A single-dose plasmid-launched live-attenuated Zika vaccine induces protective immunity
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Abstract

Background: Vaccines are the most effective means to fight and eradicate infectious diseases. Live-attenuated vaccines (LAV) usually have the advantages of single dose, rapid onset of immunity, and durable protection. DNA vaccines have the advantages of chemical stability, ease of production, and no cold chain requirement. The ability to combine the strengths of LAV and DNA vaccines may transform future vaccine development by eliminating cold chain and cell culture with the potential for adventitious agents.

Methods: A DNA-launched LAV was developed for ZIKV virus (ZIKV), a pathogen that recently caused a global public health emergency. The cDNA copy of a ZIKV LAV genome was engineered into a DNA plasmid. The DNA-LAV plasmid was delivered into mice using a clinically proven device TriGrid™ to launch the replication of LAV.

Findings: A single-dose immunization as low as 0.5 μg of DNA-LAV plasmid conferred 100% seroconversion in A129 mice. All seroconverted mice developed sterilizing immunity, as indicated by no detectable infectious viruses and no increase of neutralizing antibody titers after ZIKV challenge. The immunization also elicited robust T cell responses. In pregnant mice, the DNA-LAV vaccination fully protected against ZIKV-induced disease and maternal-to-fetal transmission. High levels of neutralizing activities were detected in fetal serum, indicating maternal-to-fetal humoral transfer. In male mice, a single-dose vaccination completely prevented testis infection, injury, and oligospermia.

Interpretation: The remarkable simplicity and potency of ZIKV DNA-LAV warrant further development of this vaccine candidate. The DNA-LAV approach may serve as a universal vaccine platform for other plus-sense RNA viruses.
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1. Introduction

Zika virus (ZIKV) is a mosquito-borne member from the genus Flavivirus within the family Flaviviridae. Besides ZIKV, many flaviviruses are significant human pathogens that cause frequent outbreaks and epidemics around the world, including dengue (DENV), yellow fever (YFV), West Nile (WNV), Japanese encephalitis (JEV), and tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV). Flaviviruses have a positive-sense, single-stranded RNA genome of about 11,000 nucleotides in length. The viral genome contains a 5′ untranslated region (UTR), a long open-reading frame, and a 3′ UTR. The single open-reading frame encodes three structural (capsid [C], precursor membrane [prM] and envelope [E]) and seven non-structural (NS1, NS2A, NS2B, NS3, NS4A, NS4B and NS5) proteins. The structural proteins, together with the genomic RNA, form viral particles. The nonstructural proteins participate in viral replication, viral assembly, and evasion of the host innate immune response [1].
ZIKV was first identified from a sentinel rhesus macaque in the Zika Forest of Uganda in 1947 [2]. Before 2007, ZIKV had silently circulated between primates and mosquitoes in the forests in Africa and Southeast Asia without causing detectable outbreaks or severe human diseases. Symptomatic ZIKV infection produces mild manifestations, such as fever, headaches, lethargy, conjunctivitis, rash, arthralgia, and myalgia [3]. However, from 2007 to 2016, ZIKV emerged explosively to cause a series of epidemics in Africa, Micronesia, the South Pacific, and the Americas, leading to >700,000 documented autochthonous human infections [4,5]. Importantly, during the recent epidemics, ZIKV caused the newly described devastating congenital Zika syndromes (CZS), including microcephaly, craniofacial disproportion, spasticity, ocular abnormalities, and miscarriage [6]. CZS was found in 6–11% of the fetuses from ZIKV-infected pregnant women [7]. In adults, Zika infection can cause Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS; an autoimmune disease that induces immunity which prevents ZIKV vertical transmission and testis damage in mice).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Cells and antibodies

The African green monkey kidney epithelial cell (Vero; ATCC Cat# CCL-81, RRID: CVCL_0059) and human embryonic kidney cell (293T; ATCC Cat# CRL-3216, RRID:CVCL_0603) were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, Bethesda, MD) and maintained in a high-glucose Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (HyClone Laboratories, South Logan, UT) and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (P/S). Cells were cultured at 37 °C with 5% CO₂. Culture medium and antibiotics were purchased from Thermofisher Scientific (Waltham, MA).

The following antibodies were used in this study: a mouse monoclonal antibody (mAb) 4G2 (ATCC Cat# HB-112, RRID: CVCL-J8900) cross-reactive with flavivirus E protein, a mouse polyclone antibody against ZIKV NS5 (in-house generated using the recombinant ZIKV NS5 protein purified from E.coli), ZIKV-specific HMAF (hyper-immune ascitic fluid; obtained from the World Reference Center of Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses [WRCeva] at the University of Texas Medical Branch), goat anti-mouse IgG conjugated with horseradish peroxidase (HRP; SeraCare KPL Cat# 474-1806, RRID: AB_2307348), and goat anti-mouse IgG conjugated with Alexa Fluor 568 (Thermo Fisher Scientific Cat# A-11004, RRID: AB_2534072).

