The remarkable evolutionary history of Short endornaviruses Communication Marilyn J. Roossinck,¹† Sead Sabanadzovic,² Ryo Okada³ and Rodrigo A. Valverde⁴ Correspondence ¹The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation, Plant Biology Division, Ardmore, OK 73402, USA Marilyn J. Roossinck ²Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology and Plant Pathology, Mississippi State mjr25@psu.edu University, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA ³Laboratory of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Faculty of Agriculture, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Tokyo 183-8509, Japan ⁴Department of Plant Pathology and Crop Physiology, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA The family Endornaviridae contains several members from diverse hosts, including plants, fungi and oomycetes. They are found as large dsRNA elements with a nick in the coding strand. All members encode a conserved RNA-dependent RNA polymerase, but no other domain that is conserved among all members. Based on the conserved domain database comparison the various domains have different origins, indicating a highly modular evolutionary history. In some cases, domains with similar putative functions are found that are derived from different protein families, Received 1 June 2011 Accepted 19 July 2011 indicating convergent evolution for a required function.

The endornaviruses are large dsRNA viruses that were first described from plants in the early 1990s (Valverde et al., 1990; Wakarchuk & Hamilton, 1990) and later found in fungi and oomycetes (Fukuhara et al., 2006), although a large dsRNA from Vicia faba was described in the early 1980s (Grill & Garger, 1981), which later proved to be an endornavirus. The first completed sequence was from a virus in rice in the mid 1990s (Moriyama et al., 1995). Endornaviruses have recently been awarded family status (Endornaviridae) by the International Committee for the Taxonomy of Viruses (http://www.ictvonline.org/ virusTaxonomy.asp?version=2009). They have a number of unique properties, including no evidence of encapsidation, a single very long ORF with a nick in the plus strand and the presence of a poly-C 3' end in some, but not all members of the group (Fukuhara et al., 2006). Endornaviruses have a persistent lifestyle in their hosts (Roossinck, 2010), and no evidence of horizontal transmission in plants or fungi, or of cell-to-cell movement in plants. They share a number of similar domains in their ORFs, but only the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) is clearly homologous among all species. The other domains are remarkable in that they are found in some, but not all members of the family, and they are not homologous. In addition, many endornaviruses

contain a glycosyltransferase (GT) domain, a highly unusual protein for RNA viruses.

The sequences of the 11 completed genomes of members and putative members of the family Endornaviridae were analysed by phylogenetic analysis and for conserved domains using the conserved domain database (CDD) through the NCBI website (Marchler-Bauer et al., 2011). When two closely related isolates had been sequenced, only one was used for the CDD analysis (nine in total), while all 11 were used for the phylogenetic analysis of the RdRp. Virus names, abbreviations and GenBank accession numbers are listed in Supplementary Table S1 (available in JGV Online). Domain hits with expect values larger than 10^{-2} were not considered. The various domains are shown in Table 1, with their protein families shown in different colours. Viruses are ordered by the size of their genomes. Two of the nine viruses, Bell pepper endornavirus (BPEV) and Gremmeniella abietina type B RNA virus XL1 (GaBRV-XL), contain a methyltransferase (MeTr) domain that is related to postive-sense ssRNA viruses. However, in the remaining seven viruses this domain is not detected, although we cannot rule out a highly diverged and unrecognizable MeTr domain. The MeTr in ssRNA viruses is used to add an m^7G cap structure to the 5' end of the viral RNA, but experimental proof of a cap structure has not been shown for any endornavirus. Both BPEV and GaBRV-XL MeTr domains are most similar to Sunn-hemp mosaic virus (SHMV), a tobamovirus. However, while there is some overlap in the conserved domains, the similarity is more

[†]Present address: Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA.

A supplementary table is available with the online version of this paper.

