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Summary

Camel papillomatosis has been previously described but the genome of the suspected papillomavirus (PV) has not been identified. An outbreak of papillomatosis occurred in a dromedary farm of 55 animals in Sudan during August 2009. The disease was only present in young animals about 3-7 months old, of which 44% (11/25) were affected with lesions mainly on the lips and lower jaw. Here we report for the first time the complete genomes of *Camelus dromedarius* papillomavirus type 1 (CdPV1) and 2 (CdPV2), isolated from a cauliflower-like nodule and a round oval raised nodule, respectively. Pairwise comparisons of their L1 nucleotide sequences revealed 69.2% identity, and phylogenetic analyses suggest that these two PV-types are grouped within the genus *Deltapapillomavirus*. Both viruses were isolated from fibropapillomas, although no putative E5 proteins homologous to that of bovine papillomavirus type 1 were identified. The genetic information will be useful for evolutionary studies of the family *Papillomaviridae* as well as for the development of diagnostic methods for surveillance of the disease in dromedaries.
Introduction

The family Papillomaviridae is composed of double stranded circular DNA viruses that are widespread among vertebrates. These viruses are known to infect the epithelial tissues of reptiles, birds, and mammals, and almost all papillomaviruses are strictly specific to their natural host and do not infect even closely related species (Bernard et al., 2010; Chow et al., 2010).

Dromedaries (Camelus dromedarius), also known as Arabic or one-humped camels, are the most abundant camelids in the world, and a very important source of meat and milk in arid regions, where they also serve as working animals (Khalafalla et al., 1998). In Sudan, the current dromedary population is estimated to be 4.6 million (Sudan Ministry of Animal Resources & Fisheries, 2010) and is located in the arid and semi-arid parts of the country, where the annual rainfall is less than 350 mm. The majority of the described camel papillomatosis cases occurred in the late rainy season (July-September) coinciding with outbreaks of camel contagious ecthyma and camel pox (Khalafalla, 1998; Munz et al., 1990). Papillomatosis has also been shown in South American camelids (llama and alpaca) (Schulman et al., 2003). The first report of papillomatosis in dromedaries was published in 1990 (Munz et al., 1990), but the genetic characteristics of the suspected papillomavirus (PV) have not yet been described.

The aim of the present study is to isolate and characterize the complete genome of the dromedary papillomavirus.

Results

Papillomatosis in a herd of dromedaries

An outbreak of skin tumours occurred in a camel farm of 55 animals in Al Qutaynah locality, about 83 km south of Khartoum during August 2009. The disease occurred in
young animals about 3-7 months old, of which 44 % (11/25) were affected with warty lesions. The lesions were mainly located on the lips and lower jaw (see table 3 of supplementary material). Two types of skin lesions were identified. Only one animal demonstrated a cauliflower-like nodule (Fig. 1a), whereas the majority of animals exhibited fissured round or oval raised nodules (Fig. 1b). The lesions were dark grey, about 0.5-1 cm in length and 1-2 cm in width. Histopathological sections showed multiple papillary proliferations covered with keratinized epithelium and downgrowth of rete ridges for both types of lesions (Fig. 1c and d). There was acanthosis with karyopyknosis and cytoplasmic vacuolations in the stratum spinosum cells and hyperkeratosis in the upper layers. In addition, subepithelial fibrosis was also observed in sections from both dromedaries. No inclusions could be detected in squamous cells. Accordingly, the lesions were diagnosed as fibropapillomas.

Characterization of complete papillomavirus genomes

DNA was extracted from a cauliflower-like nodule from the lip of a male calf (Fig. 1a) and from a round oval raised nodule from the lip of another male calf (Fig. 1b). Both animals were less than eight months old. Amplicons were detected by PCR with FA-primers (FAP 59 and FAP64) (Forslund et al., 1999). Sequencing of the product (ca. 480 bp) and subsequent analysis with BLASTn revealed subgenomic fragments of two novel putative papillomaviruses related to bovine and cervid PVs. Specific primers were then designed for each PV in a back-to-back orientation. After amplification by PCR, both complete genomes were cloned.

