West Nile Virus

Malathi. H
Assistant professor, Department of Life Science,
School of Sciences, B-II, Jain (Deemed to be University), JC Road, Bangalore-560027
Email Id: h.malathi@jainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT: ***Virus West Nile (WN) is a flavivirus of mosquito and a dog, equine and avian flavivirus. African, Asian, European and Australia emerged from the virus which recently culminated in major epidemics in Romania, Russia which Israel. Birds are the guardians of a natural pool, and in addition, the WN virus is retained throughout the transmission process of mosquito bird mosquitos primarily affecting Culexsp mosquitos. In 1999, the WN virus was first identified in North America during a Meningoencephalitis outbreak in New York City. The virus expanded its distribution in much of the eastern areas of the U.S. in 1999-2002 and is predicted to spread throughout the western hemisphere. In 1999-01 there were 142 reports of central-nervous neuroinvasive WN virus disease (including 18 deaths), and in America seven reports of uncomplicated WN fever. The majority of humans with WN virus infections are subclinical, although clinical infections can vary from uncomplicated WN fever and fatal meningoencephalitis. The centre of laboratory diagnostics remains serology. No medication or vaccination unique to the WN virus is given. Prevention relies on coordinated, effective management and public awareness of vector mosquitoes.***

KEYWORDS: ***Culexsp Mosquitos, Central-nervous neuroinvasive WN virus disease, Flavivirus, West Nile***

INTRODUCTION

In the New York City region of 19991 the sudden outbreak, with 59 hospital reports and 7 fatalities, of West Nile (WN) meningoencephalitis (panel) is a disturbing reminder of the potential of viruses, including arboviruses, to spring through continents and hemispheres[1]. While the indigenous and strongly related St Louis encephalitis (SLE) virus and the preliminary human brain tissue amplification analysis included Kunjin virus (an Australian WN virus 3 subset) for preliminary serological tests, the exact identification of the outbreak strain of Flavivirus has been speedily solved[2], [3]. The subsequent spread of the WN virus in most of the eastern half of Canada and the US throughout the nineties underlines the reality that while the propagation and maintenance processes of the arboviral tree are typically quite complicated, new areas may be extended with arboviruses if effective vectors, suitable vertebrate amplifiers, and stable wintering are created[4], [5]. It is a reminder that a virus that has been introduced in a new biome or in a new hemisphere will yield unusual effects with WN viruses in a large number of North American birds. The New York outbreak of 1999 has revealed that all the most prosperous communities in the country remain at risk for infectious arboviral disease without effective vector mosquito surveillance in metropolitan environments[6], [7]. This extreme epidemic, which took place in a major hub for business and news media, overshadowed the reality, in Russia nearly concurrently with the epidemic in New York and in Romania only three years earlier and in Israel, perhaps similarly lethal, urban epics from meningoencephalitis. In the West Nile region in northern Uganda, the WN virus was first identified from febrile blood in 1937. During the 1940s, near antigenic interrelations between WN, JE and SLE viruses were identified, mosquito transmission was demonstrated by WN virus and large prevalence of nutritional antibody virus to WN and closely related flavivirus were observed in residents of Central East Africa. In the next three decades the mosquito-borne transmission of WN viruses is assisted in the field; birds have proved to be significant amplifying hosts; severe WN epidemics have been identified with few case of neuroinvasive conditions in Israel and South Africa, , and WN virus emerged as an equine neuropathogen. No big WN viral epidemics have been reported between 1975 and 1993. Epidemics of WN meningoencephalitis nevertheless emerged in North Africa, Australia, North American and the Middle East at an unprecedented pace in 1994-2000[8], [9]. In addition to the epidemic of Israel, there were more than 400 cases, 35 fatalities in such outbreaks, mostly animals, as well as major urban epidemics, like the 2000 epidemic, the 1996 Romanian epidemic appears to have been a specific one marking the advent of the Viral Epidemic WN in cities of the developing world.

1. *Causative Agent:*

In the Flaviviridae family, the WN virus is taxonomically put. The classification flavivirus also reported the human pathogens JE, Murray Valley Encephalitis, SLE and Kunjin viruses, serologically identified WN Virus as a JE-virus antigenic group. The spherical WN virus particle is roughly 50 Nm indiametric and consisting of a host-derived two-layered lipid membrane covering a nucleocapside nucleus comprising an estimated 11 000 nucleotide single-stranded positive-sense RNA genome. The viral surface (E) and

membrane (M) proteins that are incorporated in the virus membrane have a wide number of essential virus characteristics, such as host distribution, tissue tropics, tissue replication, cell immune responses, and stimulation of B and T stimuli. The RNA genome is a small non-coding (about 100 nucleotides) 5-coding area preceded by the free read frame code for 3 viral structural proteins and 7 non-structural (NS) proteins in the order: the non-coding (about 600 nucleotides). The cytoplasm replenishes virus directly linked to the raw endoplasm reticulum and the viruses in ER-lumen and releases from cells via the cell secretory pathway.20 There have been two distinct lines of WN virus strains for phylogenetic study of nuclear acid sequence data from a variety of full genomes. Line 1 is spread globally from West Africa through to the Middle East, Eastern Europe, North America and Australia, while line 2 consists of African enzootic strains.

