

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258245842>

Characterization of 114 insertion/deletion (INDEL) polymorphisms, and selection for a global INDEL panel for human identification

Dataset · November 2013

READS

62

15 authors, including:



Bobby Larue

University of North Texas HSC at Fort Worth

30 PUBLICATIONS 201 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Jianye Ge

University of North Texas HSC at Fort Worth

56 PUBLICATIONS 515 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Jonathan L King

University of North Texas HSC at Fort Worth

61 PUBLICATIONS 323 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Ranjit Chakraborty

University of North Texas HSC at Fort Worth

203 PUBLICATIONS 6,459 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Accepted Manuscript

Characterization of 114 insertion/deletion (INDEL) polymorphisms, and selection for a global INDEL panel for human identification

Bobby L. LaRue, Robert Lagacé, Chien-Wei Chang, Allison Holt, Lori Hennessy, Jianye Ge, Jonathan L. King, Ranajit Chakraborty, Bruce Budowle

PII: S1344-6223(13)00122-3

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.legalmed.2013.10.006>

Reference: LEGMED 1072

To appear in: *Legal Medicine*

Received Date: 8 February 2013

Revised Date: 19 August 2013

Accepted Date: 22 October 2013

Please cite this article as: LaRue, B.L., Lagacé, R., Chang, C-W., Holt, A., Hennessy, L., Ge, J., King, J.L., Chakraborty, R., Budowle, B., Characterization of 114 insertion/deletion (INDEL) polymorphisms, and selection for a global INDEL panel for human identification, *Legal Medicine* (2013), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.legalmed.2013.10.006>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Characterization of 114 Insertion/Deletion (INDEL) Polymorphisms, and Selection for a Global INDEL Panel for Human Identification.

Bobby L. LaRue^{a*}	Bobby.larue@unthsc.edu
Robert Lagacé^b	Robert.lagace@lifetech.com
Chien-Wei Chang^b	Chien-wei.chang@lifetech.com
Allison Holt^b	Allison.holt@lifetech.com
Lori Hennesy^b	Lori.hennesy@lifetech.com
Jianye Ge^a	Jianye.ge@unthsc.edu
Jonathan L. King^a	Jonathan.king@unthsc.edu
Ranajit Chakraborty^a	Ranajit.chakraborty@unthsc.edu
Bruce Budowle^{a,c}	Bruce.budowle@unthsc.edu

^a Institute of Applied Genetics, Department of Forensic and Investigative Genetics, University of North Texas Health Science Center, 3500 Camp Bowie Blvd., Forth Worth, Texas, 76107, USA

^b Life Technologies, 850 Lincoln Centre Drive, Foster City, California, 94404, USA

^c Center of Excellence in Genomic Medicine (CEGMR), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

1 **Keywords**

2 INDEL, Human genotyping, Identity testing, Degraded DNA, SNP, STR, Population
3 Genetics

4 **Abstract**

5 Bi-Allelic Insertions and Deletions (INDELs) are a powerful set of genetic markers for
6 Human Identification (HID). They have certain desirable features, such as low mutation
7 rates, no stutter, and potentially small amplicon sizes that could prove effective in some
8 circumstances. In this study, we analyzed the distribution of 114 INDELs in four North
9 American populations (Caucasian, African American, Southwest Hispanic, and Asian) to
10 estimate their distribution in major global populations. Of the 114 INDELs a primary
11 panel of 38 candidate markers was selected that met the criteria of 1) a minimum allele
12 frequency of greater than 0.20 across the populations studied; 2) general concordance
13 with Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) expectations; 3) relatively low F_{ST} based on the
14 major populations; 4) physical distance between markers greater than 40 Mbp; and 5) a
15 lack of linkage disequilibria between syntenic markers. Additionally, another 11
16 supplemental markers were selected for an expanded panel of 49 markers which met
17 the above criteria, with the exception that they are separated at least by 20 Mbp. The
18 resulting panels had Random Match Probabilities that were at least 10^{-16} and 10^{-19} ,
19 respectively, and combined F_{ST} values of approximately 0.02. Given these findings,
20 these INDELs should be useful for HID.

21

22

23 **1. Introduction**

1
2
3
4 24
5
6 25 Small bi-allelic insertion and deletion (INDEL) markers have generated interest for
7
8
9 26 human identification (HID) as an adjunct or viable alternative to short tandem repeat
10
11 27 (STR) or single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)-based approaches [1-12]. Various HID
12
13
14 28 panels utilizing INDELS have been developed and described [2-10, 12]. To augment
15
16 29 these existing panels, it would be desirable to seek INDELS that apply well to HID on a
17
18
19 30 more global basis which demonstrate high discrimination power and low inter-population
20
21 31 diversity (e.g., low F_{ST}).
22

23
24 32
25
26 33 In the study herein, genotype and allele frequency distributions were generated for 114
27
28
29 34 candidate INDELS in four major population groups (Caucasian, African, Asian, and
30
31 35 Southwest Hispanic) from North America. Criteria were set to select those INDELS that
32
33 36 would be best suited for HID. Two subpanels of INDELS (a primary and a secondary
34
35
36 37 set) were derived from the 114 markers that may be well-suited for use in a global
37
38 38 INDEL panel for HID.
39

40
41 39
42
43 40

44 45 41 **2. Materials and Methods**

46
47
48 42
49

50 43 **2.1 Marker Selection**

51
52
53 44
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 45 INDEL candidates were selected from NCBI using NCBI's dbSNP [13] search web page
5
6 46 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/SNP/>). The following criteria were used to select INDELs
7
8
9 47 from dbSNP 132:

10
11 48 *Organism: Homo sapiens*

12
13 49 *Chromosomes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, x, y*

14
15 50 *Function Class: intron*

16
17 51 *SNP Class: in-del*

18
19 52 *Validation Status: by-cluster, by-frequency, by-2hit-allele*

20
21 53 *Heterozygosity: 0-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, & 40-50*

22
23 54 The resulting XML file was parsed and filtered (in-house computer programs were
24
25
26 55 written in PERL to process NCBI's data files) for INDELs of length three or more,
27
28
29 56 validated by a method other than computed and were designated as unique. Population
30
31 57 data for African, African American, American Indian, Asian, Chinese, European,
32
33
34 58 Hispanic, Japanese, and Sub-Saharan African populations were gathered from files
35
36 59 downloaded from NCBI's dbSNP ftp site and INDELs with a minor allele frequency of
37
38 60 greater than or equal to 0.20 were selected.

39
40
41 61
42
43 62 The candidate INDELs were characterized by analyzing the INDEL and its surrounding
44
45
46 63 genomic DNA using the program mreps [14]. INDELs that were shown to have a
47
48 64 repetitive element, those where the INDEL sequence was seen to repeat 2.5 times or
49
50
51 65 more, were excluded as being possible STRs and originating from a method other than
52
53 66 an insertion or deletion[15-19]. INDELs of four and five nucleotides were given priority
54
55
56 67 for integrating into a multiplex and the candidates with the highest minor allele
57
58 68 frequencies were tested against an internal panel of population samples.

69

2. 2 Primer Design and Preliminary Multiplex Optimization

71

72 Four multiplex PCR assays for the detection of a total of 114 INDEL loci were
73 developed using the primer design function of the Primer3 software [20], and the five-
74 dye technology from Applied Biosystems. Simultaneous amplification of the INDEL
75 markers was performed on the GeneAmp® PCR Systems 9700 in a reaction volume of
76 25 µl using 0.2 µM concentration of each primer and 1x AmpFISTR® Identifiler® Direct
77 Master Mix supplemented with 17.5 nmol MgCl₂, 18 nmol dNTP, and 8.1 U AmpliTaq
78 Gold® enzyme.

