

1 **Phylogenomic analysis clarifies the evolutionary origin of *Coffea arabica* L.**

2 Yves Bawin^{1,2,3,4}, Tom Ruttink¹, Ariane Staelens¹, Annelies Haegeman¹, Piet Stoffelen³, Jean-
3 Claude Ithe Mwanga Mwanga⁵, Isabel Roldán-Ruiz^{1,4}, Olivier Honnay² and Steven B.
4 Janssens^{2,3}

5 ¹Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food (ILVO), Belgium;

6 ²Plant Conservation and Population Biology, KU Leuven, Belgium;

7 ³Crop wild relatives and useful plants, Meise Botanic Garden, Belgium;

8 ⁴Department of Plant Biotechnology and Bioinformatics, Ghent University, Belgium

9 ⁵Centre de Recherche en Sciences Naturelles (CRSN), D.R. Congo

10 Key words: Allopolyploidy, *Coffea arabica* (Arabica coffee), genotyping-by-sequencing,
11 hybridization, molecular dating, self-compatibility

12 **Summary**

13 Interspecific hybridization events have played a major role in plant speciation, yet, the
14 evolutionary origin of hybrid species often remains enigmatic. Here, we inferred the
15 evolutionary origin of the allotetraploid species *Coffea arabica*, which is widely cultivated for
16 Arabica coffee production.

17 We estimated genetic distances between *C. arabica* and all species that are known to be closely
18 related to *C. arabica* using genotyping-by-sequencing (GBS) data. In addition, we
19 reconstructed a time-calibrated multilabeled phylogenetic tree of 24 species to infer the age of
20 the *C. arabica* hybridization event. Ancestral states of self-compatibility were also
21 reconstructed to infer the evolution of self-compatibility in *Coffea*.

22 *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides* were confirmed as the putative progenitor species of *C.*
23 *arabica*. These species most likely hybridized between 1.08 million and 543 thousand years
24 ago.

25 We inferred the phylogenetic relationships between *C. arabica* and its closest relatives and shed
26 new light on the evolution of self-compatibility in *Coffea*. Furthermore, the age of the
27 hybridization event coincides with periods of environmental upheaval, which may have induced
28 range shifts of the progenitor species that facilitated the emergence of *C. arabica*.

29

1 **Introduction**

2 Interspecific hybridization events have played a major role in plant speciation (Mallet, 2005;
3 Whitney *et al.*, 2010). Most known hybrid species, including wheat (*Triticum* spp.), cotton
4 (*Gossypium* spp.), and cabbage (*Brassica* spp.), are allopolyploids, which are hybrids with an
5 increased chromosomal content compared to their diploid progenitor species (Soltis & Soltis,
6 2009; Renny-Byfield & Wendel, 2014). Because many allopolyploids became ecologically
7 divergent or geographically isolated from their closest relatives, inference of their ancestry
8 solely based on non-molecular characteristics is often difficult (Abbott *et al.*, 2013). The
9 genome of allopolyploid species consists of different subgenomes, each originating from one
10 of its progenitor species. Even though subgenomes may lose genomic segments via a process
11 called ‘biased fractionation’, ancestral polymorphisms between progenitor species remain
12 present throughout the extant allopolyploid genome and can provide crucial information about
13 the progenitor species (Pelé *et al.*, 2018; Wendel *et al.*, 2018).

14 *Coffea arabica* L. is the only known natural allopolyploid species in the genus *Coffea* ($2n = 4x$
15 $= 44$) and one of the few known self-compatible species within its genus (Charrier & Berthaud,
16 1985). Cultivated across the tropics and subtropics, *C. arabica* is one of the most valuable
17 agricultural commodities, accounting for about 60% of the global coffee production (ICO,
18 2020a,b). Nowadays, wild *C. arabica* populations are only found in the Afromontane
19 rainforests of southwest Ethiopia, although small isolated populations also occur in Northern
20 Kenya and the Eastern part of South Sudan (Davis *et al.*, 2006). Wild *C. arabica* populations
21 are currently threatened by climate change (Davis *et al.*, 2012; Moat *et al.*, 2019), increasing
22 pest and disease pressure (Hindorf & Omondi, 2011; Vega *et al.*, 2015), deforestation (Tadesse
23 *et al.*, 2014; Geeraert *et al.*, 2019), and introgression of cultivar alleles into wild individuals
24 (Aerts *et al.*, 2012, 2017). Wild coffee species, including wild *C. arabica*, carry valuable genetic
25 resources for coffee breeding. However, more than half of the currently described 125 wild
26 *Coffea* species are threatened with extinction (Davis *et al.*, 2019; Govaerts *et al.*, 2020).
27 Because many of these species are also poorly conserved in *ex situ* collections, the decline of
28 wild *Coffea* species is a widely acknowledged problem (Davis *et al.*, 2019; Moat *et al.*, 2019).

29 The species *C. arabica* emerged through the natural hybridization of two *Coffea* species
30 followed by a whole genome duplication, probably during a single allopolyploidization event
31 (Clarindo & Carvalho, 2008; Lashermes *et al.*, 2014; Scalabrin *et al.*, 2020). The current
32 geographical range of *C. arabica* does not overlap with that of any other *Coffea* species so that
33 geographical co-existence cannot be used to put forward candidate progenitors (Davis *et al.*,

1 2006). Using genomic *in-situ* hybridization (GISH) and Restriction fragment length
2 polymorphism (RFLP) markers, *C. canephora* Pierre ex A.Froehner and *C. eugenioides*
3 S.Moore have been identified as the closest extant relatives of *C. arabica* (Lashermes *et al.*,
4 1999). Although cytogenetic methods such as GISH are considered reliable for studying
5 hybridization (Chester *et al.*, 2010), a certain ambiguity remains regarding the progenitor
6 species of *C. arabica*. Based on GISH and fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH), Raina *et*
7 *al.* (1998) suggested *C. congensis* A.Froehner as progenitor species of *C. arabica* instead of *C.*
8 *canephora*. Hamon *et al.* (2009), however, could not discriminate between *C. canephora* and
9 *C. congensis* as putative progenitor of *C. arabica* using FISH and fluorochrome banding (CMA,
10 DAPI). Moreover, genetic divergence in plastid DNA regions or in the internal transcribed
11 spacer (ITS) sequence were too low to resolve phylogenetic relationships between *C. arabica*
12 and other *Coffea* species (Berthou *et al.*, 1980, 1983; Lashermes *et al.*, 1997; Cros *et al.*, 1998;
13 Maurin *et al.*, 2007; Tesfaye *et al.*, 2007). In addition, species such as *C. anthonyi* Stoff. &
14 F.Anthony, *C. heterocalyx* Stoff., and *C. kivuensis* Lebrun which are closely related to *C.*
15 *eugenioides* and which share some key traits with *C. arabica*, have not been consistently
16 included in evolutionary studies of *C. arabica*. The habitus of *C. kivuensis* is very similar to
17 that of *C. arabica* and both species have similar leaf, flower, and fruit characteristics.
18 Furthermore, *C. heterocalyx* and *C. anthonyi* are, together with *C. arabica*, the only known self-
19 compatible species in *Coffea* (Coulibaly *et al.*, 2002; Stoffelen *et al.*, 2009). Taken together,
20 and despite all these research efforts, the origin of *C. arabica* remains elusive. The
21 unambiguous inference of the phylogenetic relationships between *C. arabica* and its relatives
22 remains crucial to understand the evolutionary history of these species (Teskaye *et al.*, 2007;
23 Stoffelen *et al.*, 2009).

