Immunoinformatics prediction of potential B-cell and T-cell epitopes as effective vaccine candidates for eliciting immunogenic responses against Epstein–Barr virus
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Abstract

Background: The ongoing search for viable treatment options to curtail Epstein Barr Virus (EBV) pathogenicity has necessitated a paradigmatic shift towards the design of peptide-based vaccines. Potential B-cell and T-cell epitopes were predicted for nine antigenic EBV proteins that mediate epithelial cell-attachment and spread, capsid self-assembly, DNA replication and processivity.

Methods: Predictive algorithms incorporated in the Immune Epitope Database (IEDB) resources were used to determine potential B-cell epitopes based on their physicochemical attributes. These were combined with a string-kernel method and an antigenicity predictive AlgPred tool to enhance accuracy in the end-point selection of highly potential antigenic EBV B-cell epitopes. NetCTL 1.2 algorithms enabled the prediction of probable T-cell epitopes which were structurally modeled and subjected to blind peptide-protein docking with HLA-A*02:01. All-atom molecular dynamics (MD) simulation and Molecular Mechanics Generalized-Born Surface Area methods were used to investigate interaction dynamics and affinities of predicted T-cell peptide-protein complexes.

Results: Computational predictions and sequence overlapping analysis yielded 18 linear (continuous) and discontinuous (conformational) subunit epitopes from the antigenic proteins with characteristic surface accessibility, flexibility and antigenicity, and predictive scores above the threshold value (1) set. A novel site was identified on HLA-A*02:01 with preferential affinity binding for modeled BMRF2, BXLF1 and BGLF4 T-cell epitopes. Interaction dynamics and energies were also computed in addition to crucial residues that mediated complex formation and stability.

Conclusion: This study implemented an integrative meta-analytical approach to model highly probable B-cell and T-cell epitopes as potential peptide-vaccine candidates for the treatment of EBV-related diseases.
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At a glance of commentary

Scientific background on the subject

The design of peptide-based vaccines could engender the treatment of Epstein Barr Virus (EBV) infection since no cure exists till date. Hence, predicting highly probable B- and T-cell epitopes from a cohort of antigenic EBV proteins could be vital for the design and development of highly effective anti-EBV vaccines.

What this study adds to the field

Our thorough and combinatorial investigative approaches yielded B-cell and T-cell epitopes with favorable physico-chemical attributes that make them potential anti-EBV vaccine candidates. Interestingly, we were able to define a novel site on HLA-A*02:01 that could be further exploited for high-affinity T-cell epitope binding.

Epstein Barr virus (EBV) is a ubiquitous lymphotropic gamma-1 herpesvirus that belongs to the Herpesviridae family. EBV is also known as human herpesvirus 4 (HHV-4) which is widespread in humans infecting over 90% of the adult population globally. More specifically, in developing countries, EBV mediates an asymptomatic infection that usually occurs at the early infancy stage while there is a delay in acute infection until the early adulthood stage in developed countries with about 25% cases resulting into infectious mononucleosis (IM) with clinical features such as fever, swollen lymph nodes, severe fatigue, sore throat and immunologic dysfunction [1].

EBV is the principal cause of IM while it has also been implicated in several human cancers. About 125,000 new cases of IM are reported annually in the United States while about 200,000 new cases of malignancies associated with EBV occur yearly worldwide [2]. EBV has been associated with distinct forms of cancer such as nasopharyngeal carcinoma, stomach cancer, Burkitt's lymphoma, Hodgkin's lymphoma and some entities of B-/T-cell lymphomas [3–7]. Also, the virus has been linked with autoimmune diseases such as multiple sclerosis [8].

EBV has a life-long persistence in host and it is usually transmitted via the oral route. Upon close contact, viral particles are transferred from the saliva of infected individuals to the new host, entering the oral cavity after which the virus is transmitted via the oral route. Upon close contact, viral particles are transferred from the saliva of infected individuals to a new host [9]. Regardless, the virus persists whether the infection is accompanied by a disease or not.

EBV is classified based on two types; 1 and 2, based on genetic variations in sequences for the EBV nuclear antigens (EBNA)-2 and EBNA-3. Comparatively, type 1 EBV strains exhibit higher prevalence and cell-immortalizing ability than the type 2 forms [12]. Although both types are detected across the world, type 1 is the most dominant in many populations [13].

The life cycle of EBV constitutes to widely distinct stages which include the latency and lytic stages. In the former, only a subset of genes is expressed which include six nuclear proteins, three latent membrane proteins, two EBV-encoded small non-coding RNAs and the BamHI A rightward transcripts (BARTs). The lytic stage typifies the viral replication stage (lytic reactivation) and involves the production of infectious viral particles. This constitutes about 80 proteins which are categorized into immediate-early, early and late proteins [8,14–16]. Lytic proteins are also classified based on their functionalities; capsid, tegument, envelope (glycoproteins - gp) among many others. These antigenic proteins mediate a wide range of function which includes B-cell transformation, viral attachment, membrane fusion, entry, replication and spread [8,15–19]. EBV antigens such as EBNA-1, -2, -3(A-C), -LP-, LMP1, LMP-2A, -2B and non-coding RNAs (EBERs and BARTs) are crucial for the efficient transformation of infected B-cells and subsequent lymphomagenesis [20–23]. These sums the oncogenic mechanisms (Latency III) of EBV in cancer development. Moreover, B- and T-cell epitopic predictions for most of these antigens have been previously carried out [9,14,24,25].

There have been extensive studies on immune protection against EBV invasion, which involves both protective arms of the immune systems; innate and adaptive. A major component of the early innate immune response is the Natural killer (NK) cells, which produce interferon-gamma (IFN-γ) to delay or prevent the transformation of B-cells by EBV [26,27]. B-cells and T-cells, as components of the adaptive system also mediate strong immune responses since they are activated in the presence of a foreign pathogen. The presence of EBV antigens triggers potent B-cell mediated humoral immune responses. The induction of IgM antibodies against virus capsid antigen (VCA) with a subsequent switch to an IgG isotype characterizes acute primary EBV infection. This results in the formation of non-neutralizing IgG anti-VCA antibodies which exist for a lifetime. The major EBV glycoprotein (gp350) also facilitates the induction of neutralizing IgG antibodies, a process that only occurs after the infection has been resolved [28]. In addition to the aforementioned, other antibodies that target antigens that are non-neutralizing also do not appear until the primary infection is resolved. These non-neutralizing antigens include intracellularly located viral proteins [28,29]. Cytotoxic CD8 T cells also mediate strong adaptive immune responses triggered by EBV antigens. This response is directed towards the elimination of cells infected by the virus, which are recognized due to EBV peptide antigens bound by MHC-1 molecules located at the cellular surface; descriptive of the antigenic presentation pathway [30,31]. Previous studies have reported a dramatic
pattern in IM patients whereby EBV CD8 T-cell epitopes derived from immediate-early or early antigens are recognized by about 50% CD8 T-cells [9,24]. Similarly, EBV peptide antigens bound to surface-expressing MHC-II molecules are recognized by CD4 T-cells but in a less-dramatic and focused manner after which the complex is committed into various cytokine-producing T-helper cells (Th) phenotypes that regulate immune responses. In most cases, antiviral responses from most CD4 T-cells that are EBV-specific are characterized by the production of IFN-γ and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α). In contrast, only a small proportion of these CD4 T-cells produces IL-2 even though it is the typical and most expected Th1-mediated antiviral response [32].