Virus	Host	MeTr*	Hel	Hel 2	GT	GT 2	RdRp	Length (bp)†
TaEV	Fungus	None	cl14882		None		cl03049	9760
GABrV-XL1	Fungus	cl03298	cl14882	cl14126	None		cl03049	10374
CeEV-1	Fungus	None	cl14126		cl10013		cl03049	11602
PEV-1	Oomycete	None	cl14126		cl10013		cl03049	13883
ORV	Plant	None	None		cl12292	cl10013	cl03049	13936
OSV	Plant	None	None		cl12292	cl10013	cl03049	13952
BPEV-KS	Plant	cl03298	cl14126		cl10013		cl03049	14727
HmEV-1	Fungus	None	None		cl07328		cl03049	16614
VFV	Plant	None	cl14126		None		cl03049	17635

Table 1. Superfamilies of protein domains in endornavirus polyproteins

Domains are in the same order as found in the polyprotein ORF.

*Protein domains are shown in different colours based on the protein superfamily they belong to. cl14882 is the DEAD-like helicase superfamily; cl03049 is the RdRp superfamily that includes most ssRNA virus RdRps; cl103298 is the methyl-transferase family that includes the ssRNA alpha virus MeTr, involved in capping viral RNA; cl14126 is the UvrD/REP helicase family that catalyses the ATP-dependent unwinding of DNA; cl10013 is a GT superfamily that shares a common GTB topology for nucleotide-sugar-dependentglycosyltransferases; cl12292 is another GT superfamily that contains a DXD motif, and uses nucleoside diphosphate sugars as donors; cl107328 is a third GT superfamily that is membrane associated, and is also known as the 28 N-terminal.

†Length in bp of the viral genomic RNA.

extensive between GaBRV-XL and SHMV than between BPEV and SHMV. In addition, many of the other viral MeTr domains most similar to BPEV are of mycovirus origin, while the GaBRV-XL MeTr is closer to plant viruses, even though GaBRV-XL is a fungal virus, while BPEV is a plant virus (Fig. 1). These differences suggest that the MeTr was acquired independently by the two viruses.

Most of the endornaviruses also contain a conserved helicase domain, although the two rice viruses, Oryza sativa endornavirus (OSV) and its closely related sister species Oryza rufipogon endornavirus (ORV) Helicobasidium mompa endornavirus 1 (HmEV1), and the root rot fungus virus do not by the criteria used here. Hence, if they do have a functional helicase it is too diverged from known helicases to be readily recognized. The origin of the helicase domains in the remaining six viruses is clearly different. Two of the fungal viruses, GaBRV-XL and Tuber aestivum endornavirus (TaEV) contain DEAD-like helicase domains, a diverse family of ATP-dependent helicases involved in unwinding RNA or DNA, and the remainder of the endornaviruses contain Uvr-B-like domains that are found in a number of ssRNA virus replicases. GaBRV-XL has both types of helicase (Table 1).

Six of the nine endornaviruses contain GT domains, but these are also from diverse origins (Table 1). Three of the four plant endornaviruses contain GTs from different sources. BPEV contains a GT domain that is most similar to bacterial GTs involved in the synthesis of antibiotics. This domain is also found in *Phytophthora* endornavirus 1

(PEV1), an oomycete virus, and Chalara elegans endornavirus 1 (CeEV1), a fungal virus. OSV and ORV, the rice viruses, contain a different type of GT with a DXD motif. This is a very diverse family of GTs found in many organisms. They also contain an additional GT motif that is in the same family as the BPEV GT domain. The fourth plant endornavirus, Vicia faba endornavirus (VFV) from broad bean, does not contain a GT domain. HmEV1 contains yet another GT motif from the '28 N family'. These GTs are characterized by an N-terminal domain that is probably membrane associated. It is highly unusual for RNA viruses to encode GTs. The only other GTs described in RNA viruses are found in some, but not all, of the hypoviruses of Cryphonectria (Linder-Basso et al., 2005; Smart et al., 1999). These GTs belong to the same superfamily as the GT in BPEV. Interestingly, the hypoviruses, like the endornaviruses, are found as dsRNAs in their infected hosts, lack any evidence of encapsidation, and have RdRps that are ssRNA RdRps. The function of the GTs in any of these viruses is unknown. They could play roles in protecting the viral RNA from degradation by modifying the RNA, or cellular membranes surrounding the RNA.

