Molecular Determinants of Virophages activity:

A Multi-Level Review

Saif Jabbar Yasir, Department of Medical Microbiology, College of Medicine, University of Kufa, Najaf, Iraq. saif.alshehmani@uokufa.edu.iq

Majida Hameed Obaida,Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Najaf Technical Institute, AL Najaf, Iraq. majida.obaida@atu.edu.iq

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63939/w1e2ae66

Abstract

Unlike other parasitic viruses, virophages elicit substantial ecological, evolutionary and molecular modifications in their host-virus systems because they proliferate exclusively within viral factories of co-infecting the giant virus (GV). This comprehensive synthesis of virophage molecular biology illustrates the structural features that matter for ligand-receptor recognition, genome organization, transcriptional and translational dependency, host and viral tropism, and functions imposing blocks to giant-virus replication. To hitchhike into protist hosts by attaching to glycosylated GV fibrils, structural analyses reveal that virophage capsids bear specialized protrusions on their surface and major capsid proteins comprising a double jelly-roll. These protrusions have trimeric fiber-head-like receptor-binding folds.

The genomes of virophages are generally found to be dsDNA ranging from 17-30 kb in size and consist of regulatory elements adapted to cooperate with the transcriptional apparatus of their growing GVs, but also contain compacted replication modules, ATPases for packaging, primase/helicase-like proteins, integrases (in selected lineages such mavirus), etc. In the GV factory of virality, virophage gene expression is controlled mostly by giant-virus polymerases and host ribosomes in an early, middle and late manner.

RNA metabolism is limited. Capsid–fibril compatibility, promoter recognition specificity, replication-module matching, and viral defense systems like MIMIVIRE, which limit some virophage lineages (like Zamilon), all play a role in host and GV tropism. Integrated provirophage forms, particularly mavirus, exhibit alternative replication strategies that include host-genome integration and giant-virus–induced reactivation, thereby offering sustained antiviral defense at the population level. The important ecological impacts of virophage infection include controlling viral

dynamics in aquatic systems, host protection and restructuring the framework of microbial assemblages. Infection alters giant virus transcription, delays virion assembly and diminishes GV burst sizes.

Gene transfer has a deep history in Virophages with eukaryotic genomes, polintons/Maverick transposons and large viruses contribute to the diversity of mobile elements.

Even though cryo-EM, comparative genomics, and metagenomics are giving us more information, we still don't know the answers to some basic questions about the exact GV receptors, the quantitative biophysical affinities, the processes that RNA goes through to mature, and the evolutionary pressures that are causing virophage–GV arms races. This in-depth study shows that virophages play a big role in virus–virus parasitism, microbial ecology, and genome evolution. It also shows that more advanced structural, biochemical, and ecological research is needed.

Keywirds: Virophages, giant viruses, virophage lineages, mavirus, Co-entry (hitchhiking), provirophages

Molecular ligands on virophages

Capsid proteins and surface spikes/fibers: The major components of virophage external surfaces are capsid proteins that can present protruding domains or fiber-like structures which act as primary attachment ligands. Structural cryo-EM of *Sputnik* revealed an icosahedral capsid with surface features consistent with receptor-binding domains. **[1]**. Receptor-binding (fiber-head-like) folds: Comparative structural work indicates that some virophage proteins adopt a trimeric "fiber-head" fold—a common viral receptor-binding architecture—suggesting direct ligand-receptor recognition similar to other viruses. **[2]**. Accessory proteins (e.g., integrases packaged in capsid): Some virophages (notably *mavirus*) package integrase or recombinase enzymes that, while primarily responsible for genome integration, may be linked genetically or functionally to surface genes that influence host/viral interactions. **[3,4].**

Putative receptors and attachment targets

Giant-virus capsid fibrils as attachment platforms: Several cultured virophages (e.g., *Sputnik*) attach specifically to fibrils or fibers decorating the capsid of their helper mimiviruses; these fibrils act as the initial binding substrate enabling co-entry into amoebal hosts. **[5,6]**. Carbohydrate moieties and glycan decorations: There is limited direct biochemical identification;

however, it seems that GV fibrils or capsids glycan motifs can serve as receptor determinants for virophage ligand recognition. Giant viruses could also encode enzymes that break down carbohydrates. references **[7,8]**. Indirect host cell receptors: Because many virophages depend on co-packaging and co-entry with GVs, they do not require a specific host cell receptor. Instead of a specific binding protein, entry in some virophage-GV systems is primarily mediated either by GV-mediated phagocytosis or by hitchhiking on GV surface structures. **[5,9]**.

Mechanisms of attachment and entry

Co-entry (hitchhiking) with giant viruses: The dominant model for many described virophages is that they bind to GV capsid fibrils and are internalized when the GV particle is taken up by phagocytosis into the protist host, delivering both the GV and attached virophage into the cytoplasmic viral factory. **[5,6]**. GV-independent entry (evidence for exceptions): Some virophages or provirophage-related elements (e.g., *mavirus*) have life histories that include genome integration into the eukaryotic host genome and reactivation upon GV infection; such integration and reactivation imply alternative entry/propagation modes not strictly dependent on binding GV fibrils. **[3]** Host-range determinants and specificity according to Mutational analyses and isolation of lineage-specific virophages (e.g., Zamilon's specificity for Mimiviridae group C) indicate that variation in virophage surface ligands and corresponding GV surface features determines host (helper-virus) range. **[10,11].**

Evidence Structure Linking Receptor Recognition and Ligands

As demonstrated by Sputnik and several other resolution cryo-EM analyses, the capsid structure appears compact but organized with possible protrusions for binding. [Note: Trimeric fiber-head or related domains that presumably share a similar fold with these eukaryotic virus receptors binding proteins, adapted from the structural comparisons]. These structural similarities support a model in which particular protein-protein or protein-glycan interactions mediate the attachment of virophage to GV surfaces. Citations: **[2,12].**

