Genome assembly variation and its implications for gene discovery in nematode species

Grace M. Mariene[1,2], James D. Wasmuth[1,2,*]

1. Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

2. Host-Parasite Interactions Research Training Network, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

* Corresponding author: jwasmuth@ucalgary.ca

Abstract

Background: Reduced sequencing costs is facilitating comprehensive BioGenome projects and sequencing of

specific species by individual research groups. While the choice between sequencing technologies is limited,

the choice of assembly algorithm can be overwhelming. However, this choice will influence the accuracy of the

assembly and downstream analysis and annotation. Here, we set out to demonstrate the extent and effect of

assembly variation using three nematode species—*Caenorhabditis bovis*, *Haemonchus contortus*,

Heligmosomoides bakeri—whose genomes differ in size and complexity. In addition to comparing the assembly

accuracy and structure, we predicted gene models from each assembly and investigated the effect on large

gene family membership.

Results: We found that assemblers using the Overlap-Layout-Consensus (OLC) algorithm were better choices

for assembling more complex genomes while those that used the De-Bruijn Graph (DBG) algorithm performed

better in smaller genomes. However, the DBG Redbean assembler performed comparably well in both

scenarios, making it a versatile choice. Using standard assembly metrics, variations seemed relatively minor;

however, we found noticeable intra-species/inter-assembly differences in the composition of four gene

families—CYP, GST, UGT, and NHR—that are of interest in anti-nematode drug discovery and drug resistance

research. Finally, through comparisons of highly conserved genes in the assemblies of *H. contortus*, we found

probable errors in the highly curated reference assembly, demonstrating the need to support ongoing curation

efforts.

Conclusions: While the choice of assembly algorithm can be daunting and the differences appear relatively

minor, there is a need to consider differences in assemblies in terms of the assembly structure and subsequent

annotation. We repeat the challenge, started by others, of relying on a small number of convenient assembly

metrics. Finally, we demonstrate the value of exploring alternative assemblies, particularly in the study of

content of protein-coding genes.

Introduction

Genome assembly software serves a critical, often underappreciated role in the life sciences. Its purpose is to reconstruct, *de novo*, the complete sequence of an organism's DNA—its genome—from shorter DNA fragments obtained through one or more sequencing technologies. A typical genome assembler is a pipeline of smaller programs that perform specific tasks, such as error correction, read alignment and overlap detection, and consensus building. The reduced costs and increase outputs of sequencing platforms have empowered the launch of large BioGenome consortia which strive to sequence, assemble and annotation the genomes of as many animal and plant species as possible (Darwin Tree of Life Project Consortium, 2022; Ebenezer et al., 2022). There is also an increase of individual labs constructing the genomes of their favourite species. This places the evolution and refinement of genome assemblers at the core of current and future breakthroughs in health, agricultural, and environmental sciences.

Understanding accuracy of the output of the genome assembler—long strings of As, Gs, Cs, Ts and the occasional N—is helpful; errors in the produced assembly will carry into and magnify through the annotation and analysis, often without notice. There are many sources of error. One example is high and/or inconsistent levels of heterozygosity in the organism's genome leading to sequence reads being assembled as separate loci rather than collapsed in the haploid assembly. A second example is long regions of repetitive DNA and transposable elements scattered through the genome being incorrectly collapsed or rearranged, leading to gaps. While some genome assemblers specialise in one particular problem, for example heterozygosity (Kajitani et al., 2014), most assemblers are generalists and seek to identify and resolve as many potential errors as possible. There are, naturally, different approaches to take. The result is that different assemblers—when given the same sequence reads as input—will produce different assemblies.

Evaluations of genome assembler performance show that even within a phylum, there is no single optimum. The Assemblathon2 competition used 102 metrics to compare assemblies from three chordate species (Bradnam et al., 2013); Sun and colleagues showed that genome size variation within the molluscs required different assemblers (Sun *et al.*, 2021); and we and others have shown the challenges and successes of software to construct a haploid assembly from tetraploid protozoa and plants (Pollo et al., 2020; Jung et al., 2020). These studies, and many others, provided the motivation to explore the optimal genome assembler—at the current time—for nematodes; we use their genomes to understand host-parasite interactions.

Nematode species are parasites of humans, livestock, and crops; free-living contributors to environmental health; and pivotal model organisms in understand human biology. Accordingly, nematodes have often led the way in animal genomes: the first animal species to have its genome sequenced was *Caenorhabditis elegans* (C.

elegans Sequencing Consortium, 1998); at least 177 genome assemblies are available for at least 135 species

(WormBase Parasite release 18) (Howe et al., 2017). These assemblies represent a broad range of different

sequencing technologies and assembly protocols (Coghlan et al., 2019). This availability of genomic,

transcriptomics, and proteomic information has led to comparative genomic studies on various scales, much of

it focused on the evolution of gene families; their birth and death, expansions and contractions (Wasmuth et

al., 2008; Coghlan et al., 2019; Baker et al., 2021). For this present study, in addition to understanding how

different genome assemblers perform with different nematode species, we wanted to look deeper at the

downstream consequences of the technical variation. For example, in the study of gene birth and death, if

different genome annotation protocols are used to generate the gene models of the species being compared,

there is an increase in the number of apparent lineage-specific genes (Weisman *et al.*, 2022). This motivated us

to determine the effect of genome assembler heterogeneity on gene family comparisons.

We focused on three nematode species—*Caenorhabditis bovis*, *Haemonchus contortus*, and *Heligmosomoides*

bakeri—which reflect different genomic features—size and heterozygosity—and sequencing platforms—Oxford

Nanopore Technologies (ONT) and Pacific Biosciences (PacBio).

C. bovis is associated with bovine parasitic otitis disease and is the only pathogenic member of its genus

(Msolla et al., 1993). Its genome assembly is approximately 63Mb, making it the smallest *Caenorhabditis* and

one of the smallest nematode genomes so far sequenced (Stevens et al., 2020). *H. contortus* parasitizes small

ruminants (sheep and goats) and the emergence of drug resistant strains motivated the study of its genome to

understand mechanisms of resistance and develop new drugs and vaccines (Redman *et al.*, 2012; Gilleard,

2006; Kaminsky *et al.*, 2008; Taylor *et al.*, 2013; Bethony *et al.*, 2006; LeJambre *et al.*, 2008; Knox *et al.*, 2003).

The *H. contortus* genome assembly has undergone multiple rounds of improvement; an initial short-read

assembly of ~370Mb was later surpassed by a long-read assembly that was scaffolded through optical mapping

and improved with expert manual curation (Laing et al., 2013; Doyle et al., 2018, 2020). Currently, the five

autosomes and one X chromosome of the *H. contortus* genome is assembled into seven scaffolds, with a total

length of ~283Mb. Finally, *H. bakeri* is an intestinal parasite of mice that serves as a model for studying host-

parasite interactions and testing anthelmintic efficacy (Pollo *et al.*, 2023; Reynolds *et al.*, 2012; Maizels *et al.*,

2012). Please note, that the Chow assembly paper described the species sequenced as *Heligmosomoides*

polygyrus, a long-standing miss-classification of the study species which has been recently corrected through

genomic comparisons (Stevens et al., 2023). The two *Heligmosomoides* nematode species, *H. bakeri* and *H.*

polygyrus, are separate species, with *H. bakeri* being the laboratory strain infecting domestic mice and *H.*

polygyrus the wild strain infecting wood mice (Cable et al., 2006).

Genome assemblies for each species were generated using several popular genome assemblers and annotated

using a single, widely used pipeline. We found that most programs returned assemblies with encouraging and

similar assembly metrics—size, number of scaffolds, gene completeness—but intra-species comparisons

revealed structural rearrangements in the scaffolds and diverse complements of conserved orthologues. We

explored the effect of assembly differences on annotation more deeply by carrying out a phylogenomic

comparison of large gene families—the cytochrome P450s (CYP), glutathione S-transferases (GST), UDP

glucuronosyltransferases (UGT), and nuclear hormone receptors (NHR)—and found that despite having the

same sequence reads as input, the assemblies' annotations could vary by as much as 51%.

Methods

Nematode species and sequence data

DNA sequence reads for *C. bovis* and *H. contortus* were retrieved from the Sequence Read Archive (Leinonen,

Sugawara & Shumway, 2011), and their genomes downloaded from WormBase Parasite (release 17) (Howe et

al., 2017). The sequence reads and assembly for *H. bakeri* are new for this study. *C. bovis* DNA (BioProject:

PRJEB34497) was sequenced using the Oxford Nanopore MinION platform (Stevens et al., 2020). *H. contortus*

DNA (BioProject PRJEB506) was sequenced using the PacBio RS and Sequel platforms (Doyle et al., 2020). We

generated *H. bakeri* DNA was generated as part of de novo sequencing project. A full description will follow in a

future version of this preprint. Briefly: we extracted adult *H. bakeri* worms from experimentally infected mice;

separately females and males; pooled 20 worms of each sex. PacBio Hi-Fi sequencing was done at the

University of Delaware DNA Sequencing & Genotyping Center. For the assemblies in this study, we combined

sequence reads from female and male worms.

Genome assembly and quality control.

As a guide, we reproduced the protocol for assembling the *C. bovis* genome as outlined in (Stevens et al.,

2020). The same protocol was followed to generate draft assemblies for the *C. bovis* and *H. contortus* using six

long-read assemblers that support Oxford Nanopore and PacBio RS and Sequel reads. Similarly, the protocol

was used to generate draft assemblies for the *H. bakeri* using three long-read assemblers that support HiFi

data. The protocol is briefly outlined as follows:

a) Generation of preliminary assemblies

First, preliminary genome assemblies for *C. bovis* and *H. contortus* were generated using six long-read

assemblers: Redbean v.2.5 (also known as Wtdbg2) (Ruan & Li, 2020), Canu v.2.1.1 (Koren et al., 2017), Flye

v.2.8.2 (Lin et al., 2016; Kolmogorov et al., 2019), SMARTdenovo v.1.0.0 (Liu et al., 2021), along with the Pb-

assembly suite encompassing Falcon-kit v.1.8.1 and Falcon-unzip v.1.3.7 (Chin et al., 2013, 2016). For *H. bakeri*,

preliminary assemblies were generated using three HiFi-compatible long-read assemblers: Flye v.2.8.2 (Lin et

al., 2016; Kolmogorov et al., 2019), Hifiasm v.0.16.1-r375 (Cheng et al., 2021) and HiCanu v.2.1.1 (Nurk et al.,

2020). All the commands used to generate preliminary assemblies can be found in S1-Methods.

b) Decontamination and polishing of preliminary assemblies

For the *C. bovis* and *H. contortus* assemblies contaminated contigs were removed from the preliminary draft

assemblies using Blobtools v.1.1.1 (Laetsch & Blaxter, 2017). This process involved mapping of the long reads to

assemblies using minimap2 v.2.17-r941 (Li, 2018) and the taxonomic classification of the contigs based on the

Uniprot Proteome database (Pundir, Martin & O'Donovan, 2017) using DIAMOND v.2.0.6.144 (Buchfink, Xie &

Huson, 2015). The resulting *de novo* assemblies were polished to correct for sequencing errors using different

tools as follows: for both *C. bovis* and *H. contortus*, the long MinION and PacBio reads were mapped to each of

their respective assemblies using minimap2 and four rounds of polishing performed using Racon v.1.4.20

(Vaser et al., 2017). Following this, for *C. bovis*, one round of polishing was performed using Medaka v.1.3.2

(accessible at https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka). For *H. contortus*, PacBio reads were mapped to

each of the *H. contortus* preliminary assemblies using pbmm2 v.1.4.0 (available at

https://github.com/PacificBiosciences/pbmm2) before performing one round of polishing using Arrow v2.3.3

(installed via the GenomicConsensus package v.2.3.3, available at

http://github.com/PacificBiosciences/pbbioconda). Lastly, to correct for any remaining errors, Illumina short-

reads from both species were mapped using BWA-MEM v.0.7.17-r1188 (Li, 2013) to each of the respective

assemblies and two rounds of Racon and Pilon v.1.24 (Walker et al., 2014) performed. All the commands

associated with these steps can be found in S1-Methods

c) Removal of residual haplotype duplications

Due to the high levels of duplications and heterozygosity in the *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri* genomes, an

additional step was taken to remove redundant haplotigs and contig overlaps from their assemblies. This step

was not included in the *C. bovis* protocol. To do this, we used the Purge_dups v.1.2.5 tool (Guan et al., 2020).

