Epigenetic motifs distinguishing endogenous from exogenous retroviral

integrants.

Authors: Sarah LaMere,[1]* Hanbei Xiong,[2,3] Wei Wang,[2,3] Brian LaMere,[4] Niema Moshiri[5]

[1]Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

*Corresponding author: salamere@health.ucsd.edu

[2]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California San Diego, La Jolla,

California, USA

[3]Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla,

California, USA

[4]Escondido, CA

[5]Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California San Diego, La

Jolla, California, USA

Corresponding Author:

Sarah LaMere, D.V.M., Ph.D.
Department of Medicine
University of California San Diego
9500 Gilman Dr.
La Jolla, CA 92093
Phone: (858) 947-5055
E-mail: salamere@health.ucsd.edu
23

24 **Running Title:** Comparative endogenous and exogenous retroviral epigenetic motifs
25
26 **Keywords:** DNA methylation, endogenous retrovirus, epigenetics
27
28

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the James B. Pendleton Charitable Trust,

UC San Diego faculty research funds, the California HIV Research Program CHRP

H24BD7869 (LaMere), and grants from the National Institutes of Health: 1K01OD026565

(LaMere), R01NS137852 (LaMere), and R01HG009626 (Wang). We would also like to

acknowledge Dr. Diako Ebrahimi for the provision of the Python code used for the Kmer

analysis in this manuscript.

Abstract (231 words)

Retroviruses are subject to epigenetic regulation by the host genome after integrating, similar

to vertebrate genes. However, their patterns of integration, and therefore their likely

epigenetic regulation, differ between classes. Beta- and gammaretroviruses are two classes

of simple retroviruses known to integrate near promoters, and these viruses have a strong

tendency to infect germ cells and endogenize. While ancient endogenous retroviruses are

often easy to spot due to mutations rendering them non-functional, more recent integrants

can maintain the capacity for full viral production, making it sometimes difficult to discern

which integrants are exogenous and likely more clinically relevant. Because endogenous

retroviruses generally spend a longer time integrated and subject to host epigenetic

regulation as proviral DNA, we hypothesized we could show these integrants exhibit

sequence differences from their exogenous counterparts, likely resulting from DNA

methylation and histone modifications, and that endogenous retroviruses would generally

show habituation to host promoters. Therefore, we have used statistical analyses of publicly

available sequence data to demonstrate that endogenous retroviral variants exhibit

decreased CpG dinucleotide and trinucleotide frequencies over time, and that they will show

evidence for loss of histone modification motifs associated with actively transcribed genes.

Close examination of these patterns provides further clues for distinguishing endogenous and

exogenous retroviral variants, potentially aiding in the study of retroviruses in less well-

characterized wildlife species where retroviral outbreaks are responsible for significant

disease and decline in populations.

Introduction

Retroviruses are a unique class of viruses that are capable of integrating into the genomes of

their hosts. Because these viruses carry their own distinctive polymerase capable of reverse

transcribing the viral RNA genome into DNA, followed by integration into the host DNA, they

are capable of permanently altering the genome in both the cell they infect and its progeny.

When retroviruses infect germ cells, they can become incorporated into every cell of the

resultant offspring, a process known as endogenization. Following endogenization,

retroviruses will tend to acquire mutations rendering their promoter sequences and/or gene

products deficient over the course of generations. Therefore, the degree of mutation of an

endogenous retroviral sequence can give a window into how long it has been endogenized in

a species.[1] Over 40% of mammalian genomes are reported to be products of reverse

transcription and endogenization. In stark contrast to the 1.5% of human DNA known to be

protein coding, 8-10% of the human genome is comprised of endogenous retroviruses.[2]

Retroviruses are divided into seven main classes based upon their genome organization and

structures.[3] Different classes of retroviruses exhibit different propensities for the genomic

regions into which they tend to integrate. For example, lentiviruses, which include human

immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV), have a tendency to

integrate into transcriptionally active gene bodies. On the other hand, gammaretroviruses,

which include murine leukemia virus (MuLV) and feline leukemia virus (FeLV), tend to target

gene promoters.[4] Betaretroviruses, such as mouse mammary tumor virus (MMTV) and

Jaagsiekte sheep retrovirus (JRSV), also tend to target transcriptional start sites.[5]

Gammaretroviruses and betaretroviruses are much more prone than lentiviruses to infecting

germ cells and endogenizing, as evidenced by their retroviral remnants being present in

every major mammalian genome examined, including HERV-K (betaretrovirus) and HERV-W

(gammaretrovirus) in humans. Interestingly, endogenous beta and gammaretroviruses can

frequently have exogenous counterparts that are fully infectious and replication-competent.

Their sequences are often only slightly divergent from each other, usually in the long terminal

repeat (LTR) and/or envelope (env), impacting their expression and tropism, respectively.[6]

Endogenous and exogenous retroviral variants are well-characterized for some species, such

as MuLV and FeLV. However, the distinction between recent integrants with transcriptionally

intact genomes in more poorly characterized species can be difficult. A case in point is the

koala retrovirus, KoRV, which is a gammaretrovirus in the process of endogenizing. The virus

has been associated with leukemias and lymphomas, as well as with secondary infections

such as chlamydia.[7] Thus far, ten different subtypes have been described, varying with

geography and exhibiting different associations with disease. KoRV-A appears to be the

endogenous variant that has arisen from this virus, while the other subtypes exhibit more

overt associations with disease and are believed to be exogenous.[8]

To make matters more confusing, endogenous and exogenous retroviruses will recombine.

The endogenous variant of FeLV can recombine with the exogenous variant FeLV-A to yield

a new virus with different tropism, and recombination events can even occur with other types

of less related endogenous retroviruses, giving rise to diversity and evolution within the

genera.[9] Most of these recombination events result from viruses within a single or closely

related species, but there are examples of recombination between gammaretroviruses from

more divergent species. For example, RD114, another endogenous gammaretrovirus found

in domestic cats, appears to be the product of a recombination event with Baboon

Endogenous Retrovirus (BaEV) and is believed to have resulted from a cross-species viral

transfer from an old-world monkey to a domestic cat.[10]

Multiple host epigenetic mechanisms used to suppress endogenous retroviral infections have

been described, including DNA methylation, histone modifications, and non-coding RNAs.[11]

Exogenous retroviruses can also be subject to these same mechanisms as a molecular arm

of the host antiviral defense, making them an active area of study in HIV.[12] However,

endogenous retroviruses that have co-evolved with their host species are frequently more

highly transcriptionally suppressed than their exogenous counterparts,[11] prompting the

hypothesis that sequence-specific evidence of epigenetic suppression will generally be more

apparent in endogenous variants.

