1   Detecting archaic introgression without archaic reference genomes

Laurits Skov[1*], Ruoyun Hui[2], Asger Hobolth[1], Aylwyn Scally[2], Mikkel Heide Schierup[1], Richard

Durbin[2*]

1. Bioinformatics Research Centre, Aarhus University, 8000 Aarhus C., Denmark

2. Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EH United Kingdom

*Correspondence: lskov@cs.au.dk, rd@sanger.ac.uk

Abstract

Human populations out of Africa have experienced at least two bouts of introgression from

archaic humans, Neandertal and Denisovans. In Papuans there is prior evidence of both these

introgressions. Here we present a new approach to detect segments of individual genomes of

archaic origin without using an archaic reference genome. The approach is based on the detection

of genomic regions with a high SNV density of SNVs not seen in unadmixed populations. We show

using simulations that this provides a powerful approach to identifying segments of archaic

introgression with a small rate of false detection. Furthermore our approach is able to accurately

infer admixture proportions and divergence time of human and archaic populations.

We apply the model to detect archaic introgression in 89 Papuans and show how the identified

segments can be assigned to likely Neandertal or Denisovan origin. We report more Denisovan

admixture than previous studies and directly find a shift in size distribution of fragments of

Neandertal and Denisovan origin that is compatible with a difference in admixture time.

Furthermore we identify small amounts of Denisova ancestry in West Eurasians, South East Asians

and South Asians.

Introduction

Archaic introgression into modern humans occurred at least twice (Neandertals and Denisovans)

(MEYER *et al.* 2012; PRUFER *et al.* 2014) and had a phenotypic effect on humans (HUERTA-SANCHEZ *et*

al. 2014; DANNEMANN *et al.* 2017; RACIMO *et al.* 2017). A large part of Neandertal and Denisovan

genetic material is still present in modern humans and we can learn about archaic populations

from studying the effect of their genetic variants in humans.

To harness this information a number of methods have been developed to infer segments of

archaic ancestry in an individual's genome.

Scanning along the genome, Hidden Markov Models (HMMs)(PRUFER *et al.* 2014; SEGUIN-ORLANDO *et*

al. 2014) and Conditional Random Fields (CRF)(SANKARARAMAN *et al.* 2016) can identify haplotypes

in non-Africans that are 1. closer to the archaic reference genomes, than to Africans and 2. are

longer than expected by incomplete lineage sorting, and these are then identified as archaic

introgressed segments. Another approach is to identify segments with more variants in higher

linkage disequilibrium (LD) that are unique to non-Africans than expected given a certain

demographic scenario (PLAGNOL and WALL 2006). The latest implementations of this method also

use an archaic reference genome for refining the set of putative archaic haplotypes (VERNOT *et al.*

2016).

The use of archaic reference genomes for identification of introgressed fragments has drawbacks.

First, since the Neandertal reference genomes are closer to the introgressing Neandertal (80,000-

145,000 years divergence)(PRUFER *et al.* 2017) , than the introgressing Denisova is to the Denisova

genome (276,000-403,000 years divergence)(PRUFER *et al.* 2014) detecting Denisovan ancestry will

be harder. Second, the reliance on having reference genomes implies that the introgression maps

generated by these methods need updates whenever more archaic reference genomes are

sequenced (PRUFER *et al.* 2017). Finally, it may be hard to identify introgressing segments of

unknown archaic origin if such exists, as in the case of the putative archaic introgression into

Pygmies (HSIEH *et al.* 2016) and Andamanese islanders (MONDAL *et al.* 2016).

Here we present a new method for the identification of archaic introgression that does not require

a reference genome or prior knowledge of demographic parameters, but uses density of variants

in individuals private to their population of origin. We demonstrate with Papuans how we can

estimate demographic parameters relevant to introgression and infer more archaic material than

previously. Furthermore, we can separate introgression events into Denisovan and Neandertal

components that display different length distributions in accordance with different admixture

times.

Method

Model

An archaic genomic segment introgressed into a population is expected to have a high density of

variants not found in populations without the introgression. We use a Hidden Markov Model

(HMM) to classify genomic segments into states with varying variant density. We focus on a

scenario where introgression with a deeply divergent archaic population only happened into an

ingroup and not the outgroup, see Figure 1, panel a.

We can then remove variants found in the outgroup in order to better distinguish the variant

density in introgressed segments and non-introgressed segments, see Figure 1, panel a. These

remaining variants which we denote private variants (because they are private with respect to the

ingroup) can either have occurred on the branch starting from the split of the ingroup and

outgroup or if they are introgressed, they could have occurred on the introgressing population's

branch. Because the introgressing segments have had a longer time to accumulate variants, they

have a higher probability of emitting private variants.

