coil: an R package for cytochrome C oxidase I (COI) DNA barcode data cleaning, translation, and error

evaluation.

Cameron M. Nugent[1,2,*], Tyler A. Elliott[2], Sujeevan Ratnasingham[2], Sarah J. Adamowicz[1]

[1] Department of Integrative Biology, University of Guelph. Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

[2] Biodiversity Institute of Ontario, University of Guelph. Guelph, Ontario, Canada

[*]Corresponding author: nugentc@uoguelph.ca

Abstract

Biological conclusions based on DNA barcoding and metabarcoding analyses can be strongly

influenced by the methods utilized for data generation and curation, leading to varying levels of success

in the separation of biological variation from experimental error. The five-prime region of cytochrome

c oxidase I (COI-5P) is the most common barcode gene with conserved structure and function that

allows for biologically informed error identification. Here we present coil (https://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=coil), an R package for the pre-processing and error assessment of COI-5P animal

barcode and metabarcode sequence data. The package contains functions for placement of barcodes

into a reading frame, accurate translation of sequences to amino acids, and highlighting insertion and

deletion errors. The analysis of 10,000 barcode sequences of varying quality demonstrated how coil can

place barcode sequences in reading frame and distinguish sequences containing indel errors from error

free sequences with greater than 97.5% accuracy. The limitations of the coil's analysis pipeline were

tested through the analysis of COI-5P sequences from the plant and fungal kingdoms as well as the

analysis of potential contaminants: nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes and *Wolbachia* COI-5P

sequences.

32 **Keywords:** COI, DNA barcoding, error identification, translation

Introduction

DNA barcoding leverages sequence diversity within standardized gene regions for the identification and classification of organisms (Hebert *et al.* 2003; Ratnasingham and Hebert 2007). Answering questions about biodiversity through DNA barcode analyses depends on the comparison of novel barcode sequences to reference libraries or the *de novo* comparison of sequences to one another (Hebert *et al.* 2004; Ratnasingham and Hebert 2007; Hubert and Hanner 2015; Elbrecht *et al.* 2018). Techniques such as DNA metabarcoding greatly expand the complexity of comparative analyses due to the increased scale and associated challenges such as additional noise in datasets (Cristescu 2014). Barcode and metabarcode output sequences can vary in terms of both length and accuracy due to a mixture of true biological variation (Pentinsaari *et al.* 2016), the primers or sequencing platforms utilized (Folmer *et al.* 1994; Hebert *et al.* 2018) and the data cleaning steps employed (Elbrecht *et al.* 2018). Defining the boundaries of the barcode region, trimming adjacent sequence information, and aligning barcode information in a common context makes barcode sequences more directly comparable, thereby allowing for more accurate analysis of the evolutionary history and relatedness of organisms.

An approximately 657bp fragment of the 5' region of the cytochrome C oxidase protein (COI-5P) is the main marker utilized in DNA barcoding of the animal kingdom (Hebert *et al.* 2003). COI-5P is a component of the last enzyme in the electron transport chain, which is essential to metabolism (Castresana *et al.* 1994; Pentinsaari *et al.* 2016). As a result, the COI-5P barcode region has particular selective constraints, especially against changes to the corresponding amino acid sequence that modify the protein structure and negatively affect metabolism (Tsukihara *et al.* 1995; Pentinsaari *et al.* 2016). The conserved amino acid sequence corresponding to the COI-5P barcode region means that translation of sequences can provide a powerful means of detecting insertion and deletion technical errors (indels) that have resulted in reading frame shifts that alter the inferred amino acid profile.

The wealth of COI-5P sequence data available and the conserved profile of the sequence

provide the information necessary for pre-processing and evaluation of novel COI-5P barcode data

(Ratnasingham and Hebert 2007; Pentinsaari *et al.* 2016; Porter and Hajibabaei 2018). At present, the

comparison and evaluation of sequences in a common context can be accomplished through the *de*

novo alignment of novel sequences, but this approach grows in computational complexity with the

volume of data and the rate of errors in the data (Elbrecht *et al.* 2018). If systematic errors exist in

novel samples, for reasons such as the tendency of a given sequencing platform more often to insert or

delete bases in certain regions of a sequence (Hebert *et al.* 2018) or due to bias related to certain

sequence motifs (Schirmer *et al.* 2016), then *de novo* alignment of data may not identify systematic

errors and instead depict these as biological variants. Another method for processing and analyzing

barcode sequences is to upload them to a public repository such as BOLD (boldsystems.org)

(Ratnasingham & Hebert 2007). If the analyses being conducted are exploratory or still in the

development stage, then a researcher may not yet be prepared to upload the data to a public repository.

Additionally, if methods and associated results are being refined, the repeated upload of sequences to

BOLD for processing and error checking can be inefficient and best left as a final step in the workflow.

A locally available tool for the establishment of reading frame for COI-5P data could allow researchers

to compare barcode data from different samples efficiently in a common context. Additionally, placing

DNA sequences in the correct reading frame permits the translation of the nucleotide sequence to

amino acids, thereby providing a means of indel identification. Insertions and deletions that introduce

frameshifts can be easily detected through the resulting drastic changes to the amino acid sequence.

Here, we present a new R package for the pre-processing of COI-5P DNA barcode data: coil.

The package provides several functions for: (1) placement of sequences in a common reading frame,

(2) trimming of sequences to the COI-5P barcode region, (3) translation of nucleotides to amino acid

sequences, and (4) estimating the likelihood that a sequence contains an insertion or deletion error. The

tool is free and publically available through CRAN (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=coil) and

GitHub (https://github.com/CNuge/coil). We demonstrate the effectiveness of coil by showing how it

can be used to align novel barcode sequences to the COI-5P profile and to identify sequences with

insertion or deletion errors, in most cases with greater than 97.5% accuracy.