Each of the samples contained a unique complete PV sequence (Fig. 2) and comparisons of their L1 ORF revealed they had a 69.2 % nucleotide identity to each other. The closest related papillomavirus of the first isolate was BPV1 (66.3 %), while the second
closest were BPV1 and BPV2 (both 64.6 %), justifying the naming of the genomes as *Camelus dromedarius* papillomavirus type 1 and 2 (CdPV1 and CdPV2), correspondingly (Table 1). The complete genomes of CdPV1 and CdPV2 contain 7679 bp and 7906 bp with a GC content of 45.8 % and 47.2 %, respectively.

In both genomes, seven ORFs were identified (Fig. 2). The putative E6 protein from both dromedary papillomaviruses manifested two zinc-finger domains (Barbosa *et al*., 1989), which are conserved among papillomaviruses and are present in all artiodactyl (even-toed ungulates) papillomaviruses currently known (Alberti *et al*., 2010; Erdelyi *et al*., 2008; Tomita *et al*., 2007). Similarly, there was one zinc-finger domain in the E7 proteins but no retinoblastoma tumour suppressor (pRB) binding domain (L-X-C-X-E) (Dahiya *et al*., 2000). In the E1 protein, the superfamily 3 ATP-dependent helicase domain (Iyer *et al*., 2004; Liu *et al*., 2010) was found in both viruses. The E2 proteins had the typical C-terminal DNA-binding domain and the N-terminal trans-activation domain (Hegde, 2002; Hegde *et al*., 1992).

For both CdPV1 and CdPV2, the E4 ORF did not contain a start codon. The derived E4 protein is known to be generated by RNA splicing, generating an E1^E4 fusion product with approximately five amino acids from the E1 N-terminal end (Doorbar *et al*., 1986). Based on BPV1 sequence information about donor and acceptor splicing sites (Doorbar & Myers, 1996; Yang *et al*., 1985), corresponding sites were identified in E4 for both dromedary papillomaviruses.

No obvious E5 ORF could be identified in the region between E2 and L2, although a short ORF was present in both CdPVs (Fig. 2). Additional analysis of the conceptual translation of the short ORFs revealed in both cases a hydrophobic protein of 54 and 48 aa, with grand average values of hydropathy (GRAVY) of 1.498 and 1.077 for CdPV1 and CdPV2 ORFs, respectively. In addition, transmembrane regions were predicted to
be present in the putative protein from the short ORF of both CdPV1 and CdPV2 (data not shown).

During the sequencing of CdPV1 it was observed that the L2 ORF contained a region of eleven consecutive adenines (nt 5502). This was confirmed by additional sequencing of two different clones as well as amplicons from the original DNA sample (in both orientations). Nevertheless, it must be noted that the original clone contained only ten adenines, which caused a frameshift and a consequent overlap between the L2 and L1 ORF.

In the putative L1 protein, a nuclear localization signal ubiquitous for papillomaviruses (Zhou et al., 1991) was found in both CdPVs (CdPV1: aa 481-497, CdPV2: 480-495).

Immediately downstream of the L1 ORF, a polyadenylation site (AATAAA) was identified in the CdPV1 (nt 7085) genome whereas a double polyadenylation site (AATAAATAAA) was found in the CdPV2 genome (nt 7145).

The upstream regulatory region (URR), also known as the long control region, was 622 bp for CdPV1 and 789 bp for CdPV2. The URR of CdPV1 demonstrated six E2 binding sites (E2BS) [ACC(N₆)GGT] (Androphy et al., 1987; Li et al., 1989). In the URR of CdPV2, seven E2BS were found as well as one in the 3’ region of L1. Also, two putative E1 binding sites (AACAAT) (Chen & Stenlund, 2001) were found in the URR of CdPV1, and three in that of CdPV2. The origin of replication (ori) was identified for both CdPVs, homologous to the ori from BPV1, in which an AT-rich region is in close proximity to a dyad of E1 binding sites and an E2 binding site (Ustav et al., 1993; Ustav & Stenlund, 1991; Yang & Botchan, 1990; Yang et al., 1991). In both cases, the double E1 binding site of the ori was centred in an HpaI site (CdPV1: nt 7511, CdPV2: nt 7732), similarly to BPV1 (Spalholz et al., 1993).
The phylogenetic relationships of CdPV1 and CdPV2 were established based on multiple alignments of their L1 ORFs, along with those of 71 prototype species of PVs. The phylogenetic analysis demonstrated that CdPV1 and CdPV2 were positioned on a separate branch between genera *Deltapapillomavirus* and *Epsilonpapillomavirus* (Fig. 3). Both these genera contain papillomaviruses that infect mammals of the order *Artiodactyla* (even-toed ungulates) including dromedaries, cervids, cows, bison, and sheep. CdPV1 and CdPV2 shared similar values of nucleotide identity of L1 with members of the genera *Deltapapillomavirus* and *Epsilonpapillomavirus*, with mean values of 64.0 and 62.2 % respectively (Table 1). In addition, pairwise comparisons of the L1 ORF of the PVs within these genera demonstrated nucleotide identities of more than 60 % (Table 2).

