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 (210 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 genera. Beta- and gammaretroviruses are two types of

simple retroviruses that 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 motifs associated with 'active' histone modifications. 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.

Importance

Expression of vertebrate genes is regulated by chemical modifications made directly to the

DNA or to the proteins associated with it, termed epigenetics. Because retroviruses integrate

into DNA, they are subject to the same epigenetic modifications as regular genes.

Retroviruses will tend to endogenize, meaning they will become a permanent part of a

species' genome when their hidden DNA is passed down to progeny during reproduction.

However, sometimes it is difficult to discern whether a retroviral sequence is endogenous

(permanently fixed) or exogenous (an infectious entity). We hypothesized that changes to the

retroviral sequences over time after endogenization would result from epigenetic

modifications, and that these changes could help distinguish an endogenous retrovirus from

an exogenous one. In this paper, we show that changes to the viral sequences associated

with epigenetics indeed take place after endogenization.

Introduction

Retroviruses are a unique family 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, including LINEs and SIINEs, with 8-10% derived from endogenous

retroviruses.[2]

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

structures.[3] These genera 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 CpG-rich gene

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

sheep retrovirus (JSRV), have shown a weak propensity for transcriptional start sites (TSS),[5]

but generally seem to have a more random distribution of integration.[6] 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.[7]

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.[8] 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.[9]

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.[10] 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 between an

endogenous feline retrovirus (*Felis catus* endogenous retrovirus, or FcEV) and 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.[11]

Multiple host epigenetic mechanisms used to suppress endogenous retroviral infections have

been described, including DNA methylation, histone modifications, and non-coding RNAs.[12]

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.[13] However,

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

highly transcriptionally suppressed than their exogenous counterparts,[7] 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 that this was primarily a product of deamination following CpG

methylation rather than other possible mechanisms, such as CpG depletion by APOBEC3 or

due to toll-like receptors.[14] Because of their propensity to integrate into promoter regions, we

hypothesized that gammaretroviruses would mirror the CpG content of the promoters in their

respective species, and originally, we also hypothesized that CpG content of betaretroviral

genomes might mirror that of promoters due to a TSS integration bias. We also hypothesized

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. Finally, we hypothesized that motifs consistent with active histone modifications

would be more apparent in exogenous proximal proviral sequences, while those more

consistent with repressive modifications (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.[15] Because betaretroviruses have different integration

propensities than gammaretroviruses, we focused on characteristics for the few viruses we

were able to examine in each genus, as their integration behavior potentially impacts their

epigenetic regulation.

Results

Recently endogenized beta- and gammaretroviruses 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** (see **Data**

Availability Statement for accession numbers) using a Python-based Kmer tool. The Kmer

tool calculates D-ratios, which are the observed/expected (or O/E ratios) based on a first

order Markov model of conditional probabilities (see **Methods**). We assessed the CpG

content of endogenous retroviruses relative to multiple genomic regions (500 bp upstream of

the TSS, 1kb upstream of the TSS, 2kb upstream of the TSS, whole gene bodies, 1kb

downstream of all genes, and entire chromosomes) in all five species **(Supplementary**

Figures S1 and S2).

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

	Exogenous vs endogenous % identity	Original Integration time	Exogenous CpG O/E	Endogenous CpG O/E	Exog. N	Endog. N
Gammaretroviruses						
FeLV	86%	<2 MYA[16]	0.53	0.49	8	8
MuLV	90-100%	1 MYA[17]	0.53	0.52	16	49
KoRV	90%	22,000-49,000 YA[18]	0.51	0.5	8	16
Betaretroviruses						
MMTV	95-99%	20 MYA[19]	0.45	0.46	6	5
JSRV	90-98%	5-7 MYA[20]	0.58	0.57	20	19

In most cases, ERVs reflected the CpG content of regions 500 bp upstream of the TSS,

especially for the gammaretroviruses we evaluated **(Supplementary Figure S1a-d).** The

betaretroviruses we evaluated also trended this way, although enJSRV in particular had a

higher CpG O/E ratio relative to the other endogenous retroviruses we examined

(Supplementary Figure S2a-c). However, the five different mammalian species exhibited

significantly different CpG O/E ratios from each other in promoter regions (defined in