Implementation

The coil package contains functions that allow new DNA barcode data to be placed into reading

frame, translated, and assessed for evidence of insertion or deletion errors (Fig. 1). The statistical

models the package uses to evaluate sequences are two profile hidden Markov models (PHMMs)

respectively trained on nucleotide and amino acid sequences of the COI-5P barcode region. Profile

hidden Markov models (PHMMs) are a specialized variant of a hidden Markov model well suited for

statistically representing biological sequences that share a common evolutionary origin (Durbin and

Eddy 1998; Eddy 1998; Wilkinson 2019). PHMMs capture information about the structure of

biological sequences, characterizing the probability of an observed character being present at the given

point in the sequence and the probability of transitioning from the observed character to the next

character in the sequence (Figs. 2, 3). The characters in the biological sequence (the nucleotide or

amino acid alphabets) constitute the observed characters (states), and these are related to a series of

unknown hidden states that further describe the characteristics of the sequence of characters (Figs. 2,

3). The PHMMs used within coil are meant to take a new DNA barcode sequence (the observed states)

and look for evidence of erroneously inserted or deleted base pairs in the sequence (the hidden states).

For coil, the observed character states are both the nucleotides and amino acids of the barcode sequence

and the hidden states are whether the given character: (1) matches the barcode profile, (2) is likely an

erroneous inserted character or (3) is evidence of a missing (deleted) character.

The coil analysis pipeline establishes the reading frame of sequences (Fig. 4) using the Viterbi

algorithm (Fig. 1) to compare the series of observed states (the DNA sequence) to the nucleotide

PHMM (Durbin and Eddy 1998; Wilkinson 2019). This algorithm determines the most likely sequence

of hidden states corresponding to the observed sequence by determining the optimal path through the

network of emission and transition probabilities, which are respectively defined as the probability of a

given base at a given position and the probability of a given base following the preceding base at the

given position. For framing of nucleotide data, the output is used to infer the presence of DNA not

matching the 657bp region defined by the boundaries of the model or missing information at the start

of the sequence (Figs. 1, 4). It is important to note that any data outside of the 657bp Folmer region

(upon which the model is trained) is removed and not utilized in subsequent translation or error

assessment; coil reports when information trimmed from the input sequence as part of this processing

step.

Translation

As a result of its ancient endosymbiotic origin, mitochondrial translation utilizes a different

genetic code from the nucleus, and this code additionally varies across taxa (Youle 2019). Coil is

therefore designed in a manner robust to the variability in animal mitochondrial genetic codes (NCBI

numeric identifiers: 2, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 21, 24, and 33)(Elzanowski and Ostell 2019). If the taxonomic

designation of a barcode sample is known and provided along with the input sequence, then coil calls

functions from the package SeqinR (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=seqinr) to translate the

sequence using the appropriate genetic code (Osawa *et al.* 1992; Jukes and Opsawa 1993; Charif and

Lobry 2007). By default, a special censored translation option is utilized by coil in order to

accommodate instances when the taxonomy of a sample (and therefore the correct genetic code) is

unknown. Codons that vary in the amino acid they code for across known animal mitochondrial genetic

codes are translated to a placeholder character ('?') to indicate that the amino acid at this location in the

sequence cannot be stated with certainty (Fig. 5). This allows coil to assess the likelihood of the

sequence containing indel errors, without being biased by errors introduced due to the appropriation of

the wrong genetic code. As an example of why this is necessary, if a barcode sequence from a biting fly

(genetic code = 5) was amplified in the analysis of a mammal host specimen (proper genetic code = 2)

(Ratnasingham and Hebert 2007; Elzanowski and Ostell 2019) then the codon 'AGG' would be

interpreted as a stop codon, as opposed to the correct amino acid: serine. The presence of a stop codon

due to this translation error would make the resulting amino acid sequence highly improbable and lead

to it being flagged as likely erroneous, when it is in fact a true barcode sequence that a user may in

some instances wish to retain. To avoid this, censored translation outputs placeholder characters that do

not negatively impact the likelihood of the amino acid sequence because of mistranslated codons. The

censored translation outputs do however lead to a slight loss of power for subsequent error assessment

due to reduced sample size because placeholder characters (for 5/64 codons) are not evaluated in the

calculation of the likelihood score.

Error assessment

The inference of sequence errors is accomplished by comparison of a translated barcode

sequence against the amino acid PHMM (Fig. 6). The Viterbi algorithm (Fig. 1) is used to compare the

amino acid sequence to the PHMM and the likelihood of the optimal path that aligns the input sequence

to the PHMM is considered. The likelihood is expressed in logarithmic format; the higher a log

likelihood (all log likelihood values are negative) the more likely it is that the sequence is a match to

the profile. Conversely, the lower the log likelihood, the more likely the amino acid sequence is at

some point shifted out of reading frame due to an insertion or deletion error in the nucleotide sequence,

leading to a highly unlikely amino acid sequence. Low log likelihood values could result from

frameshifts due to technical errors (i.e. PCR amplification or DNA sequencing) or due to the detection

of non-barcode sequences, such as nuclear pseudogenes. Amino acid insertions or deletions (indel of a

full codon of nucleotides) do not result in frameshifts and lead to only minor perturbations in the log

likelihood score, the check of the amino sequence is therefore receptive of mutations of this kind, even

if they were unseen in the PHMM training data. The check for frameshifts via the PHMM comparison

is complemented by a simple query of the amino acid sequence for stop codons, which can provide

additional evidence of frameshift errors or identify instances where translation has been conducted with

the wrong genetic code. Since the enzyme that COI-5P codes for is highly conserved, there is an

extremely low likelihood of a biologically viable mutation that leads to early termination of the amino

acid sequence. The log likelihood of the sequence path and the query of the sequence for stop codons

can therefore be used in conjunction to assess sequence validity with high accuracy.

Methods

BOLD data acquisition

The Barcode of Life Data Systems (BOLD: boldsystems.org) public database was queried to obtain

a taxonomically representative sample of publically available COI-5P sequences. Unique COI-5P

haplotypes (Ratnasingham and Hebert 2013) were retained if the following criteria were met: (1) the

sequence was >600bp in length within the Folmer region (this was done to ensure sequences could be

aligned with high fidelity prior to model training) (Folmer *et al.* 1994), (2) the taxonomy of the

sequence was known to a genus level, (3) there were no missing bp ('N') in the Folmer region, (4) the

corresponding amino acid sequence did not contain stop codons, (5) the result of BOLD's internal

check for contaminants was negative. The query and subsequent filtering yielded approximately 1.3

million unique sequences (in BOLD's aligned format). To isolate the 658bp COI-5P region of the

sequence, data were initially analyzed in BOLD's aligned format. Sequences with information outside

of the COI-5P region were truncated and the placeholder dashes from BOLD's aligned format were

then removed from the sequences. The resulting unaligned sequence data for only the Folmer region

were then used in subsequent model training and assessment. This process was repeated for the amino

acid sequences, with only the 219 amino acids corresponding to the barcode region retained. To ensure

that the data used for model training and the data used for model testing and validation were

independent from one another, the barcode dataset was first split in a stratified fashion (on the

taxonomic level: family) into training (70%), test (15%), and validation (15%) sets for independent use

in model training, refinement, and final assessment. The taxonomically stratified split of the data was

done to ensure that the training dataset was not biased towards the largest taxonomic orders due to

random chance and that subsequent models were trained on diverse data representative of the entire

animal kingdom. It should be noted that some of the sequences in the BOLD dataset may be

taxonomically misclassified, but that any errors of this kind would not have a significant impact on the

