

1 **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

2 **Antigen-specific T cell responses following single and co-**
3 **administration of tick-borne encephalitis, Japanese**
4 **encephalitis, and yellow fever virus vaccines: Results from an**
5 **open-label, non-randomized clinical trial-cohort**

6

7 David Wullimann¹, John Tyler Sandberg¹, Mira Akber¹, Marie Löfling¹, Sara Gredmark-
8 Russ^{1,2}, Jakob Michaëlsson¹, Marcus Buggert¹, Kim Blom^{1,3}, Hans-Gustaf Ljunggren^{1*}

9 *hans-gustaf.ljunggren@ki.se

10

11 ¹ Center for Infectious Medicine, Department of Medicine Huddinge, Karolinska
12 Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

13 ² Department of Infectious Diseases, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm,
14 Sweden

15 ³ Department of Clinical Sciences, Danderyd University Hospital, Karolinska Institutet,
16 Stockholm, Sweden

17

18 **Short title:**

19 T cell responses following co-administration of flavivirus vaccines

20

21 **Funding:**

22 This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council (2015-02499, 2020-01365;
23 HGL), the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SB12-0003; HGL), Region
24 Stockholm (CIMED 2020-2022; HGL and KB), Karolinska Institutet (HGL), and KID PhD

25 student funding grants from Karolinska Institutet for DW and JTS (HGL). The funders had
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation
27 of the manuscript.

28

29 **URL to website:**

30 [https://ki.se/en/medh/hans-gustaf-ljunggren-group-immune-responses-to-human-](https://ki.se/en/medh/hans-gustaf-ljunggren-group-immune-responses-to-human-virus-infections-and-cancer)
31 [virus-infections-and-cancer](https://ki.se/en/medh/hans-gustaf-ljunggren-group-immune-responses-to-human-virus-infections-and-cancer)

32

33 **Competing interest:**

34 The authors have declared no competing interest exists.

35

36 **Abbreviations:**

37	Ab	antibody
38	AE	adverse events
39	AIM	activation-induced marker
40	C	capsid
41	DENV	dengue virus
42	DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
43	E	envelope
44	JEV	Japanese encephalitis virus
45	nAb	neutralizing antibody
46	NS5	non-structural protein 5
47	PBMC	peripheral blood mononuclear cells
48	SEB	Staphylococcal enterotoxin B
49	TBEV	tick-borne encephalitis virus

50	YFV	yellow fever virus
51	WNV	West Nile virus
52	ZIKV	Zika virus
53		

54 **Abstract**

55 **Background**

56 Flavivirus infections pose a significant global health burden, highlighting the need for
57 safe and effective vaccination strategies. Co-administration of different vaccines,
58 including licensed flavivirus vaccines, is commonly practiced providing protection
59 against multiple pathogens while also saving time and reducing visits to healthcare
60 units. However, how co-administration of different flavivirus vaccines *de facto* affects
61 immunogenicity, particularly with respect to T cell responses, is only partially
62 understood.

63 **Methods and findings**

64 Antigen-specific T cell responses were assessed in study participants enrolled in a
65 previously conducted open-label, non-randomized clinical trial. In the trial, vaccines
66 against tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV), Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV), or yellow
67 fever virus (YFV) were administered either individually or concomitantly in different
68 combinations in healthy study participants. Peripheral blood samples were collected
69 before vaccination and at multiple time points afterward. To analyze antigen-specific
70 CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses, PBMCs were stimulated with overlapping peptide
71 pools from TBEV, JEV, YFV, and Zika virus (ZIKV) envelope (E), capsid (C), and non-
72 structural protein 5 (NS5) viral antigens. A flow cytometry-based activation-induced
73 marker (AIM) assay was used to quantify antigen-specific T cell responses. The results
74 revealed remarkably similar frequencies of CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses, regardless
75 of whether vaccines were administered individually or concomitantly. In addition,
76 administering the vaccines in the same or different upper arms did not markedly affect T
77 cell responses. Finally, no significant cross-reactivity was observed between TBEV, JEV,
78 and YFV vaccines, nor with related ZIKV-specific antigens.

79 **Conclusions**

80 TBEV or JEV vaccines can be co-administered with the live attenuated YFV vaccine
81 without any markedly altered antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses to the
82 respective flaviviruses. Additionally, the vaccines can be delivered in the same or

83 different upper arms without any significant influence on the T cell response. From a
84 broader perspective, these results provide valuable insights into the outcome of
85 immune responses following simultaneous administration of different vaccines for
86 different but related pathogens.

87

88 **Author summary**

89

90 **Why was this study done?**

- 91 • The World Health Organization recently declared a global initiative to control
92 arboviral diseases. Many of these are caused by pathogenic flaviviruses, most
93 transmitted by mosquitos and other arthropod vectors such as ticks.
- 94 • Vaccination is a key intervention for diseases caused by flaviviruses.
- 95 • Co-administration of different vaccines, including currently licensed flavivirus
96 vaccines, is commonly practiced.
- 97 • Co-administration of vaccines saves time and reduces the number of visits to
98 healthcare facilities and vaccine clinics.
- 99 • Cellular immune responses have not been thoroughly evaluated upon co-
100 administration of currently licensed flavivirus vaccines, including yellow fever
101 virus (YFV), tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV), and Japanese encephalitis virus
102 (JEV) vaccines.

103

104 **What did the researchers find?**

- 105 • The magnitude and specificity of CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses to virus-
106 specific antigens remained largely unchanged by the concomitant delivery of the
107 studied flavivirus vaccines.
- 108 • Concomitant delivery of vaccines in the same or different upper arms of the
109 study participants had minimal impact on CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses.
- 110 • The studied vaccines maintained distinct CD4+ and CD8+ T cell reactivity across
111 their respective viral antigens without generating any significantly detectable
112 cross-reactivity to each other or ZIKV-antigens.

113

114 **What do these findings mean?**

- 115 • Along with recently published data from the present study cohort, co-
116 administration of three commonly used current licensed flavivirus vaccines is
117 feasible without increasing the risk of adverse events or significantly affecting the
118 development of either neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) or T cell responses against
119 the respective viral antigens.

120 **Introduction**

121 Yellow fever virus (YFV), tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV), and Japanese encephalitis
122 virus (JEV) all belong to the *Flaviviridae* family of enveloped positive-sense RNA viruses
123 [1]. These viruses pose major global health challenges, affecting both the inhabitants of
124 endemic areas (around one-third of the world's population) and travelers to these
125 regions [2-4]. Infections with these viruses are associated with significant morbidity and
126 numerous fatalities each year [5, 6]. No specific treatment for the diseases exists,
127 though the development of antiviral drug candidates in the field is an active area of
128 research [7].

129 A range of licensed flavivirus vaccines are currently available, including vaccines against
130 YFV, TBEV, and JEV [8, 9]. These are frequently used to prevent disease among residents
131 of endemic areas and travelers visiting these regions. In addition, several newer
132 vaccines have been successful in late-phase clinical trials [10]. Safe and effective
133 vaccine administration strategies are crucial [6]. While rigorous clinical trials have
134 assessed the safety and immunogenicity of most currently approved vaccines, more
135 limited data exist regarding administration strategies and the interactions between
136 different flavivirus vaccines including the currently studied live attenuated YFV vaccine
137 as well as inactivated TBEV and JEV vaccines [11].

138 To address this knowledge gap, we conducted an open-label, non-randomized clinical
139 trial to assess the safety and serological response following concomitant delivery of
140 commonly used licensed flavivirus vaccines [12]. The trial cohort included healthy adult
141 volunteers who were vaccinated with either YFV and TBEV vaccines, YFV and JEV
142 vaccines, or with the three respective vaccines alone. Half of the co-vaccinated
143 participants received vaccines in the same upper arm, while the other half received the
144 vaccines in different upper arms. Blood samples were collected before vaccination and
145 at multiple time points afterward. Safety, as well as binding and nAb responses, were
146 evaluated in detail [12]. However, the study did not assess antigen-specific T cell
147 responses, an important part of the flavivirus immune response and induction of
148 protective immunity [13].

