

#### Host cell-specific protein expression in

M. Postigo, A. Taoufik, L. Bell-Sakyi, C.P.J. Bekker, E. de Vries, W.I. Morrison, F. Jongejan

#### ▶ To cite this version:

M. Postigo, A. Taoufik, L. Bell-Sakyi, C.P.J. Bekker, E. de Vries, et al.. Host cell-specific protein expression in. Veterinary Microbiology, 2008, 128 (1-2), pp.136. 10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.09.023 . hal-00532332

#### HAL Id: hal-00532332 https://hal.science/hal-00532332

Submitted on 4 Nov 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### Accepted Manuscript

Title: Host cell-specific protein expression *in vitro* in *Ehrlichia ruminantium* 

Authors: M. Postigo, A. Taoufik, L. Bell-Sakyi, C.P.J. Bekker, E. de Vries, W.I. Morrison, F. Jongejan

PII:	S0378-1135(07)00478-6
DOI:	doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.09.023
Reference:	VETMIC 3836
To appear in:	VETMIC

 Received date:
 13-7-2007

 Revised date:
 21-9-2007

 Accepted date:
 26-9-2007

Please cite this article as: Postigo, M., Taoufik, A., Bell-Sakyi, L., Bekker, C.P.J., de Vries, E., Morrison, W.I., Jongejan, F., Host cell-specific protein expression *in vitro* in *Ehrlichia ruminantium*, *Veterinary Microbiology* (2007), doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.09.023

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



1 2	Host cell-specific protein expression in vitro in Ehrlichia ruminantium
3	M. Postigo <sup>a,b*</sup> , A. Taoufik <sup>a</sup> , L. Bell-Sakyi <sup>b</sup> , C. P. J. Bekker <sup>c</sup> , E. de Vries <sup>a</sup> ,
4	W. I. Morrison <sup>b</sup> and F. Jongejan <sup>a,d</sup>
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	<sup>a</sup> Utrecht Centre for Tick-borne Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht
10	University, P.O.Box 80165, 3508 TD Utrecht, The Netherlands
11	<sup>b</sup> Centre for Tropical Veterinary Medicine, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies,
12	University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush, Roslin, Midlothian EH25 9RG, Scotland, UK
13	<sup>c</sup> Department of Virology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, P.O.Box
14	80165, 3508 TD Utrecht, The Netherlands
15	<sup>d</sup> Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University
16	of Pretoria, 0110 Onderstepoort, South Africa
17	
18	Veterinary Microbiology
19	
20	*Corresponding author. Mailing address: Utrecht Centre for Tick-borne Diseases,
21	Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, P.O.Box 80165, 3508 TD Utrecht,
22	The Netherlands Tel.: +31-30-2536932, fax: +31-30-2546723
23	E-mail address: <u>m.postigo@vet.uu.nl</u>

$\mathbf{a}$	1
	4
_	

- 25
- 26

27 Abstract

28

Ehrlichia ruminantium, a tick-transmitted pathogen, is the causative agent of heartwater 29 30 in ruminants. In this study, a proteomic approach was used to identify host cell-specific 31 E. ruminantium proteins encoded by the map1 multigene family, expressed in vitro in 32 bovine endothelial and tick cell cultures. Two-dimensional gel electrophoresis combined 33 with mass spectrometry analysis was used to establish the identities of immunodominant proteins. Proteins extracted from E. ruminantium-infected endothelial cells were shown 34 35 to be products of the map1 gene, whereas tick cell-derived E. ruminantium proteins were products of a different gene, map1-1. The expressed proteins were found to be 36 37 glycosylated. Differential expression of MAP1 family proteins in vitro in mammalian 38 and tick cell cultures indicates that the *map1* multigene family might be involved in the 39 adaptation of E. ruminantium to the mammalian host and vector tick.

40

41

42 Keywords: *Ehrlichia ruminantium*; *map1* multigene family; proteomics; protein
43 expression; tick cell lines.

44

#### 46 Introduction

47

48 obligately intracellular rickettsial pathogen Ehrlichia ruminantium, The 49 transmitted by Amblyomma ticks, causes the economically important disease heartwater of domestic ruminants in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean (Uilenberg, 1983). 50 51 Within the mammalian host and tick vector, E. ruminantium organisms sequentially 52 occupy different cellular environments, including mammalian neutrophils and reticulo-53 endothelial cells, and tick midgut and salivary glands (Prozesky and Du Plessis, 1987). 54 To successfully invade and multiply within all these cell types, the pathogen requires life cycle stage-specific adaptations which are likely to be reflected in differential gene 55 56 transcription and protein expression.

57 In E. ruminantium, the immunodominant major surface protein expressed in the 58 mammalian host, MAP1, is encoded by a member of a multigene family comprising 16 59 paralogs (van Heerden et al., 2004) which are differentially transcribed in vitro in 60 endothelial and tick cell cultures (van Heerden et al., 2004; Bekker et al., 2005) and in vivo in tick midguts and salivary glands (Postigo et al., 2007). It is important to 61 62 determine which proteins from the *E. ruminantium map1* cluster, other than MAP1 which is located on the surface of mammalian-stage elementary bodies (Jongejan et al., 1991), 63 64 are actually expressed and if they are differentially expressed in tick and mammalian cell 65 environments. In the present study a proteomic approach was used to identify E. 66 ruminantium proteins, encoded by the map1 cluster, which might be differentially 67 expressed *in vitro* in bovine endothelial and tick cell cultures, and additional analysis was 68 carried out to determine the glycosylation status of the expressed proteins.

#### 69 Materials and methods

70

71 Growth and harvest of E. ruminantium from in vitro cell cultures. The CTVM 72 subpopulation of the Gardel isolate of *E. ruminantium* (Uilenberg et al., 1985; Bekker et al., 2005) was cultured at 37 °C in bovine umbilical cord endothelial (BUE) cells; and at 73 31 °C in non-vector Ixodes scapularis (IDE8), and vector Amblyomma variegatum 74 (AVL/CTVM13), tick cell lines as described previously (Jongejan, 1991; Bell-Sakvi, 75 76 2004). When E. ruminantium-infected BUE cultures showed about 90 % cytolysis, or at 77 least 10 % of the tick cells were infected, the cells and supernate were harvested and centrifuged at 15000 g for 20 min at 4 °C. The resultant pellets containing both infected 78 cells and free E. ruminantium organisms were frozen at -20 °C until used for protein 79 80 extraction. Uninfected endothelial and tick cell cultures were harvested in the same way.

