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**ABSTRACT**

The Tetraviridae is a family of non-enveloped positive-stranded RNA insect viruses that is defined by the $T=4$ symmetry of virions. We report the complete Euprosterna elaeasa virus (EeV) genome sequence of 5698 nt with no poly(A) tail and two overlapping open reading frames, encoding the replicase and capsid precursor, with ~67% amino acid identity to Thosea asigna virus (TaV). The N-terminally positioned 17 kDa protein is released from the capsid precursor by a NPGP motif. EeV has 40 nm non-enveloped isometric particles composed of 58 and 7 kDa proteins. The 3'-end of TaV/EeV is predicted to form a conserved pseudoknot. Replicases of TaV and EeV include a newly delineated VPg signal mediating the protein priming of RNA synthesis in dsRNA Birnaviridae. Results of rooted phylogenetic analysis of replicase and capsid proteins are presented to implicate recombination between monopartite tetraviruses, involving autonomization of a sgRNA, in the emergence of bipartite tetraviruses. They are also used to revise the Tetraviridae taxonomy.© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

**Introduction**

The Tetraviridae is a lepidopteran-restricted family of viruses with positive-sense ssRNA [ssRNA+] genomes (Entwistle, 1987; Moore, 1991; Hanzlik and Gordon, 1997; Gordon and Hanzlik, 1998; Hanzlik et al., 1999; Christian et al., 2001; Gordon and Waterhouse, 2006). Tetravirus particles are 35–41 nm in diameter and composed of 240 copies of two proteins of approximately 60 kDa (L) and 8 kDa (S). The structures of Nudaurelia capensis β virus (N/IV) and Nudaurelia capensis α virus (NoV) have been solved (Finch et al., 1974; Olson et al., 1990; Johnson et al., 1994; Munshi et al., 1996, 1998) and reveal T = 4 icosahedral capsid architecture that distinguishes the family from other non-enveloped viruses. Eleven viruses are recognized in the family (Hanzlik et al., 2005), and N/IV (Gordon et al., 1999), NoV (Agrawal and Johnson, 1992) and Heliocoverpa armigera stunt virus (HaSV) (Gordon et al., 1995; Hanzlik et al., 1995) are considered prototypic tetraviruses.

The Tetraviridae contains the Betatetravirus and the Omegatetravirus genera (Hanzlik et al., 2005). Betatetraviruses, such as N/IV, have monopartite genomes; the 6.5 kb genomic RNA encodes the replicase and capsid precursor genes. Virions also encapsidate a 2.5 kb subgenomic RNA (sgRNA), identical to the 3′-region of the genomic RNA, that directs synthesis of the capsid precursor (see Fig. 1) (Gordon et al., 1999; Pringle et al., 1999, 2003). Betatetravirus capsids display three distinct pits and each face is separated by a deep groove (Olson et al., 1990; Pringle et al., 1999). Omegatetraviruses, such as NoV and HaSV, have bipartite ssRNA+ genomes of approximately 5.2 and 2.5 kb encoding the replicase and capsid precursor genes, respectively. Omegatetravirus capsids are more
In this report, we present the characterization of the capsid and complete sequence of the genomic RNA of *Euprosterna eleasa* virus (EeV), a promising candidate for biological control of its insect larval host *E. eleasa*, Dyar (Lepidoptera: Limacodidae), a major defoliating pest of palm-oil trees in Central and South America (Genty, 1976; Genty et al., 1978). EeV is closely related to TaV and shares signature properties distinguishing these viruses from prototypic tetraviruses, including a predicted conserved pseudoknot at the genome 3′-end. Bioinformatic analysis of TaV/EeV replicases and VP1 of birnaviruses revealed an unprecedented conservation of a newly defined VPg signal upstream of the RdRp domain. Phylogenetic analysis of the jelly-roll capsid domain in *Tetraviridae* rooted with the *Birnaviridae* was used to propose an evolutionary scenario that accounts for the monophyletic origin of the T = 4 capsid, the extraordinary diversity of replicases in tetraviruses, and the emergence of bipartite tetraviruses during co-infection of two distantly related monopartite multipartite tetraviruses.

### Results

#### Morphology and protein composition of EeV particles

Examination of purified EeV particles using electron microscopy reveals non-enveloped isometric virions of 40 nm diameter (Fig. 2A), compact than those from betatetraviruses and display neither pits, nor grooves (Johnson and Reddy, 1998).