PHMMs constructed. Training samples were used to train a single nucleotide and a single amino acid

PHMM to represent the entire animal kingdom, so misclassified training data would only cause a slight

change in the distribution of the taxonomic diversity of the test, validation, and training sets and not

likely result in a significant impact on model performance.

Model training

A nucleotide and amino acid profile hidden Markov model (PHMMs) were respectively trained on

COI-5P nucleotide and amino acid training sequences (Supplementary File 1). The models were not

trained on the entire set of 936,971 barcodes in the training set; rather, in an attempt to prevent model

overfit, different sized taxonomically representative subsamples of the full set of training data were

used to train competing PHMMs. The full training set was subsampled in a stratified fashion (on the

taxonomic level: family), and any families with fewer than 10 samples in the training set had all their

representatives added to each subset to ensure that rare families were represented in model training.

The two taxonomically representative training sets of ~1.2% (11,391 sequences) and ~3.0% (28,189) of

the training data were produced and each was subjected to the following procedure. Training of the

nucleotide and amino acid PHMMs was done using the R package aphid (Wilkinson 2019). Model

training was conducted using aphid's derivePHMM function, utilizing the 'background' option for the

pseudocounts parameter (see Durbin and Eddy 1998 – Chapter 5 for explanation of pseudocounts).

Initially, models were trained using two 'maxsize' parameter pairs (a) a nucleotide PHMM maxsize of

657 and a corresponding amino acid maxsize of 219 and (b) a nucleotide PHMM maxsize of 673 and a

corresponding amino acid maxsize of 224. The 'maxsize' parameter limits the upper bound of the

number of modules in the PHMM; i.e. it provides the maximum length of the profile that represents the

sequences. Alignment of test data to the models via the Viterbi algorithm revealed that when the larger

maxsize parameter was utilized, the PHMM expanded to the maximum size permitted. In subsequent

testing this led to variable framing of sequences (dependent on taxonomy) and made the establishment

of a common reading frame infeasible. The smaller maxsizes of 657/219 yielded a set of PHMMs that

could effectively establish the reading frame of taxonomically diverse sequences in the test data and

this pair of PHMMs was therefore retained as the internal PHMMs for coil, against which new barcode

sequences are compared. Of the two training data sizes that were used, the PHMMs resulting from

training on the smaller training set (11,391 sequences) were found to perform marginally better on

initial tests, both in terms of the framing and error classification of sequences. Therefore, the nucleotide

and amino acid PHMMs trained on 11,391 training sequences were retained for internal use in the coil

package.

Assessment of coil package performance

Following successful model training and package construction, a random subsample of 10,000

barcode sequences from the previously withheld validation data was used to assess the performance of

coil, in terms of its ability to place sequences in the correct reading frame and determine if sequences

contain insertion or deletion errors. Additionally, we aimed to test coil's establishment of reading frame

and proper translation when excess sequence information in addition to the COI-5P region is present or

when barcode information is missing from the edges of sequences. The 10,000 samples were randomly

split and altered using a custom python script (Supplementary File 2) to construct the following 5

groups (2000 sequences each):

(a) No changes made.

(b) 1-100 random base pairs added to the front and/or back of the sequence, with equal addition

230   probabilities for each of the four nucleotides.

(c) 1-100 base pairs removed from the front and/or back of the sequence.

(d) Altered with a point mutation probability of 1% per bp (a 1% chance of a nucleotide being

changed to any other nucleotide) and a random indel probability of 1% per bp (equal

probability of either an insertion or deletion, in the case of insertions a random bp was

inserted).

(e) Sequences either shortened or elongated in the manner of groups (b) or (c), with errors then

introduced in the manner of group (d).

These validation data were then loaded into R and passed through the coil analysis pipeline

twice (Supplementary File 3). First, the translation step of the coil pipeline was run using the genetic

codes known to correspond to the sequences and second, the pipeline was run using the default

behaviour, assuming unknown genetic codes and utilizing the censored translation option.

The outputs of the pipeline were assessed to determine how well sequences were framed and

translated. The package's ability to frame sequence was evaluated by looking for stop codons in the

translation outputs of the 6000 validation sequences with no artificially introduced indel errors. The

presence of stop codons would indicate a sequence was not set in reading frame properly (as their

original amino acid sequences are known and do not contain stop codons), whereas the absence of stop

codons is strongly suggestive of correct translation. Additionally, the log likelihood values obtained

from comparison of all 10,000 sequences to the amino acid PHMM were assessed to determine the log

likelihood's effectiveness as an error classifier. Sequences with introduced indel errors and those

without errors were labelled in a binary fashion. The R package ROCit (CRAN.R-

project.org/package=ROCit) was used to determine the ability of the amino acid PHMM output log

likelihood values to discern sequences with errors from those without errors. Comparisons were made

between the following groups of validation data: full length sequence data ((a) vs (d)), variable length

sequence data ((b) and (c) vs (e)), and all sequence data ((a)(b)(c) vs. (d)(e)). To determine the effect of

sequence length on classification ability, the long sequences (b) were compared to the sequences from

the variable length error dataset (e) that were elongated, and the short sequences (c) were compared to

the sequences from the variable length error dataset (e) that were shortened. The area under the curve

(AUC – a metric of how well the log likelihood values separate the two categories) and the optimal F

score threshold (the log likelihood value that optimizes the trade-off between false positive and false

negative classifications) were determined for all comparisons.

