Methylomes reveal recent evolutionary changes in populations of two plant species

Kevin Korfmann[ab1], Andreas Zauchner[a1], Bing Huo[a], Corinna Grünke[a], Yitong Wang[a], Aurélien

Tellier[a†], Ramesh Arunkumar [a†]

[a]Section of Population Genetics, School of Life Sciences, Technical University of Munich,

Liesel-Beckmann Strasse 2, 85354 Freising, Germany

[b]Present address: Department of Biology 77 Klamath Hall 1210 University of Oregon Eugene,

OR 97403

[1] These authors contributed equally

[†] Authors for correspondence (Aurélien Tellier - aurelien.tellier@tum.de, Ramesh Arunkumar

– arunkumar.ramesh@tum.de)

Abstract

Plant DNA methylation changes occur hundreds to thousands of times faster than DNA

mutations and can be transmitted transgenerationally, making them useful for studying

population-scale patterns in clonal or selfing species. However, a state-of-the-art approach to

use them for inferring population genetic processes and demographic histories is lacking. To

address this, we compare evolutionary signatures extracted from CG methylomes and

genomes in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Brachypodium distachyon*. While methylation variants

(SMPs) are less effective than single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) for identifying

population differentiation in *A. thaliana*, they can classify phenotypically divergent *B.*

distachyon subgroups that are otherwise genetically indistinguishable. The site frequency

spectra generated using methylation sites from varied genomic locations and evolutionary

conservation exhibit an excess of rare alleles. Nucleotide diversity estimates were three orders

of magnitude higher for methylation variants than for SNPs in both species, driven by the

higher epimutation rate. Correlations between SNPs and SMPs in nucleotide diversity and

allele frequencies at gene exons are weak or absent in *A. thaliana*, possibly because the two

sources of variation reflect evolutionary forces acting at different timescales. Linkage

disequilibrium quickly decays within 100 bp for methylation variants in both plant species.

Finally, we developed a deep learning-based demographic inference approach. We identified

recent population expansions in *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon* using methylation variants that

were not identified when using SNPs. Our study demonstrates the unique evolutionary insights

methylomes provide that SNPs alone cannot reveal.

Keywords: Methylation site frequency spectra, demographic inference, deep learning,

Tajima's *D*, linkage disequilibrium, nucleotide diversity, clocklike regions, gene body

methylation, *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Brachypodium distachyon*

Background

Understanding how variation is partitioned within and between populations is a central goal in evolutionary biology. Increasing evidence suggests that epigenetic modifications can vary within and between populations (Richards, et al. 2017). Nevertheless, our knowledge of how epigenomes evolve through neutral and selective forces and, consequently, their capacity to reveal population demographic histories is limited. DNA cytosine methylation, a conserved epigenetic modification in eukaryotes (Feng, et al. 2010), occurs in plants within three sequence contexts: CG, CHG, and CHH (H represents A, T, or C) (Zhang, et al. 2018). DNA methylation is known to be involved in regulating gene expression, suppressing transposable element activity, and stabilizing the genome (Zhang, et al. 2018). Long-term changes in the methylome are mainly shaped by genomic alterations such as the proliferation of transposable elements and mutations affecting DNA methylation pathways, whereas heritable stochastic epimutations that occur independent of genomic background drive short-term changes (Vidalis, et al. 2016).

The unique characteristics of epimutations make them appealing markers for evolutionary investigations. In plants, CG methylation is maintained during cell division by METHYLTRANSFERASE 1 (MET1) (Zhang, et al. 2018). Spontaneous stochastic loss or gain of methylation at CG sites can be transmitted stably across multiple generations (Cortijo, et al. 2014). van der Graaf *et al*. have estimated the forward (gain of DNA methylation) and backward (loss of methylation) epimutation rates per CG site in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* to be approximately 2.56×10^{-4} and 6.3×10^{-4}, respectively, per generation per haploid methylome (van der Graaf, et al. 2015). These rates are several orders of magnitude higher than the mutation rate of 7×10^{-9} base substitutions per site per generation in the same population (Ossowski, et al. 2010). The increased rates of change at the epigenetic level may facilitate evolutionary inference over recent timescales, where the utility of slower-evolving genetic markers is limited (Yao, et al. 2021; Sellinger, et al. 2023).

As transiently induced epimutations can be mistaken for stably inherited markers, a recent

study exposed genetically identical *A. thaliana* to various environmental conditions to identify

genomic regions—termed clocklike regions—where CG divergence rates are independent of

environmental stimuli (Yao, et al. 2023). While these regions are valuable for evolutionary

studies, they are challenging to identify in most species. Therefore, the same study observed

that gene body methylated regions (gbM) exhibit a pattern similar to that of CG divergence in

clocklike regions (Yao, et al. 2023). gbM refers to a subclass of genes that display elevated

CG methylation. They are mostly found in moderately and constitutively expressed

housekeeping genes (Muyle, et al. 2022). As they can be identified based on the distribution

of methylation in the gene bodies, their use may facilitate the investigation of evolutionary

processes in nonmodel plant species.

Previous attempts to explore how methylation variants evolve have either neglected

demographic (neutral) models, mixed environmentally sensitive and insensitive methylation

sites, or did not adequately assess the interdependence of genetic and methylation variants.

Charlesworth and Jain's analytic framework for hypermutable sites (Charlesworth and Jain

2014) has been applied to create a methylation site frequency spectrum (mSFS) (Vidalis, et

al. 2016). Previous studies generated mSFS for genic CG sites and the methylation states of

gbM genes, finding either no selection or only weak selection acting on the methylome in *A.*

thaliana (Vidalis, et al. 2016; Muyle, et al. 2021) and maize (Xu, et al. 2020). However, these

studies do not incorporate an explicit demographic model while assessing selection. Another

study found that positive selection acted on methylation variants linked to metabolite regulation

in *A. thaliana*, even after accounting for demographic histories (Shirai, et al. 2021). Other

studies in *Brachypodium distachyon* (Eichten, et al. 2020), *Fragaria vesca* (Le Vève, et al.

2024; Sammarco, et al. 2024), lettuce (Cao, et al. 2024), and grapevines (Rodriguez-

Izquierdo, et al. 2024) have compared evolutionary inferences using genetic and methylation

variants by analyzing all CG sites as the environmental sensitivity of individual sites is

unknown in most plant species. Recently, Sellinger *et al*. utilized methylation as a secondary

marker alongside SNPs to enhance demographic inference over short and long timescales (Sellinger, et al. 2023). The conceptual novelty was to consider that the underlying genealogy at a locus (*i.e.* the coalescent tree tracing back the ancestry of the sample back in time) is common for SNPs and SMPs (under a neutral model of evolution). This represents the first population genomics inference model combining DNA mutations, epimutations, and recombination along the genome, and the basis for developing a Sequential Markovian Coalescent method (SMCm). However, that study exhibits a fair amount of noise in the inference of past evolutionary history when it was applied to methylome data from *A. thaliana* [8]. These inaccuracies are due to a lack of knowledge about the optimal SMP markers to use, the relevant genomic context, the relationship between SNPs and SMPs, and the SMCm method being very sensitive and not accounting well for methylated region effects (so-called differentially methylated regions or DMRs). A related question is whether DMRs can be used for evolutionary inferences as well.

Given these limitations, our goal was to assess how well methylation variants reveal known evolutionary patterns inferred using SNPs. We chose *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon* for our analyses because their evolutionary histories are well-described (Kawakatsu, et al. 2016; Eichten, et al. 2020). We found that the capacity of methylation variants to differentiate populations is contingent on when populations diverge. We also show that CG sites across the methylome capture within- and between-population patterns comparable to environmentally insensitive sites (clocklike regions and gbM) (Yao, et al. 2023) in samples grown in a common garden. We found weak or no local correlations between genetic and methylation variants, indicating they reflect different aspects of population evolutionary histories. Additionally, the linkage between neighboring methylation variants was minimal. Conventional genome-based demographic inference methods, such as the Sequential Markovian Coalescent (Strütt, et al. 2023), show limitations in using methylation variants due to high sensitivity to violations of the Markovian properties of the underlying coalescent model along the genome [8]. Moreover, since such methods require knowing the variant

accumulation rates and distributions—often unknown for methylation in many species—we

developed a deep learning method that uses methylation as a neutral marker to estimate past

demography. Unlike conventional convolutional networks, we use (to our knowledge) the first

Encoder-Only Transformer architecture (Vaswani, et al. 2017; Devlin, et al. 2018; Korfmann,

et al. 2023) method, focusing on the placement of mutations on a hidden ancestral

recombination graph. We track estimates of coalescent events in a time-discretized transition

matrix by using heterogeneous sites per genomic window as input, thereby applying a coarse-

grained approach, similar to tsABC (Strütt, et al. 2023). By aligning training and real data

distributions, we show that rapidly changing methylation variants can reveal recent

demographic shifts in selfing and clonal species.

Results

CG methylation variants identify population structure in recently diverged groups

We analyzed genetic and methylation diversity using 63 samples each from the Central

European (CEU) and the Iberian non-relicts (IBnr) *A. thaliana* populations (Table S1). These

populations were used by (Strütt, et al. 2023). Across the two populations, 31-33% of CG

methylation sites were polymorphic (Figure S1A), which is similar to a previous estimate for

CG sites in *A. thaliana* mutation accumulation lines (Becker, et al. 2011). In contrast, 1.6-1.7%

of coding sites and 2.7-2.8% of non-coding sites were polymorphic (Figure S1A). Interestingly,

80–81% of sites in clocklike regions and 60% of sites in gbM regions were polymorphic, which

is significantly higher compared to CG sites found elsewhere in the genome (Figure S1A).

