Full title :

Understanding evolutionary and functional relationships of RNA polymerases in plant and

fungal viruses through structural modeling and divergence date estimations

Short title : Understanding RNA polymerase evolution in plant and fungal viruses

Authors :

Jérôme Gracy[1], Mahan Ghafari[2], Gilles Labesse[1], Denis Fargette[3], Eugénie Hébrard[3*]

[1]Centre de Biochimie Structurale, Montpellier, France

[2]Department of Biology, University of Oxford, UK

[3]PHIM Plant Health Institute, Univ Montpellier, IRD, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro,

Montpellier, France

*correspondence : eugenie.hebrard@ird.fr

Abstract

RNA-dependent RNA polymerases (RdRps) are crucial for replication of RNA viruses and serve as key marker genes for defining deep taxonomic ranks and for understanding viral evolutionary history. Despite shared functions and conserved amino acid motifs, the high genetic diversity of RdRps complicates precise sequence comparisons across viral families, hindering accurate taxonomic classification of new species – especially important at the age of metagenomics. When available, three-dimensional (3D) RdRp structures can help address these challenges through structure-based alignments. However, such structures are scarce for understudied viruses infecting fungi and plants, preventing the investigation of their ecological and evolutionary links.

In this study, we focused on the highy divergent order *Sobelivirales*. Using deep-learning structural modeling, we generated highly reliable 3D models on 20 representative viral species. Multiple structural alignment enabled the reconstruction of a robust phylogeny with improved quality and length. Based on this phylogeny, we proposed revisions of existing viral families and reclassified genera. Clade divergence dates were then estimated using the Prisoner of War model, which has previously revealed the ancient origin of the genus *Sobemovirus*. We provided here the first divergence time estimation between these plant and fungal viruses, dating back to 26.6 million years before present - significantly more recent than the divergence between their respective hosts. Our amino acid conservation analysis, validated on 99 other viral species, also identified molecular signatures of sobeliviral families and genera, which could help in future taxonomic assignment and diagnostic tools development. This interdisciplinary approach integrating structure modeling and date estimations offers new insights into the evolutionary divergence between fungus and plant viruses, with potential applications to other viral orders and families.

Author summary

RNA-dependent RNA polymerases (RdRps) are essential for RNA virus replication and

serve as important markers for classifying viruses and understanding their evolution. However,

with the rising popularity of metagenomics and discovery of viruses with high genetic diversity

in RdRps, it is difficult to compare viral families and accurately classify new species. When

available, 3D structures of RdRps can help overcome this challenge through structural

alignments.

In this study, we focused on the highly divergent order of the Sobelivirales, using deep-

learning models to generate reliable 3D structures for 20 representative viral species. These

structural alignments allowed us to build a more accurate viral phylogeny. Based on this

finding, we proposed updates to existing viral families and genera within the Sobelivirales

order. We also estimated divergence dates using a model that previously uncovered the ancient

origins of Sobemovirus. Notably, we provided the first estimate of when these plant and fungal

viruses diverged - around 26.6 million years ago, which is much more recent than the separation

of their hosts. We also identified molecular signatures that are useful for future virus

classification and diagnosis, with potential applications to other viral groups.

Introduction

Recent advances in viral metagenomics have revealed how extensive and unexplored viral diversity is, and have contributed significantly to a better understanding of viral evolution. Major adaptations of viral taxonomic classification have been made to incorporate numerous new lineages and their evolutionary links [1,2]. This includes the creation of novel upper ranks and subdivisions such as classes and phyla [3]. The identification of viral hallmark genes (VHG) facilitated the assignment of viral taxa into these novel groups [4,5]. Polymerases especially RNA-dependent RNA polymerases (RdRp) represent one of the major groups of VHG due to their crucial function for realm *Riboviria* (RNA viruses). RdRp comparative analyses revealed unexpected relationships between some viral groups, prompting taxonomic reassessments and modifications. For example, the establishment of the order *Reovirales* and the dissolution of the family *Reoviridae* by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV) were informed by detailed RdRp analyses [6]. This new ordering approach which groups viruses with a shared replication strategy and a conserved RdRp core has allowed *Reovirales* to be further subdivised into the families *Sedoreovirinae* and *Spinareovirinae*, based on both major differences on the arrangement of RdRp conserved motifs and on the coat protein (CP) morphology - the other crucial VHG. Similarly, the family *Luteoviridae* had initially grouped the genera *Luteovirus* and *Polerovirus*, primarily due to their similar circulative transmission mode mediated by aphids and the related readthrough domain of their CP. However, based on the low sequence similarity of their RdRps, the family *Luteoviridae* was abolished and the two genera were subsequently reassigned to the families *Tombusviridae* or *Solemoviridae*, respectively [7].

Viral RdRps are monomeric proteins responsible for synthesizing complementary RNA strands from a template RNA. They exhibit an overall structure often likened to a cupped human

right hand in which the fingers and thumb domains interact to form a characteristic central

tunnel (for review [8–11]). The palm domain is formed by a β-sheet with three to six β-strands

above two helices, the fingers domain is a mixed α/β structure and the thumb domain is highly

variable with a predominantly helical structure. The fingers and thumb domains contribute to

the RdRp overall stability and proper positioning of the RNA template and nascent RNA strand.

The palm domain is essential for the accurate and efficient RNA chain elongation. It allows the

positioning of the primer 3'OH, or the viral protein genome-linked (VPg) depending on the viral

taxon, the binding of incoming nucleotides and their incorporation to the RNA chain using two

metal ions as cofactors. Comparisons of RdRp sequences of diverse viral groups has identified

short linear motifs of highly conserved amino acids [12,13]. Five motifs (A-E) were reported

in the palm domain, two motifs (F and G) in the fingers domain and one putative and less

conserved motif (H) in the thumb domain. High throughput taxonomic assignment were often

based on ABC motifs [14–16]. Analyzing the three-dimensional (3D) structures of RdRps later

identified larger protein segments referred to as homomorphs, determined by structural

similarities rather than sequence composition [17]. However, for certain viral phyla like those

of plant and fungus viruses, lacking 3D structures, pose challenges to compare RdRps and to

reveal their phylogenetic relationships. To address this challenge, multiple protein alignments

were restricted to the central RdRp palm domain, using classical algorithms combined with

manual refinements based on available 3D structures from taxonomically less related viruses,

such as animal or human viruses. This approach led to the creation of the kingdom

Orthornavirae [4].

Although the monophyly of viruses in the order *Orthornavirae* has been established

based on comparison of their RdRps, reconstruction of their evolutionary history remains

difficult due to their strong, probably ancient, evolutionary divergence and the central role of

horizontal transfer of other viral genes in plant viruses [18]. In the picorna-like supergroup, now

referred as the phylum *Pisuviricota*, viral species share common structural and functional

features in RdRp. On the other hand, they also exhibit contrasting biological characteristics in

terms of host range (animals, insects, plants, fungi, protists), as well as variations in genomic

classification (positive single-stranded RNA or double-stranded RNA) and size (ranging from

the largest to the smallest RNA genomes) (see S1 Table). To investigate phylogeny of viral

taxons such as Pisiviricota can provide evolutionary hypotheses about the origins of these

distinct or shared traits. Viruses of fungi also named mycoviruses have been understudied, but

recent discoveries, such as cross-kingdom transmission events, highlight ecological and

evolutionary links with plant viruses [18–20]. In this study, we compared the RdRps inside the

order *Sobelivirales*, as markers of their common history to gain insights into host range

evolution. This order is one of the four orders of positive-sense single-stranded RNA (+ssRNA)

mycoviruses. It comprises families *Solemoviridae* and *Barnaviridae*, which contains plant and

fungus viruses, respectively. Solemoviridae includes four plant viral genera (*Sobemovirus*,

Polerovirus, *Enamovirus* and *Polemovirus*), while Barnaviridae consists of a single genus,

Barnavirus, composed of one approved and two tentative species infecting fungus (Table 1).