24 Estimating the age of the interspecific hybridization event at the origin of *C. arabica* has been
25 the purpose of several studies. Based on the frequency of synonymous substitutions in a
26 phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase kinase gene of *C. canephora* and its orthologue in the
27 corresponding *C. arabica* subgenome, Yu *et al.* (2011) estimated the divergence time between
28 *C. canephora* and *C. arabica* around 665 000 years ago. Cenci *et al.* (2012) calculated the
29 minimum age of *C. arabica* between 10 000 and 50 000 years by comparing the substitution
30 frequency between the *C. arabica* subgenomes in a 50 kilobase region that was assumed to be
31 duplicated in *C. arabica* after its emergence, with the substitution frequencies in other regions
32 of the *C. arabica* genome. Furthermore, it has very recently been shown that genetic diversity
33 levels in simulated populations of *C. arabica* became similar to those observed in *C. arabica*

1 accessions when the origin of *C. arabica* was set to 10 000 years, again supporting a very recent
2 origin of the species (Scalabrin *et al.*, 2020). Given these divergent estimates, a more elaborate
3 molecular dating analysis is still needed (Yu *et al.*, 2011; Cenci *et al.*, 2012).

4 The availability of affordable genome-wide sequencing techniques now enables the
5 reconstruction of hybridization events based on subtle differences in genome sequence between
6 hybrids and their relatives (Payseur & Rieseberg, 2016). For example, genotyping-by-
7 sequencing (GBS) has been used to identify the origin of hybrid species with high accuracy in
8 soybean (*Glycine* spp.) and vanilla (*Vanilla* spp.) (Sherman-Broyles *et al.*, 2017; Hu *et al.*,
9 2019). GBS markers may contain more information about the evolutionary history of a species
10 than single gene sequences because they originate from a large number of regions located across
11 the genome. The value of GBS to reconstruct phylogenetic relationships within the genus
12 *Coffea* has been demonstrated by Hamon *et al.* (2017) and Guyeux *et al.* (2019), who
13 investigated diploid *Coffea* species. The combination of GBS with a multilabeled (MUL) tree,
14 *i.e.* a phylogenetic model wherein the subgenomes of hybrid species are displayed as separate
15 tips as if they would be distinct species (Huber *et al.*, 2006), is a promising approach to
16 investigate the evolutionary origin of the allotetraploid *C. arabica*. Analyzing hybrid evolution
17 via a MUL tree has the advantage over a phylogenetic network analysis in that it allows for
18 divergence time analyses to estimate the age of a hybridization event (Estep *et al.*, 2014;
19 Marcussen *et al.*, 2015; McCann *et al.*, 2018).

20 Here, we aim to infer the evolutionary origin of the self-compatible allotetraploid species *C.*
21 *arabica* based on GBS genome fingerprinting combined with a MUL tree approach. We
22 included 23 *Coffea* species among which the seven species that are known to be closely related
23 to *C. arabica*. Our research questions were: (i) Which extant *Coffea* species are genetically
24 most closely related to *C. arabica*? (ii) When did the hybridization event at the origin of *C.*
25 *arabica* occur? (iii) How did self-compatibility evolve in the *Coffea* genus?

26 **Materials & methods**

27 *Taxon sampling and DNA extraction*

28 Leaf samples were collected from 35 accessions of *Coffea* and one of *Tricalysia*, the latter
29 serving as outgroup (Table 1, Supporting Information Table S1). All accessions were part of
30 the herbarium (BR) and the living collections of Meise Botanic Garden, Belgium. The ingroup
31 encompassed 23 *Coffea* species with at least one representative of each of the main clades in
32 the phylogeny of the genus (Hamon *et al.*, 2017; Guyeux *et al.*, 2019). All known species that

1 are closely related to *C. arabica* (i.e. *C. brevipes*, *C. canephora*, *C. congensis*, *C. anthonyi*, *C.*
2 *eugenoides*, *C. heterocalyx*, and *C. kivuensis*) were also part of the ingroup (Maurin *et al.*,
3 2007). DNA extractions were carried out using an optimized cetyltrimethylammonium bromide
4 (CTAB) protocol adapted from Doyle & Doyle (1987). DNA quantities were measured with
5 the Quantifluor dsDNA system on a Promega Quantus Fluorometer (Promega, Madison, USA).

6 *GBS Library preparation*

7 GBS libraries were prepared using a single-enzyme protocol that was slightly adapted from
8 Elshire *et al.* (2011). 100 ng of DNA was digested with *Pst*I (New England Biolabs, Ipswich,
9 USA). The digested DNA fragments were ligated to a barcode adapter-common adapter system
10 (0.045 pmol) with T4 DNA ligase (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, USA). Each in-line barcode
11 was between four and nine basepairs (bp) long, differed from all other barcodes by at least three
12 sites, and had no homopolymers longer than 2 bp. Ligation products were purified with 1.6X
13 MagNa magnetic beads (Rohland & Reich, 2012) and eluted in 30 µl TE. Of the purified DNA
14 eluate, 3 µl were used for amplification with *Taq* 2X Master Mix (New England Biolabs,
15 Ipswich, USA) using a 20-cycles PCR protocol. PCR products were bead-purified with 1.6X
16 MagNa, and their DNA concentrations were quantified with the Quantus Fluorometer.
17 Afterwards, fragment size distributions were assessed using a Qiagen QIAxcel system (Qiagen,
18 Venlo, NL). Equimolar amounts of the GBS libraries were pooled, bead-purified, and 150 bp
19 paired-end sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq-X instrument by Admera Health (South Plainfield,
20 USA). Technical GBS library replicates of 13 samples were made to test reproducibility of
21 genetic distance estimates.

22 *Data processing*

23 The quality of sequence data was validated with FastQC v0.11 (Andrews, 2010) and reads were
24 demultiplexed using GBSX v1.3 (Herten *et al.*, 2015) with one mismatch allowed in barcodes.
25 The maximum length of forward reads was adjusted to 142 bp in order to compensate for
26 variable barcode lengths. The 3' restriction site remnant and the common adapter sequence of
27 forward reads and the 3' restriction site remnant, the barcode, and the barcode adapter sequence
28 of reverse reads were removed with Cutadapt v1.9 (Martin, 2011). The 5' restriction site
29 remnant of forward and reverse reads was trimmed with FASTX-Toolkit v0.0.13 (Gordon &
30 Hannon, 2010). Next, forward and reverse reads with a minimum read length of 60 bp and a
31 minimum overlap of 10 bp were merged using PEAR v0.9.8 (Zhang *et al.*, 2014). Merged reads
32 with a mean base quality below 25 or with more than 5% of the nucleotides uncalled were

1 discarded using prinseq-lite v0.20.4 (Schmieder & Edwards, 2011). Reads containing internal
2 restriction sites were discarded using the OBITools package (Boyer *et al.*, 2016). The trimmed
3 sequencing data is available in the NCBI sequence read archive (BioProject PRJNA612193).

