Prime-boost vectored malaria vaccines
Progress and prospects
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Introduction

The identification of a highly effective malaria vaccine that prevents disease in the great majority of vaccinees remains an elusive goal. However, recent data indicate that this major contribution to global public health should be achievable with the further development of approaches that are already in clinical assessment. Of the many candidate vaccines that have entered clinical efficacy testing for P. falciparum malaria, at least 25 in total, only two approaches have provided unequivocal evidence of some protective efficacy in humans. One approach, targeting antibodies against the central repeat of the circumsporozoite protein has led to the development of RTS,S/AS01,1,2 which is now in a phase III clinical trial, aiming for partial efficacy of the order of 30–50% with durability of perhaps a year. The other approach is the subject of this review, the induction of protection using viral vector vaccines. Importantly, although viral vectors have been shown to induce significant protection by targeting the TRAP antigen expressed during the liver-stages there is now considerable interest in the possibility that vectors could induce significant protection by targeting blood-stage antigens as well.3,4

The first evidence that vectors could provide protection in humans came from a phase IIa challenge study using the orthopox vector NYVAC that encoded seven malaria antigens, including TRAP and CSP.5 Although antibody immunogenicity was poor, detectable lytic T-cell responses were found to TRAP, CSP and LSA-1 peptides, and 1 out of 35 challenged volunteers was sterilly protected. Use of TRAP with a polyepitope string, the ME.TRAP insert, was then assessed in DNA and MVA vectors both alone and in heterologous prime boost regimes. Significant reductions in parasite burden in the liver, estimated as approximately an 80% reduction,6 were measured in vaccinees receiving DNA-MVA regimes but not repeated doses of the single vectors.7,8 Using ex vivo ELISPOT assays the mean response measured after two DNA priming immunisations and an MVA boost was about 450 SFU per million. In that study one out of eight vaccinees was sterilly protected8 and in another, using related DNA-MVA regimes, there was a significant delay in time to patency.7 Subsequent evaluation of a fowlpox strain, FP9, as an alternative priming agent to DNA showed that two out of sixteen vaccinees were sterilely protected with an estimated 90% reduction in parasite burden in the liver.6,9 Field testing of the potential these regimes,10,11 particularly the latter was impeded by an unexpected drop in the potency of the vaccines when administered to 1–6 year old children amongst whom about 70% showed patent parasitaemia, a factor associated with reduced responses.11,12 Mean T-cell responses were of the order of 400–500 SFU/million in the phase IIa studies in the UK but four times lower in a Kenyan phase IIb trial in children where no efficacy was observed.13 Importantly in the phase IIa sporozoite challenge studies a clear correlation of T-cell responses measured by either ex vivo14 or cultured14 ELISPOT assays was observed with protection, the latter measured as either delay in time to patency or reduction in liver-stage parasite burden. Estimates of the magnitude of ex vivo ELISPOT responses required for sterile protection from this analysis indicated that responses exceeding a thousand were likely required for sterile protection.6,15 This target
was sobering in that very few vaccinees administered any type of vaccination regimen in malaria or any other disease,\textsuperscript{16} reached this threshold at the time.

This led to renewed interest in using potentially more potent adenoviral vectors to try to prime more potent T-cell responses than DNA or Fowlpox. Initial prime-boost studies with adenovirus-MVA regimes in mice had shown promise in the \textit{P. berghei} model\textsuperscript{25} and adenovirus used alone had shown good protection against \textit{P. yoelii} liver-stages.\textsuperscript{18} Use of adenovirus vectors also offered a potential improvement in two other aspects of the immune responses induced by the first generation (DNA-MVA) and second generation (FP9-MVA) regimes. One of these is a greater ability of adenoviral vectors to induce antibody responses: DNA and poxvirus vectors induced only weak antibody responses even in heterologous prime boost regimes.\textsuperscript{7} The other, of greater relevance to protective liver-stage immunity was the greater capacity of adenoviral vectors to induce CD8\textsuperscript{+} rather than CD4\textsuperscript{+} T-cell responses. DNA-MVA regimes in the clinic induced predominantly CD4\textsuperscript{+} T-cells\textsuperscript{7} and although FP9-MVA was better\textsuperscript{19} the predominant response was still clearly CD4 biased.

