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] Centre for Biodiversity Genomics, 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 subunit I (COI-5P) is the most common barcode gene for animals, 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 common 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. Package

limitations 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. Results demonstrated that coil is a strong technical error identification method but

is not reliable for detecting all biological contaminants.

33   **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 subunit I gene (COI-5P) is the main marker utilized in DNA barcoding of the animal kingdom (Hebert *et al.* 2003). COI 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; Stoeckle and Kerr 2012; 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). Software tools that allow for the local or web-based alignment of novel sequences to reference

datasets include MACSE (Multiple Alignment of Coding SEquences) (Ranwez *et al.* 2011) and

USEARCH (Edgar 2010). Analysis of novel sequences with these methods relies on the comparison of

inputs against large sets of reference sequences which a user must acquire, store, and curate. The

outputs must also be scrutinized in subsequent analysis so that the presence of errors can be inferred

from deviations in alignment. Additionally, if reference data sets are not sufficiently cleaned, then

sequences with errors may not be identified, and if references contain taxonomic bias then true

biological variants may be interpreted as errors. 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), which uses proprietary error evaluation

software (Ratnasingham and 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.

A tool for pre-processing and technical error identification in DNA barcodes would be a useful

addition to both DNA barcode and metabarcode workflows. In DNA barcoding, the barcode sequences

generated for a set of specimens can be evaluated and data correction efforts quantitatively targeted.

Barcodes displaying evidence of indel errors could be excluded, subjected to error correction, or

recommended for resequencing. In DNA metabarcoding, the haplotypes contained within identified

operational taxonomic units (OTUs) could be processed and tested for evidence of indels. Generation

of consensus sequences for OTUs using only sequences without evidence of technical errors would

improve quality. Additionally, if intraspecific diversity were being characterized through the

examination of haplotypes within OTUs, low-abundance haplotypes would not have to be excluded

solely based on their abundance (Elbrecht *et al.* 2018) and could be included in subsequent analyses

with higher confidence if they displayed no evidence of technical errors.

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 publicly 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). A PHMM is a probabilistic representation (profile) of a

multiple sequence alignment. Training a PHMM captures information about the structure of a series of

related 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. Once trained, PHMMs are probabilistic representations of the aligned

training sequences that can be used to determine how closely new sequences match the profile. The

characters in the new biological sequence (the nucleotide or amino acid alphabets) constitute the

observed characters (states), and comparison to the PHMM relates the observed characters to the series

of unknown hidden states that describes how the observed sequence of characters most likely match to

the probabilistic profile (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 is 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). The coil

package 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. This error

checking method has the additional advantage of not employing a computationally expensive step of

comparison of the input sequence against a large set of references (Edgar 2010; Ranwez *et al.* 2011)

and can be utilized without acquisition or user-curation of a large set of reference sequences.

Methods

BOLD data acquisition

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

a representative sample of publicly 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 657bp 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. PHMM training (described below) included *de novo*

multiple sequence alignment, so that the alignment of input sequences for PHMM generation was

repeatable (parameters for BOLD's alignment of sequences are not publicly available). 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

currently-available DNA barcode data on BOLD for the entire animal kingdom. It should be noted that

some of the sequences in the BOLD dataset may be taxonomically misidentified, 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

misidentified 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

over fit (and allow effective application on new animal taxa not yet represented on BOLD), 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) so that different taxonomic groups were proportionally represented in the subsamples,

with the exception of families with fewer than 10 samples in the training set, which had all their

representatives added to each subset to ensure that these 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, which produces a *de novo*

multiple sequence alignment and generates an optimal PHMM using the Baum-Welch training

algorithm (Wilkinson 2019). Training with the derivePHMM function utilized default parameters,

except for the 'pseudocounts' and 'maxsize' parameters. The 'background' option was used 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. The runtime (on a virtual machine hosted on Compute Canada cloud resources, with 32 CPU

cores (2.4GHz) and 120Gb of RAM) for training of the final nucleotide PHMM with 11,391 input

sequences was 2 hours and 22 minutes, and the time for training of the corresponding amino acid

model was 5 minutes.

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

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 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). Point mutations

were also applied with a probability of 1% per bp (a 1% chance of a nucleotide being

changed to any other nucleotide) in order to produce more realistic error profiles and test

indel error detection in the presence of additional noise.

(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 sequences 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.