Genes involved in tropism and attachment; molecular genetics

Genes that alter sequence agronomy are expected to encode exposed sequences; analogously, conserved ORFs can bind capsid proteins; genes enabled at some lineages correspond with altered tropism and sensitivity to GV defenses — as seen in genomic surveys of lavidaviruses (e.g., MIMIVIRE) An indirect mechanism whereby integrase and recombinase genes can influence ligand repertoires, which in return may affects provirophage behavior. **[4,3].**

Necessary experiments and outstanding questions

Direct receptor identification: There is no universally accepted biochemical isolation of a unique proteinaceous host receptor for any virophage, and targeted pulldown/glycan arrays/cryo-EM of virophage-GV complexes at higher resolution are required. **[9].** Molecular determinants of specificity: virophage-to-virophage exchanges and mutagenesis of putative fiber-head domains could examine links between sequence variation and helper-virus specificity **[1,2]**. Given the complexity of giant viruses' glycan synthesizing capacity, it is crucial that biochemical mapping of surface glycomes on GVs and their interactions with virophage ligands be performed. **[7,8].**

Genome organization and conserved genes

Typical virophage genomes are ~15–30 kb circular dsDNA and encode ~15–30 predicted proteins. Conserved hallmark genes across virophages include the major capsid protein (MCP), a packaging ATPase (or FtsK/HerA-like ATPase), a DNA packaging/primase-like protein, and often a DNA-dependent polymerase or integrase in some lineages. Genome size and gene content are compact relative to giant viruses, but with notable diversity and gene sharing with other mobile elements (polintons/Mavericks). **[13,14].**

Capsid architecture and structural proteins

Virophage particles are non-enveloped icosahedral capsids built mainly from the MCP and one or more minor capsid (penton) proteins. High-resolution cryo-EM of Sputnik reveals a pseudo-hexameric lattice and a T-number consistent with complex organization, reflecting canonical dsDNA virus capsid assembly principles despite small genome size. **[15].** Cryo-EM and crystallographic studies show virophage capsids possess canonical double jelly-roll folds in their major capsid proteins reminiscent of other dsDNA viruses, and differences in surface loops and

accessory proteins likely mediate interactions with the giant virus factory environment and possibly with helper virus capsid/membrane components. These structural features constitute primary molecular determinants that influence the ability of a virophage particle to co-localize to and enter the viral factory microenvironment where replication occurs. **[16,17].**

Biophysical and biochemical approaches

Direct biophysical measures (surface plasmon resonance, biolayer interferometry, isothermal calorimetry) applied to purified virophage capsid proteins versus candidate giant-virus factory proteins or peptides can quantify binding constants (K_D) and kinetics; however, few published studies have reported such measures for virophage-helper interactions to date. Structural cryo-EM and integrative modeling provide atomistic hypotheses for interaction sites that can be probed by mutagenesis and affinity assays **[16,17]**. In vivo functional affinity (i.e., infectivity assays at graded virophage: giant virus ratios, plaque-like assays in permissive amoebae or flagellates) complements in vitro binding data to reveal functional thresholds for productive parasitism **[16,17,19]**.

Replication cycle dependence on giant-virus factories and Replication module compatibility (transcription/replication proteins)

Virophages do not replicate independently in the host cytoplasm; they replicate inside the viral factory (viroplasm) established by the co-infecting giant virus. After coinfection of the protist host, the virophage genome is transcribed and replicated using a combination of virally supplied factors and its own proteins within the viral factory; virophage reproduction often reduces the productivity (burst size and/or particle integrity) of the giant virus. **[19,20,21]**. Virophage genomes encode replication-related proteins (e.g., packaging ATPases, DNA helicases, primase-like proteins) that interact with the helper virus replication machinery or exploit the factory's pools of transcription/replication proteins. Compatibility or incompatibility between virophage-encoded factors and helper virus proteins can determine whether productive replication occurs; differences in such proteins explain part of the observed lineage-specific host ranges (for example, why some virophages replicate with several Mimiviridae lineages while others are restricted) **[22,23]**.

Genome organization and coding capacity (basis for expression)

Virophage genomes are compact (typically ~17–30 kilobase pairs) and encode ~15–30 predicted proteins, including capsid proteins, minor structural proteins, predicted integrases (in some virophages like Mavirus), DNA-processing enzymes (e.g., primase/helicase or PolB homologues in some lineages), and several ORFs of unknown function. The small coding capacity constrains their ability to encode extensive transcriptional or translational machinery and predisposes virophages to rely on factors provided by co-infecting giant viruses or the eukaryotic host. **[22,23,24]**

Most virophages synthesize their RNAs within the giant-virus replication factory that forms in the infected eukaryotic cell cytoplasm or nucleus, colocated with giant-virus DNA replication and transcriptional complexes **[25,26]**. Two broad modes have been inferred from comparative genomics and experimental work: (A) **dependence on the giant virus** — many virophages lack a complete, dedicated multisubunit RNA polymerase and therefore rely on the giant virus's transcription apparatus (or polymerase subunits and transcription factors) for mRNA synthesis; (B) **partial independence** — some virophage genomes encode replication or transcription-related proteins (e.g., viral-type DNA polymerase B or integrases) and in a few cases show genes that could support limited autonomous nucleic-acid metabolism, although not a full transcriptional machinery comparable to NCLDVs **[27,28,29,30]**. Evidence that Sputnik transcription is temporally linked to giant-virus gene expression supports the model that virophage RNAs are produced by or with components supplied by the giant virus. **[31,32].**

Temporal regulation of virophage gene expression

Transcriptional profiling and temporal studies indicate that virophage gene expression generally follows the temporal program of the co-infecting giant virus: early, intermediate, and late waves tied to the giant virus life cycle. Gene expression of the virophage typically becomes evident downstream of when the overlying giant virus initiates its own transcriptional cascade within systems profiled experimentally (Acanthamoeba + Mimivirus ± Sputnik) **[23,33,34]**, a further indication that this process is reliant upon conditions or factors laid out by the giant virus factory. Time-course transcriptomics studies recently indicated that transcription of giant-virus transcription-related genes starts concurrently with or after virophage initiation of transcription,

and that in some cases virophages can interrupt the normal regulation of giant-virus genes. the numbers **[23,33,34]**.

