of mate-pair and pair-end libraries. Assembly gave a final genome with a scaffold N50 of 437 kb, and a total length of 658 Mb. Annotation of repetitive elements and coding regions resulted in 265.0 Mb TEs.
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Introduction

Samples and libraries construction

As a globally invasive species, the phloem-feeding whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* (Genn.; hereafter ‘*Bemisia*) has been found on all continents except Antarctica [1,2]. Taxonomically, *B. tabaci* is considered a species complex that contains several morphologically indistinguishable but genetically distinct ‘cryptic species’ [2–7]. The *Bemisia* Middle East-Asia Minor 1 (MEAM1, or ‘B’) cryptic species is highly invasive and has emerged as a major pest in the United States, Caribbean Basin, Latin America, Middle East [1], and East Asia [8]. Similarly, the invasive *Bemisia* Mediterranean (MED, or ‘Q’) cryptic species has been introduced into several geographic locations and has become established throughout China [9,10]. Despite substantial research and the recently published whitefly *B. tabaci* MEAM1/B genome [11], however, the genetic or genomic basis of MED/Q remains obscure.

The MED/Q *B. tabaci* adult whitefly females (2n) and males (1n) were initially collected from infested field-grown cucumber plants in Beijing, China during 2011 and used to establish a laboratory colony (MED/Q) at the Institute of Vegetable and Flowers, Chinese Academy of Agriculture Science by transferring adult males and females to caged pepper plants (10–12 leaf stage). Results of mtCOI gene PCR-RFLP assays [12] and direct DNA sequencing followed by phylogenetic evaluation against reference sequences [13] both confirmed that the *Bemisia* in the MED/Q colony belonged to the Q1 haplotype group, or western Mediterranean region clade (data not shown).

The MED/Q whitefly colony was used as the source initial short shotgun Illumina sequencing. Adult whiteflies fed using Parafilm membrane sacs containing a 25% sucrose solution for 48 hours prior to collection of ~5000 male and female adults (~50-50). Samples were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen for 3 hours prior to transfer to a −80°C freezer. This genomic DNA was used to construct Illumina TruSeq paired end (PE) sequencing libraries (170-, 250-, 300-, 500-, and 800-bp insert sizes) and mate pair (MP) libraries (2, 5, 10, 20, and 40 kb in size) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Additionally, two Illumina PE sequencing libraries (~500-bp and 800-bp inserts) were constructed from whole genome amplification (WGA) reactions carried out on genomic DNA isolated from two adult male whiteflies. We also constructed 13 BAC libraries with pooling of clones and Illumina library construction according to the manufacturer’s instructions.

Genome sequencing and assembly

All libraries were sequenced on an Illumina Hiseq 2000 using 100-bp reads from both fragment ends, and raw data processed and assembled as shown (Supplemental Table S1; Supplemental Fig. S1). Briefly, a series of filtering steps was performed on the raw reads to filter out the following: (1) reads with >10% Ns, >40% low-quality bases, >10 bp overlapping with adapter sequences, allowing no more than 3-bp mismatches; (2) paired-end reads that overlapped >10 bp between two ends, with insert size >200-bp libraries; and (3) duplicated reads generated by PCR amplification during the construction of the large-insert library. Filtered reads were used for K-mer determination within subsequent assembly steps. The frequency of each K-mer was calculated from the genome-sequence reads. K-mer frequencies along the sequence depth gradient follow a Poisson distribution in a given data set except for a high proportion at low frequency due to sequencing errors, as K-mers that contain such sequencing errors may be orphans among all splitting K-mers. The genome size, G, was estimated as G = K_num/K_depth, where K_num is the total number of K-mers and K_depth is the maximal frequency. Initial contigs were assembled from filtered 500- and 800-bp insert-size WGA PE libraries using SOAPdenovo. The sequencing reads obtained for 2-k to 40-kb MP libraries were used to connect the contigs and to generate the scaffolds as described by Li et al. (2010) [14] with a K-mer size of 65.