Processing non-animal barcode sequences

In addition to identifying the presence of indels in animal COI-5P sequences (which would most

likely result from technical errors), we tested how coil performed on COI-5P sequences for which it

was not designed to process. A series of plant, fungi, and bacterial COI-5P sequences as well as animal

nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes were analyzed with coil, to see if sequences from these categories

would be flagged as likely containing errors, or if they would be processed in the same manner as

animal COI-5P sequences. The first set of sequences investigated were COI-5P sequences from the

plant and fungi kingdoms. The NCBI nucleotide database (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nucleotide/)

was queried for 'cytochrome c oxidase 1' and the results were filtered to retain sequences from only

plants and fungi. Results were filtered by sequence length (minimum 550bp, maximum 2000bp) and

the sequence descriptions were all manually checked to ensure that all results were COI-5P sequences.

This resulted in a set of 570 plant and 174 fungal sequences (Supplementary File 4) that were then

analyzed using the coil analysis pipeline (coi5p_pipe function) with default parameters.

Wolbachia is a genus of bacterial endosymbionts (commonly found in arthropods) that can in

some instances confound attempts to isolate an animal specimen's barcode sequence (Smith *et al.*

2012). To see if coil would flag *Wolbachia* sequences as errors (either due to a low likelihood value or

the presence of a stop codon in the amino acid sequence), data associated with the accession numbers

of *Wolbachia* samples listed in Supplementary File S2 of Smith *et al.* (2012) were obtained from NCBI.

Data were filtered to omit sequences <550bp in length, yielding 345 *Wolbachia* sequences that were

analyzed via coil's 'coi5p_pipe' function (parameters: trans_table = 0 and indel_threshold = -440.24).

Nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes (numts) are non-encoded sequences in the nucleus that are

the product of mitochondrial DNA fragments being incorporated into the nuclear genome (Bensasson *et*

al. 2001). Numts resulting from the COI-5P gene have been shown to interfere with accurate

assessment of the COI-5P sequences for a species complex of Australian stingless bees (*Tetragonula*

carbonaria, *Tetragonula davenporti*, *Tetragonula hockingsi*, and *Tetragonula mellipes*; hereafter the

'Carbonaria group'.) (Françoso *et al.* 2019). Sequence data for the 9 numts with reported accession

numbers in Figure 7 of Françoso *et al.* (2019) were obtained and analyzed with coil (using the

coi5p_pipe function and default parameters) to see if the package identified these sequences as likely

being erroneous.

Results & Discussion

Framing and Translation

The validation data outputs were assessed to determine how effective coil was at processing of

variable-length barcode data. The package's ability to set sequences in reading frame was evaluated by

looking for stop codons in the translation outputs of the 6000 validation sequences with no introduced

indel errors. If stop codons were present, the sequence would not have been set in reading frame

properly, whereas the absence of stop codons is strongly suggestive of a correct reading frame

establishment. Of the 6000 validation sequences without introduced errors, 5888 (98.13%) were

correctly framed. The sequences with incorrectly identified reading frames were not evenly distributed

across the three sequence length categories (short sequence, full-length sequences, and long

sequences). All barcode sequences in the full-length (a) category except for one were correctly placed

in reading frame, indicating that the nucleotide PHMM is able to recognize and frame taxonomically

variable barcode data and that it is not biased against certain taxonomic groups. The program appeared

to be effective at trimming artificially lengthened sequences (category b) and placing them in reading

frame, with only 38 framing errors in the 2000 long sequences (98.1% accuracy). The program was

slightly less effective at placing shortened sequences (category c) in reading frame, with 98 errors

observed (95.1% accuracy). Despite this imperfect performance, the program is effective at framing the

vast majority of sequences and can aid the user by successfully automating this task for most inputs

(Supplementary File 5). The summary data provided by the indel check step (stop codon presence and

error likelihood values) can aid users in targeting additional manual correction effort to the subset of

sequences coil is unable to place in reading frame.

Indel Error Identification

Across the entire validation dataset, coil's indel_check function was able assess the amino acid

data and accurately discern sequences with insertion or deletion errors from correct barcode sequences

with greater than 97% accuracy. As with the framing of sequences, coil's effectiveness was influenced

by the length of the sequences (Table 1). When the full-length barcode sequences with and without

introduced errors were evaluated, they could be categorized with greater than 99.9% accuracy. For

sequences with excess DNA sequence added to the ends, the sequences with errors could be discerned

from the correct sequences with 98.0% accuracy. For the short sequences, performance was once again

the lowest, with 95.1% classification accuracy (Fig. 7). The similarity in these accuracy scores to the

percentage of sequences placed in reading frame correctly is not coincidental, but rather due to the fact

that the ability to correctly classify a sequence is highly dependent on the ability of coil to place it in

the common reading frame correctly.

Closer examination of the classification errors in the short sequence dataset (the category with

the highest error frequency) helped to characterize the limitations of coil's classification ability. The

majority of the classification errors (103/132 – 78%) were false negatives, i.e. sequences without

introduced errors that were flagged as likely to contain errors. The reason for this appears to be the

incorrect establishment of the reading frame and thus large-scale reading frame shifts, resulting in

incorrect amino acid sequences. The major limitation of coil therefore appears to be the inability to

always establish the reading frame properly, a problem that is magnified in short sequences where the

front of the sequence is truncated. The examination of the 29 falsely accepted sequences for the short

category revealed the three main patterns where coil failed to detect errors in a sequence: 1) When an

indel occurs late (>500 bp) in the sequence (observed for 7 sequences), 2) when three insertions or

three deletions are found in closely proximity (observed for 4 sequences), 3) when an insertion and

deletion occur in close proximity to one another (observed for 18 instances). All three of these patterns

do not lead to large-scale alterations to the amino acid sequence, and are therefore not easily detected

by examination of the amino acid sequence.

In all error classification tests, the accuracy (as shown by AUC) was highly similar when

translation was conducted with the known genetic codes and when censored translation was employed

(Table 1). This indicates that the censored translation method is effective at allowing error

identification to proceed with accuracy in instances where the taxonomic origin of a sequence is

unknown. It should be noted that the log likelihood values associated with sequences are overall

slightly lower when generated using censored translation, because lower numbers of amino acids

contribute to the likelihood value(5/64 codons are not translated – Fig. 5). For this reason, the threshold

used to identify sequences with indel errors should be adapted to the characteristics of the data being

analyzed. Table 1 provides users with a starting point for selecting a classification threshold, showing

the optimal log likelihood threshold (as determined through F-score maximization) for the different

comparisons of validation data. These values serve as statistically informed starting points from which

a user can deviate if they wish to attempt minimization of type 1 (lowering the logL threshold to

minimize rejection of correct sequences) or type 2 error (raising the logL threshold to minimize

acceptance of sequences with indel errors.

