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**Abstract**

We present a genome assembly from an individual male *Nemurella pictetii* (Arthropoda; Insecta; Plecoptera; Nemouridae). The genome sequence is 257 megabases in span. The majority of the assembly (99.79%) is scaffolded into 12 chromosomal pseudomolecules, with the X sex chromosome assembled. The X chromosome was found at half coverage, but no Y chromosome was found. The mitochondrial genome was assembled, and is 16.0 kb in length.
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Species taxonomy
Eukaryota; Metazoa; Ecdysozoa; Arthropoda; Hexapoda; Insecta; Pterygota; Neoptera; Polyneoptera; Plecoptera; Nemouridea; Nemouridae; Nemourinae; Nemurella; *Nemurella pictetii* Klapalek, 1900 (NCBI:txid143722).

Background
*Nemurella pictetii* is a western palearctic species found from northern Spain to Siberia, and throughout the British Isles, although appears to be less common in Scotland. It is considered a eurytherm and can be found in a variety of habitats from rivers and streams to ponds and lakes. It does not appear to have any altitudinal preference; however, in Ireland it is more usually encountered in streams draining peaty soils usually at higher altitudes and in small headwater streams and seepages (Baars & Kelly-Quinn, 2006; Hynes, 1977). In Great Britain and Europe, larvae are known to occur in small upland lakes with stony shorelines and in vegetated ponds, wetlands and marshes (e.g. Lillemhammer (1975), Macadam (2015), Wolf & Zwick (1989)). Larvae are often common and can be numerous in small trickles and streams with dense vegetation, woody material and/or organic matter (Costello et al., 1984; Feeley et al., 2019; Graf et al., 2009; Wolf & Zwick, 1989), but generally they are scarce, only occurring in low densities. They are also highly tolerant of low pH and conductivity (Baars & Kelly-Quinn, 2006; Feeley, 2012; Murphy et al., 2013). Both Brittain (1991) and Baars & Kelly-Quinn (2006) report this species as somewhat tolerant of nutrient enrichment. Larvae are opportunistic feeders utilising a broad range of food sources, but preferring biofilm (Lieske & Zwick, 2007).

*Nemurella pictetii* is the sole representative of the genus *Nemurella*. The high-quality genome sequence described here is, to our knowledge, the first one reported for *N. pictetii*. This assembly, generated as part of the Darwin Tree of Life project, also represents a high-quality addition to an underrepresented taxon (Plecoptera) and wider group of insects (aquatic insects) (Hotaling et al., 2020). The genome sequence for *N. pictetii* will aid in understanding the biology, physiology and ecology of the species.

**Genome sequence report**
The genome was sequenced from one male *N. pictetii* (Figure 1) collected from River Taff Fawr, Garwnant, Wales (latitude 51.8082, longitude -3.4449). A total of 68-fold coverage in Pacific Biosciences single-molecule long reads and 183-fold coverage in 10X Genomics read clouds were generated. Primary assembly contigs were scaffolded with chromosome conformation Hi-C data. Manual assembly curation corrected 62 missing/misjoins and removed 8 haplotypic duplications, reducing the assembly size by 2.35% and scaffold number by 65.52% and increasing the scaffold N50 by 8.35%.

The final assembly has a total length of 257 Mb in 20 sequence scaffolds with a scaffold N50 of 24.6 Mb (Table 1). The majority of the assembly sequence (99.79%) was assigned to 12 chromosomal-level scaffolds, representing 11 autosomes (numbered by sequence length), and the X sex chromosome (Figure 1–Figure 4; Table 2). The sex of the specimen was identified as male (unknown sex, Hi-C).

