Neutralization of zoonotic simian foamy viruses: genotype-specific epitopes within the receptor-

binding domain

Lasse Toftdal Dynesen[a], Ignacio Fernandez[b], Youna Coquin[a], Manon Delaplace[a], Thomas Montange[a],

Richard Njouom[c], Chanceline Bilonga-Ndongo[d], Felix A. Rey[b], Antoine Gessain[a], Marija Backovic[b], and

Florence Buseyne[a,*]

[a]Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, CNRS UMR3569, Unité d'Epidémiologie et Physiopathologie des

Virus Oncogènes, 75015 Paris, France

[b]Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, CNRS UMR3569, Unité de Virologie Structurale, 75015 Paris,

France

[c]Centre Pasteur du Cameroun, Yaoundé, Cameroon

[d]Ministère de la Santé Publique, Yaoundé, Cameroon

[*]corresponding author

Abstract

Simian foamy viruses (SFVs) are retroviruses that are frequently cross-transmitted to humans. SFVs establish life-long infection in their human hosts, with the persistence of replication-competent virus. Zoonotic SFVs do not induce severe pathology and are not transmitted between humans. Infected individuals develop potent neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) that targets the SFV envelope protein (Env). Env carries a variable region that defines two SFV genotypes and is the exclusive target of nAbs. However, its antigenic determinants are not understood. Here, we characterized nAbs from SFV-infected individuals living in Central Africa. The nAbs target conformational epitopes within two major antigenic areas located at the Env apex: One mediates the interaction between Env protomers to form Env trimers and one harbors several determinants of Env binding to susceptible cells. One binding determinant is genotype-specific. We propose a model integrating structural, genetic, functional, and immunological knowledge on the SFV receptor binding domain.

Introduction

Foamy viruses (FVs) are the most ancient of retroviruses [1, 2]. Simian foamy viruses (SFVs) are widespread in nonhuman primates (NHPs), replicate in the buccal cavity, and are transmitted to humans mostly through bites by infected NHPs [2-4]. Such cross-species transmission events currently occur in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Most individuals known to be infected with zoonotic SFV live in Central Africa, the region at the epicenter of the emergence of HIV-1 and HTLV-1 from their simian reservoirs. In their human hosts, SFVs establish a life-long persistent infection associated with subclinical pathophysiological alterations [5, 6]. Thus far, neither severe disease nor human-to-human transmission have been described, suggesting efficient control of SFV replication and transmission in humans.

SFV infection elicits envelope (Env)-specific neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) that block the entry of viral particles into susceptible cells *in vitro* [7]. Although they do not block cell-to-cell infection *in vitro*, antibodies prevent cell-associated SFV transmission by transfusion in monkeys [8, 9]. SFV Env is cleaved into three subunits, the leader peptide (LP), the surface subunit (SU), which binds to cells, and the transmembrane (TM) subunit, which carries out fusion. In several SFV species, there are two variants of the *env* gene, defining two genotypes [10-12]. The two variants differ in a discrete region encoding 250 residues, named SUvar, located at the center of the SU and overlapping with most of the receptor-binding domain (RBD) [13]. The RBD is thus bimorphic and the exclusive target of genotype-specific nAbs [7].

We have determined the RBD structure, which we describe in a co-submitted paper [14]. Here, we present the epitopic sites that were concomitantly defined by the use of plasma samples from SFV-infected African hunters. These individuals were infected by SFV of gorilla origin through bites [3]. We have previously described the infecting strains, *ex vivo* blood target cells, antibody response, and medical status of these individuals [5-7, 9, 11, 15, 16]. We expressed the SU as a soluble recombinant protein that competes with SU present on viral vector particles for binding to plasma nAbs in a neutralization assay. We defined the regions targeted by the nAbs using mutant SU protein modified at the glycosylation sites [17], RBD functional subregions [13], genotype-specific sequences that present properties of B-cell epitopes, and structural information [14]. Finally, we tested whether immunodominant epitopes recognized by nAbs are involved in SU binding to and viral entry into susceptible cells.

Results

Infrequent binding of plasma antibodies to linear epitopes located on the SU variable domain

We started the epitope mapping project by screening plasma samples for binding to 37 synthetic peptides spanning the SUvar domain from three viral strains (Fig. 1, Supplementary Tables 1 and 2, Supplementary Fig. 1). By ELISA, seven of 17 (41%) plasma samples from SFV-infected individuals reacted against at least one peptide; five locations represented by peptides with GI and/or GII sequences were recognized by at least one plasma sample (Fig. 2). In comparison, 76%, and 71% of plasma samples displayed binding activity against immunodominant viral peptides used as positive controls (see Materials and Methods). Plasma antibodies bound to GI and/or GII peptides irrespective of the SFV genotype against which they were raised. In conclusion, the binding study showed that most SFV-specific antibodies do not recognize genotype-specific linear epitopes.

SFV SU protein competes with the virus for binding to nAbs

We sought to define nAb epitopes by performing neutralization assays in the presence of recombinant SU protein that competes with the SU within Env present at the surface of foamy viral vector (FVV) particles. While wildtype (WT) SU bound to the nAbs, allowing cell infection to proceed, SU mutants with altered nAb epitopes did not (Fig. 3A and 3B). We tested several recombinant Env and SU expression constructs, of which the production level and stability varied according to the genotype: Gorilla genotype II (GII) Env-derived constructs were expressed at high levels, whereas gorilla genotype I (GI) Env-derived counterparts were poorly expressed and aggregated (Supplementary Fig. 2A). The immunoglobulin Fc domain acts as a secretion carrier for the SU, giving the construct high stability. Such chimeric proteins - referred to as immunoadhesins – have been used to produce soluble SFV SU [13]. The GI SU immunoadhesin was expressed at insufficient levels, but we readily produced the chimpanzee genotype I (CI) and GII SU immunoadhesins. We therefore studied epitopes recognized by GII-specific nAbs with the GII immunoadhesin (referred to as ^{GII}SU for the WT sequence) and those recognized by GI-specific nAbs with the CI immunoadhesin (^{CI}SU), as allowed by the frequent cross-neutralization of gorilla and chimpanzee strains belonging to the same genotype [7] and CI and GI SUvar sequence identity of 70% [11].

We validated the competition strategy with genotype-matched and mismatched immunoadhesins (Fig. 3, Supplementary Tables 3 and 4). We tested plasma samples from gorilla SFV-infected hunters at the dilution required for 90% reduction of FVV infectivity (IC_{90}) to allow Env-specific antibody saturation by the competitor immunoadhesin. Thus, plasma samples were tested at the same nAb concentration and responses from different individuals could be compared. We incubated immunoadhesins with

plasma samples before addition to a FVV expressing the matching envelope protein and titration of

residual infectivity. Both ^{CI}SU and ^{GII}SU blocked the action of nAbs present in genotype-matched plasma

samples in a concentration-dependent manner but failed to block the activity of genotype-mismatched

samples (Fig. 3C). Importantly, the immunoadhesins did not affect SFV entry (Fig. 3D, [18]), allowing

their use as competitors for binding to nAbs in an infectivity assay. The unrelated MLV SU construct

(^{MLV}SU) had no impact on either the neutralizing activity of plasma samples or SFV infectivity (Fig. 3C

and 3D). We titrated 12 samples against matched ^{CI}SU and ^{GII}SU, including one from a coinfected

individual which was tested against both immunoadhesins, leading to 13 sample-immunoadhesin pairs

tested. Immunoadhesin's effect on nAb can be described by its affinity and by the fraction of plasma

nAb blocked. The IC_{50}, a measure of affinity, ranged between 3.3 and 12.6 nM for ^{CI}SU and 2.9 and 12.5

nM for ^{GII}SU, depending on the plasma sample (Fig. 3E). Taking FVV treated with ^{MLV}SU without plasma

as a reference value for full infectivity (100%), ^{CI}SU and ^{GII}SU restored the infectivity of plasma-treated

FVV to between 56% and 94% of infectivity. This value is referred to as maximum infectivity (MaxI) and

quantifies the proportion of nAb blocked by the immunoadhesion (Fig. 3B and 3F). We used the values

from at least five independent experiments to calculate the IC_{50} and MaxI threshold values to define

the nAb blocking activity of mutated recombinant proteins as being significantly different from that of

WT SU (Fig. 3B).

We evaluated the impact of SU oligomerization and mammalian-type glycosylation on its capacity to

block nAbs by testing the following constructs: SU monomers produced in mammalian and insect cells,

trimeric Env ectodomains produced in insect cells, and dimeric SU (i.e., immunoadhesin) produced in

mammalian cells. All had the same capacity to block the nAbs (Supplementary Fig. 2B). Therefore, we

used the only recombinant proteins available for both genotypes, the SU immunoadhesins. We first

studied GII-specific nAbs using ^{GII}SU before testing GI-specific nAbs using ^{CI}SU.

Certain nAbs target glyco-epitopes

The GII SUvar domain carries seven of the 11 SU glycosylation sites (Fig. 4A and 4B). We assessed

whether these glycans are recognized by nAbs or whether they shield epitopes from nAb recognition.

We produced ^{GII}SU in the presence of the mannosidase inhibitor kifunensine, which prevents complex-

type glycan addition, or treated it with endo-H to remove all glycans. The absence of complex glycans

had no impact on nAb blockade by ^{GII}SU (Fig. 4C), confirming data obtained with GII Env constructs

expressed in insect cells, which also lack complex glycans (Supplementary Fig. 2). By contrast, the removal

of all glycans decreased nAb blockade and protein titration showed lower affinity for the nAbs present

in three out of four plasma samples (Fig. 4D). Endo-H treatment did not induce protein aggregation

(Supplementary Fig. 4) but may have a global effect on the SU affecting SFV-specific nAbs. Conversely,

glycans did not shield major nAb epitopes on SFV Env, as their removal did not enhance nAb blockade

in the samples tested.

The N10 glycosylation site is located at different positions for the two genotypes and may be part of a

potential epitopic region (N422/N423 on GI-D468/CI-PFV strains, N411 on the GII-K74 strain). The N10

glycosylation knock-down mutant (^{GII}ΔN10) was as efficient as ^{GII}SU in blocking nAbs from all plasma

samples (Fig. 4E). N10 belongs to a stretch of seven genotype-specific residues that were replaced by

those from the GI-D468 strain. The chimeric protein (^{GII}swap407) blocked nAbs as efficiently as ^{GII}SU

for three samples and showed decreased affinity against nAbs for one sample (Fig. 4F). Thus, GII-

specific nAbs occasionally target the N10 glycosylation site.

