**In-depth study of tomato and weed viromes reveals undiscovered plant**

**virus diversity in an agroecosystem**

Mark Paul Selda Rivarez[1,2,*] (mpsrivarez@gmail.com),

Anja Pecman[1,2] (anja.pecman@nib.si),

Katarina Bačnik[1] (katarina.bacnik@nib.si),

Olivera Maksimović Carvalho Ferreira[1,2] (olivera.maksimovic@nib.si),

Ana Vučurović[1] (ana.vucurovic@nib.si),

Gabrijel Seljak[1] (gabrijel.seljak@t-2.net),

Nataša Mehle[1,3] (natasa.mehle@nib.si),

Ion Gutiérrez-Aguirre[1] (ion.gutierrez@nib.si),

Maja Ravnikar[1] (maja.ravnikar@nib.si), and

Denis Kutnjak[1,*] (denis.kutnjak@nib.si)

[1]Department of Biotechnology and Systems Biology, National Institute of Biology, Večna pot

111, Ljubljana, 1000 Slovenia.

[2]Jožef Stefan International Postgraduate School, Jamova cesta 39, Ljubljana, 1000 Slovenia.

[3]School for Viticulture and Enology, University of Nova Gorica, Dvorec Lanthieri Glavni trg

8, Vipava, 5271 Slovenia

*Correspondence and request for materials, data, etc. should be addressed to Denis Kutnjak

(denis.kutnjak@nib.si, ORCID: 0000-0002-5327-0587), and Mark Paul Selda Rivarez

(mpsrivarez@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8544-5740).

**Abstract**

**Background**: In agroecosystems, viruses are well known to influence crop health and a few

cause phytosanitary and economic problems, but their diversity in non-crop plants and role

outside the disease perspective is less known. An extensive virome exploration that includes

both crop and diverse weed plants is therefore needed to better understand roles of viruses in

agroecosystems. Such unbiased exploration is possible through viromics, which could

generate biological and ecological insights from immense high-throughput sequencing (HTS)

data.

**Results**: Here, we implemented HTS-based viromics to explore viral diversity in tomatoes

and weeds in farming areas at a nation-wide scale. We detected 125 viruses, including 79

novel species, wherein 65 were found exclusively in weeds. This spanned 21 higher-level

plant virus taxa dominated by *Potyviridae*, *Rhabdoviridae*, and *Tombusviridae,* and four non-

plant virus families. We detected viruses of non-plant hosts and viroid-like sequences, and

demonstrated infectivity of a novel tobamovirus in plants of Solanaceae family. Diversities of

predominant tomato viruses were variable, in some cases, comparable to that of global

isolates of same species. We phylogenetically classified novel viruses, and showed links

between a subgroup of phylogenetically-related rhabdoviruses to their taxonomically-related

host plants. Ten classified viruses detected in tomatoes were also detected in weeds, which

might indicate possible role of weeds as their reservoirs, and that these viruses could be

exchanged between the two compartments.

**Conclusions**: We showed that even in relatively well studied agroecosystems, such as tomato

farms, a large part of very diverse plant viromes can still be unknown and is mostly present in

understudied non-crop plants. The overlapping presence of viruses in tomatoes and weeds

implicate possible presence of virus reservoir and possible exchange between the weed and

crop compartments, which may influence weed management decisions. The observed

variability and widespread presence of predominant tomato viruses and the infectivity of a

novel tobamovirus in solanaceous plants, provided foundation for further investigation of

virus disease dynamics and their effect on tomato health. The extensive insights we generated

from such in-depth agroecosystem virome exploration will be valuable in anticipating

possible emergences of plant virus diseases, and would serve as baseline for further post-

discovery characterization studies.

**Keywords**: tomato, weed, virus, viroid, virome, virus discovery, virus diversity,

phylogenetics, metagenomics, viromics

**Background**

The awareness on the importance of virus diseases, especially amid an on-going COVID-19

pandemic [1], increased research interest on the exploration of virus diversity across

ecosystems, assisted by high-throughput sequencing (HTS) [2–4], and by exploring global

nucleotide databases [5–7]. In agroecosystems, viruses are ubiquitous microbes associated

with eukaryotic hosts including crop and weed plants, fungi, oomycetes, arthropods, and

nematodes, as well as prokaryotes such as bacteria [8,9]. Thus, viruses could influence

dynamics of plant populations and individual phytobiomes, directly, or through modulation of

other ecological or environmental factors [10]. Due to the parasitic nature, high

transmissibility and adaptability of plant pathogenic viruses [11], it was estimated that they

account for half of emerging diseases in plants [12], and losses equivalent to around a quarter

of expected crop yield [13]. Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.), which has the highest

volume of vegetable production globally [14], is associated with more than 300 viruses

including several that are frequently associated with disease symptoms and yield losses [15].

In recent years plant virologists have witnessed a spread of emerging tomato viruses, such as

tomato brown rugose fruit virus (ToBRFV) [16] and tomato leaf curl New Delhi virus

(ToLCNDV) [17]. To study such a high diversity of viruses, HTS has become the tool of

choice. HTS-based viromics, coupled with bioinformatics tools, enable inference of

biological, evolutionary, and ecological insights [18], which impact also fields of virus

diagnostics and epidemiology [19].

With HTS, plant virology has greatly shifted from traditional focus on disease-associated

relationships [18], to a scalable and unbiased ecosystems-level approach [3]. The study of

plant virus pathogenesis and emergence with an ecological approach has also integrated the

modulation of various environmental factors. Specifically, studies, which have been

collectively reviewed in recent literature [20–22], demonstrated the importance of unmanaged

weed plants surrounding cultivated areas in the distribution, ecology and emergence of

viruses [23,24]. In tomato, HTS has significantly advanced virus discovery, diversity,

ecological and epidemiological studies [15]. Several HTS-based studies in the recent decade

have contributed to the current known set of tomato viruses. A survey of tomatoes showing

virus disease-like symptoms in China uncovered the presence of 21 known and one novel

viruses [25]. Similar studies reported known and novel viruses associated with individual

tomato plants or a collection of tomato samples using HTS [26–28]. Findings from these

studies significantly contributed to the characterization of the global tomato virome and

presented several insights that an HTS-based viromics survey can provide regarding the

diversity, ecology and evolution of tomato viruses. In a survey of viruses in tomato and in

surrounding *Solanum nigrum* from different locations in France possible exchanges of viruses

were observed between wild and cultivated plant species [23]. This suggests that more

extensive studies exploring the viromes of the vast diversity of weeds surrounding crop

farming areas would be needed to better understand diversity and dynamics of plant viromes

in an agroecosystem.

Studies that uncovered plant viromes at the ecosystem scale have focused mainly on

discovery, and its epidemiological or ecological implications [23,25,29]. Knowing which

species of viruses are present in an agroecosystem and to what extent they influence the host

fitness landscape will greatly aid prediction of emergence [30]. To better understand plant

virus diversity, ecology and possible emergence of plant virus diseases in an agroecosystem,

we selected tomato as a model crop, and investigated a very diverse set of mostly broadleaf

dicotyledonous volunteer plants, including weeds (designated simply 'weeds' hereafter)

surrounding selected tomato production sites in Slovenia. We examined their viromes using

an HTS-based approach, followed by virus characterization, to answer the following

questions: (1) How diverse and prevalent are plant viruses and other virus-/viroid-like agents

in tomatoes compared to that of surrounding weeds? (2) Are there overlaps of viruses detected

in tomatoes and weeds? (3) Can we identify potential weed reservoirs of known crop viruses,

and do weeds harbor an under-sampled virus diversity? (4) Can we identify some viruses in

weeds, or those shared between tomatoes and weeds, which could potentially emerge in

tomato? (5) What are the phylogenetic relationships of known and novel viruses to known

taxa?

This study represented the largest simultaneous survey of viromes of diverse weed species

and a crop (tomato) within a cropping system. Our approach can be used to gain insights on

plant virus' diversity and dynamics in the wild-cultivated agroecological interface, a known

zone for virus spillovers [11,31,32]. The virome dataset could also aid in future tomato virus

disease monitoring, thus possibly contributing to the prevention of future virus epidemics in

tomato.

**Methods**

**Sample collection and processing**

Tomato and weed plants, within or in the immediate surroundings of tomato farming fields or

greenhouses were collected in Slovenia during summer of 2019 and 2020. Fourteen farms at

six different localities were visited, spanning central (Dol pri Ljubljani, 1 farm), west (Miren-

Kostanjevica, 2 farms; Nova Gorica, 1 farm), southwest (Koper, 4 farms; Piran, 3 farms), and

southeast (Novo Mesto, 3 farms) regions of Slovenia. A total of 436 samples were collected,

full details of which are in Supplementary Table 1. Asymptomatic tomatoes were randomly

sampled within an area, while symptomatic tomatoes and weeds were selectively sampled

based on appearance of virus disease-like symptoms most commonly shown as foliar

discoloration (*e.g.,* chlorosis, mosaic, yellowing), leaf deformation (*e.g.,* folding, curling),

fruit deformation (*e.g.,* mottling, marbling), and systemic symptoms (*e.g.,* general stunting,

rosetting), among others. Selected photographs of collected plants, with a notion of associated

detected viruses, are shown in Supplementary Fig. 3 and Supplementary Table 9. Most tomato

samples collected were in the early fruiting or fruit harvesting stage, while the most weed

plants were sampled at the mature or flowering stage. To aliquot tissues for RNA extraction,

leaves or fruits were obtained equally from different parts of the plant to account for possible

uneven distribution of viruses within the plants. Leaf and fruit tissues were separately

aliquoted in cases where these were collected from a single plant. Collected tissues were

stored at -80°C.

**RNA extraction and sequencing**

Total RNAs were extracted from individual plant samples using RNeasy Plant Mini Kit

(Qiagen, USA). RNA quality and quantity were checked using QuBit fluorometer (Thermo

Fisher Scientific, USA), and NanoDrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA).

RNAs were then pooled equimolarly into composite samples based on plant type (*i.e.*, tomato

or weed), health status (*i.e.*, symptomatic or asymptomatic), and the sampling location

(Supplementary Table 2). A total of 67 composite samples were cleaned, concentrated and

treated with DNase (RNA Clean and Concentrator, Zymo Research, USA). Alien controls

from total RNAs extracted from *Phaseolus vulgaris* infected with Phaseolus vulgaris

alphaendornavirus 1, Phaseolus vulgaris alphaendornavirus 2 and Phaseolus vulgaris

alphaendornavirus 3 were included into each sequencing run. The 2019 and 2020 sample set

were separately sent to Macrogen, Inc. (South Korea), for library preparation and high-

throughput sequencing. Sequencing libraries, including depletion of ribosomal RNA using

Ribo-Zero rRNA Removal Kit (Plant) (Illumina, USA), were prepared suitable for 150 bp

paired-end sequencing using TruSeq RNA Library Prep Kit (Illumina, USA) and sequenced

using Illumina HiSeq 2500 platform.

Total RNAs from inoculated plants (discussed below) were extracted as mentioned above and

depleted of ribosomal RNA using RiboMinus$^{TM}$ Plant Kit (Invitrogen, USA), then ligated

with poly-A sequences using E. coli Poly(A) polymerase (NEB #M0276, UK). Library

preparation was done using the PCR-cDNA Barcoding kit (SQK-PCB109, version

10Oct2019, Oxford Nanopore Technologies, UK), prior to sequencing using Oxford

Nanopore Technologies MinION platform (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, UK) and base-

calling following a previously described workflow [33].

**Sequence quality screening, trimming and virus genome assembly**

Raw reads were trimmed, screened for quality and analyzed following a previously described

pipeline for plant virus detection using HTS [34]. Contigs were primarily assembled from the

filtered reads using CLC Genomics Workbench (GWB) v. 20 [34] (Qiagen, USA). Within the

used pipeline, virus and virus-like reads and contigs were initially identified by mapping

trimmed reads/contigs to virus RefSeq database (version from Jul. 2020) [35] and viral

domains searches in contigs against pFam database v. 33. Candidate viral contigs were later

confirmed by homology search using BLASTn against the NCBI nucleotide (nt) and BLASTx

[36] against NCBI non-redundant protein (nr) databases from Dec. 2020. Assembly in

metaSPAdes v. 3.14 [37] was also implemented to recover longer contigs in some cases,

where these were not assembled in CLC-GWB. Consensus genome sequences of detected

viruses were reconstructed using de-novo assembled contigs and/or iterative reads mapping to

the most similar reference sequences obtained from NCBI GenBank. Since datasets were

derived from pooled samples, consensus viral genomes were reconstructed only for the

viruses with observed low to moderate population diversity (determined after manual

inspection of the mapping files), indicative of infection with a single viral lineage. As a final

checkup, mapping of reads of corresponding datasets to reconstructed consensus virus

genomes was implemented (with 95% identity and read length fraction). Overall sequencing

results and statistics, and information on sequencing read archive (SRA) metadata are given in

Supplementary Table 3. The internal controls were used to check the prevalence of

sequencing cross-talks. A threshold of <0.00001% of total reads in the library was set, based

on the general virome composition of the internal controls, to classify sequences as either a

possible contamination, crosstalk, or low titer virus infection.