In all tetraviruses, the capsid precursor protein undergoes post-assembly autoproteolytic processing to yield two major capsid proteins. First shown to be an assembly-dependent maturation cleavage in N0V (Agrawal and Johnson, 1992, 1995; Canady et al., 2000), this processing has also been observed in N0V (Gordon et al., 1999), HaSV (Hanzlik et al., 1995), *Dendrolimus punctatus* tetravirus (DpTV) (Yi et al., 2005), *Thosea asigna* virus (TaV) (Pringle et al., 1999, 2001) and Providence virus (PrV) (Pringle et al., 2003). Additionally in TaV and PrV, the capsid precursor undergoes an apparent processing event immediately upstream of the L protein during RNA translation. It is autocatalytically mediated by the NPCP motif (Pringle et al., 2001; Luke et al., 2008), originally identified in 2A proteins of some picorna-viruses (Donnelly et al., 2001). 2A was shown to promote an internal translation termination that is followed by elongation of translation of mRNA (Doronina et al., 2008). In PrV, tandem NPCP motifs may be operational (Luke et al., 2008).

The tetraviruses with single processing of the capsid precursor also share a conserved domain organization of the replicase gene that includes putative N7-methyltransferase (NMT), superfamily 1 helicase (Hel1) and RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (acRdRp) domains typical of the vast Alphavirus-like virus supergroup (Ahlquist et al., 1985; Gordon et al., 1995). In contrast, TaV replicase has no NMT and Hel1 domains but includes a structurally unique RdRp with the permuted active site (pRdRp). It was originally identified only in the EeV/TaV RdRp and the homologous domain of virus protein 1 (VP1) of the dsRNA *Birnaviridae* (Gorbalenya et al., 2002; Garriga et al., 2007; Pan et al., 2007). Importantly, pRdRps of these two virus families are likely to be monophyletic (Gorbalenya et al., 2002). Thus, TaV was speculated to prototype a unique lineage of ssRNA+ viruses with a mosaic relationship to birnaviruses (replicase) and prototypic tetraviruses (capsid) (Gorbalenya et al., 2002). Subsequent structural analysis of the capsid of the birnavirus infectious bronchitis disease virus (IBDV) (Coulibaly et al., 2005) showed that major capsid proteins of tetraviruses and birnaviruses are also related through a common jelly-roll β barrel fold (Munshi et al., 1998) that is wedge-shaped in both proteins. The sequence of the replicase gene of PrV, another tetravirus with complex processing of the capsid precursor (Pringle et al., 2003), suggests it may belong to another phylogenetic lineage (Pringle and Ball, personal communication).

In this report, we present the characterization of the capsid and complete sequence of the genomic RNA of *Euprosterna eleasa* virus (EeV), a promising candidate for biological control of its insect larval host *E. eleasa*, Dyar (Lepidoptera: Limacodidae), a major defoliating pest of palm-oil trees in Central and South America (Genty, 1976; Genty et al., 1978). EeV is closely related to TaV and shares signature properties distinguishing these viruses from prototypic tetraviruses, including a predicted conserved pseudoknot at the genome 3′-end. Bioinformatic analysis of TaV/EeV replicases and VP1 of birnaviruses revealed an unprecedented conservation of a newly defined VPg signal upstream of the pRdRp domain. Phylogenetic analysis of the jelly-roll capsid domain in *Tetraviridae* rooted with the *Birnaviridae* was used to propose an evolutionary scenario that accounts for the monophyletic origin of the T = 4 capsid, the extraordinary diversity of replicases in tetraviruses, and the emergence of bipartite tetraviruses during co-infection of two distantly related monopartite multipartite tetraviruses.

### Results

#### Morphology and protein composition of EeV particles

Examination of purified EeV particles using electron microscopy reveals non-enveloped isometric virions of 40 nm diameter (Fig. 2A),
consistent with the morphology and size of tetraviruses (Hanzlik et al., 2005; Hanzlik and Gordon, 1997). SDS-PAGE analysis identified two capsid proteins, a major protein of approximately 58 kDa and a minor protein of approximately 7 kDa (Fig. 2B), within the range and relative intensities found for other tetraviruses: TaV (56 and 6 kDa) (Pringle et al., 1999), NβV (61 and 7.9 kDa) (Hanzlik and Gordon, 1997; Hanzlik and Gordon, 1998), NωV (62 and 7.8 kDa) (Agrawal and Johnson, 1992), PrV (60 and 7.4 kDa) (Pringle et al., 2003) and DpTV (62.5 and 6.8 kDa) (Yi et al., 2005).

