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**Create one new species (*Anativirus B*) in the genus *Anativirus***

The genus *Anativirus* presently consists of only 1 species, *Anativirus A*. Novel, anativirus-like picornaviruses were detected in faecal samples of quails (Pankovics et al., 2012), cloacal swabs of chickens (Boros et al., 2015) and in samples from broiler caecum (Morgan et al., unpublished).

**Relation to anativirus A1 and other picornaviruses:**

- Genome layout of anativirus B1 and B2:

5'-UTRIRES-IV[L-1A-1B-1C-1D/2B-2Chel/3A-3BVPg-3Cpro-3Dpol]3'-UTR

(compare Fig. 1 of supporting material)

- Anativiruses have a long, unique **L protein** with unknown function (389-451 aa). The deduced L protein of all known anativiruses has 5 conserved A-repeats (Hx2Cx2HxnCCxC-motif); in addition anativirus B1 and B2 have 2 B-repeats (VxnYPCYG-motif) (Figure 2 of supporting material). The significance of these repeats is unknown.

- Anativiruses have **no functional 2A** protein; two adjacent Q/G sites may allow the processing of short peptides (6-8 amino acids) but their significance is unclear.

- Anativiruses B1 and B2 have typical hallmarks of picornaviruses:

- **capsid proteins** 1B, 1C, 1D have **rhv** domains with drug-binding site,

- **2Chel** with **GxxGxGKS** motif of helicases,

- **3BVPg** peptide with **Y-3** residue,

- **3Cpro** with **GxCGx10GxH** motif,

- **3Dpol** with **KDE**, **PSG**, **YGDD** and **FLKR** motifs.

- Deduced P1 and 3CD sequences of anativirus B1 and B2 cluster with the respective anativirus A1 sequence in **phylogenetic analyses** (compare Figs. 3 & 4 of supporting material).

**Distinguishing features of anativirus B1 and B2 compared to anativirus A1:**

- The **L protein** of anativirus B1 and B2 is shorter (389 aa vs. 451 aa of anativirus A1). The protein sequences show little similarity except the conserved A-repeats. Anativiruses B1 and B2 have 2 B-repeats.

- **Sequence divergence** (uncorrected p-distance) of complete polyproteins suggest a distinct anativirus species: >60% divergence of polyprotein in *between-species* comparisons, <30% in *within-species* comparisons suggesting two types (compare Table 1).

**Table 1. Estimates of evolutionary divergence between anativirus sequences**

[1] AY563023, Anativirus A1 (duck picornavirus) TW90A

[2] KT880670, Anativirus B1 (phacovirus) Pf-CHK1/PhV

[3] KX100569, Anativirus B1 (chicken picornavirus) UCC/PhV

[4] JN674502, Anativirus B2 (quail picornavirus) QPV1/HUN/2010

[ 1 2 3 4 ]

[1]

[2] 0.625

[3] 0.647 0.070

[4] 0.626 0.264 0.278

- **Sequence divergences** (uncorrected p-distances) of orthologous proteins in pairwise comparisons of anativiruses with representative sequences of species of picornavirus supergroup 3 (*Anativirus/Enterovirus/Rabivirus/Sapelovirus*) support creation of a new species (compare Table 2).

**Table 2: Amino acid divergence\***

anativirus B1 (phacovirus) vs. member of ... P1 2Chel 3Cpro 3Dpol

*within-genus* comparisons:

*Anativirus* *Anativirus B* (chicken picornavirus) 14.3% 2.1% 0.5% 1.9%

*Anativirus B* (quail picornavirus) 27.0% 15.9% 25.8% 18.7%

*Anativirus A* (duck picornavirus) 57.5% 58.1% 56.5% 46.8%

*between-genus* comparisons:

*Boosepivirus*† *Boosepivirus A*† (boosepivirus A1) 61.2% 57.7% 61.2% 51.6%

*Boosepivirus B*† (boosepivirus B1) 61.2% 62.9% 64.4% 52.6%

*Boosepivirus C*† (boosepivirus C1) 61.3% 60.2% 67.4% 53.9%

*Diresapivirus*† *Diresapivirus A*† (diresapivirus A1) 62.7% 61.0% 69.8% 50.9%

*Diresapivirus B*† (diresapivirus B1) 64.1% 61.3% 69.8% 48.7%

*Enterovirus* *Enterovirus A* (enterovirus A71) 67.7% 62.2% 63.5% 54.0%

*Enterovirus B* (enterovirus B1) 66.6% 63.1% 65.2% 52.5%

*Enterovirus C* (poliovirus 1) 66.8% 61.3% 63.5% 54.1%

*Enterovirus D* (enterovirus D68) 67.5% 64.2% 63.0% 52.2%

*Enterovirus E* (enterovirus E1) 64.5% 63.1% 61.9% 54.4%

*Enterovirus F* (enterovirus F1) 65.2% 64.9% 62.4% 53.5%

*Enterovirus G* (enterovirus G1) 66.0% 63.7% 64.6% 53.1%

*Enterovirus H* (enterovirus H1) 66.1% 61.9% 68.0% 53.9%

*Enterovirus I* (enterovirus I1) 64.1% 64.6% 63.0% 53.7%

*Enterovirus J* (enterovirus J1) 64.5% 63.2% 62.4% 52.1%

*Enterovirus K* (enterovirus K1) 66.5% 60.3% 65.9% 53.9%

*Enterovirus L* (enterovirus L1) 66.3% 61.8% 61.9% 52.2%

*Rhinovirus A* (human rhinovirus A9) 68.8% 63.8% 66.3% 53.5%

*Rhinovirus B* (human rhinovirus B3) 68.4% 60.6% 65.6% 50.8%

*Rhinovirus C* (human rhinovirus C1) 69.6% 64.9% 70.7% 52.0%

*Felipivirus*† *Felipivirus A*† (felipivirus A1) 59.1% 63.4% 65.6% 50.2%

*Parabovirus*† *Parabovirus A*† (parabovirus A1) 60.1% 63.0% 61.1% 51.1%

Parabovirus B† (parabovirus B1) 61.1% 65.4% 65.0% 49.8%

Parabovirus C† (parabovirus C1) 60.6% 61.5% 66.1% 51.3%

*Rabovirus Rabovirus A* (rabovirus A1) 63.0% 63.5% 60.0% 52.4%

*Rabovirus B* (rabovirus B1) 63.1% 61.9% 66.1% 53.7%

*Rabovirus C* (rabovirus C1) 60.6% 63.9% 63.9% 51.1%

*Rabovirus D* (rabovirus D1) 62.6% 62.0% 64.4% 53.1%

*Sapelovirus Sapelovirus A* (sapelovirus A1) 59.2% 62.6% 60.6% 50.4%

*Sapelovirus B* (sapelovirus B1) 57.9% 59.8% 61.1% 50.4%

\* number of amino acid differences per site

† proposed taxa

**Exemplar:**

*Anativirus B*, anativirus B1 (phacovirus) strain Pf-CHK1/PhV, GenBank acc. no. KT880670

**Species demarcation criteria:**

Members of a species of the genus *Anativirus*:

- are less than 30% divergent in polyprotein aa sequence,

- are less than 40% divergent in P1 aa sequence,

- are less than 35% divergent in 2C+3CD aa sequence,

- share a common genome organization,
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**Figure 1:** Genome of anatiruses (schematic depiction). The open reading frame is indicated by a box. Positions of putative 3Cpro cleavage sites are indicated by a ▼ and the VP0 processing site by a ¶. The names and lengths of the deduced proteins are presented. The 5'-UTR may be incomplete. *Note*: anativirus lack a functional 2A protein; the significance of a Q/G site at aa position 1307/08 (anativirus A1), 1260/61 (anativirus B1) and 1258/59 (anativirus B2) is unclear. The resulting peptides have a length of 6-8 amino acids.

**Figure 2:** Conserved repeat elements of anativirus L protein. IUPAC standard one-letter abbreviations are used; X, any amino acid.



**Legend to Figure 3:**  Phylogenetic analysis of picornavirus **P1** using Bayesian tree inference (MrBayes 3.2). Eighty-nine picornavirus sequences of the *Anativirus/Enterovirus/Rabovirus/Sapelovirus* supergroup were retrieved from GenBank; the enterovirus sequence served as outgroup. [Note: the supergroup does not imply a taxonomic entity but reflects phylogenetic clustering of the respective genera observed in different tree inference methods (NJ, ML, Bayesian MCMC).] Presented are GenBank accession numbers, ***genus*** ***names***, *species names*, type and—if available—common names in round brackets. Designations of isolates are given in square brackets. Yet unassigned viruses are printed in blue. The proposed name is printed in red and indicated by a dot (●). Numbers at nodes indicate posterior probabilities obtained after 2,000,000 generations. The optimal substitution model (GTR+G+I) was determined with MEGA 5. The scale indicates substitutions/site.



**Legend to Figure 4:**  Phylogenetic analysis of picornavirus **3CD** using Bayesian tree inference (MrBayes 3.2). Ninty-two picornavirus sequences of the *Anativirus/Enterovirus/Rabovirus/Sapelovirus* supergroup were retrieved from GenBank; the cardiovirus sequence served as outgroup. [Note: the supergroup does not imply a taxonomic entity but reflects phylogenetic clustering of the respective genera observed in different tree inference methods (NJ, ML, Bayesian MCMC).] Presented are GenBank accession numbers, ***genus*** ***names***, *species names*, type and—if available—common names in round brackets. Designations of isolates are given in square brackets. Yet unassigned viruses are printed in blue. The proposed name is printed in red and indicated by a dot (●). Numbers at nodes indicate posterior probabilities obtained after 15,000,000 generations. The optimal substitution model (GTR+G+I) was determined with MEGA 5. The scale indicates substitutions/site.