


#### Abstract

Restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis of PCR products (PCR-RFLP) and sequencing of the variable region of the p104 and PIM genes was performed on samples obtained from South African T. parva parasites originating from cattle on farms with suspected theileriosis and from buffalo. p104 and PIM PCR-RFLP profiles similar to those of the T. parva Muguga stock, an isolate that causes ECF in Kenya, were obtained from three of seven cattle samples collected on a farm near Ladysmith in KwaZulu-Natal Province. Amino acid sequences of the p104 and PIM genes from two of these samples were almost identical to the T. parva Muguga p104 and PIM sequences. This result supports findings from a recent p 67 study in which p67 alleles similar to those of the $T$. parva Muguga stock were identified from the same samples. While these results suggest the presence of a cattle-derived T. parva parasite, reports of cattle-to-cattle transmission could not be substantiated and ECF was not diagnosed on this farm. Although extensive diversity of p104 and PIM gene sequences from South African T. parva isolates was demonstrated, no sequences identical to known cattle-type p104 and PIM alleles were identified from any of the buffalo T. parva samples analyzed. 'Mixed' PIM alleles containing both cattle- and buffalo-type amino acid motifs were identified for the first time, and there appeared to be selection of cattle-type and 'mixed'-type PIM sequences in the cattle samples examined.
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## 1. Introduction

Cattle theileriosis caused by Theileria parva is a disease of major economic importance in eastern, central and parts of southern Africa (Young et al., 1988). Infections of cattle by T. parva parasites result in three recognized disease syndromes, East Coast fever (ECF), January disease and Corridor disease. The natural tick vectors of T. parva in South Africa are Rhipicephalus appendiculatus and R. zambeziensis (Lawrence et al., 1983), and, in the presence of T. parva-infected buffalo, the vector ticks can transmit the parasite to naïve cattle, resulting in Corridor disease outbreaks. Corridor disease remains important in South Africa where it is a controlled disease. No cases of ECF have been reported in South Africa since its eradication in 1955 (Anonymous, 1981). It is not known whether ECF-causing T. parva parasites were transmitted to South African buffalo during the ECF epidemic, or if there exists in buffalo an ancestral subpopulation of T. parva parasites that could adapt to cattle.

In a recent study, size differentiation and sequence variation of the central region of the T. parva antigen gene, p67, were used to characterize South African T. parva field samples (Sibeko et al., 2010). A p67 allele (allele 1) identical to that of Muguga, a T. parva stock from Kenya which causes ECF, was obtained from cattle samples collected on a farm near the town Ladysmith in KwaZulu-Natal Province, where cattle-to-cattle transmission of T. parva was suspected (Thompson et al., 2008). This finding is of concern to the cattle industry in South Africa, as Potgieter et al. (1988) showed that buffalo-derived T. parva parasites, causing Corridor disease, can be maintained by passage between cattle and the tick vector. The persistence of T. parva infections in cattle in South Africa could eventually result in the selection of T. parva parasites adapted to cattle. It remains a concern that ECF could re-emerge and therefore a serious need exists to establish if there are cattle-type T. parva parasites in buffalo in South Africa.

Restriction fragment length polymorphism analyses of PCR products (PCR-RFLP) of T. parva antigen genes, PIM, p104, p150 and p67, have been used for characterization of T. parva stocks (Geysen et al., 1999; Bishop et al., 2001). The extensively characterized T. parva PIM (Baylis et al., 1993; Toye et al., 1996) is encoded by a single copy gene and its structure consists of a central variable region, flanked by conserved 5' and 3' termini (Toye et al., 1995a; 1995b; Geysen et al., 2004). Previous studies have identified a number of characteristics which could be used to distinguish PIM sequences from cattle-derived T. parva isolates from those from buffalo-derived isolates (Toye et al., 1995a; Geysen et al., 2004). More recently, mini- and micro-satellite markers
have been developed which enable detection of higher levels of polymorphism in T. parva stocks than PCR-RFLP methods (Oura et al., 2003; 2005). However, most field isolates, particularly those from buffalo, contain complex mixtures comprising multiple $T$. parva genotypes, making it impossible to determine the genotypes of individual parasites directly using microsatellite markers.

The genes coding for the p104 and PIM antigens of South African T. parva field isolates were examined in this study since they have previously been exploited for discrimination between $T$. parva stocks in other countries (Geysen et al., 1999; Bishop et al., 2001). PCR-RFLP and sequence analyses of the variable regions of these genes were used to identify buffalo-type and cattle-type alleles.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Sample collection and screening of T. parva-positive samples

Blood samples ( $\mathrm{n}=166$ ) were collected from buffalo from different game parks, and from cattle from farms with suspected theileriosis. The samples were collected in EDTA vaccutainer tubes and placed at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, for long term storage, or $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for short term storage, before extraction of DNA using the High Pure PCR Template Preparation kit (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany). Total DNA was extracted from $200 \mu 1$ of EDTA blood, according to the method described by the manufacturer, except that extracted DNA was eluted in $100 \mu$. The presence of $T$. parva DNA was demonstrated in field samples using the T. parva-specific real-time PCR assay as previously described (Sibeko et al., 2008). Two DNA samples from cattle-derived T. parva stocks, Muguga (Brocklesby et al., 1961) and Katete (Geysen, 2000), from Kenya and Zambia, respectively, were used as reference samples. Theileria parva (Schoonspruit), an isolate obtained from a bovine infected during the ECF epidemic in South Africa (Neitz, 1948), was also used for reference.

