Exploring the double-stranded DNA viral landscape in eukaryotic genomes

Hongda Zhao[1], Lingjie Meng[1], Ruixuan Zhang[1], Morgan Gaïa[2,3], Hiroyuki Ogata[1]*

[1] Bioinformatics Center, Institute for Chemical Research, Kyoto University, Gokasho, Uji, 611-0011, Japan

[2] Génomique Métabolique, Genoscope, Institut François Jacob, CEA, CNRS, Univ Evry, Université Paris-Saclay, F-91057 Evry, France

[3] Research Federation for the Study of Global Ocean Systems Ecology and Evolution, FR2022/Tara GOsee, F-75016 Paris, France

* Corresponding author: Hiroyuki Ogata (ogata@kuicr.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

Abstract

Sequences of viral origin constitute a large proportion of the genomes of certain eukaryotes, yet the role of double-stranded (ds)DNA viruses in shaping the genomes of diverse eukaryotes remains underexplored. Here, we present a computational framework to identify dsDNA viral regions (VRs) in eukaryotic genomes, which was we used to screen 37,254 eukaryotic genome assemblies. In total, 781,111 VRs were identified across 7,103 (19%) assemblies. VRs were found to occupy 16% of a bivalve genome assembly and over 10% of diverse invertebrate and protist genomes. These VRs recovered 29 of the 43 class-level virus–eukaryote associations previously established by virus isolation, and additionally indicated 144 candidate associations for which virus isolation evidence is currently lacking. Some VRs form previously unrecognized deep viral clades, whereas others are phylogenetically related to known viruses. Our study provides a baseline for the extent to which dsDNA viral elements are embedded in diverse eukaryotic genomes and offers an overview of the endogenous dsDNA virosphere. The resulting catalog of viral genomic elements offers opportunities for wider exploration of the significance of virus–host coevolutionary processes.

Introduction

Endogenous viral elements are widespread across diverse eukaryotic genomes[1,2]. Endogenous retroviruses in particular account for a considerable proportion of certain eukaryotic genomes, including ~8% of the human genome[3–5]. These retroviral elements can occasionally cause diseases, provide essential host functions through 'co-option' or contribute antiviral functions[6–9].

In contrast to retroviruses, endogenous elements derived from dsDNA viruses remain underexplored[2,10]. A few

eukaryotic dsDNA viruses, such as human herpesvirus 6 (HHV-6) and the mavirus virophage, are known to integrate their genomes into host chromosomes during their replication cycle[11,12]. Additional dsDNA viral lineages have recently been revealed to persist within host cells as integrated or episomal forms, with the potential for reactivation and virion production[12–15]. Domesticated dsDNA viral elements can enhance host survival, as exemplified in parasitoid wasps, where *Bracoviriform* particles derived from endogenous viral elements are delivered into parasitized lepidopteran larvae to suppress immunity and support wasp development[16,17]. Recent studies have begun to uncover signatures of specific dsDNA virus lineages in protist genomes[18,19] and horizontal transfers of viral genes to eukaryotes[20–23]. Given their large coding capacity compared with RNA viruses, endogenization of dsDNA viruses may substantially affect the evolution of their host genomes[24].

Eukaryotic dsDNA viruses are polyphyletic and highly diverse. They range from small viruses, such as papillomavirids[25] (including papillomaviruses) and viruses from the polinton-like supergroup[26,27], to giant representatives like megaviricetes[28]. Of note, the known eukaryotic dsDNA virosphere is rapidly expanding thanks to culture-independent metagenomics[29], which has led to discoveries of novel dsDNA viral groups, including polinton-like viruses[30] (PLVs, also classified as *Aquintoviricetes*), *Mirusviricota*[31], *Mriyaviricetes*[32], and the proposed *Egovirales* order[33]. Eukaryotic genome data are also accumulating at an impressive pace through international initiatives such as the Earth BioGenome Project[34]. Therefore, it is timely to re-evaluate dsDNA viral elements in diverse eukaryotes in light of these expanding datasets to better understand the endo-virosphere.

Results

Hundreds of thousands of dsDNA viral regions recovered from eukaryotic genomic assemblies

We conducted a systematic analysis to detect dsDNA VRs across eukaryotic genomic assemblies (**Fig. 1a**). In this study, VRs are operationally defined by our detection framework; given the large number of identified VRs, we do not aim to delineate the exact biological units or boundaries of individual VRs, which may be affected by complex evolutionary processes such as rearrangements or recurrent insertions. In total, 37,254 assemblies encompassing all sequenced eukaryotes (from GenBank, as of Feb. 2024) covering diverse lineages were analyzed (**Fig. 1b, Supplementary Table 1**). Open reading frames (ORFs) were predicted for each assembly. To aid the identification of viral signatures within eukaryotic contigs, scaffolds, and chromosomes (collectively referred to as 'contigs' hereafter), we constructed a comprehensive reference dataset of cellular protein sequences derived from curated databases.

Our study incorporated 2,126 reference viral genomes from 11 eukaryotic dsDNA viral taxa (**Table 1,**

Supplementary Table 2). These taxa, corresponding to one phylum, six classes, two orders, and two families, are

referred to as viral major taxa in this study. The dsDNA pararetroviruses (i.e., *Hepadnaviridae* and *Caulimoviridae*)

were not included in this dataset, as they are classified within the realm *Riboviria*, which is highly dominated by

RNA viruses. Hidden Markov models (HMMs) were constructed for 7,755 orthologous groups (OGs) derived from

these viral genomes. Among them, 1,842 viral OGs (VOGs), defined as OGs that exhibit only marginal or no

similarity to any cellular reference sequence, and 1,344 taxonomic OGs (TOGs), characterized as VOGs strictly

specific to a single viral major taxon, were selected to capture viral and viral lineage-specific signatures, respectively.

On the basis of the presence of ORFs with significant similarity to VOGs or TOGs within eukaryotic contigs (**Fig.**

1a), we identified 946,599 distinct combinations of viral major taxa and contigs (i.e., "virus–contig pairs").

Table 1 | Eleven dsDNA viral major taxa included in this study and representative viruses.

Major viral taxon	ICTV taxonomy	Representative viruses	Average genome size
Adenoviridae	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Preplasmiviricota › Polisuviricotina › Pharingeaviricetes* (monotypic)	Canine adenovirus 1[35]	33.5 kb
Herpesvirales	*Duplodnaviria › Heunggongvirae › Peploviricota › Herviviricetes* (monotypic)	Herpes simplex virus[36]; Salmonid herpesvirus 1[37]	159.1 kb
Lavidaviridae (*Virophaviricetes*)	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Preplasmiviricota › Polisuviricotina › Virophaviricetes*	Mimivirus-dependent virus Sputnik ("virophage")[38]	22.1 kb
Megaviricetes	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Nucleocytoviricota › Megaviricetes*	Megavirus chilensis[39]; Invertebrate iridescent virus 31[40]	382.4 kb
Mirusviricota	Not yet assigned in ICTV. (*Duplodnaviria › Heunggongvirae*[31])	Circular genomes uncovered from eukaryotes[19,41]	217.7 kb
Mriyaviricetes	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Nucleocytoviricota › Mriyaviricetes*	Yaravirus brasiliensis[42]	37.4 kb
Naldaviricetes	*Naldaviricetes* (Unclassified Class)	Cryptophlebia leucotreta granulovirus[43]; White spot syndrome virus[44]	134.1 kb
Papovaviricetes	*Monodnaviria › Shotokuvirae › Cossaviricota › Papovaviricetes*	Human papillomavirus[45]; Simian virus 40[46]	6.6 kb
PLVs (*Aquitoviricetes*)	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Preplasmiviricota › Polisuviricotina › Aquintoviricetes*	Gezel-14T ("virophage")[47]	18.3 kb
Pokkesviricetes	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Nucleocytoviricota › Pokkesviricetes*	African swine fever virus[48]; Monkeypox virus[49]	182.0 kb
Orthopolintovirales (*Amphintovirales*)	*Varidnaviria › Bamfordvirae › Preplasmiviricota › Polisuviricotina › Polintoviricetes* (monotypic)	Terrapene box turtle adintovirus[50]	7.8 kb

Fig. 1 | Viral regions identified in eukaryotic genome assemblies.

(a) VR discovery pipeline. Different symbols represent distinct types of hits corresponding to each ORF. Viral

contig–like VRs occupied over half of the contig length and contained fewer than 20% of cellular ORFs; the

remaining VRs were classified as integration-like. **(b) The number of eukaryotic genomic assemblies used in this**

study. Colors indicate different eukaryotic groups. **(c) The number of identified VRs.** Colors match those in (b).

The radius of each circle represents the logarithmically transformed count of VRs. **(d) VR content across the tree**

of eukaryotes. The cladogram is based on taxonomy, and each leaf represents a eukaryotic family. The attributes

shown in the outer ring are explained in the diagram in the upper-right corner.

For each virus–contig pair, we scanned the contig using HMMs for the OGs from the viral major taxon to

delineate VRs as regions enriched in clustered viral ORFs. This analysis identified a total of 781,111 VRs in 7,103

genome assemblies (19% of all assemblies) (**Supplementary Table 3**). These assemblies included 6,094 metazoan

assemblies (42.25% of all metazoan assemblies) and 633 protist assemblies (34.39%). Even though no dsDNA

viruses, except for pararetroviruses, have been isolated from fungi or higher plants, 168 Streptophyta assemblies

(4.52%) and 153 fungal assemblies (0.89%) were found to contain dsDNA VRs (e.g., *Megaviricetes* and

Orthopolintovirales). These results are consistent with previous observations of imiterviral (*Megaviricetes*) signals

in a bryophyte, a lycophyte[51,52], and zoosporic fungi[53]. The majority of VRs were taxonomically associated with

Orthopolintovirales and PLVs (**Fig. 1c, Supplementary Table 4**).

