



Published in final edited form as:

Arch Virol. 2014 May ; 159(5): 1229–1237. doi:10.1007/s00705-013-1877-2.

Virus nomenclature below the species level: a standardized nomenclature for filovirus strains and variants rescued from cDNA

A full list of authors and affiliations appears at the end of the article.

Abstract

Specific alterations (mutations, deletions, insertions) of virus genomes are crucial for the functional characterization of their regulatory elements and their expression products, as well as a prerequisite for the creation of attenuated viruses that could serve as vaccine candidates. Virus genome tailoring can be performed either by using traditionally cloned genomes as starting materials, followed by site-directed mutagenesis, or by *de novo* synthesis of modified virus genomes or parts thereof. A systematic nomenclature for such recombinant viruses is necessary to set them apart from wild-type and laboratory-adapted viruses, and to improve communication and collaborations among researchers who may want to use recombinant viruses or create novel viruses based on them. A large group of filovirus experts has recently proposed nomenclatures for natural and laboratory animal-adapted filoviruses that aim to simplify the retrieval of sequence data from electronic databases. Here, this work is extended to include nomenclature for filoviruses obtained in the laboratory via reverse genetics systems. The previously developed template for natural filovirus genetic variant naming, <virus name> (<strain>)/<isolation host-suffix>/<country of sampling>/<year of sampling>/<genetic variant designation>-<isolate designation>, is retained, but we propose to adapt the type of information added to each field for cDNA clone-derived filoviruses. For instance, the full-length designation of an Ebola virus Kikwit variant rescued from a plasmid developed at the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention could be akin to “Ebola virus H.sapiens-rec/COD/1995/Kikwit-abc1” (with the suffix “rec” identifying the recombinant nature of the virus and “abc1” being a placeholder for any meaningful isolate designator). Such a full-length designation should be used in databases and the methods section of publications. Shortened designations (such as “EBOVH.sap/COD/95/Kik-abc1”) and abbreviations (such as “EBOV/Kik-abc1”) could be used in the remainder of the text, depending on how critical it is to convey information contained in the full-length name. “EBOV” would suffice if only one EBOV strain/variant/isolate is addressed.

[†]Corresponding authors: JHK: Integrated Research Facility at Fort Detrick (IRF-Frederick), Division of Clinical Research (DCR), National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), National Institutes of Health (NIH), B-8200 Research Plaza, Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702, USA; Phone: +1-301-631-7245; Fax: +1-301-619-5029; kuhnjens@mail.nih.gov; STN: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Division of High-Consequence Pathogens Pathology (DHCPP), Viral Special Pathogens Branch (VSPB), 1600 Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA 30333, USA; Phone: +1-404-639-1122; stn1@cdc.gov.

[#]Members of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV) *Filoviridae* Study Group

Disclaimer: The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of the Army, the US Department of Defense or the US Department of Health and Human Services or of the institutions and companies affiliated with the authors.

Keywords

cDNA clone; cuevavirus; Ebola; Ebola virus; ebolavirus; filovirid; *Filoviridae*; filovirus; genome annotation; ICTV; International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses; Lloviu virus; Marburg virus; marburgvirus; mononegavirad; *Mononegavirales*; mononegavirus; reverse genetics; virus classification; virus isolate; virus nomenclature; virus strain; virus taxonomy; virus variant

Filovirus reverse genetics

Filoviruses are characterized by having linear, nonsegmented, single-stranded RNA genomes of negative polarity. The current filoviruses taxonomy is summarized in Table 1 [1, 16, 17].

Seven groups have reported the establishment of filovirus reverse genetics systems in their laboratories [11] to rescue viruses directly related to wild-type or laboratory-adapted Ebola virus (EBOV) variant Mayinga [12, 27, 33, 34], wild-type Marburg virus (MARV) variant Musoke [5, 15], and Reston virus (RESTV) variant Pennsylvania [8]. A filovirus reverse genetics system was first described in 2001 by Volchkov *et al.* [34]. Subsequently, the established EBOV cDNA clone was mutated to evaluate the role of co-transcriptional editing in EBOV replication [34, 35]; particular phosphorylation sites of filoviral protein VP30 in transcription re-initiation/replication [21, 22]; viral protein VP35 in EBOV guinea pig adaptation [29]; and viral protein VP24 in nucleocapsid assembly [23] and EBOV rodent adaptation [24]. In addition, the established EBOV cDNA clone was used to create an enhanced green fluorescent protein (eGFP)-expressing reporter virus [21].

In 2002, Neumann *et al.* established a similar reverse genetics system, demonstrating that EBOV could be rescued from plasmids encoding the EBOV genome or antigenome [27]. Neumann's antigenomic system was then used to evaluate the importance of furin cleavage of the EBOV surface spike glycoprotein GP_{1,2} on replication [27], the role of late-budding motifs located in viral protein VP40 in filovirus egress [28], the difference between wild-type and mouse-adapted EBOV [3], and the possibility of rescuing recombinant viruses using heterotypic support proteins [32]. Finally, a reporter gene (*eGFP*) was inserted into the EBOV genome for better tracking of infection [4].

