Full-length genome sequences of two SARS-like coronaviruses in horseshoe bats and genetic variation analysis
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Bats were recently identified as natural reservoirs of SARS-like coronavirus (SL-CoV) or SARS coronavirus-like virus. These viruses, together with SARS coronaviruses (SARS-CoV) isolated from human and palm civet, form a distinctive cluster within the group 2 coronaviruses of the genus Coronavirus, tentatively named group 2b (G2b). In this study, complete genome sequences of two additional group 2b coronaviruses (G2b-CoVs) were determined from horseshoe bat Rhinolophus ferrumequinum (G2b-CoV Rf1) and Rhinolophus macrotis (G2b-CoV Rm1). The bat G2b-CoV isolates have an identical genome organization and share an overall genome sequence identity of 88–92% among themselves and between them and the human/civet isolates. The most variable regions are located in the genes encoding nsp3, ORF3a, spike protein and ORF8 when bat and human/civet G2b-CoV isolates are compared. Genetic analysis demonstrated that a diverse G2b-CoV population exists in the bat habitat and has evolved from a common ancestor of SARS-CoV.
share an overall nucleotide sequence identity of 92 and 88% to the outbreak SARS-CoVs isolated from civets and humans, respectively.

In this paper, we describe the characterization of full-length genome sequences for two additional G2b-CoV isolates, Rf1 from *R. ferrumequinum* and Rm1 from *R. macrotis*, and present genome-comparison data of all known G2b-CoV genome types to demonstrate further the great genetic diversity among this group of novel coronaviruses and to identify potential genetic features that might be associated with host specificity, transmission in non-bat species and virus virulence. It should be noted that there seems to be a large number of different coronaviruses present in different bat species. At least seven other novel bat coronaviruses have been discovered among bat populations in Hong Kong (Poon et al., 2005; Woo et al., 2006). As these coronaviruses are not related to the G2b-CoVs, the focus of this study, and there were no full-length genome sequences available for them, they are not included in the current comparative study.

The collection, processing and storage of bat samples, as well as the determination of the full-length genome sequence, were conducted as described previously (Li et al., 2005b). Sequence alignment was performed by using CLUSTAL_X version 1.83 (Thompson et al., 1997) and corrected manually. Phylogenetic trees based on nucleotide sequence were constructed by using the neighbour-joining (NJ) method with a bootstrap of 1000 replicates implemented in MEGA version 3.1 (Kumar et al., 2004). The mean non-synonymous substitution rate ($K_a$), synonymous substitution rate ($K_s$) and the ratio of $K_a/K_s$ for four protein-coding sequences (ORF1a, ORF1b, ORF3a and S) were calculated by K-Estimator 6 (Comeron, 1999). The Kimura two-parameter substitution model was used and other parameters were as default settings in MEGA 3.1. Fisher’s exact test of positive-selection analysis implemented in MEGA 3.1 and the CODEML program implemented in the PAML package (Yang & Swanson, 2002) were also used to detect potential positive selection for genes P1a, P1b, ORF3a and S of bat and human/civet G2b-CoV.

The full-length genomes of Rf1 and Rm1 are 29690 and 29733 nt [excluding the poly(A) tail], respectively. The genome organization and the predicted gene products of both viruses are similar to those of other characterized G2b-CoVs (Fig. 1; Table 1). However, Rf1 seems to have a unique feature that may represent an evolutionary intermediate between bat G2b-CoVs and human/civet G2b-CoVs. As shown in Fig. 1, there is an ORF3b of 154 aa (overlapping ORF3a) in the human/civet isolate that is absent from most bat G2b-CoVs. In the corresponding region in the Rf1 genome, there were two ORFs, of 113 and 32 aa. The four bat G2b-CoV genomes share a sequence identity of 88–90% among themselves. Similar sequence identity, 88–92%, exists between bat and human/civet isolates. Nucleotide variations are scattered along the whole genome, but the most variable regions were located in the genes encoding non-structural protein 3 (nsp3), S (the N-terminal S1 domain), ORF3a and ORF8. This is also true for deletion/insertion mutations in nsp3, S and ORF8. For nsp3 genes, the deletion/insertion mutations seem to be concentrated in the region encoding a unique domain originally identified by Snijder et al. (2003) that is present

![Fig. 1. Genome organization of isolates Rf1 and Rm1 and comparison with other G2b-CoV genomes. The nomenclature of genes and ORFs follows the recommendation by Spaan et al. (2005) and is similar to those used by others (Chinese SARS Molecular Epidemiology Consortium, 2004; Lau et al., 2005; Snijder et al., 2003). The genes present in all coronaviruses are shown in dark-shaded arrows and the G2b-CoV-specific ORFs in light-shaded arrows. The most variable regions are marked with hatched boxes. The drawing is not proportional for all regions of the genomes shown.](https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/.../Fig.1.png)
in SARS-CoV, but absent in other coronaviruses (Fig. 1). The sequence identity of the S genes among four bat G2b-CoVs is 89–95 %. The sequence identity drops to 76–78 % between S genes of bat G2b-CoVs and human/civet G2b-CoVs, and even lower (63–64 %) for the putative S1 domain. There are one 6 aa insertion and three deletions of various lengths in the S1 domains of bat isolates in comparison to those of the human/civet isolates (Lau et al., 2005; Li et al., 2005b). Two deletion sites (5 and 12 aa, respectively) are located in the receptor-binding domain (RBD) region, and overlap with the so-called receptor-binding motif (RBM; aa 424–494 of the Tor2 S protein), which is identified as being critical for receptor binding (Li et al., 2005a). Human G2b-CoV isolates are known to use angiotensin-converting enzyme-2 (ACE2) as the main receptor for cell entry (Li et al., 2003). It is not known whether the bat G2b-CoVs are able to use the bat ACE2 homologue as receptor or whether they use an alternative receptor molecule for cell entry, as speculated by Li et al. (2006).

