

New insights on the role of paired membrane structures in coronavirus replication

Article

Accepted Version

Full article with figures

V'kovski, P., Al-Mulla, H., Thiel, V. and Neuman, B. W. (2015) New insights on the role of paired membrane structures in coronavirus replication. Virus Research, 202. pp. 33-40. ISSN 0168-1702 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2014.12.021 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/40455/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2014.12.021

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR



Central Archive at the University of Reading Reading's research outputs online

*Highlights (for review)

New insights on the role of paired membrane structures in coronavirus replication

Highlights

- The replication of coronaviruses, as in other positive-strand RNA viruses, is closely tied to the formation of membrane-bound replicative organelles (DMOs)
- 2. The proteins responsible for rearranging cellular membranes to form the organelles are conserved not just among the *Coronaviridae* family members, but across the order *Nidovirales*.
- 3. Here, we collect and interpret the recent experimental evidence about the role and importance of membrane-bound organelles in coronavirus replication.

1 New insights on the role of paired membrane structures in coronavirus 2 replication 3 Philip V'kovski^{a,b}, Hawaa al-Mulla^c, Volker Thiel^{a,d,*}, and Benjamin W. 4 Neuman^{c,*} 5 6 ^aFederal Institute of Virology and Immunology, Mittelhäusern and Bern, 7 Switzerland, ^bGraduate School for Biomedical Sciences, University of Bern, 8 9 Switzerland, ^cSchool of Biological Sciences, University of Reading, Reading, Berkshire, United Kingdom, ^dVetsuisse Faculty, University of Bern, Bern, 10 11 Switzerland. 12 13 *corresponding authors: Benjamin W. Neuman, University of Reading, Reading, Berkshire, United 14 15 Kingdom; e-mail: b.w.neuman@reading.ac.uk; Tel: +44 118 378 8902. 16 Volker Thiel, Insitute of Virology and Immunology, Länggassstr. 122, 3012 17 Bern, Switzerland; e-mail: Volker.thiel@vetsuisse.unibe.ch; Tel. +41 31 631 18 2413, Fax: +41 31 631 2534. 19 20 21 Keywords: RNA virus replication, membrane rearrangement, replicative 22 organelle, virus factory 23

-

Abstract

The replication of coronaviruses, as in other positive-strand RNA viruses, is closely tied to the formation of membrane-bound replicative organelles inside infected cells. The proteins responsible for rearranging cellular membranes to form the organelles are conserved not just among the *Coronaviridae* family members, but across the order *Nidovirales*. Taken together, these observations suggest that the coronavirus replicative organelle plays an important role in viral replication, perhaps facilitating the production or protection of viral RNA. However, the exact nature of this role, and the specific contexts under which it is important have not been fully elucidated. Here, we collect and interpret the recent experimental evidence about the role and importance of membrane-bound organelles in coronavirus replication.

Paired membranes associated with viral RNA

All positive-stranded RNA viruses (+RNA) that infect eukaryotes are believed to form membrane-bound replicative organelles, though this remains to be formally tested for several families of viruses (1). One of the most widespread membrane modifications caused by +RNA viruses results in the formation of paired membranes, i.e. two closely apposed lipid bilayers. A growing body of evidence, presented in Table 1 indicates that the paired membrane structures are induced by the expression of viral proteins – most typically by parts of the viral replicase. Table 1 lists the virus lineages for which there is evidence that some form of virus-induced paired-membrane structure is associated with viral replication. The wide distribution of membrane pairing in +RNA viruses suggests that this is an effective strategy for successfully producing new viruses, and that membrane pairing may somehow increase the competitive fitness of these viruses.

While we can speculate that +RNA viruses may gain a fitness advantage by replicating on the membranes of dedicated viral organelles, this has been difficult to test experimentally. However, there are several lines of experimental and genetic evidence that suggest that RNA synthesis is tied to the formation of replicative organelles. Viral RNA accumulates in the

coronavirus organelles, suggesting that the organelles may be a site of RNA synthesis (2-5). Furthermore, viral organelles are not formed when RNA synthesis is stopped (6, 7). While it is clear that RNA synthesis is linked with the organelles, it has proved difficult to directly test whether or to what extent the process of organelle formation is necessary for the process of RNA synthesis, because of the practical difficulty in separating the two processes in an experimental setting.

Structure of the organelles

Electron tomography studies have revealed that the replicative organelles of

Electron tomography studies have revealed that the replicative organelles of different nidoviruses are drawn from a repertoire of paired-membrane structures, including (paired) convoluted membranes, pouch-like double-membrane spherules, long paired membranes and double-membrane vesicles (2, 5, 8), though studies of the more recently discovered mesoniviruses and roniviruses remain poorly characterized (9, 10). A catalog of the virus-induced membrane structures that have been observed for each coronavirus is shown at right in Figure 1.

The common element in nidovirus-like membrane rearrangement is that the membranes are paired, usually maintaining a consistent-sized gap between the two membranes (reviewed here (11)). Since protein-induced membrane pairing appears to be a consistent feature associated with nidovirus replication, and in the absence of data carefully dissecting the relationship between the shape and function of these different paired membrane structures, it makes sense to refer to the resulting structures collectively as double-membrane organelles (DMO).

Despite a relative wealth of structural data, it has proved difficult to test hypotheses about the role of DMOs in viral replication and fitness directly because DMO formation is linked so closely to replication and expression of replicase proteins. Here, we will discuss the implications of two recent studies that address questions about the role of DMOs in nidovirus replication (12), and characterize the effects of a new DMO-blocking drug against a variety of coronaviruses (13).

93 Viral proteins involved in organelle formation 94 Further evidence of the probable importance of nidovirus replicative 95 organelles for viral RNA replication comes in the form of genetic conservation. 96 Nidoviruses, and most particularly coronaviruses, are highly genetically 97 variable and contain several genus-specific or even species-specific genes 98 (14). However, there are two clusters of genes that are conserved in all 99 known nidoviruses (11, 14). The first is a highly conserved cluster of genes 100 homologous to the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (SARS-101 CoV) nsp3-6 (Figure 1). Expression of the membrane-anchored proteins 102 nsp3, nsp4 and nsp6 is sufficient to induce the formation of SARS-like paired-103 membrane replicative organelles (15). The second conserved gene cluster 104 encodes the viral RNA polymerase and superfamily 1 helicase (16). The 105 conservation of membrane-pairing genes in the context of an otherwise 106 hypervariable group of viruses is a strong argument in favour of the 107 importance of at least the membrane-pairing genes for RNA synthesis 108 109 The proteins that form SARS-CoV replicative organelles have several features 110 in common with distant homologs found throughout the *Nidovirales*. We will 111 refer to the transmembrane proteins homologous to SARS-CoV nsp3, nsp4 and nsp6 a as TM1, TM2, and TM3, respectively. The relative genomic 112 113 positions and functions attributed to TM1-3 in nidoviruses are shown in Figure 114 1. 115 116 Of the three proteins involved in SARS-CoV replicative organelle formation, 117 the least conserved is TM1, which has a multidomain architecture (17). Many 118 nidovirus and all coronavirus TM1 proteins contain one or more ubiquitin-like 119 domains which may help to anchor the viral RNA to the membranes where replication takes place (18). Potentially RNA-binding macrodomains (19-25), 120 121 papain-like proteinases (26-28), other RNA binding domains (29) and a well 122 conserved but poorly understood region known only as the Y domain (17) are 123 also commonly but not ubiquitously found in nidovirus TM1 proteins. All 124 putative TM1 proteins are predicted to contain one or more transmembrane 125 domains, as shown in Figure 1. The C-terminal region of TM1, from the first