79

2. 3 Samples

81

82 Buccal swabs from unrelated individuals (80 African Americans, 85 Asians, 98
83 Caucasians, and 86 Southwestern Hispanics) residing in the United States were kindly
84 provided by Genetic Testing Laboratories (Las Cruces, NM). The samples were
85 collected and anonymized in accordance with methods approved by the Institutional
86 Review Board for the University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth,
87 Texas. Additional anonymous, unrelated human samples were obtained from the
88 University of California at San Francisco or purchased as whole blood from the
89 Interstate Blood Bank, Inc. (Memphis, TN) or Boca Biolistics (Coconut Creek, FL) (166
90 African Americans, 202 Asians, 166 Caucasians, and 167 Southwestern Hispanics).

91

92 2.4 Isolation of DNA and preparation of samples for analysis

93
94 DNA was isolated from buccal swabs using either the AutoMate Express® (Life
95 Technologies, Carlsbad, CA) or the QiaAMP DNA Investigator® Kit (Qiagen, Hilden,
96 Germany) according to the manufacturers' recommendations. The blood samples were
97 purified on an Applied Biosystems 6100 Nucleic Acid Prep Station (Life Technologies).
98 The quantity of DNA was determined by qPCR using the Quantifiler® Quantification Kit
99 and 7500 Real-Time PCR® System (Life Technologies). Samples were normalized to
100 500 pg/μL and stored at either -20°C or -40°C until amplification.

101

102 2.5 Amplification and Analysis of the 114 INDELS

103
104 Samples containing 500 pg of DNA were analyzed. Each of four preliminary multiplexed
105 primer sets using a Geneamp 9700 (Life Technologies) were amplified with an initial
106 step at 95°C for 11 minutes followed by 28 cycles of 20 seconds at 94°C for
107 denaturation and 3 minutes at 59°C for annealing/extension. A final extension step of
108 60°C for 60 minutes was employed to promote terminal adenylation.

109
110 Each sample was prepared immediately prior to electrophoretic analysis and run on a
111 3500xl Genetic Analyzer® (Life Technologies) with an injection time of 10 seconds and
112 an injection voltage of 3kV. Electrophoretic data were analyzed using Genemapper
113 IDX® (Life Technologies).

114

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.6 Statistical analyses

Allele frequencies were determined by the gene counting method. Population genetic parameters were analyzed by using either Genetic Data Analysis software [21-22] or in-house developed software. Departures from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) and linkage equilibrium were tested using Fisher's exact test. Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons and population substructure parameter (F_{ST}) was estimated by the methods described in Weir and Cockerham [21, 23-24].

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Location and Description of the Markers

The 114 INDELS reside in non-coding regions and are distributed among the non-coding regions of chromosomes 1 through 22. The size of the insertion ranged from two to nine nucleotides in all populations assayed (Table 1). Sample electropherograms of these four preliminary multiplexes are shown in Supplementary Figures 1-4. While an initial criterion was to select indels with at least 3 bp in size for the polymorphism for long term multiplex design, a few dinucleotide indels were included as they were reported in the 38-plex by Pereira et al.[10]. Although not a final construct for a validated multiplex, the amplicons of all INDELS were less than 180bp. Small size amplicons which tend to be more robust for a PCR could be more effective for analysis of

1
2
3
4 138 degraded DNA samples. The size of each amplicon, although, is not set as the purpose
5
6
7 139 of this study was to determine the subset of indels that would be well-suited for HID;
8
9 140 once selected the primers can be redesigned to generate smaller length amplicons.

10
11 141

12 13 14 142 3.2 Population Data

15
16 143

17
18
19 144 The 114 INDELS were typed in four major populations: Asian (n=287), Southwest
20
21 145 Hispanic (n=253), Caucasian (n=264), and African American (n=246). All loci were
22
23
24 146 polymorphic (Table1). Three loci, I-15, I-43, and I-93 displayed departures from Hardy-
25
26 147 Weinberg equilibrium in two or more populations and, thus, were not considered for
27
28
29 148 further analyses in this study. For the remaining 111 markers, the numbers of
30
31 149 departures from HWE expectations were 9, 4, 2, and 3 in Asian, Southwest Hispanic,
32
33
34 150 Caucasian, and African American populations, respectively. This number of departures
35
36 151 is consistent with the number of departures expected by chance (i.e., 5%), except in the
37
38
39 152 Asian population. One explanation for the larger number of departures from HWE in
40
41 153 Asians may be that diverse subpopulations might be included in the sample from this
42
43 154 group. More studies with subpopulations may provide a better indication for the cause of
44
45
46 155 these departures in the Asian sample population. However, when corrected for multiple
47
48 156 comparisons (via the bonferroni correction), none of the 111 INDELS departed
49
50
51 157 significantly from HWE in any of the four populations (Table 1).

52
53 158

54
55 159 Testing for linkage disequilibrium (LD) was performed using Fisher's exact test, with
56
57
58 160 10000 shufflings [25]. With 111 INDELS there were 6105 pairwise comparisons
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 161 performed per population sample. A total of 928 (15.2%), 245 (4.0%), 457 (7.5%), and
5
6 162 204 (3.3%) pairs displayed detectable LD at the 0.05 level in the Asian, African
7
8
9 163 American, Southwest Hispanic, and Caucasian populations, respectively. The
10
11 164 percentage of pairs displaying significant LD that were observed in African American
12
13
14 165 and Caucasian were fewer than the expected number by random chance
15
16 166 (approximately 305 of the 6105 tests per population). However, the number of
17
18
19 167 significant LDs in Hispanic and Asian populations was greater than expected by chance
20
21 168 alone.

22
23
24 169
25
26 170 Upon closer examination, there were 21, 7, 20, and 6 syntenic loci pairs (i.e., only those
27
28
29 171 on the same arm of a chromosome) out of a total of 180 syntenic comparisons in the
30
31 172 Asian, African American, Southwest Hispanic, and Caucasian populations, respectively,
32
33 173 that displayed significant LDs. Once again, the number of pairs for the African
34
35
36 174 American and Caucasian were fewer and the Hispanic and Asian populations were
37
38 175 greater than would be expected due to random chance alone (i.e., approximately 9
39
40
41 176 pairs).

