Whole genome sequencing uncovers the structural and transcriptomic landscape of hexaploid

wheat/*Ambylopyrum muticum* introgression lines

Benedict Coombes[1], John P. 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 constrained by poor genomic resolution and limited understanding of the genomic

impact of introgression breeding programmes. By sequencing 17 hexaploid wheat/*Ambylopyrum muticum*

introgression lines and the parent lines, we have precisely pinpointed the borders of introgressed segments,

most of which occur within genes. 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 novel introgressed genes are rarely expressed and those that directly replace

a wheat orthologue have a tendency towards downregulation, with no discernible compensation in the

expression of homoeologous copies. This study explores the genomic impact of introgression breeding and

provides a schematic that can be followed to characterise introgression lines and identify segments and

candidate genes underlying the phenotype. This will facilitate more effective utilisation of introgression pre-

breeding material in wheat breeding programmes.

Introduction

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

consumed globally (Reynolds et al., 2012). 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 (Hao et al., 2020). 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 (Charmet, 2011). The limited diversity stemming from this genetic bottleneck has been compounded

over time by intensive breeding. Pressure on breeders to prioritise advanced breeding material (J. Valkoun,

2001) for more rapid development of uniform, high quality varieties 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 (Ray et al., 2013). 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 (Hao et al., 2020; J. Valkoun, 2001) 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 (Doussinault et al., 1983; Fatih, 1983; Friebe et al., 1996; Klindworth et al., 2012; Sears, 1956).

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 (King et al., 2019,

2017). 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 (Khazan et al., 2020), resulting in

genes of interest captured in short introgressed segments with reduced linkage drag, ready to be deployed in

breeding programmes.

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

lines. Insufficient marker density for genotyping approaches such as Kompetitive allele specific PCR (KASP) and

low resolution of genomic *in situ* hybridisation (GISH) limits the resolution at which segments can be identified.

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 direct changes to gene expression caused

by introgression, disruptions to established regulatory networks and the resulting indirect effects on the

expression of wheat genes in the genomic background 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 (Rey et

al., 2017). A suppressed or deleted *Ph1* locus enables recombination between wheat chromosomes and non-

homologous wild relative chromosomes and is a major tool used to transfer wild relative genes into wheat

(Martín et al., 2017). However, this also enables homoeologous chromosomes to pair and recombine leading

to transmission of chromatin between the subgenomes of wheat (Koo et al., 2020) 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 (King et al., 2019, 2017), 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 (Fellers et al., 2020) 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 (Grewal et al., 2021).

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 *Ph1* suppression. 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 that novel introgressed genes are less likely to be

expressed than introgressed genes replacing an orthologue. Introgressed genes directly replacing a wheat

orthologue show a tendency to be downregulated, with no significant 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. This

was performed on 17 double haploid (DH) or backcrossed (BC) *Am. muticum* introgression lines from which

Illumina paired-end short reads were produced to an average depth of around 5x. 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. **A**

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 paired-end reads and Oxford Nanopore reads from DH65. The first four

tracks show mapped illumina WGS data, the fifth track shows assembled contig from aligned Oxford Nanopore

reads 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

(Grewal et al., 2021). 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 (Grewal et al., 2021); 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 (Table S3). All precise segment positions are listed in Table S2.

To explore junction regions of segments in fine detail, we used the Integrative Genome Viewer (IGV) (Robinson

et al., 2011), an interactive browser that allows sequencing reads mapped to a genome within a specified

interval to be manually interrogated. Using IGV to explore the junction regions, we were able to precisely

identify 33/42 segment ends (78.6%). As some segment ends are telomere substitutions as opposed to

crossovers and some segments are derived from the same initial cross, we just looked at uniquely-derived

crossover junctions and found that 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 crossovers 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 Oxford Nanopore long reads mapped to RefSeq v1.0

along with the Illumina paired-end short reads (fig. 1B). Oxford 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 identification from Illumina reads alone. We assembled these mapped Oxford Nanopore reads using

wtdbg2 (Ruan and Li, 2020) 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. This contig spans the entire

junction, including regions to which neither the Illumina reads from *Am. muticum* nor 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 Illumina paired-end short reads 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 comparable resolution (fig. S3).

Introgression breeding process induces homoeologous pairing and large chromosomal aberrations

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 one or more very large chromosomal aberrations exceeding 140Mbp. These include: duplication of most of chr1A with a deletion of the homoeologous region of chr1B in DH pair DH124+DH355 (fig. 2A); deletion of the short arm of chr4A in DH86 and deletion of the long arm of chr4B in its DH pair, DH92 (fig. 2B); monosomic deletion of most of the short arm of chr5D in DH121 and DH65 (fig. 2C), which are not a DH pair, indicating that this event has occurred multiple times at the same position; and a monosomic deletion of chr1A in DH195 (fig. 2E).

Fig. 2. Large chromosomal aberrations in *Am. muticum* introgression lines. 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 lines of the DH 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** Chromosome arm deletions on homoeologous chromosomes of DH pair. **C** Monosomic deletions at the same position in two independently derived lines. **D** Homoeologous exchange within homoeologous group 6, at similar positions in two independently derived lines. **E** Monosomic deletion of chr1A in DH195. **F** Homoeologous recombination event between chr5A and chr5D and a deleted 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 double haploid (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 corresponding deletions/duplications at homoeologous positions

(fig. 2D and fig. 2F). In BC2F420 (fig. 2F), recombination has taken place between chr5A and chr5D and chr5B

has been deleted.

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* 2130012 comprising

most of the gene space. After polishing 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 (Table S5). We estimated the

size of the *Am. muticum* genome through two independent methods: mapping the Oxford Nanopore reads

back to the assembly and computing coverage across single-copy genes; and based on k-mer counts within the

Illumina paired-end reads (fig. S4). These resulted in estimates of 4.90Gbp and 4.57Gbp, respectively,

compared to flow cytometry estimate of 6.174Gbp (Pellicer and Leitch, 2020). Although the genome spans just

53.4% of the estimated genome size (mean of our two independent estimates), BUSCO analysis (Waterhouse

et al., 2018) revealed that 94.2% of the expected gene space was assembled unfragmented (fig. S5). Gene

annotation using evidence from root and shoot transcriptomic data, proteomic data, and ab initio predictions

resulted in 86841 gene models, 32385 of which were designated as high confidence (HC) (Table 1). 28995

(89.8%) of the HC genes were assigned functional annotation.

