1

Title: Genomic and archaeological evidence suggest a dual origin of domestic dogs

Authors: Laurent A. F. Frantz[1†*], Victoria E. Mullin[2†], Maud Pionnier-Capitan[3,4], Ophélie Lebrasseur[1], Morgane Ollivier[3], Angela Perri[5], Anna Linderholm[1,6], Valeria Mattiangeli[2], Matthew D. Teasdale[2], Evangelos A. Dimopoulos[1,7], Anne Tresset[4], Marilyne Duffraisse[3], Finbar McCormick[8], László Bartosiewicz[9], Erika Gál[10], Éva A. Nyerges[10], Mikhail V. Sablin[11], Stéphanie Bréhard[4], Marjan Mashkour[4], Adrian Bălăşescu[12], Benjamin Gillet[3], Sandrine Hughes[3], Olivier Chassaing[3], Christophe Hitte[13], Jean-Denis Vigne[4], Keith Dobney[14], Catherine Hänni[3], Daniel G. Bradley[2*] and Greger Larson[1*]

Affiliations:

[1] The Palaeogenomics & Bio-Archaeology Research Network, Research Laboratory for Archaeology and History of Art, The University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

[2] Smurfit Institute of Genetics, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.

[3] CNRS/ENS de Lyon, IGFL, UMR 5242 and French National Platform of Paleogenetics, PALGENE, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France / Université Grenoble Alpes, Laboratoire d'Ecologie Alpine (LECA), F-38000, Grenoble, France.

[4] CNRS/MNHN/SUs – UMR 7209, Archéozoologie et Archéobotanique, Sociétés, Pratiques et Environnements, Département Ecologie et Gestion de la Biodiversité, 55 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France.

[5] Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

[6] Department of Anthropology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4352, USA.

[7] School of Biology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece.

[8] School of Geography, Archaeology and Palaeoecology, Queen's University Belfast, University Road, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK.

[9] Osteoarchaeological Research Laboratory, University of Stockholm, Stockholm, Sweden.

[10] Archaeological Institute, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary.

[11] Zoological Institute RAS, Universitetskaya nab. 1, 199034 Saint-Petersburg, Russia

[12] The National Museum of Romanian History, 12 Calea Victoriei, 030026 Bucharest, Romania.

[13] Institut de Génétique et Développement de Rennes, CNRS-UMR6290, Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, France.

[14] Department of Archaeology, School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen,St. Mary's, Elphinstone Road, AB24 3UF, UK.

[*] Corresponding authors: Laurent A. F. Frantz – laurent.frantz@arch.ox.ac.uk; Greger Larson – greger.larson@arch.ox.ac.uk; Dan G. Bradley - dbradley@tcd.ie

[†] Contributed equally

Abstract: The geographic and temporal origins of dogs remain controversial. Here, we generated genetic sequences from 59 ancient dogs and a complete (28x) genome of a late Neolithic dog (~4,800 calBP) from Ireland. Our analyses revealed a deep split separating modern East Asian and Western Eurasian dogs. Surprisingly, the date of this divergence (~14,000-6,400 years ago) occurs commensurate or several millennia after the first appearance of dogs in Europe and East Asia. Additional analyses of ancient and modern mitochondrial DNA revealed a sharp discontinuity in haplotype frequencies in Europe. Combined, these results suggest that dogs may have been domesticated independently in Eastern and Western Eurasia from distinct wolf populations. East Eurasia dogs were then possibly transported alongside people where they partially replaced European Palaeolithic dogs.

One Sentence Summary: Genomics and archaeology reveal both a possible dual origin of domestic dogs and a subsequent translocation of East Asian dogs into Europe.

Main Text: Dogs were the first domestic animal and the only animal domesticated prior to the advent of settled agriculture (*1*). Despite their importance in human history, no consensus has emerged with regard to their geographic and temporal origins, or whether dogs were domesticated just once or independently on more than one occasion. Though several claims have been made for an initial appearance of dogs in the early Upper Palaeolithic (~30,000 years ago; *e.g. 2*), the first remains confidently assigned to dogs appear in Europe ~15,000 years ago and in Far East Asia over 12,500 years ago (*1*, *3*). While archaeologists remain open to the idea that there was more than one geographic origin for dogs *(e.g.* (*4*, *5*), most genetic studies have concluded that dogs were likely domesticated just once (*6*) – disagreeing on whether this occurred in Europe (*7*), Central Asia (*8*), or East Asia (*9*).

