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Genome packaging in influenza A virus
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The negative-sense RNA genome of influenza A virus is composed of eight segments, which encode 12 proteins between them. At the final stage of viral assembly, these genomic virion (v)RNAs are incorporated into the virion as it buds from the apical plasma membrane of the cell. Genome segmentation confers evolutionary advantages on the virus, but also poses a problem during virion assembly as at least one copy of each of the eight segments is required to produce a fully infectious virus particle. Historically, arguments have been presented in favour of a specific packaging mechanism that ensures incorporation of a full genome complement, as well as for an alternative model in which segments are chosen at random but packaged in sufficient numbers to ensure that a reasonable proportion of virions are viable. The question has seen a resurgence of interest in recent years leading to a consensus that the vast majority of virions contain no more than eight segments and that a specific mechanism does indeed function to select one copy of each vRNA. This review summarizes work leading to this conclusion. In addition, we describe recent progress in identifying the specific packaging signals and discuss likely mechanisms by which these RNA elements might operate.

Introduction

Influenza A virus is the prototype of the family Orthomyxoviridae and, like all members of this family, the negative-sense RNA that comprises its genome is divided into separate segments (Cheung & Poon, 2007; Neumann et al., 2004). These virion (v)RNA segments share a common organization; a long central coding region (in antisense), sometimes encoding more than one polypeptide, flanked by relatively short untranslated regions (UTRs) and at the termini, sequences conserved between segments that show partial complementarity (Fig. 1a). The vRNA segments are separately encapsidated into ribonucleoprotein (RNP) structures by viral polypeptides: stochiometric amounts of a single-strand RNA-binding nucleoprotein (NP; at one monomer per 24 nt) and a single copy of a heterotrimeric RNA-dependent RNA polymerase composed of the PB1, PB2 and PA polypeptides (Fig. 1b–d) (Neumann et al., 2004; Portela & Digard, 2002). The RNPs act as independent units for the purposes of vRNA synthesis, which occurs in the nuclei of infected cells (Neumann et al., 2004). Replicated vRNAs are exported (as RNPs) from the nucleus via the cellular CRM1 pathway (Boulo et al., 2007; Neumann et al., 2004), and at the final stage of viral assembly, are incorporated into the virion as it buds from the apical plasma membrane of the cell (Fig. 2) (Cheung & Poon, 2007). The process of virion assembly is not well understood but is thought to involve a series of protein–protein interactions between the cytoplasmic tails of the viral integral membrane proteins, the matrix protein and the RNPs (Schmitt & Lamb, 2005).

Genome segmentation confers evolutionary advantages on influenza viruses, but also poses a problem in virion assembly. The eight segments encode 12 identified polypeptides, only two of which are non-essential outside of the laboratory setting (Chen et al., 2001; Wise et al., 2009). As these two non-essential proteins are encoded by segment 2, along with the essential PB1 polymerase subunit, it follows that at least one copy of each of the eight vRNAs must be packaged for a single virion to be able to initiate a productive infection. Until recently, the process by which this was achieved was poorly understood, but a clearer picture has begun to emerge of a mechanism for specifically packaging a full genome, mediated by cis-acting packaging signals in the vRNAs. This review aims to summarize the thought processes and experimental evidence leading up to the currently accepted model for influenza A genome packaging and to highlight the main questions remaining.
Genome segmentation: a mixed blessing

The majority of known virus families have monopartite genomes, and although segmentation has probably arisen independently on various occasions – suggesting that there is no substantial barrier to its evolution – it is much more common in RNA viruses (Ball, 2007). That segmentation evolved at all suggests that it can confer an evolutionary advantage, but it also results in problems for a virus, notably the increased complexity of genome packaging.

Genome segmentation could in theory provide various advantages. Chief among these for RNA viruses is probably the increased control over its evolution – it is much more common in RNA viruses (Ball, 2007). That segmentation evolved at all suggests that it can confer an evolutionary advantage, but it also results in problems for a virus, notably the increased complexity of genome packaging.
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after damage or mutation can be observed experimentally by complementation (Sugiura et al., 1972) and multiplicity reactivation (Barry, 1961). A second notable evolutionary advantage provided by a sexual mechanism such as segmentation is the acquisition of beneficial alleles. This is well-documented in influenza A virus through the phenomenon of antigenic shift, in which segments of human and animal virus genomes reassort to produce antigenically novel strains with the potential to cause pandemics and to establish themselves in new host populations (Webster et al., 1992). Such reassortment events triggered the 1957 and 1968 pandemic outbreaks as well as playing a major role in the evolution of the current swine-derived H1N1 pandemic virus (Garten et al., 2009; Smith et al., 2009).

Genome segmentation does, however, come at the cost of increasing the complexity of virion assembly, by necessitating the transmission of every segment for an infection to succeed. For those segmented viruses that initiate infection at high multiplicities, for example through vertical infection or propagation by insect vectors, correct genome packaging is not critical. An infected cell is likely to receive multiple copies of each segment due to co-infection, and infection is even possible with a ‘multicompartment’ strategy where each segment is separately encapsidated (Pressing & Reanney, 1984). This is particularly true of plant viruses, in which the majority of segmented viruses employ multicompartiment genome packaging (Lazarowitz, 2007). Conversely, the transmission of influenza virus by aerosol and/or fomite spread (or, for waterfowl, by contact with highly diluted virus in water) presumably means that many influenza infections are initiated at a low m.o.i. Consequently, it is necessary for the virus to adopt a ‘monocompartment’ strategy, with at least one copy of each individual segment in a single virion (Pressing & Reanney, 1984). Segmentation therefore poses a packaging problem – as influenza viruses cannot guarantee consistently high m.o.i. values, virus particles that fail to incorporate all eight genome segments will not replicate.

**Genome packaging: random or segment-specific?**

There are two models for the packaging of a segmented, monocompartment genome. In a random model, a mechanism exists to distinguish pieces of the viral genome from cellular RNA and non-genomic viral RNAs and incorporate them into virions, but has no way of distinguishing between different segments (Fig. 2a). Under this scheme, a fully infectious virion would acquire a complete genome purely through chance, with the probability of success being increased by packaging more segments than the minimum required for a complete genome (Compans et al., 1970; Hirst, 1962). Infectious bursal disease virus, with a two segment double-stranded (ds)RNA genome, may provide an example of such a strategy, as distinct populations of virions with increasing numbers of segments and specific infectivities can be isolated (Luque et al., 2009). Conversely, in a specific packaging model, a mechanism ensures that one copy of each different segment is specifically selected during viral assembly (Fig. 2b) (Kingsbury, 1970). The dsRNA bacteriophage Φ6 is a good example of this strategy as a specific packaging mechanism has been demonstrated for its three segments and the particle: p.f.u. ratio of the virus is close to 1 (Mindich, 2004). These models represent the extreme cases of segment-specificity – absolutely no specificity in the former case and unfailingly rigorous selection in the latter. The extent to which packaging of the influenza A genome is in fact segment-specific has been debated, and evidence for varying degrees of segment-specificity has been presented.

Initial studies appeared to favour segment-specific packaging. Along with the realization that the influenza A genome was segmented, it was shown that genetic markers in influenza viruses fell into distinct complementation groups (Duesberg, 1968; Pons & Hirst, 1968). It was noted that although the genes of co-infecting viruses readily complemented each other, even when the parent viruses did not have plaque-forming ability in their own right (Barry, 1961; Hirst, 1973; Hirst & Pons, 1973), the progeny virions seldom carried more than one allele at a specific locus (Laver & Downie, 1976; Lubeck et al., 1979; Nakajima & Sugiura, 1977; Varich et al., 2008). Plausible instances of partial heterozygotes were rare (Laver & Downie, 1976; Nakajima & Sugiura, 1977); when one such virus was examined it was found to be unstable when passaged (Scholtissek et al., 1978). It was inferred from this that influenza A virus normally has a haploid genome in which each segment is present only once (Laver & Downie, 1976; Nakajima & Sugiura, 1977). With only eight segments present, the probability of assembling a complete genome by random incorporation is very low; simple combinatorial calculations give a value of 8!/88 or 1/416 (Fig. 3) (Enami et al., 1991; Nakajima & Sugiura, 1977).

![Fig. 3. A simple mathematical model of random genome packaging. The probabilities of obtaining one copy of each segment in a single virus particle are plotted for random selection with increasing numbers of RNPs per virion [using standard probability theory (Enami et al., 1991)].](http://vir.sgmjournals.org)
This value is incompatible with the approximately 1/10–1/100 proportion of infectious influenza virions estimated from particle:p.f.u. measurements (Donald & Isaacs, 1954; Hutchinson et al., 2008; Kingsbury, 1970; Nakajima & Sugiuira, 1977). Consequently, it was concluded that there must be some form of segment specificity in genome packaging (Laver & Downie, 1976; Nakajima & Sugiuira, 1977). Further support was lent to the segment-specific packaging model by the observation that segments were present at equimolar levels in virions (Hatada et al., 1989; McGeoch et al., 1976) even when their ratios in infected cells differed (Bergmann & Muster, 1995; Smith & Hay, 1982), suggesting that some form of selection process was operating.