Supplementary S2d as 1 kb upstream of the TSS), suggesting that while endogenous beta-

and gammaretroviruses averaged CpG O/E ratios around 0.5, these could deviate

significantly from promoter CpG content, depending on the species they infect. Cats in

particular had overall higher CpG content across all regions examined **(Supplementary**

Figure S1a, **Supplementary Figure S2d)**, while sheep, koalas, and mice exhibited lower

relative CpG content closer to 0.4 within 1kb of the TSS **(Supplementary Figure S2d)**.

Table 2: Further endogenous retroviruses used for analysis.

Gammaretroviruses			
	Original Integration time	**CpG O/E**	**Endog. N**
PERV-A	6.6 MYA[21]	0.52	8
PERV-B	6.4 MYA[21]	0.53	14
PERV-C	3.2 MYA[21]	0.48	14
Betaretroviruses			
phaCin-β	0.7-1.5 MYA[22]	0.52	18

Based on our analysis, we compared CpG content of endogenous and exogenous beta- and

gammaretroviruses in each species to that of the region within 500 bp upstream of the TSS

(Figure 1a-e). Mice and sheep both displayed significant differences in CpG content of their

promoters from their respective retroviruses, reflecting their overall lower promoter CpG

content. However, three out of the five species examined had no significant difference

between their retroviral CpG content and their promoters. To rule out the potential impact of

ancient retroviral sequences inhabiting promoters, we used also LTRHarvest[23] to remove all

LTR and retrotransposon-like sequences and re-analyzed CpG content using the Kmer tool,

which resulted in a minimal change to the CpG content of the analyzed promoter sequences

(data not shown).

Endogenization impacts CpG content of beta- and gammaretroviruses due to CpG

methylation

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

gammaretroviruses FeLV and MuLV exhibited a statistically significant decrease in CpG

content compared to their exogenous counterparts (**Figure 1f-g**). However, the

betaretroviruses analyzed (MMTV and JSRV) did not have as robust a difference with the

sequences available **(Figure 1h-i)**. In fact, no significant difference was noted for

endogenous vs. exogenous MMTV, but the distribution of CpG content for MMTV is highly

skewed due to very few full-length replicates being publicly available (i.e. 5 for enMMTV and

6 for exMMTV), making concrete conclusions difficult to draw. However, JSRV had many

more replicates available, with 19 replicates for endogenous JSRV and 20 replicates for

exogenous JSRV. JSRV has two exogenous variants, one which causes enzootic nasal

tumor virus (ENTV), and another which causes ovine pulmonary adenocarcinoma (OPA).

Only the ENTV version of JSRV differed significantly in CpG content compared to the

endogenous variant, despite our own phylogenetic analysis of full-length sequences

suggesting it to be more closely related to the endogenous JSRV variant than the exogenous

OPA variant is (**Supplementary Figure S3**).

To examine the role of DNA methylation in the CpG content of all retroviruses examined, we

calculated the correlation between CpG, TpG, and CpA 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.[24] Strikingly, both the endogenous and

exogenous JSRV showed a strong significant symmetrical negative correlation **(Figure 2a-c)**.

The correlation for exogenous JSRV was surprisingly more profound than that found in the

endogenous variant. Of the endogenous retroviruses examined that had a closely related

exogenous variant, JSRV has been one of the longest circulating, prompting speculation that

perhaps long-standing integrants have relaxed epigenetic control. However, endogenous

JSRV showed heavy methylation across the provirus, with a preference for CGC and CGG

motifs **(Figure 2d-e)**. Consistent with the predilection for CGC methylation, CGC motifs had

the strongest correlation with TGC/CAC **(Figure 2f)**, while endogenous JSRV showed a

significant decrease in CGC O/E ratios compared to both exogenous JSRV subtypes **(Figure**

2g). 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 also demonstrated heavy CpG methylation across the body of the endogenous

MMTV provirus, with CGC trinucleotides exhibiting a small but significantly higher percent

methylation **(Figure 2h-i)**. 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 the two gammaretroviruses we examined were

less pronounced; FeLV, which only included 8 replicates of 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 [25], 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 1g)**, 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 S4)**.