In 2005, Towner *et al.* published the expression of an additional transcription unit from a full-length EBOV genome [33]. Towner *et al.* created an eGFP-expressing EBOV [33] and evaluated the role of several conserved GP_{1,2} amino acid residues in EBOV cell entry [26] and of an interferon-response-inhibiting domain of VP35 [9, 10]. In 2012, Hoenen *et al.* created a recombinant EBOV to study the intracellular localization of its viral polymerase L tagged with mCherry [12], to study the modulation of gene translation and virus replication by untranslated genomic regions [31], and to create a luciferase-expressing EBOV [13]. The eGFP-expressing EBOV full-length clone generated by Towner *et al.* was also used for evaluation of introduced point mutations into the various filovirus proteins [20].

The first MARV reverse genetics system was published in 2006 by Enterlein *et al.* [5]. Thus far, this system has been used to demonstrate that VP30 is required for MARV rescue [5], to characterize the MARV replication promoter [6], and to create an eGFP-expressing variant

for drug screening purposes [30]. Krähling *et al.* and Mittler *et al.* followed a similar approach for the screening of various cell types as model systems to investigate MARV infections *in vitro* [15] and to evaluate functions of the MARV GP_{1,2} cytoplasmic tail in the viral life cycle [25].

Finally, Groseth *et al.* described a RESTV reverse genetics system in 2012 and created EBOV/RESTV chimeras to assess the role of GP_{1,2} in virulence differences observed between the two viruses [8].

Systematic nomenclature for recombinant filoviruses

A large group of filovirus experts has recently established definitions and a consistent nomenclature for natural and laboratory-animal-adapted filovirus strains, variants, and isolates [18, 19]. This group also established templates for naming individual filovirus strains, variants, and isolates for a) Materials and Methods sections of manuscripts (full-length designations), b) alignment and phylogram figures (shortened designations), and c) flow-text (abbreviations) [18, 19]. These templates are generally organized in the order <virus name> (<strain>)/<isolation host-suffix>/<country of sampling>/<year of sampling>/<genetic variant designation>-<isolate designation>. Suffixes point out whether a virus has been directly sequenced from a clinical specimen (“-wt”), has undergone tissue/cell culture passaging (“-tc”), is known from sequence fragments only (“-frag”) or has been lost (“-hist”) [19]. The suffix “-lab” is to be used when a filovirus was adapted in the laboratory to cells or animals it would not normally infect [18]. Accordingly, the double suffix “hist_lab” ought to be used if a filovirus was adapted to a non-natural host but is not available for study anymore.

Here, we propose extending this nomenclature to recombinant filoviruses experimentally derived from cDNA:

Definition of “recombinant filovirus”:

A recombinant filovirus is any filovirus that has been rescued from a cDNA encoding its entire genome, i.e., any filovirus that is not derived directly from an ancestor virion infecting a cell, and any filovirus that ultimately evolved or is derived from a filovirus rescued from cDNA. The genome of a recombinant filovirus may be identical to that of a natural or laboratory animal-adapted filovirus, or it may contain artificially introduced mutations, insertions, deletions, or rearrangements not due to the evolution of the virus population in natural or laboratory organisms or derived tissue cultures. Virion-like particles (VLPs) that do not contain all filovirus elements known to be necessary to establish a self-sufficient infectious system (e.g., particles derived from filovirus “minigenomes” or filovirus genomes lacking individual vital genes) are not considered recombinant filoviruses.

Definition of “recombinant filovirus strain”:

A recombinant filovirus strain is a genetically stable recombinant filovirus variant that causes a significantly different phenotype of infection compared to a wild-type

or laboratory-adapted standard virus. The extent of genomic sequence variation is irrelevant for the classification of a variant as a strain.

Definition of “recombinant filovirus variant”:

A recombinant filovirus variant is a recombinant filovirus that differs in its genomic sequence from that of wild-type or laboratory-adapted standard by 10% (in its aligning parts) and does not necessarily cause a different phenotype of infection. All recombinant filovirus strains are recombinant filovirus variants, but most recombinant filovirus variants are not recombinant filovirus strains.

Definition of “recombinant filovirus isolate”:

A recombinant filovirus isolate is an instance of a particular recombinant filovirus strain or variant. Isolates can be identical or slightly different in sequence from each other. Both identical and slightly different isolates may represent a particular recombinant filovirus strain or variant.

Problems of and solutions for naming cDNA-clone-derived filoviruses

We propose to designate recombinant filovirus laboratory strains/variants/isolates according to the templates that were designed for natural filovirus and filovirus laboratory-animal-adapted strains/variants/isolates [18, 19]. Two opposing scenarios for filoviruses rescued from cDNA can be imagined, and both would have to be accommodated by a nomenclature system.

Naming of rescued versions of wild-type filoviruses and close derivatives

At one end of the spectrum lies a virus genome that has been assembled by cloning sequence fragments from a replicating wild-type or laboratory-adapted filovirus. The genome-encoding plasmid contains a sequence identical to the wild-type or laboratory animal-adapted consensus filovirus sequence and is available from GenBank. For instance, the virus to be cloned could be:

full: Ebola virus H.sapiens-tc/COD/1995/Kikwit-9510621
 shortened: EBOV/Hsap/COD/95/Kik-9510621
 abbreviated: EBOV/Kik-9510621 [18].

