Identification of ambisense kolmioviruses

Mai Kishimoto[1,2,3,*], Sakiho Imai[3], Manabu Igarashi[4,5], Masayuki Horie[1,2,3,*]

[1] Laboratory of Veterinary Microbiology, Graduate School of Veterinary Science, Osaka

Metropolitan University, Izumisano, Osaka, Japan

[2] Osaka International Research Center for Infectious Diseases, Osaka Metropolitan University,

Osaka, Japan

[3] School of Veterinary Science, College of Life, Environment, and Advanced Science, Osaka

Prefecture University, Izumisano, Osaka, Japan

[4] Division of Global Epidemiology, International Institute for Zoonosis Control, Hokkaido

University, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan

[5] International Collaboration Unit, International Institute for Zoonosis Control, Hokkaido

University, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan

[*]Corresponding authors

Mai Kishimoto, DVM, PhD

Email: m.kishimoto@omu.ac.jp

Masayuki Horie, DVM, PhD

E-mail: mhorie@omu.ac.jp

Abstract

Viruses in the family *Kolmioviridae* (KoVs) are unique among RNA viruses in that they have

small, highly self-complementary, circular, negative-sense genomes and are satellite viruses

requiring the envelope protein of co-infected helper viruses to form infectious virions. For

approximately 40 years, only hepatitis D virus (HDV) had been identified, but recent studies

have uncovered novel KoVs in diverse animal species. Serinus canaria-associated deltavirus

(scKoV) was recently identified form a single RNA-seq data from canary skin. However, only

the partial genome sequence corresponding to the transcript encoding DAg has been identified,

leaving questions regarding its full genetic composition and origins. In this study, we examined

publicly available RNA-seq data and identified multiple complete genome sequences of scKoV.

Our results demonstrated that genetically diverse scKoVs infect multiple bird species with

recent inter-order transmission. Additionally, scKoV was detected in various tissues including

parenchymal organs, suggesting that scKoV is a genuine avian KoV. Notably, analysis of the

genome structure and transcriptional pattern clearly revealed that scKoV transcribes a genomic-

sense mRNA encoding a novel gene, in addition to the previously known antigenomic-sense

DAg transcript. Furthermore, this newly identified gene appears to express two protein isoforms

via alternative splicing. These findings mark the first KoV with an ambisense genome that

utilizes alternative splicing, which may represent a strategy to increase gene-coding capacity

despite the constraints imposed by its small and self-complementarity genome. Moreover, co-

infection with avian bornaviruses was detected in most scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets,

suggesting that avian bornaviruses are candidate helper viruses for scKoV. In conclusion, our

study on scKoV provides novel insights into the evolution and diversity of KoVs.

Keywords

kolmioviridae, deltavirus, ambisense, bird metagenome

1. Introduction

The family *Kolmioviridae* (KoVs), recently established in the realm *Ribozyviria*, consists of

RNA viruses with negative-stranded circular genomes of approximately 1.5-1.7 kb (1). A

representative KoV is human hepatitis D virus (HDV), which was first reported in 1977 (2).

After the discovery of HDV, no other related viruses were detected for approximately 40 years.

However, since 2018, many viruses related to HDV have been discovered in various vertebrates

and invertebrates, and currently, KoVs spanning 11 genera, along with additional unassigned

viruses, have been identified (1,3–8).

KoVs share unique features markedly different from other typical RNA viruses (RNA

viruses in the kingdom *Orthornavirae* of the realm *Riboviria*) in terms of their genomes,

replication, and transmission. The KoV genome is viroid-like, circular, and single-stranded

RNA that exhibits high self-complementarity, forming a rod-like structure (3–9). Unlike other

RNA viruses, KoVs only encode the delta antigen (DAg), a nucleocapsid-like protein, and lacks

RNA-dependent RNA polymerase, a hallmark of RNA viruses. Consequently, KoVs replicate in

the cell nucleus depending on the host DNA-dependent RNA polymerase (DdRp). This unique

replication occurs though a rolling-circle replication, utilizing the autocatalytic reaction of

ribozymes present in the KoV genome and antigenome. (10,11). As KoVs encode only DAg,

and lack proteins required for the formation of virus particles, they rely on the envelope proteins

of co-infecting "helper" viruses to produce infectious virions. Thus, KoVs are classified as

"satellite" viruses (5,12,13).

KoVs may utilize unique coding strategies to provide proteins essential for replication,

given the constraints of their small, highly self-complementary genomes. HDV expresses two

isoforms of the DAg, known as small and large DAg (S-HDAg and L-HDAg), through A-to-I

RNA editing, which is mediated by the host enzyme ADAR1 and modified the stop codon of S-

HDAg ORF (14–17). As a result, L-HDAg contains a 19-amino-acid extension at its C-terminus

that includes a nuclear export signal (18) and a farnesylation site which is required to interact

with helper virus envelope proteins (19). HDV utilizes these two isoforms to finely regulate

genome replication and virion formation. Although this RNA editing mechanism has only been

observed in HDV, other KoVs might employ different strategies to expand their coding capacity.

For example, Swiss snake colony virus 1 was reported to express two isoforms of DAg,

although the underlaying mechanisms remain unclear (20). Further, several KoVs, such as

DrDV-B, possess additional relatively long ORFs in their genomes (5,21). However, these

ORFs have yet to be shown to be expressed as mRNA, and there is no evidence that they are

functional viral genes.

The Serinus canaria-associated deltavirus (following the establishment of the family

Kolmioviridae, we designates it as Serinus canaria-associated kolmiovirus [scKoV]) was recently

identified through large-scale analysis of publicly available RNA-seq data, but its characteristics

are largely unclear (3). In the previous study, only partial sequences corresponding to the

transcript encoding DAg were identified. However, the rapid increase in publicly available

RNA-seq data offers an opportunity to identify the complete viral genome and conduct more

detailed analyses (22). Further, scKoV was suspected to have originated from contaminants in

the previous study, as it was only detected in a single RNA-seq dataset from canary skin and is

genetically distinct from viruses of the genus *Perithurisazvirus*, authentic avian KoVs (3) (Fig.

1). Thus, reanalyzing scKoV with the ever-increasing RNA-seq data may help clarify its origin.

In this study, we analyzed public RNA-seq data and identified multiple complete genome

sequences of scKoV. We provided strong evidence that scKoV is an authentic avian virus.

Further, we showed that scKoV transcribes a genomic-sense mRNA that encodes a novel gene

(ORF2) in addition to the well-known antigenomic-sense mRNA encoding DAg. We also

revealed that the ORF2 gene appears to express two protein isoforms via alternative splicing.

Our findings highlight an adaptive strategy by which KoVs maximize their gene-coding

capacity under the constraints of their small and highly self-complementary genomes.

2. Results

2.1. scKoV-derived reads were identified in multiple bird public RNA-seq datasets.

As described above, the previous study detected scKoV in only one RNA-seq dataset. To further

identify scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets, we mapped 15,452 publicly available bird RNA-seq

datasets to the partial sequence of scKoV (BR001664.1). A total of 66 RNA-seq datasets were

found to contain scKoV-derived reads, including the dataset in which scKoV was initially

identified in the previous study (Tables 1 and S1).

The scKoV-reads were found in four bird species: the common canary (*Serinus canaria*

[Linnaeus, 1758]), European serin (*Serinus serinus* [Linnaeus, 1766]), and house finch

(*Haemorhous mexicanus* [Statius Müller, 1776]) in the order *Passeriformes* and monk parakeet

(*Myiopsitta monachus* [Boddaert, 1783]) in the order *Psittaciformes*. The scKoV-positive RNA-

seq datasets were distributed across five BioProjects deposited by four independent research

groups (PRJNA300534 and PRJNA591356 were deposited by the same group), suggesting that

the scKoV-positive birds originated from diverse sources.

The scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets were derived not only from skin samples but also in

various tissues including fat tissue, blood, brain, lung, and ovary. This strongly suggests that

scKoV is not a result of body-surface contamination but likely infects birds, potentially causing

systemic infection and/or viremia. These findings indicate that scKoV circulates among a broad

range of avian hosts, spanning different taxonomic orders.