149 In this study, we stimulated cryopreserved PBMCs from the above-mentioned clinical
150 trial cohort with overlapping sets of peptides from TBEV, JEV, YFV, and ZIKV to identify
151 antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cells. Stimulated PBMCs were assessed with an
152 activation-induced marker (AIM) assay to determine the total T-cell response to major
153 structural and non-structural flavivirus proteins, and to assess cross-reactivity.
154 Collectively, the present study provides insights into antigen-specific T cell responses
155 following vaccination with different types of flavivirus vaccines, whether the vaccines
156 were administered individually or concomitantly delivered to study subjects. From a
157 broader perspective, the present results add further insight into the vaccine-induced
158 immune responses that protect against diseases caused by flaviviruses.

159

160

161 **Methods**

162

163 **Cohort and clinical samples**

164 The PBMC samples used in this study are based on a completed clinical trial, referred to
165 below. The clinical trial was designed as an open label, non-randomized academic (non-
166 Pharma sponsored) trial [12]. It was conducted to assess safety and serological
167 responses to three currently licensed flavivirus vaccines administered either as single
168 agents or concomitantly delivered. Inclusion criteria allowed the participation of healthy
169 volunteers, 18 to 55 years of age, who sought protection from TBEV, JEV, or YFV or two of
170 the three viruses (YFV and TBEV or YFV and TBEV). Participants were required to meet
171 preset inclusion and exclusion criteria. All study volunteers had to sign informed
172 consent documents in line with the ethical approval and clinical trial protocol. The trial
173 was approved by the Stockholm Local Regional Ethical Committee (2017/1433-31/1)
174 and the Swedish Medical Products Agency (5.1-2017-52376). It was registered and later
175 on reported to the European database (EudraCT 2017-002137-32).

176

177 **Vaccines**

178 Study subjects included in the clinical trial were vaccinated with the following flavivirus
179 vaccines: Stamaril (Sanofi), live attenuated YFV 17D strain produced in pathogen-free
180 chick embryo cells; IXIARO (Valneva), an inactivated, alum-adjuvanted, Vero cell-
181 derived vaccine based on JEV strain SA14-14-2; FSME IMMUN (Pfizer), an inactivated,
182 alum-adjuvanted, chick embryo cell-derived vaccine based on the TBEV Neudörfl strain
183 [12]. All vaccines were obtained from Apoteket AB, Karolinska University Hospital,
184 Solna, Sweden. Vaccinations were given in accordance with the clinical trial protocol
185 and good clinical practice (GCP), with intervals for primary vaccinations as
186 recommended in FASS (Pharmaceutical Specialties in Sweden): FSME IMMUN, three
187 doses 0-, 1- and 5-month intervals; IXIARO, two doses, 0- and 1-month interval;
188 Stamaril, one dose. For cohorts A1, A2, B1, B2, C, D, and E (for cohort description, see
189 below), blood and serum were sampled before each vaccination and then on day 7 and

190 14 after each vaccination. Blood and serum were also sampled 30 days after the last
191 vaccination (Fig 1A).

192

193 **Study participants and cohorts**

194 The clinical trial was initially designed to include 140 healthy volunteers [12]. Forty
195 study participants were to receive both YFV and TBEV vaccines (cohort A). Twenty of
196 these participants were to receive the vaccines in different upper arms (sub-cohort A1),
197 and the other 20 in the same upper arm (sub-cohort A2). The next 40 study participants
198 were to receive both YFV and JEV vaccines (cohort B). Similarly, 20 of these participants
199 were to receive the vaccines in different upper arms (sub-cohort B1), and the other 20 in
200 the same upper arm (sub-cohort B2). The remaining three cohorts consisted of 20 study
201 participants per cohort and received either TBEV vaccine (cohort C), JEV vaccine (cohort
202 D), or YFV vaccine (cohort E). Upon initiation of the clinical trial, a total of 161 healthy
203 volunteers were screened for enrollment. 145 study participants were found eligible and
204 enrolled in the trial. Among them, 43 participants were assigned to cohort A (A1, 23
205 participants; A2, 20 participants), 42 participants to cohort B (B1, 21 participants; B2, 21
206 participants), and 20 participants each to cohorts C, D, and E. Following enrollment
207 three study participants dropped out from Cohort A1 and one study participant dropped
208 out from each of cohorts B1, B2, and C. Hence, 139 study participants in total
209 completed the trial. Throughout the trial, there were 13 missed visits out of a planned
210 total of 1,150 visits [12].

211

212 **Viral strain sequences and alignments**

213 The viral vaccine strains used for multiple sequence alignments and peptide pools were
214 obtained from UniProt; TBEV (Neudörfl, P14336), JEV (SA14-14-2, P27395), YFV (YFV-
215 17D, P03314) and ZIKV (MR766, Q32ZE1). To determine percentage of homology
216 between the different flaviviruses, multiple sequence alignment was performed with
217 Clustal Omega [14].

218

219 **Peptides**

220 Individual overlapping peptides consisting of 15-mers (11 amino acids overlap) were
221 synthesized as crude material and delivered solubilized in 100% DMSO at 20 mg/ml
222 (Merck). Each peptide for TBEV, JEV, and YFV as well as for ZIKV (sequences
223 corresponding to viral strain mentioned above) E, C, and NS5 antigens was pooled and
224 diluted in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) to 20% DMSO. For a full list of peptides, see
225 S1 Data set.

226

227 **Activation-induced marker (AIM) assay**

228 To assess antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses, a well-established AIM
229 assay was used with slight modifications [15]. Briefly, PBMCs from study subjects (n=84)
230 were thawed and resuspended in RPMI 1640 (Cytvia) supplemented with 10% Fetal
231 bovine serum (Sigma-Aldrich), 1% Penicillin-streptomycin (Cytvia) and 1% L-glutamine
232 (Sigma-Aldrich). One million cells per well were cultured in U-bottom 96-well plates
233 (Corning) for 3 h at 37°C to rest. After resting, cells were stimulated with a mix containing
234 the appropriate peptide pool (0.5 µg/ml), unconjugated anti-CD40, and anti-CXCR5 Abs.
235 After a 14 h incubation at 37°C and 5% CO₂, the plate was centrifuged at 1,800 rpm for 3
236 min, and the supernatant was removed. The cells were transferred to V-bottom 96-well
237 plates (ThermoFischer Scientific) and washed with PBS. Cells were stained for viability
238 for 10 min, incubated with anti-CCR7 and anti-CX3CR1 at 37°C for 10 min, followed by
239 the remaining fluorophore-conjugated Abs which were mixed with Brilliant Violet Buffer
240 Plus (BD Biosciences) and FACS buffer (PBS with 2% FBS and 2 mM
241 ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid [EDTA]) for 30 min at room temperature. All Abs used
242 are listed in S1 Table. Stained cells were washed, fixed with FoxP3/Transcription Factor
243 Buffer Set (ThermoFischer Scientific), and acquired on a BD FACS Symphony A3 (BD
244 Biosciences). Samples were analyzed with FlowJo v.10 (TreeStar, Inc.) and quality
245 control was performed with the flowAI algorithm [16]. Frequencies of CD69+CD40L+ of
246 CD4+ T cells and CD69+41BB+ of CD8+ T cells were subtracted with each respective
247 DMSO control. Negative values after subtraction were set to 0.001 as the limit of
248 detection (LOD) to allow for logarithmic scale display in graphs. For each PBMC sample,

249 DMSO at the same concentration as in the respective peptide pools was used as a
250 negative control and 1µg/ml SEB was used as a positive control.