**EeV genome organization**

More than 80% of the nucleotide sequence of the EeV genome was determined from four different overlapping cDNA clones. Five 5′ RACE clones terminated with the identical 5′-AGGTCCACCTTTCTTGTA sequence that is considered likely to include the very 5′-end. The 5′-terminal sequence was verified by direct sequencing of PCR products to exclude a possibility that it was a cloning artifact. It was concluded that this is the 5′-terminal sequence of the EeV genome.

cDNAs containing the 3′-end of the genome were synthesized by 3′ RLM-RACE, then cloned and sequenced to establish that the 3′-terminal sequence is AAAUCCUUUUUCCACGCG-3′. Although no poly (A) tail was found, it was possible to prime cDNA synthesis with oligo (dT) due to an internal (A)-rich zone (starting at nt 3323).

The EeV genome contains a total of 5698 nucleotides (GenBank AF461742), composed of 24.3% A, 23.6% U, 23.8% C and 28.3% G. It has untranslanted 5′- and 3′-terminal regions of 94 and 92 nts respectively. There are two major ORFs (Fig. 1). ORF1 (nts 95–3868) encodes a 1257 aa protein with a predicted molecular mass of 140.5 kDa. ORF2 is located at the 3′-end of the genome, overlapping ORF1 in a + 1 frame by 520 nucleotides. The AUG initiation codon for the EeV and TaV capsid precursors has not been determined experimentally. While the first AUG triplets at the start of ORF2 of these viruses are located two codons apart in a genome-wide alignment (data not shown), the second AUGs along with adjacent nucleotides are conserved and also in a better context (EeV: AGAatgA; TaV: AAAatgA) for translation initiation (Ranjan and Hasnain, 1995). Translation from this first conserved AUG codon would produce a protein of 752 aa with a calculated molecular mass of 82.5 kDa (nucleotides 3348–5606). No ORF larger than 291 nt was detected in the negative-sense RNA.

MFOLD analysis identified a 5′-terminal hairpin (nt 7–28) of -25.2 kcal/mol with a GUAU loop flanked by a 9 nt-long inverted repeat (Fig. 3A). Use of the PLMM_DPSS algorithm suggested a possible 5′ pseudoknot that was not confirmed by further analysis using pknotsRG and Kinefold (data not shown). At the 3′-termini of EeV/TaV genomic RNAs, no tRNA-like structure, as found in the prototypic tetraviruses, could be identified using programs such as RNAfold, consistent with lack of a 3′-terminal CCA.

![Fig. 3. Folding of the genomic RNA termini in EeV and TaV.](http://wilab.inha.ac.kr/pseudoviewer/) (A) MFOLD prediction for folding of the EeV 5′-UTR. (B) RNA secondary structure models for the 3′-ends of the EeV and (C) TaV RNAs. Only the 3′-terminal 94 (EeV) or 120 (TaV) nucleotides are shown, numbered from the 3′-end. The structures were drawn using the PseudoViewer program of Byun and Han (2009) (URL: http://wilab.inha.ac.kr/pseudoviewer/). Base-pairs in the pseudoknot and other stems are indicated by dots. The short stem-loop formed by nts 65–77 (EeV) or nts 84–103 (TaV) is shown to the right of and above the pseudoknot, but is likely stacked with the pseudoknot.)
The conservation of the TaV and EeV 3′-terminal sequences is mostly evident between (counting from the 5′-end) the first 19 nt of EeV and 49 of TaV, as well as between nt 51–94 (EeV) and nt 72–120 (TaV). Structurally related pseudoknots with comparable free energies of -22.50 and -24.90 kcal/mol respectively were tentatively identified in EeV and TaV (Figs. 3B and C) using pknotsRG and Kinefold. The pseudoknots contain very similar sequences that form two stems of comparable sizes. They are predicted to have the short conserved stem-loop located from 65/84 to 77/103 nt from the 3′-end stacked co-axially. The sequences containing the mainly unstructured A&U-rich loops differ in length (nt 7–50 for EeV; nt 7–71 for TaV) and may contain short, virus-specific, stem-loops. The predicted structures were also evident (unpublished observations) in analyses of larger 3′-terminal sequences than those depicted in Figs. 3B and C.