For the sequences obtained from inoculated plants (discussed below) using MinION

platform, quality screening was done following a customized workflow [33], that uses the

programs from the NanoPack program [38] for quality screening and visualization. Reads

were assembled using Racon [39]. The mapping program Minimap2 [40] run in Geneious

Prime software v. 2022.1.1 (Dotmatics, USA), was used for mapping reads to viral RefSeq

(version from May 2022) and consensus genomes of viruses detected in this study.

**Virus genome annotation and classification**

Genomes of detected viruses were annotated using the ORF prediction tool in CLC-GWB v.

20, and checked based on known genome organization and open reading frame composition

reported in the ICTV website [41], and in peer-reviewed publications. InterProScan was used

to identify known and unknown protein domains [42], and in the case of potyviruses,

homology alignment in BLASTp (E-val<$10^{-4}$) with well-characterized known species was

implemented to detect gene products and their start and cleavage sites [43]. Viruses were

taxonomically classified based on the percent pairwise identity obtained in SDT v1. 2[44],

and other genomic criteria imposed by the ICTV [41], as of Oct. 31, 2021. Multiple sequence

alignments were made for each genus or family based on the recommended gene or genome

segment by the ICTV. Unaligned ends were trimmed, and trimmed alignments were used for

pairwise identity comparisons. Details of the genes or genome segments used, and the results

of the pairwise identity comparisons are indicated in Supplementary Tables 23-42.

Classifications were then confirmed by analyses of phylogenetic relationships with known

virus taxa (described below).

**Genome assembly and screening for putative viroids**

Viroid-like circular RNAs were assembled using the SLS-PFOR2 program [45]. BLASTn

searches [36] against the NCBI nt database and BLASTx searches against NCBI nr database,

from Dec. 2020, were implemented to filter out sequences from known organisms, and

sequences that code for proteins (E-val<$10^{-4}$). Filtered contigs were re-examined by

remapping (95% identity and read length fraction) virtually-diced reads (generated as a part of

SLS-PFOR2 pipeline) and trimmed reads to the assembled circular RNAs. Contigs with

average mapping depth below 10 were manually discarded. Contigs were again filtered based

on the presence of two or more rotationally identical contigs of the same length (*i.e.*,

indicating the presence of (+) and (-) strands). After selecting for rotational identical contigs,

presence of viroid-like secondary structure motifs (*e.g.,* avsunviroid hammerhead ribozyme

and rod-like pospiviroid structures) were predicted using forna [46]. Low structural Gibbs

free energy and visual inspections such as high degree of base paring, or degree of branching

were the criteria used to preliminarily select for putative novel viroids.

**RT-PCR assays and Sanger sequencing**

PCR primers were designed using Primer3Plus [47], and RT-PCR assays were designed to

identify individual plant host(s) of selected viruses detected using HTS of pooled samples

(Supplementary Table 7). RT-PCRs were performed using OneStep RT-PCR kit (Qiagen,

USA) with thermocycling program conditions given in Supplementary Table 8. To confirm

genome circularity of viroid-like circular RNAs, abutting primers for inverse RT-PCR were

manually designed as previously described [45] (Supplementary Fig. 2). Amplicons were

visualized in 1% agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide. When PCR amplicons need to

be sequenced, to confirm sequence identity or circularity in the viroid-like sequences, they

were purified using QIAquick PCR purification kit (Qiagen, USA), and sent at Eurofins

Genomics, Germany. Amplicon sequences were visualized and trimmed in CLC-GWB v. 20.

Final sequences were remapped (95% identity and read length fraction) to the target virus

genome to confirm its identity, or to putative viroid genome to confirm its circularity

(Supplementary Fig. 2). Photos of identified plant hosts are in Supplementary Fig. 3.

**Phylogenetic analyses**

Phylogenetic analyses were performed to investigate taxonomic positions of detected newly

discovered and known viruses from different taxonomic groups (Supplementary Table 10).

Conserved amino acid sequences of viruses (mainly conserved parts of RNA-dependent RNA

polymerase (RdRp) (methyl transferase, helicase or CP were used in some cases) for RNA

viruses, replicase (C1) protein for geminivirus and reverse transcriptase (RT) for

caulimovirus) detected in this study were aligned with corresponding viral RefSeq amino acid

sequences of viruses within a recognized virus family, in addition to selected BLASTp hits

(E-val<$10^{-4}$). For multiple sequence alignment, ClustalW [48] was used as implemented in

CLC-GWB v. 20. Non-aligned sequences at both ends were trimmed after alignment.

Realignment of trimmed sequences was done using MAFFT [49] and further processed with

trimAI [50].

In the case of tobamoviruses, a nucleotide-based phylogenetic analyses were done on full

genomes. Genomes of different isolates gathered from GenBank and viral RefSeq database,

were aligned using MUSCLE [51], and checked for possible recombinants in RDP v. 4 [52].

All recombination events with *p*-val<$10^{-4}$ reported by at least four methods were considered

significant. Phylogenetic analyses were performed on alignments free of recombinants.

For both, protein and nucleotide alignments, maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses were

inferred in MEGA X [53], after the selection of the most suitable substitution models. Details

on the sequence sets for each analysis, and the parameters used in the analyses are in

Supplementary Table 10. The phylogenetic trees were visualized and edited in iToL v. 6.4

[54]. To investigate possible structuring of virus species in phylogenetic trees by associated

host plants, plant host cladograms were generated in phyloT v. 2 (https://phylot.biobyte.de/)

[54], based on NCBI Taxonomy. Host associations were based on information on the specific

accession in NCBI GenBank of the virus isolate of tobamoviruses in Fig. 7, and all isolates of

species for rhabdoviruses in Fig. 5. Connections were manually inferred between viral and

plant phylogram and cladogram and visually inspected.

**Genome-wide molecular diversity analyses**

Tomato viruses which have at least three isolates detected with full genomes reconstructed,

including their isolates from weed samples, were included in the calculation of percent

pairwise identities and polymorphisms. Full genome nucleotide sequences of selected viruses

were aligned using MUSCLE [51] in MEGA X [53], and unaligned ends were trimmed

thereafter. Genome segments of multi-segmented virus genomes were concatenated after

trimming. Percent pairwise identities and number of polymorphic sites were calculated using

SDT v. 1.2 [44]. For two newly discovered viruses, the aligned sequences were used to

calculate genome-wide polymorphisms and nucleotide diversities ($\pi$) in DnaSP v. 6 [55] in

sliding windows of 100 bases and step size of 5.

**Infectivity tests and transmission electron microscopy (TEM)**

Further characterization studies were performed to test the infectivity and visualize the virions of newly discovered Plantago tobamovirus 1 (PTV1). Five plants each of *Solanum lycopersicum, Nicotiana benthamiana,* and *Nicotiana clevelandii,* were used in the inoculation experiments, with additional two plants each as mock inoculated controls. Plants were inoculated at the four-leaf stage. The source of inoculum for PTV1 was the original *Plantago major* infected sample from the field. Mechanical inoculation of infected plant sap, diluted 1:10 in phosphate buffer, was done on two leaves (second and third youngest), dusted with carborundum, as previously described [56]. The plants were kept in a controlled environment at 20-24°C, with 16 h daylight and 8 h darkness. Inoculated leaves were tested in pools for the presence of the target virus on $7^{th}$ and $14^{th}$ day post inoculation (dpi) in RT-PCR assays. Systemic leaves of inoculated plants were tested for the presence of the PTV1 using RT-PCR assays, wherein pooled newly grown (uninoculated) leaves at 14, 21, 28 and 35 dpi were used. TEM was done to confirm the presence of the virus particles in inoculated *N. clevelandii* plants. Tissue homogenates were applied to Formvar-coated, carbon-stabilized copper grids, and negatively stained with 1% uranyl acetate (SPI Supplies, PA, USA), before inspection in TEM. To associate the observed disease symptoms with the presence of PTV1, pool of five inoculated *N. clevelandii* plant showing virus disease-like symptoms and tested positive for PTV1 was collected at 21 dpi and analyzed using nanopore sequencing as described in section 'RNA extraction and sequencing' above.

**Results**

**Overview of viruses detected in tomatoes and weeds and observed patterns of viral presence and diversity**

Tomato (n=293), and weed (n=143, 59 species in 18 families) plant samples, were collected

from six localities in Slovenia, wherein 14 farms were visited in 2019 and/or 2020 (Fig. 1a-b,

for details see Supplementary Tables 1-3). Sequencing of pooled ribosomal (r)RNA-depleted

total RNAs (*i.e.,* composite samples) from these samples, and subsequent bioinformatics

analyses revealed 126 viruses (Fig. 1c), of which 37 are known and 55 are novel classified

viruses that could be classified up to known species taxa (46 are exclusively from weeds). The

remaining 33 viruses are either isolates of known viruses, which were not yet classified under

established taxa in *Riboviria* (n=9), or unclassified putative novel *Riboviria,* satellite RNAs,

and viroid-like circular RNAs (n=24, 19 are exclusively from weeds). Thus, the total of novel

viruses discovered is 79, of which 65 were found exclusively in weed plants (Fig. 1h, for

details see Supplementary Tables 4-6). Farms from the coastal region of SW Slovenia (Piran

and Koper), where 51% of the samples were collected, have the highest count of virus species

detected (*i.e.,* 57 viruses in Koper and 84 viruses in Piran) (Fig. 1d). The viruses were

classified in 21 known plant virus taxa, and four other families that are known to be

associated with other eukaryotic hosts (*Dicistroviridae, Iflaviridae, Lispiviridae,* and

*Picornaviridae*) (Fig. 1e). Majority of the detected viruses were from 15 taxa of positive sense

(+) single-stranded (ss) RNA viruses (n=60), followed by four families of negative sense (-)

ssRNA viruses (n=17) (Fig. 1f). Ten viruses were found both in tomato and weed composite

samples from several localities, eight of which are most likely plant-infecting. Some of the ten

overlapping viruses are known to have wide host range, and are endemic in tomato (*i.e.,*

tomato spotted wilt orthotospovirus (TSWV), cucumber mosaic virus (CMV), tomato mosaic

virus (ToMV), and potato virus Y (PVY)) [15] (Fig. 1g). Viruses recently detected in tomato

(*i.e.,* Solanum nigrum ilarvirus 1 (SnIV1), Ranunculus white mottle ophiovirus (RWMV),

tomato matilda virus (TMaV)) [23,57–59], a known insect (Aphis glycines virus 1 (AGV1))

and a known fungal (Leveillula taurica associated rhabdo-like virus 1 (LtaRLV1)) virus, and a

novel virus (plant associated tobamo-like virus 1 (PaToLV1)) were also detected in both

sample types. Among the viruses detected both in tomatoes and weeds, there were several

cases in which we could detect the same virus within the same location in both sample types:

seven viruses (TSWV, CMV, ToMV, PaToLV1, LtaRLV1, PVY, and TMaV) with such

pattern were observed.

Three known viruses were detected for the first time both in tomatoes and in Slovenia, and

five others were detected for the first time in the country, (*i.e.*, were not reported before in

local comprehensive records) [60] (Fig. 1i). Lastly, other known crop viruses were detected in

composite weed samples, including two potyviruses (watermelon mosaic virus (WMV) and

carrot thin leaf virus (CTLV)),  ilarvirus (Prunus virus I (PrVI)), closterovirus (beet yellows

virus), luteovirus (soybean dwarf virus), cucumovirus (peanut stunt virus), fabavirus (broad

bean wilt virus 1), polerovirus (barley virus G), and potexvirus (white clover mosaic virus).

To get general insights into the association of detected viruses with observed disease

symptoms, we have compared the number and overlap of detected viruses in sampled

symptomatic and asymptomatic tomatoes. Out of the 45 viruses detected in tomato composite

samples, only four (8.9%) were exclusively detected in asymptomatic tomatoes, and 23

(51.1%) exclusively in symptomatic tomatoes (Fig. 2a). Eighteen (40.0%) viruses were

detected in both types of tomato samples, of which, six (*i.e.,* southern tomato virus (STV),

CMV, PVY, olive latent virus 1 (OLV1), TMaV, and ToMV) were detected in at least six

composite samples. A total of seven new viruses, and eight known but still unclassified

arthropod, fungal and oomycete viruses were detected in tomatoes. Using RT-PCR assays (for

details, see Methods and Supplementary Table 7), we confirmed the presence of a subset of

mostly novel viruses in weeds and tomatoes, and identified key hosts that could be potential

transmission hubs, or alternate hosts (Fig. 2b, for details see Supplementary Table 9). Some

examples include: SnIV1 detected in tomatoes and in another weed host, *Physalis* sp*.,* from a

single farm*,* PaToLV1 detected in tomatoes and in *Convolvulus arvensis* also in a single farm*,*

and TMaV detected in tomatoes and in three other weed species (*i.e., Chenopodium* sp.,

*Ranunculus repens,* and *Erigeron annuus*) that span five localities. RWMV was detected both

in *Solanum nigrum,* and in four pools of tomato samples from three different localities.

Twelve novel viruses (discussed in succeeding sections), including six rhabdoviruses and

three tombusviruses, were detected in four Asteraceae species (*i.e., Picris echoides,*

*Cichorium intybus, Taraxacum officinale,* and *Cirsium arvense*).

