Quantitative Assessment of Serum NV-F Virus DNA Concentrations in Samples from Patients Coinfected with Hepatitis B or C Virus
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A novel hepatotropic virus, named NV-F virus, was recently identified. The clinical information for this virus is still scarce. Using PCR assay, NV-F viral DNA (NV-F-DNA) was detected in 12 of 50 (24%) hepatitis C virus (HCV)-infected patients (HCV-coinfected [HCVCI] group), 34 of 250 (13.6%) hepatitis B virus (HBV)-infected patients (HBV-coinfected [HBVCI] group), and 28 of 100 (28%) non-A-to-E (NAE) hepatitis patients. Basic clinical parameters were not significantly different among the three groups. By use of a PCR-based quantitative assay, the NV-F-DNA concentration was found to be above the detection limit \(1.2 \times 10^5\) copies/ml in 12/12 (100%) HCVCI patients, 14/34 (41.2%) HBVCI patients, and 4/28 (14.3%) NAE patients. The median serum NV-F-DNA concentration was \(9.3 \times 10^5\) copies/ml in HCVCI patients, but it was below the detection limit in HBVCI and NAE patients (\(P = 0.0045\) and 0.0001, respectively). Stepwise multiple regression analysis identified the presence of anti-HCV as an independent factor for NV-F-DNA concentrations (\(\beta = 6.2 \times 10^5\); \(P = 0.0245\)). In HBVCI patients, the NV-F-DNA concentration was inversely correlated with the HBV DNA concentration. The median NV-F-DNA concentration was below the detection limit in patients with HBV DNA concentrations above \(1.4 \times 10^5\) copies/ml, but it was \(1.58 \times 10^5\) copies/ml in patients with HBV DNA concentrations below \(1.4 \times 10^5\) copies/ml (\(P = 0.030\)). In conclusion, NV-F-DNA concentrations were higher in HCVCI patients, indicating the presence of viral interference between these two DNA viruses.

Viral hepatitis is mostly caused by one of five known hepatitits viruses, namely, hepatitis A virus (HAV), hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), hepatitis D virus (HDV), and hepatitis E virus (HEV) (2, 9). With the help of commercially available tests as well as molecular diagnostic tools, the etiology of over 95% of patients with chronic viral hepatitis can be determined. Nevertheless, in the remaining small portion of patients, the causes of chronic hepatitis remain unknown. In the United States, no definite etiology could be found for 4.9% of patients with chronic hepatitis or cirrhosis, cases which were termed “cryptogenic” (8). Half of these patients had received blood transfusions, suggesting a viral etiology. In another report, patients with chronic non-A-to-C hepatitis were found to have enhanced HLA expressed in their liver samples, implicating a viral etiology (14). Furthermore, therapeutic trials using alpha interferon to treat chronic non-A-to-C hepatitis resulted in a response level of about 50%, again suggesting a viral pathogen (19).

For sporadic acute hepatitis, the proportion of patients with disease of undetermined etiology is even higher. In Taiwan, 15.9% of hospital inpatients with acute hepatitis and 9.7% of patients with fulminating hepatitis were categorized as non-A-to-E (NAE) hepatitis patients (3, 4). Similarly, in Japan, 20% of patients with acute sporadic hepatitis were diagnosed as NAE patients and 2 of 16 (12.5%) patients with fulminant or severe acute hepatitis were categorized as NAE patients (7). Collectively, it can be deduced that in about 5% of chronic hepatitis, 15 to 20% of acute sporadic hepatitis, and 10% of fulminant hepatitis cases, unrecognized pathogens remain to be discovered. Inspired by these observations, scientists struggled to unearth the theoretically existing hepatitis viruses. As a result, several new viruses were found, including GB virus C, TT virus, and SEN virus (12, 13, 18). Although these discoveries were highly significant in the field of molecular virology, epidemiological data failed to verify a causative role of these viruses in human hepatitis (1, 5, 6, 10, 16). Most studies showed that these viruses infected a high percentage of healthy individuals who did not have hepatitis. Furthermore, some investigators argued that GB virus C was in fact not a hepatotropic virus (6, 10).