Previously, HIV was reported to mirror the human genome with its low CpG content,

exhibiting evidence of deamination following CpG methylation.[13] Because of their propensity

to integrate into promoter regions, we hypothesized that beta and gammaretroviruses would

mirror the CpG content of the promoters in their respective species, and that endogenous

variants would exhibit decreased CpG content relative to exogenous variants, suggesting

more CpG methylation and deamination following endogenization, as well as altered CpG

trinucleotide motifs consistent with the methylation patterns in their host species. We also

hypothesized that motifs consistent with active histone modifications would be more apparent

in exogenous proximal proviral sequences, while those more consistent with repressive

motifs (e.g. H3K9me3) would be more evident in known endogenous sequences. To test

these hypotheses, we performed statistical analyses on CpG frequencies and CpG

trinucleotide motif frequencies from various retroviruses and compared endogenous to

exogenous variants, as well as all those from promoter sequences of the species in which

they are present. We also performed bisulfite mapping to examine methylation patterns in

endogenous retroviruses versus promoters. Finally, we examined differences in motifs

associated with histone modifications using the Simple Enrichment Analysis tool from the

MEME suite.[14]

Results

Gammaretroviruses evolve to reflect CpG content of eutherian host promoters, with variability

attributable to DNA methylation

To evaluate how betaretroviruses and gammaretroviruses adapt to the genomes of their

respective species, we examined CpG content of full-length endogenous and exogenous

retroviruses from cats, mice, pigs, sheep, and koalas from **Tables 1 and 2** (accession

numbers in **Supplementary Table S1**) and compared them to host promoter CpG content

(defined as 1000 bp upstream of all transcriptional start sites). In three cases, retroviral CpG

content was reflective of the median promoter CpG content **(Figure 1a-c)**. Sheep and koalas,

on the other hand, had a lower promoter CpG content that has not previously been reported

(Figure 1d-e). Marsupials might be a unique case, in that most DNA methylation occurs more

commonly in gene bodies instead of promoters,[15] and differences in promoter CpG content

reflect potential differences in epigenetic regulation.

Endogenization impacts CpG content of beta and gammaretroviruses due to CpG

methylation

When comparing CpG content of endogenous vs. exogenous retroviruses, endogenous

gammaretroviruses exhibited a significant decrease in CpG content compared to their

exogenous counterparts. However, the betaretroviruses analyzed did not have as robust a

difference with the sequences available **(Figure 2a)**. To examine the role of DNA methylation

in the CpG content of all retroviruses examined, we calculated the correlation between CpG,

TpG, and CpA observed to expected ratios (O/E ratio) to assess for deamination of

methylated cytosines. Deamination of methylated cytosines occurs over time, changing the

CpG landscape to TpG and CpA on the complementary strand, while non-methylated

cytosines are not subject to these same forces.[16] Strikingly, both the endogenous and

exogenous betaretroviruses, especially Jaagsiekte Sheep Retrovirus (JSRV), showed a

strong significant symmetrical negative correlation **(Figure 2b-d)**. The correlation for

exogenous JSRV was surprisingly more profound than that found in the endogenous variant.

Exogenous JSRV is believed to have arisen from a previous endogenous retrovirus,

suggesting it has likely been subject to selection pressure from host DNA methylation more

than other exogenous retroviruses.[17] However, endogenous JSRV showed heavy methylation

across the provirus, with a preference for CGC and CGG motifs **(Figure 2e-f)**. Consistent

with the predilection for CGC methylation, CGC motifs had the strongest correlation with

TGC/CAC **(Figure 2g)**, while endogenous JSRV showed a significant decrease in CGC O/E

ratios compared to both exogenous JSRV subtypes **(Figure 2h)**. MMTV had few full-length

replicates, three of which had identical sequences, calling into question the statistical power

of the analysis for this virus. However, Bismark bisulfite mapping demonstrated heavy CpG

methylation across the body of the MMTV provirus **(Figure 2i)**, with CGC trinucleotides

exhibiting a small but significantly higher percent methylation **(Figure 2j)**. CGC O/E ratios did

not exhibit significant differences between endogenous and exogenous MMTV (data not

shown), but few replicates were available for this analysis, making it difficult to achieve

significance.

Correlations between CpG and TpG/CpA in gammaretroviruses were less pronounced; FeLV,

which only included 8 replicate endogenous and exogenous full-length sequences each that

were publicly available, showed no significant negative correlation, and differences in TpG

and CpA O/E ratios were not significant between endogenous and exogenous variants.

However, O/E ratios of the trinucleotide motif CGC showed a significant decrease in enFeLV

compared to exFeLV, while TGC and CAC were significantly increased **(Figure 3a)**,

suggesting this trinucleotide motif in particular is prone to DNA methylation in the context of

enFeLV. Bisulfite mapping to cat promoters (defined as 1kb upstream of all transcriptional

start sites) showed significantly lower CGC and CGG methylation **(Figure 3b)**, suggesting

this pattern is inconsistent with that seen in cat promoters. Unfortunately, mapping the

bisulfite converted cat genome to enFeLV failed to produce robust results, preventing

definitive conclusions about the methylation patterns in enFeLV and their relationship to that

of promoters in the domestic cat.

More replicate sequences of endogenous and exogenous MuLV were available for analysis

from [18], allowing a comprehensive examination of this gammaretrovirus. We analyzed

promoters from three endogenous variants: polytropic (PMV), modified polytropic (MPMV),

and xenotropic (XMV) MuLV. In addition to a significant decrease in CpG O/E ratios between

enMuLV and exMuLV **(Figure 2a)**, enMuLV also exhibited a significant increase in TpG and

CpA O/E compared to exMuLV, suggesting a likely role by DNA methylation **(Figure 3c)**. A

significant correlation was also observed between CpG O/E and TpG/CpA O/E ratios in

enMuLV, providing further support for this conclusion **(Figure 3d)**. Bisulfite analysis of mouse

promoters showed no significant difference in frequency of trinucleotide motifs methylated in

mouse promoters, and enMuLV also showed no difference **(Supplementary Figure S1)**.

CGG trinucleotides showed no significant difference in frequency between enMuLV and

exMuLV, and while CCG trinucleotides did show a difference, CCG frequency negatively

correlated only with CCA and not CTG **(Supplementary Figure S2a-e)**, suggesting

APOBEC3G was a more likely cause of the asymmetric deamination.[19] Analysis of all

enMuLV sequences using Hypermut 3[20] demonstrated significant hypermutation due to

APOBEC3G for all but three of the 49 sequences examined **(Supplementary Table S2)**,

providing further support for this. Of note, the paper from which these enMuLV sequences

were retrieved discusses the role of APOBEC3 in genetic diversity among enMuLVs.[18]

Interestingly, as was true for FeLV, a significant reduction was found in CGC trinucleotide

motifs in the endogenous MuLVs compared to exMuLVs, while a significant increase in

corresponding TGC and CAC frequency was also observed **(Figure 3e)**. A modest but

significant negative correlation between CGC with TGC and CAC was also found in enMuLV

(Figure 3f), supporting the CGC motif as a more frequent past target for DNA

methyltransferases in enMuLV. Unlike the methylation patterns in the other endogenous

retroviruses, MuLV did not exhibit a significant preference for CGC methylation, nor did

mouse promoters **(Supplementary Figure S1)**, calling into question whether CpG

methylation is responsible in this case. However, these CpG frequency patterns might reflect

initial methylation following integration rather than endogenization. In all cases comparing

endogenous and exogenous variants, there was evidence of a predilection for CGC

methylation following endogenization, either via available methylation data, CGC O/E data, or

both.

CpG content of endogenous retroviruses is variably impacted by DNA methylation and

corresponds with transcriptional activity

Pigs have three highly related endogenous gammaretroviruses known as Porcine

Endogenous Retrovirus A, B, and C. The viral sequences are primarily different in their

envelope regions, as well as some difference in the LTRs that appear to confer varying levels

of transcriptional activity. PERV-A is the oldest, having endogenized approximately 6.6 million

years ago. PERV-B is close in age, having endogenized approximately 6.4 million years ago.

Finally, PERV-C is the most divergent of the three and is thought to have endogenized 3.2

million years ago.[21] Of the three, PERV-B is the most transcriptionally active, while PERV-C

is the least, and the CpG contents of the three proviruses reflect this, with PERV-B exhibiting

the highest CpG O/E ratio, and PERV-C exhibiting the lowest **(Figure 4a)**. Of the three

proviruses, only PERV-C demonstrates a correlation between CpG and TpG/CpA O/E ratios

(Figure 4b), suggesting this provirus is the most heavily impacted by DNA methylation. To

attempt to confirm this finding, we mapped a bisulfite converted pig genome to full-length

PERV-A, PERV-B, and PERV-C. The PERV-C envelope had no reads mapping, suggesting

this variant was not present in the publicly available bisulfite converted pig genome we

accessed. However, methylation was heavy across both PERV-A and PERV-B **(Figure 4c)**.