Recent palaeogenetic studies have had a tremendous impact on our understanding of early human evolution (*e.g.* (*10*, *11*)). Here we apply a similar approach to reconstruct the evolutionary history of dogs. We generated 59 ancient mtDNA sequences from European dogs (from 14,000 to 3,000 years ago) as well as a high coverage nuclear genome (~28x) of an ancient dog ~4,800 calBP (*12*) from the Neolithic passage grave complex of Newgrange (*Sí an Bhrú*) in Ireland. We combined our ancient sample with 80 modern publically available full genome sequences and 605 modern dogs (including village dogs and 48 breeds) genotyped on the 170k HD SNP array (*12*).

We first assessed characteristics of the Newgrange dog by typing SNPs associated with specific phenotypic traits and by inferring its level of inbreeding, compared to other breed and village dogs (*12*). Our results suggest that the degree of artificial selection and controlled breeding during the Neolithic was similar to that observed in modern free-living dogs. In addition, the Newgrange dog did not possess variants associated with modern breed-defining traits including hair length or coat color. And though this dog was likely able to digest starch less efficiently than modern dogs, it was more efficient than wolves (*12*).

80   A phylogenetic analysis, based on 170k SNPs revealed a deep split separating the modern
81 Sarloos breed from other dogs (Fig. 1a). This breed - created in the 1930s in the Netherlands -
82 involved breeding German Shepherds with captive wolves (*13*), thus explaining the breed's
83 topological placement. Interestingly, the second deepest split (evident on the basis of both the
84 170K SNP panel – Fig 1a - and genome-wide SNPs - Fig. S4) separates modern East Asian and
85 Western Eurasian (Europe and the Middle East) dogs. Moreover, the Newgrange dog clusters
86 tightly with Western Eurasian dogs. We used Principal Component Analysis (PCA), D-statistics
87 and *TreeMix* (*12*) to further test this pattern. Each of these analyses unequivocally placed the
88 Newgrange dog with modern European dogs (Figs. S5, S6, S7). These findings demonstrate that
89 the node separating the East Asian and Western Eurasian clades is older than the Newgrange
90 individual; directly radiocarbon dated to ~4,800 years ago.

91   Other nodes leading to multiple dog populations and breeds (including the basal breeds
92 (*1*) such as Greenland Sledge dogs or Siberian Husky; Fig. 1a) are poorly supported, suggesting
93 that these breeds likely possess mixed ancestry from both Western Eurasian and East Asian dog
94 lineages. To further assess the robustness of the deep split and those nodes associated with the
95 potentially admixed lineages, we defined Western Eurasian and East Asian "core" groups (Fig.
96 1a) supported by the strength of the node leading to each cluster (*12*). We then used D-statistics
97 to assess the affinity of each population to either Western Eurasian or East Asian core groups
98 (*12*). The results of this analysis again revealed a clear East-West geographic pattern across
99 Eurasia associated with the deep phylogenetic split (Fig. 1b). Breeds such as the Eurasier,
100 Greenland Sledge dogs and Siberian Huskies (all basal breeds from Northern regions(*1*)),
101 however, possess strong signatures of admixture with the East Asian core samples (Fig. S11), as
102 do populations sampled in East Asia that clustered alongside Western Eurasian dogs (*e.g.* Papua
103 New Guinean village dog; Fig. 1a).

104   We used the Multiple Sequentially Markovian Coalescent (*MSMC*)(*12*, *14*) to reconstruct
105 the population history of East Asian and Western Eurasia dogs. An analysis of individual high
106 coverage genomes demonstrated a long, shared population history between the Newgrange dog
107 and modern dogs from both Western Eurasia and East Asia (Fig. S15). A reconstruction using
108 two genomes per group improved the resolution for recent time periods (Fig. 2a) and revealed a
109 bottleneck in the Western Eurasian population, following its divergence from the East Asian
110 core. A similar bottleneck observed in non-African human populations has been interpreted as a
111 signature of a migration out of Africa (*15*). We therefore speculate that the analogous bottleneck
112 observed in our dataset could be the result of a divergence and subsequent migration from east to
113 west; supporting suggestions drawn from recent analyses of modern dog genomes (*8*, *9*, *16*).

