

eISSN:2703-1322





Research article

Genetic comparison of *Brucella* spp. and *Ochrobactrum* spp. erroneously included into the genus *Brucella* confirms separate genera

Katharina Holzer^{1*}, Ludwig E. Hoelzle¹ and Gamal Wareth²

¹ University of Hohenheim, Institute of Animal Science, Department of Livestock Infectiology and Environmental Hygiene, Garbenstraße 30, 70599 Stuttgart, Germany

 2 Friedrich-Loeffler Institut, Institute of Bacterial Infections and Zoonoses, Naumburger Str. 96a, 07743 Jena, Germany



Article History: Received: 10-Jan-2023 Accepted: 22-Feb-2023 *Corresponding author: Katharina Holzer katharina.holzer@unihohenheim.de

Abstract

The facultative intracellular pathogen Brucella and the free-living bacteria Ochrobactrum are both α -proteobacteria and very close to each other. A group of researchers recently clustered Ochrobactrum strains into the genus Brucella according to a BLAST distance approach. Thus, we performed a deeper comparative genetic analysis for eleven Ochrobactrum strains and twelve different Brucella isolates to demonstrate important differences between these bacteria. In addition to the clear differences between Brucella and Ochrobactrum, like the differences in genes contents, and different genome sizes, the Brucella-specific gene bscp31 was not found in Ochrobactrum, as well as other important Brucella-specific proteins and virulence factors. Differences in antimicrobial resistance genes content and the presence or absence of plasmids were obvious between Brucella and Ochrobactrum spp. Genome alignment of Brucella spp. and Ochrobactrum spp. revealed a genome similarity of 85.7% maximum, whereas all analyzed Brucella spp. in this study had a similarity of 97.6-99.9%, and all compared Ochrobactrum spp. 82.6-98.0%. Because of these facts mentioned in this work, Brucella and Ochrobactrum should be considered separate genera.

Keywords: Brucella, Ochrobactrum, Genome analysis, WGS

Citation: Holzer, K., Hoelzle, L. E. and Wareth, G. 2023. Genetic comparison of *Brucella* spp. and *Ochrobactrum* spp. erroneously included into the genus *Brucella* confirms separate genera. Ger. J. Vet. Res. 3 (1): 31-37. https://doi.org/10.51585/gjvr.2023.1.0050

Introduction

Brucella spp. are zoonotic bacteria causing brucellosis. These microorganisms are risk class three pathogens, which can cause serious illness in humans with high undulant fever, liver and spleen inflammation, joints and bursa infestation as well as spinal and testicular infections, or placental retention (Young, 1995). Infected animals usually suffer from abortions. Ochrobactrum is a risk class one pathogen, an emerging pathogen in immunodeficient and immunocompetent patients with possible clinical symptoms like fever, headache, and disorder of consciousness (Zhu et al., 2018). Brucella and Ochrobactrum spp. belong to the class 2 alphaproteobacterial (Dorsch et al., 1989; Moreno et al., 1990; Velasco et al., 1998). Recently, Ochrobactrum spp. have been falsely included in the genus of Brucella and, therefore, renamed Brucella (Hördt et al., 2020). However, there are many arguments against classifying Ochrobactrum as Brucella. The doubt about including Ochrobactrum and Brucella in the same genus was based on several differences such as the genome size, existence of plasmids, cell envelope permeability,

metabolic redundancy, and therapy regimes and responses for treatment in cases of illness. The genome size of both pathogens differs noticeably (*Brucella*: 3.1-3.4 Mb vs. *Ochrobactrum*: 4.7-8.3 Mb). *Ochrobactrum* possesses up to six plasmids, whereas in *Brucella*, no plasmid could be found (Teyssier et al., 2005).

Regarding the cell envelope permeability, Brucella is permeable to hydrophobic probes and resistant to destabilization by polycationic peptides, while Ochrobactrum is impermeable to hydrophobic probes but sensitive to polycationic peptides (Velasco et al., 2000; Barquero-Calvo et al., 2009). The next point is that Brucella has a low metabolic redundancy in contrast to Ochrobactrum, which shows a high metabolic redundancy (Diaz et al., 2018; Gohil et al., 2020). In infections cases, *Ochrobactrum* have to be threatened based on a short monotherapy, while infections with Brucella are complicated and need a long bi-therapy (Corbel, 2006; Ryan and Pembroke, 2020; Yagel et al., 2020). Another aspect is that Ochrobactrum anthropic or Ochrobactrum intermedium, representing the closest Brucella relatives, shows 900-3000 gene differences to

Brucella spp. (Moreno et al., 2022).

Furthermore, there are about 170 Brucella proteins whose genes could not be found in Ochrobactrum genomes (Wattam et al., 2014; Gohil et al., 2020). Based on the previous information, the current comparative genomic analysis between eight different Ochrobactrum spp. erroneously referred to as Brucella spp. and 11 known Brucella spp. was carried out to emphasize that both bacteria are not belonging to the same genus.

Materials and methods

$Downloaded \ sequences \ from \ GenBank \ and \ species \\ identification$

The sequences (assemblies) of eleven different Ochrobactrum (O.) spp, namely O. haematophila, O. cytisi, O. lupini, O. pseudogrignonense strain SHIN, O. anthropi, O. cicero, O. daejeonense, O. endophytica, O. intermedia, O. pituitosa, and O. rhizospaerae were downloaded from GenBank (https: //www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/). These mentioned strains were falsely renamed into Brucella (B.) pseudogrignonensis, B. anthropic, B. cicero, B. daejeonesis, B. endophytica, B. intermedia, B. pituitosa, B. rhizospaerae. Additionally, 12 Brucella spp, namely B. abortus 2308, B. melitensis 16M, B. suis 1330, B. ovis, B. microti, B. canis, B. pinnipedialis, B. ceti, B. inopinata, B. vulpis, B. neotomae, and B. papionis were used in the comparison. The reference sequences or its BioProject or BioSample are listed in Table 1. The B4 and B5 markers were used to determine the Brucella-specific gene bscp31 (Baily et al., 1992). The PCR was carried out *in-silico* based on contigs using the program Generous v.11.1.5. The sequences of the primers are B4 (5'-TGG CTC GGT TGC CAA TAT CAA-3') and B5 (5'-CGC GCT TGC CTT TCA GGT CTG-3').