Opposition to the segment-specific packaging model developed with the ability to introduce artificial segments into influenza viruses through reverse genetics (Luytjes et al., 1989). Synthetic vRNAs were produced in which viral open reading frames (ORFs) were replaced by reporter genes, retaining only the terminal UTRs of the original segment. As discussed above (Fig. 1a), the UTRs of each segment consist of 12–13 nt of highly conserved sequence, forming a panhandle structure required for polymerase binding (Neumann et al., 2004), as well as a variable amount (typically around 25 nt) of segment-specific sequence. Studies showed that the UTRs of segments 4, 5 or 8 were sufficient, in the presence of a helper virus, to direct replication of the segment, to package it into virions and, in some experiments, to maintain it for several passages, indicating that the UTRs contained the minimal determinants of segment packaging (Luytjes et al., 1989; Neumann et al., 2004; Neumann & Hobom, 1995; Tchatalbachev et al., 2001). This approach was then used to produce a virus with nine distinct segments (Enami et al., 1991). Segment 8 was duplicated such that one copy contained only the NS1 gene, while the other encoded both NS2/NEP and a temperature-sensitive NS1 protein. When introduced into a virus, the short segment 9 complemented the temperature-sensitive NS1 allele in the full-length segment 8. At the non-permissive temperature, it was shown that nine-segment viruses, including both the full-length mutant segment 8 and the NS1-only construct, could be propagated clonally with single hit infectivity kinetics. The artificial nine-segment virus showed reduced infectivity at the non-permissive temperature and this was discussed with respect to segment packaging. Using a random packaging model based on standard probability methods, the observed proportion of infectious particles was consistent with the incorporation of around 10–11 segments per particle (Enami et al., 1991). However, maintenance of this nine-segment virus required strong selection, without which the synthetic segment was rapidly lost (Enami et al., 1991), consistent with the unstable nature of a naturally occurring partial heterozygote (Scholtissek et al., 1978). More recently, it was shown that the UTRs of segments 5 (encoding NP), 6 (NA) and 8 were also able to promote the packaging of reporter genes, and that, consistent with the random packaging model, constructs containing only the UTRs did not compete for packaging in a segment-specific fashion (Bancroft & Parslow, 2002). By using two-colour reporter genes flanked by UTRs from the same segment, it was estimated that 3–5% of virions were functionally diploid. This was proposed to be consistent with the packaging of 9–11 segments per virion (Bancroft & Parslow, 2002).

Thus, the conclusions from the first applications of molecular biology to influenza genetics conflicted with the interpretation of classical viral genetics about the mechanism of genome packaging. However, further evidence in favour of specific packaging was already available, from the characterization of defective-interfering (DI) RNAs. These are truncated forms of genome segments which retain their ability to replicate and be packaged and which, due to their smaller size, out-compete full-length segments. Viruses containing DI RNAs arise in influenza A during high-multiplicity passage (von Magnus, 1954), particularly in certain genetic backgrounds (Nakajima et al., 1979; Odagiri & Tobita, 1990; Ueda et al., 1980). Sequencing of DI RNAs showed that they were derived from genomic segments by internal deletion, and retained the terminal regions of the segment (Davis et al., 1980; Davis & Nayak, 1979; Duhaut & Dimmock, 1998, 2000; Duhaut & McCauley, 1996; Hughes et al., 2000; Jennings et al., 1983; Moss & Brownlee, 1981; Nakajima et al., 1979; Nayak & Sivasubramanian, 1983; Nayak et al., 1982; Noble & Dimmock, 1995). As it became possible to determine the segment from which a DI RNA was derived, it became apparent that in many cases, their presence correlated with reduced amounts of the parent segment in virus particles (Akkina et al., 1984; Nakajima et al., 1979; Odagiri & Tobita, 1990; Ueda et al., 1980). Furthermore, this interference was shown to act at the level of packaging (rather than solely at the point of synthesis in cells) and also to affect the incorporation of the homologous segment in mixed infections of DI-containing and non-defective wild-type virus stocks (Duhaut & Dimmock, 2002; Duhaut & McCauley, 1996; Odagiri & Tashiro, 1997; Odagiri et al., 1994). This segment-specific competition implied that packaging involved selection for distinctive features shared by the segment and its DI RNA. The terminal regions retained in DI RNAs included portions of the coding region as well as the UTRs (Davis et al., 1980; Duhaut & Dimmock, 1998, 2000; Duhaut & McCauley, 1996; Hughes et al., 2000; Jennings et al., 1983; Liu & Air, 1993; Nayak & Sivasubramanian, 1983; Nayak et al., 1982; Noble & Dimmock, 1995) (see also Fig. 4). Although this could be explained by constraints on the minimum length of a DI RNA or the mechanism by which they were generated, it is plausible that the coding regions were part of a specific packaging signal. Consistent with this, when reverse genetics was used to systematically vary the length of segment 1-derived DI RNAs, it was found that portions of the 5’ coding region increased DI stability during passage (Duhaut & Dimmock, 2000) and were necessary for
interference with a wild-type virus (Duhaut & Dimmock, 2002). Although not widely accepted at the time, these studies can be viewed as the first to demonstrate a cis-acting RNA packaging signal in influenza A virus.

A further study that used reverse genetics to follow up classical virology provided the evidence that has led to widespread acceptance of the specific-packaging model (Fujii et al., 2003). Work in the 1990s showed that NA-
Deficient influenza viruses could be selected for in tissue culture using exogenously supplied bacterial neuraminidase and antibodies against the viral NA (Liu & Air, 1993; Yang et al., 1997). These viruses all retained internally deleted versions of segment 6, structurally akin to DI RNAs, strongly suggesting a positive selection pressure to retain the terminal regions of the vRNA (Yang et al., 1997). At the time, it could not be determined whether this reflected a need for the truncated vRNAs and/or the short NA peptides they encoded. However, Fujii et al. (2003) utilized reverse genetics to examine this question and found that efficient virus particle formation required the presence of eight different vRNA segments, independent of the presence or absence of their encoded peptide(s). Furthermore, inclusion of the terminal coding regions of segment 6 in addition to the UTRs promoted packaging of a reporter gene far more efficiently than the UTRs alone (Fujii et al., 2003). Similar studies have now been reported for all eight segments (summarized in Fig. 4c), and in every case, the terminal coding regions, comprising sequences unique for each segment, have been found to promote more efficient packaging than the UTRs alone (Dos Santos Afonso et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2003; Fujii et al., 2005; Gog et al., 2007; Liang et al., 2005, 2008; Marsh et al., 2007; Muramoto et al., 2006; Ozawa et al., 2007, 2009; Watanabe et al., 2003). The observation that virus formation is inefficient in the absence of the terminal regions of all eight vRNAs has also been corroborated and extended by examining the effects of removing other segments (de Wit et al., 2006; Fujii et al., 2009; Gao et al., 2008; Gao & Palese, 2009; Marsh et al., 2007).

Taken as a whole, data gained from analysing reassortant viruses, DI RNAs, and most tellingly, the fact that reverse genetics can be used to map unique sequences in all eight segments which promote incorporation of the vRNA into virus particles, provides compelling evidence in favour of a segment-specific packaging mechanism and against a purely random-packaging model. Further supporting evidence comes from electron microscopy (EM) of virus particles. The random-packaging model requires incorporation of more than eight segments per virion to be compatible with measured values for particle : p.f.u. ratios. Most versions of this model have suggested fairly conservative levels of overpackaging: typically 10–12 segments, the minimum required to produce between 10 and 20% of particles with a complete genome (Fig. 3) (Bancroft & Parslow, 2002; Enami et al., 1991; Lamb & Choppin, 1983; Luo et al., 1992). Although this is minimally compatible with estimates for influenza A virus particle : p.f.u. ratios, these conservative models thereby attribute the high proportion of apparently non-infectious influenza virions solely to defective packaging of the genome. Non-segmented negative-sense viruses, such as Newcastle disease virus and mumps virus, have similar particle : infectivity ratios to influenza viruses (Isaacs & Donald, 1955; Kingsbury, 1970), so these proposals require every other stage of influenza virus assembly and infection to be disproportionately robust in comparison. To take just one example arguing against this, it has been estimated that in one particular system, around two-thirds of influenza virions were intrinsically defective for membrane fusion (Lakadamyali et al., 2003). Variability in the cell population is also likely to contribute to lowering the apparent infectivity of a virus preparation (Snijder et al., 2009). In theory, the virus could package even higher numbers of segments, thereby increasing the chance of obtaining a full genome and allowing a greater proportion of non-infectious particles to be attributed to other defects.

