1 **The evolution, diversity and host associations of rhabdoviruses**
2

3 **Ben Longdon[1]*, Gemma GR Murray[1], William J Palmer[1], Jonathan P Day[1], Darren J**
4 **Parker[2, 3], John J Welch[1], Darren J Obbard[4] and Francis M Jiggins[1].**
5

6 [1]Department of Genetics
7 University of Cambridge
8 Cambridge
9 CB2 3EH
10 UK
11

12 [2] School of Biology
13 University of St. Andrews
14 St. Andrews
15 KY19 9ST
16 UK
17

18 [3]Department of Biological and Environmental Science,
19 University of Jyväskylä,
20 Jyväskylä,
21 Finland
22

23 [4]Institute of Evolutionary Biology, and Centre for Immunity Infection and Evolution
24 University of Edinburgh
25 Edinburgh
26 EH9 3JT
27 UK
28

29 *corresponding author
30 email: b.longdon@gen.cam.ac.uk
31 phone: +441223333945
32
33

Abstract

Metagenomic studies are leading to the discovery of a hidden diversity of RNA viruses. These new viruses are poorly characterised and new approaches are needed predict the host species these viruses pose a risk to. The rhabdoviruses are a diverse family of RNA viruses that includes important pathogens of humans, animals and plants. We have discovered 32 new rhabdoviruses through a combination of our own RNA sequencing of insects and searching public sequence databases. Combining these with previously known sequences we reconstructed the phylogeny of 195 rhabdovirus sequences, and produced the most in depth analysis of the family to date. In most cases we know nothing about the biology of the viruses beyond the host they were identified from, but our dataset provides a powerful phylogenetic approach to predict which are vector-borne viruses and which are specific to vertebrates or arthropods. By reconstructing ancestral and present host states we found that switches between major groups of hosts have occurred rarely during rhabdovirus evolution. This allowed us to propose 76 new likely vector-borne vertebrate viruses among viruses identified from vertebrates or biting insects. Based on currently available data, our analysis suggests it is likely there was a single origin of the known plant viruses and arthropod-borne vertebrate viruses, while vertebrate-specific and arthropod-specific viruses arose at least twice. There are also few transitions between aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Viruses also cluster together at a finer scale, with closely related viruses tending to be found in closely related hosts. Our data therefore suggest that throughout their evolution, rhabdoviruses have occasionally jumped between distantly related host species before spreading through related hosts in the same environment. This approach offers a way to predict the most probable biology and key traits of newly discovered viruses.

Keywords
Virus, Host shift, Arthropod, Insect, Rhabdoviridae, Mononegavirales

63   **Introduction**
64
RNA viruses are an abundant and diverse group of pathogens. In the past, viruses were
typically isolated from hosts displaying symptoms of infection, before being
characterized morphologically and then sequenced following PCR [1, 2]. PCR-based
detection of novel RNA viruses is problematic as there is no single conserved region of
the genome shared by all viruses from a single family, let alone across all RNA viruses.
High throughput next generation sequencing technology has revolutionized virus
discovery, allowing rapid detection and sequencing of divergent virus sequences simply
by sequencing total RNA from infected individuals [1, 2]
73
One particularly diverse family of RNA viruses is the *Rhabdoviridae*. Rhabdoviruses are
negative-sense single-stranded RNA viruses in the order *Mononegavirales* [3]. They
infect an extremely broad range of hosts and have been discovered in plants, fish,
mammals, reptiles and a broad range of insects and other arthropods [4]. The family
includes important pathogens of humans and livestock. Perhaps the most well-known is
rabies virus, which can infect a diverse array of mammals and causes a fatal infection
killing 59,000 people per year with an estimated economic cost of $8.6 billion (US) [5].
Other rhabdoviruses, such as vesicular stomatitis virus and bovine ephemeral fever
virus, are important pathogens of domesticated animals, while others are pathogens of
crops [3].
84
Arthropods play a key role in the transmission of many rhabdoviruses. Many viruses
found in vertebrates have also been detected in arthropods, including sandflies,
mosquitoes, ticks and midges [6]. The rhabdoviruses that infect plants are also often
transmitted by arthropods [7] and some that infect fish can potentially be vectored by
ectoparasitic copepod sea-lice [8, 9]. Moreover, insects are biological vectors;
rhabdoviruses replicate upon infection of insect vectors [7]. Other rhabdoviruses are
insect-specific. In particular, the sigma viruses are a clade of vertically transmitted
viruses that infect dipterans and are well-studied in *Drosophila* [10-12]. Recently, a
number of rhabdoviruses have been found to be associated with a wide array of insect
and other arthropod species, suggesting they may be common arthropod viruses [13,
14]. Furthermore, a number of arthropod genomes contain integrated endogenous viral
elements (EVEs) with similarity to rhabdoviruses, suggesting that these species have
been infected with rhabdoviruses at some point in their history [15-18].
98
Here we explore the diversity of the rhabdoviruses, and examine how they have
switched between different host taxa during their evolutionary history. Insects infected
with rhabdoviruses commonly become paralysed on exposure to CO_2 [19-21]. We
exploited this fact to screen field collections of flies from several continents for novel
rhabdoviruses that were then sequenced using metagenomic RNA-sequencing (RNA-
seq). Additionally we searched for rhabdovirus-like sequences in publicly available
RNA-seq data. We identified 32 novel rhabdovirus-like sequences from a wide array of
invertebrates and plants, and combined them with recently discovered viruses to
produce the most comprehensive phylogeny of the rhabdoviruses to date. For many of
the viruses we do not know their true host range, so we used the phylogeny to identify a

large number of new likely vector-borne viruses and to reconstruct the evolutionary
history of this diverse group of viruses.
111
112
113 **Methods**
114
115 *Discovery of new rhabdoviruses by RNA sequencing*
116
Diptera (flies, mostly Drosophilidae) were collected in the field from Spain, USA, Kenya,
France, Ghana and the UK (Data S1: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425432).
Infection with rhabdoviruses can cause *Drosophila* and other insects to become
paralysed after exposure to CO_2 [19-21], so we enriched our sample for infected
individuals by exposing them to CO_2 at 12°C for 15 mins, only retaining individuals that
showed symptoms of paralysis 30mins later. We extracted RNA from 79 individual
insects (details in Data S1 http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425432) using
Trizol reagent (Invitrogen) and combined the extracts into two pools (retaining non-
pooled individual RNA samples). RNA was then rRNA depleted with the Ribo-Zero Gold
kit (epicenter, USA) and used to construct Truseq total RNA libraries (Illumina).
Libraries were constructed and sequenced by BGI (Hong Kong) on an Illumina Hi-Seq
2500 (one lane, 100bp paired end reads, generating ~175 million reads). Sequences
were quality trimmed with Trimmomatic (v3); Illumina adapters were clipped, bases
were removed from the beginning and end of reads if quality dropped below a
threshold, sequences were trimmed if the average quality within a window fell below a
threshold and reads less than 20 base pairs in length were removed. We *de novo*
assembled the RNA-seq reads with Trinity (release 2013-02-25) using default settings
and jaccard clip option for high gene density. The assembly was then searched using
tblastn to identify rhabdovirus-like sequences, with known rhabdovirus coding
sequences as the query. Any contigs with high sequence similarity to rhabdoviruses
were then reciprocally compared to Genbank cDNA and RefSeq nucleotide databases
using tblastn and only retained if they most closely matched a virus-like sequence. Raw
read data were deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRP057824). Putative
viral sequences have been submitted to Genbank (accession numbers in Tables S1 and
S2).
142
As the RNA-seq was performed on pooled samples, we assigned rhabdovirus sequences
to individual insects by PCR on RNA from individual samples. cDNA was produced using
Promega GoScript Reverse Transcriptase and random-hexamer primers, and PCR
performed using primers designed from the rhabdovirus sequences. Infected host
species were identified by sequencing the mitochondrial gene *COI*. We were unable to
identify the host species of the virus from a *Drosophila affinis* sub-group species
(sequences appear similar to both *Drosophila affinis* and the closely related Drosophila
athabasca), despite the addition of further mitochondrial and nuclear sequences to
increase confidence. In all cases we confirmed that viruses were only present in cDNA
and not in non reverse-transcription (RT) controls (i.e. DNA) by PCR, and so they cannot
be integrated into the insect genome (i.e. endogenous virus elements or EVEs [17]). *COI*
primers were used as a positive control for the presence of DNA in the non RT template.
155

