

IMPROVED REFERENCE GENOME FOR *CYCLOTELLA CRYPTICA* CCMP332, A MODEL  
FOR CELL WALL MORPHOGENESIS, SALINITY ADAPTATION, AND LIPID  
PRODUCTION IN DIATOMS (BACILLARIOPHYTA)

Wade R. Roberts<sup>1</sup>, Kala M. Downey<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth C. Ruck<sup>1</sup>, Jesse C. Traller<sup>2</sup>, and Andrew J.  
Alverson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Arkansas, Department of Biological Sciences, SCEN 601, Fayetteville, AR 72701  
USA, Phone: +1 479 575 4886, FAX: +1 479 575 4010

<sup>2</sup>Global Algae Innovations, San Diego, CA 92159 USA, Phone: +1 760 822 8277

**Data available from:** NCBI BioProjects PRJNA628076 and PRJNA589195

**Running title:** IMPROVED *CYCLOTELLA CRYPTICA* GENOME

**Key words:** algal biofuels, horizontal gene transfer, lipids, nanopore, transposable elements

**Corresponding author:** Wade R. Roberts, University of Arkansas, Department of Biological Sciences, SCEN 601, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA, +1 479 575 4886, [wader@uark.edu](mailto:wader@uark.edu)

## ABSTRACT

The diatom, *Cyclotella cryptica*, is a well-established experimental model for physiological studies and, more recently, biotechnology applications of diatoms. To further facilitate its use as a model diatom species, we report an improved reference genome assembly and annotation for *C. cryptica* strain CCMP332. We used a combination of long- and short-read sequencing to assemble a high-quality and contaminant-free genome. The genome is 171 Mb in size and consists of 662 scaffolds with a scaffold N50 of 494 kb. This represents a 176-fold decrease in scaffold number and 41-fold increase in scaffold N50 compared to the previous assembly. The genome contains 21,250 predicted genes, 75% of which were assigned putative functions. Repetitive DNA comprises 59% of the genome, and an improved classification of repetitive elements indicated that a historically steady accumulation of transposable elements has contributed to the relatively large size of the *C. cryptica* genome. The high-quality *C. cryptica* genome will serve as a valuable reference for ecological, genetic, and biotechnology studies of diatoms.

## INTRODUCTION

The diatom *Cyclotella cryptica* Reimann, J.C.Lewin & Guillard has a range of properties that have made it a valuable experimental model in studies dating back to the 1960s (Lewin and Lewin 1960). *Cyclotella cryptica* can grow across a broad range of salinities, and its responses to altered salinity offer opportunities to study several important aspects of diatom biology. For example, salinity shifts can induce gamete production (Schultz and Trainor 1970) and cause cells to alternate between cell wall morphologies resembling *C. cryptica* and the closely related freshwater species, *Cyclotella meneghiniana* Kützinger (Schultz 1971). Later studies demonstrated the utility of *C. cryptica* for understanding cell wall morphogenesis in diatoms (Tesson and Hildebrand 2010). *Cyclotella cryptica* has other properties that make it an attractive candidate for biotechnology applications, including the ability to grow heterotrophically (Hellebust 1971; White 1974; Pahl *et al.* 2010) and produce high levels of lipids for use as biofuels or nutraceuticals (Roessler 1988; Traller and Hildebrand 2013; Slocombe *et al.* 2015).

A draft genome assembly for *C. cryptica* revealed a large, gene- and repeat-rich genome (Traller *et al.* 2016). The genome was sequenced without the benefit of long-read sequencing platforms, which enable short contigs—particularly those containing repetitive DNA—to be joined into large contiguous scaffolds. Consequently, the version 1.0 genome assembly of *C. cryptica* was highly fragmented, with most fragments measuring <1 kb in length. Although the gene space appeared to be well characterized and the size accurately estimated, highly fragmented assemblies can suffer from overestimation of gene number (Denton *et al.* 2014) and hinder insights into genome structure. It is also challenging to fully characterize intergenic regions, which hold noncoding RNAs, promoter regions, and allow comparisons of genomic synteny across species. This is especially challenging for historically understudied groups, such

as diatoms, in which the pace of genomic sequencing has lagged behind other groups such as animals and flowering plants. The relatively small number of sequenced genomes from distantly related diatom species gives the impression each newly sequenced diatom genome contains a large fraction of unique, species-specific sequence. As small fragments, the origin and identity of these sequence fragments are especially challenging to characterize. Diatoms maintain intimate relationships with bacteria both in nature (Amin *et al.* 2012) and in cell culture (Johansson *et al.* 2019). In addition, some diatoms may have incorporated bacterial genes into their genomes (Bowler *et al.* 2008). With long contiguous scaffolds, the proximal source of bacterial-like genes should be much easier to determine in diatom genome assemblies that contain a mix of DNA from both the diatom and its associated bacteria.

We combined short and long sequencing reads to produce a more contiguous version 2.0 genome assembly for *C. cryptica* CCMP332. The addition of long direct sequencing reads allowed us to improve the gene models, remove contaminant sequences, and better characterize the structure of this relatively large genome. As a result, the improved assembly provides a better resource for functional studies of *C. cryptica* such as genome-enabled reverse genetics and read-mapping for resequencing and experimental transcriptomics.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Strain information and sequencing

We acquired *Cyclotella cryptica* strain CCMP332 from the National Center for Marine Algae and Microbiota (NCMA). This strain was originally isolated from Martha's Vineyard, MA, USA, by R. Guillard in 1956. We grew the culture in L1 marine medium (Guillard 1975) at 22°C on a 12:12 light: dark cycle.

We harvested non-axenic cells during late exponential-phase growth, filtered them through 5.0  $\mu\text{m}$  Millipore membrane filters to reduce the bacterial load, rinsed the cells from the filter before pelleting them by centrifugation at 2500 x g for 10 minutes, and stored the cell pellets at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$ . We extracted DNA using the DNeasy Plant Kit (Qiagen) or a modified CTAB protocol (Doyle and Doyle 1987). For the CTAB protocol, we resuspended cell pellets in 3 $\times$  CTAB buffer (CTAB, 3% w/v; 1.4 M NaCl; 20 mM EDTA, pH 8.0; 100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0; 0.2%  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol), disrupted them by vortexing briefly with 1.0 mm glass beads, and incubated them at  $65^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 1 hour. We then extracted the DNA twice with 1 $\times$  volume of 24:1 chloroform:isoamyl alcohol and precipitated the DNA with 1 $\times$  volume of isopropanol and 0.8 $\times$  volume of 7.5 M ammonium acetate. We assessed the quality and quantity of the DNA with 0.8% agarose gels, a Nanodrop 2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and a Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer (dsDNA BR kit; Thermo Fisher Scientific).