Table 1 – Metrics for *Am. muticum* high-confidence (HC) and low-confidence (LC) gene models

	HC	LC
Total genes (no.)	32385	54456
Single exon (no.)	6695	27364
Multi exon genes (no.)	25690	27092
Mean gene length (bp)	3355	1642
Median gene length (bp)	2178	713
Mean CDS length (bp)	1198	716
Median CDS length (bp)	1000	502
Mean exons per transcript (no.)	4.81	2.39
Median exons per transcript (no.)	3	1
Mean exon length (bp)	249	307
Median exon length (bp)	131	196

To identify *Am. muticum* genes not present in wheat and gene families that have undergone expansion in *Am.*

muticum, both of which could be contributing novel variation in introgression lines, we used OrthoFinder

(Emms and Kelly, 2019) to construct 31616 orthogroups from the proteins encoded by the HC genes from *Am.*

muticum, *Triticum aestivum*, *Triticum urartu*, *Aegilops tauschii*, *Oryza sativa* and *Brachypodium distachyon* (fig.

S6). 93.8% of *Am. muticum* genes were placed in an orthogroup. 3873 *Am. muticum* genes are not present in

wheat and 108 orthogroups, comprising 867 *Am. muticum* genes, have undergone expansion in *Am. muticum*

compared to wheat. Enrichment analysis of GO Slim terms (fig. S7) revealed that the novel *Am. muticum* genes

were enriched most significantly for terms associated with metabolic processes.

Expression of introgressed genes and impact on the background wheat transcriptome

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

programme on the wheat transcriptome, we produced mRNAseq data for six of the introgression lines and the

wheat parent lines. *Am. muticum* genes introgressed into each line were identified using orthologue

assignments and DNA read mapping evidence. RNA reads were mapped to a pseudo genome (ABDT)

constructed by concatenating the wheat reference genome, RefSeq v1.0, with the draft *Am. muticum* genome

assembly; this allows us to distinguish between RNA deriving from wheat genes and from *Am. muticum* genes

in the same way that we can distinguish between wheat homoeologues.

Across all six lines, 1750/4989 (35.1%) introgressed genes were expressed. Splitting the introgressed genes

into those with an orthologue in wheat and those that are novel revealed that while 1627/3691 (44.1%)

introgressed genes with a wheat orthologue were expressed, only 123/1298 (9.48%) novel introgressed genes

were expressed (fig. 3A). For introgressed genes that do have a wheat orthologue, those that are more

diverged from the orthologue are less likely to be expressed (fig. 3B), ranging from 21.5% of genes with no

wheat orthologue >90% protein identity being expressed, to 64.8% of genes with an orthologue in wheat with

>= 99% protein identity being expressed.

Fig. 3. Expression of introgressed *Am. muticum* genes. A Expression state (Expressed or Not Expressed) of novel introgressed genes and introgressed genes in an orthogroup with a wheat gene **B** Expression state (Expressed or Not Expressed) of introgressed genes within an orthogroup with a wheat gene, binned by the protein identity between the *Am. muticum* protein and the most similar protein in the wheat reference genome annotation RefSeq v1.1. **C** 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 represents 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.

To test whether *Am. muticum* genes that have directly replaced a wheat orthologue are expressed differently to that orthologue, we called differential expression between each introgression line and the wheat parent lines using DESeq2 (Love et al., 2014) after summing the expression count of each replaced wheat gene with that of its introgressed *Am. muticum* orthologue. Between 13.3% and 23.1% (mean of 19.3% across all lines) of introgressed genes were called as differentially expressed (abs(log_2FC) >= 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. 3C). Between 54.5% and 87.8% (mean of 69.8% across the lines) of these differentially expressed introgressed genes were downregulated in the introgression line.

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. The results of multiple approaches support a lack of overall rebalancing of triad expression

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 triads where the D homoeologue has been replaced by a *Am.*

muticum gene or been deleted, there is an overall reduction in expression on the D homoeologue (fig. 4A iii

and 4B iii), though to a much lesser degree in the introgression where introgressed *Am. muticum* orthologues

are being expressed. In the introgression, there were 74 triads with the D homoeologue introgressed and

called as downregulated; none of these triads had any homoeologues called as upregulated. This was

compared to 10953 control triads, where no homoeologues are introgressed or deleted and the D

homoeologue is not differentially expressed, of which 17 (0.155 %) triads had the A or B homoeologue

upregulated. For the deletion, out of 1294 triads with the D homoeologue deleted and therefore not

expressed, just 6 triads had one or more homoeologues upregulated (0.464%); this compares to 37 (0.369%)

out of 10031 control triads having the A or B homoeologue upregulated. These differences are not significant

(Fisher's exact test two-tailed p-values of 1.00 and 0.628, respectively).

Fig. 4. Expression profile across introgression and a deleted region and their homoeologous regions. **A** chr5A, chr5B and chr5D in BC3F45, with a chr5D:1-400Mbp introgression where chr5D genes have been replaced by *Am. muticum* orthologues **B** chr7A, chr7B and chr7D in DH161 where chr7D has been deleted. **i** DESeq2 processed log$_2$FC (introgression line / Paragon) of expression compared to Paragon binned into 10Mbp window **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**. log$_2$FC (introgression line / Paragon) of A, B and D homoeologues belonging to triads in which the D copy has been deleted or replaced by an *Am. muticum* 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 of DESeq2 normalised expression counts in 10Mbp windows (fig. 4A i and 4B i) across the chromosomes illustrates the overall stability of expression in homoeologous regions of introgressions and deletions. For the introgression and the deletion, we compared the log$_2$FC of the A and B homoeologues of triads where the D homoeologue had been introgressed or deleted with the log$_2$FC of the A and B homoeologues of a control set of triads defined as above (fig. S9). We found no statistically significant difference between the test and control sets (two-tailed t test p-values: deletion = 0.209; introgression = 0.252). This indicates that, like the proportion of DEGs, the change in expression counts of

homoeologues in which the D homoeologue has been downregulated/silenced does not change beyond that
expected by chance.

