









BioKIT: a versatile toolkit for processing and analyzing diverse types of sequence data

Jacob L. Steenwyk ^{1,2,*} Thomas J. Buida III ³ Carla Gonçalves ^{1,2,4,5} Dayna C. Goltz,⁶ Grace Morales ⁷ Matthew E. Mead ^{1,2} Abigail L. LaBella ^{1,2} Christina M. Chavez,^{1,2} Jonathan E. Schmitz,⁷ Maria Hadjifrangiskou,^{2,7} Yuanning Li ¹ and Antonis Rokas ^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Biological Sciences, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA,

²Evolutionary Studies Initiative, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA,

³9 City Place #312, Nashville, TN 37209, USA,

⁴Associate Laboratory i4HB—Institute for Health and Bioeconomy, NOVA School of Science and Technology, NOVA University Lisbon, 2819-516 Caparica, Portugal,

⁵UCIBIO—Applied Molecular Biosciences Unit, Department of Life Sciences, NOVA School of Science and Technology, NOVA University Lisbon, 2819-516 Caparica, Portugal,

⁶2312 Elliston Place #510, Nashville, TN 37203, USA,

⁷Department of Pathology, Microbiology & Immunology, Center for Personalized Microbiology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232, USA

*Corresponding author: Department of Biological Sciences, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B 35-1364, Nashville, TN 37235, USA. Email:

jacob.steenwyk@vanderbilt.edu; *Corresponding author: Department of Biological Sciences, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B 35-1364, Nashville, TN 37235, USA.

Email: antonis.rokas@vanderbilt.edu

Abstract

Bioinformatic analysis—such as genome assembly quality assessment, alignment summary statistics, relative synonymous codon usage, file format conversion, and processing and analysis—is integrated into diverse disciplines in the biological sciences. Several command-line pieces of software have been developed to conduct some of these individual analyses, but unified toolkits that conduct all these analyses are lacking. To address this gap, we introduce BioKIT, a versatile command line toolkit that has, upon publication, 42 functions, several of which were community-sourced, that conduct routine and novel processing and analysis of genome assemblies, multiple sequence alignments, coding sequences, sequencing data, and more. To demonstrate the utility of BioKIT, we conducted a comprehensive examination of relative synonymous codon usage across 171 fungal genomes that use alternative genetic codes, showed that the novel metric of gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage can accurately estimate gene-wise codon optimization, evaluated the quality and characteristics of 901 eukaryotic genome assemblies, and calculated alignment summary statistics for 10 phylogenomic data matrices. BioKIT will be helpful in facilitating and streamlining sequence analysis workflows. BioKIT is freely available under the MIT license from GitHub (<https://github.com/JLSteenwyk/BioKIT>), PyPi (<https://pypi.org/project/jlsteenwyk-biokit/>), and the Anaconda Cloud (<https://anaconda.org/jlsteenwyk/jlsteenwyk-biokit>). Documentation, user tutorials, and instructions for requesting new features are available online (<https://jlsteenwyk.com/BioKIT>).

Keywords: multiple sequence alignment; genome assembly quality; codon; bioinformatics; gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage; genetic code

Introduction

Bioinformatics is the application of computational tools to process and analyze biological data, such as nucleotide or amino acid sequences in the form of genome assemblies, gene annotations, and multiple sequence alignments (Bayat 2002). Diverse disciplines in the biological sciences rely on bioinformatic methods and software (Wren 2016). Researchers have acknowledged the need to consider diverse types of biological scientists with different levels of experience, including those with no experience—such as students in classroom settings, when developing software (Kumar and Dudley 2007). It is also essential to implement high standards of software development that ensure software

functionality and archival stability (Mangul, Martin, et al. 2019; Mangul, Mosqueiro, et al. 2019). For example, code quality can be improved by utilizing tests that help ensure faithful function of code and facilitate debugging (Darriba et al. 2018). More specifically, integration tests examine end-to-end functionality of software, whereas unit tests evaluate the functionality of smaller chunks of code. Both tests ensure specific inputs result in expected outputs. As a result, the development of effective and user-friendly software for diverse biologists often requires an interdisciplinary team of software engineers, biologists, and others.

Even though numerous bioinformatic pieces of software are available, there are still several barriers to creating seamless and

reproducible workflows (Kim *et al.* 2018). This issue in part stems from different pieces of software requiring different input file formats, being unable to account for nonstandard biological phenomena, such as the use of alternative genetic codes, or can only be executed using web servers or graphical user interfaces, which cannot be incorporated into high-throughput pipelines. Another factor is that multiple pieces of software or custom scripts are typically needed to execute different steps in a larger bioinformatic pipeline; for example, bioinformatic workflows often rely on 1 software/script for converting file formats, another software/script for translating sequences using standard and non-standard genetic codes, another software/script to examine the properties of genomes or multiple sequence alignments, etc. As a result, maintaining efficacious bioinformatic workflows is cumbersome (Kulkarni *et al.* 2018). To address this need, package, and workflow managers have facilitated stringing together numerous pieces of software. An alternative approach to addressing this issue is the development of multipurpose toolkits that contain diverse processing and analysis functions and therefore reduce the overall number of pieces of software users need to install regardless of the use of package and workflow managers.

To address this need, we—an interdisciplinary team of software engineers, evolutionary biologists, molecular biologists, microbiologists, and others—developed BioKIT, a versatile toolkit that currently has 42 functions, several of which were requested by the research community, that conduct routine and novel processing and analysis of diverse sequence files including genome assemblies, multiple sequence alignments, protein coding sequences, and sequencing data (Table 1). Functions implemented in BioKIT facilitate a wide variety of standard bioinformatic analyses, including processing and analysis of protein coding sequences (e.g. translation using 26 genetic codes including user-specified translation tables, GC content at the first, second, and third codon positions, and relative synonymous codon usage), evaluation of genome assembly quality [e.g. N50, L50, assembly size, guanine-cytosine (GC) content, number of scaffolds, and others], and the calculation of multiple sequence alignment properties (i.e. number of taxa, alignment length, the number of constant sites, the number of parsimony-informative sites, and the number of variable sites). To demonstrate the utility of BioKIT, we calculated relative synonymous codon usage in 171 fungal genomes, estimated codon optimization in each gene from 2 *Saccharomyces* budding yeast species using a novel metric, gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage (gRSCU), examined the genome assembly quality of 901 eukaryotic genomes, and evaluated the properties of 10 phylogenomic data matrices. We hope that BioKIT will improve reproducibility and accessibility of diverse bioinformatic analysis, serve as an effective teaching tool, and facilitate discovery in the biological sciences.

Materials and methods

BioKIT is an easy-to-install command-line software that conducts diverse bioinformatic analyses. BioKIT is written in the Python programming language and has few dependencies, namely Biopython (Cock *et al.* 2009) and NumPy (Van Der Walt *et al.* 2011).

