Whole genome sequencing uncovers the structural and transcriptomic landscape of hexaploid

wheat/*Am. muticum* introgression lines

Benedict Coombes[1], John Fellers[2], Surbhi Grewal[3], Rachel Rusholme-Pilcher[1], Stella Hubbart-

Edwards[3], Cai-yun Yang[3], Ryan Joynson[1], Ian P. King[3], Julie King[3], Anthony Hall[1*]

[1]Earlham Institute, Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7UZ, UK

[2]USDA–ARS Hard Winter Wheat Genetics Research Unit, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA

[3]School of Biosciences, The University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington Campus, Loughborough,

Leicestershire, LE12 5RD, UK

*Corresponding author – anthony.hall@earlham.ac.uk

Abstract

Wheat is a globally vital crop, but its limited genetic variation creates a challenge for breeders aiming to

maintain or accelerate agricultural improvements over time. Introducing novel genes and alleles from wheat's

wild relatives into the wheat breeding pool via introgression lines is an important component of overcoming

this low variation but is limited by poor genomic resolution and limited understanding of the genomic impact

of introgression breeding. By sequencing 17 hexaploid wheat/*Ambylopyrum muticum* introgression lines and

the parent lines, we have precisely pinpointed the borders of introgressed segments. We report a genome

assembly and annotation of *Am. muticum* that has facilitated the identification of *Am. muticum* resistance

genes commonly introgressed in lines resistant to stripe rust. Our analysis has identified an abundance of

structural disruption and homoeologous pairing across the introgression lines, likely caused by the suppressed

Ph1 locus. mRNAseq analysis of six of these introgression lines revealed that introgressed genes tend to be

downregulated, shifting the expression balance of triads towards suppression of the introgressed region, with

no discernible compensation in the expression of the homoeologous copies. This analysis explores the

genomic impact of introgression breeding and provides an affordable way for breeders to better characterise

introgression lines and more effectively deploy wild relative variation.

Introduction

Triticum aestivum L. (bread wheat) is a vital crop, providing around 20% of calories and 25% of protein

consumed globally (*1*). Improvements to wheat since the late 19th century have largely come from

conventional breeding strategies, but these improvements rely on ample genetic variation in the primary gene

pool (*2*). The hexaploid bread wheat grown today derives from just one or two polyploidisation events ~10,000

years ago between the tetraploid *Triticum turgidum* and the diploid *Aegilops tauschii* (*3*). The limited diversity

stemming from this genetic bottleneck has been compounded over time by intensive breeding. Pressure on

breeders to prioritise advanced breeding material (*4*) for more rapid development of elite uniform, high

quality varieties that perform competitively has limited the introduction of genetic variation from external

sources. The genetic variation that does exist in modern wheat material is rapidly being exhausted, evident in

plateauing yield improvements that left unchecked, will be insufficient to meet global demands (*5*). Wild

relative introgression breeding will be a major component of overcoming this genetic constraint in the years to

come, enabling breeders to access the secondary and tertiary gene pools of wheat (*2, 4*) and incorporate novel

alleles or genes into modern breeding material.

There are many examples of the successful transfer of wild relative genes into wheat since first pioneered by

E.R. Sears (*6–10*). However, challenges associated with the high-throughput production and verification of

introgression lines, in addition to the linkage drag of introgressed segments, has limited the widespread

adoption of introgression breeding. Utilising recombination mutants and high-throughput marker methods,

introgressing entire wild relative genomes into wheat as stably inherited, homozygous segments is now

possible (*11, 12*). These sets of lines provide the raw material required for the incorporation of alien variation

into breeding programmes. Segments in these lines that confer phenotypes of interest can be identified. Lines

with overlapping segments can then be crossed to break down large segments (*13*), resulting in genes of

interest captured in short introgressed segments with reduced linkage drag, ready to be crossed into elite lines

and deployed in breeding programmes.

Identifying the introgressed content of each introgression line is important for the effective utilisation of these

lines. Insufficient marker density and low resolution of genomic *in situ* hybridisation (GISH) limits the

resolution at which segments can be identified. Genotyping, using methods such as Kompetitive allele specific

PCR (KASP), is a cheap and effective way to screen lines for introgressed segments. Determining the precise

size and positions of segments and refining positions of overlap between introgression lines is important when

relating to phenotypic data to narrow down regions containing genes of interest. Identifying introgression

boundaries at a higher resolution will allow lines with overlapping segments to be identified; these can be

crossed to break down segments and capture genes of interest in smaller segments with reduced linkage drag.

Wild relative genes have undergone selection in a different environment to the agricultural setting in which

elite wheat lines are selected and thus may be deleterious, or be, at the very least imperfect replacements of

their wheat orthologue when deployed in field conditions. Therefore, many genes introgressed along with a

gene of interest will contribute to reduced agronomic performance of a line. This reduced performance will be

driven by differences both in the encoded protein and in the pattern of expression of the introgressed gene

compared to the wheat orthologue it replaced. In addition to these cis effects of introgression, disruptions to

established regulatory networks and resulting trans effects on the expression of background wheat genes will

likely contribute to altered performance.

Ordinarily, hexaploid wheat behaves as a diploid during meiosis. The *Pairing Homoeologous 1* (*Ph1*) locus is

largely responsible for this behaviour, restricting synapsis and crossovers to homologous chromosomes (*14*). A

suppressed or deleted *Ph1* locus enables recombination between wheat chromosomes and non-homologous

wild relative chromosomes and has been a major tool used for decades to transfer wild relative genes into

wheat (*15*). However, this also enables homoeologous chromosomes to pair and recombine leading to

transmission of chromatin between the subgenomes of wheat (*16*) and deletions/duplications where synteny

between homoeologous chromosomes breaks.

Here, we have conducted a high-resolution genomic analysis on 17 *Am muticum*/hexaploid wheat

introgression lines (*11*, *12*), utilising whole-genome sequencing (WGS) data from the introgression lines and

the parent lines and a draft genome assembly of *Amblyopyrum muticum* [(Boiss.) Eig.; *Aegilops mutica* Boiss;

2n=2X=14; genome TT], a wild relative of wheat belonging to its tertiary gene pool. Phenotypic screening of

Am. muticum introgression lines (*17*) has revealed resistances to leaf, stem and stripe rust not observed in the

parental wheat lines and thus likely conferred by introgressed genes. KASP genotyping to identify segments

has been conducted on many of these lines (*18*). Through this analysis, we have pinpointed introgression

segment junctions to a higher resolution than previously possible, in many cases within a single pair of reads,

demonstrating segments of variable size that overlap between introgression lines, which explains some

differences in resistance phenotype seen between lines. These overlaps will enable these segments to be

further broken down by crossing introgression lines together. Using *in silico* karyotyping, we have shown that

large-scale structural disruption is ubiquitous across the lines, including deletions and duplications up to

whole-chromosome size and homoeologous recombination likely facilitated by the suppressed *Ph1* locus. A

genome assembly and gene annotation of *Am. muticum* has enabled us to identify introgressed resistance

genes in stripe, stem and leaf rust resistant lines that may represent novel resistance conferred by *Am.*

muticum genes. Analysis of gene expression of six introgression lines compared to the wheat parent lines has

revealed a tendency for introgressed genes to be downregulated or silenced compared to the wheat

orthologue they replace, with minimal balancing of the homoeologous copies in the remaining subgenomes.

Results

Whole genome sequencing facilitates high resolution introgression detection

To reveal *Am. muticum* segments within introgression lines using WGS data, we developed a workflow that

utilises mapping coverage and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) information from the introgression line

and the wheat parents. If a wheat segment is replaced by an *Am. muticum* segment the mapping coverage will

drop in that region due to structural variation and breaks in synteny between wheat and *Am. muticum*. Due to

the homozygous nature of the lines, homozygous muticum-specific SNPs are indicative of the site of

introgression. Reads derived from an introgressed segment that aberrantly map to a non-introgressed region

will map at the same position as the wheat reads coming from that region and result in heterozygous SNP calls

with muticum-specific and wheat-specific alleles found at the same position. Therefore, to locate

introgressions, we searched for genomic blocks with reduced mapping coverage, homozygous *Am. muticum*-

specific SNPs and few heterozygous *Am. muticum*-specific SNPs. We identified introgressions using 1Mbp

genomic windows and then defined the borders to a higher resolution using 100Kbp genomic windows. Figure

1A shows an example of this macro-level visualisation of introgression line DH65, which has a 51.29Mbp

segment on the telomere of the short arm of chr4D, and a 139.6Mbp monosomic deletion on the short arm of

chr5B. Macro-level genome plots for all lines can be seen in fig. S1.

Fig. 1. Identifying introgressed *Am. muticum* segments using whole-genome sequencing data. A Visualising introgressed segments and structural variation in introgression lines using WGS sequencing data. Each point represents the deviation in mapping coverage compared to the parent lines in 1Mbp windows across Chinese Spring RefSeq v1.0. Windows within assigned *Am. muticum* introgression blocks are coloured red. Introgression line DH65, which has a 51.29Mbp introgressed segment on chr4D and a 139.6Mbp monosomic on chr5D. **B** IGV image showing junction at the right-hand side of chr4D segment in the introgression line DH65 (fig. 1A), spanned by both illumina and nanopore data from DH65. The first four tracks show mapped illumina WGS data, the fifth track shows assembled nanopore contig for DH65 and the bottom track shows high confidence genes from the RefSeq v1.1 annotation.

