Title: Perturbation of *de novo* lipogenesis hinders MERS-CoV assembly and release,

but not the biogenesis of viral replication organelles

Authors:

M. Soultsioti[1], A.W.M. de Jong[2], N. Blomberg[3], A. Tas[1], M. Giera[3], E. J. Snijder[1]#, M.

Barcena[2] #

Affiliations:

1. Molecular Virology Laboratory, Center for Infectious Diseases (LUCID), Leiden University

Medical Center

2. Section Electron Microscopy, Department of Cell and Chemical Biology, Leiden University

Medical Center

3. Center for Proteomics and Metabolomics, Leiden University Medical Center

#Corresponding author: m.barcena@lumc.nl or e.j.snijder@lumc.nl

Keywords:

coronavirus, TOFA, 2-BP, acetyl-CoA carboxylase, lipid metabolism, palmitoylation

Abstract (*max 250 words***)**

Coronaviruses hijack host cell metabolic pathways and resources to support their

replication. They induce extensive host endomembrane remodeling to generate viral

replication organelles and exploit host membranes for assembly and budding of their

enveloped progeny virions. Because of the overall significance of host membranes,

we sought to gain insight into the role of host factors involved in lipid metabolism in

cells infected with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV). We

employed a single-cycle infection approach in combination with pharmacological

inhibitors, biochemical assays, lipidomics, light and electron microscopy.

Pharmacological inhibition of acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) and fatty acid synthase

(FASN), key host factors in *de novo* fatty acid biosynthesis, led to pronounced

inhibition of MERS-CoV particle release. Inhibition of ACC led to a profound

metabolic switch in Huh7 cells, altering their lipidomic profile and inducing lipolysis.

However, despite the extensive changes induced by the ACC inhibitor, the

biogenesis of viral replication organelles remained unaffected. Instead, ACC

inhibition appeared to affect the trafficking and post-translational modifications of the

MERS-CoV envelope proteins. Electron microscopy revealed an accumulation of

nucleocapsids in early budding stages, indicating that MERS-CoV assembly is

adversely impacted by ACC inhibition. Notably, inhibition of palmitoylation resulted in

similar effects, while supplementation of exogenous palmitic acid reversed the

compound's inhibitory effects, possibly reflecting a crucial need for palmitoylation of

the MERS-CoV Spike and Envelope proteins for their role in virus particle assembly.

Importance (*max 150 words***)**

Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) is the etiological agent

of a zoonotic respiratory disease of limited transmissibility between humans.

However, MERS-CoV is still considered a high-priority pathogen and is closely

monitored by WHO due to its high lethality rate of around 35% of laboratory-

confirmed infections. Like other positive-strand RNA viruses, MERS-CoV relies on

the host cell's endomembranes to support various stages of its replication cycle.

However, in spite of this general reliance of MERS-CoV replication on host cell lipid

metabolism, mechanistic insights are still very limited. In our study, we show that

pharmacological inhibition of acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC), a key enzyme in the

host cell's fatty acid biosynthesis pathway, significantly disrupts MERS-CoV particle

assembly without exerting a negative effect on the biogenesis of viral replication

organelles. Furthermore, our study highlights the potential of ACC as a target for the

development of host-directed antiviral therapeutics against coronaviruses.

Introduction

Viruses rely heavily on the host cell's metabolic and biosynthetic capabilities to

support their replication cycle. As such, the manipulation of host cell metabolic

pathways has been a long-standing research topic for a range of evolutionary

divergent DNA and RNA virus families, such as herpesviruses, flaviviruses, and

picornaviruses, as reviewed in (1, 2). In the case of coronaviruses, virus-host

interactions related to cellular metabolism constituted a rather poorly studied area

until the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-

CoV-2) in December 2019 (3, 4). Since then, several studies have highlighted that

coronaviruses, like other virus families, hijack host metabolic pathways to support

various stages of their replication (5-12).

During their replication cycle (reviewed in (13-15)), coronaviruses, including the

highly pathogenic SARS-CoV, SARS-CoV-2, and Middle East respiratory syndrome

coronavirus (MERS-CoV), hijack intracellular membranes to accommodate viral RNA

synthesis (16-23) and the assembly of enveloped progeny virions (21, 24-27).

Briefly, after coronavirus entry and release of the positive-strand RNA genome

(gRNA) into the cytoplasm, the gRNA is translated into two large replicase

polyproteins. These are autoproteolytically processed by internally encoded viral

proteases, resulting in the generation of 16 viral nonstructural proteins (nsps) that

engage in viral RNA synthesis and a range of virus-host interactions. All

coronaviruses studied so far induce the formation of a perinuclear network of

modified membrane structures that derive from the endoplasmic reticulum (ER). This

network includes double-membrane vesicles (DMVs), paired or convoluted

membranes (CMs), and double-membrane spherules (DMSs), which are collectively

referred to as the coronavirus replication organelle (RO) (18, 20). DMVs are the most

abundant structures and constitute the primary site of viral genome replication and

generation of subgenomic (sg) mRNAs (20, 21). A molecular pore complex was

found to span the DMV's double membrane, thus connecting the DMV interior with

the cytosol (28-30) and presumably constituting a gateway for viral RNA export. In

the cytoplasm, the sg mRNAs are translated, giving rise to the viral structural and

accessory proteins. In parallel, part of the newly synthesized gRNAs associate with

Nucleocapsid (N) proteins to form ribonucleoprotein (RNP) complexes, which

constitute the nucleocapsid substructures that will be packaged in the virus particle.

During their synthesis, the viral envelope proteins associate with membranes of the

secretory pathway, into which the nucleocapsid buds. Progeny virions acquire their

envelope from intracellular membranes that primarily originate from the ER-Golgi

intermediate compartment (ERGIC) (21, 26), after which they are released from the

infected cell. Historically, viral egress was thought to occur via the biosynthetic

secretory pathway (31), but recent evidence suggests that coronaviruses may (also)

employ parts of the lysosomal pathway (27, 32-34).

Given the overall significance of host cell lipids and membranes in pivotal stages of

coronavirus replication, it is not surprising that recent genome-wide association

studies (GWAS) have identified host factors involved in fatty acid biosynthesis/*de*

novo lipogenesis (DNL) and cholesterol biosynthesis to be important for the

replication of SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses (35-37). Host factors identified

included the sterol regulatory element-binding proteins (SREBP-1 and SREBP-2) and SREBP cleavage-activating protein (SCAP), which are major regulators of DNL and cholesterol biosynthesis (38). A prior study also implicated SREBPs in MERS-CoV replication, potentially in DMV formation (6). Due to the impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and the urgency of developing broad-spectrum antiviral therapeutics, the potential of enzymes of the DNL pathway as drug targets for intervention and treatment of COVID-19 has been explored, yielding some promising results (10, 39, 40). It should however be noted that, while most studies on coronavirus replication so far have uncovered a general reliance on DNL-related pathways, further mechanistic insights remain scarce.

The aim of our present study was to explore the role of DNL in the MERS-CoV replication cycle. Our results show that inhibition of acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) disrupts the assembly of infectious MERS-CoV progeny, while the formation of viral replication organelles remains unaffected. The inhibitory effect on virus assembly could be partially reversed by supplementation with exogenous palmitic acid, possibly reflecting a need for palmitoylation of the MERS-CoV Spike (S) and Envelope (E) proteins. Our results also highlight the potential of ACC as a target for the development of host-directed antiviral treatment.

Results

MERS-CoV infection increases gene expression of host factors involved in DNL

De novo lipogenesis begins with the generation of acetyl-CoA from citrate through the activity of ATP citrate lyase (ACLY) (Figure 1A). Acetyl-CoA is further carboxylated by the rate-limiting enzyme ACC, leading to the production of malonyl-

CoA. Malonyl-CoA then serves as a substrate for the fatty acid synthase enzyme

(FASN), leading to the generation of saturated fatty acids (such as myristic acid,

palmitic acid, and stearic acid) that can be utilized in post-translational modifications

(e.g., myristoylation and palmitoylation), phospholipid synthesis, and fatty acid

catabolism (β-oxidation) (Figure 1A).

First, we investigated if MERS-CoV infection altered the gene expression levels of

various host factors involved in DNL (*ACLY, ACC, FASN, SCD-1*), phospholipid

synthesis (*DGAT1*), formation of lipid droplets (LDs) (*ADRP*), or fatty acid oxidation

pathways (*CPT1α* and *ACOX*). To this end, Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-

CoV at a high multiplicity of infection (MOI 5). At 12 h p.i., cells were lysed and

mRNA expression was analyzed by RT-qPCR. This timepoint was chosen as it

combined abundant viral RNA synthesis with the early phase of virus assembly and

release. Under such conditions, we observed an increase in the mRNA levels of host

factors involved in initial steps of the DNL pathway, such as the rate-limiting

enzymes ACC and FASN, and an increase in the mRNA levels of ADRP (Figure 1B).

From the fatty acid oxidation pathway factors that were analyzed, only ACOX was

moderately increased. We then evaluated the expression of ACC and FASN on a

protein level by Western blot analysis (Figure 1C). Despite the observed alterations

in mRNA levels, a clear change in the protein abundance of ACC and FASN could

not be detected. However, this result may be attributed to the limited sensitivity of the

assay or a reduced turn-over of these proteins. During high energy requirement, the

activity of ACC is regulated via its phosphorylation by AMP-activated protein kinase

(AMPK), which leads to inactivation of ACC. In this context, we also evaluated the

levels of phospho-ACC by Western blot, but did not observe any changes (Figure

1C), indicating that ACC's activity is not inhibited in MERS-CoV-infected cells.

Our combined observations suggested that host factors of the DNL branch of lipid

metabolism are transcriptionally upregulated in MERS-CoV-infected cells.

DNL inhibition does not affect viral RNA synthesis but impairs a later step in

the MERS-CoV replication cycle

To investigate the role of DNL pathways in coronavirus replication, we made use of

the fast-acting and potent small-molecule inhibitor 5-(tetradecyloxy)-2-furoic acid

(TOFA), which blocks the activity of ACC and thus the synthesis of fatty acids

(Figure 1A) (41, 42). Our aim was to explore whether pharmacological inhibition of

ACC would influence viral replication, in particular the steps that directly involve host

cell endomembranes: replication organelle formation and assembly of progeny

virions. For this, Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV at MOI 5 and treated with

non-cytotoxic concentrations of TOFA (Figure S1A) from 1 h p.i. onward, following

removal of the virus inoculum. Total intracellular RNA and cell culture supernatant

were collected at 16 h p.i. Interestingly, compared to the DMSO-treated control, no

changes were observed in the levels of intracellular viral RNA (as detected by RT-

qPCR) when infected Huh7 (Figure 2A) or MRC5 (Figure 2B) cells were treated with

TOFA. However, by plaque assay we measured a 4-log reduction in infectious viral

progeny released from Huh7 cells (Figure 2C) and an approximately 2.5-log

reduction in the case of MRC5 cells (Figure 2D). When using TVB-2640, a small-

molecule inhibitor that blocks the activity of FASN downstream of ACC (Figure 1A),

similar trends were again observed in Huh7 cells, with the intracellular viral RNA

levels remaining unaltered while the infectious progeny titers were reduced

approximately 30-fold upon compound treatment (Figure 2E and 2F). Taken

together, our data indicated that the DNL branch of lipid metabolism plays a proviral

role in MERS-CoV replication.

