A literature review as an aid to identify strategies for mitigating ostreid herpesvirus 1 in *Crassostrea gigas* hatchery and nursery systems
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**Abstract**

An understanding of husbandry strategies and any associated risk factors is important for designing management control measures that can reduce mortality in Pacific oysters, *Crassostrea gigas*, caused by ostreid herpesvirus 1 (OsHV-1). The type of culture facility can be considered in relation to the potential pathways that could lead to the entry of a pathogen and its survival. In addition, the animal host (e.g. age, physiological state, selective breeding programmes), husbandry procedures (e.g. stocking density), the pathogen itself (e.g. pathogenicity, virulence) and environmental effects (e.g. temperature) represent other relevant interconnected factors. However, all these factors provide valuable background information for outlining the mitigation strategies needed by the industry, as well as in the context of surveillance and biosecurity programmes. These control mechanisms for hatchery or nursery areas are related to movement restrictions, water treatment, virus inactivation, the production calendar and practical farm management decisions. This comprehensive literature review compiles information related to such approaches and also includes the different existing guidelines suggested for control of OsHV-1. Therefore, the review represents a solid foundation for a more critical appraisal currently being developed to support recommendations for disease management strategies.
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**Definitions used**

Hatchery: Any installation that produces bivalve oyster seed for subsequent growth immersed directly in an open-water culture system

Nursery: An intermediate protected area for growth of oyster seed or spat prior to transplanting in an open-water culture system

**Introduction**

Husbandry strategies to reduce mortality in Pacific oysters, *Crassostrea gigas*, caused by ostreid herpesvirus 1 (OsHV-1) should be designed to prevent or manage the introduction and dissemination of the pathogen in bivalve aquaculture facilities. Potential specific pathways for the entry of a pathogen need to be identified, but they can be considered generally as: water (both hatcheries and open-water facilities), bivalve broodstock movements (into hatcheries), other bivalve movements (inter- and intra-production sites), shared facilities and equipment (baskets, ropes, transport vessels), staff movements (inter- and intra-production sites), wildlife (incl. wildlife vectors) and feed (hatchery algae with uncontrolled source) (adapted from Georgiades *et al.* 2016). Many of the risk factors applying to open-water culture will also be relevant to hatcheries and nursery areas with unprotected water supplies (e.g. semi-closed systems). However, movement of marine aquatic organisms for aquaculture purposes raises many problems and challenges, as such movements may be deliberate, although they are often accidental, with bivalve spat and juveniles being transferred by the thousands or millions (Rodgers *et al.* 2015).

Bivalve molluscs do not have a conventional adaptive immune system that results in acquired immunity leading to immune memory and production of antibodies (Gestal
Therefore, vaccination against pathogens is not feasible, and the use of drugs to treat any infection is limited in open-water production facilities (Renault 2016), since the rapid dilution of chemicals in water makes treatment impractical (Rodgers et al. 2015).

Crassostrea gigas originated from Asia and was intentionally introduced from the Pacific coast into a number of European countries in the 1970s (Rohfritsch et al. 2013; Rodgers et al. 2015). However, there are inherent risks associated with the transfer of shellfish, such as the introduction of diseases, including viruses, associated with any translocated species (Brenner et al. 2014). In addition, subsequent control measures rely on an understanding of factors such as the spatial distribution of mortalities, the hydrodynamics within a bay and other environmental aspects that, in the case of OsHV-1, still require scientific input to determine the relationships that lead to pathogen dissemination (Paul-Pont et al. 2014). Therefore, this review concentrates on the generic factors related to the animal host itself, aquaculture husbandry practices, the viral pathogen and associated environmental influences in the context of surveillance and biosecurity programmes, as well as any resultant mitigation strategies already published.

The purpose of the review is to reflect the diversity of various worldwide approaches that suggest mitigation measures for OsHV-1 according to local and national industry practices. These practices are faced with a global problem that is subjected to different environmental conditions according to the location of the specific sector. The review represents a solid foundation for a more critical appraisal that is currently being prepared which will use this information as a key element for recommending disease management strategies.

Animal host factors

Animal host factors can be related to the age of bivalves, their physiological state and growth rate, as well as any immunity resulting from exposure to a pathogen. Genetic resistance traits useful for developing selective breeding programmes can also be considered in this category. Table S1 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to animal host factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Host range

Ostreid herpesvirus 1 and its variants (see the section on other variants) have a wide bivalve host range, although they are associated with often severe mortalities in Pacific oyster C. gigas aquaculture facilities. The host-range species also include other Crassostrea spp. (i.e. C. angulata and C. ariakensis), as well as Ostrea edulis, Ruditapes decussatus, R. philippinarum and Pecten maximus (Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015). OsHV-1 has also been observed in mussels Mytilus edulis (Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015) and M. galloprovincialis (Domenechetti et al. 2014; Bivalife, pers. comm., 2014). A newly described variant of OsHV-1 (OsHV-1-SB) was recently reported to be associated with mass mortalities of blood clam (Scapharca brounontii) broodstock in China (Xia et al. 2015). However, Arzul et al. (2001c) maintained that bivalve herpesviruses could be confined to a single host species in nature, but other factors, such as current intensive husbandry practices, may have led to transmission to new host species. Nevertheless, Burge et al. (2011) detected low levels of OsHV-1 DNA by PCR in C. sikamea, C. virginica, M. galloprovincialis, O. edulis and Venerupis philippinarum compared to higher levels in C. gigas.

Bivalve age

Mortality rates of C. gigas have been shown to vary between different production sites, and they depend on the age of oysters affected (Renault 2016; De Kantzow et al. 2017). The C. gigas age groups most susceptible to OsHV-1 infection and subsequent mortality are larvae and spat, whereas adults are less susceptible, although Petton et al. (2015b) showed that only juveniles carried and transmitted a detectable amount of OsHV-1 virus in field-exposed SPF animals. Nevertheless, OsHV-1 horizontal transmission has been demonstrated from both asymptomatic adults and infected spat to naïve spat (Dégremont et al. 2013; Dégremont & Benabdellmouna 2014).

Therefore, it is clear that all stages are susceptible to the virus, although to varying degrees, and Azéma et al. (2017a) even showed that the average mean mortality for naïve adults was 55%, although it could range from 0% to 100% depending on the family. The same authors also demonstrated that susceptibility to OsHV-1 infection decreased with age. Adults have also been shown to exhibit significantly lower mortality (Peeler et al. 2012), which was supported by De Kantzow et al. (2016) who showed in laboratory experiments that 8-month-old spat were 2.7 times more likely to die after challenge with OsHV-1 µVar than 17-month-old adults.

However, adult Pacific oysters can also act as symptomatic carriers of the herpesvirus (Arzul et al. 2002; Paul-Pont et al. 2014; Petton et al. 2015b) that could then be capable of infecting the juvenile stages by cohabitation. Although vertical transmission is suspected in C. gigas (Barbosa-Solomieu et al. 2005), it has not been unequivocally demonstrated to date, except that C. angulata surviving an OsHV-1 mortality outbreak were shown to carry the virus and vertically transmit it to their offspring (López Sanmartín et al. 2016).
Nevertheless, in general terms, spat and juveniles, as well as rapidly growing *C. gigas*, have been reported to be more susceptible to OsHV-1, whereas decreased mortalities have actually been demonstrated in certain specific oyster families challenged by the virus (Anon 2011). Azéma et al. (2017a) found that a few tested families had a high resistance to OsHV-1 infection, whereas others had high susceptibility irrespective of the development stage. However, a majority of full-sib families exhibited increased resistance to infection from the spat to adult stage, emphasizing the importance of the life stage for resistance to OsHV-1 infection in *C. gigas*. Petton et al. (2015a) showed that the probability of mortality decreased with the age of oysters after first exposure, although it was also shown that the relationship between mortality and size was stronger than the relationship between mortality and age under field conditions (Dégremont 2013). Moreover, Azéma et al. (2017b) showed that smaller oysters had higher relative growth and higher mean mortality than larger oysters after testing 40 different families, indicating the importance of size in mortality associated with OsHV-1. In addition, although mortalities occurred in adults under experimental conditions, the adult stage was capable of managing infection despite apparent viral replication (Segarra et al. 2014a). In fact, Arzul et al. (2002) demonstrated that oyster herpesvirus could infect adults with high prevalence and the virus persisted after primary infection, whereas it was shown that juvenile and adult oysters could be a reservoir of putative pathogens (Petton et al. 2015b). Nevertheless, Pernet et al. (2012) found that Pacific oyster mortalities varied with farming practices in the Mediterranean. All this combined evidence indicates that selective breeding programmes could be a successful strategy for reducing *C. gigas* mortalities due to OsHV-1 μVar infection (see the section on selective breeding programmes for more detail).

