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Abstract

Cellular responses to pathogen invasion are crucial for maintaining cell homeostasis and survival. The interferon (IFN) system is one of the most effective cellular responses to viral intrusion in mammals. Viral recognition by innate immune sensors activates the antiviral IFN system. Retinoic acid-inducible gene I (RIG-I) like receptors (RLRs) are DExD/H box RNA helicases that sense viral invasion. RLRs recognize cytoplasmic viral RNAs and trigger antiviral responses, resulting in production of type I IFN and inflammatory cytokines. Unique and common sensing mechanisms among RLRs have been reported. In this review, recent progress in the understanding of antiviral responses by RLRs is summarized and discussed.
Introduction
Virus infection induces numerous host responses to eliminate pathogen invasion. Host antiviral responses are operated by germline-encoded cellular receptors that recognize specific patterns of foreign molecules, termed pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs). PAMPs are detected by the ‘sensor’ molecules, known as pattern recognition receptors (PRRs), which play a crucial role in triggering host innate immunity, a primary cellular defense system. Recent studies have identified several innate immune receptors including Toll-like receptors (TLRs), nucleotide-binding oligomerization domain (NOD)-like receptors (NLRs) and RLRs, and clarified their roles in antiviral signaling by sensing virus-derived molecules.

In this review, we focus on RLRs, which detect cytoplasmic viral RNA PAMPs. For the function of TLRs and NLRs, refer to reviews published elsewhere [1] [2].

RLR-mediated signaling
RLRs are Asp-Glu-Ala-Asp (DEAD) box containing RNA helicases. To date, three members including RIG-I, melanoma differentiation-associated gene 5 (MDA5) and laboratory of genetics and physiology 2 (LGP2) have been indentified. All RLRs share helicase domain and C-terminal domain (CTD), however LGP2 lacks a caspase activation and recruitment domain (CARD), that is critical for signal transduction; thus, LGP2 has been suggested as the regulatory molecule for RIG-I and MDA5 [3] [4].

Upon viral infection, RLRs recognize PAMP RNAs (Table 1) and undergo conformational change mediated by ATPase/Helicase activity, which results in the exposure of CARD [5] [6]. Although RIG-I and MDA5 sense distinct viral infections [7] (Table 2), they share a common mitochondria-localized downstream signal adaptor, interferon promoter stimulator-1 (IPS-1, also termed MAVS, VISA or Cardif) for signal transduction [8]. Upon interaction between RLR and IPS-1 via their CARD-CARD association, IPS-1 conforms aggregates which share several features of prions [9]. The mitochondrial component, mitofusin 1 (MFN1) plays a critical role in the IPS-1 aggregation by
regulation of the mitochondrial fusion and fission [10]. This assembly further results in the recruitment of several ubiquitin ligases (TRAFs) and kinase complexes (TBK1 or IKKε and IKKα/β/γ complex). A recent study suggested that microtubule network-associated protein, regulates the trafficking of IFN signaling by mediating the interaction between TBK1/IKKε and IRF3 [11]. Eventually, the activation of transcription factors IRF3 and IRF7, as well as NF-κB, leads to the production of type I IFNs and pro-inflammatory cytokines [8] (Figure 1).

The produced IFN becomes a messenger of the ‘warning sign’ for both IFN-producing and bystander cells, and promotes the ‘second round’ antiviral responses by inducing the expression of hundreds of interferon-stimulated genes (ISGs). The antiviral roles of several representative ISGs, such as PKR, OASs and RNase L, are well-characterized. Recent studies further elucidated the function of another ISG, IFITs, in their antiviral activity. IFITs, especially IFIT1, IFIT2 and IFIT5, recognize 5' triphosphorylated (5' ppp) RNA or capped RNA lacking 2'-O-methyl groups and sequester such RNA from translation, leading to the inhibition of viral replication [12] [13].