2. *Geographical Distribution and Epidemiology:*

It has recently been deployed in North America and was first observed in New York City. WN Virus sensuality is endemic to Africa, Asia, Europe, and Australia. The Middle East was the likely root of the added strain, but the introductory style is uncertain. The virus WN has spread its range from Mainland to the Florida Keys and from the coast of the Atlantic to the East of Dakota during 1999–2002, which are now found in several sections of the east of the USA (unpublished data). The virus was also identified in the south-central portion of Canada, and in 2001, WN encephalitis was confirmed serologically in a citizen of Cayman Islands who does not have a recent history of travel, which is circumstantial proof that this virus is reaching the Caribbean region4. Although Moscow-borne WN virus transmission is by far the dominant form, infection acquired by laboratory inoculation or an aerial pathway may occur. No data has been given on person to person or non-human vertebrate to man transmission. Most human WN diseases arise in summer or early fall in temperate and subtropical environments. For tropics, the most common occurrence would be during the rainy season, but no reported literature is known for tropical wetlands on the epidemiology and ecology of WN viruses. Together with other age classes and races, the occurrence of encephalitis and mortality is rising as a consequence of age. WN virus infection. Current environmental epidemics include the long spending outside time, inability to apply daily mosquito repellents, catching mosquitoes in the household, and staying in an apartment complex with an overflowing basement. Clearly, these considerations are important for growing sensitivity to mosquitoes potentially contaminated. Factors that raise the likelihood of contracting meningoencephalitis (e.g., obesity, smoking, cerebrovascular disease) in those with WN and SLE viral inflammation are not yet known other than their era.

In Africa, the Middle East, Europe, West and South Asia, Australia and North America, epidemics of or intermittent cases of WN viral diseases in humans or horses have been recorded. Only isolated cases of Kunjin virus, including unusual cases of encephalitis, have been reported in Australia; hence Kunjin virus will not be further considered. The bulk of human WN virus infections are subclinical, while the remainder of them cause diseases of a broad variety. The proportions of the different clinical syndromes that are identified in each community with the WN virus are based on the historical history of WN virus infection in this region and consequent rates of community context immunity (possibly involving immunity to similarly associated flaviviruses), population age structure and surveillance intensity and comprehensiveness. Based on detailed research performed in Egypt in the 1950s, WN virus circulates in an epidemiological severe in the most years; uncomplicated WN fever, which is a moderate, normal infant-based disease and is easily missed in many other febrile cases, strong context immunity and that with age. On the other hand are the advanced metropolitan regions in the temperate northern region where there was few to no prior occurrence of the WN virus; this infection was first observed in an aging and largely resistant community with a number of neuroinvasive events. A level of around a case of meningoencephalitis is close to that of some WN epidemics in Bucharest, Romania, the province of Staten Island (Richmond County), New York, and in some US epidemics of SLE in 140 WN gross viral infections, reported at BBT Queens, New York. Such proportions rely almost inevitably upon the age composition of the surveyed population, which is estimated to be higher in older populations. In Queens, the number is projected to be 1/50, and in men under 65 it is projected to be 1/300.

3. *Transmission Cycle and Host Range:*

In fact, WN Virus remains predominantly correlated with Culexsp mosquitoes in the mosquito-bird mosquito-transmission process. However, the virus is isolated from 10 genera in the United States (data not published) from 29 mosquito species. Many of these animals are not informed of their vector position and epidemiologic significance. Although Culexpipiens was a broad epizootic WN virus vector for both birds in Bucharest and New York, a strongly ornithophilic species that is always common in urban areas, its role in transmission to humans is unknown. The epidemical urban transmission of WN virus also needs *C.*

quinquefasciatus (south house mosquito), but it has considerable potential. Similarly, *C. nigripalpus* and C tarsalis are expected to potentially serve as disease vectors of the WN virus in Florida and western sections of the USA, where they exist in remote agricultural and residential areas and where they are the primary vectors of the SLE virus. Throughout Europe, *C. univittatus* seems to be the most effective carrier of the WN virus to humans. Although WN virus has been reported from both hard and soft ticks in the eastern hemisphere, ticks are definitely not big epidemic / epizotic vectors of the virus. Their position in the management of viruses is uncertain. Birds are known reservoir (amplifying) hosts for WN virus, which have been shown to infect at least 111 bird species in North America alone (unpublished data). Most avian animals, once contaminated with the WN virus, develop temporary high-titre viraemia to spread the virus to the mosquito feeding. Infected birds usually recover and establish lifelong immunity, but some individuals (particularly in North America) become ill and die. In North America the WN virus appears particularly virulent for Corvidae family species (e.g. crows and jays) which play a central part in dead-bird surveillance programs for the region's virus detection and monitoring.