We initially applied the default cut-off threshold, followed by two manually set cut-offs derived from the

default cutoffs. This step is recommended by (Guan et al., 2020) because default cutoffs in the Purge_dups

pipeline may not be optimal for reducing low-coverage k-mers in highly heterozygous and/or repetitive diploid

organisms. However, this comes with a trade-off between achieving more accurate assemblies and maintaining

completeness. All the commands and parameters implemented in this step can be found in S1-Methods. We

considered the second manually set cut-offs for all the generated assemblies for the *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri*

(Table S4)

d) Assembly evaluation

All the generated assemblies for the *C. bovi*s, *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri* were evaluated for contiguity and

completeness using various metrics, including the number of fragments, assembly size, N50, length of the

longest contig, and BUSCO v.4.1.4 (Simão et al., 2015). The command used for the BUSCO evaluation was:

(busco -i [PATH/TO/ASSEMBLY] --lineage nematoda_odb10 --out [UNIQUE_NAME] --mode genome --long --

augustus). Additionally, we assessed the alignment of sequence reads to each assembled genome using

Inspector v.1.0.2 (Chen et al., 2021) to identify potential large-scale (structural) and small-scale errors. For this

evaluation, we used the raw ONT reads for the *C. bovis* assemblies, the raw PacBio RS and Sequel reads for the

H. contortus assemblies, and the raw HiFi long reads for the *H. bakeri* assemblies. The command used to align

the reads to the assemblies was: (inspector.py --thread 24 --contig [PATH/TO/ASSEMBLY] --read

[PATH/TO/READS] --outpath [UNIQUE_NAME_FOR_OUTPUT_DIRECTORY] --datatype [nanopore for *C. bovis* or

clr for *H. contortus* or hifi for *H. bakeri*]. To generate the corrected assembly, we used the command:

(inspector-correct.py --thread 24 --inspector [UNIQUE_NAME_FOR_OUTPUT_DIRECTORY] --datatype [nano-

raw or pacbio-raw or pacbio-hifi] --outpath [DIRECTORY_FOR_CORRECTED_ASSEMBLY]).

Genome synteny

Genome-to-genome alignments of the final draft assemblies were performed using the Nucmer wrapper script

incorporated in MUMmer v.3.23 (Kurtz et al., 2004; Marçais et al., 2018), with the options: (nucmer --

maxmatch --prefix=[UNIQUE_NAME] [REFERENCE GENOME] [QUERY GENOME]). For *C. bovis*, we considered

the Redbean v2.5 assembly as the reference genome given its better contiguity while the Doyle assembly

served as the reference genome for *H. contortus*. For *H. bakeri*, the Hifiasm assembly was the reference

genome. Additionally, for the *C. bovis*, we used the dnadiff wrapper script found within Nucmer, with the

options (dnadiff -d [NUCMER_OUTPUT].delta), to report one-to-one alignment coordinates. The coordinates

were used to link scaffolds between assemblies for the visualization of synteny between *C. bovis* genomes

using the Circos tools v.0.69-8 (Krzywinski et al., 2009). Lastly, for all the generated assemblies, we used

NucDiff v.2.0.3 (Khelik et al., 2017) to quantify the structural and local genome differences between each

assembly and its respective reference genome. The options used for the NucDiff analyses were: (nucdiff --proc

24 --ref_name_full yes --query_name_full yes [REFERENCE GENOME] [QUERY GENOME] [PREFIX NAME]).

BUSCO genes analyses

The number of highly conserved orthologues correctly assembled across the generated assemblies were

determined using BUSCO v.4.1.4 (Simão et al., 2015) with the options: (busco -i [PATH/TO/ASSEMBLY] --lineage

nematoda_odb10 --out [UNIQUE_NAME] --mode genome --long --augustus). We then generated Sankey

diagrams using the SankeyMATIC builder (available at http://sankeymatic.com/build/) to visualize the

transitions of BUSCO genes—genes that changed categories—between assemblies i.e., those that were not S-S-

S, D-D-D, F-F-F or M-M-M. In the Sankey diagrams, each BUSCO category, Single (S), Duplicated (D),

Fragmented (F), or Missing (M), is represented by a distinct column and the connections or "flows" between

these columns indicate how elements move from one category to another in the next assembly. The thickness

of the connecting lines reflects the proportion of elements transitioning between categories. We highlight that

the Sankey diagrams illustrate pairwise comparisons of BUSCO genes flowing between two assemblies at a

time. Set-based BUSCO genes data was displayed using UpSet plots (Lex et al., 2014) with additional annotation

in Adobe Illustrator (available at https://www.adobe.com). For *H. contortus*, we created a heatmap with the

ggplot2 package in R (Wickham, 2016; Core, 2022) to visualize the pattern of BUSCO genes reported as missing

in the reference Doyle assembly but found complete (single or duplicated) in at least one of the other six

assemblies. Lastly, we used the BlastKOALA tool (Kanehisa, Sato & Morishima, 2016) to identify the functions of

BUSCO genes absent in both the *H. contortus* reference Doyle assembly and the HiFi-based *H. bakeri*

assemblies, Flye, Hicanu and Hifiasm.

Genome annotation

a) Soft masking assemblies

All the generated assemblies were soft masked prior to genome annotation, using RepeatModeler v2.0.3 (Flynn

et al., 2020) and RepeatMasker v4.1.2-p1 (Tarailo-Graovac & Chen, 2009). Briefly, we used the NCBI/RMBLAST

[2.11.0+] search engine to create a default repeat library for RepeatModeler from the Dfam database of

transposable elements and DNA repeats (Hubley et al., 2016). Next, we used the RepeatMasker util

(queryRepeatDatabase.pl script) to create a custom library specific to nematode species. Both repeat libraries

were combined as input for the RepeatMasker program.

b) Gene prediction

Protein coding genes (gene models) in the generated assemblies were predicted using Braker 3 (Stanke et al.,

2006, 2008; Hoff et al., 2016, 2019; Brůna et al., 2021) installed using the Singularity container (available at

https://hub.docker.com/r/teambraker/braker3). For *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri*, we used short-read RNA-seq

data from the Sequence Read Archive (Leinonen, Sugawara & Shumway, 2011) as external evidence for the

gene prediction (BioProjects: PRJEB506 (Laing et al., 2013) and PRJNA750155 (Pollo et al., 2023) respectively).

The RNA-seq data was first aligned using the STAR v.2.7.10a aligner (Dobin et al., 2013) and the generated

alignments, in bam-format, used to produce a training set for AUGUSTUS, using GeneMark-ET (Hoff *et al*.,

2016; Li *et al*., 2009; Barnett *et al*., 2011) and DIAMOND (Buchfink, Xie & Huson, 2015), to filter redundant

training gene structures. For *C. bovis*, we used the longest isoforms of the *C. elegans* gene models (BioProject:

PRJNA13758) retrieved from WormBase Parasite (release 17) (Howe et al., 2017), as the protein evidence for

gene prediction.

Identification of gene family members

Members of the Cytochrome P450 (CYP), Glutathione S-transferase (GST), UDP-glucuronosyltransferase (UGT)

and nuclear hormone receptors (NHR) gene families were identified by comparing each assembly's predicted

gene models against the full *C. elegans* gene models using BLASTP (Altschul et al., 1990; Camacho et al., 2009;

Boratyn et al., 2012). The top hit of each gene model was selected and the gene class annotation from

WormBase Parasite (release 17) (Howe et al., 2017) used to identify the gene family members. In each species

and for every gene family, we used OrthoFinder2 (Emms & Kelly, 2019), (with parameters set to -S blast,

otherwise default) to detect homologs and cluster them with the *C. elegans* proteins. We then computed the

percentage differences between the minimum and maximum counts of gene models and the members of the

CYP, GST, UGT and NHR gene families predicted in all the assemblies used in the study.

Results

We generated fifteen new assemblies—six for *C. bovis*, six for *H. contortus*, and three for *H. bakeri*—which we used, along with the published genomes for each species, for intraspecies comparisons. For readability, we will refer to the published genomes by their papers' first author—Stevens for *C. bovis*, Doyle for *H. contortus*, and Chow for *H. bakeri*—and by the name of the genome assembly program for the others (Chow et al., 2019; Stevens et al., 2020; Doyle et al., 2020). Each new assembly was subject to decontamination and polishing protocols with an additional step of 'purging' duplicates in the highly heterozygous *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri* assemblies. Decontamination—the removal of contigs from bacteria and other heterogenous sources— removed approximately 20% of the nucleotides of any given intermediate assembly and, in *C. bovis*, up to 90% of the scaffolds (Table S1, Table S2, Table S3). *C. bovis* samples were obtained directly from cattle ears in the field (Stevens et al., 2020), where contamination levels were higher than in controlled lab settings. Also, the ONT reads used to assemble the *C. bovis* genome have higher error rates, that increase sequencing errors particularly in homopolymeric regions (Eid et al., 2009; Rhoads & Au, 2015; Kinkar et al., 2021). Polishing— using the original sequence reads to identify and fix any small errors—led to notable improvements in the ONT *C. bovis* assemblies; for example, the Redbean2.5 assembly was improved from 79% to 96% of the BUSCO genes were found as complete (Table S1). However, polishing had a minor impact on the PacBio-based assemblies, *H. contortus* (CSII) and *H. bakeri* (HiFi), presumably because the genome assemblers used had their own in-built polishing steps. 'Purging' duplicates—phasing out allelic repeats in highly heterozygous genomes based on read depth—led to notable reductions in the genome sizes and duplication of BUSCO genes; for example, the BUSCO genes' duplication in the *H. contortus*' Canu assembly was reduced by 48%. In heterozygous genomes, allelic contigs (haplotigs) are assembled into separate contigs, resulting in an increased assembly size.

Below, we compare the assemblies of each species using general assembly statistics, synteny, and BUSCO gene completeness. We then use four gene families to demonstrate how differences in assembly impact downstream analysis. For the BUSCO analyses, we use the term *present* to define genes which are either single or duplicated, and the term *absent* to define genes which are either fragmented or missing.

C. bovis assemblies

The Stevens *C. bovis* assembly was generated using ONT reads with the Redbean assembler v2.3 and polished with Racon and Medaka. We generated assemblies using an updated Redbean (v2.5, hereafter Redbean2.5), Flye, Canu, SMARTdenovo, Falcon, and Falcon-Unzip (Ruan & Li, 2020; Lin *et al.*, 2016; Kolmogorov *et al.*, 2018, 2019; Koren *et al.*, 2017, 2018; Liu *et al.*, 2021; Chin *et al.*, 2013, 2016) . Following decontamination and

polishing (Table S1), the overall standard assembly metrics were relatively similar (Table 1) . Compared to the

Redbean v2.3 Stevens assembly, the Redbean2.5 assembly was near identical in size but on fewer scaffolds (21

vs 35) and the N50 was 400 kb larger. The Canu assembly size was 10% larger and was on almost four times as

many scaffolds. The other four assemblies were comparable to the Stevens assembly in terms of assembly size

and the number of scaffolds, but the N50s were between 25% and 50% smaller.