**RNA ligands of RIG-I**

1. Does RIG-I recognize RNA with 5’- triphosphate?

In 2006, two groups simultaneously provided significant evidence that triphosphate moiety on the 5’ end is an essential determinant of RIG-I activation using single-stranded (ss) ‘in vitro transcribed’ RNA (ivtRNA) or a viral genome containing 5’ppp [14] [15] [16]. Rehwinkel et al. also proved that viral genomes bearing 5’ppp trigger IFN responses [17]. However, it became clearer in the following two studies that 5’ppp itself is not sufficient for efficient RIG-I activation [18] [19]. These reports commonly found that, unlike 5’ppp ivtRNA, chemically synthesized 5’ppp ssRNA did not activate RIG-I and they also realized that products of in vitro transcription by phage RNA polymerase retained the unexpected ‘copy-back’ structure. Therefore they concluded that an additional double-stranded region or a stem-loop structure is necessary for a true RIG-I agonist. Indeed, it was clarified that Sendai virus (SeV) and
vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV) produce RIG-I agonist RNA, known as a 'defective-interfering (DI) RNA', which contains a copy-back structure with 5’ppp [20] [21]. Moreover, recent studies showed that PAMP RNA from negative-strand ssRNA viruses, including influenza A, rabies, and measles virus, possess conserved panhandle structures with 5’ppp in their genomes, further confirming that 5’ppp along with secondary structures is an indispensable characteristic of RIG-I activators.

2. dsRNA activates RLRs

dsRNA is a classical non-self RNA, which is not produced in uninfected cells due to a lack of RNA-dependent RNA polymerase in mammalian cells. Both RIG-I and MDA5 appear to regulate the induction of type I IFN after stimulation by dsRNA [22]. Since artificial dsRNA, polyinosinic:polycytidylic acid (poly I:C), does not possess 5’ triphosphate, several studies using various 5’- or 3’-modified dsRNAs also showed that 5’ppp is dispensable for RIG-I activation [5] [23]; it is generally assumed that recognition of dsRNA by RIG-I does not require 5’ppp. Interestingly, it was discovered that the length of dsRNA is a critical determinant that enables RNA ligands to turn on either RIG-I or MDA5 activation [24]. It was revealed that short dsRNA (< 1 kb) elicited IFN production through RIG-I while long dsRNA (> 7 kb) failed to activate RIG-I, but efficiently activate MDA5. Related to the size-dependent activation of RIG-I by dsRNA, it is suggested that RIG-I conforms to a different structure when bound to short and long dsRNA [5].

The dsRNA chain length-dependent recognition was confirmed by viral infection [24]. For example, viruses that produce undetectable (Influenza A virus) or short dsRNA (VSV) activate RIG-I-dependent signaling. In contrast, long dsRNA-producing viruses, such as encephalomyocarditis virus (EMCV) induce IFN signaling through MDA5. Interestingly, reovirus, whose genome is composed of different-sized segmented dsRNA, is recognized by both RIG-I and MDA5 [24].

3. RNA sequence specificity

Although sensing of dsRNA does not seem to require sequence specificity, the RNA sequence is an important feature for the recognition of 5’ppp RNAs by
RIG-I. Saito et al. found that 3’-untranslated region (3’ UTR) of the hepatitis C virus (HCV) genome (ssRNA) is a potent RIG-I activator [25]. On screening of the RIG-I activating domain by dissecting the HCV 3’UTR, they discovered that the uridine-rich region has the potential to trigger IFN signaling through RIG-I in a 5’ppp dependent manner. Nucleotide substitution analysis further revealed that adenosine-rich RNA also potentially activates RIG-I. Moreover, the authors also showed that IFN induction by the full-length HCV genome is dependent on 3’UTR in vivo, confirming that the uridine-rich sequence is a crucial PAMP for the recognition of HCV by RIG-I.