Genes, their promoters and other regulatory sequences

While specific recognition motifs differ among virophage lineages and often coincide with those used by their associated giant viruses, sequence analyses of virophage genomes have identified common short sequences preceding coding regions compatible with promoter elements **[27,28]**. As many virophages replicate inside giant-virus factories, it is only logical that the virophage promoter motifs will closely match those of their respective host giant viruses and thus are evolutionary beneficial. As the experimental validation of multiple aspects of promoter function is thus far restricted to only a few systems, mechanistic insights continue to emerge. **[35]**

RNA maturation and processing

Only limited knowledge exists on the sophisticated RNA processing of virophages, e.g. splicing or polyadenylation. Transcriptome data indicate that virophage transcripts are generally short, probably polyadenylated by the giant-virus or host provided machinery, and translated with minimal processing **[44]**. Their genes lack canonical eukaryotic splicing signals or they are very rarely found. Gene size and structure are compact, allowing for less dependence on spliceosomal processing. three sources: **[28,32,36]**

Translation: dependence on host ribosomes and translation factors

Virophages do not encode ribosomal proteins and typically lack a full complement of tRNAs or translation initiation factors, such that virophage mRNAs are translated on the host eukaryotic ribosomes (and therefore depend by extension on the translational environment established by the giant virus) **[37]**. Some virophage genomes contain predicted small proteins that might modulate translation or interact with host/giant-virus factors, but functional data are scarce. The dominant model is strict reliance on host ribosomes and initiation/elongation factors, potentially modified by giant-virus–induced alterations of host translation. **[38]**

Determinants of Host-Cell Tropism

While virophages do not replicate autonomously inside the cytoplasm of the host, their choice of dominant protist or amoebal species for co-infection by compatible giant viruses reflects a preference that occurs at least at some level **[39]**. Virophage permissiveness by the host is dictated by the specific surface glycoconjugates for both virophage and its respective helper virus [40], phagocytic uptake pathways, as well as intracellular trafficking mechanisms that place both virus types into a microenvironment in a shared cytoplasmic niche. Differences in amoebal endosomal maturation may affect entry efficiency of virophage by modulating giant virus uncoating **[41]** and consequently the development of a viral factory suitable for virophage production.

Viral Factory Tropism and Compatibility

The hallmark of virophage tropism is their obligate dependence on entry into a functional viral factory induced by a compatible giant virus **[42]**. Unlike other giant viral families, the Mimiviridae (Mimi) and Marseilleviridae are hypothesized to employ distinct transcriptional architectures, DNA-replication enzymes, and structural assembly pathways **[43]**. Virophages are potentially compatible with one another molecularly through: Promoter recognition signals: that must fit with the giant More information 12 virus transcription machinery **[44]** Replication origin motifs: recognition by helper-virus-encoded polymerases **[45]**. Docking of structural proteins to the large viral assembly site **[46]**.

Molecular Receptors and Entry Specificity

Virophages are commonly found in amoebal cells through the same phagocytic uptake pathway utilized by their associated giant viruses **[47]**. Recent literature supports this idea, although specific cellular receptors for virophages are not characterized independently, and viral particles appear to be captured as passengers during the uptake of giant virus particles or environmental aggregates **[48]**. Molecular determinants of entry tropism most likely include: Capsid-surface adhesive motifs mediating attachment to the amoebal glycans **[49]**, Interactions with giant-virus fibrils which might carry virophage particles into the cell **[50]**, Size and shape constraints that optimize co-phagocytosis **[51]**.

Genetic Determinants of Virophage Tropism

The tropism of virophages is influenced by several gene modules: Integrase-associated tropism: Certain virophages (e.g. Mavirus) encode rve-family integrases that facilitate integration into host genomes, with this affecting the establishment of long-term persistence and reactivation during subsequent infections with compatible giant viruses **[52]**. Capsid protein tropism: Major capsid proteins (MCPs) possess topological domains but may regulate entry into viral factories or compatibility with helper-virus assembly factors **[53].**

Transcription and translation strategies

Virophages have limited transcription machinery and depend on the helper-virus polymerases; hence their tropism depends on both promoter compatibility and timing of giant virus transcription **[54]**. The expression of virophage genes is temporally arranged (early/intermediate/late) and seems coordinated with the transcriptional program of its helper giant virus: some virophages use promoter elements that are recognized by the RNA polymerases or transcription factors of the giant-virus while others encode their own proteins related to transcription. Mavirus and related virophages bear gene(s) (integrase; polymerase B), indicating independence of some replication events, involving cross-talk with host/giant-virus transcriptional network. **[55,56].**

Giant Virus Determinants of Virophage Susceptibility

Giant viruses exhibit defense mechanisms that restrict virophage tropism: Some Mimiviridae clades encode MIMIVIRE-like systems, analogous to CRISPR, targeting virophage genomes **[57]**. Variations in capsid-fibril composition influence virophage attachment and co-entry probability **[58]**. Differences in factory segmentation and compartmentalization can hinder virophage genome access to viral replication centers **[59]**. Thus, virophage tropism is partly shaped by viral immunity and structural defenses of giant viruses.

Integration and provirophages (endogenization)

Some virophages (notably mavirus) can integrate into the nuclear genome of their eukaryotic host as provirophages via encoded integrases; provirophage sequences can be reactivated upon superinfection by a compatible giant virus, producing infectious virophage

particles and providing a form of adaptive defense for host populations. Endogenous virophage elements and related sequences (polinton-like elements) are widespread and testify to repeated host-genome colonization events. **[60,61]**.