4 *Clustering analyses and genetic distance calculation*

5 Preprocessed reads were analyzed with the GIBPSs toolkit (Hapke & Thiele, 2016), a software
6 package that clusters GBS reads into loci without using a reference genome and that allows for
7 variant calling in mixed-ploidy data (Supporting Information Method S1). We defined a locus
8 as a cluster of at least 20 reads of the same length that consisted of one or more alleles
9 (~haplotypes). Alleles were sequence variants that were supported by at least 5 identical reads
10 in at least one sample. If the number of nucleotide differences between alleles was less than
11 10% of the allele length, they were assigned to the same locus. To remove possible
12 contamination, an additional BLAST search against a local reference database was performed
13 for all alleles in the dataset. This database consisted of RefSeq genomes of viruses, prokaryotes,
14 and fungi (O’Leary *et al.*, 2016), the reference genome sequence of *C. canephora* (Denoëud *et*
15 *al.*, 2014), and the reference chloroplast genome sequence of *C. arabica* (Genbank accession
16 number NC_008535.1). At the time of our analyses, the *C. canephora* reference genome was
17 the only published high quality reference genome sequence of a *Coffea* species. As the *C.*
18 *canephora* chloroplast reference genome sequence was found to differ substantially from the
19 chloroplast genome sequence of many other *Coffea* species (Guyeux *et al.*, 2019), the use of
20 the *C. arabica* chloroplast reference genome sequence resulted in the identification of
21 additional chloroplast alleles in our dataset. The expect value cutoff of the BLAST search was
22 set to 0.0001 and the single best search result was used to deduce the putative origin of each
23 allele. Loci with no allele matching the *Coffea* reference genome sequences were removed.
24 Next, loci with data in less than 5% of the samples were discarded to reduce the amount of
25 missing data. Jaccard genetic similarities (J) between pairs of samples were calculated as the
26 number of common alleles divided by the total number of alleles (Jaccard, 1912). Only loci
27 without missing data in both samples were taken into account for these calculations. Genetic
28 distances were subsequently calculated as $1 - J$ and visualized in a genetic distance matrix using
29 a custom python script.

30 *Phylogenetic and divergence time analyses*

31 One representative sample of each species was selected for MUL phylogenetic tree
32 reconstruction to reduce computation time of the analysis. As genetic distances between

1 conspecific samples were acceptably low compared to interspecific genetic distances, reducing
2 the number of samples per species did not influence the results. Loci of *C. arabica* samples
3 were split into two distinct sets, which corresponded to the subgenomes of the *C. arabica*
4 genome, following a two-step approach. First, the alleles of the putative progenitor species of
5 *C. arabica* were partitioned into two groups: one group with all alleles of *C. brevipes*, *C.*
6 *canephora*, and *C. congensis* and another with all alleles of *C. anthonyi*, *C. eugenioides*, *C.*
7 *kivuensis*, and *C. heterocalyx*. Next, each *C. arabica* allele was compared to all alleles of the
8 same locus in both groups of progenitor species. If a *C. arabica* allele was more similar to an
9 allele in one group of progenitors than to any of the alleles in the other group, the allele was
10 assigned to the corresponding “group-specific” subgenome of *C. arabica*. The entire locus was
11 discarded if allelic data was absent in one or both progenitor groups or if not all alleles of that
12 locus could be assigned to one of the two progenitor groups. Afterwards, locus data was
13 converted into consensus alignments using custom python scripts. The scripts used to process
14 the GIBPSs output files are available on GitLab
15 (https://gitlab.com/ybawin/origin_coffea_arabica).

16 Next, the most optimal substitution model was determined for each locus alignment based on
17 the Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc) using jModelTest
18 v2.1.10 (Darriba *et al.*, 2012). A Maximum Likelihood multilabeled (MUL) phylogenetic tree
19 was reconstructed for each locus alignment with RAxML v8 (Stamatakis, 2014). Up to 1000
20 thousand bootstrap replicates were created for each alignment, but bootstrapping was halted
21 when support values stabilized earlier, which was tested using the extended majority-rule
22 consensus tree criterion (Pattengale *et al.*, 2010). A 75% majority-rule consensus tree was
23 reconstructed for each locus and the information in all locus trees was summarized in one
24 consensus tree using ASTRAL-III (Zhang *et al.*, 2018). A local posterior probability (localPP)
25 threshold of 0.95 was used to accept nodes.

26 In addition, a Bayesian MUL phylogenetic tree was reconstructed for each locus alignment with
27 MrBayes v3.2.6. (Ronquist *et al.*, 2012). The number of generations per run was set to five
28 million. A relative burn-in of ten percent was applied and three replicate runs were performed
29 for every alignment. Convergence within each run was assessed based on the effective sampling
30 size (ESS) (> 200) and the potential scale reduction factor (between 0.99 and 1.01).
31 Convergence between runs was evaluated using the average standard deviation of split
32 frequencies (< 0.01). A consensus tree was reconstructed based on all locus trees using
33 ASTRAL-III. Nodes with a localPP lower than 0.95 were removed.

1 A Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) divergence time analysis was done with
2 BEAST v1.10 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018) and parameters for this analysis were set in BEAUTi v1.10
3 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018). GBS data of separate loci were concatenated to reduce computational
4 complexity. The most parameter-rich substitution model (GTR+G+I) was chosen for the entire
5 dataset, which should compensate for deviations from this model for separate loci and provide
6 accurate results (Abadi *et al.*, 2019). The age of the most recent common ancestor of the *C.*
7 *mannii* - *C. lebruniana* clade and all other *Coffea* species was re-estimated using the age
8 estimate of Tosh *et al.* (2013) as secondary calibration point and a normal prior (mean = 10.77
9 Ma, SD = 1.0 Ma). Evolution was modeled as a Yule process and rates varied across lineages
10 according to an uncorrelated relaxed lognormal molecular clock (Drummond *et al.*, 2006). This
11 clock model was selected based on marginal likelihood estimations using the generalized
12 stepping-stone sampling method (Baele *et al.*, 2016) with five hundred stepping stones and a
13 chain length of one million generations. Five hundred million generations were run to complete
14 the analysis with trees sampled every five thousand generations. Three replicate runs were
15 performed and chain convergence, run convergence, and ESS parameter estimation (> 200)
16 were evaluated with Tracer v1.7.1 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018). The results of the three runs were
17 combined with LogCombiner v1.10 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018) and a maximum clade credibility
18 tree with a posterior probability limit of 0.9 was reconstructed using TreeAnnotator v1.10.1
19 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018).

20 The evolution of self-compatibility in *Coffea* was inferred using the BEAST maximum clade
21 credibility tree and a Maximum Likelihood reconstruction method implemented in Mesquite
22 v2.75 (Maddison & Maddison, 2006, 2011). The ability of species to self-pollinate was coded
23 as a binary trait (0 = self-incompatible (SI), 1 = self-compatible (SC)) and likelihoods were
24 calculated using a Markov *k*-state one-parameter model (Mk1), assuming a single transition rate
25 between SI and SC. Character states were assigned to nodes based on a likelihood ratio test
26 with a likelihood decision limit of two. If the difference in log-likelihood of SI and SC was two
27 or more, the state with the highest likelihood was accepted as the most likely state. Nodes with
28 a log-likelihood difference lower than two were considered to be ambiguous.

29 **Results**

30 *GBS summary data and ancestry of Coffea arabica*

31 In total, 23 676 loci (including 47 chloroplast loci) of a size between 60 and 273 bp and with
32 data for at least 5 percent of the samples were retrieved. Out of a total of 3 901 029 nucleotide

1 sites sequenced, 237 619 sites (6.09 %) were variable. The number of loci without missing data
2 in each pair of samples was sufficiently high to obtain stable genetic distance estimates (Fig.
3 1a, Supporting Information Fig. S1, Supporting Information Fig. S2). However, the number of
4 chloroplast loci was too low to infer distance estimates solely based on this set of loci (data not
5 shown). Genetic distance values were highly reproducible, as genetic distances between
6 technical replicates (0.02 – 0.04) were much lower than the mean genetic distance between
7 different accessions (0.88) (Fig. 1b, Supporting Information Fig. S3). Considering the two
8 species groups containing all species closely related to *C. arabica*, genetic distances between
9 *C. brevipes*, *C. canephora*, and *C. congensis* on the one hand and *C. anthonyi*, *C. heterocalyx*,
10 *C. eugenioides*, and *C. kivuensis* on the other were moderately high (0.87 – 0.89). Within these
11 groups, *C. eugenioides* (0.66 – 0.68) and *C. canephora* (0.63 – 0.65) displayed the lowest
12 genetic distances to the *C. arabica* accessions (Fig. 1b, Supporting Information Fig. S3). These
13 distances were substantially lower than the genetic distance between *C. arabica* and the second-
14 most genetically similar species in each group (*C. kivuensis*: 0.73 – 0.76; *C. congensis*: 0.78-
15 0.79), showing that among the species included in this analysis, *C. eugenioides* and *C.*
16 *canephora* are genetically most closely related to *C. arabica*.