Using this approach, we confirm the existence of 100% of segments previously identified with KASP genotyping

(*18*). However, we were able to resolve the locations of segment junctions to a much higher resolution than

previous methods, due to the limited marker density available for KASP genotyping and the inability of GISH to

resolve segments below ~20Mbp. In addition, we were able to uncover two previously unreported segments

that have been subsequently validated by KASP genotyping (*18*); a 17.39Mbp on the telomere of chr7D of

DH195 and a 22.68Mbp segment on the telomere of chr5D in DH121. We also identified a new 3.99Mbp

segment on chr6D of DH15 that we subsequently validated using 2 KASP markers, WRC1873 and WRC1890. All

precise segment positions are listed in table S2.

By manually searching the boundary regions using IGV, we were able to identify segment end positions for

33/42 segment ends (78.6%). Looking solely at crossovers (excluding telomere substitutions) and excluding

junctions from non-independently derived segments, we could identify the precise crossover point between

wheat and *Am. muticum* in 12/17 (70.6%) cases. Of the remaining junctions, two were narrowed down to

within 100kbp and three had complex structures with duplication events that prohibited precise localisation.

Out of the 12 high resolution junctions, 11 (91.7%) were within 670bp upstream or downstream of a wheat

gene, with 8 falling within the gene body itself, suggesting that crossover points may be localised to genes. The

remaining junction was 6.75Kbp downstream from the nearest gene.

For line DH65, the pinpointed junction was validated with nanopore data (fig. 1B). 7x coverage of nanopore

sequencing data for DH65 was produced and mapped to the RefSeq v1.0 along with the illumina data.

Nanopore reads spanned the breakpoint between *Am. muticum* and wheat at the right-hand side of the

51.6Mbp chr4D segment, adding confidence to the illumina identification. We assembled these mapped

nanopore reads using wtdbg2 (*19*) with relaxed parameters to include reads that were clipped due to high

divergence between wheat and *Am. muticum*, producing a contig that spans the junction. The nanopore contig

spans the entire junction, including regions to which neither the illumina reads from *Am. muticum* or DH65

map. These regions appear to have elevated SNP density, explaining the gaps in mapping.

For introgression lines with KASP genotyping verification, WGS data may offer an affordable tool to aid

breeders to identify precise location and size of these segments. To assess the sequencing depth requirements

and locate the position and size of introgressed segments using coverage deviation alone, we downsampled

the paired-end Illumina sequencing data from 2 lines for which we have identified very precise positions of the

junction borders; DH65, and DH92, to 1x, 0.1x, 0.01x and 0.001x to choose the lowest depth at which we could

still resolve segment position. 0.01x was the lowest depth that still provided good resolution (fig. S2).

Introgression crossing induces large chromosomal aberrations and homoeologous

pairing/recombination

In addition to introgression sites, we have identified large deletions and duplications, many of which were

whole arm or whole chromosome in scale, based on the deviations in mapping coverage not attributable to

introgressions. Within the 17 lines examined, 12 lines (70.6%) have 1 or more very large chromosomal

aberrations exceeding 140Mbp. These include 3 examples of whole chromosomes being duplicated, along with

the corresponding deletion of one of its homoeologous chromosomes (fig. 2A), 2 arm or near-arm deletions

(fig. 2B), 2 near arm monosomies at identical positions between 2 independently derived lines (fig. 2C), and 2

whole-chromosome monosomies (fig. 2E).

Fig. 2. Large chromosomal aberrations induced by introgression crossing. Each point shows mapping coverage deviation compared to the wheat parents in 500Kbp windows across the genome. **A** Corresponding duplication and deletion seen in both DH lines of BC3 pair, caused by pairing of a duplicated chr1A and chr1B. Mapping coverage deviation of 1 at the end of chr1A and chr1B indicates a large translocation between chr1A and chr1B has taken place in duplicated chr1A+chr1B pair and discontiguous mapping coverage deviation change towards beginning of chr1A and chr1B suggests lots of smaller translocation events. **B** Arm deletions on homoeologous chromosomes of DH pair. Possibly caused by pairing of chr4A and chr4B due to inverted synteny between these chromosomes. **C** Monosomic deletions at the same position in two independently derived lines. **D** Signal of duplicated translocations within homoeologous group 6, at similar positions in two independently derived lines. **E** Monosomic deletion of chr1A in DH195. **F** Complex chromosome structure, with a chimeric chr5A-chr5D replacing chr5B.

Homoeologous translocations resulting in the non-reciprocal transfer of genetic material can be detected

through mapping coverage deviation, indicated by a duplication and deletion in corresponding homoeologous

regions. We can also use differences within a DH pair (table S1) to infer what genetic events must have taken

place to give rise to the segregation patterns we see from DH lines derived from the same BC3 line. We see

evidence of homoeologous pairing both from duplicated/deleted pairs of chromosomes, such as in DH355 and

DH124 (fig. 2A) and from signatures of duplicated translocations, such as in DH202 and BC2F420 (fig. 2D). In

BC2F420, the event involves two chromosomes, and in DH202 it involves all three chromosomes in the

homoeologous group, where a region on chr6B and chr6D have duplicated and translocated side by side

replacing the homoeologous regions on chr6A.

Genome assembly and annotation of Am. muticum:

To facilitate identification of introgressed genes both for differential expression analysis and to find candidate

introgressed resistance genes, we produced a draft genome assembly for *Am. muticum* comprising most of the

gene space. 178Gbp of Oxford Nanopore reads were produced for *Am. muticum* accession JIC 2130012

(previously *Aegilops mutica;* GRU Store Code: T2130012). 156Gbp of these reads passed filtering and were

assembled using Flye (*20*). After polishing the resulting assembly with long and short reads and resolving

haplotigs, the assembly comprised 96,256 contigs and was 2.53Gbp in length, with an N50 of 75.5Kbp.

Mapping the nanopore reads back to the assembly and computing coverage across single-copy genes allowed

us to estimate the genome size at ~4.99Gbp. This is smaller than the c-value estimate for *Ae. mutica* of

6.174Gbp (*21*), suggesting variation in genome size between accessions. This is supported by variation in c-

value seen across wild *Aegilops tauschii* accessions (*21*). Although heavily collapsed, spanning just 50.1% of the

estimated genome size, BUSCO analysis (*22*) revealed that 94.2% of the expected gene space was assembled

unfragmented. Gene annotation using root and shoot transcripts, proteome, and ab initio evidence resulted in

63,032 gene models, 48,606 of which received transferred functional annotations from other well annotated

species. 26,597 *Am. muticum* genes were identified as orthologous to a corresponding wheat gene and

assigned to an orthologue pair.

Expression of introgressed genes and trans-regulatory impact on the transcriptome

To explore how introgressed genes are expressed and to understand the impact of introgression crossing on

the wheat transcriptome, we produced mRNAseq data for six of the introgression lines. *Am. muticum* genes

introgressed into each line were identified using orthologue assignments and DNA read mapping evidence.

RNA was mapped to a pseudo genome (ABDT) constructed by concatenating RefSeq v1.0 with the draft *Am.*

muticum genome assembly; this allows us to distinguish RNA deriving from wheat from RNA deriving from *Am.*

muticum genes. Differential expression was called between each introgression line and the wheat parent lines

using DESeq2 (*23*), substituting expression counts of wheat genes in introgressed regions with those of the

introgressed *Am. muticum* orthologue. Between 20.1% and 32.9% (27.2% across all lines) of introgressed

genes were called as differentially expressed (abs($\log_2$FC) >= 1 and adj. p-value <= 0.05 in both parental

comparisons) when compared to the expression in the parent lines of the wheat orthologue they replaced (fig. 3). Between 57.1% and 87.3% (73.5% across the lines) of these differentially expressed introgressed genes were downregulated or silenced in the introgression line.

Fig. 3. Differential expression within introgression lines. Differential expression in 6 introgression lines, looking at introgressed genes compared to the orthologue they replaced in the parent lines, and background wheat genes compared to the expression in the wheat parent lines. The height of the bar represented the percentage of genes differentially expressed within introgressed and background regions for each line. The number above each bar is the number of genes called as differentially expressed.

We hypothesised that suppression of wheat genes in an introgressed or deleted region would lead to a change

in the expression of homoeologous copies of that gene in the other subgenomes to compensate for the loss of

expression and partially or completely restore the overall level of expression across the triad. The results of

multiple approaches support a lack of overall rebalancing of the triad following suppression of one of the

copies, both in the 400Mbp introgressed region on chr5D of BC3F45 and in the deletion of chr7D in DH161 (fig.