For DNA samples with high molecular weight and sufficient quantity (1–3  $\mu\text{g}$ ), we prepared libraries for long-read sequencing using the ligation sequencing kit SQK-LSK108 (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, ONT). We sequenced the libraries using the MinION platform with FLO-MIN106 (R9.4.1) flowcells (Table S1). After sequencing, we used Guppy (version 2.3.5) (ONT) with default settings to convert raw signal intensity data into base calls. We kept all nanopore reads with a length greater than 500 bp and trimmed them for adapter sequences with NanoPack (De Coster *et al.* 2018). We used Canu (version 1.7) (Koren *et al.* 2017) to correct base calls in the low quality of nanopore raw reads.

We prepared short-read Illumina sequencing libraries using the Kapa HyperPlus Kit (Roche) with 300–400 bp insert sizes and barcoded the libraries with dual indices. These libraries were sequenced using the Illumina HiSeq4000 at the University of Chicago Genomics

Facility. Twelve libraries were sequenced for 50 bp single end (SE) reads and 3 libraries were sequenced for 100 bp paired-end (PE) reads (Table S1). We quality trimmed the short-reads using Trimmomatic (version 0.36) (Bolger et al. 2014) with options ‘ILLUMINACLIP:TruSeq3-PE-2.fa:2:30:10 LEADING:3 TRAILING:3 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:15 MINLEN: 50’.

## Genome assembly, error correction, and scaffolding

K-mer based analyses estimated the haploid genome size of *C. cryptica* to be 161.7 Mb (Traller *et al.* 2016). We used an estimated genome size of 165 Mb for genome assembly. We assembled the metagenome (*C. cryptica* and associated bacteria) of our culture using Flye (version 2.4.2) (Kolmogorov *et al.* 2019b, 2019a) with the raw nanopore reads and options ‘--meta --plasmids --iterations 1 --genome-size 165m’. We then mapped the corrected nanopore reads back to the assembled contigs with Minimap2 (version 2.10-r761) (Li 2018), using the settings recommended for nanopore reads. We used these mappings for error correction of the initial draft assembly with Racon (version 1.3.3) (Vaser *et al.* 2017) using default settings. We then used the r941\_flip935 model in Medaka (version 0.8.1) (<https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka>) for a second round of error correction using the Racon-corrected contigs and the corrected nanopore reads. After contig correction, we separately aligned the SE and PE Illumina reads to the corrected contigs using BWA-MEM (version 0.7.17-r1188) (Li and Durbin 2009). We merged and sorted the alignment BAM files using SAMTOOLS (version 1.9) (Li *et al.* 2009) and used the merged BAM file for sequence polishing of all variant types (‘--changes --fix all’) with Pilon (version 1.23) (Walker *et al.* 2014). We performed three iterative rounds of Illumina read mapping and Pilon polishing.

We scaffolded the polished contigs using the corrected nanopore sequences with SSPACE-LongRead (version 1-1) (Boetzer and Pirovano 2014), requiring three overlaps to connect contigs ('-l 3'). We used the corrected nanopore reads to extend contigs and fill scaffold gaps using LR\_Gapcloser (Xu *et al.* 2019) with default settings and a total of ten iterative rounds. Finally, we aligned the corrected nanopore reads to the scaffolds with Minimap2 and used these alignments to remove redundant scaffolds from the assembly using Purge Haplotigs (version 1.0.0) (Roach *et al.* 2018). We evaluated each stage of the assembly with QUAST (version 5.0.0) (Gurevich *et al.* 2013) and BUSCO (version 4.0.6; genome mode, eukaryote\_odb10 dataset) (Simão *et al.* 2015) (Table S2).

### **Contaminant identification and removal**

We used the Blobtools pipeline (version 1.1.1) (Laetsch and Blaxter 2017) to identify and remove contaminant scaffolds. Blobtools uses a combination of taxonomic assignment, GC percentage, and read coverage to identify contaminants. We assigned the taxonomy of each scaffold from a Diamond BLASTX search (version 0.9.21) (Buchfink *et al.* 2015) against the UniProt Reference Proteomes database (release 2019\_06) (UniProt Consortium 2018) using options '--max-target-seqs 1 --sensitive --evaluate 1e-25 --outfmt 6'. We estimated read coverage using all reads (corrected nanopore and Illumina) mapped to the scaffolds with Minimap2, and merged and sorted the alignments using SAMTOOLS. We flagged and removed scaffolds that met the following criteria: (1) taxonomic assignment to bacteria, archaea, or viruses, (2) low GC percentage indicative of organellar scaffolds, and (3) no taxonomic assignment for scaffolds <1 kb in length. Following the removal of the contaminant sequences, we performed an additional two rounds of Pilon polishing as described above.



## RNA sequencing and assembly

We used RNA-seq reads and transcriptome assemblies for *C. cryptica* CCMP332 from Nakov et al. (2020). For that study, total RNA was extracted from cells grown in five different salinity treatments (0, 2, 12, 24, 36 parts per thousand) using the RNeasy Plant Kit (Qiagen), and 15 Illumina libraries were prepared using the Kapa mRNA HyperPrep kit and sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq2000 platform at the Beijing Genomics Institute.

## Gene annotation

We used the MAKER software package (version 2.31.10) to identify protein-coding genes in the genome (Cantarel *et al.* 2008; Holt and Yandell 2011). We used the *C. cryptica* transcriptome as expressed sequence tag (EST) evidence (est2genome=1) and the protein sequences from *Cyclotella nana*, *Thalassiosira oceanica*, *Phaeodactylum tricornutum*, and *Fragilariopsis cylindrus* as protein evidence (protein2genome=1) for the MAKER pipeline. Protein sequences were downloaded from the Joint Genome Institutes (JGI) PhycoCosm resource (<https://phycocosm.jgi.doe.gov/phycocosm/home>; last accessed 2 Jan 2020). We also allowed MAKER to predict single exon genes (single\_exon=1) and search for alternative splicing (alt\_splice=1). Repetitive elements identified during the repeat analysis (see below) were used to mask the repetitive regions for this analysis. After the first round of MAKER using EST and protein evidence, we used the predicted genes with annotation edit distance (AED) scores less than 0.5 to train gene prediction models in SNAP (version 2006-07-28) (Korf 2004) and Augustus (version 3.3.2) (Stanke *et al.* 2008). We then performed two subsequent rounds of MAKER annotation using the trained SNAP and Augustus models. We retrained SNAP after the

second round of MAKER. We evaluated the completeness and quality of the MAKER proteins after each round using BUSCO (protein mode against the eukaryota\_odb9 dataset) and AED scores (Table S3).