2.2. Plasmid construction

The plasmid pFLZIKV-PRV (derived from a single-copy vector pCC1™ [ Epicentre, Madison, WI]) [28] was used as a starting vector to construct the DNA-launched plasmids in this study. Firstly, the cDNA sequence of ZIKV strain Cambodian FSS13025 (GenBank accession No. KJ955593) and the hepatitis delta virus ribozyme (HDVr) was digested from an infectious clone pFLZIKV [29], and cloned into the pFLZIKV-PRV using restriction enzymes NotI and Clal, resulting in the plasmid pCC1-T7-ZIKV. Next, the simian virus 40 (SV40) or cytomegalovirus (CMV) promoter sequences were amplified by standard PCR from the pcDNA3.1(+) (ThermoFisher Scientific) and fused with the 5’UTR sequence of ZIKV, respectively. The resulting DNA fragments were cloned into the pCC1-T7-ZIKV plasmid using restriction enzymes Hpal and Nhel, resulting in subclones pCC1-SV40-ZIKV and pCC1-CMV-ZIKV. Lastly, the SV40 or bovine growth hormone (BGH) polyadenylation (pA) signal sequences were amplified from the pcDNA3.1 vector and cloned into the pCC1-SV40-ZIKV and pCC1-CMV-ZIKV vectors through restriction enzymes Clal and SrfI, respectively, resulting in plasmids pSV40-ZIKV (short as WT or SV40-WT) and pCMV-ZIKV (short as CMV-WT). The flavivirus-conserved polymerase motif GDD mutation (corresponding to residues Gly664, Asp665, and Asp666 in ZIKV NS5) was mutated to Ala) [30] and the 3’UTR 20 nucleotide deletion (Δ20) [22] was introduced by overlap PCR and cloned into the plasmid pCC1-SV40-ZIKV through restriction enzymes EcoRI and Clal, resulting in plasmids pFLZIKV-ΔGDD (short as ΔGDD) and pFLZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 (short as Δ20). Plasmids were propagated in the TransforMax EPI3000
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Chemically Competent E. coli (Epicentre, Madison, WI). This pCC1™ vector-derived plasmid could be induced to generate 10–20 copies/cell using L-arabinose in the E. coli strain EPI300. All restriction enzymes were purchased from New England BioLabs (Ipswitch, MA). All plasmids were validated through restriction enzyme digestion and Sanger DNA sequencing. All primers were synthesized from Integrated DNA Technologies (Skokie, Illinois) and available upon request.

2.3. DNA transfection

$5 \times 10^5$ Vero cells or $7 \times 10^5$ 293T cells per well were seeded into a 6-well plate. The next day, cells were transfected with 4 μg plasmids by X-tremeGENE 9 DNA transfection reagent (Roche) in 3 ml 2% FBS DMEM medium. From day 1 to 5 post-transfection, 200 μl of culture fluids were collected daily, centrifuged at 415 × g for 5 min to remove cell debris and stored at −80 °C. Viral titers were determined by plaque assay.

2.4. Plaque assay

$1.5 \times 10^5$ Vero cells per well were seeded into a 24-well plate. The next day, 100 μl of undiluted virus sample or series of 10-fold diluted virus samples were added to individual well of cell monolayer. After 1 h of incubation at 37 °C with 5% CO₂, the inoculum in each well was replaced with 0.6 ml of overlay medium (DMEM medium supplemented with 2% FBS and 0.8% methylcellulose [Sigma]). After incubation at 37 °C with 5% CO₂ for 4 days, cells were fixed in 3.7% formalin solution and stained with 1% crystal violet. For ZIKV Δ20 mutant viruses, viral titers were determined by focus-forming assay as described previously [22].

2.5. Immunofluorescence assay (IFA)

8 × 10⁴ Vero Cells were seeded into each well of an 8-well Lab-Tek II chamber slide (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The next day, cells were transfected with 0.5 μg of DNA per well. At selected time points, cells were fixed with chilled methanol at −20 °C for 30 min. After 1 h incubation in blocking buffer (PBS supplemented with 1% FBS and 0.05% Tween-20), cells were incubated with the primary antibody 4G2 for 1 h. After three PBS washes, cells were incubated with goat anti-mouse IgG conjugated with Alexa Fluor 568 (1:1000 diluted in blocking buffer) for 1 h. Finally, after three PBS washes, cells were mounted in a Vectashield mounting medium with DAPI (Vector Laboratories). Fluorescence images were acquired under Eclipse Ti2 inverted fluorescence microscope (Nikon Instruments Inc.).