To gain further insights on the population genomic diversity of the most prevalent tomato

viruses, we examined populations of 12 viruses (viruses for which we were able to assemble

at least three full genomes). STV, ToMV, TMaV and TSWV showed the narrowest range of

pairwise nucleotide identities, lowest nucleotide diversity and number of polymorphic sites,

while Physostegia chlorotic mottle virus (PhCMoV), RWMV, and potato virus S (PVS) have

a moderate level of diversity (Fig 3a, Supplementary Tables 11-22). PVY, CMV, potato virus

M (PVM), tomato betanucleorhabdovirus 2 (TBRV2), and tomato vitivirus 1 (TomV1)

showed wide range of pairwise nucleotide identities and high number of polymorphic sites

(Fig 3a, Supplementary Tables 11-22). Sliding window analysis of nucleotide diversity for

two novel tomato viruses found in Slovenia (TBRV2 and TomV1), did not pinpoint specific

regions of their genomes that might be more variable than others (Fig. 3b-c). Divergent

lineages detected for both TBRV2 and TomV1, resulted in a high genome-wide variability

depicted as fluctuations of nucleotide diversity along the genome (Fig. 3b-c).

**(-)ssRNA viruses in tomatoes and weeds: discovery of novel orthotospovirus, an**

**ophiovirus, and a divergent bunya-like virus**

Several (-)ssRNA viruses were detected in both, tomatoes and weeds. A novel

orthotospovirus, Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1 (MerV1)*,* was detected in *Mercurialis annua*

(Fig. 4a) in four composite samples from three localities. Pairwise comparison of RNA-

dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) amino acid (aa) sequences showed 72.4-76.0% identity

of MerV1 to related *Tospoviridae* species. MerV1 has genome segments similar to plant

orthotospoviruses (Fig. 4b,e). Phylogenetic analyses based on conserved RdRp aa sequences

of orthotospoviruses revealed that MerV1 is related to viruses in phylogroup C (*i.e.,* a clade of

phylogenetically-related orthotospoviruses) [61] (Fig. 4i).

A novel fimovirus, Artemisia fimovirus 1 (ArtV1) was detected in *Artemisia verlotiorum.* It is

30.2-46.1% identical to related *Fimoviridae* species based on RdRp aa comparison, and has

genome organization similar to plant fimoviruses (Fig. 4a,c,f). Phylogenetic analyses with

known fimoviruses revealed that ArtV1 is related to *Perilla mosaic virus,* making it the fourth

member of the divergent phylogroup IV of *Fimoviridae* (*i.e.,* a clade of phylogenetically-

related fimoviruses) [62,63] (Fig. 4i).

A novel bunya-like virus, closely related to *Fimoviridae* and *Tospoviridae,* was detected in

seven symptomatic tomatoes using RT-PCR assays, thus named tomato associated bunya-like

virus 1 (TaBLV1). Pairwise comparison of RdRp aa sequences showed that TaBLV1 is only

20.8-22.4% identical to closely related bunyaviruses, however, only L- and M-like genome

segments were found for TaBLV1 (L, M and S segments are characteristic of plant-infecting

orthotospoviruses) (Fig. 4a,g). TaBLV1 is more closely related to orthotospoviruses based on

RdRp phylogenetic analyses (Fig. 4i).

We assembled for the first time, the full genome of RWMV, which was previously detected in

tomatoes and peppers in Slovenia [57] (Fig. 4a,d,h). Using RT-PCR assays, RWMV was

detected in three different localities, in eight tomatoes, and one *S. nigrum*, which is a newly

identified associated host. All RWMV isolates form a single clade (100% bootstrap support

(BS)), but Slovenian isolates cluster separately (98.9% BS) from the Australian and Italian

subclade (96.6% BS) (Fig. 4j). For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary

Table 23-25. Phylogenetic trees where the subtrees in Fig. 4 were derived depicting

*Tospoviridae* and *Fimoviridae* families in one tree, and *Aspiviridae* with other related viruses

in one tree, are shown in Supplementary Fig. 4-01 and 4-02, where the GenBank accession

numbers of the sequences used in the analyses are also indicated.

**Discovery of novel rhabdoviruses and their links to Solanaceae and Asteraceae hosts**

In this study, nine novel rhabdoviruses were discovered in tomatoes and weeds. Using RT-

PCR assays, tomato alphanucleorhabdovirus 1 (TARV1), tomato betanucleorhabdovirus 1

(TBRV1) and TBRV2 were confirmed in tomatoes. Five were detected in Asteraceae weeds:

*P. echoides* (Picris betanucleorhabdovirus 1 (PBRV1), Picris cytorhabdovirus 1 (PiCRV1)),

*T. officinale* (Taraxacum betanucleorhabdovirus 1 (TarBRV1) and Taraxacum

cytorhabdovirus 1 (TCRV1)), *Cirsium arvense* (Cirsium cytorhabdovirus 1 (CCRV1)). One

cytorhabdovirus was detected in *Pastinaca sativa* (Apiaceae) (Pastinaca cytorhabdovirus 1

(PaCRV1)). TarBRV1 and TCRV1 were found to be co-infecting a single *T. officinale*

sample, and PBRV1 and PiCRV1 co-infecting one *P. echoides* sample (Fig. 5a). Viruses were

distinguished based on pairwise comparison of full genome nucleotide (nt) sequences (Fig.

5b-d). All novel rhabdoviruses have genomes typical of their genus, except for the highly

divergent PiCRV1, which might have a putative bipartite genome, or the two contigs were not

assembled together in our analyses (Fig. 5e). PiCRV1 is only 29.1-33.5% identical to closely

related cytorhabdoviruses, based on comparison of RdRp aa sequences (Supplementary Table

26-B).

Investigation of virus-host relationships was done by drawing links between rhabdovirus

phylogram and plant host cladogram (Fig. 5f). This revealed that rhabdoviruses from certain

clades are often associated with Solanaceae and Asteraceae plant hosts. In particular, a clade

of closely related alphanucleorhabdoviruses, including one discovered from this study (potato

yellow dwarf virus, joa yellow blotch virus, eggplant mottled dwarf virus, PhCMoV,

TARV1), was associated with eight plant species from family Solanaceae, both

experimentally and as natural hosts. A few associations of betanucleorhabdoviruses

discovered in weeds (PBRV1, TarBV1), and in tomatoes (TBRV1, TBRV2) with solanaceous

plants were also found. Two novel betanucleorhabdoviruses (PBRV1, TarBV1) from this

study and one known virus (Sonchus yellow net virus) were associated with three Asteraceae

plants. For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary Tables 26-28. An identical

rhabdovirus phylogenetic is shown in Supplementary Fig. 4-03, where the GenBank accession

numbers of the sequences used in the analyses are indicated.

**Detection of a kitavirus in tomatoes and other known and novel *Martellivirales* species**

The recently described tomato fruit blotch virus (ToFBV, *Kitaviridae*) [28,64,65], was

detected in two symptomatic tomato leaf samples from Slovenia (Fig. 6a). Infectivity and

possible vector of ToFBV were not reported yet, and it is currently classified in the genus

*Blunervirus.* Pairwise comparison of conserved RdRp aa sequences of blunerviruses (Fig. 6b),

revealed high molecular divergence among members, with only 30.9-41.3% pairwise identity

between species. Phylogenetic analyses using conserved RdRp aa sequences showed that all

known ToFBV isolates from a single clade (100% BS) (Fig. 6k).

SnIV1, a recently described ilarvirus, was detected in *Physalis* sp., which is the sixth distinct

source association with the virus, aside from three other plant species (*S. lycopersicum, S.*

*nigrum,* and an unidentified legume plant) [23,29], and grapevines infected with a fungus

(*Erysiphe necator*) and an oomycete (*Plasmopara viticola*) [66,67]. PrVI, recently discovered

in sweet cherry [68], was detected in our study in *P. echoides*, co-infected with PiCRV1.

Pairwise comparison of RdRp aa sequences of the isolates of SnIV1 and PrVI from this study

showed that they are >98% identical to other isolates of each species (Fig. 6c). A novel

subgroup II ilarvirus, tomato ilarvirus 1 (TIV1), was detected in an asymptomatic tomato

sample, and is at most 83.3% identical to closely related ilarviruses based on RdRp aa

sequence comparison (Fig. 6d,h).

Three new *Closteroviridae* species were detected in weeds through HTS (Fig. 6e,f,i).Two new

alphaendornaviruses with their typical protein domains were also discovered, one of which is

from a pool of symptomatic tomatoes (Fig. 6g,j). Novel ilarvirus*,* closterovirus and

alphaendornavirus all form distinct phylogenetic clades with related viruses (>60% BS) (Fig.

6l-n). For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary Tables 29-33. Expanded

versions of the collapsed phylogenetic trees in Fig. 6 are shown in Supplementary Fig. 4-04,

05, 06, and 07, where the GenBank accession numbers of the sequences used in the analyses

are indicated. Details of InterPro domain search are in Supplementary Tables 43-44.

**Characteristics of a new tobamovirus, and a divergent tobamo-like virus species**

A new tobamovirus, Plantago tobamovirus 1 (PTV1), was discovered in *Plantago major* (Fig.

7a), and percent pairwise identities based on whole genome nt sequences revealed that PVT1

is 80.4-85.7% identical to closely related tobamoviruses, which is below the current species

demarcation at <90% (Fig. 7b). PTV1 has genome composition and organization typical of

tobamoviruses (Fig. 7c). Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses using conserved methyl

transferase-helicase aa sequences showed that PTV1 is closely related to ribgrass mosaic virus

(RMV), turnip vein clearing virus (TVCV), youcai mosaic virus (YoMV), and wasabi mottle

virus (WMoV) (Fig. 7h, highlighted in yellow). Phylogenetic analyses using full nt genome

sequences of all known isolates from this tobamovirus clade including RMV, TVCV, YoMV,

WMoV revealed relatedness but distinct divergence of PTV1 from the RMV clade (Fig. 7i).

By superimposing information on host and country of origin (Fig. 7l), we found that aside

from PTV1, *P. major* (Plantaginaceae) is a common host for RMV from Germany, and for

RMV and TVCV in another eco-geographically distinct country, New Zealand [69,70].

Systemic infection with disease symptoms, which was confirmed by RT-PCR, was observed

in *Nicotiana benthamiana* and *Nicotiana clevelandii* that were mechanically-inoculated with

PTV1-infected *P. major* leaf tissues. Inoculated tomato plants remained asymptomatic,

however, PTV1 was detected by RT-PCR in systemic leaves until 28 dpi but not at 35 dpi and

beyond (Fig. 7e-g, Supplementary Fig. 5), which might be a consequence of either transient

infection or cross-contamination during the experiment. Transmission electron microscopy of

a *N. clevelandii* infected plant revealed PTV1 virions that are rigid rods, typical for

tobamoviruses (Fig. 7f). HTS of the same plant confirmed the presence of PTV1 in systemic

tissues (Supplementary Fig. 5).

A tobamo-like virus, PaToLV1, was detected in symptomatic tomatoes and in *Convolvulus*

*arvensis* (Fig. 7a). Pairwise identity analysis using RdRp aa sequences showed that PaToLV1

is <31% identical to Plumeria mosaic virus (*Tobamovirus*), tobacco rattle virus (*Tobravirus*)

and Beihai chrarybdis crab virus 1 (BCCV1, unclassified *Riboviria*) (Supplementary Table

35). PaToLV1 has genome structure similar to BCCV1, except for an additional unknown

open reading frame (ORF) (Fig. 7d). Phylogenetic analyses based on the RdRp and CP aa

sequences both revealed that PaToLV1 isolates form a monophyletic clade, which is clustered

together with BCCV1 (Fig. 7h). For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary

Table 34-35. Detailed version of the *Virgaviridae* phylogenetic trees in Fig. 7 are shown in

Supplementary Fig. 4-08-A (methyl transferase, helicase-based) and Supplementary Fig. 4-

08-B (coat protein-based), where the GenBank accession numbers of the sequences used in

the analyses are indicated. Details of InterPro domain search for virus genomes are in

Supplementary Tables 45-46.

**Characteristics of novel *Potyviridae* species, and crop-infecting potyviruses found in**

**weeds**

Aside from PVY, two known potyviruses (WMV and CTLV), previously detected in

Slovenian crops and ornamentals [71,72], were detected in pools of weed plants from this

study. Full genomes of these viruses were detected in composite samples from five different

tomato farms, encompassing two localities in the Primorska region (SW Slovenia: Koper,

Piran). Henbane mosaic virus, previously found in tomatoes from Slovenia[56], was detected

in a composite sample of open field-grown symptomatic tomatoes. Three novel members of

*Potyviridae* (Mentha macluravirus 1 (MenMV1), Plantago potyvirus 1 (PlaPV1) and Rumex

potyvirus 1 (RumPV1)) were discovered in weeds showing virus disease-like symptoms (Fig.

8a). Pairwise comparison of full-length (nt, aa) polyprotein ORF distinguished the new

species from the known ones based on molecular demarcation criteria for *Potyviridae* (<82%

aa, <76% nt) [73] (Fig. 8b-e). The genome and polyprotein ORF of novel potyviruses were

characterized, and all protein domains, typical of macluraviruses and potyviruses were found

(Fig. 8f). Phylogenetic analyses based on conserved RdRp aa sequence placed MenMV1 in a

clade with artichoke latent virus and Narcissus latent virus (100% BS) (Fig. 8g). PlaPV1 was

placed in a clade with cucurbit vein banding virus (83.1% BS), and RumPV1 was placed in a

clade with lotus latent virus and Calystegia hederacea virus (100% BS).

