

Original citation:

Allaby, Robin G., Ware, Roselyn and Kistler, Logan (2018) A re-evaluation of the domestication bottleneck from archaeogenomic evidence. *Evolutionary Applications* .
doi:10.1111/eva.12680

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/104822>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0) and may be reused according to the conditions of the license. For more details see: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

A note on versions:

The version presented in WRAP is the published version, or, version of record, and may be cited as it appears here.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

PROF. ROBIN G ALLABY (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5046-002X)

Article type : Special Issue Original Article

Corresponding Author Email ID: r.g.allaby@warwick.ac.uk

A re-evaluation of the domestication bottleneck from archaeogenomic evidence

Robin G. Allaby^{1*}, Roselyn Ware¹ and Logan Kistler²

1. School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

2. Department of Anthropology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, USA

* corresponding author.

Acknowledgements

Data generated for this study was supported by the NERC (NE/L006847/1).

Abstract

Domesticated crops show a reduced level of diversity that is commonly attributed to the ‘domestication bottleneck’; a drastic reduction in the population size associated with sub-sampling the wild progenitor species and the imposition of selection pressures associated with the domestication syndrome. A prediction of the domestication bottleneck is a sharp decline in genetic diversity early in the domestication process. Surprisingly, archaeological genomes of three major annual crops do not indicate that such a drop in diversity occurred early in the domestication process. In light of this

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/eva.12680

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

observation, we revisit the general assumption of the domestication bottleneck concept in our current understanding of the evolutionary process of domestication.

Keywords: archaeogenomics, domestication, domestication bottleneck

Introduction

Domestication is the process by which wild plants and animals become adapted to the human environment as a consequence of their exploitation. In plants, domestication results from the selection of a group of traits collectively termed ‘domestication syndrome’ that make them better suited to the human environment (Harlan et al 1973). Such traits include a loss of shattering, changes in seed size, germination, and architecture (Fuller 2007). Generally, such trait changes are disadvantageous for plants in the wild environment, but advantageous in the human environment, such that domestication is a mutualistic relationship.

Domesticated plants generally show a significant reduction in genetic diversity relative to wild progenitor species, which is attributed to an initial dramatic reduction in population size termed the ‘domestication bottleneck’, followed by an expansion in population size (Meyer and Purugganan 2013), Figure 1. This key concept has been universally applied to models of domestication (e.g. Eyre-Walker and Gaut 1998, Allaby *et al.* 2008, Zhu *et al.* 2004, Gaut *et al.* 2015) and inferred from modern genetic diversity (Meyers *et al.* 2016). Two key drivers underlie the domestication bottleneck concept. Firstly, there is the notion that the domesticate population is derived from a relatively small subsample of the wild population as proto-farmers ‘captured’ small populations for cultivation and effectively isolated them from the wild gene pool. Secondly, the selection pressures involved in the transition to the domesticated form would have further reduced population sizes through the effects of the substitution load (Haldane 1957, Allaby *et al.* 2015), originally referred to by Haldane as ‘the cost of selection’.

The reduction in population size associated with a bottleneck is expected to produce predictable effects. Most obviously, early population genetics theory demonstrated that the constriction in population size, if severe, would lead to a rapid loss of heterozygosity through the increased strength of drift (Nei *et al.* 1975). This lays the foundations for tests of population history (Tajima 1989, Watterson 1986), and more recently extended to the pairwise sequentially Markovian coalescent (PSMC) and the multiple sequentially Markovian coalescent (MSMC) genome wide models using the coalescent to survey the frequency of most recent common ancestor ages and reconstruct a history of population size through time (Li and Durbin 2011, Schiffels and Durbin 2014).

A second type of effect expected from population bottlenecks relates to the efficacy of selection. The increased strength of drift in small populations has a masking effect over selection. This can be explored by considering the strength of selection required to effect the same pace of allele frequency change as would be expected from random genetic drift representing the point at which selection is no stronger than drift, Figure S1. We can see, for instance, that for recessive mutation in an outbreeding plant, the parameter $N_e s$ (the product of effective population size and selection coefficient) is about 63.3 when drift and selection are equable. Therefore, for a selection coefficient (s) of 0.015, such has been found for maize (Hufford *et al.* 2012), effective population size (N_e) would need to be considerably larger than 4220 individuals in order to counter the effects of drift. The equivalent $N_e s$ value for inbreeders is 3.5. Consequently, at these population sizes purifying selection begins to fail and deleterious mutations are expected to become incorporated into the population at a drift-determined rate. Therefore, the domestication bottleneck is expected to lead to an increase in the incorporation of deleterious mutations, or the ‘mutation load’ (Henn *et al.* 2015). A few studies have emerged which confirm this observation in rice (Liu *et al.* 2017), sunflower (Renaut and Rieseberg 2015), and maize (Wang *et al.* 2017), as well as dogs and horses in the case of animal domesticates (Schubert *et al.* 2014, Marsden *et al.* 2016). In these studies the increased mutation load is interpreted as a cost of domestication, which is distinct to cost of selection described above consequent of the substitution load.