Package limitations

The results of processing non-animal COI-5P sequences with coil were variable; 167/174 (96%)

of fungi and 336/570 (58.8%) of plant sequences were flagged as likely erroneous based on the

resulting log likelihood scores and/or the presence of stop codons. The reason for coil labelling fungi

sequences as likely erroneous is the existence of introns in fungal COI-5P sequences (Avin *et al.* 2017).

Fungal sequences show drastic variability in length due to the presence of introns, compared to animal

sequences which do not contain introns and are relatively consistent in length (Avin *et al.* 2017). This

variation in the structure of fungal sequences is interpreted by coil's processing pipeline as evidence of

indel errors, resulting in the majority of true fungal sequences being flagged as erroneous. Plant COI-

5P sequences are less variable in structure than fungi, but more than half of the sequences tested

deviated from the animal COI-5P profile in a manner extreme enough for them being flagged as

erroneous. These results show that coil cannot be used to reliably pre-process and filter errors from

non-animal COI-5P sequences. The PHMMs are not trained to accommodate non-animal data and

processing sequences from the plant or fungal kingdoms results in a large number of false negatives. A

future extension of coil can be the addition of PHMMs trained on data from different kingdoms or

barcodes, which would allow coil's processing pipeline to be applied in error filtration of other protein

coding, intron-free barcodes.

Of the 345 *Wolbachia* COI-5P sequences analyzed, only five were flagged as likely to be

erroneous and only a single sequence contained stop codons. The five instances of *Wolbachia*

sequences being flagged as errors resulted from the incorrect framing and translation of sequences.

Since the *Wolbachia* sequences are real instances the COI-5P gene (albeit from bacteria as opposed to

animals) that do not possess any drastic changes to reading frame relative to animals, their nucleotide

and corresponding amino acid sequences are likely enough to be accepted as matches to the animal

COI-5P PHMMs. This demonstrates that coil cannot be effectively appropriated to separate animal

COI-5P sequences from the COI-5P sequences of endosymbiote contaminants.

All 9 of the numt sequences from the Carbonaria group analyzed with coil were flagged as

likely to contain an error. This was accomplished despite the fact that none of the translated sequences

contained a stop codon. Each pseudogene possessed an amino acid sequence that the program

characterized as improbable (all log likelihood values lower than -754.00). It should be noted that the

numts analyzed were shorter sequences (333bp each), which inherently possess lower log likelihood

values. However, animal COI-5P sequence fragments of this length tend to yield log likelihood values

of approximately -450.00, so the drastically lower log likelihood sequences are sufficient to distinguish

the pseudogene sequences from COI-5P sequences. The number of numts tested was low and limited to

sequences identified within a single species complex. Expansion of these tests to COI-5P-derived

numts from a more diverse set of taxa could reveal how well coil is able to characterize numts. At

present, it is hypothesized that the ability to discern pseudogenes from true barcode sequences will

depend on how diverged the structure and sequence of a pseudogene are, with frame-shift-causing

indels increasing the likelihood of detection by coil.

Taken together, these results show that coil Version 1.0 should only be used to process animal

COI-5P data and that it is less reliable at detecting biological contaminants than technical errors. The

genetic structure of biological contaminants such as *Wolbachia* COI-5P is not always dissimilar enough

from animal COI-5P sequences for the PHMMs to discern the two categories. Additionally, if an

animal specimen were contaminated with DNA not from another kingdom, but rather with DNA from

another animal then detection with coil in most instances would not be possible, as the models

employed by the package are trained on a taxonomically robust sample of animal sequences. The

results presented here regarding the identification of biological contaminants are conservative, as in all

tests we have used coil's default censored translation option, which assumes that taxonomic

information is not available. The ability to identify biological contaminants can be greatly increased if

the taxonomy (and therefore the genetic code) corresponding to a sample is known. Contaminants from

organisms that appropriate a different genetic code would have a higher likelihood of being identified

in this situation, as translation would be more likely to yield amino acid sequences with stop codons or

highly improbable amino acids. Overall the coil package should not be considered a panacea for all

DNA barcode data errors, but rather as a tool that can be incorporated into barcode analysis as a

reliable pre-processing and data-cleaning step that can identify technical errors. Researchers using

barcode data should consider additional steps in their analyses, such as BLAST, which can help inform

the taxonomy of sequences and identify biological contaminants.

Conclusion

We have presented the R package coil and demonstrated how it can effectively set COI-5P

barcode data in reading frame, translate sequences in a taxonomically robust fashion and identify

sequences containing frame-shifting indel errors with greater than 97% accuracy. A vignette

demonstrating the software's functionality and suggested workflows is available within the package

(and included here as well – Supplementary File 6). The package can facilitate exploratory analysis of

barcode data and aid in data cleaning and error assessment. At present, the package's functionality is

limited to the main DNA barcode region for animals, COI-5P. In the future, we hope to extend the

package's functionality to additional DNA barcode regions, including alternative animal barcodes like

cytochrome b (Kochzius *et al.* 2010; Yacoub *et al.* 2015) and 16S rRNA (Vences *et al.* 2005), as well

barcodes employed in analysis of species from other kingdoms (Hollingsworth *et al.* 2009;

Hollingsworth *et al.* 2011). Adding this functionality would require the training of addition profile

hidden Markov models for these barcode regions and integration of these models into the coil package.

This is a feasible addition thanks to the large amount of additional barcode data available through

BOLD (Ratnasingham & Hebert 2007) and other protein-coding markers available through NCBI,

which can be queried and filtered using methods similar to those employed here for COI-5P. Another

extension of the functionality of the coil package is to move from error identification to error

correction. PHMMs are robust models of the conserved sequence of the COI-5P barcode region on both

a DNA and amino acid level. Accurately identifying where deviations from the expected sequence

occur and applying corrections to the sequences in an unbiased fashion would allow PHMMs to serve

as the basis of a DNA barcode data denoiser. Corrections based on PHMMs trained on the wealth of

barcode sequence information available could serve as a powerful complement, or alternative, to

current denoising methods which rely on read abundance and *de novo* clustering of sequences (Nearing

et al. 2018).

