DATA NOTE



The complete genome sequence of *Eimeria tenella* (Tyzzer

1929), a common gut parasite of chickens [version 1; peer

review: 2 approved]

Eerik Aunin¹, Ulrike Böhme¹, Damer Blake², Alexander Dove¹, Michelle Smith¹, Craig Corton¹, Karen Oliver¹, Emma Betteridge¹, Michael A. Quail¹, Shane A. McCarthy¹, Jonathan Wood¹, Alan Tracey¹, James Torrance¹, Ying Sims¹, Kerstin Howe¹, Richard Challis¹, Matthew Berriman¹, Adam Reid¹

¹Wellcome Sanger Institute, Cambridge, CB10 1SA, UK ²Royal Veterinary College, Hatfield, AL9 7TA, UK

✔1 First published: 09 Sep 2021, 6:225
 https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17100.1

 Latest published: 09 Sep 2021, 6:225
 https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17100.1

Abstract

We present a genome assembly from a clonal population of *Eimeria tenella* Houghton parasites (Apicomplexa; Conoidasida; Eucoccidiorida; Eimeriidae). The genome sequence is 53.25 megabases in span. The entire assembly is scaffolded into 15 chromosomal pseudomolecules, with complete mitochondrion and apicoplast organellar genomes also present.

Keywords

Eimeria tenella, Apicomplexa, parasite, protist, genome sequence, chromosomal



This article is included in the Tree of Life gateway.

Open Peer R	eview	
Reviewer Sta	atus 🗹 🗸	
	Invited R	eviewers
	1	2
version 1 09 Sep 2021	report	report

- Arnab Pain, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, Saudi Arabia
- 2. **Jon Boyle**, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, USA

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

Corresponding author: Adam Reid (ar11@sanger.ac.uk)

Author roles: Aunin E: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; Böhme U: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; Blake D: Investigation, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing; Dove A: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; Smith M: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; Corton C: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; Oliver K: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; Betteridge E: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; Quail MA: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; McCarthy SA: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Writing – Review & Editing; Wood J: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Writing – Review & Editing; Tracey A: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; Torrance J: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; Sims Y: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – Review & Editing; Howe K: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; Challis R: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; Review & Editing; Review & Editing; Review & Editing; Berriman M: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; Review & Editing; Challis R: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This work was supported by Wellcome through core funding to the Wellcome Sanger Institute (206194) and the Darwin Tree of Life Discretionary Award (218328). SAM is supported by Wellcome (207492). *The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*

Copyright: © 2021 Aunin E *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Aunin E, Böhme U, Blake D *et al.* The complete genome sequence of *Eimeria tenella* (Tyzzer 1929), a common gut parasite of chickens [version 1; peer review: 2 approved] Wellcome Open Research 2021, 6:225 https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17100.1

First published: 09 Sep 2021, 6:225 https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17100.1

Species taxonomy

Eukaryota; Apicomplexa; Conoidasia; Eucoccidiorida; Eimeriidae; Eimeria; *Eimeria tenella* Tyzzer 1929 (NCBItxid:5802).

Introduction

The genome of *Eimeria tenella* (Houghton strain) was sequenced as part of the Darwin Tree of Life Project, a collaborative effort to sequence all of the named eukaryotic species in Britain and Ireland. Here we present a chromosomally complete genome sequence based on a clonal specimen maintained initially at the Houghton Poultry Research Station (HPRS) and more recently at the Royal Veterinary College, Hertfordshire, UK, where it was collected from experimentally infected *Gallus gallus domesticus*. This apicomplexan parasite is a major cause of coccidiosis in farmed chickens in the UK.

Genome sequence report

The genome was sequenced from a clonal specimen of E. tenella collected from experimentally infected G. gallus domesticus at the Royal Veterinary College, UK. A total of 41-fold coverage in Pacific Biosciences single-molecule long reads (N50 8 kb) and 107-fold coverage in 10X Genomics read clouds were generated. Primary assembly contigs were scaffolded with chromosome conformation Hi-C data. Manual assembly curation corrected 200 missing/misjoins, reducing the scaffold number by 77.9%, increasing the scaffold N50 by 0.1% and decreasing the assembly length by 1.85%. The final assembly has a total length of 53.25 Mb in 15 chromosomal scaffolds, one mitochondrial scaffold and one apicoplast scaffold. The total scaffold N50 was 4.01 Mb (Table 1). The chromosomal scaffolds are numbered by sequence length, 1 being the smallest and 15 the largest, as is typical for Apicomplexa (Figure 1-Figure 3; Table 2). The organellar mitochondrial and apicoplast genome sequences were each assembled into single contigs and circularized to remove redundancy. The assembly has a BUSCO v5.1.2 (Simao et al., 2015) completeness of 98.8% and duplication rate of 0.2% using the coccidia_odb10 reference set.