These families share the same genomic arrangement, chymotrypsine-like protease / VPg / RdRp

[21,22], but their sequence conservation is restricted to very short linear motifs. Similarities

between RdRp active sites of sobemovirus and polero-/enamovirus were noted as early as 1991

[12], leading finally to their taxonomic grouping in 2021 [23]. Close to poleroviruses, the

unique polemovirus species results from a recombination event with sobemovirus CP. Although

RdRp homologies between sobemoviruses and barnaviruses were proposed in 2008 [10], they

have not yet translated into any taxonomic revisions. Furthermore, a newly proposed genus of

fungal virus, *Hubsclerovirus*, has recently been assigned to the phytoviral family *Solemoviridae*

instead of *Barnaviridae* [24]. Thus, comparing more precisely the RdRps from these two viral

families would provide valuable insights into the complex history of plant and fungus viruses.

Our focus on Sobelivirales enabled the application of modern methodologies to

reconstruct their deep evolutionary histories. Notably, the genus *Sobemovirus* exemplifies a

unique case where the impact of time-dependent rate phenomenon (TDRP) on underestimation

divergence times using standard molecular clock methods has been considered using the

Prisoner of War model (PoW) [25,26]. Originally developped for reconstructing the

evolutionary history of human and animal viruses, the PoW model corrects for heterogeneous

and time-dependent evolutionary rates of viruses that may arise due to factors like epistasis,

nucleotide biases, and substitution saturation. The PoW model reproduces the empirically

observed power-law rate decay in estimated evolutionary rates of many RNA and DNA viruses

across deep evolutionary timescales. This method revealed a very ancient origin of sobemovirus

genus (over four million years) by contrast to the previous estimation based solely on the

extrapolation of short-term substitution rates [27]. The PoW model application needs three key

prerequisites - the detection of a temporal signal in time-stamped sequences, identification of

non-recombinant genomic regions, and a robust phylogenetic signal in the data. To overcome

the last issue at the high taxonomic rank of Sobelivirales, we leveraged both the structural

protein conservation and the advancements in deep-learning algorithms. Protein sequences

evolve at a faster rate than their corresponding structures. When proteins are distantly related,

which is the case in this group of virus sequences, mutational saturation becomes more likely

and interpretation of evolutionary signals becomes more challenging. The reliable structural

models predicted by Alphafold [28], which is using deep-learning for protein reconstruction,

allows us to build more accurate sequence alignments from highy divergent virus families [29]

collected from the vast number of metagenomics studies and to infer phylogenetic relationships

more accurately [16,30–32].

In this paper, applying AlphaFold on 20 representative species of sobelivirales revealed

the highly conserved folding of their RdRps. The subsequent superposition of all generated 3D

protein models with the multiple structure alignment algorithm mTM-align resulted in an robust

RdRp nucleotidic alignment reaching the quality requirements to estimate the divergence dates

with the PoW model at the scale of Sobelivirales. The analysis of amino acid conservation based

on the structural alignment also provided molecular signatures of sobeliviral families and

genera that will be useful to design taxonomical assignment and diagnostic tools in future. Our

interdisciplinary approach integrating structure modeling and date estimations on sobeliviral

RdRps provided new insights on the evolutionary divergence between fungal and plant viruses.

Results

<u>Structural modeling</u>

A set of 20 viral species was selected to be representative of Sobelivirales infecting

plants and fungi (Table 1). The RdRp structural models for these viruses were generated using

the Alphafold 2.2 algorithm. Additionally, three outgroup RdRps were identified, modeled and

incorporated into the initial dataset (Table 2). These homologues (MyCV, BeSV, XiNV),

present in the Uniprot database, were identified through metagenomics analyses from

arthropods or soil samples and found through AlphaFold based on their structural similarity

with sobeliviral RdRps. In total, more than 2,500 related proteins were aligned for each of the

23 target sequences. Predicted 3D models showed local distance difference test (plDDT) scores

ranging from 92% to 96%, indicating highly reliable structural models (Fig 1, see S2 Figure &

S3 File). We also conducted a preliminary analysis of *Heterocapsa circularisquama RNA virus*

(HcRNAV). This virus, which infects dinoflagellates, is currently the only described species of

the genus *Dinornavirus* in the family *Alvernaviridae* in the order *Sobelivirales*. While the

structural model of HcRNAV RdRp can be easily superimposed on that of RYMV RdRp, the

modeling scores were locally low along the protein, with 10 % of the residues having low-

confidence plDDT scores (< 60) (see S4 Figure). As a result, HcRNAV was excluded from

dowstream analyses.

The predicted 3D model of RYMV RdRp was initially compared to available 3D

structures of poliovirus (PV) and foot-and-mouth disease virus (FMDV), two well-studied

species of picornavirales in the phylum *Pisuviricota* [33]. The characteristic fingers-palm-

thumb organization was observed in all three structures (Fig 2, see S5 Figure & S6 File).

Although conservation between RYMV and PV/FMDV sequences was low (~10% identity)

except in the RdRp motifs, the nature and 3D orientation of most secondary structural elements

(α-helices and β-sheets) were preserved across all three structures. The central part of the

protein, which forms the conserved palm domain, showed high local structural similarity, with

root mean square deviations (RMSD) below 1 angstrom (Å). However, in this domain, there

was a larger number of β-strand elements which are longer in RYMV compared to the two

picornaviruses. In contrast, the thumb domain, formed by α-helices at the C-terminal part of

RdRps, was smaller in the predicted RYMV structure. At the N-terminal region, a conserved

feature of picornavirales RdRps was observed: the index finger interacted with the top of the

thumb, trapping the ring finger beneath it. Additionally, the orientation of the « pinky finger

helix », which has been previously described to distinguish two picornavirales groups including

FMDV or PV [33], would bring the predicted structure of RYMV closer to that of FMDV.

<u>Structural alignment</u>

Each RdRp 3D model of the 23 sobelivirales was structurally aligned using the mTM-

align algorithm [34]. We firstly analyzed the superimpositions of the models inside the same

genus (Fig 3). Given the sequence similarity between the RdRps of polemovirus and

poleroviruses (~75%), they were grouped together as « poler/moviruses » for the remainder of

the analyses. Intra-genus model superpositions revealed a high degree of structural similarity

in the alpha-carbon traces, with maximum RMSD below 1.3 Å. The least divergent structures

were found among poler/moviruses (0.68 Å) while hubscleroviruses and enamoviruses showed

intermediate values (1.10 Å and 1.12 Å, respectively). Higher RMSD values were observed for

sobemoviruses and barnaviruses (1.26 Å and 1.29 Å), primarly due to two main structural

variations: the distinct loop lengths at the thumb joint in sobemoviruses and at the edge of the

palm in barnaviruses, referred to here as the « orange loop » and the « light blue loop ».

However, we noted that unlike the « orange loop », the « light blue loop » exhibited lower

plDDT values (<70), indicating that the 3D conformation of this loop was uncertain. The three

outgroups exhibited greater structural divergence, with a maximum RMSD of 1.84 Å, which

was consistently localized to the external domains of the RdRp.

The 3D overlay of the 23 RdRps confirmed the global conservation of the structure of

sobeliviral RdRps (1.9 Å < RMSD < 2.5 Å) (Fig 4). While the RdRp core was highly conserved,

the main structural differences were observed on the protein surface, particularly in external

loops. In addition to the variable loops previously identified at the intra-genus level, the global

model superimposition revealed secondary structure elements specific to certain genera. For

instance, a longer loop was found in the wrist domain of barnavirus RdRps, which we refer to

as the « yellow loop ». Again, low plDDT values were observed in this barnaviral loop. In

poler/movirus and enamovirus RdRps, a supplementary helix and a longer loop, named here

the « green helix » and « red loop », were identified at the thumb junction and the thumb tip,

respectively (Fig 4). These specific secondary elements showed high plDDT scores (>90-80).

Additionally, the « light blue loop », found to be variable among barnaviruses but with

relatively low plDDT values, was also longer in hubscleroviruses compared to other sobeliviral

genera but with high plDDT scores (>90). Notably, the amino-terminal extremity of all

sobeliviral RdRps studied forms a β-strand, interacting with other strands of the middle and

ring fingers (Fig 4). At this inter-genera taxonomic level, it is the first time that an extra domain

has been explicitly included in the sequence alignment.