Individual BAC pools were assembled independently using SOAPdenovo and the whole genome shotgun reads from PE and MP libraries were used to fill gaps in the BAC scaffolds. After sequencing, the raw reads were filtered as described above. In addition, reads representing contamination by *Escherichia coli* or the plasmid vector were filtered. The pooled reads were sepa-
rated according to the BAC-reads index, and each BAC was assembled using a combination of “hierarchical assembly” and “de Bruijn graph assembly.” First, the reads linked to each BAC were assembled using SOAPdenovo [14], with various combinations of parameters with a K-mer range from 27 to 63 and a step size of 6. The assembly with the longest scaffold N50 was defined as the “best” for each BAC. The resulting BACs were mapped with the large shotgun MP read data to optimize the assembly for each BAC.

The final draft assembly was produced by integrating sequences that overlapped among the scaffolds independently assembled from genome shotgun and BAC reads, and in doing so eliminated the redundant scaffolds using the following steps. To integrate the two assemblies, the software Rabbit [15] was applied to identify any relationship between scaffolds, to connect the overlapping regions that shared at least 90% similarity, and to remove redundancy based on a 17-mer frequency. Finally, SSPACE [16] was used to construct super-scaffolds containing 800-bp to 40-kb whole genome sequence (WGS) reads, and the 170- to 800-bp genome shotgun read data were used to fill the gaps using GapCloser [14]. Postassembly processing included removal of contaminating bacterial and viral DNA sequences by aligning all assembled sequences to the genome sequences of viruses and bacteria, obtained from previous local BLASTn alignments and by NCBI upload filter. Aligned sequences that shared >90% identity and were >200 bp in size were filtered from the final assembly. The assembled sequences that were covered by at least one expressed sequence tag (EST) sequence were retained. Process read data were mapped to the draft MED/Q genome using SOAPaligner software and read counts were made from .bam files and the average depth was computed from all bases in the window. The relation graph of base pair percentages, and each given sequencing depth along the genome, was obtained.

Using genomic DNA from the MED/Q colony, a total of 20 WGS shotgun sequencing libraries was generated (18 pooled male and female PE and MP libraries, and two haploid male-derived WGA PE libraries), from which sequences were generated on an Illumina Hiseq2500 platform. Library sequencing produced a total of 428.2 Gb or an approximate 594.7-fold genome coverage assuming a 0.72-Gbp genome size (based on 17-mer analysis). For the 10 short-insert PE libraries, there were a total of 229.4 Gb (100-bp or 150-bp read length, approximately 318.6-fold genome coverage). Sequencing the eight large-insert (>1 kb) MP libraries produced 80.3 Gb of reads (49 bp read length, 111.5-fold coverage) for use in scaffold construction (Supplemental Table S1). The two male WGA libraries produced a total of 118.5 Gb of data (Supplemental Table S1) or approximately 164.6-fold genome coverage. Sequencing of 13 BAC pools generated 362.6 Gbp of raw data (288.4 Gbp processed data; results not shown). The subsequent assembly of this sequence data using our pipeline (Supplemental Fig. S1) generated a 658-Mbp draft genome assembly for MED/Q consistent with recent flow cytometry estimates [17]. The mean read depth across 10-kb windows indicated that all genome regions were highly represented within the read data, with >1.5% having a depth of >10× (remaining data not shown).

Through statistical comparison of genome assembly and annotation between MED/Q and MEAM1/B (Table 1), we found the draft genome of MED/Q consisted of a genome size of 658 Mb with contig N50 size 44 kb, while MEAM1/B assembly was 615 Mb with contig N50 of 30 kb. They have similar G+C content of about 39%, while higher TE existed in MEAM1/B (44%) than MED/Q (40%). After combining several annotation methods, 20 748 genes were predicted in MED/Q, whereas 15 664 genes in MEAM1/B, and about 80% of both two gene sets were supported by several public functional databases.

