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## Materials and Methods

Genome assembly
The DNA sample for sequencing of the reference genome was extracted from blood obtained from a single, male Danish Tumbler, bred by Anders and Hans Ove Christiansen (Danmarks Racedueforeninger, Næstved, Denmark). This breed was chosen because it is an old breed that is believed to have changed little in recent history. Seven paired-end sequencing libraries were constructed, with insert sizes of $170 \mathrm{bp}, 500 \mathrm{bp}, 800 \mathrm{bp}, 2 \mathrm{~kb}, 5 \mathrm{~kb}, 10 \mathrm{~kb}$ and 20 kb . The libraries were sequenced using Illumina HiSeq2000 platform, yielding a total of 127.17 Gb raw data (Table S 1 ). The raw sequences were filtered for low quality, adapter sequence, paired-end read overlap, and PCR duplicates. We also performed an error correction step on the raw reads before assembling. Filtering and error correction resulted in 81.57 Gb of clean data for genome assembly with the genome with SOAPdenovo (20). We used k-mer frequency to estimate genome size at 1.3 Gb (Table S3); final genome coverage was 62.75 -fold. The assembly has an N 50 scaffold length of 3.15 Mb and a total length of $1.11 \mathrm{~Gb}(84.6 \%$ representation), the largest contig is $>250 \mathrm{~kb}$ and the largest scaffold $>25.6 \mathrm{Mb}$ (Table S4). Overall, the assembly of the pigeon genome surpasses the turkey genome (assembled using reads from a combination of next-generation technologies) in both contig and scaffold size (Table S6), demonstrating that deep sequencing using only short Illumina reads is sufficient to produce a useful draft avian genome assembly.

To detect contamination, we aligned the assembly against the NCBI nr databases, but we found little contamination from non-pigeon genomic sequence. We also assessed the assembly by aligning the genome to 2108 ESTs from Columba livia (downloaded from Genbank). Approximately $90 \%$ of these ESTs could be mapped to the assembly (Table S5), suggesting the assembly has good coverage of gene regions.

The sequencing coverage of the assembled genome sequence was evaluated by mapping the raw sequencing data back to the scaffolds using SOAPaligner (27). The peak sequencing depth was 60 X and more than $87 \%$ of the assembly had at least 20 -fold raw sequence coverage (Fig. S1). A scatter graph of GC content versus sequencing depths (Fig. S2) shows a typical distribution for Illumina data, and the GC content distribution in pigeon is similar to other avian genomes (Fig. S3).

To improve the quality of the annotation, we also sequenced six RNA-seq libraries using Illlumina RNA-seq technology. RNA samples from heart and liver were extracted for sequencing from three different birds: the Danish tumbler used for the reference genome, plus an Oriental frill and and a racing homer. These RNA-seq data were used in the annotation pipeline (see below for methods and Table S2 for sequencing statistics).

## Annotation

We used Tandem Repeats Finder (28) to identify tandem repeats across the genome. Transposable elements (TEs) were identified using an approach combining both homology-based and de novo predictions. We identified known TEs in the pigeon assembly using RepeatMasker (http://www.repeatmasker.org) and RepeatProteinMask with the Repbase TE library. RepeatModeler was used to perform de novo predictions. The percentage of repetitive content in
the pigeon genome was $8.7 \%$, which is similar to other avian genomes (29-31); however, we expect that the unassembled regions of the pigeon genome are also enriched in repeats.

Homology information, transcription information from RNA-seq data, and de novo predictions were integrated to annotate the protein coding genes of pigeon genome. First, protein sequences from Gallus gallus, Homo sapiens, and Taeniopygia guttata were used to perform homology-based gene predictions on the pigeon assembly. The homology-based pipeline included following steps: 1) homology searching against a non-redundant collection of protein sequences using TBLASTN with a E-value cutoff of $1 \mathrm{E}-5 ; 2$ ) selection of the most similar proteins for each region with homologous protein matching; 3 ) exclusion of regions with homologous blocks shorter than $50 \%$ of query proteins; 4) use of Genewise (version 2.0) (32) to generate gene structures based on the homology alignments. Output gene models with a Genewise score of less than 70 were discarded. We also did pairwise whole genome alignments for pigeon and the other species to determine the syntenic blocks between them, using LASTZ (http://www.bx.psu.edu/~rsharris/lastz/). The gene models located in syntenic blocks were considered high quality genes. Three homolog-based predictions (based on proteins from Gallus gallus, Homo sapiens, and Taeniopygia guttata) were merged; for a given locus, the longest gene model was selected. Gene models located in non-syntenic regions that had no known SwissProt function were discarded. The merged "homology-based gene set" served as the starting point for the additional analyses described below.

RNA-seq reads were mapped to the genome by Tophat (33), and then Cufflinks (34) was used to assemble transcripts and predict open reading frames (ORFs). Transcript-based gene models with intact ORFs that had no overlap with the merged homology-based gene set were added to a merged gene set. If a transcript-based gene model with an intact ORF covered more than one homology-based gene, we replaced the homology-based gene with the transcript-based model. Transcripts without intact ORFs were used to extend incomplete homology-based gene models to find start and stop codons. The gene set improved by transcript evidence was considered the "homology-transcript gene set".

Augustus (35) and Genscan (30) were used for de novo gene prediction. The predicted gene models from these two programs were then merged by GLEAN (37). De novo gene models that had a known SwissProt function and did not overlap with the homology-transcript gene set were added to the annotation.

Due to limitations of automated annotation, some genes might be missed. Potentially missed genes - those that are present in the gene sets of chicken, turkey, and zebra finch but absent from pigeon - were identified from gene family analyses (see below). Protein sequences of potentially missed genes were used by Genewise to perform an additional round of homology-based gene predictions. The output gene models with transcript support and Genewise scores $>70$ were added to the pigeon gene annotation set. Genes related to transposons usually have many copies and can affect the subsequent analyses. Therefore, after functional annotation (see below), we removed the gene models containing transposon-related InterPro domains from the gene set, and curated some problematic gene models.

In summary, annotation of the pigeon genome identified 17,300 genes (Table S8), and all but 1,928 gene predictions are found in other avian genomes. 817 of the 1,928 contain homology to genes outside Aves and/or contain an identifiable protein domain, 1,111 have no homology or identifiable domains, but 115 of these have at least one splice site confirmed by RNA-seq data; thus, few gene predictions are good candidates for pigeon-specific protein coding genes. Fig. S4 compares general features of genes of the pigeon and other avian species.

The CEGMA pipeline (37) was used to assess the quality of the protein-coding gene annotation set. Of the 248 core eukaryotic genes in CEGMA, 197 genes were predicted in pigeon, and all the predicted genes can be found in our final annotation set. We compared the gene models predicted by CEGMA with the gene models by our annotation pipeline, and calculated the overlapping ratio for each CEGMA gene model (overlapping cds length / CEGMA cds length). Of the 197 predicted CEGMA genes, 166 had an overlapping ratio of at least $80 \%$ at the CDS level (Table S9).

Functions were assigned to annotated genes based on best alignments (minimum aligned coverage $\geq 50 \%$ ) to the SwissProt database (release 15.10) (38) using BLASTP (Table S10). The motifs and domains of genes were determined by searching InterPro databases (v29.0) (39), including Pfam, PRINTS, PROSITE, ProDom, and SMART databases. GO terms for each gene were obtained from the corresponding InterPro entry. All genes were aligned against KEGG proteins (release 60.0) (40), and the pathways in which the gene might be involved were derived from the best matched protein in KEGG.

We used tRNAscan-SE (41) and INFERNAL (42) to predict ncRNAs in the pigeon genome (Table S11). tRNA genes were predicted by tRNAscan-SE with eukaryote parameters. rRNA fragments were identified by aligning rRNA template sequences from human using BLASTN with an E-value cutoff of $1 \mathrm{E}-5$. miRNA and snRNA genes were predicted by INFERNAL software using the Rfam database (release 15.01) (43). To accelerate the analysis, a rough filtering was performed before INFERNAL by using BLASTN against the Rfam sequence database with an E-value cutoff of 1 .

## Construction of gene families

To examine the evolution of gene families in birds, genes from four avian and one lizard species (T. guttata, C. livia, G. gallus, M. gallopavo, and Anolis carolinensis) were used to construct gene families by Treefam (44). First, all-versus-all BLAST was performed for the protein sequences of the five species with an E-value cutoff of 1e-7. After conjoining the fragmented alignment for each gene pair by Solar (a program in Treefam), the alignments were used to calculate the distance between two genes. Next, a hierarchical clustering algorithm was used to cluster all the genes, with the following parameters: min_weight $=20$, min_density $=0.34$, and max_size=700. We found that most gene families are shared among all four birds (Fig. S5).

## Functional enrichment analyses

Functional enrichment analyses were performed based on the methods described in Huang et al. (45). Chi-square test and Fisher's exact test (for small samples) were used to calculate the statistical significance of enrichment. For each functional class, a p-value was calculated representing the probability that the observed numbers of counts could have resulted from
randomly distributing this class between the tested gene list and the reference gene list. The pvalues were adjusted by FDR and the adjusted p-value cutoff was 0.05 . For GO enrichment, to remove redundancy, if the GO terms enriched at different levels with parent-child relationship and had the same gene list, the lowest level was chosen and other levels were filtered.

We found some false positives in the enrichment analysis that were due to fragmented or partial genes (e.g., one gene is split into two or more genes because of assembly gaps or annotation errors). Fragmented/partial genes may lead to a larger size of their corresponding gene family and thus result in a false signal of over-representation in the enrichment tests. Therefore, before performing the enrichment tests, we filtered the putative fragmented genes based on the SwissProt annotation. The filtering criteria were: 1) in the alignment results against SwissProt database, the query (gene in pigeon) length was shorter than half of the target length, and 2 ) the percent identity of the alignment was $>50 \%$ (suggesting good homology). Ultimately, 1507 genes were filtered from the gene set for enrichment analyses.

## Expansion and contraction of gene families

We used CAFE (46) to identify the clustered gene families that have undergone expansion or contraction in the pigeon relative to other birds. Some gene families identified as expanded or contracted by CAFE might be due to artifacts (incorrect automated annotation, parameter bias during clustering, etc.). Therefore, we performed a closer check on families of interest (preliminary candidates for expansion or contraction) after running CAFE and corrected the members of each family if needed. Ultimately we found 2 expanded gene families and 2 contracted gene families in the pigeon (Tables S15-S16). We constructed phylogenetic trees of these families using the WAG model in PhyML (47) (Figs. S6-S9).

## Gene loss

Based on the gene clustering results, a gene was considered to be lost in pigeon if it was present in the chicken, turkey, and zebra finch genomes but absent from the pigeon genome. To ensure that putative losses were not due to incorrect clustering or incomplete annotation, we realigned these genes against the integrated gene set (homology-transcript and de novo gene predictions) and genome assembly. Gene predictions that had good homology (Genewise score $>60$ and no frame shift) but failed to pass the gene prediction criteria, and had expression support (average coverage depth of RNA-seq reads $\geq 1$ ), were not considered lost.

In addition to the above screening criteria, we also checked the genes that flank the putatively lost genes. For a given gene loss candidate, if the flanking genes were included in the pigeon assembly and these flanking genes had conserved synteny between pigeon and other birds, the absence of the gene from pigeon was deemed to be unlikely due to incompleteness of the assembly. Thus, we filtered the candidates that had no synteny support from any of the other 3 bird genomes. For each remaining gene loss candidate, we required that at least one of its three upstream genes and at least one of its three downstream genes in another bird be assembled in the same scaffold/contig of pigeon assembly, and that these assembled flanking genes were syntenic between pigeon and the other bird. Ultimately, 67 gene families that had no annotated homolog in pigeon, but did have at least one homolog in the other 3 birds, passed the synteny criteria. We used the homologous genes of these families (204 genes in 67 families) in the other 3 birds to perform enrichment analyses (Tables S17-S19).