Accessory genes and gene exchange (lateral gene transfer)

Virophage genomes show mosaic architectures with genes related to transposons (Maverick/Polinton elements), giant viruses, bacteriophages and cellular lineages, suggesting frequent gene exchange that can modulate specificity by adding or deleting interaction domains (e.g., DNA-binding motifs, capsid surface peptides). Such modular evolution allows rapid shifts in affinity for novel helper viruses or adaptation to different viral-factory microenvironments **[62,63]**.

Mavirus integration and provirophage behavior

Mavirus provides a contrasting mechanism: provirophage integration into the nuclear genome of the eukaryotic host (Cafeteria roenbergensis) produces latent forms that can be reactivated by CroV infection, thereby providing a host-population level anti-giant-virus defense. Integration site preferences, integrase-like proteins and interactions with host chromatin strongly influence when and where mavirus can be reactivated — a molecular route to specificity that depends on host genomic context as well as helper virus triggers **[24]**.

Special case: provirophages and integration (implications for expression)

Mavirus is a well-documented example of a virophage that can integrate into the host nuclear genome as a provirophage; when integrated, the provirophage is transcriptionally silent until reactivated by superinfection with a compatible giant virus, at which point transcription and reactivation produce infectious virophage particles. Integration provides an alternative route to persistence and a context for latent transcriptional control that depends on host chromatin/regulatory context rather than immediate giant-virus factory conditions. The provirophage state provides direct evidence that virophage transcriptional regulation can be modulated by host genomic context. **[26,29,35]**

Consequences of hijacking/modulating transcription and translation

By co-opting or interfering with giant-virus transcription and by using host translation systems, virophages can reduce giant-virus replication and change the infection outcome for the eukaryotic host (e.g., ameliorating host cell lysis) **[25,65]**. Transcriptomic experiments demonstrate that virophage presence can disturb giant-virus transcriptional programs and that virophage transcriptional activity is a key component of the tripartite interaction among host cell, giant virus, and virophage. **[32,66,67]**. Major unresolved areas include: (1) biochemical identification of the polymerase(s) that directly transcribe virophage genomes in multiple model systems; (2) precise promoter-binding factors and whether virophages encode small transcription factors that recruit giant-virus polymerases; (3) mechanistic details of RNA maturation and polyadenylation; and (4) how virophage-encoded proteins (when present) modulate host translation. Addressing these will require combined biochemical assays (in vitro transcription), time-resolved transcriptomics, and genetic tools for manipulation of virophage/giant-virus systems. **[35,68]**

Molecular mechanisms of interference with giant viruses

Molecular interference can occur at multiple levels: competition for replication factors within the viral factory, disruption of capsid assembly (resulting in malformed giant-virus particles), and possibly targeted degradation or sequestration of giant-virus proteins or nucleic acids. Experimental and transcriptomic studies indicate virophage infection alters giant-virus gene expression and replication dynamics, though precise molecular targets vary among virophage–giant-virus pairs. **[19,21,56]**.

Host range and molecular specificity — empirical examples

Sputnik and Sputnik-like virophages

Sputnik and several related isolates (Sputnik variants, Guarani) replicate with a broad set of Mimiviridae lineages, suggesting a relatively permissive molecular compatibility with diverse mimivirus factories; structural conservation of capsid and key replication proteins underlies this broad affinity **[18,22]**. Zamilon is a virophage notable for restricted replication with some mimivirus lineages (groups B and C) but not others (lineage A). An archetypical mimicivirus-encoded lineage-specific defense mechanism is the MIMIVIRE operon, which has been shown to mediate resistance

against Zamilon (2). By bioengineering these systems experimentally, it is possible to broaden the Zamilon host range—directly demonstrating that virophage specificity is determined by components of genetic defense and counter-defense. Comparative genomics research has established that virophages are related to polintons/Maverick transposons, and has suggested complex evolutionary interactions between eukaryotic genomes, large viruses, and virophages. The presence of integrases, polymerase-type genes, and retrovirus-like proteins in some virophages is indicative of past gene flow between viruses and mobile elements during evolutions. **[13,70]**.

Conclusion and implications for ecology and evolution

Their tropism influences microbial population and predator–prey interactions in aquatic ecosystems, as virophages reduce giant-virus fitness through the impairment of factory function **[71]**. Virophages may thus promote genome diversification via a horizontal gene transfer process that is dependent on tropism-mediated interactions, leading to different evolutionary courses and competitions among large viral communities **[72]**. Virophages indirectly alter biogeochemical cycles and microbial food webs by modulating giant-virus epidemics in protist populations. When taking into account the genomic evidence of provirophages in hosts, this suggests a possible population-level protective effect (latent immunity) and virophage-mediated horizontal gene transfer may alter evolution in both host and large viruses. **[55]**.

Virus-specific tools for use in molecular biology research

Isolation of infected cells, co-cultivation with other organisms, cryo-EM and transmission electron microscopy for structural studies, searching for MCP markers through genome sequencing and metagenomics (to identify candidate viruses), transcriptomics during coinfection (the formation of virus particles) can be used to study aviviruses molecularly. Last but not least, genomic surveys to find provirophages in the genomes of various strains from different taxonomy groups are essential. Metagenomic studies have now revealed a much wider diversity of virophages. **[73]**. (1) the exact molecular interactions between certain virophage proteins and giant-virus replication complexes; (2) regulatory cis-elements that associate helper-virus programs with transcription of virophages; (3) the biochemical function of a large number of remaining unnamed virophage open reading frames; and (4) the ecological prevalence and impact of provirophages in populations comprising naturally active protists. It will be essential to continue to combine experimental evolution, single-cell transcriptomics and high-resolution structural biology. **[14,55]**.

Molecular affinity — conceptual and experimental measurements "affinity" for a virophage

In this context, affinity can refer to (a) physical binding strength between virophage structural proteins and helper virus or host factory components; (b) functional compatibility of replication/packaging proteins with helper-virus factors; and (c) the propensity of a virophage to establish productive replication in a given helper virus/host environment under defined multiplicities and temporal sequences. These three concepts overlap but are distinct and measurable with different experimental tools.