We identified sigma virus sequences in RNA-seq data from *Drosophila montana* [22]. We
used RT-PCR on an infected fly line to amplify the virus sequence, and carried out
additional Sanger sequencing with primers designed using the RNA-seq assembly.
Additional virus sequences were identified from an RNA-seq analysis of pools of wild
caught *Drosophila*: DImmSV from *Drosophila immigrans* (collection and sequencing
described [23]), DTriSV from a pool of *Drosophila tristis* and SDefSV from
Scaptodrosophila deflexa (both Darren Obbard, unpublished data). Genbank accession
numbers for new virus sequences are (KR822817, KR822816, KR822823, KR822813,
KR822820, KR822821, KR822822, KR822815, KR822824, KR822812, KR822811,
KR822814 and KR822818). A full list of accessions can be found in tables S1 and S2.
166
167 *Discovery of rhabdoviruses in public sequence databases*
168
Rhabdovirus L gene sequences were used as queries to search (tblastn) expressed
sequence tag (EST) and transcriptome shotgun assembly (TSA) databases (NCBI). All
sequences were reciprocally BLAST searched against Genbank cDNA and RefSeq
databases and only retained if they matched a virus-like sequence. We used two
approaches to examine whether sequences were present as RNA but not DNA. First,
where assemblies of whole-genome shotgun sequences were available, we used BLAST
to test whether sequences were integrated into the host genome. Second, for the virus
sequences in the butterfly *Pararge aegeria* and the medfly *Ceratitis capitata* we were
able to obtain infected samples to confirm whether sequences are only present in RNA
by performing PCR on both genomic DNA and cDNA as described above (samples kindly
provided by Casper Breuker/Melanie Gibbs, and Philip Leftwich respectively)
180
181 *Phylogenetic analysis*
182
All available rhabdovirus-like sequences were downloaded from Genbank (accessions in
Data S2: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425419). Amino acid sequences for
the L gene (encoding the RNA Dependent RNA Polymerase or RDRP) were used to infer
the phylogeny (L gene sequences: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425067), as
they contain conserved domains that can be aligned across this diverse group of viruses.
Sequences were aligned with MAFFT [24] under default settings and then poorly aligned
and divergent sites were removed with either TrimAl (v1.3 strict settings, implemented
on Phylemon v2.0 server, alignment: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425069)
[25] or Gblocks (v0.91b selecting smaller final blocks, allowing gap positions and less
strict flanking positions to produce a less stringent selection, alignment:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425068) [26]. These resulted in alignments of
1492 and 829 amino acids respectively.
195
Phylogenetic trees were inferred using Maximum Likelihood in PhyML (v3.0) [27] using
the LG substitution model [28] (preliminary analysis confirmed the results were robust
to the amino acid substitution model selected), with a gamma distribution of rate
variation with four categories and a sub-tree pruning and regrafting topology searching
algorithm. Branch support was estimated using Approximate Likelihood-Ratio Tests
(aLRT) that are reported to outperform bootstrap methods [29]. Figures were created
using FIGTREE (v. 1.4) [30].

203
204 *Analysis of phylogenetic structure between viruses taken from different hosts and ecologies*
205
We measured the degree of phylogenetic structure between virus sequences identified
in different categories of host (arthropods, vertebrates and plants) and ecosystems
(terrestrial and aquatic). Following Bhatia et al [32], we measured the degree of genetic
structure between virus sequences from different groups of hosts/ecosystems using
Hudson's F_{st} estimator [31] as in [32]. We calculated F_{st} as: 1- the mean number of
differences between sequences within or between populations, where a population is a
host category or ecosystem. The significance of this value was tested by comparison
with 1000 replicates with host categories randomly permuted over sequences. We also
measured the clustering of these categories over our phylogeny using the genealogical
sorting index (GSI), a measure of the degree of exclusive ancestry of a group on a rooted
genealogy [33], for each of our host association categories. The index was estimated
using the genealogicalSorting R package [34], with significance estimated by
permutation. The tree was pruned to remove strains that could not be assigned to one of
the host association categories under consideration. Finally, since arthropods are the
most sampled host, we tested for evidence of genetic structure within the arthropod-
associated viruses that would suggest co-divergence with their hosts or preferential
host-switching between closely related hosts. We calculated the Pearson correlation
coefficient of the evolutionary distances between viruses and the evolutionary distances
between their hosts and tested for significance by permutation (as in [35]). We used the
patristic distances of our ML tree for the virus data and a time-tree of arthropod genera,
using published estimates of divergence dates [36, 37].
227
228 *Reconstruction of host associations*
229
Viruses were categorised as having one of four types of host association: arthropod-
specific, vertebrate-specific, arthropod-vectored plant, or arthropod-vectored
vertebrate. However, the host association of some viruses are uncertain when they have
been isolated from vertebrates, biting-arthropods or plant-sap-feeding arthropods. Due
to limited sampling it was not clear whether viruses isolated from vertebrates were
vertebrate specific or arthropod-vectored vertebrate viruses; or whether viruses
isolated from biting-arthropods were arthropod specific viruses or arthropod-vectored
vertebrate viruses; or if viruses isolated from plant-sap-feeding arthropods were
arthropod-specific or arthropod-vectored plant viruses.
239
We classified a virus from a nematode as having its own host category. We classified
three of the fish infecting dimarhabdoviruses as vertebrate specific based on the fact
they can be transmitted via immersion in water containing virus during experimental
conditions [38-40], and the widely held belief amongst the fisheries community that
these viruses are not typically vectored [8]. However, there is some evidence these
viruses can be transmitted by arthropods (sea lice) in experiments [8, 9] and so we
would recommend this be interpreted with some caution. Additionally, although we
classified the viruses identified in sea-lice as having biting arthropod hosts, they may be
crustacean-specific. The two viruses from *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* do not seem to infect

the fish they parasitise and are present in all developmental stages of the lice, suggesting
they may be transmitted vertically [41].

We simultaneously estimated both the current and ancestral host associations, and the
phylogeny of the viruses, using a Bayesian analysis, implemented in BEAST v1.8 [42, 43].
Since meaningful branch lengths are essential for this analysis (uncertainty about
branch lengths will feed into uncertainty about the estimates), we used a subset of the
sites and strains used in the Maximum Likelihood (ML) analysis. We retained 189 taxa;
all rhabdoviruses excluding the divergent fish-infecting novirhabdovirus clade and the
virus from *Hydra*, as well as the viruses from *Lolium perenne and Conwentzia
psociformis*, which had a large number of missing sites. Sequences were trimmed to a
conserved region of 414 amino acids where data was recorded for most of these viruses
(the Gblocks alignment trimmed further by eye:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425431).