The virus rescued from the plasmid created based on this parental virus may have a genomic sequence identical to that encoded by the plasmid or may contain a limited number of mutations. The name for this recombinant virus should ideally reflect its derivation, while at the same time clarifying that it is a recombinant virus. We therefore recommend such a virus to be called

full: Ebola virus H.sapiens-rec/COD/1995/Kikwit-*isolate name*
 shortened: EBOV/Hsap/COD/95/Kik-*isolate name*
 abbreviated: EBOV/Kik-*isolate name*.

The suffix “-rec” points towards the cDNA-cloned (recombinant) nature of the virus. The variant designation “Kikwit” implies that the rescued virus falls into the overall class of Kikwit isolates (i.e., the Kikwit variant), and a unique isolate name separates the new virus

from already known isolates. The isolate name should be chosen by the team of researchers creating it. As explained previously, the <strain> field should remain empty except if the rescued virus fulfills the previously outlined criteria for a “strain” [18, 19]. We further advise that the full or near-complete sequence of the rescued virus be deposited in the GenBank database and, ideally, that the sequence is associated with a peer-reviewed publication. The “/Notes” field of the GenBank entry should be filled with information about the clone (for instance: “derived from GenBank #AF_1234.2” or specific mutations, deletions or insertions characteristic for the virus). Importantly, the isolate name should be short and succinct. The isolate name does not necessarily have to convey meaning, although, of course, it is preferable if it does.

Naming of rescued versions of complex mosaic or chimeric filoviruses

At the other end of the spectrum lies a (hypothetical) virus genome that has very little resemblance to any archived filovirus sequence. For instance, the rescued virus could be a mouse-adapted mosaic of two MARV, three EBOV, and two Lloviu (LLOV) genes; have two of those genes codon-optimized for expression in bat cells. This virus could contain one additional gene cassette expressing eGFP and with the mCherry open reading frame fused to VP40. All untranslated regions could be standardized to the same sequence, and two gene overlaps could have been resolved. The cDNA encoding the genome of this virus could have been assembled entirely from synthetic oligonucleotides.

It is important to keep such a mosaic virus in mind, as any nomenclature system should work prospectively, and filovirus cDNA clones will certainly become more complex with time. Less-complex filovirus genome mosaics have already been created to elucidate the mechanism behind EBOV adaptation to mice [3] or to find an answer to the question why RESTV does not seem to be virulent for humans [8]. Very complex mosaic and chimeric viruses have been created for other viruses (e.g., HIV-1) and are indicators for possible future developments in filovirology.

Three major problems arise in designating a mosaic virus. First, since such a virus is completely artificial, a parental (wild-type or laboratory-adapted) virus is not necessarily obvious. Consequently, variant and isolate names need to be chosen by the research team that created the virus. Second, because there is no parental virus, the “isolation host” field cannot contain an organism name. We therefore propose to fill this field with information about the cell type from which the virus was rescued. Third, depending on the complexity of the virus, it may not even be apparent whether the rescued entity is a Marburg virus, an Ebola virus or a Lloviu virus, or even whether it is a marburgvirus or an ebolavirus (note that the ICTV does not permit actual classification of recombinant viruses). To solve this problem, we propose to use the actual sequence cutoffs for the various filovirus taxa outlined in ref. 16 to determine which term should be used for the “virus name” field. For instance, if

- the new virus was rescued at USAMRIID in the USA in 2012 from Vero E6 cells,
- the genome of the virus fulfills the criteria of being a filovirus but differs from the type viruses of the type species of the three filovirus genera by 50%,

- and assuming that the rescued virus, because of its extensive modification, fulfills the criteria for being a filovirus “strain” [18, 19],

then the name of this virus could be

full: filovirus USAMRIID/Vero_E6-rec/USA/2012/Weirdo-abc2
shortened: filovirus/USAMRIID/Vero_E6/USA/12/Weirdo-abc2
abbreviated: filovirus/Wei-abc2

with “Weirdo” and “abc2” being the variant and isolate names chosen by the researchers who synthesized the genome and rescued the virus. Alternatively, if

- the new virus was rescued at DSTL in the UK in 2013 from HeLa cells,
- if the genome of the virus fulfills the criteria of being a filovirus but differs from the type virus of the type species of the genus *Marburgvirus* (Marburg virus) by <50% but >30%,
- and assuming that the rescued virus does not fulfill the criteria for being a filovirus “strain” [18, 19],

then the name of this virus could be

full: marburgvirus HeLa-rec/GBR/2013/Strange-abc3
shortened: marburgvirus/HeLa/GBR/13/Strange-abc3
abbreviated: marburgvirus/Strange-abc3

Proposed designations of recombinant filoviruses

Full-length designation

<virus name> (<strain>)/<isolation host-suffix>/<country of sampling>/<year of sampling>/<genetic variant designation>-<isolate designation>

