High performance imputation of structural and single nucleotide variants

in Atlantic salmon using low-coverage whole genome sequencing

Manu Kumar Gundappa [1] *, Diego Robledo [1], Alastair Hamilton [2], Ross D. Houston

[3, 1 ‡], James G. D. Prendergast [1], Daniel J. Macqueen [1]

[1] *The Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush Campus, EH25 9RG,*

United Kingdom

[2] *Hendrix Genetics, Villa 'de Körver', Boxmeer, 695831 CK Spoorstraat, The*

Netherlands

[3] *Benchmark Genetics, Pioneer House, Edinburgh Technopole, Penicuik EH26 0BB,*

United Kingdom

* Corresponding author

‡ Former affiliation

Running title: Imputation with low-coverage WGS in salmon

Abstract

Whole genome sequencing (WGS), despite its advantages, is yet to replace alternative methods for genotyping single nucleotide variants (SNVs). Structural variants (SVs) have larger effects on traits than SNVs, but are more challenging to accurately genotype. Using low-coverage WGS with genotype imputation offers a cost-effective strategy to achieve genome-wide variant coverage, but is yet to be tested for SVs. Here, we investigate combined SNV and SV imputation with low-coverage WGS data in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). As the reference panel, we used genotypes for high-confidence SVs and SNVs for n=445 wild individuals sampled from diverse populations. We also generated 15x WGS data (n=20 samples) for a commercial population out-with the reference panel, and called SVs and SNVs with gold-standard approaches. An imputation method (GLIMPSE) was tested at WGS depths of 1x, 2x, 3x and 4x for samples within and out-with the reference panel. SNVs were imputed with high accuracy and recall across all WGS depths, including for samples out-with the reference panel. For SVs, we compared imputation based purely on linkage disequilibrium (LD) with SNVs, to that supplemented with SV genotype likelihoods (GLs) from low-coverage WGS. Including SV GLs increased imputation accuracy, but as a trade-off with recall, requiring 3-4x coverage for best performance. Combining strategies allowed us to capture 84% of the reference panel deletions with 87% accuracy at 1x WGS. This study highlights the promise of reference panel imputation using low-coverage WGS, including novel opportunities to enhance the resolution of genome-wide association studies by capturing SVs.

21 **Key Words**: Low-coverage whole genome sequencing, Imputation, Structural

22 variants, Single nucleotide variants, Atlantic salmon, Aquaculture

Introduction

The use of whole genome sequencing (WGS) is increasing due to reducing costs and

accessibility of sequencing technologies. Nonetheless, WGS, performed at the

depths required to accurately detect genetic variants, remains more expensive than

strategies that genotype a reduced set of variants, typically single nucleotide

variants (SNV); including arrays (Balagué-Dobón *et al.*, 2022) and reduced

representation sequencing (Davey *et al.*, 2011). Consequently, WGS remains less

commonly used for large-scale genotyping applications like genome-wide

association studies (GWAS). WGS has major advantages though, in theory capturing

all SNVs and indels in each sample, enhancing the chance of identifying causative

variants for a target phenotype, rather than relying on linkage disequilibrium (LD)

of nearby markers (Uffelmann *et al.*, 2021). WGS also enhances scope to directly

identify and genotype other classes of variation, such as larger structural variants

(SVs) (Mahmoud *et al.*, 2019), though the accuracy of such calls is generally

substantially lower than for SNVs when using the most common short-read

sequencing approaches.

Several frameworks exist for statistical imputation of genotypes in

individuals with limited genotyping information, exploiting data from individuals

that have been densely genotyped (Li *et al.*, 2009; Marchini and Howie, 2010;

Torkamaneh and Belzile, 2021). Imputation can improve statistical power in GWAS

and increase resolution to fine map causative variants in quantitative trait loci (QTL)

regions (Li *et al.*, 2009; Marchini and Howie, 2010; Torkamaneh and Belzile, 2021).

Using closely related individuals with known pedigrees, densely typed genotypes in

a few individuals (e.g. parents) can be accurately imputed to related individuals

(e.g. offspring) according to shared haplotypes (Li *et al.* 2009). It is also possible to

apply imputation using broader reference panels of genetic variation that capture

different populations and haplotypes within a species, as done routinely in humans

(e.g. McCarthy *et al.*, 2016). Within this framework, methods have been developed

for imputation against a reference panel using low coverage WGS data (Pasaniuc *et*

al., 2012; Nicod *et al.*, 2016; Spiliopoulou *et al.*, 2017; Rubinacci *et al.*, 2021; Davies

et al., 2021). Imputation from low coverage sequencing data has the advantage of

reduced sequencing costs, while sufficient alleles are still covered to effectively

reconstruct haplotypes in the individual. In recent studies using the most advanced

algorithms in humans, this strategy was shown to have the potential to be more

accurate and cost-effective at defining sample genotypes than array-based

imputation against a reference panel (Rubinacci *et al.*, 2021; Davies *et al.*, 2021).

To date, imputation against a species-level reference panel has focussed

fundamentally on SNVs and indels, largely ignoring SVs; barring limited work in

humans (Hehir-Kwa *et al.*, 2016; Torkamaneh and Belzile, 2021). While SNVs and

indels are markedly easier to detect and genotype with high accuracy, SVs are

thought to contribute more to phenotypic variation, including by influencing gene

expression with larger effect sizes (Chiang *et al.*, 2017; Li *et al.*, 2017; Chen *et al.*,

2021; Scott *et al.*, 2021) and showing higher enrichment in GWAS haplotypes

(Sudmant *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, imputation of SVs using low coverage WGS

should markedly increase the ability of GWAS to identify causative variants.

Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) is a species of great societal importance,

being among the top farmed aquaculture species globally by value. Furthermore,

wild populations furthermore have major conservation value and cultural

significance (Houston and Macqueen, 2019; Houston *et al.*, 2020). To support

genetic studies with both farmed and wild Atlantic salmon populations, numerous

genomic resources have been developed (Macqueen *et al.*, 2017; Houston and

Macqueen, 2019). This includes reference genomes for different phylogenetic

lineages (Lien *et al.*, 2016; Stenløkk *et al.*, 2022; Gao *et al.*, 2022), high-density SNV

arrays (e.g. Houston *et al.*, 2014; Barson *et al.*, 2015), and WGS data spanning

diverse populations (e.g. Gao *et al.*, 2020; Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020; Stenløkk *et al.*,

2022). Atlantic salmon benefits from an existing panel of high-confidence SVs

detected using WGS across 492 individuals representing European and North

American populations (Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020) and a global set of SNVs from most

of the same individuals (Sinclair-Waters *et al.*, 2022). These past efforts provide a

broad representation of both SNVs and SVs to leverage as a reference panel for

imputation studies.