251

252 **Statistics**

253 Statistical analysis was performed in Python (version 3.12.4) using SciPy (version 1.11.4)
254 and scikit-posthocs (version 0.9.0). All plots and statistical annotations were generated
255 using pandas (version 1.5.3), numpy (version 1.26.3), seaborn (version 0.13.2) and
256 matplotlib (version 3.7.1) through custom scripts. Data distributions from flow
257 cytometry experiments were determined to be non-parametric using diagnostic plots
258 and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. For unpaired data, comparisons between three
259 or more groups were analysed using the Kruskal-Wallis's test followed by the Dunn's
260 post hoc test. For unpaired data between two groups, the Mann-Whitney rank test was
261 used. Paired data were analysed using the Friedman test followed by Siegel and
262 Castellan's All-Pairs Comparisons post hoc test. Post hoc test results were corrected
263 using the Bonferroni method (adjusted alpha = 0.002 for comparisons between cohorts
264 A and C, and adjusted alpha = 0.005 cohorts B, D and E). All tests were two-sided, with
265 statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$. The adjusted p-value is reported in figures when
266 correction for multiple comparisons was applied.

267

268 **Results**

269 **Overview of vaccine cohorts**

270 Out of the total 139 study subjects, clinical samples from 84 study subjects (12
271 randomly selected from each of the respective seven study cohorts A1, A2, B1, B2, C, D,
272 and E) were selected for inclusion in the present study (Fig 1A and B). One study
273 participant from cohort A1 was later excluded from all data analyses due to the
274 detection of nAbs against TBEV at day 0, leaving 83 study subjects remaining in the
275 present study. PBMCs were stimulated with overlapping peptide pools consisting of 15-
276 mers spanning the entire length of the two structural proteins envelope (E) and capsid
277 (C), as well as the large and conserved non-structural protein-5 (NS5) (Fig 1C).

278

279 **Kinetics of the antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell vaccine response**

280 First, we assessed antigen-specific T cell responses in the three cohorts that received
281 TBEV (cohort C), JEV (cohort D), and YFV (cohort E) vaccines, respectively (Fig 2). CD4+
282 and CD8+ T cell responses were evaluated using an AIM assay (Fig 2A and S1 Fig).
283 Significantly higher TBEV E- and C-specific CD4+ T cell responses were observed in the
284 TBEV vaccinated cohort over time compared to baseline (Fig 2B). Similarly, significantly
285 higher JEV E- and C-specific CD4+ T cell responses were observed over time compared
286 to baseline (Fig 2C). In contrast, no detectable NS5-specific CD4+ T cell response was
287 observed after vaccination with either TBEV or JEV vaccines (Fig 2B and C). Following
288 YFV vaccination, YFV-specific CD4+ T cell responses were observed against both E, C,
289 and NS5 (Fig 2D). The overall activation of antigen-specific CD8+ T cells was lower in
290 participants who received the inactivated vaccines against TBEV (Fig 2E) and JEV (Fig
291 2F), while significant E- and NS5-specific CD8+ T cell responses were detected in
292 participants who received the live attenuated YFV vaccine (Fig 2G). In summary, the AIM
293 assay effectively captured the overall kinetics of the antigen-specific T cell response
294 following vaccination with inactivated TBEV and JEV vaccines as well as with the live
295 attenuated YFV flavivirus vaccine.

296

297 **Co-vaccination retains the antigen-specific T cell response**

298 Overall, the CD4+ and CD8+ T cell response against E epitopes was the most dominant
299 antigen-specific T cell response across all vaccine cohorts (Fig 2). To evaluate the
300 influence of concomitant delivery of vaccines on the antigen-specific T cell response,
301 we compared the results from the single vaccinated TBEV, JEV, and YFV cohorts (cohorts
302 C, D, and E) with those from the two co-vaccinated cohorts (cohorts A and B); the latter
303 co-vaccinated with TBEV and YFV (TBEV+JEV) as well as JEV and YFV (JEV+YFV)
304 vaccines, respectively (Fig 1). Initial analyses revealed similar kinetics in terms of CD4+
305 and CD8+ T cell responses in cohort A and cohort B, respectively (S2 Fig). Importantly,
306 overall, no major differences in the magnitude of TBEV or JEV E-specific CD4+ T cell
307 responses were observed when comparing the respective single and co-vaccinated
308 cohorts (Fig 3A and B). Similar response patterns, though generally weaker than the
309 CD4+ T cell responses, were observed among TBEV or JEV E-specific CD8+ T cells (Fig
310 3C and D). Additionally, we investigated whether the YFV response was influenced by
311 co-vaccination with TBEV or JEV vaccines. Overall, the observed YFV-specific T cell
312 responses were similar (S3A Fig) or lower (S3B-D Fig) in the single vaccinated compared
313 to the co-vaccinated cohorts, though the significance of this finding is not fully clear
314 (see Discussion).

315

316 **Co-vaccination in the same or different upper arm does not impact the antigen-** 317 **specific T cell response**

318 To determine whether concomitant delivery of the TBEV or JEV vaccines with the YFV
319 vaccine affects immunogenicity depending on whether the vaccines were administered
320 in the same or different upper arms, we analyzed specific subgroups of the co-
321 vaccinated TBEV+YFV (cohort A1 and A2) and JEV+YFV (cohort B1 and B2) cohorts (Fig
322 1). The frequency of TBEV E-specific CD4+ T cells was overall similar when the two
323 TBEV+YFV subgroups were compared most apparent when evaluating results at the
324 peak of responses and/or later timepoints (Fig 4A). Likewise, the frequency of JEV E-
325 specific CD4+ T cells was overall similar when the two JEV+YFV subgroups were
326 compared (Fig 4B). Overall, analysis of the CD8+ T cell responses yielded similar results

327 in terms of comparisons between groups vaccinated in the same or different upper arms
328 (Fig 4C and Fig 4D), Additionally, the CD8+ T cell responses were overall weaker than
329 CD4+ T cell responses, in line with our previous results (Figs 2 and 3). Similar patterns
330 were observed for the YFV E-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell response, comparing
331 corresponding groups (S4 Fig). Taken together, these data indicate that multiple
332 immunizations in the same or different upper arms do not markedly influence the
333 outcome the generation of CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses.

334

335 **Effector memory T cells (T_{EM}) constitute the main memory phenotype of antigen-** 336 **specific T cells**

337 We further investigated the phenotypical characteristics of the activated CD4+ and
338 CD8+ T cells in the vaccine cohorts. The memory phenotypes studied for CD4+ and
339 CD8+ T cells included central memory (T_{CM}, CCR7+CD45RA-), effector memory (T_{EM},
340 CCR7-CD45RA-), effector memory T cells re-expresses CD45RA (T_{EMRA}, CCR7-
341 CD45RA+), as well as CD4+ T follicular helper cells (T_{fh}, CXCR5+). Across the studied
342 cell populations, we observed an increase in the frequency of CD4+ T_{EM} cells following
343 vaccination in the study cohorts (Fig 5 and S5 Fig). As a result, remaining populations,
344 including T_{fh} cells, decreased in frequencies over time following vaccination (S5 Fig).
345 The expansion of CD4+ T_{EM} cells follow as expected the initial expansion of AIM+
346 populations towards specific viral proteins as shown in Figs 2-4. These observations are
347 in line with the notion that many of the above-mentioned CD4+ T cell populations,
348 including T_{CM} and T_{fh}, may migrate to lymphoid tissues upon antigen activation [17].