$\label{eq:whole-genome sequencing and bioinformatic procedure$

The sequences of the Ochrobactrum strains were compared to Brucella strains. For analyzing the downloaded 23 genome assemblies in a standardized and automated manner, the Linux-based bioinformatic WGSBAC (v.2.1) pipeline (https://gitlab. com/FLI_Bioinfo/WGSBAC/-/tree/version2, accessed on 02 September 2022) was used for running certain software. The pipeline input consisted of a metadata file and genome assemblies fastq files.

Comparison with entries in public databases

The tool pyANI v. 0.2.10 (https://github.com/ widdowquinn/pyani#conda), accessed on 19 June 2021) is a module for whole-genome classification of microbes using average nucleotide identity. This module was used to compute a pairwise ANI and other metrics between *Brucella* assemblies and *Ochrobactrum* contigs.

Antimicrobial resistance and plasmid determination In-silico detection of AMR genes and virulenceassociated determinants was performed using different databases, i.e., the Resistance Gene Identifier (RGI) based on the Comprehensive Antibiotic Resistance Database (CARD) (Jia et al., 2017), the ResFinder database (Zankari et al., 2012), and the NCBI AMR Finder Plus (https://github.com/ncbi/ amr/wiki/Running-AMRFinderPlus, accessed on 19 June 2022) (Feldgarden et al., 2019) for the identification of resistance genes and chromosomal mutations mediating antimicrobial resistance. Identifying the potential virulence-associated determinants was retrieved from the virulence factor database (VFDB, http://www.mgc.ac.cn/VFs/) using the core dataset (Liu et al., 2019). Plasmid identification was performed with the PlasmidFinder (https://cge.cbs. dtu.dk/services/PlasmidFinder/ (accessed on 19 June 2022), and Platon (https://github.com/oschwengers/ platon, accessed on 10 January 2023).

In-silico MLST and MLVA-16 analysis

Multilocus Sequence Typing (MLST) (Maiden al., 1998)carried in-silico et was out (https://github.com/tseemann/mlst, accessed on 02 November 2022). A scheme using the nine distinct genes gap, aroA, glk, dnaK, gyrB, trpE, cobQ, int_hyp and omp25 was used, of which seven represent housekeeping genes, whereas the two other genes, omp25 and int_hyp , represent an outer membrane protein and a hypothetical protein (Whatmore et al., 2007). Multiple-Locus Variable-Number Tandem Repeat Analysis using 16 markers (MLVA-16) genotyping system was carried out insilico using MISTReSS (https://github.com/Papos92/ MISTReSS, accessed on 22 February 2022) with primers adapted for *Brucella* (Sacchini et al., 2019). To avoid multiple primer binding sites, the forward primer sequence of Bruce21 was extended to (5'-GGCAGTGGGGGCAGTGAAGAATATGGTCGCTG-CGCTCATGCGCAACCAAAACA-3'). The number of repeats at each locus was determined by the fragment size according to the published Brucella allele assignment table (Al Dahouk et al., 2007).

Results and Discussion

Species identification with specific Brucella primer and comparative genomics

Comparing Ochrobactrum to Brucella showed a clear difference. The binding of the Brucella-specific primers B4 and B5, identifying the Brucella-specific bscp31 gene, was not detectable in the Ochrobactrum spp. The MLST and MLVA-16 analysis based on the whole genome revealed that no MLST or MLVA results exist for all Ochrobactrum strains. Measurement of the genome lengths of both genera showed that the genome size of the Ochrobactrum strains varies between 4,393,164 bp and 5,937428 bp and has a GC content of 53.0-60.7%, whereas Brucella spp. have a genome size of up to 3.4 Mb (Jumas-Bilak et al., 1998; Moreno et al., 2022) and a GC content of 57.2-57.3% (Table 1).

| Table 1: | Genome length | of the examined | Brucella and | Ochrobactrum spp. | and their GC content. |
|----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
|----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|

| Genus and species | Total length [bp] | GC content $[\%]$ | \mathbf{RefSeq} |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| B. melitensis | 3294931 | 57.22 | NC_003317.1, NC_003318.1 |
| B. abortus | 3278307 | 57.22 | NC_007618.1, NC_007624.1 |
| B. suis | 3315175 | 57.25 | NC_004310.3, NC_004311.2 |
| B. neotomae | 3329628 | 57.23 | BioSample SAMEA104210778 |
| B. inopinata | 3442381 | 57.15 | NZ_LT605585.1, NZ_LT605586.1 |
| B. vulpis | 3238137 | 57.13 | LN997863.1, LN997864.1 |
| B. ovis | 3275590 | 57.19 | NC_009505.1, NC_009504.1 |
| B. canis | 3312769 | 57.24 | NC_010103.1, NC_010104.1 |
| B. ceti | 3278034 | 57.23 | NC_022905.1, NC_022906.1 |
| B. microti | 3329628 | 57.23 | NC_013119.1, NC_013118.1 |
| B. pinnipedialis | 3331029 | 57.24 | NZ_CP007743.1, NZ_CP007742.1 |
| B. papionis | 3255082 | 57.26 | BioProject PRJNA251693 |
| O. Rhizosphaerae | 4903046 | 53.01 | SAMN07258022 |
| O. endophytica | 4932019 | 60.73 | PRJDB10509 |
| O. pituitosa | 4885407 | 53.44 | SAMN08100214 |
| O. intermedia | 4727886 | 57.74 | SAMEA3146534 |
| O. anthropi | 4858647 | 56.11 | SAMN16619790 |
| O. ciceri | 4741587 | 57.63 | SAMN25207262 |
| O. daejeonensis | 4642379 | 58.49 | SAMN1202516 |
| O. pseudogrignonensis | 5622438 | 54.11 | SAMN08166471 |
| O. lupini | 5582483 | 56.35 | SAMN07259926 |
| O. cytisi | 5937428 | 55.46 | SAMN05941866 |
| O. haematophilum | 5503262 | 56.67 | SAMN11855631 |

Furthermore, using pyANI alignment to all mentioned Brucella isolates compared to the Ochrobactrum spp. showed that there was a genome similarity of 83.2%-85.7%, whereas all compared Brucella spp. had a similarity of 97.6-99.9% to each other (Table 2 and Supplementary Table S1). Recently, the genus Ochrobactrum was included in the genus Brucella (Hördt et al., 2020). The reason for renaming Ochrobactrum as Brucella was a phylogenic BLAST distance approach and a supposed equivalence with some genera of pathogenic bacteria. In this study, eleven known Ochrobactrum spp. were taken for deeper genome analysis and compared with the genomes of twelve known taxonomy-accepted Brucella spp.