Here, our primary aim was to investigate the potential for joint SV and SNV

imputation in Atlantic salmon, using low-coverage WGS imputed against

haplotypes phased from an existing, high-quality reference panel. To achieve this

aim, we utilized GLIMPSE (Rubinacci *et al.*, 2021) - an imputation method applied

to date to impute SNVs using low-coverage WGS in humans. Our results

demonstrate excellent performance for imputation of both SNVs and deletion SVs

in Atlantic salmon even at very low WGS depths, and scope to accurately capture a

broader spectrum of SVs in future genetics studies. This highlights the potential of

such approaches to enhance the resolution of downstream GWAS, and to begin to

better characterise the likely important role of SVs in shaping economically and

ecologically important phenotypes.

Materials and methods

Reference panel of SNVs and SVs

Our reference panel integrated SV and SNV genotypes from the same wild Atlantic

salmon individuals (n=445) defined in two independent studies using the

ICSASG_v2 genome (Lien *et al.*, 2016). These individuals represent diverse

European populations from a broad geographical range (Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020). For

SVs, this included 13,999 deletions, 1,221 duplications and 241 inversions curated

individually using a method shown to exclude the majority of false positive calls,

retaining mainly true variants (Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020). We also used 3,156,297 high

quality SNVs (Sinclair-Waters *et al.*, 2022). SVs and SNVs were merged into a single

VCF file using Picard Toolkit v2.23.8 (Broad Institute, 2019) then sorted and indexed

using BCFtools v1.12 (Danecek *et al.*, 2021).

Overview of imputation strategy

The key aim of this study was to test the ability of GLIMPSE (Rubinacci *et al.*, 2021)

to impute SNVs and SVs in Atlantic salmon. This section outlines the general

workflow and its rationale, and is followed by detailed methods in sections that

follow. Code for the full workflow is available through GitHub

(https://github.com/manugundappa/SV_imputation_pipeline).

GLIMPSE was tested against two sets of samples described in

Supplementary Tables 1 and 2. The first set represented samples taken from within

the reference panel (hereafter: 'in-panel'), comprising n=10 individuals from the

same river in Norway (River Enningdalselva; 58.981''N, 11.474''E) with mean and

standard deviation (s.d.) WGS depth = 7.8x and 1.2x, respectively (Supplementary

Table 1). These samples were dropped from the panel in-turn when assessing their

imputation performance. The second set represented samples out-with the

reference panel (hereafter: 'out-panel'), comprising 20 farmed individuals from the

Hendrix Genetics Landcatch Strain (Norwegian origin), with mean and s.d. WGS

depth = 15.7x and 1.1x, respectively (Supplementary Table 2). This included two

individuals each per 10 families previously shown to have contrasting within-family

genomic estimated breeding values for resistance to amoebic gill disease (Robledo

et al., 2018). The out-panel WGS data was generated as described in a following

section.

Using the in-panel samples provided a benchmark to test the performance

of SNV and SV imputation, where the variants were known to directly match with

haplotypes phased in the reference panel. The out-panel samples were used to test

imputation performance for samples unrepresented within the reference panel,

which consists largely of wild individuals sampled from locations across Norway,

inclusive of rivers from which the founders of Norwegian aquaculture were derived

(Gjedrem and Baranski, 2010). The Hendrix-Genetics Landcatch strain we used was

derived from sources with strong connections to the founder populations of

Norwegian aquaculture, and hence was expected to also share haplotypes with the

reference panel. A further rationale for choosing samples from the chosen

aquaculture population was to demonstrate utility of the pipeline developed in

commercial aquaculture breeding programs.

The GLIMPSE workflow is validated for and by default restricted to SNVs.

We modified it to accommodate SVs and provide an efficient workflow to jointly

impute SNVs and SVs (Fig. 1). Briefly, both the in-panel and out-panel datasets were

down-sampled to 1x, 2x, 3x and 4x WGS depths. The reference panel was processed

to generate a list of all variable SNV and SV positions for which imputation should

be performed. Genotype likelihoods (GLs) for SNVs within the reference panel were

generated per down-sampled WGS dataset for input for the GLIMPSE pipeline (see

below). Imputation was firstly performed against down-sampled datasets across all

variable SNVs and SVs solely using the SNV GLs. In addition, we also developed and

tested an alternative approach, where the pipeline was fed with SV GLs (see below).

The imputed SNV and SV genotypes were later compared to reference genotypes

derived from the original higher coverage WGS depth data to calculate imputation

performance.

Imputation of in-panel samples

 GLIMPSE imputation ignoring SV GLs

Samtools v1.12 (Danecek *et al.*, 2021) *view* was used to down-sample BAM files per

chromosome. The Samtools *coverage* command was used to retrieve mean

sequencing depth and calculate down-sampling factors. The Samtools *view*

command was used to down-sample each chromosome BAM file to the target

depths (1x, 2x, 3x, 4x) using sub-sampling factors generated from the data above.

The down-sampled BAM files were used as inputs to GLIMPSE (Fig. 1: Step 1).

BCFtools v1.12 was used to split the reference panel by chromosomes and

exclude the selected n=10 individuals from the reference panel. This was done in

turn such that each sample was excluded individually, with the other nine samples

remaining in the panel (Fig. 1: Step 2). The output of this step was stored in a BCF

file. Variable positions across each chromosome-specific BCF file were identified

using the BCFtools *view* command (Fig. 1: Step 3). The GLIMPSE pipeline restricts

this step to include SNVs only. However, considering our objective of imputing SVs,

we ignored the *–v snps* flag during this step. A proxy genetic map was generated

across all the samples and chromosomes (assuming 1Mb per cM) using the variable

sites information and a custom R script (Fig. 1: Step 4). The GLIMPSE_*chunk*

command was then used to define regions on which to perform imputation and

phasing across all chromosomes. A window size of 100Mb and buffer size of 200kb

was used for this step (Fig. 1: Step 5). GLs were calculated for all variable SNVs

within the variable sites datasets using the *mpileup* command within BCFtools (Fig.