17 *Phylogenetic reconstruction and divergence time analysis*

18 The topology of the phylogenetic trees reconstructed with Maximum Likelihood (Supporting
19 Information Fig. S4) and Bayesian inference were identical (Supporting Information Fig. S5).
20 Within these trees, *C. arabica* subgenome A was sister to *C. eugenioides* (localPP: 1), whereas
21 *C. arabica* subgenome B was sister to *C. canephora* (localPP: 1). In the clade of *C. arabica*
22 subgenome A, the West-African species *C. anthonyi* and *C. heterocalyx* branched off first
23 followed by *C. kivuensis*, which was positioned close to *C. eugenioides*. In the clade containing
24 *C. arabica* subgenome B, *C. brevipes* was the most early diverged species, while *C. congensis*
25 was a sister species to *C. canephora*. The stem age of the *C. arabica* subgenome A was
26 estimated around 934 thousand years, while the stem age of the *C. arabica* subgenome B was
27 estimated around 720 thousand years (Fig. 2). The highest posterior density interval of both
28 estimates, which is the credible interval containing 95% of the values sampled by the MCMC
29 chain, overlapped between 543 thousand years and 1.08 million years. The age estimates of *C.*
30 *arabica* were much younger than the estimates of other *Coffea* species in our dataset.

31 The ancestral state reconstruction of self-compatibility in *Coffea* showed that most ancestors of
32 extant *Coffea* species were most likely self-incompatible (Supporting Information Fig. S6). The
33 ancestral state of all nodes in the clade comprising *C. arabica* subgenome A and the two other

1 known self-compatible *Coffea* species (i.e. *C. heterocalyx* and *C. anthonyi*) remained
2 ambiguous, as SI and SC were both assigned to the recent common ancestors of these species
3 with similar log likelihood values.

4 **Discussion**

5 The current study provides a clear hypothesis regarding the evolutionary origin of *C. arabica*.
6 GBS data proved to be more informative than the molecular data used in previous studies
7 (Lashermes *et al.*, 1997; Cros *et al.*, 1998; Raina *et al.*, 1998; Lashermes *et al.*, 1999; Maurin
8 *et al.*, 2007; Tesfaye *et al.*, 2007; Hamon *et al.*, 2009), also because a substantial amount of
9 informative sites seems to be required to get reliable genetic distance estimates for *Coffea*
10 species (Fig. 1). Based on the similarity in plastid DNA markers, previous research suggested
11 that *C. eugenioides* or a close relative of this species was the ovule donor in the *C. arabica*
12 hybridization event (Maurin *et al.*, 2007; Tesfaye *et al.*, 2007; Guyeux *et al.*, 2019). In this
13 study, we confirmed that *C. eugenioides* is genetically more similar to *C. arabica* than *C.*
14 *anthonyi*, *C. heterocalyx*, and *C. kivuensis*. *Coffea kivuensis* was positioned as a sister species
15 to *C. eugenioides* and *C. arabica* subgenome A (Fig. 2, Supporting Information Fig. S4, Fig.
16 S5), corroborating the high morphological and ecological similarity between *C. kivuensis* and
17 *C. arabica*. Chevalier (1947) classified *C. kivuensis* as a variety of *C. eugenioides*, which is in
18 accordance with the low genetic distances between *C. kivuensis* and *C. eugenioides* found in
19 this study. However, we believe that the classification of *C. kivuensis* as a separate species is
20 justified, because genetic distance values between these species were substantially higher than
21 the intraspecific genetic distances estimated in this study (Fig. 1, Supporting Information Fig.
22 S3). The West-Central African species *C. anthonyi* and *C. heterocalyx* were more distantly
23 related to *C. arabica*, reflecting their geographical distance to this species.

24 Using our GBS and MUL tree approach, we confirmed that *C. canephora* was the putative
25 pollen donor in the hybridization event prior to the emergence of *C. arabica*. *C. congensis* and
26 *C. brevipes* were clearly more distantly related to *C. arabica* subgenome B (Fig. 2, Supporting
27 Information Fig. S4, Fig. S5). *Coffea canephora* currently has one of the widest natural
28 distribution ranges in the *Coffea* genus, reaching from Guinea to Tanzania, but it does not
29 naturally co-occur with *C. arabica* (Supporting Information Fig. S7, Davis *et al.*, 2006). Using
30 single nucleotide polymorphisms in *C. canephora* individuals that were sampled across its
31 entire natural range, *C. arabica* was found to be genetically most similar to *C. canephora*
32 accessions in northern Uganda (Merot-L'anthoene *et al.*, 2019; Scalabrin *et al.*, 2020).

1 Although the natural ranges of *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides* overlap in East-Central Africa
2 (Supporting Information Fig. S7), natural hybrids between these species in this area are not
3 known so far. The absence of known recent hybrids between *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides*
4 can be explained by three factors. First, although both species can be found in the same area,
5 their habitat preference differs substantially. *Coffea eugenioides* is especially found near forest
6 edges, while *C. canephora* is mainly restricted to the forest interior (Noirot *et al.*, 2016).
7 Second, the flowering time of both species does not coincide (Noirot *et al.*, 2016). The
8 flowering time of *Coffea* species is highly species-specific and genetically controlled,
9 hampering interspecific gene flow via pollination (Gomez *et al.*, 2016). Third, the success rate
10 of induced cross-pollination between *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides* is very low, suggesting
11 the presence of additional reproductive barriers (Noirot *et al.*, 2016). However, changes in
12 environmental conditions may have broken (some of the) reproductive barriers between *C.*
13 *canephora* and *C. eugenioides* in the past, enabling a successful interspecific hybridization
14 between these species at the origin of *C. arabica*. In support of this hypothesis, Gomez *et al.*
15 (2016) reported that the flowering time of *C. arabica*, *C. canephora*, and *C. liberica* became
16 more synchronized in New Caledonia, in response to changes in precipitation regime, resulting
17 in the emergence of spontaneous hybrids. Similar events were also observed in living
18 collections, where different *Coffea* species that were *ex situ* conserved in a common
19 environment more easily hybridized (Noirot *et al.*, 2016).

