

Master Thesis

---

# Development of Galaxy Workflows for Sequence Data Analysis of Notifiable Viral Livestock Diseases

---

Viktoria Isabel Schwarz

Examiner: Prof. Dr. Rolf Backofen

Second Examiner: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Hess

Advisor: Dr. Wolfgang Maier



Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg

Faculty of Engineering

Department of Computer Science

Bioinformatics Group

April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**Writing Period**

October 28th, 2022 – April 28th, 2023

**Examiner**

Prof. Dr. Rolf Backofen

**Second Examiner**

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Hess

**Advisor**

Dr. Wolfgang Maier

# Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author and composer of my thesis and that no other sources or learning aids other than those listed have been used. Furthermore, I declare that I have acknowledged the work of others by providing detailed references of said work.

I hereby also declare that my thesis has not been prepared for another examination or assignment, either wholly or excerpts thereof.

---

Place, Date

---

Signature



# Acknowledgements



# Abstract

auf englisch





# Zusammenfassung

auf deutsch



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Viral Livestock Diseases . . . . .	2
1.2	Prevention, Surveillance and Control . . . . .	6
1.3	Motivation and Objectives of the Thesis . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>State-of-the-Art</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	High-throughput Technologies in Diagnostic Virology . . . . .	11
2.1.1	Overview of NGS Platforms and Applications . . . . .	12
2.1.2	Detection of Viral Pathogens . . . . .	14
2.1.3	Data Analysis Issues . . . . .	15
2.2	NGS Methods for Poxviruses . . . . .	16
2.2.1	Poxviruses . . . . .	16
2.2.2	Application of NGS Technologies in Poxvirus Diagnostics . .	20
2.3	NGS Methods for Avian Influenza Virus . . . . .	21
2.3.1	Avian Influenza Virus . . . . .	21
2.3.2	Application of NGS Technologies in Avian Influenza Virus Diagnostics . . . . .	22
<b>3</b>	<b>Materials and Methods</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1	Galaxy Platform . . . . .	25
3.2	Workflow Design . . . . .	27
3.2.1	SARS-CoV-2 Pipeline as Baseline . . . . .	27

3.2.2	Requirements . . . . .	28
3.3	Workflow Development . . . . .	29
3.3.1	Pox Virus Illumina Amplicon Workflow . . . . .	29
3.3.2	AIV Illumina Amplicon Workflow . . . . .	30
3.4	Workflow Evaluation . . . . .	30
3.4.1	Evaluation of AIV Workflow Using Test Datasets . . . . .	30
3.4.2	Evaluation of Pox Virus Workflow Using LSDv Test Dataset . . . . .	30
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Pox Virus Illumina Workflow . . . . .	31
4.1.1	Results for LSDv Datasets 20L70 and 20L81 . . . . .	31
4.2	AIV Workflow . . . . .	31
4.2.1	Results for Dataset U2012100-n21_S8 . . . . .	31
4.2.2	Results for Dataset U2008751-n5_S4 . . . . .	32
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>33</b>
5.1	Contribution to the Field . . . . .	33
5.2	Future Directions . . . . .	34
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>47</b>

# List of Figures

1	Overview of next-generation sequencing technology applications in diagnostic virology. . . . .	13
2	Simplified SARS-CoV-2 ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow. . . .	27
3	Simplified minimal ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow. . . . .	28
4	Simplified LSDV ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow. . . . .	29
5	Simplified AIV ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow. . . . .	30



# List of Tables

1	Representative viruses from ten Chordopoxvirus genera. . . . .	18
---	--	----





# 1 Introduction

Sharing environments means sharing diseases – this simple relationship expresses how pathogens found in animal populations can spread to humans and have severe impacts. The impact can be as severe as the whole world experienced during the pandemic of Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) that originated in Wuhan, China in 2019. This highly contagious disease was caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), an infectious virus of presumed zoonotic origin [1]. With more than 757.26 million reported cases and more than 6.85 million confirmed deaths as of February 24, 2023 **TODO: update numbers**, this pandemic is a public health emergency that has caused estimated costs of 16 trillion U.S. dollars. Apart from this, it invoked an outstanding interest in virology research [2].

Since then, professionals from many different fields, i.e. public health specialists, researchers, biomedical staff, bioinformaticians and veterinarians have put even more effort than before into the monitoring of potentially dangerous viral diseases. International managing institutions with a globally distributed network work on safe and healthy environments for animal and human populations. The World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH), founded as Office International des Epizooties (OIE), implements standards in animal health and the handling of zoonoses and other diseases. As an intergovernmental organisation following the multidisciplinary One Health principle, it supports its members in the prevention of animal diseases of concern. National veterinary authorities must notify the WOAH in case they detect cases of diseases that are listed by the WOAH. The most important definitions,

the significance, impacts and surveillance measures of animal diseases are examined below.

## **1.1 Viral Livestock Diseases**

Infectious diseases caused by viruses that affect domesticated animals, like for example cattle, pigs, goats, sheep, and poultry are referred to as viral livestock diseases. The most frequent and known diseases include Foot-and-Mouth Disease, African Swine Fever, Avian Influenza and Newcastle Disease. They can spread quickly among animals, and in some cases are transmitted to humans, making them zoonotic diseases. There are over 200 known types of zoonoses, some of them like rabies being 100% preventable through vaccination and medication [3]. When viral livestock diseases become zoonotic, they pose a significant public health risk, possibly leading to widespread illness and death. A report from the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) states that zoonoses account for approximately 2.5 billion illness cases in humans and 2.7 million deaths annually [4]. The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and its U.S. government partners listed the top eight zoonotic diseases of national concern in a report, filing zoonotic influenza and emerging coronaviruses such as SARS and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) [5]. This collaborative report is used for focussing on the listed diseases since they are of greatest concern [6]. At the same time, not all livestock diseases of viral origin are zoonotic: Around 60% of all known human infectious diseases and approximately 75% of all newly emerging infections are zoonotic [7].

The term livestock is a vague term that generally refers to any breed or animal population that is kept by humans for commercial or useful purpose. According to the 20th Livestock Census of the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, given out by the Indian government, India holds the world's largest amount of livestock with 535.78 million animals as of 2019 [8]. Globally, the ice-free surface

that is dedicated to the purpose of livestock whether it is for farmlands or feed production, is up to 26% of the area [9]. Not only food production and economy, but also global trade, the agricultural sector and employment rates highly depend on livestock resources. These numbers illustrate the impressive interconnectedness of the humans with the livestock sector. The consequences of a collapse of this important industry would therefore be significant and far-reaching. As the livestock industry is directly affected by the occurrence of zoonoses in both developed and developing countries, affected parties have a strong interest in avoiding any constraints that might be caused by disease outbreaks. Some diseases cause high costs for the industry every year because many animals are affected or infected and have to be culled.

### **Historic Outbreaks of Zoonotic Diseases**

Historically, zoonoses have shaped serious infectious events. Pathogens that cause zoonotic diseases are viruses (37.7%), and according to surveillance data also bacteria (41.4%), parasites (18.3%), fungi (2.0%) or prions (0.8%) [10]. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic modern zoonotic diseases like Ebola virus disease and salmonellosis had high infection rates. Influenza viruses cause epidemics each year, and circulate in all parts of the world. There are four types of seasonal influenza viruses (A, B, C and D), however only influenza A and B cause yearly epidemics. Influenza strains appear in zoonotic and human-only spreads, but the viruses can recombine occasionally and cause events such as the 1918 Spanish flu [11, 12]. Especially for poultry, highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) of the H5 subtype is an ongoing threat [13]. Since its first case in China, 1996 it has been detected in many avian populations, both domestic and wild. The H5 subtype is the avian influenza type with the greatest risk. Even though it has adapted to birds as the specific host, the virus can further adapt and be transmitted between humans [14]. Avian influenza has caused seasonal outbreaks, such as the 2014-15 outbreak in the United States resulting in almost 50 million birds that died as a consequence of an infection or of

depopulation [15]. In 2020, there were several outbreaks reported in Europe, almost all with HPAI viruses from the H5 subtype [16]. It mainly affected farmed ducks due to the high density of animals in the facilities and the separation from wild birds due to domestication [16]. The latest outbreak of avian influenza is still ongoing, started in early 2022 and until today, February 23, 2023 **TODO: update numbers and source** has led to more than 58 million culled or died birds. It is reported in 37 countries and so far, six human infections were reported in this outbreak [17]. This number is not nearly as high as for the animals affected, but considering that during the last 20 years, there were fewer than 900 confirmed cases of H5N1 in humans and the mortality rate of 50%, each human infection is a risk [17].