Because sequences are identical for the two variants across the LTR, gag, and pol, we

compared CpG methylation across the env regions of the two subtypes, demonstrating that

CpG methylation was comparable between the two at approximately 80% **(Figure 4d)**.

The koala gammaretrovirus, KoRV, is the youngest known endogenous retrovirus, as

evidence points to it being in the midst of endogenizing. KoRV-A was the first subtype

discovered and appears to be the most commonly endogenized variant, showing less

association with disease than other subtypes. It is not entirely clear whether the other

subtypes are endogenous or exogenous, but subtypes B-F are believed to be primarily

exogenous.[8] The CpG patterns of the other subtypes suggest they are less impacted by

DNA methylation and potentially more transcriptionally active. For example, KoRV-A exhibits

a significantly lower frequency of CpG dinucleotides than the other KoRV subtypes **(Figure**

4e). Additionally, KoRV-A shows a significant correlation between CpG and TpG/CpA, once

again suggesting DNA methylation plays a more significant role for this subtype **(Figure 4f)**,

while no significant correlation was found between CpG O/E ratios and TpG/CpA ratios of the

other subtypes (data not shown). Mapping of bisulfite converted koala DNA against the

KoRV-A sequence showed heavy DNA methylation across the provirus, which was also

recently reported by [22] **(Figure 4g)**, reinforcing the likely impact of DNA methylation upon the

CpG composition of this provirus. Interestingly, the endogenous koala betaretrovirus, phaCin-

β,[23] also exhibited evidence for past DNA methylation, with a significant correlation between

CpG O/E ratios with TpG/CpA ratios **(Figure 4h)**. Calculation of median %CpG methylation

from mapping of bisulfite converted genomes for all endogenous retroviruses examined

showed a significant correlation to median CpG O/E ratios, with KoRV-A proving to be a

major outlier **(Figure 4i)**, perhaps reflecting its recent integration into the koala genome, as

CpG frequencies have not yet decreased to the same extent as older endogenous

retroviruses.

Exogenous retroviruses exhibit more histone modification motifs associated with active

transcription than endogenous variants

To evaluate differences in histone modifications across endogenous and exogenous

retroviruses, we used Simple Enrichment Analysis (SEA) from the MEME suite[14] to compare

endogenous to exogenous proviral sequences and discover the most commonly enriched

motifs in each. For this analysis we compared each of two types of endogenous MuLV

sequences (modified polytropic (MPMV) and polytropic (PMV)) to exogenous MuLV

sequences. We also compared endogenous FeLV to exogenous FeLV-A, and endogenous

JSRV to the two types of exogenous JSRV (Enzootic Nasal Tumor Virus, or ENTV, and

Ovine Progressive Pleuropneumonia, or OPP).

Because mice have considerably more genome-wide histone modifications publicly available,

a more thorough characterization of histone modification motifs across MuLVs was possible.

We performed CpG island (CGI) analysis with Emboss Cpgplot[24] to refine results for histone

modifications typically confined to promoters and CGIs. CGI analysis showed that exogenous

MuLV exhibited a CGI not present in the endogenous variants **(Figure 5a)**. Three statistically

significant motifs for H3K27ac and H3K9ac, which are histone modifications associated with

active transcription, were found in this CGI that were not located in the endogenous MuLVs

(Figure 5a, Supplementary Table S3). However, in PMV, which is more transcriptionally

active than MPMV,[25] a considerable number of motifs associated with both active (H3K9ac,

H3K27ac, H3K4me3) and repressive (H3K27me3, H3K9me3) modifications were

concentrated in the CGI traversing the U5 region of the 5' LTR and the leader region **(Figure**

5b). Interestingly, in addition to some of the 'active' histone modification motifs, MPMV had

multiple repressive H3K27me3 motifs throughout the provirus, including in the LTR, the CGI

in the leader region, located in *gag*, and also in the CGI located at the *pol-env* junction

(Figure 5c).

To attempt to validate these findings, we examined enMuLVs aligned with mouse genome

assembly MM10 in the UCSC Genome Browser with ENCODE histone modification tracks.

Surprisingly, 73% of enMuLV's (57/78) showed no histone modifications at all, but a few did,

summarized in **Table 3**. Repressive H3K9me3 and H3K27me3 were the most commonly

found modifications, with some modifications associated with active transcription, including

H3K27ac, H3K4me3, and H3K9ac **(Figure 5d)**. H3K27me3 and H3K27ac were most

commonly located in the proximal LTR, while H3K4me3 and H3K9ac were distributed among

CGIs and CpG-rich regions. H3K9me3 was broadly distributed across gene bodies, while

H3K36me3 was located in the gene body of one provirus, with H3K9me3 marking the same

spot. CpG methylation in embryonic stem cells and neural progenitors was usually found in

sparse or moderate amounts in all proviruses examined and frequently overlapped histone

modifications when they were present **(Table 3, Supplementary Figure S3a-b)**. However,

mapping of bisulfite converted DNA from liver tissue showed heavy average CpG methylation

across the provirus, suggesting CpG methylation might be more critical for proviral epigenetic

regulation after differentiation **(Supplementary Figure S3c)**, although these data represent

an average of proviral CpG methylation from different integrants at different sites vs. the

individual sites examined for histone modifications.

To examine another gammaretrovirus, we generated H3K4me3 and H3K27ac motifs for the

domestic cat and used SEA to examine enrichment throughout the endogenous and

exogenous FeLVs. As both of these marks are associated with active transcription, there was

a marked absence of any of these motifs meeting the relatively high significance threshold in

enFeLVs (e-value < 0.05). However, exFeLV-A had multiple CGIs with which these

modifications were associated **(Figure 6a, Supplementary Table S4)**.

We also examined betaretroviruses for significantly enriched histone motifs. SEA analysis

was overall unsuccessful for MMTV because too few full-length sequences were publicly

available. However, JSRV analysis yielded some interesting findings. Both JSRV and MMTV

exhibit considerably fewer conventional CGIs than the gammaretroviruses, so we narrowed

the minimum length to 100 bp to pick up CpG-rich regions where histone modifying enzymes

would be more likely to bind. All JSRV variants had short CpG stretches in the U5 region of

the LTR and the CGI located in the pol-env junction. Endogenous JSRV had a CpG-rich

region located in the *gag-pro-pol* junction, while the exogenous JSRVs had one more

proximally located in *gag* **(Figure 6b-d)**. A few statistically significant H3K4me3 sites were

found in the endogenous JSRV, but overall they were sparse **(Figure 6b, Supplementary**

Table S5). Both exogenous JSRVs had H3K27ac and H3K4me3 motifs in the proximal LTR

(Figure 6c-d). However, the ENTV JSRV variant had more of these motifs in the CpG-rich

leader region and the *pol-env* junction, while the OPP variant had significant motifs in *gag,*

suggesting these two exogenous variants are potentially regulated differently.

