

# Genome Annotation Submission Cover Sheet

## Preliminary Annotation Review Checklist 5-15-2018

Phage Name: Typha  
Your Name: Mary Ann Smith  
Your Institution: Marywood University  
Your email: masmith@marywood.edu  
Additional emails: SmithMaryAnnV@aol.com  
(For correspondence)

*Please check each box indicating completion of each task. If you are not sure how to do something, please see the Online Bioinformatics manual page "How to Pass Preliminary Review".*

- ☒ 1. Does the genome sequence in your final contain the same number of bases and is it the same as the posted sequence on phagesdb.org?
- ☒ 2. Are all the genes "valid" when you click the "validate" button?
- ☒ 3. Have the genes been renumbered such that they go sequentially from 1 to the highest number?
- ☒ 4. Have all old BLAST hits been cleared, and all gene features reBLASTed?
- ☒ 5. Are the locus tags the "SEA\_ PHAGENAME"?
- ☒ 6. Has the Documentation been recreated to match the information in the feature table?
- ☒ 7. Have tRNA ends been adjusted with web-based Aragorn and/or tRNAscan SE?
- ☒ 8. Has the frameshift in the tail assembly chaperone been annotated (where applicable?)

9. For the items below, generate a genome profile, and review the following. For the

YourPhageName\_CompleteNotes.dnam5 file:

- ☒ a. Have any duplicate genes (or any with the same stop coordinate?) been removed?
- ☒ b. Does every gene have **one and only one** complete set of Notes
- ☒ c. Do the functions in the Notes match the official function list?
- ☒ d. Are all three lines of functional evidence described for EVERY gene?
- ☒ e. Do the notes contain the initial Glimmer/GeneMark data from the autoannotation?

For the YourPhageName .dnam5 file:

- ☒ a. Have any duplicate genes (or any with the same stop coordinate?) been removed?
- ☒ b. Is the Notes field empty (including hidden marks?)
- ☒ c. Do the function names in the Product field either match the official function list or say "Hypothetical Protein"?
- ☒ d. Is the Function field empty (including hidden marks?)

- ☐ 10. Did you use PECAAN to annotate your phage?  
If, so please describe how in the text field after question 11.
11. Describe any issues or specific genes that you were unable to satisfactorily resolve, and warrant further inspection in the Quality Control review.

GP9 – 37bp overlap, like in other Y phages (following Bipper); GP42 - Typha has coding in reverse, but Bipper has it forward; GAP 35900-36175 - tried different options - extend 47, no support, bad blast, no CP, tried to add gene, 35917-36117, only blimp of CP, bad blast, OneUp gp90, Phagesdb, Query 5: Subject 142, 29%, e=2.0; GAP 40500-40800 - checked no blast data to support extension of integrase, no CP or other phage support; GAP 41200-41380 - checked no support for gene, area for reverse/forward; GAP 63900-64150 - checked no support for gene; GAP 70700-71225 - checked area, very little CP, bad blast, 70811-71011, LastHope gp80, Phagesdb, Query 14: Subject 31, 34%, e=3.5; ORPHAMs- Several have really strong CP, Glimmer and GeneMark calls, area not conserved with other clusters and at times within cluster