All of the endornaviruses encode an RdRp at the C terminus of the long ORF. These are all similar, and are the only highly conserved domain in members and putative members of the family *Endornaviridae*. They are related to the RdRps of ssRNA viruses, rather than dsRNA RdRps, and are closest to the RdRps of closteroviruses. The RdRp amino acid sequences of the nine viruses, plus an additional strain of

1	1
(2	a).
10	~/

BPEV-KS SHMV OMSV BVF BVX GVE BmMLV EMV PhyMV GRVFV	244 47 38 40 39 39 38 38 38 38 169	.[89].PCLDWRDVE .[78].PALDARDLA .[79].EIITPADHT .[81].YAITARDHV .[80].YAREAKDLS .[77].YCHEPKDVL .[78].FRHTPKDIT .[78].FRLTAADTT .[78].YRLTSADTC .[78].YSLVARDIT	RY.[26].LI RN.[74].AT RY.[15].II RY.[15].LF RF.[15].AV RY.[12].AF RY.[12].CF RY.[12].CF RY.[12].WF	SVDAMYDIDP SLHSLYDIPY VDDALQHWSRI MHDALQYMTPI LHDTLHFLSPI VISDTLHFMSTI MHDALMFITPS MHDALMYFSPI MHDALMYYHPS MHDSIMYLSAI	TDVISLM.[1]. 2NLGPAL.[1]. ERIDAAF LDVYTLF.[1]. RQLAQLF.[1]. 4QVWTLF.[1]. SQILGLF.[1]. AQIVDLF.[1]. SQILDLF.[1].	RTG.[2].QL RKR IK RHF GG TSP EM HNP NL NNP KL DSP SM QSP AL SCE QL ACP HL	.[1].FCLST VLHAA.[4] .[1].RLIGT.[4] .[1].SLVAT.[4] .[1].LLYAT.[4] .[1].LLYAT.[4] .[1].RLYGT.[4] .[1].SLYCS.[4] .[1].TLYCS.[4] .[1].RLYAS.[4]	AEVDFENT - EDLLLGAS - DEVRSGHA - PESVDRLE - VEALHNLE - VEALHKLE - AEAAYGVE - PESHFTDI - PESHFTDI - PESSFTDI	410 251 184 189 187 184 181 181 181 181 181
BPEV-KS SHMV OMSV BVF BVX GVE BmMLV EMV PhyMV GRVFV	411 252 185 190 188 185 182 182 182 313	NGKLAHGQGEW.[2] EGLLTQIGGTF SRYPDLYTIEY AFWPELYQLAY SLNPHAYTLEY SLFPEIYKLEY SLFPDLYSYTI SLFPEIYTYKI SLYPSVYTYQI SLNPSLYRYRF	.HDDK QRNG.[2]. LPNR.[1]. YEDH FSNG.[1]. YERH KDDQ SGQT HGRT HGDQ	LVTVLRGD LTFSFLDE.[] YGLLSHRH.[] LCYAPDGN.[] FAYMPGGH.[] FAYMPGGY.[] LVYTLEGN.[] LHYIPENH.[] LHYIPESH.[] LIYRLEEN.[]	DRPYVNNW 1].SLIYTHSF. 1].SASYEASI 1].ADAYNQPL 1].GSGYYHSA 1].GGAYIHSY 1].TGNYTQPL 1].SGSYNQPL 1].AGSYDQPL 1].SHSYQQPK	KLTK.[[1].NVFE DEAW AAHQ ETLH GTLK RSLD QAPS DALS AALK	L].WSTADLIQ YVTRTFFV MLDCGDFT WMTMKSLH WLRAGQIK WLSTAQIG.[: WLRSGIS WLKISSIL WLKISSIL WLKIHSIP WLQTNSIQ	AGHV 4 ACNR 3 VDDR 2 GPDF 2 LGHF 2 SGDL 2 SPSL 2 HPSL 2 GNDI 3	60 33 37 36 47 29 29 29 29
BPEV-KS SHMV OMSV BVF BVX GVE BmMLV EMV PhyMV GRVFV	461 303 234 238 237 248 230 230 230 230 361	ELSVQTVKTI .[1].AYMKEFRSRR AYDVEFLLSY TLSVDVPASR SLSLNKEDSF HLSIEKIETK HLSVTLLESF ALSVTKLESW TLSVTRLESW FLAITRLESW	SNH II VDT.[4].FI SPY.[4].VV YSH.[4].IS GAH.[4].VI AAH.[4].IQ VSV.[4].II SPV.[4].IQ GPC.[4].IQ GPV.[4].II	IR. [2].T. [19] IR. [2].T. [19] VP. [2].G. [SK. [2].G. [VR. [3].P. [QR R. [IR. [2].Q. [QR G. [10] QR GR GR GR GR GR GR GR GR GR G. [51]. 630 51]. 477 54]. 320 54]. 324 63]. 323 70]. 338 55]. 317 07]. 357 07]. 357 58]. 449				

