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Abstract

Probiotic supplements are currently widely used in cattle feeding practices. However, knowledge regarding the genomic landscape of cattle probiotic microorganisms is relatively scarce and is based on analogies with human probiotics. Here, we report on the draft genome sequences of two *Enterococcus lactis* strains, VKPM B-4989 and VKPM B-4992, which were isolated from the rumen of a healthy calf and utilized as a probiotic additive.

Probiotic additives have been shown to improve productivity and fitness characteristics of cattle and to reduce methane emissions from farms and agricultural companies (1). Lactic acid bacteria, primarily belonging to the genera *Bifidobacterium*, *Enterococcus*, and *Lactococcus*, represent the predominant class of microbial additives, reported to improve weight gain and feed efficiency (2, 3). Widespread representatives of the genus *Enterococcus* are currently widely utilized as a basis for human food supplements (4) and were recently shown to demonstrate significant potential as cattle probiotic additives, having a positive effect on the diversity of rumen microbiota (5). Here, we report the draft genome sequences of two *Enterococcus lactis* strains, VKPM B-4989 and VKPM B-4992, which were isolated from the rumen of a healthy calf in 1989 in STC Lekbiotech (Moscow, USSR). Later the strains were used as a probiotic additive (6, 7).

Before DNA isolation, the strains were cultured in MRS medium for 36 h at 28°C to 30°C under aerobic conditions. The genomic DNA was extracted as described previously (8). Fragment genomic libraries were prepared with a Nextera XT reagent kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. Sequencing was performed on an Illumina MiSeq system using a 2 × 250-bp MiSeq reagent kit.

Quality control of the reads was performed using fastp v0.20.1 (9). Read processing and genome assembly were conducted with the ZGA pipeline v0.0.9 (10). Reads were trimmed based on quality (qtrim=r, trimq=18), and Illumina adapter sequences were removed with BBduk v38.75; overlapping paired reads were merged with BBmerge v38.75 (11). The remaining paired reads and merged reads were assembled with the SPAdes v3.14.0 assembler (12) using the --careful option. Assembled genomes were annotated using the NCBI Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline v5.1 (13). Unless stated otherwise, default parameters were used for all software tools.

Genome-based taxonomic classification of the sequenced strains was performed with the Type Strain Genome Server (TYGS) (14). TYGS analysis identified strains B-4989 and B-4992 as *E. lactis* with high confidence (digital DNA-DNA hybridization [dDDH] values of >90%) (Table 1).

Antibiotic resistance analysis performed with the Comprehensive Antibiotic Resistance Database (CARD) Resistance Gene Identifier (RGI) web server v5.2.0 (15), using Perfect and Strict hits only search criteria, discovered two antibiotic resistance genes. The identified genes were present in both strains; AAC(6')-Ib homologs are involved in aminoglycoside...
antibiotic inactivation, and ABC-F ribosomal protection protein homologs are involved in antibiotic resistance via ribosomal protection.

A search of secondary metabolite gene clusters was carried out with antiSMASH (16). A type III polyketide synthase (PKS) gene cluster was found in both genomes. The genome of strain B-4989 includes two ribosomally synthesized and posttranslationally modified peptide product (RiPP)-like gene clusters, both of which encode class II bacteriocin and related biosynthetic enzymes and transporters. The genome of strain B-4992 includes two nonribosomal peptide synthetase clusters.

An NCBI search showed a lack of sequenced genomes of cattle probiotic microorganisms. *E. lactis* strains VKPM B-4989 and VPKM B-4992 possess antibiotic resistance genes and secondary metabolite gene clusters; however, in-depth analysis is needed to characterize cattle-specific genetic determinants of their probiotic properties.

**Data availability.** The genomes have been deposited in NCBI GenBank and are available under accession numbers JAGPYO000000000.1 (E. lactis strain B-4989) and JAGPYP000000000.1 (E. lactis strain B-4992). Raw sequencing reads are available in the NCBI SRA under accession numbers SRX10881548 (E. lactis strain B-4989) and SRX10881549 (E. lactis strain B-4992).

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Sequencing was supported by a grant from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation, allocated to the Kurchatov Center for Genome Research (agreement 075-15-2019-1659). Genome analysis was supported by the NRC Kurchatov Institute (order 1056 from 2 July 2020). Cultivation and DNA extraction were supported by Russian State assignment AAAA-A20-120093090016-9 and were carried out using the equipment of the Unique Scientific Facility of the Biological Resource Center (BRC), Russian National Collection of Industrial Microorganisms (VKPM).

