

Replication kinetics, shedding, transmission and protective efficacy of Rispens/CVI988 vaccine virus in single and combined infections with very virulent Marek's disease virus

Tanzila Islam

DVM, Sylhet Agricultural University, Sylhet, Bangladesh

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Environmental and Rural Sciences

University of New England, Australia



July 2013

Declaration

I hereby certify that this work is the original work of the author except where acknowledged in the text. Any help I have received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

The substance of this thesis has not been submitted for any degree, either in full or in part and it is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification at this or any other University.

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the author's signature.

Tanzila Islam

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my beloved

father, Md. Nurul Islam and

mother, Mahfuza Islam

Acknowledgements

I would like to pay my deepest gratitude to Almighty Allah who has given me opportunity and strength to pursue my PhD study.

This research was financially supported by the Australian Egg Corporation Limited (AECL) and University of New England, which is greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank my principal supervisor, Prof. Stephen Walkden-Brown, for his supervision, inspiration, support and overall guidance throughout my PhD candidature. His excitement and enthusiasm for any research is unsurpassed and this has incited me along until the end of my thesis and beyond. I would like to specially acknowledge the support and input he gave me during writing and finalizing the thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to my co- supervisors Dr. Katrin Renz and Dr. Fakhru Islam for their greatly appreciated advice and invaluable support during the molecular work and analysis.

Special thanks are also extended to Dr Katrin Renz, Sithara Ralapanawe (UNE), for doing the lab work (preparation of DNA and qPCR) for all of my feather samples.

I am deeply grateful to School of Environmental and Rural Science (UNE) specially Frank Leayr and Shirley Fraser for understanding my situation and supporting me financially.

For their technical assistance throughout my thesis, I would like to thank Susan Burgess (UNE), Michel Raue (UNE), Sara Bowers (UNE), Andrew Blakely (UNE), Grahame Chaffey (UNE) and Garry Taylor (UNE).

I also want to thank all my friends, especially Reza Barekatin, Fatima Tuzzohora, Tahmina Islam, A/Prof Habib Zafarullah, Izaz Raisul and Belal family for their undying moral support and inspiration. They always managed to make me smile during the hard times of my PhD candidature. And although being thousands of kilometres apart, both my family and friends

always kept as close contact as possible with me and gave me all the help and support they could.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for all their love and encouragement. Thanks to my parents who raised me with a love of science and supported me in all my pursuits. Thanks to my sisters, Tahrima and Tasmiyah Islam for their sincere encouragement and inspiration throughout my research work and lifting me uphill this phase of life. I owe everything to them. I wish to extend my special tribute to my loving, supportive, encouraging, and patient husband Mohammad Forhad Hossain whose faithful support during every single moment of this PhD is so appreciated. And most of all, my precious daughter, Fatiha Binte Fuad, who encourages me to finish the final stage of PhD by giving lovely smile always.

List of Publications from this thesis

Journal Articles

1. **Islam, T.**, Renz, K. G., Walkden-Brown, S. W., & Ralapanawe, S. (2013). Viral Kinetics, Shedding Profile and Transmission of Serotype 1 Marek's Disease Vaccine Rispens/CVI988 in Maternal Antibody-negative Chickens. *Avian Diseases*, 57, 454-463.
2. **Islam, T.**, Walkden-Brown, S. W., Renz, K. G., Islam, A. F. M. F., & Ralapanawe, S. (2013). Vaccination-challenge interval markedly influences protection provided by Rispens/CVI988 vaccine against very virulent Marek's disease virus challenge *Avian Pathology*, 42(6), 516-526.
3. **Islam, T.**, Walkden-Brown, S. W., Renz, K. G., Islam, A. F. M. F., & Ralapanawe, S. (2013). Replication kinetics and shedding of very virulent Marek's Disease virus and vaccinal Rispens/CVI988 virus during single and mixed infections varying in order and interval between infections. *Veterinary Microbiology*, Re-submitted.

Conference Presentations

1. **Islam, T.**, Renz, K. G., Walkden-Brown, S. W., & Ralapanawe, S. (2011). Viral load, shedding rate and lateral transmission of Marek's disease vaccinal virus (Rispens/CVI988) in SPF chickens. Proceedings of the Australian Poultry Science Symposium, Sydney, 22, 239-242.
2. **Islam, T.**, Walkden-Brown, S. W., Renz, K. G., Islam, A. F. M. F., & Ralapanawe, S. (2013). Effect of widely divergent vaccination-challenge intervals on protection provided by Rispens/CVI988 vaccine against very virulent Marek's disease virus challenge in ISA Brown chickens. Proceedings of the Australian Poultry Science Symposium, Sydney, 24, 243-246.
3. **Islam T**, Renz K. G., Islam, A. F. M. F., Walkden-Brown S.W. (2012) Effect of wide variation in the timing of vaccination relative to challenge on protection against MDV provided by Rispens CVI988 vaccine. Proceedings of the 9th International Meeting on Marek's Disease and Avian Herpesviruses Berlin, 24-28 June 2012, 39.