1: Step 6). SV GLs were not included in this step, as the objective was to impute SVs

using GLs for SNVs only (i.e. on the basis of LD). Finally, all variants including SNVs

and SVs were imputed against the reference panel using the GLIMPSE_*phase*

command at the four down-sampled WGS depths (Fig. 1: Step 7). This command

takes in a dataset containing low depth GLs, the reference panel of all haplotypes,

the genetic map, and chunk information across each sample and chromosome to

generate a VCF file containing genotype probabilities. BCFtools *view* was used to

extract the original reference genotypes of all variants from the reference panel

previously called from the higher coverage sequence data using GATK (Sinclair-

Waters *et al.*, 2022) for comparison against the imputed genotypes (Fig. 1: Step 8).

GLIMPSE imputation accuracy estimation

The imputed genotype values for variants were extracted and filtered using a

custom R script to calculate imputation accuracies in comparison to the reference

genotypes (Fig. 1: Step 9). Imputed VCF files for each sample were merged across

all chromosomes and processed to extract posterior support values for each

variant. We then filtered the imputed variants at different posterior support cut-

off values of 0.60, 0.75 and 0.90, to establish the trade-off between imputation

accuracy and recall rate. We then compared the imputed genotypes against the

higher-coverage genotype calls in the reference panel to generate a matrix of 'true'

vs imputed genotypes for SNVs and different categories of SVs. The output for each

sample at different depths was used to generate positive predictive values (PPVs)

and recall rates, to gauge overall imputation performance. PPV was considered as

the ratio between the number of correct genotype calls divided by the sum of

correct and incorrect genotype calls. Recall rate was calculated as the proportion

of variants imputed against the total number of variants in the reference panel.

PPVs and recall rates across all samples and posterior cut-offs were visualised using

the package ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016) within R.

GLIMPSE imputation including SV GLs

We devised an approach to feed SV GLs into the GLIMPSE imputation pipeline to

improve SV imputation performance. SVTyper (Chiang *et al.*, 2015) was run via the

Smoove (Layer *et al.*, 2014) pipeline to genotype all SVs in the reference panel

across all downsampled BAM files for the ten samples (Fig. 1: Step 10). A custom R

script was used to convert SV GLs into phred-scaled genotype likelihoods (PLs)

rounded to the closest integer. The VCF files containing SV PLs were then merged

with the SNV GL VCF files generated in the GLIMPSE pipeline using Picard toolkit

v2.23.8 (Broad Institute, 2019) (Fig. 1: Step 11). The rest of the pipeline remained

the same (i.e. as described when running imputation without SV GLs), except

running the GLIMPSE_phase command after removing the *--impute-reference-only-*

variants flag. The final imputed genotypes were processed as described above to

generate PPVs and recall rates.

Merging SVs across different imputation strategies

Supplying the GLIMPSE pipeline with SV GL's increased PPV, but reduced recall rates

(see Results). We therefore developed an approach to merge the outputs from both

approaches (i.e. either including or excluding SV GLs during imputation) to test if

performance was optimized by taking the 'best of both' strategies. A custom R

script was used to overlap the VCF files obtained through both the pipelines. For

SVs, we tested two distinct approaches for downstream processing – defined as

'logical' and 'non-logical' filtering. Logical filtering takes forward SV genotypes with

a higher likelihood. Non-logical filtering takes forward SV genotypes from GLIMPSE

imputation that included SV GLs, irrespective of whether the alternative approach

(i.e. excluding SV GLs) had a better likelihood. After applying these filters, we

merged the output with all SVs imputed by the approach excluding SV GLs, making

a comprehensive dataset of all imputed SVs from both approaches. We then

calculated PPVs and recall rates as described above.

Out-panel SV and SNV detection and genotyping

236   DNA was extracted from each sample using a standard phenol chloroform

method. Purity of the DNA was confirmed using Nanodrop 1000 (Thermo Scientific)

and the integrity was confirmed using agarose gel electrophoresis. Approximately

1.0μg DNA per sample was used to generate the DNA sequencing libraries.

Sequencing libraries were generated by Novogene using the NEBNext® DNA Library

Prep Kit. The DNA libraries were sequenced on a Novaseq 6000 platform by

Novogene UK to generate paired-end 150bp reads (information on sequencing data

provided in Supplementary Table 2).

244   Raw fastq data was quality checked using fastqc (Andrews, 2010) and

trimmed to remove adapters and low quality bases (phred<25) using Trimgalore

(Krueger, 2015). The trimmed reads were aligned to Atlantic salmon genome

version ICSAG_v2 (NCBI accession: GCA_000233375.4) using BWA (Li and Durbin,

2009) to generate alignment files (SAM format), which were converted into BAM

format using Samtools (Danecek *et al.*, 2021). SV calling was performed using the

pipeline described in Bertolotti et al. (2020). Briefly, the alignment BAM files were

processed through the SMOOVE v2.3 pipeline, which used Lumpy v 0.2.13 (Layer *et*

al., 2014) to generate SV calls across all 20 samples (Fig. 1: Step 12). Gap regions

and high coverage regions in the genome were excluded from SV calling (Bertolotti

et al., 2020). A VCF file merging all SVs was manually curated using SV-plaudit

(Belyeu *et al.*, 2018) to generate a list of high-confidence SV calls. This was

overlapped with the SV dataset generated by Bertolotti et al. (2020) using Bedtools

intersect. SVs with a reciprocal overlap of 90% across both datasets were

considered the same variant. Histograms illustrating SVs lengths were generated

using ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016). SV overlap with SVs from Bertolotti et al. (2020)

was illustrated using upsetR (Conway *et al.*, 2017).

SNV calling was performed using the BAM alignments. Deepvariant (Poplin

et al., 2018) was used to call SNVs, setting *--model_type=WGS*, with other

parameters as default (Step 12). The output gVCF files were split by chromosome

using the BCFtools *view* command. GLNEXUS (Lin *et al.*, 2018) was used (default

parameters) to perform joint variant calling and merge gVCFs from all samples by

chromosome. This was done with the config set to 'DeepVariantWGS' to produce

an individual merged BCF file per chromosome. BCF files from all chromosomes

were merged using the BCFtools *concat* command. Vcftools (Danecek *et al.*, 2011)

was used to filter SNVs using the additional criteria: *--min-alleles 2 --max-alleles 2 -*

-maf 0.01 --max-missing 0.7 --remove-indels --minGQ 10 --minDP 4 --recode --

recode-INFO-all --minQ 30.