### 2.2. Amplification of p104 and PIM genes from T. parva samples

The variable regions of the $T$. parva PIM and p104 genes were amplified using the semi-nested PCR-RFLPs described by De Deken et al. (2007). SYBR ${ }^{\circledR}$ green (SIGMA-ALDRICH, USA) was used for DNA detection.

### 2.3. PCR-RFLP analysis of p104 and PIM amplicons

RFLP patterns were analysed by visual inspection and using BioNumerics version 5.1 (Applied Maths, Kortrijk, Belgium). RFLP profiles were normalised using the 100 bp DNA Ladder
(Fermentas Life Sciences, Germany). DNA fragments of less than 100 bp were excluded from the analysis as these could not be accurately estimated using the molecular weight marker and in some instances had run out of the gel. Samples with similar RFLP profiles obtained from different animals were defined as clusters.

### 2.4. Cloning and sequencing of p104 and PIM PCR products

The p104 and PIM PCR products from selected $T$. parva samples were cloned into $\mathrm{pCR}^{\circledR}$ 2.1TOPO ${ }^{\circledR}$ cloning vector (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, USA); at least 24 clones were screened for each sample. The presence of inserts in the recombinants was confirmed by colony PCR following the secondary PCR protocol described by De Deken et al. (2007). Amplicons produced from the PIM colony PCR were digested with BclI to produce RFLP profiles for individual clones. Only clones that produced amplicons which successfully digested were considered for further analysis. The ABI Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing kit version 3.1 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) was used for sequencing reactions including 300 to 450 ng of plasmid DNA. Sequencing of the PIM gene was performed by INQABA Biotechnologies (South Africa) and p104 gene sequencing was done at the Genetic Service Facility of the University of Antwerp (Belgium).

### 2.5. Sequence analysis

The p104 and PIM gene sequences were assembled and edited using the GAP4 program of the Staden package (version 1.6.0 for Windows) (Bonfield et al., 1995; Staden, 1996; Staden et al., 2000). p104 sequences were aligned with previously published T. parva p104 sequences (Table 1). A multiple sequence alignment of p104 amino acid sequences was performed using MAFFT version 6 (Katoh et al., 2002) (http://align.bmr.kyushu-u.ac.jp/mafft/software), and maximum parsimony and Bayesian analyses were used to produce phylogenetic trees. The maximum parsimony analysis was performed in PAUP*4.0b10 (Swofford, 2003) with 1000 random addition sequence followed by bisection-reconnection (TBR) branch swapping and branch support was assessed with 100 bootstrap replicates. The Bayesian analysis was performed using MrBayes v3.1.1 (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck, 2003). A Markov chain Monte Carlo run of five million generations consisting of four parallel MCMC chains was performed.

PIM sequences were aligned with previously published T. parva PIM sequences (Table 1) using MacClade v4.0 (Maddison and Maddison, 1992). The alignment was adjusted manually because of the highly polymorphic structure of the PIM gene. It was impossible to perform phylogenetic analyses for the PIM sequences because of the polymorphic nature of this gene.

## 3. Results

Theileria parva DNA was detected in 111/166 (67\%) samples using real-time PCR (Sibeko et al., 2008). These comprised 103 field samples collected from buffalo and eight collected from cattle (Table 2).

### 3.1. PCR-RFLP profile analysis

p104 gene analysis: A p104 PCR product of approximately 800 bp in size was obtained from 101 samples analyzed in this study (results not shown). From visual analysis, cattle samples, Lad 02, Lad 06, Lad 10 (from Ladysmith) and T. parva Schoonspruit (Neitz, 1948) had an identical PCRRFLP profile to that of T. parva Muguga, a stock from Kenya responsible for ECF (Fig. 1).

The p104 PCR-RFLP cluster analysis using BioNumerics revealed two major groups, A and B, each of which could be divided into three subgroups (Fig. A available online). The clustering correlated broadly with geographic origin of the samples: group A consisted mainly of samples obtained from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Game Park (39/50, 78\%) and group B consisted largely of samples from Kruger National Park (KNP) (42/51, 82.4\%), although KNP samples were also present in group A. Samples from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi produced a relatively homogeneous fingerprint, with most (38/42, 90.5\%) appearing in subgroup A1, while those from KNP buffalo samples were heterogeneous and appeared in all six fingerprint groups. The p104 RFLP profiles from four cattle samples, Lad 02, Lad 06, Lad 10 and T. parva Schoonspruit, which were identical to that of T. parva Muguga from visual inspection, grouped with T. parva Muguga in subgroup A2. These cattle samples clustered amongst p104 profiles mainly from buffalo samples from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi in group A. Other cattle samples, Lad 11, Lad 15, Lad 17, Bloe B and Lyd N254 grouped with samples in group B which contained mainly buffalo samples from KNP. The T. parva Muguga-like cattle-type p104 fingerprints were not obtained from any of the buffalo samples analyzed in this study.