4. **Islam T**, Renz KG, Walkden-Brown SW (2012) Viral load, shedding rate and lateral transmission of Marek's disease vaccinal virus (Rispens/CVI988) in SPF chickens. Proceedings of the 9th International Meeting on Marek's Disease and Avian Herpesviruses Berlin, 24-28 June 2012, 50.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| Declaration | i |
| Dedication | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| List of Publications from this thesis | v |
| Table of contents | vii |
| List of Tables | xii |
| List of Figures | xiii |
| Abstract | xvii |
| List of abbreviations | xviii |
| General Introduction | xxiv |
| 1 Review of Literature | 1 |
| <i>1.1 Introduction to Marek's disease</i> | 1 |
| <i>1.2 Economic Significance of Marek's Disease</i> | 2 |
| <i>1.3 Public Health significance of Marek's Disease</i> | 3 |
| <i>1.4 Scientific Significance of Marek's Disease</i> | 4 |
| <i>1.5 Aetiology of Marek's Disease</i> | 4 |
| <i>1.6 Biology of Marek's Disease virus</i> | 5 |
| 1.6.1 Classification | 5 |
| 1.6.1.1 Serotype or species | 5 |
| 1.6.1.2 Pathotype | 6 |
| 1.6.1.3 Neuropathotype | 7 |
| 1.6.2 Morphology | 8 |
| 1.6.3 Susceptibility to chemical and physical agents | 9 |
| 1.6.4 Virus-cell interactions | 9 |
| 1.6.4.1 Fully productive infection | 10 |
| 1.6.4.2 Restrictively productive infection (Abortive) | 10 |
| 1.6.4.3 Non-productive latent infection | 10 |
| 1.6.4.4 Non-productive neoplastic infection | 10 |
| <i>1.7 Epidemiology</i> | 11 |
| 1.7.1 Host | 11 |
| 1.7.2 Transmission | 11 |
| 1.7.3 Incubation period | 12 |
| 1.7.4 Morbidity and Mortality | 12 |
| <i>1.8 Pathogenesis</i> | 13 |
| 1.8.1 Early cytolytic phase | 14 |
| | vii |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1.8.2 Latent phase | 15 |
| 1.8.3 Late cytolitic and immunosuppressive phase | 16 |
| 1.8.4 Proliferative phase | 16 |
| <i>1.9 Clinical signs</i> | 16 |
| <i>1.10 Pathology</i> | 19 |
| 1.10.1 Gross lesions | 19 |
| 1.10.2 Microscopic Lesions | 20 |
| <i>1.11 Diagnosis</i> | 21 |
| 1.11.1 Clinical Diagnosis | 22 |
| 1.11.2 Laboratory diagnosis | 22 |
| 1.11.2.1 Histopathology | 22 |
| 1.11.2.2 Isolation and identification of virus | 23 |
| 1.11.2.3 Assays for detection of MDV | 23 |
| <i>1.12 Prevention & Control</i> | 32 |
| 1.12.1 Vaccination | 32 |
| 1.12.1.1 Responses to vaccination | 34 |
| 1.12.1.2 Mechanism of protection | 35 |
| 1.12.1.3 Factors affecting vaccine efficacy | 36 |
| 1.12.2 Genetic resistance | 38 |
| 1.12.3 Management procedures | 40 |
| <i>1.13 Status of MD and its control in Australia</i> | 40 |
| <i>1.14 History and details of the Rispens/CVI988 MD vaccine</i> | 42 |
| 1.14.1 History of the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine | 42 |
| 1.14.2 Earlier transmission studies with the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine | 42 |
| 1.14.3 Molecular characteristics of Rispens/CVI988 vaccine | 43 |
| <i>1.15 Conclusions</i> | 45 |
| 2 General Materials and Methods | 47 |
| <i>2.1 Animal Management</i> | 47 |
| 2.1.1 Experimental Chickens | 47 |
| 2.1.2 Animal House rooms | 47 |
| 2.1.3 Isolator unit | 48 |
| 2.1.4 Cleaning, disinfection and biosecurity | 50 |
| 2.1.5 Vaccination of birds | 50 |
| 2.1.6 Challenge of birds with MDV-1 | 51 |
| 2.1.7 Euthanasia of chickens | 51 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.1.8 MD lesion detection and scoring from birds | 52 |
| 2.1.9 Sample collection from chickens | 53 |
| <i>2.2 General laboratory Procedures</i> | <i>54</i> |
| 2.2.1 Separation of peripheral blood lymphocytes (PBL) | 54 |
| 2.2.2 DNA extraction from PBL | 55 |
| 2.2.3 DNA extraction from feather tips, dust and spleen | 55 |
| 2.2.4 DNA Quantification | 57 |
| 2.2.5 Quantitative real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR) | 58 |
| 2.2.6 Enzyme Linked Immuno Sorbent Assay (ELISA) | 62 |
| 3 Viral Kinetics, Shedding Profile and Transmission of Serotype 1 Marek's Disease Vaccine Rispens/CVI988 in Maternal Antibody-free Chickens | 66 |
| Abstract | 66 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 67 |
| 3.2 Materials and methods | 69 |
| 3.2.1 Experimental design | 69 |
| 3.2.2 Vaccines and vaccination | 70 |
| 3.2.3 Sampling | 70 |
| 3.2.4 DNA extraction and quantification | 71 |
| 3.2.5 qPCR and ELISA | 71 |
| 3.2.6 Statistical Analysis | 72 |
| 3.3 Results | 72 |
| 3.3.1 Bird survival and well-being | 72 |
| 3.3.2 Vaccination success and room biosecurity | 72 |
| 3.3.3 Infection rate in vaccinated and in-contact chickens | 73 |
| 3.3.4 MDV load in PBL | 76 |
| 3.3.5 MDV load in feather tips | 78 |
| 3.3.6 MDV load in spleen cells | 80 |
| 3.3.7 MDV load in dust | 80 |
| 3.3.8 MDV-specific serology | 81 |
| 3.3.9 Association between variables and prediction of anti MDV antibody titre | 82 |
| 3.3.9.1 Individual sample data | 82 |
| 3.3.9.2 Associations with weekly dust samples (room means) | 82 |
| 3.4 Discussion | 83 |