Both clones were deposited in the new International Reference Centre for Animal Papillomavirus at the American Museum of Natural History (New York, USA).

**Discussion**

Here we report for the first time the complete genomes of *Camelus dromedarius* papillomavirus types 1 and 2, tentatively classified within the genus *Deltapapillomavirus*. These are the first complete PVs characterized in species of the suborder *Tylopoda*. All other artiodactyl PVs described so far are from members of the suborder *Ruminantia*.

Both viruses were isolated from fibropapillomas, although no putative E5 proteins homologous to E5 of BPV1 were identified. The BPV1 E5 is known for its fibroblast transforming activities (Talbert-Slagle & DiMaio, 2009), and the absence of BPV1-like E5 proteins in CdPV1 and CdPV2 raises questions about alternative E5-like proteins and their possible role in fibroblast transformation. Hitherto, all PVs within the genera
*Deltapillomavirus* and *Epsilonpapillomavirus* have been described as harbouring E5 or at least a hydrophobic putative protein between the E2-L2 region (Bravo & Alonso, 2004; Erdelyi *et al.*, 2008; Tomita *et al.*, 2007). Since we identified short ORFs between early and late genes that might represent E5-like proteins it would be interesting to express these proteins and analyze their fibroblast transforming capability.

The primary target of the papillomavirus E7 protein is the retinoblastoma family proteins (pRb), whose inactivation is important for the differentiation-dependent productive viral lifecycle and for tumour progression (Moody & Laimins, 2010). However, none of the E7 proteins of CdPV1 or CdPV2 demonstrated the defined pRb binding domain, as was also the case with the E7 proteins of the delta- and epsilonpapillomaviruses (Erdelyi *et al.*, 2008; Narechania *et al.*, 2004; Tomita *et al.*, 2007). The lack of the pRB binding domain in E7 proteins of PVs within these genera has been suggested to be a marker for the development of fibropapillomas, which may not be a characteristic that is only attributable to E5 (Narechania *et al.*, 2004).

The L1 ORF is the most conserved region in the papillomavirus, and has been used successfully for phylogeny and taxonomy (Bernard, 2005; Bernard *et al.*, 2010). We grouped CdPV1 and 2 within the deltapapillomaviruses due to a combination of facts, namely that their average L1-nucleotide identity was highest to PVs in that genus (Table 1) and that their position in the phylogenetic tree was slightly closer to the deltapapillomavirus than to the epsilonpapillomavirus (Fig. 3). According to the current classification system, PVs of a genus share more than 60 % nucleotide identity in the L1 ORF (Bernard *et al.*, 2010; de Villiers *et al.*, 2004). In the present study, the pairwise nucleotide comparisons of the members of the epsilon and deltapapillomaviruses showed values above the range of 60 % (Table 2), indicating that all these PVs can be lumped into one genus. Due to the relatively close distance
between these genera it has also been suggested that the delta- and epsilonpapillomaviruses should be classified within one genus if using an alternative classification system based on the E1–E2 ORFs (Bravo & Alonso, 2007) as well as a system of amino acid sequences of compiled ORFs (E6-E7-E2-E1-L2-L1) (Narechania et al., 2004). Furthermore, the International Committee for the Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV) recommends inclusion of both genotypic and phenotypic information in the definition of viral genera and species, i.e. information on the ecological niche and the relational properties of viral and host components (Bernard et al., 2010; van Regenmortel, 2000). Concerning the delta- and epsilonpapillomaviruses, they manifest L1 ORF nucleotide identities higher than the percentage-border of a genus, but also exclusively infect ungulates, and are the etiological agents of fibropapillomas. Thus, the available data of nucleotide similarity and tropism of these PVs strongly suggest that it might be worth considering merging these two genera into one genus, tentatively labelled as delta-epsilonpapillomavirus, with the inclusion of the dromedary papillomaviruses.