Antimicrobial response

Bivalves actually possess a wide-ranging number of responses to invading pathogens based on immune cells and haemocytes, as well as mucosal cells, that represent the first line of contact with their aquatic environment. According to Allam and Raftsos (2015), bivalves respond to viral infections and the responses include reactions such as chemotaxis, encapsulation, apoptosis and the induction of antiviral states. In addition, oyster haemolymph has been shown to have virucidal activity against herpesviruses of mammals and fish (Olicard et al. 2005a,b; Carriel-Gomes et al. 2006). However, most important invertebrate infections actually initiate at mucosal surfaces (Allam & Raftsos 2015).

It was assumed by Clegg et al. (2014) that prior exposure of seed or related broodstock to OsHV-1 μVar in French hatcheries led to a likely genetic protective effect, since *C. gigas* from French hatcheries showed less mortality than those from non-French hatcheries where there had been no previous exposure. The protective effect of prior exposure was also noted by other studies that showed a strong genetic basis for survival (Dégremont et al. 2007; Sauvage et al. 2009), as well as oysters selected for their higher survival that did not horizontally transmit OsHV-1 to non-resistant bivalves (Dégremont et al. 2013). Nevertheless, previous exposure is not related to a specific immune response because bivalve shellfish do not have an immunological memory, and they rely on innate immunity to fight pathogen-induced diseases (Clegg et al. 2014). Prado-Alvarez et al. (2016) also showed that the survival rate in previously exposed *C. gigas* was significantly higher than in naïve oysters after OsHV-1 μVar challenge by intramuscular injection.

A study of gene transcript expression showed that OsHV-1 was able to replicate in a specific family of oysters, but they recovered from the infection, which indicated the virus could be able to enter into a persistence or latency phase (Segarra et al. 2014b). One area that has received insufficient consideration to date is the effect of symbiotic microflora on host protection (Allam & Raftsos 2015). This is either through indirect action, such as the production of probiotic antimicrobial compounds by haemolymph microbiota (Desriac et al. 2014), or direct action, such as killing of microorganisms by specific phage (Barr et al. 2013) and viral pathogen interference using a therapeutic virus (Paff et al. 2016).

It is clear that OsHV-1 infection can occur quickly, but the disease process only lasts a few days and apparently some oysters can effectively control the infection through a complex antiviral response, including control of OsHV-1 μVar gene expression and reduction in virus load with subsequent survival after infection (Segarra et al. 2014b; He et al. 2015). Very few studies have concentrated on the ontogeny of the oyster immune system (Pernet et al. 2012), although the ability of immunocompetent cells to express immune-related genes has been suggested to explain the variability of susceptibility to infection during larval development (Tirapé et al. 2007). In addition, Green et al. (2014) used a herpes simplex virus (HSV-1) model to show that oysters relied on a cellular response for minimizing viral replication, which induced host cells into an antiviral state that, interestingly, was adversely affected by age and increased temperature.

The immunostimulant poly(I:C) is an analog of double-stranded RNA and can be used to mimic viral infection. It has been shown that poly(I:C) can decrease OsHV-1 replication in experimentally injection-infected *C. gigas* through induction of a protective antiviral immune response (Green & Montagnani 2013). Such studies related to RNA interference could provide valuable information concerning the
action of OsHV-1 in oyster disease processes (Petton et al. 2015b) and lead to early treatment of juvenile bivalves at the hatchery stage. In fact, Green et al. (2016) showed that larvae produced from poly(I:C)-treated parents had double the chance of surviving exposure to OsHV-1 compared to controls.

Selective breeding programmes

Based on the studies mentioned above, the role of innate immunity in C. gigas and the gene markers for OsHV-1 resistance will be of great value for attempting to develop specific breeding programmes. In addition, high genetic correlation for survival between different sites led Dégremont et al. (2007) to conclude that selective breeding at only a single site could be an effective management measure for improving survival, and therefore yield, in oysters (<1 year old) produced in all French coastal growing areas. Huvet et al. (2010) also suggested that resistant lines of C. gigas may survive better because it was shown that they were not as reproductively active as susceptible lines.

However, more information is needed for the metabolic processes and their pathways related to OsHV-1 infection in C. gigas that could be used to identify any biomarkers of disease resistance and thus develop antiviral control measures for mitigating the impact of mortalities (Corporeau et al. 2014). Nevertheless, selective breeding as a management strategy can be implemented easily for hatchery production to improve OsHV-1 resistance, and this will limit the spread of disease (Dégremont & Benabdelmouna 2014).

Dégremont et al. (2015c) suggested that mass selection after four generations of C. gigas originally derived from stocks of adult wild oysters could be an easier technique than much more costly family-based selection for commercial hatcheries. Nevertheless, another study demonstrated a large additive genetic variation for resistance to OsHV-1 infection in C. gigas that could also help selective breeding programmes (Dégremont et al. 2015b).

Specific C. gigas breeding programmes designed to produce genetically resistant oysters capable of withstanding OsHV-1 infection with reduced mortalities in production stocks are seen as an important addition to currently considered mitigation strategies. Dégremont et al. (2015a) considered that genetic improvement for disease resistance to pathogens would be an attractive option for reducing any impact on oyster production. In addition, producing resistant C. gigas in hatcheries can also be used subsequently in the development of restoration programmes in the field for wild oysters (Dégremont & Benabdelmouna 2014).

The selection of a family because of its resistance to OsHV-1-related summer mortality was shown to confer a survival advantage for juvenile C. gigas that was passed to descendant batches (Dégremont 2011), and OsHV-1-resistant oyster lines were postulated as one way to reduce mortalities, as well as limit the spread of the disease and any potential reservoir role (Dégremont et al. 2013).

Renault (2016) indicated that studies to determine the genetic parameters for OsHV-1 infection resistance, as well as how these related to growth rates, were already making good progress, such as for the production of larvae with genetic resistance to OsHV-1 infection from selected adults (Dégremont et al. 2016b). Future genetic selection and selective breeding programmes need to form an important part of promoting resistance to mortalities caused by OsHV-1 and its variants that, once established, should increase the productivity of oysters in the production sector, since resistance has been demonstrated to be a highly heritable but variable trait (Sauvage et al. 2010; Dégremont 2013; Prado-Alvarez et al. 2016). Dégremont et al. (2005) indicated there was also a genetic basis for this trait, as there was a large variation in survival among families, although this was related to environmental factors rather than the presence of virus.

Nevertheless, Whittington et al. (2015a) cautioned that selective breeding programmes can have certain drawbacks, such as a long development time. However, selective breeding programs can actually determine how the selection of one trait will act on another trait, and Azéma et al. (2017a) found an absence of genetic correlation between resistance to OsHV-1 and resistance to Vibrio aestuarianus leading to the conclusion that selection for dual resistance could be possible. In addition, lines selected for their higher survival and higher resistance to OsHV-1 have been shown to have higher growth than unslected lines after four generations, although in practice this benefit would depend on the concomitant use of adequate culture techniques under actual production conditions (Dégremont et al. 2015c).