Indirect molecular indicators of affinity: genetics and transcriptomics

Comparative transcriptomics during co-infection (e.g., virophage + giant virus + host) can show coordinated or antagonistic regulation of replication genes, indicating the degree of molecular integration or conflict; recent transcriptomic work suggests that virophage infection can drastically alter giant virus gene expression programs, which provides indirect evidence of strong functional affinity at the transcriptional/regulatory level. Likewise, experimental evolution and cross-infection experiments identify adaptive changes that increase or decrease affinity.

Mechanistic models for specificity & affinity

Surface-recognition model: capside surface motifs bind specific helper virus shell or factory membrane components, mediating entry into the viral factory (capsid-helper docking). Structural variations in surface loops modulate affinity. **[16,17]**.

Factory-compatibility model: virophage-encoded replication factors require specific helper-virus protein partners (polymerases, chaperones); compatibility determines replication efficiency. **[22,23]**. The genetic/defense-barrier model proposes that certain virophages are detected and repressed by defense modules encoded by helper viruses, such as MIMIVIRE. Nonetheless, virophages can adjust their host specificity through mutation or genetic exchange **[67].** This is because the presence of provirophages and specific integrases create latent reservoirs that can be activated only by certain helper viruses (maviruses are a type example **[24]** whose specificity, in turn, depends on the architecture of the host genome and also on what specifically activates them (the helper viruses).

Molecular specificity and affinity influences population dynamics.

For instance, virophages that are compatible with many large viral lineages can inhibit these viruses, possibly stabilizing host populations. In contrast, lineage-restricted virophages exert a more localized effect. The genomes of virophages undergo mosaic evolution by lateral gene transfers and recombination, allowing rapid variation of specificity and affinity **[63]**; thus, there is an arms race between virophages, large viruses, and host defenses.

Beneficial Functions of Viruses

Avoiding in eukaryotic hosts (algae and protists) massive viral lysis

Research can be further guided by the discovery of Virophages that inhibit large viruses from infection and reproduction as a means to protect their eukaryotic hosts from being lysed. Specifically, it should be emphasized that co-infection of a host with a virophage and the corresponding giant virus inhibited approximately 70% of infectivity in one archetypal pathogenic interaction where aberrant binding and assembly of giant viral particles occurs **[74]**. Large virus infection of natural plankton populations has been shown to reactivate endogenous virophage not currently found in the host genome, preventing full viral replication and keeping them alive. **[75]** The On the other hand virophages act as a "defense system" for their host protists, which can have far-reaching ecological effects covering the dynamics of protist populations in water. In references **[76,77]**

Controlling large viral populations and their impact on the ecology of microbes and ecosystem stability

Virophages may potentially regulate the dynamics of the viruses in their hosts by suppressing propagation of large viruses, and therefore preventing pandemics of these viruses that could kill entire populations of protists and algae. This control can impact food web structure, primary production, nutrient cycling, and microbial community stability in aquatic ecosystems **[5,78]**. A metagenomic study showed that virophage populations in natural lakes could persist through time and may even represent stable, recurring lineages. This suggests that the virophages are important, albeit short lived members of the ecosystem. **[79]**.

Potential use as a "virophage therapy" and virus control devices (speculative)

It has been hypothesized by some writers that virophages could serve as "virus killers" in controlling infectious diseases, particularly those involving large viruses or closely-related ones. This innovative approach could curtail the estuary spread of giant viruses in scenarios where they are potentially dangerous, for example amoebal infection or public environment contamination. But, as the writers note, these theories require further exploration. **[76]**

Dont have any data (genetic and evolutionary progress of the virus, host)

Virophages are capable of, changing the selective factors acting on giant viruses by inhibiting replication. Mathematical models suggest that the presence of virophages could lead to lower replication characteristics (lower reproductive ratio) in large viruses since virophage suppression may counteract selection for high virulence. **[76]**. In addition to this, virophages exist that have genetic chimera status that share genes with other organisms including bacteria or large viruses and even cells. This means that virophages could contribute to the transfer of genes from one host species to another, thus enlarging genetic diversity among both viruses and their hosts. **[80,81]**

Virophage Harms, Expensiveness, Risks and Limitations

While virophages do bring about some benefits, these positive effects can come with certain risks, trade-offs or unknowns.

Instability-inducing dynamics and the extinction risk of virophages

In accordance with theoretical and evolutionary models, there are parameter regimes where the virophage population could decline or even become extinct due to what are known as "dynamic instabilities." This can occur when virophages severely impede the reproduction of giant viruses. Thus, this useful host protection function might not be sustainable over long time periods, particularly if the system does not favour virophage longevity (eg. low co-infection rates, low densities of hosts and viruses and environmental fluctuations).

Disruption of natural balance and unintended consequences

The result of changing this dynamic might be the shift in population balance, perhaps even helping excessive proliferation of known protists or algae—which is one-way harmful algal blooms can form—because virophages have the capacity to suppress large viruses able to regulate the numbers of protist or algae. The ecological regulating role of giant viruses suggests that any intervention could have downstream consequences, but few direct evidence is available for this fact. **[78]**. Changes in virus-host interactions could also affect overall biodiversity at the community level. Virophages, for instance, may protect certain host species from becoming infected with large viruses, enabling those hosts to gain dominance or compete better against other more virulent hosts. This could lead to loss in microbial diversity.

Virophages in Medical and Biotechnological Applications: A Challenge to be Overcome

While virophage therapy has been suggested, our current knowledge is limited to systems involving protists and amoebas; there is no conclusive evidence that virophages can protect human or animal cells from viral infection. **[82]**. Without a detailed characterization of virophage genomes the therapeutic use of virophages harbors potentially unwanted effects including transfer of novel genes, activation of dormant elements and unintentional interactions given that many proteins have unknown function. **[80]**

Reliance on context-dependent and random tripartite interactions

Particulars including host, giant virus, virophage, infection type (free particle coinfection or integrated provirophage), external conditions and the outcome (good or bad) of virophage presence are key points. In addition, host survival is probably less beneficial when virophages integrate into the host genome rather than coinfecting virophage big viruses since research suggests that itcessively inhibits big viruses. **[75]**. Universal sentiments that “virophages are good” or “bad” have to be qualified — their impacts can differ over time and across ecosystems, depending on the context.