Discussion

We have shown that beta and gammaretroviruses frequently reflect the CpG content of their

host promoters, but this is not always true in species where promoter CpG content is

naturally lower. As shown in **Figure 1**, both beta and gammaretroviruses can reflect promoter

CpG content, where in most species, ~67% of promoters will contain CpG islands.[26]

Interestingly, sheep and koalas, where the retroviral CpG content did not reflect that of

promoters, exhibited significantly lower CpG content than other vertebrate species examined

(i.e. 0.3 vs 0.45-0.5) **(Figure 1)**. This could suggest that these retroviruses reflect evolution

within other species first. KoRV in particular is hypothesized to have arisen in either rodents

or bats based on phylogenomic studies.[27, 28] JSRV is an older virus thought to have

integrated around 5-7 million years ago, but the exogenous virus is believed to have arisen

recently from endogenous variants and continues to produce more endogenous integrants.[17]

The strong negative correlation between CpG and TpA/CpG motifs appears to reflect this

evolutionary history, suggesting a long history of host CpG methylation and therefore

integration within the species. Overall, sheep promoters exhibit low CpG content compared to

other species, resulting in a disparity between CpG content of promoters and JSRV.

Betaretroviruses have a predilection for integration near transcriptional start sites,[5] but they

do not generally show a preference for CGIs as gammaretroviruses do,[4] suggesting their

integration requirements might be less dependent on CGIs. The viral p12 protein of

gammaretroviruses is known to tether the preintegration complex to nucleosomes via

bromodomain and extraterminal domain (BET) proteins, playing a role in both integration and

in nucleosome loading onto the provirus while targeting the PIC to CpG promoters and

enhancers.[29, 30] However, a tethering mechanism still has not been elucidated for

betaretroviruses,[31] so it is more difficult to hypothesize how their evolution might be impacted

by host CpG content.

We have also shown that endogenization clearly impacts CpG content and CpG trinucleotide

motif patterns, and that these results are likely due to CpG methylation. Every endogenous

retrovirus to which we mapped bisulfite sequencing exhibited >80% methylation across the

entire provirus **(Figures 2 and 4, Supplementary Figure S3c)**. CpG methylation has long

been known to silence endogenous retroviruses during embryonic development.[32] However,

CpG methylation within gene bodies is generally not silencing and instead associated with

active transcription.[33] From an epigenetic standpoint, this could suggest that the entire

provirus is treated similarly to a silenced host promoter. That said, even highly transcribed

endogenous retroviruses (e.g. PERV[21]) showed heavy CpG methylation in somatic cells

(Figure 4c), calling into question what this mechanism achieves beyond transcriptional

silencing.

Almost across the board, endogenous retroviruses exhibited significantly lower CpG content

than their exogenous counterparts **(Figures 2-4)**, with some showing evidence more refined

to methylation of particular CpG trinucleotide motifs. In general, these did not appear to

reflect the methylation patterns of specific trinucleotide motifs in the host species. Different

DNA methyltransferases will target different CpG trinucleotide motifs more heavily,[34, 35] and it

is unknown whether these might change between species. The varying promoter methylation

patterns of CpG trinucleotides between the different species seem to suggest this is the case.

Retroviral methylation is often initiated during embryonic development by *de novo*

methyltransferases DNMT3a and DNMT3b.[34-36] This may not be reflective of the overall

methylation pattern in somatic cells, which is normally maintained by DNMT1.[37]

Using enMuLV data, we found that histone modifications were generally sparse among

endogenous retroviruses, suggesting that the seemingly ubiquitous DNA methylation we

observed **(Figures 2 and 4, Supplementary Figure S3c)** was more likely important for

endogenous retroviral epigenetic regulation. Of proviruses that did have modifications, those

associated with both active (H3K27ac, H3K9ac, H3K4me3, H3K36me3) and repressive

(H3K27me3, H3K9me3) chromatin could be found **(Figure 5d, Table 3)**. It is probable the

proviral histone modification pattern is dictated by the integration site environment and less

by the endogenous provirus itself, which requires further exploration. However, there did

appear to be significant differences in motifs associated with active and repressive histone

modifications when comparing endogenous and exogenous retroviruses **(Figures 5 and 6)**,

suggesting histone modifications could be playing an important role early after

endogenization, but future work will need to evaluate this hypothesis. Alterations to histone

modifications frequently precede DNA methylation for vertebrate gene regulation,[38] so newly

endogenized proviruses might be treated similarly. However, previous work on the more

ancient human endogenous retroviruses suggested that DNA methylation was an earlier

modification, while histone modifications were found in older and more degenerate LTRs.[39]

The profound (~93%) DNA methylation across the provirus of the recently integrated KoRV-A

supports this hypothesis **(Figure 4g)**. Additionally, KoRV-A defied the clear relationship

between proviral DNA methylation and CpG frequency observed for older endogenous

proviruses **(Figure 4i)**, suggesting changes to the viral sequence associated with methylated

cytosine deamination have thus far been minimal, and supporting the idea that DNA

methylation is a common initial epigenetic method for regulation of recent integrants.

Interestingly, with the exception of MMTV, the amount of CpG methylation across

endogenous proviruses appeared to correlate roughly to their ages, with lower amounts of

methylation corresponding to older integrants **(Table 1, Figure 4i)**, further supporting this

hypothesis.

We confined our analysis of mouse enMuLVs to sequences over 4000 bp, selecting for more

intact sequences, and the majority of these sequences (73%) contained no histone

modifications. Of those that did, CpG methylation was frequently present overlapping both

activation-associated and repressive histone marks in neural progenitors **(Table 3,**

Supplementary Figure S3a-b). CpG methylation in embryonic stem cells and neural

progenitors was almost ubiquitously present, but generally either in sparse or moderate

amounts. However, heavy average CpG methylation is present across the enMuLV provirus

in mouse liver **(Supplementary Figure S3c)**, suggesting DNA methylation is dynamic across

enMuLV during development and also suggesting marked regulation via CpG methylation in

somatic tissue.

In conclusion, retroviral endogenization shapes the sequence landscape of the provirus due

to host epigenetic factors. CpG methylation clearly impacts proviral CpG content over time,

while histone modification motifs appear to reflect the transcriptional state of the provirus,

whether endogenous or exogenous. Generally speaking, of the three retroviruses we

evaluated for histone modification motifs, exogenous variants appeared to have more

prominent activation-associated motifs (i.e. H3K27ac and H3K4me3) than their endogenous

counterparts relative to repression-associated motifs **(Figures 5 and 6)**. Endogenous MuLVs,

for which we had more well-defined motifs to examine, exhibited more significant motifs

associated with repression than exogenous variants, although those classified as PMV also

harbored a number of activation-associated motifs, consistent with their known elevated

transcriptional activity compared to other enMuLVs.[40] While no one clear pattern emerged to

distinguish endogenous from exogenous variants, we are still able to show that

endogenization impacts the proviral sequence landscape in generally predictable ways,

despite our analyses traversing multiple endogenous integrants in what are likely a wide

variety of chromatin environments from different species. These changes due to evolutionary

pressure from the host epigenetic machinery provide a starting point to aid in deciphering

when beta- and gammaretroviruses are clinically significant and warrant further investigation.

Methods

CG trinucleotide motif O/E calculation:

To calculate trinucleotide D-ratios (Observed/Expected or O/E ratios), a first order Markov

model of conditional probabilities was used.[13, 41, 42] The expected frequency of each motif is

estimated using the individual base components with the following example equation:

$P_{exp}(CpGpT) = \underline{P_{obs}(CpG) \times P_{obs}(GpT)}$

$\qquad\qquad P_{obs}(G)$

The D-ratio was calculated by dividing the P_{obs} of each trinucleotide by the P_{exp}.

CG trinucleotide D-ratios were calculated for all proviral sequences using the provided Kmer

tool, as well as promoter sequences retrieved from each respective species using the

Ensembl Biomart Tool,[43] where sequences 1000 bp upstream of each transcriptional start

site of all Refseq annotated genes were extracted.