Two different lineages of broad-leafed dock virus A (BDVA), were also detected. A lineage

with a considerably low pairwise identity compared with original isolate (86.6% aa, 76.0% nt)

was found in *Rumex crispus*. For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary

Tables 36-37. An expanded version of the collapsed *Potyviridae* phylogenetic tree in Fig. 8, is

shown in Supplementary Fig. 4-09, where the GenBank accession numbers of the sequences

used in the analyses are indicated. Details of protein domain and cleavage site search for virus

genomes are in Supplementary Table 47.

**Known tomato tombusviruses, and discovery of new *Tombusviridae* species and**

**tombusvirus-like associated RNAs in weeds**

Genomes of three known members of *Tombusviridae* (tomato bushy stunt virus (TBSV),

tobacco necrosis virus A (TNVA), olive latent virus 1 (OLV1)), and partial genome of olive

mild mosaic virus (OMMV), were assembled from sequences derived from composite tomato

samples. Five new viruses classified in four different *Tombusviridae* genera were discovered

in weeds showing virus disease-like symptoms (Fig. 9a). These include two new

umbraviruses (Pastinaca umbravirus 1 (PasUV1) and Picris umbravirus 1 (PicUV1)), one new

aureusvirus (Convolvulus aureusvirus 1 (ConAV1)), one new pelarspovirus (Calystegia

pelarspovirus 1 (CalPV1)), and one new alphacarmovirus (Cichorium alphacarmovirus 1

(CicAV1)). Three sequences, with similarity to self-replicating, coat-dependent RNA

replicons, called tombusvirus-like associated RNAs [74], were also detected in composite

weed samples. Pairwise comparisons of full genome nt or RdRp (replicase) aa sequences were

done, whichever is appropriate for species demarcation (Fig. 9b-f). Genome organization

typical for the genera was determined for the new *Tombusviridae* members. Novel unknown

ORFs were detected in Picris umbravirus 1 and CalPV1 (Fig. 9g). Genome compositions and

organizations of new tombusvirus-like associated RNAs were similar to those previously

described [74], except for the two plant associated tombusvirus-like RNA 1 isolates, in which

ambisense ORFs were detected. Phylogenetic analyses placed the novel tombusvirus-like

associated RNAs in a clade with Arracacha latent virus E associated RNA, a member of

subgroup III tombusvirus-like associated RNAs (78.7% BS) [74]. Novel tombusviruses were

likewise placed in clades with known species of their respective genera (>60% BS) (Fig. 9h).

For details of the pairwise comparisons, see Supplementary Tables 38-42. An expanded

version of the collapsed *Tombusviridae* phylogenetic tree in Fig. 9, with providence virus

(*Carmotetraviridae*) as outgroup, is shown in Supplementary Fig. 4-10, where the GenBank

accession numbers of the sequences used in the analyses are also indicated.

**Discovery of other numerous viruses, satellite RNAs, and viroid-like circular RNAs**

Aside from viruses mentioned above, a diverse set of 37 classified known and novel viruses,

21 putative virus-like *Riboviria* species (*i.e.,* cannot be classified in known virus taxa), and

four known and new satellite RNAs were also detected (Supplementary Table 5). Genome

organization of these viruses and phylogenetic trees including the viruses are shown in

Supplementary Fig. 1 and 4. Aside from STV, other dsRNA viruses were discovered,

including six new *Partitiviridae* members from weeds, two of which were detected in 2019

and 2020 at the same farm. Three new *Totiviridae* members were discovered, two of which

are phylogenetically related to plant-associated members of the family. Circular DNA viruses

were discovered, including two new caulimoviruses found in weeds, and partial genome of a

new geminivirus (Calystegia geminivirus 1), from a symptomatic *Calystegia* sp. sample co-

infected with CalPV1. To our knowledge, this could be one of the few geminiviruses in wild

plants from Europe, since the majority of geminiviruses were found in Asia and the Americas

[75]. Several other (+)ssRNA viruses were also discovered and classified under

*Alphaflexiviridae* (n=1), *Dicistroviridae* (n=3)*, Iflaviridae* (n=1), *Secoviridae* (n=5), and

*Solemoviridae* (n=3). The new alphaflexivirus (Pastinaca potexvirus 1) was detected in a *P.*

*sativa* sample co-infected with PasUV1 and PaCRV1. One new satellite virus (tomato

albetovirus 1) and new satellite RNA (TBSV satellite RNA C), associated with

*Tombusviridae* species [76,77], were detected in tomatoes. Six putative virus-like sequences

detected were previously associated with arthropod [4], fungi [66], or oomycete [67] hosts,

while other 15 are highly divergent ones with unidentified hosts. Using a custom discovery

pipeline based on SLS-PFOR2 [45], we assembled and screened 4249 circular RNAs, and

identified 344 viroid-like candidates (Supplementary Table 6). Five viroid-like circular RNAs

were preliminarily selected, based on predicted secondary structure, %GC content, and degree

of branching. Genome circularity was confirmed for Taraxacum viroid-like circular RNA 1

(Supplementary Fig. 2), which was detected in a *T. officinale* sample co-infected with

TarBV1.

**Discussion**

Virus diversity in specific crops is relatively well-studied compared to weed plants or crop's

wild relatives [20,21]. A few studies used HTS to uncover virus diversity and possible

exchanges in the cultivated and wild compartments of agroecosystems [23,29]. Here, we

detected 37 known and 55 novel viruses, which were classified in established virus taxa, and

33 unclassified *Riboviria* members. This indicates a highly understudied diversity of novel

viruses in an agroecosystem, especially in weeds that might serve as reservoirs of viruses that

could infect crops. This study represents the largest survey of viromes of diverse weed species

within tomato agroecosystems or any cropping system. Forty-six novel viruses classified in

known taxa, and additional 19 novel unclassified viruses, were detected in weeds, some of

which are also present in tomatoes (*e.g.,* PaToLV1, LtaRLV1). Overall, the viromes were

dominated by 60 (+)ssRNA viruses (under *Martellivirales, Potyviridae*, and *Tombusviridae*)

and 17 (-)ssRNA viruses (under *Mononegavirales*). Another study looked at the exchanges of

viruses between tomato and a wild relative, *S. nigrum,* in France, wherein PVY and SnIV1

were found to be present in both, cultivated and wild compartments [23]. Here we observed

the same pattern, finding PVY and SnIV1 in tomato and a weed (*Physalis* sp.), and in

addition, we identified new weed hosts of viruses found in tomatoes, such as RWMV in *S.*

*nigrum*. We also detected in weed samples known viruses of other crops, which were

previously detected in the country (*e.g.,* WMV, CTLV). The detection of crop-infecting

viruses in weed plants implies the possible role of weeds as wild reservoirs and alternate hosts

for such viruses [78].

In this study, around two-thirds (60/92) of the known and novel classified viruses detected

were found exclusively in weeds surrounding tomato farms, 22 were found exclusively in

tomatoes, and 10 viruses were found both in weed and tomato samples. The shared viruses

include both generalist viruses (*i.e.*, viruses with known wide host range that includes wild

plants)  some of which are also important pathogens of tomatoes [15] (*e.g.,* TSWV, CMV,

PVY). Overall, a small proportion of viruses was associated with plants from different

families, which might suggest a wide host range for these viruses. Associated host plants were

further confirmed using RT-PCR for 36 out of all 125 viruses detected, of which, only three

(*i.e.,* TMaV, PaToLV, and Rumex potyvirus 1) were associated with at least two plants from

different botanical families. Such small proportion of generalist viruses is consistent with

previous hypotheses that most viruses evolved and settled as specialists that are only adapted

to a few hosts (*i.e.,* have narrow host ranges), because of the fitness cost and evolutionary

constraints associated to a generalist lifestyle [79]. This also implies presence of possible

barriers for host-switching that could be established in the course of virus-host co-evolution

[11]. Nevertheless, in this study, we collected just a portion of larger plant diversity and did

not confirm plant infectivity of these viruses. Thus, post-discovery characterization and

extending sampling and analysis to other crops and weeds, will help confirm these

hypotheses.

Viruses infecting plants may not cause any disease symptoms, because of a rather neutral or

beneficial interaction with its host, latent infection, host resistance, or modulation of

environmental factors [10,80]. A previous study of tomato viruses in China focused only on

symptomatic samples [25]. In our study, HTS and RT-PCR assays further revealed viruses

that are shared between tomatoes and weeds, and those that were detected in both

asymptomatic and symptomatic tomatoes. In tomatoes, 45 different viruses were detected, 18

of which were found in both asymptomatic and symptomatic tomatoes. This observation has

an important implication when aiming to capture a significant breadth of virus diversity

through sampling across ecosystem scales. This observation also gave important insights on

possible symptom masking due to virus-tomato-environment interactions leading to latency,

or due to host resistance or tolerance.

Monitoring virus diversity and evolutionary dynamics of economically important and

widespread viruses could help anticipate emergence of new variants, thus preventing disease

outbreaks [30]. Here, we investigated the molecular diversity of viruses based on full genome

nucleotide identities, and variability among virus isolates based on genome-wide polymorphic

sites and nucleotide diversity scanning. These were determined on the most prevalent viruses

in tomatoes, wherein some were detected for the first time in Slovenian tomatoes and are

present in several localities, such as TMaV. Low diversity was observed among the isolates of

ToMV and the persistent STV, which is consistent with previous reports on their global

diversity [81,82]. TSWV, in contrast to its considerable diversity at the global scale [83],

showed low diversity in the samples analyzed here.. Sequenced genomes of PVY, CMV,

PVM, PhCMoV, RWMV showed moderate levels of variability. PhCMoV is a recently

detected, and widespread pathogen of tomato and other crops in Europe, where considerable

level of diversity was observed among the isolates [84,85]. RWMV was recently detected in

Slovenian peppers and tomatoes, where isolates showed moderate diversity as well [57].

Moreover, two new viruses (TBRV2, TomV1) associated with tomatoes, showed high level of

variability, which might imply that these viruses are circulating in the area for a long time

already and/or are undergoing diversifying evolution. Further diversity and evolution studies

of viruses found in tomatoes in our virome survey, such as ToFBV, PhCMoV, TMaV, SnIV1,

RWMV, TBRV2, and TomV1 would bring insightful information about the nature of the

observed variations, *e.g.*, if they are the result of neutral processes or are subjected to different

kind of selection pressures and/or possible ongoing adaptation to tomato.

We observed high diversity of novel viruses at higher taxonomical levels. The most

illustrative example is detection of 11 rhabdoviruses, of which 9 are newly discovered

species. Three new rhabdoviruses phylogenetically-related to plant rhabdoviruses were

associated with tomato, which increases the count of known tomato rhabdoviruses from two

to five. In weeds, six new rhabdoviruses were detected, primarily associated with Asteraceae

species. Our observations added to the discoveries made in other studies, *e.g.,* a recent

discovery of 27 new viruses that are phylogenetically-related to plant rhabdoviruses through

homology searches in the transcriptome shotgun assembly database of NCBI [86]. Some

rhabdoviruses are known to replicate in its arthropod vector as well [87], thus, further

infectivity tests are needed to confirm their infectivity and pathogenicity in associated plant

hosts.

Among the most economically important viruses of tomato, tobamoviruses are the most

problematic in recent years, due to the emergence of ToBRFV [16]. We detected a novel

tobamovirus (PTV1) in *Plantago major* surrounding a greenhouse farm in Slovenia. We

demonstrated the systemic infection of PTV1 in various Solanaceae hosts, but more extensive

biological and genetic characterization is needed to understand its biological characteristics.

Nevertheless, such discovery calls for further research on risks associated with tobamoviruses

as one of the major causes of disease outbreaks in tomato and other solanaceous crops [15]. A

novel tobamo-like virus (PaToLV1) was also detected in tomatoes and in *Convolvulus*

*arvensis*. A previous study showed the evolutionary relationship of the most similar known

virus, BCCV1, to *Virgaviridae* and *Martellivirales* families [4]*,* which could also be the case

for PaToLV1.

Moreover, besides viruses, we also attempted to uncover new viroid-like agents in our dataset,

with the aim to contribute to their possibly still undiscovered diversity [45]. We obtained five

candidate viroids, wherein one was experimentally confirmed to be circular and structurally

similar to members of *Avsunviroidae* due to the presence of a hammerhead ribozyme motif

[88]. These results suggest that further research in this direction and development of new

bioinformatics tools for viroid discovery within sequencing datasets could uncover even

larger hidden diversity of these non-protein coding pathogenic agents.

