A high-quality chromosome-level genome assembly of rohu carp, Labeo rohita, and discovery of SNP markers

This manuscript (permalink) was automatically generated from IGBB/rohu-genome@f366434 on September 29, 2021.

Authors

Mark A. Arick II

© 0000-0002-7207-3052 · ♠ maa146

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA · Funded by Grant 7200AA18CA00030

Chuan-Yu Hsu

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

· Zenaida Magbanua

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Corrinne E. Grover

D 0000-0003-3878-5459

Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology Dept., Iowa State University, Ames, IA, 50010 USA

• Emma R. Miller

D 0000-0001-9009-5303

Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology Dept., Iowa State University, Ames, IA, 50010 USA

Olga Pechanova

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Charles A. Thrash

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Ramey C. Youngblood

ID XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Lauren Ezzell

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXXX

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Samsul Alam

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX

placeholder

• John Benzie

(b) XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX placeholder

• Matthew Hamilton

(b) XXXX-XXXX-XXXX placeholder

• Attila Karsi

(b) XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX placeholder

• Mark L. Lawrence

D XXXX-XXXX-XXXX
placeholder

• Daniel G. Peterson

© 0000-0002-0274-5968

Institute for Genomics, Biocomputing & Biotechnology, Mississippi State University, MS, 39762 USA

Abstract

Introduction

Methods & Materials

Genome Sequencing & Flowcytometry

ALAM - Rohu blood collection

Flow cytometry

The genome size of *Labeo rohita* was estimated for five samples via flow cytometry using trout erythrocyte nuclei (TENs; https://www.biosure.com/tens.html) as a standard (genome size=6.5pg). For each sample, nuclei were stabilized in 200 ul of LB01-propidium iodide (PI) buffer as per (Pellicer & Leitch, 2014), and two drops of TENs standard were used per 50ul of fish blood. Each sample was measured twice, totaling 10 runs overall. Only measurements with greater than 5,000 nuclei and a coefficient of variation (CV) of less than 3% were retained (Pellicer & Leitch, 2014).

Illumina short-read sequencing

A total of 2 µg of extracted genomic DNA was used for DNA-Seq library preparation using Illumina TruSeq DNA PCR-free Library Prep Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). The final DNA-Seq library with the insert size range of 350 bp to 450 bp was submitted to Novogene company (www.en.novogene.com) for total of 2 lanes of PE150 Illumina HiSeq X-Ten (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) sequencing.

Oxford Nanopore sequencing

For each Nanopore sequencing run, 2 to 2.5 µg of genomic DNA was used in the library preparation with Nanopore Genomic DNA Ligation Sequencing Kit SQK-LSK 109 (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, Oxford, UK). The final library (about 700 to 750 ng) was loaded on a Nanopore Flow Cell R9.4.1 (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, Oxford, UK) and sequenced on GridION sequencer (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, Oxford, UK) for 48 hours. A total of 10 flow cell runs were conducted for the genome assembly.

Hi-C sequencing

One hundred µl of fish blood was subjected to the Hi-C library preparation using the Proximo Hi-C Animal Kit (Phase Genomics, Seattle, WA, USA). The final DNA-Seq library was submitted to Novogene company (www.en.novogene.com) for 1 lane of PE150 Illumina HiSeq X-Ten (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) sequencing run.

Bionano

Assembly & Annotation

Jellyfish (v2.2.10) [1] and GenomeScope (v1.0) [pcmid:PMC5870704?] estimated the genome size using the Illumina paried reads digested into 50-mers.

Nanopore data was filtered to remove the control lambda-phage and sequences shorter the 1000 bases using the nanopack tool suite (v1.0.1) [2]. The filtered data was assembled into contigs using wtdbg2 (v2.4) [3]. The contigs were polished using the two iterations of racon (v1.4.0) [4] with minimap2 (v2.17) ([5]) mapping the nanopore reads. The contigs were further polished using pilon (v1.23) [6] with bwa (v0.7.10) [7] mapping the Illumina paired reads. The contigs were scaffolded using Bionano Solve (Solve3.4.1_09262019) [[8]/) and SALSA (v2.3) [9]. That scaffolds larger than 10Mb were linked and oriented based on the Onychostoma macrolepis genome [10], the most similar chromosome assembly available on NCBI, using ragtag (v1.1.1) [11].