2.2. The complete genome sequences of scKoV were identified.

To obtain complete genome sequences of scKoV, each scKoV-positive RNA-seq dataset was

assembled. Among the resultant contigs, six contigs were identified as potential complete scKoV

genome sequences. Self-dotplot analyses revealed identical sequences at both ends of each contig

(Fig. S1), suggesting that they are circular contigs. We mapped the original RNA-seq datasets

back to the circularized contigs, confirming that multiple reads spanned the junctions

appropriately. These data strongly suggest that the contigs are indeed circular genomes.

To obtain additional complete scKoV genomes, we mapped scKoV-positive RNA-seq

datasets, from which no complete scKoV genomes had been obtained above, to the circularized

complete genomes of scKoV and extracted the consensus sequences. As a result, a total of 16

complete scKoV genomes were reconstructed from the RNA-seq datasets of *S. canaria*, *H.*

mexicanus, and *M. monachus* (Table 1). Notably, by this mapping-based method, we succesfully

recovered the complete scKoV genome from the RNA-seq datasets where only the partial

sequence had been initially reported in the previous study (3).

2.3. Genetically diverse scKoV circulate among multiple bird species.

To elucidate the evolutionary relationships among scKoVs, we performed a phylogenetic analysis

using the complete nucleotide sequences of scKoV genomes. The resulting phylogenetic tree

showed three distinct clusters of scKoVs, designated as genotype 1, 2, and 3 (Fig. 2A). The

genotype 1 included scKoVs identified in all the three bird species (*S. canaria*, *H. mexicanus*, and

M. monachus), while the genotypes 2 and 3 were exclusively found in scKoVs from *S. canaria*

and *M. monachus*, respectively. Pairwise nucleotide sequence comparisons revealed high

nucleotide sequence identities (>95%) within each genotype, whereas inter-genotype nucleotide

sequence identities were <84% between genotypes 1 and 2, <83% between genotypes 1 and 3,

and <89% between genotypes 2 and 3 (Fig. 2B).

We also obtained data indicating that multiple genotypes of scKoV existed within individual

hosts. For example, all scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets from BioProject PRJNA679636

originated from a single individual (23) , and both genotypes 1 and 3 were detected within these

datasets (Table 1). We thus investigated whether multiple genotypes of scKoV coexisted within

each scKoV-positive sample. The scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets from BioProjects

PRJNA591356, PRJNA939570, and PRJNA679636 were mapped to the genomes of distinct

genotypes detected within the same BioProjects in a manner that ensures unique alignment to the

best match. The results indicated the coexistence of two genotypes of viruses within individual

RNA-seq data in varying ratios, with some data showing nearly a 1:1 ratio of mixed genotypes

(Fig. 2C). Apparently, these RNA-seq data were not derived from pooled samples of multiple

individuals based on the available metadata and literatures. Taken together, these findings suggest

that multiple genotypes of scKoV circulate among the birds and may occasionally cause mixed

infections.

2.4. scKoV potentially infects to various tissues.

To understand the tissue tropism of scKoV, we analyzed the number of scKoV-derived reads

across the scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets from BioProject PRJNA679636, which were

derived from various tissues of a single individual (23). The reads per million (RPM) of scKoV

was highest in the brain (264.1 RPM in the forebrain and 121.9 RPM in the cerebellum), followed

by the lung (164.1 RPM) and ovary (77.3 RPM), while only a small number of scKoV reads were

detected in the liver (0.2 RPM) and muscle (5.5 RPM) (Tables 1 and S1 and Fig. 2C). Moderate

amounts of scKoV reads were detected in the kidney (25.2 RPM), heart (22.7 RPM), and spleen

(21.8 RPM). These results suggest that scKoV infects a broad range of tissues.

2.5. scKoV exhibits ambisense gene coding and utilizes alternative splicing.

We next characterized the genome structures of scKoV, revealing that the typical characteristics

of KoVs are conserved in scKoVs as follows. The scKoV genomes were approximately 1,670 bp

in length, with a GC content of approximately 55%, consistent with other KoV members (3–8).

The high self-complementarity of the circular genome, a typical feature of KoVs, was also

conserved in scKoV (Figs. 3A and S2). The relative positions of the DAg-encoding ORF, the

downstream poly-A signal, and both the genomic and antigenomic ribozymes were consistent

with those of other typical KoVs (Fig. 3B). Additionally, the predicted scKoV ribozymes exhibit

the conserved HDV ribozyme class, unlike toad and termite KoVs, which retain type III

hammerhead ribozymes (24) (Figs. 3C and S3). The ribozymes of scKoV contain sequence

variations, but these are expected to have minimal effects on their secondary structures (Fig. S3).

Notably, two additional ORFs (tentatively named ORF2 and ORF3) were identified on both

the genomic- and antigenomic-senses, respectively, which were located in the self-

complementary region of the DAg ORF (Figs. 3A and 3B). ORF2 is conserved in all scKoVs,

whereas ORF3 is absent in one virus (BR002468.1, assembled from SRR13480248) (Fig. S4).

Moreover, an additional poly-A signal was located immediately downstream of ORF2 (Fig. 3B).

To elucidate the transcriptional patterns of scKoVs, we mapped scKoV-positive RNA-seq

datasets to the corresponding viral genomes. The results exhibited a bimodal mapping pattern

(Fig. S5), suggesting the presence of a novel transcript in addition to the one encoding DAg. To

further characterize the putative novel transcript, we mapped strand-specific RNA-seq datasets

(BioProjects PRJNA591356 and PRJNA939570) to the corresponding viral genomes. The

mapping patterns clearly indicated the presence of a genomic-sense transcript encoding ORF2, as

well as the typical antigenomic-sense transcript encoding DAg (Figs. 3D and S5). The boundary

between the genomic and antigenomic transcripts was estimated to be located at the edge of the

rod-like structure of the scKoV genome, which is thought to function as a transcriptional promoter

(25). The edge of the rod in scKoV largely retained the conserved domains previously reported

in HDVs (Fig. S6) (25). Furthermore, based on the mapping patterns of the RNA-seq data in

BioProject PRJNA591356, the transcription start sites of the genomic- and antigenomic-sense

transcripts were predicted to be located between the internal and external bulges of the rod edge

(Fig. 3E). These data strongly suggest that scKoV expresses a genomic-sense transcript encoding

ORF2.

The mapping results also showed several putative splicing junctions. Among them, the one

located in the genomic-sense ORF2 transcript is prominent and reliable, as a large number of

reads consistently spanned the junction across all the RNA-seq data (Figs. 3D and S5). The

putative intron retains the typical features of major eukaryotic introns, including the GU-AG

motifs of donor/acceptor sites and a polypyrimidine tract present upstream of the AG motif at the

end of the intron (Fig. 3F) (26). Notably, the spliced ORF2 transcript encodes a protein that differs

from the unspliced ORF2 transcript in its C-terminal region (Fig. 3D and Table S2).

To investigate the function of the putative proteins translated from unspliced and spliced

ORF2 transcripts (designated ORF2a and ORF2b, respectively), we first performed sequence

similarity searches. However, neither protein showed sequence similarity to any known protein.

Additionally, no significant biases in hydrophobicity or polarity were observed (Figs. S7A and

S7B). We also carried out a series of in *silico* analyses, including functional domain searches,

predictions of topological structures, nuclear localization signals, and transmembrane domains

(Fig. S7C), but could not find any functional domains. An intrinsically disordered region was

identified exclusively in the C-terminal third of the ORF2b (Fig. S7D). Additionally, structural

predictions indicated that the N-terminus of the ORF2 protein forms a well-defined helical

structure, whereas the C-terminus of the ORF2 lacks a defined structure (Fig. S7E). These

findings suggest that scKoV expresses genomic-sense transcripts encoding proteins of unknown

function.