### **Risk Factors and Impact of Disease Outbreaks**

Reasons for recurring huge outbreaks of viral diseases in animal confinements come from the advantageous circumstances for virus transmission as it is warm and humid. In general, animal husbandry practices have evolved in the sense that domestic animal species are raised in relatively small and usually confined spaces at a high density. This domestication has given plenty of opportunities to develop more pathogens of viral or bacterial origin over time. The spread of international trading of farm animals has amplified the number of infected animals and the number of infectious diseases. As transmission routes can differ depending on the disease, the other factor is how easy the infectious agent spreads (transmissibility). Vector-borne diseases are transmitted by living organisms that transfer pathogenic microorganisms to other, uninfected animals or humans. Vectors can be mosquitoes, fleas or ticks. Among others, the World Health Organization (WHO) identifies major globally present vector-borne diseases as malaria, dengue, yellow fever and Zika virus disease [18]. Another transmission mode is direct contact airborne transmission. Environmental factors such as a high temperature, humidity and precipitation can facilitate a virus to spread and keeping it alive [19]. Overpopulation, inadequate food and water

supplies and mass migration of populations pose additional risks for transmission of animal diseases.

Outbreaks of livestock diseases do not only affect animal and human health, but also cause high economic losses. Restrictions and containment measures, as well as the culling of animals in the case of confirmed cases of listed diseases, lead to a loss of income for farmers – since livestock and their products, such as milk, eggs or meat, are used for further production, other businesses that rely on these products are also affected by disease outbreaks. Even if infected animals do not die or have to be culled, the medium- and long-term consequences of infection can affect the health of the animals. This can lead to poor growth or poor production and feed conversion. Another impact of depopulating infected animal populations is the loss of biodiversity [20, 21]. Wildlife populations of endangered species experiencing disease outbreak can be decimated, leading to ecological imbalances and interference with natural food chains [22, 23, 24].

As shown, the spread of viral diseases among animal populations can have enormous impacts on dependent industries, individuals and populations.

### **Notifiable Animal Diseases**

For reasons of biosecurity and surveillance purposes, the WOAHA has agreed on a list of notifiable animal diseases that must be reported to in agricultural authorities. This list includes a total of 117 diseases, partly endemic or highly transmissible, such as Foot-and-mouth-disease, lumpy skin disease, peste des petits ruminants, classical swine fever, highly pathogenic avian influenza and Newcastle disease. The list does not cover all known zoonoses and animal diseases since not all of them pose an actual risk for costly outbreaks.

Reports of illness cases of animals filed by national veterinary authorities are used to detect unusual incidents, including mortality or sickness of animals and have adverse effects on socio-economic or public health. The notifiable animal diseases include

more than 50 wildlife diseases, which may have impact on livestock health [25]. As the surveillance of viral animal diseases is still of highest priority in order to avoid expensive and dangerous outbreaks, this topic is discussed in more detail in the following introductory chapter.

## **1.2 Prevention, Surveillance and Control**

Given the potential danger of disease outbreaks to animal, human and public health, the question is how to detect, monitor, control and prevent outbreaks in farm animal populations.

To avoid the impact that a disease outbreak can have, the best method is to avoid the disease in the first place. This leads to the principle of prevention, which sees its main task as reducing the overall risk of a virus spreading. Corresponding measures can be vaccinations and the establishment of hygiene standards. For viral material that recombines over time as the number of infections increases, the potential for the virus to exploit host cell genes that favour viral growth and survival may be high [26]. Therefore, it seems logical to reduce the overall number of infections. Other disease prevention practises primarily include disinfection and good animal husbandry. Practitioners in the field or in veterinary clinics are obliged to follow this principle of prevention. In-depth strategies to prevent viral diseases depend heavily on the characteristics of the virus, taking into account transmission modes, environmental stability, zoonotic risk and pathogenesis. Exclusion of livestock and the use of vaccines from potentially infected flocks is increasingly practised [26]. The spatial spread of disease can be contained through quarantine, separation from wildlife populations, testing and regular inspections of imported animals.

In the event of an actual outbreak of a viral animal disease, control and surveillance are key. Surveillance of viral diseases involves the collection of basic information about the disease, including incidence, prevalence and transmission patterns; the systematic and regular collection and analysis of these data is crucial to obtain a

detailed overview of the spread. This need for data has led the WOAAH to publish the above-mentioned list of notifiable diseases. Based on the data collected, authorities can inform their decisions on the allocation of resources for disease control and other containment activities [26, 27].

Common methods for animal diseases surveillance include notifiable diseases reporting, laboratory-based surveillance and population-based surveillance. General awareness among veterinary diagnosticians and practitioners is another key to an effective surveillance system. Most countries have their own national veterinary authorities, coordinated by the WOAAH to enable a coordinated exchange of information [27].

It is vital to analyse collected data promptly in order to influence necessary follow-up actions. National databases may contain reliable and annotated data, but they often reflect information gathered several weeks or months ago. On the other hand, early warning signs of a potential disease outbreak may be found in local media reviews, unusual social media activity or unverified individual reports on the internet. However, such sources can provide well-intentioned but inaccurate information. Timely action and communication of information, particularly to local veterinaries is a crucial component of effective surveillance systems. Nevertheless it is important to exercise caution to prevent unnecessary public concern.

One important component of modern and accurate surveillance systems of viral diseases is the access to relevant data. Technologies to produce DNA sequencing data have developed to be very cost and time efficient which makes the study of infectious diseases better and faster. At the same time, the amount of DNA sequencing data produced with next-generation sequencing (NGS; also known as high-throughput sequencing, HTS) platforms prove this change. NGS platforms include IonTorrent, Illumina HiSeq/MiSeq (for different read lengths) and Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT). Advances in the biotechnological application and evaluation of these data are revolutionising the field of studying these data on the molecular level [28]. Sequencing technologies take a key role nowadays in describing viral diversity in humans and animals, in detecting pathogens and co-infections, in epidemiologic

research about the evolution of viral material and in metagenomic characterization of new microbial material. More detailed methods that are used for viral animal disease surveillance with NGS-based technologies are described in Chapter 2.

### **1.3 Motivation and Objectives of the Thesis**

Bioinformatics and data analysis are crucial for understanding and monitoring viral diseases. However, there is a lack of knowledge and resources in many parts of the world. This is particularly true for poorer countries with small laboratories and national health organisations that are not well equipped. Nonetheless, efforts are made to establish global networks such as the Zoonotic Disease Integrated Action (ZODIAC). It is an initiative by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), launched in 2021, with five major objectives: (1) Strengthening member states' detection, diagnostic and monitoring capabilities, (2) Developing and making novel technologies available for the detection and monitoring of zoonotic diseases, (3) Making real-time decision-making support tools available for timely interventions, (4) Understanding the impact of zoonotic diseases on human health and (5) Providing access to an agency coordinated response for zoonotic diseases [29]. In collaboration with technical experts from different fields and from all over the world, and to support the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory (VETLAB) Network, the ZODIAC project has the resources to provide standardised, easy-access, public and integrated pipelines for virus surveillance on a long-term. This will enable laboratories and veterinarians to monitor and analyse their samples more effectively, leading to early detection and prevention of viral livestock diseases.