114   We then used *MSMC* to compute divergence times as a mean to assess the time frame of
115 the shared population history among dogs, and between dogs and wolves. To obtain reliable time
116 estimates, we used the radiocarbon age of the Newgrange dog to calibrate the mutation rate for
117 dogs (*12*)(Fig. S16). This resulted in a mutation rate estimate of between 0.3×10^{-8} and 0.45×10^{-8}
118 per generation - similar to that obtained with an ancient grey wolf genome (*17*). Using this
119 mutation rate, we calculated the divergence time between the two modern Russian wolves (*18*)
120 used in this study and the modern dogs to be 60,000-20,000 years ago (Fig. S17; Fig. 2b).
121 Importantly, this date should not be interpreted as a time frame for domestication, since the
122 wolves we examined may not have been closely related to the population that gave rise to dogs
123 (*6*).

These analyses also suggested that the divergence between the East Asian and Western
Eurasian core groups (~14,000-6,400 years ago) occurred commensurate, or several millennia
after the earliest known appearance of domestic dogs in both Europe (>15,000 years) and East
Asia (>12,500 years) (*1*) (Figs. S17, 2b). In addition, admixture signatures from wolves into
Western Eurasian dogs most likely pushed this estimated time of divergence deeper into the past
(*12*) meaning that the expected time of divergence between East and Western cores is likely
younger than our estimate. These results imply that indigenous populations of dogs were already
present in Europe and East Asia during the Palaeolithic (prior to this genomic divergence).
Under this hypothesis, this early indigenous dog population in Europe was replaced (at least
partially) by the arrival of East Eurasian dogs.

To investigate this potential replacement, we sequenced and analyzed 59 hyper-variable
mtDNA fragments from ancient dogs spread across Europe and combined those with 167
modern sequences (*12*). Each sequence was then assigned to one of four major well-supported
haplogroups (A-D) (*19*). While the majority of ancient European dogs belonged to either
haplogroup C or D (63% and 20%, respectively), most modern European dogs possess sequences
within haplogroups A and B (64 and 22% respectively) (Fig. 2c, d, e). Using simulations, we
showed that this finding cannot be explained by drift alone (*12*). Instead, this pattern arose from
clear turnover in the mitochondrial ancestry of European dogs, most likely as a result of an
arrival of East Asian dogs. This migration led to a partial replacement of ancient dog lineages in
Europe that were present by at least 15,000 years ago (*1*).

Though the mtDNA turnover is obvious, the nuclear signature reveals an apparent long-
term continuity. Assessments of ancestry in humans have demonstrated that major (nuclear)
turnovers can be difficult to detect without samples from the admixing population (*11*). A
genome-wide PCA analysis revealed that PC2 clearly discriminates the Newgrange dog from
other modern dogs (Fig. S8), suggesting that this individual possessed ancestry from an
unsampled population.

Our MSMC analysis reveals that the population split between the Newgrange dog and the
East Asian core (as measured by cross coalescence rate [CCR]) is older (on average) than the
split between modern Western Eurasian and East Asian lineages (Fig. 2b). Simulations suggest
that this pattern could be explained by a partial replacement model in which the Newgrange dog
retained a degree of ancestry from an outgroup population (Fig. S20a,b), that was different from
modern wolves (*12*). Alternatively, this pattern could also be explained by secondary gene flow
from Asian dogs into modern European dogs (Fig. S20c). Nevertheless, simulations show that
secondary gene flow has a smaller effect on CCR than the partial replacement model (Fig.
S20b,d). Moreover, secondary gene flow cannot explain the placement of the Newgrange dog on
our genome-wide PCA (Fig. S8). Overall, these observations are consistent with a scenario in
which the Newgrange dog retained a degree of ancestry from an ancient canid population that
falls outside of the variation of modern dogs, but that is also different from modern wolves. This
pattern also suggests that the replacement of European indigenous Palaeolithic dogs may not
have been complete.

To assess the consilience between our results and the archaeological record, we compiled
evidence for the earliest dog remains across Eurasia (Fig. 3a). We found that while dogs are
present at sites as old as 12,500 years in Eastern Eurasia (China, Kamchatka and East Siberia)
and 15,000 years in Western Eurasia (Europe and Near East) dog remains older than 8,000 years
have yet to be recovered in Central Eurasia (Fig. 3a; Table S7). Combined with our DNA

169 analyses, this observation suggests that two distinct populations of dogs were present in Eastern
170 and Western Eurasia during the Palaeolithic.