A recent report showed a corneal papilloma from an adult camel (15 years), in which BPV1 was suggested as the possible cause of the disease (Kilic et al., 2010). In that study, the presence of a virus was shown by immunohistochemistry using an antibody to BPV1. The viral antigen was observed in keratinocytes as well as in fibrocytes. Speculatively, the corneal papilloma may have contained CdPV that cross-reacted with the BPV1-antibodies, which is supported by our observation of the relatively close relationships between the CdPVs and BPV1. Furthermore, five fibropapillomas from llamas and alpacas have been reported (Schulman et al., 2003). From one of these lesions an amplicon (ca. 160 bp) was sequenced that was most closely related to BPV1 (73 %). The corresponding identities to CdPV1 and CdPV2 were 76 % and 72 %,
respectively (data not shown), indicating that additional PV types within the genus Delta exist.

An interesting feature of the outbreak in our study was that only young animals (<8 months old) were affected. This is in agreement with the survey of camel papillomatosis carried out between 1992 and 1994 in eastern Sudan by Khalafalla et al. (1998). That work revealed a 3.3 % morbidity rate predominantly in young animals 3-14 months of age. This suggests that the immune system of adults is capable of controlling these papillomaviruses and that CdPV1 and 2 are immunogenic. Nevertheless, in the present study the cumulative incidence was about 20 % for the herd and 44 % for the young animals. The higher morbidity observed here could be due to differences in the number of young animals studied or the time of the year in which the animals were examined, since not only papillomatosis, but also camel contagious eczema and camel pox have been associated with the rainy season (Khalafalla, 1998). Also, the time point for examination of animals could influence the prevalence of papillomatosis since it has been reported that within three weeks virtually all young animals in a herd are infected (Munz et al., 1990). Even though papillomatosis is a mild disease in dromedaries, and recurrence has not been reported, the high morbidity shown in this and previous studies highlights the importance of understanding the viral genomic sequences for surveillance of the disease, as new outbreaks with a higher severity might occur.

A limitation of the study was that only two samples were taken from the herd. This was done in order to reduce stress to the animals. As a consequence, the question remains of whether the characterized viruses were also present in lesions from other animals in the herd. It is noteworthy that two different PVs were identified from the only two lesions analyzed, and they were distant enough to be considered as two different species. It is likely that a wide diversity of PVs exists in dromedaries since several PVs have been
described in other animal species. For example, 10 PV types have been identified in
domestic cows and about 120 HPVs are characterized (Bernard et al., 2010). Moreover,
the diversity seems to be even broader as about 130 putative types have also been
observed on the human skin (Forslund, 2007).
In conclusion, we showed for the first time the genomic characteristics of
papillomaviruses infecting a camelid. The genetic information will be useful for
evolutionary studies of the family Papillomaviridae as well as for the development of
diagnostic methods for surveillance of the disease in camels.
Materials and methods

Sample collection
All animals in the farm (n = 55) were restrained and the skin all over the body was inspected for abnormal lesions. Animals with skin lesions were identified, and the lesions were described and photographed.
Whole biopsies from affected animals were excised surgically (lidocaine 2 % was used as a local anaesthetic) and fixed in 10 % neutral buffered formalin. Samples for DNA extraction were preserved in 50 % buffered glycerol.

Histopathology
Samples for histopathology were trimmed, serially dehydrated, paraffin embedded, sectioned at 5 µm and stained with hematoxylin and eosin.