Aquaculture has already had a genetic impact on farmed oyster species, but care must be taken when choosing and characterizing the broodstock at the beginning of a breeding programme, as well as monitoring any new genetic diversity after a programme has been established (Rohfritsch et al. 2013). However, reducing mortalities using such programmes will have important economic benefits for the production sector, not only in the short term but in the future, since genetic improvement is inheritable and sustainable (Gjedrem et al. 2012). These programmes should be combined with a reconsideration of husbandry practices (e.g. oyster exchanges, stocking densities) (Rohfritsch et al. 2013) in order to offer solutions to the current mortality problems suffered by the sector.

Ploidy

Triploid C. gigas have been shown by Cheney et al. (2000) to undergo higher ‘summer mortalities’, even with no viral
association, compared to diploid oysters, although, in general, the oysters were subjected to chronic stress due to multiple environmental factors, such as low dissolved oxygen, high water temperatures and the presence of phytoplankton blooms. However, these factors often also occur at the time of OsHV-1 infections, which indicates that triploid oysters could be even more susceptible after the onset of the disease process according to the conditions at each specific production site.

Pernet et al. (2012) found that mortalities of diploid and triploid C. gigas were similar during spring, although they doubled in diploid oysters in summer and autumn. The same authors, unlike Cheney et al. (2000), commented that triploid oysters cultured in a French lagoon area had historically actually shown higher resistance to summer mortalities, which prior to 2008 were not necessarily linked to OsHV-1. Dégremont et al. (2010a) recorded similar mortality rates for both ploidy levels, whereas lower mortalities were shown in triploids (Gagnaire et al. 2006; Jenkins et al. 2013). Dégremont et al. (2016a) found that both diploid and chemically induced triploid C. gigas had similar mortality that could be high using unselected parents or low using parents selected for their higher resistance to OsHV-1. In Ireland, diploid C. gigas had a greater mortality risk (e.g. slightly higher cumulative mortalities) than triploid oysters following natural exposure to OsHV-1 µVar (Clegg et al. 2014), whereas differences in ploidy have been found to have no significant effect on mortality (Peeler et al. 2012; De Kanzow et al. 2017). Therefore, according to the genetic material used, different studies have shown different results and the effect of ploidy is not clear, although Dégremont et al. (2016a) suggested that most studies confirmed ploidy and family effects, although the absence of OsHV-1 susceptibility between diploids and triploids has been shown (Azéma et al. 2016; Dégremont et al. 2017). Therefore, it has been suggested that either tetraploid lines need to be produced from selected diploid broodstocks or hatcheries need to be provided with the best breeders that have the greatest resistance to OsHV-1 (Dégremont et al. 2016a).

Physiological and nutritional state

Whittington et al. (2015b) reported that well-fed oysters died due to OsHV-1, whereas poorly fed oysters did not, although it was suggested that this was probably associated with a lack of development of infection after removal of food from the water by filtration. However, Pernet et al. (2014b) showed that higher energy reserves in well-fed C. gigas coincided with a decreased risk of mortality, whereas Evans et al. (2015) maintained that cumulative mortality was higher and median time to death was lower in fed oysters compared to non-fed oysters. Nevertheless, the opposite has also been reported, since high mortality was shown in unfed oysters challenged with OsHV-1 (Schikorski et al. 2011a,b). Therefore, the role of the physiological state of C. gigas exposed to OsHV-1 is unclear.

Pernet et al. (2014a) studied the energetic reserves and quality of available food in a C. gigas lagoon production area and concluded that the dynamics of spat mortality correlated with differences in their energetic condition, which was related to variable food quality and the role of diatoms in the diet. Pernet et al. (2012) previously showed that oysters cemented onto ropes had a better nutritional condition, as measured by triacylglycerol tissue levels, which enhanced their resistance to mortality compared to C. gigas in baskets.

Nevertheless, mass mortalities of C. gigas can occur only due to local environmental conditions without the involvement of any known pathogens. For instance, Bodoy et al. (1990) showed that ecological changes in the spring were associated with poor physiological condition of oysters growing at high densities, which coincided with high metabolic requirements, exhausted energetic reserves and scarce natural food resources that together caused mortalities. These conditions have subsequently also been shown to be factors in mass mortalities linked closely to OsHV-1 infections, with or without the involvement of Vibrio spp. Consequently, the potential for rapid OsHV-1 progression is likely to be exacerbated due to the coincidence of weakened oysters and rising water temperatures.

Petton et al. (2015b) considered that oyster physiology was a key feature of disease caused by OsHV-1 in C. gigas co-infected naturally with the herpesvirus and pathogenic vibrios, which linked physiology with associated microbial communities.

Husbandry factors

Husbandry factors can be related to the production cycle, including the culture systems used, stocking densities and the presence of co-cultured bivalves. Table S2 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to husbandry factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Type of culture

Whittington et al. (2015c) considered that improved husbandry was needed at all stages of the production cycle. However, Pernet et al. (2012) showed that C. gigas cemented onto ropes had approximately 30% mortality by the end of a production cycle compared to 80% held in Australian-type baskets that had a higher (6×) stocking density. This was attributed to enhanced water circulation around each oyster resulting in an increased flushing rate,
since the detection frequency and quantity of OsHV-1 DNA were similar in both culture systems.

Ostreid herpesvirus 1 was detected more frequently in sheltered inland facilities, such as nurseries and semi-enclosed areas (e.g. estuaries and rivers), which was significantly related to spat mortalities (Garcia et al. 2011). This was supported by Pernet et al. (2012) who showed C. gigas could be reared with no mortality in the open Mediterranean Sea compared to a nearby lagoon area, although the oysters remained susceptible to disease during the 2-year production cycle. In addition, the risk of mortality in sentinel oysters was shown to be higher inside a bivalve farming area than outside the area, leading Pernet et al. (2014b) to suggest that the infection pressure would be higher in intensive farming activity areas, and local differences in husbandry practices would have a significant role in the spatial and temporal dynamics of mortalities. Oyster leases are habitually concentrated in sheltered inshore areas where relatively low tidal currents represent favourable conditions for disease transmission and mortality (Petton et al. 2015a). Petton et al. (2015b) found that cultured oysters had a significantly higher mortality and transmitted more disease than wild oysters. However, it is generally considered that there must be a sufficient population of susceptible aquatic animals to support the spread of any infection; therefore, the start of an epidemic requires a minimum threshold of infected individuals that will lead to increasing disease spread (Murray 2009), which is related, in this case, to the density of cultured oysters.

The protective effect of high growing height on adult oysters but not spat was also confirmed by Whittington et al. (2015a), since age and growing height in the intertidal zone were important determinants of mortality related to OsHV-1 infection, and infection prevalences was lower in baskets than in trays. In contrast, the protective effect of a high growing height on spat oysters was observed by Azéma et al. (2017b), although the height had no effect on 31 of 40 families studied as these families showed no potential for adaptation to improved growing height practices. However, certain families showed extremely high mortality (>95%), whereas two families showed the lowest mortality (<40%), and there was a tendency in nine families towards higher mortality in oysters that emerged less (85% for a low height practice compared to 72% for high height). Nevertheless, a comparison between studies with variable results is difficult as they do not standardize on the same families, which highlights the importance of the germplasm due to the strong genetic basis for resistance to OsHV-1 in C. gigas (Azéma et al. 2017b).

It has also been determined that mortality associated with OsHV-1 depended on the position of oysters in the seawater column, since decreased mortality occurred for adults in intertidal trays at a high height compared with a low height (Paul-Pont et al. 2013b).

