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Abstract
We present a genome assembly from an individual male Biston betularia (the peppered moth; Arthropoda; Insecta; Lepidoptera; Geometridae). The genome sequence is 405 megabases in span. The majority of the assembly (99.99%) is scaffolded into 31 chromosomal pseudomolecules, with the Z sex chromosome assembled. Gene annotation of this assembly on Ensembl has identified 12,251 protein coding genes.
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Species taxonomy
Eukaryota; Metazoa; Ecdysozoa; Arthropoda; Hexapoda; Insecta; Pterygota; Neoptera; Endopterygota; Lepidoptera; Glossata; Ditrysia; Geometroidea; Geometridae; Ennominae; Biston; Biston betularia Linnaeus, 1758 (NCBI:txid82595).

Background
The peppered moth, Biston betularia, is widely distributed throughout Europe, Asia and North America. The species has one generation per year, with adults flying between May and August in England. Larvae mimic twigs in their form, and can even change colour to match their surroundings (Eacock et al., 2019; Eacock et al., 2017). Larvae feed on a wide variety of deciduous trees and bushes, including birch, blackthorn and roses. Individuals overwinter underground as pupae. A pale typica form is white, peppered with black on wings and body while a melanic, carbonaria form with white spots is associated with areas with higher atmospheric pollution levels. The two forms can interbreed resulting in intermediate forms. Genetically distinct are insularia, with a range of intermediate colour patterns. Industrial melanism in the peppered moth is a classic example of rapid adaptive response to environmental change (Cook, 2003). High levels of coal pollution during the industrial revolution led to a rise in the frequency of the carbonaria form in urban areas due to selective predation. In recent decades, the frequency of the melanic form has decreased, in line with reduced pollution levels. The genetic basis of industrial melanism has been attributed to the insertion of a large transposable element into the first intron of the gene cortex (Van’t Hof et al., 2016). This event occurred in Britain in approximately 1819, in line with the historical record (Van’t Hof et al., 2016). Interestingly, cortex has been repeatedly associated with colour pattern variation in diverse lepidopteran species, including in Heliconius butterflies where it is a major determinant of scale cell identity (Livraghi et al., 2021; Nadeau et al., 2016; Van Belleghem et al., 2017). Biston betularia has a karyotype of 31 chromosomes (Van’t Hof et al., 2013).

Genome sequence report
The genome was sequenced from one male B. betularia (Figure 1) collected from Wytham Woods, Oxfordshire (biological vice-county: Berkshire), UK (latitude 51.772, longitude -1.338). A total of 27-fold coverage in Pacific Biosciences single-molecule long reads and 91-fold coverage in 10X Genomics read clouds were generated. Primary assembly contigs were scaffolded with chromosome conformation Hi-C data. Manual assembly curation corrected 8 missing/misjoins, reducing the scaffold number by 15.79% and increasing the scaffold N50 by 2.39%.

The final assembly has a total length of 405 Mb in 32 sequence scaffolds with a scaffold N50 of 14.7 Mb (Table 1). The majority of the assembly sequence (99.99%) was assigned to 31 chromosomal-level scaffolds, representing 30 autosomes (numbered by sequence length, and the Z chromosome

Figure 1. Image of the iLBisBetu1 specimen taken prior to preservation and processing. Specimen shown next to FluidX storage tube, 43.9 mm in length.
The assembly has a BUSCO v5.1.2 (Manni et al., 2021) completeness of 98.7% (single 98.3%, duplicated 0.4%) using the lepidoptera_odb10 reference set. While not fully phased, the assembly deposited is of one haplotype. Contigs corresponding to the second haplotype have also been deposited.

Genome annotation report
The ilBisBetu1.1 genome was annotated using the Ensembl rapid annotation pipeline (Table 1; https://rapid.ensembl.org/Biston_betularia_GCA_905404145.1/). The resulting annotation includes 19,758 transcribed mRNAs from 12,251 protein-coding and 2,985 non-coding genes. There are 1.61 coding transcripts per gene and 7.88 exons per transcript.

Methods
Sample acquisition and DNA extraction
A single male B. betularia (ilBisBetu1) was collected from Wytham Woods, Oxfordshire (biological vice-county: Berkshire), UK (latitude 51.772, longitude -1.338) by Douglas Boyes, UKCEH, using a light trap. The sample was identified by the same individual, and preserved on dry ice.

