Genome Annotation Submission Cover Sheet

Preliminary Annotation Review Checklist 5-15-2018

Phage Name: London

Your Name: Andrea Beyer

Your Institution: Virginia State University

Your email: abeyer@vsu.edu

Additional emails:
(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".

- [x] 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?
- [x] 2. Are all the genes "valid" when you click the "validate" button?
- [x] 3. Have the genes been renumbered such that they go sequentially from 1 to the highest number?
- [x] 4. Have all old BLAST hits been cleared, and all gene features reBLASTed?
- [x] 5. Are the locus tags the"SEA_ PHAGENAME"?
- [ ] 6. Has the Documentation been recreated to match the information in the feature table?
- [x] 7. Have tRNA ends been adjusted with web-based Aragorn and/or tRNAscan SE?
- [x] 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:

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

For the YourPhageName .dnam5 file:

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

- [x] 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.

Overall, this is the toughest genome I've annotated so far. Lots of questionable areas, noted below.
There is signifcant homology of London to draft phage Elezi; it may be helpful to review them simultaneously, as they are the only 2 phage in some pfams.
Difficult Start Calls: gene 9 (real gene?); 25; 29; 47 (reverse; not in any other annotated genomes, 100% identical to gene in Elezi_draft); 53; and 55 (orpham- real?)
Difficult function calls: 4; [22, 23, 24] as proposed membrane proteins; 25 (semantics of what kind of lysin it is); 28; 29; and 47 (reverse-new function? Inquired on forum but had not response as of submission.)
Removed reverse genes called at 10891-10718 and 20583-20440; small reverse genes in