When MERS-CoV-infected Huh7 cells were treated with TOFA, the amount of

infectious viral progeny was found to slowly increase from undetectable at 12 h p.i. to

about 10^3 PFU/ml by 16 h p.i. Although the viral titers showed an increase over time,

a systematic 4-log difference was observed when comparing the vehicle control and

the TOFA-treated samples (Figure 2G). Overall, these data led us to conclude that

pharmacological inhibition of ACC, without affecting viral RNA synthesis, severely

hampered a later step in the coronavirus replication cycle, such as virus assembly,

egress, or virus particle infectivity.

Because of the significant reduction in extracellular infectious viral progeny following

compound treatment, we sought to understand whether the pharmacological

inhibition of ACC affected the host cell's secretory pathway, which is involved in

virion release. Using a *Gaussia* luciferase reporter assay (43), we observed that

TOFA did not affect the integrity of the secretory pathway, while Brefeldin A, a well-

characterized protein trafficking inhibitor, strongly inhibited the secretion of *Gaussia*

luciferase in the supernatant (Figure 2H). There were no differences in the

intracellular levels of *Gaussia* luciferase across all conditions (Figure 2I), which

excluded a general effect of TOFA on protein synthesis. Taken together, our data

pointed to an intact secretory pathway in the TOFA-treated cells, without a negative,

off-target effect of the compound on the cellular translation machinery, suggesting

that the reduction in extracellular infectious particles was not due to a virus egress

defect.

TOFA alters the host cell lipidomic profile and induces lipolysis

To gain insight into TOFA's impact on host pathways that are relevant for virus

assembly and release, uninfected cells were treated with the compound and

harvested 12 h post treatment for targeted lipidomics analysis. This revealed that

TOFA treatment induced profound changes in the host cell's lipidomic profile,

including increased levels of phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylserine,

lysophospholipids, and lipids of the ceramide biosynthetic pathway (Figure S2A).

Strikingly, the levels of neutral lipids including triacylglycerols (TG), cholesterol

esters (CE) and diacylglycerols (DG) were significantly reduced (Figure S2A), while

free fatty acids (FFA) increased. These latter effects strongly suggested a metabolic

switch in TOFA-treated cells towards the hydrolysis of triacylglycerols and

diacylglycerols into their constituent molecules of acylglycerols and FFAs, a process

also known as lipolysis. Lipolysis ultimately results in the degradation of LDs, which

constitute the cellular neutral lipid storage compartments (44).

To corroborate the above findings, we used immunofluorescence microscopy and LD

labeling with BODIPY 493/503, a well-known neutral lipid dye, and observed a

reduced amount of LDs in TOFA-treated cells compared to DMSO-treated control

cells (Figure S2B). Our results strongly suggested that pharmacological inhibition of

ACC and thus FFA synthesis has a broader effect on lipid metabolism than

previously described (42) and induces a compensatory shift toward lipolytic

pathways. Similar effects were observed in MERS-CoV-infected cells in a time-

dependent manner. At 9 h p.i. (8 h after the start of TOFA treatment), lipid droplets

were still present at detectable levels in TOFA-treated infected and uninfected cells

(Figure 3A and 3B, panels ii), albeit in somewhat reduced amounts in comparison to

the DMSO-treated control cells (Figure 3A and 3B, panels i). However, by 12 h p.i.

(11 h after the start of TOFA treatment), there was a prominent difference between

the DMSO- and TOFA-treated cells (Figure 3A and 3B, compare panels iii and iv),

with the abundance of LDs being strongly reduced in the latter. Taken together,

TOFA treatment appeared to induce a gradual metabolic rewiring towards lipolytic

pathways in both mock-infected and MERS-CoV-infected cells.

Subcellular localization of MERS-CoV structural proteins upon ACC inhibition

Next, we studied whether the trafficking of MERS-CoV envelope proteins was

affected by ACC inhibition. To this end, we investigated their subcellular localization

by immunofluorescence labeling and confocal microscopy, while using antibodies

recognizing well-characterized host marker proteins to visualize specific

compartments of the secretory pathway. Specifically, antibodies against S and M or

S and E proteins were used for the simultaneous labeling of two of the envelope

proteins, while in the same specimens antibodies against PDI, ERGIC-53, or giantin

were used to stain the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), ER-Golgi intermediate

compartment (ERGIC), and Golgi complex, respectively. As previously reported for

other coronaviruses (26, 45, 46), in untreated infected cells, viral envelope proteins

co-localized in both ERGIC (Figure S3) and Golgi membranes (Figure 4A-B). After

ACC inhibition, limited changes in the intracellular co-localization patterns of the

envelope proteins were observed. For example, in the DMSO-treated control cells,

the S protein co-localized with the giantin marker in the Golgi complex (white arrows,

Figures 4A and 4B, panel i, yellow spots). Post-TOFA treatment, this co-localization

was not observed with the same intensity and the signal for both S protein and

giantin seemed more dispersed (Figures 4A and 4B, panel ii). Furthermore, while in

the untreated control cells E (Figure 4A) or M (Figure 4B) proteins co-localized with

giantin (white arrows in Figures 4A and 4B, panel iii, yellow spots), these co-

localizations were no longer apparent after TOFA treatment (Figures 4A and 4B,

panel iv). In combination, TOFA treatment resulted in a reduced triple co-localization

between S and E proteins with the giantin marker (Figure 4A) or S and M proteins

with the giantin marker (Figure 4B) (panels v., white arrows, in comparison with

panels vi.). Though the changes upon ACC inhibition were limited in nature, they did

suggest that viral envelope protein trafficking to the Golgi complex was altered

compared to that in untreated MERS-CoV-infected cells.

TOFA treatment affects intracellular processing and trafficking of MERS-CoV

envelope proteins

Using Western blot analysis, we further investigated the status of the MERS-CoV

structural proteins S, E, M, and N in both extracellular samples (culture supernatants

from infected and TOFA-treated cells) as well as cell lysates.

Only trace amounts of the N protein could be detected in the supernatant collected

from TOFA-treated infected cells (Figure 5A), while the amounts of the three

envelope proteins were below the detection limit of our assay. Importantly, this result

excluded the possibility that the decrease in viral infectivity titers in supernatants

from TOFA-treated cells (Figure 2C) was merely due to the production of non-

infectious virus particles.

Intracellularly, only the overall levels of N protein remained more or less unaffected

at 9 and 12 h p.i. in the presence of TOFA. Decreased levels of full-length (FL) S

glycoprotein as well as its S1 and S2 fragments were observed, at 9 h and 12 h p.i.

Moreover, after TOFA treatment, we could not detect a second band below the S2

fragment, which likely corresponds to the S2′ fragment (47), suggesting a decreased

transport of the S protein to the trans-Golgi network where the furin protease

responsible for this cleavage is located. We also observed that the E protein

consistently migrated slightly faster after compound treatment, again suggesting

changes in the protein's post-translational modifications (Figure 5B).

The M protein was detectable as the usual double band, indicative of the two

different glycosylation states of M (48), migrating around 15-25 kDa (Figure 5B).

However, following compound treatment, the blot for the M protein also revealed a

smear of products with a higher molecular weight (in the 20-35 kDa range),

suggesting a change in the post-translational maturation and/or trafficking of the M

protein. The smear disappeared after glycosidase treatment of the cell lysates with

PNGase (Figure 5C), confirming that it resulted from a change in the glycosylation

status of M, which was likely linked to a disruption of the protein's intracellular

trafficking.

Electron microscopy reveals that TOFA treatment interferes with MERS-CoV

assembly and release.

Overall, our data confirmed that TOFA treatment caused a major defect in the

release of infectious MERS-CoV progeny, and excluded the possibility that large

amounts of non-infectious particles were secreted instead. Our subsequent

microscopy and biochemical studies pointed towards changes in the post-

translational modification and trafficking of all three MERS-CoV envelope proteins,

which might disrupt the normal intracellular assembly of new virions.

We employed transmission electron microscopy (TEM) to directly visualize the

impact of TOFA treatment on the viral replication cycle. Huh7 cells were infected with

MERS-CoV at MOI 5 and treated with the compound from 1 h p.i. onward. Cells

were fixed at 12 h p.i. and analyzed with TEM. We observed that pharmacological

inhibition of ACC did not affect the formation or morphology of virus-induced ROs

(DMVs and CMs) in comparison to the vehicle-treated control cells (Figure 6A,

panels i and ii), which aligns with our previous data regarding the unaffected

intracellular viral RNA levels upon TOFA treatment (Figure 2A). Moreover, while

extracellular progeny virions were abundantly found at the plasma membrane of

untreated MERS-CoV-infected cells, they were hardly present in the TOFA-treated

samples (Figure 6B, panels i. and ii.), in agreement with the strong reduction in

progeny virus titers observed when ACC is inhibited (Figure 2B).

Our ultrastructural studies further revealed that the consequences of TOFA

treatment hindered virus particle assembly. In untreated control samples (Figure 6C),

different stages of virion budding could be detected, from early stages in which the

nucleocapsid starts to be engulfed by a curved membrane (Figure 6C, panel i and ii)

to (nearly) fully budded virions (panel iii), with the latter representing most virions.

However, in TOFA-treated samples, the early stages of virus particle assembly were

particularly abundant (Figure 6D), with exceptionally large areas containing particles

representing this stage (Figure 6D, panels i and ii). This strongly suggested that

TOFA treatment interferes with the normal progress towards a fully budded virus

particle, leading to an unusual accumulation of nucleocapsids in an initial budding

state.

Inhibition of palmitoyltransferase enzymes mimics the effects of ACC

inhibition

One of the many end products of the DNL pathway is the fatty acid palmitate.

Palmitate, or palmitic acid, plays an important role in various cellular processes: as a

signaling molecule, a structural element of various lipids, and by participating in

posttranslational modifications, such as protein palmitoylation catalyzed by

palmitoyltransferase enzymes (49). Coronavirus S and E proteins contain a

conserved C-terminal cysteine-rich region next to their transmembrane domain,

which can serve as a palmitoylation substrate (Figure 7A) (50). Previous studies in

cells infected with the murine hepatitis (MHV), transmissible gastroenteritis (TGEV),

SARS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2 coronaviruses, have shown that their S proteins are

post-translationally palmitoylated (51-58), while the cysteine-rich regions of the E

proteins of SARS-CoV, MHV, and infectious bronchitis virus (IBV) were also found to

be palmitoylated (59-62). Since there is no experimental data on the palmitoylation

status of the MERS-CoV S and E proteins and the potential role of this

posttranslational modification in assembly, we initially tested the importance of

palmitoyltransferase enzymes for MERS-CoV replication using 2-bromopalmitic acid

(2-BP), a small-molecule inhibitor with a broad effect on palmitoyltransferase

enzymes (Figure 1A) (63). In an earlier antiviral compound screen (6), 2-BP was

shown to inhibit MERS-CoV replication in a multi-cycle experimental setup, but its

mechanism of action was not explored. We now employed a single-cycle setup as

described above: Huh7 cells were infected with MOI 5, treated with 2-BP from 1 h

p.i. onward, and at 16 h p.i. culture supernatants and total intracellular RNA were

collected. Interestingly, we observed that inhibition of palmitoyltransferase enzymes

induced similar changes as the ACC inhibition (Figure 7B and 7C). Compared to the

untreated control, no major changes were observed in the levels of intracellular viral

RNA detected by RT-qPCR in cells treated with 2-BP (Figure 7B). However, there

was a ~250-fold reduction in the extracellular infectious progeny titers (Figure 7C),

aligning with the hypothesis that limited availability of palmitate after DNL inhibition

may be partly responsible for the observed assembly impairment.