However, the mathematics of random incorporation of eight segments dictate that to obtain around 50% viable genomes, 20 segments must be packaged, and that as many as 38 are required to produce a 95% success rate (Fig. 3). Not only are such levels of overpackaging incompatible with observed viral genetics, as discussed above, but also routine polyploidy to even a limited degree is inconsistent with EM imaging of virus particles. Early studies that examined negatively stained virus sections revealed electron-dense interior structures, sometimes with apparent organization suggesting bundles of aligned RNPs (Apostolov & Flewett, 1969; Bachi et al., 1969; Birch-Andersen & Paucker, 1959; Comps & Dimmock, 1969; Morgan et al., 1956) that in cross section could be seen to be organized into a ‘7 + 1’ array of seven particles surrounding a central member (Oxford & Hockley, 1987). A recent analysis confirmed that the interior density of virions did indeed represent RNPs and moreover, showed that many particles from a variety of influenza virus strains contained eight RNPs organized into this characteristic 7 + 1 array (Noda et al., 2006). An example of this virion morphology is shown in Fig. 2(c) and a representation is shown in Fig. 5. Application of more specialized EM imaging techniques to influenza viruses has provided data that are, at least in part, consistent with this arrangement; although not all particles were seen to contain organized bundles of RNPs, no evidence for routine incorporation of more than eight RNPs has been presented (Harris et al., 2006; Yamaguchi et al., 2008).

Thus, overall, a large body of data contradict the purely random-packaging model, leaving the specific model as the option that better fits observation. The favoured current model is therefore that the predominant route of viral assembly involves the packaging of eight RNPs including one copy of each of the segments.

**Defining segment-specific packaging signals**

Both the random and segment-specific packaging models require that segments possess packaging signals. In the case of the random model, all that is required is a means of distinguishing viral genomic RNA from non-genomic and cellular RNA, whereas the specific model requires this plus a means of distinguishing individual vRNA segments. For influenza A virus, it appears that the two processes are achieved through adjacent but largely separate cis-acting
RNA elements present in all vRNAs. Genomic RNA is distinguished from non-genomic by the presence of the conserved terminal promoter sequences located at the 5’ and 3’ end of all segments (Fig. 1, depicted in green). These sequences are partially base-paired in RNPs to form a panhandle or corkscrew structure (Fig. 1c, d) although the 5’-arm contains the primary sequence-specific motif recognized by the viral RNA polymerase (Neumann et al., 2004). Without a functionally intact terminal panhandle structure, an RNA will not be packaged into an RNP and thus will not be a substrate for packaging into virions, irrespective of the presence or absence of a specific packaging signal (Luytjes et al., 1989; Neumann & Hobom, 1995). The partial complementarity of the 5’- and 3’-termini means that a similar but not identical panhandle structure is present in the plus-sense cRNA replicative intermediates from which progeny vRNAs are transcribed (Neumann et al., 2004). In the context of a synthetic vRNA lacking an influenza gene and therefore a specific packaging signal, the unpaired A10 residue in the 5’-arm of vRNA is apparently crucial for differentiating vRNA from cRNA, operating to prevent packaging of the latter by not supporting its nuclear export (Tchatalbachev et al., 2001).

As discussed above, segment-specific packaging signals are found in unique regions adjacent to the panhandle of each segment, including the UTRs and coding regions. Sequences contributing to these specific packaging signals have been identified by various means: (i) the structure of DI RNAs, (ii) the flanking sequences required to efficiently package reporter genes, (iii) sequence conservation and (iv) the effect of point mutations on packaging.

Naturally occurring DI RNAs are predominantly derived from the three largest segments (Davis et al., 1980; Davis & Nayak, 1979; Duhaut & Dimmock, 1998; Jennings et al., 1983). Examples from every segment have been identified, but as yet, no sequence data have been reported for a segment 7 DI RNA (Davis et al., 1980; Davis & Nayak, 1979; Duhaut & Dimmock, 1998, 2000; Duhaut & McCauley, 1996; Hughes et al., 2000; Jennings et al., 1983; Liu & Air, 1993; Nayak & Sivasubramanian, 1983; Nayak et al., 1982; Noble & Dimmock, 1995). The majority of DI RNAs studied have a single major internal deletion (Jennings et al., 1983; Nayak et al., 1982; Winter et al., 1981) and retain the terminal UTRs of their parent segment along with a variable amount of coding sequence (Davis et al., 1980; Davis & Nayak, 1979; Moss & Brownlee, 1981; Nakajima et al., 1979). The mechanism of DI RNA generation is not known, but it is likely that the size and location of deletions is determined by several factors, including the juxtaposition of non-contiguous sequences brought about by the coiled path of the vRNA in the RNP (Jennings et al., 1983). In addition, for a DI RNA to be selected for and reach detectable levels it must out-compete other segments (most importantly its parent segment) during replication and at the point of genome packaging. It can therefore be assumed that a DI RNA will contain signals sufficient for both processes, while being sufficiently smaller than the parent segment to have a significant replicative advantage. In general, this seems to equate to retaining between 100 and 300 nt of sequence from each end of the segment, but wide variation is evident (Duhaut & Dimmock, 1998, 2000; Jennings et al., 1983; Nayak & Sivasubramanian, 1983; Nayak et al., 1982; Noble & Dimmock, 1995). Noting the regions incorporated in DI RNAs thus provides a first approximation of the regions required for segment packaging (Fig. 4b).

Further evidence for the location of specific packaging signals comes from applying reverse genetics to the DI principle. Artificial segments, usually carrying an easily assayable reporter gene replacing the majority of the influenza ORF, can readily be expressed in cells and potentially packaged into a superinfecting influenza A virus (Luytjes et al., 1989; Neumann et al., 1994). Infection of a second set of cells then allows a quantitative measure of the
efficiency with which the segment is acquired by virions. By varying the amount of flanking sequence, regions of segments promoting efficient packaging have been mapped (Dos Santos Afonso et al., 2005; Duhaut & Dimmock, 2000; Enami et al., 1991; Fujii et al., 2003; Fujii et al., 2005; Liang et al., 2005; Luytjes et al., 1989; Marsh et al., 2007; Muramoto et al., 2006; Ozawa et al., 2007, 2009; Watanabe et al., 2003). There are certain caveats for this approach. Depending on the experimental setup, detection of reporter gene expression in the second set of cells may depend on the ability of the infecting virus to replicate its genome. This presupposes the presence of the four segments encoding the viral polymerase and NP (Bancroft & Parslow, 2002) and, as discussed below, disruption of the packaging of one segment can affect the incorporation of others. It is also important to control for adventitious effects of the mutations on synthesis and/or stability of the mutant vRNA molecule or its mRNA. Although the core promoter sequences for vRNA synthesis and encapsidation reside in the conserved terminal regions of the segments (Neumann et al., 2004), instances have been noted where alteration of more distal sequences within the unique regions of a segment have affected its accumulation and/or transcription (Bergmann & Muster, 1996; Hutchinson et al., 2008; Zheng et al., 1996). Also, depending on the experimental design, the reporter construct may or may not be competing for packaging with the genomic segment from which it was derived, while requirements for packaging may differ for single-cycle and multi-cycle growth. Factors such as these (as well as the use of different virus strains) may explain differences in outcomes when different laboratories have attempted to map signals on the same segment (e.g. Liang et al., 2005; Marsh et al., 2007; Muramoto et al., 2006; Watanabe et al., 2003). It is also not known to what extent the length of a packagable vRNA is limited by the maximum total size of the segment, or by the stoichiometry of nucleotides to NP monomers in the RNP, though neither has been shown yet to have an obvious effect on packaging (Dos Santos Afonso et al., 2005; Marsh et al., 2007).

Caveats notwithstanding, this approach has been used successfully to map packaging elements in all eight segments (Dos Santos Afonso et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2003; Fujii et al., 2005; Liang et al., 2005; Marsh et al., 2007; Muramoto et al., 2006; Ozawa et al., 2007, 2009; Watanabe et al., 2003). In all cases, segments were found to have a bipartite specific packaging signal that involved extended sequences at both ends of the vRNA (Fig. 4c), in broad agreement with the inferences drawn from the study of DI RNA structure. For most segments, the regions defined as containing the minimal specific packaging signals by deliberate deletion mutagenesis tend to be slightly smaller than those contained in the smallest reported DI RNA (Fig. 4b, c). To some extent, this apparent difference may be more artificial than real. In most cases, incremental deletion of flanking sequences reduced the packaging efficiency of the reporter vRNA gradually rather than revealing a sharp cut-off point between functional and non-functional. Thus, as well as making the definition of a minimal ‘efficient’ packaging signal somewhat arbitrary, this also suggests that complete packaging signals are composed of numerous contributing parts rather than a single discrete sequence element. Although both ends of the segment contribute to the packaging signal in all segments, the 5’ end was shown to be more important for segments 1–3 (Liang et al., 2005; Muramoto et al., 2006), whereas the 3’ end contributed more for segments 6 and 8 (Fujii et al., 2003; Fujii et al., 2005).