Of particular note is that 15 chromosomal scaffolds were identified, each with telomeres attached to both ends. This calls into question previous reports which suggested a haploid chromosome number of 14 for this species (del Cacho et al., 2005). The Hi-C map (Figure 4) shows that each of the 15 chromosomal scaffolds has a single contact region with each of the others. It has been shown in the coccidian relative Toxoplasma gondii that centromeres are sequestered together within the nucleus throughout the cell cycle (Brooks et al., 2011). The Hi-C map suggests that this also occurs in E. tenella and if true, further supports the existence of 15 chromosomes. We examined the putative centromeric regions as identified by Hi-C in the Artemis genome browser (Carver et al., 2012) and found almost all to be in intergenic regions of, on average, 35 kb (min=15 kb, max=74 kb). The exception was chromosome 1, where it was adjacent to a repeat near to the end of the chromosome. The data suggest that E. tenella chromosomes have single, well-localised centromeres which occupy acrocentric and sub-metacentric positions (Table 2).

Table 1. Genome data for *Eimeria tenella*, pEimTen1.1.

Project accession data			
Assembly identifier	pEimTen1.1		
Species	Eimeria tenella		
Specimen	pEimTen1		
NCBI taxonomy ID	NCBI:txid5802		
BioProject	PRJEB43184		
BioSample ID	SAMEA7524401		
Isolate information	Clonal specimen, Houghton strain		
Raw data accessions			
PacificBiosciences SEQUEL I	ERR6447337		
10X Genomics Illumina	ERX5693366-ERX5693369		
Hi-C Illumina	ERX5693901		
Genome assembly			
Assembly accession	GCA_905310635.1		
Span (Mb)	381		
Number of contigs	35		
Contig N50 length (Mb)	14		
Number of scaffolds	33		
Scaffold N50 length (Mb)	14		
Longest scaffold (Mb)	16		
BUSCO* genome score	C:98.8%[S:98.4%,D:0.4%],F:0.4%, M:0.8%,n:502		

*BUSCO scores based on the coccodia_odb10 BUSCO set using v5.1.2. C= complete [S= single copy, D=duplicated], F=fragmented, M=missing, n=number of orthologues in comparison. A full set of BUSCO scores is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/Eimeria%20tenella/ dataset/pEimTen1_1/busco.

The GC content of the genome was 58.6%.

Genome annotation report

We identified 7268 protein coding genes. Around 2000 gene models were manually corrected. The average exon length was 350.1, average intron length 298.1, with an average of 6.34 exons per gene. We annotated 44 pseudogenes, 32 degraded LTR retrotransposons (currently not included in GFF annotation), 140 rRNAs, 31 repeat regions, 28 ncRNAs and 345 tRNAs.

Methods

A clonal specimen of *E. tenella* was collected from experimentally infected *G. gallus domesticus* at the Royal Veterinary College, Hertfordshire, UK. Four-week-old Lohmann Valo chickens reared under specific pathogen-free conditions were used to propagate oocysts of the *E. tenella* Houghton strain as



Figure 1. Genome assembly of *Eimeria tenella* Houghton, pEimTen1.1: metrics. The BlobToolKit Snailplot shows N50 metrics and BUSCO gene completeness. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/pEimTen1.1/ dataset/pEimTen1_1/snail.

described previously (Long *et al.*, 1976). Standard methods were used to purify and sporulate oocysts and to purify sporozoites through nylon wool and DE-52 columns (Pastor-Fernández *et al.*, 2019; Shirley *et al.*, 1995). Animals were raised in strict accordance with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, an Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom. All animal studies and protocols were approved by the Royal Veterinary College Animal Welfare & Ethical Review Body (AWERB) and the UK Government Home Office under specific project licence.