PIM gene analysis: The PIM gene PCR products obtained from 109 T. parva positive samples analyzed in this study ranged in size from 0.7 to 1.2 kb (results not shown). Since PIM is a single copy gene (Toye et al., 1995a), multiple PCR products obtained from a single sample indicated the presence of mixed infections. Mixed infections were evident from 56/109 (51\%) samples.

PIM PCR-RFLP profiles from all 48 samples from KNP were heterogeneous by visual inspection (Fig. 2a), while the profiles obtained from 23/39 (59\%) of the Hluhluwe-iMfolozi samples from buffalo were relatively homogeneous (Fig. 2b). Similarly $4 / 6$ ( $67 \%$ ) samples from Mabalingwe and all 10 from Ithala produced relatively homogeneous profiles (Fig. 2c and 2d). Further analysis of PIM PCR-RFLP profiles by cluster analysis using BioNumerics was not possible, since these profiles were too complex as a result of multiple infections with different T. parva strains. Furthermore, PCR products were present at different concentrations resulting in multiple bands of different intensities, and it was difficult to distinguish between bands from incompletely digested amplicons and authentic bands. Therefore, 27 samples representative of T. parva samples from buffalo that produced homogeneous and heterogeneous profiles as well as six cattle samples (Table 2) were selected for cloning in order to produce RFLP profiles from individual clones.

More than one profile was obtained from the cloned PIM amplicons from 30/33 (91\%) of the field samples. Different PCR-RFLP profiles were also obtained from clones produced from some of the samples which had a single band when analyzed on the agarose gel. Three samples from Ladysmith (Lad 02, Lad 06 and Lad 10) were exceptions, as all clones from these samples produced only one profile and this profile was identical to that of T. parva Muguga and T. parva Schoonspruit (Fig. 3). When RFLP profiles obtained from clones produced from samples which had homogeneous overall PIM-RFLP profiles were visually analysed, it was observed that there were dominant profiles that were responsible for the apparently homogeneous overall profile. For example, among other profiles, three profiles were found to be dominant in clones produced from the 10 samples from Ithala; the three profiles were obtained in, respectively, $20 / 61$ (33\%), 14/61 (23\%) and 11/61 (18\%) clones produced from four different samples.

Cluster analysis of PIM PCR-RFLP profiles from 259 clones produced from both buffalo and cattle T. parva samples identified five cluster groups, A, B, C, D and E, (Fig. B available online). Cluster A was the largest group with 105/259 ( $40.5 \%$ ) clones followed by cluster D with 73/259 (28\%), then C $(42 / 259,16 \%)$, B $(26 / 259,10 \%)$ and $\mathrm{E}(15 / 259,6 \%)$. No correlation with geographic distribution could be established from the major cluster groups. Profiles from clones produced from cattle samples Lad 02, Lad 06 and Lad 10 grouped with T. parva Muguga and T. parva Schoonspruit profiles in cluster A. Although most PIM profiles in cluster A were obtained from buffalo samples, $42 / 48$ ( $88 \%$ ) of the PIM profiles from clones obtained from cattle samples also occurred in this group. PIM profiles from clones produced from the other cattle T. parva samples
from Ladysmith and Bloemfontein grouped closely with profiles obtained from buffalo samples from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi and Ithala in different subgroups within cluster A.

Specific 'signatures' composed of several small fragments (less than 150 bp ) were produced in the PIM PCR-RFLP profiles obtained from some T. parva field samples from KNP (results not shown) and Hluhluwe-iMfolozi (Fig. 2b). Two specific 'signatures' were associated with some RFLP profiles from clones from KNP samples and both 'signatures' co-occurred with other bands of larger sizes. The Hluhluwe-iMfolozi 'signature' was also apparent in profiles from field samples obtained from buffalo from Ithala (Fig. 2d), and from three bovines from Ladysmith (Lad 17, Lad I438 and Lad M119) and a bovine from Bloemfontein (results not shown).

### 3.2. Sequence analysis

p104 gene analysis: To confirm results obtained by RFLP profile cluster analysis and to establish p104 alleles that occur in the different subgroups, PCR products from 18 field samples (Table 2) representative of each cluster group were cloned and sequenced. Fifty-three good quality p104 sequences were obtained. None of these was identical to the four p104 alleles previously reported by Skilton et al. (2002) from different T. parva stocks of cattle and buffalo in East Africa (Table 1), although they were very similar with sequence identities ranging from $92-99 \%$ in the region analyzed.

Both maximum parsimony and Bayesian analyses produced similar groupings of p104 sequences; however, the maximum parsimony analysis did not resolve the differences within groups containing alleles 2 and 3. Therefore only the phylogenetic tree based on Bayesian analysis is presented (Fig. 4). The p104 sequences obtained in this study could be grouped into two main clades, A and B, and each of the major clades could be divided into two sub-clades, A1 and A2, and B1 and B2. Alleles 2 and 3 grouped in sub-clade A2 and alleles 1 and 4 in sub-clade B1. The p104 amino acid sequence obtained from Lad10 was identical to the p104 sequence from T. parva Schoonspruit. The Lad10 and T. parva Schoonspruit p104 sequences grouped with the T. parva Muguga p104 sequence (allele 1) and both had sequence identity of $99 \%$ to the T. parva Muguga p104 amino acid sequence. In addition to these, a p104 sequence obtained from a buffalo T. parva sample, KNP B10_3.0.2, had $97 \%$ sequence identity to that of T. parva Muguga and grouped closely to p104 sequences from Lad10, T. parva Schoonspruit and T. parva Muguga in sub-clade B1. Apart from $T$. parva Katete, no sequences grouped closely to p104 allele 2; similarly no sequences grouped
closely with allele 3 . Sequence identities of $96-97 \%$ were obtained from sequences that grouped closely with p104 allele 4 (KNP102 8 3, KNPW8 8.0.2, KNPAB47 8.0.1).