42
43 177
44
45 178 Among non-syntenic pairs, LD was observed in 907, 238, 437, and 198 pairs out of a
46
47
48 179 total of 5925 comparisons in the Asian, African American, Southwestern Hispanic, and
49
50
51 180 Caucasian populations, respectively. The number of pairs displaying LD would be
52
53 181 expected to be approximately 290 pairs if the departures were attributable to chance
54
55 182 alone. The same trends were observed as in the overall and syntenic pairs (i.e., fewer
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 183 than expected in Caucasian and African American, and greater than expected in
5
6 184 Hispanic and Asian populations) (Supplementary Table 1).
7
8
9 185
10
11 186 One plausible explanation for these departures, as stated above could be the construct
12
13
14 187 of the Hispanic and Asian sample populations studied. Another explanation is that the
15
16 188 greater than expected numbers of pairs exhibiting LD could be associated with loci
17
18
19 189 which showed departures from HWE, as previously described in the literature [25]. The
20
21 190 Asian and Southwestern Hispanic populations had 9 and 4 such loci, respectively, with
22
23 191 departures from HWE at a 0.05 level of significance. While not meeting the HWE
24
25 192 criterion for elimination (i.e., departing from HWE at 0.05 level in more than one
26
27 193 population), these loci may have distorted the LD analysis, exhibiting apparent linkage
28
29 194 with other loci in a greater number of instances than would be expected due to chance
30
31 195 alone. For example, among non-syntenic loci pairs, the same loci that showed slight
32
33 196 departures from HWE were overrepresented as exhibiting LD in comparison to what
34
35 197 would be attributable to random chance alone. 220 of 437 (50.3%) pairs with significant
36
37 198 LD in Hispanics and 531 of 907 (58.5%) pairs in Asians contained at least one locus
38
39 199 that had a departure from HWE. These loci represented 3.6% and 8.1% of the total
40
41 200 markers analyzed for LD in Hispanics and Asians, respectively. The fact that these loci
42
43 201 are overrepresented in loci pairs demonstrating LD lends supports that these loci may
44
45 202 be distorting the LD analysis. In a similar fashion, these same loci accounted for 12 of
46
47 203 20 (60.0%) Hispanic and 11 of 21 (52.4%) Asian syntenic loci pairs exhibiting LD. They
48
49 204 represented 16% in Hispanic and 36% of the Asian loci involved in pairs exhibiting LD.
50
51 205 If these loci were removed from the LD analysis, the Hispanic and Asian syntenic pairs
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 206 exhibiting LD would be either slightly lower (Hispanic) or much closer (Asian) to what
5
6
7 207 would be expected due to chance alone (i.e., approximately 9 pairs). These
8
9 208 observations further support that these loci may have distorted the LD analysis. When
10
11
12 209 corrected for multiple comparisons (via the Bonferroni correction) [23-24], however, only
13
14 210 one of the pairs of syntenic loci (markers I-113 and I-114 in the Southwest Hispanics
15
16 211 and about 10 Mbp distant) (Supplemental Table 1). and 19 non-syntenic pairs in the
17
18
19 212 Asian population still demonstrated significant LD (Supplemental Table 2)
20
21 213
22
23
24 214 To determine the effects of substructure among the four tested major population
25
26 215 groups, Wright's F_{ST} was estimated [24]. The global F_{ST} value for the set of 111 INDELs
27
28
29 216 was 0.06. Some markers, such as I-51, I-64, I-79, I-92 and I-109 had individual F_{ST}
30
31 217 values greater than 0.20 and thus contributed to elevating the overall F_{ST} value (Table
32
33 218 1). Clearly a subset of the 111 INDELs could be selected that would display a much
34
35
36 219 lower overall F_{ST} and be a desirable candidate panel for HID (see below).
37
38 220
39
40
41 221 Using the four major population groups to derive a F_{ST} value provided an indication of
42
43 222 an upper bound of the effects of population substructure. For HID purposes the degree
44
45
46 223 of substructure within a major population may have more practical application. Since the
47
48 224 major population group samples were collected from two geographically distinct areas,
49
50
51 225 substructure within the United States, F_{ST} for geographically different populations was
52
53 226 estimated. The overall F_{ST} for each major population group was approximately
54
55 227 6.57×10^{-4} , 1.0×10^{-5} , 3.52×10^{-3} , and 1.65×10^{-4} in the Asian, African American, Southwest
56
57
58 228 Hispanic, and Caucasian populations, respectively. These data indicate that the effects
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 229 of substructure within a major United States population group may be nominal. More
5
6 230 subgroup data from within major population groups from around the world would be
7
8
9 231 necessary to define better the effects.

10
11 232
12
13
14 233 The cumulative random match probability (RMP) for all 111 INDELS assuming
15
16 234 independence and no effects of substructure approached 10^{-42} in all populations. The
17
18
19 235 RMP is provided as a guide only (Table 1). This could be an overestimation of the RMP
20
21 236 as the assumption of independence may not hold for all loci.

22
23
24 237
25
26 238 Selecting a robust HID candidate INDEL panel is desirable. This panel should be one
27
28
29 239 that is effective across major populations and thus should exhibit low effects of
30
31 240 substructure. With low substructure effects not as many population databases may
32
33
34 241 need to be generated for use across the HID laboratories and a maximized
35
36 242 discrimination power can be obtained. In addition, those pairs of loci that do not
37
38 243 demonstrate detectable LD or are sufficiently separated physically on the chromosomes
39
40
41 244 are desirable for simplifying estimation of the RMP. To identify a set of INDELS that
42
43 245 could be included in a potential panel the following criteria were used: minor allele
44
45
46 246 frequencies greater than 0.20 in all four populations; F_{ST} values per locus approximately
47
48 247 or less than 0.06 (similarly set for SNPs by Kidd et al [11, 26]); physical distance greater
49
50
51 248 than 40 Mbp between markers or for a larger alternative set that includes the 40 Mbp
52
53 249 set and additional INDELS that are at least 20 Mbp distant on the same chromosome.

54
55 250
56

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 251 Given that Pereira et al. and others [2-3, 6, 8, 10] already described a multiplex INDEL
5
6 252 panel, some of these markers were given preference for compatibility or data sharing if
7
8
9 253 the INDEL met the above criteria in all four sample populations when a similarly
10
11 performing alternative INDEL was less than 40 Mbp or 20 Mbp for each panel set. The
12 254 frequency of alleles observed at each locus in the individual populations generally were
13
14 255 similar between the same population groups described herein and those described by
15
16 256 Fondevilla et al [3]. The few discrepancies observed were in the US Asian populations.
17
18 257 Again a likely reason is that the broad category of Asian samples may be composed of
19
20 258 notably different subpopulations; further studies are needed with better defined Asian
21
22 259 population categories.
23
24 260
25
26 261
27
28
29
30
31 262 16 of the markers from Pereira et al [10] met the above criteria and were included in the
32
33 263 initial panel of INDELS separated by at least 40 Mbp (Table 1). The primary panel that
34
35 264 met the selection criteria contains 38 INDELS (Table 1). The RMP assuming
36
37 265 independence approached 10^{-16} for each population group. The overall F_{ST} value for
38
39 266 this primary panel was approximately 0.023 which was less than those from the Pereira
40
41 267 et al [10] (Table 1).
42
43 268
44
45
46 269 If the physical distance criterion was relaxed to approximately 20 Mbp, the number of
47
48 270 INDELS included in the secondary panel increased to 49. The RMP for the secondary
49
50 271 panel, assuming independence, increased to 10^{-19} and the overall F_{ST} value was similar
51
52 272 to that of the primary panel (Table 1).
53
54
55 273
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

274

4. Conclusions

276

277 Using the criteria of HWE, allele frequency distribution, physical location, population
278 substructure, lack of detectable LD, and conformity with the assumption of mutual
279 independence, a candidate INDEL panel set of 38 or 49 markers (the latter if the
280 physical distance criterion is relaxed) has been identified. The F_{ST} value across these
281 major populations is relatively low (i.e., 0.023) and will be lower if calculated for each
282 population instead of combining the major population groups. More subpopulation data
283 are needed to define better major population-specific F_{ST} values. These INDELs should
284 be good candidates for development of an HID panel.

285

5. Acknowledgements

287 This work was funded in part by the Intelligence Community Postdoctoral Research
288 Fellowship program.

289

6. Conflict of Interest

291 R. Lagacé, C-W Chang, A. Holt, and L. Hennessy were/are employees of Life
292 Technologies, Foster City, CA. BL. LaRue, J. Ge, JL. King, R. Chakraborty, and B.
293 Budowle have no conflict of interest.

294

7. Protection of Human Subjects

1
2
3
4 296 All protocols have been approved by the UNTHSC Institutional Review Board to ensure
5
6
7 297 the ethical protection of human subjects.
8