2.6. No evidence for RNA-editing was found on the stop codon of DAg.

HDV utilizes the host A-to-I RNA editing machinery at the stop codon of DAg to express the

larger isoform of DAg protein. To investigate whether scKoV also employs A-to-I RNA editing,

we analyzed nucleotide variations at the stop codons of each ORF using the mapping data. Base

variations (A-to-G or T-to-C), potentially resulting from A-to-I editing of the genome or antigenome,

were observed in 11 out of the 16 mapping datasets (Table S3). However, except for SRR23747114,

the stop codons of the extended DAg ORFs, generated by the cancellation of the original stop

codon through A-to-I RNA editing, were located downstream of the poly-A signal (Fig. S8). These

results suggest that scKoV is unlikely to utilize host A-to-I RNA editing to produce DAg proteins

of different lengths.

2.7. Avian bornaviruses are the candidate helper virus for scKoV.

To gain insights into potential helper viruses for scKoV, we searched for co-existing viruses in

the scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets. BLAST searches using the assembled contigs revealed that

contigs derived from avian bornaviruses (ABVs), canary bornavirus 1 and 3 (CnBV-1 and -3) and

parrot bornavirus 2 (PaBV-2) (the genus *Orthobornavirus* of the family *Bornaviridae*) were

detected in 64 out of 66 scKoV-positive datasets (Figs. 4A and S9). CnBV-1 and 3 were detected

in the RNA-seq datasets from *S. canaria*, *S. serinus*, and *H. mexicanus* (the order *Passeriformes*),

while PaBV-2 was detected in the data from *M. monachus* (the order *Psittaciformes*). No other

enveloped viruses were identified. We also analyzed the correlation between their read counts. As

a result, the RPMs of scKoV and ABVs showed a weak positive correlation (Fig. 4B). These

results suggest that scKoV may utilize co-infecting ABVs as helper viruses.

2.8. Other possible ambisense kolmioviruses

We investigated whether any known KoVs exhibit ambisense gene expression. Among the

KoVs with genome sequences deposited in GenBank or reported by the Serratus project (27),

six additional KoVs possessed genomic-sense ORFs upstream of poly-A signals (Figs 5A, 5B,

and S10). Of these, Amboli leaping frog (*Indirana chiravasi*) kolmiovirus (icKoV) and

Babylonia areolata KoV (baKoV) displayed clear bimodal transcription patterns (Figs.5C and

S10). Furthermore, for icKoV, the closest relative of scKoV, mapping of the strand-specific

RNA-seq dataset (SRR8954567) revealed transcripts derived from both the genome and

antigenome strands, like the pattern observed in scKoV (Fig. 5C). However, unlike scKoV,

icKoV lacks clear alternative splicing site. The icKoV ORF2 showed 36.6% amino acid

sequence identity with scKoV ORF2a, and sequence alignment revealed the N-terminal 80

residues are relatively well conserved (Fig. 5D).

For other potential ambisense KoVs, mapping patterns did not exhibit a clear bimodal

distribution (Fig. S10), suggesting that these ORFs may not be transcribed. As those RNA-seq

libraries were prepared via rRNA depletion rather than poly-A enrichment, we cannot exclude the

possibility that the data do not accurately reflect transcription. In addition, in DrDV-B, the ORF2

start codon is not conserved across all viral strains (Fig. S11A). These genomic-sense ORFs also

lack similarity in both secondary and 3D structure to scKoV ORF2 (Figs. S11B and S11C),

implying that they may not encode conserved genes. These results suggest that the ambisense

genome structure may be conserved among closely related species of scKoV.

3.   Discussion

Although many novel KoVs have been identified recently, the diversity of KoVs remains unclear

since some KoVs have not yet been characterized well. We previously identified scKoV from a

single canary RNA-seq datasets, which is distantly related to the other avian KoVs, but only a

partial sequence corresponding to the DAg mRNA had been identified. In this study, we identified

the complete genome sequences of scKoV and revealed its unique genetic features among KoVs.

Notably, we showed a series of evidence strongly suggesting that scKoV expresses genomic-sense

transcripts encoding proteins of unknown function, designated ORF2, besides the antigenomic-

sense transcript encoding DAg (Figs. 3B and 3D). Although KoVs are currently classified as

negative-strand RNA viruses, our findings strongly suggest that scKoV is an ambisense virus.

Furthermore, our data indicate that the genomic-sense transcript undergoes alternative splicing,

potentially encoding two ORF2 protein isoforms. Therefore, scKoV employs a unique strategy to

maximize its coding capacity under the constraints of its small and self-complementary circular

genome.

Our results strongly suggest that the promoter of scKoV could initiate bidirectional

transcription. HDV transcribes mRNA using the host DdRp, with the rod-like edge of its circular

RNA genome functioning as a transcriptional promoter, and the promoter on the genomic-strand

initiate the transcription of antigenomic-strand mRNA (25). In scKoV, the mapping pattern clearly

revealed that the transcripts were expressed in both the genomic- and antigenomic-senses, with

the edge of the rod-like structure serving as the boundary (Figs. 3D and 3E). Some RNA-seq

datasets showed that the approximate initiation sites of both the genomic- and antigenomic-sense

transcripts are located between the internal and external bulges at edge of the rod-like structure,

which is close to the location previously identified in HDV (25). Although further experiments

are necessary, these observations suggest that both the genomic and antigenomic rod edges of

scKoV possess distinct promoter activity. The presence of KoVs with bidirectional and

monodirectional promoters provides valuable insights into their evolutionary processes and

difference in replication strategies.

Our mapping analyses revealed potential splicing events in the genomic transcripts of scKoV.

While the majority of RNA viruses replicate in the host cytoplasm, a few lineages, such as KoVs,

bornaviruses, orthomyxoviruses, and some rhabdoviruses, transcribe in the host cell nucleus and

employ the host splicing machinery, which occurs inside of the nucleus, to express multiple

proteins from the same genomic regions (28–31). However, evidence for alternative splicing in

KoVs has been lacking thus far. Here, we identified a putative splicing site in the scKoV ORF2

gene (Figs. 3D and 3F), which may lead to the expression of two isoforms of ORF2 proteins (Fig.

3D). Thus, this study provides the first evidence that KoV utilizes alternative splicing and

emphasizes the need for future characterization of other KoV strains, considering the potential

use of alternative splicing mechanisms.

The ambisense coding strategy of scKoV is analogous to that of other circular RNA viruses.

KoVs share the genome structure and the replication mechanism with circular RNA replicons,

including viroids, virusoids, and other unclassified mobile genetic elements (32,33). Recent

studies have revealed an unprecedented diversity of circular RNA replicons (27,34,35). Among

the newly identified circular RNA viruses, fungal viruses in the phylum *Ambiviricota* (the

kingdom *Orthornavirae* of the realm *Riboviria*) possess at least two non-overlapping ambisense

ORFs, one of which encodes a distinct viral RdRp, suggesting their role as evolutionary

intermediates (34,36). The genome of scKoV exhibits a similar organization to that of ambiviruses,

with the two ORFs (DAg and ORF2) arranged in an ambisense orientation within a self-

complementary region (Fig. 3). This suggests that ambisense coding strategies may be common

among certain circular RNA viruses.

Our findings strongly suggest that birds are the authentic host of scKoV. The previous study

proposed the possibility that scKoV does not infect canaries but rather originates from

contaminants, based on the following two points: (i) scKoV is distantly related to tgDeV, which

is an authentic avian virus found in a wide range of passerine birds; (ii) scKoV was detected only

in a single RNA-seq dataset obtained from canary skin (3). However, our study identified scKoV

in several passerine birds, including canaries, as well as in a parrot (Tables 1 and S1). Additionally,

scKoV was detected not only in the skin but also in multiple parenchymal organs, fat tissue, and

blood (Tables 1 and S1). Furthermore, the bimodal transcription patterns observed for scKoV

suggest active transcription of viral mRNA in those tissues (Fig. 3D). These findings strongly

suggest that scKoV is an authentic avian virus rather than a contaminant. The existence of avian

kolmioviruses that are phylogenetically distinct from the lineages of known reptilian, avian, and

mammalian KoVs (Fig. 1), suggests that KoVs infecting the above-mentioned animals are far

more genetically diverse than previously thought. Further studies on KoVs are required to

understand their host range and genetic diversity.