Examination of sequence conservation has been further used to define the location of specific packaging signals. As cis-acting RNA sequences, they will be subject to functional selection and should therefore be conserved. Since packaging signals overlap with coding regions, it is difficult to tease out whether conservation of a particular nucleotide sequence arose from selection for protein and/or for RNA function. The large numbers of influenza sequences available makes it possible to address this by considering the levels of synonymous variation within the coding regions (Gog et al., 2007; Liang et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2008). These analyses identified codons with very low levels of synonymous variation at positions where variation should have been possible, consistent with functional conservation of the primary RNA sequence beyond that required for its coding capacity. A large-scale analysis that considered all eight segments of the genome (Gog et al., 2007) found that these conserved codons tended to cluster in the terminal regions of each segment, in the same areas implicated by experimental or DI RNA structure as containing packaging signals (Fig. 4d, pink shading). Although the conserved codons formed clusters, these were not necessarily totally contiguous and the degree of conservation tended to decrease with increasing distance from the termini (Gog et al., 2007), consistent with the ‘fuzzy’ boundaries of packaging elements defined by deletion mapping. Other statistically significant clusters of low variability codons in regions outside of the terminal packaging signals were also identified, some attributable to features such as overlapping ORFs or splice sites, others in areas with no known constraint (Fig. 4d; Gog et al., 2007).

Further information on the identity of the packaging signals comes from point mutagenesis of regions thought to be part of the signal. A major advantage of this approach is that it can be applied to otherwise wild-type virus (Fujii et al., 2005; Hutchinson et al., 2008, 2009; Liang et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2007, 2008; Ozawa et al., 2009) as well as to constructs containing reporter genes (Fujii et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2009; Gog et al., 2007; Liang et al., 2008). For all segments, point mutagenesis has identified nucleotides, individually or in small clusters, whose alteration causes significant reductions in packaging of the altered segment as well as (where examined) reductions in the titre of replicated virus (Fujii et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2009; Gog et al., 2007; Hutchinson et al., 2008, 2009; Liang et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2007, 2008) (Fig. 4e). The finding that
alteration of a small number of nucleotides (even as few as one) can have a profound effect on segment incorporation is perhaps surprising, given the apparently large size of the signals. However, in many cases, other mutations within areas predicted to be part of the packaging signal had no apparent effect on its function (Fujiij et al., 2005; Gog et al., 2007; Hutchinson et al., 2008, 2009; Liang et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2007, 2008). This may, in part, reflect the discontinuous nature of the signals, as suggested by analysis of sequence conservation (Gog et al., 2007). However, in some instances, mutation of conserved nucleotides had no phenotypic effect and indeed, studies have found that a variety of randomly selected sequences within the 3'-end of the segment 8 or the 5'-end of the segment 7 packaging signals supported substantial levels of looping of the RNA (Jennings et al., 2007). The physical sizes of the components, implies a degree of protein in the RNP (Portela & Digard, 2002), which, given the vRNAs are still partially accessible to RNases and other modifying agents. A variety of approaches though the vRNAs are still partially accessible to RNases and other modifying agents. A variety of approaches, but through the vRNAs are still partially accessible to RNases, suggests that the rod-like structure of the RNP is in fact helical, often opening out (when examined in physiological salt conditions) into a terminal loop (Fig. 1b). Cartoon models of this often place the viral polymerase at the opposite end of the RNP (Fig. 1c). However, this organization is uncertain as negative stain techniques have not permitted unambiguous visualization of the viral polymerase on authentic RNPs. Although an immuno-gold labelling study showed that the polymerase was located at one end of the RNP, terminal loops in the backbone of the RNP were not seen in this case (Murty et al., 1988). Indeed, one study presenting a detailed form of the RNP model considered it more likely that the polymerase was located at the open end (Fig. 1d), based on a possible mechanism for the generation of DI RNAs (Jennings et al., 1983). In light of the extended and perhaps flexible nature of the packaging signals, this latter organization is plausible. Thus, although the position of the packaging signals in the primary nucleotide sequence is increasingly clearly delineated, their position in the 3D structure of the RNP remains ambiguous. Ongoing work characterizing the structure of intact RNPs (e.g. Coloma et al., 2009) may well rectify this gap in the future.

Mechanisms of segment selection

Although there is now compelling evidence for segment-specific packaging in influenza A virus, the mechanism of this process remains unclear. The best characterized mechanism of specific packaging in a segmented virus is that of the bacteriophage φ6. Here, three segments of plus-strand RNA (later converted into dsRNA) are sequentially recruited into a preformed capsid through a series of conformational changes driven by interactions with the segment packaging signals that expose and then mask sequence/structure-specific RNA binding sites while simultaneously expanding the capsid to allow incorporation of more RNA (Huiskonen et al., 2006; Mindich, 2004). This model seems unlikely to be applicable to influenza virus for several reasons. During influenza infections, preformed capsids are not seen in the cytoplasm, with the virus instead assembling at the point of budding through the plasma membrane (Cheung & Poon, 2007). In addition, the pleiomorphy of influenza virus particles seems intrinsically ill-suited to a mechanism founded on ordered conformational changes of the capsid that regulate specific RNA-binding sites in the virion interior. Indeed, it has even been proposed that the viral glycoproteins alone can drive particle assembly and that not all influenza virions even contain a matrix protein layer (Chen et al., 2007; Harris et al., 2006). Instead, as EM analyses suggest that budding influenza A virions incorporate a parallel 7+1 array of eight RNPs (Harris et al., 2006; Noda et al., 2006; Oxford & Hockley, 1987; Yamaguchi et al., 2008), it has been plausibly hypothesized that this represents a specific multi-segmental ‘genome complex’ containing one copy of
each of the eight vRNAs whose assembly confers specificity on packaging (Heggeness et al., 1982; Noda et al., 2006).

The way in which this putative viral genome complex assembles remains a matter of speculation (as does the existence of the complex itself) but it presumably would involve recognition of the various specific packaging signals present on the eight vRNAs. Theoretically, this might involve the action of sequence-specific RNA-binding proteins (Fig. 5b), of either viral or cellular origin. However, the formation of a specific complex of eight RNPs requires a minimum of seven inter-RNP interactions (Fig. 5c, d) and no evidence has been found so far for even a single protein able to recognize an influenza virus specific packaging signal, let alone the 14 or more separate RNA elements required to bring together eight RNPs. This is not to say that such a mechanism is impossible; although not strictly analogous, the structures of ribosomal subunits illustrate how megadalton ribonucleoprotein assemblies can be constructed through multiple individual proteins binding to non-contiguous RNA elements that are primarily recognized as structures rather than as nucleotide sequences (Brodersen et al., 2002; Klein et al., 2004). Some cellular proteins have been shown to be incorporated into released influenza virus particles (Shaw et al., 2008); further low abundance components (perhaps only present at one copy per virion) could still remain to be discovered. A more parsimonious (but not necessarily exclusive) hypothesis is that the RNA signals themselves function as the recognition surfaces via direct RNA–RNA interactions (Fig. 5a) (Fuji et al., 2003; Kingsbury & Webster, 1969). This hypothesis has viral precedents in the formation and packaging of homodimers of the retroviral genome (Greatorex, 2004), as well as (in a heterodimeric context) during RNA synthesis in red clover necrotic mosaic virus (Sit et al., 1998). It is also generally consistent with the structural diversity of RNA, even when in the form of an RNP (Brodersen et al., 2002; Holbrook, 2005; Klein et al., 2004). However, attempts to identify plausible interacting motifs by *in silico* analysis of vRNA sequences have so far been unsuccessful, as might be expected given the complex way in which vRNA coils around NP to form the RNP, the discontinuous nature of the signals and that the hypothesized RNA–RNA interactions need not be limited to Watson–Crick base-pairs. Thus at present, our understanding of the mechanism by which specific genome packaging in influenza A virus is achieved is at the stage of testing plausible hypotheses. Nevertheless, some prior evidence, albeit equivocal, has a bearing on these proposals.