20 We estimated the time of the *C. arabica* hybridization event between 1.08 million and 543
21 thousand years ago. The *C. arabica* subgenomes were the youngest taxa within the phylogenetic
22 tree, meaning that the diversity in extant *Coffea* species was generally established before *C.*
23 *arabica* emerged. The age interval found in this study overlaps with the maximum age estimate
24 of Yu *et al.* (2011) but contained much older estimates than the estimates provided by Cenci *et*
25 *al.* (2012) and Scalabrin *et al.* (2020). Interestingly, age estimates based on the diversity *within*
26 *C. arabica* (Cenci *et al.*, 2012; Scalabrin *et al.*, 2020) situated the origin of *C. arabica* much
27 more recent than estimates based on the diversity *between Coffea* species (Yu *et al.*, 2011; this
28 study), which might suggest that *C. arabica* underwent a large genetic bottleneck (Scalabrin *et*
29 *al.*, 2020). Moreover, the median values of the stem age estimates of both subgenomes (*i.e.* 965
30 and 720 thousand years) were higher than the estimate of Yu *et al.* (2011), plausibly situating
31 the *C. arabica* hybridization event further back in time. Changing environmental conditions
32 during this period might have played an important role in *C. arabica* speciation. Pollen records
33 of marine and lake sediment cores in the Congo basin and East Africa indicate that the

1 Afromontane forest regularly expanded to lower altitudes during the glacial periods between
2 1.05 million and 600 thousand years ago (Dupont *et al.*, 2001; Owen *et al.*, 2018). These forest
3 expansions might have enlarged the contact zone between *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides*
4 and the coinciding altered environmental conditions may have weakened interspecific
5 reproductive barriers between these species. Moreover, the aridification of East-Africa over the
6 past 575 thousand years may have changed the natural ranges of *C. canephora*, *C. eugenioides*,
7 and *C. arabica* to their current distribution area (Owen *et al.*, 2018). The emergence of hybrid
8 species is often linked to climate-induced range shifts of progenitor species (Kadereit, 2015;
9 Arnold, 2016; Wagner *et al.*, 2019). Likewise, the origin and subsequent emergence of *C.*
10 *arabica* might have been influenced by climate fluctuations in East-Africa during the last one
11 million years.

12 The reconstruction of the evolution of self-compatibility in *Coffea* showed that the character
13 state regarding self-compatibility of each node in the clade of *C. arabica* subgenome A and
14 other self-compatible *Coffea* species (*C. heterocalyx* and *C. anthonyi*) could not unambiguously
15 be inferred (Supporting Information Fig. S6). However, the fact that *C. arabica* is closest related
16 to two self-incompatible species may suggest that the ovule donor of *C. arabica* was self-
17 incompatible as well. Consequently, self-compatibility in *Coffea* most likely evolved first in
18 the most recent common ancestor of *C. heterocalyx* and *C. anthonyi*, followed by a reversal to
19 self-incompatibility in the most recent common ancestor *C. kivuensis* and *C. eugenioides*, and
20 the independent development of self-compatibility in *C. arabica*. The breakdown of self-
21 incompatibility in allopolyploids with self-incompatible progenitor species is believed to be a
22 survival strategy to assure reproduction when the number of available mating partners is limited
23 (Osabe *et al.*, 2012). The presence of self-compatible species at the basis of the clade containing
24 *C. arabica* subgenome A may suggest that the ancestor of *C. arabica* possessed a certain
25 aptitude for the change to self-compatibility that may have facilitated its survival after its
26 emergence.

27 Age estimates of allopolyploids may deviate from their actual age because the genotypes of
28 progenitor species included in the dating analyses were divergent from the actual progenitor
29 genotypes (Doyle & Egan, 2010). Our *C. canephora* specimens were sampled in D.R. Congo
30 from populations closely related to the Ugandan populations (Supporting Information Table
31 S1), which were found to be genetically most similar to *C. arabica* (Merot-L'anthoene *et al.*,
32 2019; Scalabrin *et al.*, 2020). Although we do not know which *C. eugenioides* populations are
33 genetically closest to *C. arabica*, age estimates of *C. arabica* are probably less affected by the

1 origin of the *C. eugenioides* genotype as genetic diversity in this species was found to be very
2 low compared to the diversity in *C. canephora* (Merot-L'anthoene *et al.*, 2019).

3 Overall, we have clearly confirmed *C. canephora* and *C. eugenioides* as the closest known
4 relatives of *C. arabica*. The hybridization event at the origin of *C. arabica* was estimated
5 between 1.08 million and 543 thousand years ago and was linked to changing environmental
6 conditions in East-Africa during glacial-interglacial cycles in the last one million years. We
7 inferred that self-compatible species in *Coffea* were a paraphyletic group and that self-
8 compatibility most likely evolved twice in *Coffea*. Our research clarified the evolutionary
9 relationships between the direct wild relatives of cultivated Arabica coffee, providing a strong
10 instrument for the selection of wild plant species in coffee breeding programs. The closest
11 relatives of a crop often contain more favorable characteristics for breeding than distantly
12 related species, showing the importance of phylogenetic studies on crop wild relatives for crop
13 improvement (Preece *et al.*, 2015, 2018; Martín-Robles *et al.*, 2019).

14 **Acknowledgements**

15 We thank Cephas Masumbuko Ndabaga, Eberhard Fischer, Samuel Vanden Abeele, and Filip
16 Vandeloos for collecting plant material, and Sabine Van Glabeke and Zyon Vansteelandt for
17 their technical support. This research was funded by Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO)
18 (project N° G056517N).

19 **Author Contribution**

20 IRR, OH, and SJB designed the research. JCIMM and PS provided the leaf material. YB, TR,
21 and AS planned and executed the lab work. YB, TR, AH, and SJB processed and analyzed the
22 sequence data. YB wrote the manuscript, which was revised and commented by all authors.

23 **References**

24 Abadi S, Azouri D, Pupko T, Mayrose, I. 2019. Model selection may not be a mandatory step
25 for phylogeny reconstruction. *Nature Communications* 10: 1–11.

26 Abbott R, Albach D, Ansell S, Arntzen JW, Baird SJE, Bierne N, Boughman J, Brelsford A,
27 Buerkle CA, Buggs R *et al.* 2013. Hybridization and speciation. *Journal of Evolutionary*
28 *Biology* 26: 229–246.

29 Aerts R, Berecha G, Gijbels P, Hundera K, Van Glabeke S, Vandepitte K, Muys B, Roldán-
30 Ruiz I, Honnay O. 2012. Genetic variation and risks of introgression in the wild *Coffea arabica*

- 1 gene pool in south-western Ethiopian montane rainforests. *Evolutionary Applications* 6: 243–
2 252.
- 3 Aerts R, Geeraert L, Berecha G, Hundera K, Muys B, De Kort H, Honnay O. 2017 Conserving
4 wild Arabica coffee: Emerging threats and opportunities. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and*
5 *Environment* 237: 75-79.
- 6 Andrews S. 2010. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.
7 <https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/>.
- 8 Arnold ML. 2016. Anderson’s and Stebbins’ Prophecy Comes True: Genetic Exchange in
9 Fluctuating Environments. *Systematic Botany* 41: 4–16.
- 10 Baele G, Lemey P, Suchard, MA. 2016 Genealogical Working Distributions for Bayesian
11 Model Testing with Phylogenetic Uncertainty. *Systematic Biology* 65: 250–264.
- 12 Berthou F, Trouslot P, Hamon S, Vedel F, Quetier F. 1980. Analyse en électrophorèse du
13 polymorphisme biochimique des caféiers: Variation enzymatique dans dix-huit populations
14 sauvages. Variation de l’ ADN mitochondrial dans les espèces: *C. canephora*, *C. eugenioides*
15 et *C. arabica*. *Café Cacao Thé* 24: 313–326.
- 16 Berthou F, Mathieu C, Vedel F. 1983. Chloroplast and mitochondrial DNA variation as
17 indicator of phylogenetic relationships in the genus *Coffea* L. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*
18 65: 77–84.
- 19 Boyer F, Mercier C, Bonin A, Le Bras Y, Taberlet P, Coissac E. 2016. OBITOOLS: a UNIX -
20 inspired software package for DNA metabarcoding. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 16: 176–
21 182.
- 22 Bridson DM. 1982. Studies in *Coffea* and *Psilanthus* (Rubiaceae subfam. Cinchonoideae) for
23 part 2 of ‘Flora of Tropical East Africa’: Rubiaceae. *Kew Bulletin* 36: 817–859.
- 24 Bridson D, Verdcourt B. 1988. *Coffea*. In: Polhill RM, ed. Flora of Tropical East Africa.
25 Rubiaceae (Part 2). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: AA Balkema, 703-727.
- 26 Clarindo WR, Carvalho CR. 2008. First *Coffea arabica* karyogram showing that this species is
27 a true allotetraploid. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 274: 237–241.