The EeV replicase: delineation of a nucleotidylation (VPg) signal upstream of the permuted RdRp

The 1257 aa EeV replicase ORF was used in our previous analysis of the identically sized TaV replicase (Gorbalenya et al., 2002), with which it has 68% aa identity also over the RdRp domain that is conserved in the VP1 of the Birnaviridae (Fig. 1). The RdRp domain commences at ~200 aa from the N-terminus of the TaV/EeV replicases and VP1 of birnaviruses (Gorbalenya et al., 2002). We have now used profile-to-profile analysis to achieve a multiple sequence alignment that extends the remote conservation between TaV/EeV and birnaviruses to the very N-terminus (Fig. 4). Notably, there is a conserved position that includes a Ser residue whose hydroxyl group is guanylated in vitro in a fraction of VP1 molecules in infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV) (Xu et al., 2004). The Ser residue is replaced by a physico-chemically similar Thr residue in some birnaviruses and TaV (Fig. 4); this replacement introduced in the IPNV VP1 was shown to be compatible with the guanylation (Xu et al., 2004). The nucleotidylated Ser/Thr residue is part of the highly conserved Y/FXXGS/TXXGXXXR signature (dubbed VPg motif) (Fig. 4), whose conserved residues may contribute to the nucleotidylation reaction. In the IBDV VP1 structure, the VPg motif encompasses the interdomain junction and adjacent residues from the N-terminal domain and the most N-terminal α-helix 5 of the RdRp (Garriga et al., 2007).

Upstream of the VPg motif, four α-helices and four β-strands were identified in the IBDV VP1 structure with the N-terminal 26 aa residues remaining unresolved (Garriga et al., 2007). The conservation in this area is only moderate among birnaviruses (Fig. 4). Consistently, only two Pro and one Asn have been found to be invariant among TaV/EeV and birnaviruses; variation of dozens of other residues is limited within groups of physico-chemically similar residues (Fig. 4). These observations indicate that the N-terminal domain may adopt a similar structure and have a similar function in TaV/EeV and birnaviruses, although secondary structure prediction for TaV/EeV supported only the presence of the conserved α-helices in this domain (data not shown).

The sequences C-terminal to the RdRp domain comprise ~600 and ~300 aa residues in the TaV/EeV replicase and birnavirus VP1, respectively. In the IBDV VP1, this domain adopts a unique α-helix fold that was implicated in the regulation of the RdRp activity (Garriga et al., 2007). No appreciable across-family similarity was found in this region.

Two-site capsid precursor processing pathway is conserved in EeV and TaV

Initiation of the capsid precursor synthesis at the first conserved AUG codon of EeV ORF2 would yield a protein of 82.5 kDa. Based on the strong similarity with TaV (Pringle et al., 1999, 2001; Donnelly et al., 2001), three proteins are predicted to be derived from this precursor, due to translation interruption mediated by the NPGP motif (between Gly-146 and Pro-147 of the motif) and assembly-dependent, autocatalytic cleavage between Asn-701 and Gly-702 (Taylor and Johnson, 2005). These proteins are (from the N- to C-term) P1 (146 aa), L (544 aa) and S (62 aa), the latter two forming the mature capsid. SDS-PAGE analysis of EeV particles showed two major structural proteins of 58 kDa (L) and 7 kDa (S) (Fig. 2B). N-terminal sequencing of these proteins yielded the sequences PPSVARGLQE and GWGLM, matching the deduced sequences at 147–156 and 698–702 in the EeV capsid precursor, respectively, and confirming the predicted sites. Blast searches revealed that the predicted and similarly positioned EeV and TaV P17s (Fig. 1) are orthologous (51.0% identity, 63.2% similarity) but otherwise have no similarity with other proteins outside a short region linked to the NPGP motif (Pringle et al., 2001). These results strongly support the conservation of the two-step processing of the capsid precursor in EeV and TaV that distinguishes these viruses from most tetraviruses.