Currently, no medicinal cure for EBV exists neither are there any prophylactic or therapeutic vaccines available. Numerous vaccine-development efforts to curtail EBV infection have been directed towards these antigenic proteins, particularly gp350 since it is the primary target of naturally occurring neutralizing antibodies and mostly abundant gp present on the virus and in infected cells [2]. Several clinical trials have been carried out for vaccine development, including a phase 2 trial for an EBV vaccine from gp350 protein, which reduced the rate of IM but not viral infection [23–35]. Suggestively, this limitation could be due to variations in vaccine attributes such as efficacy and duration of protection towards EBV transmission and disease progression. From previous reports, most of the potential vaccines have a short duration efficiency in which they may delay EBV infection but possibly cannot prevent the increases in IM cases over a long period [36].

Dosing is also an important factor to be considered in EBV vaccination. Taking a cue from a closely-related Varicella-zoster virus (VZV), the efficacy of its approved vaccine is based on dosing as studies have reported that about 85% efficacy is recorded with a single dose while a double dose increased the vaccine efficacy to 94% [37–39]. Relative to EBV infection, a logical explanation could be that current vaccines with shorter duration are efficient until they lapse after which a loss of protection is recorded in concurrence with increased susceptibility to EBV-disease such as IM at a later age in patients [33,34,40,41]. Presumably, given the short duration of protection for current EBV (gp350) vaccines, the need for increased single or double doses may be considered in future clinical evaluations [34,42].

The ability of EBV to evade immune response is another factor that may account for the reduced efficacy of potential EBV vaccines. While most vaccines are focused on gp350, certain antigens have been identified for their crucial roles in immune evasion. These include BGLF5, BZLF1, BNLF2a, BILF1, EBNA1, EBNA2 among others [10,43]. Possible inclusion of these antigens to consist of a prophylactic vaccine may further improve efficacy if evaluated in future clinical trials [44].

Vaccination has served as a viable therapeutic option for the prevention and treatment of several microbial infections with a common goal of inducing adaptive immune responses by presenting antigenic fragments to the immune system [45–47].

Over the years, the use of peptide-based vaccines has been promising due to their safety and easy preparation [48–51] and are designed based on different B- and T-cell epitopes. This is possible due to the antigenic nature of proteins secreted by the virus [15,52,53], hence the prediction of antibody epitopes using in silico methods have evolved as a crucial step in vaccine design [53–57].

Epitopic prediction has been made possible via the implementation of immunoinformatics methods which contributes strongly towards the development of fast, reliable and effective peptide-based vaccines. These involve the identification of linear (continuous) or non-linear (non-continuous) epitopes for B-cells and T-cells for in silico vaccine design with a desirable reduction in cost and resources compared to immunological experimentalizations which are tedious and costly.

These predictions are usually centered on the physico-chemical properties of these epitopes and their tendencies to provoke desired immunological responses mediated by B- and T-cells [58]. Therefore, immunoinformatics prediction of potential B and T-cell epitopes for viral antigens remains a prominent way-forward for peptide vaccine development [59,60]. Moreover, tools for predicting T-cell epitopes help identify allele-specific peptides, thereby increasing the possibility of selecting and characterizing peptides that are potential vaccine candidates.

These approaches have been successfully implemented for vaccine prediction against multiple HPV, Ebola, HIV, Nipah, and Zika viruses among others [31,53,56,61–67].

Moreover, immunoinformatics methods have also been employed to predict antibody epitopes for some major latent and lytic antigens that play important roles in EBV virulence [14,53].

Complementarily, in this study, we carried out exhaustive B- and T-cell epitopic predictions of antigenic EBV proteins involved in capsid self-assembly, viral DNA synthesis/replication, and oral epithelial cell attachment/cell-to-cell spread as efficient sub-unit vaccine candidates (Table 1) (Fig. 1). This study is highly essential and could serve as an avenue to achieve the design of highly effective and dynamic prophylactic vaccines having a characteristic mix of multiple EBV antigens with diverse functions over the lytic stage of viral infection [68].

Interestingly, these antigenic EBV proteins have not been previously examined using immunoinformatics method despite their crucial roles in EBV virulence.

Immunogenicity of the potential T-cell epitope was also predicted, which entailed their binding strength to human MHC-1 molecule, HLA-A*02:01. This allele (HLA-A*02) is usually reported as the most frequent across various populations and locations, hence our focus on the *02 haplotype in this study. Likewise, MHC-I HLA-B*35, MHC-II DRB1*13, and HLA-DRB1*15 molecules have been pin-pointed for their frequencies in human populations, according to previous reports [69–72].

The response of the immune system to a pathogen in different populations is largely influenced by host genetic polymorphisms. This is because, in the human genome, the HLA genes are the most polymorphic. This has posed a serious challenge in vaccine design and population coverage since each allele interacts with a certain group of peptides [73–75]. Most HLA-I alleles have been grouped based on their ability to bind similar peptides, with this classification covering over 80% of the HLA-A and HLA-B alleles. This classification is
referred to as supertypes which consist of HLA molecules that bind similar peptide sets [31]. Both classes I and II MHC molecules present T-cell epitopes that are recognized by the CD8 and CD4 subsets of T-cells respectively, indicating there are CD8 and CD4 T-cell epitopes [30]. Upon recognition of their corresponding epitopes, CD8 T-cells are translated into cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTL) while primed CD4 T-cells are changed into helper (Th) or regulatory (T-reg) T-cells [76]. MHC-I presented peptides generated from the intracellular region are commonly recognized by the CD8 CTLs while those that originate from the extracellular region and presented by the MHC-II molecules are mostly recognized by the CD4 helper T lymphocytes (HTLs) as earlier stated. According to previous reports, epitopes of CD8 cytotoxic CTLs are highly immunogenic and their presence in vaccine formulation has been linked to the induction of a robust immune response. Epitopes of the CD4 T cell subclass also play important augmentative roles when added relative to the duration and strength of the vaccine [77–79].

Immunogenic prediction is important for surface antigenic presentation relative to T-cell induced cytotoxic cell death [30,80]. Interactions between the peptide-MHC complexes were also modeled and investigated using peptide docking.