## Pseudogene identification

In order to identify genes that might be pseudogenized due to mutations in coding sequences, we used the gene set of the zebra finch to identify homologous genes in pigeon, and those genes with frameshifts or premature terminations were considered as candidate pseudogenes. To ensure that candidate pseudogenes were not due to assembly errors, we verified that putative mutation sites were consistent with the corresponding bases in the raw reads used in the genome assembly. If inconsistent, we filtered the corresponding candidates. Moreover, if the mutation site in the transcriptome assembly was not the same as that in genome assembly, or there was an alternative spliced form, the candidate also would be discarded. Table S20 lists putative pseudogenes in the pigeon genome, and Tables S21-S23 summarize functional enrichment of this list.

Resequencing and variant calling
Non-reference genomes were sequenced using paired-end libraries on the Illumina HiSeq2000 (all C. livia genomes, sequenced at BGI or the University of Utah) or Genome Analyzer IIx platform (C. rupestris only, CoFactor Genomics, St. Louis). Raw sequencing depth ranged from 8 - to 26 -fold coverage. We concatenated the reference assembly scaffolds into 9 pseudo-chromosomes to facilitate alignment of the resequenced genomes (48). We then aligned the raw reads to the reference by SOAPaligner (v2.21) and sorted the alignment results according to chromosome coordinates. We discarded multiple-hit alignments (reads that be mapped to more than one locus). For variant calling, we first converted SOAP alignment results into SAM format, and used a custom script to retain short ( $\leq 5 \mathrm{bp}$ ) indel information. Then we used the "pileup" command in SAMtools to call variants (SNPs and short indels). Next, we filtered the variants using "samtools.pl" (version 0.3.3, a helper script in SAMtools), with parameter set "varFilter -S 20 -i 50 -d 3 -D 50". We observed that some SNPs or indels were very close together, which was probably attributable to alignment errors. Therefore, we filtered variants separated by $\leq 5 \mathrm{bp}$. Finally, we converted the coordinates of the variants in the pseudochromosomes to the coordinates in scaffolds and contigs in the reference assembly.

We performed an additional round of variant processing to filter on depth and quality. First, the SAMtools pileup files were converted to Genome Variant Format (GVF). Then, the mean depth was calculated for each scaffold and contig. These data were used as lambda to model depth with the Poisson distribution. Variants with a depth less than 5 or greater than the $98 \%$ quantile were masked, as were variants with a Phred scaled quality below 20. These masked variants comprise the "no-call" category of Fig. S12. The final variant data set included $22,020,759$ single nucleotide variants, $1,246,896$ small ( $\leq 5 \mathrm{bp}$ ) insertions, and 71,495 small deletions in the 40 C. livia genomes compared to the Danish tumbler reference (Fig. S10F). Deletions are underrepresented in the filtered data set due to low sequence coverage in flanking regions. This bias is probably not biologically meaningful and deletion variants were not used in subsequent analyses. VAT (in the VAAST (18) pipeline) was used to annotate the variant effects based on a draft GFF annotation file. All 41 C. livia and C. rupestris GVF files were then condensed to the internal VAAST condenser format (CDR) by the VST function in VAAST. We used the proportion of masked variants as an estimate of the called proportion of each genome, which ranged from $71 \%$ to $93 \%$.

## Diminishing returns of novel variants

To examine the number of new variants discovered in each successive genome sequenced (Fig. S10F), genomes were randomly sampled in bin sizes ranging from 1 to 40 . The quantity of novel variants was counted in each group, and this process was repeated 100 times. No-calls were treated as reference alleles and the outgroup C. rupestris was excluded from this analysis.

## Phylogenetic tree

SNP sites with genotype data for all 41 resequenced birds were used to create a binary matrix of presence and absence data relative to the reference genome assembly ( 1.48 million loci). This matrix was used in the R statistical environment (49) to generate a neighbor-joining tree using the APE (50) phylogenetic library. The tree was bootstrapped by sampling the binary matrix 1,000 times using the "boot.phylo" command (Figs. 1, S16).

## ADMIXTURE analysis

We used the rapid, maximum likelihood algorithm in ADMIXTURE (13) to estimate proportion of group membership across different values of $K$ (number of putative ancestral clusters of allelic similarity). A PLINK (51) genotype file was generated from the CDR file for SNP loci with complete genotype information (no missing data). As a conservative control for linkage disequilibrium (LD), the data matrix was pruned to include sites at least 100 kb apart. A mean $\mathrm{r}^{2} \ll 0.2$ was observed at this distance (see Fig. S10J). This filtering resulted in a matrix of 10,026 sites for the 41 Columba genomes (C. livia and C. rupestris). Q-matrices generated for individuals in ADMIXTURE were displayed graphically using DISTRUCT (v1.1) (52) (Fig. S19). We performed a second analysis that included data from C. livia genomes only (Fig. S17). In the absence of $C$. rupestris, we used PLINK to exclude variant sites with MAF $<0.10$ to reduce the effects of rare variants on the analysis (had we done this in the complete dataset that included C. rupestris, we would have removed many of the unique variants that distinguished C. rupestris from C. livia). This filtered dataset included 3950 sites. We repeated the ADMIXTURE analysis, and the results of both analyses from $\mathrm{K}=1-10$ are shown in Figs. S17-S20.

## Linkage disequilibrium

To avoid biases in linkage disequilibrium (LD) calculations due to rare alleles, we filtered the pigeon resequencing data to include only biallelic sites and alleles with frequencies between 0.30 and 0.70 . The outgroup species C rupestris was excluded from this analysis. Pearson's correlation ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ ) was then calculated for every pairwise SNP comparison at distances between 1 bp and 1 Mb across all contigs and scaffolds in the genome assembly (53). Human samples (YRI) were taken from the October 2011 release of the 1000 Genomes Project and randomly subsampled to correspond to the pigeon group size ( 40 individuals). The $r^{2}$ values were aggregated by distance using the mean. A 500-bp sliding window was then applied, and every $100^{\text {th }}$ data point was plotted in Fig. S10J to smooth the curves.

Mutation rate in the pigeon lineage
We used TBLASTX (54) alignments ( $\mathrm{E}<10^{-8}$ ) to identify one-to-one orthologs between chicken, zebra finch, and pigeon. Chicken was aligned to zebra finch and pigeon separately. We then parsed the BLAST reports with custom perl scripts to identify four-fold degenerate codon positions shared between the three species. This procedure generated three-way alignments of $1,271,075$ fourfold degenerate sites from 7690 orthologous genes. We ran MODELTEST (55)
using these alignments and found that the General Time Reversible (GTR) substitution model fits best with the observed data. By setting the divergence time between pigeon and zebra finch to 85.5 million years ago (50) and running the baseml script in the PAML package (under the GTR model) (57), we estimated the mutation rate in the pigeon lineage after the divergence from zebra finch to be $1.42 \times 10^{-9}$ substitutions site ${ }^{-1}$ year $^{-1}\left( \pm 2.60 \times 10^{-12} \mathrm{SE}\right)$. Concurrent estimates for the mutation rates in zebra finch and chicken lineages are $2.40 \times 10^{-9}$ and $1.90 \times 10^{-9}$ substitutions site $^{-1}$ year $^{-1}$, respectively, which agree well with previous estimates $\left(2.21 \times 10^{-9}\right.$ and $1.91 \times 10^{-9}$ substitutions site ${ }^{-1}$ year $^{-1}$ ) (58).

## Time to most recent common ancestor (TMRCA)

We inferred the demographic history of the pigeon population using $\partial \mathrm{a} \partial \mathrm{i}$ (59), an inference method based on a diffusion approximation to the observed allele frequency spectrum. We started with the simplest model of a constant-size pigeon population, and then gradually switched to more complex models, using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) to choose the best-fit model. We found that a three-epoch model fits significantly better than less complicated models. Further increasing the complexity does not improve the model. In this three-epoch model, the effective population size for the rock pigeon increased from 95,000 to 760,000 approximately 1.50 million generations ago, then remained constant until very recently, when a large decrease in population size occurred. The $95 \%$ Confidence Interval for the decrease in population size ranges from 1 to 90 generations ago. We suspect that low-coverage depth data that we generated for the 40 resequenced genomes might bias against the discovery of rare variants, which in turn could create an effect that mimics a recent reduction in population size. However, we also suspect that the recent history of inbreeding in domesticated pigeon breeds at least partially accounts for the population size decrease in the best-fitting model. In summary, the estimated effective population size for the rock pigeon over the last 1.5 million years is approximately 760,000 , but because of a very recent bottleneck, the current effective population size is estimated to be 520,563 .

Under the three-epoch model, we estimated the mean TMRCA value for all 40 resequenced rock pigeons by running 10,000 coalescence simulations with the program $\mathrm{ms}(60)$ and calculating the mean TMRCA value from all simulations. This resulted in an estimated TMRCA for all rock pigeons at an average genomic locus of 1.65 million years.

To generate the confidence interval for the statistics reported here, we used two different approaches. First, starting with the maximum likelihood (ML) model that $\partial \mathrm{a} \partial \mathrm{i}$ derived from the observed frequency spectrum, we selected one parameter at a time, and introduced a small deviation from the ML estimate given by $\partial \mathrm{a} \partial \mathrm{i}$. Under the null hypothesis that the new model describes the data equally well as the ML model, $-2 \times \log$-likelihood ratio of the two models should asymptotically conform to a chi-square distribution with 1 degree of freedom. This allows us to calculate the confidence interval of each parameter using the Composite Likelihood Ratio Test (CLRT). This approach does not account for the correlation between loci (i.e., linkage disequilibrium), but we expect the correlation to be minor given the size of the pigeon genome. To ensure that we accounted for correlation at linked sites, we employed a second approach to calculate CIs by bootstrap-sampling genomic contigs from the pigeon assembly. Within each bootstrap, we computed the frequency spectrum based on the sampled genomic regions, and used
$\partial \mathrm{a} \partial \mathrm{i}$ to generate ML estimates for demographic parameters. In Table S28, we report combined results from the two approaches by providing conservative estimates based on both approaches.

Shared variation among crested birds
Although crested birds do not appear to form an exclusive clade or share high allelic similarity (Figs. 1, S19), it is possible that the genomes of crested birds might share variants and haplotypes at a higher rate than other, random groupings of genomes. This potential for genetic structure among crested birds could lead to an excess of false-positive or uninformative signals of shared allele frequency (e.g., $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ST}}$ ) and extended homozygosity. To measure diversity of the head crest group and compare it to other random groups of pigeon genomes, C. livia genomes were randomly binned into a group size of 8 (the number of genomes from crested birds), and the numbers of shared variants were counted. This process was repeated 10,000 times, yielding a normal distribution (Fig. S25A). The 8-genome bin containing the crested birds falls well within the normal distribution, suggesting this group is not highly structured. Because the crested group contains two birds from the same breed (Indian fantail), we also repeated the analysis using a bin size of 7, so that we could assess the number of shared variants in each of the Indian fantails plus the other 6 crested breeds (Fig. S25B).

## Fist $^{\text {analysis }}$

$\mathrm{F}_{\text {ST }}$ was calculated for bi-allelic sites using the method of Weir and Cockerham (61). We excluded SNP sites at which $<50 \%$ of birds were genotyped. After sorting genomes into crested and uncrested bins, we further excluded SNP sites that had $>25 \%$ no-calls in either the crested or uncrested bin. In total, $17,500,439$ SNP sites were used in the analysis. The outgroup species $C$ rupestris was excluded from this analysis. Distribution of $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ST}}$ statistics is shown in Fig. S22A.

