High Fidelity DNA Polymerase Introduces Bias into 16S rRNA Gene Sequencing Results

Marc A Sze[1] and Patrick D Schloss[1†]

† To whom correspondence should be addressed: pschloss@umich.edu

1 Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Co-author e-mails:

- marcsze@med.umich.edu

Abstract

Background. Many of the different steps used during 16S rRNA gene sequencing can introduce bias and by extension change the observed microbial community results. Although cycle number and high fidelity (HiFi) DNA polymerase are studied less often, they are still important sources of bias in this workflow. Here, we critically examine both cycle number and HiFi DNA polymerase for biases that may influence downstream bacterial community results.

Methods. DNA from fecal samples (n = 4) were extracted using a PowerMag DNA extraction kit with a 10 minute bead beating step and amplified at 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35 cycles using Accuprime, Kappa, Phusion, Platinum, or Q5 HiFi DNA polymerase. Mock communities (technical replicates n = 4) consisting of previously isolated whole genomes of 8 different bacteria were also amplified using the same approach. First, the number of OTUs (Operational Taxonomic Units) were examined for both fecal samples and mock communities. Next, Bray-Curtis index, the error rate, sequence error prevalence, and chimera prevalence were investigated. Finally, the chimera prevalence correlation with number of OTUs was assessed.

Results. At 35 cycles there were significant differences between HiFi DNA polymerase for fecal samples (P-value < 0.0001). These HiFi dependent differences in the number of OTUs could be identified as early as 20 cycles in the mock communities (P-value = 0.002). Chimera prevalence varied by HiFi DNA polymerase and these differences were still observed after chimera removal using VSEARCH. Additionally, the chimera prevalence had a strong positive correlation with the number of OTUs and this association was not changed by chimera removal with VSEARCH.

Conclusions. Due to HiFi DNA polymerase dependent differences in the number of OTUs and chimera prevalence, common diversity metrics could have values that are not

26   comparable across studies.

Introduction

This study will specifically address how cycle number and high fidelity (HiFi) DNA polymerases can bias observed bacterial community results derived from 16S rRNA gene sequencing. First, it is important to differentiate between bias, reproducibility, and standardization since often times these three can be confused and used interchangeably with each other. Bias can change the observed results in a way that is reproducible and standardized. For example, if one group uses one brand of DNA extraction kit for their 16S rRNA gene sequencing, their results may be biased versus another group not using the same brand kit but within their group they can still have reproducible results. Therefore, standardization of 16S rRNA gene sequencing methods to increase reproducibility can still be problematic due to bias. Determining how different aspects of a 16S rRNA gene sequencing workflow could bias the observed results is critical for the interpretation of specific studies in the borader context of the overall field.

A typical 16S rRNA gene sequencing workflow can be divided into preservation, extraction, PCR, and sequencing steps. Generally, not using a preservation media and leaving samples at room temperature has been shown to cause overgrowth of low abundance members of the fecal bacterial community [ref]. Similarily, this overgrowth could still occur if the preservation media does not adequately inhibit growth [ref]. Reports have also shown that changes in specific community members might occur due to differing susceptibility to freeze thaw cycles amongst microbes [ref]. Additionally, reagent contamination has been shown to add community members and the contribution of these contaminant members grows larger with lower biomass samples (Salter et al., 2014). Recent studies have shown that the majority of these biases due to either preservation or extraction tend to be smaller than the overall biological signal being measured [refs]. However, the contribution of PCR bias to this overall workflow is not well characterized since these studies use the same PCR approach while varying preservation or extraction method.

4

Identifying the biases in the PCR stage of 16S rRNA gene sequencing is important because a large body of literature shows that there are a variety of steps during PCR that can change the observed results [refs]. Many of these sources of biases are made worse as cycle number increases [ref]. For example, the selective amplification of the dominant sequence can increase the difference between the most and next abundant sequence, over-emphasizing the actual difference [ref]. Both amplification error and non-specific amplification (e.g. incorrect amplicon size products) can also increase as cycle number increases which can drastically change commonly used diversity measures [refs]. Additionally, chimeras can form from an aborted extension followed by subsequent priming error and secondary extension and even if it has not been explicitly shown to increase with cycle number it is easy to postulate that this does happen and will also artificially increase community diversity (Haas et al., 2011).