### Table 1: Showing detailed information on selected EBV proteins investigated in this study.

| EBV proteins                                      | Functions                                                                 | Expression stage     | Accession number | Residue count | References           |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| BMRF2                                            | Viral entry, attachment to oral epithelial cells, manipulates cellular actin cell-to-cell spread | Lytic/structural     | P03192           | 357           | [132–134]            |
| BDLF2                                            | Interacts with BMRF2, rearranges cellular actin to promote viral cell-to-cell spread in epithelial cells | Lytic/structural     | P03225           | 420           | [18,135]             |
| BORF1 (Triplex Protein 1, TRX1)                   | Capsid assembly (minor capsid protein-binding protein; mCPBP). Required for efficient nuclear transport of Triplex protein 2 (TRX2) | Early lytic/structural | P03187           | 364           | [18]                 |
| BcLF1                                            | EBV capsid self-assembly (Major capsid protein; MCP) required for capsid assembly in the nucleus | Early lytic/structural | P03226           | 1381          | [18,136]             |
| BDLF1 (Triplex Protein 2, TRX2)                   | Involved in the activation and re-activation of viral DNA replication | Early lytic/structural | P25214           | 301           | [136]                |
| BFRF3                                            | Small capsomere-interacting protein (sCP) involved in capsid assembly | Early lytic/structural | P14348           | 176           | [18]                 |
| BXL1 (EBV Thymidine kinase; TK)                   | Involved in the activation and re-activation of viral DNA replication | Early lytic/structural | P14348           | 176           | [18]                 |
| BGLF4                                            | Serine/threonine protein kinase. Mediates the phosphorylation of host nucleoporins. Enhances nuclear export of EBV lytic proteins, facilitates virion production | Early lytic/structural | P13288           | 429           | [138–144]            |
| BMRF1                                            | DNA polymerase processivity factor. Plays essential roles in lytic DNA activation and replication. Major phosphoryl target for BGLF4. Interacts with other EBV DNA-binding proteins | Early lytic/structural | P03191           | 404           | [83,145–148]         |

### Fig. 1: Schematic representation of the EBV virion showing structural components and their respective locations. Also, possible locations of antigenic proteins investigated in this study are respectively shown to depict their functionalities.
and molecular dynamics simulation algorithms to identify potential epitopic candidates for peptide/multi-peptide vaccine development. Current findings will contribute to the development of possible prophylactic vaccine candidates against EBV infections.

Materials and methods

Retrieval of EBV-target sequences

The respective sequences of the selected proteins were obtained from the Universal Protein Knowledgebase (Uniprot) database [31] using corresponding accession numbers presented in Table 1. The FASTA formats were retrieved and used for antigenic epitopic predictions and structural modeling. Structural modeling was performed using the Local Meta-Threading Protein Fold Recognition Algorithm [82], which applies to non-resolved structures while the structurally resolved protein; BMRF1, was retrieved from the Protein Data Bank (PDB) with entry 220L [83]. Validation of the modeled structures was done using PROCHECK [84] and RAMPAGE [85].

B-cell epitopic prediction and validation

Linear (continuous) B-cell epitopes were predicted from the retrieved antigenic protein sequences while the 3D structures of the respective proteins were used to predict non-linear (discontinuous) epitopes.

Integrative methods were used for linear B-cell epitopic predictions based on the physicochemical attributes of the innate antigenic sequences. These attributes include surface exposure (accessibility), flexibility, antigenicity, and hydrophilicity. These were estimated from the linear antigenic sequence using Emini Surface Accessibility [86], Karplus & Schulz flexibility [87], Kolaskar & Tongaonkar Antigenicity [88] and Parker hydrophilicity [89] predictive tools on Immune Epitope Database (IEDB) analysis resources [90]. High thresholds range of 0.9–1.0 were selected for epitopic prediction.

The B-cell epitope prediction method (BCPRED) was also employed for linear epitope prediction and scoring [91]. The epitope lengths were varied from 12 to 22 to obtain epitopes within the high threshold range of 0.9–1.0.

Using the 3D structures of the respective proteins, linear and discontinuous B-cell epitopes were predicted with ElliPro which functions based on structural protrusion measured by residual protrusion indices (PI), an approximation of protein shape together with the final neighboring residual clustering [92].

Multiple prediction methods were employed for cross-validation and end-point selection of the most probable antigenic EBV B-cell epitopes based on their physicochemical attributes.

Allergenicity predictions and mapping of probable IgE epitopes from the designed peptides were performed using support machine vector, motif-based and BLAST-search algorithms integrated with AlgPred web server, with a reported 85% accuracy [93].

Prediction of potential cytotoxic T-cell epitopes and MHC-1 processing

The NetCTL 1.2 method [94] was used to predict probable CTL epitopes from the selected antigenic EBV proteins. Moreover, this method integrates the prediction of the three main steps of the MHC-1 antigenic presentation pathways which include proteasomal processing, transporter-associated with antigen processing (TAP) and MHC-1 binding. While TAP transport efficiency is predicted using the weight matrix, MHC-peptide binding and proteasomal C-terminal cleavage were predicted using an artificial neural network [95,96]. Default values of 0.15 and 0.05 were used for weights on C terminal cleavage and TAP transport efficiency while the threshold for epitope identification was set at 1.00 to enhance predictive accuracy.

Prediction of MHC-1 immunogenicity

This was essential to further identify epitopic from non-epitopic peptides from the predicted sequences. This explains their ability to be recognized by T cells. According to previous studies, amino acid residues with large aromatic side chains have a higher propensity to induce T-cell immunogenicity. Moreover, highly critical positions in a peptide for provoking immunogenic responses are positions P4-6 [97]. Immunogenic determination of the predicted epitopes was carried out using an integrated IEDB method [97], which determines potential immunogenicity of a peptide-MHC complex (pMHC) based on amino acid properties and location in the queried peptide sequence.

Construction of selected peptide library and blind peptide-protein docking

The PEP-FOLD algorithm was employed for the de-novo structural prediction of selected epitopes. This stochastic procedure entails a Hidden Markov Model-derived Structural Alphabet (SA) [98] which relies on the sOPEP coarse-grained forcefield for 3D sampling and generation, [99] and the Monte-Carlo procedure for final refinement. This is the final step wherein clusters are identified and sorted while resulting conformations are scored [100].

The best-ranked peptide models were then docked to HLA-A*02:01 (A2 supertype) which is a highly frequent human MHC-I allele [31] with a well-resolved X-ray crystal structure; 4UQ3 as retrieved from PDB [101]. Since the predicted epitopes could possess varying binding site affinities for the selected MHC-1 molecule (HLA-A*02:01), a blind peptide-protein docking approach was employed using the pep-ATTRACT algorithm (http://bioserv.rpbs.univ-paris-diderot.fr/services/pepATTRACT/) [102,103]. This incorporates a three-step procedure involving ATTRACT, iATTRACT and AMBER modules. The procedure is initiated by ATTRACT which executes rigid-body docking using the coarse-grained ATTRACT forcefield after which resulting models were ranked by their respective ATTRACT scores [104]. Afterward, the best 1000 models were firstly refined using iATTRACT [103], which is a flexible interface refinement method and then secondly by molecular
dynamics simulation using AMBER14 [105]. Then, the final models were clustered and ranked by the average energy of top-ranked four models [106,107].

Taken together, this method performs a rigid-body global search of the surfaces of receptor proteins provided as inputs and identifies the most appropriate sites for peptide binding.

Moreover, the docked complexes with the highest global energy scores were analyzed and further simulated in explicit solvent using Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulation methods according to protocols employed in our previous studies [108,109].