Bisulfite sequencing alignment and cytosine methylation calculation

Bisulfite converted genomes used in these analyses are reported in **Supplementary Table**

S6. SRA files obtained from NCBI were converted to fastq using the NCBI prefetch utility.

Fastq files were subjected to Trim Galore![44] Alignment of retrieved promoter and retroviral

sequences (accessions in **Supplementary Table S1**) to bisulfite converted genomes was

performed using Bismark software.[45] Deduplication and methylation extraction were also

performed using Bismark. CpG methylation reports generated from Bismark were used to

calculate CpG methylation for CGA, CGC, CGG, and CGT trinucleotides.

Histone motif generation

Motifs for all mouse histone modifications were retrieved from[46]. Epigram was used as

described in [46] to generate motifs for H3K4me3 and H3K27ac in sheep and domestic cats

using the following data sets: H3K4me3 and H3K27ac from sheep liver GSE206736[47] aligned

with the Ovis aries genome assembly Oar_rambouillet_v1.0, and H3K4me3 and H3K27ac

from cat heart GSE182952 aligned with the Felis catus genome assembly

F.catus_Fca126_mat1.0.

CpG Island Identification

For CpG Island identification, consensus sequences for each provirus were generated using

MacVector[TM] software. Sequences were entered into Emboss Cpgplot[24] using a window size

of 100, a minimum length of 200, a minimum observed CpG frequency of 0.6, and a minimum

CpG percentage of 50. For JSRV sequences, CGI minimum lengths were dropped to 100.

SEA analysis

For SEA analysis, histone modification motif analyses for exogenous retrovirus variants were

submitted for enrichment compared to their corresponding endogenous variants as negative

controls, and vice versa with histone motifs generated from Epigram analyzed for enrichment

as described above with an E-value cutoff of 0.05. Motifs for H3K4me3, H3K27ac, and

H3K27me3 were retrieved only if they aligned with CpG islands from the corresponding

proviruses being analyzed. In all cases, only sequence motifs enriched in all inputted

sequences with no more than one of the negative control sequences, or one less than all

inputted sequences with no negative control sequences, were considered significant, even

when E-value and CGI criteria were met.

enMuLV histone modification identification

Consensus sequences for endogenous MuLV variants MPMV, PMV, and XMV were all

entered into the UCSC Genome Browser BLAT tool.[48, 49] ENCODE histone tracks for

H3K27ac, H3K27me3, H3K9ac, H3K9me3, H3K4me3, H3K36me3, and H3K4me1 from

forebrain, liver, kidney, and intestine from day 16 embryonic mice aligning $\geq$ 4000 bp of

enMuLV sequence were visualized to identify sites of modification throughout the provirus.

ENCODE tracks for CpG methylation in mouse embryonic stem cells and neural progenitor

cells were also included.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses and data visualization were performed using GraphPad Prism software

version 10.4.2 for macOS. Multiple comparisons for CpG trinucleotide motifs between

proviruses and promoters were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Two-sided

independent t-tests or Mann-Whitney tests were used for individual comparisons where

appropriate. All correlation analyses were performed using Spearman's rank correlation test

with a 95% confidence interval. Pearson correlation was used in one case (Figure 4i) after

the normality assumption was confirmed by Shapiro-Wilk and Komogorov-Smirnov tests. In

all analyses, statistical significance was defined as p-value < 0.05.

516 Tables:

Table 1: Endogenous with counterpart exogenous retroviruses used for analysis.

	Exogenous vs endogenous % identity	Integration time	Exogenous CpG O/E	Endogenous CpG O/E	Exog. N	Endog. N
Gammaretroviruses						
FeLV	86%	<2 MYA[50]	0.53	0.49	8	8
MuLV	90-100%	1 MYA[25]	0.53	0.52	16	49
KoRV	90%	22,000-49,000 YA[51]	0.51	0.5	8	16
Betaretroviruses						
MMTV	95-99%	20 MYA[52]	0.45	0.46	6	5
JSRV	90-98%	5-7 MYA[17]	0.58	0.57	20	19

Table 2: Further endogenous retroviruses used for analysis.

	Integration time	CpG O/E	Endog. N
Gammaretroviruses			
PERV-A	6.6 MYA[47]	0.52	8
PERV-B	6.4 MYA[47]	0.53	14
PERV-C	3.2 MYA[47]	0.48	14
Betaretroviruses			
phaCin-b	0.7-1.5 MYA[53]	0.52	18

Table 3: Histone modifications found in enMuLV using UCSC Genome Browser.

Chromosomal position	Approximate Proviral Position							
	H3K27 ac	**H3K27 me3**	**H3K4 me3**	**H3K9 me3**	**H3K9ac**	**H3K36 me3**	**CpG Meth ESC**	**CpG Meth NP**
Chr13:21812647	~1-50		~1-50, ~1900		~1900		Sparse	Sparse
Chr15:76559905		~1-50					Moderate	Moderate
Chr5:23700719				~5700		~5700	Sparse	Heavy
Chr1:171481826				~2000			Sparse	Heavy
Chr1:164224022			~1085		~1085		Moderate	Moderate
Chr18:30266726			~1100, 1780		~1100, 1780		Moderate	Moderate
Chr8:123428312				~2830,3370,5650			Sparse	Heavy
Chr4:134159771			~925-1300		~925-1300		Moderate	Moderate
Chr18:82693551	~1-50		~1-50		~1-50		Sparse	Sparse
Chr9:62439174	~1-50				~1-50		Sparse	Sparse
Chr8:119889565		~1-150					Moderate	Moderate
Chr11:88890180		~1-50					Moderate	Moderate
Chr5:109901526				~1730			Sparse	Sparse
Chr19:38375022		~1-50					Moderate	Sparse
Chr5:24215308		~1-50					Sparse	Sparse
Chr1:164223807			~1100		~1100		Moderate	Moderate
Chr7:30688640		~1-50					Moderate	Sparse
Chr10:41436648		~1-50					Moderate	Sparse
Chr1:191933613		~1-50					Sparse	Sparse
Chr8:85125855		~1-50					Moderate	Moderate
Chr14:54292373		~1-50					Sparse	Sparse

521
522

Figures:

Figure 1: CpG content of beta- and gammaretroviruses commonly reflects CpG content

of promoter sequences. Endogenous and exogenous retroviral median CpG D-ratios are

compared to those of promoters for **a)** domestic cats **b)** mice **c)** pigs **d)** sheep and **e)** koalas.

P-values are reported from Kruskal-Wallis tests for multiple comparisons. Error bars

represent interquartile ranges. n.s. $p > 0.05$, **** $p < 0.0001$

Figure 2: Endogenization of beta- and gammaretroviruses impacts retroviral CpG content: a) Endogenized retroviral variants exhibit lower CpG content than exogenous counterparts for Feline Leukemia Virus (FeLV), Murine Leukemia Virus (MuLV), and Jaagsiekte sheep retrovirus (JSRV). Mouse Mammary Tumor Virus (MMTV) shows no significant change to median CpG content. JSRV shows a strong negative correlation between CpG content and TpG/CpA content in **b)** endogenous **c)** exogenous Enzootic Nasal Tumor Virus (ENTV) and **d)** exogenous Ovine Progressive Pleuropneumonia (OPP) variants. **e)** CpG methylation across endogenous JSRV shows uneven CpG trinucleotide distribution, with a preference for CGC trinucleotides. **f)** Bismark mapping shows heavy CpG methylation across the entire JSRV provirus. **g)** Endogenous JSRV shows a strong negative correlation between CGC content and TGC/CAC. **h)** CGC content is significantly decreased in endogenous JSRV compared to both exogenous JSRV strains. **i)** Trinucleotide analysis of

MMTV methylation shows a significant preference for CGC motifs. **j)** Bismark mapping shows

heavy CpG methylation across the body of the MMTV provirus.