The distribution of VRs across different host lineages was uneven, with metazoans accounting for the largest

proportion (757,529 VRs, 96.98%), followed by protists (20,186 VRs, 2.58%), green plants (2,442 VRs, 0.31%),

and fungi (954 VRs, 0.12%) (**Fig. 1c**). The mean of the family-level average numbers of VRs per assembly is 101.84,

19.23, 1.72, and 0.28 for metazoans, protists, green plants, and fungi, respectively. VRs were identified in 2,951

genera, but approximately 80% of VRs were derived from 300 genera (**Supplementary Fig. 1a**), and 4.3% originated

from a single genus, *Unio* (bivalve). We examined the relationship between the abundance of VRs and the

completeness of genome assemblies (**Supplementary Fig. 1b**). Neither the VR content (i.e., the proportion of VRs

in individual assemblies) nor the number of VRs was correlated with assembly completeness, indicating that

potential viral contamination in low-quality assemblies had no major influence on the overall detection of VRs.

To distinguish potential endogenizations from unintegrated viral sequences, we classified VRs into

'integration-like' or 'viral contig-like' categories based on the VR and contig lengths as well as the cellular OG

content (**Fig. 1a**). The majority (n = 766,069; 98%) of VRs were classified into the integration-like category, whereas

only a small subset of VRs (n = 15,042; 2%) was classified as viral contig-like and lacked signatures of integration.

General features of viral regions

We investigated several characteristics of VRs to assess their quality as *bona fide* virally derived regions.

Regions derived from viral genomes are expected to be rich in coding sequences compared with eukaryotic genomic

regions. The ORF density of a VR or a eukaryotic assembly was calculated as the total length of ORFs divided by

the length of the VR or the assembly, respectively. Considering the effect of the definition of a VR (i.e., it starts with

an ORF and ends with another ORF) on the computed ORF density, we only considered VRs longer than 50 kb. The

analyzed VRs exhibited higher coding potential than their host genomes (**Supplementary Fig. 1d**), with most

showing 20–40% higher ORF density, suggesting their distinct origin from the surrounding genomic regions.

We investigated tetranucleotide frequency (TNF) differences between VRs and their host genomic regions (see

Methods for details). The proportion of VRs showing TNF values distinct from the host genomes was highly

dependent on their assigned viral major taxa (**Supplementary Fig. 1f**). VRs assigned to *Herpesvirales*,

Papovaviricetes, and *Lavidaviridae* tend to exhibit TNF compositions distinct from their host assemblies, whereas

most VRs related to *Orthopolintovirales*, *Pokkesviricetes*, and *Mriyaviricetes* display compositions more similar to

those of their hosts.

We assessed the cellular homologs within the identified VRs to further qualify their viral likeness

(**Supplementary Fig. 1c**). Nearly three-quarters of VRs contained less than 20% of ORFs with best hits to cellular

references, indicating a general enrichment of viral genes in the VRs.

The VRs showed shorter ORFs than those in the reference viral genomes. The normal length range of a viral

ORF was defined based on the length distribution of ORFs in the same OG from reference viral genomes of the same

viral major taxon. For most VRs, nearly half of their ORFs fell outside this range (**Supplementary Fig. 1e**),

suggesting that pseudogenization through degradation is a common phenomenon in VRs.

We noticed that some VRs exhibited chimeric signatures from multiple viral taxa (**Supplementary Table 3**).

For example, the previously identified *Nucleocytoviricota*-like 1.5 Mb endogenous viral element in a fungal

chromosome (CP080821.1)[54] corresponded to four VRs. One of the VRs contained *Pokkesviricetes*-specific

homologs and *Megaviricetes*-specific homologs. These observations may reflect either the existence of chimeric

viruses from unknown clades or the accumulation of multiple independent viral insertions within the same locus.

dsDNA viral elements make substantial contributions to the genome composition of diverse eukaryotes

The VR content showed substantial variation across host lineages (**Fig. 1d**). The VR content of metazoans

ranged from trace levels up to over 10% (**Fig. 2**). High VR content was observed for animal species belonging to

different taxa, such as Bivalvia (*Unio delphinus*, 16.20%; *Sinohyriopsis cumingii*, 13.38%; *Unio pictorum*, 11.71%),

Insecta (*Neoaliturus tenellus*, 14.68%), and Anthozoa (*Ricordea florida*, 12.90%). The three bivalve species belong

to the same freshwater mussel family Unionidae[55]. VRs accounted for 0.004% (75 VRs from 59 assemblies) of the

human genome on average, and those in vertebrate genomes accounted for 0.014% on average, with the highest

proportion (0.725%) observed in the assembly of a fish, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*.

Protists showing VR content higher than 1% belonged to Parabasalia, Oomycota, Ciliophora, Cercozoa,

Bacillariophyta, Glaucocystophyceae, Dinophyceae, Xanthophyceae, and Bigyra. *Trichomonas vaginalis*, a

flagellated protozoan pathogen (phylum Parabasalia), showed the highest VR content (12.13%) among protists. The

genome was enriched in VRs assigned to *Pokkesviricetes* (1,514 VRs, 97%) or *Megaviricetes* (43 VRs, 3%). The

Pokkesviricetes VRs showed specific similarities to the genomes of recently discovered egovirals in this class[33].

In fungi and streptophytes, the VR content was generally low and seldom exceeded 1% (**Fig. 2**). The highest

VR content was observed in a lichen assembly of *Cladonia squamosa* (6.93%) among fungi and in the unicellular

biflagellate alga *Mesostigma viride* (1.19%) among streptophytes.

The high VR content appears to result, at least in part, from intragenomic proliferation of existing elements,

although the contribution of this process varies among assemblies. Among the 435 assemblies containing more than

1% VR content, 10 assemblies had a proportion of nearly identical VRs (≥90% identity and ≥90% coverage) above

30% (with the maximum of 50% for an insect genome, *Sphinx pinastri*) (**Supplementary Table 5**). These assemblies

were enriched in VRs annotated as *Orthopolintovirales* and PLVs. In contrast, the proportion of nearly identical VRs

was below 20% in 400 assemblies, including the cases of the three bivalve species with over 10% VR content. These

results suggest that some of the identified VRs may have proliferated within the genome like transposons, but the

majority of VRs did not show high intragenomic similarity, thus lacking signals of recent proliferation.

Fig. 2 | The proportion of identified VRs within different eukaryotic groups.

(a–d) metazoans, fungi, green plants and protists. Each dot represents a genomic assembly, with its color and

Expansion of known virus–eukaryote associations

The viral taxonomy of VRs may reveal previously unrecognized virus–eukaryote associations. However,

taxonomic assignment may not be unequivocal when a VR harbors features from multiple viral lineages. To identify

VRs with homogeneous viral taxonomic signals and thus ensure reliable relationships between viral and eukaryotic

lineages, we applied more stringent criteria including the proportion of OGs conserved in a specific viral taxon,

uniform taxonomic signals in TOGs, and the eukaryotic assembly quality (see Methods for details). As a result, a

subset of VRs was defined as highly taxonomically confidence viral regions (HCVRs). This filtering yielded 50,058

HCVRs in metazoans (6.61% of all metazoan VRs), 381 in fungi (39.94%), 366 in green plants (14.99%), and 269

in protists (1.33%). An independent taxonomic assessment of the HCVRs using an extended viral genome database

provided consistent results (Supplementary Fig. 2), supporting the accuracy of our viral taxonomic annotations. Of

these, 49,530 HCVRs (96.98%) were classified as integration-like, whereas 1,544 (3.02%) were viral contig-like.

The HCVRs greatly expanded current knowledge of eukaryote–dsDNA virus relationships by uncovering 173

putative associations between viral major taxa and eukaryotic classes (or orders when the class-level taxa were

unavailable) (Fig. 3). These spanned more than 6 eukaryotic supergroups[56], 27 phyla and 79 classes. Most (n = 159,

91.91%) of these associations were supported by the presence of integration-like HCVRs. Of 43 associations

between viral major taxa and eukaryotic classes currently known from isolation studies, the HCVRs recovered 29

(67%) associations. Notably, most of the associations (n = 144, 83.24%) involved a viral taxon from which no virus

has yet been isolated from the paired eukaryotic taxon.

The quality-controlled catalog of VRs and HCVRs provides multifaceted starting points for exploring the

largely uncharacterized endogenous dsDNA virosphere. In the following sections, we illustrate examples of such

investigations using detailed comparative genomics and phylogenetic approaches.

Fig. 3 | HCVR distribution in eukaryotes.

(a) The distribution of HCVRs across the eukaryotic tree of life[56]**.** *Polisuviricotina* includes *Adenoviridae*,
Lavidaviridae, PLVs, and *Orthopolintovirales*. *Nucleocytoviricota* includes *Megaviricetes*, *Pokkesviricetes,* and
Mriyaviricetes. Taxa shown in purple indicate lineages for which no genome assemblies are currently available in
GenBank. **(b) The distribution of HCVRs in distinct eukaryotic groups.** In each heatmap, the horizontal axis
represents the eukaryotic taxon, the vertical axis represents the viral taxon, and the color gradient indicates the
number of HCVRs in each unit. The color of each eukaryotic taxon corresponds to its phylum, which is indicated
alongside the heatmap. A light blue triangle marks units where all HCVRs are viral contig-like, while a gray triangle
indicates the presence of viruses previously isolated from these eukaryotes.

Previously unrecognized virus–eukaryote associations

Even in well-studied metazoan lineages such as Arthropoda, Chordata, and Mollusca, we revealed numerous

previously unrecognized putative associations (n = 88, 79.28% of all 111 detected virus–metazoan associations).

