



Draft Genome Sequences of Seven *Limosilactobacillus fermentum* Indigenously Isolated Probiotic Strains from the Artisanal Fermented Milk Product Dahi

Muhammad Nadeem Khan,^a DMuhammad Imran^a

^aDepartment of Microbiology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

ABSTRACT Here, we report the draft genome sequences of seven strains of potentially probiotic *Limosilactobacillus fermentum* isolated from the traditional fermented milk product dahi. The estimated average genome size was 1,955,815 bp, with a median GC content of 52%. Genome annotation predicted an average of 1,871 protein-coding genes and 47 RNAs.

Linear time to the part of the system of the

We report the genome sequences of seven strains of *L. fermentum* (QAULFN56, QAULFN64, QAULFN21, QAULFN53, QAULFN54, QAULFN55, and QAULFN62) that were isolated from the traditional fermented milk product dahi. Samples were collected from dairy corner shops of Rawalpindi, Islamabad, Pakistan. For isolation, 100 μ l of dahi sample was plated on de Man Rogosa Sharpe (MRS) agar (pH 6.8 \pm 2) and incubated at 37°C for 24 h in a GasPak anaerobic system (Sigma-Aldrich). Single colonies from MRS plates were subcultured, and purified cultures were obtained. The cultures were identified as strains of *L. fermentum* with a microbial identification system explained previously (9), followed by analysis using the ON-rep-seq gene sequencing tool (10).

The pure colonies from agar plates were grown overnight in MRS broth followed by DNA extraction using InstaGene matrix (Bio-Rad Laboratories, California, USA). A Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA) was used to quantify the DNA. DNA libraries for high-throughput sequencing were obtained with the commercially available Vazyme TruePrep DNA library prep kit V2 (Vazyme Biotech, Nanjing, China). Sequencing of these libraries was performed on an Illumina HiSeq-2000 sequencing platform (BGI-Shenzhen, Shenzhen, China) with an average read length of 101 bp. FASTQ files were generated, and average total raw reads were 10,294,243. Default parameters were used for all software unless otherwise specified. The quality trimming of the sequencing reads was performed using Trimmomatic version 0.38 (11). The number of filtered average reads was 9,340,781, and these were aligned with the reference genome of *L. fermentum* IFO 3956 (NCBI RefSeq accession number NC_010610). The assembly of the high-quality reads was performed using The Velvet (v1.2.10) assembler (12).

Editor Julie C. Dunning Hotopp, University of Maryland School of Medicine

Copyright © 2022 Khan and Imran. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

Address correspondence to Muhammad Imran, mmimran@qau.edu.pk.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Received 20 July 2022 Accepted 21 September 2022 Published 10 October 2022

Feature	QAULFN56	QAULFN64	QAULFN21	QAULFN53	QAULFN54	QAULFN55	QAULFN62
GenBank accession no.	JAJAOT000000000	JAJAOV000000000	JAJAOP00000000	JAJAOQ00000000	JAJAOR00000000	JAJAOS00000000	JAJAOU000000000
SRA accession no.	SRR19959948	SRR19959946	SRR19959952	SRR19959951	SRR19959950	SRR19959949	SRR19959947
Raw reads	10,296,951	10,294,952	10,293,176	10,292,199	10,297,350	10,292,921	10,292,151
Genome coverage	300×	300×	300×	300×	300×	300×	300×
Size (bp)	1,900,053	1,900,053	1,867,005	2,077,539	1,966,551	2,011,311	1,968,193
% GC	52.4	52.4	52.8	51.7	52	51.8	52
Contigs	102	102	74	170	129	137	80
Total genes	1,919	1,919	1,848	2,148	2,059	2,041	2,001
CDSs with proteins	1,803	1,803	1,724	2,002	1,965	1,935	1,869
RNAs	52	52	63	53	20	29	60
Pseudogenes	64	64	61	80	74	70	72
Subsystem	207	207	212	220	215	220	213
COGs	776	778	795	845	826	840	822
eggNOG features	1,653	1,643	1,595	1,800	1,715	1,749	1,684
Bacteriocin gene	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A	Enterolysin_A
CRISPR ^a	С	С	С	Р	Nil	С	C