9 298
10
11 299 **8. References**
12
13

- 14 300 1. Budowle B, van Daal A. Forensically relevant SNP classes. *BioTechniques*2008.
15 301 2. Edelmann J, Hering S, Augustin C, Szibor R. Indel polymorphisms--An additional
16 302 set of markers on the X-chromosome. *Forensic Science International: Genetics*
17 303 *Supplement Series*. [doi: 10.1016/j.fsigss.2009.08.148]. 2009;2(1):510-2.
18 304 3. Fondevila M, Phillips C, Santos C, Pereira R, Gusmão L, Carracedo A, Butler
19 305 JM, Lareu MV, Vallone PM. Forensic performance of two insertion–deletion marker
20 306 assays. *International journal of legal medicine*2012 2012/09/01;126(5):725-37.
21 307 4. Francez PAdC, Ribeiro-Rodrigues EM, dos Santos SEB. Allelic frequencies and
22 308 statistical data obtained from 48 AIM INDEL loci in an admixed population from the
23 309 Brazilian Amazon. *Forensic Science International: Genetics*2012;6(1):132-5.
24 310 5. Friis SL, Børsting C, Rockenbauer E, Poulsen L, Fredslund SF, Tomas C,
25 311 Morling N. Typing of 30 insertion/deletions in Danes using the first commercial indel
26 312 kit—Mentype® DIPplex. *Forensic Science International: Genetics*. [doi:
27 313 10.1016/j.fsigen.2011.08.002]. (0).
28 314 6. LaRue BL, Ge J, King JL, Budowle B. A validation study of the Qiagen
29 315 Investigator DIPplex® kit; an INDEL-based assay for human identification. *International*
30 316 *Journal of Legal Medicine*2012:1-8.
31 317 7. Li C, Zhao S, Zhang S, Li L, Liu Y, Chen J, Xue J. Genetic polymorphism of 29
32 318 highly informative InDel markers for forensic use in the Chinese Han population.
33 319 *Forensic Science International: Genetics*. [doi: 10.1016/j.fsigen.2010.03.004].
34 320 2011;5(1):e27-e30.
35 321 8. Pereira R, Phillips C, Alves C, Amorim A, Carracedo Á, Gusmão L.
36 322 Insertion/deletion polymorphisms: A multiplex assay and forensic applications. *Forensic*
37 323 *Science International: Genetics Supplement Series*. [doi: 10.1016/j.fsigss.2009.09.005].
38 324 2009;2(1):513-5.
39 325 9. Weber JL, David D, Heil J, Fan Y, Zhao C, Marth G. Human Diallelic
40 326 Insertion/Deletion Polymorphisms. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. [doi:
41 327 10.1086/342727]. 2002;71(4):854-62.
42 328 10. Pereira R, Phillips C, Alves C, Amorim A, Carracedo Á, Gusmão L. A new
43 329 multiplex for human identification using insertion/deletion polymorphisms.
44 330 *Electrophoresis*2009;30(21):3682-90.
45 331 11. Pakstis A, Speed W, Kidd J, Kidd K. Candidate SNPs for a universal individual
46 332 identification panel. *Human Genetics*2007;121(3):305-17.
47 333 12. Pena HB, Pena SDJ. Automated genotyping of a highly informative panel of 40
48 334 short insertion-deletion polymorphisms resolved in polyacrylamide gels for forensic
49 335 identification and kinship analysis. *Transfusion Medicine and*
50 336 *Hemotherapy*2012;39(3):211.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 337 13. Sherry ST, Ward M-H, Kholodov M, Baker J, Phan L, Smigielski EM, Sirotkin K.
5 338 dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2001 January
6 339 1, 2001;29(1):308-11.
- 8 340 14. Kolpakov R, Bana G, Kucherov G. mreps: efficient and flexible detection of
9 341 tandem repeats in DNA. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2003;31(13):3672-8.
- 10 342 15. Ndifon W, Nkwanta A, Hill D. Identifying Nonrandom Occurrences of Simple
11 343 Sequence Repeats in Genomic DNA Sequences. *ETHNICITY AND*
12 344 *DISEASE* 2005;15(4):5.
- 14 345 16. Leclercq S, Rivals E, Jarne P. DNA slippage occurs at microsatellite loci without
15 346 minimal threshold length in humans: a comparative genomic approach. *Genome*
16 347 *Biology and Evolution* 2010;2:325.
- 17 348 17. Dieringer D, Schlötterer C. Two distinct modes of microsatellite mutation
18 349 processes: evidence from the complete genomic sequences of nine species. *Genome*
19 350 *Research* 2003;13(10):2242-51.
- 21 351 18. Messer PW, Arndt PF. The majority of recent short DNA insertions in the human
22 352 genome are tandem duplications. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 2007;24(5):1190-7.
- 23 353 19. Amos W. Mutation biases and mutation rate variation around very short human
24 354 microsatellites revealed by human–chimpanzee–orangutan genomic sequence
25 355 alignments. *Journal of Molecular Evolution* 2010;71(3):192-201.
- 27 356 20. Rozen S, Skaletsky H. Primer3 on the WWW for general users and for biologist
28 357 programmers. *Methods Mol Biol* 2000;132(3):365-86.
- 30 358 21. Lewis P, Zaykin D. GDA: software for the analysis of discrete genetic data. Free
31 359 computer program distributed by the authors at:
32 360 <http://hydrodictyoneebucnnetdu/people/plewis/softwarephp1999>.
- 33 361 22. Weir BS. *Genetic data analysis II*: Sinauer Associates; 1996.
- 34 362 23. Dunn OJ. Multiple comparisons among means. *Journal of the American*
35 363 *Statistical Association* 1961;56(293):52-64.
- 37 364 24. Weir B, Cockerham CC. Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of population
38 365 structure. *Evolution* 1984:1358-70.
- 39 366 25. Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK. Inference of population structure using
40 367 multilocus genotype data: linked loci and correlated allele frequencies.
41 368 *Genetics* 2003;164(4):1567.
- 43 369 26. Kidd KK, Pakstis AJ, Speed WC, Grigorenko EL, Kajuna SLB, Karoma NJ,
44 370 Kungulilo S, Kim J-J, Lu R-B, Odunsi A, Okonofua F, Parnas J, Schulz LO, Zhukova
45 371 OV, Kidd JR. Developing a SNP panel for forensic identification of individuals. *Forensic*
46 372 *Science International*. [doi: 10.1016/j.forsciint.2005.11.017]. 2006;164(1):20-32.

48 373
49 374 Supplementary Figure 1. A sample electropherogram of preliminary multiplex assay 1.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

375 Supplementary Figure 2. A sample electropherogram of preliminary multiplex assay 2.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

376 Supplementary Figure 3. A sample electropherogram of preliminary multiplex assay 3.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

377 Supplementary Figure 4. A sample electropherogram of preliminary multiplex assay 4.

378

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 1. A Description, Location, and Distribution of 114 Small INDELs In Four North American Populations