Table 1. Genome data for Biston betularia, ilBisBetu1.1.

| Project accession data |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Assembly identifier     | ilBisBetu1.2 |
| Species                | Biston betularia |
| Specimen               | ilBisBetu1 |
| NCBI taxonomy ID       | NCBI:txid82595 |
| BioProject             | PRJEB43794 |
| BioSample ID           | SAMEA7520512 |
| Isolate information    | Male, thorax/abdomen (genome assembly), head (Hi-C) |

| Genome assembly        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Assembly accession     | GCA_905404145.2 |
| Accession of alternate haplotype | GCA_905404215.1 |
| Span (Mb)              | 405 |
| Number of contigs      | 43 |
| Contig N50 length (Mb) | 14.0 |
| Number of scaffolds    | 32 |
| Scaffold N50 length (Mb) | 14.7 |
| Longest scaffold (Mb)  | 17.1 |
| BUSCO* genome score    | C:98.7%, S:98.3%, D:0.4%, F:0.4%, M:0.9%, n:5286 |

| Genome annotation      |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Number of protein-coding genes | 12,251 |
| Average coding sequence length (bp) | 1,547.96 |
| Average number of exons per transcript | 7.88 |
| Average exon length (bp) | 329.93 |
| Average intron size (bp) | 2,082.45 |

*BUSCO scores based on the lepidoptera_odb10 BUSCO set using v5.2.2. C= complete [S= single copy, D=duplicated], F= fragmented, M= missing, n= number of orthologues in comparison. A full set of BUSCO scores is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/ilBisBetu1.1/dataset/CAJQEU01/busc.
**Figure 2. Genome assembly of *Biston betularia*, ilBisBetu1.1: 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 404,525,905 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 (18,795,478 bp, shown in red). Orange and pale-orange arcs show the N50 and N90 scaffold lengths (14,733,994 and 9,789,996 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 lepidoptera_odb10 set is shown in the top right. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/ilBisBetu1.2/dataset/CAJQEU02/snail.

DNA was extracted at the Tree of Life laboratory, Wellcome Sanger Institute. The ilBisBetu1 sample was weighed and dissected on dry ice with tissue set aside for Hi-C sequencing. Thorax 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 HiSeq X (10X) instruments. Hi-C data were generated from head tissue using the Arima Hi-C+ kit and sequenced on HiSeq X.

Genome assembly
Assembly was carried out with Hifiasm (Cheng et al., 2021); haplotypic duplication was identified and removed with 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.

Figure 3. Genome assembly of *Biston betularia*, ilBisBetu1.2: GC coverage. BlobToolKit GC-coverage plot. Scaffolds are coloured by phylum. Circles are sized in proportion to scaffold length. Histograms show the distribution of scaffold length sum along each axis. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/ilBisBetu1.2/dataset/CAJQEU02/blob.
and corrected using the gEVAL system (Chow et al., 2016) as described previously (Howe et al., 2021). Manual curation (Howe et al., 2021) was performed using gEVAL, 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.

**Genome annotation**

The Ensembl gene annotation system (Aken et al., 2016) was used to generate annotation for the Biston betularia assembly (GCA_905404145.1). Annotation was created primarily through alignment of transcriptomic data to the genome, with gap filling via protein-to-genome alignments of a select set of proteins from UniProt (UniProt Consortium, 2019).

**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,
Figure 5. Genome assembly of *Biston betularia*, ilBisBetu1.2: Hi-C contact map. Hi-C contact map of the ilBisBetu1.2 assembly, visualised in HiGlass. Chromosomes are shown in order of size from left to right and top to bottom. An interactive version of this map is available here.

Table 2. Chromosomal pseudomolecules in the genome assembly of *Biston betularia*, ilBisBetu1.1.

| INSDC accession | Chromosome | Size (Mb) | GC% |
|-----------------|------------|-----------|-----|
| FR989863.1      | 1          | 17.11     | 36.7|
| FR989864.1      | 2          | 17.08     | 36.5|
| FR989865.1      | 3          | 16.63     | 36.7|
| FR989866.1      | 4          | 16.55     | 36.7|
| FR989867.1      | 5          | 16.27     | 36.4|
| FR989868.1      | 6          | 15.89     | 36.1|
| FR989869.1      | 7          | 15.72     | 36.4|
| FR989870.1      | 8          | 15.42     | 36.3|
| FR989871.1      | 9          | 15.10     | 36.4|
| FR989872.1      | 10         | 15.08     | 36.2|
| FR989873.1      | 11         | 14.79     | 36.5|
| FR989874.1      | 12         | 14.73     | 36.7|
| FR989875.1      | 13         | 14.73     | 36.5|
| FR989876.1      | 14         | 14.39     | 36.5|
| FR989877.1      | 15         | 14.09     | 36.7|
| FR989878.1      | 16         | 14.01     | 36.8|
| FR989862.1      | Z          | 18.80     | 36.3|
| FR989893.2      | MT         | 0.02      | 18  |
| FR989879.1      | 17         | 13.31     | 36.9|
| FR989880.1      | 18         | 13.14     | 36.6|
| FR989881.1      | 19         | 12.73     | 36.5|
| FR989882.1      | 20         | 12.30     | 37.1|
| FR989883.1      | 21         | 12.17     | 37.1|
| FR989884.1      | 22         | 10.08     | 37.4|
| FR989885.1      | 23         | 9.97      | 37.1|
| FR989886.1      | 24         | 9.84      | 37.3|
| FR989887.1      | 25         | 9.79      | 37.3|
| FR989888.1      | 26         | 8.39      | 37.4|
| FR989889.1      | 27         | 7.55      | 37.6|
| FR989890.1      | 28         | 6.44      | 38.5|
| FR989891.1      | 29         | 6.28      | 37.9|
| FR989892.1      | 30         | 6.08      | 38.1|
| FR989862.1      | Z          | 18.80     | 36.3|
| FR989893.2      | MT         | 0.02      | 18  |