Thus, we define a HMM with two states. The hidden states are Ingroup and Archaic, and the

probability for changing state in the Ingroup is p and the probability for changing state in the

Archaic is q, see Figure 1, panel b. The probability of changing state can also be expressed in terms

of a constant recombination rate between windows $r \cdot L$, the admixture time T_{admix} and

admixture proportion a, Figure 1, panel b. We show how to derive it in Supplementary note 1.

The number of private variants observed in a window of length L (typically $L = 1000\ bp$) is

Poisson distributed with a rate $\lambda_{Ingroup}$ and $\lambda_{Archaic}$, respectively where $\lambda_{Ingroup} = \mu \cdot L \cdot$

$T_{Ingroup}$ and $\lambda_{Archaic} = \mu \cdot L \cdot T_{Archaic}$. μ is the mutation rate, $T_{ingroup}$ is the mean coalescence

time for the ingroup and the outgroup and $T_{Archaic}$ is the mean coalescence time for the archaic

population and the outgroup, see Figure 1, panel c.

We make a correction of the rates to take into account the number of missing bases in a window

and the local mutation rate. For window i we have $\lambda_{Ingroup}^{i} = \mu_i \cdot L_i \cdot T_{Ingroup}$ and $\lambda_{Archaic}^{i} = \mu_i \cdot$

$L_i \cdot T_{Archaic}$, where μ_i is the local mutation rate and L_i is the number of called bases in a widow.

The set of transition parameters p, q and the Poisson parameters $\lambda_{Ingroup}$, $\lambda_{archaic}$ that

maximizes the likelihood given the observations are found using the Baum-Welch algorithm for an

individual genome. These parameters are informative of the mean coalescence with the ingroup

and archaic with the outgroup, the admixture time and the admixture proportion if we assume a

known mutation rate μ and a known recombination rate between windows rL.

Once the set of optimal parameters are found they can be used to decode the genome, using

posterior decoding. We call each window where the posterior probability of being in the archaic

state is bigger than 0.5 as archaic. We group consecutive archaic windows together into archaic

segments and calculate the mean posterior probability of being archaic for the entire segment.

Results

Testing the model with simulations

To investigate the ability of our model to identify archaic (Neandertal and Denisovan) admixture

into Papuans we simulated un-phased whole autosome data with admixture with an archaic

hominin 1,500 generations ago replacing 5% of the population – (a script with all demographic

parameters are shown in Supporting information – Simulation script.py and a graphic

representation of the demography is shown in Supporting figure 1). We simulated three scenarios

to test the effects of missing data and varying recombination rate. The mutation rate were kept

constant across the genome for all simulations.

First, we simulated five individuals where every base in the genome is called equally well and

there is a constant recombination rate of $1.2 \cdot 10^{-8}$ events per basepair per generation. We call

this dataset the ideal data. Second, we simulated five individuals and removed all variants that are

in repetitive regions (using the repeatmask track for the human reference genome hg19 (SMIT *et*

al. 2013)) to test how the model performs with missing data. Third, we simulated five individuals

with missing data and using a varying recombination rate (using HapMap phase II (INTERNATIONAL

HapMap *et al.* 2007)) to test the effect of missing data and recombination. We analyzed all

genomes in bins of 1000 bp, and removed all variants found in 500 simulated Africans, 100

simulated Europeans and 100 simulated Asians. We combine two haplotypes to form genotype

data for the simulated individuals. This will be more similar to situations where phased data is not

available. For diploid data the conversion from $p, q, \lambda_{Ingroup}$ and $\lambda_{Archaic}$ to $T_{archaic}$, $T_{Ingroup}$,

T_{admix} and a changes as is shown in Supplementary note 1.

We found the transition and emission parameters that optimized the likelihood, using the Baum-

Welch algorithm and used them to get an estimate for the admixture time T_{admix}, the admixture

proportion a and the mean coalescent times with the outgroup $T_{ingroup}$ and $T_{archaic}$ for the

ingroup and archaic segments respectively, see Figure 2 panel b.

For all scenarios the coalescence time between the ingroup and outgroup ($T_{ingroup}$) the mean

estimate is 2,625 generations ago(max = 2,647, min = 2,595), and the average simulated

coalescent time with the outgroup is 3,109 generations ago. For the coalescence time between

the outgroup and the archaic ($T_{archaic}$) the mean estimate is 37,345 generations ago (max =

37,832, min = 37,028) and the simulated values were 35,543 generations ago.