Recently, a novel hepatotropic virus, named NV-F, was discovered (20). Initial epidemiological study indicated that only 2.8% of healthy individuals carried this virus, whereas 24.6% of patients with NAE hepatitis were seropositive for the NV-F sequence. In this study, we have developed a semiquantitative method to measure the serum concentrations of NV-F viral DNA (NV-F-DNA) in patients with NV-F virus infection. Furthermore, clinical parameters were compared among NV-F virus-infected patients with or without HBV or HCV coinfection.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients. Under informed consent, the remaining aliquots of serum samples previously submitted for biochemistry tests in patients visiting Hepatitis Clinics in Chang Gung Medical Center were collected for this study. A total of 400 patients were included. All patients had histories of mild serum transaminase elevation. Among them, 250 patients were positive for serum HBV surface antigen (HBsAg), 50 patients were positive for antibody against HCV (anti-HCV), and 100 patients were negative for both HBsAg and anti-HCV. All patients were tested for serum NV-F-DNA, for which results were positive for 34 of 250 (13.6%) HBV patients, 12 of 50 (24%) HCV patients, and 28 of 100 (28%)
NAE patients. These 74 patients with positive serum NV-F-DNA were subjected to clinical analysis. Gender, age, aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), total bilirubin, alpha-fetoprotein (AFP), leukocyte counts, hemoglobin concentrations, platelet counts, and a clinical diagnosis of liver cirrhosis were documented. A clinical diagnosis of liver cirrhosis was defined as the presence of liver cirrhosis by ultrasound examination, plus at least one of the following: spider nevi, gynecomastia, esophageal varices (by upper gastrointestinal endoscopy), and palmar erythema. Ultrasound diagnosis for liver cirrhosis was made according to an established scoring system (11).

Results from all patients were negative for immunoglobulin M (IgM) class antibody against HAV (anti-HAV), antibody against hepatitis D virus (anti-HDV), IgM class antibody against HBV core antigen (anti-HBc), and HEV RNA. None of these patients were alcoholic, and no known hepatotoxic medication had been taken. Patients with fatty livers were not excluded from this study.

Autoimmune markers, including anti-nuclear antigen, anti-smooth muscle antigen, and anti-mitochondrial antigen, were all negative. Test results for other virological markers, including antibody for human immunodeficiency virus, IgM class antibody for Epstein-Barr virus, and IgM class antibody for cytomegalovirus, were all negative.

Serology. HBsAg, IgM anti-HAV, IgM anti-HBc, and anti-HDV were assessed using radioimmunoassay kits (Austria-II, HAVAB-M, and anti-delta; Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, IL). Anti-HCV was detected using an enzyme immunoassay kit (HCV-II; Abbott laboratories). PCR RNA was quantified using a COBAS Amplicor HCV monitor test (version 2.0; Roche Diagnostics, Branchburg, NJ). The detection limit was 1.44 × 10^5 copies/ml. HBV DNA was quantified using a hybrid capture assay (Digene Hybrid Capture II HBV DNA test; Digene Corp., Gaithersburg, MD). The detection limit was 1.4 × 10^1 copies/ml to 10^5 copies/ml with tenfold serial dilution. The quantity was determined by spectrophotometry, and the copy numbers were calculated accordingly. All samples, including the standard controls, were subjected to one-step PCR as described in the previous section. Subsequently, 30 μl of the PCR products was submitted to agarose gel electrophoresis and Southern blot analysis. A digoxigenin-labeled probe was generated according to a published protocol. The signal was detected by a DIG luminescent detection kit (Boehringer Mannheim, Germany). The density of the signal was read by a computer-assisted densitometer (imaging densitometer, model GS-670; Bio-Rad). To plot out the standard curve, all standards were tested in triplicate with the percent coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean) kept within 15%.

Statistical analysis. Results were given as means ± standard deviations or medians (ranges) for nonparametric data. Analysis was conducted using the t test, the Mann-Whitney U test, the chi-square test with Yates’ correction, and Fisher’s exact test as appropriate. All statistical testing was two tailed at the 5% level. A stepwise multiple regression model was undertaken by using a stringent P value for entry (P < 0.05) and exit (P > 0.10) criteria. The overall model fit was examined by likelihood function. Statistical analysis was carried out with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Science, version 13.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Ill.).

RESULTS

Basic clinical data for patients infected by NV-F virus. Results from 74 patients were positive for NV-F viral DNA. Among them, 34 were coinfected by HBV (HBVCI) (positive for HBsAg), 12 were coinfected by HCV (HCVCI) (positive for anti-HCV), and 28 were NAE patients. The clinical parameters, including gender, age, AST, ALT, total bilirubin, AFP, leukocyte counts, hemoglobin concentrations, platelet counts, and a clinical diagnosis of liver cirrhosis, were not significantly different among the three groups of patients (P > 0.05) (Table 1).