We also looked at genes in genomic windows not deviating in coverage compared to the wheat parent lines
(fig. 3) to explore whether the introgressions and structural changes induced by the introgression breeding
programme had indirectly affected the expression of remaining wheat genes. Between 0.181% and 2.40%
(106-1261 genes; mean of 0.860% across 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. S8). We found some terms to be enriched, suggesting a
non-stochastic impact on background transcription, however differences between lines suggests that the
nature of the impact on background transcription depends on the genes introgressed/disrupted elsewhere in
the genome. Some terms are enriched in more than 3 lines, suggesting these are commonly affected. 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

Two of the lines that we sequenced, DH92 and DH121 (fig. 5A), have complete resistance at the seedling stage
to Kansas isolates of *Puccinia striiformis tritici* (stripe/yellow rust) (Fellers et al., 2020). 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. Therefore, 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 (fig. 5B) 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 and 2 displayed unique NB-ARC domain signatures. 10 of the NLRs are within a

597.34Kbp cluster, including the 2 novel NLRs. 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, 3 of which 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 (Chen et al., 2020; Krattinger et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2020). 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. 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) (Dmochowska-Boguta et al., 2020). 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 in 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 (Grewal et al., 2021; King et al., 2019).
De novo discovery of SNPs to produce higher density KASP markers has improved the resolution but are
insufficient for unpicking 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 sources of novel 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. S2), can only be
inferred in conjunction with cytogenetic data and/or segregation patterns of DH pairs. 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 (Nyine et al., 2020), which mirrors recombination rates along the genome (Gardiner et al., 2019). 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. Interestingly,

this follows the same pattern previously identified for crossovers between homoeologous chromosomes

(Zhang et al., 2020), in contrast to homologous crossovers which, while enriched in subtelomeric regions and

at recombination hotspot motifs, are not specifically enriched in and adjacent to gene bodies.

Genomic instability generated through introgression breeding programme

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 (Dover and Riley, 1972a; Dover and Riley,

1972b), however forced chromosome pairings in the F1 cross and the DH process may also be involved,

although we see similar disruption in non-DH lines. 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 (Li et al., 2017) to prevent segments being carried forward into breeding programmes that

contain a *Ph1* suppressor that could generate further genomic disruption. For introgression lines conferring

specific phenotypes of interest, it may be important to remove the chromosomal aberrations through further

backcrossing, or to characterise which wheat genes have been deleted or duplicated as these may have large

effects on phenotype.

Smaller scale variation in mapping coverage suggests there is structural variation taking place that we can't

accurately assess with our available data, such as transposable element mobilisation. It will be important to

assess the nature and extent of such variation in the future. Unfortunately, structural variation between

available chromosome-level genome assemblies and Paragon/Pavon76 is too great for structural variants

arising from genome shock to be distinguished from existing structural variation between the cultivars. To

study this type of variation, we will need genome assemblies 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.

Identification of novel introgressed genes and gene expression profile of introgression lines

We identified 3873 novel *Am. muticum* genes that could underlie novel traits to introduce into wheat. The

gene expression analysis revealed that in the introgression lines, these novel genes are much less likely to be

expressed than introgressed genes with an orthologue in wheat. For introgressed genes that do have an

orthologue in wheat, there is a further relationship between level of divergence and likelihood of being

expressed. This may reflect a lack of required regulatory elements or less efficient transcription factor binding

due to divergence between the *Am. muticum* and wheat genes. However, some of this relationship could be

driven by the confounding effect of more conserved genes having more core functions and therefore being

more constitutively expressed (Luna and Chain, 2021). It will be important to explore this further to begin to

determine whether traits identified in wild relatives may present differently when introgressed into wheat.

Many of the introgressed genes are differentially expressed compared to the wheat orthologue replaced, far

exceeding the proportion of wheat genes in the background that are differentially expressed. This makes sense

biologically due to the different genomic background the *Am. muticum* genes have been placed in. Two

previous studies have explored the expression of genes in wheat introgression lines with barley (Rey et al.,

2018) and *Aegilops longissima* (Dong et al., 2020) 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. Despite the elevated levels of differential expression among introgressed orthologues, it is important

to note that the majority of introgressed genes replacing a direct orthologue were not differentially expressed,

suggesting a remarkable similarity in expression compared to the replaced gene in the majority of cases.

We didn't see significant change in homoeologue expression in response to introgression or deletion events.

This is line with previous results showing a lack of compensation in homoeologue expression following

aneuploidy (Zhang et al., 2017). 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 (Walkowiak et al.,

2020) 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.

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 (Rey et al., 2018). 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 phenotypic information and a genic

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

of candidate genes. 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 didn't find evidence for other classes of

resistance genes that have been cloned for stripe rust resistance (Zheng et al., 2020) 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 (Dmochowska-Boguta et al., 2020) and protein kinase

proteins, such as Yr36, have been implicated in APR (Ellis et al., 2014). 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.

In addition to narrowing down the source of resistance genes and identifying introgressed resistance

candidates, this method acts as a case study that can be built on to aid the dissection of traits in sets of

introgression lines. 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.

Experimental procedures

Introgression line selection

Hexaploid wheat/*Am. muticum* Introgression lines were produced as in (King et al., 2019, 2017) and

summarised in method S1. 13 DH lines, 3 selfed lines and 1 heterozygous BC line, along with *Am. muticum*,

Paragon, Pavon76 and Chinese Spring, were selected for DNA whole-genome sequencing (Table S1). 12 of the

lines belong to a pair or a trio of lines (referred to in this manuscript as DH pairs) that derive from seed from

the same BC1 cross, so common segments are not independently derived. 4 DH and 2 BC lines (Table S1), along

with *Am. muticum*, Paragon, Pavon76 and Chinese Spring, were selected for RNA extraction and sequencing.