We compared our results from *A. thaliana* with those from 18 samples from the clonally

propagating grass *B. distachyon*. Wilson *et al*. used SNPs to identify clonal groups among

Turkish *B. distachyon*, with samples within each clonal group showing high levels of genetic

similarity (Wilson, et al. 2019). Eichten *et al*. identified high levels of consistency between the

known genetic relationships for the clonal groups and the extent of CG divergence (Eichten,

et al. 2020). Through the analysis of a larger number of Turkish accessions, Skalska *et al*.

identified two distinct genetic clusters: one in coastal regions and the other in central regions,

the latter roughly corresponding to the high-elevation Anatolian plateau (Skalska, et al. 2020).

In this study, we focus exclusively on a single clonal group, as defined by Eichten *et al*. (clonal

group 1), and analyze only the 18 samples from the central Turkish region that have average

bisulfite sequencing depths greater than 10 (Eichten, et al. 2020) (Table S1). Between 0.8-

2.8% of CG methylation sites were polymorphic in *B. distachyon* (Figure S1B). Similar to *A.*

thaliana, the frequency of segregating CG methylation sites was higher within gbM regions,

with 3–4% of sites segregating (Figure S1B). The median length of DMRs in *B. distachyon*

was 107 bp (1st percentile: 44 bp, 99% percentile: 717 bp) which is smaller than the median

length in *A. thaliana* DMRs, which was 181 bp (1st percentile: 78 bp, 99% percentile: 1125 bp)

(Figure S2).

Figure 1. Methylomes outperform single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) in detecting population subdivision in *Brachypodium distachyon* but not *Arabidopsis thaliana*. (**A**) Neighbor-joining trees were generated using p-distance matrices for non-coding SNPs, coding SNPs, clocklike region single methylation polymorphisms (SMP), and clocklike region differentially methylated regions (DMR) for Central European (CEU) and the Iberian non-relicts (IBnr) *A. thaliana*. (**B**) Neighbor-joining trees generated using p-distance matrices estimated for SMP and DMR in gbM regions of a Turkish *Brachypodium distachyon* clonal group.

We estimated the proportion of sites at which two samples were different (p-distance) and

clustering to uncover how the net total of genetic and methylation variation differed between

samples from the CEU and IBnr populations. In this approach, a clear separation between the

CEU and IBnr populations was apparent with both coding and non-coding single nucleotide

polymorphisms (SNP) (Figure 1A). Although single methylation polymorphisms (SMP) and

differentially methylated regions (DMR) largely separated the two populations, some samples

were separated by only minimal distances (Figure 1A). Clustering indicated nine or more

groups within the SNP data (Figure S3A-B), whereas only two groups were apparent in the

SMP and DMR datasets (Figure S3C-D).

Furthermore, we performed discriminant analysis of principal components (DAPC) analyses

to identify how correlated changes in subsets of genetic and methylation variants can be used

to discriminate the two populations. DAPC indicated greater discriminatory power with coding

and non-coding SNPs compared to SMPs and DMRs (Figure S3E). Although p-distance

matrix-based comparisons could have been influenced by the greater number of SNPs (Figure

1A), marker numbers were comparable for the DAPC, and yet SMPs and DMRs showed poor

discriminatory capability (Figure S3E). SMPs and DMRs that occur within gbM genes have

comparable performance to those occurring within clocklike regions in discriminating the two

populations (Figure S4). High methylation rates in *A. thaliana* may have caused multiple

changes at the same site (so-called homoplasy accounted for as a finite site model

(Charlesworth and Jain 2014; Wang and Fan 2014; Vidalis, et al. 2016)), resulting in the

underestimation of the true levels of divergence. Indeed, the divergence between IBnr and

CEU populations is estimated to have occurred after the last glacial maximum ca. 10,000-

20,000 years ago (Hewitt 1999; Sharbel, et al. 2000; The1001GenomesConsortium 2016).

We then performed a similar analysis using the *B. distachyon* accessions. Unlike the *A.*

thaliana populations, there were just 63 segregating SNP sites within the *B. distachyon* clonal

group 1, suggesting a very recent origin for this genetically homogeneous clone. We expected

that methylomes would be more useful in revealing population structure during the very early

stages of clonal expansion and divergence. Even though both samples were genetically

identical (Wilson, et al. 2019) and originated from a similar elevational gradient in the central

Turkish region, SMPs and DMRs revealed two distinct subgroups (Figures 1B, S5). Both our

results using gbM regions and the results from Eichten *et al*. that use the entire collection of

CG sites (Eichten, et al. 2020) reveal a difference in methylation profiles between the two

subgroups of Group 1. The SMP and DMR based trees were longer compared to those in *A.*

thaliana (Figure S4A) indicating greater methylome differentiation in *B. distachyon*. We

obtained phenotype data for the two subgroups (Filiz, et al. 2009) and found significant

differences in the longitude, seed lengths, seed yield, seed production, and germination

percentages (Figure S6-S7). As expected, we did not find any significant difference in

elevation between the subgroups from the Central Turkish region (Figure S7). Our findings

suggest that methylation variants can reveal subpopulation structure in recent timescales,

where there has been little time for genetic differences and multiple methylation changes to

accumulate. However, they become saturated with multiple changes occurring at the same

site as time passes obscuring population differentiation.

Excess of rare alleles for SMP and DMR

Figure 2. Methylation site frequency spectra generated using single methylation polymorphisms were similar regardless of genomic contexts. Methylation site frequency spectra (mSFS) generated using differentially methylated regions (DMR) exhibited greater variability. (**A**) mSFS for the Central European (CEU, Salmon) and the Iberian non-relicts (IBnr, Cyan) *Arabidopsis thaliana* populations using CG sites that occur in clocklike, gene body methylated (gbM), non-gbM, and low and high Sorting Intolerant from Tolerant (SIFT) score regions. Only sites with minor allele frequencies (MAF) >0.02 were used to generate the

mSFS. (**B**) mSFS for *Brachypodium distachyon* clonal group 1.2 for single methylation polymorphisms (SMP) and DMRs occurring within gbM and non-gbM regions. Only polymorphic sites were used to generate the mSFS. For (A) and (B), the numbers in each panel indicate the number of sites used for the analyses.

We sought to understand how genomic contexts influenced the methylation site frequency spectra (mSFS) in *A. thaliana*. The mSFS reveals how methylation rates, demographic changes, and natural selection influence changes in the methylome over time (Charlesworth and Jain 2014; Vidalis, et al. 2016). When considering all CG SMP or DMRs jointly, we found a greater frequency of unmethylated alleles for the CEU and IBnr populations, but IBnr consistently had higher frequencies of unmethylated alleles for SMP sites at all genomic regions (Figure 2A). The overall shapes of the mSFS for SMPs are consistent with previous findings that the backward methylation rate promoting the change from methylated to unmethylated is higher than the forward rate (van der Graaf, et al. 2015) and are consistent with previous mSFS generated by combining *A. thaliana* samples from extended geographic regions (Vidalis, et al. 2016; Muyle, et al. 2021).

The relative frequencies of methylated and unmethylated alleles varied across individual genomic regions. SMPs in gbM regions for CEU and DMRs in gbM regions in both populations showed an excess of methylated alleles (Figure 2A). gbM are defined based on an excess of CG methylation and this is reflected in the mSFS. The number of methylated and unmethylated alleles was similar for SMP sites in clocklike regions, which could partly result from their comparable forward and backward methylation rates (Yao, et al. 2023). However, the differing direction of the skew in CEU and IBnr indicates some differences in the methylation rates for the populations for these sites. We also studied the mSFS for intervals containing genes with low and high Sorting Intolerant From Tolerant (SIFT) scores, which are positively correlated with the level of evolutionary constraint that genes are under (Ng and Henikoff 2003). Our results indicate that the level of gene constraint has little impact on the

mSFS shape (Figure 2A). While individual genomic regions differ in the proportion of

methylated sites they contain, it is evident that all cases exhibit an excess of rare variants,

suggesting a shared influence of demographic changes on all classes of variants.

In contrast to the mSFS for SMPs in *A. thaliana* (Figure 2A), the mSFS of *B. distachyon* group

1.2 indicated a slight excess of methylated alleles within gbM and non-gbM SMPs, although it

was less pronounced for the latter (Figure 2B). Similar to *A. thaliana*, an excess of rare alleles

was observed, suggesting a common demographic influence.

SMP and SNP show unique evolutionary signatures

Figure 3. Unique evolutionary signatures in genomes and methylomes. (**A**) Estimates of pairwise nucleotide diversity (π) scaled by the number of cytosines per region for single methylation polymorphisms (π_{SMP}) and the number of bases for single nucleotide polymorphisms (π_{SNP}) for the Central European (CEU) and the Iberian non-relicts (IBnr) *Arabidopsis thaliana* populations. (**B**) Estimates of Tajima's *D* per region for CEU and IBnr. Comparisons of (**C**) π_{SNP} versus π_{SMP} and (**D**) Tajima's *D* for SNPs (D_{SNP}) and SMPs (D_{SMP}) per gene for CEU and IBnr. The numbers in the titles of each panel indicate the number of

sites used for the analyses. Correlation tests were conducted to assess the associations between π and Tajima's D. (**E**) π_{SMP} scaled by the number of cytosines per region for *Brachypodium distachyon* clonal group 1.2. (**F**) D_{SMP} per region for *B. distachyon* group 1.2. For (A), (B), (E), and (F), the numbers above the boxplots indicate the number of intervals. For (A) and (B), letters indicate group-wise differences in means following Tukey's honest significant difference tests. For (E) and (F), P-values from Wilcoxon tests are shown. For (F), the color scheme and number of sites are the same as in (E).