One such association was the *Lavidaviridae*–insect relationship. Lavidavirids are satellite viruses that are only

known to infect protists together with their helper imitervirals (*Megaviricetes*), which are also only known to infect

protists. A recent study detected signals of PLVs in insect genomes[57], whereas no lavidavirid–metazoan relationship

has been described to date. In our study, two *Lavidaviridae* HCVRs were identified within a single contig from the

pomace fly *Lordiphosa mommai* (**Fig. 4a**). Both HCVRs contained core genes of *Lavidaviridae*, including those

encoding the hexon and penton capsid proteins, the packaging ATPase (pATPase), a cysteine protease, as well as an

integrase that may facilitate their integration into the eukaryotic genome. We reconstructed the phylogeny of the

hexon (**Fig. 4b**) and pATPase **(Supplementary Fig. 3)** proteins to infer their evolutionary relationships within

Polisuviricotina (*Lavidaviridae*, *Adenoviridae*, PLVs, and *Orthopolintovirales*). For both genes, the proteins from

the two HCVRs consistently clustered with *Lavidaviridae* members, confirming their taxonomic identity. The contig

harboring the HCVRs encoded 19 ORFs with similarities to sequences in the database. Of these, 14 showed best

matches to metazoan proteins and 5 to prokaryotic proteins (**Fig. 4c**), with most metazoan ORFs located outside the

VRs. We also examined the publicly available nanopore long reads to assess the depth of this assembly; both the

contig and the two HCVRs exhibited depth levels comparable to the genomic background (**Fig. 4d**). These results

confirm the eukaryotic origin of this contig and the integration of the HCVRs. We also found that a *Lavidaviridae*

HCVR integrated into a 14 Mb scaffold of *Ephydatia muelleri* (sponge), which also contains a VR classified in

Megaviricetes (**Supplementary Table 3**). These findings suggest the existence of diverse lavidavirids in metazoans,

possibly together with their helper viruses.

Fig. 4 | The *Lavidaviridae* HCVRs from *L. mommai*.

(a) Two *Lavidaviridae* HCVRs within a contig. The thick blue line represents the full contig; shaded regions

indicate HCVRs. Their magnified genome maps are displayed below the contig. ORFs in the magnified genome

maps are color-coded. **(b) Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree reconstructed using the hexon protein.** The

tree is midpoint-rooted, and ultrafast bootstrap support values are shown along the branches. The best-fit substitution

Viruses of *Imitervirales* are known to infect protists. A previous study identified *Imitervirales* signals in a 400-

kb genomic scaffold of a cnidarian, *Hydra vulgaris*[52]. The entire length of the scaffold appeared to be part of a viral

genome, thus lacking evidence of integration. In the present study, we identified a cluster of *Imitervirales* VRs

localized on chromosome 9 (53 Mb, CM039220.1) of *H. vulgaris*. With the largest HCVR reaching 240 kb in length,

our results confirm the integration of imiterviral genomes in *Hydra* (**Supplementary Table 3**).

Another previously undescribed virus–host association was suggested for mirusviruses. The genome of a parrot

(*Agapornis swindernianus*) showed two HCVRs and one VR of *Mirusviricota* (**Supplementary Table 3**), a viral

lineage previously reported only from unicellular eukaryotes. The longest HCVR spans nearly 35 kilobases and

encodes two ORFs with best matches to metazoan proteins and one to a fungal protein (**Supplementary Fig. 4a**).

Structural prediction of the HK97 MCP revealed the highest TM-score (0.825) when compared with the mirusviral

MCP references reported previously[19] (**Supplementary Fig. 4b**), whereas the highest TM-scores for herpesviral and

caudoviral MCPs were 0.564 and 0.631, respectively. Phylogenetic analysis incorporating recently reported

sequences[58] further showed that this HK97 MCP does not cluster within any previously described putative orders

(**Supplementary Fig. 4c**). The average sequencing depth of the assembly was 60×, while the depth of the contigs

was 20×. Together with its short size, the contig harboring the mirusvirus signal may be part of episomal viral DNA.

Host interaction factors in high-confidence viral regions

Genes in HCVRs were functionally annotated using COG, PFAM, and KEGG. The most prevalent COG

category was "Replication, recombination and repair", with 93.33% of HCVRs carrying at least one gene in this

category. Consistent results were obtained by PFAM analysis with the dominance of replication related functions,

such as *rve* (90.45%), endonuclease VII (76.69%), and *polB* (75.89%) (**Supplementary Fig. 5a**). These HCVRs

primarily originated from *Orthopolintovirales*, *Megaviricetes*, and *Herpesvirales*, all of which are known to encode

replication-associated genes essential for propagation of these viral lineages.

KEGG Orthologs (KOs) were assigned to 22,299 genes, which were distributed across 51 of the 56

KEGG/BRITE functional categories, indicating broad functional representation (**Supplementary Fig. 5b**). The three

most frequently detected KOs were GOLGB1 (n = 5,147; membrane traffic system), BIRC7_8 (n = 3,760), and

BIRC4 (n = 3,754; ubiquitin system) (**Supplementary Fig. 5c**). These genes were predominantly derived from

Orthopolintovirales HCVRs. GOLGB1 (i.e., Giantin) is a coiled-coil protein that regulates Golgi architecture and

function[59] and has been reported to interact with viral proteins and be involved in the formation of viral factories in

the case of RNA viruses[60,61]. BIRC7_8 and BIRC4 belong to the baculoviral IAP repeat-containing protein (BIRC)

family and interact with caspases to inhibit apoptosis in eukaryotic cells[62]. GOLGB1, BIRC7_8, and BIRC4 genes

identified in HCVRs were broadly distributed across multiple assemblies rather than being confined to a small

number of eukaryotic species. They were predominantly detected in insects, spanning 8, 18, and 17 orders,

respectively (**Supplementary Table 6**). Overall, HCVRs are enriched in core viral replication genes, and they also

contain host-interaction factors.

Previously unrecognized viral lineages

To investigate the evolutionary origins of the identified VRs, we reconstructed phylogenetic trees of VRs and

reference viral sequences using a representative marker gene conserved among reference genomes for each viral

major taxon (**Fig. 5, Supplementary Fig. 6, Supplementary Data**). For taxa with the DNA polymerase as the

phylogenetic marker, additional trees were constructed by including eukaryotic homologs (**Supplementary Fig. 7**)[63],

which supported the viral origin of these genes in the VRs.

The phylogenetic trees revealed that many of the VRs were closely related to reference viral genomes, although

several clades were enriched in VRs with few or no reference sequences. These clades may represent previously

unrecognized viral lineages. The *Alloherpesviridae* had previously been reported to integrate into the genomes of 15

fish species[64]. Our approach identified two VR-only clades (branches colored blue in **Fig. 5**), which were distantly

related to the *Alloherpesviridae* and comprised MCP marker genes from 72 fish species. An additional VR-only

clade (branches colored green in **Fig. 5**) was identified between the *Orthoherpesviridae* and the *Malacoherpesviridae*

clades. Orthoherpesvirids and malacoherpesvirids are known to infect vertebrates and molluscs, while the sequences

in the VR-only clade were derived from a ribbon worm genome (*Notospermus geniculatus*), thus expanding previous

observations[65]. Regarding *Mriyaviricetes*, a recently discovered viral clade known to infect amoebae and

haptophytes[32], we identified a novel VR-only clade (branches colored blue in **Fig. 5**). This clade comprises sequences

from 10 distinct eukaryotic species, including those from Cnidaria, Mollusca, Echinodermata, and

Glaucocystophyceae, suggesting a high host diversity for this group of viruses. The novelty of VR-only clades in

other viral taxa requires further investigation using more comprehensive datasets.

The phylogenetic distribution of identified integration-like VRs showed a bias across viral major taxa. There

were very few such signals in *Adenoviridae* and *Papovaviricetes*, whereas in other viral taxa, such as *Lavidaviridae*,

Megaviricetes, *Mriyaviricetes*, and PLVs, integration-like VRs were widespread. An imbalanced distribution of

integration-like VRs was also obvious within several viral taxa. For example, VRs were found concentrated in deep

branching lineages of *Herpesvirales*, including *Alloherpesviridae* and the above-mentioned related lineages. VRs

from *Mirusviricota* were not identified in the clade of viruses detected in marine ecosystems (the *Demutovirales*[58])

but mainly found in other orders. Regarding *Orthopolintovirales*, VRs were widely distributed across the tree, except

for one clade composed exclusively of reference sequences derived from aquatic environmental metagenomes.

Viruses with an integration life stage are known to appear sporadically during viral evolution (e.g., HHV-6 among

diverse herpesviruses[11]). The replication compartment (nucleus or cytoplasm) can also differ between the lineages

even within a virus group (e.g., mirusviruses[58]). The imbalanced phylogenetic distributions of VRs across viral

phylogenetic trees thus may be due to differences in replication strategy and host groups.

Fig. 5 | Reconstructed phylogenetic trees of VRs and viruses.

Discussion

The computational framework presented in this work detected dsDNA VRs in 19% of the analyzed eukaryotic

genome assemblies, with substantial variations in VR content across organisms. A notable observation was the high

abundance of VRs in some invertebrates such as molluscs, arthropods, and cnidarians. VRs accounted for more than

0.1% up to 16% of the genome in 1,920 metazoan assemblies from 892 genera, suggesting a role of dsDNA viruses

in shaping these animal genomes (**Fig. 2, Supplementary Table 1**). Phylogenetic trees (**Fig. 5**) of viral and VR

sequences revealed an obvious separation between the currently observable "virosphere" and "endo-virosphere"

based on genomic data. These results suggest that some viruses have a greater propensity to leave traces in eukaryotic

genomes, whereas others do not. Our study revealed many previously unrecognized associations (n = 144) between

viral major taxa and eukaryotic classes, whereas only 43 associations are currently supported by evidence from virus

isolation (**Fig. 3**). We conducted several targeted bioinformatics analyses to investigate selected cases, such as the

lavidavirid–insect association. Similar approaches can be applied to further explore VRs and candidate associations.

It has become increasingly common to detect entirely novel viral signals in sequence data prior to virus isolation or

microscopic observation[14,15,53]. In this context, the putative associations and viral signals presented here may serve

as a gateway to currently hidden areas of the virosphere.

