AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MICROBIOLOGY | Microbiology Resource Announcements

GENOME SEQUENCES

Genome Sequences of *Erwinia* Phyllophages AH04 and AH06

Greg P. Krukonis,[a] Sam J. Roth,[b] Véronique A. Delesalle[b]

[a]Department of Biology, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas, USA
[b]Department of Biology, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, USA

ABSTRACT Although crucial in shaping bacterial communities, few bacteriophages of the phyllosphere have been described. We provide genome data for two *Myoviridae* phages, AH04 and AH06, isolated on *Erwinia billingiae* strains. AH04 shares limited genetic similarity with previously described phages, while AH06 shares over 75% similarity with various *Erwinia* phages.

Despite their relevance to bacterial population dynamics on plants (1–5), bacteriophages that infect plant pathogens are poorly described. Here, we describe two phages isolated on *Erwinia billingiae* strains, themselves isolated from the leaves of horse chestnut trees (*Aesculus hippocastanum*; Sapindaceae) from the same location in Oxford, UK (1–3). The bacterial strains were classified based on sequencing of 800 bp of the 16S rRNA region and the top BLASTn hits associated with a sequence (E value, $<10^{-10}$) (1).

Each phage was single-plaque purified at least three times on its focal host and amplified by overnight culturing in 10 ml King's broth and 100 μl of isolation bacteria (1). The cultured lysate was filtered (pore size, 0.45 μm), and following the Promega Wizard PCR Preps DNA purification system kit protocol (no. 7170), phage DNA was extracted by the Koskella lab. DNA samples were sent to North Carolina State University's Genomic Science Laboratory for sequencing. Libraries were prepared using the Illumina TruSeq Nano DNA library prep kit following the manufacturer's protocol. Sequencing was conducted on the Illumina MiSeq platform, using a v3 150 SE flow cell. For each sample, 150-bp reads were assembled into one contig using the GS v2.9 *de novo* assembler, with $>200\times$ coverage (Table 1); the quality of the consensus contig was verified using Consed v29 (6, 7). The genome ends were determined to be circularly permuted through analysis with PAUSE and PhageTerm (8, 9). The sequences were imported into DNA Master v5.22.22 (10) to map the open reading frames. Putative genes were called based on Glimmer v3.0 and GeneMark v2.5 algorithms (11, 12). Putative functions of the gene products were predicted using BLAST v2.12 (13) and HHpred (14). For the BLASTp matches, an E value below 10^{-5} was required to assign a function. For the HHpred matches, a high probability ($>85\%$), substantial coverage ($>50\%$), and low E value ($<10^{-5}$) were required. The presence of tRNA genes was verified through the Web-based program ARAGORN (15). Default settings were used in all analyses.

Both phages have similar GC contents and relatively large genomes, with more than 290 genes, including one tRNA gene for AH04 (Table 1). Based on a BLASTn search of the nucleotide (nt) database restricted to phages (taxid 10699, 10662, and 10744), both phages are likely *Myoviridae*. AH04 shows limited nucleotide similarity (15 to 25%) to three *Myoviridae* phages isolated on different *Proteobacteria* hosts (Table 1). AH06 exhibits greater nucleotide similarity ($>75\%$) to a number of *Myoviridae Erwinia* phages (Table 1). As is typical of *Myoviridae* genomes (16, 17), there is little conservation of genome organization, and only 19 to 20% of genes could be assigned a function. Both genomes include three endolysins, including one with a family 19 chitinase domain—the biggest gene in each genome (7,215 and 6,678 bp, respectively, in AH04 and AH06), which is impressively long, given the average gene length in these phages (851 and 773 bp) and the published average phage gene length of 616 bp (18). Based on sequencing of DNA extracted from

Citation Krukonis GP, Roth SJ, Delesalle VA. 2021. Genome sequences of *Erwinia* phyllophages AH04 and AH06. Microbiol Resour Announc 10:e00820-21. https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA.00820-21.

Editor Simon Roux, DOE Joint Genome Institute

Address correspondence to Véronique A. Delesalle, delesall@gettysburg.edu.

Received 23 August 2021
Accepted 9 October 2021
Published 4 November 2021

TABLE 1 Isolation information and genome characteristics for *Erwinia* phages AH04 and AH06

Phage name	Isolation yr	No. of reads	Coverage (×)	Genome size (bp)	%GC	No. of protein genes	No. of tRNA genes[a]	Best BLASTn matches (GenBank accession no.)[b]
AH04	2011	910,482	520	262,639	43.3	293	1; Cys (gca)	*Klebsiella* phage N1M2 (MN642089.1), *Pseudomonas* phage OBP (JN627160.1), *Edwardsiella* virus pEt-SU (NC_048182.1)
AH06	2012	400,092	218	275,293	48.1	333	0	vB_EamM_Simmy50 (NC_041974.1), vB_EamM_Special (NC_041975.1), Ea35-70 (KF806589.1)

[a]The tRNA gene is listed with amino acid (anticodon) information.