BPEV (BPEV-YW) and an additional strain of GaBRV-XL (GaBRV-XL2) were aligned along with the RdRp of *Pineapple mealybug wilt-associated virus* 1 (PMWaV-1; family *Closteroviridae*, genus *Ampelovirus*), which was used as an outgroup for phylogenetic analysis. Initial alignments were done in MAFFT and were edited manually using Mesquite 2.74 (Maddison & Maddison, 2010). Aligned sequences were imported into Geneious (www.geneious. com) and analysed via a MrBayes (Ronquist & Huelsenbeck, 2003) plugin. The rate matrix was set to a Poisson distribution with a gamma rate variation. Burn-in was 100 000 and total chain length was 1 100 000. Branch lengths were unconstrained. Tree topologies were confirmed using PhyML (Guindon *et al.*, 2009) and PAUP 4.0 Beta 4b10 (Swofford, 2002), which gave very similar trees (not shown).

The topology of the tree does not follow the relationships of the hosts. For example, VFV, a plant virus, is most closely related to CeEV-1, a fungal virus, and the oomycete virus PEV-1 is a sister virus to these two (Fig. 2). The two rice viruses form a separate clade that is closer to the root rot virus (HmEV-1) than it is to the Bell pepper virus. One explanation is that these viruses have a common origin, most likely in fungi, and have been transmitted horizontally at some time in their history. The accompanying paper on BPEV suggests that short-term evolution may be congruent with a host group, but long-term evolution clearly is not.

The relationships of the viruses inferred from their RdRps follow the relationships based on shared domains in several cases, but not always. For example, CeEV-1, VFV and PEV-1 all share helicase domains, but while CeEV-1 and PEV-1 contain GT domains from the same superfamily, VFV lacks a GT domain altogether (Table 1). BPEV and GaBRV-XL are the only viruses with a MeTr domain, but they are found in distal portions of the tree (Fig. 2). TaEV and GaBRV-XL form a separate clade by RdRp analysis and share a Hel domain from the same superfamily, but TaEV does not contain the MeTr domain. In addition, GaBRV-XL contains a second Hel domain (a UVR-D Hel domain) that is shared with several other endornaviruses. HmEV-1, closest to the rice viruses by RdRp, shares the lack of a Hel domain with them, but has a different GT domain that is not found in any of the other viruses.