Acknowledgements

Funding for this research was provided by grants in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology from

the Government of Canada through Genome Canada and Ontario Genomics and from the Ontario

Research Fund. Funders played no role in software design or manuscript preparation. Thank you to

Samantha E. Majoros for aiding in the initial testing of the coil package.

References

Avin, F.A., Subha B., Tan Y.S., Braukmann T.W., Vikineswary S., Hebert P.D. 2017. Escaping introns in COI through cDNA barcoding of mushrooms: *Pleurotus* as a test case. Ecology and Evolution. **7**(17):6972-80. doi: 10.1002/ece3.3049.

Bensasson D., Zhang D.X., Hartl D.L., Hewitt G.M. 2001. Mitochondrial pseudogenes: evolution's misplaced witnesses. 2001. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. **16**(6):314-21. doi: 10.1016/s0169-5347(01)02151-6.

Calderón-Sanou I., Münkemüller T., Boyer F., Zinger L., Thuiller W. 2019. From environmental DNA sequences to ecological conclusions: How strong is the influence of methodological choices?. Journal of Biogeography. doi: 10.1111/jbi.13681.

Castresana J., Lübben M., Saraste M., Higgins D.G. 1994. Evolution of cytochrome oxidase, an enzyme older than atmospheric oxygen. The EMBO journal. **13**(11):2516-25. doi: 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1994.tb06541.x

Charif D., Lobry J.R. 2007. SeqinR 1.0-2: a contributed package to the R project for statistical computing devoted to biological sequences retrieval and analysis. In Structural approaches to sequence evolution 2007 (pp. 207-232). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-35306-5_10

Durbin R., Eddy S.R., Krogh A., Mitchison G. 1998. Biological sequence analysis: probabilistic models of proteins and nucleic acids. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Eddy S.R. 2009. A new generation of homology search tools based on probabilistic inference. In Ge-

nome Informatics Series. Vol. 23 pp. 205-211.

Elbrecht V., Vamos E.E., Steinke D., Leese F. 2018. Estimating intraspecific genetic diversity from

community DNA metabarcoding data. PeerJ. **6**:e4644. doi: 10.7717/peerj.4644.

Elzanowski A., Ostell J. 2019. The Genetic Codes [online]. Available from

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Taxonomy/Utils/wprintgc.cgi#SG5. [accessed Sept 9 2019].

474
475 Françoso E., Zuntini A.R., Ricardo P.C., Silva J.P., Brito R., Oldroyd B.P., Arias M.C. 2019. Con-

476   served numts mask a highly divergent mitochondrial-COI gene in a species complex of Austral-

477   ian stingless bees *Tetragonula* (Hymenoptera: Apidae). Mitochondrial DNA Part A. **16**:1-2. doi:

478   10.1080/24701394.2019.1665036.

479
Folmer O., Black M., Hoeh W., Lutz R., Vrijenhoek R. 1994. DNA primers for amplification of mito-

chondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. Molecular Ma-

rine Biology and Biotechnology. **3**(5):294-9. PMID: 7881515.

Hebert P.D., Cywinska A., Ball S.L., deWaard J.R. 2003. Biological identifications through DNA bar-

codes. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences.

270(1512):313-21. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2002.2218.

Hebert P.D., Penton E.H., Burns J.M., Janzen D.H., Hallwachs W. 2004. Ten species in one: DNA bar-

coding reveals cryptic species in the neotropical skipper butterfly *Astraptes fulgerator*. Proceed-

ings of the National Academy of Sciences. **101**(41):14812-7. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0406166101.

Hebert P.D., Braukmann T.W., Prosser S.W., Ratnasingham S., deWaard J.R., Ivanova N.V., Janzen

D.H., Hallwachs W., Naik S., Sones J.E., Zakharov E.V. 2018. A Sequel to Sanger: amplicon

sequencing that scales. BMC Genomics. **19**(1):219. doi: 10.1186/s12864-018-4611-3.

Hollingsworth P.M., Forrest L.L., Spouge J.L., Hajibabaei M., Ratnasingham S., van der Bank M.,

Chase M.W., Cowan R.S., Erickson D.L., Fazekas A.J. 2009. A DNA barcode for land plants.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. **106**(31):12794-7. doi:

10.1073/pnas.0905845106.

500
501   Hollingsworth P.M., Graham S.W., Little D.P. 2011. Choosing and using a plant DNA barcode. PloS

502   One. **6**(5):e19254. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0019254.

503
504   Hubert N., Hanner R. 2015. DNA barcoding, species delineation and taxonomy: a historical perspec-

505   tive. DNA Barcodes. **3**(1):44-58. doi: 10.1515/dna-2015-0006.

506
Jukes T.H., Osawa S. 1993. Evolutionary changes in the genetic code. Comparative Biochemistry and

Physiology. B, Comparative Biochemistry. **106**(3):489-94. doi: 10.1016/0305-0491(93)90122-l.

Kochzius M., Seidel C., Antoniou A., Botla S.K., Campo D., Cariani A., Vazquez E.G., Hauschild J.,

Hervet C., Hjörleifsdottir S., Hreggvidsson G. 2010. Identifying fishes through DNA barcodes

and microarrays. PLoS One. **5**(9):e12620. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0012620

Nearing J.T., Douglas G.M., Comeau A.M., Langille M.G. 2018. Denoising the Denoisers: an inde-

pendent evaluation of microbiome sequence error-correction approaches. PeerJ. **6**:e5364. doi:

10.7717/peerj.5364.

Osawa S., Jukes T.H., Watanabe K., Muto A. 1992. Recent evidence for evolution of the genetic code.

Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews. **56**(1):229-64. PMCID: PMC372862.

Paradis E., Schliep K. 2018. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary anal-

yses in R. Bioinformatics. **35**(3):526-8. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/bty633.

Pentinsaari M., Salmela H., Mutanen M., Roslin T. 2016. Molecular evolution of a widely-adopted tax-

onomic marker (COI) across the animal tree of life. Scientific Reports. **13**;6:35275. doi:

10.1038/srep35275.

Porter T.M., Hajibabaei M. 2018. Over 2.5 million COI sequences in GenBank and growing. PLoS

One. **13**(9):e0200177. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0200177.