The amino acid alignment of the 23 RdRps from plant and fungal viruses has a mean

length of 459 residues across 649 sites (Fig 5). Amino acid conservation was notably low, with

only 31 out of 459 residues being strictly conserved (less than 7% of the mean length). Half of

these conserved residues are located within well-characterized RdRp motifs, including a third

within the ABC motifs. As expected, the solvent accessibility scores and predicted secondary

structure elements were well conserved along the linear sequences (see S7 File). The 3D

modeling facilitated alignment and optimization of gap positions and lengths. We observed

sequence clustering based on their secondary structure elements, which reflected both intra-

and inter-genus relationships. For example, positions 56-59 formed an α-helix in both

poler/movirus and enamovirus RdRps, while positions 118-130 folded as coil + 3_{10} helix in

both hubsclerovirus and sobemovirus polymerases.

The insertion/deletion (indels) of gaps to account for longer secondary structure

elements is heterogeneously distributed depending on the domains and viral species. These

indels corresponded to domains identified through the global superimposition of the 3D models

(Fig 4 & 5). Some indels were specific to individual genera, such as those for the « yellow

loop » at positions 492-507 in barnaviruses and the « orange loop » at positions 557-565 in

sobemoviruses. Other indels were shared between two genera, such as those for the « green

helix » and « red loop » at positions 370-380 and 604-609 in both poler/mo- and enamoviruses,

and those for the « light blue loop » at positions 138-186 found in barnaviruses and

husceroviruses.

<u>Phylogeny and divergence date estimation</u>

The structural alignment was translated into a multiple sequence alignment of nucleic

acids by replacing each amino acid by its corresponding codon (see S8 File), which was used

to construct the maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of Sobelivirales using the GTR+G+I

substitution model in PhyML (Fig 6). The outgroups formed a well-supported cluster and

contributed to reveal two main clades (with high bootstrap supports), referred to as Polena- and

Sobarna- throughout the text. Within the Polena-clade, the phylogenetic relationships between

poler/moviruses and enamoviruses were confirmed. In the Sobarna-clade, phylogenetic links

between plant sobemoviruses and fungal barna-/hubsclerovirus were highlighted, with a

bootsptrap value of 90, establishing this monophyletic group for the first time. However, the

phylogenetic relationships between hubscleroviruses and sobemoviruses lacked strong support.

The time-scaled phylogenetic history for the 20 Sobelivirales was constructed using the

PoW model applied to the structural alignment. According to this analysis, the most recent

common ancestor (TMRCA) of sobemoviruses dates back to 2.3 million years before present

(BP) (95% highest posterior density (HPD): 1.3-3.5 million years BP) (Fig 7), aligning closely

with a recent estimate [26]. The divergence time of the Polenamo-clade was estimated to 5.3

(95% HPD: 3.4–7.9) million years BP. The findings here provides the first estimate of the

TMRCA for fungal (barna)viruses, which dates back to 3 (95% HPD: 1.8-5.0) million years

BP, and for the Sobarna-clade to 17.7 (95% HPD: 12.2– 24.8) million years BP. Furthermore,

the analysis here offers the first estimation of the TMRCA of the Sobelivirales order, reaching

back to 26.6 (95% HPD: 19.2-34.8) million years BP, which is nearly ten times older than the

origins of sobemoviruses.

Polymerase evolution

The RdRp core and active sites within the central tunnel of Sobelivirales were found to

be highly conserved across all genera, despite significant divergence in their protein sequences

(see S9 Figure). In contrast, genus-specific residues were evenly distributed around the core

without being spatially clustered (data not shown). In order to take phylogenic data into account

in the study of the evolution of structure/function relationships of sobeliviral polymerases, we

analyzed sequence conservation by comparing the Polena- versus Sobarna- clades after

exclusion of the three outgroups (see S10 File & S11 Table). We identified 35 clade-specific

residues - i.e. amino acids strictly present (or physico-chemically similar) in all sequences of

one clade and strictly absent from sequences of the other clade. These residues were located on

31 polymorphic sites in the RdRps. Of these, 25 residues were strictly conserved : 4/11 in the

sobarnaviral sequences and 21/24 in the polenaviral sequences (see S11 Table). Six clade-

specific residues were found within the conserved RdRp motifs – three in the palm domain and

three in the fingers domains.

To validate these clade-specific residues, 99 additional sobeliviral sequences were

incorporated into our aligned dataset, resulting in a total dataset of 119 sequences, which

included all ICTV-recognized viral species in the studied genera (see S12 Table & S13 File).

Almost 70% (24/35) of the clade-specific polymorphisms were confirmed, including 3/4 and

10/21 strictly conserved residues for the Sobarna- and Polena-clades, respectively (Table 3).

Two new Sobarna-specific residues were detected in conserved motifs of the extended dataset :

a serine and a histidine within Motifs G and D, respectively, at positions 188 and 486 (referring

to the alignment with 20 sequences). In the Sobarna-clade, residues at positions 486 and 489

were particularly notable for their 3D positions within Motif D - residue 489K/R pointed into

the central tunnel, while 486H/K was likely stabilized by residue 365E (Fig 8). In the Polena-

clade, a strictly conserved lysine at position 263 within Motif F also pointed into the central

tunnel, alongside the conserved sobeliviral lysine at position 266 (Fig 8). This analysis revealed

molecular signatures of these deeply divergent clades, refining the definitions of the conserved

motifs (Fig 9). In addition to clade-specific polymorphic positions such as 354I/C, 468S/A and

188S/G, certain residues were strictly conserved across sobelivirales, including 355-356SG,

261-262PH, 512-514FCS in Motifs A, F and E, respectively. The specificity of these conserved

residues to the sobeliviral order have to be tested by analyzing a larger dataset of RdRp

sequences from species of other viral orders. Moreover, genera-specific features idenfied on the

structural alignment of 20 sequences were confirmed on the expanded corpus. Notably, the

polena- « green helix » upstream Motif A and the polena- « red loop » dowstream Motif H

provided robust indel signatures. The sobemoviral « orange loop » between Motifs D and E

was also validated, appearing less variable than previously observed in the smaller corpus of

20 sequences.

Discussion

Protein structure modeling has proved effective in addressing some of the challenges to

making reliable sequence alignments posed by low sequence conservation at high taxonomic

levels. In this study, we used AlphaFold models to produce a robust and extensive sequence

alignement of sobeliviral RdRps, for the first time at this taxonomic level. Although initially

based on a limited set of sequences, the alignment was extensively validated using a full set of

known viral species in this order. Minor discrepancies, however, were observed in gap positions

at carboxy-terminal extremity of RdRp. In addition, the limited number of known

hubscleroviruses and barnaviruses prevented the validation of some features such as the « light

blue loop » and « yellow loop », respectively. Protein structure modeling successfully provided

high confidence supports that complemented classical functional motifs, serving as anchor

points. Notably, the RdRp extremities which are typically trimmed upstream of motif G and

downstream of motif E - deleting approximatively 150 residues - were very well predicted by

Alphafold, with plDDT exceeding 90%, and showing high structural similarity (RMSD < 2 Å).

Here, we considered the amino-terminal extremity of RdRp and its intra-molecular interactions,

improving the alignement length and quality.

In addition to generating robust structure models, Alphafold helps to identify new

homologues in databases. In this study, we selected three outgroups from metagenomic data

based on their genetic distance from the 20 initial sequences. Generally closer than

alvernaviruses, these outgroups served as a reliable reference for rooting the phylogenetic tree

and enhancing the quality of the phylogenetic analysis. We evaluated the accuracy of our

structural alignement to traditional alignment algorithms. The residue pairing between our

structural alignment and MAFFT, Clustal Omega, and MUSCLE showed differences of 21%,

23%, and 30%, respectively. Most of these differences were observed in the loop/coil regions

as well as in the amino- and carboxy-terminal extremities of the protein (see S14 File).

However, these differences had minimal impact on tree topology as they mainly concerned the

outgroup alignment (see S15 Figure). MUSCLE produced results similar to mTM-align, while

Clustal Omega and MAFFT failed to detect phylogenetic relationships between

hubscleroviruses and sobemovirus. Furthermore, Clustal Omega yielded low internal node

support at the sobemovirus / barnavirus split. The lower accuracy of Clustal Omega compared

to MUSCLE and MAFFT has been already reported for structural alignments of Flaviviridae

glycoproteins [31].