We used the host-association categories described above, which included ambiguous
states. To describe amino acid evolution we used an LG substitution model with gamma
distributed rate variation across sites [28] and an uncorrelated lognormal relaxed clock
model of rate variation among lineages [44]. To describe the evolution of the host
associations we used a strict clock model and a discrete asymmetric transition rate
matrix (allowing transitions to and from a host association to take place at different
rates), as previously used to model migrations between discrete geographic locations
[45] and host switches [43, 46]. We also examined how often these viruses jumped
between different classes of hosts using reconstructed counts of biologically feasible
changes of host association and their HPD confidence intervals (CI) using Markov Jumps
[47]. These included switches between arthropod-specific and both arthropod-vectored
vertebrate and arthropod-vectored plant states, and between vertebrate specific and
arthropod-vectored vertebrate states. We used a constant population size coalescent
prior for the relative node ages (using a birth-death prior gave equivalent results) and
the BEAUti v1.8 default priors for all other parameters [42] (BEAUti xml
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1431922). In Figure 2 we have transferred the
ancestral state reconstruction from the BEAST tree to the maximum likelihood tree.

Convergence was assessed using Tracer v1.6 [48], and a burn-in of 30% was removed
prior to the construction of a consensus tree, which included a description of ancestral
host associations in the output file. High effective sample sizes were achieved for all
parameters (>200). Previous simulations, in the context of biogeographical inference,
have shown that the approach is robust to sampling bias [45]. However, to confirm this,
following [49], we tested whether sample size predicts rate to or from a host
association.

Results

Novel rhabdoviruses from RNA-seq

To search for new rhabdoviruses we collected a variety of different species of flies,
screened them for CO_2 sensitivity, which is a common symptom of infection, and

sequenced total RNA of these flies by RNA-seq. We identified rhabdovirus-like
sequences from a *de-novo* assembly by BLAST, and used PCR to identify which samples
these sequences came from.
299
This approach resulted in eleven rhabdovirus-like sequences from nine (possibly ten)
species of fly. Seven of these viruses were previously unknown and four had been
reported previously from shorter sequences (Tables S1 and S2
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1502665). The novel viruses were highly
divergent from known viruses. Sigma viruses known from other species of *Drosophila*
typically have genomes of ~12.5Kb [12, 50], and six of our sequences were
approximately this size, suggesting they are near-complete genomes. None of the
viruses discovered in our RNA-seq data were integrated into the host genome (see
Methods for details).
309
To investigate the putative gene content of the viruses, we predicted genes based on
open reading frames (ORFs). For the viruses with apparently complete genomes (Figure
1), we found that those from *Drosophila ananassae, Drosophila affinis, Drosophila*
immigrans and *Drosophila sturtvanti* contained ORFs corresponding to the five core
genes found across all rhabdoviruses, with an additional ORF between the P and M
genes. This is the location of the X gene found in sigma viruses, and in three of the four
novel viruses it showed BLAST sequence similarity to the X gene of sigma viruses. The
virus from *Drosophila busckii* did not contain an additional ORF between the P and M
genes, but instead contained an ORF between the G and L gene.
319
Using the phylogeny described below, we have classified our newly discovered viruses
as either sigma viruses, rhabdoviruses or other viruses, and named them after the host
species they were identified from (Figure 1) [51]. We also found one other novel
mononegavirales-like sequence from *Drosophila unispina* that groups with a recently
discovered clade of arthropod associated viruses (Nyamivirus clade [13], see Table S5
and the full phylogeny: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425083), as well as five
other RNA viruses from various families (data not shown), confirming our approach can
detect a wide range of divergent viruses.

Figure 1. Genome organization of newly discovered viruses from metagenomic RNA sequencing of CO$_2$ sensitive flies.

Putative genes are shown in colour, non-coding regions are shown in black. ORFs were designated as the first start codon following the transcription termination sequence (7 U's) of the previous ORF to the first stop codon. Dotted lines represent parts of the genome not sequenced. These viruses were either from our own RNA-seq data, or were first found in in public databases and key features verified by PCR and Sanger sequencing. Rhabdovirus genomes are typically ~11-13kb long and contain five core genes 3'-N-P-M-G-L-5' [3]. However, a number of groups of rhabdoviruses contain additional accessory genes and can be up to ~16kb long [14, 52].

New rhabdoviruses from public databases

We identified a further 26 novel rhabdovirus-like sequences by searching public databases of assembled RNA-seq data with BLAST. These included 19 viruses from arthropods (Fleas, Crustacea, Lepidoptera, Diptera), one from a Cnidarian (*Hydra*) and 5 from plants (Table S3). Of these viruses, 19 had sufficient amounts of coding sequence (>1000bp) to include in the phylogenetic analysis (Table S3), whilst the remainder were too short (Table S4).

Four viruses from databases had near-complete genomes based on their size. These were from the moth *Triodia sylvina*, the house fly *Musca domestica* (99% nucleotide identity to Wuhan house fly virus 2 [13]), the butterfly *Pararge aegeria* and the medfly *Ceratitis capitata*, all of which contain ORFs corresponding to the five core rhabdovirus genes. The sequence from *C. capitata* had an additional ORF between the P and M genes with BLAST sequence similarity to the X gene in sigma viruses. There were several unusual sequences. Firstly, in the virus from *P. aegeria* there appear to be two full-length glycoprotein ORFs between the M and L genes (we confirmed by Sanger sequencing that both exist and the stop codon between the two genes was not an error). Secondly, the *Agave tequilana* transcriptome contained a L gene ORF on a contig that was the length of a typical rhabdovirus genome but did not appear to contain typical gene content, suggesting it has very atypical genome organization, or has been misassembled, or is integrated into its host plant genome [53]. Finally, the virus from

Hydra magnipapillata contained six predicted genes, but the L gene (RDRP) ORF was
unusually long. Some of the viruses we detected may be EVEs inserted into the host
genome and subsequently expressed [18]. For example, this is likely the case for the
sequence from the silkworm *Bombyx mori* that we also found in the silkworm genome,
and the L gene sequence from *Spodoptera exigua* that contains stop codons. Under the
assumption that viruses integrated into host genomes once infected those hosts, this
does not affect our conclusions below about the host range of these viruses [15-17]. We
also found nine other novel mononegavirale-like sequences that group with recently
discovered clades of insect viruses [13] (see Table S5 and
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425083).
371
372 *Rhabdovirus Phylogeny*
373
To reconstruct the evolution of the *Rhabdoviridae* we have produced the most complete
phylogeny of the group to date (Figure 2). We aligned the relatively conserved L gene
(RNA Dependant RNA Polymerase) from our newly discovered viruses with sequences
of known rhabdoviruses to give an alignment of 195 rhabdoviruses (and 26 other
mononegavirales as an outgroup). We reconstructed the phylogeny using different
sequence alignments and methodologies, and these all gave qualitatively similar results
with the same major clades being reconstructed (Gblocks:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425083, TrimAl:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425082 and BEAST:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425436). The ML and Bayesian relaxed clock
phylogenies were very similar: 149/188 nodes are found in both reconstructions and
only 2 nodes present in the Bayesian relaxed clock tree with strong support are absent
from the ML tree with strong support. These are found in a single basal clade of
divergent but uniformly arthropod-specific strains, where the difference in topology will
have no consequence for inference of host association. This suggests that our analysis is
robust to the assumptions of a relaxed molecular clock. The branching order between
the clades in the dimarhabdovirus supergroup was generally poorly supported and
differed between the methods and alignments. Eight sequences that we discovered were
not included in this analysis as they were considered too short, but their closest BLAST
hits are listed in Table S4 (http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1502665).
394
We recovered all of the major clades described previously (Figure 2), and found that the
majority of known rhabdoviruses belong to the dimarhabdovirus clade (Figure 2b). The
RNA-seq viruses from *Drosophila* fall into either the sigma virus clade (Figure 2b) or the
arthropod clade sister to the cyto- and nucleo- rhabdoviruses (Figure 2a). The viruses
from sequence databases are diverse, coming from almost all of the major clades with
the exception of the lyssaviruses.
401
402 *Predicted host associations of viruses*
403
With a few exceptions, rhabdoviruses are either arthropod-vectored viruses of plants or
vertebrates, or are vertebrate- or arthropod- specific. In many cases the only
information about a virus is the host from which it was isolated. Therefore, *a priori*, it is
not clear whether viruses isolated from vertebrates are vertebrate-specific or