RepeatModeler [VERSION] (CITE) and RepeatMasker [VERSION] (CITE) were used to create a speciesspecific repeat database, and mask those repeats in the genome. All available RNA-seq libraries for L. rohita (ADD TABLE) were downloaded from NCBI and mapped to the masked genome using hisat2 [VERSION] (CITE). These alignments were used in the mikado [VERSION] (CITE) and braker2 [VERSION] (CITE) pipelines. Mikado uses the putative transcripts assembled from the RNA-seq alignments using stringtie [VERSION] (CITE), cufflinks [VERSION] (CITE), and trinity [VERSION] (CITE); along with the junction site prediction from portcullis [VERSION] (CITE), the alignments of the putative transcripts with uniport swiss-prot [VERSION] (CITE), and the ORFs from prodigal [VERSION] (CITE) to select the best representative for each locus. Braker2 [VERSION] (CITE) uses the RNA-seq alignments and the gene prediction from GeneMark [VERSION] (CITE) to train a species-specific Augustus model [VERSION] (CITE). Maker2 [VERSION] (CITE) predicts genes based on the new Augustus, GeneMark, and SNAP models; modifying the predictions based on the available RNA and protein evidence from the Cyprinidae family in the NCBI RefSeq database. Any predicted genes with an AED above 0.47 were removed from further analysis. The surviving genes were functionally annotated using InterProScan [VERSION] (CITE) and Blast [VERSION] (CITE) alignments against the uniprot swiss-prot database [VERSION] (CITE). Busco [VERSION] (CITE) using the actinopterygii_odb10 database was used to verify the completeness of both the genome and annotations.

ddRAD-Seq & SNP Discovery

WORLDFISH - Fin clipping collection

ZENAIDA – ddRAD-Seq method

CORRINNE - SNP Discovery, population analyses, interested in using the gender, which contigs associated with sex

Data Availability

The data used for the *L. rohita* genome and annotation is available at NCBI under the BioProject PRJNA650519. The assembled genome sequence and annotations are available at GenBank under accessions JACTAM000000000. The raw data is available at the SRA (Sequence Read Archive) under accessions SRR12580210 – SRR12580221.

Results & Discussion

Sequencing & Assembly

The C-value of *L. rohita* was previously reported as 1.99 pg (\sim 1.95Gb) using Feulgen densitometry [12] or 1.5Gb using k-mer estimation [13]. However, the flow cytometry results [1] show a C-value of 0.99 pg (\sim 0.97Gb) with a standard deviation of 0.02 across all measurements. The smaller C-value is also

closer to the genome estimate produced by GenomeScope (0.97Gb) and the final genome assembly size of 0.95 Gb.

Table 1: Flow cytometry results for 5 *L. rohita* blood samples, measured twice. 1) (Trout erthrocyte nuclei) Genome size = 5.19pg 2) Genome estimate calculated as (average sample fluorescence/ average standard fluorescence * standard genome size) in picograms DIPLOID (i.e., 2C)

Specimen Name	Number of Sample nuclei	Average sample fluorescence	Number of standard nuclei	Average standard fluorescence	Estimated Genome size ²	HAPLOI D
Fish 1 Sample 1	16020	27350	2065	69247	2.049857756	1.02492 8878
Fish 2 Sampe 1	13082	25929	6570	66671	2.018441451	1.00922 07255
Fish 2 Sample 2	15402	25665	4354	67489	1.973674969	0.98683 74845
Fish 3 Sample 1	15124	25798	4442	68195	1.963364176	0.98168 2088
Fish 3 Sample 2	14923	25763	4823	68837	1.942414254	0.97120 7127
Fish 4 Sample 1	13320	26346	5913	69665	1.962760927	0.98138 04635
Fish 4 Sample 2	5624	26612	4097	68876	2.005288925	1.00264 44625
Fish 5 Sample 1	6771	25761	3080	68825	1.942602107	0.97130 10535
Fish 5 Sample 2	15926	26369	3352	68832	1.988248344	0.99412 4172
Standard only ¹	3	25258	3311	64331	NA	
				Average	1.982961434	0.99148 07172
				Standard Deviation	0.03607582	0.01803 790999