We next sought to understand how SNPs and methylation polymorphisms are distributed within *A. thaliana* populations. We first calculated the pairwise nucleotide diversity (π) for SMPs (π_{SMP}) and SNPs (π_{SNP}) from noncoding, clocklike, gbM, non-gbM, and high and low SIFT genic regions. We scaled estimates by the total number of sites (polymorphic and monomorphic) to ensure that the results were comparable (that is per-site estimates). π_{SMP} is three orders of magnitude higher than π_{SNP} (Figure 3A), likely driven by the high rates of change in methylomes (van der Graaf, et al. 2015). π_{SNP} in the CEU population and π_{SMP} in CEU and IBnr populations for clocklike regions were significantly higher than in other regions (Figure 3A). This may indicate improved detection of environmental insensitivity—the criterion for defining clocklike regions—when more polymorphic sites are present. π_{SMP} was similar for gbM and non-gbM regions indicating that the levels of polymorphisms are not affected by gbM (Figure 3A). π_{SMP} was also similar for regions containing genes with high-SIFT scores or low-SIFT scores (Figure 3A) indicating that constraint at the genic level has negligible effects on the levels of local methylation diversity.

We then compared how selective and demographic processes influence genomes and methylomes by estimating Tajima's D for CEU and IBnr. For methylomes, we used a modified Tajima's D using the D^m (Wang and Fan 2014) that accounts for the hypermutability of the methylation sites. D_{SNP} was slightly negative for noncoding sites in the CEU and IBnr populations (Figure 3B), reflecting the known history of population expansions (Strütt, et al.

2023). The higher D_{SNP} for IBnr (Figure 3B) is consistent with larger effective population sizes over recent timescales (Strütt, et al. 2023). In contrast, IBnr had significantly lower D_{SMP} compared to CEU (Figure 3B). This could be due to variation in methylation rates, purifying selection, or demographic and selective (purifying selection) histories. Therefore, we used SMCm (Sellinger, et al. 2023), which employs fixed mutation rates and compares the distributions of mutation and methylation markers, to estimate the forward and backward methylation rates for the IBnr and CEU populations. Methylation rates were only slightly higher in CEU but the ratio of backward to forward rates was similar in both populations (Figure S8). Hypermutability should result in greater frequencies of intermediate variants (Charlesworth and Jain 2014), but we did not observe such a pattern (Figure 2A). Tajima's D is based on a comparison of the number of segregating sites versus π. The disparity in D_{SMP} appears to be driven primarily by the variation in the number of segregating sites per region (Figure S9). This difference suggests that the demographic histories of the two populations may be slightly different.

We then estimated Tajima's D in different genomic contexts for CEU and IBnr. Clocklike regions had significantly higher D_{SNP} and D_{SMP} compared to other regions (Figure 3B). The D^m method assumes that forward and backward methylation rates are equivalent (Wang and Fan 2014). Although the ratio of the backward to forward methylation rates in clocklike regions is 1.36, the ratios are 2.11 and 2.84 for gbM and non-clocklike regions, respectively (Yao, et al. 2023), indicating the assumption of D^m is less strongly violated for clocklike regions. The differences in D_{SMP} between high-SIFT vs low-SIFT or between gbM and non-gbM were not consistent in both populations (Figure 3B). This contrasts with consistently lower D_{SNP} for regions containing genes with low-SIFT score that are under lower selective constraints compared to regions with genes with higher-SIFT regions (Figure 3B). While ignoring the differences between regions can introduce some noise when inferring evolutionary signatures from methylomes, our results suggest any such effect is minimal. There was only a weak

positive correlation for π (Figure 3C) generated for SNPs vs SMPs that occur in coding regions

and negligible correlation for Tajima's *D* (Figure 3D).

We compared π and Tajima's *D* for *B. distachyon* SMPs generated using SNPs for the

Anatolian and Turkish lineage (B_East) (Stritt, et al. 2022; Minadakis, et al. 2023), to which

clonal group 1.2 belongs. Scaled π for SMPs was larger for the clonal group 1.2 compared to

the *A. thaliana* populations, but there were no consistent differences between gbM and non-

gbM regions (Figure 3A, 3E). Similar to *A. thaliana* (Figure 3A), scaled π for SMPs for clonal

group 1.2 was three orders of magnitude larger than the median SNP-based scaled π

($\sim 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$) for the B_East lineage (Stritt, et al. 2022; Minadakis, et al. 2023) (Figure 3E).

Similar to *A. thaliana* (Figure 3B), D_{SMP} for clonal group 1.2 was negative. D_{SMP} was slightly

but significantly larger in non-gbM regions compared to gbM regions (Figure 3F). These

negative values contrast with the positive D_{SNP} for SNPs in the B_East lineage (Minadakis, et

al. 2023), further suggesting that methylomes exhibit unique signatures.

Linkage disequilibrium quickly erodes for methylation variants

Figure 4. Weak linkage disequilibrium (LD) between neighboring single methylation

polymorphisms (SMP). (**A**) Pairwise r^2 estimated using all single nucleotide polymorphisms

(SNP), coding SNPs, non-coding SNPs, all SMPs, and SMPs occurring within clocklike

regions, SMPs occurring within gene body methylated regions (gbM) for Central European

(CEU) and Iberian non-relicts (IBnr) *Arabidopsis thaliana* populations. (**B**) Pairwise r^2 was

estimated using SMPs for *Brachypodium distachyon* clonal group 1.2.

An important consideration for population genetic analysis is the presence of sites with

independent evolutionary histories (Sellinger, et al. 2023). Therefore, we assessed the levels

of pairwise linkage disequilibrium (LD) to identify the number of independent polymorphic

SNPs and SMPs. Pairwise LD decay was quicker for SMPs compared to SNPs in *A. thaliana*

(Figure 4A). LD decay was much stronger for SMPs occurring within clocklike or gbM regions

than for coding and noncoding SNPs with r^2 dropping below 0.1 within the first 100 bp (Figure

4A). LD decays to 0.1 for SMPs sites within gbM regions for *B. distachyon* within the first 100

bp (Figure 4B).

Demographic inference using genetic and methylation variants

382

Figure 5. Demographic inference using mutation or methylation markers. (**A**) Schematic of

the approximated transition matrix inference framework. The genome is first divided into 20

Kbp bins, and heterozygous markers are counted for all pairwise comparisons in a sample of

10 individuals. These counts are then scaled by an empirically chosen factor to ensure

sufficient values in the approximated transition matrix by aligning the number of markers per

window to the TMRCA in that window. The framework constructs this matrix by concatenating

all pairwise comparisons into a long sequence and applying a sliding window of size 2 and

step size 1. Each pair of consecutive values in this window represents coordinates in the

transition matrix, which is incremented at those positions. This process results in an

unnormalized transition matrix that captures the genetic relationships between samples.

Finally, an encoder-only transformer neural network takes this noisy matrix as input, implicitly

learning the fixed scaling factor, and predicts population sizes at various time points. Inference

using over 42 time steps using (**B**) single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) and (**C**) single

methylation polymorphisms (SMP) for the central European (CEU) and the Iberian non-relicts

(IBnr) *Arabidopsis thaliana* populations. (**D**) Demographic inference using SMP for

Brachypodium distachyon groups 1.2. SMP inference was done using sequences from all five

chromosomes (light lines, average in bold), while SNP inference is based on chromosome

one. (**E**) Inference of simulated sawtooth demography using five replicates, 4Mbp segments,

and 10 samples.

We developed a novel inference method that focuses on large genome blocks (20 Kbp

windows) likely spanning multiple coalescent genealogies (Figure 5A), to estimate the times

to the most recent common ancestor (TMRCA). Our method assumes that the number of

heterozygous markers per window is correlated with the average TMRCA. Essentially, longer

coalescent times allow more mutations and epimutations to accumulate. To mitigate the

possibility that older genealogies (long TMRCA) can be unexpectedly short due to immediate

recombination, our approach uses 20 Kbp windows to average out genealogies. We apply a

scaling to the number of markers to estimate the TMRCA (Figure S10). Although the chosen

scaling factor will not perfectly offset all variable demographic samples—given that we trained

using a fixed recombination rate and a fixed window size—offsets are minimal and addressed

during training. An encoder-only transformer neural network processes this data, learns the scaling factor, and predicts population sizes over time. This is done by summarizing the TMRCA of two consecutive windows in the empirical transition matrix. The differences between each pair of samples are used to infer their TMRCA. The TMRCA values for all pairs across multiple intervals (windows) in the genome are then represented as a transition matrix. This method combines raw genotype data restructuring with deep learning to infer demographic history.

For deep learning inference, the distributions of heterozygous markers in training and real data must overlap to ensure in-distribution inference. For the training data, we collapsed each training transition matrix into a single scalar by summing the flattened matrix and plotted the distribution of unnormalized transition matrices (Figure S11A). To ensure the real data *from A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon* matched the training data, we analyzed 20 randomly sampled genomic regions. For the SNP data, we selected start positions uniformly between 0-28 Mbp, whereas for the methylation data, the start positions were chosen uniformly between 0-0.5 Mbp. For both data types, we determined each region's length by sampling from a uniform distribution between 1-3 Mbp. Summing the resulting transition matrices for the IBnr, CEU, and Group 1.2 regions (Figure S11B-D) produced values within the training data range (Figure S11A). Despite the differential properties of SMPs and SNPs, the distribution of heterozygous markers per 20 Kbp window was similar across populations (Figure S11B-C), supporting the use of a common training dataset for deep learning.