The phylogenic analysis led to a new taxonomic proposal : the creation of two new

tentative families Polenaviridae and Sobarnaviridae, replacing Solemoviridae and

Barnaviridae. By assessing the conservation of the structural alignment, we enriched the

common conserved motifs, identified molecular signatures of the new tentative families, and

revealed structural diversity (e.g., loop lengths) that can be used as marker of viral genera.

Interestingly, newly identified putative sobemo-like and sobeli-like viruses often represent a

significant portion of newly discovered plant and fungus taxa within environnemental viromes

[16,35–38]. Extending this approach in the near future will accelerate their taxonomic

classification, a priority for virus research [39]. Additionally, these RdRp features could be

useful for the development of molecular tools for diagnostic and detection.

The efficiency of our integrative approach was demonstrated at the taxonomic rank of

order/family and could be implemented to other clades, such as fungal viruses in the phylum

Pisuviricota, such as Polymycoviridae and Yadokarivirales, currently unassigned at the family

and order levels, respectively. However, this approach requires some level of structural

similarity below which comparisons are not recommended. To assess this limit, we predicted

3D models of the RdRp of Luteovirus pavhordei (previously named BYDV-pav) and

Dianthovirus trifolii (previously named RCNMV), since the former was previously classified

in the family *Luteoviridae* with the poleroviruses and is now classified with the latter in

Tombusviridae (Order *Totivirales*, Class *Tolucaviricetes*, phylum *Kitrinoviricota*) [7]. These

3D models were aligned with one representative of each six genera using the same method as

described above (see S16 File). Although the core of all three RdRps showed good sequence

and structure similarity, the overlay score on the full-length protein was low (3.3 Å > RMSD >

3.5Å). As expected, most of the Sobarna-and Polena-specific residues in the motifs, were not

shared with the two totivirales analyzed. The unique exception was observed in the motif G for

which *Luteovirus pavhordei* showed the same pattern as sobarnavirid sequences (188-189SP).

Noteworthy, half of the sobeliviral-conserved residues in Motifs A, F and E were also present

in the two totivirales analyzed (355S, 262H, 512-513FC, respectively) suggesting that these

residues were not strictly specific. These preliminary analyses should be continued and

expanded in the future. By contrast to the core, the external loops of the two totiviral RdRps

analyzed here showed very low structural similarity with the sobeliviral ones. In addition,

neither the « green helix » and « red loop » nor the « orange loop », the secondary structure

elements specific to polenavirids and sobarnavirids, respectively, were observed. Consequently,

we considered that entire RdRps of luteoviruses were significantly too distant to RdRps of

poleroviruses and sobelivirales to be aligned accurately with our structural approach.

Furthermore, structural similarity does not always imply phylogenic relationships. As

mentionned earlier, for the picorna-like supergroup, the hypothesis of convergent evolution

cannot be excluded [5]. Picornaviruses show both structural and functional similarities with

sobelivirales, such as the use of a Viral Protein genome-linked (VPg) to prime RNA replication

by the RdRp. However, picornaviral VPg are very small (~20 residues) and are cleaved from

the RdRp by a viral protease located downtream of the VPg domain. In contrast, the

sobarnavirids and polenavirids share a conserved genomic organization

(protease/VPg/polymerase) and have larger VPgs (80-150 residues), which likely result in or

induce specific molecular mechanisms. While interactions between VPg and RdRps and their

structure-function relationships have been extensively studied in human and animal viruses,

very little data exist for plant viruses. Our approach could help to fill this knowledge gap, or at

least provide a better understanding of plant RdRp features through *in silico* comparative

analyses.

For example, the comparative analysis of Motif E, unique to RdRps compared to other

polymerases, offers a good starting point for better understanding of some of the plant RdRp

features. The amino acid composition of this motif is directly linked to the viral replication

strategy, using protein priming (VPg) or not. Described as « primer grip », this motif has been

shown to help correctly position the 3' OH end of the primer strand [9,17]. In picornaviral

RdRps, the conserved phenylalanine in Motif E, which faces Motif C, is followed by two

residues with relatively long side chains (phenylalanine-leucine-lysine, FLK), while in

flaviviral RdRps, the central channel is narrower, and these residues have rather short side

chains (phenylalanine-cysteine-serine, FCS). Interestingly, plant and fungus sobeliviral RdRps

share the same conserved Motif E as flavivirids. Additionaly, the homomorph that contains

Motif E forms part of the NTP entry tunnel and can vary in lenght depending on the viral

species. Sobemoviruses exhibit a longer « orange loop » at the thumb joint compared to other

members of sobelivirales, another unexpected similarity with flaviviral hepatitis virus C.

At a different taxonomic scale, Motif D illustrates the common evolutionary history of

plant and fungus sobeliviral RdRps. This motif influences the rate of nucleotide addition to the

nascent RNA strand. Characterized by a glycine hinge and a positively charged lysine, both

located in similar positions across available RdRp crystal structures, the distance inside the

linear sequence between these two conserved residues varies across different viral families [9].

In the Sobarnaviridae clade, lysine (or its equivalent arginine) is conserved at position N+4, i.e.

position 489 (in the reference alignement of 20 sequences) (Fig 9). In the Polenaviridae clade,

our initial analysis was too stringent to detect the conserved lysine, as one species out of 89 had

a non-conserved hydrophobic isoleucine at this position. However, when *Enamovirus CLEV*

was excluded from the dataset, the conserved lysine was found at position N+2 – i.e. position

487, with its orientation differing from the sobernaviridae lysine in the 3D structural model.

Motif D has been shown to influence not only incorporation speed but also fidelity, both of

which are closely linked to viral pathogenesis and virulence. For example, increased fidelity in

a poliovirus mutant has been associated with viral attenuation [40].

The structural differences and evolutionary distances between RdRps of sobemoviruses

and poleroviruses (two phytovirus genera in the order *Sobelivirales*) were found to be greater

than those between sobemoviruses and barnaviruses (a mycovirus genus in the family

Barnaviridae) as well as hubscleroviruses (a mycovirus genus in the family *Solemoviridae*).

Given the role of RdRp as a major marker of viral evolutionary history, our results confirmed

that horizontal viral transfert(s) (HVT) between plant/fungal viruses occured in the Order

Sobelivirales. The direction of the HVT(s) cannot yet be determined without further data on the

hosts of metagenomic sequences we used as outgroups. Using an interdisciplinary approach,

we provided the first divergence time estimation between these plant and fungal viruses, dating

back to ~26 million years BP. The TDRP-corrected evolutionary history of sobelivirales was

extended five thousand times far beyond previous estimates [27]. However, we note that this

estimate may reflect a conservative timeframe based on current methodologies, as our

understanding of TDRP and application of the PoW model has primarily been at the genus and

family levels. With future advances in modeling and expanded data, these divergence times

could potentially be revised further back. Yet, even with our current conservative estimates, the

divergence time remains more recent than the divergence between the respective plant and

fungal hosts (>400 millions years) [41], suggesting that a strict virus-host co-evolution

hypothesis not fully explain these evolutionary relationships. Other lineages of mycoviruses

either with single- or double-stranded RNA genomes showed close phylogenetic relationships

with plant viruses at different taxonomical ranks [18,20,42], suggesting that taxonomy of these

viruses should rather be viewed as a continuum. An interdisciplinary approach at the interface

of biophysics, bioinformatics, and virology should be encouraged to better understand

evolution, interactions and biological mechanisms of myco- and phytoviruses.

Material and methods

Sequence selection

The sobeliviral dataset initially consisted of 20 species from six genera (Table 1). Six sobemoviruses including four recently described (ArtVA, CyCMV, PLYV, XYDV), four poleroviruses, four enamoviruses, one polemovirus, two hubscleroviruses including one candidate species, and three barnaviruses including two candidate species. Complementary analyses were performed on *Heterocapsa circularisquama RNA virus* (HcRNAV, accession NC007518, *Dinornavirus, Alvernaviridae, Sobelivirales*), on *Luteovirus pavhordei* (BYDV-pav, accession OM046620, *Luteovirus, Tombusviridae, Tolivirales*) and on *Dianthovirus trifolii* (RCNMV, accession OL311680, *Dianthovirus, Tombusviridae, Tolivirales*).