Imputation of out-panel samples

SV and SNV imputation was performed for the 20 out-panel samples as described

above (i.e. Fig. 1), with the following modifications: the reference panel included all

445 individuals in Step 2; GLIMPSE phase was run across all samples to impute SNVs

and SVs against the reference panel (Step 7); we performed imputation of SVs in

the out-panel samples by generating SVTyper GLs for SVs in the reference panel

(Step 10) and merging them into the pipeline (Step 11); 'true' genotype calls were

extracted from the Deepvariant SNV calls and SVtyper genotypes derived from 15x

data (Steps 12-13). PPVs and recall rates were calculated and visualized as

described for the in-panel samples.

Results

In-panel imputation performance for SNVs

We first assessed the impact of coverage and posterior probability (PP) cut-off on

SNV imputation performance. Increasing sequencing coverage is expected to

increase the accuracy of downstream genotype calls, but at increased financial cost.

Likewise increasing the PP cut-off is expected to lead to more accurate calls among

the remaining genotypes, but at the trade-off of having less genotype calls

remaining that pass the filter. SNVs were found to be imputed with high accuracy

for the ten in-panel samples, irrespective of sequencing depth or PP cut-off. PPVs

ranged from PPV = 0.91 at 1x WGS depth with PP > 0.6, to PPV = 0.98 at 4x WGS

depth with PP > 0.90 (Fig. 2a). As expected higher PP cut-offs increased SNV

imputation accuracy across all WGS depths, but at the expense of lower recall rates

(Fig. 2a, b). Recall rates varied markedly by WGS depth and cut-off (Fig. 2b). The

highest recall rate (83%) was achieved at 4x WGS depth with PP > 0.60 (PPV = 0.97).

Recall rate increased slightly with WGS depths using PP > 0.60 (from 0.79 to 0.83 at

1x to 4x depth). Using PP > 0.90 resulted in recall rates from 63 to 78% at 1x to 4x

WGS depth. In summary, GLIMPSE showed excellent performance for SNV

imputation using the in-panel samples, capturing 1,998,178 SNVs (see

Supplementary Table 3) with 95% accuracy (i.e. PPV = 0.95) at 1x WGS depth when

applying the PP=0.9 cut-off.

In-panel imputation performance for deletion SVs

We next assessed the ability to impute genotypes at deletion SVs using GLIMPSE.

We compared two approaches. In the first, we ignored reads in the sequencing data

overlapping an SV, relying solely on LD between SNVs and SVs to impute the

deletion genotypes. In the second approach we provided GLIMPSE with prior SV

GLs for deletions called using SVTyper ('GLIMPSE+SVtyper' approach), therefore

accounting for reads observed at SV locations in the corresponding low-depth WGS

data. As can be seen in Fig. 3a, the GLIMPSE+SVtyper approach consistently

increased deletion imputation accuracy compared to relying on LD between SNVs

and SVs alone. This demonstrates that accounting for the low coverage reads at SV

positions improves the SV calls. However, applying this strategy introduces a trade-

off of lower recall rates that is particularly evident with very low coverage WGS (Fig.

3b). As GLIMPSE will only make calls for SVs with prior GLs when run using the

GLIMPSE+SVTyper approach, any SVs lacking prior GLs (i.e. owing to lack of

sequencing data) are excluded. In contrast, when run without prior SV GLs,

GLIMPSE will call genotypes at all SVs, increasing the corresponding recall rates. At

4x WGS depth, a maximum recall rate of 91.7% (PP > 0.6) was achieved for the

GLIMPSE+SVTyper method, approaching the recall rate using GLIMPSE without

supplementation of SV GLs (97.4%) (Fig. 3b), though with a higher PPV than when

relying on LD alone (0.83 vs 0.73).

In-panel imputation performance for duplication and inversion SVs

PPVs were lower for duplication and inversion SVs than deletions, irrespective of

whether GLs were supplied to GLIMPSE (Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2). For both SV

types, we observed higher PPVs using the GLIMPSE+SVtyper approach, with a

stronger effect than for deletions (Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2). As for deletions,

when GLIMPSE was not supplied with SV GLs, WGS depth had little impact on PPV

and recall rate across WGS depths and PP cut-offs for both these SV classes

(Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2). Compared to deletions, there was more sample-to-

sample variation in PPV and recall rate for both other SV types across different WGS

depths and PP cut-offs (Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2). As for deletions, the highest

PP cut-off (PP=0.9) decreased recall rate across both imputation strategies for

duplications and inversions (Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2).

When using the GLIMPSE+SVTyper approach for duplications, the highest

PPVs were achieved at 1x WGS depth across all tested PP cut-offs (Supplementary

Fig. 1). This is likely explained by the extremely low recall rate at 1x WGS depth

(Supplementary Fig. 1), suggesting a subset of SV duplications captured at 1x WGS

depth is biased to a set that imputes accurately. When using the GLIMPSE+SVTyper

approach, recall rates of both duplications and inversions increased with WGS

depth, reaching maximum values of 86.9% (PP > 0.6) and 92.1% (PP > 0.6),

respectively, at a mean WGS depth of 4x (Supplementary Fig. 1). The best overall

performance for both these SV classes was observed at 4x WGS depth with PP >

0.9, with 77.2% / 92.3% of the duplication / inversion SVs captured with PPVs of

0.63 and 0.81, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 1 and 2).

Merging in-panel SV imputation results

Running GLIMPSE using only SNV GLs, resulted in comparatively lower PPVs, but

higher recall rates, compared to the GLIMPSE+SVTyper approach. To exploit the

benefits of each strategy we assessed the performance of merging the SV calls from

both approaches using 'logical' 'and non-logical' filtering strategies as described in

the Methods. As a general rule, logical filtering led to slightly lower PPVs and slightly

higher recall rates for all SV types across different WGS depths and PP cut-offs (Fig.

4). Overall, deletions were the best performing SVs. Even at 1x WGS depth, we were

able to impute 11,899 (~85%) of the reference panel deletions at PPV values

approaching 80%, with relatively small gains in accuracy achieved at higher WGS

depths, but significant gains in recall rate, e.g. with an additional 1,400 deletions

captured at 4x coverage. PPVs of duplications and inversions remained similar to

results before merging, with no pronounced impact on recall rates (Fig. 4a, b).