Ratnasingham S., Hebert P.D. 2007. BOLD: The Barcode of Life Data System

(http://www.barcodinglife.org). Molecular Ecology Notes. **7**(3):355-64. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-

8286.2007.01678.

Schirmer M., D'Amore R., Ijaz U.Z., Hall N., Quince C. 2016. Illumina error profiles: resolving fine-

scale variation in metagenomic sequencing data. BMC Bioinformatics. 17(1):125. doi:

10.1186/s12859-016-0976-y

Schoch C.L., Seifert K.A., Huhndorf S., Robert V., Spouge J.L., Levesque C.A., Chen W., Fungal Bar-

coding Consortium. 2012. Nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region as a uni-

versal DNA barcode marker for Fungi. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

109(16):6241-6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1117018109.

Tsukihara T., Aoyama H., Yamashita E., Tomizaki T., Yamaguchi H., Shinzawa-Itoh K., Nakashima R.,

      Yaono R., Yoshikawa S.. Structures of metal sites of oxidized bovine heart cytochrome c oxi-

      dase at 2.8 A. Science. 1995 Aug 25;269(5227):1069-74. doi: 10.1126/science.7652554

Vences M., Thomas M., Van der Meijden A., Chiari Y., Vieites D.R.. 2005. Comparative performance

      of the 16S rRNA gene in DNA barcoding of amphibians. Frontiers in Zoology. **2**(1):5. doi:

      10.1186/1742-9994-2-5

Wilkinson S.P. 2019. aphid: an R package for analysis with profile hidden Markov models. Bioinfor-

      matics. **35**(19):3829-30. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btz159.

554
Yacoub H.A., Fathi M.M., Sadek M.A. 2015. Using cytochrome b gene of mtDNA as a DNA barcoding

      marker in chicken strains. Mitochondrial DNA. **26**(2):217-23. doi:

      10.3109/19401736.2013.825771

Youle R.J. 2019. Mitochondria—Striking a balance between host and endosymbiont. Science.

      16;365(6454):eaaw9855. doi: 10.1126/science.aaw9855.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Classification accuracy of coil's indel check function on test sequence groups of different

compositions. AUC – area under the curve for the ability of the amino acid PHMM log likelihood score

to discriminate sequences with insertion or deletion errors from sequences without errors. The optimal

LogL threshold for differentiating sequences with indels from those without indels is shown. The

optimal LogL cut off, as determined through F-score maximization, is shown.

Dataset	Translation	AUC	Optimal LogL Cut Off
Full length sequences	Genetic code known	0.9989	-246.20
	Censored	0.9982	-358.88
Variable length sequences	Genetic code known	0.9662	-354.44
	Censored	0.9659	-457.39
Short length sequences	Genetic code known	0.9509	-354.44
	Censored	0.9504	-440.24
Long length sequences	Genetic code known	0.9802	-324.37
	Censored	0.9795	-412.88
All data combined	Genetic code known	0.9776	-308.05
	Censored	0.9773	-425.21

coil workflow components

Load raw sequences (`coi5p` function)
- Takes a DNA sequence and builds a coi5p object

```
Standard sequence:  actttatatttctta......................ttatatcaacattta
   Extra sequence:  gcgcgcgacttctta......................accaacatttacgcg
 Missing sequence:  ttcttatttggagct......................ttataccaacattta
   Error sequence:  actttatagtatatt......................ttatatcaacattta
```

Place in common reading frame (`frame` function)
- Trims excess base pairs from the sequence, adds dashes for sequences with missing base pairs at front

```
Standard sequence:  actttatatttctta......................ttatatcaacattta
   Extra sequence:  ttcttatttggagct......................ttataccaacattta
 Missing sequence:  ---------acttta......................ttataccaacattta
   Error sequence:  actttatagtatatt......................ttatatcaacattta
```

Translate sequence to amino acids (`translate` function)
- Translate the framed sequence to amino acids, with known known genetic code or censored translation

```
Standard (know translation table = 5):  TLYFLFGMWSGMIGS......................FDPAGGGDPILYQHL
Standard (unknown translation table):  TLYFLFG?WSG?IGS......................FDPAGGGDPILYQHL
                     Extra sequence:  TLYFLFGAWSG?VGT......................FDPAGGGDPILYQHL
                   Missing sequence:  ---FLFGAWSG?VGT......................FDPAGGGDPILYQHL
                     Error sequence:  TL*YIFGAFFWDD?N......................FWSSW???PCFYINI
```

Evaluate amino acid sequence (`indel_check` function)
- Check for stop codons and check if the Markov model log likelihood is suggestive of an indel

```
  Standard (known translation table): indel_likely: FALSE, stop_codons: FALSE
Standard (unknown translation table): indel_likely: FALSE, stop_codons: FALSE
                     Extra sequence: indel_likely: FALSE, stop_codons: FALSE
                   Missing sequence: indel_likely: FALSE, stop_codons: FALSE
                     Error sequence: indel_likely:  TRUE, stop_codons:  TRUE
```

571 **Fig. 1.** Depiction of the coil library's analysis pipeline. The tasks performed by the four main functions

572 of the analysis pipeline on a variety of potential use cases are shown, and a brief explanation is given.

573 For information on how to implement the analysis pipeline, please consult the package's vignette

574 (Supplementary File 6).

575
576

A

Sequence: C T C T A C T A G

B

C

PHMM Path: D M M M M M M I M
Sequence: – C T C T A C T A G

Fig. 2. Description of how a profile hidden Markov model (PHMM) determines the hidden state of

nucleotides in a biological sequence. (A) An truncated example of a DNA sequence (the nucleotides are

the observed states) to be evaluated using the PHMM. An erroneous nucleotide (indicated in orange)

has been inserted into the sequence; this fact would be unknown prior to evaluation. (B) A diagram of

the potential paths of hidden states through the PHMM. The possible hidden states are: M (indicates a

nucleotide is a match to the sequence profile), D (indicates the nucleotide for the given position in the

profile has been deleted) and I (indicates a nucleotide has been inserted into the sequence at that

position). The arrows indicate the possible transitions from one hidden state to another and the

numbers below the diagram indicate the positions in the profile. (C) The Viterbi algorithm is used to

compare the observed states (nucleotide sequence) to the PHMM to determine the most probable set of

hidden states corresponding to the sequence. When a DNA sequence is evaluated against the PHMM

using the Viterbi algorithm, the position-specific emission and transition probabilities (essentially the

probability of a given nucleotide being found at that point in the sequence and the probability of

transitioning from the current nucleotide to the next observed nucleotide, see Fig. 3) are used to assign

hidden states to the nucleotides in the sequence. In this example, a nucleotide was missing at the start

of the sequence, so the hidden state for position 1 in the profile is delete ('D'). The orange (inserted)

nucleotide has been identified as an insertion between positions 8 and 9 of the profile and therefore this

nucleotide is assigned the hidden state of insert ('I'), while all other nucleotides are found to match

positions in the profile and have been assigned hidden states of match ('M').