The identification of the complete scKoV genome will contribute to updating the taxonomy

of KoVs. The current genus demarcation criterion established by the International Committee on

Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV) is DAg with ≤60% amino acid sequence identity (1). Thus, scKoV

is classified as a new genus because its DAg sequence identity to other KoVs is below 40% (3).

We further demonstrated the presence of genetic diversity within scKoVs. The ICTV species

demarcation criteria require ≤80% nucleotide genome identity and ≤70% S-DAg amino acid

identity (1). Based on these criteria, the three groups of scKoV are classified as different

genotypes of the same species (Fig. 2B). Given the limited information on viral genome sequences

for classifying KoVs into distinct species within the same genus, our findings on scKoV sequence

diversity may help refine future classification criteria for KoVs.

Our study revealed that scKoV has a broad host range and the potential for interspecies

transmission. Our findings suggest that scKoV, particularly genotype 1, is capable of interspecies

transmission between birds of different orders (Fig. 2A). It has been suggested that KoVs have

evolved through the multiple interspecies transmission (3,8). Thus, evidence of relatively recent

inter-order transmission of scKoV may provide insights into the evolutionary history of KoVs.

Further detailed analyses of the host specificity of scKoV are necessary.

We also reveal the mixed infections of different genotypes of scKoV in some individuals.

scKoVs of different genotypes were detected mixed within RNA-seq data from the same

individual (Fig. 2C). These mixed infections, observed across multiple BioProjects and in some

cases with nearly equal ratios and certain read numbers of different genotypes, suggest that they

are unlikely to be due to contamination and/or index hopping during sampling, library preparation,

and sequencing processes. HDV has been reported to undergo recombination between different

genotypes during coinfection (37). Our findings of mixed infection with scKoVs belonging to

different genotypes provide important insights into the epidemiology and evolution of KoVs.

Our study identified ABVs as candidate helper viruses for scKoV. The helper viruses for

non-HDV KoVs remain largely unknown except for snake deltavirus that utilizes the envelope

proteins of co-infected reptarenavirus or hartmanivirus in the family *Arenaviridae* (5,13). Our

previous study indicated co-existence of scKoV with CnBV in a single RNA-seq dataset

(SRR2915371); however, this RNA-seq dataset was derived from a pooled sample from multiple

individuals, and no definitive evidence of co-infection between scKoV and CnBV was obtained

(3). In this study, we identified CnBV-1, CnBV-3 and PaBV-2, which encode envelope

glycoproteins, in 64 out of 66 scKoV-positive RNA-seq datasets (Figs. 4A and S8). Notably,

except for the RNA-seq dataset in which scKoV was previously identified (3), none of these were

clearly from pooled samples. Although further experimental validation is needed, these results

suggest that ABVs are helper viruses for scKoV. Further, our data provide insights into the

hypothesis that KoVs have evolved with diverse satellite-helper relationships.

Co-infection with scKoV and ABV suggests that the pathogenicity of scKoV in infected

birds needs to be considered. Co-infection of HDV and HBV accelerates the pathogenic effects

of HBV, leading to severe or fulminant hepatitis and progression to hepatocellular carcinoma (38).

The pathogenicity of scKoV remains unknown due to the lack of metadata clarifying whether

scKoV-positive RNA-seq data were obtained from healthy birds. In contrast, the co-infecting

PaBV is a causative agent of proventricular dilatation disease (PDD), an immune-mediated

inflammatory disease (39,40). Similarly, CnBV was also reported to be associated with PDD in

canaries, but experimental infections using a CnBV isolate have not successfully reproduced the

pathology, suggesting that other factors may be involved in the onset of the disease (41).

Analogous to co-infection of HDV and HBV, scKoV may also contribute to or exacerbate PDD

through co-infection with CnBV. Further epidemiological studies of scKoV and CnBV is required

to clarify the etiology of PDD.

Our analysis suggests that scKoV may have the potential to infect various tissues. While

HDV is known for its high tropism for the liver (12), non-HDV KoVs have been detected in

multiple organs (3,7,8,13). Like other non-HDV KoVs, scKoV was found to predominantly target

the skin, fat tissue, blood, and some parenchymal organs, rather than the liver (Table 1 and Fig.

2C). ABVs, candidate helper viruses for scKoV, can also infect various organs (41,42). Our results

support the hypothesis that while the tissue tropism of scKoV and other KoVs is broad, it is likely

dependent on the tissue infectivity of the helper virus (3,7,13).

Taken together, we provide novel insights into the genomic features, replication strategies,

epidemiology, and satellite-helper relationships of KoVs through the comprehensive and detailed

analyses of the complete scKoV genomes. Further analyses are needed to explore the broader

diversity of KoVs.

4.   Materials and Methods

4.1. Detection of scKoV-derived reads from public RNA-seq data

RNA-seq data from birds (in the class *Aves* without *Gallus gallus* [Linnaeus, 1758]) were

downloaded from the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (43) (accessed on Jan 20, 2024) and mapped

to the partial scKoV genome (BR001664.1) using Magic-BLAST v1.7.1 (44) with the options "-

splice T -word_size 16 -lcase_masking". The mapped read numbers were counted using

SAMtools v1.19 (45). The mapping results were manually verified, and reads that were locally

aligned to sequences of less than 25 bases in the reference were excluded as non-specific mapping.

4.2. Identification of complete scKoV genomes

The scKoV-positive RNA-seq data were downloaded and dumped using SRA Toolkit

(https://github.com/ncbi/sra-tools), which were preprocessed using fastp v0.23.4 (46) with the

options "-l 35 -x -y". The preprocessed reads were mapped to the host genome sequences using

HISAT2 v2.2.1 (47) with the default settings. The unmapped reads were extracted with SAMtools

v1.19 and subjected to *de novo* assembly using Trinity v2.15.1 (48) with the default settings. The

scKoV contigs were identified through a two-step sequence similarity search: BLASTn against

the partial scKoV genome and BLASTx against the clustered nr database (43), using BLAST+

v2.15.0 (49).

Self-dotplot analysis of the linear scKoV contigs was performed using the YASS program

with the default settings (50). Contigs with identical ends were manually circularized using

Geneious Prime v2024.0.5 (https://www.geneious.com). The circularities of scKoV contigs were

further verified by mapping short reads to the circularized scKoV contigs using Geneious and

manually checking the mapped reads across the circularized boundaries.

For RNA-seq data where circularized scKoV contigs could not be obtained by *de novo*

assembly, the scKoV-positive RNA-seq data were mapped to the circular scKoV contigs using

Geneious and extracted the circular consensus sequences.

For all the contigs, all positions were confirmed to be covered with at least three reads.

4.3. Phylogenetic analysis

Phylogenetic relationship among all known KoVs were inferred as follows. The amino acid

sequences of KoV DAg were aligned by MAFFT v7.490 with the E-INS-I algorithm (51). The

phylogenetic tree was constructed using the Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

method in MrBayes version 3.2.7a (52) with two independent runs, four chains per run, and the

JTT model of substitution. The analysis was run for 5 million iterations, with samples taken every

5,000 steps. The average standard deviation of split frequencies was 0.010.

For the nucleotide sequences of the full-length scKoV genomes, multiple sequence

alignment was performed using MAFFT v7.490 with the E-INS-I algorithm (51). Pairwise

sequence identities were calculated based on the alignment using Geneious. A maximum-

likelihood tree was constructed using the TVM+I+G4 model, selected as the best-fit model based

on the minimum AIC in RAxML v1.1.0 (53). The reliability of the tree was assessed by 1,000

bootstrap resampling with the transfer bootstrap expectation method (54). Both trees were

visualized and annotated in the Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v6.9.1 (55).

4.4. Sequence Characterization

The self-complementarities of scKoV genomes were analyzed using the Mfold web server (56) with the default settings. Genomic and antigenomic ribozyme structures were initially inferred using the IPknot web server (57), with the visualized output from IPknot serving as a guide for manual ribozyme structure drawing. Poly-A signals (AAUAAA) were manually identified in both strands of KoV genomes. ORFs were detected using the 'Find ORF' function in Geneious, with a minimal threshold of 300 nucleotides. ORFs that overlap with the terminal rod-like structure of the viral genome, where the putative transcriptional promoter is located, poly(A) signal, or the predicted ribozyme regions were excluded.