The absence of the *Brucella*-specific *bsc*p31 genes, as well as the absent MLST and MLVA profiles from the genome of all tested *Ochrobactrum*, in addition to the differences in the genome length, point out that both bacteria are completely different and including them in one genus is doubtful. Despite *Brucella* being phylogenetically close to *Ochrobactrum*, the alignment that has been carried out to include *Brucella* and *Ochrobactrum* together in one genus is not enough for the classification of the genus (Moreno et al., 2022).

Antimicrobial resistance and plasmid contents

In this section, clear differences could be demonstrated. The *in-silico* detection of AMR genes in *Ochrobac*- trum and Brucella strains successfully identified only the Brucella suis mprF gene and bepC, bepD, bepE, bepF, and bepG genes in all tested brucellae except for B. vulpis, where bepG and bepF are missing for whatever reason. However, none of those genes were found in the genomes of all tested Ochrobactrum spp. (except bepE for O. anthropi, O. cicero, O. intermedia and O. lupini). In contrast, resistance genes mediating resistance to β -lactamase (blaOXA and blaOXA-919), carbapenems (IMP-8), phenicol (floR), tetracycline (tetG), and aminoglycoside such as gentamicin (aac(6')-Ib) were found only in the genomes of Ochrobactrum and no classical AMR genes were found in all tested brucellae (Table 3).

The two identified AMR genes, the Brucella suis mprF, and bepC-G, were also found in genomes of almost all *B. abortus* and *B. melitensis* previously investigated (Wareth et al., 2021). The multiple peptide resistance factor mprF (Brucella suis mprF gene) is an integral membrane protein encoding a peptide, which modifies anionic phosphatidylglycerol for repulsion of cationic antimicrobial peptides (CAMPs), leading to resistance to CAMPs (Ernst et al., 2009) as well as resistance to methicillin, oxacillin, bacitracin, gentamycin, β -lactams, and other cationic peptides (Andrä et al., 2011) which were found in Brucellaceae.

The mprF also promises resistance to moenomycin, vancomycin, human defensins (HNP1-3), and oxygen-

Table 2: pyANI results classification of microbes using average nucleotide identity (%) showing the homogeneity between *Ochrobactrum pseudogrignonensis* strain SHIN as an example and the different *Brucella* spp. The entire detailed table, including all *Ochrobactrum* spp, is shown in Table S1.

| Commentation in the second second | | | | | | Perc | ent ide | ntity | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Genus and species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 1. O. pseudogrignonensis SHIN | 100.00 | 83.88 | 83.81 | 83.81 | 83.81 | 83.78 | 84.05 | 83.83 | 83.81 | 83.82 | 83.82 | 83.82 | 83.80 |
| 2. B. vulpis | | 100.00 | 97.70 | 97.77 | 97.78 | 97.78 | 97.58 | 97.76 | 97.78 | 97.83 | 97.65 | 97.79 | 97.73 |
| 3. B. melitensis 16M | | | 100.00 | 99.64 | 99.65 | 99.64 | 97.71 | 99.64 | 99.65 | 99.72 | 99.53 | 99.65 | 99.70 |
| 4. B. canis | | | | 100.00 | 99.73 | 99.70 | 97.78 | 99.70 | 99.73 | 99.78 | 99.59 | 99.90 | 99.66 |
| 5. B. microti | | | | | 100.00 | 99.73 | 97.78 | 99.72 | 100.00 | 99.80 | 99.62 | 99.75 | 99.68 |
| 6. B. papionis | | | | | | 100.00 | 97.78 | 99.71 | 99.72 | 99.78 | 99.60 | 99.73 | 99.67 |
| 7. B. inopinata | | | | | | | 100.00 | 97.76 | 97.79 | 97.84 | 97.66 | 97.80 | 97.73 |
| 8. B. ceti | | | | | | | | 100.00 | 99.71 | 99.83 | 99.59 | 99.71 | 99.67 |
| 9. B. neotomae | | | | | | | | | 100.00 | 99.80 | 99.62 | 99.75 | 99.68 |
| 10. B. pinipedialis | | | | | | | | | | 100.00 | 99.68 | 99.81 | 99.75 |
| 11. B. ovis | | | | | | | | | | | 100.00 | 99.62 | 99.56 |
| 12. B. suis | | | | | | | | | | | | 100.00 | 99.69 |
| 13. B. abortus | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100.00 |

Table 3: Results of antimicrobial resistance genes analysis in Brucella and Ochrobactrum.

| AMR genes found | Antimicrobial group and mecha- | Brucella spp. | $Ochrobactrum \ { m spp}.$ |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| | nism of action | | |
| blaOXA-919 | β -Lactam | Absent | Present |
| floR_2 | Phenicol (Chlorampheni- | Absent | Present |
| | col/florfenicol) | | |
| tet(G) | Tetracycline | Absent | Present |
| <i>aac</i> (6')-Ib | Aminoglycoside (Gentamicin) | Absent | Present |
| blaIMP-8 | β -Lactam (Carbapenem) | Absent | Present |
| $B.suis_mprF$ cationic an- | Integral membrane protein modi- | Present | Absent |
| timicrobial peptides | fying the negatively-charged phos- | | |
| | phatidylglycerol on the membrane | | |
| <i>Bep</i> -C, D, E, F, G | Efflux pump | Present | Absent (except $bepE$ was found |
| | | | in O. anthropi, O. ciceri, O. |
| | | | lupini O. intermedia) |

independent neutrophil killing (Andrä et al., 2011). It is worth mentioning that the mprF plays a crucial role in the virulence and pathogenesis of *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) and is involved in resistance to daptomycin (Ernst and Peschel, 2019), which is used for the treatment of methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) and vancomycin-resistant *Enterococci* (VRE). However, it is ineffective in Gram-negative bacteria, and the presence of this resistance is of no clinical relevance for treating brucellosis. The mprF1 and mprF2 also play a role in the pathogenicity of *Enterococcus faecalis* (Bao et al., 2012). The outer membrane efflux protein bepC-G of *B. suis* (strain 1330) is involved in the efflux of toxic and relatively hydrophobic compounds.