Due to the outstanding research efforts brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, analysis pipelines for SARS-CoV-2 samples were developed on the Galaxy platform. Galaxy and the implementation of pipelines is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. Using the knowledge and application of SARS-CoV-2 and transferring it to other viruses will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of viral diseases and better



prevention strategies.

This work is part of the ZODIAC project and supports pillar (2) in the development of integrated pipelines that enable laboratories, veterinarians and other health professionals to analyse their data from samples obtained with HTS technologies. The zoonoses studied are avian influenza A for subtype identification and a poxvirus pipeline for determining poxvirus genomes sequenced as half-genomes in a tiled-amplicon approach. This pipeline has been tested with samples of lumpy skin disease virus. These two viruses have been chosen because of available test samples that were used for validation of the pipelines.

In summary, the lack of bioinformatics knowledge and resources in poorer countries poses a major challenge to effective, globally integrated viral animal diseases surveillance systems. However, established global networks such as ZODIAC together with VETLAB can provide the necessary resources to enable effective surveillance and analysis of viral animal diseases. This in turn will lead to early detection and prevention of disease outbreaks and ultimately protect public health and reduce the impact of viral diseases on livestock.



## 2 State-of-the-Art

In the demand for an effective, high-quality approach to the analysis of isolates from infected animals, molecular studies help to investigate characteristics of the sample. Genome analysis has become an integral part of animal disease surveillance, especially since the advent of high-throughput sequencing technologies in the last 15 years. Next-generation techniques and applications are described below, the state of the art in poxvirus and avian influenza virus detection and analysis, and lastly the drawbacks of the methods discussed.

### 2.1 High-throughput Technologies in Diagnostic Virology


When comparing DNA sequencing technologies, there are differences in speed, throughput and volume of sequences. The term "next-generation" in NGS used to describe newer technologies in the field implies a next step in the evolution of sequencing technologies. As sequencing machine technologies evolve rapidly, there are gradations such as "second-generation" and "third-generation". Following the original 1977 Sanger sequencing method using radioactivity and gels, second-generation sequencers are advancements of Sanger sequencing that uses sequencing by synthesis [30]. In second-generation methods, reactions run in parallel and drastically reduce overall costs compared to Sanger sequencing. They produce short sequence reads length and are able to detect reads without using electrophoresis. Third-generation sequencing technologies typically generate longer primary reads of DNA (and RNA) molecules

while maintaining the massive parallelism of the technology and taking advantage of this benefit [31]. The nowadays most commonly used next-generation technologies for DNA sequencing and their applications are described below.

### **2.1.1 Overview of NGS Platforms and Applications**

By far the biggest player in the field of DNA sequencing is the Illumina platform, first developed by Solexa and Lync Therapeutics [32]. Illumina sequencing is based on bridge amplification, which creates clusters of copies of each DNA fragment. This technique involves repeated synthesis reactions with proprietary modified nucleotides containing a different fluorescent label for each of the four bases A, T, C and G. The reactions are performed over 300 or more rounds, and fluorescent detection allows for faster detection through direct imaging. An Illumina sequencer outputs data in the form of sequence reads, which are short DNA fragments ranging from 50 to 600 base pairs in length depending on the specific instrument and protocol used [32, 31, 30]. The output data from an Illumina sequencer typically is in the form of raw sequence files in FASTQ format, which contain the base calls and corresponding quality scores for each read. These reads can be used for downstream analyses such as viral genome assembly and variant calling.

Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT) is a third-generation paradigm shifting sequencing technology. It measures changes in ionic current accross membranes as single-stranded DNA nucleotides pass through a nanopore [33]. Nanopore-based DNA sequencing technologies are purchasable as a portable, small MinION (ONT) device, allowing experts to use it for applications where space requirements or portability are important [34, 33]. The cyclic mode of sequencing used in second-generation approaches is replaced by sequencing in real-time with read lengths of up to 10,000 basepairs [33]. Despite its advantages, the main caveat of ONT is its relatively high error rate compared to other HTS methods [35]. This makes ONT



**Figure 1:** Overview of next-generation sequencing technology applications in diagnostic virology.

less suitable for single-nucleotide variant analysis that is required in some diagnostic applications [36, 37].

Other frequently used second-generation platforms are Roche/454 sequencing, Ion Torrent (Thermo Fisher) technology and SOLiD (Sequencing by Oligonucleotide Ligation and Detection). Third-generation platforms include single molecule real-time sequencing (SMRT) by PacBio and nanopore sequencing [38].

As NGS platforms are widely used in biomedical and clinical contexts, some of the most important applications in diagnostic virology are depicted in Figure 1. In virology, metagenomics can be used to identify viruses in complex clinical samples [39]. It allows for the detection of known and novel viruses without prior knowledge of the infectious agent. Metagenomics involves the sequencing of all genetic material in a sample, including viral genomes, to identify the presence of viruses. Once a virus is identified, genomic variation refers to differences in the DNA sequence of a virus between different strains or isolates. These variations can be used for tracking the spread of an outbreak, identification of sources of an infection, or determination of the level of virus virulence [40].

Genetic selection describes to the process by which certain viral strains become more

prevalent in a population over time due to selective pressures. In diagnostic virology, genetic selection is used to track the evolution of a virus in the course of time and determine which strains are most likely to cause outbreaks or epidemics. This is of special interest in the backtracing of infected animals to know where the virus came from. Using gene ontology, functions and interactions of genes are described. This is crucial to identify the genes responsible for specific viral functions and to understand how these functions contribute to viral pathogenesis.

Based on their genetic and structural characteristics, viruses are classified to existing systems, called taxonomic classification. This clustering analysis can be used for the type identification of a virus causing infections and determination of its potential for transmission and pathogenicity [41].

Whole-genome de novo sequencing is the sequencing of an entire viral genome without prior knowledge of its genetic sequence. Similar to metagenomics, this technique can be used to identify novel viruses, to study mutations in viral genomes and to track the evolution of a virus over time [31].

### **2.1.2 Detection of Viral Pathogens**

For NGS methods to be a viable tool in diagnosis of viral animal diseases, the methods must be efficient and reliable. Almost all downstream analyses depend on the data obtained by sequencing, so it is imperative to choose the most appropriate method for each application. Metagenomics-based approaches use whole-genome sequencing to characterise viral diversity in animal, human and environmental samples. The detection of rare and novel infectious pathogens and the study of mutations in the genome are crucial for developing a deeper understanding of livestock viromes and potential zoonotic agents. In addition, NGS has been shown to detect non-culturable organisms as well as co-infections that have not been detected using traditional microbiological approaches [42]. Metagenome sequencing often relies on a low number of pathogenic reads to detect and to make diagnostic calls. As

sequencing depth directly influences genome coverage that can be obtained, the optimal amount of data to cover the complete genome is necessary. It has been shown that for a full virus genome to be represented, NGS data generated from ribo-depleted total RNA with a minimum length of one million high-quality reads works best [43]. Nevertheless, validation pipelines and confirmatory tests are needed for NGS approaches to pathogen detection [44]. **TODO: more?**

### 2.1.3 Data Analysis Issues

Since the surveillance of viral animal diseases with NGS is advancing rapidly, it is important that regions and health organizations that experience high damage of viral outbreaks but do not have their own facilities and know-how have access to the needed tools and knowledge. Costs for NGS sequencers are still high and the access to appropriate laboratories is not given everywhere. Networks like VETLAB and standardisation of techniques, for example freely available and published by the WOAHP, can enable professionals worldwide independent of their equipment on site. In the scope of the ZODIAC project, this aspect is addressed by providing protocols for each step from taking samples of potentially infected animals to the detailed analysis and derived actions [29].

This emphasizes the importance of free and easy-access platforms that entitle professionals to analyse their samples. Technical know-how to develop and maintain servers for analysis of NGS data is not part of the average global standard tool package, even though multidisciplinary approaches can help to facilitate by being shared through platforms.