4 Replication kinetics and shedding of very virulent Marek's Disease virus and vaccinal Rispens/CVI988 virus during single and mixed infections varying in order and interval between infections **92**

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract | 92 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 93 |
| 4.2 Materials and Methods | 96 |
| 4.2.1 Experimental design | 96 |
| 4.2.2 Experimental chickens and management | 98 |
| 4.2.3 Vaccines, vaccination and challenge virus | 98 |
| 4.2.4 Sampling | 99 |
| 4.2.5 DNA extraction and differential MDV-1 real-time PCR assays | 99 |
| 4.2.6 Statistical Analysis | 100 |
| 4.3 Results | 101 |
| 4.3.1 Application of treatments | 101 |
| 4.3.2 Viral load in PBL | 104 |
| 4.3.3 Viral load in feather cells | 108 |
| 4.3.4 Viral load in dust | 113 |
| 4.3.5 Association between variables | 118 |
| 4.4 Discussion | 120 |

5 Vaccination-challenge interval markedly influences protection provided by Rispens/CVI988 vaccine against very virulent Marek's disease virus challenge **129**

| | |
|---|-----|
| Abstract | 129 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 130 |
| 5.2 Materials and Methods | 133 |
| 5.2.1 Experimental design | 133 |
| 5.2.2 Experimental chickens and management | 134 |
| 5.2.3 Vaccines, vaccination and challenge virus | 135 |
| 5.2.4 MD diagnosis and scoring | 135 |
| 5.2.5 Sampling | 136 |
| 5.2.6 DNA extraction, differential MDV-1 real-time PCR assays and ELISA | 136 |
| 5.2.7 Vaccinal protective index (PI) | 137 |
| 5.2.8 Statistical analysis | 137 |
| 5.3 Results | 138 |
| 5.3.1 Application of treatments | 138 |
| 5.3.2 Mortality/Survival | 138 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 5.3.3 Incidence of MD and vaccinal protective index | 140 |
| 5.3.4 MDV-specific serology | 141 |
| 5.3.5 Relationship between Marek's disease incidence at 56 dpc and MDV load in PBL, feathers, dust, immune organ weights and MD serology | 143 |
| 5.4 Discussion | 147 |
| 6 General discussion and conclusions | 154 |
| 6.1 Kinetics and shedding of Rispens/CVI988 in vaccinated chickens (single infection) | 154 |
| 6.2 Transmission of Rispens/CVI988 vaccine | 155 |
| 6.3 Protection and vaccination challenge interval | 156 |
| 6.4 Effect of mixed infection on kinetics | 158 |
| 6.5 Prediction of vaccinal success and protection | 159 |
| 6.6 Application of findings | 160 |
| 6.7 Future work | 162 |
| 7 References | 164 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Table 1.1 Serotypes and pathotypes of MDV.....</i> | <i>6</i> |
| <i>Table 1.2 Classification of MDV on the basis of neuropathotype (Gimeno, et al, 2002)</i> | <i>7</i> |
| <i>Table 1.3 Overall distribution of MD lymphomas in different organs with the incidence rate</i> | <i>20</i> |
| <i>Table 2.1 Sequences of meq-gene primers and probe used for qPCR MDV-1 and differentiation between Rispens/CVI988 and pathogenic assays</i> | <i>58</i> |
| <i>Table 2.2 Details of standards and QCs used in the qPCR assays.....</i> | <i>61</i> |
| <i>Table 2.3 Overall mean intra and inter assay coefficients of variation (CV) based on mean Ct values and mean calculated viral copy number (VCN) of all samples.....</i> | <i>62</i> |
| <i>Table 2.4 Standards used in ELISA assay</i> | <i>64</i> |
| <i>Table 3.1 Details of vaccination and the vaccines used.</i> | <i>70</i> |
| <i>Table 3.2 Mean time of detection of infection in PBL and feather tips by vaccine.....</i> | <i>76</i> |
| <i>Table 4.1 Combination of treatments showing treatment abbreviations and vaccination challenge interval and the treatments included in each analysis.....</i> | <i>97</i> |
| <i>Table 4.2 Viruses used in the experiment.....</i> | <i>99</i> |
| <i>Table 5.1 Summary of treatments showing treatment abbreviations and vaccination challenge interval</i> | <i>134</i> |
| <i>Table 5.2 Details of viruses used in the experiment.....</i> | <i>135</i> |
| <i>Table 5.3 Effect of vaccination with Rispens/CVI988 vaccine and challenge with vvMDV isolate 02LAR in various time combinations on total mortality, mortality with MD, incidence of MD to 56 dpc and protection index by VCI and treatment in commercial ISA Brown chickens. Mortality is for eligible chickens from 2 dpc; MD incidence from 31 dpc when the first MD case occurred.....</i> | <i>139</i> |
| <i>Table 5.4 Pairwise correlation of MD incidence (MD %) at d56 with viral load in various tissues, immune organ weight and MD antibody titre of different challenge days. Correlation is between least squares mean values for each isolator. Analysis includes 16 isolators excluding only treatments not challenged with pathogenic MDV.....</i> | <i>144</i> |
| <i>Table 5.5 Pairwise correlation of MD incidence (MD %) at d56 with viral load in various tissues, immune organ weight and MD antibody titre of different challenge days. Correlation is between least squares mean values for each isolator. Analysis includes 10 isolators in VCI treatments involving infection with both the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine virus and vvMDV isolate 02LAR.....</i> | <i>146</i> |