**MD simulation of peptide-protein complexes and interaction analyses**

To further explore the interaction dynamics between the modeled complexes, we employed the GPU-PMEMD engine of AMBER18 MD package together with its interaction modules [110]. The complexes were parameterized using the FF14SB forcefield while the tleap module was used to neutralize the systems by the addition of Na+/Cl⁻ counter ions. More so, the systems were explicitly solvated in a TIP3P water box of sizes 10 Å. Resulting complexes were subjected to an initial 2500 energy minimization steps with a restraint potential of 500 kcal/mol. This was followed by a second full minimization of 5000 steps without restraints. The systems were then heated gradually from 0 → 310K for 50ps to maintain a fixed volume and atomic number. The solutes were restrained with a potential harmonic restraint of 1ps and maintained at a collision frequency of 1ps. Long-range interactions were included using the SHAKE algorithm and Particle-Mesh Ewald (PME) method while a nonbonded interaction cut-off radius of 12 Å was employed. The systems were then equilibrated for 500ps time at constant temperature (310K) and pressure with fixed atoms, simulating the isobaric-isothermal NPT ensemble. The Berendsen barostat was used to maintain the pressure at 1 bar [111]. MD production run of 100ns was then initiated.
for the respective epitopic-HLA complexes while resulting trajectories were saved at every 2ps. The integrated CPTRAJ and PTRAJ modules were used to analyze these trajectories at the end of the simulation.

Post–MD analytical methods employed in this study include root mean square deviation (RMSD) and root mean square fluctuation (RMSF). Ca RMSD measures time-based deviations and motions that occur across the protein backbone atoms relative to the starting structures. This provides a clue into the degree of stability exhibited by the complex from the resulting frames, particularly when bound by the respective T-cell epitopes. The mathematical expression for RMSD is given below:

$$\text{RMSD} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (R_i - \bar{R})^2$$

From the equation, N depicts the total number of atoms in the system while R_i represents the vector position of the Ca atom of particle i. Alignment of the initial (o) and final conformations with the least square fitting was used to predict R_i.

Moreover, the equation for calculating RMSF is shown below; and accordingly, to obtain the standardized RMSF (sRMSF), the average RMSF is deducted from RMSF (RMSF of the ith residue) and further divided by its standard deviation. The RMSF parameter is used to monitor the motion or fluctuations of individual residues that constitute the protein molecule, giving overall insights into the characteristic flexibility or rigidity of such molecule [112,113].

$$\text{sRMSF} = \frac{(\text{RMSF}_i - \text{RMSF})}{\sigma(\text{RMSF})}$$

3D visualization was done on the Graphical User Interfaces (GUIs) of UCSF Chimera, (BIOVIA) Discovery studio and Schrodinger Maestro while resulting data-plots were done using the Origin analytical tool [114–117].

**MM/GBSA peptide-protein interaction analysis**

The interaction-free energies between the predicted T-cell epitopes and HLA-A*02:01 were estimated using the Molecular Mechanics Generalized-Born Surface Area (MM/GBSA) method which also enabled the estimation of other energy components such as van der Waals, electrostatic, polar and non-polar solvation energies [108,118–120]. The equations below mathematically describe total binding energy ($\Delta G_{\text{bind}}$) for complex formation:

$$\Delta G_{\text{bind}} = G_{\text{complex}} - (G_{\text{receptor}} + G_{\text{peptide}})$$

(1)

$$\Delta G_{\text{bind}} = E_{\text{gas}} + G_{\text{sol}} - T\Delta S$$

(2)

$$E_{\text{gas}} = E_{\text{int}} + E_{\text{vdw}} + E_{\text{ele}}$$

(3)

$$G_{\text{sol}} = G_{\text{pol}} + G_{\text{SA}}$$

(4)

$$G_{\text{SA}} = \gamma \text{SASA}$$

(5)

From the equation, $G_{\text{peptide}}$, $G_{\text{receptor}}$, and $G_{\text{complex}}$ represent the absolute free energies of the peptides, unbound protein and peptide-protein complex respectively. Decomposition of the total energy ($\Delta G_{\text{bind}}$) as shown in equations (2)–(5) results in the solvation energy term ($G_{\text{sol}}$) which sums up the polar ($G_{\text{pol}}$) and non-polar ($G_{\text{SA}}$) solvation terms; the gas-phase ($E_{\text{gas}}$) energy contribution which also sums up the non-bonded [van der Waals ($E_{\text{vdw}}$) and electrostatics ($E_{\text{ele}}$)] in addition to the bonded [internal energy ($E_{\text{int}}$)] energy terms, and the entropy term ($T\Delta S$), which was estimated using the quasi approximation method. The non-polar solvation term was determined by estimating the surface accessible surface area (SASA) using a water probe of 1.4 Å. Total binding energy ($\Delta G_{\text{bind}}$) for the peptide-protein complexes were computed in addition to other energy components. More so, to eliminate entroptical effects, we selected frames at which the systems were structurally stable for MM/GBSA energy computations. 3D structures averaged over the 100ns simulation run were also used to investigate binding patterns and dynamics relative to complex formation.

**Results**

**Sequence retrieval and 3D structural modeling**

Accession numbers (AN) for the retrieved sequences are shown in Table 1, which also indicated the number of residues in the constituent proteins.

Also, the corresponding secondary structures of the proteins as modeled on LOMET webserver are shown in Fig. 2 including the crystal structure of BMRF1 obtained from PDB. Structural validation was carried out to verify the quality of the protein models used in this study. Ramachandran plots that estimate the percentage of residues in favored, allowed, expected and disallowed/outlier regions are shown in Supplementary Fig. S1.

**Physicochemical characterization of linear B-cell epitopes**

The selected epitopes were further analyzed for antigenic sequence characteristics using amino acid residue scale and Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) which incorporated integrative methods as earlier mentioned. The hydrophilicity of the predicted epitopes was accessed using the Parker hydrophilicity prediction method while graphical illustrations of corresponding residual hydrophilicity are presented in Supplementary Fig. S2. Regions with the highest score could correlate with high hydrophilicity. Threshold values of 1 were set to determine hydrophilic peptide sequences while those with the maximum and minimum scores were identified. Among the predicted epitopes, amino acid positions GEEDDDG_44-60 for BXLF1 had the highest score while the minimum calculated score was $-7.414$ at positions FFIFLAL_165-171 for BMRF2. Maximum and minimum hydrophilicity scores for other EBV antigenic proteins are presented in Table 2.

Surface flexibility prediction of the respective epitopes was predicted using the Karplus and Schulz flexibility method,
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Physicochemical characterization of predicted EBV B-cell epitopes based on their innate physicochemical properties.

BFRF3, BXLF1, BGLF4 and BMRF1 were 4.805 (QDQNQN95-100), 6.535 (RRRLQR9-14, RRLQRR10-15), 8.22 (PRDRRE480-485), 8.702 (KKNYQPR349-355) respectively for BMRF2, BDLF2, BORF1, BcLF1, BDLF1, BFRF3, BXLFI, BGLF4 and BMRF1. Graphical illustrations coupled with the predicted minimum scores are shown in Supplementary Fig. S3. The Emini Surface Accessibility prediction method was used to determine the probable surface availability or exposure of the predicted epitopes on protein surfaces [86]. The threshold value was set at 1 which implies that epitopes with higher probability scores (＞1) tend to localize on the surface of the respective antigenic proteins.

Among all predicted proteins, epitope RYKLKK320-325 from BMRF2 had the highest maximum score of 10.315. Moreover, predicted maximum scores for BDLF2, BORF1, BcLF1, BDLF1, BFRF3, BXLFI, BGLF4 and BMRF1 were 4.805 (QDQNQN95-100), 6.535 (RRRLQR9-14, RRLQRR10-15), 8.22 (PRDRRE480-485), 8.702 (KKNYQPR349-355) respectively. Predicted minimum scores are 0.068 (VLVVCV226-231) - BMRF2; 0.070 (CYYLAF195-200) - BDLF2; 0.078 (GGVCFV245-250) - BFRF3; 0.052 (ACVVSC1207-1212) - BcLF1; 0.156 (VAGAGA82-87) - BGLF4; and 0.052 (GIAYVY71-76) - BMRF1. Graphical illustrations showing the predicted surface accessibility of EBV are shown in Supplementary Fig. S4.