4. PAMP production by host enzymes
In 2009, two groups simultaneously reported that AT-rich dsDNA triggers IFN signaling through the RIG-I pathway [26] [27]. It was discovered that AT-rich, but not GC- or IC-rich dsDNA, is a template for RNA polymerase III that produces 5’ppp-containing AU-rich RNA. Since transcription may occur for both strands of a template, RNA transcripts are perfectly complementary, producing 5’ppp-dsRNA.

By definition, ‘non-self RNAs’ are derived from a pathogen, however, one report suggests the conversion of ‘self RNAs’ into immune-stimulatory molecules. Malathi et al. discovered that small RNAs produced from the cleavage of both viral and host RNA by RNase L can activate interferon signaling through both RIG-I and MDA5 [28]. Cleaved products are small RNAs (< 200 nt) with 5’-hydroxyl (5’-OH) and 3’-monophosphoryl (3’-P) groups. Interestingly, loss of 3’-monophosphate abolished its ability to activate RLR, suggesting a 3’-monophosphate-dependent sensing mechanism for RLR signaling. The authors further suggested the requirement of a higher order structure in addition to 3’-P for this regulation [29].

RNA ligands of MDA5
1. MDA5 recognizes long dsRNA
Compare to RIG-I ligands, very little is known about the biochemical specificities of ‘MDA5-activating’ RNA ligands. To date, several approaches
have elucidated that MDA5 mainly senses positive single-stranded RNA or dsRNA viruses, such as Picornaviridae, Caliciviridae, Togaviridae, Flaviviridae, and Reoviridae. While IFN induction by Picornaviridae and Caliciviridae exclusively detected by MDA5 [7] [30], MDA5 is partially involved in antiviral responses induced by Togaviridae [31], Flaviviridae [32] and Reoviridae [24]. These viruses produce or possess ‘long dsRNA’ and this is consistent with the central concept that MDA5 senses long dsRNA. Recently, Feng et al. suggested that MDA5 senses neither genomic RNA nor viral mRNA, but recognizes ‘replication intermediates’ generated during minus-strand RNA synthesis [33], further supporting the idea that long dsRNA is a critical determinant of an MDA5 ligand.

2. RNA web
In addition to length dependency, there is another hallmark of MDA5 ligand in relation to the RNA structure. Recently, Pichlmair et al. suggested the new concept that activation of MDA5 requires a ‘high-order’ RNA structure [34]. Interestingly, ‘pure’ long dsRNA (> 10 kb) generated by the viruses such as EMCV or vaccinia virus (VV) does not trigger IFN expression even though MDA5 interacts with it. However, ‘high molecular weight’ viral RNA that contains both ssRNA and dsRNA, robustly induces innate immune responses. Since MDA5 recognition of these RNAs does not require sequence specificity, they concluded that MDA5 activation requires an ‘RNA web’ rather than just ‘simply long’ dsRNA. Since this result was confirmed with natural viral RNA, their finding may provide a significant clue for the identification of natural MDA5 ligand.

3. Cooperation of RNase L for MDA5 sensing
Interestingly, there is a recent report showing that MDA5 can recognize viral mRNA and induce IFN signaling. Luthra et al. showed that parainfluenza virus 5 (PIV5) mRNA coding L protein can be converted to a potent MDA5 ligand by RNase L [35]. It is of interest to note that only a specific region of viral mRNA cleaved by RNase L activates MDA5, suggesting that MDA5 requires a specific RNA sequence or structure for recognition.
Contribution of LGP2 to RLR sensing