As eukaryotes diversified in lifestyle[66], cellular architecture, and antiviral defenses[67,68], their associated viral

lineages, as well as the abundance of endogenized viral elements, are expected to be diverse. In land plants and fungi,

it has been suggested that structural features such as cell walls and plasmodesmata act as barriers against large

dsDNA viruses[69], which may explain the observed scarcity of dsDNA viral signals. Protists, which encompass most

of the major eukaryotic supergroups[56], exhibit substantial viral diversity despite representing the group with the

fewest assemblies in our dataset (**Fig. 1b and 1c**). This finding underscores the vast, largely unexplored diversity of

the protist virosphere and highlights the need for further studies on protist–virus interactions and antiviral

mechanisms. In metazoans, vertebrates in particular, diverse and complex antiviral immune systems have evolved,

encompassing both innate and adaptive immunity[70,71]. These defenses may limit dsDNA viral infections and purge

endogenous viral elements[72], providing a plausible explanation for the relatively low density of dsDNA viral

sequences observed in vertebrate genomes. In contrast, invertebrates lack adaptive immunity and maintain extensive

interactions with symbionts and environmental microbes[73], factors that may collectively account for the high

proportions of dsDNA viral elements observed in their genomes (**Fig. 2**). Host ecological and immunological

characteristics may have shaped the evolutionary trajectories and diversity of endogenous dsDNA viruses.

The present study was limited to reference genomes from only 11 major viral taxa. As more viral groups are

discovered and characterized, additional genomic regions may be recognized as being of viral origin. Furthermore,

resolving virus–host taxonomic relationships at a finer taxonomic scale will require additional analytical efforts.

While these represent limitations of the present study, the catalog of VRs that we provide here should serve as a

valuable resource and foundation for future investigations of viral diversity and virus–host coevolutionary processes.

Methods

Construction of cellular reference HMMs

Cellular reference HMMs were constructed in two sequential steps. First, protein sequences were downloaded

from the KEGG database[74], covering 778 eukaryotic species from different genera (one species per genus).

Sequences shorter than 50 amino acids or longer than 4,000 amino acids were removed. OGs were identified using

OrthoFinder v2.5.5[75]. OGs present in at least 60% of genomes within at least one of the four major eukaryotic groups

(animals, green plants, fungi, or protists) were retained, yielding 12,555 OGs. For each OG, up to 200 sequences

were randomly selected and aligned using Muscle v5.1[76]. Alignments were trimmed with trimAl v1.4.1[77] using the

'-gt 0.05' option, and trimmed alignments were used to construct HMMs with HMMER v3.4[78].

The second step was based on HMMs from Pfam-A v37[79]. To minimize potential viral contamination, HMMs

containing virus-related keywords (i.e., 'virus', 'viral', 'phage', 'capsid', 'double jelly roll', 'terminase') were

excluded. The remaining HMMs were then evaluated using hmmscan (E-value < 10^{-3}) against both the collected

viral proteins (**Supplementary Table 2**) and eukaryotic proteins from KEGG. HMMs that produced more hits to

viral sequences than to eukaryotic sequences were removed, leaving 19,991 HMMs. In total, 32,546 HMMs from

both steps were retained as cellular reference models.

Construction of VOGs and TOGs

We collected reference genomes of the 11 eukaryotic dsDNA viral major taxa from various sources. For six

viral taxa (*Adenoviridae*, *Herpesvirales*, *Lavidaviridae*, *Megaviricetes*, *Naldaviricetes*, and *Papovaviricetes*), we

obtained protein sequences from RefSeq genomes in NCBI Virus (as of June 10, 2024). For *Mirusviricota*,

Mriyaviricetes, PLVs, *Pokkesviricetes*, and *Orthopolintovirales*, we additionally gathered genomic data from other

sources (see details in Supplementary Table 2). Gene prediction was performed for large/giant viruses using Prodigal

v2.6.3[80] with default options and for smaller viruses using GeneMarkS v4.30[81] with the metagenomic model and

other default options. For each viral taxon, we identified OGs using Proteinortho v6.3.2[82] with parameters following

a previously described approach[83] (-e = 1e-3 -identity = 15 -p = blastp+ -selfblast -cov = 40). For each taxon, we

constructed viral HMMs based on OGs shared by at least three genomes using the same methodology as described

in the previous section.

To identify OGs exhibiting viral specificity (i.e., VOGs), we performed hmmsearch using both cellular

reference HMMs and viral HMMs against proteins from all OGs identified in viral genomes. An OG was classified

as a VOG if at least one protein within the OG showed an E-value smaller than 10^{-5} against viral HMMs. For all

proteins in this OG, the minimum E-value for the cellular reference HMM had to exceed 10^{-5} and be at least 10^3

times greater than that of the corresponding viral HMM, ensuring viral specificity. The classification of TOGs was

based on VOGs. Proteins within a TOG were required to exhibit the best HMM match to viral HMMs from their

own taxon, while the minimum E-values for HMMs from other viral major taxa had to exceed 10^{-5} and be at least

10^3 times higher than those of their own taxon, thereby confirming taxonomic specificity.

Detection of relationships between viral major taxa and eukaryotic contigs

We first retrieved eukaryotic taxonomic information using the Bio.Entrez module of Biopython[84], followed by

manual curation. For each eukaryotic assembly, Prodigal (with configurations adjusted for long input sequences)

and GeneMarkS were used to identify ORFs. The existence of introns was not considered here, as the goal of this

study is to identify viral-like regions. Thus, the ORF density of a eukaryotic assembly does not reflect the true coding

density. We then performed hmmsearch to identify ORFs with significant similarity to VOGs. To inclusively capture

candidate contigs in the initial screening step, an E-value threshold of 10^{-3} was applied. Because some ORFs may

match multiple VOGs, only the best hit was considered in each case.

We conducted a secondary hmmsearch using the -Z parameter to standardize E-value calculations across

searches, with database sizes specified for each eukaryotic group (Metazoa: 4,962,163; Fungi: 193,281;

Viridiplantae: 237,367; Protists: 317,655). If an ORF had a hit to a cellular model with an E-value less than 100

times that of its best VOG match, the hit was removed as a potential cellular sequence. The remaining ORFs with

VOG hits were considered viral-like ORFs. A virus–contig pair for a specific viral major taxon was recorded if the

contig contained either (i) at least one viral-like ORF with a TOG hit or (ii) two viral-like ORFs with hits to distinct

VOGs from the viral major taxon. If a virus–contig pair was detected based on the ORFs predicted by either Prodigal

or GeneMarkS, the corresponding ORF set was used for downstream analyses. When the same virus–contig pair was

detected based on ORFs predicted by both methods, only one ORF set was retained. The selected method was the

one showing better overall performance, defined as detecting a greater number of contigs specifically associated

with the corresponding viral major taxon and eukaryotic kingdom.

Determination of viral regions

We performed hmmsearch on all ORFs within each contig against OGs from the corresponding viral taxon and

cellular references (E-value $< 10^{-3}$) to obtain cellular and viral annotations. VRs were identified on the basis of these

annotations and the genomic locations of ORFs. A region was classified as a VR if it contained multiple distinct viral

hits originating from a single viral taxon. Specifically, at least two distinct viral hits were required for *Adenoviridae*,

Lavidaviridae, *Mriyaviricetes*, PLVs, *Papovaviricetes*, and *Orthopolintovirales*, whereas at least three distinct viral

hits were required for *Herpesvirales*, *Megaviricetes*, *Mirusviricota*, *Naldaviricetes*, and *Pokkesviricetes*. In both

cases, all viral hits had to originate from the dominant viral major taxon within the region. Additionally, no more

than 10 ORFs with cellular annotations were allowed between two viral ORFs, and the genomic distance between

them could not exceed 10 kb. The length of each VR was determined from the start of the first ORF with a viral best

hit to the end of the last ORF with a viral best hit.

Annotation of viral regions

Viral–cellular annotation tables were generated for each VR based on the minimum E-value comparison

between HMM hits from the cellular reference and OGs within the corresponding viral taxon. Functional annotation

of VRs was performed using eggNOG-mapper v2.1.12[85]. Annotation quality was assessed by manual inspection of

assigned COG categories. Genes were defined as having unknown function if they were assigned to COG categories

'–', 'R', or 'S', or if no hits were reported by eggNOG-mapper. The frequency of each functional label (i.e., COG

category, PFAM, and KEGG KO) was calculated at the region level by first scoring the presence or absence of the

label in each VR and then computing the average proportion of regions containing that label. For proteins associated

with multiple hits (e.g., multiple PFAM domains), all identified domains were counted. KEGG annotations were

retrieved from the KEGG Orthology database (https://www.genome.jp/kegg/ko.html) on October 22, 2025.

Redundancy analysis of VRs in individual assemblies

We extracted nucleotide sequences of VRs from each assembly and clustered them using MMseqs2 v16-

747c6[86] under different thresholds for minimum sequence identity and alignment coverage. Nearly identical VRs

were defined using sequence identity and coverage thresholds both set at 0.9.

TNF composition analysis

For each assembly containing identified VRs, the assembly was divided into viral and cellular components. If

the total length of VRs exceeded half the length of the contig on which they were located, the contig was classified

as viral. In other cases, the genomic regions adjacent to the VRs within the same contig were treated as cellular

components. These regions were combined with contigs lacking VRs to calculate the average cellular TNF vector

for each assembly. From the cellular regions, 1,000 random fragments of 3,000 bp were sampled, and their Pearson

correlation coefficients with the average cellular TNF vector were calculated to establish an assembly-specific

baseline. Pearson correlation coefficients were then calculated between the TNF vector of each VR and the average

cellular TNF vector to assess whether the nucleotide composition of VRs differed from that of the cellular

components, as described in the main text and Supplementary Fig. 1f.

Classification of viral regions

Viral contig-like VRs were defined based on two criteria (**Fig. 1a**). First, their total length was required to

exceed half the length of the corresponding contig. Second, the proportion of annotated ORFs assigned to cellular

OGs was required to be less than 20%. VRs that did not simultaneously satisfy both conditions were considered to

be potentially integrated into host genomes and were thus classified as integration-like VRs.

To classify HCVRs, we first identified conserved OGs for each viral taxon. Redundant reference viral genomes

were removed using vclust v1.3.1[87] (--metric ani --ani 0.95). An OG was considered conserved if it was present in

more than half of the filtered reference genomes of the corresponding taxon. We then calculated the acceptable range

for the proportion of conserved OGs based on the interquartile range (IQR; $Q1 - 1.5 \times IQR$ to $Q3 + 1.5 \times IQR$). An

HCVR was required to contain at least one conserved OG, and its proportion of conserved OGs had to fall within

the calculated range.