### Table 1. Genome data for *Nemurella pictetii*, ipNemPict2.1.

| Project accession data          |          |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Assembly identifier            | ipNemPict2.1 |
| Species                        | *Nemurella pictetii* |
| Specimen                       | ipNemPict2 (male, genome assembly); ipNemPict1 (unknown sex, Hi-C) |
| NCBI taxonomy ID               | NCBI:txid143722 |
| BioProject                     | PRJEB47468 |
| BioSample ID                   | SAMEA7520996 |
| Isolate information            | Male, whole organism (ipNemPict2); unknown sex, whole organism (ipNemPict1) |

**Raw data accessions**
- PacificBiosciences SEQUEL II: ERR6808073, ERR6909090, ERR6939286, ERR6939287
- 10X Genomics Illumina: ERR6688441-ERR6688448
- Hi-C Illumina: ERR6688440

**Genome assembly**
- Assembly accession: GCA_921293315.1
- Accession of alternate haplotype: GCA_921293065.1
- Span (Mb): 257
- Number of contigs: 105
- Contig N50 length (Mb): 9.6
- Number of scaffolds: 20
- Scaffold N50 length (Mb): 24.6
- Longest scaffold (Mb): 37.3

**BUSCO+ genome score**
C: 98.8% [S: 98.0%, D: 0.8%], F: 0.4%, M: 0.8%, N: 1367

*BUSCO+ scores based on the insecta_odb10 BUSCO set using v5.1.2.*
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Figure 1. Genome assembly of *Nemurella pictetii*, ipNemPict2.1: metrics. The BlobToolKit Snailplot shows N50 metrics and BUSCO gene completeness. The main plot is divided into 1,000 size-ordered bins around the circumference with each bin representing 0.1% of the 257,052,056 bp assembly. The distribution of scaffold lengths is shown in dark grey with the plot radius scaled to the longest scaffold present in the assembly (37,341,160 bp, shown in red). Orange and pale-orange arcs show the N50 and N90 scaffold lengths (24,564,665 and 12,448,030 bp), respectively. The pale grey spiral shows the cumulative scaffold count on a log scale with white scale lines showing successive orders of magnitude. The blue and pale-blue area around the outside of the plot shows the distribution of GC, AT and N percentages in the same bins as the inner plot. A summary of complete, fragmented, duplicated and missing BUSCO genes in the insecta_odb10 set is shown in the top right. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/CAKLCZ01/dataset/CAKLCZ01/snail.

determined to be male as chromosome X was found at half coverage, despite no evidence of the presence of a Y chromosome. The assembly has a BUSCO v5.1.2 (Manni et al., 2021) completeness of 98.8% (single 98.0%, duplicated 0.8%) using the insecta_odb10 reference set (n=1,367). While not fully phased, the assembly deposited is of one haplotype. Contigs corresponding to the second haplotype have also been deposited.

Methods
Sample acquisition and DNA extraction
Two *N. pictetii* specimens (ipNemPict1, unknown sex, and ipNemPict2, male) were collected from River Taff Fawr, Garwnant, Wales (latitude 51.8082, longitude -3.4449) by Natural Resources Wales using a kick-net. The sample was identified by representatives of the same body and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen. Unfortunately, no images of the samples are available.
DNA was extracted at the Tree of Life laboratory, Wellcome Sanger Institute. The ipNemPict2 sample was weighed and dissected on dry ice. Whole organism tissue was cryogenically disrupted to a fine powder using a Covaris cryoPREP Automated Dry Pulveriser, receiving multiple impacts. Fragment size analysis of 0.01–0.5 ng of DNA was then performed using an Agilent FemtoPulse. High molecular weight (HMW) DNA was extracted using the Qiagen MagAttract HMW DNA extraction kit. Low molecular weight DNA was removed from a 200-ng aliquot of extracted DNA using 0.8X AMPure XP purification kit prior to 10X Chromium sequencing; a minimum of 50 ng DNA was submitted for 10X sequencing. HMW DNA was sheared into an average fragment size between 12–20 kb in a Megaruptor 3 system with speed setting 30. Sheared DNA was purified by solid-phase reversible immobilisation using AMPure PB beads with a 1.8X ratio of beads to sample to remove the shorter fragments and concentrate the DNA sample. The concentration of the sheared and purified DNA was assessed using a Nanodrop spectrophotometer and Qubit Fluorometer and Qubit dsDNA High Sensitivity Assay kit. Fragment size distribution was evaluated by running the sample on the FemtoPulse system.

