

Short communication

The fallacy of identification by neutralization in the light of non-cytopathic effect producing enterovirus strains.

ABSTRACT:

We describe the characterization of an enterovirus isolate recovered from untreated raw sewage in Ibadan, southwest Nigeria in 2010. The isolate was neutralized by specific antisera and consequently identified as Echovirus 7 (E7). Subsequent molecular characterization showed the isolate to be a mixture of E7 and Coxsackievirus A24 (CV-A24) thereby suggesting the CV-A24 strain to be non-cytopathic effect producing. It is therefore crucial that identities of enterovirus strains determined by neutralization assay be verified by molecular characterization to ensure they do not have any non-cytopathic effect producing strain(s) lurking unnoticed.

Keywords: Nigeria, Enterovirus, Neutralization, Coxsackie Virus-A24, Cytopathic effect.

Word Count: 90

21 INTRODUCTION

22 Enteroviruses (EVs) are members of the family *Picornaviridae*, order *Picornavirales*. There
23 are 13 species in the genus and while Enterovirus Species B (EV-B) contain the most
24 serotypes (>60), Enterovirus Species C (EV-C) contains the prototype member of the genus
25 (Poliovirus). EVs have a 27 – 30nm diameter naked icosahedral capsid which encapsidates a
26 5' protein-linked, positive-sense, single-stranded, ~7.5kb, RNA genome. The genome is
27 flanked on both ends by 5' and 3' untranslated regions (UTRs) and has a single open reading
28 frame (ORF) between the UTRs. The ORF is translated into a polyprotein that is self-cleaved
29 into three smaller proteins (P1, P2 and P3) and subsequently into 11 protein products. VP1-
30 VP4 (from P1) are the structural proteins which form the capsid. While 2A-3D (from P2 &
31 P3) are nonstructural proteins crucial for virus replication.

32 Classically enterovirus detection is by isolation in cell culture (usually RD and L20B) [1, 2]
33 although this is fast being replaced by cell-culture independent strategies [3]. Also,
34 identification was classically by neutralization using polyclonal antisera. However with an
35 association shown between VP1 sequence data and enterovirus serotypes VP1 amplification
36 and sequencing is now being used for enterovirus identification [4, 5].

37 In June 2010 we isolated an enterovirus in RD cell culture. The isolate was from a sample of
38 untreated raw sewage collected in Ibadan, southwest Nigeria. The sample was collected as
39 part of an environmental surveillance study conducted by our group (unpublished). It was
40 subsequently concentrated and enterovirus was recovered from it by culture in RD cell line as
41 previously detailed [6]. The RD cell culture isolate was subjected to enterovirus
42 neutralization test as previously described [2, 6] using a panel of antisera provided by RIVM,
43 Netherland and identified as Echovirus 7 (E7). On passage in L20B cell line, the isolate did
44 not show cytopathic effect (CPE). Interestingly, on subjection to both the Panenterovirus and

45 Panpoliovirus realtime reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) assay
46 routinely used by the Global Polio Laboratory Network (GPLN) and as previously detailed
47 [6], the isolate was positive for both but with variations. While the Panenterovirus assay was
48 clearly positive with an early (≤ 30 cycles) Ct value, the Panpoliovirus assay was
49 controversially positive with a late (≥ 32 cycles) Ct value. The result of the Panpoliovirus
50 rRT-PCR assay did not improve despite repeated cycles of passage in RD cell line and
51 subsequent Panpoliovirus rRT-PCR screen.

52 In this study we attempted to better characterize this E7 isolate in a bid to determine the
53 reason an RD cell culture positive but L20B negative isolate is showing late positivity with
54 very high Ct value on subjection to the Panpoliovirus rRT-PCR assay. The algorithm
55 followed in this study is depicted by Figure 1.

56

57 METHODS

58 RNA was extracted using the JenaBioscience RNA extraction kit (Jena Bioscience, Jena,
59 Germany). Using the Script cDNA synthesis kit (Jena Bioscience, Jena, Germany) two
60 different cDNAs were made (Figure 1). The basic difference was that the first cDNA
61 (cDNA 1) was done using random hexamers while the second cDNA (cDNA 2), was done
62 using primers AN32, AN33, AN34 and AN35 [3]. A Veriti thermal cycler (Applied
63 Biosystems, California, USA) was used for thermal cycling.