81

82 Soluble and membrane-bound proteins were extracted by Protein extraction. 83 resuspending the thawed cell pellets in 10 mM Tris, 10 mM NaCl, 0.5 % Nonidet P40, 2 84 % CHAPS and 1X of Complete® protease inhibitor (Roche). The suspensions were 85 mixed on a shaker platform at 100 rpm for 45 min at 4 °C and then centrifuged at 15000 g for 20 min at 4 °C. The supernatants were recovered and passed through a protein 86 87 desalting spin column (Pierce) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Desalted 88 proteins were diluted 1:10 in PBS and the protein concentration measured in a Ceres UV 89 900C ELISA reader (Biotek Instruments) according to the Bradford protein assay method 90 (Bradford, 1976).

92 SDS-PAGE and Western blot analysis. Protein samples (5-10 µg), were solubilised in 93 1X Laemmli sample buffer and heated for 5 min at 90°C. Once cooled, 15-20 µl samples 94 were loaded onto 12.5% acrylamide gels, with a bisacrylamide/acrylamide ratio of 1:37.5 95 (Bio-Rad Laboratories). Electrophoresis was performed in a Hoefer Scientific cell 96 apparatus at 20mAmp per gel for 1 h at room temperature in a 50 mM Tris-glycine buffer. 97 Separated proteins were immediately transferred to nitrocellulose (Whatman) membranes 98 at 38mAmp per gel per hour in a LKB MultiphorII blotter unit (Pharmacia). Blots were 99 stained with 8% Direct Blue 71 (0.1% in water) in 40% ethanol and 10% acetic acid 100 solution, then scanned, destained in destaining solution (96% ethanol, 1M NaHCO<sub>3</sub>) and 101 kept in deionised water. Non-specific binding was reduced by incubating the membranes 102 for 1 hour at 37°C in blocking buffer consisting of 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 9), 0.9% NaCl, 0.05% Tween 20 (TBS), with 5% skimmed milk (Elk Campina, The Netherlands) added 103 104 just before use (TBSM). The membranes were incubated with specific antibodies 105 (diluted in TBSM) overnight at 4°C. Blots containing E. ruminantium-infected and 106 uninfected endothelial and tick cell protein extracts were incubated with pre-infection and 4 weeks post-infection sera, diluted 1:250, from a sheep immunised with supernatant 107 108 from E. ruminantium (Gardel)-infected endothelial cell cultures, to identify E. 109 ruminantium immunodominant proteins. Monoclonal antibodies 4F10B4 and 1E5H8, 110 reactive with an *E. ruminantium* (Welgevonden) 32 kDa protein identified as MAP1 111 (Jongejan and Thielemans, 1989; Jongejan et al., 1991), were used at dilutions of 1:2000 112 and 1:200 respectively to identify MAP1 cluster proteins. Incubation with the appropriate 113 horseradish peroxidase-conjugated anti-species immunoglobulin secondary antibody 114 (DAKO) (diluted 1:2000 or according to the manufacturer's instructions) was carried out

for 1 h at room temperature. The membranes were washed three times with TBS for 5 min after each incubation step. Finally the membranes were incubated with enhanced chemiluminescence detection reagents (Amersham Biosciences) and exposed to X-ray films (Hyperfilm, Amersham Biosciences).

119

Two dimensional gel electrophoresis (2DE). Protein samples (10-30 µg) were mixed 120 with rehydration solution (7 M urea, 2 M thiourea, 4 % CHAPS, 0.3 % DTT, 0.5 % 3-10 121 122 NL IPG buffer, 1 X of Complete® protease inhibitor and a trace of bromophenol blue) 123 and resolved at 20 °C in the first dimension by isoelectric focusing (IEF) in an IPGphor 124 (Amersham Pharmacia Biotech) using 7 cm long, pH 3 to 10, precast immobilised 125 nonlinear pH gradient strips (Amersham Pharmacia Biotech). The IEF parameters were as 126 follows: rehydration of the strips was carried out for 15 hours at 30 volts, followed by 500 volts  $\times$  30 min, 1000 volts  $\times$  30 min and 5000 volts  $\times$  100 min. At the end of the 127 128 IEF, the strips were equilibrated sequentially for 15 min in 5 ml each of equilibration buffers I (50 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.8], 6 M urea, 2 % SDS, 30 % glycerol and 10 mg ml<sup>-1</sup> 129 DTT) and II (50 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.8], 6 M urea, 2 % SDS, 30 % glycerol and 25 mg 130 ml<sup>-1</sup> of iodoacetamide). Subsequently, second-dimension SDS-polyacrylamide gel 131 132 electrophoresis was performed as described above. The 2DE resolved gels were stained 133 with either silver (Merck) or Coomassie blue (Bio-Rad) or used to perform Western blot 134 analysis.

135

Cloning and expression of recombinant proteins MAP1 and MAP1-1. Expression of
the recombinant MAP1-GST fusion protein (fragment F1R4, approximately 50 kDa) was

138 performed as described in Van Vliet et al. (1995). The full length of the *map1-1* gene 139 was amplified by using a sense primer containing a *BamHI* restriction site (MAP1-1F2, 140 5'-GCGAGCGGATCCGAACCTGTAAGTTCAAAT), and an anti-sense primer 141 containing Sall restriction site (MAP1-1R3, 5'а 142 GCGAGCGTCGACGAAAGTAAACCTTACTCCA). The positions of these primers are 143 respectively 15099-15116bp and 15851-15869bp on the Genbank accession nr. 144 AF319940. The PCR product was cut with *BamHI* and *SalI* and ligated to pQE9 plasmid 145 cut with the same enzymes. Ligation was done with T4 ligase and 5x ligase buffer 146 (Promega). The recombinant pQE9 plasmid was transferred into E. coli strain M15. 147 Positive clones were tested for incorporation of the correct insert by carrying out a PCR 148 with specific primers. Inserts were checked by digestion with BamHI & Sall and 149 sequencing. Expression of the recombinant MAP1-1 protein (approximately 30 kDa) was 150 done using the QIA expressionist kit (QIAGEN) according to the manufacturer's 151 instructions. Expression of MAP1-GST and MAP1-1 His-Tag recombinant proteins was 152 confirmed by SDS-PAGE electrophoresis and immunoblotting.