Whole-genome sequencing, mapping and SNP calling

480   DNA from young leaf tissue was extracted and sequenced on Illumina NovaSeq 6000 S4 flowcells to produce

481   150bp paired-end reads for the introgression lines and Pavon76 and 250bp paired-end reads for *Am. muticum*

482   (method S2). 150bp paired-end reads from Chinese Spring and Paragon was previously produced. Reads were

483   mapped to the Chinese Spring reference genome RefSeq v1.0 (International Wheat Genome Sequencing

484   Consortium (IWGSC) et al., 2018), followed by SNP calling and filtering (method S3).

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 (Quinlan and Hall, 2010) and hts-nim-tools

(Pedersen and Quinlan, 2018) 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 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 (method S4). 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 as this signifies collapsed repeat expansion. These SNPs were

then split into homozygous and heterozygous and binned into 1Mbp windows using bedtools coverage

(Quinlan and Hall, 2010).

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. Coverage deviation

blocks were assigned as *Am. muticum* based on the presence of homozygous *Am. muticum*-specific SNPs and a

high ratio of homozygous to heterozygous *Am. muticum*-specific SNPs, within 1Mbp windows across the block

(method S5). Coverage deviation in 100Kbp windows either side of the larger block was used to define the

borders 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 (Robinson et al., 2011). The region

around the border 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

520   To validate the newly identified segment that hadn't been previously validated, a KASP™ genotyping assay was

521   conducted as described in (Grewal et al., 2020) (method S6) (Table S4).

Junction validation using Oxford Nanopore long reads

DNA from introgression line DH65 extraction was prepared using ligation sequencing kit SQK-LSK109 and sequenced to a depth of 7x on a MinION using the R9.4.1_RevD flow cell. Reads were filtered using NanoFilt (De Coster et al., 2018) to remove reads below a quality score of 7 or a length of 1Kbp. Filtered reads were mapped to RefSeq v1.0 using minimap2 (Li, 2018) with parameters -ax map-ont and --secondary=no. Mapped reads around the breakpoint (chr4D:51283000-51595000) were extracted using samtools (Li et al., 2009), including clipped portions of mapped reads, and assembled using wtdbg2 (Ruan and Li, 2020). The resulting contigs were mapped to RefSeq v1.0 using minimap2 (Li, 2018) with parameters -ax map-ont and visualised in IGV (Robinson et al., 2011) along with the mapped Illumina paired-end short 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 Oxford Nanopore long reads were filtered using NanoFilt (De Coster et al., 2018), removing reads below a quality score of 7 or a length of 1Kbp. Filtered reads were assembled using the Flye assembler (Kolmogorov et al., 2019). Following polishing integrated into Flye using Oxford Nanopore reads, we conducted 2 rounds of pilon (Walker et al., 2014) polishing using 102Gbp of Illumina paired-end short reads to correct systematic errors in the Oxford Nanopore reads. Finally, haplotigs that were not collapsed in the assembly were detected and resolved using purge_haplotigs (Roach et al., 2018). Gene completeness was assessed using BUSCO 3.0.2 (Waterhouse et al., 2018) with parameters -l viridiplantae_odb10 –species wheat and -m geno. Genome size of *Am. muticum* accession 2130012 was estimated by mapping back the Oxford Nanopore reads to putative single-copy genes and through a k-mer based approach (method S7).

Gene annotation

Following annotation and masking of transposable elements (method S8), gene annotation was performed using *ab initio*, protein homology and transcriptome evidence from *Am. muticum* root and shoot mRNAseq data (method S9). These were sources of evidence were integrated using EvidenceModeler (Haas et al., 2008) and partitioned into high and low-confidence genes.

Protein family analysis

OrthoFinder (Emms and Kelly, 2019) was used with default settings to cluster the longest protein encoded by high-confidence genes from *Am. muticum*, *Ae. tauschii*, *T. urartu*, *T. aestivum*, *O. sativa*, and *B. distachyon* into orthogroups. *Am. muticum* genes were classified as novel if in an orthogroup without a wheat protein or unassigned to an orthogroup. An orthogroup was determined to have expanded in *Am. muticum* compared to

554   wheat if the orthogroup contained 4 or more *Am. muticum* proteins more than twice the number of proteins

555   than wheat.

Assigning orthologue pairs

First, we computed best reciprocal blast hits between *Am. 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) were aligned reciprocally using blastp (Camacho et al., 2009) with parameters -outfmt 6

-max_hsps 3 -max_target_seqs 3 -evalue 1e-6. Hits were retained if percentage identity >= 90.0% and

alignment length was >= 80.0% query length. *An Am. muticum* gene was placed in an orthologue pair with a

wheat gene if it was in an orthogroup with that gene and the pair were each other's best reciprocal blast hit.

Classifying introgressed genes

The wheat reference genome RefSeq v1.0 and the draft *Am. muticum* assembly were concatenated to form a

pseudo ABDT genome. Illumina paired-end short 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 mean depth across their length >= 13.2x in DH202 and >= 3x for

the remaining lines (>= ~0.6 * mean sequencing depth) from the ABDT pseudo genome mapping above and on

a contig/scaffold with a gene assigned to an orthologue pair with a wheat gene whose start position is within a

region labelled as a *Am. muticum* introgression and also passes the coverage threshold above. This is a

conservative classification to prevent inclusion of non-introgressed genes.

mRNA extraction, sequencing, alignment, and quantification

mRNA was extracted and sequenced in triplicate from leaf tissue of six introgression lines, CS, Paragon,

Pavon76 (method S10). RNA reads were trimmed using Trimmomatic (Bolger et al., 2014) 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 (Kim et al., 2019). 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

(Pertea et al., 2015) was used to compute gene-level abundances, outputting both raw counts and transcript-

per-million (TPM) values.