Compared to other RLRs, the functional role of LGP2 in viral recognition is still not well understood. LGP2 was originally thought to function as a negative regulator of RLR signaling due to the lack of the signaling domain, CARDs [3]. Indeed, several earlier reports showed the negative regulation of RLR signaling by overexpression of LGP2 [3] [36]. However, two recent independent studies using a ‘LGP2-knockout’ system suggested a positive role of LGP2 in RLR sensing [4] [37]. These two studies confirmed impaired IFN production in LGP2-deficient cells by picornavirus, indicating that LGP2 functions positively in MDA5-derived IFN signaling. However, the functional role of LGP2 in RIG-I-induced antiviral responses is inconsistent with these studies; thus, the contribution of LGP2 to sensing by RIG-I is controversial. It is proposed that LGP2 may cooperate with either MDA5 or RIG-I to transmit a signal to IPS-1 through their CARDs. Interestingly, LGP2 is dispensable for IFN production by synthetic RNA molecules such as poly I:C and 5'ppp RNA. Although ATPase activity of LGP2 is essential for this regulation [4], the exact mechanism of LGP2-mediated augmentation remains to be clarified.

Post-translational modification: the mainspring of RLR signaling

Upon viral infection, antiviral IFN signaling is immediately propagated through the cooperative association of multiple antiviral molecules. During the signaling cascade, antiviral proteins undergo various biochemical or physical modifications, such as oligomerization, ubiquitination and phosphorylation.

It was reported that RIG-I and MDA5 are oligomerized upon ligand recognition. Indeed, artificial oligomerization of RIG-I using a chemical cross linker can activate an antiviral response without a virus or dsRNA stimulus [38]. Recent studies suggested that oligomerization of RIG-I occurs through its ATPase activity and is required for optimal RIG-I activation [39] [40]. Peisley et al. showed that RIG-I binds to the end region of dsRNA without ATP hydrolysis but upon ATP treatment, RIG-I forms a ‘filament-like’ oligomer along dsRNA [40]. Unlike RIG-I, however, MDA5 is capable of assembling a filament in an ATP-independent manner, suggesting distinct sensing mechanisms between
RIG-I and MDA5 [41]. In addition, Jiang et al. reported that lysine-63 (K63) poly-ubiquitination on the CARD domain induces a hetero-tetrameric complex of RIG-I and further elucidated that ubiquitin-induced RLR oligomerization is critical for downstream signal transduction [42]. Thus, oligomerization of RLR is a significant hallmark of RLR activation.

The importance of K63 poly-ubiquitination on RIG-I by ubiquitin ligases TRIM25 and Riplet has been previously reported [43] [44]. Indeed, multiple ubiquitin ligases are involved in the regulation of innate immune signaling [45]. Upon K63 ubiquitination-mediated RIG-I/IPS-1 interaction, IPS-1 forms a fibril-like structure that converts ‘normal’ IPS-1 to ‘functional’ IPS-1, thus termed ‘prion-like-aggregates’, leading to the propagation of antiviral signaling [9]. Thus, ubiquitination seems to be a critical post-translational modification for governing the antiviral signaling from ‘RLR activation’ to ‘signal transduction’.

Phosphorylation is one of the best-studied post-translational modifications that switch many cellular signaling pathways on and off. Indeed, several kinases are involved in IFN signaling and play crucial roles in host antiviral responses. dsRNA-dependent protein kinase (PKR) is a classic IFN-inducible antiviral protein that comprises a dsRNA-binding motif and a kinase domain [46]. Recently, it was suggested that PKR is a key factor for the induction of cytoplasmic bodies called ‘stress granule’ (SG) by viral infection and we further demonstrated that SGs provide a critical platform for interactions between antiviral proteins, including RLRs, DHX36, RNase L and OAS1, and non-self RNA ligands, thus termed ‘antiviral stress granule’ (avSG) [47] [48] [49] [50] (Figure 1) More recently, it was shown that the ubiquitin ligases TRIM25 and Riplet are co-localized with SG after viral infection or poly I:C transfection, further suggesting the significant role of avSG in RLR signal transduction [50] [44] (Figure 1).