Marker	RS Number ^a	Alleles ^a	Chr ^a	Location ^a	Asian (n=287)				Southwestern Hispanic (n=253)				Caucasian (n=264)				African American (n=246)				F _{ST} ^d
					Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	
I-1 ^{f,g}	4646006	-/CTCA	1	15845022	0.3739	0.4435	0.4906	0.3924	0.5456	0.4606	0.3016	0.3771	0.4494	0.5253	0.3791	0.3776	0.2913	0.4008	0.6418	0.4299	0.046
I-2 ^{f,g}	13447508	-/CTTAGA	1	91977954	0.4087	0.3913	0.0046*	0.3838	0.3498	0.4609	0.8845	0.4006	0.2763	0.4436	0.0910	0.4401	0.2901	0.4156	1.0000	0.4307	0.014
I-3 ^{e,f,g}	3047269	-/CTGA	1	162810828	0.5660	0.4340	0.0825	0.3795	0.4717	0.5348	0.3005	0.3758	0.4283	0.4303	0.0638	0.3803	0.6763	0.4730	0.2388	0.4119	0.047
I-4 ^g	2307507	-/ATTTT	1	190257015	0.4022	0.4913	0.7847	0.3851	0.4897	0.5413	0.2414	0.3751	0.4494	0.4553	0.2061	0.3776	0.2789	0.4008	1.0000	0.4382	0.032
I-5 ^{e,f,g}	2307579	-/ATG	1	247812083	0.2863	0.4103	1.0000	0.4332	0.3092	0.3991	0.3505	0.4194	0.5082	0.5082	0.9002	0.3751	0.4979	0.5228	0.5216	0.3750	0.056
I-6 ^{f,g}	3838581	-/TAAC	2	100050427	0.3500	0.4478	0.8865	0.4005	0.5806	0.4917	1.0000	0.3817	0.4319	0.4903	1.0000	0.3798	0.3905	0.5083	0.3398	0.3879	0.038
I-7 ^{f,g}	2308276	-/TTTAA	2	172915805	0.3630	0.3957	0.0317*	0.3959	0.4835	0.5391	0.2474	0.3753	0.3716	0.4397	0.3487	0.3931	0.5434	0.5000	1.0000	0.3769	0.029
I-8 ^{f,g}	3042783	-/GAGTT	2	222160758	0.6325	0.4056	0.0540	0.3944	0.6319	0.4676	1.0000	0.3942	0.6745	0.3843	0.0464*	0.4110	0.7522	0.3973	0.3777	0.4629	0.012
I-9 ^e	16624	-/GT	2	235016391	0.4100	0.3800	0.0118*	0.3835	0.5063	0.5125	0.8762	0.3750	0.7805	0.3659	0.4930	0.4908	0.2870	0.3889	0.5686	0.4327	0.170
I-10 ^e	2308242	-/CT	3	8616709	0.2702	0.3872	0.7430	0.4445	0.1787	0.2979	1.0000	0.5421	0.2070	0.3074	0.3215	0.5051	0.3402	0.4481	1.0000	0.4044	0.025
I-11 ^{f,g}	3841948	-/ATTTA	3	30715071	0.4239	0.4913	1.0000	0.3810	0.3704	0.4856	0.5888	0.3935	0.4261	0.4786	0.7946	0.3806	0.3107	0.4321	1.0000	0.4185	0.011
I-12 ^{f,g}	35716687	-/TTAA	3	112650221	0.6565	0.4609	0.8852	0.4031	0.5123	0.5391	0.2468	0.3752	0.5467	0.5019	0.8994	0.3772	0.7190	0.4132	0.8815	0.4368	0.036
I-13 ^{f,g}	2307603	-/GATCT	3	153886702	0.5341	0.5542	0.0964	0.3762	0.4731	0.5165	0.6040	0.3757	0.5725	0.4627	0.3711	0.3804	0.4489	0.4723	0.5029	0.3776	0.011
I-14	3057785	-/ATTTG	3	188417221	0.2848	0.4043	0.8728	0.4342	0.2984	0.4403	0.5376	0.4256	0.3852	0.5136	0.1947	0.3892	0.0926	0.1687	1.0000	0.7063	0.076
I-15 ⁱ	17131840	-/CCGCCCTGC	4	1283077	0.7730	0.0000	<0.0001*	0.4829	0.8031	0.0438	<0.0001*	0.5175	0.5667	0.4424	0.2091	0.3796	0.7184	0.0190	<0.0001*	0.4363	0.050
I-16 ^{f,g}	60901515	-/AAGT	4	23792754	0.6225	0.4739	1.0000	0.3914	0.6058	0.4813	1.0000	0.3869	0.6569	0.4510	1.0000	0.4032	0.6170	0.4340	0.2153	0.3898	0.000
I-17 ^{f,g}	2308292	-/TAAGT	4	107889773	0.5109	0.5000	1.0000	0.3751	0.3180	0.4184	0.5460	0.4147	0.3366	0.4764	0.3249	0.4060	0.4195	0.4915	1.0000	0.3817	0.030
I-18 ^{e,f,g}	2307526	-/ACAC	5	5125112	0.5723	0.4213	0.0346*	0.3804	0.3092	0.4079	0.5394	0.4194	0.3648	0.4918	0.4086	0.3953	0.4066	0.5145	0.3409	0.3842	0.049
I-19	2308240	-/AGAA	5	18217324	0.3353	0.4538	0.8891	0.4065	0.3471	0.4959	0.1626	0.4017	0.4765	0.4824	0.6203	0.3756	0.1723	0.2851	1.0000	0.5515	0.066
I-20 ^g	2307656	-/TAAGT	5	34844425	0.4217	0.4435	0.1775	0.3813	0.5926	0.4774	0.8934	0.3840	0.4903	0.4591	0.2107	0.3751	0.5494	0.5226	0.4397	0.3775	0.019
I-21	2307661	-/TTCT	5	34893909	0.4197	0.5422	0.0870	0.3817	0.3777	0.4378	0.3237	0.3913	0.4294	0.4745	0.6041	0.3801	0.5022	0.4848	0.6858	0.3750	0.008
I-22	2307848	-/AAGTGCACG	5	36819396	0.4618	0.4980	1.0000	0.3765	0.3954	0.4393	0.2235	0.3867	0.2680	0.3760	0.5158	0.4462	0.6474	0.4231	0.2509	0.3996	0.096
I-23 ^e	1160956	-/AGA	5	65378460	0.5830	0.5191	0.3486	0.3822	0.6346	0.4316	0.3186	0.3951	0.8689	0.2213	0.5840	0.6221	0.5602	0.4896	0.8960	0.3787	0.087
I-24 ^{f,g}	2308196	-/ATTG	5	73798863	0.6871	0.3681	0.0636	0.4174	0.6350	0.4479	0.7326	0.3952	0.5904	0.4819	1.0000	0.3836	0.6656	0.4110	0.3771	0.4070	0.004
I-25	1610959	-/CTTA	5	76003944	0.4799	0.5261	0.4420	0.3754	0.3947	0.4825	1.0000	0.3868	0.4255	0.4667	0.5182	0.3807	0.6498	0.4185	0.2449	0.4005	0.047
I-26	10590424	-/AATAA	5	79347159	0.5060	0.5329	0.4432	0.3750	0.5274	0.4939	0.8746	0.3758	0.5215	0.5399	0.3449	0.3755	0.6182	0.4606	0.7358	0.3901	0.007
I-27	35864678	-/GTAACACTAC	5	100097302	0.8213	0.3012	0.8349	0.5422	0.5885	0.4425	0.2152	0.3832	0.6569	0.4667	0.6790	0.4032	0.5826	0.4420	0.1668	0.3821	0.053
I-28	1160936	-/ATTTA	5	115787453	0.2043	0.2870	0.1028	0.5083	0.4318	0.4835	0.7890	0.3798	0.5233	0.4786	0.5327	0.3755	0.1723	0.2941	0.8179	0.5516	0.127
I-29 ^{f,g}	2067140	-/CAGT	5	115887784	0.5982	0.4356	0.2542	0.3852	0.5215	0.3804	0.0027*	0.3755	0.5873	0.5000	0.7479	0.3830	0.3282	0.4110	0.3930	0.4097	0.058
I-30 ^g	2067191	-/TCTA	5	135274588	0.5141	0.5060	0.8965	0.3752	0.4539	0.5044	0.8916	0.3771	0.5216	0.4784	0.5336	0.3755	0.4408	0.5044	0.7867	0.3786	0.005
I-31	2307687	-/TTGT	5	144002681	0.2952	0.3655	0.0651	0.4275	0.2438	0.3625	0.8633	0.4665	0.2157	0.3765	0.0920	0.4950	0.1603	0.2607	0.6371	0.5704	0.016
I-32	1160941	-/AAAAGC	5	156621965	0.9960	0.0080	1.0000	0.9841	0.9871	0.0258	1.0000	0.9501	0.9882	0.0235	1.0000	0.9543	0.9957	0.0087	1.0000	0.9828	0.001
I-33 ^{e,f,g}	1610871	-/TAGG	5	171087970	0.4120	0.4869	1.0000	0.3831	0.4153	0.4587	0.4287	0.3825	0.4789	0.4981	1.0000	0.3754	0.4551	0.4939	1.0000	0.3770	0.002
I-34	2307680	-/CAAA	6	10020397	0.1109	0.1522	0.002*	0.6640	0.3128	0.4198	0.7646	0.4174	0.3794	0.4553	0.5974	0.3908	0.2078	0.3086	0.3324	0.5041	0.069
I-35 ^{e,f,g}	2307710	-/AGGA	6	47821263	0.2128	0.3149	0.3357	0.4983	0.2830	0.4043	1.0000	0.4354	0.3053	0.4631	0.1806	0.4215	0.4419	0.4855	0.7899	0.3784	0.040
I-36	2307938	-/CCCA	6	79100815	0.2490	0.3293	0.0663	0.4618	0.5473	0.5021	0.8973	0.3773	0.4863	0.5098	0.7991	0.3752	0.6857	0.4346	1.0000	0.4166	0.126
I-37	2308231	-/GACAAA	6	116436397	0.6152	0.5087	0.3338	0.3893	0.4136	0.4650	0.5126	0.3828	0.4086	0.4514	0.3023	0.3838	0.0885	0.1687	0.7049	0.7164	0.186
I-38 ^{e,g}	2307839	-/GA	6	117093558	0.4295	0.5427	0.1114	0.3801	0.2467	0.3511	0.4733	0.4639	0.2500	0.4098	0.1758	0.4609	0.2261	0.3361	0.5739	0.4837	0.041
I-39 ^e	2308137	-/GA	6	149614198	0.4340	0.4851	0.8908	0.3795	0.2983	0.4163	1.0000	0.4256	0.3115	0.4262	0.8838	0.4181	0.6058	0.4647	0.6951	0.3869	0.081
I-40 ^{f,g}	34510056	-/CTTTA	6	153353935	0.6696	0.4174	0.3739	0.4087	0.5864	0.4403	0.1490	0.3828	0.5233	0.5331	0.3155	0.3755	0.5165	0.5537	0.1181	0.3753	0.018
I-41	1160847	-/TAAAA	7	11562255	0.8609	0.2609	0.2631	0.6070	0.7798	0.3333	0.7149	0.4901	0.8288	0.2879	1.0000	0.5532	0.6322	0.4959	0.3380	0.3943	0.055
I-42	1611033	-/GAAA	7	70068205	0.1978	0.3000	0.3954	0.5163	0.3244	0.4174	0.4671	0.4115	0.4942	0.4903	0.8033	0.3750	0.4104	0.5375	0.1061	0.3834	0.066