126 transmembrane region to the end of the Y domain induces membrane 127 proliferation, which in some ways resembles an autophagy response (30). 128 129 TM2 and TM3 are recognizable because they contain four or more predicted 130 transmembrane regions, and are encoded immediately before and after the viral main protease (M^{pro}). Bioinformatics generally predicts an even number 131 132 of transmembrane spans in these proteins, which would be necessary to 133 localize M^{pro} on the same side of the membrane as all of its predicted 134 upstream and downstream cleavage sites. However there are additional 135 hydrophobic regions that are strongly predicted to span the membrane, but 136 which do not for several viruses, including most coronaviruses (31-33). 137 138 TM2 contains two potential conserved domains located between the first and 139 second transmembrane domains in coronavirus, and after the final transmembrane domain in most nidoviruses. Mutations in the first non-140 141 hydrophobic domain of TM2, which is the largest part of the coronavirus 142 replicase to localize on the luminal face of the membrane, have been 143 demonstrated to disrupt RNA replication and may cause defects in membrane 144 pairing (34). Deletion of the latter conserved domain of TM2, which has been 145 structurally solved (35, 36), was surprisingly well tolerated (35, 37). TM2 146 localizes to membranes, but does not induce any recognizable change to 147 intracellular membranes in the absence of other viral proteins (30). However, 148 co-expression of TM2 with full-length TM1 results in extensive pairing of 149 perinuclear membranes in both coronavirus (30) and arterivirus (38, 39). 150 Additionally, it has recently been shown that co-expression of a fragment of 151 MHV TM1 including the transmembrane region and the C-terminus with TM2 152 induced ER membrane zippering and curvature similar to the phenotype 153 observed after SARS-CoV TM1 and TM2 co-expression (40). In that report 154 TM1 and TM2 were demonstrated to interact via protein loops on the luminal 155 face of the membrane. 156 157 The maze-like paired-membrane structures that resulted from coexpression of 158 SARS-CoV TM1 and TM2 have not ever been reported in coronavirus-159 infected cells, suggesting that this should be interpreted as a conditional, or

160 perhaps partial phenotype, that is not observed when the full viral replicase polyprotein is expressed. This suggests that membrane pairing is caused by 161 162 heterotypic interactions between TM1 and TM2 on opposing membranes, but 163 that the final architecture of the paired membranes is dependent on additional 164 viral proteins. 165 166 TM3 largely consists of transmembrane regions, without the hallmarks of 167 amino acid conservation or predicted structural conservation that would be 168 expected for an enzyme. Overexpression of TM3 alone disturbs intracellular 169 membrane trafficking (41, 42), resulting in an accumulation of single-170 membrane vesicles around the microtubule organization complex (30). 171 However, quantitative electron microscopy revealed that expression of TM2 172 with TM3 prevents the membrane disruption seen with TM3 expression alone 173 (30). When SARS-CoV TM1, TM2 and TM3 are coexpressed, membrane-174 containing bodies which resembled authentic SARS-CoV replicative 175 organelles were formed. However, in each of the cell sections where DMV-176 like membranes were observed, the membrane proliferation phenotype of 177 TM1, the paired membrane phenotype of TM1+TM2 and the single membrane 178 vesicle accumulation from TM3 were each visible, suggesting that these 179 proteins do not always colocalize efficiently when expressed from plasmids in 180 different parts of the cell instead of being expressed in the natural form as a 181 polyprotein (BWN, personal communication). This suggests that while TM3 is not necessary for membrane pairing, TM3 may be necessary to induce the 182 183 formation of the double-membrane vesicles (DMVs) that are characteristic of 184 coronavirus replicative organelles. 185 186 **Interactions among DMV-making proteins** 187 The formation of large intracellular structures such as the maze-like 188 TM1+TM2 bodies and DMV-like TM1+TM2+TM3 bodies suggests that nsp3, 189 nsp4 and nsp6 may interact both homotypically and heterotypically. SARS-190 CoV nsp3-nsp3 interactions have been detected in cells by yeast two-191 hybridization (43) and GST pulldown (44), and in purified protein by 192 perfluorooctanoic acid polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (17). While SARS-

CoV nsp4-nsp4 interactions were not found in yeast-two hybrid or mammalian

two-hybrid screens (43, 45) studies with another coronavirus did detect nsp4-nsp4 interactions by Venus reporter fluorescence (46). To date, homotypic interactions have not been demonstrated for nsp6 despite several attempts (43-45).

Heterotypic interactions between coronavirus TM1-3 proteins have been demonstrated biochemically: a TM1-TM2 interaction was detected by mammalian two-hybridization (43) and weakly detected by Venus reporter fluorescence (46). A TM2-3 interaction has been demonstrated by Venus reporter fluorescence (46), though it did not appear in other hybridization studies. A one-way interaction between the amino-terminal 192 amino acid domain of TM1 and TM3 detected by yeast two-hybridization (44) has also been reported. However, the apparent independence of TM1 and TM3 phenotypes after coexpression, coupled with the abrupt change in both phenotypes in the presence of TM2 suggests that interactions between these proteins may be largely mediated by TM2 (30).

Virus-host interactions

Molecular interactions between host and viral factors are observed in virtually every step of the viral life cycle. Viruses rely on and manipulate established cellular pathways to accommodate their needs during replication and to counteract host innate immune signalling. Replication of coronaviruses is no exception; while some host factors have been described in the context of viral RNA replication and transcription (47), few studies have looked closely at the complex interplay of host pathways in the establishment of virus-induced membrane-bound replication complexes.

To date, the precise origin of DMO membranes remains elusive. DMO membranes were initially suggested to derive from the early secretory pathway, although the absence of conventional ER, ERGIC and Golgi protein markers on viral replicative membranes argues against this hypothesis (48, 49). Since DMVs are reminiscent of the double-membranes of autophagosomes, several lines of controversial evidence hypothesized a diversion of Atg (autophagy-related) proteins and autophagosome function

during coronavirus replication, as it is the case for other +RNA viruses (50-54). The involvement of autophagy was recently investigated in the context of the avian CoV Infectious Bronchitis Virus (IBV) infections (41). The authors conclude that the presence of exogenous, individually expressed IBV nsp6, which localizes to the ER, induces the formation of autophagosomes in **IBV** contrast other replicase proteins. Additionally. although autophagosomes induced by IBV nsp6 or IBV infection appeared smaller than conventional autophagosomes observed after starvation of cells, they were similar in size to DMVs (42). However, the data reported here do not appear to support the assumption that there is a functional link between IBV nsp6 and autophagosomes, and a role of the autophagy in the formation of IBV replicative structures can hereby not be demonstrated. Moreover, neither induction nor inhibition of autophagy seems to affect IBV replication (55).