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 S5a-e)**, suggesting

APOBEC3G was a more likely cause of the asymmetric deamination.[26] Analysis of all

enMuLV sequences using Hypermut 3[27] demonstrated significant hypermutation due to

APOBEC3G for all but three of the 49 sequences examined **(Supplementary Table S1)**,

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.[25]

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 S4)**, calling into question whether CpG

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

initial methylation following integration rather than following 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.[28] 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.[9] 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 in somatic liver

tissue, which was also recently reported by [29] for testicular tissue **(Figure 4g)**, reinforcing the

likely impact of DNA methylation upon the CpG composition of this provirus. Interestingly, the

endogenous koala betaretrovirus, phaCin-β,[30] 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 motifs associated with 'active' histone modifications

than endogenous variants

To evaluate differences in histone modifications across endogenous and exogenous

retroviruses, we used Simple Enrichment Analysis (SEA) from the MEME suite[15] 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 Pulmonary Adenocarcinoma, or OPA).

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

a more thorough characterization of motifs associated with histone modifications across

MuLVs was possible. We performed CpG island (CGI) analysis with Emboss Cpgplot[31] 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 S2)**. However, in PMV,

which is more transcriptionally active than MPMV,[17] 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 motifs associated

with 'active' histone modifications, 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

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

Chromosomal position	Approximate Proviral Position						CpG Meth ESC	CpG Meth NP
	H3K27ac	H3K27me3	H3K4me3	H3K9me3	H3K9ac	H3K36me3		
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

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 S6a-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 S6c)**, 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 assess 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 S3)**.

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 S4). 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 OPA 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 host

promoter CpG content, where in most species, ~67% of promoters will contain CpG islands.[32]

Interestingly, promoter CpG content varies significantly between the different species

examined **(Figure 1 and Supplementary Figure S2d)**, and those with lower CpG content

appeared more divergent from the CpG content of their respective retroviruses. In some part,

this could reflect retroviral evolution within other species first. KoRV in particular is

hypothesized to have arisen in either rodents or bats based on phylogenomic studies.[33, 34]

JSRV is an older betaretrovirus thought to have integrated around 5-7 million years ago, but

there is evidence of more recent endogenous variants having integrated only 200 years ago,

and it is likely that the currently circulating exogenous variants continue to endogenize.[20] The

strong negative correlation between CpG and TpA/CpG motifs in the exogenous variants

appears to reflect this evolutionary history, suggesting a long history of host CpG methylation

and therefore repeated 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. Originally, we hypothesized that the CpG content of the betaretroviral

genomes might mirror that of host promoters due to a TSS integration bias. However, while

this integration preference is not supported in the literature,[6] the CpG content similarity to

gammaretroviruses is still striking. 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.[35, 36] However, a tethering

mechanism still has not been elucidated for betaretroviruses,[37] so it is more difficult to

hypothesize how their evolution might be impacted by host CpG content. The similarities

between the genera in this respect could reflect convergent pressures for these endogenizing

viruses. Instead of reflecting integration propensities, perhaps CpG content reflects the

proviral tendency to harness promoter-like epigenetic machinery for successful transcription.

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 S6c)**. CpG methylation has long

been known to silence endogenous retroviruses during embryonic development.[38] However,

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

active transcription.[39] 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[28]) showed heavy CpG methylation in somatic cells

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

silencing. However, bisulfite mapping shows an average of all integrants in different regions,

and it is possible that only a few escape repression to produce viral particles, while the

majority are silenced.

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,[40, 41] 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.[40-42] This may not be reflective of the overall

methylation pattern in somatic cells, which is normally maintained by DNMT1.[43]

Time from initial ERV endogenization did not appear to correlate well with CpG methylation.