P-values for individual comparisons are from Mann-Whitney tests **(a)** and Kruskal-Wallis test

for multiple comparisons with Dunn's multiple comparisons **(e,i)**, while R and p-values for

correlation analyses are from Spearman correlations **(b-d,g)**. Error bars in **e)** and **i)** represent

interquartile ranges. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001

Figure 3: Endogenization of gammaretroviruses impacts retroviral CpG content: a)

FeLV endogenization leads to a significant decrease in CGC content, with corresponding

increases in CAC and TGC content. **b)** Domestic cat promoters exhibit uneven median CpG

methylation across trinucleotides, with CGC being the least methylated. **c)** Endogenous

MuLV exhibits significantly increased TpG and CpA content compared to exogenous variants.

d) enMuLV shows a strong negative correlation between CpG, TpG, and CpA, suggesting

methylated cytosine deamination of enMuLV. **e)** EnMuLV CGC frequencies are significantly

decreased compared to exMuLV, with corresponding increases in TGC/CAC frequencies. **f)**

enMuLV shows a strong negative correlation between CGC and TGC/CAC, suggesting

methylated cytosine deamination of enMuLV at CGC trinucleotides. P-values are reported for

Mann-Whitney tests **(a, c, e)**, Kruskal-Wallis test for multiple comparisons **(b)**, and Spearman

correlation **(d, f)**. Error bars for **b)** represent interquartile ranges. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p <

0.001, ****p < 0.0001

Figure 4: CpG content of endogenous retroviruses corresponds with prior CpG

methylation and transcriptional activity: a) Porcine Endogenous Retrovirus (PERV)

variants exhibit significant variation in CpG content. **b)** PERV-C shows a significant negative

correlation between CpG with TpG/CpA content, suggesting prior methylation. **c)** Bisulfite

mapping with Bismark shows both PERV-A and PERV-B are heavily methylated across the

entire provirus. **d)** PERV-A and PERV-B show no significant difference in median CpG

methylation content. **e)** endogenous Koala Retrovirus (KoRV-A) has significantly lower CpG

content than the other KoRV subtypes. **f)** KoRV-A shows significant negative correlation

between CpG and TpG/CpA frequency, suggesting impacts from DNA methylation. **g)**

Bismark bisulfite mapping shows KoRV-A is heavily methylated across the entire provirus. **h)**

Endogenous koala betaretrovirus phaCin-β shows a significant negative correlation between

CpG and deamination products TpG/CpA. **i)** Median CpG % methylation plotted against

median CpG observed/expected (O/E) ratios demonstrates a significant negative correlation

between them for all endogenous retroviruses except KoRV-A (in red). Error bars in **(d)**

represent interquartile ranges. P-values are reported for Kruskal-Wallis tests for multiple

584 comparisons **(a)**, Mann-Whitney tests **(d,e)**, Spearman correlation **(b,f,h)**, and Pearson

585 correlation **(i)**. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $*** p < 0.001$, $****p < 0.0001$

586
587

Figure 5: Murine leukemia virus (MuLV) shows histone modification motifs consistent

with exogenous and variably active endogenous variants: a) Emboss Cpgplot and SEA

analysis identify CpG islands (shaded in green) across the exogenous MuLV provirus, with

one in particular containing H3K27ac and H3K9ac-associated motifs. **b)** Emboss Cpgplot and

SEA analysis of polytropic endogenous MuLV (PMV) show heavy density of histone

modification motifs within a CGI in the leader region, including those for active (H3K27ac,

H3K4me3, H3K9ac) and repressive (H3K27me3 and H3K9me3) domains. **c)** Emboss

Cpgplot and SEA analysis of endogenous modified polytropic endogenous MuLV (MPMV)

shows widespread H3K27me3 motifs in the LTR and CGIs throughout the provirus. **d)**

Visualization of ENCODE ChIP-Seq data from day 16 mouse embryos in the UCSC Genome

Browser shows several histone modifications present in endogenous MuLV sequences

(Figure details in **Table 3**). Further details on MuLV SEA analysis can be found in

Supplementary Table S3.

Figure 6: Exogenous Jaagsiekte Sheep Retrovirus (JSRV) and Feline Leukemia Virus (FeLV) variants contain more significant activation-associated histone modification motifs than endogenous variants. a) EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis show endogenous JSRV contains several CG-rich regions with only H3K4me3 motifs present and no H3K27ac. **b)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis of the exogenous Enzootic Nasal Tumor Virus (ENTV) JSRV variant show significant motifs present in the LTR, leader region, and *pol-env* junction for both H3K27ac and H3K4me3. **c)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis of the exogenous Ovine Progressive Pleuropneumonia (OPP) JSRV variant shows several H3K27ac and H3K4me3-associated motifs within CG-rich regions primarily in the LTR and *gag*. **d)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis of exogenous FeLV showed significant H3K27ac and H3K4me3 motifs in the LTR and CGIs throughout the provirus. Further details on SEA analysis can be found in **Supplementary Tables S4 and S5**.

616 <div align="center">References</div>
617

1.   Meyer TJ, Rosenkrantz JL, Carbone L, Chavez SL. Endogenous Retroviruses: With Us and
against Us. Front Chem. 2017;5:23. Epub 20170407. doi: 10.3389/fchem.2017.00023. PubMed PMID:
28439515; PMCID: PMC5384584.
2.   Mager DL, Stoye JP. Mammalian Endogenous Retroviruses. Microbiol Spectr.
2015;3(1):MDNA3-0009-2014. doi: 10.1128/microbiolspec.MDNA3-0009-2014. PubMed PMID:
26104559.
3.   Coffin J, Blomberg J, Fan H, Gifford R, Hatziioannou T, Lindemann D, Mayer J, Stoye J, Tristem
M, Johnson W, Ictv Report C. ICTV Virus Taxonomy Profile: Retroviridae 2021. J Gen Virol.
2021;102(12). doi: 10.1099/jgv.0.001712. PubMed PMID: 34939563; PMCID: PMC8744268.
4.   De Rijck J, de Kogel C, Demeulemeester J, Vets S, El Ashkar S, Malani N, Bushman FD, Landuyt
B, Husson SJ, Busschots K, Gijsbers R, Debyser Z. The BET family of proteins targets moloney murine
leukemia virus integration near transcription start sites. Cell Rep. 2013;5(4):886-94. Epub 20131031.
doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2013.09.040. PubMed PMID: 24183673; PMCID: PMC4197836.
5.   Felice B, Cattoglio C, Cittaro D, Testa A, Miccio A, Ferrari G, Luzi L, Recchia A, Mavilio F.
Transcription factor binding sites are genetic determinants of retroviral integration in the human
genome. PLoS One. 2009;4(2):e4571. Epub 20090224. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0004571. PubMed
PMID: 19238208; PMCID: PMC2642719.
6.   Jarosz AS, Halo JV. Transcription of Endogenous Retroviruses: Broad and Precise Mechanisms
of Control. Viruses. 2024;16(8). Epub 20240817. doi: 10.3390/v16081312. PubMed PMID: 39205286;
PMCID: PMC11359688.
7.   Tarlinton R, Meers J, Hanger J, Young P. Real-time reverse transcriptase PCR for the
endogenous koala retrovirus reveals an association between plasma viral load and neoplastic disease
in koalas. J Gen Virol. 2005;86(Pt 3):783-7. doi: 10.1099/vir.0.80547-0. PubMed PMID: 15722540.
8.   Hashem MA, Kayesh MEH, Maetani F, Eiei T, Mochizuki K, Ochiai S, Ito A, Ito N, Sakurai H, Asai
T, Tsukiyama-Kohara K. Koala retrovirus (KoRV) subtypes and their impact on captive koala
(Phascolarctos cinereus) health. Arch Virol. 2021;166(7):1893-901. Epub 20210426. doi:
10.1007/s00705-021-05078-y. PubMed PMID: 33900468.
9.   Ngo MH, AbuEed L, Kawasaki J, Oishi N, Pramono D, Kimura T, Sakurai M, Watanabe K,
Mizukami Y, Ochi H, Anai Y, Odahara Y, Umehara D, Kawamura M, Watanabe S, Miyake A, Nishigaki K.
Multiple recombination events between endogenous retroviral elements and feline leukemia virus. J
Virol. 2024;98(2):e0140023. Epub 20240119. doi: 10.1128/jvi.01400-23. PubMed PMID: 38240589;
PMCID: PMC10878261.
10.   van der Kuyl AC, Dekker JT, Goudsmit J. Discovery of a new endogenous type C retrovirus
(FcEV) in cats: evidence for RD-114 being an FcEV(Gag-Pol)/baboon endogenous virus BaEV(Env)
recombinant. J Virol. 1999;73(10):7994-8002. doi: 10.1128/JVI.73.10.7994-8002.1999. PubMed PMID:
10482547; PMCID: PMC112814.
11.   Du Toit A. Leaving a mark on retroviruses. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2021;19(3):138-9. doi:
10.1038/s41579-021-00514-x. PubMed PMID: 33469167.
12.   Letchumanan P, Theva Das K. The role of genetic diversity, epigenetic regulation, and sex-
based differences in HIV cure research: a comprehensive review. Epigenetics Chromatin.
2025;18(1):1. Epub 20250103. doi: 10.1186/s13072-024-00564-4. PubMed PMID: 39754177; PMCID:
PMC11697457.