Aside from studying virus diversity and evolution, understanding of host-virus co-

evolutionary relationships is also essential in predicting possible virus emergence through

host-switching [89]. We observed an association of a clade of closely related

alphanucleorhabdoviruses with plant species from family Solanaceae. However, the general

topology of tanglegram suggested discordant evolutionary historic events between plant

rhabdoviruses and their hosts, which is similar to what was previously shown in animal/insect

rhabdoviruses [89]. Likewise, we found frequent association of different but related viruses

with a single plant host. This is the case of *Plantago major,* which was associated with PTV1,

RMV, and TVCV isolates from four different countries from two very distinct eco-

geographical regions. This subgroup was originally associated with brassica hosts [90] and

recently, as reported in this study, with several Plantaginaceae and Actinidiaceae plants. This

observation indicates a possibility of virus spread through introduction of plants, followed by

diversifying evolution through a mix of confounding environmental and host-related factors

[91].

**Conclusions**

Viruses, viroids and other virus-like agents are well-studied in crops, but known to a much

lesser extent in non-crop plants. Their phytosanitary implications and economic importance in

crops such as tomato [15], resulted to an increased interest to discover novel species. Here, we

presented an extensive viromics study, where we uncovered the vast diversity of viromes of

plant species in defined agroecosystems linked with tomato production. Similar systematic

surveys in various crop agroecosystems, which could also include fungal, oomycete,

arthropod or nematode vectors and environmental media, such as soil and water should, in the

future, provide more virome data from still undescribed compartments of agroecosystems.

Collectively, this will help uncover fraction of the unknown viruses in the global virosphere

[92], and including their yet unknown ecological interactions and functions [8,9]. Overall, our

study contributed valuable information that will, in future studies, help predict possible virus

emergence in the wild-cultivated agroecological interface, a zone of possible virus spillovers

and disease outbreaks [11,31,32].

**Figure captions**

**Figure 1 | Diversity and distribution of samples and viruses detected in tomatoes and**

**weeds surrounding tomato farms. a** Pie chart showing proportion of sample count per

sample type, and separately for weed samples, proportion of sample count per plant family. **b**

Map showing the geographical locations where sampling was done. Farm codes are indicated

for each locality. **c** Overall count of viruses, with (near) complete genomes, identified from

this study, distributed as proportion of known, novel and unclassified *Riboviria* species. **d** Bar

plot summarizing the number of samples collected, and viruses detected in each sampling

locality. **e** Heatmap showing the diversity of identified viruses by genome composition, their

distribution in each known virus taxa by sample type, and the known eukaryotic host

(Kingdom) of each virus taxa. **f** Summary of count of identified viruses based on Baltimore

class or genome composition. **g** Venn diagram showing the number of identified known and

novel viruses found exclusively in tomato or weed composite samples, and the viruses found

in both sample types. Credit: Images or icons used in the figure were from

https://freesvg.com/,         and       are       under       Public       Domain       (CC0       license,

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/publicdomain/). The map of Slovenia was derived from

work of Andrei Nacu uploaded in Wikimedia Commons, the free media repository, under the

Public Domain (CC0 license). The authors and publisher remain neutral with regard to

jurisdictional claims in published maps.

**Figure 2 | Connectivity and overlaps of viruses detected in different sample types. a**

Bipartite network showing detection of viruses in composite symptomatic and asymptomatic

tomato samples from the present study. The node represents the viruses, in which outline

thickness is weighted based on the number of composite samples where the virus was

detected by HTS. The lines connect viruses with a sample type in which they were detected.

Virus names are color coded according to classification status: known viruses are either

officially recognized ICTV species (black font), or viruses that are deposited and classified in

GenBank, but not ICTV-recognized (purple). Novel viruses from this study, which are

classified up to the species level, are in blue font, while putative viruses without any official

classification yet are in red font. **b** Plant-virus-sample pool tripartite network, showing the

connectivity of the subset of viruses detected in weeds with associated hosts. Shown in the

network is the subset of novel viruses detected in weeds by HTS, which were further

associated with specific host species (NCBI taxonomy IDs are shown) using RT-PCR assays

or deduction from HTS data (for tomato, which was not pooled with other species). Virus

names in blue font are those detected in both tomato and weed samples by HTS and RT-PCR.

Credit: Images and icons used in the figure were from www.freesvg.com, and are under

Public Domain (CC0 license, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/publicdomain/).

**Figure 3 | Molecular diversity and genome-wide variability of most frequently detected**

**tomato viruses in this study. a** Pairwise nucleotide identities of populations of tomato

viruses from Slovenia. Isolates of tomato viruses from weed samples, were included in the

calculation of pairwise identities. **b, c** Genome-wide nucleotide diversity of novel viruses in

tomatoes from Slovenia with at least three isolates. All open reading frames and protein

domain cleavage sites are shown for each virus genome.

**Figure 4 | Characteristics of (-)ssRNA viruses under family *Tospoviridae*, *Fimoviridae*,**

**and *Aspiviridae*, from the present study. a** Selected photographs showing associated

symptoms in field samples that tested positive for the respective viruses in RT-PCR assays. **b-**

**d** Heatmaps showing the pairwise identities of selected viruses based on alignment and

comparison of full length RdRp amino acid sequences. **e-h** Genome organization of the

viruses presented herewith showing the predicted open reading frames and protein products. **i-**

**j** Maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees based on the conserved RNA-dependent RNA

polymerase (RdRp) amino acid sequences of *Tospoviridae* and *Fimoviridae* also showing

tomato associated bunya-like virus 1 (**i**), and *Aspivirdae* (**j**). Branch length scale represents

amino acid substitution per site. Virus names and acronyms in blue bold font are the novel

viruses, while those in black bold font are known viruses from the present study. Indicated

after the name or acronym are the isolate IDs of the viruses. Full virus names of those

abbreviated in the pairwise identity matrices (**b-d**) can be found in the genome organization

and phylogenetic trees (**e-j**).

**Figure 5 | Characteristics of novel (-)ssRNA viruses classified in family *Rhabdoviridae***

**from the present study. a** Photographs of samples that tested positive for selected novel

rhabdoviruses in RT-PCR assays. **b-d** Heatmaps showing the pairwise identities of species in

genus *Alphanucleorhabdovirus* (**b**), *Betanucleorhabdovirus* (**c**), and *Cytorhabdovirus* (**d**),

based on full genome length nucleotide sequences. Virus acronyms in blue bold font are the

novel rhabdoviruses, while those in black bold font are known rhabdoviruses from the present

study. Indicated after virus names and acronyms are the isolate IDs. **e** Genome organization of

novel rhabdoviruses discovered in the present study. Genome lengths are shown to scale.

Open reading frames (ORFs) and the proteins they code for are color coded accordingly. **f** Co-

phylogenetic tree (tanglegram) showing the phylogenetic relationships of novel rhabdoviruses

among known species (left tree), which are linked with associated plant host(s) indicated in

GenBank, shown on the right tree. Numerous links of well-supported clade of viruses to

taxonomically-related plants are highlighted in red. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree of

rhabdoviruses was constructed **based** on the conserved amino acid sequence of the RdRp.

Branch length scale represents amino acid substitution per site. The host cladogram was made

in phyloT (www.phylot.biobyte.de). In the virus tree, viruses associated with at least two

plant hosts are indicated by a blue circle. In the host tree, green circles are used to indicate

plants that are associated with two or more rhabdoviruses, and the host species names in bold

green font are those that have representative samples in the present study. The clades are

separately color coded and annotated for each tree. Full virus names of those abbreviated in

the pairwise identity matrices (**b-d**) can be found in the genome organization and

phylogenetic trees (**e, f**).

**Figure 6 | Characteristics of (+)ssRNA viruses in families *Kitaviridae, Bromoviridae,***

***Closteroviridae*, and *Endornaviridae* from the present study. a** Photograph of one of the

symptomatic tomato samples that tested positive for ToFBV in RT-PCR assays. **b-g**

Heatmaps showing the pairwise identities to distinguish different *Kitaviridae* (**b**) and

*Bromoviridae* (**c, d**) species based on alignment and comparison of RdRp amino acid

sequences, members of *Closterovirus* genus (**e**) based on full genome nucleotide sequences,

members of *Crinivirus* genus (**f**) based on full RNA1 segment nucleotide sequence, and

members of *Alphaendornavirus* (**g**) based on full genome nucleotide sequences **h-j** Genomes

of the novel viruses, with the predicted open reading frames, protein domains, and genome

size. **k-n** Maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees constructed based on the conserved amino

acid sequence of the RdRp of (**k**) *Kitaviridae*, (**l**) *Bromoviridae*, (**m**) *Closteroviridae*, and (**n**)

*Endornaviridae*. Branch length scale represents amino acid substitution per site. Indicated

after the acronym are the isolate IDs of the viruses. Virus names and acronyms in blue bold

font are the novel viruses, while those in black bold font are known viruses from the present

study. Full virus names of those abbreviated in the pairwise identity matrices (**b-g**) can be

found in the genome organization and phylogenetic trees (**h-n**).

**Figure 7 | Characteristics of (+)ssRNA viruses in family *Virgaviridae* from the present**

**study. a** Selected photographs of samples that tested positive in RT-PCR assays for the

viruses presented herewith. **b** Heatmap of pairwise identities of *Tobamovirus* (*Virgaviridae*)

species based on full genome nucleotide sequences. **c, d** Genome organization and read

coverage of novel viruses showing the open reading frames, and the proteins they code for. **e**

Photographs of the PTV1 inoculated symptomatic plants and mock inoculated control plants.

**f** Electronmicrograph showing particle morphology of PTV1. **g** RT-PCR assays of test plants

inoculated with Plantago tobamovirus 1 (PTV1). **h** Maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees

constructed based on the conserved amino acid sequence of methyl transferase-helicase (left)

and coat protein (CP) (right). The phylogenetic congruence of the methyl transferase-helicase-

based tree (left) is demonstrated by line connecting identical viruses to the CP-based tree

(right). Congruent clades with >60% bootstrap support are highlighted (light blue). The clade

of viruses closely related to PTV1 is highlighted in yellow. **i** Maximum likelihood

phylogenetic tree, based on full genome nucleotide sequences, of all the isolates of a subgroup

of tobamoviruses including PTV1. Virus names and acronyms in blue bold font are the novel

viruses from the present study. Indicated after the acronym are the isolate IDs of the viruses.

Branch length scale represents amino acid (**h**) or nucleotide substitution (**i**) per site. The hosts

or isolation sources of the viruses as indicated in NCBI GenBank, and the countries and dates

of collection are indicated. Full virus names of those abbreviated in (**b**) and (**i**) are indicated in

(**c-d**) and (**h**).

**Figure 8 | Characteristics of (+)ssRNA viruses from family *Potyviridae* from the present**

**study. a** Selected photographs of samples that tested positive in RT-PCR assays for the

viruses presented herewith. **b-e** Heatmaps of the pairwise identities of *Macluravirus* and

*Potyvirus* species based on alignment and comparison of full genome nucleotide sequences

(**b-c**) and based on full polyprotein amino acid sequence (**d-e**). **f** Genome organization with

predicted cistrons and read coverage for novel potyviruses from this study. **g** Maximum

likelihood phylogenetic tree based on the alignment of conserved RdRp amino acid sequence

of RefSeq species from the *Potyviridae* family. Branch length scale represents amino acid

substitution per site. Virus names and acronyms in blue bold font are the novel viruses, while

those in black bold font are known viruses from the present study. Indicated after the acronym

are the isolate IDs of the viruses. Full virus names of those abbreviated in the pairwise

identity matrices (**b-e**) can be found in the genome organization and phylogenetic trees (**f-g**).

**Figure 9 | Characteristics of (+)ssRNA viruses in family *Tombusviridae* from the present**

**study. a** Selected photographs of samples that tested positive in RT-PCR assays for the

viruses presented herewith. **b-f** Heatmaps of pairwise identities of plant tombusvirus-like

associated RNAs based on alignment and comparison of RdRp amino acid sequences (**b**),

*Umbravirus* species based on full genome nucleotide sequences (**c**), *Aureusvirus* species (**d**),

*Pelarspovirus* species (**e**), and *Alphacarmovirus* species (**f**) based on RdRp amino acid

sequences. **g** Genome organization of novel *Tombusviridae* species and tombusvirus-like

associated RNAs from this study. Open reading frames (ORFs) and the proteins they code for

are color coded accordingly. **h** Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree based on the conserved

amino acid sequence of RdRp. Virus names and acronyms in blue bold font are the novel

viruses, while those in black bold font are known viruses from the present study. Indicated

after the acronym are the isolate IDs of the viruses. Branch length scale represents amino acid

substitution per site. Full virus names of those abbreviated in the pairwise matrices in (**b-f**) are

in the phylogenetic tree (**h**).

**Supplementary information**

**Additional File 1: Supplementary Table 1.** Individual plant samples, their species names,

corresponding plant families and sampling locations. **Supplementary Table 2.** Composite

samples used in high-throughput sequencing, their composition, year of collection, farm type

and other associated information. **Supplementary Table 3.** Sequence read archive (SRA)

metadata of the sequencing experiments, read counts, and other associated information.

**Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 4.** List summarizing all viruses detected in the

composite samples. **Supplementary Table 5.** List of analyses done in the reconstruction and

identification of individual virus genomes. **Supplementary Table 6.** List of circular RNAs

assembled using a custom pipeline based on SLS-PFOR2, with filtering using BLASTn and

BLASTx searches.

