From David Paul Bicket

dpbicket@btinternet.com

We are currently aware of twelve branches of the tree with living male Bicket(t)s, all of which go back to Ayrshire in Scotland, especially to the area around Fenwick, Kilmarnock, Kilwinning, and Stewarton. These branches are currently well represented in Scotland, England, the USA, and Australia, with limited numbers of members in other countries.

Related to file: 02-23-2020\_graham\_relationship\_to\_bicket\_families

Hi Boog,

 I’m just following up on the work I did previously analyzing the private variants of everyone from Family Tree DNA under the R-S8137 SNP, including yours.

 For me and the Bicket project, the results of the detailed SNP testing that comes with the Big Y 700 test have been fantastic.  They have demonstrated that all 9 branches for which we have received results go back to a common ancestor, and then which branches diverged at what points.  (I’ve attached a diagram I produced for people in the project to demonstrate the results.)

 Unfortunately, however, they haven’t done anything to demonstrate that you and the Bicket testers have anything in common below R-S8137.  This is in spite of the fact that we share a number of private SNPs, as demonstrated by my initial analysis.

 I asked FTDNA about this, as part of a series of questions I had in trying to understand the results better.  The exchange was as follows:

 I’m telling you this because I think FTDNA needs to clarify – and name – the SNPs shared by you and the Bicket testers, and I cannot believe that they can all be explained away by the explanations given above.  However FTDNA has not done so to-date.  I don’t want to push this issue with FTDNA myself because it is not critical to the results I am getting.  However, you might wish to follow up with FTDNA yourself about it, if it is of interest to you.

 All the best,

 David Bicket

My query:

**Specific Questions Re SNP Naming for Bickets and Others Previously with R-S8137 Terminal SNP**

1. …
2. **Why aren't all shared Bicket SNPs named and shown on the FTDNA Haplotree?**All four Bickets shared 16 private SNPs (except for 3 which apparently had no-calls for 1 or 2 individuals).  Yet only two SNPs were named by FTDNA as shared by all four Bickets (as best I can read the FTDNA haplotree – please correct me if I am wrong).  The (shared) private SNPs before naming, and those which were subsequently named, are shown in this table (which is also referred to in question 5):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Location | Named SNP | Shared by | Comment |
| 7429123 | FT94522 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - definite |   |
| 7513218 | FT94527 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - definite |   |
| 8801293 | FT94547 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - definite |   |
| 11649685 | FT219214 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - definite |   |
| 10233831 | FT219215 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - likely | Apparent no-call for Robert Morris Bicket |
| 12876944 | FT105080 | All Bickets & Robert Graham - likely | Apparent no-calls for Robert Morris Bicket & Alan Glassford Bicket |
| 3214280 | FT94260 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 4322279 | FT103793 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 4336049 | FT94336 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 5431598 | FT94416 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 7226643 | FT94518 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| **9231735** | **FT104740** | **All Bickets - definite** | **Only named SNPs shown on updated FTDNA haplotree.** |
| **11672522** | **FT219207** | **All Bickets - definite** | **Only named SNPs shown on updated FTDNA haplotree.** |
| 15839848 | Y21572 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 26517244 | S8133 | All Bickets - definite |   |
| 14598095 | FT105355 | All Bickets - likely | Apparent no-calls for Robert Martin Bicket & Robert Morris Bicket |

1. **…**
2. **…**
3. **Why are there no named SNPs shown for all Bickets plus Robert Graham?**  There are four private SNPs definitely shared by all of these individuals, plus probably two more.  (See the table after question 2.)

FTDNA’s answers (from Casimir R., Big Y Specialist):

2. There are various reasons why some SNPs are not on the haplotree. Sometimes the SNPs are not reliable for genetic genealogy for one reason or another. Among other reasons, this is occasionally because a SNP appears in multiple haplogroups or subclades within a haplogroup, or because it shows up too inconsistently in test results to use reliably.

5. I'm not sure why these four SNPs FT94522 FT94527 FT94547 FT219214 are not on the haplotree. However, according to Y-Browse they are not one of our competitor Y-DNA haplotrees either, so it may be that they have not been placed on the haplotree for one of the reasons I mentioned in Question 2.