TABLE 1 Genome statistics for L	. fermentum isolates obtained fro	om the fermented milk	product dah
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

^a P, possible; C, confirmed. No resistance gene was found in any of the strains.

genomes were annotated through PGAP (14). The subsystem identification in the genomes was determined through RAST (15), while evaluation of orthologous genes was performed via clusters of orthologous genes (COGs) analysis (16) and eggNOG (17). The results are presented in Table 1. The genomes were mined for the presence of bacteriocin, antibiotic resistance, and CRISPR/CRISPR-Cas genes through the online tools BAGEL4, CARD, and CRISPR Finder, respectively (18–22). Except for strains QAULFN54 and QAULFN21, the rest of the five strains had bacteriocin genes. CRISPR sequences were identified in all the strains except QAULFN54. The presence of CRISPRs suggested immunity to foreign attacking agents, like phages, jumping genes, or transfer elements (23).

Data availability. The genomic data reported here have been deposited in GenBank under the accession numbers given in Table 1. The SRA accession numbers are also provided in Table 1. The BioProject number is PRJNA744373, and the relevant BioSample numbers are SAMN20114169 to SAMN20114175.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by Higher Education Commission, Pakistan (HEC) under NRPU Project no 6167.

REFERENCES

- Zheng J, Wittouck S, Salvetti E, Franz CMAP, Harris HMB, Mattarelli P, O'Toole PW, Pot B, Vandamme P, Walter J, Watanabe K, Wuyts S, Felis GE, Gänzle MG, Lebeer S. 2020. A taxonomic note on the genus *Lactobacillus*: description of 23 novel genera, emended description of the genus *Lactobacillus* Beijerinck 1901, and union of *Lactobacillaceae* and *Leuconostocaceae*. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 70:2782–2858. https://doi.org/10.1099/ijsem.0.004107.
- Duar RM, Lin XB, Zheng J, Martino ME, Grenier T, Pérez-Muñoz ME, Leulier F, Gänzle M, Walter J. 2017. Lifestyles in transition: evolution and natural history of the genus Lactobacillus. FEMS Microbiol Rev 41:S27–S48. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/femsre/fux030.
- Mikelsaar M, Sepp E, Stsepetova J, Hutt P, Zilmer K, Kullisaar T, Zilmer M. 2015. Regulation of plasma lipid profile by lactobacillus fermentum (probiotic strain ME-3 DSM14241) in a randomised controlled trial of clinically healthy adults. BMC Nutr 1:27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40795-015-0020-z.
- Naghmouchi K, Belguesmia Y, Bendali F, Spano G, Seal BS, Drider D. 2020. Lactobacillus fermentum: a bacterial species with potential for food preservation and biomedical applications. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 60:3387–3399. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2019.1688250.
- Ghosh T, Beniwal A, Semwal A, Navani NK. 2019. Mechanistic insights into probiotic properties of lactic acid bacteria associated with ethnic fermented dairy products. Front Microbiol 10:502. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.00502.
- Garcia-Gonzalez N, Battista N, Prete R, Corsetti A. 2021. Health-promoting role of Lactiplantibacillus plantarum isolated from fermented foods. Microorganisms 9:349. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9020349.
- Fidanza M, Panigrahi P, Kollmann TR. 2021. Lactiplantibacillus plantarum: nomad and ideal probiotic. Front Microbiol 12:712236. https://doi.org/10 .3389/fmicb.2021.712236.

