Multidimensional analysis of Gammaherpesvirus RNA expression reveals

unexpected heterogeneity of gene expression

Lauren M. Oko[1], Abigail K. Kimball[2], Rachael E. Kaspar[2], Ashley N. Knox[1], Tim Chang[3],

Benjamin Alderete[3], Linda F. van Dyk[1]*, Eric T. Clambey[2]*#

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Immunology and Microbiology, [2] Department of Anesthesiology,

University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, 80045, USA

[3] MilliporeSigma, a business of Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany (Seattle, WA)

* Co-Corresponding authors:

Eric T. Clambey, eric.clambey@ucdenver.edu, 303-724-7783 (phone)

Linda F. van Dyk, linda.vandyk@ucdenver.edu, 303-724-4207 (phone)

 # Lead author for MS correspondence

Short title: Single-cell heterogeneity of Gammaherpesvirus RNA expression

ABSTRACT

Virus-host interactions are frequently studied in bulk cell populations, obscuring cell-to-cell variation. Here we investigate endogenous herpesvirus gene expression at the single-cell level, combining a sensitive and robust fluorescent in situ hybridization platform with multiparameter flow cytometry, to study the expression of gammaherpesvirus non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs) during lytic replication, latent infection and reactivation in vitro. This method allowed robust detection of viral ncRNAs of murine gammaherpesvirus 68 (γHV68), Kaposi's sarcoma associated herpesvirus and Epstein-Barr virus, revealing variable expression at the single-cell level. By quantifying the inter-relationship of viral ncRNA, viral mRNA, viral protein and host mRNA regulation during γHV68 infection, we find heterogeneous and asynchronous gene expression during latency and reactivation, with reactivation from latency identified by a distinct gene expression profile within rare cells. Further, during lytic replication with γHV68, we find many cells have limited viral gene expression, with only a fraction of cells showing robust gene expression, dynamic RNA localization, and progressive infection. These findings, powered by single-cell analysis integrated with automated clustering algorithms, suggest inefficient or abortive γHV infection in many cells, and identify substantial heterogeneity in viral gene expression at the single-cell level.

AUTHOR SUMMARY

The gammaherpesviruses are a group of DNA tumor viruses that establish

lifelong infection. How these viruses infect and manipulate cells has frequently been

studied in bulk populations of cells. While these studies have been incredibly insightful,

there is limited understanding of how virus infection proceeds within a single cell. Here

we present a new approach to quantify gammaherpesvirus gene expression at the

single-cell level. This method allows us to detect cell-to-cell variation in the expression

of virus non-coding RNAs, an important and understudied class of RNAs which do not

encode for proteins. By examining multiple features of virus gene expression, this

method further reveals significant variation in infection between cells across multiple

stages of infection. These studies emphasize that gammaherpesvirus infection can be

surprisingly heterogeneous when viewed at the level of the individual cell. Because this

approach can be broadly applied across diverse viruses, this study affords new

opportunities to understand the complexity of virus infection within single cells.

INTRODUCTION

The *Herpesviridae* are a family of large dsDNA viruses that include multiple

prominent human and animal pathogens [1]. Although these viruses infect different cell

types, and are associated with diverse pathologies, they share conserved genes and

two fundamental phases of infection: lytic replication and latent infection [1]. Lytic

replication is characterized by a cascade of viral gene expression, active viral DNA

replication and the production of infectious virions. Conversely, latency is characterized

by limited viral gene expression and the absence of de novo viral replication. While

latent infection is a relatively quiescent form of infection, the herpesviruses can

reactivate from latency, to reinitiate lytic replication.

Among the herpesviruses, the gammaherpesviruses (γHV) are lymphotropic

viruses that include the human pathogens Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) [2] and Kaposi's

sarcoma associated herpesvirus (KSHV) [3]. Murine gammaherpesvirus 68 (γHV68, or

MHV-68; ICTV nomenclature *Murid herpesvirus 4*, MuHV-4), is a well-described small

animal model for the γHVs [4]. While these viruses establish a lifelong infection that is

often clinically inapparent, immune-suppressed individuals are particularly at risk for

γHV-associated malignancies [5].

Herpesvirus gene expression is extremely well-characterized in bulk populations.

Despite increasing evidence for single-cell heterogeneity in gene expression [6-8], there

remains limited understanding of herpesvirus infection at the single-cell level [9-12].

Here, we tracked endogenous viral and host RNAs using a sensitive, robust fluorescent

in situ hybridization assay combined with multiparameter flow cytometry (PrimeFlow[TM])

[13] to analyze the expression and inter-relationships of viral ncRNA, viral mRNA and

cellular mRNA at the single-cell level during γHV latency, reactivation and lytic

replication. These studies revealed unanticipated heterogeneity of infection,

emphasizing how single-cell analysis of virus infection can afford significant new

insights into the complexity of γHV infection.

RESULTS

Single-cell analysis of viral RNAs during lytic infection.

Traditional measurements of gene expression frequently rely on pooled cellular

material, obscuring intercellular variation in gene expression. To better define

expression of γHV RNAs at the single cell level, we employed the PrimeFlow^{TM} RNA

assay [13] to study viral gene expression during murine gammaherpesvirus 68 (γHV68)

infection, a small animal γHV [4, 13]. This method is a highly sensitive, extremely

specific in situ hybridization assay, integrating Affymetrix-designed branched DNA

technology with single-cell analysis powered by multiparameter flow cytometry. This

method has been successfully used to detect both virus and host RNAs (e.g. in the

context of HIV infected individuals [13, 14]).

We first tested the ability of PrimeFlow^{TM} to measure multiple viral RNAs during

lytic infection with γHV68, including small non-coding RNAs (tRNA-miRNA encoding

RNAs or TMERs [15]) and mRNAs. Mouse fibroblasts were infected with an

intermediate multiplicity of infection (MOI=5 plaque forming units of virus/cell) resulting

in a mixture of infected and uninfected cells. Under these conditions, TMER-5, one of

the eight γHV68 TMERs, and the γHV68 gene 73, were readily detectable by

conventional real-time PCR in γHV68-infected, but not mock-infected, cultures (Fig. 1A,

C). Parallel cultures were analyzed for RNA expression by PrimeFlow^{TM}. Whereas

mock-infected cells had no detectable expression of either the γHV68 TMERs or gene

73, WT γHV68-infected fibroblasts had a prominent population of TMER+ and gene 73+

cells, respectively (Fig. 1B and 1D). Infection of cells with a TMER-deficient γHV68

(TMER-TKO [16]), in which TMER expression is ablated through promoter disruption,

revealed no detectable TMER expression (Fig. 1B), yet robust gene 73 expression (Fig.

1D). Parallel studies revealed ready detection of gene 18, another γHV68 gene product

(Fig. 1E). These studies show that PrimeFlow^{TM} is a sensitive, robust and specific

method to detect both viral non-coding and messenger RNAs during lytic infection,

quantifying both the frequency of gene expression and expression on a per cell basis.

Heterogeneous gene expression during γHV latency and reactivation from latency.

γHV latency is characterized by limited gene expression. We next

measured viral RNAs during latency and reactivation using the γHV68-infected

A20 HE2.1 cell line (A20.γHV68), a drug-selected latency model with restricted viral

gene expression that can reactivate following stimulation [17]. A20.γHV68 cells are

characterized by restricted viral gene expression, yet remain competent for reactivation

from latency and the production of infectious virions following chemical stimulation with

the phorbol ester, TPA [17, 18].