Addition of exogenous palmitic acid partially rescues assembly and release of

MERS-CoV progeny

Based on the possible involvement of palmitoylation defects in the observed

disturbances of MERS-CoV assembly, we investigated whether assembly could be

restored by supplementing some of the end products of the DNL pathway, such as

palmitic acid or oleic acid. To this end, Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV at

MOI 5 and from 1 h p.i. onward they were treated with 10 μM TOFA or TOFA

supplemented with 100 μM BSA-conjugated palmitic acid or BSA-conjugated oleic

acid. A treatment with 100 μM BSA without conjugated fatty acid served as a vehicle

control for the fatty acids (Figure 7D). Fatty acid concentrations where chosen based

on previous cytotoxicity assays, using concentrations that would not reduce cell

viability below 90% (Figures S1E and S1F), thus aiming to avoid potential

confounding effects of lipotoxicity-induced cell death. Interestingly, we observed that

the addition of exogenous palmitic acid conjugated with BSA partially restored the

release of infectious MERS-CoV progeny in the supernatant (by almost 100-fold),

while addition of BSA-conjugated oleic acid or BSA alone did not (Figure 7D).

Moreover, the effects of TOFA treatment that we had observed at the level of

individual envelope proteins (Figure 5) could be partially reversed by addition of

palmitic acid, resulting in intracellular protein levels and post-translational

modifications that were closer to those seen in samples from untreated infected cells

(Figure 7E). Electron microscopy analysis of large EM data sets also revealed an

increase in the number of extracellular virions after palmitic acid addition (Figure 7F),

while intracellularly there was a significant decrease in the proportion of virions

arrested in the early assembly stage (Figure 7G, with representative images

provided in Figure S4). In contrast, a quantitative analysis of the abundance of DMVs

(Figure 7H) and CMs (Figure 7I) did not reveal significant changes in comparison to

the DMSO-treated control, neither upon TOFA treatment nor upon addition of

palmitic acid. Overall, our data indicate an important role for palmitic acid during

MERS-CoV assembly, potentially involving palmitoylation of the S and E structural

proteins.

Discussion

Being enveloped positive-strand RNA viruses, coronaviruses depend on the host

cell's endomembrane system to facilitate and support their propagation in several

ways. They transform intracellular, ER-derived membranes into the ROs that

accommodate viral RNA synthesis and hijack membranes of the secretory pathway

to generate enveloped virus particles. Due to this extensive involvement of host

membranes, lipid metabolism pathways have been implicated in coronavirus

replication (5, 6). After the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, several studies touched

upon the potential reprogramming of lipid metabolism in the context of coronaviral

replication (8, 10, 11, 39), but few mechanistic details were resolved. Here, we report

on the importance of lipid homeostasis in MERS-CoV-infected cells for viral

propagation to take place, as perturbations of the fatty acid biosynthesis pathway

were found to have a strong inhibitory effect, specifically on the assembly and/or

release of viral progeny.

Due to the extensive remodeling of the ER during coronavirus RO biogenesis, it has

been speculated that fatty acid biosynthetic pathways would be activated to fuel the

formation of these membrane structures (6, 10). However, our data show that

perturbation of DNL does not affect MERS-CoV RNA synthesis or RO biogenesis

(Figure 2A, 2B, 2E and 6A), indicating that – contrary to previous speculations - DNL

is not among the host cell pathways critically required for coronaviral RO formation

(6, 10). Our data are in partial agreement with published literature on SARS-CoV-2.

Earlier studies have shown that lipid metabolism pathways, especially anabolic

branches such as DNL and not catabolism of fatty acids (like β-oxidation), play a

general proviral role in coronavirus replication (6, 10, 39), which is also corroborated

by our data when using inhibitors of ACC and FASN.

A previous SARS-CoV-2 study (10), using TOFA among other small-molecule

inhibitors of the DNL pathway, showed that DNL inhibition impedes SARS-CoV-2

replication. However, using immunofluorescence microscopy, Williams et al,

observed a change in the intracellular distribution of double-stranded RNA (dsRNA)

foci, which was interpreted to represent a change in the formation of viral ROs. In our

study with MERS-CoV, such a dsRNA pattern change was not observed (Figure S5),

while electron microscopy analyses of large EM data sets showed no alterations in

the morphology (Figure 6) or abundance (Figure 7H-I) of viral ROs. These

differences could be attributed to technical details of the immunolabeling protocol or

the use of different coronavirus species and host cells. Another technical difference

was the use of a single-cycle of viral replication setup in our study, in contrast to the

multi-cycle approach and longer experimental timeframes applied in most of the

previously published studies (6, 10, 39, 64). By using a single-cycle approach, we

aimed to synchronize the different steps of the viral cycle (entry, RO formation, peak

of viral RNA and protein synthesis, particle assembly) and study them at defined

timepoints.

Our data indicate that the DNL pathway, and in particular palmitate, one of its end

products, plays a role in MERS-CoV particle assembly or maturation (Figure 7)

rather than in RO formation. Palmitoylation of the S and E proteins has been

reported to be important for the replication of other coronaviruses, like MHV, SARS-

CoV, and SARS-CoV-2 (51-62), making it tempting to assume a similar involvement

for MERS-CoV. However, palmitoylation of MERS-CoV structural proteins has not

been investigated directly, in infected cells or overexpression/virus-like-particle

systems. Consequently, the number of palmitoylated cysteines, and their role and

position with respect to the transmembrane domain of the MERS-CoV S and E

proteins remain unknown.

Depending on the coronavirus studied, disruption of palmitoylation seems to have

divergent effects on the replication cycle. For example, palmitoylation of the MHV S

protein was reported to be necessary for its interaction with the M protein and

assembly of virus particles (51), while palmitoylation of the SARS-CoV or SARS-

CoV-2 S protein is not required for its interaction with the M protein (53, 55). It is

unknown and rather difficult to predict what the importance of palmitoylation of the

MERS-CoV envelope proteins might be, since the molecular interactions between

coronaviral S and M protein are generally not well defined. In the coronaviruses

studied so far, palmitoylation of S and E proteins seems to increase protein stability

and to decrease their turnover rate (61, 62). This could also be the case for MERS-

CoV, as suggested by the decrease we observed in intracellular S protein levels

after ACC inhibition (Figure 5B). Attempts to use a triple-mutated MHV E protein

lacking all potentially palmitoylated cysteines to generate virus-like particles (VLPs)

or recombinant mutant MHV, resulted in particles incapable of proper assembly and

release in both cases (61, 62). Interestingly, this triple-mutated MHV E protein also

exhibited faster migration during SDS-PAGE (61), which is in line with our western

blot observations after ACC inhibition (Figure 5B) and the partial recovery of the

protein's normal migration after addition of palmitic acid (Figure 7E). Besides

impacting their stability, another common effect of palmitoylation on the S and E

proteins is the influence on their affinity for specific membrane lipid nanodomains

(55, 61). Lack of S and E protein palmitoylation might lead to their association with

membranes of different lipid composition than what is necessary for efficient

assembly, eventually leading to disruption of the regular assembly events. This is

partially supported by our immunofluorescence microscopy data, since we observed

reduced co-localization of the S and E proteins with a Golgi compartment marker

(Figure 4).

The most abundant viral envelope protein and a key driver of particle assembly is the

M protein, which has not been reported to be palmitoylated, but it is known to be

glycosylated on its short N-terminal ectodomain. Upon TOFA treatment, the M

protein exhibited differences in its glycosylation pattern (Figure 5B and 5C). Being on

the luminal side of the membrane, the glycans decorating the MHV or SARS-CoV M

proteins do not seem to have a crucial role in virion assembly and release, nor in M

protein interactions with the S and E proteins (65, 66). However, these previous

studies have mainly explored the use of mutated M proteins that lacked the specific

amino acid residues normally used for glycan conjugation. In our study, following

TOFA treatment, we observed M proteins carrying longer, possibly untrimmed,

glycan chains. Trimming of glycan chains takes place as proteins progress from the

ER to the Golgi complex, as part of the ER's quality control machinery for misfolded

proteins. Glycans are further processed, trimmed, and extended during protein

trafficking through the Golgi complex, as part of normal glycoprotein maturation (67,

68). Thus, the M protein's glycosylation differences observed in our study could

signal trafficking issues that lead to delayed or aberrant processing of its (predicted)

single N-linked glycan. Although these changes may not affect virus assembly, they

are in line with our immunofluorescence microscopy observations regarding the M

protein's reduced colocalization with giantin (Figure 4). According to the western blot

results (Figure 5C), about half of the total amount of M protein still appears to be

properly processed and trafficked, but the impact of the reduced or delayed

availability of M protein at the site of virus assembly is difficult to predict.

In conclusion, the observed major impairment of the assembly and release of

infectious MERS-CoV progeny upon ACC inhibition may well be a multifactorial

phenomenon. In our TEM images (Figure 6D), inhibition of the fatty acid synthesis

pathway resulted in a striking increase of the number of early assembly/budding

events relative to (nearly) fully-formed virus particles. TOFA treatment may affect

virus particle assembly by reducing palmitoylation of S and E proteins, which can

potentially result in their instability and increased turnover. Simultaneous changes in

M protein trafficking may contribute to an overall imbalance in the viral envelope

proteins needed for interactions with each other, host lipids, and viral nucleocapsids,

ultimately affecting the pace and quality of virion assembly and budding. In addition

to its presumed impact on the trafficking and post-translational modification of viral

envelope proteins, TOFA treatment may also affect the properties of unidentified

host factors that are directly or indirectly involved in coronavirus assembly. This

could also contribute to the general disruption of lipid metabolism pathways and the

metabolic switch towards lipolytic pathways that we observed in both mock- and

MERS-CoV-infected cells (Figure 3 and S3), which could contribute to an

unfavorable microenvironment and host membrane composition for efficient virion

assembly. The proviral role of *de novo* lipogenesis in MERS-CoV replication also

highlights its potential as a target for the development of host-directed antiviral

therapeutics against coronaviruses.