153

MALDItof MS analysis. Protein spots excised from the gels were digested in gel with trypsin (Promega) in 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate (Sigma). Before Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization Time-Of-Flight (MALDI-TOF) analysis (carried out at the Moredun Research Institute, Scotland), peptides were concentrated using  $\mu$ C18-ZipTips (Millipore) and eluted directly on the MALDI-target in 1  $\mu$ l of a saturated solution of  $\alpha$ cyanohydroxycinnamic acid in 50 % acetonitrile. Peptides were analysed using a Voyager DE-PRO MALDI-TOF mass spectrometer (Applied Biosystems) operated in

reflectron mode at 20 kV accelerating voltage. The resulting peptide mass fingerprints were subjected to an NCBI-nr database search using the Mascot search programmes, wherein MOWSE scores greater than 76 are considered significant p<0.05 (www.matrixscience.com). Alignment of MAP1 and MAP1-1 was performed using the Clustal-X programme, and potential N- and O-glycosylation sites (showing G-scores higher than 0.4) were predicted using the NetNGlyc 1.0 and NetOGlyc 3.1 servers respectively (Julenius et al., 2005).

168

169 **Glycosylation analysis.** Glycoprotein staining was performed on proteins resolved by 170 2DE using the Pro-Q Emerald 300 staining method according to the manufacturer's 171 protocol (Molecular Probes). Images of the stained gels were captured using a UV 172 transilluminator (UVP Bio imaging System). The gels were restained with silver nitrate 173 according to the manufacturer's protocol to detect total protein present in the gels. A 174 Candy Cane glycoprotein molecular weight standard (Molecular Probes) was used as a 175 positive control for glycoprotein detection and protein size determinations. To further demonstrate glycosylation, protein extracts were treated using the GlycoProfile<sup>™</sup> IV 176 177 chemical deglycosylation kit (Sigma-Aldrich). Briefly, 10-20 µg of lyophilised total 178 protein, extracted from *E. ruminantium*-infected endothelial and tick cell cultures, were 179 mixed gently with trifluoromethanesulfonic (TFMS) acid and incubated at -20° C for 30 180 min. After incubation, bromophenol blue and pyridine solution were added to the mix 181 and neutralised deglycosylated glycoproteins were purified using the protein desalting 182 spin column (Pierce) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Proteins were 183 concentrated by TCA precipitation and resuspended in10 mM Tris, 10 mM NaCl, 0.5 %

Nonidet P40, 2 % CHAPS and 1X of Complete® protease inhibitor (Roche).
Subsequently, 2DE was carried out and deglycosylated proteins were stained with the
Pro-Q Emerald 300 staining method and restained with silver nitrate according to the
manufacturer's protocol.

#### 189 **Results**

190

191 Immunodominant E. ruminantium proteins. Proteins from uninfected or E. 192 ruminantium-infected BUE, IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13 cells were separated by SDS-193 PAGE and transferred to nitrocellulose membranes. When probed with sera from sheep 194 inoculated with endothelial cell-derived E. ruminantium, the post-inoculation serum 195 reacted with three proteins, of approximately 29 kDa, 30 kDa and 32 kDa, extracted from 196 E. ruminantium-infected endothelial cell cultures, but with only one protein in the same 197 molecular weight region (~30 kDa) extracted from E. ruminantium-infected tick cells. 198 The pre-inoculation serum did not reveal any protein bands (Fig. 1).

199

200 Identification of 2DE-separated E. ruminantium proteins by Western blot analysis. 201 In order to identify which proteins of the MAP1 multigene family were expressed in 202 *vitro*, proteins derived from uninfected and *E. ruminantium*-infected endothelial and tick 203 cell cultures were resolved by 2DE and silver stained. Differences in the protein profiles of samples from uninfected and E. ruminantium-infected sources were apparent by 204 205 comparing the stained gels, especially in the area of 24 to 37 kDa size range, where 206 MAP1 family proteins are expected to migrate since their predicted molecular weights 207 range from 24 to 35 kDa (van Heerden et al, 2004) (Fig. 2a-f).

The main differences included a group of proteins around 30 kDa, with p*I* values between 4.5 and 6.0, present only in infected samples of the three culture systems (BUE, IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13). Comparison of the pattern of proteins from *E. ruminantium*–infected endothelial cell cultures with those derived from tick cells revealed a higher density of

proteins, migrating between p*I* 4.5 and 5.5, with molecular weights of around 30kDa, in extracts of infected endothelial cells (Fig. 2a, 2b) compared with samples derived from *E*. *ruminantium*-infected tick cells, where a single row of proteins of around 30 kDa, migrating widely between p*I* 4.5 and 6.0, was observed (Fig. 2c-f).

216 Western blotting analysis showed that the row of approximately 30 kDa proteins in each 217 cell type (Fig. 3a) was recognised by post-infection sheep serum and not by pre-infection 218 serum, indicating that they represented immunodominant *E. ruminantium* proteins (Fig. 219 3b, 3c). The same sera did not recognise any spots of this size in uninfected endothelial 220 and tick cell protein extracts (data not shown). In addition, the MAP1-reactive 221 monoclonal antibody 4F10B4 reacted with the rows of proteins in both endothelial and 222 tick cells infected with E. ruminantium (Fig. 3d) whereas only spots present in infected 223 endothelial cells were recognised by the MAP1-reactive monoclonal antibody 1E5H8 224 (Fig. 3e).