When we compared TMER expression between uninfected (parental, virus-

negative A20) and infected (A20.γHV68) cells by qRT-PCR, the viral ncRNA TMER-5

was exclusively detectable in A20.γHV68 cells, with minimal changes between

untreated and chemically-stimulated conditions (Fig. 2A). PrimeFlow^{TM} analysis of

TMER expression in untreated A20.γHV68 cells revealed that a majority of these cells

expressed the TMERs, as defined by a positive signal in samples subjected to the

TMER probe relative to unstained cells (Fig. 2B). Untreated A20.γHV68 cells contained

a high frequency of cells expressing intermediate levels of TMERs (i.e. TMER^{mid} cells),

with a significant signal enrichment above parental, virus-negative A20 cells (Fig. 2C).

While the frequency of TMER^{mid} cells remained relatively constant following TPA

stimulation (compare "Untreated" versus "Stimulated", Fig. 2C), stimulated A20.γHV68

cultures also contained a small fraction of cells with high levels of TMERs (i.e. TMER^{high}

cells), not present in untreated cultures (Fig. 2C-D). Chemical stimulation is known to

result in variable penetrance of reactivation in latently infected cell lines [17]. Based on

this, we hypothesized that these rare, TMER^{high} cells may represent a subset of cells

that are undergoing reactivation from latency.

To test this, we analyzed the properties of TMER^{mid} and TMER^{high} cells,

comparing viral protein expression in untreated and stimulated A20.γHV68 cells. We

analyzed: 1) a γHV68 expressed GFP-hygromycin resistance fusion protein

(HygroGFP), under the control of a heterologous viral promoter (the CMV immediate

early promoter) [17], and 2) the γHV68 regulator of complement activation (RCA), a viral

protein encoded by the γHV68 gene 4 [19]. The vast majority of TMER^{mid} cells were

negative for HygroGFP and RCA (i.e. HygroGFP- RCA-), regardless of whether the

cells were present in untreated or stimulated cultures (Fig. 2E-F). Conversely, TMER^{high}

cells, which were uniquely present in stimulated cultures, had a significantly increased

frequency of HygroGFP+ cells with induction of RCA protein+ cells in a subset of cells

when compared to TMER^{mid} cells present in either untreated or stimulated cultures (Fig.

2E-F). By using imaging flow cytometry, we further analyzed the subcellular localization

of TMERs in TMER^{mid} cells compared with TMER^{high} RCA+ cells. TMERs were

predominantly nuclear in both TMER^{mid} and TMER^{high} RCA+ cells, as defined by co-

localization with DAPI fluorescence (Fig. 2G). These data demonstrate that the TMERs

are expressed during latency, and that following reactivation-inducing stimulation,

TMERs are further induced in a rare subset of cells which are characterized by

increased viral transcription and translation.

Detection of endogenous viral gene expression during KSHV latency and reactivation.

157   To extend these findings, we analyzed viral gene expression in the KSHV

infected B cell tumor line, BCBL-1, focused on detection of an abundant viral ncRNA,

the KSHV polyadenylated nuclear RNA (PAN, nut1, or T1.1) [20]. PAN RNA is known to

be highly inducible upon induction of reactivation in KSHV latently infected B cell

lymphoma cell lines [10, 20]. The frequency of PAN RNA+ cells was low in untreated

BCBL-1 cells, with ~1% of cells spontaneously expressing this ncNRA (Fig. 3A-B).

Despite the low frequency, this hybridization was clearly above background, as ncRNA

defined on the KSHV- and EBV-negative B cell lymphoma cell line BL41 [21, 22] (Fig.

3A-B). Upon stimulation of BCBL-1 cells with the reactivation-inducing stimuli TPA and

sodium butyrate, the frequency of PAN RNA+ cells significantly increased with

expression in ~25% of cells (Fig. 3A-B). Although stimulation of BCBL-1 cells

significantly increased the frequency of PAN RNA+ events compared to untreated

cultures, PAN RNA expression on an individual cell basis was comparable between

cells from untreated or stimulated cultures (Fig. 3C). As anticipated, stimulation of

BCBL-1 cells was associated with increased viral DNA, consistent with stimulated

cultures undergoing reactivation from latency (Supplemental Fig. 1).

173   We next analyzed the properties of BCBL-1 cells as a function of PAN RNA

expression. In untreated cells, PAN RNA+ or RNA- cells had comparable cell size

(define by forward scatter, FSC) and granularity (defined by side scatter, SSC). Gene

73 expression was low in untreated BCBL-1 samples, with signal intensity in PAN RNA-

cells close to the background fluorescence observed in unstained samples. PAN RNA+

cells in untreated cultures had a modest increase in gene 73 expression relative to PAN

RNA- cells (Fig. 3D-E). In stimulated BCBL-1 cultures, PAN RNA+ cells had a modest

decrease in cell size (defined by forward scatter) and a trend towards reduced

granularity (defined by side scatter) compared to PAN RNA- cells (Fig. 3F-G).

Stimulated BCBL-1 cultures also had an increased gene 73 signal when compared to

unstained samples (Fig. 3F), with PAN RNA+ cells again showing ~2-fold increase

compared to PAN RNA- cells (Fig. 3F-G). These data demonstrate robust detection of

PAN RNA by PrimeFlow^{TM}, and further identify PAN RNA expression in a subset of both

untreated and reactivation-induced BCBL-1 cells.

Detection of endogenous viral gene expression during EBV latency and reactivation.

189   EBV encodes two abundant non-coding RNAs, the EBV-encoded RNAs (EBERs)

EBER1 and EBER2. We tested the ability of the PrimeFlow^{TM} method to detect EBER in

an EBV positive, Burkitt lymphoma type I latency cell line, Mutu I [23]. EBER expression

was detected in a ~45% of Mutu I cells in either untreated or stimulated conditions, with

no significant probe hybridization in the KSHV- and EBV-negative BL41 cell line (Fig.

4A). Stimulated Mutu I cells showed a modest, 2-fold increase in EBER expression on

an individual cell basis, relative to untreated EBER+ cells (Fig. 4B). Based on these

data, EBER expression in Mutu I cells appears to be constitutive, with stimulation under

these conditions resulting in minimal consequences on either the frequency or per-cell

expression of the EBERs.

Single-cell analysis of actin mRNA degradation as a readout of virus-induced host

shutoff.

Many herpesviruses, including γHV68, EBV and KSHV, induce host shutoff

during lytic replication and reactivation from latency, a process characterized by

dramatic decreases in host mRNAs [24, 25]. Consistent with published reports [24],

qRT-PCR analysis of a cellular housekeeping gene, β-actin (Actb), showed reduced

actin mRNA in γHV68 lytically-infected fibroblasts by 18 hours pi (Fig. 5A). While mock-

infected samples had a uniformly positive population of actin RNA^{high} cells detectable by

PrimeFlow[TM], γHV68-infected fibroblast cultures demonstrated a bimodal distribution of

actin RNA[high] and actin RNA^{low} cells (Fig. 5B). The actin RNA[low] population had a

fluorescent signal that was only modestly above background fluorescence (defined by

the "No probe" sample), suggesting an all-or-none phenomenon in which cells either

had no change in actin RNA levels or had pronounced actin RNA degradation.

Simultaneous analysis of TMER and actin RNA expression revealed that actin RNA[low]

cells were frequently TMER[high], with actin^{high} cells frequently TMER[negative] at this time

(Fig. 5C).