There are also intrinsic properties to primers and DNA polymerases chosen that can introduce bias. Primers have variable region dependent binding affinities for different bacteria and depending on the primer pair do not detect specific bacteria (e.g. V1-V3 does not detect *Haemophilus Influenzae* and V3-V5 does not detect *Propionibacterium acnes*) [refs]. Additionally, there are multiple families of DNA polymerases that have their own error rate and proof reading capcity (Ishino & Ishino, 2014). Interestingly, the influence that these different DNA polymerases can have on the observed results have not been well studied like some of the other previously mentioned sources of PCR-based bias.

A recent study found clear differences between normal and high fidelity (HiFi) DNA polymerase and that optimization of the PCR protocol could reduce error and chimera generation (Gohl et al., 2016). This study also found that regardless of DNA polymerase, the number of Operational Taxonomic Units (OTUs) or taxa generated were not easily reduced using the authors chosen bioinformatic pipeline (Gohl et al., 2016). It is natural to extend this line of inquiry and ask if biases in the number of OTUs and chimeras are also

5

dependent on HiFi DNA polymerases. There is some reason to think that this may be the

case since many of these HiFi DNA polymerases come from different families (e.g. *Taq*

belongs to the family A polymerases) and may intrinsically have different error rates that

cannot be completely removed with modifications (Ishino & Ishino, 2014). In this study, we

critically examine if any of five different HiFi DNA polymerases introduce significant biases

into 16S rRNA gene surveys, if this is a cycle dependent phenomenon, and whether they

can be removed using a standard bioinformatic pipeline.

Materials & Methods

Human and Mock Samples: A single fecal sample was obtained from 4 individuals who were part of the Enterics Research Investigational Network (ERIN). The processing and storage of these samples have been previously published (Seekatz et al., 2016). Other than confirmation that none of these individuals had a *Clostridium difficle* infection, clinical data and other types of meta data were not utilized or accessed for this study. All samples were extracted using the MOBIO^{TM} PowerMag Microbiome RNA/DNA extraction kit (now Qiagen, MD, USA). The ZymoBIOMICS^{TM} Microbial Community DNA Standard (Zymo, CA, USA) was used in this study and is made up of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella enterica*, *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and *Bacillus subtilis* at equal genomic DNA abundance (http://www.zymoresearch.com/microbiomics/microbial-standards/ zymobiomics-microbial-community-standards).

PCR Protocol: The five different HiFi DNA polymerases that were tested included AccuPrime^{TM} (ThermoFisher, MA, USA), KAPA HIFI (Roche, IN, USA), Phusion (ThermoFisher, MA, USA), Platinum (ThermoFisher, MA, USA), and Q5 (New England Biolabs, MA, USA). The PCR cycle conditions for Platinum and Accuprime followed a previously published protocol (Kozich et al., 2013) (https://github.com/SchlossLab/MiSeq_ WetLab_SOP/blob/master/MiSeq_WetLab_SOP_v4.md). The HiFi DNA polymerase activation time was 2 minutes, unless a different activation was specified. For Kappa and Q5, the protocol previously published by Gohl and colleagues was used (Gohl et al., 2016). For Phusion, the company defined conditions were used except for extension time, where the Accuprime and Platinum settings were used.

Both fecal and mock samples cycle conditions started at 15 and increased by 5 up to 35 cycles with amplicons used at each 5-step increase for sequencing. The fecal PCR

consisted of all 4 samples at 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35 cycles for each HiFi DNA polymerase (total samples = 100). The mock communities had 4 replicates at 15, 20, 25, and 35 cycles and 10 replicates for 30 cycles for all HiFi DNA polymerase (total samples = 130). No mock community sample had enough PCR product at 15 cycles for adequate 16S rRNA gene sequencing.

Sequence Processing: The mothur software program was utilized for all sequence processing steps (Schloss et al., 2009). Generally, the protocol followed what has been previously published (Kozich et al., 2013) (https://www.mothur.org/wiki/MiSeq_SOP). Two major differences from the stated protocol were the use of VSEARCH instead of UCHIME for chimera detection and the use of the OptiClust algorithm instead of average neighbor for OTU generation at 97% similarity (Edgar et al., 2011; Rognes et al., 2016; Westcott & Schloss, 2017). Sequence error was determined using the 'seq.error' command on mock samples after chimera removal and classification to the RDP to remove non-bacterial sequences (Schloss et al., 2009; Cole et al., 2013; Rognes et al., 2016).