2.6. SDS-PAGE and western blot

Cells from the 6-well plates were washed once with PBS and lysed at 4 °C for 1 h in 200 μl RIPA lysis buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) supplemented with 1 × complete protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche). Lysates were centrifuged at 20,000 × g and 4 °C for 30 min to remove cell debris. Supernatants were collected and mixed with 4 × LDS sample buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). After denaturing at 70 °C for 15 min, 10 μl samples were loaded onto a 12% Mini-Protean TGX Stain-Free Prestac gel (Bio-Rad Laboratories). After separation by electrophoresis, proteins were transferred onto a polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) membrane using a Trans-Blot Turbo Transfer System (Bio-Rad Laboratories). The blot was firstly incubated at room temperature for 1 h in a blocking buffer containing TBST (10 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0], 150 mM NaCl, and 0.1% Tween 20) and 5% skim milk, followed by 1 h of incubation with primary antibody (1:1000 dilution in blocking buffer). After three TBST-buffer washes, the blot was incubated with the goat anti-mouse IgG conjugated to HRP (1:10,000 dilution in blocking buffer). After another three TBST-buffer washes, the blot was incubated with SuperSignal™ West Femto Maximum Sensitivity Substrate (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Chemiluminescence signals were detected in ChemiDoc System (Bio-Rad).

2.7. RT-PCR and sequencing

Viral RNAs in culture fluids (140 μl) or mouse serum were used for viral RNA extraction by QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen). RT-PCR assays were performed using SuperScript III One-Step RT-PCR System with Platinum Taq DNA Polymerase kit (Life technologies) following the manufacturer’s protocols. Six cDNA fragments covering the entire genome of ZIKV were amplified by RT-PCR, purified and subjected to Sanger sequencing at GENEWIZ (South Plainfield, NJ).

2.8. ZIKV/mCherry neutralization assay

Titers of neutralizing antibody in mouse serum were determined by using a ZIKV/mCherry infection assay as described previously [22,23]. Briefly, sera were 2-fold serially diluted (starting at 1:25 dilution) in culture medium (containing 2% FBS) and then incubated with equal volume of ZIKV/mCherry reporter viruses at 37 °C for 1 h. Afterwards, antibody-virus complexes were added to Vero cell monolayers in a 96-well plate. At 48 h post-infection, mCherry fluorescence-positive cells were quantified by Cytoflex 5 Cell Imaging Multi-Mode Reader (Biotek). Fluorescence-positive cells from serum-treated wells were normalized to those of non-treatment controls (set as 100%). The effective dilution of sera to reduce the percentage of mCherry-positive cells by 50% (NT₅₀) was calculated using nonlinear regression analysis in GraphPad Prism 7 software (La Jolla, CA).

2.9. Mouse experiment

All animal studies were performed as approved by the University of Texas Medical Branch (UTMB) Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). All efforts were made to minimize animal suffering. Plasmid DNA was diluted to indicated concentration in calcium/magnesium-free phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS, ThermoFisher Scientific) and administered into A129 mice by intramuscular (IM) injection or by IM injection together with electroporation (IM&EP) using the TriGrid™ Delivery System (Ichor Medical Systems, San Diego, CA) as described previously [31]. The A129 mouse is a model susceptible to ZIKV infection [32]. For consistent dosing by TriGrid™ device, six-week-old mice A129 mice with weight above 15 g were chosen for this study. Briefly, after anesthetized with isoflurane gas, mice were injected into one tibialis anterior muscle with 20 μl of DNA solution using a 3/10 ml U-100 insulin syringe (Becton-Dickinson, Franklin Lakes, NJ) inserted into the center of a TriGrid electrode array with 2.5 mm electrode spacing. Mock-infected mice were given DPBS by the same route. Injection of DNA was followed immediately by electrical stimulation at an amplitude of 250 V/cm, and the total duration was 40 ms over a 400-ms interval. The control intramuscular injection was performed as described above without the application of electrical stimulation.

After immunization, mice were monitored for weight loss and signs of disease daily. At selected time points, mice were bled via the retro-orbital sinus (RO) and viremia was determined by plaque assay. Neutralizing antibodies in sera were measured using ZIKV/mCherry infection assay. Mice were challenged on day 29 post-immunization with parental ZIKV strain PRVABC59 (10⁸ PFU) via the subcutaneous route. On day 2 post challenge, mice were bled and viremia were determined by plaque assay. Sperm counting was performed according to the protocol as described previously [23]. Mice were euthanized and necropsied at indicated time points. Epididymis and testes were harvested immediately. Motile and non-motile sperms were counted manually on a hemocytometer by microscopy. Total sperm counts equals to the sum of motile and non-motile sperms.