To determine whether actin RNA regulation could also be observed during γHV68

latency and reactivation, we measured actin RNA levels in A20.γHV68 cells. Parental,

virus-negative A20 cells and A20.γHV68 cells had relatively comparable actin RNA

levels by qRT-PCR, in both untreated and stimulated cells (Fig. 5D). Given that host

shutoff is expected to primarily occur in rare, reactivating cells, we measured actin RNA

degradation relative to TMER expression by the PrimeFlow[TM] method. Untreated

A20.γHV68 cultures had no discernable population of TMER+ actin RNA^{low} events,

whereas stimulated cultures were characterized by a rare population of TMER^{high} actin

RNA^{low} cells (Fig. 5E). We further compared actin RNA expression between TMER^{mid}

and TMER^{high} cells, in untreated versus stimulated cultures using our previously defined

subpopulations (Fig. 2). While TMER^{mid} cells from either untreated or stimulated

cultures were predominantly actin RNA+, TMER^{high} cells from stimulated cultures

showed a significant increased frequency of actin RNA^{low} events (Fig. 5F-G). These

studies reveal actin RNA as a sensitive indicator of virus-induced host shutoff, and

demonstrate this as an all-or-none phenomenon that can be readily queried at the

single-cell level.

Heterogeneity of gene expression during de novo lytic replication.

Next, we revisited our analysis of gene expression during de novo lytic infection

of fibroblasts, to examine co-expression relationships between viral ncRNA (TMERs),

viral mRNA (the γHV68 gene 73), viral protein (RCA protein) and cellular actin mRNA

degradation [19, 24]. Fibroblast cultures were infected with an intermediate multiplicity

of infection to produce a mixture of uninfected and infected cells, and then subjected to

the PrimeFlow^{TM} method.

To enable an unbiased, automated analysis of gene expression profiles in γHV68

lytically infected cells relative to mock infected cells, data were subjected to the

automated clustering algorithm X-shift [26], to identify potential subpopulations of cells

with heterogeneous gene expression in these cultures. By sampling 1,000 cells from

multiple mock- and virus-infected cultures, the X-shift algorithm consistently identified 7

major clusters of cells (Fig. 6A) defined by varying gene expression patterns. While

some of the clusters were exclusively found in mock-infected cultures, virus-infected

cultures contained three broad types of cell clusters: 1) uninfected cells, with no viral

gene expression and normal actin RNA, 2) fully infected cells, with robust expression of

the TMERs, gene 73, actin RNA downregulation and frequent expression of the RCA

protein, and 3) intermediate populations characterized by variable expression of the

TMERs and gene 73 (Fig. 6A).

To validate these findings using a more conventional method, we compared

TMER and gene 73 RNA co-expression on a biaxial plot. By comparing mock-infected,

WT-infected and TMER-TKO-infected cultures, this analysis revealed five populations of

gene expression (Fig. 6B), including cells with: 1) no detectable expression of either

viral RNA (TMER- gene 73-), 2) TMER+ gene 73- cells (bottom right quadrant), 3)

TMER- gene 73+ cells (upper left quadrant), 4) TMER^{low} gene 73^{low} cells (lower left

edge of the upper right quadrant), and 5) TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} cells (upper right

quadrant). The definition of TMER positive events was defined based on background

fluorescent levels observed in TMER-TKO infected cultures (Fig. 6B). These 5

populations were each assigned a unique color for subsequent analysis (Fig. 6C).

We then compared the cellular phenotype and gene expression within these 5

distinct populations. Analysis of TMERs, gene 73, actin RNA, RCA protein, cell size

(forward scatter), and granularity (side scatter) revealed multiple types of viral gene

expression. As expected, TMER- gene 73- cells (in black) had no evidence of virus

infection, with no detectable viral protein (RCA) or actin downregulation (Fig. 6D-E).

Cells with low expression of either the TMERs and/or gene 73 contained viral RNAs, but

had minimal expression of either viral protein or actin downregulation (Fig. 6D-E). In

stark contrast, cells that were TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} (in red, Fig. 6D-E) had multiple

characteristics of progressive virus infection including a prominent fraction of cells that

expressed RCA and/or had actin RNA downregulation. Further, TMER^{high} gene 73^{high}

cells were consistently smaller in cell size (defined by forward scatter, FSC) and higher

in granularity (defined by side scatter, SSC), a feature that was unique to this phenotype

(Fig. 6D-E).

Given the heterogeneous patterns of RNA and protein expression among

lytically-infected cells, we next queried TMER subcellular localization as a function of

viral gene expression using imaging flow cytometry. While the majority of TMER+ cells

had a primarily nuclear TMER localization (defined by DAPI co-localization, as in [27]),

the frequency of cells with nuclear TMER localization was highest among TMER+ gene

73- cells and lowest among TMER+ gene 73+ RCA+ cells (Fig. 7A-B). These data

suggest that the TMERs can be localized in either the nucleus or cytoplasm during

γHV68 lytic replication, and that this localization is not strictly a function of magnitude of

gene expression.

Finally, we used tSNE, a dimensionality reduction algorithm, to better delineate

the relationship between TMER, gene 73, RCA protein and actin downregulation across

populations defined by variable TMER and gene 73 expression. Consistent with our

histogram analysis (Fig. 6D-E), uninfected and intermediate populations that expressed

either TMERs or gene 73 were relatively uniform in gene expression (Fig. 7C). In

contrast, TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} cells expressed a wider array of phenotypes, including

both a predominant fraction of cells that were actin RNA^{low} RCA+, as well as a distinct

group of cells that were actin RNA+ RCA- (Fig. 7C). Notably, RCA expression and actin

degradation were inversely correlated, with very few cells that expressed RCA also high

for actin RNA. Actin RNA+ populations among TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} cells were

associated with larger cell size (Supplementary Fig. 2). The diversity of phenotypes

among TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} cells was confirmed by biaxial gating of actin RNA versus

RCA protein expression (Fig. 7D). In total, these data indicate heterogeneous

progression of lytic replication in vitro. While some cells have robust viral mRNA and

protein expression, additional cell subsets are characterized by limited or divergent

gene expression.

DISCUSSION

Herpesvirus gene expression has been historically analyzed in bulk cell

populations. These studies have provided an essential cornerstone to understanding

the transcriptional and translational capacity of the herpesviruses. Despite this, recent

studies on cellular and viral transcription from other systems have emphasized a high

degree of cell-to-cell variation in gene expression [6-11, 13, 14], something we have

further investigated here. By applying the PrimeFlow[TM] methodology to measure

endogenous viral gene expression across multiple gammaherpesviruses, and multiple

stages of infection, we have gained critical new insights into the inter-relationships of

gene expression at the single-cell level.

A primary focus of the current study has been to analyze expression of γHV

ncRNAs. Although the TMERs, EBERs and PAN RNA all represent abundant γHV

ncRNAs, these ncRNAs are transcribed by distinct mechanisms: KSHV PAN is a highly-

inducible, RNA pol II-transcribed ncRNA [20], in contrast to the RNA pol III-transcribed

TMERs and EBERs [15, 28]. This differential regulation was mirrored in the expression

patterns we observed. Whereas TMERs and EBERs were detected in a large fraction of

latently infected cells, PAN RNA was expressed in a low frequency of latently infected

cells, with prominent induction following cell stimulation and the induction of

reactivation. The viral ncRNAs were efficiently detected, as might be predicted due to

their abundance. The viral gene 73 encodes a transcription factor that is expressed at a

far lower level and are also efficiently detected, demonstrating that rare mRNAs can be

measured coincidently with abundant RNAs and with proteins, with no modifications

required. A unique advantage of our current approach is the ability to measure the

frequency of ncRNA expressing cells and changes in expression within individual cells.

This has been particularly insightful for the identification of rare PAN RNA+ cells in

untreated BCBL-1 cells and a TMER^{high} subpopulation of cells in reactivating

A20.γHV68 cells. Integrating this method with cell sorting will afford future opportunities

to investigate unique properties of these rare cell populations.