Analysis Workflow: The total number of OTUs after sub-sampling was analyzed for both the fecal and mock community samples. Cycle dependent affects on Bray-Curtis indices were next assessed for the fecal samples looking at both overall cycle differences and within individual differences for the previous cycle (e.g. 20 versus 25, 25 versus 30, etc.). For these community based measures, the fecal samples were analyzed at 4 different sub-sampling sequence depths (1000, 5000, 10000, and 15000) while the mock community samples were analysed at 3 levels (1000, 5000, 10000). Next, based on these observations we wanted to analyze potential reasons for these differences. First, analysis of general sequence error rate, number of sequences with an error, and base substitution were assessed in the mock community for each HiFi DNA polymerase. After assessing these errors, the total number of chimeras was determined after sequence processing and correlations to the number of OTUs also assessed.

8

137 ***Statistical Analysis:*** All analysis was done with the R (v 3.4.3) software package (R Core

138 Team, 2017). Data transformation and graphing was completed using the tidyverse package

139 (v 1.2.1) and colors selected using the viridis package (v 0.4.1) (Garnier, 2017; Wickham,

140 2017). Differences in the total number of OTUs were analyzed using an ANOVA with a

141 tukey post-hoc test. For the fecal samples the data was normalized to each individual by

142 cycle number to account for the biological variation between people. Bray-Curtis distance

143 matrices were generated using mothur after 100 sub-samplings at 1000, 5000, 10000,

144 and 15000 sequence depth. The distance matrix data was analyzed using PERMANOVA

145 with the vegan package (v 2.4.5) (Oksanen et al., 2017) and Kruskal-Wallis tests within

146 R. For both error and chimera analysis, samples were tested using Kruskal-Wallis with

147 a Dunns post-hoc test. Where applicable correction for multiple comparison utilized the

148 Benjamini-Hochberg method (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995).

149 ***Reproducible Methods:*** The code and analysis can be found here https://github.com/

150 SchlossLab/Sze_PCRSeqEffects_XXXX_2017. The raw sequences can be found in the

151 SRA at the following accession number SRP132931.

Results

The Number of OTUs is Dependent on HiFi DNA Polymerase: There was a HiFi DNA polymerase dependent difference that was consistent across sub-sampling [Figure 1]. Lower cycle numbers (15-20) tended to result in less differences between HiFI DNA polymerase versus higher cycle numbers (25, 30, and 35) [Figure 1]. At 35 cycles, all sub-sampling levels had significant differences between HiFi DNA polymerases (P-value < 0.0001) [Table S1]. Some differences between HiFi DNA polymerase we identifed at 25 and 30 cycles but the sub-sampling depth had to be 5000 or higher (P-value < 0.05) [Table S1]. Most of the differences observed at 35 cycles were between Platinum and other HiFi DNA polymerases, based on a Tukey post-hoc test (P-value < 0.05) [Table S2]

This HiFi DNA polymerase dependent difference in the number of OTUs was also observed in the mock community samples with the same DNA polymerases having high (Platinum) and low (Accuprime) number of OTUs [Figure 2 & Table S3]. In contrast to fecal samples, differences between HiFi DNA polymerase were observed as early as 20 cycles and as low as a sub-sampling depth of 1000 sequences (P-value = 0.002) [Table S3]. For both different cycle numbers and sub-sampling depths, the majority of differences were between Platinum and the other HiFi DNA polymerases [Table S4]. The lowest number of OTUs identified was from Accuprime™ while the highest was from Platinum and this was consistent for both fecal and mock samples across sub-sampling depth and cycle number [Figure 1 & 2]. Based on these observations it is clear that different HiFi DNA polymerase result in different total number of OTUs observed within a sample.