A key component of the currently favoured hypothesis is the formation of a specific genome complex of the eight RNPs. Although EM imaging indicates that some virions contain a 7 + 1 array of RNPs, this is not proof of a complex with a specific composition or even that the RNPs are actually associated; the apparent order could potentially result from the geometry of packing eight rods into a spherical particle and/or the mechanism of the budding process itself. Images showing the 7 + 1 array appear to be less common when released particles are examined, in comparison to sections across budding virions (Booy et al., 1985; Harris et al., 2006; Noda et al., 2006; Oxford & Hockley, 1987; Yamaguchi et al., 2008; Yazaki et al., 1984). This may well be because released particles are free to rotate, reducing the chance of seeing RNPs in cross section, whereas cell-associated virions maintain the directionality of budding. However, it could also indicate that the RNPs are not bound together in the particle and redistribute once freed from an initial constraint imposed by the budding process; a hypothesis supported by a tomographic study in which ordered arrays of RNPs were found more frequently in elongated virions than in larger spherical particles (Harris et al., 2006). As a counter-argument against general disorder in virion contents, magnetic birefringence analysis of released virions indicated that the interior components were probably ordered to some degree (Torbet, 1983). Similarly, EM studies have also provided striking images of long helical structures released from partially disrupted virions, proposed to be RNP (Almeida & Brand, 1975; Murti et al., 1980). These helical structures were often too long to represent individual RNPs and the authors speculated they might represent non-covalently linked complexes formed as part of the genomic packaging process. However, again in counter-argument, a subsequent study disputed this, proposing instead that the structure were helices of M1 (Ruigrok et al., 1989). Furthermore, sedimentation analysis of material released from purified virus particles has so far failed to provide evidence for the existence of a packaging complex, with RNPs instead migrating at the approximate positions expected for their individual molecular masses (Compans et al., 1972; Duesberg, 1969; Krug, 1971; Pons et al., 1969). It should be noted, however, that these early experiments were all performed in buffer conditions that would not necessarily maintain structured RNA–RNA interactions. Therefore, overall, microscopic and biochemical evidence for the existence of a specific influenza A genome complex is ambivalent; further work in this area is required.

A further key prediction of the current hypothesis for how specific packaging operates is that there is a specific suite of inter-segment interactions. Within a 7 + 1 array of rod-like structures all containing their packaging signals at one end, not every RNP is likely to interact with all others; instead, various specific linkage schemes can be envisaged. In a ‘daisy chain’ network, most segments would interact with two others while the end ones only interact with one (Fig. 5c). Alternatively, a ‘master’ segment (perhaps in the centre of the array) that interacts with many or all other segments can be envisaged (Fig. 5d). More complex ‘hybrid’ schemes with additional interactions between adjacent RNPs are also plausible, but in any case, the model predicts that deleterious mutations in the packaging signal of a given segment have the possibility of affecting the incorporation of adjacent, interacting segments. Initial evidence consistent with this hypothesis came from studying the incorporation of reporter vRNAs with
flanking sequences from the three largest segments. In a systematic examination of all eight segments, the presence of the coding regions from segment 1 (and in particular the 5’-end) was found to be especially important not only for packaging of the recombinant vRNA but also to the efficiency with which infectious virus-like particles (VLPs) were formed (Muramoto et al., 2006). Detection of the VLPs relied on their incorporating either segment 4 (HA) or 5 (NP) so this effect could have arisen from knock-on effects on the incorporation of other segments and/or the actual budding process itself. Subsequent work has confirmed that both mechanisms potentially play a part. Several studies have since examined the phenotype of packaging mutants in the context of viable virus (rather than via artificial reporter constructs) and directly examined the relative amounts of segments incorporated per virion. Consistent with the previous VLP study by Muramoto et al. (2006), mutations to segment 1 were found to reduce packaging of not only itself but also all other segments (Marsh et al., 2008). Similarly, mutations in the segment 7 packaging signals reduced incorporation of each of the eight segments by an approximately equal extent, such that the majority of virions contained an incomplete genome (Hutchinson et al., 2008). Lesions in segment 7 also reduced virus budding (Hutchinson et al., 2008), consistent with the prior data inferred from examining VLPs and viruses with less than eight segments (de Wit et al., 2006; Fujii et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2009; Gao et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2007; Ozawa et al., 2009). More specific secondary effects on segment incorporation after mutation of a single packaging signal have also been seen. Mutations to segment 4 that reduced its packaging also reduced incorporation of other segments; notably 2, but also (to lesser extents) 3, 5 and 6 (Marsh et al., 2007). Similarly, mutations in the segment 3 packaging signal affected incorporation of segments 1 and 5, in some instances to the point where they showed a greater packaging deficit than the mutated segment 3 (Marsh et al., 2008). Conversely, a packaging signal mutation in segment 5 reduced incorporation of segment 3 (Hutchinson et al., 2009).

Thus, taken as a whole, evidence for trans-acting effects of packaging mutations on other segments is consistent with an important prediction of the ‘genome complex’ hypothesis; that packaging of individual segments is not independent but instead is interlinked. It is tempting to try and deduce likely patterns of inter-segment interaction from the available data. For instance, comparison of experiments suggests a reciprocal packaging interaction between segments 3 and 5 (Hutchinson et al., 2009; Marsh et al., 2008). However, other data suggest complexities arguing against such straightforward interpretations. For instance, a single nucleotide mutation to codon 745 of PB2 in the 5’-end of segment 1 vRNA reduced the relative packaging of the segment by nearly tenfold and also decreased incorporation of segments 2 and 5 by over fivefold. However, mutation of the adjacent codon 744 only significantly affected packaging of segment 1 itself (Marsh et al., 2008), suggesting complex position-dependent effects of packaging signal mutations that may confound simple interpretation. Thus, while further experimentation of this sort may elucidate a proposed web of inter-segment interactions, other approaches are needed. At present, it is probably safe to conclude that the data do not support the hypothesis of a simple ‘daisy chain’ to assemble the genome complex (Fig. 5c), but instead suggest more complex interaction patterns. Segments 1 and 7 seem to be potential candidates for ‘master segments’ (Fig. 5d), based on the pleiotropic effects mutation of their packaging signals have on virus budding and incorporation of other vRNAs (Hutchinson et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2008; Muramoto et al., 2006; Ozawa et al., 2009).

Packaging signals and influenza virus evolution

Genome segmentation clearly plays a major role in influenza virus evolution, both within a single host species and in facilitating jumps in host range (Dugan et al., 2008; Garten et al., 2009; Hatchette et al., 2004; Kuiken et al., 2006; Nelson & Holmes, 2007; Smith et al., 2009). As discussed above, although the strategy of a divided genomic structure confers fitness benefits, it comes at the direct cost of increasing the complexity of virus assembly. It is clear that the virus has evolved a solution to this problem, although the exact mechanism by which specificity in packaging is achieved is still uncertain. Does the nature of the solution impose constraints on virus evolution? In one sense the answer is an unequivocal ‘yes’; the footprints of conservation left by the specific packaging signals on the viral terminal coding regions are clear to see (Gog et al., 2007; Liang et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2008). This may be exploitable for intervention strategies. For instance, it has been suggested that packaging signals are good targets for oligonucleotide-based inhibition (Giannecchini et al., 2009). In a similar vein, the M2 ectodomain has been proposed as a candidate immunogen for a ‘universal’ influenza vaccine, for which antigenic escape mutants will be less likely to develop because the M2e coding region is either congruent with or overlaps that of M1 (Saelens, 2008). We speculate that the fact that the first nine codons of the M2e coding region also overlap the segment 7 packaging signal (Gog et al., 2007; Hutchinson et al., 2008; Ozawa et al., 2009) will further constrain the development of escape mutants. Better understanding of influenza virus genome packaging has also facilitated attempts to use the virus as a gene delivery vector (Gao et al., 2008; Shinya et al., 2004) as well as providing an ingenious approach to improving engineered virus biosafety through reducing the probability of successful reassortment with ‘wild’ viruses (Gao & Palese, 2009).

We also hypothesize that the evolutionary solution the virus has found to the packaging problem has broader implications for its biology. The fact that the same stretches
of RNA perform multiple functions in addition to acting as packaging signals [coding for proteins, as well as cis-acting functions such as promoter or splice signals (Gog et al., 2007; Hutchinson et al., 2008)] creates potentially conflicting requirements that reduce the chances of finding an optimal solution to the problems of genome packaging. Although the evidence for a specific packaging method is overwhelming, the mechanism is clearly not perfect. The existence of nine segment viruses (Enami et al., 1991; Laver & Downie, 1976; Nakajima & Sugiuira, 1977; Scholtissek et al., 1978) and the low levels of ‘background’ packaging of reporter vRNAs lacking specific packaging signals seen by several laboratories and for all segments (Bancroft & Parslow, 2002; Dos Santos Afonso et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2003; Luytjes et al., 1989; Muramoto et al., 2006; Neumann et al., 1994; Tchatalbachev et al., 2001) suggest that there is a measurable degree of imprecision in the mechanism. We are also presented with the apparent paradox, that in the laboratory, small mutations (even a single nucleotide) can significantly disrupt packaging of a particular segment to the point where the virus replicates noticeably more poorly (e.g. Gog et al., 2007; Hutchinson et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2008) and yet in other circumstances, selection of efficient packaging signals from a pool of randomized sequences reveals no clear consensus sequence (Fujii et al., 2009; Ozawa et al., 2009). Similarly, reassortment in nature seems readily capable of bringing together segments from diverged genetic backgrounds that could, on occasion, include changes to packaging signals (Dugan et al., 2008; Ghedin et al., 2009; Hatchette et al., 2004). This discrepancy lacks a molecular explanation at present, but it provides further evidence that the virus tolerates a degree of imprecision in its packaging mechanism.