The validation dataset consisted of 99 sequences of sobelivirales species made of all the ICTV viral species available in the studied genera. In addition to the two hubscleroviruses, the three barnaviruses and the polemovirus already cited, the complete corpus consisted of 25 sobemoviruses, 73 poleroviruses and 15 enamoviruses (see S12 Table).

3D model prediction

The structures of the corresponding RdRps were predicted using a locally installed version of Alphafold 2.2 [28]. For each sequence, 5 models were generated and relaxed using default Alphafold parameters. All homologues detected by Jackhmmer [43] in the Uniprot database (https://www.uniprot.org/) during these 20 Alphafold runs were then clustered using kClust into groups of proteins sharing at least both 80% sequence identity and 50% sequence overlap [44]. The representative sequences of each group were then aligned using MAFFT [45] and a phylogenetic tree was derived from the alignment using FastME [46]. From this tree, three new proteins were selected forming an outlier group (MyCV, BeSV, XiNV) (Table 2).

The 3D structure of these new proteins, as well as RdRps of HcRNAV, BYDV-pav and

RCNMV, were also predicted using Alphafold.

<u>Evaluation of 3D models</u>

One representative of each 6 viral genera was selected - RYMV (*Sobemovirus*), PLRV

(*Polerovirus*), PeMV (*Enamovirus*), MBV (*Barnavirus*), HuSRV (*Hubsclerovirus*), XyNV

(outgroups). The best RdRp 3D models predicted by Alphafold for these viral species were

structurally aligned using mTM-align [34]. The pLDDT reliability scores available in the B-

factor field of each Alphafold model were coded as integers (0=0-10, 1=10 -20, …, 9=90-100)

which were added to the mTM-align structural alignment with sequence identifiers suffixed by

.sc.PLDDT. This alignment is displayed in a web page where the aligned sequences and their

corresponding pLDDT scores are interfaced with 6 representative 3D models using Jsmol applet

and script [47]. Selected Alphafold models can displayed and customized by using the toggle

buttons and the popup menus from the right bottom panel and the colors of the amino acids or

pLDDT scores of one aligned sequence from the top panel can be projected on the selected 3D

structure(s) by clicking on the corresponding protein identifier in the top left panel (see S3 File).

The RYMV 3D model with highest Alphafold pLDDT scores was superposed to 1RA6

and 1U09 PDB structures of poliovirus (PV) and foot-and-mouth disease virus (FMDV) RdRps,

respectively, using mTM-align. The sequence identity between the three proteins was

calculated after alignment with Ident and Sim software [48]. The observed Cα deviations, in

Angstroms, where added below the obtained structural alignment (identifier suffixed with

d3.RMSD_1ra6A an .d3.RMSD_1u09A). The Cα deviation colors can be projected onto one

of the displayed structures by cliking one of these identifiers (see S6 File).

 Structural alignment construction

    All the best 3D models predicted by Alphafold for the 23 virus proteins were structurally

 aligned using mTM-align. The 23 analyzed proteins were clustered into 6 subgroups

 (Sobemovirus, Barnavirus, Hubsclerovirus, Poler/movirus, Enamovirus and a subgroup of

 outlier viruses). The best RdRp 3D model of the 23 sobelivirales were superimposed with the

 other models inside its group using mTM-align. The RMSD between the aligned carbon alpha

 atoms was calculated for each viral pair inside each subgroup, then the maximum and average

 RMSD between subgroup pairs were computed.

    We carefully delineated the polymerase domain shared by the 23 proteins by inspecting

 both the positional conservation of the aligned sequences, the superposition of their predicted

 secondary structures and the solvent accessibility (see S7 File). The secondary structure and the

 solvent accessibility of each model residue was calculated using STRIDE [49] and the

 positional conservation was calculated as the frequency of the most represented amino acid in

 a given alignment column.

 Phylogenetic analysis and time tree reconstruction with PoW model

    The mTM-align structural alignment was translated into a multiple sequence alignment

 of nucleic acids by replacing each amino acid by its corresponding codon (Table 1) (see S8

 File). JModelTest 2 [50] was used to identify the best nucleotide substitution model for

 phylogenetic analysis based on the Akaike Information Criterion. The Maximum-Likelihood

 tree was then constructed with the General Time Reversible Model with an optimised rate

 variation and class for invariant sites (GTR + G + I) using PhyML implemented in SeaView (v

 5.05) [51]. The absence of recombination events between species was confirmed with the Phi

 test [52]. The reliability of the phylogenetic tree nodes was estimated via a bootstrap resampling

 procedure with 100 replicates. The phylogenetic tree was rooted using the outgroup branch.

We have also detected the homologous amino acid pairs which were identically aligned

between the mTM-align structural alignment and each multiple sequence alignment built using

respectively MAFFT [45], MUSCLE [53] and Clustal Omega [54]. The frequencies of shared

amino acid pairs were calculated both over the whole alignments and within each alignment

column (see S14 File).

We used the Prisoner of War (PoW) model of virus evolution to account for the power-

law decay in the substitution rate estimates of sobemoviruses, as described in Ghafari et al. [26],

where we also established the presence of a robust and representative molecular clock signal

for the RdRp locus for sobemoviruses. Briefly, the short-term substitution rate of RYMV's

polymerase gene, inferred from a standard molecular clock model was used as the baseline rate,

then ultrametric distance trees were constructed using the substitution rate at the fastest-

evolving rate group for our dataset with a strict molecular clock in BEAST (v 1.10.4) [55]. The

maximum clade credibility tree was constructed after 100 iterations using TreeAnnotator

v.1.10.4 and visualized through a lineages-through-time plot using the phytools library in R

[56].

Polymerase evolution

The analyzed proteins were clustered into 2 subgroups comparing the Polena- versus

Sobarna- clades. The three outgroups were not considered in this analysis (see S10 File). At

each site of this new mTM-align structural alignment, amino acids strictly present in all

sequences of one clade (or that were similar based on BLOSUM score ≥ 0) and strictly absent

from sequences of the other clade were considered as clade-specific residue. These conserved

residues specific to Sobarna- and Polena-clades were added to the mTm-align alignment as two

final consensus sequences suffixed by c1.PID and .c2.PID respectively. The location of these

signature residues can be highlighted on the displayed 3D model clicking one of the c1.PID and

.c2.PID identifier and by hovering the mouse pointer onto one of the consensus sequence. In

the supplementary table, only strictly conserved or similar in all sequences of one clade were

considered. Motif analysis was made with WebLogo v2.8.2 [57].

Acknowledgements

This work benefited from discussions with Aurore Comte and Nils Poulicard, other members

of Virus/Cereal Interactions in Tropical Agroecosystems group and colleagues of Plant Health

Institute Montpellier. This work was supported by the French Infrastructure for Integrated

Structural Biology (FRISBI) ANR-10-INBS-0005.

Data and code availability

The code for the PoW model is available on GitHub https://github.com/mg878/PoW_model

All the data (including accession numbers) are provided within the main text and supporting

information.

Competing interest

None.

Funding

None.

Author contribution

Writing (original draft) JG and EH; Writing -- review and editing all authors; Formal Analysis

JG MG EH: Conceptualization all authors; Data Collection JG DF EH; Supervision EH. All

authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Correspondence to Eugénie Hébrard (eugenie.hebrard@ird.fr).