NGS methods themselves have downsides that need to be considered when applying these techniques. Generally, chimerical sequences are formed during sequencing, which may be interpreted as false positives for novel organisms. Chimeric products are artifacts originating from joining sequences and are represented by point mutations, insertions and deletions. Chimera formation also occurs during PCR

amplification [45].

During bioinformatics analysis steps using algorithms with computationally expensive steps, the choice of the algorithm as well as its configuration settings have huge impact on the final results obtained. This includes algorithms in steps such as filtering for quality, clustering and sequence classification [46]. The cleaning step or filtering phase eliminates low-quality reads from the dataset, whereas the error correction process distinguishes true variants from those caused by experimental noise. This is based on the concept that errors occur randomly with low frequency, while true mutations tend to be clustered, and their frequency can be measured [47]. Longer reads avoid this problem because contigs must not be assembled in the first place, avoiding clustering and filtering errors. This is why the shift in third-generation and later sequencing platforms is towards longer reads again.

Each application of software with NGS data requires expertise in resolving limitations and drawbacks of specific methods. This in turn requires skills and experience in the field and the careful interpretation of results. Still, NGS provides a large pool of methods which eases this task, although available algorithms for genome assembly and amplicon analysis have drawbacks and limitations [48].

## **2.2 NGS Methods for Poxviruses**

In the following, current approaches to analyse NGS data of poxviruses are described. To get into the topic, the characteristics of poxviruses are examined.

### **2.2.1 Poxviruses**

Throughout human history, poxviruses have played a significant role with variola being the most notorious as it is the causative agent of smallpox. Smallpox has been described in Chinese texts dating back to the 4th Century AD, and evidence of



pox-like scars found on Egyptian mummies suggests the disease may have existed as far back as the 2nd millennium BC [49]. The discovery of a vaccine for smallpox made it the first disease to be eradicated by human efforts, and variola was the first human virus to be successfully eliminated [50]. Modern vaccinology owes its origins to Edward Jenner’s discovery in the late 18th century that zoonotic infections with the “cowpox virus” provided immunity to smallpox [49]. Furthermore, vaccinia virus, which is now used for smallpox vaccination, was the first animal virus to be observed using electron microscopy and the first to be utilized as a vector for transporting foreign genes into animals. This is why poxviruses are among the best-known viruses. The family of poxviruses, *Poxviridae*, is a family of double-stranded DNA viruses. Its natural hosts are vertebrates and arthropods and there are currently 83 species within 22 genera in this family. The family is divided into two subfamilies, *Entomopoxvirinae* (insect-infecting viruses) and *Chordopoxvirinae* (vertebrate-infecting viruses). Historically, poxviruses were classified based on disease symptoms and the animal species that was infected. Humans, cows, sheep, goats, horses and pigs have been studied to determine not only clinical symptoms but with the aim to classify poxviruses. This genus classification has been confirmed by recent comparative genome analysis [51]. Symptoms of disease caused by a poxvirus infection are skin lesions that can differ in size. Depending on the type of poxvirus, the papules can vary from small and pearly papules in infections of lumpy skin disease virus (LSDV) to larger crusts and spread generalized pustules in infections with the variola virus. Other general symptoms include fever, headache and rash.

Table 1 shows ten representatives of the 18 Chordopoxvirus genera according to the newest ICTV (International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses) Taxonomy Release from 2021, while at least five genera contain zoonotic poxviruses [52]. Orthopoxviruses have the biggest impact on human and animal health, and are remarkable for their broad host spectrum ranging from humans to wild and domestic animals [50]. The Chordopoxvirus subfamily is characterised by its large, linear double-stranded genome. Size varies between 134 to 365 kilobases [53, 54]. Chordopoxvirus genomes contain

Genus	Virus Species	Natural Hosts
Avipoxvirus	Canarypox virus	Songbirds
	Fowlpox virus	Chickens, turkeys
Capripoxvirus	Sheep pox virus	Sheep
	Lumpy skin disease virus	Cattle
Centapoxvirus	Yokapox virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, mosquitoes
Cervidpoxvirus	Deerpox virus	Deer
Crocodylidpoxvirus	Crocodilepox virus	Crocodiles
Leporipoxvirus	Myxoma virus	Rabbits, hares
Molluscipoxvirus	Molluscum contagiosum virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, primates, birds, dogs
Orthopoxvirus	Variola virus (Smallpox)	Humans (eradicated)
	Mpox virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, primates
	Cowpox virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, cats, cows, elephants
	Vaccinia virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, cattle, buffalos, rabbits
	Camelpox virus	Camels
Parapoxvirus	Pseudocowpox virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, cattle
	Orf virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, sheep, goats, etc.
Suipoxvirus	Swinepox virus	Pigs
Yatapoxvirus	Yaba monkey tumour virus <sup>1</sup>	Humans, rhesus monkeys

<sup>1</sup> Zoonotic disease

**Table 1:** Representative viruses from ten Chordopoxvirus genera.

130 to 328 open reading frames (ORF), and typically, two identical inverted terminal repeats (ITR) are located at both ends of poxvirus genomes.

Vaccination is available for smallpox, and the vaccine is even considered protective against symptoms of all orthopoxvirus infections. It is recommended for laboratory staff that works with mpox, cowpox, vaccinia and variola [55]. For animals, there is a smallpox-based vaccine that is used to protect elephants against cowpox [56]. Sheep and goats are broadly vaccinated with an orf vaccine, which is, similar to smallpox vaccine, a live virus. The effective vaccination against existing poxvirus diseases and

further microbiological studies, as well as similarities between poxviruses, motivate the expansion of existing data analysis pipelines that work for a specific poxvirus so that they can also work with other poxviruses.

### **Lumpy Skin Disease Virus**

Lumpy Skin Disease is caused by the lumpy skin disease virus belonging to the *Capripoxvirus* (CaPV) genus within the family of poxviruses, subfamily *Chordopoxvirinae* [57]. The LSD virus genome is a double-stranded linear DNA molecule of circa 151 kilobasepairs in length. It contains between 147 and 156 open reading frames. Similar to other poxviruses, the LSDV genome consists of a central coding region which is bounded by two identical ITR regions with a length of circa 2,400 basepairs at both ends of the genome. This is a key characteristic to consider during reconstruction of the genome. With a sequence identity of over 96% with the other CaPV genus members sheep pox and goatpox, the LSDV genome is highly similar to the other CaPV genomes [58].

LSDV is not known to be transmissible to humans and therefore not a zoonosis. Natural hosts of LSDV are cattle and Asian water buffalos. Although CaPV is considered to be host specific, sheep pox and goatpox strains can naturally cross-infect in both host species. There have been no cases of natural infection of sheep or goats with LSDV reported [59]. The three CaPV viruses are the most serious poxvirus diseases of livestock in terms of economic losses in the case of an outbreak.

Cattle infected with the LSDV typically show symptoms like fever, reduced feed and water uptake and characteristic skin nodules. The number of lesions varies from a few to many, covering the whole body [60]. From these symptoms alone, it is impossible to differentiate the diagnosis between sheep pox, goatpox and lumpy skin disease. Even with classical methods like cell culture and electron microscopy the highly similar viruses cannot be distinguished. Nowadays, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and sequencing are the techniques used to provide the sensitive detection of

CaPv [61].

LSDV has spread from the African continent and since 2019 reached major cattle producer countries in Asia, mainly India, Republic of China and Bangladesh. Other bigger outbreaks in south-west Europe were reported in 2014 to 2018, although these countries opted for a strict vaccination program and successfully eliminated LSDV from the region [62]. In African and Asian countries, veterinarians struggle to fight endemic LSDV outbreaks because of a lacking financial support by governments, justified by low mortality and morbidity rates.