Minimal Bray-Curtis Differences are Detected by Cycle Number: Overall, there were a few sub-sampling dependent differences in bacterial communities between cycle number . First, independent of HiFi DNA polymerase there were differences for the same fecal sample between 20 versus 25 cycles that was dependent on sub-sampling depth

10

(sub-sampled to 1000 = 0.51 (0.4 - 0.79) (median (25% - 75% quantile)), sub-sampled to 5000 = 0.43 (0.33 - 0.63), sub-sampled to 10000 = 0.4 (0.24 - 0.43)) [Figure 3A]. Second, where data is available for the mock communities, there were larger difference between 20 and 25 cycles (sub-sampled to 1000 = 0.88 (0.42 - 0.91)) [Figure 3B]. Third, using PERMANOVA to test for differences within HiFi DNA polymerase groups based on cycle number, only Phusion had cycle dependent differences at 1000 and 5000 sub-sampling depth (P-value = 0.03 and 0.01, respectively). Phusion was one of only two HiFi DNA polymerases that that had fecal samples for the 1000 sub-sampling depth at 15 cycles. These stated differences between the next 5-cycle increment do not persist once 25 cycles are reached [Figure 3].

Next, we assessed whether there were any differences between 5-cycle increments within each individual or sample replicate. For both fecal and mock samples, we found that there was no detectable difference in Bray-Curtis index when comparing to the previous 5-cycle increment (P-value > 0.05). However, Phusion at 1000 sub-sampling depth had a P-value = 0.02 before multiple comparison correction. Similar to the PERMANOVA analysis, at higher sub-sampling depths these differences in Bray-Curtis indices disappear. Overall, HiFi DNA polymerase differences in Bray-Curtis index are dependent on both sub-sampling depth and cycle number.

Sequence Error is Dependent on both HiFi DNA Polymerase and Cycle Number: Differences by HiFi DNA polymerase in the median average per base error varied without a clear pattern across sub-sampling depth [Table S5]. The highest per base median average error rates were for the Kappa HiFi DNA polymerase [Figure 4]. This error rate was minimally affected by both the 'pre.cluster' step and chimera removal by VSEARCH [Figure 4]. The differences in the per base error rate between the various HiFi DNA polymerase was cycle dependent with Platinum having the largest differences versus other HiFi DNA polymerases [Figure 4B-C and Table S6]. The total sequences with at least one error had

11

was also cycle number dependent and mostly alleviated by the use of the 'pre.cluster' step [Figure S1]. Differences in sequences with an error before this 'pre.cluster' step were due to large differences in Accuprime[TM] and Platinum versus the other HiFi DNA polymerases [Figure S1 & Table S7 & S8]. Investigation of whether there were HiFi DNA polymerase dependent effects on base substitution found that there were no biases in the types of substitution made [Figure S2]. Although though sequence error is dependent on HiFi DNA polymerase it can be corrected using exsiting bioinformatic approaches.

Chimeric Sequences are HiFi DNA Polymerase Dependent and Correlate with Number of OTUs: At all levels of sub-sampling and cycle numbers there were significant differences in the chimera prevalence based on HiFi DNA polymerase used (P-value < 0.05) [Table S9]. Differences between Platinum and all other HiFi DNA polymerases accounted for the majority of these differences and was independent of cycle number and sub-sampling depth [Table S10]. Across sub-sampling depth and cycle number Accuprime[TM] had the lowest chimera prevalence of all the HiFi DNA Polymerases regardless of whether 'pre.cluster' or chimera removal with VSEARCH was used [Figure 5].

For all HiFi DNA polymerases, a positive correlation was observed between chimeric sequences and number of OTUs, with this correlation being strongest for Accuprime, Platinum and Phusion HiFi DNA Polymerase [Figure 6]. The R^2 value between the number of OTUs and chimeric sequences did not change with the use of 'pre.cluster' or with the removal of chimeras using VSEARCH [Figure 6]. Taken together, this data suggests that a strong correlation exists between the number of OTUs and the prevalence of chimeric sequences.

Discussion

These observations build upon previous studies (Gohl et al., 2016) by showing that different HiFi DNA polymerases have significant differences in the number of OTUs and that changes in total OTUs correlate with chimeras not removed after sequence processing [Figure 1-2 & 5]. HiFi DNA polymerase dependent differences in total number of OTUs are important to consider since many diversity metrics rely on this measure as part of their calculations. Our observations show that HiFi DNA polymerase can have a noticeable affect on the OTUs generated and these differences are consistent across sub-sampling depth and PCR cycle number [Figure 2-4]. Importantly, high biomass samples may underestimate the biases present within low biomass samples. An indication that this may be the case is the earlier detection of differences in total number of OTUs between HiFi DNA polymerases in the mock versus fecal samples.