The groups obtained from PCR-RFLP cluster analysis did not correlate with the clades identified by phylogenetic analysis of p104 amino acid sequences. Unfortunately, DNA from samples of reference sequences was not available for PCR-RFLP analysis and it was therefore not possible to determine where the p104 profiles from these samples would fit in the cluster analysis.

PIM gene analysis: Clones from different cluster groups were selected for sequencing. A total of 97 PIM sequences were obtained from cloned amplicons produced from 26 selected $T$. parva-positive samples (Table 2). Analysis of the amino acid alignment of the PIM sequences revealed three groups of PIM sequences, cattle-type, buffalo-type and 'mixed'-type (Fig. C available online).

## Cattle-type PIM sequences:

A tetrapeptide repeat, QPEP, in the variable region of the PIM gene was previously identified by Toye et al. (1995b) and found to be characteristic of cattle-derived T. parva PIM sequences (Geysen et al., 2004). The amino acid sequences between positions 29 and 259 and positions 493 and 497 were also identified as exclusive to cattle-type PIM alleles in the present study. In this way, six PIM sequences obtained from two field samples investigated in this study (Lad 02 and Lad 10) were identified as cattle-type T. parva PIM sequences. These sequences were identical to the PIM sequence obtained from T. parva Schoonspruit. These sequences had $98 \%$ identity to the T. parva Muguga PIM sequence, with one to three amino acid differences; the major difference being a deletion of eight amino acids at position 420-427 in the South African sequences. Cattle-type PIM sequences were not identified from samples obtained from buffalo in this study.

## Buffalo-type PIM sequences:

Toye et al. (1995a) identified a 20-amino-acid insert (VDQQQPVQQPSQDQPSGPDS) as characteristic to buffalo-type PIM amino acid sequences. In addition to this, two other buffalo-type amino acid motifs and other unique inserts were identified in our study. The 20-amino-acid insert identified by Toye et al. (1995a) from PIM sequences from buffalo-derived T. parva 7014 and Hluhluwe stocks PIM sequences, was missing from 9/53 (17\%) of the buffalo-type PIM sequences obtained in this study. $54.6 \%$ (53/97) of the PIM sequences obtained in our study were identified as buffalo-type PIM sequences and were obtained from T. parva samples collected from both cattle and buffalo.

## 'Mixed'-type PIM sequences:

The use of the amino acid motifs identified in our study allowed identification of 37 'mixed' PIM sequences. Two subtypes of 'mixed' PIM sequences were identified, M-I (32/37) and M-II (5/37) (Fig. D available online). Subtype M-I consisted of sequences characteristic of cattle-type T. parva PIM sequences at the amino-terminus and buffalo-type sequences at the carboxy-terminus. Subtype M-II comprised sequences characteristic of buffalo-type $T$. parva PIM sequences at the aminoterminus and cattle-type sequences at the carboxy-terminus. The 37 'mixed' PIM sequences were obtained from samples collected from both cattle and buffalo.

Of the 22 T. parva PIM sequences obtained from cattle samples in this study (T. parva Schoonspruit and six field samples), $31.8 \%$ ( $7 / 22$ ) were cattle-type, $59.1 \%$ ( $13 / 22$ ) were 'mixed'-type, and only $9.1 \%(2 / 22)$ were buffalo-type. In comparison, no cattle-type PIM sequences were identified from 20 buffalo samples, $32 \%(24 / 75)$ of the PIM sequences obtained from buffalo samples were mixedtype, and $68 \%$ (51/75) were buffalo-type.