One strain of LSDV that has been extensively studied is the Neethling strain, first isolated in Kenya in 1958. It constitutes the strain used for the live attenuated vaccine that is widely used, if accessible, for cattle against LSDV outbreaks. Some countries use sheep pox vaccines to protect cattle against LSD, even though it does not bring complete immunity. Nevertheless they are used in regions where all CaPV are prevalent [63].

### **2.2.2 Application of NGS Technologies in Poxvirus Diagnostics**

characteristic ITR that is left out in other pipelines (Yale University primer scheme starts after and ends before ITR)

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166093422000118> explains Primer scheme and why tiling amplicon approach makes sense even for large genome size of CaPV genome and complex structure with repetitive ITR regions

\* VirusDetect <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0042682216303166> virus discovery using sRNA sequences. evaluates sRNA size profiles

\* VirIdAl <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4915/13/10/2006> detecting and identifying viral pathogens in sequencing data. filtering, virus search (megablast), additional search

\* with Neural-KSP [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307615364\\_Finishing\\_monkeypox\\_genomes\\_from\\_short\\_reads\\_Assembly\\_analysis\\_and\\_a\\_neural\\_network\\_method\\_monkeypox\\_genome\\_construction](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307615364_Finishing_monkeypox_genomes_from_short_reads_Assembly_analysis_and_a_neural_network_method_monkeypox_genome_construction). "smart" gap filling

## 2.3 NGS Methods for Avian Influenza Virus

### 2.3.1 Avian Influenza Virus

Informally known as bird flu, avian influenza is a viral infectious disease that affects wild birds and poultry. The avian influenza virus (AIV) has occasionally crossed the species barrier and infects mammals, including humans. This makes it a high-priority zoonotic viral disease that has been designated as notifiable by WHO and WOAHA [25]. Avian influenza occurs in two variants determining its severity: low pathogenic avian influenza (LPAI) and high pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI), although only HPAI cases need to be reported.

AIV contains a segmented RNA genome, and co-infection can lead to reassortment events. Avian influenza viruses are members of the *Orthomyxoviridae* family and the four types Influenza A, B, C and D are distinguished on the basis of the presence of the nucleoprotein (NP) and matrix (M1) proteins [14]. AIV subtypes are determined by the hemagglutinin (HA) and neuraminidase (NA) segments, which include all known influenza A virus subtypes H1-H16 in combination with N1-N9 [14]. In order to be infectious, a virus particle has to contain each of the eight unique segments PB2 (polymerase), PB1/PB1-F2 (polymerase), PA/PA-X (polymerase), HA, NP, NA, M1/M2 and NS1/NEP (distinct non-structural proteins). Mutations in the HA and NA genes occur relatively frequently due to the prone-error RNA polymerase in the viral genome. AIV subtypes H5 and H7 usually infect poultry, although the natural hosts of avian influenza A are wild waterfowl. Both LPAI and HPAI infections have been reported in domestic poultry, i.e. ducks and chickens, turkeys, caged birds, aquatic birds and wild birds.

The H5, H7 and H9 subtypes are responsible for the biggest outbreaks of AIV with human cases [64]. The first confirmed report of human infection with an animal avian influenza virus dates 1958, and since then 16 subtypes have been found in humans [65]. Zoonotic spillover events have occurred with increasing frequency since the beginning of the 20th century and caused major epidemics such as a huge H5 outbreak in the U.S. in 2014-2015, which led to over 25 million dead birds [66]. Another ongoing outbreak that led to more than 58 million dead birds and costs of roughly 661 million U.S. dollars started in 2022 and spreads in the U.S. [67]. Influenza viruses of all subtypes have been isolated in almost all countries of the world, indicating its efficient

\* transmission \* symptoms \* endemic/seasonal disease \* historic outbreaks \* Human influenza virus: AIV has more subtypes as there are more prevalent subtypes in many different populations; more variants

\* vaccination

### **2.3.2 Application of NGS Technologies in Avian Influenza Virus Diagnostics**

surveillance systems include classical phylogenetic methods to genotype novel emerging strains, classify viral lineages or assess tree topologies to distinguish between novel and emerging strains (taxonomic classification – there are many strains) SARS-CoV-2 tracking is of huge global interest, resulting in a highly regarded topic with ongoing scientific activity in terms of publications

includes established institutions in bioinformatics that hand out approaches, guidelines, recommendations to govern outbreaks of viral livestock diseases. includes comprehensive pipelines for bioinformaticians, veterinarians and other health professionals. major platforms that offer exhaustive approaches to analyse genomic

samples from infected stock.

INSaFLU, ViReflow? (SARS-CoV-2 samples)

VAPOR (ref datasets)

\* INSaFLU (inside the flu) -> for influenza, NGS towards metagenomic virus detection, routine genomic surveillance,

\* Nextstrain -> for RT SARS-CoV-2, Influenza, Ebola pathogen populations \* Kraken2 -> taxonomic sequence classifier (using database and k-mers of FASTA sequences) \* VirFind (by Arkansas High Performance Computing Center) -> for fasta/Illumina fastq files, to detect new samples (trimming, mapping to ref, de novo assembly, Blastn, Blastx) \* ARTIC Network -> RAMPART for Ebola, yellow fever virus (read assignment, mapping, phylogenetic analysis on ONT data) \* IRIDA -> Integrated Rapid Infectious Disease Analysis for NGS data e.g. de novo assembly (FLAsh, SPAdes, Prokka)

tracking viruses using genomic sequence data collection; effective surveillance does not require exhaustive case surveillance, instead the collection of enough data from representative populations. This enables health professionals to detect newly evolved variants and to monitor trends in the circulating variants.

wastewater

<https://synapse.koreamed.org/articles/1134050>





## 3 Materials and Methods

### 3.1 Galaxy Platform

Galaxy is a web-based scientific platform that has become a major player in many fields of life sciences and bioinformatics. Founded in 2007 it has provided an emerging amount of resources and tools to empower scientists and researchers to work with biomedical datasets. The platform is free to use and collaborative, making it one of the biggest of its kind. Resources on Galaxy cover genomics, metagenomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, drug discovery and non-biology fields like natural language processing and social sciences.

Galaxy's primary objective is to make analyses more accessible, reproducible, and easier to communicate among researchers. The platform's distinctive success is attributed to four core elements: a very active community, a public server for analyses, an open-source software ecosystem, and the Galaxy ToolShed. The community adheres to the FAIR practices (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) [68].

The Galaxy community is thriving, with over 124,000 users who also contribute to subcommunities. The public server for analyses provides access to public datasets and workflows. The open-source software ecosystem ensures automated setup and deployment of all tools and services, making it simple for beginners and professionals to use. The Galaxy ToolShed is a server dedicated to hosting, sharing, and installing

tools used on the platform. A Galaxy tool is the abstraction layer that makes external software usable from within Galaxy with a frontend, i.e. lets users use the program with all its parameters and inputs from within Galaxy.

Galaxy workflows are a key feature that allow the user to stack tools in a chain and to configure them so that the workflow user only has to upload his or her data for the input fields. The automation of tools in a chain is used for modular, longer analyses that are executed repeatedly.

Workflows that are available on and accepted by the Intergalactic Workflow Commission (IWC; <https://github.com/galaxyproject/iwc>) conform with the community's best practise standards and tested on the latest Galaxy release. Dockstore and WorkflowHub automatically publish the IWC workflows and guarantee the availability in a Docker-based environment on Dockstore [69] and on the workflow collaboratory WorkflowHub [70].

Important contributions of Galaxy, as stated by the Galaxy Community (2022), include Vertebrate Genome Project assembly workflows and collaborations on SARS-CoV-2 research. Another toolkit leveraged in Galaxy is Galaxy-ML, a set of tool that provides a suite for analyses based on machine learning. With growing publicity, more topics are covered by and moved to Galaxy. It has contributed to over 5,700 scientific publications and has many tutorials available for researchers to use. Training material and ready-to-use workflows facilitate professionals and beginners in the field to use Galaxy for their research purposes.