Why then, has packaging in influenza A virus not evolved a higher degree of precision? As already discussed, the overlap of packaging signals with open reading frames and cis-acting RNA functions may hinder the evolution of a ‘perfect’ genome packaging solution of the sort achieved by the bacteriophage Φ6 (Mindich, 2004), as indeed may constraints from other aspects of virus biology such as virion morphology or the mechanism of budding. However (to end on a speculative note), we wonder if an imperfect packaging strategy is actually beneficial to virus fitness, by providing flexibility for reassortment. Studies of natural isolates suggest that widespread and continuous reassortment events drive influenza virus evolution (Dugan et al., 2008; Ghedin et al., 2009; Hatchette et al., 2004), and in this respect the ability to package evolutionarily diverged segments would carry benefits. As well as increasing the selective advantage that the rudimentary sexual process of reassortment provides to the virus, this can perhaps be viewed in terms of selection acting on individual segments. Participation of a ‘selfish segment’ in a selective packaging mechanism would be balanced between the need to be correctly packaged in the context of its current genome and retaining sufficient flexibility to be able to occasionally ‘jump ship’ through facile reassortment with an evolutionarily diverged genome. At the level of both the virus and its segments, a mechanism of selective genome packaging that is neither entirely random nor unfailingly rigorous may have proven to be the most successful evolutionary strategy for influenza A virus.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr Helen Wise for comment and discussion. Research in the authors’ laboratories is supported by the MRC, Wellcome Trust and BBSRC. E.C.H. was supported by a studentship from the Wellcome Trust. J.C.V.K. is supported by a studentship from the MRC. J.R.G. is a Royal Society University Research Fellow.

References

Akkina, R. K., Chambers, T. M. & Nayak, D. P. (1984). Mechanism of interference by defective-interfering particles of influenza virus: differential reduction of intracellular synthesis of specific polymerase proteins. Virus Res 1, 687–702.

Almeida, J. D. & Brand, C. M. (1975). A morphological study of the internal component of influenza virus. J Gen Virol 27, 313–318.

Apostolov, K. & Fiewett, T. H. (1969). Further observations on the structure of influenza viruses A and C. J Gen Virol 4, 365–370.

Bachi, T., Gerhard, W., Lindenmann, J. & Muhlethaler, K. (1969). Morphogenesis of influenza A virus in Ehrlich ascites tumor cells as revealed by thin-sectioning and freeze-etching. J Virol 4, 769–776.

Ball, L. A. (2007). Virus replication strategies. In Fields Virology, 5th edn, pp. 119–140. Edited by D. M. Knipe & P. M. Howley. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Bancroft, C. T. & Parslow, T. G. (2002). Evidence for segment-specific packaging of the influenza A virus genome. J Virol 76, 7133–7139.

Barry, R. D. (1961). The multiplication of influenza virus. II. Multiplicity reactivation of ultraviolet irradiated virus. Virology 14, 398–405.

Belshaw, R., Gardner, A., Rambaut, A. & Pybus, O. G. (2008). Pacing a small cage: mutation and RNA viruses. Trends Ecol Evol 23, 188–193.

Bergmann, M. & Muster, T. (1995). The relative amount of an influenza A virus segment present in the viral particle is not affected by a reduction in replication of that segment. J Gen Virol 76, 3211–3215.

Bergmann, M. & Muster, T. (1996). Mutations in the nonconserved noncoding sequences of the influenza A virus segments affect viral vRNA formation. Virus Res 44, 23–31.

Birch-Andersen, A. & Paucker, K. (1959). Studies on the structure of influenza virus. II. Ultrathin sections of infectious and noninfectious particles. Virology 8, 21–40.

Booy, F. P., Ruigrok, R. W. & van Bruggen, E. F. (1985). Electron microscopy of influenza virus. A comparison of negatively stained and ice-embedded particles. J Mol Biol 184, 667–676.

Boulo, S., Akarsu, H., Ruigrok, R. W. & Baudin, F. (2007). Nuclear traffic of influenza virus proteins and ribonucleoprotein complexes. Virus Res 124, 12–21.

Brodersen, D. E., Clemons, W. M., Jr, Carter, A. P., Wimberly, B. T. & Ramakrishnan, V. (2002). Crystal structure of the 30 S ribosomal subunit from Thermus thermophilus: structure of the proteins and their interactions with 16 S RNA. J Mol Biol 316, 725–768.
Chao, L., Tran, T. T. & Tran, T. T. (1997). The advantage of sex in the RNA virus Φ6. *Genetics* 147, 953–959.

Chen, W., Calvo, P. A., Malide, D., Gibbs, J., Schubert, U., Bacik, I., Basta, S., O’Neill, R., Schickli, J. & other authors (2001). A novel influenza A virus mitochondrial protein that induces cell death. *Nat Med* 7, 1306–1312.

Chen, B. J., Leser, G. P., Morita, E. & Lamb, R. A. (2007). Influenza virus hemagglutinin and neuraminidase, but not the matrix protein, are required for assembly and budding of plasmid-derived virus-like particles. *J Virol* 81, 7111–7123.

Cheung, T. K. & Poon, L. L. (2007). Biology of influenza a virus. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1102, 1–25.

Coloma, R., Valpuesta, J. M., Arranz, R., Carrascosa, J. L., Ortín, J. & Martín-Benito, J. (2009). The structure of a biologically active influenza virus ribonucleoprotein complex. *PLoS Pathog* 5, e1000491.

Comprans, R. W. & Dimmelock, N. J. (1969). An electron microscopic study of single-cycle infection of chick embryo fibroblasts by influenza virus. *Virology* 39, 499–515.

Comprans, R. W., Dimmelock, N. J. & Meier-Ewart, H. (1970). In *The Biology of Large RNA Viruses*, pp. 87–108. Edited by R. D. Barry & B. W. J. Mahy. New York: Academic Press.

Comprans, R. W., Content, J. & Duesberg, P. H. (1972). Structure of the ribonucleoprotein of influenza virus. *J Virol* 10, 795–800.

Davis, A. R. & Nayak, D. P. (1979). Sequence relationships among defective interfering virus RNA segments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 76, 3092–3096.

Davis, A. R., Hiti, A. L. & Nayak, D. P. (1980). Influenza defective interfering viral RNA is formed by internal deletion of genomic RNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 77, 215–219.

de Vil, E., Spronken, M. I., Rimmelzwaan, G. F., Osterhaus, A. D. & Fouchier, R. A. (2006). Evidence for specific packaging of the influenza A virus genome from conditionally defective virus particles lacking a polymerase gene. *Vaccine* 24, 6647–6650.

Donald, H. B. & Isaacs, A. (1954). Counts of influenza virus particles. *J Gen Microbiol* 10, 457–464.

Dos Santos Afonso, E., Esciriou, N., Leclercq, I., van der Werf, S. & Naffakh, N. (2005). The generation of recombinant influenza A viruses expressing a PB2 fusion protein requires the conservation of a packaging signal overlapping the coding and noncoding regions at the 5′ end of the PB2 segment. *Virology* 341, 34–46.

Duesberg, P. H. (1968). The RNA of influenza virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 59, 930–937.

Duesberg, P. H. (1969). Distinct subunits of the ribonucleoprotein of influenza virus. *J Mol Biol* 42, 485–499.

Dugan, V. G., Chen, R., Spiro, D. J., Sengamalay, N., Zaborsky, J., Ghedin, E., Nolting, J., Swayne, D. E., Runstadler, J. A. & other authors (2008). The evolutionary genetics and emergence of avian influenza viruses in wild birds. *PLoS Pathog* 4, e1000076.

Duhaut, S. D. & Dimmelock, N. J. (1998). Heterologous protection of mice from a lethal human H1N1 influenza A virus infection by H3N8 equine defective interfering virus: comparison of defective RNA sequences isolated from the DI inoculum and mouse lung. *Virology* 248, 241–253.

Duhaut, S. D. & Dimmelock, N. J. (2000). Approximately 150 nucleotides from the 5′ end of an influenza A segment 1 defective virion RNA are needed for genome stability during passage of defective virus in infected cells. *Virology* 275, 278–285.

Duhaut, S. D. & Dimmelock, N. J. (2002). Defective segment 1 RNAs that interfere with production of infectious influenza A virus require at least 150 nucleotides of 5′ sequence: evidence from a plasmid-driven system. *J Gen Virol* 83, 403–411.

Duhaut, S. D. & McCauley, J. W. (1996). Defective RNAs inhibit the assembly of influenza virus genome segments in a segment-specific manner. *Virology* 216, 326–337.