We also evaluated the completeness of each assembly using BUSCO v5.1.2[88], applying metazoa_odb10,

fungi_odb10, viridiplantae_odb10, or eukaryota_odb10 datasets for metazoan, fungal, green plants, and protist

assemblies, respectively. VRs from assemblies with completeness scores below 30% were excluded from HCVR

classification. Additionally, we calculated the rate of unique hits for each VR using our annotation tables; VRs in

which fewer than 50% of hits were unique were excluded.

Finally, an HCVR was required to meet two additional conditions: (i) at least 20% of annotated ORFs within

the region had best hits to models constructed from viral sequences, with $\geq$ 90% of these hits assigned to the same

viral major taxon; and (ii) the region contained at least one TOG from its assigned viral major taxon and no TOGs

from other taxa.

Independent taxonomic assessment of the HCVRs

We performed DIAMOND blastp (v2.1.9, E-value < 10^{-3})[89] to compare all ORFs from the HCVRs against a

custom viral reference database and recorded the dominant taxon of the best hits. The custom database was built

from the reference viral genomes used in this study and complemented with high-confidence sequences from

corresponding taxa in the IMG/VR v7.1 database[90]. Notably, at the time when this version of the IMG/VR database

was compiled, several viral taxa (e.g., *Mirusviricota*, *Mriyaviricetes*, and PLVs) had not yet been formally

established. Therefore, TOGs from these taxa were used to identify potentially related contaminant sequences in the

database. Specifically, some sequences likely belonging to *Mirusviricota* or *Mriyaviricetes* were annotated as

Nucleocytoviricota in the database, whereas PLV-related sequences were annotated as *Polisuviricotina*. These

sequences were removed from the database prior to analysis.

Distribution statistics of HCVRs in distinct eukaryotic groups

The information on virus–host associations in specific eukaryotic lineages was obtained from the Virus–Host

database (https://www.genome.jp/virushostdb). All associations supported solely by viral contigs were manually

examined. As a result, the *Papovaviricetes*–Magnoliopsida association was removed, as the only supporting evidence

was a short viral contig (CBTL0109906317.1) showing clear similarity to human papillomavirus, whereas the

corresponding host assembly (GCA_900067735.1) was annotated as "contaminated" in GenBank.

Detailed analysis of viral regions from *L. mommai*

We collected hexon gene sequences from the NCBI database, with the following accession numbers:

DAC81274.1, AP_000059.1, QKW89985.1, UYE94489.1, BBW89580.1, DAC81566.1, YP_010796969.1,

YP_004300296.1, YP_002122381.1, DAC81730.1, YP_010796952.1, YP_009177804.1, YP_009177819.1,

YP_009177692.1 and YP_008859635.1. Multiple sequence alignments were generated using Muscle, and the

alignments were trimmed with trimAl using a gap threshold of 0.1. Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed using IQ-

TREE v2.2.0[91] with the parameters "-m MFP -B 1000 -alrt 1000 -wbtl".

Alignment-based taxonomic annotation of ORFs was performed using DIAMOND (E-value < 0.1) against the

RefSeq database (downloaded on 2024-12-02). The taxonomic identity of the best hit for each ORF was recorded.

For depth analysis, we downloaded the dataset SRR13070751 from NCBI using the "prefetch" command of

sratoolkit v3.0.9 (https://github.com/ncbi/sra-tools) and converted it to FASTQ format with the "fastq-dump"

command. Reads were mapped to the assembly (GCA_018904225.1) using the "mem" command of BWA v0.7.17[92].

The average depth of each contig was then calculated with samtools v1.18[93].

Detailed analysis of HK97 MCP from *A. swindernianus*

Alignment-based taxonomic annotation, phylogenetic reconstruction, and depth analysis were conducted using

the same approach as described for *L. mommai.* The dataset used for depth analysis was SRR25700359. The structure

of the MCP was predicted with AlphaFold v2.3.2[94] and visualized using ChimeraX v1.7[95]. Structural similarity

between HK97 MCPs was assessed using Foldseek v6-29e2557[97] with the easy-search module.

Phylogenetic analysis of discovered VRs and reference viruses

For each viral taxon, two marker genes were initially selected as candidates for phylogenetic analysis. One

seed sequence was collected for each marker gene from public reference datasets. The selected seed sequences are

listed as follows, with different functional genes chosen depending on the lineage. *Adenoviridae*: YP_002213842.1

(DNA polymerase) and AP_000211.1 (hexon); *Herpesvirales*: YP_010084960.1 (DNA polymerase) and

YP_010084972.1 (capsid protein); *Lavidaviridae*: YP_002122370.1 (cysteine protease) and YP_002122381.1

(capsid protein); *Megaviricetes*: YP_003986825.1 (DNA polymerase) and YP_003986929.1 (capsid protein);

Mirusviricota: TARA_AON_NCLDV_00056_000000000009   (DNA   polymerase)   and

TARA_AON_NCLDV_00032_000000000015 (capsid protein); *Mriyaviricetes*: HUH_long_consensus (HUH

endonuclease) and Yaravirus_MCP_consensus (capsid protein); *Naldaviricetes*: YP_009116659.1 (DNA

polymerase) and YP_009116734.1 (capsid protein); *Papovaviricetes*: NP_041327.2 (E1 helicase) and NP_041332.2

(L1 capsid protein); PLVs: SAF1_17 (pATPase) and SAF1_16 (capsid protein); *Pokkesviricetes*: YP_009162448.1

(DNA polymerase) and YP_009162470.1 (capsid protein); *Orthopolintovirales*: YP_010796957.1 (DNA

polymerase) and Polinton-1_DY (capsid protein).

We then compared the coverage of seed sequence alignments against the reference genome dataset. Five

approaches were used: (i) BLASTP (BLAST+ v2.16.0[96]) with an E-value cut-off of 1e-5; (ii) PSI-BLAST[97], where

all reference genes within a given lineage were pooled into one database and searched against corresponding seed

sequences with five iterations using an E-value cut-off of 1e-5; (iii) HMMER, using HMM profiles built from initial

reference OGs to identify marker genes, applying hmmscan to the reference sequences; (iv) JackHMMER[98], where

all reference genes within a lineage were pooled into one database and searched against corresponding seed

sequences with five iterations; and (v) MMseqs2, where all seed and reference protein sequences were pooled and

clustered using the cluster function with a minimum sequence identity of 0.2 and a coverage threshold of 0.5. The

coverage of each marker gene on reference genomes is shown in Supplementary Fig. 6.

Owing to its superior sensitivity, JackHMMER was used to identify all marker genes in the viral regions using

the same parameters and a database comprising VR protein sequences. The proportions of VRs encoding marker

genes were as follows: DNA polymerase for *Adenoviridae* (15%), *Herpesvirales* (21%), *Megaviricetes* (5%),

Naldaviricetes (28%), and *Pokkesviricetes* (2%); major capsid protein for *Lavidaviridae* (87%), *Mirusviricota* (10%),

and *Mriyaviricetes* (10%); E1 helicase for *Papovaviricetes* (100%); and pATPase for PLVs (86%). Redundant

sequences from viral regions were removed using CD-HIT v4.8.1[99]. Most lineages were filtered using a minimum

sequence identity of 0.8 and an alignment coverage threshold of 0.8 for the shorter sequence. For *Orthopolintovirales*,

identity and coverage thresholds were set to 0.6; for PLVs, more relaxed thresholds of 0.4 were applied due to the

large number of detected sequences. These lineage-specific thresholds ensured sufficient representation of

homologous sequences and supported reliable downstream phylogenetic analyses.

The dereplicated viral region sequences were then combined with reference sequences. Multiple sequence

alignments were performed using Clustal Omega v1.2.4[100] and trimmed with trimAl using a gap threshold of 0.05.

Aligned sequences with gaps as the predominant (90%) sites were removed. Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed

using IQ-TREE with the -m TEST option, allowing automatic model selection based on the Bayesian Information

Criterion. The selected models for each viral lineage were as follows: *Adenoviridae*: pfam+F+I+G4; *Herpesvirales*:

JTT+F+G4; *Lavidaviridae*: Blosum62+F+G4; *Megaviricetes*: VT+F+G4; *Mirusviricota*: Q.pfam+F+I+G4;

Mriyaviricetes: VT+F+G4; *Naldaviricetes*: VT+F+I+G4; *Papovaviricetes*: Q.yeast+F+I+G4; PLVs: VT+F+G4;

Pokkesviricetes: VT+F+I+G4; and *Orthopolintovirales*: VT+F+I+G4.

An additional phylogenetic analysis was independently performed for the HCVR dataset. JackHMMER was

used to identify all marker genes in HCVR sequences. Sequence alignment and trimming were performed using the

same procedures described above. Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed with IQ-TREE using the -m TEST option to enable automatic model selection. The selected substitution models for each viral lineage were as follows: *Adenoviridae*: Q.pfam+F+I+G4; *Herpesvirales*: Q.pfam+F+I+G4; *Lavidaviridae*: Q.pfam+F+G4; *Megaviricetes*: VT+F+G4; *Mirusviricota*: WAG+F+I+G4; *Mriyaviricetes*: Blosum62+F+G4; *Naldaviricetes*: Q.yeast+F+I+G4; *Papovaviricetes*: Q.yeast+F+I+G4; PLVs: Q.pfam+F+G4; *Pokkesviricetes*: VT+F+I+G4; and *Orthopolintovirales*: VT+F+G4. The phylogenetic trees were visualized with iTOL v7[101].

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS/KAKENHI (nos. 25KJ1513 and 22H00384), iJURC (2024-27) and HFSP (Ref. No.: RGP011/2024). Computational time was provided by the Supercomputer System, Institute for Chemical Research, Kyoto University (Kyoto, Japan). The authors thank Edanz (https://jp.edanz.com/ac) for editing a draft of this manuscript. The authors thank Dr. Kenji K. Kojima from Genetic Information Research Institute for his valuable suggestions.

Data Availability

HMM files of VOG/TOG and their annotations, amino acid sequences and annotation files of VRs, multiple sequence alignments for phylogenetic analysis, tree files and annotation files for visualization via iTOL have been deposited in Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18919361).