## Cross-population extended haplotype homozygosity (XP-EHH)

We converted the CDR file to BEAGLE (62) format, and then to XP-EHH format to generate an input data file. To calculate XP-EHH, a script was retrieved from the Prichard Lab (University of Chicago) website: http://hgdp.uchicago.edu/Software/. The program was run with default settings and treated the 8 birds with head crests as one population (archangel, English trumpeter, 2 Indian fantails, mookee, Iranian tumbler, oriental frill, Jacobin) and all other resequenced birds as another population. Genome-wide XP-EHH scores are plotted in Fig. S21, and distribution of XP-EHH statistics is shown in Fig. S22B.

## Haplotype network analysis

BEAGLE was used to phase and impute genotypes for sites with no more than $7 \%$ masked data and allele frequencies between 0.30 and 0.70 . Phased haplotypes around the SNP at scaffold 612:596613 (cr locus) were aligned manually to identify a 27.4-kb haplotype (40 SNP loci) shared by all 8 crested birds in the resequencing set (Fig. S23). Two uncrested birds were heterozygous for the derived T allele at $c r$, further refining the $c r$ haplotype to 11 kb (19 SNP loci; Fig. 2). Haplotype networks were generated using TCS (v1.21) (63), with the connection limit equivalent to the number of variant sites in the haplotype. For subsequent visualization of the haplotype tree, CLUSTAL W (64) was used to create a multiple-sequence alignment dendrogram, which was found to be consistent with the network generated in TCS.

TaqMan genotyping assay for the $c r$ SNP in EphB2
DNA was extracted from 10 uL of blood of an additional 61 crested birds from 22 breeds and 69 uncrested birds from 57 breeds as described (12). Samples were diluted to $10 \mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{L}$ and genotyped using TaqMan SNP genotyping assay (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) on an ABI GeneAmp PCR System 9700 at the University of Utah Microarray Core Facility. Primers used to amplify the target sequence were 5'-CGGCGGGCATGAAATACCT-3' and 5'-CAGACCAGGTTGCTGTTCAC-3', and the reporter sequences were 5'-
ATGTTGCGGGCAGCC-3' and 5'-ATGTTGCAGGCAGCC-3'. Birds from the following breeds were genotyped for the wild-type and $c r$ variant at scaffold 612:596,613:

Crested - archangel, Bokhara trumpeter, classic oriental frill, crested Saxon field color pigeon, Danzig highflier, English trumpeter, fairy swallow, Franconian trumpeter, Indian fantail, Iranian tumbler, Jacobin, medium-faced crested helmet, mindian fantail, mookee, nun, Old Dutch capuchine, Old German owl, oriental frill, Russian tumbler, saint, schmalkaldener soorhead.

Uncrested - African owl, Altenburg trumpeter, American show racer, American flying tumbler, Berlin long-faced tumbler, Bohemian pouter, Brunner cropper, Budapest tumbler, carneau, cauchois, Chinese owl, cumulet, domestic show flight, Dragoon, Egyptian swift, English baldhead long-faced clean-legged tumbler, English carrier, English long-faced muffed tumbler, English magpie, English short-faced tumbler, fantail, French mondaine, frillback, German nose-crested trumpeter, Holle cropper, horseman pouter, ice pigeon, Italian owl, king, Lahore, Lebanon, little Spanish friar tumbler, Maltese, Marchenero pouter, Modena, Norwich cropper, oriental roller, parlor roller, Pomeranian pouter, Portuguese tumbler, racing homer, Lebanon, runt, Saxon monk, Saxon pouter, Scandaroon, Shaksharli, Spanish barb, starling, Syrian Baghdad, Texas pioneer, Thai laugher, Thuringer clean leg, Vienna medium-faced tumbler, Voorburg shield cropper, West-of-England tumbler, and zitterhals.

Whole-mount in situ hybridization
To generate probes for RNA in situ hybridization, RNA was isolated from four-day postlaying pigeon embryos using the RNeasy kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), and cDNA was synthesized using M-MLV-RT (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Linear templates for probe synthesis were amplified by PCR using the following primers: Cttnbl (5'-
CGATGATTAACCCTCACTAAAGGGACAATGGGTGGAACACAACAG-3' and 5'-CGATGTTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGCTAGGATCATCTGGGCGGTA-3'), EphA4 (5’-CGATGATTAACCCTCACTAAAGGGAAGCAACCTGGTCTGCAAAGT-3' and $5^{\prime}$ -CGATGTTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGCCACAGCCTCTAGGGTGGTA-3'), and EphB2 (5'-CGATGATTAACCCTCACTAAAGGGACGGGACTTCTTGAGTGAAGC-3' and 5’-CGATGTTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGCTGTGCTCTCATCACCTGGA-3'). Binding sites for T3 and T7 polymerase (underlined) were incorporated into the forward and reverse primers to facilitate subsequent transcription of sense and antisense probe, respectively.

Embryos used for RNA in situ hybridization were dissected from eggs, and fixed overnight in $4 \%$ paraformaldehyde at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on a shaking table, then dehydrated into $100 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ and stored at $-20^{\circ}$ C. RNA in situ hybridization was performed as described (65), with larger wash volumes
and longer wash times used to accommodate the large size of the embryos. Hybridization with a sense probe was performed as negative control.

## Supplementary Text

Geographic origins of breeds
Our phylogenetic and ADMIXTURE analyses includes several breeds that were not used in previous studies of pigeon relationships (12), including some breeds that were only recently exported from the Middle East. These breeds provide a geographic anchor to infer the origins of other breeds. For example, the fantail breeds probably have been in India for at least 2000 years (14), yet they show a close genetic association with three ancient breeds from Iran: the Shakhsharli, Iranian tumbler, and Lahore (also known in Iran as the Sherazi (14)). This affinity suggests that the ancestors of (or major genetic contributors to) fantails might have been imported from Iran and Turan (central Asia) via longstanding trade routes between these two regions (60). Similarly, the owl breeds (Fig. 2a, red branches) are closely related to three ancient breeds from the eastern and southern Mediterranean region, supporting their hypothesized origins in Asia Minor and Northeast Africa (14, 67).

The $c r$ allele segregates in a cross
The presence or absence of a head crest is often an important part of a breed standard (68). Breeders typically cull birds not meeting this standard because they will not be competitive at shows. However, we found a notable exception to a breed standard that segregated the cr allele and phenotype in a cross. We genotyped a small pedigree of American show racers, an uncrested breed, in which two uncrested parents produced both crested ( $\mathrm{n}=2$ ) and uncrested ( $\mathrm{n}=1$ ) offspring. As expected, we found that both parents were $+/ \mathrm{cr}$, the crested offspring were $\mathrm{cr} / \mathrm{cr}$, and the uncrested offspring was $+/ c r$. In summary, homozygosity for the $c r$ allele is perfectly associated with the crest phenotype across 79 diverse breeds of domestic pigeon (see main text) and in an unusual cross.
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Fig. S1.
Sequencing depth distribution. The raw reads were aligned onto the assembled genome sequence using SOAPaligner, allowing 2 mismatches for 44-bp reads, 5 mismatches for the longer reads.


Fig. S2.
GC content versus sequencing depth. The $x$-axis represents GC content and the $y$-axis represents average depth using $10-\mathrm{kb}$ non-overlapping sliding windows.


Fig. S3.
GC content distributions of 4 avian genomes. The $x$-axis represents GC content and the $y$-axis represents the percentage of $500-\mathrm{bp}$, non-overlapping, sliding windows in the genome. GC content distributions are similar among the pigeon, zebra finch, chicken, and turkey genomes.


Fig. S4.
Comparison of general features of protein-coding genes. Cliv, Ggal, Hsap and Tgut are abbreviations for C. livia, G. gallus, H. sapiens and T. guttata, respectively.


Fig. S5.
Venn diagram of gene families of four birds. CLIV, TGUT, MGAL and GGAL are abbreviations for C. livia, T. guttata, M. gallopavo and G. gallus, respectively.


Fig. S6.
Phylogenetic tree of the gene family "type II keratin". Tree was generated by PhyML, with parameters "-d aa -m WAG -b -4 -rates gamma".


Fig. S7.
Phylogenetic tree of the gene family "lactosylceramide 4-alpha-galactosyltransferase". Tree was generated by PhyML, with parameters "-d aa -m WAG -b -4 -rates gamma".


Fig. S8.
Phylogenetic tree of the gene family "protocadherin". Tree was generated by PhyML, with parameters "-d aa -m WAG -b -4 -rates gamma".


Fig. S9.
Phylogentic tree of the gene family "PHD finger protein 7". Tree was generated by PhyML, with parameters "-d aa -m WAG -b -4 -rates gamma". Because no homolog was found in lizard, we used the 'root' function in Treebest (http://treesoft.sourceforge.net/treebest.shtml) to determine the root.


Fig. S10.
Phenotypic and genomic diversity in the rock pigeon. a-e, Wild type (a) and diverse domestic breeds of rock pigeon (b-e) as illustrated in Darwin's Variation in Animals and Plants under Domestication (4). f, The number of unique single nucleotide variants (SNVs) declines rapidly with each new rock pigeon genome sequenced, similar to a pattern observed for resequenced human genomes (69). Error bars are +/- SEM from 100 bootstrap replicates. Inset, frequency of SNV counts (200,000-SNV bins) across 40 resequenced C. livia genomes. g, Proportion of the pigeon reference genome composed of exon, intron, and intergenic sequence. h, Proportion of single-nucleotide and insertion variants in the 40 resequenced rock pigeon genomes. i, Location of variants in the resequenced genomes (SJV, splice junction variant). As expected, variants are found preferentially in non-coding regions of the genome. Of the variants predicted in exons, $60 \%$ are synonymous and $40 \%$ are non-synonymous. $\mathbf{j}$, Linkage disequilibrium in the rock pigeon and an African human population. Mean $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ across a $500-\mathrm{bp}$ sliding window is plotted against genomic distance for 40 C. livia genomes (black trace), and 40 randomly selected genomes from the 1000 Genomes Project YRI population (red).


Fig. S11.
Circos plot of chicken Z-chromosome (gdZ, red) and corresponding scaffolds in the pigeon genome (blue; "cc" precedes scaffold number). Black lines show regions of high sequence conservation as aligned by BLAT (70). Pigeon scaffolds map to most of the chicken Zchromosome, and most scaffolds map to a single contiguous segment of the Z-chromosome.


Fig. S12.
Numbers of variants in 40 rock pigeon (C. livia) genomes after filtering for sequencing coverage and quality. Boxes define $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ quantiles, horizontal line indicates median. A high number of "no-call" deletion sites probably resulted from low sequencing coverage in and around indel clusters.


## Fig. S13.

Proportion of heterozygous SNP sites in 41 resequenced genomes of Columba livia and C. rupestris. Feral birds are have a high proportion of heterozygous sites (blue numbers 27 and 28) and, as expected, the outgroup species C. rupestris (red number 36) has an excess of SNP loci when variants are called against the C. livia reference. Domestic pigeons are indicated with black numbers, which correspond to individuals from the following breeds: 0 , Indian fantail; 1, African owl; 2, laugher; 3, Mookee; 4, Spanish barb; 5, starling; 6, English carrier; 7, Scandaroon; 8, Berlin long-face tumbler; 9, Birmingham roller; 10, king; 11, Chinese owl; 12, Saxon monk; 13, Syrian dewlap; 14, Shakhsharli; 15, Oriental roller; 16, Carneau; 17, English long-face tumbler; 18, English pouter; 19, Jacobin; 20, Lahore; 21, Lebanon; 22, parlor roller; 23, racing homer; 24, archangel; 25, cumulet; 26, Egyptian swift; 27, feral (Virginia, USA); 28, feral (Utah, USA); 29, ice pigeon; 30, frillback; 31, Iranian tumbler; 32, Marchenero pouter; 33, runt; 34, Saxon pouter; 35, English trumpeter; 36, Columba rupestris (wild, UWBM 59803); 37, fantail; 38, Indian fantail; 39 , racing homer; 40 , oriental frill.