4). In the introgression, there were 262 triads with the D copy introgressed and called as downregulated; just 1

(0.382%) of these triads had one or more homoeologues called as upregulated; this compares to 4 (0.0509%)

triads out of 7863 background triads having the A or B homoeologue upregulated. For the deletion, out of

1294 triads with D copy deleted and therefore not expressed, just 5 triads had one or more homoeologues

upregulated (0.386%); this compares to 13 triads (0.170%) out of 7637 background triads having the A or B

homoeologue upregulated. Despite the percentage of upregulated homoeologues being lower in the

background, the difference is not significant (Fisher's exact test two-tailed p-values of 0.151 and 0.167,

respectively) and the number of triads with upregulated homoeologues is very small regardless.

Fig. 4. Expression profile across introgressed and a deleted region and their homoeologous regions. Exploring triads **A** Within chr5D:1-400Mbp introgression in BC3F45 where chr5D copy is replaced with *Am. muticum* orthologue and **B** within chr7D in DH161 where the chr7D copy deleted. i. DESeq2 processed log₂FC of expression compared to Paragon binned into 10Mbp windows ii. Macro level structure in 1Mbp windows. Each point represents the deviation in mapping coverage compared to the parent lines in 1Mbp windows across Chinese Spring RefSeq v1.0. Windows within assigned *Am. muticum* introgression blocks are coloured red; iii. Triad expression balance in triads where the D copy has been deleted or replaced by introgressed gene, comparing the wheat parent Paragon with the introgression line; iv. log₂FC of A, B and D in triads in which the D copy has been deleted or replaced by an introgressed gene.

To complement the above approach and consider homoeologues whose expression may have changed but not

sufficiently to be called as significant by DESeq2, we looked at the $\log_2$ fold change ($\log_2$FC) in DESeq2

normalised expression counts. Plotting the $\log_2$FC in 10Mbp windows across the chromosomes illustrates the

correlation between introgression boundaries and alteration of expression as well as a lack of general

expression change in the homoeologous regions. For the introgression and the deletion, we compared the

$\log_2$FC of the A and B homoeologues of triads where the D copy had been introgressed or deleted with the

$\log_2$FC of the A and B homoeologues of a control set of triads where the D copy is not differentially expressed

(fig 4A iv and 4B iv). We found no statistically significant difference between the test and control sets (two-

tailed t test p-values: deletion = 0.142; introgression = 0.0656). This indicates that, like the proportion of DEGs,

the change in expression counts of homoeologues in which the D copy has been downregulated/silenced does

not change beyond that expected by chance in triads in which the D copy is present and not differentially

expressed.

In lines possessing the chr5D introgression or the chr7D deletion, the balance of expression in the triads

shifted towards D suppression (fig. 4A iii), although this suppression was less extreme for the introgression due

to a partial compensation from the introgressed *Am. muticum* genes. Across chr5D:1-400Mbp, the region

introgressed in BC34F45, 66.4% of triads are balanced in Paragon, compared to just 1.56% of triads balanced in

the introgression line, with 74.4% being D suppressed. This further supports a lack of compensation as the

parental triad balance seen in the wheat parents is not retained, with triads that were balanced becoming D

suppressed and triads that were D suppressed remaining D suppressed.

To explore the indirect impact of expression on the wheat background caused by trans effects and not altered

copy number, we also looked at genes in genomic windows not deviating in coverage compared to the wheat

parent lines (fig. 3). Between 0.182% and 2.43% (107-1268 genes; 0.890% across all lines) of these wheat

genes were differentially expressed compared to the wheat parents. To assess whether any specific gene

functions were enriched in the differentially expressed genes we looked for enriched GO Terms (fig. S3). We

found some terms to be enriched, suggesting a non-stochastic impact on background transcription, however

differences between lines suggests that the nature of trans impact depends on the genes

introgressed/disrupted elsewhere in the genome. Some terms are enriched in more than 3 lines, suggesting

these are commonly affected in response to the large structural changes. These are oxidoreductase activity,

oxidation-reduction process, tetrapyrrole binding, catalytic activity, carbohydrate metabolic process, cofactor

binding, which are enriched in downregulated genes; and ion binding, hydrolase activity, and catalytic activity,

which are enriched in upregulated background genes.

Identifying candidate introgressed genes underlying Am. muticum derived rust resistance

Combining high resolution definition of segment positions with phenotypic information allows us to compare

lines and more accurately predict the location of genes underlying the phenotype of interest. Combining this

with a genome assembly of the introgressed wild relative allows us to identify introgressed genes that act as

candidate genes for the phenotype of interest. We explored this approach using previously reported rust

resistance phenotypes as a case study. Two of the lines that we sequenced, DH92 and DH121 (fig. 5), have

complete resistance at the seedling stage to Kansas isolates of *Puccinia striiformis tritici* (stripe/yellow rust)

(*17*). DH92 also displays chlorotic adult resistance to leaf rust and partial resistance to stem rust that is absent

in DH121. These lines have overlapping 5D segments, the positions of which were refined to 533.2-566.1Mbp

(32.9Mbp) in DH92, and 544.1-566.1Mbp (22Mbp) in DH121. The source of the stripe rust resistance is likely

within the overlapping 22.68Mbp region, and the source of leaf/stem rust resistance is likely within the

10.9Mbp region unique to DH92.

Fig. 5. Identifying candidate introgressed resistance genes. Introgression lines DH92 and DH121 possess a partially overlapping introgressed segment on chr5D, a common resistance phenotype to stripe rust but a differential resistance phenotype to leaf and stripe rust. A Macro-level structure of the D subgenome of DH92 and DH121 (no segments on A or B subgenomes). Each point represents the deviation in mapping coverage compared to the parent lines in 1Mbp windows across Chinese Spring RefSeq v1.0. Windows within assigned *Am. muticum* introgression blocks are coloured red. B Identifying resistance genes uniquely introgressed in DH92 and DH121 and thus candidates for the stripe rust resistance shared between the two lines.

Using a mapping-based approach to the pseudo ABDT genome and combining with functional annotation, we

identified 13 complete nucleotide-binding, leucine-rich repeat (NLR) immune receptors uniquely introgressed

in these two lines. 12 of these have a syntenic wheat orthologue within the overlapping region of the 5D

segments. 2 of the NLRs display unique NB-ARC domain signatures (< 80.0% protein identity) when compared

to 16 assembled wheat cultivars and wheat progenitor genomes; *Ae. tauschii*, *Triticum urartu*, and *T. turgidum*

ssp. *dicoccoides*. 10 of the NLRs are within a 597.34Kbp cluster, which includes the 2 NLRs with novel NB-ARC

domains, which are anchored within 19.06Kb from one another. We also identified 2 ABC transporters

uniquely introgressed, both of which have 5D orthologues with over 97.5% protein identity, and 7 protein

kinase genes uniquely introgressed. 6 of these are LRR protein kinases and 1 has a malectin-like domain and a

protein kinase domain. 3 of these protein kinases are highly diverged at the protein level compared to the

closest protein in wheat (52.2%, 74.2% and 77.0%). NLRs, ABC transporters and LRR protein kinases have all

been previously implicated in resistance to stripe, leaf and stem rust (*24–26*). Gene candidates are detailed in

table S6.

We identified 3 wall-associated protein kinases (WAKs), and 3 protein kinases uniquely introgressed in DH92

with orthologoues or proximal to orthologues of wheat genes in the 10.9Mbp non-overlapping region of the

5D segment. All but 1 of these were found on the same 104.7Kbp contig. 2 of the WAKs are orthologues of

TaWAK388 and TaWAK390 on 5D and 1 is orthologous to TaWAK255 on chr4A. Wall-associated kinases have

previously been associated with leaf rust adult plant resistance (APR) (*27*). Two of the protein kinases are

identical at the protein level and are most similar to TaWAK387 just upstream of the TaWAK388 and

TaWAK390. These may be truncated tandem duplications of this WAK. Unlike the other uniquely introgressed

genes identified, the WAKs have some reads mapping to them in most of the introgression lines but only in

DH92 is the coverage uniform across their lengths. This likely suggests that these are uniquely introgressed in

DH92 and thus can remain as resistance candidates, but similar *Am. muticum* WAKs present in other lines are

falsely mapping to these. This is supported by a lack of mapping across the rest of the contig in the other lines,

unlike DH92. Gene candidates are detailed in table S7.

Discussion

Using whole-genome sequencing to pinpoint wild relative introgressions in wheat – an affordable
approach to better characterise introgression lines

The current approach for studying synthetic introgression lines prior to deployment in breeding programmes

relies on cytogenetic and genotyping techniques, namely GISH and KASP (*12, 18*). *De novo* discovery of SNPs to

produce higher density KASP markers has improved the resolution and as demonstrated here, recent KASP

genotyping was able to detect most of the introgressed segments identified with our approach. However,

these approaches lack the resolution needed to unpick the precise size and location of segments and will likely

miss small segments without the guidance of WGS data to identify areas in which additional markers should be

deployed. We observe this with the new chr6D segment, the small chr7D segment in DH195 and chr5D

segment in DH121, the latter two of which are novel sources of disease resistance.