SVs and SNVs detected in the out-panel samples

To assess the performance of imputation on a set of samples more divergent from

the reference panel, we called 44,779 SVs across 20 Atlantic salmon individuals

representing the out-panel samples (35,728 deletions, 8,532 duplications, 519

inversions). Manual visual curation of these variants in the SV-plaudit framework

(Belyeu *et al.*, 2018) using the strategy published by Bertolotti *et al*. (2020) allowed

us to define a high-confidence set of 6,301 SVs (6,078 deletions, 208 duplications,

15 inversions). We discarded 85.92% (i.e. 38,478/44,779) of the raw SV calls, a

similar rate to that observed previously (Bertolotti *et al*. 2020). Deletions,

duplications and inversions had an average length of 1,082bp (range: 100 – 413,436

bp, s.d. 7,930 bp), 4,273 bp (range: 142 – 30,608 bp, s.d. 4,202 bp), and 4,740 bp

(range: 1,152 – 16,008 bp, s.d: 4,146 bp), respectively (Fig. 5a-c). Overlapping these

variants against the reference panel SVs identified 3,352, 96 and 3 shared deletions,

duplications and inversions, respectively (Fig. 3d-f). Thus, 2,726 deletions, 112

duplications and 12 inversions were specific to the out-panel samples (Fig. 5d-f).

379   Allele frequencies of homozygous SVs (1/1) in out-panel samples revealed

no clear difference in distribution between SVs unique to the out-panel population

and those overlapping the reference panel (Fig. 5g, h). However, frequencies of

heterozygous SVs (0/1) were slightly higher at lower frequencies in the SVs private

to the out-panel samples (Fig. 5i, j). 4,009,327 SNVs were retained in the out-panel

samples after applying all the filters described in the methods.

Out-panel sample imputation performance for SNVs

SNV imputation performance for the twenty out-panel samples was similar to the

in-panel samples, with PPVs ranging from 0.92 to 0.98 across the tested WGS

depths and PP cut-offs (Fig. 6a). However, recall rate was markedly lower across all

tested conditions (Fig. 6b), presumably owing to differences in haplotypes between

the (wild) reference panel individuals and (farmed) out-panel samples.

Nonetheless, we were able to impute 52-70% of the SNVs in the reference panel

(i.e. 1.62 - 2.21 million SNVs) across the different PP cut-offs (Fig. 6b;

Supplementary Table 3).

Out-panel sample imputation performance for deletion SVs

Performance of deletion SV imputation was slightly better than for the in-panel

samples (compare Fig. 3 and 7), with PPVs approaching or exceeding 0.9 using the

GLIMPSE+SVtyper approach (Fig. 7a). We also observed comparative higher PPVs

for the out-panel samples using GLIMPSE supplemented only with SNV GLs, with

PPVs exceeding 0.85 achieved even at 1x WGS depth using PP > 0.9 (Fig. 7a). Both

results are potentially products of the increased depth of WGS data used to

estimate the 'true' genotypes in the out-panel samples. There was no major

difference in recall rates comparing the out-panel and in-panel samples (compare

Fig. 3 and 7). To summarise, it was possible to capture a large proportion of deletion

SVs in the out-panel samples with high accuracy, even using very low WGS depths

without supplementing GLIMPSE with SV GLs.

Out-panel sample imputation performance for duplication SVs

PPVs for imputed duplications ranged from 0.50-0.60 across all WGS depths and PP

cut-offs using the out-panel samples (Supplementary Fig. 3), similar to the in-panel

samples (see Supplementary Fig. 1). As for the in-panel samples, imputation of

duplication SVs performed better using the GLIMPSE+SVtyper approach

(Supplementary Fig. 3). Recall rates were also comparable for the out-panel

imputed duplication SVs (Supplementary Fig. 3).

Only 3 inversions were common between the out-panel samples and the

reference panel, though these were generally successfully imputed across

coverages (Supplementary Fig. 5). With that caveat noted, inversion imputation

was more accurate than observed for the larger inversion set available for in-panel

samples. We achieved PPVs for inversions ranging from 0.80-0.90 across all WGS

depths (Supplementary Fig. 5a). Recall rates for inversions were similar to that

achieved for the in-panel values (Supplementary Fig. 5b).

Merging of out-panel sample SV imputation results

Merging outputs from the two imputation strategies provides an estimate of the

maximal imputation performance for the out-panel samples (Fig. 8). Even at 1x

WGS depth PPVs reached 0.86-0.87 for deletions with recall rates of 84-85% (Fig.

8a, b). At 4x WGS depth, the highest PPV of 0.92 was recovered for deletions with

a recall rate of 0.93 using non-logical filtering (Fig. 8a, b). Imputed duplications for

the out-panel samples reached a much lower PPV than deletions (Fig. 8a), but were

consistent with the in-panel samples (Fig. 4).

Discussion

It has been argued that genotype imputation using low-coverage WGS against a

reference panel is poised to bring about a paradigm shift in genetics by enabling

genome-wide variant analyses in a highly cost-effective manner (Rubinacci et al.

2021). Beyond human genetics, the farmed animal community has begun to uptake

this strategy, for example a recent study of cattle that benchmarked different

imputation methods (Teng *et al.*, 2022). Our study demonstrates the successful

application of GLIMPSE for genome-wide variant imputation using low coverage

WGS in Atlantic salmon. We advance on previous work by capturing a global set of

SVs in the reference panel defined previously by Bertolotti et al. (2020). While

imputation performance was lower for SVs than SNVs, this must be framed against

the challenge of accurately calling SVs directly using WGS data, which suffers from

extremely high false positive rates, approaching 90% in Atlantic salmon, demanding

extensive curation and filtering to define a high-confidence set (Bertolotti *et al.*,

2020). In this context, the accuracy and recall of SV calls achieved using low

coverage WGS was impressive, for instance reaching 92% accuracy and 94% recall

for deletions with 4x WGS data. A caveat of our method is that only known high-

confidence SVs defined within the reference panel are imputed. This is well-

illustrated by the out-panel samples tested, where approximately half the high-

confidence SVs detected *de novo* were not present in the reference panel. This

limitation requires updating the SV reference panel to ensure all variants of interest

are captured in a target population (discussed further below). Interestingly, the

equivalent imputation performance of the Hendrix-Genetics Landcatch strain (i.e.

out-panel) samples to the in-panel samples indicates that these farmed fish share

extensive haplotypes with the wild reference panel. This in turn highlights the

applicability of combined genome-wide SV and SNV imputation with low-coverage

WGS in commercial Atlantic salmon breeding programmes.