Richez (2012) reported that oysters placed in ponds (e.g. French ‘claires’) were much less affected by mortalities during the summer due to a short 6 month production cycle starting in spring before any temperature increase and using very low densities (5 per m²), which gave C. gigas time to acclimatize. In addition, no mortality was seen in hatchery-produced oysters reared alone in ponds, although mortality was high following cohabitation with known positive wild-caught C. gigas (Dégremont & Benabdelmouna 2014).

In addition, hatcheries and nursery areas should be carefully located to avoid the direct influence of tidal currents that pass through known disease-positive zones. In fish farming areas, it has been shown that fewer, highly separated farms reduced overall losses compared to numerous smaller farms in close proximity (Salama & Murray 2011).

Density and handling

To understand the potential differences between hatchery and nursery/grow-out facilities that might influence the dissemination of OsHV-1 and its subsequent control, it is necessary to consider in general that the dynamics of aquatic infectious diseases are related to the density of host populations (Krkošek 2010). Any mitigation strategies (including possible eradication) depend on host density thresholds (Pernet et al. 2012) that need to consider the presence of the number of aquaculture facilities in a local epidemiological unit and how they interact. Low host densities decrease the contact rate defined by the relationship between the susceptible host and the host containing the pathogen, which can lead to slower pathogen dissemination and unsustainable infection (Pernet et al. 2012).

De Kantzow et al. (2017) showed that, even after allowing for time on farm, density and handling, baskets containing oysters with a greater average length had a lower mortality than baskets containing smaller oysters. In addition, handling oysters in the week before an outbreak led to higher mortality, indicating that handling should be avoided during designated high risk periods. Pernet et al. (2016) indicated that OsHV-1 disease risk increased in fast-growing C. gigas compared to slow-growing individuals. After a year, selected farm-reared small oysters were shown by Azéma et al. (2017b) to have twice the growth rate of large oysters and significantly higher mortality in 29 of 40 families tested. Therefore, it was hypothesized by the same authors that OsHV-1 could actively use oyster cellular mechanisms to replicate, which would lead to increased OsHV-1-associated mortality in fast-growing oysters, as the oyster daily growth rate is known to decrease from larvae
to adult that coincides with a decrease in susceptibility to OsHV-1 (Whittington et al. 2015a; Azéma et al. 2016).

Petton et al. (2015a) reported that the possibility of mortality in oysters decreased with water renewal and increased with the biomass of neighbouring infected animals, and that the early rearing history, timing and duration of exposure to the disease were important additional factors to consider (see also the section on the production calendar) together with density.

Presence of other species (incl. wild species and co-culture)

The presence of wild species in the same area as bivalve hatcheries or nursery areas, as well as on-site co-culture in aquaculture facilities, can be a potential source of pathogen transmission from non-susceptible to susceptible species. As OsHV-1 has been shown to have a wide host range that includes non-susceptible bivalve species (see the section on host range), these may have a direct effect on disease control strategies in hatcheries and nursery areas due to the potential for interspecies transmission (Arzul et al. 2001b,c; Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015). In addition, Burge et al. (2011) also considered that various bivalve species could represent potential reservoirs for OsHV-1.

However, non-susceptible species could also be beneficial as their close proximity may lead to synergistic effects. For instance, Whittington et al. (2015a) found that the presence of a large number of non-susceptible adult Sydney rock oysters, Saccostrea glomerata, probably acted as a ‘buffer’ by removing OsHV-1 viral particles from the water close to cultivated C. gigas because of their filtration capacity. In addition, it has been shown that the mortality risk for sentinel oysters in mussel, M. galloprovincialis, facilities was lower than in oyster farms, indicating that they could possibly reduce the infection pressure on susceptible C. gigas (Pernet et al. 2014b).

Nevertheless, Pernet et al. (2016) considered that there were still information gaps concerning the definition of aquatic reservoirs and wild animal carriers of OsHV-1, which prevent an accurate evaluation of the effectiveness of disease management strategies. As OsHV-1 infections can start in wild oysters already infected in their native areas and rapid transmission can then occur to nursery areas, the virus cannot be eradicated from stocks of self-recruiting oysters (Dégremont & Benabdelmouina 2014).

Pathogen factors

The pathogen factors to consider for OsHV-1 can be related to its virulence, survival in the environment, life cycle, any latent period and pathogenicity. Table S3 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to pathogen factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Life cycle

Domingo (2010) described three main steps for the processes of viral disease emergence: (i) introduction of a viral pathogen into a new host species; (ii) establishment of the pathogen in the new host; and (iii) dissemination of the pathogen in a large number of individuals of the new host.

Ostreid herpesvirus 1 satisfies these steps through its capability of direct transmission between hosts (Schikorski et al. 2011a,b). There are many reports that OsHV-1 is rapidly disseminated and causes explosive mortalities in C. gigas, which has led some authors to consider that the transmission phase of the life cycle cannot only be related to transfer between individual bivalve hosts. Paul-Pont et al. (2013a) suggested that the virus could be transmitted by specific planktonic vector particles in the water, since the spatial clustering of oyster mortalities is similar to that seen in planktonic aggregations (Whittington et al. 2015c). Therefore, Paul-Pont et al. (2014) considered that the most likely explanation for an Australian mass mortality event was synchronous exposure to a common environmental source capable of infecting most individuals at the same time.

It has also been considered that the induction of mortality events in C. gigas spat and larvae is probably multifactorial (Clegg et al. 2014; EFSA 2015). Nevertheless, Petton et al. (2015b) indicated that oysters were naturally co-infected by the herpesvirus and vibrios.

Pathogenicity and survival in the environment

The maximum survival time outside the described host bivalve species is still unknown (OIE 2016), and it is difficult to predict how pathogenicity can change over time (Castinel et al. 2013). Therefore, Pernet et al. (2016) considered there were information gaps related to the persistence of OsHV-1 outside its host.

Early experimental transmission showed OsHV-1 pathogenicity that was capable of causing 100% mortality within 6 days after infection (Renault et al. 1995). Later, Martenot et al. (2015) demonstrated that OsHV-1 μVar could persist and remain infectious in seawater (54 h at 16°C), but high temperatures seemed to reduce its infectivity (33 h at 25°C), although pathogenicity could be modulated by biological, physical and chemical factors (e.g. plankton, water currents or pesticides). Hick et al. (2016) showed that OsHV-1 retained its infectivity in seawater for 2 days at 20°C. However, although OsHV-1 μVar was shown to be significantly associated with mortality, indicating that it was therefore necessary although insufficient to
cause such events, it may also be the case that OsHV-1 is after all a sufficient cause, but there is a very strong dose effect (Whittington et al. 2013; Clegg et al. 2014). Nevertheless, it is also possible that OsHV-1 has low pathogenicity (Pande et al. 2015), although Burge et al. (2006) indicated that pathogenicity varied with the size of the host oyster. OsHV-1 μVar has also been detected in the absence of mortality in imported C. gigas cultivated in Italy (Dundon et al. 2011).

Ostreid herpesvirus 1 μVar DNA was detected in seawater by PCR and copy numbers in the first 48 h after injecting spat with virus were $1 \times 10^5 \text{ mL}^{-1}$, and a maximum of $1 \times 10^6 \text{ mL}^{-1}$ following infection after cohabitation with oysters (Schikorski et al. 2011a,b).

Virulence

Pernet et al. (2016) considered there were information gaps related to the minimum infective dose of OsHV-1, which would be data useful for constructing epidemiological models. Oden et al. (2011) defined a viral load threshold of $8.8 \times 10^7 \text{ OsHV-1 DNA mg tissue}^{-1}$ above which there was a risk of oyster mortality. However, Petton et al. (2015b) showed that, although the quantity of OsHV-1 DNA was a predictor of mortality, in the absence of Vibrio spp. a high load of virus was not enough to induce full expression of the disease. Castinel et al. (2013) (citing Mortensen et al. 2007) considered that husbandry practices, such as stress or stock transfer, could lead to an increase in virulence of some pathogens. However, their direct role in disease outbreaks in the shellfish sector is unclear (Castinel et al. 2013).