We have demonstrated how whole genome sequencing data can be used to define introgressions to a very

high resolution as well as resolve large-scale structural changes in these lines. Downsampling has shown that if

we don't require SNP information, only 0.01x sequencing coverage is required to pinpoint the junctions of

known introgressed segments to a comparable resolution. Overlaying this information with KASP genotyping

will undoubtedly provide an affordable method to characterise sets of synthetic introgression lines more

accurately and comprehensively.

Introgressed segments nested within complex genomic structures, such as in DH202 (fig. S1), can only be

inferred in conjunction with cytogenetic data and/or segregation patterns of DH pairs. In this example, the

part of the introgression signal from chr7D appears on chr7A instead, due to a 7D-7A translocation. Some

introgression segment boundaries, such as the left-hand border of chr2A in DH15, can be identified but are

difficult to pinpoint precisely due to structural complexities around the junction. Therefore, caution is advised

when relying on introgression assignments provided by WGS data alone, particularly for complex lines with

several large introgressions/deletions/duplications. However, for most lines, where genomic structure is

simpler, this approach is robust, and is nevertheless an improvement on lower resolution methods, even if

only to identify confounding structural complexities that would otherwise have been missed.

We have found that crossover points between wheat and *Am. muticum* mostly take place within or adjacent to

genes. Previous work has shown crossovers between wheat and wild relatives are enriched in gene rich

regions (*28*), which mirrors recombination rates along the genome (*29*). Here we have achieved sufficient

resolution to reveal these wild relative crossovers are taking place not only in regions of open chromatin and

increased recombination rate, but within the genes themselves. This may be because these are the points at

which synteny is sufficiently high for recombination to take place.

Genomic instability following alien introgression crossing

We have illustrated that structural disruption is common in introgression pre-breeding material, including

homoeologous pairing and recombination, and duplications and deletions up to chromosome size. This is likely

caused by the *Am. muticum*-induced suppression of the *Ph1* locus which is currently used to induce

recombination between wheat and wild relative chromosomes. This *Ph1* suppression enables pairing of

chromosomes from different subgenomes, which can cause translocations between subgenomes and unstable

chromosome pairings that can cause large deletions and duplications. Forced pairings between wheat and wild

relative chromosomes in the F1 cross are likely also responsible for structural change. The DH process could be

inducing structural change, but the fact we see this in lines that haven't undergone this process excludes the

DH process from being the primary explanation. We can be confident that *Ph1* is contributing to the structural

change due to the evidence of subgenome pairings we see tied to some of these chromosomal aberrations.

Backcrossing in the development of these lines will have removed much of the initially induced structural

change, so what we see here is a subset of structural change initially generated. An awareness of

chromosomal aberrations is important for breeders using these lines in their breeding programmes. It will be

important to identify the location of the *Ph1* suppressor in *Am. muticum* and other wild relatives that have an

innate *Ph1* suppression system, such as *Ae. speltoides* (*30*) to prevent segments being carried forward into

breeding programmes that contain a *Ph1* suppressor that could generate further genomic disruption.

Smaller scale variation in mapping coverage suggests that structural disruption is not restricted to large

crossovers and provides some evidence of many potentially smaller scale structural variations in these lines

that we can't accurately assess with our available data, such as transposable element mobilisation and smaller

INDELs. It will be important to assess the nature and extent of such variation in the future. To understand this

type of variation, we will need a genome assembly of an introgression line and the wheat parents used in the

cross, or a genome assembly of the wheat parent and long read data from the introgression line like we

produced here for DH65. Unfortunately, structural variation between available chromosome-level genome

assemblies and Paragon and Pavon76 is too great for structural variants arising from genome shock to be

distinguished from existing structural variation between the cultivars.

Given that we see large-scale structural change as a by-product of most synthetically derived introgressions,

perhaps similar structural changes have been induced from historic natural introgressions of wild relative

material. We are increasingly becoming aware of the abundance of introgressions throughout wheat

germplasm (*31*, *32*); it is possible that many of the structural changes/rearrangements we see in wheat

accessions has its origin in unstable chromosome pairings induced by natural introgression events and could

be driving the evolution of wheat genomes beyond the addition of novel genes.

Gene expression following alien introgression, lack of homoeologous balancing, and impact on the
wheat transcriptome

Many of the introgressed genes are differentially expressed compared to the wheat orthologue replaced. This

makes sense biologically due to the very different genomic background the *Am. muticum* genes have been

introgressed into, with many factors likely underlying these observed differences such as mismatches between

transcription factor binding sites of *Am. muticum* genes and the transcription factors found in wheat. Two

previous studies have explored the expression of genes in wheat introgression lines with barley (*33*) and

Aegilops longissima (*34*) introgressed. Due to the differences in methods used for different studies, it is

difficult to compare the total proportion of DEGs. However, both previous studies also show that many

introgressed genes are differentially expressed with most of these being downregulated or silenced.

We expected to see some balancing of expression in the homoeologues of genes heavily downregulated or

silenced due to introgression or deletion events, but we didn't observe significant alteration in the expression

of homoeologues. This lack of response suggests that if large-scale balancing of triad expression does take

place, it must require selection pressure, which these synthetic lines lack. Now that genome assemblies are

available for wheat cultivars possessing many wild relatives introgressions (*31*) that have undergone extensive

artificial selection in a wheat background, it will be interesting to analyse how these introgressed regions are

expressed and whether balancing of triad expression arises after a period of selection.

Due to the complex nature of the introgression line genomes, it is difficult to distinguish between the effect of

introgressions and deletions/monosomies on the background expression. In the future, analysing the

expression of introgression lines with less complex genomes may allow us to better unpick the trans-

regulatory effects of introgressed genes from those of deleted or duplicated wheat genes. We see some

commonly enriched GO Terms in the genomic background that may be linked with cellular stress or loss of

cellular homeostasis; this conclusion is supported by conclusions drawn in the wheat/barley introgression line

(*33*). The lines without these enriched GO Terms have less disruption overall, with fewer differentially

expressed genes in the background and thus may either not have sufficient genomic stress to trigger these

responses or lack sufficient sample size of DEGs to call significance.

A case study for uncovering candidate introgressed genes underlying phenotypes of interest

Combining high resolution detection of introgressed segment borders with phenotype information and a genic

assembly of *Am. muticum* has enabled us to identify likely regions for novel resistances and produce lists of

candidate genes. This will allow breeders to target regions to incorporate into elite lines and to analyse further

to identify causal resistance genes. It also acts as a template that can be built upon for new methods to unpick

traits of interest in sets of introgression lines.

We identified the probable region of stripe rust resistance in DH92 and DH121 as being within the 22.68Mbp

overlapping region of the chr5D segment. The small size and telomeric position of this segment makes it

conducive for use in breeding. Within this region, we have identified candidate resistance genes, including 3

novel NLRs and 3 novel LRR Pkinase proteins. We searched for other classes of genes that have been cloned

for stripe rust resistance (*35*), such as hexose transporter, wheat Kinase-START (WKS), tandem kinase-

pseudokinase (TKP), but found no examples of these genes uniquely introgressed in these lines. The DH92

resistance to leaf rust that is not shared with DH121, is only seen in adult plants and to a composite of isolates;

this race non-specific APR tends to be more durable and, in combination with the small segment size, makes

this resistance another good target for further characterisation. We identified 3 WAKs and 3 protein kinases

uniquely introgressed in DH92. Wall-associated kinases have previously been shown to confer resistance to

leaf rust that looks similar to APR (*27*) and protein kinase proteins, such as Yr36, have been implicated in APR

(*36*). It should be noted that any resistance here could be conferred by genes that are absent from the

assembly or the annotation. If only interested in either the stripe rust or leaf/stem rust resistance, DH92 and

DH121 could be crossed to recover the desired resistance in a smaller segment with less linkage drag.

Accession-level differences between wild relatives used for introgression crossing might underlie differences in

phenotype between introgression lines with overlapping segments. This is likely the case for the leaf rust

resistance in DH195. DH195 has seedling and adult leaf rust resistance not seen in DH202, DH123, or

DH121(*17*), all of which have 7D/7T segments. Differences in segment size and position between these lines

(fig. S1) are insufficient to explain the differential resistance we see as there is no segment in DH195 with no

overlaps with the other 3 lines. However, the *Am. muticum* accession used to produce DH195 and DH202 (*Am.*

muticum 2130004) is different to that used to produce DH121 and DH123 (*Am. muticum* 2130012) so

differences in resistance genes between these accessions in the 16.69Mbp region at the end of the

chromosome may underlie resistance. Isolating this telomeric segment from the other DH195 segment and

screening for resistance will be able to confirm this and provide a new segment conferring resistance for

breeders to utilise. Due to the *Am. muticum* assembly being produced from *Am. muticum* 2130012, any

resistance genes specific to 2130004 would not be present in the assembly and so cannot be assessed.

These lines as well as many other sets of synthetic introgression lines are being phenotyped for a variety of

agronomically important traits and genome assemblies for additional wild relatives are likely to be produced in

the coming years. The analysis we have described here will work better with improved assemblies in which

contiguous introgressed segments can be reconstructed and introgressed content fully assessed. This study

provides a schematic that can be followed to characterise introgression lines, identify likely positions of genes

of interest within segments and candidate genes underlying the phenotype. This will facilitate more effective

utilisation of introgression pre-breeding material in wheat breeding programmes.