References

References

1.   Simmonds P, Adams MJ, Benkő M, Breitbart M, Brister JR, Carstens EB, et al. Virus taxonomy in
the age of metagenomics. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2017;15: 161–168. doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2016.177

2.   Gorbalenya AE. Increasing the number of available ranks in virus taxonomy from five to ten and
adopting the Baltimore classes as taxa at the basal rank. Arch Virol. 2018;163: 2933–2936.
doi:10.1007/s00705-018-3915-6

3.   Siddell SG, Walker PJ, Lefkowitz EJ, Mushegian AR, Adams MJ, Dutilh BE, et al. Additional
changes to taxonomy ratified in a special vote by the International Committee on Taxonomy of
Viruses (October 2018). Arch Virol. 2019;164: 943–946. doi:10.1007/s00705-018-04136-2

4.   Koonin EV, Dolja VV, Krupovic M, Varsani A, Wolf YI, Yutin N, et al. Global Organization and
Proposed Megataxonomy of the Virus World. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2020;84: e00061-19.
doi:10.1128/MMBR.00061-19

5.   Wolf YI, Kazlauskas D, Iranzo J, Lucía-Sanz A, Kuhn JH, Krupovic M, et al. Origins and Evolution
of the Global RNA Virome. Racaniello VR, editor. mBio. 2018;9: e02329-18.
doi:10.1128/mBio.02329-18

6.   Walker PJ, Siddell SG, Lefkowitz EJ, Mushegian AR, Adriaenssens EM, Alfenas-Zerbini P, et al.
Recent changes to virus taxonomy ratified by the International Committee on Taxonomy of
Viruses (2022). Arch Virol. 2022;167: 2429–2440. doi:10.1007/s00705-022-05516-5

7.   Walker PJ, Siddell SG, Lefkowitz EJ, Mushegian AR, Adriaenssens EM, Alfenas-Zerbini P, et al.
Changes to virus taxonomy and to the International Code of Virus Classification and
Nomenclature ratified by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (2021). Arch
Virol. 2021;166: 2633–2648. doi:10.1007/s00705-021-05156-1

8.   Ferrero D, Ferrer-Orta C, Verdaguer N. Viral RNA-Dependent RNA Polymerases: A Structural
Overview. In: Harris JR, Bhella D, editors. Virus Protein and Nucleoprotein Complexes.
Singapore: Springer Singapore; 2018. pp. 39–71. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-8456-0_3

9.   Jácome R, Becerra A, Ponce de León S, Lazcano A. Structural Analysis of Monomeric RNA-
Dependent Polymerases: Evolutionary and Therapeutic Implications. Kuhn JH, editor. PLOS
ONE. 2015;10: e0139001. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139001

10.   Koonin EV, Wolf YI, Nagasaki K, Dolja VV. The Big Bang of picorna-like virus evolution antedates
the radiation of eukaryotic supergroups. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2008;6: 925–939.
doi:10.1038/nrmicro2030

11.   te Velthuis AJW. Common and unique features of viral RNA-dependent polymerases. Cell Mol
Life Sci. 2014;71: 4403–4420. doi:10.1007/s00018-014-1695-z

12.   Koonin EV. The phylogeny of RNA-dependent RNA polymerases of positive-strand RNA viruses.
J Gen Virol. 1991;72: 2197–2206. doi:10.1099/0022-1317-72-9-2197

13.   Poch O, Sauvaget I, Delarue M, Tordo N. Identification of four conserved motifs among the
RNA-dependent polymerase encoding elements. EMBO J. 1989;8: 3867–3874.
doi:10.1002/j.1460-2075.1989.tb08565.x

14.   Charon J, Buchmann JP, Sadiq S, Holmes EC. RdRp-scan: A bioinformatic resource to identify
598   and annotate divergent RNA viruses in metagenomic sequence data. Virus Evol. 2022;8:
599   veac082. doi:10.1093/ve/veac082

600   15.   Edgar RC, Taylor B, Lin V, Altman T, Barbera P, Meleshko D, et al. Petabase-scale sequence
601   alignment catalyses viral discovery. Nature. 2022;602: 142–147. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-
602   04332-2

603   16.   Hou X, He Y, Fang P, Mei S-Q, Xu Z, Wu W-C, et al. Using artificial intelligence to document the
604   hidden RNA virosphere. Cell. 2024; S0092867424010857. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2024.09.027

605   17.   Lang DM, Zemla AT, Zhou CLE. Highly similar structural frames link the template tunnel and NTP
606   entry tunnel to the exterior surface in RNA-dependent RNA polymerases. Nucleic Acids Res.
607   2013;41: 1464–1482. doi:10.1093/nar/gks1251

608   18.   Dolja VV, Krupovic M, Koonin EV. Deep Roots and Splendid Boughs of the Global Plant Virome.
609   Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2020;58: 23–53. doi:10.1146/annurev-phyto-030320-041346

610   19.   Andika IB, Tian M, Bian R, Cao X, Luo M, Kondo H, et al. Cross-Kingdom Interactions Between
611   Plant and Fungal Viruses. Annu Rev Virol. 2023;10: 119–138. doi:10.1146/annurev-virology-
612   111821-122539

613   20.   Roossinck MJ. Evolutionary and ecological links between plant and fungal viruses. New Phytol.
614   2019;221: 86–92. doi:10.1111/nph.15364

615   21.   Gorbalenya AE, Donchenko AP, Blinov VM, Koonin EV. Cysteine proteases of positive strand
616   RNA viruses and chymotrypsin-like serine proteases: A distinct protein superfamily with a
617   common structural fold. FEBS Lett. 1989;243: 103–114. doi:10.1016/0014-5793(89)80109-7

618   22.   Revill PA, Davidson AD, Wright PJ. Mushroom Bacilliform Virus RNA: The Initiation of
619   Translation at the 5' End of the Genome and Identification of the VPg. Virology. 1998;249: 231–
620   237. doi:10.1006/viro.1998.9345

621   23.   Sõmera M, Fargette D, Hébrard E, Sarmiento C, ICTV Report Consortium. ICTV Virus Taxonomy
622   Profile: Solemoviridae 2021: This article is part of the ICTV Virus Taxonomy Profiles collection. J
623   Gen Virol. 2021;102. doi:10.1099/jgv.0.001707

624   24.   Simmonds P, Adriaenssens EM, Lefkowitz EJ, Oksanen HM, Siddell SG, Zerbini FM, et al.
625   Changes to virus taxonomy and the ICTV Statutes ratified by the International Committee on
626   Taxonomy of Viruses (2024). Arch Virol. 2024;169: 236. doi:10.1007/s00705-024-06143-y

627   25.   Ghafari M, Simmonds P, Pybus OG, Katzourakis A. A mechanistic evolutionary model explains
628   the time-dependent pattern of substitution rates in viruses. Curr Biol. 2021;31: 4689-4696.e5.
629   doi:10.1016/j.cub.2021.08.020

630   26.   Ghafari M, Sõmera M, Sarmiento C, Niehl A, Hébrard E, Tsoleridis T, et al. Revisiting the origins
631   of the Sobemovirus genus: A case for ancient origins of plant viruses. Nagy PD, editor. PLOS
632   Pathog. 2024;20: e1011911. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1011911

633   27.   Fargette D, Pinel A, Rakotomalala M, Sangu E, Traoré O, Sérémé D, et al. *Rice Yellow Mottle
634   Virus* , an RNA Plant Virus, Evolves as Rapidly as Most RNA Animal Viruses. J Virol. 2008;82:
635   3584–3589. doi:10.1128/JVI.02506-07

28. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, et al. Highly accurate protein
structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature. 2021;596: 583–589. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-
03819-2

29. Carpentier M, Chomilier J. Protein multiple alignments: sequence-based versus structure-based
programs. Valencia A, editor. Bioinformatics. 2019;35: 3970–3980.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz236

30. Gutnik D, Evseev P, Miroshnikov K, Shneider M. Using AlphaFold Predictions in Viral Research.
Curr Issues Mol Biol. 2023;45: 3705–3732. doi:10.3390/cimb45040240

31. Mifsud JCO, Lytras S, Oliver MR, Toon K, Costa VA, Holmes EC, et al. Mapping glycoprotein
structure reveals Flaviviridae evolutionary history. Nature. 2024;633: 695–703.
doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07899-8

32. Nino Barreat JG, Katzourakis A. Deep mining reveals the diversity of endogenous viral elements
in vertebrate genomes. Nat Microbiol. 2024;9: 3013–3024. doi:10.1038/s41564-024-01825-4

33. Peersen OB. Picornaviral polymerase structure, function, and fidelity modulation. Virus Res.
2017;234: 4–20. doi:10.1016/j.virusres.2017.01.026

34. Dong R, Peng Z, Zhang Y, Yang J. mTM-align: an algorithm for fast and accurate multiple protein
structure alignment. Valencia A, editor. Bioinformatics. 2018;34: 1719–1725.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx828