241242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

New evidence concerning the source of membranes for CoV-induced DMOs was proposed, in which Mouse Hepatitis Virus (MHV) probably co-opts a cellular degradation pathway of ER-associated degradation (ERAD) regulators, known as the ERAD tuning pathway (56). The ERAD pathway is responsible for the turnover of folding-defective polypeptides in the ER and is modulated by stress-inducible positive regulators of ERAD-mediated protein disposal such as EDEM1 (ER degradation-enhancing alpha mannosidase-like 1) and OS-9 (osteosarcoma amplified 9). The latter assist in transporting misfolded proteins into the cytosol for subsequent degradation by the proteasomal system. Under physiological conditions, however, low concentrations of EDEM1 and OS-9 are maintained in the ER lumen in order to avoid premature degradation of proteins that are undergoing folding programs (57). In this case, EDEM1 and OS-9 are selectively confined by interacting with the transmembrane-anchored cargo receptor SEL1L (suppressor of lin-12-like protein 1) and later released from the ER lumen in small short-lived vesicles, called EDEMosomes, which rapidly fuse with the endolysosomal compartments (58). This steady-state disposal of EDEM1 and OS-9 is known as ERAD tuning pathway. While not relying on the coat protein complex II (COPII) or Atg7, it critically depends on the non-lipidated form of LC3 (LC3-I), which is recruited to EDEMosomes. However, the specific autophagosomal marker GFP-LC3 does not associate with EDEMosomes, which are therefore distinct structures (59).

The coronavirus MHV is hypothesized to divert the ERAD tuning machinery for the generation of DMOs. Similarly to EDEMosomes, colocalization of EDEM1, OS-9, SEL1L, LC3-I and double-stranded (ds) RNA is observed upon MHV infection. Moreover, replication of MHV, which does not require an intact autophagy pathway, is impaired upon knockdown of LC3 or SEL1L (58). DMVs furthermore lack conventional ER markers and do not associate with GFP-LC3 (56). Altogether, the evidence from this study strongly suggests that MHV exploits the ERAD-tuning machinery to establish its replicative structures.

In order to learn whether this mechanism might be common to other nidoviruses, other viruses that use a similar replication strategy to MHV were examined. One of these, the arterivirus Equine Arteritis Virus (EAV) has been shown to require the same subset of ERAD tuning factors as MHV to ensure replication (60). Recently, investigations of the even more distantly-related Japanese Encephalitis Virus (JEV), which belongs to the *Flaviviridae* family, revealed that it may usurp the same components of the ERAD-tuning pathway as well (61). Consistent with this hypothesis, both viruses were shown to replicate independently of a functional autophagy pathway. The non-lipidated LC3 marker protein, which is essential for the replication of EAV and JEV, associated with their replication complexes together with EDEM1 whereas GFP-LC3 did not label these structures. These observations parallel the ones seen for MHV but raise further questions whether this feature is even more widespread amongst +RNA viruses.

Despite the resemblance of MHV, EAV and JEV in the requirement of host factors for efficient replication, diversion of the ERAD tuning pathway cannot be considered as a generic way of inducing replicative membranes by these viral families. Probable variations within families have to be kept in mind as exemplified by the comparison of DMOs from two different coronavirus genus members. Indeed, IBV's recently described spherules derived from paired ER

membranes significantly differ from the DMO structures observed upon alphaand beta-coronaviruses infections (8, 62) and their generation might require a different set of factors. Furthermore, the morphology of DMOs induced by flaviviruses such as Hepatitis C Virus, Dengue virus or West Nile Virus is highly heterogeneous and the identification of a common, conserved membrane diversion strategy seems unlikely (63). However, it is possible that the diversion of one pathway could lead to the generation of the different arrangements of membrane that we collectively refer to as the DMO.

304305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

Importantly, it has been shown that, in contrast to what is observed during EAV infection, endogenous LC3 does not colocalize with membrane puncta induced by expression of EAV nsp2 and nsp3, and the membrane modifications induced by the latter are not affected by LC3 knockdown (60). Similarly, LC3 and EDEM1 were not recruited to rearranged membranes induced by co-expression of MHV TM1 and TM2 (40). While this still has to be proven in the context of CoV TM1, TM2 and TM3 expression, it raises the questions whether LC3 participates to the biological function of DMVs rather than its generation. A novel hypothesis has been recently suggested for Poliovirus, according to which the virus might not only co-opt a host pathway, but also divert the functional network of individual proteins (64). Host factors could therefore have a proviral function during infection, distinct from the function for which they have been initially described. Accordingly, this is reminiscent with novel functions attributed to LC3 during cellular homeostasis, cytoprotection against invading pathogens or during Chlamydia trachomatis' intracellular life cycle (65).

321322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

Natural variation in DMV structure

The DMOs of the model coronavirus MHV take the form of perinuclear DMVs which appear either singly, or grouped around and interconnected with a region of paired, convoluted membrane (CM;). A recent study examined DMV formation by *wild-type* MHV-inf-1 (*wt*) and five *temperature-sensitive* (*ts*) MHV mutants, each of which differed from *wt* by a single amino acid substitution. The panel of *ts* viruses chosen contained mutations in an interdomain linker of nsp3 (TM1), M^{pro}, the viral RNA polymerase, cap N-methyltransferase and

cap O-methyltransferase, respectively (6, 12, 66). With the exception of the polymerase mutant, which was attenuated tenfold, these viruses produced the same amount of infectious progeny as *wt* (12).

All of the mutants produced significantly smaller DMVs than *wt* virus, varying from almost *wt* size to 17% smaller (Table 2). In two of the mutants that produced normal amounts of infectious progeny, not only were the DMVs smaller, there were only about half as many DMVs per visibly infected cell compared to *wt* (Table 2). Examination of the size and number of intracellular virus particles from the same samples did not reveal corresponding changes, suggesting that the observed DMV phenotypes were not an artifact of sample preparation. The number of CMs remained in a constant ratio to the number of DMVs present, suggesting that the mutations affected production of the entire DMO.

Induced variation in DMVs

The DMOs of human coronavirus 229E (HCoV-229E) include DMVs similar to those observed after MHV infection (13). In testing a new antiviral called K22, it was observed that infectivity, viral RNA, and DMV formation were all blocked by treatment with 4 μ M K22. A time of addition study revealed that K22 did not block viral entry, and had the greatest antiviral effects after virus entry during the first few hours of infection, leading to the interpretation that K22 inhibits a cellular or viral component involved in a post-entry, early stage of viral replication.