13.   Alinejad-Rokny H, Anwar F, Waters SA, Davenport MP, Ebrahimi D. Source of CpG Depletion in
the HIV-1 Genome. Mol Biol Evol. 2016;33(12):3205-12. Epub 20160928. doi:
10.1093/molbev/msw205. PubMed PMID: 27682824.
14.   Bailey TL, Johnson J, Grant CE, Noble WS. The MEME Suite. Nucleic Acids Res.
2015;43(W1):W39-49. Epub 20150507. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkv416. PubMed PMID: 25953851; PMCID:
PMC4489269.
15.   Johnson BJ, Robbins A, Gyawali N, Ong O, Loader J, Murphy AK, Hanger J, Devine GJ. The
environmental and ecological determinants of elevated Ross River Virus exposure in koalas residing in
urban coastal landscapes. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):4419. Epub 20210224. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-
83919-1. PubMed PMID: 33627779; PMCID: PMC7904799.
16.   Upadhyay M, Samal J, Kandpal M, Vasaikar S, Biswas B, Gomes J, Vivekanandan P. CpG
dinucleotide frequencies reveal the role of host methylation capabilities in parvovirus evolution. J
Virol. 2013;87(24):13816-24. Epub 20131009. doi: 10.1128/JVI.02515-13. PubMed PMID: 24109231;
PMCID: PMC3838256.
17.   Arnaud F, Varela M, Spencer TE, Palmarini M. Coevolution of endogenous betaretroviruses of
sheep and their host. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2008;65(21):3422-32. doi: 10.1007/s00018-008-8500-9.
PubMed PMID: 18818869; PMCID: PMC4207369.
18.   Jern P, Stoye JP, Coffin JM. Role of APOBEC3 in genetic diversity among endogenous murine
leukemia viruses. PLoS Genet. 2007;3(10):2014-22. Epub 20070910. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.0030183. PubMed PMID: 17967065; PMCID: PMC2041998.
19.   Harris RS, Bishop KN, Sheehy AM, Craig HM, Petersen-Mahrt SK, Watt IN, Neuberger MS,
Malim MH. DNA deamination mediates innate immunity to retroviral infection. Cell. 2003;113(6):803-
9. doi: 10.1016/s0092-8674(03)00423-9. PubMed PMID: 12809610.
20.   Lapp Z, Yoon H, Foley B, Leitner T. Hypermut 3: identifying specific mutational patterns in a
defined nucleotide context that allows multistate characters. Bioinform Adv. 2025;5(1):vbaf025. Epub
20250210. doi: 10.1093/bioadv/vbaf025. PubMed PMID: 39981109; PMCID: PMC11842049.
21.   Chen Y. CM, Duan X., Cui J. Ancient origin and complex evolution of porcine endogenous
retroviruses. Biosafety and Health. 2020;2:142-51. doi:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bsheal.2020.03.003.
22.   Yu T, Blyton MBJ, Abajorga M, Koppetsch BS, Ho S, Xu B, Hu Z, Luban J, Chappell K, Weng Z,
Theurkauf WE. Evolution of KoRV-A transcriptional silencing in wild koalas. Cell. 2025. Epub
20250226. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2025.02.006. PubMed PMID: 40056902.
23.   Lillie M, Hill J, Pettersson ME, Jern P. Expansion of a retrovirus lineage in the koala genome.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2022;119(25):e2201844119. Epub 20220613. doi:
10.1073/pnas.2201844119. PubMed PMID: 35696585; PMCID: PMC9231498.
24.   Rice P, Longden I, Bleasby A. EMBOSS: the European Molecular Biology Open Software Suite.
Trends Genet. 2000;16(6):276-7. doi: 10.1016/s0168-9525(00)02024-2. PubMed PMID: 10827456.
25.   Stocking C, Kozak CA. Murine endogenous retroviruses. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2008;65(21):3383-98.
doi: 10.1007/s00018-008-8497-0. PubMed PMID: 18818872; PMCID: PMC4802364.
26.   Antequera F. Structure, function and evolution of CpG island promoters. Cell Mol Life Sci.
2003;60(8):1647-58. doi: 10.1007/s00018-003-3088-6. PubMed PMID: 14504655; PMCID:
PMC11138798.