Enami, M., Sharma, G., Benham, C. & Palese, P. (1991). An influenza virus containing nine different RNA segments. *Virology* 185, 291–298.

Fujii, Y., Goto, H., Watanabe, T., Yoshida, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2003). Selective incorporation of influenza virus RNA segments into virions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100, 2002–2007.

Fujii, K., Fujii, Y., Noda, T., Muramoto, Y., Watanabe, T., Takada, A., Goto, H., Horimoto, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2005). Importance of both the coding and the segment-specific noncoding regions of the influenza A virus NS segment for its efficient incorporation into virions. *J Virol* 79, 3766–3774.

Fujii, K., Ozawa, M., Iwatsuki-Horimoto, K., Horimoto, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2009). The incorporation of influenza A virus genome segments does not absolutely require wild-type sequences. *J Gen Virol* 90, 1734–1740.

Gao, Q. & Palese, P. (2009). Rewiring the RNAs of influenza virus to prevent reassortment. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106, 15891–15896.

Gao, Q., Brydon, E. W. & Palese, P. (2008). A seven-segmented influenza A virus expressing the influenza C virus glycoprotein HEF. *J Virol* 82, 6419–6426.

Garten, R. J., Davis, C. T., Russell, C. A., Shu, B., Lindstrom, S., Balish, A., Sessions, W. M., Xu, X., Skepner, E. & other authors (2009). Antigenic and genetic characteristics of swine-origin 2009 A(H1N1) influenza viruses circulating in humans. *Science* 325, 197–201.

Ghedin, E., Fitch, A., Boyne, A., Griesemer, S., DePasse, J., Bera, J., Zhang, X., Halpin, R. A., Smit, M. & other authors (2009). Mixed infection and the genesis of influenza virus diversity. *J Virol* 83, 8832–8841.

Giannechini, S., Clausi, V., Nosi, D. & Azzi, A. (2009). Oligonucleotides derived from the packaging signal at the 5′ end of the viral PB2 segment specifically inhibit influenza virus infection. *Arch Virol* 154, 821–832.

Gog, J. R., Rimmelzwaan, G. F., Osterhaus, A. D. & Grenfell, B. T. (2003). Population dynamics of rapid fixation in cytotoxic T lymphocyte escape mutants of influenza A. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100, 11143–11147.

Gog, J. R., Alonso Edos, S., Dalton, R. M., Leclercq, I., Tiley, L., Elton, D., von Kirchbach, J. C., Naffakh, N., Esciriou, N. & Digard, P. (2007). Codon conservation in the influenza A virus genome defines RNA packaging signals. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35, 1897–1907.

Greatorex, J. (2004). The retroviral RNA dimer linkage: different structures may reflect different roles. *Retrovirology* 1, 22.

Harris, A., Cardone, G., Winkler, D. C., Heymann, J. B., Brecher, M., White, J. M. & Steven, A. C. (2006). Influenza virus pleiomorphy characterized by cryoelectron tomography. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103, 19123–19127.

Hatada, E., Hasegawa, M., Mukaigawa, J., Shimizu, K. & Fukuda, R. (1989). Control of influenza virus gene expression: quantitative analysis of each viral RNA species in infected cells. *J Biochem* 105, 537–546.

Hatchette, T. F., Walker, D., Johnson, C., Baker, A., Pryor, S. P. & Webster, R. G. (2004). Influenza A viruses in feral Canadian ducks: extensive reassortment in nature. *J Gen Virol* 85, 2327–2337.

Heggeness, M. H., Smith, P. R., Ulmanen, I., Krug, R. M. & Choppin, P. W. (1982). Studies on the helical nucleocapsid of influenza virus. *Virology* 118, 466–470.

Hirst, G. K. (1962). Genetic recombination with Newcastle disease virus, polioviruses, and influenza. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 27, 303–309.
Hirst, G. K. (1973). Mechanism of influenza recombination. I. Factors influencing recombination rates between temperature-sensitive mutants of strain WSN and the classification of mutants into complementation–recombination groups. *Virology* 55, 81–93.

Hirst, G. K. & Pons, M. W. (1973). Mechanism of influenza recombination. II. Virus aggregation and its effect on plaque formation by so-called noninfective virus. *Virology* 56, 620–631.

Holbrook, S. R. (2005). RNA structure: the long and the short of it. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 15, 302–308.

Hughes, M. T., Matrosovich, M., Rodgers, M. E., McGregor, M. & Kawaoka, Y. (2000). Influenza A viruses lacking sialidase activity can undergo multiple cycles of replication in cell culture, eggs, or mice. *J Virol* 74, 5206–5212.

Huiskonen, J. T., de Haas, F., Bubeck, D., Bamford, D. H., Fuller, S. D. & Butcher, S. J. (2006). Visualizing infection of individual influenza viruses. *Virology* 340, 394–397.

Isaacs, A. & Donald, H. B. (1955). Particle counts of haemagglutinating viruses. *J Gen Microbiol* 12, 241–247.

Jennings, P. A., Finch, J. T., Winter, G. & Robertson, J. S. (1983). Does the higher order structure of the influenza virus ribonucleoprotein guide sequence rearrangements in influenza viral RNA? *Cell* 34, 619–627.

Kingsbury, D. W. (1970). Replication and functions of myxovirus ribonucleic acids. *Prog Med Virol* 12, 49–77.

Kingsbury, D. W. & Webster, R. G. (1969). Some properties of influenza virus nucleocapsids. *J Virol* 4, 219–225.

Klein, D. J., Moore, P. B. & Steitz, T. A. (2004). The roles of ribosomal proteins in the structure assembly, and evolution of the large ribosomal subunit. *J Mol Biol* 340, 141–177.

Krug, R. M. (1971). Influenza viral RNPs newly synthesized during the latent period of viral growth in MDCK cells. *Virology* 44, 125–136.

Kuiken, T., Holmes, E. C., McCauley, J., Rimmelzwaan, G. F., Williams, C. S. & Grenfell, B. T. (2006). Host species barriers to influenza virus genome consists of eight distinct RNA species. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 73, 3045–3049.

Lindich, L. (2004). Packaging, replication and recombination of the segmented genome of bacteriophage φ6 and its relatives. *Virus Res* 101, 83–92.

Morgan, C., Rose, H. M. & Moore, D. H. (1956). Structure and development of viruses observed in the electron microscope. III. Influenza virus. *J Exp Med* 104, 171–182.

Moss, B. A. & Brownlee, G. G. (1981). Sequence of DNA complementary to a small RNA segment of influenza virus A/NT/60/68. *Nucleic Acids Res* 9, 1941–1947.

Moya, A., Holmes, E. C. & Gonzalez-Candelas, F. (2004). The population genetics and evolutionary epidemiology of RNA viruses. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2, 279–288.

Mueller, H. J. (1964). The relation of recombination to mutational advance. *Mutat Res* 106, 2–9.

Muramoto, Y., Takada, A., Fujii, K., Noda, T., Iwatsuki-Horimoto, K., Watanabe, S., Horimoto, T., Kida, H. & Kawaoka, Y. (2006). Hierarchy among viral RNA (vRNA) segments in their role in vRNA incorporation into influenza A virions. *J Virol* 80, 2318–2325.

Murti, K. G., Bean, W. J., Jr & Webster, R. G. (1980). Helical ribonucleoproteins of influenza virus: an electron microscopic analysis. *Virology* 104, 224–229.

Murti, K. G., Webster, R. G. & Jones, I. M. (1988). Localization of RNA polymerases on influenza viral ribonucleoproteins by immunogold labeling. *Virology* 164, 562–566.

Nakajima, K. & Sugiura, A. (1977). Three-factor cross of influenza virus. *Virology* 81, 486–489.

Nakajima, K., Ueda, M. & Sugiura, A. (1979). Origin of small RNA in von Magnus particles of influenza virus. *J Virol* 29, 1142–1148.

Nayak, D. P. & Sivasubramanian, N. (1983). The structure of influenza virus defective interfering (DI) RNAs and their progenitor genes. In *Genetics of Influenza Viruses*, pp. 255–279. Edited by P. Palese & D. W. Kingsbury. Wien: Springer.

Nayak, D. P., Sivasubramanian, N., Davis, A. R., Cortini, R. & Sung, J. (1982). Complete sequence analyses show that two defective interfering influenza viral RNAs contain a single internal deletion of a polymerase gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 79, 2216–2220.

Nelson, M. I. & Holmes, E. C. (2007). The evolution of epidemic influenza. *Nat Rev Genet* 8, 196–205.

Neumann, G. & Hobom, G. (1995). Mutational analysis of influenza virus promoter elements in vivo. *J Gen Virol* 76, 1709–1717.
Influenza A genome packaging

Neumann, G., Zobel, A. & Hobom, G. (1994). RNA polymerase I-mediated expression of influenza viral RNA molecules. Virology 202, 477–479.