To demonstrate how coil can be applied in metabarcoding analyses, the coil analysis pipeline

described above was rerun, and associated evaluation metrics were generated, for non-full-length

barcode sequences from a defined subsection for the COI-5P region. Subsets of the barcode sequences

in categories (a) and (c) were taken for an arbitrarily chosen 300bp window (base pairs 337-636 of the

full COI-5P region) to simulate non-full-length COI-5P sequences commonly generated in DNA

metabarcoding. Sequences from group (c) were only retained if they contained a documented indel

error within the defined 300bp region (1868 sequences). To determine coil's baseline classification

ability on these data, the coil analysis pipeline was run for the non-full-length sequences using the full-

length nucleotide and amino acid PHMMs. To test if the use of targeted PHMMs (corresponding to

only that specific 300bp section COI-5P region) improves coil's ability to frame sequences and identify

indels, the complete coil analysis pipeline was then rerun an additional time using a subsection of the

PHMMs representing only the given 300bp window to evaluate the non-full-length barcode sequences

(Supplementary File 4).

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 5) 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, *T. davenporti*, *T. hockingsi*, and *T. 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

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

error likelihood values) can aid users in targeting additional 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), and 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).

Extension of coil to metabarcode data analysis

The indel identification tests showed that coil's performance is suboptimal when the length of

the examined sequence is far shorter than the PHMM profile length. The proximal cause of this issue is

that similarity between probabilistic profiles for different parts of the barcode region can lead to

continuous series of base pairs from the sequence matching to an incorrect portion of the PHMM and

incorrect establishment of the reading frame. This is problematic in the analysis of metabarcode data,

where non-full-length (~200-400bp) sections of the COI-5P barcode are targeted for amplification and

sequencing by custom primers. The fact that these non-full-length barcodes are in most instances

derived from targeted subsections of the COI-5P region means that the framing limitation can be

overcome by comparing sequences to only a subsection of coil's complete PHMMs. Using a subsection

of the full PHMMs reduces or eliminates the discrepancy in size between the PHMM and the non-full-

length barcodes, drastically reducing the false positive indel signals caused by incorrect establishment

of the reading frame.

Using the subsection of the complete PHMMs (defined using coil's subsetPHMM function),

coil was able to separate non-full-length barcode sequences with indel errors from correct sequences

with greater than 99.4% accuracy (Fig 8.). This proved to be a drastic improvement over the use of the

full-length PHMMs in the analysis of the same 300bp sequence dataset (AUC = 0.77). Using the full-

length model, 513 sequences from group (a) were incorrectly flagged as containing stop codons,

indicating a high rate of incorrect reading frame establishment (25.6%). This high level of incorrect

framing is a result of the 300bp window starting late (base pair 337) in the COI-5P region, providing a

large set of leading profile positions to which incorrect matches could occur. Conversely, the false

positive rate using the subsection of the full PHMMs led to an extremely low false positive rate (0.1%).

This indicates that the coil analysis pipeline is appropriate for technical error identification in non-full-

length metabarcode outputs, if there is available information on the approximate subsection of the COI-

5P region from which the sequences are derived.

It should also be noted that amino acid PHMM log likelihood values reported for input

sequences are dependent on the size of the model to which they are compared. The optimal log

likelihood cut offs presented (in Table 1) are therefore not applicable when user-defined subsets of the

complete PHMMs are used. Supplementary File 4 has been included to aid in determining the optimal

log likelihood cut off for a user defined COI-5P subsection of interest.

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 presently be used to pre-process and filter errors reliably

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 of 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 7). 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), 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. This research was

enabled in part by resources provided by Compute Canada (www.computecanada.ca). 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.N. 2017. Escaping in-

527   trons in COI through cDNA barcoding of mushrooms: *Pleurotus* as a test case. Ecology and

528   Evolution. **7**(17):6972-80. doi: 10.1002/ece3.3049.

530 Bensasson D., Zhang D.X., Hartl D.L., Hewitt G.M. 2001. Mitochondrial pseudogenes: evolution's

531   misplaced witnesses. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. **16**(6):314-21. doi: 10.1016/s0169-

532   5347(01)02151-6.

534 Calderón-Sanou I., Münkemüller T., Boyer F., Zinger L., Thuiller W. 2019. From environmental DNA

535   sequences to ecological conclusions: How strong is the influence of methodological choices?.