The platform is continuously enhanced, and it still attracts around 2,000 new users every month, indicating the quality and significance of the project. The team and infrastructure of Galaxy initially come from the Nekrutenko lab in the Center for Comparative Genomics and Bioinformatics at Penn State, the Taylor lab at Johns Hopkins University, and the Goecks Lab at Oregon Health & Science University. All of these organisations have contributed significantly to the success of Galaxy. There are 138 public servers available worldwide as of 2023, while the most prominent

general-purpose server instances are hosted by teams at University of Freiburg, Germany (for UseGalaxy.eu), Texas Advanced Computing Center (for UseGalaxy.org) and Genomics Virtual Laboratory, formerly at the University of Queensland (for UseGalaxy.org.au). These main public servers are synchronized in their tools and set of reference tools [68].

## 3.2 Workflow Design


### 3.2.1 SARS-CoV-2 Pipeline as Baseline

annotated variants are of interest

description of basic steps

well-established workflow, includes 'minimal' steps:

1. Quality control
2. Mapping
3. Filtering
4. Trimming
5. Consensus Sequence Construction



**Figure 2:** Simplified SARS-CoV-2 ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow.

Plus Variant Calling and genome annotation;

Plus phylogenetic ranking "to assign a SARS-CoV-2 genome sequence the most likely lineage based on a chosen nomenclature system" (Pangolin)

### 3.2.2 Requirements

which problems should the pipeline solve?


what is "ampliconic" sequence analysis, ARTIC Illumina-sequenced data

#### Requirements for LSDV Workflow


- repetitions in the start and end regions → need to split reads into 2 pools and mask references
- after splitting, merging alignments back

#### Requirements for AIV Workflow

- reference for each of the 8 segments has to be chosen
  - align reference of each segment with consensus sequence for phylogenetic analysis
  - snipit for visualisation of SNPs
  - trimming would dismiss too many of the already short reads
- a tool to get closest reference



**Figure 3:** Simplified minimal ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow.



**Figure 4:** Simplified LSDV ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow.

### 3.3 Workflow Development

"Reference-based genomic Surveillance" (INSaFLU)


#### 3.3.1 Pox Virus Illumina Amplicon Workflow

Tiling amplicon approach for CaPV genome. Makes up 23 primer pairs for an amplicon size of 7.5 kb each instead of smaller sizes usually used in tiling amplicon protocols.

Workflow is composed of seven crucial steps: - preparing reference sequence for mapping (masking halves) - quality control - mapping - Filtering - merging - trimming - consensus sequence construction

LSDV genome has its central coding region bounded by identical inverted terminal repeats, containing 156 putative genes. the repeat of the ITRs would make any mapping in these regions ambiguous. need to part the reads in two pools and do mapping in two parts: N-mask the reference

Efficiency: Assembly vs. Mapping!!; efficiency (hier nur kurz, ausführlicher in Diskussion). Wenn Ziel viele Samples/flächendeckende Überwachung ist, dann ist Assembly zu teuer. Im großen Stil soll das hier genutzt werden)



**Figure 5:** Simplified AIV ARTIC PE reads iVar-based workflow.

building index is expensive (BWT)

### 3.3.2 AIV Illumina Amplicon Workflow

explain VAPOR here

Kraken2 vs. VAPOR; Efficiency: LoFreq vs. iVar consensus; both consensus identification methods using the same site-specific depth threshold

## 3.4 Workflow Evaluation

### 3.4.1 Evaluation of AIV Workflow Using Test Datasets

Sciensano s4+s8, Tunisian?

### 3.4.2 Evaluation of Pox Virus Workflow Using LSDv Test Dataset

Sciensano by Elisabeth Mathijs

## 4 Results

real-world data provided by Belgian Sciensano laboratory to test the workflow.

### 4.1 Pox Virus Illumina Workflow

IWC link, primer scheme. tested with LSDV data, pipeline outputs on 20L70, 20L81

#### 4.1.1 Results for LSDv Datasets 20L70 and 20L81

### 4.2 AIV Workflow

IWC link if existent. point out output for downstream analysis

#### 4.2.1 Results for Dataset U2012100-n21\_S8

Quality report, snipit plots, IQ-Tree for HA/NA, consensus reference, VAPOR scores

#### **4.2.2 Results for Dataset U2008751-n5\_S4**

Quality report, snipit plots, IQ-Tree for HA/NA, consensus reference, VAPOR scores



## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Contribution to the Field

single sample vs. multi sample (reality check, what is needed?)

further pox viruses, pipelines can be more or less easily applied/adjusted

limitations

LSDV für alle Pox-Viren interessant

AIV downstream alles. Es wäre gut key minor assets zu highlighten, die auf Adaption bei Säugetiere hinweist -> Databases werden benötigt zum Abgleichen ob ein Isolat mutiert ist?

Generell will man auf Aminosäure-Ebene annotieren (meiste Information)

Stammbäume zugänglich öffentlich, wäre gut die öffentlich zu haben, auch detailliert also >1 Sample pro Land, sehr feingliedrig um echt einordnen zu können (1 Isolat pro Kontinent bringt nicht so viel)

"The high sensitivity of the NGS technology ensures that major kinds of viral pathogens in mixed samples can be detected." One strength of NGS is that it can be used to detect emerging viral diseases with a high genetic variation. Like AIV. Since it can analyse a full sequence instead of targeting a specific gene. -> makes sense to use virus-specific primers for PCR or NGS

## 5.2 Future Directions

further validation and improvement of the developed pipelines, expansion to other viral livestock diseases, integration with existing surveillance systems; expand the VETLAB network to entitle even more professionals to professionally analyse their samples.

AIV workflow offers many possible directions for downstream analysis:

- \* consensus sequence for each segment -> compare consensus sequence to others can help identify outbreaks and patterns of transmission, get more insights how the virus spreads and its evolution
- \* Prokka annotation file. Predict the protein coding regions of the virus, to understand the function of the viral proteins and how they interact with host cells
- \* SNPs relative to the reference sequence
- \* MSA and phylogenetic tree for broad or detailed phylogenetic analysis and understand evolutionary relationships between the sample and other strains. could also use clusters or subtypes within the sample. make trees available so that new isolates can be immediately arranged
- \* more visualisation of the data
- \* long-term objective: build public high-resolution databases to enable researchers to detect mutation of an isolate. this is crucial for a global surveillance system to work.

## 6 Conclusion

Summary of objective and discussion



# Bibliography

- [1] F. Wu, S. Zhao, B. Yu, Y.-M. Chen, W. Wang, Z.-G. Song, Y. Hu, Z.-W. Tao, J.-H. Tian, Y.-Y. Pei, *et al.*, “A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China,” *Nature*, vol. 579, no. 7798, pp. 265–269, 2020.
- [2] World Health Organization (WHO), “Weekly epidemiological update on covid-19.” <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19—22-february-2023>, 2023. Retrieved: 22nd February, 2023.
- [3] World Health Organization (WHO), “Zoonoses.” <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/zoonoses>, 2020. Retrieved: 23rd February, 2023.
- [4] D. Grace, F. Mutua, P. Ochungo, R. Kruska, K. Jones, L. Brierley, M. Lapar, M. Y. Said, M. T. Herrero, P. Phuc, *et al.*, “Mapping of poverty and likely zoonoses hotspots,” 2012.
- [5] I. Brown, J. Banks, R. Manvell, S. Essen, W. Shell, M. Slomka, B. Londt, and D. Alexander, “Recent epidemiology and ecology of influenza A viruses in avian species in Europe and the Middle East,” *Developments in biologicals*, vol. 124, pp. 45–50, 2006.
- [6] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, “Zoonotic Diseases Shared Between Animals and People of Most Concern in the US CDC Newsroom,” 8.

