Characterization of a variant of transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV)

 I^{5U} / *J}* Pomtippa Nawagitgul *(.!* •

by

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE

> Major: Veterinary Microbiology Major Professor: Prem S. Paul

> > Iowa State University Ames, Iowa

1997

Graduate college Iowa State University

This is to certify that the Master' s Thesis of

Pomtippa Nawagitgul

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

A TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, and a PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, originating from a TGE outbreak on a swine farm in 1995, were characterized biologically, antigenically and genetically. Their growth characteristics were compared with the standard Miller strain of TGEV. The growth curves for the three viruses were similar. However, the average plaque size of the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 (0.99 $+/-$ 0.31 mm) was smaller than that for the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 (2.33 +/- 0.56 mm) and the TGEV isolate Miller (2.47 +/- 0.50 mm). These isolates reacted in virus neutralization tests with both hyperimmune sera raised against Miller strain of TGEV and the MAbs against the conserved epitopes on the S glycoprotein of TGEV. For genetic characterization of these isolates, the Sand 3/3. 1 genes were sequenced and compared with known sequences of TGEV and PRCV isolates. The S gene of the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 showed a 96 - 97 % homology with the published sequences of TGEV, with 120 - 169 nucleotide differences. The identity between the S gene sequence of the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 and that of other PRCV isolates was also $96 - 97$ %. The PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 had a truncated S gene with a 714 nucleotide deletion. This is the largest deletion detected thus far in PRCV isolates. Without accounting for the deletion, TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 showed a very high level of homology in the S gene with only 6 nucleotide differences between all 4353 nucleotides. At the amino acid level, the difference was only 4 amino acids. The protein profiles of these isolates by radioimmunoprecipitation assay also confirmed that the M and N proteins of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were similar in size but the S glycoprotein of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 was smaller. The ORF 3 and 3.1 genes of PRCV isolate NVSL 5 170 were intact with only 2 nucleotide differences in this region when compared to TGEV isolate VMRI 5170. However, the first different nucleotide in the 3.1 gene of NVSL 5170 created a top codon which may have resulted in a truncated 3. 1 protein. In conclusion, TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5 170 are closely related to each other in both antigenic and genetic properties as well as biological characteristics. In addition, Phylogenetic analysis of the sequences demonstrated a very close relationship among these two isolates and presented strong evidence that PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 emerged from TGEV isolate VMRI 5 170 by a single deletion. This deletion could possibly be the cause of the smaller S glycoprotein and the smaller plaque size of PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170.

1. INTRODUCTION

Transmissible gastroenteritis (TGE) disease in swine was first detected by Doyle in 1946. The causative agent was referred to as transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) which was shown to be in the family of coronaviridae (Siddell et al. 1983a). TGEV produces watery diarrhea in swine of all ages; however, the disease is most severe in pigs less than 3 weeks of age. The severity of disease depends on the immune status and the age of the piglets (Hill, 1988). By negative stainjng electron microscopic examination, coronavirus particles are 60 - 160 nm in diameter and are spherical to pleomorphic (Holmes, 1990; Saif and Wesley, 1992). The TGEV is enveloped with widely spaced club-shaped peplomers, 12 - 25 nm in length (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The TGEV has 3 major structural proteins, the nucleocapsid protein (N), the integral membrane glycoprotein (M) and the peplomer glycoprotein (S) (Spaan et al., 1988). The N protein is a basic phosphoprotein to which the genomic RNA binds to form a helically symmetrical nucleocapsid. The M and S proteins are glycosylated transmembrane proteins.

As a member of coronaviridae, TGEV contains a large, positive - sense, single stranded RNA genome (Siddell et al., 1983). During productive infection, TGEV synthesizes at least 8 subgenomic mRNAs (Sethna et al., 1989; Wesley et al., 1989), arranged as a nested set which have a common 3' poly-A termini, with different base sequences on the 5' end (Spaan et al., 1988). The products of 8 subgenomic mRNAs are: polymerase from mRNA l, the peplomer or spike protein (S) from mRNA 2, a 7.9 kD protein from mRNA 3, a 27.7 kD protein from mRNA 4, a 9.3 kD protein from mRNA 5, an integral membrane from mRNA 6, nucleocapsid from mRNA 7 and a 14 kD polypeptide from mRNA 8.

The TGEV is closely related to porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV), because PRCV was neutralized *in vitro* by antiserum against TGEV (Callebaut et al., 1988). However, some of the monoclonal antibodies against the S protein epitopes of TGEV do not recognize PRCV. The close antigenic relatedness between these viruses is due to the similarity of their genomic RNAs. The differences that have been observed between TGEV and PRCV are deletions in the S gene and the nonstructural ORF 3 gene of PRCV (Laude et al., 1993; Russchaert et al., 1990; Vaughn et al., 1995). Thus, PRCV may be regarded as a TGEV variant. However, TGEV and PRCV isolates from the same pigs are not available to conclusively determine if PRCV originated from TGEV.

The TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, and the PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, provide the opportunity to study the genetic and antigenic relationship between TGEV and PRCV. The VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates originated from the same TGE outbreak in a swine herd. However, they were later determined to be different viruses. Therefore, the hypothesis of this study is that the PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, emerged from the TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, caused by a deletion mutation. In addition, the purpose of the study is also to determine how the mutation influences some biological properties of the viruses. To achieve the objective, the two viruses will be characterized in comparison to the standard Miller strain of TGEV. The characteristics to be examined include:

I. growth characterization

- 1.1. one step growth curve
- 1.2. plaque size measurement
- 2. antigenic characterization using viral neutralization test
- 3. viral protein profiles by radioimmunoprecipitation assay
- 4. genetic characterization by PCR and sequence analysis

It is expected that this study should present strong evidence of the emergence of PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, from TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, caused by a deletion mutation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Corona viruses

Coronaviruses are large pleomorphic single - stranded positive RNA viruses (Tyrrell et al., 1978). The viruses in this genus have an unique morphology which is a pleomorphic spherical virion with club - shaped peplomers, when examined by negative stained electronmicroscopy. Their genomic nucleotides are plus - stranded RNAs which replicate by a unique mechanism. Coronaviruses infect humans and a wide range of animals causing either systemic or local diseases. However, the viruses can be divided into 3 antigenic groups (Table I) in which there are some degrees of cross - reactivity within each group.

antigenic group	Virus	Host	Respiratory infection	Enteric infection	Hepatitis	Neurologic infection
	HCV-229E	Human	X			
	TGEV	Pig	$\mathbf X$	$\mathbf X$		
	PRCV	Pig	$\mathbf X$			
	CCV	Dog		X		
	FECV	Cat		X		
	FIPV	Cat	$\mathbf X$	$\mathbf X$		
	RbCV	Rabbit		X	X	X
$\sqrt{2}$	HCV-OC43	Human	X			
	MHV	Mouse	$\mathbf X$	$\mathbf X$	$\mathbf X$	$\mathbf X$
	SDAV	Rat				$\mathbf X$
	HEV	Pig	X	$\mathbf X$		X
	BCV	Cow		$\mathbf X$		
	BRCV	Cow	$\mathbf X$			
	RbEVC	Rabbit		X		
	TCV	Turkey	X	$\mathbf X$		
3	IBV	Chicken	X		$\mathbf X$	
	BDV	Turkey		$\mathbf X$		

Table 1: *Coronaviruses,* antigenic groups and diseases. (from Holmes and Lai, 1996, *Coronaviridae:* The Virus and Their Replication)

Note: HCV-229E, human respiratory coronavirus; TGEV, porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus; PRCV, porcine respiratory coronavirus; CCV, canine coronavirus; FECV, Feline enteric coronavirus; FIPV, feline infectious peritonitis virus; TCV, turkey coronavirus; HCV-OC43, human respiratory coronavirus; MHV, mouse hepatitis virus; SDAV, sialodacryoadenitis virus; HEY, porcine hemagglutinating encephalomyelitis virus; BCV, bovine coronavirus; BRCY, bovine respiratory coronavirus; RbCY, rabbit coronavirus.

Coronavirus Properties

Coronaviruses are separated from other groups of viruses according to their distinct morphology. Their genomes are single plus stranded RNAs, 27 - 32 kb in size, which are 5' end capped and 3' end polyadenylated (Spaan et al., 1988; Lai, 1990). The genomic RNA of coronavirus is associated with nucleocapsid phosphoprotein to form a helical ribonucleoprotein about 9 - 11 nm in diameter. The ribonucleocapsid is surrounded by an envelope, derived from a host intracellular membrane and viral structural proteins. *All* coronaviruses possess 3 major structural proteins; a nucleocapsid protein $(N; 50 - 60 \text{ kD})$, a membrane glycoprotein $(M \text{ or } E1;$ 23 - 29 kD) and a spike glycoprotein (S or E2; 170 - 220 kD). Trimers of S glycoproteins held by a noncovalent bond form long petal - shaped spikes which are embedded in and projected from the viral envelope. Therefore, the morphology of the coronaviruses is similar to a solar corona when examined by negative staining EM. The size of coronavirus particles is about 100 nm. However, they are pleomorphic and range in size from 75 - 160 nm.

Antigenic group II coronaviruses also have a fourth structural protein, hemagglutinin esterase glycoprotein (HE, E3 or gp65; 62 - 65 kD) (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The HE dimer protein linked by a disulfide bond forms a short spike on the envelope which is homologous to that of influenza C virus. Coronaviruses that possess HE have hemagglutination, hemadsorption and acetylesterase activities.

Virions attach to receptors on the host cell membrane via the S protein. Coronaviruses are endocytosed into the cytoplasm where they replicate (Fenner et al., 1993). The genomic RNA is transcribed to a minus - stranded RNA which in turn is transcribed to a nested set of mRNA with a common 3' end. The translated proteins mature in the endoplasmic reticulum followed by assembly in and budding from Golgi cysternae. The budding viruses do not contain RNA - directed RNA polymerase (Siddell et al., 1981).

Transmissible Gastroenteritis Virus

Virion structure

TGEV is a virus in the genus coronaviruses, under the family coronaviridae (Siddell et al. l 983a) with pleomorphic spherical morphology and a diameter of about 60 - 160 nm (Okaniwa et al., 1968; Philip et al., 1971). Like other coronaviruses, TGEV also has a corona like morphology because the S glycoproteins form club - shaped surface projections, 12 - 25 nm in length which are scattered on the virus envelope. Without projections, the size of the viral particle is around 65 - 90 nm. (Thake, 1968; Pensaert et al., 1970b; Wagner et al., 1973). Intact virions have a buoyant density of 1.18 - 1.20 g/ml in a sucrose gradient (Briton et al., 1980; Jimenez et al., 1986).

The genomic RNA of TGEV encodes 4 structural proteins which include the small integral protein (sM), nucleocapsid protein (N), membrane glycoprotein (M), and the spike glycoprotein (S) (Spann, 1988; Laude et al., 1993; Holmes and Lai, 1996). These structural proteins incorporate into the virion and have different functions, as discussed below.

Small integral protein (sM)

Godet et al. (1992) reported that ORF 4 of genomic RNA encodes a 10 kD polypeptide called the small integral membrane (sM). This sM is incorporated into the virus envelope as an integral protein, however, its function is unknown.

Nucleocapsid Protein (N)

The N protein is a 47 kD phosphoprotein bound with RNA to form the ribonucleoprotein (Laude et al., 1990). These proteins are basic as they contain clusters of basic residues, but their C termini are acidic (Kapke and Brian, 1986; Spaan, 1988). Around 8 - 10 % of the total amino acid residues are serine. In fact, most of the serine residues on the N protein are phosphorylated. The N protein has 3 structural domains; the middle domain binds to the RNA (Master, 1992) to form a helical nucleocapsid. *In vitro* studies reveal that N binds to the intracytoplasmic domain of the M protein during virus budding (Sturman et al., 1980). This leads N to facilitate encapsidation of the genomic RNA. In addition, it is now known that N protein also participates in RNA replication since antibody against N significantly inhibits genomic RNA synthesis (Compton et al., 1987; Spaan et al., 1988). The N protein is also known to elicit cell - mediated immunity (Holmes and Lai, 1996).

Membrane Glycoprotein (M)

The M is a 29 - 36 kD protein which functions as a matrix protein (Laude et al., 1993). It is composed of a 245 amino acid residue polypeptide that folds into 3 domains; hydrophilic N terminal domain, transmembrane domain, and C terminal intracytoplasmic membrane domain (Spaan et al., 1988). The N terminus domain of M, about 10 % of the M molecule, is N - linked glycosylated and is exposed on the outer surface of the envelope. Around 17 residues of the N - terminus of the M glycoprotein form a signal peptide which is recognized by the signal recognition particle for membrane insertion. This signal peptide targets M protein to the golgi complex.

The transmembrane domain is about one third of the M protein. It spans 3 times in the envelope while folding into 3 hydrophobic alpha helices (Spaan et al., 1988). This domain functions as the matrix for the viral envelope. Approximately half of the M molecule is a C

terminus intracytoplasmic domain which lies under the intracellular bilayer. This part associates with the N protein during viral budding.

The M protein not only serves as a matrix protein, but also participates in other TGEV properties. Hydrophilic N terminus which is exposed on the outer surface is responsible for mediating complement - dependent neutralization and interferon induction (Charley and Laude, 1988; Woods et al., 1988). M is also important for viral maturation, assembly and budding of the virus. The supportive evidence is that M appears to accumulate in the golgi apparatus where the virus buds in infected cells.

Spike Glycoprotein (S)

Spike or peplomer is a large membrane - anchored glycoprotein which is 220 kD of relative mass (Laude et al., 1993). S glycoprotein contains 1447 amino acid residues which form the N - to C - terminus containing a 16 amino acid residue, long N - terminal signal sequence, two large external domains $(S_1 \& S_2)$, a transmembrane domain, and a short C terminal intracytoplasmic domain. S protein contains a large number of N - linked glycosylation sites (Rasschaert and Laude, 1987; Jacob et al., 1987). The Intracytoplasmic domain which is rich in cysteine residues may direct S glycoproteins to be incorporated into the viral envelope and interact with other structural proteins (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The $S₂$ segment, which connects to the cytoplasmic domain, is the carboxyl half of the S molecule. This part forms the alpha helix secondary structure with 2 heptad repeated motifs that tend to fold to an intra - chain coiled coil structure of the peplomer. Unlike antigenic group II coronaviruses, TGEV does not have a trypsin cleavage motif between S_2 and S_1 . The S_1 is a N terminal polypeptide which forms a globular glycoprotein. Trimers of S_1 and S_2 hold together by non covalent bonds to form petal - shaped spikes projecting from the envelope.

S glycoprotein has many biological functions (Holmes and Lai, 1996). It binds to *aminopeptidase N,* a specific host cell surface receptor glycoprotein, during viral attachment. Inhibition of cell fusion by monoclonal antibodies against S glycoprotein suggests that S induces cell fusion of infected cells (Spaan et al., 1988). Furthermore, S glycoprotein possesses neutralizing epitopes as antibodies raised against it can neutralize the viruses at multiple steps in the viral replication cycle (Nguyen et al., 1986; Sune et al. 1990). Presentation of the S protein on infected cells also induces cellular mediated immune response (Holmes et al., 1986; Welsh et al., 1986).

6

Genomic Structure and Organization

The genome of coronavirus is a large single stranded RNA of positive polarity (Spaan et al., 1988; Laude et al., 1993). It is about 27 - 30 kb in length, which is the largest known genome of all RNA viruses (Spaan et al., 1988). The genomic RNA is 5' capped and 3' polyadenylated, therefore, it is infectious when introduced into host cells (Lai, 1990). TGEV genome contains 7 genes and a 60 - 80 nucleotide leader sequence at its 5' end. Each gene may have 1 or more ORFs which are separated by intergenic sequences (IS) which contain signals for transcription of a nested set of subgenomic RNAs (Spaan et al., 1988). The first gene from the 5' end is about 20 kb long consisting of 2 ORFs that encode viral RNA polymerase, protease, and other nonstructural proteins (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The rest of the genomic RNA is approximately 8.5 kb made up of 6 genomic regions; 2 (S), 3, 4 (sM), 5 (M), 6 (N) and 7. TGEV also shares the common gene order for coronaviruses, Pol - S - M - N, (Laude et al., 1993). In addition to region 1 of the genomic RNA, gene 3 of TGEV is also bicistronic. (Spaan et al, 1988; Lai 1990).

Growth Characteristics and Physicochemical Properties

TGEV can be propagated in primary and secondary pig kidney cells, pig kidney cell line (Laude et al. 1981), and McClurkin swine testicle (ST) cell line (McClurkin and Norman, 1966). The virus also replicates in organ cultures from pig esophagus, ileum and colon (Rubenstein et al., 1970). Cytopathic effect (CPE) may not be observed in the primary isolate, so a higher viral passage may be required for CPE production. The CPE includes fusion of infected cells, rounding, enlargement or elongation of infected cells, ballooning effect of the infected cells and detachment of cells (McClurkin and Norman, 1966; Kemeny, 1978; Vaughn and Paul, 1993). TGEV can be isolated from freezing and thawing of the infected cell culture, and the titer of TGEV isolates range from 1 x $10⁵$ to 5 x $10⁷$ pfu/ml (Vaughn and Paul, 1993).

TGEV is sensitive to heat and light but is resistant to the intestinal environment. TGEV is very stable when stored frozen but is labile at room temperature (Bay et al., 1952; Young et al., 1995). The virus can be kept at -20 \degree C for 6 months without loss of infectivity. In contrast, at 37°C, the infectivity titer of the viruses will decrease 10 fold at every 24 hour interval. In addition, TGEV is inactivated by exposure to both sunlight and UV light (Haelterman, 1963; Cartwright et al., 1965). TGEV is resistant to trypsin and bile and is stable at pH 3 (Harada et al., 1968; Moscari 1980a). Resistance of TGEV to trypsin and bile allows it to pass from the stomach to the small intestine without degradation.

Replication Strategy

The replication cycle of coronaviruses has been extensively studied for mouse hepatitis virus (MHV). The events from the very beginning to the end of the cycle include; attachment and penetration, primary translation, transcription, replication, late translation and assembly, and release. The following section summarizes a TGEV replication strategy based on a MHV replication model.

Attachment and Penetration

The first step of the replication cycle is the binding of S glycoprotein to a specific receptor on the host cell membrane. For TGEV, S glycoprotein binds with aminopeptidase N (APN), a zinc binding protease (Delmas et al., 1992a) which is abundantly present on the brush border membrane of small intestinal villi (Delmas et al., 1992a). However, protease activity is not required for viral attachment. It was found that some monoclonal antibodies against porcine and human APN can inhibit binding of S to APN. The cells that are normally resistant to TGEV become susceptible to infection when cDNA coded for APN glycoprotein was inserted in the cells (Tung et al., 1992). Viruses enter into cells by fusion of the virus envelope with either a plasma membrane or an endosomal membrane (Gallagher et al., 1991; Kooi et al., 1991).

Primary Translation

After viruses penetrate into cells, they start translation of their genomic RNA. The first translated gene encodes RNA directed RNA polymerase (Holmes and Lai, 1996). It contains 2 ORFs which are translated into a polyprotein by a ribosomal frame - shifting mechanism (Brierley et al., 1989; 1991). The polyprotein is co - translationally modified to multiple proteins including RNA directed RNA polymerase by viral and host protease. The polymerase is synthesized continuously during the replication cycle.