The rooted phylogeny of tetraviruses

According to psi-BLAST-mediated analysis, capsid proteins of tetraviruses form a separate cluster, with the EeV and TaV capsid precursors being most closely related (18–87% identity range for the...
Remarkably, while ML distances separating diverse bipartite tetraviruses indicate bipartite viruses to have originated late in the evolution. It has a topology matching that of hepeviruses (Gordon et al., 1995). A Bayesian tree of the replicase of prototypic tetraviruses was by bipartite tetraviruses (Figs. 1 and 5B and C) (prototypic tetraviruses) formed by the monopartite genome betatetravirus NHaSV, NPrV, and NHaSV. A comparison of EeV and TaV RNA terminal sequences, based on analysis of multiple clones, shows them to be very similar. EeV possesses an extra eight 5′-nucleotides, suggesting that the sequence of TaV (Gorbalenya et al., 2002) was not completely determined. Bioinformatics analysis further predicts that the 5′-end of TaV/EeV is blocked with a protein (see below), a prediction that remains to be verified experimentally. The TaV/EeV 3′-terminus is predicted to form a conserved pseudoknot with the 3′-terminal residue located at its base. Pseudoknots are found in the 3′-non-coding regions of many RNA viruses, and may be involved in regulation of genome replication (Brierley et al., 2007). The most relevant to TaV/EeV may be the pseudoknot of tomato bushy stunt virus that has the 3′-terminus buried within stacked helices (Na et al., 2006). This “closed” conformation is thought to prevent genome replication, favoring translation. An alternative, “open”, conformation disrupts the pseudoknot to enable replication to occur. This model might be relevant in regulation of EeV/TaV genome expression and replication. The predicted 3′-end pseudoknot may also or alternatively protect EeV/TaV RNAs from exonucleases.

The differences in the predicted terminal structures for EeV/TaV genomic RNAs from those of protopotic tetraviruses, that are predicted to have a 5′-cap and a 3′-tRNA-like structure (Hanzlik and Gordon, 1997), correlate with the differing domain compositions of replicases in these viruses. Replicases of protopotic tetraviruses include the NMT-Hel1-acRdRp array of conserved domains; in contrast, TaV/EeV replicases have no Hel and MT domains and encode a non-canonical pRdRp in the N-terminal half (Fig. 1). The lack of a Hel domain in TaV/EeV, and its presence in protopotic tetraviruses, are consistent with the observation that ssRNA+ viruses with a genome size above 6–7 kb have a Hel domain, whereas those under 6–7 kb do not (Gorbalenya and Koonin, 1989). The TaV/EeV and birnavirus replicases share an additional conserved N-terminal domain not found in protopotic tetraviruses. It includes a newly described Vpg motif used in birnaviruses to covalently link 5′-ends of positive-strand RNA of two genomic segments to a fraction of VP1 molecules (replicase), thought to serve as protein primers for replication (Dobos, 1995; Magyar et al., 1998; Xu et al., 2004). Likewise, this signal could be used by TaV/EeV to prime genomic and sgRNA synthesis; since genomic RNA of EeV starts with an adenine, this signal is predicted to be adenylated. The priming of RNA synthesis with a protein in TaV/EeV would be consistent with the distant phylogenetic affinity of pRdRp and canonical RdRps of other RNA viruses that use VPg (Gorbalenya et al., 2002; Hanzlik et al., 2005; Garriga et al., 2007).

The across-family conservation of the Vpg signal, evident in TaV/EeV and birnaviruses and unprecedented for other Vpg types

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replicase</th>
<th>PrV</th>
<th>HaSV</th>
<th>NoV</th>
<th>DpTV</th>
<th>Nj/V</th>
<th>EeV</th>
<th>TaV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PrV</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HaSV</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoV</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DpTV</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nj/V</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EeV</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaV</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ML distances estimate the average number of substitutions per amino acid position. Percentage distances were calculated for the jelly-roll domain (capsid proteins), concatenated NMT, Hel1 and acRdRp domains (replicase proteins with the domain layout conserved in Alpha-like viruses) or pRdRp domain (TaV and EeV). Bold numbers are discussed in text. n.a., not available.
in many RNA virus families (Le Gall et al., 2008; Gorbalenya, unpublished), further supports the evolutionary relationship between replicases of TaV/EeV and birnaviruses spanning across two different RNA virus classes (Gorbalenya et al., 2002). The special affinity between two families also extends to the capsid and also includes tetraviruses that employ different replicases (Coulibaly et al., 2005). A distinct structural variant of the jelly-roll domain was found to be used for building the $T=4$ capsid of tetraviruses and the external shell layer of the $T=13$ capsid of birnaviruses. We used this observation to root the tetravirus capsid tree in our study.