DNA extraction, cloning and sequencing
DNA was extracted from two biopsies of about 3 mm diameter, by incubation overnight at 37°C, with 400 µl `lysis buffer' (10 mM Tris-HCl, 10 mM NaCl, 10 mM EDTA, pH 7.8) with 4 % SDS and proteinase K (200 µg/ml) (Boehringer Mannheim), and then 200 µl was processed through the automated MagNA Pure LC using the Total Nucleic acid kit (Roche) and eluted in 100 µl. From a dilution 1:10, 5 µl was used for amplification of the papillomavirus genome by PCR using FA-primers targeting the L1 ORF (Forslund et al., 1999). These PCR products were sequenced and used to design primers with Oligo 7 software (Molecular Biology Insights, USA) that were used to amplify the complete genomes with Expand Long Template PCR kit (Roche). The reaction was prompted in buffer 2 according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The following primers were used: CdPV1 FAP F (CTACCTGCCGGATCATGTCCA), CdPV1 FAP R
Forty-four cycles of PCR were performed with the following conditions: 2 min at 94 ºC; 10 cycles of 10 sec at 94 ºC, 30 sec at 68 ºC with a decrease of 0.5 ºC per cycle and 6 min at 68 ºC; 10 cycles of 10 sec at 94 ºC, 30 sec at 59 ºC and 6 min at 68 ºC; 24 cycles of 15 sec at 94 ºC, 30 sec at 57 ºC and 6 min at 68 ºC with an increase of 10 sec per cycle; and finally 10 min at 68 ºC. PCR products were visualized by 0.6 % agarose gel electrophoresis, and the bands of about 8 kb were excised from the gel without UV irradiation (the position of the bands was assessed with an aliquot run in a parallel lane). The product was further purified with QIAquick Gel Extraction Kit (QIAGEN) and cloned using TOPO-TA cloning kit (Invitrogen), according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Transformed bacteria were identified by colony PCR with FAP59 and M13 (-29 and -43) primers. The plasmids were purified with QIAprep Spin Miniprep kit (QIAGEN) and sequenced by primer walking (ABI 3730XL, MWG, Germany).

Bioinformatic analysis
Sequence handling, including pattern searches (Smith-Waterman algorithm) to identify common papillomavirus features as well as annotation of the viral genome for GenBank were carried out using the UGENE software v1.8.0 (http://genome.unipro.ru). Putative proteins from ORFs were generated by UGENE and they were then searched for similarities with other proteins using BLASTp (http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Proteins were analyzed for unique domains with ScanProsite (http://www.expasy.ch/prosite) and SMART (Letunic et al., 2009), including searches in the Pfam database (http://pfam.sanger.ac.se/search) (Finn et al., 2010). Hydrophobicity profiles were
calculated with the online tool ProtScale (Gasteiger et al., 2005) (http://expasy.org/cgi-bin/protscale.pl), using the Kyte & Doolittle scale (Kyte & Doolittle, 1982) and a window size of 13 aa. Transmembrane segments were predicted with the TMHMM algorithm on the HUSAR server (http://genome.dkfz-heidelberg.de). The grand average of hydropathy (GRAVY), defined by the sum of hydropathy values of all amino acids divided by the protein length, was calculated with the GRAVY Calculator (http://www.gravy-calculator.de). Pairwise identity values from nucleotides and proteins were calculated using the MatGAT program (Campanella et al., 2003).

Phylogenetic inference

L1 nucleotide sequences (including stop codons) of CdPV1, CdPV2 and of 71 PV types, each representing the prototype for each species according to ICTV (Bernard et al., 2010; Fauquet et al., 2005), and recently reported genomes were used for phylogenetic analysis (see supplementary table 4 for a list of accession numbers).

A multiple alignment was made using Muscle version 3.8 (Edgar, 2004) plug-in from the UGENE package. With the software jModelTest (Guindon & Gascuel, 2003; Posada, 2008), we examined 88 models of nucleotide substitution for our data. Setting the Akaike Information Criterion, jModelTest selected the General Time Reversible as the best-fitting model, with a rate variation showing a gamma distribution and a proportion of invariant sites (GTR+\Gamma+I). We made a Bayesian phylogenetic inference with MrBayes 3.2 (Ronquist & Huelsenbeck, 2003) using the GTR+\Gamma+I model (settings: nst = 6 nucmodel = 4by4 rates = invgamma). Six independent analyses, each with four Markov chains (one cold), were run for 10 000 000 generations, sampling every 100 generations. Prior to termination of the run, we analyzed the posterior sample of trees using the diagnostic software AWTY (Nylander et al., 2008). Parameters were
also checked for acceptable mixing and convergence to the stationary distribution with the program Tracer 1.5 (Rambaut & Drummond, 2009).