**Viral evasion of RLR sensing**
The loser of the battle between a virus and host will face a ‘dead-end’, thus
arming it with a better strategy that is essential for survival. Recent reports showed multiple strategies of viruses to evade RLR sensing by encoding suppressors that target signaling molecules in antiviral responses. Several viral proteins directly target RLRs. For example, influenza virus NS1, a multifunctional antagonist of host immune responses [51], inhibits ubiquitination of RIG-I CARD by interrupting TRIM25 [52]. In addition, hijacking of RIG-I and TRIM25 by viral protein abrogates IFN signaling [53]. Moreover, it is known that V protein of paramyxoviridae member viruses directly binds to MDA5 and suppresses the function of MDA5 [54]. Critical signal adaptor, IPS-1 is also an attractive target of HCV that induce cleavage of IPS-1 by viral protease, NS3/4A [55]. Furthermore, function of downstream signal molecules such as TBK1 and IRF3 is also hampered by viral infection [56] [57] [58].

In addition to direct inhibition of the signaling molecules, several viruses also counteract IFN production by preventing or disrupting the formation of avSG. It is reported that influenza viral protein NS1 inhibits PKR activation to prevent avSG formation [47] [59]. EMCV also blocks antiviral signaling by disrupting avSG through cleavage of G3BP by viral protease 3C [48]. Furthermore, several viruses antagonize the induction of avSG formation by preventing dsRNA accumulation that would otherwise induces antiviral signaling [60] [61].

**Conclusions**

It has been a decade since the ‘long-sought’ cytoplasmic viral sensors, RLRs, were identified. During the last decade, numerous efforts by colleagues in this field have advanced our understanding of the cytoplasmic antiviral sensing system. However, there are still unsolved fundamental questions that remain to be addressed. Although accumulated research has identified the essential properties of RLR-activating ligands, our knowledge is limited due to the physiological differences between ‘artificial’ and ‘natural’ RLR agonists. Therefore, it is important to investigate 1) what types of RNA are produced by different viral infections, 2) which RNA molecules from viral replication are truly responsible for RLR activation, 3) what is the exact molecular feature of RLR-activating
viral RNAs and 4) how each virus evades host immune responses. By understanding these issues, it may be possible to develop ‘order-made’ antiviral therapeutics or vaccines for ‘viral strain-specific’ clinical treatment.

Another important issue to be considered is that, although major players in IFN signaling have been identified, the molecular mechanisms of signal transduction and termination are still poorly understood. Since autoimmune disorders are often related to the loss of ‘self-immune control’, understanding the precise molecular mechanisms of the signal transduction may enable us to target specific signal molecules to relieve ‘hypersensitive’ immune reactions.

Finally, it would be also worth connecting RLRs to other applications, for instance, developing anti-cancer or anti-aging treatments for the next decade.
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Figure legends

Figure 1. RLR signal pathway
Upon viral infection, non-self RNAs, such as 5’ppp-containing structured RNA or dsRNA, are recognized by host cytoplasmic sensors, RLRs and PKR. Recognition of RNA ligands induces conformational changes of RLRs and PKR, leading to the initiation of downstream signaling cascades. Activated PKR immediately induces avSG, where antiviral proteins and signal molecules interact, and augments RLR signaling. E3 ubiquitin ligases-mediated CARD-CARD interaction between RLRs and IPS-1 recruits TRAFs and kinase complexes (TBK1 & IKKe) to facilitate IRF3 phosphorylation and nuclear translocation, resulting in the expression of type I IFN genes.
References


• This paper clarified the mechanism of antiviral function of IFIT1 protein.

• This study revealed the involvement of viral RNA structures for evading host antiviral sensing.


   • This paper describes the importance of ATPase-mediated RIG-I oligomerization in the optimal antiviral signaling.


   • These studies suggest the importance of filament formation of RIG-I and MDA5 in RNA recognition and antiviral signaling.


   • See annotation to Ref. [40*]

This work report the significance of ubiquitin-mediated RLR oligomerization for IFN signaling.