For the mouse pregnancy study, the same IM&EP procedures were applied to administer the DNA solution into six-week old female mice.
On day 29 post-immunization, mice were bled for measuring NT50. Mice were mated starting on day 30 post-immunization. Mouse embryonic development started (E0.5) once mouse vaginal plugs were observed.

We chose to convert ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 (a LAV candidate containing a 20-nucleotide deletion within the 3′ UTR of the ZIKV genome) into a plasmid DNA-launched LAV. ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 has an excellent safety and efficacy profile; a single-dose vaccination of 10^5 PFU confers stabilizing immunity in NHPs [23]. To convert it to a plasmid-launched LAV, we selected the pCCL™ vector to clone the cDNA of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 because its copy number can be conditionally controlled in E. coli: (i) A single copy per cell to maximize the plasmid stability during cloning and (ii) 10–20 copies per cell to increase plasmid yield during production [34]. A eukaryotic promoter was engineered at the 5′ end of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 cDNA to launch the transcription of viral RNA through cellular RNA polymerase II (Fig. 1a). A hepatitis delta virus ribozyme (HDVr) sequence and a polyA-sign sequence were engineered at the 3′ end of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 cDNA for generation of the authentic 3′ end of the viral RNA and for transcription termination (Fig. 1a). The resulting plasmid is named pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20. As controls, we also cloned the cDNA of wild-type (WT) ZIKV and a viral polymerase-defective mutant (containing an active site GDD—AAA mutation, defined as ΔGDD) into the pCCL™ plasmid, resulting in pZIKV-WT and pZIKV-ΔGDD, respectively.

We initially determined which eukaryotic promoter should be selected to launch the LAV viral replication in cells. Using pZIKV-WT, we compared the efficiencies of two commonly used eukaryotic promoters (SV40 and CMV) to launch ZIKV (Supplementary Fig. 1a). After transfecting pZIKV-WT DNA into Vero and 293 T cells, the SV40 promoter launched ZIKV more rapidly than the CMV promoter in both cell lines from days 2 to 3 (Supplementary Fig. 1b). This result prompted us to engineer the SV40 promoter into plasmid-launched ZIKV (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d). Compared with pZIKV-WT, pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 produced fewer E-positive cells (Fig. 1b) and less NS5 protein (Fig. 1c), and high titers of LAV virus (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d). During the transfection into Vero cells, pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 generated viral E protein-positive cells (Fig. 1b), viral NS5 protein (Fig. 1c), and high titers of LAV virus (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d).

### 2.10 Intracellular cytokine staining (ICS)

Approximately 2.5 × 10^5 splenocytes were stimulated with 1 × 10^5 IFU of live ZIKV (strain FSS13025) for 24 h or 10 ng/ml E peptide (Sequence 294–302 in ZIKV polyprotein) [33] for 5 h. Live ZIKV was used as a stimulant for measuring both CD4^+ and CD8^+ T cell response [22]. The E peptide was used as stimulant for measuring CD8^+ T cell response [33]. During the final 5 h of stimulation, BD GolgiPlug (BD Bioscience) was added to block protein transport. Cells were stained with antibodies against surface markers CD3 (APC-conjugated) and CD4 (FITC-conjugated) or CD8 (FITC-conjugated). Afterwards, cells were fixed in 2% paraformaldehyde and permeabilized with 0.5% saponin. Cells were then incubated with PE-conjugated anti-IFN-γ and PE-Cy7-conjugated anti-TNF-α antibodies or control PE-conjugated rat IgC1. Samples were processed with a BD Accuri™ C6 Flow Cytometer instrument. Dead cells were excluded on the basis of forward and side light scatter. Data were analyzed with a CFlow Plux Flow Cytometer (BD Biosciences).

### 2.11 Bio-Plex immunoassay

Approximately 3 × 10^5 splenocytes per well were plated in a 96-well plate and stimulated with 2 × 10^4 FFU of ZIKV (strain FSS13025) for 2 days, respectively. Culture supernatants were harvested and frozen at −80°C. Cytokines IL-2, IFN-γ and TNF-α in the culture supernatants were measured using a Bio-Plex Pro Mouse Cytokine Assay (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

### 2.12 Data process and analysis

Images were processed in software ImageJ (NIH). Data were analyzed in GraphPad Prism 7.0 software (La Jolla, CA). Results were presented as the mean ± standard deviation unless indicated separately. Comparisons of groups were performed using multiple t-test, unpaired nonparametric Mann-Whitney unpaired test or one-way ANOVA test. *p < 0.05, significant; **p < 0.01, very significant; ***p < 0.001, highly significant; ****p < 0.0001, extremely significant; n.s., not significant. Figures were assembled using Adobe illustrator.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Construction and characterization of plasmid DNA-LAV in cell culture