171   The establishment of these populations is consistent with two scenarios: a single origin of
172 Eurasian dogs followed by early transportation, founder effects, isolation and drift, or two
173 independent domestication processes on either side of Eurasia. In the first scenario, the
174 archaeological record should reveal a temporal cline of the first appearance of dogs across
175 Eurasia stemming from a single source. Given the current lack of dog remains prior to 8,000
176 years ago in Central Eurasia, a scenario involving a single origin followed by an early
177 transportation seems less likely.

178   Given our combined results, we suggest the following hypothesis: two genetically
179 differentiated and potentially extinct wolf populations in Eastern (*8*, *9*) and Western Eurasia (*7*)
180 may have been independently domesticated prior to the advent of settled agriculture (Fig. 3a).
181 The eastern dog population then dispersed westward alongside humans, between 6,400 and
182 14,000 years ago, into Western Europe (*10*, *11*, *20*) whereupon they partially replaced an
183 indigenous Palaeolithic dog population. Our hypothesis reconciles previous studies that have
184 suggested domestic dogs originated in East Asia (*9*, *19*) and Europe (*7*). For numerous reasons,
185 the null hypothesis should be that individual animal species were domesticated just once (*21*).
186 The combined genetic and archaeological results presented here, however, suggest that dogs, like
187 pigs (*22*), may have been domesticated twice. Nevertheless, given the complexity of the
188 evolutionary history of dogs and uncertainties related to mutation rates, generation times and the
189 incomplete nature of the archaeological record, our scenario remains hypothetical. Genome
190 sequences derived from ancient Eurasian dogs and wolves will provide the necessary means to
191 assess whether dog domestication occurred more than once.

192 **References and Notes:**

193 1.   G. Larson *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 8878-83 (2012).

194 2.   M. Germonpré, M. Lázničková-Galetová, M. V. Sablin, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **39**, 184–202
195   (2012).

196 3.   M. Pionnier-Capitan *et al.*, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **38**, 2123–2140 (2011).

197 4.   T. Dayan, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **21**, 633–640 (1994).

198 5.   M. Ollivier *et al.*, *PLoS One*. **8**, e75110 (2013).

199 6.   A. H. Freedman *et al.*, *PLoS Genet.* **10**, e1004016 (2014).

200 7.   O. Thalmann *et al.*, *Science*. **342**, 871–4 (2013).

201 8.   L. M. Shannon *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 13639–13644 (2015).

202 9.   G.-D. Wang *et al.*, *Cell Res.* **26**, 21-33 (2015).

203 10.   M. E. Allentoft *et al.*, *Nature*. **522**, 167–172 (2015).

204 11.   W. Haak *et al.*, *Nature*. **522**, 207–211 (2015).

205 12.   Supplementary Material.

206 13.   D. Morris, *Dogs: The Ultimate Dictionary of Over 1,000 Dog Breeds* (Trafalgar Square,
207   2008).

208   14.   S. Schiffels, R. Durbin, *Nat. Genet.* **46**, 919–25 (2014).

209   15.   H. Li, R. Durbin, *Nature.* **475**, 493–6 (2011).

210   16.   M. Pilot *et al.*, *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **282**, 20152189– (2015).

211   17.   P. Skoglund, E. Ersmark, E. Palkopoulou, L. Dalén, *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 1515–1519 (2015).

212   18.   G. Wang *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 1860 (2013).

213   19.   P. Savolainen, Y. Zhang, J. Luo, J. Lundeberg, T. Leitner, *Science.* **298**, 1610–3 (2002).

214   20.   L. M. Cassidy *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 201518445 (2015).

215   21.   G. Larson, J. Burger, *Trends Genet.* **29**, 197–205 (2013).

216   22.   L. A. F. Frantz *et al.*, *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 1141–1148 (2015).

217   23.   C. Gamba *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5257 (2014).

218   24.   L. H. van Wijngaarden-Bakker, *Proc. R. Irish Acad. Sect. C Archaeol. Celt. Stud. Hist.*
219   *Linguist. Lit.* **86C**, 17–111 (1986).