BioKIT currently has 42 functions that process and analyze sequence files such as genome assemblies, multiple-sequence alignments, protein coding sequences, and sequencing data (Table 1). Processing functions include those that convert various file formats, subset sequence reads from FASTQ files, rename entries in FASTA files, and others. Analysis functions include those that trim sequence reads in FASTQ files according to

quality and length thresholds, calculate relative synonymous codon usage, estimate codon optimization, and others. Where applicable, BioKIT functions can also take standard output as input thereby enabling the use of POSIX pipes.

Details about each function, their usage, tutorials, and other information such as how to request additional functions can be found in the online documentation (<https://jlsteenwyk.com/BioKIT>). To demonstrate the utility of BioKIT, we highlight 4 use-cases: (1) determination of relative synonymous codon usage using different genetic codes; (2) determination of a novel metric for estimation of gene-wise codon optimization, gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage (gRSCU); (3) genome assembly quality assessment; and (4) summarizing properties of multiple sequence alignments.

Examining features of coding sequences including relative synonymous codon usage

BioKIT contains multiple functions that process or analyze protein coding sequences including translating protein coding sequences into amino acids. One distinct advantage of BioKIT is its ability to account for diverse genetic codes (currently, BioKIT comes complete with 26 genetic codes) or take as input a user-defined translation table. Other coding sequence-related analyses include determining the GC content at the first, second, and third codon positions.

Here, we highlight the *relative_synonymous_codon_usage* function, which calculates relative synonymous codon usage, the ratio of the observed frequency of synonymous codons to an expected frequency in which all synonymous codons are used equally (Xu *et al.* 2008). In this analysis, overrepresented codons have relative synonymous codon usage values greater than one whereas underrepresented codons have relative synonymous codon usage values less than 1. Relative synonymous codon usage values of one fit the neutral expectation. The *relative_synonymous_codon_usage* function can be used with one of 26 genetic codes including user-specified translation tables. The ability of BioKIT to account for diverse genetic codes, which cannot be done by other currently available software, makes it uniquely suitable for analyses of lineages that contain multiple genetic codes (Krassowski *et al.* 2018; LaBella *et al.* 2019). Other software that conduct similar analyses include DAMBE and GCUA (McInerney 1998; Xia 2013).

We also highlight the *gene_wise_relative_synonymous_codon_usage* function, which calculates a novel metric, gRSCU, to examine biases in codon usage among individual genes encoded in a genome. Specifically, the gRSCU is calculated by determining the mean or median relative synonymous codon usage value for all codons in each gene based on their genome-wide values. Thus, BioKIT calculates relative synonymous codon usage for each codon based on codon usage in an entire set of protein coding genes, individually re-examines each gene and the relative synonymous codon usage value for each codon therein, and then determines the mean or median relative synonymous codon usage value for the individual gene. The formula for the mean gRSCU calculation is as follows:

$$gRSCU^a = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j RSCU_i}{n},$$

where gRSCU^a is the gene that gRSCU is being calculated for, RSCU_i is the relative synonymous codon usage value (calculated from all protein coding genes in a genome) for the *i*th codon of *j* codons in a gene, and *n* is the number of codons in a gene. To

Table 1. Summary of 42 functions available in BioKIT at the time of publication.

Function name	Description	Type of function	Input data	Citation	Example software that performs this function
alignment_length	Calculate alignment length	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	NA	AMAS (Borowiec 2016)
alignment_recoding	Recode alignments using reduced character states	Processing	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Woese et al. (1991), Embley et al. (2003), Kosiol et al. (2004), Hrdy et al. (2004), Susko and Roger (2007)	Custom scripts (Hernandez and Ryan 2021)
alignment_summary	Summarize diverse properties of a multiple sequence alignment	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	NA	AMAS (Borowiec 2016); custom scripts (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016); PhyKIT (Steenwyk, Buida, et al. 2021)
consensus_sequence	Generates a consensus sequence	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Sternke et al. (2019)	Geneious (https://www.geneious.com)
constant_sites	Determine the number of constant sites in an alignment	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Kumar et al. (2016)	IQ-TREE (Minh et al. 2020)
parsimony_informative_sites	Determine the number of parsimony-informative sites in an alignment	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Kumar et al. (2016)	AMAS (Borowiec 2016); custom scripts (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016)
position_specific_score_matrix	Generates a position specific score matrix for an alignment	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Gribskov et al. (1987)	BLAST+ (Camacho et al. 2009)
variable_sites	Determine the number of variable sites in an alignment	Analysis	Multiple-sequence file in FASTA format	Shen, Salichos, et al. (2016)	AMAS (Borowiec 2016); custom scripts (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016); PhyKIT (Steenwyk, Buida, et al. 2021)
gc_content_first_position	Determine the GC content of the first codon position among protein coding sequences	Analysis	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	Bentele et al. (2013)	Custom scripts (Bentele et al. 2013)
gc_content_second_position	Determine the GC content of the second codon position among protein coding sequences	Analysis	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	Bentele et al. (2013)	Custom scripts (Bentele et al. 2013)
gc_content_third_position	Determine the GC content of the third codon position among protein coding sequences	Analysis	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	Bentele et al. (2013)	Custom scripts (Bentele et al. 2013)
gene_wise_relative_synonymous_codon_usage	Calculate gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage	Analysis	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	This study	This study
relative_synonymous_codon_usage	Calculate relative synonymous codon usage	Analysis	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	Xu et al. (2008)	MEGA (Kumar et al. 2016)
translate_sequence	Translate protein coding sequences to amino acid sequences	Processing	Protein coding sequences in FASTA format	NA	EMBOSS (Rice et al. 2000)
fastq_read_lengths	Examine the distribution of read lengths	Analysis	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	FQStat (Chanumolu et al. 2019)
subset_pe_fastq_reads	Down sample paired-end reads	Processing	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	SeqKit (Shen, Le, et al. 2016)
subset_se_fastq_reads	Down sample single-end reads	Processing	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	SeqKit (Shen, Le, et al. 2016)
trim_pe_fastq_reads	Trim paired-end reads based on quality and length thresholds	Analysis	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014)
trim_se_fastq_reads	Trim single-end reads based on quality and length thresholds	Analysis	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014)