We chose to convert ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 (a LAV candidate containing a 20-nucleotide deletion within the 3′ UTR of the ZIKV genome) into a plasmid DNA-launched LAV. ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 has an excellent safety and efficacy profile; a single-dose vaccination of 10^5 PFU confers stabilizing immunity in NHPs [23]. To convert it to a plasmid-launched LAV, we selected the pCCL™ vector to clone the cDNA of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 because its copy number can be conditionally controlled in E. coli: (i) A single copy per cell to maximize the plasmid stability during cloning and (ii) 10–20 copies per cell to increase plasmid yield during production [34]. A eukaryotic promoter was engineered at the 5′ end of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 cDNA to launch the transcription of viral RNA through cellular RNA polymerase II (Fig. 1a). A hepatitis delta virus ribozyme (HDVr) sequence and a polyA-sign sequence were engineered at the 3′ end of ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 cDNA for generation of the authentic 3′ end of the viral RNA and for transcription termination (Fig. 1a). The resulting plasmid is named pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20. As controls, we also cloned the cDNA of wild-type (WT) ZIKV and a viral polymerase-defective mutant (containing an active site GDD—AAA mutation, defined as ΔGDD) into the pCCL™ plasmid, resulting in pZIKV-WT and pZIKV-ΔGDD, respectively.

We initially determined which eukaryotic promoter should be selected to launch the LAV viral replication in cells. Using pZIKV-WT, we compared the efficiencies of two commonly used eukaryotic promoters (SV40 and CMV) to launch ZIKV (Supplementary Fig. 1a). After transfecting pZIKV-WT DNA into Vero and 293 T cells, the SV40 promoter launched ZIKV more rapidly than the CMV promoter in both cell lines from days 2 to 3 (Supplementary Fig. 1b). This result prompted us to engineer the SV40 promoter into plasmid-launched ZIKV (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d). Compared with pZIKV-WT, pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 produced fewer E-positive cells (Fig. 1b) and less NS5 protein (Fig. 1c), and high titers of LAV virus (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d). During the transfection into Vero cells, pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 generated viral E protein-positive cells (Fig. 1b), viral NS5 protein (Fig. 1c), and high titers of LAV virus (peak viral titer of 2 × 10^6 PFU/ml; Fig. 1d).
ΔGDD DNA conferred no viremia post-immunization (Fig. 2f), no neutralizing antibodies before challenge (Fig. 2f), and no protection against challenge (Fig. 2f). Taken together, the results indicate that a single dose of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 is able to rapidly elicit sterilizing immunity (defined as no detectable infectious viruses and no increase of neutralizing antibody titers after challenge) that confers complete protection against ZIKV infection.

### Minimal dose for 100% seroconversion and protective immunity

To determine the minimal dose required for 100% seroconversion, we immunized A129 mice with 0.3 or 0.5 μg of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 (Supplementary Fig. 2a). All 10 mice from the 0.5-μg group and 14 out of 15 mice from the 0.3-μg group developed viremia during days 6–10 post-immunization (Supplementary Fig. 2b, c, f), and elicited high titers of neutralizing antibodies (about 10^4) from day 14 to 29 post-immunization (Supplementary Fig. 2d–f). Consistently, all seraconfected mice were fully protected against infection (Supplementary Fig. 2b & c), whereas the seronegative mouse from the low-dose (0.3 μg) group generated viremia on day 2 post-challenge (data not shown). The challenge did not boost neutralizing antibody titers in any seraconfected mice (compare the neutralizing antibody titers on days 29 and 43 in Supplementary Fig. 2d & e). The results demonstrate that immunization of 0.5 μg pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 DNA is sufficient to confer 100% seroconversion and protective immunity.

### Attenuation of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 in the A129 mice

To validate whether the DNA-launched LAV is attenuated in vivo, we compared the viremia and neutralizing antibody titer between the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 and pZIKV-WT in A129 mice (Supplementary Fig. 3a). After immunizing mice with 1 μg of plasmid DNA, neither pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 (Fig. 2b) nor pZIKV-WT caused weight loss, disease, or death (Supplementary Fig. 3b). This is not surprising because ZIKV-inflicted morbidity and mortality are age-dependent in A129 mice [32]. We were not able to use younger mice because their tibialis anterior muscles are too small for consistent dosing by the TriGrid™ device. With older mice, we examined the immunization efficiency using the traditional intramuscular needle injection without electroporation. A129 mice were intramuscularly needle injected with 1 μg of pZIKV-WT and pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20, then analyzed for viremia and neutralizing antibodies (Supplementary Fig. 4a). After needle injection, 40% (n = 6/15) of the pZIKV-WT-immunized animals showed viremia (Supplementary Fig. 4b & f) and 47% (n = 7/15) seroconverted (Supplementary Fig. 4d & f), whereas 20% (n = 3/15) of the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized mice showed viremia (Supplementary Fig. 4c & f) and 33% (n = 5/15) seroconverted (Supplementary Fig. 4e&f). Correlation analysis showed that all mice with detectable viremia after immunization were seraconfected (data not shown). These results demonstrate that, compared with TriGrid™, needle injection alone is much less efficient in DNA delivery, as reflected by viral replication and immunogenicity. Thus, all subsequent mouse experiments were performed using the TriGrid™ device.