It is too early to determine whether the newly described variants of OsHV-1 (see the section on other variants) have different virulence from OsHV-1 and OsHV-1 μVar (Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015).

Other variants

Gittenberger et al. (2016) considered the possibility that OsHV-1 μVar and other variants could be more widespread than originally thought, especially in areas with wild stocks where there is no commercial oyster culture. In addition, Burioli et al. (2016) found nine different geographically distributed OsHV-1 μVar genotypes in healthy wild C. gigas in Italy. The studies of Bai et al. (2015) and Martenot et al. (2013) both showed that OsHV-1 was distributed as widely as OsHV-1 μVar and its other variants.

New variants μVar Δ9 and μVar Δ15 have been described in France associated with C. gigas (Martenot et al. 2013; Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015), whereas new OsHV-1 virus types causing mortalities in clams, S.roughtonii, and scallops, Chlamys farrier, have been characterized from China (Bai et al. 2015; Xia et al. 2015). Lynch et al. (2012) described a previously undescribed OsHV-1 genotype in Ireland that was closely related to OsHV-1 μVar, whereas Morrissey et al. (2015) detected another genotype closely related to OsHV-1 μVar in approximately 21% of virus-infected bays.

Environment factors

The potential influence of environmental factors on OsHV-1, such as temperature, reservoir populations or water pollution, is important for hatchery and nursery areas due to the close association between each ecosystem compartment. Table S4 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to environment factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Temperature

In Europe, it has been shown that a seawater temperature of approximately 16°C triggers the onset of OsHV-1 infections (Dégremont 2013), and this is often followed by severe mortality outbreaks (up to 90–100%) in zones where the temperature increases rapidly in spring. This pattern occurs particularly in Atlantic (i.e. France) and Mediterranean (i.e. France and Spain but not Italy) coastal production sites.

Other, more northern countries, that have been reported positive for OsHV-1 μVar (e.g. Ireland, UK-England), where the temperature reaches 16°C in the late spring-summer months, do not have sudden increases in water temperature in subsequent weeks and do not undergo such high mortality levels (Roque et al. 2012; Barbosa Solomieu et al. 2015). This indicates that viral infection must take place before seawater reaches a temperature of 16°C, as OsHV-1 virus DNA can be detected at $<16°C$ before significant mortality events are reported (Renault et al. 2014). The upper limit for natural mortalities in the Thau Lagoon, France, has been shown to be approximately 22–25°C (Pernet et al. 2012).

Nevertheless, although OsHV-1-related mortality depends on seawater temperature, a lower threshold of 14°C has been observed, although this was linked to a higher temperature of 16°C during the previous 2 weeks (Dégremont et al. 2013). However, irrespective of temperature, mortalities are not consistent across sites, although, generally, higher temperatures equate to higher mortalities.

Low risk of infection in healthy oysters exposed to field conditions has been shown provided the daily average seawater temperature was $<14.7°C$, whereas OsHV-1 was transmitted to oysters when the temperature was between 14.7 and 15.8°C and mass mortalities then occurred at
>16°C (Petton et al. 2015a). De Kantzow et al. (2016) also showed the direct effect of water temperature on infection and disease by removing the field variables using laboratory challenge with OsHV-1 μVar and they indicated that infection did not take place below a threshold temperature of 14–18°C.

In Australia, the seasonal risk factors are less certain, and the effects of temperature are not the same as those in Europe (Paul-Pont et al. 2013b), although stressful conditions (e.g. rearing techniques) favour viral infection. Whittington et al. (2015c) showed that mortality outbreaks occurred, the water temperatures in New South Wales (NSW) were 20°C, which was approximately 4°C higher compared to, for instance, France. However, Paul-Pont et al. (2014) indicated a slightly higher temperature of 22°C was needed for onset of mortalities. Nevertheless, it has been pointed out that comparison with French farming sites should be treated with caution, as the density of cultured Crassostrea gigas is much lower in NSW coastal areas, which could explain why outbreaks in France are continuous in summer (Whittington et al. 2015c). The density and design of trays is also one of the factors that affects the circulation of water and the accessibility of oysters to viral particles in the water (Paul-Pont et al. 2013b). Close contact between animals facilitates infection and subsequent disease transmission as the temperature increases, which is augmented by high quantities of viral particles released by a larger number of infected hosts (Pernet et al. 2012; Whittington et al. 2015c), potentially leading to a higher probability of observing mortality at a lower temperature.

Nevertheless, irrespective of latitude, if oyster transfers occur during summer, this can result in virus transmission (OIE 2016). Table 1 shows the reported effect of temperature on OsHV-1 infection and/or mortalities in more detail.

### Table 1 OsHV-1 infection and/or mortalities related to temperature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Temp. range (°C)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Infection/mortality</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>No virus transmission</td>
<td>Petton et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 μVar</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Infection with no mass mortality</td>
<td>Renault et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 μVar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>France, Ireland, Spain</td>
<td>Lower threshold temperature above which natural mortality occurs</td>
<td>Clegg et al. (2014), Pernet et al. (2012),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16–22</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Effective virus transmission</td>
<td>Petton et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 μVar</td>
<td>19–24</td>
<td>Australia (NSW)</td>
<td>Disease occurrence‡</td>
<td>Paul-Pont et al. (2013a, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 μVar</td>
<td>21–22</td>
<td>Australia (NSW)</td>
<td>Lower threshold temperature above which mortality occurs</td>
<td>Jenkins et al. (2013) and Paul-Pont et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 μVar</td>
<td>§24</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Upper threshold temperature above which natural mortality ceases to occur</td>
<td>Pernet et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1</td>
<td>27–29</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>50% mortalities in oysters challenged by cohabitation</td>
<td>Petton et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Bivalife: Controlling infectious diseases in oysters and mussels in Europe. FP7-KBBE-2010-4, grant agreement 266157.
‡DNA present at lower water temperature.
§OsHV-1 detected but probably the microvariant.

Viral particle attachment

The sudden explosive C. gigas mortality outbreaks associated with rapidly rising temperatures of >16°C often occur almost simultaneously in shallow-water oyster cultivation areas, such as embayments or lagoons. This indicates that the majority of oysters are almost certainly infected from a common environmental source, and that OsHV-1 is probably transmitted through water (Whittington et al. 2015c) and carried to susceptible oysters by plankton particles (Paul-Pont et al. 2013b; Evans et al. 2014, 2015). Viruses are too small to be efficiently retained by the gills of bivalves (Riisgård 1988), but suspension feeders can ingest picoplankton-sized particles embedded within aggregates (Kach & Ward 2008), indicating that OsHV-1 could also be associated with such marine accumulations (Whittington et al. 2015b).

Fouling organisms

Fitridge et al. (2012) considered that fouling organisms and microbial communities on cage netting could represent a health risk to cultured species by harbouring pathogenic
microorganisms. In addition, herpes-like particles have been seen in an estuarine thraustochytrid-like organism, as well as OsHV-1-like virions in a marine protist in experimental rearing tanks containing C. gigas larvae, and it is possible that this type of protist could act as a vector for OsHV-1 (Paul-Pont et al. 2013b).

**Water hydrodynamics (incl. connectivity, tides/currents)**

Pernet et al. (2016) considered there were information gaps related to the potential for long-distance dispersal of OsHV-1 associated with the influence of environmental factors. The siting of hatcheries and nursery areas is important because the hydrodynamic connectivity and biomass of potentially infected oysters can represent major drivers for disease in culture facilities (Salama & Murray 2011; Petton et al. 2013). Paul-Pont et al. (2014) considered that the exposure of oysters via tidal movements of water could explain a mass mortality, and Pernet et al. (2012) indicated that mortality spread between infected and healthy oysters as a result of hydrodynamic connectivity, which has major biosecurity implications for hatcheries with no protected water source or nurseries operating with semi-open systems.