- [7] K. E. Jones, N. G. Patel, M. A. Levy, A. Storeygard, D. Balk, J. L. Gittleman, and P. Daszak, “Global trends in emerging infectious diseases,” *Nature*, vol. 451, no. 7181, pp. 990–993, 2008.
- [8] Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry & Dairying, “Livestock Census.” <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1813802>, 2022.
- [9] H. Steinfeld, P. Gerber, T. D. Wassenaar, V. Castel, M. Rosales, M. Rosales, and C. de Haan, *Livestock’s Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options*. Food & Agriculture Org., 2006.
- [10] S. J. Salyer, R. Silver, K. Simone, and C. B. Behraves, “Prioritizing Zoonoses for Global Health Capacity Building—Themes from One Health Zoonotic Disease Workshops in 7 Countries, 2014—2016,” *Emerging infectious diseases*, vol. 23, no. Suppl 1, p. S55, 2017.
- [11] R. J. Garten, C. T. Davis, C. A. Russell, B. Shu, S. Lindstrom, A. Balish, W. M. Sessions, X. Xu, E. Skepner, V. Deyde, *et al.*, “Antigenic and Genetic Characteristics of Swine-Origin 2009 A(H1N1) Influenza Viruses Circulating in Humans,” *science*, vol. 325, no. 5937, pp. 197–201, 2009.
- [12] M. J. Gibbs, J. S. Armstrong, and A. J. Gibbs, “Recombination in the hemagglutinin gene of the 1918 “Spanish flu”,” *Science*, vol. 293, no. 5536, pp. 1842–1845, 2001.
- [13] D.-H. Lee, K. Bertran, J.-H. Kwon, and D. E. Swayne, “Evolution, global spread, and pathogenicity of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5Nx clade 2.3. 4.4,” *Journal of veterinary science*, vol. 18, no. S1, pp. 269–280, 2017.
- [14] R. G. Webster, W. J. Bean, O. T. Gorman, T. M. Chambers, and Y. Kawaoka, “Evolution and Ecology of Influenza A Viruses,” *Microbiological reviews*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 152–179, 1992.

- [15] D.-H. Lee, J. Bahl, M. K. Torchetti, M. L. Killian, H. S. Ip, T. J. DeLiberto, and D. E. Swayne, “Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Viruses and Generation of Novel Reassortants, United States, 2014–2015,” *Emerging infectious diseases*, vol. 22, no. 7, p. 1283, 2016.
- [16] N. S. Lewis, A. C. Banyard, E. Whittard, T. Karibayev, T. Al Kafagi, I. Chvala, A. Byrne, S. Meruyert, J. King, T. Harder, *et al.*, “Emergence and spread of novel H5N8, H5N5 and H5N1 clade 2.3. 4.4 highly pathogenic avian influenza in 2020,” *Emerging Microbes & Infections*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 148–151, 2021.
- [17] C. Adlhoch, A. Fusaro, J. L. Gonzales, T. Kuiken, S. Marangon, É. Niqueux, C. Staubach, C. Terregino, I. Aznar, *et al.*, “Avian influenza overview September–December 2022,” *EFSA journal. European Food Safety Authority*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. e07786, 2023.
- [18] World Health Organization, “Global vector control response 2017-2030,” *Global vector control response 2017-2030*, 2017.
- [19] R. Eccles, “An Explanation for the Seasonality of Acute Upper Respiratory Tract Viral Infections,” *Acta oto-laryngologica*, vol. 122, no. 2, pp. 183–191, 2002.
- [20] C. Lacroix, A. Jolles, E. W. Seabloom, A. G. Power, C. E. Mitchell, and E. T. Borer, “Non-random biodiversity loss underlies predictable increases in viral disease prevalence,” *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, vol. 11, no. 92, p. 20130947, 2014.
- [21] S. Morand, “Emerging diseases, livestock expansion and biodiversity loss are positively related at global scale,” *Biological Conservation*, vol. 248, p. 108707, 2020.
- [22] R. S. Reid, C. Bedelian, M. Y. Said, R. L. Kruska, R. M. Mauricio, V. Castel, J. Olson, and P. K. Thornton, “Global Livestock Impacts on Biodiversity,”

- Livestock in a Changing Landscape. Drivers, Consequences, and Responses;* Steinfeld, H., Mooney, HA, Schneider, F., Neville, LE, Eds, pp. 111–138, 2010.
- [23] D. J. Civitello, J. Cohen, H. Fatima, N. T. Halstead, J. Liriano, T. A. McMahon, C. N. Ortega, E. L. Sauer, T. Sehgal, S. Young, *et al.*, “Biodiversity inhibits parasites: Broad evidence for the dilution effect,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 112, no. 28, pp. 8667–8671, 2015.
- [24] R. Espinosa, D. Tago, and N. Treich, “Infectious Diseases and Meat Production,” *Environmental and Resource Economics*, vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 1019–1044, 2020.
- [25] World Organisation for Animal Health, “Animal Diseases.” <https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/animal-health-and-welfare/animal-diseases/>, 2023. Retrieved: 25th February, 2023.
- [26] “Chapter 6 - Epidemiology and Control of Viral Diseases,” in *Fenner’s Veterinary Virology (Fifth Edition)* (N. J. MacLachlan and E. J. Dubovi, eds.), pp. 131–153, Boston: Academic Press, fifth edition ed., 2017.
- [27] WHO, OIE, “One Health,” *World Health Organization*, vol. 736, 2017.
- [28] G. G. D. Suminda, S. Bhandari, Y. Won, U. Goutam, K. K. Pulicherla, Y.-O. Son, and M. Ghosh, “High-throughput sequencing technologies in the detection of livestock pathogens, diagnosis, and zoonotic surveillance,” *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 2022.
- [29] International Atomic Energy Agency, “Zoonotic Disease Integrated Action Initiative.” <https://nucleus.iaea.org/sites/zodiac/Shared2021>. Retrieved: 21st February, 2023.
- [30] E. R. Mardis, “Next-generation DNA sequencing methods,” *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, vol. 9, pp. 387–402, 2008.



- [31] B. E. Slatko, A. F. Gardner, and F. M. Ausubel, “Overview of Next Generation Sequencing Technologies,” *Current protocols in molecular biology*, vol. 122, no. 1, p. e59, 2018.
- [32] Illumina, “An introduction to Next-Generation Sequencing Technology,” *Illumina, Inc*, 2015.
- [33] M. Jain, H. E. Olsen, B. Paten, and M. Akeson, “The Oxford Nanopore MinION: delivery of nanopore sequencing to the genomics community,” *Genome biology*, vol. 17, pp. 1–11, 2016.
- [34] A. L. Greninger, S. N. Naccache, S. Federman, G. Yu, P. Mbala, V. Bres, D. Stryke, J. Bouquet, S. Somasekar, J. M. Linnen, *et al.*, “Rapid metagenomic identification of viral pathogens in clinical samples by real-time nanopore sequencing analysis,” *Genome medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 1–13, 2015.
- [35] S. Fu, A. Wang, and K. F. Au, “A comparative evaluation of hybrid error correction methods for error-prone long reads,” *Genome biology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2019.
- [36] R. Bowden, R. W. Davies, A. Heger, A. T. Pagnamenta, M. de Cesare, L. E. Oikkonen, D. Parkes, C. Freeman, F. Dhalla, S. Y. Patel, *et al.*, “Sequencing of human genomes with nanopore technology,” *Nature communications*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 1869, 2019.
- [37] C. P. Stefan, A. T. Hall, A. S. Graham, and T. D. Minogue, “Comparison of Illumina and Oxford Nanopore Sequencing Technologies for Pathogen Detection from Clinical Matrices Using Molecular Inversion Probes,” *The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 395–405, 2022.
- [38] A. Rhoads and K. F. Au, “PacBio sequencing and its applications,” *Genomics, proteomics & bioinformatics*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 278–289, 2015.