The ability of the epitopes to induce immune B-cell responses were also predicted using the Kolaskar & Tongaonkar antigenicity method. The epitopes with the maximum score were identified as those with greater probability to be immunogenic using a threshold of 1. As predicted, BMRF2 had the most antigenic epitope located at TVLVVCV225-231 with a score of 1.3 > 1 threshold set for predictions.

The allergenicity of the respective B-cell epitopes as predicted by Algpred showed that all the proteins were non-allergenic as they do not match with any similar IgE epitopes. This is indicated in Table 2. Also, most antigenic epitopes for the other EBV proteins are presented in Table 2 together with their maximum and minimum scores. Graphical illustrations showing the degree of antigenicity per-residue are presented in Supplementary Fig. S5.

**Prediction of linear B-cell epitopes**

The most potentially antigenic B-cell epitopes selected were those with predictive values of 1 and are presented in Table 3. Using the BCPred server, a total of 16 epitopes were predicted for the nine antigenic EBV proteins, among which 14 had predictive scores of 1 and 13 were 20mer peptides. Two, with starting residue positions (62, 39) were predicted for BDLF2, three for BORF1 (positions 239, 71, 8); two for BcLF1 (positions 262, 475); two for BFRF3 (positions 157, 92); three for BXLFI (positions 112, 2, 89); one for BGLF4 (position 10) and two for BMRF1 (positions 327, 349).

![Table 2 Characterization of predicted EBV B-cell epitopes based on their innate physicochemical properties.](image-url)

![Graphical illustration showing the degree of antigenicity per-residue.](image-url)
BcLF1 KGVSTYTTAKGGEPVGGVFI475-494 was selected for its characteristic surface accessibility with a BCPred predictive score of 0.998. B-cell epitopes with predictive scores of 0.96 and 0.94 were selected for BMRF2 being the highest scores obtained for the 16mer peptides at positions (90,195). Moreover, a 12mer peptide was predicted for BDLF1 with a score of 1 at position (189). 75% specificity was used for scoring indicative of its degree of accuracy [91]. These were cross-referenced with inherent or overlapping residues that constitute linear B-cell epitopic peptides predicted by the Emini Surface Accessibility and Kolaskar & Tongaonkar Antigenicity methods. Relatively, we checked for surface accessibility and antigenic properties possessed by the 12-, 16- and 20-mer B-cell epitopes predicted by BCPred for the respective EBV proteins. Our results are presented in Fig. 3.

**Prediction of B-cell conformational or discontinuous epitopes**

Discontinuous (non-linear) B-cell epitopes were predicted from the 3D structure of the respective antigenic proteins using the Ellipro method which functions based on structural protrusion measured by the protrusion index (PI). Minimum scores were varied from 0.5 to 1.0 to succinctly explore potential epitopes on the protein conformation. Predicted non-linear epitopes and 3D positional representation are shown in Fig. 4. Predicted discontinuous epitopes correlate with some

---

**Table 3 Predicted linear B-cell epitopes of antigenic EBV proteins.**

| EBV proteins | Starting Position | Sequences | Epitope length | BCPred Score |
|--------------|------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| BMRF2        | 90               | SLRVYSTTWVVSAPCL | 16             | 0.963        |
|              | 195              | IFCARGDHSVLSKET | 16             | 0.939        |
| BDLF2        | 62               | PAAAAGPGEPEPHPPMP | 20             | 1            |
|              | 39               | VFYKAPAPRFEGRASTFH | 20             | 1            |
| BORF1        | 239              | GGAGGGGCGVFGGLQPC | 20             | 1            |
|              | 71               | AGGGSSGGSFWSGWRPPVF | 20             | 1            |
|              | 8                | DRRQLRQAAGLPPPARRL | 20             | 1            |
| BcLF1        | 262              | KGVSTYTTAKGGEPVGGVFI | 20             | 1            |
|              | 475              | NAAPAPDRRETYSLQHRRP | 20             | 0.998        |
| BDLF1        | 189              | ALPEVPGPLGLA | 12             | 1            |
| BFRF3        | 157              | GSGGGGQPHTAPRGARKQ | 20             | 1            |
|              | 92               | GGSATPVQAQQASAGTG | 20             | 1            |
| BXLFI        | 112              | GAQPPAPAHQKPTAPTFR | 20             | 1            |
|              | 2                | AGFPGKEAGPPGWKRCQED | 20             | 1            |
|              | 89               | AVTSNTGNPSGRHTCPT | 20             | 1            |
| BGLF4        | 10               | SPTNSSSGELSVSPEPPE | 20             | 1            |
| BMRF1        | 327              | RPRHTVSPSFPPPPPRTPT | 20             | 1            |
|              | 349              | SPARPETPSAPIPSHSSNTA | 20             | 1            |
of the linear epitopes earlier determined (surface accessibility and antigenicity) as presented earlier in Table 2.

**Identification of potential T-cell epitopes**

As earlier mentioned, the NetCTL method was used to predict epitopes for the selected antigenic proteins, a platform that incorporates the SNN, weight matrix and artificial neural network methods. Scoring of MHC-1 binding affinity was done against HLAs of the A2 supertype among which HLA-A*02:01 is reportedly the most frequent haplotype across various populations [69–72].

Related antigenic processing stages were predicted using the proteasomal C-terminal cleavage and TAP scores, which
altogether presents the possibility of identifying the most promising T-cell epitopes for the antigenic proteins. Peptides with nine residues (9mers) were selected since mostly presented peptides are of that length [121]. Possible MHC-1 ligands were identified (< - E) as indicated in Table 4 while the two highly ranked epitopes were selected and shown accordingly.

Structural modeling of selected epitopes and HLA-A*02:01 docking analysis

The selected T-cell epitopes (peptides) were structurally modeled using the FEPFOLD server before docking to HLA-A*02:01. pepATTRACT blind peptide-protein docking method was used to identify the most appropriate binding sites on HLA-A*02:01 for the respective epitopes into which they were docked simultaneously. 51 clusters were obtained for each peptide-protein complex and the best-docked complexes were selected based on global energy scoring and shown in Table 5. Moreover, 3D models of EBV T-cell epitopes with the highest energy scores are shown in Fig. 5.

As estimated, BMRF2 T-cell epitope FMSPFFI161-169 had the most favorable docking energy of −18.4 kcal/mol compared to FVFTFCEYL1327-1335.

Likewise, the most favorable peptide-HLA-A*02:01 energy scores based on site binding affinities include −14.5 kcal/mol, −15.1 kcal/mol, −20.4 kcal/mol, −14.8 kcal/mol, −17.4 kcal/mol and −18.5 kcal/mol respectively for BDLF2 (KVTLYLPAY246-254), BORF1 (YLKNITTVV199-208), BcLF1 (FQFQAAPKVK336-344), BGLF4 (FQFQAAPKVK336-344), BFRF3 (SQFCYEEYV53-61), and BMRF1 (ALMPYMPPA144-152).