**Reservoir populations**

A study by Whittington et al. (2013) showed that no species sampled (i.e. wild molluscs, decapods, gastropods and algae) could either be confirmed or ruled out as potential reservoirs for OsHV-1 and, as a result, they considered that the determination of environmental reservoirs of pathogens was inherently difficult.

Nevertheless, wild stocks of C. gigas are often used as broodstock and Petton et al. (2015a) suggested that OsHV-1 was maintained in wild oysters in most French farming areas. Therefore, translocation of wild oysters for use in hatcheries can be considered as an important risk factor for disease transmission that could lead to mortality of spat and juveniles once transferred to nursery and grow-out areas.

**Watershed pollution (incl. pesticides/herbicides)**

Moreau et al. (2015) showed that pesticides at environmentally relevant concentrations were able to cause adverse effects on Pacific oysters and they increased the susceptibility to OsHV-1 virus infection under experimental conditions. In addition, Gagnaire et al. (2007) reported that mortality was higher in pesticide-treated oysters compared to untreated oysters after challenge with Vibrio splendidus. This represents a problem for nursery areas sited in coastal areas, which are often shallow semi-enclosed lagoon-type ecosystems, because this type of watershed pollution is inextricably linked to local agriculture and the seasonal use of herbicides or pesticides (Carafa et al. 2007, 2009). In addition, it has been shown that bioaccumulation of herbicides occurs in the water column, sediment, macroalgae and wild bivalves (Carafa et al. 2007, 2009).

**Global warming/climate change**

There is a link between global warming and the increased frequency of invertebrate mass mortality in littoral areas that leads to energetic constraints for suspension filter feeders, such as bivalves (Coma et al. 2009). Increased risk of mortality due to OsHV-1 has been linked to low energy reserves in C. gigas (Pernet et al. 2014b).

Wild and aquacultured populations can be connected by shared pathogens and any diseases are influenced by host densities, which in turn are affected by environmental alterations, such as climate change, that will moderate increased aquaculture production in the future (Krkošek 2010).

**Designing management control measures**

Some of the most important practical considerations for reducing C. gigas mortalities caused by OsHV-1 include the concepts of biosecurity and mitigation. Figure 1 shows potential management control strategies to reduce mortality considering the main compartments affected. However, prevention and establishment of the absence of a problem (e.g. a pathogen) should be the priority (Brenner et al. 2014), although early detection of disease trends or drivers relies on good quality surveillance data. Tables S5–S7 summarize the strategies detailed below related to surveillance, biosecurity and mitigation factors, respectively, for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

**Surveillance programmes**

‘Surveillance’ is used to indicate the collection, analysis and dissemination of health information (OIE 2009). Carnegie et al. (2016) considered that solutions used to improve shellfish aquaculture health management should include the establishment of more broad-based surveillance programmes and application of risk analyses to improve regulation. The sustainability of bivalve shellfish production relies on the continuous provision of background scientific knowledge through surveillance programmes that can identify early trends in the development of emerging diseases. This is especially important because it is considered that the legislation has been slow to react to emerging diseases and the appearance of exotic pathogens in new areas (Rodgers et al. 2015), which is important for hatcheries and nursery areas.
The importance of data collection through surveillance programmes and the creation of linked databases were reported by Soletchnik et al. (2007) who monitored oyster mortalities at multiple sites along the French coastline during a 10–12 year period. Mortality data were combined with information from environmental monitoring databases to show differences in different age classes for summer and spring mortality patterns in 1- and 2-year-old oysters, respectively, but without making reference to any specific pathogen.

However, it has been considered that there are data gaps in certain key areas (Rodgers et al. 2011) and a lack of basic consistent chronological data that could be used for generating real-time trends useful for informing decision-making (Peeler & Taylor 2011; Peeler et al. 2012; Rodgers et al. 2015). This is also supported by Brenner et al. (2014) who recommended: ‘...the need for comprehensive health surveillance strategies involving procedures to systematically look for early signs and assess the adverse effects on the health-status of a country...’, which has important implications for translocation of wild C. gigas into hatcheries as broodstock.

It is considered very important to establish farmers as the starting point of disease surveillance, so they can use their practical knowledge in conjunction with an awareness of the perceived surveillance benefits (Brugere et al. 2017), before involving policy makers and scientists in the development of necessary strategies and procedures that need to be developed through interdisciplinary collaboration (Brenner et al. 2014). This was also echoed by Castinel et al. (2015) who considered there was a need to work in partnership for developing practical and effective measures to manage bivalve diseases such as that caused by OsHV-1.

Nevertheless, the findings of a workshop recognized that passive farmer reporting was still the main system used to identify new outbreaks in all countries (Anon 2011), since OsHV-1 and its variants do not cause any listed (notifiable) diseases. Consequently, many mortality episodes are probably not reported unless high mortalities significantly affect production stocks or compensation schemes are in place to cover any losses.

However, the new European Animal Health Law (EU Regulation 2016/429; Anon 2016) emphasizes the importance of surveillance as a key element of animal health policy, whilst prioritizing prevention, early detection and a quick response, to enable more efficient control and eradication procedures (Brenner et al. 2014). The hope is that data collection, data analysis and the response to developing mortality outbreaks can be improved, although it is recognized that there are very few means to routinely collect useful risk factor data for trend identification. The Australian Aquavetplan (Anon 2015) also outlines the necessity for surveillance (see Annex S1).

Biosecurity programmes

Aquaculture facilities have an inherent risk of pathogen introduction and dissemination, but specified biosecurity measures can be used for their management (Georgiades et al. 2016). However, such measures are essentially more efficient if they are preventive, therefore, they should be proactive (early practical) rather than reactive (late responsive). Some basic concepts for biosecurity programmes are shown in Annex S2. In general, the identification and management of risks should be based on good epidemiological principles together with a logical, science-based approach to disease control (Subasinghe 2005). Castinel et al. (2015)

---

**Figure 1** Management control strategies to reduce mortality considering the main compartments affected.
indicated what the most effective preventive strategies were for OsHV-1 considered by producers in Australia and New Zealand (see Annex S3).

Biosecurity in the context of the husbandry strategies for managing OsHV-1 in bivalve facilities (e.g. hatcheries and nursery areas) can be identified as a number of different measures designed to prevent or reduce the risk of transmission of the herpesvirus associated with disease. This approach helps to minimize the risk of disease transmission between neighbouring sites and protects a locally defined epidemiological unit from production losses.

Renault (2016) also considered that biosecurity measures for OsHV-1 could be designed to protect hatchery and nursery facilities, as well as the surrounding environment, from the introduction of the virus. However, after mortality outbreaks, the destruction of infected stock, disinfection of water and equipment, and culling can be used together with other biosecurity measures to limit the spread and prevent the reintroduction of OsHV-1 (Pernet et al. 2016). This was also supported by Normand et al. (2014) who considered that onshore rearing in hatcheries allowed closer control of the inputs related to the prevention of pathogen entry through the application of biosecurity-based management practices. The same authors considered that the use of large-sized hatchery spat on inshore nurseries would reduce the probability of disease outbreaks in closed production systems.

Sauvage et al. (2009) recommended screening for OsHV-1 in stocks of oysters during their transportation between different geographical zones or before transfer of larvae and seed to the field in order to help prevent the spread of the virus.

Coen and Bishop (2015) considered that biosecurity programmes were being increasingly used to reduce the translocation of diseases during aquaculture production in conjunction with measures such as cultivation using animals selectively bred for disease resistance. These authors (additionally citing Rodgers et al. 2015) indicated that biosecurity programmes involved:

- disease prevention (e.g. sourcing stock from certified disease-free locations or holding animals under quarantine conditions until they can be verified as disease-free);
- disease monitoring (e.g. regular assessment of the water quality and health of animals);
- cleaning and disinfection between production cycles (e.g. equipment);
- general security precautions (e.g. selective breeding).