35. Chen Y-M, Sadiq S, Tian J-H, Chen X, Lin X-D, Shen J-J, et al. RNA viromes from terrestrial sites
across China expand environmental viral diversity. Nat Microbiol. 2022;7: 1312–1323.
doi:10.1038/s41564-022-01180-2

36. Duarte MF, De Andrade IA, Silva JMF, De Melo FL, Machado AM, Inoue-Nagata AK, et al.
Metagenomic analyses of plant virus sequences in sewage water for plant viruses monitoring.
Trop Plant Pathol. 2023;48: 408–416. doi:10.1007/s40858-023-00575-8

37. Maksimović O, Bačnik K, Rivarez MPS, Vučurović A, Mehle N, Ravnikar M, et al. Virome analysis
of irrigation water sources provides extensive insights into the diversity and distribution of
plant viruses in agroecosystems. Water Res. 2024;249: 120712.
doi:10.1016/j.watres.2023.120712

38. Shi M, Lin X-D, Tian J-H, Chen L-J, Chen X, Li C-X, et al. Redefining the invertebrate RNA
virosphere. Nature. 2016;540: 539–543. doi:10.1038/nature20167

39. Gorbalenya AE, Siddell SG. Recognizing species as a new focus of virus research. Morrison TE,
editor. PLOS Pathog. 2021;17: e1009318. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009318

40. Castro C, Smidansky ED, Arnold JJ, Maksimchuk KR, Moustafa I, Uchida A, et al. Nucleic acid
polymerases use a general acid for nucleotidyl transfer. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2009;16: 212–218.
doi:10.1038/nsmb.1540

41. Selosse, Marc-André, Strullu-Derrien, Christine, Martin, Francis M., Kamoun, Sophien, Kenrick,
Paul. Plants, fungi and oomycetes: a 400-million year affair that shapes the biosphere. New
Phytol. 2015;206: 501–506. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/newphytologist.206.2.501

42.   Ghabrial SA, Castón JR, Jiang D, Nibert ML, Suzuki N. 50-plus years of fungal viruses. Virology.
675   2015;479–480: 356–368. doi:10.1016/j.virol.2015.02.034

676   43.   Johnson LS, Eddy SR, Portugaly E. Hidden Markov model speed heuristic and iterative HMM
677   search procedure. BMC Bioinformatics. 2010;11: 431. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-11-431

678   44.   Hauser M, Mayer CE, Söding J. kClust: fast and sensitive clustering of large protein sequence
679   databases. BMC Bioinformatics. 2013;14: 248. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-14-248

680   45.   Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software Version 7: Improvements
681   in Performance and Usability. Mol Biol Evol. 2013;30: 772–780. doi:10.1093/molbev/mst010

682   46.   Lefort V, Desper R, Gascuel O. FastME 2.0: A Comprehensive, Accurate, and Fast Distance-
683   Based Phylogeny Inference Program: Table 1. Mol Biol Evol. 2015;32: 2798–2800.
684   doi:10.1093/molbev/msv150

685   47.   Hanson RM. *Jmol* – a paradigm shift in crystallographic visualization. J Appl Crystallogr. 2010;43:
686   1250–1260. doi:10.1107/S0021889810030256

687   48.   Stothard P. The Sequence Manipulation Suite: JavaScript Programs for Analyzing and
688   Formatting Protein and DNA Sequences. BioTechniques. 2000;28: 1102–1104.
689   doi:10.2144/00286ir01

690   49.   Frishman D, Argos P. Knowledge-based protein secondary structure assignment. Proteins Struct
691   Funct Bioinforma. 1995;23: 566–579. doi:10.1002/prot.340230412

692   50.   Darriba D, Taboada GL, Doallo R, Posada D. jModelTest 2: more models, new heuristics and
693   parallel computing. Nat Methods. 2012;9: 772–772. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2109

694   51.   Guindon S, Gascuel O. A Simple, Fast, and Accurate Algorithm to Estimate Large Phylogenies by
695   Maximum Likelihood. Rannala B, editor. Syst Biol. 2003;52: 696–704.
696   doi:10.1080/10635150390235520

697   52.   Bruen TC, Philippe H, Bryant D. A Simple and Robust Statistical Test for Detecting the Presence
698   of Recombination. Genetics. 2006;172: 2665–2681. doi:10.1534/genetics.105.048975

699   53.   Edgar RC. MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and space
700   complexity. BMC Bioinformatics. 2004;5: 113. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-5-113

701   54.   Sievers F, Higgins DG. Clustal Omega for making accurate alignments of many protein
702   sequences. Protein Sci. 2018;27: 135–145. doi:10.1002/pro.3290

703   55.   Suchard MA, Lemey P, Baele G, Ayres DL, Drummond AJ, Rambaut A. Bayesian phylogenetic and
704   phylodynamic data integration using BEAST 1.10. Virus Evol. 2018;4. doi:10.1093/ve/vey016

705   56.   Revell LJ. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things).
706   Methods Ecol Evol. 2012;3: 217–223. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00169.x

707   57.   Crooks GE, Hon G, Chandonia J-M, Brenner SE. WebLogo: A Sequence Logo Generator: Figure 1.
708   Genome Res. 2004;14: 1188–1190. doi:10.1101/gr.849004

711   **Tables**

713   **Table 1**: Virus name and accession numbers of the 20 sobeliviral species and candidate

714   species or genus (*).

Family	Genus (N)	Species	Name	NCBI /uniprot nuc accession number	Uniprot accession nb
Solemoviridae	Sobemovirus (21)	Rice yellow mottle virus	RYMV	AJ608207	Q709L0
		Turnip rosette virus	TRoV	NC004553/AY177608	Q80QX5
		Artemisia virus A	ArtVA	NC017914/JN620802	I1WZY5
		Cymbidium chlorotic mosaic virus	CyCMV	LC381945	A0A2Z6E9A6
		Papaya lethal yellowing virus	PLYV	NC018449/JX123318	J7GBL4
		Xufa yellow dwarf virus	XYDV	ON828429	A0A977KCX8
	Polerovirus (26)	Potato leafroll virus	PLRV	AF453394/X74789	Q84837
		Beet chlorosis virus	BChV	NC002766/MH271171	A0A385L367
		Beet mild yellowing virus	BYMV	NC003491/DQ132996	Q45GB9
		Cereal yellow dwarf virus RPS	CYDV	NC002198/AF235168	Q9IZF5
	Enamovirus (5)	Pea enation mosaic virus 1	PeMV	MN497823	A0A6M8PM86
		Alfalfa enamovirus 1	AlEV	/KU297983	A0A166J1Q2
		Citrus vein enation virus	CVEV	/HF679486	S0EQ55
		Grapevine enamovirus 1	GREnV	/KX645875	A0A1B3B596
	Polemovirus (1)	Poinsettia latent virus	PnLV	AJ867490	Q5NDM9
	Hubsclerovirus (1)	Hubei sclerotinia RNA virus 1	HUSRV	/MK889164	A0A649X039
		Erysiphe necator associated sobemo-like virus 4*	EnAV*	/MN630192	A0A8E3YYS7
Barnaviridae	Barnavirus (1)	Mushroom bacilliform virus	MBV	NC001633/U07551	Q9YPD4
		Rhizoctonia solani barnavirus 1*	RsBV*	/KP900904	A0A0M4KGX8
		Colobanthus quitensis associated barnavirus 1*	CoBV*	MG686618	A0A2P1JMX2

717   **Table 2**: Accession numbers of the 5 additional proteins found as homologues of RdRp

718   sobeliviral by AlphaFold

Candidate species	Abbreviation	Uniprot access nb	Source	Reference
Mycroft virus	MyCV	A0A5B8XAH7	arthropods	Harvey et al. 2019
Beihai shrimp virus 5	BeSV	A0A1L3KE75	invertebrates	Shi et al. 2016
Xingshan nematode virus 5	XINV	A0A1L3KF94	invertebrates	Shi et al. 2016

720   **Table 3** : Clade-specific residues. Strictly conserved residues and shared sites were indicated

721   (bold and underligned, respectively). Position numbers referred at the structural alignment of

722   the 99 sobelivirales sequences (without the 3 outgroups, see S11 File).