This interesting and highly modular arrangement of domains in the endornaviruses suggests that they have acquired various functional domains from different sources and/or at different times during their evolution. The lack of domains in some viruses could mean that these domains were not acquired or that the domains were in some ancestral virus and subsequently lost. The occurrence of domains with similar functions from obviously different sources, such as the Hel and GT domains from different protein superfamilies indicates a convergent pattern of (b)

GaBRV-XL1 SHMV AltMV AMV CiLRV TVCV ORSV TMGMV PMMV PEBV	233[29].AAHSHIYHHANRL.[1].LTEMLAS.[4].NALLYDIGGNINRHLDHGRLNVHCVYTTS47.[29].TSHA.[1].AAGLRG.[2].LEYLYTLVPYGAVSYDIGGNFPAHMMKGRSYVHCCNPAL39.[25].RAHTHAAAKS.[2].LDMYKITGYS.[5].PITFLFMKRSKLQYFHRGP.[1].HGDLFLNAWIH68.[29].SSHC.[1].AAAHRL.[2].TDFVYRCFGN.[1].VDSIIDLGGNFVSHMKVKRHNVHCCCPIL59.[29].SSHA.[1].AAAHRV.[2].TDYIYSRFQT.[1].NTTIIDIGGNFSTHAKMGRSNVHSCCPIL50.[29].AVHS.[1].AGGLRS.[2].LEYLMMQVPFGSLTYDIGGNFSAHLFKGRDYVHCCMPNL50.[29].AVHS.[1].AGGLRA.[2].LEYLMMQIFFGSITYDIGGNFAAHLFKGRDYVHCCMPNL50.[29].AVHS.[1].AGGLRS.[2].LEYLMMQIPYGSTYDIGGNFAAHLFKGRDYVHCCMPNL50.[29].AVHS.[1].AGGLRS.[2].LEYLMMQIPYGSTYDIGGNFAAHLFKGRDYVHCCMPNL63.[29].MVHG.[1].AAAERK.[2].ALLLMARVPKLEPVDDIGGQWSFWLSRGDKRVHSSCPIL	315 127 149 140 130 130 130 130
GaBRV-XL1 SHMV AltMV AMV CiLRV TVCV ORSV TMGMV PMMV PEBV	316TPADLSRH. [29].ASMIKEDNS. [19].AMSIDTLVHLDPSDLIKFY. [1].DN. [1].VAHASH. [1].MTIPDNYAY128DARDLARN. [8].NYLSRFEDK. [57].ATSLHSLYDIPYQNLGPAL. [1].RK. [3].VLHAAFHFSEDLLLG121EPKDVTRY. [8].SITPEIQTR. [1].AFIGDTLHFLPLGAIREIF. [1].NS. [4].TLYATMVLPPEAMHR150DARDGARL. [8].SYVRKHPEI. [20].AFAIHSTSDLDVGELACSL. [1].QK. [3].KFICTMMVDADMLIH141DVHDGERY. [8].GALEKQPDR. [20].AMAIHSISDIPITTVVKHC. [1].RR. [3].KLIASIMDGSNDVNR131DVRDIARH. [8].SYVNRLKRQ. [42].AVALHSIYDIPVEEFGSAL. [1].RK. [3].TCFAAFHFHENMLLD131DIRDVARH. [8].TYLARLERS. [42].AVGLHSIYDIPADEFGAAL. [1].RK. [3].VCYAAFHFSENLLLE131DLRDVMRH. [8].LYLSKLAQK. [42].AVALHSLYDIPADEFGAAL. [1].RR. [3].VCYAAFHFSENLLLE144DMRDKQRE. [8].VFRDNATTS. [50].AIALHSLYDFKLDDVADAM. [1].EK. [3].FLHAAMLFAPEAELE	419 249 187 234 225 237 237 238 237 238 237