We applied our coarse−grained inference approach to *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon*. We generated approximated transition matrices from 10 samples and 4 Mbp sequence lengths. The 45 pairwise comparisons totaling 180 Mbp with 20 Kbp windows yielded 9,000 pairs of TMRCA values per matrix. We detected a population bottleneck ~100,000 years ago (100 kya) in CEU and IBnr using SNPs (Figure 5B), which was consistent with the findings of a previous study (Strütt, et al. 2023). This signal was not clearly detected with SMPs (Figure 5C),

indicating their limited use for ancient events. Both SNPs and SMPs indicated another bottleneck between 1-10 kya (Figure 5B-C), but SMPs also revealed a subsequent population expansion (Figure 5C) undetected by SNPs (Figure 5B). The steeper expansion of IBnr compared to CEU (*A. thaliana*) in the last 10,000 years likely led to the observed excess of rare methylation alleles (Figures 2A, 3B). Using SMPs, we recovered two bottlenecks (~100 kya and between 1-10 kya) in *B. distachyon* (Figure 5D).

We validated our demographic inference method with two approaches. First, we simulated the sawtooth demography observed in both species, confirming that our deep learning method accurately detected multiple bottleneck and expansion events (Figure 5E). Second, we simulated methylation markers with high rates of change (10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, or 10^{-6} per site per generation) and backward rates 2.5 times larger than forward rates, based on the estimates provided in (van der Graaf, et al. 2015), to test whether deviations from the infinite sites model affect inference. We found that our method accurately recovered demographic histories beyond 0.6 kya and before 5, 22, and 442 kya for methylation rates of 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, and 10^{-6} per site per generation, respectively (Figure S12). Conservatively, this suggests that inferences 20 kya and beyond are unlikely to be accurate for CEU and IBnr due to their estimated rates of methylation change being around 10^{-5} per site per generation (Figure S8). Note that the demographic estimates with SNPs are likely accurate for older events (>20kya).

Finally, we obtained short tandem repeat (STR) calls from (Reinar, et al. 2021) to test whether this independent, fast-mutating marker also provides evidence for population expansions in the *A. thaliana* populations. STRs occurring within noncoding regions were obtained from 36 and 54 samples from the CEU and IBnr, respectively, that overlapped with our methylation dataset. We used the Bottleneck software (Cornuet and Luikart 1996) to test for a heterozygosity deficit, which can serve as evidence of a population expansion (Luikart and Cornuet 1998; Girod, et al. 2011). Since we were working with highly inbred effectively haploid samples, we combined the calls from two randomly chosen pairs of samples to create diploid

data. We consistently detected a significant heterozygosity deficit using the sign test, the

standardized difference test, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test in CEU and IBnr (Table S2).

These results indicate that we are confidently estimating recent population expansion using

SMPs (Figure 5C), highlighting the potential of methylation markers to provide insights beyond

those offered by SNPs alone.

Discussion

We observed contrasting patterns in the capacity of methylation variants to distinguish

population subdivisions in *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon*. In *A. thaliana*, the infinite sites model

is likely violated for methylation, resulting in the erosion of methylome differentiation likely due

to the older divergence between populations. In contrast, genetically identical *B. distachyon*

samples exhibited distinct methylation profiles, most likely driven by their very recent

divergence. While individual genomic locations varied in whether they had more methylated

or unmethylated alleles—likely driven by the underlying molecular architecture—CG

methylation sites and DMRs consistently showed an excess of rare alleles in *A. thaliana* and

B. distachyon, indicating a common demographic influence. We found weak negative

correlations between π and no local correlations for Tajima's *D* between SNPs and methylation

variants in *A. thaliana*, underscoring their distinct molecular and evolutionary properties,

similar to the conclusions reached by (Schmitz, et al. 2013). Linkage quickly decays between

neighboring SMPs, which was also seen in wild *A. thaliana* sampled across the Northern

Hemisphere (Schmitz, et al. 2013). SMPs and SNPs recover recent and older demographic

changes, respectively, providing a comprehensive reconstruction of population evolutionary

histories.

The differing ability to detect population subdivisions in *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon* using

methylation variants could lead to differences in divergence times, methylation rates, or local

adaptation. As the post-glacial re-colonization of the Iberian Peninsula and the spread

northward started ~16 kya (Hewitt 1999), multiple changes at the same methylation site

(homoplasy) during this period may have caused an underestimation of the true levels of

divergence in *A. thaliana*. The lack of congruence between SMP- and SNP-based

comparisons in A. thaliana also suggests that there has been limited post-expansion gene

flow, as otherwise, the two profiles would be more similar. The greater capacity to detect group

subdivision is *B. distachyon* could reflect a recent separation by longitude contributing to

methylome divergence. We indeed rule out the role of adaptation such as found in *F. vesca*

(Le Vève, et al. 2024), because we generated inferences using gbM regions that are highly

conserved in angiosperms (Muyle, et al. 2022). The observed divergence could be due to low

rates of methylation change, but we could not estimate methylation rates for *B. distachyon* as

our rate estimate relies on comparing the distributions of SNP and methylation variants. The

most parsimonious explanation is that the two subgroups diverged recently. As the B_East

lineage split from the western Mediterranean lineage 23 kya (Stritt, et al. 2022; Minadakis, et

al. 2023), the split between the closely related subgroups is likely to have been far more recent,

ensuring that the infinite sites model was not violated for methylation variants. Our findings

underscore the necessity for methods distinguishing neutral demographic changes from

selective pressures on the methylome, elucidating why SMPs behave differently across

species.

The differences between the shapes of the mSFS for the different genomic contexts indicate

that potential for differences in their molecular basis. gbM results from the combined activity

of MET1, which is enhanced by nearby existing methylation, as well as the histone variant

H2A.Z and the DNA demethylase ROS1 (Briffa, et al. 2023). The molecular basis underlying

the clocklike, non-gbM regions, as well as regions with high and low SIFT scores, remains

unknown. Interestingly, the shapes of the mSFS from SMPs in clocklike regions vary between

IBnr and CEU, and both also differ from the mSFS of DMRs in the same regionsThis pattern,

combined with their much higher rates of polymorphism compared to the remaining genomic

regions, suggests that these intervals likely have a unique molecular basis that warrants

further research. As clocklike regions accumulate methylation differences in a linear fashion

over time, they can be useful for studying neutral signatures (Yao, et al. 2023). While gbM

sites may not be entirely neutral—partly because they are known to affect gene expression

(Muyle, et al. 2022)—the similarity of their mSFS to those of clocklike regions, along with the

fact that ~60% of clocklike regions occur within gbM regions (Yao, et al. 2023), suggests

shared molecular features and that gbM sites may serve as a suitable substitute when

clocklike regions have not been defined.

Our results support the use of individual CG sites from all genomic contexts for population-

genetic analyses. Our between-population comparisons using CG sites in gbM regions

successfully identified the known population structure within *B. distachyon*, similar to a

previous study using genic CG sites (Eichten, et al. 2020). Sites from various genomic

contexts showed variation in the prevalence of methylated versus unmethylated alleles.

However, a consistent feature was the excess of rare alleles across these sites. Given the

rapid changes in markers such as methylation, determining the ancestral state is challenging.

The skew toward rare alleles in the mSFS suggests that demographic parameters exert a

consistent impact, even when the molecular mechanisms controlling different genomic regions

vary. Moreover, the *A. thaliana* (Kawakatsu, et al. 2016) and *B. distachyon* (Eichten, et al.

2020) methylomes, generated under similar environmental conditions, ensure that sites

affected solely by transient environmental effects would not be recognized as SMPs. Another

study using all CG sites from lettuce methylomes, cultivated under uniform environmental

conditions, also demonstrated the capacity to distinguish multiple species (Cao, et al. 2024).

DMRs may be preferable when low sequencing depth limits SMP identification (Taudt, et al.

2018), but their unclear evolutionary basis and susceptibility to multiple forces (Sellinger, et al.

2023) make them unreliable when used on their own.

The weak local correlations between genetic and methylation diversity and the association between gene constraint and methylation diversity in *A. thaliana* can partly be attributed to methylation affecting the mutability of neighboring sites (Mugal and Ellegren 2011; Xia, et al. 2012; Kusmartsev, et al. 2020) and transposable element polymorphisms influencing methylation variation (Stuart, et al. 2016; Shen, et al. 2018). However, only about 12% of methylation quantitative trait loci (QTLs) in *A. thaliana* are within 10Kbp of the epiallelic target (Schmitz, et al. 2013). In maize, approximately 50% of methylation QTLs occur in *cis* (Eichten, et al. 2013), indicating a potentially stronger trend in this species. The higher rate of methylation changes compared to mutation accumulation (Ossowski, et al. 2010; van der Graaf, et al. 2015) may also explain why methylation differences persist despite genetic homogeneity. Our simulations also show that coalescent histories of markers with vastly different rates of change diverge, which can explain the general lack of correlation between π and Tajima's *D* for local genetic and methylation diversity. Our results are similar to those of previous studies in lettuce (Cao, et al. 2024) and cotton (Zhao, et al. 2024), which also found higher levels of polymorphism in the methylome compared to the genome. The lack of correlation or similarity between the Tajima's *D* estimates from the genome and methylome in *A. thaliana* and *B. distachyon* supports the notion that the SNPs and SMPs likely reflect different parts of the common underlying coalescent genealogy at a locus: SNPs reflect the older part of the tree, whereas SMPs would reflect the topology and branch lengths in the more recent past. It is then not surprising that for recent positive selection events (selective sweeps), the signatures are similar for both types of markers, and SMPs may even be more accurate in detecting them (Shirai, et al. 2021). Our study mostly focuses on local correlations in diversity, rather than genome-wide correlations, where life history traits and genetic differentiation levels also play a significant role (Lele, et al. 2018; Medrano, et al. 2020; Wang, et al. 2020; Avramidou, et al. 2021; Fargeot, et al. 2021; Avramidou, et al. 2023; Langford, et al. 2024).