- 1 Cenci A, Combes MC, Lashermes P. 2012. Genome evolution in diploid and tetraploid *Coffea*
2 species as revealed by comparative analysis of orthologous genome segments. *Plant Molecular*
3 *Biology* 78: 135–145.
- 4 Charrier A, Berthaud J. 1985. Botanical Classification of Coffee. In: Clifford MN, Willson KC,
5 Eds. Coffee: Botany, Biochemistry, and Production of Beans and Beverage. London, UK:
6 Croom Helm, 13–47.
- 7 Chester M, Leitch, AR, Soltis PS, Soltis DE. 2010. Review of the Application of Modern
8 Cytogenetic Methods (FISH/GISH) to the Study of Reticulation (Polyploidy/Hybridisation).
9 *Genes* 1: 166–192.
- 10 Chevalier A. 1947. Les caféiers du globe, fasc. III: systématique des caféiers et faux-caféiers
11 maladies et insectes nuisibles. *Encyclopédie Biologique* 28: 1–352.
- 12 Cros J, Combes MC, Trouslot P, Anthony F, Hamon S, Charrier A, Lashermes P. 1998.
13 Phylogenetic Analysis of Chloroplast DNA Variation in *Coffea* L. *Molecular Phylogenetics* 9:
14 109–117.
- 15 Coulibaly I, Noirot M, Lorieux M, Charrier A, Hamon S, Louarn J. 2002. Introgression of self-
16 compatibility from *Coffea heterocalyx* to the cultivated species *Coffea canephora*. *Theoretical*
17 *and Applied Genetics* 105: 994–999.
- 18 Darriba D, Taboada GL, Doallo R, Posada D. 2012. jModelTest 2: more models, new heuristics
19 and parallel computing. *Nature Methods* 9: 772.
- 20 Davis AP, Govaerts R, Bridson DM, Stoffelen P. 2006. An annotated taxonomic conspectus of
21 the genus *Coffea* (Rubiaceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 152: 465–512.
- 22 Davis AP, Gole TW, Baena S, Moat J. 2012. The Impact of Climate Change on Indigenous
23 Arabica Coffee (*Coffea arabica*): Predicting Future Trends and Identifying Priorities. *PLoS*
24 *One* 7: 1–13.
- 25 Davis AP, Chadburn H, Moat J, O’Sullivan R, Hargreaves S, Lughadha EN. 2019. High
26 extinction risk for wild coffee species and implications for coffee sector sustainability. *Science*
27 *Advantages* 5: 1–9.
- 28 Denoeud F, Carretero-paulet L, Dereeper A, Droc G, Guyot R, Pietrella M, Zheng C, Alberti
29 A, Anthony F, Aprea G *et al.* 2014. The coffee genome provides insight into the convergent
30 evolution of caffeine biosynthesis. *Science* 345: 1181–1184.

- 1 Doyle JJ, Doyle JL. 1987. A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf
2 tissue. *Phytochemical Bulletin* 19: 11–15.
- 3 Doyle JJ, Egan AN. 2010. Dating the origins of polyploidy events. *New Phytologist* 186, 73–
4 85.
- 5 Drummond AJ, Ho SYW, Phillips MJ, Rambaut A. 2006. Relaxed Phylogenetics and Dating
6 with Confidence. *PLoS Biology* 4: e88.
- 7 Dupont LM, Donner B, Schneider R, Wefer G. 2001. Mid-Pleistocene environmental change
8 in tropical Africa began as early as 1.05 Ma. *Geology* 29: 195–198.
- 9 Elshire RJ, Glaubitz JC, Sun Q, Poland JA, Kawamoto K, Buckler ES, Mitchell SE. 2011. A
10 Robust, Simple Genotyping-by-Sequencing (GBS) Approach for High Diversity Species. *PLoS*
11 *One*, 6: 1–10.
- 12 Estep MC, Mckain MR, Diaz DV, Zhong J, Hodge JG, Hodkinson TR, Layton DJ, Malcomber
13 ST, Pasquet R, Kellogg, EA. 2014. Allopolyploidy, diversification, and the Miocene grassland
14 expansion. *PNAS* 111: 15149–15154.
- 15 Geeraert L, Hulsmans E, Helsen K, Berecha G, Aerts R, Honnay O. 2019. Rapid diversity and
16 structure degradation over time through continued coffee cultivation in remnant Ethiopian
17 Afromontane forests. *Biological Conservation* 236: 8–16.
- 18 Gomez C, Desinoy M, Hamon S, Hamon P, Salmon D, Akaffou DS, Legnate H, de Kochko A,
19 Mangeas M, Poncet V. 2016. Shift in precipitation regime promotes interspecific hybridization
20 of introduced *Coffea* species. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6: 3240–3255.
- 21 Gordon A, Hannon G. 2010. Fastx-toolkit. FASTQ/A short-reads preprocessing tools
22 (unpublished).
- 23 Govaerts R, Ruhsam M, Andersson L, Robbrecht E, Bridson D, Davis A, Schanzer I, Sonké B.
24 2020. *World Checklist of Rubiaceae*. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. [WWW
25 document] URL <http://wccsp.science.kew.org/>. [accessed 29 February 2020].
- 26 Guyeux C, Charr JC, Tran HTM, Furtado A, Henry RJ, Crouzillat D, Guyot R, Hamon P. 2019.
27 Evaluation of chloroplast genome annotation tools and application to analysis of the evolution
28 of coffee species. *PLoS ONE* 14: e0216347.

- 1 Hamon et al., 2009. Physical mapping of rDNA and heterochromatin in chromosomes of 16
2 *Coffea* species: A revised view of species differentiation. *Chromosome Research* 17: 291–304.
- 3 Hamon P, Grover CE, Davis AP, Rakotomalala JJ, Raharimalala NE, Albert VA, Sreenath HL,
4 Stoffelen P, Mitchell SE, Couturon E *et al.* 2017. Genotyping-by-sequencing provides the first
5 well-resolved phylogeny for coffee (*Coffea*) and insights into the evolution of caffeine content
6 in its species GBS coffee phylogeny and the evolution of caffeine content. *Molecular*
7 *Phylogenetics and Evolution* 109: 351–361.
- 8 Hapke A, Thiele D. 2016. GIBPSs: a toolkit for fast and accurate analyses of genotyping-by-
9 sequencing data without a reference genome. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 16: 979–990.
- 10 Herten K, Hestand MS, Vermeesch JR, Van Houdt JKJ. 2015. GBSX: a toolkit for experimental
11 design and demultiplexing genotyping by sequencing experiments. *BMC Bioinformatics* 16: 1–
12 6.
- 13 Hindorf H, Omondi CO. 2011. A review of three major fungal diseases of *Coffea arabica* L. in
14 the rainforests of Ethiopia and progress in breeding for resistance in Kenya. *Journal of*
15 *Advanced Research* 2: 109–120.
- 16 Hu Y, Resende Jr MFR, Bombarely A, Brym M, Bassil E, Chambers AH. 2019. Genomics-
17 based diversity analysis of *Vanilla* species using a *Vanilla planifolia* draft genome and
18 Genotyping-By-Sequencing. *Scientific Reports* 9: 1–16.
- 19 Huber KT, Oxelman B, Lott M, Moulton V. 2006. Reconstructing the Evolutionary History of
20 Polyploids from Multilabeled Trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 23: 1784–1791.
- 21 ICO. 2020a. Total production by all exporting countries. Version January 2020.
- 22 ICO. 2020b. Country Data on the Global Coffee Trade. [WWW document] URL
23 http://www.ico.org/profiles_e.asp. [accessed 29 February 2020].
- 24 Jaccard P. 1912. The Distribution of the Flora in the Alpine Zone. *New Phytologist* 11: 37–50.
- 25 Kadereit JW. 2015. The geography of hybrid speciation in plants. *Taxon* 64: 673–687.
- 26 Lashermes P, Combes MC, Trouslot P, Charrier A. 1997. Phylogenetic relationships of coffee-
27 tree species (*Coffea* L.) as inferred from ITS sequences of nuclear ribosomal DNA. *Theoretical*
28 *and Applied Genetics* 94: 947–955.

