Treatment with broadly neutralizing influenza antibodies reduces severity of secondary pneumococcal pneumonia in mice
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Secondary bacterial pneumonia is a frequent complication of influenza, associated with high morbidity and mortality. We hypothesized that treatment with neutralizing influenza A antibody AT10_002 protects against severe secondary pneumococcal infection in a mouse model of influenza A infection. Influenza A (H3N2) virus–infected male C57Bl6 mice were treated intravenously with either AT10_002 or a control 2 days postinfection. Seven days later, both groups were infected with Streptococcus pneumoniae and killed 18 hours later. Mice receiving AT10_002 showed less loss of bodyweight compared with controls (+1% vs −12%, P < .001), lower viral loads in bronchoalveolar lavage fluids (BALFs) (7 vs 194 RNA copies per µL; P < .001), and reduced bacterial outgrowth in lung homogenates (3.3 × 10^1 vs 2.5 × 10^5 colony-forming units per mg; P < .001). The treatment group showed lower pulmonary wet weights, lower cell counts, and lower protein levels in BALF compared with controls. Treatment with AT10_002 was associated with lower levels of tumor necrosis factor-α, interleukin (IL)-6, cytokine-induced neutrophil chemoattractant (KC), and interferon-γ in BALF and lower IL-6 and KC in lung homogenates. Treatment with anti-influenza antibody AT10_002 is associated with reduced weight loss, viral load, bacterial outgrowth, and lung injury in a murine model of secondary pneumococcal pneumonia following influenza infection.

KEYWORDS
AT10_002, broadly neutralizing antibodies, influenza virus, murine model, secondary infections, Streptococcus pneumoniae

1| INTRODUCTION

The annual influenza epidemics have a high burden on society, with an estimated 250,000 to 500,000 influenza-related deaths worldwide.1 Secondary bacterial pneumonia is a frequent complication and an important cause of both seasonal and pandemic influenza–associated mortality.2 Although influenza virus infection commonly leads to mild and self-limiting disease, it can cause dysregulation of the innate and adaptive immune response, increasing susceptibility to bacterial infection and contributing to disease severity.3-6 Secondary bacterial infection is most frequently caused by Streptococcus pneumoniae and Staphylococcus aureus,6,7 though in critically ill patients Gram-negative bacteria, such as Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Klebsiella pneumoniae, are often also implicated.8,9
Potential complications that may arise from future use of neuraminidase inhibitors include the emergence of influenza variants resistant to these treatments.21-23 In the current study, we hypothesized that treatment with influenza antibody AT10_002 reduces disease severity in mice infected with influenza A virus subtypes H3 and H7 variants in vitro.26

Broadly neutralizing influenza antibodies are a promising new treatment option. These antibodies target conserved regions of the surface glycoprotein hemagglutinin (HA), thereby blocking infection and replication of multiple influenza A virus subtypes.24,25 Influenza A antibody AT10_002 targets HA of group 2 viruses and has been shown to neutralize multiple influenza H3 and H7 variants in vitro.26 In the current study, we hypothesized that treatment with influenza antibody AT10_002 reduces disease severity in a mouse model of secondary pneumococcal infection following influenza virus infection.

2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 | Mice

All experiments were approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of the Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam (Amsterdam, the Netherlands). Male C57Bl6 mice (±25 g) were obtained from Charles River Nederland B.V. (Leiden, the Netherlands) and maintained at animal biosafety level 2.

2.2 | Experimental infection protocol

Mice were briefly anesthetized by inhalation of 3% isoflurane and intranasally inoculated with 400 median tissue culture infective dose (TCID50) of influenza A/Hkx/31 (H3N2) in a volume of 50 µL phosphate-buffered saline. On day 2 after inoculation, mice were injected in the tail-vein with antibody AT10_002 (n = 8) (kindly provided by AIMM Therapeutics B.V., Amsterdam, the Netherlands) in a dose of 15 mg/kg. AT10_002 is a human antibody derived from memory B cells of influenza-vaccinated individuals.26-28 Controls received an isotypic nonbinding control anti-CD20 antibody (Rituximab, Roche, Grenzach-Wyhlen, Germany) (n = 7) in the same volume. On day 7 after influenza virus infection, both groups were intranasally inoculated under isoflurane anesthesia with S. pneumoniae, type 3 (ATCC 6303, Rockville, MD) in a dose of 5 x 10^3 colony-forming units (CFU) suspended in 50 µL saline (0.9%). Mice were killed 18 hours after pneumococcal infection. Bodyweight was measured at baseline, 3 times during the course of the infection, and at sacrifice.