Amongst all predicted T-cell epitopes, BcLF1 epitope BcLF1 (FQFQAAPKVK336-344) had the highest docking score. Also, we observed that the binding of all predicted T-cell epitopes occurred majorly across two sites on HLA-A*02:01 designated Site 1 and 2, which are depicted in Fig. 6. The predicted Site 2

| Antigenic proteins | Peptide sequences (T-cell epitopes) | MHC-1 binding affinity | Rescale binding affinity | Proteasomal C-terminal Cleavage | Transport affinity | Prediction score | MHC-1 binding |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| BMRF2 161-169      | FMSPPFI161-169                     | 0.9130                 | 1.361                    | 0.9775                         | 1.024             | 1.5588          | < - E         |
| BDLF2 246-254      | KVYTLIPAY246-254                   | 0.8028                 | 1.1967                   | 0.4223                         | 0.74              | 1.297           | < - E         |
| BORF1 199-207      | YLNKITTVV199-207                   | 0.7341                 | 1.0942                   | 0.8579                         | −0.447            | 2.006           | < - E         |
| BcLF1 157-165      | LLYDSPATL157-165                   | 0.8500                 | 1.2671                   | 0.973                          | 0.230             | 1.425           | < - E         |
| BcLF1 201-208      | BMRF1 401-409                      | 0.9188                 | 1.3696                   | 0.7904                         | 0.756             | 1.526           | < - E         |
| BGLF4 336-344      | BMRF1 1327-1335                    | 0.8944                 | 1.3332                   | 0.9578                         | 0.901             | 1.524           | < - E         |
| BDLF1 266-274      | VMHTVYQSL266-274                   | 0.8772                 | 1.3076                   | 0.9626                         | 1.335             | 1.535           | < - E         |
| BFRF3 53-61        | SQFCYEEYV53-61                     | 0.7511                 | 1.1196                   | 0.7174                         | 0.5650            | 1.254           | < - E         |
| BMRF1 144-152      | ALMPYMPPA144-152                   | 0.9089                 | 1.3549                   | 0.6638                         | 0.3140            | 1.4388          | < - E         |
| 32-40              | VQVNLSSV13-23                      | 0.6918                 | 1.0312                   | 0.8818                         | 0.3340            | 1.1802          | < - E         |

| Antigenic proteins | Peptide-MHC-1 complexes | pepATTRACT MM/GBSA estimations |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                    | Global energy (kcal/mol) | ΔE_{ele} (kcal/mol) | ΔE_{vdw} (kcal/mol) | ΔE_{ele} (kcal/mol) | ΔE_{GB} (kcal/mol) | ΔE_{SA} (kcal/mol) | ΔG_{bind} (kcal/mol) |
| BMRF2              | −18.44                  | −11.24                       | −58.83              | 61.37              | −7.4              | −10.18          |
| BDLF2              | −14.50                  | −10.22                       | −12.95              | 17.20              | −6.41             | −7.25           |
| BORF1              | −15.08                  | −10.42                       | −11.55              | 15.85              | −6.51             | −7.43           |
| BcLF1              | −20.42                  | −10.87                       | −9.78               | 14.44              | −7.4              | −7.69           |
| BDLF1              | −14.37                  | −8.4                         | −15.03              | 17.02              | −5.9              | −7.59           |
| BFRF3              | −13.89                  | −11.99                       | −4.78               | 11.98              | −7.97             | −6.38           |
| BcLF1              | −14.79                  | −16.69                       | −58.64              | 64.04              | −10.85            | −13.47          |
| BGLF4              | −14.70                  | −10.61                       | −67.05              | 69.94              | −6.89             | −9.12           |
| BMRF1              | −18.54                  | −10.36                       | −14.07              | 16.84              | −6.6              | −8.88           |

ΔE_{ele}: electrostatic energy; ΔE_{vdw}: van der Waals energy; ΔG_{bind}: total binding free energy; ΔE_{GB}: polar desolvation energy; ΔE_{SA}: non-polar solvation energy.
into which some of the epitopes were docked correlates with the binding site determined in HLA-A*02:01 crystal structure (PDB ID: 4UQ3). As predicted, T-cell epitopes for EBV proteins; BMRF2, BXLF1, and BGLF4 exhibited a higher affinity for Site 1 where they were docked while epitopes for BDLF2, BFRF3, BORF1, BcLF1, BDLF1, BFRF3, and BMRF1 had a higher binding propensity for Site 2 as predicted by pepATTRACT.

**MD simulation and MM/GBSA-based interaction analyses**

MD analyses were performed to obtain molecular insights into the binding and interaction dynamics of the predicted EBV T-cell epitopes and HLA-A*02:01. 100ns MD simulation runs were performed for the complexes and individual epitopes while resulting trajectories were analyzed.

This was performed using post-analytical metrics such as the root mean square deviation (RMSD) and root mean square fluctuation (RMSF) methods which were used to estimate trajectorial motions of constituent Ca atoms. Results showing estimated mean values for the epitopes and their corresponding MHC-1 complexes are presented in Table 6.

Comparatively Site 1-bound BXLFI T-cell epitope [RTLAYLQFV_548-556] exhibited the highest RMSD with a mean value of 4.9 Å while the lowest RMSD of 2.4 Å was exhibited by BMRF2 [FMSFFIFL_151-169], indicative of its highly stable motion at the target Site 1 region of HLA-A*02:01. The trajectorial motions of the respective epitopes at the target Sites (1 and 2) are shown in Fig. 7. Moreover, it can be deduced from the plot that while their motions were highly unstable at the initial periods of the MD simulation, they seemingly attained stability towards the end of the simulation (~50–80ns) which could mediate optimal binding and interactions at their target sites. Dynamical motions of the peptide-MHC complexes were also measured using the RMSD and RMSF.
metrics. Mean values are also presented in Table 6 while corresponding plots are shown in Fig. 7. BXLF1 [RTLALQFV548-556]-MHC complex was more stable while the highest structural instability was exhibited by the BGLF4 [FLQFAAPKV336-344]-MHC complex.

Presumably, high RMSDs exhibited by the epitopes at the respective binding sites could correlate with systematic motions necessary to achieve optimal and high-affinity binding with target residues. Consequently, this could account for the complementary increase in structural motions and deviations observed for the peptide-MHC complexes until relative stability was attained.

Complementary interaction dynamics of the EBV T-cell epitopes were also investigated while binding affinities were measured using the MM/GBSA method. Findings revealed that predicted Site 1 HLA-A*02:01 binders; BMRF2 [FMSPFFIFL161-169], BXLF1 [RTLALQFV548-556] and BGLF4 [FLQFAAPKV336-344]-MHC complex had total binding energies ($\Delta G_{\text{bind}}$) of $-10.18$, $-13.85$ and $-9.1$ kcal/mol, which are higher when compared to other EBV T-cell epitopes that are Site 2 binders as shown in Table 5.