![Diagram of RNA virus families and their evolutionary relationships](image_url)
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beta- and tetraviruses (Fig. 5 C). Likewise, the ancestral tetravirus might, like PrV, Nj/V and TaV/EeV and in contrast to phylogenetically compact omegatetraviruses, have had a monopar-
hitals presented by the omegatetraviruses: while these viruses derive their replicase from an Nj/V-like ancestor, their capsid proteins are more closely related to that of PrV. These viruses are also distinct among tetraviruses in expressing the capsid gene from a separate genomic RNA rather than from a sgRNA.
Two evolutionary scenarios for the origin of the bipartite omegatetraviruses, accounting for major specific features of tetraviruses, can be drawn. Both exploit a unique property of diverse monopar-tetraviruses, all of which have been shown or are assumed to encapsidate a sgRNA along with the genomic RNA. (Evidence for sgRNA in the EeV virions has not been obtained due to limited quantities of the specimen available for the analysis.) They require co-infection of a cell by two different parental monopar-tetraviruses of the Nj/V and PrV lineages but differ regarding important aspects of their interaction. According to the first scenario, the co-infection could have given rise to a hybrid virion progeny including the genomic RNA encoding an Nj/V-like replicase and a subgenomic RNA encoding a PrV-like capsid. Possible mutations severely compromising
omogeneous RNA rather than dsRNA. A subgenomic RNA and a prRdRp have been introduced from either the TaV/EeV or PrV lineage to the
leading to prototypic omega- and betatetraviruses, respectively (Fig. 5C). Alternatively, if the NPGP module is promiscuous, it could have been introduced from either the TaV/EeV or PrV lineage to the other lineage by recombination.
The family Tetraviridae clearly includes viruses with vastly incongruent evolutionary histories of capsid and RdRp proteins. This conflict, challenging for virus taxonomy, is not evident in most families of ssRNA+ viruses, the foundations of which are phyloge-netically sound. To resolve this conflict, TaV/EeV and, probably PrV, must be placed in two new families separate from the prototypic tetraviruses. Since all these viruses possess a T = 4 capsid, their family names could include “Tetraviridae” with a prefix referring to the unique replicase. Accordingly, we propose a family prototypic by TaV/EeV to be named Permutotetraviridae and the current Tetravi-
dae, encompassing prototypic viruses, be renamed Alphatetraviridae or split further to recognize prototypic Beta- and Omegatetraviruses as
(Figs. 5B and C). As argued previously (Coulibaly et al., 2005), the ancestral virus for tetra- and birnaviruses might have used the
T = 3 virions evident in nodaviruses (Schneemann et al., 1998) or
T = 4 virions. Alternatively if the ancestor was very small it might have used T = 1 virions; strikingly, this latter arrangement is evident in subvirial particles formed by VP2 expressed alone (Caston et al., 2001; Coulibaly et al., 2005). This ancestor was possibly a ssRNA+ virus since dsRNA birnaviruses most resemble viruses with
omegatetraviruses, have had a monopar-tetraviruses of the N
the ancestral V and PrV lineages but differ regarding important
features of tetra-
and IBDV capsid proteins. The j-beta and a-helix structural elements that are conserved in the S and L proteins of IBV and NoV, respectively, are shown as blue rectangles that are
connected by double-head arrows. Structural elements that have no counterpart in the other protein are labeled above IBDV VP2 or below Nj/V L proteins, respectively, or indicated in red (B and P domains of IBV and Ig-like domain of NoV). (B) Phylogeny of tetraviruses. The capsid tree for seven tetraviruses is based on an amino acid alignment of the Jelly Roll domain (L protein) (661 positions) and was rooted using S protein of IBDV and Nj/V L proteins, respectively, or indicated
beta-V-like replicase and a subgenomic RNA
encoding a PrV-like capsid. Possible mutations severely compromising
the replicase-donor’s capsid gene expression and enabling replication of a mutant PrV capsid sgRNA by the Nj/V-like replicase would have
promoted subsequent proliferation of the progeny to establish a new
bipartite genome lineage. Numerous concerted mutations are not uncommon in RNA viruses; they must have been involved in the RdRp diversification to generate prRdRp and canonical RdRp in a progenitor of this lineage (Gorbalenya et al., 2002) and in the independent emergence of RdRp in a species of the Tymoviridae (Sabanadzovic et al., 2009). The above scenario exploits the natural evolutionary potential of a sgRNA toward becoming a genomic segment in a process resembling reassortment in segmented viruses that could be driven by genetic drift or selection. An alternative, and more complex, scenario postulates recombination between the parental viruses to generate an intermediate monopartite virus with Nj/V-like replicase and PrV-like capsid, followed by genome segmentation to separate these genes. There is no apparent rationale, however, why the process of genome segmentation required by this scenario (and which appears to have happened repeatedly among the ssRNA+ viruses (Strauss and Strauss, 1988; Le Gall et al., 2008), should have occurred in this putative lineage, when it has not been observed in any of the ancestral monopar-tete-
iravirus lineages, i.e. Nj/V, PrV and TaV/EeV lineages. We favor the first scenario.
Despite belonging to two different tetravirus lineages, TaV/EeV and PrV share another conserved protein module, characterized by the ~17 aa NPGP motif (Pringle et al., 2003; Luke et al., 2008). Its small size makes reliable phylogenetic reconstruction challenging, although the clustering of TaV/EeV and PrV in a tree comparing the NPGP-containing proteins of ssRNA+ viruses has been reported (Luke et al., 2008). An alternative approach to infer the evolutionary history of this module is through analysis of associated capsid proteins. Assuming that the observed association is stable, the ancestral NPGP module might have already been present in the MRCA of the tetravirus capsids. It was subsequently and independently lost in two lineages, leading to prototypic omega- and betatetraviruses, respectively (Fig. 5C). Alternatively, if the NPGP module is promiscuous, it could have been introduced from either the TaV/EeV or PrV lineage to the other lineage by recombination.
two families. The recognition of multiple virus families with T = 4 architecture and monophyletic history of the major proteins would be somewhat reminiscent of relationships observed between numerous virus families with the pseudo T = 3 architecture now united in the order Picornavirales (Le Gall et al., 2008). A similar rational could also be adopted for consistent naming of other newly emerging RNA virus families whose members employ pRdRp and jelly-roll-based virions with non-T = 4 symmetry.

