Estimation of the number of virus particles transmitted by an insect vector

Benoît Moury^{†‡}, Frédéric Fabre^{†‡}, and Rachid Senoussi[§]

[†]Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, UR407, Pathologie Végétale, F-84143 Montfavet, France; and [§]Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, UR546, Biostatistique et Processus Spatiaux, F-84914 Montfavet, France

Edited by Francisco J. Ayala, University of California, Irvine, CA, and approved September 19, 2007 (received for review March 23, 2007)

Plant viruses are submitted to narrow population bottlenecks both during infection of their hosts and during horizontal transmission between host individuals. The size of bottlenecks exerted on virus populations during plant invasion has been estimated in a few pathosystems but is not addressed yet for horizontal transmission. Using competition for aphid transmission between two *Potato virus Y* variants, one of them being noninfectious but equally transmissible, we obtained estimates of the size of bottlenecks exerted on an insect-borne virus during its horizontal transmission. We found that an aphid transmitted on average 0.5–3.2 virus particles, which is extremely low compared with the census viral population into a plant. Such narrow bottlenecks emphasize the strength of stochastic events acting on virus populations, and we illustrate, in modeling virus emergence, why estimating this parameter is important.

aphid | genetic drift | population bottleneck | potyvirus | nonpersistent virus

Horizontal transmission to switch host individuals, which is a critical step in the life cycle of parasites, is ensured by specific biological vectors for many plant and animal viruses. Two major categories of plant viruses, persistent and nonpersistent, can be distinguished according to their transmission mode. Nonpersistent viruses have very short retention times in their vector, usually <12 h. Acquisition and inoculation access periods (AAP and IAP, respectively) are short for these viruses (<5 min). Nonpersistent viruses are not simply transmitted by pure mechanical processes (the vector acting as a “dirty needle”), but a high degree of specificity exists between vector and viral components (1). This kind of virus transmission, largely shared by plant viruses, seems absent among animal viruses. An exception could be *Lumpy skin disease virus* (family *Poxviridae*, genus *Capripox*), which is transmitted by the mosquito *Aedes aegypti* in a more complex way than by a “dirty needle” (2), but information on the characteristics of the virus–vector interaction is still lacking.

Persistent viruses, in contrast, require longer AAP and IAP, and retention of the virus can last from ≈12 h to the lifetime of the vector. Between acquisition and inoculation, a latent period of one to several days is necessary for persistent viruses to be transmitted, whereas it is not for nonpersistent ones.

Aphids are the most widespread plant virus vectors and can transmit both persistent and nonpersistent viruses. More than 200 plant virus species are transmitted nonpersistently by aphids. Virus particles inoculated to plants are previously retained either directly or indirectly in the mouthparts of aphids. In the case of indirect interaction, binding of virus particles to the aphid mouthparts is mediated by one or more viral-encoded proteins, the helper component (3). For example, aphid transmission of viruses from the genus *Potyvirus* involves the helper component-proteinase (HC-Pro) protein, which plays the role of a “molecular bridge” by its interactions with the virus coat protein (CP) and with the vector’s stylet (4). As a consequence, only mutations in the HC-Pro and CP of potyviruses have been shown to affect their transmissibility by aphids. The aphid receptors allowing

retention and inoculation of nonpersistent viruses are unknown but are presumably localized at the distal tip of the stylet bundle (5, 6). Virus acquisition and inoculation occur during the brief (≈10 s) intracellular punctures (or probes) exerted by aphids into epidermal or mesophyll plant cells to select their hosts.

The effects of horizontal transmission by vectors on the evolution of plant virus populations are largely unknown. Vectors are presumed to impose both selective and bottlenecks effects on virus populations. The selective impact of aphids was clearly demonstrated by relaxing the aphid transmission constraint on plant virus populations, during series of mechanical inoculations in the laboratory (1). A large number of virus variants issued from these experiments were shown to be poorly or non transmissible by vectors. Differential transmission efficiency of virus variants between different aphid species was also shown experimentally (7) and could be a major evolutionary constraint on some virus populations (8). Genetic drift was also demonstrated recently by the stochastic extinction of genotypes in CMV populations after nonpersistent aphid transmission due to narrow bottlenecks during transmission (9). Besides these qualitative results, estimating the size of the bottlenecks exerted by vectors is crucial to quantify their consequences on virus evolution.

Very few studies have attempted to estimate the size of bottlenecks exerted on plant virus populations, either persistent or nonpersistent, during transmission by vectors. Pirone and Thornbury (10) estimated the number of particles of *Tobacco etch virus* or *Tobacco vein mottling virus* (genus *Potyvirus*) in aphids after acquisition of purified, radioactively labeled virus. In their experiments, individual aphids that succeeded in infecting a plant after the transmission procedure acquired from 15 to 20,760 potyvirus particles. Given the relatively small number of aphids analyzed and given such a huge range of variation, it remains important to get a more precise estimate of the average number of acquired virus particles. In addition, these figures certainly overestimate the number of transmitted virus particles because they include virions that did not contribute to plant infection, i.e., (i) those that were ingested, (ii) the stylet-borne virions that will not be inoculated to the plants, and (iii)

Author contributions: B.M. and F.F. contributed equally to this study; B.M. designed research; B.M. and F.F. performed research; B.M., F.F., and R.S. analyzed data; and B.M., F.F., and R.S. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission.

Abbreviations: PVY, *Potato virus Y*; AAP, acquisition access period; IAP, inoculation access period; HC-Pro, helper component-proteinase; λ_a , total number of PVY particles transmitted by an aphid to a plant after *in vitro* acquisition; λ_p , total number of PVY particles transmitted by an aphid to a plant after *in planta* acquisition; κ , number of aphid probing punctures required to inoculate the acquired virus particles; λ_p , number of PVY particles required to infect a plant; Vir, PVY variant SON41; Avir, PVY variant SON41xVPgLYE84.2.

[†]To whom correspondence may be addressed at: Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, Domaine St. Maurice, Unité de Pathologie Végétale, BP94, F-84143 Montfavet Cedex, France. E-mail: benoit.moury@avignon.inra.fr or frederic.fabre@avignon.inra.fr.

This article contains supporting information online at www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/0702739104/DC1.

© 2007 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA

stylet-borne virions that will be inoculated to the plants but that are unviable because of deleterious mutations.

In the present article, we analyze results of competitions for aphid transmission between two *Potato virus Y* (PVY; genus *Potyvirus*) variants to get an estimate of the size of population bottlenecks during transmission. By-products of our analyses are estimates of two other important epidemiological parameters: the number of virus particles required to infect a plant and the number of probes made by aphids to inoculate the acquired virus particles.

Results

Evidence for Population Bottleneck During PVY Transmission by Aphids Revealed by Competition Between Virulent and Avirulent Virus Variants. In our experiments, virus acquisition was carried out by allowing aphids to feed on artificial mixtures of two PVY variants (SON41 and SON41xVPgLYE84.2 (11), named in the following Vir and Avir, respectively) in different relative proportions in an *in vitro* device (12). The two PVY variants differ only by 14 nucleotide substitutions (corresponding to five putative amino acid substitutions) in the virus protein genome-linked (VPg) cistron. These substitutions determine the ability to infect [called virulence in the field of plant pathology (13)] pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.) plants carrying the *pvr2¹* recessive resistance allele (11). The Vir variant is virulent toward *pvr2¹* whereas the Avir variant is not (i.e., it is avirulent). However, both Vir and Avir are virulent toward the *pvr2⁺* allele. After feeding, aphids were transferred onto pepper plants for inoculation, and the number of infected plants was recorded for each Vir:Avir ratio [Table 1, columns I–VIII, XI, and XII; and [supporting information \(SI\) Fig. 3](#)].

When a single aphid per plant was used for PVY transmission, the infection frequency was low and decreased rapidly as the proportion of the Vir component decreased. Consequently, the experiment was not much informative and confidence intervals of estimated parameters were excessively large (data not shown). We therefore used two aphids per plant for inoculation in the following experiments. Comparing the infection frequency of “Yolo Wonder” plants (*pvr2⁺/pvr2⁺*) inoculated after acquisition from a medium containing only the Vir or the Avir variants with identical concentrations showed no significant differences ($0.35 < P \text{ value} < 0.69$, depending on the experiments; Fisher’s exact test; Table 1, columns XI and XII). We may consequently consider that the two PVY variants share the same aphid transmission efficiency.

A marked decrease of the frequency of PVY-infected “Yolo Y” (*pvr2¹/pvr2¹*) plants was observed as the relative proportion of the Vir component decreased in the acquisition medium (Fig. 1). This decrease was not due to lower absolute concentrations of the Vir component in the acquisition media. Indeed, a strong competition effect is revealed if we compare the frequencies of “Yolo Y” plants infected from a medium containing 10% of Vir to those obtained from a ten fold dilution of the Vir variant in buffer. The absolute concentration of the Vir component is the same (3.5 ng/ μ l) in both acquisition media, but the infection frequency is drastically reduced in case of competition for transmission between the two PVY variants ($P \text{ values} < 3 \times 10^{-4}$, Fisher’s exact test; Table 1, columns II and VII). This result indicates that there is a limited number of binding sites in the aphid stylet and that the number of Vir particles transmitted to the plants is drastically reduced when the Avir component is also present in the acquisition medium, therefore revealing that a bottleneck affected the total PVY population.

Estimation of the Size of Bottlenecks Affecting PVY Populations During Transmission. A simple stochastic model was developed to estimate the size of bottlenecks affecting PVY populations during aphid transmission from the experiments described

Table 1. Aphid transmission of two variants of *Potato virus Y* (Vir and Avir) to pepper plants

Exp. no.	Plant stage ^a	Infection frequency in “Yolo Y” (<i>pvr2¹/pvr2¹</i>), <i>in vitro</i> acquisition [†]										Infection frequency in “Yolo Wonder” (<i>pvr2⁺/pvr2⁺</i>), <i>in vitro</i> acquisition [†]	
		1.00 [§] I	1.00 II	0.75 III	0.50 IV	0.40 V	0.25 VI	0.10 VII	0.00 VIII	1.00 IX	1.00 X	0.00 XI	1.00 XII
1	18 days	51/95 (53.7%)	40/61 (65.6%)	49/92 (53.3%)	48/94 (51.1%)	— ^{††}	22/95 (23.1%)	14/90 (15.6%)	0/87 (0.0%)	76/108 (70.4%)	—	43/72 (59.7%)	56/90 (62.2%)
2	18 days	58/102 (56.9%)	50/95 (52.6%)	—	58/128 (45.3%)	41/126 (32.5%)	21/120 (17.5%)	12/130 (9.2%)	0/101 (0.0%)	50/72 (69.4%)	—	30/47 (63.8%)	53/90 (58.9%)
3	25 days	8/34 (23.5%)	11/45 (24.4%)	—	7/42 (16.7%)	5/43 (11.6%)	1/40 (2.5%)	0/43 (0.0%)	—	25/61 (41.0%)	—	—	9/42 (21.4%)
4	18 days	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	59/120 (49.2%)	30/100 (30.0%)	—	—

Absolute PVY concentration in the acquisition medium (Vir plus Avir) was 35 ng/ μ l in columns I, III–VIII, XI, and XII; it was 3.5 ng/ μ l in column II.

Time allowed for virus inoculation was 16 h for columns I–IX, XI, and XII; one probe only was allowed for column X.

[†]Inoculations performed with two aphids per plant.

^{††}Inoculations performed with one aphid per plant after acquisition from “Yolo Wonder” leaves.

[§]Proportion of the Vir PVY variant in the acquisition medium relative to the total PVY population (Vir plus Avir).

^aDays after sowing.

^{||}Infected/inoculated plants.

^{††}Not tested.

Fig. 1. Competition for aphid transmission between PVY variants affects plant infection. Shown is the proportion of PVY-infected pepper plants (*Cap-sicum annuum* cv. "Yolo Y," *pvr21/pvr21*) after inoculation by aphids that acquired the virus from an artificial mixture of the two variants Vir and Avir with different relative proportions. Only the Vir variant is able to infect (i.e., is virulent to) these plants. The results were obtained in three independent experiments (Table 1), with inoculations performed by two aphids per plant. Curves represent the results expected with the maximum-likelihood estimates under the "non additive" model for plant infection (see *Methods*). In Exp. 3, inoculated plants were older.

above. The model breaks down the virus transmission mechanism into three successive steps, all described by Poisson processes (see [SI Methods](#) for a detailed presentation of the model): (i) virus acquisition by aphids, (ii) virus inoculation by aphids, and (iii) plant infection. Each step introduces a single parameter in the model: λ_a , the average number of PVY particles acquired *in vitro* (and further inoculated) by an aphid; κ , the average number of probing punctures required by an aphid to inoculate the acquired viruses; and λ_p , the average number of Vir PVY particles sufficient to infect a plant. For the plant infection step, we favored a “non additive” model, where infection was con-

sidered to be the independent issue of each aphid probe, which corresponds to results obtained previously (14).

Our results showed that PVY transmission was more efficient when aphids had acquired the virus from infected pepper leaves than from artificial media containing purified virus. By using the Vir variant alone, the percentage of infected “Yolo Y” plants was always higher when plants were inoculated with one aphid fed on infected leaves than with two aphids fed on artificial medium (Table 1, columns I, II, and IX), which could be due either to differences in aphid behaviors between the two virus acquisition protocols, to a damaging effect of the purification step on the virus viability or to a lack of the helper component. As a consequence, estimates of λ_a obtained with PVY acquisition from artificial medium would underestimate the mean number λ_a^* of particles transmitted after acquisition from PVY-infected leaves. In contrast, λ_p and κ should be identical for both acquisition protocols within experiments 1, 2, and 3. For a more accurate estimation of κ , we performed an additional experiment (Experiment 4, Table 1), which allowed the comparison of plant infection frequencies by aphids that either were allowed to perform a single probe for inoculation or that were not limited in their number of probes. The results of this experiment were close to those obtained independently by Martín *et al.* (6) for a similar PVY-*Myzus persicae*-pepper combination with the help of electrical penetration graphs to control the number of aphid probes.

Numerical simulations were used to check that, by combining several subsets of experiments, the four parameters described above were simultaneously identifiable using the maximum-likelihood principle (SI Fig. 3). The different experiments yielded remarkably consistent estimates of λ_a , λ_a^* , κ , and λ_p (Table 2). Parameters λ_a^* and λ_p were found to be very small: λ_a^* varied from 0.64 to 3.24, and λ_p varied from 1.65 to 5.13 between experiments. κ was found to vary from 4.37 to 5.25. When combining the results of our four independent experiments, thus incorporating the maximum of information into the model, an average of 1.2–1.4 PVY particles was found to be transmitted from plant to plant per aphid (Table 2). Accordingly, 99% of aphids transmitted five virus particles or less to the plants. Note that the λ_a , λ_a^* , and λ_p parameter values that could be obtained under an alternative “additive” model for plant infection were very close to the ones obtained with the “non additive” model (data not shown).

Table 2. Estimates of PVY aphid transmission parameters

Exp. nos.	ML estimate of					Log L
	λ_a	λ_a^*	λ_{p1}	λ_{p2}	κ	
1 + 4	$0.34 \pm 0.06^{\dagger}$	0.64 ± 0.09	1.65 ± 0.13	NA [§]	4.37 ± 0.53	-548.18
2 + 4	1.14 ± 0.15	1.55 ± 0.15	3.00 ± 0.20	NA	5.03 ± 0.71	-596.98
3 + 4 (4 parameters) [¶]	1.33 ± 0.38	3.24 ± 0.51	4.14 ± 0.62	NA	5.25 ± 0.72	-320.39
3 + 4 (5 parameters) [¶]	1.34 ± 0.39	1.79 ± 9.16	3.32 ± 12.05	5.13 ± 0.65	5.11 ± 2.05	-320.39
1 + 2 + 4	0.24 ± 0.03	0.53 ± 0.07	1.40 ± 0.10	NA	3.79 ± 0.42	-884.98
1 + 2 + 3 + 4 (4 parameters) [¶]	0.85 ± 0.11	1.38 ± 0.12	2.73 ± 0.21	NA	4.80 ± 0.76	-973.55
1 + 2 + 3 + 4 (5 parameters) [¶]	0.84 ± 0.15	1.24 ± 0.14	2.51 ± 0.27	4.21 ± 0.27	4.58 ± 0.81	-946.67

Maximum-likelihood (ML) estimates of the number of virus particles transmitted by an aphid to a pepper plant (λ_a for *in vitro* acquisition and λ_a^* for acquisition from infected pepper leaves), of the threshold number of PVY particles required to infect a plant (λ_{p1} for younger plants and λ_{p2} for older plants), and of the number of probes required to inoculate the acquired virus particles (κ) for different sets of experiments.

[†]Logarithm of the likelihood corresponding to ML estimates of parameters.[‡]ML estimate $\pm$ SD.

[§]NA, not applicable.

[†]When older plants were inoculated (Exp. 3), two models were considered: a single λ_{p1} parameter for plant infection or two parameters (λ_{p1} and λ_{p2}) corresponding to the different ages of plants in the experiments. A likelihood ratio test comparing the model with distinct λ_p values for Exp. 3 to the model with the same λ_p value for that experiment, indicated that λ_{p2} was significantly higher than λ_{p1} for the combination of Exps. 1, 2, 3, and 4 whereas no significant difference between λ_{p1} and λ_{p2} was observed for the combination of Exps. 3 and 4.

Fig. 2. Effect of the size of population bottlenecks during aphid transmission on the emergence of virus variants. The effect of (i) the size N of population bottleneck during aphid transmission, (ii) the fitness cost s of virulence, and (iii) the rate θ of aggregation of Vir and Avir particles within plants is illustrated on both the probability π of extinction of the Vir variant in the viral population (A–C) and on the mean number $\bar{\tau}$ of transmission events to achieve this extinction (D). (A) Plots of π versus N , without ($\theta = 0$, black lines) and with ($\theta = 0.026$, red lines) virus aggregation within plants, for three values of s . (B and C) Plots of the odds in favor of Vir extinction [i.e., $\pi/(1 - \pi)$] in the (N, s) plane for $\theta = 0$ (B) and $\theta = 0.026$ (C). (D) Plots of $\bar{\tau}$ versus N , without ($\theta = 0$, black lines) and with ($\theta = 0.026$, red lines) virus aggregation within plants, for three values of s . Estimations of π and $\bar{\tau}$ are based on 25,000 simulations per (N, s, θ) parameter set. The value $\theta = 0.026$ describes a situation of moderate aggregation of Vir and Avir particles within plants; for $N = 5$, the variance of the beta-binomial distribution used to describe the number of Vir viruses transmitted between plants is 10% higher than the variance of the corresponding binomial distribution (see [SI Methods](#)).

Investigating Virus Emergence by Modeling the Extinction of Virulent Variants. A simulation model was developed to explore how bottlenecks during aphid transmission affect the evolution of plant virus populations (see [SI Methods](#) for a detailed presentation of the simulation model). We considered a virus population composed of Vir and Avir individuals that undergo alternated growth phases within plants and periodical sampling phases during which a random fraction of the virus population is transmitted by aphids to initiate infection of a new plant. We investigated how the size of bottlenecks N during sampling phases, the fitness cost s associated with virulence and the aggregation rate θ of the Vir and Avir particles within plants affected (i) the probability π of extinction of the Vir viruses in

the population and (ii) the number of transmission events τ required to achieve this extinction.

Regarding the probability of extinction, in the presence of no fitness cost of virulence ($s = 0$), π is close to 0.5, whatever N and θ (Fig. 2A). If $s > 0$, the Vir viruses will always get extinct ($\pi = 1$), except if stochastic effects occur because of bottlenecks or virus aggregation. Depending on s , there is a threshold value N_1 of N beyond which extinction of the Vir viruses is nearly certain (Fig. 2A). In the (s, N) plane, the area where the extinction of Vir viruses is nearly certain [let us say higher than 0.95, or equivalently, where the odds of π , $\pi/(1 - \pi)$, are higher than 19] defines an upper-right triangle where N_1 decreases linearly (in a x -log, y -log scale) with s (Fig. 2B). Importantly, in our range of N

relative proportions and half volume of the solution containing HC-Pro through a stretched Parafilm membrane in a similar way as in Govier *et al.* (12). This AAP was shown to be optimal for transmission (not significantly different from a 1- to 2-min AAP), whereas transmission efficiency decreased significantly for a 10- to 11-min or 15- to 16-min AAP (data not shown). The total (Vir plus Avir) PVY concentration was identical for all of the artificial acquisition media (35 ng/ μ l), except one series of inoculations performed after acquisition from a medium containing 3.5 ng/ μ l PVY (Table 1, column II). Fed aphids were transferred with a paintbrush to *C. annuum* “Yolo Y” (*pvr2¹/pvr2¹*) or “Yolo Wonder” (*pvr2⁺/pvr2⁺*) seedlings at the cotyledon or one-expanded-leaf stage (18 or 25 days after sowing, respectively), depending on the experiment. “Yolo Wonder” and “Yolo Y” are nearly isogenic inbred lines with different alleles at the *pvr2* locus (30). Inoculations were performed with one or two aphids per plant, depending on the experiment, which were maintained on a single cotyledon of the plants overnight and treated with an insecticide. Additional experiments were performed by using apical leaves of “Yolo Wonder” plants infected

with the Vir variant for acquisition. In one of these latter experiments, aphids were allowed to perform only one probe during the IAP as assessed by the observation of their behavior under the microscope (immobilization of aphids during a short period of $\approx$ 10 s with typical posture of legs and antennae). Afterward, they were immediately withdrawn from the plants with a paint brush. After the IAP, the plants were maintained in greenhouse conditions for one month. Their infection status was then checked by symptom reading, and DAS-ELISA was performed on apical, uninoculated leaves.

We thank Joël Chadoeuf for his help in modeling; Benny Raccach for sharing his experience in PVY acquisition *in vitro*; Vincent Simon, Julien Petit-Pierre, and Béranger Janzac for their help in the transmission experiments; Catherine Rys for raising the aphids; and Hervé Lecoq and two anonymous reviewers for their stimulating comments on the manuscript. Funding by the Ecologie pour la Gestion des Écosystèmes et de Leurs Ressources action of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche “Ecosphère Continentale: Processus, Modélisation et Risques Environnementaux” is also acknowledged.

1. Ng JCK, Falk BW (2006) *Annu Rev Phytopath* 44:183–212.
2. Chihota CM, Rennie LF, Kitching RP, Mellor PS (2001) *Epidemiol Infect* 126:317–321.
3. Froissart R, Michalakakis Y, Blanc S (2002) *Phytopathology* 92:576–579.
4. Pirone T, Blanc S (1996) *Annu Rev Phytopath* 34:227–247.
5. Wang RY, Ammar ED, Thornbury DW, Lopez-Moya JJ, Pirone TP (1996) *J Gen Virol* 77:861–867.
6. Martin B, Collar JL, Tjallingii WF, Fereres A (1997) *J Gen Virol* 78:2701–2705.
7. Perry KL, Zhang L, Palukaitis P (1998) *Virology* 242:204–210.
8. Moury B (2004) *Mol Biol Evol* 21:1602–1611.
9. Ali A, Li H, Schneider WL, Sherman DJ, Gray S, Smith D, Roossinck MJ (2006) *J Virol* 80:8345–8350.
10. Pirone TP, Thornbury DW (1988) *Phytopathology* 78:104–107.
11. Moury B, Morel C, Johansen E, Guilbaud L, Souche S, Ayme V, Caranta C, Palloix A, Jacquemond M (2004) *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* 17:322–329.
12. Govier DA, Kassanis B, Pirone TP (1977) *Virology* 78:306–314.
13. Shaner G, Stromberg EL, Lacy GH, Barker KR, Pirone TP (1992) *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 30:47–66.
14. Watson MA (1972) in *Principles and Techniques in Plant Virology*, eds Kado CI, Agrawal HO (Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York), pp 131–167.
15. French R, Stenger DC (2003) *Annu Rev Phytopath* 41:199–214.
16. Li H, Roossinck MJ (2004) *J Virol* 78:10582–10587.
17. Sacristán S, Malpica JM, Fraile A, García-Arenal F (2003) *J Virol* 77:9906–9911.
18. Chao L (1990) *Nature* 348:454–455.
19. Duarte E, Clarke D, Domingo E, Holland J (1992) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 89:6015–6019.
20. Bergstrom CT, McElhany P, Real LA (1999) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 96:5095–5100.
21. Hill WG, Rasbash J (1986) *Genet Res* 48:125–131.
22. French R, Stenger DC (2005) *Virology* 343:179–189.
23. Lecoq H, Moury B, Desbiez C, Palloix A, Pitrat M (2004) *Virus Res* 100:31–39.
24. Scherm H, Ngugi HK, Ojiambo PS (2006) *Eur J Plant Pathol* 115:61–73.
25. Jeger MJ, Holt J, van den Bosch F, Madden LV (2004) *Physiol Entomol* 29:291–304.
26. Dietrich C, Maiss E (2003) *J Gen Virol* 84:2871–2876.
27. Jridi C, Martin JF, Marie-Jeanne V, Labonne G, Blanc S (2006) *J Virol* 80:2349–2357.
28. Moghal SM, Francki RIB (1976) *Virology* 73:350–362.
29. Thornbury DW, Hellmann GM, Rhoads RE, Pirone TP (1985) *Virology* 144:260–267.
30. Cook AA (1961) *Phytopathology* 51:550–552.