Table 1. (Cont)

Marker	RS Number ^a	Alleles ^a	Chr ^a	Location ^a	Asian (n=287)				Southwestern Hispanic (n=253)				Caucasian (n=264)				African American (n=246)				F _{ST} ^d
					Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	
I-43 ⁱ	2067151	-/TATTA	7	78252645	0.3635	0.3815	0.0075*	0.3957	0.6288	0.4592	0.7840	0.3932	0.6608	0.3569	0.0013*	0.4049	0.4539	0.5044	0.8915	0.3771	0.079
I-44 ^e	2307978	-/GA	7	83283913	0.3426	0.4553	1.0000	0.4035	0.3075	0.4027	0.4271	0.4203	0.1557	0.2705	0.8075	0.5778	0.3942	0.5145	0.2727	0.3869	0.049
I-45	1610907	-/AAAGT	7	110559277	0.1891	0.3087	1.0000	0.5277	0.5351	0.4752	0.5151	0.3762	0.6031	0.4825	1.0000	0.3863	0.2128	0.3182	0.4383	0.4983	0.183
I-46 ^{f,g}	16458	-/TTCC	7	122151327	0.6135	0.4663	0.8708	0.3889	0.5859	0.5460	0.1485	0.3827	0.6536	0.4759	0.6046	0.4019	0.4663	0.5276	0.5369	0.3761	0.024
I-47	2307571	-/TACTT	7	137050412	0.6767	0.4297	0.7722	0.4121	0.5932	0.4682	0.6788	0.3841	0.6608	0.4902	0.1681	0.4049	0.7500	0.3584	0.4864	0.4609	0.016
I-48	3062629	-/CTGT	8	10606219	0.6145	0.5221	0.1447	0.3891	0.4871	0.5172	0.6979	0.3752	0.4725	0.4980	1.0000	0.3758	0.2978	0.4304	0.7536	0.4259	0.064
I-49	17515041	-/CAAGA	8	16855495	0.5109	0.5174	0.7001	0.3751	0.4877	0.4733	0.4452	0.3752	0.4222	0.4786	0.8042	0.3813	0.1379	0.2263	0.4250	0.6093	0.118
I-50 ^{f,g}	34535242	-/GTAG	8	18429416	0.5402	0.4859	0.7975	0.3766	0.6234	0.5105	0.2136	0.3916	0.6608	0.4275	0.4898	0.4049	0.5736	0.5065	0.6867	0.3806	0.010
I-51	2308127	-/TCAAG	8	24053261	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0434	0.0785	0.3661	0.8443	0.0039	0.0078	1.0000	0.9845	0.2827	0.4135	0.8821	0.4356	0.227
I-52	34293322	-/ACTC	8	34948880	0.6968	0.4297	0.8765	0.4227	0.4958	0.4768	0.5188	0.3750	0.3706	0.4510	0.5860	0.3934	0.3803	0.4359	0.2671	0.3905	0.090
I-53	10666410	-/AGTG	8	61190688	0.4761	0.5000	1.0000	0.3756	0.4918	0.5144	0.7038	0.3751	0.5097	0.5058	0.8983	0.3751	0.1983	0.3140	0.8381	0.5157	0.086
I-54 ^e	35769550	-/TGAC	8	76518680	0.5830	0.4681	0.5938	0.3822	0.5085	0.4468	0.1122	0.3751	0.3668	0.4631	1.0000	0.3946	0.1805	0.3029	0.8270	0.5396	0.124
I-55	35146764	-/TCTTA	8	117130337	0.6345	0.4498	0.6824	0.3951	0.6508	0.4587	1.0000	0.4009	0.5882	0.4627	0.5240	0.3831	0.3468	0.5234	0.0213*	0.4018	0.075
I-56 ^{f,g}	10623496	-/GAAT	8	123945645	0.4237	0.4297	0.0691	0.3810	0.2991	0.4274	0.8823	0.4251	0.4039	0.4706	0.7017	0.3847	0.3565	0.5043	0.1526	0.3981	0.011
I-57 ^e	5895447	-/CA	8	138420594	0.2851	0.4255	0.6341	0.4340	0.3249	0.4009	0.2068	0.4113	0.3402	0.4672	0.5764	0.4045	0.2729	0.3958	1.0000	0.4425	0.003
I-58 ^{f,g}	33951431	-/AGTT	9	2626813	0.5913	0.4348	0.1340	0.3838	0.6446	0.4711	0.7825	0.3985	0.5856	0.5175	0.3035	0.3827	0.6379	0.3951	0.0264*	0.3962	0.002
I-59 ^{e,g}	16402	-/TTAT	9	38406788	0.2553	0.3574	0.3843	0.4564	0.3013	0.4330	0.7459	0.4238	0.2930	0.4385	0.4333	0.4288	0.3382	0.4440	0.8859	0.4053	0.003
I-60 ^e	2067294	-/CTT	9	71314421	0.1936	0.3106	1.0000	0.5217	0.3655	0.4622	1.0000	0.3950	0.3566	0.4426	0.5814	0.3981	0.1722	0.2531	0.1112	0.5517	0.051
I-61	2308113	-/TACT	9	98479484	0.2028	0.3173	0.6957	0.5101	0.2045	0.3595	0.1180	0.5080	0.2373	0.3412	0.3797	0.4726	0.1097	0.1772	0.1681	0.6666	0.017
I-62 ^{f,g}	2308112	-/ACACC	9	98574109	0.4819	0.5141	0.7059	0.3753	0.5917	0.5333	0.1364	0.3838	0.5647	0.5020	0.7994	0.3793	0.5468	0.5149	0.5908	0.3772	0.007
I-63 ^e	2307580	-/AATT	9	105586193	0.5277	0.4426	0.0914	0.3758	0.5498	0.4842	0.7920	0.3775	0.4877	0.5164	0.7006	0.3752	0.2967	0.4108	0.8772	0.4266	0.051
I-64	41308024	-/GTAA	9	123793536	0.7217	0.4087	0.8710	0.4387	0.6770	0.4074	0.3079	0.4122	0.5875	0.4825	1.0000	0.3830	0.2087	0.3430	0.6955	0.5031	0.205
I-65 ^g	2307850	-/GGTG	9	135380186	0.3649	0.5040	0.2192	0.3952	0.3347	0.4628	0.6652	0.4068	0.3000	0.4353	0.6453	0.4246	0.4703	0.5424	0.1968	0.3759	0.021
I-66 ^{e,f,g}	140809	-/CAA	10	5987163	0.2830	0.3787	0.3256	0.4354	0.2863	0.3965	0.6224	0.4332	0.3668	0.5205	0.0701	0.3946	0.4461	0.5021	0.8990	0.3780	0.024
I-67 ^{e,f,g}	1160886	-/ACT	10	54442386	0.5043	0.4979	1.0000	0.3750	0.3796	0.5185	0.1544	0.3907	0.3689	0.5082	0.1716	0.3940	0.3174	0.4108	0.4626	0.4150	0.025
I-68 ^g	34051577	-/TCTTA	10	89690955	0.5823	0.5221	0.2955	0.3821	0.5833	0.4907	1.0000	0.3822	0.6686	0.4431	1.0000	0.4083	0.5045	0.5336	0.3586	0.3750	0.017
I-69 ^{e,f,g}	10688868	-/CT	11	268180	0.4511	0.4426	0.1127	0.3774	0.3109	0.3782	0.0710	0.4184	0.3033	0.4344	0.7676	0.4227	0.2614	0.3817	0.8575	0.4514	0.028
I-70	34823526	-/AAGT	11	14200361	0.4785	0.4417	0.1618	0.3755	0.3497	0.4540	1.0000	0.4007	0.4277	0.4940	1.0000	0.3804	0.5307	0.4601	0.3485	0.3759	0.021
I-71 ^{e,g}	34811743	-/TG	11	30177690	0.6936	0.4170	0.7513	0.4209	0.7577	0.3260	0.1056	0.4679	0.6393	0.4590	1.0000	0.3967	0.6328	0.4855	0.5812	0.3945	0.013
I-72	2307666	-/GTTAC	11	64729920	0.2087	0.2957	0.1140	0.5031	0.3663	0.4691	1.0000	0.3948	0.5798	0.4669	0.5302	0.3816	0.2284	0.3827	0.2070	0.4814	0.125
I-73 ^{f,g}	2307696	-/CGAC	11	70595112	0.3414	0.4659	0.6782	0.4040	0.4661	0.4746	0.5140	0.3762	0.4118	0.4627	0.5176	0.3831	0.5043	0.4224	0.0162*	0.3750	0.018
I-74 ^g	34528025	-/GAGT	11	99514962	0.4819	0.5382	0.2575	0.3753	0.3548	0.4855	0.4003	0.3988	0.2863	0.3843	0.3622	0.4332	0.5601	0.4764	0.5971	0.3787	0.059
I-75	11281892	-/GTCAT	11	124644227	0.7783	0.2957	0.0356*	0.4884	0.8189	0.2716	0.1976	0.5388	0.8327	0.2568	0.2583	0.5592	0.2593	0.3868	1.0000	0.4531	0.319
I-76	2307805	-/CCATAAACC	12	67705010	0.6064	0.5141	0.2868	0.3871	0.4219	0.5063	0.5995	0.3813	0.3627	0.4588	0.8938	0.3960	0.5590	0.4716	0.5047	0.3785	0.051
I-77 ^{f,g}	3045264	-/GTCT	12	77216833	0.3715	0.4297	0.2243	0.3932	0.3130	0.4328	1.0000	0.4173	0.3863	0.4039	0.0197*	0.3889	0.4095	0.4655	0.5864	0.3836	0.005
I-78 ^g	2308232	-/AGTTTA	12	96991884	0.3000	0.4348	0.6513	0.4246	0.2794	0.3908	0.6345	0.4379	0.3541	0.4981	0.1734	0.3990	0.2748	0.4421	0.1090	0.4412	0.005
I-79 ^e	2308171	-/TCTG	13	44880155	0.0759	0.1296	0.1791	0.7489	0.1687	0.2651	0.3622	0.5571	0.2015	0.3118	0.5725	0.5117	0.5490	0.5020	0.9004	0.3774	0.214
I-80 ^{f,g}	4187	-/TAAAGA	13	50106333	0.5153	0.5276	0.5277	0.3752	0.4294	0.5153	0.6308	0.3801	0.5181	0.5181	0.7519	0.3753	0.6288	0.4847	0.7417	0.3933	0.024
I-81	2308057	-/AATAA	13	110810568	0.4261	0.4783	0.7788	0.3806	0.2181	0.2716	0.0029*	0.4924	0.2140	0.3502	0.5809	0.4969	0.4339	0.4793	0.6909	0.3795	0.067
I-82 ^{f,g}	3038530	-/TCAA	13	112546924	0.4558	0.5100	0.7074	0.3770	0.4635	0.4721	0.4339	0.3763	0.4020	0.4431	0.2486	0.3852	0.2651	0.4353	0.0927	0.4485	0.032
I-83 ^{e,f,g}	2308189	-/AACTA	14	29036757	0.4043	0.5447	0.0567	0.3847	0.4908	0.5229	0.5902	0.3751	0.4221	0.4836	0.8980	0.3813	0.5041	0.5519	0.1262	0.3750	0.008