Materials and Methods

Cells

Huh7 cells (kindly provided by Dr. Ralf Bartenschlager, Heidelberg University,

Germany) and MRC5 cells (purchased from ATCC, CCL-171) were cultured in

Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) (Lonza) supplemented with 8% (v/v)

fetal calf serum (FCS), 100 IU/mL penicillin/streptomycin, 2 mM L-glutamine, and

non-essential amino acids, at 37°C and 5% CO_2.

Viruses and virus purification

MERS-CoV strain EMC/2012 (NC_019843) (69, 70) was kindly provided by Dr. Ron

Fouchier, Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam, the Netherlands, and working stocks

were prepared using Huh7 cells. All work with live MERS-CoV was performed inside

a biosafety level 3 facility at Leiden University Medical Center. Virus titrations by

plaque assay were performed as described before (71). Huh7 cells were seeded in

tissue culture-treated multiwell plates and the next day were infected with serial

dilutions of MERS-CoV containing supernatant for 1 h at 37°C. The virus inoculum

was removed and replaced by overlay medium containing 1.2% Avicel RC-581 (Cas.

No.: 9004-34-6, FMC/IMCD Benelux) in DMEM supplemented with 2% FCS and 100

IU/mL penicillin/streptomycin. Cells were incubated for 3 days at 37°C, after which

they were fixed with formaldehyde and stained with crystal violet.

Virus concentration by ultracentrifuge pelleting through a sucrose cushion (Figure

5A) Infected cell culture supernatants were harvested 16 h p.i. and clarified from cell

debris by low-speed centrifugation at 1,200 g for 5 min at 4°C. The virus particles

were pelleted through a 20% (w/v) sucrose cushion in TES buffer (0.02 M Tris-HCl,

1mM EDTA, 0.1 M NaCl, pH 7.4) by centrifugation in an SW41 Ti rotor (Beckman

Coulter) for 3.5 h at 30,000 rpm and 4°C. Virus pellets were resuspended overnight

in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) at 4°C, lysed in 100mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.6 and 4%

(w/v) sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), and used for SDS-PAGE and Western blot

analysis.

Small-molecule inhibitors

TOFA (5-tetradecyloxy-2-furoic-acid, cat. No.: HY-101068) and TVB-2640

(Denifanstat, cat. No.: HY-112829) were purchased from MedChemExpress.

2-bromopalmitic acid (2-bromohexadecanoic acid, cat. No: 21604) was purchased

from Sigma. Compounds were dissolved in anhydrous DMSO for stock preparation.

BSA-conjugated palmitate saturated fatty acid complex (PA) (cat. No.: 29558), BSA-

conjugated oleate monounsaturated fatty acid complex (OA) (cat. No. 29557) and

BSA control for BSA-fatty acid complexes (cat. No. 29556) were purchased from

Cayman Chemicals.

Cytotoxicity assays

Cell viability was monitored using CellTiter 96 aqueous non-radioactive cell

proliferation reagent (Promega), following the manufacturer's instructions. Cells were

seeded in 96-well plates and incubated overnight at 37°C and 5% CO_2. On the next

day, the cells were treated with serial dilutions of the different compounds in DMEM

containing 2% FCS, 100 IU/mL penicillin/streptomycin, 2 mM L-glutamine and non-

essential amino acids. Cells were incubated for 22 h, and then 20 ml/well of MTS

solution (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-5-(3-carboxymethoxyphenyl)-2-(4-sulfophenyl)-

2H-tetrazolium) were added. The cells were incubated for 2 h at 37°C, after which

the absorbance was measured at 495 nm using the Envision multiplate reader

(PerkinElmer). Cell viability was normalized against the DMSO-treated control.

Quantitative PCR

Viral RNA in MERS-CoV-infected Huh7 cells was quantified by using RT-qPCR. To

this end, samples were collected in Tripure Isolation Reagent (Sigma), intracellular

RNA was isolated following the manufacturer's instructions, and RT-qPCR was

performed using the Applied Biosystems™ TaqMan Fast™ Virus 1-step Multiplex

Master Mix for qPCR (ThermoFisher) with MERS-CoV-specific primers and probes

(designed in-house as described before (72)) in a CFX384 Touch RT-PCR detection

system (Biorad). For absolute quantification, a standard curve was generated using

10-fold serial dilutions of an *in vitro* transcript containing the target sequences,

generated using T7 RNA polymerase. The expression of human PGK1 gene

(ThermoFisher, TaqMan gene expression Assay VIC-MGB, cat. No. #4448490,

assay ID Hs00943178_g1) was used as an internal standard to ensure equal sample

loading between conditions.

Gene expression analysis for host factors was performed using real-time RT-qPCR

with iTaq SYBR Green Supermix (Biorad) in a CFX384 Touch RT-PCR detection

system (Biorad). Primer sequences for *ACLY, ACC, FASN, SCD-1, DGAT1, ADRP,*

CPT1a, ACOX and human β-actin were described elsewhere (6, 73). Quantification

was performed by normalizing against the amount of human β-actin mRNA. Fold

gene expression changes in MERS-CoV-infected cells relative to mock-infected cells

were calculated by using the delta-delta Ct formula ($2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$).

All oligonucleotide sequences and sources are provided in the Supplementary Table

1.

Gaussia luciferase reporter assay

For monitoring the effect of TOFA on the secretory pathway's activity, Pierce™

Gaussia luciferase glow assay kit (ThermoFisher, cat. No.: 16160) was used

following the manufacturer's instructions. Huh7 cells were seeded in 96-well plates

and the next day, they were transfected with 150 ng of a Gaussia luciferase

expression plasmid using Lipofectamine 3000 (ThermoFisher) at a 1:3 ratio of DNA

to Lipofectamine. At 24 h post transfection, the cell culture supernatant was

aspirated, and the cells were treated for 8 h with DMSO, TOFA, or brefeldin A. After

incubation with the compounds, the cell culture supernatant containing secreted

Gaussia luciferase was collected, and the cell monolayer was lysed for detection of

intracellular luciferase. The luciferase signal output was measured at 485 nm using

an Envision multiplate reader (PerkinElmer).

Immunofluorescence microscopy

Huh7 cells were seeded on glass coverslips and left to attach overnight at 37°C and

5% CO2. The next day, cells were either mock- or MERS-CoV infected for 9 h or 12

h and then fixed with 3% paraformaldehyde. Immunofluorescence labelling was

performed as described before (74). In this study, the following antibodies were used

for immunofluorescence analyses: human monoclonal antibody against MERS-CoV

Spike protein (kindly provided by Dr. Berend Jan Bosch, Utrecht University) (75),

rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV M protein antibody (20, 76), rabbit polyclonal anti-

MERS-CoV E protein antibody (ThermoFisher, cat. No.: PA5-143457), rabbit

polyclonal anti MERS-CoV N protein antibody (Sino Biological, cat. No.: 40068-

RP02), mouse monoclonal anti-dsRNA J2 antibody (Scicons), mouse monoclonal

anti-PDI antibody (Enzo Life Sciences, ADI-SPA-891), mouse monoclonal ERGIC-53

G1/93 Ab (Enzo Life Sciences/ Alexis Biochemicals, ALX-804-602), mouse

monoclonal anti-giantin antibody (Enzo Life Sciences/Alexis Biochemicals, ALX-804-

600), BODIPY493/503 (ThermoFisher, cat. No.: D3922). For viral M and E protein

labeling, an Alexa-647-conjugated donkey anti-rabbit secondary antibody (Jackson

Laboratories, cat. No.: 711-605-152) was used, the S protein labelling was visualized

with an Alexa-488-conjugated goat anti-human antibody (ThermoFisher, cat. No.:

A11013), while for the N protein labeling an Alexa-488-conjugated goat anti-rabbit

secondary antibody (ThermoFisher, cat. No.: A11008) was used. Cellular organelle

markers and dsRNA were labelled using a Cy3-conjugated donkey anti-mouse

antibody (Jackson Laboratories, cat. No.: 715-165-150). Leica Sp8 confocal and

DM6 fluorescence microscopes were used for image acquisition. During confocal

image acquisition, laser strength and gain were kept consistent between all samples

and conditions. To obtain high-resolution images, an acquisition format of

1024x1024 pixels and speed of 400 Hz were selected and kept consistent between

samples. Image acquisition settings were chosen to maximally reduce false-positive

co-localization signal due to overexposure of the samples.

For image processing, Leica Application Suite X version 3.7 software was used. All

images were processed in the same manner to increase brightness and contrast for

this publication. Raw, unprocessed images are available upon request.

Targeted lipidomics analysis

Comprehensive, quantitative shotgun lipidomics was carried out as described in

detail elsewhere (77, 78). Briefly, samples were spiked with deuterated internal

standards and lipids were extracted using methyl tert-butyl ether. The combined

organic extracts were subsequently dried under a gentle stream of nitrogen and the

dried extracts were dissolved in methanol:chloroform 1:1 containing 10 mM

ammonium acetate. Lipids were then analyzed with a flow injection method at a flow

rate of 8 µL/min applying differential ion mobility for lipid class separation and

subsequent multiple reaction monitoring in positive and negative electrospray

ionization mode. Using the Shotgun Lipidomics Assistant (SLA) software individual

lipid concentrations were calculated after correction for sample input and their

respective internal standards.

Western blot and PNGase assay

After lysis of cells or purified virus particles, obtained as described above, the protein

content of samples was quantified using the Pierce BCA protein assay kit

(ThermoFisher). Samples were mixed with 4x Laemmli sample buffer, incubated at

96°C for 5 min, and separated using SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-

PAGE). Post separation, the proteins were transferred to Amersham Hybond-LFP

0.45 µm PVDF blotting membrane (Cytiva) using the semidry Trans-Blot Turbo

Transfer System (Biorad). For the E protein, Amersham Hybond-LFP 0.2 µm PVDF

blotting membrane was used instead. The membranes were blocked for 1 h at room

temperature. For ACC and FASN, 5% bovine serum albumin (BSA) in TBS with

0.05% Tween-20 (TBST) was used as a blocking buffer, while for viral proteins 1%

casein in PBS with 0.05% Tween-20 (PBST) was used instead. Membranes were

incubated with primary antibodies overnight in 2.5% BSA in TBST or 0.5% casein in

PBST respectively.

Antibodies used in this study were: ACC (Cell Signaling Technology, cat.no.: #3662),

phospho-ACC (Ser79) (Cell Signaling Technology, cat.no.: #3661), FASN (Cell

Signaling Technology, cat.no.: #3180), rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV S1 antibody

(ThermoFisher, cat. No.: PA5-119581), rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV S2

antibody (ThermoFisher, cat. No.: PA5-81788), rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV M

protein antibody (20, 76), rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV E protein antibody

(ThermoFisher, cat. No.: PA5-143457), rabbit polyclonal anti-MERS-CoV N protein

antibody (Sino Biological, cat. No.: 40068-RP02), mouse monoclonal anti-β-actin

antibody (Sigma, cat. No.: A5316), GAPDH (14C10) (Cell Signaling Technology,

cat.no.: #2118). Following primary antibody incubation, membranes were incubated

with a secondary antibody: biotin-conjugated anti-mouse IgG (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, cat.no.: 31800) or anti-rabbit IgG (Thermo Fisher Scientific, cat.no.:

A16033). After 1 h incubation at room temperature, the membranes were incubated

for 1 h with a tertiary Cy3-conjugated anti-biotin antibody (Jackson Laboratories,

cat.no.: 200-162-211). Protein bands were visualized using an Alliance Q9 advanced

imaging system (Uvitec).