GABRV-XL1 SHMV AltMV AMV CiLRV TVCV ORSV TMGMV PMMV PEBV	420 A.[1].KGVLRHNEGHWYRTN.[5].IEFVGESLSYEQKVSYTD.[1].YLQTLIFTAGEM472250 A.[1].EGLLTQIGGTFQRNG.[2].LTFSFL.[3].SLIYTHSF.[1].NVFEYVTRTFFVACNR302188 M.[1].SIHPSIYELEFHERNFIYKPG.[3].GASYCHEYSQLQWLKVGKFE.[5].YQKH242235 NEGEIPNFNVRWEIDR.[4].IHFDFI.[3].NLGYSHRF.[1].LLKHYLTYNAVDLGHA288226 HRSFIPRLNVRWEVET.[6].ISFHFV.[3].GLSYTHNF.[1].VLMQYMTCNQVIVTGK281238 C.[1].TVTLDEIGATFQKSG.[2].LSFFFH.[3].TLNYTHSF.[1].NIIKYVCKTFFPASQR290238 T.[1].SAPLDEIGATFYKSG.[2].LSFFFQ.[3].TLNYEHSY.[1].NVIKYVCKTFFPASNR290239 Q.[1].EVTLNEIGATFKREG.[2].VSFFFA.[3].TLNYSHKY.[1].NILHYVVKSYFPASSR291238 D.[1].YVSLDDIGAFFSREG.[2].LNFSFV.[3].TLNYTHSY.[1].NVLKYVCKTYFPASSR290259 KEGPLPSVDGYYERKE.[8].IFFGFN.[3].SYAYIHDW.[1].EYKKYLRGEPFSRRGH316	
GaBRV-XL1 SHMV AltMV CiLRV TVCV ORSV TMGMV PMMV PEBV	473AVYNKVVGRKGPHML.[3].FLITRAKL.[14].MDEIFVMIPEIDFDSAVTLMK533303.[1].AYMKEFRSRRVDTVFCSFIRIDT.[52].KDKVCLP.[11].V.[1].TRH.[5].DFYWTALNHI416243YVTSQILETKGANHLFVFQRGNF.[2].PTYRTFGV.[1].TKF.[5].IFLPKKYNAR294289AYRIERKQDFGGVMVIDLTYSLG.[19].KGQMVVH.[13].A.[1].RRK.[5].KVLTRVTEVA370282.[1].AYRVERVADLSGVFIVEITLAST.[21].RKKTLVR.[9].W.[1].IKH.[5].DFVRVAEVS362291.[1].VYHKEFLVTRVNTWYCKFTRVDT.[54].RDMVIVP.[10].M.[1].RRE.[5].DFVYTVLNHI405292.[1].VYFKEFLVTRVNTWFCKFTKVDT.[54].KDMVIVP.[10].M.[1].RSE.[5].DFVYTVLNHI406291.[1].VYMKEFLVTRVNTWFCKFTKVDT.[54].KDMVIVP.[10].M.[1].RSE.[5].DFVYTVLNHI407317VFMFEPWQARGDTMFFTLYRMTG.[20].EGMVVVP.[10].L.[1].KSS.[5].AYMDKCLDYV396	
Gabrv-xL1 SHMV AltMV AMV CiLRV TVCV ORSV TMGMV PMMV PEBV	<pre>534 .[1].EPFTMKTVSINLRFYERLLNRLLQ.[35]. 593 417 .[2].YPDGKADFRGVMSFLESIRSRVVI.[35]. 477 295 YPIKKTVAQQLFLYIKSVKTVTER.[12]. 330 371 .[6].NADAHSAIQSIATMLSSSTNHTII.[35]. 435 363 .[6].DTPLENLVQSVATMISSASNHCVI.[35]. 427 406 .[2].YQAKALTYANVLSFVESIRSRVII.[35]. 466 406 .[2].YQDKALTYKNVLSFVESIRSRVII.[35]. 466 407 .[2].YQAKALTYQNVLSFVESIRSRVII.[35]. 467 408 .[2].YQSKALTYANVLSFVESIRSRVII.[35]. 468 397 .[2].LSDQQLTINNVKSFMSSNNWVLFI.[35]. 457</pre>	