64 Four (two each for EV-B [7, 8] & EV-C [9, 10]) different polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
65 assays were done. For each species one of the PCR assays targeted the VP1 (structural
66 region) and the other the nonstructural (3C/D for EV-B and 3D/3^I-UTR for EV-C) region
67 (Figure 1). All the four assays (EV-B-3C/D-PCR, EV-B-VP1-PCR, EV-C-3D/3^I-UTR-PCR

68 and EV-C-VP1-PCR) were consequently two-step RT-PCR assays except for EV-C-VP1-
69 PCR which was an RT-seminested PCR (RT-snPCR) assay [3]. All amplicons generated
70 were sequenced and isolate identity determined using the enterovirus genotyping tool [12].
71 Multiple sequence alignments and phylogenetic trees were done using the default settings of
72 the CLUSTAL W program in MEGA 5 software [13] as previously described [11]. The
73 sequences obtained from this study have been deposited in GenBank with accession numbers
74 KM264408, KM264416, MF535106 & MF535107.

75

76 RESULTS

77 The isolate was positive for all four assays. All four amplicons were successfully sequenced
78 and exploited for virus identification. The, EV-B-3C/D-PCR result confirmed that the isolate
79 contained a Species B enterovirus. The EV-B-VP1-PCR result confirmed that the EV-B in
80 the isolate is E7, thereby confirming the results of the neutralization assay. The EV-C-3D/3^L-
81 UTR-PCR showed that the isolate also contained a Species C enterovirus and the EV-C-VP1-
82 PCR showed that the EV-C contained in the isolate is Coxsackievirus (CV) A24 (CV-A24).

83 Considering the EV-C was missed by the neutralization assay, it was further subjected to
84 phylogenetic analysis. Figure 2 shows that, with respect to the VP1 sequence, the CV-A24
85 strain detected in this study belongs to a lineage that has only been described in sub-Saharan
86 Africa till date.

87

88 DISCUSSION

89 In this study we attempted to determine the reason an already serotyped E7 that showed CPE
90 on RD but not in L20B cell culture, is showing late positivity with very high Ct value (>32

91 cycles) on subjection to the Panpoliovirus rRT-PCR assay. We found that the isolate
92 contained both E7 and a CV-A24. The Panpoliovirus rRT-PCR assay was specifically
93 designed to screen for the presence of poliovirus in isolates that had shown CPE in both RD
94 and L20B cell lines in tandem (which is not the case with this isolate). The results of this
95 study however showed that the assay might also be valuable for detecting non-polio
96 enterovirus C (NPEV-C) members when used outside of its prescribed algorithm.

97 Though the isolate was a mixture of E7 and CV-A24, the fact that it was neutralized by
98 antisera specific for E7 suggest that either the CV-A24 was very slow growing or was not
99 replicating in RD cell line with evident CPE. In the light of Jiang et al., [14], this is not totally
100 strange. In fact, we have also recently isolated some EV-Cs that replicate in RD cell line
101 without cytopathic effect (unpublished) and thus, further buttress the likelihood of such find.
102 If indeed the CV-A24 does not produce CPE in RD cell line and was replicating alongside the
103 CPE producing E7, it is crucial that the logic underlying enterovirus neutralization assays be
104 revisited.

105 The neutralization assay done in cell culture is predicated on the assumption that any
106 enterovirus added to the cell line of interest will produce CPE unless it is neutralized by the
107 specific antibodies the virus was previously mixed and incubated with. The findings of this
108 study question this assumption and shows it can be false if the isolate is a mixture of CPE
109 producing and non-producing enterovirus strains. As shown by the result of this study, with
110 such mixtures, the antibodies specific for the CPE producing strain will neutralize it and
111 prevent CPE development. The fact that the other strain in the mixture does not produce CPE
112 in the cell line of choice gives the impression that the CPE producing strain is the only one
113 present in the mixture. This error can only be corrected by confirming the results of
114 neutralization assays with other assays like the molecular ones used in this study.

115

116 CONCLUSION

117 In this study we show that defining the presence and replication of an enterovirus in the cell
118 line of interest by the production of CPE can be erroneous as some EV strains can be
119 replicating without producing CPE. Consequently, enterovirologists should be cautious about
120 how far the results of neutralization assays are extrapolated as it might be incorrect in the
121 context of co-infections that involve one each of a CPE producing and nonproducing strain.
122 Furthermore, though enterovirology is moving away from the classic technique of enterovirus
123 identification by neutralization and depending more on molecular identification, a lot of
124 studies are still dependent on the use of antibodies raised against enterovirus isolates. It is
125 therefore essential to ensure that pure cultures intended for such purpose are truly pure and do
126 not have any non-CPE producing strain(s) lurking unnoticed.