Among the viral ncRNAs measured, in-depth analysis of TMER expression

during γHV68 infection has revealed new insights into infection. In the context of

latency, the TMERs are constitutively expressed in many, but not all, latently infected

cells using the A20.γHV68 model. Further, stimulating these cells to undergo

reactivation has a minimal effect on the frequency of cells expressing intermediate

levels of TMERs (i.e. TMER^{mid} cells), instead resulting in the appearance of a minor

population of TMER^{high} cells. Notably, TMER^{high} cells show additional features of lytic

cycle progression, including actin RNA degradation and RCA protein expression. Why

only some latently infected cells show the TMER^{high} phenotype, and what regulates the

inducible expression of the RNA pol III-transcribed TMERs remain important questions

raised by this analysis.

Of the γHVs studied here, only γHV68 has a robust in vitro lytic replication

system. Our studies on γHV68 lytic replication revealed multiple unanticipated results.

By using cultures that contained both infected and uninfected cells, our analysis

identified at least four different subsets of cells, stratified by differential viral gene

expression of the TMERs and gene 73. Strikingly, during lytic replication there were

many cells with limited viral gene expression, expressing low levels of either the TMERs

and/or gene 73, but lacking additional signs of virus gene expression (i.e. actin RNA

degradation or RCA protein expression). Conversely, only some viral RNA+ cells

showed robust viral expression characterized by a constellation of gene expression,

defined as $TMER^{high}$ gene 73^{high} actin RNA^{low} RCA+. While there is precedence that

reactivation from latency in KSHV infection can be asynchronous [9], this heterogeneity

of viral gene expression during in vitro lytic replication was unanticipated and suggests

that lytic infection under these reductionist conditions is either asynchronous, abortive,

or inefficient. This heterogeneity of gene expression raises important questions

regarding the universality of the prototypical cascade of immediate early, early and late

gene expression that is widely accepted in the herpesvirus field and suggests additional

levels of complexity that may be obscured by bulk cell analysis.

This method allows multiplexed analysis of single-cell gene expression, to both

directly measure viral RNAs and downstream consequences of gene expression

including viral protein production and host RNA degradation, secondary to protein

translation. This approach has notable advantages to conventional analyses of gene

expression: 1) it can measure endogenous viral gene expression (both mRNA and

ncRNA) in the absence of recombinant viruses or marker genes, and 2) it can rapidly

analyze gene and protein expression inter-relationships, across millions of cells,

providing unique complementary strengths to other single-cell methodologies (e.g.

single-cell RNA-seq). In future, this method can be further integrated with additional

antibody-based reagents, to simultaneously query post-translational modifications (e.g.

protein phosphorylation) as a function of cell cycle stage. It is also notable that through

the use of imaging flow cytometry, it is possible to interrogate subcellular RNA and

protein localization throughout distinct stages of virus infection.

In total, these studies demonstrate the power of single-cell analysis of

herpesvirus gene expression. Our data emphasize the heterogeneity of γHV gene

expression at the single-cell level. The factors that underlie this heterogeneity are

currently unknown, but could reflect either asynchronous or inefficient infection in many

infected cells (e.g. in the context of lytic infection). Whether this variation arises from

viral or cellular heterogeneity is a fundamental question for future research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Viruses and tissue culture. All γHV68 viruses were derived from the γHV68 strain

WUMS (ATCC VR-1465) [29], using bacterial artificial chromosome-derived wild-type

(WT) γHV68 or γHV68.TMER-Total KnockOut (TMER-TKO) [16]. Virus stocks were

passaged, grown, and titered as previously described [16]. Mouse 3T12 fibroblasts

(ATCC CCL-164) were inoculated with 5 plaque forming units/cell for one hour, followed

by inoculum removal and replacement with fresh media, with analysis between 8-18 hpi.

Parental, virus-negative A20 B cells, or A20.γHV68 (HE2.1) B cells [17], were treated

with vehicle (untreated) or stimulated with 12-O-tetradecanolphrobol-13-actate (TPA) 20

ng/ml (Sigma) (in DMSO) harvested 24 hr later. BCBL-1 B cells, latently infected with

KSHV (HHV-8), were cultured in RPMI containing 20% FBS, 1% Penicillin/Streptomycin

with L-glutamine, 1% HEPES and 50 μM βME. BCBL-1 B cells were treated with vehicle

(untreated) or stimulated with 20 ng/ml TPA (in DMSO) and Sodium Butyrate (NaB) 0.3

mM (Calbiochem) (in water) and then harvested 72 hr later. BL41 B cells (negative for

KSHV and EBV) were cultured in RPMI with 10% FBS, 1% Penicillin/Streptomycin with

L-glutamine, and 50 μmol βME. Mutu I cells, an EBV-infected, type I latency Burkitt's

lymphoma cell line [23] were cultured in RPMI with 10% FBS, 1%

Penicillin/Streptomycin and L-glutamine. Mutu I or BL41 B cells were either treated with

vehicle (DMSO) or stimulated with 20 ng/ml TPA (in DMSO) and then harvested 48 hr

later. BCBL-1 and BL41 cells were generously provided by Dr. Rosemary Rochford

(University of Colorado), with additional BCBL-1 cells obtained from the NIH AIDS

reagent program (catalog # 3233). Mutu I cells were generously provided by Dr.

Shannon Kenney (University of Wisconsin).

Flow cytometric analysis. Cells were harvested at the indicated time points and

processed for flow cytometry using the PrimeFlow™ RNA Assay (Thermo Fisher). Cells

were incubated with an Fc receptor blocking antibody (2.4G2) for 10 min and then fixed

with 2% PFA (Fisher), washed with PBS (Life Technology). Cells were stained with a

rabbit antibody against the γHV68 gene 4 protein, regulator of complement activation

(RCA) [19], labeled with Zenon R-phycoerythrin rabbit IgG label reagent (Life

Technologies) following manufacturer's protocol. Samples were subjected to the

PrimeFlow™ RNA Assay following manufacturer's protocols, using viral and host target

probes conjugated to fluorescent molecules (Table S1). DAPI (BioLegend) was used on

a subset of samples following manufacturer's protocol, prior to PrimeFlow™ probe

hybridization. Flow cytometric analysis was done on LSR II (BD Biosciences), Fortessa

(BD Biosciences), and ZE5 (Bio-Rad) flow cytometers, with compensation values based

on antibody-stained beads (BD Biosciences), and modified as needed post-collection

using FlowJo.

Imaging flow cytometry. Cells were treated as described above then harvested, and split

into two aliquots: one for conventional flow cytometry, and one for imaging flow

cytometry, acquired on an Amnis ImageStream®^{X} Mark II imaging flow cytometer

(MilliporeSigma) with a 60X objective and low flow rate/high sensitivity using INSPIRE$^®$

software. Brightfield (BF) and side scatter (SSC) images were illuminated by LED light

and a 785nm laser respectively. Fluorescent probes were excited off 405nm, 488nm,

and 642nm lasers with the power adjusted properly to avoid intensity saturation of the

camera. Single color controls for compensation were acquired by keeping the same

acquisition setting for samples, with the difference of turning the BF LED light and

785nm (SSC) laser off.

The acquired data were analyzed using IDEAS® software (MilliporeSigma).

Single cells that were in focus were defined as a population with a high "gradient RMS"

value, an intermediate "Area" value, and a medium to high "Aspect ratio" value for

subsequent analysis. Positive and negative events for each fluorescent marker were

determined using the "Intensity" feature. TMER nuclear localization was quantified using

"Similarity" feature, the log-transformed Pearson's correlation coefficient by analyzing

the pixel values of two image pairs [27]. The degree of nuclear localization of TMER

was measured by correlating the pixel intensity of two images with the same spatial

registry. The paired TMER and DAPI images were quantified by measuring the

"Similarity Score" which cells with high similarity scores display high TMER nuclear

localization with similar image pairs. By contrast cells with low similarity scores show

low TMER nuclear localization with dissimilar image pairs.