2.3 | Exsanguination and organ processing

Mice were anesthetized intraperitoneally with 7.5 µL/g bodyweight of a mixture of ketamine (16.8 mg/mL) and dexmedetomidine (27 µg/mL) in sterile saline (0.9%). Mice were bled by heart puncture. Blood was collected in EDTA tubes, centrifuged at 800g for 10 minutes at 4°C, and plasma was stored at −80°C for further analysis. The right lung lobes were harvested and homogenized in 4 volumes of sterile saline using an Omni-TH Tissue Homogenizer (Wilton Instruments, Etten-Leur, the Netherlands). The left lung was used for bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) and the right lung was used to determine wet weight. BAL fluids were obtained by flushing the left lung 3 times with 0.5 mL sterile saline (0.9%). Supernatant was obtained after centrifugation at 260g for 10 minutes at 4°C, in which the total amount of cells was counted using a Z2 Coulter Particle Counter (Beckman-Coulter Corporation, Miami, FL) and the total protein levels were measured (Oz Biosciences, Marseille, France).

2.4 | Viral load measurement

Nucleic extractions were performed on 50 µL BAL fluid obtained after sacrifice using the Roche MagNA Pure Total Nucleic Acid Kit on a MagNA Pure 96 instrument (Roche Diagnostics, Penzberg, Germany). A semi-quantitative reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction was performed with the LightCycler 480 (Roche Diagnostics, Penzberg, Germany), using a validated protocol for influenza A.29 Cycle threshold (Ct) values above 40 were considered negative; viral load estimates were calculated based on Ct values.

2.5 | Bacterial outgrowth

Lung homogenates were diluted in serial 10-fold dilutions in sterile saline (0.9%) and plated on blood-agar plates. CFUs were counted after 12-hour incubation at 37°C with 5% CO2.

2.6 | Cytokine and chemokine assays

Lung homogenates were diluted with equal volumes of lysis buffer (300 mM sterile saline [0.9%], 30 mM Tris, 2 mM MgCl2, 2 mM CaCl2, 1% [v/v] Triton X-100, 20 ng/mL Pepstatin A, 20 ng/mL Leupeptin, 20 ng/mL Aprotinin, pH 7.4) and placed on ice for 30 minutes. After centrifugation at 680g for 10 minutes at 4°C, supernatants were obtained and stored at −80°C. The following cytokines and chemokines were measured in lysates by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay according to the manufacturer’s instructions (R&D Systems, Abingdon, UK): interleukin 6 (IL)-6, tumor necrosis factor (TNF)-α, interferon (IFN)-γ, and cytokine-induced neutrophil chemoattractant (KC).
2.7 Statistical analysis

Data are expressed as median and interquartile range, unless stated otherwise. Results of the intervention group were compared to those of the control group using Mann-Whitney U tests. \( P < .05 \) was considered to represent a statistical significant difference.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 Influenza antibody treatment reduces bodyweight loss during influenza and secondary pneumococcal pneumonia

All mice survived until exsanguination. Mice receiving influenza antibodies exhibited less loss of bodyweight compared with the control group on day 5 (−4% [interquartile range, −3% to −5%] vs −7% [−5% to −10%], \( P = .029 \)) on day 7 after influenza infection (−2% [−1% to −3%] vs −15% [−13% to −16%], \( P < .001 \)), as well as following secondary pneumococcal infection (+1% [0% to 2%] vs −12% [−9% to −14%], \( P < .001 \)) (Figure 1).