To identify protein families, domains, and gene ontology (GO) terms, we searched the predicted protein sequences against the Pfam (version 32.0) (El-Gebali *et al.* 2019), PRINTS (version 42.0) (Attwood *et al.* 2012), PANTHER (version 14.1) (Thomas *et al.* 2003), SMART (version 7.1) (Letunic *et al.* 2012), SignalP (version 4.1) (Petersen *et al.* 2011), and TMHMM (version 2.0c) (Krogh *et al.* 2001) databases using InterProScan (version 5.36-75.0) (Jones *et al.* 2014). We also searched the proteins against the SwissProt (release 2019\_06) and UniProt Reference Proteomes (release 2019\_06) databases using NCBI BLASTP (version 2.4.0+) (Camacho *et al.* 2009) using options ‘-evalue 1e-6 -outfmt 6 -num\_alignments 1 -seg yes -soft\_masking true -lcase\_masking -max\_hsps 1’.

We predicted non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs) in the genome using Infernal (version 1.1.2) (Nawrocki and Eddy 2013) against the Rfam database (version 14.1) (Kalvari *et al.* 2018). We used tRNAscan-SE (version 2.0.5) (Chan and Lowe 2019) for tRNA annotation and RNAmmer (version 1.2) (Lagesen *et al.* 2007) for rRNA annotation.

Chloroplast and mitochondrial genomes were annotated with GeSeq (Tillich *et al.* 2017). Gene and inverted repeat boundaries from GeSeq were manually curated as necessary by comparison to annotations from sequenced diatom organellar genomes.

## **Repetitive element annotation**

We built custom repeat libraries to identify repetitive elements across the genome. We searched for long terminal repeat (LTRs) retrotransposons using the program LTRharvest

(version 1.5.8) (Ellinghaus *et al.* 2008) with options ‘-minlenltr 100 -maxlenltr 6000 -mindistltr 1500 -maxdistltr 25000 -motif tgca -similar 85 -mintsd 5 -maxtsd 5 -vic 10’. We filtered the candidate LTRs from LTRharvest using LTRdigest (version 1.5.8) (Steinbiss *et al.* 2009) to keep elements with polypurine tracts (PPT) and primer binding sites (PBS) inside the predicted LTR sequence region. We further filtered LTR elements using Perl scripts (Campbell *et al.* 2014) to remove elements with nested insertions and select representative (exemplar) elements. We identified miniature inverted transposable elements (MITEs) with MITE-Hunter (Han and Wessler 2010). We then masked the genome with the combined LTR and MITE libraries using RepeatMasker (version 4.0.5) (<https://www.repeatmasker.org>). After masking, we identified other repetitive elements using RECON (version 1.08) (Bao and Eddy 2002) and RepeatScout (version 1.06) (Price *et al.* 2005) as implemented within the RepeatModeler package (version 2.0) (Flynn *et al.* 2020). We combined all candidate exemplar elements and searched them against the UniProt Reference Proteomes database with NCBI BLASTX using settings ‘-evaluate 1e-10 -num\_descriptions 10’. We removed elements from the final repeat library that contained overlaps with any predicted proteins using ProtExcluder (version 1.2) (Campbell *et al.* 2014).

We used RepeatMasker and the final repeat library to annotate the repetitive elements in the genome. We ran RepeatMasker with the NCBI RMBLAST (version 2.6.0+) search engine (‘-e ncbi’), the sensitive option (‘-s’), and the ‘-a’ option to obtain the alignment file. We then used the provided parseRM.pl script (version 5.8.2) (downloaded from <https://github.com/4ureliek/Parsing-RepeatMasker-Outputs>) on the alignment files from RepeatMasker to generate the repeat landscape with the ‘-l’ option (Kapusta *et al.* 2017). This script collects the percent divergence from the repeat library for each TE element, correcting for higher mutation rates at CpG sites and using Kimura 2-Parameter distance output by

RepeatMasker. The percent divergence to the repeat library is a proxy for age (older TE elements will have accumulated more nucleotide substitutions), and the script splits TEs into bins of 1% divergence.

## Assembly comparisons

We downloaded the *C. cryptica* version 1.0 genome assembly and gene models from <http://genomes.mcdub.ucla.edu/Cyclotella/download.html>. We downloaded the *P. tricornutum* version 2.0, *F. cylindrus* version 1.0, and *C. nana* version 3.0 genome assemblies from GenBank (accession numbers available in Table 1). To compare these genomes against the *C. cryptica* version 2.0 assembly, we performed QUAST and BUSCO analyses as described above.

We identified putative contaminant scaffolds in the *C. cryptica* version 1.0 assembly using the same Blobtools procedure described above and with read-mapping information from our Illumina reads. To compare functional information between the *C. cryptica* versions 1.0 and 2.0 annotations, we searched the proteins from the version 1.0 assembly against the Pfam, PRINTS, PANTHER, SMART, SignalP, and TMHMM databases using InterProScan. We also searched the proteins against the SwissProt and UniProt Reference Proteomes databases using NCBI BLASTP.

To assess overlap between the *C. cryptica* versions 1.0 and 2.0 annotations, we aligned predicted protein sequences from the two genomes to one another with NCBI BLASTP with options ‘-evalue 1e-6 -max\_target\_seqs 1 -max\_hsps 1 -outfmt 6’. We parsed these results to count those with the same length (qlen = slen), those with 100% identity (pident = 100), those with high similarity (pident ≥ 90), and those with full alignment lengths (qcovs = 100).

## **Data availability**

The genome assembly and sequence data are available from NCBI BioProject PRJNA628076. RNAseq data are available through the NCBI Short Read Archive under BioProject PRJNA589195. A genome browser and gene annotations are available through the Comparative Genomics (CoGe) web platform (<https://genomevolution.org/coge/>) under genome ID 57836. File S1 contains Tables S1–S6. File S2 contains Figures S1–S3. File S3 contains the genome annotation GFF3, protein fasta, and transcript fasta files. File S4 contains the non-coding RNA annotation files. File S5 contains the repeat element annotation files.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Genome assembly**

We sequenced five libraries on the MinION platform and base called over 5.9 million reads that totaled 9.42 Gb of sequence, where the read length N50 was 4.4 kb and the median quality score per read was 9.9 (Table S1 and Figure S1). After trimming and filtering, we used a total of 2,941,466 nanopore reads with a median quality score per read of 10.1 for genome assembly (Figure S1). We also sequenced 15 short-read libraries on the Illumina platform which provided nearly 450 million reads, totaling 35.3 Gb of sequence data (Table S1). Transcriptome sequencing of 15 libraries were assembled into 35,726 transcripts and used for genome annotation (Nakov et al. 2020).