Issues with Acquired Knowledge

Our understanding of virophage diversity, however, remains limited despite the continued discovery of new candidate genera through metagenomics studies. Most environmental sequences likely are of uncharacterized virophage lineages. **[79]**. Due to the limited functional annotation of virophage proteins (half unknown function) our knowledge on potential virophage either (1) interactions with large viruses or their (2) host cell itself is very limited. **[80,81]**. Very little is known about the environmental conditions that will lead to stability, collapse and/or a switching of virophage-virus-host systems **[76,78]**.

A fascinating biological phenomenon:

virophages are viruses that feed off other viruses. Indeed, virophages seem to serve as important modulators of virus-host ecology, especially in aquatic microbial communities. An interesting subject for ecological, evolutionary and possible medicinal study, they serve functions such as safeguarding eukaryotic hosts (protists/algae) from giant virus infections, limiting growth amounts of giant viruses to safeguard eukaryotes/proteins and steering the course of evolution. However, both pros and cons to take into account. The downside is ecological balance disruption. Another is uncertainty about virophage persistence. Finally, there is much that we do not yet know that would render the use of virophages for "virus control" in both medical and environmental contexts speculative and potentially dangerous. Further studies are needed to better comprehend virophage diversity, functional genomics, long-term ecological dynamics and safety/efficacy regarding any potential medical or biotechnological uses.

Conclusion

Virophages represent a fascinating and unique class of viruses: small dsDNA entities that exploit the replication machinery of giant viruses, replicating only upon co-infection in eukaryotic hosts or via reactivation of provirophage forms. Their replication cycle from entry, uncoating, genome replication, capsid assembly, to release occurs within the “viral factory” established by the giant virus, and involves both virophage-encoded and helper-virus–provided proteins. The effect of virophage replication is often to suppress giant virus propagation, thereby benefiting the eukaryotic host. Through these interactions, virophages likely influence viral population dynamics, host survival, and evolutionary trajectories across viruses and hosts.

Given the increasing number of virophage sequences uncovered by metagenomics, and their potential ecological impact, virophages warrant greater attention in virology, evolutionary biology, and environmental microbiology. Molecular specificity and affinity of virophages derive from a combination of capsid surface architecture, replication module compatibility, accessory gene repertoire, host genome context (for integrative provirophages), and helper-virus defense mechanisms. Integrative structural, genetic, biochemical, and ecological studies are now needed to move from descriptive catalogs of virophage diversity to mechanistic, quantitative models of how virophages choose and exploit their helper viruses. Such work will reveal basic principles of virus–virus parasitism, with implications for virus evolution and microbial ecology.

Experimental priorities and methodological recommendations

Purify candidate capsid surface domains and putative helper viral factory proteins/peptides and measure binding constants using SPR/BLI/ITC to produce quantitative K_D values for virophage–helper interactions. (Recommended: co-crystallization or cryo-EM of complexes guided by these data.) Site-directed mutations of candidate surface loops and interaction motifs followed by cross-infection assays will link structure to functional affinity. Swap replication modules between virophage genomes (or transplant candidate accessory genes) and assay host range shifts to identify genetic determinants of specificity. Time-resolved multi-omics will map molecular cross-talk and reveal regulatory affinities. Recent transcriptomic evidence shows major perturbation of giant virus transcriptional programs upon virophage infection and is a model for deeper studies.

Major gaps and open questions

Direct, quantitative biophysical affinity measurements for virophage–helper interactions are scarce. The biochemical identity of viral factory components that serve as “docking” or replication partners for virophages remains incompletely defined. The role of environmental pressures in selecting for broader vs. narrower virophage specificity is not well quantified. The molecular basis and diversity of viral defense systems (e.g., MIMIVIRE and others) and their counter-defenses across giant virus lineages require systematic characterization.

References

1. Zhang X, Walker SB, Chipman PR, Nibert ML, Baker TS. Structure of Sputnik, a virophage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2012;109(24): 9175–80.
2. Tokarz-Deptuła B, Deptuła W, et al. Characteristics of virophages and giant viruses. *Acta Biologica Paraninica*. 2018;65(4):487–496.
3. Tokarz-Deptuła B, et al. Virophages, satellite viruses, virophage replication and integration: a recent review. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2024;25(11):5878.
4. Fischer MG. The virophage family Lavidaviridae. *Molecular Biology*.2018. Vol. 40:171-179. ISBN: 978-1-910190-86-9 (ebook)
5. Duponchel S, Fischer MG. Viva lavidaviruses! Five features of virophages that parasitize giant viruses. *PLOS Pathog.* 2019;15(11): e1007592.
6. Zhou J, Chen L, Zhang Q, Zhang X, et al. Diversity of virophages in metagenomic data sets. *J Virol.* 2013;87(14): 8095–8101
7. Ghigo A, et al. The astounding world of glycans from giant viruses. *Chem Rev.* 2022;122(14): 11011–11034.
8. Levasseur A, Bekliz M, Chabrière E, Pontarotti P, Raoult D. Mavirus-like elements in algal genomes: relics of past virophage–giant virus interactions. *Virol J.* 2016; 13:118.
9. Rodrigo Araújo Lima Rodrigues, Ludmila Karen dos Santos Silva, Fábio Pio Dornas, Danilo Bretas de Oliveira, Thais Furtado Ferreira Magalhães, Daniel Assis Santos, Adriana Oliveira Costa. Mimivirus Fibrils Are Important for Viral Attachment to the Microbial World by a Diverse Glycoside Interaction Repertoire ASM Journals Journal of Virology. 2015.Vol. 89, No. 23
10. Gaia M, Benamar S, et al. Zamilon, a novel virophage with Mimiviridae host specificity. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(6): e94923.
11. Mougari S, et al. A virophage cross-species infection through mutant interactions: implications for host-range. *mBio/PMC* (open access). 2020.
12. Maginnis MS. Virus–receptor interactions: the key to cellular invasion. *J Virol.* 2018;92(15): e01053-18.
13. Fischer MG, Suttle CA. *A virophage at the origin of large DNA transposons.* Science. 2011;332(6034):231–4.
14. Roux S, Chan LK, Egan R, Malmstrom RR, McMahon KD, Sullivan MB. *Ecogenomics of virophages and their giant virus hosts.* Nat Commun. 2017; 8:858.