arthropod-vectored, or whether viruses isolated from biting arthropods (e.g.
mosquitoes, sandflies, ticks, midges and sea lice) are arthropod specific or also infect
vertebrates. Likewise, it is not clear whether viruses isolated from sap-sucking insects
(all Hemiptera: aphids, leafhoppers, scale insect and mealybugs) are arthropod-specific
or arthropod-vectored plant viruses. By combining data on the ambiguous and known
host associations with phylogenetic information, we were able to predict both the
ancestral and present host associations of these viruses
(http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425436). To do this we used a Bayesian
phylogenetic analysis that simultaneously estimated the phylogeny and host association
of our data. In the analysis we defined our host associations either as vertebrate-
specific, arthropod-specific, arthropod-vectored vertebrate, arthropod-vectored plant,
nematode, or as ambiguous between two (and in one case all five) of these states (see
Methods).
421
This approach identified a large number of viruses that are likely to be new arthropod-
vectored vertebrate viruses (Figure 2b). Of 80 viruses with ambiguous 89 host
associations were assigned a host association with strong posterior support (>0.95). Of
the 52 viruses found in biting arthropods, 45 were predicted to be arthropod-vectored
vertebrate viruses, and 6 to be arthropod-specific. Of the 30 viruses found in
vertebrates, 22 were predicted to be arthropod-vectored vertebrate viruses, and 2 were
predicted to be vertebrate-specific (both fish viruses). Of the 7 viruses found in plant-
sap-feeding arthropods (Figure 2a), 3 were predicted to be plant-associated and 2
arthropod-associated.

432
Figure 2. Maximum likelihood phylogeny of the *Rhabdoviridae.*
(A) shows the basal fish-infecting novirhabdoviruses, an unassigned group of arthropod
associated viruses, the plant infecting cyto- and nucleo- rhabdoviruses, as well as the vertebrate
specific lyssaviruses. **(B)** shows the dimarhabdovirus supergroup, which is predominantly
composed of arthropod-vectored vertebrate viruses, along with the arthropod-specific sigma
virus clade. Branches are coloured based on the Bayesian host association reconstruction
analysis. Black represents taxa omitted from host-state reconstruction or associations with <0.95
support. The tree was inferred from L gene sequences using the Gblocks alignment. The columns
of text are the virus name, the host category used for reconstructions, and known hosts (from left
to right). Codes for the host categories are: VS= vertebrate-specific, VV = arthropod-vectored
vertebrate, A= arthropod specific, BS = biting-arthropod (ambiguous state), V = vertebrate
(ambiguous state) AP =plant-sap-feeding-arthropod (ambiguous state), UH = uncertain-host
(ambiguous across all states) and N = nematode. Names in bold and underlined are viruses
discovered in this study. The tree is rooted with the Chuvirus clade (root collapsed) as identified

as an outgroup in [13] but we note this gives the same result as midpoint and the molecular clock
rooting. Nodes labelled with question marks (?) represent nodes with aLRT (approximate
likelihood ratio test) statistical support values less than 0.75. Scale bar shows number of amino-
acid substitutions per site. Bayesian MCC tree used to infer ancestral traits:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425436.
452
To test the accuracy of our predictions of current host associations we randomly
selected a set of viruses with known associations, re-assigned their host association as
ambiguous between all possible states (a greater level of uncertainty than we generally
attributed to viruses in our data), and re-ran our analysis. We repeated this 10 times for
9 sets of 10 viruses and one set of 9 viruses (randomly sampling without replacement
from the 99 viruses in our data with known host associations). These analyses correctly
returned the true host association for 95/99 viruses with strong posterior support
(>0.9) and 1 with weak support (mean support = 0.99, range = 0.73-1.00; Data S3
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1538584). All three cases in which the
reconstruction returned a false host association involved anomalous sequences (e.g., a
change in host association on a terminal branch). Note, there would be no failure in
cases where there was no phylogenetic clustering of host associations. In such cases the
method would – correctly – report high levels of uncertainty in all reconstructed states.
466
467 We checked for evidence of sampling bias in our data by testing whether sample size
468 predicts rate to or from a host association [49]. We found there is a high level of
469 uncertainty around all rate estimates, but that there is no pattern of increased rate to or
470 from states that are more frequently sampled.
471
472 *Ancestral host associations and host-switches*
473
Viral sequences from arthropods, vertebrates and plants form distinct clusters in the
phylogeny (Figure 2). To quantify this genetic structure we calculated the F_{st} statistic
between the sequences of viruses from different groups of hosts. There is strong
evidence of genetic differentiation between the sequences from arthropods, plants and
vertebrates (P<0.001, Figure S1 http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1495351).
Similarly, viruses isolated from the same host group tend to cluster together on the tree
(GSI analysis permutation tests: arthropod hosts GSI = 0.43, P<0.001, plant hosts GSI =
0.46, P<0.001, vertebrate hosts GSI = 0.46, P < 0.001).
482
Our Bayesian analysis allowed us to infer the ancestral host association of 176 of 188 of
the internal nodes on the phylogenetic tree (support >0.95), however we could not infer
the host association of the root of the phylogeny, or some of the more basal nodes. A
striking pattern that emerged is that switches between major groups of hosts have
occurred rarely during the evolution of the rhabdoviruses (Figure 2). There are a few
rare transitions on terminal branches (Santa Barbara virus and the virus identified from
the plant *Humulus lupulus*) but these could represent errors in the host assignment (e.g.
cross-species contamination) as well as recent host shifts. Our analysis allows us to
estimate the number of times the viruses have switched between major host groups
across the phylogeny, while accounting for uncertainty about ancestral states, the tree
topology and root. We found strong evidence of only two types of host-switch across our
phylogeny: two transitions from being an arthropod-vectored vertebrate virus to being