To identify other glycosylation sites targeted by nAbs, we knocked them down one by one, except for

N8, which is critical for SU expression [17]. The ^{GII}ΔN7' mutant showed reduced capacity to block nAbs

from five of the seven samples (Fig. 4J). ^{GII}ΔN5 and ^{GII}ΔN9 showed reduced capacity to block nAbs from

one or two plasma samples (Fig. 4G and 4K). Knock down of N6 and N7 had no impact (Fig. 4H and 4I).

Overall, our data support that most glycans are not part of glyco-epitopes, except those at the N7'

glycosylation site.

SFV-specific nAbs target loops at the RBD apex

Next, we aimed to locate nAb epitopes on the SU subdomains involved in binding to susceptible cells

[13]. Two regions of the RBD were identified as being essential for binding (RBD1 and RBD2) and the

region in between (RBDj) could be deleted without fully compromising cell binding (Fig. 1A, 1C, 5A and

5B). The SUvar region encompasses RBD1 (except its first 16 N-term residues), RBDj, and the seven N-

terminal residues of RBD2 (Fig. 1B, 1D). We first constructed a mutant immunoadhesin with RBDj

deleted. ^{GII}ΔRBDj was highly impaired in blocking nAbs from three individuals: the IC$_{50}$ values were

above the highest concentration tested (200 nM) and the MaxI values were close to 10%, the value of

plasma samples incubated with the irrelevant ^{MLV}SU (Fig. 5C). By contrast, ^{GII}ΔRBDj blocked nAbs from

the BAD551 plasma sample as efficiently as ^{GII}SU.

Then, we used the recently discovered RBD structural elements. In the lower subdomain, the main

candidate epitopic region was the heparan sulfate glycosaminoglycan binding site (HBS). The GII Env

ectodomain mutated on HBS residues (^{GII}K342A/R343A or ^{GII}R356A/R369A, [14]) blocked nAbs from

three samples as efficiently as their WT counterpart and showed lower affinity for the MEBAK88

plasma sample (Fig. 5D and 5E). Thus, nAb activity is modestly affected by mutated HBS residues.

The X-ray structure of the RBD showed that four loops emanate from the upper domain [14]. L1 is

shielded at the center of the trimer and is probably not accessible to nAbs, whereas L2 (276-281), L3

(416-436), and L4 (446-453) are exposed to solvent, mobile, and therefore considered to be candidate

epitopic regions. Furthermore, L3 and L4 are located in the RBDj region, which is a major target of nAbs

(Fig. 5C). We deleted the loops individually (Fig. 5F-H). ^{GII}ΔL3 blocked all GII-specific samples but one,

although with lower affinity. ^{GII}ΔL2 and ^{GII}ΔL4 showed plasma-dependent effects, with three patterns:

(1) full activity (such as against BAD551) (2), full loss or a strong reduction of activity (for example,

against BAK133), (3) or reduction of the MaxI with unchanged affinity (such as MEBAK88). The last

pattern probably reflects the presence of nAbs targeting different epitopes within the same plasma

sample, some epitopes being altered on mutant immunoadhesins while others are not.

Even though L2, L3, and L4 are mobile in the structure of the RBD monomer [14], the plasma samples

did not recognize synthetic peptides spanning these loops (Supplementary Fig. 5), indicating that they

may be part of conformational epitopes. Overall, we show that nAbs from most samples target

conformational epitopes at the RBD apex, some being carried by L2, L3, and L4.

SFV-specific nAbs target the base of the SUvar region

Before the 3D structure was available, we used the insertion of N-linked glycosylation sequences

(NXS/T) to disrupt potential epitopes. We selected seven genotype-specific sequences predicted to

have a disordered secondary structure or to contain a B-cell epitope and built mutant immunoadhesins

with a glycosylation site inserted in the targeted sequence (Fig. 6A, 6B, Supplementary Table 5). Four of

the seven glycans were inserted in the upper subdomain and resulted in decreased affinity against

certain plasma nAbs: ^{GII}426$_{glyc}$ in L3, ^{GII}450$_{glyc}$ in L4, ^{GII}459$_{glyc}$ after L4, and ^{GII}485$_{glyc}$ in RBDj (Fig. 6C-F).

^{GII}263$_{glyc}$ had no or only a modest effect on nAb activity, which is consistent with its location at the

center of the trimer (Fig. 6G, [14]). Overall, glycan insertions at five sites of the RBD upper subdomain

confirmed its frequent recognition by nAbs.

One immunoadhesin with glycans inserted in the lower RBD subdomain (^{GII}351$_{glyc}$) showed a strongly

reduced capacity to block the nAbs (Fig. 6H). The modified residue is located on a solvent-exposed loop

at the base of the SUvar region (aa 345-353) (Fig. 6B and 6B'). ^{GII}351$_{glyc}$ was the first mutant to indicate

that nAbs recognize a region of the RBD to which no function has yet been attributed. We therefore

focused the following experiments on this novel epitopic region.

As ^{GII}351$_{glyc}$ was prone to aggregation (Supplementary Fig. 4H), we produced a second batch, half of which

was purified by affinity chromatography (standard protocol) and the other half further purified by size

exclusion chromatography (SEC) to eliminate aggregates. Both ^{GII}351$_{glyc}$ preparations were unable to

block nAbs from the plasma samples (Supplementary Fig. 6A-E). Glycan insertion at an adjacent position

in ^{GII}350$_{glyc}$ led to the loss of nAb blockade and reduced aggregation (Fig. 6I). The GII 345-353 loop is

one residue shorter than that of the GI-D468 and CI-PFV strains (Fig. 6B'). The mutant immunoadhesin

with an extra E at position 349 ($^{GII}349_{+E}$) showed a strongly reduced capacity to block the nAbs (Fig.

6J). We replaced the seven GII residues by the eight residues from the GI-D468 strain; ^{GII}swap345

showed a reduced ability to block nAbs from five of the seven plasma samples (Fig. 6K). By contrast,

swapping the α3-helix located N-terminal to the loop (^{GII}swap333) had no impact on the capacity to

block the nAbs (Fig. 6L). Finally, we tested the substitution of residues on the α8-helix facing the 345-

353 loop; ^{GII}E502A and ^{GII}L505N showed a reduced capacity to block the nAbs (Fig. 6M-N). Overall, these

experiments define the 345-353 loop and adjacent α8-helix as a major epitopic region on GII RBD.

GI and GII-specific nAbs target different epitopes

We applied a similar strategy using GI-specific plasma samples and ^{CI}SU harboring the mutations with

the greatest impact on GII-specific epitopes. We present these data with a comparison with those

obtained with the GII-specific samples (Fig. 7, blue symbols over light red lines). GI-specific nAbs

targeted glycans removed by endo-H but not complex glycans and did not recognize N10, for which

the presence is genotype-specific (Fig. 7A-7C). We could not test the recognition of N7', as it is absent

from the CI-PFV strain.

The most striking difference between GI and GII epitopes was around residue 350: in sharp contrast to

$^{GII}351_{glyc}$ (Fig. 6H) and $^{GII}350_{glyc}$ (Fig. 6I), $^{CI}350_{glyc}$ fully blocked GI-specific nAbs (Fig. 7D). Neither ^{CI}ΔRBDj

nor ^{CI}ΔL3 proteins blocked the nAbs (Fig. 7E and 7G). Thus, L3 is more important for GI- than GII-specific

nAbs. Indeed, ^{GII}ΔL3 blocked GII-specific nAbs, although with lower affinity than ^{GII}SU. ^{CI}ΔL2 and ^{CI}ΔL4

showed sample-dependent effects, as their GII counterparts (Fig. 7F and 7H). $^{CI}463_{glyc}$ blocked GI-specific

nAbs, with a reduced MaxI (Fig. 7I), indicating that a fraction of GI-specific nAbs was not blocked,

whereas the other was blocked as efficiently as by ^{CI}SU. The corresponding $^{GII}459_{glyc}$ mutant blocked

GII-specific nAbs, but with lower affinity than ^{GII}SU (Fig. 6E). Overall, nAbs from GI- and GII-specific

plasma samples target different epitopes.

The mutations on the SU immunoadhesins may have induced epitope-specific or nonspecific

conformational changes. The RBDj deletion had a likely epitope-specific effect on the GII backbone, as

^{GII}ΔRBDj retained its capacity to block one sample containing nAbs that preferentially targeted epitopes

outside the RBDj (Fig. 5C). However, ^{CI}ΔRBDj and ^{CI}ΔL3 did not display any nAb blocking activity. Thus,

we confirmed the results using chimeric immunoadhesins: ^{GII}swapRBDj (i.e., GI RBDj in ^{GII}SU) blocked

nAbs from the four anti-GI plasma samples with a similar or modestly reduced capacity relative to that

of ^{CI}SU (Fig. 7J), whereas ^{GII}SU had no blocking activity (Fig. 7K). ^{CI}swapL3 (GII L3 in ^{CI}SU) did not block

the nAbs (Fig. 7L). These data suggest that either GI-specific nAbs recognize the L3 loop or that the L3

loop requires a matching interaction to adopt its native conformation.

Human plasma samples contain nAbs targeting a variable number of epitopic regions

The effect of the mutant SU on each plasma sample can be summarized as recognition similar to that as for WT SU, recognition with a reduced affinity (i.e., increased IC_{50}), blocking a smaller fraction of nAbs than WT SU (i.e., reduced MaxI), or having both effects (Fig. 8). We grouped the most relevant mutants according to their location: the RBD apex, the 345-353 loop, and the N7' region. We tested the recognition of the N7' region by GII-specific samples only. This summary highlights the two genotype-specific and immunodominant epitopic regions that we identified: loop 345-353 on ^{GII}SU (Fig. 8A) and L3 on ^{CI}SU (Fig. 8B). Within the RBD apex, four mutant immunoadhesins correspond to different epitopic sites (L2, L3, L4, and 459/463^{glyc}). GI-specific plasma samples contained nAbs focused on a single subdomain (such as BAK55 and ^{CI}L3) or epitopes on up to four sites (BAD348 and BAK132). Similarly, GII-specific plasma samples presented interindividual variations in their specificity. We examined the sequence of the identified epitopes and found that all were conserved on the SFV strains infecting individuals from this study or circulating in Central Africa (Supplementary Fig. 7). Overall, we identified three immunodominant epitopic regions (RBD apex, 345-353 loop, and N7' region), of which the sequences are conserved within each genotype. We provide evidence that SFV-infected individuals have nAbs that target several epitopes and recognize epitopes that differ between individuals.