225

Expression of recombinant proteins and monoclonal antibody specificity. Since the 226 227 MAP1 protein has been found to be predominant in E. ruminantium-infected endothelial 228 cell cultures (Jongejan and Thielemans, 1989; Jongejan et al., 1991) and transcripts of the 229 *map1-1* gene predominated in infected tick cells (Bekker et al., 2005), expression of 230 recombinant MAP1 and MAP1-1 proteins was carried out to define the specificity of 231 monoclonal antibodies 4F10B4 and 1E5H8. Expression of recombinant proteins was 232 confirmed by SDS-PAGE (Fig. 4a). Immunoblotting of recombinant proteins with the 233 monoclonal antibodies demonstrated specificity of 1E5H8 antibodies for the MAP1 234 protein, whereas 4F10B4 reacted with both MAP1 and MAP1-1 recombinant proteins

(Fig. 4b). These results indicated that the immunodominant *E. ruminantium* proteins
expressed in endothelial and tick cells *in vitro* were not identical.

237

238 Identification by MALDI tof MS analysis of host cell-specific protein expression by 239 the E. ruminantium map1 cluster. In order to definitively identify the most abundant 240 proteins expressed in the three culture systems, the three most prominent spots within the 241 30 kDa region of gels prepared from infected BUE cells (spots B1, B2, B3) and tick cells 242 (spots Is1, Is2 and Is3 in IDE8 and Av1, Av2, and Av3 in AVL/CTVM13) were excised 243 and submitted to MALDItof MS analysis (Fig. 3a). All fingerprint analyses showed 244 MOWSE scores greater than 76 (between 86 and 113 for B1, B2 and B3; between 83 and 245 127 for Is1, Is2, and Is3; and between 85 and 116 for Av1, Av2, and Av3) and therefore 246 were considered a significant match for the proteins. The proteins expressed in BUE 247 cells were encoded by the *map1* gene, while the proteins extracted from *E. ruminantium*-248 infected tick cell cultures, both IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13, were all found to be products 249 of the *map1-1* gene. Similar results were obtained using E. ruminantium-infected 250 cultures from different passage level and protein batch extractions (results not shown). 251 The identified peptides are indicated on an alignment of MAP1 and MAP1-1 sequences 252 for all nine recognised spots (Fig. 5). A slightly different set of peptides was identified 253 for each spot which could have resulted from differential post-translational modification. 254 Since predicted N- and O-linked glycosylation sites (shown within boxes in Fig. 5) were 255 found to be present in these regions of the proteins, they were further analysed for 256 glycosylation.

258 **Identification of glycoproteins.** Glycoprotein staining revealed that all three forms of 259 MAP1 expressed in E. ruminantium-infected endothelial cells, and all three forms of 260 MAP1-1 expressed in both E. ruminantium-infected tick cell lines were glycoproteins 261 (Fig. 6a; although all three spots from AVL/CTVM13 are not well-reproduced in the 262 photograph, they were clearly visible in the original gel). Glycosylation was confirmed 263 by staining of two positive control proteins of 42 kDa and 82 kDa included in the Candy 264 Cane molecular marker (Fig. 6a, 6b). Chemical deglycosylation of proteins extracted 265 from E. ruminantium-infected cultures further demonstrated the glycosylated nature of 266 these proteins. E. ruminantium-infected BUE, IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13 protein samples 267 treated with TFMS acid no longer stained for glycoproteins while the control 42 kDa and 268 82 kDa glycoproteins of the Candy Cane molecular marker remained positive (results not 269 shown). Furthermore, when these gels were restained with silver nitrate, the rows of 270 spots that were previously located in the area between pI 4.5 and 6.0 (Fig. 7a), were 271 found to have shifted to the right (between pI 6.0 and 9.0) (Fig. 7b). To confirm that the 272 spots in the post-deglycosylation gels were in fact deglycosylated E. ruminantium MAP1 273 family proteins, blots were prepared and reacted with monoclonal antibody 4F10B4. The 274 most prominent spot in treated E. ruminantium-infected BUE and all the spots in treated 275 E. ruminantium-infected IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13 were recognised by 4F10B4, 276 indicating that the spots were deglycosylated forms of MAP1 family proteins (Fig. 7c). 277 The reactivity of the monoclonal antibody with the deglycosylated forms of the proteins 278 was in general weaker than that observed previously with the corresponding 279 glycoproteins.

# 281282 Discussion

283 The present study identified the antigenic E. ruminantium MAP1 family proteins 284 predominantly expressed in infected bovine endothelial and tick cell cultures. Reaction 285 with immune serum in one-dimensional Western blots revealed several proteins between 286 29 and 32 kDa in E. ruminantium-infected endothelial cells and a single band, of 287 approximately 30 kDa, in *E. ruminantium*-infected tick cells. In 2DE blots, the ~30 kDa 288 proteins from infected endothelial and tick cells were strongly recognised by immune 289 serum and MAP1-reactive monoclonal antibody 4F10B4, while monoclonal antibody 290 1E5H8 only reacted with the proteins expressed in endothelial cells. Expression of 291 recombinant proteins and Western blotting with the same monoclonal antibodies 292 indicated that the protein spots identified in endothelial and tick cell systems represented 293 different proteins, since recombinant MAP1 reacted with both 4F10B4 and 1E5H8, while 294 recombinant MAP1-1 only reacted with 4F10B4. MALDItof MS analysis revealed that 295 the row of proteins around 30 kDa in extracts from endothelial cells represented 296 expressed products of *map1*, whereas those detected in extracts from both tick cell lines 297 were products of the *map1-1* gene.

*E. chaffeensis* and *E. canis*, the causative agents of human and canine monocytic ehrlichiosis respectively, and the pathogens most closely related to *E. ruminantium*, possess gene clusters encoding outer membrane proteins, commonly referred to as the p28- and p30-Omps respectively, which are orthologous to the MAP1 multigene family (van Heerden et al., 2004). Singu et al. (2006) demonstrated that the P28/P30 proteins expressed *in vitro* in infected canine macrophage cell cultures included the orthologs of the map1 (p28-Omp19 and p30-1) and map1+1 (p28-Omp20 and p30-20) genes whereas