RNA and qRT-PCR. RNA was isolated using Trizol (Life Technologies) per

manufacturer's protocol and re-suspended in DEPC treated water. 3 μg of RNA was

treated with DNase 1 (Promega) for 2 hours at 37°C, heat inactivated for 10 min at

65°C. 500 ng of RNA was then subjected to reverse transcription using SuperScript II

(Life Technologies) following manufacturer's protocol for gene specific, oligo(dT), or

random primers (Life Technologies). Quantitative PCR (qPCR) was performed using iQ

SYBR Green super mix (Bio-Rad) follow manufacturer's protocol using host and viral

primer sets (Table S2) or using QuantiTech Primer Assay (Qiagen) for 18s (Hs-

RRN18S_1_SG). qPCR conditions: 3 min at 95°C, amplification cycles for 40 cycles of

15 sec at 95°C, annealing/ extension at temperature for specific primer set for 1 min

ending with a melt curve which started at 50°C or 55°C to 95°C increasing 0.5°C for

0:05 sec. A standard curve for each primer set was generated by pooling a portion of

each sample together and doing a 1:3 serial dilution. 75 ng of cDNA of the unknown

samples was loaded per qPCR reaction/primer set, with reactions run on a Bio-Rad 384

CFX LightCycler and data analyzed using Bio-Rad CFX manager software. Data

analysis was done using the 1:3 standard curve as the control Ct value to calculate the

delta ct, and the Pfaffl equation was used to define the fold difference between the gene

of interest and 18s (reference gene) [30]. qPCR products were analyzed by melt curve

analysis, with all reactions having a prominent, uniform product. In the case of primers

with an aberrant melt curve product (e.g. that arose at late cycles), products were

clearly a different product as defined by melt curve analysis.

KSHV genome quantification. BCBL-1 or BL41 cells were plated at 7.5e5 cells/well in a

6 well plate with 20 ng/ml TPA and 0.3 mM NaB or vehicle only (DMSO and H_2O). Cells

and supernatant were harvested at 72 hrs post-treatment, hard-spun for 30 min at 4° C

and DNA was isolated using the DNeasy Blood and Tissue kit following manufacturer's

protocol, except for sample digestion for 1 hour instead of 10 min. 100 ng of DNA per

sample was used for qPCR analysis via SYBR green detection using KSHV ORF50

primers (5' -TCC GGC GGA TAT ACC GTC AC- 3' and 5'- GGT GCA GCT GGT ACA

GTG TG-3') [31]. qPCR was analyzed using relative quantification normalized against

unit mass calculation, ratio = $E^{deltaCt}$ (Real-Time PCR Application Guide, Bio-Rad

Laboratories Inc. 2006).

<u>Software and Statistical analysis.</u> All flow cytometry data were analyzed in FlowJo

(version 8.8.7 or 10.5.0), with flow cytometry data shown either as histogram overlays or

pseudo-color dot plots (with or without smoothing), showing outliers (low or high

resolution) on $\log_{10}$ scales. Statistical analysis and graphing were done in GraphPad

Prism (Version 6.0d and 7.0d). Statistical significance was tested by unpaired t test

(when comparing two conditions) or by one-way ANOVA (when comparing three or

more samples) subjected to multiple corrections tests using recommended settings in

Prism. *X-shift analysis:* For automated mapping of flow cytometry data using X-shift,

data were obtained from compensated flow cytometry files, exported from FlowJo, using

singlets that were live (defined by sequential gating on single cells by FSC-H vs. FSC-W

and SSC-H vs. SSC- W, that were DAPI bright vs. SSC-A). These events were imported

into the Java based program VorteX (http://web.stanford.edu/~samusik/vortex/) [26].

Four parameters [TMER (AlexaFluor (AF) 488), RCA (PE), gene 73 (AF647), and Actin

(AF750)] were selected for clustering analysis using the X-shift algorithm. The following

settings were used when importing the data set into VorteX: i) Numerical transformation:

arcsinh(x/f), f=150, ii) noise threshold: apply noise threshold of 1.0 (automatic and

recommended setting), iii) feature rescaling: none, and iv) normalization: none, v) a

Euclidean noise filter was used with a Minimal Euclidean length of the profile of 1.0, and

vi) an import max of 1,000 rows from each file after filtering was selected. The following

settings were used when preparing the data set for clustering analysis: i) distance

measure: angular distance, ii) clustering algorithm: X-shift (gradient assignment), iii)

density estimate: N nearest neighbors (fast), iv) number of neighbors for density

estimate (K): from 150 to 5, with 30 steps, and v) number of neighbors for mode finding

(N): determine automatically. After the cluster analysis was completed, all results were

selected and the K value that corresponded with optimal clustering (the elbow point)

was calculated, in this case K= 50. All clusters (seven clusters total) for the optimal K

value were selected and a Force-Directed Layout was created. The maximum number

of events sampled from each cluster was 20, and the number of nearest neighbors was

10. All settings used for this analysis were automated or explicitly recommended

(https://github.com/nolanlab/vortex/wiki). Force-Directed layouts in Fig. 6A were saved

as graphml files from VorteX, opened in the application Gephi v 0.9.1, and colored by

different variables (Cluster ID, experimental group, Actin mRNA, RCA, Gene 73, and

TMERs respectively) in Adobe Illustrator CC 2017. Full details on use of the X-shfit

algorithm and analysis pipeline can be found in [32]. *tSNE analysis:* Gated events for

each of the six identified populations were exported from FlowJo, and then imported into

Cytobank (www.cytobank.org) for analysis using the viSNE algorithm. Each file was

used for a separate viSNE analysis (six total runs), where all available events were

selected for clustering (202,669, 128,028, 29,096, 5,610, 8,956, 35,850 respectively)

and four parameters were selected for clustering (Actin mRNA, RCA, Gene 73, and

TMERs). The resulting tSNE plots were colored according to expression using the

"rainbow" color option, with individual events shown using the stacked dot option. The

channel range was user-defined for each marker according to the range in expression

established in Fig. 6E.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge insightful comments made by members of the

Clambey and van Dyk laboratories, support of flow cytometry services through

ClinImmune, the Dept. of Immunology & Microbiology, and the University of Colorado

Cancer Center, the provision of KSHV and EBV cell lines by Dr. Rosemary Rochford

(University of Colorado) and Dr. Shannon Keeney (University of Wisconsin), and expert

technical guidance from Matt Cato and Dr. Nori Ueno (Thermo Fisher). T.C. and B.A.

are employees of EMD Millipore and have a potential conflict of interest. E.T.C. was a

recipient of the 2016 North America Affymetrix Single-cell Grant Recipient, for studies

unrelated to this manuscript.

FUNDING

This research was funded by National Institutes of Health grants R01CA103632 and

R01CA168558 to L.F.V.D., R21AI134084 to E.T.C. and L.F.V.D., and by an American

Heart Association National Scientist Development grant (#13SDG14510023), a

Colorado CTSI Novel methods development grant, and funding from the University of

Colorado Dept. of Anesthesiology to E.T.C.. The Colorado CTSI is supported by

NIH/NCATS Colorado CTSA Grant Number UL1 TR002535. Contents are the authors'

sole responsibility and do not necessarily represent official NIH views. The funders had

no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation

of the manuscript.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Eric T. Clambey, Linda F. van Dyk

Data curation: Lauren M. Oko, Eric T. Clambey

Formal analysis: Lauren M. Oko, Abigail K. Kimball, Rachael E. Kaspar, Benjamin

Alderete, Tim Chang, Eric T. Clambey

Funding acquisition: Eric T. Clambey, Linda F. van Dyk

Investigation: Lauren M. Oko, Ashley N. Knox

Methodology: Lauren M. Oko, Benjamin Alderete, Tim Chang, Linda F. van Dyk, Eric T.