220   25.   M. J. O'Kelly, R. M. Cleary, D. Lehane, *Newgrange, Co. Meath, Ireland: The Late*
221   *Neolithic/Beaker Period Settlement* (B.A.R., 1983).

222   26.   F. McCormick, in *The Holocene History of the European Vertebrate Fauna: Modem*
223   *Aspects of Research*, N. Benecke, Ed. (1998).

224   27.   P. Reimer, *Radiocarbon.* **55**, 1869–1887 (2013).

225   28.   S. Pääbo *et al.*, *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **38**, 645–679 (2004).

226   29.   L. Orlando *et al.*, *Genome Res.* **21**, 1705–19 (2011).

227   30.   J. T. Vilstrup *et al.*, *PLoS One.* **8**, e55950 (2013).

228   31.   M. Meyer, M. Kircher, *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.* **2010**, pdb.prot5448 (2010).

229   32.   M. Martin, *EMBnet.journal.* **17**, 10 (2011).

230   33.   H. Li, R. Durbin, *Bioinformatics.* **25**, 1754–60 (2009).

231   34.   K. Lindblad-Toh *et al.*, *Nature.* **438**, 803–19 (2005).

232   35.   M. Schubert *et al.*, *Nat. Protoc.* **9**, 1056–82 (2014).

233   36.   H. Li *et al.*, *Bioinformatics.* **25**, 2078-9 (2009).

234   37.   A. McKenna *et al.*, *Genome Res.* **20**, 1297–1303 (2010).

235   38.   K. Okonechnikov, A. Conesa, F. García-Alcalde, *Bioinformatics.* **32**, 292-4 (2015).

236   39.   H. Jónsson, A. Ginolhac, M. Schubert, P. L. F. Johnson, L. Orlando, *Bioinformatics.* **29**,
237   1682–4 (2013).

238   40.   B. Bai *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, 777-83 (2014).

239   41.   A. Auton *et al.*, *Science.* **336**, 193-8 (2012).

240   42.   A. R. Quinlan, I. M. Hall, *Bioinformatics.* **26**, 841–2 (2010).

241   43.   E. Han, J. S. Sinsheimer, J. Novembre, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **31**, 723–35 (2014).

242   44.   A. Vaysse *et al.*, *PLoS Genet.* **7**, e1002316 (2011).

243   45.   M. L. Speir *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **44** 717–25 (2016).

244   46.   S. Purcell *et al.*, *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **81**, 559–75 (2007).

245   47.   E. Paradis, J. Claude, K. Strimmer, *Bioinformatics*. **20**, 289–290 (2004).

246   48.   N. Patterson, A. L. Price, D. Reich, *PLoS Genet.* **2**, e190 (2006).

247   49.   J. K. Pickrell, J. K. Pritchard, *PLoS Genet.* **8**, e1002967 (2012).

248   50.   E. Y. Durand, N. Patterson, D. Reich, M. Slatkin, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **28**, 2239–2252 (2011).

249   51.   N. Patterson *et al.*, *Genetics*. **192**, 1065–93 (2012).

250   52.   S. R. Browning, B. L. Browning, *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **81**, 1084–97 (2007).

251   53.   Z. Fan *et al.*, *Genome Res.* **26**, 163-73 (2016).

252   54.   H. Angleby, P. Savolainen, *Forensic Sci. Int.* **154**, 99–110 (2005).

253   55.   A. Ardalan *et al.*, *Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 373–85 (2011).

254   56.   A. R. Boyko *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 13903–8 (2009).

255   57.   S. K. Brown *et al.*, *PLoS One*. **6**, e28496 (2011).

256   58.   S. Castroviejo-Fisher, P. Skoglund, R. Valadez, C. Vilà, J. A. Leonard, *BMC Evol. Biol.*
257   **11**, 73 (2011).

258   59.   V. Muñoz-Fuentes, C. T. Darimont, P. C. Paquet, J. A. Leonard, *Conserv. Genet.* **11**, 547–
259   556 (2009).

260   60.   N. Okumura, N. Ishiguro, M. Nakano, A. Matsui, M. Sahara, *Anim. Genet.* **27**, 397–405
261   (2009).

262   61.   M. C. R. Oskarsson *et al.*, *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **279**, 967–74 (2012).

263   62.   J.-F. Pang *et al.*, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **26**, 2849–64 (2009).