4.5. Short read mapping to analyze mixed infection with scKoV of different genogroups.

The short reads from scKoV-positive RNA-seq data belonging to BioProjects PRJNA591356, PRJNA939570, and PRJNA679636 were mapped to scKoV sequences of different genogroups detected from the same BioProject (scKoV from SRR10526804 and SRR10526851 for PRJNA591356, scKoV from SRR23747122 and SRR23747110 for PRJNA939570, scKoV from SRR13480248 and SRR13480240 for PRJNA679636). Mapping was performed using of HISAT ver 2.2.1. with the `-k 1` option. The mapped read numbers were counted using SAMtools v1.19 (45). The data with RPM>10 were visualized.

4.6. Short read mapping to analyze transcriptional patterns

The short reads from scKoV-positive RNA-seq data were preprocessed as described above (see the section 4.2) and mapped to the corresponding scKoV genomes using HISAT2 v2.2.1 (47) with the options "-k 2 --max-intronlen 1000 --rna-strandness RF". To accurately evaluate reads

spanning the circularized genome boundaries, 2x tandemly repeated genomes were used as the

references. The "-k 2" option in HISAT2 was selected to ensure precise mapping to the 2x

genomes. For strand-specific RNA-seq data, the "--rna-strandness RF" option was also used to

retain strand information. The mapped reads were counted using SAMtools v1.19 (45).

4.7. Characterization of ORF2 proteins

The amino acid sequences of both ORF2a and ORF2b were analyzed using BLASTp, employing

the PSI-BLAST and the DELTA-BLAST algorithms with an e-value threshold of < 0.05.

Theoretical molecular weight and isoelectric point was calculated using ProtParam web server

(https://web.expasy.org/protparam/). Amino acid sequence alignments, colored according to

hydrophobicity and polarity, were generated using Geneious. Membrane topology of ORF2 proteins

was inferred using DeepTMHMM ver. 1.0 (58). Nuclear localization signal was inferred using the

cNLS mapper web server with a cut-off value of 3.0 (59). Intrinsically disordered region were

predicted using AIUPred web server (60). Secondary structures of ORF2 proteins were predicted using

JPred v4 (61).Protein structure predictions were performed by AlphaFold3 web server (62).

4.8. Detection of RNA-editing on the stop codon of DAg

Sequence variations at the DAg stop codon were identified in the mapping data of section 4.5

using 'Find SNP/Variants' in Geneious.

4.9. Detection of co-existing viruses

To identify co-existing viruses in scKoV-positive RNA-seq data, the assembled contigs (see the

section 4.2) were clustered using CD-HIT v 4.8.1 (63) with the 95 % threshold. The clustered

contigs of 500 nucleotides or longer were extracted using SeqKit v2.4.0 (64), which were

subjected to a two-step sequence similarity search. The first search was conducted by MMseqs2 (version c48da9d781b81804727b5cccfed7f97cfcc20c9d) (65) with the default settings against a custom database consisting of viral protein sequences with a threshold E-value of 0.001. The custom database was created as follows. Viral protein sequences were downloaded from the NCBI nr database on June 22, 2023, which was clustered by using CD-HIT v4.8.1 (63) with a threshold of 0.9. Contigs alignable to viral sequences other than retroviruses and environmental viruses were extracted. The second BLASTx search was then performed using the extracted contigs as queries against the NCBI clustered nr database (43) with the options "-e-value < 1e-4 -word_size 2 -max_target_seqs 10" on Aug 26, 2024. The contigs with the best hit to viruses were extracted and manually analyzed. Contigs with the best hit to bornaviruses (the family *Bornaviridae*) were further subjected to a BLASTn search against a database of CnBVs and PaBVs to accurately identify the species/genotypes.

To quantify ABVs-derived reads in scKoV-positive RNA-seq data, preprocessed reads were mapped using HISAT2 (47) with the option "-k 1" against CnBV-1 (NC_030690.1), CnBV-3 (NC_024296.1), and newly obtained PaBV contig assembled from SRR13480248 (Supplementary Materials) because the genome sequence of co-existed PaBV is slightly different from the ones deposited in INSDC.

Acknowledgements

The super-computing resources were provided by Human Genome Center, the Institute of Medical Science, the University of Tokyo.

497   This study was supported by KAKENHI grant numbers 21H01199 (MH), 22K19234 (MI

498   and MH), 23K20902 (MH), 24K21922 (MH), and 24K18455 (MK) and the 2024 Osaka

499   Metropolitan University (OMU) Strategic Research Promotion Project (Young Researcher) (MK).

References

References

1. Kuhn JH, Babaian A, Bergner LM, Dény P, Glebe D, Horie M, et al. ICTV

Virus Taxonomy Profile: Kolmioviridae 2024. J Gen Virol. 2024;105(2):001963.

2. Rizzetto M, Canese MG, Aricò S, Crivelli O, Trepo C, Bonino F, et al.

Immunofluorescence detection of new antigen-antibody system (delta/anti-delta)

associated to hepatitis B virus in liver and in serum of HBsAg carriers. Gut. 1977 Dec

1;18(12):997–1003.

3. Iwamoto M, Shibata Y, Kawasaki J, Kojima S, Li YT, Iwami S, et al.

Identification of novel avian and mammalian deltaviruses provides new insights into

deltavirus evolution. Virus Evol. 2021 Jan 20;7(1):veab003.

4. Wille M, Netter HJ, Littlejohn M, Yuen L, Shi M, Eden JS, et al. A Divergent

Hepatitis D-Like Agent in Birds. Viruses. 2018 Dec;10(12):720.

5. Hetzel U, Szirovicza L, Smura T, Prähauser B, Vapalahti O, Kipar A, et al.

Identification of a Novel Deltavirus in Boa Constrictors. mBio. 2019 Apr

2;10(2):10.1128/mbio.00014-19.

6. Chang WS, Pettersson JHO, Le Lay C, Shi M, Lo N, Wille M, et al. Novel

hepatitis D-like agents in vertebrates and invertebrates. Virus Evol. 2019 Jul

1;5(2):vez021.

7. Paraskevopoulou S, Pirzer F, Goldmann N, Schmid J, Corman VM, Gottula

LT, et al. Mammalian deltavirus without hepadnavirus coinfection in the neotropical

rodent Proechimys semispinosus. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2020 Jul 28;117(30):17977–83.

8. Bergner LM, Orton RJ, Broos A, Tello C, Becker DJ, Carrera JE, et al.

Diversification of mammalian deltaviruses by host shifting. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2021

Jan 19;118(3):e2019907118.

9. Wang KS, Choo QL, Weiner AJ, Ou JH, Najarian RC, Thayer RM, et al.

Structure, sequence and expression of the hepatitis delta (δ) viral genome. Nature. 1986

Oct;323(6088):508–14.

10. Macnaughton TB, Beard MR, Chao M, Gowans EJ, Lai MMC. Endogenous

Promoters Can Direct the Transcription of Hepatitis Delta Virus RNA from a

Recircularized cDNA Template. Virology. 1993 Oct 1;196(2):629–36.

11. Jeng KS, Daniel A, Lai MM. A pseudoknot ribozyme structure is active in vivo

and required for hepatitis delta virus RNA replication. J Virol. 1996 Apr;70(4):2403–

10.

12. Asselah T, Rizzetto M. Hepatitis D Virus Infection. N Engl J Med. 2023 Jul

5;389(1):58–70.

13.   Szirovicza L, Hetzel U, Kipar A, Martinez-Sobrido L, Vapalahti O, Hepojoki J.
Snake Deltavirus Utilizes Envelope Proteins of Different Viruses To Generate
Infectious Particles. mBio. 2020 Mar 17;11(2):e03250-19.

14.   Bergmann KF, Gerin JL. Antigens of Hepatitis Delta Virus in the Liver and
Serum of Humans and Animals. J Infect Dis. 1986 Oct 1;154(4):702–6.

15.   Bonino F, Heermann KH, Rizzetto M, Gerlich WH. Hepatitis delta virus:
protein composition of delta antigen and its hepatitis B virus-derived envelope. J Virol.
1986 Jun;58(3):945–50.