- the **virus name** should be given in full, as outlined recently [16, 17]. For instance: “Marburg virus,” “Ebola virus,” “Sudan virus”. Depending on sequence divergence, the virus name could also be “ebolavirus”, “marburgvirus”, “cuevavirus” or “filovirus”
- the **strain** field should contain the abbreviation of the institute at which the strain was developed (for institute designations, see ref. 18). The field should remain empty if the virus in question does not fulfill the previously outlined criteria for a filovirus “strain” [18, 19]
- the **isolation host** should be provided in one word in the format “First letter of genus name.full name of species descriptor” of the host, but remain unitalicized to denote the fact that the virus was isolated from an entity and not from a taxon [2]. For instance: “H.sapiens” (member of the species *Homo sapiens*). Laboratory mice and some other laboratory animals cannot be assigned to a species. Consequently, this field should be filled with the official strain designation of the animal used for the experiments – in the case of laboratory mice and laboratory rats in accordance with the most recent “Guidelines for Nomenclature of Mouse and Rat Strains”, e.g.

“C57BL/6” or “BALB/c” [14]. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should contain the name of the cell line from which the virus was rescued. For instance: “Vero_E6” or “HEK_293T” (spaces replaced with “_”)

- the **country of sampling** field should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should pertain to the country in which the virus was created
- the **year of sampling** field should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should pertain to the year in which the virus was created
- the **genetic variant designation-isolate designation** field should contain the same information as provided in the same field for the natural (wild-type) virus, connected by a hyphen to an isolate descriptor. The isolate descriptor should be unique to separate the new virus from already known isolates. For instance: “Kikwit-abc1”. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, a unique variant name should be chosen. For instance, “Weirdo”

Examples for full-length designations of isolates in the methods sections of manuscripts:

“Ebola virus H.sapiens-rec/COD/1995/Kikwit-abc1” or “filovirus USAMRIID/Vero_E6-rec/USA/2012/Weirdo-abc2”.

Shortened designation

<virus name abbreviation> (<strain>)<isolation host-suffix>/<country of sampling>/<year of sampling>/<genetic variant designation>-<isolate designation>

- the **virus name abbreviation** should be accepted by the ICTV *Filoviridae* Study Group, as outlined recently [16, 17]. For instance: “MARV,” “EBOV,” “SUDV”. Depending on sequence divergence, the virus name could also be “ebolavirus”, “marburgvirus”, “cuevavirus” or “filovirus” (no abbreviations)
- the **strain** field should contain the abbreviation of the institute at which the strain was developed (for institute designations see ref. 18). The field should remain empty if the virus in question does not fulfill the previously outlined criteria for a filovirus “strain” [18, 19]
- the **isolation host** should be provided in a four-letter format “First letter of genus name.first three letters of species descriptor” of the laboratory host. For instance: “C.por” (member of the species *Cavia porcellus*). Laboratory mice and some other laboratory animals cannot be assigned to a species. Consequently, this field should be filled with the official strain designation abbreviation of the animal used for the experiments – in the case of laboratory mice and laboratory rats in accordance with the most recent “Guidelines for Nomenclature of Mouse and Rat Strains”. For instance, “B6” for C57BL/6 mouse strains or “C” for “BALB/c” mouse strains [14]. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should contain the name of the cell line from which the virus was rescued. For instance: “Vero_E6” or “HEK_293T” (spaces replaced with “_”)

- the **country of sampling** field should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should indicate the country in which the virus was created
- the **year of sampling** field should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, the field should indicate the year in which the virus was created
- the **genetic variant designation-isolate designation** should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus, connected by a hyphen to an isolate abbreviation, e.g., “Kik-abc1”. The isolate descriptor should be unique to separate the new virus from already known isolates. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, an abbreviation of the unique variant name should be chosen. For instance “Wei”

Examples for the shortened designations of isolates in the methods sections of manuscripts:

“EBOV H.sap/COD/95/Kik-abc1” or “filovirus/USAMRIID/Vero_E6/USA/12/Weirdo-abc2”.

Abbreviation

<virus abbreviation>/<genetic variant designation-isolate designation>

- the **virus abbreviation** should be one accepted by the ICTV *Filoviridae* Study Group, as outlined recently [16, 17]. For instance: “MARV,” “EBOV,” “SUDV”. Depending on sequence divergence, the virus name could also be “ebolavirus”, “marburgvirus”, “cuevavirus” or “filovirus” (no abbreviations)
- the **genetic variant designation-isolate designation** should contain the same information as provided in the field for the natural (wild-type) virus, connected by a hyphen to an isolate abbreviation, e.g., “Kik-abc1”. The isolate descriptor should be unique to separate the new virus from already known isolates. In the case of a completely artificial filovirus, an abbreviation for the unique variant name should be chosen. For instance “Wei”

Examples for abbreviations in the text of a manuscript: “EBOV/Kik-abc1” or “filovirus/Wei-abc2” (if other isolates of the same genetic strain/variant/isolate are addressed in the same article); or simply “EBOV” or “filovirus” (if the article only addresses work with one particular genetic strain/variant/isolate).