4. *Pathogenesis and Pathology:*

Unknown are the precise mechanisms and locations of WN reproduction by virus after the bite of an infected mosquito, however an initial reproduction in the skin and the local lymph nodes is believed to take place and to contribute to primary viremia seeding the reticuloendothelial network (RES). The virus can then seed CNS depending on the amount of secondary virus resulting from RES replication. In healthy individuals that become sick, it is likely that the virus can typically remain blood-isolated during the peak infection that is from around 2 days prior or about 4 days after the beginning of illness. However, the effectiveness of infection isolation may decline dramatically after the first day of illness. Up to 28 days post-inoculation, the WN virus was retrieved from the blood and certain terminally ill individuals intentionally contaminated with WN virus produced extreme viremia in the blood of the immune compromised individual. Studies of young, stable individuals therefore show that viral illness due to naturally-acquired infection is typically much lower and inadequate to threaten mosquitoes. The degree of viremia arises from the virus and host specific influences and determines the outcome of clinical manifestations and diseases. The membrane of the WN virus (E) protein mediates neuro-invasive bound cells and tends to be a key component of virulence. Influences fostering WN virus CN Sentry remain uncertain but could involve influences that facilitate viral entry into and replication in the blood-brain barrier endothelium. The higher WN meningoencephalitis in the elderly can be explained by an increased amount of factors which increase viral entry into the CNS through cerebral endothelial disturbance (e.g.: hypertension, cerebrovascular condition); an increase in viral magnitude and length (e.g.: immunosuppression, immune senescence). Certain pathways suggested for CNS viral entry include axonal transportation by olfactory neurons, cytokine-directed leukocyte diapedesis via endothelial junctions or viral clearance by the choroid plexus. The risk of WN virus neuroinvasion is likely to correspond with the extent and length of VIRAEMIA, based on SLE virus experiments in laboratory animals.

5. *Laboratory Diagnosis:*

In laboratory treatment of WN viral (and most other Arboviral infections) infections in humans, serology appears to play a dominant position. The production of WN virus-specific neutral antibodies between acute and convalescent disease phases is the most compelling serological proof of infection and is connected with long-term immunity, as is shown by > four times the titular increase, normally by a plaque-reduction neutral study. For contrast, a group of other flaviviruses will be used in the study (selected as scientifically suitable). Specificity means that neutralizing WN virus antibody titres are more than four times greater than the titres of other flaviviruses associated with. A neutralizing antibody reaction to a variety of flaviviruses is typically present in second or subsequent flaviviral infections, and may also trigger diagnostic confusion. The best acute and convalescent specimens for neutralisation testing usually are those obtained on the first day of the disease for more than three weeks after the disease. While less popular in other labs, haem agglutination-inhibition monitoring is also used for serodiagnosing arboviral infections. Checking complements is never seen today. The identification of IgM in serum or CSF will cause a recent Viral WN infection – other suitably identified flaviral antigen should be included in the research battery for comparison. For this respect, immunoassays of the anticorper catch enzyme (EIA) are preferred, while there are also immunofluorescent (IFA) studies. Unless verified by neutralization testing of the same or later organism, positive findings of each process will be considered definitive. Conservatively, a subsequent specimen report will be corroborated by incorrect IgM results conducted fewer than the 14 days following the start of disease.

6. Clinical Management:

Since the therapy with uncomplicated WN virus infections is symptomatic, all patients with confirmed WN meningoencephalitis are treated for retrospective and supportive therapies and for rule-out-treatable CNS infections or disorders. Neural impairment, respiratory loss, and cerebral edema (following neural damage and death) are the most frequent cause of death in patients of WN encephalitis. There is not currently any virus-specific treatment and no controlled prophylactic trials have been recorded with corticosteroids, anticonvulsants and or osmotic agents (e.g. mannitol). The clinical effects of high-dose shortcut corticosteroids in cerebral oedema should be measured against the possible danger of viral infection. Many antivirals have been tested either in vitro in WN cell lines contaminated with viruses, in laboratory organisms, or empirically applied to some WN encephalitis patients. These compounds are classified into three general categories: purine and pyrimidine analogy (e. g. ribavirine).