264   63.   P. Savolainen, T. Leitner, A. N. Wilton, E. Matisoo-Smith, J. Lundeberg, *Proc. Natl.*
265   *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **101**, 12387–90 (2004).

266   64.   K. Tsuda, Y. Kikkawa, H. Yonekawa, Y. Tanabe, *Genes Genet. Syst.* **72**, 229–38 (1997).

267   65.   J. A. Leonard *et al.*, *Science*. **298**, 1613–6 (2002).

268   66.   M. F. Deguilloux, J. Moquel, M. H. Pemonge, G. Colombeau, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **36**, 513–
269   519 (2009).

270   67.   F. Verginelli *et al.*, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **22**, 2541–51 (2005).

271   68.   M. Pionnier-Capitan, thesis, ENS Lyon (2010).

272   69.   O. Lebrasseur, thesis, Durham University (2014).

273   70.   N. Rohland, M. Hofreiter, *Nat. Protoc.* **2**, 1756–62 (2007).

274   71.   A. Cooper, *Science (80-.).* **289**, 1139b–1139 (2000).

275   72.   M. T. P. Gilbert, H.-J. Bandelt, M. Hofreiter, I. Barnes, *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **20**, 541–4

276   (2005).

73.   K. S. Kim, S. E. Lee, H. W. Jeong, J. H. Ha, *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **10**, 210–20 (1998).

74.   M.-S. Peng *et al.*, *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **15**, 1238–42 (2015).

75.   R. C. Edgar, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**, 1792–7 (2004).

76.   J. Leigh, PopART (Population Analysis with Reticulate Trees) (2015).

77.   R. R. Hudson, *Bioinformatics*. **18**, 337–338 (2002).

78.   G. K. Chen, P. Marjoram, J. D. Wall, *Genome Res.* **19**, 136–42 (2009).

79.   D. H. Alexander, J. Novembre, K. Lange, *Genome Res.* **19**, 1655–64 (2009).

80.   M. Boudadi-Maligne, J.-B. Mallye, M. Langlais, C. Barshay-Szmidt, *PALEO*, 39–54 (2012).

81.   R. J. Losey *et al.*, *PLoS One*. **8**, e63740 (2013).

82.   N. Benecke, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **14**, 31–49 (1987).

83.   M. Germonpré *et al.*, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **36**, 473–490 (2009).

84.   R. Flad, *J. East Asian Archaeol.* **3**, 23–51 (2001).

85.   L. Barton *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 5523–8 (2009).

86.   A. Lasota-Moskalewska, K. Szymczak, M. Khudzhanazarov, *Archaeol. Balt.* **11** (2009).

87.   A. Razzokov. *Sarazm. Dushanbe: Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography. Dushanbe, Tajikistan: Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan A. Donish History, Archaeology and Ethnographic Institute.* (2008).

88.   H. Bocherens, M. Mashkour, D. Billiou, *Environ. Archaeol.* **33**, 253-64 (2013).

89.   A. K. Kasparov, *Paléorient*. **22**, 161–167 (1996).

90.   M. Frachetti, N. Benecke, *Antiquity*. **83**, 1023–1037 (2015).

91.   C. Chang, N. Benecke, F. Grigoriev, A. Rosen, P. Tourtellotte, *Antiquity*. **77**, 298-312 (2003)

92.   V. Bakhshaliev, in *The Archaeology of Nakhichevan. Ten Years of New Discoveries* (Ege Yayinlari, Istanbul, 1997).

93.   R. Berthon *et al.*, *Environ. Archaeol.* **18**, 191-200 (2013).

94.   S. J. Pawankar and P. K. Thomas, *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* **56**, 363-370 (1996).

95.   B. & R. Allchin, F. R. Allchin, in *The Birth of Indian Civilization: India and Pakistan Before 500 B.C.* (1968).

96.   R. V. Joshi, *Archaeol. Surv. India, New Delhi, India*, 12–16 (1961).

97.   P. K. Thomas, in *The Walking larder: patterns of domestication, pastoralism, and predation* (Routledge, 2014).

98.   B. P. Sahu, *From hunters to breeders: faunal background of early India* (Anamika

311   Prakashan, 1988).

312   99.   N. Bhola, G. V. S. Rao, *Animal remains from Lothal excavations* (Zoological Survey of
313   India, 1962).