**REFERENCES**

1. Sun K, Liu H, Fan H, Liu T, Zheng C. 2021. Research progress on the application of feed additives in ruminal methane emission reduction: a review. PeerJ 9:e11151. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11151.
2. Elghandour MMY, Salem AZM, Castaneda JSM, Camacho LM, Kholif AE, Chagoya JCV. 2015. Direct-fed microbmes: a tool for improving the utilization of low-quality roughages in ruminants. J Integr Agric 14:526–533. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(14)60834-0.
3. Direkvandi E, Mohammadabadi T, Salem AZM. 2020. Effect of microbial feed additives on growth performance, microbial protein synthesis, and rumen microbial population in growing lambs. Transl Anim Sci 4txaa203. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41429-020-0312-2.
4. Franz CMAP, Huch M, Abriouel H, Holzapfel W, Gálvez A. 2011. Enterococci as probiotics and their implications in food safety. Int J Food Microbiol 151:125–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.08.014.
5. Mumau DD, Kim SH, Biswas AA, Yu Z, Cho KK, Kim SB, Lee K, Lee SS. 2019. Rumen fermentation and microbial community composition influenced by live *Enterococcus faecium* supplementation. AMB Express 9:123. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13568-019-0848-8.
6. Isakova DM, Peskova LL, Jadrova OL. 10 August 2000. Strain of bacterium *Lactobacillus acidophilus* varietas cocoideus used in industrial production of probiotic for ruminant young animals. Russian patent 2153531. https://new.fips.ru/registers-doc-view/fips_server?DB=RUPAT&DocNumber=2153531&TypeFile=html.
7. Isakova DM, Peskova LL, Jadrova OL, Elagina EV. 27 July 2000. Strain of bacterium *Streptococcus lactis* used for industrial production of probiotic for ruminant young animals. Russian patent 2153531. https://new.fips.ru/registers-doc-view/fips_server?DB=RUPAT&DocNumber=2153531&TypeFile=html.
8. Sidoruk KV, Levitin EI, Sviridov BV, Piksasova OV, Shustikova TE. 2020. Extraction of DNA from a wide range of objects by treatment with ammonium salts. Biotehnologîâ (Mosk) 36:98–106. https://doi.org/10.21519/0234-2758-2020-36-6-98-106.
9. Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. 2018. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. Bioinformatics 34:884–890. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty560.
10. Korzenkov A. 2021. ZGA: a flexible pipeline for read processing, de novo assembly and annotation of prokaryotic genomes. bioRxiv 2021.04.27.441618. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.27.441618.
11. Bushnell B, Rood J, Singer E. 2017. BBMerge: accurate paired shotgun read merging via overlap. PLoS One 12:e0185056. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185056.
12. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Danilyants A, Lesin VM, Nikolenko SI, Pham S, Pyribelski AD, Pyshkin LV, Sirotkin AV, Vyahhi N, Tesler G, Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA. 2012. SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. J Comput Biol 19:455–477. https://doi.org/10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.
13. Tatsurova T, DiCuccio M, Badrettin A, Chetvernin V, Nawrocki EP, Zaslavsky L, Lomsadze A, Pruit KD, Borodovsky M, Ostell J. 2016. NCBI Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res 44:6614–6624. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw569.

**TABLE 1** Genome sequencing of *E. lactis* strains

| Strain          | No. of raw sequencing reads | Genome size (bp) | No. of contigs | N50 (bp) | Mean genome coverage (x) | G+C content (%) | GenBank accession no. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| VKPM B-4989     | 509,264                     | 2,831,734        | 77            | 140,067 | 70                       | 38.19          | JAGPYO000000000.1    |
| VKPM B-4992     | 580,275                     | 2,643,596        | 66            | 97,582  | 93                       | 38.27          | JAGPYP000000000.1    |

**7. Isakova DM, Peskova LL, Jadrova OL. 10 August 2000. Strain of bacterium *Lactobacillus acidophilus* varietas cocoideus used in industrial production of probiotic for ruminant young animals. Russian patent 2153531.**

https://new.fips.ru/registers-doc-view/fips_server?DB=RUPAT&DocNumber=2153531&TypeFile=html.

**8. Sidoruk KV, Levitin EI, Sviridov BV, Piksasova OV, Shustikova TE. 2020.**

Extraction of DNA from a wide range of objects by treatment with ammonium salts. Biotehnologîâ (Mosk) 36:98–106. https://doi.org/10.21519/0234-2758-2020-36-6-98-106.

**9. Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. 2018.**

fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. Bioinformatics 34:884–890. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty560.

**10. Korzenkov A. 2021.**

ZGA: a flexible pipeline for read processing, de novo assembly and annotation of prokaryotic genomes. bioRxiv 2021.04.27.441618. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.27.441618.

**11. Bushnell B, Rood J, Singer E. 2017.**

BBMerge: accurate paired shotgun read merging via overlap. PLoS One 12:e0185056. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185056.

**12. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Danilyants A, Lesin VM, Nikolenko SI, Pham S, Pyribelski AD, Pyshkin LV, Sirotkin AV, Vyahhi N, Tesler G, Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA. 2012.**

SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. J Comput Biol 19:455–477. https://doi.org/10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.

**13. Tatsurova T, DiCuccio M, Badrettin A, Chetvernin V, Nawrocki EP, Zaslavsky L, Lomsadze A, Pruit KD, Borodovsky M, Ostell J. 2016.**

NCBI Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res 44:6614–6624. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw569.
14. Meier-Kolthoff JP, Göker M. 2019. TYGS is an automated high-throughput platform for state-of-the-art genome-based taxonomy. Nat Commun 10: 2182. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10210-3.

15. Alcock BP, Raphenya AR, Lau TTY, Tsang KK, Bouchard M, Edalatmand A, Huynh W, Nguyen A-LV, Cheng AA, Liu S, Min SY, Miroshnichenko A, Tran H-K, Werfalli RE, Nasir JA, Oloni M, Speicher DJ, Florescu A, Singh B, Faltyn M, Hernandez-Koutoucheva A, Sharma AN, Bordeleau E, Pawlowski AC, Zubyk HL, Dooley D, Griffiths E, Maguire F, Winsor GL, Beiko RG, Brinkman FSL, Hsiao WWL, Domselaar GV, McArthur AG. 2020. CARD 2020: antibiotic resistome surveillance with the Comprehensive Antibiotic Resistance Database. Nucleic Acids Res 48:D517–D525. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz935.

16. Blin K, Shaw S, Steinke K, Villebro R, Ziemert N, Lee SY, Medema MH, Weber T. 2019. antiSMASH 5.0: updates to the secondary metabolite genome mining pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res 47:W81–W87. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz310.