An interesting observation when performing SV imputation with GLIMPSE

was that the supplementation of SV genotype likelihoods (i.e. GLIMPSE+SVtyper

approach) increased imputation accuracy compared to imputation based solely on

LD with SNVs in the same haplotypes. By combining the unified SV calls from both

strategies, we achieved the best combination of accuracy and recall, at the cost of

a more complex computational workflow. However, notable gains in performance

using the GLIMPSE+SVtyper approach requires 3-4x WGS depths, which adds

further sequencing costs compared to relying purely on LD with SNVs. We also

observed differences in imputation of different SV classes, with performance for

deletions exceeding that of duplications and inversions. Duplications were the

worst performing SV class, with accuracy never exceeding ~60% on average.

Differences in imputation performance across different type of SVs could arise for

many reasons, including different allele frequency distributions and perhaps most

importantly, the comparative ability to call these variants accurately from

sequencing data for both the reference panels and individual low pass data. In this

respect, the relative performance of imputation across different SV classes matches

closely to differences in the accuracy of the original reference panel used for the

same classes of SV (Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020).

Our study has several obvious limitations, and the method we report can

be improved in the future. Firstly, our reference panel was based on mapping WGS

reads to the previous Atlantic salmon reference genome ICSAG_v2 (Lien *et al.*,

2016), which was recently superseded by higher quality assemblies for multiple

phylogeographic lineages (Stenløkk *et al.*, 2022; Gao *et al.*, 2022). A genome for a

Norwegian fish represents the current Atlantic salmon reference (Ssal_v3.1), and

has been annotated by NCBI (accession: GCF_905237065) and Ensembl

(https://www.ensembl.org/Salmo_salar/). In the future, a new reference panel can

be built taking advantage of these assemblies, which have much greater contiguity

and completeness and fewer errors than ICSAG_v2, owing to their construction

with long-read technologies (e.g. Stenløkk *et al.*, 2022). The Ssal_v3.1 genome is

being annotated using extensive functional genomic data (RNA-Seq, ChIP-Seq,

ATAC-Seq) generated across development and tissue types by the European AQUA-

FAANG consortium (https://www.aqua-faang.eu/), with the results due for release

through Ensembl in 2023 (personal communication). A future reference panel

updated to Ssal_v3.1 could cross-reference imputed variants with this rich

functional annotation, including regulatory elements in non-coding regions that

control gene expression, enhancing scope to identify candidate causal variants in

QTL regions.

Another way to improve our reference panel would be to incorporate a

broader definition of genetic diversity for Atlantic salmon. As our reference panel

is comprised solely of European (mainly Norwegian) Atlantic salmon populations, it

should be updated in the future to capture other lineages. Atlantic salmon is split

into two major phylogeographic lineages that separated more than 1 Myr ago with

limited subsequent gene flow (Rougemont and Bernatchez, 2018), leading to major

genomic differences and an argument for two 'sub-species' (Brenna-Hansen *et al.*,

2012; Gao *et al.*, 2022). Wild North American salmon have been used as separate

founders to aquaculture strains (Gao *et al.*, 2020) and are of substantial interest in

terms of molecular ecology and applied conservation genetics. Due to the

significant evolutionary distance involved, the performance of our reference panel

with low-coverage WGS data from North American salmon will likely be

substantially reduced. As WGS data is available for North American salmon (Gao *et*

al., 2020), future updates to the reference panel should capture this, and other

available genetic variation representing the major Atlantic salmon lineages.

Another limitation of our reference panel is that SVs were defined solely by

short-read sequencing (Bertolotti *et al.*, 2020). The current state of the art for SV

discovery is long-read sequencing, which has higher baseline accuracy, and enables

the discovery of more types of SVs compared to short-read data (Mahmoud *et al.*,

2019). Moreover, the method used previously by Bertolotti et al. (2020) for SV

discovery excluded insertion variants. Consequently, our current reference panel is

likely far from comprehensive of the true catalogue of SVs in Atlantic salmon

genomes. There are several ways to enhance representation of SVs in a future

Atlantic salmon reference panel. The lack of insertions could be addressed using an

SV calling algorithm specifically designed to capture this class of variant (Chen *et*

al., 2019). More importantly, long-read sequencing should also be leveraged to

characterise SVs more comprehensively. Given the availability of multiple high-

quality assemblies for different Atlantic salmon lineages built with long-read data

(Stenløkk *et al.*, 2022), there is an exciting opportunity to produce a graph-genome

(alternatively called pan-genome) representation of genetic variation in the Atlantic

salmon genome, which could be used for subsequent genotyping with short-read

WGS (Eizenga *et al.*, 2020). This strategy was performed recently in a related

salmonid species (whitefish; *Coregonus* spp.) to define a much larger set of SVs than

captured with short-read data (Mérot *et al.*, 2022). Graph/pan genome

representations also allow variants to be captured within regions of the genome

absent in a single reference genome (Sherman *et al.*, 2019). While graph genomes

have not yet been used alongside imputation with low-coverage WGS in the

published literature, this will be a valuable strategy in the future to capture a

comprehensive spectrum of SVs and explore their impact on phenotypic variation.

In conclusion, we demonstrate the promise of leveraging a reference panel

to call SNVs and SVs with low-coverage WGS in Atlantic salmon using the GLIMPSE

approach. The strategy we developed is generic and can be readily transferred to

other species with a high-quality set of SNVs and SVs defined in a representative

panel of individuals, providing opportunities to enhance the resolution of GWAS in

a cost-effective manner by capturing a wider spectrum of potential causal variants.

Data availability: The twenty WGS samples generated for the out-panel samples

are available through NCBI (BioProject accession - PRJNA917857). All WGS and

genetic variant data associated with the reference panel, including the in-panel

WGS data, is available in public archives, as described by Bertolotti et al. (2020))

and Sinclair-Waters et al. (2022).

Acknowledgements: Prof. Sigbjørn Lien and Dr Torfinn Nome (Norwegian

University of Life Sciences) shared the SNV data from Sinclair-Waters et al. 2022.

Funding: This study was funded by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences

Research Council (BBSRC), including award BB/S004181/1 (DJM), which received

co-funding from the Sustainable Aquaculture Innovation Centre, and award

BBS/E/D/30002275 (Institute Strategic Programme grant to the Roslin Institute).

Contributions: Designed study: MKG, JGDP, and DJM. Secured funding: RDH and

DJM. Provided out-panel samples used for WGS: AH. Performed imputation

analyses: MKG and JGDP. Performed detection of SVs and SNVs in out-panel

samples: MKG. Supported data analysis: DR and JGDP. Prepared figures: MKG.

Drafted manuscript: MKG and DJM. Provided intellectual inputs, and contributed

to data interpretation, writing and finalization of manuscript: All authors.