The presence of the bepC confers resistance to drugs such as chloramphenicol and acriflavine. An insertional mutation in the bepC gene in *B. suis* decreased the resistance to antibiotics such as tetracycline, erythromycin, ampicillin, and norfloxacin; consequently, bepC-dependent efflux processes of toxic compounds contribute to *B. suis* survival inside the host (Posadas et al., 2007). Furthermore, the presence of bepD-E increased resistance to tetracycline, doxycycline, ampicillin, norfloxacin, and ciprofloxacin in *B. suis* (Martin et al., 2009). No resistances genes were present for the efflux pump system bepC, bepD, bepF, and bepG, in the genomes of *Ochrobactrum*, which are indeed present in *Brucella*, contributing to resistance to some drugs like quinolones (Ravanel et al., 2009). However, *O. anthropi*, *O. ciceri*, *O. lupini*, and *O. intermedia* have bepE, a part of the efflux system. But because it occurs singly, it is not able to lead to the resistance of quinolones.

Analyzing the sequence of *Ochrobactrum* spp. revealed the presence of one plasmid. This may explain the presence of some classical AMR genes in the genome of *Ochrobactrum*. In comparison, analyzing the sequences of *Brucella* spp. could not detect any plasmids, as it is known that *Brucellaceae* have no plasmids.

Important proteins and virulence factors contents Forty-three virulence-related genes corresponding to five virulence factors were identified in the genomes of

all tested brucellae, i.e., lipopolysaccharide (LPS) associated genes, type IV secretion system (virB1-B12), TIR domain-containing effectors BtpA and BtpB, the Rab2 interacting conserved protein A (ricA), and cgs gene which is belonging to cyclic β -1,2 glucans (Supplementary Table S2). Among them, the LPS corresponding genes (lpxA-lpsE, lpsA, lpsB, lpcC, wbdA, wbkA-C, wboA, wbpL, wbpZ, wzm and wzt) could not be detected in the genomes of all tested Ochrobactrum spp. except O. intermedia and O. daejeonensis.

In the genome of O. intermedia, only the wbpZ gene was found, and the genome of O. daejeonensis only has the lpxA gene. The same applies to the genes of BtpAand *BtpB*, the Vir System (*vir*B1-*vir*B12), which were only found in the Brucella isolates. Brucella wboA, coding for a glycosyltransferase is playing a role in the establishment of the O-antigen in the lipopolysaccharide (LPS) biosynthesis. In general, the LPS of Brucella is different from other Enterobacteriaceae, like Escherichia coli (Christopher et al., 2010), and acts as a virulence factor (Cardoso et al., 2006). The genes lpsA, lpsB/lpcC, lpxA, lpxB, lpxC, lpxD, lpxE, qmd, per, wbkA, wbkB, wbkC, wbpL, wbdA, wzm and wzt regulating the LPS synthesis and its functions could only be found in the Brucella isolates. In Brucellaceae, the important virB type IV secretion system (T4SS) genes coding proteins for cell entry, intracellular trafficking, and survival genes (Christopher et al., 2010; Ke et al., 2015). The major outer membrane protein omp25, as well as BtpA, and BtpB proteins, act as virulence factors and interfere with toll-like receptors by interrupting the signaling pathway (Felix et al., 2014).

The major mechanisms known to contribute to virulence in the intracellular pathogens of the genus Bru*cella* are intracellular survival via LPS, genes *csg* (encoding for a glycoprotein), and the protein *ricA*, which interacts with the human Rab2 (de Barsy et al., 2011). Rab2 is a small GTPase required for protein transport from the endoplasmatic reticulum to the Golgi apparatus. Furthermore, immune avoidance in brucellae occurs via BtpA/BtpB/Btp1/TcpB, regulating the expression of the two-component BvrR/BvrS regulatory system and the T4SS secretion system (Głowacka et al., 2018). The cyclic β -1,2 glucan is a key virulence factor for the pathogenesis of brucellae and is described as a potent immune stimulator facilitating intracellular survival of Brucella (Roset et al., 2014; Degos et al., 2015). Rab2a is also required for a Brucellacontaining vacuole (BCV) biogenesis and intracellular replication of brucellae (Smith et al., 2020). The absence of those genes and other important Brucella virulence proteins in the genome of Ochrobactrum, according to the results of the current study, supports that both genera must be maintained separately, and including Ochrobactrum in the genus Brucella is not correct.

Conclusion

According to the results mentioned above, like the complete difference in antimicrobial resistant gene content between brucellae and *Ochrobactrum*, the absence

of important *Brucella* virulent factors and the bscp31 gene in *Ochrobactrum*, support the idea of not clustering *Ochrobactrum* to the genus *Brucella*. This statement is supported by the alignment between both bacteria (*Brucella* and *Ochrobactrum* strains: up to 85.7%, whereas *Brucella* spp. among themselves: at least 97.6%). Therefore, we recommend separating both genera again and keeping them separated.

Article Information

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Authors Contributions. Conceptualization: K. Holzer, G. Wareth, L. Hoelzle; resources: L. Hoelze; methodology: K. Holzer; software: K. Holzer; validation: L. Hoelzle, K. Holzer, G. Wareth; investigation: K. Holzer; data curation: K. Holzer; writing-original draft preparation: K. Holzer and G. Wareth; writing-review and editing: L. Hoelzle. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Publisher's Note. The claims and data contained in this manuscript are solely those of the author(s) and do not represent those of the GMPC publisher, editors, or Reviewers. GMPC publisher and the editors disclaim the responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from the contents of this article.