We used BUSCO to evaluate how well assembled the highly conserved genes were across seven assemblies

(including the Stevens-Redbean2.3 assembly). There are 3131 pan-nematode orthologues (v10) and six of the

assemblies had similar scores (Table 1). Of the 3131 BUSCO genes, 2972 (95%) were present (single or

duplicated) in all seven assemblies, with 2850 (91%) as singletons (Figure S1).

Assembly Stats	Stevens	Redbean v2.5	Flye	Canu	SMARTdenovo	Falcon	Falcon-unzip
# Scaffolds	35	21	34	134	32	48	41
Assembly size (Mb)	62.73	62.72	62.93	69.16	63.39	64.93	64.40
N50 (Mb)	7.60	8.03	5.86	4.01	3.56	4.41	4.41
Longest contig (Mb)	10.86	10.08	10.12	12.16	6.29	9.90	9.79
BUSCO % n=3131	C:96.2 S:95.6 D:0.6	C:96.0 S:95.3 D:0.7	C:96.4 S:95.5 D:0.7	C:96.3 S:93.2 D:3.1	C:96.1 S:93.2 D:0.9	C:96.1 S:95.0 D:1.1	C:96.2 S:95.1 D:1.1
Inspector QV	25.1	25.1	25.0	25.3	25.1	25.0	25.2
Structural errors	12	8	9	10	16	21	9

Table 1: **Assembly statistics for *Caenorhabditis bovis.*** We used BUSCO version 4.1.4 with Augustus. The

lineage option used is 'nematoda_odb10', and C is for complete genes, S for singletons, and D for duplicates (all

% from 3131 genes). We used Inspector version 1.0.2 to evaluate the alignment of *C. bovis* ONT long reads to

the generated scaffolds to identify both large-scale (structural) and small-scale errors.

Six genes were present in only one assembly. Ninety-one (3%) were absent in all seven assemblies. A notable

difference was the duplication rate in the Canu assembly, which was five times that of the Stevens assembly:

18 genes (0.6%) vs 97 genes (3.1%). Of the BUSCO orthologues, 97.1% (3040 genes) were complete (singleton

or duplicated) in at least one assembly and 94.9% (2972) were complete in all seven assemblies. Of these

complete genes, 15 were duplicated in all assemblies. Ninety-one genes were missing or fragmented in all

seven assemblies, which suggests they are undergoing pseudogenization or have been lost as a consequence of

a genome size reduction in *C. bovis* (Stevens et al., 2020). In total, the BUSCO classification differed for 178

genes, *e.g.* from Duplicated to Fragmented (Figure 1A). Expectedly, there was little disagreement between the

Stevens (Redbean2.3) and the new Redbean2.5 assemblies; nine genes complete and single in the Stevens

assembly were fragmented or missing in the Redbean2.5 assembly with six genes in the reverse situation

(Figure 1A). Disagreements between BUSCO classification was more striking between the other assemblies. For

example, SMARTdenovo and Falcon had near identical BUSCO scores, but 36 complete and singleton genes in

the SMARTdenovo assembly were classified as duplicated (16), fragmented (13) or missing (7) in the Falcon

assembly. In a direct comparison of Redbean2.5 and Canu assemblies, 18 genes considered fragmented or

missing in Redbean2.5 but were found complete and single copy in Canu (Figure 1B). The full list of BUSCO

genes found in each assembly can be found in Tables S5-to-S11.

F**igure 1: Transitions of BUSCO genes across multiple *C. bovis* assemblies.**

(A) A Sankey diagram of the 178 genes that changed categories in at least one assembly. The order of the

assemblies is consistent with Table 1. The data for this figure can be found in Data S2 and Data S3. (B)

Comparison of the 110 BUSCO genes that were categorized differently in the Readbean2.5 and Canu

assemblies. Data for this figure can be found in Data S4. The figures were generated using SankeyMATIC

(https://sankeymatic.com/). Red – complete & single; Green – complete & duplicated; Yellow – Fragmented;

Purple – Missing.

We used the original ONT reads to evaluate the reads alignment to each of the assemblies, identifying large

structural and small errors with the Inspector program (Chen et al., 2021). Overall, all the assemblies had near

identical QV scores; the Redbean2.5 assembly had the fewest large structural errors, and the Flye assembly had

the fewest small-scale errors (Table 1 and Table S12). In considering the fundamental algorithm of each

assembly program, the DBG assemblers—Redbean and Flye—typically performed best in the traditional

metrics—e.g., N50 and BUSCO (Table 1). The Inspector report was a more mixed, but it should be stressed that

the margins of difference were typically very small.

Next, we investigated the structural variation—insertions, deletions, and translocations—between assemblies.

Because we consider the Redbean2.5 assembly to give the best statistics, we used it as the reference and

aligned the other assemblies to it using MUMmer and the alignments summarized with NucDiff (Kurtz et al.,

2004; Khelik et al., 2017; Marçais et al., 2018). As expected, Stevens and Flye, which use the DBG algorithm,

had the fewest number of differences (Table 2 and Table S13). These were followed by the OLC-based

SMARTdenovo assembly, the related HGAP Falcon and Falcon-Unzip assemblies, with the OLC-based Canu

assembly having the most differences to the Redbean2.5 assembly. For all assemblies, at least 97% of the

variants were insertions or deletions, typically short regions (1-to-10bp). However, we did find longer

duplications and tandem duplications which could impact accurate curation of genes. To ascertain this, we

investigated whether any of the braker 3-annotated genes predicted in both Stevens and Redbean2.5

assemblies were on any of the duplications or tandem duplications. For the Stevens assembly, five genes were

found in these regions (four genes in tandem duplications and one gene on a duplication). For the Redbean2.5

assembly, 19 genes were found in these regions (17 genes in tandem duplications and two on duplications)

(Table S14).

	Stevens	Flye	Canu	SMARTdenovo	Falcon	Falcon-unzip
Total number	8,215	8,527	62,971	12,895	19,319	16,540
Insertions	2,421	3,350	25,809	4,913	8,002	6,718
Deletions	5,553	4,916	36,399	7,684	10,929	9,363
Translocation	194	207	478	218	290	336
Relocations	29	18	142	38	39	57
Reshufflings	8	11	32	15	21	18
Inversions	10	25	109	27	38	48
Unaligned seq	0	0	2	0	0	0

Table 2 NucDiff results for *C. bovis* assemblies. Here, the reference assembly is Redbean2.5.

We did find structural rearrangements, with translocations, relocations, reshufflings, and inversions (Table 2

and Figure 2). Again, we focus on assemblies by different versions of the same program—Redbean2.5 and the

Stevens's (Redbean2.3) assemblies—we found 194 translocations and the Redbean2.5 Scaffold 3 is split across

the Stevens Scaffolds 6, 7, and 11. These would likely have larger consequences in downstream analysis,

affecting gene finding and population-based association studies.

Figure 2: Circos plots showing synteny across six genome assemblies for the *C. bovis*. The colored
chromosomes represent the reference genome (Redbean2.5) and the gray chromosomes represent different
assemblies as query.

Finally, we note that two scaffolds in the Canu assembly did not align to the Redbean2.5 assembly. Through a

BLASTX search against NCBI NR database (Camacho et al., 2009; Sayers et al., 2022), we were able to determine

that these are most likely of bacterial origin and not removed by the decontamination protocols (data not

shown).

H. contortus assemblies

The published *H. contortus* assembly is the result of an ongoing multinational consortium and involved deep

sequencing using multiple platforms and labour-intensive manual identification and correction of assembly

errors (Laing et al., 2013; Doyle et al., 2018, 2020). Here, we use it as the gold-standard reference, termed the

Doyle assembly, against which the other assemblies are compared, unless otherwise stated. We generated six

assemblies using the PacBio reads that were used in Doyle assembly. These six assemblies, once

decontaminated and polished, varied considerably in their length, fragmentation, and completeness (Table 3).

There was a 23% difference between the longest (Flye 331 Mb) and shortest (Falcon-unzip 262 Mb) assemblies.

The SMARTdenovo assembly was the most contiguous, with the fewest scaffolds and largest N50. The

350   Redbean2.5 and Falcon assemblies were the closest to the Doyle assembly in terms of assembly length, 13 Mb

351   longer and 16 Mb shorter, respectively.

	Doyle	Redbean v2.5	Flye	Canu	SMARTdenovo	Falcon	Falcon-unzip
# Scaffolds	7	1844	3249	2364	1473	2402	1975
Assembly size (Mb)	283.44	296.37	331.35	341.72	314.72	267.14	262.37
N50 (Mb)	47.40	0.31	0.24	0.34	0.45	0.23	0.25
Longest contig (Mb)	51.80	3.45	4.85	2.76	4.47	3.22	3.24
BUSCO % n=3131	C:94.8 S:93.7 D:1.1	C:93.9 S:86.7 D:7.2	C:94.1 S:85.0 D:9.1	C:95.2 S:86.6 D:8.6	C:94.7 S:86.5 D:8.2	C:88.2 S:84.2 D:4.0	C:87.7 S:84.2 D:3.5
Inspector Reference-free (mapping reads-to-assembly):							
Inspector QV	22.0	42.9	39.6	44.6	39.1	31.8	42.8
Structural errors	170	53	146	67	180	826	62
Inspector results Reference-guided (mapping assemblies-to-Doyle):							
Coverage of Doyle (%)	98	84	80	84	84	79	79
Reference bases with depth 0; 1; 2+ (%)	2; 98; 0	16; 82; 2	20; 76; 4	16; 78; 6	16; 81; 3	21; 77; 2	21; 77; 2
Number of collapses	0	1197	1633	1512	1234	6370	1019
Number of expansions	0	1004	1136	1127	1113	845	888
Number of inversions	0	1	0	0	0	2	0

353   **Table 3: Assembly statistics for *H. contortus*.** We used BUSCO version 4.1.4 with Augustus. The lineage option
354   used is 'nematoda_odb10', and (C) is for complete genes, (S) for singletons, and (D) for duplicates (all % from
355   3131 genes). We used Inspector version 1.0.2 to evaluate the alignment of *H. contortus* PacBio RSII and Sequel
356   long reads to the generated scaffolds to identify both large-scale (structural) and small-scale errors.
357

For the Inspector reports, we used both the reads and the Doyle assembly for reference-free and reference-

guided metrics, respectively (Table 3 and Table S15). We were initially surprised to see that the Doyle assembly

had the lowest QV score. Here, it is important to note that this score is reference-free, and a function of read

alignments to the assembly. The Doyle assembly has undergone extensive curation, in which data, including

optical mapping, was used to identify mistakes in the preliminary long-read driven assembly. So, a higher level

of disagreement with the raw sequence reads is to be expected. For example, the Doyle assembly had the

highest number of haplotype switches (Table S15), likely a consequence of the manual improvement that

sought to maximize scaffold continuity. For the six assemblies that we generated, the Inspector metrics were

similar. The coverage of the assembly-to-Doyle alignments were relatively low (79%-to-84%). The effect of the

alignment algorithm is demonstrated with the 98% coverage Doyle-to-Doyle assembly. Therefore, the regions

not covered predominantly are due to differences between each of the six assemblies and the Doyle reference.

The duplication rate—where the assembly-to-Doyle coverage was two or more—was lowest for Redbean,

Falcon and Falcon-unzip and highest in the Canu assembly.

