Actinobacteriophage Genome Annotation Submission Cover Sheet

This Cover Sheet will accompany each genome’s annotation file(s) submission and succinctly describe the work that your students and you have done. This document ensures that the work done was as complete and thorough as it could be. Most important to the QC reviewer, denote where the trouble spots were in your annotation and how they were resolved.

Phage Name. Asta

Your Name. Catalina Davila Aguer

Your Institution. Universidad Ana G. Mendez, Gurabo campus

Your email. Davilac2@uagm.edu

Additional emails. (for correspondence). frivera@uagm.edu

Describe any issues or specific genes that you would like to highlight for the QC reviewer. This includes any genes that you had questions about or received help with or that warrant further inspection in the QC review process. Include those genes that you deliberated on and/or want to strongly advocate for. If you contacted SMART, workshop facilitator, or a buddy school for help, please document.

1. We eliminated gene 7 since it run in the opposite direction and had a total overlap with gene 8
2. Function of gene 12 (11 after eliminating gene 7) requires attention. We assigned the function “Minor capsid protein” based on HHPred results, since no function could be assigned with BLAST or Synteny.
3. We changed the start of gene 16 (15 in the draft annotation) to reduce the gap with the next gene from 237 bp to 15 bp. Such a larger gap is not probable specially between the two Tail Assembly Chaperone genes. A translational frameshift was not detected in this phage; the same happens with most phages in this cluster (EA1).
4. We assigned gene 25 the function "Membrane Protein" although none of the members of cluster EA1 have the function in this gene. We made this decision based on results from TmHHm, Deep TmHHm, and SOSUI (as supporting information we include a second spreadsheet named “Asta\_Memb Prot\_Supporting info” which includes the corresponding images.
5. We changed the start of the following genes, based on results from the Starterator and in some cases to improve the alignment and e value in the Blast results: 28, 33, 38, 51, 56, 59, 61, 62
6. We eliiminated gene 39 (in the draft annotation) since there are not Blast results for it. Also it runs in the forward direction in spite it is between genes that run in the reverse direction. Furthermore, none of the phages in this cluster have annotated this gene.

Please record yes/no for each of the questions below. If further explanation is needed, please add this item to the above box.

In the submitted DNA Master file (Yes/No):

yes 1. Does the genome sequence in your submitted DNA Master file match the nucleotide fasta file posted on phagesDB (same number of bases, no N bases, etc.)?

yes 2. Are all the genes ‘Valid” when you click the [Validation button](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-84)?

yes 3. Are the genes (and matching LocusTag numbers) [sequential](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-77), starting with #1, counting by 1s.

yes 4. Are the Locus Tags the “[SEA\_PHAGE NAME](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-77)” format?

yes 5. Has the [documentation been recreated](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-86) from the Feature Table to match the latest file version?

N/A 6. Have tRNAs followed the [tRNA protocol](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/undefined), **COPYING** tRNA-AMINOACID type (DNA equivalent of the anti-codon) from Aragorn output - ﻿tRNA-Gln(ctg) - AND the ends been adjusted to match the Aragorn output?

N/A 7. Has the [frameshift in the tail assembly chaperone](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-54) been annotated correctly (if applicable)?

yes 8. Have you cleared your Draft\_Blast data and have you [re-Blasted](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-57) the submitted DNA Master file?

yes 9. Has every gene been [described and supported in your Supporting Data file](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-44)?

yes 10. Did you investigate ‘[gaps](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-31)’?

yes 11. Did you [delete the genes](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-65) that you meant to delete?

Now, [make a profile of the file](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/article-64) you plan to send. (And you can save this file for [Review to Improve!)](https://seaphagesbioinformatics.helpdocsonline.com/untitled-18)

yes 1. Have any duplicate genes been deleted?

yes 2. Has the Notes field been cleared (using the automated buttons)?

yes 3. Do the gene numbers and locus tags match?

yes 4. Are the correct Feature\_Types correctly selected (most will be ORFs, but check that tRNAs and tmRNAs are correctly labeled)?

yes 5. Do the function names in the Product field either match the official function list or say “Hypothetical Protein”?

yes 6. Has the Function field been cleared (using the automated buttons)?

How are you documenting your gene calls in class? Choose any/all that apply:

      PECAAN output

      DNA Master shorthand (previously used format)

  X   Spreadsheet

      Powerpoint

      Word document (must be easily searchable)

      Other: Describe.

What is the file type (sort) submitted for QC to document your gene calls? Choose only one.:

      PECAAN output

      DNA Master shorthand (previously used format)

  X   Spreadsheet

      Powerpoint

      Word document (must be easily searchable)

      Other: Describe.