Muehlbauer et al. (2014) supported that good husbandry and biosecurity practices were essential for successful prevention and control of disease, and they have additional benefits associated with increased production and profit. However, key complements to promoting biosecurity include education of the industry and the public as well as other biosecurity measures to limit the spread and prevent the reintroduction of OsHV-1 (Rodgers et al. 2015). In New Zealand, oyster and mussel farms put few biosecurity measures into practice but, as a result of OsHV-1, they now recognize the need for better education of the industry concerning the importance of prevention, disease transmission mechanisms and the need for rapid action following disease detection (Sim-Smith et al. 2016).

Mitigation strategies

Pernet et al. (2016) considered that ‘...disease management relies on establishment and maintenance of disease freedom or control of established diseases or both...’, although it is recognized that this is impossible in open-water marine bivalve systems once infection is established (Rodgers et al. 2015). Nevertheless, Segarra et al. (2014b) indicated that control of OsHV-1 infection was a key element for maintaining the competitiveness and increasing the sustainability of the oyster industry. Castinel et al. (2015) recommended that disease prevention and control strategies should be included in business risk management plans for the shellfish farming industry. The Australian Aquavetplan (Anon 2015) considers disease control strategies for OsHV-1 μVar (see Annex S1), whereas Richez (2012) recommended sanitary measures to reduce the dissemination of OsHV-1 μVar (see Annex S4), and Abollo Rodríguez and Villalba García (2013) provided guidelines for control (see Annex S5). An International OsHV-1 μVar Workshop (Anon 2011) recommended specific control measures and contingency plans (see Annex S6).

Movement restrictions

Unrestricted movement of oysters is associated with a high risk of spread of OsHV-1 (EFSA 2015). Pernet et al. (2016) indicated that the risk of OsHV-1 dissemination in France was much higher for wild oysters collected in infected areas than for those from hatcheries and nurseries. Therefore, movement restrictions on C. gigas derived only from aquaculture cannot prevent the introduction of OsHV-1 to previously uninfected areas (EFSA 2015). However, Murray et al. (2012) suggested that OsHV-1 impact could be reduced by ceasing movements for restocking in areas where there is no natural recruitment. Nevertheless, since pathogen dissemination can take place naturally through the water, movement restrictions of live animals might not be effective in all cases (Pernet et al. 2016).

Renault (2016) considered that controlling animal transfers was one of the most suitable ways to combat infectious diseases in bivalve molluscs. This was shown by restrictions on movements of oysters in the UK that contributed to limiting the spread of OsHV-1 after diagnosis of disease (Renault 2011; cited by Pernet et al. 2016).
In general, Rodgers et al. (2015) considered that global movements posed a great threat to OsHV-1 dissemination because non-commercial bivalve species may be carriers of the herpesvirus without showing symptoms of disease.

**Water treatment**
An EFSA report considered that one of the potential routes for transmission of infectious agents affecting bivalves was the discharge of untreated seawater from depuration plants or other bivalve holding facilities (EFSA 2015). Therefore, effective disinfection of seawater effluent from closed or semi-closed *C. gigas* hatchery and nursery installations, such as using UV light or filtration, would be feasible for minimizing the risk of transmission of OsHV-1, although it is generally accepted that wild or grow-out oysters cultivated in open waters cannot be treated. In addition, hatcheries importing *C. gigas* broodstock should apply effluent controls to prevent infection of local wild stocks (Whittington et al. 2015b).

A simple and practical method using pumped seawater filtered to 5 μm in an upwelling oyster nursery facility was shown to prevent mortality caused by OsHV-1 μVar without the need for UV irradiation of the water, which could be used for water even from infected areas during risk periods (Whittington et al. 2015b). The same authors reported that ageing seawater for 48 h could also prevent mortalities.

**Inactivation of virus**
UV irradiation at 254 nm has been shown to be effective for inactivating OsHV-1 (EFSA 2015), although Evans et al. (2016) reported that standard biofiltration and UV irradiation in a recirculation aquaculture system did not remove all detectable OsHV-1 DNA from seawater. The iodophor Buffodine®, the surfactant Impress and calcium hypochlorite were shown to inactivate a similar herpesvirus (AbHV of abalone) (Corbeil et al. 2012). Whittington et al. (2015c) reported that the alkaline detergent Pyroneg used for cleaning medical instruments and heating seawater to 42°C did not inactivate OsHV-1, whereas heating to 50°C for 5 min, the quaternary ammonium compound Virkon-S® (1% v/v for 15 min), sodium hydroxide (20 g L⁻¹ for 10 min), iodine (0.1% for 5 min) and formalin (10% v/v for 30 min) were shown to be effective. The same authors showed that chlorine (50 ppm for 15 min) inactivated OsHV-1 in seawater but not after the addition of 10% foetal bovine serum.

Renault (2016) concluded that as OsHV-1 was a fragile virus due to its lipid-containing envelope, adapted treatments in bivalve hatcheries and nurseries could be used to control viral infection.

**Production calendar**
Dégremont et al. (2005) showed the importance of field placement timing in relation to oyster survival, growth and yield, and suggested transferring hatchery-produced spat after the critical period for mortalities (e.g. in their case early August to early September), although this was related to either environmental conditions or an unspecified pathogen. Dégremont et al. (2010b) reported a reduction in mortalities in selected resistant oysters at the juvenile stage when they were protected from summer mortality with an unspecified cause. Dégremont (2013) also recommended that prudent management strategies, such as transferring juveniles after the threat of exposure to OsHV-1 has passed, according to the seawater temperature, would support more effective production and lead to reduced mortalities by avoiding the higher risk periods for mortalities.

Carrasco et al. (2017) in conjunction with the collaboration of local producers designed a successful production calendar by adjusting production activities to local water temperature dynamics. Essentially, this involved optimizing the spat immersion schedule into two periods: summer (temperatures ≥25°C) and the end of autumn and beginning of winter (temperatures ≤13°C). These authors reported that the introduction of such a timetable together with recommendations concerning spat immersion size, culture density and the cementing calendar, reduced oyster mortalities from 80% to 2–7.5% in successive seasons.

**Transmission**
Barbosa-Solomieu et al. (2005) considered that the relationship shown between the infective status of oyster broodstock was of interest for hatchery production of larvae, and screening for OsHV-1 could help to avoid poor hatching success and subsequent survival. However, Sauvage et al. (2009) indicated that improved knowledge concerning OsHV-1 transmission was required for developing practical recommendations for limiting the impact of viral infection. Schikorski et al. (2011a) showed that only a short contact time was sufficient for virus transmission from infected oysters to healthy oysters. Moreover, interspecies viral transmission has been reported, including *C. gigas* to *C. ariakensis* and *O. edulis*, *R. philippinarum* to *C. gigas* and *C. gigas* to *C. angulata* larvae, which may be influenced by intensive rearing conditions in bivalve hatcheries (Arzul et al. 2001a,b,c).

**Epidemiology**
Epidemiological models can be used to assess the effectiveness of disease control scenarios in oyster-farm ecosystems (Pernet et al. 2016) and, as such, can be applied to a consideration of strategies for OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems. Data related to pathogen prevalence and distribution can help to determine the technical feasibility and cost of eradication (Peeler & Otte 2016), although this is only realistic in closed-water systems rather than open water with no protected water source. Nevertheless, knowledge
gaps exist for areas such as persistence outside the host and potential for pathogen dispersal related to environmental factors, which are important considerations for disease management scenarios (Murray 2009).