We find that the mean estimate of the admixture proportion a when using the transition matrix is

between 4.62 % and 5.34 %.

We also find that with a posterior cutoff at 0.8 for segments (mean posterior probability of being

archaic for all windows in segment), the amount of false positives can be reduced to around 50%,

while still keeping 90% of the true segments, see Supporting figure 4.

An estimate of the false negative rate of the model is counting the amount of simulated archaic

segments that have zero overlap with the putative archaic sequence, which is 11.1 Mb for ideal

simulations, 32.2 Mb for simulations with missing data and 26.3 Mb for simulations with missing

data and a varying recombination rate, see Figure 2 panel a. The model has less power to identify

short segments as can be seen in Supporting figure 2.

If we estimate the false positive rate as the amount of putative archaic segments that have zero

overlap with the simulated archaic segments we find 8.4 Mb for ideal simulations, 4.1 Mb for

simulations with missing data and 9.0 Mb for simulations with missing data and a varying

recombination rate, see Figure 2 panel a. In total, we recover 243 Mb, 198 Mb and 184 Mb of

archaic sequence for Ideal simulations, simulations with missing data and simulations with missing

data and varying recombination rate respectively.

An example of how the simulated and putative archaic segments overlap is shown in Figure 2,

panel c for the a 10 Mb window. A map of all simulated archaic segments and putative archaic

segments can be seen in Supporting figure 3.

The mean estimate for the admixture time using transition matrix is around 1,704 generations ago

when using the ideal data and 1,522 generations ago when adding missing data. When we vary the

recombination rate across the genome the average estimate of the admixture time is 1,146

generations ago if we estimate it using the transition matrix. The underestimate of the admixture

time might be due to fact that the model fail to identify around 80% of the short segments. This

would make the average segment length longer and make the admixture time seem more recent.

Application to Papuan genomes

Having verified the validity of the model, we applied it to 14 Papuan individuals from Simons

diversity project (MALLICK *et al.* 2016), 40 Papuans from (MALASPINAS *et al.* 2016) and an additional

35 Papuans (VERNOT *et al.* 2016). In addition to this, we also analyzed individuals from West

Eurasia, East Asia and South East Asia.

For each individual we used two different sets of variants as outgroup. We estimate the

background mutation rate in windows of 100 kb, using the variant density of all variants in the

African populations from the 1000 genomes project.

Our model will not be able to distinguish Neandertal from Denisova segments in Papuans, because

the Denisovans and Neandertals share a common ancestor before they do with humans and

therefore the mean coalescence time with humans will be the same (PRUFER *et al.* 2014). This

means that the Poisson parameters will be the same as they both depend on $T_{archaic}$. However,

we should be able to enrich for Denisova and Neandertal segments by using different outgroups in

our filtering step.

First, we used only variants found in Sub-Saharan populations as an outgroup. This should remove

variation in the common ancestor of Sub-Saharan Africans and the Papuans, retaining archaic

variants of Neandertal and Denisova origin as both are present in Papuans, but mainly absent in

Africa (SANKARARAMAN *et al.* 2016; VERNOT *et al.* 2016). We also used this filter when analyzing

Eurasian populations.

Second we remove variants found in all non Papuan populations, only retaining variants that are

unique to Papuan populations. This should remove Neandertal variants that are shared with other

non-African populations (PRUFER *et al.* 2014) and also to some extend remove variants of Denisova

origin that are mainly found in Asians and Native Americans (SKOGLUND and JAKOBSSON 2011; QIN

and STONEKING 2015). Thus removing all variants from 1000 genomes should enrich for Denisova

segments while the segments that do not overlap when using the two different outgroups should

be enriched for Neandertal segments.

We found the optimal set of transition and emission parameters for each Papuan individual and

found them to be largely consistent across the different datasets, See Supporting figure 5. The

parameters were converted into estimates of T_{admix}, a, $T_{ingroup}$ and $T_{archaic}$ using an average

recombination rate of and mutation rate of $1.2 \cdot 10^{-8}$ events per basepair per generation and an

average mutation rate of $1.25 \cdot 10^{-8}$ mutations per base pair per generation, see Figure 3, panel a

and b.

We find that mean coalescence time between Papuans and non-Papuan individuals happened

more recently ($1,395 - 1,540$ generations ago) than the mean coalescence time with Sub-Saharan

Africans ($1,953$-$2,293$ generations ago) reflecting that Papuans are more closely related to other

Non-Africans than to Africans. The mean coalescence time between Papuans and other non-

Africans also provides an upper limit for Neandertal introgression because it happened into the

common ancestor of these populations.