Author Contributions

HZ designed the study, performed most of the analyses and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. LM contributed to the phylogenetic analyses. RZ contributed to the gene function analyses. MG contributed to the investigation of individual VRs. HO supervised the study and contributed to the design of the bioinformatics pipeline. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Feschotte, C., and Gilbert, C. (2012). Endogenous viruses: insights into viral evolution and impact on host biology. Nat. Rev. Genet. *13*, 283–296. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3199.

2. Barreat, J.G.N., and Katzourakis, A. (2022). Paleovirology of the DNA viruses of eukaryotes. Trends Microbiol. *30*, 281–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2021.07.004.

3. Lander, E.S., Linton, L.M., Birren, B., Nusbaum, C., Zody, M.C., Baldwin, J., Devon, K., Dewar, K., Doyle, M., FitzHugh, W., et al. (2001). Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. Nature *409*, 860–921. https://doi.org/10.1038/35057062.

4. Weiss, R.A. (2006). The discovery of endogenous retroviruses. Retrovirology *3*, 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-4690-3-67.

5. Shi, M., Lin, X.-D., Chen, X., Tian, J.-H., Chen, L.-J., Li, K., Wang, W., Eden, J.-S., Shen, J.-J., Liu, L., et al. (2018). The evolutionary history of vertebrate RNA viruses. Nature *556*, 197–202. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0012-7.

6. Mi, S., Lee, X., Li, X., Veldman, G.M., Finnerty, H., Racie, L., LaVallie, E., Tang, X.Y., Edouard, P., Howes, S., et al. (2000). Syncytin is a captive retroviral envelope protein involved in human placental morphogenesis. Nature *403*, 785–789. https://doi.org/10.1038/35001608.

7. Chuong, E.B., Elde, N.C., and Feschotte, C. (2016). Regulatory evolution of innate immunity through co-option of endogenous retroviruses. Science *351*, 1083–1087. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aad5497

8. Ashley, J., Cordy, B., Lucia, D., Fradkin, L.G., Budnik, V., and Thomson, T. (2018). Retrovirus-like Gag Protein Arc1 Binds RNA and Traffics across Synaptic Boutons. Cell *172*, 262-274.e11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.12.022.

9. Ritsch, M., Brait, N., Harvey, E., Marz, M., and Lequime, S. (2024). Endogenous viral elements: insights into data availability and accessibility. Virus Evol. *10*, veae099. https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/veae099.

10. Moniruzzaman, M., and Aylward, F.O. (2023). Endogenous DNA viruses take center stage in eukaryotic genome evolution. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *120*, e2305212120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305212120.

11. Morissette, G., and Flamand, L. (2010). Herpesviruses and Chromosomal Integration. J. Virol. *84*, 12100–12109. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01169-10.

12. Fischer, M.G., and Hackl, T. (2016). Host genome integration and giant virus-induced reactivation of the virophage mavirus. Nature *540*, 288–291. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20593.

13. Delaroque, N., Maier, I., Knippers, R., and Müller, D.G. (1999). Persistent virus integration into the genome of its algal host, Ectocarpus siliculosus (Phaeophyceae). J. Gen. Virol. *80*, 1367–1370. https://doi.org/10.1099/0022-1317-80-6-1367.

14. Chung, D., Brask, N., Matar, S., Gallot-Lavallée, L., Pringle, E.S., Duguay, B.A., Blais, C., Latimer, J., Haro, R., Slamovits, C.H., et al. (2025). Persistent mirusvirus infection in the marine protist Aurantiochytrium. Nat.

Commun. *16*, 9922. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-65172-6.

15. Erazo-Garcia, M.P., Sheyn, U., Barth, Z.K., Craig, R.J., Wessman, P., Jivaji, A.M., Ray, W.K., Svensson-Coelho,
M., Cornwallis, C.K., Rengefors, K., et al. (2025). Cryptic infection of a giant virus in a unicellular green alga.
Science *388*, eads6303. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ads6303.

16. van Oers, M.M., Herniou, E.A., Jehle, J.A., Krell, P.J., Abd-Alla, A.M.M., Ribeiro, B.M., Theilmann, D.A., Hu,
Z., and Harrison, R.L. (2023). Developments in the classification and nomenclature of arthropod-infecting large
DNA viruses that contain pif genes. Arch. Virol. *168*, 182. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-023-05793-8.

17. Bézier, A., Annaheim, M., Herbinière, J., Wetterwald, C., Gyapay, G., Bernard-Samain, S., Wincker, P., Roditi,
I., Heller, M., Belghazi, M., et al. (2009). Polydnaviruses of Braconid Wasps Derive from an Ancestral
Nudivirus. Science *323*, 926–930. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1166788.

18. Bellas, C., Hackl, T., Plakolb, M.-S., Koslová, A., Fischer, M.G., and Sommaruga, R. (2023). Large-scale
invasion of unicellular eukaryotic genomes by integrating DNA viruses. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *120*,
e2300465120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2300465120.

19. Zhao, H., Meng, L., Hikida, H., and Ogata, H. (2024). Eukaryotic genomic data uncover an extensive host
range of mirusviruses. Curr. Biol. *34*, 2633-2643.e3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2024.04.085.

20. Irwin, N.A.T., Pittis, A.A., Richards, T.A., and Keeling, P.J. (2022). Systematic evaluation of horizontal gene
transfer between eukaryotes and viruses. Nat. Microbiol. *7*, 327–336. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-021-
01026-3.

21. Gallot-Lavallée, L., and Blanc, G. (2017). A Glimpse of Nucleo-Cytoplasmic Large DNA Virus Biodiversity
through the Eukaryotic Genomics Window. Viruses *9*, 17. https://doi.org/10.3390/v9010017.

22. Haapa-Paananen, S., Wahlberg, N., and Savilahti, H. (2014). Phylogenetic analysis of Maverick/Polinton giant
transposons across organisms. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. *78*, 271–274.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.05.024.

23. Krupovic, M., and Koonin, E.V. (2015). Polintons: a hotbed of eukaryotic virus, transposon and plasmid
evolution. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. *13*, 105–115. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3389.

24. Moniruzzaman, M., Weinheimer, A.R., Martinez-Gutierrez, C.A., and Aylward, F.O. (2020). Widespread
endogenization of giant viruses shapes genomes of green algae. Nature *588*, 141–145.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2924-2.

25. de Villiers, E.-M., Fauquet, C., Broker, T.R., Bernard, H.-U., and zur Hausen, H. (2004). Classification of
papillomaviruses. Virology *324*, 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2004.03.033.

26. Fischer, M.G. (2021). The Virophage Family Lavidaviridae. Curr. Issues Mol. Biol. *40*, 1–24.
https://doi.org/10.21775/cimb.040.001.

27. Koonin, E.V., Fischer, M.G., Kuhn, J.H., and Krupovic, M. (2024). The polinton-like supergroup of viruses:
evolution, molecular biology, and taxonomy. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev. *88*, e00086-23.

https://doi.org/10.1128/mmbr.00086-23.

28.   Raoult, D., Audic, S., Robert, C., Abergel, C., Renesto, P., Ogata, H., La Scola, B., Suzan, M., and Claverie, J.-
       M. (2004). The 1.2-Megabase Genome Sequence of Mimivirus. Science *306*, 1344–1350.
       https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1101485.

29.   Schulz, F., Roux, S., Paez-Espino, D., Jungbluth, S., Walsh, D.A., Denef, V.J., McMahon, K.D., Konstantinidis,
       K.T., Eloe-Fadrosh, E.A., Kyrpides, N.C., et al. (2020). Giant virus diversity and host interactions through
       global metagenomics. Nature *578*, 432–436. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-1957-x.

30.   Bellas, C.M., and Sommaruga, R. (2021). Polinton-like viruses are abundant in aquatic ecosystems.
       Microbiome *9*, 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-020-00956-0.

31.   Gaïa, M., Meng, L., Pelletier, E., Forterre, P., Vanni, C., Fernandez-Guerra, A., Jaillon, O., Wincker, P., Ogata,
       H., Krupovic, M., et al. (2023). Mirusviruses link herpesviruses to giant viruses. Nature *616*, 783–789.
       https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-05962-4.

32.   Yutin, N., Mutz, P., Krupovic, M., and Koonin, E.V. (2024). Mriyaviruses: small relatives of giant viruses.
       mBio *15*, e01035-24. https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.01035-24.

33.   Gaia, M., Ruscheweyh, H.-J., Eren, A.M., Koonin, E.V., Sunagawa, S., Krupovic, M., and Delmont, T.O. (2025).
       Closest relatives of poxviruses are spread in the gut of humans and animals worldwide: the egoviruses. Preprint
       at bioRxiv, https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.23.586382 https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.23.586382.

34.   Lewin, H.A., Richards, S., Lieberman Aiden, E., Allende, M.L., Archibald, J.M., Bálint, M., Barker, K.B.,
       Baumgartner, B., Belov, K., Bertorelle, G., et al. (2022). The Earth BioGenome Project 2020: Starting the clock.
       Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *119*, e2115635118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2115635118.

35.   Dowgier, G., Lahoreau, J., Lanave, G., Losurdo, M., Varello, K., Lucente, M.S., Ventriglia, G., Bozzetta, E.,
       Martella, V., Buonavoglia, C., et al. (2018). Sequential circulation of canine adenoviruses 1 and 2 in captive
       wild carnivores, France. Vet. Microbiol. *221*, 67–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2018.05.025.

36.   Whitley, R.J., and Roizman, B. (2001). Herpes simplex virus infections. Lancet *357*, 1513–1518.
       https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04638-9.

37.   Davison, A.J. (1998). The Genome of Salmonid Herpesvirus 1. J. Virol. *72*, 1974–1982.
       https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.72.3.1974-1982.1998.

38.   Zhang, X., Sun, S., Xiang, Y., Wong, J., Klose, T., Raoult, D., and Rossmann, M.G. (2012). Structure of Sputnik,
       a virophage, at 3.5-Å resolution. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *109*, 18431–18436.
       https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211702109.