- 1 Lashermes P, Combes MC, Robert J, Trouslot P, D'Hont A, Anthony F, Charrier A. 1999.
- 2 Molecular characterisation and origin of the *Coffea arabica* L. genome. *Molecular & General*
- 3 *Genetics* 261, 259–266.
- 4 Lashermes P, Combes, MC, Hueber Y, Severac D, Dereeper A. 2014. Genome rearrangements
- 5 derived from homoeologous recombination following allopolyploidy speciation in coffee. *The*
- 6 *Plant Journal* 78: 674–685.
- 7 Maddison WP, Maddison DR. 2006. StochChar: A package of Mesquite modules for stochastic
- 8 models of character evolution. Version 1.1.
- 9 Maddison WP, Maddison DR. 2011. Mesquite: A modular system for evolutionary analysis.
- 10 Version 2.75. <http://mesquiteproject.org>.
- 11 Mallet J. 2005. Hybridization as an invasion of the genome. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*
- 12 20: 229–237.
- 13 Marcussen T, Heier L, Brysting AK, Oxelman B, Jakobsen KS. 2015. From Gene Trees to a
- 14 Dated Allopolyploid Network: Insights from the Angiosperm Genus *Viola* (Violaceae).
- 15 *Systematic Biology* 64: 84–101.
- 16 Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.
- 17 *Embnet.journal* 17: 10–12.
- 18 Martín-Robles N, López JM, Freschet GT, Poorter H, Roumet C, Milla R. 2019. Root traits of
- 19 herbaceous crops: Pre-adaptation to cultivation or evolution under domestication? *Functional*
- 20 *Ecology* 33: 273–285.
- 21 Maurin O, Davis AP, Chester M, Mvungi EF, Jaufeerally-Fakim Y, Fay MF. 2007. Towards a
- 22 Phylogeny for *Coffea* (Rubiaceae): Identifying Well-supported Lineages Based on Nuclear and
- 23 Plastid DNA Sequences. *Annals of Botany* 100: 1565–1583.
- 24 McCann J, Jang TS, Macas J, Schneeweiss GM, Matzke NJ, Novák P, Stuessy TF, Villaseñor
- 25 JL, Weiss-Schneeweiss H. 2018. Dating the Species Network: Allopolyploidy and Repetitive
- 26 DNA Evolution in American Daisies (*Melampodium* sect . *Melampodium*, Asteraceae).
- 27 *Systematic Biology* 67: 1–15.
- 28 Merot-L'anthoene V, Tournebize R, Darracq O, Rattina V, Lepelley M, Bellanger L,
- 29 Tranchant-Dubreuil C, Coulée M, Pégard M, Metairon S *et al.* 2019. Development and
- 30 evaluation of a genome-wide Coffee 8.5K SNP array and its application for high-density genetic

- 1 mapping and for investigating the origin of *Coffea arabica* L. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* 17:
2 1418–1430.
- 3 Moat J, Gole TW, Davis AP. 2019. Least concern to endangered: Applying climate change
4 projections profoundly influences the extinction risk assessment for wild Arabica coffee.
5 *Global Change Biology* 25: 390–403.
- 6 Noirot M, Charrier A, Stoffelen P, Anthony F. 2016. Reproductive isolation, gene flow and
7 speciation in the former *Coffea* subgenus: a review. *Trees* 30, 597–608.
- 8 O'Leary NA, Wright MW, Brister JR, Ciufu S, Haddad D, McVeigh R, Rajput B, Robbertse B,
9 Smith-white B, Ako-Adjei D *et al.* 2016. Reference sequence (RefSeq) database at NCBI:
10 current status, taxonomic expansion, and functional annotation. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44:
11 733–745.
- 12 Osabe K, Kawanabe T, Sasaki T, Ishikawa R, Okazaki K, Dennis, SE, Kazama T, Fujimoto R.
13 2012. Multiple Mechanisms and Challenges for the Application of Allopolyploidy in Plants.
14 *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 13: 8696–8721.
- 15 Owen RB, Muiruri VM, Lowenstein TK, Renaut RW, Rabideaux N, Luo S, Deino AL, Sier,
16 MJ, Dupont-Nivet G, McNulty EP *et al.* 2018. Progressive aridification in East Africa over the
17 last half million years and implications for human evolution. *PNAS* 115: 11174–11179.
- 18 Pattengale ND, Alipour M, Bininda-emonds ORP, Moret BME, Stamatakis A. 2010. How
19 Many Bootstrap Replicates Are Necessary? *Journal of Computational Biology* 17: 337–354.
- 20 Payseur BA, Rieseberg LH. 2016. A genomic perspective on hybridization and speciation.
21 *Molecular Ecology* 25: 2337–2360.
- 22 Pelé A, Rousseau-gueutin M, Chèvre AM. 2018. Speciation Success of Polyploid Plants
23 Closely Relates to the Regulation of Meiotic Recombination. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 9: 1–
24 9.
- 25 Preece C, Livarda A, Wallace M, Martin G, Charles M, Christin P, Jones G, Rees M, Osborne
26 CP. 2015. Were Fertile Crescent crop progenitors higher yielding than other wild species that
27 were never domesticated? *New Phytologist* 207: 905–913.
- 28 Preece C, Clamp NF, Warham G, Charles M, Rees M, Jones G, Osborne CP. 2018. Cereal
29 progenitors differ in stand harvest characteristics from related wild grasses. *Journal of Ecology*
30 106: 1286–1297.