Using only Sub-Saharan individuals as an outgroup we find a mean coalescence time to between

the archaic and outgroup to be between $29,404$ and $33,944$ generations ago. When using non-

Papuans as an outgroup the estimate is between $25,268$ and $30,352$ generations ago. The lower

estimate is likely due to the fact that some of the variants in the common ancestor of Denisovans

and Neandertals have been removed.

We estimate the admixture proportion of archaic sequence to between 4.1-4.4 % and the

admixture proportion that is unique to Papuans between 1.5-1.8 %. This means that around 2.6 %

is shared with Non-Papuans, see Figure 3, panel a.

Using the transition parameters we estimate that both admixture events happened around 1000

generations ago which is likely an underestimate as it was for the simulated data with missing data

and varying recombination rate. Neandertal admixture likely occurred some 2,000 generations ago

after the out of Africa migration (FU *et al.* 2014; SANKARARAMAN *et al.* 2016) and Denisova admixture

likely occurred before the peopling of Sahul which is thought to be 47-55 thousand years ago

(1,620-1,896 generations ago assuming a generation time of 29 years) (CLARKSON *et al.* 2015;

O'CONNELL and ALLEN 2015), if one assumes that Denisova ancestry in Asians, Native Americans and

Papuans have the same origin.

We use a threshold of 0.8 posterior probability as in the case of the simulated data. By comparing

to the Vindija (PRUFER *et al.* 2017) and Denisova (MEYER *et al.* 2012) genomes we find that this

cutoff removes around 50% of the short segments that don't share variants with any archaic

reference genome and could be deeply coalescing modern human haplotypes, see Supporting

figure 8.

When we use a cutoff of 0.8 we find that 84 % of the segments unique to Papuans (80 % of the

total sequence) shared more variants Denisova genome than Vindija and that 78 % the segments

that are shared with other non-Africans (83 % of the total sequence) shared more variants with

the Vindija Neandertal than the Denisova, See Figure 3, panel c. This means that a majority of the

archaic sequence unique to Papuans likely comes from a population more closely related to

Denisovans.

However, segments that are unique to Papuans are longer on average (94.2 kb) compared to

those shared with other non-African populations (76.9 kb), See Figure 3, panel d. The difference in

length distributions are not seen as clearly when using Sstar or CRF, see Supporting figure 6.

Moreover, the length distribution of archaic segments that are not unique to Papuans are more

similar to other non-African populations, see Supporting figure 7.

We compared our archaic segments to those previously reported using other methods

(SANKARARAMAN *et al.* 2016; VERNOT *et al.* 2016). We find that 67% of the archaic sequence found

using CRF are also recovered using our method, and that 74% of the archaic sequence found using

Sstar are also recovered using our method.

Comparing to the archaic reference genomes our method finds more Denisova in Papuans than it

finds Neandertal unlike the CRF. It also finds a significant amount of additional Denisova segments

in East and South East Asians, see Table 1.

Model	Pop	Both	Denisova	None	Vindija	Total
HMM	Papuan	4.40	77.00	11.39	71.44	164.23
	eastasia	1.48	5.69	9.96	61.37	78.49
	southasia	1.62	5.85	10.12	51.36	68.95
	westeurasia	1.47	2.39	10.14	43.95	57.94
Sstar	Papuan	26.5	43.11		49.21	118.82
	eastasia	-	0.00	-	65.02	65.02
	southasia	-	0.00	-	55.18	55.18
	westeurasia	-	0.00	-	51.23	51.23
CRF	Papuan	-	58.17	-	84.72	142.89
	eastasia	-	3.21	-	72.92	76.14
	southasia	-	2.79	-	61.36	64.15
	westeurasia	-	0.68	-	57.29	57.97

Table 1. Amount of sequence of different origins. The amount of sequence (in Mb) that is equally

related to Denisova and Vindija, more closely related to Denisova, doesn't share any variation with

either and is more closely related to Vindija are shown different populations and different

methods.

Discussion

Since emission probabilities are very different between the human and archaic states in our

model, we expect a low rate of false positive archaic inference and this is also what we see in

simulations made to match the real data closely. However, since recombination rates are highly

variable, a lot of very short archaic segments are expected and these have a very high false

negative rate. Our inability to identify these cause us to underestimate of the admixture time.