A total of 130.5 Gb of Nanopore long reads from 44.7 million read, and 261 Gb of Illumina short reads from 870 million pairs were produced, along with 382 million pairs (114 Gb) for the Hi-C library. The initial *de novo* assembly consisted of 4999 contigs with an N50 of 1.28 Mb. After the Bionano and HiC data was incorporated, the total number of sequences dropped to 2899 and the N50 increased to 29.9 Mb. The final assembly consisted of 25 chromosome length scaffolds and 2844 unplaced scaffolds, ranging in size from 1,479bp to 7.18 Mb. [2] contains a list of assembly statistics for each step. The final genome size is 97.9% of the estimated genome size. BUSCO analysis show the genome completely contains 98.1% of the 3640 genes in the actinopterygii_odb10 database with a 36 (1%) genes duplicated, 23 (0.6%) fragmented, and 46 (1.3%) missing.

Table 2: Assembly statistics

n	n:500	L50	min	N75	N50	N25	E-size	max	sum	name
4999	4999	202	1348	514919	1281850	2395030	1727184	7832582	9.43E+08	wtdbg2
3709	3706	15	1479	1.13E+07	2.65E+07	3.08E+07	2.20E+07	3.79E+07	9.46E+08	bionano
2899	2896	14	1479	2.64E+07	2.99E+07	3.43E+07	2.69E+07	4.45E+07	9.46E+08	hic

n	n:500	L50	min	N75	N50	N25	E-size	max	sum	name
2872	2869	13	1479	2.88E+07	3.25E+07	3.61E+07	3.00E+07	4.53E+07	9.46E+08	ragtag

```
238509 | CDS |
239799 | exon |
9824 | five_prime_UTR |
24385 | gene |
24385 | mRNA |
1509 | three prime UTR |
```

```
==> 99-final/Rohu.busco.genome.txt <==
# BUSCO version is: 5.2.2
# The lineage dataset is: actinopterygii_odb10 (Creation date: 2020-08-05,
number of genomes: 3640, number of BUSCOs: 26)
# Summarized benchmarking in BUSCO notation for file /work/maa146/rohu-
genome/annotations/0-ref/Rohu.genome.fa
# BUSCO was run in mode: genome
# Gene predictor used: metaeuk
        **** Results: ****
        C:98.1%[S:97.1%,D:1.0%],F:0.6%,M:1.3%,n:3640
        3571
                Complete BUSCOs (C)
                Complete and single-copy BUSCOs (S)
        3535
        36
                Complete and duplicated BUSCOs (D)
        23
                Fragmented BUSCOs (F)
                Missing BUSCOs (M)
        46
        3640
                Total BUSCO groups searched
```

```
==> 99-final/Rohu.busco.transcript.txt <==
# BUSCO version is: 5.2.2
# The lineage dataset is: actinopterygii_odb10 (Creation date: 2020-08-05,
number of genomes: 3640, number of BUSCOs: 26)
# Summarized benchmarking in BUSCO notation for file /work/maa146/rohu-
genome/annotations/10-rename/Rohu.transcripts.fa
# BUSCO was run in mode: transcriptome
        **** Results: ****
        C:80.1%[S:78.2%,D:1.9%],F:5.5%,M:14.4%,n:3640
                Complete BUSCOs (C)
        2915
                Complete and single-copy BUSCOs (S)
        2845
                Complete and duplicated BUSCOs (D)
        70
                Fragmented BUSCOs (F)
        200
                Missing BUSCOs (M)
        525
        3640
                Total BUSCO groups searched
```

```
==> 99-final/Rohu.busco.unfiltered_transcripts.txt <==
# BUSCO version is: 5.2.2
# The lineage dataset is: actinopterygii_odb10 (Creation date: 2020-08-05,
number of genomes: 3640, number of BUSCOs: 26)
# Summarized benchmarking in BUSCO notation for file /work/maa146/rohu-
genome/annotations/5-maker/Rohu/all.transcripts.fasta
# BUSCO was run in mode: transcriptome
        **** Results: ****
        C:83.4%[S:81.4%,D:2.0%],F:6.2%,M:10.4%,n:3640
                Complete BUSCOs (C)
        3036
                Complete and single-copy BUSCOs (S)
        2962
                Complete and duplicated BUSCOs (D)
        74
        225
                Fragmented BUSCOs (F)
               Missing BUSCOs (M)
        379
```