Although we did not observe strong differences in the Bray-Curtis index the data suggests that there may be differences between 15 and 20 cycles versus higher cycle numbers, such as 30 cycles, that are commonly used. There was few differences within individuals between corresponding 5-cycle increments (e.g. 15 to 20, 20 to 25, etc.). However, there is a clear trend that suggests that the community at 20 cycles is different then the community at 25 cycles [Figure 3]. These findings, in conjunction with the PERMANOVA results, suggest that cycle number can change bacterial community calculations but that these differences are minimal once 25 cycles are reached. Further, for some HiFi DNA polymerases, increasing the sub-sampling depth may reduce some of these observed community differences at lower cycle numbers.

Increasing the cycle number also exacerbated chimera prevalence differences between the different HiFi DNA polymerases [Figure 5]. The chimera prevalence was strongly correlated with the number of OTUs which is relied upon heavily for many community metric

13

calculations. However, Bray-Curtis analysis with PERMANOVA showed few differences based on HiFi DNA polymerase. It is possible that many of the increased number of OTUs are not highly abundant allowing the Bray-Curtis index to be able to successfully down-weight these respective OTUs (Minchin, 1987). The choice of downstream diversity metric could be an important consideration in helping to mitigate these observed changes due to high chimera prevalence in specific HiFi DNA polymerases.

Our observations suggest that there are clear HiFi DNA polymerase dependent differences in both per base error rate and chimera prevalence that cannot be removed using bioinformatic approaches [Figure 4 & 5]. Although it may be a natural assumption that the variation may be due to the DNA polymerase family, the highest chimera rate, from Platinum, was a family A polymerase while the lowest, from Accuprime, was also an A family polymerase (Ishino & Ishino, 2014). In fact, from the material safety data sheet (MSDS), the differences between the two is not immediately apparent. Both Accuprime and Platinum contain a recombinant *Taq* DNA polymerase, a *Pyrococcus* spp GB-D polymerase and a platinum *Taq* antibody. It is possible that differences in how the recombinant *Taq* was generated could be the main reason for the differences in chimera rate.

Conclusion

Our findings show that the number of OTUs will be dependent on both HiFi DNA polymerase and cycle number chosen. Care should be taken when choosing a HiFi DNA polymerase for 16S rRNA gene surveys since intrinsic differences can change the number of OTUs observed and influence diversity based metrics that do not down-weight rare observations.

Acknowledgements

References

Benjamini Y., Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 57:289–300.

Cole JR., Wang Q., Fish JA., Chai B., McGarrell DM., Sun Y., Brown CT., Porras-Alfaro A., Kuske CR., Tiedje JM. 2013. Ribosomal database project: Data and tools for high throughput rRNA analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research* 42:D633–D642. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkt1244.

Edgar RC., Haas BJ., Clemente JC., Quince C., Knight R. 2011. UCHIME improves sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics* 27:2194–2200. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr381.

Garnier S. 2017. *Viridis: Default color maps from 'matplotlib'.*

Gohl DM., Vangay P., Garbe J., MacLean A., Hauge A., Becker A., Gould TJ., Clayton JB., Johnson TJ., Hunter R., Knights D., Beckman KB. 2016. Systematic improvement of amplicon marker gene methods for increased accuracy in microbiome studies. *Nature Biotechnology* 34:942–949. DOI: 10.1038/nbt.3601.

Haas BJ., Gevers D., Earl AM., Feldgarden M., Ward DV., Giannoukos G., Ciulla D., Tabbaa D., Highlander SK., Sodergren E., Methe B., DeSantis TZ., Petrosino JF., Knight R., and BWB. 2011. Chimeric 16S rRNA sequence formation and detection in sanger and 454-pyrosequenced PCR amplicons. *Genome Research* 21:494–504. DOI: 10.1101/gr.112730.110.

Ishino S., Ishino Y. 2014. DNA polymerases as useful reagents for biotechnology â the history of developmental research in the field. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 5. DOI:

302 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00465.