Our study demonstrates that methylation variants can independently detect and allow

inference of historical demographic changes. This represents a significant improvement over

a previous approach (Sellinger, et al. 2023), where methylation was used only as a secondary

marker to supplement SNP-based inferences. Furthermore, our improved deep learning

method does not require precise methylation rate parameters and is less sensitive to the

presence of invariant methylation sites (compared to the SMCm in (Sellinger, et al. 2023)).

Instead, it trains on diverse scenarios to match observed variant distributions. Our simulations

confirmed the utility of rapidly mutating markers for inferring demographic changes. Our STR

analysis confirm that there have been recent population expansions in the two *A. thaliana*

populations. While population expansions have previously been detected using SNPs in global

and European *A. thaliana* (The1001GenomesConsortium 2016; Lee, et al. 2017) and samples

combined from multiple *B. distachyon* clonal groups (Minadakis, et al. 2023), our approach

offers the advantage of identifying such signatures within a single population without requiring

excessively deep sequencing or a large sample size. Additionally, it enables the inference of

demographic history in studies that only generate methylation data and details the limits of

inference when using methylation markers. Overall, our study highlights the value of

methylation markers for understanding recent shifts in population size.

Conclusions

Our findings demonstrate that CG methylation can provide new insights into population

structure in clonal and selfing species, similar to its previously demonstrated utility in *A.*

thaliana from America and the clonal seagrass *Zostera marina* (Yao, et al. 2023). We

demonstrate the utility of methylation variants for uncovering very recent demographic events,

where SNP markers are limited due to their slower rate of change. We also illustrate its

usefulness in clonal groups, where the paucity of SNPs would render such inferences either

impossible or necessitate very deep and costly levels of DNA sequencing. Conversely, at older

timescales, methylation markers are unlikely to be informative because the high rates of

change would have resulted in the violation of the infinite sites model. We show that SNPs

and SMPs are complementary for generating demographic inferences over short and long

timescales, highlighting the value of a recently developed method that leverages both sources

of variation for inferring demography (Sellinger, et al. 2023). Our work demonstrates that

methylomes contain unique evolutionary insights unattainable through studying genomic

variation in isolation.

Methods

Genetic and methylation variant calling in Arabidopsis thaliana

We obtained the *A. thaliana* 1001 genomes (The1001GenomesConsortium 2016) SNP calls

from https://1001genomes.org/data/GMI-MPI/releases/v3.1/. We only retained biallelic SNPs

for our analyses. As C/T variant calls can become confounded with methylation calls for data

generated using bisulfite sequencing, we generated sample-specific genome references for

mapping bisulfite sequencing reads. We substituted the SNP calls for each sample into the

TAIR10 genome reference (Lamesch, et al. 2012) using SAMtools (Danecek, et al. 2021),

BCFtools consensus (Danecek, et al. 2021), and fastq split (Nassar, et al. 2023). We obtained

bisulfite sequencing data for the 1001 *A. thaliana* from (Kawakatsu, et al. 2016). We first

removed poor-quality reads using Trimmomatic (Bolger, et al. 2014) with the following options:

ILLUMINACLIP:TruSeq3-SE.fa:2:30:10 LEADING:3 TRAILING:3 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:15

MINLEN:36 for single-end reads and ILLUMINACLIP:TruSeq3-PE.fa:2:30:10:2:True

LEADING:3 TRAILING:3 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20 MINLEN:36 for paired-end reads. We

subsequently mapped reads to the sample-specific reference genomes using Bismark with

the aid of the HISAT2 aligner (Krueger and Andrews 2011). We ran Bismark

deduplicate_bismark to remove optical duplicates and ran bismark_methylation_extractor to

extract methylation calls. Some samples were sequenced using both single-end and paired-

end reads. For these samples, the cytosine counts were merged after methylation calling. We

studied cytosine sites with a coverage of at least five reads similar to what was done in

(Kawakatsu, et al. 2016). To identify the methylation state of a site, we performed a binomial

test with the non-conversion rate being used as the hypothesized probability of success

following the method in (Lister, et al. 2008). The non-conversion rate was calculated as the

proportion of methylation in the chloroplast as done in (Lister, et al. 2008). Sites were assigned

as methylated if the false discovery rate corrected *P*-values following the binomial test was

less than 0.01. Otherwise, they were designated as unmethylated. We used jDMR (Hazarika,

et al. 2022) to identify DMRs in the CG contexts as this method accounts for coverage when

calculating likelihood scores for methylation states. For this, we called the methylation status

per site using METHimpute (function: callMethylationSeparate) (Taudt, et al. 2018), extracted

cytosine clusters in the CG context ensuring that there was a minimum of eight cytosines in

each cluster (function: CfromFASTAv4 and makeReg with default options makeRegnull =

c(FALSE), N.boot = 10^5, N.sim.C = "all", fp.rate = 0.01, set.tol = 0.01), and identified the

methylation states of the regions in each sample (function: runMethimputeRegions), ensuring

that we used a minimum of eight cytosines and a coverage of three.

63 IBnr and 67 CEU samples overlapped between the SNP and methylation variant call files.

We randomly subsampled 63 samples from the CEU population to ensure the numbers were

comparable to those of the IBnr population. For our analyses, we only used sites where at

least 80% of the samples within each population were genotyped. The proportions of variant

SNP and SMP sites were calculated by dividing the number of sites with minor allele

frequencies greater than 0.02 by the total number of variant and invariant sites.

Population (epi)genetic metric estimation for Arabidopsis thaliana

To estimate π and Tajima's *D*, we created fasta files for each genomic region containing the

sequences for each sample. We substituted the variants from the SNP vcf into the TAIR10

reference genome using the approach described previously for each sample, extracted the

region of interest, and converted it to a fasta format. The regions could be the clocklike regions

described in (Yao, et al. 2023), genic regions comprising all exons, or non-coding regions

comprising all regions other than exons. Genic regions were further split into gbM genes using

the list for *A. thaliana* provided by (Williams, et al. 2023) and high SIFT-score (>0.75) and low

SIFT-score (<0.3) genes using the list provided by (Hamala and Tiffin 2020).

We estimated π_{SNP} and D_{SMP} using pegas (Paradis 2010) and estimated π_{SMP} and D_{SMP} using

the D^m (Wang and Fan 2014). We only analyzed intervals that had at least three polymorphic

sites and sequences with lengths greater than 10bp. We calculated the number of cytosines

in each interval using METHimpute (Taudt, et al. 2018). To compare π and Tajima's D among

the different genomic contexts, we built a linear model where these metrics were the

dependent variable, and the concatenated population and genomic context groupings were

the predictor variables. We then applied a Tukey honest significant differences test using the

agricolae R package (https://myaseen208.com/agricolae//index.html) to identify significant

differences between individual predictor levels. We performed a correlation test to compare

the π and Tajima's D for SMPs and SNPs per exon.

We used VCFtools (Danecek, et al. 2011) to estimate the allele frequencies for SMPs and

DMRs. We used PopLDdecay (Zhang, et al. 2019) to estimate pairwise LD using the r^2 metric

analyzing all sites with a minor allele frequency greater than 0.05. r^2 values across every three

base pair interval were averaged prior to plotting the decay curve.

We detected a total of 6,012 and 6,188 polymorphic noncoding STRs in the CEU and IBnr

populations, respectively. To reduce computational time, we randomly sampled 100 STRs

without replacement for each run and repeated this process 10 times for each population. We

performed the sign test, the standardized difference test, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

The tests were conducted using the two-phase model (TPM) and the stepwise mutation model

(SMM), as these models best describe mutational processes in STRs. The variance for TPM

was set to 30, with 70% SMM in the TPM. We ran 1,000 iterations.

Between population comparisons for Arabidopsis thaliana

We combined the CEU and IBnr vcfs and used VCF2Dis ([https://github.com/BGI-](https://github.com/BGI-shenzhen/VCF2Dis)

[shenzhen/VCF2Dis](https://github.com/BGI-shenzhen/VCF2Dis)) to estimate the p-distance matrix. We used this matrix to generate

neighbor-joining trees using FastME (Lefort, et al. 2015) and plotted it using ggtree (Yu, et al.

2017). We also performed DAPC to discriminate samples from the CEU and IBnr populations.

We thinned the dataset so that only sites that were separated by 1Kbp were sampled to reduce

the computational time. We converted vcf files into a genlight format using the

genomic_converter function in the R package radiator

(https://thierrygosselin.github.io/radiator/). We used the find.clusters function in adegenet

(Jombart 2008) to identify the number of clusters in each dataset allowing for a maximum of

20 clusters for SMPs/DMRs and 30 clusters for SNPs. As DAPC regions require fully typed

data, we imputed missing values using the mean value. Then, we performed cross-validation

using adegenet (Jombart 2008) to identify the number of informative principal components.

We retained a maximum of 15 principal components, used 90% of the data for training, and

calculated group-wise assignment success. We centered but did not scale variables. We used

30 replicates for each principal component. Finally, we performed DAPC using adegenet

(Jombart 2008).

Methylation rate estimation *for Arabidopsis thaliana*

We generated the multihetsep files for SNPs for the same 5Mbp regions that were used for

SMPs (described in the section immediately above). We combined the SNP and SMP

multihetsep files. We randomly selected 20 samples from each population to ensure

reasonable runtimes. We used the *Methylation_rate_estimation* function in SMCm to estimate

forward and backward rates (Sellinger, et al. 2023). We set the mutation rate as 7×10^{-9} per

site per generation and the recombination rate as 3.5×10^{-8} per site per generation. We ignored

regional influences on methylation rates and estimated rates under a site-only model. We used

the known estimates of forward (2.56×10^{-4} per generation per haploid methylome) and

backward methylation rates (6.3×10^{-4} per generation per haploid methylome) for *A. thaliana*

(van der Graaf, et al. 2015) as priors.

