



Genetic Odyssey of Coxsackievirus A16: Insights from Phylogenetics and Phylogeography

Xiaochun Bao*

Department of Microbiology, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China

DESCRIPTION

Coxsackievirus A16 (CVA16) is one of the common causes of Hand Foot and Mouth Disease (HFMD) and herpangina cases around the world. Phylogenetics, a branch of biological science which deals with evolutionary history, has been used to study CVA16 outbreaks in the past. This article will explore the phylogenetic analysis conducted on CVA16 infections and discuss its phylogeography to better understand the evolutionary history of CVA16 viruses [1]. Phylogenetics and phylogeography are two branches of evolutionary biology used to analyze the evolutionary history of an organism. Phylogenetics focuses on studying the relationship between organisms, while phylogeography looks at how the geographical area they inhabit affects their genetics. By combining these two methods can gain a greater understanding of how a species or virus has evolved over time [2].

Coxsackievirus A16 is a member of the Enterovirus genus within the Picornaviridae family, commonly found in humans worldwide. It is one of the main causative agents for HFMD and Herpangina, both acute febrile diseases that affect humans primarily in childhood. The prevalence of Coxsackievirus A16 varies depending on geography, and understanding its evolution over time may help us better prepare for future outbreaks [3]. The most common method used to investigate evolutionary history is phylogenetic analysis. This technique involves constructing phylogenetic trees by comparing DNA sequence data from samples taken from different locations. Through this analysis can trace ancestral relationships between different strains of Coxsackievirus A16 to determine which ones have evolved from which ancestors over time [4]. This allows us to get an idea as to which parts of the world it has spread from over time, as well as any other interesting trends in its evolution. This information is particularly helpful when assessing whether particular mutations are beneficial or detrimental to the virus's survival in a given area [5]. Combining both techniques phylogenetics and phylogeography helps researchers understand more about Coxsackievirus A16's evolutionary history regarding

both its genetic relationships with other viruses as well as its distribution in various geographical locations around the world over time.

Coxsackievirus A is a major causative agent of Hand Foot and Mouth Disease (HFMD) and herpangina in humans. It has been difficult to determine the evolutionary history of this virus due to its complex genetic diversity [6]. To better understand its evolutionary history, researchers rely on phylogenetics, Coxsackievirus A genomics, and phylogeography. Analyzing the evolutionary history of Coxsackievirus A16 has become an important element in understanding its role in causing Hand Foot and Mouth Disease (HFMD) and herpangina cases. Through the study of phylogenetics, researchers have been able to trace the mutual evolutionary relationships between viruses belonging to this family. This enables us to identify how Coxsackievirus A16 has evolved over time, leading to its emergence as a major cause of HFMD and herpangina cases [7]. The phylogenetic analysis of Coxsackievirus A16 is conducted using sequences obtained from various strains of the virus. By comparing these sequences, it is possible to identify their relatedness and trace evolutionary links between them. In addition, analyzing the geographical distribution of different strains can also provide insight into how Coxsackievirus A16 has evolved over time [8]. For example, by looking at where certain strains are most prevalent can determine whether certain environmental factors may have contributed to its spread or if any genetic mutations have played a role in shaping its evolution. The phylogenetics of Coxsackievirus A16, phylogeographical studies have also been used to understand its evolution over time. Phylogeographical studies involve analyzing both genetic data and geographical information to trace the movements and spread of a virus throughout different areas [9]. By examining where certain variants are most common in each region, it is possible to gain insight into how they may be geographically linked or even if they have spread through human migration patterns.

The phylogenetics and phylogeography of Coxsackievirus A16 reveals its evolutionary history in Hand Foot and Mouth Disease

Correspondence to: Xiaochun Bao, Department of Microbiology, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China, Email: xiaochunb@gmail.com

Received: 01-Sep-2023, Manuscript No. TPMS-23-23352; **Editor assigned:** 04-Sep-2023, PreQC No. TPMS-23-23352 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Sep-2023, QC No. TPMS-23-23352; **Revised:** 25-Sep-2023, Manuscript No. TPMS-23-23352 (R); **Published:** 02-Oct-2023, DOI: 10.35248/2329-9088.23.11:332

Citation: Bao X (2023) Genetic Odyssey of Coxsackievirus A16: Insights from Phylogenetics and Phylogeography. Trop Med Surg.11:332.

Copyright: © 2023 Bao X. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

and Herpangina cases. This study established that there are distinct viral lineages prevalent in different geographical locations, with the Far East region being the birthplace of this virus [10]. This is a powerful tool for understanding the emergence of viral strains, making it possible to trace their genetic relationships and identify potential sources of infection.

REFERENCES

1. Kamgno J, Djeunga HN. Progress towards global elimination of lymphatic filariasis. *Lancet Glob Heal*. 2020;8(9):1108-1109.
2. Jones C, Ngasalla B, Derua YA, Tarimo D, Malecela MN. Lymphatic filariasis elimination efforts in Rufiji, southeastern Tanzania: decline in circulating filarial antigen prevalence in young school children after twelve rounds of mass drug administration and utilization of long-lasting insecticide-treated nets. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2017;61:38-43.
3. Kisoka WJ, Simonsen PE, Malecela MN, Tersbøl BP, Mushi DL, Meyrowitsch DW. Factors influencing drug uptake during mass drug administration for control of lymphatic filariasis in rural and urban Tanzania. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(10):e109316.
4. Simonsen PE, Derua YA, Magesa SM, Pedersen EM, Stensgaard AS, Malecela MN, et al . Lymphatic filariasis control in Tanga Region, Tanzania: status after eight rounds of mass drug administration. *Parasit Vectors*. 2014;7(1):1-9.
5. Boyd A, Won KY, McClintock SK, Donovan CV, Laney SJ, Williams SA, et al. A community-based study of factors associated with continuing transmission of lymphatic filariasis in Leogane, Haiti. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2010 ;4(3):e640.
6. Shuford KV, Turner HC, Anderson RM. Compliance with anthelmintic treatment in the neglected tropical diseases control programmes: a systematic review. *Parasit Vectors*. 2016;9(1):1-6.
7. Parker M, Allen TI. Will mass drug administration eliminate lymphatic filariasis? Evidence from northern coastal Tanzania. *J Biosoc Sci*. 2013;45(4):517-545.
8. Krentel A, Fischer PU, Weil GJ. A review of factors that influence individual compliance with mass drug administration for elimination of lymphatic filariasis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2013;7(11):e2447.
9. Babu BV, Kar SK. Coverage, compliance and some operational issues of mass drug administration during the programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis in Orissa, India. *Trop Med Int Heal*. 2004;9(6):702-709.
10. Lupenza E, Gasarasi DB, Minzi OM. Lymphatic filariasis, infection status in *Culex quinquefasciatus* and *Anopheles* species after six rounds of mass drug administration in Masasi District, Tanzania. *Infect Dis Poverty*. 2021;10:1-1.