**Annotation of repetitive elements**

Repetitive elements were searched for and identified using Repeatmasker [18] implemented in TRF software [19], and a de novo approach implemented in Filer [20]. For the Repeatbase-based method, two software programs named RepeatMasker [21] and RepeatPro-

---

**Table 1: Statistics comparison of genome assembly and annotation between MED/Q and MEAM1/B**

| Sequecing summary | Scaffold | Contig | Scaffold | Contig |
|------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Total number     | 4954    | 29 618 | 19 761  | 52 036 |
| Total length of (bp) | 658 272 463 | 638 061 971 | 615 029 878 | 599 923 598 |
| Gap number (bp)  | 19 828 575 | 0      | 14 380 491 | 0    |
| Average length (bp) | 132 877 | 21 543 | 31 123 | 11 529 |
| N50 length (bp)  | 436 791 | 44 366 | 3 232 964 | 29 918 |
| N90 length (bp)  | 111 835 | 11 504 | 381 346 | 6117 |
| Maximum length (bp) | 2 857 362 | 362 835 | 11 178 615 | 267 706 |
| Minimum length (bp) | 501     | 500    | 500     | 500    |
| GC content (%)    | 39.46   | 39.46  | 39.64   | 39.64  |
| TEs proportion (%)| 265 Mb (0.40) | 269 Mb (0.44) | 100      | 100    |
| CEGMA evaluation (%) | 96    | 1      | 100     | 1      |
| BUSCO evaluation  | 78      | 96.8   | 96.8    | 96.8   |
| Gene number       | 20 786  | 15 664 | 6       | 6      |
| Average gene length (bp) | 10 065 | 22 762 | 1470    | 1470   |
| Average CDS length (bp) | 1952 | 6       | 3125    | 3125   |
| Average exon per gene | 6         | 6              | 81      | 81      |
| Average exon length (bp) | 351 | 234     | 3125    | 3125   |
| Average intron length (bp) | 1776 | 3125    | 3125    | 3125   |
| Annotation gene (%) | 79.97   | 81     | 81      | 81      |
| Assemble software  | SOAPdenovo | 78      | Platanus | 78     |

*a*From this study  
*b*From the published MEAM1/B genome [11].  
*c*Only contigs and scaffolds ≥500 bp were included in the genome assembly.
teinMask were used to identify repetitive sequences. In the de novo approach, Pilere-Df-1.0 [20], RepeatScout-1.0.5 [22], and LTR-FINDER-1.0.5 [23] were used to build de novo repeat libraries from the genome sequences. Finally, the repeated sequences were searched for and classified using the RepeatMasker software. Homology-based annotation of MED/Q repeat elements was queried against Repbase v.20.05 [18] with RepeatMasker [21]. We found a total of 265.0 Mb TEs, or 40.3% of the MED/Q genome size. This was about 10% higher than the repeat contents of Acyrthosiphon pisum and Rhodnius prolixus, but similar to that of Nilaparvata lugens (39.8%) (Supplemental Table S2). This suggests that long terminal repeat (LTR) (18.5%) are more abundant and contain more nucleotides than all other TE classes. This proliferation of LTR retrotransposons has been found in only one other Hemipteran genome, that of N. lugens (12.29%). The MED/Q genome also contains the high proportion of the DNA-transposon TEs (12.92%) found in other fully described Hemipteran genomes. As with both N. lugens (0.5%) and R. prolixus (0.01%), the MED/Q genome also devoid of short interspersed nuclear elements (0.96%). These other Hemipteran genomes also contain a small amount of long interspersed nuclear elements (A. pism: 2.6%; MED/Q: 3.18%; R. prolixus: 3.2%), but N. lugens (12.84%). This suggests that MED/Q-specific TEs, especially the LTRs, have evolved relatively recently and contribute to the large number of gene sets.