In considering the BUSCO results, the six new assemblies varied more than those of the other two species, with

between 87.7% to 95.2% of genes found complete. The duplication rate was notably higher in the six

assemblies compared to the Doyle reference. Of the 3131 pan-nematode orthologous genes, 3020 genes

(96.5%) were found in at least one assembly, with 2525 genes (80.6%) were complete (singleton or duplicated)

in all seven assemblies and 94 genes (3.0%) missing or fragmented in all seven (Figure S2, Figure S3, Figure S4).

It is striking that fewer genes were missing in the Canu and SMARTdenovo assemblies compared to the

reference. Looking more broadly, of the 141 genes missing in the Doyle assembly, 56 (39.7%) were found

complete in at least one of the new assemblies, 27 in all six assemblies (Figure 3). It is likely that these

represent errors in the current reference assembly.

Figure 3: A heatmap showing BUSCO genes missing from the Doyle reference assembly but found present in
at least one of the other six assemblies. Red – complete and single, Blue – complete and duplicated, Yellow –
Fragmented.
384

We further examined the functions of the 141 genes absent in the Doyle assembly identifying several genes

whose true absence could have significant implications on the *H. contortus* and other Clade V nematodes

(Table S16). One example is the *let-756* gene, a lethal locus in the worm. This gene is involved in the fibroblast

growth factor receptor signaling pathway essential in nematode larval development. The knock-down of *let-*

756 expression by RNA interference (RNAi) induces larval arrest in worms (Roubin et al., 1999). A second

example is the *nck-1* gene, which enables kinase activity required for neuronal guidance (Mohamed & Chin-

Sang, 2011). The knock-down of this gene expression results in worms with impairments in axon guidance,

neuronal cell positioning, and abnormalities in the excretory canal cell, gonad, and male mating (Mohamed &

Chin-Sang, 2011). A third example is the *gcn-2* gene which is a kinase involved in the nutrient-sensing

pathways, impacting several processes that include determining the adult lifespan. Low amino acid supply,

leads to loss of *gcn-2* and shortened life spans in worms, supporting its function in stress response under

nutrient deprivation (Rousakis et al., 2013).

Of the 35 BUSCO genes duplicated in the Doyle reference assembly, 29 were also duplicated in most of the new

assemblies and three were singletons in all six new assemblies (Figure S2). Comparing between the new

assemblies, there were large exchanges between singleton and duplicated categories, suggesting that assembly

algorithms successfully collapsed divergent haplotypes of different genes at different rates (Figure S5 and Data

S5). The presence or absence of BUSCOs between the new assemblies was striking. For example, 44 genes

considered missing or fragmented in the Doyle reference assembly ('red') were classified as complete and

singletons in the Redbean2.5 assembly (Figure S5). Another example is, 62 genes considered missing or

fragmented in the Redbean2.5 assembly ('green') were complete and singletons in Flye (Figure S5), with 66

genes reclassified in the other direction ('red') (Figure S6 and Data S6). Both assemblers use the DBG algorithm.

The full list of BUSCO genes for each assembly can be found in Tables S17-to-S23).

H. bakeri assemblies

At the start of this study, there were two published *H. bakeri* assemblies; one generated from short-reads only

(PRJEB1203) and one that used a low-coverage of PacBio reads to scaffold together a short-read assembly

(PRJEB15396) (Coghlan et al., 2019; Chow et al., 2019). We selected the second assembly as it was more

contiguous and had a higher BUSCO score (Chow et al., 2019). We acknowledge that as we finished our study, a

chromosome-scale assembly for *H. bakeri* was published (Stevens et al., 2023). While more contiguous than

the Chow assembly—essentially six chromosomes—we note that the Chow assembly had a higher BUSCO score

(Table 4).

As part of our own *H. bakeri* genome project, we generated HiFi PacBio reads and assembled them with three

different software—Flye, HiCanu, and Hifiasm. The assembly lengths differed less than 6%, with the Chow

genome being the longest (Table 4). As expected, the N50 and longest scaffold of the new HiFi-based

assemblies were considerably longer than the Chow assembly but themselves varied five-fold (from 944 kb to

4.9 Mb) for N50 and three-fold (5.9 Mb to 20 Mb) for the longest contigs.

Assembly	Chow	Flye	HiCanu	Hifiasm	Stevens *et al.* (Chromosome-scale)
# Scaffolds	23647	2380	1115	284	321
Assembly size (Mb)	696.95	658.60	685.42	678.45	649.16
N50 (Mb)	0.18	0.94	1.9	4.94	110.8
Longest contig (Mb)	1.25	5.94	11.70	20.45	114.7
BUSCO % n=3131	C:94.3 S:93.1 D:1.2	C:94.6 S:92.5 D:2.1	C:95.0 S:92.2 D:2.8	C:94.9 S:92.0 D:2.9	C:93.8 S:92.6 D:1.2
Inspector QV	22.1	36.0	35.5	32.5	-
Structural errors	34	116	74	268	-

423 **Table 4: Assembly statistics for *H. bakeri*.** We used BUSCO version 4.1.4 with Augustus. The lineage option
424 used is 'nematoda_odb10', and C is for complete genes, S for singletons, and D for duplicates (all % from 3131
425 genes). We used Inspector version 1.0.2 to evaluate the alignment of *H. bakeri* HiFi long reads to the generated
426 scaffolds to identify both large-scale (structural) and small-scale errors. The chromosome-level Stevens *et al.*
427 assembly was only published at the end of our study and was not included in our comparisons.
428

The three newly generated assemblies exhibited comparable performance in the reference-free Inspector

analysis. However, the Hifiasm assembly, despite its higher contiguity, exhibited more structural errors (Table

4). As expected, the highly fragmented Chow assembly had a three-fold higher split-read rate (Table S24).

Nonetheless, it had the fewest structural errors, suggesting well assembled contigs. The assembly also

displayed a higher count of small-scale errors potentially attributed to divergence of sequence data as the HiFi

data used for assembly was generated from a Canadian isolate of *H. bakeri*; the Chow assembly is from a British

isolate (Table S24).

Marginally more BUSCO genes were found in the HiFi assemblies—Flye, HiCanu, Hifiasm—but at the cost of a

duplication rate higher than for the Chow assembly. We found that 164 BUSCO genes were complete (single

and duplicated) in at least one assembly; the majority of these were assembly specific (Figure 4A) with 19

found duplicated in all four assemblies and 10 found in the HiFi-based assemblies (Figure 4B). This tempts

speculation that the ~29 genes are indeed duplicated. Similar to *C. bovis* and *H. contortus*, the *H. bakeri*

assemblies contained different cohorts of BUSCO genes (Figure 5).

Figure 4: UpSet plots of (A) Single and Duplicated BUSCOs present in *H. bakeri* assemblies, and (B) Duplicated BUSCOs in the assemblies. The figures were generated with https://asntech.shinyapps.io/intervene/.

Figure 5: Transitions of BUSCO genes across multiple *H. bakeri* assemblies. A Sankey diagram of the 351 genes that changed categories in at least one *H. bakeri* assembly. The figures were generated using SankeyMATIC (https://sankeymatic.com/). Red – complete & single; Green – complete & duplicated; Yellow – Fragmented; Purple – Missing.

When we considered the union of Single and Duplicated categories as 'present' and the union of Fragmented and Missing as 'absent', we found that between 36 and 80 genes were present in at least one assembly and absent in another (Table 5).

		Absent: Fragmented/Missing			
		Chow *et al.*	Flye	HiCanu	Hifiasm
Present: Single/ Duplicated	Chow *et al.*	-	70	60	55
	Flye	80	-	38	36
	HiCanu	79	47	-	42
	Hifiasm	7 5	46	43	-

Table 5: BUSCO category transition data for *Heligmosomoides bakeri*. An alternative way to show the Sankey diagram data considering the union of Single and Duplicated categories as 'present' and the union of Fragmented and Missing as 'absent'.

A total of 120 genes were present in three assemblies and absent in one (Figure 4 **(A)**). We note that while 58 of these in-three-out-one genes were absent in the Chow assembly, 62 genes were absent in one of the HiFi-based assemblies. We explored the functions of these 62 genes to determine their potential impact on hypotheses regarding *H. bakeri* biology (Missing in Hicanu: Table S25, Missing in Hifiasm: Table S26, Missing in Flye: Table S27).

We found several genes whose absence, if real, could significantly impact a *H. bakeri* worm. One example is *mog-1*, absent only in the Flye assembly, encoding a mannosyl-oligosaccharide glucosidase which is involved in N-Glycan biosynthesis (Grinna & Robbins, 1979, 1980; Michael & Kornfeld, 1980; Elting, Chen & Lennarz, 1980; Kilker et al., 1981). The knock-down of *mogs-1* expression by RNA interference (RNAi) results in worms that exhibit slow growth and shortened lifespans (Katoh et al., 2013). A second example is *gpb-1,* the G protein beta subunit, which is also absent in the Flye assembly. RNAi knock-down of *gpb-1* expression is embryonic lethal (Kamath et al., 2000). A third example, this time absent only in the HiCanu assembly, is *fmo-4*, which encodes for flavin-containing monooxygenase and is necessary for the biosynthesis of taurine (Ziegler & Pettit, 1966; Jones & Ballou, 1986; Chiba et al., 1988, 1995; Cashman, 1995; Cashman & Zhang, 2006). RNAi knock-down of *fmo-4* expression causes defects in the nervous system development (axon pathfinding) and is lethal to *C. elegans* (Gujar, Stricker & Lundquist, 2017). The full list of BUSCO genes for each assembly can be found in Table S28, Table S29, Table S30, Table S31).

Impact of assembly variation on gene family analysis

We generated protein-coding gene models for each of the assemblies and identified members of four gene families: the cytochrome P450s (CYP), glutathione S-transferase (GST), UDP glucuronosyltransferases (UGT),

and nuclear hormone receptors (NHR). Members of these families have been implicated in anthelmintic drug

susceptibility and are among the largest in *C. elegans*: 79 CYPs, 74 GSTs, 67 UGTs and 277 NHRs. The full list of

the *C. elegans* gene family members can be found here: CYP450s: Table S32, GSTs: Table S33, UGTs: Table S34,

NHRS: Table S35.

In each species and for each gene family, we used sequence similarity to identify likely homologues and

clustered them, with the *C. elegans* proteins (Emms & Kelly, 2019). If the differences in genome assemblies did

not affect the genome annotation, we would expect that every cluster would have an identical number of

proteins from each assembly (excluding *C. elegans*). Any deviation from this would demonstrate that

differences in the assemblies led to different gene model predictions. We considered cluster membership

across all assemblies ('all') and just for those assemblies generated in this study ('new') (Table 6).