However the model does seem to find the correct size distribution for longer segments (> 50 kb),

see Supporting figure 2. The mean coalescence times of modern and archaic humans is estimated

well in simulations. In real data, the potential presence of super-archaic introgression as reported

into the sequenced Denisovan (PRUFER *et al.* 2014) should cause us to overestimate this quantity,

but this effect is expected to be small since there is little difference between Europeans and

Papuans for this quantity. It remains to be seen whether there is also evidence for super-archaic

admixture in the introgressing Denisova. One way to do this would be to just add an extra super-

archaic hidden state to our model.

Our model reports more Denisova segments than approaches relying on the Denisovan reference.

This is likely because our method does not rely on putative Denisova segments being more closely

related to the Denisova genome than the Vindija Neandertal genome. Given that the introgressing

and sequenced Denisova split shortly after the Neandertals split from Denisovans (PRUFER *et al.*

2014) many segments are expected to be equally close to the Vindija Neandertal and Denisova. It

is also expected that a fraction of segments introgressed for Denisova are more closely related to

Vindija and vice verse due to incomplete lineage sorting. It is therefore also reassuring that we do

not find the same large excess of Neanderthal fragments in Papuans compared to Asian

populations as has been reported previously, see Table 1.

We find no clear evidence for an introgression with a new archaic hominin in Papuans, but we do

find segments that do not share variation with any of the sequenced archaic populations. These

segments could likely represent variation in Neandertals and Denisovans that is not captured by

the three high coverage archaic reference genomes. In the future it will be interesting to compare

these segments to other human populations that might also have archaic segments of unknown

origin (HSIEH *et al.* 2016; MONDAL *et al.* 2016).

Our model works particularly well when it is possible to remove all the common variation between

the ingroup and outgroup. As a larger number of individuals from different species are being

sequenced, this method could be used as an alternative method for identifying introgression in

other species, e.g. chimp bonobo (DE MANUEL *et al.* 2016), bears (LIU *et al.* 2014), elephants

(PALKOPOULOU *et al.* 2018) or gibbons (CARBONE *et al.* 2014).

Materials and methods

Simulations

To simulate data we used Msprime (KELLEHER *et al.* 2016). We simulated 5 Papuans and as an

outgroup we simulated 500 Africans, 100 Europeans and 100 Asians using demographic

parameters from (MALASPINAS *et al.* 2016). We simulated data where we varied the recombination

rate according to HapMap recombination maps (INTERNATIONAL HAPMAP *et al.* 2007) for 5 individuals

and removed variants within non-callable regions and variants that were found in the simulated

outgroup. We grouped all autosomes into bins of 1000 base pairs and counted the number of

variants. For each 1000 bp windows we calculated the number of called bases using the repeat

masked segments.

Train parameters and decode segments

We trained and decoded the segments using our HMM, which is available at:

https://github.com/LauritsSkov/Introgression-detection/

Data sets

We used 14 Papuans, 71 WestEurasians, 72 East Asians and 39 South Asians individuals from

Simons diversity project (MALLICK *et al.* 2016), 40 Papuans form (MALASPINAS *et al.* 2016) and an

additional 35 Papuans (VERNOT *et al.* 2016).

Filtering variants in real data

We used two sets of outgroups. One is all Sub-Saharan Africans (populations: YRI, MSL, ESN) from

1000 Genomes Project (GENOMES PROJECT *et al.* 2015) and all Sub-Saharan African populations from

Simons (MALLICK *et al.* 2016) (not Masai, Somali, Sharawi and Mozabite).

The other ougroup is all individuals from the 1000 Genomes (GENOMES PROJECT *et al.* 2015) as

outgroup and all Non-Papuans from Simons diversity project.

For all human data sets, we also removed sites that fell within repeatmasked (SMIT *et al.* 2013)

regions, and sites that were not in the Strict callability mask for the 1000 genomes Project.

Repeat mask regions

hgdownload.cse.ucsc.edu/goldenpath/hg19/bigZips/chromFaMasked.tar.gz

Strict callability mask for 1000 genomes:

The background mutation rate was calculated using the variants density of all variants from

populations YRI, LWK, GWD, MSL and ESN in windows of 100 Kb divided by the mean variant

density of the whole genome.

