The Koala and its Retroviruses: Implications for Sustainability and Survival

edited by

Geoffrey W. Pye, Rebecca N. Johnson, and Alex D. Greenwood

Preface ............................................................... Pye, Johnson, & Greenwood 1
A novel exogenous retrovirus ................................................................. Eiden 3
KoRV and other endogenous retroviruses ........................................... Roca & Greenwood 5
Molecular biology and evolution of KoRV ........................................... Greenwood & Roca 11
Prevalence of KoRV ................................................... Meers, Simmons, Jones, Clarke, & Young 15
Disease in wild koalas ................................................................. Hanger & Loader 19
Origins and impact of KoRV ....................................................... Simmons, Meers, Clarke, Young, Jones, Hanger, Loader, & McKee 31
Koala immunology ............................................................. Higgins, Lau, & Maher 35
Disease in captive Australian koalas .................................................. Gillett 39
Molecular characterization of KoRV .................................................. Miyazawa 47
European zoo-based koalas .............................................................. Mulot 51
KoRV in North American zoos ...................................................... Pye, Zheng, & Switzer 55
Disease at the genomic level .......................................................... Neil 57
Koala retrovirus variants ............................................................... Young 59
KoRV epidemiology research priorities ............................................. Witte 61
Prevention and treatment of KoRV infection ...................................... Lifson 65
Immunization with envelope proteins ............................................... Denner 71
Human restriction factors and KoRV .............................................. Xu, Blankenship, & Eiden 79
Murine leukemia viruses ............................................................... Fan 83
KoRV and Chlamydia ................................................................. Timms 89
The Koala Genome Consortium ....................................... Johnson, Hobbs, Eldridge, King, Colgan, Wilkins, Chen, Prentis, Pavasovic, Polkinghorne, & Timms 91
Anti-retroviral drugs and vaccines .................................................... Levy & Lifson 93
Managing the spread of KoRV ........................................................ Ivy 97
Safety considerations handling KoRV ............................................. Xu & Stoye 99
The future of KoRV research ......................................................... Pye, Johnson, & Greenwood 103

nature culture discover

Australian Museum science is freely accessible online at
http://australianmuseum.net.au/journalfinder
6 College Street, Sydney NSW 2010, Australia
Koala Retrovirus (KoRV):
Molecular Biology and Evolution

ALEX D. GREENWOOD*1 AND ALFRED L. ROCA2

1 Department of Wildlife Diseases, Leibniz Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research, 10315 Berlin, Germany
2 Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, United States of America

greenwood@izw-berlin.de · roca@illinois.edu

Abstract. The koala retrovirus (KoRV) is in transition between occurring as an exogenous retrovirus spread by infection and becoming an endogenous retrovirus spread primarily as part of the host germ line. While up to 10% of mammalian genomes are composed of such endogenous retroviruses (ERVs), KoRV is the only known example of a retrovirus in the process of making this transition. Thus, it presents a singular opportunity to study the host-pathogen interactions involved during retroviral invasion of a vertebrate germ line.

Overview of KoRV molecular biology

KoRV is most similar genetically to the gibbon ape leukemia virus (GALV). However, biologically, they are quite different. GALV is a highly aggressive oncogenic virus whereas KoRV, while associated with leukemia in koalas, is not as infectious (Hanger et al., 2000). Molecular studies of the genetic differences between KoRV and GALV have demonstrated that specific mutations likely account for the decreased pathogenicity of KoRV relative to GALV (Oliveira et al., 2006, Oliveira et al., 2007). Thus, replacing important GALV domains with their KoRV homologues decreases the infectivity of the GALV recombinants. Recently, however, an infectious KoRV clone has been developed that, despite its molecular differences with GALV, remains quite capable of infecting and replicating in tissue cultures from many mammalian species (Shojima et al., 2013). This KoRV clone provides a novel resource for comparative studies. Since this KoRV clone can infect a wide variety of mammalian cell types, it is not clear why KoRV has only been detected in koalas and is not more widely distributed.