For the PNGase assay, the PNGase F kit (New England Biolabs, cat. no.: P0704)

was used according to the manufacturer's instructions with a few modifications. The

protocol for denaturing conditions was followed and the glycoprotein denaturing

buffer was added directly to samples lysed with 4x Laemmli Sample Buffer. The

samples were denatured by heating at 100°C for 10 min, they were briefly placed on

ice and then centrifuged for 10 sec. GlycoBuffer, 10% NP-40 and H_2O were added to

the denatured protein lysate according to NEB's protocol. The reaction mixture was

incubated for 1 h at 37°C and then directly subjected to SDS-PAGE and Western

blotting.

Electron microscopy

Cells were fixed with 1.5% (vol/vol) glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M cacodylate buffer (pH

7.4) for 30 min at room temperature, and then stored overnight at 4°C before being

exported from the BSL3 facility. Then, the samples were first stained with OsO_4 at

4°C for 1 h and subsequently at room temperature with 1% (w/v) uranyl acetate in

Milli-Q water for 1 h, with washing steps with 0.1 M cacodylate buffer in between.

After a washing step with Milli-Q water, the samples were dehydrated in increasing

concentrations of ethanol (70%, 80%, 90%, 100%), embedded in epoxy resin (LX-

112, Ladd Research), and polymerized at 60°C. Sections were collected on mesh-

100 copper EM grids covered with a carbon-coated Pioloform layer, and poststained

with 7% (w/v) uranyl acetate and Reynold's lead citrate.

The samples were examined in a Tecnai12 BioTwin or a Twin transmission electron

microscope, equipped with an Eagle 4k CCD camera (Thermo Fisher Scientific) or a

OneView 4k high-frame rate CMOS camera (Gatan), respectively. For the

quantifications, mosaic images of large areas were generated using automatically

collected overlapping images (pixel size 2 nm) that were subsequently combined in

composite images, as described in (79).. A minimum of 3 large mosaic images from

at least 2 different EM grids were analyzed per condition, each one including ~10-25

cells and DMVs and virus particles were manually annotated and CM regions

delineated using Aperio Imagescope software (Leica). On average, each of these

large areas contained ~1,900 DMVs, as well as ~3,000 virus particles in different

stages of assembly. The latter were classified based on their assembly stage:

particles in early-stage assembly were defined as those with a budding envelope

forming a crescent smaller than a semi-circle, whereas virus particles with a budding

envelope forming a crescent larger than a semi-circle or appearing fully budded were

assigned to the late-stage assembly class. The perimeter of cells and nuclei in these

regions was also manually delineated to calculate densities per μm^2 of cytoplasm.

Statistical analysis

Data are represented as mean ± standard deviation (SD) of at least two biological

replicates. Statistical significance was calculated using unpaired Student's t-test,

when comparing two groups, or two-way ANOVA and applying multiple comparison

corrections, when comparing multiple groups. Statistical significance is denoted with

asterisks as: * $p<0.05$, ** $p< 0.01$, *** $p< 0.001$, **** $p< 0.0001$. Prism version 10

(GraphPad Software Inc.) was used to perform all statistical analyses and

calculations.

Software

Geneious Software (version 10.2) was used for the alignment of partial S and E

protein sequences from selected coronaviruses. The list of viruses was selected

based on available information from published literature on S and E protein

palmitoylation modifications of these viruses. Their protein sequences were then

compared to the sequences of MERS-CoV S and E proteins. The following

accession numbers were used: MERS-CoV (NC_019843), SARS-CoV (NC_004718)

SARS-CoV-2 (NC_045512), MHV (AY700211), TGEV (AJ271965), IBV

(NC_001451), HCoV-229E (NC_001451).

Figure annotations (Fig. 5, 7E and S1) and schematics (Fig. 1A) were created using Adobe Illustrator 2025.

Supplementary data

Available as a separate file.

Data availability

Raw lipidomics data used to generate and support the conclusions of Figure S2A are available in a public repository (Mendeley Data, doi: 10.17632/sknp5pwj5y.1).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Patrick Wanningen, Heidi de Gruyter, and Tim Dalebout for technical assistance, Annelies Boonzaier-van der Laan for confocal microscopy assistance, Nadya Urakova and Quinten Ducarmon for helpful discussions. The study was partially funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number 813343 (H2020-MSCA-ITN-813343-INITIATE), and by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (grant NWO-OCENW.M.21.339).

Author Contribution

Study design, M.S., M.B., and E.J.S.; methodology, M.S., A.W.M.J., and N.B.; investigation, M.S., A.W.M.J., N.B., and A.T.; formal analysis, M.S. and M.B.; resources, M.G., M.B., and E.J.S.; writing – original draft, M.S., M.B., and E.J.S.; writing - editing and final approval, M.S., A.W.M.J., A.T., N.B., M.G., M.B., and E.J.S.; supervision, M.B. and E.J.S.; funding acquisition, M.B. and E.J.S.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

1.   Goodwin CM, Xu S, Munger J. 2015. Stealing the Keys to the Kitchen: Viral Manipulation of the Host Cell Metabolic Network. Trends in Microbiology 23:789-798.
2.   Sanchez EL, Lagunoff M. 2015. Viral activation of cellular metabolism. Virology 479-480:609-618.
3.   Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, Si H-R, Zhu Y, Li B, Huang C-L, Chen H-D, Chen J, Luo Y, Guo H, Jiang R-D, Liu M-Q, Chen Y, Shen X-R, Wang X, Zheng X-S, Zhao K, Chen Q-J, Deng F, Liu L-L, Yan B, Zhan F-X, Wang Y-Y, Xiao G-F, Shi Z-L. 2020. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. Nature 579:270-273.
4.   Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. N Engl J Med 382:727-733.
5.   Yan B, Chu H, Yang D, Sze K-H, Lai P-M, Yuan S, Shuai H, Wang Y, Kao RY-T, Chan JF-W, Yuen K-Y. 2019. Characterization of the Lipidomic Profile of Human Coronavirus-Infected Cells: Implications for Lipid Metabolism Remodeling upon Coronavirus Replication. Viruses 11:73.
6.   Yuan S, Chu H, Chan JF-W, Ye Z-W, Wen L, Yan B, Lai P-M, Tee K-M, Huang J, Chen D, Li C, Zhao X, Yang D, Chiu MC, Yip C, Poon VK-M, Chan CC-S, Sze K-H, Zhou J, Chan IH-Y, Kok K-H, To KK-W, Kao RY-T, Lau JY-N, Jin D-Y, Perlman S, Yuen K-Y. 2019. SREBP-dependent lipidomic reprogramming as a broad-spectrum antiviral target. Nature Communications 10:120.
7.   Codo AC, Davanzo GG, Monteiro LdB, de Souza GF, Muraro SP, Virgilio-da-Silva JV, Prodonoff JS, Carregari VC, de Biagi Junior CAO, Crunfli F, Jimenez Restrepo JL, Vendramini PH, Reis-de-Oliveira G, Bispo dos Santos K, Toledo-Teixeira DA, Parise PL, Martini MC, Marques RE, Carmo HR, Borin A, Coimbra LD, Boldrini VO, Brunetti NS, Vieira AS, Mansour E, Ulaf RG, Bernardes AF, Nunes TA, Ribeiro LC, Palma AC, Agrela MV, Moretti ML, Sposito AC, Pereira FB, Velloso LA, Vinolo MAR, Damasio A, Proença-Módena JL, Carvalho RF, Mori MA, Martins-de-Souza D, Nakaya HI, Farias AS, Moraes-Vieira PM. 2020. Elevated Glucose Levels Favor SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Monocyte Response through a HIF-1α/Glycolysis-Dependent Axis. Cell Metabolism 32:437-446.e5.
8.   Dias SSG, Soares VC, Ferreira AC, Sacramento CQ, Fintelman-Rodrigues N, Temerozo JR, Teixeira L, Nunes da Silva MA, Barreto E, Mattos M, de Freitas CS, Azevedo-Quintanilha IG, Manso PPA, Miranda MD, Siqueira MM, Hottz ED, Pao CRR, Bou-Habib DC, Barreto-Vieira DF, Bozza FA, Souza TML, Bozza PT. 2020. Lipid droplets fuel SARS-CoV-2 replication and production of inflammatory mediators. PLoS Pathog 16:e1009127.
9.   Zhang Y, Guo R, Kim SH, Shah H, Zhang S, Liang JH, Fang Y, Gentili M, Leary CNO, Elledge SJ, Hung DT, Mootha VK, Gewurz BE. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 hijacks folate and one-carbon metabolism for viral replication. Nature Communications 12:1676.
10.   Williams CG, Jureka AS, Silvas JA, Nicolini AM, Chvatal SA, Carlson-Stevermer J, Oki J, Holden K, Basler CF. 2021. Inhibitors of VPS34 and fatty-acid metabolism suppress SARS-CoV-2 replication. Cell Rep 36:109479.
11.   Farley SE, Kyle JE, Leier HC, Bramer LM, Weinstein JB, Bates TA, Lee J-Y, Metz TO, Schultz C, Tafesse FG. 2022. A global lipid map reveals host dependency factors conserved across SARS-CoV-2 variants. Nature Communications 13:3487.

793   12.   Greene KS, Choi A, Chen M, Yang N, Li R, Qiu Y, Lukey MJ, Rojas KS, Shen J, Wilson KF, Katt
794   WP, Whittaker GR, Cerione RA. 2023. Inhibiting Glutamine Metabolism Blocks Coronavirus
795   Replication in Mammalian Cells. bioRxiv
796   doi:10.1101/2023.09.27.559756:2023.09.27.559756.

797   13.   Wang Y, Grunewald M, Perlman S. 2020. Coronaviruses: An Updated Overview of Their
798   Replication and Pathogenesis, p 1-29. *In* Maier HJ, Bickerton E (ed), Coronaviruses: Methods
799   and Protocols doi:10.1007/978-1-0716-0900-2_1. Springer US, New York, NY.

800   14.   Malone B, Urakova N, Snijder EJ, Campbell EA. 2022. Structures and functions of coronavirus
801   replication-transcription complexes and their relevance for SARS-CoV-2 drug design. Nat Rev
802   Mol Cell Biol 23:21-39.

803   15.   Steiner S, Kratzel A, Barut GT, Lang RM, Aguiar Moreira E, Thomann L, Kelly JN, Thiel V. 2024.
804   SARS-CoV-2 biology and host interactions. Nat Rev Microbiol doi:10.1038/s41579-023-
805   01003-z.