Comparison to Sstar and Conditional Random Field

We called Neandertal and Denisova segments in the 14 Papuans and compared them to the

segments called with CRF with more than 50 posterior probability (SANKARARAMAN *et al.* 2016)

available at:

https://sriramlab.cass.idre.ucla.edu/public/sankararaman.curbio.2016/

The path to the haplotypes is:

summaries/2/denisova/oceania/summaries/haplotypes/CRHOM.thresh-50.length-0.00.haplotypes

We called Neandertal and Denisova segments in the 35 Papuans and compared them to the

segments called with Sstar with more than 99 posterior probability (VERNOT *et al.* 2016) available

at:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B9Pc7_zItMCVWUp6bWtXc2xJVkk

The path to the haplotypes is:

introgressed_haplotypes/LL.callsetPNG.mr_0.99.den_calls_by_hap.bed.merged.by_chr.bed

Calculation of admixture time using length distribution

We fitted a linear regression line to the log of the length distribution of putative archaic segments

with a posterior probability greater than 0.5. The slope is an estimate of the mean of the

exponential distribution and can be converted into an admixture time using

$mean\ of\ exponential = \frac{1}{(1-m)r(t-1)}$ where where m is the admixture proportion, t is the

admixture time and r is the recombination rate per base pair.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Overview of the model. Illustration on small test dataset. a) An archaic segment

introgresses into the ingroup population at time T_{admix} with admixture proportion a. The

segments in the ingroup has a mean coalescence time with a segment from the outgroup at time

$T_{Ingroup}$ and an archaic segment has a mean coalescence time with a segment from the outgroup

at time $T_{Archaic}$. Removing all variants found in the outgroup (light orange points) should remove

all the variants in the common ancestor of ingroup and outgroup, leaving only private variants that

either occurred on the ingroup branch (dark orange) or on the archaic branch (dark blue). This will

make the archaic segment have a higher variant density. The genome is then binned into windows

of L (here 1000 bp) and the number of private variants are counted in each window. These are the

observations and the hidden states are either Ingroup state or Archaic state. When decoding the

sequence the most likely path through the sequence is found. b) The transition matrix between

the archaic state and ingroup state. c) The emission probabilities are modelled as Poisson

distributions with means $\lambda_{Ingroup}$ and $\lambda_{Archaic}$. It is more likely to see more private variants in the

Archaic state than in the Ingroup state.

Figure 2. Evaluation of the model on simulated data. a) Average amount of sequence per

individual that come from segments that are classified as false archaic (zero percent overlap with

any true archaic segment), found < 50% (segment where there is less than 50 % overlap with true

archaic segments), found > 50 % (segments where more than 50 % overlap with true archaic

segments) and missed archaic which are segments that the model does not identify as archaic. The

bars are colored according to what simulation scenarios they belong to. All segments are used

here are required to have > 0.8 posterior probability. b) The estimation of the four parameters

T_{admix}, a, $T_{ingroup}$ and $T_{archaic}$ are shown for the different simulation scenarios. c) And example

of how simulated archaic segments and putative archaic segments overlap in a 10 Mb window.

The x-axis is the genomic coordinates in Mb and the y-axis is the different simulation scenarios.

Figure 3. Application of model to Papuan genomes. a) Relationship between modern and archaic

humans with the outgroup branches (Sub-Saharan Africans) colored in red. The average

coalescence times for ingroup and outgroup $T_{Ingroup}$ and archaic and outgroup $T_{Archaic}$ are

shown. The admixture proportions a and admixture time T_{admix} are shown for segments that are

shared with other non-African populations. b) The outgroup colored in red is now all non-Papuans,

and the new demographic parameters are shown. c) The segments that are shared with other

Non-Africans share more variation with the Vindija Neandertal than they do with the Altai

Denisova. Segments that are unique to Papuan individuals share more variation with Altai

Denisova than they do with the Vindija Neandertal. d) The length distribution (all archaic segments

with a mean posterior probability > 0.5 are kept) for segments that are shared with other non-

African populations is shorter than segments that are unique to Papuans.

Supporting Figure legends

Supporting figure 1 – Demographic parameters for simulation. The effective population sizes,

split times and bottleneck population sizes are shown for the simulated populations.

Supporting figure 2 - Total segments and sequence called SIM. The first column show the total

number of segments found and the second column show the total amount of sequence that these

segments add up to. The rows are different simulation scenarios and the colors of the stacked bar

plot show the amount/number of segments that are not found using posterior decoding, where

less than half of the segment overlap with the true archaic segments or where more than half of

the segment overlaps with the true archaic segment.

Supporting figure 3- True and inferred archaic for the whole genome for simulated data. The x-

axis is the genomic coordinates and the y-axis is the simulated individual. We colored the

segments according to if they are true archaic of inferred archaic by the model using a cutoff of 0.5

for the mean posterior probability of the segment.

Supporting figure 4 – Effect of adjusting cutoff for when to include a putative archaic segment.

