



LETTER

Reconciling individual and population levels of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus evolution

Dear Editor,

Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV), a member of the family *Arteriviridae*, represents one of the most challenging pathogens in the swine industry, with serious economic impact. Unfortunately, despite widespread application, vaccination has not been successful in effectively controlling the virus, mainly because of the limited cross-protection among different strains (Kimman et al., 2009).

A longitudinal study revealed a gradual rise in genetic divergence among field isolates of PRRSV type 2 (Brar et al., 2015). Similar to other RNA viruses, PRRSV displays high mutation and recombination rates, which give rise to a plethora of new variants able to rapidly explore the fitness landscape. The substantial viral population size at the host and the population level should create optimal conditions for natural selection to act. Accordingly, different studies have pointed out selective pressures, mainly related to host immunity, which affect PRRSV evolution (Franzo et al., 2015; Goldberg et al., 2003). However, the level at which these forces act is still a matter of debate. Although intra-host viral variability has been reported and escape mutants have been identified in experimental settings (Costers et al., 2010), their roles in viral evolution have been often downgraded (Brar et al., 2015).

A recent study based on deep sequencing evidenced that high quasispecies diversity occurs during the transition from the acute to the rebound stage of infection, and the introduction of mutations resulting in a gain of fitness could provide a mechanism of persistence, potentially increasing within-animal fitness (Chen et al., 2016). These variants could be transmitted to other pigs (Goldberg et al., 2003), leading to further evolution and spread of new variants. However, a trade-off between adaptation to specific individuals and transmissibility has been reported for some viruses (Pybus and Rambaut, 2009). In this study, a large-scale analysis of selective-pressure action was conducted to investigate whether intra-host adaptation and immuno-escape can be the source of population-level variability. Selective pressures acting at the population level on 5 regions of 4 different viral proteins (NSP1,

NSP2, GP3, and GP5) were estimated and compared with those acting at the individual level in experimental conditions.

A collection of PRRSV type 2 full genomes was downloaded, and sequences related to Ingelvac PRRSV[®] MLV, Prime Pac[™], and Ingelvac PRRSV[®] ATP vaccines were removed. The remaining genomes (i.e., 382 sequences) were aligned using the MAFFT method (Kato and Standley, 2013), and regions in the 5 segments located in the 4 proteins in which positive selection was detected by Chen *et al.* (2016) were selected. The analysis was limited to these regions to allow proper comparison with experimental data (Chen et al., 2016) for robust evaluation of the forces acting at different levels of PRRSV evolution. Only complete genomes were included to guarantee consistency between sequence datasets. The sequences were aligned at the amino-acid level and then back-translated to nucleotide alignments using TranslatorX (Abascal et al., 2010). For each region, recombination breakpoints were identified using GARD (Kosakovskiy et al., 2006), and for each non-recombinant partition, a phylogenetic tree was reconstructed using PhyML (Guindon et al., 2010).

Partition-specific trees were used to analyze selective pressures by the Single Likelihood Ancestor Counting (SLAC), Mixed Effects Model of Evolution (MEME), and Fast Unconstrained Bayesian Approximation (FUBAR) methods implemented in HyPhy (Kosakovskiy Pond et al., 2005). Significance was set at $P < 0.05$ for MEME and at $P < 0.1$ for SLAC, which is more conservative. The results of FUBAR were accepted when the posterior probability was greater than 0.9. Sites were assumed to be under diversifying selection when detected by MEME, which can model episodic diversifying selection, or by at least two other methods. Positions detected to be under positive selection were mapped to the genome of the reference strain (NVSL97-7895; Acc. No: AY545985) used by Chen *et al.* (2016). Per-site ancestral-sequence reconstruction was conducted on positions detected under statistically significant diversifying selection in both the current study and in Chen *et al.* (2016), by using the maximum-likelihood approach of the ape package implemented in R (Paradis et al., 2004). The partition-specific phylogenetic trees were used for this purpose.

Compared to the results of Chen *et al.* (2016), a greater number of positions within each region were identified to be under pervasive or episodic diversifying selection (Table 1, Supplementary Figure S1). This is clearly expected considering the different scales of the two studies. The limited number of pigs (i.e., 4) analyzed by Chen *et al.* (2016) surely prevented exploration of the full set of potentially advantageous mutations that were investigated more comprehensively in the current study. The fact that some sites under diversifying selection identified in Chen *et al.* (2016) were not identified in this study can be ex-

plained by several reasons. Firstly, a chance effect causing an apparent statistically significant excess of temporary mutations cannot be excluded, particularly in the case of a small sample size. Secondly, several non-synonymous mutations could have persisted for a certain time even if not beneficial to the virus, before being purged by natural selection. Interestingly, Chen *et al.* (2016) reported an overall decrease in the number of detected substitutions at 42 days post infection after a peak at day 28, supporting this hypothesis. Finally, as proposed for the human immunodeficiency virus, the adaptation to the specific

Table 1. Sites under statistically significant diversifying selection as determined by SLAC, MEME, and FUBAR