Expression of introgressed *Am. muticum* genes

583   The protein sequences encoded by introgressed *Am. muticum* genes were aligned to the proteins encoded by

584   RefSeq v1.1 HC genes using blastp (Camacho et al., 2009). The identity of the best hit for each protein was

585   retained, with an identity of 0 assigned to proteins with no hit. TPM values for each gene were taken as the

586   mean of the three replicates. Genes with mean TPM greater than 1.0 were classified as expressed.

Differential expression analysis

For each wheat gene in a region identified as introgressed, they were either removed if not in an orthologue

pair with an introgressed *Am. muticum* gene or their expression count was summed with that of its *Am.*

muticum orthologue. Differential expression analysis between each introgression line and its two wheat

parents was performed using DESeq2 (Love et al., 2014). A gene was classified as differentially expressed if it

had an adjusted p-value below 0.05 and an absolute $\log_2FC \geq 1$ in both parental comparisons. Differentially

expressed genes were partitioned into those in introgressed regions, and in the unaffected wheat 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 (Ramírez-González et al., 2018) that satisfied

the following conditions: the D copy is introgressed or deleted and called as downregulated; the A and B

homoeologues are in normal copy number regions (coverage deviation between 0.8 and 1.2); and all

homoeologues have normalised expression count across samples >= 1. These were compared to control sets of

triads that satisfied the same conditions except the D homoeologue was within a normal copy number region

and was not called as differentially expressed. These sets were used for both the comparison of number of

triads with A and/or B homoeologue upregulated and for the comparisons of the mean $\log_2FC$ of the A and B

homoeologues between the test and control sample of triads. The significance of these comparisons was

tested using two-tailed Fisher's exact test and two-tailed t test, respectively.

GO Term analysis

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

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

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

the R package topGO (Alexa and Rahnenfuhrer, 2020) with the following parameters: nodeSize=10;

classicFisher test p < 0.05 and algorithm="parentchild". Enrichment for GO Terms involved in biological

processes was tested against all background genes that fall within windows with mapping coverage deviation

between 0.8 and 1.2. For novel *Am. muticum* genes, GO terms were extracted from the eggnog functional

annotation and converted to GO Slim terms using owltools Map2Slim

(https://github.com/owlcollab/owltools). Enrichment was performed as above but against all *Am. muticum* HC

genes.

Identifying introgressed resistance genes:

Potential resistance genes in the *Am. muticum* assembly, including NLRs, Protein Kinases and ABC transporters were identified (method S11). Resistance genes were manually checked using IGV to identify candidates with even sequencing coverage across the genes in DH92 and DH121 only, in the case of the shared stripe rust resistance, and across the genes in DH92 only, in the case of the DH92-specific leaf and stem rust resistance. To reduce the number of genes to manually check, we removed any genes with less than 2x mean mapping coverage across their length in either DH92 or DH121. The gene models were manually curated using the available evidence. For NLRs revealed by NLRAnnotator (Steuernagel et al., 2020) with no gene model but transcriptomic and *ab initio* evidence, gene models were manually constructed. The novelty of the uniquely introgressed NLRs was tested by extracting the NB-ARC domains using hmmscan (Finn et al., 2011) and aligning them using blastp (Camacho et al., 2009) to the proteins of HC genes from 10 wheat cultivars (Walkowiak et al., 2020). Hits below 85% identity were considered novel. The novelty of the other protein types was tested by aligning the whole amino acid sequence to the same protein set; here, hits below <80.0% were considered novel.

Data 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. *Am. muticum* Illumina short-read sequencing reads 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.

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, RJ, RR-P)

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 (AH, RJ, RR-P, JK, IPK, SG, SE, CY)

BBSRC grant BB/J004596/1 as part of the Wheat Improvement Strategic Programme (WISP) (JK, IPK, SG, SE, CY)

USDA-ARS CRIS 3020-21000-011-000-D (JF)

Competing interests:

Authors declare that they have no competing interests

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

Supporting information

Supporting figures

Figure S1: Whole genome macro-level plot for all 17 hexaploid wheat/*Am. muticum* introgression lines.

Figure S2: Macro structure of chr7A, chr7B and chr7D in four introgression lines (two DH pairs: DH195+DH202,

and DH121+DH123).

Figure S3: Minimum required sequencing depth to uncover introgressed segments in introgression lines.

Figure S4: k-mer distribution of *Am. muticum* Illumina paired-end short reads used to estimate genome

size.

Figure S5: BUSCO results using the viridiplantae_odb10 dataset after each sequential round of the
assembly.

Figure S6: Interspecies intersection of orthogroups produced by OrthoFinder.

Figure S7: GO Slim terms enriched in novel *Am. muticum* genes.

Figure S8: GO terms enriched in differentially expressed wheat genes.

Figure S9: Testing compensation in homoeologue expression following deletion or introgression.

Supporting tables

Table S1: Introgression lines sequenced in this study.

Table S2: Segments identified in each introgression line included in this study. If junction within or nearby a
gene, the gene name is included.

Table S3: Genotyping results of DH15 with newly discovered small 6D segment. 'a' indicates presence of
homozygous wheat-specific alleles; 'b' indicates presence of homozygous *Am. muticum*-specific alleles; '-'
indicates absence of a genome-specific allele for a particular KASP assay.

Table S4: Primer details for the KASP assays used for genotyping of DH15.

Table S5. Metrics of *Am. muticum* genome assembly.

Table S6. Potential resistance genes uniquely introgressed in DH92 and DH121, which share resistance to
stripe rust.

Table S7. Potential resistance genes introgressed in DH92 but absent from DH121 and the other lines. DH92
has stem and leaf rust resistance not seen in DH121.