The rows are different simulation scenarios and the rows are different classifications of putative

archaic segments. False is segments with zero overlap to the true archaic segments, found<50%

are archaic segments that overlap with less than 50% with the true archaic segments and

found>50% are segments that overlap with more than 50% with the true archaic segments. On

the x-axis is the mean posterior probability of an archaic segment and the y-axis is the amount of

sequence left when applying the filter.

Supporting figure 5 - Parameter estimation of Papuans. The different facets show the estimates

for the parameters t_admix, a, T_ingroup and T_archaic depending on which outgroup was used

(Sub-Saharan Africans or the whole world (non-Papuans). The bars are colored according to which

dataset they came from.

Supporting figure 6 - Length distribution other methods. The length distribution of all Denisova

and Neandertal segments found using conditional random field (CRF), the hidden Markov model

(HMM) and Sstar. For the HMM Neandertal are those segments that are shared with other non-

African populations and Denisova are those unique to Papuans.

Supporting figure 7 - Length distribution of Asia, Europe and Papuans. The length distribution of

segments unique to Papuans (Denisova) and segments shared with other non-African populations

(Neandertal) are shown for four different population groups.

Supporting figure 8 - Closeness to archaic humans with cutoff. The probability of a segment

sharing any variants with the archaic reference genomes as a function of the average posterior

probability of a segment.

References

Carbone, L., R. A. Harris, S. Gnerre, K. R. Veeramah, B. Lorente-Galdos *et al.*, 2014 Gibbon genome
and the fast karyotype evolution of small apes. Nature 513: 195-201.
Clarkson, C., M. Smith, B. Marwick, R. Fullagar, L. A. Wallis *et al.*, 2015 The archaeology,
chronology and stratigraphy of Madjedbebe (Malakunanja II): A site in northern Australia
with early occupation. J Hum Evol 83: 46-64.
Dannemann, M., K. Prufer and J. Kelso, 2017 Functional implications of Neandertal introgression in
modern humans. Genome Biol 18: 61.
de Manuel, M., M. Kuhlwilm, P. Frandsen, V. C. Sousa, T. Desai *et al.*, 2016 Chimpanzee genomic
diversity reveals ancient admixture with bonobos. Science 354: 477-481.
Fu, Q., H. Li, P. Moorjani, F. Jay, S. M. Slepchenko *et al.*, 2014 Genome sequence of a 45,000-year-
old modern human from western Siberia. Nature 514: 445-449.
Genomes Project, C., A. Auton, L. D. Brooks, R. M. Durbin, E. P. Garrison *et al.*, 2015 A global
reference for human genetic variation. Nature 526: 68-74.
Hsieh, P., A. E. Woerner, J. D. Wall, J. Lachance, S. A. Tishkoff *et al.*, 2016 Model-based analyses of
whole-genome data reveal a complex evolutionary history involving archaic introgression
in Central African Pygmies. Genome Res 26: 291-300.
Huerta-Sanchez, E., X. Jin, Asan, Z. Bianba, B. M. Peter *et al.*, 2014 Altitude adaptation in Tibetans
caused by introgression of Denisovan-like DNA. Nature 512: 194-197.
International HapMap, C., K. A. Frazer, D. G. Ballinger, D. R. Cox, D. A. Hinds *et al.*, 2007 A second
generation human haplotype map of over 3.1 million SNPs. Nature 449: 851-861.
Kelleher, J., A. M. Etheridge and G. McVean, 2016 Efficient Coalescent Simulation and Genealogical
Analysis for Large Sample Sizes. PLoS Comput Biol 12: e1004842.
Liu, S. P., E. D. Lorenzen, M. Fumagalli, B. Li, K. Harris *et al.*, 2014 Population Genomics Reveal
Recent Speciation and Rapid Evolutionary Adaptation in Polar Bears. Cell 157: 785-794.
Malaspinas, A. S., M. C. Westaway, C. Muller, V. C. Sousa, O. Lao *et al.*, 2016 A genomic history of
Aboriginal Australia. Nature 538: 207-214.
Mallick, S., H. Li, M. Lipson, I. Mathieson, M. Gymrek *et al.*, 2016 The Simons Genome Diversity
Project: 300 genomes from 142 diverse populations. Nature 538: 201-206.
Meyer, M., M. Kircher, M. T. Gansauge, H. Li, F. Racimo *et al.*, 2012 A high-coverage genome
sequence from an archaic Denisovan individual. Science 338: 222-226.
Mondal, M., F. Casals, T. Xu, G. M. Dall'Olio, M. Pybus *et al.*, 2016 Genomic analysis of
Andamanese provides insights into ancient human migration into Asia and adaptation. Nat
Genet 48: 1066-1070.
O'Connell, J. F., and J. Allen, 2015 The process, biotic impact, and global implications of the human
colonization of Sahul about 47,000 years ago. Journal of Archaeological Science 56: 73-84.
Palkopoulou, E., M. Lipson, S. Mallick, S. Nielsen, N. Rohland *et al.*, 2018 A comprehensive genomic
history of extinct and living elephants. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 115: E2566-E2574.
Plagnol, V., and J. D. Wall, 2006 Possible ancestral structure in human populations. PLoS Genet 2:
e105.
Prufer, K., C. de Filippo, S. Grote, F. Mafessoni, P. Korlevic *et al.*, 2017 A high-coverage Neandertal
genome from Vindija Cave in Croatia. Science.
Prufer, K., F. Racimo, N. Patterson, F. Jay, S. Sankararaman *et al.*, 2014 The complete genome
sequence of a Neanderthal from the Altai Mountains. Nature 505: 43-49.