Protein ^a	Codon ^b	SLAC dN-dS	SLAC <i>P</i> -value	MEME ω^+	MEME <i>P</i> -value	FUBAR dN-dS	FUBAR Post.Pr.
nsp1 Region1(387 bp)	75	-1.633	0.991	>100	<u>0.039</u>	-0.167	0.020
	111	-0.91	0.899	86.227	<u>0.018</u>	-0.097	0.111
	113	-0.737	0.855	90.103	0.001	-0.053	0.229
	171	-0.246	0.708	>100	<u>0.006</u>	-0.005	0.427
nsp1 Region2(336 bp)	193	-0.404	0.951	16.022	<u>0.041</u>	-0.053	0.197
	267	0.896	<u>0.001</u>	>100	<u>0</u>	0.288	<u>0.998</u>
	287	-0.288	0.921	31.674	<u>0.039</u>	-0.048	0.212
nsp2 Region7(462 bp)	754	-0.212	1.000	74.104	<u>0.028</u>	-0.709	0.002
	772	-0.097	0.89	>100	<u>0.001</u>	-0.157	0.131
	780	0.109	<u>0.064</u>	5.502	<u>0.036</u>	0.473	<u>0.946</u>
	785	0.103	<u>0.099</u>	>100	<u>0.007</u>	0.372	0.891
	796	0.068	0.22	39.974	<u>0.049</u>	0.246	0.759
	811	-0.024	0.728	>100	<u>0.003</u>	-0.199	0.197
	824	-0.083	0.926	9.693	<u>0.033</u>	-0.128	0.283
	840	0.115	<u>0.011</u>	>100	<u>0.017</u>	0.486	<u>0.964</u>
	842	0.019	0.48	23.925	<u>0.027</u>	-0.15	0.214
	944	-0.008	0.641	>100	<u>0.024</u>	-0.043	0.352
GP3 Region8(357 bp)	30	0.823	0.004	>100	0	0.227	0.999
	41	0.236	0.198	>100	<u>0.035</u>	0.075	0.885
	77	-2.024	1.000	11.314	<u>0.041</u>	-0.362	0.003
	97	-0.224	0.941	94.368	<u>0.032</u>	-0.123	0.062
	134	0.839	0.065	2.219	0.095	0.525	0.985
	143	0.747	<u>0.072</u>	12.568	<u>0.002</u>	0.519	<u>0.982</u>
GP5 Region9(294 bp)	13	3.021	<u>0.035</u>	4.153	<u>0.021</u>	0.235	<u>0.977</u>
	14	2.496	<u>0.002</u>	>100	<u>0.002</u>	0.29	<u>0.996</u>
	15	2.169	<u>0.030</u>	7.506	<u>0.022</u>	0.157	<u>0.958</u>
	24	1.765	<u>0.047</u>	>100	<u>0.005</u>	0.177	<u>0.981</u>
	25	3.102	<u>0.008</u>	16.273	<u>0.002</u>	0.361	<u>0.995</u>
	26	2.400	<u>0.008</u>	>100	<u>0.003</u>	0.194	<u>0.992</u>

To be continued

Protein ^a	Codon ^b	SLAC dN-dS	SLAC <i>P</i> -value	MEME ω^+	MEME <i>P</i> -value	FUBAR dN-dS	FUBAR Post.Pr.
	29	1.609	<u>0.039</u>	>100	<u>0.002</u>	0.166	<u>0.983</u>
	39	1.865	<u>0.037</u>	>100	<u>0.006</u>	0.156	<u>0.969</u>
	32	5.558	0	>100	0	0.708	1.000
	33	7.124	<u>0</u>	49.667	<u>0</u>	0.683	<u>1.000</u>
	34	6.212	<u>0</u>	>100	<u>0</u>	0.736	<u>1.000</u>
	35	5.975	<u>0</u>	>100	<u>0</u>	0.732	<u>1.000</u>
	41	2.303	<u>0.008</u>	12.617	<u>0.022</u>	0.255	<u>0.980</u>
	57	-0.052	0.599	4.472	<u>0.002</u>	0.023	0.054
	58	2.075	<u>0.002</u>	5.082	<u>0</u>	1.655	<u>0.996</u>
	59	0.842	<u>0.085</u>	5.617	<u>0.039</u>	0.413	0.826
	73	-0.503	0.989	47.497	<u>0.042</u>	-0.245	0.017
	81	-0.302	0.958	>100	<u>0.025</u>	-0.113	0.038

Notes: For each method, dN-dS values or ω^+ (dN/dS) and the respective *P*-values are reported. Significant *P*-values and posterior probability are underlined. Positions detected under statistically significant (underlined) diversifying selection in both the current study and in Chen *et al.* (2016) are highlighted in bold. ^aProtein name and corresponding region as described by Chen *et al.* (2016). The genomic region length is reported between brackets. ^bCodon position in the reference genome strain NVSL97-7895 (Acc. No.: AY545985).

host immune system could, in some circumstances, carry a penalty in terms of transmissibility, decreasing viral fitness in other animals and the population-level success (Pybus and Rambaut, 2009). Despite these inconsistencies between both studies, it is noteworthy that half of the sites under diversifying selection at the animal level were identified also at the population level. In particular, position 113 of nsp1, positions 30 and 143 of GP3, and position 32 of GP5 were detected in both studies (Table 1, Supplementary Figure S1). Remarkably, these proteins play important roles in conditioning the host immune response by serving as epitopes and interacting with the cellular machinery (Darwich *et al.*, 2010). The evidence that the a single position can be prone to diversification at both the individual and population levels supports the idea that some of the changes favoring virus persistence can be efficiently transmitted to other animals and spread on a large scale, providing further opportunity for selective pressure to act. Consequently, these results, combined with those of Chen *et al.* (2016), provide strong evidence that the variability generated during viral persistence within the host can have a pivotal role in PRRSV evolution, suggesting that the strategy used to persist in a single animal can be translated into a strategy to survive and spread at the population level. The high homogeneity of swine populations from a genetic and immunological perspective could favor this phenomenon by reducing the difference between individual and population fitness. In fact, even if advantageous mutations within a host have a cost in terms of transmission

fitness because of increased specialization to the particular environment, the uniformity that characterizes modern livestock populations is likely to lower the impact of this limiting factor. Consequently, although the emergence of fitter variants can be assumed to be rare and conditions favorable to evolution are probably sporadic (e.g., rebound infection has been reported only in approximately 15% of infections; Chen *et al.*, 2016), other epidemiological and managerial factors are probably creating an ideal condition for the maintenance and spread of these variants (Franzo *et al.*, 2016).

Despite these indicative results, this study has some limitations, mostly related to paucity of currently available data. Particularly, the complete genome sequences included in the current study were mainly from highly pathogenic strains from China and the U.S., and cannot be considered representative of the entire PRRSV type 2 population. Clearly, more extensive sampling, including asymptomatic animals, would greatly benefit the study of PRRSV evolution, and consequently, our understanding thereof. Nevertheless, despite these limitations imposed by practical and economical constraints, the use of a mathematical method able to detect sites under episodic diversifying selection (i.e., affecting even a single branch of the gene tree) substantially compensates for the effect of these biases. Additionally, although the viral population herein cannot be regarded as representative of the entire PRRSV type 2 population, the biological relevance of the results is not precluded. In fact, interactions between intra- and inter-host evolution have been proven to happen

in the vast viral populations affecting developed (U.S.) and developing (China) countries, which are also relevant from a sanitary and economic point of view. Despite the lack of extensive data on intra-host viral evolution hampering the formulation of a definitive hypothesis, the present work, extending the findings of Chen *et al.* (2016) study to an epidemiological scale, provides a comprehensive, albeit preliminary, model linking the different levels of PRRSV evolution.

In summary, the present study demonstrates that the forces favoring intra-animal diversification can cause the emergence of variants that, benefiting of their diversity at the population level, are able to succeed and spread in an often highly homogeneous environment, and to be further selected later.

FOOTNOTES

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects performed by any of the authors.

Supplementary figure S1 is available on the websites of *Virologica Sinica*: www.virosin.org; link.springer.com/journal/12250.

Giovanni Franzo , Claudia Maria Tucciarone,
Mattia Cecchinato, Michele Drigo

Department of Animal Medicine, Production and Health (MAPS),

University of Padua, Viale dell'Università 16, 35020 Legnaro, Italy

✉Correspondence:

Phone: +39-0498272968 Fax: +39-0498272954

Email: giovanni.franzo@unipd.it

ORCID: 0000-0003-2991-217X

Published online: 7 August 2017

REFERENCES

- Abascal F, Zardoya R, Telford MJ. 2010. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 38: W7–W13.
- Brar MS, Shi M, Murtaugh MP, et al. 2015. *J Gen Virol*, 96: 1570–1580.
- Chen N, Tribble B., Kerrigan MA, et al. 2016. *Infect Genet Evol*, 40: 167–175.
- Costers S, Vanhee M, Van Breedam W, et al. 2010. *Virus Res*, 154: 104–113.
- Darwich L, Díaz I, Mateu E. 2010. *Virus Res*, 154: 123–132.
- Franzo G, Cortey M, Segales J, et al. 2016. *Mol Phylogenet Evol*, 100: 269–280.
- Franzo G, Dotto G, Cecchinato M, et al. 2015. *Infect Genet Evol*, 31: 149–157.
- Goldberg TL, Lowe JF, Milburn SM, et al. 2003. *Virology*, 317: 197–207.
- Guindon S, Dufayard JFF, Lefort V, et al. 2010. *Syst Biol*, 59: 307–321.
- Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. *Mol Biol Evol*, 30: 772–780.
- Kimman TG, Cornelissen LA, Moormann R, et al. 2009. *Vaccine*, 27: 3704–3718.
- Kosakovsky Pond SL, Posada D, Gravenor MB, et al. 2006. *Bioinformatics*, 22: 3096–3098.
- Kosakovsky Pond SL, Frost S, Muse SV. 2005. *Bioinformatics*, 21: 676–679.
- Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K. 2004. *Bioinformatics*, 20: 289–290.
- Pybus OG, Rambaut A. 2009. *Nat Rev Genet*, 10: 540–550.