**Sequencing**

Pacific Biosciences HiFi circular consensus and 10X Genomics Chromium read cloud sequencing libraries were constructed according to the manufacturers’ instructions. Sequencing was performed by the Scientific Operations core at the Wellcome Sanger Institute on Pacific Biosciences SEQUEL II (HiFi) and Illumina NovaSeq 6000 (10X) instruments. Hi-C data were generated from whole organism tissue of ipNemPict1 using the Arima Hi-C+ kit and sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq X instrument.

**Genome assembly**

Assembly was carried out with Hifiasm (Cheng et al., 2021); haplotypic duplication was identified and removed with...
**Figure 3.** Genome assembly of *Nemurella pictetii*, ipNemPict2.1: cumulative sequence. BlobToolKit cumulative sequence plot. The grey line shows cumulative length for all scaffolds. Coloured lines show cumulative lengths of scaffolds assigned to each phylum using the buscogenes taxrule. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/CAKLCZ01/dataset/CAKLCZ01/cumulative.

**Figure 4.** Genome assembly of *Nemurella pictetii*, ipNemPict2.1: Hi-C contact map. Hi-C contact map of the ipNemPict2.1 assembly, visualised in HiGlass. Chromosomes are shown in order of size from left to right and top to bottom.
purge_dups (Guan et al., 2020). One round of polishing was performed by aligning 10X Genomics read data to the assembly with longranger align, calling variants with freebayes (Garrison & Marth, 2012). The assembly was then scaffolded with Hi-C data (Rao et al., 2014) using SALSA2 (Ghurye et al., 2019). The assembly was checked for contamination as described previously (Howe et al., 2021). Manual curation (Howe et al., 2021) was performed using HiGlass (Kerpedjiev et al., 2018) and Pretext. The mitochondrial genome was assembled using MitoHiFi (Uliano-Silva et al., 2021), which performs annotation using MitoFinder (Allio et al., 2020). The genome was analysed and BUSCO scores generated within the BlobToolKit environment (Challis et al., 2020). Table 3 contains a list of all software tool versions used, where appropriate.

**Ethics/compliance issues**
The materials that have contributed to this genome note have been supplied by a Darwin Tree of Life Partner. The submission of materials by a Darwin Tree of Life Partner is subject to the Darwin Tree of Life Project Sampling Code of Practice. By agreeing with and signing up to the Sampling Code of Practice, the Darwin Tree of Life Partner agrees they will meet the legal and ethical requirements and standards set out within this document in respect of all samples acquired for, and

### Table 2. Chromosomal pseudomolecules in the genome assembly of *Nemurella picteti*, ipNemPict2.1.

| INSDC accession | Chromosome | Size (Mb) | GC% |
|-----------------|------------|-----------|-----|
| OV121115.1      | 1          | 37.34     | 43.7|
| OV121117.1      | 2          | 28.23     | 43.9|
| OV121118.1      | 3          | 27.56     | 44.2|
| OV121119.1      | 4          | 24.56     | 44.5|
| OV121120.1      | 5          | 22.19     | 43.8|
| OV121121.1      | 6          | 17.00     | 44.6|
| OV121122.1      | 7          | 15.30     | 44.2|
| OV121123.1      | 8          | 14.27     | 44.7|
| OV121124.1      | 9          | 12.45     | 45.0|
| OV121125.1      | 10         | 12.20     | 44.4|
| OV121126.1      | 11         | 11.63     | 43.2|
| OV121116.1      | X          | 32.95     | 41.1|
| OV121127.1      | MT         | 0.02      | 29.3|
| - Unplaced      |            | 1.35      | 44.3|