Transcription and replication

Positive sense stranded genomic RNA is transcribed into a minus - strand RNA which in turn serves as the template for either subgenomic mRNA or genomic RNA synthesis. All minus stranded RNAs appear as double stranded RNA in replicative intermediate forms and no free minus stranded RNA is found (Perman et al., 1986). All mRNAs and genomic RNA are 5' capped and 3' polyadenylated. TGEV have 7 subgenomic mRNAs which form a nested set of mRNA with a common 3' end. They are numbered 1 to 7 according to their sizes which decrease by the increasing number (Lai, 1990). Most of the subgenomic mRNAs except the smallest one are polycistronic. However, only the ORF at the 5' end of each mRNA is translated, with the exception of mRNA I and 3 which are translated into 2 proteins (Spaan et

al, 1988; Lai 1990). The subgenomic mRNAs are synthesized in unequal but constant amounts during the replication cycle (Siddell et al., 1983). The mRNAs are not processed by splicing because the replication takes place in the cytoplasm, and mRNAs are transcribed independently (Siddell et al., 1983).

As a coronavirus member, TGEV mRNAs have some specific characteristics. Although the leader sequence is on the 5' end of the genomic RNA only, all subgenomic mRNAs have the leader sequence at their 5' end. However, at the 5' end of each ORF of the TGEV genome, there is a consensus intergenic sequence of 6 - 8 nucleotides, AACUAAAC (Spaan, 1986; Laude et al., 1993). This sequence is complementary to that of the 3' end of the leader sequence.

Two models can explain how coronaviruses synthesize their subgenomic mRNAs (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The first model is the discontinuous, nonprocessive leader - primed transcription (Holmes and Lai, 1996). In this model, the full length minus - strand RNA is translated from the genomic plus strand RNA. Thereafter, polymerase transcribes the antileader sequence at the 3' terminus of the full length minus - strand RNA, and then terminates with dissociation of the leader from the template. The leader with or without polymerase jumps to bind with an intergenic sequence (IS) down stream of the template, which serves as the primer for mRNA synthesis. Thus, an IS acts as the core promoter for mRNA transcription (Joo et al., 1992; Kim et al., 1993). However, the upstream sequence from the leader and 5' end sequence of subgenomic mRNA are also required for transcription initiation (Liao and Lai, 1994). Within the TGEV genome, there is a conserved sequence of 10 nucleotides, around 80 bases from the 3' end of the genomic RNA that may relate to minus - stranded template synthesis (Kapke and Brian, 1986).

Another synthesis model is discontinuous transcription during minus - tranded RNA synthesis (Sawicki and Sawicki, 1990). Transcription of minus - stranded RNA terminates when the polymerase complex reaches the 3' end of an IS, which then jumps to bind to the 3' end of the leader sequence at the 5' end of the genomic RNA. Subsequently, the minus stranded subgenomic and genomic RNAs with an antileader at their 3' end can be continuously transcribed into subgenomic or genomic mRNAs. Therefore, ISs serve as termination sites and bind with leader sequences for jumping of RNA polymerase during minus - strand transcription (Holmes and Lai, 1996). However, this model is controversial. Since loop structures have never been found on the Replicative Intermediate molecules, therefore, jumping of polymerase by looping out of the negative - stranded template and co - or post transcriptional ligation of subgenomic minus - stranded RNAs to leaders, should not occur.

9

Furthermore, by coinfection of 2 strains of coronaviruses, the combination of mRNA of one strain and the leader of another strain may occur (Spaan et al., 1988).

In vitro transcription studies suggest that RNA polymerase complexes with some proteins. These proteins may be the products of the gene 1 and N protein (Brayton et al., 1982; Dennis and Brian, 1982). The polymerases for minus and plus stranded RNAs synthesis are different (Brayton et al., 1982; Brayton et al., 1984). The two RNA polymerase complexes, the early and the late polymerases, involved in the negative - stranded RNA synthesis and the mRNA synthesis, respectively.

For replication of coronaviruses to occur the Replicative Intermediate form of the full length RNA is needed (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The genomic RNA must be transcribed continuously to the full length minus - stranded RNA which in turn will serve as the template for the plus - stranded genomic RNA synthesis. The studies on defective interfering RNA of coronavirus (mouse hepatitis virus) suggest that the replication also requires a leader sequence. However, the nucleotides in the IS for genomic RNA synthesis may differ from those for the subgenomic mRNA synthesis. In addition, about 200 nucleotides at the 3' and the 5' termini of the genomjc RNA may participate in the replication.

Late Translation

During late translation, coronaviruses synthesize all structural proteins and some non structural proteins from their corresponding mRNA. Most subgenomic mRNAs of TGEV are polycistronic, but only the ORF at the 5' end is translated (Holmes and Lai, 1996). However, mRNA I and 3 are bicistronic (Rasschaert et al., 1987). The mRNA 3 of TGEV has 2 ORFs which are translated into 2 non structural proteins. In non virulent Purdue - 15, and virulent British FS772 strain of TGEV, the genomic RNA possess the ORF 3a and 3b which are bicistronic (Spaan et al, 1988; Laude et al., 1993). Unlikely, upstream of the ORF 3b of the virulent Miller strain of TGEV exists a hexameric IS, CUAAAC. The beginning of the ORF also has a start codon to signal for mRNA production (Laude et al, 1993). Therefore, ORF 3 of Miller strain is transcribed into 2 mRNAs, so called ORF 3/3-1 instead of ORF 3a/3b. The IS of ORF 4 is also a hexamer, CUAAAC, while those of the ORF M, N and 7 are the heptameric ACUAAAC (Britton et al., 1991).

The translated proteins are processed and transported to their target sites. N is translated on free polysomes, rapidly phosphorylated in cytosol and then bound to the genomic RNA (Stohlman et al., 1983; Baric et al., 1988). M is translated and inserted into the RER and post translationally modified by N - linked glycan (Spaan et al., 1988). The processed M glycoproteins then accumulate in the golgi apparatus where the budding virions are located. S

proteins are N - linked glycosylated, reduced and non covalently linked to form trimers. Mature S glycoproteins also accumulate in the golgi apparatus. However, some of the excess S glycoprotein is transported to the host cell membrane which may mediate cell to cell fusion (Vennema et al., 1990; Griffiths and Rottier, 1992).

Assembly and Release

Assembly and budding of viruses takes place in specific compartments followed by release of virions by exocytosis (Holmes and Lai, 1996). N phosphoproteins may bind to specific sequences, possibly leader sequences (Stohlman et al., 1988), on the genomic RNAs to initiate the helical structure. The successive binding may not require the specific binding between the RNAs and the N protein (Robbin et al., 1986; Stohlman et al., 1988). Encapsidation of RNA may be associated with a specific sequence within gene I b, approximately 20 kb from the 5' end of the genomic RNA (Van der Most et al., 199 1; Fosmire et al., 1992). The nucleoproteins of the encapsidated particles bind to M glycoproteins incorporated on to the intracellular membrane. Thereafter, they develop from a budding compartment between the RER and the golgi apparatus (Holmes and Lai, 1996). S glycoproteins which are incorporated at the time of budding, are not necessary for viral assembly but S - naked virions are non infectious (Holmes et al., 1981).

Genetics

RNA recombination is common among coronaviruses because of their unique replication trategy (Lai, 1992). During discontinuous transcription, RNA polymerase sometimes dissociates from a RNA template and jumps to attach to a homologous region on a different RNA template (Lai, 1992). RNA recombination leads to evolution of different strains of the same species or to different species of coronaviruses. For example, feline infectious peritonitis virus (FIPV) may have originated from the combination between TGEV and related viruses (Jacobs et al., 1987) because one domain of the S protein of FIPV and the S protein of TGEV is 93% homologous where as the other domains are somewhat different. Moreover, the homology between the amino acid sequence of the HA 1 domain of MHV - 59 and the amino acid sequence of the S protein of influenza C could be evidence of RNA recombination between 2 types of viruses (Spaan et al., 1988).

Like other RNA viruses, which have no proof - reading mechanism in their replication process, mutations frequently occur among coronaviruses (Holmes and Lai, 1996). The mutations are either point mutations or large genomic deletions. The point mutations in the S gene of MHV lead to alteration of CPE and tissue tropism (Dalziel et al., 1986; Fazakerley et

11

al., 1992; Gombol et al., 1993). The incidence of deletion mutations among coronaviruses is also high. The most distinctive deletion mutation is the emergence of porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV) from TGEV (Holmes and Lai, 1996).

Antigenicity

Antigenic Determinants

Studies on the monoclonal antibodies against TGEV tructural proteins have allowed characterization of the antigenic map of TGEV. The structural S, M and N proteins are antigenic but the S glycoprotein is the primary protein that induces neutralizing antibodies (Jimenez et al., 1986; Laude et al., 1986). Antibodies against the M protein can neutralize TGEV in the presence of complement (Woods et al., 1988; Laude e al., 1988; Callebaut et al. 1988; Laude et al., 1990). There are 4 major antigenic sites on the S glycoprotein defined as site A, B, C and D (Gebauer et al., 1991). All antigenic sites are located in the N terminal half (543 amino acid residues) of the S glycoprotein (Correa et al., 1990). Only antigenic site A elicits neutralizing antibodies (Callebaut et al., 1988; Laude et al., 1988; Sanchez et al., 1990).

Antigenic site A is complex and is divided into 3 subsites, Aa, Ab and Ac (Correa et al., 1988). The amino acid residues in site A are intracellular, glycosylated and are located on the surface of TGEV. Amino acid residues involved in site A are 538, 591, and 543 for subsites Aa, Ab and Ac, respectively (Gebuaer et al., 1991). In addition, subsites Aa and Ab may overlap in residue 586 because change in residue 586 effects the conformation of both subsites. The amino acid sequence, 537 - MKSGYGQPIA - 547, which is highly conserved among TGEV may contribute partially to subsite Ac. This subsite may also contribute to protective immunity and is most likely crucial for diagnosis (Sanchez et al., 1990; Gebauer et al., 1991). Antigenic site A represents group specific epitopes which are shared by enteric TGEV and respiratory PRCV isolates (Sanchez et al., 1990).

Other antigenic sites are also characterized. Antigenic site B contains type specific epitopes which are represented by enteric TGEV isolates (Sanchez et al., 1990). It consists of at least 3 conformational epitopes two of which overlap to each other (Gebauer et al., 1991). The residues involved in antigenic site B are glycosylated residues 97 and 144. Antigenic site C contains linear epitopes which are non glycosylated (Correa et. al., 1990; Gebauer et al., 1991). The amino acid residues involved in site C are residues 50 and 51. However, the consensus sequence of site C, deduced by PEPSCAN, is possibly 48 - P - P/S - N - S - D/E -52 (Gebauer et al., 1991). In contrast to site A, B and D, antigenic site C is not accessible in the native form. Most TGEV isolates are conserved at antigenic sites B and C but vary in site D

(We sley et al., 1990a). The residues involved in site D are residues 381 (Gebauer et al., 1991) to 392 (Pothumus et al., 1990; De lmas et al. , 1990).

Antigenic Relationship

There is only one serotype of TGEV; however, TGEV is related to other coronaviruses (Saif and Wesley, 1992). TGEV and PRCV are closely related because hyperimmune serum against TGEV can neutralize PRCV. In contrast, TGEV shows no antigenic relationship to other porcine coronaviruses, porcine epidemic diarrhea virus or hemagglutinating encephalomyelitis virus. TGEV is related to feline infectious peritonitis virus (FIPV) and canine coronavirus (CCV) showing cross reactivity with TGEV to some degree by IFA and VN. However, they can be differentiated using a two way cross neutralization test (Reynolds et al., 1986). The monoclonal antibodies against non neutralizing epitopes of the spike protein of TGEV can recognize TGEV; however, it does not recognize FIPV, CCV or PRCV (Laude et al., 1988; Callebaut et al., 1988; Sanchez et al., 1990).

Porcine Respiratory Coronavirus (PRCV)

History

From the early 1980's, the incidence of TGE, the disease caused by TGEV, has decreased considerably in Europe. However, the serostatus of swine herd for TGEV increased without evidence of any clinical enteric disease (Pensaert et al., 1986; Jestin et al., 1987b). A coronavirus, isolated from nasal swabs, was neutralized by antiserum to TGEV (Penseart et al., 1986), and was found to infect cells of the respiratory tract (Pensaert et al., 1989). In 1990, the TGEV-like virus was also isolated from swine herds in the US (Hill, 1989; Wesley et al., l 990a). Recent studies revealed that the virus seemed to be a TGEV like - mutant since there were deletion mutations of the viral genome when compared with those of TGEV. The virus was named porcine respiratory coronavirus because of its respiratory tropism (Pensaert et al., 1986; Wesley et al., 1990a; Paul et al., 1995). It is not clear whether PRCV emerged from the recombination of TGEV and related viruses or a mutation within the TGEV genome itself. Nevertheless, the evidence from genetic sequencing suggests that PRCV originated from TGEV (Laude et al., 1993). In fact, the defective RNAs, discontinuous parts of the genomic RNAs, are normally found in infected cells. Thus, it is possible that dissociated RNA polymerase together with a nascent RNA may reassociate with the template downstream of the pause site, resulting in a deletion.

Genetic Relationship between TGEV and PRCV

The pairwise alignments of the genomic RN As and the translated ORFs of TGEV and PRCV show only a 3 % nucleotide and amjno acid difference (Laude et al., 1993). This diversity results from deletion mutations and point mutations which are limited within the 5' half of the S gene and ORF 3a (Rasschaert et al., 1990; Britton et al., 1991; Page et al., 1991). Indeed, there are some differences in the mutations between European PRCV and USA PRCV isolates. Subsequently, both USA and European PRCV may have emerged from different mutational events (Laude et al., 1993; Paul et al., 1995). However, both of them possess S genes encoding the N terminus truncating S glycoproteins, and non - translated ORF 3a psuedogenes (Laude et al., I 993). The evolutionary tree of 6 European PRCV and 5 TGEV isolates suggests that PRCV and TGEV have a common ancestor (Sanchez et al., 1992).

The mutation within the S gene of PRCV is a large deletion of 672 - 681 nucleotides at the 5' end of the S gene of TGEV (Laude et al., 1993). All European PRCV isolates have a 672 nucleotide deletion of the S gene (Sanchez et al., I 992). The deletions occur in the same position and cause a 224 amino acid truncated S glycoprotein. The number of deleted bases within the S gene of USA PRCV vary greatly. It is a 681 nucleotide deletion within the S gene of USA PRCV, ISU 1, which corresponds to 227 amino acid residues (Laude et al., 1993). Other USA PRCV isolates have 621 - 681 nucleotide deletions within the S gene (Vaughn et al., 1994; Vaughn et al., 1995). Without accounting for the deleted amino acids, the S proteins of PRCV and TGEV show a 98 % homology (Britton et al. 1991). Therefore, the S protein of PRCV and TGEV contain about 1206 - 1209 and 1431 - 1433 amino acid residues, respectively (Laude et al., 1993). Subsequently, the S glycoprotein produced by PRCV has a relative mass of 190 kD compared with that of 220 kD for TGEV (Rasschaert et al., 1990).

The mutation within the ORF 3a of European PRCV and USA PRCV are also different, but the ORF 3b are the same (Laude et al., 1993). The ORF 3a of European PRCV has 3 mutation events; a 13 nucleotide deletion including the hexameric IS, a 22 nucleotide deletion covering the AUG initiation codon, and a 36 nucleotide deletion (Laude et al., 1993). These deletions destroy the transcription start site in which, consequently the ORF 3a is a pseudogene. In the ORF 3a of USA PRCV, there is a 5 nucleotide deletion, but IS or the initiation codon is intact which does not effect transcription. However, the consensus sequence is CUAAAU instead of CUAAAC which may cause ineffective transcription. In contrast, the ORF 3b of the PRCV genome has both IS and the start codon like that of TGEV. Thus, it can be transcribed into the 3 - 1 non structural protein (Wesley et al., 1989). In fact, gene 3 of

Purdue - 115, and FS 772 TGEV do not have the CUAAAC equence downstream of the ORF 3b but their ORF 3b encodes the same 3 - I products by a RNA framshifting mechanism.

The ORF 4, M, N and 7 of PRCV and TGEV are 98 % homologous (Britton, 1991). The ORF 4 of PRCV shows 96 % homology to FS 772 and Purdue 115, but 100 % identity to Miller TGEV (Rasschaert et al., 1987; Britton et al., 1989; Wesley et al., 1989). There is no deletion or insertion within the N and 7 gene of PRCV when compared with those of TGEV. The relative mass of the M and N protein produced by PRCV and TGEV infected cells are similar (Rasschaert et al., 1990).

Antigenic Relationship between TGEV and PRCV

It has been known since 1984 that TGEV and PRCV are closely related, as polyclonal antibodies were not able to distinguish between TGEV and PRCV. By one way and two way viral neutralization tests, both viruses showed complete cross reactivity (Callebaut et al., 1988). By immunoblotting using polyclonal antiserum, their antigenicities could not be differentiated using S, M and N antigens (Callebaut et al., 1988). However, monoclonal antibodies elicited to some epitopes of TGEV were unique for TGEV which would therefore differentiate PRCV from TGEV.

TGEV and PRCV have several common antigenic determinants, but recent studies show that some epitopes are not present on PRCV. Antigenic site A with neutralizing activity is fully shared between TGEV and PRCV because monoclonal antibodies against these antigenic sites neutralize both TGEV and PRCV (Callebaut, 1988; Laude et al., 1988; Sanchez et al., 1990). PRCV possesses the deleted S gene whose products are the truncated S glycoprotein (Rasschaert et al., 1990; Britton et al. 1991; Wesley et al., 1991). The deletions are 224 to 227 amino acid residues which may include antigenic sites B, C and D since the monoclonal antibodies against the epitopes within these site do not recognize PRCV (Callebaut, 1988; Laude et al., 1988; Sanchez et al., 1990). Indeed, Laude et al. (1988) found that there is some cross reactivity at site D between TGEV and PRCV, as some residues involved in the conformational epitopes of site D come from outside the truncated domain.

In addition to the S antigen, TGEV and PRCV also exhibit M and N antigens. Monoclonal antibodies against the epitopes within the M and N protein of TGEV can recognize PRCV (Callebaut, 1988; Laude et al., 1988; Sanchez et al., 1990). However, about 30 residues of the N terminus of the M protein of TGEV which are extruded from the virion envelope do not react with 3 PRCV isolates (Laude et al., 1988). On the other hand, the epitopes within the C terminus of the M protein are conserved between TGEV and PRCV because of their cross reactivities.