## 4. Discussion

## Identification of cattle-type p104 and PIM alleles from cattle T. parva samples

Cattle-to-cattle transmission of T. parva was suspected on a farm near Ladysmith in the KwaZuluNatal Province following cattle theileriosis outbreaks in several consecutive years in the apparent absence of infected buffalo (Thompson et al., 2008). Three cattle samples from the Ladysmith farm and T. parva Schoonspruit had p104 and PIM PCR-RFLP profiles and inferred amino acid sequences almost identical to those of T. parva Muguga. These results could imply that there was selection of cattle-type alleles in some of the cattle on the farm, suggesting that cattle-to-cattle transmission may indeed have occurred. However, the original source of T. parva infection remains undiscovered and ECF was not diagnosed in animals on this farm. There have not been reports of any officially recognized ECF outbreaks in South Africa since its eradication in the early 1950s. While the presence, in South African cattle, of a parasite apparently similar to T. parva Muguga and the Schoonspruit isolate made during the ECF epidemic is a concern, there is no evidence to suggest that genotypes at individual loci such as p104, PIM and p67, can be linked to the pathogenicity of the isolate or to the disease syndrome it causes.
p104 and PIM alleles obtained from T. parva samples from several other animals from this farm were either buffalo-type or 'novel' (or mixed-type in the case of PIM) suggesting that the parasite population infecting cattle on this farm originated from buffalo, although contact between these cattle and T. parva-infected buffalo could not be confirmed (Thompson et al., 2008). The Hluhluwe-iMfolozi 'signature' obtained in PIM PCR-RFLP profiles from cattle samples from the Ladysmith farm, similar to that obtained from buffalo samples from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi game park, provides further support for the hypothesis that there may have been contact between cattle on this farm and T. parva-infected buffalo.
p104 and PIM PCR-RFLP fingerprints obtained from a sample collected from a bovine which died of Corridor disease (Bloe B) on a vector-free game farm near Bloemfontein on which there was an infected buffalo breeding herd, grouped with profiles from buffalo samples, suggesting that these $T$. parva parasites may have originated from the buffalo on the farm. This hypothesis is supported by the presence of the 'signature' in the Bloe B PIM profile characteristic of most Hluhluwe-iMfolozi profiles and the sequence analyses, all of which suggest that the T. parva parasite characterized from the Bloemfontein bovine sample was similar to T. parva parasites from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi. In fact, the infected buffalo breeding herd on the Bloemfontein farm originated from HluhluweiMfolozi. Therefore, it might be possible to use PIM PCR-RFLP profiles to track the origin of $T$. parva infections, especially when the profiles have a specific signature that characterizes a particular parasite population.

## Identification of cattle-type alleles from buffalo T. parva samples

Although no p104 or PIM alleles identical to T. parva cattle-type alleles previously reported (Iams et al., 1990; Toye et al., 1995a; 1995b; Skilton et al., 2002) were obtained from buffalo samples analyzed in this study, variants of p67 allele 1 (Sibeko et al., 2010) as well as variants of p104 allele 1 (both cattle-type alleles) were obtained. These findings suggest that parasites possessing cattletype p67 and p104 alleles may not be exclusively associated with cattle-derived T. parva parasites. While these results could suggest that there may have been transmission of cattle-derived T. parva parasites to buffalo, they could also be indicative of an ancestral buffalo-derived $T$. parva subpopulation with characteristics that might aid the parasite to adapt to cattle.

Since we identified cattle-type p104 and PIM alleles in cattle, we might have expected to see cattletype p104 and/or PIM sequences in T. parva samples from buffalo. Buffalo are believed to carry a heterogeneous population of parasites and, as original hosts of the parasite, cattle-derived T. parva
parasites might have originated in buffalo. It is possible that the pool of buffalo samples investigated was not large enough to allow detection of all T. parva alleles that occur in buffalo. Therefore, a larger pool of samples will have to be characterized in order to determine if there are cattle-type alleles in buffalo.

It is still not clear if the parasite that caused ECF in South Africa in the early part of the $20^{\text {th }}$ century was transmitted to buffalo during the ECF epidemic, or whether South African strains of T. parva existing in buffalo could eventually become adapted to cattle to cause ECF. To date, there are no reports where the source of infection was determined in cases where both cattle- and buffaloderived $T$. parva parasites occur, and more reliable markers to distinguish between cattle-derived and buffalo-derived parasites would be needed in order to perform such experiments. There are reports indicating that cattle-derived parasites can be transmitted to buffalo (Walker, 1932; Lewis, 1943; Brocklesby, 1964; Barnett and Brocklesby, 1966a; 1966b). In this study, variants of cattletype alleles were obtained from samples originating from buffalo, however there is no evidence that these were transmitted from cattle. Such transmission, if it did occur, could play an important role in the evolution of genetic polymorphism in T. parva parasites and in the selection for genetically variant T. parva strains.

## Genetic diversity among South African T. parva parasite populations:

The sequence identities of p104 sequences obtained from buffalo in this study, when compared with published sequences (Skilton et al., 2002), ranged from 94 to $97 \%$ suggesting that T. parva p104 alleles in South African buffalo are more diverse and that variations in the p104 gene may not be as limited as previously thought (Geysen et al., 1999).

None of the PIM gene sequences obtained from T. parva field samples from buffalo characterized in this study were identical, providing further evidence that the PIM gene evolves at an extremely high rate (Toye et al., 1995a). Extensive sequence heterogeneity among PIM sequences was demonstrated in the South African T. parva samples, confirming the extensive genetic diversity reported previously in T. parva parasites in buffalo (Collins and Allsopp, 1999; Sibeko et al., 2010). Furthermore, sequence variants of buffalo-type PIM sequences were identified which have never been reported before. Novel alleles have been reported to arise from re-shuffling of important epitopes as a result of gene conversion and reciprocal intergenic exchanges (Dormoy et al., 1997). While the discriminative characteristics of the PIM gene render it a good candidate for exploitation in discriminatory assays used for T. parva isolates (Bishop et al., 2001; De Deken et al., 2007), it is
advisable that assays based on this gene should be continuously evaluated because of the rapid evolution of the PIM gene.