127

128 CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

129 The authors declare that no conflict of interests exist.

130 REFERENCES

- 131 1. World Health Organisation. Guidelines for environmental surveillance of
132 poliovirus circulation. Geneva. 2003
- 133 2. World Health Organisation 2004 Polio laboratory Manual, 4th edition, Geneva.
- 134 3. World Health Organisation. Enterovirus surveillance guidelines: Guidelines for
135 enterovirus surveillance in support of the Polio Eradication Initiative. Geneva, 2015
- 136 4. Oberste, MS, Schnurr, D., Maher, K., Al-Busaidy, S., Pallansch, MA. Molecular
137 identification of new picornaviruses and characterization of a proposed enterovirus 73
138 serotype. *Journal of General Virology*. 2001;82(2), 409-416.
- 139 5. Oberste, MS, Nix, WA, Maher, K., Pallansch, MA. Improved molecular identification
140 of enteroviruses by RT-PCR and amplicon sequencing. *Journal of Clinical Virology*.
141 2003;26(3), 375-377.
- 142 6. Adeniji, JA and Faleye, TOC. Isolation and identification of enteroviruses from
143 sewage and sewage contaminated water in Lagos, Nigeria. *Food and Environmental*
144 *Virology*, 2014a; 6:75-86

- 145 7. Bailly, J.-L., Mirand, A., Henquell, C., Archimbaud, C., Chambon, M., Regagnon, C.,
146 Charbonne, F., Peigue-Lafeuille, H. Repeated genomic transfers from echovirus 30 to
147 echovirus 6 lineages indicate co-divergence between co-circulating populations of the
148 two human enterovirus serotypes. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* 2011;11,276–
149 289.
- 150 8. Oberste, MS., Maher, K., Williams, AJ., Dybdahl-Sissoko, N., Brown, BA., Gookin,
151 MS., Penaranda, S., Mishrik, N., Uddin, M. and Pallansch, MA. Species-specific RT-
152 PCR amplification of human enteroviruses: a tool for rapid species identification of
153 uncharacterized enteroviruses. *Journal of General Virology*. 2006;87, 119–128
- 154 9. Adeniji, JA and Faleye, T.O.C. Impact of Cell Lines Included in Enterovirus Isolation
155 Protocol on Perception of Nonpolio Enterovirus Species C Diversity. *Journal*
156 *of Virological Methods*. 2014b; 207: 238-247.
- 157 10. Nix, WA, Oberste, MS, Pallansch, MA. Sensitive, Seminested PCR Amplification of
158 VP1 Sequences for Direct Identification of All Enterovirus Serotypes from Original
159 Clinical Specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 2006;44(8): 2698–2704
- 160 11. Faleye, TOC., Adewumi, MO, Kareem, SA, Adesuyan, YO, Fapohunda, FA,
161 Fasanya, ST, Jimeto, T, Lawrence, OE, Obembe, AA, Adeniji, JA. The impact of a
162 panenterovirus VP1 assay on our perception of the enterovirus diversity landscape of
163 a sample. *Journal of Human Virology and Retrovirology*, 2016;4(3):00134.
- 164 12. Kroneman A., Vennema H., Deforche K. et al., 2011. An automated genotyping tool
165 for enteroviruses and noroviruses. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2011; 51(2): 121–
166 125.
- 167 13. Tamura K., Peterson D., Peterson N., Stecher G., Nei M. and Kumar S. MEGA5:
168 molecular evolutionary genetics analysis using maximum likelihood, evolutionary
169 distance, and maximum parsimony methods. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,
170 2011;28:2731–2739.
- 171 14. Jiang P, Faase JA, Toyoda H, Paul A, Wimmer E, et al. Evidence for emergence of
172 diverse polioviruses from C-cluster coxsackie A viruses and implications for global
173 poliovirus eradication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science U S A*, 2007;
174 104: 9457–9462.




Figure 1: A schematic representation of the algorithm followed in this study.




Figure 2: Phylogram of Coxsackievirus A24. The phylogram is based on an alignment of partial VP1 sequences. The newly sequenced strain is highlighted with Black circle. The GenBank accession number of the strains are indicated in the phylogram. Bootstrap values are indicated if > 50%. The labelled vertical bar is for ease of reference only.