Materials and Methods

Introgression line production and selection

As described in (*11*, *12*), *Am. muticum* accessions 2130004/2130012 were crossed with Pavon76 or Chinese

Spring. The F1 interspecific hybrid was backcrossed 3 times, once with Paragon, Pavon76 or Chinese Spring

and twice with Paragon. To make homozygous lines in which introgressions are stably inherited, the resulting

BC3 lines were either pollinated with maize and treated with colchicine to generate doubled haploids (DH) (*12*)

or were selfed 2 or 3 times. 13 DH lines, 3 selfed lines and 1 heterozygous BC line, along with *Am. muticum*,

Paragon, Pavon76 and Chinese Spring, were selected for DNA WGS. 12 of the lines belong to a pair or a trio of

lines that derive from seed from the same BC1 cross, so common segments are not independently derived. 4

DH and 2 BC lines, along with *Am. muticum*, Paragon, Pavon76 and Chinese Spring, were selected for RNA

extraction and sequencing.

WGS, read processing, mapping and SNP calling:

Am. muticum introgression lines and wheat parents were grown in a growth room (16h, 21°C day/8h, 18°C

night). Genomic DNA from young leaves was isolated using extraction buffer (0.1 m Tris–HCl pH 7.5, 0.05 m

EDTA pH 8.0, 1.25% SDS). Samples were incubated at 65 °C for 1 h before being placed on ice and mixed with

ice-cold 6 m $NH_4C_2H_3O$ for 15 min. The samples were then spun down, the supernatant was mixed with

isopropanol to pellet the DNA and the isolated DNA was treated with RNase A then purified with

phenol/chloroform. DNAs were dissolved in TE (10mM Tris-HCl pH8.0, 0.1mM EDTA). PCR-free libraries were

produced from this DNA with >600bp insert sizes (gel size-selection). These were sequenced on Illumina

NovaSeq 6000 S4 flowcells to produce 150bp paired-end reads. Adaptors were removed and reads trimmed

for quality using Trimmomatic (*37*) with the following parameters: ILLUMINACLIP:TruSeq3-PE-2.fa:2:30:10

SLIDINGWINDOW:4:15 MINLEN:40 CROP:150. Contaminants were screened and removed using Kontaminant

(*38*) with *E. coli*, phage, and vector libraries.

The cleaned reads were mapped to the Chinese Spring reference genome RefSeqv1.0 (*39*) using BWA-MEM

(*40*) with the -M parameter to enable duplicates to be marked. The alignment was filtered using samtools (*41*):

supplementary alignments, improperly paired reads, and non-uniquely mapped reads (q <= 10) were removed.

PCR duplicates were detected and removed using Picard's MarkDuplicates (*42*). Variants were called using

samtools mpileup (*41*) and bcftools call (*43*) using the multiallelic calling model -m.

Initial variant filtering was performed using GATK VariantFiltration (*42*) to remove INDELs and to retain SNPs

with a quality score >= 30 and a read depth >= 10 for the parental lines and >= 5 for the introgression lines.

Introgression line SNPs were further filtered as follows: homozygous SNPs were kept if 5 or more reads

supporting the alternative allele and the allele frequency (AF) was 1; heterozygous SNPs were kept if 3 or more

reads supporting each allele. Sites with more than 3 alleles were removed.

In silico karyotyping - calculating mapping coverage deviation compared to wheat parents

The number of mapped reads post filtering and duplicate removal was counted across genomic windows

(1Mbp and 100Kbp) in RefSeq v1.0 using bedtools makewindows (*44*) and hts-nim-tools (*45*) for the wheat

parents (Chinese Spring, Paragon and Pavon76) and each introgression line. Mapped read counts were

normalised by dividing by the total read number post duplicate removal. Normalised counts of each

introgression line were divided by the normalised count of each wheat parent in its crossing history (Paragon +

Pavon76 or Paragon + Chinese Spring) and the number closest to 1 was kept as the coverage deviation for that

window, under the assumption that the parent with mapping coverage closest to the introgression line is the

parental donor in that window. The resulting number reflects the copy number of wheat DNA in that window

relative to the wheat parent. A number of 1 indicates that the DNA in that window is present in the same

amount as in the parent line. A number approaching 0 suggests either a deletion or an introgression has

occurred at that region, and a number of 2 suggests a duplication event has taken place. Intermediate values

indicate a heterozygous copy number change. We defined windows with a coverage deviation between 0.8

and 1.2 as being 'normal' and not in copy number variation compared to the wheat parents.

Identifying *Am. muticum*-specific SNPs and assigning introgressed regions:

A set of custom python scripts were used to analyse the coverage deviation files and vcfs and identify the

introgression segments in each line. These scripts, alongside more detailed methods, are available at:

https://github.com/benedictcoombes/alien_detection. First, we produced 18,496,474 SNPs between *Am.*

muticum and Chinese Spring that weren't shared with either Paragon or Pavon76. *Am. muticum* SNPs were

retained as genome-specific if not shared with Paragon or Pavon76. At heterozygous sites where one allele

was specific to *Am. muticum*, the specific SNP was retained. If two alternative alleles present, both were kept if

both were specific to *Am. muticum*.

Introgression line SNPs were then assigned as *Am. muticum* if matching a muticum specific SNP in position and

allele. Sites exceeding 3x mean coverage level were removed; this is a signature of collapsed repeat expansion.

These SNPs were then split into homozygous and heterozygous and binned into 1Mbp windows using bedtools

coverage (*44*). Coverage deviation blocks were defined based on contiguous blocks of 1Mbp windows with

coverage deviation < 0.7, with windows within 5Mbp from the previous coverage deviation block being

merged. The block was discarded if < 80.0% of constituent windows had a coverage deviation < 0.7. 1Mbp

windows containing >= 55 homozygous *Am. muticum* specific SNPs and a ratio of homozygous to heterozygous

Am. muticum specific SNPs >= 4 that fell within a coverage deviation block were classified as candidate *Am.*

muticum windows. Coverage deviation blocks with >= 14% windows assigned as *Am. muticum* using the

parameters above were classed as an introgressed segment. These parameters are adjustable and were

chosen because they revealed previously known introgression segments and didn't falsely class any known

deletions as introgressions. The coverage deviation values in the 100Kbp windows up and downstream of

either end of the introgression blocks were examined to determine where the coverage deviation starts to

decrease. The first 100Kbp window either side that falls below coverage deviation of 0.7 was assigned as the

border window of the segment. To locate the precise position of this junction, the BAM alignment files for *Am.*

muticum, Paragon, Pavon76 and the introgression line were loaded into IGV (*46*). The border window (+-

100Kbp) identified above was searched manually to find the position where the coverage and SNP profile

switches from that of the wheat parents to that of *Am. muticum*.

KASP validation

Genomic DNA was isolated from leaf tissue of 10-day old seedlings in a 96-well plate as described by Thomson

and Henry (*47*). All DH lines were genotyped alongside the three parental wheat genotypes (Chinese Spring,

Paragon and Pavon 76) and the two *Am. muticum* accessions as controls. For each KASP™ assay, two allele-

specific primers and one common primer were used (Table S1). The genotyping procedure was as described in

(*48*). In summary, the genotyping reactions were set up using the automated PIPETMAX° 268 (Gilson, UK) and

performed in a ProFlex PCR system (Applied Biosystems by Life Technology) in a final volume of 5 μl with 1 ng

genomic DNA, 2.5 μl KASP reaction mix (ROX), 0.068 μl primer mix and 2.43 μl nuclease free water. PCR

conditions were set as 15 min at 94°C; 10 touchdown cycles of 10 s at 94°C, 1 min at 65–57°C (dropping 0.8°C

per cycle); and 35 cycles of 15 s at 94°C, 1 min at 57°C. Fluorescence detection of the reactions was performed

using a QuantStudio 5 (Applied Biosystems) and the data analysed using the QuantStudio™ Design and Analysis

Software V1.5.0 (Applied Biosystems).

Nanopore junction validation

DNA from introgression line DH65 extraction was prepared using ligation sequencing kit SQK-LSK109 and

sequenced on a MinION using the R9.4.1_RevD flow cell. Reads were filtered using NanoFilt (*49*) to remove

reads below a quality score of 7 or a length of 1Kbp. Filtered reads were mapped to RefSeq v1.0 using

minimap2 (*50*) with parameters -ax map-ont and --secondary=no. Mapped reads around the breakpoint

(chr4D:51283000-51595000) were extracted using samtools (*41*), including clipped portions of mapped reads,

and assembled using wtdbg2 (*19*). The resulting contigs were mapped to RefSeq v1.0 using minimap2 (*50*) with

parameters -ax map-ont and examined in IGV (*46*) along with the mapped illumina reads from the parent lines

and DH65.