### Protection from ZIKV-induced damages to testes

Since ZIKV infection can persist in the male reproductive tract and lead to sexual transmission [36–38], we examined the ability of
pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 to prevent testis infection and injury in A129 mice. First, we tested the safety of pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 in males (Fig. 3). Six-week-old male mice were immunized with 1 μg of pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20, 1 μg of pZIKV-WT, or DPBS. On day 29 post-immunization, pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 and pZIKV-WT elicited comparable levels of neutralizing antibody titers (Fig. 3b). No infectious virus was detected in brains (Fig. 3c), spleens (Fig. 3d), or testes (Fig. 3e) of pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20-, pZIKV-WT- or DPBS-immunized mice. Notably, one testis from each of the pZIKV-WT-immunized animals showed significantly lower total sperm counts (Fig. 3h) and motile sperm counts (Fig. 3i). In contrast, mice immunized with pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 or DPBS did not exhibit any weight loss or oligospermia (Fig. 3f–i). We currently don’t know what contributed to the uneven weight loss of testis pair from the pZIKV-WT-immunized animals. Nevertheless, the results suggest that pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 immunization does not cause persistent infection or oligospermia.

Next, we tested the efficacy of pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 in preventing testis infection and damage (Fig. 4). Six-week-old A129 male mice were immunized with 1 μg of pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 or DPBS. By day 29 post-immunization, pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 elicited robust neutralizing antibody titers of 10^4 (Fig. 4b). On the same day, mice were challenged with 10^6 PFU of ZIKV strain PRVABC59 via the subcutaneous route (indicated by a red arrow). At indicated time, the mice were bled for measuring viremia using a focus-forming assay; (b) Mouse weight post-immunization. (c–f) Viremia for the mouse groups. On day 29 post-immunization, the mice were challenged with 10^6 PFU of ZIKV strain PRVABC59 via the intramuscular (IM) injection and electroporation (EP) using TriGrid™. Following immunization, mice were monitored for weight loss over 14 days. Since our IACUC protocol only allows four blood draws per mouse over 28 days post-transfection (or infection), blood draws were staggered for different mouse sub-cohorts to cover the sampling period of days 5–10 post-immunization. Mice were bled at indicated time for measuring neutralizing antibody titers (NT50) using a focus-forming assay and neutralization assay (NT50) were 100 FFU/ml and 100-fold dilution, respectively.
Fig. 5. Analysis of viral loads after ZIKV infection. (a) Experimental design. Six-week-old A129 mice were immunized with pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 (1 μg), pZIKV-WT (1 μg), or DPBS (sham) via intramuscular (IM) injection and electroporation (EP) using TriGrid™. On day 29 post-immunization, mice were sacrificed for analysis. Neutralizing antibody titers were measured on day 29 post-immunization using an mCherry ZIKV neutralization assay (b). Viral loads in mouse brain (c), spleen (d), and testis (e) were determined by a focus-forming assay. The LODs for organ viral load and NT_{50} were 100 FFU/g tissue and 100-fold dilution, respectively. (f) Testis weight. (g) Representative images of testes from each group. The epididymis was harvested for counting total sperm (h) and motile sperm (i). Individual mice are indicated by different colors and symbols. The means and standard deviations are shown. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed to determine the statistically significant differences among groups.