Usage of designations

We suggest that full-length isolate designations always be used once in the Materials and Methods section of a manuscript next to the taxonomic placement of the closest natural isolate (family, species) and its passaging history. Examples of placement of these designations are:

“Vero E6 cells in 24-well plates were infected for 1 h with Ebola virus H.sapiens-rec/COD/1995/Kikwit-abc1 (GenBank #AF1234; derived from an Ebola virus of the family *Filoviridae*, species *Zaire ebolavirus*) at an MOI of 0.5, 1, or 5. Virus

was created by transfecting BSR T7/5 cells with plasmids encoding the viral genome and proteins NP, VP35, VP30, L, and T7 RNA polymerase as described previously.”

or

“HEK 293T cells in 6-well plates were infected for 1 h with filovirus USAMRIID/Vero_E6-rec/USA/2012/Weirdo-abc2 (henceforth “Weirdo”) at an MOI of 5. The genome of Weirdo (GenBank #AF5678) was synthesized commercially by company X, and the virus was rescued by following standard filovirus rescue protocols using Vero E6 cells.”

We urge investigators not to use taxon (italicized) names elsewhere in the manuscript, as artificially created organisms currently do not have taxonomic standing. We further suggest using only the virus abbreviation or a designation determined by the authors in the remainder of the manuscript text (in the examples above, “EBOV” or “Weirdo”) after proper introduction as long as no other version of the same virus or another filovirus of the same species is addressed. We recommend using abbreviations in cases where several variants or isolates of one filovirus are addressed:

“Here we demonstrate that infection of rhesus monkeys with EBOV/Kik-abc1 results in clinical signs indistinguishable from animals infected with EBOV/Kik-GFP1.”

In the example above, it would also be unproblematic to only differentiate between “abc1” and “GFP1” viruses in the flow of text. Of course, the authors would be free to introduce their own abbreviations for the viruses used for the sake of manuscript writing. We propose to limit the use of shortened designations to phylograms and sequence alignments or to replace them with abbreviations if space is limited.

Authors

Jens H. Kuhn^{1,*,#}, Y míng Bào², Sina Bavari³, Stephan Becker⁴, Steven Bradfute⁵, Kristina Brauburger⁶, J. Rodney Brister², Alexander A. Bukreyev^{7,#}, Yíngyún Cai¹, Kartik Chandran^{8,#}, Robert A. Davey⁹, Olga Dolnik^{4,#}, John M. Dye^{3,#}, Sven Enterlein¹⁰, Jean-Paul Gonzalez^{11,12}, Pierre Formenty¹³, Alexander N. Freiberg⁷, Lisa E. Hensley¹, Thomas Hoenen¹⁴, Anna N. Honko³, Georgy M. Ignatyev¹⁵, Peter B. Jahrling¹, Karl M. Johnson¹⁶, Hans-Dieter Klenk⁴, Gary Kobinger¹⁷, Matthew G. Lackemeyer¹, Eric M. Leroy^{18,#}, Mark S. Lever¹⁹, Elke Mühlberger^{6,#}, Sergey V. Netesov^{20,#}, Gene G. Olinger³, Gustavo Palacios³, Jean L. Patterson^{9,#}, Janusz T. Paweska^{21,#}, Louise Pitt³, Sheli R. Radoshitzky³, Elena I. Ryabchikova²², Erica Ollmann Saphire^{23,#}, Aleksandr M. Shestopalov^{20,24}, Sophie J. Smither^{19,#}, Nancy J. Sullivan²⁵, Robert Swanepoel²⁶, Ayato Takada^{27,#}, Jonathan S. Towner^{28,#}, Guido van der Groen²⁹, Viktor E. Volchkov^{30,#}, Valentina A. Volchkova³⁰, Victoria Wahl-Jensen¹, Travis K. Warren^{3,#}, Kelly L. Warfield¹⁰, Manfred Weidmann³¹, and Stuart T. Nichol^{28,*}

Affiliations

¹Integrated Research Facility at Fort Detrick, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland, USA ²Information Engineering Branch, National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA ³United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland, USA ⁴Institut für Virologie, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Marburg, Germany ⁵University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA ⁶Department of Microbiology and National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratory, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA ⁷Department of Pathology and Galveston National Laboratory, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas, USA ⁸Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York, USA ⁹Department of Virology and Immunology, Texas Biomedical Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, USA ¹⁰Integrated BioTherapeutics, Inc., Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA ¹¹Health Department, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, Marseille, France ¹²Metabiota, Inc., San Francisco, California, USA ¹³World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland ¹⁴Laboratory for Virology, Division of Intramural Research, National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT, USA ¹⁵Federal State Unitary Company “Microgen Scientific Industrial Company for Immunobiological Medicines”, Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia ¹⁶Bozeman, Montana, USA ¹⁷Special Pathogens Program, National Microbiology Laboratory, Public Health Agency of Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada ¹⁸Centre International de Recherches Médicales de Franceville, Franceville, Gabon ¹⁹Biomedical Sciences Department, Dstl, Porton Down, Salisbury, Wiltshire, UK ²⁰Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Novosibirsk Region, Russia ²¹Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Sandringham-Johannesburg, Gauteng, South Africa ²²Institute of Chemical Biology and Fundamental Medicine, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, Novosibirsk Region, Russia ²³Department of Immunology and Microbial Science and The Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, California, USA ²⁴State Research Center of Virology and Biotechnology “Vector”, Koltsovo, Novosibirsk Region, Russia ²⁵Vaccine Research Center, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA ²⁶Zoonoses Research Unit, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa ²⁷Division of Global Epidemiology, Hokkaido University Research Center for Zoonosis Control, Sapporo, Japan ²⁸Viral Special Pathogens Branch, Division of High-Consequence Pathogens Pathology, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, USA ²⁹Prins Leopold Instituut voor Tropische Geneeskunde, Antwerp, Belgium ³⁰Laboratoire des Filovirus, Inserm U758, Université de Lyon, UCB-Lyon-1, Ecole-