Functional studies

Protein binding to susceptible cells

All immunoadhesins used for epitope mapping were tested for their capacity to bind to human HT1080 cells, which are highly susceptible to gorilla and chimpanzee SFVs [15] (Fig. 9A, Supplementary Fig. 8). Immunoadhesin binding was enhanced after glycan removal, possibly through reduced steric hindrance. Deletion of the RBDj reduced binding to susceptible cells, while one-by-one deletion of loops L2, L3, and L4 abolished it. We observed genotype-specific differences; the RBDj deletion had a stronger impact on GII than on CI immunoadhesins (6- vs. 2.5-fold reduction). Conversely, glycan insertion after L4 had only a moderate impact on the GII immunoadhesin (^{GII}459$_{glyc}$, 6-fold reduction) but abolished binding of the CI immunoadhesin (^{CI}463^{glyc}, ≈100-fold reduction). In the 345-353 loop, glycan insertion strongly affected the binding of GII immunoadhesins (^{GII}350$_{glyc}$ and ^{GII}351$_{glyc}$, ≈50-fold reduction), but there was no effect on CI immunoadhesins, mirroring the recognition by the nAbs. Overall, our data suggest that certain residues involved in cell binding may be genotype-specific.

The binding data were also considered for the interpretation of nAb blocking experiments. The mutant immunoadhesins that retained their capacity to bind cells were considered to likely be properly folded and loss of nAb blockade could be considered as being due to mutation of the epitope. Overall, a single

256 mutated adhesins failed to bind cells and block the nAbs from all samples tested and related data are
257 not presented.

The epitopic regions targeted by nAbs are involved in viral infectivity

We then tested the impact of RBDj and loop deletions in the context of FVVs. We produced FVVs with
Env mutants corresponding to the immunoadhesins most affected in blocking genotype-specific nAbs
(i.e., ΔRBDj and ΔL3 CI-PFV, ΔRBDj, ΔL2, and ΔL4 GII-K74 Env). The quantity of FVV particles carrying
deletions was strongly reduced, over 1000-fold for CI-PFV ΔRBDj, over 100-fold for CI-PFV ΔL3 and GII-
K74 ΔRBDj, and over 50-fold GII-K74 ΔL2 and ΔL4 (Fig. 9B), despite all mutant Env being expressed in
transfected cells (Supplementary Fig. 9). Moreover, none of the FVVs with mutant Env were infectious
(Fig. 9C). However, most bound to susceptible cells at levels 2 to 4-fold below those of FVVs with WT
Env, except the CI-PFV ΔRBDj mutant, for which the binding was reduced ≈ 30-fold) (Fig. 9D). In
conclusion, the regions from the upper RBD subdomain targeted by nAbs are required for viral
infectivity independently of their capacity to bind to susceptible cells.

Three-dimensional map of epitopic regions

We built a model integrating the current knowledge on Env structure, genetic variability, function, and
our findings on the recognition by nAbs (Fig. 10). According to our model for the arrangement of the
RBD within the trimeric Env, the RBD occupies the space at the top of Env spike [14, 19]; each RBD has
two subdomains, referred to as upper and lower [14] (Fig. 10A). The genotype-specific SUvar region is
targeted by nAbs [7, 11, 12] and comprises the entire upper RBD subdomain (SUvar^{Up}) and one third
of its lower subdomain (SUvar^{Lo}) (Fig. 10B). SUvar^{Lo} wraps around a stem formed by the conserved part
of the RBD (SUcon region). The functionally defined bipartite RBD [13] could be located as follows:
RBD1 forms half of the SUvar^{Up} and the SUvar^{Lo} region wrapping around the conserved RBD2, while
the RBDj forms the top of SUvar^{Up}.

Here, we show that nAbs recognize the three solvent-exposed loops on SUvar^{Up} (Fig. 10D). We also
identified mutations located C-terminal ($^{GII}459_{glyc}$ and $^{CI}463_{glyc}$) that may affect nAb binding or the SU
folding. For SUvar^{Lo}, we show the 345-353 loop to be an immunodominant epitope exclusively
recognized by GII-specific nAbs and that it has a role in binding to cells. The glycosylation site N7' had
the greatest impact on the nAbs. It is located at the opening of the cavity in which the essential N8
glycan is buried [14]. Of note, the glycan inserted in $^{GII}485_{glyc}$ may interfere with N8 function and/or
accessibility to nAbs. SUvar^{Lo} comprises the HBS, which was not frequently recognized. In conclusion,
the nAbs bound to the loops on SUvar^{Up} might interfere with trimer integrity or the conformational
changes required for the triggering of fusion, whereas those that bound to SUvar^{Lo} may prevent viral
attachment and/or binding.

Discussion

Here, we demonstrate that SFV GII-specific nAbs raised by infected humans recognize two antigenic regions in the genotype-specific region of the SU and that GI-specific nAbs target at least one of these regions. Based on previous knowledge [13, 19], the X-ray structure presented in the co-submitted paper [14], and our functional data, the SFV-specific nAbs most likely target sites involved in either Env trimer formation or cell binding.

We identified conformational epitopes only, despite several attempts to capture linear epitopes using peptides (Fig. 2, Supplementary Fig. 5 and [20]). Our data are consistent with the low reactivity of NHP and human immune sera to denatured Env in immunoblot assays, which contain Abs that bind to native Env in radio-immunoprecipitation and neutralization assays [21-24]. Linear epitopes are usually located in mobile regions of the polypeptide chains. Such mobile segments are absent from the RBD lower subdomain formed by the compact assembly of α-helices and β-sheets [14]. In RBD monomers, the upper subdomain loops appear to be mobile, but inter-protomer interactions probably impose specific conformations in full-length Env. The loops likely form a number of discontinuous epitopes; L2 and L4 are in proximity in the monomer and L3 and L4 in the trimer [14].

Twelve plasma samples were used in this study, including one from an individual infected by strains belonging to both genotypes. Overall, the epitopic regions were recognized by all or most donors and can be considered to be immunodominant (Fig. 8). Importantly, within each genotype, sequences from the epitopic regions were identical among SFV strains infecting the studied individuals and those circulating in the same geographical area. This observation is consistent with the genetic stability of SFV [25]. The use of polyclonal plasma samples was key to providing a global picture of nAbs raised upon infection with zoonotic SFV, but only epitopes recognized by a significant fraction of plasma antibodies can be detected. Thus, future studies may identify subdominant epitopes and provide a more precise definition of those that are immunodominant.

Immunoadhesins fully blocked nAbs from certain samples. However, for most tested samples, the infectivity was maintained but at levels lower than those observed for FVVs not exposed to plasma samples (Fig. 3). The heterogeneous glycosylation of the immunoadhesins could explain the partial blockade of nAbs [23], as proposed for the incomplete neutralization of HIV [26-29]. The SU antigenicity of soluble monomeric proteins probably differed from those contained within viral particles due to the lack of the intra- and interprotomer interactions that form quaternary structures. Thus, our data identify nAb epitopes presented on the monomeric SU domain and indirectly suggest the existence of quaternary epitopes.

We have provided experimental evidence for the targeting of different epitopes by nAbs raised after infection by the two SFV genotypes. The RBD fold from different genotypes and FV from different host species is highly conserved [14]. In superinfection-resistance experiments, the CI Env inhibited entry from genotype II strains, indicating that SFV from different genotypes share the use of at least one molecule for entry into target cells; this molecule could act as an attachment factor or receptor [30]. The SUvar^{Up} domain was recognized by both GI- and GII-specific nAbs and the SUvar^{Lo} by GII-specific nAbs only. GI-specific nAbs may, nevertheless, recognize epitopes on SUvar^{Lo} that are yet to be identified. Indeed, the biochemical properties of GI Env protein resulted in low expression and protein aggregation. Therefore, we used an SU from chimpanzee genotype I SFV to map epitopes recognized by antibodies induced by a gorilla genotype I SFV. We previously reported that plasma samples cross-neutralize both SFV species, with a strong correlation between nAb titers; however, nAb titers were globally higher against the GI than CI strain [7]. Thus, we may have missed a number of GI-specific epitopes.

Relative to other viruses, SFV-specific nAbs target a limited region on Env, i.e., they do not recognize epitopes on the TM nor non-RBD sites of the SU [31-33]. Based on the inhibition mechanisms described for other viruses [33], we can propose a number of possible modes of action. The targeting of RBD loops by nAbs may prevent the fusogenic conformational transition and exposure of the fusion peptide, which is located at the center of the trimer and shielded by the RBD, as visualized on viral particles [19]. It is possible that certain loop-specific nAbs bind several protomers, as described for HIV- and Ebola-specific nAbs [34, 35]. An alternative neutralization mechanism could be the targeting of epitopes located close to the protomer interface, resulting in trimer disruption, as described for HIV- and Flu-specific nAbs [36, 37].

Many nAbs interfere with particle binding to susceptible cells. The existence of a *bona fide* receptor for SFV is yet to be demonstrated. Consequently, the molecular determinants of Env binding to susceptible cells within SUvar^{Lo} are still only roughly defined. Certain nAbs recognize attachment factors, such as an HBS on SARS-CoV2 spike [38]. The SFV HBS is a patch of residues located in SUvar^{Lo}. The mutants deficient for HS binding efficiently blocked most plasma samples, indicating that HBS is either not a major nAb target or that the antigenicity of these mutants is preserved. Of note, the N7' site located in the vicinity of HBS was recognized. All immunoadhesins designed to map potential B-cell epitopes were tested for their capacity to bind susceptible cells. SU from the two genotypes differed in certain residues involved in cell binding. Most notably, nAbs recognizing the 345-353 loop may prevent GII Env binding, whereas the loop on GI Env is not involved in cell binding and is not targeted by nAbs (Fig. 9). This last observation highlights, for the first time, genotype-specific

differences in SFV binding to susceptible cells and could be a starting point for further studies on
identifying attachment factors and receptors for SFV.

Our choice of a functional strategy to map the epitopes targeted by nAbs proved to be critical due to
the lack of linear epitopes. Overall, the use of human samples and soluble SU as competitor allowed
us to create the first map of targeted regions. We considered several caveats (polyspecificity of plasma
samples, absence of quaternary epitopes). We also carefully considered the possible nonspecific effect
of mutations on protein folding, which could generate misleading results. Certain mutants were,
indeed, poorly expressed and could not be used (Supplementary Table 3). A number of these limitations
may be overcome in the future with the use of alternative tools, such as human monoclonal antibodies
and subviral particles.