References

- Al Dahouk, S., Flèche, P.L., Nöckler, K., Jacques, I., Grayon, M., Scholz, H.C., Tomaso, H., Vergnaud, G., Neubauer, H., 2007. Evaluation of brucella MLVA typing for human brucellosis. Journal of Microbiological Methods 69, 137-145. 10.1016/j.mimet.2006.12.015.
- Andrä, J., Goldmann, T., Ernst, C.M., Peschel, A., Gutsmann, T., 2011. Multiple peptide resistance factor (MprF)-mediated resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* against antimicrobial peptides coincides with a modulated peptide interaction with artificial membranes comprising lysyl-phosphatidylglycerol. The Journal of Biological Chemistry 286, 18692–18700. 10.1074/ jbc.M111.226886.
- Baily, G.G., Krahn, J.B., Drasar, B.S., Stoker, N.G., 1992. Detection of *Brucella melitensis* and *Brucella abortus* by DNA amplification. The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 95, 271–275. URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/ 1495123.
- Bao, Y., Sakinc, T., Laverde, D., Wobser, D., Benachour, A., Theilacker, C., Hartke, A., Huebner, J., 2012. Role of mprF1 and mprF2 in the pathogenicity of *Enterococcus faecalis*. Plos One 7, e38458. 10.1371/journal.pone.0038458.
- Barquero-Calvo, E., Conde-Alvarez, R., Chacón-Díaz, C., Quesada-Lobo, L., Martirosyan, A., Guzmán-Verri, C., Iriarte, M., Mancek-Keber, M., Jerala, R., Gorvel, J.P., Moriyón, I., Moreno, E., Chaves-Olarte, E., 2009. The differential interaction of *Brucella* and *Ochrobactrum* with innate immunity reveals traits related to the evolution of stealthy pathogens. Plos One 4, e5893. 10.1371/journal.pone. 0005893.
- de Barsy, M., Jamet, A., Filopon, D., Nicolas, C., Laloux, G., Rual, J.F., Muller, A., Twizere, J.C., Nkengfac, B., Vandenhaute, J., Hill, D.E., Salcedo, S.P., Gorvel, J.P., Letes-

son, J.J., De Bolle, X., 2011. Identification of a *Brucella* spp. secreted effector specifically interacting with human small GTPase rab2. Cellular Microbiology 13, 1044–1058. 10.1111/j.1462-5822.2011.01601.x.

- Cardoso, P.G., Macedo, G.C., Azevedo, V., Oliveira, S.C., 2006. Brucella spp noncanonical LPS: Structure, biosynthesis, and interaction with host immune system. Microbial Cell Factories 5, 13. 10.1186/1475-2859-5-13.
- Christopher, S., Umapathy, B.L., Ravikumar, K.L., 2010. Brucellosis: Review on the recent trends in pathogenicity and laboratory diagnosis. Journal of Laboratory Physicians 2, 55– 60. 10.4103/0974-2727.72149.
- Corbel, M.J., 2006. Brucellosis in humans and animals. World health organization ed., World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization and World Organisation for Animal Health. URL: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43597.
- Degos, C., Gagnaire, A., Banchereau, R., Moriyón, I., Gorvel, J.P., 2015. Brucella CβG induces a dual pro- and antiinflammatory response leading to a transient neutrophil recruitment. Virulence 6, 19–28. 10.4161/21505594.2014. 979692.
- Diaz, M., Wegmann, U., Akinyemi, N., Oguntoyinbo, F.A., Sayavedra, L., Mayer, M.J., Narbad, A., 2018. Complete genome sequence of *Ochrobactrum haematophilum* FI11154, isolated from Kunu-Zaki, a Nigerian millet-based fermented food. Genome Announcements 6. 10.1128/genomeA. 00428-18.
- Dorsch, M., Moreno, E., Stackebrandt, E., 1989. Nucleotide sequence of the 16S rRNA from *Brucella abortus*. Nucleic Acids Research 17, 1765. 10.1093/nar/17.4.1765.
- Ernst, C.M., Peschel, A., 2019. MprF-mediated daptomycin resistance. International Journal of Medical Microbiology 309, 359–363. 10.1016/j.ijmm.2019.05.010.
- Ernst, C.M., Staubitz, P., Mishra, N.N., Yang, S.J., Hornig, G., Kalbacher, H., Bayer, A.S., Kraus, D., Peschel, A., 2009. The bacterial defensin resistance protein MprF consists of separable domains for lipid lysinylation and antimicrobial peptide repulsion. PLoS Pathogens 5, e1000660. 10.1371/journal.ppat.1000660.
- Feldgarden, M., Brover, V., Haft, D.H., Prasad, A.B., Slotta, D.J., Tolstoy, I., Tyson, G.H., Zhao, S., Hsu, C.H., McDermott, P.F., Tadesse, D.A., Morales, C., Simmons, M., Tillman, G., Wasilenko, J., Folster, J.P., Klimke, W., 2019. Validating the AMRFinder tool and resistance gene database by using antimicrobial resistance genotype-phenotype correlations in a collection of isolates. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 63. 10.1128/AAC.00483-19.
- Felix, C., Kaplan Türköz, B., Ranaldi, S., Koelblen, T., Terradot, L., O'Callaghan, D., Vergunst, A.C., 2014. The *Brucella* TIR domain containing proteins BtpA and BtpB have a structural WxxxE motif important for protection against microtubule depolymerisation. Cell Communication and Signaling 12, 53. 10.1186/s12964-014-0053-y.
- Gohil, K., Rajput, V., Dharne, M., 2020. Pan-genomics of Ochrobactrum species from clinical and environmental origins reveals distinct populations and possible links. Genomics 112, 3003–3012. 10.1016/j.ygeno.2020.04.030.
- Głowacka, P., Żakowska, D., Naylor, K., Niemcewicz, M., Bielawska-Drózd, A., 2018. Brucella- Virulence factors,

pathogenesis and treatment. Polish Journal of Microbiology 67, 151–161. 10.21307/pjm-2018-029.