arthropod specific (modal estimate = 2, median = 3.1, CI's= 1.9–5.4) and three
transitions from being an arthropod-vectored vertebrate virus to a vertebrate-specific
virus (modal estimate = 3, median = 3.1, CI's= 2.9–5.2). We could not determine the
direction of the host shifts into the other host groups.
499
500   Vertebrate–specific viruses have arisen once in the lyssaviruses clade [3], as well as at
501   least once in fish dimarhabdoviruses (in one of the fish-infecting clades it is unclear if it
502   is vertebrate-specific or vector-borne from our reconstructions). There has also likely
503   been a single transition to being arthropod-vectored vertebrate viruses in the
504   dimarhabodovirus clade.
505
Insect-vectored plant viruses in our dataset have arisen once in the cyto- and nucleo-
rhabdoviruses, although the ancestral state of these viruses is uncertain. A single virus
identified from the hop plant *Humulus lupulus* appears to fall within the
dimarhabdovirus clade. However, this may be because the plant was contaminated with
insect matter, as the same RNA-seq dataset contains *COI* sequences with high similarity
to thrips.
512
There are two large clades of arthropod-specific viruses. The first is a sister group to the
large clade of plant viruses. This novel group of predominantly insect-associated viruses
are associated with a broad range of insects, including flies, butterflies, moths, ants,
thrips, bedbugs, fleas, mosquitoes, water striders and leafhoppers. The mode of
transmission and biology of these viruses is yet to be examined. The second clade of
insect-associated viruses is the sigma virus clade [11, 12, 19, 50]. These are derived
from vector-borne dimarhabdoviruses that have lost their vertebrate host and become
vertically transmitted viruses of insects [10]. They are common in Drosophilidae, and
our results suggest that they may be widespread throughout the Diptera, with
occurrences in the Tephritid fruit fly *Ceratitis capitata*, the stable fly *Muscina stabulans,*
several divergent viruses in the housefly *Musca domestica* and louse flies removed from
the skin of bats. For the first time we have found sigma-like viruses outside of the
Diptera, with two Lepidoptera associated viruses and a virus from an aphid/parasitoid
wasp. All of the sigma viruses characterised to date have been vertically transmitted
[10], but some of the recently described viruses may be transmitted horizontally – it has
been speculated that the viruses from louse flies may infect bats [54] and Shayang Fly
Virus 2 has been reported in two fly species [13] (although contamination could also
explain this result). Drosophila sigma virus genomes are characterised by an additional
X gene between the P and M genes [50]. Interestingly the two louse fly viruses with
complete genomes, Wuhan insect virus 7 from an aphid/parasitoid and *Pararge aegeria*
rhabdovirus do not have a putative X gene. The first sigma virus was discovered in
Drosophila melanogaster in 1937 [55]. In the last few years related sigma viruses have
been found in other *Drosophila* species and a Muscid fly [10-12, 50] and here we have
found sigma-like viruses in a diverse array of Diptera species, as well as other insect
orders. Overall, our results suggest sigma-like viruses may be associated with a wide
array of insect species.
539
Within the arthropod-associated viruses (the most sampled host group) it is common to
find closely related viruses in closely related hosts (Figure 1). Viruses isolated from the

same arthropod orders tended to cluster together on the tree (GSI analysis permutation
tests: Diptera GSI = 0. 57, *P*<0.001, Hemiptera GSI = 0.34, *P*<0.001, Ixodida GSI = 0.38,
P<0.001, Lepidoptera GSI = 0.15, *P*=0.089). This is also reflected in a positive correlation
between the evolutionary distance between the viruses and the evolutionary distance
between their arthropod hosts (Pearson's correlation=0.36, 95% CI's=0.34-0.38,
P<0.001 based on permutation, Figure 3 and Figure S2
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1495351). Since the virus phylogeny is
incongruent with that of the respective hosts, this suggests rhabdoviruses preferentially
host shift between closely related species [56, 57].

551
552   **Figure 3. The relationship between the evolutionary distance between viruses and the**
553   **evolutionary distance between their arthropod hosts (categorised by genus).** Closely
554   related viruses tend to be found in closely related hosts. Permutation tests find a significant
555   positive correlation (correlation=0.36, 95% CI's=0.34-0.38, *P*<0.001) between host and virus
556   evolutionary distance (see Figure S2).

557
We also find viruses clustering on the phylogeny based on the ecosystem of their hosts;
there is strong evidence of genetic differentiation between viruses from terrestrial and
aquatic hosts (F_{st} permutation test *P*=0.007, Figure S3
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1495351; GSI analysis permutation tests:
terrestrial hosts= 0.52, aquatic hosts= 0.29, *P*<0.001 for both). There has been one shift
from terrestrial to aquatic hosts during the evolution of the basal novirhabdoviruses,
which have a wide host range in fish. There have been other terrestrial to aquatic shifts
in the dimarhabdoviruses: in the clades of fish and cetacean viruses and the clade of
viruses from sea-lice.
567
568
569   **Discussion**
570

Viruses are ubiquitous in nature and recent developments in high-throughput
sequencing technology have led to the discovery and sequencing of a large number of
novel viruses in arthropods [13, 14, 64]. Here we have identified 43 novel virus-like
sequences from our own RNA-seq data and public sequence repositories. Of these, 32
were rhabdoviruses, and 26 were from arthropods. Using these sequences we have
produced the most extensive phylogeny of the *Rhabdoviridae* to date, including a total of
195 virus sequences.
578
In most cases we know nothing about the biology of the viruses beyond the host they
were isolated from, but our analysis provides a powerful way to predict which are
vector-borne viruses and which are specific to vertebrates or arthropods. We have
identified a large number of new likely vector-borne viruses – of 85 rhabdoviruses
identified from vertebrates or biting insects we predict that 76 are arthropod-borne
viruses of vertebrates (arboviruses). The majority of known rhabdoviruses are
arboviruses, and all of these fall in a single clade known as the dimarhabdoviruses. In
addition to the arboviruses, we also identified two clades of likely insect-specific viruses
associated with a wide range of species.
588
We found that shifts between distantly related hosts are rare in the rhabdoviruses,
which is consistent with previous observations that both rhabdoviruses of vertebrates
(rabies virus in bats) and invertebrates (sigma viruses in Drosophilidae) show a
declining ability to infect hosts more distantly related to their natural host [46, 57, 58].
It is thought that sigma viruses may sometimes jump into distantly related but highly
susceptible species [56, 57, 59], but our results suggest that this rarely happens between
major groups such as vertebrates and arthropods. It is nonetheless surprising that
arthropod-specific viruses have arisen rarely, as one might naively assume that there
would be fewer constraints on vector-borne viruses losing one of their hosts. However,
this would involve evolving a new transmission route among insects, and this may be an
important constraint. Within the major clades, closely related viruses often infect closely
related hosts (Figure 2). For example, within the dimarhabdoviruses viruses identified
from mosquitoes, ticks, *Drosophila*, Muscid flies, Lepidoptera and sea-lice all tend to
cluster together (Figure 2B). However, it is also clear that the virus phylogeny does not
mirror the host phylogeny, and our data on the clustering of hosts across the virus
phylogeny therefore suggests that viruses preferentially shift between more closely
related species (Figures 3, S1 and S2) in the same environment (Figure S3).
606
There has been a near four-fold increase in the number of recorded rhabdovirus
sequences in the last five years. In part this may be due to the falling cost of sequencing
transcriptomes [60], and initiatives to sequence large numbers of insect and other
arthropods [37]. The use of high-throughput sequencing technologies should reduce the
likelihood of sampling biases associated with PCR, where people look for similar viruses
in related hosts. Therefore, the pattern of viruses forming clades based on the host taxa
they infect is likely to be robust. However, sampling is biased towards arthropods, and it
is possible that there may be a great undiscovered diversity of rhabdoviruses in other
organisms [61].
616