Genome assembly of Am. muticum:

DNA from *Aegilops mutica* (now *Am. muticum*) line 2130012 (JIC) was prepared using ligation sequencing kit

SQK-LSK109 and sequenced on a MinION using the R9.4.1_RevD flow cell. 178Gbp of raw nanopore reads were

filtered using NanoFilt (*49*), removing reads below a quality score of 7 or a length of 1Kbp. Filtered reads were

assembled using the Flye assembler (*20*). Following nanopore read polishing integrated into Flye, we

conducted 2 rounds of pilon (*51*) polishing using 102Gbp of illumina short reads to correct systematic errors in

the nanopore data. Finally, haplotigs that were not collapsed in the assembly were detected and resolved

using purge_haplotigs (*52*). Gene completeness was assessed using BUSCO 3.0.2 (*22*) with parameters -l

viridiplantae_odb10 –species wheat and -m geno.

Estimating genome size:

Filtered nanopore reads were mapped back to the polished genome assembly using minimap2 (*50*) with

parameters -x asm5 and filtered to retain uniquely mapping reads with mapQ >= 10. We computed mean

coverage across single-copy genes in the assembly. These were identified by orthofinder (*53*) with *T. aestivum*,

T. turdigum, *Ae. tauschii*, *T. urartu*, *Brachypodium distachyon*, and *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Am. muticum* genes

belonging to an orthogroup with no other *Am. muticum* genes in all species represented at least once and

fewer than 20 total genes in the orthogroup, were used. The estimated genome size was calculated as the

total number mapped bases / mean coverage across single-copy genes, using post-filtering numbers.

Repeat annotation:

A de novo library of transposable elements was produced using EDTA v1.9.5 (*54*), using cds sequences from *T.*

aestivum to exclude protein-coding regions from the library. The resulting library was aligned to the assembly

using blastn (*55*) and sequences with fewer than 3 full length hits (defined as over 80.0% similarity across more

than 80.0% of the length of the element) were removed and remaining sequences were clustered using cd-hit-

est v4.6.7 (*56*) with parameters aL 0.8 aS 0.8 -c 0.8 to remove redundant sequences. The resulting library was

used to mask the genome assembly using RepeatMasker v4.07 (*57*) with parameters -s -no_is -norna -nolow -

div 40 -cutoff 225.

Gene annotation:

Ab initio, protein homology and transcriptome evidence were combined to predict protein-coding genes in the

Am. muticum assembly. First, the *Am. muticum* RNA reads (4 root replicates and 4 shoot replicates) were

trimmed using Trimmomatic (*37*) with the parameters ILLUMINACLIP:BBDUK_adaptor.fa:2:30:12

SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20 MINLEN:20 AVGQUAL:20. The trimmed RNA reads were mapped to the masked

genome using STAR (*58*). Transcripts were assembled using four independent reference-guided approaches;

Trinity (*59*); StringTie (*60*), cufflinks (*61*) and CLASS2 (*62*). Transdecoder (*63*) was used on each set of

transcripts to produce coding ORFs. PORTCULLIS (*64*) was used to produce splice information. Uniprot (*65*)

reference proteomes for *T. aestivum*, *Ae. tauschii*, *T. turgidum*, *Oryza sativa*, *B. distachyon*, and *A. thaliana*

were aligned to the genome using blastx (*55*). Mikado (*66*) was used to merge and refine the transcripts

produced by each tool, aided by the splice site information and the protein homology evidence. The same

uniprot reference proteomes as above were aligned to the masked genome using TBLASTN (*55*). Hits with an

e-value below 1e-5 and sequence identity greater than 75% within 20Kb were merged using bedtools merge

(*44*). These regions were searched using exonerate (*67*) to refine protein alignments. To produce a set of

transcript annotations to train Augustus (*68*), Mikado protein coding genes were filtered to retain multi-exon

genes with < 80.0% amino acid identity with any other protein, not have a stop codon in the ORF, and be at

least 500bp away from another gene. Of the remaining transcripts, the 2000 with the highest mikado score

were retained and randomly split into 1800 training genes and 200 testing genes. The AUGUSTUS HMM was

trained using these transcripts using etraining followed by 10-fold cross validation using optimize_augustus.pl.

To produce initial *ab initio* gene predictions, Augustus was run using this HMM, along with intron hints

produced from the STAR bam file using bam2hints from Augustus. EvidenceModeler (*69*) was used to produce

a set of HC gene models with *ab initio*, transcriptome, and protein homology evidence. This set of HC genes

was used to retrain Augustus as before, as well as GlimmerHMM (*70*). Augustus, SNAP (*71*) (using the rice

HMM) and GlimmerHMM were run to produce final ab initio gene predictions. These predictions were

incorporated with the transcript and protein homology evidence using EvidenceModeler to produce final gene

models with the following weightings: mikado transcriptome, weight 14; Augustus gene models - weight 4;

exonerate protein evidence - weight 7; SNAP gene models - weight 1; GlimmerHMM gene models - weight 2.

Predicted proteins blasted to the TREP database of transposable elements and to TREMBL proteins. Proteins

were retained with no significant hit to TREP (*72*) but at least one significant hit to TREMBL (*73*). Gene

functions were assigned using eggnog 5.0 (*74*).

Assigning orthologue pairs:

Am. muticum/wheat orthologue pairs were assigned using best reciprocal blast hits between *muticum* and

each wheat subgenome independently. *Am. muticum* proteins (extracted and translated from gff) and wheat

proteins (taken from IWGSC 1.1 pep.fa file for wheat proteins) were aligned reciprocally using blastp (*55*) with

parameters -outfmt 6 -max_hsps 3 -max_target_seqs 3 -evalue 1e-6. Hits were retained if percentage identity

>= 80.0% and alignment length was >= 50.0% query length. An orthologue pair was defined as a pair of

proteins whose top hit were each other.

Classifying introgressed genes

RefSeq v1.0 genome and the draft *Am. muticum* assembly were concatenated to form a pseudo ABDT genome.

DNA reads from the introgression lines were mapped to this genome and filtered using the same process as

mapping to RefSeq v1.0 alone. Introgressed *Am. muticum* genes in each line were defined as those with a

wheat orthologue with a start position that fell within a region labelled as a *Am. muticum* introgression and >=

2x mean mapping coverage across its length from the ABDT pseudo genome mapping above.

mRNA extraction, sequencing, alignment, and quantification

Seeds were germinated and grown to the 4th leaf stage in a growth chamber set to 22C, 16-hour days. Plants

were well watered and supplemented with nutrients. The 4th leaf was extracted and snap frozen in liquid

nitrogen within 20 seconds of sampling and stored at -80C. Three reps of each line were sampled individually.

Each sample was ground in a pestle and mortar using liquid nitrogen and a sub-set taken for Total RNA

extraction using Qiagen RNeasy plant mini kit (Qiagen, Germany). DNA was removed using a digestion step

with RNase-free DNase (Qiagen, Germany). Ratios of 260:280 were measured using a Nanodrop (ThermoFisher

Scientific) and samples were only used with ratios between 1-9 and 2.1. Only samples with RNA integrity

number (RIN) >8 and a concentration of 50-200ng/ul (Agilent Bioanalyzer) were sequenced.

Library preparation was conducted using automated NEBNext Ultra II Directional RNA-Seq library construction

with Poly-A selection and was sequenced in triplicate on an Illumina NovaSeq 6000 S2 flowcell by Genomic

Pipelines at the Earlham Institute to produce 150bp paired-end reads. RNA reads were trimmed using

Trimmomatic (*37*) with the parameters ILLUMINACLIP:BBDUK_adaptor.fa:2:30:12 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20

MINLEN:20 AVGQUAL:20. The gff3 for the high confidence CS genes was concatenated with the gff3 for *Am.*

muticum genes. Splice site hints for HISAT2 were produced using extract_splice_sites.py from HISAT-2.0.4 (*75*).

The trimmed reads were mapped to the pseudo ABDT genome using HISAT2 with the splice hint file provided

and parameters -k 101 --dta --rna-strandness RF. Non uniquely mapping reads were removed using samtools

view -q 40. Stringtie (*60*) was used to compute gene-level abundances, outputting both raw counts and

transcript-per-million (TPM) values.

Differential expression analysis:

For each wheat gene in a region identified as introgressed, they were either removed or their expression count

was replaced with that of its *Am. muticum* orthologue. Differential expression analysis between each

introgression line and its two wheat parents was performed using DESeq2 (*23*). A gene was considered to be

differentially expressed if it had an adjusted p-value below 0.05 and an absolute $\log_2$FC >= 1 in both parental

comparisons. Differentially expressed genes were partitioned into those in introgressed regions, deleted

regions, duplicated regions, and in the unaffected background where coverage deviation is between 0.8 and

1.2.

Testing triad expression balancing

To examine whether genes belonging to triads that have homoeologues that have been replaced by a *Am.*

muticum gene or have been deleted, we took a test set of triads (*76*) that satisfied the following conditions:

593 the D copy is introgressed or deleted and called as downregulated; the A and B copy are in normal copy

594 number regions (coverage deviation between 0.8 and 1.2); and all homoeologues have normalised expression

595 count across samples >= 1. These were compared to control sets of triads that satisfied the same conditions

596 except the D copy was not called as differentially expressed and had abs($\log_2$FC) <= 0.20. These sets were used

597 for both the comparison of number of triads with A and/or B homoeologue upregulated and for the

598 comparisons of the mean $\log_2$FC of the A and B homoeologues between the test and control sample of triads.