Qin, P., and M. Stoneking, 2015 Denisovan Ancestry in East Eurasian and Native American
Populations. Mol Biol Evol 32**:** 2665-2674.
Racimo, F., D. Gokhman, M. Fumagalli, A. Ko, T. Hansen *et al.*, 2017 Archaic Adaptive Introgression
in TBX15/WARS2. Mol Biol Evol 34**:** 509-524.
Sankararaman, S., S. Mallick, N. Patterson and D. Reich, 2016 The Combined Landscape of
Denisovan and Neanderthal Ancestry in Present-Day Humans. Curr Biol 26**:** 1241-1247.
Seguin-Orlando, A., T. S. Korneliussen, M. Sikora, A. S. Malaspinas, A. Manica *et al.*, 2014
Paleogenomics. Genomic structure in Europeans dating back at least 36,200 years. Science
346**:** 1113-1118.
Skoglund, P., and M. Jakobsson, 2011 Archaic human ancestry in East Asia. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
108**:** 18301-18306.
Smit, A. F. A., R. Hubley and P. Green, 2013 RepeatMasker Open 4.0. RepeatMasker Open 4.0.
Vernot, B., S. Tucci, J. Kelso, J. G. Schraiber, A. B. Wolf *et al.*, 2016 Excavating Neandertal and
Denisovan DNA from the genomes of Melanesian individuals. Science 352**:** 235-239.
474

a   Overview of the model

$T_{Archaic}$

$T_{Ingroup}$

a

T_{admix}

Admixture event

Outgroup   Ingroup   Archaic

Observed variants

2 kb   4 kb   6 kb   8 kb

Remove variants found in outgroup

Count variants in window

① ⓪ ⓪ ② ② ① ⓪

Decode sequence

Archaic

Ingroup

b   Transition probabilities

$1 - p$ q $1 - q$

Ingroup   Archaic

p

$$q \approx T_{admix} \cdot r \cdot L \cdot (1 - a)$$

$$p \approx T_{admix} \cdot r \cdot L \cdot a$$

c   Emission probabilities

$\lambda_{Ingroup} = \mu \cdot L \cdot T_{Ingroup}$

Ingroup

Probability of obersving n variants

0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0

0   1   2   3

Number of private variants observed

$\lambda_{Archaic} = \mu \cdot L \cdot T_{Archaic}$

Archaic

Probability of obersving n variants

0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0

0   1   2   3

Number of private variants observed

a Using Africans as outgroup

$T_{Archaic}$ = 29,404 - 33,944 generations ago

$T_{Ingroup}$ = 1,953 - 2,293 generations ago

T_{Admix} = 953 - 1254 generations ago

a = 2.6 %

Africans   Eurasians   Papuans   Neandertal   Denisova

b Using Non-Papuans as outgroup

$T_{Archaic}$ = 25,268 - 30,352 generations ago

$T_{Ingroup}$ = 1,395 - 1,540 generations ago

T_{Admix} = 888 - 1191 generations ago

a = 1.5-1.8 %

Africans   Eurasians   Papuans   Neandertal   Denisova

c

Shared with other Non-Africans

83 % of sequence closer to Neandertal

Unique to Papuans

80 % of sequence closer to Denisovan

Proportion of variants shared with Neandertal

Proportion of variants shared with Denisova

d

Segment type
- Unique to Papuans
- Shared with other Non−Africans

Density

Segment length (kb)