---

**Table 6 Post-MD simulation analyses of structural motions and stability for the T-cell epitopes and peptide-protein complexes.**

| EBV proteins       | T-cell Epitope RMSD (Å) | T-cell Epitope-MHC complex |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                    | Ca- RMSD (Å)            | Ca- RMSF (Å)                |
| BMRF2 [FMSPFFIFL161-169] | 2.4 ± 0.4               | 4.2 ± 1.0                  | 1.9 ± 0.8 |
| BDLF2 [KVYTLIPAV246-254] | 4.2 ± 1.0               | 6.8 ± 1.9                  | 3.0 ± 1.2 |
| BORF1 [YLNKITTYYV199-207] | 4.1 ± 1.0               | 4.1 ± 1.7                  | 3.0 ± 1.3 |
| BcLF1 [FLQFAAPAL1327-1335] | 2.7 ± 0.5               | 6.4 ± 3.5                  | 4.2 ± 1.8 |
| BDLF1 [VMMTTYQSIL266-274] | 3.9 ± 0.6               | 5.5 ± 2.3                  | 3.3 ± 2.0 |
| BFRF3 [QFNCYEYYV53-61] | 3.2 ± 0.3               | 4.3 ± 2.4                  | 3.1 ± 1.1 |
| BXL1 [RTLALQFV548-556] | 4.9 ± 1.0               | 2.8 ± 0.4                  | 1.9 ± 0.6 |
| BGLF4 [FLQFAAPKV336-344] | 3.6 ± 1.5               | 9.0 ± 3.0                  | 3.9 ± 1.7 |
| BMRF1 [ALMPYMPPA144-152] | 3.5 ± 0.5               | 5.6 ± 2.9                  | 3.7 ± 1.4 |

---

Fig. 6 Potential HLA-A*02:01 binding sites predicted for the respective EBV T-cell epitopes. [A] Site 1 and corresponding constituent residues [B] Site 2 and corresponding constituent residues. Also shown are the cohort of epitopes that bind with selective affinity to the respective sites as predicted by pepATTRACT blind-docking algorithm.
Estimations of other energy components revealed that both van der Waals ($\Delta E_{\text{vdW}}$) and electrostatic energies ($\Delta E_{\text{ele}}$) contributed to the $\Delta G_{\text{bind}}$, while positive polar desolvation energy values ($\Delta E_{\text{desolv}}$) indicated that binding interactions were favorable in the hydrophobic regions. This is supported by the estimated negative non-polar energies ($\Delta E_{\text{non-polar}}$) as shown.

Analysis of the intermolecular interactions between the T-cell epitopes and target MHC-1 molecule revealed a similar binding pattern across both sites as shown in Fig. 8.

For Site 1 binders; amino acid residues Asp29, Asp30 and Gln115 (amongst other interacting residues) were crucial to the binding and stability of the epitopes; BMRF2 [FMSPPFFIFL161-169], BXLF1 [RTLAYLQFV548-556] and BGLF4 [FLQFAAPKV336-344]. These include the formation of high-affinity hydrogen bonds with proximal residues of the T-cell epitopes. As shown, Site 1 residues; Asp29, Asp30 and Gln115 formed H bonds with Met2, Ser3 and Ile7 of BMRF2 [FMSPPFFIFL161-169] respectively. Likewise, Asp30 and Gln115 recurrently interacted with Arg1 and Gln7 of BXLF1 [RTLAYLQFV548-556] respectively.

Similarly in BGLF4 [FLQFAAPKV336-344] complex, Asp29 formed two H bonds with Gln3 and Phe4 whilst also involved in H bond formation with Phe1. On the other hand, Asp30 existed in hydrophobic interactions with the hydrophobic side chain of Phe4.

Also, we identified important interactions that account for the stability of Site 2 binders at the target region (Fig. 8). A highly important residue that was uniformly involved in complementary H bonding with the respective EBV epitopes is Gln155. At the target Site 2, His70, Thr73, Lys246 and, Gln155 contributed to the binding of BcLF1 [FLQEAFPAL1327-1335] via H bond interactions while Gln155, Arg97, Lys66, Trp167 were involved in the binding of BDLF1 [VMMTYLQSL266-274]. Moreover, we observed that Lys146 and Arg65 played key roles in the binding of BDLF2 [KVYTLIPAV246-254] while BFRF3...
binding was stabilized by interactions with His70, Gln155, Thr73, Arg97 and, Lys146. Gln155 and Lys66 were crucial for the binding of BMRF1 [ALMPYMPPA144-152] while constituent BORF1 [YLNKITTVV199-208] residues; Leu2, Ile5, Thr7 and, Val8 interacted with Site 2 residues; Thr163, Arg97, Thr73, and Gln155 respectively as shown in Fig. 8.

Discussion

Efforts to curtail the virulent activities of EBV have been ongoing requiring several therapeutic options ranging from the development of small molecule inhibitors to vaccination.
While antagonists are directed towards crucial viral proteins [122,123], vaccines are developed to stimulate immunogenic B-cell or T-cell responses towards lytic and latent EBV proteins [2,15]. Although efforts to develop effective cures for EBV-mediated infections have been unsuccessful, a gp350 vaccine has made significant progress through clinical trials even though it does not curtail viral infections [2,33–35].

Among the various vaccine types, peptide or subunit vaccines have emerged as attractive candidates for treatment since there is a huge possibility of designing them based on essential information from viral pathogenic components. This is achievable via the implementation of immunoinformatics approaches which has been widely employed for B- and T-cells epitopic predictions from viral proteins [31,53,56,61–65]. The antigenic nature of viral proteins corresponds with their ability to elicit adaptive immunogenic responses by host B- and T-cells which could, in turn, lead to the death of infected cells. Molecular components (antigens) and not the whole pathogens are recognized by receptors on B- and T-cells; B-cell receptors (BCR) and T-cell receptors (TCR), a process that differs greatly for both cells. While BCRs recognize and bind surface-exposed antigens (epitopes) on viral proteins to secrete antibodies and mediate humoral adaptive immunity, TCRs recognize antigens presented on the surfaces of antigen-presenting cells (APCs) that are bound to major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules categorized into MHC-I and II. These are respectively recognized by CD8+ (cytotoxic) and CD4+ (helper) T-cells. Altogether, the pathway for antigenic presentation (at the extracellular surface) incorporates proteasomal degradation, TAP processing and MHC-1 [human leukocytes antigen (HLA) in humans] binding [31,124–126].

Several crucial functional proteins (lytic and latent) constitute the EBV proteome and contribute to its virulence in host cells. Similar to EBV glycoproteins [8,53], proteins that regulate epithelial cell attachment, DNA synthesis/replication and, capsid assembly are highly important in the viral latent and lytic cycles. These proteins include BMRF2, BDLF2, BORF1, BcLF1, BFRF3, BXLFI, BGLF4, and BMRF1 (see Table 1). Therefore, immunoinformatics prediction of potential B-cell and T-cell (CD8+) epitopes for these proteins represent the highlight of this study.