599 The significance of these comparisons was tested using two-tailed Fisher's exact test and two-tailed t test,

600 respectively.

601 GO Term analysis

602 We transferred functional GO Term annotation from genes in the RefSeq v1.0 annotation to genes in the

603 RefSeq v1.1 annotation if they shared greater that 99% similarity across greater than 90.0% of their length.

604 Statistically enriched GO Terms within the differentially expressed background gene set were computed using

605 the R package topGO (*77*) with the following parameters: nodeSize=10; classicFisher test p < 0.05 and

606 algorithm="parentchild". Enrichment for GO Terms involved in biological processes was tested against all

607 background genes that fall within windows with mapping coverage deviation between 0.8 and 1.2. Bubble

608 plots were plotted using adapted code.

609 Identifying introgressed resistance genes:

610 *Am. muticum* NLR genes were identified using two parallel methods. The first was to scan the gene models for

611 typical NLR domains using hmmscan from the HMMER package (*78*) in the filtered protein-coding gene models

612 produced by EVM. The second was to scan the entire genome de novo for complete, functional NLR protein-

613 coding regions using NLRAnnotator (*79*). This allowed several additional NLR genes whose gene model had

614 been filtered out or was never constructed to be recovered. Other types of genes that have been previously

615 implicated in stripe rust resistance (*35*) (ABC transporters, Pkinases, hexose transporters, wheat Kinase-START

616 genes, tandem kinase-pseudokinase proteins) were identified from the eggnog annotation and validated

617 manually using hmmscan and pfam domains. Resistance genes were manually checked using IGV to identify

618 candidates with even sequencing coverage across the genes in DH92 and DH121 only, in the case of the shared

619 stripe rust resistance, and across the genes in DH92 only, in the case of the DH92-specific leaf and stem rust

620 resistance. To reduce the number of genes to manually check, we removed any genes with less than 2x mean

621 mapping coverage across their length in either DH92 or DH121. The gene models were manually curated using

622 the available evidence. For NLR predictions with no gene model but transcriptomic and ab initio evidence,

623 gene models were manually constructed. The novelty of the uniquely introgressed NLRs was tested by

624 extracting the NB-ARC domains using hmmscan and aligning them using blastp to the proteins of HC genes

625 from 10 wheat cultivars, and to the proteins of the wheat progenitor species: *Ae. tauschii*; *T. urartu*; and

626 *T. turgidum* ssp. *dicoccoides*. Hits below 85% identity were considered novel. The novelty of the other protein

627 types was tested by aligning the whole amino acid sequence to the same protein set; proteins below <80.0%

628 were considered novel.

References

1. M. Reynolds *et al.*, Achieving yield gains in wheat. *Plant Cell Environ.* **35**, 1799–1823 (2012).

2. M. Hao *et al.*, The resurgence of introgression breeding, as exemplified in wheat improvement. *Front.*
Plant Sci. **11**, 252 (2020).

3. G. Charmet, Wheat domestication: lessons for the future. *C R Biol*. **334**, 212–220 (2011).

4. J. J. Valkoun, Wheat pre-breeding using wild progenitors. *Euphytica*. **119**, 17-23 (2001).

5. D. K. Ray, N. D. Mueller, P. C. West, J. A. Foley, Yield trends are insufficient to double global crop
production by 2050. *PLoS One*. **8**, e66428 (2013).

6. G. Doussinault, A. Delibes, R. Sanchez-Monge, F. Garcia-Olmedo, Transfer of a dominant gene for
resistance to eyespot disease from a wild grass to hexaploid wheat. *Nature*. **303**, 698–700 (1983).

7. B. Friebe, K. S. Gill, N. A. Tuleen, B. S. Gill, Transfer of Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus Resistance from
Agropyron intermedium into Wheat. *Crop Sci*. **36**, 857–861 (1996).

8. A. M. Fatih, Analysis of the breeding potential of wheat-Agropyron and wheat-Elymus derivatives. I.
Agronomic and quality characteristics. *Hereditas*. **98**, 287–295 (1983).

9. E. R. Sears, *The transfer of leaf-rust resistance from Aegilops umbellulata to wheat.* (1956).

10. D. L. Klindworth *et al.*, Introgression and characterization of a goatgrass gene for a high level of
resistance to ug99 stem rust in tetraploid wheat. *G3 (Bethesda)*. **2**, 665–673 (2012).

11. J. King *et al.*, A step change in the transfer of interspecific variation into wheat from Amblyopyrum
muticum. *Plant Biotechnol. J.* **15**, 217–226 (2017).

12. J. King *et al.*, Development of Stable Homozygous Wheat/Amblyopyrum muticum (Aegilops mutica)
Introgression Lines and Their Cytogenetic and Molecular Characterization. *Front. Plant Sci.* **10**, 34
(2019).

13. S. Khazan *et al.*, Reducing the size of an alien segment carrying leaf rust and stripe rust resistance in
wheat. *BMC Plant Biol.* **20**, 153 (2020).

14. M.-D. Rey *et al.*, Exploiting the ZIP4 homologue within the wheat Ph1 locus has identified two lines
exhibiting homoeologous crossover in wheat-wild relative hybrids. *Mol. Breed.* **37**, 95 (2017).

15.   A. C. Martín, M.-D. Rey, P. Shaw, G. Moore, Dual effect of the wheat Ph1 locus on chromosome synapsis
and crossover. *Chromosoma*. **126**, 669–680 (2017).

16.   D.-H. Koo, B. Friebe, B. S. Gill, Homoeologous recombination: A novel and efficient system for
broadening the genetic variability in wheat. *Agronomy*. **10**, 1059 (2020).

17.   J. P. Fellers *et al.*, Resistance to wheat rusts identified in wheat/ *Amblyopyrum muticum* chromosome
introgressions. *Crop Sci* (2020), doi:10.1002/csc2.20120.

18.   S. Grewal *et al.*, A novel approach to develop wheat chromosome-specific KASP markers for detecting
Amblyopyrum muticum segments in doubled haploid introgression lines. *BioRxiv* (2021),
doi:10.1101/2021.09.29.462370.

19.   J. Ruan, H. Li, Fast and accurate long-read assembly with wtdbg2. *Nat. Methods*. **17**, 155–158 (2020).

20.   M. Kolmogorov, J. Yuan, Y. Lin, P. A. Pevzner, Assembly of long, error-prone reads using repeat graphs.
Nat. Biotechnol. **37**, 540–546 (2019).

21.   J. Pellicer, I. J. Leitch, The Plant DNA C-values database (release 7.1): an updated online repository of
plant genome size data for comparative studies. *New Phytol.* **226**, 301–305 (2020).

22.   R. M. Waterhouse *et al.*, BUSCO applications from quality assessments to gene prediction and
phylogenomics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35**, 543–548 (2018).

23.   M. I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data
with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 550 (2014).

24.   H. Wang, S. Zou, Y. Li, F. Lin, D. Tang, An ankyrin-repeat and WRKY-domain-containing immune receptor
confers stripe rust resistance in wheat. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1353 (2020).

25.   S. G. Krattinger *et al.*, A putative ABC transporter confers durable resistance to multiple fungal
pathogens in wheat. *Science*. **323**, 1360–1363 (2009).

26.   S. Chen *et al.*, Wheat gene Sr60 encodes a protein with two putative kinase domains that confers
resistance to stem rust. *New Phytol.* **225**, 948–959 (2020).

27.   M. Dmochowska-Boguta *et al.*, TaWAK6 encoding wall-associated kinase is involved in wheat resistance
to leaf rust similar to adult plant resistance. *PLoS One*. **15**, e0227713 (2020).

28.   M. Nyine *et al.*, Genomic Patterns of Introgression in Interspecific Populations Created by Crossing
Wheat with Its Wild Relative. *G3 (Bethesda)*. **10**, 3651–3661 (2020).

29.   L.-J. Gardiner *et al.*, Analysis of the recombination landscape of hexaploid bread wheat reveals genes

controlling recombination and gene conversion frequency. *Genome Biol.* **20**, 69 (2019).

30.   H. Li *et al.*, Introgression of the Aegilops speltoides Su1-Ph1 Suppressor into Wheat. *Front. Plant Sci.* **8**,
2163 (2017).

31.   S. Walkowiak *et al.*, Multiple wheat genomes reveal global variation in modern breeding. *Nature*. **588**,
277–283 (2020).

32.   A. M. Przewieslik-Allen *et al.*, The role of gene flow and chromosomal instability in shaping the bread
wheat genome. *Nat. Plants*. **7**, 172–183 (2021).

33.   E. Rey *et al.*, Transcriptome reprogramming due to the introduction of a barley telosome into bread
wheat affects more barley genes than wheat. *Plant Biotechnol. J.* **16**, 1767–1777 (2018).