Human infection with zoonotic SFV represents a model for cross-species transmission of retroviruses
leading to persistent infection that is successfully controlled by the immune system. We have
previously reported the presence of potent nAbs in most infected individuals [20]. Here, we have
mapped major antigenic sites. Concerning the control of SFV in humans, a notable result from the
present study is that two immune escape mechanisms, sequence variation and glycan shielding, were
observed. The SFV RBD is structurally different from known and modelled retroviral RBDs [39]. We
have provided a novel model integrating structural, genetic, functional, and immunological knowledge
on the bimorphic SFV RBD. We have thus gained information on the two SFV genotypes that have
persisted for over 30 million years of evolution with their animal hosts. Through the study of SFV and
its unique properties, we should also gain fundamental knowledge on the structural basis for the
inhibition of viruses by nAbs.

Methods

Human plasma samples

Blood samples were drawn from adult populations living in villages and settlements throughout the
rainforests of Cameroon. Participants gave written informed consent. Ethics approval was obtained
from the relevant national authorities in Cameroon (the Ministry of Health and the National Ethics
Committee) and France (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés, Comité de Protection
des Personnes Ile de France IV). The study was registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov,
https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03225794/. SFV infection was diagnosed by a clearly positive
Gag doublet on Western blots using plasma samples from the participants and the amplification of the
integrase gene and/or LTR DNA fragments by PCR using cellular DNA isolated from blood buffy-coats
[3]. We identified the SFV origin by phylogenetic analysis of the integrase gene sequence [3]. The SFV

genotype was determined by amplification of the SUvar DNA fragment by PCR [7]. Plasma samples

from 24 participants were used for this study (Supplementary Tables 1 and 4). Four participants were not

infected with SFV and 20 were infected with a gorilla SFV.

Viral strains, amino-acid numbering, and Env domain nomenclature

We used sequences from primary zoonotic gorilla SFVs, SFVggo_huBAD468 (GI-D468, JQ867465) and

SFVggo_huBAK74 (GII-K74, JQ867464) [40] and the laboratory-adapted chimpanzee SFV,

SFVpsc_huPFV (CI-PFV, KX087159) [41] for the synthesis of foamy viral vectors (FVV) and envelope

proteins and peptides. For simple reference to previously described Env sequences and functions, we

used the amino-acid positions from the CI-PFV strain, unless otherwise stated. The GI-D468, GII-K74,

and CI-PFV sequence alignment are shown in supplementary Fig. 1. When referring to infecting SFV

strains and the antibodies raised against them, gorilla and chimpanzee genotype I SFV are referred to

as GI and CI, respectively; gorilla genotype II SFV is referred to as GII.

Cells

Baby hamster kidney (BHK)-21 cells (ATCC-CLL-10, hamster kidney fibroblast) were cultured in DMEM-

5% fetal bovine serum (FBS). HT1080 cells (ECACC 85111505, human fibrosarcoma) were cultured in

Eagle's Minimum Essential Medium with Earle's Balanced Salts and L-glutamine supplemented with

10% FBS and 1% L-glutamine. Human embryonic kidney 293T cells (Cat. N° 12022001, Sigma) were

cultured in DMEM-10% FBS. FreeStyle 293-F cells (Life Technologies) were cultured in Ex-cell 293 HEK

serum-free medium supplemented with 5 µg/mL phenol red sodium salt, 2% L-glutamine, and 0.2x

penicillin-streptomycin.

Peptides

At the beginning of the project, the SUvar (aa 248-488) sequences from the GI-D468 and GII-K74 strains

were analyzed using linear B-cell epitope prediction software available on the Immune Epitope Data

Base (http://tools.iedb.org/bcell/), which are based on known B-cell epitopes (LBtope [42]),

hydrophilicity (Parker prediction replaced by Bepipred software [43]), and protrusion outside of

globular proteins (Ellipro [44]). In addition, we manually inspected viral sequences for stretches of

genotype-specific epitopes. We selected 14 sequences and tested the corresponding GI-D468 and GII-

K74 peptides, as well as nine CI-PFV peptides from a previously synthesized peptide set [20]

(Supplementary Table 2). After resolution of the RBD crystal structure, we designed a novel peptide set

corresponding to the four loops located in the RBD upper subdomain [14]. As positive controls, we

used the N_{96}-V_{110} (NKDIQVLGPVIDWNV from SFV Env LP) and I_{176}-I_{199} (INTEPSQLPPTAPPLLPHSNLDHI

from HTLV-1 gp46) peptides containing immunodominant epitopes [20]. Peptides were synthesized by

Smartox SAS (Saint-Martin d'Hères, France) or Genscript (Leiden, The Netherlands) and were tested

individually.

ELISA

The protocol was described in [20]. Briefly, peptides diluted in carbonate buffer at 1 µg/mL were

coated on clear high-binding polystyrene 96-well microplates (Biotechne) overnight (ON) at +4°C.

Plasma samples were diluted at 1:200 in phosphate buffered saline (PBS)-0.1% bovine serum albumin

(BSA)-0.1% Tween20. Bound plasma antibodies were detected with horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-

conjugated goat anti-human IgG H+L (0.02 µg/mL, #109-035-008, Jackson Immuno Research Europe).

The peptide diluent was used as the negative control and antibody binding to peptides is expressed as

the difference in OD (Δ_{OD} = ODtest – ODcontrol). Plasma samples from three SFV-uninfected individuals

were tested for binding to the 37 peptides. The mean + 2 SD of Δ_{OD} (0.14) was used to define the

positivity cutoff. The proportion of responding individuals was calculated among those infected with a

given virus (SFV, n = 17; HTLV-1, n = 7).

Plasmids

The four-component CI-PFV FVV system (pcoPG, pcoPP, pcoPE, and pcu2MD9) and the gorilla SFV Env

constructs containing sequence from the zoonotic GI-D468 and GII-K74 *env* genes have already been

described [7, 45]. Novel plasmids were synthesized by Genscript (Piscataway, NJ, USA). We built a FVV

expressing β-galactosidase with a nuclear localization signal (puc2MD9-B-GAL) by replacement of the

gfp gene in the puc2MD9 backbone for easier image analysis on our quantification device. CI-PFV Env

deleted of RBDj or L3, GII-K74 Env deleted of RBDj or L2 or L4 were constructed with the boundaries

used for immunoadhesins (Supplementary Table 3).

Immunoadhesin constructs express a fusion protein formed by the murine IgK signal peptide, SFV SU

with deleted furin cleavage site (aa 127-567), and the heavy chain (hinge-CH2-CH3) of murine IgG2a.

A Twin-Strep-tag was fused after the mIgG2a to facilitate immunoadhesin purification, except for the

first immunoadhesin constructs (GIIΔRBDj, GIIswapRBDj and GIIΔN10). The murine leukemia virus (MLV)

gp70 SU (aa 34-475, strain FB29, NP_040334.1) was fused to the Twin-Strep-tag. All genes were codon

optimized for expression in mammalian cells and placed under the control of a CMV promotor and

intron in the pcZI plasmid [46].

The codon-optimized synthetic genes encoding GII-K74 SU (aa 127-566) and ectodomain (aa 91-907)

were cloned into the already described pT350 plasmid [47], which contains the *Drosophila*

metallothionein promoter, which is inducible by divalent cations [48], the *Drosophila* BiP signal peptide

(MKLCILLAVVAFVGLSLG) at the N-terminus and a Twin-Strep-tag

(AGWSHPQFEKGGGSGGGSGGGSWSHPQFEK) for affinity purification at the C-terminus. Stable S2 cell

lines were generated by antibiotic resistance and protein production was induced by the addition of 2

μM CaCl$_2$. For expression in mammalian cells, the murine IgK signal peptide was fused at the N-

terminus of codon-optimized genes encoding GII-K74 SU (aa 127-566). The genes were placed under

the control of the CMV promoter and intron [46] by insertion into the pcDNA3.1 vector.

Protein expression and purification

293-F cells were seeded at 2.5 10^6 cells/mL in FreeStyle 293 Expression medium and transfected by the

addition of plasmid DNA (2 μg/mL) and LipoD293 (6 μg/mL #SL100668, Tebu-bio). After 24 h, cells were

diluted 1:1 in Ex-cell culture media and cultivated for another 48 h and the supernatants collected and

stored at -80°C. For the expression of immunoadhesins with high-mannose-type glycans, transfected

cells were cultivated in the presence of 5 μM Kifunensine mannosidase inhibitor (#BML-S114-0005,

Enzo Life Sciences). Glycans were removed by incubating the immunoadhesins ON at room

temperature (RT) with endoglycosidase H (endo-H, 0.8 U/mL, #P0702L, New England Biolabs) in 50

mM Na acetate-50 mM NaCl, pH 6. Supernatants were thawed and filtrated through a 0.2 μm filter

before centrifugation at 4500 x g at 4°C in VivaSpin tubes (Sartorius). The first-generation

immunoadhesins do not carry the Twin-Strep-tag and were purified using Protein A Mag Sepharose^{TM}

Xtra beads (50 μL beads/mL of supernatant; #28-9670-62, GE Healthcare) using binding Buffer pH 7,

0.2 M Na$_3$PO$_4$ (#28-9030-59, Ab Buffer Kit, GE Healthcare). Beads were incubated at 4°C on a rotator

ON. Proteins were eluted with a pH 2.5 elution buffer containing 0.2 M Glycine-HCl and neutralized

with 1 M Tris-HCl, pH 9 (#PUR004, NEO Biotech, CliniSciencesProteus). Immunoadhesins and ^{MLV}SU

fused to Twin-Strep-tag were purified using Gravity Flow Strep-Tactin XT Superflow High-Capacity

columns (#2-4031-001, Iba Lifescience). Concentrated proteins were resuspended in buffer W at pH 8

and incubated with BioLock (#2-0205-050, Iba Life sciences) for 15 min at RT to neutralize biotin.

Loading onto the columns and elution were performed according to manufacturer's instructions.

GII-K74 SU, WT, and mutated ectodomains were expressed in *Drosophila* Schneider's cell line 2 (S2)

cells following the standard protocol [49]. GII monomeric SU and trimeric ectodomain proteins were

purified by affinity chromatography on a Streptactin column (IBA Biosciences), followed by size-

exclusion chromatography on Superdex 200, using standard methods provided by the manufacturers.

Protein concentrations were measured by NanoDrop. To verify protein purity and aggregate

formation, 1.5 μg of purified proteins was heat-denatured at 70°C for 10 min in NuPAGE LDS sample

buffer (#NP0007, Introgen), with or without NuPAGE reducing buffer (50 mM DTT; #NP0009,

Invitrogen). Samples were loaded onto a precast NuPAGE 4-12% Bis-Tris gel (#NP0322, Invitrogen). The

gel was incubated with Bio-Safe Coomassie staining solution (#1610786, Bio-Rad) for 2 h with gentle

shaking, rinsed in H$_2$O ON, and imaged using a G:BOX (Syngene) (Supplementary Fig. 4).