In this study, for the first time, 'mixed' PIM sequences with characteristics of both cattle-type and buffalo-type PIM sequences were identified. It is possible that hybrid PCR products could arise during PCR amplification in samples containing mixed infections, as a result of template switching (Wang and Wang, 1997; Thompson et al., 2002). These PCR artifacts are identifiable by sequence identities in hybrid sequences when compared with sequences of other amplicons produced in the same amplification reaction. To confirm whether the 'mixed' sequences obtained in this study were authentic, the PIM nucleic acid sequences in the more conserved regions, i.e. sequences flanking the central variable region, were compared to those of other sequences obtained from the same sample. None of the 'mixed' sequences were identical to any of the other PIM sequences obtained from the same sample in these conserved regions, suggesting that the 'mixed' sequences were therefore genuine and could not have resulted from PCR artifacts.

The combinations of different "blocks" of sequence observed in the PIM gene, in this study and elsewhere (Geysen et al., 2004), are reminiscent of the structure that has previously been shown for the precursor to the major merozoite surface antigens (PMMSA) in Plasmodium falciparum (Peterson et al., 1988). Recombination within the conserved blocks in the PMMSA is thought to result in reassembling of the variable blocks and accounts for much of the antigenic variation in this molecule. Studies of the population structure of T. parva parasites in Uganda showed that genetic exchange occurs frequently between isolates of T. parva, confirming the existence of a sexual cycle (Oura et al., 2005). Evidence for recombination between T. parva parasites, in a form of mosaic segments, has previously been observed in the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region (Collins and Allsopp, 1999) and sexual recombination between different $T$. parva stocks has been demonstrated in the laboratory (Morzaria et al., 1993; Bishop et al., 2002). It seems likely that the 'mixed' PIM sequences have arisen through recombination between cattle-type and buffalo-type PIM sequences.

While the 'mixed' PIM sequences identified in this study may well represent recombination events, we do not know the full extent of the recombination in the rest of the genome in these parasites. Recombination between buffalo-type T. parva parasites and cattle-type parasites can only occur where there has been contact between buffalo and cattle, and it has been reported that it is unlikely for recombinant parasites to become established in the cattle population (Geysen, 2000; Geysen et al., 2004). Nonetheless, 'mixed' PIM sequences were obtained from samples originating from both
buffalo and cattle in this study, and the results indicate that 'mixed' PIM sequences are more prevalent in T. parva samples from cattle than in T. parva samples from buffalo ( $51 \%$ of sequences obtained from cattle samples were 'mixed' type PIM alleles compare to $32 \%$ from buffalo samples). This could suggest that $T$. parva parasites with the 'mixed' PIM allele might be more likely to establish in cattle. In fact, very few buffalo-type PIM sequences were identified in cattle, suggesting that there may have been selection for both 'mixed'-type and cattle-type PIM sequences in cattle.

Our results demonstrate that p104 and PIM amino acid sequences very similar to those of T. parva Muguga were present in T. parva parasites on a farm in South Africa, where pathogenic cattle theileriosis was reported. The possibility of cattle-to-cattle transmission of T. parva in South Africa and the selection of cattle-type parasites in such animals should be further investigated. Although no cattle-type p104 or PIM alleles were identified from samples obtained from buffalo in this study, more samples need to be examined to confirm this finding. The challenge to identify more reliable and specific markers that can be directly associated with different disease syndromes caused by $T$. parva still remains. This is crucial for the design and implementation of control measures in South Africa to protect cattle against disease caused by T. parva infections.
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## Table legends

Table 1: Previously published p104 and PIM sequences

Table 2: Geographical origin and source of blood samples ( $\mathrm{n}=111$ ) used for characterization of $T$. parva parasites

## Figure legends

Fig. 1: p104 gene AluI RFLP profiles showing the T. parva Muguga RFLP profile and identical profiles obtained from cattle samples from a farm near Ladysmith.

Fig. 2: Representative PIM gene $B c l$ I PCR-RFLP profiles showing (a) heterogeneous profiles obtained from buffalo T. parva samples from KNP, (b), (c) and (d) homogeneous profiles obtained from buffalo samples from Hluhluwe-iMfolozi, Mabalingwe and Ithala, respectively.

Fig. 3: PIM gene BclI PCR-RFLP profiles obtained from (a) cattle $T$. parva samples from Ladysmith and (b) clones produced from cattle sample, Lad 10.

Fig. 4: Phylogenetic relationship of T. parva strains as revealed by p104 amino acid sequence analysis. The phylogenetic tree was inferred by Bayesian analysis; the first 10,000 trees were discarded as burnin and the majority-rule consensus tree was generated.

## Legends for online supplementary figures

Fig. A: A similarity dendrogram generated by BioNumerics v5.1 cluster analysis of PCR-RFLP profiles from p104 amplicons using the Dice Coefficient analysis.

Fig. B: A similarity dendrogram generated by BioNumerics v5.1 cluster analysis of PCR-RFLP profiles from cloned PIM amplicons using the Dice Coefficient analysis.

Fig. C: Multiple sequence alignment of selected PIM amino acid sequences, representative of cattle, buffalo- and 'mixed'-type sequences. The inferred PIM sequences obtained from buffalo and cattle T. parva samples collected from different geographical areas in South Africa were aligned with previously published T. parva PIM amino acid sequences (Table 1). The sequence alignment was constructed manually because of the extreme polymorphism in the central region of the PIM gene. Amino acid motifs characteristic of cattle-type PIM sequence are shown in solid-line blocks including the tetrapeptide repeat characteristic of the
central variable region of cattle-derived PIM sequences at positions 428-447. All amino acid motifs characteristic of buffalo-type PIM sequence are shown in broken-line blocks.