### Table 3. Software tools used.

| Software tool   | Version      | Source                                      |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Hifiasm         | 0.15.3       | Cheng et al., 2021                         |
| purge_dups      | 1.2.3        | Guan et al., 2020                          |
| SALSA2          | 2.2          | Ghurye et al., 2019                        |
| longranger align| 2.2.2        | https://support.10xgenomics.com/genome-exome/software/pipelines/latest/advanced/other-pipelines |
| freebayes       | 1.3.1-17-gaa2ace8 | Garrison & Marth, 2012                     |
| MitoHiFi        | 2.0          | Uliano-Silva et al., 2021                  |
| HiGlass         | 1.11.6       | Kerpedjiev et al., 2018                    |
| PretextView     | 0.2.x        | https://github.com/wtsi-hpag/PretextView   |
| BlobToolKit     | 2.6.4        | Challis et al., 2020                       |
supplied to, the Darwin Tree of Life Project. Each transfer of samples is further undertaken according to a Research Collaboration Agreement or Material Transfer Agreement entered into by the Darwin Tree of Life Partner, Genome Research Limited (operating as the Wellcome Sanger Institute), and in some circumstances other Darwin Tree of Life collaborators.

**Data availability**

European Nucleotide Archive: Nemoura pictetii. Accession number PRJEB47468; [identifiers.org/ena.embl/PRJEB47468] (identifiers.org)

The genome sequence is released openly for reuse. The Nemoura pictetii genome sequencing initiative is part of the Darwin Tree of Life (DToL) project. All raw sequence data and the assembly have been deposited in INSDC databases. The genome will be annotated and presented through the Ensembl pipeline at the European Bioinformatics Institute. Raw data and assembly accession identifiers are reported in Table 1.
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Table 1: Summary of the status of the Plecoptera of Irish freshwater.
Andrew J. Veale
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In the Background section, "although appears to be less common in Scotland" should be "although it appears to be less common in Scotland".

In the methods you should identify what life stage each of the individuals was - are these adults or juveniles, and if juvenile, which instar?

In stonefly genomics I have found issues with contamination from filamentous algae and diatoms in particular, which you appear not to have had issues with. When you say whole organism tissue what do you mean? Was the gut present? Was the outer cuticle present? My assumption is that you had an adult and dissected out the gut but it would be good to confirm.

Were any tissues stored for museum accession?

Was species ID confirmed through mitochondrial sequences?

Having an XO sex determination system appears relatively common in Plecoptera, as it appears to be in this species\(^1\). This should probably be made explicit.

I have no issues with the genome assembly and methods therein - it looks like a high quality assembly.

Good luck!
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In this study, Macadam and colleagues report the assembly of a high-quality stonefly genome—the best to date for this entire order of insects. The study and methods contain no notable flaws and I see no issues in terms of its scientific robustness.

**Background:**
- One missing component - placing this genome assembly in context for the group and insects as a whole. It fills a major niche for Plecoptera and adds a key species for aquatic insects broadly which are dramatically underrepresented (see my article Hotaling et al. 2020¹). These points can be highlighted for the reader. It might also be useful to note that the three previous stonefly genomes are exceptionally poor-quality and represent perhaps the lowest quality group of assemblies for any insect order (see my article Hotaling et al. 2021, Figure 1d²). Adding these references is far from critical to the report’s effectiveness. They would simply be "value added" for a future reader seeking broader context in terms of insect genomics.
  - Also there are double parentheses in the first paragraph of the section in the PDF, mid-way through. These may need correction.

**Genome sequence report:**
- Described as being a female specimen in the first sentence but later as male. This should be confirmed/corrected.

**Genome assembly:**
- There is a space missing in the PDF between “Table 3“ and “contains” on the top of pg. 7.
  - In this study, Macadam and colleagues report the assembly of a high-quality stonefly genome—the best to date for this entire order of insects.
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