**Additional File 3: Supplementary Figure 1**. Genome organization of novel viruses, first full

genomes of known viruses showing known and putative open reading frames and the protein

they code for and predicted secondary structures of selected viroid-like circular RNAs

detected in this study.

**Additional File 4: Supplementary Table 7.** RT-PCR primers and PCR conditions used in

confirmation of associated plant hosts of selected viruses and putative viroids.

**Supplementary Table 8.** RT-PCR thermocycling conditions used in the detection of selected

viruses and putative viroids in associated plant hosts. **Supplementary Figure 2**. Orientation

and annealing sites of the primers designed for the amplification of the circular genome of

Taraxacum viroid-like circular RNA 1, and results of RT-PCR confirmation of the circular

genome. **Supplementary Table 9.** List of confirmed associated plant hosts of selected viruses

and putative viroids.

**Additional File 5: Supplementary Figure 3**. Representative field photos of confirmed

associated plant hosts of selected viruses and putative viroids.

**Additional File 6: Supplementary Table 10.** Model selection and other parameters used for

phylogenetic analyses. **Supplementary Figure 4.** Phylogenetic trees up to the virus family or

order level showing relationships of identified known and novel viruses in this study.

**Additional File 7 (Data Source): Supplementary Table 11-22.** Summary of all results from

the DnaSP v. 6 analyses.

**Additional File 8 (Data Source): Supplementary Table 23-42.** Summary of all pairwise

identity values from the SDT v. 1.2 analyses.

**Additional File 9 (Data Source): Supplementary Table 43-47.** Summary of all results from

the protein domain prediction using InterPro scans, and homology alignments with known

species of potyviruses to identify start and cleavage sites of proteins.

**Additional File 10: Supplementary Figure 5.** RT-PCR, TEM and nanopore sequencing

results on the confirmation of infectivity of Plantago tobamovirus 1 in solanaceous hosts.

**Declarations**

**Funding**

This work mainly received funding from Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions

Innovative Training Network project "Innovative Network for Next Generation Training and

Sequencing of Virome (INEXTVIR)" (GA 813542). It also received support from the

Administration of the Republic of Slovenia for Food Safety, Veterinary Sector and Plant

Protection and Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS) core (P4-0165, P4-0407), and project

financing (projects L7-2632 and L4-3179, co-financed by the Ministry of Agriculture,

Forestry and Food of the Republic of Slovenia, and BIA Laboratory and Process Equipment

Co., Ltd.).

**Authors' contributions**

M.R., D.K., and I.G.A. acquired funding. D.K., M.R., and M.P.S.R. formulated and designed

the study. D.K. and M.R. supervised the study. M.P.S.R. did the laboratory and greenhouse

work, the data analyses, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. K.B. did the electron

microscopy, and A.P. did a part of the nanopore sequencing of inoculated plants and data

analyses. The rest of the authors significantly helped in sampling and sample processing. All

authors contributed to editing the final manuscript.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Zala Kogej, Živa Lengar, Meta Ješelnik, Lija Fajdiga, Miha

Kitek, and Anja Cerovšek for their help in sampling and sample processing, Živa Ramšak and

Henrik Krnec for helping in setting up bioinformatics programs used in viroid discovery, and

Magda Tušek Žnidarič for guidance in the electron microscopy experiment. Finally, the

authors would like to thank Benjamin Lee and Uri Neri for insightful discussions on viroid

discovery, and the Plant Virus Ecology Journal Club led by Carolyn Malmstrom for the

informative and stimulating discussions on virology that contributed useful insights to this

study.

**Availability of data and material**

Raw sequencing reads were submitted in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRA), with the

BioProject accession number PRJNA772045. All sample and sequencing metadata, and SRA

accession numbers are in Supplementary Tables 1-3. All data related to virus genome

assembly and identification, and their NCBI GenBank accession numbers are in

Supplementary Tables 4-6. Description of other supplementary material are provided in the

'Supplementary information' section of this paper. High quality version of tables and figures

and supplementary files are available in *Figshare* (link:

https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20200769).

**Competing interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.

**Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Not applicable.

**Consent for publication**

Not applicable.

**References**

1. Hu B, Guo H, Zhou P, Shi Z-L. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. Nat Rev

Microbiol. 2021;19:141–54.

2. Sommers P, Chatterjee A, Varsani A, Trubl G. Integrating Viral Metagenomics into an

Ecological Framework. Annu Rev Virol. Annual Reviews; 2021;8:133–58.

3. Maclot F, Candresse T, Filloux D, Malmstrom CM, Roumagnac P, van der Vlugt R, et al.

Illuminating an ecological blackbox: using high throughput sequencing to characterize the

plant virome across scales. Front Microbiol. 2020;11.

4. Shi M, Lin X-D, Tian J-H, Chen L-J, Chen X, Li C-X, et al. Redefining the invertebrate

RNA virosphere. Nature. Nature Publishing Group; 2016;540:539–43.

5. Edgar RC, Taylor J, Lin V, Altman T, Barbera P, Meleshko D, et al. Petabase-scale

sequence alignment catalyses viral discovery. Nature. 2022;602:142–7.

6. Neri U, Wolf YI, Roux S, Camargo AP, Lee B, Kazlauskas D, et al. A five-fold expansion

of the global RNA virome reveals multiple new clades of RNA bacteriophages. bioRxiv.

Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2022;2022.02.15.480533.

7. Mifsud JCO, Gallagher R V., Holmes EC, Geoghegan JL. Transcriptome Mining Expands

Knowledge of RNA Viruses across the Plant Kingdom. Simon AE, editor. J Virol.

American Society for Microbiology 1752 N St., N.W., Washington, DC; 2022;

8. Schoelz JE, Stewart LR. The Role of Viruses in the Phytobiome. Annu Rev Virol.

2018;5:93–111.

9. Roossinck MJ. Viruses in the phytobiome. Curr Opin Virol. Elsevier B.V.; 2019;37:72–6.

10. Fraile A, García-Arenal F. Environment and evolution modulate plant virus pathogenesis.

Curr Opin Virol. 2016;17:50–6.

11. Elena SF, Fraile A, García-Arenal F. Evolution and Emergence of Plant Viruses. Adv

Virus Res. Elsevier; 2014. p. 161–91.

12. Anderson PK, Cunningham AA, Patel NG, Morales FJ, Epstein PR, Daszak P. Emerging

infectious diseases of plants: pathogen pollution, climate change and agrotechnology

drivers. Trends Ecol Evol. 2004;19:535–44.

13. Oerke EC. Crop losses to pests. J Agric Sci. Stockholm University Library; 2006;144:31–

43.

14. FAO. World Food and Agriculture – Statistical Yearbook 2021. World Food Agric. – Stat.

Yearb. 2021. FAO; 2021.

15. Rivarez MPS, Vučurović A, Mehle N, Ravnikar M, Kutnjak D. Global Advances in

Tomato Virome Research: Current Status and the Impact of High-Throughput Sequencing.

Front Microbiol. 2021;12.

16. Oladokun JO, Halabi MH, Barua P, Nath PD. Tomato brown rugose fruit disease: current

distribution, knowledge and future prospects. Plant Pathol. 2019;68:1579–86.

17. Zaidi SS-E-A, Martin DP, Amin I, Farooq M, Mansoor S. Tomato leaf curl New Delhi

virus□: a widespread bipartite begomovirus in the territory of monopartite begomoviruses.

Mol Plant Pathol. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2017;18:901–11.

18. Lefeuvre P, Martin DP, Elena SF, Shepherd DN, Roumagnac P, Varsani A. Evolution and

ecology of plant viruses. Nat Rev Microbiol. Springer US; 2019;17:632–44.

19. Olmos A, Boonham N, Candresse T, Gentit P, Giovani B, Kutnjak D, et al. High-

throughput sequencing technologies for plant pest diagnosis: challenges and opportunities.

EPPO Bull. 2018;48:219–24.

20. Hasiów-Jaroszewska B, Boezen D, Zwart MP. Metagenomic Studies of Viruses in Weeds

and Wild Plants: A Powerful Approach to Characterise Variable Virus Communities.

Viruses 2021 Vol 13 Page 1939. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute;

2021;13:1939.

21. Hančinský R, Mihálik D, Mrkvová M, Candresse T, Glasa M. Plant viruses infecting

Solanaceae family members in the cultivated and wild environments: a review. Plants.

Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2020;9:667.

22. García-Arenal F, Zerbini FM. Life on the Edge: Geminiviruses at the Interface Between

Crops and Wild Plant Hosts. Annu Rev Virol. Annual Reviews; 2019;6:411–33.

23. Ma Y, Marais A, Lefebvre M, Faure C, Candresse T. Metagenomic analysis of virome

cross-talk between cultivated Solanum lycopersicum and wild Solanum nigrum. Virology.

Elsevier Inc.; 2020;540:38–44.

24. Bernardo P, Charles-Dominique T, Barakat M, Ortet P, Fernandez E, Filloux D, et al.

Geometagenomics illuminates the impact of agriculture on the distribution and prevalence

of plant viruses at the ecosystem scale. ISME J. 2018;12:173–84.

25. Xu C, Sun X, Taylor A, Jiao C, Xu Y, Cai X, et al. Diversity, Distribution, and Evolution

of Tomato Viruses in China Uncovered by Small RNA Sequencing. Simon AE, editor. J

Virol. American Society for Microbiology; 2017;91.

26. de Nazaré Almeida dos Reis L, Fonseca ME de N, Ribeiro SG, Naito FYB, Boiteux LS,

Pereira-Carvalho R de C. Metagenomics of Neotropical Single-Stranded DNA Viruses in

Tomato Cultivars with and without the Ty-1 Gene. Viruses. 2020;12:819.

27. Rego-Machado CM, Nakasu EYT, Blawid R, Nagata T, Inoue-Nagata AK. Complete

genome sequence of a new bipartite begomovirus infecting tomato in Brazil. Arch Virol.

2019;164:2873–5.

28. Maachi A, Torre C, Sempere RN, Hernando Y, Aranda MA, Donaire L. Use of High-

Throughput Sequencing and Two RNA Input Methods to Identify Viruses Infecting

Tomato Crops. Microorganisms. 2021;9:1043.

29. Gaafar YZA, Herz K, Hartrick J, Fletcher J, Blouin AG, MacDiarmid R, et al.

Investigating the Pea Virome in Germany—Old Friends and New Players in the Field(s).

Front Microbiol. 2020;11:2605.

30. McLeish MJ, Fraile A, García-Arenal F. Population Genomics of Plant Viruses: The

Ecology and Evolution of Virus Emergence. Phytopathology®. 2021;111:32–9.

31. Alexander HM, Mauck KE, Whitfield AE, Garrett KA, Malmstrom CM. Plant-virus

interactions and the agro-ecological interface. Eur J Plant Pathol. 2014;138:529–47.

32. García-Arenal F, Zerbini FM. Life on the Edge: Geminiviruses at the Interface Between

Crops and Wild Plant Hosts. Annu Rev Virol. Annual Reviews; 2019;6:411–33.

33. Pecman A, Adams I, Gutiérrez-Aguirre I, Fox A, Boonham N, Ravnikar M, et al.

Systematic Comparison of Nanopore and Illumina Sequencing for the Detection of Plant

Viruses and Viroids Using Total RNA Sequencing Approach. Front Microbiol. Frontiers;

2022;13:1424.

34. Pecman A, Kutnjak D, Gutiérrez-Aguirre I, Adams I, Fox A, Boonham N, et al. Next

Generation Sequencing for Detection and Discovery of Plant Viruses and Viroids:

Comparison of Two Approaches. Front Microbiol. 2017;8:1–10.

35. O'Leary NA, Wright MW, Brister JR, Ciufo S, Haddad D, McVeigh R, et al. Reference

sequence (RefSeq) database at NCBI: current status, taxonomic expansion, and functional

annotation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016;44:D733–45.

36. Altschul S. Basic Local Alignment Search Tool. J Mol Biol. Elsevier BV; 1990;215:403–

10.

37. Nurk S, Meleshko D, Korobeynikov A, Pevzner PA. MetaSPAdes: A new versatile

metagenomic assembler. Genome Res. 2017;27:824–34.

38. De Coster W, D'Hert S, Schultz DT, Cruts M, Van Broeckhoven C. NanoPack:

visualizing and processing long-read sequencing data. Berger B, editor. Bioinformatics.

Oxford University Press; 2018;34:2666–9.

39. Vaser R, Sović I, Nagarajan N, Šikić M. Fast and accurate de novo genome assembly

from long uncorrected reads. Genome Res. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press;

2017;27:737–46.

40. Li H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Birol I, editor.

Bioinformatics. Oxford University Press; 2018;34:3094–100.

41. Lefkowitz EJ, Dempsey DM, Hendrickson RC, Orton RJ, Siddell SG, Smith DB. Virus

taxonomy: The database of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV).

Nucleic Acids Res. Oxford University Press; 2018;46:D708–17.

42. Blum M, Chang H-Y, Chuguransky S, Grego T, Kandasaamy S, Mitchell A, et al. The

InterPro protein families and domains database: 20 years on. Nucleic Acids Res.

2021;49:D344–54.

43. Adams M, Antoniw J, Beaudoin F. Overview and analysis of the polyprotein cleavage

sites in the family Potyviridae. Mol Plant Pathol. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2005;6:471–87.