Normale-Supérieure de Lyon, Lyon, France ³¹Universitätsmedizin Göttingen,
Abteilung Virologie, Göttingen, Germany

Acknowledgments

This work was funded in part by the Joint Science and Technology Office for Chem Bio Defense (proposal #TMTI0048_09_RD_T to SB). YC, JHK, and VWJ performed this work as employees of Tunnell Consulting, Inc., and MGL as an employee of Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute, both subcontractors to Battelle Memorial Institute under its prime contract with NIAID, under Contract No. HHSN272200700016I. This research was also supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National Library of Medicine (YB and JRB), and the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, NIAID (TH).

References

- Adams MJ, Carstens EB. Ratification vote on taxonomic proposals to the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (2012). *Arch Virol.* 2012; 157:1411–1422. [PubMed: 22481600]
- Calisher CH, van Regenmortel MHV. Should all other biologists follow the lead of virologists and stop italicizing the names of living organisms? *Zootaxa.* 2009; 2113:63–68.
- Ebihara H, Takada A, Kobasa D, Jones S, Neumann G, Theriault S, Bray M, Feldmann H, Kawaoka Y. Molecular determinants of Ebola virus virulence in mice. *PLoS Pathog.* 2006; 2:e73. [PubMed: 16848640]
- Ebihara H, Theriault S, Neumann G, Alimonti JB, Geisbert JB, Hensley LE, Groseth A, Jones SM, Geisbert TW, Kawaoka Y, Feldmann H. In vitro and in vivo characterization of recombinant Ebola viruses expressing enhanced green fluorescent protein. *J Infect Dis.* 2007; 196(suppl 2):S313–S322. [PubMed: 17940966]
- Enterlein S, Volchkov V, Weik M, Kolesnikova L, Volchkova V, Klenk HD, Mühlberger E. Rescue of recombinant Marburg virus from cDNA is dependent on nucleocapsid protein VP30. *J Virol.* 2006; 80:1038–1043. [PubMed: 16379005]
- Enterlein S, Schmidt KM, Schumann M, Conrad D, Krähling V, Olejnik J, Mühlberger E. The Marburg virus 3′ noncoding region structurally and functionally differs from that of Ebola virus. *J Virol.* 2009; 83:4508–4519. [PubMed: 19225002]
- Feldmann H, Geisbert TW, Jahrling PB, Klenk HD, Netesov SV, Peters CJ, Sanchez A, Swanepoel R, Volchkov VE. FAMILY *FILOVIRIDAE*. In: Fauquet CM, Mayo MA, Maniloff J, Desselberger U, Ball LA, editors. *Virus Taxonomy - Eighth Report of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses*. Elsevier/Academic Press; San Diego, California, U.S.A: 2005. p. 645-653.
- Groseth A, Marzi A, Hoenen T, Herwig A, Gardner D, Becker S, Ebihara H, Feldmann H. The Ebola virus glycoprotein contributes to but is not sufficient for virulence in vivo. *PLoS Pathog.* 2012; 8:e1002847. [PubMed: 22876185]
- Hartman AL, Dover JE, Towner JS, Nichol ST. Reverse genetic generation of recombinant Zaire Ebola viruses containing disrupted IRF-3 inhibitory domains results in attenuated virus growth in vitro and higher levels of IRF-3 activation without inhibiting viral transcription or replication. *J Virol.* 2006; 80:6430–6440. [PubMed: 16775331]
- Hartman AL, Bird BH, Towner JS, Antoniadou ZA, Zaki SR, Nichol ST. Inhibition of IRF-3 activation by VP35 is critical for the high level of virulence of Ebola virus. *J Virol.* 2008; 82:2699–2704. [PubMed: 18199658]
- Hoenen T, Groseth A, de Kok-Mercado F, Kuhn JH, Wahl-Jensen V. Minigenomes, transcription and replication competent virus-like particles and beyond: reverse genetics systems for filoviruses and other negative stranded hemorrhagic fever viruses. *Antiviral research.* 2011; 91:195–208. [PubMed: 21699921]
- Hoenen T, Shabman RS, Groseth A, Herwig A, Weber M, Schudt G, Dolnik O, Basler CF, Becker S, Feldmann H. Inclusion bodies are a site of ebolavirus replication. *J Virol.* 2012; 86:11779–11788. [PubMed: 22915810]