349

350 **The vaccine-induced T cell response showed limited cross-reactivity towards other** 351 **flavivirus antigens**

352 Because similarities in amino acid sequences in viral proteins can drive cross-reactive
353 immune responses between different viruses, we conducted multiple amino acid
354 sequence alignments of the flaviviruses included in this study to characterize their
355 overall sequence similarity. The E protein has 41-44% similarity when compared
356 between TBEV, JEV, and YFV. The C protein has the lowest similarity, ranging from 24-

357 31% similarity, while the highest sequence similarity was seen within the NS5 protein
358 with 61-63% similarity (Fig 6A). To address the extent to which T cell cross-reactivity
359 among the flaviviruses studied exists, we compared TBEV, JEV, and YFV E-, C-, and NS5-
360 specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses in all vaccine cohorts. With respect to E
361 responses, we observed very limited cross-reactive T cell responses across all vaccine
362 cohorts, including CD4+ (Fig 6B and C) and CD8+ T cell responses (Fig 6D and E). Similar
363 results were also observed for CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses against C (S6 Fig) and
364 NS5 (S7 Fig). The results were further corroborated by analyses of increases in the
365 median response on peak response days against the respective E, C, and NS5 antigens
366 (S8-13 Figs). Taken together, these data demonstrate that the present flavivirus vaccines
367 induce, at most, very limited cross-reactive T cell responses against each other.

368

369 **Limited cross-reactivity against Zika virus antigens**

370 Zika virus (ZIKV) also possesses amino acid sequence similarities with the other
371 flaviviruses studied here (Fig S14A). This led to us to assess potential cross-reactivity to
372 ZIKV antigens following vaccination with the present studied vaccines, with a particular
373 focus on studies of cross-reactive responses elicited by the YFV vaccine. To this end, we
374 did not detect any marked vaccine-induced CD4+ or CD8+ T cell reactivity against the
375 ZIKV antigens (E, C, and NS5) in any of the three YFV, YFV+TBEV, or YFV+JEV vaccinated
376 cohorts (Fig S14B-G).

377

378

379

380

381 Discussion

382 The present study presents findings from a non-randomized clinical trial cohort in which
383 healthy study subjects received single or concomitant administrations of different
384 flavivirus vaccines directed against TBEV, JEV, and YFV. Flow cytometry-based analysis
385 revealed robust antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses across all studied
386 cohorts, with similar levels as single-vaccinated regardless of the concomitant vaccine-
387 delivery or the site of administration. Additionally, the vaccines did not induce
388 significant T cell cross-reactivity among each other or to ZIKV specific antigens.

389 Vaccines remain the most effective interventions for many flavivirus-induced diseases
390 [8]. Because of the general knowledge gap in relation to safety and immunogenicity-
391 related responses on concomitantly delivered vaccines [18], the recently conducted
392 open label, non-randomized clinical trial was designed to provide safety and Ab
393 immunogenicity-related data upon concomitant delivery of TBEV, JEV, and YFV vaccines
394 [12]. However, the pivotal study did not address antigen-specific cellular immune
395 responses. The present results complement the latter by showing that concomitant
396 vaccine delivery does not markedly affect the generation of antigen-specific T cell
397 responses, neither enhancing nor suppressing them. Additionally, immunization in the
398 same or different upper arms did not largely impact the generation of antigen-specific T
399 cell responses. The rationale for addressing the latter question was that local innate
400 adjuvant-related effects from one vaccine might affect responses to the other vaccine,
401 or that induction of specific immunity in the same local draining lymph nodes might
402 skew the response towards one type of antigen over another. The recently reported
403 binding and nAb-responses from the same study cohort [12] are in line with the above-
404 mentioned conclusions. However, notably, we did observe an indication of an increased
405 YFV-specific T cell response in the co-vaccinated study participants compared to the
406 single YFV-vaccinated study participants (S3 Fig). Further research is needed to assess
407 the validity of this finding in a larger study cohort.

408 The present study demonstrated marked CD4+ T cell responses in all vaccine cohorts,
409 while CD8+ T cell responses were predominantly detected in the YFV vaccine recipients.
410 It should be noted that the lower and more heterogenous detection of CD8+ T cells is

411 not unexpected with stimulation using 15-mer peptides. These observations are in line
412 with earlier studies on T cell reactivity to YFV vaccination [19-21] and to more limited
413 studies published with respect to T cell responses to TBEV [22-24] and JEV [25]
414 vaccination. In this context, it has been described that alum-adjuvanted flavivirus
415 vaccines induce more of a Th2-biased response and, in this, may avoid a more,
416 sometimes immunopathological, Th1 and/or CD8+ T cell response [8]. The present study
417 also mapped CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses specifically against structural and non-
418 structural proteins from YFV, TBEV, JEV, and additionally ZIKV using overlapping peptide
419 pools targeting the entire E, C, and NS5 proteins. While nAbs predominantly target the E
420 protein [11, 26, 27], T cell responses can be directed against both structural and non-
421 structural flavivirus proteins [13, 28]. TBEV and JEV inactivated vaccine recipients
422 predominantly showed responses to E and C, while live attenuated YFV vaccine
423 recipients developed responses against all antigens, where the highest reactivities
424 detected were against the E and NS5 antigens. Consistent with these observations,
425 previous studies have shown that inactivated vaccines, such as those against TBEV and
426 JEV, do not generate efficient T cell responses specific to NS proteins, resulting in lower
427 CD8+ T cell activation and reduced immunogenicity compared to the live attenuated
428 YFV vaccine [22, 24].

429 Several studies have addressed the role of pre-existing immunity upon flavivirus
430 vaccination [29-38]. For example, in a study by Lima and collaborators, pre-existing
431 immunity from prior JEV vaccination, but not YFV vaccination, was found to influence
432 the duration of the CD4+ T cell response following vaccination with an inactivated ZIKV
433 vaccine [39]. In relation to this, our longitudinal TBEV- and JEV-vaccination and
434 consecutive sampling strategy also allowed for investigations of the influence of pre-
435 existing immunity from YFV vaccination on the T cell response to TBEV- and JEV-booster
436 doses up to 210 and 60 days, respectively. Assessing the present data, we did not detect
437 a significant enhancement or reduction in T cell responses towards TBEV or JEV
438 epitopes in the YFV co-vaccinated groups, indicating that pre-existing immunity from
439 YFV vaccination does not markedly influence the CD4+ and CD8+ T cell response to
440 TBEV or JEV booster doses, at least not within the present study (rather short) period.

441 In relation to the discussion above, we also more specifically addressed potential T cell
442 cross-reactivities between the vaccine-induced immune responses. In short, we found
443 no evidence that vaccination with YFV, TBEV, or JEV alone or in combination resulted in
444 any significant cross-reactive T cell response to viral antigens other than those specific
445 to the vaccine used for vaccination. This included no detectable T cell responses against
446 ZIKV virus epitopes. The present results align with those from a comprehensive study by
447 Grifoni and colleagues [40]. In that study, vaccination with YFV-17D resulted in limited
448 cross-reactive T cells against DENV, ZIKV, West Nile virus (WNV), and JEV antigens.
449 Additionally, cross-reactive T cells were predominately seen against 9 or 10-mers with a
450 sequence similarity above 67%. In line with the findings above, the lack of cross-reactive
451 T cell responses in the present study can be explained by the relatively long antigenic
452 distance between YFV, JEV, and TBEV, which correspond to three different
453 serocomplexes. Furthermore, the YFV serocomplex has the highest genetic distance
454 from other flavivirus serocomplexes, where most of the conserved T cell epitopes are
455 lost [41]. Epidemiological studies further support the present conclusions. For example,
456 no protective association was found between YFV antibody titers and protection against
457 serious adverse outcomes from ZIKV exposure in utero [42]. In this context, it is noted
458 that vaccination against YFV early on following the ZIKV outbreak in 2015 was suggested
459 as a possible means to limit the severe consequences of ZIKV infection in the absence
460 of a ZIKV-specific vaccine [43]. However, it cannot be excluded that responses to other
461 combinations of flavivirus vaccines or combinations of vaccines from other vaccine
462 platforms than the present ones studied could result in cross-reactive T cell responses
463 [44].

