Appendix S1. Comparison of incurred costs between the traditional method of individually labeling each primer and the dual labeling technique, using 10 primer pairs and 50 samples. Also shown below for comparison are total costs for 100 and 300 samples. In the table, steps that are relatively constant (i.e., not necessarily dependent on sample size or primer number) are shaded. All costs are in US\$.

| Step | Individual primer method |  | Dual labeling method |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial testing of unlabeled primers ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Forward primers: $\$ 5.50 \times 10=\$ 55$ <br> Reverse primers: $\$ 5.50 \times 10=\underset{\$ 110}{\$ 55}$ |  | Forward primers (unlabeled): $\$ 5.50 \times 10=\$ 55$ |  |
|  |  |  | Reverse primers: | \$5.50 $\times 10=\$ 55$ |
|  |  |  | Tagged forward primer: | \$5.50 $\times 10=\$ 55$ |
|  |  |  |  | \$165 |
| Order forward <br> fluorescent primers | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { VIC-labeled: } & \$ 75 \times 2=\$ 150 \\ \text { NED-labeled: } & \$ 75 \times 2=\$ 150 \\ \text { PET-labeled: } & \$ 75 \times 3=\$ 225 \\ \text { 6-FAM-labeled: } & \$ 65^{\mathrm{b}} \times 3=\underline{\$ 195} \\ & \end{array}$ |  | VIC-labeled: $\$ 75 \times 1=\$ 75$ <br> NED-labeled: $\$ 75 \times 1=\$ 75$ <br> PET-labeled: $\$ 75 \times 1=\$ 75$ <br> 6-FAM-labeled: $\$ 65^{\text {b }} \times 1=\underline{\$ 65}$ <br>   <br>   |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Per sample: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| QIAGEN Mix $=$ | $\$ 0.254$ |
| Tips $^{\mathrm{d}}=$ | $\$ 0.0625 \times 2$ |
| Plate $^{\mathrm{e}}=$ | $\underline{\$ 0.042}$ |
|  | $\$ 0.421$ |

For all samples:
$\$ 0.421 \times \mathbf{1 0}$ primers $\times 50$ samples $=\$ 210.50$

| Per sample: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| QIAGEN Mix |  |
| Tips $^{\mathrm{d}}=$ | $\$ 0.254$ |
| Plate $^{\mathrm{e}}=$ | $\$ 0.0625 \times 2$ |
|  | $\$ 0.042$ |
|  | $\$ 0.421$ |

For all samples:
$\$ 0.421 \times 2$ primer mixes $\times 50$ samples $=\$ 42.10$