Western blots

Western-blot analysis of protein expression was performed on cell supernatants. Samples were heat-denaturated and reduced as described for purified proteins before loading onto precast NuPAGE 4-12% Bis-Tris gels (#NP0322, Invitrogen). Proteins were migrated for 2-3 h at 120 V in NuPAGE MOPS SDS running buffer (#NP0001, Invitrogen) and transferred onto a PVDF membrane (#1704156, Bio-Rad) using a Trans-Blot Turbo transfer system (Bio-Rad). Membranes were blocked and antibody labeled in Tris-buffered saline (TBS)-0.1%Tween-5% BSA. For Strep-tag detection, membranes were incubated with StrepMAB-Classic monoclonal antibody conjugated to HRP (0.05 μg/mL, #2-1509-001, Iba Lifesciences) for 2 h at RT. For SFV SU detection, membranes were incubated with a biotinylated anti-SU murine antibody ON at 4°C (3E10, 1 μg/mL), washed three times in TBS-0.1% Tween for 10 min and incubated with Streptavidin-HRP (1:2000, #DY998, Biotechne). Membranes were washed three times in TBS-0.1% Tween for 10 min before revelation with SuperSignal West Pico PLUS chemiluminescence substrate (#34579, ThermoFischer Scientific) and signal acquisition using a G:BOX.

Foamy viral vectors (FVVs)

FVV particles were produced by co-transfection of HEK293T cells by the four plasmids. Fifteen μg total DNA (gag:env:pol:transgene ratio of 8:2:3:32) and 45 μl polyethyleneimine (#101-10N, JetPEI, Polyplus) were added to a 10 cm^2 culture dish seeded with 4 x 10^6 293T cells. Supernatants were collected 48 h post-transfection, clarified at 500 x g for 10 min, filtered using a 0.45 μm filter, and stored as single-use aliquots at -80°C. FVVs were titrated as described [7, 50], with minor modifications to optimize X-Gal staining of transduced cells, which was lighter than that of infected cells. Briefly, FVV samples were thawed and clarified by spinning at 10,000 x g at 4°C for 10 min. Serial five-fold dilutions were added in triplicate to sub-confluent BHK-21 cells seeded in 96-well plates and cultured for 72 h at 37°C. Plates were fixed with 0.5% glutaraldehyde in PBS for 10 min at RT, washed with PBS, and stained with 150 μl X-gal solution containing 2 mM $MgCl_2$, 10 mM potassium ferricyanide, 10 mM potassium ferrocyanide, and 0.8 mg/mL 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-B-D-galactopyranoside in PBS for 3 h at 37°C. Blue-stained cells were counted using an S6 Ultimate Image UV analyzer (CTL Europe, Bonn, Germany). One infectious unit was defined as one blue cell. Cell transduction by FVV is a surrogate for viral infectivity and FVV titers are expressed as infectious units (IU)/mL.

Neutralization assays

Prior to use in neutralization assays, plasma samples were diluted 1:10 in DMEM + 1 mM $MgCl_2$, decomplemented by heating at 56°C for 30 min, and frozen at -80°C as single-use aliquots. Thawed plasma samples were clarified by spinning at 10,000 x g for 10 min at 4°C. Serial two-fold dilutions were incubated with FVV for 1 h at 37°C before titration in triplicate and residual infectivity quantified using

the 96-well plate microtitration assay described above. P96-well plates seeded with 5,000 BHK-21 cells

were exposed to 300 IUs of FVV. Plasma samples were initially titrated against replicating virus [7]. We

selected those with neutralization titers > 1:100 against the virus and performed plasma titration

against the FVV. We defined the plasma dilution required for a 90% reduction of FVV infectivity and

used it as the fixed concentration for the nAbs. Plasma samples were incubated with serial dilutions of

recombinant Env proteins for 1 h at 37°C. FVV was then mixed with the plasma/protein preparation

and incubated 1 h at 37°C before addition to BHK-21 cells. FVV infectivity was quantified 72 h later as

described for their titration. All conditions were tested in triplicate and the mean IU/well calculated.

Cells transduced with mock treated FVV (i.e., incubated with ^{MLV}SU at 20 nM or with medium) were

quantified on each plate and this value used as a reference. Relative infectivity was calculated for wells

treated with the plasma/protein mix and is expressed as the percentage of the reference value. The

WT immunoadhesin (^{GII}SU or ^{CI}SU) matched with the FVV Env was titrated along with the tested mutant

immunoadhesins on every plate in every experiment for each plasma tested. All immunoadhesins were

tested against each plasma at least twice and against at least four plasma samples. In the first assay

(screening), immunoadhesins were added at three concentrations, ranging from 200 to 2 nM. In the

second assay (confirmation), immunoadhesins with activity similar to that of WT or with no activity

were tested a second time at three dilutions. Mutant immunoadhesins with intermediate activity were

titrated in a three-fold serial dilution setting starting at 60 nM. We used two parameters to define the

action of the immunoadhesins on the nAbs from each plasma sample: maximum infectivity (MaxI) and

50% inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}). MaxI corresponds to the maximal infectivity in the presence of

immunoadhesin-blocking nAb and is defined as the mean relative infectivity at the two highest doses

tested. The IC_{50} values were calculated by plotting the relative infectivity as a function of

immunoadhesin concentration and a four parameters regression modeling of the Prism software

(Version 9, GraphPad). Mutant immunoadhesins with nAb activity similar to the WT one were given its

IC_{50}, and those with minimal or no activity were given an arbitrary IC_{50} value of 200 nM, corresponding

to the highest concentration of immunoadhesin tested.

SFV Env binding to cells

Immunoadhesins were thawed at RT and clarified at 10,000 x g for 10 min. HT1080 cells were treated

with trypsin-EDTA and 5×10^5 cells resuspended in 0.1 mL FACS buffer (PBS-0.1% BSA) containing the

immunoadhesins and incubated on ice for 1 h. Cells were washed twice and incubated with donkey

anti-murine IgG-(H+L)-AF488 (20 µg/mL, #A21202, Invitrogen) on ice for 30 min. Cells were washed

and resuspended in 0.2 mL PBS-2% PFA. Data were acquired on a CytoFlex cytometer (Beckman

Coulter) and analyzed using Kaluza software. A minimum of 25,000 cells were acquired. Single cells

were selected by sequential gating on FSC-A/SSC-A and SSC-A/SSC-H dot-plots (Supplementary Fig. 8).

Immunoadhesin binding is expressed as the ratio of mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of immunoadhesin-treated over untreated cells. Each immunoadhesin was tested twice at 3, 30, and 300 nM. The MFI ratios were plotted as a function of immunoadhesin concentration and the area under the curve was calculated (Supplementary Fig. 5). To limit inter-experimental variation, WT immunoadhesins were included in every experiment and the binding level of mutant immunoadhesins normalized to that of the WT.

Analysis of FVVs carrying mutated Env

The yield of FVV particles was estimated by quantifying particle-associated transgene RNA. FVV RNA was extracted from raw cell supernatants using a QIAamp Viral RNA Extraction Kit (Qiagen), treated with a DNA-free kit (Life Technologies), and retro-transcribed with Maxima H Minus Reverse Transcriptase (Thermo Fischer Scientific) using random primers (Thermo Fischer Scientific) according to the manufacturers' instructions. qPCR was performed on cDNA using BGAL primers (BGAL_F 5' AAACTCGCAAGCCGACTGAT 3' and BGAL_R 5' ATATCGCGGCTCAGTTCGAG 3') with a 10-min denaturation step at 95°C and 40 amplification cycles (15 s at 95°C, 20 s at 60°C, and 30 s at 72°C) carried out using an Eppendorf realplex2 Mastercycler (Eppendorf). A standard curve prepared with serial dilutions of pcu2MD9-BGAL plasmid was used to determine the FVV copy number. Results are expressed as vector particles/mL, considering that each particle carries two copies of the transgene.

The expression level of mutated Env proteins in producer cells was assessed by western-blot analysis. 293T cells transfected to produce FVVs were collected and lysed in RIPA buffer (#R0278, Sigma) containing protease inhibitors (#11140920, Roche) for 2 h at 4°C. Samples were heat-denaturated at 70°C for 10 min in LDS sample buffer (NuPage) and 50 mM DTT before loading onto a precast NuPAGE 4-12% Bis-Tris gel (Invitrogen) and migration for 2 h at 120 V in MOPS running buffer. The content of ≈ one million cells was analyzed. Samples were transferred onto a PVDF membrane using a Trans-Blot Turbo transfer system (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). Membrane blockade and antibody labelling were performed in TBS-0.1%Tween-5%BSA. Membranes were incubated with an anti-LP antibody ON at 4°C (clone P6G11-G11, 1 µg/mL), washed, and incubated with a goat anti-mouse secondary antibody HRP conjugate (1:10000, #31430, Invitrogen). Membranes were washed three times in TBS-0.1% Tween for 10 min before revelation using Immobilon ECL Ultra Western HRP Substrate (WBULS0100, Merck) and signal acquisition on an Amersham Imager 680 (GE Healthcare).

To test the capacity of mutated Env to mediate the binding of vector particles to cells, HT1080 cells were incubated with the FVV particles (1, 10 and 100 particles/cell) on ice for 1 h. The cells were washed three times with PBS to eliminate unbound FVV and RNA was extracted using an RNeasy plus mini-Kit (Qiagen) according to manufacturer's protocol and RT performed as described for FVV RNA

quantification. Bound FVV was quantified by qPCR of the *bgal* gene as described for vector titration;
cells were quantified by qPCR amplification of the *hgapdh* gene with the following primers: hGAPDH_F
5' GGAGCGAGATCCCTCCAAAAT 3' and hGAPDH_R 5' GGCTGTTGTCATACTTCTCATGG 3'. The qPCR
reaction conditions were the same as those used to amplify the *bgal* gene. The relative mRNA
expression of *bgal* versus *hgapdh* was calculated using the -ΔΔCt method, and relative binding as 2-
ΔΔCt.