References

Andrews S (2010). FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence
data.

Balagué-Dobón L, Cáceres A, González JR (2022). Fully exploiting SNP arrays: a
systematic review on the tools to extract underlying genomic structure.
Brief Bioinform 23: bbac043.

Barson NJ, Aykanat T, Hindar K, Baranski M, Bolstad GH, Fiske P, et al. (2015). Sex-
dependent dominance at a single locus maintains variation in age at
maturity in salmon. Nature 528: 405–408.

Belyeu JR, Nicholas TJ, Pedersen BS, Sasani TA, Havrilla JM, Kravitz SN, et al.
(2018). SV-plaudit: A cloud-based framework for manually curating
thousands of structural variants. GigaScience 7: giy064.

Bertolotti AC, Layer RM, Gundappa MK, Gallagher MD, Pehlivanoglu E, Nome T, et
al. (2020). The structural variation landscape in 492 Atlantic salmon
genomes. Nat Commun 11: 5176.

Brenna-Hansen S, Li J, Kent MP, Boulding EG, Dominik S, Davidson WS, et al.
(2012). Chromosomal differences between European and North American
Atlantic salmon discovered by linkage mapping and supported by
fluorescence in situ hybridization analysis. BMC Genomics 13: 432.

Broad Institute (2019). Picard Toolkit. GitHub Repository.
https://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/; Broad Institute

Chen L, Abel HJ, Das I, Larson DE, Ganel L, Kanchi KL, et al. (2021). Association of
structural variation with cardiometabolic traits in Finns. Am J Hum Genet
108: 583–596.

Chen S, Krusche P, Dolzhenko E, Sherman RM, Petrovski R, Schlesinger F, et al.
(2019). Paragraph: a graph-based structural variant genotyper for short-
read sequence data. Genome Biol 20: 291.

Chiang C, Layer RM, Faust GG, Lindberg MR, Rose DB, Garrison EP, et al. (2015).
SpeedSeq: ultra-fast personal genome analysis and interpretation. Nat
Methods 12: 966–968.

Chiang C, Scott AJ, Davis JR, Tsang EK, Li X, Kim Y, et al. (2017). The impact of
structural variation on human gene expression. Nat Genet 49: 692–699.

Conway JR, Lex A, Gehlenborg N (2017). UpSetR: an R package for the visualization
of intersecting sets and their properties. Bioinformatics 33: 2938–2940.

Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, et al. (2011).
The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics 27: 2156–2158.

Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, et al. (2021).
Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. GigaScience 10: giab008.

Davey JW, Hohenlohe PA, Etter PD, Boone JQ, Catchen JM, Blaxter ML (2011).
Genome-wide genetic marker discovery and genotyping using next-
generation sequencing. Nat Rev Genet 12: 499–510.

Davies RW, Kucka M, Su D, Shi S, Flanagan M, Cunniff CM, et al. (2021). Rapid
genotype imputation from sequence with reference panels. Nat Genet 53:
1104–1111.

Eizenga JM, Novak AM, Sibbesen JA, Heumos S, Ghaffaari A, Hickey G, et al.
(2020). Pangenome Graphs. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet 21: 139–162.

Gao G, Pietrak MR, Burr GS, Rexroad CE, Peterson BC, Palti Y (2020). A New Single
Nucleotide Polymorphism Database for North American Atlantic Salmon
Generated Through Whole Genome Resequencing. Front Genet 11.

Gao G, Waldbieser GC, Youngblood RC, Zhao D, Pietrak MR, Allen MS, et al.
(2022). The generation of the first chromosome-level de-novo genome
assembly and the development and validation of a 50K SNP array for
North American Atlantic salmon. bioRxiv: 2022.09.28.509896.

Gjedrem T, Baranski M (2010). Selective Breeding in Aquaculture: an Introduction.
Springer Science & Business Media.

Hehir-Kwa JY, Marschall T, Kloosterman WP, Francioli LC, Baaijens JA, Dijkstra LJ,
et al. (2016). A high-quality human reference panel reveals the complexity
and distribution of genomic structural variants. Nat Commun 7: 12989.

Houston RD, Bean TP, Macqueen DJ, Gundappa MK, Jin YH, Jenkins TL, et al.
(2020). Harnessing genomics to fast-track genetic improvement in
aquaculture. Nat Rev Genet 21: 389–409.

Houston RD, Macqueen DJ (2019). Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar L.) genetics in the
21st century: taking leaps forward in aquaculture and biological
understanding. Anim Genet 50: 3–14.

Houston RD, Taggart JB, Cézard T, Bekaert M, Lowe NR, Downing A, et al. (2014).
Development and validation of a high density SNP genotyping array for
Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar). BMC Genomics 15: 90.

Krueger F (2015). Trim galore. A wrapper tool around Cutadapt and FastQC to
consistently apply quality and adapter trimming to FastQ files.

Layer RM, Chiang C, Quinlan AR, Hall IM (2014). LUMPY: a probabilistic framework
for structural variant discovery. Genome Biol 15: R84.

Li H, Durbin R (2009). Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–
Wheeler transform. Bioinformatics 25: 1754–1760.

Li X, Kim Y, Tsang EK, Davis JR, Damani FN, Chiang C, et al. (2017). The impact of
rare variation on gene expression across tissues. Nature 550: 239–243.

Li Y, Willer C, Sanna S, Abecasis G (2009). Genotype Imputation. Annu Rev
Genomics Hum Genet 10: 387–406.

Lien S, Koop BF, Sandve SR, Miller JR, Kent MP, Nome T, et al. (2016). The Atlantic
salmon genome provides insights into rediploidization. Nature 533: 200–
205.

Lin MF, Rodeh O, Penn J, Bai X, Reid JG, Krasheninina O, et al. (2018). GLnexus:
joint variant calling for large cohort sequencing. bioRxiv: 343970.

Macqueen DJ, Primmer CR, Houston RD, Nowak BF, Bernatchez L, Bergseth S, et
al. (2017). Functional Annotation of All Salmonid Genomes (FAASG): an
international initiative supporting future salmonid research, conservation
and aquaculture. BMC Genomics 18: 484.

Mahmoud M, Gobet N, Cruz-Dávalos DI, Mounier N, Dessimoz C, Sedlazeck FJ
(2019). Structural variant calling: the long and the short of it. Genome Biol
20: 246.

Marchini J, Howie B (2010). Genotype imputation for genome-wide association
studies. Nat Rev Genet 11: 499–511.