Trees generated before the stabilization of the likelihood scores were discarded (25 % burn in). We used all six runs to generate a consensus tree with clade-credibility values (posterior probabilities) and branch lengths and used the program FigTree 1.3.1 (Rambaut, 2009) to make a graphical representation.
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Figure 1

Papillomatosis in dromedary calves. (a) Young dromedary showing cauliflower–like papillomas in the muzzle. (b) Calf showing multiple round nodules in the upper lip. (c) Histopathological section (×100) showing hyperkeratosis, A; acanthosis, H and dermal fibrosis, F. (d) Histopathological section (×100) showing multiple papillary proliferations. Note hyperkeratosis (white arrow) and hydropic degeneration in keratinocytes (black arrow). Panels a and c refer to the sample from which CdPV1 was isolated, and panels b and d to the one for CdPV2.
Figure 2

Genomic organization of CdPV1 and CdPV2. The three main regions of the genome are depicted below the ruler. Numbers below each ORF (white boxes) indicate nucleotide position from start to stop codon and the molecular mass for the corresponding putative protein. The E4 ORF does not contain a start codon (ATG), but an ATG is probably added by splicing of E4 mRNA to E1-mRNA generating an E4 protein which starts with five amino acids from E1 (E1^E4). Putative binding sites for viral proteins and cellular factors are shown as follows: E2 binding site, E2BS (▼); E1 binding site, E1BS (▲); TATA-box (■); Polyadenylation signal (●). The position of primers used for amplification of the genome and further cloning are indicated with half arrows.
Figure 3

Bayesian phylogenetic tree inferred from the L1 nucleotide sequence of CdPV1 and CdPV2, and of 71 representative papillomaviruses. Acronyms are according to Bernard et al. (2010) and genera (Fauquet et al., 2005) indicated in bold. CdPV1 and CdPV2 are located in a separate branch between delta- and epsilonpapillomaviruses. Numbers on nodes are the supporting posterior probability of the split. Branch lengths are displayed to scale according to the bar (0.2 substitutions per site). * Genus suggested by the authors of the paper describing the virus and not yet officially recognized by the ICTV.