Statistical analysis

Mutations in the immunoadhesins modified their ability to block the nAbs in two ways: either by
reducing avidity, leading to a higher IC_{50}, or by the fraction of plasma nAb blocked, leading to lower
maximal infectivity. For each plasma sample, the IC_{50} and MaxI were tested for the WT immunoadhesin
in at least five experiments. The threshold value defining a statistically significant change rerlative to
WT was defined as the mean + 3*SD for the IC_{50} and the mean - 3*SD for MaxI. Thresholds were defined
for each plasma sample. The infectious titers, particle concentration, percentage of infectious
particles, and quantity of bound FVV carrying WT and mutant immunoadhesins were compared using
the ANOVA test for paired samples and Sidak's multiple comparisons test (GraphPad Prism 9 software).

Acknowledgements

600 We thank H. Mouquet and V. Lorin for sharing the 293-F cells and advice. We are grateful to Mathilde
601 Couteaudier for mentoring MD and LTD in their performance of the experimental work. We used
602 devices from the Cytometry and Biomarker Utechs at the Institut Pasteur and we thank their staff for
603 their support and advice. We thank Delphine Brun from the Unité de Virologie Structurale for technical
604 assistance. The manuscript has been edited by a native English speaker.

Funding

This work was supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-10-LABX62-IBEID, Intra-Labex
Grant (M.B.)), and the Programme de Recherche Transversal from the Institut Pasteur (PTR2020-353
ZOOFOAMENV, F.B.). SFV protein production was supported by the European Virus Archive-GLOBAL
project, which has received funding from the EU Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme
(grant agreement number 871029). L.T.D. was supported by the Pasteur-Paris-University (PPU)
International Doctoral Program and the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale, including additional
supportive funding from the Danish Pasteur Society, Augustinus Fonden, Knud-Højgaards Fond, and
Viet-Jacobsen Fonden. The funding agencies had no role in the study design, generation of results, or
writing of the manuscript.

Authors contribution

FB, MB, FR, and AG designed the project. FB and MB supervised the project and acquired funding. LTD, IF, YC, MD, and TM performed the experiments. LTD, IF, FB, and MB analyzed the data. AG, RN, and CBN collected the human samples. LTD and YC provided figures and text elements for the draft. FB wrote the initial and final drafts. All authors participated in reviewing the drafts.

References

1. Rethwilm, A. and J. Bodem, Evolution of foamy viruses: the most ancient of all retroviruses. *Viruses* **5,** 2349-2374 (2013).
2. Pinto-Santini, D.M., C.R. Stenbak, and M.L. Linial, Foamy virus zoonotic infections. *Retrovirology* **14,** 55 (2017).
3. Betsem, E., R. Rua, P. Tortevoye, A. Froment, and A. Gessain, Frequent and recent human acquisition of simian foamy viruses through apes' bites in Central Africa. *PLoS Pathog.* **7,** e1002306 (2011).
4. Filippone, C., et al., A severe bite from a nonhuman primate is a major risk factor for HTLV-1 infection in hunters from Central Africa. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **60,** 1667-1676 (2015).
5. Buseyne, F., et al., Clinical signs and blood test results among humans infected with zoonotic simian foamy virus: a case-control study. *J. Infect. Dis.* **218,** 144-151 (2018).
6. Gessain, A., et al., Case-control study of immune status in humans infected with zoonotic gorilla simian foamy viruses. *J. Infect. Dis.* **221,** 1724-1733 (2020).
7. Lambert, C., et al., Potent neutralizing antibodies in humans infected with zoonotic simian foamy viruses target conserved epitopes located in the dimorphic domain of the surface envelope protein. *PLoS Pathog.* **14,** e1007293 (2018).
8. Williams, D.K. and A.S. Khan, Role of neutralizing antibodies in controlling simian foamy virus transmission and infection. *Transfusion* **50,** 200-207 (2010).
9. Couteaudier, M., et al., Plasma antibodies from humans infected with zoonotic simian foamy virus do not inhibit cell-to-cell transmission of the virus despite binding to the surface of infected cells. *PLoS Pathog.* **18,** e1010470 (2022).
10. Galvin, T.A., I.A. Ahmed, M. Shahabuddin, T. Bryan, and A.S. Khan, Identification of recombination in the envelope gene of simian foamy virus serotype 2 isolated from Macaca cyclopis. *J. Virol.* **87,** 8792-8797 (2013).
11. Richard, L., et al., Cocirculation of two *env* molecular variants, of possible recombinant origin, in gorilla and chimpanzee simian foamy virus strains from Central Africa. *J. Virol.* **89,** 12480-12491 (2015).
12. Aiewsakun, P., et al., Modular nature of simian foamy virus genomes and their evolutionary history. *Virus Evol.* **5,** vez032 (2019).
13. Duda, A., D. Luftenegger, T. Pietschmann, and D. Lindemann, Characterization of the prototype foamy virus envelope glycoprotein receptor-binding domain. *J. Virol.* **80,** 8158-8167 (2006).
14. Fernandez, I., et al., The crystal structure of a simian Foamy Virus receptor binding domain provides clues on the entry to host cells. (2022, submitted).
15. Couteaudier, M., D. Calzada-Fraile, T. Montange, A. Gessain, and F. Buseyne, Inhibitors of the interferon response increase the replication of gorilla simian foamy viruses. *Virology* **541,** 25-31 (2020).
16. Rua, R., E. Betsem, T. Montange, F. Buseyne, and A. Gessain, *In vivo* cellular tropism of gorilla simian foamy virus in blood of infected humans. *J. Virol.* **88,** 13429-13435 (2014).
17. Luftenegger, D., M. Picard-Maureau, N. Stanke, A. Rethwilm, and D. Lindemann, Analysis and function of prototype foamy virus envelope N glycosylation. *J. Virol.* **79,** 7664-7672 (2005).

18. Berg, A., T. Pietschmann, A. Rethwilm, and D. Lindemann, Determinants of foamy virus
envelope glycoprotein mediated resistance to superinfection. *Virology* **314,** 243-252 (2003).
19. Effantin, G., et al., Cryo-electron microscopy structure of the native prototype foamy virus
glycoprotein and virus architecture. *PLoS Pathog.* **12,** e1005721 (2016).
20. Lambert, C., et al., An immunodominant and conserved B-cell epitope in the envelope of
simian foamy virus recognized by humans infected with zoonotic strains from apes. *J. Virol.* **93,**
e00068-00019 (2019).
21. Netzer, K.O., A. Rethwilm, B. Maurer, and V. Termeulen, Identification of the major
immunogenic structural proteins of human foamy virus. *J. Gen. Virol.* **71,** 1237-1241 (1990).
22. Hahn, H., et al., Reactivity of primate sera to foamy virus Gag and Bet proteins. *J. Gen. Virol.*
75, 2635-2644 (1994).
23. Herchenroder, O., et al., Specific binding of recombinant foamy virus envelope protein to host
cells correlates with susceptibility to infection. *Virology* **255,** 228-236 (1999).
24. Cummins, J.E., et al., Mucosal and systemic antibody responses in humans infected with simian
foamy virus. *J. Virol.* **79,** 13186-13189 (2005).
25. Switzer, W.M., et al., Ancient co-speciation of simian foamy viruses and primates. *Nature* **434,**
376-380 (2005).
26. McCoy, L.E., et al., Incomplete neutralization and deviation from sigmoidal neutralization
curves for HIV broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibodies. *PLoS Pathog.* **11,** e1005110 (2015).
27. Doores, K.J. and D.R. Burton, Variable loop glycan dependency of the broad and potent HIV-1-
neutralizing antibodies PG9 and PG16. *J. Virol.* **84,** 10510-10521 (2010).
28. Kim, A.S., D.P. Leaman, and M.B. Zwick, Antibody to gp41 MPER alters functional properties of
HIV-1 Env without complete neutralization. *PLoS Pathog.* **10,** e1004271 (2014).
29. Prasad, V.M., et al., Cryo-ET of Env on intact HIV virions reveals structural variation and
positioning on the Gag lattice. *Cell* **185,** 641-653 (2022).
30. Hill, C.L., P.D. Bieniasz, and M.O. McClure, Properties of human foamy virus relevant to its
development as a vector for gene therapy. *J. Gen. Virol.* **80,** 2003-2009 (1999).
31. Burkhart, M.D., S.C. Kayman, Y.X. He, and A. Pinter, Distinct mechanisms of neutralization by
monoclonal antibodies specific for sites in the N-terminal or C-terminal domain of murine
leukemia virus SU. *J. Virol.* **77,** 3993-4003 (2003).
32. Chuang, G.Y., et al., Structural Survey of Broadly Neutralizing Antibodies Targeting the HIV-1
Env Trimer Delineates Epitope Categories and Characteristics of Recognition. *Structure* **27,**
196-206.e196 (2019).
33. Murin, C.D., I.A. Wilson, and A.B. Ward, Antibody responses to viral infections: a structural
perspective across three different enveloped viruses. *Nature Microbiology* **4,** 734-747 (2019).
34. McLellan, J.S., et al., Structure of HIV-1 gp120 V1/V2 domain with broadly neutralizing
antibody PG9. *Nature* **480,** 336-U386 (2011).
35. Milligan, J.C., et al., Asymmetric and non-stoichiometric glycoprotein recognition by two
distinct antibodies results in broad protection against ebolaviruses. *Cell* **185,** 995-1007.e1018
(2022).
36. Bangaru, S., et al., A site of vulnerability on the Influenza virus hemagglutinin head domain
trimer interface. *Cell* **177,** 1136-1152.e1118 (2019).
37. Turner, H.L., et al., Disassembly of HIV envelope glycoprotein trimer immunogens is driven by
antibodies elicited via immunization. *Science Adv.* **7,** eabh2791 (2021).
38. Bermejo-Jambrina, M., et al., Infection and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 depend on heparan
sulfate proteoglycans. *EMBO J.* **40,** e106765 (2021).
39. Hötzel, I., Deep-time structural evolution of retroviral and filoviral surface envelope proteins.
J. Virol. **96,** e00063-00022 (2022).
40. Rua, R., E. Betsem, S. Calattini, A. Saib, and A. Gessain, Genetic characterization of simian
foamy viruses infecting humans. *J. Virol.* **86,** 13350-13359 (2012).
41. Wagner, T.C. and J. Bodem, Sequence errors in foamy virus sequences in the GenBank
database: resequencing of the prototypic foamy virus proviral plasmids. *Arch. Virol.* (2016).