52. Gack MU, Albrecht RA, Urano T, Inn KS, Huang IC, Camero E, Farzan M, Inoue S, Jung JU, Garcia-Sastre A: Influenza a virus NS1 targets


Virus

Cytoplasm

dsRNA

5'ppp RNA

5'ppp

dsRNA

Inactive RLRs

Conformation Change

Active RLRs

avSG-dependent signaling

avSG-independent signaling?

Mitochondrion

TRIM25

Ub

AvSG

Active IPS-1 (Aggregates)

Optimal RLRs (Oligomer)

TRAFs

TBK1

IKKi

IRF3

IRF3

AvSG-independent signaling?

Riplet

Active PKR

Inactive PKR

Inactive RLRs

Conformation Change

Type I IFN

Nucleus

ISRE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNA types</th>
<th>RNAs / Viruses</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artificial RNA</td>
<td>5' ppp copy-back RNA</td>
<td>In vitro transcribed RNA</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Schlee (2009), Schmidt (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5'ppp AU-rich RNA</td>
<td>Pol III product from poly dA:dT</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Ablasser (2009), Chiu (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poly I:C short</td>
<td>Short dsRNA (&lt; 1 kb)</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Kato (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poly I:C long</td>
<td>Long dsRNA (&gt; 7 kb)</td>
<td>MDA5</td>
<td>Kato (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural RNA</td>
<td>IAV genomic RNA</td>
<td>5' ppp with panhandle structure</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Rehwinkel (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCV 3'UTR UUC rich RNA</td>
<td>5' ppp dependent</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Saito (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IAV 3'UTR UUA rich RNA</td>
<td>5' ppp independent</td>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Davis (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VV, EMCV</td>
<td>High molecular weight RNA</td>
<td>MDA5</td>
<td>Pichlmair (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVB3, Mengo</td>
<td>Replication intermediates</td>
<td>MDA5</td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PiVS L mRNA</td>
<td>RNase L product</td>
<td>MDA5</td>
<td>Luthra (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMCV L antisense</td>
<td>LGP2-interacting RNA</td>
<td>MDA5 / LGP2</td>
<td>Deddouche (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host RNA</td>
<td>5'OHIR-3p short RNA</td>
<td>RNase L product</td>
<td>RIG-I / MDA5</td>
<td>Malathi (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>Viruses</th>
<th>Families / Genome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle disease virus</td>
<td>Paramyxoviridae / (-) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Kato (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respiratory syncytical virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loo (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vesicular stomatitis virus</td>
<td>Rhabdoviridae / (-) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Yoneyama (2005), Kato (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rabies virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hornung (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIG-I</td>
<td>Influenza A virus</td>
<td>Orthomyxoviridae / (-) ssRNA, segmented</td>
<td>Kato (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influenza B virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loo (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rift Valley fever virus</td>
<td>Bunyaviridae / (-) ssRNA, segmented</td>
<td>Weber (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Crosse virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hepatitis C virus</td>
<td>Flaviviridae / (+) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Saito (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epstein-Barr virus</td>
<td>Gammaherpesviridae / dsDNA</td>
<td>Samanta (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA5</td>
<td>Encephalomyocarditis virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kato (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theiler's murine encephalitis virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kato (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coxackie virus</td>
<td>Picornaviridae / (+) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterovirus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Parechovirus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equine Rhinitis A virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saffold virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feng (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norovirus</td>
<td>Caliciviridae / (+) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>McCartney (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaccinia virus</td>
<td>Poxviridae / dsDNA</td>
<td>Pichlmair (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIG-I / MDA5</td>
<td>Westnile virus</td>
<td>Flaviviridae / (+) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Loo (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dengue virus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loo (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measles virus</td>
<td>Paramyxoviridae / (-) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Satoshi (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semliki forest virus</td>
<td>Togaviridae / (+) ssRNA, non-segmented</td>
<td>Schulz (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>