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Function name	Description	Type of function	Input data	Citation	Example software that performs this function
trim_pe_adapters_fastq_reads	Trim adapters from paired-end reads and implement length thresholds	Analysis	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014)
trim_se_adapter_fastq_reads	Trim adapters from single-end reads and implement length thresholds	Analysis	Sequence reads in FASTQ format	NA	Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014)
gc_content	Determine GC content	Analysis	FASTA file of nucleotide sequences	Romiguier et al. (2010)	custom scripts (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016); GC-Profile (Gao and Zhang 2006)
genome_assembly_metrics	Determine diverse properties of a genome assembly for quality assessment and characterization	Analysis	FASTA file of a genome assembly	Gurevich et al. (2013)	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013); REAPR (Hunt et al. 2013)
150	L50	Analysis	FASTA file of a genome assembly	Gurevich et al. (2013)	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
190	L90	Analysis	FASTA file of a genome assembly	Gurevich et al. (2013)	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
longest_scaffold	Determine the length of the longest entry in a FASTA file	Analysis	FASTA file	Gurevich et al. (2013)	Custom scripts (Ou et al. 2020)
n50	N50	Analysis	FASTA file of a genome assembly	Gurevich et al. (2013)	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
n90	N90	Analysis	FASTA file of a genome assembly	Gurevich et al. (2013)	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
number_of_large_scaffolds	Determine the number and length of scaffolds longer than 500 nucleotides. Length threshold of 500 nucleotides can be modified by the user	Analysis	FASTA file	NA	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
number_of_scaffolds	Determine the number of FASTA entries	Analysis	FASTA file	NA	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
sum_of_scaffold_lengths	Determine the total length of all FASTA entries	Analysis	FASTA file	NA	QUAST (Gurevich et al. 2013)
character_frequency	Determine the frequency of each character. Gaps are assumed to be represented as '?' and '.' characters	Analysis	FASTA file	NA	Biostrings (https://rdrr.io/bioc/Biostrings/)
faidx	Get sequence entry from FASTA file	Processing	FASTA file	NA	SAMtools (Li et al. 2009)
file_format_converter	Converts multiple sequence alignments from one format to another	Processing	FASTA, Clustal, MAF, Mauve, Phylip, Phylip-sequential, Phylip-relaxed, and Stockholm	NA	ALTER (Glez-Pena et al. 2010)
multiple_line_to_single_line_fasta	Reformat sequences to be represented on one line	Processing	FASTA file	NA	FASTX-Toolkit (http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/)
remove_fasta_entry	Remove sequence based on entry identifier	Processing	FASTA file	NA	NA
remove_short_sequences	Remove short sequences	Processing	FASTA file	NA	NA
rename_fasta_entries	Rename FASTA entries	Processing	FASTA file	NA	FASTX-Toolkit (http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/)
reorder_by_sequence_length	Reorder FASTA entries by length	Processing	FASTA file	NA	SeqKit (Shen, Le, et al. 2016)
sequence_complement	Generate sequence complements in the forward or reverse direction	Processing	FASTA file	Britten (1998)	EMBOSS (Rice et al. 2000)

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Function name	Description	Type of function	Input data	Citation	Example software that performs this function
sequence_length	Calculate the length of each FASTA file	Analysis	FASTA file	NA	bioawk (https://github.com/lh3/bioawk)
single_line_to_multiple_line_fasta	Reformat sequences to be represented on multiple lines	Processing	FASTA file	NA	FASTX-Toolkit (http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/)

evaluate within-gene variation in relative synonymous codon usage, BioKIT also reports the standard deviation of relative synonymous codon usage values for each gene. Like the *relative_synonymous_codon_usage* function, gRSCU can be calculated using alternative genetic codes including user-specified ones. Taken together, these functions can be used individually or in tandem to investigate diverse biological phenomena, including codon usage bias (Brandis and Hughes 2016; LaBella et al. 2019) while also accounting for diverse genetic codes.

Genome assembly quality assessment

Determination of genome assembly properties is essential when evaluating assembly quality (Gurevich et al. 2013; Hunt et al. 2013). To facilitate these analyses, the *genome_assembly_metrics* function in BioKIT calculates 14 diverse properties of genome assemblies that evaluate assembly quality and characteristics including:

- assembly size: sum length of all contigs/scaffolds;
- L50 (and L90): the number of contigs/scaffolds that make up 50% (or, in the case of L90, 90%) of the total length of the genome assembly;
- N50 (and N90): the length of the contig/scaffold which, along with all contigs/scaffolds longer than or equal to that contig/scaffold, contain 50% (or, in the case of N90, 90%) the length of a particular genome assembly;
- GC content: fraction of total bases that are either G or C;
- number of scaffolds: total number of contigs/scaffolds;
- number and sum length of large scaffolds: total number and sum length of contigs/scaffolds above 500 nucleotides in length (length threshold of a “large scaffold” can be modified by the user); and
- frequency of nucleotides: fraction of occurrences for adenine (A), thymine (T), G, and C nucleotides.

Each metric can also be called using individual functions (e.g. the *n50* function calculates the N50 of an assembly and the *number_of_large_scaffolds* function calculates the number of large scaffolds in an assembly). We anticipate the ability of BioKIT to summarize genome assembly properties will be helpful for assessing genome quality as well as in comparative studies of genome properties, such as the evolution of genome size and GC content (Walker et al. 2015; Shen et al. 2020). Other pieces of software that conduct similar analyses include QUAST, REAPR, and GenomeQC (Gurevich et al. 2013; Hunt et al. 2013; Manchanda et al. 2020).

Processing and assessing the properties of multiple sequence alignments

Multiple sequence alignments—the alignment of 3 or more biological sequences—contain a wealth of information. To facilitate easy use and manipulation of multiple sequence alignments, BioKIT implements 16 functions that process or analyze alignments including: generating consensus sequences; generating a

position-specific score matrix (which represents the frequency of observing a particular amino acid or nucleotide at a specific position); recoding an alignment using different schemes, such as the RY-nucleotide scheme for nucleotide alignments (Woese et al. 1991; Phillips et al. 2001) or the Dayhoff-6, S&R-6, and KGB-6 schemes for amino acid alignments (Embley et al. 2003; Hrdy et al. 2004; Kosiol et al. 2004; Susko and Roger 2007); converting alignments among the following formats: FASTA, Clustal, MAF, Mauve, PHYLIP, PHYLIP-sequential, PHYLIP-relaxed, and Stockholm; extracting entries in FASTA files; removing entries from FASTA file; removing short sequences from a FASTA file; and others.

We highlight the *alignment_summary* function, which calculates numerous summary statistics for a multiple sequence alignment, a common step in many molecular evolutionary analyses (Plomion et al. 2018; Winterton et al. 2018). More specifically, the *alignment_summary* function calculates:

- alignment length: the total number of sites in an alignment;
- number of taxa: the total number of sequences in an alignment;
- number of parsimony-informative sites: a site in an alignment with at least 2 distinct nucleotides or amino acids that each occur at least twice;
- number of variable sites: a site in an alignment with at least 2 distinct nucleotides or amino acids;
- number of constant sites: sites with the same nucleotide or amino acid (excluding gaps); and
- the frequency of all character states: the fraction of occurrence for all nucleotides or amino acids (including gap characters represented as “-” or “?” in an alignment).

Like the *genome_assembly_metrics* function, each metric can be calculated individually (e.g. the *constant_sites* function calculates the number of constant sites in an alignment and the *character_frequency* function calculates the frequency of all character states). We anticipate the *alignment_summary* function will assist researchers in statistically evaluating the properties of their alignments, which may help guide subsampling strategies in phylogenomic studies (Edwards 2016; Mongiardino Koch 2021). Other pieces of software that perform similar operations include AMAS (Borowiec 2016) and Mesquite (Mesquite Project Team 2014). One advantage of BioKIT compared with other software [such as Phyutility (Smith and Dunn 2008)] the ability to calculate diverse summary statistics.

Implementing high standards of software development

Archival instability is a concern for bioinformatic tools and threatens the reproducibility of bioinformatic research. For example, in an analysis that aimed to evaluate the “installability” of bioinformatic software, 28% of over 36,000 bioinformatic tools failed to properly install due to implementation errors (Mangul, Mosqueiro, et al. 2019). To ensure archival stability of




Fig. 1. Relative synonymous codon usage across 171 fungal genomes. Relative synonymous codon usage (RSCU) was calculated from the coding sequences of 103 Eurotiomycetes (filamentous fungi) and 68 Saccharomycetes (budding yeasts) genomes obtained from NCBI. Hierarchical clustering was conducted across the fungal species (rows) and codons (columns). Eight groups of clustered rows were identified; 7 groups of clustered columns were identified. Broad differences were observed in the RSCU values of Eurotiomycetes and Saccharomycetes genomes. For example, Saccharomycetes tended to have higher RSCU values for the AGA codon, whereas Eurotiomycetes tended to have higher RSCU values for the CUG codon. To account for the use of an alternative genetic code in budding yeast genomes from the CUG-Ser1 and CUG-Ser2 lineages (Krassowski et al. 2018), the alternative yeast nuclear code—which is one of 26 alternative genetic codes incorporated into BioKIT—was used during RSCU determination. User's may also provide their own genetic code if it is unavailable in BioKIT. This figure was made using pheatmap (Kolde 2012).

BioKIT, we implemented a previously established protocol (Steenwyk et al. 2020; Steenwyk, Buida, et al. 2021; Steenwyk, Goltz, et al. 2021; Steenwyk and Rokas 2021b) for high standards of software development and design practices. More specifically, we wrote 339 unit and integration tests that ensure faithful functionality of BioKIT and span 95.35% of the codebase. We also implemented a continuous integration pipeline, which builds, packages, installs, and tests the functionality of BioKIT across Python versions 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9. To accommodate diverse installation workflows, we also made BioKIT freely available under the MIT license across popular platforms including GitHub (<https://github.com/JLSteenwyk/BioKIT>), PyPi (<https://pypi.org/project/jlsteenwyk-biokit/>), and the Anaconda Cloud (<https://anaconda.org/jlsteenwyk/jlsteenwyk-biokit>). To make BioKIT more user-friendly, we wrote online documentation, user tutorials, and instructions for requesting new features (<https://jlsteenwyk.com/BioKIT>). We anticipate our strategy to implement high standards of software development, coupled to our approach to decrease barriers to software usage (e.g. easy installation and extensive documentation), will address instabilities observed among many bioinformatic software and increase the long-term usability of BioKIT.

Results

Relative synonymous codon usage in 107 budding yeast and filamentous fungi

To demonstrate the utility of BioKIT in analyzing protein coding sequences, we calculated the relative synonymous codon usage

of all codons in the protein coding sequences of 103 Eurotiomycetes (filamentous fungi) and 68 Saccharomycetes (budding yeasts) genomes obtained from the RefSeq database of NCBI (Fig. 1). This example also demonstrates the flexibility of BioKIT to account for nonstandard genetic codes, which are observed among some budding yeasts that use the CUG codon to encode a serine or alanine rather than a leucine (Krassowski et al. 2018). Hierarchical clustering of relative synonymous codon usage values per codon (columns in Fig. 1) revealed similar patterns across groups of codons. For example, CUA, AUA, and GUA—3 of the 4 codons that end in UA—were underrepresented in all fungi. Hierarchical clustering of relative synonymous codon usage values per species (rows in Fig. 1) revealed filamentous fungi and budding yeasts often clustered separately. For example, UGA, GUG, AAC, UAC, AAG, UUC, UCC, ACC, GCC, CGC, CUG, AUC, GUC, CUC, and GGC are more often overrepresented among filamentous fungi in comparison to budding yeasts; in contrast, UUG, GUU, CCA, and GGU are more often overrepresented among budding yeasts in comparison to filamentous fungi. Variation within each lineage was also observed; for example, UUA was underrepresented in most, but not all, budding yeasts. These findings demonstrate how BioKIT can be used to examine patterns of RSCU in a single genome or across species.

Patterns of gene-wise codon usage bias can be used to assess codon optimization and predict steady-state gene expression levels

To evaluate the utility of BioKIT in examining gene-wise codon usage biases, we calculated the mean and median gRSCU value, a novel metric introduced in the present manuscript, for




Fig. 2. Mean gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage accurately estimates codon optimization. a) Gene-wise relative synonymous codon usage (gRSCU), the mean (x-axis) or median (y-axis) relative synonymous codon usage value per gene (based on RSCU values calculated from the entire set of protein coding genes), was calculated from the coding sequences of the model budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. b, c) In *S. cerevisiae*, a significant correlation was observed between tRNA adaptation index (tAI), a well-known measure of codon optimization (Sabi and Tuller 2014), and mean as well as median gRSCU ($r^2 = 0.52$, $P < 0.001$ and $r^2 = 0.25$, $P < 0.001$, respectively; Pearson's Correlation Coefficient). d) Using previously published data, a correlation is observed between median log2 gene expression and tAI in *Saccharomyces mikatae* (LaBella et al. 2019), which is evidence of tAI values being indicative of codon optimization. Comparison of mean and median gRSCU (e and f, respectively) and median log2 gene expression revealed similarly strong correlations ($r^2 = 0.57$, $P < 0.001$ and $r^2 = 0.41$, $P < 0.001$, respectively; Pearson's correlation coefficient). Of note, mean gRSCU had a strong correlation to gene expression than median gRSCU. Each gene is represented by a dot. In (a), the size of each dot represents the standard deviation of RSCU values observed in the gene.

individual protein coding genes in the genome of the baker's yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Fig. 2a). Mean and median gRSCU values were often, but not always, similar—the average absolute difference between mean and median gRSCU is 0.05 ± 0.04 . In *S. cerevisiae*, as well as other organisms, genes encoding ribosomal components and histones are known to be codon optimized and highly expressed (Sharp et al. 1986; Hershberg and Petrov 2009; LaBella et al. 2021). Therefore, we hypothesized that genes with high gRSCU values will have functions related to ribosomes or histones because patterns of gene-wise codon usage bias may be indicative of codon optimization. Supporting this hypothesis, examination of the 10 genes with the highest mean gRSCU revealed 5 genes with ribosome-related functions [RPL41B (YDL133C-A), mean gRSCU: 1.60; RPL41A (YDL184C), mean gRSCU: 1.58; RPS14A (YCR031C), mean gRSCU: 1.44; RPS9B (YBR189W), mean gRSCU: 1.43; and RPL18A (YOL120C), mean gRSCU: 1.43] and 4 genes with histone-related functions [HHF1 (YBR009C), mean gRSCU: 1.45; HTA2 (YBL003C), mean gRSCU: 1.44; HHF2 (YNL030W), mean gRSCU: 1.43; and HTA1 (YDR225W), mean gRSCU: 1.43]. Examination of the 10 most optimized genes according to median gRSCU revealed similar observations wherein 9 genes had ribosome-related functions [RPS14A (YCR031C), median gRSCU:

1.48; RPS12 (YOR369C), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPS30B (YOR182C), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPP2A (YOL039W), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPL18A (YOL120C), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPS3 (YNL178W), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPL13B (YMR142C), median gRSCU: 1.40; RPP0 (YLR340W), median gRSCU: 1.40; and RPS0B (YLR048W), median gRSCU: 1.40]. More broadly, genes associated with the 60S and 40S ribosomal units (gold color in Fig. 2a) tended to have high gRSCU values. These results suggest gRSCU values may be useful for estimating codon optimization.

To further explore the relationship between gRSCU and codon optimization, we compared gRSCU values to the values of the tRNA adaptation index, a measure of codon optimization (Sabi and Tuller 2014), in *S. cerevisiae* as well as in steady state gene expression data from *Saccharomyces mikatae* (LaBella et al. 2019). In *S. cerevisiae*, strong correlation was observed between mean gRSCU and tRNA adaptation index values (Fig. 2b) and a less robust, but still significant, correlation was observed between median gRSCU and tRNA adaptation index values (Fig. 2c). Examination of gRSCU and gene expression data from *S. mikatae* revealed a robust correlation (Fig. 2, e and f) suggesting gRSCU, and in particular the mean gRSCU, can serve as a measure of gene-wise codon optimization.




Fig. 3. Summary of genome assembly metrics across 901 genomes from 3 eukaryotic classes. Nine hundred and one scaffold-level genome assemblies from 3 major eukaryotic classes [215 Eurotiomycetes (kingdom: Fungi), 336 Magnoliopsida (kingdom: Plantae), 350 Mammalia (kingdom: Animalia)] were obtained from NCBI and examined for diverse metrics including assembly size, GC content, frequency of A, T, C, and G, N50, N90, L50, L90, number of scaffolds, number of large scaffolds (defined as being greater than 500 nucleotides, which can be modified by the user), sum length of large scaffolds, and longest scaffold in the assembly. Bar plots represent the mean for each taxonomic class. Error bars represent the standard deviation of values. This figure was made using ggplot2 (Wickham 2009) and ggpubfigs (Steenwyk and Rokas 2021a).

Genome assembly quality and characteristics among 901 eukaryotic genomes

Other functions in BioKIT can facilitate, but are not limited to, examining data quality, a prerequisite for many downstream analyses. For example, BioKIT can be useful in examining genome assembly quality and characteristics. To do so, we calculated 14 diverse genome assembly metrics among 901 scaffold-level haploid assemblies of eukaryotic genomes, which were obtained from NCBI, and span 3 major classes of animals (Mammalia; $N=350$), plants (Magnoliopsida; $N=336$), and fungi (Eurotiomycetes; $N=215$). Genome assembly properties exhibited variation both within and between the 3 classes (Fig. 3). For example, fungi had the smallest average genome size of 32.71 ± 7.04 Megabases (Mb) whereas mammals had the largest average genome size of $2,645.50 \pm 487.48$ Mb. Extensive variation in genome size within each class corroborates previous findings of extreme genome size variation among eukaryotes (Elliott and Gregory 2015). Variation in GC content, a genome property that has been actively investigated for decades (Galtier

et al. 2001; Romiguier et al. 2010; Serres-Giardi et al. 2012), was observed among the 3 eukaryotic classes—animals, plants, and fungi had an average GC content of 0.40 ± 0.04 , 0.35 ± 0.04 , and 0.49 ± 0.03 , respectively. Lastly, there was wide variation in genome assembly metrics associated with continuity of assembly. For example, the average N50 values for animals, plants, and fungi were $12,287.64 \pm 25,317.31$ Mb, $5,030.15 \pm 19,358.58$ Mb, and $1,370.77 \pm 1,552.13$ Mb, respectively. Taken together, these results demonstrate BioKIT can assist researchers in examining genome assembly quality but can also be used for studying genome evolution—such as the evolution of genome size and GC content.

Properties of multiple sequence alignment from 10 phylogenomic studies

The properties of multiple sequence alignments are routinely used to evaluate aspects of alignment information content (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016)—such as in phylogenomic and systematic studies (Oliveira et al. 2011; Pyron et al. 2013). To demonstrate the




Fig. 4. Summary metrics among multiple sequence alignments from phylogenomic studies. Multiple sequence alignments of amino acid sequences from 10 phylogenomic data matrices (Misof et al. 2014; Nagy et al. 2014; Borowiec et al. 2015; Chen et al. 2015; Struck et al. 2015; Whelan et al. 2015; Yang et al. 2015; Shen, Zhou, et al. 2016; Shen et al. 2018; Steenwyk et al. 2019) were examined for 5 metrics: number of taxa, alignment length, number of constant sites, number of parsimony-informative sites, and number of variable sites. The x-axis depicts the last name of the first author of the phylogenomic study followed by a description of the organisms that were under study. The abbreviation PI represents parsimony-informative sites. Although excluded here for simplicity and clarity, BioKIT also determines character state frequency (nucleotide or amino acid) when summarizing alignment metrics. This figure was made using ggplot2 (Wickham 2009) and ggpufigs (Steenwyk and Rokas 2021a).

utility of BioKIT in calculating summary statistics for multiple sequence alignments, we calculated 6 properties across 10 previously published phylogenomic data matrices of amino acid sequences (Misof et al. 2014; Nagy et al. 2014; Borowiec et al. 2015; Chen et al. 2015; Struck et al. 2015; Whelan et al. 2015; Yang et al. 2015; Shen, Zhou, et al. 2016, 2018; Steenwyk et al. 2019) (Fig. 4). Phylogenomic data matrices varied in the number of taxa (mean = 109.50 \pm 87.26; median = 94; max = 343; min = 36). Alignment length is associated with greater phylogenetic accuracy and bipartition support (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016); however, recent analyses suggest that in some instances shorter alignments that contain a wealth of informative sites (such as parsimony-informative sites) harbor robust phylogenetic signal (Steenwyk et al. 2020). Interestingly, the longest observed alignment (1,806,035 sites; Chen, Vertebrates in Fig. 4) (Chen et al. 2015) contained the highest number of constant sites ($N = 610,994$), which are phylogenetically uninformative, as well as the highest number of variable sites ($N = 1,195,041$), which are phylogenetically informative (Shen, Salichos, et al. 2016). In contrast to the multiple sequence alignment of vertebrate sequences, the second longest alignment of budding yeast sequences (1,162,805 sites; Shen, 332 Yeast in Fig. 4) has few constant sites ($N = 2,761$) and many parsimony-informative ($N = 1,152,145$) and variable sites ($N = 1,160,044$). This observation may be driven in part by the rapid rate of budding yeast evolution compared to animals (Shen et al. 2018). These results demonstrate BioKIT is useful in summarizing properties of multiple sequence alignments.

Discussion

The exemplary analyses discussed in the present manuscript represent a small fraction of the ways to implement BioKIT. To further demonstrate how BioKIT may be used in multistep bioinformatic workflows, we depict how BioKIT can be incorporated into genome assembly workflows, genomic analysis pipelines,

and phylogenomic workflows (Fig. 5). Taken together, these analyses demonstrate how BioKIT, alone or in tandem with other software, can facilitate the execution of diverse bioinformatic pipelines.

As noted throughout the manuscript, there are numerous other tools that perform similar functions to BioKIT. Our intent is not to replace these toolkits but provide a convenient package that conducts diverse analyses. Toolkits that conduct diverse analyses, like BioKIT, can help facilitate the long-term stability of bioinformatic workflows—such as those created using SnakeMake—by reducing the number of dependencies. We also believe BioKIT can be used as an effective teaching tool. The first step in teaching bioinformatics is often downloading and installing software, however, this step can be challenging and time-consuming due to lack of experience, differing installation requirements, and installation errors. Thus, BioKIT helps overcome this hurdle in the classroom.

Future releases of BioKIT will likely feature improvements in its scope and speed. BioKIT is a community-driven tool, thus, users are encouraged to request new functions or contribute their own. We recommend following standard GitHub operating procedures when doing so. In brief, new functions can be requested as GitHub issues and novel functions can be developed in a separate branch and then integrated into the main branch (or the distributed package). To help ensure long-term stability of BioKIT, users should write integration and unit tests for new functions prior to requesting to add them to the main branch. Beyond other functions, visualizing results will be considered in future releases of BioKIT. For the present manuscript, visualization of results was done with ggplot2 (Wickham 2009), pheatmap (Kolde 2012), and ggpufigs (Steenwyk and Rokas 2021a) in the R programming language. Other future improvements may be related to the speed of BioKIT. Although numerous functions are relatively fast—for example, summarizing genome assembly metrics took 1.25 and 2.55 s for the genomes of *S. cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus fumigatus*—




Fig. 5. BioKIT can be incorporated into diverse bioinformatic workflows. This flowchart depicts how BioKIT can be incorporated into numerous bioinformatic pipeline using genome assembly (left), genome analysis (middle), and phylogenomic analysis (right) as examples. For each workflow, steps that can be executed by BioKIT are depicted in bold-faced font.

some functions, especially those that process large files, such as FASTQ files, may benefit from codebase modifications that improve speed. Speed improvements will likely be guided by user needs.

Conclusion

BioKIT is a multipurpose toolkit that has diverse applications for bioinformatics research. The utilities implemented in BioKIT aim to facilitate the execution of seamless bioinformatic workflows that handle diverse sequence file types. Implementation of state-of-the-art software development and design principles in BioKIT help ensure faithful function and archival stability. BioKIT will be helpful for bioinformaticians with varying levels of expertise and biologists from diverse disciplines including molecular biology.

Data availability

BioKIT is freely available under the MIT license from GitHub (<https://github.com/JLSteenwyk/BioKIT>), PyPi (<https://pypi.org/project/jlsteenwyk-biokit/>), and the Anaconda Cloud (<https://anaconda.org/jlsteenwyk/jlsteenwyk-biokit>). Documentation, user tutorials, and instructions for requesting new features are available online (<https://jlsteenwyk.com/BioKIT>).

Acknowledgments

We thank the Rokas lab for helpful discussion and feedback. We also thank the bioinformatic community for providing suggestions of functions to implement in BioKIT.

Funding

JLS and AR were funded by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute through the James H. Gilliam Fellowships for Advanced Study program. Research in AR's lab is supported by grants from the National Science Foundation (DEB-1442113 and DEB-2110404), the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (R56 AI146096 and R01 AI153356), and the Burroughs Wellcome Fund.

Conflicts of interest

AR is a scientific consultant for LifeMine Therapeutics, Inc. JLS is a scientific consultant for Latch AI Inc.

Literature cited

- Bayat A. Science, medicine, and the future: ioinformatics. *BMJ*. 2002; 324(7344):1018–1022.
- Bentele K, Saffert P, Rauscher R, Ignatova Z, Blüthgen N. Efficient translation initiation dictates codon usage at gene start. *Mol Syst Biol*. 2013;9:675.
- Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics*. 2014;30(15):2114–2120.
- Borowiec ML. AMAS: a fast tool for alignment manipulation and computing of summary statistics. *PeerJ*. 2016;4:e1660.
- Borowiec ML, Lee EK, Chiu JC, Plachetzki DC. Extracting phylogenetic signal and accounting for bias in whole-genome data sets supports the Ctenophora as sister to remaining Metazoa. *BMC Genomics*. 2015;16:987.
- Brandis G, Hughes D. The selective advantage of synonymous codon usage bias in *Salmonella*. *PLoS Genet*. 2016;12(3):e1005926.

- Britten RJ. Precise sequence complementarity between yeast chromosome ends and two classes of just-subtelomeric sequences. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1998;95(11):5906–5912.
- Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2009;10:421.
- Chanumolu SK, Albahrani M, Otu HH. FQStat: a parallel architecture for very high-speed assessment of sequencing quality metrics. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2019;20(1):424.
- Chen M-Y, Liang D, Zhang P. Selecting question-specific genes to reduce incongruence in phylogenomics: a case study of jawed vertebrate backbone phylogeny. *Syst Biol*. 2015;64(6):1104–1120.
- Cock PJA, Antao T, Chang JT, Chapman BA, Cox CJ, Dalke A, Friedberg I, Hamelryck T, Kauff F, Wilczynski B, et al. Biopython: freely available Python tools for computational molecular biology and bioinformatics. *Bioinformatics*. 2009;25(11):1422–1423.
- Darriba D, Flouri T, Stamatakis A. The state of software for evolutionary biology. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2018;35(5):1037–1046.
- Edwards SV. Phylogenomic subsampling: a brief review. *Zool Scr*. 2016;45(S1):63–74.
- Elliott TA, Gregory TR. What's in a genome? The C-value enigma and the evolution of eukaryotic genome content. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2015;370(1678):20140331.
- Embley M, van der Giezen M, Horner DS, Dyal PL, Foster P. Mitochondria and hydrogenosomes are two forms of the same fundamental organelle. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2003;358(1429):191–203.
- Galtier N, Piganeau G, Mouchiroud D, Duret L. GC-content evolution in mammalian genomes: the biased gene conversion hypothesis. *Genetics*. 2001;159(2):907–911.
- Gao F, Zhang C-T. GC-Profile: a web-based tool for visualizing and analyzing the variation of GC content in genomic sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2006;34(Web Server Issue):W686–W691.
- Glez-Pena D, Gomez-Blanco D, Reboiro-Jato M, Fdez-Riverola F, Posada D. ALTER: program-oriented conversion of DNA and protein alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2010;38(Web Server Issue):W14–W18.
- Gribskov M, McLachlan AD, Eisenberg D. Profile analysis: detection of distantly related proteins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1987;84(13):4355–4358.
- Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler G. QUASt: quality assessment tool for genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics*. 2013;29(8):1072–1075.
- Hernandez AM, Ryan JF. Six-state amino acid recoding is not an effective strategy to offset compositional heterogeneity and saturation in phylogenetic analyses. *Syst Biol*. 2021;70(6):1200–1212.
- Hershberg R, Petrov DA. General rules for optimal codon choice. *PLoS Genet*. 2009;5(7):e1000556.
- Hrdy I, Hirt RP, Dolezal P, Bardónová L, Foster PG, Tachezy J, Embley TM. Trichomonas hydrogenosomes contain the NADH dehydrogenase module of mitochondrial complex I. *Nature*. 2004;432(7017):618–622.
- Hunt M, Kikuchi T, Sanders M, Newbold C, Berriman M, Otto TD. REAPR: a universal tool for genome assembly evaluation. *Genome Biol*. 2013;14(5):R47.
- Kim Y-M, Poline J-B, Dumas G. Experimenting with reproducibility: a case study of robustness in bioinformatics. *Gigascience*. 2018;7(7):giy077.
- Kolde R. Package 'pheatmap'. *Bioconductor*. 2012;1–6.
- Kosiol C, Goldman N, Buttimore NH. A new criterion and method for amino acid classification. *J Theor Biol*. 2004;228(1):97–106.
- Krassowski T, Coughlan AY, Shen X-X, Zhou X, Kominek J, Opulente DA, Riley R, Grigoriev IV, Maheshwari N, Shields DC, et al. Evolutionary instability of CUG-Leu in the genetic code of budding yeasts. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9(1):1887.
- Kulkarni N, Alessandri L, Panero R, Arigoni M, Olivero M, Ferrero G, Cordero F, Beccuti M, Calogero RA. Reproducible bioinformatics project: a community for reproducible bioinformatics analysis pipelines. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2018;19(Suppl 10):349.
- Kumar S, Dudley J. Bioinformatics software for biologists in the genomics era. *Bioinformatics*. 2007;23(14):1713–1717.
- Kumar S, Stecher G, Tamura K. MEGA7: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis version 7.0 for bigger datasets. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2016;33(7):1870–1874.
- LaBella AL, Opulente DA, Steenwyk JL, Hittinger CT, Rokas A. Signatures of optimal codon usage in metabolic genes inform budding yeast ecology. *PLoS Biol*. 2021;19(4):e3001185.
- LaBella AL, Opulente DA, Steenwyk JL, Hittinger CT, Rokas A. Variation and selection on codon usage bias across an entire subphylum. *PLoS Genet*. 2019;15(7):e1008304.
- Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R; 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*. 2009;25(16):2078–2079.
- Manchanda N, Portwood JL, Woodhouse MR, Seetharam AS, Lawrence-Dill CJ, Andorf CM, Hufford MB. GenomeQC: a quality assessment tool for genome assemblies and gene structure annotations. *BMC Genomics*. 2020;21(1):193.
- Mangul S, Martin LS, Eskin E, Blekhman R. Improving the usability and archival stability of bioinformatics software. *Genome Biol*. 2019;20(1):47.
- Mangul S, Mosqueiro T, Abdill RJ, Duong D, Mitchell K, Sarwal V, Hill B, Brito J, Littman RJ, Statz B, et al. Challenges and recommendations to improve the installability and archival stability of omics computational tools. *PLoS Biol*. 2019;17(6):e3000333.
- McInerney JO. GCUA: general codon usage analysis. *Bioinformatics*. 1998;14(4):372–373.
- Mesquite Project Team Mesquite. A Modular System for Evolutionary Analysis; 2014. https://bomeara.github.io/wikispaces_mesquite (accessed: 2022 May 11).
- Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, von Haeseler A, Lanfear R. IQ-TREE 2: new models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2020;37(5):1530–1534.
- Misof B, Liu S, Meusemann K, Peters RS, Donath A, Mayer C, Frandsen PB, Ware J, Flouri T, Beutel RG, et al. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. *Science*. 2014;346(6210):763–767.
- Mongiardino Koch N. Phylogenomic subsampling and the search for phylogenetically reliable loci. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2021;38(9):4025–4038.
- Nagy LG, Ohm RA, Kovács GM, Floudas D, Riley R, Gácsér A, Sipiczki M, Davis JM, Doty SL, de Hoog GS, et al. Latent homology and convergent regulatory evolution underlies the repeated emergence of yeasts. *Nat Commun*. 2014;5:4471.
- Oliveira C, Avelino GS, Abe KT, Mariguela TC, Benine RC, Ortí G, Vari RP, Corrêa e Castro RM. Phylogenetic relationships within the speciose family Characidae (Teleostei: Ostariophysi: Characiformes) based on multilocus analysis and extensive ingroup sampling. *BMC Evol Biol*. 2011;11:275.
- Ou S, Liu J, Chougule KM, Fungtammasan A, Seetharam AS, Stein JC, Llac V, Manchanda N, Gilbert AM, Wei S, et al. Effect of sequence depth and length in long-read assembly of the maize inbred NC358. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):2288.
- Phillips MJ, Lin Y-H, Harrison G, Penny D. Mitochondrial genomes of a bandicoot and a brushtail possum confirm the monophyly of