Disease control in hatcheries and nursery systems has to consider the concept of an epidemiological unit, which can be contemplated as a group of aquatic animals or aquaculture establishments that share the same risk of exposure to a pathogen within a defined location (OIE 2009). Once this is established, the management of a designated zone can be tailored towards reducing the risk shared by such a common area, providing all the enterprises within the same unit apply the same management plan.

Collaboration between all those involved in designing the correct management scenario is essential for successful avoidance of disease. In this context, Turnbull et al. (2011) considered that scientists have the best understanding of the causes of a disease, but farmers can identify the aspects of their farming practices that can be changed or modified to reduce the impact of disease. However, social epidemiology that considers education at all levels can be useful for improving risk management in the production sector and enhancing the awareness of the need for disease controls (Castinel et al. 2015).

**Farm management decisions**

Table S8 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to farm management decision factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Carnegie et al. (2016) considered that one of the solutions that could be used to improve shellfish aquaculture health management would be wider training to enable better on-farm management decisions to be made, since it is considered that farmers can influence disease dynamics through such decisions and other related behaviours (Lupo et al. 2014).

Castinel et al. (2015) considered that the management decisions of oyster farmers could have played a part in the extent of OsHV-1 mortality outbreaks in Australia and New Zealand. Consequently, Turnbull et al. (2011) suggested that reliable scientific data and practical time-series observations from the aquaculture production sector applicable to disease control strategies should be tested in field trials before being used.

Lupo et al. (2014) found that notification procedures were quite well known among farmers and a reporting system was well accepted overall but the aims of the system, including providing details of mortalities, lacked awareness and this led to late reporting. This highlighted that the dialogue proposed by Turnbull et al. (2011) between all parties was important in disease control process, in a similar way to zone management. Nevertheless, it was found that financial compensation for oyster production losses appeared to be a more important benefit than reporting the early detection of a disease outbreak (Lupo et al. 2014).

However, more specific prevention strategies have been seen as stopping movements of stock and gear, and zoning of farming areas by OsHV-1 status, since these were considered more useful because of their perceived effectiveness and practicality (Castinel et al. 2015). On-farm exposure to OsHV-1 and subsequent mortalities have resulted in farmers in Australia and New Zealand changing their approach to growing oysters. This has necessitated modification of husbandry techniques and operational strategies, such as species diversification, more use of hatchery spat and new or more versatile infrastructure (Castinel et al. 2015). In addition, Petton et al. (2015a) proposed the regulation of oyster movements between sites, timing of seeding and spatial planning related to seawater temperature and seed origin, restrictions on livestock movements between production areas, and density regulation for oyster beds.

**Integrated and adaptive management approaches**

Table S9 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to integrated management factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Rice et al. (2005) considered that ‘…the alternative to rigid and inflexible management frameworks is adaptive management, and adaptive management is part of the ecosystem approach…’. Adaptive management can apply spatial and temporal distribution controls that include regulations for the localization of installations and closed areas for shellfisheries, but it requires supporting through assessment, monitoring and scientific research, thus providing structured feedback for decision-making (Rice et al. 2005).

Cranford et al. (2012) recommended that such an approach for bivalve aquaculture should be based on a tiered indicator monitoring system using knowledge-based management and an integrative management framework, since pathogens represent only one of the pressures on the system together with others such as introductions and harvesting.

Pernet et al. (2016) also explored the case for a protective integrated approach to the management of bivalve diseases such as OsHV-1 through the incorporation of multidisciplinary science for a holistic understanding of the disease process. This process needs to be considered in terms of the diverse nature of bivalve culture husbandry techniques and the variable risk of the impact of bivalve aquaculture on marine environments (e.g. Europe and Australasia) (Cranford et al. 2012). In addition, the carrying capacity is a useful concept for maximizing aquaculture
stocking biomass, as lower density can lead to less disease pressure, although the concept could consider the whole ecosystem and all the activities involved in the aquaculture process under an integrated management approach (Filgueira et al. 2013). Murray (2013) considered that an understanding of transmission processes helped to group finisher sites into spatially separated disease management areas, thus reducing the risks of pathogen spread and disease emergence by reducing movements between the areas.

Traceability

Table S10 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to traceability factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

Hastein et al. (2001) considered that the lack of traceability in oyster farming was a major limiting factor for the identification of epizootic sources, routes of spread and application of control measures. A system that allows the traceability of movements is recommended by the OIE (2017) at the compartment level (see the section on zoning and compartmentalization). A compartment is generally considered to be ‘...one or more aquaculture establishments under a common biosecurity management system containing an aquatic animal population with a distinct health status with respect to a specific disease or diseases for which required surveillance and control measures are applied and basic biosecurity conditions are met...’ (OIE 2017). Rodgers et al. (2015) considered that rapid and efficient traceability could stop potentially infected consignments being immersed in disease-free areas that might contain bivalve nurseries or hatcheries.

Zoning and compartmentalization

Table S11 summarizes the strategies detailed below related to zoning and compartmentalization factors for potentially avoiding the entrance and survival of OsHV-1 in hatchery and nursery systems.

The OIE Aquatic Animal Health Code (OIE 2017) indicates that zoning and compartmentalization can help in local disease eradication, as well as limiting disease spread and preventing pathogen introduction. Compartmentalization considers management practices related to biosecurity (see the section on biosecurity programmes), whereas zoning is more geographically aligned, but spatial considerations and good management have integral roles in their application (OIE 2017). Therefore, the concepts could be used to protect hatcheries and nursery areas providing the disease status of origin zones and their stocks is known. As such, Pernet et al. (2016) suggested that compartmentalization was ideally suited for closed and semi-closed oyster farming systems (see also Zepeda et al. 2008).

Pernet et al. (2016) also considered the value of minimum separation distances between farms, ‘firebreaks’ between aquaculture zones, and density regulation of susceptible hosts to limit disease spread in terms of zoning and compartmentalization for OsHV-1.

Clear epidemiological separation of aquatic animals with different disease status is required for the efficient designation of a compartment; therefore, the potential sources of infection and the risk of spread of infection into a compartment have to be identified (Zepeda et al. 2008). For nursery areas, and especially hatcheries, a protected water supply (e.g. filtered and/or UV treated) is important, as is axenic or mixed algal culture from a certified source, the entry of fomites (e.g. transport crates, settlement media, nets) and the entry of staff working at other sites (Zepeda et al. 2008).

Acknowledgements

This review was financed through the EC Horizon 2020 Framework Programme and the VIVALDI project (Preventing and Mitigating Farmed Bivalve Diseases – ref. 678589) awarded by the European Commission Research Executive Agency (REA), Sustainable Resources for Food Security and Growth.

References


Filgueira R, Comeau LA, Guyondet T (2015) Modelling carrying capacity of bivalve aquaculture: a review of definitions and


Green TJ, Montagnani C (2013) Poly I:C induces a protective antiviral immune response in the Pacific oyster (Crassostrea gigas) against subsequent challenge with Ostreid herpesvirus (OsHV-1 μVar). Fish and Shellfish Immunology 35: 382–388.


Murray AG (2009) Using simple models to review the application and implications of different approaches used to simulate transmission of pathogens among aquatic animals. Preventive Veterinary Medicine 88: 167–177.


Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table S1</td>
<td>Strategies related to ANIMAL HOST factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S2</td>
<td>Strategies related to HUSBANDRY factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S3</td>
<td>Strategies related to PATHOGEN factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S4</td>
<td>Strategies related to ENVIRONMENT factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S5</td>
<td>Strategies related to SURVEILLANCE factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S6</td>
<td>Strategies related to BIOSECURITY factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S7</td>
<td>Strategies related to MITIGATION factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S8</td>
<td>Strategies related to FARM MANAGEMENT DECISION factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S9</td>
<td>Strategies related to INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S10</td>
<td>Strategies related to TRACEABILITY factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table S11</td>
<td>Strategies related to ZONING AND COMPARTMENTALISATION factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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