Our conclusions are likely to be robust to biases in the data or limitations in the analysis.
By reconstructing host associations using the Bayesian methods in the BEAST software
[42] we have avoided most of the simplifying assumptions of earlier methods (e.g.
symmetric transition rate matrices, lack of uncertainty associated with estimates).
Nonetheless all such methods depend on there being some of sort of "process
homogeneity" over the phylogeny [62]. Such analyses are of course limited by sampling;
for example, if a past host is now extinct, it will never be reconstructed as an ancestral
state. Nevertheless, previous studies have shown that the method is relatively robust to
uneven sampling across hosts [45]. Furthermore, when we have viruses from under-
sampled groups like cnidarians, fungi, nematodes, they fall outside the main clades of
viruses that we are analysing. The limitations of the approach are evident in our results:
we were unable to reconstruct the host associations of the root or most basal nodes of
the phylogeny. The reconstructions were, however, very successful within clades that
were strongly associated with a single host or clades where the less common hosts tend
to form distinct subclades. As a result of this high level of phylogenetic structure, our
approach was able to reconstruct the current host associations of many viruses for
which we had incomplete knowledge of their host range. To check that this approach is
reliable, we repeated the analysis on datasets where we deleted the information about
which hosts well-characterised viruses infect. Our analysis was found to be robust, with
97% of reconstructions being accurate. The method only failed for strains with irregular
host associations for their location in the phylogeny (i.e. recent changes in host on
terminal branches)– a limitation that would be expected for such an analysis.
639
Rhabdoviruses infect a diverse range of host species, including a large number of
arthropods. Our search has unearthed a large number of novel rhabdovirus genomes,
suggesting that we are only just beginning to uncover the diversity of these viruses. The
host associations of these viruses have been highly conserved across their evolutionary
history, which provides a powerful tool to identify previously unknown arboviruses.
The large number of viruses being discovered through metagenomic studies [13, 63, 64]
means that in the future we will be faced by an increasingly large number of viral
sequences with little knowledge of the biology of the virus. Our phylogenetic approach
could be extended to predict key biological traits in other groups of pathogens where
our knowledge is incomplete. However, there are limitations to this method, and the
rapid evolution of RNA viruses may mean that some traits change too quickly to
accurately infer traits. Therefore, such an approach should complement, and not replace,
examining the basic biology of novel viruses.
653
654 **Acknowledgments**
655
656 Many thanks to Mike Ritchie for providing the DMonSV infected fly line; Casper Breuker
657 and Melanie Gibbs for PAegRV samples and Philip Leftwich for CCapSV samples. Thanks
658 to everyone who provided fly collections. Thanks to two reviewers and Oliver Pybus for
659 useful comments.
660
661 **Contributions**
662

663 BL and FMJ conceived and designed the study. BL and JD carried out molecular work. BL,
664 WJP, DJP and DJO carried out bioinformatic analysis. BL, GGRM and JJW carried out
665 phylogenetic analysis. BL GGRM, JJW and FMJ wrote the manuscript with comments
666 from all other authors. All authors gave final approval for publication.
667
668 **Funding**
669
670 BL and FMJ are supported by a NERC grant (NE/L004232/1), a European Research
671 Council grant (281668, DrosophilaInfection), a Junior Research Fellowship from Christ's
672 College, Cambridge (BL). GGRM is supported by an MRC studentship. The metagenomic
673 sequencing of viruses from *D. immigrans, D. tristis* and *S. deflexa* was supported by a
674 Wellcome Trust fellowship (WT085064) to DJO.
675
676

677 **References**
678
1.   Lipkin W.I., Anthony S.J. 2015 Virus hunting. *Virology* **479-480C**, 194-199.
(doi:10.1016/j.virol.2015.02.006).
2.   Liu S., Vijayendran D., Bonning B.C. 2011 Next generation sequencing
technologies for insect virus discovery. *Viruses* **3**(10), 1849-1869.
(doi:10.3390/v3101849).
3.   Dietzgen R.G., Kuzmin I.V. 2012 *Rhabdoviruses: Molecular Taxonomy, Evolution,*
Genomics, Ecology, Host-Vector Interactions, Cytopathology and Control. Norfolk, UK,
Caister Academic Press.
4.   Bourhy H., Cowley J.A., Larrous F., Holmes E.C., Walker P.J. 2005 Phylogenetic
relationships among rhabdoviruses inferred using the L polymerase gene. *Journal of*
General Virology **86**, 2849-2858.
5.   Hampson K., Coudeville L., Lembo T., Sambo M., Kieffer A., Attlan M., Barrat J.,
Blanton J.D., Briggs D.J., Cleaveland S., et al. 2015 Estimating the global burden of
endemic canine rabies. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **9**(4), e0003709.
(doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0003709).
6.   Walker P.J., Blasdell K.R., Joubert D.A. 2012 Ephemeroviruses: Athropod-borne
Rhabdoviruses of Ruminants, with Large, Complex Genomes. In *Rhabdoviruses:*
Molecular Taxonomy, Evolution, Genomics, Ecology, Host-Vector Interactions,
Cytopathology and Control (eds. Dietzgen R.G., Kuzmin I.V.), pp. 59-88. Norfolk, UK,
Caister Academic Press.
7.   Hogenhout S.A., Redinbaugh M.G., Ammar E.D. 2003 Plant and animal
rhabdovirus host range: a bug's view. *Trends in Microbiology* **11**(6), 264-271. (doi:Doi
10.1016/S0966-842x(03)00120-3).
8.   Ahne W., Bjorklund H.V., Essbauer S., Fijan N., Kurath G., Winton J.R. 2002 Spring
viremia of carp (SVC). *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* **52**, 261-272.
9.   Pfeilputzien C. 1978 EXPERIMENTAL TRANSMISSION OF SPRING VIREMIA OF
CARP THROUGH CARP LICE (ARGULUS-FOLIACEUS). *Zentralblatt Fur Veterinarmedizin*
Reihe B-Journal of Veterinary Medicine Series B-Infectious Diseases Immunology Food
Hygiene Veterinary Public Health **25**(4), 319-323.
10.   Longdon B., Jiggins F.M. 2012 Vertically transmitted viral endosymbionts of
insects: do sigma viruses walk alone? *Proc Biol Sci* **279**(1744), 3889-3898.
(doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1208).
11.   Longdon B., Wilfert L., Obbard D.J., Jiggins F.M. 2011 Rhabdoviruses in two
species of Drosophila: vertical transmission and a recent sweep. *Genetics* **188**(1), 141-
150. (doi:10.1534/genetics.111.127696).