39.   Arslan, D., Legendre, M., Seltzer, V., Abergel, C., and Claverie, J.-M. (2011). Distant Mimivirus relative with
       a larger genome highlights the fundamental features of Megaviridae. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *108*, 17486–
       17491. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1110889108.

40.   Piégu, B., Guizard, S., Yeping, T., Cruaud, C., Asgari, S., Bideshi, D.K., Federici, B.A., and Bigot, Y. (2014).

Genome sequence of a crustacean iridovirus, IIV31, isolated from the pill bug, Armadillidium vulgare. J. Gen. Virol. *95*, 1585–1590. https://doi.org/10.1099/vir.0.066076-0.

41. Collier, J.L., Rest, J.S., Gallot-Lavallée, L., Lavington, E., Kuo, A., Jenkins, J., Plott, C., Pangilinan, J., Daum, C., Grigoriev, I.V., et al. (2023). The protist Aurantiochytrium has universal subtelomeric rDNAs and is a host for mirusviruses. Curr. Biol. *33*, 5199-5207.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.10.009.

42. Boratto, P.V.M., Oliveira, G.P., Machado, T.B., Andrade, A.C.S.P., Baudoin, J.-P., Klose, T., Schulz, F., Azza, S., Decloquement, P., Chabrière, E., et al. (2020). Yaravirus: A novel 80-nm virus infecting Acanthamoeba castellanii. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. *117*, 16579–16586. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001637117.

43. Lange, M., and Jehle, J.A. (2003). The genome of the *Cryptophlebia leucotreta* granulovirus. Virology *317*, 220–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0042-6822(03)00515-4.

44. Lightner, D.V., Redman, R.M., Pantoja, C.R., Tang, K.F.J., Noble, B.L., Schofield, P., Mohney, L.L., Nunan, L.M., and Navarro, S.A. (2012). Historic emergence, impact and current status of shrimp pathogens in the Americas. J. Invertebr. Pathol. *110*, 174–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2012.03.006.

45. Doorbar, J., and Gallimore, P.H. (1987). Identification of proteins encoded by the L1 and L2 open reading frames of human papillomavirus 1a. J. Virol. *61*, 2793–2799. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.61.9.2793-2799.1987.

46. Gazdar, A.F., Butel, J.S., and Carbone, M. (2002). SV40 and human tumours: myth, association or causality? Nat. Rev. Cancer *2*, 957–964. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc947.

47. Roitman, S., Rozenberg, A., Lavy, T., Brussaard, C.P.D., Kleifeld, O., and Béjà, O. (2023). Isolation and infection cycle of a polinton-like virus virophage in an abundant marine alga. Nat. Microbiol. *8*, 332–346. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-022-01305-7.

48. Karki, S., Moniruzzaman, M., and Aylward, F.O. (2021). Comparative Genomics and Environmental Distribution of Large dsDNA Viruses in the Family Asfarviridae. Front. Microbiol. *12*, 657471. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.657471.

49. Mitjà, O., Ogoina, D., Titanji, B.K., Galvan, C., Muyembe, J.-J., Marks, M., and Orkin, C.M. (2023). Monkeypox. Lancet *401*, 60–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(22)02075-X.

50. Starrett, G.J., Tisza, M.J., Welch, N.L., Belford, A.K., Peretti, A., Pastrana, D.V., and Buck, C.B. (2021). Adintoviruses: a proposed animal-tropic family of midsize eukaryotic linear dsDNA (MELD) viruses. Virus Evol. *7*, veaa055. https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/veaa055.

51. Maumus, F., Epert, A., Nogué, F., and Blanc, G. (2014). Plant genomes enclose footprints of past infections by giant virus relatives. Nat. Commun. *5*, 4268. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5268.

52. Filée, J. (2014). Multiple occurrences of giant virus core genes acquired by eukaryotic genomes: the visible part of the iceberg? Virology *466–467*, 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2014.06.004.

53. Myers, J.M., Schulz, F., Rahimlou, S., Yadav, V., Amses, K.R., Simmons, D.R., Sun, S., Orozco-Quime, M., Heitman, J., Stajich, J.E., et al. (2025). Discovery of giant viruses as past and present infections of zoosporic

fungi. Preprint at bioRxiv, https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.04.574182.

54.   Zhao, H., Zhang, R., Wu, J., Meng, L., Okazaki, Y., Hikida, H., and Ogata, H. (2023). A 1.5-Mb continuous
endogenous viral region in the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus Rhizophagus irregularis. Virus Evol. *9*, vead064.
https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/vead064.

55.   Lopes-Lima, M., Froufe, E., Do, V.T., Ghamizi, M., Mock, K.E., Kebapçı, Ü., Klishko, O., Kovitvadhi, S.,
Kovitvadhi, U., Paulo, O.S., et al. (2017). Phylogeny of the most species-rich freshwater bivalve family
(Bivalvia: Unionida: Unionidae): Defining modern subfamilies and tribes. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. *106*, 174–
191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2016.08.021.

56.   Burki, F., Roger, A.J., Brown, M.W., and Simpson, A.G.B. (2020). The New Tree of Eukaryotes. Trends Ecol.
Evol. *35*, 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.008.

57.   Barth, Z.K., Hicklin, I., Thézé, J., Takatsuka, J., Nakai, M., Herniou, E.A., Brown, A.M., and Aylward, F.O.
(2024). Genomic analysis of hyperparasitic viruses associated with entomopoxviruses. Virus Evol. *10*, veae051.
https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/veae051.

58.   Medvedeva, S., Guyet, U., Pelletier, E., Ruscheweyh, H.-J., Sunagawa, S., Ogata, H., Aylward, F.O., Gaïa, M.,
Yutin, N., Koonin, E.V., et al. (2026). Widespread and intron-rich mirusviruses are predicted to reproduce in
nuclei of unicellular eukaryotes. Nat. Microbiol. *11*, 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-025-02190-6.

59.   Barr, F.A., and Short, B. (2003). Golgins in the structure and dynamics of the Golgi apparatus. Curr. Opin. Cell
Biol. *15*, 405–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0955-0674(03)00054-1.

60.   Barbosa, N.S., Mendonça, L.R., Dias, M.V.S., Pontelli, M.C., da Silva, E.Z.M., Criado, M.F., da Silva-Januário,
M.E., Schindler, M., Jamur, M.C., Oliver, C., et al. (2018). ESCRT machinery components are required for
Orthobunyavirus particle production in Golgi compartments. PLoS Pathog. *14*, e1007047.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007047.

61.   Zhu, P., Liang, L., Shao, X., Luo, W., Jiang, S., Zhao, Q., Sun, N., Zhao, Y., Li, J., Wang, J., et al. (2016). Host
Cellular Protein TRAPPC6AΔ Interacts with Influenza A Virus M2 Protein and Regulates Viral Propagation by
Modulating M2 Trafficking. J. Virol. *91*, 10.1128/jvi.01757-16. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01757-16.

62.   Hay, B.A., Wassarman, D.A., and Rubin, G.M. (1995). Drosophila homologs of baculovirus inhibitor of
apoptosis proteins function to block cell death. Cell *83*, 1253–1262. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-
8674(95)90150-7.

63.   Kazlauskas, D., Krupovic, M., Guglielmini, J., Forterre, P., and Venclovas, Č. (2020). Diversity and evolution
of B-family DNA polymerases. Nucleic Acids Res. *48*, 10142–10156. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa760.

64.   Aswad, A., and Katzourakis, A. (2017). A novel viral lineage distantly related to herpesviruses discovered
within fish genome sequence data. Virus Evol. *3*, vex016. https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/vex016.

65.   Rosani, U., Gaia, M., Delmont, T.O., and Krupovic, M. (2023). Tracing the invertebrate herpesviruses in the
global sequence datasets. Front. Mar. Sci. *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2023.1159754.

66.   Guinet, B., Lepetit, D., Charlat, S., Buhl, P.N., Notton, D.G., Cruaud, A., Rasplus, J.-Y., Stigenberg, J., de
735   Vienne, D.M., Boussau, B., et al. (2023). Endoparasitoid lifestyle promotes endogenization and domestication
736   of dsDNA viruses. eLife *12*, e85993. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.85993.

737   67.   Koonin, E.V. (2017). Evolution of RNA- and DNA-guided antivirus defense systems in prokaryotes and
738   eukaryotes: common ancestry vs convergence. Biol. Direct *12*, 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13062-017-0177-2.

739   68.   Marques, J.T., Meignin, C., and Imler, J.-L. (2024). An evolutionary perspective to innate antiviral immunity
740   in animals. Cell Rep. *43*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2024.114678.

741   69.   Dolja, V.V., Krupovic, M., and Koonin, E.V. (2020). Deep Roots and Splendid Boughs of the Global Plant
742   Virome. Annu. Rev. Phytopathol. *58*, 23–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-030320-041346.

743   70.   Paludan, S.R., Pradeu, T., Masters, S.L., and Mogensen, T.H. (2021). Constitutive immune mechanisms:
744   mediators   of   host   defence   and   immune   regulation.   Nat.   Rev.   Immunol.   *21*,   137–150.
745   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0391-5.

746   71.   Kassiotis, G. (2023). The Immunological Conundrum of Endogenous Retroelements. Annu. Rev. Immunol. *41*,
747   99–125. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-immunol-101721-033341.

748   72.   Sarre, L.A., Kim, I.V., Ovchinnikov, V., Olivetta, M., Suga, H., Dudin, O., Sebé-Pedrós, A., and de Mendoza,
749   A. (2024). DNA methylation enables recurrent endogenization of giant viruses in an animal relative. Sci. Adv.
750   *10*, eado6406. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ado6406.

751   73.   Rathour, R., Ma, Y., Xiong, J., Wang, X.-W., Petersen, J., and Zhang, X. (2025). Hemolymph microbiota and
752   host immunity of crustaceans and mollusks. ISME J. *19*, wraf133. https://doi.org/10.1093/ismejo/wraf133.

753   74.   Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Sato, Y., Matsuura, Y., and Ishiguro-Watanabe, M. (2025). KEGG: biological
754   systems   database   as   a   model   of   the   real   world.   Nucleic   Acids   Res.   *53*,   D672–D677.
755   https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkae909.