Neumann, G., Brownlee, G. G., Fodor, E. & Kawaoka, Y. (2004). Orthomyxovirus replication, transcription, and polyadenylation. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol 283, 121–143.

Ng, A. K., Zhang, H., Tan, K., Li, Z., Liu, J. H., Chan, P. K., Li, S. M., Chan, W. Y., Au, S. W. & other authors (2008). Structure of the influenza virus A H5N1 nucleoprotein: implications for RNA binding, oligomerization, and vaccine design. PASEB J 22, 3638–3647.

Noble, S. & Dimmock, N. J. (1995). Characterization of putative defective interfering (DI) A/WSN RNAs isolated from the lungs of mice protected from an otherwise lethal respiratory infection with influenza virus A/WSN (H1N1): a subset of the inoculum DI RNAs. Virology 210, 9–19.

Nobusawa, E. & Sato, K. (2006). Comparison of the mutation rates of human influenza A and B viruses. J Virol 80, 3675–3678.

Noda, T., Sagara, H., Yen, A., Takada, A., Kida, H., Cheng, R. H. & Kawaoka, Y. (2006). Architecture of ribonucleoprotein complexes in influenza A virus particles. Nature 439, 490–492.

Odagiri, T. & Tashiro, M. (1997). Segment-specific noncoding sequences of the influenza virus genome RNA are involved in the specific competition between defective interfering RNA and its progenitor RNA segment at the virion assembly step. J Virol 71, 2138–2145.

Odagiri, T. & Tobita, K. (1990). Mutation in NS2, a nonstructural protein of influenza A virus, extragonically causes aberrant replication and expression of the PA gene and leads to generation of defective interfering particles. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 87, 5988–5992.

Odagiri, T., Tominaga, K., Tobita, K. & Ohta, S. (1994). An amino acid change in the non-structural NS2 protein of an influenza A virus mutant is responsible for the generation of defective interfering (DI) particles by amplifying DI RNAs and suppressing complementary RNA synthesis. J Gen Virol 75, 43–53.

Oxford, J. S. & Hockley, D. J. (1987). Orthomyxoviridae. In Perspectives in Medical Virology. Animal Virus Structure, pp. 213–232. Edited by M. V. Nermut & A. C. Steven. New York: Elsevier.

Ozawa, M., Fuji, K., Muramoto, Y., Yamada, S., Yamayoshi, S., Takada, A., Goto, H., Horimoto, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2007). Contributions of two nuclear localization signals of influenza A virus nucleoprotein to viral replication. J Virol 81, 30–41.

Ozawa, M., Maeda, J., Iwatsuki-Horimoto, K., Watanabe, S., Goto, H., Horimoto, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2009). Nucleotide sequence requirements at the 5′ end of the influenza A virus M RNA segment for efficient virus replication. J Virol 83, 3384–3388.

Pons, M. W. & Hirst, G. K. (1968). Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of influenza virus RNA. Virology 34, 385–388.

Pons, M. W., Schulze, I. T., Hirst, G. K. & Hauser, R. (1969). Isolation and characterization of the ribonucleoprotein of influenza virus. J Virol 39, 250–259.

Portela, A. & Digard, P. (2002). The influenza virus nucleoprotein: a multifunctional RNA-binding protein pivotal to virus replication. J Gen Virol 83, 723–734.

Pressing, J. & Reanney, D. C. (1984). Divided genomes and intrinsic noise. J Mol Evol 20, 135–146.

Rambaut, A., Pybus, O. G., Nelson, M. L., Viboud, C., Taubenberger, J. K. & Holmes, E. C. (2008). The genomic and epidemiological dynamics of human influenza A virus. Nature 453, 615–619.

Ruigrock, R. W., Calder, L. J. & Wharton, S. A. (1989). Electron microscopy of the influenza virus submembranal structure. Virology 173, 311–316.

Saelens, X. (2008). The influenza matrix protein 2 as a vaccine target. Future Virology 3, 167–178.

Schmitt, A. P. & Lamb, R. A. (2005). Influenza virus assembly and budding at the viral budzone. Adv Virus Res 64, 383–416.

Scholtissek, C., Rohde, W., Harms, E., Rott, R., Ortlich, M. & Boschek, C. B. (1978). A possible partial heterozygote of an influenza A virus. Virology 89, 586–516.

Shaw, M. L., Stone, K. L., Colangelo, C. M., Gulickev, E. E. & Palese, P. (2008). Cellular proteins in influenza virus particles. PLoS Pathog 4, e1000085.

Shinya, K., Fujii, Y., Ito, H., Ito, T. & Kawaoka, Y. (2004). Characterization of a neuraminidase-deficient influenza A virus as a potential gene delivery vector and a live vaccine. J Virol 78, 3083–3088.

Sit, T. L., Vaewhongs, A. A. & Lommel, S. A. (1998). RNA-mediated trans-activation of transcription from a viral RNA. Science 281, 829–832.

Smith, G. L. & Hay, A. J. (1982). Replication of the influenza virus genome. Virology 118, 96–108.

Smith, G. J., Vijaykrishna, D., Bahl, J., Lycett, S. J., Worobey, M., Pybus, O. G., Ma, S. K., Cheung, C. L., Raghwani, J. & other authors (2009). Origins and evolutionary genomics of the 2009 swine-origin H1N1 influenza A epidemic. Nature 459, 1122–1125.

Snijder, B., Sacher, R., Ramo, P., Dam, E. M., Liberali, P. & Peikmans, L. (2009). Population context determines cell-to-cell variability in endocytosis and virus infection. Nature 461, 520–523.

Suarez, P., Valcarcel, J. & Ortin, J. (1992). Heterogeneity of the mutation rates of influenza A viruses: isolation of mutator mutants. J Virol 66, 2491–2494.

Sugiura, A., Tobita, K. & Kilbourne, E. D. (1972). Isolation and preliminary characterization of temperature-sensitive mutants of influenza virus. J Virol 10, 639–647.

Tchatalbachev, S., Flick, R. & Hobom, G. (2001). The packaging signal of influenza viral RNA molecules. RNA 7, 979–989.

Torbet, J. (1983). Internal structural anisotropy of spherical viruses studied with magnetic birefringence. EMBO J 2, 63–66.

Ueda, M., Nakajima, K. & Sugiura, A. (1980). Extra RNAs of the 2009 swine influenza virus causing reduction of particular polymerase genes. J Virol 34, 1–8.

Varich, N. L., Gietelman, A. K., Shilov, A. A., Smirnov, Y. A. & Kaverin, N. V. (2008). Deviation from the random distribution pattern of influenza A virus gene segments in reassortants produced under non-selective conditions. Arch Virol 153, 1149–1154.

von Magnus, P. (1954). Incomplete forms of influenza virus. Adv Virus Res 2, 59–79.

Watanabe, T., Watanabe, S., Noda, T., Fujii, Y. & Kawaoka, Y. (2003). Exploitation of nucleic acid packaging signals to generate a novel influenza virus-based vector stably expressing two foreign genes. J Virol 77, 10575–10583.

Webster, R. G., Bean, W. J., Gorman, O. T., Chambers, T. M. & Kawaoka, Y. (1992). Evolution and ecology of influenza A viruses. Microbiol Rev 56, 152–179.

Winter, G., Fields, S. & Ratti, G. (1981). The structure of two subgenomic RNAs from human influenza virus A/PR/8/34. Nucleic Acids Res 9, 6907–6915.

Wise, H. M., Foegelein, A., Sun, J., Dalton, R. M., Patel, S., Howard, W., Anderson, E. C., Barclay, W. S. & Digard, P. (2009). A complicated message: identification of a novel PB1-related protein translated from influenza A virus segment 2 mRNA. J Virol 83, 8021–8031.

Yamaguchi, M., Danev, R., Nishiyama, K., Sugawara, K. & Nagayama, K. (2008). Zernike phase contrast electron microscopy of ice-embedded influenza A virus. J Struct Biol 162, 271–276.
Yang, P., Bansal, A., Liu, C. & Air, G. M. (1997). Hemagglutinin specificity and neuraminidase coding capacity of neuraminidase-deficient influenza viruses. *Virology* **229**, 155–165.

Yazaki, K., Sano, T., Nerome, K. & Miura, K. (1984). Arrangement of coiled ribonucleoprotein in influenza A virus particles. *J Electron Microsc (Tokyo)* **33**, 395–400.

Ye, Q., Krug, R. M. & Tao, Y. J. (2006). The mechanism by which influenza A virus nucleoprotein forms oligomers and binds RNA. *Nature* **444**, 1078–1082.

Zheng, H., Palese, P. & Garcia-Sastre, A. (1996). Nonconserved nucleotides at the 3’ and 5’ ends of an influenza A virus RNA play an important role in viral RNA replication. *Virology* **217**, 242–251.