** Dyoepsilon. CcaPV, Capreolus capreolus papillomavirus; CcPV, Caretta caretta papillomavirus; ChPV, Capra hircus papillomavirus; CPV, Canis familiaris papillomavirus; EcPV, Equus caballus papillomavirus; EdPV, Erethizon dorsatum
papillomavirus; EePV, *Erinaceus europaeus* papillomavirus; FcPV, *Fringilla coelebs* papillomavirus; FdPV, *Felis domesticus* papillomavirus; FlPV, *Francolinus leucoscepus* papillomavirus; HPV, human papillomavirus; MaPV, *Mesocricetus auratus* papillomavirus; MfPV, *Macaca fascicularis* papillomavirus; MmiPV, *Micromys minutus* papillomavirus 1; MmPV, *Macaca mulata* papillomavirus; MNPV, *Mastomys natalensis* papillomavirus; OcPV, *Oryctolagus cuniculus* papillomavirus; PePV, *Psittacus erithacus* papillomavirus; PlPV, *Procyon lotor* papillomavirus; PsPV, *Phocoena spinipinnis* papillomavirus; RaPV, *Rousettus aegyptiacus* papillomavirus; SfPV, *Sylvilagus floridanus* papillomavirus; TmPV, *Trichechus manatus latirostris* papillomavirus; TtPV, *Tursiops truncatus* papillomavirus; UmPV, *Ursus maritimus* papillomavirus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus*</th>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Accession No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CdPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>52.6 (39.8)</td>
<td>56.9 (47.2)</td>
<td>66.3 (62.4)</td>
<td>62.1 (51.6)</td>
<td>52.2 (45.3)</td>
<td>58.7 (50.5)</td>
<td>69.2 (72.8)</td>
<td>HQ912791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>53.9 (39.1)</td>
<td>49.0 (30.8)</td>
<td>60.0 (52.0)</td>
<td>44.6 (32.3)</td>
<td>49.9 (25.2)</td>
<td>52.7 (38.4)</td>
<td>66.3 (65.0)</td>
<td>NC_001522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPV2</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>51.8 (38.4)</td>
<td>48.9 (31.6)</td>
<td>59.3 (51.8)</td>
<td>54.4 (40.6)</td>
<td>46.8 (32.4)</td>
<td>51.3 (37.9)</td>
<td>65.5 (64.6)</td>
<td>M20219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CcaPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>52.8 (42.0)</td>
<td>47.8 (33.3)</td>
<td>59.8 (52.3)</td>
<td>55.4 (43.3)</td>
<td>43.9 (29.0)</td>
<td>53.9 (38.8)</td>
<td>65.3 (65.6)</td>
<td>EF680235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RpPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>51.4 (38.6)</td>
<td>49.2 (29.8)</td>
<td>60.0 (50.7)</td>
<td>53.2 (43.8)</td>
<td>48.5 (27.3)</td>
<td>53.1 (39.4)</td>
<td>64.1 (64.9)</td>
<td>AF443292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AaPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>51.3 (38.1)</td>
<td>51.1 (34.4)</td>
<td>59.8 (52.4)</td>
<td>54.2 (39.1)</td>
<td>43.8 (29.4)</td>
<td>51.9 (38.6)</td>
<td>64.5 (64.7)</td>
<td>NC_001524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OvPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>53.4 (41.3)</td>
<td>49.6 (29.4)</td>
<td>60.5 (50.8)</td>
<td>53.7 (41.2)</td>
<td>47.3 (27.1)</td>
<td>53.2 (37.3)</td>
<td>62.7 (59.3)</td>
<td>NC_001523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OaPV1</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>50.3 (40.0)</td>
<td>47.7 (31.5)</td>
<td>59.0 (52.0)</td>
<td>52.8 (42.5)</td>
<td>48.4 (31.2)</td>
<td>48.6 (31.3)</td>
<td>63.2 (62.9)</td>
<td>NC_001789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OaPV2</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>49.7 (40.0)</td>
<td>47.2 (31.7)</td>
<td>59.2 (51.4)</td>
<td>54.7 (45.4)</td>
<td>48.1 (33.3)</td>
<td>52.2 (36.1)</td>
<td>65.2 (64.9)</td>
<td>U83595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPV5</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>52.4 (38.7)</td>
<td>48.5 (29.9)</td>
<td>57.3 (48.6)</td>
<td>52.6 (37.3)</td>
<td>48.3 (24.3)</td>
<td>54.1 (38.8)</td>
<td>62.2 (59.6)</td>
<td>NC_004195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPV8</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>50.7 (38.5)</td>
<td>49.1 (30.4)</td>
<td>58.2 (48.1)</td>
<td>53.4 (40.6)</td>
<td>48.6 (24.3)</td>
<td>53.5 (40.7)</td>
<td>62.1 (60.6)</td>
<td>NC_009752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CcaPV1, Capreolus capreolus papillomavirus 1; RpPV1, Rangifer tarandus papillomavirus 1 [Reindeer papillomavirus (RPV)]; AaPV1, Alces alces papillomavirus 1 [European elk papillomavirus (EEPV)]; OvPV1, Odocoileus virginianus papillomavirus 1 [deer papillomavirus (DPV)]; OaPV, Ovis aries papillomavirus.
Table 2

Pairwise nucleotide identities of L1 ORF between all members of the *Delta*- and *Epsilonpapillomavirus* genera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>CdPV2</th>
<th>OvPV1</th>
<th>BPV1</th>
<th>BPV2</th>
<th>BPV5</th>
<th>BPV8</th>
<th>AaPV1</th>
<th>OaPV2</th>
<th>OaPV1</th>
<th>RtPV1</th>
<th>CcaPV1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Camelus dromedarius</td>
<td>CdPV1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Camelus dromedarius</td>
<td>CdPV2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
<td>OvPV1 (DPV)</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>BPV1</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>BPV2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>BPV5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>BPV8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Alces alces</td>
<td>AaPV1 (EEPV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>OaPV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>OaPV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Rangifer tarandus</td>
<td>RtPV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>