44. Muhire BM, Varsani A, Martin DP. SDT: A Virus Classification Tool Based on Pairwise

Sequence Alignment and Identity Calculation. Kuhn JH, editor. PLoS ONE.

2014;9:e108277.

45. Zhang Z, Qi S, Tang N, Zhang X, Chen S, Zhu P, et al. Discovery of Replicating Circular

RNAs by RNA-Seq and Computational Algorithms. Ding B, editor. PLoS Pathog. Public

Library of Science; 2014;10:e1004553.

46. Gendron P, Lemieux S, Major F. Quantitative analysis of nucleic acid three-dimensional

structures. J Mol Biol. 2001;308:919–36.

47. Untergasser A, Cutcutache I, Koressaar T, Ye J, Faircloth BC, Remm M, et al. Primer3—

new capabilities and interfaces. Nucleic Acids Res. Oxford Academic; 2012;40:e115–

e115.

48. Thompson JD, Higgins DG, Gibson TJ. CLUSTAL W: improving the sensitivity of

progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific

gap penalties and weight matrix choice. Nucleic Acids Res. Oxford University Press;

1994;22:4673–80.

49. Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:

Improvements in performance and usability. Mol Biol Evol. Oxford University Press;

2013;30:772–80.

1038 50. Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. trimAl: A tool for automated

1039   alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics. Oxford

1040   University Press; 2009;25:1972–3.

1041 51. Edgar RC. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high

1042   throughput. Nucleic Acids Res. 2004;32:1792–7.

1043 52. Martin DP, Murrell B, Golden M, Khoosal A, Muhire B. RDP4: Detection and analysis of

1044   recombination patterns in virus genomes. Virus Evol. 2015;1.

1045 53. Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C, Tamura K. MEGA X: Molecular Evolutionary

1046   Genetics Analysis across Computing Platforms. Battistuzzi FU, editor. Mol Biol Evol.

1047   2018;35:1547–9.

1048 54. Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for phylogenetic tree

1049   display and annotation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2021;49:W293–6.

1050 55. Rozas J, Ferrer-Mata A, Sánchez-DelBarrio JC, Guirao-Rico S, Librado P, Ramos-Onsins

1051   SE, et al. DnaSP 6: DNA Sequence Polymorphism Analysis of Large Data Sets. Mol Biol

1052   Evol. 2017;34:3299–302.

1053 56. Pecman A, Kutnjak D, Mehle N, Žnidarič MT, Gutiérrez-Aguirre I, Pirnat P, et al. High-

1054   throughput sequencing facilitates characterization of a "forgotten" plant virus: The case of

1055   a henbane mosaic virus infecting tomato. Front Microbiol. 2018;9:1–11.

1056 57. Rivarez MPS, Kogej Z, Jakoš N, Pecman A, Seljak G, Vučurović A, et al. First Report of

1057   Ranunculus White Mottle Ophiovirus in Slovenia in Pepper with Yellow Leaf Curling

1058   Symptom and in Tomato. Plant Dis. 2022;

1059 58. Saqib M, Wylie SJ, Jones MGK. Serendipitous identification of a new Iflavirus -like virus

1060   infecting tomato and its subsequent characterization. Plant Pathol. 2015;64:519–27.

1061 59. Mahlanza T, Makwarela L, Roberts R, van der Merwe M. Occurrence of the Iflavirus-like

1062   Tomato Matilda Virus in Solanum Species in South Africa. Plant Dis. 2022;106:1766.

60. Kmetijski Institute Slovenia. Rastlinski Virusi In Njihovo Poimenovanje (in Slovenian).

Plesko IM, editor. Ljiubljana, Slovenia; 2016.

61. Butković A, González R, Elena SF. Revisiting Orthotospovirus phylogeny using full-

genome data and testing the contribution of selection, recombination and segment

reassortment in the origin of members of new species. Arch Virol. 2021;166:491–9.

62. Fan X, Li C, Zhang Z, Ren F, Hu G, Shen H, et al. Identification and Characterization of a

Novel Emaravirus From Grapevine Showing Chlorotic Mottling Symptoms. Front

Microbiol. Frontiers; 2021;12:1437.

63. Kubota K, Usugi T, Tomitaka Y, Shimomoto Y, Takeuchi S, Kadono F, et al. Perilla

Mosaic Virus Is a Highly Divergent Emaravirus Transmitted by Shevtchenkella sp. (Acari:

Eriophyidae). Phytopathology®. Phytopathology; 2020;110:1352–61.

64. Ciuffo M, Kinoti WM, Tiberini A, Forgia M, Tomassoli L, Constable FE, et al. A new

blunervirus infects tomato crops in Italy and Australia. Arch Virol. Springer;

2020;165:2379–84.

65. Nakasu EYT, Nagata T, Inoue-Nagata AK. First Report of Tomato Fruit Blotch Virus

Infecting Tomatoes in Brazil. Plant Dis. Scientific Societies; 2022;

66. Chiapello M, Rodríguez☐Romero J, Nerva L, Forgia M, Chitarra W, Ayllón MA, et al.

Putative new plant viruses associated with Plasmopara viticola ☐infected grapevine

samples. Ann Appl Biol. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2020;176:180–91.

67. Chiapello M, Rodriguez-Romero J, Ayllon M, Turina M. VIROPLANT: A report on the

virome of obligatory biotrophs [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 May 20]. p. 106. Available

from:

https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/documents/downloadPublic/K01rSjRoV0FVd0F

RRm8vc1RrUHhlazdxOStqS3pyNWRJTzhUYWFEeFM5VjRmdGJybWdnbE5nPT0=/atta

chment/VFEyQTQ4M3ptUWZkVkZCb05IcXJuaTVTZmZYeXVTb0s=

68. Orfanidou CG, Xing F, Zhou J, Li S, Katis NI, Maliogka VI. Identification and Sequence

Analysis of a Novel Ilarvirus Infecting Sweet Cherry. Plants. 2021;10:514.

69. Chavan RR, Cohen D, Blouin AG, Pearson MN. Characterization of the complete genome

of ribgrass mosaic virus isolated from Plantago major L. from New Zealand and Actinidia

spp. from China. Arch Virol. 2012;157:1253–60.

70. Chavan RR, Pearson MN. Molecular characterisation of a novel recombinant Ribgrass

mosaic virus strain FSHS. Virol J 2016 131. BioMed Central; 2016;13:1–6.

71. Mehle N, Kutnjak D, Tušek Žnidarič M, Ravnikar M. First Report of Apium Virus Y and

Carrot Thin Leaf Virus in Parsley in Slovenia. Plant Dis. 2019;103:592.

72. Vozelj N, Petrovic N, Pompe Novak M, Tusek M, Mavric I, Ravnikar M. The most

frequent viruses on selected ornamental plants and vegetables in Slovenia. Zb Pred Ref 6

Slov Posvetovanje O Varstvu Rastl Zrece Slov 4-6 Marec 2003. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Plant

Protection Society of Slovenia; Ljubljana Univ., Biotechnical Fac., Agronomy Dep.;

2003;498–504.

73. Adams MJ, Antoniw JF, Fauquet CM. Molecular criteria for genus and species

discrimination within the family Potyviridae. Arch Virol. 2005;150:459–79.

74. Campbell AJ, Erickson A, Pellerin E, Salem N, Mo X, Falk BW, et al. Phylogenetic

classification of a group of self-replicating RNAs that are common in co-infections with

poleroviruses. Virus Res. Elsevier; 2020;276:197831.

75. Nawaz-ul-Rehman MS, Fauquet CM. Evolution of geminiviruses and their satellites.

FEBS Lett. No longer published by Elsevier; 2009;583:1825–32.

76. Celix A, Rodriguez-Cerezo E, Garcia-Arenal F. New Satellite RNAs, but No DI RNAs,

Are Found in Natural Populations of Tomato Bushy Stunt Tombusvirus. Virology.

1997;239:277–84.

77. Krupovic M. Plant Satellite Viruses (Albetovirus, Aumaivirus, Papanivirus, Virtovirus).

Encycl Virol. Elsevier; 2021. p. 581–5.

78. Cooper I, Jones RAC. Wild Plants and Viruses: Under-Investigated Ecosystems. Adv.

Virus Res. 2006. p. 1–47.

79. Elena SF, Agudelo-Romero P, Lalic J. The Evolution of Viruses in Multi-Host Fitness

Landscapes. Open Virol J. 2009;3:1–6.

80. Takahashi H, Fukuhara T, Kitazawa H, Kormelink R. Virus Latency and the Impact on

Plants. Front Microbiol. 2019;10.

81. Elvira-González L, Rubio L, Galipienso L. Geographically distant isolates of the

persistent southern tomato virus (STV) show very low genetic diversity in the putative coat

protein gene. Virus Genes 2020 565. 2020;56:668–72.

82. Rangel EA, Alfaro-Fernández A, Font-San-Ambrosio MI, Luis-Arteaga M, Rubio L.

Genetic variability and evolutionary analyses of the coat protein gene of Tomato mosaic

virus. Virus Genes. 2011;43:435–8.

83. Zhang Z, Wang D, Yu C, Wang Z, Dong J, Shi K, et al. Identification of three new

isolates of Tomato spotted wilt virus from different hosts in China: molecular diversity,

phylogenetic and recombination analyses. Virol J. 2016;13:8.

84. Temple C, Blouin AG, De Jonghe K, Foucart Y, Botermans M, Westenberg M, et al.

Biological and genetic characterization of Physostegia chlorotic mottle virus in Europe

based on host range, location, and time. Plant Dis. 2022;

85. Vučurović A, Kutnjak D, Mehle N, Stanković I, Pecman A, Bulajić A, et al. Detection of

Four New Tomato Viruses in Serbia Using Post Hoc High-Throughput Sequencing

Analysis of Samples From a Large-Scale Field Survey. Plant Dis. 2021;105:2325–32.

86. Bejerman N, Dietzgen RG, Debat H. Illuminating the Plant Rhabdovirus Landscape

through Metatranscriptomics Data. Viruses. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute;

2021;13:1304.

87. Dietzgen RG, Bejerman NE, Goodin MM, Higgins CM, Huot OB, Kondo H, et al.

Diversity and epidemiology of plant rhabdoviruses. Virus Res. 2020;281:197942.

88. Daròs J-A. Viroids: Small Noncoding Infectious RNAs with the Remarkable Ability of

Autonomous Replication. Curr Res Top Plant Virol. Cham: Springer International

Publishing; 2016. p. 295–322.

89. Geoghegan JL, Duchêne S, Holmes EC. Comparative analysis estimates the relative

frequencies of co-divergence and cross-species transmission within viral families. Drosten

C, editor. PLOS Pathog. 2017;13:e1006215.

90. Lartey RT, Voss TC, Melcher U. Tobamovirus evolution: gene overlaps, recombination,

and taxonomic implications. Mol Biol Evol. 1996;13:1327–38.

91. Fraile A, García-Arenal F. Tobamoviruses as Models for the Study of Virus Evolution. In:

Palukaitis P, Roossinck MJBT-A in VR, editors. Academic Press; 2018. p. 89–117.

92. Geoghegan JL, Holmes EC. Predicting virus emergence amid evolutionary noise. Open

Biol. 2017;7:170189.

Figure 1

**a**

*Albetovirus* — tomato albetovirus 1
*Amalgaviridae* — southern tomato virus
*Aspiviridae* — Ranunculus white mottle ophiovirus
*Betaflexiviridae* — potato virus M
— potato virus S
— tomato vitivirus 1
*Bromoviridae* — cucumber mosaic virus
— tomato aspermy virus
— Solanum nigrum ilarvirus 1
— tomato ilarvirus 1
*Endornaviridae* — tomato associated alphaendornavirus 1
*Kitaviridae* — tomato fruit blotch virus
*Potyviridae* — henbane mosaic virus
— potato virus Y
— olive latent virus 1
*Tombusviridae* — olive mild mosaic virus
— tobacco necrosis virus A
— tomato bushy stunt virus
— eggplant mottle dwarf virus
— Physostegia chlorotic mottle virus
*Rhabdoviridae* — tomato alphanucleorhabdovirus 1
— tomato betanucleorhabdovirus 1
— tomato betanucleorhabdovirus 2
*Tospoviridae* — tomato spotted wilt orthotospovirus
*Virgaviridae* — tomato mosaic virus

asymptomatic tomatoes

symptomatic tomatoes

Aphis glycines virus 1
Erysiphales associated totivirus 24
Erysiphe necator associated ambiguivirus 2
Erysiphe necator associated ssRNA virus 9
Erysiphe necator ourmia-like virus 82
Hubei picorna-like virus 36
Leveillula taurica-associated noda-like virus 1
Leveillula taurica-associated rhabdo-like virus 1
tomato matilda virus
tomato bushy stunt virus satellite RNA C
Cymbidium ringspot virus satellite RNA
tomato bushy stunt virus satellite RNA B10
tomato bushy stunt virus satellite RNA L
Novo Mesto picornavirus 1
plant associated tobamo-like virus 1
plant associated virga-like virus 1
tomato associated bunya-like virus 1
tomato associated partiti-like virus 1
tomato associated tombus-like virus 1
tomato associated virga-like virus 1

Scale for node outline, representing total number of composite samples where the virus is detected by HTS:
1 2 3 4 5 6≤