13. Hoenen T, Groseth A, Callison J, Takada A, Feldmann H. A novel Ebola virus expressing luciferase allows for rapid and quantitative testing of antivirals. *Antiviral research*. 2013
14. International Committee on Standardized Genetic Nomenclature for Mice. Guidelines for Nomenclature of Mouse and Rat Strains. 2011. <http://www.informatics.jax.org/mgihome/nomenclature/strains.shtml>
15. Krähling V, Dolnik O, Kolesnikova L, Schmidt-Chanasit J, Jordan I, Sandig V, Günther S, Becker S. Establishment of fruit bat cells (*Rousettus aegyptiacus*) as a model system for the investigation of filoviral infection. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2010; 4:e802. [PubMed: 20808767]
16. Kuhn JH, Becker S, Ebihara H, Geisbert TW, Johnson KM, Lipkin WI, Negredo A, Netesov SV, Nichol ST, Palacios G, Peters CJ, Tenorio A, Volchkov VE, Jahrling PB. Proposal for a revised taxonomy of the family *Filoviridae*: classification, names of taxa and viruses, and virus abbreviations. *Arch Virol*. 2010; 155:2083–2103. [PubMed: 21046175]
17. Kuhn, JH.; Becker, S.; Ebihara, H.; Geisbert, TW.; Jahrling, PB.; Kawaoka, Y.; Netesov, SV.; Nichol, ST.; Peters, CJ.; Volchkov, VE.; Ksiazek, TG. FAMILY *FILOVIRIDAE*. In: King, AMQ.; Adams, MJ.; Carstens, EB.; Lefkowitz, EJ., editors. *Virus Taxonomy - Ninth Report of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses*. Elsevier/Academic Press; London, United Kingdom: 2011. p. 665-671.
18. Kuhn JH, Bao Y, Bavari S, Becker S, Bradfute S, Brister JR, Bukreyev AA, Cai Y, Chandran K, Davey RA, Dolnik O, Dye JM, Enterlein S, Gonzalez JP, Formenty P, Freiberg AN, Hensley LE, Honko AN, Ignatyev GM, Jahrling PB, Johnson KM, Klenk HD, Kobinger G, Lackemeyer MG, Leroy EM, Lever MS, Lofts LL, Mühlberger E, Netesov SV, Olinger GG, Palacios G, Patterson JL, Paweska JT, Pitt L, Radoshitzky SR, Ryabchikova EI, Saphire EO, Shestopalov AM, Smither SJ, Sullivan NJ, Swanepoel R, Takada A, Towner JS, van der Groen G, Volchkov VE, Wahl-Jensen V, Warren TK, Warfield KL, Weidmann M, Nichol ST. Virus nomenclature below the species level: a standardized nomenclature for laboratory animal-adapted strains and variants of viruses assigned to the family *Filoviridae*. *Arch Virol*. 2013; 158:1425–1432. [PubMed: 23358612]
19. Kuhn JH, Bao Y, Bavari S, Becker S, Bradfute S, Brister JR, Bukreyev AA, Chandran K, Davey RA, Dolnik O, Dye JM, Enterlein S, Hensley LE, Honko AN, Jahrling PB, Johnson KM, Kobinger G, Leroy EM, Lever MS, Mühlberger E, Netesov SV, Olinger GG, Palacios G, Patterson JL, Paweska JT, Pitt L, Radoshitzky SR, Saphire EO, Smither SJ, Swanepoel R, Towner JS, van der Groen G, Volchkov VE, Wahl-Jensen V, Warren TK, Weidmann M, Nichol ST. Virus nomenclature below the species level: a standardized nomenclature for natural variants of viruses assigned to the family *Filoviridae*. *Arch Virol*. 2013; 158:301–311. [PubMed: 23001720]
20. Lubaki NM, Ilinykh P, Pietzsch C, Tigabu B, Freiberg AN, Koup RA, Bukreyev A. The lack of maturation of Ebola virus-infected dendritic cells results from the cooperative effect of at least two viral domains. *J Virol*. 2013; 87:7471–7485. [PubMed: 23616668]
21. Martínez MJ, Biedenkopf N, Volchkova V, Hartlieb B, Alazard-Dany N, Reynard O, Becker S, Volchkov V. Role of Ebola virus VP30 in transcription reinitiation. *J Virol*. 2008; 82:12569–12573. [PubMed: 18829754]
22. Martinez MJ, Volchkova VA, Raoul H, Alazard-Dany N, Reynard O, Volchkov VE. Role of VP30 Phosphorylation in the Ebola Virus Replication Cycle. *J Infect Dis*. 2011; 204(Suppl 3):S934–940. [PubMed: 21987772]
23. Mateo M, Carbonnelle C, Martinez MJ, Reynard O, Page A, Volchkova VA, Volchkov VE. Knockdown of Ebola Virus VP24 Impairs Viral Nucleocapsid Assembly and Prevents Virus Replication. *J Infect Dis*. 2011; 204(Suppl 3):S892–896. [PubMed: 21987766]
24. Mateo M, Carbonnelle C, Reynard O, Kolesnikova L, Nemirov K, Page A, Volchkova VA, Volchkov VE. VP24 is a Molecular Determinant of Ebola virus Virulence in Guinea Pigs. *J Infect Dis*. 2011; 204(Suppl 3):S1011–1020. [PubMed: 21987737]
25. Mittler E, Kolesnikova L, Herwig A, Dolnik O, Becker S. Assembly of the Marburg virus envelope. *Cell Microbiol*. 2013; 15:270–284. [PubMed: 23186212]
26. Mpanju OM, Towner JS, Dover JE, Nichol ST, Wilson CA. Identification of two amino acid residues on Ebola virus glycoprotein 1 critical for cell entry. *Virus Res*. 2006; 121:205–214. [PubMed: 16839637]