For example, MMTV was believed to have endogenized initially around 20 million years ago

(Table 1), but it exhibited the most methylation and least amount of CpG loss compared to

the other endogenous viruses **(Figure 4i)**, which integrated into their respective genomes

initially ranging from 1-7 million years ago **(Table 1)**. However, it is critical to keep in mind

that the endogenous retroviruses with exogenous counterparts, such as MMTV, are

continuing to produce new endogenous variants that are younger and perhaps more prone to

CpG methylation, and their integration sites likely also play a role in methylation frequencies.

Therefore, while the approach of using CpG frequencies to estimate time from initial

endogenization might work for stable integrants, it cannot be used to generalize time from

endogenization for viruses that continue to circulate and create new integrants.

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 S6c)** 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,[44] 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.[45]

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 enMuLV histone modifications 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 S6a-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 S6c)**, 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 motifs associated with histone modifications appear to reflect the transcriptional state of

the provirus, whether endogenous or exogenous. Generally speaking, of the three

retroviruses we evaluated for motifs associated with histone modifications, 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.[46] 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.

Methods

CG content and 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.[14, 47, 48] The expected frequency of each motif is

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

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

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 a Kmer tool

previously published and provided by Dr. Diako Ebrahimi,[14] as well as genomic sequences

retrieved from each respective species using the *Ensembl* Biomart Tool.[49] Genomic

sequences extracted included 500 bp, 1 kb upstream, and 2 kb upstream of each TSS, as

well as complete gene bodies and 1kb downstream of all Refseq annotated genes.

To identify and remove long terminal repeats from analyzed promoter sequences, we used

LTRharvest[23] from GenomeTools to identify and remove LTR sequences from all promoter

regions in each species. Identification parameters included a minimum length of 10 bp,

maximum length of 1000 bp, a minimum interval between LTRs of 15 bp with a maximum

interval of 1000 bp.

Bisulfite sequencing alignment and cytosine methylation calculation

Bisulfite converted genomes used in these analyses are reported in **Table 4**. SRA files

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

toolkit. Fastq files were subjected to Trim Galore![50] Alignment of retrieved promoter and

retroviral sequences (accessions in **Table 5**) to bisulfite converted genomes was performed

using Bismark software.[51] 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.[52] Epigram was used as

described in [52] to generate motifs for H3K4me3 and H3K27ac in sheep and domestic cats

using the following data sets: H3K4me3 and H3K27ac from sheep liver GSE206736[21] 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® software. Sequences were entered into Emboss Cpgplot[31] 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 Simple Enrichment Analysis (SEA), we used the SEA tool from the MEME suite.[15]

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.[53, 54] 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, as well as the stats and rstatix packages in R for statistics and

ggplot2 for visualization. Multiple comparisons for CpG motifs between proviruses and

promoters were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test for multiple comparisons followed by

Dunn's tests. 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.

Phylogenetic analysis

Phylogenetic analysis for JSRV sequences reported in **Supplementary Figure S2** were

conducted using MacVector® software. Neighbor-joining trees were built using 1000

bootstraps from from enJSRV and exJSRV sequences aligned with Clustal W.

Data Availability Statement

Accession numbers:

Chip-seq data from GSE206736 was retrieved to analyze for H3K4me3 and H3K27ac motifs

in sheep. Chip-seq data from GSE182952 was retrieved to analyze for H3K4me3 and

H3K27ac motifs in domestic cats.

Table 4 lists bisulfite converted genome sequences accessed on the NCBI BioProjects

database with the following Project, SRA Experiment, and Accession numbers:

Table 4: Bisulfite converted genomes from the NCBI BioProjects database used for this study.