- Australidelphian marsupials. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2001;268(1475):1533–1538.
- Plomion C, Aury J-M, Amsellem J, Leroy T, Murat F, Duplessis S, Faye S, Francillon N, Labadie K, Le Provost G, et al. Oak genome reveals facets of long lifespan. *Nat Plants.* 2018;4(7):440–452.
- Pyron R, Burbrink FT, Wiens JJ. A phylogeny and revised classification of Squamata, including 4161 species of lizards and snakes. *BMC Evol Biol.* 2013;13:93.
- Rice P, Longden I, Bleasby A. EMBOSS: The European Molecular Biology Open Software Suite. *Trends Genet.* 2000;16(6):276–277.
- Romiguier J, Ranwez V, Douzery EJP, Galtier N. Contrasting GC-content dynamics across 33 mammalian genomes: relationship with life-history traits and chromosome sizes. *Genome Res.* 2010;20(8):1001–1009.
- Sabi R, Tuller T. Modelling the efficiency of codon–tRNA interactions based on codon usage bias. *DNA Res.* 2014;21(5):511–526.
- Serres-Giardi L, Belkhir K, David J, Glémin S. Patterns and evolution of nucleotide landscapes in seed plants. *Plant Cell.* 2012;24(4):1379–1397.
- Sharp PM, Tuohy TMF, Mosurski KR. Codon usage in yeast: cluster analysis clearly differentiates highly and lowly expressed genes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 1986;14(13):5125–5143.
- Shen W, Le S, Li Y, Hu F. SeqKit: a cross-platform and ultrafast toolkit for FASTA/Q file manipulation. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(10):e0163962.
- Shen X-X, Opulente DA, Kominek J, Zhou X, Steenwyk JL, Buh KV, Haase MAB, Wisecaver JH, Wang M, Doering DT, et al. Tempo and mode of genome evolution in the budding yeast subphylum. *Cell.* 2018;175(6):1533–1545.e20.
- Shen X-X, Salichos L, Rokas A. A genome-scale investigation of how sequence, function, and tree-based gene properties influence phylogenetic inference. *Genome Biol Evol.* 2016;8(8):2565–2580.
- Shen X-X, Steenwyk JL, LaBella AL, Opulente DA, Zhou X, Kominek J, Li Y, Groenewald M, Hittinger CT, Rokas A, et al. Genome-scale phylogeny and contrasting modes of genome evolution in the fungal phylum Ascomycota. *Sci Adv.* 2020;6(45):eabd0079.
- Shen X-X, Zhou X, Kominek J, Kurtzman CP, Hittinger CT, Rokas A. Reconstructing the backbone of the *Saccharomycotina* yeast phylogeny using genome-scale data. *G3 (Bethesda).* 2016;6(12):3927–3939.
- Smith SA, Dunn CW. Phyutility: a phyloinformatics tool for trees, alignments and molecular data. *Bioinformatics.* 2008;24(5):715–716.
- Steenwyk JL, Buida TJ, Labella AL, Li Y, Shen X-X, Rokas A. PhyKIT: a broadly applicable UNIX shell toolkit for processing and analyzing phylogenomic data. *Bioinformatics.* 2021;37(16):2325–2331.
- Steenwyk JL, Buida TJ, Li Y, Shen X-X, Rokas A. ClipKIT: a multiple sequence alignment trimming software for accurate phylogenomic inference. *PLoS Biol.* 2020;18(12):e3001007.
- Steenwyk JL, Goltz DC, Buida TJ, Li Y, Shen X-X, Rokas A. orthoSNAP: a tree splitting and pruning algorithm for retrieving single-copy orthologs from gene family trees. *bioRxiv* 2021.10.30.466607; 2021.
- Steenwyk JL, Rokas A. ggpubfigs: colorblind-friendly color palettes and ggplot2 graphic system extensions for publication-quality scientific figures. *Microbiol Resour Announc.* 2021a;10(44):e00871–21.
- Steenwyk JL, Rokas A. orthofisher: a broadly applicable tool for automated gene identification and retrieval. 2021b;11(9):jkab250.
- Steenwyk JL, Shen X-X, Lind AL, Goldman GH, Rokas A. A robust phylogenomic time tree for biotechnologically and medically important fungi in the Genera *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium*. *MBio.* 2019;10(4):e00925–19.
- Sternke M, Tripp KW, Barrick D. Consensus sequence design as a general strategy to create hyperstable, biologically active proteins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2019;116(23):11275–11284.
- Struck TH, Golombek A, Weigert A, Franke FA, Westheide W, Purschke G, Bleidorn C, Halanych KM. The evolution of Annelids reveals two adaptive routes to the interstitial realm. *Curr Biol.* 2015;25(15):1993–1999.
- Susko E, Roger AJ. On reduced amino acid alphabets for phylogenetic inference. *Mol Biol Evol.* 2007;24(9):2139–2150.
- Walker PJ, Firth C, Widen SG, Blasdel KR, Guzman H, Wood TG, Paradkar PN, Holmes EC, Tesh RB, Vasilakis N, et al. Evolution of genome size and complexity in the Rhabdoviridae. *PLoS Pathog.* 2015;11(2):e1004664.
- Van Der Walt S, Colbert SC, Varoquaux G. The NumPy array: a structure for efficient numerical computation. *Comput Sci Eng.* 2011;13(2):22–30.
- Whelan NV, Kocot KM, Moroz LL, Halanych KM. Error, signal, and the placement of Ctenophora sister to all other animals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2015;112(18):5773–5778.
- Wickham H. ggplot2. New York (NY): Springer; 2009.
- Winterton SL, Lemmon AR, Gillung JP, Garzon IJ, Badano D, Bakkes DK, Breitkreuz LC, Engel MS, Lemmon EM, Liu X, et al. Evolution of lacewings and allied orders using anchored phylogenomics (Neuroptera, Megaloptera, Raphidioptera). *Syst Entomol.* 2018;43(2):330–354.
- Woese CR, Achenbach L, Rouviere P, Mandelco L. Archaeal phylogeny: reexamination of the phylogenetic position of *Archaeoglobus fulgidus* in light of certain composition-induced artifacts. *Syst Appl Microbiol.* 1991;14(4):364–371.
- Wren JD. Bioinformatics programs are 31-fold over-represented among the highest impact scientific papers of the past two decades. *Bioinformatics.* 2016;32(17):2686–2691.
- Xia X. DAMBE5: a comprehensive software package for data analysis in molecular biology and evolution. *Mol Biol Evol.* 2013;30(7):1720–1728.
- Xu X, Liu Q, Fan L, Cui X, Zhou X. Analysis of synonymous codon usage and evolution of Begomoviruses. *J Zhejiang Univ Sci B.* 2008;9(9):667–674.
- Yang Y, Moore MJ, Brockington SF, Soltis DE, Wong GK-S, Carpenter EJ, Zhang Y, Chen L, Yan Z, Xie Y, et al. Dissecting molecular evolution in the highly diverse plant clade caryophyllales using transcriptome sequencing. *Mol Biol Evol.* 2015;32(8):2001–2014.

Communicating editor: J. Stajich