Clambey

Project administration: Eric T. Clambey, Linda F. van Dyk

Resources: Lauren M. Oko, Benjamin Alderete, Tim Chang

Software: Abigail K. Kimball

Supervision: Eric T. Clambey, Linda F. van Dyk

Validation: Lauren M. Oko, Eric T. Clambey

Visualization: Lauren M. Oko, Abigail K. Kimball, Rachael E. Kaspar, Benjamin

Alderete, Tim Chang, Eric T. Clambey

Writing – original draft: Eric T. Clambey, Linda F. van Dyk

Writing – review & editing:

REFERENCES

1.   Pellett PJ, Roizman B. *Herpesviridae*. Fields Virology. 6th ed2013.

2.   Longnecker RM, Kieff, E., Cohen, J.I. Epstein-Barr Virus. Fields Virology. 6th

ed2013.

3.   Ganem D. KSHV infection and the pathogenesis of Kaposi's sarcoma. Annu Rev

Pathol. 2006;1:273-96. doi: 10.1146/annurev.pathol.1.110304.100133. PubMed PMID:

18039116.

4.   Barton E, Mandal P, Speck SH. Pathogenesis and host control of

gammaherpesviruses: lessons from the mouse. Annual review of immunology.

2011;29:351-97. doi: 10.1146/annurev-immunol-072710-081639. PubMed PMID:

21219186.

5.   Cesarman E. Gammaherpesviruses and lymphoproliferative disorders. Annu Rev

Pathol. 2014;9:349-72. doi: 10.1146/annurev-pathol-012513-104656. PubMed PMID:

24111911.

6.   Shalek AK, Satija R, Adiconis X, Gertner RS, Gaublomme JT, Raychowdhury R,

et al. Single-cell transcriptomics reveals bimodality in expression and splicing in immune

cells. Nature. 2013;498(7453):236-40. doi: 10.1038/nature12172. PubMed PMID:

23685454; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3683364.

7.   Battich N, Stoeger T, Pelkmans L. Control of Transcript Variability in Single

Mammalian Cells. Cell. 2015;163(7):1596-610. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2015.11.018. PubMed

PMID: 26687353.

8.   Chen KH, Boettiger AN, Moffitt JR, Wang S, Zhuang X. RNA imaging. Spatially

resolved, highly multiplexed RNA profiling in single cells. Science.

2015;348(6233):aaa6090. doi: 10.1126/science.aaa6090. PubMed PMID: 25858977;

PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4662681.

9.   Adang LA, Parsons CH, Kedes DH. Asynchronous progression through the lytic

cascade and variations in intracellular viral loads revealed by high-throughput single-cell

analysis of Kaposi's sarcoma-associated herpesvirus infection. J Virol.

2006;80(20):10073-82. doi: 10.1128/JVI.01156-06. PubMed PMID: 17005685; PubMed

Central PMCID: PMCPMC1617294.

10.   Borah S, Nichols LA, Hassman LM, Kedes DH, Steitz JA. Tracking expression

and subcellular localization of RNA and protein species using high-throughput single

cell imaging flow cytometry. RNA. 2012;18(8):1573-9. doi: 10.1261/rna.033126.112.

PubMed PMID: 22745225; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3404377.

11.   Ma JZ, Russell TA, Spelman T, Carbone FR, Tscharke DC. Lytic gene

expression is frequent in HSV-1 latent infection and correlates with the engagement of a

cell-intrinsic transcriptional response. PLoS Pathog. 2014;10(7):e1004237. doi:

10.1371/journal.ppat.1004237. PubMed PMID: 25058429; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC4110040.

12.   Shnayder M, Nachshon A, Krishna B, Poole E, Boshkov A, Binyamin A, et al.

Defining the Transcriptional Landscape during Cytomegalovirus Latency with Single-

Cell RNA Sequencing. MBio. 2018;9(2). Epub 2018/03/15. doi: 10.1128/mBio.00013-18.

PubMed PMID: 29535194; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5850328.

13.   Porichis F, Hart MG, Griesbeck M, Everett HL, Hassan M, Baxter AE, et al. High-

throughput detection of miRNAs and gene-specific mRNA at the single-cell level by flow

cytometry. Nat Commun. 2014;5:5641. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6641. PubMed PMID:

25472703; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4256720.

14.   Baxter AE, Niessl J, Fromentin R, Richard J, Porichis F, Charlebois R, et al.

Single-Cell Characterization of Viral Translation-Competent Reservoirs in HIV-Infected

Individuals. Cell Host Microbe. 2016;20(3):368-80. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2016.07.015.

PubMed PMID: 27545045; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5025389.

15.   Diebel KW, Claypool DJ, van Dyk LF. A conserved RNA polymerase III promoter

required for gammaherpesvirus TMER transcription and microRNA processing. Gene.

2014;544(1):8-18. doi: 10.1016/j.gene.2014.04.026. PubMed PMID: 24747015.

16.   Diebel KW, Oko LM, Medina EM, Niemeyer BF, Warren CJ, Claypool DJ, et al.

Gammaherpesvirus small noncoding RNAs are bifunctional elements that regulate

infection and contribute to virulence in vivo. MBio. 2015;6(1):e01670-14. doi:

10.1128/mBio.01670-14. PubMed PMID: 25691585; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC4337559.

17.   Forrest JC, Speck SH. Establishment of B-cell lines latently infected with

reactivation-competent murine gammaherpesvirus 68 provides evidence for viral

alteration of a DNA damage-signaling cascade. J Virol. 2008;82(15):7688-99. doi:

10.1128/JVI.02689-07. PubMed PMID: 18495760; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC2493333.

18.   Cheng BY, Zhi J, Santana A, Khan S, Salinas E, Forrest JC, et al. Tiled

microarray identification of novel viral transcript structures and distinct transcriptional

profiles during two modes of productive murine gammaherpesvirus 68 infection. J Virol.

2012;86(8):4340-57. doi: 10.1128/JVI.05892-11. PubMed PMID: 22318145; PubMed

Central PMCID: PMCPMC3318610.

19.   Kapadia SB, Molina H, van Berkel V, Speck SH, Virgin HWt. Murine

gammaherpesvirus 68 encodes a functional regulator of complement activation. J Virol.

1999;73(9):7658-70. PubMed PMID: 10438856; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC104293.

20.   Sun R, Lin SF, Gradoville L, Miller G. Polyadenylylated nuclear RNA encoded by

Kaposi sarcoma-associated herpesvirus. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences of the United States of America. 1996;93(21):11883-8. Epub 1996/10/15.

PubMed PMID: 8876232; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC38153.

21.   Marchini A, Longnecker R, Kieff E. Epstein-Barr virus (EBV)-negative B-

lymphoma cell lines for clonal isolation and replication of EBV recombinants. J Virol.

1992;66(8):4972-81. Epub 1992/08/01. PubMed PMID: 1321281; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMCPMC241347.

22.   Cao S, Strong MJ, Wang X, Moss WN, Concha M, Lin Z, et al. High-throughput

RNA sequencing-based virome analysis of 50 lymphoma cell lines from the Cancer Cell

Line Encyclopedia project. J Virol. 2015;89(1):713-29. doi: 10.1128/JVI.02570-14.

PubMed PMID: 25355872; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4301145.

23.   Gregory CD, Rowe M, Rickinson AB. Different Epstein-Barr virus-B cell

interactions in phenotypically distinct clones of a Burkitt's lymphoma cell line. The

Journal of general virology. 1990;71 (Pt 7):1481-95. Epub 1990/07/01. doi:

10.1099/0022-1317-71-7-1481. PubMed PMID: 2165133.

24.   Covarrubias S, Richner JM, Clyde K, Lee YJ, Glaunsinger BA. Host shutoff is a

conserved phenotype of gammaherpesvirus infection and is orchestrated exclusively

from the cytoplasm. J Virol. 2009;83(18):9554-66. doi: 10.1128/JVI.01051-09. PubMed

PMID: 19587049; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2738246.

25.   Rowe M, Glaunsinger B, van Leeuwen D, Zuo J, Sweetman D, Ganem D, et al.

Host shutoff during productive Epstein-Barr virus infection is mediated by BGLF5 and

may contribute to immune evasion. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

of the United States of America. 2007;104(9):3366-71. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0611128104.

PubMed PMID: 17360652; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1805610.

26.   Samusik N, Good Z, Spitzer MH, Davis KL, Nolan GP. Automated mapping of

phenotype space with single-cell data. Nature methods. 2016;13(6):493-6. doi:

10.1038/nmeth.3863. PubMed PMID: 27183440; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC4896314.

27.   Maguire O, Collins C, O'Loughlin K, Miecznikowski J, Minderman H. Quantifying

nuclear p65 as a parameter for NF-kappaB activation: Correlation between

ImageStream cytometry, microscopy, and Western blot. Cytometry A. 2011;79(6):461-9.

doi: 10.1002/cyto.a.21068. PubMed PMID: 21520400; PubMed Central PMCID:

PMCPMC3140714.

28.   Rosa MD, Gottlieb E, Lerner MR, Steitz JA. Striking similarities are exhibited by

two small Epstein-Barr virus-encoded ribonucleic acids and the adenovirus-associated

ribonucleic acids VAI and VAII. Mol Cell Biol. 1981;1(9):785-96. Epub 1981/09/01.

PubMed PMID: 9279391; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC369362.

29.   Virgin HWt, Latreille P, Wamsley P, Hallsworth K, Weck KE, Dal Canto AJ, et al.

Complete sequence and genomic analysis of murine gammaherpesvirus 68. J Virol.

1997;71(8):5894-904. PubMed PMID: 9223479; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC191845.

30.   Pfaffl MW. A new mathematical model for relative quantification in real-time RT-

PCR. Nucleic Acids Res. 2001;29(9):e45. PubMed PMID: 11328886; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMCPMC55695.

31.   Li Q, He M, Zhou F, Ye F, Gao SJ. Activation of Kaposi's sarcoma-associated

herpesvirus (KSHV) by inhibitors of class III histone deacetylases: identification of

sirtuin 1 as a regulator of the KSHV life cycle. J Virol. 2014;88(11):6355-67. Epub

2014/03/29. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00219-14. PubMed PMID: 24672028; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMCPMC4093851.

32.   Kimball AK, Oko LM, Bullock BL, Nemenoff RA, van Dyk LF, Clambey ET. A

Beginner's Guide to Analyzing and Visualizing Mass Cytometry Data. J Immunol.

2018;200(1):3-22. Epub 2017/12/20. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1701494. PubMed PMID:

29255085; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5765874.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. RNA-Flow cytometry using the PrimeFlow^{TM} method affords robust and

sensitive analysis of endogenous γHV genes at the single-cell level. Viral RNA

analysis in γHV68-infected fibroblasts by qRT-PCR (A, C) or by flow cytometric analysis

using PrimeFlow^{TM} at 16 hpi (B, D, E, F). Samples were either mock, TMER-TKO, or

WT γHV68-infected, with infections done using 5 plaque forming units/cell. qRT-PCR

standardized to 18s RNA, at the indicated times. All flow cytometric events gated on a

generous FSC x SSC gate, followed by singlet discrimination. PrimeFlow^{TM} analysis

quantified probe fluorescence for (B) TMERs, (D) gene 73, (E) gene 18 or (F) gene 72

relative to side-scatter area (SSC-A). Probe fluorescence is indicated, with all probes

detected using either AlexaFluor (AF) 647 or 488 conjugates. Data representative of 2

independent experiments, each done with biological replicates.

Figure 2. Heterogeneous gene expression in a γHV68 latently infected B cell line.

Viral, host RNA analysis during γHV68 latency and reactivation in A20.γHV68 (HE2.1)

cells by qRT-PCR (A) and flow cytometric analysis using PrimeFlow^{TM} (B-G), comparing

untreated or TPA-stimulated samples at 24 hrs post-treatment. Analysis includes A20,

virus-negative cells and A20.γHV68 cells. (A) qRT-PCR analysis of TMER-5 expression

relative to 18s RNA in A20 and A20.γHV68 (HE2.1) cells, untreated or stimulated with

TPA for 24 hrs. (B) PrimeFlow^{TM} detection of TMER expression in A20.γHV68 (HE2.1)

cells, comparing either samples that were unstained (solid gray) or stained for the

TMERs (open black line). (C) Analysis of TMER expression in multiple conditions,

comparing untreated and stimulated A20 and A20.γHV68 cells, with gates defining the

frequency of events that expressed either intermediate (mid) or high levels of TMERs.

Data depict lymphocytes that were singlets, defined by sequential removal of doublets.

(D) Quantification of the frequency of TMER^{high} cells in stimulated A20.γHV68 cells. (E)

Histogram overlays of HygroGFP and RCA protein expression in A20.γHV68 cells

comparing TMER^{mid} cells from untreated cultures (top, gray), TMER^{mid} cells from TPA-

stimulated cultures (middle, blue), with TMER^{high} cells from stimulated cultures (bottom,

red). (F) Quantification of the frequencies of HygroGFP+ (left) and RCA protein+ (right)

cells as a function of TMER expression and treatment condition. (G) Flow cytometric

analysis on an imaging flow cytometer, with each row showing an individual cell and

representative images of brightfield (BF), RCA protein (RCA), DAPI, and TMER

localization in TMER^{mid} cells from untreated cultures (left) or TMER^{high} RCA+ cells from

stimulated (right) A20.γHV68 cells. Data are from two independent experiments, with

biological replicates within each experiment for all A20.γHV68 cultures. Graphs depict

the mean ± SEM, with each symbol identifying data from a single replicate. Statistical

analysis was done using an unpaired t test (D) or one-way ANOVA, subjected to

Tukey's multiple comparison test (A, F), with statistically significant differences as

indicated, * $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 3. Single-cell analysis of KSHV PAN RNA expression in the BCBL-1 B cell

lymphoma cell line. (A) Flow cytometric analysis of PAN RNA expression in multiple

conditions, from cells incubated with no probe (left), or cells subjected to hybridization

using a probe for PAN RNA, comparing virus-negative BL41 cells (second from left) with

KSHV+ BCBL-1 cells that were either untreated or stimulated (with TPA and sodium

butyrate (NaB)) for 72 hours. Data depict lymphocytes that were singlets, defined by

sequential removal of doublets. Representative images were defined as samples that

were closest to the median frequency. Quantification of (B) the frequency of PAN RNA+

cells and (C) PAN RNA median fluorescence within PAN RNA+ cells, comparing

untreated or stimulated BCBL-1 cells. D, E) Flow cytometric analysis of untreated

BCBL-1 cells, using histogram overlays, to compare cell size (forward scatter, FSC),

granularity (side scatter, SSC) and gene 73 expression in cells that were either PAN

RNA negative [-] (blue line) or PAN RNA positive [+] (red line). Data show (D) histogram

overlays of these populations with fluorescence quantification provided in panel E. Gene

73 analysis includes samples in which there was no gene 73 probe (i.e. "No Probe", in

solid gray), to define background fluorescence. (F, G) Flow cytometric analysis of

stimulated BCBL-1 cells, using histogram overlays, to compare cell size (forward

scatter, FSC), granularity (side scatter, SSC) and gene 73 expression in cells that are

either PAN RNA negative [-] (blue) or PAN RNA positive [+] (red). Data show (F)

histogram overlays of these populations with fluorescence quantification provided in

panel G, with gene 73 analysis including a "No Probe" sample (gray) to define

background fluorescence. Due to variable baseline fluorescence values for SSC and

gene 73 between experiments, values were internally standardized to fluorescent

intensities within the PAN RNA negative population for each experiment, with data

depicting mean ± SEM. Symbols in panels B and C indicate values from individual

samples. Data are from two independent experiments, with biological replicates within

each experiment, with total number of biological replicates as follows: No Probe (n = 2),

BL41 control (n = 3), BCBL-1 untreated (n = 6), BCBL-1 stimulated (n = 6). Statistical

analysis was done using an unpaired t test with statistically significant differences as

indicated, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001.

Figure 4. Single-cell analysis of EBV EBER expression in the Mutu I B cell

lymphoma cell line. (A) Flow cytometric analysis using the PrimeFlow^{TM} method, to

quantify EBER expression in multiple conditions, from cells incubated with no probe

(left), or cells subjected to hybridization using a probe for the EBERs, comparing virus-

negative BL41 cells (second from left) with Mutu I EBV+ cells that were either untreated

(with DMSO) or stimulated (with TPA in DMSO) for 48 hours. Data depict lymphocytes

that were singlets, defined by sequential removal of doublets. Representative images

were defined as samples that were closest to the median frequency, with data depicting

mean ± SEM. (B) Quantitation of median EBER fluorescence within EBER+ Mutu I cells

in untreated and stimulated cultures. Horizontal dashed line indicates the background

fluorescent signal from BL41 controls. Data are from two independent experiments, with

biological replicates within each experiment, with total biological replicates as follows:

No Probe (n = 2), BL41 Control untreated (n = 6), Mutu I untreated (n = 6), Mutu I

stimulated (n = 6). Statistical analysis was done using an unpaired t test with statistically

significant differences as indicated, * p<0.05.

Figure 5. Actin mRNA degradation identifies virally-infected cells experiencing

virus-induced host shutoff. Actin mRNA analysis by qRT-PCR (A,D) or by flow

cytometric analysis using PrimeFlow^{TM} (B,C,E-G), comparing cells with variable

infection status. (A) qRT-PCR analysis of beta-actin (Actb) mRNA expression relative to

18s RNA in mock, WT or TMER-TKO infected 3T12 fibroblasts at 18 hpi. (B)

PrimeFlow^{TM} analysis of actin mRNA in 3T12 fibroblasts, either unstained ("No probe"),

mock-infected or infected with WT γHV68 or TMER-TKO at 18 hpi. (C) PrimeFlow^{TM}

analysis of actin mRNA and TMER expression in WT γHV68 infected fibroblasts at 18

hpi. (D) qRT-PCR analysis of beta-actin (Actb) mRNA expression relative to 18s RNA

in A20, virus-negative cells and A20.γHV68 (HE2.1) cells, untreated or stimulated with

TPA for 24 hrs. (E) PrimeFlow^{TM} analysis of actin mRNA and TMER expression in

untreated and stimulated A20.γHV68 cells, with the frequency of TMER^{high} actin

mRNA^{low} cells indicated, based on the gated events. (F,G) Actin mRNA analysis by

PrimeFlow^{TM} using either (F) histogram overlays or (G) quantifying frequencies,

comparing A20.γHV68 cells that were either untreated or stimulated, further stratified by

whether the cells were TMER^{mid} or TMER^{high} (using the gating strategy defined in Fig.

2C). All flow cytometry data depict single cells, defined by sequential removal of

doublets. Data are from two-three independent experiments, with biological replicates

within each experiment. Graphs depict the mean ± SEM, with each symbol identifying

data from a single replicate. Statistical analysis was done using one-way ANOVA,

subjected to Tukey's multiple comparison test (A, D, G), with statistically significant

differences as indicated, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 6. Heterogeneous viral gene expression at the single-cell level during lytic

replication. Viral, host RNA flow cytometric analysis in γHV68-infected fibroblasts at 16

hpi defined by the PrimeFlow^{TM} method, comparing (A) X-shift clustering analysis and

(B-E) biaxial gating analysis for the indicated features. (A) Automated, clustering

analysis using the X-Shift algorithm on 10,000 events total, compiled from mock- and

γHV68-infected fibroblasts at 16 hrs pi (1,000 events randomly imported per sample,

mock infected n=4, γHV68-infected n=6) identifies multiple clusters of cells with

differential gene expression (7 clusters, colored distinctly, "Cluster ID"), with these

clusters then depicted for expression of TMERs, gene 73, Actin mRNA, and RCA.

Range of expression is identified for each parameter. (B) Analysis of TMER and gene

73 co-expression in mock (left), WT γHV68-infected (middle), and TMER-TKO-infected

(right) samples, with gates depicting populations with different gene expression profiles,

defined relative to mock and TMER-TKO infected samples. (C) Color-coded populations

from WT-infected sample in panel B, with each color indicating a different gene

expression profile. (D) Histogram overlays of the five populations identified in panel C

for the indicated parameters. (E) Quantitation of gene expression among the five

populations identified in panel C, using the same color-coding strategy. Data are from

three independent experiments, with each experiment containing biological replicates.

Flow cytometry data shows single cells that are DNA+ (DAPI+). Statistical significance

tested by one-way ANOVA, comparing the mean of TMER^{high} gene 73^{high} cells to all

other means, followed by Dunnett's multiple testing correction. Significance identified as

*** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 7. Lytic replication is characterized by heterogeneous TMER localization

and variable penetrance of actin RNA degradation. Viral, host RNA flow cytometric

analysis in γHV68-infected fibroblasts at 16 hpi defined by the PrimeFlow^{TM} method. (A)

The frequency of γHV68-infected fibroblasts with TMERs primarily in the nucleus was

quantified by ImageStream, with data showing the frequency of cells in which

TMER:DAPI colocalization (i.e. similarity score) was >1. (B) Images showing brightfield

(BF), TMER, RCA protein (RCA), DAPI, gene 73 and actin mRNA localization,

comparing cells with nuclear TMER localization (left) versus cytoplasmic TMER

localization (right). (C) Analysis of cell subpopulations stratified by TMER and gene 73

expression (defined in Fig. 6C), subjected to the tSNE dimensionality reduction

algorithm. Data and cell populations are derived from the dataset presented in Fig. 6,

showing all DNA+ (DAPI+) single cells (FSC-A, SSC-A) subjected to the tSNE

algorithm. The tSNE algorithm provides each cell with a unique coordinate according to

its expression of Actin mRNA, RCA, Gene 73, and TMERs, displayed on a two-

dimensional plot (tSNE1 versus tSNE2). Visualization grid of tSNE plots, with plots

arranged according to marker expression (rows) relative to phenotype of the cellular

population examined (columns). (D) Biaxial analysis of actin RNA versus RCA protein,

among the five populations identified in Fig. 6. Flow cytometry data shows single cells

that are DNA+ (DAPI+). Data in panels A-B from two independent experiments, in panel

C-D from three independent experiments.

Figure 2
Oko et al

Figure 3
Oko et al

A.

No probe

SSC

AF647

0.047

BL41 Control (KSHV- EBV-) Untreated

0.05 ± 0.02%

Mutu I (EBV+) Untreated

42.1 ± 8.47%

Mutu I (EBV+) Stimulated

45.1 ± 10.2%

EBERs – AF647

B.

EBER Median Fluorescence among EBER+ cells

*

Untreated Stimulated

Figure 4
Oko et al

Figure 6
Oko et al

Figure 7
Oko et al