Tissue Tropism

TGEV causes an enteric disease because the virus itself has a tropism for the gastrointestinal tract, but some strains of TGEV replicate in other organs. TGEV receptors on the host cell membrane are *aminopeptidase N* (APN) which are abundant on the brush border of the intestinal villi (Delmas et al., 1992a). Therefore, TGEV can infect the mucosal epithelial cells of intestinal villi. However, most of TGEV strains also replicate in the cells of the respiratory tract and alveolar macrophage (Wesley, 1990b; Britton, 1992; Laude et al., 1993). The Nebraska strains of TGEV are found to have respiratory tropism, so called respiratory TGEV (Underdhal et al., 1978; Laude et al., 1993). The antigenic sites of TGEV for APN receptors are likely to be antigenic sites *ND* and B/C on the globular domain or N - terminal half of the S glycoprotein (Sanchez et al., 1992) because monoclonal antibodies against site A and D inhibit virus binding (Sanchez et al., 1992) and decrease multiplicity of TGEV in ST cells (Sune et al., 1990).

The cell receptor for PRCV seems to be APN, as it is for TGEV (Laude et al., 1993). The APN is also expressed on epithelial cells of the respiratory tract. In fact, anti APN monoclonal antibodies can inhibit the multiplication of PRCV (Delmas et al., 1992b). Additionally, cells resistant to PRCV replication when transfected with cDNA encoded for APN could support growth of PRCV (Laude et al., 1993). Interestingly, PRCV has respiratory tropism instead of enteric tropism. However, it can replicate to a Iimjted extent in epithelial cells of the intestinal villi (Paul et al, 1995).

The mechanism of the difference in tissue tropism of TGEV and PRCV is unclear but it may be due to genetic deletions. The deletion region in the S gene of PRCV includes B and C antigenic sites (Sanchez et al., 1992) which may be the enteric receptor binding sites that TGEV uses for attachment. The four residue changes in the S protein of respiratory TGEV (residue 219 of NEB 72 and residues 92, 94 and 218 of TOY 56) are located within the deletion region of the PRCV S protein. This assumption might not be true since receptors on host cell membrane for both TGEV and PRCV are APN which are expressed in either respiratory tract or enteric tract (Laude et al., 1993). However, the deletion in the S gene of PRCV may result in an unstability of the globular part of the S glycoprotein in gastroenteric tract (Laude et al. 1993) which could effect the attachment of viruses to cells. In addition, the deletion of ORF 3a may lead to respiratory tropism of PRCV (Laude et al. 1993) since the TGEV adapted strains, which produce small plaque (SP) size, have a reduced ability to grow in intestinal cells (Wesley et al., 1990b). SP strains of TGEV also have a deletion of 462 nucleotides downstream of the S gene including ORF 3a but have a normal S gene (Wesley et

al., 1990b; Britton et al., 1992). Indeed, several cell types, which are conducted to stably express APN, could support growth of TGEV in different levels (Delmas et al., 1992b). Other factors that influence the replication cycle of the viruses may effect tissue tropism of viruses (Laude et al., 1993).

Transmissible Gastroenteritis (TGE)

Transmjssible Gastroenteritis (TGE) is a disease caused by TGEV. Thjs disease is classified in to 2 forms, epizootic and enzootic TGE (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The epizootic feature seems to be seasonal in appearance which is most prevalent in winter. This may be due to the characteristics of the virus which is easily labile at warm temperature and to sun light (Haelterman, 1962). The susceptible herds may become infected by addition of carrier pigs from infected herds. The infected pigs can shed TGEV in their feces for up to 2 weeks (Pensaert et al., 1970a) and via respiratory tract for up to 11 days (Kemeny et al., 1975).

Clinical Signs

Epizootic TGE occurs in swine herds in which most or all animals are susceptible (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The disease spreads rapidly to swine of all ages, but high mortality occurs in suckling pigs under 2 weeks of age. However, pigs over 3 weeks of age normally survive. The typical clinical signs in piglets are; transient vomiting, concomitantly or rapidly followed by profuse watery diarrhea, rapid weight loss and dehydration (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Clinical signs in growing and finishing pigs are inappetance and diarrhea for a few days. Some lactating sows may show a very sick appearance with fever, agalactia, vomiting, inappetance and diarrhea (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The incubation period of the virus is approximately 18 hours to 3 days. Therefore, most of the pigs in the herd will be affected within 2 - 3 days.

Enzootic TGE refers to a persistence of the virus and disease in a herd which periodically results in an outbreak in susceptible animals such as weaning piglets and replacement swine (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The susceptibility of animals and severity of the disease are associated with the immune status of those animals. In herd replacements, TGEV spreads slowly among adult swine. The outbreak in piglets after weaning is common because viral exposure exceeds the passive immunity of pigs (Saif and Wesley, l 992). The pigs will show signs of TGE after weaning from 6 days to 2 weeks. Clinical signs of enzootic TGE are similar to but are less severe than those of epizootic TGE. Mortality is also low. The disease will perpetuate in the herd as long as susceptible animals or immune deprived piglets are exposed to TGEV.

Pathogenesis

In the gastrointestinal tract, TGEV can survive in acidic condition and in the presence of proteolytic enzymes (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Subsequently, virus particles attach to epithelial cells of the villi of the small intestine. The infected cells are rapidly destroyed and lose their functions in digestion and absorption (Moon, 1978), resulting in diarrhea. The extensive destruction by viruses results in atrophy of villi which is most severe in jejunum and ileum, but is seldom found in the proximal part of duodenum (Hooper and Haelterman, 1966). Both virus production and villous atrophy are severe in newborn piglets rather than in piglets over 3 weeks of age (Moon et al., 1973) because the 3 - week old pigs replace villous epithelial cells 3 times more rapidly than neonatal pigs (Moon, 1978). The immune status also plays an important role in protecting cells from viral infection since the older pigs are more resistant to TGE.

Although the enteric tract is the most important replication site of TGEV, virus can multiply in other organs. TGEV was found in alveolar macrophages of infected neonatal pigs and cell culture adapted TGEV can replicate in alveolar macrophage cultures (Laude et al., 1984). Some TGEV such as a highly attenuated strain of TGEV has been found in the respiratory tract of pigs. TGEV can also replicate in the mammary glands and is shed in milk (Kemeny and Woods, 1977), which serves as a source of infection for piglets.

The most severe TGEV - induced lesions are found in the gastrointestinal tract of suckling piglets with evere dehydration (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The stomach are full of curdled milk. The small intestine is distended with yellow and foamy fluid and the intestinal wall is thin due to villous atrophy. A lack of chyle absorption is observed in lacteals of mesentery. The shortened villi appear in both the jejunum and the ileum. The ratio of the length of jejunal villi, and the depths of crypts of Lieberkuhn, decreases from 3:1 to 1:1 in severe cases of TGEV - induced villous atrophy. Transmission EM of TGEV infected epithelial cells reveals that the viral particles are in cytoplasmic vacuoles within villous enterocytes, as well as in M cells, lymphocytes and macrophages in Peyer's patches (Thake, 1968; Wagner et al., 1973; Chu et al., 1982a).

PRCV Associated Disease

Although PRCV was first isolated from normal swine and thought to be non pathogenic, some experiments and field observations have shown that, in young piglets, it can cause a mild to moderate respiratory disease without enteric signs (O' Toole et al., 1989; Cox et al., 1990a; Laval et al., 1991; Halbur et al., 1993). Anorexia, fever and coughing are the main clinical signs. In severe cases, dyspnea, polypnea, short lasting fever and prostration may appear (Vannier, 1990). Young piglets are much more susceptible to the disease than adults. Therefore, the older pigs may be asymptomatic following aerosal infection (Cox et al., 1990b). The virus can be isolated from nasal mucosa, tonsils, trachea, lung, stomach and small intestines (O' Toole et al., 1989; Cox et al., 1990a). However, in aerosol infected piglets, the viruses are found in mesenteric lymph nodes and in the colon. The virus particles may reach the intestine via ingestion or viremia from the respiratory tract (Laude et al., 1993).

Diagnosis

TGE shows very distinctive clinical signs and characteristic lesion of villous atrophy (Bohl 1981). Differential diagnosis should include rotavirus, porcine epidemic diarrhea virus and coccidia which may produce profuse watery diarrhea with villous atrophy. Laboratory diagnosis of TGEV may be achieved by one or more methods, such as detection of viral antigen, detection of viral nucleic acid, identification of the virus or detection of antibody response. Yet, PRCV is closely related to TGEV in both genetic and antigenic properties which requires more specific differential procedures.

The viral particles can be detected in feces and in the intestinal contents of infected animals by negative - contrast transmission EM (Saif et al., 1977). Sensitivity of diagnosis may be enhanced using immune EM (IEM) to differentiate TGEV from other enteric viruses. TGEV and PRCV may be distinguished using monoclonal antibodies.

TGEV antibodies have been detected by several different serological tests (Saif and Wesley, 1992). The most common serological method is the VN test. However, polyclonal antibodies and some monoclonal antibodies can not discriminate between TGEV and PRCV. In addition, a variety of serological techniques such as IFA, immunodiffusion, passive HA and ELISA have been applied for diagnosis. Other recently developed methods are, blocking ELISA, indirect immunoperoxidase, radioimmunoprecipitation and modified autoradiography (Saif and Wesley, 1992).

A competitive inhibition ELISA or blocking ELISA can differentiate antibodies to PRCV from those to TGEV with the same sensitivity as when detected by a viral neutralization (VN) test (Callebaut et al., 1989). The competitive inhibition ELISA has been developed using TGEV as the coating - antigen. The dilutions of test sera are reacted with the fixed antigen. Anti - TGEV serum blocks the binding of mouse monoclonal antibody raised against antigenic site B of S glycoprotein (CaJlebaut et al., 1988). Therefore, it gives a negative result when detected with peroxidase - mouse IgG conjugate. In contrast, anti - PRCV serum does not recognize the antigenic site B of S glycoprotein, giving a positive signal. By this method, pigs infected with

PRCV can be differentiated from those infected with TGEV (Callebaut et al., 1989; Laude et al. , 1993).

Viral antigen can be detected in epithelial cells of the small intestine (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Infected pigs should be euthanized at the early stages of diarrhea for collection of mucosa! scrapings or frozen sections from jejuni and ileum. These specimens are examined by FA, IFA or a immunoperoxidase method. Cross reactions may occur among TGEV, PRCV, FIPV and CCV.

TGEV could be differentiated from PRCV based on genetic differences. Both PCR and hybridization techniques have been developed to detect TGEV genomic RNA in fecal samples or infected tissues (Shockley et al., 1987; Benfield et al., 199 1; Vaughn et al., 1994). Since PRCV has a 672 - 681 nucleotide deletion in the S gene, the relative mass of the PCR product of the PRCV S gene is lower than that of the TGEV S gene (Vaughn et al., 1994). Moreover, RNA probes for hybridization have also been derived from the 5' end of the S gene of TGEV which can differentiate between TGEV and PRCV. Recently, *in situ* hybridization (ISH) has been developed that can detect nucleic acid of TGEV in formalin - fixed tissue (Sirinarumitr et al., 1995). This technique applies not only to diagnostic testing for the differentiation of TGEV and PRCV, but also in studies of virus pathogenesis.

Isolation and Identification of Virus

A swine testicle cell line has been used for detecting field strains of TGEV and PRCV (McClurkin, 1966; Kemeny, 1978; Bohl, 1979; Pensaert and Cox, 1989; Vaughn et al., 1993). The presence of the virus in the cells may be observed by CPE, plaque production, VN and IFA. The CPE or plaque formation may be enhanced by using older cells (Stark et al., 1975) and adding pancreatin or trypsin to the cell culture media (Bohl, 1979; Woods, 1982). The CPE produced by PRCV resembles that of TGEV plus syncytia formation (Pensaert and Cox, 1989).

Immunity

Adult wine infected with TGEV are immune against TGEV but only local immunity i protective (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Swine infected orally develop both serum and mucosal antibodies. Serum antibodies can be detected in serum for 6 months to several years after infection (Stepanek et al., 1979), but serum antibodies provide little protection against TGEV reinfection (Haelterman, 1965; Harada, 1969). In contrast, local mucosal immunity, induced by oral but not parenteral inoculation with TGEV can protect swine from subsequent TGEV exposure (Kodama, 1980; Sprino and Ristic, 1982). The prominent clas of local

immunoglobulin is secretory IgA (slgA) which covers along the gut mucosa (Kodama, 1980). CMI also appears in infected swine but no direct evidence has been presented as to the role of CMI in the resistance of swine against TGEV (Saif and Wesley, 1992). However, it is believed that CMI may play a role in either recovery from TGEV infection or resistance to reinfection.

Sows recovered from TGE can transmit passive immunity to their suckling piglets via colostrum (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Since newborn piglets lack immunity to TGEV, passive immunity is important for immediate protection against TGEV. In the first week of parturition, the IgG class is dominant in colostrum which crosses piglets' enterocytes and provides serum antibodies (Porter and Allen, 1972; Bourne, 1973). The circulatory antibodies protect against systemic infection but not intestinal infection (Hooper and Haelterman, 1966). After a week, IgG in milk decreases while slgA in milk is predominant (Porter and Allen, 1972). Secretory IgA will not be absorbed by the piglets but provides local immunity against TGEV in the gut tract (Roux et al., 1977), by neutralizing ingested TGEV. IgA clas is produced only by oral immunization of sows but not by parenteral or systemic infection.

Vaccines have been developed to induce protective immunity for both piglets and sows. Live attenuated and inactivated TGEV vaccines are available for oral or intraperitoneal administration after birth (Saif and Wesley, 1992). Orally vaccinated newborn piglets require 5 days for active immunity development which obviously can not provide immediate protection against TGEV for the first few days of life (Pensaert, 1979). Immunization of suckling or feeder pigs could decrease mortality rate of enzootic TGEV. However, the presence of maternal antibodies in these pigs can suppress active immunity (Furuuchi et al., 1978; Hess et al., 1982). Vaccination of pregnant swine increases passive immunity for suckling piglets via colostrum and milk. There are several vaccine preparations for immunization of pregnant dams such as virulent, attenuated, inactivated and subunit vaccines which may be inoculated via oraJ, intranasal, intramuscular and intramammary routes (Saif and Wesley, 1992). OraJ administration of virulent autogenous viruses induces the highest level of immunity, consistently producing higher titers of persisting IgA in milk (Saif and Wesley, 1992; Paul et al. , 1988).

The wide prevalence of PRCV in swine herds seems to overcome the prevalence of epizootic TGE, since TGE outbreaks have declined concomitantly with the increases in the occurrence of PRCV infection (Pensaert and Cox, 1989). This suggests that PRCV infected pigs are partially immune to TGEV infection (Pensaert, 1989; Pensaert and Cox, 1989). Sows oronasaJiy infected with PRCV after natural exposure to PRCV secrete slgA in their milk but the level of antibody rapidly decrease approximately 24 weeks after infection (Laude et al., 1993).

However, natural infection of sows with TGEV followed with PRCV infection during pregnancy stimulates slgA production against TGEV which can protect offspring (Duen et al., 1990). Sows first infected with PRCV develop rapid secondary immune response against TGEV with higher lactogenic IgA (Pensaert, 1989, Pensaert and Cox, 1989). Lactogenic protection in piglets from TGEV immune sows is higher than in piglets from PRCV immune sows (De Diego et al., 1992). However, Paton and Brian (1990) reported that no cross protection occurs between PRCV and TGEV via sow' s milk.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell Culture

The swine testis (ST) cell line (McClurkin and Norman, 1966) was used to propagate TGEV and PRCV. The ST cells were cultured in Eagle's minimum essential medium (MEM; Gibco BRL, Grand Island, NY) supplemented with 10 % fetal bovine serum (FBS; Gibco BRL, Grand Island, NY), sodium bicarbonate (2.0 g/1) (Fisher Scientific, Fair Lawn, NJ), 2 % L - glutamine (Gibco, Grand Island, NY) and lactalbumin enzymatic hydrolysate (5.0g/l) (Sigma, St. Louis, MO). The ST cell lines were grown in 75 cm^2 flasks (Corning, Cambridge, MA) at 37° C in a humid 5 % CO₂ atmosphere and subcultured every 3 - 4 days.

Viruses

The Miller strain (American Type Culture Collection, Rockville, MD) was used as the standard TGEV strain in this study. The VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5 170 isolates were obtained from diarrheic pigs.

VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates are the viruses isolated from suckling pigs in a herd with enteric disease in 1995 (Halbur et al., 1995). Approximately 15 - 20 % of sows and almost l 00% of weaned pigs had diarrhea which suggested periodical TGE since November, 1994. However, the causative agent was still unclear. The fecal samples and tissues from neonatal pigs with diarrhea were then sent to Iowa State University - Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory for definitive identification of enteric pathogens. Microscopic examination of intestinal section demonstrated severe atrophic enteritis. Electron microscopic examination of feces demonstrated a large number of atypical coronavirus like particles. Fluorescent antibody examination of frozen tissues demonstrated weak positive staining using anti - TGEV polyclonal antibodies. The fecal samples were also cultured on ST cells at Veterinary Medical Reseach Institute and National Veterinary Service Laboratory. Cytopathic effect typical of TGEV was observed in both laboratories. The isolates were called VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170. By *In situ* hybridization, performed at VMRI, the tissue sample demonstrated a weak positive signal. Finally, RT - PCR was performed on RNA isolated from the viruses propagated on ST cells. Initial results revealed that the VMRI 51 70 isolate was TGEV while NVSL 5170 isolate was PRCV.

Virus Plaque Purification

The 2 viral isolates and a standard virus, Miller strain of TGEV, were plaque purified a totaJ of three times. Ten - fold serial dilutions of the viral isolates were prepared as inoculum. Four-day-old ST cell monolayers in six-well plates were inoculated with 0.5 ml of each virus and then incubated at 37° C for I hour. After incubation, the inoculum was removed, and the ST cell monolayers were overlaid with 2 ml of a mixture of Eagle's basal medium (BME; Gibco BRL, Grand Island, NY) and 2% agarose (FMC Bioproducts, Rockland, ME) containing 0.0016% neutral red (Fisher Scientific, Fair Lawn, NJ) and 30 mM sodium bicarbonate. The plates were placed in the dark at room temperature until the agarose became solid and then incubated at 37° C for 2 days. The virus was collected from individual plaques by aspirating infected cells and agarose with a sterile Pasteur pipette. The agarose plugs containing TGEV-infected cells were transferred into tubes containing 1 ml of MEM with 2% FBS and 1 % antibiotics - antimycotics (GibcoBRL, Grand Island, NY). The tubes were frozen and thawed three times and clarified by centrifugation at 2,000 rpm for 10 minutes. The viral suspension was diluted ten - fold for further plaque purification. This procedure was replicated three times. The viral stocks were stored at -70° C.

One Step Growth Curves

Each strain of virus was inoculated on 4 day old ST cells cultured in 12 well plates (Corning, Cambridge, MA) at a MOI of 1 pfu/cell. At each time point from 0 to 96 hours post inoculation, the media was collected and the infected cells were scraped and transferred into a tube. The virus - cell suspension was frozen at -70° C and thawed 3 times and then clarified by centrifugation at 2,000 rpm for 10 minutes. The virus suspension was inoculated on $2 - 3$ day old ST cells seeded in 96 - well plates, 8 wells each, and then incubated at 37° C in a CO₂ incubator. After 72 hours post inoculation, the cultures were observed for CPE. The reciprocal of the highest dilution that was infectious for cell cultures was the virus titer. One step growth curves were generated for each virus.