7. Prevention:

There is no human WN vaccine authorized, but many vaccine testing laboratories are currently undertaking. Nevertheless, it is doubtful that these vaccinations will be cost-efficiently utilized for public safety owing to the small prevalence of WN infectious disease among human beings in most countries. Inactivated and DNA dependent vaccinations for the use in equines have been developed but have not yet been proven to be successful. Apprehensive comprehensive arbo-viral surveillance and vector mosquito control programs, which are locally-funded, focus on the successful prevention of human VN viral infection in virus areas where the disease occur. Which local mosquito species are essential for propagation, even those that may serve as a link between birds and humans, is key. A monitoring and coordinated protection will be carried out at the beginning of the year to try to interrupt virus intensity in springtime in birds and mosquitoes; larval control should be emphasized by an integrated approach which involves the reduction of sources, management of water, chemical products and biological control. Once WN virus development has been reported in the environment, chemical spraying for adult vector mosquitoes will be reserved for emergency applications. The goal would be to implement mosquito protection early enough to prevent or raising the possibility of contamination of WN virus by human and domestic animals.

CONCLUSION

WN virus is almost likely to propagate during the next two years, mainly by the migration of virus birds, throughout the continental western region of the United States. Similarly, although this epidemic does not already exist, it is expected to be imported into Central and South America and the Caribbean. WN Virus would eventually reach an ecological / epidemiological equilibrium comparable to SLE Virus, after several years or decades in the western hemisphere. In the USA, this may include enzootic / epizootic geographic or multifocal WN, a small amount of distributed case forms, occurring much of the time, with sporadic outbreaks difficult to predict.90 A median of 26 cases of SLE a year were registered in the United States (range 2-1967) (data unpublished) between 1964 and 2000. It is impossible to determine whether WN and SLE viruses communicate epidemiologically and greenly. Approximately 2,000 cases of human SLE and close to 170 deaths have been reported in the summer and fall of 1975, mainly in urban and suburban areas in the central and southern regions of the United States and particularly elderly people.90 The ecological, climatic and other factors which contributed to the outbreak remain unknown, while urban culex species obviously had prominent function. Whether an outbreak of WN meningoencephalitis, equally wide and geographically diverse, would inevitably happen is unclear, but this grim possibility poses a major obstacle for societies and politicians in several areas of the United States. It is practically certain that more, massive, metropolitan, WN meningoencephalitis-driven *C. pipiens* epidemics in the future could arise across the increasing geographical spectrum of WN viruses. Particularly susceptible are communities with comparatively weak economic and infrastructure circumstances, missing successful arbovirus detection systems and vector mosquito control programs.

REFERENCES

[1] R. (200. R. from http://www. sciencedirect. com/science/article/pii/S0169555X1200381. Carley, J., Pasternack, G., Wyrick, J., & Barker, J. (2012). Significant decadal channel change 58–67years post-dam accounting for uncertainty in topographic change detection between contour maps and point cloud models. Geomorphology, Caballero, Y., Cheva *et al.*, "Entrances used and passage through fishways for adult Chinook salmon and steelhead," *Coop. Fish …*, 1998, doi: 10.1101/gad.221010.113.

[2] G. A. Weinberg and K. M. Edwards, "Parainfluenza Viral Disease," in *Goldman's Cecil Medicine: Twenty Fourth Edition*, vol. 2, 2011, pp. 2092–2095.

[3] T. G. Fox and J. C. Christenson, "Influenza and parainfluenza viral infections in children," *Pediatr. Rev.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 217–228, 2014, doi: 10.1542/pir.35-6-217.

[4] C. Chancey, A. Grinev, E. Volkova, and M. Rios, "The global ecology and epidemiology of west nile virus," *BioMed Research International*. 2015, doi: 10.1155/2015/376230.

[5] D. Sirohi *et al.*, "The 3.8 Å resolution cryo-EM structure of Zika virus," *Science (80-.).*, 2016, doi: 10.1126/science.aaf5316.

[6] S. H. Paull *et al.*, "Drought and immunity determine the intensity of west nile virus epidemics and climate change impacts," *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1098/rspb.2016.2078.

[7] A. T. Ciota, "West Nile virus and its vectors," *Current Opinion in Insect Science*. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.cois.2017.05.002.

[8] E. Pérez-Ramírez, F. Llorente, and M. Á. Jiménez-Clavero, "Experimental infections of wild birds with West Nile virus," *Viruses*. 2014, doi: 10.3390/v6020752.

[9] H. Song, J. Qi, J. Haywood, Y. Shi, and G. F. Gao, "Zika virus NS1 structure reveals diversity of electrostatic surfaces among flaviviruses," *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 2016, doi: 10.1038/nsmb.3213.