34.   Z. Dong *et al.*, Genome-wide impacts of alien chromatin introgression on wheat gene transcriptions. *Sci.*
Rep. **10**, 4801 (2020).

35.   S. Zheng *et al.*, Characterization and diagnostic marker development for Yr28-rga1 conferring stripe rust
resistance in wheat. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* **156**, 623–634 (2020).

36.   J. G. Ellis, E. S. Lagudah, W. Spielmeyer, P. N. Dodds, The past, present and future of breeding rust
resistant wheat. *Front. Plant Sci.* **5**, 641 (2014).

37.   A. M. Bolger, M. Lohse, B. Usadel, Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
Bioinformatics. **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).

38.   G. M. Daly *et al.*, Host subtraction, filtering and assembly validations for novel viral discovery using next
generation sequencing data. *PLoS One*. **10**, e0129059 (2015).

39.   International Wheat Genome Sequencing Consortium (IWGSC) *et al.*, Shifting the limits in wheat
research and breeding using a fully annotated reference genome. *Science*. **361** (2018),
doi:10.1126/science.aar7191.

40.   H. Li, Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. **00**, 1–3 (2013).

41.   H. Li *et al.*, The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*. **25**, 2078–2079 (2009).

42.   M. A. DePristo *et al.*, A framework for variation discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA
sequencing data. *Nat. Genet.* **43**, 491–498 (2011).

43.   H. Li, A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association mapping and population
genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*. **27**, 2987–2993 (2011).

44. A. R. Quinlan, I. M. Hall, BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.
Bioinformatics. **26**, 841–842 (2010).

45. B. S. Pedersen, A. R. Quinlan, hts-nim: scripting high-performance genomic analyses. *Bioinformatics*. **34**,
3387–3389 (2018).

46. J. T. Robinson *et al.*, Integrative genomics viewer. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **29**, 24–26 (2011).

47. D. Thomson, R. Henry, Single-step protocol for preparation of plant tissue for analysis by PCR.
BioTechniques. **19**, 394–7, 400 (1995).

48. S. Grewal *et al.*, Development of Wheat-Aegilops caudata Introgression Lines and Their Characterization
Using Genome-Specific KASP Markers. *Front. Plant Sci.* **11**, 606 (2020).

49. W. De Coster, S. D'Hert, D. T. Schultz, M. Cruts, C. Van Broeckhoven, NanoPack: visualizing and
processing long-read sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*. **34**, 2666–2669 (2018).

50. H. Li, Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics*. **34**, 3094–3100 (2018).

51. B. J. Walker *et al.*, Pilon: an integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant detection and genome
assembly improvement. *PLoS One*. **9**, e112963 (2014).

52. M. J. Roach, S. A. Schmidt, A. R. Borneman, Purge Haplotigs: allelic contig reassignment for third-gen
diploid genome assemblies. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **19**, 460 (2018).

53. D. M. Emms, S. Kelly, OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative genomics.
Genome Biol. **20**, 238 (2019).

54. S. Ou *et al.*, Benchmarking transposable element annotation methods for creation of a streamlined,
comprehensive pipeline. *Genome Biol.* **20**, 275 (2019).

55. C. Camacho *et al.*, BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **10**, 421 (2009).

56. W. Li, A. Godzik, Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of protein or nucleotide
sequences. *Bioinformatics*. **22**, 1658–1659 (2006).

57. N. Chen, Using RepeatMasker to identify repetitive elements in genomic sequences. *Curr Protoc
Bioinformatics*. **Chapter 4**, Unit 4.10 (2004), doi:10.1002/0471250953.bi0410s05.

58. A. Dobin *et al.*, STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*. **29**, 15–21 (2013).

59. M. G. Grabherr *et al.*, Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference
genome. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **29**, 644–652 (2011).

60.   M. Pertea *et al.*, StringTie enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads.
741   *Nat. Biotechnol.* **33**, 290–295 (2015).

742   61.   C. Trapnell *et al.*, Differential gene and transcript expression analysis of RNA-seq experiments with
743   TopHat and Cufflinks. *Nat. Protoc.* **7**, 562–578 (2012).

744   62.   L. Song, S. Sabunciyan, L. Florea, CLASS2: accurate and efficient splice variant annotation from RNA-seq
745   reads. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, e98 (2016).

746   63.   B. J. Haas *et al.*, De novo transcript sequence reconstruction from RNA-seq using the Trinity platform for
747   reference generation and analysis. *Nat. Protoc.* **8**, 1494–1512 (2013).

748   64.   D. Mapleson, L. Venturini, G. Kaithakottil, D. Swarbreck, Efficient and accurate detection of splice
749   junctions from RNA-seq with Portcullis. *Gigascience*. **7** (2018), doi:10.1093/gigascience/giy131.

750   65.   UniProt Consortium, UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D506–D515
751   (2019).

752   66.   L. Venturini, S. Caim, G. G. Kaithakottil, D. L. Mapleson, D. Swarbreck, Leveraging multiple transcriptome
753   assembly methods for improved gene structure annotation. *Gigascience*. **7** (2018),
754   doi:10.1093/gigascience/giy093.

755   67.   G. S. C. Slater, E. Birney, Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison. *BMC*
756   *Bioinformatics*. **6**, 31 (2005).

757   68.   K. J. Hoff, M. Stanke, Predicting Genes in Single Genomes with AUGUSTUS. *Curr Protoc Bioinformatics*.
758   **65**, e57 (2019).

759   69.   B. J. Haas *et al.*, Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the
760   Program to Assemble Spliced Alignments. *Genome Biol.* **9**, R7 (2008).

761   70.   W. H. Majoros, M. Pertea, S. L. Salzberg, TigrScan and GlimmerHMM: two open source ab initio
762   eukaryotic gene-finders. *Bioinformatics*. **20**, 2878–2879 (2004).

763   71.   I. Korf, Gene finding in novel genomes. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **5**, 59 (2004).

764   72.   T. Wicker, D. E. Matthews, B. Keller, TREP: a database for Triticeae repetitive elements. *Trends Plant Sci.*
765   **7**, 561–562 (2002).

766   73.   A. Bairoch, R. Apweiler, The SWISS-PROT protein sequence data bank and its supplement TrEMBL.
767   *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25**, 31–36 (1997).

74.   J. Huerta-Cepas *et al.*, eggNOG 5.0: a hierarchical, functionally and phylogenetically annotated

orthology resource based on 5090 organisms and 2502 viruses. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D309–D314

(2019).

75.   D. Kim, J. M. Paggi, C. Park, C. Bennett, S. L. Salzberg, Graph-based genome alignment and genotyping

with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 907–915 (2019).

76.   R. H. Ramírez-González *et al.*, The transcriptional landscape of polyploid wheat. *Science*. **361** (2018),

doi:10.1126/science.aar6089.

77.   A. Alexa, J. Rahnenfuhrer, Gene set enrichment analysis with topGO (2020).

78.   R. D. Finn, J. Clements, S. R. Eddy, HMMER web server: interactive sequence similarity searching.

Nucleic Acids Res. **39**, W29-37 (2011).

79.   B. Steuernagel *et al.*, The NLR-Annotator Tool Enables Annotation of the Intracellular Immune Receptor

Repertoire. *Plant Physiol.* **183**, 468–482 (2020).

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge BBS/E/T/000PR9816 (NC1 - Supporting EI's ISPs and the UK Community with

Genomics and Single Cell Analysis) for data generation and BB/CCG1720/1 for the physical HPC infrastructure

and data centre delivered via the NBI Computing infrastructure for Science (CiS) group.

Funding:

BBSRC Core Capability Grant BB/CCG1720/1 (AH)

BBSRC funded Norwich Research Park Biosciences Doctoral Training Partnership grant BB/M011216/1 (BC)

BBSRC Designing Future Wheat grant BB/P016855/1 and its constituent work packages DFW WP4 Data Access

and Analysis

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: AH, JL, IPK, BC

Methodology: BC, RJ, RR-P

Formal analysis: BC

Investigation: JF, SG, CY, SE

Writing - Original Draft: BC

Writing - Review & Editing: BC, AH, RR-P, JK, JF

Visualization: BC

Supervision: AH

Funding acquisition: AH, JK, IPK

Competing interests:

Authors declare that they have no competing interests

Data and materials availability:

Sequencing data produced as part of this study, along with the *Am. muticum* assembly is available at:

https://opendata.earlham.ac.uk/wheat/under_license/toronto/Hall_2021-10-08_wheatxmuticum. [This data

will be uploaded to the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) while the paper is under review]. *Am. muticum*

illumina sequencing data available at:

https://opendata.earlham.ac.uk/wheat/under_license/toronto/Grewal_et_al_2021-09-

13_Amybylopyrum_muticum/. The Chinese Spring sequencing data used is available from ENA (study

PRJNA393343; runs SRR5893651 and SRR5893652). The Paragon sequencing data used is available from ENA

(study PRJEB35709; runs ERR3728451, ERR3760033, ERR3760405 and ERR3728448). Custom scripts used for

introgression detection are available at: https://github.com/benedictcoombes/alien_detection.