Intuitively, the domestication bottleneck makes sense. Notionally, we expect that domestication involved a small population that also underwent the stresses of selection, therefore we should see reduced genetic diversity, evidence for selective sweeps and an increased mutation load, illustrated in Figure 1. All this evidence has been observed, which would seem to confirm the original predictions.

Over the past decade our understanding of the process of domestication has become revised considerably (Larson et al. 2014). In the case of cereals such as rice, wheat, and barley there has been a shift from a rapid to a protracted transition paradigm in which the emergence of domesticated forms was slow (Allaby *et al.* 2008, Allaby 2010). Archaeological data show that selection for domestication syndrome traits such as loss of seed shattering and seed size was weak—comparable to that of natural selection (Purugganan and Fuller 2009, 2010)—and that the onset of selection likely preceded domesticated forms by over ten thousand years in the case of the cereals of the Near East (Allaby et al. 2017). These observations are supported by underlying theory, which suggests that under the constraints of the substitution load there could only have been relatively few loci of selection, and that weak selection would have been involved (Allaby *et al.* 2015). Consequently, there are relatively few opportunities for hitchhiking effects that may contribute to the mutation load. It should be noted that many of the cereals involved in domestication are inbreeders and so will tend to have relatively large levels of linkage disequilibrium increasing the Hill-Robertson effect (Hill and Robertson 1966)—compromising the efficiency of selection and leading to an expectation of increased mutation load. Indeed, increased mutation load has been observed in areas of the both maize (Rodgers-Melnick *et al.* 2015) and rice (Liu *et al.* 2017) genomes in regions where recombination is lower.

The relatively slow pace of selection raises questions about the strength of selection involved, and its demographic consequences on genetic diversity. Furthermore, it raises questions about the domestication bottleneck itself, and a paradox begins to emerge. If selection for the domestication syndrome was generally weak, contemporaneous and contributory to a domestication bottleneck in

which purifying selection was not efficacious leading to an increased mutation load, how could selection for the domestication syndrome have been efficacious?

A bottleneck is defined as a drastic reduction in population size, followed by a recovery.

Surprisingly, the domestication bottleneck concept is one that has had little direct scrutiny, although there has been some debate as to its nature (Glemin and Bataillon 2009). To date, the most direct tests of past bottlenecks have used the PSMC and MSMC approaches to reconstruct past population histories (Li and Durbin 2011, Schiffels and Durbin 2014). While such approaches have frequently been applied to human demographic history, little has yet been done to date to examine plant domestication histories. In the case of African rice, evidence for a bottleneck occurs dating to some 10,000 years prior to domestication (Meyer *et al.* 2016), and in the case of maize evidence of a steady decline in diversity long predating human occupancy of the New World is observed rather than a classic bottleneck (Wang *et al.* 2017). Such results could reflect long term ecological trends, but can also reflect potentially erroneous signals if domesticate populations are derived from a subset of wild populations (Mazet *et al.* 2016).

Archaeogenomics provides a means to directly track population genomic trends through real time, and so provides the most direct means to monitor the domestication bottleneck. Archaeogenomic data are available now for three major cereal crops, maize (da Fonseca *et al.* 2015, Ramos-Madriral *et al.* 2016, Vallebuena-Estrada *et al.* 2016, Swarts *et al.* 2017), barley (Mascher *et al.* 2016) and sorghum (Smith *et al.* 2018), providing absolute genetic diversity measurements at points of time in the past. By taking information directly from the past we avoid proxy estimates of past diversity based entirely on modern data. We also have the potential to negate issues arising from post-domestication crop-wild gene flow that could serve to bolster genetic diversity over time masking the effects of a domestication bottleneck, by reaching genomes before such gene flow occurred. In the case of barley it has been shown that wild populations from across the Near Eastern region contributed to the genetic

diversity of the domesticated crop (Poets et al. 2015) confounding the idea of a single point of origin for this crop (Allaby 2015). Furthermore, archaeological evidence has been used to suggest that early domesticates were continuously replenished from wild stands, facilitating a broad gene flow into the cultivated gene pool (Willcox 2005). Similarly, in maize gene flow has occurred between wild and domesticated populations (Ross-Ibarra *et al.* 2009), while sorghum has been subject to a series of transracial hybridizations giving rise to different cultivar types (Doggett 1988).