Virus name font color key (elaborated in the caption):
known viruses (ICTV recognized)
known viruses (GenBank curated)
novel viruses or virus satellite, from this study
putative viruses under *Riboviria*, from this study

Known eukaryotic host(s) icon key:
Kingdom *Viridiplantae*
Kingdom *Fungi* or *Protista*
Kingdom *Animalia*

**b**

**Plants**

**Viruses**

**Sequencing pools / Localities**

Taxa color key for virus family:
*Alphaflexiviridae*
*Aspiviridae*
*Bromoviridae*
*Fimoviridae*
*Geminiviridae*
*Tospoviridae*
*Potyviridae*
*Rhabdoviridae*
*Tombusviridae*
*Virgaviridae*
unclassified *Iflaviridae*
unclassified virus-like *Riboviria*
viroid-like circular RNA

Ranunculus repens 137665
Mercurialis annua 3986
Chenopodium sp. 3558
Rumex sp. 3618
Pastinaca sativa 4041
Cirsium arvense 41550
Artemisia verlotiorum 72356
Erigeron annuus 91248
Cichorium intybus 13427
Picris sp. 122541
Taraxacum officinale 50225
Plantago sp. 26867
Mentha spicata 29719
Calystegia sp. 47518
Convolvulus sp. 4122
Physalis sp. 24663
Solanum nigrum 4112
Solanum lycopersicum 4081

Taxa branch color key for the host cladogram. NCBI taxonomy ID is indicated after each scientific name:
— Ranunculaceae
— Euphorbiaceae
— Chenopodiaceae
— Polygonaceae
— Apiaceae
— Asteraceae
— Plantaginaceae
— Lamiaceae
— Convolvulaceae
— Solanaceae

Link annotation key:
● plants associated with ≥2 viruses
● viruses detected in ≥2 localities

Color key for locality:
Nova Gorica
Miren Kostanjevica
Koper
Piran
Novo Mesto

Pastinaca potexvirus 1
Ranunculus white mottle ophiovirus
Prunus virus I
Solanum nigrum ilarvirus 1
Artemisia fimovirus 1
Calystegia geminivirus 1
Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1
Plantago potyvirus 1
Rumex potyvirus 1
Mentha macluravirus 1
broad-leafed dock virus A, isolate 2
Picris betanucleorhabdovirus 1
Taraxacum betanucleorhabdovirus 1
Cirsium cytorhabdovirus 1
Pastinaca cytorhabdovirus 1
Picris cytorhabdovirus 1
Taraxacum cytorhabdovirus 1
Pastinaca umbravirus 1
Picris umbravirus 1
Cichorium alphacarmovirus 1
Calystegia pelarspovirus 1
Convolvulus aureusvirus 1
Plantago tobamovirus 1
tomato matilda virus
plant associated tobamo-like virus 1
Taraxacum viroid-like circular RNA 1

P04
P05
P08
P48
P10
P11
P12
P13
P14
P21
P22
P23
P37
P49
P50.1
P50.2
P51.2
P52
P53.2
P54
P15.1
P15.2
P16
P17
P18
P19
P20
P32
P43.1
P43.2
P46
P55.2
P56
P58.1
P58.2
P60

**Figure 2**

**Figure 3**

# Figure 4

## a

*Mercurialis annua* (Euphorbiaceae) **MerV1** (+)

*Solanum lycopersicum* **TaBLV1** (+)

*Artemisia verlotiorum* (Asteraceae) **ArtV1** (+)

*Solanum lycopersicum* **RWMV** (+)

Note: There are other viruses detected in the sequencing pools (*i.e.* composite sample) where the samples shown belong, which implies possible co-infection of viruses on the specific sample shown. Full virus names are indicated in **i**, **j**.

## e

L (RNA-dependent RNA polymerase) — segment L 8.95kb

G (glycoprotein) — NSm (movement protein) — segment M 4.71kb

N (nucleocapsid) — NSs (RNA silencing suppressor) — segment S 3.38kb

**Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1** (MerV1) 16.8kb

## f

RNA-dependent RNA polymerase — RNA 1 7.25kb

glycoprotein — RNA 2 2.06kb

nucleocapsid — RNA 3 1.09kb

movement protein — RNA 4 1.33kb

26kDa unknown protein — RNA 5 0.90kb

**Artemisia fimovirus 1** (ArtV1) 12.6kb

## g

L (RNA-dependent RNA polymerase) — segment L 7.86kb

G (glycoprotein) — unknown protein — segment M 4.90kb (no segment S found)

**tomato associated bunya-like virus 1** (TaBLV1) 12.8 kb

## h

19kDa unknown protein — RNA-dependent RNA polymerase — RNA 1 7.59kb

movement protein — RNA 2 1.76kb

coat protein — RNA 3 1.48kb

38kDa unknown protein — 5.9kDa unknown protein — RNA 4 1.30kb

**Ranunculus white mottle ophiovirus** (RWMV) (first full genome) 12.1kb

## b

(Note: Species level demarcation is set at <90% identity. Full virus names are indicated in **i**)

|  | MerV1 BOL19SW | MerV1 PAR19SW | MerV1 KOP19SW | MerV1 KOP20SW1 | TYRV | IYSV | PolRSV | HCRV | AYSV | SCRV |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MerV1 BOL19SW | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 73 |
| MerV1 PAR19SW |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 73 |
| MerV1 KOP19SW |  |  | 100 | 100 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 73 |
| MerV1 KOP20SW1 |  |  |  | 100 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 73 |
| TYRV |  |  |  |  | 100 | 89 | 90 | 89 | 87 | 73 |
| IYSV |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 86 | 86 | 85 | 72 |
| PolRSV |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 92 | 86 | 73 |
| HCRV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 86 | 73 |
| AYSV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 73 |
| SCRV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |

Scale: 100–70

## c

(Note: Species level demarcation is set at <75% identity. Full virus names are indicated in **i**)

|  | ChMaV | PCLSaV | PVBV | HPWMoV | WMoV | CjaEV-1 | CjaEV-2 | PerMV | ArtV1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ChMaV | 100 | 45 | 34 | 32 | 32 | 30 | 32 | 31 | 31 |
| PCLSaV |  | 100 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 31 |
| PVBV |  |  | 100 | 51 | 51 | 32 | 32 | 30 | 31 |
| HPWMoV |  |  |  | 100 | 75 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 31 |
| WMoV |  |  |  |  | 100 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 |
| CjaEV-1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 60 | 35 | 37 |
| CjaEV-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 37 | 37 |
| PerMV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 46 |
| ArtV1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |

Scale: 100–25

## d

(Note: Species level demarcation is set at <85% identity. Full virus names are indicated in **j**)

|  | RWMV PLE20ST2 | RWMV KOP19ST | RWMV NGO19AT | RWMV NGO19ST | RWMV KOP19SW1 | RWMV Aus | RWMV Ita | RWMV SA | LRNV | MLBVV | BlMaV | CPsV |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RWMV PLE20ST2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98 | 98 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 46 | 45 |
| RWMV KOP19ST |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 97 | 97 | 67 | 69 | 66 | 46 | 45 |
| RWMV NGO19AT |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 97 | 98 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 46 | 45 |
| RWMV NGO19ST |  |  |  | 100 | 100 | 97 | 98 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 46 | 45 |
| RWMV KOP19SW1 |  |  |  |  | 100 | 97 | 98 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 46 | 45 |
| RWMV Aus |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 99 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 47 | 44 |
| RWMV Ita |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 47 | 44 |
| RWMV SA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 68 | 66 | 47 | 45 |
| LRNV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 65 | 47 | 46 |
| MLBVV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 47 | 54 |
| BlMaV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 54 |
| CPsV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |

Scale: 100–40

## i

Branch length scale: 0.5

Bootstrap support: 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Clade branch color key:
— *Fimoviridae* Phylogroup II
— *Fimoviridae* Phylogroup III
— *Fimoviridae* Phylogroup IV
— *Tospoviridae* Phylogroup B
— *Tospoviridae* Phylogroup C

- Palo verde broom virus (PVBV)
- wheat mosaic virus (WMoV)
- High Plains wheat mosaic emaravirus (HPWMoV)
- raspberry leaf blotch emaravirus
- jujube yellow mottle-associated virus
- alfalfa ringspot-associated virus
- ti ringspot-associated virus
- common oak ringspot-associated virus
- Phylogroup I (n=13)
- Perilla mosaic virus (PerMV)
- **Artemisia fimovirus 1** (ArtV1) MIR20SW
- Camellia japonica associated emaravirus 2 (CjaEV-2)
- Camellia japonica associated emaravirus 1 (CjaEV-1)
- Camellia chlorotic ringspot virus
- pear chlorotic leaf spot-associated virus (PCLSaV)
- Chrysanthemum mosaic-associated virus (ChMaV)
- **tomato associated bunya-like virus 1** (TaBLV1) MIR20ST
- groundnut chlorotic fan-spot orthotospovirus
- soybean vein necrosis orthotospovirus
- bean necrotic mosaic orthotospovirus
- Impatiens necrotic spot orthotospovirus
- melon severe mosaic orthotospovirus
- zucchini lethal chlorosis orthotospovirus
- Chrysanthemum stem necrosis orthotospovirus
- tomato spotted wilt orthotospovirus
- tomato chlorotic spot orthotospovirus
- groundnut ringspot orthotospovirus
- Phylogroup A (n=14)
- Scadoxus chlorotic ringspot orthotospovirus (SCRV)
- **Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1** (MerV1) BOL19SW
- **Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1** (MerV1) KOP19SW
- **Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1** (MerV1) PAR19SW
- **Mercurialis orthotospovirus 1** (MerV1) KOP20SW1
- Iris yellow spot orthotospovirus (IYSV)
- Polygonum ringspot orthotospovirus (PolRSV)
- Hippeastrum chlorotic spot orthotospovirus (HCRV)
- tomato yellow ring orthotospovirus (TYRV)
- Alstroemeria yellow spot orthotospovirus (AYSV)

## j

Branch length scale: 0.5

Bootstrap support: 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

- Citrus psorosis ophiovirus (CPsV) CHN-UN21
- CPsV CHN-2
- Blueberry mosaic ophiovirus (BlMaV) JAT8
- BlMaV USA
- Mirafiori lettuce big-vein ophiovirus (MLBVV) X26199.1
- MLBVV AWJ64333.1
- Lettuce ring necrosis ophiovirus (LRNV) QTP72396.1
- LRNV YP_053236.1
- Ranunculus white mottle ophiovirus (RWMV) S. Africa (SA)
- RWMV AWJ64354.1
- RWMV AWJ64314.1
- RWMV Italy (Ita)
- RWMV Australia (Aus)
- **RWMV** PLE20ST2
- **RWMV** KOP19ST
- **RWMV** NGO19AT
- **RWMV** KOP20SW1
- **RWMV** NGO19ST

**Figure 5**

Figure 6

**a**

**Plantago tobamovirus 1** (+)

*Plantago major* (Plantaginaceae)

**plant associated tobamo-like virus 1** (+)

*Convolvulus arvensis* (Convolvulaceae)

*Solanum lycopersicum*

Note: There are other viruses detected in the sequencing pools (*i.e.* composite sample) where the samples shown belong, which implies possible co-infection of viruses on the specific sample shown.

**b**

(Note: Species level demarcation is set at <90%. Full virus names are indicated in **h**.)

Scale: -100 / -75 / -50

**c**

**Plantago tobamovirus 1** (PTV1) 6.30 kb

**d**

**plant associated tobamo-like virus 1** (PaToLV1) 6.55 kb

**e**

mock inoculated — inoculated with PTV1
*Nicotiana benthamiana* (systemic symptoms, 14 dpi)

mock inoculated — inoculated with PTV1
*Nicotiana clevelandii* (systemic symptoms, 14 dpi)

**f**

100 nm

**g**

| Inoculated plant | 7 dpi* | 14 dpi* | 14 dpi** | 21 dpi** | 28 dpi** | 28 dpi# | 35 dpi** | 49 dpi** | 56 dpi** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Solanum lycopersicum* | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | 4/5 (+) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| *Nicotiana benthamiana* | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | n.t. | n.t. | n.t. | n.t. |
| *Nicotiana clevelandii* | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | n.t. | n.t. | n.t. | n.t. |

Note: dpi - days post inoculation. n.t. - not tested. (*) - pool of inoculated leaves, (**) - pool of young, apical (systemic) leaves, (#) - young, apical (systemic) leaves from individual plants

**h**

**i**

Note: Full virus names are indicated in **h**. There is a partial genome isolate of TVCV found in *Penstemon digitalis* (□) from USA (DQ658743), not included in the analyses.

Figure 7

**Figure 8**

**a**

*Pastinaca sativa*
Pastinaca umbravirus 1 (+)

*Picris echoides*
Picris umbravirus 1 (+)

*Convolvulus arvensis*
Convolvulus aureusvirus 1 (+)

*Cichorium intybus*
Cichorium alpha-carmovirus 1 (+)

*Calystegia* sp.
Calystegia pelarspovirus 1 (+)

Note: There are other viruses detected in the sequencing pools (*i.e.* composite sample) where the samples shown belong, which implies possible co-infection of viruses on the specific sample shown.

**Figure 9**