3.7. Prevention of vertical transmission in pregnant mice

To test the ability of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 to prevent in utero transmission, we immunized six-week-old A129 female mice with 1 μg of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 or DPBS (Fig. 5a). The immunized mice developed high neutralizing antibody titers of 5.6 × 10^3 on day 29 post-immunization (Fig. 5b). Female mice were then mated with males on days 30–37 post-immunization, and examined for pregnancy [indicated by vaginal plugs observed after mating and defining embryonic day 0.5 (E0.5)]. At E10.5, the pregnant mice were challenged with 10^6 PFU of ZIKV PRVABC59 by the subcutaneous route. No viremia was detected in the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized mice on day 2 post-challenge, whereas viremia of 1.7 × 10^5 PFU/ml was observed in the control DPBS-immunized group (Fig. 5c). At E18.5, the pregnant mice were measured for viral loads in maternal and fetal organs. For the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized group, no infectious virus was detected in maternal brains (Fig. 5d), spleens (Fig. 5e), placentas (Fig. 5f), or in fetal heads (Fig. 5g). Normal fetal weights were observed in the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized mice (Fig. 5h). In contrast, in the DPBS-immunized and challenged group, infectious virus was found in 100% (n = 5/5) of maternal brains (Fig. 5d), 40% (n = 2/5) of maternal spleens (Fig. 5e), 100% (n = 35/35) of placentas (Fig. 5f), and 6% (n = 2/35) of fetal heads (Fig. 5g). In addition, significantly higher levels of IL-2 (Fig. 5c), IFN-γ (Fig. 5d), and TNF-α (Fig. 5e) proteins than the DPBS-immunized animals upon ex vivo re-stimulation with ZIKV. These data indicate that immunization with pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 elicits robust CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses in mice.

3.8. T cell response after pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 immunization

T cell immunity plays an important role in preventing ZIKV infection [33]. We examined T cell responses in A129 mice immunized with 0.5 μg of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 or DPBS. Mouse spleens were harvested on day 29 post-immunization. Splenocytes were cultured ex vivo, stimulated with a previously reported ZIKV E peptide [33] or infectious WT ZIKV, and analyzed by an intracellular cytokine staining (ICS) assay and a Bio-Plex immunoassay. The pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized animals had significantly more ZIKV-specific IFN-γ+ and IFN-γ+ TNF-α+ CD4+ T cells (Fig. 5a and Supplementary Fig. 5a) and CD8+ T cells (Fig. 5b and Supplementary Fig. 5b) than the DPBS-vaccinated animals. In addition, splenocytes from the pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20-immunized mice produced significantly higher levels of IL-2 (Fig. 5c), IFN-γ (Fig. 5d), and TNF-α (Fig. 5e) proteins than the DPBS-immunized animals upon ex vivo re-stimulation with ZIKV. These data indicate that immunization with pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 elicits robust CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses in mice.

4. Discussion

Vaccines, especially LAV, have been highly effective in controlling and even eradicating infectious diseases [39]. Enhancing vaccine performance with improved simplicity, immunity, and delivery speed is critical, particularly when responding to epidemic emergency. The goal of this study is to develop and characterize pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 that combines the strengths of DNA vaccines (chemical stability, no cold chain, easy production, and low cost) and LAVs (single dose, quick immunity and durable protection). Our results showed that a single-dose vaccination of 0.5 μg of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 elicited 100% protective immunity within 14–21 days in the A129 mice. The vaccination completely prevented ZIKV infection, vertical transmission during pregnancy, and male reproductive tract infections. However, due to the detection limits of plaque and focus-forming assays used in this study, we could not exclude the possibility of low levels of viral replication after challenge.
Since RT-PCR test is much more sensitive than the plaque and focus-forming assays (Supplementary Fig. 6), future non-human primate studies should employ RT-PCR assay to detect viral RNA. The RT-PCR assay should also be used in preclinical safety studies to measure viral RNA levels in different organs collected at multiple time points post-vaccination. Besides antibody response, the immunized mice also developed robust T cell responses. The DNA-launched approach could serve as a universal platform to deliver LAVs for other positive-sense, single-stranded RNA viruses. Indeed, such DNA-launched LAVs have been explored for the efficacy of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 as a vaccine candidate. First, what are the initial cell types that launch ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 LAV replication after plasmid electroporation? It is well documented that intramuscular injection of plasmid DNA results in transgene expression primarily in muscle conditions (e.g., RNA/DNA delivery methods, different promoters used in plasmids, and mouse strains). For practical purposes, lowering the minimal protective dose is desirable for a vaccine, particularly when responding to epidemic emergencies that often require the rapid production of millions of doses for vaccinating large populations. In addition, lower doses of DNA plasmid could minimize potential adverse effects in vaccinees. Thus, future studies should be performed to further improve the delivery efficiency of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 by comparing different DNA delivery devices (e.g., injection/electroporation device from Inovio and needle-free injection device from ParmaJet) and through different routes of administration (e.g., intradermal versus intramuscular). Since several of these DNA delivery devices have already been used in clinical trials, these devices will greatly facilitate the advancement of DNA-launched LAVs to clinics. Due to the large size of DNA-launched LAV plasmid (about 18 kb in the case of pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20), we think that electroporation may contribute significantly to the efficient delivery of large DNA plasmid into cells. Besides the delivery devices discussed above, nanoparticle technology could also be explored for the efficient delivery of the DNA-launched LAVs. Such nanoparticle formulations have to be co-developed with the DNA-launched LAVs in pre-clinics and clinics. A number of important questions remain to be answered to further develop pZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 as a vaccine candidate. First, what are the initial cell types that launch ZIKV-3′-UTR-Δ20 LAV replication after plasmid electroporation? It is well documented that intramuscular injection with plasmid DNA results in transgene expression primarily in muscle
cells. Bone marrow-derived dendritic cells are central to the induction of immune response by DNA vaccines [45]. Engineering pZIKV-3′UTR-Δ20 with a reporter gene (e.g., GFP or mCherry in-frame fused with the viral open-reading-frame) may facilitate tracking the initial production and spread of the DNA-launched LAV. The same experiment may also be used to estimate the duration of LAV production at the injection site after plasmid vaccination. Second, how long will the protective immunity last after vaccination with pZIKV-3′UTR-Δ20? In