Despite the potential complexities in the history of sorghum, Smith *et al.* (2018) observed a surprisingly linear decrease in individual heterozygosity over time in the case of sorghum rather than the negative exponential trend one would expect from an early initially rapid loss of diversity imposed by a domestication bottleneck. This pattern was coupled with a contrasting trend of low to high mutation load over time, which would seem to contradict the occurrence of a strong bottleneck in the earlier stages of domestication. In this study we utilized the currently available archaeogenomic data sets of barley, maize and sorghum to test whether the record of past diversity is compatible with the domestication bottleneck concept.

Methods

Drift threshold values of s were calculated by estimating the selection coefficient required to change an allele frequency from 0.001 to 0.999 in $4N_e$ generations by entering dates of allele frequencies as $4N_e$ years apart in the *selection time* program (Allaby *et al.* 2017), for values of N_e ranging from 10 to 4500 in increments of 10.

Archaeogenome data retrieval. In the case of sorghum genomic heterozygosity data were taken directly from Smith *et al.* (2018). For maize the VCF files of GBS data were used from Swarts et al 2017. In the case of barley VCF files for all barley accessions were obtained from Mascher *et al.*

2016, which included the 267 georeferenced barley landraces of Russell *et al.* 2016, Table S1. While this SNP call set could be used to analyze modern barley populations, heterozygous calls were not made in the original publication for the ancient Yoram Cave barley samples. In order to obtain heterozygous data for the ancient barley we therefore mapped the original ancient sequence data along with a sub sample of wild and cultivated barleys (Table S1).

The raw sequence data for ancient and modern barley were retrieved from public ENA archives in fastq format and mapped to the pseudo-genome of barley utilized by Mascher *et al.* 2016 hosted in the e!DAL data repository. Of the Yoram Cave samples we used sequence data sets JK2281E1U, JK2281E2U, JK3009E1U, JK3010E1U, JK3013E1U, JK3014E1U, JK3014E1U1, JK3014E1U2, JK3014E1U3 and JK3014E1U4 obtained from 5 ancient barley grains (JK2281, JK3009, JK3010, JK3013 and JK3014). We used sequence data sets for wild barley accessions FT11, FT037, FT045, FT067 and FT144, and for cultivated barley accessions BCC131, BCC107, BCC103, BCC105, BCC110 and BCC108. Adapters and 10 terminal bases were trimmed from the raw sequence data using cutadapt. Because the barley genome is large and highly repetitive, a mapping strategy was taken to screen out paralogous mapped reads. Initially, sequence data was split into 35nt kmers using Gerbil, and only unique 35-mers were mapped to the barley pseudo-genome using BWA (Li and Durbin 2009) using the following parameters:

```
bwa aln -t 1 -i 0 -o 0 -n 0.02 -l 1024 -e 7
```

SAMtools (Li *et al.* 2009) was used to index the barley pseudo-genome, create SAM, BAM and BCF files. BCF tools were used to convert BCF to VCFsfiles. Sites with less than 35 fold coverage were discarded, as were 35-mers that mapped to the genome more than once with up to a 1 base mismatch. Sites were then further filtered to include only binary character states, 20% of taxa with data present, and a minimum mapping quality score of 50. We further used the inbreeding nature of barley as a criterion for filtering sites. A stringent cut-off of sites at which more than 25% of taxa were

heterozygous were removed. This threshold was based on a binomial test of the number of heterozygous individuals expected in a population that has an inbreeding coefficient of $2/3$, as determined for an 80% inbreeding system using the ‘estimate F’ function of the *selection time* program (Allaby *et al.* 2017). This is less stringent than the expected 98% inbreeding habit of barley. We validated the appropriateness of this cut-off by comparing a range of heterozygosity thresholds and plotted resultant H_e and π values, Figure S2. Incorporation of mis-mapped (paralogous) sites would be expected to inflate H_e estimates relative to π , when increasingly stringency measures cut largely legitimate sites (false negatives), then both H_e and π estimates should reduce proportionately. We observed that a linear relationship holds between π and H_e up to a threshold of 30% heterozygous sites tolerated, above which H_e is disproportionately inflated relative to π , suggesting our 25% heterozygous cut off is reasonable for this data set.