464 The relative strength of the present study is that data were collected from a *bona fide*
465 prospective clinical trial cohort with the scientific and regulatory rigor inherent to this
466 design, including independent study monitoring of original clinical trial data. It
467 complements recently published clinical safety and serological data from the same
468 study cohort addressing the effects of concomitant delivery of different flavivirus
469 vaccines [12]. With respect to the limitations of this study, larger study groups could
470 have given even more robust data. Deeper analyses on responding T cell populations
471 could have given more detailed insights into other characteristics of responding T cell

472 populations. Studies could have been performed also against other flavivirus antigens
473 than E, C and NS5. The absence of screening for seropositivity to flavivirus exposure
474 other than those the study subjects were vaccinated with prior to enrollment into the
475 study is a relative limit. However, with respect to this, only two study participants with
476 positive nAbs against TBEV and no one to JEV or YFV were identified among the entire
477 cohort (n=139). One of these study subjects randomly picked for the present study had
478 to be omitted from further analysis. Hence, the present study came to include 83 of the
479 intended 84 study subjects.

480 In conclusion, the present study, together with data from the previous clinical trial [12],
481 underscores the development of robust Ab and T cell responses elicited by flavivirus
482 vaccinations. The two studies support the safety and efficacy of simultaneous vaccine
483 administration strategies with the herein studied flavivirus vaccines. These findings
484 provide valuable insights into the optimization of vaccination protocols, highlighting the
485 compatibility of different vaccination regimens with minimal impact on immune
486 response quality and safety profiles. This is particularly important as the world becomes
487 increasingly susceptible to flavivirus-caused diseases as a consequence of climate
488 change facilitating the geographical expansion of insect vectors, habitat, and urban
489 environmental changes, as well as extensive global traveling [6, 8].

490 **Acknowledgments**

491 We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of all study participants in the original
492 clinical trial. We also extend our appreciation to the Karolinska Trial Alliance staff and
493 research nurses for their exceptional organization of participant recruitment,
494 scheduling, vaccination, and clinical sampling. Special thanks go to R. Varnaité, J.
495 Emgård, N. Al-Tawil, L. Lindquist, J. Klingström and K. Loré for their dedicated efforts and
496 contributions to the original clinical trial. We are grateful to Y. Gao for providing
497 methodological advice. Additionally, we thank E. Alici and D. Calder for their support
498 during the initial phase of this project.

499

500

501 References

- 502 1. Simmonds P, Becher P, Bukh J, Gould EA, Meyers G, Monath T, et al. ICTV Virus
503 Taxonomy Profile: Flaviviridae. *J Gen Virol.* 2017;98(1):2-3. doi: 10.1099/jgv.0.000672.
504 PubMed PMID: 28218572; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5370391.
- 505 2. World Health Organization: Yellow Fever 2024. Available from:
506 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/yellow-fever>.
- 507 3. Riccardi N, Antonello RM, Luzzati R, Zajkowska J, Di Bella S, Giacobbe DR. Tick-
508 borne encephalitis in Europe: a brief update on epidemiology, diagnosis, prevention,
509 and treatment. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2019;62:1-6. Epub 20190122. doi:
510 10.1016/j.ejim.2019.01.004. PubMed PMID: 30678880.
- 511 4. Wang H, Liang G. Epidemiology of Japanese encephalitis: past, present, and
512 future prospects. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.* 2015;11:435-48. Epub 20150319. doi:
513 10.2147/TCRM.S51168. PubMed PMID: 25848290; PubMed Central PMCID:
514 PMC5373597.
- 515 5. Chong HY, Leow CY, Abdul Majeed AB, Leow CH. Flavivirus infection-A review of
516 immunopathogenesis, immunological response, and immunodiagnosis. *Virus Res.*
517 2019;274:197770. Epub 20191015. doi: 10.1016/j.virusres.2019.197770. PubMed PMID:
518 31626874.
- 519 6. Pierson TC, Diamond MS. The continued threat of emerging flaviviruses. *Nat*
520 *Microbiol.* 2020;5(6):796-812. Epub 20200504. doi: 10.1038/s41564-020-0714-0.
521 PubMed PMID: 32367055; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC53769730.
- 522 7. van den Elsen K, Chew BLA, Ho JS, Luo D. Flavivirus nonstructural proteins and
523 replication complexes as antiviral drug targets. *Curr Opin Virol.* 2023;59:101305. Epub
524 20230302. doi: 10.1016/j.coviro.2023.101305. PubMed PMID: 36870091; PubMed
525 Central PMCID: PMC5370023477.
- 526 8. Rawle DJ, Hugo LE, Cox AL, Devine GJ, Suhrbier A. Generating prophylactic
527 immunity against arboviruses in vertebrates and invertebrates. *Nat Rev Immunol.*
528 2024;24(9):621-36. Epub 20240403. doi: 10.1038/s41577-024-01016-6. PubMed PMID:
529 38570719.
- 530 9. Heinz FX, Stiasny K. Flaviviruses and flavivirus vaccines. *Vaccine.*
531 2012;30(29):4301-6. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.09.114. PubMed PMID: 22682286.
- 532 10. Dutta SK, Langenburg T. A Perspective on Current Flavivirus Vaccine
533 Development: A Brief Review. *Viruses.* 2023;15(4). Epub 20230328. doi:
534 10.3390/v15040860. PubMed PMID: 37112840; PubMed Central PMCID:
535 PMC5370142581.
- 536 11. Orenstein WA, Offit PA, Edwards KM, Plotkin SA. Plotkin's vaccines. 8th edition.
537 ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier; 2024. xxiii, 1782 pages p.
- 538 12. Sandberg JT, Lofling M, Varnaite R, Emgard J, Al-Tawil N, Lindquist L, et al. Safety
539 and immunogenicity following co-administration of Yellow fever vaccine with Tick-borne
540 encephalitis or Japanese encephalitis vaccines: Results from an open label, non-
541 randomized clinical trial. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2023;17(2):e0010616. Epub 20230209.
542 doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0010616. PubMed PMID: 36758067; PubMed Central PMCID:
543 PMC53709946270.
- 544 13. Slon Campos JL, Mongkolsapaya J, Screatton GR. The immune response against
545 flaviviruses. *Nature Immunology.* 2018;19(11):1189-98. doi: 10.1038/s41590-018-0210-
546 3.