Supporting experimental procedures

Methods S1: Introgression line production

Method S2. DNA extraction and whole-genome sequencing

Method S3. Read mapping and SNP calling

Method S4. Producing *Am. muticum*-specific SNPs

Method S5. Assigning coverage deviation blocks as *Am. muticum*

Method S6. KASP genotyping

Method S7. Estimating genome size

Method S8. Repeat annotation and masking

Method S9. Gene annotation

Method S10. mRNA extraction and sequencing

Method S11. Identifying resistance genes

References

Alexa, A., Rahnenfuhrer, J., 2021. topGO: Enrichment Analysis for Gene Ontology. R package version 2.38.1.

Bolger, A.M., Lohse, M., Usadel, B., 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
705   Bioinformatics 30, 2114–2120. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

706   Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., Madden, T.L., 2009. BLAST+:
707   architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10, 421. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-10-421

708   Charmet, G., 2011. Wheat domestication: lessons for the future. C R Biol 334, 212–220.
709   doi:10.1016/j.crvi.2010.12.013

710   Chen, S., Rouse, M.N., Zhang, W., Zhang, X., Guo, Y., Briggs, J., Dubcovsky, J., 2020. Wheat gene Sr60 encodes a
711   protein with two putative kinase domains that confers resistance to stem rust. New Phytol. 225, 948–
712   959. doi:10.1111/nph.16169

713   De Coster, W., D'Hert, S., Schultz, D.T., Cruts, M., Van Broeckhoven, C., 2018. NanoPack: visualizing and
714   processing long-read sequencing data. Bioinformatics 34, 2666–2669.
715   doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty149

716   Dmochowska-Boguta, M., Kloc, Y., Zielezinski, A., Werecki, P., Nadolska-Orczyk, A., Karlowski, W.M., Orczyk,
717   W., 2020. TaWAK6 encoding wall-associated kinase is involved in wheat resistance to leaf rust similar
718   to adult plant resistance. PLoS One 15, e0227713. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0227713

719   Dong, Z., Ma, C., Tian, X., Zhu, C., Wang, G., Lv, Y., Friebe, B., Li, H., Liu, W., 2020. Genome-wide impacts of
720   alien chromatin introgression on wheat gene transcriptions. Sci. Rep. 10, 4801. doi:10.1038/s41598-
721   020-61888-1

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

doi:10.1038/303698a0

Dover, GABRIEL A., Riley, R., 1972a. Prevention of pairing of homoeologous meiotic chromosomes of wheat by
an activity of supernumerary chromosomes of aegilops. Nature 240, 159–161. doi:10.1038/240159a0

Dover, G A, Riley, R., 1972b. Variation at two loci affecting homoeologous meiotic chromosome pairing in
Triticum aestivum x Aegilops mutica hydrids. Nature New Biol. 235, 61–62.
doi:10.1038/newbio235061a0

Ellis, J.G., Lagudah, E.S., Spielmeyer, W., Dodds, P.N., 2014. The past, present and future of breeding rust
resistant wheat. Front. Plant Sci. 5, 641. doi:10.3389/fpls.2014.00641

Emms, D.M., Kelly, S., 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative genomics.
Genome Biol. 20, 238. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1832-y

Fatih, A.M., 1983. Analysis of the breeding potential of wheat-Agropyron and wheat-Elymus derivatives. I.
Agronomic and quality characteristics. Hereditas 98, 287–295. doi:10.1111/j.1601-
5223.1983.tb00607.x

Fellers, J.P., Matthews, A., Fritz, A.K., Rouse, M.N., Grewal, S., Hubbart-Edwards, S., King, I.P., King, J., 2020.
Resistance to wheat rusts identified in wheat/ Amblyopyrum muticum chromosome introgressions.
Crop Sci. doi:10.1002/csc2.20120

Finn, R.D., Clements, J., Eddy, S.R., 2011. HMMER web server: interactive sequence similarity searching.
Nucleic Acids Res. 39, W29-37. doi:10.1093/nar/gkr367

Friebe, B., Gill, K.S., Tuleen, N.A., Gill, B.S., 1996. Transfer of Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus Resistance from
Agropyron intermedium into Wheat. Crop Sci 36, 857–861.
doi:10.2135/cropsci1996.0011183X003600040006x

Gardiner, L.-J., Wingen, L.U., Bailey, P., Joynson, R., Brabbs, T., Wright, J., Higgins, J.D., Hall, N., Griffiths, S.,
Clavijo, B.J., Hall, A., 2019. Analysis of the recombination landscape of hexaploid bread wheat reveals
genes controlling recombination and gene conversion frequency. Genome Biol. 20, 69.
doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1675-6

Grewal, S., Coombes, B., Joynson, R., Hall, A., Fellers, J., Yang, C., Scholefield, D., Ashling, S., Isaac, P., King, I.,
King, J., 2021. A novel approach to develop wheat chromosome-specific KASP markers for detecting
Amblyopyrum muticum segments in doubled haploid introgression lines. BioRxiv.
doi:10.1101/2021.09.29.462370

Grewal, S., Othmeni, M., Walker, J., Hubbart-Edwards, S., Yang, C.-Y., Scholefield, D., Ashling, S., Isaac, P., King,
I.P., King, J., 2020. Development of Wheat-Aegilops caudata Introgression Lines and Their

Characterization Using Genome-Specific KASP Markers. Front. Plant Sci. 11, 606.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2020.00606

Haas, B.J., Salzberg, S.L., Zhu, W., Pertea, M., Allen, J.E., Orvis, J., White, O., Buell, C.R., Wortman, J.R., 2008.
Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the Program to
Assemble Spliced Alignments. Genome Biol. 9, R7. doi:10.1186/gb-2008-9-1-r7

Hao, M., Zhang, L., Ning, S., Huang, L., Yuan, Z., Wu, B., Yan, Z., Dai, S., Jiang, B., Zheng, Y., Liu, D., 2020. The
resurgence of introgression breeding, as exemplified in wheat improvement. Front. Plant Sci. 11, 252.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2020.00252

Appels, R. et al., 2018. Shifting the limits in wheat research and breeding using a fully annotated reference
genome. Science 361. doi:10.1126/science.aar7191