	CYP	GST	UGT	NHR
C. bovis:				
Number found	min: 44 max: 58 diff: 27%	min: 38 max: 41 diff: 8%	min: 39 max: 51 diff: 27 %	min: 144 max: 160 diff: 11%
Number of clusters	42	35	16	144
Identical size	all: 26 new: 26	all: 32 new: 32	all: 9 new: 10	all: 120 new: 122
H. contortus:				
Number found	min: 35 max: 59 diff: 51%	min: 37 max: 49 diff: 28%	min: 31 max: 37 diff: 18%	min:103 max: 136 diff: 28 %
Number of clusters	35	29	14	107
Identical size	all: 14 new: 14	all: 12 new: 13	all: 8 new: 9	all: 56 new: 57
H. bakeri:				
Number found	min: 33 max: 40 diff: 19%	min: 48 max: 50 diff: 4%	min: 32 max: 43 diff: 29%	min: 121 max: 141 diff: 15%
Number of clusters	29	31	18	128
Identical size	all: 17 new: 20	all: 19 new: 24	all: 9 new: 11	all: 86 new: 100

502   **Table 6:** Showing percentage differences between the minimum and maximum number of the
503   predicted members of the CYP, GST, UGT and NHR gene families across assemblies. We considered
504   cluster membership across all assemblies ('all') and just for those assemblies generated in this study
505   ('new').
506

507   Overall, we found considerable variation within gene families, ranging from a difference of three in the *C. bovis*

508   GSTs to a difference of 12 genes in *C. bovis* UGTs (Table 6 and Table 7).

Species	Assembly	Number of protein-coding gene models	Number of CYP450s	Number of GSTs	Number of UGTs	Number of NHRs
C. elegans	-	**19,981**	**79**	**74**	**67**	**277**
C. bovis						
	Stevens	14,945	44	39	40	146
	Canu	15,010	50	41	51	160
	Falcon	14,143	58	39	45	144
	Flye	14,070	44	38	39	151
	Redbean2.5	14,001	44	38	41	148
	SMARTdenovo	13,863	44	39	43	145
	Falcon-unzip	13,988	50	38	45	149
H. contortus						
	Doyle	14,824	35	37	36	103
	Canu	18,808	36	39	37	136
	Falcon	16,259	46	40	37	103
	Flye	19,225	59	45	36	131
	Redbean2.5	17,220	47	46	36	121
	SMARTdenovo	17,589	53	49	32	114
	Falcon-unzip	15,890	54	41	31	103
H. bakeri						
	Chow	23,218	40	50	43	141
	Flye	20,801	35	48	37	132
	HiCanu	20,259	36	49	34	127
	Hifiasm	20,079	33	48	32	121

509 **Table 7:** Counts of protein-coding gene models and members of the CYP450, GST, UGT and NHR gene families
510 in each assembly for the *C. bovis, H.contortus and H. bakeri*.

Species	Assembly	Number of CYPs	Number of GSTs	Number of UGTs	Number of NHRs
C. bovis	ρ w/ assembly size	0.51	0.85	0.95	0.77
	ρ w/ BUSCO duplication %	0.34	0.85	0.9	0.87
H. contortus	ρ w/ assembly size	0.07	0.39	0.26	0.9
	ρ w/ BUSCO duplication %	0.39	0.66	0.09	0.86
H. bakeri	ρ w/ assembly size	0.66	0.86	0.4	0.35
	ρ w/ BUSCO duplication %	-0.87	-0.69	-0.99	-0.97

Table 8: Showing correlations between gene family count differences between assemblies with assembly size
and BUSCO duplication. The correlation coefficient (rho) is indicated by the symbol ρ. The correlations were
calculated using the Correlation coefficient calculator - Pearson and Spearman's rank, with solution
(statskingdom.com).

The difference in gene family counts between assemblies was strongly and positively correlated with the size of

the assembly and BUSCO duplications for UGTs in the *C. bovis* assemblies and between the size of the assembly

for NHRs in *H. contortus* assemblies (Table 8).

Across the 628 clusters that we generated, approximately 60% contained the same number of members for

each assembly. Put another way, ~40% of clusters contained a variable number of proteins for each assembly

(Table 6). Often, this variation was an additional member in just one assembly.

We provide three examples of variable cluster memberships from the CYPs. The first example is cluster bovis-

cyp-0000003, which has the same count for the Redbean2.5 and the *C. elegans* (one member each). When

compared to *C. elegans* the Falcon and Falcon-unzip assemblies showed expansions (three members each) and

the remaining *C. bovis* assemblies (two members each) (Table S36 and Table S37). The *C. elegans* protein is

CYP-33C9 whose function has been associated with fatty-acid desaturation hence reducing susceptibility of

xenobiotics by increasing desiccation tolerance (Erkut et al., 2013). A second example is cluster bovis-cyp-

0000013, which contains one protein from *C. elegans* (CYP-36A1), two members from the Canu assembly and

one member each for the remaining *C. bovis* assemblies (Table S36 and Table S37). CYP-36A1 is responsible for

the metabolism of tolbutamide (Harlow et al., 2018). A third example is cluster contortus-cyp-0000026 which

contains one protein in *C. elegans* (CYP-43A1), and the *H. contortus* falcon, flye and falcon-unzip assemblies but

is seemingly absent in the other assemblies (Table S38 and Table S39). The proposed orthologue of CYP-43A1 in

an earlier version of the *H. contortus* assembly was shown to be the most highly expressed CYP in the *H.*

contortus intestine (Laing et al., 2015). The full list of cluster information can be found in Table S36 and Table

S37 for *C. bovis* CYPs, Table S38 and Table S39 for *H. contortus* CYPs and Table S40 and Table S41 for *H. bakeri*

CYPs.

Discussion

The need for more contiguous and complete genomes have led to a myriad of novel computational approaches

with continuous advancements in sequencing technology rendering some assembly programs obsolete. We

acknowledge that newer long-read assembly programs are available, with others becoming available as we

carried out our study, we selected assemblers based on their popularity at the start of our study. The

performance of most of these programs has also been benchmarked in several studies using complex genomes

(Jung *et al.*, 2020; Sun *et al.*, 2021; Koo *et al.*, 2023; Low *et al.*, 2019; Pollo *et al.*, 2020). We may have reached a

point, at which the number of independent comparisons of assembly algorithms exceeds the number of

assembly algorithms. However, these comparisons remain useful, particularly considering the tremendous

diversity observed in genomes so far sequenced. Acknowledging the impracticality of testing every available or

emerging program and the researchers' likelihood to maintain their preferences amidst evolving tools, we

aimed to explore the effectiveness of these programs and the impact of the resulting assembly variations on

gene finding, focusing on nematodes, species which have a significant effect on animal (including human) and

crop health, and, led by *C. elegans*, the fundamental understanding of life's many processes.

Long-read assemblers implement two major classes of assembly algorithms: the Overlap-Layout-Consensus

(OLC) and the De-Bruijn Graph (DBG) (Flicek & Birney, 2009; Miller, Koren & Sutton, 2010; Schatz, Delcher &

Salzberg, 2010). Briefly, the OLC algorithm first identifies overlaps in reads, constructs a layout based on the

reads and overlap information and finally builds a consensus. On the other hand, the DBG algorithm works by

first trimming reads into shorter sequences of a given length (k-mer) and then using all the k-mers to form

repeat graphs and finally merging them to infer the genome sequence (Li et al., 2012). The algorithmic

differences and tailored refinements among assemblers, result in varying strategies to handle inherent

biological characteristics within genomes, such as repetitive regions and ploidy, as well as error read rates,

especially in regions with structural variations. For the smaller and less complex *C. bovis* genome, the DBG-

Redbean and Flye assemblers, produced the least fragmented assemblies, with larger N50 and highest BUSCO

scores. Further, these assemblers reported the highest mapping read rate to large contigs, alignment depth and

the least number of errors, with Redbean having the fewest structural errors. Despite the low heterozygosity in

C. bovis, the OLC- Canu assembler generated a 10% larger assembly with more duplicated BUSCO genes than

other assemblies. This highlights the potential difficulties in handling repeats and heterozygosity by Canu. For

the larger and more complex *H. contortus* genome, OLC- SMARTdenovo and Canu assemblers, reported larger

N50 sizes, higher BUSCO scores, higher mapping read rates, and lower read split rates. Although Canu

incorporates a base-correction step in its algorithm, it produced an assembly with the highest duplication rates.

The DBG- Redbean assembler had the lowest duplication rate and fewest structural errors, demonstrating its

effectiveness in handling genomes with repeats and allelic variations. SMARTdenovo, Canu, and Redbean

assemblers reported the highest percentage coverage to the Doyle reference assembly. We encourage

researchers to consider Redbean when selecting assemblers, even for genomes with greater complexities. For

H. bakeri, the Hifiasm assembler, despite producing the most contiguous assembly, displayed the highest

number of structural errors. This suggests potential challenges in handling highly heterozygous regions by the

assembly algorithm, despite its default haplotype-resolving capabilities.

Assembly variations, as expected, resulted in differentially classified BUSCO genes across assemblers. Given the

high conservation of BUSCO genes within a lineage, the shared presence or absence of these genes across

multiple assemblers may reflect inherent biological characteristics and evolutionary events, like duplications,

within a species. However, we highlight that while the count of duplicated BUSCO genes provides a metric for

duplication, the specific genes involved and the context in which they undergo duplication may vary among

assemblies. Similarly, BUSCO genes consistently absent in multiple assemblies may suggest gene loss

presumably due to pseudogenes. Pseudogenes are prevalent in eukaryotic genomes and typically, have short

life spans attributed to chance DNA replication or repair errors and accumulated mutational changes that

render them unrecognizable (Chu et al., 2021). Therefore, considering alternative assemblies may facilitate

more accurate conclusions regarding the presence or absence of true biological elements within genomes.

Alternative assemblies can also guide merging of multiple assemblies to increase contiguity and identify or

resolve mis-assemblies. For example, the larger translocations shared by multiple assemblies in *C. bovis* hint at

how supporting assemblies could be merged to give a more contiguous assembly. Joining Scaffolds 4 and 8 from

Redbean2.5 is supported by their alignments with four assemblies—Stevens, SmartDenovo, Falcon, and Falcon-

unzip—which share the translocation in the same region (Figure 2). Sequences from the five assemblies could

be aligned to each other and the overlapping regions integrated into a single assembly either by concatenating

sequences or by selecting the best representative for each region. However, merging Scaffolds 1 and 10 from

Redbean2.5 is only supported by their alignments with the Canu assembly (Figure 2) suggesting a possible mis-

assembly in these regions.

We identified the functions of some BUSCO genes absent in the *H. contortus* Doyle reference genome and the

HiFi-based *H. bakeri* assemblies. Given that these missing genes are part of the BUSCO set for the nematode

lineage, their presence across the nematodes is expected, especially considering the relatively close

relationship between *C. elegans*, *H. contortus* and *H. bakeri* (all being Clade V nematodes). Therefore, it is not

too bold a suggestion that the detrimental effects of loss-of-function in *C. elegans* would equally harm *H.*

contortus and *H. bakeri*. Faced with such striking loss in a key pathway of a favorite organism, a researcher may

formulate alternative and/or novel pathways. Instances of this phenomenon are evident in the literature, and

as peer-reviewers, we have encountered and experienced it in our research into nematode biology. This

phenomenon is not limited to nematodes and should be taken into consideration by researchers utilizing

genome assemblies from their favorite organisms.

Comparative analyses often involve species assembled and annotated using different methods across different

laboratories (Drukewitz & von Reumont, 2019; Coghlan et al., 2019). However, this practice has been shown to

inflate lineage-specific genes due to annotation heterogeneity, where orthologous DNA sequences are

annotated as genes in one species and as lineage-specific in another (Weisman *et al.*, 2022). To avoid

introducing such biases, we used a uniform annotation method, Braker 3. Unlike in the highly conserved BUSCO

genes, assembly variations were more pronounced in the less conserved genes and increased with genome

complexity. There was an 8% percentage difference in the predicted gene models for *C. bovis*, 14% for *H.*

bakeri, and 25% for *H. contortus* assemblies. We acknowledge that efforts to reduce heterozygosity in the *H.*

contortus and *H. bakeri* assemblies may have resulted in potential differential gene losses across assemblies.

Results also showed considerable variations in the member counts of the four gene families under study.

Although most variation, based on cluster membership, was an additional member in just one assembly, the

variation could be larger with important ramifications on biological interpretation. Using examples from the *C.*

bovis and *H. contortus* CYP family we demonstrated how variations in assembly can produce results that may

lead to inaccurate conclusions. The CYPs are arguably the family with the best functional annotation, however

studies into the other families are increasing and variation in the assemblies and annotation could have

important consequences. Particularly for gene families that influence drug susceptibility, accurate gene

prediction is key for drug design as it guides inferences crucial for determining toxicity and optimal drug

dosages.