- 547 14. Sievers F, Wilm A, Dineen D, Gibson TJ, Karplus K, Li W, et al. Fast, scalable
548 generation of high-quality protein multiple sequence alignments using Clustal Omega.
549 Mol Syst Biol. 2011;7:539. Epub 20111011. doi: 10.1038/msb.2011.75. PubMed PMID:
550 21988835; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3261699.
- 551 15. Niessl J, Sekine T, Lange J, Konya V, Forkel M, Maric J, et al. Identification of
552 resident memory CD8(+) T cells with functional specificity for SARS-CoV-2 in unexposed
553 oropharyngeal lymphoid tissue. Sci Immunol. 2021;6(64):eabk0894. Epub 20211022.
554 doi: 10.1126/sciimmunol.abk0894. PubMed PMID: 34519539; PubMed Central PMCID:
555 PMCPMC10763663.
- 556 16. Monaco G, Chen H, Poidinger M, Chen J, de Magalhaes JP, Larbi A. flowAI:
557 automatic and interactive anomaly discerning tools for flow cytometry data.
558 Bioinformatics. 2016;32(16):2473-80. Epub 20160410. doi:
559 10.1093/bioinformatics/btw191. PubMed PMID: 27153628.
- 560 17. Lam N, Lee Y, Farber DL. A guide to adaptive immune memory. Nat Rev Immunol.
561 2024. Epub 20240603. doi: 10.1038/s41577-024-01040-6. PubMed PMID: 38831162.
- 562 18. Vaccine Recommendations and Guidelines of the ACIP 2024. Available from:
563 <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/acip-recs/general-recs/timing.html>.
- 564 19. Akondy RS, Monson ND, Miller JD, Edupuganti S, Teuwen D, Wu H, et al. The
565 Yellow Fever Virus Vaccine Induces a Broad and Polyfunctional Human Memory CD8+ T
566 Cell Response. The Journal of Immunology. 2009;183(12):7919-30. doi:
567 10.4049/jimmunol.0803903.
- 568 20. James EA, LaFond RE, Gates TJ, Mai DT, Malhotra U, Kwok WW. Yellow fever
569 vaccination elicits broad functional CD4+ T cell responses that recognize structural and
570 nonstructural proteins. J Virol. 2013;87(23):12794-804. Epub 20130918. doi:
571 10.1128/JVI.01160-13. PubMed PMID: 24049183; PubMed Central PMCID:
572 PMCPMC3838168.
- 573 21. Mateus J, Grifoni A, Voic H, Angelo MA, Phillips E, Mallal S, et al. Identification of
574 Novel Yellow Fever Class II Epitopes in YF-17D Vaccinees. Viruses. 2020;12(11). Epub
575 20201112. doi: 10.3390/v12111300. PubMed PMID: 33198381; PubMed Central PMCID:
576 PMCPMC7697718.
- 577 22. Varnaité R, Blom K, Lampen MH, Vene S, Thunberg S, Lindquist L, et al.
578 Magnitude and Functional Profile of the Human CD4+ T Cell Response throughout
579 Primary Immunization with Tick-Borne Encephalitis Virus Vaccine. The Journal of
580 Immunology. 2020;204(4):914-22. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1901115.
- 581 23. Schwaiger J, Aberle JH, Stiasny K, Knapp B, Schreiner W, Fae I, et al. Specificities
582 of human CD4+ T cell responses to an inactivated flavivirus vaccine and infection:
583 correlation with structure and epitope prediction. J Virol. 2014;88(14):7828-42. Epub
584 20140430. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00196-14. PubMed PMID: 24789782; PubMed Central
585 PMCID: PMCPMC4097808.
- 586 24. Aregay A, Sluneko J, Korva M, Bogovic P, Resman Rus K, Knap N, et al. Tick-
587 borne encephalitis vaccine breakthrough infections induce aberrant T cell and antibody
588 responses to non-structural proteins. NPJ Vaccines. 2024;9(1):141. Epub 20240807. doi:
589 10.1038/s41541-024-00936-7. PubMed PMID: 39112523; PubMed Central PMCID:
590 PMCPMC11306791.
- 591 25. Turtle L, Bali T, Buxton G, Chib S, Chan S, Soni M, et al. Human T cell responses to
592 Japanese encephalitis virus in health and disease. Journal of Experimental Medicine.
593 2016;213(7):1331-52. doi: 10.1084/jem.20151517.

- 594 26. Hu T, Wu Z, Wu S, Chen S, Cheng A. The key amino acids of E protein involved in
595 early flavivirus infection: viral entry. *Virology*. 2021;18(1):136. Epub 20210703. doi:
596 10.1186/s12985-021-01611-2. PubMed PMID: 34217298; PubMed Central PMCID:
597 PMCPMC8254458.
- 598 27. Wu KP, Wu CW, Tsao YP, Kuo TW, Lou YC, Lin CW, et al. Structural basis of a
599 flavivirus recognized by its neutralizing antibody: solution structure of the domain III of
600 the Japanese encephalitis virus envelope protein. *J Biol Chem*. 2003;278(46):46007-13.
601 Epub 20030902. doi: 10.1074/jbc.M307776200. PubMed PMID: 12952958.
- 602 28. Aberle JH, Koblischke M, Stiasny K. CD4 T cell responses to flaviviruses. *J Clin
603 Virol*. 2018;108:126-31. Epub 20181003. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2018.09.020. PubMed PMID:
604 30312909; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7611868.
- 605 29. Malafa S, Medits I, Aberle JH, Aberle SW, Haslwanter D, Tsouchnikas G, et al.
606 Impact of flavivirus vaccine-induced immunity on primary Zika virus antibody response
607 in humans. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(2):e0008034. Epub 20200204. doi:
608 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008034. PubMed PMID: 32017766; PubMed Central PMCID:
609 PMCPMC7021315.
- 610 30. Santos-Peral A, Luppá F, Goresch S, Nikolova E, Zaucha M, Lehmann L, et al.
611 Prior flavivirus immunity skews the yellow fever vaccine response to cross-reactive
612 antibodies with potential to enhance dengue virus infection. *Nat Commun*.
613 2024;15(1):1696. Epub 20240224. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-45806-x. PubMed PMID:
614 38402207; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10894228.
- 615 31. Bradt V, Malafa S, von Braun A, Jarmer J, Tsouchnikas G, Medits I, et al. Pre-
616 existing yellow fever immunity impairs and modulates the antibody response to tick-
617 borne encephalitis vaccination. *NPJ Vaccines*. 2019;4:38. Epub 20190906. doi:
618 10.1038/s41541-019-0133-5. PubMed PMID: 31508246; PubMed Central PMCID:
619 PMCPMC6731309.
- 620 32. Tricou V, Essink B, Ervin JE, Turner M, Escudero I, Rauscher M, et al.
621 Immunogenicity and safety of concomitant and sequential administration of yellow fever
622 YF-17D vaccine and tetravalent dengue vaccine candidate TAK-003: A phase 3
623 randomized, controlled study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2023;17(3):e0011124. Epub
624 20230308. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011124. PubMed PMID: 36888687; PubMed
625 Central PMCID: PMCPMC9994689.
- 626 33. Sirivichayakul C, Biswal S, Saez-Llorens X, Lopez-Medina E, Borja-Tabora C, Bravo
627 L, et al. Efficacy and Safety of a Tetravalent Dengue Vaccine (TAK-003) in Children With
628 Prior Japanese Encephalitis or Yellow Fever Vaccination. *J Infect Dis*. 2024. Epub
629 20240429. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiae222. PubMed PMID: 38682569.
- 630 34. Burgomaster KE, Foreman BM, Aleshnick MA, Larman BC, Gordon DN,
631 Maciejewski S, et al. Limited Flavivirus Cross-Reactive Antibody Responses Elicited by a
632 Zika Virus Deoxyribonucleic Acid Vaccine Candidate in Humans. *J Infect Dis*.
633 2021;224(9):1550-5. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiab185. PubMed PMID: 33961055; PubMed
634 Central PMCID: PMCPMC8599923.
- 635 35. Li Y, Merbah M, Wollen-Roberts S, Beckman B, Mdluli T, Curtis DJ, et al. Priming
636 with Japanese encephalitis virus or yellow fever virus vaccination led to the recognition
637 of multiple flaviviruses without boosting antibody responses induced by an inactivated
638 Zika virus vaccine. *EBioMedicine*. 2023;97:104815. Epub 20231002. doi:
639 10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104815. PubMed PMID: 37793212; PubMed Central PMCID:
640 PMCPMC10562857.