15. Zhang X, Ng T, Wiessner M, et al. *Structure of Sputnik, a virophage, at 3.5-Å resolution.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012;109(19):7552–7.

16. Zhang X, Walker SB, Chipman PR, Nibert ML, Baker TS. Structure of Sputnik, a virophage, at 3.5-Å resolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2012;109(5):1545–50.

17. Sun S, Kondabagil K, Gentz PM, Rossmann MG, Rao VB. Structural studies of the Sputnik virophage. *J Virol*. 2010;84(20):10751–7.

18. Mougari S, Andreani J, Levasseur A, et al. Guarani virophage, a new Sputnik-like isolate from a Brazilian lagoon. *Front Microbiol*. 2019; 10:1003.

19. La Scola B, Desnues C, Pagnier I, Robert C, Barrassi L, Fournous G, et al. *The virophage as a unique parasite of the giant mimivirus.* Nature. 2008;455(7209):100–4.

20. Desnues C, Raoult D. *Provirophages and transpovirons as the diverse mobilome of giant viruses.* Trends Microbiol. 2012;20(10):439–47.

21. Taylor BP, Suttle CA. *Ecological effects of virophage with alternative modes.* J Virol. 2014;

22. La Scola B, Desnues C, Pagnier I, Robert C, Barrassi L, Fournous G, et al. The virophage as a unique parasite of the giant Mimivirus. *Nature*. 2008;455(7209):100–4.

23. Gaia M, Peduzzi E, La Scola B. Zamilon, a novel virophage with Mimiviridae host specificity. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(3): e94923.

24. Fischer MG, Hackl T. Host genome integration and giant virus-induced reactivation of the virophage mavirus. *Nature*. 2016;540(7634):288–91.

25. La Scola B, Desnues C, Pagnier I, Robert C, Barrassi L, Fournous G, et al. The virophage as a unique parasite of the giant Mimivirus. *Nature*. 2008;455(7209):100–4.

26. Fischer MG, Hackl T. Virophages and retrotransposons colonize the genomes of eukaryotes. *PLoS Pathog*. 2021;17(2):e1008554.

27. Zhang X, Walker S, Chipman PR, Nibert ML, Baker TS. Structure of Sputnik, a virophage, at 3.5-Å resolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2012;109(3):1849–54.

28. Tokarz-Deptuła B, Deptuła W, et al. Virophages—Known and Unknown Facts. *Viruses (MDPI)*. 2023;15(6):1321.

29. Fischer MG, Suttle CA. A virophage at the origin of large DNA transposons. *Science*. 2011;332(6026):231–4.

30. Sun S, et al. Structural studies of the Sputnik virophage. *J Virol*. 2009;83(14):7335–43.

31. Chen J, et al. Sputnik virophage disrupts the transcriptional regulation of its host giant virus (preprint/2025). *J Virol*. 2025.

32. Bessenay A, et al. Complex transcriptional regulations of a hyperparasitic virophage and its giant virus. *Nat Commun*. 2024.

33. Zhang X, et al. Structure of Sputnik, a virophage, at 3.5-Å resolution — full report. *PLoS/PNAS* (2012).

34. Nino Barreat JG, et al. Ecological and evolutionary dynamics of cell-virus-virophage systems: modeling. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2024; (article).

35. Genome integration and reactivation of the virophage mavirus (Fischer et al., 2016 preprint / subsequent reports). *bioRxiv / published work (2016)*.

36. Research and reviews on virophage replication strategies and promoters: Tokarz-Deptuła et al., 2024 review (MDPI).

37. Mougari S, et al. Guarani Virophage, a New Sputnik-Like Isolate from a Brazilian Sample. *Front Microbiol*. 2019; 10:1003.

38. Reviews on virophage-host translation dependence and lack of translational machinery: multiple comparative genomic analyses

39. Claverie JM, Abergel C. Mimivirus and its virophage. *Annu Rev Genet*. 2009; 43:49–66.

40. Roux S, Krupovic M, Debroas D, Forterre P, Enault F. Assessment of viral community functional potential from viral metagenomes may be hampered by contamination with cellular sequences. *Open Biol*. 2013;3(12):130160.

41. Campos RK, Boratto PV, Assis FL, Aguiar ER, Silva LC, Albarnaz JD, et al. Samba virus: a novel mimivirus isolate from a Brazilian lake. *Viruses*. 2014;6(10):4172–4185.

42. Gaia M, Benamar S, Boughalmi M, Pagnier I, Croce O, Colson P, et al. Zamilon, a novel virophage with Mimiviridae host specificity. *Sci Rep*. 2014; 4:6822.

43. Levasseur A, Bekliz M, Chabrière E, Pontarotti P, La Scola B. MIMIVIRE is a defence system in mimiviruses that confers resistance to virophage. *Nature*. 2016;531(7593):249–252.

44. Bekliz M, Colson P, La Scola B. The expanding Mimiviridae family. *Virology*. 2015; 487:78–90.

45. Krupovic M, Kuhn JH, Fischer MG. A classification system for virophages and satellite viruses. *Arch Virol*. 2016;161(1):233–247.

46. Yutin N, Raoult D, Koonin EV. Virophages, polintons, and transpovirons: a complex evolutionary network of diverse selfish genetic elements. *Virol J*. 2013; 10:158.