Unplaced 0.03 49.6
and 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.

Table 3. Software tools used.

| Software tool     | Version | Source                        |
|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------|
| Hifiasm           | 0.12    | 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          | 1.0     | Uliano-Silva et al., 2021     |
| gEVAL             | N/A     | Chow et al., 2016             |
| HiGlass           | 1.1.6   | Kerpedjiev et al., 2018       |
| PretextView       | 0.1.x   | https://github.com/wtsi-hpag/PretextView |
| BlobToolKit       | 2.6.2   | Challis et al., 2020          |

Data availability

European Nucleotide Archive: Biston betularia (peppered moth). Accession number PRJEB43794; https://identifiers.org/ena.ebi.prjeb43794.

The genome sequence is released openly for reuse. The B. betularia 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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Martina Dalíková
The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, USA

The manuscript entitled “The genome sequence of the peppered moth, Biston betularia Linnaeus, 1758” presents the assembly of the genome of an iconic lepidopteran species. The text briefly describes the motivation, used methods and basic characterization of the assembly. The authors used recent sequencing and assembling methods which are reflected in the high quality of obtained results. The information provided is mostly sufficient for this type of manuscript, however, I would still appreciate it if the authors can clarify the following points:

1. What methods if any were used for genome size estimation? Or was this information obtained from previously published data? What are the comparison of estimated genome size and obtained assembly length?

2. Can you provide more information about the Ensemble annotation process? (e.g. what transcriptomes and protein sets were used).

3. Although the haploid peppered moth haploid chromosome number is 31, the authors obtained 32 scaffolds, the fate of the “extra” scaffold is unclear to me. Can authors provide more information on if this scaffold was merged with another scaffold during Hi-C data incorporation, did it remain an unassigned scaffold? If so can the assignment be done by comparing the sequence with the published linkage map?

4. The Hi-C map contains few higher density signals outside of the assigned chromosomes, can authors briefly comment on this?

Minor comment: missing "(" before Cook, 2003 reference in the Background chapter

Is the rationale for creating the dataset(s) clearly described?
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Are the protocols appropriate and is the work technically sound?
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Are sufficient details of methods and materials provided to allow replication by others?
Partly

Are the datasets clearly presented in a useable and accessible format?
Partly
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**Martin Pippel**
Max Planck Institute of Molecular Cell Biology and Genetics, Dresden, Germany

“The genome sequence of the peppered moth, *Biston betularia*” from Boyes *et al.* describes a high-quality genome assembly based on PacBio HiFi reads, 10X Genomics read clouds and HiC data.

The data note is well structured and based on the described methods and the publicly available sequencing data also reproducible by the scientific community. The primary assembly has a very high contiguity already at the contig level.

**Methods:**

Genome assembly methods are a bit short and it could be hard to reproduce the assembly without further documentation of the used program arguments. Even if all tools were run in default mode, it would be worth mentioning. Some of the used tools, such as purge_dups depend itself on other programs like minimap2. But those could not be found in Table 3. I could not find any information if all variants from Freebayes were used for the error polishing or if a variant filtering step was applied beforehand.

I do only have some minor comments and suggestions:

- I could not find the HiC read coverage in the Data Note.
- Additional statistics about the sequencing data (e.g. read length N50 of HiFi reads and 10X read clouds, kmer based genome size and heterozygosity estimates) and the final assembly (e.g. merqury QV scores, repeat content) would be nice to see as well.
Error-polishing strategies of HiFi-based assemblies are currently under debate. I assume you applied bcftools consensus on the filtered Freebayes VCF files similar to the VGP assembly pipeline (https://github.com/VGP/vgp-assembly/tree/master/pipeline). How big was the improvement based in the QV-score? Were the alternate contigs included in the longranger alignment step?

It is great that you also included the ccs bam file, including the kinetics information. A further great feature would be to make the potential methylation sites (5mc in CpG islands) available for both assemblies.

Why were different BUSCO versions used? Table 1: v5.2.2 versus Figure 2: v5.1.2.

Is the rationale for creating the dataset(s) clearly described?
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