Genetic and methylation variant calling in Brachypodium distachyon

We obtained whole genome sequencing data (29 samples) for *B. distachyon* from (Wilson, et

al. 2019) and whole genome bisulfite sequencing data from (Eichten, et al. 2020). We used

Bd21-3 v1.2 genome reference and the GenBank annotation from the Joint Genome Institute

(http://phytozome.jgi.doe.gov/) for variant calling. We used Trimmomatic (Bolger, et al. 2014)

to trim reads using the paired-end options as stated above for the whole genome sequencing

data and the single-end option for the whole genome bisulfite sequencing data. We mapped

whole genome sequencing data reads to the reference using bwa-mem (Li 2013). We used

Picard Toolkit (https://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/) to add read groups and mark duplicate

reads. We used SAMtools (Danecek, et al. 2021) to remove unpaired reads, remove reads

with a mapping quality of less than 20, and sort reads. We called SNPs using GATK

HaplotypeCaller (McKenna, et al. 2010). We only retained SNPs with depths greater than five

and quality scores greater than 30 using BCFtools (Danecek, et al. 2021). Using this SNP

variant call file, we perform methylation variant calling in the same way as was done for *A.*

thaliana. We obtained the sample localities from (Filiz, et al. 2009) and created a map showing

their occurrence with Map Maker (https://maps.co/).

We used a minor allele frequency threshold of 10% to identity polymorphic sites in *B.*

distachyon due to the smaller number of samples being analyzed when compared to *A.*

thaliana. For the analysis of SMPs and DMRs, we only used variants that occurred within CG-

gbM regions identified in (Niederhuth, et al. 2016). We estimated mSFS, LD, p-distance

matrices, π, and Tajima's *D* in a similar way as we did for *A. thaliana*. We used the first principal

component for the DAPC analyses.

Generating the approximated transition matrix for demographic inference

We created a training and testing dataset consisting of a combined 60×10^3 simulations

(80%/20%, respectively). Of these 10×10^3 were constant demographies (*i.e.*, no demographic

change) with a random population size drawn between 10×10^3 and 200×10^3, and the other

50×10^3 simulations were random walk demographies, with time steps being defined for i $\in$

$\{0,1,...,K - 1\}$ using:

$$753 \quad (\text{population\_time})_i = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{i}{K - 1} \cdot \ln(1 + \delta t_{\max})\right) - 1}{\delta}$$

where K=42 is the number of time points, $\delta = 0.001$ is the growth rate, and $t_{\max} = 2.1 \times 10^6$ is the

maximum time.

The population size was drawn for each of the K=42 time points in the following way: an initial

population size was randomly selected between a minimum ($N\_min = 10 \times 10^3$) and maximum

($N\_max = 1.2 \times 10^6$) value. For each subsequent time point, a new population size was

proposed by multiplying the previous size by a random factor between 0.1 and 10. If this

proposed size fell outside the allowed range (N_min to N_max), new proposals were

generated until an acceptable value was found. This process was repeated for all 42 time

points, resulting in a sequence of population sizes that exhibit both gradual and abrupt

changes while remaining within the specified bounds. Nevertheless, a sliding window average

with a size of 6 and a step size of 1 was applied to smooth extreme changes. This approach

for sampling demographies was adapted from (Sanchez, et al. 2021).

The obtained population sizes and times were passed onto *msprime* (Baumdicker, et al. 2022)

to simulate the corresponding ancestral recombination graphs using a recombination rate of

3.4×10^{-8} per base pair and generation. For SNPs, branches were mutated at a rate of 7×10^{-9}

per base pair and generation, leading to a ρ over θ ratio of 4.86.

Simulated and real data are summarized as a genotype matrix (*GM*) with dimensions $n \times m$,

where $n,m \in N$ represent the number of samples and mutations, respectively. Each element

g_{ij} of *GM*, where i ∈ {1,...,n} and j ∈ {1,...,m}, denotes the presence (g_{ij} = 1) or absence (g_{ij} = 0)

of mutation *j* in sample *i*. We generated a corresponding vector of positions of size *m* for each

segregating site containing floating point numbers of the location in the genome.

For each random population size parameter, we used a genome of length 4Mbp,10 samples

(ploidy=1), and the *GM* and positions vector to construct a density estimate of mutations along

the genome (in theory, corresponding to the respective TMRCA at that region). To ensure the

presence of enough markers, we segmented the genome into 20Kbp pieces and counted the

number of heterozygous markers between all pairwise $\binom{10}{2}$ combinations. The 4Mbp

sequences of all the comparisons were concatenated and log-transformed. Likewise, the

population time steps were also log-scaled. To make sure that the number of markers per

window fell approximately into the time windows, we scaled the markers by an arbitrarily

chosen scaling factor (=$e^{8.2}$) (Figure S12). The importance of the given scaling factor is

negligible, due to all the transformation steps occurring in the pre-training, and therefore any

noisy representation presented to the learning algorithm will be part of the training.

Each *msprime* simulation (under a random demographic history) yielded one *approximated*

transition matrix, which was obtained by counting the transitions (scaled number of

heterozygous sites in window t → window t+1) from one 20 Kbp window to the next using the

following algorithm: a sliding window of size 2 and step size 1 was applied along the sequence

and each pair of consecutive values in this window represents coordinates in the transition

matrix, which was incremented at those positions leading to a filled matrix which remained

unnormalized. Lastly, the entire transition matrix was incremented by one at each entry and

scaled by the natural log to squeeze all values approximately into the same range to avoid

training instability.

Model description, training, and inference

The inference approach can be described as a supervised learning approach using the

approximated transition matrices *x* with defined dimensions $R^{L=42 \times K=42}$ as the input and the

population size at each time step as the predicted variable. The input is a square matrix where

both dimensions (K and L) are 42. The model architecture is an encoder-only transformer

(Paszke, et al. 2019) (https://github.com/lucidrains/x-transformers). It consists of three main

components: an input projection layer, a transformer encoder, and an output projection layer.

It can be formalized as:

1. Input Projection: $x_{proj} = W_{in}x + b_{in}$, where $W_{in} \in R^{D_{enc} \times K_{in}}, b_{in} \in R^{D_{enc}}, x \in R^{L \times K_{in}}$

2. Transformer Encoder: $z = \text{Encoder}(x_{proj})$, where $z \in R^{L \times D_{enc}}$

The Encoder employs a configuration with dimension D_{enc} = 512, depth N_{enc} = 12, number

of attention heads H_{enc} = 10 heads, Gated Linear Unit activation in feed-forward layers

(Shazeer 2020), residual attention connections (He, et al. 2021), and rotary positional

embeddings (Su, et al. 2024).

3. Dimension Reduction: $z_{reduced} = \sum_{i=1}^{L} z_i$, where $z_{reduced} \in R^{D_{enc}}$

4. Output Projection: $y = W_{out}z_{reduced} + b_{out}$, where $W_{out} \in R^{D_{out} \times D_{enc}}, b_{out} \in R^{D_{out}}$

In this formalization, sequence length *L* = the input dimension of the transition matrix K_{in} =

42, which represents the square input matrix of 42 x 42 dimensions, and the output

dimension D_{out} = 42.

The neural network model underwent training for 50 epochs, employing mean squared error

as the loss function. The training process leverages the Accelerate framework from Hugging

Face to enhance performance (Gugger, et al. 2022). An Accelerator object was configured with mixed precision using bfloat16 and gradient accumulation over 12 steps (with batch size 32). Throughout the training regiment, both the training and test losses were continuously monitored to evaluate model performance and assess convergence.

Generating data for demographic inference

We first generated unique variant call files for each sample from the population variant call files using BCFtools (Danecek, et al. 2021). We then used the generate_multihetsep.py from MSMC-tools (https://github.com/stschiff/msmc-tools/tree/master) to combine all the samples per chromosome. For *A. thaliana* SNPs, we used the entire chromosome 1 as we needed a long contiguous fragment to generate the approximated transition matrix. For SMPs, we used 5Mbp segments in each of the five chromosomes (Table S3) as the SMP density was far higher. We used the list of genotyped cytosine positions as a genomic location mask for the SMPs. For *B. distachyon*, we included singletons to support the demographic inference given the small sample sizes in this species. The data were polarized by identifying the minor (less frequent) alleles and encoding them as derived, whereas the major alleles were encoded as ancestral. The resulting genotype matrix represents this polarized, unphased data, where each row corresponds to an individual and each column corresponds to a genomic position.

Methylation simulation model

We explored the boundaries of our course-grained demographic inference by adding a new mutation model to msprime (Baumdicker, et al. 2022). We simulated a sawtooth demographic model with cyclical population size changes over time and a baseline effective population size of 2×10^5 individuals. Simulations were conducted on a 5Mbp sequence with a recombination rate of 3.4×10^{-8} per base pair per generation (ploidy=1), to isolate the influence of methylation dynamics.

A custom matrix mutation simulation was implemented to model methylation and

demethylation processes, employing 2 allelic states: 0 (unmethylated) and 1 (methylated). The

model incorporates 3 key rates: the site introduction rate (μ), methylation rate (β), and

demethylation rate (δ). The methylation and demethylation rates are measured as factors of

the site entry rate, where β = the methylation factor·μ and δ = the demethylation factor·μ. The

transition probabilities between the unmethylated and methylated states are determined by

the ratio $\beta/(\beta+\delta)$ for methylation and $\delta/(\beta+\delta)$ for demethylation. The resulting 2×2 transition

matrix encapsulates these probabilities:

862
$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - [\beta/(\beta + \delta)] & \beta/(\beta + \delta) \\ \delta/(\beta + \delta) & 1 - [\delta/(\beta + \delta)] \end{bmatrix}$$

This framework allowed us to explore various methylation scenarios by adjusting β and δ

relative to μ. We investigated cases where $\beta = \mu$ and $\delta = 2.5\mu$, $\beta = 10\mu$ and $\delta = 25\mu$, and β =

100μ and $\delta = 250\mu$, representing low, medium, and high methylation dynamics respectively,

with the demethylation rate 2.5 times higher than the methylation rate. By varying the

epimutation rate compared to the mutation rate, we test the robustness of our approach in

correlating the number of markers in one Kbp windows with the average coalescent time. This

proportionality, and the robustness of our method, is expected to decrease for higher

epimutation rates, as these would violate the infinite site model for older coalescent times more

strongly (due to homoplasy, (Vidalis, et al. 2016)).