- 641 36. Rossbacher L, Malafa S, Huber K, Thaler M, Aberle SW, Aberle JH, et al. Effect of
642 previous heterologous flavivirus vaccinations on human antibody responses in tick-
643 borne encephalitis and dengue virus infections. *J Med Virol.* 2023;95(11):e29245. doi:
644 10.1002/jmv.29245. PubMed PMID: 38009693; PubMed Central PMCID:
645 PMCPMC10952712.
- 646 37. Saron WAA, Rathore APS, Ting L, Ooi EE, Low J, Abraham SN, et al. Flavivirus
647 serocomplex cross-reactive immunity is protective by activating heterologous memory
648 CD4 T cells. *Sci Adv.* 2018;4(7):eaar4297. Epub 20180704. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aar4297.
649 PubMed PMID: 29978039; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6031378.
- 650 38. Nasveld PE, Marjason J, Bennett S, Aaskov J, Elliott S, McCarthy K, et al.
651 Concomitant or sequential administration of live attenuated Japanese encephalitis
652 chimeric virus vaccine and yellow fever 17D vaccine: randomized double-blind phase II
653 evaluation of safety and immunogenicity. *Hum Vaccin.* 2010;6(11):906-14. Epub
654 20101101. doi: 10.4161/hv.6.11.12854. PubMed PMID: 20864814; PubMed Central
655 PMCID: PMCPMC3060385.
- 656 39. Lima NS, Moon D, Darko S, De La Barrera RA, Lin L, Koren MA, et al. Pre-existing
657 Immunity to Japanese Encephalitis Virus Alters CD4 T Cell Responses to Zika Virus
658 Inactivated Vaccine. *Front Immunol.* 2021;12:640190. Epub 20210224. doi:
659 10.3389/fimmu.2021.640190. PubMed PMID: 33717194; PubMed Central PMCID:
660 PMCPMC7943459.
- 661 40. Grifoni A, Voic H, Dhanda SK, Kidd CK, Brien JD, Buus S, et al. T Cell Responses
662 Induced by Attenuated Flavivirus Vaccination Are Specific and Show Limited Cross-
663 Reactivity with Other Flavivirus Species. *Journal of Virology.* 2020;94(10). doi:
664 10.1128/jvi.00089-20.
- 665 41. Dos Santos Franco L, Gushi LT, Luiz WB, Amorim JH. Seeking Flavivirus Cross-
666 Protective Immunity. *Front Immunol.* 2019;10:2260. Epub 20190920. doi:
667 10.3389/fimmu.2019.02260. PubMed PMID: 31616432; PubMed Central PMCID:
668 PMCPMC6763598.
- 669 42. Piauilino ICR, Souza R, Lima MT, Rodrigues YKB, da Silva LFA, Gouveia AS, et al.
670 Does the Presence or a High Titer of Yellow Fever Virus Antibodies Interfere with
671 Pregnancy Outcomes in Women with Zika Virus Infection? *Viruses.* 2023;15(11). Epub
672 20231111. doi: 10.3390/v15112244. PubMed PMID: 38005922; PubMed Central PMCID:
673 PMCPMC10675107.
- 674 43. Blom K, Sandberg JT, Loré K, Ljunggren HG. Prospects for induction of CD8 T cell-
675 mediated immunity to Zika virus infection by yellow fever virus vaccination. *Journal of*
676 *Internal Medicine.* 2017;282(3):206-8. doi: 10.1111/joim.12638.
- 677 44. Rathore APS, St John AL. Cross-Reactive Immunity Among Flaviviruses. *Front*
678 *Immunol.* 2020;11:334. Epub 20200226. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.00334. PubMed
679 PMID: 32174923; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7054434.

680

681 **Figure Legends**

682 **Fig 1. Overview of the vaccine cohorts**

683 **(A)** Blood sampling schedule and **(B)** administration sites for all vaccine cohorts
684 included in the study. The number (*n*) of study participants in each vaccine cohort is
685 written and applies to all subsequent Figs. **(C)** Out of the three structural and seven non-
686 structural proteins encoded by the flavivirus genome, capsid (C), envelope (E), and non-
687 structural protein-5 (NS5), were selected as targets for overlapping peptide pool-
688 generation. Peptides, 15-mers with 11 amino acid (aa) overlap, were pooled for the
689 respective protein and the number of peptides for each pool indicated.

690

691 **Fig 2. Kinetics of the antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell response in study** 692 **participants vaccinated against TBEV, JEV, and YFV.**

693 **(A)** Representative flow cytometry gating for the AIM assay used to identify antigen-
694 specific CD4+ T cells (CD69+CD40L+) and antigen-specific CD8+ T cells (CD69+41BB+)
695 after PBMC stimulation with DMSO (negative control), SEB (positive control), and
696 peptide pool (E, C or NS5). **(B-D)** Frequency of TBEV-, JEV- and YFV-specific E, C, and
697 NS5 CD4+ T cells in the **(B)** TBEV (cohort C), **(C)** JEV (cohort D) and **(D)** YFV vaccinated
698 (cohort E), respectively. **(E-G)** Frequency of TBEV-, JEV- and YFV-specific E, C, and NS5
699 CD8+ T cells in the **(E)** TBEV (cohort C), **(F)** JEV (cohort D) and **(G)** YFV vaccinated (cohort
700 E), respectively. **(D-G)** Statistical analysis assessed by Friedman test, with Siegel and
701 Castellan's All-Pairs Comparisons post hoc tests with Bonferroni correction. Significant
702 results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

703

704 **Fig 3. Influence of co-vaccination on antigen-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cell** 705 **responses.**

706

707

708 **(A)** Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD4+ T cells between study participants from cohort C
709 (TBEV) and cohort A (TBEV+YFV) and **(B)** frequency of JEV E-specific CD4+ T cells
710 between cohort D (JEV) and cohort B (JEV+YFV). **(C)** Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD8+
711 T cells between cohort C and cohort A and **(D)** frequency of JEV E-specific CD8+ T cells
712 between cohort D and cohort B. **(A-D)** Statistical analysis assessed by Mann-Whitney
713 rank test at each time point. Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with
714 median and 25th-75th percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant
715 results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

716

717 **Fig 4. Influence of co-vaccination on antigen-specific T cell responses upon**
718 **vaccination in the same or different upper arms.**

719 **(A)** Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD4+ T cells compared between cohort A1 and A2. **(B)**
720 Frequency of JEV E-specific CD4+ T cells compared between cohort B1 and B2. **(C)**
721 Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD8+ T cells compared between cohort A1 and A2. **(D)**
722 Frequency of JEV E-specific CD8+ T cells compared between cohort B1 and B2. **(A-D)**
723 Statistical analysis assessed by Mann-Whitney rank test at each time point. Distribution
724 of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th percentiles; whiskers
725 are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$,
726 ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

727

728 **Fig 5. Kinetics of the antigen-specific CD4+ memory effector T cell (T_{EM}) responses.**

729 **(A)** Representative flow cytometry gating of memory CD4+ T cells based on CD45RA and
730 CCR7 expression within bulk CD4+ T cells (left panel) and within CD69+CD40L+ of CD4+
731 T cells after peptide stimulation (right panel). **(B)** Frequency of TBEV E-, C- and NS5-
732 specific CD4+ T_{EM} cells in TBEV vaccinated (cohort C). **(C)** Frequency of TBEV E-, C- and
733 NS5-specific CD4+ T_{EM} cells in YFV+TBEV vaccinated (cohort A). **(D)** Frequency of JEV E-,
734 C- and NS5-specific CD4+ T_{EM} cells in JEV vaccinated (cohort D). **(E)** Frequency of JEV E-,
735 C- and NS5-specific CD4+ T_{EM} cells in YFV+JEV vaccinated (cohort B). **(F)** Frequency of
736 YFV E-, C- and NS5-specific CD4+ T_{EM} cells in YFV vaccinated (cohort E). **(B-F)** Statistical
737 analysis assessed by Friedman test, with Siegel and Castellan's All-Pairs Comparisons

738 post hoc tests with Bonferroni correction. Significant results are shown, where: *p
739 ≤ 0.05 , **p ≤ 0.01 , ***p ≤ 0.001 , ****p ≤ 0.0001 .