[b]The complete genome of each phage was searched using BLASTn against the nucleotide (nt) database restricted to phages (taxid: 10699, 10662, and 10744). For AH04, matches with more than 40% coverage of the query are reported. For AH06, only the top three matches out of 10 matches with over 80% coverage, all to *Erwinia* phages, are listed.

different samples, AH04 was isolated twice from different leaves of tree 1 in 2011, while AH06 was isolated three times from the leaves of tree 6 in 2012 (1).

Data availability. The genome sequences and associated information can be found under GenBank and SRA accession no. MZ501267 and SRX11736855 (AH04) and MZ501268 and SRX11736857 (AH06), and are also associated with BioProject accession no. PRJNA754193.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by research and professional development grants from Gettysburg College to V.A.D.

We thank the SEA-PHAGES program, especially Graham Hatfull, Welkin Pope, Dan Russell, and Debbie Jacobs-Sera, for training in genome annotation and answering all our phage questions. We thank Britt Koskella for providing us with phage DNA to sequence and the opportunity to learn more about the phyllosphere.

REFERENCES

1. Koskella B, Thompson JN, Preston GM, Buckling A. 2011. Local biotic environment shapes the spatial scale of bacteriophage adaptation to bacteria. Am Nat 177:440–451. https://doi.org/10.1086/658991.
2. Koskella B. 2013. Phage-mediated selection on microbiota of a long-lived host. Curr Biol 23:1256–1260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.05.038.
3. Koskella B, Parr N. 2015. The evolution of bacterial resistance against bacteriophages in the horse chestnut phyllosphere is general across both space and time. Philos Trans R Soc B 370:20140297. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0297.
4. Koskella B, Meaden S. 2013. Understanding bacteriophage specificity in natural microbial communities. Viruses 5:806–823. https://doi.org/10.3390/v5030806.
5. Morella NM, Gomez AL, Wang G, Leung MS, Koskella B. 2018. The impact of bacteriophages on phyllosphere bacterial abundance and composition. Mol Ecol 27:2025–2038. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14542.
6. Gordon D, Green P. 2013. Consed: a graphical editor for next-generation sequencing. Bioinformatics 29:2936–2937. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt515.
7. Russell DA. 2018. Sequencing, assembling, and finishing complete bacteriophage genomes. Methods Mol Biol 1681:109–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-7343-9_9.
8. Center for Phage Technology. 2016. Pause3. https://cpt.tamu.edu/analysis-with-pause3-2016-edition/. Accessed 1 July 2019.
9. Garneau JR, Depardieu F, Fortier LC, Bikard D, Monot M. 2017. PhageTerm: a tool for fast and accurate determination of phage termini and packaging mechanism using next-generation sequencing data. Sci Rep 7:8292. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07910-5.
10. DNA Master. http://cobamide2.bio.pitt.edu/computer.htm. Accessed 1 July 2019.
11. Delcher AL, Harmon D, Kasif S, White O, Salzberg SL. 1999. Improved microbial gene identification with GLIMMER. Nucleic Acids Res 27:4636–4641. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/27.23.4636.
12. Lukashin AV, Borodovsky M. 1998. GeneMark.hmm: new solutions for gene finding. Nucleic Acids Res 26:1107–1115. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/26.4.1107.
13. Boratyn GM, Schäffer AA, Agarwala R, Altschul SF, Lipman DJ, Madden TL. 2012. Domain enhanced lookup time accelerated BLAST. Biol Direct 7:12. https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6150-7-12.
14. Söding J, Biegert A, Lupas AN. 2005. The HHpred interactive server for protein homology detection and structure prediction. Nucleic Acids Res 33:244–248. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gki408.
15. Laslett D, Canback B. 2004. ARAGORN, a program to detect tRNA genes and tmRNA genes in nucleotide sequences. Nucleic Acids Res 32:11–16. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkh152.
16. Hatfull GF. 2012. The secret lives of mycobacteriophages. Adv Virus Res 82:179–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394621-8.00015-7.
17. Lavigne R, Ceyssens P-J. 2012. Family Myoviridae, p 46–62. *In* King AMQ, Adams MJ, Carstens EB, Lefkowitz EJ (ed), Virus taxonomy. Elsevier, San Diego, CA.
18. Hatfull GF, Jacobs-Sera D, Lawrence JG, Pope WH, Russell DA, Ko CC, Weber RJ, Patel MC, Germane KL, Edgar RH, Hoyte NN, Bowman CA, Tantoco AT, Paladin EC, Myers MS, Smith AL, Grace MS, Pham TT, O'Brien MB, Vogelsberger AM, Hryckowian AJ, Wynalek JL, Donis-Keller H, Bogel MW, Peebles CL, Cresawn SG, Hendrix RW. 2010. Comparative genomic analysis of 60 Mycobacteriophage genomes: genome clustering, gene acquisition, and gene size. J Mol Biol 397:119–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2010.01.011.