Plaque Size Measurement

Four to five day old ST cells cultured in 6 - well plates (Corning, Cambridge, MA) were inoculated at a 0.001 MOI for each strain of virus. One hour post inoculation, the inoculum was removed and replaced with 2 % Sea Plaque agarose (FME bioproducts, Rockland, NY) in an equal amount of BME (Gibco, Grand Island, NY) containing 0.0016 % neutral red (Fisher Scientific, Fair Lawn, NJ) and 30 mM sodium bicarbonate. The plates were placed in the dark for 15 minutes and then incubated at 37° C. At 48 hours post inoculation the diameters of plaques were randomly measured in one direction. Sixty plaques of each strain of viruses were recorded and analyzed statistically using the ANOVA procedure.

Virus Neutralization Test

Hyperimmune serum or monoclonal antibodies, MH11 and MH5, directed against conserved epitopes on the S glycoprotein of TGEV were serially diluted two - fold in 96 - well plates from 1:100 to 1:102,400. Eight wells were used for each serum dilution. Diluted serum or monoclonal antibodies were mixed with 50 µI of MEM containing I 00 pfu of the virus and incubated for 1 hour at 37 \degree C. One hundred µl of ST cell suspension at a concentration of 5 x $10⁵$ cells/ml were dispensed into each well. The plates were incubated at $37[°]$ C for 48 hours and the cultures were observed for CPE. The experiment was replicated 6 times. The VN titer of the tested serum, resulting from the last dilution of serum neutralizing TGEV, was calculated from the average of the 6 values by the regression analysis procedure.

Radioimmunoprecipitation Assay **(RIP)**

Metabolic Labeling

Radioimmunoprecipitation was used to determine differences in the migration of viral tructural proteins. The ST cells infected with the Miller strain, the NVSL 5 170 or the VMRI 5170 isolate, and mock-infected cells were labeled with ³⁵S-methionine-cysteine. The viruses were inoculated into 3-day-old ST cells in 25 cm² flasks at a MOI of 0.1 pfu/cell. Inoculum was removed after 16 hours post inoculation and Met - Cys deficient DMEM (ICN, Costa -Mesa, CA) was added. After 1 hour of incubation at 37° C, the spent media was decanted and replaced with fresh Met - Cys free DMEM containing 100μ Ci/ml³⁵S-methionine-cysteine (ICN, Costa Mesa, CA). Four hours after adding 35S-methionine-cy teine, the spent media was removed and the infected cell monolayers were washed 3 times with cold PBS. Sub equently, I ml of lysis buffer (Cellular labeling and immunoprecipitation kit, Boehringer Mannheim, Indianapolis, IN) was added into each flask. ST cells were then scraped from the surface of the flasks and transferred into 1.5 ml microfuge tubes. The cell - lysis buffer suspensions were vortex mixed vigorously for I minute and then incubated on ice for 30 minutes. Then, the suspensions were centrifuged at high speed at 4° C for 15 minutes. The supernatant was collected and stored at -20° C until needed.

Immunoprecipitation

Lysate $(50 \mu l)$ was clarified by incubating with 20 μl of protein A coated sepharose beads (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) for 1 hour at 4° C on a rocking platform. The clarified lysate was allowed to react with 1μ I of the hyperimmune serum or monoclonal antibody, MH11, for 3 hours at 4° C on a rocking platform. Immune complexes were collected by adding protein - A - coated sepharose beads (Sigma. St. Louis, MO) and incubated overnight at 4° C on a rocking platform. The antigen-antibody complexes were washed by rinsing twice with wash buffer I, twice with wash buffer II, once with wash buffer ill and twice with deionized distilled water as the method described in the cellular labeling and immunoprecipitation kit (Boehringer Mannheim, Indianapolis, IN). These immune complexes were resuspended in 30 µl Laemmli sample buffer (Bio - Rad, Hercules, CA) and heated for 3 minutes in a boiling water bath. The protein - bead mixtures were centrifuged at high speed for 30 seconds, and the supernatants were electrophoresesed through a 10 % SDS-polyacrylamide gel at 100 volts for 15 minutes, and 150 volts for 1 hour, respectively.

Autoradirography

The electrophoresed gel was fixed in acid - methanol (1 % formic acid and 31.25 % methanol) for 15 minutes and then washed 3 times with deionized water. The radioactive signals were enhanced by incubation of the fixed gel in 50 volumes of EnlighteningTM (NEN, Boston, MA) for 30 minutes on rocking platform. Subsequently, the gel was vacuum dried for 90 minutes at 65° C, and was then exposed to biomax film (Kodak, Rochester, NY) overnight at-70° C.

Sequence Analysis

RNA Extraction

Viral RNAs were isolated from TGEV or PRCV infected ST cells by using a RNA isolation kit (Strategene, La Jolla, CA). Four day old ST cells grown in 75 cm^2 flasks were inoculated with NVSL 5170 or VMRI 5170 isolates and then incubated until approximately 50 % CPE was observed. The spent media was decanted and replaced with 2 mJ of cold solution D (provided by the kit) in each flask. The flasks were swirled gently for 30 seconds at room temperature to lyse the cells and denature all proteins. The suspensions in 5 flasks were transferred into a chilled polypropylene tube. Then 0.5 mJ of 2 M sodium acetate and 5 ml of phenol were added into each tube immediately, and thoroughly mixed. Subsequently, I ml of

chloroform : isoamyl alcohol was added into the mixture, vortex mixed vigorously for 10 seconds and incubated on ice for 15 minutes. The suspension was transferred into a prechilled thick - wall Nalgene 50 - ml round - bottom centrifuge tube and centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 20 minutes at 4°C. The aqueous phase was transferred to a tube and mixed with an equal volume of isopropanol. The RNA was precipitated by chilling the RNA - isopropanol mixture at -20 $^{\circ}$ C for 1 hour. The mixture was centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 20 minutes at 4 $^{\circ}$ C and then the supernatant was discarded. The quality of RNA was improved by dissolving the pellet in 3 ml of solution D and precipitating with 3 ml of isopropanol. The RNA - isopropanol mixture was dispensed in 100 μ l volumes into 0.5 ml microfuge tubes and stored at -20 \degree C for 1 hour or until used. The chilled RNA - isopropanol mixture was thawed and pelleted at 10,000 rpm for 10 minutes at 4° C. The supernatant was removed and the pellet was dried under vacuum for 3 - 5 minutes. The RNA pellet was resuspended in IO µI of sterile DEPC - treated water.

cDNA Synthesis

cDNA was synthesized using the cDNA cycle kit for RT-PCR (lnvitrogen, San Diego, Calif). RNA samples in the previous step were transferred using 7μ of each into 0.5 ml microfuge tubes. Then, 1μ l of random primer and 4μ l of DEPC - treated water was added into the tubes and mixed well. The tubes were placed in a 65° C water bath for 10 minutes to denature the secondary structure of RNAs. The tubes were then left at room temperature for a few minutes to let the primer anneal. Subsequently, 4μ of $5 \times RT$ buffer, 1μ of dNTP, 1μ l of 80 mM sodium pyrophosphate, 1 µI of RNase inhibitor and I µl of reverse transcriptase were added into each tube and mixed well. For cDNA synthesis, the mixture was then incubated in a 42° C water bath for 60 minutes.

Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) and Sequence Analysis

PCR-amplified fragments were obtained using cDNA-RNA heteroduplexes as templates and following the basic PCR protocol (Gibco BRL, Gaithersburg, MD). The components of the PCR mixture in each reaction were 10μ I of 5 x PCR buffer (Gibco BRL, Gaithersburg, MD), 2 mM dNTP, 6 μ l of 50 mM MgCl₂, 10 μ l of 2 mM forward primer, 10 μ l of 2 mM reverse primer, 4 µI of cDNA template, 5 units of Taq DNA polymerase (Gibco BRL, Gaithersburg, MD) and sterile distilled water to 100 µl. Thirty cycles of 92° C for 30 seconds for denaturation, 48° C for 30 seconds for annealing and 72° C for 45 seconds for primer extension were performed in a thermocycler (Gene Amp PCR system 2400, Perkin Elmer). The primers used in the PCR reaction are shown in Table 2. The PCR products were

electrophoresesed through a 0.8% agarose gel and then extracted from the gel using the QIAEX II Gel Extraction kit (QIAGEN, Germany). The extracted DNA was sequenced using the primers presented in Table 3, by an automated fluorescent method using ABI 377 at the DNA sequencing facility, ISU. The positions and primers used in PCR and sequence analysis are presented in Figure 1. The base sequences were analyzed and DNA fragments were combined using the Mac Vector program. The combined fragments were compared by the Gene Works program.

	name	sequence $(5' \rightarrow 3')$	direction	base range
1	185	AGG GTA AGT TGC TCA TTA G	forward	$-50 - -32$
\overline{c}	2F	CAA ACA ACG GTT AAA CGT	forward	$297 - 316$
		AG		
3	5FC	CGC TTC ATA CCA AGA CCA	reverse	1599-1616
4	4FF	GTA TCT AGG AAC ATT ACC A	forward	1224-1242
5	6RR	GTT AGA ATA GGT TAT GAC AG	reverse	2393-2412
6	6FF	TTA CAC ATC ACT ATC AGG T	forward	2130-2148
7	4RR	CCT TGT GGG TTG ACA ACA T	reverse	3308-3326
8	4RC	AGA TGT TGT CAA CAC ACA A	forward	3306-3324
9	2R	GCC TAT TAG TAG CCA CAC	reverse	4171-4188
10	5RC	CGT TGT ACA GGT GGT TAT G	forward	2941-2959
11	3RR	CTG GAC ATC TTT AAC GAC	reverse	3736-3573
12	3RC	GTC GTT AAA GAT GTC CAG	forward	3736-3753
13	662	ATT GAT GCT AAT GAC CAT TC	reverse	5495-5514

Table 2: primers and their sequences used for amplification

Note: The primer 2F was used for VMRI 5170 gene amplification only

	name	sequence $(5' \rightarrow 3')$	direction	base range
$\overline{1}$	185	AGG GTA AGT TGC TCA TTA G	forward	$-50 - -32$
$\overline{2}$	2F	CAA ACA ACG GTT AAA CGT AG	forward	$297 - 316$
3	3FF	GAT CAA TGT GCT AGT TAT G	forward	657-675
$\overline{4}$	5FC	CGC TTC ATA CCA AGA CCA	reverse	1599-1616
5	4FF	GTA TCT AGG AAC ATT ACC A	forward	1224-1242
6	5FF	CAG GAT AAC AAC ACC GAT	forward	1672-1689
7	6RR	GTT AGA ATA GGT TAT GAC AG	reverse	2393-2412
8	6FF	TTA CAC ATC ACT ATC AGG T	forward	2130-2148
9	6RC	CGT CAC ACA TTC TGA TGG	forward	2451-2468
10	GAP1	GCT CTT GGC TAG AAG GTC	forward	2807-2824
11	4RR	CCT TGT GGG TTG ACA ACA T	reverse	3308-3326
12	4RC	AGA TGT TGT CAA CAC ACA A	forward	3306-3324
13	2R	GCC TAT TAG TAG CCA CAC	reverse	4171-4188
14	5RC	CGT TGT ACA GGT GGT TAT G	forward	2941-2959
15	3RR	CTG GAC ATC TTT AAC GAC	reverse	3736-3573
16	3RC	GTC GTT AAA GAT GTC CAG	forward	3736-3753
17	583	CTA TTG AAA AAG TGC ACG TC	reverse	
18	662	ATT GAT GCT AAT GAC CAT TC	reverse	5495-5514
19	EV048	GCA TAG GTC CTA AAA GTG TCA TTG	forward	

Table 3: Primers used for DNA sequencing

Note : The primer 2F was used for VMRI 5170 gene sequencing only

Figure 1: The positions and the primers used in DNA amplification and sequence analysis. The thick line indicates S gene and ORF 3/3. l regions of the genome of TGEV. Each thin line shows the amplified fragment. The letters and numbers are the names of the primers while the arrows indicate the direction of the amplification leaded by the primers.

4 .RESULTS

One Step Growth Curve

The titers of the three viruses exhibited the same pattern at each time point. The average titers that represented the $TCID_{50}$ of each virus and time points are shown in Table 4. However, the highest titer of each virus at a certain time point is different. The Miller strain of TGEV reached the highest titer, $10^{6.25}$, at 30 hour post inoculation while those of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170, and TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 were $10^{6.63}$ and $10^{5.63}$ at the time points of 46 and 54 hour post inoculation respectively. The log_{10} of the virus titers were plotted to create 3 growth curves demonstrated in Figure 2. There was no difference among the growth curves of the three viruses ($p = 0.63$) using one way ANOVA.

Plaque Size Measurement

The Miller strain of TGEV, TGEV isolate VMRI 5170, and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 produced almost round plaques at 48 hour post inoculation. The diameters of the plaques of

	Virus Strain			
Time(h.p.i.)	TGEV Miller	PRCV NVSL 5170	TGEV VMRI 5170	
$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	Ω	$\boldsymbol{0}$	
5	$10^{2.5}$	$10^{2.75}$	$10^{3.25}$	
11	$10^{4.0}$	$10^{3.75}$	$10^{4.13}$	
18	$10^{5.13}$	$10^{4.5}$	$10^{4.38}$	
22	$10^{6.0}$	$10^{5.5}$	$10^{5.0}$	
30	$10^{6.25}$	$10^{5.5}$	$10^{5.0}$	
38	$10^{5.38}$	$10^{6.13}$	$10^{5.63}$	
46	$10^{5.63}$	$10^{6.63}$	$10^{5.5}$	
54	$10^{5.25}$	$10^{6.5}$	$10^{5.63}$	
66	$10^{4.75}$	$10^{6.13}$	$10^{4.75}$	
80	$10^{3.25}$	$10^{5.5}$	$10^{3.75}$	
90	$10^{2.52}$	$10^{4.88}$	$10^{3.25}$	

Table 4: The average titers of the Miller strain of TGEV, the TGEY isolate, YMRI 5170, and the PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, at each time point.

Note: Cell culture were inoculated with TGEV or PRCY at **1** MOI

Figure 2: Growth curves of the Miller strain of TGEV, VMRI 5170 isolate of TGEV and NVSL 5170 of PRCV.
Plaque No.	TGEV Miller	PRCV NVSL 5170	TGEV VMRI 5170
	1.925	0.950	2.650
	2.500	0.950	3.200
$\frac{2}{3}$	2.400	0.825	2.300
$\overline{4}$	3.375	0.500	2.900
5	2.425	1.300	3.450
6	2.400	0.400	1.600
$\boldsymbol{7}$	2.725	1.050	2.675
$\,$ 8 $\,$	2.575	0.850	2.700
9	2.450	0.700	2.575
$10\,$	2.975	1.200	3.000
11	3.050	1.450	2.675
12	2.000	0.975	2.000
13	2.425	1.175	3.175
14	2.450	1.175	2.200
15	3.400	1.675	2.300
16	3.175	1.000	2.450
17	2.000	1.025	2.850
18	3.350	1.000	2.800
19	3.200	1.025	1.650
20	1.925	1.500	2.000
21	2.000	1.000	2.200
22	2.500	0.900	2.900
23	2.950	1.150	1.750
24	2.225	1.500	2.200
25	2.975	1.075	2.500
26	2.600	1.175	2.600
27	2.475	1.125	2.750
28	2.400	0.900	2.700
29	2.200	1.075	3.050
30	2.700	0.575	1.975
31	2.375	0.750	2.100
32	2.875	0.575	3.425
33	2.975	0.825	2.725
34	3.125	1.000	3.900
35	2.975	0.900	2.275
36	2.125	1.250	2.350
37	2.500	1.000	2.850
38	2.000	0.800	2.300
39	2.000	1.350	2.050
40	2.325	0.650	1.975
41	2.475	0.500	1.975
42	2.125	0.700	2.600
43	1.000	0.950	2.000
44	2.250	1.000	2.525
45	2.575	1.300	1.600
46	2.725	1.300	1.500

Table 5: Diameters of plaques of the Miller train of TGEV, the TGEV isolate, YMRI 5170, and the PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170.

Plaque No.	TGEV Miller	PRCV NVSL 5170	TGEV VMRI 5170
47	3.050	0.750	1.575
48	1.525	0.800	2.250
49	2.325	1.600	1.825
50	2.075	0.900	2.000
51	2.975	1.000	1.500
52	3.100	0.525	2.525
53	3.200	0.800	2.425
54	2.500	0.725	1.800
55	2.075	1.500	1.500
56	2.400	0.825	1.425
57	2.050	0.950	1.400
58	2.000	1.450	1.375
59	2.100	0.500	1.975
60	1.100	0.350	2.200
61	1.975		
62	2.700		
63	2.500	\blacksquare	
n	63	60	60

Table 5: (continued)

each virus is included in Table 5. Average size of plaques of Miller strain, VMRI 5170 isolate and NVSL 5170 isolate were 2.47 ± 0.50 , 2.33 ± 0.56 and 0.987 ± 0.31 , respectively. The raw data calculated by the ANOVA procedure revealed that the plaque sizes of these 3 viruses were different ($p < 0.0001$). However, comparison of the plaque sizes of the Miller strain and VMRI 5170 isolate showed that they were not distinguishable ($p = 0.13$). In contrast, the plaque size of the TGEV isolate, Miller strain and VMRI 5170, were significantly larger than that of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 ($p < 0.0001$).

Virus Neutralization Test

The virus neutralization titer of the TGEY hyperimrnune sera or monoclonal antibodies was calculated from an average of the replications of the highest dilution of the serum or ascites fluid that resulted in neutralization of TGEV. The YN titers are shown in Table 6. The TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were neutralized by hyperimmune sera raised against the Miller strain of TGEY, as well as Mab against the S glycoprotein of TGEV. However, TGEV hyperimmune sera, MAb 3H **l** I and MAb 5A5 had lower VN titers for TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 than for the TGEV Miller strain. VN titer of MAb 5A5 for TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 was an exception.

Table 6: Neutralization of the Miller strain of TGEV, the TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170, and the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 by TGEV hyperimmune sera, and anti - TGEV MAbs, 3H11 and *SAS.*

Radioimmunoprecipitation Assay

In the radioimmunoprecipitation assay, the three viruses demonstrated the similar pattern of protein profiles (Figure 3) when reacted with hyperimmune sera, against TGEV. The molecular mass of M (28 kD) and N (46 kD) proteins were similar for the Miller strain of TGEV, the TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 and the PRCV isolate NVSL *S* 170. The molecular mass of the S glycoprotein of the TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 was 220 kD and was similar for the Miller strain. In contrast, the S glycoprotein of the PRCV isolate NVSL *S* 170 was approximately 190 kD which was less than that for the TGEV isolates Miller and VMRI *S* 170 (Figure 3&4).

Sequencing Analysis

The pairwise alignment of the S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 and PRCV isolate NVSL *S* 170 compared to other strains of TGEV are presented in Figure *S.* The S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 consisted of 4353 bases while that of PRCV isolate NVSL *S* 170 was 3639 bases, including start and stop codons. The PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 had a 714 and 711 nucleotide deletion when aligned with the VMRI 5170 isolate and Miller strain; FS772; TFl ; Purdue and NEB 72. The nucleotide and deduced amino acid homology S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 compared with those of other TGEVs are shown in Table 7. It was found that the S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 exhibited 96-97% identity to the published sequences of the S genes of TGEV with 120-169 nucleotide differences. Without accounting for the 714 nucleotide deletion, the S genes of TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 are markedly identical with only 5 nucleotide differences.

Figure 3: Immunoprecipitation of ³⁵S trans methionine - cysteine labeled structural proteins of the Miller strain of TGEV, the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 by hyperimmune anti-TGEY erum. The S glycoprotein of the Miller strain of TGEV and the VMRI isolate of TGEV have a molecular mass of 220 kD and that of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 is 190 kD. The M and N proteins of the three viruses had molecular mass of 28 and 46 kD respectively.

Figure 4: Immunoprecipitation of ³⁵S trans methionine - cysteine labeled S glycoprotein of the Miller strain of TGEV, TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NYSL 5170 by MAb 3Hll against S glycoprotein of TGEY. The S glycoprotein of the Miller strain of TGEV and the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 have M_r of 220 kD and that of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 is 190 kD.

Note: A = mock infected cell lysate.

- $B =$ Miller strain of TGEV infected cell lysate.
- $C = PRCV$ isolate NVSL 5170 infected cell lysate.
- $D = TGEV$ isolate VMRI 5170 infected cell lysate.

Likewise, the sequence of the S gene of the TGEV isolate VMRJ 5170 and the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were also compared with other published sequences of the S genes of PRCV. The pairwise alignments are shown in Figure 6. The S gene of NVSL 5170 isolate had a 96 - 97 % nucleic acid identity with that of the published sequences of PRCV isolates (Table 8). The position of the deletions within the S gene of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 and that of other PRCVs are summarized in Table 9.

Figure 5: Pairwise alignments of S genes of the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170, the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 and other TGEV isolates.

Note: The sequences begin with the start codons and are shown as underlined bases. The position having identical nucleotides are presented as dots and the positions of deleted nucleotides are exhibited as dashes. The $\tilde{5}$ bases that are diferent between TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 are presented as bold letters.

Purdue S ... C G A T C .. 250 NEB72 S .. . C G A T C .. 250 TFl S . .. C G A T T . . 250 Miller S ... C G A T T .. 250 FS772 S ... C A A T T .. 250 NVSL S 27 VMRI S . . . T G G C T 250 Consensus TTGYATTCRC AATRATAGTA AYGACCT'ITA TG'ITACAYTG GAAAATCTTA 250 299 Purdue S GT...T... GA.. ...T..C..GG-NEB72 STT...T...GA.. ...T..C..GG-299 TFl S 'IT.. T.. GA T .. T .. G G- 299 Miller S 'IT T GA T .. C .. T A- 299 FS772 S 'IT C GA G .. C .. G A- 299 NVSL S 27 VMRI STG...T...AG.. ...T..C..GA. 300 Consensus AAGCAKKGTA 'fTGGGAYTAT GCTACARRAA ATAKCAY'ITK GAATCACARG 300 Purdue S 347 .
The Therman and the property and the contract and the contract of the contract of the second service of the co NEB72 S 347 TFl S 347 347 Miller s Tutus pada tahun 1999 kalendar kalendar pada kalendar San Pada Pada P FS772 S 347 Matthews and the communication of the second service of the service of the service of NVSL S 27 VMRI S 350 Consensus GACCAACGGT TAAACGTAGT CG'ITAATGGA TACCCATACT CCATCACAGT 350 397 Purdue S G NEB72 S G 397 TFl S T 397 Miller s G 397 FS772 S G 397 NVSL S 27 VMRI S G 400 Consensus TACAACAACC CGCAATTTTA ATTCTKCTGA AGGTGCTATT ATATGCATTT 400 .T A .. A Purdue s 447 NEB72 S .T A .. A 447 TFl S .c C . . A 447 Miller s .c A . . A 447 FS772 S .c C .. A 447 NVSL S 27 VMRI S .c C .. G 450 Consensus GYAAGGGCTC ACCACCTACT ACCACCACMG ARTCTAGTTT GACTTGCAAT 450 T T .. . Purdue S 497 T T .. . NEB72 S 497 G. T .. . TFl S 497 T. T .. . Miller s 497 T. T . . . FS772 S 497 NVSL S 27 T. C ... VMRI S 500 Consensus TGGGGTAGKG AGTGCAGG'IT AAACCAYAAG TTCCCTATAT GTCCTTCTAA 500

Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller s FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller s FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus C T• C T T C TTCAGAGGCA AATTGTGGTA ATATGYTGTA YGGCCTACAA TGGTITGCAG ... A A c c c $\begin{minipage}{0.5\textwidth} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf{1.6}\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf{1.6}\end{tabular} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}{0.5\textwidth} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf{2.6}\end{tabular} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}{0.5\textwidth} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf{2.6}\end{tabular} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}{0.5\textwidth} \begin{tabular}{l} \bf{2.6}\end{tabular} \end{minipage} \end{minipage} \begin{minipage}{0.5\textwidth} \$. . T C ... T G A .. A T C ... T G A .. A T T ... C T T .. A T T ... C G T .. A T T ... C G T .. A c T .. . C G T .. G .. AAYCAATGGT CTGGCACTGT YACAYTTGGT GATATGCGTK CGACWACRTT .G .. GT.G C G T .G .. GT.T C G T .G .. AC.G C T T $.G. . AC.G. C. G. T$.G .. AC.G C G T .C .. AC.G T G C ASAARYCKCT GGCAYGCTTG TAGACCT'ITG KTGGTI'TAAY CCTGTI'TATG G c G A c T A A c c A ... ---------- ---------- - c ATGTCAGTTA TTATAGRGTT AATAATAAAA ATGGTACTAY CGTAGTTTCC A ... • • .. AC AAC G GT G GT AATTGCACTG ATCARTGTGC TAGTTATGTG GCTAATGTTT TTRYTACACA 547 547 547 547 547 27 550 550 597 597 597 597 597 27 600 600 647 647 647 647 647 27 650 650 697 697 697 697 697 27 700 700 747 747 747 747 747 36 750 750 797 797 797 797 797 86 800 800

Purdue S

847

Purdue S G T . . T G.G .. 2041 NEB72 S G T .. T G.G . 2041 TFl S G C . . C T.G .. 2047 Miller S $G_1, \ldots, G_n, \ldots, T, T, \ldots, T, A, \ldots, \ldots, \ldots, \ldots, \ldots, \ldots,$ 2047 FS772 S G C . . T T .G .. 2047 A C . . T T .G NVSL S 1336 VMRI S A C . . T T.G 2050 RGGTGTACCG TCTGAYAAYA GTGGTKTRCA CGATTTGTCA GTGCTACACC 2050 **Consensus** Purdue S c c c . . . 2091 NEB72 S 2091 TFl S C C c A T c c c c . . . 2097 Miller S 2097 FS772 S A•... C G .. . 2097 A C c . . . 1386 NVSL S VMRI S 2100 TAGATTCMTG CACAGATTAY AATATATATG GTAGAASTGG TGTTGGTATT Consensus 2100 Purdue S c .. . G 2141 NEB72 S A .. . G 2141 TFl S c .. . A 2147 Miller S c . . . G .. .• ... •. 2147 FS772 S c .. . G 2147 NVSL S c .. . A 1436 VMRI S c .. . A 2150 **Service Service** Consensus ATTAGAMAAA CTAACAGGAC RCTACTTAGT GGCTTATATT ACACATCACT 2150 Purdue S . . . A G.C 2191 NEB72 S ... A G.C 2191 TFl S . . . T G.T 2197 Miller S ... A G.C 2197 FS772 S . . . T G.C 2197 NVSL S . .. T A.T 1486 VMRI S . .. T A.T 2200 Consensus ATCWGGTGAT TTGTTAGGTT TTAAAAATGT TAGTGATGGT RTYATCTACT 2200 Purdue S G . . A C 2241 NEB72 S G .. A C 2241 TFl S G .. A T 2247 Miller S G . . A C 2247 FS772 S T .. A C 2247 NVSL S G .. G C 1536 VMRI S•. G .. G ...•.. . • C 2250 Consensus CTGTAACKCC RTGTGATGTA AGCGYACAAG CAGCTGTTAT TGATGGTACC 2250 . . A C C A .. Purdue S 2291 NEB72 S .. A C C A .. 2291 TFl S .. G C T A .. 2297 .. A C C A .. Miller s 2297 . . A C T A .. FS772 S 2297 NVSL S .. A T T G .. 1586 VMRI S .. A T T G .. 2300 Consensus ATAGTTGGGG CTRTCACTTC YATTAACAGT GAAYTGTTAG GTCTAACRCA 2300

Purdue S a constitution of the constitution of 2341 NEB72 S 2341 TFl S 2347 Miller S 2347 FS772 S a di provincia como la caractería de la caractería de la caractería de la caractería de la caractería 2347 NVSL S 1636 .
In a contra angles - prana angles a ang ita ang ang angles ang ita ang ang anggota ang ang ang ang ang ang VMRI S 2350 Consensus TI'GGACAACA ACACCTAATT TTTATTACTA CTCTATATAT AATTACACAA 2350 G .. C G.TT. Purdue s 2391 G .. C G.TG . NEB72 S 2391 G .. C G. CG . TFl S 2397 G .. C G.TG. Miller s 2397 T .. C G.TG. FS772 S 2397 G .. T G.CG. NVSL S 1686 G .. T C.CG. 2400 VMRI S Consensus ATGATAKGAY TCGTGGCACT GCAATTGACA GTAATSAYKT TGATTGTGAA 2400 Purdue S T T .. 2441 NEB72 S T T .. 2441 TFl S T G .. 2447 2447 Miller s T G .. FS772 S T G .. 2447 NVSL S 1736 C G C G .. 2450 VMRI S CCTGTCATAA CCTATTCTAA CATAGGTGTT TGTAAAAAYG GTGCTI'TKGT 2450 Consensus Purdue S T .. C 2491 NEB72 S 2491 T .. C TFl S T .. T 2497 Miller S T . . C 2497 FS772 S T . . C 2497 NVSL S C .. C 1786 VMRI S 2500 c .. c Consensus TTTTATYAAY GTCACACATT CTGATGGAGA CGTGCAACCA ATTAGCACTG 2500 T T C C A .. T Purdue S 2541 T T C C A . . T NEB72 S 2541 C T C T. G .. C TFl S 2547 C T C T. A .. T Miller S 2547 C C C T. A .. C FS772 S 2547 C T T T. A .. C NVSL S 1836 C T T T. A . . C VMRI S 2550 GTAAYGTCAC GATACCYACA AAYTTTACYA TATCCGTGCA AGTCGARTAY **Consensus** 2550 Purdue S T 2591 NEB72 S T 2591 TFl S T 2597 Miller S T 2597 FS772 S T 2597 NVSL S c 1886 VMRI S c ATI'CAGGTIT ACACTACACC AGTGTCAATA GACI'GTI'CAA GATAYGTTTG 2600 Consensus 2600

Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller s FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus Purdue S NEB72 S TFl S Miller S FS772 S NVSL S VMRI S Consensus T T.G C T T.G C c C.G C c T.G C c T.G C c C.A ^T c C.A T TAATGGYAAC CCTAGGTGTA ACAAAYTRTT AACACAATAY GTTTCTGCAT A c A c A T A c G c A T A T .. . GTCAAACTAT TGAGCAAGCA CTTGCARTGG GTGCCAGACT TGAAAAYATG . . G A G A.CA G A G G.CA A A A G.GT A G A G.CT A A A G.CT A A A G.CT A A A G.CT . . GARGTTGRTT CCATGTTRTT TGTTTCTGAA AATGCCCTTA AATTRGSWIC ... T A C A. ... T A C A. ... c A T A. . .. c A T A. . . . c A T A T G T C. . . . T G T C. TGTYGAAGCA TTCAATAGTT CAGAARCTTT AGAYCCTATT TACAAAGAMT A T . . . C T A T .. . C T A C .. . C T A C .. . C T A C .. . C T G C .. . T G G C .. . T G .. . GGCCTARTAT AGGTGGYTCr TGGCTAGAAG GTCTAAAATA YATACTKCCG ... C A. ... C A. ... G •.. A. ... G A G A. ... G C. ... G C . TCCSATAATA GCAAACGTMA GTATCGTTCA GCTATAGAGG ACI'TGCTI'TT 2641 2641 2647 2647 2647 1936 2650 2650 2691 2691 2697 2697 2697 1986 2700 2700 2741 2741 2747 2747 2747 2036 2750 2750 2791 2791 2797 2797 2797 2086 2800 2800 2841 2841 2847 2847 2847 2136 2850 2850 2891 2891 2897 2897 2897 2186 2900

2900

	% homology with S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170		
Virus Strains	Nucleic Acid Homology	Amino Acid Homology	
Miller	97%	97%	
FS772	97%	97%	
NEB72	96%	96%	
Purdue	96%	96%	
TF1	97%	97%	

Table 7: Percent nucleotide and deduced amino acid homology between S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and that of other TGEV isolates.

In addition, the ORF 3/3.1 genes of VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates were compared with those of other PRCY isolates as depicted in Figure 7. The ORF 3 of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were comprised of 219 bases while ORF 3.1 had 736 bases including start and stop codons. Like other coronaviruses, the ORF 3/3.1 genes of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NYSL 5 170 had an intergenic sequence, of CUAAAC, upstream of the start codon. The base compositions within the ORF 3 of VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates were completely identical, whereas ORF 3. 1 had only 2 nucleotide differences. The first nucleotide difference within the 3.1 gene of NVSL 5170 isolate was T instead of C. Therefore, it created a stop codon which may have resulted in a truncated product of ORF 3.1 in NVSL 5170 isolate. The ORF 3/3.1 genes of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were shown to be similar to those of other PRCV isolates except that the ORF 3 of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 were intact (Figure 7).

Figure 6: Pairwise alignment of S genes of TGEV isolate, Miller strain and VMRI 5170, PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 and other PRCV's S genes.

Note: The sequences begin with the start codons and are shown as underlined bases. The position having identical nucleotides are presented as dots and the positions of deleted nucleotides are exhibited as dashes. The 5 bases that are diferent between TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 are presented as bold letters.

59 86 / 137004 s C .. G - HOL87 S C .. G - 59 C .. G - RM4 S 59 VMRI S 100 T .. T A NVSL S C .. T c YAAKTTTCCT TGTI'CTAAAT 'roACTAATAG AACTATAGGT AAMCATI'GGA 27 Miller s 100 Consensus 100 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 T T ... A C C 59 RM4 S VMRI S 150 NVSL S 27 Miller s A C ... C T T 150 Consensus ATCTCATTGA WACCTTYCTT MTAAATTATA GTAGYAGGTT AYCACCTAAT 150 86/ 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 200 .
Senata estable el la presidencia de la francesa esta llega establecer esta llega establecer NVSL S 27 Miller S 200 Consensus TCAGATGTGG TGTTAGGTGA TTATTTTCCT ACTGTACAAC CTTGGTTTAA 200 86/137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S ... T G C 59 VMRI S 250 NVSL S ... C A T 27 Miller S 250 TTGYATTCGC AATRATAGTA AYGACCTTTA TGTTACATTG GAAAATCTTA 250 Consensus 86/137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 G AG G RM4 S 59 VMRI S 300 NVSL S 27 Miller s 299 T GA T Consensus AAGCATKGTA TI'GGGATTAT GCTACARRAA ATATCACTTK GAATCACAAG 300 59 86/137004 s HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 350 NVSL S 27 Miller s 347 Teta izazza serienezen asierieren baierieren bereiniere Consensus GACCAACGGT TAAACGTAGT CGTTAATGGA TACCCATACT CCATCACAGT 350 86/ 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 400 $\label{eq:convergence} \textbf{1} \textbf{2} \textbf{3} \textbf{4} \textbf{5} \textbf{5} \textbf{5} \textbf{6} \textbf{7} \textbf{8} \textbf{8} \textbf{7} \textbf{8} \text$ NVSL S Lacemente Governance distributo distributo distributo 27

Miller S 397 Consensus TACAACAACC CGCAATTTTA ATTCTGCTGA AGGTGCI'ATT ATATGCATTT 400 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S C .. G 59 VMRI S 450 NVSL S 27 Miller S 447 A .. A Consensus GCAAGGGCTC ACCACCTACT ACCACCACMG ARTCTAGTTT GACTTGCAAT 450 86 / 137004 s <u> Coronador compreser consecuente enchantere compreser</u> 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 500 c ... NVSL S 27 Miller S 497 T ... TGGGGTAGTG AGTGCAGGTT AAACCAYAAG TTCCCTATAT GTCCTTCTAA 500 Consensus 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S T C 550 NVSL S C T 27 Miller s 547 Consensus TTCAGAGGCA AATTGTGGTA ATATGYTGTA YGGCCTACAA TGGTTTGCAG 550 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 600 FREEFERER REFERERED TREFFERER FREEFERER FREEFER NVSL S 27 Miller s 597 a provincia de la caractería Consensus ATGCGGTTGT TGCTTATTTA CATGGTGCTA GTTACCGTAT TAGTTTTGAA 600 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S 59 VMRI S 650 .. c G .. NVSL S 27 Miller S .. T A . . 647 Consensus AAYCAATGGT CTGGCACTGT TACACTTGGT GATATGCGTG CGACTACRTT 650 86 / 137004 s 59 HOL87 S 59 RM4 S .C T c 59 VMRI S 700 NVSL S 27 Miller S .G C T 697 ASAAACCGCT GGCAYGCITG TAGACCTTTG GTGGTTTAAY CCTGTTTATG Consensus 700 86/ 137004 s --------- ---------- --------- ----,...T. 75 ---------- - --- ------ --- - ------ ---- T. HOL87 S 75

RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus ----.... T. A. ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- - A. ATGTCAGTI'A Tl'ATAGAGTT AATAATAAAA ATGGTACTWC CGTAGT'ITCC A AC . . C .. A A AC .. C .. A A AC .. T .. T G GT .. C .. A G GT .. C .. A A AC .. C .. A AATTGCACTG ATCARTGTGC TAGTTATGTG GCTAATGTTT TTRYTAYACW G G A.C. G G c .c . A G c.c. G T C.T . G G C.T . G G C.T. RCCAGGAKGC TITATACCAT CAGATITTAG TITTAATAAT TGGTICMIYC G ... C. T G ... T. T A ... T. T G ... T A G ... T A G ... T G TAACTAATAG CTCCACGTTG GTTARTGGYA AATTAGTTAC CAAACAGCCD c c c c c T T c T c T c YTATTAGTI'A ATTGCTI'ATG GCCAGTCCCT AGCI"ITGAAG AAGYAGCI'TC T A G T T A G T. T A G T T A G C. T A G C. c G C T . TACAYTITGT TTIGAAGGTG CTGRCTTTGA TCAATGTAAT GGTSCTGTYT C C T T. C C T C. C C T T. T T C T. T T C T. C C C T. TAAATAAYAC TGTAGAYGTC ATYAGGTTYA ACCTTAATTI' TACTACAAAT 75 750 36 747 750 125 125 125 800 86 797 800 175 175 175 850 136 847 850 225 225 225 900 186 897 900 275 275 275 950 236 947 950 325 325 325 1000 286 997 1000 375 375 375 1050 336 1047 1050

Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S C T T TTGACYACTG GYGATAGTGA CGTYTTCTGG ACAATAGCTT ACACATCGTA A .. T A .. T A .. T G .. G G .. G A .. G CACTGAAGCR TTAGTACAAG TTGAAAACAC AGCTATTACA AAKGTGACGT ... T T T c c c A'ITGTAATAG TTAYGTTAAT AACATTAAAT GCTCTCAACT TACTGCTAAT T TC TTC T TC c TT C TT T CT TI'GAATAATG GATTTTAYCC TGTTTCTTCA AGTGAAGTTG GTYYTGTCAA T CT G .. A T CT G .. A T CT G . . A T TAC .. G A TAC .. G T TAC .. A TAAGAGTG'IW GTGTTACTAC CTAGCTITYW SACRCATACC ATTGTTAACA G G G A G G TAACTATTGR TCTTGGTATG AAGCGTAGTG GTTATGGTCA ACCCATAGCC GC c GC c GC A TC c TC c AT c TCAACDYTAA GTAACATTAC ACTACCAATG CAGGATAACA ACAMCGATGT G C. c. G C. c . 1397 1400 775 775 775 1450 736 1447 1450 825 825 825 1500 786 1497 1500 875 875 875 1550 836 1547 1550 925 925 925 1600 886 1597 1600 975 975 975 1650 936 1647 1650 1025 1025 1025 1700 986 1697 1700 1075 1075

. G C c T . 1075 RM4 S VMRI S A T. 1750 A T. T. NVSL S 1036 A C. c . Miller s 1747 GTACTGTRTT CGTTCTGAYC AATTTTCAGT TTATGTTCAT TCTACTTGYA Consensus 1750 86/137004 s ll25 GC .. . HOL87 S GC .. . ll25 RM4 S GT . . . 1125 VMRI S GC .. . 1800 NVSL S GC . . . 1086 Miller s TC .. . 1797 AAAGTKYTI'T ATGGGACAAT GTI'TI'TAAGC GAAACTGCAC GGACGTTI'TA Consensus 1800 86 / 137004 s careeries icorrects areas corrected and contract and correct 1175 HOL87 S 1175 .
A statistical de la accesa de ser la constitución de la constitución de la constitución de la constitución de RM4 S and a develop one of a distance and any of a distance of any of a state of a set of any of a state of a state 1175 VMRI S and a measured to the company of the properties of the property of the company of the company of the 1850 NVSL S .
Anala analara a anali ilianalara analara iliana analara arabana ilaya a anala analara ilayaha arabana analar ll36 Miller s 1847 Consensus GATGCCACAG C'TGTTATAAA AACTGGTACT TGTCCTTTCT CATI'TGATAA 1850 86 / 137004 s . T G T . 1225 HOL87 S . T G T . 1225 RM4 S . T G C . 1225 VMRI S 1900 .C T T. NVSL S .C T T . 1186 Miller s .T G T. 1897 Consensus AYTGAACAAT TACTTAACTT TTAACAAGTT CTGTTTKTCG TTGAGTCCYG 1900 86/137004 s C A T 1275 HOL87 S C C .•......... G 1275 RM4 S C A T 1275 VMRI S T A T 1950 NVSL S T A T 1236 Miller S C A T 1947 Consensus TI'GGTGCTAA TTGTAAGTTT GATGTAGYTG CCCGTACMAG AACCAATGAK 1950 86/ 137004 s . . . T G 1325 HOL87 S 1325 ... G G RM4 S . . . G ...•.. . .. G 1325 VMRI S 2000 ... G A NVSL S 1286 ... G A Miller s 1997 ... G A Consensus CAGKTTGTTA GAAGTTTGTA TGTAATATAT GAAGAAGGAG ACARCATAGT 2000 86 / 137004 s T C G .. 1375 HOL87 S T C G .. 1375 RM4 S T C G .. 1375 VMRI S A C G .. 2050 NVSL S A C G .. 1336 Miller S G T A 2047 Consensus DGGTGTACCG TCTGAYAATA GTGGTTTRCA CGATTTGTCA GTGCTACACC 2050

86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S G G G A A c .. TAGATI'CVTG CACAGATTAC AATATATATG GTAGAACTGG TGTTGGTATT GC ..•..... GC ..•..... GA AC AC GC ..•..... ATTAGACAAA CTAACAGGAC RMTACTTAGT GGCTI'ATATT ACACATCACT . . . T A G.T T A G.T T C G.T T A A.T T A A.T A A G.C A'I'CW3GTGAT TTG'ITAGGTT TTAMAAATGT TAGTGATGGT RTYATCTACT A T A G .. A T G A A T A A G A G A G A G A A A G A .. CTGTAACGCC RTGTGATG'IW AGCGCACAAG CAGCTRTTAT TGATGGTRCC C.........T...... C.......A.. C T G A .. C T G A . . T T G G T. G G G . . . C C G A .. ATAGTTGGGG CTATCACTI'C YATTAACAGT GAAYTGTTAG STCTAACRCA T. T. c. c. c. c. TTGGACAAYA ACACCTAATT TTTATTACTA CTCTATATAT AATTACACAA A .. C C G G.C A A .. C C A G.C G A .. C C G G.C A G .. T G A ^C .C A G .. T G A G.C A 1425 1425 1425 2100 1386 2097 2100 1475 1475 1475 2150 1436 2147 2150 1525 1525 1525 2200 1486 2197 2200 1575 1575 1575 2250 1536 2247 2250 1625 1625 1625 2300 1586 2297 2300 1675 1675 1675 2350 1636 2347 2350 1725 1725 1725 2400 1686

Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S G .. C G A G.T A ATGATARGAY TCGTGGCACT SCAATTGRCA GTAATSAYGT TGRTTGTGAA T. T. T. c. c. T CCTGTCATAA CCTATTCTAA CATAGGTGTT TGTAAAAAYG GTGCTTTGGT T T TA T T c T cT T T 'ITITATYAAC GrCACACATT CTGATGGAGA CGTGCAACCA A'IWAGCACTG C T .. C c T T .. C c C T .. C -.. ... c C A .. T c C A .. T c C A .. C T GTAAYGTCAC GATACCTACW AAYTTTACTA TATCCGTGCA AGTCGAATAY T T T c c T ATTCAGGTrT ACACTACACC AGTGTCAATA GACTGTTCAA GATAYGTTTG C.G C C.G C C.G C C.A T C.A T T.G C TAATGGCAAC CCTAGGTGTA ACAAAYTRTT AACACAATAY G'I'TTCTGCAT c c c T T c .. . GTCAAACTAT TGAGCAAGCA CTTGCAATGG GTGCCAGACT TGAAAAYATG A A .. 2397 2400 1775 1775 1775 2450 1736 2447 2450 1825 1825 1825 2500 1786 2497 2500 1875 1875 1875 2550 1836 2547 2550 1925 1925 1925 2600 1886 2597 2600 1975 1975 1975 2650 1936 2647 2650 2025 2025 2025 2700 1986 2697 2700 2075 2075

RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus A A A G .. GAAGTTGRTT CCATGTTATT TGTTTCTGAA AATGCCCTTA AATTGGCTTC . . . c A A.G.A T A C.C.A c A A.G.A. ... T G A.G.C T G A.G.C c A A.G.A . TGTYGAAGCA TTCAATAGTT CAGAARCTTT AGATCCTATT TACAMASAMT A T. C T A T. C T A T. C T G C. T G G C. T G A C C T .. . GGCCTARTAT AGG'IGGCTYT TGGCTAGAAG GTCTAAAATA YATACTKCCG A. A A. c. c. A TCCGATAATA GCAAACGTMA GTATCGTI'CA GCTATAGAGG ACTTGCTTI'T . T c T cT cT TT TG T TKCTAAGGTT GTAACATCTG GTTTAGGTAC AGTTGATGAA GATTAYAAAC c c C T G T .. T T G T .. T c A C .. C A C . . T
....A.....C..T A C .. T GTTGTACAGG TGGTTATGAY ATAGCTGACT TAGTRTGTGC TCAATAYTAY c. c. T. c. c. c . AATGGCATYA TGG'ffiCTACC TGGTGTGGCT AATGCTGACA AAATGACTAT 2075 2750 2036 2747 2750 2125 2125 2125 2800 2086 2797 2800 2175 2175 2175 2850 2136 2847 2850 2225 2225 2225 2900 2186 2897 2900 2275 2275 2275 2950 2236 2947 2950 2325 2325 2325 3000 2286 2997 3000 2375 2375 2375 3050 2336 3047 3050

86/137004 s . . . c c 2425 2425 HOL87 S . . . T T RM4 S . . . c c c c 2425 3100 VMRI S 2386 NVSL S . . . c c c c 3097 Miller S GTAYACAGCA TCCCTCGCAG GTGGTATAAC ATTAGGTGCA Y'TTGGTGGAG Consensus 3100 86/137004 s 2475 .C GG. A. HOL87 S . C GT. c . 2475 RM4 S .C GG. A. 2475 .T AG. A. VMRI S 3150 NVSL S .T AG A 2436 Miller S .C GG A 3147 Consensus GYGCCGTRKC TATACCTITI' GCAGTAGCAG TTCAGGCTMG ACITAATTAT 3150 86/137004 s 2525 .•. G •..... HOL87 S ... G 2525 RM4 S ... G 2525 VMRI S ... A 3200 NVSL S ... A 2486 Miller S ... G 3197 Consensus GTIGCTCTAC AAACTGATGT ATTRAACAAA AACCAGCAGA TCCTGGCTAG 3200 86/137004 s T .. . 2575 HOL87 S T .. . 2575 RM4 S 2575 T .. . VMRI S T .. . 3250 NVSL S 2536 T .. . Miller S c . . . 3247 **Consensus** TGCTITYAAT CAAGCTATTG GTAACATTAC ACAGTCATTT GGTAAGGTTA 3250 A .. A 86 / 137004 s 2625 A .. A HOL87 S 2625 A .. A RM4 S 2625 G .. G VMRI S 3300 G .. G NVSL S 2586 A .. G Miller S 3297 ATGATGCTAT ACATCAAACR TCACGAGGTC TTRCAACTGT TGCTAAAGCA Consensus 3300 86/137004 s ... C .. C T A .. 2675 HOL87 S ... C .. C T•.... A .. 2675 RM4 S ... C .. C T A .. 2675 VMRI S ... T .. T G C .. 3350 NVSL S ... T .. T G C .. 2636 Miller S ... C .. C G C .. 3347 Consensus TTGGCAAAAG TGCAAGATGT TGTYAAYACA CAAGGKCAAG CITTAAGMCA 3350 86/137004 s .. T 2725 HOL87 S .. T 2725 RM4 S .. T 2725 VMRI S .. c c 3400 NVSL S 2686

3397 Miller s T CCTAACAGTA CAATTGCAAA ATAATTTCCA AGCCATTAGT AGYTCTATTA 3400 Consensus 86/137004 s c c c T .. . 2775 HOL87 S 2775 2775 RM4 S VMRI S 3450 NVSL S T .. . 2736 3447 Miller S T .. . Consensus GTGACATTTA TAATAGGCTT GATGAATTGA GTGCTGATGC ACAAGTYGAC 3450 2825 86/137004 s .G HOL87 S .G 2825 .G RM4 S 2825 VMRI S 3500 .A NVSL S .A 2786 Miller S .G 3497 Consensus AGGCTGATCA CAGGAAGACT TACAGCACTT AATGCATTTG TRTCTCAGAC 3500 86 / 137004 s T T 2875 T T 2875 HOL87 S 2875 RM4 S T T VMRI S c c 3550 NVSL S c c T C 2836 3547 Miller S Consensus TCTAACCAGA CAAGCCGAGG TTAGGGCTAG YAGACAACTT GCYAAAGACA 3550 86/ 137004 s A T .. T C 2925 HOL87 S G T .. G C 2925 RM4 S G T .. G C 2925 VMRI S G C .. G C 3600 NVSL S G C .. G C 2886 Miller s G T .. G A 3597 Consensus AGGTTAATGA ATGCGTTARG TCTCAGTCYC AKAGATTCGG MTTCTGTGGT 3600 86/137004 s 2975 visionistis, international sentralistic department (proprietis) HOL87 S and a statement of a statement of the statement of the statement of the statement of the 2975 RM4 S 2975 .
Kabupaten 1969 - Kabupaten Kabupaten Kabupaten Bandungan di Bandungan Kabupaten I VMRI S 3650 NVSL S 293 6 Miller S STATISTICS, PERSONALE AVELIATING TELEPHONE AND EXPERIENCE 3647 Consensus AATGGTACAC ATTTGTTTTC ACTCGCAAAT GCAGCACCAA ATGGCATGAT 3650 86/137004 s c T 3025 HOL87 S c T 3025 RM4 S c G 3025 VMRI S T c T C 3700 NVSL S 2986 Miller S C T 3697 Consensus YTTCTTTCAC ACAGTGCTAT TACCAACGGC BTATGAAACT GTGACTGCTT 3700 86/ 137004 s .. T G G 3075 HOL87 S .. T G G 3075

RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus . . T T G G G G G G A G G G GGKCAGGTAT TIGTGCTTTA GATGKTGATC GCACTTTTGG ACTTRTCGTT . . T AT T AG T AG• . . C GG C GG T G G AAAGATGTCC AGYTGACTTT RTTTCGTAAT CTAGATGACA AKTTCTATTT ... A A A T T c GACHCCCAGA ACTATGTATC AGCCTAGAGT GGCAACTAGT TCTGATI"ITG A A A G G G TICAAATIGA AGGGTGCGAT GTGCTGTITG TTAATRCAAC TGTAAGTGAT G. G. G. A. A. G. TTGCCTAGTA TTATACCTGA TTATATTGAT ATTAATCARA CTGTTCAAGA T T G C TA.G. T T G C AT.G. T T G C AT.G. c c TT AT.T. c c TT AT.T. T T G T AT.T. CATAYTAGAA AATTTYAGAC CAAATTGGAC TGTACCTGAK YTGACWWTKG .. G C G G C G G C G A T T A T T A C G ACR'ITITI'AA CGCAACCTAT TTAAAYCTGA CTGKTGAAAT TGATGACTI'A 3075 3750 3036 3747 3750 3125 3125 3125 3800 3086 3797 3800 3175 3175 3175 3850 3136 3847 3850 3225 3225 3225 3900 3186 3897 3900 3275 3275 3275 3950 3236 3947 3950 3325 3325 ,3325 4000 3286 3997 4000 3375 3375 3375 4050 3336 4047 4050

86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller s Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/ 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86 / 137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus 86/137004 s HOL87 S RM4 S VMRI S NVSL S Miller S Consensus .. G G G A A A GARTITAGGT CAGAAAAGCT ACATAACACT ACTGTAGAAC TTGCCATTCT c c TT $C_1, \ldots, C_{i}, \ldots, C_{i},$ c c GT $T_1, \ldots, T_n, \ldots, T_n$ $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{i}, \ldots, T_{i},$ YATTGAYAAC ATTAACAATA CAKTAGTCAA TCTTGAATGG CTYAATAGAA T c c T c c T c c T c c .. . 'ITGAAACYTA TGTAAAATGG CC'ITGGTATG TGTGGCTACT AATAGGY'ITAC......
.....C.....
.....C......
.....T..... T c GTACH'AATAT 'ITI'GCATACC A'ITAYTGCI'A ~ GTAGTACAGG .. c • T T T C T C G c G c G .. TIGCIGTGGA TGYATAGGTT GTTTAGGAAG TTGTTGTCAC TCTATATKCA A T G T A T A T A T A C GTAGAAGACA RTTTGAAAAT TAYGAACCTA 'ITGAAAAAGT GCACCH'CCAT 3425 3425 3425 4100 3386 4097 4100 3475 3475 3475 4150 3436 4147 4150 3525 3525 3525 4200 3486 4197 4200 3575 3575 3575 4250 3536 4247 4250 3625 3625 3625 4300 3586 4297 4300 3675 3675 3675 4350 3636 4347 4350

Table 8: Percent homology of nucleotide and deduced amino acid of S gene of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 compared to that of other PRCV isolates.

	% homology with S gene of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170		
Virus Strains	Nucleic Acid Homology	Amino Acid Homology	
87/137004	96%	96%	
Hol87	96%	96%	
RM4	96%	96%	

Table 9: The deletion positions and number of deleted nucleotides within S genes of PRCV isolates when compared to S gene of TGEV isolate VMRI 5170.

Figure 7: Comparison of the nucleotide sequences of the ORF 3/3.1 region of the TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, the PRCV isolate, NVSL 5170, and other PRCV isolates.

Note: The positions of intergenic sequences are underlined and marked with the symbol \triangle . The start codons and stop codons of each ORF are underlined and labeled with $\left| \right|$ -> and <-respectively. The positions having identical nucleotides are presented as dots and the positions of deleted nucleotides are marked by dashes. The 2 different nucleotides among VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates are bold letters.

PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138)T.. 445 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) G .. 473 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) G •. 473 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) T .. 300 CTTAATACI'C TGAG'ITI'KGT AATTGTTAGT AACCATTCTA TTGTTAATAA Consensus 450 NVSL5170 (3681-482 4) C C . . C T G. 4180 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) C C . . C C G. 4917 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) T T .. T C T. 495 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) C T .. T C G. 523 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) C T .. T C G. 523 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) C......... T .. T. - ---------- ---------- ³²⁹ YACAGCAAAT GTGCAYCAYA CACAACAAGA CCGTGTTATA GTAYAACAKC NVSL5170 (3681-4824) G. A C ... G . 4230 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) G. A C ... T . 4967 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) A. G T ... G. 545 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) G. A C ... G. 573 573 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) G. A C . .. G. PRCV-ISU1 (24-876)
Consensus 329 ATCAGGTTRT TAGTGCTAGA RCACAAAATT ATTAYCCAKA GTTCAGCATC 550 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) CT T T ... A 4280 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) CT T T . . . A 5017 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) TC G C . .. C 595 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) CC G T ... A 622 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) CC G T ... A 622 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 333 GCTGTACTTT TTGTATCTTT YYTAGCTTTK TACCGYAGTM CAAACTTTAA Consensus 600 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) 4330 an experience throughout the consequence of the period departments. VMRI5170 (4418-5561) 5067 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 645 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) 672 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 672 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 383 Consensus GACGTGTGTC GGTATCTTAA TGTTTAAGAT TTTATCAATG ACACTTTTAG 650 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) 4380 processes and conservative areas processes and the processes are processes VMRI5170 (4418-5561) analization and the company of the company 5117 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 695 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) 722 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 722 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 433 Consensus GACCTATGCT TATAGTATAT GGTTACTACA TTGATGGCAT TGTTACAACA 700 NVSL5170 (3681-482 4) . . . G 4430 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) ... G 5167 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 745 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) ... G 772 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) ... G 772 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) ... T 483 Consensus **ACTKTCTTAT CTTTAAGATT CGCCTACTTA GCATACTTTT GGTATGTTAA** 750
VMRI5170 (4418-5561) C 5217 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) T 795 822 PRCV- LEPP (24-1165) T $PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) T...$ 822 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 533 T Consensus YAGTAGGTI'T GAATTTATTT TATACAACAC AACGACACTC ATGTTTGTAC 800 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) 4530 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) 5267 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 845 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) 872 eleppine e konsiliere herrikoar diarritari kanada eta PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 872 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 583 a i da e e estas calabeleras a la elevación de la elevación de estas entre Consensus ATGGCAGAGC TGCACCGTTT AAGAGAAGTT CTCACAGCTC TATTTATGTC 850 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) A c . .. c 4580 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) A c ... c 5317 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) G c ... c A c ... c 895 A c ... c PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) 922 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 922 633 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) A T ... T Consensus ACATTRTATG GTGGCATAAA TTATATGTTT GTGAATGACY TCAYG'ITGCA 900 4630 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) ... AA VMRI5170 (4418-5561) 5367 ... AA GC PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 945 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) . . . AC 972 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 972 ... AC PRCV-ISUl (24-876) ... AC 683 Consensus TTTTGTAGAC CCTATGCTTG TAAGCATAGC AATACGTGGC TTARMTCATG 950 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) **NA PARA PARA TANG PANGANG TANG PANGANG PANG PANG PAT TANG PANGANG** 4680 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) 5417 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 995 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) . The contract of the contract 1022 PRCV-AR310 (24-1165) 1022 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) 733 Consensus CTGATCTAAC TGTAGTTAGA GCAGTTGAAC TTCTCAATGG TGATTTTATT 1000 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) GC. C C . . . 4730 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) GC . C C .. . 5467 TT. T T .. . PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) 1045 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) GC. C C .. . 1072 PRCV- AR310 (24-1165) GC . C C .. . 1072 PRCV-ISUl (24-876) GC. C C .. . 783 Consensus TATATATTTT CACAGGAKYC YGTAGTYGGT GTTTACAATG CAGCCTTTTC 1050 NVSL5170 (3681-4824) G A .. 4780 VMRI5170 (4418-5561) A .. 5517 PRCV-IA1894 (24-1138) A G .. 1095 PRCV-LEPP (24-1165) G .. 1122

Figure 7: (continued)

4480

NVSL5170 (3681-4824) C

Figure 7: (continued)

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study we have shown that PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 differed from TGEV VMRI 5170 isolate and the standard Miller strain of TGEV. The VMRI 5170 strain was similar to the Miller strain of TGEV in growth characteristics and protein profiles. However, there was some degree of genetic and antigenic diversity when compared to other TGEV strains.

It has been indirectly proven that the TGEV variant, PRCV, has evolved from TGEV by a deletion mutation of the S gene (Rasschaert et al., 1990; Wesley et al., 1990; Wesley et al., 1991). This study presents strong evidence that the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 is a truncated version of the TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 by a single deletion of the S gene. It should be noted that both viruses were isolated from the same TGE outbreak in a swine herd (Halbur et al., 1995). Furthermore, the pairwise alignment of the S gene and ORF 3/3. l regions of both isolates when compared with other TGEV and PRCV isolates showed that VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates are highly identical. With the exception of the large deletion, the homology of these regions is more than 99 %. Interestingly, the 714 nucleotide deletion of the NVSL 5170 isolate was the largest single deletion of all published sequences among PRCV isolates. Deletions in all other PRCV isolates to date range from 672 - 68 1 nucleotides (Laude et al., 1993; Vaughn et al., 1995).

The ORF 3/3. l region of TGEV and PRCV isolates is normally diverse. The number of deleted bases and the positions of deletions vary among PRCV isolates (Rasschaert et al., 1990; Britton et al., 199 1; Wesley et al., 199 1; Vaughn et al., 1995). Some of the PRCV isolates, AR310 and LEPP, have complete ORF 3/3. I region (Vaughn et al., 1995). Likewise, the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 had intact ORF 3/3.1 region including the perfect IS elements and start codons. However, the first ubstituted nucleotide within the ORF 3.1 of the NVSL 51 70 isolate created a top codon which may have resulted in a truncated 3. l gene product. These diversities could be a consequence of that as each PRCV isolate originates from a different TGEV ancestor. For instance, the European PRCV and the USA PRCV arose independently from different strains of TGEV (Laude et al., 1993). In this case, the TGEV isolate, VMRI 5170, seemed to be the ancestor of the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170, because their genomic sequences within the S gene and ORF 3/3. 1 regions were much more alike than those of other TGEV or PRCV isolates.

The one step growth curves depict the multiplication of the three viruses in cell culture. The growth curve of VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates were similar to that of the Miller strain of TGEV. There were differences in the plaque sizes of the TGEV and PRCV isolates.

The PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 had an average plaque size that was significantly smaller than that of VMRI and the Miller strain of TGEV. The small plaque size is possibly associated with the mutation within the S gene or the ORF 3/3. 1 gene. It is believed that the small plaque size variants are due to the mutation within the S gene (Holmes and Lai, 1996) or the ORF 3/3. 1 regions (Wesley et al., 1990; Vaughn et al., 1995). Thus, it is possible that the deletion within the S gene of NVSL 5170 isolate or the truncated 3.1 gene products may contribute to the small plaque size of the NVSL *S* 170 isolate.

Antigenic diversity among TGEV and PRCV has been demonstrated using a viral neutralization (VN) test (Kemedy, 1967; Vaughn and Paul, 1993). However, only one serotype of TGEV is recognized. In this study, the three viruses were neutralized by hyperimmune sera and monoclonal antibodies raised against the Miller strain of TGEV with different VN titers. Callebaut et al. (1988), also reported the antigenic differences between TGEV and PRCV. In addition, there are alterations of amino acid residues within the antigenic sites which arose from changes of nucleotides within the S gene of TGEV and PRCV, and the residues within antigenic sites A and D show a high number of amino acid changes (Gebauer et al., 1991; Sanchez et al., 1992). The Miller strain reacted with hyperimmune sera and MAb 3H₁₁ and 5A₅ with high VN titers, with the exception of the reaction between VMRI 5170 and MAb 5A5. This is possibly due to the substitution or deletion of nucleotides within the S genes of the VMRI 5170 and NVSL 5170 isolates. However, the alterations of the residues in the S glycoprotein of VMRI *S* 170 isolate that react with MAb *SAS* may increase the affinity of antigenic sites on the S gene of VMRI *S* 170 and MAb *SAS.* Thus, the reaction between VMRI *S* 170 and MAb *SAS* gives very high VN titers.

Radioimrnunoprecipitation assay (RIP) provides information on the major structural proteins, S, Mand N, of TGEV and PRCV. Our data confirms that the S glycoprotein of PRCV is smaller than that of TGEV and is caused by the large deletion within the S gene (Rasschaert et al., 1990).

This study presented strong evidence that the PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 originated from the TGEV isolate VMRI *S* 170 caused by a single deletion within the *S'* half of the S gene, resulting in a truncated S glycoprotein. The deletion mutation within the S gene of PRCV isolate NVSL 5170 may be the result of genetic recombination as reported for mouse hepatitis virus and other coronaviruses because the repeated IS elements along the genomic RNA could facilitate genetic recombination during RNA synthesis using a copy - choice mechanism (Lai, 1992). Therefore, deletion mutation and genetic recombination tend to play an important role in the evolution of coronaviruses and other plus - stranded RNA viruses.

REFERENCES

- Baric RS, Nelson GW, Fleming JO, et al. Interaction between coronavirus nucleocapsid protein and viral RN As: Implication for viral transcription. J Virol 1988; 62:4280 - 4287.
- Bay WW, Doyle LP, Hutchings LM,. Some properties of the causative agent of transmissible gastroenteritis in swine. Am Vet Res 1952; 13:318 - 321.
- Benfield DA, Jackwood DJ, Bae I, et al. Detection of transmissible gastroenteritis virus using cDNA probes. Arch Virol 1991; 116:91 - 106.
- Bohl EH. Diagnosis of diarrhea in pigs due to transmissible gastroenteritis virus or rotavirus. In Viral Enteritis in Humans and Animals. Eds. F. Bricout and R. Scherer. INSERM (Paris) 1979; 90:341 - 343.
- Bohl EH. Coronaviruses: Diagnosis of infections. In Comparative Diagnosis of Viral Diseases, vol. 4. Eds. E. Kurstak and C. Kurstak. New York: Academic Press. 1981; Pages 30 I - 328.
- Bohl EH. Transmissible gastroenteritis virus (classical enteric variant). In Virus infections of porcines. Ed. Pensaert MB Elsevier Science Publishing Company Inc., New York, NY. 1989; Pages 139 - 153.
- Bourne FJ. Symposium on nutrition of the young farm animal: The immunoglobulin system of the suckling pig. Proc Nutr Soc 1973; 32:205 - 2 14.
- Brayton PR, Lai MMC, Patton CF, et al. Characterization of two RNA polymerase activities induced by mouse hepatitis virus. J Virol 1982; 42:847 - 853.
- Brayton PR, Stohlman SA, Lai MMC. Further characterization of mouse hepatitis virus RNA dependent RNA polymerase. Virology 1984; 133:197 - 201.
- Brian AB, Dennis DE, Grey JS. Genome of porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Virol 1980; 34:4 10 -4 15
- Brierley I, Digard P, Inglis SC. Characterization of an efficient coronavirus ribosomal frarneshifting signal: Requirement for an RNA pseudoknot. Cell 1989; 57:537 - 547.
- Brierley I, Rolley NJ, Jenner AJ, Inglis SC. Mutational analysis of the RNA pseudoknot component of corona virus ribosomal frameshifting signal. J Mol Biol 1991; 220:889 -902.
- Britton P, Mawditt KL, Page KW. The cloning and sequencing of virion protein genes from a British isolate of porcine respiratory coronavirus: Comparison with transmissible gastroenteritis virus genes. Virus Res 1991; 21:181 - 198.
- Britton P, Otin CL, AJonso JMM, Parra F. Sequence of the coding regions from the 3.0 kb and 3.9 kb mRNA subgenomic species from a virulent isolate of transmissible gastroenteritis virus Arch Virol 1989; 10:165 - 178.
- Britton P, Kottier S, Chen CM, Pocock DH, Salmon H, Aynaud JM. The use of PCR mapping for the characterization of TGEV strains. In Coronaviruses: Molecular Biology and Virus - host Intercation. Eds. Laude H, Vautherot JF. Plenum Press, New York. 1992.
- Callebaut P, Correa I, Pensaert M , et al. Antigenic differentiation between transmissible gastroenteritis virus of swine and related porcine respiratory coronavirus. J Gen Virol 1988; 69:1725 - 1730.
- Callebaut P, Pensaert MB, Hooyberghs J. A comparative inhibition ELISA for the differentiation of serum antibodies from pigs infected with transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) or with the TGEV - related porcine respiratory coronavirus. Vet Microbiol 1989; 20:9 - 19.
- Cartwright SF, Harris HM, Blandford TB, et al. A cytopathic virus causing transmissible gastroenteritis in swine. I. Isolation and properties. J Comp Pathol 1965; 75:386 - 395.
- Charley B, Laude H. Induction of alpha interferon by transmissible gastroenteritis coronavirus: Role of transmembrane glycoprotein EI. J Virol 1988; 62:8 - 11.
- Chu RM, Glock RD, Ross RF. Changes in gut associated lymphoid tissues of small intestine of eight - week - old pigs infected with transmissible gastroenteritis viru Am J Vet Res J 982a; 43 :67 - 76.
- Compton SR, Rogers DB, Holmes KV et al. In vitro replication of mouse hepatitis virus strain A59. J Virol 1987; 6 1: 18 14 - 1820.
- Correa I, Jimenez G, Sune C, Bullido MJ, Enjuanes L. Antigenic structure of $E₂$ glycoprotein of TGEV. Virus Res 1988; 10:77-94.
- Cox E, Hooyberghs J, Pensaert MB. Sites of replication of a porcine respireatory coronavirus related to transmissible gastroenteritis virus. Res Vet Sci 1990a; 48:165 - 169.
- Cox E, Pensaert M, Hooyberghs J, Van Deun K. Sites of replication of porcine coronavirus in 5 week - old - pigs with or without maternal antibodies. In Coronaviruses and their diseases. Eds. Cavanagh D and Brown TDK. Plenum Press, New York 1990b; Pages 429 - 433.
- Dalziel RG, Lampert PW, Talbot PJ, Buchmeier MJ. Site pecific alteration of murine hepatitis virus type 4 peplomer glycoprotein $E₂$ results in reduced neurovirulence. J Virol 1986; 59:463 - 47 1.
- Delmas B, Gelfi J, L' Haridon R, et al. Aminopeptidase N is a major receptor for the entero pathogenic coronavirus TGEV. Nature 1992a; 357:417 - 420.
- Delmas B, Rasschaert D, Godet M, Gelfi J, Laude H. Four major antigenic sites of the coronavirus transmisible gastroenteritis virus are located on the amino - terminal half of spike glycoprotein S. J Gen Virol 1990; 7 1: 13 13 - 1323.
- Diego M, Laviada MD, Enjuanes L, Escribano JM. Epitope specificity of protective lactogenic immunity against swine transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Virol 1992; 66:6502 - 6508.
- Denins DE, Brian DA. RNA dependent RNA polymease activity in coronavirus infected cells. J Virol 1982; 42: 153 - 164.
- Doyle LP, Hutchings LM. A transmissible gastroenteritis in pigs. J Am Vet Med Assoc 1946; 108:257 - 259.
- Fazakerley JK, Parker SE, Bloom F, Buchmeier MJ. The V5A13.1 envelope glycoprotein deletion mutant of mouse hepatitis virus type 4 is neuroattenuated by its reduced rate of spread in the central nervous system. Virology 1992 187:178 - 188.
- Fosmire JA, Hwang K, Makino S. Identification of a coronavirus packaging signal. J Virol 1992; 66:3522 - 3530.
- Fenner FJ, Gibbs EPJ, Murphy FA, et al. Veterinary Virology 2nd edition. Academic Press Inc., California 1993; Pages 457 - 469.
- Furuuchi S, Shimizu M, Shimizu Y. Field trials on Transmissible gastroenteritis live virus vaccine in newborn piglets. Natl Inst Anim Health Q (Tokyo) 1978; 18: 135 - 143.
- Gallagher TM, Escarmis C, Buchmeier MJ. Alteration of the pH dependence of coronavirus induced cell fusion: Effect of mutations in the spike glycoprotein. J Virol 1991; 65: 19 16 - 1928.
- Gebauer F, Posthumus WPA, Correa I, et al. Residues involved in the antigenic sites of transmjssible gastroenteritis coronavirus S glycoprotein. Virology 1991; 183:225 - 238.
- Godet M, L'Haridon R, Vautherot JF, Laude H. TGEV coronavirus ORF 4 encodes a member protein that is incorporated into virions. Virology 1992; 188:666 - 675.
- Gombold JL, Ringley ST, Weiss SR. Fusion detective mutants of mouse hepatitis virus A59 contain a mutation in the spike protein clevage signal. J Virol 1993; $67:4504 - 4512$.
- Grawes DJ, Pocock DH. The polypeptide structure of transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Gen Virol 1975; 29:25 -34.
- Griffiths G, Rottier P. Cell biology of viruses that assemble along the biosynthetic pathway. Semin Cell Biol 1992; 3:367 - 381.
- Haerterman EO. Epidemiolagical studies of transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. Proc US Livest Sanit Assoc 1962; 66:305 - 315.
- Haerterman EO. Transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. Proc 17th World Vet Congr, Hannover 1963; 1:615 - 618.
- Haerterman EO. Lactogenic immunity to transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. J Am Vet Med Assoc 1965; 147: 1661.
- Halbur PG, Paul PS, Morozov I, et al. TGE like disease outbreak: A foreign disease or a variant? Allen D. Leman swine Conf 1995; Pages I - 2.
- Halbur PG, Paul PS, Vaughn EM and Andrews JJ. Experimental reproduction of pneumonia in gnotobiotic pigs with porcine respiratory corona virus isolate AR310. J Vet Diagn Invest 1993; 5: 184 - 188.
- Harada K, Kaji T, Kumagai T, Sasahara J. Studies on transmissibale gastroenteritis in pigs. IV. Physicochemical and biological properties of TGEV. Natl Inst Anim Health Q (Tokyo) 1968; 8: 140 - 147.
- Harada K, Furuuchi S, Kumagai T, Sasahara J, Pathogenicity, immunogenicity and distribution of transmissible gastroenteritis virus in pigs. Natl Inst Anim Health Q (Tokyo) 1969; 9: 185 - 192.
- Hess RG, Chen YS, Bachmann PA. Active immunization of feeder pigs against transmissible gastroenteritis (TGE): Influence of maternal antibadies. Proc 7th Int Congr Pig Vet Soc, Mexico City 1982; Page I.
- Hill HT. Preventing epizootic TGE from becoming enzootic TGE. Veterinary Medicine 1989; 4: 432 - 436.
- Hill HT, Biwer JD, Wood RD. Porcine respiratory coronavirus isolated from two US swine herds. Pro Am Assoc Swine Practl989 Pages 333 - 335.
- Hohdatsu T, Eigushi Y, Tsuchimoto M, et al. Antigenic variation of porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus detected by monoclonal antibodies. Vet Microbiol 1987b; 14: 11 5 - 124.
- Holmes KV, Lai MMC. Coronaviridae: The Viruses and their replication. In. Field Virology. 3nd edition. Eds. Fields BN, Knipe OM, Howley PM, et al. Lippincott - Raven publishers, Philadephia. 1996; pages 1075 - 1094.
- Holmes KV, Doller EW, Sturman LS. Tunicamycin resistant glycosylation of coronavirus glycoprotein: Demonstration of a novel type of viral glycoprotein. Virology 1981; 115:334 - 344.
- Holmes KV, Welsh RM, Haspel MV. Natural cytotoxicity against mouse hepatitis virus infected target cells. I. Correlation of cytotoxicity with virus binding to leucocytes. J Immunol 1986; 136:1446 - 1453.
- Hooper BE, Haelterman EO. Concepts of pathogenesis and passive immunity in transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. J Am Vet Med Assoc 1966; 149:1580 - 1586.
- Jacobs L, Van der Zeijst BAM, Horzinek MC. Characterization and translation of transmissible gastroenteritis virus mRNAs. J Virol 1986; $57:1010 - 1015$.
- Jacobs L, De Groot R, Van der Zeijst BAM, et al. The nucleotide sequence of the peplomer gene of porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV): Comparison with the sequence of the pepplomer protein of feline infectious peritinitis virus (FIPV). Virus Res 1987; 8:363 - 371.
- Jestin A, Leforban Y, Vannier P. Les coronavirus du porc. Recl Med Vet 1987a; 163:583 -588 .
- Jimenez G, Correa I, Melgosa MP, Buillido MJ, Enjuanes I. Critical epitopes in transmissible gastroenteritis virus neutralization. J Virol 1986; 60:131 - 139.
- Joo M, Makino S. Mutagenic analysis of the coronavirus intergenic consensus sequence. J Virol 1992; 66:6330 - 6337.
- Kapke PA, Brian DA. Sequence analysis of the porcine transmissible gastroenteritis coronavirus nucleocapsid protein gene. Virology 1986; 151:41 - 49.
- Kemeny LJ. Isolation of transmissible gastroenteritis virus from pharyngeal swabs obtained from sows at sloughter. Am J Vet Res 1978 ; $39:703 - 705$.
- Kemeny LJ, Woods RD. Quantitative transmissible gastroen teritis virus shedding patterns in lactating sows. Am J Vet Res 1977; 38:307 - 3 10
- Kemedy LJ, Wiltsey VL, Riley JL. Upper respiratory infection of lactating sows with transmissible gastroenteritis virus following contact exposure to infected piglets. Cornell Vet 1975; 65:352 - 362.
- Kim YN, Jeong YS, Makino S. Analysis of cis acting sequences essential for coronavirus defective interfering RNA replication. Virology 1993; 197:53 - 63.
- Kodama Y, Ogata M, Shizumi Y. Characteristics of immunoglobulin A antibody in serum of swine inoculated with transmissible gastroenteritis virus. Am J Vet Res 1980; 40:740 - 745.
- Kooi C, Cervin M, Anderson R. Differentiation of acid pH dependent and nondependent entry pathways for mouse hepatitis virus. Virology 1991; 180:108 - 119.
- Lai MMC. Coronavirus leader RNA primed transcription : An alternative mechanism to RNA splicing. Bio Essays 1986; 5:257 - 260.
- Lai MMC. Coronavirus: Organization, replication and expression of genome. Annu Rev Microbial 1990; 44:303 - 333.
- Lai MMC. Genetic recombination in RNA viruses. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol 1992; 176:21 - 32.
- Lai MMC, Patton CS, Barie RS, Stolhlman SA. Presence of reader sequences in the mRNA of mouse hepatitis virus. J Virol 1983; 46:1027 - 1033.
- Lai MMC, Patton CS, Stolhlman SA. Replication of mouse hepatitis virus : Negative stranded RNA and Replicative from RNA are of genome length. J Virol 1982; 44: 487 - 492.
- Laio CL, Lai MMC. Requirement of the 5' end genomic sequence as an upstream cis acting element for coronavirus subgenomic mRNA transcriptiion. J Virol 1994; 68:4727 - 4737.
- Laude H, Chapsal J, Gelfi J, Labian S, Grosclaude J, Antigenic structure of transmissible gastroenteritis virus. I. Properties of monoclonal antibodies directed against virion proteins. J Gen Virol 1986; 67:119 - 130.
- Laude H, Chaspal JM, Gelfi J, Labiau S, Grosclaude J. antigenic tructure of transmjssible gastroente ritis virus. I. Properties of monoclonal antibodies directed against virion proteins. J Gen virol 1986; 67: 119 - 130.
- Laude H, Gelfi J, Aynaud JM. In vitro properties of low and high passaged strain of transmissible gastroenteritis coronaivrus of swine. Am J Vet Res 1981; 42:447 - 449.
- Laude H, Grilfi J, Rasschaert D, Delmas B. Characterization antigenique du coronavirus respiratoire porcin a l'aide d'anticorps monoclonaux diriges contre le virus de la gastro - enterite transmissible. J Rech Porcine Fr 1988; 20:89 - 94.
- Laude H, Rasschaert D, Delmas B, et al. Molecular biology of transmissible gastroenteritis virus. Vet Microbiol 1990; 23:147 - 154.
- Laude H, Van Reeth K, Pensaert M. Porcine respiratory Coronavirus: Molecular feature and virus - host interactions. Vet Res 1993; $24:125 - 150$.
- Laval A, Le Foll P, Gestin G, Reynaud G. Grippes et coronavirus respiratorire porcin: Etude serologique dans dix elevages bretons. Reel. Med. Yet. 199 1; 167:521 - 528.
- Makino S, Joo M. Effect of intergenic consensus sequence flanking sequences on coronavirus transcription. J Virol 1993; 67:3304 - 33 11.
- Master PS. Localization of an RNA binding domain in the nucleocapsid protein of the coronavirus mouse hepatitis virus Arch Virol 1992; 125:141 - 160.
- McClurkin AW, Norman JO. Studies on transmissible gastroenteritis of swine. Il. Selected characteristic of a cytopathogenic virus common to five isolates from transmjssible gastroenteritis. Can J comp Med 1966; 30:190 - 198.
- McClurkin AW, Stark SL, Norman JO. Transmissible gastroenteritis (TGE) of wine: The possible role of dogs in the epizooticology of TGE. Can J Comp Med 1970; 34:347 - 349.
- Moon HW. Mechanisms in the pathogenesis of diarrhea: A review. J Am Vet Med Assoc 1978; 172:443 - 448.
- Moon HW, Norman JO, Lambert G. Age dependent resistance to TGE of swine. I. Clinical signs and some mucosal dimensions in the small intestine. Can J Comp Med 1973; 37:157 - 166.
- Moscari E. Phisicochemical properties of field and cell culture attenuated strains of swine transmissible gastroenteritis (TGE) coronavirus. Acta Vet Acad Sci Hung 1980a; 28:341 -350.
- Moxley RA, Olson LO. Clinical evaluation of transmissible gastroenteritis virus vaccines and vaccination procedures for inducing lactogenic immunity in ows. Am J Yet Res 1989; 50: 111 - 118.
- Nguyen TD, Bottreau E, Bernard S, et al.. Neutralizing secretory IgA and IgG do not inhibit attachment of transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Gen Yirol 1986; 67 :939 - 943.
- Okaniwa A, Harada K, Park DK. Structure of swine transmissible gastroenteritis virus exmained by negative staining. Natl Ins Anim Health Q (Tokyo) 1968; 8: 175 - 18 1.
- O'Toode D, Brown I, Bridges A, Cartwright SF. Pathogenicity of experimental infection with pneumotropic porcine coronavirus. Res Yet Sci 1989; 47:23 - 29.
- Page KW, Mawditt ML, Britton P. Sequence comparison of the 5' end of mRNA 3 from transmissible gastroenteritis virus and porcine respiratory coronavirus. J Gen Virol 1991; 72 :579 - 587.
- Paton DJ, Brown IH. Sows infected in pregnancy with porcine respiratory coronavirus show no evidence of protecting their suckling piglets against transmissible gastroenteritis. Vet Res Commun 1990; 14:329 - 337.
- Paul PS, Halbur PG, Vaughn EM. Significance of porcine respiratory coronavirus infection. Compendium on Continuing Education for practicing veternarian. 1994; 16:1223 - 1234.
- Paul PS, Zhu XL, Vaughn EM. Current strategies for the development of efficacious vaccines for transmissible gastroenteritis in swine. Proc US Anim Hlth Assoc 1988; 92:429 -443 .
- Pensaert MB. Immunity in TGE of swine after infection and vaccination. In Viral Enteritis in Humans and animals. Eds. F. Bricout and R. Scherrer. INSERM (Paris) 1979; 90:28 1 - 293.
- Pensaert MB. Transmissible gastroenteritis virus (respiratory variant). In Virus Infection of Porcines. Ed. M.B. Pensaert. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science. 1989 Pages 154 - 165.
- Pensaert MB, Cox E. Porcine respiratory coronavirus related to transmissible gastroenteritis virus. Agri - Pract 1989; 10: 17 - 21.
- Pensaert MB, Callebaut P, Vergote J. Isolation of porcine respiratory non enteric coronavirus related to transmissible gastroenteritis. Vet Q 1986; 8:257 - 261.
- Pensaert MB, Haelterman EO, Burnstein T. Transmissible gastroenteritis of swine: Virus intestinal cell interactions. I Immunofluorescence, histopathology and virus production in the small intestine through the course of infection. Arch Gesamte Virusforsch 1970a; 3 1 :32 1 - 334.
- Pensaert MB, Haelterman EO, Hinsman EJ. Transmissible gastroenteritis of swine: Virus intestinal cell interactions. II. Electron microscopy of the epithelium in isolated jejuna] loops. Arch Gesamte Virusforsch 1970b; 31:335 - 351.
- Perlman S, Ries D, Bolger E, Chang LJ, Stoltzfus CM. MHV nucleocapsid synthesis in the present of cycloheximide and accumul ation of negative strand MHV RNA. Virus Res 1986; 6: 261 - 272.
- Phillip JIH, Cartwright SF, Scott AC. The size and morphology of TOE and vomiting and Wasting disease of pigs. Vet Res 1971; 88: 311 - 312.
- Porter P, Allen WD. Classes of immunoglobulins related to immunity in the pigs: A review. J Am Vet Med Assoc 1972; 160: 511 - 518.
- Posthumus WAP, Lenstra JA, Schaaper WMM, et al. Analysis and stimulation of a neutralizing epitope of TGEY. J Yirol 1990; 64:3304 - 3309.
- Rasschaert D, Duarte M, Laude H. Porcine respiratory coronavirus differs from transmissible gastroenteritis virus by a few genomjc deletions. J Gen Virol 1990; 7 1 :2599 - 2607.
- Rasschaert D, Gelfi J, Laude H. Enteric coronavirus TGEV: Partial sequence of the genomic RNA its organization and expression. Biochimie 1987; 69:591 - 600.
- Rasschaert D, Laude H. The predicted primary structure of the peplomer protein $E₂$ of porcine coronavirus transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Gen Virol 1987; 68:1883 - 1890.
- Reynolds DJ, Garwes DJ, Lucey S. Differentiation of canine coronavirus and porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus by neutralization wth canine, porcine and filine sera. Vet Microbiol 1980; 5:283 - 290.
- Robbins SG, Frana MF, McGowan JJ, et al.. RNA binding proteins of coronavirus MHV: Detectin of monomeric and multimeric N protein with an RNA oiverlay - protein blot assay. Virology 1986; 150:402 - 410.
- Roux ME, Mc Williams M, Phillips Quagliata JM, et al. Origin of IgA secreting cells in the mammary gland. J Exp Med 1977 146:1311.
- Rubinstein D, Tyrrell AJ, Derbyshire JB, et al.. Growth of porcine transmissible gastroenteritis virus in organ cultures of pig tissue. Nature 1970; $\overline{2}27:1348 - 1349$.
- Saif LJ, and Bohl EH. Passive immunity in transmissible gastroenteritis of swine: Immunoglobulin classes of milk antibodies after oral - intranasal inoculation of sows with a live low cell culture - passaged virus. Am J Vet res 1979; 40:115 - 117.
- Saif LJ, and Bohl EH. Passive immunity to transmissible gastroenteritis virus: Intramammary viral inoculation of sows. Ann NY Acad Sci 1983; 409:708 - 723.
- Saif LJ, and Wesley RD,. Transmissible gastroenteritis. In Disease of swine. 7th edition. Eds. Leman AD, Straw BE, Mengeling WL, Allaire SD and Taylor DJ. Iowa State University Press, Ames I. A. 1992; Pages 362 - 386.
- Saif LJ, Bohl EH, Kohler EM, et al. Immune electron microscope of transmissible gastroenteritis virus and rotavirus (reovirus - like agent) of swine. Am J Yet Res 1977; 38: 13 - 20.
- Sanchez CM, Gebauer F, Sune C, et al. Genetic evolution and tropism of transmissible gastroenteritis coronaviruses. Virology 1992; 190:92 - 105.
- Sanchez CM, Jimenez G, Laviada MD, et al. Antigenic homology among coronaviruses related to transmissible gastroenteritis virus. Virology 1990; 174:410 - 417.
- Sawichi SG, Sawichi DL. Coronavirus tanscription: Subgenomic mouse hepatitis virus replication intermediates function in RNA synthesis. J Virol 1990; 64: 1050 - 1056.
- Sethna PB, Hung SL, Brain DA. Coronavirus subgenomic minus strand RNAs and the potential for mRNA replicons. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1989; 86: 5626 - 5630.
- Shockley LJ, Kapke PA, Lapps W, et al. Diagnosis of porcine and bovine enteric coronavirus infections using cloned cDNA probes. J Clin Microbiol 1987; 25: 1591 - 1596.
- Siddell SG. Coronavirus JHM: Coding assignment of subgenomic mRNAs. J Gen Virol 1983; $64:113 - 125.$
- Siddell SG, Anderson R, Cavanagh D, et al. Coronaviridae. Intervirology l 983a; 20: 181 189.
- Siddell SG, Barthel A, ter Meulen V. Coronavirus JHM: A virions associated protein kinase. J Gen Virol 1981; 52:235 - 243.
- Siddell SG, Wege H, Ter Meulen V. The biology of coronaviruses. J Gen virol 1983; 64:761 776
- Sirinarumitr T, Paul PS, Kluge JP, et al.. In situ hybridization for detection of swine enteric and respiratory coronaviruses, transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) and porcine respiratory coronavirus (PRCV), in formalin - fixed paraffin - embedded tissues. J virol Methods 1996; 56: 149 - 160.
- Spaan W, Cavangh D, Horzinek MC. Coronaviruses: Structure and genome expression. J Gen Virol 1988 69:2932 - 2952.
- Sprino PJ, Ristic M. Intestinal, pulmonary and serum antibody responses of feeder pigs exposed to transmissibal gastroenteritis virus by oral and oral - intranasal routes of inoculation. Am Vet Res 1982; 43:255 - 261.
- Stark SL, Fernelius AL, Booth GD, Lambert G. Transmissible gastroenteritis of swine: Effect of age of swine testes cell culture monolayers on plaque assays of TGE virus. Can J Comp Med 1975; 39:466 - 468.
- Stepanek J, Mensik J, Franz J, Hornich M. Epizootiology, diagnosis and prevention of viral diarrhea I piglets under intensive husbandry condtions. Proc 21st World Vet Congr, Moscow. 1979; 6:43.
- Stohlman SA, Barie RS, Nelson GN, et al.. Specific interation between coronavirus leader RNA and nucleocapsid protein. J Virol 1988; 62:4288 - 4295.
- Stohlman SA, Flaming JO, Patton CD, Lai MMC. Synthesis and subcellular localization of the murine coronavirus nucleocapsid protein. Virology 1983; 130:527 - 532.
- Strurman LS, Holmes KV, Behnke J. Isolation of coronavirus envelope glycoproteins and interaction with the viral nucleocapsid. J Virol 1980; 33:449 - 462.
- Sune C, Jimenez G, Correa I, et al.. Mechanism of transmissible gastroenteritis virus neutralization. Virology 1990; 177:559 - 569.
- Thake DC. Jejuna} epithelium in transmissible gastroenteritis of swine (an electron microscopic and histochemical study). Am J Pathol 1968; 53: 149 - 168.
- Tung FY, Abraham S, Sethna M, et al.. The 9 kda hydrophobic protein encoded at the 3' end of the porcine transmissible gastroenteritis coronavirus genome is membrane associated. Virology 1992; 186:676 - 683.
- Tyrrell DA, Alexander DI, Almeida JD et al. Coronaviridae: 2nd report. Intervirology. 1978; 10:321 - 328.
- Underdahl NR, Mebus CA, Torres Medina A. Recovery of transmissible gastroenteritis virus from chronically infected experimental pigs. Am J Vet Res 1975; 36: 1473 - 1476.
- Van Deun K, Cox E, CaJlebaut P, Pensaert M, Milk of sows infected with the porcine respiratory coronavirus: induction of IgA antibodies against transmissible gastroenteritis virus and protective capacity against intestinal infection in piglets. In Proc 11th Congr Int Pig Vet Soc, Lausanne, Switzerland. 1990. Page 263.
- Van der Most RG, Bredenbeek PJ, Spaan WJ. A domain at 3' end of the polymerase gene is essencial for encapsidation of coronavirus defective interfering RNAs. J Virol 1991; 65:3219 - 3226.
- Vannier P. Disorders included by the experimental infection of pigs with the porcine respiratory coronavirus. J Vet Med 1990; 37: 117 - 180.
- Vaughn EM, Halbur PG, Paul PS. Sequence comparison of procine respiratory coronavirus isolates reveals heterogeneity in the S, 3 and 3-1 genes. J Virol 1995; 69:3176 - 3184.
- Vaughn EM, Halbur PG, Paul PS. Three new isolates of porcine respiratory coronavirus with various pathogenicities and spike (S) gene deletion. J Clin Microbiol 1994; 32:1809 -1812.
- Vaughn EM, Paul PS. Antigenic and biological diversity among transmissible gastroenteritis virus isolates of swine. Veterinary Microbiology 1993; 36:333 - 347.
- Vennema H, Heijnen L, Zijderveld A, Horzinek MC, Spaan WJ. Intracellular transport of recombinant coronavirus spike protein: Implications for virus assembly. J virol 1990; 64:339 - 346.
- Wagner JE, Beamer PD, Ristic M. Electron microscopy of intestinal epithelial cells of piglets infected with a transmissible gastroenterits virus. Can J Comp Med 1973; 37: 177 - 188.
- Welsh RM, Haspel MV, Parker DC, Holmes KV. Natural cytotoxicity against mouse hepatitis virus - infected cells. II. A cytotoxic effector cell with a B lymphocyte phenotype. J Immunol 1986; 136: 1454 - 1460.
- Wesley RD, Cheung AK, Micheal DD, et al. Nucleotide sequences of coronavirus TGEV genomjc RNA: Evidence for 3 mRNA species between the peplomer and matrix protein genes. Virus Res 1989; 13:87 - 100.
- Wesley RD, Wood RD, Cheung AK. Genetic basis for the pathogenesis of transmisible gastroenteritis virus. J Virol l 990b; 64:4761 - 4766.
- Wesley RD, Wood RD, Cheung AK. Genetic analysis of porcine respiratory coronavirus, an attenuated variant of transmissible gastroenteritis virus. J Virol 1991 65:3369 - 3373.
- Wesley RD, Wood RD, Hill KT, Biwer JD. Evidence for a porcine respiratory coronavirus, antigenically similar to transmissible gastroenteritis virus in the United States. J Vet Diagn Invest 1990a; 2:312 - 317.
- Woods RD. Studies of enteric coronaviruses in feline cell line. Vet Microbiol 1982 7:427 435.
- Woods RD, Wesley RD, Kapke PA. Neutralization of transmissible gastroenteritis virus by complement dependent monoclonal antibodies. Am J Vet Res 1988; 49:300 - 304.
- Yeager CL, Ashmum RA, Williums RK, et al. Human aminopeptidase N is a receptor for human coronavirus 229E. Nature. 1992; 357:420 - 422.
- Young GA, Hinz RW, Underdahl NR. Some characteristics of transmissible gastroenteritis in disease free antibody - deviod pigs. Am J Vet Res 1955; 16:529 - 535.
- Zhu XL, Paul PS, Vaughn EM, Morales A. Characterization and reactivity of monoclonal antibodies to the Mi1ler strain of transmissible gastroenteritis virus of swine. Am J Vet Res 1990; 51:232 - 238.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Thai scholarship and Kasetsart University, Thailand for the financial support of my study and Dr. Prem S Paul, my major professor, for providing instrument and material as well as advice. I greatfully acknowledge Dr. Patrick G Halbur and Dr. Kenneth B Platt, my committee, for valuable advice. Thanks are also due to Marsha Morgan for TGEV isolate VMRI 5170 and thesis review as well as Dr. Marwin Frey and Dana McCullough for PRCV isolate NVSL 5170. I highly thank Dr. Igor Morozov for being my molecular bio - technique instructor, Yanjin Zhang for his advice in RIP assay and Jim Fosse, BMC, for perfecting the images.