305 in vector (Amblyomma americanum) and non-vector (I. scapularis) tick cell lines, the 306 ortholog of map1-1 (p28-Omp14 and p30-10) was detected. Since many map1 gene 307 paralogs appear to be transcribed in different tick cell lines (Bekker et al., 2005), it is 308 interesting that only one paralog appears to be dominantly translated in tick cell culture 309 systems. In contrast, in endothelial cell cultures, in which all 16 map1 paralogs are 310 transcribed (van Heerden et al., 2004; Bekker et al., 2005), immune serum recognised 311 several proteins in the 29-32 kDa range in Western blots and many E. ruminantium-312 specific protein spots were present in the 24–37 kDa range in 2DE gels, although we 313 were only able to subject the three major ~30 kDa spots to MALDItof MS analysis. It is 314 possible that some of the additional spots observed in the silver-stained gels and blots 315 represented different MAP1 family proteins, since 14 out of 16 proteins of the MAP1 316 family are predicted to have signal peptides and to be situated at the surface of the 317 bacterial cell (Collins et al., 2005). Recently Ge and Rikihisa (2007) reported that 19 out 318 of 22 p28 family proteins were expressed at the protein level in E. chaffeensis cultured in 319 human monocytic leukemia THP-1 cells; the p28-Omp14 (ortholog of map1-1) was not 320 detected in these cultures. Altogether these results indicate that *Ehrlichia* pathogens 321 consistently exhibit a differential pattern of expression of multigene family surface 322 proteins between host and vector cells in vitro.

An interesting observation was the identification in 2DE gels of MAP1 and MAP1-1 proteins in rows of spots with the same molecular size but different p*I*, which could be explained by the presence of post-translational modifications. Different degrees of glycosylation at a single site in a single protein can result in "trains" of protein spots that separate on the basis of different isoelectric point and/or molecular mass in 2DE gels

328 (Sickmann et al., 2002). Moreover, location of the detected peptides in the alignment of
329 MAP1 and MAP1-1 proteins showed predicted glycosylation sites in the different
330 sequences which might be responsible for the differences in migration detected in 2DE
331 gels. By applying chemical deglycosylation in combination with immunoblotting for
332 definitive detection of p*I*-shifted spots, we confirmed the glycosylated nature of MAP1
333 family proteins.

334 Glycosylation of immunodominant proteins has been reported in *Ehrlichia* spp. (McBride 335 et al., 2000, 2003, 2007; Doyle et al., 2006), and evidence of glycosylation of P28-OMP1 336 proteins in *E. chaffeensis* has been demonstrated (Singu et al., 2005). Doyle et al. (2006) 337 reported substantially lower immunoreactivity of immune sera against nonglycosylated 338 synthetic peptides from E. canis gp36 and E. chaffeensis gp47 than against the 339 corresponding recombinant glycosylated proteins, suggesting that glycans are important 340 epitope determinants. The major surface proteins MSP1a and MSP1b of the closely-341 related pathogen Anaplasma marginale have been shown to be glycosylated and it was 342 suggested that the glycosylation of MSP1a plays a role in the adhesion of the organism to 343 tick cells (Garcia-Garcia et al., 2004).

Expression of the MAP1 protein was not detected in the present study in organisms grown in the tick cell lines, although transcription of *map1* has been detected in salivary glands of infected ticks during feeding and in organisms growing in tick cell cultures (Bekker et al., 2002, 2005; Postigo et al., 2007). MAP1 expression by tick cells *in vitro* cannot be ruled out, as the detection techniques used were of relatively low sensitivity. The IDE8 cells resemble haemocytes (Munderloh et al., 1996) while AVL/CTVM13 comprises a variety of cells including haemocytes and could contain

351 differentiated midgut cells since it was established from moulting larvae (Bell-Sakvi, 352 2004), but neither line contains recognisable differentiated salivary gland cells, which 353 might be necessary for development in vitro of E. ruminantium salivary gland stages 354 expressing MAP1. On the other hand, organisms grown in both vector and non-vector 355 tick cell lines expressed MAP1-1 protein, in line with the detection of abundant 356 transcripts of the *map1-1* gene in *E. ruminantium*-infected midguts of *A. variegatum* ticks 357 (Postigo et al. 2007) and in vector and non-vector tick cell lines (Bekker et al., 2002, 358 2005). Since both midgut and tick cell line stages have low infectivity for sheep 359 (Waghela et al., 1991; Bell-Sakyi et al., 2002), these results suggest that the MAP1-1 360 protein may be associated with colonisation and replication of *E. ruminantium* in the tick 361 midgut, rather than development of mammal-infective stages in the salivary glands. 362 Ganta et al. (2007) reported that E. chaffeensis grown in tick cells induced a cellular and 363 humoral immune response in experimentally-infected mice that was distinct from the 364 response following infection with the pathogen grown in mammalian cells. This response 365 was apparently related to the shift in gene expression from the tick cell-specific omp14 to 366 the macrophage-specific omp19. The different humoral immune responses observed in 367 sheep immunised with E. ruminantium derived from tick and mammalian cell cultures 368 (Bell-Sakyi et al., 2002) might similarly be related to the differences in MAP1 family 369 protein expression between the host cell types that we have described in the present 370 study.

The glycoproteins MAP1 and MAP1-1 and their orthologs in related pathogens have consistently been detected differentially in mammalian and tick cell culture systems respectively, regardless of transcription of other *map1* and orthologous genes in these

374	cultures. These results indicate the need for validation at the protein level of $E$ .											
375	ruminantium gene expression data, using proteomics technologies; and most											
376	significantly, support the hypothesis that MAP1 family proteins and their orthologs are											
377	important for <i>Ehrlichia</i> species in host adaptation and intracellular survival.											
378												
379												
380	Acknowledgements											
381												
382	The research described in this manuscript was supported by two consecutive grants from											
383	the European Union (ICA4-CT-2000-30026 and INCO-CT-2005-003713). The authors											
384	would like to thank Ulrike Munderloh for kindly providing the IDE8 cell line, Stuart											
385	Smith for access to unpublished results and Ana Yatsuda for excellent technical											
386	assistance.											
387												
388												
389	References											
390												
391	Bekker, C. P. J., Bell-Sakyi, L., Paxton, E. A., Martinez, D., Bensaid, A. and Jongejan,											
392	F., 2002. Transcriptional analysis of the major antigenic protein 1 multigene											
393	family of Cowdria ruminantium. Gene 285, 193-201.											
394												
395	Bekker, C. P. J., Postigo, M., Taoufik, A., Bell-Sakyi, L., Ferraz, C., Martinez, D. and											
396	Jongejan, F., 2005. Transcription analysis of the major antigenic protein 1											
397	multigene family of three in vitro-cultured Ehrlichia ruminantium isolates. J.											
398	Bacteriol. 187, 4782-4791.											
399												
400	Bell-Sakyi, L., 2004. Ehrlichia ruminantium grows in cell lines from four ixodid tick											
401	genera. J. Comp. Path. 130, 285-293.											
402												