3.2 Influenza antibody treatment reduces viral load and pneumococcal outgrowth

Treatment with influenza antibodies resulted in lower viral loads in BAL fluids compared with the control group (7 [2–14] vs 194 [107–314] RNA copies/µL, \( P < .001 \)) (Figure 2), as well as almost a 4 log reduction in CFUs of \( S. \) pneumoniae in lung homogenates compared with controls (3.3 × 10¹ vs 2.5 × 10⁵ CFUs/mg, \( P < .001 \)) (Figure 3).

3.3 Influenza antibody treatment reduces lung injury after secondary pneumococcal pneumonia

Mice receiving AT10_002 influenza antibodies exhibited less pulmonary edema, as measured by a lower lung wet weight compared with...
4 | DISCUSSION

The current study is the first to investigate the effect of broadly neutralizing influenza antibody treatment in a murine postinfluenza bacterial infection model. Treatment with AT10_002 significantly reduces loss of bodyweight, viral load, and bacterial outgrowth. This effect was associated with reduction of lung injury, as demonstrated by lower wet lung weight, lower cell count, and lower protein levels in BALF. Moreover, lower BALF levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines were observed in the treatment group.

The observed treatment effect may be attributed to a less-severe course of influenza infection, thereby retaining the ability of the host to prevent or combat secondary infection. The current study could not distinguish between lung injury caused by influenza infection and bacterial infection. However, mice receiving AT10_002 had lower viral loads and already exhibited less loss of bodyweight before inoculation with S. pneumoniae, suggesting a less-severe primary influenza infection. It is well established that the virus, bacteria, and host interact with each other in the development of secondary bacterial pneumonia. Influenza virus infection can impair the host response against bacterial invaders in several ways, including an increased adherence and invasion of bacteria due to virus-induced damage of the epithelium and decreased mucociliary velocity and bacterial clearance. Furthermore, the innate host response can be dysregulated, including decreased phagocytosis of neutrophils and desensitization of alveolar macrophages. The adaptive response can also be impaired during severe influenza infection, which may increase the susceptibility of the host to bacterial superinfection.

There were distinct effects of AT10_002 on IFN-γ levels, a key cytokine mediator in antiviral immunity. IFN-γ inhibits viral replication directly and has numerous immunomodulatory effects, including promoting Th0 differentiation to Th1 cells, which leads to an adaptive response. In postinfluenza pneumonia however, IFN-γ appears to suppress the host response, possibly by inhibiting phagocytosis of bacteria. In our study, we found lower IFN-γ in BALF but higher IFN-γ in lung homogenates of mice receiving antibody treatment compared with controls. We hypothesize that a lower IFN-γ response in the lung compartment is the result of a lower viral load, which might have led to less epithelial damage and increased clearance of bacteria. We are however unsure as to how to interpret the high IFN-γ level in lung homogenates. This may suggest a more adequate systemic host response to bacterial infection, a treatment effect prior to bacterial infection, or a specific binding in the assay.

The current study has several limitations. AT10_002 antibody treatment was highly effective when administered 2 days after influenza infection; however, it remains to be determined whether treatment at a later time point or during secondary bacterial infection is equally beneficial. In addition, survival experiments are needed to study the effects of AT10_002 treatment on mortality. These were not performed as the focus of this project was to study bacterial loads and markers of inflammation and lung injury. Furthermore, adverse effects of AT10_002 are unknown and should be closely monitored when tested in a clinical trial.
**FIGURE 6**  A-H, Pulmonary cytokines and chemokines in BALF and lung homogenate influenza-infected mice with secondary pneumococcal pneumonia treated with AT10_002 influenza antibodies vs control. Measurements were performed after sacrifice at 18 hours after pneumococcal infection. BALF, bronchoalveolar lavage fluid; IFN, interferon; IL, interleukin; KC, cytokine-induced neutrophil chemoattractant; TNF, tumor necrosis factor.
In conclusion, we show that early treatment with influenza antibody AT10_002 significantly reduced weight loss, lung injury, bacterial outgrowth, and inflammation in a mouse model of influenza infection, followed by secondary pneumococcal pneumonia. Currently, several phase 2 studies are ongoing with similar broadly neutralizing HA antibodies in primary influenza infection. Results from these studies will help determine the significance of our promising findings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Sjoerd Rebers and Richard Molenkamp for technical assistance with the RT-PCR.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Frank van Someren Grève http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6984-6683