	Sobarnaviruses	Polenamoviruses
Palm		
motifs (A, B, C, D)	I<u>354</u>,S<u>468</u>,K489	**C<u>354</u>**, A<u>468</u>
other sites	**P99,E365**,H486	**A286,F323,D368,N374,T377,R390,W393,**L478
Fingers		
motifs (F,G,H)	S<u>188</u>,**P189**	**G<u>188</u>,K263**
other sites	V<u>205</u>	W25,G26,W<u>205</u>,N529,S561

Figure captions

Figure 1: RdRp 3D models colored by per-residue model confidence score (local distance

difference test, plDDT). The regions modeled with high confidence (plDDT>90) are shown

dark blue. The regions colored light blue (plDDT>80) and green (plDDT>70) were modeled

with confidence whereas yellow (plDDT>60) and orange (plDDT>50), confidence was low.

RYMV (Sobemovirus), PLRV (Polerovirus), PeMV (Enamovirus), MBV (Barnavirus),

HuSRV (Hubsclerovirus), XyNV (outgroups).

Figure 2: Comparison of RdRp 3D model and structures. RdRp domains, palm, fingers and

thumb, are colored on RYMV model, grey, purple and pink, respectively. The RdRp

picornavirales feature was conserved i.e., index finger structure interacted with the top of the

thumb and trapped the ring finger underneath it (black arrows). RdRp structures of

picornaviruses (PDB 1RA6, Poliovirus and PDB 1U09, Foot-and-mouth disease virus) are

compared to RYMV model and colored based on root mean square deviations (RMSD). The

regions with high local structural similarity (RMSD<1Å) are shown dark blue. The regions

colored light blue (1<RMSD<2) and green (2<RMSD<3) were similar whereas colored other

colors, similarity was low. The α-helix of picornaviruses located at the carboxy-terminal

extremity (thumb domain) was lacking in RdRp sobelivirales (shown red). The orientation of

the pinky finger in the RYMV predicted structure was closer to FMDV rather than PV (grey

arrows).

Figure 3: Superimposition of RdRp 3D models by genera (a) Sobemovirus (6 ICTV recognized

or candidate species), (b) Poler/movirus (5 species), (c) Enamovirus (4 species), (d)

Hubsclerovirus (2 recognized or candidate species), (e) Barnavirus (3 recognized or candidate

species), (f) outgroups (3 candidate species). Models were colored using standard rainbow code

(from N-terminus, dark blue, to C-terminus, red). Major variable segments are pointed out at

the intra-genera scale (black arrows) or between outgroups (white arrows).

Figure 4: Inter-genera superimposition of RdRp 3D models. For clarity reason, only one model

per genera was represented (sobemovirus RYMV, poler/movirus PLRV, enamovirus PeMV,

barnavirus, hubsclerovirus HuSRV) and only the regions of interest were colored using standard

rainbow code (see text). Grey arrows indicated regions with intra-genera variability (as reported

in Fig 3), black arrows pointed out regions with inter-genera variability. Highlighted in a circle,

the amino-terminal extremity of RdRps forms a conserved β-strand (dark blue) and interacts

with other conserved strands of the middle and ring fingers (yellow and green).

Figure 5: Optimized amino acid alignment of 23 viral RdRps. A-H conserved motifs are

framed, strictly conserved residues are indicated in red above. The conservation and RMSD

scores were measured at each site and were colored in red and blue to highlight respectively the

local similarities and the local differences between both alignments (see Material & Methods).

Regions of interest (see text) are figured by arrows, loops or helices.

Figure 6: Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of sobelivirales based on the structural

alignement. The branches are colored according to the five genera and the outgroups. Number

at each node indicates bootstrap values based on 100 replicates (only values above 80 are

indicated).

Figure 7: PoW-transformed time tree of the 20 sobelivirales species. The horizontal blue bars

show 95% highest posterior density of the node age.

Figure 8: Clade-specific residues located on 3D RdRp models. Sobarna- and polena-specific

residues confirmed on the 99 dataset were figured as sticks on Cα trace of one representative

species (RYMV and AlEV). Sobarna- and polena-specific residues which belonged to

conserved motifs were colored red & blue, respectively, clade-specific residues of other

domains were colored orange & light blue, respectively. Remarkable residues at positions 263,

489 or in interaction 365-486 were indicated by arrows or circled in dotted line (see text).

Figure 9: Figure 9: Optimized motifs of sobeliviral RdRps. (a) For each conserved motif, RdRp

conserved residues were colored (black), additional sobeli-specific residues (purple), sobarna-

specific residues (red) and polena-specific residues (blue). Common clade-specific positions

were highlighted (yellow open boxes). Each sequence logo consists of stacks of symbols, one

stack for each position in the sequence. The overall height of the stack indicates the sequence

conservation at that position, while the height of symbols within the stack indicates the relative

frequency of each amino at that position. Position numbering referred to the alignment with 20

sequences. (b) Conserved motifs were indicated on 3D RdRp models of one representative

species of each sobeli-clade (sobarna-, RYMV and polena-, AlEV, respectively). Color code

was conserved, except clade-specific polymorphic positions colored yellow (arrows).

Additional sobeli-specific residues (purple) are circles in dotted lines.

Supporting information

S1 Table : Taxonomy and biological characteristics in the phylum Pisuviricota.

S2 Figure : Back side of RdRp 3D models colored by per-residue model confidence score.

Color code is similar to Figure 1. RYMV (Sobemovirus), PLRV (Polerovirus), PeMV

(Enamovirus), MBV (Barnavirus), HuSRV (Hubsclerovirus), XyNV (outgroups).

S3 File : Local pLDDT scores of representative Alphafold models

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/plddt.html

S4 Figure : Local Distance Difference Test (pLDDT) data for 5 models of the HcRNAV and

RYMV RdRps arranged according to rank by the AlphaFold algorithm.

S5 Figure : Back side of RYMV RdRp 3D model and picornaviral structures. PDB 1RA6,

Poliovirus and PDB 1U09, Foot-and-mouth disease virus. Color code is similar to Figure 2.

S6 File : RMSD between RYMV Alphafold model and PDB templates

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/rmsd.html

S7 File : Sequence, secondary structure and solvent accessibility alignments built using

mTM-align and STRIDE

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/align_2d.html

S8 File : Nucleic acid alignment derived from the amino acid alignment of the 23 Alphafold

models

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/align_dna.fasta

S9 Figure : Inter-genera superimposition of RdRp 3D models. For clarity reason, only one

model per genera was represented (sobemovirus RYMV, poler/movirus PLRV, enamovirus

PeMV, barnavirus, hubsclerovirus HuSRV). Major residues of conserved motifs were

indicated as black sticks and displayed alone.

S10 File : Subgroup-conserved amino acids colored and projected on RYMV 3D model

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/bipart

S11 Table : Additionnal 79 sequences (genus, name species and accession numbers).

S12 Table : Clade-specific residues. Strictly conserved residues and shared sites were

indicated (bold and underligned, respectively). Position numbers referred at the structural

alignment of the 20 sobelivirales sequences (without the 3 outgroups, see S13 File).

S13 File : MAFFT alignment of 119 sobeliviral RdRps

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/homologs.html

S14 File : Comparison of mTM-align structural alignment with MAFFT, Clustal Omega and

MUSCLE sequence alignments

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/align_comp.html

S15 Figure : Phylogenetic tree of sobelivirales based on the structural, MAAFT, Clustalo and

Muscle alignements.

S16 File : RMSD between six sobeliviral and two tombusviral Alphafold RdRp models

(BYDV-pav, Luteovirus, and RCNMV, Dianthovirus)

https://pat.cbs.cnrs.fr/sobemo/rmsd_bydv_rcnmv

Figure 1

Figure 2

RYMV   1RA6   1U09

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5 part I

Figure 5 part II

Figure 6

Figure 7

Years before present

Figure 8

Figure 9

(a)

Motif A : Dx(S/T)xxD   **Motif B : SGxxxTxxxN(S/T)**   **Motif C : GDD**   **Motif D :**

Motif G : (T/S)SxGxP   **Motif F : KxExxxxxxK**   **Motif E :**

(b)