314   100.   R. B. . Sewell, B. S. Guha, in *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus* (1931).

315   101.   G. Stein, in *Early Animal Domestication and Its Cultural Context*, P. J. Crabtree, D. V.
316   Campana, K. Ryan, Eds. (UPenn Museum of Archaeology, 1989).

317   102.   Telegin D.Ya., *redno-Stogivska kultura epokhi midi.* (1973).

318   103.   K. N. Wilkinson *et al.*, *J. F. Archaeol.* **37**, 20-33 (2013).

319   104.   R. D. Barnett, W. Watson, *Iraq.* **14**, 132 (1952).

320   105.   M. D. Frachetti, N. Benecke, A. N. Mar'yashev, P. N. Doumani, *World Archaeol.* **42**,
321   622–646 (2010).

322   106.   P. M. Dolukhanov, in *Hunters in transition: Mesolithic societies of temperate Eurasia and
323   their transition to farming* (1986).

324   107.   G. Matyushin, *The mesolithic and neolithic in the southern Urals and central Asia.*
325   (1986).

326   108.   N. D. Ovodov *et al.*, *PLoS One.* **6**, e22821 (2011).

327   109.   M. Germonpré, M. Lázničková-Galetová, R. J. Losey, J. Räikkönen, M. V. Sablin, *Quat.*
328   *Int.* **359-360**, 261–279 (2015).

329   110.   M.-A. Garcia, *Bull. la Société préhistorique française.* **102**, 103–108 (2005).

330   111.   M. V. Sablin, G. A. Khlopachev, *Curr. Anthropol.* **43**, 795–799 (2002).

331   112.   A. Perri, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **68**, 1–4 (2016).

332   113.   S. J. Crockford, Y. V. Kuzmin, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **39**, 2797–2801 (2012).

333   114.   M. Boudadi-Maligne, G. Escarguel, *J. Archaeol. Sci.* **45**, 80–89 (2014).

334   115.   A. G. Drake, M. Coquerelle, G. Colombeau, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 8299 (2015).

335   116.   D. P. Howrigan, M. A. Simonson, M. C. Keller, *BMC Genomics.* **12**, 460 (2011).

336   117.   E. Axelsson *et al.*, *Nature.* **495**, 360–4 (2013).

337   118.   E. Cadieu *et al.*, *Science.* **326**, 150–3 (2009).

338   119.   H. G. Parker *et al.*, *Science.* **325**, 995–8 (2009).

339

Fig. 1: Deep split between East Asian and Western Eurasian dogs.*a.* A neighbour-joining tree (with bootstrap values) based on Identity by State (*12*) of 605 dogs. Red and yellow clades represent the East Asian and Western Asian core groups respectively (*12*). *b.* A map showing the location and relative proportion of ancestry (mean D-values) of dogs (Fig. S10). Positive values (red) indicate that the population shares more derived alleles with the East Asian core while negative values (yellow) indicate a closer association with the Western Eurasian core.

Fig. 2: Effective population size, divergence times and mtDNA. *a.* Effective population size through time of East and Western Eurasian dogs and wolves with MSMC. *b.* Cross-coalescence rate (CCR) per year for each population pair in Fig. 2a. The CCR represents the ratio of within and between population coalescence rates (CR). The ratio measures the age and pace of divergence between two populations. Values close to 1 indicate that both within and between CR are equal meaning the two populations have not yet diverged. Values close to 0 indicate that the populations have completely diverged. *c.* Bar plot representing the proportion of mtDNA haplogroups at different time periods. *d.* Locations of archaeological sites with haplogroup proportions. *e.* Location of modern samples with haplogroup proportions.

Fig. 3: Archaeological evidence for the first appearance of dogs across Eurasia and a model of dog domestication. *a.* Map representing the geographic origin and age of the oldest archaeological dog remains in Eurasia (*12*). *b.* A suggested model of dog domestication under the dual origin hypothesis. An initial wolf population split into East and West Eurasian wolves that were then domesticated independently before going extinct (as indicated by the † symbol). The Western Eurasian dog population (European) was then partially replaced by a human-mediated translocation of Asian dogs at least 6,400 years ago, a process that took place gradually after the arrival of the eastern dog population.

Supplementary Materials:

Materials and Methods

Figs. S1-S29

Tables S1-S7

References (23-110)