806   16.   Gosert R, Kanjanahaluethai A, Egger D, Bienz K, Baker SC. 2002. RNA replication of mouse
807   hepatitis virus takes place at double-membrane vesicles. J Virol 76:3697-708.

808   17.   Snijder EJ, van der Meer Y, Zevenhoven-Dobbe J, Onderwater JJ, van der Meulen J, Koerten
809   HK, Mommaas AM. 2006. Ultrastructure and origin of membrane vesicles associated with
810   the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus replication complex. J Virol 80:5927-40.

811   18.   Knoops K, Kikkert M, Worm SHEVD, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Van Der Meer Y, Koster AJ,
812   Mommaas AM, Snijder EJ. 2008. SARS-Coronavirus Replication Is Supported by a
813   Reticulovesicular Network of Modified Endoplasmic Reticulum. PLoS Biology 6:e226.

814   19.   Maier HJ, Neuman BW, Bickerton E, Keep SM, Alrashedi H, Hall R, Britton P. 2016. Extensive
815   coronavirus-induced membrane rearrangements are not a determinant of pathogenicity.
816   Scientific Reports 6:27126.

817   20.   Snijder EJ, Limpens RWAL, De Wilde AH, De Jong AWM, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Maier HJ,
818   Faas FFGA, Koster AJ, Bárcena M. 2020. A unifying structural and functional model of the
819   coronavirus replication organelle: Tracking down RNA synthesis. PLOS Biology 18:e3000715.

820   21.   Klein S, Cortese M, Winter SL, Wachsmuth-Melm M, Neufeldt CJ, Cerikan B, Stanifer ML,
821   Boulant S, Bartenschlager R, Chlanda P. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 structure and replication
822   characterized by in situ cryo-electron tomography. Nature Communications 11:5885.

823   22.   Cortese M, Lee J-Y, Cerikan B, Neufeldt CJ, Oorschot VMJ, Köhrer S, Hennies J, Schieber NL,
824   Ronchi P, Mizzon G, Romero-Brey I, Santarella-Mellwig R, Schorb M, Boermel M, Mocaer K,
825   Beckwith MS, Templin RM, Gross V, Pape C, Tischer C, Frankish J, Horvat NK, Laketa V,
826   Stanifer M, Boulant S, Ruggieri A, Chatel-Chaix L, Schwab Y, Bartenschlager R. 2020.
827   Integrative Imaging Reveals SARS-CoV-2-Induced Reshaping of Subcellular Morphologies.
828   Cell Host & Microbe 28:853-866.e5.

829   23.   Ogando NS, Dalebout TJ, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Limpens R, van der Meer Y, Caly L, Druce J,
830   de Vries JJC, Kikkert M, Bárcena M, Sidorov I, Snijder EJ. 2020. SARS-coronavirus-2
831   replication in Vero E6 cells: replication kinetics, rapid adaptation and cytopathology. J Gen
832   Virol 101:925-940.

833   24.   Tooze J, Tooze S, Warren G. 1984. Replication of coronavirus MHV-A59 in sac- cells:
834   determination of the first site of budding of progeny virions. Eur J Cell Biol 33:281-93.

835   25.   Klumperman J, Locker JK, Meijer A, Horzinek MC, Geuze HJ, Rottier PJ. 1994. Coronavirus M
836   proteins accumulate in the Golgi complex beyond the site of virion budding. Journal of
837   Virology 68:6523-6534.

838   26.   Stertz S, Reichelt M, Spiegel M, Kuri T, Martínez-Sobrido L, García-Sastre A, Weber F, Kochs
839   G. 2007. The intracellular sites of early replication and budding of SARS-coronavirus. Virology
840   361:304-315.

841   27.   Ghosh S, Dellibovi-Ragheb TA, Kerviel A, Pak E, Qiu Q, Fisher M, Takvorian PM, Bleck C, Hsu
842   VW, Fehr AR, Perlman S, Achar SR, Straus MR, Whittaker GR, de Haan CAM, Kehrl J, Altan-

Bonnet G, Altan-Bonnet N. 2020. β-Coronaviruses Use Lysosomes for Egress Instead of the
Biosynthetic Secretory Pathway. Cell 183:1520-1535.e14.

28.   Wolff G, Limpens R, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Laugks U, Zheng S, de Jong AWM, Koning RI,
Agard DA, Grünewald K, Koster AJ, Snijder EJ, Bárcena M. 2020. A molecular pore spans the
double membrane of the coronavirus replication organelle. Science 369:1395-1398.

29.   Zimmermann L, Zhao X, Makroczyova J, Wachsmuth-Melm M, Prasad V, Hensel Z,
Bartenschlager R, Chlanda P. 2023. SARS-CoV-2 nsp3 and nsp4 are minimal constituents of a
pore spanning replication organelle. Nature Communications 14:7894.

30.   Huang Y, Wang T, Zhong L, Zhang W, Zhang Y, Yu X, Yuan S, Ni T. 2024. Molecular
architecture of coronavirus double-membrane vesicle pore complex. Nature 633:224-231.

31.   Tooze J, Tooze SA, Fuller SD. 1987. Sorting of progeny coronavirus from condensed secretory
proteins at the exit from the trans-Golgi network of AtT20 cells. J Cell Biol 105:1215-26.

32.   Scherer KM, Mascheroni L, Carnell GW, Wunderlich LCS, Makarchuk S, Brockhoff M, Mela I,
Fernandez-Villegas A, Barysevich M, Stewart H, Suau Sans M, George CL, Lamb JR, Kaminski-
Schierle GS, Heeney JL, Kaminski CF. 2022. SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein adheres to
replication organelles before viral assembly at the Golgi/ERGIC and lysosome-mediated
egress. Science Advances 8:eabl4895.

33.   Miura K, Suzuki Y, Ishida K, Arakawa M, Wu H, Fujioka Y, Emi A, Maeda K, Hamajima R,
Nakano T, Tenno T, Hiroaki H, Morita E. 2023. Distinct motifs in the E protein are required
for SARS-CoV-2 virus particle formation and lysosomal deacidification in host cells. J Virol
97:e0042623.

34.   Pearson GJ, Mears HV, Broncel M, Snijders AP, Bauer DLV, Carlton JG. 2024. ER-export and
ARFRP1/AP-1-dependent delivery of SARS-CoV-2 Envelope to lysosomes controls late stages
of viral replication. Sci Adv 10:eadl5012.

35.   Daniloski Z, Jordan TX, Wessels HH, Hoagland DA, Kasela S, Legut M, Maniatis S, Mimitou EP,
Lu L, Geller E, Danziger O, Rosenberg BR, Phatnani H, Smibert P, Lappalainen T, tenOever BR,
Sanjana NE. 2021. Identification of Required Host Factors for SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Human
Cells. Cell 184:92-105.e16.

36.   Wang R, Simoneau CR, Kulsuptrakul J, Bouhaddou M, Travisano KA, Hayashi JM, Carlson-
Stevermer J, Zengel JR, Richards CM, Fozouni P, Oki J, Rodriguez L, Joehnk B, Walcott K,
Holden K, Sil A, Carette JE, Krogan NJ, Ott M, Puschnik AS. 2021. Genetic Screens Identify
Host Factors for SARS-CoV-2 and Common Cold Coronaviruses. Cell 184:106-119.e14.

37.   Schneider WM, Luna JM, Hoffmann HH, Sánchez-Rivera FJ, Leal AA, Ashbrook AW, Le Pen J,
Ricardo-Lax I, Michailidis E, Peace A, Stenzel AF, Lowe SW, MacDonald MR, Rice CM, Poirier
JT. 2021. Genome-Scale Identification of SARS-CoV-2 and Pan-coronavirus Host Factor
Networks. Cell 184:120-132.e14.

38.   Eberlé D, Hegarty B, Bossard P, Ferré P, Foufelle F. 2004. SREBP transcription factors: master
regulators of lipid homeostasis. Biochimie 86:839-848.

39.   Chu J, Xing C, Du Y, Duan T, Liu S, Zhang P, Cheng C, Henley J, Liu X, Qian C, Yin B, Wang HY,
Wang RF. 2021. Pharmacological inhibition of fatty acid synthesis blocks SARS-CoV-2
replication. Nat Metab 3:1466-1475.

40.   Duan X, Tang X, Nair MS, Zhang T, Qiu Y, Zhang W, Wang P, Huang Y, Xiang J, Wang H,
Schwartz RE, Ho DD, Evans T, Chen S. 2021. An airway organoid-based screen identifies a
role for the HIF1α-glycolysis axis in SARS-CoV-2 infection. Cell Reports 37:109920.

41.   McCune SA, Harris RA. 1979. Mechanism responsible for 5-(tetradecyloxy)-2-furoic acid
inhibition of hepatic lipogenesis. J Biol Chem 254:10095-101.

42.   Halvorson DL, McCune SA. 1984. Inhibition of fatty acid synthesis in isolated adipocytes by 5-
(tetradecyloxy)-2-furoic acid. Lipids 19:851-6.

43.   Tannous BA. 2009. Gaussia luciferase reporter assay for monitoring biological processes in
culture and in vivo. Nat Protoc 4:582-91.