Fig. S14.
Genome-wide distribution of nucleotide diversity $(\pi)$ among 40 genomes of domestic and feral rock pigeons.


Fig. S15.
Distribution of identical amino acids and identical nucleotides at fourfold degenerate codon sites between pigeon-chicken and zebra finch-chicken orthologs.


Fig. S16.
Neighbor-joining tree of domestic and feral Columba livia and sister species C. rupestris based on genotypes from 1.48 million SNP loci. This diagram emphasizes the topology of the tree and branch lengths are not to scale. Percent bootstrap support ( $>50 \%$, based on 1000 iterations) is indicated on branches. Breeds with head crests are indicated with bold, red lettering.


Fig. S17.
ADMIXTURE plot for rock pigeon genomes (excluding the outgroup C. rupestris). For this analysis, 3950 SNP loci with MAF>0.10 were included to examine genetic structure within the rock pigeon only. CV error data suggest that that $\mathrm{K}=1$ is the most likely number of populations (see Fig. S18); however, higher K values are biologically informative about allelic similarity among breeds as well (for example, patterns of population membership at $\mathrm{K}=6-8$ are similar to groupings in the tree in Fig. 1). Several breeds were inconsistent in their cluster assignments, including very ancient breeds (laugher, cumulet, Jacobin, Spanish barb, runt) and recent hybrids (English trumpeter, Carneau, king, Berlin long-face tumbler, racing homer). The modern racing homer was derived from the cumulet, owl, carrier, and other breeds approximately 200 years ago, and this recent admixture is evident at $\mathrm{K} \geq 2$.


Fig. S18.
Plot of cross-validation (CV) errors in ADMIXTURE for each value of K between 1 and 10 in an analysis of 41 C. livia genomes. 3950 SNP loci with MAF $>0.10$ were included. Lower CV errors indicate a better model fit. Thus, our data imply a best fit at $\mathrm{K}=1$, or a single population.


Fig. S19.
ADMIXTURE plot indicating proportion of membership of each bird in each of $K$ putative ancestral populations for $\mathrm{K}=2$ to $\mathrm{K}=10$. Dataset includes the reference genome and all 41 resequenced Columba genomes and $10,026 \mathrm{SNP}$ sites. CV error data suggest that that $\mathrm{K}=1$ is the most likely number of populations (see Fig. S20). At $\mathrm{K}=2$ and higher, the outgroup C. rupestris is distinct from the C. livia breeds.


Fig. S20.
Plot of cross-validation (CV) errors in ADMIXTURE for each value of $K$ between 1 and 10 in an analysis of all 42 Columba genomes. Lower CV errors indicate a better model fit. Thus, our data imply a best fit at $\mathrm{K}=1$, or a single population.


Fig. S21.
Genome-wide cross-population extended haplotype homozygosity (XP-EHH, unstandardized). The window of highest $\mathrm{F}_{\text {ST }}$ (Fig. 2B) corresponds to a position in the top $1 \%$ of XP-EHH scores (red star), suggesting positive selection in crested birds.


Fig. S22.
Distribution of $\mathrm{F}_{\text {ST }}(\mathbf{a})$ and XP-EHH (b) statistics in the comparison between genomes of crested and non-crested pigeons. Red lines indicate scores at the cr locus (EphB2) on scaffold 612.


Fig. S23.
Haplotype network diagram of a 27.4-kb interval around the cr locus on scaffold 612. All crested birds in the resequencing set were homozygous for a $27.4-\mathrm{kb}$ haplotype (red), and two uncrested birds were heterozygous for haplotypes containing the T allele at scaffold 612:596,613 (yellow). Haplotypes in uncrested birds without the T allele are shown in blue. Sizes of circles are proportional to the number of chromosomes containing a haplotype, and line segments (separated by dots) represent single nucleotide changes. All haplotypes with the T allele share an 11-kb haplotype (see Fig. 2), and the apparent divergence of the yellow haplotype at the top of the diagram is due to recombination with another haplotype.


## Fig. S24.

Unrooted maximum likelihood tree of vertebrate Eph receptor protein sequences. Pigeon EphB2 alleles are more closely related to $E p h B 2$ orthologs of other vertebrates than to other $E p h B$ or $E p h A$ genes. Tree was generated in MEGA 5 with the JTT matrix-based model (71, 72) using annotated Eph receptor amino acid sequences from Ensembl and UCSC genome browsers. The percentage of replicate trees in which amino acid sequences clustered together in the bootstrap test ( 500 replicates) are shown next to the branches. The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths measured in the number of substitutions per site. All positions containing gaps and missing data were eliminated. The final dataset includes 290 positions.


Fig. S25.
Numbers of shared variants in 10,000 bins of 7 and 8 random genomes. a, Shared variants in bins of 8 genomes, the number of crested genomes in the resequencing set. The number of variants shared by the 8 crested birds (red line) lay near the peak of the normal distribution. b, Shared variants in bins of 7 genomes. Two Indian fantails are included in the set of 8 resequenced crested birds. Since these two birds are closely related (Figs. 1, S17, S18), we also used bins of 7 instead of 8 to assess the number of variants shared among the 7 crested breeds. Red lines indicate positions of the two 7-bird bins that contain one Indian fantail and crested birds from 6 other breeds. The numbers of shared variants in the bin of 8 crested birds and the two bins containing one Indian fantail and the other 6 crested breeds lay within the normal distribution, indicating that the group of crested breeds is not highly structured.


Fig. S26.
Expression of $E p h B 2$ mRNA in the neck and occipital skin of pigeon embryos as detected by whole-mount in situ hybridization. Unlike EphA4 (see main text Fig. 3), EphB2 is expressed weakly and is not obviously polarized in the feather placodes of stage 36 embryos of racing homer (a, uncrested) or English trumpeter (b, crested) pigeon breeds. Signal from EphB2 antisense probe is only slightly elevated above background, as indicated by sense control (c).


Fig. S27.
Male Danish tumbler pigeon used for the reference genome sequence.

Table S1.
Statistics of raw data of pigeon genome sequencing. Coverage calculation was based on the estimated genome size of 1.3 Gb .

|  |  | Raw data |  | After filtering and error <br> correction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Insert <br> Size | Read Length <br> $(\mathrm{bp})$ | Total Data <br> $(\mathrm{Gb})$ | Sequence <br> coverage <br> $(\mathrm{X})$ | Total Data <br> $(\mathrm{Gb})$ | Sequence <br> coverage <br> $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| 200 bp | 100 | 29.11 | 22.39 | 24.25 | 18.65 |
| 500 bp | 100 | 31.94 | 24.57 | 23.64 | 18.18 |
| 800 bp | 100 | 32.97 | 25.36 | 20.51 | 15.78 |
| 2 kb | 50 | 14.36 | 11.05 | 8.5 | 6.54 |
| 5 kb | 50 | 45.08 | 3.47 | 2.65 | 2.04 |
| 10 kb | 50 | 7.59 | 5.84 | 0.99 | 0.76 |
| 20 kb | 50 | 6.8 | 5.23 | 1.03 | 0.79 |
| Total |  | 127.27 | 97.9 | 81.57 | 62.75 |

Table S2.
Statistics of RNA-seq data. Read mapping was done by Tophat (33), using parameters "-r 20 --mate-std-dev 10 -m 2 -I 100000".

| Sample | \#Total reads | \#Reads mapped to <br> genome | Mapped rate (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Danish Tumbler (heart) | $26,128,246$ | $17,850,929$ | 68.32 |
| Danish Tumbler (liver) | $46,640,568$ | $34,125,091$ | 73.17 |
| Oriental Frill (heart) | $18,609,914$ | $13,135,374$ | 70.58 |
| Oriental Frill (liver) | $31,205,996$ | $24,505,498$ | 78.53 |
| Racing Homer (heart) | $23,241,351$ | $17,319,740$ | 74.52 |
| Racing Homer (liver) | $35,047,903$ | $26,843,926$ | 76.59 |

Table S3.
Genome size estimation. Data from 3 short-insert libraries ( $200 \mathrm{bp}, 500 \mathrm{bp}, 800 \mathrm{bp}$ ) were used to estimate the genome size according to the formula, $\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{kmer}$ _num $/ \mathrm{kmer}$ _depth.

| genome | Kmer <br> length | \#kmer | Peak depth | Estimated genome size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pigeon | 17 | $27,351,030,104$ | 21 | $1,302,430,004$ |

Table S4.
Statistics of the assembled genome. Note that sequences shorter than 100 bp were not included in the statistics.

|  | Contig |  | Scaffold |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Size (bp) | Number | Size (bp) | Number |
| N90 | 5,460 | 51,170 | 617,714 | 394 |
| N80 | 9,609 | 36,379 | $1,135,308$ | 263 |
| N70 | 13,675 | 26,914 | $1,624,766$ | 181 |
| N60 | 17,804 | 19,932 | $2,320,313$ | 124 |
| N50 | 22,406 | 14,473 | $3,148,738$ | 82 |
| Longest | 250,040 |  | $25,666,195$ |  |
| Total Size | $1,090,726,554$ |  | $1,111,581,692$ |  |
| Total Number (>100 bp) |  | 143,123 |  | 38,878 |
| Total Number $(>2 \mathrm{~kb})$ |  | 71,982 |  | 2,190 |

Table S5.
Assembly assessment with EST data. EST data from Columba livia were downloaded from the NCBI EST database.

| Dataset | Number | Total <br> length <br> (bp) | Covered <br> by <br> assembly | with $>90 \%$ sequence <br> in one scaffold |  | with $>50 \%$ sequence <br> in one scaffold |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | Percent |  |  |
| All | 2,108 | 614,321 | $87.86 \%$ | 1,524 | 72.30 | 1,743 | 82.69 |
| $>100 \mathrm{bp}$ | 2,082 | 612,127 | $88.04 \%$ | 1,511 | 72.57 | 1,724 | 82.81 |
| $>200 \mathrm{bp}$ | 1,755 | 561,555 | $89.40 \%$ | 1,297 | 73.90 | 1,472 | 83.87 |
| $>500 \mathrm{bp}$ | 58 | 32,604 | $89.66 \%$ | 29 | 50.00 | 36 | 62.07 |

Table S6.
Comparison of 4 avian assemblies.

| Genome Feature | Chicken | Zebra finch | Turkey | Pigeon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N50 contig length | 36 kb | 39 kb | 12.6 kb | 22 kb |
| N50 scaffold length | 7 Mb | 10 Mb | 1.5 Mb | 3.1 Mb |
| Assembled bases | 1.06 Gb | 1.2 Gb | 931 M | 1.11 Gb |
| GC (\%) | 41.5 | 41.3 | 40.5 | 41.5 |

Table S7.
Repeats predicted in the assembly. The overlaps between repeats were excluded before the calculation of the total.

| Type | Repeat Size | \% of genome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proteinmask | $42,558,810$ | 3.828671 |
| Repeatmasker | $41,235,770$ | 3.709648 |
| Trf | $20,769,448$ | 1.868459 |
| Denovo | $67,844,898$ | 6.103456 |
| Total | $97,039,882$ | 8.729892 |