List of Figures

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Figure 1.1 Partially purified Marek's disease stained with silicotungstic acid. A: three Marek's disease virus nucleocapsids in a single envelope; B: enveloped Marek's disease virus; D: naked Marek's disease virus nucleocapsid. The bar at the bottom right hand corner of each electron photomicrograph represents 100 nm.(Lee, et al, 1969).....</i> | <i>8</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.2 Stages in the cycle of MD pathogenesis. Birds acquire infection by inhalation of infectious virus shed from the feather follicle epithelium (FFE). Following early replication in the lungs, the virus replicates in the lymphoid organs. B-cells go through a lytic infection, resulting in the activation of T-cells, which are target cells of virus. Throughout the lytic infection, noticeable cytolysis in both B and T cells (cells with cross mark) occur. T-cells are transformed by the virus to produce tumours in different organs. Infected T-cells convey the infection to the FFE (Baigent and Davison, 2004).</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.3 Typical gross Marek's Disease Lymphomas of the liver (left), ovary (middle) and liver and spleen (right). (Source – T. Islam).....</i> | <i>19</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.4 Schematic drawing of the PCR cycle. (1) Denaturing at 94 – 96 °C. (2) Annealing at ~60 °C (3) Elongation at 72 °C. Four cycles are shown here.</i> | <i>28</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.5 Real-time PCR response curves. A threshold level is set sufficiently above background and the number of cycles required to reach threshold, Ct, are registered (Kubista, et al., 2006).....</i> | <i>30</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.6 Real-time PCR standard curve inset in an amplification plot of the same standards. Real-time PCR amplification curves are shown on a logarithmic scale for five standard samples in a 10-fold serial dilution series. The crossing points with threshold line are the C_t values. In the inset the C_t values are plotted against the logarithm of the initial number of template copies in the standard samples (Kubista, et al., 2006).....</i> | <i>31</i> |
| <i>Figure 1.7 Possible mechanisms of vaccinal protection against MD (Morimura, et al., 1998).....</i> | <i>36</i> |
| <i>Figure 2.1 Typical set up of the floor pens used in the experiment. For the first few days, ice cube trays were used as additional water source.</i> | <i>48</i> |
| <i>Figure 2.2 Interior of PC2 animal facility containing 24 isolators, also showing main air inlet duct which carries HEPA filtered, heated air to each isolator.....</i> | <i>49</i> |
| <i>Figure 2.3 Examples of MD gross lesions observed during post mortem, a) thymic atrophy, b) lymphoma in ovary and kidney, c) enlarged spleen, d) lymphoma in heart, e) lymphoma in breast muscle, f) lymphoma in liver.....</i> | <i>53</i> |
| <i>Figure 2.4 RotorGene 3000 real-time PCR machine.....</i> | <i>59</i> |
| <i>Figure 2.5 Standard curve of the ELISA assay. Dashed line showing the region of sensitive detection points... 64</i> | <i>64</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.1 Cumulative (A, C) and actual weekly (B, D) proportion of vaccinated and in-contact chickens MDV positive each week, as determined by qPCR of PBL (A, B) and feather (C, D) for MDV-1 commencing at days 7 (vaccinated) and 21 (in-contact) respectively. For A and C the curves differ significantly</i> | |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>(P < 0.001) using survival analysis. For B and D asterisks indicate significant differences within time periods.....</i> | <i>74</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.2 Cumulative proportion of vaccinated chickens (A, C) becoming MDV positive over time as determined by qPCR of PBL (A) and feather tips (C) for MDV-1 commencing at day 7 and cumulative proportion of in-contact chickens (B, D) becoming MDV positive over time as determined by qPCR of.....</i> | <i>75</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.3 Overall effect of vaccine on mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ PBL of vaccinated and in-contact chickens (P = 0.7). All sampling times are included. Columns are not sharing the same letter are significantly different.....</i> | <i>77</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.4 Mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ PBL of all vaccinated and in-contact chickens over time (Effect of mode of infection P = 0.05) (left panel) and Mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ PBL of MDV-positive vaccinated and in-contact chickens over time (Effect of mode of infection P < 0.0001) (right panel)</i> | <i>78</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.5 Overall effect of vaccine on mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ feather tips of vaccinated and in-contact chickens (P = 0.02). Columns are not sharing the same letter are significantly different</i> | <i>79</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.6 Mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ feather of vaccinated and in-contact chickens over time (Effect of mode of infection P < 0.0001) (left panel) and Mean (LSM ± SEM) viral copy number per 10⁶ feather of MDV-positive vaccinated and in-contact chickens over time (Effect of mode of infection P < 0.0001) (right panel)</i> | <i>80</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.7 Overall effect of vaccine on the mean log₁₀ viral copy number per mg dust over time (LSM ± SEM). Vaccinated and in-contact chickens combined as they were in the same room.</i> | <i>81</i> |
| <i>Figure 3.8 Mean (LSM ± SEM) serum Log₁₀ MDV antibody titre of vaccinated and in-contact chickens grouped by three vaccines at day 56 post vaccination. There are no significant differences.</i> | <i>81</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.1 Percentage of chickens positive for pathogenic MDV and Rispens virus in each treatment in a) PBL, b) feather cells and c) dust as determined by qPCR of samples collected at 7, 14, 21, 35, 42, 49 and 56 dpi for PBL and dust and 7, 14 and 21 dpi for feathers (all time periods included).....</i> | <i>103</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.2 Analysis 1. Mean (LSM±SEM) Log₁₀ viral copy number of pathogenic MDV in PBL (a), feather cells (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in samples positive for MDV, showing interaction between the effects of vaccination status (Rispens at day 0 or unvaccinated) and challenge day (challenge with vvMDV 02LAR on days 0, 5 or 10). PBL and dust samples were collected at 7, 14, 21, 35, 42, 49 and 56 dpi and feather samples at 7, 14 and 21 dpi. Samples from all time periods are included. See Table 1 for details of treatments included in the analysis.</i> | <i>105</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.3 Analysis 1. Mean (LSM±SEM) Log₁₀ viral copy number of pathogenic MDV in PBL (a), feather tips (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in positive samples, showing interaction between the effects of vaccination status (Rispens at day 0 or unchallenged) and day post challenge (7, 14, 21, 35, 42, 49 and 56 dpc). Chickens were challenged with vvMDV 02LAR on days 0, 5 or 10. Samples from all challenge treatments are included. See Table 1 for details of treatments included in the analysis.....</i> | <i>107</i> |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 4.4 Analysis 2. Mean (LSM±SEM) Log ₁₀ viral copy number of Rispens MDV in PBL (a), feather cells (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in samples positive for Rispens, showing interaction between the effects of challenge status (02LAR at day 0 or unchallenged) and vaccination day (Rispens at days 0, 5 or 10). PBL and dust samples were collected at 7, 14, 21, 35, 42 and 49 dpv and feather samples at 7, 14 and 21 dpi. Samples from all time periods are included. See Table 1 for details of treatments included in the analysis..... | 110 |
| Figure 4.5 Analysis 2. Mean (LSM ± SEM) Log ₁₀ viral copy number of Rispens MDV in PBL (a), feather tips (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in samples positive for Rispens, showing interaction between the effects of challenge status (02LAR at day 0 or unchallenged) and day post..... | 112 |
| Figure 4.6 Analysis 3. Mean (LSM±SEM) Log ₁₀ viral copy number in PBL (a), feather cells (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in samples positive for either MDV or Rispens, showing interaction between the effects of virus (02LAR or Rispens administered on days 0, 5 or 10) and vaccination challenge interval (-10, -5, 0, 5 or 10). See Table 1 for details of treatments included in the analysis..... | 115 |
| Figure 4.7 Analysis 3. Mean (LSM ± SEM) Log ₁₀ viral copy number in PBL (a), feather cells (b) and dust (c) in all samples, and in the same sample types (d-f) in samples positive for either MDV or Rispens, showing interaction between the effects of virus (02LAR or Rispens administered on days 0, 5 or 10) and day post infection (7, 14, 21, 35, 42 and 49 dpc). See Table 1 for details of treatments included in the analysis..... | 117 |
| Figure 4.8 Association between VCI and pathogenic MDV (1 st row) or Rispens (2 nd row) load in PBL (left), Feather tips (middle) and dust (right). Each point is the mean of data from two isolators for each VCI value and the line is a linear regression curve. | 119 |
| Figure 5.1 Survival patterns of commercial ISA Brown layer chickens vaccinated with Rispens/CVI988 vaccine and/or challenged with MDV isolate 02LAR showing the effects of vaccination-challenge intervals (VCI) ranging from -10 to 10 (left; P < 0.0001), challenge with 02LAR in unvaccinated chickens (middle; P = 0.38) and vaccination with Rispens/CVI988 in unchallenged chickens (right; P < 0.0001). | 140 |
| Figure 5.2 Association between vaccination challenge interval and (a) MD incidence, (b) Protection Index. Each point represents an individual isolator | 141 |
| Figure 5.3 Mean (LSM ± SEM) serum Log ₁₀ of MD antibody titre for the different VCI treatments measured at 21 and 56 dpc. The effect of VCI was significant (P = 0.006)..... | 142 |
| Figure 5.4 Mean (LSM ± SEM) serum Log ₁₀ of MD antibody titre for all treatments measured at 21 and 56 dpc for all treatments involving MDV challenge or 21 and 56 dpv in the RIS treatments. The effect of treatment was significant (P = 0.0006). | 142 |
| Figure 5.5 Association between MD incidence and pathogenic MDV load in PBL at various times post infection. Each data point represents the mean Log ₁₀ MDV copy number in PBL of five chickens from each | |

isolator and the corresponding MD incidence of that group up to 56 dpc. 1st row: Unchallenged isolators excluded; 2nd row: Unchallenged and unvaccinated treatments excluded. 143

Figure 5.6 Association between MD incidence and pathogenic MDV load in feather cells at various times post infection. Each data point represents the mean Log₁₀ MDV copy number in feather cells of five chickens from each isolator and the corresponding MD incidence of that group up to 56 dpc at the end of the experiment. 1st row: Unchallenged isolators excluded; 2nd row: Unchallenged and unvaccinated treatments excluded..... 145

Abstract

The attenuated MDV-1 Rispens/CVI988 vaccine is widely used to vaccinate chickens worldwide and is the most effective current vaccine against MD. Two experiments were designed to investigate transmission of the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine virus (Rispens/CVI988) between chickens, the viral kinetics and shedding profile of Rispens/CVI988 and very virulent MDV (vvMDV, isolate 02LAR) in single and mixed infections and the effect of vaccination to challenge interval on the protection provided by Rispens/CVI988 against vvMDV challenge. Experiment 1 used 70 specific pathogen free (SPF) chickens in four climate controlled rooms. In three rooms, 10 chickens were vaccinated with one of the three commercial Rispens/CVI988 vaccines at day old and left in contact with 10 unvaccinated chickens. The fourth room held 10 unvaccinated control birds. As determined by MDV-specific qPCR of weekly room dust, PBL and feather samples the commercially available Rispens/CVI988 vaccine virus strains are shed in significant quantities and transmit effectively to in-contact chickens. Experiment 2 used 600 commercial ISA Brown layers of the same age (day old) in 24 isolators. Chickens were vaccinated with Rispens/CVI988 (3200 pfu) and/or challenged with the 02LAR (400 pfu) on days 0, 5, 10 post hatching providing vaccination to challenge intervals (VCI) of -10, -5, 0, 5, 10 days with the negative values indicating challenge prior to vaccination. As determined by MDV-specific qPCR able to differentiate between the viruses, vaccination with Rispens/CVI988 greatly reduced the viral load of vvMDV in PBL and feather cells but only if birds were vaccinated prior challenge. The effects on shedding of vvMDV in dust were smaller and occurred later. Similarly, pathogenic MDV-1 also significantly reduced the viral load of Rispens/CVI988 in PBL and feather cells if birds were challenged prior to vaccination. There was no significant effect on shedding in dust. Because of these effects VCI was significantly and negatively associated with vvMDV load and significantly and positively with Rispens/CVI988 load. The Rispens/CVI988 vaccine provided no significant protection when challenge preceded vaccination, with protective indices (PI) of -4 % and 21 % for VCI of -5 and -10 respectively. On the other hand it provided PI of 60 %, 85 % and 100 % at VCI of 0, 5 and 10 respectively. The study also showed that vvMDV load in PBL or feather tips at 14 and 21 dpc were accurate early predictors of MD incidence at 56 dpc.

List of abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| A | Adenine |
| aa | Amino acid |
| ARC | Australian Research Council |
| BAC | Bacterial artificial chromosome |
| B-cell | Bursa-derived cell |
| BHQ | Black hole quencher |
| BLAST | Basic local alignment search tool |
| bp | Base pairs |
| bZip | Basic leucine zipper |
| Bursa | Bursa of Fabricius |
| C | Cytosine |
| CAV | Chicken infectious anaemia virus |
| CEF | Chicken embryo fibroblasts |
| CKC | Chicken kidney cells |
| CPE | Cytopathic effect (in cell culture) |
| cDNA | Complimentary DNA |
| CNS | Central nervous system |
| C _t | Cycle threshold |
| CV | Coefficient of variance |

| | |
|--------|---|
| CY5 | Fluorescent reporter dye |
| Da | Dalton |
| DMSO | Dimethyl sulfoxide |
| DNA | Deoxyribonucleic acid |
| DNase | Deoxyribonuclease |
| dpc | Days post-challenge |
| dpi | Days post-infection |
| dpv | Days post-vaccination |
| FAM 5 | Carboxyfluorescein (Fluorescent reporter dye) |
| FFE | Feather follicle epithelium |
| G | Guanine |
| GaHV-2 | Gallid herpesvirus type 2 |
| GaHV-3 | Gallid herpesvirus type 3 |
| gp | Glycoprotein |
| h | Hour |
| HEPA | High Efficiency Particulate air |
| HEX | Fluorescent reporter dye |
| HVT | Herpesvirus of Turkeys. Also known as Meleagrid herpesvirus 1 (MeHV-1) and Marek's disease virus serotype 3 (MDV3). |
| IA/ia | Intra-abdominal |
| IP/ip | Intra-peritoneal |

| | |
|--------|--|
| IBDV | Infectious bursal disease virus |
| ICP4 | Intracellular protein 4 |
| IFN | Interferon |
| Ig | Immunoglobulin |
| IL | Interleukin |
| iNOS | Inducible nitric oxide synthase |
| kDa | Kilo dalton |
| kB | Kilo base pairs |
| LAT | Latency-associated transcript |
| mab | Maternal antibody |
| MATSA | Marek's disease-associated tumour surface antigen |
| MD | Marek's disease |
| MDV | Marek's disease virus |
| MDV-1 | Marek's disease virus serotype 1. Also known as Gallid herpesvirus 2 (GaHV-2). |
| MDV-2 | Marek's disease virus serotype 2. Also known as Gallid herpesvirus type 3 (GaHV-3). |
| MeHV-1 | Meleagrid herpesvirus type 1 |
| MHC | Major histocompatibility complex |
| mMDV | Mild MDV. A pathotype under the USDA ADOL classification. MDV, which induces mainly paralysis and nerve lesions. HVT |

provides good protection.

| | |
|-------|--|
| mRNA | Messenger RNA |
| NK | Natural killer |
| NO | Nitric oxide |
| ORF | Open reading frame |
| PBL | Peripheral blood lymphocytes |
| PBS | Phosphate buffered saline |
| pc | Post challenge |
| PCR | Polymerase chain reaction (conventional, end point form) |
| pfu | Plaque forming units |
| PI | Protective index. ($\% \text{ MD in Sham-vaccinated chickens} - \% \text{ MD in HVT-vaccinated chickens}$) \div ($\% \text{ MD in Sham-vaccinated chickens}$) $\times 100$ |
| pp38 | Phosphoprotein of 38 kDa |
| pv | Post vaccination |
| qPCR | Quantitative real-time PCR |
| REV | Reticuloendotheliosis virus |
| RNA | Ribonucleic acid |
| RNase | Ribonuclease |
| ROX | Fluorescent reporter dye |
| rpm | Revolutions per minute |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| RT-PCR | Reverse transcriptase PCR (conventional, end point form) |
| s | Second |
| SPF | Specific pathogen free |
| Syn | Synonym |
| T | Thymine |
| T-cell | Thymus - derived cell |
| UNE | The University of New England |
| USDA ADOL | United States Department of Agriculture Avian Diseases and Oncology Laboratory |
| VCI | Vaccination challenge interval |
| vMDV | Virulent MDV. A pathotype under the USDA ADOL classification. MDV, which causes low levels of mortality by day 56pc, but induces lymphomas and nerve lesions in a high proportion of susceptible unvaccinated chickens. HVT provides good protection. |
| vvMDV | Very virulent MDV. A pathotype under the USDA ADOL classification. MDV, which causes moderate levels of mortality by day 56pc and induces lymphomas and nerve lesions in a high proportion of susceptible unvaccinated chickens. HVT is only partially protective but HVT/MDV2 vaccines provide a high level of protection. |

| | |
|--------|--|
| vv+MDV | Very virulent plus MDV. A pathotype under the USDA ADOL classification. MDV, which causes high levels of mortality by day 56pc and induces lymphomas and nerve lesions in a high proportion of susceptible unvaccinated chickens. HVT and HVT/MDV-2 are only partially protective. |
| VN | Virus neutralising |
| VR | Virulence rank (100 – PI) |
| wk | Week |

General Introduction

Marek's disease (MD) is a tumour causing lymphoproliferative disease of chickens caused by Gallid herpesvirus 2 or Marek's disease virus serotype 1 (MDV) which is a DNA virus belonging to the family *Herpesviridae*, sub-family *Alphaherpesvirinae* and genus *Mardivirus* (King, *et al.*, 2012). There are two other species under the genus *Mardivirus*: Gallid herpesvirus 3, avirulent chicken herpesvirus (MDV serotype 2); and Meleagrid herpesvirus 1, naturally occurring turkey herpesvirus (HVT) (MDV serotype 3).

The disease was first described by Josef Marek in 1907 causing paralysis in older chickens and it was described as polyneuritis (Marek, 1907). In 1926 it was revealed this disease also causes tumours in organs such as ovary, liver, kidneys, lungs, adrenals and muscle (Pappenheimer, *et al.*, 1926). In 1957 the disease appeared with neural involvement in 8 - 10 week old chickens with a mortality rate of 40 % in layers (Benton and Cover, 1957) and was described as acute leukosis (Biggs, *et al.*, 1965). In 1969 the disease was first successfully controlled by vaccinating chickens with live attenuated serotype 1 virus (Churchill, *et al.*, 1969b). In the 1970s HVT vaccine was introduced and found to be effective against virulent Marek's Disease Virus (vMDV) (Witter, 1983; Witter, *et al.*, 1970c). In the late 1970s new very virulent strains of MDV were isolated in the USA (vvMDV) associated with frequent HVT vaccination failure (Eidson, *et al.*, 1978b; Witter, 1983). To overcome this situation a new bivalent vaccine (HVT + MDV-2) was introduced (Calnek, *et al.*, 1983; Witter, 1981; Witter, 1982). Again in early 1990s major outbreaks occurred due to vaccine failure associated with ongoing increase in virulence. This led to assignment of a new pathotype category for MDV designated as very virulent plus MDV (vv+MDV) (Witter, 1996, 1997). This vv+MDV causes earlier and severe forms of MDV in younger chickens resulting in very high mortality to younger birds (Ficken, *et al.*, 1991; Spencer, *et al.*, 1992; Venugopal, *et al.*, 1996; Witter, 1996). An attenuated vaccine strain of serotype 1 named Rispens/CVI988 provided good protection against this vv+MDV (Rispens, *et al.*, 1972b; Rispens, *et al.*, 1972a; Witter, *et al.*, 1995) and is now widely used. This brief overview illustrates how Marek's disease virus has changed over the decades becoming more virulent over time, with increasing virulence inducing vaccine failure. Rispens/CVI988 is the most effective vaccine against vv+

pathotypes of MDV but if history is to repeat itself, evolution of virulence may also render this vaccine ineffective.

In Australia, the first vaccine was introduced in 1971. It was HVT. Due to maternal antibody interference with cell free HVT vaccine and contamination of HVT with REV a serotype 2 MD vaccine (Maravac) was introduced in 1978 (Jackson, 2000a, 2000b). Between 1992 and 1997, MD caused very severe losses in both the layer and broiler industries as conventional Australian vaccines and vaccination programs failed to control MD in the imported genotypes of chickens. The problem in layers and broiler breeders was brought under control by the importation of seed for the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine (attenuated MDV-1) in 1997 and MD remains well controlled in layers and breeders by this vaccine at present. Moreover, since 1996 imported strains of HVT (FC126, and NBSL S.AR) are now widely used as vaccines for broiler chickens in cell-associated form administered *in ovo* (Jackson, 2000a, 2000b). Very virulent MDV strains, against which HVT confers only partial protection first identified in Australia in 1985 (McKimm-Breschkin, *et al.*, 1990) and isolated from subsequent outbreaks of MD in vaccinated birds (De Laney, *et al.*, 1995; Zerbes, *et al.*, 1994). In consequent challenge experiments using titrated doses of a local isolate of MDV (MPF57), failure of HVT to provide complete protection has repeatedly been demonstrated (Islam, *et al.*, 2007a; Islam, *et al.*, 2006b; Islam, *et al.*, 2002). Formal pathotyping experiments have identified v and vv MDV pathotypes, but not the vv+ pathotypes reported overseas (Renz, *et al.*, 2012; Walkden-Brown, *et al.*, 2013b).

While MDV vaccines have provided effective protection against Marek's disease they failed to prevent evolution of virulence of MDV. Indeed it is speculated that MDV vaccines have played an important role in the increase in virulence of MDV (Witter, 1996, 1997). This is because vaccination of MD is imperfect i.e. the vaccine prevents the disease but not the infection and both pathogenic virus and vaccinal virus replicate together in the chickens (Atkins, *et al.*, 2012; Gandon, *et al.*, 2001). In such a situation increases in virulence may be favoured, as the higher replication rate of the more virulent viruses is not counterbalanced by increased mortality rate and reduction in virus fitness due to termination of replication by host death. Thus, in vaccinated hosts more virulent MDVs are likely to have greater overall reproductive success than less virulent MDVs. Recent modelling studies based on measured shedding data in chickens co-infected with vaccinal and pathogenic virus have confirmed this situation and the hypothesis of vaccination-induced evolution in virulence, together with an

important role for marked reductions in the mean lifespan of chickens (Atkins, *et al.*, 2012). At this moment it is not clear whether MDV will continue to increase in virulence and overcome the protection provided by the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine. While the kinetics of co-infection of MDV with HVT and MDV-2 have been comparatively well documented (Atkins, *et al.*, 2011; Islam, *et al.*, 2006a; Islam, *et al.*, 2008; Renz, *et al.*, 2006; Walkden-Brown, *et al.*, 2013b) co-infection with serotype 1 vaccine is much more difficult to study due to difficulties in differentiation between vaccinal and pathogenic MDV-1. This difficulty has also led to practical issues in measuring vaccine take following serotype 1 vaccination, and in diagnostic differentiation between the two viruses. This issue of differentiation has recently been solved with the development of a fully quantitative real-time PCR test that differentiates Australian wild-type MDV from the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine (Renz, *et al.*, 2013).

As Rispens/CVI988 is the most effective vaccine against MD at present time we need to understand the nature of this virus and its interaction with pathogenic viruses in co-infected hosts. Baigent *et al.* (2005b) reported the replication kinetics of the Rispens/CVI988 virus in PBL and feather tips up to 28 days post vaccination (dpv) and extending their findings in feather tips showed that presence of high levels of this virus in feather tips at 13 days post vaccination was strongly correlated with subsequent protection against MDV challenge (Baigent, *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, Rispens *et al.* (1972a) showed that at a passage level of 35 the virus spread readily from vaccinated to in-contact chickens (Rispens, *et al.*, 1972a). Subsequent publications report that both a plaque purified clone of CVI988 (988 C) at a passage level 65 and CVI988 at passage 42 showed very limited transmission between birds (Witter, 1987; Witter, *et al.*, 1995). Given currently used vaccine strains have likely passage level in the range of 40-45 it is important to determine the extent to which this virus is shed and transmits between birds, and whether it is able to circulate independently in chicken flocks. The main focus of my thesis is therefore on the detailed understanding of Rispens/CVI988 virus kinetics in single and mixed infections to gain insight into the likely effects of Rispens/CVI988 vaccination on evolution of virulence and to also determine the optimum sampling regimen to confirm Rispens/CVI988 vaccine take. This study aims to

- Investigate the kinetics, shedding and transmission of Rispens/CVI988 including the time of appearance and level of virus in PBL, feather dust and feathers.
- Investigate the protective efficacy followed by Rispens/CVI988 vaccine against very virulent MDV

- Investigate the effect of vaccination challenge interval on the protective efficacy of Rispens/CVI988 vaccine
- Investigate interaction between Rispens/CVI988 and pathogenic MDV in viral kinetic studies in co-infected chickens including shedding of virus in dust.
- Investigate the effect of vaccination to challenge and challenge to vaccination intervals on the kinetics and shedding of both pathogenic MDV and the Rispens/CVI988 vaccine virus.