Fig. D: Multiple sequence alignment of representative amino acid sequences of 'mixed'-type T. parva PIM sequences, showing subtypes M-I and M-II. Regions typical of buffalo-type and cattle-type PIM sequences are indicated in broken-line and solid-line blocks, respectively. This alignment excludes the region between positions 101 and 300, which has buffalo-type PIM sequences in all subtypes.

Table 1

| Isolate name | Accession number and reference |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | p104 | PIM |
| T. parva Muguga | Allele 1: M29954 (Iams et al., 1990) | L06323 (Baylis et al., 1993) |
| T. parva Marikebuni | Allele 2: AY034069 (Skilton et al., 2002) | L41148 (Toye et al., 1995a) |
| T. parva Boleni | Allele 3: AY034070 (Skilton et al., 2002) | - |
| T. parva 7014 | Allele 4: AY034071 (Skilton et al., 2002) | L41833 (Toye et al., 1995b) |

Table 2

| Geographical location | Province | Sample Name | Host of blood sample | Date of collection/ References |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Park ( $\mathrm{n}=39$ ) | KwaZulu-Natal | HIP 01, HIP 03, HIP 04, HIP 05, HIP 06, HIP 07, HIP 08, HIP 09, HIP 10, HIP 11, HIP 12, HIP 13, HIP 14, HIP 15, HIP 16, HIP 18, HIP 19, HIP 20, HIP 21, HIP 22, HIP 23, HIP 24, HIP 25, HIP 26, HIP 27, HIP 28, HIP 30, HIP 31, HIP 32, HIP 33, HIP 34, HIP 35, HIP 36, HIP 37, HIP 38, HIP 39, HIP 41, HIP 42, HIP 49 | Buffalo | 2004 |
| Kruger National Park (KNP) ( $\mathrm{n}=48$ ) | Mpumalanga | KNP 39, KNP 42, KNP 43, KNP 47, KNP 48, KNP 49, KNP 50, KNP 61, KNP 62, KNP 63, KNP 66, KNP 67, KNP 68, KNP 102, KNP AA5, KNP AB47, KNP AC10, KNP AD3, KNP B10, KNP B22, KNP D11, KNP D24, KNP E7, KNP E18, KNP F9, KNP G2, KNP G11, KNP H8, KNP J5, KNP L6, KNP L27, KNP M2, KNP M12, KNP M2706, KNP N1, KNP N8, KNP O1, KNP O11, KNP $P 7$, KNP S17, KNP U3, KNP U20, KNP V5, KNP W8, KNP X4, KNP Y4, KNP Y19, KNP Z4 | Buffalo | 2003 |
| Ladysmith ( $\mathrm{n}=7$ ) | KwaZulu-Natal | Lad 02, Lad 06, Lad 10, Lad 15, Lad 17 Lad M119, Lad I438 | Bovines | 2003, <br> Thompson et al. (2008) |
| Mabalingwe Game Reserve ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) | Limpopo | Mab A13, Mab A22, Mab B21, Mab BB37, Mab BB38, Mab BB43 | Buffalo | 2004 |
| \#Ithala Game Reserve ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | KwaZulu-Natal | Itha 1, Itha 2, Itha 3, Itha 4, Itha 5, Itha 6, Itha 7, Itha 8, Itha 9, Itha 10 | Buffalo | 2005/6 |
| Bloemfontein ( $\mathrm{n}=1$ ) | Free-State | Bloe B | Bovine | 2004 |

Samples in bold were selected for cloning of the PIM gene to produce RFLP profiles from individual clones and only 26 of the 33 were used for sequencing.
\# Samples from this Game Reserve (Ithala) were only analyzed for the p104 gene.
Samples in italic were used for sequencing of the p104 gene variable region.
Samples in italic and bold were used for sequencing of both the p104 and PIM genes.
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Cattle-type
'Mixed'-type

Itha2＿cl2－11
HIP22＿8－9
HIP22＿8－9
HIP19 2／4
HIP19＿2／4
BloeB＿4．0．2
BloeB＿4．0．2
HIP32＿24－0－1
Itha2＿cl2－24
Itha6＿cl6－22
Lad M119＿9
Lad I438＿10－15
Lad 17＿10
HIP 22＿8－13
KNP W8＿17
KNP W8－17
KNP W8＿8－2
KNP W8＿7
Mab BB43＿1210

Itha2＿cl2－11
HIP22＿8－9
HIP19＿2／4
BloeB＿4．0．2
BloeB＿12－2
HIP32＿24－0－1
Itha2＿cl2－24
tha6＿cl6－22
Lad M119＿9
Lad I438＿10－15
Lad 17＿10
HIP 22＿8－13
KNP W8＿17
KNP W8＿8－2
KNP W8＿7
KNP W8＿1
Mab BB43＿1210

Itha2＿cl2－11
HIP22＿8－9
HIP22＿8－9
HIP19＿2／4
BloeB＿4．0．2
BloeB＿12－2
HIP32＿24－0－1
Itha2＿cl2－24
Itha6＿cl6－22
Lad M119＿9
Lad I438＿10－15
Lad 17＿10
HIP 22＿8－13
KIP K W8＿17
KNP W8＿17
KNP W8＿8－2
KNP W8＿7
KNP
Mab＿1
BB43＿1210


 DSTGSSDVIQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPD DSTGSSDVAQADSESNDSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP
DSTGSSDVTQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSSGSSDVTQVDSESNDTSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQVDSEPNDTSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQVDSESNDTSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP DSTGSSDVTQADSESNDSSSSSETSQQGQPQPDQP

QPP－ $\qquad$
$\qquad$ IDQPDQHQQ－
ODOPD HOQPTOTSGQGPDTPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ QDQPDQHQQPTQG中TSGQQGPDTPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ EDQPDQHQQPTQGDTSGQQGPHTPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ DDQPDQHQQPTQG TSGQQGPHAPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ QDQPDQHQQPTQGQTSGQQGPHTPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ QDQPDQHQQPTQG中TSGQQGPDTPQPIQEPSGPVQPDQ
 DSTGSSDLTOVDTESNDGSSSSETSQQPP－－－DQAVDQQQP－VQQ－－－－－－－PSQDOPSGPDSODOPVDHOOPTQADSSGQOGQQOQPLDOPTGQPGP－－－

 DSTGSSDLTHVDTESNDTSSSSETSQQGKPQPDQ－－－－DQHQEPTQADQS－－－－－－－GQGPVEPVDQQQQPVQE



| 310 | 320 | 330 | 340 | 350 | 360 | 370 | 380 | 390 | 400 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －－－ャ．－－ | －－ | －－ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 IPEQPPVEPVDQQQQPVQDQPSGKETPQPTQGDQPVQDPSGQEQ－1 PEPEQTPEHTPSkDDPTGEEBVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPGDDSKGKDS EPEQPPVQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPPEQKPE－PEPEQTPEHTPSKDDPTGEEIVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDSKGKDGS IEPEQPQDQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPTEQK－－PEPEQTPEHTPSKGDSGEEAVQPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDDS
 EPEQPQDQPVDQQQPTQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPTEQK－－TPEPEQTPEHTPSKDDLSGEEIVKPPEGLMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPGDDSKGKDGS EPEQPQDQ IPEQTPVEPVDQQQQPVQDQPSGKETPQPTQGDQPVQDPSGQEQ－4PEPEQTPEHTPSKDDPTGEEPVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS EPEQPPVQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPPEQKPE－1PEPEQTPEHTPSKDDPTGEEIVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS EPEQPPVQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPPEQKPE TPEPEQTPEHTPSKDDPTGEEPVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS IEPEQPPVQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPVQEPPEQKPE $\perp_{\text {PEPEQTPEHTPSkDDPTGEEHVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS }}$ QTPEPPVEPVDQQQPVHE－PSGQETPQPIPDDQPVREPTE－K－E $\frac{1}{1}$ PEPEQKPDHTPSKDDTSGEEIVQPSEGHMTGAAPDGSGQPPEKKPGDDSKGKDGS IEPEQPQDQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPDDQPVQEPPEQKPE PEPEQTPEHTPS MDASGEVIVVKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS $\mathbf{I}^{--D Q P Q D Q P V D Q Q Q P T Q D Q P S G Q E T P Q P I P D D Q P V Q E P P E Q K P E+P E P E Q T P E H T P S K D A S G E V Z V K P S E G H M T G A A A D G S G Q P P D K K P D D D S K G K D G S ~}$ I－－DQPQDQPVDQQQPTQDQPSGQETPQPIPDDQPVQEPPEQKPE $\frac{1}{1}$ PEPEQTPEHTPS KDDASGEV VKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS EPDQPQDQPVDQQQPTQDQPSGQETPQPIPDDQPVQEPPEQKPE ${ }^{P}$ PEPEQTPEHTPS KDDASGEVF VKPSEGHMTGAAADGSGQPPDKKPDDDSKGKDGS IQPEQPPVQPVDQQQPVQDQPSGQETPQPIPEDQPAKDEPTGQQDQPEPEQTPEHTPSKDASGEVDVKPSEGLMTGAAADGSGQPPDQPSDDDSKGKDS

## 410

KSDSGTPSKDK… KSDSGMPSKDKKDSK KSDSGSPIKDKKDSK KSDSGTP SKDKKHSK KSGSGTP SKDKKDSK KSGSGTPSKDKKDSK KSDSGTPSKDKKHSK KSDSGTPIKDKKHYK KSDSGTPSKDKKDSK KSDSGSPIKDKKHSK KSDSGTPIKDKKDSK KSDSGSPIKDKKHSK KSDSGTPSKDKKHSK KSDSGSPIKDKKHSK KSDSGSIKDKKHSN KSDSGSPIKDKKHSK KSDSGSPIKDKKisk KSDSGSPIKDKKHSK KSDSGSPIKDRKHPK

M－II

M－I
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

M－I

## M－II

## M－I



$\qquad$


[^0]:    DHQPPVQPVDQQQPTQDQPSGQGPVEPVDQKQEPVQDDASGKQETPVQPEQTPEAPVKEPSGQQPQDAPIHQQ DHQPPVQPVDHQPPTQDQPSGQGPVEPVDQKQEPVQDDASGKQETPVQPEQTPEAPVKEPSGQQPQDAPIHQH
    HOPPVPVD