303 Kozich JJ., Westcott SL., Baxter NT., Highlander SK., Schloss PD. 2013. Development of
304 a dual-index sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon sequence
305 data on the MiSeq illumina sequencing platform. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*
306 79:5112–5120. DOI: 10.1128/aem.01043-13.

307 Minchin PR. 1987. An evaluation of the relative robustness of techniques for ecological
308 ordination. *Vegetatio* 69:89–107. DOI: 10.1007/bf00038690.

309 Oksanen J., Blanchet FG., Friendly M., Kindt R., Legendre P., McGlinn D., Minchin PR.,
310 O'Hara RB., Simpson GL., Solymos P., Stevens MHH., Szoecs E., Wagner H. 2017. *Vegan:*
311 *Community ecology package*.

312 R Core Team. 2017. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna,
313 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

314 Rognes T., Flouri T., Nichols B., Quince C., Mahé F. 2016. VSEARCH: A versatile open
315 source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ* 4:e2584. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.2584.

316 Salter SJ., Cox MJ., Turek EM., Calus ST., Cookson WO., Moffatt MF., Turner P.,
317 Parkhill J., Loman NJ., Walker AW. 2014. Reagent and laboratory contamination
318 can critically impact sequence-based microbiome analyses. *BMC Biology* 12. DOI:
319 10.1186/s12915-014-0087-z.

320 Schloss PD., Westcott SL., Ryabin T., Hall JR., Hartmann M., Hollister EB., Lesniewski
321 RA., Oakley BB., Parks DH., Robinson CJ., Sahl JW., Stres B., Thallinger GG., Horn
322 DJV., Weber CF. 2009. Introducing mothur: Open-source, platform-independent,
323 community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities.

Applied and Environmental Microbiology 75:7537–7541. DOI: 10.1128/aem.01541-09.

Seekatz AM., Rao K., Santhosh K., Young VB. 2016. Dynamics of the fecal microbiome in patients with recurrent and nonrecurrent clostridium difficile infection. *Genome Medicine* 8. DOI: 10.1186/s13073-016-0298-8.

Westcott SL., Schloss PD. 2017. OptiClust, an improved method for assigning amplicon-based sequence data to operational taxonomic units. *mSphere* 2:e00073–17. DOI: 10.1128/mspheredirect.00073-17.

Wickham H. 2017. *Tidyverse: Easily install and load 'tidyverse' packages*.

Figure 1: Normalized Fecal Number of OTUs. The x-axis represents the different sub-sampling depths used and the y-axis is the normalized within individual number of OTUs. The red line represents the overall mean Z-score normalized number of OTUs for each respective HiFi DNA polymerase. The dashed black line represents the overall Z-score normalized mean number of OTUs.

Figure 2: Mock Sample Variability in Number of OTUs based on HiFi DNA Polymerase. A) Sub-sampled to 1000 reads. B) Sub-sampled to 5000 reads. C) Sub-sampled to 10000 reads. The dotted line represents the number of OTUs generated when the mock reference sequences are run through the pipeline.

Figure 3: Community Differences by Five-Cycle Intervals and Sub-sampling Depth. A) Fecal samples within person difference based on the next 5-cycle PCR interval. B) Mock samples within replicate difference based on the next 5-cycle PCR interval.

Figure 4: HiFi DNA Polymerase Per Base Error Rate in Mock Samples. A) Error rate before the merger of sequences with pre.cluster and the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. B) Error rate before the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. C) Full pipeline. The error bars represent the 75% interquartile range of the median.

Figure 5: HiFi DNA Polymerase Chimera Prevalence in Mock Samples. A) Chimera sequence percentage before the merger of sequences with pre.cluster and the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. B) Chimera sequence percentage before the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. C) Full pipeline. The error bars represent the 75% interquartile range of the median.

Figure 6: The Correlation between Number of OTUs and Chimeras. A) Correlation before the merger of sequences with pre.cluster and the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. B) Correlation before the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. C) Correlation with full pipeline.

Figure S1: HiFi DNA Polymerase Sequence Error Prevalence in Mock Samples. A) Sequence error prevalence before the merger of sequences with pre.cluster and the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. B) Sequence error prevalence before the removal of chimeras with VSEARCH. C) Full pipeline. The error bars represent the 75% interquartile range of the median.

Figure S2: HiFi DNA Polymerase Nucleotide Subsitutions in Mock Samples.