Declarations

Availability of data and materials

The scripts for analyzing and plotting all the results, except for the demographic inference,

have been published on GitHub (arunkumarramesh/methevolve) and archived using Zenodo

(https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14851293). The demographic inference method is available

on   GitHub   (kevinkorfmann/aTMi)   and   has   been   archived   using   Zenodo

(https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13332833).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

RA was funded by the Peter and Traudl Engelhorn Foundation.

Authors' contributions

RA and AT designed the research. RA, KK, AW, BH, CG, and YW performed the research. RA,

AT, KK, and AW wrote the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Thibaut Paul Patrick Sellinger for helping with the estimation of

methylation rates. This work was supported by the de.NBI Cloud within the German Network

for Bioinformatics Infrastructure (de.NBI) and ELIXIR-DE (Forschungszentrum Jülich and W-

de.NBI-001, W-de.NBI-004, W-de.NBI-008, W-de.NBI-010, W-de.NBI-013, W-de.NBI-014, W-

de.NBI-016, W-de.NBI-022).

References

Avramidou EV, Korakaki E, Malliarou E, Boutsios S. 2023. Studying the Genetic and the

Epigenetic Diversity of the Endangered Species Juniperus drupacea Labill. towards

Safeguarding Its Conservation in Greece. Forests 14:1271.

Avramidou EV, Moysiadis T, Ganopoulos I, Michailidis M, Kissoudis C, Valasiadis D,

Kazantzis K, Tsaroucha E, Tsaftaris A, Molassiotis A, et al. 2021. Phenotypic, Genetic,

and Epigenetic Variation among Diverse Sweet Cherry Gene Pools. Agronomy 11:680.

Baumdicker F, Bisschop G, Goldstein D, Gower G, Ragsdale AP, Tsambos G, Zhu S, Eldon
B, Ellerman EC, Galloway JG, et al. 2022. Efficient ancestry and mutation simulation
with msprime 1.0. Genetics 220.

Becker C, Hagmann J, Muller J, Koenig D, Stegle O, Borgwardt K, Weigel D. 2011.
Spontaneous epigenetic variation in the Arabidopsis thaliana methylome. Nature
480:245-249.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

Briffa A, Hollwey E, Shahzad Z, Moore JD, Lyons DB, Howard M, Zilberman D. 2023.
Millennia-long epigenetic fluctuations generate intragenic DNA methylation variance in
Arabidopsis populations. Cell Syst 14:953-967 e917.

Cao S, Sawettalake N, Li P, Fan S, Shen L. 2024. DNA methylation variations underlie
lettuce domestication and divergence. Genome Biol 25:158.

Charlesworth B, Jain K. 2014. Purifying selection, drift, and reversible mutation with
arbitrarily high mutation rates. Genetics 198:1587-1602.

Cornuet JM, Luikart G. 1996. Description and power analysis of two tests for detecting
recent population bottlenecks from allele frequency data. Genetics 144:2001-2014.

Cortijo S, Wardenaar R, Colome-Tatche M, Gilly A, Etcheverry M, Labadie K, Caillieux E,
Hospital F, Aury JM, Wincker P, et al. 2014. Mapping the epigenetic basis of complex
traits. Science 343:1145-1148.

Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, Handsaker RE, Lunter
G, Marth GT, Sherry ST, et al. 2011. The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics
27.

Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T,
McCarthy SA, Davies RM, et al. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools.
Gigascience 10:giab008.

Devlin J, Chang M-W, Lee K, Toutanova K. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional
Transformers for Language Understanding. arXiv 1810.04805.

Eichten SR, Briskine R, Song J, Li Q, Swanson-Wagner R, Hermanson PJ, Waters AJ, Starr
E, West PT, Tiffin P, et al. 2013. Epigenetic and genetic influences on DNA methylation
variation in maize populations. Plant Cell 25:2783-2797.

Eichten SR, Srivastava A, Reddiex AJ, Ganguly DR, Heussler A, Streich JC, Wilson PB,
Borevitz JO. 2020. Extending the Genotype in Brachypodium by Including DNA
Methylation Reveals a Joint Contribution with Genetics on Adaptive Traits. G3
(Bethesda) 10:1629-1637.

Fargeot L, Loot G, Prunier JG, Rey O, Veyssiere C, Blanchet S. 2021. Patterns of Epigenetic
Diversity in Two Sympatric Fish Species: Genetic vs. Environmental Determinants.
Genes (Basel) 12:107.

Feng S, Cokus SJ, Zhang X, Chen PY, Bostick M, Goll MG, Hetzel J, Jain J, Strauss SH,
Halpern ME, et al. 2010. Conservation and divergence of methylation patterning in
plants and animals. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 107:8689-8694.

Filiz E, Ozdemir BS, Budak F, Vogel JP, Tuna M, Budak H. 2009. Molecular, morphological,
and cytological analysis of diverse Brachypodium distachyon inbred lines. Genome
52:876-890.

Girod C, Vitalis R, Leblois R, Freville H. 2011. Inferring population decline and expansion
from microsatellite data: a simulation-based evaluation of the Msvar method. Genetics
188:165-179.

Gugger S, Debut L, Wolf T, Schmid P, Mueller Z, Mangrulkar S, Sun M, Bossan B. 2022.
Accelerate: Training and inference at scale made simple, efficient and adaptable.
https://github.com/huggingface/accelerate.

Hamala T, Tiffin P. 2020. Biased Gene Conversion Constrains Adaptation in Arabidopsis
thaliana. Genetics 215:831-846.

Hazarika RR, Serra M, Zhang Z, Zhang Y, Schmitz RJ, Johannes F. 2022. Molecular
properties of epimutation hotspots. Nat Plants 8:146-156.

He R, Ravula A, Kanagal B, Ainslie J. 2021. RealFormer: Transformer Likes Residual
Attention. arXiv:2012.11747.

Hewitt G. 1999. Post-glacial re-colonization of European biota. Biological Journal of the
Linnean Society 68:87-112.

Jombart T. 2008. adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic markers.
Bioinformatics 24:1403–1405.

Kawakatsu T, Huang SC, Jupe F, Sasaki E, Schmitz RJ, Urich MA, Castanon R, Nery JR,
Barragan C, He Y, et al. 2016. Epigenomic Diversity in a Global Collection of Arabidopsis
thaliana Accessions. Cell 166:492-505.

Korfmann K, Gaggiotti OE, Fumagalli M. 2023. Deep Learning in Population Genetics.

Genome Biol Evol 15.

Krueger F, Andrews SR. 2011. Bismark: a flexible aligner and methylation caller for

Bisulfite-Seq applications. Bioinformatics 27:1571-1572.

Kusmartsev V, Drozdz M, Schuster-Bockler B, Warnecke T. 2020. Cytosine Methylation

Affects the Mutability of Neighboring Nucleotides in Germline and Soma. Genetics

214:809-823.

Lamesch P, Berardini TZ, Li D, Swarbreck D, Wilks C, Sasidharan R, Muller R, Dreher K,

Alexander DL, Garcia-Hernandez M, et al. 2012. The Arabidopsis Information Resource

(TAIR): improved gene annotation and new tools. Nucleic Acids Res 40:D1202-1210.

Langford N, Fargeot L, Blanchet S. 2024. Spatial covariation between genetic and

epigenetic diversity in wild plant and animal populations: a meta-analysis. J Exp Biol

227.

Le Vève A, Sammarco I, Latzel V, Lafon Placette C. 2024. DNA methylation shows

footprints of altitude selection in the clonal plant species Fragaria vesca. bioRxiv

2024.03.19.585697.

Lee CR, Svardal H, Farlow A, Exposito-Alonso M, Ding W, Novikova P, Alonso-Blanco C,

Weigel D, Nordborg M. 2017. On the post-glacial spread of human commensal

Arabidopsis thaliana. Nat Commun 8:14458.

Lefort V, Desper R, Gascuel O. 2015. FastME 2.0: A Comprehensive, Accurate, and Fast

Distance-Based Phylogeny Inference Program. Mol Biol Evol 32:2798-2800.

Lele L, Ning D, Cuiping P, Xiao G, Weihua G. 2018. Genetic and epigenetic variations

associated with adaptation to heterogeneous habitat conditions in a deciduous shrub.

Ecol Evol 8:2594-2606.

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads , clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-

MEM. 00:1-3.

Lister R, O'Malley RC, Tonti-Filippini J, Gregory BD, Berry CC, Millar AH, Ecker JR. 2008.

Highly integrated single-base resolution maps of the epigenome in Arabidopsis. Cell

133:523-536.

Luikart G, Cornuet JM. 1998. Empirical Evaluation of a Test for Identifying Recently

Bottlenecked Populations from Allele Frequency Data. Conservation Biology 12:228-

237.

McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, Garimella K,

Altshuler D, Gabriel S, Daly M, et al. 2010. The Genome Analysis Toolkit: A MapReduce

framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. Genome Research

20:1297–1303.

Medrano M, Alonso C, Bazaga P, Lopez E, Herrera CM. 2020. Comparative genetic and

epigenetic diversity in pairs of sympatric, closely related plants with contrasting

distribution ranges in south-eastern Iberian mountains. AoB Plants 12:plaa013.