- [39] C. Y. Chiu and S. A. Miller, “Clinical metagenomics,” *Nature Reviews Genetics*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 341–355, 2019.
- [40] M. Capobianchi, E. Giombini, and G. Rozera, “Next-generation sequencing technology in clinical virology,” *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 15–22, 2013.
- [41] B. E. Dutilh, A. Varsani, Y. Tong, P. Simmonds, S. Sabanadzovic, L. Rubino, S. Roux, A. R. Muñoz, C. Lood, E. J. Lefkowitz, *et al.*, “Perspective on taxonomic classification of uncultivated viruses,” *Current opinion in virology*, vol. 51, pp. 207–215, 2021.
- [42] P. G. Cantalupo and J. M. Pipas, “Detecting viral sequences in NGS data,” *Current opinion in virology*, vol. 39, pp. 41–48, 2019.
- [43] M. Visser, R. Bester, J. T. Burger, and H. J. Maree, “Next-generation sequencing for virus detection: covering all the bases,” *Virology journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2016.
- [44] T. D. Minogue, J. W. Koehler, C. P. Stefan, and T. A. Conrad, “Next-generation sequencing for biodefense: biothreat detection, forensics, and the clinic,” *Clinical chemistry*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 383–392, 2019.
- [45] P. Zylstra, H. S. Rothenfluh, G. F. Weiller, R. V. Blanden, and E. J. Steele, “Pcr amplification of murine immunoglobulin germline v genes: strategies for minimization of recombination artefacts,” *Immunology and cell biology*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 395–405, 1998.
- [46] E. Kopylova, J. A. Navas-Molina, C. Mercier, Z. Z. Xu, F. Mahé, Y. He, H.-W. Zhou, T. Rognes, J. G. Caporaso, and R. Knight, “Open-source sequence clustering methods improve the state of the art,” *MSystems*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. e00003–15, 2016.

- [47] O. Zagordi, R. Klein, M. Däumer, and N. Beerenwinkel, “Error correction of next-generation sequencing data and reliable estimation of HIV quasispecies,” *Nucleic acids research*, vol. 38, no. 21, pp. 7400–7409, 2010.
- [48] F. Finotello, E. Lavezzo, P. Fontana, D. Peruzzo, A. Albiero, L. Barzon, M. Falda, B. Di Camillo, and S. Toppo, “Comparative analysis of algorithms for whole-genome assembly of pyrosequencing data,” *Briefings in bioinformatics*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 269–280, 2012.
- [49] F. Fenner, D. A. Henderson, I. Arita, Z. Jezek, and I. D. Ladnyi, “The history of smallpox and its spread around the world,” *Smallpox and its Eradication*, pp. 209–244, 1988.
- [50] F. Fenner, “Adventures with poxviruses of vertebrates,” *FEMS microbiology reviews*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 123–133, 2000.
- [51] C. Gubser, S. Hué, P. Kellam, and G. L. Smith, “Poxvirus genomes: a phylogenetic analysis,” *Journal of General Virology*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 105–117, 2004.
- [52] International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses, “Virus Taxonomy: 2021 Release.” <https://ictv.global/taxonomy>, 2021. Retrieved: 3rd March, 2023.
- [53] C. R. Brunetti, H. Amano, Y. Ueda, J. Qin, T. Miyamura, T. Suzuki, X. Li, J. W. Barrett, and G. McFadden, “Complete genomic sequence and comparative analysis of the tumorigenic poxvirus yaba monkey tumorvirus,” *Journal of virology*, vol. 77, no. 24, pp. 13335–13347, 2003.
- [54] E. Tulman, C. Afonso, Z. Lu, L. Zsak, G. Kutish, and D. Rock, “The genome of canarypox virus,” *Journal of virology*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 353–366, 2004.
- [55] J. Cono, C. G. Casey, and D. M. Bell, “Smallpox vaccination and adverse reactions; guidance for clinicians,” *MMWR. Recommendations and reports*:

- Morbidity and mortality weekly report. Recommendations and reports*, vol. 52, no. RR-4, 2003.
- [56] A. Kurth, G. Wibbelt, H.-P. Gerber, A. Petschaelis, G. Pauli, and A. Nitsche, “Rat-to-elephant-to-human transmission of cowpox virus,” *Emerging infectious diseases*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. 670, 2008.
  - [57] P. J. Walker, S. G. Siddell, E. J. Lefkowitz, A. R. Mushegian, D. M. Dempsey, B. E. Dutilh, B. Harrach, R. L. Harrison, R. C. Hendrickson, S. Junglen, *et al.*, “Changes to virus taxonomy and the International Code of Virus Classification and Nomenclature ratified by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (2019),” *Archives of virology*, vol. 164, no. 9, pp. 2417–2429, 2019.
  - [58] E. Tulman, C. Afonso, Z. Lu, L. Zsak, G. Kutish, and D. Rock, “Genome of Lumpy Skin Disease Virus,” *Journal of virology*, vol. 75, no. 15, pp. 7122–7130, 2001.
  - [59] F. Namazi and A. Khodakaram Tafti, “Lumpy skin disease, an emerging trans-boundary viral disease: A review,” *Veterinary Medicine and Science*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 888–896, 2021.
  - [60] L. Prozesky and B. Barnard, “A study of the pathology of lumpy skin disease in cattle,” *The Onderstepoort journal of veterinary research*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 167–175, 1982.
  - [61] S. Lafar, K. Zro, and M. M. Ennaji, “Capripoxvirus diseases: Current updates and developed strategies for control,” in *Emerging and Reemerging Viral Pathogens*, pp. 635–655, Elsevier, 2020.
  - [62] FAO Sustainable Prevention, “Control and Elimination of Lumpy Skin Disease—Eastern Europe and the Balkan,” *FAO Animal Production and Health Position Paper; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO): Rome, Italy*, vol. 2, p. 25, 2017.

- [63] J. Brenner, M. Bellaiche, E. Gross, D. Elad, Z. Oved, M. Haimovitz, A. Wasserman, O. Friedgut, Y. Stram, V. Bumbarov, *et al.*, “Appearance of skin lesions in cattle populations vaccinated against lumpy skin disease: statutory challenge,” *Vaccine*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 1500–1503, 2009.
- [64] M.-A. Widdowson, J. S. Bresee, and D. B. Jernigan, “The global threat of animal influenza viruses of zoonotic concern: then and now,” *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, vol. 216, no. suppl\_4, pp. S493–S498, 2017.
- [65] V. Kluska, M. Macku, and J. Mensik, “Demonstration of antibodies against swine influenza viruses in man,” *Ceskoslovenska pediatrie*, vol. 16, pp. 408–414, 1961.
- [66] R. M. Seeger, A. D. Hagerman, K. K. Johnson, D. L. Pendell, and T. L. Marsh, “When poultry take a sick leave: Response costs for the 2014–2015 highly pathogenic avian influenza epidemic in the usa,” *Food Policy*, vol. 102, p. 102068, 2021.
- [67] Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, “2022-2023 confirmations of highly pathogenic avian influenza in commercial and backyard flocks.” <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/animalhealth/animal-disease-information/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-2022/2022-hpai-commercial-backyard-flocks>, 2023. Retrieved: 9th March 2023.
- [68] The Galaxy Community, “The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2022 update,” *Nucleic Acids Res.*, vol. 50, no. W1, pp. W345–W351, 2022.
- [69] B. D. O’Connor, D. Yuen, V. Chung, A. G. Duncan, X. K. Liu, J. Patricia, B. Paten, L. Stein, and V. Ferretti, “The Dockstore: enabling modular,

community-focused sharing of Docker-based genomics tools and workflows,” *F1000Research*, vol. 6, 2017.

- [70] C. Goble, S. Soiland-Reyes, F. Bacall, S. Owen, A. Williams, I. Eguinoa, B. Driesbeke, S. Leo, L. Pireddu, L. Rodríguez-Navas, *et al.*, “Implementing FAIR Digital Objects in the EOSC-Life Workflow Collaboratory,” *Zenodo*, 2021.

# Appendix

\* table with WF tools, versions?

\* results of datasets

