Table S1. Cumulative interpretation rate of the model in the resistant and susceptible soybeans

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title | Type | N | R2X(cum) | R2Y(cum) | Q2(cum) |
| PI437654\_SCN VS PI437654\_0 | PCA | 12 | 0.776 | / | / |
| WM82\_SCN VS WM82\_0 | PCA | 12 | 0.739 | / | / |
| ZH13\_SCN VS ZH13\_0 | PCA | 12 | 0.823 | / | / |
| HF47\_SCN VS HF47\_0 | PCA | 12 | 0.708 | / | / |
| PI437654\_SCN VS PI437654\_0 | PLS-DA | 12 | 0.817 | 0.949 | 0.807 |
| WM82\_SCN VS WM82\_0 | PLS-DA | 12 | 0.891 | 0.986 | 0.955 |
| ZH13\_SCN VS ZH13\_0 | PLS-DA | 12 | 0.964 | 0.988 | 0.962 |
| HF47\_SCN VS HF47\_0 | PLS-DA | 12 | 0.825 | 0.990 | 0.942 |

Note: N, Number of samples analyzed; R2X, Interpret-ability of X variable; R2Y, Interpret-ability of Y variable; Q2, Predictable value of the model. The closer R2Y and Q2 values were to 1, the better the PLS-DA model interpreted and predicted the differences between the two groups of samples.