On average, each position in the version 2.0 genome was covered by 152 reads, including both the Nanopore (74×) and Illumina (78×) reads. The new assembly represents a substantial improvement over the original version 1.0 genome assembly, which was generated from Illumina short-read sequencing data only. The application of long-read sequencing data resulted in several important changes or improvements, including: (1) an increase in the estimated genome size,

from 161.7 Mb to 171.1 Mb; (2) a 176-fold decrease in the number of scaffolds, from 116,815 in version 1.0 to 662 in version 2.0; (3) a 41-fold increase in the scaffold N50, from 12 kb in version 1.0 to 494 kb in version 2.0; (4) a substantial decrease in the number of N's linking contigs into scaffolds, from 5,360 N's per 100 kb in version 1.0 to 52 N's per 100 kb in version 2.0; and (5) increased detection of conserved eukaryotic orthologs, from 183/255 (72%) complete BUSCO genes in version 1.0 to 191/255 (75%) in version 2.0 (Table 1 and Figure 1). The BUSCO count for *C. cryptica* is now on par with those of the model diatoms, *C. nana* (75%), *F. cylindrus* (78%), and *P. tricornutum* (78.5%) (Table 1 and Figure 1).

The plastid genome assembly was 129,328 bp in total length with 2,707× coverage, which did not differ significantly from the 129,320 bp plastid genome size reported in the version 1.0 assembly (Table 1). The mitochondrial genome was assembled to a total size of 46,485 bp with 2,520× coverage, which was nearly 12 kb shorter than the 58,021 bp genome assembled previously (Table 1). This 12 kb difference reflects the size of the complex repeat region present in many diatom mitochondrial genomes (Oudot-Le Secq and Green 2011). We were able to fully span this region with long sequencing reads.


**Table 1.** Genome characteristics for *P. tricornutum*, *F. cylindrus*, *C. nana*, and *C. cryptica*.

	<i>PHAEODACTYLUM</i>	<i>FRAGILARIOPSIS</i>	<i>CYCLOTELLA</i>	<i>CYCLOTELLA</i>	<i>CYCLOTELLA</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>S CYLINDRUS</i>	<i>NANA</i> VERSION	<i>A CRYPTICA</i>	<i>A CRYPTICA</i>
	<i>TRICORNUTUM</i>	VERSION 1.0	3.0	VERSION	VERSION
	VERSION 2.0			1.0	2.0
GENOME SIZE, MB	27.4	61.1	32.4	161.8	171.1
NUMBER OF SCAFFOLDS	33	271	27	116,815	662
N50 LENGTH, KB	945	1295.6	1,992	12	494
MEDIAN SCAFFOLD LENGTH, KB	703.2	17.2	965.0	0.2	139.0
GC CONTENT, %	49	39	47	43	43
REPETITIVE ELEMENTS, %	12	Not available	2	54	59
COMPLETE EUKARYOTIC BUSCO COUNT (%) <sup>1</sup>	200 (78.5%)	199 (78.0%)	191 (74.9%)	183 (71.8%)	191 (74.9%)
GENBANK ACCESSION NUMBER	GCA_000150955.2	GCA_001750085.1	GCA_000149405.2	None <sup>2</sup>	PRJNA628076

PLASTID	117,369	123,275	128,814	129,320	129,328
GENOME SIZE, BP					
MITOCHONDRI AL GENOME SIZE, BP	77,356	58,295	43,827	58,021	46,485
REFERENCE	Bowler <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Mock <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Armbrust <i>et al.</i> (2004)	Traller <i>et al.</i> (2016)	This study

<sup>1</sup>Genome mode against the eukaryota\_odb10 dataset.

<sup>2</sup>Available from <http://genomes.mcdb.ucla.edu/Cyclotella/download.html>



**Figure 1.** Improved genome assembly for *Cyclotella cryptica*. (A) Cumulative scaffold length and N50 comparison in the version 1.0 and version 2.0 assemblies. Summary statistics for each assembly are given in Table 1. (B) BUSCO analysis of selected diatom genomes using the set of 255 conserved eukaryotic single-copy orthologs. Bars show the proportions of genes found in each assembly as a percentage of the total gene set.



## Bacterial co-assembly versus horizontal gene transfer


Most microbial eukaryotic cultures are non-axenic and contain diverse bacterial communities. As a result, genome sequencing projects often generate data from both the target and non-target genomes. Identifying and removing contaminant contigs from these metagenome assemblies is challenging, particularly for those based only on short-read Illumina data. Illumina-only assemblies can result in many short contigs (Figure 1A) that contain one or few (sometimes fragmented) genes that may or may not belong to the target genome. In contrast, assemblies from long-read technology can produce contigs and scaffolds with hundreds or thousands of genes or even entire bacterial genomes, making it much easier to identify and remove non-target sequences from the final assembly.

Contaminant scaffolds can be identified using the Blobtools pipeline on the basis of GC content, sequencing coverage, and taxonomic assignment via BLAST searches to reference protein databases. This pipeline has been used to identify and remove contaminants from other microbial eukaryotic genome projects (Koutsovoulos *et al.* 2016; Nowell *et al.* 2018; Yubuki *et al.* 2020). During the construction of the version 2.0 assembly, we used the Blobtools pipeline to identify and remove all scaffolds from the metagenome assembly with lengths less than 1 kb or with a taxonomic assignment to bacteria, archaea, or viruses (Figure S2). These criteria resulted in the removal of 1,974 contaminant scaffolds, leaving a total of 662 scaffolds in the version 2.0 assembly (Figure 2). We also applied the Blobtools pipeline and the same filtering criteria to the version 1.0 assembly and found 99,200 contigs that were less than 1 kb in length with no taxonomic assignment and 211 contigs that were assigned to bacteria or viruses (Figure 2). Of these 211 bacterial or viral scaffolds, a majority (169, or 80%) were less than 1 kb in length, whereas 36 of them had lengths greater than 5 kb, and 21 were larger than 10 kb in length. After

removing short and contaminant contigs, the size of the version 1.0 assembly was reduced to 143.4 Mb (161.8 Mb original) and 30,667 scaffolds (116,815 original) (Figure S3).