DNA was extracted from the clonal specimen using the Qiagen MagAttract HMW DNA kit according to the manufacturer's instructions. Pacific Biosciences CLR long read and 10X Genomics read cloud sequencing libraries were constructed according to the manufacturers' instructions. Hi-C data were generated using the Arima Hi-C kit. Sequencing was performed

by the Scientific Operations DNA Pipelines at the Wellcome Sanger Institute on Pacific Biosciences SEQUEL I (long read), Illumina HiSeq (10X) and Illumina MiSeq (Hi-C) instruments.

The assembly pEimTen1.1 is based on 41x PacBio data, 10X Genomics Chromium data, and Arima Hi-C data generated by the Darwin Tree of Life Project. PacBio subreads were assembled with Canu 1.6 (Koren *et al.*, 2017). After running Canu, some deduplication of contigs was performed using GAP5 v1.2.14-r3753M (Bonfield & Whitwham, 2010). The assembly was scaffolded with scaff10x 4.2 using *E. tenella* 10x Chromium Illumina reads. This was then broken with break10x 3.1 and re-scaffolded using SALSA2 (October 2019 version) (Ghurye *et al.*, 2018) and Tigmint 1.1.2 (Jackman *et al.*, 2018) were used to break scaffolds. RaGOO 1.1 (Alonge *et al.*, 2019) was then used to re-scaffold, using another assembly



Figure 2. Genome assembly of *Eimeria tenella* **Houghton, pEimTen1.1: GC coverage.** BlobToolKit GC-coverage plot. Scaffolds are coloured by phylum. Circles are sized in proportion to scaffold length. Histograms show the distribution of chromosome length sum along each axis. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/pEimTen1.1/dataset/pEimTen1_1/blob.

generated from the same PacBio reads using wtdbg2 2.5 (20190621) (Ruan & Li, 2020). The assembly was then polished with Arrow (gcpp 1.0.0-SL-release-8.0.0, with pbmm2 version 1.1.0). Further polishing of the assembly was done with Pilon 1.19 (Walker *et al.*, 2014), using 10x Chromium Illumina reads from which 10x bar codes and linkers had been removed. The assembly was checked for contamination and analysed

using the gEVAL system (Chow *et al.*, 2016) as described previously (Howe *et al.*, 2021). Manual curation was performed using gEVAL, HiGlass (Kerpedjiev *et al.*, 2018) and Pretext, before final polishing with Pilon. The genome was analysed and BUSCO v5.1.2 scores generated using BlobToolKit 2.6.1 (Challis *et al.*, 2020). The software tools used, with versions, are summarised in Table 3.



Figure 3. Genome assembly of *Eimeria tenella* **Houghton, pEimTen1.1: cumulative sequence.** BlobToolKit cumulative sequence plot. The grey line shows cumulative length for all chromosomes. Coloured lines show cumulative lengths of chromosomes assigned to each phylum using the buscogenes taxrule. An interactive version of this figure is available at https://blobtoolkit.genomehubs.org/view/pEimTen1.1/dataset/pEimTen1_1/cumulative.

Table 2. Chromosomal pseudomolecules in the genome assembly of *Eimeria*

tenella, **pEimTen1.1**. The numbering of chromosomes is based on ordering the pEimTen1.1 assembly scaffolds by size in reverse order, so the chromosome names do not necessarily correspond to chromosome names in previously existing literature on *Eimeria tenella*.

INSDC accession	Chromosome	Size (kb)	GC%	Gaps	Putative centromeric region (bp)
HG994961	1	998.4	50.0	0	837838-871939
HG994962	2	1,151.2	47.8	1	530700-562938
HG994963	3	1,819.2	50.5	1	1605419-1629071
HG994964	4	1,948.7	50.0	2	1130403-1164585
HG994965	5	2,810.7	52.0	2	2256341-2281694

INSDC accession	Chromosome	Size (kb)	GC%	Gaps	Putative centromeric region (bp)
HG994966	6	3,367.5	51.8	3	2700201-2728956
HG994967	7	3,616.8	50.8	9	1871503-1901473
HG994968	8	3,810.9	51.5	1	1320955-1355380
HG994969	9	3,854.2	51.8	2	2305986-2344056
HG994970	10	4,007.2	53.4	1	2379713-2394995
HG994971	11	4,218.1	51.4	4	747612-790704
HG994972	12	4,348.4	52.3	0	418148-444959
HG994973	13	4,564.6	53.0	7	830432-888266
HG994974	14	5,913.3	51.4	4	3126091-3200449
HG994975	15	6,779.9	51.7	9	346670-377612
HG994976	MT	6.2	35.0	0	N/A
HG994977	Apicoplast	34.8	20.5	0	N/A



Figure 4. Genome assembly of *Eimeria tenella*, pEimTen1.1: Hi-C contact map. Hi-C contact map of the pEimTen1.1 assembly, visualised in HiGlass.