16.   Wong SK, Lazinski DW. Replicating hepatitis delta virus RNA is edited in the
nucleus by the small form of ADAR1. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2002 Nov 12;99(23):15118–
23.

17.   Taylor JM. Infection by Hepatitis Delta Virus. Viruses. 2020 Jun;12(6):648.

18.   Lee CH, Chang SC, Wu CHH, Chang MF. A Novel Chromosome Region
Maintenance 1-independent Nuclear Export Signal of the Large Form of Hepatitis Delta
Antigen That Is Required for the Viral Assembly *. J Biol Chem. 2001 Mar
1;276(11):8142–8.

19.   O'Malley B, Lazinski DW. Roles of Carboxyl-Terminal and Farnesylated
Residues in the Functions of the Large Hepatitis Delta Antigen. J Virol. 2005 Jan
15;79(2):1142–53.

20.   Khalfi P, Denis Z, McKellar J, Merolla G, Chavey C, Ursic-Bedoya J, et al.
Comparative analysis of human, rodent and snake deltavirus replication. PLOS Pathog.
2024 Mar 5;20(3):e1012060.

21.   Khalfi P, Denis Z, Merolla G, Chavey C, Ursic-Bedoya J, Soppa L, et al.
Unraveling human, rodent and snake Kolmioviridae replication to anticipate cross-
species transmission [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2023 [cited 2023 Oct 20]. p.
2023.05.17.541162. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.05.17.541162v1

22.   Kawasaki J, Kojima S, Tomonaga K, Horie M. Hidden Viral Sequences in
Public Sequencing Data and Warning for Future Emerging Diseases. mBio. 2021 Aug
17;12(4):10.1128/mbio.01638-21.

23.   Huang Z, De O. Furo I, Liu J, Peona V, Gomes AJB, Cen W, et al. Recurrent
chromosome reshuffling and the evolution of neo-sex chromosomes in parrots. Nat
Commun. 2022 Feb 17;13(1):944.

24.   de la Peña M, Ceprián R, Casey JL, Cervera A. Hepatitis delta virus-like
circular RNAs from diverse metazoans encode conserved hammerhead ribozymes.
Virus Evol. 2021 Jan 20;7(1):veab016.

25. Beard MR, MacNaughton TB, Gowans EJ. Identification and characterization
of a hepatitis delta virus RNA transcriptional promoter. J Virol. 1996 Aug;70(8):4986–
95.

26. Wilkinson ME, Charenton C, Nagai K. RNA Splicing by the Spliceosome.
Annu Rev Biochem. 2020 Jun 20;89(Volume 89, 2020):359–88.

27. Edgar RC, Taylor J, Lin V, Altman T, Barbera P, Meleshko D, et al. Petabase-
scale sequence alignment catalyses viral discovery. Nature. 2022 Feb;602(7895):142–7.

28. Dubois J, Terrier O, Rosa-Calatrava M. Influenza Viruses and mRNA Splicing:
Doing More with Less. mBio. 2014 May 13;5(3):10.1128/mbio.00070-14.

29. Schneider PA, Schneemann A, Lipkin WI. RNA splicing in Borna disease
virus, a nonsegmented, negative-strand RNA virus. J Virol. 1994 Aug;68(8):5007–12.

30. Cubitt B, Oldstone C, Valcarcel J, de la Torre JC. RNA splicing contributes to
the generation of mature mRNAs of Borna disease virus, a non-segmented negative
strand RNA virus. Virus Res. 1994 Oct 1;34(1):69–79.

31. Kuwata R, Isawa H, Hoshino K, Tsuda Y, Yanase T, Sasaki T, et al. RNA
Splicing in a New Rhabdovirus from Culex Mosquitoes. J Virol. 2011 Jul;85(13):6185–
96.

32. Elena SF, Dopazo J, Flores R, Diener TO, Moya A. Phylogeny of viroids,
viroidlike satellite RNAs, and the viroidlike domain of hepatitis delta virus RNA. Proc
Natl Acad Sci. 1991 Jul;88(13):5631–4.

33. Jenkins GM, Woelk CH, Rambaut A, Holmes EC. Testing the Extent of
Sequence Similarity Among Viroids, Satellite RNAs, and Hepatitis Delta Virus. J Mol
Evol. 2000 Jan 1;50(1):98–102.

34. Forgia M, Navarro B, Daghino S, Cervera A, Gisel A, Perotto S, et al. Hybrids
of RNA viruses and viroid-like elements replicate in fungi. Nat Commun. 2023 May
5;14(1):2591.

35. Zheludev IN, Edgar RC, Lopez-Galiano MJ, Peña M de la, Babaian A, Bhatt
AS, et al. Viroid-like colonists of human microbiomes [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2024 [cited
2024 Aug 29]. p. 2024.01.20.576352. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.01.20.576352v1

36. Kuhn JH, Botella L, de la Peña M, Vainio EJ, Krupovic M, Lee BD, et al.
Ambiviricota, a novel ribovirian phylum for viruses with viroid-like properties. J Virol.
2024 Jun 10;98(7):e00831-24.

37. Wang TC, Chao M. RNA Recombination of Hepatitis Delta Virus in Natural
Mixed-Genotype Infection and Transfected Cultured Cells. J Virol. 2005 Feb
15;79(4):2221–9.

38.   Rizzetto M. The adventure of delta. Liver Int. 2016;36(S1):135–40.

39.   Honkavuori KS, Shivaprasad HL, Williams BL, Quan PL, Hornig M, Street C,

et al. Novel Borna Virus in Psittacine Birds with Proventricular Dilatation Disease.

Emerg Infect Dis. 2008 Dec;14(12):1883–6.

40.   Kistler AL, Gancz A, Clubb S, Skewes-Cox P, Fischer K, Sorber K, et al.

Recovery of divergent avian bornaviruses from cases of proventricular dilatation

disease: Identification of a candidate etiologic agent. Virol J. 2008 Jul 31;5(1):88.

41.   Rubbenstroth D, Rinder M, Stein M, Höper D, Kaspers B, Brosinski K, et al.

Avian bornaviruses are widely distributed in canary birds (*Serinus canaria* f.

domestica). Vet Microbiol. 2013 Aug 30;165(3):287–95.

42.   Gancz AY, Kistler AL, Greninger AL, Farnoushi Y, Mechani S, Perl S, et al.

Experimental induction of proventricular dilatation disease in cockatiels (Nymphicus

hollandicus) inoculated with brain homogenates containing avian bornavirus 4. Virol J.

2009 Jul 9;6(1):100.

43.   Sayers EW, Bolton EE, Brister JR, Canese K, Chan J, Comeau DC, et al.

Database resources of the National Center for Biotechnology Information in 2023.

Nucleic Acids Res. 2023 Jan 6;51(D1):D29–38.

44.   Boratyn GM, Thierry-Mieg J, Thierry-Mieg D, Busby B, Madden TL. Magic-

BLAST, an accurate RNA-seq aligner for long and short reads. BMC Bioinformatics.

2019 Jul 25;20(1):405.

45.   Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, et al.

Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. GigaScience. 2021 Feb 1;10(2):giab008.

46.   Chen S. Ultrafast one-pass FASTQ data preprocessing, quality control, and

deduplication using fastp. iMeta. 2023;2(2):e107.

47.   Kim D, Paggi JM, Park C, Bennett C, Salzberg SL. Graph-based genome

alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. Nat Biotechnol. 2019

Aug;37(8):907–15.

48.   Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, et al.

Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome.

Nat Biotechnol. 2011 Jul;29(7):644–52.

49.   Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, et al.

BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics. 2009 Dec 15;10(1):421.

50.   Noé L, Kucherov G. YASS: enhancing the sensitivity of DNA similarity

search. Nucleic Acids Res. 2005 Jul 1;33(suppl_2):W540–3.

51.   Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software
Version 7: Improvements in Performance and Usability. Mol Biol Evol. 2013 Apr
1;30(4):772–80.

52.   Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, Höhna S, et al.
MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference and Model Choice Across a
Large Model Space. Syst Biol. 2012 May 1;61(3):539–42.