- Hördt, A., López, M.G., Meier-Kolthoff, J.P., Schleuning, M., Weinhold, L.M., Tindall, B.J., Gronow, S., Kyrpides, N.C., Woyke, T., Göker, M., 2020. Analysis of 1,000+ typestrain genomes substantially improves taxonomic classification of *Alphaproteobacteria*. Frontiers in Microbiology 11, 468. 10.3389/fmicb.2020.00468.
- Jia, B., Raphenya, A.R., Alcock, B., Waglechner, N., Guo, P., Tsang, K.K., Lago, B.A., Dave, B.M., Pereira, S., Sharma, A.N., Doshi, S., Courtot, M., Lo, R., Williams, L.E., Frye, J.G., Elsayegh, T., Sardar, D., Westman, E.L., Pawlowski, A.C., Johnson, T.A., Brinkman, F.S.L., Wright, G.D., McArthur, A.G., 2017. CARD 2017: Expansion and model-centric curation of the comprehensive antibiotic resistance database. Nucleic Acids Research 45, D566–D573. 10.1093/nar/gkw1004.
- Jumas-Bilak, E., Michaux-Charachon, S., Bourg, G., O'Callaghan, D., Ramuz, M., 1998. Differences in chromosome number and genome rearrangements in the genus *Brucella*. Molecular Microbiology 27, 99–106. 10.1046/j.1365-2958.1998.00661.x.
- Ke, Y., Wang, Y., Li, W., Chen, Z., 2015. Type IV secretion system of *Brucella* spp. and its effectors. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology 5, 72. 10.3389/fcimb.2015.00072.
- Liu, B., Zheng, D., Jin, Q., Chen, L., Yang, J., 2019. VFDB 2019: A comparative pathogenomic platform with an interactive web interface. Nucleic Acids Research 47, D687–D692. 10.1093/nar/gky1080.
- Maiden, M.C., Bygraves, J.A., Feil, E., Morelli, G., Russell, J.E., Urwin, R., Zhang, Q., Zhou, J., Zurth, K., Caugant, D.A., Feavers, I.M., Achtman, M., Spratt, B.G., 1998. Multilocus sequence typing: a portable approach to the identification of clones within populations of pathogenic microorganisms. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 95, 3140–3145. 10.1073/pnas.95.6.3140.
- Martin, F.A., Posadas, D.M., Carrica, M.C., Cravero, S.L., O'Callaghan, D., Zorreguieta, A., 2009. Interplay between two RND systems mediating antimicrobial resistance in *Brucella suis*. Journal of Bacteriology 191, 2530–2540. 10.1128/ {JB}.01198-08.
- Moreno, E., Blasco, J.M., Letesson, J.J., Gorvel, J.P., Moriyón, I., 2022. Pathogenicity and its implications in taxonomy: The *Brucella* and *Ochrobactrum* case. Pathogens 11. 10.3390/ pathogens11030377.
- Moreno, E., Stackebrandt, E., Dorsch, M., Wolters, J., Busch, M., Mayer, H., 1990. Brucella abortus 16S rRNA and lipid A reveal a phylogenetic relationship with members of the alpha-2 subdivision of the class Proteobacteria. Journal of Bacteriology 172, 3569–3576. 10.1128/jb.172.7.3569–3576.1990.
- Posadas, D.M., Martín, F.A., Sabio y García, J.V., Spera, J.M., Delpino, M.V., Baldi, P., Campos, E., Cravero, S.L., Zorreguieta, A., 2007. The TolC homologue of *Brucella suis* is involved in resistance to antimicrobial compounds and virulence. Infection and Immunity 75, 379–389. 10.1128/IAI.01349-06.
- Ravanel, N., Gestin, B., Maurin, M., 2009. In-vitro selection of fluoroquinolone resistance in Brucella melitensis. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents 34, 76-81. 10.1016/ j.ijantimicag.2009.01.002.

- Roset, M.S., Ibañez, A.E., de Souza Filho, J.A., Spera, J.M., Minatel, L., Oliveira, S.C., Giambartolomei, G.H., Cassataro, J., Briones, G., 2014. Brucella cyclic β-1,2-glucan plays a critical role in the induction of splenomegaly in mice. Plos One 9, e101279. 10.1371/journal.pone.0101279.
- Ryan, M.P., Pembroke, J.T., 2020. The genus Ochrobactrum as major opportunistic pathogens. Microorganisms 8. 10.3390/microorganisms8111797.
- Sacchini, L., Wahab, T., Di Giannatale, E., Zilli, K., Abass, A., Garofolo, G., Janowicz, A., 2019. Whole genome sequencing for tracing geographical origin of imported cases of human brucellosis in Sweden. Microorganisms 7. 10.3390/ microorganisms7100398.
- Smith, E.P., Cotto-Rosario, A., Borghesan, E., Held, K., Miller, C.N., Celli, J., 2020. Epistatic interplay between type IV secretion effectors engages the small GTPase rab2 in the *Bru*cella intracellular cycle. mBio 11. 10.1128/mBio.03350-19.
- Teyssier, C., Marchandin, H., Masnou, A., Jeannot, J.L., de Buochberg, M.S., Jumas-Bilak, E., 2005. Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis to study the diversity of whole-genome organization in the genus *Ochrobactrum*. Electrophoresis 26, 2898– 2907. 10.1002/elps.200410323.
- Velasco, J., Bengoechea, J.A., Brandenburg, K., Lindner, B., Seydel, U., Gonzalez, D., Zahringer, U., Moreno, E., Moriyon, I., 2000. Brucella abortus and its closest phylogenetic relative, Ochrobactrum spp., differ in outer membrane permeability and cationic peptide resistance. Infection and Immunity 68, 3210–3218. 10.1128/IAI.68.6.3210–3218.2000.
- Velasco, J., Romero, C., López-Goñi, I., Leiva, J., Díaz, R., Moriyón, I., 1998. Evaluation of the relatedness of *Brucella* spp. and *Ochrobactrum anthropi* and description of *Ochrobac*trum intermedium sp. nov., a new species with a closer relationship to *Brucella* spp. International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology 48 Pt 3, 759–768. 10.1099/00207713-48-3-759.