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

Khazan, S., Minz-Dub, A., Sela, H., Manisterski, J., Ben-Yehuda, P., Sharon, A., Millet, E., 2020. Reducing the size
of an alien segment carrying leaf rust and stripe rust resistance in wheat. BMC Plant Biol. 20, 153.
doi:10.1186/s12870-020-2306-9

Kim, D., Paggi, J.M., Park, C., Bennett, C., Salzberg, S.L., 2019. Graph-based genome alignment and genotyping
with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. Nat. Biotechnol. 37, 907–915. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0201-4

King, J., Grewal, S., Yang, C.-Y., Hubbart, S., Scholefield, D., Ashling, S., Edwards, K.J., Allen, A.M., Burridge, A.,
Bloor, C., Davassi, A., da Silva, G.J., Chalmers, K., King, I.P., 2017. A step change in the transfer of
interspecific variation into wheat from Amblyopyrum muticum. Plant Biotechnol. J. 15, 217–226.
doi:10.1111/pbi.12606

King, J., Newell, C., Grewal, S., Hubbart-Edwards, S., Yang, C.-Y., Scholefield, D., Ashling, S., Stride, A., King, I.P.,
2019. Development of Stable Homozygous Wheat/Amblyopyrum muticum (Aegilops mutica)
Introgression Lines and Their Cytogenetic and Molecular Characterization. Front. Plant Sci. 10, 34.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2019.00034

Klindworth, D.L., Niu, Z., Chao, S., Friesen, T.L., Jin, Y., Faris, J.D., Cai, X., Xu, S.S., 2012. 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. doi:10.1534/g3.112.002386

Kolmogorov, M., Yuan, J., Lin, Y., Pevzner, P.A., 2019. Assembly of long, error-prone reads using repeat graphs.
Nat. Biotechnol. 37, 540–546. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0072-8

Koo, D.-H., Friebe, B., Gill, B.S., 2020. Homoeologous recombination: A novel and efficient system for
broadening the genetic variability in wheat. Agronomy 10, 1059. doi:10.3390/agronomy10081059

Krattinger, S.G., Lagudah, E.S., Spielmeyer, W., Singh, R.P., Huerta-Espino, J., McFadden, H., Bossolini, E.,
Selter, L.L., Keller, B., 2009. A putative ABC transporter confers durable resistance to multiple fungal
pathogens in wheat. Science 323, 1360–1363. doi:10.1126/science.1166453

Li, H., 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics 34, 3094–3100.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty191

Li, H., Deal, K.R., Luo, M.-C., Ji, W., Distelfeld, A., Dvorak, J., 2017. Introgression of the Aegilops speltoides Su1-
Ph1 Suppressor into Wheat. Front. Plant Sci. 8, 2163. doi:10.3389/fpls.2017.02163

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R., 1000
Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup, 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and
SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25, 2078–2079. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

Love, M.I., Huber, W., Anders, S., 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data
with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 15, 550. doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8

Luna, S.K., Chain, F.J.J., 2021. Lineage-Specific Genes and Family Expansions in Dictyostelid Genomes Display
Expression Bias and Evolutionary Diversification during Development. Genes (Basel) 12.
doi:10.3390/genes12101628

Martín, A.C., Rey, M.-D., Shaw, P., Moore, G., 2017. Dual effect of the wheat Ph1 locus on chromosome
synapsis and crossover. Chromosoma 126, 669–680. doi:10.1007/s00412-017-0630-0

Nyine, M., Adhikari, E., Clinesmith, M., Jordan, K.W., Fritz, A.K., Akhunov, E., 2020. Genomic Patterns of
Introgression in Interspecific Populations Created by Crossing Wheat with Its Wild Relative. G3
(Bethesda) 10, 3651–3661. doi:10.1534/g3.120.401479

Pedersen, B.S., Quinlan, A.R., 2018. hts-nim: scripting high-performance genomic analyses. Bioinformatics 34,
3387–3389. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty358

Pellicer, J., Leitch, I.J., 2020. 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. doi:10.1111/nph.16261

Pertea, M., Pertea, G.M., Antonescu, C.M., Chang, T.-C., Mendell, J.T., Salzberg, S.L., 2015. StringTie enables
improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. Nat. Biotechnol. 33, 290–295.
doi:10.1038/nbt.3122

Pflug, J.M., Holmes, V.R., Burrus, C., Johnston, J.S., Maddison, D.R., 2020. Measuring Genome Sizes Using
Read-Depth, k-mers, and Flow Cytometry: Methodological Comparisons in Beetles (Coleoptera). G3
(Bethesda) 10, 3047–3060. doi:10.1534/g3.120.401028

Quinlan, A.R., Hall, I.M., 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.
Bioinformatics 26, 841–842. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq033

Ramírez-González, R.H., Borrill, P., Lang, D., Harrington, S.A., Brinton, J., Venturini, L., Davey, M., Jacobs, J., van
Ex, F., Pasha, A., Khedikar, Y., Robinson, S.J., Cory, A.T., Florio, T., Concia, L., Juery, C., Schoonbeek, H.,
Steuernagel, B., Xiang, D., Ridout, C.J., Chalhoub, B., Mayer, K.F.X., Benhamed, M., Latrasse, D.,
Bendahmane, A., International Wheat Genome Sequencing Consortium, Wulff, B.B.H., Appels, R.,
Tiwari, V., Datla, R., Choulet, F., Pozniak, C.J., Provart, N.J., Sharpe, A.G., Paux, E., Spannagl, M.,
Bräutigam, A., Uauy, C., 2018. The transcriptional landscape of polyploid wheat. Science 361.
doi:10.1126/science.aar6089

Ray, D.K., Mueller, N.D., West, P.C., Foley, J.A., 2013. Yield trends are insufficient to double global crop
production by 2050. PLoS One 8, e66428. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066428

Rey, E., Abrouk, M., Keeble-Gagnère, G., Karafiátová, M., Vrána, J., Balzergue, S., Soubigou-Taconnat, L.,
Brunaud, V., Martin-Magniette, M.-L., Endo, T.R., Bartoš, J., International Wheat Genome Sequencing
Consortium (IWGSC), Appels, R., Doležel, J., 2018. 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. doi:10.1111/pbi.12913