REFERENCES

1. WHO Influenza Fact sheet No. 211. 2014. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs211/en/ (accessed 9 Nov 2016).
2. Metersky ML, Masterton RG, Lode H, File TM, Babinchak T. Epidemiology, microbiology, and treatment considerations for bacterial pneumonia complicating influenza. Int J Infect Dis. 2012;16: e321-e331.
3. Ballinger MN, Standiford TJ. Postinfluenza bacterial pneumonia: host defenses gone awry. J Interferon Cytokine Res. 2010;30:643-652.
4. van der Sluijs KF, van der Poll T, Lutter R, Juffermans NP, Schultz MJ. Bench-to-bedside review: bacterial pneumonia with influenza - pathogenesis and clinical implications. Crit Care. 2010;14:219.
5. Martin-Löeches I, van Someren Grève F, Schultz MJ. Bacterial pneumonia as an influenza complication. Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2017;30:201-207.
6. Rynda-Apple A, Robinson KM, Alcorn JF. Influenza and bacterial superinfection: illuminating the immunologic mechanisms of disease. Infect Immun. 2015;83:3764-3770.
7. Grabowska K, Högborg L, Penttinien P, Svensson A, Ekdahl K. Occurrence of invasive pneumococcal disease and number of excess cases due to influenza. BMC Infect Dis. 2006;6:58.
8. Kim S-H, Hong S-B, Yun S-C, et al. Corticosteroid treatment in critically ill patients with pandemic influenza A/H1N1 2009 infection: analytic strategy using propensity scores. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;183:1207-1214.
9. Martin-Löeches I, Lisboa T, Rhodes A, et al. Use of early corticosteroid therapy on ICU admission in patients affected by severe pandemic (H1N1)v influenza A infection. Intensive Care Med. 2011;37:272-283.
10. McCullers JA, English BK. Improving therapeutic strategies for secondary bacterial pneumonia following influenza. Future Microbiol. 2008;3:397-404.
11. Vu T, Farish S, Jenkins M, Kelly H. A meta-analysis of effectiveness of influenza vaccine in persons aged 65 years and over living in the community. Vaccine. 2002;20:1831-1836.
12. Nichol KL. The efficacy, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of inactivated influenza virus vaccines. Vaccine. 2003;21:1769-1775.
13. Andrew MK, Shinde V, Hatchette T, et al. Influenza vaccine effectiveness against influenza-related hospitalization during a season with mixed outbreaks of four influenza viruses: a test-negative case-control study in adults in Canada. BMC Infect Dis. 2017;17:805.
14. Treanor JJ, Talbot HK, Ohmit SE, et al. Effectiveness of seasonal influenza vaccines in the United States during a season with circulation of all three vaccine strains. Clin Infect Dis. 2012;55:951-959.
15. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Seasonal influenza vaccine effectiveness, 2005-2016. http://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/vaccination/effectiveness-studies.htm (accessed 31 Oct 2016).
16. Nicholson KG, Aoki FY, Osterhaus AD, et al. Efficacy and safety of oseltamivir in treatment of acute influenza: a randomised controlled trial. Neuraminidase Inhibitor Flu Treatment Investigator Group. Lancet (London, England). 2000;355:1845-1850.
17. Kaiser L, Wat C, Mills T, Mahoney P, Ward P, Hayden F. Impact of oseltamivir treatment on influenza-related lower respiratory tract complications and hospitalizations. Arch Intern Med. 2003;163:1667-1672.
18. Treanor JJ, Hayden FG, Vrooman PS, et al. Efficacy and safety of the oral neuraminidase inhibitor oseltamivir in treating acute influenza: a randomized controlled trial. US Oral Neuraminidase Study Group. JAMA. 2000;283:1016-1024.
19. Dobson J, Whitley RJ, Pocock S, Monto AS. Oseltamivir treatment for influenza in adults: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Lancet (London, England). 2015;385:1729-1737.
20. Muthuri SG, Venkatesan S, Myles PR, et al. Effectiveness of neuraminidase inhibitors in reducing mortality in patients admitted to hospital with influenza A H1N1pdm09 virus infection: a meta-analysis of individual participant data. Lancet Respir Med. 2014;2:395-404.
21. Moscona A. Oseltamivir resistance—disabling our influenza defenses. N Engl J Med. 2005;353:2633-2636.
22. Ison MG. Antivirals and resistance: influenza virus. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 2003;271:17-43.
23. Nguyen HT, Fry AM, Gubareva LV. Neuraminidase inhibitor resistance in influenza viruses and laboratory testing methods. Antivir Ther. 2012;17:159-173.
24. Lee PS, Wilson IA. Structural characterization of viral epitopes recognized by broadly cross-reactive antibodies. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 2015;386:323-341.
25. Naessen L, Stevaert A, Vanderlinden E. Antiviral therapies on the horizon for influenza. Curr Opin Pharmacol. 2016;30:106-115.
26. Wagner K, Kwakkenbos MJ, Claassen YB, et al. Bispecific antibody generated with sortase and click chemistry has broad antiinfluenza virus activity. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2014;111:16820-16825.
27. Kwakkenbos MJ, Diehl SA, Yasuda E, et al. Generation of stable monoclonal antibody-producing B cell receptor-positive human memory B cells by genetic programming. Nat Med. 2010;16:123-128.
28. Kwakkenbos MJ, Bakker AQ, van Helden PM, et al. Genetic manipulation of B cells for the isolation of rare therapeutic antibodies from the human repertoire. Methods. 2014;65:38-43.
29. Jansen RR, Schinkel J, Koekkoek S, et al. Development and evaluation of a four-tube real time multiplex PCR assay covering fourteen respiratory viruses, and comparison to its corresponding single target counterparts. J Clin Virol. 2011;51:179-185.
30. Plotkowski MC, Puchelle E, Beck G, Jacquot J, Hannoun C. Adherence of type I Streptococcus pneumoniae to tracheal epithelium of mice infected with influenza A/PR8 virus. Am Rev Respir Dis. 1986;134:1040-1044.
31. Louria DB, Blumenfeld HL, Ellis JT, Kilbourne ED, Rogers DE. Studies on influenza in the pandemic of 1957-1958. II. Pulmonary complications of influenza. J Clin Invest. 1959;38:213-265.