Minadakis N, Williams H, Horvath R, Caković D, Stritt C, Thieme M, Bourgeois Y, Roulin

AC. 2023. The demographic history of the wild crop relative Brachypodium distachyon is

shaped by distinct past and present ecological niches. Peer Community Journal 3:e84.

Mugal CF, Ellegren H. 2011. Substitution rate variation at human CpG sites correlates

with non-CpG divergence, methylation level and GC content. Genome Biol 12:R58.

Muyle A, Ross-Ibarra J, Seymour DK, Gaut BS. 2021. Gene body methylation is under

selection in Arabidopsis thaliana. Genetics 218:iyab061.

Muyle AM, Seymour DK, Lv Y, Huettel B, Gaut BS. 2022. Gene Body Methylation in Plants:

Mechanisms, Functions, and Important Implications for Understanding Evolutionary

Processes. Genome Biol Evol 14:evac038.

Nassar LR, Barber GP, Benet-Pages A, Casper J, Clawson H, Diekhans M, Fischer C,

Gonzalez JN, Hinrichs AS, Lee BT, et al. 2023. The UCSC Genome Browser database:

2023 update. Nucleic Acids Res 51:D1188-D1195.

Ng PC, Henikoff S. 2003. SIFT: Predicting amino acid changes that affect protein function.

Nucleic Acids Research 31:3812-3814.

Niederhuth CE, Bewick AJ, Ji L, Alabady MS, Kim KD, Li Q, Rohr NA, Rambani A, Burke JM,

Udall JA, et al. 2016. Widespread natural variation of DNA methylation within

angiosperms. Genome Biol 17:194.

Ossowski S, Schneeberger K, Lucas-Lledo JI, Warthmann N, Clark RM, Shaw RG, Weigel

D, Lynch M. 2010. The rate and molecular spectrum of spontaneous mutations in

Arabidopsis thaliana. Science 327:92-94.

Paradis E. 2010. pegas: an R package for population genetics with an integrated-modular

approach. Bioinformatics 26:419-420.

Paszke A, Gross S, Massa F, Lerer A, Bradbury J, Chanan G, Killeen T, Lin Z, Gimelshein N,
Antiga L, et al. 2019. pyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning
Library: Curran Associates, Inc.

Reinar WB, Lalun VO, Reitan T, Jakobsen KS, Butenko MA. 2021. Length variation in short
tandem repeats affects gene expression in natural populations of Arabidopsis thaliana.
Plant Cell 33:2221-2234.

Richards CL, Alonso C, Becker C, Bossdorf O, Bucher E, Colome-Tatche M, Durka W,
Engelhardt J, Gaspar B, Gogol-Doring A, et al. 2017. Ecological plant epigenetics:
Evidence from model and non-model species, and the way forward. Ecol Lett 20:1576-
1590.

Rodriguez-Izquierdo A, Carrasco D, Anand L, Magnani R, Catarecha P, Arroyo-Garcia R,
Rodriguez Lopez CM. 2024. Epigenetic differences between wild and cultivated
grapevines highlight the contribution of DNA methylation during crop domestication.
BMC Plant Biol 24:504.

Sammarco I, Diez Rodriguez B, Galanti D, Nunn A, Becker C, Bossdorf O, Munzbergova Z,
Latzel V. 2024. DNA methylation in the wild: epigenetic transgenerational inheritance
can mediate adaptation in clones of wild strawberry (Fragaria vesca). New Phytol
241:1621-1635.

Sanchez T, Cury J, Charpiat G, Jay F. 2021. Deep learning for population size history
inference: Design, comparison and combination with approximate Bayesian
computation. Mol Ecol Resour 21:2645-2660.

Schmitz RJ, Schultz MD, Urich MA, Nery JR, Pelizzola M, Libiger O, Alix A, McCosh RB,
Chen H, Schork NJ, et al. 2013. Patterns of population epigenomic diversity. Nature
495:193-198.

Sellinger T, Johannes F, Tellier A. 2023. Improved inference of population histories by
integrating genomic and epigenomic data. eLife 12:RP89470.

Sharbel TF, Haubold B, Mitchell-Olds T. 2000. Genetic isolation by distance in Arabidopsis
thaliana: biogeography and postglacial colonization of Europe. Mol Ecol 9:2109-2118.

Shazeer N. 2020. GLU Variants Improve Transformer. arXiv:2002.05202.

Shen Y, Zhang J, Liu Y, Liu S, Liu Z, Duan Z, Wang Z, Zhu B, Guo YL, Tian Z. 2018. DNA
methylation footprints during soybean domestication and improvement. Genome Biol
19:128.

Shirai K, Sato MP, Nishi R, Seki M, Suzuki Y, Hanada K. 2021. Positive selective sweeps of
epigenetic mutations regulating specialized metabolites in plants. Genome Res
31:1060-1068.

Skalska A, Stritt C, Wyler M, Williams HW, Vickers M, Han J, Tuna M, Savas Tuna G, Susek
K, Swain M, et al. 2020. Genetic and Methylome Variation in Turkish Brachypodium
Distachyon Accessions Differentiate Two Geographically Distinct Subpopulations. Int J
Mol Sci 21.

Stritt C, Gimmi EL, Wyler M, Bakali AH, Skalska A, Hasterok R, Mur LAJ, Pecchioni N,
Roulin AC. 2022. Migration without interbreeding: Evolutionary history of a highly selfing
Mediterranean grass inferred from whole genomes. Mol Ecol 31:70-85.

Strütt S, Sellinger T, Glemin S, Tellier A, Laurent S. 2023. Joint inference of evolutionary
transitions to self-fertilization and demographic history using whole-genome
sequences. eLife 12:e82384.

Stuart T, Eichten SR, Cahn J, Karpievitch YV, Borevitz JO, Lister R. 2016. Population scale
mapping of transposable element diversity reveals links to gene regulation and
epigenomic variation. eLife 5:e20777.

Su J, Ahmed M, Lu Y, Pan S, Bo W, Liu Y. 2024. RoFormer: Enhanced transformer with
Rotary Position Embedding. Neurocomputing 568:127063.

Taudt A, Roquis D, Vidalis A, Wardenaar R, Johannes F, Colome-Tatche M. 2018.
METHimpute: imputation-guided construction of complete methylomes from WGBS
data. BMC Genomics 19:444.

The1001GenomesConsortium. 2016. 1,135 Genomes Reveal the Global Pattern of
Polymorphism in Arabidopsis thaliana. Cell 166:481-491.

van der Graaf A, Wardenaar R, Neumann DA, Taudt A, Shaw RG, Jansen RC, Schmitz RJ,
Colome-Tatche M, Johannes F. 2015. Rate, spectrum, and evolutionary dynamics of
spontaneous epimutations. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 112:6676-6681.

Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, Uszkoreit J, Jones L, Gomez AN, Kaiser L, Polosukhin I.
2017. Attention Is All You Need. arXiv 1706.03762.

Vidalis A, Zivkovic D, Wardenaar R, Roquis D, Tellier A, Johannes F. 2016. Methylome
evolution in plants. Genome Biol 17:264.

Wang J, Fan C. 2014. A neutrality test for detecting selection on DNA methylation using
single methylation polymorphism frequency spectrum. Genome Biol Evol 7:154-171.

Wang MZ, Li HL, Li JM, Yu FH. 2020. Correlations between genetic, epigenetic and

phenotypic variation of an introduced clonal herb. Heredity (Edinb) 124:146-155.

Williams CJ, Dai D, Tran KA, Monroe JG, Williams BP. 2023. Dynamic DNA methylation

turnover in gene bodies is associated with enhanced gene expression plasticity in

plants. Genome Biol 24:227.

Wilson PB, Streich JC, Murray KD, Eichten SR, Cheng R, Aitken NC, Spokas K, Warthmann

N, Gordon SP, Accession C, et al. 2019. Global Diversity of the Brachypodium Species

Complex as a Resource for Genome-Wide Association Studies Demonstrated for

Agronomic Traits in Response to Climate. Genetics 211:317-331.

Xia J, Han L, Zhao Z. 2012. Investigating the relationship of DNA methylation with

mutation rate and allele frequency in the human genome. BMC Genomics 13:S7.

Xu G, Lyu J, Li Q, Liu H, Wang D, Zhang M, Springer NM, Ross-Ibarra J, Yang J. 2020.

Evolutionary and functional genomics of DNA methylation in maize domestication and

improvement. Nat Commun 11:5539.

Yao N, Schmitz RJ, Johannes F. 2021. Epimutations Define a Fast-Ticking Molecular Clock

in Plants. Trends Genet 37:699-710.

Yao N, Zhang Z, Yu L, Hazarika R, Yu C, Jang H, Smith LM, Ton J, Liu L, Stachowicz JJ, et al.

2023. An evolutionary epigenetic clock in plants. Science 381:1440-1445.

Yu G, Smith DK, Zhu H, Guan Y, Lam TTY. 2017. ggtree: an r package for visualization and

annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other associated data.

Methods in Ecology and Evolution 8:28-36.

Zhang C, Dong SS, Xu JY, He WM, Yang TL. 2019. PopLDdecay: a fast and effective tool for

linkage disequilibrium decay analysis based on variant call format files. Bioinformatics

35:1786-1788.

Zhang H, Lang Z, Zhu JK. 2018. Dynamics and function of DNA methylation in plants. Nat

Rev Mol Cell Biol 19:489-506.

Zhao T, Guan X, Hu Y, Zhang Z, Yang H, Shi X, Han J, Mei H, Wang L, Shao L, et al. 2024.

Population-wide DNA methylation polymorphisms at single-nucleotide resolution in

207 cotton accessions reveal epigenomic contributions to complex traits. Cell Res.

1124