42. Singh, H., H.R. Ansari, and G.P. Raghava, Improved method for linear B-cell epitope prediction
using antigen's primary sequence. *PLoS One* **8,** e62216 (2013).
43. Larsen, J.E., O. Lund, and M. Nielsen, Improved method for predicting linear B-cell epitopes.
Immunome Res. **2,** 2 (2006).
44. Ponomarenko, J., et al., ElliPro: a new structure-based tool for the prediction of antibody
epitopes. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9,** 514 (2008).
45. Hutter, S., E. Mullers, N. Stanke, J. Reh, and D. Lindemann, Prototype foamy virus protease
activity is essential for intraparticle reverse transcription initiation but not absolutely required
for uncoating upon host cell entry. *J. Virol.* **87,** 3163-3176 (2013).
46. Heinkelein, M., et al., Improved primate foamy virus vectors and packaging constructs. *J. Virol.*
76, 3774-3783 (2002).
47. Krey, T., et al., The disulfide bonds in glycoprotein E2 of hepatitis C virus reveal the tertiary
organization of the molecule. *PLoS Pathog.* **6,** e1000762 (2010).
48. Bunch, T.A., Y. Grinblat, and L.S. Goldstein, Characterization and use of the Drosophila
metallothionein promoter in cultured Drosophila melanogaster cells. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **16,** 1043-
1061 (1988).
49. Backovic, M. and T. Krey, Stable drosophila cell lines: An alternative approach to exogenous
protein expression. *Meth. Mol. Biol.* **1350,** 349-358 (2016).
50. Lambert, C., R. Rua, A. Gessain, and F. Buseyne, A new sensitive indicator cell line reveals cross-
transactivation of the viral LTR by gorilla and chimpanzee simian foamy viruses. *Virology* **496,**
219-226 (2016).
51. Gliniak, B.C., S.L. Kozak, R.T. Jones, and D. Kabat, Disulfide bonding controls the processing of
retroviral envelope glycoproteins. *J Biol Chem* **266,** 22991-22997 (1991).
52. Kelley, L.A., S. Mezulis, C.M. Yates, M.N. Wass, and M.J. Sternberg, The Phyre2 web portal for
protein modeling, prediction and analysis. *Nat. Protoc.* **10,** 845-858 (2015).
53. Ansari, H.R. and G.P. Raghava, Identification of conformational B-cell Epitopes in an antigen
from its primary sequence. *Immunome Res.* **6,** 6 (2010).

Figure legends

Figure 1. SFV Env

Schematic representation of SFV Env. The precursor Env protein is cleaved by furin-like protease(s) at two sites (vertical bars) to generate LP, SU, and TM. The dark sections highlight the transmembrane regions of LP (H) and TM (MSD), and the fusion peptide (F). The minimal continuous RBD (aa 225-555, blue background) comprises two regions essential for SU binding to cells, RBD1 (aa 225-396) and RBD2 (aa 484-555) [13]. The intervening region (aa 397-483), named RBDj, can be deleted without abrogating binding to susceptible cells. B.The genotype-specific variable SU region (SUvar, aa 248-488) partially overlaps with the RBD and is the exclusive target of nAbs [7]. C. The structure of the GII-K74 RBD monomer (aa 218-552, PDB code 8AEZ, [14]) is presented in cartoon with glycans shown as sticks. RBD1, RBD2, and RBDj regions are color-coded as on panel A. Structural elements relevant for the present study are indicated, and the full description of the structure is available in [14]. D. The SUvar region (red) is rendered as solvent accessible surface. The conserved region (SUcon) is displayed in cartoon. The dashed line indicates the boundary between the lower and upper RBD subdomains.

Figure 2. Only a small proportion of plasma samples bind to peptides covering the SUvar domain

Seventeen plasma samples from African hunters were tested for binding to 37 peptides located in the SUvar domain (Supplementary Table 2). The summary graph shows positive responses (Δ_{OD}, y-axis) plotted against peptides identified by the position of their first aa (x-axis). Plasma samples are identified by a color code corresponding to the genotype(s) of the infecting strains (blue: infected with a GI strain, red: infected with a GII strain, purple: infected by strains of both genotypes [7]). Left, peptides spanning GI SUvar; right, peptides spanning GII SUvar; the RBDj region is indicated by the lighter color. Detailed binding activity is shown on the aligned SU sequences; the RBDj sequence is highlighted in italic characters; the sequence covered by peptides is highlighted by grey background. Recognized peptides are underscored and designated by the same letters as those used in panel A. Reactive plasma samples are indicated above the sequence and colored according to the genotype(s) of the infecting strains. Six plasma samples from SFV-infected individuals reacted against seven peptides located in the RBDj region (BAD551, BAK55, BAK56, BAK74, BAK82, and BAK132) and two samples reacted against a peptide located in the RBD1 or RBD2 subdomains (BAD468 and BAK56, respectively). Plasma antibody binding to the peptides was not genotype-specific. For example, sample BAK56 reacted against peptide b (399W-K418) from the GI-D468 and GII-K74 strains.

 Figure 3. The SFV SU block nAbs without affecting viral entry

A. Schematic presentation of the neutralization assay using SU immunoadhesin as competitor. Plasma

samples were diluted to achieve a reduction in the number of FVV-transduced cells by 90%. WT

immunoadhesins compete with Env on FVV for binding by nAbs, resulting in a higher number of FVV-

transduced cells; mutations in SU that affect binding by nAbs result in inefficient competition and

reduced FVV transduction. Representative images of wells with FVV-transduced cells stained by X-gal

are shown. B. Schematic representation of titration curves corresponding to SU mutants that loose

their capacity to block a fraction of nAbs (mut1, green), block all nAbs with reduced affinity (mut2 SU,

orange), or block a fraction of nAbs with reduced affinity (mut 3, pink) or those with no blocking activity

(mut4, purple). The curves are summarized by two parameters, MaxI and IC_{50}, which were compared

to those obtained with WT SU (panel C and D) to define significant differences in binding (see Materials

and Methods). C. The BAK132 (anti-GI) and MEBAK88 (anti-GII) plasma samples were incubated with

immunoadhesins and the mix added to FVVs expressing matched Env before titration. The relative

proportion of transduced cells is expressed as the percentage of cells transduced by untreated FVVs

(no plasma and no protein), is referred to as the relative infectivity, and is presented as a function of

protein concentration. The addition of ^{CI}SU (blue symbols) inhibited the action of nAbs from sample

BAK132, as shown by increased CI-PFV Env FVV relative infectivity, whereas ^{GII}SU (red symbols) had no

effect. Conversely, ^{GII}SU inhibited the action of nAbs from sample MEBAK88. ^{MLV}SU (grey symbols) had

no effect on the plasma antibodies. D. The infectivity of the CI-PFV and GII-K74 Env vectors was

quantified in the presence of ^{CI}SU, ^{GII}SU, and ^{MLV}SU; the relative infectivity is presented as a function of

protein concentration. E and F. Thirteen pairs of plasma samples and genotype-matched

immunoadhesins were tested at least five times for their activity against FFVs. The mean and standard

error of the mean of the IC_{50} (panel E) and MaxI (panel F) are shown for the CI-PFV Env vectors and

anti-GI plasma samples (blue symbols) and the GII-K74 Env vectors and anti-GII plasma samples (red

symbols).

Figure 4. SFV-specific nAbs recognize glycans on SUvar

A. Schematic representation of N-glycosylation sites on the SUvar domain. The N7' site (position 374,

brown symbol) is absent from CI-PFV but present in zoonotic gorilla SFV and several chimpanzee SFVs

[11]. The N8 site (position 391, bold stem) is required for SU expression [17]. The N10 site has a

genotype-specific location (N411 in GII strains, red symbol; N422 or 423 in GI/CI strains, blue symbol).

The glycosylation sites outside SUvar are shown in grey. B. The RBD is shown as a solvent accessible

surface, with SUvar in dark grey and SUcon in light grey. Side chains of the glycans are shown in orange

and were identified on deglycosylated RBD; the N5 glycan was poorly resolved and N286 is colored to

indicate the localization of its anchor. C and D. To determine whether SFV-specific nAbs target residue

glycosylated epitopes, vectors carrying CI-PFV or GII-K74 Env were mixed with four genotype-matched plasma samples previously incubated with untreated, kifunensine (C), or kifunensine and endo-H treated (D) ^{GII}SU at several concentrations. E. To test whether nAbs target the genotype-specific N10 glycosylation site, the immunoadhesin in which N10 was inactivated (^{GII}ΔN10) was incubated with four genotype-matched plasma samples. F. Residues 407-413 were swapped with those from the GI-D468 strain and the resulting ^{GII}swap407 was tested for its ability to block four anti-GII plasma samples. The glycosylation sites located on the immunoadhesins were inactivated one by one (except N8) and tested for their inability to block four GII-specific plasma samples (G to K). ^{GII}ΔN7' was tested against three additional samples to confirm its impact on nAbs (J). For each plasma sample, the IC$_{50}$ is presented as a function of MaxI for untreated and enzyme-treated ^{GII}SU (C and D) or ^{GII}SU and mutated immunoadhesins (E to K). The IC$_{50}$ and MaxI values for untreated ^{GII}SU are presented as open symbols and are from the same experiment in which the mutant immunoadhesins were tested. For the enzyme-treated and mutated immunoadhesins, the symbols are colored according to the IC$_{50}$ and MaxI thresholds that were used to statistically define significant differences from ^{GII}SU.

Figure 5. Most SFV-specific nAbs recognize the RBDj domain

A. Schematic representation of functional RBD subdomains [13], loops, and HBS identified in [14]. B. The RBD is shown as a solvent accessible surface with SUvar in dark grey, SUcon in light grey, L2 in orange, L3 in green, L4 in maroon, and HBS in black. To locate SFV-specific nAb epitopes on SU functional domains, vectors carrying GII-K74 Env were treated with GII-specific plasma samples previously incubated with ^{GII}SU and mutant immunoadhesin with RDBj deleted (^{GII}ΔRBDj, C), the Env ectodomain with WT or mutated HBS (^{GII}K342A-R343A in panel D and ^{GII}K356A-R369A in panel E), and immunoadhesins with deleted loops (^{GII}ΔL2, ^{GII}ΔL3, and ^{GII}ΔL4 in panels F to H). For each plasma sample, the IC$_{50}$ is presented as a function of MaxI for ^{GII}SU and the mutated immunoadhesins. The IC$_{50}$ and MaxI values for ^{GII}SU are presented as open symbols and are from the same experiment in which the mutant immunoadhesins were tested. Symbols are colored according to the IC$_{50}$ and MaxI thresholds used to define statistically significant differences from ^{GII}SU; we applied the same threshold values for the analyses of the Env ectodomain, which had the same inhibitory activity as ^{GII}SU (Supplementary Fig. 2).