KoRV titres are positively correlated with infection by the bacterial pathogen Chlamydia, which has a severe impact on koala health (Tarlinton et al., 2008). The interaction between KoRV and Chlamydia in terms of koala health needs to be clarified, in order to design appropriate interventions. Currently, research on KoRV and Chlamydia occur largely independently of one another, although both would benefit from coordination of efforts.

Genomically, KoRV integration sites vary across infected individuals, most likely KoRV inserts largely at random across the genome of koalas (Hanger et al., 2000; Tarlinton et al., 2006). In northern Australian koala populations, some copies of KoRV are found at the same locus across individuals, suggesting that the virus has been vertically transmitted as an endogenous retrovirus, i.e., has become part of the germ line. The KoRV genome is highly but variably expressed in tissues of infected individuals, as is common for exogenous and endogenous retroviruses alike (Seifarth et al., 2005). Among various other ERVs, expression of endogenous proviruses may evolve to benefit the host species, e.g., through development of novel gene
function or protection from infection by other retroviruses (Blikstad et al., 2008). However, in the case of KoRV, there is currently no evidence of a positive benefit to koalas from the ongoing endogenization of proviruses. Conversely, a detrimental role for KoRV has not been conclusively established either, and the mechanisms by which KoRV may be involved in enabling Chlamydia infections or in tumor formation are not well characterized.

**Evolution of KoRV**

Evolutionary analysis of KoRV suggests that it is most closely related to GALV, more distantly to pig endogenous retroviruses (PERVs), and embedded overall in a clade of retroviruses that include the murine leukemia viruses (MLVs) (Hanger et al., 2000). These comprise the gamma-retroviruses, a genus of the Retroviridae, with many members known to cause diseases, particularly cancers. The phylogeny is somewhat surprising as GALV has only been detected in captive or small introduced free-ranging populations of Southeast Asian gibbons, while KoRV is found in both captive and free-ranging Australian koalas (Reitz et al., 1979). The host species do not overlap in geographic distribution, which are separated by deep seas and were not connected by land bridges in the past. This would likely rule out the direct transfer of a virus from gibbon to koala, and may suggest transfer from a third species, rodent or perhaps bat. Bats are known to carry retroviruses similar to GALV and KoRV (Cui et al., 2012). Rodents, and particularly the diverse species of Mus from Southeast Asia, are also potential reservoirs: GALV-like sequences have been detected in Mus caroli and Mus cervicolor (Lieber et al., 1975; Bovenenste et al., 1977). Modern sequencing efforts have not followed up on this rodent research, conducted nearly 40 years ago. Further progress in understanding the evolutionary origins, diversity and epidemiology of the KoRV/GALV family is of particular interest given the broad diversity of species infected by related viruses and considering that GALV is a pathogenic retrovirus that infects higher primates.

How and when did KoRV appear in the koala population? Until recently it was thought that the ancestor of KoRV may have entered the koala population as recently as ca. 200 years ago, and then spread from northern Australia southward (Tarlinton et al., 2008). The geographic spread of KoRV is incomplete since KoRV is ubiquitous among northern koalas but absent in some southern populations. In many northern locations 100% of koalas are positive for KoRV. Until recently it was thought that some parts of the south, and in particular islands off the southern Australian coast, were completely KoRV free. However, recent research suggests that, while low in prevalence, KoRV may be present in most if not all southern populations (Simmons et al., 2012). Whether this represents historical or recent introduction of KoRV to southern populations is unclear. In northern koalas, individuals may share the same KoRV integration sites (Hanger et al., 2000; Tarlinton et al., 2006). This suggests that KoRV, while persisting as an exogenous retrovirus, also exists as an endogenous retrovirus. Of course, since some koalas are completely KoRV-free, there are not yet any fixed ERVs, those found at the same chromosomal location in all members of a species. This lack of fixation is an indication that the process of retroviral endogenization by KoRV in koalas is a recent one (relative to many ERVs found in other taxa) that is still underway.