Diversity analyses Custom scripts were used to analyze the resultant VCF files to calculate the number of heterozygous sites and empty sites to calculate the per site heterozygosity of variant sites, and pairwise differences between taxa. To assess the appropriateness of using heterozygosity we used population information from the barley and maize data sets in order to compare heterozygosity to nucleotide diversity. In the case of the maize data set, we used the populations defined in Swarts *et al.* 2017. In the case of the barley data set we used the pairwise distance matrix we generated from the VCF of Mascher *et al.* 2016 to produce a cluster analysis using the neighbor-joining algorithm of NEIGHBOR from the PHYLIP package (Felsenstein 1989), from which we identified ‘pseudo-populations’ based on clusters. We identified 7 (sample sizes 42,36,13,34,16,20 and 9) cultivated barley and 2 (sample sizes 23 and 18) wild pseudo-populations, Table S1. We also considered all cultivated and all wild barleys together. For each population of maize and barley we calculated nucleotide diversity (π) and individual heterozygosity (H_e), Table S1. In the case of the remapped Yoram Cave samples we calculated π as the average pairwise difference between data sets obtained from different barley grains, and H_e as the average H_e value per grain across data sets.

We calculated the expected reduction in genomic heterozygosity due to inbreeding from values of nucleotide diversity by determining the inbreeding coefficient F for a given level of inbreeding using the estimate F function of the *selection time* program (Allaby et al 2017).

In all cases we have used modern wild populations as an approximation of diversity at the time of domestication, which assumes that there has been little change in diversity over the Holocene.

Results

For maize we used the genotype by sequencing (GBS) data set of Swartz *et al.* 2017 to calculate heterozygous sites. The depth of coverage of Tehuacan maize (Ramos-Madriral *et al.* 2016) was insufficient to include in this analysis, and the data from ancient SW US of da Fonseca *et al.* (2015) does not significantly overlap the GBS loci used by Swartz *et al.* (2017). In the case of barley we used the data set of Mascher et al 2016 of the 6,000 year old Yoram Cave barley which included 267 modern cultivated and wild barley accessions of Russell *et al.* 2016. However, in the Yoram Cave data set heterozygous sites were not called, so we remapped the ancient DNA and a sample of 11 modern wild and cultivated barleys to the same barley pseudo-genome used by Mascher *et al.* and made heterozygous calls (see methods).

Plant accessions maintained in germplasm banks may over time suffer a loss of genomic diversity and become inbred even though the population as a whole maintains the overall nucleotide diversity. This is particularly a concern for inbreeding species such as barley. Therefore, we first assessed the use of heterozygosity as a measure of diversity by comparing the nucleotide diversity of populations with the average genomic heterozygosity of members of the same populations, Figure 2. Under ideal population conditions, nucleotide diversity is an estimator of heterozygosity. However, heterozygosity is reduced under inbreeding conditions by an extent determined by the inbreeding coefficient, F . We

determined the expected levels of heterozygosity associated with nucleotide diversity for given levels of inbreeding (see methods) to gauge the potential loss of diversity in germplasm samples. In the case of the maize data suitable populations were defined by Swarts et al (2017), Figure 2A. Despite being known as an outbreeder (Waller 1917), maize populations showed levels of genomic heterozygosity expected of a 70-80% inbreeder. This result could be expected if germplasm accessions had become inbred over time. However, to our surprise the 2,000 year old maize from Turkey Pen also shows this trend suggesting the possibility that this may reflect the natural ratio for maize for this data set. Many factors influence the rate of outcrossing including topography, climate and the general ratio between self and exogenous pollen. Despite the physiological potential of a 5% inbreeding rate, the levels of inbreeding observed here have largely been observed in the field presumably due to such confounding factors (Sanvido *et al.* 2008). Previous studies have similarly hinted that maize may not out-cross as frequently as is generally assumed (Bannert and Stamp 2007), and evidence of extreme inbreeding has been observed directly in ancient maize genomes (Vallebueno-Estrada *et al.* 2016).

For barley we constructed pseudo-populations by clustering barley accessions on the basis of genome-wide similarity (see methods). In all we constructed 7 cultivated barley (pseudopops 1-7) and 2 wild (pseudopops 8-9) pseudopopulations, Figure 2B. Broadly, barley showed levels of heterozygosity expected of 80-90% inbreeders, somewhat higher heterozygosity than expected for a purported 98% inbreeder. This finding is also in line with previous studies which have suggested barley may be subject to more outcrossing events than generally supposed (Morrell *et al.* 2005). In this case the Yoram Cave samples sit in the same trend. In both the cases of barley and maize, neither modern germplasm sets show evidence of any depression in heterozygosity relative to the ancient that could be due to germplasm propagation, and show that there is a consistency of signal between ancient and modern samples suggesting that heterozygosity is an appropriate measure of diversity to compare wild, modern and ancient data sets.

We then compared levels of heterozygosity in sorghum, maize and barley across time, Figure 3. Maize and teosinte show a pattern that is initially counterintuitive, with some maize accessions from the US southwest and northern Mexico showing higher heterozygosity than teosinte (Figure 3B). This runs counter to the expectation of lower diversity in maize—approximately 83% relative to teosinte based on nucleotide diversity analyses (Hufford *et al.* 2012). This result may reflect structured populations in teosinte, which when considered together give rise to relatively high nucleotide diversity values because of the extent of inter-population differentiation, making nucleotide diversity a poor estimator of heterozygosity in this case. Conversely, the maize of central Mexico and South America show heterozygosity similar to that found in teosinte populations (Figure 3C). It is likely the higher maize heterozygosities of northern Mexico and the US represent accessions in which multiple teosinte populations have input genetic material augmenting the primary gene pool of domestication. Consequently, teosinte should not be considered as a single unit of origin of maize, but a series of differentiated populations, not all of which will have contributed to the maize gene pool, nor which have contributed to the diverse lineages of domestic maize uniformly. The ancient maize genomes of Turkey Pen show an elevated heterozygosity range relative to teosinte, which suggests a general reduction in heterozygosity in the central Mexican and South American maize, if continuity can be assumed, and maintenance of genetic diversity in the North Mexican and US maize.

Barley shows little change in heterozygosity over time with an increase in variation in heterozygosity apparent in the 6,000-year-old genomes of the Yoram Cave barley relative to the wild progenitor (Figure 3D). Similarly, the wider data set of modern wild and cultivated barleys show no discernible difference in heterozygosity, Figure S3. As with maize, this result runs contrary to the expectations based on species wide nucleotide diversity analyses that indicate a fall in diversity in landraces of about 20% (Morrell *et al.* 2014). This discord between nucleotide diversity and heterozygosity is also likely due to the existence of structured wild populations, some of which have combined in domesticated barley, as has been previously argued (Poets *et al.* 2015).

In all three major crops, there is no apparent indication of the dip in genetic diversity at the individual genome level expected from a domestication bottleneck. The discord between nucleotide diversity and heterozygosity in barley and maize illustrate a requirement to rethink how genetic diversity evidence is interpreted in terms of domesticate origins. The heterozygosity evidence suggests some of the subdivided wild populations gave rise to domesticates without meaningful loss of genetic diversity. This is not a bottleneck scenario, and moreover, genetic diversity in wild populations isolated from the progenitor populations of domesticated crops should not contribute to interpretations of lost diversity during domestication.

Loss of genetic diversity is unlikely directly due to domestication

The lack of a dip in genetic diversity that could be associated with a distinct bottleneck episode suggests a disconnect between an intensification of selection, such as from sickle technologies (Allaby *et al.* 2017), and meaningful loss of genetic diversity during the rise of domesticated types. Rather, the drift and selection associated processes responsible for the removal of diversity have acted continuously. The pattern is similar to that observed for human populations with increasing distance to Africa inversely proportional to genetic diversity, most closely modeled by a scenario of repeated bottlenecks over time driven by serial founder effects (de Giorgio *et al.* 2009). Similar explanations have been put forward to explain the reduction in maize diversity over time (Wang *et al.* 2017). A serial founder model representative of a cropping regime where 25% grain is set aside from the harvest has also been put forward to explain loss of diversity in sorghum (Smith *et al.* 2018). Consequently, a simple observation of reduced genetic diversity in a domesticated crop should not be interpreted as evidence of a domestication bottleneck. The diminishing diversity observed over time reflecting a contracting effective population size may be better described as a post-domestication erosion.

A corollary of this scenario regards the mutation load, which hitherto has been regarded as a ‘cost of domestication’. Under a continuous erosion of genetic diversity through repeated bottlenecks we should expect a pattern in which mutation load increases over time. This notion is supported by recent findings in which the mutation load in horses was found to increase some time after domestication (Librado *et al.* 2017). In the case of sorghum, mutation load was found to increase over time and significantly correlate with signals of selection (Smith *et al.* 2018). This could have important implications for crop management today since it would indicate that the deleterious effects of mutation load may not be the consequence of a process in the distant past, but an ongoing process that impacts crops today. It may be more accurate to describe the mutation load as a cost of agriculture or agricultural spread, rather than a cost of domestication itself.

The process of domestication cannot be pinned down to a specific point in time since different traits of the domestication syndrome were selected for at different times through changing behaviours (Fuller, Allaby and Stevens 2010), and even within single traits selection pressures were dynamic over time (Allaby *et al.* 2017). Furthermore, a common theme from investigations in the cereals is the weakness of the selection pressures involved (Purugganan and Fuller 2011, Hufford *et al.* 2012). Such weak selection requires long periods of time and a sufficiently large population to both counter the effects of drift and generate the variation required that is not represented in standing variation. The observation here of a lack of a domestication bottleneck in three major cereals suggests a resolution to the paradox that such weak selection would be unlikely to endure or contribute to a domestication bottleneck. Instead, domestication in these cases fits with a long-term evolutionary trajectory in which genetic diversity is whittled away and mutation load accumulates through a series of minor founder events either through neutral demographic change or dynamic episodes of selection.

Is the domestication bottleneck a myth for annual species?

It has been observed in recent years that the perennial crops apple and grape do not show evidence of a domestication bottleneck (Gross *et al.* 2014, Zhou *et al.* 2017), and that has been attributed to the contrasting life history of perennials exploited for domestication relative to annuals (Gaut *et al.* 2015). The emerging evidence from archaeogenomics suggests that annuals too may not show a strict domestication bottleneck. In the cases of barley and North American maize, as with apple and grapevine, there is hardly a discernible reduction in genetic diversity at all. While the data are currently most comprehensive for sorghum, a wider archaeogenomic survey is required across the annual domesticated plant species to establish whether the emergent picture is exceptional or a general rule.

Acknowledgements

Data generated for this study was supported by the NERC (NE/L006847/1).

References

Allaby RG (2010) Integrating the processes in the evolutionary system of domestication. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 61:935-944.

Allaby RG (2015) Barley domestication: the end of a central dogma? *Genome Biology* 16:176.

Allaby RG, Fuller DQ, Brown TA (2008) The genetic expectations of a protracted model for the origins of domesticated crops. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 105:13982-13986.

Allaby RG, Kitchen JL, Fuller DQ (2015) Surprisingly low limits of selection in plant domestication. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics* 11:(S2) 41-51.

Allaby RG, Stevens S, Lucas L, Maeda O, Fuller DQ (2017) Geographic mosaics and changing rates of cereal domestication. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0429>.

Bannert M, Stamp P (2007) Cross-pollination of maize at long distance. *European Journal of Agronomy* 27:44-51.

Da Fonseca, R and 18 others (2015) The origin and evolution of maize in the Southwestern United States. *Nature Plants* 1: 14003.

De Giorgio M, Jakobsson M, Rosenberg NA (2009) Explaining worldwide patterns of human genetic variation using a coalescent-based serial founder model of migration outward from Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 106:16057-16062.

Doggett H (1988) *Sorghum* 2nd Ed, Longman, Harlow.

Felsenstein, J. (1989) PHYLIP - Phylogeny Inference Package (Version 3.2). *Cladistics* 5: 164-166

Fuller D (2007) Contrasting patterns in crop domestication and domestication rates: recent archaeobotanical insights from the Old World. *Annals of Botany* 100: 903-924.

Fuller DQ, Allaby RG, Stevens C (2010) Domestication as Innovation: The entanglement of techniques, technology and chance in the domestication of cereal crops. *World Archaeology* 42:13-28.