53.   Kozlov AM, Darriba D, Flouri T, Morel B, Stamatakis A. RAxML-NG: a fast,
scalable and user-friendly tool for maximum likelihood phylogenetic inference.
Bioinformatics. 2019 Nov 1;35(21):4453–5.

54.   Lemoine F, Domelevo Entfellner JB, Wilkinson E, Correia D, Dávila Felipe M,
De Oliveira T, et al. Renewing Felsenstein's phylogenetic bootstrap in the era of big
data. Nature. 2018 Apr;556(7702):452–6.

55.   Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for
phylogenetic tree display and annotation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2021 Jul 2;49(W1):293–6.

56.   Zuker M. Mfold web server for nucleic acid folding and hybridization
prediction. Nucleic Acids Res. 2003 Jul 1;31(13):3406–15.

57.   Sato K, Kato Y, Hamada M, Akutsu T, Asai K. IPknot: fast and accurate
prediction of RNA secondary structures with pseudoknots using integer programming.
Bioinformatics. 2011 Jul 1;27(13):i85–93.

58.   Hallgren J, Tsirigos KD, Pedersen MD, Armenteros JJA, Marcatili P, Nielsen
H, et al. DeepTMHMM predicts alpha and beta transmembrane proteins using deep
neural networks [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2022 [cited 2024 Sep 20]. p. 2022.04.08.487609.
Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.04.08.487609v1

59.   Kosugi S, Hasebe M, Tomita M, Yanagawa H. Systematic identification of cell
cycle-dependent yeast nucleocytoplasmic shuttling proteins by prediction of composite
motifs. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2009 Jun 23;106(25):10171–6.

60.   Erdős G, Dosztányi Z. AIUPred: combining energy estimation with deep
learning for the enhanced prediction of protein disorder. Nucleic Acids Res. 2024 Jul
5;52(W1):W176–81.

61.   Drozdetskiy A, Cole C, Procter J, Barton GJ. JPred4: a protein secondary
structure prediction server. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015 Jul 1;43(W1):W389–94.

62.   Abramson J, Adler J, Dunger J, Evans R, Green T, Pritzel A, et al. Accurate
structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold 3. Nature. 2024
Jun;630(8016):493–500.

63.   Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-
generation sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 2012 Dec 1;28(23):3150–2.

64.   Shen W, Le S, Li Y, Hu F. SeqKit: A Cross-Platform and Ultrafast Toolkit for
FASTA/Q File Manipulation. PLOS ONE. 2016 Oct 5;11(10):e0163962.
65.   Steinegger M, Söding J. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence
searching for the analysis of massive data sets. Nat Biotechnol. 2017 Nov;35(11):1026–
8.

 Figure legends

 Fig. 1 Phylogenetic relationships of kolmioviruses. The phylogenetic tree was inferred by the

 Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo method based on an amino acid sequence alignment of DAg.

 Posterior probabilities are shown for all nodes. Figure arts were created with BioRender.com or

 downloaded from https://www.phylopic.org/. The scale bar indicates the number of amino acid

 substitutions per site.

 Fig. 2 Phylogenetic analysis based on nucleotide sequences of complete scKoV genomes. (A)

 The phylogenetic tree was inferred by the maximum likelihood method using nucleotide

 sequences of complete scKoV genomes. Bootstrap values are indicated at each branch. The

 BioProjects of each SRA data that scKoV sequences originated are indicated with dark blue, blue,

 light blue, and red circles, respectively. The scale bar indicates the number of nucleotide

 substitutions per site. **(B)** Heat map of pairwise identities of scKoV variants based on nucleotide

 sequences of complete genomes (lower left) and amino acid sequences of DAg (upper right). **(C)**

 Detection of mixed infections with scKoV of different genogroups. For BioProject

 PRJNA679636, their tissue of origin is indicated.

 Fig. 3 Genome organization and transcriptional pattern of scKoV. (A) Self-

 complementarities of scKoV. The predicted RNA structures were visualized using the Mfold web

 server (56). (B) Genome organization of scKoV. Colored arrows indicate annotations (ORFs,

 ribozymes, and poly-A signals). The numbers indicate nucleotide positions. **(C)** Predicted

 genomic and antigenomic structures of scKoV. Gray numbers indicate nucleotide positions of

 each predicted ribozyme. The names of secondary structural elements of ribozymes are indicated

 in blue. Red triangles indicate catalytic sites. Information of SRR10526804 is indicated as a

representative. Information about other variants is provided in Figs. S2, S3, and S4. (**D**) Strand-

specific mapping coverage of original short reads of scKoV full-genome sequence. Colored

arrows indicate annotations (ORFs, ribozymes, poly-A signals). Light pink box indicates putative

intron. Green triangle indicates edge of the rod-like structure of circulated scKoV genome.

Information of SRR10526804 is indicated as a representative. Information about other variants is

provided in Fig. S5. (**E**) Secondary structures and expanded mapping patterns of the putative

promoter regions of scKoV. Conserved domains were annotated as previously reported (25). (**F**)

Nucleotide alignment of predicted intron region using representative variants of scKoV in each

genotype. Dots indicate common bases in the alignment. Gray and blue box indicate conserved

GU-AG boundary and polypyrimidine tract, respectively. Gray numbers indicate nucleotide

position in alignment of full-genome sequences.

Fig. 4 Co-existing viruses in scKoV-positive RNA-seq data. (**A**) Co-existing avian bornaviruses

(ABVs) (left panel) and scKoV-derived read number (right panel) detected from each RNA-seq

dataset are shown. Black indicates the presence of a viral contig, while white indicates its absence.

Read per million (RPM) of scKoV is shown as a heatmap. Results from RNA-seq data with

scKoV RPM ≥ 5 are shown. Full information is available in Fig. S8. (**B**) Scatter plot showing

RPM of scKoV and ABVs of each RNA-seq data. The linear prediction is shown as a dotted line.

The correlation coefficient (R^2) of the linear prediction is shown on the graph.

Fig. 5 identification of other potential ambisense KoV. (A) Phylogenetic tree of all known

KoVs. The tree was inferred by the Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo method based on an

amino acid sequence alignment of DAg. Posterior probabilities are shown for all nodes. The scale

bar indicates the number of amino acid substitutions per site. KoVs with potential ambisense

genome structures are shown in blue, and those with confirmed ambisense transcription patterns

are shown in red. (**B**) Genome organization of Amboli leaping frog KoV (icKoV). Colored arrows

indicate annotations (ORFs, ribozymes, and poly-A signals). The numbers indicate nucleotide

positions. (**C**) Strand-specific mapping coverage of original short reads of icKoV. Colored arrows

indicate annotations (ORFs, ribozymes, poly-A signals). Green triangle indicates edge of the rod-

like structure of circulated scKoV genome. (**D**) Amino acid alignment of scKoV ORF2a and

icKoV ORF2. Identical amino acid residues are highlighted in black, similar substitutions in grey,

and gaps are shown as dashes.

Table 1. Detection of scDeV reads in public RNA-seq data

Bio Project	SRA	Host					RPM (read per million)[a]	Tissue	full-length scDeV genome		
		Common name	Taxonomy						DDBJ accession	Length (bp)	GC content (%)
			Order	Family	Species						
PRJNA300534[b]	SRR2915371[c]	Common canary	*Passeriformes*	*Fringillidae*	*Serinus canaria*		10.17	Skin	BR002460	1,672	54.7
PRJNA939570	SRR23747102						41.63	Fat tissue	BR002469	1,672	
	SRR23747110						96.01	Fat tissue	BR002470	1,674	
	SRR23747114						5.26	Fat tissue	BR002471	1,676	
	SRR23747122						57.30	Fat tissue	BR002472	1,672	
PRJNA591356[b]	SRR10526804						758.69	Skin	BR002461[d]	1,672	54.5
	SRR10526806						570.30	Skin	BR002464[d]	1,672	54.6
	SRR10526807						525.41	Skin	BR002462	1,672	54.7
	SRR10526821						153.89	Skin	BR002465[d]	1,676	55.5
	SRR10526846						809.00	Skin	BR002461[d]	1,672	54.5
	SRR10526848						685.58	Skin	BR002464[d]	1,672	54.6
	SRR10526849						488.29	Skin			
	SRR10526851						194.19	Skin	BR002465[d]	1,676	55.5
	SRR10526845	European serin	*Passeriformes*	*Fringillidae*	*Serinus serinus*		5.52	Skin			
	SRR10526817	House finch	*Passeriformes*	*Fringillidae*	*Haemorhous mexicanus*		20.35	Skin			
	SRR10526824						16.80	Skin	BR002463	1,672	54.0
PRJNA679636	SRR13480239	Monk parakeet	*Psittaciformes*	*Psittacidae*	*Myiopsitta monachus*		16.38	Brain	BR002466	1,671	54.6
	SRR13480240						38.42	Brain	BR002467	1,671	54.6
	SRR13480246						22.48	Lung			
	SRR13480248						11.49	Ovary	BR002468	1,671	54.9

[a]This table only shows the SRA data wirh RPM > 5. The full version of the table is available as Supplementary Table S1.