Recent analysis by our group suggests that while the overall evolutionary trajectory postulated for KoRV is largely correct, the time frame appears to have been underestimated (Ávila-Arcos et al., 2013). Using museum samples dating from the late 1800s to present, we demonstrated using next generation sequencing (NGS) that KoRV was widespread in northern Australian koalas by the 1800s. Since KoRV was already ubiquitous among koalas in northern Australia by the late 1800s (close to the previously postulated time at which the virus first infected koalas), it seems likely that the initial infection of koalas by KoRV occurred far earlier than 200 years ago.

We also found that evolution of the provirus across this time has been extremely slow (Ávila-Arcos et al., 2013). Only minor mutations that appeared to be individual-specific were found in the region of env coding for the receptor-binding domain. The receptor binding domain of the virus is exposed to the host immune system and is thus under the most pressure to make compensatory changes. The slow evolutionary rate of KoRV suggests that it has been under limited pressure to evolve, and also suggests that koalas have been affected for an extended period of time by harmful KoRV strains that reduce host fitness. We recently demonstrated by examining mitochondrial DNA variation from museum samples that genetic diversity in koalas has been low for more than a century, and it is possible that KoRV pathogenicity has persisted for this time due to the limited genetic diversity of the host species, which could preclude substantial increases in host fitness in response to KoRV (Tsangaras et al., 2012). Selective sweeps of resistance to KoRV would not be possible if koalas lack the genetic variation necessary to mediate differences in fitness. On a more positive note, the slow evolutionary rate of KoRV may also suggest that vaccines targeting viral proteins face limited diversity in the targeted proteins, increasing the chance that vaccinated koalas may be successfully protected from infection.

**Looking forward**

For retroviruses such as KoRV that can form quasi-species and that exist in the genome at high copy number, complex analytical tools may be required. Analytical problems are compounded for historical samples since DNA damage can introduce substantial amounts of artifactual variation. As described in the previous section, NGS can provide novel data and insights; however, new methods are showing even greater promise.

Hybridization capture is a method whereby PCR products or synthesized oligonucleotides (similar to PCR primers) can be used as “baits” to “fish” out or capture related sequences from genomic DNA or reverse transcribed RNA libraries (Maricic et al., 2010). Such methods have several advantages over PCR amplification, especially as applied to retroviruses or to ancient DNA (Fig. 1). First, while PCR is very sensitive, it is susceptible to false negatives due to primer-target mismatch. Second, for PCR to work, DNA molecules must be present that are the size of the target amplicon, typically at least 50 bp and often much larger. By contrast, the PCR products or oligonucleotides used for enrichment can bind their targets even if the target DNA is much shorter or contains mismatches. This is important in particular for retroviruses since different virus copies may be quite divergent. Also, short target DNA fragments typical of historical samples (often no larger than 100 bp and sometimes under 20 bp) can be readily retrieved by hybridization. The number of targets that can be “baited” in a given experiment is effectively unlimited. Coupled with NGS, many kilobases or tens of kilobases of target DNA
can be retrieved during a single experiment. By appending a short fragment of DNA containing a specimen identifier to each set of captured DNA, multiple samples can be processed in one NGS run. Illumina and 454 GS FLX technologies provide ample read length and high throughput, suitable for a broad variety of experimental needs. Such techniques have been extremely successful for ancient DNA and virological studies, including the sequencing of *Yersina pestis* genomes from 500 year old plague pits (Schuenemann *et al*., 2011), and identifying variation and integration sites for the Merkel cell polyomavirus in formalin fixed tissues (Duncavage *et al*., 2011).

We are applying these methods to investigate the evolution of KoRV. These are proving superior to our previous analysis by PCR and NGS and have yielded full KoRV genomes from modern and museum specimens and have determined integration site variation (Tsangaras *et al*., 2014). These methods can reveal the full palette of variation at any given site of the KoRV genome in any individual. KoRV present across individuals at the same locus, which likely represent endogenous proviruses, can be examined for their presence or absence in museum samples and further investigated. We have also applied the technique to rodents that could harbor relatives of KoRV and GALV with promising leads regarding the reservoirs for some known GALV strains. As these methods are in their infancy, they will develop further and will enable studies of KoRV molecular evolution to advance rapidly.
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