

Q: Radiocarbon analysis dated the sample at 24,000 years old, which is just before the LGM. In the area of Siberia where the sample was found, what was the environment like then?

MR: Glaciated areas were spreading southward during that time, so it would have been pretty cold in Siberia. Mal'ta and other contemporaneous settlements in Siberia thrived during pre-LGM times, despite the onset of environmentally stressful conditions that ultimately led to the depopulation of the area during the LGM.

Q: When you first sequenced the Mal'ta sample what did you find?

MR: Initially, we decided to type the control region of the mitochondrial genome and obtained a typical European mitochondrial haplogroup U signature. Our first thoughts were that it had to be due to contamination. We decided to move forward anyway and see what the nuclear genome signal looked like. We had just received the HiSeq 2000 system, so we decided to use that to perform shotgun sequencing on the sample.

Q: Was the Illumina sequencing performed in your laboratory?

MR: The Danish National High Throughput Sequencing Centre is associated with the Centre of Excellence in GeoGenetics and it acts as our in-house facility. We performed the DNA extraction and library preparation at our ancient-DNA laboratory and then walked down the street to the sequencing center to get it sequenced.

Q: What were the results when you sequenced the MA-1 sample on the HiSeq 2000 system?

MR: Next-generation sequencing (NGS) provided us with orders of magnitude more sequences of the information-rich nuclear genome. It enabled us to observe on a much larger scale that the sample carried post-mortem damage, yielding a very typical ancient DNA signature. That told us there was definitely an endogenous signal and the European-like signature wasn't just contamination. We took it from there and generated more sequences and started performing downstream population genomics analyses.

Q: How does the MA-1 genomic signature compare with those of worldwide populations?

MR: We found through principal component analysis that MA-1 was intermediate between modern Native Americans and Western Eurasians. This was an intriguing signature and we decided to explore it further by performing model-based population genetics analyses. We used SNP array data and complete genomes from several worldwide modern-day populations, including Native Americans and Siberians. We also sequenced four new genomes from Eurasia with Mari, Avar, Indian, and Tajik ancestry. Further analyses demonstrated that even though MA-1 showed a genetic affinity to Native Americans, there was actually nothing East Asian about the signature. If MA-1 was a Native American or had received gene flow from Native Americans, then it would be expected to show some affinity to East Asians since Native Americans derive from ancestors of present-day East Asians. However, this was not the case. All our analyses indicated that MA-1 was of Western Eurasian ancestry and was either a part of or related to a population that had contributed genes to ancestral Native Americans.

Q: You also compared the genome of the Mal'ta boy to sequences derived from the remains of an ancient East Asian individual. What did the data show?

MR: The 40,000 year old individual from Tianyuan Cave in China has been found to be ancestral to modern-day Asians and Native Americans. We wanted to test if the greater genetic affinity of Western Eurasians to Native Americans over East Asians might be due to events in the recent history of East Asians. We used the available sequence data from chromosome 21 of the Tianyuan individual in lieu of present-day East Asians and found this was not the case. The Tianyuan individual and modern East Asians behaved similarly in these tests.

“Next-generation sequencing (NGS) provided us with orders of magnitude more sequences of the information-rich nuclear genome.”

Q: You compared MA-1 with several Native American gene signatures. What did those results show?

MR: We compared MA-1 to published data sets, including the genome of a Karitiana individual from Brazil and SNP panels from several Native American and Eskimo-Aleut populations. We employed this complementary approach because the genome data set overcame inherent genotype data biases, while the genotype data provided us with a larger panel of New World populations. The other important consideration was that the SNP data had been masked for recent European admixture to avoid detecting a post-Columbian** European signal. Whether we employed the masked SNP data or the Karitiana genome, we found evidence of gene flow between Native Americans and the MA-1 lineage.

Q: How does MA-1 compare with modern Siberian gene signatures?

MR: Several Northwestern Siberian and Northeastern European populations showed slightly higher affinity to MA-1 than some of the central and south Siberian populations did. That makes sense because the more southern Siberian groups have received recent gene flow from East Asians. It goes to show that the population structure that is evident today is not necessarily reflective of the scenario in the past.

Q: Why did you compare MA-1 with the gene signature of younger ancient remains found at Afontova Gora-2 (AG-2), an archaeological site about 600 miles (965 km) from the Mal'ta site?

MR: The two specimens bridged the transition into and out of the LGM. We wanted to see if the gene signature in central Siberia changed after the LGM. The younger remains were radiocarbon dated to about 17,000 years before present. Although the sample was more heavily contaminated than MA-1, using the HiSeq 2000

**Post-Columbian = after 1492 CE