McCarthy S, Das S, Kretzschmar W, Delaneau O, Wood AR, Teumer A, et al. (2016).
A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. Nat
Genet 48: 1279–1283.

Mérot C, Stenløkk KSR, Venney C, Laporte M, Moser M, Normandeau E, et al.
(2022). Genome assembly, structural variants, and genetic differentiation
between lake whitefish young species pairs (Coregonus sp.) with long and
short reads. Mol Ecol.

Nicod J, Davies RW, Cai N, Hassett C, Goodstadt L, Cosgrove C, et al. (2016).
Genome-wide association of multiple complex traits in outbred mice by
ultra-low-coverage sequencing. Nat Genet 48: 912–918.

Pasaniuc B, Rohland N, McLaren PJ, Garimella K, Zaitlen N, Li H, et al. (2012).
Extremely low-coverage sequencing and imputation increases power for
genome-wide association studies. Nat Genet 44: 631–635.

Poplin R, Chang P-C, Alexander D, Schwartz S, Colthurst T, Ku A, et al. (2018). A
universal SNP and small-indel variant caller using deep neural networks.
Nat Biotechnol 36: 983–987.

Robledo D, Matika O, Hamilton A, Houston RD (2018). Genome-Wide Association
and Genomic Selection for Resistance to Amoebic Gill Disease in Atlantic
Salmon. G3 Bethesda Md 8: 1195–1203.

Rougemont Q, Bernatchez L (2018). The demographic history of Atlantic salmon
(Salmo salar) across its distribution range reconstructed from
approximate Bayesian computations. Evolution 72: 1261–1277.

Rubinacci S, Ribeiro DM, Hofmeister RJ, Delaneau O (2021). Efficient phasing and
imputation of low-coverage sequencing data using large reference panels.
Nat Genet 53: 120–126.

Scott AJ, Chiang C, Hall IM (2021). Structural variants are a major source of gene
expression differences in humans and often affect multiple nearby genes.
Genome Res 31: 2249–2257.

Sherman RM, Forman J, Antonescu V, Puiu D, Daya M, Rafaels N, et al. (2019).
Assembly of a pan-genome from deep sequencing of 910 humans of
African descent. Nat Genet 51: 30–35.

Sinclair-Waters M, Nome T, Wang J, Lien S, Kent MP, Sægrov H, et al. (2022).
Dissecting the loci underlying maturation timing in Atlantic salmon using
haplotype and multi-SNP based association methods. Heredity 129: 356–
365.

Spiliopoulou A, Colombo M, Orchard P, Agakov F, McKeigue P (2017). GeneImp:
Fast Imputation to Large Reference Panels Using Genotype Likelihoods
from Ultralow Coverage Sequencing. Genetics 206: 91–104.

Stenløkk K, Saitou M, Rud-Johansen L, Nome T, Moser M, Árnyasi M, et al. (2022).
The emergence of supergenes from inversions in Atlantic salmon. Philos
Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 377: 20210195.

Sudmant PH, Rausch T, Gardner EJ, Handsaker RE, Abyzov A, Huddleston J, et al.
(2015). An integrated map of structural variation in 2,504 human
genomes. Nature 526: 75–81.

Teng J, Zhao C, Wang D, Chen Z, Tang H, Li J, et al. (2022). Assessment of the
performance of different imputation methods for low-coverage
sequencing in Holstein cattle. J Dairy Sci 105: 3355–3366.

Torkamaneh D, Belzile F (2021). Accurate Imputation of Untyped Variants from
Deep Sequencing Data. In: Shomron N (ed) Deep Sequencing Data

Analysis, Methods in Molecular Biology. Springer US: New York, NY, pp
271–281.

Uffelmann E, Huang QQ, Munung NS, de Vries J, Okada Y, Martin AR, et al. (2021).
Genome-wide association studies. Nat Rev Methods Primer 1: 1–21.

Wickham H (2016). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. Work flow describing steps of imputation pipeline. Highlighted in blue is the core GLIMPSE pipeline we used to impute SNVs and SVs. Steps in green highlight the details of the reference panel used for imputation, in brown the additional steps used when running GLIMPSE supplemented with SV genotype likelihoods, and in red are steps highlighting generation of SNV and SV genotypes for the out-panel samples and downstream use in the imputation pipeline.

Fig. 2. SNV imputation results for in-panel samples. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for SNVs across tested WGS depths and PP cut-offs.

Fig. 3. SV deletion imputation results for in-panel samples. a) PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.

Fig. 4. Merged SV imputation results for in-panel samples. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for SV imputation across different SV classes, WGS depths and strategies. Red plots indicate PPVs for the 'logical' and 'non-logical' SV filtering approaches (see Methods).

Fig. 5. A high-confidence set of SVs were detected in the out-panel samples,

representing twenty Atlantic salmon from a commercial population. Size

distributions are shown for deletions (**a**), duplications (**b**) and inversions (**c**). Venn

diagrams highlighting overlap of SVs between the reference panel (blue circle) and

out-panel sample (orange circle) are shown for deletions (**d**), duplications (**e**) and

inversions (**f**). Allele frequency distributions are shown for overlapping (**g**) and non-

overlapping (**h**) homozygous (i.e. 1/1) SVs, as well as for overlapping (**i**) and non-

overlapping (**j**) heterozygous (0/1) SVs, in the out-panel samples.

Fig. 6. SNV imputation results for out-panel samples. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for

SNVs across tested WGS depths and PP cut-offs.

Fig. 7. SV deletion imputation results for out-panel samples. a) PPV (**a**) and recall

rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red

and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or

both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.

Fig. 8. Merged SV imputation results for out-panel samples. PPV (**a**) and recall rate

(**b**) for SV imputation across different SV classes, WGS depths and strategies. Red

plots indicate PPVs for the 'logical' and 'non-logical' SV filtering approaches (see

Methods).

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figure 1. Performance of in-panel sample (n=10) duplication SV imputation. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.

Supplementary Figure 2. Performance of in-panel sample (n=10) inversion SV imputation. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.

Supplementary Figure 3. Performance of out-panel sample (n=20) dupliction SV imputation. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.

Supplementary Figure 2. Performance of out-panel sample (n=20) inversion SV imputation. PPV (**a**) and recall rate (**b**) for across different PP cut-offs, sequencing depths and strategies used. Red and blue plots indicate PPVs when the pipeline was supplied with SNP GLs only, or both SNP and SV GLs, respectively.