Different assembly algorithms link contigs in different ways, potentially altering their order and orientation, and

consequently changing gene structures. The more common annotation errors in eukaryotic genomes are

attributed to the complexity of intron-exon structures and may result in either an overestimation or

underestimation of genes. Overestimations of genes potentially arise from either "split" or "cleaved" genes

(Denton et al., 2014). Split genes are a result of the splitting of haplotypes (allelic variations) in heterozygous

organisms into separate contigs which often appear as tandem duplications or with one copy independently on

a small scaffold (Denton et al., 2014). Cleaved genes on the other hand, are a result of the fragmentation of a

single gene onto multiple scaffolds. These two gene categories can cause an annotation program to predict a

single split gene as multiple separate genes, or alternatively, to fail in connecting distant exons altogether

(Denton et al., 2014). Underestimations of genes are often caused by insufficient representation of genes in

low-coverage regions, such as gaps, and the collapse of true paralogous gene copies into a single locus—a

phenomenon particularly affecting newly duplicated genes that have not yet undergone significant divergence

(Denton et al., 2014).

Eukaryotic organisms such as nematodes, therefore, require more contiguous assemblies to avoid splitting

genes across gene scaffolds. Thus, assembly methods that effectively resolve repeats and allelic variations are

critical. Similarly, it is important to examine the features of genes of interest and assess the functionalities

and/or parameters of the chosen assembly method. Genes that are short exons may go undetected or get

discarded by some assemblers. Canu, for instance, only selects the longest 40-fold of reads for correction

before assembly (Koren et al., 2017). This process could potentially lead to loss of genes.

In summary, algorithmic differences and genome characteristics of species under study impact the accuracy and

completeness of assembled genomes and the subsequent genome annotation process. Considering the varying

impact of each assembly method on genomic feature identification and the absence of a single gold standard

assembler, researchers should carefully select methods that best suit the genomic traits of their study species

and research objectives. For instance, contiguity and genome organization, particularly gene order, are crucial in

population genetics studies that seek to identify regions under selection. For this reason, assemblers that excel

in contiguity are better choices. Similarly, studies that investigate important gene families require assembly

methods that demonstrate better genome accuracy and completeness.

Conclusion

653 We encourage those charged with assembling genomes—whether nematode, nautilus, or natterjack—to be

654 aware of the important differences between seemingly very similar assemblies. We emphasize the importance

655 of exploring alternative assemblies generated by multiple assemblers to validate biological hypotheses. Finally,

656 these results demonstrate the need to support the continual curation of an organism's assembly and

657 annotation (Doyle, 2022).

Acknowledgements

659 We acknowledge the high-performance computing resources made available by the Faculty of Veterinary

660 Medicine and Research Computing at the University of Calgary.

Funding

662 This work was supported by grants to JDW from Results Driven Agricultural Research (RDAR, Alberta) and the

663 Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC)

References

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search tool. *Journal of*
Molecular Biology 215:403–410. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-2836(05)80360-2.

Baker EA, Gilbert SPR, Shimeld SM, Woollard A. 2021. Extensive non-redundancy in a recently duplicated
developmental gene family. *BMC Ecology and Evolution* 21:33. DOI: 10.1186/s12862-020-01735-z.

Barnett DW, Garrison EK, Quinlan AR, Strömberg MP, Marth GT. 2011. BamTools: a C++ API and toolkit for
analyzing and managing BAM files. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 27:1691–1692. DOI:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btr174.

Bethony JM, Loukas A, Hotez PJ, Knox DP. 2006. Vaccines against blood-feeding nematodes of humans and
livestock. *Parasitology* 133 Suppl:S63-79. DOI: 10.1017/S0031182006001818.

Boratyn GM, Schäffer AA, Agarwala R, Altschul SF, Lipman DJ, Madden TL. 2012. Domain enhanced lookup time
accelerated BLAST. *Biology Direct* 7:12. DOI: 10.1186/1745-6150-7-12.

Bradnam KR, Fass JN, Alexandrov A, Baranay P, Bechner M, Birol I, Boisvert S, Chapman JA, Chapuis G, Chikhi R,
Chitsaz H, Chou W-C, Corbeil J, Del Fabbro C, Docking TR, Durbin R, Earl D, Emrich S, Fedotov P, Fonseca
NA, Ganapathy G, Gibbs RA, Gnerre S, Godzaridis É, Goldstein S, Haimel M, Hall G, Haussler D, Hiatt JB,
Ho IY, Howard J, Hunt M, Jackman SD, Jaffe DB, Jarvis ED, Jiang H, Kazakov S, Kersey PJ, Kitzman JO,
Knight JR, Koren S, Lam T-W, Lavenier D, Laviolette F, Li Y, Li Z, Liu B, Liu Y, Luo R, MacCallum I,
MacManes MD, Maillet N, Melnikov S, Naquin D, Ning Z, Otto TD, Paten B, Paulo OS, Phillippy AM,
Pina-Martins F, Place M, Przybylski D, Qin X, Qu C, Ribeiro FJ, Richards S, Rokhsar DS, Ruby JG, Scalabrin
S, Schatz MC, Schwartz DC, Sergushichev A, Sharpe T, Shaw TI, Shendure J, Shi Y, Simpson JT, Song H,
Tsarev F, Vezzi F, Vicedomini R, Vieira BM, Wang J, Worley KC, Yin S, Yiu S-M, Yuan J, Zhang G, Zhang H,
Zhou S, Korf IF. 2013. Assemblathon 2: evaluating de novo methods of genome assembly in three
vertebrate species. *GigaScience* 2:2047-217X-2–10. DOI: 10.1186/2047-217X-2-10.

Brůna T, Hoff KJ, Lomsadze A, Stanke M, Borodovsky M. 2021. BRAKER2: automatic eukaryotic genome
annotation with GeneMark-EP+ and AUGUSTUS supported by a protein database. *NAR Genomics and*
Bioinformatics 3:lqaa108. DOI: 10.1093/nargab/lqaa108.

Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. 2015. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND. *Nature Methods*
12:59–60. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.3176.

C. elegans Sequencing Consortium. 1998. Genome sequence of the nematode C. elegans: a platform for
investigating biology. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 282:2012–2018. DOI: 10.1126/science.282.5396.2012.

Cable J, Harris PD, Lewis JW, Behnke JM. 2006. Molecular evidence that Heligmosomoides polygyrus from
laboratory mice and wood mice are separate species. *Parasitology* 133:111–122. DOI:
10.1017/S0031182006000047.

Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009. BLAST+: architecture
and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* 10:421. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2105-10-421.

Cashman JR. 1995. Structural and catalytic properties of the mammalian flavin-containing monooxygenase.
Chemical Research in Toxicology 8:166–181. DOI: 10.1021/tx00044a001.

Cashman JR, Zhang J. 2006. Human flavin-containing monooxygenases. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and*
Toxicology 46:65–100. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.46.120604.141043.

Chen Y, Zhang Y, Wang AY, Gao M, Chong Z. 2021. Accurate long-read de novo assembly evaluation with
Inspector. *Genome Biology* 22:312. DOI: 10.1186/s13059-021-02527-4.

Cheng H, Concepcion GT, Feng X, Zhang H, Li H. 2021. Haplotype-resolved de novo assembly using phased
assembly graphs with hifiasm. *Nature Methods* 18:170–175. DOI: 10.1038/s41592-020-01056-5.

Chiba K, Kobayashi K, Itoh K, Itoh S, Chiba T, Ishizaki T, Kamataki T. 1995. N-oxygenation of 1-methyl-4-phenyl-
1,2,3,6-tetrahydropyridine by the rat liver flavin-containing monooxygenase expressed in yeast cells.
European Journal of Pharmacology 293:97–100. DOI: 10.1016/0926-6917(95)90023-3.

Chiba K, Kubota E, Miyakawa T, Kato Y, Ishizaki T. 1988. Characterization of hepatic microsomal metabolism as
an in vivo detoxication pathway of 1-methyl-4-phenyl-1,2,3,6-tetrahydropyridine in mice. *The Journal
of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics* 246:1108–1115.

Chin C-S, Alexander DH, Marks P, Klammer AA, Drake J, Heiner C, Clum A, Copeland A, Huddleston J, Eichler EE,
Turner SW, Korlach J. 2013. Nonhybrid, finished microbial genome assemblies from long-read SMRT
sequencing data. *Nature Methods* 10:563–569. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.2474.

Chin C-S, Peluso P, Sedlazeck FJ, Nattestad M, Concepcion GT, Clum A, Dunn C, O'Malley R, Figueroa-Balderas
R, Morales-Cruz A, Cramer GR, Delledonne M, Luo C, Ecker JR, Cantu D, Rank DR, Schatz MC. 2016.
Phased diploid genome assembly with single-molecule real-time sequencing. *Nature Methods*
13:1050–1054. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.4035.

Chow FW-N, Koutsovoulos G, Ovando-Vázquez C, Neophytou K, Bermúdez-Barrientos JR, Laetsch DR,
Robertson E, Kumar S, Claycomb JM, Blaxter M, Abreu-Goodger C, Buck AH. 2019. Secretion of an
Argonaute protein by a parasitic nematode and the evolution of its siRNA guides. *Nucleic Acids
Research* 47:3594–3606. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkz142.

Chu X, Li S, Wang S, Luo D, Luo H. 2021. Gene loss through pseudogenization contributes to the ecological
diversification of a generalist Roseobacter lineage. *The ISME Journal* 15:489–502. DOI:
10.1038/s41396-020-00790-0.

Coghlan A, Tyagi R, Cotton JA, Holroyd N, Rosa BA, Tsai IJ, Laetsch DR, Beech RN, Day TA, Hallsworth-Pepin K,
Ke H-M, Kuo T-H, Lee TJ, Martin J, Maizels RM, Mutowo P, Ozersky P, Parkinson J, Reid AJ, Rawlings ND,
Ribeiro DM, Swapna LS, Stanley E, Taylor DW, Wheeler NJ, Zamanian M, Zhang X, Allan F, Allen JE,
Asano K, Babayan SA, Bah G, Beasley H, Bennett HM, Bisset SA, Castillo E, Cook J, Cooper PJ, Cruz-
Bustos T, Cuéllar C, Devaney E, Doyle SR, Eberhard ML, Emery A, Eom KS, Gilleard JS, Gordon D, Harcus
Y, Harsha B, Hawdon JM, Hill DE, Hodgkinson J, Horák P, Howe KL, Huckvale T, Kalbe M, Kaur G, Kikuchi
T, Koutsovoulos G, Kumar S, Leach AR, Lomax J, Makepeace B, Matthews JB, Muro A, O'Boyle NM,
Olson PD, Osuna A, Partono F, Pfarr K, Rinaldi G, Foronda P, Rollinson D, Samblas MG, Sato H, Schnyder
M, Scholz T, Shafie M, Tanya VN, Toledo R, Tracey A, Urban JF, Wang L-C, Zarlenga D, Blaxter ML,
Mitreva M, Berriman M, International Helminth Genomes Consortium. 2019. Comparative genomics of
the major parasitic worms. *Nature Genetics* 51:163–174. DOI: 10.1038/s41588-018-0262-1.

Core R. 2022. TEAM, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. *Online: https://www. r-project. org*.

Darwin Tree of Life Project Consortium. 2022. Sequence locally, think globally: The Darwin Tree of Life Project.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 119:e2115642118.
DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2115642118.