Software tool	Version	Source
Canu	1.6	(Koren <i>et al.</i> , 2017)
GAP5	v1.2.14-r3753M	(Bonfield & Whitwham, 2010)
scaff10x	4.2	https://github.com/wtsi-hpag/Scaff10X
break10x	3.1	https://github.com/wtsi-hpag/Scaff10X
SALSA2	October 2019	(Ghurye <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Juicebox	1.9.1	(Durand <i>et al.</i> , 2016)
Tigmint	1.1.2	(Jackman <i>et al.</i> , 2018)
RaGOO	1.1	(Alonge <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Wtdbg2	2.5 (20190621)	(Ruan & Li, 2020)
Arrow	gcpp 1.0.0-SL-release-8.0.0	https://github.com/PacificBiosciences/GenomicConsensus
Pilon	1.19	(Walker <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
STAR	2.5.3a	(Dobin <i>et al.</i> , 2013)
Cufflinks	2.2.1	(Trapnell <i>et al.</i> , 2010)
HISAT2	2.2.0	(Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Companion	May 2020	(Steinbiss <i>et al.</i> , 2016)
gEVAL	N/A	(Chow <i>et al.</i> , 2016)
HiGlass	1.11.8	(Kerpedjiev <i>et al.,</i> 2018)
PretextView	0.1	https://github.com/wtsi-hpag/PretextView
BlobToolKit	2.6.1	(Challis <i>et al.</i> , 2020)

Table 3. Software tools used.

An initial annotation was performed using Companion (Steinbiss et al., 2016) with the previous Eimeria tenella strain Houghton assembly and annotation as the reference (Ling et al., 2007). Eimeria tenella RNA-seq reads (from project PRJEB3308 in the European Nucleotide Archive, runs ERR178634, ERR178635, ERR178636, ERR178637 and ERR178638 (Reid et al., 2014)) were mapped to the assembly using 2-pass mapping method with STAR RNA-seq aligner version 2.5.3a (Aunin et al., 2020; Dobin et al., 2013). The mapped reads were processed with Cufflinks v2.2.1 (Trapnell et al., 2010) to produce a GTF file, which was then used as an input for Companion. Companion (May 2020 version) was run with Augustus threshold set to 0.2, alignment of proteins to the target genome enabled and other settings left as default. The annotations were then manually curated using Artemis v18.1.0 (Rutherford et al., 2000) and the Artemis Comparison Tool v18.1.0 (Carver et al., 2005)

with the help of previously published RNA-seq data (Reid *et al.*, 2014). For viewing in Artemis, the RNA-seq data (Reid *et al.*, 2014) was mapped to the assembly with HISAT2 2.2.0 (Kim *et al.*, 2019).

Data availability

European Nucleotide Archive: Eimeria tenella (Coccidian parasite). Accession number PRJEB43184: https://identifiers.org/ena.embl:PRJEB43184

The genome sequence is released openly for reuse. The *E. tenella* genome sequencing initiative is part of the Darwin Tree of Life (DToL) project. All raw sequence data and the assembly have been deposited in INSDC databases. Raw data and assembly accession identifiers are reported in Table 1.

References

Alonge M. Sovk S. Ramakrishnan S. et al.: RaGOO: Fast and Accurate Reference-Guided Scaffolding of Draft Genomes. Genome Biol. 2019; 20(1): 224 PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Aunin E. Böhme U. Sanderson T. et al.: Genomic and Transcriptomic Evidence for Descent from *Plasmodium* and Loss of Blood Schizogony in *Hepatocystis* Parasites from Naturally Infected Red Colobus Monkeys. PLoS Pathogens. 2020; 16(8): e1008717.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Bonfield JK, Whitwham A: Gap5—editing the Billion Fragment Sequence Assembly. Bioinformatics. 2010; 26(14): 1699–1703. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Brooks CF, Francia ME, Gissot M, et al.: Toxoplasma Gondii Sequesters Centromeres to a Specific Nuclear Region throughout the Cell Cycle. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2011; 108(9): 3767–72.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Carver T, Harris SR, Berriman M, et al.: Artemis: An Integrated Platform for Visualization and Analysis of High-Throughput Sequence-Based Experimental Data. Bioinformatics. 2012; 28(4): 464-69.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Carver TJ, Rutherford KM, Berriman M, et al.: ACT: The Artemis Comparison Tool. Bioinformatics. 2005; 21(16): 3422-23. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Challis R, Richards E, Rajan J, et al.: BlobToolKit - Interactive Quality Assessment of Genome Assemblies. G3 (Bethesda). 2020; 10(4): 1361-74. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Chow W, Brugger K, Caccamo M, et al.: gEVAL - a Web-Based Browser for Evaluating Genome Assemblies. Bioinformatics. 2016; 32(16): 2508-10. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

del Cacho E, Pages M, Gallego M, et al.: Synaptonemal Complex Karyotype of Eimeria Tenella. Int J Parasitol. 2005; 35(13): 1445–51. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, et al.: STAR: Ultrafast Universal RNA-Seq Aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013; 29(1): 15–21. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Durand NC, Robinson JT, Shamim MS, et al.: Juicebox Provides a Visualization System for Hi-C Contact Maps with Unlimited Zoom. Cell Syst. 2016; 3(1): 99-101.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Ghurye J, Rhie A, Walenz BP, et al.: Integrating Hi-C Links with Assembly Graphs for Chromosome-Scale Assembly. PLoS Comput Biol. 2019; 15(8): e1007273

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Howe K, Chow W, Collins J, et al.: Significantly Improving the Quality of Genome Assemblies through Curation. Gigascience. 2021; 10(1): giaa153. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Jackman SD, Coombe L, Chu J, et al.: Tigmint: Correcting Assembly Errors Using Linked Reads from Large Molecules. BMC Bioinformatics. 2018; 19(1): 393. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Kerpedjiev P, Abdennur N, Lekschas F, et al.: HiGlass: Web-Based Visual Exploration and Analysis of Genome Interaction Maps. Genome Biol. 2018; 19(1): 125

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Kim D, Paggi JM, Park C, et al.: Graph-Based Genome Alignment and Genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-Genotype. Nat Biotechnol. 2019; 37(8): 907-15

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Koren S, Walenz BP, Berlin K, et al.: Canu: Scalable and Accurate Long-Read Assembly via Adaptive K-Mer Weighting and Repeat Separation. Genome Res. 2017; 27(5): 722-36.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Ling KH, Rajandream MA, Rivailler P, et al.: Sequencing and Analysis of Chromosome 1 of Eimeria Tenella Reveals a Unique Segmental Organization. Genome Res. 2007; 17(3): 311–19.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Long PL, Millard BJ, Joyner LP, et al.: A Guide to Laboratory Techniques Used in the Study and Diagnosis of Avian Coccidiosis. Folia Vet Lat. 1976; 6(3): 201-17.

PubMed Abstract

Pastor-Fernández I, Pegg E, Macdonald SE, et al.: Laboratory Growth and Genetic Manipulation of Eimeria Tenella. Curr Protoc Microbiol. 2019; 53(1): e81.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Reid AJ, Blake DP, Ansari HR, et al.: Genomic Analysis of the Causative Agents of Coccidiosis in Domestic Chickens. Genome Res. 2014; 24(10): 1676-85 PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Robinson JT, Turner D, Durand NC, et al.: Juicebox.js Provides a Cloud-Based Visualization System for Hi-C Data. *Cell Syst.* 2018; 6(2): 256–58.e1. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Ruan J, Li H: Fast and Accurate Long-Read Assembly with wtdbg2. Nat Methods. 2020; 17(2): 155–58. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Rutherford K, Parkhill J, Crook J, et al.: Artemis: Sequence Visualization and Annotation. Bioinformatics. 2000; 16(10): 944–45. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Shirley MW, Bushell AC, Bushell JE, et al.: A Live Attenuated Vaccine for the Control of Avian Coccidiosis: Trials in Broiler Breeders and Replacement Layer Flocks in the United Kingdom. *Vet Rec.* 1995; **137**(18): 453–57. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Simao FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, et al.: BUSCO: Assessing Genome Assembly and Annotation Completeness with Single-Copy Orthologs. Bioinformatics. 2015; 31(19): 3210-12.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Steinbiss S, Silva-Franco F, Brunk B, et al.: Companion: A Web Server for Annotation and Analysis of Parasite Genomes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016; 44(W1): W29-34.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Trapnell C, Williams BA, Pertea G, et al.: Transcript Assembly and Quantification by RNA-Seq Reveals Unannotated Transcripts and Isoform Switching during Cell Differentiation. Nat Biotechnol. 2010; 28(5): 511–15. PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, et al.: Pilon: An Integrated Tool for Comprehensive Microbial Variant Detection and Genome Assembly Improvement. PLoS One. 2014; 9(11); e112963.

PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text | Free Full Text

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:

Version 1

Reviewer Report 13 October 2021

https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.18887.r45920

© **2021 Boyle J.** This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Jon Boyle

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

This is a nice genome assembly and is presented well by experts in the field. Hybrid assemblies are the norm now and the integration with Hi-C data is also impactful.

There are multiple software tools used and while versions are listed it would be very helpful if command line parameters were included in the manuscript so that these studies could be repeated by others either with the same data or with other similar data sets.

Is the rationale for creating the dataset(s) clearly described?

Yes

Are the protocols appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and materials provided to allow replication by others? Partly

Are the datasets clearly presented in a useable and accessible format?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: genomics, toxoplasma gondii

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Reviewer Report 11 October 2021

https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.18887.r45921

© **2021 Pain A.** This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Arnab Pain

Biological Environmental Sciences and Engineering (BESE) Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, Jeddah, 23955 6900, Saudi Arabia

The article (as Data Note) by Eerik Aunin and colleagues has produced a complete genome assembly and partially manually curated annotation of a clonal population of the apicomplexan parasite *Eimeria tenella* (Houghton strain) as part of the Darwin Tree of Life Project. *E. tenella* is a major parasite of chickens in the UK and worldwide and causes massive economic loss to poultry farming worldwide.

Using a combination of single-molecule long reads (Pacific Biosciences), and 10X Genomics read clouds, they generated a set of primary assembly contigs which were subsequently scaffolded with the use of chromosome conformation Hi-C data. This resulted in 53.25 megabases assembly of the genome of *E. tenella* (Houghton), represented by 15 chromosomal pseudomolecules, along with complete organellar genomes (mitochondrion and apicoplast). Remarkably, the authors have provided sufficient evidence that *E. tenella* has 15 chromosomes (as opposed to 14 chromosomes reported previously) and all of them have telomeres attached to both ends – thus confirming the truly 'complete' nature of the assembly. The authors also re-annotated the genome with appropriate bioinformatics tools and with the use of bulk RNA-seq datasets generated as part of the original pan-Eimeria genome analysis study (Reid *et al.*, 2014). The revised assembly has 7,268 protein-coding genes (out of which 2,000 were annotated manually) – reflecting an impressive BUSCO completeness of 98.8%.

This is a truly remarkable achievement by the authors and I wish to congratulate them for this. Surely, access to this high-quality genome annotation and assembly will help researchers not only interested in coccidiosis in chicken but also in comparative genomics of apicomplexan parasites in general. I encourage the authors to also produce similar high-quality reference assemblies for the other *Eimeria* species as well (if supported by sufficient funding resources) that were previously reported in the *Eimeria* Pan-genomics study (Reid *et al.*). I encourage the authors to make this genome also publicly available via VEuPathDB for wider accessibility.

The manuscript is clearly written with all the relevant details of all the tools used to generate the datasets and then analyze the results. I have absolutely no criticism for this manuscript. However, I have the following suggestions for the authors to add to the existing manuscript:

- 1. A comparative overview of how this assembly outperformed the previously assembled and annotated (& published) genome of *E. tenella* Houghton.
- 2. Since this represents a complete end-to-end assembly of all 15 chromosomes, a revised list of gene family annotations (such as the SAGs) would be very useful for the scientific community.

References

1. Reid AJ, Blake DP, Ansari HR, Billington K, et al.: Genomic analysis of the causative agents of coccidiosis in domestic chickens.*Genome Res.* 2014; **24** (10): 1676-85 PubMed Abstract | Publisher Full Text

Is the rationale for creating the dataset(s) clearly described? Yes

Are the protocols appropriate and is the work technically sound? $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Yes}}$

Are sufficient details of methods and materials provided to allow replication by others? $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Yes}}$

Are the datasets clearly presented in a useable and accessible format? $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Yes}}$

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Comparative genomics of apicomplexan parasites; Host-pathogen interactions, metagenomics-driven pathogen discovery.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.