Gaut BS, Díez CM, Morrell PL (2015) Genomics and the contrasting dynamics of annual and perennial domestication. *Trends in Genetics* 31:709-719.

Glemin and Bataillon (2009) A comparative view of the evolution of grasses under domestication. *New Phytologist* 183: 273–290

Gross BL, Henk AD, Richards CM, Fazio G, Volk GM (2014) Genetic diversity in *Malus ×domestica* (rosaceae) through time in response to domestication. *American Journal of Botany* 101:1770-1779.

Haldane JBS (1957) The cost of selection. *Journal of Genetics* 55:511-24.

-

Harlan JR, De Wet JMJ, Price EG. (1973) Comparative evolution of cereals. *Evolution* 27: 311–325.

Henn BM, Botigué LR, Bustamante CD, Clarke AG, Gravel S (2015) Estimating the mutation load in humans. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 16:333-343.

Hill WG, Robertson A (1966) The effect of linkage on limits to artificial selection. *Genetics Research* 8:269-294.

Hufford MB and 24 others (2012) Comparative population genomics of maize domestication and improvement. *Nature Genetics* 44:808-811.

Larson G, Piperno D, Allaby RG et al. (2014) Current perspectives and the future of domestication studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 111:6139-6146.

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

Li, H. & Durbin, R. (2011) Inference of human population history from individual whole-genome sequences. *Nature* **475**, 493–496

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell ., Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G and Durbin R (2009) The sequence alignment/map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, **25**, 2078–2079.

Librado P and 32 others (2017) Ancient genomic changes associated with domestication of the horse. *Science* **356**: 442–445

Liu Q, Zhou Y, Morrell PL, and Gaut BS (2017) Deleterious variants in asian rice and the potential cost of domestication. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 34:908-924.

Marsden CD and 9 others (2016) Bottlenecks and selective sweeps during domestication have increased deleterious genetic variation in dogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 113:152-157.

Mascher M and 21 others (2016) Genomic analysis of 6,000-year-old cultivated grain illuminates the domestication history of barley. *Nature Genetics*. **48**:1089-1093

Mazet O, Rodríguez W, Grusea S, Boitard S, Chikhi L (2016) On the importance of being structured: instantaneous coalescence rates and human evolution-- lessons for ancestral population size inference. *Heredity* 116: 362-371

Meyer RS *et al.* (2016) Domestication history and geographical adaptation inferred from a SNP map of African rice. *Nature Genetics* 48:1083-1088.

Meyer RS, Purugganan MD (2013) Evolution of crop species: genetics of domestication and diversification. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 14:840-852.

Morrell PL, Gonzales AM, Meyer KKT, Clegg MT (2014) Resequencing data indicate a modest effect of domestication on diversity in barley: A cultigen with multiple origins. *Journal of Heredity* 105:253-264.

Morrell PL, Toleno DM, Lundy KE, Clegg MT (2005) Low levels of linkage disequilibrium in wild barley (*Hordeum vulgare* ssp *spontaneum*) despite high rates of self-fertilization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 102:2442-2447

Nei M, Maruyama T, Chakraborty R (1975) The bottleneck effect and genetic variability in populations. *Evolution* 29:1-10.

Poets AM, Fang Z, Clegg MT, Morell PL. (2015) Barley landraces are characterized by geographically heterogeneous genomic origins. *Genome Biology* 16:173

Purugganan MD, Fuller DQ 2009 The nature of selection during plant domestication. *Nature* 457:843-848.

Purugganan MD, Fuller DQ (2011) Archaeological data reveal slow rates of evolution during plant domestication. *Evolution* 65:171-183.

Ramos-Madriral J, Smith BD, Moreno-Mayaer V, Gopalakrishnan, Ross-Ibarra J, Gilbert MTP, Wales N (2016) Genome sequence of a 5,310-year-old maize cob provides insights into the early stages of maize domestication. *Current Biology* 26:3195-3201.

Rodgers-Melnick E and 8 others (2015) Recombination in diverse maize is stable, predictable, and associated with genetic load. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 112:3823-3828.

Ross-Ibarra J, Tenaillon M, Baut G (2009) Historical divergence and gene flow in the genus *Zea*. *Genetics* 181:1399-1413.

Russell J and 20 others (2016) Exome sequencing of geographically diverse barley landraces and wild relatives gives insights into environmental adaptation. *Nature Genetics* 48:1024-1030.