Annotation of coding regions

Initial evaluation of the gene coverage rate in the draft MED/Q genome assembly was assessed by comparing against 248 core eukaryotic genes obtained using CEGMA 2.4 [24] and Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Orthologs (BUSCO) [25]. Additionally, 105,067 B. tabaci transcript sequences, ESTs, of >200 bp were used as BLASTN queries against the assembled genome to estimate the representation (cutoff E-value ≥ 10^-40). Protein-coding gene de novo predictions using GENEWISE [26] and ab initio gene predictions using GENSCAN [27] and AUGUSTUS [28] were made in combination with 13.7 Gbp of transcriptome (RNA-Seq) data including published MED/Q B. tabaci body, guts, and salivary glands [29–31] and additional, previously unpublished data from females and males [32], to obtain consensus gene sets using GLEAN [33].

For homolog-based prediction, protein sequences from nine species (A. pism, A. mellifera, D. melanogaster, R. prolixus, Z. nevadensis, A. gambiae, B. mori, P. humanus, and T. castaneum) were aligned with the MED/Q genome scaffolds using TblastN (E-value <1e-5). Target sequences were used to search for accurate gene structures implementing the GeneWise software [26]. For the RNA-Seq datasets, the transcriptome reads were first aligned against the genome using TopHat [33] to identify candidate exon regions. Then, the Cufflinks software [34] was used to assemble the aligned reads into transcripts, and the open reading frames were predicted to obtain reliable transcripts using a Hidden Markov Model-based training parameter. Finally, GLEAN [33] was used to integrate the predicted genes with the de novo, homologous, and RNAseq data to produce the final gene set. The functional annotation of genes was performed using BLASTP alignment to KEGG [35], SwissProt, and TriEMBL [36] databases. Motifs and domains were determined by InterProScan [37] and protein database searches against ProDom, PRINTS, Pfam, SMART, PANTHER, and PROSITE.

Preliminary evaluation of transcribed regions within the draft MED/Q genome assembly coverage found that ~95.2% of B. tabaci ESTs > 200 bp were present, with 90,652 ESTs showing ≥90% length coverage on one scaffold (Supplemental Table S7). This alignment encompassed 92.9% of nucleotides within the EST dataset. Analogously, 229 (96%) of the 248 sequences in the CEGMA gene set and 79% complete and fragmented BUSCOs were present in the MED/Q genome assembly (remaining data not shown). The final GLEAN gene models predicted a reference gene set of 20,786 protein-coding genes, a consensus result derived from de novo, orthology, and evidence (RNA-seq)-based prediction methods (Supplemental Table S3) and integrated into GLEAN gene models (Supplemental Table S5). Among the GLEAN gene models, 16,622 (79.97%) received functional gene annotations using the various databases queried in our analysis pipeline (Supplemental Table S5).

Prediction of gene orthology

Twelve insect species including B. tabaci (Genn.) (Gennadius, 1889) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae), Acyrthosiphon pisum (Harris, 1776) (Hemiptera: Aphididae), Rhodnius prolixus (Stal, 1859) (Hemiptera: Triatominae), Nilaparvata lugens (Stål, 1854) (Hemiptera: Delphacidae), Pediculus humanus (Linnaeus, 1758) (Phthiraptera: Pediculidae), Apis mellifera (Linnaeus, 1758) (Hymenoptera, Apidae), Nasonia vitripennis (Ashmead, 1904) (Hymenoptera, Pteromalidae), Tribolium castaneum (Herbst, 1797) (Coleoptera, Tenebrionidae), Anopheles gambiae (Giles, 1902) (Diptera, Culicidae), Drosophila melanogaster (Meigen, 1830) (Diptera, Drosophilidae), Bombyx mori (Linnaeus, 1758) (Lepidoptera, Bombycidae) and Danaus plexippus (Klug, 1802) (Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae), and two divergent arthropods, Daphnia pulex (Müller, 1785) (O. Cladocera, Daphniidae) and Tetranychus urticae (C. L. Koch, 1836) (O. Arachnida, Tetranychidae), were used to predict orthologs and to reconstruct the phylogenetic tree. Gene families were identified using TreeFam [38,39], and single-copy gene families were assembled to reconstruct phylogenetic relationships. Coding sequences of each single-copy family were concatenated to form one super gene group for each species. All of the nucleotides at codon position 2 of these concatenated genes were extracted to construct the phylogenetic tree by PhyML [40], with a gamma distribution across sites and an HKY+8 substitution model. The same set of sequences at codon position 2 was used to estimate divergence times among lineages. The fossil calibrations were set with two previous node data [41,42]. The PAML mcmctree program (v.4.5) [43,44] was used to compute split times using the approximate likelihood calculation algorithm. The software Tracer (v.1.5.0) was utilized to examine the extent of convergence for two independent runs.