Denton JF, Lugo-Martinez J, Tucker AE, Schrider DR, Warren WC, Hahn MW. 2014. Extensive Error in the
Number of Genes Inferred from Draft Genome Assemblies. *PLOS Computational Biology* 10:e1003998.
DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003998.

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras TR. 2013. STAR:
ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 29:15–21. DOI:
10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635.

Doyle SR. 2022. Improving helminth genome resources in the post-genomic era. *Trends in Parasitology* 38:831–
840. DOI: 10.1016/j.pt.2022.06.002.

Doyle SR, Laing R, Bartley DJ, Britton C, Chaudhry U, Gilleard JS, Holroyd N, Mable BK, Maitland K, Morrison AA,
Tait A, Tracey A, Berriman M, Devaney E, Cotton JA, Sargison ND. 2018. A Genome Resequencing-Based

Genetic Map Reveals the Recombination Landscape of an Outbred Parasitic Nematode in the Presence of Polyploidy and Polyandry. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 10:396–409. DOI: 10.1093/gbe/evx269.

Doyle SR, Tracey A, Laing R, Holroyd N, Bartley D, Bazant W, Beasley H, Beech R, Britton C, Brooks K, Chaudhry U, Maitland K, Martinelli A, Noonan JD, Paulini M, Quail MA, Redman E, Rodgers FH, Sallé G, Shabbir MZ, Sankaranarayanan G, Wit J, Howe KL, Sargison N, Devaney E, Berriman M, Gilleard JS, Cotton JA. 2020. Genomic and transcriptomic variation defines the chromosome-scale assembly of Haemonchus contortus, a model gastrointestinal worm. *Communications Biology* 3:656. DOI: 10.1038/s42003-020-01377-3.

Drukewitz SH, von Reumont BM. 2019. The Significance of Comparative Genomics in Modern Evolutionary Venomics. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 7.

Ebenezer TE, Muigai AWT, Nouala S, Badaoui B, Blaxter M, Buddie AG, Jarvis ED, Korlach J, Kuja JO, Lewin HA, Majewska R, Mapholi N, Maslamoney S, Mbo'o-Tchouawou M, Osuji JO, Seehausen O, Shorinola O, Tiambo CK, Mulder N, Ziyomo C, Djikeng A. 2022. Africa: sequence 100,000 species to safeguard biodiversity. *Nature* 603:388–392. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-022-00712-4.

Eid J, Fehr A, Gray J, Luong K, Lyle J, Otto G, Peluso P, Rank D, Baybayan P, Bettman B, Bibillo A, Bjornson K, Chaudhuri B, Christians F, Cicero R, Clark S, Dalal R, deWinter A, Dixon J, Foquet M, Gaertner A, Hardenbol P, Heiner C, Hester K, Holden D, Kearns G, Kong X, Kuse R, Lacroix Y, Lin S, Lundquist P, Ma C, Marks P, Maxham M, Murphy D, Park I, Pham T, Phillips M, Roy J, Sebra R, Shen G, Sorenson J, Tomaney A, Travers K, Trulson M, Vieceli J, Wegener J, Wu D, Yang A, Zaccarin D, Zhao P, Zhong F, Korlach J, Turner S. 2009. Real-Time DNA Sequencing from Single Polymerase Molecules. *Science* 323:133–138. DOI: 10.1126/science.1162986.

Elting JJ, Chen WW, Lennarz WJ. 1980. Characterization of a glucosidase involved in an initial step in the processing of oligosaccharide chains. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* 255:2325–2331.

Emms DM, Kelly S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative genomics. *Genome Biology* 20:238. DOI: 10.1186/s13059-019-1832-y.

Erkut C, Vasilj A, Boland S, Habermann B, Shevchenko A, Kurzchalia TV. 2013. Molecular Strategies of the Caenorhabditis elegans Dauer Larva to Survive Extreme Desiccation. *PLOS ONE* 8:e82473. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0082473.

Flicek P, Birney E. 2009. Sense from sequence reads: methods for alignment and assembly. *Nature Methods* 6:S6–S12. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.1376.

Flynn JM, Hubley R, Goubert C, Rosen J, Clark AG, Feschotte C, Smit AF. 2020. RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117:9451–9457. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1921046117.

Gilleard JS. 2006. Understanding anthelmintic resistance: the need for genomics and genetics. *International Journal for Parasitology* 36:1227–1239. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpara.2006.06.010.

Grinna LS, Robbins PW. 1979. Glycoprotein biosynthesis. Rat liver microsomal glucosidases which process oligosaccharides. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* 254:8814–8818.

Grinna LS, Robbins PW. 1980. Substrate specificities of rat liver microsomal glucosidases which process glycoproteins. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* 255:2255–2258.

Guan D, McCarthy SA, Wood J, Howe K, Wang Y, Durbin R. 2020. Identifying and removing haplotypic duplication in primary genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 36:2896–2898. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa025.

Gujar MR, Stricker AM, Lundquist EA. 2017. Flavin monooxygenases regulate Caenorhabditis elegans axon guidance and growth cone protrusion with UNC-6/Netrin signaling and Rac GTPases. *PLoS genetics* 13:e1006998. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006998.

Harlow PH, Perry SJ, Stevens AJ, Flemming AJ. 2018. Comparative metabolism of xenobiotic chemicals by
cytochrome P450s in the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans. *Scientific Reports* 8:13333. DOI:
10.1038/s41598-018-31215-w.

Hoff KJ, Lange S, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. 2016. BRAKER1: Unsupervised RNA-Seq-Based Genome
Annotation with GeneMark-ET and AUGUSTUS. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 32:767–769. DOI:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btv661.

Hoff KJ, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M, Stanke M. 2019. Whole-Genome Annotation with BRAKER. *Methods in
Molecular Biology (Clifton, N.J.)* 1962:65–95. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-9173-0_5.

Howe KL, Bolt BJ, Shafie M, Kersey P, Berriman M. 2017. WormBase ParaSite – a comprehensive resource for
helminth genomics. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology* 215:2–10. DOI:
10.1016/j.molbiopara.2016.11.005.

Hubley R, Finn RD, Clements J, Eddy SR, Jones TA, Bao W, Smit AFA, Wheeler TJ. 2016. The Dfam database of
repetitive DNA families. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44:D81–D89. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkv1272.

Jones KC, Ballou DP. 1986. Reactions of the 4a-hydroperoxide of liver microsomal flavin-containing
monooxygenase with nucleophilic and electrophilic substrates. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*
261:2553–2559.

Jung H, Jeon M-S, Hodgett M, Waterhouse P, Eyun S. 2020. Comparative Evaluation of Genome Assemblers
from Long-Read Sequencing for Plants and Crops. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 68:7670–
7677. DOI: 10.1021/acs.jafc.0c01647.

Kajitani R, Toshimoto K, Noguchi H, Toyoda A, Ogura Y, Okuno M, Yabana M, Harada M, Nagayasu E, Maruyama
H, Kohara Y, Fujiyama A, Hayashi T, Itoh T. 2014. Efficient de novo assembly of highly heterozygous
genomes from whole-genome shotgun short reads. *Genome Research*:gr.170720.113. DOI:
10.1101/gr.170720.113.

Kamath RS, Martinez-Campos M, Zipperlen P, Fraser AG, Ahringer J. 2000. Effectiveness of specific RNA-
mediated interference through ingested double-stranded RNA in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Genome
Biology* 2:research0002.1. DOI: 10.1186/gb-2000-2-1-research0002.

Kaminsky R, Ducray P, Jung M, Clover R, Rufener L, Bouvier J, Weber SS, Wenger A, Wieland-Berghausen S,
Goebel T, Gauvry N, Pautrat F, Skripsky T, Froelich O, Komoin-Oka C, Westlund B, Sluder A, Mäser P.
2008. A new class of anthelmintics effective against drug-resistant nematodes. *Nature* 452:176–180.
DOI: 10.1038/nature06722.

Kanehisa M, Sato Y, Morishima K. 2016. BlastKOALA and GhostKOALA: KEGG Tools for Functional
Characterization of Genome and Metagenome Sequences. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 428:726–731.
DOI: 10.1016/j.jmb.2015.11.006.

Katoh T, Takase J, Tani Y, Amamoto R, Aoshima N, Tiemeyer M, Yamamoto K, Ashida H. 2013. Deficiency of α-
glucosidase I alters glycoprotein glycosylation and lifespan in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Glycobiology*
23:1142–1151. DOI: 10.1093/glycob/cwt051.

Khelik K, Lagesen K, Sandve GK, Rognes T, Nederbragt AJ. 2017. NucDiff: in-depth characterization and
annotation of differences between two sets of DNA sequences. *BMC bioinformatics* 18:338. DOI:
10.1186/s12859-017-1748-z.

Kilker RD, Saunier B, Tkacz JS, Herscovics A. 1981. Partial purification from Saccharomyces cerevisiae of a
soluble glucosidase which removes the terminal glucose from the oligosaccharide Glc3Man9GlcNAc2.
The Journal of Biological Chemistry 256:5299–5603.

Kinkar L, Gasser RB, Webster BL, Rollinson D, Littlewood DTJ, Chang BCH, Stroehlein AJ, Korhonen PK, Young
ND. 2021. Nanopore Sequencing Resolves Elusive Long Tandem-Repeat Regions in Mitochondrial
Genomes. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 22:1811. DOI: 10.3390/ijms22041811.

Knox DP, Redmond DL, Newlands GF, Skuce PJ, Pettit D, Smith WD. 2003. The nature and prospects for gut
membrane proteins as vaccine candidates for Haemonchus contortus and other ruminant
trichostrongyloids. *International Journal for Parasitology* 33:1129–1137. DOI: 10.1016/S0020-
7519(03)00167-X.

Kolmogorov M, Armstrong J, Raney BJ, Streeter I, Dunn M, Yang F, Odom D, Flicek P, Keane TM, Thybert D,
Paten B, Pham S. 2018. Chromosome assembly of large and complex genomes using multiple
references. *Genome Research* 28:1720–1732. DOI: 10.1101/gr.236273.118.

Kolmogorov M, Yuan J, Lin Y, Pevzner PA. 2019. Assembly of long, error-prone reads using repeat graphs.
Nature Biotechnology 37:540–546. DOI: 10.1038/s41587-019-0072-8.

Koo H, Lee G-W, Ko S-R, Go S, Kwon S-Y, Kim Y-M, Shin A-Y. 2023. Two long read-based genome assembly and
annotation of polyploidy woody plants, Hibiscus syriacus L. using PacBio and Nanopore platforms.
Scientific Data 10:713. DOI: 10.1038/s41597-023-02631-z.

Koren S, Rhie A, Walenz BP, Dilthey AT, Bickhart DM, Kingan SB, Hiendleder S, Williams JL, Smith TPL, Phillippy
AM. 2018. De novo assembly of haplotype-resolved genomes with trio binning. *Nature Biotechnology*
36:1174–1182. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.4277.

Koren S, Walenz BP, Berlin K, Miller JR, Bergman NH, Phillippy AM. 2017. Canu: scalable and accurate long-read
assembly via adaptive k-mer weighting and repeat separation. *Genome Research* 27:722–736. DOI:
10.1101/gr.215087.116.

Krzywinski M, Schein J, Birol İ, Connors J, Gascoyne R, Horsman D, Jones SJ, Marra MA. 2009. Circos: An
information aesthetic for comparative genomics. *Genome Research* 19:1639–1645. DOI:
10.1101/gr.092759.109.

Kurtz S, Phillippy A, Delcher AL, Smoot M, Shumway M, Antonescu C, Salzberg SL. 2004. Versatile and open
software for comparing large genomes. *Genome Biology*:9.

Laetsch DR, Blaxter ML. 2017. BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies. DOI:
10.12688/f1000research.12232.1.