Table S8.
General statistics of predicted protein-coding genes.

| Gene set |  | Number | Average <br> transcript length <br> (bp) | Average <br> CDS length <br> (bp) | Average <br> exons <br> per gene | Average <br> exon <br> length (bp) | Average <br> intron <br> length (bp) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De novo | Augustus | 24156 | 18145.26 | 1156.19 | 6.67 | 173.21 | 2993.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Genscan | 37395 | 21756.10 | 1323.55 | 8.01 | 165.31 | 2916.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Homolog | G.gallus | 10835 | 21775.19 | 1527.21 | 9.65 | 158.25 | 2340.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | H.sapiens | 7712 | 26389.97 | 1768.23 | 10.82 | 163.45 | 2507.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | T.guttata | 12894 | 20246.15 | 1447.93 | 9.12 | 158.81 | 2315.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final gene set |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17300 | 18364.87 | 1404.2 | 8.47 | 165.87 | 2271.79 |

Table S9.
CEGMA assessment for the pigeon gene set, compared with the chicken gene set.

|  | Pigeon (\#gene) | Chicken (\#gene) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Identified CEGMA genes | 197 | 191 |
| Overlap with pigeon gene set more than $80 \%$ in CDS level | 166 | 167 |
| Overlap with pigeon gene set more than $50 \%$ in CDS level | 187 | 185 |

Table S10.
Statistics of functional annotation.

|  |  | \#Gene | Percent (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  | 17300 |
| Annotated | Swiss-Prot | 12841 | 74.23 |
|  | KEGG | 8870 | 51.27 |
|  | InterPro | 13602 | 78.62 |
|  | GO | 11319 | 65.43 |
| Unannotated |  | 1895 | 10.95 |

Table S11.
Non-coding RNA genes in the assembly.

| Type |  | Copy | Average length (bp) | Total length (bp) | \% of genome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| miRNA |  | 173 | 84.54 | 14,626 | 0.001316 |
| tRNA |  | 188 | 75.86 | 14,262 | 0.001283 |
| rRNA | rRNA | 119 | 87.74 | 10,441 | 0.000939 |
|  | 18S | 6 | 95.83 | 575 | 0.000052 |
|  | 28 S | 18 | 154.33 | 2,778 | 0.00025 |
|  | 5.8S | 1 | 155.00 | 155 | 0.000014 |
|  | 5S | 94 | 73.76 | 6,933 | 0.000624 |
| snRNA | snRNA | 184 | 114.57 | 21,080 | 0.001896 |
|  | CD-box | 100 | 89.45 | 8,945 | 0.000805 |
|  | HACA-box | 54 | 142.31 | 7,685 | 0.000691 |
|  | splicing | 22 | 134.09 | 2,950 | 0.000265 |

Table S12.
GO terms enriched in pigeon gene predictions that are not annotated in other birds. (MF, molecular function; BP , biological process.)

| GO ID | GO Term | Class | Level | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO:0008907 | integrase activity | MF | 3 | $3.770 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0018149 | peptide cross-linking | BP | 6 | $3.770 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

Table S13.
IPR terms enriched in pigeon gene predictions that are not annotated in other birds.

| IPR ID | IPR Title | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| IPR008160 | Collagen triple helix repeat | $6.981 \mathrm{E}-17$ |
| IPR018957 | Zinc finger, C3HC4 RING-type | $1.480 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| IPR003596 | Immunoglobulin V-set, subgroup | $3.413 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| IPR013106 | Immunoglobulin V-set | $5.662 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR007110 | Immunoglobulin-like | $1.996 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR001841 | Zinc finger, RING-type | $3.153 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR011004 | Trimeric LpxA-like | $1.719 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR001037 | Integrase, C-terminal, retroviral | $1.990 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR003302 | Cornifin (SPRR) | $2.015 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008936 | Rho GTPase activation protein | $6.415 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR016133 | Insect antifreeze protein | $7.853 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR000198 | Rho GTPase-activating protein domain | $1.207 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR013164 | Cadherin, N-terminal | $1.689 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR012337 | Ribonuclease H-like | $2.292 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR013787 | S100/CaBP-9k-type, calcium binding, subdomain | $2.751 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR013649 | Integrin alpha-2 | $4.475 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001101 | Plectin repeat | $4.475 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001584 | Integrase, catalytic core | $4.475 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR002717 | MOZ/SAS-like protein |  |

Table S14.
KEGG pathways enriched in pigeon gene predictions that are not annotated in other birds.

| Map ID | Map Title | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| map00230 | Purine metabolism | $6.942 \mathrm{E}-49$ |
| map03020 | RNA polymerase | $7.836 \mathrm{E}-40$ |
| map00240 | Pyrimidine metabolism | $3.702 \mathrm{E}-26$ |

Table S15.
Gene families under expansion or contraction in pigeon lineage. The functions were assigned based on the best hits to the SwissProt database.

| Pigeon | Zebra <br> finch | Turkey | Chicken | Lizard | Expansion or <br> contraction | Putative function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | expansion | Type II keratin |
| 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | expansion | Lactosylceramide 4-alpha- <br> galactosyltransferase |
| 4 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 0 | contraction | PHD finger protein 7 |
| 14 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 84 | contraction | Protocadherin |

Table S16.
Classification of type II keratins in four avian genomes, based on SwissProt annotation.

|  | Pigeon | Zebra finch | Turkey | Chicken |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal 75 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal 6A | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal 79 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Type II keratin, cytoskeletal <br> cochleal | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 12 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

## Table S17.

GO terms enriched in putatively lost genes in pigeon lineage.

| GO ID | GO Term | Class | Level | P-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO:0005126 | cytokine receptor binding | MF | 5 | $4.770 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| GO:0050909 | sensory perception of taste | BP | 7 | 5.382E-07 |
| GO:0008534 | oxidized purine base lesion DNA N-glycosylase activity | MF | 6 | 7.026E-07 |
| GO:0007631 | feeding behavior | BP | 4 | $7.026 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| GO:0006952 | defense response | BP | 4 | $8.359 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| GO:0007218 | neuropeptide signaling pathway | BP | 6 | 8.359E-07 |
| GO:0005801 | cis-Golgi network | CC | 5 | $4.453 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| GO:0006950 | response to stress | BP | 3 | $4.507 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| GO:0005576 | extracellular region | CC | 2 | $5.729 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| GO:0005136 | interleukin-4 receptor binding | MF | 6 | 6.984E-06 |
| GO:0004568 | chitinase activity | MF | 6 | $1.067 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0006032 | chitin catabolic process | BP | 7 | $1.067 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0003721 | telomeric template RNA reverse transcriptase activity | MF | 8 | $8.009 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0016798 | hydrolase activity, acting on glycosyl bonds | MF | 4 | 8.243E-05 |
| GO:0006284 | base-excision repair | BP | 7 | $1.205 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0016813 | hydrolase activity, acting on carbon-nitrogen (but not peptide) bonds, in linear amidines | MF | 5 | $1.205 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0006888 | ER to Golgi vesicle-mediated transport | BP | 5 | $2.432 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0003684 | damaged DNA binding | MF | 5 | $2.877 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0008061 | chitin binding | MF | 5 | $3.147 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0006289 | nucleotide-excision repair | BP | 7 | $4.145 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0004045 | aminoacyl-tRNA hydrolase activity | MF | 6 | $4.698 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0045596 | negative regulation of cell differentiation | BP | 4 | $9.056 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0050896 | response to stimulus | BP | 2 | $9.056 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0006414 | translational elongation | BP | 6 | $6.237 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0005044 | scavenger receptor activity | MF | 6 | $1.069 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0006259 | DNA metabolic process | BP | 5 | $2.324 \mathrm{E}-02$ |


| GO:0007186 | G-protein coupled receptor protein signaling <br> pathway | BP | 5 | $2.570 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| GO:0006278 | RNA-dependent DNA replication | BP | 7 | $2.667 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0016455 | RNA polymerase II transcription mediator activity | MF | 5 | $3.289 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0016592 | mediator complex | CC | 4 | $3.289 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0006357 | regulation of transcription from RNA polymerase <br> II promoter | BP | 7 | $3.623 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0008033 | tRNA processing | BP | 7 | $3.683 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0008083 | growth factor activity | MF | 5 | $3.683 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0051258 | protein polymerization | BP | 7 | $4.233 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

## Table S18.

IPR domains enriched in putatively lost genes in pigeon lineage.

| IPR ID | IPR Title | P-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IPR000471 | Interferon alpha/beta/delta | $2.628 \mathrm{E}-15$ |
| IPR009079 | Four-helical cytokine-like, core | $9.456 \mathrm{E}-15$ |
| IPR022409 | PKD/Chitinase domain | $1.432 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| IPR007960 | Mammalian taste receptor | $1.024 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR000601 | PKD domain | $1.024 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR000874 | Bombesin/neuromedin-B/ranatensin peptide family | $1.324 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR001704 | Prepro-orexin | $1.324 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR003566 | T-cell surface glycoprotein CD5 | $1.324 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR007233 | Sybindin-like protein | $1.324 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR012904 | 8-oxoguanine DNA glycosylase, N-terminal | $1.324 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| IPR002354 | Interleukin-4 | $2.193 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR006035 | Ureohydrolase | $2.193 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR001223 | Glycoside hydrolase, family 18, catalytic domain | $3.283 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR011583 | Chitinase II | $3.283 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR003265 | HhH-GPD domain | $4.587 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR011257 | DNA glycosylase | $4.587 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR000369 | Potassium channel, voltage-dependent, beta subunit, KCNE | $9.213 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR012294 | Transcription factor TFIID, C-terminal/DNA glycosylase, N- |  |
| terminal | $1.589 \mathrm{E}-05$ |  |
| IPR003038 | Defender against death DAD protein | $2.052 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR003545 | Telomere reverse transcriptase | $2.052 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR019403 | Mediator complex, subunit Med19, metazoa | $2.052 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR021891 | Telomerase ribonucleoprotein complex - RNA-binding domain | $2.052 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR022773 | Siva | $2.052 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR008160 | Collagen triple helix repeat | $2.828 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR002347 | Glucose/ribitol dehydrogenase | $6.677 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR002198 | Short-chain dehydrogenase/reductase SDR | $7.486 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR002557 | Chitin binding domain | $9.728 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR002759 | Ribonuclease P/MRP protein subunit | F |
|  |  | $\mathrm{E}-05$ |


| IPR002833 | Peptidyl-tRNA hydrolase, PTH2 | $9.728 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IPR001813 | Ribosomal protein 60S | $1.514 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR019391 | Storkhead-box protein, winged-helix domain | $1.514 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008717 | Noggin | $3.068 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR011012 | Longin-like | $6.321 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR001190 | Speract/scavenger receptor | $1.634 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR017448 | Speract/scavenger receptor-related | $1.878 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001859 | Ribosomal protein P2 | $4.266 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR003226 | Metal-dependent protein hydrolase | $4.266 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR005651 | Uncharacterised protein family UPF0434/Trm112 | $4.266 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR019605 | Misato Segment II, myosin-like | $4.266 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR000477 | Reverse transcriptase | $4.871 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR017853 | Glycoside hydrolase, catalytic core | $5.169 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR002035 | von Willebrand factor, type A | $7.444 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR003979 | Tropoelastin | $7.726 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR003008 | Tubulin/FtsZ, GTPase domain | $8.973 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR003129 | Laminin G, thrombospondin-type, N-terminal | $9.175 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001846 | von Willebrand factor, type D domain | $9.783 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001325 | Interleukin-4/interleukin-13 | $1.059 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001254 | Peptidase S1/S6, chymotrypsin/Hap | $1.405 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR009003 | Peptidase cysteine/serine, trypsin-like | $1.446 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR008795 | Prominin | $2.309 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