After serial passage of the virus in the presence of K22, resistant mutants were selected. Surprisingly, two independently isolated resistance mutations mapped to opposite ends of transmembrane helices in TM3 (nsp6) at positions H121L and M159V. The resistant viruses released similar amounts of new progeny compared to wt, but produced only about half as many DMVs per infected cell. In addition, the DMVs induced by resistance mutants appeared structurally impaired. Similarly to MHV nsp4 mutants) K22 escape mutants induced DMV with partially collapsed inner membranes, even when K22 was not present. Moreover, the specific infectivity of those newly

364 released virions was about ten-fold lower for TM3 mutants than for wt. This 365 suggested that the mutations in nsp6 conferred resistance to K22 at a cost of 366 impairing an early intracellular step in the establishment of infection. 367 368 Fitness consequences 369 From these experiments it was clear that HCoV-229E viruses with K22 370 resistance mutations in TM3 incurred a steep fitness cost, in the form of 371 decreased specific infectivity. There were also indications of a similar 372 decrease in efficiency in the MHV nsp3 mutant Brts31, which produced 373 significantly more intracellular RNA than wt, but without a corresponding 374 increase in infectious progeny. 375 376 To find out if the MHV mutants also incurred a fitness cost associated with 377 producing smaller and fewer DMVs, competitive fitness assays were carried 378 out. To do this, equal infectivities of two viruses were added to the same flask 379 at a temperature where both viruses could grow normally. After 24h in direct 380 competition, the amount of each virus was quantified either by sequencing to 381 look for the ts mutation, or by phenotypically screening for ts and non-ts virus. 382 None of the MHV mutants tested was significantly less fit than wt in 383 continuous or primary fibroblasts, and two mutants were significantly fitter 384 than wt under the assay conditions. One of the viruses with increased fitness 385 compared to wild-type was the N-methyltransferase mutant Brts105, which 386 produced only half as many DMVs as wt. These results demonstrated that at 387 least under these experimental conditions, producing larger or more 388 numerous DMVs did not confer a corresponding fitness advantage. 389 390 Implications for coronavirus replication 391 When interpreting these findings, it is important to consider that none of the 392 HCoV-229E or MHV mutants tested to date has been able to replicate entirely 393 without DMOs. And while some of these tests were carried out in primary 394 cells, work in animal models was not possible because of the lack of a small

growth of MHV mutants at physiological temperatures. These two studies do

animal model for HCoV-229E, and because the mutations restricted the

not disprove the fundamental connectedness between coronavirus RNA

395

396

398 replication and DMO formation, but together, they reveal an unexpected 399 plasticity in the size and number of DMVs that are needed to carry out wild-400 type amounts of RNA synthesis. 401 402 For these reasons, along with the observation that RNA replication is 403 detectable before the first appearance of organelles (67), we favour an 404 interpretation in which the organelles are a late manifestation of accumulated 405 viral proteins resulting from abundant RNA expression. In this interpretation, 406 DMOs could still play an obligate role in viral replication under specific 407 conditions or in specific cell types, but the primary role for DMOs would be to 408 increase the efficiency of either RNA production, delivery of newly 409 synthesized RNA to sites where it could be translated or packaged, and/or 410 shielding abundantly synthesized viral RNA from host cell innate immune sensing pathways. These studies also suggest that at least half of the DMVs 411 412 present in infected cells may be in excess of what is strictly needed to sustain 413 normal levels of RNA synthesis, given that both MHV and HCoV-229E 414 mutants replicated normally despite producing only half the normal 415 complement of DMVs. 416 417 Before these studies, very little was known about the potential for natural and 418 induced variation in intracellular membrane rearrangement. The viruses 419 described in these studies all produced normal amounts of progeny virus 420 particles, and were all selected for analysis for reasons unrelated to DMO 421 formation. These represent only a handful of the available nidovirus replicase 422 mutants that have been published. From this work we can hypothesize that 423 other MHV ts mutants, or K22-resistant HCoV-229E mutants with replicase 424 defects would probably make either smaller or fewer DMVs, and a larger 425 collection of such mutants will like be highly informative to further our 426 understanding on the pivotal role(s) of DMOs in the coronavirus life cycle. 427 Hopefully the unique insight provided by these results, together with the 428 relative ease of analysis will make quantitative electron microscopy a routine 429 part of the characterization of new virus mutants. In addition, the accumulated 430 knowledge on the nature of coronavirus DMOs and the possibility to 431 experimentally interfere with DMO formation by using small compound

432	inhibitors, such as K22, will allow us to dissect similarities and differences
433	between viral DMOs and related cellular organelles.
434	
435	
436	Acknowledgements
437	
438	This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF
439	project 149784; VT and PV).
440	

Table 1. Evidence paired membrane structures in +RNA virus infection.

Order Nidovirales Picornavirales Tymovirales Unclassified	Family Arteriviridae Coronaviridae Mesoniviridae Picornaviridae Secoviridae Betaflexiviridae Tymoviridae Astroviridae Bromoviridae Closteroviridae Flaviviridae Nodaviridae Togaviridae	Host ^a A A A A P P A A A A A A A A	Origin ^b ER ER ER ER ER ER ER ER ER Cp, Mt ER ER ER ER Mito Ly, ER	Type ^c V,Z V,Z,S,C V? V V V V V V V V V V,S,C S V,S;	nsp2, 3 nsp3+4+6 nr ^p 2BC, 3A nr nr nr nsp1a 1a+2a ^{pol} nr NS4A+4B pA+RNA P123	Reference 3 (38, 39, 48, 40) (2, 8, 30), 45 (71) 446 (72-75) 447 (77, 78), 448 (79) 449 (80, 81), 450 (82-84), 451 (86-91), 452 (92, 93), 453 (94-96), 454
	Togaviridae Tombusviridae	A P	Ly, ER Px	V,S? S	P123 nr	(94-96) 454 (97) 455
•						100

456 457 458 459 460

441

442

461 462 463

464

^aAnimals (A) or Plants (P) ^bMembranes from the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), chloroplast (Cp), mitochondria (Mt),

lysosome (Ly) or peroxisome (Px) ^cPaired membranes in the form of double-membrane vesicles (V), zippered ER (Z), open-

necked spherules (S), or convoluted membranes (C)

^dProteins implicated in membrane rearrangements

^eNot reported (*nr*)

465 466

Table 2. Differences in size and prevalence of MHV DMVs and intracellular virions (IV). Prevalence Size (nm)

					1 TOVAL	CHOC			0120 (11111)	
Virus	Condition s	ts	Cells	DMV	P value ^a	IV	P value	DMV	P value ^b	IV	P value
Wild-type	DBT 33℃		n=323	6%		7%		228 ± 45		69 ± 8	
Br <i>ts</i> 31	5.5 hpi	nsp3	n=753	2%	8×10 ⁻⁴	7%	ns ^c	195 ± 38	2×10 ⁻⁶	69 ± 9	ns
Wild-type			n=161	40%		29%		228±36		68±10	
Br <i>ts</i> 31		nsp3	n=238	24%	4×10 ⁻⁴	25%	ns	208±34	5×10 ⁻¹⁹	68±10	ns
Alb <i>ts</i> 16	17CI-1	nsp5	n=120	37%	ns	19%	ns	189±33	8×10 ⁻⁶⁶	70±8	ns
Wü <i>ts</i> 18	33°C	nsp16	n=140	36%	ns	20%	ns	211±35	2×10 ⁻¹⁵	67±12	ns
Br <i>ts</i> 105	10 hpi	nsp14	n=230	22%	1×10 ⁻⁴	32%	ns	220±36	2×10 ⁻⁴	69±10	ns
Alb <i>ts</i> 22 ^d		nsp12	n=320	13%	1×10 ⁻⁵	9%	1×10 ⁻⁵	204±43	2×10 ⁻¹³	68±11	ns

⁴⁶⁷ 468 469 470

^aCalculated by two-tailed Fisher's exact test

^bCalculated by two-tailed Mann-Whitney test

^cNot significantly different from the appropriate wild-type control

^dAttenuated growth at 33°C compared to wild-type

Figure Legend

472473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493494

Figure 1. Conservation and functional organization of the carboxyl-terminal region of nidovirus polyprotein 1a. Domains that are homologous at the amino acid level are shown at left in solid colors. More distantly related potential homologs identified by genome position and comparison of predicted secondary structures are marked with stripes. Positions of transmembrane regions (black bars) and hydrophobic non-transmembrane regions (striped bars) were predicted by TMHMM 2.0 (98) and amended to reflect known topologies (31-33) wherever possible. Clusters of conserved cysteine and histidine residues that may bind metal ions are marked with white ovals. A jagged line denotes the uncertain position of the amino terminus. Regions that induce membrane pairing, proliferation or vesiculation in betacoronavirus SARS-CoV and arterivirus EAV are shown above and below the domain annotation, respectively, and all annotations come from the references listed for Table 1. Double-membrane organelles observed (x) or uncertainly observed (?) in infected cells are marked at right. Virus names are abbreviated as follows: white bream virus (WBV), fathead minnow nidovirus (FHMNV), equine arteritis virus (EAV), lactate dehydrogenase elevating virus (LDV), porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV), simian hemorrhagic fever virus (SHFV) and wobbly possum nidovirus (WPNV).

495	Refe	erences
496		
497	1.	Neuman BW, Angelini MM, Buchmeier MJ. 2014. Does form meet function
498		in the coronavirus replicative organelle? Trends Microbiol.
499	2.	Knoops K, Kikkert M, Worm SH, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, van der Meer Y,
500		Koster AJ, Mommaas AM, Snijder EJ. 2008. SARS-coronavirus replication
501		is supported by a reticulovesicular network of modified endoplasmic
502		reticulum. PLoS biology 6: e226.
503	3.	Gosert R, Kanjanahaluethai A, Egger D, Bienz K, Baker SC. 2002. RNA
504		replication of mouse hepatitis virus takes place at double-membrane
505		vesicles. Journal of virology 76: 3697-3708.
506	4.	Hagemeijer MC, Vonk AM, Monastyrska I, Rottier PJ, de Haan CA. 2012.
507		Visualizing coronavirus RNA synthesis in time by using click chemistry.
508		Journal of virology 86: 5808-5816.
509	5.	Knoops K, Barcena M, Limpens RW, Koster AJ, Mommaas AM, Snijder
510		EJ. 2012. Ultrastructural characterization of arterivirus replication
511		structures: reshaping the endoplasmic reticulum to accommodate viral RNA
512		synthesis. Journal of virology 86: 2474-2487.
513	6.	Stokes HL, Baliji S, Hui CG, Sawicki SG, Baker SC, Siddell SG. 2010. A new
514		cistron in the murine hepatitis virus replicase gene. Journal of virology
515		84: 10148-10158.
516	7.	Verheije MH, Raaben M, Mari M, Te Lintelo EG, Reggiori F, van
517		Kuppeveld FJ, Rottier PJ, de Haan CA. 2008. Mouse hepatitis coronavirus
518		RNA replication depends on GBF1-mediated ARF1 activation. PLoS
519		pathogens 4: e1000088.
520	8.	Maier HJ, Hawes PC, Cottam EM, Mantell J, Verkade P, Monaghan P,
521		Wileman T, Britton P. 2013. Infectious bronchitis virus generates spherules
522		from zippered endoplasmic reticulum membranes. mBio 4:e00801-00813.
523	9.	Zirkel F, Kurth A, Quan PL, Briese T, Ellerbrok H, Pauli G, Leendertz FH,
524		Lipkin WI, Ziebuhr J, Drosten C, Junglen S. 2011. An insect nidovirus
525		emerging from a primary tropical rainforest. MBio 2:e00077-00011.
526	10.	Spann KM, Vickers JE, Lester RJG. 1995. Lymphoid organ virus of Penaeus
527		monodon from Australia. Diseases of aquatic organisms 23:127-134.

528	11.	Angelini MM, Neuman BW, Buchmeier MJ. 2014. Untangling membrane
529		rearrangement in the nidovirales. DNA and cell biology 33:122-127.
530	12.	Al-Mulla HM, Turrell L, Smith NM, Payne L, Baliji S, Zust R, Thiel V,
531		Baker SC, Siddell SG, Neuman BW. 2014. Competitive fitness in
532		coronaviruses is not correlated with size or number of double-membrane
533		vesicles under reduced-temperature growth conditions. MBio 5:e01107-
534		01113.
535	13.	Lundin A, Dijkman R, Bergstrom T, Kann N, Adamiak B, Hannoun C,
536		Kindler E, Jonsdottir HR, Muth D, Kint J, Forlenza M, Muller MA,
537		Drosten C, Thiel V, Trybala E. 2014. Targeting membrane-bound viral
538		RNA synthesis reveals potent inhibition of diverse coronaviruses including
539		the middle East respiratory syndrome virus. PLoS pathogens 10:e1004166.
540	14.	Lauber C, Goeman JJ, Parquet Mdel C, Nga PT, Snijder EJ, Morita K,
541		Gorbalenya AE. 2013. The footprint of genome architecture in the largest
542		genome expansion in RNA viruses. PLoS pathogens 9:e1003500.
543	<i>15.</i>	Angelini MM, Akhlaghpour M, Neuman BW, Buchmeier MJ. 2013. Severe
544		acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus nonstructural proteins 3, 4, and 6
545		induce double-membrane vesicles. MBio 4.
546	16.	Deng Z, Lehmann KC, Li X, Feng C, Wang G, Zhang Q, Qi X, Yu L, Zhang
547		X, Feng W, Wu W, Gong P, Tao Y, Posthuma CC, Snijder EJ, Gorbalenya
548		AE, Chen Z. 2014. Structural basis for the regulatory function of a complex
549		zinc-binding domain in a replicative arterivirus helicase resembling a
550		nonsense-mediated mRNA decay helicase. Nucleic acids research 42:3464-
551		3477.
552	17.	Neuman BW, Joseph JS, Saikatendu KS, Serrano P, Chatterjee A,
553		Johnson MA, Liao L, Klaus JP, Yates JR, 3rd, Wuthrich K, Stevens RC,
554		Buchmeier MJ, Kuhn P. 2008. Proteomics analysis unravels the functional
555		repertoire of coronavirus nonstructural protein 3. Journal of virology
556		82: 5279-5294.
557	18.	Hurst KR, Koetzner CA, Masters PS. 2013. Characterization of a critical
558		interaction between the coronavirus nucleocapsid protein and
559		nonstructural protein 3 of the viral replicase-transcriptase complex. Journal
560		of virology 87: 9159-9172.

561	19.	Serrano P, Jonnson MA, Almeiaa MS, Horst R, Herrmann T, Joseph JS,
562		Neuman BW, Subramanian V, Saikatendu KS, Buchmeier MJ, Stevens
563		RC, Kuhn P, Wuthrich K. 2007. Nuclear magnetic resonance structure of
564		the N-terminal domain of nonstructural protein 3 from the severe acute
565		respiratory syndrome coronavirus. Journal of virology 81:12049-12060.
566	<i>20.</i>	Xu Y, Cong L, Chen C, Wei L, Zhao Q, Xu X, Ma Y, Bartlam M, Rao Z. 2009.
567		Crystal structures of two coronavirus ADP-ribose-1"-monophosphatases
568		and their complexes with ADP-Ribose: a systematic structural analysis of
569		the viral ADRP domain. Journal of virology 83:1083-1092.
570	21.	Wojdyla JA, Manolaridis I, Snijder EJ, Gorbalenya AE, Coutard B,
571		Piotrowski Y, Hilgenfeld R, Tucker PA. 2009. Structure of the X (ADRP)
572		domain of nsp3 from feline coronavirus. Acta crystallographica. Section D,
573		Biological crystallography 65: 1292-1300.
574	22.	Saikatendu KS, Joseph JS, Subramanian V, Clayton T, Griffith M, Moy K,
575		Velasquez J, Neuman BW, Buchmeier MJ, Stevens RC, Kuhn P. 2005.
576		Structural basis of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus ADP-
577		ribose-1"-phosphate dephosphorylation by a conserved domain of nsP3.
578		Structure 13: 1665-1675.
579	23.	Tan J, Vonrhein C, Smart OS, Bricogne G, Bollati M, Kusov Y, Hansen G,
580		Mesters JR, Schmidt CL, Hilgenfeld R. 2009. The SARS-unique domain
581		(SUD) of SARS coronavirus contains two macrodomains that bind G-
582		quadruplexes. PLoS pathogens 5: e1000428.
583	24.	Chatterjee A, Johnson MA, Serrano P, Pedrini B, Joseph JS, Neuman BW,
584		Saikatendu K, Buchmeier MJ, Kuhn P, Wuthrich K. 2009. Nuclear
585		magnetic resonance structure shows that the severe acute respiratory
586		syndrome coronavirus-unique domain contains a macrodomain fold.
587		Journal of virology 83: 1823-1836.
588	<i>25.</i>	Johnson MA, Chatterjee A, Neuman BW, Wuthrich K. 2010. SARS
589		coronavirus unique domain: three-domain molecular architecture in
590		solution and RNA binding. Journal of molecular biology 400:724-742.
591	26.	Ratia K, Saikatendu KS, Santarsiero BD, Barretto N, Baker SC, Stevens
592		RC, Mesecar AD. 2006. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
593		papain-like protease: structure of a viral deubiquitinating enzyme.

594		Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of
595		America 103: 5717-5722.
596	<i>27.</i>	Wojdyla JA, Manolaridis I, van Kasteren PB, Kikkert M, Snijder EJ,
597		Gorbalenya AE, Tucker PA. 2010. Papain-like protease 1 from
598		transmissible gastroenteritis virus: crystal structure and enzymatic activity
599		toward viral and cellular substrates. Journal of virology 84:10063-10073.
600	28.	van Kasteren PB, Bailey-Elkin BA, James TW, Ninaber DK, Beugeling C,
601		Khajehpour M, Snijder EJ, Mark BL, Kikkert M. 2013. Deubiquitinase
602		function of arterivirus papain-like protease 2 suppresses the innate immune
603		response in infected host cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of
604		Sciences of the United States of America 110:E838-847.
605	29.	Serrano P, Johnson MA, Chatterjee A, Neuman BW, Joseph JS,
606		Buchmeier MJ, Kuhn P, Wuthrich K. 2009. Nuclear magnetic resonance
607		structure of the nucleic acid-binding domain of severe acute respiratory
608		syndrome coronavirus nonstructural protein 3. Journal of virology
609		83: 12998-13008.
610	<i>30.</i>	Angelini MM, Akhlaghpour M, Neuman BW, Buchmeier MJ. 2013. Severe
611		acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus nonstructural proteins 3, 4, and 6
612		induce double-membrane vesicles. MBio 4: e00524-00513.
613	31.	Kanjanahaluethai A, Chen Z, Jukneliene D, Baker SC. 2007. Membrane
614		topology of murine coronavirus replicase nonstructural protein 3. Virology
615		361: 391-401.
616	<i>32.</i>	Oostra M, Hagemeijer MC, van Gent M, Bekker CP, te Lintelo EG, Rottier
617		PJ, de Haan CA. 2008. Topology and membrane anchoring of the
618		coronavirus replication complex: not all hydrophobic domains of nsp3 and
619		nsp6 are membrane spanning. Journal of virology 82:12392-12405.
620	33.	Oostra M, te Lintelo EG, Deijs M, Verheije MH, Rottier PJ, de Haan CA.
621		2007. Localization and membrane topology of coronavirus nonstructural
622		protein 4: involvement of the early secretory pathway in replication. Journal
623		of virology 81: 12323-12336.
624	34.	Gadlage MJ, Sparks JS, Beachboard DC, Cox RG, Doyle JD, Stobart CC,
625		Denison MR. 2010. Murine hepatitis virus nonstructural protein 4 regulates

626		virus-induced membrane modifications and replication complex function.
627		Journal of virology 84: 280-290.
628	<i>35.</i>	Manolaridis I, Wojdyla JA, Panjikar S, Snijder EJ, Gorbalenya AE,
629		Berglind H, Nordlund P, Coutard B, Tucker PA. 2009. Structure of the C-
630		terminal domain of nsp4 from feline coronavirus. Acta crystallographica.
631		Section D, Biological crystallography 65:839-846.
632	36.	Xu X, Lou Z, Ma Y, Chen X, Yang Z, Tong X, Zhao Q, Xu Y, Deng H,
633		Bartlam M, Rao Z. 2009. Crystal structure of the C-terminal cytoplasmic
634		domain of non-structural protein 4 from mouse hepatitis virus A59. PloS one
635		4: e6217.
636	<i>37.</i>	Sparks JS, Lu X, Denison MR. 2007. Genetic analysis of Murine hepatitis
637		virus nsp4 in virus replication. Journal of virology 81:12554-12563.
638	38.	Snijder EJ, van Tol H, Roos N, Pedersen KW. 2001. Non-structural
639		proteins 2 and 3 interact to modify host cell membranes during the
640		formation of the arterivirus replication complex. The Journal of general
641		virology 82: 985-994.
642	39.	Posthuma CC, Pedersen KW, Lu Z, Joosten RG, Roos N, Zevenhoven-
643		Dobbe JC, Snijder EJ. 2008. Formation of the arterivirus
644		replication/transcription complex: a key role for nonstructural protein 3 in
645		the remodeling of intracellular membranes. Journal of virology 82:4480-
646		4491.
647	40.	Hagemeijer MC, Monastyrska I, Griffith J, van der Sluijs P, Voortman J,
648		van Bergen en Henegouwen PM, Vonk AM, Rottier PJ, Reggiori F, de
649		Haan CA. 2014. Membrane rearrangements mediated by coronavirus
650		nonstructural proteins 3 and 4. Virology 458-459:125-135.
651	41.	Cottam EM, Maier HJ, Manifava M, Vaux LC, Chandra-Schoenfelder P,
652		Gerner W, Britton P, Ktistakis NT, Wileman T. 2011. Coronavirus nsp6
653		proteins generate autophagosomes from the endoplasmic reticulum via an
654		omegasome intermediate. Autophagy 7: 1335-1347.
655	42.	Cottam EM, Whelband MC, Wileman T. 2014. Coronavirus NSP6 restricts
656		autophagosome expansion. Autophagy 10: 1426-1441.
657	43.	Pan J, Peng X, Gao Y, Li Z, Lu X, Chen Y, Ishaq M, Liu D, Dediego ML,
658		Enjuages I. Guo D 2008 Genome-wide analysis of protein-protein

659		interactions and involvement of viral proteins in SARS-CoV replication. Plos
660		one 3: e3299.
661	44.	Imbert I, Snijder EJ, Dimitrova M, Guillemot JC, Lecine P, Canard B.
662		2008. The SARS-Coronavirus PLnc domain of nsp3 as a
663		replication/transcription scaffolding protein. Virus research 133:136-148.
664	45.	von Brunn A, Teepe C, Simpson JC, Pepperkok R, Friedel CC, Zimmer R,
665		Roberts R, Baric R, Haas J. 2007. Analysis of intraviral protein-protein
666		interactions of the SARS coronavirus ORFeome. PloS one 2:e459.
667	46.	Hagemeijer MC, Ulasli M, Vonk AM, Reggiori F, Rottier PJ, de Haan CA.
668		2011. Mobility and interactions of coronavirus nonstructural protein 4.
669		Journal of virology 85: 4572-4577.
670	47.	Zhong Y, Tan YW, Liu DX. 2012. Recent progress in studies of arterivirus-
671		and coronavirus-host interactions. Viruses 4: 980-1010.
672	48.	Verheije M, Raaben M, Mari M, Te Lintelo E, Reggiori F, van Kuppeveld
673		F, Rottier P, de Haan C. 2008. Mouse hepatitis coronavirus RNA replication
674		depends on GBF1-mediated ARF1 activation. PLoS pathogens 4.
675	49.	Knoops K, Swett-Tapia C, van den Worm S, Te Velthuis A, Koster A,
676		Mommaas A, Snijder E, Kikkert M. 2010. Integrity of the early secretory
677		pathway promotes, but is not required for, severe acute respiratory
678		syndrome coronavirus RNA synthesis and virus-induced remodeling of
679		endoplasmic reticulum membranes. Journal of virology 84:833-846.
680	<i>50.</i>	Prentice E, Jerome W, Yoshimori T, Mizushima N, Denison M. 2004.
681		Coronavirus replication complex formation utilizes components of cellular
682		autophagy. The Journal of biological chemistry 279:10136-10141.
683	51.	Snijder E, van der Meer Y, Zevenhoven-Dobbe J, Onderwater J, van der
684		Meulen J, Koerten H, Mommaas A. 2006. Ultrastructure and origin of
685		membrane vesicles associated with the severe acute respiratory syndrome
686		coronavirus replication complex. Journal of virology 80:5927-5940.
687	<i>52.</i>	Zhao Z, Thackray L, Miller B, Lynn T, Becker M, Ward E, Mizushima N,
688		Denison M, Virgin H. 2007. Coronavirus replication does not require the
689		autophagy gene ATG5. Autophagy 3: 581-585.
690	<i>53.</i>	Maier HJ, Britton P. 2012. Involvement of autophagy in coronavirus
691		renlication Viruses 4:3440-3451

692	<i>54.</i>	Richards AL, Jackson WT. 2013. How positive-strand RNA viruses benefit
693		from autophagosome maturation. J Virol 87:9966-9972.
694	<i>55.</i>	Maier HJ, Cottam EM, Stevenson-Leggett P, Wilkinson JA, Harte CJ,
695		Wileman T, Britton P. 2013. Visualizing the autophagy pathway in avian
696		cells and its application to studying infectious bronchitis virus. Autophagy
697		9: 496-509.
698	56.	Reggiori F, Monastyrska I, Verheije MH, Cali T, Ulasli M, Bianchi S,
699		Bernasconi R, de Haan CA, Molinari M. 2010. Coronaviruses Hijack the
700		LC3-I-positive EDEMosomes, ER-derived vesicles exporting short-lived ERAD
701		regulators, for replication. Cell host & microbe 7:500-508.
702	<i>57.</i>	Calì T, Galli C, Olivari S, Molinari M. 2008. Segregation and rapid
703		turnover of EDEM1 by an autophagy-like mechanism modulates standard
704		ERAD and folding activities. Biochemical and biophysical research
705		communications 371: 405-410.
706	58.	Bernasconi R, Galli C, Noack J, Bianchi S, de Haan CA, Reggiori F,
707		Molinari M. 2012. Role of the SEL1L:LC3-I complex as an ERAD tuning
708		receptor in the mammalian ER. Mol Cell 46:809-819.
709	<i>59.</i>	Noack J, Bernasconi R, Molinari M. 2014. How viruses hijack the ERAD
710		tuning machinery. J Virol.
711	60.	Monastyrska I, Ulasli M, Rottier PJ, Guan JL, Reggiori F, de Haan CA.
712		2013. An autophagy-independent role for LC3 in equine arteritis virus
713		replication. Autophagy 9: 164-174.
714	61.	Sharma M, Bhattacharyya S, Nain M, Kaur M, Sood V, Gupta V, Khasa R,
715		Abdin M, Vrati S, Kalia M. 2014. Japanese Encephalitis Virus Replication is
716		Negatively Regulated by Autophagy and Occurs on LC3-I- and EDEM1-
717		containing Membranes. Autophagy 10: 54-53.
718	<i>62.</i>	Neuman BW. 2013. How the double spherules of infectious bronchitis virus
719		impact our understanding of RNA virus replicative organelles. mBio
720		4 :e00987-00913.
721	63.	Romero-Brey I, Bartenschlager R. 2014. Membranous Replication
722		Factories Induced by Plus-Strand RNA Viruses. Viruses 6: 2826-2857.
723	64.	Belov GA, Sztul E. 2014. Rewiring of Cellular Membrane Homeostasis by
724		Picornaviruses. J Virol 88: 9478-9489.

Bestebroer J, V'Kovski P, Mauthe M, Reggiori F. 2013. Hidden behind 725 65. 726 autophagy: the unconventional roles of ATG proteins. Traffic 14:1029-1041. 727 66. Sawicki SG, Sawicki DL, Younker D, Meyer Y, Thiel V, Stokes H, Siddell 728 SG. 2005. Functional and genetic analysis of coronavirus replicase-729 transcriptase proteins. PLoS pathogens 1:e39. 730 67. Ulasli M, Verheije MH, de Haan CA, Reggiori F. 2010. Qualitative and 731 quantitative ultrastructural analysis of the membrane rearrangements 732 induced by coronavirus. Cellular microbiology **12:**844-861. 733 68. **Wood O, Tauraso N, Liebhaber H.** 1970. Electron microscopic study of 734 tissue cultures infected with simian haemorrhagic fever virus. The Journal of 735 general virology 7:129-136. 736 69. Pedersen KW, van der Meer Y, Roos N, Snijder EJ. 1999. Open reading 737 frame 1a-encoded subunits of the arterivirus replicase induce endoplasmic 738 reticulum-derived double-membrane vesicles which carry the viral 739 replication complex. Journal of virology 73:2016-2026. 740 Pol JM, Wagenaar F, Reus JE. 1997. Comparative morphogenesis of three *70.* 741 PRRS virus strains. Veterinary microbiology **55:**203-208. 742 71. Thuy NT, Huy TQ, Nga PT, Morita K, Dunia I, Benedetti L. 2013. A new nidovirus (NamDinh virus NDiV): Its ultrastructural characterization in the 743 744 C6/36 mosquito cell line. Virology 444:337-342. 745 72. Hsu NY, Ilnytska O, Belov G, Santiana M, Chen YH, Takvorian PM, Pau C, 746 van der Schaar H, Kaushik-Basu N, Balla T, Cameron CE, Ehrenfeld E, 747 van Kuppeveld FJ, Altan-Bonnet N. 2010. Viral reorganization of the 748 secretory pathway generates distinct organelles for RNA replication. Cell 749 **141:**799-811. 750 *73.* Richards AL, Soares-Martins JA, Riddell GT, Jackson WT. 2014. 751 Generation of unique poliovirus RNA replication organelles. MBio 5:e00833-752 00813. 753 Teterina NL, Bienz K, Egger D, Gorbalenya AE, Ehrenfeld E. 1997. 74. 754 Induction of intracellular membrane rearrangements by HAV proteins 2C 755 and 2BC. Virology 237:66-77.

endoplasmic reticulum by poliovirus infection and by individual viral

Suhy DA, Giddings TH, Jr., Kirkegaard K. 2000. Remodeling the

756

757

75.

758		proteins: an autophagy-like origin for virus-induced vesicles. Journal of
759		virology 74: 8953-8965.
760	76.	Roberts IM, Harrison BD. 1970. Inclusion bodies and tubular structures in
761		Chenopodium amaranticolor plants infected with strawberry latent
762		ringspot virus. The Journal of general virology 7:47-54.
763	<i>77.</i>	Edwardson JR, Christie RG. 1978. Use of virus-induced inclusions in
764		classification and diagnosis. Ann Rev Phytopathol 16:31-55.
765	78.	Rudzinska-Langwald A. 1990. Cytological changes in phloem parenchyma
766		cells of Solanum rostratum (Dunal.) related to the replication of potato
767		virus M (PVM). Acta Societatis Botanicorum Poloniae 59:45-53.
768	<i>79.</i>	Lesemann DE. 1977. Virus group-specific and virus-specific cytological
769		alterations induced by members of the tymovirus group. J Phytopathol
770		90: 315-336.
771	80.	Guix S, Caballero S, Bosch A, Pinto RM. 2004. C-terminal nsP1a protein of
772		human astrovirus colocalizes with the endoplasmic reticulum and viral
773		RNA. Journal of virology 78: 13627-13636.
774	81.	Mendez E, Aguirre-Crespo G, Zavala G, Arias CF. 2007. Association of the
775		astrovirus structural protein VP90 with membranes plays a role in virus
776		morphogenesis. Journal of virology 81: 10649-10658.
777	82.	Moreira AG, Kitajima EW, Rezende JAM. 2010. Identification and partial
778		characterization of a Carica papaya-infecting isolate of Alfalfa mosaic virus
779		in Brazil. J Gen Plant Pathol 76: 172-175.
780	83.	Schwartz M, Chen J, Janda M, Sullivan M, den Boon J, Ahlquist P. 2002. A
781		positive-strand RNA virus replication complex parallels form and function of
782		retrovirus capsids. Molecular cell 9: 505-514.
783	84.	Schwartz M, Chen J, Lee WM, Janda M, Ahlquist P. 2004. Alternate, virus-
784		induced membrane rearrangements support positive-strand RNA virus
785		genome replication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
786		United States of America 101:11263-11268.
787	<i>85.</i>	Medina V, Tian T, Wierzchos J, Falk BW. 1998. Specific inclusion bodies
788		are associated with replication of lettuce infectious yellows virus RNAs in
789		Nicotiana benthamiana protoplasts. The Journal of general virology 79 (Pt
790		10): 2325-2329.

/91	86.	Gillespie LK, Hoenen A, Morgan G, Mackenzie JM. 2010. The enaoplasmic
792		reticulum provides the membrane platform for biogenesis of the flavivirus
793		replication complex. Journal of virology 84:10438-10447.
794	<i>87.</i>	Welsch S, Miller S, Romero-Brey I, Merz A, Bleck CK, Walther P, Fuller
795		SD, Antony C, Krijnse-Locker J, Bartenschlager R. 2009. Composition and
796		three-dimensional architecture of the dengue virus replication and
797		assembly sites. Cell host & microbe 5: 365-375.
798	88.	Romero-Brey I, Merz A, Chiramel A, Lee JY, Chlanda P, Haselman U,
799		Santarella-Mellwig R, Habermann A, Hoppe S, Kallis S, Walther P,
800		Antony C, Krijnse-Locker J, Bartenschlager R. 2012. Three-dimensional
801		architecture and biogenesis of membrane structures associated with
802		hepatitis C virus replication. PLoS pathogens 8:e1003056.
803	89.	Miller S, Kastner S, Krijnse-Locker J, Buhler S, Bartenschlager R. 2007.
804		The non-structural protein 4A of dengue virus is an integral membrane
805		protein inducing membrane alterations in a 2K-regulated manner. J Biol
806		Chem 282: 8873-8882.
807	90.	Roosendaal J, Westaway EG, Khromykh A, Mackenzie JM. 2006.
808		Regulated cleavages at the West Nile virus NS4A-2K-NS4B junctions play a
809		major role in rearranging cytoplasmic membranes and Golgi trafficking of
810		the NS4A protein. Journal of virology 80:4623-4632.
811	91.	Egger D, Wolk B, Gosert R, Bianchi L, Blum HE, Moradpour D, Bienz K.
812		2002. Expression of hepatitis C virus proteins induces distinct membrane
813		alterations including a candidate viral replication complex. Journal of
814		virology 76: 5974-5984.
815	92.	Kopek BG, Settles EW, Friesen PD, Ahlquist P. 2010. Nodavirus-induced
816		membrane rearrangement in replication complex assembly requires
817		replicase protein a, RNA templates, and polymerase activity. Journal of
818		virology 84: 12492-12503.
819	93.	Kopek BG, Perkins G, Miller DJ, Ellisman MH, Ahlquist P. 2007. Three-
820		dimensional analysis of a viral RNA replication complex reveals a virus-
821		induced mini-organelle. PLoS biology 5: e220.

822	94.	Magliano D, Marshall JA, Bowden DS, Vardaxis N, Meanger J, Lee JY.
823		1998. Rubella virus replication complexes are virus-modified lysosomes.
824		Virology 240: 57-63.
825	<i>95.</i>	Fontana J, Lopez-Iglesias C, Tzeng WP, Frey TK, Fernandez JJ, Risco C.
826		2010. Three-dimensional structure of Rubella virus factories. Virology
827		405: 579-591.
828	96.	Salonen A, Vasiljeva L, Merits A, Magden J, Jokitalo E, Kaariainen L.
829		2003. Properly folded nonstructural polyprotein directs the semliki forest
830		virus replication complex to the endosomal compartment. Journal of
831		virology 77: 1691-1702.
832	9 <i>7.</i>	Barajas D, Jiang Y, Nagy PD. 2009. A unique role for the host ESCRT
833		proteins in replication of Tomato bushy stunt virus. PLoS pathogens
834		5 :e1000705.
835	98.	Krogh A, Larsson B, von Heijne G, Sonnhammer EL. 2001. Predicting
836		transmembrane protein topology with a hidden Markov model: application
837		to complete genomes. Journal of molecular biology 305:567-580.
838		
839		
840		

Figure 1
Click here to download high resolution image