Simian Adenoviral Vectors as Malaria Vaccines

A major concern with the use of human adenoviral vectors for malaria in African was the recognition that levels of anti-vector immunity were particularly high in African populations. For example the prevalence of antibodies to the most widely used and very potent vector Ad5 was reported as 80% and 85% in Southern and west African populations, respectively.\textsuperscript{30} Also, a non-significant trend towards negative efficacy in the HIV vaccine STEP trial\textsuperscript{21} also suggested that there might be some safety concern with the widespread used of Ad5 vectors in Africa where HIV is prevalent. Reassuringly, however, further follow up of the STEP trial cohort and detailed immunological efforts\textsuperscript{22,22} all now support the safety of Ad5 vectors. Yet the potentially impeding effect of anti-vector immunity on vaccine potency remains an issue for malaria, particularly if high level potency is required for efficacy as suggested by the TRAP studies. One option is to use less prevalent adenoviral vectors such as Ad35, and this option is being pursued by a Crucell-NIH collaboration, but Ad35 vectors appear substantially less potent than Ad5, at least in pre-clinical studies.\textsuperscript{24} Therefore, the option of using adenoviral vectors of simian origin (Fig. 1) to which humans have much lower levels of anti-vector immunity appeared particularly attractive for malaria.

For clinical use a viral vector must display not just good potency, but also genetic stability in repeated passage and a high viral yield in a usable GMP-approved cell line to allow large scale manufacture. Extensive studies by groups in the US\textsuperscript{25} and in Italy\textsuperscript{26} have led to the identification of several potentially suitable adenoviral vectors of chimpanzee origin. Our group in Oxford has collaborated with both the University of Pennsylvania and Okairos (Rome, Italy) groups to assess several simian vectors with malaria inserts. Phylogenetic analysis of the hexons of simian and human adenoviruses (Fig. 1) shows substantial overlap indicating that there is no clear sequence feature that distinguished a simian from a human adenovirus: in fact these sequences suggest one large family of higher primate adenoviruses.\textsuperscript{25} Three vectors, C6, C7 and C9 (also called AdCh68) from the Wilson lab were assessed initially followed by AdCh63 and AdCh3 from Okairos. Using these vectors we made several observations.\textsuperscript{27,28} The safety of these vectors in mice, macaques and, recently in humans has been very similar to that of human adenovirus vectors suggesting that these might be suitable for widespread use. The T-cell immunogenicity of some of these vectors matched or even exceeded the immunogenicity of the standard Ad5 vector used as a comparator. For example in the \textit{P. berghei} model immunogenicity of simian adenoviral vectors AdC7, AdC9 (also called AdCh68)\textsuperscript{28} and AdCh63 (unpublished) was as great as that of Ad5 and considerably stronger than with the poxviruses FP9 and MVA. For the first time it was possible to induce single dose high level protective efficacy against sporozoite challenge in the \textit{P. berghei} model by using simian adenoviral vectors. Moreover, boosting these responses with MVA led to greater and more durable immunogenicity and also more durable efficacy against sporozoite challenge.\textsuperscript{30} The latter may relate to a more polyfunctional phenotype of the CD8\textsuperscript{+} T-cell responses post-boosting with a large proportion of IL2 positive cells observed post- but not pre-boosting with MVA.

The vector chosen for clinical assessment in malaria was the AdCh63 vector, one of the species E adenoviruses. This was found to grow well in HEK293 cells and recombinants have been stable on repeated passage. The prevalence of antibodies to AdCh63 was assessed in Kenyan children using a neutralisation assay. It was found that 23% of the children (aged 1–6 years) had high-titer neutralizing antibodies to AdHu5, but only 4% had high-titer neutralizing antibodies to AdCh63.\textsuperscript{29} An increasing number of simian adenoviruses are now being reported of several different species suggesting that there will be sufficient different vector backbones available to allow different ones to be used for a variety of different diseases. Recently, progress in the clinical development of the simian AdCh3 vector as a vaccine against hepatitis C has been reported.\textsuperscript{30}

Vectors for Blood-Stage Malaria

Early evidence that cellular immunity was relevant to protection in some murine malaria models was followed by the demonstration that repeated low dose inoculations of blood-stage parasites appeared to induce protection in human volunteers in the absence of detectable antibodies.\textsuperscript{31} Very recently the induction of some cellular immunity to blood-stage antigens by inducing strong immunity with viable sporozoites administered with chloroquine in human volunteers, also supported the potential importance of T cells at the blood-stage in \textit{P. falciparum} malaria.\textsuperscript{32} This sort of evidence led to exploration of the capacity of viral vectored vaccines to produce immunity to blood-stage malaria in rodent models. Recently Draper et al.\textsuperscript{3} identified a powerfully protective regime for \textit{P. yoelii} using an adenovirus prime followed by an MVA boost (Ad-M) using the 42Kd C-terminal portion of the classic blood-stage antigen MSP1. This is of course an excellent regime for inducing powerful cellular immunity but the protection observed against blood-stage parasite challenge was entirely antibody-mediated. Strong antibody responses were indeed induced by this
regime and they could be amplified further and rendered more protective by the addition at the C-terminus of a core domain of the complement protein C4bp as a fusion to the MSP1 sequence. This ability to induce powerful protective antibodies with vectored vaccines is of interest beyond malaria and potentially considerably broadens the potential applications of this technology.