756   75.   Emms, D.M., and Kelly, S. (2019). OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative genomics.
757   Genome Biol. *20*, 238. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1832-y.

758   76.   Edgar, R.C. (2022). Muscle5: High-accuracy alignment ensembles enable unbiased assessments of sequence
759   homology and phylogeny. Nat. Commun. *13*, 6968. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34630-w.

760   77.   Capella-Gutiérrez, S., Silla-Martínez, J.M., and Gabaldón, T. (2009). trimAl: a tool for automated alignment
761   trimming   in   large-scale   phylogenetic   analyses.   Bioinformatics   *25*,   1972–1973.
762   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348.

763   78.   Eddy,   S.R.   (2011).   Accelerated   Profile   HMM   Searches.   PLoS   Comput.   Biol.   *7*,   e1002195.
764   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002195.

765   79.   Finn, R.D., Bateman, A., Clements, J., Coggill, P., Eberhardt, R.Y., Eddy, S.R., Heger, A., Hetherington, K.,
766   Holm, L., Mistry, J., et al. (2014). Pfam: the protein families database. Nucleic Acids Res. *42*, D222.
767   https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkt1223.

80. Hyatt, D., Chen, G.-L., LoCascio, P.F., Land, M.L., Larimer, F.W., and Hauser, L.J. (2010). Prodigal:
prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC Bioinformatics *11*, 119.
https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-119.

81. Besemer, J., Lomsadze, A., and Borodovsky, M. (2001). GeneMarkS: a self-training method for prediction of
gene starts in microbial genomes. Implications for finding sequence motifs in regulatory regions. Nucleic Acids
Res. *29*, 2607–2618. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/29.12.2607.

82. Klemm, P., Stadler, P.F., and Lechner, M. (2023). Proteinortho6: pseudo-reciprocal best alignment heuristic for
graph-based detection of (co-)orthologs. Front. Bioinform. *3*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbinf.2023.1322477.

83. Moniruzzaman, M., Martinez-Gutierrez, C.A., Weinheimer, A.R., and Aylward, F.O. (2020). Dynamic genome
evolution and complex virocell metabolism of globally-distributed giant viruses. Nat. Commun. *11*, 1710.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15507-2.

84. Cock, P.J.A., Antao, T., Chang, J.T., Chapman, B.A., Cox, C.J., Dalke, A., Friedberg, I., Hamelryck, T., Kauff,
F., Wilczynski, B., et al. (2009). Biopython: freely available Python tools for computational molecular biology
and bioinformatics. Bioinformatics *25*, 1422–1423. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp163.

85. Cantalapiedra, C.P., Hernández-Plaza, A., Letunic, I., Bork, P., and Huerta-Cepas, J. (2021). eggNOG-mapper
v2: Functional Annotation, Orthology Assignments, and Domain Prediction at the Metagenomic Scale. Mol.
Biol. Evol. *38*, 5825–5829. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msab293.

86. Steinegger, M., and Söding, J. (2017). MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for the analysis
of massive data sets. Nat. Biotechnol. *35*, 1026–1028. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3988.

87. Zielezinski, A., Gudyś, A., Barylski, J., Siminski, K., Rozwalak, P., Dutilh, B.E., and Deorowicz, S. (2025).
Ultrafast and accurate sequence alignment and clustering of viral genomes. Nat. Methods *22*, 1191–1194.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-025-02701-7.

88. Simão, F.A., Waterhouse, R.M., Ioannidis, P., Kriventseva, E.V., and Zdobnov, E.M. (2015). BUSCO: assessing
genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. Bioinformatics *31*, 3210–3212.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv351.

89. Buchfink, B., Xie, C., and Huson, D.H. (2015). Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND. Nat.
Methods *12*, 59–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3176.

90. Camargo, A.P., Nayfach, S., Chen, I.-M.A., Palaniappan, K., Ratner, A., Chu, K., Ritter, S.J., Reddy, T.B.K.,
Mukherjee, S., Schulz, F., et al. (2023). IMG/VR v4: an expanded database of uncultivated virus genomes
within a framework of extensive functional, taxonomic, and ecological metadata. Nucleic Acids Res. *51*, D733–
D743. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkac1037.

91. Minh, B.Q., Schmidt, H.A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M.D., von Haeseler, A., and Lanfear,
R. (2020). IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era.
Mol. Biol. Evol. *37*, 1530–1534. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msaa015.

92. Li, H., and Durbin, R. (2009). Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform.

Bioinformatics *25*, 1754–1760. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp324.

93. Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R., and
1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.
Bioinformatics *25*, 2078–2079. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352.

94. Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R.,
Žídek, A., Potapenko, A., et al. (2021). Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature
596, 583–589. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2.

95. Meng, E.C., Goddard, T.D., Pettersen, E.F., Couch, G.S., Pearson, Z.J., Morris, J.H., and Ferrin, T.E. (2023).
UCSF ChimeraX: Tools for structure building and analysis. Protein Sci. *32*, e4792.
https://doi.org/10.1002/pro.4792.

96. Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., and Madden, T.L. (2009).
BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics *10*, 421. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-
421.

97. Altschul, S.F., Madden, T.L., Schäffer, A.A., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Miller, W., and Lipman, D.J. (1997). Gapped
BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. Nucleic Acids Res. *25*, 3389–
3402. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/25.17.3389.

98. Johnson, L.S., Eddy, S.R., and Portugaly, E. (2010). Hidden Markov model speed heuristic and iterative HMM
search procedure. BMC Bioinformatics *11*, 431. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-431.

99. Li, W., and Godzik, A. (2006). Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of protein or
nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics *22*, 1658–1659. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl158.

100. Sievers, F., and Higgins, D.G. (2018). Clustal Omega for making accurate alignments of many protein
sequences. Protein Sci. *27*, 135–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/pro.3290.

101. Letunic, I., and Bork, P. (2024). Interactive Tree of Life (iTOL) v6: recent updates to the phylogenetic tree
display and annotation tool. Nucleic Acids Res. *52*, W78–W82. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkae268.

Supplemental dataset legends

Supplementary Table 1: Eukaryotic assemblies used in this study

Supplementary Table 2: Reference viral genomes used in this study

Supplementary Table 3: Information on identified VRs

Supplementary Table 4: Summary statistics of VRs across major viral taxa

Supplementary Table 5: Proportion of redundant VRs across individual assemblies

Supplementary Table 6: Host distribution of the three most abundant KOs

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Fig. 1 | Properties of VRs

(a–f) Subfigure titles are shown at the top of each panel. (b) The left plot represents the number of VRs, and the right plot represents the proportion of VRs in each assembly. Each dot corresponds to one assembly, and the regression line is shown in yellow. **(d)** The difference represents the ORF density of VRs minus that of the corresponding. **(e)** The y-axis represents, for each VR or viral genome, the proportion of ORFs within the normal length range of their corresponding OG. **(f)** The y-axis represents, for all VRs of a given taxon, the proportion of VRs whose TNF composition differs from that of the host assembly.

Tree scale: 1

- Duck aviadenovirus B
- Human adenovirus 53
- Canine adenovirus 1
- Terrapene box turtle adintovirus
- Gezel-14T
- Stylophora coral adintovirus
- Hydra adintovirus
- Bos-associated insect adintovirus 2
- Mayetiola barley midge adintovirus
- Yellowstone Lake virophage 5
- Maverick-related virus strain Spezl
- Sputnik virophage
- Zamilon virus
- Yellowstone Lake virophage 7
- Yellowstone Lake virophage 6
- VR1-2
- VR2-1
- VR1-1
- VR2-2

Adenoviridae Lavidaviridae PLV Orthopolintovirales

Supplementary Fig. 3 | Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree reconstructed using the pATPase sequences

The reference viral sequences included YP_010796965.1, AVL93344.1, YP_009177784.1, UYE94484.1,

BBW89550.1, YP_004300293.1, DAC81269.1, YP_002122364.1, YP_009177673.1, YP_010796956.1,

XAM99555.1, DAC81558.1, DAC81736.1, YP_009177816.1 and Q65945.1. The tree was midpoint-rooted, and

ultrafast bootstrap support values were shown along the branches. The best-fit substitution model was

Q.pfam+F+I+R3.

Supplementary Fig. 4 | *Mirusviricota* **MCP from** *A. swindernianus*

(a) Genomic context of the HCVR containing an HK97 MCP. The region delimited by two light blue vertical

lines indicates the HCVR. ORFs in the magnified genome maps are color-coded. **(b) Predicted structure of the**

HK97 MCP encoded by this contig and its closest mirusviral reference sequence. Distinct secondary structure

elements are indicated in different colors. **(c) Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree reconstructed from the**

HK97 MCP. The tree was midpoint-rooted, and ultrafast bootstrap support values were shown along the branches.

The best-fit substitution model was VT+F+I+G4.

Supplementary Fig. 5 | Annotation statistics for proteins in HCVRs

(a) Top 20 PFAM domains by prevalence. A fraction of 0.8 represents 80% of HCVRs have at least one corresponding PFAM domain-containing gene. **(b)** Top 10 KEGG BRITE categories ranked by number of distinct KOs detected in HCVRs. **(c)** Occurrence of the top 20 KOs in HCVRs.

Supplementary Fig. 6 | Distribution of marker genes in reference viral genomes.

Each radar plot corresponds to a viral taxon, as labeled above. Concentric circles represent the proportion of genomes

in which homologs of each gene were detected using the indicated method. Colored lines denote different marker

genes, as shown in the legend (top right). Triangles indicate the genes selected for phylogenetic tree reconstruction.

Supplementary Fig. 7 | Phylogenetic trees of DNA polymerase including eukaryotic homologs.

Each tree corresponds to a specific viral taxon, as indicated in the panel title. Scale bars are shown in the lower left

corners, and all trees are midpoint-rooted. Black circles indicate ultrafast bootstrap support values greater than 90.

The color legend is shown at the bottom. The best-fit substitution model used for *Adenoviridae*, *Herpesvirales*, and

Naldaviricetes was Q.pfam+I+G4, while Q.pfam+F+I+G4 was applied for *Megaviricetes* and *Pokkesviricetes*.

889