Phylogenetic trees based on the full-length genome sequences and individual genes of selected human and civet G2b-CoVs and four bat G2b-CoVs are shown in Fig. 2. Depending on the sequences used, several different phylogenetic patterns were observed. When the full-length genome sequences were used, bat isolate Rp3 grouped closer to the human/civet isolates than to other bat isolates, with a high bootstrap support (Fig. 2a). Similar observations were also made for trees based on P1a and P1b gene sequences (data not shown). When the full-length S genes were analysed, all bat G2b-CoVs clustered together and were separated from human/civet isolates (Fig. 2b). A third pattern was observed for trees based on ORF3a, M, ORF6 and ORF8 sequences (the representative tree of ORF3a is shown in Fig. 2c). In these trees, the Rf1 sequence does not group with other bat isolates; instead, it sits between the bat isolates and human/civet isolates, and for ORF8, the Rf1 sequence is related much more closely to human/civet isolates than to other bat isolates. Poorly resolved trees were observed for genes E, ORF7a, ORF7b and N among four different bat isolates (a representative tree of ORF7a is shown in Fig. 2d). These incongruent phylogenetic trees seem to suggest potential recombination events among these G2b-CoVs. However, when these sequences were analysed by using a recombination-detection program (RDP2; Martin et al., 2005), we were unable to obtain conclusive evidence for any definitive recombination event (data not shown). We aim to collect more G2b-CoVs and related coronaviruses of bat to continue the search for recombination points in the G2b-CoV genomes.

Table 1. Comparison of deduced gene-product size and protein sequence identity of different G2b-CoVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene/ORF</th>
<th>Gene product size (aa)</th>
<th>Amino acid sequence identity with Tor2/SZ3 (%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tor2</td>
<td>SZ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1a</td>
<td>4382</td>
<td>4382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1b</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>2628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1)†</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2)†</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF3a</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF3b</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF3c</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF7a</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF7b</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF8a</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF8b</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF8</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF9b</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF9c</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tor2 was used for all similarity calculations with the exception of ORF8, which is absent in Tor2. The SZ3 ORF8 was used instead.
†S1, the N-terminal domain of the coronavirus S protein responsible for receptor binding; S2, the C-terminal domain responsible for membrane fusion.

NP, Not present; NA, not applicable.
The synonymous and non-synonymous substitution rates ($K_a$ and $K_s$, respectively) for genes P1a, P1b, ORF3a and S were used to estimate the selection pressure for bat and human/civet G2b-CoVs. The $K_a/K_s$ ratio of these four genes among all bat isolates and between bat and human/civet isolates is $<1$. By contrast, the $K_a/K_s$ ratios of human/civet isolates from different origins were different. For P1a and P1b, $K_a/K_s$ is $<1$ among isolates of different origins, except for P1a between civet isolate SZ3 (isolated in 2003) and human isolate Tor2 (from a human patient in the late phase of the 2002–2003 outbreak). However, the $K_a/K_s$ ratios were significantly greater than 1 for S and ORF3a sequences among civet isolates obtained from 2003 (SZ3) and 2004 (PC4-227) and human isolates from early (GD01) and late (Tor2) phases of the outbreak. These results indicate that G2b-CoVs in bats found to date have not experienced a positive-selection pressure and that these viruses have evolved independently for a relatively long time. In contrast, the human/civet isolates have undergone a strong positive selection during the transmission from animal to human (Song et al., 2005), suggesting a recent species-crossing event.

Among the five complete bat isolates sequenced so far, HKU3-1 and HKU-2 were almost identical in genome sequence, which was not unexpected considering that they were isolated from the same species ($R. sinicus$) within a small geographical location in Hong Kong (Lau et al., 2005). For that reason, we considered them to be of the same genome type. We noted that the genome sequence of Rf1 displayed a more distant evolutionary relationship to other bat isolates. Whether these different G2b-CoV genotypes from different bat species are linked to their host evolution needs further investigation when more G2b-CoVs from different bat species become available. Based on the current data, it can be hypothesized that there is a wide spectrum of genetically diverse G2b-CoVs present in their natural reservoir hosts, and viruses with a much closer evolutionary relationship to the SARS outbreak strains from civets and human may be present in different $Rhinolophus$ species or other bat species in China or neighbouring countries.
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