

618 Suppl. Fig. 1. Performance of chromosome aneuploidy detection by scBS-seq.

619

(A) Circle plots showing that the CN profiles by scBS-seq (inner) and MALBAC (outer)
gave the same CN patterns for HCT116 cells. (B) Distribution of CV as a function of
the mean of read numbers among different numbers of unique mapping reads.

623 Suppl. Fig. 2. Classification of CN profiles by comparing SEM and TE biopsy.



624

(A) The sample numbers of different CN categories and subcategories. Note that gender
discordance is not considered here. (B) Representative examples of chromosome CN
profiles in three major CN subcategories.



628 Suppl. Fig. 3. Assessment of polar body and ICM/TE origins for SEM.

(A) DNA methylation levels of O-DMRs for three SEM samples clustered with the MII 630 oocytes and the female pronuclei compared with other samples. (B) The chromosome 631 CN profile of the SEM sample (#S193) clustered with the female pronuclei. (C) PCA 632 of the single-cell DNA methylation data of the EPI (n = 22) and TE (n = 25, all from633 day 6 embryos) using the promoter regions of the top 300 differentially expressed genes 634 between the EPI and TE; the single-cell triple omics sequencing data were from our 635 previous study (32). A cluster of 15 TE cells (TE cluster) was separated from a cluster 636 of 22 EPI cells and 10 TE cells (EPI cluster). Chi square test was used for significance 637 test. (D) PCA of the day 6 SEM samples (with no cumulus cell or polar body 638 contamination) together with EPI and TE single cells. Eighteen SEMs were clustered 639 with the TE cluster, and 43 SEMs were clustered with the EPI cluster. Two-tailed Mann-640 641 Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) test was used for significance test.



642 Suppl. Fig. 4. Cumulus cell and polar body ratios in SEM.

(A) Pie charts showing the numbers and percentages of the SEM samples with different
cumulus (left) and polar body (right) ratios. (B) Performance characteristics of SEM,

including sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive value, taking the TE 646 biopsy as the reference. Sensitivity = [true positives]/[true positives + false negatives]; 647 Specificity = [true negatives]/[true negatives + false positives]; positive predictive 648 value (PPV) = [true positives]/[true positives + false positives]; negative predictive 649 value (NPV) = [true negatives]/[true negatives + false negatives]. True positives 650 indicated that both SEM and TE were aneuploidy; true negatives indicated that both 651 SEM and TE were euploidy; false positives indicated that SEM was aneuploidy with 652 653 TE euploidy; false negatives indicated that SEM was euploidy with TE aneuploidy. All these calculations were based on the literature of Simon's group (16). (C) 654 Representative CN profiles for false negative SEM with nearly no maternal DNA 655 contamination. The false negative result of the fourth case was caused by a small-656 segment aneuploidy of 8 Mb, which did not reach our aneuploidy calling criterion of 657 10 Mb. The others were all caused by aneuploid and euploid cells released into the 658 culture medium, while no euploid cells were sampled by TE biopsy. (D)- (F) Violin 659 plots showing D) the cumulus ratios, E) the polar body ratios, and F) the amplified DNA 660 661 amount in SEM samples of day 4/5 (D5), 4/6 (D6) and 4/7 (D7). Two-tailed Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) test was used for significance test. (G) Histograms 662 showing the GDR, FNR, GCR and FPR of day 4/5 (D5) and day 4/6 (D6) SEM samples. 663

A В 2.5e-05 0.02 0.64 0.71 0.89 512 Contamination Amplified DNA amounts (ng) Copy number ratio Amplified DNA amounts (ng) 0.96 variation 256 512 • 0-20% Normal 20-40% 256 Duplication 128 • 40-60% Deletion 128 • • 60-80% 64 Both • 80-100% 64 32 32 16 16 0-20% 20-40% 40-60% 60-80% 80-100% Duplication Deletion Both Normal С 100 100 R = 0.80 p-value = 0.00013 R = 0.90 p-value = 1e-06 Polar body known fraction(%) Cumulus known fraction(%) 75 75 50 50 0.5 cell 25 25 C 25 50 75 Cumulus predicted fraction(%) 100 50 75 100 Polar body predicted fraction(%) 100 100 R = 0.97 R = 0.82 Polar body known fraction(%) p-value = 0.00097 p-value = 9.6e-08 Cumulus known fraction(%) 75 75 50 50 1 cell 25 25 25 50 75 Cumulus predicted fraction(%) 100 50 100 25 75 Polar body predicted fraction(%) 100 100 R = 0.98 R = 0.91 p-value = 1.5e-08 Polar body known fraction(%) p-value = 5e-05 Cumulus known fraction(%) 75 75 50 50 2 cell 25 25 0 25 50 75 Cumulus predicted fraction(%) 100 25 50 75 Polar body predicted fraction(%) ò 100



666

(A) Violin plot showing variations in amplified DNA amounts between different
contamination ratio samples. Two-tailed Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) test was
used for significance test. (B) Violin plot showing variations in amplified DNA amounts

between different chromosome copy number samples. Normal represented euploid; 670 duplication represented copy number increase; deletion represented copy number 671 decrease; both represented copy number increase and decrease. Two-tailed Mann-672 Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) test was used for significance test. (C) Correlations 673 between the predicted and input component fractions of the simulated DNA mixing 674 experiment. The red box indicated a total data volume of 0.5 cell; the yellow box 675 indicated a total data volume of 1 cell; the blue box indicated a total data volume of 2 676 677 cells. Two-tailed Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) test was used for significance test.

678 Supplementary Tables

679 Supplementary Table 1

680 Sample information included quality control information, copy number variations,

681 maternal contamination, sampling time.

682 Supplementary Table 2

Position of O-DMRs and C-DMRs and statistics of reads mapped on O-DMRs and C-DMRs.