The T cells recognizing MSP1 induced by this Ad-M regime were of protective value against the liver-stage parasite as manifest both by reduced liver parasite burden and a greater efficacy of the regime against sporozoite than blood-stage parasite challenge. Interestingly, part of the latter effect appeared attributable to a different cytokine profile induced at the blood-stage in vaccinated mice challenged with sporozoites rather than blood-stage parasites. Analysis of the protective effects of prime-boost vectored vaccines in the rhesus P. knowlesi challenge model led Weiss et al. to conclude that significant protection was being induced by the blood-stage antigens MSP1 and AMA1.

Goodman et al. (submitted 2009) have recently taken this approach forward to blood-stage P. falciparum antigens and have generated a novel MSP1 insert comprising two allelic 42Kd fragments placed C-terminal to four relatively conserved domains of this large molecule, with the aim of inducing protective antibodies to the C-terminal fragments and T cells to conserved domains. It was found that a variety of simian adenoviral vectors could act as good priming agents and heterologous adenoviral vector strains were able to boost antibodies as well as recombinant MVA. Strong cross-strain growth inhibitory activity was found associated with the high antibodies induced and this activity was against strains expressing both alleles of the highly polymorphic 42Kd fragment. Similar work with a biallelic AMA1 insert is in progress, also with promising results (Biswas et al. unpublished).

These exciting preclinical data led to generation of biallelic MSP1 and AMA1 constructs in the AdCh63 and MVA vectors and all four vaccine vectors have now completed GMP manufacture prior to planned clinical trials. In view of the added protection observed in pre-clinical studies with sporozoite compared to blood-stage parasite challenge, the first phase IIa efficacy trials of these new vectors will involve a sporozoite rather than a blood-stage parasite challenge protocol.

**Clinical Development**

The vectored vaccine programme at Oxford has continued to focus primarily on the TRAP antigens for T-cell-inducing
vaccines targeting the liver-stage. This is supported by data from both DNA-MVA and FP9-MVA trials that found significant efficacy with a TRAP insert but no efficacy with CSP as an insert.\textsuperscript{8,9,35} This contrasts with the success of RTS,S as a protective CSP-based antibody inducing vaccine. However, although CSP is the major coat protein on the sporozoite, recent evidence suggests that TRAP may be a better target of protective T cells, consistent with the vectored vaccine clinical trial data. Firstly, analysis of the time course of expression of TRAP and CSP by \textit{P. falciparum} in cultured human hepatocytes found more durable expression of the former, while CSP disappeared rapidly.\textsuperscript{36} Secondly, population genetic analysis searching for evidence of selection in the patterns of polymorphism observed in these two genes found stronger evidence that coding variation in TRAP reflected selection, consistent with immune attack from T cells.\textsuperscript{37}

Several challenges were faced in translating the promising pre-clinical data with simian adenoviruses to phase I/II trials. A set of simian vectors that showed promise in malaria and were owned by the University of Pennsylvania were in-licensed by GSK Biologicals and became unavailable to the Oxford malaria programme. Fortunately, a more promising vector was available from Okairos (Rome, Italy), AdCh63, and ME-TRAP recombinants showed not only excellent genetic stability but high yields in the HEK293 cell line without generating any replication competent adenovirus. Studies of the prevalence of neutralizing antibodies to this chimpanzee virus in the UK (unpublished) and also at a malaria vaccine trial site in Kilifi, Kenya, found low anti-vector prevalences, well below the rates for Ad5 antibodies.\textsuperscript{9} This AdCh63 vector encoding ME-TRAP was then manufactured to GMP standard at the University of Oxford’s Clinical Biomanufacturing Facility and approved for clinical testing in 2007 by UK regulatory and ethical review committees, the first clinical trial of any simian adenoviral vector. During the phase I trial data emerged on a possible, albeit non-statistically significant, increased incidence of HIV infections in a subset of vaccines administered an HIV vaccine comprising three different Ad5 vectors encoding HIV antigens.\textsuperscript{21} This had no impact on the continuation of the AdCh63 malaria trial and recent follow-up data support the view that the slightly increased infection rate in the HIV STEP trial was likely a chance occurrence.