12.   Longdon B., Wilfert L., Osei-Poku J., Cagney H., Obbard D.J., Jiggins F.M. 2011
Host switching by a vertically-transmitted rhabdovirus in Drosophila. *Biology Letters*
7(5), 747-750. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0160).
13.   Li C.X., Shi M., Tian J.H., Lin X.D., Kang Y.J., Chen L.J., Qin X.C., Xu J., Holmes E.C.,
Zhang Y.Z. 2015 Unprecedented genomic diversity of RNA viruses in arthropods reveals
the ancestry of negative-sense RNA viruses. *eLife* **4**. (doi:10.7554/eLife.05378).
14.   Walker P.J., Firth C., Widen S.G., Blasdell K.R., Guzman H., Wood T.G., Paradkar
P.N., Holmes E.C., Tesh R.B., Vasilakis N. 2015 Evolution of genome size and complexity
in the rhabdoviridae. *PLoS Pathog* **11**(2), e1004664.
(doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004664).
15.   Ballinger M.J., Bruenn J.A., Taylor D.J. 2012 Phylogeny, integration and
expression of sigma virus-like genes in Drosophila. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* **65**(1), 251-258.
(doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2012.06.008).
16.   Fort P., Albertini A., Van-Hua A., Berthomieu A., Roche S., Delsuc F., Pasteur N.,
Capy P., Gaudin Y., Weill M. 2011 Fossil Rhabdoviral Sequences Integrated into
Arthropod Genomes: Ontogeny, Evolution, and Potential Functionality. *Mol Biol Evol*.
(doi:10.1093/molbev/msr226).
17.   Katzourakis A., Gifford R.J. 2010 Endogenous Viral Elements in Animal Genomes.
Plos Genet **6**(11), e1001191. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001191).
18.   Aiewsakun P., Katzourakis A. 2015 Endogenous viruses: Connecting recent and
ancient viral evolution. *Virology* **479-480C**, 26-37. (doi:10.1016/j.virol.2015.02.011).
19.   Longdon B., Wilfert L., Jiggins F.M. 2012 *The Sigma Viruses of Drosophila*, Caister
Academic Press.
20.   Rosen L. 1980 Carbon-dioxide sensitivity in mosquitos infected with sigma,
vesicular stomatitis, and other rhabdoviruses. *Science* **207**(4434), 989-991.
21.   Shroyer D.A., Rosen L. 1983 Extrachromosomal-inheritance of carbon-dioxide
sensitivity in the mosquito culex-quinquefasciatus. *Genetics* **104**(4), 649-659.
22.   Parker D.J., Vesala L., Ritchie M.G., Laiho A., Hoikkala A., Kankare M. 2015 How
consistent are the transcriptome changes associated with cold acclimation in two
species of the Drosophila virilis group? *Heredity (Edinb)*. (doi:10.1038/hdy.2015.6).
23.   van Mierlo J.T., Overheul G.J., Obadia B., van Cleef K.W., Webster C.L., Saleh M.C.,
Obbard D.J., van Rij R.P. 2014 Novel Drosophila viruses encode host-specific suppressors
of RNAi. *PLoS Pathog* **10**(7), e1004256. (doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004256).
24.   Katoh K., Standley D.M. 2013 MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software
version 7: improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* **30**(4), 772-780.
(doi:10.1093/molbev/mst010).
25.   Capella-Gutierrez S., Silla-Martinez J.M., Gabaldon T. 2009 trimAl: a tool for
automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics*
25(15), 1972-1973. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348).
26.   Talavera G., Castresana J. 2007 Improvement of phylogenies after removing
divergent and ambiguously aligned blocks from protein sequence alignments. *Syst Biol*
56(4), 564-577. (doi:Doi 10.1080/10635150701472164).
27.   Guindon S., Dufayard J.F., Lefort V., Anisimova M., Hordijk W., Gascuel O. 2010
New Algorithms and Methods to Estimate Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies: Assessing
the Performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst Biol* **59**(3), 307-321. (doi:Doi
10.1093/Sysbio/Syq010).
28.   Le S.Q., Gascuel O. 2008 An improved general amino acid replacement matrix.
Molecular Biology and Evolution **25**(7), 1307-1320. (doi:Doi 10.1093/Molbev/Msn067).
29.   Anisimova M., Gascuel O. 2006 Approximate likelihood-ratio test for branches: A
fast, accurate, and powerful alternative. *Syst Biol* **55**(4), 539-552.
(doi:10.1080/10635150600755453).
30.   Rambaut A. 2011 FigTree. (v1.3 ed.
31.   Hudson R.R., Slatkin M., Maddison W.P. 1992 Estimation of levels of gene flow
from DNA sequence data. *Genetics* **132**(2), 583-589.

32.   Bhatia G., Patterson N., Sankararaman S., Price A.L. 2013 Estimating and
interpreting FST: the impact of rare variants. *Genome Res* **23**(9), 1514-1521.
(doi:10.1101/gr.154831.113).
33.   Cummings M.P., Neel M.C., Shaw K.L. 2008 A genealogical approach to
quantifying lineage divergence. *Evolution* **62**(9), 2411-2422. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-
5646.2008.00442.x).
34.   Bazinet A., Myers D., Khatavkar P. 2009 genealogicalSorting v.0.91. . (
35.   Hommola K., Smith J.E., Qiu Y., Gilks W.R. 2009 A permutation test of host-
parasite cospeciation. *Mol Biol Evol* **26**(7), 1457-1468. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msp062).
36.   Jeyaprakash A., Hoy M.A. 2009 First divergence time estimate of spiders,
scorpions, mites and ticks (subphylum: Chelicerata) inferred from mitochondrial
phylogeny. *Experimental & applied acarology* **47**(1), 1-18. (doi:10.1007/s10493-008-
9203-5).
37.   Misof B., Liu S., Meusemann K., Peters R.S., Donath A., Mayer C., Frandsen P.B.,
Ware J., Flouri T., Beutel R.G., et al. 2014 Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern
of insect evolution. *Science* **346**(6210), 763-767. (doi:10.1126/science.1257570).
38.   Bootsma R., Dekinkelin P., Leberre M. 1975 Transmission Experiments with Pike
Fry (Esox-Lucius L) Rhabdovirus. *J Fish Biol* **7**(2), 269-276. (doi:Doi 10.1111/J.1095-
8649.1975.Tb04599.X).
39.   Dorson M., Dekinkelin P., Torchy C., Monge D. 1987 Susceptibility Of Pike (Esox-
Lucius) To Different Salmonid Viruses (Ipn, Vhs, Ihn) And To The Perch Rhabdovirus.
Bulletin Francais De La Peche Et De La Pisciculture (307), 91-101.
40.   Haenen O., Davidse A. 1993 Comparative pathogenicity of two strains of pike fry
rhabdovirus and spring viremia of carp virus for young roach, common carp, grass carp
and rainbow trout. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* **15**(2), 87-92.
41.   Okland A.L., Nylund A., Overgard A.C., Blindheim S., Watanabe K., Grotmol S.,
Arnesen C.E., Plarre H. 2014 Genomic characterization and phylogenetic position of two
new species in Rhabdoviridae infecting the parasitic copepod, salmon louse
(Lepeophtheirus salmonis). *Plos One* **9**(11), e112517.
(doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112517).
42.   Drummond A.J., Suchard M.A., Xie D., Rambaut A. 2012 Bayesian phylogenetics
with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. *Mol Biol Evol* **29**(8), 1969-1973.
(doi:10.1093/molbev/mss075).
43.   Weinert L.A., Welch J.J., Suchard M.A., Lemey P., Rambaut A., Fitzgerald J.R. 2012
Molecular dating of human-to-bovid host jumps by Staphylococcus aureus reveals an
association with the spread of domestication. *Biol Lett* **8**(5), 829-832.
(doi:10.1098/rsbl.2012.0290).
44.   Drummond A.J., Ho S.Y., Phillips M.J., Rambaut A. 2006 Relaxed phylogenetics
and dating with confidence. *PLoS Biol* **4**(5), e88. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040088).
45.   Edwards C.J., Suchard M.A., Lemey P., Welch J.J., Barnes I., Fulton T.L., Barnett R.,
O'Connell T.C., Coxon P., Monaghan N., et al. 2011 Ancient hybridization and an Irish
origin for the modern polar bear matriline. *Curr Biol* **21**(15), 1251-1258.
(doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.05.058).
46.   Faria N.R., Suchard M.A., Rambaut A., Streicker D.G., Lemey P. 2013
Simultaneously reconstructing viral cross-species transmission history and identifying
the underlying constraints. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **368**(1614), 20120196.
(doi:10.1098/rstb.2012.0196).
47.   Minin V.N., Suchard M.A. 2008 Counting labeled transitions in continuous-time
Markov models of evolution. *Journal of mathematical biology* **56**(3), 391-412.
(doi:10.1007/s00285-007-0120-8).
48.   Rambaut A., Drummond A.J. 2007. *Tracer v16, Available from*
http://beastbioedacuk/Tracer
49.   Lemey P., Rambaut A., Bedford T., Faria N., Bielejec F., Baele G., Russell C.A.,
Smith D.J., Pybus O.G., Brockmann D., et al. 2014 Unifying Viral Genetics and Human