Phylogenetic analysis based on orthologs across 14 arthropod taxa (Supplemental Table S6) suggested that MED/Q is clustered into a hemipteran clade containing A. pism and is a sister lineage to a clade containing both R. prolixus and N. lugens (Fig. 1A). The range of species-specific genes within the four hemipteran genomes ranged from 38% to 60%, with higher values for the three phloem-feeding specialists. This led us to investigate interspecific changes in the number and diversity of gene family members (orthologs and paralogs) within this group.

Figure 1C: Phylogenetic analysis based on orthologs across 14 arthropod taxa (Supplemental Table S6) suggested that MED/Q is clustered into a hemipteran clade containing A. pism and is a sister lineage to a clade containing both R. prolixus and N. lugens. This genome assembly will provide a valuable resource for studying climatic and host plant adaptations, invasive-invasive and native-exotic interactions, insecticide resistance, vector competence, and its relationships with bacterial endosymbionts.
Genome sequencing of sweetpotato whitefly

Figure 1: Phylogenetic relationships and genomic comparisons between Bemisia tabaci and other insect species (A) Phylogenetic relationships of B. tabaci (BEMTA) to insects and other arthropods based on single-copy orthologous genes present in their complete genomes. The following 12 insect species were used for this analysis: Acyrthosiphon pism (ACYPI), Anopheles gambiae (ANOGA), Apis mellifera (APIME), BEMTA, Bombyx mori (BOMMO), Danaus plexippus (DANPL), Drosophila melanogaster (DROME), Nasonia vitripennis (NASVI), Nilaparvata lugens (NILLU), Pediculus humanus (PEDHU), Rhodnius prolixus (RHOPR), and Tribolium castaneum (TRICA). The two arthropods Daphnia pulex (DAPPL) and Tetranychus urticae (TETUR) were used as outgroup taxa. Branch lengths represent divergence times estimated for the second codon position of 308 single-copy genes, using PhyML with a gamma distribution across sites and a HKY85 substitution model. The branch supports were inferred based on the approximate likelihood ratio test (aLRT). Gene orthology was determined by comparing the genomes of these 14 arthropod species. The use of 1:1:1 refers to single-copy gene orthologs found across all 14 lineages. The use of N:N:N refers to multi-copy gene paralogs found across the 14 lineages. Diptera, Hemiptera, Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera, and Insecta refer to taxon-specific genes present only in the particular lineage. SD indicates species-specific duplicated genes, and ND indicates species-specific unclustered genes. (B) Image of adult MED/Q. (C) A Venn diagram showing the orthologous groups shared among the hemipteran genomes of A. pism, B. tabaci, N. lugens, and R. prolixus. Our analysis found 3341 gene families common to all four hemipteran genomes, and 2921 common to the genomes of the six vascular (blood and phloem) feeders.

Availability of supporting data

This whole genome shotgun project has been deposited at DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank under the accession LIED00000000. The version described in this paper is version LIED01000000 accessible at NCBI. Further data, including annotation files and assembled transcripts, are available in the GigaScience GigaDB repository [32].
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