Confidently removing potential contaminant sequences has important implications for the identification of genes that arose by horizontal gene transfer (HGT) (Koutsovoulos *et al.* 2016). This is especially complicated for a group like diatoms, which are thought to contain hundreds of genes acquired by HGT from bacteria (Bowler *et al.* 2008). The version 1.0 assembly used the DarkHorse tool (Podell and Gaasterland 2007) to identify 368 foreign genes (1.7% of the 21,121 genes) from bacteria (n = 340 genes), archaea (n = 12 genes), and viruses (n = 16) (Traller *et al.* 2016). Application of our filtering routine to the version 1.0 assembly showed that 31 of the 368 HGT genes (8.4%) originally identified as foreign were located on one or more of the 211 contigs that were flagged and removed as contaminants by our filtering criteria. Repeating the Blobtools pipeline to use either 20 or 50 of the top BLASTX hits to each contig for taxonomic assignment, we flagged 540 and 699 contigs in the version 1.0 assembly as contaminants, respectively. These contaminant scaffolds contained a total 1037 and 1639 genes, respectively, with 67 (18.2%) and 73 (19.8%) of those genes present in the set of 368 HGT genes in the version 1.0 assembly.

These results show that long-read sequencing, combined with better tools to identify and remove contaminant sequences, can greatly improve genome assemblies, particularly for repeat-rich genomes that contain a mix of eukaryotic and bacterial sequences. Applying our pipeline to both assemblies, we found that the version 1.0 assembly of *C. cryptica* contained hundreds of scaffolds matching bacterial or viral proteins, whereas the version 2.0 assembly is free of contaminants (Figure 2).



**Figure 2.** The updated assembly of *Cyclotella cryptica* is contiguous and free from contamination. Blobplots showing the taxon-annotated GC content and coverage of (A) the version 1.0 assembly, and (B) the version 2.0 genome assembly after removal of contaminant scaffolds. Legend format: “superkingdom (number of scaffolds; length of scaffolds; scaffold N50 length)”.

### Updated gene annotation of the *Cyclotella cryptica* genome

The version 2.0 assembly contains an updated and more thorough set of gene models. The updated annotation contains 21,250 gene models and 31,409 transcript isoforms (Table 2). The version 2.0 gene models contain more annotated features, including predicted genes, exons, introns, CDS (coding sequences), mRNAs (messenger RNAs), and UTRs (untranslated regions) (File S3). Our annotations of the version 2.0 assembly led to substantial increases in: (1) the mean predicted gene size [from 1.47 kb in version 1.0 to 2.09 kb in version 2.0], (2) mean exon length [608 vs. 722 bp], (3) mean intron length [125 vs. 152 bp], and (4) total length of the coding regions [27.96 vs. 41.84 Mb] (Table 2).

More importantly, we saw an increase in support for the protein gene models in the version 2.0 assembly, with a higher proportion of proteins containing Pfam protein domains (from 44.7% in version 1.0 to 46.2% in version 2.0) and matches to SwissProt (26.8% vs. 41.6%) or UniProt proteins (71.0% vs. 74.9%) (Table 2 and Table S4). These increases were possibly due to longer lengths of transcript isoforms in version 2.0 (Table 2). We also identified 188 tRNAs and 36 ncRNAs (File S4). These updated models should better enable physiological, metabolomic, and evolutionary studies of *C. cryptica*.

Fully 96.5% of the models had AED scores less than 0.5 (Table 2), indicating that the updated gene annotations were highly concordant with the input evidence (transcripts and proteins). Additionally, the 31,409 annotated isoforms included 192/255 (75.3%) of the BUSCO conserved single-copy orthologs in eukaryotes, which represents an increase from 184/255 (72.2%) in the version 1.0 assembly (Table 2). The BUSCO counts for the updated *C. cryptica* protein models are now comparable to those of the model diatoms, *C. nana* (70.2%), *F. cylindrus* (73.7%), and *P. tricornutum* (76.5%) (Table S5).

We compared the non-redundant protein sets of versions 1.0 and 2.0 using NCBI BLASTP. Protein sets were similar overall, with 19,333 (83.2%) of the version 1.0 proteins aligned to version 2.0 proteins. Of these, 4,949 (25.6%) were perfect matches (same length, 100% identity, and full length) and 6,337 (32.8%) were the same length with high similarity (> 90% identity). The remaining 8,047 (41.6%) alignments were not the same length, but 4,221 (21.8%) of these had 100% identity.

**Table 2.** Summary of the *Cyclotella cryptica* genome annotations.

	VERSION 1.0	VERSION 2.0
TOTAL GENE	21,121	21,250
MODELS		
TOTAL GENE	31.07 (19.2%)	44.35 (25.9%)
LENGTH, MB (%)		
GENE DENSITY	131	124
(GENES PER MB)		
MEAN GENE SIZE, BP	1,471	2,087
TOTAL CODING	27.96 (17.3%)	41.84 (24.3%)
LENGTH, MB (%)		
EXONS PER GENE	2.18	4.30
MEAN EXON	608	722
LENGTH, BP		
MEAN INTRON	125	152
LENGTH, BP		
TOTAL TRANSCRIPT	23,235	31,409
ISOFORMS		
AVERAGE	1.10	1.48
TRANSCRIPT		
ISOFORMS PER GENE		
PROTEINS WITH	10,384 (44.7%)	14,518 (46.2%)
PFAM DOMAIN (%)		

PROTEINS WITH INTERPROSCAN HIT (%)	14,565 (62.7%)	19,690 (62.7%)
PROTEINS WITH SWISSPROT HIT (%)	6,219 (26.8%)	13,054 (41.6%)
PROTEINS WITH UNIPROT HIT (%)	16,495 (71.0%)	23,530 (74.9%)
GENE MODELS WITH AED < 0.5 (%)	Not determined	20,506 (96.5 %)
COMPLETE EUKARYOTIC BUSCO COUNT (%) <sup>1</sup>	184 (72.2%)	192 (75.3%)

---

<sup>1</sup>Protein mode against the eukaryota\_odb10 dataset.

### Repeat landscape of the *Cyclotella cryptica* genome

We also revisited the characterization of repetitive elements in the *C. cryptica* genome by applying more robust structural and *de novo* discovery approaches (File S5). Repeats collectively comprised 59.3% (101.5 Mb) of the version 2.0 assembly, which was slightly greater than the version 1.0 assembly (53.8%, 98.3 Mb) (Table 1 and Figure 3). We also classified a greater fraction of the genome as transposable elements (TEs) in the version 2.0 (32.4%) than version 1.0 (12.9%) assemblies (Figure 3). Additionally, the number of unclassified repeat elements decreased from 40% to 24% between the version 1.0 and version 2.0 assemblies (Figure 3). Repeats represent just 2% and 12% of the genomes of *C. nana* and *P. tricornutum* (Armbrust *et al.* 2004; Maumus *et al.* 2009; Rastogi *et al.* 2018) (Table 1).