536   Journal of Biogeography. **47**(1):193-206. doi: 10.1111/jbi.13681.

538 Castresana J., Lübben M., Saraste M., Higgins D.G. 1994. Evolution of cytochrome oxidase, an en-

539   zyme older than atmospheric oxygen. The EMBO journal. **13**(11):2516-25. doi: 10.1002/j.1460-

540   2075.1994.tb06541.x

542 Charif D., Lobry J.R. 2007. SeqinR 1.0-2: a contributed package to the R project for statistical compu-

543   ting devoted to biological sequences retrieval and analysis. In Structural approaches to sequence

544   evolution 2007 (pp. 207-232). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-35306-

545   5_10

547 Cristescu M.E. 2014. From barcoding single individuals to metabarcoding biological communities: to-

548   wards an integrative approach to the study of global biodiversity. Trends in Ecology & Evolu-

549   tion. **29**(10):566-71. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2014.08.001

Durbin R., Eddy S.R., Krogh A., Mitchison G. 1998. Biological sequence analysis: probabilistic mod-

els 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.

Edgar R.C. 2010. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST. Bioinformatics.

26(19):2460-1. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461.

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].

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

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

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

10.1080/24701394.2019.1665036.

570
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.N., Cywinska A., Ball S.L., deWaard J.R. 2003. Biological identifications through DNA

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

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

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

barcoding reveals cryptic species in the neotropical skipper butterfly *Astraptes fulgerator*. Pro-

ceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. **101**(41):14812-7. doi:

10.1073/pnas.0406166101.

Hebert P.D.N., 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.

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

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

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

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

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.

Ranwez V., Harispe S., Delsuc F., Douzery E.J. 2011. MACSE: Multiple Alignment of Coding SE-

quences accounting for frameshifts and stop codons. PLoS One. 6(9):e22594. doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0022594.

Ratnasingham S., Hebert P.D.N. 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.

Stoeckle M.Y, Kerr K.C. 2012. Frequency matrix approach demonstrates high sequence quality in avi-

an BARCODEs and highlights cryptic pseudogenes. PLoS One. **7**(8). doi:

10.1371/journal.pone.0043992

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

Yaono R., Yoshikawa S. 1995. Structures of metal sites of oxidized bovine heart cytochrome c

oxidase at 2.8 A. Science. **269**(5227):1069-74. doi: 10.1126/science.7652554

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.

650
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.

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
```

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

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

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

668   (Supplementary File 7).

669
670

A

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

of nucleotides for a new biological sequence. The input (A) is a 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 trained PHMM (only first

9 of 657 profile positions shown). 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 COI-5P profile. 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. The most probable hidden state path aligning the new sequence to the

displayed section of the PHMM is indicated by the series of coloured hidden state cells (with italicized

letters) and the dotted arrows indicating the transitions between states. (C) 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').

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 (synonymous with nucleotide

frequencies) 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

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

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

711 sequence to the nucleotide PHMM.

712
```
        Amino Acid =    FFLLSSSSYY?*CCWWLLLLPPPPHHQQRRRRII?MTTTTNN?KSS??VVVVAAAADDEEGGGG

           Base 1  =    TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGG
           Base 2  =    TTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGGTTTTCCCCAAAAGGGG
           Base 3  =    TCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAG
```
713

Fig. 5. The censored genetic code utilized by coil to translate codons of nucleotides to amino acids

when the genetic code corresponding to an input sequence is not known. For each column, the three

bottom rows represent the nucleotide composition of the codon (base pair 1, 2, and 3 of the codon read

from top to bottom). The amino acid characters in the top row represents the result of translating the

codon listed below. The '?' placeholder characters in the Amino Acid row correspond to the ambiguous

codons, which code for different amino acids in different animal mitochondrial genetic codes. These

amino acids are therefore censored to avoid translation errors, while translation of all other codons is

conducted normally.

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.

111222112222211......................**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.

723
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 classify correctly

sequences as being 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 indel errors. 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).

Fig 8. ROC (receiver operating characteristic) curve showing coil's ability to classify correctly non-

full-length barcode sequences (300bp) from a defined sub-region of the COI-5P barcode, using a

subsection of the nucleotide and amino acid PHMMs corresponding to the same sub-region. The ROC

values shown correspond to analysis using censored translation, which assumes unknown genetic code

(AUC = 0.994). When the analysis was repeated using known genetic codes, the AUC value improved

slightly (AUC = 0.996).

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 for application of the coil pipeline in the analysis of the validation data.

Supplementary File 4 – 'S4-constrained_eval.r' R script that contains the code for analyzing short 300bp barcode sequences with subsets of the complete PHMMs.

Supplementary File 5 – 'S5-non_animal_tests_output.tsv' Output from the analysis of publicly available *Wolbachia,* plant and fungi COI-5P barcode sequences and nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes (numts) using the coil analysis pipeline.

Supplementary File 6 – 'S6-validation_data' Folder containing the validation data inputs and outputs produced for the assessment of coil effectiveness.

Supplementary File 7 – 'S7-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