Laing R, Bartley DJ, Morrison AA, Rezansoff A, Martinelli A, Laing ST, Gilleard JS. 2015. The cytochrome P450
family in the parasitic nematode Haemonchus contortus. *International Journal for Parasitology* 45:243–
251. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpara.2014.12.001.

Laing R, Kikuchi T, Martinelli A, Tsai IJ, Beech RN, Redman E, Holroyd N, Bartley DJ, Beasley H, Britton C, Curran
D, Devaney E, Gilabert A, Hunt M, Jackson F, Johnston SL, Kryukov I, Li K, Morrison AA, Reid AJ, Sargison
N, Saunders GI, Wasmuth JD, Wolstenholme A, Berriman M, Gilleard JS, Cotton JA. 2013. The genome
and transcriptome of Haemonchus contortus, a key model parasite for drug and vaccine discovery.
Genome biology 14:R88. DOI: 10.1186/gb-2013-14-8-r88.

Leinonen R, Sugawara H, Shumway M. 2011. The Sequence Read Archive. *Nucleic Acids Research* 39:D19–D21.
DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkq1019.

LeJambre LF, Windon RG, Smith WD. 2008. Vaccination against Haemonchus contortus: Performance of native
parasite gut membrane glycoproteins in Merino lambs grazing contaminated pasture. *Veterinary*
Parasitology 153:302–312. DOI: 10.1016/j.vetpar.2008.01.032.

Lex A, Gehlenborg N, Strobelt H, Vuillemot R, Pfister H. 2014. UpSet: Visualization of Intersecting Sets. *IEEE*
transactions on visualization and computer graphics 20:1983–1992. DOI: 10.1109/TVCG.2014.2346248.

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. DOI:
10.48550/arXiv.1303.3997.

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

Li Z, Chen Y, Mu D, Yuan J, Shi Y, Zhang H, Gan J, Li N, Hu X, Liu B, Yang B, Fan W. 2012. Comparison of the two
major classes of assembly algorithms: overlap–layout–consensus and de-bruijn-graph. *Briefings in*
Functional Genomics 11:25–37. DOI: 10.1093/bfgp/elr035.

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

Lin Y, Yuan J, Kolmogorov M, Shen MW, Chaisson M, Pevzner PA. 2016. Assembly of long error-prone reads
using de Bruijn graphs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113:E8396–E8405. DOI:
10.1073/pnas.1604560113.

Liu H, Wu S, Li A, Ruan J, Wu S, Li A, Ruan J. 2021. SMARTdenovo: a de novo assembler using long noisy reads.
Gigabyte 2021:1–9. DOI: 10.46471/gigabyte.15.

Low WY, Tearle R, Bickhart DM, Rosen BD, Kingan SB, Swale T, Thibaud-Nissen F, Murphy TD, Young R, Lefevre
L, Hume DA, Collins A, Ajmone-Marsan P, Smith TPL, Williams JL. 2019. Chromosome-level assembly of
the water buffalo genome surpasses human and goat genomes in sequence contiguity. *Nature*
Communications 10:260. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-018-08260-0.

Maizels RM, Hewitson JP, Murray J, Harcus YM, Dayer B, Filbey KJ, Grainger JR, McSorley HJ, Reynolds LA, Smith
KA. 2012. Immune modulation and modulators in Heligmosomoides polygyrus infection. *Experimental*
Parasitology 132:76–89. DOI: 10.1016/j.exppara.2011.08.011.

Marçais G, Delcher AL, Phillippy AM, Coston R, Salzberg SL, Zimin A. 2018. MUMmer4: A fast and versatile
genome alignment system. *PLOS Computational Biology* 14:e1005944. DOI:
10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005944.

Michael JM, Kornfeld S. 1980. Partial purification and characterization of the glucosidases involved in the
processing of asparagine-linked oligosaccharides. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* 199:249–
258. DOI: 10.1016/0003-9861(80)90278-7.

Miller JR, Koren S, Sutton G. 2010. Assembly algorithms for next-generation sequencing data. *Genomics*
95:315–327. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygeno.2010.03.001.

Mohamed AM, Chin-Sang ID. 2011. The C. elegans nck-1 gene encodes two isoforms and is required for
neuronal guidance. *Developmental Biology* 354:55–66. DOI: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2011.03.019.

Msolla P, Semuguruka WD, Kasuku AA, Shoo MK. 1993. Clinical observations on bovine parasitic otitis in
Tanzania. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 25:15–18. DOI: 10.1007/BF02236880.

Nurk S, Walenz BP, Rhie A, Vollger MR, Logsdon GA, Grothe R, Miga KH, Eichler EE, Phillippy AM, Koren S. 2020.
HiCanu: accurate assembly of segmental duplications, satellites, and allelic variants from high-fidelity
long reads. :2020.03.14.992248. DOI: 10.1101/2020.03.14.992248.

Pollo SMJ, Leon-Coria A, Liu H, Cruces-Gonzalez D, Finney CAM, Wasmuth JD. 2023. Transcriptional patterns of
sexual dimorphism and in host developmental programs in the model parasitic nematode
Heligmosomoides bakeri. *Parasites & Vectors* 16:171. DOI: 10.1186/s13071-023-05785-2.

Pollo SMJ, Reiling SJ, Wit J, Workentine ML, Guy RA, Batoff GW, Yee J, Dixon BR, Wasmuth JD. 2020.
Benchmarking hybrid assemblies of Giardia and prediction of widespread intra-isolate structural
variation. *Parasites & Vectors* 13:108. DOI: 10.1186/s13071-020-3968-8.

Pundir S, Martin MJ, O'Donovan C. 2017. UniProt Protein Knowledgebase. In: Wu CH, Arighi CN, Ross KE eds.
Protein Bioinformatics: From Protein Modifications and Networks to Proteomics. Methods in Molecular
Biology. New York, NY: Springer, 41–55. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-6783-4_2.

Redman E, Sargison N, Whitelaw F, Jackson F, Morrison A, Bartley DJ, Gilleard JS. 2012. Introgression of
ivermectin resistance genes into a susceptible Haemonchus contortus strain by multiple backcrossing.
PLoS pathogens 8:e1002534. DOI: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1002534.

Reynolds LA, Filbey KJ, Maizels RM. 2012. Immunity to the model intestinal helminth parasite Heligmosomoides
polygyrus. *Seminars in Immunopathology* 34:829–846. DOI: 10.1007/s00281-012-0347-3.

Rhoads A, Au KF. 2015. PacBio Sequencing and Its Applications. *Genomics, Proteomics & Bioinformatics*
13:278–289. DOI: 10.1016/j.gpb.2015.08.002.

Roubin R, Naert K, Popovici C, Vatcher G, Coulier F, Thierry-Mieg J, Pontarotti P, Birnbaum D, Baillie D, Thierry-
Mieg D. 1999. let-756, a C. elegans fgf essential for worm development. *Oncogene* 18:6741–6747. DOI:
10.1038/sj.onc.1203074.

Rousakis A, Vlassis A, Vlanti A, Patera S, Thireos G, Syntichaki P. 2013. The general control nonderepressible-2
kinase mediates stress response and longevity induced by target of rapamycin inactivation in
Caenorhabditis elegans. *Aging Cell* 12:742–751. DOI: 10.1111/acel.12101.

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

Sayers EW, Bolton EE, Brister JR, Canese K, Chan J, Comeau DC, Connor R, Funk K, Kelly C, Kim S, Madej T,
Marchler-Bauer A, Lanczycki C, Lathrop S, Lu Z, Thibaud-Nissen F, Murphy T, Phan L, Skripchenko Y, Tse
T, Wang J, Williams R, Trawick BW, Pruitt KD, Sherry ST. 2022. Database resources of the national
center for biotechnology information. *Nucleic Acids Research* 50:D20–D26. DOI:
10.1093/nar/gkab1112.

Schatz MC, Delcher AL, Salzberg SL. 2010. Assembly of large genomes using second-generation sequencing.
Genome Research 20:1165–1173. DOI: 10.1101/gr.101360.109.

Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO: assessing genome
assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*
31:3210–3212. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv351.

Stanke M, Diekhans M, Baertsch R, Haussler D. 2008. Using native and syntenically mapped cDNA alignments to
improve de novo gene finding. *Bioinformatics* 24:637–644. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btn013.

Stanke M, Schöffmann O, Morgenstern B, Waack S. 2006. Gene prediction in eukaryotes with a generalized
hidden Markov model that uses hints from external sources. *BMC Bioinformatics* 7:62. DOI:
10.1186/1471-2105-7-62.

Stevens L, Martínez-Ugalde I, King E, Wagah M, Absolon D, Bancroft R, Gonzalez de la Rosa P, Hall JL, Kieninger
M, Kloch A, Pelan S, Robertson E, Pedersen AB, Abreu-Goodger C, Buck AH, Blaxter M. 2023. Ancient
diversity in host-parasite interaction genes in a model parasitic nematode. *Nature Communications*
14:7776. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-023-43556-w.

Stevens L, Rooke S, Falzon LC, Machuka EM, Momanyi K, Murungi MK, Njoroge SM, Odinga CO, Ogendo A,
Ogola J, Fèvre EM, Blaxter M. 2020. The Genome of Caenorhabditis bovis. *Current biology: CB* 30:1023-
1031.e4. DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2020.01.074.

Sun J, Li R, Chen C, Sigwart JD, Kocot KM. 2021a. Benchmarking Oxford Nanopore read assemblers for high-
quality molluscan genomes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
376:20200160. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0160.

Sun J, Li R, Chen C, Sigwart JD, Kocot KM. 2021b. Benchmarking Oxford Nanopore read assemblers for high-
quality molluscan genomes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
376:20200160. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0160.

Tarailo-Graovac M, Chen N. 2009. Using RepeatMasker to identify repetitive elements in genomic sequences.
973   *Current Protocols in Bioinformatics* Chapter 4:4.10.1-4.10.14. DOI: 10.1002/0471250953.bi0410s25.

974   Taylor CM, Martin J, Rao RU, Powell K, Abubucker S, Mitreva M. 2013. Using existing drugs as leads for broad
975   spectrum anthelmintics targeting protein kinases. *PLoS pathogens* 9:e1003149. DOI:
976   10.1371/journal.ppat.1003149.

977   Vaser R, Sović I, Nagarajan N, Šikić M. 2017. Fast and accurate de novo genome assembly from long
978   uncorrected reads. *Genome Research* 27:737–746. DOI: 10.1101/gr.214270.116.

979   Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, Cuomo CA, Zeng Q, Wortman J, Young SK,
980   Earl AM. 2014. Pilon: An Integrated Tool for Comprehensive Microbial Variant Detection and Genome
981   Assembly Improvement. *PLOS ONE* 9:e112963. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0112963.

982   Wasmuth J, Schmid R, Hedley A, Blaxter M. 2008. On the Extent and Origins of Genic Novelty in the Phylum
983   Nematoda. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 2:e258. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000258.

984   Weisman CM, Murray AW, Eddy SR. 2022. Mixing genome annotation methods in a comparative analysis
985   inflates the apparent number of lineage-specific genes. *Current biology: CB* 32:2632-2639.e2. DOI:
986   10.1016/j.cub.2022.04.085.

987   Wickham H. 2016. Data Analysis. In: Wickham H ed. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Use R! Cham:
988   Springer International Publishing, 189–201. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-24277-4_9.

989   Ziegler DM, Pettit FH. 1966. Microsomal oxidases. I. The isolation and dialkylarylamine oxygenase activity of
990   pork liver microsomes. *Biochemistry* 5:2932–2938. DOI: 10.1021/bi00873a024.