Total BUSCO groups searched

3640

file name: Rohu.genome.fa sequences: 2872

total length: 1128029156 bp (945637473 bp excl N/X-runs)

GC level: 36.05 %

bases masked: 465289941 bp (41.25 %)

======================================	====== ber of	_			
	ments*		-	entage quence	
Retroelements	123482	53424977	bp	4.74	%
SINEs:	0	0	bp	0.00	%
Penelope	0	0	bp	0.00	%
LINEs:	29838	13842585	bp	1.23	%
CRE/SLACS	0	0	bp	0.00	%
L2/CR1/Rex	15537	8265099	bp	0.73	%
R1/LOA/Jockey	981	643697	bp	0.06	%
R2/R4/NeSL	936	732043	bp	0.06	%
RTE/Bov-B	271	181676	bp	0.02	%
L1/CIN4	7978	1801119	bp	0.16	%
LTR elements:	93644	39582392	bp	3.51	%
BEL/Pao	1287	1138420	bp	0.10	%
Ty1/Copia	221	110739	bp	0.01	%
Gypsy/DIRS1	32714	19073624	bp	1.69	%
Retroviral	2443	1815904	bp	0.16	%
DNA transposons	79815	22485920	bp	1.99	%
hobo-Activator	2242	639067	bp	0.06	%
Tc1-IS630-Pogo	49209	16661924	bp	1.48	%
En-Spm	0	0	bp	0.00	%
MuDR-IS905	0	0	bp	0.00	%
PiggyBac	0	0	bp	0.00	%
Tourist/Harbing	er 1794	259934	bp	0.02	%
Other (Mirage, P-element, Tra	900 nsib)	209002	bp	0.02	%
Rolling-circles	196	71055	hn	0.01	02
Notting crictes	190	11055	ъþ	0.01	70
Unclassified:	1774260	36186998	2 bp	32.08	3 %
Total interspersed	repeats:	437780879	bp	38.81	%
Small RNA:	0	0	bp	0.00	%
Satellites:	1	267	bp	0.00	%
Simple repeats:	_		•		
Low complexity:			•		
=======================================	======	=======	====	======	

* most repeats fragmented by insertions or deletions have been counted as one element

RepeatMasker version 4.1.1 , default mode

run with rmblastn version 2.10.0+ The query was compared to classified sequences in "Rohu-families.fa"

Acknowledgements

ISU Office of Biotechnology Flow Cytometry Facility

ResearchIT Iowa State University

References

1. A fast, lock-free approach for efficient parallel counting of occurrences of k-mers

Guillaume Marçais, Carl Kingsford

Bioinformatics (2011-03-15) https://doi.org/b7gkd6

DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr011 · PMID: 21217122 · PMCID: PMC3051319

2. NanoPack: visualizing and processing long-read sequencing data

Wouter De Coster, Svenn D'Hert, Darrin T Schultz, Marc Cruts, Christine Van Broeckhoven *Bioinformatics* (2018-08-01) https://doi.org/gf38cx

DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/bty149 · PMID: 29547981 · PMCID: PMC6061794

3. Fast and accurate long-read assembly with wtdbg2

Jue Ruan, Heng Li

Nature Methods (2019-12-09) https://doi.org/ggd8j9

DOI: 10.1038/s41592-019-0669-3 · PMID: 31819265 · PMCID: PMC7004874

4. Fast and accurate de novo genome assembly from long uncorrected reads

Robert Vaser, Ivan Sović, Niranjan Nagarajan, Mile Šikić

Genome Research (2017-05) https://doi.org/gfkmzr

DOI: <u>10.1101/gr.214270.116</u> · PMID: <u>28100585</u> · PMCID: <u>PMC5411768</u>

5. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences

Heng Li

Bioinformatics (2018-09-15) https://doi.org/gdhbqt

DOI: <u>10.1093/bioinformatics/bty191</u> · PMID: <u>29750242</u> · PMCID: <u>PMC6137996</u>

6. Pilon: An Integrated Tool for Comprehensive Microbial Variant Detection and Genome Assembly Improvement

Bruce J Walker, Thomas Abeel, Terrance Shea, Margaret Priest, Amr Abouelliel, Sharadha Sakthikumar, Christina A Cuomo, Qiandong Zeng, Jennifer Wortman, Sarah K Young, Ashlee M Earl

PLoS ONE (2014-11-19) https://doi.org/gfkmz5

DOI: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0112963</u> · PMID: <u>25409509</u> · PMCID: <u>PMC</u>4237348

7. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform

H Li, R Durbin

Bioinformatics (2009-05-18) https://doi.org/dqt59j

DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp324 · PMID: 19451168 · PMCID: PMC2705234

8. **Bionano Access Software**

Bionano Genomics

https://bionanogenomics.com/support-page/bionano-access-software/

9. Integrating Hi-C links with assembly graphs for chromosome-scale assembly

Jay Ghurye, Arang Rhie, Brian P Walenz, Anthony Schmitt, Siddarth Selvaraj, Mihai Pop, Adam M Phillippy, Sergey Koren

PLOS Computational Biology (2019-08-21) https://doi.org/gf74qw

DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007273 · PMID: 31433799 · PMCID: PMC6719893

10. Chromosome-level genome assembly of a cyprinid fish <i>Onychostoma macrolepis</i>by integration of nanopore sequencing, Bionano and Hi-C technology

Lina Sun, Tian Gao, Feilong Wang, Zuliang Qin, Longxia Yan, Wenjing Tao, Minghui Li, Canbiao Jin, Li Ma, Thomas D Kocher, Deshou Wang

Molecular Ecology Resources (2020-07-20) https://doi.org/gmx33w

DOI: <u>10.1111/1755-0998.13190</u> · PMID: <u>32419357</u>

11. RaGOO: fast and accurate reference-guided scaffolding of draft genomes

Michael Alonge, Sebastian Soyk, Srividya Ramakrishnan, Xingang Wang, Sara Goodwin, Fritz J Sedlazeck, Zachary B Lippman, Michael C Schatz

Genome Biology (2019-10-28) https://doi.org/ggctnf

DOI: <u>10.1186/s13059-019-1829-6</u> · PMID: <u>31661016</u> · PMCID: <u>PMC6816165</u>

12. http://zotero.org/users/local/gVY292am/items/GYK6YE2l

13. <i>De novo</i> Assembly and Genome-Wide SNP Discovery in Rohu Carp, <i>Labeo rohita</i>

Paramananda Das, Lakshman Sahoo, Sofia P Das, Amrita Bit, Chaitanya G Joshi, Basdeo Kushwaha, Dinesh Kumar, Tejas M Shah, Ankit T Hinsu, Namrata Patel, ... Joykrushna Jena *Frontiers in genetics* (2020-04-21) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7186481/
DOI: 10.3389/fgene.2020.00386 · PMID: 32373166 · PMCID: PMC7186481