Fig. 1. The MeTr domains of BPEV (a) and GaBRV-XL1 (b). Alignments were generated by the NCBI CDD tool. Numbers refer to the position of the domains in their respective proteins/polyproteins. Viruses not mentioned in the text are: Oyster mushroom sperical virus (OMSV), *Botrytis virus F* (BFV), *Botrytis virus X* (BVX), *Garlic virus E* (GVE), *Bombyx mori Macula-like latent virus* (BmMLC), *Eggplant mosaic virus* (EMV), *Physalis mottle virus* (PhyMV), Grapevine rupestis vein feathering virus (GRVFV), Alternanthera mosaic virus (AltMV), *Alfalfa mosaic virus* (AlMV), *Citrus leaf rugose virus* (CiLRV), *Turnip vein-clearing virus* (TVCV), *Odontoglossum ringspot virus* (ORSV), *Tobacco mild green mosaic virus* (TMGMV), *Pepper mild mottle virus* (PMMV) and *Pea early browning virus* (PEBV).



Fig. 2. Phylogeny of endornavirus RdRps. Bayesian analysis of the relationships among aligned amino acid sequences of the RdRps. PMWaV-1 was used as an outgroup. Relative branch lengths are indicated by numbers above branches. Virus GenBank accession numbers and abbreviations are given in Supplementary Table S1.

evolution. Although the method of acquisition of these domains is not known, it suggests a very complex and dynamic evolutionary history that is unprecedented in other families of plant or fungal viruses.

Since the endornaviruses do not have any known effects on their hosts, they have been understudied. However, sequence analysis of more endornavirus genomes will certainly shed new light on this interesting virus family.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Dr Ping Xu for carefully reading of the manuscript. This work was supported in part by the Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation, and by the National Science Foundation (grant EF-067108 to M.R.). This manuscript is approved for publication as journal article no. 12039 of the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station, MSU.

References

Fukuhara, T., Koga, R., Aoki, N., Yuki, C., Yamamoto, N., Oyama, N., Udagawa, T., Horiuchi, H., Miyazaki, S. & other authors (2006). The wide distribution of endornaviruses, large double-stranded RNA replicons with plasmid-like properties. *Arch Virol* 151, 995–1002.

Grill, L. K. & Garger, S. J. (1981). Identification and characterization of double-stranded RNA associated with cytoplasmic male sterility in *Vicia faba. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **78**, 7043–7046.

Guindon, S., Delsuc, F., Dufayard, J. F. & Gascuel, O. (2009). Estimating maximum likelihood phylogenies with PhyML. *Methods Mol Biol* 537, 113–137.

Linder-Basso, D., Dynek, J. N. & Hillman, B. I. (2005). Genome analysis of *Cryphonectria hypovirus* 4, the most common hypovirus species in North America. *Virology* 337, 192–203.

Maddison, W. P. & Maddison, D. R. (2010). Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis, 2.74 edn. http://mesquiteproject.org/mesquite/mesquite.html

Marchler-Bauer, A., Lu, S., Anderson, J. B., Chitsaz, F., Derbyshire, M. K., DeWeese-Scott, C., Fong, J. H., Geer, L. Y., Geer, R. C. & other authors (2011). CDD: a conserved domain database for the functional annotation of proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res* **39** (Database issue), D225–D229.

Moriyama, H., Nitta, T. & Fukuhara, T. (1995). Double-stranded RNA in rice: a novel RNA replicon in plants. *Mol Gen Genet* 248, 364–369.

Ronquist, F. & Huelsenbeck, J. P. (2003). MrBayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. *Bioinformatics* **19**, 1572–1574.

Roossinck, M. J. (2010). Lifestyles of plant viruses. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **365**, 1899–1905.

Smart, C. D., Yuan, W., Foglia, R., Nuss, D. L., Fulbright, D. W. & Hillman, B. I. (1999). *Cryphonectria hypovirus* 3, a virus species in the family *Hypoviridae* with a single open reading frame. *Virology* **265**, 66–73.

Swofford, D. L. (2002). PAUP*: Phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (and other methods), version 4. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Valverde, R. A., Nameth, S., Abdallha, O., Al-Musa, O., Desjardins, P. & Dodds, A. (1990). Indigenous double-stranded RNA from pepper (*Capsicum annuum*). *Plant Sci* 67, 195–201.

Wakarchuk, D. A. & Hamilton, R. I. (1990). Partial nucleotide sequence from enigmatic dsRNAs in *Phaseolus vulgaris*. *Plant Mol Biol* 14, 637–639.