27.   Hayward A, Grabherr M, Jern P. Broad-scale phylogenomics provides insights into retrovirus-
host evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(50):20146-51. Epub 20131125. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1315419110. PubMed PMID: 24277832; PMCID: PMC3864273.
28.   Hayward JA, Tachedjian M, Kohl C, Johnson A, Dearnley M, Jesaveluk B, Langer C, Solymosi PD,
Hille G, Nitsche A, Sanchez CA, Werner A, Kontos D, Crameri G, Marsh GA, Baker ML, Poumbourios P,
Drummer HE, Holmes EC, Wang LF, Smith I, Tachedjian G. Infectious KoRV-related retroviruses
circulating in Australian bats. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020;117(17):9529-36. Epub 20200413. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1915400117. PubMed PMID: 32284399; PMCID: PMC7196810.
29.   Wang GZ, Goff SP. Moloney Murine Leukemia Virus p12 Is Required for Histone Loading onto
Retroviral DNAs. J Virol. 2021;95(15):e0049521. Epub 20210712. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00495-21. PubMed
PMID: 34011543; PMCID: PMC8274600.
30.   Miklik D, Slavkova M, Kucerova D, Mekadim C, Mrazek J, Hejnar J. Long Terminal Repeats of
Gammaretroviruses Retain Stable Expression after Integration Retargeting. Viruses. 2024;16(10).
Epub 20240925. doi: 10.3390/v16101518. PubMed PMID: 39459853; PMCID: PMC11512309.
31.   Desfarges S, Ciuffi A. Retroviral integration site selection. Viruses. 2010;2(1):111-30. Epub
20100112. doi: 10.3390/v2010111. PubMed PMID: 21994603; PMCID: PMC3185549.
32.   Jahner D, Stuhlmann H, Stewart CL, Harbers K, Lohler J, Simon I, Jaenisch R. De novo
methylation and expression of retroviral genomes during mouse embryogenesis. Nature.
1982;298(5875):623-8. doi: 10.1038/298623a0. PubMed PMID: 6285203.
33.   Jjingo D, Conley AB, Yi SV, Lunyak VV, Jordan IK. On the presence and role of human gene-
body DNA methylation. Oncotarget. 2012;3(4):462-74. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.497. PubMed PMID:
22577155; PMCID: PMC3380580.
34.   Mao SQ, Cuesta SM, Tannahill D, Balasubramanian S. Genome-wide DNA Methylation
Signatures Are Determined by DNMT3A/B Sequence Preferences. Biochemistry. 2020;59(27):2541-50.
Epub 20200628. doi: 10.1021/acs.biochem.0c00339. PubMed PMID: 32543182; PMCID:
PMC7364778.
35.   Mallona I, Ilie IM, Karemaker ID, Butz S, Manzo M, Caflisch A, Baubec T. Flanking sequence
preference modulates de novo DNA methylation in the mouse genome. Nucleic Acids Res.
2021;49(1):145-57. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkaa1168. PubMed PMID: 33290556; PMCID: PMC7797059.
36.   Gao L, Emperle M, Guo Y, Grimm SA, Ren W, Adam S, Uryu H, Zhang ZM, Chen D, Yin J, Dukatz
M, Anteneh H, Jurkowska RZ, Lu J, Wang Y, Bashtrykov P, Wade PA, Wang GG, Jeltsch A, Song J.
Comprehensive structure-function characterization of DNMT3B and DNMT3A reveals distinctive de
novo DNA methylation mechanisms. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):3355. Epub 20200703. doi:
10.1038/s41467-020-17109-4. PubMed PMID: 32620778; PMCID: PMC7335073.
37.   Alvarez-Ponce D, Torres-Sanchez M, Feyertag F, Kulkarni A, Nappi T. Molecular evolution of
DNMT1 in vertebrates: Duplications in marsupials followed by positive selection. PLoS One.
2018;13(4):e0195162. Epub 20180405. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195162. PubMed PMID:
29621315; PMCID: PMC5886458.
38.   Stewart KR, Veselovska L, Kim J, Huang J, Saadeh H, Tomizawa S, Smallwood SA, Chen T,
Kelsey G. Dynamic changes in histone modifications precede de novo DNA methylation in oocytes.
Genes Dev. 2015;29(23):2449-62. Epub 20151119. doi: 10.1101/gad.271353.115. PubMed PMID:
26584620; PMCID: PMC4691949.

39.   Ohtani H, Liu M, Zhou W, Liang G, Jones PA. Switching roles for DNA and histone methylation
depend on evolutionary ages of human endogenous retroviruses. Genome Res. 2018;28(8):1147-57.
Epub 20180703. doi: 10.1101/gr.234229.118. PubMed PMID: 29970451; PMCID: PMC6071641.
40.   Boi S, Rosenke K, Hansen E, Hendrick D, Malik F, Evans LH. Endogenous retroviruses mobilized
during friend murine leukemia virus infection. Virology. 2016;499:136-43. Epub 20160919. doi:
10.1016/j.virol.2016.07.009. PubMed PMID: 27657834; PMCID: PMC5102782.
41.   Ebrahimi D, Anwar F, Davenport MP. APOBEC3G and APOBEC3F rarely co-mutate the same
HIV genome. Retrovirology. 2012;9:113. Epub 20121220. doi: 10.1186/1742-4690-9-113. PubMed
PMID: 23256516; PMCID: PMC3532371.
42.   Anwar F, Davenport MP, Ebrahimi D. Footprint of APOBEC3 on the genome of human
retroelements. J Virol. 2013;87(14):8195-204. Epub 20130522. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00298-13. PubMed
PMID: 23698293; PMCID: PMC3700199.
43.   Kinsella RJ, Kahari A, Haider S, Zamora J, Proctor G, Spudich G, Almeida-King J, Staines D,
Derwent P, Kerhornou A, Kersey P, Flicek P. Ensembl BioMarts: a hub for data retrieval across
taxonomic space. Database (Oxford). 2011;2011:bar030. Epub 20110723. doi:
10.1093/database/bar030. PubMed PMID: 21785142; PMCID: PMC3170168.
44.   Krueger F. Trim Galore! Available from:
https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/trim_galore/.
45.   Krueger F, Andrews SR. Bismark: a flexible aligner and methylation caller for Bisulfite-Seq
applications. Bioinformatics. 2011;27(11):1571-2. Epub 20110414. doi:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btr167. PubMed PMID: 21493656; PMCID: PMC3102221.
46.   Ngo V, Chen Z, Zhang K, Whitaker JW, Wang M, Wang W. Epigenomic analysis reveals DNA
motifs regulating histone modifications in human and mouse. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2019;116(9):3668-77. Epub 20190212. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1813565116. PubMed PMID: 30755522;
PMCID: PMC6397554.
47.   Chen S, Liu S, Shi S, Jiang Y, Cao M, Tang Y, Li W, Liu J, Fang L, Yu Y, Zhang S. Comparative
epigenomics reveals the impact of ruminant-specific regulatory elements on complex traits. BMC Biol.
2022;20(1):273. Epub 20221208. doi: 10.1186/s12915-022-01459-0. PubMed PMID: 36482458;
PMCID: PMC9730597.
48.   Perez G, Barber GP, Benet-Pages A, Casper J, Clawson H, Diekhans M, Fischer C, Gonzalez JN,
Hinrichs AS, Lee CM, Nassar LR, Raney BJ, Speir ML, van Baren MJ, Vaske CJ, Haussler D, Kent WJ,
Haeussler M. The UCSC Genome Browser database: 2025 update. Nucleic Acids Res.
2025;53(D1):D1243-D9. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkae974. PubMed PMID: 39460617; PMCID: PMC11701590.
49.   Kent WJ. BLAT--the BLAST-like alignment tool. Genome Res. 2002;12(4):656-64. doi:
10.1101/gr.229202. PubMed PMID: 11932250; PMCID: PMC187518.
50.   Roca AL, Pecon-Slattery J, O'Brien SJ. Genomically intact endogenous feline leukemia viruses
of recent origin. J Virol. 2004;78(8):4370-5. doi: 10.1128/jvi.78.8.4370-4375.2004. PubMed PMID:
15047851; PMCID: PMC374283.
51.   Ishida Y, Zhao K, Greenwood AD, Roca AL. Proliferation of endogenous retroviruses in the
early stages of a host germ line invasion. Mol Biol Evol. 2015;32(1):109-20. Epub 20140925. doi:
10.1093/molbev/msu275. PubMed PMID: 25261407; PMCID: PMC4271524.
52.   Parisi F, Freer G, Mazzanti CM, Pistello M, Poli A. Mouse Mammary Tumor Virus (MMTV) and
MMTV-like Viruses: An In-depth Look at a Controversial Issue. Viruses. 2022;14(5). Epub 20220506.
doi: 10.3390/v14050977. PubMed PMID: 35632719; PMCID: PMC9147501.

53.   Lillie M, Pettersson M, Jern P. Contrasting segregation patterns among endogenous
retroviruses across the koala population. Commun Biol. 2024;7(1):350. Epub 20240321. doi:
10.1038/s42003-024-06049-0. PubMed PMID: 38514810; PMCID: PMC10957985.
791