740

741 **Fig 6. Cross-reactive E-specific T cell responses in the vaccine cohorts.**

742 **(A)** Sequence alignments between TBEV, JEV, and YFV. Heatmaps are annotated
743 according to percent of amino acid sequence similarity. **(B-C)** Frequency of TBEV, JEV,
744 and YFV E-specific CD4+ T cells, and **(D-E)** TBEV, JEV, and YFV E-specific CD8+ T cells, in
745 study participants from all vaccine cohorts expressed as fold change relative to day 0.
746 Line plots show median and 95% confidence interval (shaded area).

747

748 **Supporting information**

749 **S1 Fig. Flow cytometry gating strategy for identification of AIM markers and memory** 750 **phenotypes.**

751 Lymphocytes were gated followed by subsequent singlet gating. Cells were then gated
752 as CD3⁺ and Dump⁻ (dead cells, CD19⁺ and CD14⁺). T cells were subdivided as either
753 CD4⁺ or CD8⁺ cells. CD4⁺ T follicular helper cells were identified as CXCR5⁺. CD4⁺ and
754 CD8⁺ (bulk) memory cell phenotypes were defined by CD45RA and CCR7 expression.
755 CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ AIM⁺ cells were gated on bulk and non-naive cells (CCR7⁺CD45RA⁺).
756 Antigen-specific T cells were identified with AIM markers, where antigen-specific CD4⁺ T
757 cells were defined by CD69⁺CD40L⁺ and antigen-specific CD8⁺ T cells as CD69⁺41BB⁺.

758

759 **S2 Fig. Kinetics of the antigen-specific T cell response in cohort A and B.**

760 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV- and JEV-specific E, C, and NS5 CD4⁺ T cells in the **(A)**
761 TBEV+YFV (cohort A) and **(B)** JEV+YFV (cohort B), respectively. **(C-D)** Frequency of TBEV-
762 and JEV-specific E, C, and NS5 CD8⁺ T cells in the **(C)** TBEV+YFV (cohort A) and **(D)**
763 JEV+YFV (cohort B), respectively. **(A-D)** Statistical analysis assessed by Friedman test,
764 with Siegel and Castellan's All-Pairs Comparisons post hoc tests with Bonferroni
765 correction. Significant results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$,
766 **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

767

768 **S3 Fig. Influence of co-vaccination on the YFV-specific T cell response.**

769 **(A)** Frequency of YFV E-specific CD4⁺ T cells between study participants from cohort E
770 (YFV) and cohort A (TBEV+YFV) and **(B)** frequency of YFV E-specific CD4⁺ T cells
771 between study participants from cohort E and cohort B (JEV+YFV). **(C)** Frequency of YFV
772 E-specific CD8⁺ T cells between study participants from cohort E and cohort A and **(D)**
773 frequency of YFV E-specific CD8⁺ T cells between cohort E and cohort B. **(A-D)**
774 Statistical analysis assessed by Mann-Whitney rank test at each time point. Distribution
775 of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th percentiles; whiskers

776 are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$,
777 ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

778

779 **S4 Fig. Influence of co-vaccination on YFV E-specific T cell responses upon**
780 **vaccination in the same or different upper arms.**

781 **(A)** Frequency of YFV E-specific CD4+ T cells compared between cohort A1 and A2. **(B)**

782 Frequency of YFV E-specific CD4+ T cells compared between cohort B1 and B2. **(C)**

783 Frequency of YFV E-specific CD8+ T cells compared between cohort A1 and A2. **(D)**

784 Frequency of YFV E-specific CD8+ T cells compared between cohort B1 and B2. **(A-D)**

785 Statistical analysis assessed by Mann-Whitney rank test at each time point. Distribution

786 of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th percentiles; whiskers

787 are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown, where: * $p \leq 0.05$,

788 ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

789

790 **S5 Fig. Distribution of antigen-specific T cell memory phenotypes and Tfh cells.**

791 **(A-E)** Frequencies of T_{EM} , T_{CM} , T_{EMRA} , naive and Tfh of CD69+CD40L+ among CD4+ T cells

792 for cohort C, A, D, B and E, respectively. Frequencies represents proportions of the total

793 indicated populations. **(F-J)** Frequencies of T_{EM} , T_{CM} , T_{EMRA} , and naive of CD69+41BB+

794 among CD8+ T cells for cohort C, A, D, B and E, respectively. Frequencies represents

795 proportions of the total CD69+41BB+ among CD8+ T cell population.

796

797 **S6 Fig. Crossreactive C-specific T cell responses in the vaccine cohorts.**

798 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV, JEV, and YFV C-specific CD4+ T cells and **(C-D)** TBEV, JEV, and

799 YFV C-specific CD8+ T cells in study participants from all cohorts expressed as fold

800 change relative to day 0. Line plots show median and 95% confidence interval (shaded

801 area).

802

803 **S7 Fig. Crossreactive NS5-specific T cell responses in the vaccine cohorts.**

804 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV, JEV, and YFV (NS5-specific CD4+ T cells and **(C-D)** TBEV, JEV,
805 and YFV NS5-specific CD8+ T cells in study participants from all cohorts expressed as
806 fold change relative to day 0. Line plots show median and 95% confidence interval
807 (shaded area).

808

809 **S8 Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive E-specific CD4+ T cell responses in the**
810 **vaccine cohorts.**

811 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD4+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
812 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
813 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.
814 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th
815 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
816 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

817

818 **S9. Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive E-specific CD8+ T cell responses in the**
819 **vaccine cohorts.**

820 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV E-specific CD8+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
821 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
822 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.
823 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th
824 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
825 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

826

827 **S10. Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive C-specific CD4+ T cell responses in the**
828 **vaccine cohorts.**

829 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV C-specific CD4+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
830 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
831 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.

832 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th
833 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
834 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

835

836 **S11. Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive C-specific CD8+ T cell responses in the**
837 **vaccine cohorts.**

838 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV C-specific CD8+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
839 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
840 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.

841 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th
842 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
843 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

844

845 **S12. Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive NS5-specific CD4+ T cell responses in the**
846 **vaccine cohorts.**

847 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV NS5-specific CD4+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
848 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
849 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.

850 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th
851 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
852 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

853

854 **S13. Fig. Comparisons of cross-reactive NS5-specific CD8+ T cell responses in the**
855 **vaccine cohorts.**

856 **(A-B)** Frequency of TBEV NS5-specific CD8+ T cells in **(A)** cohorts C, D and E and **(B)** in
857 cohorts A and B, expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(A-B)** Statistical analysis
858 assessed by Kruskal-Wallis's and post hoc Dunn's tests with Bonferroni correction.

859 Distribution of data points is determined by boxplot with median and 25th-75th

860 percentiles; whiskers are drawn from 1.5 times the IQR. Significant results are shown,
861 where: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, **** $p \leq 0.0001$.

862

863 **S14 Fig. YFV vaccine-induced T cell response shows limited cross-reactivity with**
864 **ZIKV antigens.**

865 **(A)** Sequence alignments between TBEV, JEV, YFV and ZIKV. Heatmaps are annotated
866 according to percent of amino acid sequence similarities. **(B)** Frequency of ZIKV E, C-
867 and NS5-specific CD4+ T cells in cohort A expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(C)**
868 Frequency of ZIKV E, C- and NS5-specific CD4+ T cells in cohort B expressed as fold
869 change relative to day 0. **(D)** Frequency of ZIKV E, C- and NS5-specific CD4+ T cells in
870 cohort E expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(E)** Frequency of ZIKV E, C- and NS5-
871 specific CD8+ T cells in cohort A expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(F)**
872 Frequency of ZIKV E, C- and NS5-specific CD8+ T cells in cohort B expressed as fold
873 change relative to day 0. **(G)** Frequency of ZIKV E, C- and NS5-specific CD8+ T cells in
874 cohort E expressed as fold change relative to day 0. **(B-G)** Line plots show median and
875 95% confidence interval (shaded area).

FIG 1






FIG 2

FIG 3




FIG 4




FIG 5





FIG 6



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.14.24317320>; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