Rey, M.-D., Martín, A.C., Higgins, J., Swarbreck, D., Uauy, C., Shaw, P., Moore, G., 2017. 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. doi:10.1007/s11032-017-0700-2

Reynolds, M., Foulkes, J., Furbank, R., Griffiths, S., King, J., Murchie, E., Parry, M., Slafer, G., 2012. Achieving
yield gains in wheat. Plant Cell Environ. 35, 1799–1823. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2012.02588.x

Roach, M.J., Schmidt, S.A., Borneman, A.R., 2018. Purge Haplotigs: allelic contig reassignment for third-gen
diploid genome assemblies. BMC Bioinformatics 19, 460. doi:10.1186/s12859-018-2485-7

Robinson, J.T., Thorvaldsdóttir, H., Winckler, W., Guttman, M., Lander, E.S., Getz, G., Mesirov, J.P., 2011.
Integrative genomics viewer. Nat. Biotechnol. 29, 24–26. doi:10.1038/nbt.1754

Ruan, J., Li, H., 2020. Fast and accurate long-read assembly with wtdbg2. Nat. Methods 17, 155–158.
doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0669-3

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

Steuernagel, B., Witek, K., Krattinger, S.G., Ramirez-Gonzalez, R.H., Schoonbeek, H.-J., Yu, G., Baggs, E., Witek,
A.I., Yadav, I., Krasileva, K.V., Jones, J.D.G., Uauy, C., Keller, B., Ridout, C.J., Wulff, B.B.H., 2020. The
NLR-Annotator Tool Enables Annotation of the Intracellular Immune Receptor Repertoire. Plant

Physiol. 183, 468–482. doi:10.1104/pp.19.01273

Walker, B.J., Abeel, T., Shea, T., Priest, M., Abouelliel, A., Sakthikumar, S., Cuomo, C.A., Zeng, Q., Wortman, J.,
Young, S.K., Earl, A.M., 2014. Pilon: an integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant detection
and genome assembly improvement. PLoS One 9, e112963. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112963

Walkowiak, S., Gao, L., Monat, C., Haberer, G., Kassa, M.T., Brinton, J., Ramirez-Gonzalez, R.H., Kolodziej, M.C.,
Delorean, E., Thambugala, D., Klymiuk, V., Byrns, B., Gundlach, H., Bandi, V., Siri, J.N., Nilsen, K.,
Aquino, C., Himmelbach, A., Copetti, D., Ban, T., Venturini, L., Bevan, M., Clavijo, B., Koo, D.-H., Ens, J.,
Wiebe, K., N'Diaye, A., Fritz, A.K., Gutwin, C., Fiebig, A., Fosker, C., Fu, B.X., Accinelli, G.G., Gardner,
K.A., Fradgley, N., Gutierrez-Gonzalez, J., Halstead-Nussloch, G., Hatakeyama, M., Koh, C.S., Deek, J.,
Costamagna, A.C., Fobert, P., Heavens, D., Kanamori, H., Kawaura, K., Kobayashi, F., Krasileva, K., Kuo,
T., McKenzie, N., Murata, K., Nabeka, Y., Paape, T., Padmarasu, S., Percival-Alwyn, L., Kagale, S.,
Scholz, U., Sese, J., Juliana, P., Singh, R., Shimizu-Inatsugi, R., Swarbreck, D., Cockram, J., Budak, H.,
Tameshige, T., Tanaka, T., Tsuji, H., Wright, J., Wu, J., Steuernagel, B., Small, I., Cloutier, S., Keeble-
Gagnère, G., Muehlbauer, G., Tibbets, J., Nasuda, S., Melonek, J., Hucl, P.J., Sharpe, A.G., Clark, M.,
Legg, E., Bharti, A., Langridge, P., Hall, A., Uauy, C., Mascher, M., Krattinger, S.G., Handa, H., Shimizu,
K.K., Distelfeld, A., Chalmers, K., Keller, B., Mayer, K.F.X., Poland, J., Stein, N., McCartney, C.A.,
Spannagl, M., Wicker, T., Pozniak, C.J., 2020. Multiple wheat genomes reveal global variation in
modern breeding. Nature 588, 277–283. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2961-x

Wang, H., Zou, S., Li, Y., Lin, F., Tang, D., 2020. An ankyrin-repeat and WRKY-domain-containing immune
receptor confers stripe rust resistance in wheat. Nat. Commun. 11, 1353. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-
15139-6

Waterhouse, R.M., Seppey, M., Simão, F.A., Manni, M., Ioannidis, P., Klioutchnikov, G., Kriventseva, E.V.,
Zdobnov, E.M., 2018. BUSCO applications from quality assessments to gene prediction and
phylogenomics. Mol. Biol. Evol. 35, 543–548. doi:10.1093/molbev/msx319

Zhang, A., Li, N., Gong, L., Gou, X., Wang, B., Deng, X., Li, C., Dong, Q., Zhang, H., Liu, B., 2017. Global Analysis
of Gene Expression in Response to Whole-Chromosome Aneuploidy in Hexaploid Wheat. Plant
Physiol. 175, 828–847. doi:10.1104/pp.17.00819

Zhang, Z., Gou, X., Xun, H., Bian, Y., Ma, X., Li, J., Li, N., Gong, L., Feldman, M., Liu, B., Levy, A.A., 2020.
Homoeologous exchanges occur through intragenic recombination generating novel transcripts and
proteins in wheat and other polyploids. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 117, 14561–14571.
doi:10.1073/pnas.2003505117

Zheng, S., Wu, Y., Zhou, M., Zeng, L., Liu, R., Li, Y., Liu, Z., Zhang, C., Lu, L., Zhang, L., 2020. Characterization and
diagnostic marker development for Yr28-rga1 conferring stripe rust resistance in wheat. Eur. J. Plant

Pathol. 156, 623–634. doi:10.1007/s10658-019-01912-x