598
599

Fig. 3. Diagram of the emission and transition probabilities for the first and last 10 positions in the

nucleotide PHMM used in the coil package. The circles represent the hidden delete states and contain

the profile positions, the diamonds indicate the hidden insert states and the numbers within the

diamonds indicate the probability of insert-insert transitions. The rectangles indicate the match states

and the horizontal bars within represent the emission probabilities for the possible nucleotides at the

given profile position. The weight of the lines between shapes represent the transition probabilities.

Establishment of common reading frame

Sequence with missing information:

□□□□□□□□□TTCTTATTTGGAGCT........................TTATACCAACATTTA

Frame function
Viterbi algorithm used to obtain hidden state path
0 indicates deletion (missing bp), 1 indicates match to profile.

□□□□□□□□□TTCTTATTTGGAGCT........................TTATACCAACATTTA
000000000111111111111111........................111111111111111

Path suggests 9 **missing bp** at start of sequence.
Placeholder characters **added** to sequence to place in reading frame.

─ ─ ─ ─ ─ ─ ─ ─ ─TTCTTATTTGGAGCT........................TTATACCAACATTTA

Sequence with excess information:

GCGCGCGACACTCTATATTTTATA........................ACCAACATTTACGCG

Frame function
Viterbi algorithm used to obtain hidden state path
2 indicates insertion (added bp), 1 indicates match to profile.

GCGCGCGACACTCTATATTTTATA........................ACCAACATTTACGCG
222222222111111111111111........................111111111112222

Path suggests 9 **extra bp** at start of sequence and 4 at end
Excess bp **trimmed** from sequence to place in reading frame.

ACTCTATATTTTATA........................ACCAACATTTA

611 **Fig. 4.** Diagram showing how coil establishes the reading frame of nucleotide sequences through

612 assessment of the hidden state path produced through the Viterbi algorithm's comparison of input

613 sequence to the nucleotide PHMM.

```
Amino Acid =    FFLLSSSSYY?*CCWWLLLLPPPPHHQQRRRRII?MTTTTNN?KSS??VVVVAAAADDEEGGGG

    Base 1  =   TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGG
    Base 2  =   TTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGG
    Base 3  =   TCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAG
```

616 **Fig. 5.** Censored genetic code utilized by coil when the genetic code corresponding to an input

617 sequence is not known. The '?' placeholder characters correspond to the ambiguous codons which code

618 for different amino acids in different animal mitochondrial genetic codes. These amino acids are

619 therefore censored to avoid translation errors.

Sequence without errors:

TLYFLFGMWSGMIGS……………………**FDPAGGGDPILYQHL**

Viterbi algorithm used to obtain hidden state path
0 indicates deletion, 1 indicates match to profile, 2 indicates insertion.

111111111111111………………………**111111111111111**

Path suggests all match states, suggestive of a barcode sequence
without errors. The log likelihood of the sequence is therefore high.

Log likelihood: **-237.68** , stop codons: **False**

Additionally, the amino acid sequence does not contain stop codons,
which is further suggestive of a correct amino acid sequence.

Sequence with errors:

TLYIW*GAFFWDDGS……………………**FWSSWGGGPCFYINI**

Viterbi algorithm used to obtain hidden state path
0 indicates deletion, 1 indicates match to profile, 2 indicates insertion.

1112221122222211………………………**222221112122222**

Path is rife with insert states, suggests a phase shift has occurred
in the nucleotide sequence, moving the sequence out of correct
reading frame. The log likelihood of the sequence is therefore low.

Log likelihood: **-1138.69**, stop codons: **True**

Additionally, the amino acid sequence contains stop codons,
which is further suggestive of a shift out of correct reading frame.

621
Fig. 6. Diagram showing how coil's indel_check function utilizes the hidden state path output by the

Vitertbi algorithm to determine the likelihood that a sequence contains an insertion or deletion error

that has led to a shift in reading frame.

Fig. 7. ROC (receiver operating characteristic) curves showing the ability of coil to correctly classify

sequences as correct or containing insertion or deletion errors. Indel classification ability for three types

of sequences (all translated with known genetic codes) are displayed: full-length barcode sequences

(barcode sequences of unaltered lengths), long sequences (1-100bp added to both ends of the

sequences) and short sequences (1-100bp removed from each end of the sequence). Black lines indicate

the ability of the classifier to separate true sequences from those with indels. A perfect classifier would

have an area under the curve (AUC) of 1 and intersect the top left corner of the graph (See table 1 for

corresponding AUC values). The dotted grey lines represent classification through chance (AUC = 0.5).

List of Supplementary Files

Supplementary File 1 – 'S1-train_bold_coi_public_data_subsample.zip' A .tsv file with the representative subsample of the BOLD public database used to train the nucleotide and amino acid PHMMs.

Supplementary File 2 – 'S2-create_assessment_data.py' Custom python script used in the creation of the variable quality dataset for testing coil.

Supplementary File 3 – 'S3-coil-utilization.r' R script showing how the coil pipeline was applied to the validation data

Supplementary File 4 – 'S4-non_animal_tests_output.tsv' Output from the analysis of publically available *Wolbachia,* plant and fungi COI-5P barcode sequences and nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes (numts) using the coil analysis pipeline.

Supplementary File 5 – 'S5-validation_data' Folder containing the validation data inputs and outputs produced for the assessment of coil effectiveness.

Supplementary File 6 – 'S6-coil-vignette.pdf' A pdf demonstrating the functionality of the coil package. This is the static version of the package vignette, which is available through R. The original R markdown file is available for download from: https://github.com/CNuge/coil/tree/master/vignettes