- Wareth, G., El-Diasty, M., Abdel-Hamid, N.H., Holzer, K., Hamdy, M.E.R., Moustafa, S., Shahein, M.A., Melzer, F., Beyer, W., Pletz, M.W., Neubauer, H., 2021. Molecular characterization and antimicrobial susceptibility testing of clinical and non-clinical *Brucella melitensis* and *Brucella abortus* isolates from Egypt. One health 13, 100255. 10.1016/j.onehlt. 2021.100255.
- Wattam, A.R., Foster, J.T., Mane, S.P., Beckstrom-Sternberg, S.M., Beckstrom-Sternberg, J.M., Dickerman, A.W., Keim, P., Pearson, T., Shukla, M., Ward, D.V., Williams, K.P., Sobral, B.W., Tsolis, R.M., Whatmore, A.M., O'Callaghan, D., 2014. Comparative phylogenomics and evolution of the brucellae reveal a path to virulence. Journal of Bacteriology 196, 920–930. 10.1128/JB.01091-13.
- Whatmore, A.M., Perrett, L.L., MacMillan, A.P., 2007. Characterisation of the genetic diversity of *Brucella* by multilocus sequencing. BMC Microbiology 7, 34. 10.1186/ 1471-2180-7-34.
- Yagel, Y., Sestito, S., Motro, Y., Shnaiderman-Torban, A., Khalfin, B., Sagi, O., Navon-Venezia, S., Steinman, A., Moran-Gilad, J., 2020. Genomic characterization of antimicrobial resistance, virulence, and phylogeny of the genus Ochrobactrum. Antibiotics 9. 10.3390/antibiotics9040177.
- Young, E.J., 1995. An overview of human brucellosis. Clinical Infectious Diseases 21, 283-9; quiz 290. 10.1093/clinids/21. 2.283.
- Zankari, E., Hasman, H., Cosentino, S., Vestergaard, M., Rasmussen, S., Lund, O., Aarestrup, F.M., Larsen, M.V., 2012. Identification of acquired antimicrobial resistance genes. The Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 67, 2640–2644. 10. 1093/jac/dks261.
- Zhu, M., Zhao, X., Zhu, Q., Zhang, Z., Dai, Y., Chen, L., Liang, Z., 2018. Clinical characteristics of patients with Ochrobactrum anthropi bloodstream infection in a Chinese tertiarycare hospital: A 7-year study. Journal of Infection and Public Health 11, 873–877. 10.1016/j.jiph.2018.07.009.

Supplementary Data

Holzer, K., Hoelzle, L. E. and Wareth, G. Genetic comparison of *Brucella* spp. and *Ochrobactrum* spp. erroneously included into the genus *Brucella* confirms separate genera. Ger. J. Vet. Res. 3 (1):31-37. https://doi.org/10.51585/gjvr.2023.1.0050

| Genus and species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| B. vulpis | 100.0 | 83.9 | 97.7 | 97.8 | 83.9 | 97.8 | 85.4 | 97.8 | 97.6 | 85.2 | 85.3 | 97.8 | 97.8 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.7 | 97.8 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 85.2 | 97-7 | 97.8 | 97-7 |
| O. pituitosa | 83.9 | 100.0 | 84.0 | 84.0 | 86.5 | 84.0 | 86.3 | 84.0 | 84.0 | 84.7 | 86.1 | 84.0 | 84.0 | 87.2 | 84.8 | 84.8 | 84.0 | 84.5 | 83.0 | 86.2 | 84.0 | 84.0 | 84.0 |
| B. melitensis 16M | 97.7 | 84.0 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 83.8 | 99.7 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 97.7 | 85.1 | 85.2 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 83.7 | 85.5 | 85.5 | 99.7 | 84.9 | 83.2 | 85.3 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 99.7 |
| B. canis | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 83.8 | 99.7 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 85.1 | 85.2 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.7 | 85.5 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.8 | 83.3 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 99.9 | 99.7 |
| O. pseudogrigonensis SHIN | 83.9 | 86.5 | 83.8 | 83.8 | 100.0 | 83.8 | 84.8 | 83.8 | 84.0 | 84.0 | 85.2 | 83.8 | 83.8 | 84.6 | 84.5 | 84.5 | 83.8 | 84.4 | 82.6 | 85.0 | 83.8 | 83.8 | 83.8 |
| B. microti | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 100.0 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 85.1 | 85.2 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 83.7 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.9 | 83.2 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 99.8 | 99.7 |
| O. lupini | 85.4 | 86.3 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 84.8 | 85.3 | 100.0 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 85.2 | 97.9 | 85.4 | 85.4 | 84.4 | 88.1 | 88.0 | 85.4 | 85.9 | 83.7 | 95.7 | 85.3 | 85.4 | 85.3 |
| B. papionis | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 99.7 | 85.3 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 85.2 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 85.2 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 99.7 |
| B. inopinata | 97.6 | 84.0 | 97.7 | 97.8 | 84.0 | 97.8 | 85.3 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 97.8 | 97.8 | 83.9 | 85.6 | 85.7 | 97.8 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 85.2 | 97.7 | 97.8 | 97.7 |
| O. daejeonensis | 85.2 | 84.7 | 85.1 | 85.1 | 84.0 | 85.1 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 100.0 | 85.4 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 83.6 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 85.2 | 85.1 | 83.6 | 85.2 | 85.1 | 85.1 | 85.1 |
| O. anthropi | 85.3 | 86.1 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 97.9 | 85.3 | 85.2 | 85.4 | 100.0 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 84.2 | 88.1 | 88.0 | 85.3 | 85.7 | 83.4 | 95.9 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 85.3 |
| B. ceti | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 99.7 | 85.4 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 85.2 | 85.3 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 83.7 | 85.5 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.9 | 83.3 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 99.7 |
| B. neotomae | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 100.0 | 85.4 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 85.2 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 83.7 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.9 | 83.2 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 99.8 | 99.7 |
| 0. rhizosphaerae | 83.8 | 87.2 | 83.7 | 83.7 | 84.6 | 83.7 | 84.4 | 83.8 | 83.9 | 83.6 | 84.2 | 83.7 | 83.7 | 100.0 | 84.0 | 83.9 | 83.8 | 85.2 | 82.9 | 84.1 | 83.8 | 83.8 | 83.8 |
| O. ciceri | 85.6 | 84.8 | 85.5 | 85.5 | 84.5 | 85.6 | 88.1 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 85.7 | 88.1 | 85.5 | 85.6 | 84.0 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 85.6 | 85.4 | 83.6 | 87.9 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 85.6 |
| O. intermedia | 85.7 | 84.8 | 85.5 | 85.6 | 84.5 | 85.6 | 88.0 | 85.6 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 88.0 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 83.9 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 85.6 | 85.5 | 83.5 | 87.9 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 85.6 |
| B. pinipedialis | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 83.8 | 99.8 | 85.4 | 99.8 | 97.8 | 85.2 | 85.3 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 100.0 | 84.9 | 83.3 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 99.7 |
| O. haematophilum | 84.9 | 84.5 | 84.9 | 84.8 | 84.4 | 84.9 | 85.9 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 85.1 | 85.7 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 85.2 | 85.4 | 85.5 | 84.9 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 85.7 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 85.0 |
| O. endophytica | 83.4 | 83.0 | 83.2 | 83.3 | 82.6 | 83.2 | 83.7 | 83.4 | 83.4 | 83.6 | 83.4 | 83.3 | 83.2 | 82.9 | 83.6 | 83.5 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 83.5 | 83.4 | 83.4 | 83.4 |
| O. cytisi | 85.2 | 86.2 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 85.0 | 85.3 | 95.7 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 85.2 | 95.9 | 85.3 | 85.3 | 84.1 | 87.9 | 87.9 | 85.3 | 85.7 | 83.5 | 100.0 | 85.2 | 85.4 | 85.4 |
| B. ovis | 97.7 | 84.0 | 99.5 | 99.6 | 83.8 | 99.6 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 97.7 | 85.1 | 85.3 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.7 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 85.2 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 99.6 |
| B. suis | 97.8 | 84.0 | 99.7 | 99.9 | 83.8 | 99.8 | 85.4 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 85.1 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.8 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 85.4 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 99.7 |
| B. abortus | 97.7 | 84.0 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 99.7 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 97.7 | 85.1 | 85.3 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 83.8 | 85.6 | 85.6 | 99.7 | 85.0 | 83.4 | 85.4 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 100.0 |