Species	Tissue	Bioproject	Experiment	Accession numbers					
Cat	Blood	PRJNA16726	SRX548709	SRR1293903	SRR1293905				
Sheep	Skeletal Muscle	PRJNA622418	SRX8073310	SRR11497387					
Pig	Blood	PRJEB55066	ERX11037418	ERR11635337					
Koala	Kidney	PRJNA629340	SRX8207656	SRR11646494	SRR11646495				
Mouse	Liver	PRJNA416505	SRX3347189	SRR6239777	SRR6239784	SRR6239792	SRR6239799	SRR6239807	SRR6239814
				SRR6239778	SRR6239785	SRR6239793	SRR6239801	SRR6239808	SRR6239815
				SRR6239779	SRR6239786	SRR6239794	SRR6239802	SRR6239809	SRR6239816
				SRR6239780	SRR6239787	SRR6239795	SRR6239803	SRR6239810	
				SRR6239781	SRR6239788	SRR6239796	SRR6239804	SRR6239811	
				SRR6239782	SRR6239789	SRR6239797	SRR6239805	SRR6239812	
				SRR6239783	SRR6239790	SRR6239798	SRR6239806	SRR6239813	

611 **Table 5** lists accession numbers for all viral sequences accessed on NCBI Genbank:

Table 5: Sources and NCBI GenBank Accession numbers for proviral sequences used in this study.

Gammaretroviruses					
enMuLV [25]					
Mpmv1	Mpmv6	Pmv14	Pmv22	Xmv10	Xmv42
Mpmv10	Mpmv7	Pmv15	Pmv23	Xmv12	Xmv43
Mpmv11	Mpmv8	Pmv16	Pmv24	Xmv13	Xmv8

Mpmv12	Mpmv9	Pmv17	Pmv4	Xmv15	Xmv9
Mpmv13	Pmv1	Pmv18	Pmv5	Xmv16	
Mpmv2	Pmv10	Pmv19	Pmv6	Xmv17	
Mpmv3	Pmv11	Pmv2	Pmv7	Xmv18	
Mpmv4	Pmv12	Pmv20	Pmv8	Xmv19	
Mpmv5	Pmv13	Pmv21	Pmv9	Xmv41	

exMuLV

KY574504.1	KY574507.1	KY574510.1	KY574513.1	KY574516.1	MG525170.1
KY574505.1	KY574508.1	KY574511.1	KY574514.1	KY574517.1	
KY574506.1	KY574509.1	KY574512.1	KY574515.1	KY574518.1	

enFeLV

AY364318.1	LC196053.1	LC196055.1	OP595707.1		
AY364319.1	LC196054.1	OP595706.1	OP595708.1		

exFeLV-A

AB672612.1	AB672612.1	M18247.1	MZ964580.1		
AF052723.1	AF052723.1	MT129531.1	NC_001940.1		

KoRV-A full-length

AB721500.1	KF786280.1	KF786282.1	KF786284.1	KF786286.1	
KC779547.1	KF786281.1	KF786283.1	KF786285.1	NC_039228.1	

KoRV-A env

AB721500.1	JQ244835.1	JQ244838.1	KF786281.1	KF786284.1	NC_039228.1
AB823238.1	JQ244836.1	JQ244839.1	KF786282.1	KF786285.1	
AF151794.2	JQ244837.1	KF786280.1	KF786283.1	KF786286.1	

KoRV-B-F env

AB822553.1	AB828005.1	KP792564.1	KU533852.1		
AB828004.1	KC779547.1	KP792565.1	KU533853.1		

PERV-A

AF435966.1	AY099323.1	HM159246.1	KY484771.1		
AJ133817.1	EF133960.1	HQ540591.1	OR574834.1		

PERV-B

AJ133816.1	AJ293657.1	EU523109.1	HQ536010.1	HQ540594.1	
AJ133818.1	AY056035.1	HQ536008.1	HQ536011.1	HQ540595.1	
AJ279057.1	AY099324.1	HQ536009.1	HQ540593.1		

PERV-C

AF038599.1	AY570980.1	HQ536014.1	KC116219.1	KY352351.2	
AF038600.1	HQ536012.1	HQ536015.1	KC116220.1	MT984604.1	
AM229312.2	HQ536013.1	HQ536016.1	KC116221.1		