44.   Grabner GF, Xie H, Schweiger M, Zechner R. 2021. Lipolysis: cellular mechanisms for lipid
894   mobilization from fat stores. Nature Metabolism 3:1445-1465.
895   45.   Lim KP, Liu DX. 2001. The Missing Link in Coronavirus Assembly: Retention of the avian
896   coronavirus infectious bronchitis virus envelope protein in the pre-Golgi compartments and
897   physical interaction between the envelope and membrane proteins. Journal of Biological
898   Chemistry 276:17515-17523.
899   46.   Venkatagopalan P, Daskalova SM, Lopez LA, Dolezal KA, Hogue BG. 2015. Coronavirus
900   envelope (E) protein remains at the site of assembly. Virology 478:75-85.
901   47.   Millet JK, Whittaker GR. 2014. Host cell entry of Middle East respiratory syndrome
902   coronavirus after two-step, furin-mediated activation of the spike protein. Proceedings of
903   the National Academy of Sciences 111:15214-15219.
904   48.   Perrier A, Bonnin A, Desmarets L, Danneels A, Goffard A, Rouille Y, Dubuisson J, Belouzard S.
905   2019. The C-terminal domain of the MERS coronavirus M protein contains a trans-Golgi
906   network localization signal. J Biol Chem 294:14406-14421.
907   49.   F SM, Abrami L, Linder ME, Bamji SX, Dickinson BC, van der Goot FG. 2024. Mechanisms and
908   functions of protein S-acylation. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 25:488-509.
909   50.   J Alsaadi EA, Jones IM. 2019. Membrane Binding Proteins of Coronaviruses. Future Virology
910   14:275-286.
911   51.   Thorp EB, Boscarino JA, Logan HL, Goletz JT, Gallagher TM. 2006. Palmitoylations on murine
912   coronavirus spike proteins are essential for virion assembly and infectivity. J Virol 80:1280-9.
913   52.   Petit CM, Chouljenko VN, Iyer A, Colgrove R, Farzan M, Knipe DM, Kousoulas KG. 2007.
914   Palmitoylation of the cysteine-rich endodomain of the SARS-coronavirus spike glycoprotein
915   is important for spike-mediated cell fusion. Virology 360:264-74.
916   53.   McBride CE, Machamer CE. 2010. Palmitoylation of SARS-CoV S protein is necessary for
917   partitioning into detergent-resistant membranes and cell-cell fusion but not interaction with
918   M protein. Virology 405:139-48.
919   54.   Gelhaus S, Thaa B, Eschke K, Veit M, Schwegmann-Wessels C. 2014. Palmitoylation of the
920   Alphacoronavirus TGEV spike protein S is essential for incorporation into virus-like particles
921   but dispensable for S-M interaction. Virology 464-465:397-405.
922   55.   Mesquita FS, Abrami L, Sergeeva O, Turelli P, Qing E, Kunz B, Raclot C, Paz Montoya J,
923   Abriata LA, Gallagher T, Dal Peraro M, Trono D, D'Angelo G, van der Goot FG. 2021. S-
924   acylation controls SARS-CoV-2 membrane lipid organization and enhances infectivity. Dev
925   Cell 56:2790-2807 e8.
926   56.   Wu Z, Zhang Z, Wang X, Zhang J, Ren C, Li Y, Gao L, Liang X, Wang P, Ma C. 2021.
927   Palmitoylation of SARS-CoV-2 S protein is essential for viral infectivity. Signal Transduct
928   Target Ther 6:231.
929   57.   Puthenveetil R, Lun CM, Murphy RE, Healy LB, Vilmen G, Christenson ET, Freed EO, Banerjee
930   A. 2021. S-acylation of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein: Mechanistic dissection, in vitro
931   reconstitution and role in viral infectivity. J Biol Chem 297:101112.
932   58.   Li D, Liu Y, Lu Y, Gao S, Zhang L. 2022. Palmitoylation of SARS-CoV-2 S protein is critical for S-
933   mediated syncytia formation and virus entry. J Med Virol 94:342-348.
934   59.   Corse E, Machamer Carolyn E. 2002. The Cytoplasmic Tail of Infectious Bronchitis Virus E
935   Protein Directs Golgi Targeting. Journal of Virology 76:1273-1284.
936   60.   Liao Y, Yuan Q, Torres J, Tam JP, Liu DX. 2006. Biochemical and functional characterization of
937   the membrane association and membrane permeabilizing activity of the severe acute
938   respiratory syndrome coronavirus envelope protein. Virology 349:264-75.
939   61.   Boscarino JA, Logan HL, Lacny JJ, Gallagher TM. 2008. Envelope protein palmitoylations are
940   crucial for murine coronavirus assembly. J Virol 82:2989-99.
941   62.   Lopez Lisa A, Riffle Ambere J, Pike Steven L, Gardner D, Hogue Brenda G. 2008. Importance
942   of Conserved Cysteine Residues in the Coronavirus Envelope Protein. Journal of Virology
943   82:3000-3010.

944   63.   Webb Y, Hermida-Matsumoto L, Resh MD. 2000. Inhibition of protein palmitoylation, raft
945   localization, and T cell signaling by 2-bromopalmitate and polyunsaturated fatty acids. J Biol
946   Chem 275:261-70.
947   64.   Yuan S, Yan B, Cao J, Ye Z-W, Liang R, Tang K, Luo C, Cai J, Chu H, Chung TW-H, To KK-W,
948   Hung IF-N, Jin D-Y, Chan JF-W, Yuen K-Y. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 exploits host DGAT and ADRP for
949   efficient replication. Cell Discovery 7:100.
950   65.   de Haan CA, Kuo L, Masters PS, Vennema H, Rottier PJ. 1998. Coronavirus particle assembly:
951   primary structure requirements of the membrane protein. J Virol 72:6838-50.
952   66.   de Haan CA, Smeets M, Vernooij F, Vennema H, Rottier PJ. 1999. Mapping of the coronavirus
953   membrane protein domains involved in interaction with the spike protein. J Virol 73:7441-
954   52.
955   67.   Helenius A, Aebi M. 2004. Roles of N-linked glycans in the endoplasmic reticulum. Annu Rev
956   Biochem 73:1019-49.
957   68.   Moremen KW, Tiemeyer M, Nairn AV. 2012. Vertebrate protein glycosylation: diversity,
958   synthesis and function. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 13:448-62.
959   69.   van Boheemen S, de Graaf M, Lauber C, Bestebroer Theo M, Raj VS, Zaki Ali M, Osterhaus
960   Albert DME, Haagmans Bart L, Gorbalenya Alexander E, Snijder Eric J, Fouchier Ron AM.
961   2012. Genomic Characterization of a Newly Discovered Coronavirus Associated with Acute
962   Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Humans. mBio 3:e00473-12.
963   70.   Zaki AM, van Boheemen S, Bestebroer TM, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. 2012. Isolation of a
964   novel coronavirus from a man with pneumonia in Saudi Arabia. N Engl J Med 367:1814-20.
965   71.   van den Worm SH, Eriksson KK, Zevenhoven JC, Weber F, Züst R, Kuri T, Dijkman R, Chang G,
966   Siddell SG, Snijder EJ, Thiel V, Davidson AD. 2012. Reverse genetics of SARS-related
967   coronavirus using vaccinia virus-based recombination. PLoS One 7:e32857.
968   72.   Ogando NS, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Meer Yvd, Bredenbeek PJ, Posthuma CC, Snijder EJ.
969   2020. The Enzymatic Activity of the nsp14 Exoribonuclease Is Critical for Replication of
970   MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2. Journal of Virology 94:10.1128/jvi.01246-20.
971   73.   van Huizen M, Bloeme - ter Horst JR, de Gruyter HLM, Geurink PP, van der Heden van Noort
972   GJ, Knaap RCM, Nelemans T, Ogando NS, Leijs AA, Urakova N, Mark BL, Snijder EJ, Myeni SK,
973   Kikkert M. 2024. Deubiquitinating activity of SARS-CoV-2 papain-like protease does not
974   influence virus replication or innate immune responses in vivo. PLOS Pathogens
975   20:e1012100.
976   74.   van der Meer Y, van Tol H, Krijnse Locker J, Snijder Eric J. 1998. ORF1a-Encoded Replicase
977   Subunits Are Involved in the Membrane Association of the Arterivirus Replication Complex.
978   Journal of Virology 72:6689-6698.
979   75.   Widjaja I, Wang C, van Haperen R, Gutiérrez-Álvarez J, van Dieren B, Okba NMA, Raj VS, Li W,
980   Fernandez-Delgado R, Grosveld F, van Kuppeveld FJM, Haagmans BL, Enjuanes L, Drabek D,
981   Bosch BJ. 2019. Towards a solution to MERS: protective human monoclonal antibodies
982   targeting different domains and functions of the MERS-coronavirus spike glycoprotein.
983   Emerg Microbes Infect 8:516-530.
984   76.   de Wilde AH, Raj VS, Oudshoorn D, Bestebroer TM, van Nieuwkoop S, Limpens R, Posthuma
985   CC, van der Meer Y, Bárcena M, Haagmans BL, Snijder EJ, van den Hoogen BG. 2013. MERS-
986   coronavirus replication induces severe in vitro cytopathology and is strongly inhibited by
987   cyclosporin A or interferon-α treatment. J Gen Virol 94:1749-1760.
988   77.   Su B, Bettcher LF, Hsieh W-Y, Hornburg D, Pearson MJ, Blomberg N, Giera M, Snyder MP,
989   Raftery D, Bensinger SJ, Williams KJ. 2021. A DMS Shotgun Lipidomics Workflow Application
990   to Facilitate High-Throughput, Comprehensive Lipidomics. Journal of the American Society
991   for Mass Spectrometry 32:2655-2663.
992   78.   Ghorasaini M, Mohammed Y, Adamski J, Bettcher L, Bowden JA, Cabruja M, Contrepois K,
993   Ellenberger M, Gajera B, Haid M, Hornburg D, Hunter C, Jones CM, Klein T, Mayboroda O,
994   Mirzaian M, Moaddel R, Ferrucci L, Lovett J, Nazir K, Pearson M, Ubhi BK, Raftery D, Riols F,

Sayers R, Sijbrands EJG, Snyder MP, Su B, Velagapudi V, Williams KJ, de Rijke YB, Giera M.
2021. Cross-Laboratory Standardization of Preclinical Lipidomics Using Differential Mobility
Spectrometry and Multiple Reaction Monitoring. Analytical Chemistry 93:16369-16378.
79. Faas FG, Avramut MC, van den Berg BM, Mommaas AM, Koster AJ, Ravelli RB. 2012. Virtual
nanoscopy: generation of ultra-large high resolution electron microscopy maps. J Cell Biol
198:457-69.

1001

Figure legends

Figure 1

Gene expression of host factors of the DNL pathway increases upon MERS-CoV

infection. A) Schematic representation of the main steps of the *de novo* lipogenesis

pathway, the key enzymes involved (ACLY, ACC, FASN), and the downstream

biological functions of the resulting fatty acids. Double arrows indicate that multiple

reactions are involved but not depicted here. Small-molecule inhibitors used in this

study are denoted in red. PTMs: posttranslational modifications. B) Gene expression

analysis of key host factors participating in DNL and phospholipid synthesis (dark

gray) or fatty acid oxidation (light gray) in mock-infected Huh7 cells in comparison

with MERS-CoV-infected cells (MOI 5) at 12 h p.i. The mRNA levels of *ACLY, ACC,*

FASN, SCD-1, DGAT1, ADRP, CPT1a and *ACOX* were determined by RT-qPCR

and normalized against the mock-infected control. C) Western Blot analysis of ACC,

phospho-ACC and FASN in MERS-CoV infected Huh7 cells, at 9 and 12 h p.i.

Data are represented as mean ± SD of two biological replicates. Statistical

significance was calculated using two-way ANOVA and applying Bonferroni multiple

comparison correction, * $p<0.05$, ** $p< 0.01$, *** $p< 0.001$, **** $p< 0.0001$.

Figure 2

DNL inhibition strongly reduces the release of infectious MERS-CoV progeny,

without affecting intracellular viral RNA synthesis. A) Huh7 cells or B) MRC5 were

infected with MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated with either DMSO (vehicle control) or

10 μM TOFA from 1 h p.i. onward. Cell lysates were harvested at 12 h p.i. (Huh7

cells) or 16 h p.i. respectively, and intracellular viral RNA copies were measured by

RT-qPCR. C) and D) Infectious viral progeny was quantified by plaque assay on

Huh7 cells, using the harvested culture supernatant (see panel A and B,

respectively). E) Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated with

either DMSO (vehicle control) or 15 μM TVB-2640 from 1 h p.i. onward. At 16 h p.i.,

cells were harvested, and intracellular viral RNA copies were measured by RT-

qPCR. F) Infectious viral progeny from TVB-2640-treated and untreated Huh7 cells

(see panel E) was quantified by plaque assay on Huh7 cells. G) Huh7 cells were

infected with MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated with either DMSO (vehicle control) or

10 μM TOFA from 1 h p.i. onward. Samples were collected at 12, 14, and 16 h p.i.