Figure 6. Epitope disruption by glycan insertion revealed additional sites recognized by nAbs

A. Schematic representation of the seven sites of glycan insertion on SU. Functional RBD subdomains and loops are indicated using the same color code as in Fig.5. B. The RBD is shown as a solvent accessible surface with SUvar in dark grey, SUcon in light grey, and the seven glycan insertion sites in

orange; front (top) and back (bottom) views are shown. B'. The 345-353 loop and adjacent helix are presented as ribbons and side chains for GII-K74 (red) and CI-PFV (blue, AlphaFold2-predicted structure). C to I: Seven candidate genotype-specific sequences (Supplementary Table 5) were disrupted by inserting glycans in the immunoadhesins that were tested for their capacity to block nAbs. J to M: five mutant immunoadhesins were tested to characterize the epitopic region in the 345-353 loop. All mutants were tested against at least four plasma samples. Those for which the capacity to block nAbs was the most altered were then tested on additional samples. For each plasma sample, the IC_{50} is presented as a function of MaxI for ^{GII}SU and the mutant SUs. The IC_{50} and MaxI values of ^{GII}SU are presented as open symbols and are those from the same experiment in which the mutated immunoadhesins were tested. Symbols are colored according to the IC_{50} and MaxI thresholds used to statistically define significant differences from ^{GII}SU. $^{GII}swap333$ was tested twice at three concentrations and showed similar blocking capacity as ^{GII}SU; the IC_{50} values were arbitrarily set to the same level as those of ^{GII}SU (see Materials and Methods).

Figure 7. GI and GII-specific nAbs target different epitopes

CI SU immunoadhesins with mutations matching the most informative GII-K74 mutations were tested for their capacity to block nAbs from GI-specific plasma samples. A, Kifunensin-treated ^{CI}SU; B, Kifunensin and endoH-treated ^{CI}SU; C, $^{CI}\Delta N10$; D, $^{CI}350_{glyc}$; E, $^{CI}\Delta RBDj$; F, $^{CI}\Delta L2$; G, $^{CI}\Delta L3$; H, $^{CI}\Delta L4$; I, $^{CI}463_{glyc}$; J, $^{GII}swapRBDj$; K, ^{GII}SU; L, $^{CI}swapL3$. All mutants were tested against four plasma samples. Those for which the capacity to block nAbs was the most altered were then tested on additional samples. For each plasma sample, the IC_{50} is presented as a function of MaxI for the ^{CI}SU and mutant immunoadhesins. The IC_{50} and MaxI values of ^{CI}SU are presented as open symbols and are those from the same experiment in which the mutant immunoadhesins were tested. For mutant immunoadhesins, the symbols are colored according to the IC_{50} and MaxI thresholds used to statistically define significant differences from ^{CI}SU. The red lines correspond to data obtained with GII-specific plasma samples against equivalent constructs (Panels 4C, 4D, 4E, 5C, 5F, 5H, 6E, and 6H match panels 7A to 7H, respectively).

Figure 8. Most samples contain nAbs that recognize several epitopic regions on SUvar

The results from competition experiments were summarized for each plasma sample and for the mutant immunoadhesins from the most targeted regions (apex, 345-353 loop, and the N7' region). Four outcomes are presented: same recognition as WT SU (green), recognition with reduced affinity (i.e., increased IC_{50}, orange vertical shading), blocking a smaller fraction of nAbs than WT SU (i.e., reduced MaxI, orange horizontal shading), or having both effects, orange. Black squares indicate the major epitopic regions of the GII- and GI-specific samples (panels A and B, respectively). Within each

epitopic region defined by several mutant immunoadhesins, nAb specificity varied between individuals.

Figure 9. nAbs target epitopic regions involved in SU binding to susceptible cells or required for viral infectivity

A. HT1080 cells were incubated with the panel of tested immunadhesins (Fig. 4 to 7). Cell-bound immunoadhesins were detected by staining with a fluorescently labeled antibody targeting the murine IgG Fc fragment. Stained cells were analyzed on a flow cell cytometer. Supplementary Fig. 8 presents the gating strategy and normalization of the results to the levels of bound WT immunoadhesins (^{GII}SU and ^{CI}SU). Binding levels of GII mutants (red symbols) are presented in the same order as in Fig. 4, 5 and 6. CI mutants (blue symbols) are presented side-by-side with the corresponding and related GII mutants, with a colored background. Mutated HBS shows reduced binding to susceptible cells, as shown in [14]. C. Three batches of FVVs carrying WT or mutated Env were produced. The concentration of vector particles was quantified by RT-qPCR amplification of the *bgal* transgene. Each batch was titrated twice and the mean titers are presented; lines represent the mean values from the three FVV batches. D. FVV infectious titers were quantified on BHK-21 cells. Each batch was titrated twice and the mean titers are presented; lines represent the mean values from the three FVV batches. E. FVVs carrying WT and mutated Env were incubated with HT1080 cells on ice for 1 h before washing and quantification of *bgal* mRNA incorporated in the vector particles and the *gapdh* gene of susceptible cells. The FVV dose was 10 FVV particles per cell. The levels of *bgal* and cellular *gapdh* mRNA were quantified by RT-qPCR; the ΔΔCt method was used to calculate the relative amount of FVV particles bound to cells. Values below the threshold were arbitrarily set at 0.0005. Lines represent the mean values from tested FVV batches. The dotted lines in panels B to D represent the quantification threshold. The infectious titers, particle concentration, and levels of bound particles from FVVs carrying mutant or WT SU were compared using the ANOVA test and Sidak's multiple comparison test, $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$, $****p < 0.0001$.

 Figure 10. Schematic summary of current knowledge on SFV Env.

A. The RBD domain is composed of two subdomains located at the top of Env trimers; the drawing

highlights the region involved in trimer assembly and the HBS [14, 19]. B. Genetic studies on SFV strains

circulating in Central Africa have identified two genotypes that differ in the sequence encoding the

central part of the SU (SUvar) domain [11, 12]. The SUvar domain forms the upper part of the RBD

(SUvar^{Up}) prolonged, in the lower subdomain, by an arm (SUvar^{Lo}) wrapping around the stem of which

the sequence is conserved (SUcon). Binding studies defined the RBD as being bipartite, with two

essential binding regions (RBD1 and RBD2) separated by RBDj [13]. These regions form the bottom of

SUvar^{Up} and SUvar^{Lo} (variable part of RBD1), the top of SUvar^{Up} (RBDj), and the stem (short conserved

fragment of RBD1 and RBD2). C. nAbs exclusively target the SUvar domain [7]. In the present paper,

we identified GII-specific epitopes in the SUvar^{Up} and SUvar^{Lo} domains and GI-specific epitopes in

SUvar^{Up} only. nAbs recognized L2, L3, and L4 of SUvar^{Up} and the N7' region and 345-353 loop of SUvar^{Lo}

(lines ending with a dot). Glycans inserted in both domains revealed additional epitopic sites (lines

ending with a triangle).

    Figure 1. SFV Env

Figure 2. Only a small proportion of plasma samples bind to peptides spanning the SUvar

918   domain

```
CI-PFV      LVKYKEPKPW  PKEGLIADQC  PLPGYHAGLT  YNRQSIWDYY       276
                        BAD468[g1g2]
GI-D468     LVKYKTPQPW  PSEELIADQC  PLPGYHAGVE  YTTQAIWDYY       276

GII-K74     LVKYKTPQPW  PNEGLIADQC  PLPGLADVSF  YPYQAIWDYY       276

IKVESIRPAN  WTTKSKYGQA  RLGSFYIPSS  LRQINVSHVL  FCSDQLYSKW       326
IKVEITRPKN  WTSYAQYGNA  RLGSFFIPPH  VRK-NFTHVL  FCSDQLYAKW       325
AKIENIRPAN  WTSSKLYGKA  RMGSYYIPKR  LRNINNTHIL  FCSDVLYSKW       326

YNIENTIEQN  ERFLLNKLNN  LTSGTSVLKK  RALPKDWSSQ  GKNALFREIN       376
YNIENTLLKN  EELLQKKLNN  LTELTSLLKK  RALPRTWTTQ  GKNNLFRNIT       375
YNLQNSILQN  ENELTKRLSN  LT-IGNKLKN  RALPYEWAKG  GLNRLFRNIS       375

VLDICSKPES  VILLNTSYYS  FSLWEGDCNF  TKDMISQLVP  ECDGFYNNSK       426
                        b-BAK56[g1]
VLDVCNRPEM  VLLLNISYDL  FSLWEGDCNY  TKDKISEIVP  QCKGFYNNSK       425
                        b-BAK56[g1] BAK82[g1]
VLDVCSRPEM  VLLLNKTYYT  FSLWEGDCNI  TRYNVNETVP  ECKDFPHRR-       424

WMHMHPYACR  FWRSKNEKEE  TKCRDGETKR  CLYYPLWDSP  ESTYDFGYLA       476
                        c-BAD551[g2] BAK55[g1g2] BAK74[g1g2]
WMHMHPYACR  FWRNKNEKEE  TKCDGRDDNK  CLYYPLWDSP  EATYDFGFLA       475
-FNDHPYSCR  LWRYREGKEE  VKCLTSDHTR  CLYYPEYSNP  EALFDFGFLS       473

d-BAK132[g1]
YQKNFPSPIC  IEQQKIRDQD  YEVYSLYQER  KIASKAYGID  TVLFSLKNFL       526
                e-BAK56[g1]
YQNNFPAPIC  ISSKQIRQQD  YEVYSIYQEC  KLASRIHGID  SVLFSLKNFL       525
                e-BAK56[g1]
YMRNFPGPQC  IESTSIRQQD  YEVYSIYQEC  KLASKTYGID  SVLFSLKNFL       523
```

Figure 3. The SFV SU blocks nAbs without affecting viral entry

Figure 4. SFV-specific nAbs recognize glycans on SUvar

Figure 5. Most SFV-specific nAbs recognize the RBDj domain

Figure 6. Epitope disruption by glycan insertion reveals additional nAb recognition sites

Figure 7. GI and GII-specific nAbs target different epitopes

CI-PFV Env vector + anti-GI plasma

○ BAD348	▽ BAD468	○ BAK132			
△ BAD448	◇ BAK55	□ LOBAK2			

Mutant vs. ^{GII}SU	$IC_{50mut} = IC_{50wt}$	$IC_{50mut} > IC_{50wt}$
$MaxI_{mut} = MaxI_{wt}$	●	◐
$MaxI_{mut} < MaxI_{wt}$	●	○

Figure 8. Most samples contain nAbs that recognize several epitopic regions on SUvar

Figure 9. nAbs target epitopic regions involved in SU binding to susceptible cells or required for viral infectivity

Figure 10. Schematic summary of current knowledge on SFV Env