Potential linear B-cell epitopes reported in this study were selected based on their characteristic surface-exposure/ accessibility and antigenicity. These attributes are essential to facilitate their recognition and binding to paratopes on BCRs provoking humoral immunogenic responses. Therefore, linear (continuous) B-cell epitopes; BMRF2 [SLRVYSTSTWV-BRCS provoking humoral immunogenic responses. Therefore, to facilitate their recognition and binding to paratopes on accessibility and antigenicity. These attributes are essential selected based on their characteristic surface-exposure/fore, immunoinformatics prediction of potential B-cell and T-cells epitopic predictions from viral proteins [31,53,56,61–65]. The antigenic nature of viral proteins corresponds with their ability to elicit adaptive immunogenic responses by host B- and T-cells which could, in turn, lead to the death of infected cells. Molecular components (antigens) and not the whole pathogens are recognized by receptors on B- and T-cells; B-cell receptors (BCR) and T-cell receptors (TCR), a process that differs greatly for both cells. While BCRs recognize and bind surface-exposed antigens (epitopes) on viral proteins to secrete antibodies and mediate humoral adaptive immunity, TCRs recognize antigens presented on the surfaces of antigen-presenting cells (APCs) that are bound to major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules categorized into MHC-I and II. These are respectively recognized by CD8+ (cytotoxic) and CD4+ (helper) T-cells. Altogether, the pathway for antigenic presentation (at the extracellular surface) incorporates proteasomal degradation, TAP processing and MHC-1 [human leukocytes antigen (HLA) in humans] binding [31,124–126].

Several crucial functional proteins (lytic and latent) constitute the EBV proteome and contribute to its virulence in host cells. Similar to EBV glycoproteins [8,53], proteins that regulate epithelial cell attachment, DNA synthesis/replication and, capsid assembly are highly important in the viral latent and lytic cycles. These proteins include BMRF2, BDLF2, BORF1, BcLF1, BFRF3, BXLFI, BGLF4, and BMRF1 (see Table 1). Therefore, immunoinformatics prediction of potential B-cell and T-cell (CD8+) epitopes for these proteins represent the highlight of this study.

Potential linear B-cell epitopes reported in this study were selected based on their characteristic surface-exposure/ accessibility and antigenicity. These attributes are essential to facilitate their recognition and binding to paratopes on BCRs provoking humoral immunogenic responses. Therefore, linear (continuous) B-cell epitopes; BMRF2 [SLRVYSTSTWV-
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Among the various vaccine types, peptide or subunit vaccines have emerged as attractive candidates for treatment since there is a huge possibility of designing them based on essential information from viral pathogenic components. This is achievable via the implementation of immunoinformatics approaches which has been widely employed for B- and T-cells epitopic predictions from viral proteins [31,53,56,61–65]. The antigenic nature of viral proteins corresponds with their ability to elicit adaptive immunogenic responses by host B- and T-cells which could, in turn, lead to the death of infected cells. Molecular components (antigens) and not the whole pathogens are recognized by receptors on B- and T-cells; B-cell receptors (BCR) and T-cell receptors (TCR), a process that differs greatly for both cells. While BCRs recognize and bind surface-exposed antigens (epitopes) on viral proteins to secrete antibodies and mediate humoral adaptive immunity, TCRs recognize antigens presented on the surfaces of antigen-presenting cells (APCs) that are bound to major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules categorized into MHC-I and II. These are respectively recognized by CD8+ (cytotoxic) and CD4+ (helper) T-cells. Altogether, the pathway for antigenic presentation (at the extracellular surface) incorporates proteasomal degradation, TAP processing and MHC-1 [human leukocytes antigen (HLA) in humans] binding [31,124–126].

Several crucial functional proteins (lytic and latent) constitute the EBV proteome and contribute to its virulence in host cells. Similar to EBV glycoproteins [8,53], proteins that regulate epithelial cell attachment, DNA synthesis/replication and, capsid assembly are highly important in the viral latent and lytic cycles. These proteins include BMRF2, BDLF2, BORF1, BcLF1, BFRF3, BXLFI, BGLF4, and BMRF1 (see Table 1). Therefore, immunoinformatics prediction of potential B-cell and T-cell (CD8+) epitopes for these proteins represent the highlight of this study.

Potential linear B-cell epitopes reported in this study were selected based on their characteristic surface-exposure/ accessibility and antigenicity. These attributes are essential to facilitate their recognition and binding to paratopes on BCRs provoking humoral immunogenic responses. Therefore, linear (continuous) B-cell epitopes; BMRF2 [SLRVYSTSTWV-
As proposed in this study, while BMRF2 [SLRVYSTSTV-V SAPCL90-103], BDLF2 [PAAAAPGPEPEEPHPMP62-81], BORF1 [DRLRLQRIAGLLPPPARLa2-37], BcLF1 [KVYSTTTAKG- GEPVGGVFi162-172], BGLF4 [SPTNSSGELSVSPEPPRE10-30] and [RPRTHVPSPISPPPPRTPT127-147] depict potential epitopes for antigenic EBV proteins that mediate epithelial cell–cell attachment/spread, capsid self-assembly, DNA synthesis, replication and, processivity. Predictive BCPred and Ellipro algorithms were used to rank linear and conformational B-cell epitopes based on their physicochemical properties such as surface-exposure or accessibility, flexibility, hydrophilicity and, antigenicity. More so, based on the Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC) class 1 antigenic presentation pathway, potential T-cell epitopes were predicted using the integrative weight matrix and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) algorithm of the NetCTL 1.2 webserver. Peptide modeling and blind docking were used to identify probable binding sites on a highly frequent human MHC-1 molecule; HLA-A*02:01 while varying binding affinities for the peptide-MHC complexes were obtained. A novel high-affinity binding site (Site 1) was identified in addition to a structurally resolved site (Site 2). Dynamical studies revealed that the binding of the T-cell epitopes induced a high degree of structural motions in HLA-A*02:01 with favorable binding energy (ΔG) that correlates with their stabilities at their targeted sites. Our results suggest potential B- and T-cell epitopes that could serve as effective candidates for peptide-vaccine development towards the treatment of EBV-related diseases.

Conclusion

The recent paradigm shift towards peptide or subunit vaccine development has been highly resourceful, particularly with regards to provoking adaptive or cell-mediated immune responses. These are designed based on B-cell and T-cell epitopes derived as components of antigenic proteins secreted by viruses during their infectious life cycles. Although no significant progress has been made to date, vaccination remains a promising treatment option to curtail the virulence of Epstein Barr virus (EBV) implicated in infectious mononucleosis (IM) and several human cancers. In this study, we implement a computational meta-analysis paradigm that integrates immunoinformatics, blind peptide-protein docking, and molecular dynamics to predict potential B-cell and T-cell epitopes for antigenic EBV proteins that mediate epithelial cell–cell attachment/spread, capsid self-assembly, DNA synthesis, replication and, processivity. Predictive BCPred and Ellipro algorithms were used to rank linear and conformational B-cell epitopes based on their physicochemical properties such as surface-exposure or accessibility, flexibility, hydrophilicity and, antigenicity. More so, based on the Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC) class 1 antigenic presentation pathway, potential T-cell epitopes were predicted using the integrative weight matrix and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) algorithm of the NetCTL 1.2 webserver. Peptide modeling and blind docking were used to identify probable binding sites on a highly frequent human MHC-1 molecule; HLA-A*02:01 while varying binding affinities for the peptide-MHC complexes were obtained. A novel high-affinity binding site (Site 1) was identified in addition to a structurally resolved site (Site 2). Dynamical studies revealed that the binding of the T-cell epitopes induced a high degree of structural motions in HLA-A*02:01 with favorable binding energy (ΔG) that correlates with their stabilities at their targeted sites. Our results suggest potential B- and T-cell epitopes that could serve as effective candidates for peptide-vaccine development towards the treatment of EBV-related diseases.
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