[b]PRJNA300534 and PRJNA591356 were deposited by the same group

[c]Identified in the previous study (Iwamoto et al. Virus Evol, 2021)

[d]Identical accession numbers indicate that the genome sequences obtained are identical.

Fig. 1

Tree scale: 0.5

Fig. 2

(A) Tree scale: 0.1 ▬▬▬

- ● Bio project PRJNA300534
- ● Bio project PRJNA591356
- ● Bio project PRJNA939570
- ● Bio project PRJNA679636

```
                                    100 ┌ SRR10526806 ●  ┐
                                     90 ├ SRR10526848 ●  │
                                     75 ├ SRR2915371  ●  │
                                     71 ├ SRR10526807 ●  │
                                     84 ├ SRR23747102 ●  │  Serinus canaria
                                     95 ├ SRR10526846 ●  │
                                     94 ├ SRR10526804 ●  │
                                        ├ SRR23747122 ●  │
                                     65 ├ SRR10526824 ●  Haemorhous mexicanus
                                        └ SRR13480248 ●  Myiopsitta monachus
```
Genotype 1

```
            100 ┌ SRR10526821 ●  ┐
        100 ├   ├ SRR10526851 ●  │  Serinus canaria
         93 │   ├ SRR23747114 ●  │
         84 │   └ SRR23747110 ●  ┘
```
Genotype 2

```
                ┌ SRR13480240 ●  ┐  Myiopsitta monachus
                └ SRR13480239 ●  ┘
```
Genotype 3

(B)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	SRR2915371 *S. canaria*		100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
2	SRR10526806 *S. canaria*	99.5		100.0	100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
3	SRR10526848 *S. canaria*	99.5	100.0		100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
4	SRR10526807 *S. canaria*	99.5	99.4	99.4		99.5	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
5	SRR23747102 *S. canaria*	99.3	99.2	99.2	99.7		99.5	99.5	99.0	99.0	97.1	92.7	92.7	92.7	93.2	91.3	91.7
6	SRR10526804 *S. canaria*	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.3		100.0	99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
7	SRR10526846 *S. canaria*	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.3	100.0		99.5	99.5	97.6	93.2	93.2	92.7	93.7	91.7	92.2
8	SRR10526824 *H. mexicanus*	98.3	98.3	98.3	98.6	98.7	98.4	98.4		100.0	98.1	92.7	92.7	92.2	93.2	91.3	91.7
9	SRR23747122 *S. canaria*	98.8	98.5	98.5	98.9	98.9	98.8	98.8	99.0		98.1	92.7	92.7	92.2	93.2	91.3	91.7
10	SRR13480248 *M. monachus*	95.6	95.3	95.3	95.6	95.6	95.9	95.9	95.6	95.9		92.2	92.2	91.7	92.7	90.8	91.3
11	SRR10526821 *S. canaria*	83.0	82.8	82.8	83.1	83.1	83.3	83.3	83.0	83.3	83.0		100.0	99.5	99.5	93.7	94.2
12	SRR10526851 *S. canaria*	83.0	82.8	82.8	83.1	83.1	83.3	83.3	83.0	83.3	83.0	100.0		99.5	99.5	93.7	94.2
13	SRR23747114 *S. canaria*	83.3	83.0	83.0	83.1	83.1	83.4	83.4	83.0	83.4	83.0	99.0	99.0		99.0	93.2	93.7
14	SRR23747110 *S. canaria*	83.4	83.3	83.3	83.5	83.6	83.8	83.8	83.1	83.6	83.1	96.5	96.5	96.4		94.2	94.7
15	SRR13480239 *M. monachus*	81.6	81.7	81.7	81.9	82.0	82.1	82.1	81.7	81.8	82.1	88.5	88.5	88.6	88.5		99.5
16	SRR13480240 *M. monachus*	81.7	81.7	81.7	82.0	82.0	82.2	82.2	81.8	81.9	82.1	88.5	88.5	88.6	88.5	99.9	

Identity (%)
High
Low

| DAg (aa) |
| Genome (nt) |

(C) PRJNA591356

PRJNA679636

PRJNA939570

- ▢ Genotype 1
- ▢ Genotype 2
- ▣ Genotype 3

Fig. 3

(A)

(B)

83-490 (ORF2)
496-164 (ORF3)

1,672 nt

1611
994
898 806
757
669
945-940
622-627

(C)

Genomic ribozyme

Antigenomic ribozyme

Active site

(D)

7,201

Mapped reads (genomic)

ORF2a
ORF2b
ORF3

Mapped reads (antigenomic)

12,526

Delta antigen ORF
Other ORF
Putative intron
Putative genomic ribozyme
Putative antigenomic ribozyme
Poly-A signal
Edge of the rod-like structure

(E)

Genotype 1 (SRR10526804)

Turnover
External bulge
Internal bulge
Start codon of DAg ORF
GC-rich

3,452

Mapped reads (genomic)

0
AUCUCUUCCUCGUUCCGAUUUUCGACAGAAAAUGGAGAGAGAGAAUUG
0

Mapped reads (antigenomic)

4,444

Genotype 2 (SRR10526851)

Turnover
External bulge
Internal bulge
Start codon of DAg ORF
GC-rich

1,488

Mapped reads (genomic)

0
AUCUCUUCCUCUCACACUUUCUUCAGAAAGGUGCAGAGAGAGAAUUC
0

Mapped reads (antigenomic)

4,181

(F)

375   468

SRR10526804 (genotype 1)   CUCCG GUGAGCACGCAGCUGCGCGA · · · AGUCGCCGGGAGUUCCCUCUCUUCUGGCAG GGGCG
SRR10526851 (genotype 2)   . . . . U . . . .
SRR13480240 (genotype 3)   AA . . . . U . . . . A . . . . A .   . . .

Doner   Polypyrimidine tract   Acceptor

Intron

Fig. 4

(A)

(B)

$R^2 = 0.2022$

Fig. 5

(A)

(B)

Amboli leapng frog KoV (icKoV)
1,710 nt

- Delta antigen ORF
- Other ORF
- Putative intron
- Putative genomic ribozyme
- Putative antigenomic ribozyme
- Poly-A signal
- Edge of the rod-like structure

(C)

Mapped reads (genomic)

Mapped reads (antigenomic)

(D)

```
            1           10              20              30
icKoV ORF2  MEQLVLNLEQGLKQLKIVAGIGSQHLELSE
scKoV ORF2a MEEIVRELQEQVEKLKVRAGIGSQQLKLSE

                    40              50              60
icKoV ORF2  FPTPVAQWRRSLEDGDWLCLRVVGAATLEE
scKoV ORF2a FPAPVTTWGRTLQKGGWICARFVGDPSDAL

                    70              80              90
icKoV ORF2  TRKDLDHVLGGVGRGAARGNVTVYRGKAVV
scKoV ORF2a ANQDLNNLLAGMGRSAARGNLIFYKGDPVD

                    100             110             120
icKoV ORF2  ESKVEPQPRDSSQQ------SGDPRSDP
scKoV ORF2a EDEDLYSGEHAAAQGLCCPGVRSGENRG--

                    130             140     145
icKoV ORF2  SRPTSRSLLTDGSSSSTAGATDGR*
scKoV ORF2a --PVAGSSLSSGRGEA-----HWS*
```