

Bankoff et al. Table 2

	Human reference coding region size (bp)	BEAT with aye-aye sequence reads¹			Untrimmed aye-aye <i>de novo</i> assembly²				Trimmed aye-aye <i>de novo</i> assembly²			
Gene		bp recovered	% coverage	% identity to reference	bp recovered	% coverage	% identity to reference	% identity to BEAT	bp recovered	% coverage	% identity to reference	% identity to BEAT
<i>CDH23</i>	8976	8952	99.73	92.76	7863	87.60	92.81	98.99	7139	79.53	93.14	99.52
<i>KCNQ4</i>	1713	1713	100	94.74	1013	59.14	90.97	95.63	815	47.58	91.78	96.93
<i>OTOF</i>	5634	5605	99.49	92.73	4190	74.37	91.63	98.56	3854	68.41	92.53	99.77
<i>PCDH15</i>	4194	4189	99.88	94.84	4009	95.59	94.51	98.98	3581	85.38	94.86	99.75
<i>PJVK</i>	840	840	100	96.07	840	100	96.07	100	840	100	-	-
<i>SLC26A5</i>	2016	2016	100	94.81	1968	97.62	94.70	98.93	1687	83.68	95.14	99.70
<i>TMC1</i>	2116	1969	93.05	94.29	1886	89.13	92.21	96.04	905	42.77	94.59	99.11

Table 2. Comparison of *de novo* genome assembly and BEAT methods for reconstruction of aye-aye gene coding regions using the same shotgun sequence read data for both methods.

¹ Analysis based on BEAT reconstructions from the same shotgun sequencing read data used in Perry, Reeves et al. (2012), a subset of the sequence read data used in the full analysis of this paper.

² Analysis based on BLAST reconstructions of scaffolds from aye-aye *de novo* assembly published in Perry, Reeves et al. (2012). Sequences assembled from the aye-aye *de novo* assembly were scanned for regions with more than one non-identical mapping scaffold; these scaffolds were allowed to contribute to the consensus in the “Untrimmed” group, and removed from the “Trimmed” group.