

Performance evaluation of taxonomic classification between different Kraken databases

Fredrik Dyrkell¹, Dimitrios Arnellos¹, Oskar Andersson¹

¹1928 Diagnostics AB – Gothenburg (Sweden)

Background

Species identification by means of taxonomic classification is an integral part of computational genomics pipelines. In metagenomics it provides abundance estimations characterising the content, and for single cultures it provides contamination checks and verification of other molecular methods such as MALDI-TOF.

1928 Diagnostics develops a cloud-based platform that analyses WGS sequences to trace outbreaks and perform prospective genomic surveillance. The platform is built to handle all major sequencing platforms and supports 25 different clinically relevant bacterial pipelines with analysis including species identification, high-resolution strain typing, AMR and virulence.

The aim of this project was to benchmark different database versions for species identification and compare results over a large dataset, to evaluate trade-off in performance for bacterial species, while including protozoa and fungi in the database.

Method

From 252 different bioprojects, 2475 single culture isolates were selected and downloaded from ENA, annotated as 138 different species designations. 76 samples were sequenced using Oxford Nanopore, whereas the rest with Illumina. The samples were subsequently analysed by 1928's custom developed identification pipeline, and uses Kraken 2^[1] for classification of FASTQ reads in conjunction with Bracken^[2] to assign prediction at species level. The database versions under test were:

- k2 pluspf 8gb – 20220908 (pluspf)
- k2 standard 8gb – 20210517 (standard)

The classification results were divided into three distinct classes.

- Samples with a single unique species prediction,
- No unique species, multiple predictions belonging to the same genus
- Different genera in prediction

In the results generating non-unique predictions, classification was performed on species predictions with abundance >1.0%.

Results

The benchmark results for the two databases are shown in Figure 1.

	STANDARD			PlusPF			Delta		
	Unique species prediction	Single Genus	Multiple genera	Unique species prediction	Single Genus	Multiple genera			
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	53	7	1	57	3	1	4	-4	0
<i>Campylobacter jejuni</i>	86	8	0	88	6	0	2	-2	0
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	40	1	60	28	20	53	-12	19	-7
<i>Clostridioides difficile</i>	99	0	0	99	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Enterobacter</i>	108	0	2	107	0	3	-1	0	-1
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	98	0	1	98	0	1	0	0	0
<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>	85	2	0	85	2	0	0	0	0
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	111	0	3	110	0	4	-1	0	1
<i>Klebsiella aerogenes</i>	94	2	6	87	6	9	-7	4	3
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	59	20	23	60	17	25	1	-3	2
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	99	11	7	110	1	6	11	-10	-1
<i>Klebsiella variicola</i>	9	64	28	5	73	23	-4	9	-5
<i>Legionella pneumophila</i>	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	65	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Mycobacterium</i>	91	1	1	86	6	1	-5	5	0
<i>Mycobacteroides abscessus</i>	100	0	1	100	0	1	0	0	0
Nanopore	68	6	2	66	9	1	-2	3	-1
<i>Neisseria meningitidis</i>	51	2	0	51	2	0	0	0	0
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	101	0	2	101	0	2	0	0	0
<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	93	1	4	94	0	4	1	-1	0
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	28	4	1	23	8	2	-5	4	1
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	116	0	1	116	0	1	0	0	0
<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	117	1	3	116	1	4	-1	0	1
<i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i>	86	15	2	79	22	2	-7	7	0
<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	45	1	0	46	0	0	1	-1	0
Tail samples	54	16	9	54	19	6	0	3	-3
	2156	162	157	2131	195	149	-25	33	-8
	2475			2475			-1.01%	1.33%	-0.32%

Figure 1. Prediction difference between Standard and PlusPF databases. “Nanopore” and “Tail samples” consist of species with <=5 samples per species.

Conclusions

Including protozoa and fungi in the Kraken 2 database maintains a high predictive power for bacteria, with only 1.01% fewer unique predictions, while additionally enabling classification of fungal pathogens.

References

1. Wood DE, Lu J, Langmead B. Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2. *Genome Biology*. Springer Science and Business Media LLC; 2019.
2. Lu J, Breitwieser FP, Thielen P, Salzberg SL. Bracken: estimating species abundance in metagenomics data. *PeerJ Computer Science*. PeerJ; 2017. p. e104.

Conflict of interest statement

F.D., D.A. and O.A. are employees of 1928 Diagnostics AB.

Contact

fredrik.dyrkell@1928diagnostics.com