Among Class I retrotransposons, we identified short interspersed nuclear elements (SINEs), long interspersed nuclear elements (LINEs), and long terminal repeats (LTRs) (Figure 3 and Table S6). SINEs were not identified in the *C. cryptica* version 1.0 assembly and have only been identified in later annotations of the *P. tricornutum* genome (Rastogi *et al.* 2018). SINEs are known for their impacts on mRNA splicing, protein translation, and allelic expression (Kramerov and Vassetzky 2011) and were previously thought to be absent from unicellular eukaryotes (Kramerov and Vassetzky 2011). Their functional roles, if any, in diatoms remain poorly understood. Similar numbers of LINEs were identified in versions 1.0 and 2.0 genomes (2,626 vs. 2,350) (Table S6). We detected fewer numbers of LTRs in *C. cryptica* version 2.0 than version 1.0 (26,418 vs. 43,176), but these elements appear to represent a larger fraction of the genome (20.9%) than previously thought (8.6%) (Figure 3 and Table S6). Comparative genomics has established that diatom genomes contain diatom-specific Copia-like LTR elements called CoDis (Maumus *et al.* 2009). Gypsy-type LTR elements were predominant in *C. cryptica* and covered approximately 22.7 Mb of the genome, whereas Copia-type LTR elements covered 9.5 Mb (Table S6). Both Gypsy- and Copia-type LTRs have been identified in *C. nana* (Armbrust *et al.* 2004; Maumus *et al.* 2009), whereas only Copia-type LTRs have been found in *P. tricornutum* (Rastogi *et al.* 2018).

We also identified higher numbers of Class II DNA transposons in the version 2.0 assembly than version 1.0 (52,786 vs. 15,402), constituting a higher proportion of the genome (11.5%) than the previous assembly (3.2%) (Figure 3 and Table S6). These elements in the version 2.0 genome were classified into 12 superfamilies: *Crypton*, *Ginger*, *EnSpm*, *hAT*, *Helitron*, *Kolobok*, *MuDr*, *PiggyBac*, *PIF-Harbinger*, *Polintron*, *Sola*, and *TcMar* (Table S6). The age distribution of TEs, based on sequence divergence from exemplar elements in the repeat

library, indicates that there has been a steady accumulation of DNA TEs over time in the *C.*

*cryptica* genome (Figure 3). In comparison, DNA TEs make up less than 1% of the genome in both *C. nana* and *P. tricornutum* (Maumus *et al.* 2009).

With the improved genome assembly, we can infer that the large genome of *C. cryptica* is due to recent and gradual accumulation of repetitive elements, particularly LTR and DNA TEs (Figure 3), similar to the process commonly found in flowering plants (Piegu *et al.* 2006; Verde *et al.* 2013). TEs can impact gene function and regulation and may participate in the emergence of novel phenotypes (Kazazian 2004; Veluchamy *et al.* 2013). They have previously been investigated in diatoms for their roles in stress response and environmental adaptation (Maumus *et al.* 2009; Oliver *et al.* 2010; Norden-Krichmar *et al.* 2011). The expanded repeat classification of *C. cryptica* contributes to our growing knowledge of TE diversity in diatoms and their role in diatom genome evolution.



**Figure 3.** Repeat content of the *Cyclotella cryptica* genome. (A) Repeat content in the version 1.0 and version 2.0 assemblies. Bars show the proportions of the genome assemblies masked and annotated by RepeatMasker. (B) Age distribution of transposable elements in the *C. cryptica* version 2.0 genome. The total amount of DNA in each TE class was split into bins of 1% Kimura divergence, shown on the X axis (see Methods). Abbreviations: DNA, DNA transposon; LINE,



long interspersed nuclear element; LTR, long terminal repeat retrotransposon; RC, rolling circle transposons (*Helitron*); SINE, small interspersed nuclear element.

## CONCLUSIONS

*Cyclotella cryptica* is one of a growing list of diatoms with a high-quality sequenced genome. The addition of long-read sequencing data improved the contiguity, completeness, and overall quality of the genome. The version 2.0 assembly allowed for new mechanistic insights into the large size of the genome, namely the historically steady and ongoing accumulation of TEs. The combination of long- and short-read sequencing data provides an effective and relatively inexpensive approach for sequencing modestly sized diatom genomes that will hopefully accelerate the pace of genomic sequencing in diatoms. The improved genome and genome annotation should also help facilitate the continued use of *C. cryptica* as a model for addressing a wide range of basic and applied research questions in diatoms.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (grant no. DEB-1651087, AJA) and by a grant from the Simons Foundation (403249, AJA).

## LITERATURE CITED

- Amin, S. A., M. S. Parker, and E. V. Armbrust, 2012 Interactions between diatoms and bacteria. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* 76: 667–684.
- Armbrust, E. V., J. A. Berges, C. Bowler, B. R. Green, D. Martinez *et al.*, 2004 The genome of the diatom *Thalassiosira pseudonana*: ecology, evolution, and metabolism. *Science* 306:

79–86.

- Attwood, T. K., A. Coletta, G. Muirhead, A. Pavlopoulou, P. B. Philippou *et al.*, 2012 The PRINTS database: A fine-grained protein sequence annotation and analysis resource—its status in 2012. *Database* 2012.
- Bao, Z., and S. R. Eddy, 2002 Automated de novo identification of repeat sequence families in sequenced genomes. *Genome Res.* 12: 1269–1276.
- Boetzer, M., and W. Pirovano, 2014 SSPACE-LongRead: Scaffolding bacterial draft genomes using long read sequence information. *BMC Bioinformatics* 15: 211.
- Bowler, C., A. E. Allen, J. H. Badger, J. Grimwood, K. Jabbari *et al.*, 2008 The *Phaeodactylum* genome reveals the evolutionary history of diatom genomes. *Nature* 456: 239–244.
- Buchfink, B., C. Xie, and D. H. Huson, 2015 Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND. *Nat. Methods* 12: 59–60.
- Camacho, C., G. Coulouris, V. Avagyan, N. Ma, J. Papadopoulos *et al.*, 2009 BLAST+: Architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* 10: 421.
- Campbell, M. S., M. Law, C. Holt, J. C. Stein, G. D. Moghe *et al.*, 2014 MAKER-P: A tool kit for the rapid creation, management, and quality control of plant genome annotations. *Plant Physiol.* 164: 513–524.
- Cantarel, B. L., I. Korf, S. M. C. Robb, G. Parra, E. Ross *et al.*, 2008 MAKER: An easy-to-use annotation pipeline designed for emerging model organism genomes. *Genome Res.* 18: 188–196.
- Chan, P. P., and T. M. Lowe, 2019 tRNAscan-SE: Searching for tRNA genes in genomic sequences. *Methods in Molecular Biology* 1–14.
- De Coster, W., S. D’Hert, D. T. Schultz, M. Cruts, and C. Van Broeckhoven, 2018 NanoPack:

- Visualizing and processing long-read sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 34: 2666–2669.
- Denton, J. F., J. Lugo-Martinez, A. E. Tucker, D. R. Schrider, W. C. Warren *et al.*, 2014  
Extensive error in the number of genes inferred from draft genome assemblies. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 10: e1003998.
- Doyle, J. J., and J. L. Doyle, 1987 A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf tissue. *Phytochemical Bulletin* 19: 11–15.
- El-Gebali, S., J. Mistry, A. Bateman, S. R. Eddy, A. Luciani *et al.*, 2019 The Pfam protein families database in 2019. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 47: D427–D432.
- Ellinghaus, D., S. Kurtz, and U. Willhoeft, 2008 LTRharvest, an efficient and flexible software for de novo detection of LTR retrotransposons. *BMC Bioinformatics* 9: 18.
- Flynn, J. M., R. Hubley, C. Goubert, J. Rosen, A. G. Clark *et al.*, 2020 RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 117: 9451–9457.
- Guillard, R. R. L., 1975 Culture of Phytoplankton for Feeding Marine Invertebrates, pp. 29–60 in *Culture of Marine Invertebrate Animals: Proceedings — 1st Conference on Culture of Marine Invertebrate Animals Greenport*, edited by W. L. Smith and M. H. Chanley. Springer US, Boston, MA.
- Gurevich, A., V. Saveliev, N. Vyahhi, and G. Tesler, 2013 QUAST: Quality assessment tool for genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics* 29: 1072–1075.
- Han, Y., and S. R. Wessler, 2010 MITE-Hunter: A program for discovering miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements from genomic sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 38: e199.
- Hellebust, J. A., 1971 Kinetics of glucose transport and growth of *Cyclotella cryptica* Reimann, Lewin and Guillard. *J. Phycol.* 7: 1–4.

- Holt, C., and M. Yandell, 2011 MAKER2: An annotation pipeline and genome-database management tool for second-generation genome projects. BMC Bioinformatics 12: 491.
- Johansson, O. N., M. I. M. Pinder, F. Ohlsson, J. Egardt, M. Töpel *et al.*, 2019 Friends with benefits: Exploring the phycosphere of the marine diatom *Skeletonema marinoi*. Front. Microbiol. 10: 1828.
- Jones, P., D. Binns, H.-Y. Chang, M. Fraser, W. Li *et al.*, 2014 InterProScan 5: Genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics 30: 1236–1240.
- Kalvari, I., J. Argasinska, N. Quinones-Olvera, E. P. Nawrocki, E. Rivas *et al.*, 2018 Rfam 13.0: Shifting to a genome-centric resource for non-coding RNA families. Nucleic Acids Research 46: D335–D342.
- Kapusta, A., A. Suh, and C. Feschotte, 2017 Dynamics of genome size evolution in birds and mammals. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 114: E1460–E1469.
- Kazazian, H. H., Jr, 2004 Mobile elements: Drivers of genome evolution. Science 303: 1626–1632.
- Kolmogorov, M., M. Rayko, J. Yuan, E. Pevnikov, and P. Pevzner, 2019a metaFlye: Scalable long-read metagenome assembly using repeat graphs. bioRxiv 637637.
- Kolmogorov, M., J. Yuan, Y. Lin, and P. A. Pevzner, 2019b Assembly of long, error-prone reads using repeat graphs. Nat. Biotechnol. 37: 540–546.
- Koren, S., B. P. Walenz, K. Berlin, J. R. Miller, N. H. Bergman *et al.*, 2017 Canu: Scalable and accurate long-read assembly via adaptive k-mer weighting and repeat separation. Genome Res. 27: 722–736.
- Korf, I., 2004 Gene finding in novel genomes. BMC Bioinformatics 5: 59.
- Koutsovoulos, G., S. Kumar, D. R. Laetsch, L. Stevens, J. Daub *et al.*, 2016 No evidence for

- extensive horizontal gene transfer in the genome of the tardigrade *Hypsibius dujardini*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 113: 5053–5058.
- Kramerov, D. A., and N. S. Vassetzky, 2011 Origin and evolution of SINEs in eukaryotic genomes. *Heredity* 107: 487–495.
- Krogh, A., B. Larsson, G. von Heijne, and E. L. Sonnhammer, 2001 Predicting transmembrane protein topology with a hidden Markov model: Application to complete genomes. *J. Mol. Biol.* 305: 567–580.
- Laetsch, D. R., and M. L. Blaxter, 2017 BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies. *F1000Res.* 6: 1287.
- Lagesen, K., P. Hallin, E. A. Rødland, H.-H. Staerfeldt, T. Rognes *et al.*, 2007 RNAmmer: Consistent and rapid annotation of ribosomal RNA genes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 35: 3100–3108.
- Letunic, I., T. Doerks, and P. Bork, 2012 SMART 7: Recent updates to the protein domain annotation resource. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 40: D302–5.
- Lewin, J. C., and R. A. Lewin, 1960 Auxotrophy and heterotrophy in marine littoral diatoms. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 6: 127–134.
- Li, H., 2018 Minimap2: Pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* 34: 3094–3100.
- Li, H., and R. Durbin, 2009 Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* 25: 1754–1760.
- Li, H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan *et al.*, 2009 The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* 25: 2078–2079.
- Maumus, F., A. E. Allen, C. Mhiri, H. Hu, K. Jabbari *et al.*, 2009 Potential impact of stress

activated retrotransposons on genome evolution in a marine diatom. BMC Genomics 10: 624.

Mock, T., R. P. Otillar, J. Strauss, M. McMullan, P. Paaanen *et al.*, 2017 Evolutionary genomics of the cold-adapted diatom *Fragilariopsis cylindrus*. Nature 541: 536–540.

Nakov, T., K. J. Judy, K. M. Downey, E. C. Ruck, and A. J. Alverson, 2020 Transcriptional response of osmolyte synthetic pathways and membrane transporters in a euryhaline diatom during long-term acclimation to a salinity gradient. under review.

Nawrocki, E. P., and S. R. Eddy, 2013 Infernal 1.1: 100-fold faster RNA homology searches. Bioinformatics 29: 2933–2935.

Norden-Krichmar, T. M., A. E. Allen, T. Gaasterland, and M. Hildebrand, 2011 Characterization of the small RNA transcriptome of the diatom, *Thalassiosira pseudonana*. PLoS One 6: e22870.

Nowell, R. W., P. Almeida, C. G. Wilson, T. P. Smith, D. Fontaneto *et al.*, 2018 Comparative genomics of bdelloid rotifers: Insights from desiccating and nondesiccating species. PLoS Biol. 16: e2004830.

Oliver, M. J., O. Schofield, and K. Bidle, 2010 Density dependent expression of a diatom retrotransposon. Mar. Genomics 3: 145–150.

Oudot-Le Secq, M.-P., and B. R. Green, 2011 Complex repeat structures and novel features in the mitochondrial genomes of the diatoms *Phaeodactylum tricornutum* and *Thalassiosira pseudonana*. Gene 476: 20–26.

Pahl, S. L., D. M. Lewis, F. Chen, and K. D. King, 2010 Heterotrophic growth and nutritional aspects of the diatom *Cyclotella cryptica* (Bacillariophyceae): Effect of some environmental factors. J. Biosci. Bioeng. 109: 235–239.

- Petersen, T. N., S. Brunak, G. von Heijne, and H. Nielsen, 2011 SignalP 4.0: Discriminating signal peptides from transmembrane regions. *Nat. Methods* 8: 785–786.
- Piegu, B., R. Guyot, N. Picault, A. Roulin, A. Sanyal *et al.*, 2006 Doubling genome size without polyploidization: Dynamics of retrotransposition-driven genomic expansions in *Oryza australiensis*, a wild relative of rice. *Genome Res.* 16: 1262–1269.
- Podell, S., and T. Gaasterland, 2007 DarkHorse: a method for genome-wide prediction of horizontal gene transfer. *Genome Biol.* 8: R16.
- Price, A. L., N. C. Jones, and P. A. Pevzner, 2005 De novo identification of repeat families in large genomes. *Bioinformatics* 21 Suppl 1: i351–8.
- Rastogi, A., U. Maheswari, R. G. Dorrell, F. R. J. Vieira, F. Maumus *et al.*, 2018 Integrative analysis of large scale transcriptome data draws a comprehensive landscape of *Phaeodactylum tricornutum* genome and evolutionary origin of diatoms. *Sci. Rep.* 8: 4834.
- Roach, M. J., S. A. Schmidt, and A. R. Borneman, 2018 Purge Haplotigs: Allelic contig reassignment for third-gen diploid genome assemblies. *BMC Bioinformatics* 19: 460.
- Roessler, P. G., 1988 Effects of silicon deficiency on lipid composition and metabolism in the diatom *Cyclotella cryptica*. *J. Phycol.* 24: 394–400.
- Schultz, M. E., 1971 Salinity-related polymorphism in the brackish-water diatom *Cyclotella cryptica*. *Can. J. Bot.* 49: 1285–1289.
- Schultz, M. E., and F. R. Trainor, 1970 Production of male gametes and auxospores in a polymorphic clone of the centric diatom *Cyclotella*. *Can. J. Bot.* 48: 947–951.
- Simão, F. A., R. M. Waterhouse, P. Ioannidis, E. V. Kriventseva, and E. M. Zdobnov, 2015 BUSCO: Assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics* 31: 3210–3212.

- Slocombe, S. P., Q. Zhang, M. Ross, A. Anderson, N. J. Thomas *et al.*, 2015 Unlocking nature's treasure-chest: Screening for oleaginous algae. *Sci. Rep.* 5: 9844.
- Stanke, M., M. Diekhans, R. Baertsch, and D. Haussler, 2008 Using native and syntenically mapped cDNA alignments to improve de novo gene finding. *Bioinformatics* 24: 637–644.
- Steinbiss, S., U. Willhoeft, G. Gremme, and S. Kurtz, 2009 Fine-grained annotation and classification of de novo predicted LTR retrotransposons. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 37: 7002–7013.
- Tesson, B., and M. Hildebrand, 2010 Dynamics of silica cell wall morphogenesis in the diatom *Cyclotella cryptica*: Substructure formation and the role of microfilaments. *J. Struct. Biol.* 169: 62–74.
- Thomas, P. D., M. J. Campbell, A. Kejariwal, H. Mi, B. Karlak *et al.*, 2003 PANTHER: A library of protein families and subfamilies indexed by function. *Genome Res.* 13: 2129–2141.
- Tillich, M., P. Lehwark, T. Pellizzer, E. S. Ulbricht-Jones, A. Fischer *et al.*, 2017 GeSeq – versatile and accurate annotation of organelle genomes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 45: W6–W11.
- Traller, J. C., S. J. Cokus, D. A. Lopez, O. Gaidarenko, S. R. Smith *et al.*, 2016 Genome and methylome of the oleaginous diatom *Cyclotella cryptica* reveal genetic flexibility toward a high lipid phenotype. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 9: 258.
- Traller, J. C., and M. Hildebrand, 2013 High throughput imaging to the diatom *Cyclotella cryptica* demonstrates substantial cell-to-cell variability in the rate and extent of triacylglycerol accumulation. *Algal Research* 2: 244–252.
- UniProt Consortium, T., 2018 UniProt: The universal protein knowledgebase. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 46: 2699.



- Vaser, R., I. Sović, N. Nagarajan, and M. Šikić, 2017 Fast and accurate de novo genome assembly from long uncorrected reads. *Genome Res.* 27: 737–746.
- Veluchamy, A., X. Lin, F. Maumus, M. Rivarola, J. Bhavsar *et al.*, 2013 Insights into the role of DNA methylation in diatoms by genome-wide profiling in *Phaeodactylum tricornutum*. *Nat. Commun.* 4: 2091.
- Verde, I., The International Peach Genome Initiative, A. G. Abbott, S. Scalabrin, S. Jung *et al.*, 2013 The high-quality draft genome of peach (*Prunus persica*) identifies unique patterns of genetic diversity, domestication and genome evolution. *Nature Genetics* 45: 487–494.
- Walker, B. J., T. Abeel, T. Shea, M. Priest, A. Abouelliel *et al.*, 2014 Pilon: An integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant detection and genome assembly improvement. *PLoS One* 9: e112963.
- White, A. W., 1974 Growth of two facultatively heterotrophic marine centric diatoms. *J. Phycol.* 10: 292–300.
- Xu, G.-C., T.-J. Xu, R. Zhu, Y. Zhang, S.-Q. Li *et al.*, 2019 LR\_Gapcloser: A tiling path-based gap closer that uses long reads to complete genome assembly. *Gigascience* 8.:
- Yubuki, N., L. J. Galindo, G. Reboul, P. López-García, M. W. Brown *et al.*, 2020 Ancient adaptive lateral gene transfers in the symbiotic *Opalina-Blastocystis* stramenopile lineage. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 37: 651–659.