- Filannino P, De Angelis M, Di Cagno R, Gozzi G, Riciputi Y, Gobbetti M. 2018. How Lactobacillus plantarum shapes its transcriptome in response to contrasting habitats. Environ Microbiol 20:3700–3716. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/1462-2920.14372.
- Klingler JM, Stowe RP, Obenhuber DC, Groves TO, Mishra SK, Pierson DL. 1992. Evaluation of the Biolog automated microbial identification system. Appl Environ Microbiol 58:2089–2092. https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.58.6 .2089-2092.1992.
- Krych Ł, Castro-Mejia JL, Forero-Junco LM, Moesby DN, Mikkelsen MB, Rasmussen MA, Sykulski M, Nielsen DS. 2019. DNA enrichment and tagmentation method for species-level identification and strain-level differentiation using ON-rep-seq. Commun Biol 2:369. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-019-0617-x.
- 11. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120. https://doi.org/10 .1093/bioinformatics/btu170.
- Zerbino DR, Birney E. 2008. Velvet: algorithms for de novo short read assembly using de Bruijn graphs. Genome Res 18:821–829. https://doi.org/ 10.1101/gr.074492.107.
- Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler G. 2013. QUAST: quality assessment tool for genome assemblies. Bioinformatics 29:1072–1075. https:// doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt086.
- Tatusova T, DiCuccio M, Badretdin A, Chetvernin V, Nawrocki EP, Zaslavsky L, Lomsadze A, Pruitt KD, Borodovsky M, Ostell J. 2016. NCBI prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res 44:6614–6624. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/nar/gkw569.
- Aziz RK, Bartels D, Best AA, Dejongh M, Disz T, Edwards RA, Formsma K, Gerdes S, Glass EM, Kubal M, Meyer F, Olsen GJ, Olson R, Osterman AL,

Overbeek RA, McNeil LK, Paarmann D, Paczian T, Parrello B, Pusch GD, Reich C, Stevens R, Vassieva O, Vonstein V, Wilke A, Zagnitko O. 2008. The RAST Server: rapid annotations using subsystems technology. BMC Genomics 9:75. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-9-75.

- Galperin MY, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2015. Expanded microbial genome coverage and improved protein family annotation in the COG database. Nucleic Acids Res 43:D261–D269. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/ gku1223.
- Huerta-Cepas J, Szklarczyk D, Forslund K, Cook H, Heller D, Walter MC, Rattei T, Mende DR, Sunagawa S, Kuhn M, Jensen LJ, von Mering C, Bork P. 2016. eggNOG 4.5: a hierarchical orthology framework with improved functional annotations for eukaryotic, prokaryotic and viral sequences. Nucleic Acids Res 44:D286–D293. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv1248.
- van Heel AJ, de Jong A, Song C, Viel JH, Kok J, Kuipers OP. 2018. BAGEL4: a user-friendly web server to thoroughly mine RiPPs and bacteriocins. Nucleic Acids Res 46:W278–W281. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky383.
- Alcock BP, Raphenya AR, Lau TTY, Tsang KK, Bouchard M, Edalatmand A, Huynh W, Nguyen A-LV, Cheng AA, Liu S, Min SY, Miroshnichenko A, Tran

H-K, Werfalli RE, Nasir JA, Oloni M, Speicher DJ, Florescu A, Singh B, Faltyn M, Hernandez-Koutoucheva A, Sharma AN, Bordeleau E, Pawlowski AC, Zubyk HL, Dooley D, Griffiths E, Maguire F, Winsor GL, Beiko RG, Brinkman FSL, Hsiao WWL, Domselaar GV, McArthur AG. 2020. CARD 2020: antibiotic resistome surveillance with the comprehensive antibiotic resistance database. Nucleic Acids Res 48:D517–D525.

- Grissa I, Vergnaud G, Pourcel C. 2008. CRISPRcompar: a website to compare clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats. Nucleic Acids Res 36:W145–W148. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkn228.
- Grissa I, Vergnaud G, Pourcel C. 2007. The CRISPRdb database and tools to display CRISPRs and to generate dictionaries of spacers and repeats. BMC Bioinformatics 8:172. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-8-172.
- Grissa I, Vergnaud G, Pourcel C. 2007. CRISPRFinder: a web tool to identify clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats. Nucleic Acids Res 35:W52–W57. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkm360.
- 23. Marraffini L. 2015. CRISPR-Cas immunity in prokaryotes. Nature 526:55–61. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15386.