 Table S1: pyANI results of the Ochrobactrum and Brucella genome alignment.

Table S2: Detected genes coding for virulence factors. 'X' means it was detectable, while '-' was not detectable.

| | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Vi | rule | nce f | acto | rs | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|-------|---|-----|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|---|---|-----|-----|---------|---------|-----|-----|------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|----|------------|----|----|----|------------|-------------|----|------|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|------|
| Genus and species | Total No | acpXL | | btp | cgs | fabZ | bmd | htrB | kds | | sdj | | | xdl | | manAoAg | manCoAg | per | шbd | mmd | ricA | | | | | | vir | | | | | | į | Abda | whk | | W | ada | | mzm |
| | | | A | В | | | | | AE | S A | в,0 | A | в | С | DE | _ | | | | | | Bı | B10 | B11 | B12 | B2 | B 3 | B4 | B5 | B6 | B 7 | B8 1 | B9 | | A | вс | - | L | z | |
| B. abortus | 43 | х | x | x | х | x | x | х | x x | x | x | х | x | x | x x | x | x | x | х | x | х | x | х | x | x | х | х | x | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x : | x : |
| B. canis | 42 | х | - | х | х | x | х | х | хx | x | х | x | х | x | x x | х | х | х | х | х | х | x | х | х | х | х | х | х | x | х | x | x | х | x | x | x x | х | x | x | x : |
| B. ceti | 43 | x | x | x | х | x | x | x | хx | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | х | x | х | х | х | х | x | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | х | x | x : | x : |
| B. inopinata | 28 | x | - | - | x | x | - | х | хx | x | х | х | x | x | x x | - | - | - | х | - | х | x | х | x | x | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | - | | - | x | | |
| B. melitensis | 43 | x | x | x | х | x | x | х | хx | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | х | х | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | х | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x : |
| B. microti | 43 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | хx | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x : |
| B. neotomae | 43 | x | x | x | x | x | x | х | хx | x | x | x | х | x | x x | x | x | x | х | х | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x :: |
| B. ovis | 41 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x | х | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | х | x | x | | x | x x | - | x | x | x : |
| B. pinnipedialis | 42 | х | x | x | х | x | x | х | x x | x | х | х | x | x | x x | х | x | x | х | - | х | x | x | х | x | x | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x : |
| B. suis | 42 | х | - | х | х | x | x | х | хx | x | x | х | х | х | x x | x | x | x | х | х | х | x | x | x | x | x | x | х | x | х | х | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x : |
| B. papionis | 42 | x | - | x | x | x | x | x | хx | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x x | x | x | x | x , |
| O. anthropi | 7 | x | - | - | x | x | - | х | x x | - : | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | | - | - | | |
| O. ciceri | 8 | х | - | - | x | x | - | х | x x | | - | - | - | | | - | - | - | x | - | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | |
| O. daejeonensis | 9 | х | - | - | x | x | - | х | x x | - | - | x | - | - | | - | - | - | х | - | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | |
| O. endophytica | 1 | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | |
| O. intermedia | 12 | x | - | - | х | х | - | х | хx | - | - | - | - | - | | х | х | - | х | х | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | x | |
| O. pituitosa | 5 | x | - | - | x | - | - | x | x - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | |
| O. rhizosphaerae | 3 | х | - | - | х | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | _ |
| O. pseudogrignonensis | 6 | х | - | - | х | - | - | х | | - | - | - | - | - | | х | х | - | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - |
| O. lupini | 7 | x | - | - | х | x | - | х | x x | | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | |
| O. cytisi | 7 | х | - | - | х | х | - | х | хx | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - |
| O. haematophilum | 8 | х | - | - | х | х | - | х | хx | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | х | - | х | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | - |