



## **Complete Genome Sequence of Salmonella enterica Siphophage Shelanagig**

**Kathryn Broussard,a Yicheng Xie,a Heather Newkirk,a Mei Liu,a [Jason J. Gill,](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9494-6053)a [Jolene Ramseya](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3774-5896)**

aCenter for Phage Technology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

**ABSTRACT** Salmonella enterica is a Gram-negative human pathogen widely known to cause food poisoning. Here, the genome of S. enterica phage Shelanagig is described. Its 42,541-bp genome codes for 68 proteins, for which 33 were assigned a predicted function. Shelanagig shares high similarity at the protein level with other Salmonella phages.

The Gram-negative bacterium Salmonella enterica is a bacterial human pathogen,<br>causing illnesses such as gastroenteritis and typhoid fever [\(1\)](#page-1-0). Outbreaks of S. enterica typically lead to many deaths, have high monetary costs, and spread via bacterial contamination of food products such as chicken or leafy greens. Phages that target this pathogen may be used to decrease the prevalence of S. enterica outbreaks through decontamination of food or food production facilities [\(2\)](#page-1-1). Here, we report the genome sequence of phage Shelanagig, which infects S. enterica.

Phage Shelanagig was isolated from cattle holding pen soil samples collected in Michigan after processing as described by Xie et al. [\(3\)](#page-1-2). The host, S. enterica serovar Enteritidis, was cultured on tryptic soy broth or agar (Difco) at 37°C with aeration. Phage were propagated using the soft agar overlay method [\(4\)](#page-1-3). Phage samples were stained with 2% (wt/vol) uranyl acetate and viewed using transmission electron microscopy at the Texas A&M Microscopy and Imaging Center to ascertain morphology [\(5\)](#page-1-4). The Shelanagig genome was purified by the shotgun library preparation protocol modification of the Promega Wizard DNA clean-up system [\(6\)](#page-1-5). Illumina sequencing libraries were prepared with their TruSeq Nano low-throughput kit. The sequencing occurred by v2 500-cycle chemistry on an Illumina MiSeq platform with paired-end 250-bp reads. The 162,861 total reads in the index containing the phage were controlled for quality using FastQC [\(http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/\)](http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/). Based on that, the reads were trimmed with the FASTX-Toolkit v0.0.14 [\(http://hannonlab.cshl](http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/) [.edu/fastx\\_toolkit/\)](http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/). Assembly using SPAdes v3.5.0 yielded a contig with 74-fold cov-erage [\(7\)](#page-1-6). The contig was fully closed by PCR (forward primer, 5'-GCTCAAGACAGTGA GCAGTAA-3', and reverse primer, 5'-TTTACAGCCCATCTGTCGTG-3') and Sanger sequencing. Genes were predicted with Glimmer v3.0 and MetaGeneAnnotator v1.0 [\(8,](#page-1-7) [9\)](#page-1-8). tRNA coding was probed with ARAGORN v2.36 [\(10\)](#page-1-9). The presence of Rho-independent terminators was predicted with TransTermHP v2.09 [\(11\)](#page-1-10). Gene functions were then predicted using domain searching with InterProScan v5.22-61 and comparison via BLAST v2.2.31 to the NCBI nonredundant, UniProtKB Swiss-Prot, and TrEMBL databases using a 0.001 cutoff for the maximum expectation value [\(12](#page-1-11)[–](#page-1-12)[14\)](#page-1-13). As needed, TMHMM v2.0 results were also inspected [\(15\)](#page-1-14). Full-length nucleotide sequence similarity was calculated using progressiveMauve v2.4.0 [\(16\)](#page-1-15). All annotation tools are hosted in the Galaxy and Web Apollo instances at the Center for Phage Technology [\(https://cpt.tamu](https://cpt.tamu.edu/galaxy-pub) [.edu/galaxy-pub\)](https://cpt.tamu.edu/galaxy-pub) [\(17,](#page-1-16) [18\)](#page-1-17). Unless otherwise stated, all tools were executed using default parameters.

Shelanagig is a siphophage with a genome of  $42,541$  bp and  $49.8\%$  G+C content.

sequence of Salmonella enterica siphophage Shelanagig. Microbiol Resour Announc 8:e01033-19. [https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA](https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA.01033-19) [.01033-19.](https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA.01033-19) **Editor** Catherine Putonti, Loyola University

**Citation** Broussard K, Xie Y, Newkirk H, Liu M, Gill JJ, Ramsey J. 2019. Complete genome

Chicago **Copyright** © 2019 Broussard et al. This is an

open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) [International license.](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Address correspondence to Jolene Ramsey, [jolenerr@tamu.edu.](mailto:jolenerr@tamu.edu)

**Received** 25 August 2019 **Accepted** 7 September 2019 **Published** 26 September 2019 It has 68 protein-coding genes on both strands, 33 of which have predicted functions, and the coding density is 94.1%. The phage contains no tRNA genes. The program PhageTerm predicts a headful packaging mechanism [\(19\)](#page-1-18). While at the nucleotide level, Shelanagig has the highest identity to Salmonella phages ST3 (GenBank accession number [MF001364\)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MF001364) and ST1 (GenBank accession number [MF001366\)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MF001366), at 84.92% and 84.90% similarity, respectively, Shelanagig shares 59 proteins with Salmonella phages SETP7 (GenBank accession number [KF562865\)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/KF562865), wksl3 (GenBank accession number [JX202565\)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/JX202565), and BPS11Q3 (GenBank accession number [KX405002\)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/KX405002). Interestingly, Shelanagig contains the slippery sequence needed to produce a frameshifted version of the tail assembly chaperone, as characterized in Escherichia phage lambda G and GT [\(20\)](#page-1-19).

**Data availability.** The genome sequence and associated data for phage Shelanagig were deposited under GenBank accession number [MK931446,](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MK931446) BioProject accession number [PRJNA222858,](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/?term=PRJNA222858) SRA accession number [SRR8869227,](https://trace.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/sra/?run=SRR8869227) and BioSample accession number [SAMN11360386.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/biosample/SAMN11360386)

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was supported by funding from the National Science Foundation (awards EF-0949351 and DBI-1565146) and from the National Cattlemen's Beef Association and Texas Beef Cattle. Additional support came from the Center for Phage Technology (CPT), an Initial University Multidisciplinary Research Initiative supported by Texas A&M University and Texas AgriLife, and from the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics of Texas A&M University.

We are grateful for the advice and support of the CPT staff.

This announcement was prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for BICH464 Bacteriophage Genomics, an undergraduate course at Texas A&M University.

## <span id="page-1-0"></span>**REFERENCES**

- 1. Andino A, Hanning I. 2015. Salmonella enterica: survival, colonization, and virulence differences among serovars. ScientificWorldJournal 2015: 520179. [https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/520179.](https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/520179)
- <span id="page-1-1"></span>2. Oh J-H, Park M-K. 2017. Recent trends in Salmonella outbreaks and emerging technology for biocontrol of Salmonella using phages in foods: a review. J Microbiol Biotechnol 27:2075–2088. [https://doi.org/10](https://doi.org/10.4014/jmb.1710.10049) [.4014/jmb.1710.10049.](https://doi.org/10.4014/jmb.1710.10049)
- <span id="page-1-2"></span>3. Xie Y, Savell JW, Arnold AN, Gehring KB, Gill JJ, Taylor TM. 2016. Prevalence and characterization of Salmonella enterica and Salmonella bacteriophages recovered from beef cattle feedlots in South Texas. J Food Prot 79:1332–1340. [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-15-526.](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-15-526)
- <span id="page-1-4"></span><span id="page-1-3"></span>4. Adams MH. 1956. Bacteriophages. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, NY.
- <span id="page-1-5"></span>5. Valentine RC, Shapiro BM, Stadtman ER. 1968. Regulation of glutamine synthetase. XII. Electron microscopy of the enzyme from Escherichia coli. Biochemistry 7:2143–2152. [https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00846a017.](https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00846a017)
- <span id="page-1-6"></span>6. Summer EJ. 2009. Preparation of a phage DNA fragment library for whole genome shotgun sequencing. Methods Mol Biol 502:27– 46. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-565-1\\_4.](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-565-1_4)
- 7. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, Lesin VM, Nikolenko SI, Pham S, Prjibelski AD, Pyshkin AV, Sirotkin AV, Vyahhi N, Tesler G, Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA. 2012. SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. J Comput Biol 19:455– 477. [https://doi.org/10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.](https://doi.org/10.1089/cmb.2012.0021)
- <span id="page-1-8"></span><span id="page-1-7"></span>8. 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.](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/27.23.4636)
- 9. Noguchi H, Taniguchi T, Itoh T. 2008. MetaGeneAnnotator: detecting species-specific patterns of ribosomal binding site for precise gene prediction in anonymous prokaryotic and phage genomes. DNA Res 15:387–396. [https://doi.org/10.1093/dnares/dsn027.](https://doi.org/10.1093/dnares/dsn027)
- <span id="page-1-10"></span><span id="page-1-9"></span>10. 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.](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkh152)
- 11. Kingsford CL, Ayanbule K, Salzberg SL. 2007. Rapid, accurate, computational discovery of Rho-independent transcription terminators illumi-

nates their relationship to DNA uptake. Genome Biol 8:R22. [https://doi](https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-2-r22) [.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-2-r22.](https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-2-r22)

- <span id="page-1-11"></span>12. Jones P, Binns D, Chang H-Y, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, McWilliam H, Maslen J, Mitchell A, Nuka G, Pesseat S, Quinn AF, Sangrador-Vegas A, Scheremetjew M, Yong S-Y, Lopez R, Hunter S. 2014. InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics 30: 1236 –1240. [https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu031.](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu031)
- <span id="page-1-12"></span>13. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10:421. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-421.](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-421)
- <span id="page-1-14"></span><span id="page-1-13"></span>14. The UniProt Consortium. 2018. UniProt: the universal protein knowledgebase. Nucleic Acids Res 46:2699. [https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky092.](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky092)
- 15. Krogh A, Larsson B, Heijne von G, Sonnhammer EL. 2001. Predicting transmembrane protein topology with a hidden Markov model: application to complete genomes. J Mol Biol 305:567–580. [https://doi.org/10](https://doi.org/10.1006/jmbi.2000.4315) [.1006/jmbi.2000.4315.](https://doi.org/10.1006/jmbi.2000.4315)
- <span id="page-1-16"></span><span id="page-1-15"></span>16. Darling AE, Mau B, Perna NT. 2010. progressiveMauve: multiple genome alignment with gene gain, loss and rearrangement. PLoS One 5:e11147. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0011147.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0011147)
- 17. Afgan E, Baker D, Batut B, van den Beek M, Bouvier D, Cech M, Chilton J, Clements D, Coraor N, Grüning BA, Guerler A, Hillman-Jackson J, Hiltemann S, Jalili V, Rasche H, Soranzo N, Goecks J, Taylor J, Nekrutenko A, Blankenberg D. 2018. The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update. Nucleic Acids Res 46:W537–W544. [https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky379.](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky379)
- <span id="page-1-17"></span>18. Lee E, Helt GA, Reese JT, Munoz-Torres MC, Childers CP, Buels RM, Stein L, Holmes IH, Elsik CG, Lewis SE. 2013. Web Apollo: a Web-based genomic annotation editing platform. Genome Biol 14:R93. [https://doi](https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-8-r93) [.org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-8-r93.](https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2013-14-8-r93)
- <span id="page-1-18"></span>19. Garneau JR, Depardieu F, Fortier L-C, 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.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07910-5)
- <span id="page-1-19"></span>20. Xu J, Hendrix RW, Duda RL. 2014. Chaperone-protein interactions that mediate assembly of the bacteriophage lambda tail to the correct length. J Mol Biol 426:1004 –1018. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2013.06.040.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2013.06.040)