Quantitative assessment of NV-F viral DNA. By use of serial standard controls, a standard curve was plotted for Fig. 1. Although the limit of percent coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean) of each point was set to be within 15%, a range of 0 to 10% was achieved. The standard control with 10^5 copies/ml always gave a positive and clear signal, whereas the standard control with 10^1 copies/ml sometimes resulted in a negative signal. Repeated testing indicated that a control with 1.2 × 10^5 copies/ml was always detectable. The lower limit of this assay was thus set at 1.2 × 10^5 copies/ml. A polynomial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>HBV coinfected</th>
<th>HCV coinfected</th>
<th>NV-F virus only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of parameter for group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/female</td>
<td>25/9</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>17/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yr)</td>
<td>44.1 ± 10.6</td>
<td>42.8 ± 16.0</td>
<td>51.6 ± 15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST (U/liter)</td>
<td>25.5 (14-499)</td>
<td>39.5 (22-94)</td>
<td>29 (12-1,708)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT (U/liter)</td>
<td>32 (9-1,468)</td>
<td>55.5 (10-244)</td>
<td>30.5 (10-3,157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirubin concn (mg/dl)</td>
<td>1.5 ± 2.0</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.9 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP concn (ng/ml)</td>
<td>8.0 ± 11.4</td>
<td>4.9 ± 3.6</td>
<td>10.0 ± 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukocyte count (10^3 cells/μl)</td>
<td>5.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.3 ± 2.4</td>
<td>6.0 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemoglobin concn (g/dl)</td>
<td>13.5 ± 2.1</td>
<td>12.9 ± 2.4</td>
<td>11.4 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelet count (10^3 cells/mm^3)</td>
<td>189.8 ± 59.9</td>
<td>188.8 ± 55.6</td>
<td>174.5 ± 80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients with cirrhosis diagnosis (%)</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Basic clinical data for NV-F virus-infected patients

---

<ref>Vol. 44, 2006 SERUM CONCENTRATIONS OF NV-F VIRUS DNA 3131</ref>

---

<ref>Downloaded from http://jcm.asm.org on June 22, 2017 by guest</ref>
The prevalences of NV-F virus infection in hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and hepatitis non-A-E patients were 13.6, 24, and...
28%, respectively. This is consistent with our previous report, in which the prevalences were 14.0, 28, and 24.6%, respectively (20). In this study, we have developed an assay for quantitative assessment of serum NV-F-DNA levels. The detection limit in this method was $1.2 \times 10^5$ copies/ml. In the future, it will be possible to develop a quantitative assay with increased sensitivity and specificity by using other methods such as real-time PCR or branched DNA probes.

Strikingly, the NV-F-DNA concentrations were significantly higher in HCVCI patients, whereas the NV-F-DNA concentrations in NAE patients were generally below the lower limit of our quantitative assay. In addition, stepwise multiple regression analysis identified the presence of anti-HCV as a predictor for high NV-F-DNA levels. The reason for this finding is not clear. It is possible that in patients with chronic HCV infection, the immune response is somewhat impaired, allowing for a second hepatitis virus, such as NV-F, to replicate better. This view is supported by recent studies indicating that regulatory T cells play roles in impaired immune responses in patients with chronic hepatitis C (17). Therefore, NV-F virus could replicate better in a host with higher regulatory T-cell function. On the other hand, in NAE patients, the host immunity has not yet been altered, thus prohibiting a high level of NV-F virus replication. Alternatively, viral protein derived from one virus may enhance the replication of the other virus. For instance, HBV X protein can transactivate the promoters in the long terminal repeat of human immunodeficiency virus (15). Whether HCV viral proteins are capable of enhancing NV-F virus replication remains to be elucidated.

Although a higher percentage of HBVCI than NAE patients with measurable NV-F-DNA was found, the median concentrations were not significantly different. However, for HBVCI patients, it was found that the HBV DNA concentration was inversely correlated with the NV-F-DNA concentration. Since both viruses are DNA viruses, we speculate that some common molecular resource is shared between these two viruses during viral replication and, thus, competition occurs.

In summary, higher NV-F-DNA concentrations were found in HCVCI patients. A reciprocal relationship was found between HBV DNA and NV-F DNA concentrations in HBVCI patients. This finding suggests a clinical role of NV-F virus infection, at least in HBVCI patients.
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