32. Pittet LA, Hall-Stoodley L, Rutkowski MR, Harmsen AG. Influenza virus infection decreases tracheal mucociliary velocity and clearance of *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol. 2010;42:450-460.

33. McNamee LA, Harmsen AG. Both influenza-induced neutrophil dysfunction and neutrophil-independent mechanisms contribute to increased susceptibility to a secondary *Streptococcus pneumoniae* infection. Infect Immun. 2006;74:6707-6721.

34. Ghoneim HE, Thomas PG, McCullers JA. Depletion of alveolar macrophages during influenza infection facilitates bacterial superinfections. J Immunol. 2013;191:1250-1259.

35. Didierlaurent A, Goulding J, Patel S, et al. Sustained desensitization to bacterial Toll-like receptor ligands after resolution of respiratory influenza infection. J Exp Med. 2008;205:323-329.

36. Bermejo-Martin JF, Martin-Loeches I, Rello J, et al. Host adaptive immunity deficiency in severe pandemic influenza. Crit Care. 2010;14:R167.

37. Sun K, Metzger DW. Inhibition of pulmonary antibacterial defense by interferon-gamma during recovery from influenza infection. Nat Med. 2008;14:558-564.

How to cite this article: van Someren Gréve F, van der Sluijs KF, Tuip AM, Schultz MJ, de Jong MD, Juffermans NP. Treatment with broadly neutralizing influenza antibodies reduces severity of secondary pneumococcal pneumonia in mice. J Med Virol. 2018;90:1431–1437. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25212