- 1 Raina SN, Mukai Y, Yamamoto M. 1998. In situ hybridization identifies the diploid progenitor
2 species of *Coffea arabica* (Rubiaceae). *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 97: 1204–1209.
- 3 Renny-Byfield S, Wendel JF. 2014. Doubling down on genomes: Polyploidy and crop plants.
4 *American Journal of Botany* 101: 1711–1725.
- 5 Rohland N, Reich D. 2012. Cost-effective, high-throughput DNA sequencing libraries for
6 multiplexed target capture. *Genome Research* 22: 939–946.
- 7 Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, Höhna S, Larget B, Liu L,
8 Suchard MA, Huelsenbeck JP. 2012. MrBayes 3.2 : Efficient Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference
9 and Model Choice Across a Large Model Space. *Systematic Biology* 61: 539–542.
- 10 Scalabrin S, Toniutti L, Di Gaspero G, Scaglione D, Magris G, Vidotto M, Pinosio S, Cattonaro
11 F, Magni F, Jurman I *et al.* 2020. A single polyploidization event at the origin of the tetraploid
12 genome of *Coffea arabica* is responsible for the extremely low genetic variation in wild and
13 cultivated germplasm. *Scientific Reports* 10: 1–13.
- 14 Schmieder R, Edwards R. 2011. Quality control and preprocessing of metagenomic datasets.
15 *Bioinformatics* 27: 863–864.
- 16 Sherman-Broyles S, Bombarely A, Doyle J. 2017. Characterizing the allopolyploid species
17 among the wild relatives of soybean: Utility of reduced representation genotyping
18 methodologies. *Journal of Systematics and Evolution* 55: 365–376.
- 19 Soltis PS, Soltis DE. 2009. The Role of Hybridization in Plant Speciation. *Annual Review in*
20 *Plant Biology* 60: 561–588.
- 21 Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML Version 8: A tool for Phylogenetic Analysis and Post-Analysis
22 of Large Phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30: 1312–1313.
- 23 Stoffelen P. 1998. *Coffea* and *Psilanthus* in Tropical Africa: a systematic and palynological
24 study, including a revision of the West and Central African Species. PhD Thesis, KU Leuven,
25 Leuven, Belgium.
- 26 Stoffelen P, Noirot M, Couturon E, Bontems S, De Block P, Anthony F. 2009. *Coffea anthonyi*,
27 a new self-compatible Central African coffee species, closely related to an ancestor of *Coffea*
28 *arabica*. *Taxon* 58: 133–140.

- 1 Suchard MA, Lemey P, Baele G, Ayres DL, Drummond AJ, Rambaut A. 2018. Bayesian
2 phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using BEAST 1.10. *Virus Evolution* 4: 1–5.
- 3 Tadesse G, Zavaleta E, Shennan C, FitzSimmons M. 2014. Policy and demographic factors
4 shape deforestation patterns and socio-ecological processes in southwest Ethiopian coffee
5 agroecosystems. *Applied Geography* 54: 149–159.
- 6 Tesfaye K, Borsch T, Govers K, Bekele E. 2007. Characterization of *Coffea* chloroplast
7 microsatellites and evidence for the recent divergence of *C. arabica* and *C. eugenioides*
8 chloroplast genomes. *Genome* 50: 1112–1129.
- 9 Tosh J, Dessein S, Buerki S, Groeninckx I, Mouly A, Bremer B, Smets EF, De Block P. 2013.
10 Evolutionary history of the Afro-Madagascan *Ixora* species (Rubiaceae): species diversification
11 and distribution of key morphological traits inferred from dated molecular phylogenetic trees.
12 *Annals of Botany* 112: 1723–1742.
- 13 Vega FE, Infante F, Johnson AJ. 2015. The Genus *Hypothenemus*, with Emphasis on *H.*
14 *hampei*, the Coffee Berry Borer. In: Vega FE, Hofstetter RW, eds. *Bark Beetles: Biology and*
15 *Ecology of Native and Invasive Species*. London, UK: Academic Press, 427–494.
- 16 Wagner F, Ott T, Zimmer C, Reichhart V, Vogt R, Oberprieler C. 2019. ‘At the crossroads
17 towards polyploidy’: Genomic divergence and extent of homoploid hybridization are drivers
18 for the formation of the ox-eye daisy polyploid complex (*Leucanthemum*, Compositae-
19 Anthemideae). *New Phytologist* 223: 2039–2053.
- 20 Wendel JF, Lisch D, Hu G, Mason AS. 2018. The long and short of doubling down: polyploidy,
21 epigenetics, and the temporal dynamics of genome fractionation. *Current Opinion in Genetics*
22 *and Development* 49: 1–7.
- 23 Whitney KD, Ahern JR, Campbell LG, Albert LP, King MS. 2010. Patterns of hybridization in
24 plants. *Perspectives in Plant Evolution and Systematics* 12: 175–182.
- 25 Yu Q, Guyot R, de Kochko A, Byers A, Navajas-pérez R, Langston BJ, Dubreuil-Tranchant C,
26 Paterson AH, Poncet V, Nagai C *et al.* 2011. Micro-collinearity and genome evolution in the
27 vicinity of an ethylene receptor gene of cultivated diploid and allotetraploid coffee species
28 (*Coffea*). *The Plant Journal* 67: 305–317.
- 29 Zhang J, Kobert K, Flouri T, Stamatakis A. 2014. PEAR: a fast and accurate Illumina Paired-
30 End reAd mergeR. *Bioinformatics* 30: 614–620.

1 Zhang C, Rabiee M, Sayyari E, Mirarab S. 2018. ASTRAL-III: polynomial time species tree
2 reconstruction from partially resolved gene trees. *BMC Bioinformatics* 19: 15–30.

3 **Fig. 1.** Heat map of the number of common loci **(a)** and the Jaccard genetic distance estimates
4 **(b)** between the 23 *Coffea* accessions and one *Tricalysia* accession that were included in the
5 molecular dating analysis. Annotated heat maps of the complete data set are available as
6 supporting information (supporting information Fig. S2 and S3). The number of common loci
7 is indicated in false color ranging from white (no common loci) to black (11 thousand common
8 loci). The Jaccard genetic distance estimates are shown in false color ranging from black
9 (identical) to white (completely different). *Coffea eugenioides* and *C. canephora* were
10 genetically most similar to *C. arabica*, confirming that they are the putative progenitors of this
11 species.

12 **Fig 2.** BEAST maximum clade credibility tree of the genus *Coffea* inferred from a combined
13 dataset of variable GBS loci comprising 551 852 nucleotide sites. A *Tricalysia* species was used
14 as outgroup. The node corresponding to the secondary calibration point is indicated by an
15 asterisk (*). Blue node bars display highest posterior density (HPD) intervals and a time scale
16 axis (in Ma) is depicted below the tree. HPD intervals of the *C. arabica* subgenomes overlapped
17 between 543 thousand years and 1.08 million years ago, situating the origin of *C. arabica* within
18 this time interval.

19

1 **Table 1.** Overview of the species and the number of accessions that were included in this study.

Taxon name	Number of accessions
Outgroup	
<i>Tricalysia</i> sp.	1
Ingroup	
<i>Coffea anthonyi</i> Stoff. & F.Anthony	2
<i>Coffea arabica</i> L.	3
<i>Coffea brevipes</i> Hiern	2
<i>Coffea canephora</i> Pierre ex A.Froehner	2
<i>Coffea charrieriana</i> Stoff. & F.Anthony	2
<i>Coffea congensis</i> A.Froehner	2
<i>Coffea dubardii</i> Jumelle	1
<i>Coffea eugenioides</i> S.Moore	2
<i>Coffea humilis</i> A.Chev.	1
<i>Coffea kapakata</i> (A.Chev.) Bridson	1
<i>Coffea kivuensis</i> Lebrun	2
<i>Coffea lebruniana</i> Germ. & Kesler	1
<i>Coffea liberica</i> ex Hiern	2
<i>Coffea lulandoensis</i> Bridson	2
<i>Coffea macrocarpa</i> A.Rich.	1
<i>Coffea mannii</i> (Hook.f.) A.P.Davis	1
<i>Coffea pocsii</i> Bridson	1
<i>Coffea pseudozanguebariae</i> Bridson	1
<i>Coffea racemosa</i> Lour.	1
<i>Coffea salvatrix</i> Swynn. & Philipson	1
<i>Coffea sessiliflora</i> Bridson	1
<i>Coffea stenophylla</i> G.Don	2
<i>Coffea heterocalyx</i> Stoff.	1

2

3