Materials and methods

Source of virus-infected larvae and virus purification

Cadavers of E. elaeasa larvae were collected in 1996 from the Peruvian palm-oil plantation (Palmas del Espino, near Uchiza) after natural epizootics and stored at -20 °C. EeV particles were extracted from the frozen cadavers and purified on sucrose gradients as described by Hanzlik et al. (1993).

Transmission electron microscopy

Gradient purified virus was deposited on 200-mesh grids and stained with 2 % phosphotungstic acid according to Brenner and Horne (1959). Observations were made with a Zeiss EM-10-CR transmission electron microscope.

N-terminal sequencing of EeV capsid proteins

Viruses samples were denatured then subjected to electrophoresis on 12.5% SDS-polyacrylamide gels (SDS-PAGE) (Laemmli, 1970). After staining with Coomassie blue, the capsid protein bands were excised and subjected to 10 cycles of N-terminal sequencing by Edman degradation at the Australian National University Biomolecular Resource Facility.

cDNA synthesis and cloning

EeV RNA was extracted from purified capsids as described by Hanzlik et al. (1993). cDNA was synthesized in the presence of random hexamers using Superscript II reverse-transcriptase (Life Technologies). The cDNAs were blunt-ended with T4 DNA polymerase random hexamers using Superscript II reverse-transcriptase (Life Technologies). The cDNAs were blunt-ended with T4 DNA polymerase according to the manufacturer’s specifications with minor modifications. cDNAs synthesized with Superscript II and the EeV-specific primer 450R (complementary to nucleotides 1132 to 1154: 5′-TATAGGGGGCTTGTATCCG-3′) was dC-tailed using terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT). After annealing to Abridged Anchor Primer (AAP: 5′-GGGACAGGGTCTACCTAGTACGGGGGAGG-3′; Life Technologies), dC-tailed cDNAs were subjected to 20 cycles of PCR (extension time: 3 min) using Pfu DNA polymerase (New England BioLabs), size selected for lengths >1 kbp on a spin column (Clontech) and cloned into the EcoRV site of pBluescript (SK+) (pBS, Stratagene) using standard procedures.