![Fig. 5. Prevention of vertical transmission from pregnant mice. (a) Experimental design. The right panel shows three mouse groups (IV, V, and VI) with different immunizing agents and challenge conditions. Six-week-old female A129 mice were immunized with pZIKV-3′UTR-Δ20 (1 μg) or DPBS (sham) using TriGrid™. At E10.5, mice were challenged with 10⁶ PFU of ZIKV strain PRVABC59 or DPBS controls via the subcutaneous route. At E18.5, the mice were sacrificed for measuring viral loads in maternal and fetal organs. (b) Maternal NT₅₀ values on day 29 post-immunization and at E18.5. For mouse group IV, paired t-test was performed to indicate no significant difference (n.s.) between the pre-challenge (day 29) and post-challenge (E18.5) neutralizing antibody titers. (c) Viremia on day 2 post-challenge. (d) Maternal brain viral loads. (e) Maternal spleen viral loads. (f) Placenta viral loads. (g) Fetal head viral loads. (h) Fetal weight. (i) Neutralizing antibodies in fetal blood. Individual dams are indicated by different colors and symbols. Fetuses and their parental mice are matched with the same colors and symbols. The L.O.D.s for viremia, organ virus load, and neutralizing antibody titer are 100 PFU/ml, 100 PFU/g, and 100-fold dilutions, respectively. A one-way ANOVA test was performed to determine statistically significant differences among groups.

![Fig. 6. T cell responses in A129 mice after pZIKV-3′UTR-Δ20 immunization. Six-week-old A129 mice were immunized with pZIKV-3′UTR-Δ20 (0.5 μg) or DPBS (sham) using TriGrid™. On day 29 post-immunization, splenocytes were harvested for T cell analysis. (a) Total numbers of CD4+ T cell subsets per spleen. Splenocytes were cultured ex vivo with ZIKV for 24 h and stained for IFN-γ, TNF-α, and CD4 T cell markers. (b) Total numbers of CD8+ T cell subsets. Splenocytes were cultured ex vivo with ZIKV for 24 h (right panel) or with an E peptide for 5 h (left panel) and stained for IFN-γ, TNF-α, and CD8 T cell markers. Cytokines IL-2 (c), IFN-γ (d), and TNF-α (e) in cell culture media were measured after splenocytes were stimulated by ZIKV for 2 days. An unpaired nonparametric Mann-Whitney test was performed to analyze statistical significance.]
non-human primates, two immunizations with a subunit DNA vaccine resulted in short-lived immunogenicity and efficacy (reduced protection and declining neutralizing antibody titers to sub-protective levels at the end of year one) [46]. Since pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 launches LAV virus, the durability of protective immunity after vaccination is expected be significantly improved. As of today, the neutralizing antibody titers from the 1× pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20-immunized mice remained >2 × 104 four months post-immunization (data not shown). Third, maternal neutralizing antibody transfer was observed from the vaccinated dams to fetuses. The transferred maternal antibodies were presumably IgGs because IgMs cannot cross the placenta. It remains to be determined how long the maternally transferred neutralizing activity would last in protecting the newborn mice against infection. Finally, DNA vaccines have repeatedly shown good efficacy in mice, but not in larger animals. Although expression of replicating RNA genome from the DNA-launched platform may improve this outcome, the single-dose mouse efficacy observed here remains to be validated in non-human primates and humans.

In summary, we have developed a plasmid-launched ZIKV LAV that combines the advantages of DNA vaccines and LAVs. A single-dose immunization of our pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 induces robust immunity to prevent pregnancy transmission and testis damage in mouse models. Our results suggest that further development of the pZIKV-3’UTR-Δ20 is warranted, and that the plasmid-launched LAV platform could be applied to other plus-sense, single-stranded RNA viruses.
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