47. Sun CL, Edwards RA, Rohwer F, Youle M, Blainey PC, Leonard J, et al. Phage particles in microbial communities. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2014;12(7):469–478.

48. Alors M, Gaia M, Pagnier I, et al. Giant virus hosts and virophage interactions: infectivity and co-infection dynamics. *Front Microbiol*. 2017; 8:132.

49. Desnues C, Boyer M, Raoult D. Sputnik, a virophage infecting the viral domain of life. *Adv Virus Res*. 2012; 82:63–89.

50. Koonin EV, Yutin N. Evolution of the large nucleocytoplasmic DNA viruses of eukaryotes and convergent origins of viral gigantism. *Adv Virus Res*. 2010; 78:167–221.

51. Arslan D, Legendre M, Seltzer V, Abergel C, Claverie JM. Distant Mimivirus relative with a larger genome highlights the fundamental features of Megaviridae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011;108(42):17486–17491.

52. Thomas V, Bertelli C, Collyn F, Casson N, Telenti A, Goesmann A, et al. Lausannevirus, a giant amoebal virus encoding histone doublets. *Environ Microbiol*. 2011;13(6):1454–1466.

53. Kanhayuwa L, Khedkar S, McInerney JO. Novel virophage genomes from metagenomic datasets expand the global distribution of virophages. *Front Microbiol*. 2016; 7:270.

54. Debat HJ. Giant viruses and their mobile genetic elements: the molecular symphony underlying virophage interactions. *Front Microbiol*. 2019; 10:2213.

55. Hackl T, et al. *Virophages and retrotransposons colonize the genomes of their hosts.* eLife. 2021;10: e72674.

56. Chen J, et al. *Sputnik virophage disrupts the transcriptional regulation of its giant-virus host.* J Virol. 2025;

57. Paez-Espino D, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Pavlopoulos GA, Thomas AD, Huntemann M, Mikhailova N, et al. Uncovering Earth's virome. *Nature*. 2016;536(7617):425–430.

58. Yutin N, Koonin EV. Hidden evolutionary complexity of giant viruses and their virophages. *Curr Opin Microbiol*. 2012;15(5):542–549.

59. Blanc G, Gallot-Lavallée L, Maumus F. Provirophages in the Bigelowiella genome support the existence of an ancient virophage lineage. *Virus Evol*. 2017;3(2): vex018.

60. Blanc G, et al. *Provirophages in the Bigelowiella genome bear testimony to past encounters with giant viruses.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112(38):E5129–38.

61. Koslová A, et al. *Endogenous virophages are active and mitigate giant virus infection.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2024.

62. Krupovic M, Koonin EV. Self-synthesizing transposons: unexpected key players in the evolution of viruses and defense systems. *Curr Opin Microbiol*. 2015.

63. Barreat JGN, Bellanger X, et al. A billion-year arms-race between viruses, virophages, and transposable elements. *Biol Rev*. 2023; (review).

64. Mougari S, Bekliz M, Levasseur A, et al. Virophages of giant viruses: an update at eleven. *Viruses*. 2019;11(8):733.

65. Raoult D. How the virophage compels the need to readdress viral classification and ecology. *Trends Microbiol*. 2015; (review).

66. Structural cryo-EM and capsid studies: Zhang et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2009.

67. Desnues C. Sputnik, a virophage infecting the viral domain of life (book chapter/review). In: *Current Topics in Virology* (2012).

68. Taylor BP, et al. Ecological effects of virophage with alternative modes of transmission. *J Theor Biol* (2014).

69. Mougari S, Bekliz M, et al. A virophage cross-species infection through mutant expansion and MIMIVIRE manipulation. *Commun Biol*. 2020;3:

70. Yutin N, Koonin EV. Evolution of virophages from polinton-like viruses and their diversification by gene exchange with giant viruses. *Virology.* 2013;447(1–2):384–94.

71. Krupovic M, Bamford DH. Virus evolution: how to build a virophage. *Nature*. 2008;455(7209):119–120.

72. Moreira D, López-García P. Ten reasons to exclude viruses from the tree of life. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2009;7(4):306–311.

73. Villalta L, Schulz F, Roux S. Metagenomic discovery and evolutionary analysis of new virophage lineages across ecosystems. *Microbiome.* 2023; 11:79. doi:10.1186/s40168-023-01573-1.

74. La Scola B, Desnues C, Pagnier I, Robert C, Barrassi L, Fournous G, et al. The virophage as a unique parasite of the giant mimivirus. *Nature.* 2008;455(7209):100–104.

75. Fischer MG, Hackl T. Host genome integration and giant virus–induced reactivation of the virophage mavirus. *Nature.* 2016;540(7632):288–291.

76. Wodarz D. Evolutionary dynamics of giant viruses and their virophages. *Ecol Evol.* 2013;3(7):2103–2115.

77. "Viruses protect their hosts from other viruses." Max Planck Institute / press release. 2021 Oct 28.

78. Oh S, Yoo D, Liu W-T. "Metagenomics Reveals a Novel Virophage Population in a Tibetan Mountain Lake." *Microbes Environ.* 2016; 31:173–177.

79. Paez-Espino D, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Pavlopoulos GA, Thomas AD, Huntemann M, Mikhailova N, et al. Diversity, evolution, and classification of virophages uncovered through global metagenomics. *Nat Commun.* 2019; 10:2321.

80. Desnues C, La Scola B, Yutin N, Fournous G, Robert C, Azza S, et al. Provirophages and transpovirons as the diverse mobilome of giant viruses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2012;109(44):18078–18083.

81. eLife Staff / Authors. Virophages and retrotransposons colonize the genomes of a heterotrophic flagellate. *eLife.* 2021; 10:72674.

82. Ribeiro São-Jóse C, Mello LV, et al. Diversity of virophage signatures in global freshwater systems. *ISME J.* 2022; 16:1121–34.