Betaretroviruses

enMMTV

AC122322.4	AF228550.1	NG_005612.1			
AC140344.3	AL683884.26				
exMMTV					
AF033807.1	AF228552.1	M15122.1			
AF228551.1	D16249.1	NC_001503.1			
enJSRV					
AF136224.1	EF680297.1	EF680302.1	EF680307.1	EF680314.1	MF175071.1
AF136225.1	EF680298.1	EF680303.1	EF680308.1	MF175067.1	
AF153615.1	EF680299.1	EF680304.1	EF680309.1	MF175068.1	
DQ838493.1	EF680300.1	EF680305.1	EF680310.1	MF175069.1	
EF680296.1	EF680301.1	EF680306.1	EF680312.1	MF175070.1	
exJSRV OPA					
AF105220.1	CQ964469.1	KP691837.1	NC_001494.1		
AF357971.1	DQ838494.1	M80216.1			
exJSRV ENTV					
FJ744146.1	FJ744149.1	GU292315.1	GU292318.1	PP707036.1	
FJ744147.1	FJ744150.1	GU292316.1	KC189895.1		
FJ744148.1	GU292314.1	GU292317.1	NC_007015.1		
phaCin-β [30]					
pCi1002	pCi237	pCi366	pCi47	pCi921	pCi989
pCi194	pCi273	pCi414	pCi643	pCi933	pCi998
pCi233	pCi303	pCi457	pCi786	pCi983	

Tools and software:

Genomic sequence retrieval was performed with Ensembl Biomart.

LTRHarvest[23] from GenomeTools was used to extract LTR sequences from promoters.

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

SRA toolkit. Fastq files were trimmed using Trim Galore!.[50] Bisulfite converted sequences

were aligned with Bismark[51] software.

Epigram[52, 55] was used to predict motifs associated with histone modifications.

Proviral alignments, consensus generation, and phylogenetic analysis was performed with

MacVector® software.

Emboss Cpgplot[31] was used for CpG Island identification.

The SEA tool from the MEME suite[15] was used for Simple Enrichment Analysis.

The UCSC Genome Browser BLAT tool[53, 54] was used to locate endogenous proviral

sequences in the mouse genome for histone modification identification with ENCODE histone

modification tracks.

Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® software, as well as the rtstatix

package in R. Visualization was also performed with GraphPad Prism® software and ggplot2

in R.

Figures:

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

and CpG content is usually lower with endogenization. a-e) Endogenous and exogenous retroviral median CpG D-

ratios are compared to those of promoters (500 bp upstream of the TSS) for **a)** domestic cats **b)** mice **c)** pigs **d)** sheep

635   and **e)** koalas. **f-h)** Endogenized retroviral variants exhibit lower CpG content than exogenous counterparts for **f)** Feline

636   Leukemia Virus (FeLV), **g)** Murine Leukemia Virus (MuLV), and **h)** Jaagsiekte sheep retrovirus (JSRV). **i)** Mouse

637   Mammary Tumor Virus (MMTV) shows no significant change to median CpG content. P-values are reported from Kruskal-

638   Wallis tests for multiple comparisons **(a-e)** and Mann-Whitney comparisons **(f-i)**. Error bars represent interquartile ranges.

639   n.s. p > 0.05, *** p < 0.001, **** p < 0.0001

640
641

Figure 2: Endogenous betaretroviruses JSRV and MMTV are highly methylated and exhibit CpG decline. a-c)

JSRV shows a strong negative correlation between CpG content and TpG/CpA content in **a)** endogenous **b)** exogenous

Enzootic Nasal Tumor Virus (ENTV) and **c)** exogenous Ovine Pulmonary Adenocarcinoma (OPA) variants. **d)** CpG

methylation across endogenous JSRV shows uneven CpG trinucleotide distribution, with a preference for CGC and CGG

trinucleotides. **e)** Bismark mapping shows heavy CpG methylation across the entire JSRV provirus. **f)** Endogenous JSRV

shows a strong negative correlation between CGC content and TGC/CAC. **g)** CGC content is significantly decreased in

endogenous JSRV compared to both exogenous JSRV strains. **h)** Trinucleotide analysis of MMTV methylation shows a

significant preference for CGC motifs. **i)** Bismark mapping shows heavy CpG methylation across the body of the MMTV

provirus.