Table 1. (Cont)

Marker	RS Number ^a	Alleles ^a	Chr ^a	Location ^a	Asian (n=287)				Southwestern Hispanic (n=253)				Caucasian (n=264)				African American (n=246)				F _{ST} ^d
					Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	Frequency of Deletion	H _o ^c	HWE ^b (p-value)	RMP ^c	
I-84	3059434	-/CTCTT	14	34152270	0.9196	0.1261	0.0461*	0.7370	0.7335	0.4174	0.3291	0.4473	0.6654	0.4514	0.8918	0.4068	0.9564	0.0788	0.3674	0.8437	0.128
I-85 ^{f,g}	34795726	-/AAGA	15	58348104	0.6466	0.4819	0.4886	0.3993	0.6535	0.4440	0.7814	0.4019	0.4490	0.5294	0.3157	0.3776	0.5214	0.4444	0.0921	0.3755	0.039
I-86	2307519	-/TTTCAA	15	64367358	0.2239	0.3435	0.8570	0.4861	0.3864	0.4256	0.1315	0.3889	0.1829	0.2879	0.5346	0.5362	0.3601	0.4650	1.0000	0.3969	0.047
I-87	3029195	-/ATGGGA	16	7758509	0.2370	0.3348	0.2706	0.3911	0.3864	0.4421	0.7014	0.3889	0.4377	0.5097	0.6038	0.3790	0.1364	0.2562	1.0000	0.6121	0.088
I-88 ^{f,g}	17859968	-/TAAA	16	55530356	0.3783	0.4609	0.7861	0.4657	0.4669	0.5124	0.3367	0.3761	0.4144	0.4708	0.6616	0.3827	0.2955	0.4174	1.0000	0.4273	0.020
I-89 ^e	2067208	-/GCCAG	16	84582287	0.2447	0.3532	0.4809	0.4657	0.2818	0.3771	0.3367	0.4362	0.3176	0.4221	0.6616	0.4149	0.1577	0.2656	1.0000	0.5746	0.023
I-90 ^e	3051300	-/GTAT	17	10135941	0.3489	0.4681	0.7751	0.4009	0.3403	0.4202	0.3192	0.4044	0.4508	0.4754	0.5156	0.3775	0.1950	0.3154	1.0000	0.5199	0.048
I-91 ^{f,g}	28923216	-/TTGTA	17	12011874	0.5500	0.4130	0.0102*	0.3775	0.5926	0.4856	1.0000	0.3840	0.5233	0.5019	1.0000	0.3755	0.6694	0.4545	0.7747	0.4086	0.015
I-92	16715	-/AAGCTC	17	61393657	0.8204	0.2635	0.1989	0.5408	0.6677	0.3841	0.1070	0.4079	0.6810	0.4172	0.5977	0.4142	0.1606	0.2970	0.2569	0.5698	0.316
I-93 ⁱ	16430	-/CTTTAA	18	673444	0.7450	0.3092	0.0036*	0.4566	0.4464	0.2747	<0.0001*	0.3779	0.3412	0.3137	<0.0001*	0.4040	0.7162	0.3231	0.0027*	0.4348	0.156
I-94 ^g	36062169	-/GTACTG	18	8073016	0.4261	0.4696	0.5869	0.3806	0.5124	0.5455	0.1984	0.3752	0.5992	0.4747	0.9007	0.3854	0.4772	0.4979	1.0000	0.3755	0.019
I-95 ^e	3080855	-/AATT	18	23253207	0.3090	0.4382	0.7732	0.4195	0.2745	0.3872	0.7408	0.4414	0.2816	0.4023	1.0000	0.4363	0.2837	0.4122	0.8777	0.4349	0.001
I-96	34000371	-/GTTA	18	27291283	0.3655	0.4337	0.3465	0.3951	0.5000	0.4746	0.4402	0.3750	0.6255	0.4588	0.7890	0.3922	0.5396	0.4890	0.7855	0.3766	0.046
I-97	34999022	-/TAAA	18	33050322	0.4196	0.4739	0.6803	0.3817	0.5658	0.4568	0.2979	0.3794	0.6712	0.4553	0.6732	0.4095	0.5640	0.4917	1.0000	0.3792	0.041
I-98 ^{e,f,g}	34511541	-/CTCTT	18	36423040	0.3809	0.4809	0.8898	0.3904	0.5000	0.4498	0.1447	0.3750	0.3586	0.4467	0.6807	0.3974	0.3714	0.4772	0.7864	0.3932	0.015
I-99	4149614	-/TTAAA	18	56040243	0.5978	0.5000	0.5876	0.3851	0.5103	0.5350	0.3113	0.3751	0.5778	0.4942	0.9005	0.3813	0.2695	0.4403	0.0747	0.4450	0.087
I-100 ^e	36040336	-/AT	19	1402662	0.7596	0.3447	0.3725	0.4696	0.6915	0.4298	1.0000	0.4197	0.8115	0.3033	0.8360	0.5285	0.4627	0.5021	1.0000	0.3764	0.105
I-101	34560670	-/CATAGAG	19	5059801	0.8024	0.2754	0.0889	0.5166	0.4055	0.5427	0.1508	0.3844	0.3865	0.4172	0.1358	0.3889	0.3879	0.4970	0.6263	0.3885	0.160
I-102	34781304	-/GATAA	19	38094947	0.5804	0.4652	0.5006	0.3817	0.2531	0.3909	0.7410	0.4583	0.2121	0.3152	0.3629	0.4992	0.3889	0.4156	0.0571	0.3883	0.113
I-103 ^e	2307689	-/TTC	19	44204340	0.1979	0.3021	0.4100	0.5163	0.4013	0.5084	0.4260	0.3853	0.2418	0.3852	0.4826	0.4683	0.4627	0.5519	0.1194	0.3764	0.069
I-104 ^{f,g}	34495360	-/AAGT	20	4954109	0.5848	0.5087	0.4988	0.3825	0.5288	0.4897	0.8055	0.3758	0.5603	0.5370	0.1596	0.3787	0.6049	0.5267	0.1414	0.3867	0.002
I-105	35149698	-/CAACTA	20	7672133	0.7329	0.3735	0.5135	0.4469	0.4535	0.4735	0.5049	0.3772	0.5882	0.4627	0.5176	0.3831	0.2701	0.4241	0.3100	0.4446	0.146
I-106 ^e	33917182	-/CA	20	11695625	0.5043	0.4638	0.2929	0.3750	0.6468	0.4587	1.0000	0.3993	0.5656	0.4508	0.1956	0.3794	0.5125	0.5417	0.2388	0.3752	0.015
I-107	33921337	-/GGGGTCTGA	20	24727238	0.9202	0.1227	0.0618	0.7387	0.6902	0.3865	0.2680	0.4190	0.6657	0.4639	0.7280	0.4070	0.5736	0.5460	0.1492	0.3806	0.100
I-108 ^e	34541393	-/AACT	20	30701405	0.6685	0.4307	0.6780	0.4082	0.4693	0.4959	1.0000	0.3760	0.4004	0.4866	0.8959	0.3855	0.3959	0.5061	0.4219	0.3865	0.065
I-109	34785121	-/TGGA	20	58311383	1.0000	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.9664	0.0588	0.2287	0.8764	0.9942	0.0117	1.0000	0.9770	0.6996	0.4115	0.7596	0.4244	0.250
I-110 ^{e,f,g}	35605984	-/TAAAG	21	15634865	0.3894	0.5234	0.1445	0.3881	0.5446	0.4225	0.0385*	0.3770	0.4549	0.5082	0.7926	0.3771	0.5858	0.4686	0.5980	0.3827	0.029
I-111	10629864	-/TTAAT	21	30695351	0.1674	0.2217	0.0042*	0.5591	0.2243	0.3498	1.0000	0.4857	0.3891	0.5058	0.3543	0.3882	0.1157	0.1818	0.1109	0.6535	0.079
I-112 ^e	10629077	-/AT	21	31372337	0.2511	0.3319	0.0823	0.4600	0.2478	0.3805	0.8621	0.4629	0.1660	0.2828	1.0000	0.5613	0.2116	0.3402	0.8504	0.4997	0.007
I-113 ^{e,f,g}	2307700	-/TCAC	22	26790901	0.2907	0.3889	0.3724	0.4303	0.3865	0.4382	0.2291	0.3889	0.5209	0.4487	0.1078	0.3754	0.2469	0.3633	0.7326	0.4636	0.061
I-114	3218285	-/AACC	22	37536724	0.4719	0.5020	1.0000	0.3758	0.5667	0.5583	0.0497*	0.3796	0.5392	0.4745	0.5171	0.3766	0.1897	0.3017	0.8330	0.5270	0.112
					Asian RMP				Southwestern Hispanic RMP				Caucasian RMP				African American RMP				F _{ST}
Overall For 111 Markers^h					6.53 x 10 ⁻⁴²				5.03 x 10 ⁻⁴⁴				1.87 x 10 ⁻⁴³				1.15 x 10 ⁻⁴¹				0.060
Overall For 33 Markers Described By Pereria et al. ^e					4.38x10 ⁻¹³				2.38x10 ⁻¹³				6.22x10 ⁻¹³				3.41x10 ⁻¹³				0.050
Overall For Suggested Panel 1^f					4.27x10 ⁻¹⁶				3.68x10 ⁻¹⁶				2.43x10 ⁻¹⁶				5.79x10 ⁻¹⁶				0.023
Overall For Suggested Panel 2^g					2.30x10 ⁻¹⁹				2.52x10 ⁻¹⁹				1.60x10 ⁻¹⁹				3.62x10 ⁻¹⁹				0.023

a. According to dbSNP [26]

b. * denotes markers that display departures from HWE at a critical value of .05; α -level of .05 is adjusted from .05 to 0.000431 when corrected for multiple tests (Bonferroni's correction) [32, 33] as calculated by GDA [32]c. H_o denotes Observed Heterozygosity and RMP denotes Random Match Probability

- d. F_{ST} calculated according to Weir and Cockerham [34]
- e. 33 Markers also described in Pereria et al. [10]
- f. 38 Markers meeting the criteria of no observable departures from HWE, LD, minor allele frequencies $>.20$, $F_{ST} < .062$, and $>40\text{Mb}$ between markers on the same chromosome
- g. Expanded set of 49 Markers (38 markers from f. and 11 additional markers) meeting the criteria of no observable departures from HWE, LD, minor allele frequencies $>.20$, $F_{ST} < .062$, and $>20\text{Mb}$ between markers on the same chromosome
- h. Calculated assuming independence at population level
- i. Markers excluded based on departure from HWE in more than one population

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT