Chronic Exposure of Goldfish-derived Cell Cultures to Toxaphene Alters the Replication of Goldfish Virus-2

Thomas B. Shea and Eugene S. Berry

Department of Biology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115

In a recent examination of the effect of toxaphene on the goldfish-derived CAR cell line, it was demonstrated that cells chronically exposed to low levels of toxaphene were more sensitive to subsequent exposure to increased concentrations of this insecticide than were cells which had not been previously exposed (SHEA & BERRY 1982).

To further explore this phenomenon, we examined the response of chronically exposed cells to infection by Goldfish Virus-2.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Cells and virus: cultivation of the goldfish-derived CAR cell line (ATCC CCL-71) has been previously described (SHEA & BERRY 1982). Goldfish Virus-2 (GFV-2), an Iridovirus, was originally isolated from air bladder cultures of healthy goldfish in this laboratory (BERRY & SHEA 1982); viral growth studies have indicated GFV-2 replication is completed by 5 days in CAR cell cultures at 25°C.

Medium: Medium 199 was employed, supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, and 100 units of penicillin and streptomycin and 0.025 mcg. Fungizone/mL (Gibco).

Toxaphene: technical grade toxaphene (99.5% pure) was obtained from Hercules Corp., Delaware. Stock solutions were prepared in 100% ethanol at 0.2g/mL and serially diluted with medium to final concentrations of 50, 35, 25, 15, 10, and 5 parts per million (ppm).

Chronic exposure of cells: cells were chronically exposed to toxaphene at 5ppm for 100 days as previously described (SHEA & BERRY 1982). In brief, cells were planted in $150 \, \mathrm{cm}^2$ flasks (Corning) at a density of $2 \times 10^6 / \mathrm{flask}$ in 20mL medium without toxaphene and incubated for 24hr at 25°C. Medium was then replaced with 20mL medium containing 5ppm toxaphene. At 10-day intervals, cells were subcultured, with the above proceedure repeated.

Infection of chronically-exposed cells: after 100 days chronic exposure to 5ppm toxaphene (above), cells were planted in 24-well trays (Falcon) at a density of $1 \times 10^5/\text{well}$ in medium without toxaphene; these cells were termed CAR_5 . Control cells (CAR $_0$) were passaged in identical manner in medium without toxaphene. 24hr later, medium was removed, and duplicate cultures received $2 \times 10^6 \text{TCID50 GFV-2}$. After allowing 2hr for viral adsorption, cultures were rinsed and refed with medium without toxaphene. The viral inoculum was retained for titration of unadsorbed virus. Viral progeny were harvested on day 5 after infection. TCID50 were determined by endpoint dilution using the microtitration system (BERRY & SHEA 1982). Total protein/culture was determined according to OYAMA & EAGLE (1956).

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Cells chronically exposed to 5ppm toxaphene for 100 days exhibit mild granulation but otherwise appear normal, and replicate at a rate equivalent to that of cells not exposed to toxaphene (SHEA & BERRY 1982).

Chronically-exposed cells (CAR5) and cells not treated with toxaphene (CAR0) were planted at equivalent densities (Table 1) and infected with GFV-2. Both the time course and extent of viral-induced cytopathology was identical for CAR5 and CAR0 as monitored by phase-contrast microscopy, but examination of viral progeny showed nearly 10-fold fewer progeny produced in CAR5 than in CAR0. The possibility existed that uninfected CAR0 cells continued to grow at a rate beyond that of CAR5 during the 5-day incubation. If this were the case, it could conceivably account for increased viral progeny synthesis. However, determination of the total protein/infected culture discounted this possibility, as there was no significant difference in protein/culture; the amount of viral progeny produced/ug protein in infected cultures (Table 1) for CAR5 versus CAR0 showed nearly a 10-fold difference.

Table 1: Effect of chronic exposure of CAR cells to toxaphene on GFV-2 replication

$\frac{\text{\# cells x }10^5/\text{well at time of infection}}{\frac{\text{CAR}_0}{3.9}} \\ \frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_5}{5.4}}{5.4} \\ 2.2 (3.1)* \\ 4.4(4.9) \\ \underline{\text{Unadsorbed viral inoculum 2hr after infection(TCID50/mL)}} \\ \frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_0}{4.0 \times 10^5}}{4.0 \times 10^5} \\ \frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_5}{8.6 \times 10^5}}{8.6 \times 10^5} \\ 1.3 \times 10^6 (1.1 \times 10^6) \\ \underline{\text{Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)}} \\ \frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_0}{4.0 \times 10^6}}{4.0 \times 10^6} \\ \frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_5}{4.0 \times 10^5}}{4.0 \times 10^6} \\ 4.0 \times 10^6 (4.0 \times 10^6) \\ 8.6 \times 10^5 (6.3 \times 10^5) \\ \underline{\text{CAR}_5}}$
2.2 (3.1)* Unadsorbed viral inoculum 2hr after infection(TCID50/mL) CARO 4.0x10 ⁵ 4.0x10 ⁵ 4.0x10 ⁵ 4.0x10 ⁵ Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL) Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)
Unadsorbed viral inoculum 2hr after infection(TCID50/mL) CARO 4.0x10 ⁵ 8.6x10 ⁵ 4.0x10 ⁵ (4.0x10 ⁵) 1.3x10 ⁶ (1.1x10 ⁶) Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)
$\begin{array}{c} \text{CAR}_0 & \text{CAR}_5 \\ 4.0 \text{x} 10^5 & 8.6 \text{x} 10^5 \\ 4.0 \text{x} 10^5 & (4.0 \text{x} 10^5) & 1.3 \text{x} 10^6 & (1.1 \text{x} 10^6) \end{array}$ $\text{Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)}$
$\begin{array}{c} \text{CAR}_0 & \text{CAR}_5 \\ 4.0 \text{x} 10^5 & 8.6 \text{x} 10^5 \\ 4.0 \text{x} 10^5 & (4.0 \text{x} 10^5) & 1.3 \text{x} 10^6 & (1.1 \text{x} 10^6) \end{array}$ $\text{Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)}$
4.0×10^{5} 8.6×10^{5} 4.0×10^{5} (4.0×10^{5}) 1.3×10^{6} (1.1×10^{6}) Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)
Viral progeny day 5 after infection(TCID50/mL)
CAR ₀ CAR ₅
7 7 7 6
$4.0 \times 10^{\circ}$ $4.0 \times 10^{\circ}$
$4.0 \times 10^6 (4.0 \times 10^6) 8.6 \times 10^5 (6.3 \times 10^5)$
Total protein day 5 after infection(ug/infected culture)
$\frac{\text{CAR}_0}{140}$ $\frac{\text{CAR}_5}{110}$
95 (117.5) 145 (127.5)
75 (11/0)
(TCID50/culture)/(ug protein/culture)
$\frac{\frac{\text{CAR}_0}{3.4 \times 10^4} \qquad \frac{\text{CAR}_5}{4.9 \times 10^3}$
Progeny TCID50 produced/TCID50 adsorbed from inoculum
$\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\text{CAR}_0}{12.5} & \frac{\text{CAR}_5}{3.5} \end{array}$
*duplicate determinations shown; averages in parentheses

 ${\rm CAR}_5$ adsorbed significantly less virus than ${\rm CAR}_0$ (Table 1); it at first seems that this is the reason for synthesis of fewer progeny

in CAR_5 than in CAR_0 . However, determination of the progeny virus produced/adsorbed virus demonstrates a ratio of 12.5 for CAR_0 , yet only 3.5 for CAR_5 . Approximately 3.6 times as much infectious progeny was produced per adsorbed virus by CAR_0 as was produced by CAR_5 . Thus, although adsorption of GFV-2 is restricted by chronic exposure of CAR cells to toxaphene, this alone cannot account for the observed restriction in progeny synthesis.

A previous study (SHEA & BERRY 1982) has shown that toxaphene is taken up by CAR cells, and localizes in the alcohol-soluble cell-ular fraction; indications of metabolic interactions between pesticide and cells were also observed. It was further demonstrated that chronic exposure of CAR cells to low levels of toxaphene resulted in increased sensitivity to subsequent exposure to increased concentrations. The present study has demonstrated that chronically passaged cells are restricted in an undisclosed manner in both the adsorption and replication of Goldfish Virus-2.

These results represent a situation differing from that of an earlier study, in which chronic exposure of HeLa cells to several insecticides enhanced poliovirus replication (GABLIKS 1965).

Goldfish have been shown to concentrate toxaphene in their fatty tissue 200-fold over that of the environment (HUNT & KEITH 1960) Since toxaphene has until recently been the most widely used organochlorine insecticide in the United States (CASIDA et al. 1974) and is still in use in other countries, and has been shown to persist in the environment for as long as 10 years (EPA TOXAPHENE STATUS REPORT 1971) further studies on the nature of the interaction of this pesticide with piscine cells are warranted.

REFERENCES

BERRY, E.S. and T.B. SHEA: Abstracts 82nd Amer. Soc. Micro. S77, 247(198: CASIDA, J.E., R.L. HOLMSTEAD, S.KHALIFA, J.R.KNOX, T.OHSAWA, K.J.PALMER and R.Y.WONG: Science 183, 520 (1974)

GABLIKS, J.: Soc. Exp. Biol. Med. 120, 172-175 (1965)

HUNT, E.G. and J.O.KEITH: Proc. 2nd. Conf. Use Agricult. Chem. Calif. $\underline{1}$ (1963)

OYAMA, V.I. and H.EAGLE: Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med. 91, 305 (1956)
SHEA, T.B. and E.S.BERRY: Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 29,68-75 (1982)
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY: Toxaphene Status Report. Office of Pesticide Programs. Wash., D.C. (1971)

Accepted October 3, 1982