R and p-values for correlation analyses are from Spearman correlations **(a-c,f)**. P-values are reported for the Kruskal-

Wallis test for multiple comparisons with Dunn's test **(d,g,h)**, while error bars in **d)**, **g)**, and **h)** represent interquartile

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

Figure 3: Endogenization of gammaretroviruses FeLV and MuLV 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 seven vertebrate 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 comparisons **(a)**, Mann-Whitney tests **(d,e)**, Spearman correlation **(b,f,h)**, and

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

685
686

Figure 5: Murine leukemia virus (MuLV) shows motifs associated with histone modifications 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

motifs associated with histone modifications 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 S2**.

Figure 6: Exogenous Feline Leukemia Virus (FeLV) and Jaagsiekte Sheep Retrovirus (JSRV) variants contain more significant motifs associated with 'active' histone modifications than endogenous variants. a) 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 S3 and S4**.

705   **b)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis show endogenous JSRV contains several CG-rich regions with only H3K4me3

706   motifs present and no H3K27ac. **c)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis of the exogenous Enzootic Nasal Tumor Virus

707   (ENTV) JSRV variant show significant motifs present in the LTR, leader region, and *pol-env* junction for both H3K27ac

708   and H3K4me3. **d)** EMBOSS Cpgplot and SEA analysis of the exogenous OPA JSRV variant shows several H3K27ac and

709   H3K4me3-associated motifs within CG-rich regions primarily in the LTR and *gag*.

References

711
712
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.   Goubran M, Wang W, Indik S, Faschinger A, Wasilenko ST, Bintner J, Carpenter EJ, Zhang G,
Nuin P, Macintyre G, Wong GK, Mason AL. Isolation of a Human Betaretrovirus from Patients with
Primary Biliary Cholangitis. Viruses. 2022;14(5). Epub 20220424. doi: 10.3390/v14050886. PubMed
PMID: 35632628; PMCID: PMC9146342.
6.   Faschinger A, Rouault F, Sollner J, Lukas A, Salmons B, Gunzburg WH, Indik S. Mouse
mammary tumor virus integration site selection in human and mouse genomes. J Virol.
2008;82(3):1360-7. Epub 20071121. doi: 10.1128/JVI.02098-07. PubMed PMID: 18032509; PMCID:
PMC2224419.
7.   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.
8.   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.
9.   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.
10.   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.
11.   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.

12.   Zamudio N, Bourc'his D. Transposable elements in the mammalian germline: a comfortable
niche or a deadly trap? Heredity (Edinb). 2010;105(1):92-104. Epub 20100505. doi:
10.1038/hdy.2010.53. PubMed PMID: 20442734.
13.   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.
14.   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.
15.   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.
16.   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.
17.   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.
18.   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.
19.   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.
20.   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.
21.   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.
22.   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.
23.   Ellinghaus D, Kurtz S, Willhoeft U. LTRharvest, an efficient and flexible software for de novo
detection of LTR retrotransposons. BMC Bioinformatics. 2008;9:18. Epub 20080114. doi:
10.1186/1471-2105-9-18. PubMed PMID: 18194517; PMCID: PMC2253517.
24.   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.
25.   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.

26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. 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.
37. 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.
38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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.
41.   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.
42.   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.
43.   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.
44.   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.
45.   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.
46.   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.
47.   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.
48.   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.
49.   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.
50.   Krueger F. Trim Galore! Available from:
https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/trim_galore/.
51.   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.
52.   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.

53.   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.
54.   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.
55.   Whitaker JW, Chen Z, Wang W. Predicting the human epigenome from DNA motifs. Nat
Methods. 2015;12(3):265-72, 7 p following 72. Epub 20140921. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3065. PubMed
PMID: 25240437; PMCID: PMC4344378.
893