27. Neumann G, Feldmann H, Watanabe S, Lukashevich I, Kawaoka Y. Reverse genetics demonstrates that proteolytic processing of the Ebola virus glycoprotein is not essential for replication in cell culture. *J Virol.* 2002; 76:406–410. [PubMed: 11739705]
28. Neumann G, Ebihara H, Takada A, Noda T, Kobasa D, Jasenosky LD, Watanabe S, Kim JH, Feldmann H, Kawaoka Y. Ebola virus VP40 late domains are not essential for viral replication in cell culture. *J Virol.* 2005; 79:10300–10307. [PubMed: 16051823]
29. Prins KC, Delpeut S, Leung DW, Reynard O, Volchkova VA, Reid SP, Ramanan P, Cardenas WB, Amarasinghe GK, Volchkov VE, Basler CF. Mutations abrogating VP35 interaction with double-stranded RNA render Ebola virus avirulent in guinea pigs. *J Virol.* 2010; 84:3004–3015. [PubMed: 20071589]
30. Schmidt KM, Schumann M, Olejnik J, Kräling V, Mühlberger E. Recombinant Marburg Virus Expressing EGFP Allows Rapid Screening of Virus Growth and Real-time Visualization of Virus Spread. *J Infect Dis.* 2011; 204(Suppl 3):S861–870. [PubMed: 21987762]
31. Shabman RS, Hoenen T, Groseth A, Jabado O, Binning JM, Amarasinghe GK, Feldmann H, Basler CF. An upstream open reading frame modulates Ebola virus polymerase translation and virus replication. *PLoS Pathog.* 2013; 9:e1003147. [PubMed: 23382680]
32. Theriault S, Groseth A, Neumann G, Kawaoka Y, Feldmann H. Rescue of Ebola virus from cDNA using heterologous support proteins. *Virus Res.* 2004; 106:43–50. [PubMed: 15522446]
33. Towner JS, Paragas J, Dover JE, Gupta M, Goldsmith CS, Huggins JW, Nichol ST. Generation of eGFP expressing recombinant Zaire ebolavirus for analysis of early pathogenesis events and high-throughput antiviral drug screening. *Virology.* 2005; 332:20–27. [PubMed: 15661137]
34. Volchkov VE, Volchkova VA, Mühlberger E, Kolesnikova LV, Weik M, Dolnik O, Klenk HD. Recovery of infectious Ebola virus from complementary DNA: RNA editing of the GP gene and viral cytotoxicity. *Science.* 2001; 291:1965–1969. [PubMed: 11239157]
35. Volchkova VA, Dolnik O, Martinez MJ, Reynard O, Volchkov VE. Genomic RNA editing and its impact on Ebola virus adaptation during serial passages in cell culture and infection of guinea pigs. *J Infect Dis.* 2011; 204(Suppl 3):S941–946. [PubMed: 21987773]

Table 1

Summary of the current filovirus taxonomy as endorsed by the ICTV *Filoviridae* Study Group and accepted by the ICTV

Current taxonomy and nomenclature (Ninth ICTV Report and updates) [1, 16, 17]	Previous taxonomy and nomenclature (Eighth ICTV Report) [7]
Order <i>Mononegavirales</i>	Order <i>Mononegavirales</i>
Family <i>Filoviridae</i>	Family <i>Filoviridae</i>
Genus <i>Marburgvirus</i>	Genus <i>Marburgvirus</i>
Species <i>Marburg marburgvirus</i>	Species <i>Lake Victoria marburgvirus</i>
Virus 1: Marburg virus (MARV)	Virus: Lake Victoria marburgvirus (MARV)
Virus 2: Ravn virus (RAVV)	
Genus <i>Ebolavirus</i>	
Species <i>Tai Forest ebolavirus</i>	Genus <i>Ebolavirus</i>
Virus: Tai Forest virus (TAFV)	Species <i>Cote d'Ivoire ebolavirus</i> [sic]
Species <i>Reston ebolavirus</i>	Virus: Cote d'Ivoire ebolavirus [sic] (CIEBOV)
Virus: Reston virus (RESTV)	
Species <i>Sudan ebolavirus</i>	Species <i>Reston ebolavirus</i>
Virus: Sudan virus (SUDV)	Virus: Reston ebolavirus (REBOV)
Species <i>Zaire ebolavirus</i>	Species <i>Sudan ebolavirus</i>
Virus: Ebola virus (EBOV)	Virus: Sudan ebolavirus (SEBOV)
Species <i>Bundibugyo ebolavirus</i>	Species <i>Zaire ebolavirus</i>
Virus: Bundibugyo virus (BDBV)	Virus: Zaire ebolavirus (ZEBOV)
Genus <i>Cuevavirus</i> *	
Species <i>Lloviu cuevavirus</i> *	
Virus: Lloviu virus (LLOV)	

* These taxa were approved by the ICTV Executive Committee in July 2013 but have not yet been ratified.