403	Bell-Sakyi, L., Paxton, E. A., Wright, P. and Sumption, K. J., 2002. Immunogenicity of
404	Ehrlichia ruminantium grown in tick cell lines. Exp. Appl. Acarol. 28, 177-185.
405	
406	Bradford, M.M. (1976). A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram
407	quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. Anal. Biochem.
408	72, 248-254.
409	
410	Collins, N. E., Liebenberg, J., De Villiers, E. P., Brayton, K. A., Louw, E., Pretorius, A.,
411	Faber, F. E., van Heerden, H., Josemans, A. I., van Kleef, M., Steyn, H. C., van
412	Strijp, M. F., Zweygarth, E., Jongejan, F., Maillard, J. C., Berthier, D., Botha, M.,
413	Joubert, F., Corton, C. H., Thomson, N. R., Allsopp, M. T. and Allsopp, B. A.,
414	2005. The genome of the heartwater agent Ehrlichia ruminantium contains
415	multiple tandem repeats of actively variable copy number. PNAS 102, 838-843.
416	
417	Doyle, K. C., Nethery, K. A., Popov, V. L. and McBride, J. W., 2006. Differentially
418	expressed and secreted major immunoreactive protein orthologs of Ehrlichia
419	canis and E. chaffeensis elicit early antibody responses to epitopes on
420	glycosylated tandem repeats. Infect. Immun. 74, 711–720.
421	
422	Ganta, R. R., Cheng, C., Miller, E. C., McGuire, B. L., Peddireddi, L., Sirigireddy, K. R.
423	and Chapes, S. K., 2007. Differential clearance and immune responses to tick cell-
424	derived versus macrophage culture-derived Ehrlichia chaffeensis in mice. Infect.
425	Immun. 75, 135-145.
426	
427	Garcia-Garcia, J. C., de la Fuente, J., Bell-Eunice, G., Blouin, E. F. and Kocan, K. M.,
428	2004. Glycosylation of Anaplasma marginale major surface protein 1a and its
429	putative role in adhesion to tick cells. Infect. Immun. 72, 3022-3030.
430	
431	Ge Y. and Rikihisa Y., 2007. Surface-exposed Proteins of Ehrlichia chaffeensis. Infect
432	Immun. doi:10.1128/IAI.00188-07.
433	

434	Jongejan, F. and Thielemans, M. J. C., 1989. Identification of an immunodominant
435	antigenically conserved 32-kilodalton protein from Cowdria ruminantium. Infect.
436	Immun. 57, 3243-3246.
437	
438	Jongejan, F., 1991. Protective immunity to heartwater (Cowdria ruminantium infection)
439	is acquired after vaccination with in vitro-attenuated rickettsiae. Infect. Immun.
440	59,729-731.
441	
442	Jongejan, F., Thielemans, M. J. C., de Groot, M., van Kooten, P. J. S. and van der Zeijst,
443	B. A. M., 1991. Competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for heartwater
444	using monoclonal antibodies to a Cowdria ruminantium-specific 32- kilodalton
445	protein. Vet. Microbiol. 28, 199-211.
446	
447	Julenius, K., Mølgaard, A., Gupta, R. and Brunak, S., 2005. Prediction, conservation
448	analysis and structural characterization of mammalian mucin-type O-
449	glycosylation sites. Glycobiology 15, 153-164.
450	
451	McBride, J. W., Doyle, C. K., Zhang, X., Cardenas, A. M., Popov V. L., Nethery, K. A.
452	and Woods E. M., 2007. Identification of a glycosylated Ehrlichia canis 19-
453	kilodalton major immunoreactive protein with a species-specific serine-rich
454	glycopeptide epitope. Infect. Immun. 75, 74-82.
455	
456	McBride, J. W., Comer, J. E. and Walker, D. H., 2003. Novel immunoreactive
457	glycoprotein orthologs of Ehrlichia spp. Ann. N Y Acad. Sci. 990, 678-684.
458	
459	McBride, J. W., Yu, X. J. and Walker, D. H., 2000. Glycosylation of homologous
460	immunodominant proteins of Ehrlichia chaffeensis and Ehrlichia canis. Infect.
461	Immun. 68, 13-18.
462	
463	

464	Munderloh, U. G., Blouin E. F., Kocan, K. M., Ge, N. L., Edwards, W. L. and Kurtti T.
465	J., 1996. Establishment of the tick (Acari:Ixodidae)-borne cattle pathogen
466	Anaplasma marginale (Rickettsiales: Anaplasmataceae) in tick cell culture. J.
467	Med. Entomol. 33, 656-664.
468	
469	Postigo, M., Taoufik, A., Bell-Sakyi, L., de Vries, E., Morrison, W. I. and Jongejan. F.,
470	2007. Differential transcription of the major antigenic protein 1 multigene family
471	of Ehrlichia ruminantium in Amblyomma variegatum ticks. Vet. Microbiol. 122,
472	298-305.
473	
474	Prozesky, L. and J. L. Du Plessis 1987. Heartwater. The development and life cycle of
475	Cowdria ruminantium in the vertebrate host, ticks and cultured endothelial cells.
476	Onderstepoort J. Vet. Res. 54: 193-6.
477	
478	Sickmann, A., Mreyen, M. and Meyer, H. E., 2002. Identification of modified proteins by
479	mass spectrometry. IUBMB Life 54, 51-57.
480	
481	Singu, V., Liu, H., Cheng, C. and Ganta, R. R., 2005. Ehrlichia chaffeensis expresses
482	macrophage- and tick cell-specific 28-kilodalton outer membrane proteins. Infect.
483	Immun. 73, 79-87.
484	
485	Singu, V., Peddireddi, L., Sirigireddy, K. R., Cheng, C., Munderloh, U. and
486	Ganta, R. R., 2006. Unique macrophage and tick cell-specific protein expression
487	from the p28/p30-outer membrane protein multigene locus in Ehrlichia
488	chaffeensis and Ehrlichia canis. Cell. Microbiol. 8, 1475–1487.
489	
490	Uilenberg, G. (1983). Heartwater (Cowdria ruminantium infection): current status. Adv.
491	Vet. Sci. Comp. Med. 27, 427-480.
492	
493	

494	Uilenberg, G., Camus, E. and Barré, N., 1985. Quelques observations sur une souche de
495	Cowdria ruminantium isolée en Guadeloupe (Antilles francaises). Rev. Elev.
496	Med. vet. Pays trop. 38, 34-42.
497	
498	van Heerden, H., Collins, N. E., Brayton, K. A., Rademeyer, C. and Allsopp, B. A., 2004.
499	Characterization of a major outer membrane protein multigene family in Ehrlichia
500	<i>ruminantium</i> . Gene 330, 159-168.
501	
502	van Vliet, A. H. M., van der Zeijst, B. A. M., Camus, E., Mahan, S. M., Martinez, D. and
503	Jongejan., F., 1995. Use of a specific immunogenic region on the Cowdria
504	ruminantium MAP1 protein in a serological assay. J. Clin. Microbiol. 33, 2405-
505	2410.
506	
507	Waghela, S. D., Rurangirwa, F. R., Mahan, S. M., Yunker, C. E., Crawford, T. B.,
508	Barbet, A. F., Burridge, M. J. and McGuire T. C., 1991. A cloned DNA probe
509	identifies Cowdria ruminantium in Amblyomma variegatum ticks. J. Clin.
510	Microbiol. 29, 2571-2577.
511	
512	
513	
514	
515	
516	
517	
518	
510	
520	
520	
321	
522	
523	

524

#### 525 Figure legends

526

**Figure 1:** Western blots of 12.5% SDS-PAGE gels containing proteins extracted from *E. ruminantium*-infected bovine endothelial (BUE) and tick (IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13) cells. Blots were probed with pre- (1) and post- (2) infection sera of sheep inoculated with endothelial cell-derived *E. ruminantium*. Molecular size marker (M) in kilodaltons.

531

**Figure 2:** Two-dimensional SDS-PAGE gels of *E. ruminantium* grown *in vitro*. Total protein extracts from uninfected and *E. ruminantium*-infected BUE (a, b), IDE8 (c, d) and AVL/CTVM13 (e, f) cell cultures respectively, were subjected to 2DE analysis and silver-stained. The region of interest (approx. 24-37 kDa) is surrounded by a box in all panels. M: Molecular masses in kDa.

537

**Figure 3:** Total protein extracts from *E. ruminantium* grown in endothelial or tick cell cultures resolved by 2DE. (a) Gels were Coomassie blue-stained; spots analysed by MALDItof MS are indicated as B1, B2, B3 for BUE cells and Is1, Is2, Is3 and Av1, Av2 and Av3 for IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13 cells respectively. Blots from 2DE gels were probed with pre-infection (b) and post-infection (c) sheep serum; and monoclonal antibodies 4F10B4 (d) and 1E5H8 (e). M: Molecular masses in kDa.

544

**Figure 4:** SDS-PAGE electrophoresis of uninduced (0) and after 4 hours induced (4) *E. coli* cultures. MAP1-GST (~50 kDa) and MAP1-1 His-Tag (~30 kDa) recombinant proteins are indicated with asterisks (Panel A). Extracts containing recombinant proteins were transferred to membranes and reacted with monoclonal antibodies 4F10B4 and 1E5H8. U: Uninduced *E. coli* cultures (Panel B).

550

551

552

553

554

555

**Figure 5:** Amino acid sequence alignment of *E. ruminantium* MAP1 (Acc.no. CAI28368) and MAP1-1 (Acc.no. CAI28367) proteins identified by MS analysis. Identical residues between the two proteins are shown in the top row. The identified peptide sequences in B1, B2, B3 (bovine endothelial cells) (MAP1 proteins), Is1, Is2, Is3 (IDE8, the non-vector line) and Av1, Av2 and Av3 (AVL/CTVM13, the vector line) (MAP1-1 proteins) are shaded black, grey and light blue respectively. Predicted *N*- and *O*-linked glycosylation sites are enclosed in boxes.

563

**Figure 6:** Glycoprotein and total protein staining of *E. ruminantium* 2DE gels. Total protein extracts from *E. ruminantium* grown in BUE, IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13 cell cultures were resolved by 2DE. Gels were stained for glycoproteins (a) and re-stained with silver nitrate for total protein comparisons (b). Spots of MAP1 (BUE) and MAP1-1 (IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13) proteins are surrounded by boxes. Glycoprotein molecular weight standards are indicated on the right.

570

**Figure 7:** 2DE gels of total protein extracts from *E. ruminantium*-infected endothelial (BUE) and tick (IDE8 and AVL/CTVM13) cell cultures before (a) or after chemical deglycosylation (b). Deglycosylated protein samples were transferred to membranes and reacted with monoclonal antibody 4F10B4 (c). The spots of interest are surrounded by boxes in all panels. M: Molecular masses in kDa. p*I*: Isoelectric point.









		*	20		*		40		*			50		*	8	10				100		
	ML F	I LF :	C	NMN K	KI :	S LISL	SFLF	SF					YISAK	YР	HFF	s	Е		т	VFGLK	K G	
в1	MLLFFTS	TIVNLEV	IR	CNMNCK	KIFIT:	STLISI	VSFLE	GVSF	SDVI	ged-	s	PAGS	VYISAK	YMPTA:	SHFGR	MSIK	ED	SK	NTQT	VFGLK	KDWDGV	95
в2	MLLFFTS	TIVNLEV:	IR	CNMNCK	KIFIT:	STLISI	VSFLE	GVSF	SDVI	QED-	s	PAGS	VYISAK	YMPTA	SHFGF	MSIK	ED	sk	NTQT	VFGLK	KDWDGV	95
в3	MLLFFTS	TIVNLEV:	IR	CNMNCK	KIFIT:	STLISI	VSFLF	GVSF	SDVI	QED-	s	PAGS	VYISAK	YMPTA	SHFGF	MSIK	ED	sk	NTQT	VFGLK	KDWDGV	95
Is1	MLFFTYE	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNE	AKEG	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	GKDS	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
Is2	MLFFTYE	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNEN	AKEG	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	GKDS	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
Is3	MLFFTYP	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNEN	AKEG	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	GKDS	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
Av1	MLFFTYP	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNEN	IAKEG	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	GKDS	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
Av2	MLFFTYE	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNE	IAKEG	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	(GK <mark>DS</mark>	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
Av3	MLFFTYF	IILKLFI:	FYKRF	INMNYK	KILVR	SALISI	MSFLF	YQSF.	AEPV	SSNN	IGNE	IAK <mark>EG</mark>	FYISAK	YNPSI	PHFRF	FSAE	ETPVY	(GK <mark>DS</mark> )	PTKK	VFGLK	KEGS	105
	*	120		*	1	40		*		160		*		180		*		20	D		*	
	T SD	F	D S	F NN	GF	G IGY	M GE	RE	ΕY	F	KNP	N	Y					V I	N	T I	M NACY	
в1	KTPSSDS	GNNSIIF	PEKDYS.	FKYENN	PFLGF	AGAIGY	SMNGF	RIEF	EVSYI	ETFD	VKNPO	GNYK	NDAHMY	CALDT	GTPGS	TQGA	TINSS	VMAKI	NENI	TDIAL	MINACY	202
в2	KTPSSDS	GNNSIIF	EKDYS	FKYENN	PFLGF	AGAIGY	SMNGE	RIEF	EVSY	ETFD	VKNPO	GNYK	NDAHMY	CALDT	GTPGS	STQGA	TLNSS	VMVR	NENL	TDIAL	MINACY	202
в3	KTPSSDS	GNNSIIF	EKDYS	FKYENN	PFLGF	AGAIGY	SMNGE	RIEF	EVSY	ETFD	VKNPO	GNYK	NDAHMY	CALDT	GTPGS	TQGA	TINSS	VMVKI	NENI	TDIAL	MINACY	202
Is1	ITKYSD-	F	PRTDIS:	FEGQNN	FISGF	SGSIGY	IMDGE	RVEI	EAAY	QKFN	PKNP-	ANET	DTSDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKZ	(VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
Is2	ITKYSD-	F	RTDIS	FEGQNN	FISGF	SGSIGY	IMDGE	RVEI	EAAY	QKFN	PKNP-	ANET	DTSDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKY	VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
Is3	ITKYSD-	F	RTDIS	FEGQNN	FISGE	SGSIGY	IMDGE	RVEI	EAAY	QKFN	PKNP-	ANET	DTSDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKY	VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
Av1	ITKYSD-	F'	RTDIS	FEGQNN	FISGE	SGSIGY	IMDGF	RVEI	EAAY	QKFN	PKNP-	ANET	DISDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKZ	(VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
Av2	ITKYSD-	F	TRTDIS	FEGQNN	FISGE	SGSIGY	IMDGE	RVEI	EAAY	QK FN	PKNP-	ANET:	DTSDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKY	(VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
Av3	ITKYSD-	F'	TRTDIS	FEGQNN	FISGF	SGSIGY	IMDGE	RVEI	EAAY	QKFN	PKNP-	ANET	DTSDYY	KHYGL	SR	AEAM	ADKKA	(VVLTI	NNGV	TFSSI	MFNACY	201
	220		*	240		*		260			*		280		*		300		*		320	
	DIT EG	P PY C	AGIG D	LS	NK	YQGK	GISY	IP	ESI	FIGG	н	/IGN		т	I	A	7	S TL	D	FG E	GRFF	
В1	DITLEGM	IPVSPYVC	AGIGTD:	LVSVIN	ATNPK	LSYQGK	LGISY	SINP	EASI	FIGG	HFHR	IGNE:	FRDITT	SKIFT	STGKI	AATA	SPGFA	SATL	DVCH	FGIEI	GGRFVF	309
в2	DITLEGN	IPVSPYVC	AGIGTD:	LVSVIN	ATNPK:	LSYQGK	LGISY	SINP	EASI	FIGG	HFHR	IGNE	FKDITT	SKIFT	STGKI	ATAA	SPGF	SATL	DVCH	FGIEI	GGRFVF	309
в3	DITLEGN	IPVSPYVC	AGIGTD	LVSVIN	ATNPK:	LSYQGK	LGISY	SINP	EASI	FIGG	HFHR	IGNE	FKDITT	SKIFT	STGKI	ATAA	SPGFA	SATL	DVCH	FGIEI	GGRFVF	309
Is1	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD:	LISIFD	DINLK	FAYQGK	IGISY	PITP	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	IGNK	YNKVPV	KLPVT	I	IDAP	QSTSF	SVIL	DAGY	FGGEI	GVRFTF	304
Is2	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD	LISIFD	DINLK	FAYQGK	IGISY	PITP	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	IGNK	YNKVPV	KLPVT	I	IDAP	QSTSZ	SVTL	DAGY	FGGEI	GVRFTF	304
Is3	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD	LISIFD	DINTR	FAYQGK	IGISY	PITP	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	IGNK	YNKVPV	KLPVT	I	IDAP	QSTSI	SVTL	DAGY	FGGEL	GVRFTF	304
Av1	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD:	LISIFD	DINTR	FAYQGK	IGISY	PITP.	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	IGNK	YNKVPV	KT ÞAL	1	IDAP	QSTSA	SVTL	DAGY	FGGEL	GVRFTF	304
Av2	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD	LISIFD	DINLK	FAYQGR	IGISY	PITP	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	IGNK	YNKVPV	KLPVT.	1	IDAP	QSTSA	SVIL	DAGY	FGGEL	GVRFTF	304
Av3	DITAEGV	PFIPYAC	AGIGAD	LISIFD	DINLK	FAYQGK	IGISY	PITP	EISAI	FIGG	YYHG	/IGNK	YNKVPV	<b>K</b> LPVT	1	IDAP	QSTSA	SVTL	DAGY	FGGEI	GVRFTF	304

Fig. 6 Μ Μ a b BUE ..... IDE8 AVL/CTVM13 1.6 