Determination of terminal sequences

A 5′-RACE kit (Life Technologies) was used to amplify the 5′ ends according to the manufacturer’s specifications with minor modifications. cDNAs synthesized with Superscript II and the EeV-specific primer 450R (complementary to nucleotides 1132 to 1154: 5′-TCTGTATCATCACCATAACAGGC-3′) were dC-tailed using terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT). After annealing to Abridged Anchor Primer (AAP: 5′-GGGACAGGGTCTACCTAGTACGGGGGAGG-3′; Life Technologies), dC-tailed cDNAs were subjected to 20 cycles of PCR (extension time: 3 min) using Pfu DNA polymerase (New England BioLabs), size selected for lengths >1 kbp on a spin column (Clontech) and cloned into the EcoRV site of pBluescript (SK+) (pBS, Stratagene) using standard procedures.

Universal Amplification Primer (AUAP: GGCAACCCGTGCACTAGTAC; Life Technologies) whose sequence is complementary to the 5′-end of that of EeV3R primer. The EeV-specific primer 4725F (NT 5411 to 5437: 5′-TATTAGGGGGCTTGTATCCG-3′) was used conjointly with UAP ([CUA]6GGCAACCCGTGCACTAGTAC) for the PCR amplification of 3′ terminus sequences. PCR products were resolved on agarose gels, cloned into pBS and sequenced.

Sequence analyses

cDNA clones were sequenced with an Applied Biosystems model 373A sequencer using the Taq dyeode terminator sequencing. Universal forward and reverse primers were used in conjunction with synthetic primers based on sequenced portions of the virus. Genomic sequences were assembled using the GCG 8.1 software package (Genetics Computer Group, Madison, WI, USA (Devereux et al., 1984).

Bioinformatic analyses

RNA secondary structure was analyzed using MFOLD software (Zuker, 2003), Pseudoknot Motif Model and Dynamic Partner Sequence Stacking (PLMM DPSS) algorithm of Huang and Ali (2007), RNAfold from http://rna.tbi.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/RNAfold.cgi, pknotsRG (Reeder and Giegerich, 2004; Reeder et al., 2007); server at: http://bibiserv.techfak.uni-bielefeld.de/pknotsrg/submission.html and Kinefold (Xayaphoummine et al., 2005); server at http://kinefold.curie.fr/cgi-bin/form.pl). Amino acid (aa) sequence alignments were generated using either Megalign software (Lasergene; DNASTar Inc.) or Clustal (versions 1.81 and 1.82) (Thompson et al., 1994) and Muscle (Edgar, 2004) programs assisted by Blosum position-specific matrices (Henikoff and Henikoff, 1994) in the Viriscal software platform (Gorbalenya, unpublished), and they were processed for presentation using GeneDoc (Nicholas et al., 1997). Profiles were built from multiple sequence alignments using Compass (Sadreyev and Grishin, 2003), GenBank (Benson et al., 2008) was searched in default mode, unless otherwise stated, using FASTA (GCG) and Blast programs (Altschul et al., 1997). Pairwise comparison of protein structures was performed using DaliLite software (Holm and Park, 2000). Protein secondary structure predictions were made using PsiPred (Jones, 1999).

Phylogenetic analyses

Multiple amino acid sequence alignments of the capsid and replicase proteins were used for phylogenetic analysis employing the neighbor-joining (NJ) method in PHYLP (Phylogeny Inference Package) version 3.5c (Felsenstein, 1989), parsimonious method with exhaustive search of the entire tree-space as implemented in the UNIX version of the PAUP* 4.0b10 program (Swofford, 2000), and a Bayesian posterior probability approach utilizing the BEAST software (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007). For the latter analysis, MCMC chains (two per dataset) were run for 2 million steps (10% burn-in, sampled every 50 generations). For each Bayesian analysis three molecular clock models (strict, relaxed with lognormal distribution, relaxed with exponential distribution) were tested (Drummond et al., 2006). The more complex model, e.g. relaxed molecular clock, was favored over the simpler model, e.g. strict molecular clock, if the Bayes factor (ratio of tree likelihoods) was bigger than five (Goodman, 1999). Convergence of runs was verified and Bayes factors were estimated using Tracer (Rambaut and Drummond, 2007). Pairwise evolutionary distances (estimated number of amino acid substitutions per site on average) were calculated by applying a maximum likelihood (ML) approach using the Tree-Puzzle program (Schmidt et al., 2002). The WAG amino acid substitution model (Whelan and Goldman, 2001) was used and rate heterogeneity among sites
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