Transportation Data to Predict the Global Transmission Dynamics of Human Influenza
H3N2. *Plos Pathogens* **10**(2). (doi:ARTN e1003932
10.1371/journal.ppat.1003932).
50.   Longdon B., Obbard D.J., Jiggins F.M. 2010 Sigma viruses from three species of
Drosophila form a major new clade in the rhabdovirus phylogeny. *Proceedings of the*
Royal Society B **277**, 35-44. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1472).
51.   Longdon B., Walker P.J. 2011 ICTV sigmavirus species and genus proposal. (
52.   Walker P.J., Dietzgen R.G., Joubert D.A., Blasdell K.R. 2011 Rhabdovirus accessory
genes. *Virus Res* **162**(1-2), 110-125. (doi:10.1016/j.virusres.2011.09.004).
53.   Chiba S., Kondo H., Tani A., Saisho D., Sakamoto W., Kanematsu S., Suzuki N. 2011
Widespread Endogenization of Genome Sequences of Non-Retroviral RNA Viruses into
Plant Genomes. *Plos Pathogens* **7**(7). (doi:Artn E1002146
Doi 10.1371/Journal.Ppat.1002146).
54.   Aznar-Lopez C., Vazquez-Moron S., Marston D.A., Juste J., Ibanez C., Berciano J.M.,
Salsamendi E., Aihartza J., Banyard A.C., McElhinney L., et al. 2013 Detection of
rhabdovirus viral RNA in oropharyngeal swabs and ectoparasites of Spanish bats. *J Gen*
Virol **94**(Pt 1), 69-75. (doi:10.1099/vir.0.046490-0).
55.   L'Heritier P.H., Teissier G. 1937 Une anomalie physiologique héréditaire chez la
Drosophile. *CR Acad Sci Paris* **231**, 192-194.
56.   Longdon B., Brockhurst M.A., Russell C.A., Welch J.J., Jiggins F.M. 2014 The
Evolution and Genetics of Virus Host Shifts. *PLoS Pathog* **10**(11), e1004395.
(doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004395).
57.   Longdon B., Hadfield J.D., Webster C.L., Obbard D.J., Jiggins F.M. 2011 Host
phylogeny determines viral persistence and replication in novel hosts. *PLoS Pathogens*
7((9)), e1002260. (doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1002260).
58.   Streicker D.G., Turmelle A.S., Vonhof M.J., Kuzmin I.V., McCracken G.F., Rupprecht
C.E. 2010 Host Phylogeny Constrains Cross-Species Emergence and Establishment of
Rabies Virus in Bats. *Science* **329**(5992), 676-679. (doi:10.1126/science.1188836).
59.   Longdon B., Hadfield J.D., Day J.P., Smith S.C., McGonigle J.E., Cogni R., Cao C.,
Jiggins F.M. 2015 The Causes and Consequences of Changes in Virulence following
Pathogen Host Shifts. *PLoS Pathog* **11**(3), e1004728.
(doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004728).
60.   Wang Z., Gerstein M., Snyder M. 2009 RNA-Seq: a revolutionary tool for
transcriptomics. *Nat Rev Genet* **10**(1), 57-63. (doi:10.1038/nrg2484).
61.   Dudas G., Obbard D.J. 2015 Are arthropods at the heart of virus evolution? *eLife*
4.
62.   Omland K.E. 1999 The assumptions and challenges of ancestral state
reconstructions. *Syst Biol* **48**(3), 604-611. (doi:Doi 10.1080/106351599260175).
63.   Aguiar E.R., Olmo R.P., Paro S., Ferreira F.V., de Faria I.J., Todjro Y.M., Lobo F.P.,
Kroon E.G., Meignin C., Gatherer D., et al. 2015 Sequence-independent characterization
of viruses based on the pattern of viral small RNAs produced by the host. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkv587).
64.   Webster C.L., Waldron F.M., Robertson S., Crowson D., Ferrai G., Quintana J.F.,
Brouqui J.M., Bayne E.H., Longdon B., Buck A.H., et al. 2015 The discovery, distribution
and evolution of viruses associated with Drosophila melanogaster. *PLOS Biology* **13(7):**
e1002210.

868
869 **Supplementary materials**
870
871 Tables S1-5. List of newly discovered viruses:
872
873 Figures S1-S3
874

875   Supplementary Figure 1.
876
Results of permutation tests of population differentiation between the sequences of
viruses taken from different categories of host: (a) between arthropods and vertebrates,
(b) between arthropods and plants and (c) between plants and vertebrates. Red lines
show the degree of differentiation, measured using Hudson's F_{st} estimator, and grey
histograms show the F_{st} values from 1000 unique random permutations of host
categories over viral sequences. We found significant differentiation between each pair
of categories (F_{st} values: a=0.07, b=0.35, c=0.48) with none of the 1000 permutations
resulting in as high an F_{st} value as the data ($P<0.001$ for all).
885
886   Supplementary Figure 2.
887
Correlation of the evolutionary distances between rhabdovirueses and the evolutionary
distances between their arthropod hosts. Figure shows the results of a permutation test
of this relationship (measured by Pearson's correlation coefficient). The red line shows
the true correlation coefficient (0.36), and the grey histogram shows the correlation
coefficients returned from 1000 unique random permutations of host genera over viral
sequences (see Methods). We found a significant association between viral and host
phylogenies with none of the 1000 permutations resulting in as strong a correlation as
the data ($P<0.001$).
896
897   Supplementary Figure 3.
898
Results of the permutation test of population differentiation between the sequences of
viruses taken from land and aquatic arthropod and vertebrate hosts. Only arthropod
and vertebrate hosts were included in the test, since aquatic hosts only included
arthropods and vertebrates. The red line shows the true degree of differentiation,
measured using Hudson's F_{st} estimator, and the grey histogram shows the F_{st} values
returned from 1000 unique random permutations of host categories over viral
sequences. Viruses from terrestrial and aquatic hosts were found to have significant
population differentiation (with only 7 of the 1000 permutations resulted in as high an
F_{st} value as the data (F_{st} =0.07, $P=0.007$).
908
909
910   **All data has been made available in public repositories:**
911
NCBI Sequence Read Archive Data: SRP057824
Data S1, sample information: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425432
Data S2, virus ID, Genbank accession numbers and host information:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425419
Data S3, results from testing ancestral trait reconstructions predictions:
http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1538584
L gene sequences fasta: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425067
TrimAl alignment fasta: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425069
Gblocks alignment fasta: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425068
Phylogenetic tree Gblocks alignment: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425083
Phylogenetic tree TrimAl alignment: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425082
BEAST alignment fasta: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425431
BEAUti xml file: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1431922
Bayesian analysis tree: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1425436
926
927