Table S19.
KEGG pathways enriched in putatively lost genes in pigeon lineage.

| Map ID | Map Title | P-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| map00510 | N-Glycan biosynthesis | $7.541 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| map04742 | Taste transduction | $7.541 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| map00072 | Synthesis and degradation of ketone bodies | $1.223 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map00040 | Pentose and glucuronate interconversions | $2.890 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map00520 | Amino sugar and nucleotide sugar metabolism | $2.890 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map04350 | TGF-beta signaling pathway | $2.890 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map00330 | Arginine and proline metabolism | $2.890 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map04622 | RIG-I-like receptor signaling pathway | $3.912 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map03410 | Base excision repair | $4.557 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map00650 | Butanoate metabolism | $7.232 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map04640 | Hematopoietic cell lineage | $4.813 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

## Table S20.

Putative pseudogenes identified in pigeon. In "Type" column "F" indicates frameshift and "S" indicates premature stop codon; putative functions were assigned by BLASTing the proteins of zebra finch against SwissProt database.
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Seq name } & \text { Start } & \text { End } & \text { Type } & \text { Homolog in zebra finch } & \text { Putative function } \\ \hline \text { scaffold53 } & 45328 & 46490 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000002855 } & \text { 5-hydroxytryptamine receptor 1A } \\ \hline \text { scaffold240 } & 38891 & 55369 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000016958 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { A disintegrin and metalloproteinase } \\ \text { with thrombospondin motifs 14 }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { scaffold730 } & 54737 & 125833 & \text { S } & \text { ENSTGUP00000005592 } & \text { ALK tyrosine kinase receptor } \\ \hline \text { scaffold111 } & 3943548 & 3980555 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000008006 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Alpha-1,6-mannosylglycoprotein 6- } \\ \text { beta-N- } \\ \text { acetylglucosaminyltransferase B }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { scaffold23 } & 935009 & 958005 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000010806 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Ankyrin repeat domain-containing } \\ \text { protein 29 }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { scaffold16 } & 12011433 & 12088795 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000004825 } & \text { Anoctamin-3 } \\ \hline \text { scaffold94 } & 2132410 & 2149196 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000018000 } & \text { Argininosuccinate lyase } \\ \hline \text { scaffold72 } & 1113381 & 1115963 & \text { F } & \text { ENSTGUP00000006818 } & \text { Aryl-hydrocarbon-interacting } \\ \text { protein-like 1 }\end{array}\right]$

| scaffold128 | 2875006 | 2964895 | F | ENSTGUP00000010818 | DNA-binding protein SATB2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scaffold196 | 2506214 | 2552640 | F | ENSTGUP00000006561 | Doublecortin domain-containing protein 2 |
| scaffold77 | 805734 | 886292 | F | ENSTGUP00000000216 | Down syndrome cell adhesion molecule-like protein 1 |
| scaffold209 | 2443295 | 2497377 | F | ENSTGUP00000009472 | Dynein heavy chain 3, axonemal |
| scaffold97 | 383916 | 513582 | F | ENSTGUP00000007744 | Dynein heavy chain 5, axonemal |
| scaffold133 | 469779 | 480210 | F | ENSTGUP00000000801 | E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase UHRF1 |
| scaffold9 | 1089235 | 1138025 | F | ENSTGUP00000001397 | ELAV-like protein 2 |
| scaffold111 | 3206137 | 3224294 | F | ENSTGUP00000008382 | Envoplakin |
| scaffold391 | 1689031 | 1711474 | F | ENSTGUP00000001574 | Ephrin type-A receptor 10 |
| scaffold218 | 2950041 | 2979523 | F | ENSTGUP00000013330 | Estrogen receptor beta |
| scaffold577 | 31420 | 33059 | F | ENSTGUP00000015065 | Fascin-2 |
| scaffold 1246 | 237364 | 237706 | F | ENSTGUP00000004424 | Feather keratin 2 |
| scaffold837 | 15669 | 15974 | S | ENSTGUP00000017121 | Feather keratin 2 |
| scaffold156 | 18388 | 18678 | S | ENSTGUP00000014178 | Feather keratin $\operatorname{Cos} 1-1 / \operatorname{Cos} 1-3 / \operatorname{Cos} 2-$ 1 |
| scaffold534 | 29367 | 29659 | F | ENSTGUP00000018103 | Feather keratin Cos1-1/Cos1-3/Cos21 |
| scaffold216 | 6673871 | 6738878 | S | ENSTGUP00000012834 | Fer-1-like protein 6 |
| scaffold18 | 644059 | 671351 | S | ENSTGUP00000008341 | FERM and PDZ domain-containing protein 2 |
| scaffold466 | 7040 | 35410 | S | ENSTGUP00000013723 | Frizzled-3 |
| scaffold140 | 511386 | 651332 | F | ENSTGUP00000011271 | Gamma-1-syntrophin |
| scaffold59 | 5782872 | 5784360 | F | ENSTGUP00000011655 | Gap junction alpha-3 protein |
| scaffold111 | 1511805 | 1520852 | F | ENSTGUP00000009145 | Glutamate [NMDA] receptor subunit epsilon-3 |
| scaffold3 | 2687804 | 2927380 | F | ENSTGUP00000003214 | Glutamate receptor delta-2 subunit |
| scaffold277 | 2033463 | 2089915 | F | ENSTGUP00000008650 | Glutamate receptor-interacting protein 2 |
| scaffold101 | 6133930 | 6213352 | F | ENSTGUP00000013858 | Glutamate receptor, ionotropic kainate 1 |
| scaffold506 | 3370159 | 3371517 | F | ENSTGUP00000014651 | Gonadotropin-releasing hormone II receptor |
| scaffold444 | 634672 | 648755 | F | ENSTGUP00000010512 | GRB2-related adapter protein 2 |
| scaffold16 | 3247944 | 3289446 | F | ENSTGUP00000009045 | Harmonin |
| scaffold215 | 945389 | 987563 | F | ENSTGUP00000004131 | High affinity cAMP-specific and IBMX-insensitive 3',5'-cyclic phosphodiesterase 8B |
| scaffold56 | 4029944 | 4070302 | F | ENSTGUP00000010590 | Homeobox protein aristaless-like 4 |
| scaffold264 | 259693 | 263080 | F | ENSTGUP00000003980 | Homeobox protein SIX2 |
| scaffold194 | 178941 | 181045 | F | ENSTGUP00000014409 | Hyaluronan and proteoglycan link protein 4 |
| scaffold644 | 11400 | 14073 | F | ENSTGUP00000017647 | Insulin receptor-related protein |
| scaffold644 | 4894 | 11106 | F | ENSTGUP00000017650 | Insulin receptor-related protein |
| scaffold111 | 859332 | 880125 | F | ENSTGUP00000008671 | Integrin beta-4 |
| scaffold415 | 1021407 | 1025421 | F | ENSTGUP00000008764 | Iroquois-class homeodomain protein irx-2 |
| scaffold748 | 53800 | 56769 | F | ENSTGUP00000002436 | Keratin-like protein KRT222 |
| scaffold487 | 170774 | 203064 | F | ENSTGUP00000005027 | Kinesin-like protein KIF15 |
| scaffold176 | 1599190 | 1620885 | F | ENSTGUP00000001231 | Kinesin-like protein KIF21A |
| scaffold232 | 3417955 | 3456388 | F | ENSTGUP00000009939 | Kinesin-like protein KIF25 |


| scaffold179 | 1133008 | 1146449 | F | ENSTGUP00000004052 | Leishmanolysin-like peptidase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scaffold9 | 2521066 | 2522894 | F | ENSTGUP00000001446 | Leucine-rich repeat and <br> immunoglobulin-like domain- <br> containing nogo receptor-interacting <br> protein 2 |
| scaffold7 | 16570045 | 16600480 | F | ENSTGUP00000010668 | Leucine-rich repeat-containing <br> protein 7 |
| scaffold7 | 16605281 | 16645225 | F | ENSTGUP00000010664 | Leucine-rich repeat-containing <br> protein 7 |
| scaffold250 | 893558 | 902750 | F | ENSTGUP00000014037 | Leukemia NUP98 fusion partner 1 |
| scaffold7 | 17700659 | 17741714 | F | ENSTGUP00000017593 | LIM homeobox transcription factor <br> 1-alpha |
| scaffold176 | 592634 | 625095 | F | ENSTGUP00000001421 | Liprin-alpha-2 |
| scaffold1150 | 11463 | 17570 | F | ENSTGUP00000014265 | Myosin heavy chain, skeletal muscle, |
| adult |  |  |  |  |  |


| scaffold83 | 13471 | 15660 | F | ENSTGUP00000000137 | Retinal homeobox protein Rx1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scaffold7 | 2268125 | 2339194 | F | ENSTGUP00000005983 | Retinal-specific ATP-binding cassette transporter |
| scaffold34 | 7763640 | 7768799 | F | ENSTGUP00000011874 | Retinol dehydrogenase 12 |
| scaffold362 | 1106455 | 1109934 | F | ENSTGUP00000010860 | Rhodopsin |
| scaffold102 | 20266489 | 20271297 | F | ENSTGUP00000013430 | Ribonucleoside-diphosphate reductase subunit M2 |
| scaffold1374 | 61859 | 62940 | F | ENSTGUP00000003799 | RNA-binding protein MEX3A |
| scaffold101 | 15699493 | 15699781 | F | ENSTGUP00000013940 | Roundabout homolog 2 |
| scaffold589 | 835372 | 990644 | F | ENSTGUP00000013641 | Runt-related transcription factor 2 |
| scaffold34 | 9257529 | 9456426 | F | ENSTGUP00000012081 | Ryanodine receptor 3 |
| scaffold94 | 1318739 | 1325164 | F | ENSTGUP00000004678 | Scavenger receptor cysteine-rich domain-containing group $B$ protein |
| scaffold421 | 604452 | 609051 | S | ENSTGUP00000002141 | Serpin B4 |
| scaffold79 | 6283354 | 6350042 | F | ENSTGUP00000001250 | Short transient receptor potential channel 7 |
| scaffold16 | 6042061 | 6080197 | F | ENSTGUP00000008559 | Signal peptide, CUB and EGF-like domain-containing protein 2 |
| scaffold219 | 707593 | 709512 | F | ENSTGUP00000011587 | SLIT and NTRK-like protein 5 |
| scaffold627 | 336497 | 339003 | F | ENSTGUP00000012970 | SLIT and NTRK-like protein 6 |
| scaffold32 | 4393984 | 4456791 | F | ENSTGUP00000007683 | Sodium channel protein type 1 subunit alpha |
| scaffold265 | 514646 | 548036 | F | ENSTGUP00000003375 | Sodium channel protein type 2 subunit alpha |
| scaffold32 | 4048043 | 4108186 | F | ENSTGUP00000007354 | Sodium channel protein type 2 subunit alpha |
| scaffold32 | 4524109 | 4559382 | F | ENSTGUP00000007765 | Sodium channel protein type 2 subunit alpha |
| scaffold60 | 2341383 | 2417808 | F | ENSTGUP00000011594 | Stabilin-2 |
| scaffold20 | 797776 | 809621 | F | ENSTGUP00000008222 | Sushi domain-containing protein 2 |
| scaffold31 | 13538580 | 13639250 | F | ENSTGUP00000013766 | Syntaxin-binding protein 5-like |
| scaffold102 | 16266990 | 16310938 | F | ENSTGUP00000013346 | Thyroid peroxidase |
| scaffold427 | 139698 | 316535 | F | ENSTGUP00000007563 | Thyrotropin-releasing hormonedegrading ectoenzyme |
| scaffold64 | 977357 | 1035340 | F | ENSTGUP00000007506 | Tolloid-like protein 2 |
| scaffold363 | 1311767 | 1312758 | F | ENSTGUP00000011952 | Trace amine-associated receptor 1 |
| scaffold725 | 213034 | 249428 | F | ENSTGUP00000003679 | Transient receptor potential cation channel subfamily M member 8 |
| scaffold148 | 207822 | 258675 | F | ENSTGUP00000000839 | Transmembrane channel-like protein 2 |
| scaffold974 | 46425 | 64294 | F | ENSTGUP00000011000 | Transmembrane protease, serine 6 |
| scaffold77 | 1495726 | 1508435 | F | ENSTGUP00000000412 | Tripartite motif-containing protein 29 |
| scaffold873 | 138748 | 155693 | F | ENSTGUP00000003891 | Tripartite motif-containing protein 71 |
| scaffold34 | 19784160 | 19790557 | F | ENSTGUP00000012663 | tRNA wybutosine-synthesizing protein 2/3/4 |
| scaffold599 | 604986 | 655114 | F | ENSTGUP00000013283 | Tyrosinase |
| scaffold75 | 25742 | 37680 | F | ENSTGUP00000015371 | Ubiquitin-associated and SH3 domain-containing protein A |
| scaffold220 | 1606156 | 1607116 | F | ENSTGUP00000013710 | Uncharacterized protein C12orf53 homolog |


| scaffold873 | 274315 | 294467 | F | ENSTGUP00000003918 | Uncharacterized protein C3orf77 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scaffold277 | 1671707 | 1709132 | F | ENSTGUP00000008500 | Urocanate hydratase |
| scaffold440 | 230917 | 617963 | F | ENSTGUP00000002977 | Usherin |
| scaffold176 | 1637994 | 1666541 | S | ENSTGUP00000001207 | Voltage-dependent L-type calcium channel subunit alpha-1S |
| scaffold1281 | 81092 | 254843 | F | ENSTGUP00000003146 | Voltage-dependent N-type calcium channel subunit alpha-1B |
| scaffold87 | 6780837 | 6852339 | F | ENSTGUP00000017636 | Voltage-dependent R-type calcium channel subunit alpha-1E |
| scaffold444 | 518589 | 523070 | F | ENSTGUP00000010514 | Voltage-dependent T-type calcium channel subunit alpha-1I |
| scaffold102 | 20709936 | 20729400 | S | ENSTGUP00000013443 | V-type proton ATPase subunit C 2 |
| scaffold1 | 6941443 | 6960735 | F | ENSTGUP00000012100 | V-type proton ATPase subunit d 2 |
| scaffold832 | 294993 | 303476 | F | ENSTGUP00000011968 | Wee1-like protein kinase |
| scaffold647 | 708096 | 712973 | F | ENSTGUP00000005942 | Wiskott-Aldrich syndrome protein family member 3 |
| scaffold111 | 5096295 | 5096381 | S | ENSTGUP00000007788 | Unknown function |
| scaffold1320 | 64495 | 66032 | F | ENSTGUP00000009143 | Unknown function |
| scaffold166 | 483495 | 483598 | F | ENSTGUP00000005831 | Unknown function |
| scaffold244 | 2086729 | 2086854 | S | ENSTGUP00000010883 | Unknown function |

Table S21.
GO enrichment of putative pseudogenes in pigeon.

| GO ID | GO Term | Class | Level | P-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO:0008324 | cation transmembrane transporter activity | MF | 6 | $1.235 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0005886 | plasma membrane | CC | 4 | $1.235 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0032991 | macromolecular complex | CC | 2 | $1.537 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0005262 | calcium channel activity | MF | 8 | $1.537 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0055085 | transmembrane transport | BP | 3 | $2.583 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0003774 | motor activity | MF | 8 | $2.842 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0015672 | monovalent inorganic cation transport | BP | 6 | $2.903 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0006816 | calcium ion transport | BP | 8 | $3.426 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0034220 | ion transmembrane transport | BP | 4 | $3.624 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0016020 | membrane | CC | 3 | $3.812 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0005272 | sodium channel activity | MF | 8 | $4.848 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0005887 | integral to plasma membrane | CC | 6 | $4.978 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0005891 | voltage-gated calcium channel complex | CC | 5 | $9.931 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0003777 | microtubule motor activity | MF | 9 | $3.749 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0005245 | voltage-gated calcium channel activity | MF | 9 | $4.147 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0051925 | regulation of calcium ion transport via voltage-gated calcium channel activity | BP | 7 | $4.147 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0007155 | cell adhesion | BP | 3 | 4.984E-03 |
| GO:0005856 | cytoskeleton | CC | 5 | $5.122 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0007018 | microtubule-based movement | BP | 4 | $6.323 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0044430 | cytoskeletal part | CC | 4 | $7.068 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0006810 | transport | BP | 3 | $7.068 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0004970 | ionotropic glutamate receptor activity | MF | 7 | $7.068 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0005234 | extracellular-glutamate-gated ion channel activity | MF | 10 | $7.068 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0006814 | sodium ion transport | BP | 7 | $8.218 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0030247 | polysaccharide binding | MF | 4 | $1.144 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0016021 | integral to membrane | CC | 5 | $1.867 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0044425 | membrane part | CC | 3 | $2.281 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0030288 | outer membrane-bounded periplasmic space | CC | 4 | $3.309 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0005540 | hyaluronic acid binding | MF | 6 | $3.845 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0007275 | multicellular organismal development | BP | 3 | $4.349 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0070588 | calcium ion transmembrane transport | BP | 5 | $4.349 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0030286 | dynein complex | CC | 5 | $4.349 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0005515 | protein binding | MF | 3 | $4.473 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0004871 | signal transducer activity | MF | 3 | $4.473 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0015276 | ligand-gated ion channel activity | MF | 7 | $4.927 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

Table S22 IPR enrichment of putative pseudogenes in pigeon.

| IPR ID | IPR Title | P-value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| IPR010526 | Sodium ion transport-associated | $1.346 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR003961 | Fibronectin, type III | $1.179 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR014873 | Voltage-dependent calcium channel, alpha-1 subunit, IQ domain | $1.179 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001696 | Voltage gated sodium channel, alpha subunit | $1.639 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR008957 | Fibronectin type III domain | $2.017 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR002077 | Voltage-dependent calcium channel, alpha-1 subunit | $2.771 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001320 | Ionotropic glutamate receptor | $1.857 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR019594 | Glutamate receptor, L-glutamate/glycine-binding | $1.967 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR003968 | Potassium channel, voltage dependent, Kv | $2.827 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR000859 | CUB | $2.844 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR003971 | Potassium channel, voltage dependent, Kv9 | $4.402 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

Table S23.
KEGG pathway enrichment of putative pseudogenes in pigeon.

| Map ID | Map Title | P-value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 04080 | Neuroactive ligand-receptor interaction | $7.488 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| 04020 | Calcium signaling pathway | $2.963 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

## Table S24.

GO terms enriched in Neoaves-specific genes. (CC, cellular component; MF, molecular function; BP, biological process.)

| GO ID | GO Term | Class | Level | P value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO:0007040 | lysosome organization | BP | 7 | $1.677 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| GO:0004348 | glucosylceramidase activity | MF | 6 | $1.485 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0047961 | glycine N -acyltransferase activity | MF | 8 | $6.177 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0051015 | actin filament binding | MF | 6 | $6.177 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| GO:0005764 | lysosome | CC | 7 | $1.118 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0016810 | hydrolase activity, acting on carbon-nitrogen (but not peptide) bonds | MF | 4 | $2.252 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0006665 | sphingolipid metabolic process | BP | 6 | $8.289 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| GO:0016811 | hydrolase activity, acting on carbon-nitrogen (but not peptide) bonds, in linear amides | MF | 5 | $1.385 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0004523 | ribonuclease H activity | MF | 9 | $1.640 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0008108 | UDP-glucose:hexose-1-phosphate uridylyltransferase activity | MF | 7 | $1.725 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0000247 | C-8 sterol isomerase activity | MF | 6 | $1.725 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0006696 | ergosterol biosynthetic process | BP | 6 | $1.725 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0044444 | cytoplasmic part | CC | 4 | $2.400 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0003725 | double-stranded RNA binding | MF | 5 | $7.147 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0003676 | nucleic acid binding | MF | 3 | $7.736 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0004109 | coproporphyrinogen oxidase activity | MF | 6 | $7.741 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0016814 | hydrolase activity, acting on carbon-nitrogen (but not peptide) bonds, in cyclic amidines | MF | 5 | $7.741 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0030674 | protein binding, bridging | MF | 4 | $7.741 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| GO:0006955 | immune response | BP | 3 | $1.068 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0004045 | aminoacyl-tRNA hydrolase activity | MF | 6 | $1.068 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0005737 | cytoplasm | CC | 4 | $1.352 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0005739 | mitochondrion | CC | 5 | $1.352 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0017176 | phosphatidylinositol Nacetylglucosaminyltransferase activity | MF | 7 | $1.356 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0006012 | galactose metabolic process | BP | 7 | $1.356 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0009968 | negative regulation of signal transduction | BP | 4 | $1.356 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0004553 | hydrolase activity, hydrolyzing O-glycosyl compounds | MF | 5 | $1.514 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0005125 | cytokine activity | MF | 5 | $2.810 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0010467 | gene expression | BP | 4 | $2.993 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0006779 | porphyrin biosynthetic process | BP | 6 | $3.215 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0019068 | virion assembly | BP | 4 | $3.569 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| GO:0003677 | DNA binding | MF | 4 | $3.696 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

## Table S25.

IPR terms enriched in Neoaves-specific genes.

| IPR ID | IPR Title | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| IPR003308 | Integrase, N-terminal zinc-binding domain | $2.123 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| IPR001139 | Glycoside hydrolase, family 30 | $1.475 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR003350 | Homeodomain protein CUT | $9.634 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| IPR001584 | Integrase, catalytic core | $3.742 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR012858 | Dendritic cell-specific transmembrane protein-like | $3.742 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR006846 | Ribosomal protein S30 | $3.742 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR009829 | Protein of unknown function DUF1395 | $3.742 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR015938 | Glycine N-acyltransferase, N-terminal | $3.742 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| IPR022768 | Fascin domain | $2.708 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR016187 | C-type lectin fold | $3.064 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008999 | Actin cross-linking | $5.205 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR010982 | Lambda repressor-like, DNA-binding | $5.205 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008063 | Fas receptor | $5.618 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR001304 | C-type lectin | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR013158 | APOBEC-like, N-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR002156 | Ribonuclease H domain | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR012337 | Ribonuclease H-like | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR010625 | CHCH | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR000118 | Granulin | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR000940 | Methyltransferase, NNMT/PNMT/TEMT | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR001328 | Peptidyl-tRNA hydrolase | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR002036 | Uncharacterised protein family UPF0054, metalloprotease YbeY, <br> predicted |  |
| IPR005341 | Protein Transporter, Pam16 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR005849 | Galactose-1-phosphate uridyl transferase, N-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR005850 | Galactose-1-phosphate uridyl transferase, C-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR006716 | ERG2/sigma1 receptor-like | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR006849 | IKI3 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR007128 | Nnf1 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR007635 | Tis11B-like protein, N-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008657 | Jumping translocation breakpoint | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008806 | RNA polymerase III Rpc82, C -terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR009125 | DAPIT | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR009450 | Phosphatidylinositol N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR009787 | Protein of unknown function DUF1352 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR010342 | Protein of unknown function DUF938 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR010681 | Plethodontid receptivity factor PRF | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR010723 | HemN, C-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR012574 | Mitochondrial proteolipid | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR012918-04 |  |  |
| IPR013197 | RTP801, C-terminal | RNA polymerase III subunit RPC82-related, helix-turn-helix |
| IPR013549 | Domain of unknown function DUF1731, C-terminal |  |
|  |  |  |


| IPR013652 | Glycine N-acyltransferase, C-terminal | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IPR018881 | Uncharacterised protein family UPF0565 | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR019095 | Mediator complex, subunit Med18, metazoa/fungi | $7.011 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| IPR008160 | Collagen triple helix repeat | $1.604 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR007248 | Mpv17/PMP22 | $1.916 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR009865 | Proacrosin binding sp32 | $1.916 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR019522 | Phosphoinositide 3-kinase 1B, gamma adapter, p101 subunit | $1.916 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR017853 | Glycoside hydrolase, catalytic core | $3.101 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001356 | Homeobox | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR000235 | Ribosomal protein S7 | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR002772 | Glycoside hydrolase, family 3, C-terminal | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR003573 | Interleukin-6/G-CSF/MGF | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR007741 | Ribosomal protein/NADH dehydrogenase domain | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR009626 | Uncharacterised protein family UPF0258 | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR009764 | Ovarian carcinoma immunoreactive antigen | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR013093 | ATPase, AAA-2 | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR019489 | Clp ATPase, C-terminal | $3.158 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR001159 | Double-stranded RNA-binding | $3.213 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR006630 | RNA-binding protein Lupus La | $3.684 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR008962 | PapD-like | $4.312 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR008253 | Marvel | $4.574 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR014730 | Electron transfer flavoprotein, alpha/beta-subunit, N-terminal | $4.814 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR009079 | Four-helical cytokine-like, core | $5.821 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR005437 | Gamma-aminobutyric-acid A receptor, gamma subunit | $6.742 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR007904 | APOBEC-like, C-terminal | $6.742 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR021673 | C-terminal domain of RIG-I | $6.742 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR010844 | Occludin/RNA polymerase II elongation factor, ELL domain | $9.229 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| IPR004877 | Cytochrome b561, eukaryote | $1.187 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR009851 | Modifier of rudimentary, Modr | $1.187 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR009057 | Homeodomain-like | $1.565 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR021128 | MARVEL-like domain | $1.799 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR006593 | Cytochrome b561/ferric reductase transmembrane | $1.801 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001368 | TNFR/CD27/30/40/95 cysteine-rich region | $1.916 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR003036 | Core shell protein Gag P30 | $2.099 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR003165 | Stem cell self-renewal protein Piwi | $2.099 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR000120 | Amidase | $2.467 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001270 | Chaperonin ClpA/B | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR006638 | Elongator protein 3/MiaB/NifB | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR007593 | Interferon-induced transmembrane protein | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR010926 | Myosin tail 2 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR011146 | Histidine triad-like motif | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR000181 | Formylmethionine deformylase | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR000892 | Ribosomal protein S26e | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR006996 | Dynamitin subunit 2 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR009445 | Protein of unknown function DUF 1077, TMEM85 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR015216 | SANT associated | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |


| IPR015362 | Exon junction complex, Pym | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IPR018902 | Uncharacterised protein family UPF0573/UPF0605 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR019351 | Protein of unknown function DUF2039 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR020546 | ATPase, F1 complex, delta/epsilon subunit, N-terminal | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR020547 | ATPase, F1 complex, delta/epsilon subunit, C-terminal | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR021148 | Protein of unknown function DUF579 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR022702 | DNA (cytosine-5)-methyltransferase 1, replication foci domain | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR022730 | DAZ associated protein 2 | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR003115 | ParB-like nuclease | $2.733 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR007197 | Radical SAM | $3.051 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR001279 | Beta-lactamase-like | $4.213 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR004156 | Organic anion transporter polypeptide OATP | $4.626 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR002035 | von Willebrand factor, type A | $4.927 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR015373 | Interferon alpha/beta receptor, beta chain | $4.972 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR010515 | Collagenase NC10/endostatin | $4.972 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| IPR020977 | Beta-casein-like | $4.972 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

Table S26.
KEGG pathways enriched in Neoaves-specific genes.

| Map ID | Map Title | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| map04512 | ECM-receptor interaction | $1.758 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| map00791 | Atrazine degradation | $1.758 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| map00511 | Other glycan degradation | $6.854 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map03020 | RNA polymerase | $8.276 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| map04623 | Cytosolic DNA-sensing pathway | $2.361 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| map00230 | Purine metabolism | $2.361 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| map04510 | Focal adhesion | $3.218 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| map03010 | Ribosome | $4.144 \mathrm{E}-02$ |

## Table S27.

MHC B locus of chicken aligned to pigeon assembly.

| Chicken MHC locus B Region |  |  |  | Pigeon |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seq name | Start | End | Seq len | Seq name | Start | End | +/- | Seq len |
| AB268588 | 25 | 234 | 241833 | scaffold2135 | 1554 | 1769 | - | 2932 |
| AB268588 | 18881 | 19294 | 241833 | scaffold335 | 1124193 | 1124649 | - | 3333588 |
| AB268588 | 19556 | 19656 | 241833 | scaffold218 | 1097607 | 1097707 | - | 4344174 |
| AB268588 | 20530 | 22050 | 241833 | scaffold 1271 | 116686 | 117370 | + | 180513 |
| AB268588 | 23743 | 23908 | 241833 | scaffold3891 | 211 | 376 | + | 733 |
| AB268588 | 26023 | 35031 | 241833 | scaffold1043 | 4777 | 26100 | + | 36866 |
| AB268588 | 37149 | 37635 | 241833 | scaffold1679 | 5742 | 6158 | + | 31163 |
| AB268588 | 41923 | 43328 | 241833 | scaffold306 | 147143 | 148078 | + | 5637556 |
| AB268588 | 44359 | 64482 | 241833 | scaffold1061 | 6786 | 31767 | + | 32087 |
| AB268588 | 44670 | 45123 | 241833 | scaffold445 | 1825303 | 1825665 | - | 2813049 |
| AB268588 | 59429 | 59614 | 241833 | scaffold38 | 14155392 | 14155569 | - | 19163802 |
| AB268588 | 59615 | 59732 | 241833 | scaffold121 | 1602344 | 1602473 | - | 2822310 |
| AB268588 | 63890 | 64158 | 241833 | scaffold172 | 742893 | 743166 | - | 7630735 |
| AB268588 | 66399 | 66746 | 241833 | scaffold2773 | 1466 | 1808 | + | 2734 |
| AB268588 | 68540 | 68781 | 241833 | scaffold2451 | 11408 | 11656 | - | 18113 |
| AB268588 | 76322 | 76656 | 241833 | scaffold 1679 | 14793 | 15062 | - | 31163 |
| AB268588 | 76883 | 88040 | 241833 | scaffold2451 | 65 | 17464 | + | 18113 |
| AB268588 | 80868 | 81025 | 241833 | scaffold534 | 100691 | 100801 | - | 193724 |
| AB268588 | 85197 | 85335 | 241833 | scaffold1679 | 5743 | 5881 | - | 31163 |
| AB268588 | 88041 | 89568 | 241833 | scaffold679 | 157761 | 161245 | + | 187166 |
| AB268588 | 97204 | 97383 | 241833 | scaffold111 | 496683 | 496880 | - | 5910799 |
| AB268588 | 98984 | 99173 | 241833 | scaffold314 | 188883 | 189100 | + | 3454423 |
| AB268588 | 99174 | 99379 | 241833 | scaffold17 | 2851508 | 2851713 | - | 18212151 |
| AB268588 | 99409 | 99570 | 241833 | scaffold2459 | 79365 | 79530 | + | 121524 |
| AB268588 | 99571 | 99906 | 241833 | scaffold1938 | 1804 | 2338 | - | 9131 |
| AB268588 | 105954 | 108327 | 241833 | scaffold1060 | 4681 | 10159 | + | 47963 |
| AB268588 | 114066 | 114250 | 241833 | scaffold1060 | 15816 | 16078 | + | 47963 |
| AB268588 | 116771 | 117046 | 241833 | scaffold486 | 988487 | 988756 | + | 3153651 |
| AB268588 | 121272 | 121706 | 241833 | scaffold1060 | 25068 | 25487 | + | 47963 |
| AB268588 | 144258 | 144442 | 241833 | scaffold4426 | 615 | 842 | - | 1359 |
| AB268588 | 144443 | 145525 | 241833 | scaffold4680 | 60 | 1328 | - | 2495 |
| AB268588 | 145590 | 145865 | 241833 | C16435426 | 66 | 368 | - | 373 |
| AB268588 | 148409 | 148530 | 241833 | scaffold 2825 | 9296 | 9423 | - | 9425 |
| AB268588 | 149326 | 149623 | 241833 | scaffold3458 | 2 | 262 | - | 266 |
| AB268588 | 151364 | 152466 | 241833 | scaffold4680 | 60 | 1348 | + | 2495 |
| AB268588 | 154310 | 157761 | 241833 | scaffold417 | 12400 | 29538 | + | 208115 |
| AB268588 | 167553 | 167704 | 241833 | scaffold363 | 1942872 | 1943023 | + | 4238849 |
| AB268588 | 170482 | 170880 | 241833 | scaffold2691 | 89 | 474 | - | 866 |


| AB268588 | 172589 | 173260 | 241833 | C16605824 | 2 | 661 | + | 671 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AB268588 | 175266 | 176029 | 241833 | scaffold1621 | 101 | 911 | - | 2723 |
| AB268588 | 186436 | 187106 | 241833 | C16605824 | 2 | 661 | - | 671 |
| AB268588 | 192750 | 193131 | 241833 | scaffold136 | 174729 | 175090 | - | 190033 |
| AB268588 | 194335 | 195513 | 241833 | scaffold1339 | 13494 | 13942 | + | 28095 |
| AB268588 | 202834 | 202978 | 241833 | scaffold4793 | 2281 | 2425 | + | 2856 |
| AB268588 | 203734 | 205205 | 241833 | scaffold171 | 2706568 | 2708114 | + | 2848140 |
| AB268588 | 207727 | 208063 | 241833 | scaffold4677 | 644 | 975 | - | 980 |
| AB268588 | 208771 | 209033 | 241833 | scaffold1872 | 2830 | 3066 | - | 11578 |
| AB268588 | 210063 | 210205 | 241833 | scaffold145 | 159858 | 160000 | + | 195293 |
| AB268588 | 212023 | 212551 | 241833 | scaffold3167 | 470 | 1019 | - | 1041 |
| AB268588 | 222320 | 227432 | 241833 | scaffold853 | 2441 | 10636 | - | 12383 |
| AB268588 | 227913 | 228013 | 241833 | scaffold161 | 4097273 | 4097373 | + | 11859676 |
| AB268588 | 235574 | 241429 | 241833 | scaffold335 | 3315356 | 3330267 | + | 3333588 |

Table S28.
Three-epoch demographic model for C. livia.

|  | Epoch 1 <br> population <br> size | Epoch 2 <br> generations | Epoch 2 <br> population <br> size | Epoch 3 <br> generations | Epoch 3 <br> population <br> size | TMRCA <br> (years) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point estimate | 95,079 | $1,496,541$ | 760,597 | 1 | 90 | $1,650,636$ |
| Lower 95\% CI | 16,499 | 986,564 | 742,949 | 1 | 1 | $1,611,061$ |
| Higher 95\% CI | 276,107 | $1,692,590$ | 782,576 | 90 | 6,839 | $1,730,866$ |
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