Infectious viral progeny was quantified by plaque assay on Huh7 cells. While at 12 h

p.i the number of infectious virus particles was below the detection limit of the assay,

virus titers increased over time at 14 h p.i and 16 h p.i. H) Analysis of the secretory

pathway's functionality upon TOFA treatment. Huh7 cells were transfected with a

plasmid expressing *Gaussia* luciferase, a naturally secreted reporter protein. From 8

h post transfection., transfected cells were treated with either 10 μM TOFA or 5 μM

Brefeldin A. At 24 h post compound addition, the levels of extracellular *Gaussia*

luciferase secreted in the supernatant were measured using an enzymatic assay

(see Materials and Methods). I) The cell monolayers from the same wells (panel H)

were also lysed and intracellular *Gaussia* luciferase expression was measured and

compared with the amount of secreted reporter protein. Dotted lines indicate the

background levels measured. Data are represented as mean ± SD of two (D), three

(B, E, G) or four (H, I) biological replicates. Statistical significance was calculated

1048   using one-way ANOVA and applying Bonferroni multiple comparison correction, ***

1049 $p < 0.001$

1050

Figure 3

TOFA induces lipolysis in uninfected and MERS-CoV-infected cells.

A) Uninfected Huh7 cells were treated with DMSO or 10 μM TOFA. B) Huh7 cells

were infected with MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated with either DMSO (vehicle

control) or 10 μM TOFA from 1 h p.i. onward. For both uninfected and infected cells,

samples were collected at 8 and 11 h p.t. The next day the fixed cells were stained

with BODIPY 493/503 (lipid droplets), and Hoechst 33342 (nuclei) and the presence

of lipid droplets was analyzed by wide-field fluorescence microscopy.

1059

Figure 4

Subcellular localization of MERS-CoV envelope proteins following TOFA treatment.

Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV, treated with TOFA as previously

described, fixed at 12 h p.i and analyzed using immunofluorescence microscopy.

Cells were triple-labelled for A) S (green, panels i. and ii.) and or E proteins (green,

panels iii. and iv.) in combination with labeling for giantin (red), as a marker for the

Golgi complex or B) S (green, panels i. and ii.) and M (green, panels iii. and iv.)

proteins in combination with labeling for giantin (red). Confocal images are

representative of at least two independent biological replicates. White arrows point to

co-localization foci of two or three markers.

1070

Figure 5

Effect of TOFA treatment on MERS-CoV structural protein expression and post-

translational modifications. Expression levels of S protein (using separate antibodies

against the S1 and S2 subunits), N protein, M protein, and E protein were analyzed

by western blot, using β-actin as internal control. A) Huh7 cells were infected with

MERS-CoV and treated with DMSO or TOFA as previously described. Supernatants

were collected at 16 h p.i. and progeny virus particles were pelleted through a

sucrose cushion by ultracentrifugation, lysed, and used for Western blot analysis. B)

Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV and DMSO- or TOFA-treated as

previously described, and samples (WCL: Whole Cell Lysate) were collected at 9

and 12 h p.i. for analysis by Western blotting. C) Western blot for PNGase assay

(described in Materials and Methods) using lysates collected from MERS-CoV-

infected Huh7 cells and collected at 12 h p.i. Blots are representative of at least two

independent biological replicates.

1085

Figure 6

TEM analysis of TOFA-treated Huh7 cells infected with MERS-CoV. Cells were

infected with MOI 5, treated with TOFA or with DMSO and fixed and processed for

electron microscopy at 12 h p.i. A) Morphologically comparable virus-induced DMVs

(asterisks) can be readily observed in both conditions. Close-ups of the boxed areas

are provided in the insets. B) Extracellular virions abundantly present in the

extracellular space of DMSO-treated MERS-CoV-infected cells (i, inset: zoomed-in

image of the boxed area), but not in the extracellular space of TOFA-treated and

virus-infected cells (ii). C) Consecutive stages of MERS-CoV particle assembly in

DMSO-treated and infected cells; assembly events were split in two categories for

simplicity (see Materials and Methods), denoted as early-stage assembly events of

budding nucleocapsid complexes in membranes of the secretory pathway (panels i

and ii) and late-stage assembly events including nearly fully-formed virus particles

and virions fully-budded inside large vesicles (iii). D) In TOFA-treated MERS-CoV-

infected cells early assembly stage events, as seen in panels (i) and (ii), were

abnormally abundant, revealing a stalling of virus particle assembly in the presence

of the compound. Mitochondria are annotated with M, convoluted membranes with

CM, and cell nuclei with N. Scale bar is 200 nm.

1104

Figure 7

Exogenous palmitic acid supplementation partially rescues MERS-CoV assembly

after TOFA treatment. A) Alignment of S and E protein C-terminal sequences from

selected coronaviruses using the following accession numbers: MERS-CoV

(NC_019843), SARS-CoV (NC_004718) SARS-CoV-2 (NC_045512), MHV

(AY700211), TGEV (AJ271965), IBV (NC_001451), HCoV-229E (NC_001451).

Cysteines next to the transmembrane domain that can serve as palmitoylation

substrates are highlighted in yellow and noted with an asterisk. B) Huh7 cells were

infected with MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated with either DMSO (vehicle control) or

30 μM 2-BP from 1 h p.i. onward. At 16 h p.i., cell lysates were harvested, and

intracellular viral RNA copies were measured by RT-qPCR. C) Infectious viral

progeny was quantified by plaque assay on Huh7 cells. Data are represented as

mean ± SD of three independent experiments. D) Huh7 cells were infected with

MERS-CoV (MOI 5) and treated from 1 h p.i. onward with DMSO supplemented with

100 μM BSA, TOFA, TOFA supplemented with 100 μM BSA-PA, or TOFA

supplemented with 100 μM BSA-OA. At 16 h p.i., samples were collected, and

infectious viral progeny was quantified by plaque assay on Huh7 cells. Data are

represented as mean ± SD of two independent experiments. Statistical significance

was calculated using one-way ANOVA and applying Dunnet multiple comparison

correction, **** $p< 0.0001$ and ** $p< 0.01$, ns: not significant. E) Huh7 cells were

infected with MERS-CoV and treated with DMSO, TOFA or TOFA with BSA-PA from

1 h p.i. onward as previously described, and samples were collected at 12 h p.i. for

analysis by western blotting. Blots are representative of at least two independent

biological replicates. F-I) Huh7 cells were infected with MERS-CoV and treated as

described above. At 12 h p.i., samples were fixed and processed for TEM. F) Post

addition of palmitic acid, the number of extracellular virus particles present in TOFA-

treated virus-infected cells is increased. Scale bar is 100nm. G) Virions either in the

late-stage (advanced/ fully assembled particles) or early-stage were quantified (see

Materials and Methods), and the ratio of both classes was determined. H) Number of

DMVs per μm^2 of cytoplasm observed (see Materials and Methods) in the DMSO

and BSA-treated, TOFA-treated or TOFA and BSA-PA-treated virus-infected cells. I)

In the same samples, the area of CMs (in nm^2) was also determined per μm^2 of

cytoplasm (see Materials and Methods). Data are represented as mean ± SD of

three separate stiches. Statistical significance was calculated using one-way ANOVA

and applying Tukey multiple comparison correction, *** $p< 0.001$, ** $p< 0.01$, and *

$p<0.05$.

Figure 1

A)

B)

C)

Figure 2

Figure 3

A)

Lipid droplets/nuclei

8 hours p.t.

Mock-DMSO
i.

Mock-TOFA
ii.

Mock-DMSO
iii.

Mock-TOFA
iv.

11 hours p.t.

B)

Lipid droplets/nuclei

8 hours p.t. (9 hours p.i.)

MERS-CoV-DMSO
i.

MERS-CoV-TOFA
ii.

MERS-CoV-DMSO
iii.

MERS-CoV-TOFA
iv.

11 hours p.t. (12 hours p.i.)

Figure 4

Figure 5

A) <u>Supernatant</u>

DMSO	+	−
TOFA	−	+

B) <u>WCL</u>

	+	−	+	−
	−	+	−	+

9 h p.i.   12 h p.i.

180 kDa —

100 kDa —

FL ←
S1 ←

Spike/S1

180 kDa —

100 kDa —

FL ←

S2 ←
S2′ ←

Spike/S2

40 kDa —

N

25 kDa —

M

15 kDa —

E

β-actin

C) <u>PNGase treated</u>

DMSO	+	−	+	−
TOFA	−	+	−	+

Figure 6

A) DMVs

B) Extracellular virions

C) DMSO

D) TOFA

Figure 7

A)

S protein — TMD

```
          TMD                    *  *  **  *  *  * * * * *              * *  * * *
MERS-CoV   GLVALALCVFFILCCTGCGTNCMGKL-----------KCNRCCDRYEEYDLEPHKVHVH
SARS-CoV   GLIAIVMVTILLCCMTSCCSCLKGAC-----------SCG-SCCKFDEDDSEPVLKGVKLHYT
SARS-CoV-2 GLIAIVMVTIMLCCMTSCCSCLKGCC-----------SCG-SCCKFDEDDSEPVLKGVKLHYT
HCoV-229E  VLIFVVSMLLCCCSTGCGFFSCFA-----------SSIRGCCESTKLPYYD-VEKIHIQ
MHV-A59    AGVAVCVLLFFICCCTGCG-SCCFK-----------GCNCCDEYGGHQDSIVIHNISSHED
IBV        ATIIFILILGWVFFMTGCCGCCCGCCGIMPLMSKCGKKSSYYTTFDNDVVTEQYRPKKSV
TGEV       VVIFCIPLLLFCCCSTGCCGCIGCLG-----------CCHSICSRRQFENYEPIEKVHVH
```

E protein

```
                  TMD                       *  * *       *
MERS-CoV   MLPFV--QERIGLFIVNFFIFTVVCAITLLVCMAFLTATRLCVQCMTGFNTLLVQP--
SARS-CoV   MYSFV---SEETGTLIVNSVLLFLAFVVFLLVTLAILTALRLCAYCCNIVNVSLVKP--
SARS-CoV-2 MYSFV---SEETGTLIVNSVLLFLAFVVFLLVTLAILTALRLCAYCCNIVNVSLVKP--
HCoV-229E  MFLKLVDDHALVVNNVLLWCVVLIVILLVCITIIKLIKLCFTCHMFCNRTVYGP--
MHV-A59    MFNLF----LTDTVWYVGQIIFIFAVCLMVTIIVVAFLASIKLCIQLCGLCNTLVLSP--
IBV        VMMNLLNKSLEENGSFLT-ALYIIVGFLALYLLGRALQAFVQAADACCLFWYTWVVIPGA
TGEV       MTFPRALTVIDDNG-MVINIIFWFLLIIILILLSIALLNIIKLCMVCCNLGRTVIIVPAQ
```

B) Intracellular viral RNA

C) Infectious virus particles

D)

E)

F)

G)

H)

I)