A dose escalation phase I study and phase Ia sporozoite challenge study of AdCh63-MVA vaccinees have now been undertaken with very encouraging results. In particular T-cell immunogenicity with AdCh63-MVA regimes is very substantially higher than with any previously assessed prime-boost regimes and many-fold greater that immunogenicities reported for adenovirus vectors used alone, or even DNA prime-adenovirus boost regimes,\textsuperscript{8} in HIV vaccine trials (O’Hara G et al., unpublished).

Encouraged by these safety, immunogenicity and efficacy findings with ME-TRAP as an insert both MSP1 and AMA1 inserts have been successfully manufactured to GMP standard (Draper S et al., unpublished) in the same simian adenoviral and MVA vectors and will soon enter clinical testing. If either or both of these new blood-stage vectored vaccine regimes show efficacy in phase Ia testing the objective would be to develop a combination product with the ME-TRAP vectors. Adenoviral vectors have been used as mixtures in several previous HIV vaccine trials\textsuperscript{21} without evidence of interference or antigenic competition, and MVA has the capacity to express multiple antigens from the same recombinant virus.

In parallel, two groups have been assessing human adenoviral vectors expressing CSP and/or AMA1 in US-based clinical trials. The US Navy-Genvec program using Ad5 vectors is described elsewhere in this volume and an NIH-Crucell collaboration has initiated a phase I clinical trial of an Ad35 vector expressing CSP.\textsuperscript{39} The Oxford-Okairos program aims to initiate the first phase Ib trials of the simian adenovirus-MVA approach in a malaria endemic area of Africa in late 2009 with support from the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership and other funders.

**Towards Higher Efficacy: Combination Approaches**

Although significant efficacy in clinical trials has now been achieved with several vectored vaccine regimes encoding ME-TRAP the levels attained are probably still insufficient for deployment of this single antigen vaccine on its own.\textsuperscript{40} But upcoming trials of blood-stage vectors may well lead to further efficacy and a combination of TRAP-expressing vectors and a blood-stage antigen vector may be more efficacious as suggested by several preclinical studies.

Another approach would be to assess the utility of combining the two existing subunit vaccines that show significant efficacy in human, RTS,S in adjuvant and TRAP-expressing vectors. RTS,S in the adjuvants AS01 and AS02 generates sterile protective immunity in some 32–50% of vaccines in sporozoite challenge trials\textsuperscript{2} and similar levels of field efficacy in some\textsuperscript{41} phase Iib studies in Africa.\textsuperscript{42,43} Immunological analysis indicates strongly that antibodies are the likely main protective mechanism as T-cell responses induced are very modest.\textsuperscript{44,45} Hence, this is an anti-sporozoite vaccine whereas vectored TRAP-based vaccines are anti-liver stage. We recently assessed in a pre-clinical \textit{P. berghei} model in mice whether combined use of a protein-adjuvant based anti-sporozoite vaccine could add to the partial efficacy of a vectored vaccine against the liver-stage parasite.\textsuperscript{46}

The results were striking (Fig. 2). Each vaccine individually afforded 33–35% sterile efficacy but the combination showed 90% sterile efficacy against sporozoite challenge. Immunological analysis showed that the combination induced both the antibody response induced by the protein-adjuvant vaccine plus the T-cell response induced by the vectors.\textsuperscript{46} Hence it appears that there can be synergistic efficacy with this approach, probably resulting from a substantial reduction in sporozoite number effected by the antibodies making it much easier for the T cells to clear a far smaller number of infected liver cells. Data of this type make a compelling case for assessing RTS,S and TRAP vectors together in humans. Interestingly, the MVA vector itself has been found to have significant adjuvant activity when it is used in a mixture with a co-administered protein, at least in pre-clinical studies, and if this adjuvantation is also found in humans it may facilitate further combination vaccine strategies.\textsuperscript{47}
It is interesting to reflect on the comparative performance of DNA vaccines and viral vectors in human vaccine trials. Ten years ago there was enormous interest in the possibility that plasmid DNA vaccines could provide an approach to inducing easily strong cellular as well as antibody responses in humans. Although those hopes have been dashed, viral vectors are now showing the performance that was anticipated by enthusiastic advocates of DNA vaccination. Equally importantly, substantial progress has been achieved in overcoming the challenge for viral vectors of genetic stability, large scale low cost manufacturing and avoiding anti-vector immunity. We are even gaining important insights from the field of innate immunity about the diverse pattern recognition receptors that underlie the remarkable potency of some vectors. As reviewed recently, viral vectors now present a major option for controlling diseases ranging from HIV, TB and malaria to dengue, Japanese encephalitis, Ebola and pandemic influenza.
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