Sanvido O, Widmer F, Winzeler M, Streit B, Szerencsits E, Bigler F (2008) Definition and feasibility of isolation distances for transgenic maize cultivation. *Transgenic Res.* 17:317-335.

Schiffels S, Durbin R (2014) Inferring human population size and separation history from multiple genome sequences. *Nature Genetics* 46:919-925.

Schubert M and 35 others (2014) Prehistoric genomes reveal the genetic foundation and cost of horse domestication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 111:E5661-E5669

Smith O, Nicholson W, Fuller D, Stephens C, Kistler L, Mace E, Jordan D, Barker G, Allaby RG (2018) A domestication history of dynamic adaptation and genomic deterioration in sorghum. *BioRxiv*: doi 10.1101/336503.

Swarts K and 18 others (2017) Genomic estimation of complex traits reveals ancient maize adaptation to temperate North America. *Science* 357:512-515.

Tajima F (1989) The effect of change in population size on DNA polymorphism. *Genetics* 123:597-601.

Vallebuena-Estrada M, and 6 authors. The earliest maize from San Marcos Tehuacán is a partial domesticate with genomic evidence of inbreeding. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 113:14151–14156.

Waller AE (1917) A method for determining the percentage of self-pollination in maize. *Agronomy J* 9:35-37.

Wang L, Beissinger TM, Lorant A, Ross-Ibarra C, Ross-Ibarra J, Hufford MB (2017) The interplay of demography and selection during maize domestication and expansion. *Genome Biol.* 18,:215.

Watterson GA (1986) The homozygosity test after a change in population size. *Genetics* 112:899-907.

Willcox G (2005) The distribution, natural habitats and availability of wild cereals in relation to their domestication in the Near East: multiple events, multiple centers. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 14:534-541.

Zhou Y, Massonnet M, Sanjak J, Cantu D, Gaut BS (2017) The evolutionary genomics of grape (*Vitis vinifera* ssp. *vinifera*) domestication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* doi: 10.1073/pnas.1709257114.

Zhu Q, Zheng X, Luo J, Gaut B and Song G (2007) Multilocus analysis of nucleotide variation of *Oryza sativa* and its wild relatives: severe bottleneck during domestication of rice. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 24:875-888.

Figure 1. The conventional view of the domestication bottleneck.

Figure 2. Mean population heterozygosity against population nucleotide diversity (π). A. Maize populations defined by Swarts *et al.* (2017). B. Barley pseudopopulations identified by cluster analysis of SNP matrix of Mascher *et al.* 2016. Remapped barley samples: subsample of wild accessions (FT), subsample of modern barley (BCC), Yoram Cave ancient barley sample (Yoram Cave). Nucleotide diversity was conventionally calculated as number of pairwise differences divided by number of sites. Note in the maize data total number of sites was unknown from GBS data so values are based on number of GBS sites reported in Swarts *et al.* 2017, hence both H_e and π values are elevated.

Figure 3. Direct estimates of genomic heterozygosity over time from modern and archaeogenomes. All heterozygosity estimates based on the number of heterozygous sites within a single genome. Modern wild progenitors taken as estimates of heterozygosity at the time of domestication. A. *Sorghum bicolor* (data taken from Smith *et al.* 2018) B. *Zea mays* of Northern Mexico and US (data taken from Swarts *et al.* 2017). D. *Zea mays* of central Mexico and South America (data taken from Swarts *et al.* 2017). D. *Hordeum vulgare* (data taken from Mascher *et al.* 2016).

Figure S1. Drift threshold values of the selection coefficient s .

A. Values of s calculated for alleles under selection that take $4N_e$ generations to reach fixation under a Hardy-Weinberg model at varying values of N_e using the selection_time program (Allaby *et al.* 2017). The threshold represents the point at which the strength of selection operates at the same pace as random genetic drift representing an approximation of the point at which selection becomes no stronger than drift.

B. Values of $N_e s$ occurring at threshold s values for a given N_e .

Figure S2. Values of π and H_e associated with different stringencies % heterozygous taxa tolerated per site in remapped barley. A. H_e values; B. π values; C Ratio of H_e to π ; D H_e plotted against π . The expected H_e for values of π determined by inbreeding coefficients for 70 and 80% inbreeding systems are plotted.

Figure S3 Values of H_e determined for 267 wild and cultivated barleys based on the SNP matrix of Mascher *et al.* 2016.





